EMBEDDING TOPOLOGICAL SPACES INTO HAUSDORFF $\omega$-BOUNDED SPACES

TARAS BANAKH, SERHII BARDYLA, AND ALEX RAVSKY

Abstract. We discuss the problem of embeddibility of a topological space into a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space, and present two canonical constructions of such an embedding.

1. Introduction

It is well-known that a topological space $X$ is homeomorphic to a subspace of a compact Hausdorff space if and only if the space $X$ is Tychonoff.

A topological space $X$ is $\omega$-bounded if each countable set in $X$ has compact closure in $X$. It is clear that each compact space is $\omega$-bounded. The ordinal $\omega_1 := [0, \omega_1)$ endowed with the order topology is $\omega$-bounded but not compact. More information on $\omega$-bounded spaces can be found in [4], [6].

In this paper we discuss the following

Problem 1.1. Which topological spaces are homeomorphic to subspaces of $\omega$-bounded Hausdorff spaces?

In Theorem 5.1 we shall prove that the necessary and sufficient conditions of embeddability of a $T_1$-topological space $X$ into a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space are the $\omega$-regularity and $\omega$-normality of $X$, respectively. $\omega$-Regular and $\omega$-normal spaces are introduced and studied in Section 2. In Sections 3, 4 we present two canonical constructions of embedding a topological space into a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space and in Section 5 we prove that these two constructions are equivalent for $\omega$-normal spaces. In the last Section 6 we construct a space that embeds into a Hausdorff $\omega$-compact space but is not functionally Hausdorff, and a (consistent) example of a sequentially compact separable regular space which is not Tychonoff and hence does not embed into a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space.

2. $\omega$-Regular and $\omega$-Normal Spaces

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of closed subsets of a topological space $X$. The topological space $X$ is called

- $\mathcal{F}$-regular if for any set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and point $x \in X \setminus F$ there exist disjoint open sets $U, V \subseteq X$ such that $F \subseteq U$ and $x \in V$;
- $\mathcal{F}$-Tychonoff if for any set $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and point $x \in X \setminus F$ there exist a continuous function $f : X \to [0, 1]$ such that $f(F) \subseteq \{0\}$ and $f(x) = 1$;
- $\mathcal{F}$-normal if for any disjoint sets $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ there exist disjoint open sets $U, V \subseteq X$ such that $A \subseteq U$ and $B \subseteq V$.

It is easy to see that a topological space is $\mathcal{F}$-regular if it is $\mathcal{F}$-Tychonoff or $\mathcal{F}$-normal. However, the $\mathcal{F}$-normality does not imply the $\mathcal{F}$-Tychonoff property, see Example 6.1 below.

Proposition 2.1. If a topological space $X$ is $\mathcal{F}$-regular for some family $\mathcal{F}$ of closed Lindelöf subspaces of $X$, then $X$ is $\mathcal{F}$-normal.

Proof. To show that $X$ is $\mathcal{F}$-normal, fix any two disjoint closed sets $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$. By the $\mathcal{F}$-regularity, for every $a \in A$ there exists an open neighborhood $V_a \subseteq X$ of $a$ whose closure $\overline{V}_a$ in $X$ does not
intersect the set $B$. By the Lindelöf property of $A$ the open cover $\{V_a : a \in A\}$ of $A$ has a countable subcover $\{V_{a_n}\}_{n \in \omega}$.

By analogy, for every for every $b \in B$ there exists an open neighborhood $U_b \subset X$ of $b$ whose closure $\overline{U_b}$ in $X$ does not intersect the set $A$. By the Lindelöf property of $B$, the open cover $\{U_b : b \in B\}$ of $B$ has a countable subcover $\{U_{b_n}\}_{n \in \omega}$. For every $n \in \omega$ let

$$V_A = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} V_{a_n} \setminus \bigcup_{k \leq n} \overline{U_{b_k}} \quad \text{and} \quad U_B = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} U_{b_n} \setminus \bigcup_{k \leq n} \overline{V_{a_k}}.$$ 

It is can be shown that $V_A, U_B$ are two disjoint open neighborhoods of the sets $A, B$, witnessing that the space $X$ is $\mathcal{F}$-normal. \hfill \qed

A topological space $X$ is called $\mathcal{F}$-normal (resp. $\mathcal{F}$-regular, $\mathcal{F}$-Tychonoff) if it is $\mathcal{F}$-normal (resp. $\mathcal{F}$-regular, $\mathcal{F}$-Tychonoff) for the family $\mathcal{F}$ of closed subsets of closed separable subspaces of $X$.

**Proposition 2.2.** Each $\omega$-bounded Hausdorff space $X$ is $\mathcal{F}$-normal.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of closed subspaces of closed separable subsets in $X$. Given two disjoint closed sets $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, we observe that the sets $A, B$ are compact. By the Hausdorff property of $X$, the disjoint compact sets $A, B$ have disjoint open neighborhoods. \hfill \qed

**Corollary 2.3.** Each subspace $X$ of an $\omega$-bounded Hausdorff space $Y$ is $\mathcal{F}$-regular.

**Proof.** Let $F$ be a closed subspace of a closed separable subspace $E \subset X$ and let $x \in X \setminus F$ be a point. The $\omega$-boundedness of $Y$ ensures that the closure $\overline{F}$ of $F$ in $Y$ is compact. Then so is the closure $\overline{F'}$ of $F'$ in $Y$. Since $x \notin \overline{F'} = X \setminus \overline{F}'$, by the Hausdorff property of $Y$ there exist two disjoint open sets $V, U \subset Y$ such that $x \in V$ and $\overline{F'} \subset U$. Then $V \cap X$ and $U \cap X$ are two disjoint open sets in $X$ such that $x \in V \cap X$ and $F \subset U \cap X$, which means that the space $X$ is $\mathcal{F}$-regular. \hfill \qed

**Proposition 2.4.** Each separable subspace $X$ of an $\omega$-bounded Hausdorff space $Y$ is Tychonoff.

**Proof.** Let $D$ be a countable dense subset in $X$. By definition of an $\omega$-bounded space, the closure $\overline{D}$ of $D$ in $Y$ is compact and being Hausdorff is Tychonoff. Then $X \subset \overline{D}$ is Tychonoff, too. \hfill \qed

3. The maximal $\omega$-compactification of a topological space

**Definition 3.1.** For a topological space $X$ its maximal $\omega$-compactification is a pair $(M_\omega X, i_X)$ consisting of a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space $M_\omega X$ and a continuous map $i_X : X \to M_\omega X$ such that for any continuous map $f : X \to Y$ to a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space $Y$ there exists a unique continuous map $\hat{f} : M_\omega X \to Y$ such that $\hat{f} = f \circ i_X$.

**Theorem 3.2.** Every topological space $X$ has a maximal $\omega$-compactification $(M_\omega X, i_X)$. Moreover, this $\omega$-compactification is unique in the sense that for any other maximal $\omega$-compactification $(M_\omega' X, i_X')$ there exists a unique homeomorphism $h : M_\omega X \to M_\omega' X$ such that $h \circ i_X = i_X'$.

**Proof.** In the proof we follow the classical idea of Kakutani [1]. If $X = \emptyset$, then put $M_\omega X = \emptyset$ and $i_X : X \to M_\omega X$ be the unique map between the empty sets. So, assume that $X$ is not empty.

Consider the cardinal $\kappa = 2^{2^{|X|}}$. For any non-zero cardinal $\lambda \leq \kappa$ let $T_\lambda$ be the family of all possible topologies on $\lambda$, turning $\lambda$ into a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space $\lambda_\tau := (\lambda, \tau)$. It is clear that $|T_\lambda| \leq 2^{2^{|X|}}$. For every topology $\tau \in T_\lambda$ let $\mathcal{F}_\tau$ be the family of all continuous functions from $X$ to $(\lambda, \tau)$. Now consider the Tychonoff product $\Pi := \prod_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \kappa} \prod_{\tau \in T_\lambda} \lambda_\tau^{2^{|X|}}$ and the diagonal map

$$i_X : X \to \Pi, \quad i_X : x \mapsto ((f(x))_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\tau})_{\tau \in T_\lambda}_{0 \leq \lambda \leq \kappa}.$$ 

Let $M_\omega X$ be the closure of $X$ in the space $\Pi$. The space $\Pi$ is Hausdorff and $\omega$-bounded, being the Tychonoff product of the Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded spaces $\lambda_\tau$. Then the closed subspace $M_\omega X$ of $\Pi$ also is Hausdorff and $\omega$-bounded.

It remains to show that the pair $(M_\omega X, i_X)$ is a maximal $\omega$-compactification of $X$. Given any continuous map $g : X \to Y$ to a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space $Y$, we need to find a unique continuous map $\hat{g} : M_\omega X \to Y$ such that $\hat{g} = g \circ i_X$. The uniqueness of $\hat{g}$ follows from the density of $i_X(X)$ in $M_\omega X$ and the Hausdorffness of $Y$. To show that the map $\hat{g}$ exists, consider the closure
$g(X)$ of $g(X)$ in $Y$. By [3] 1.5.3, $|g(X)| \leq 2^{2^{||g(X)||}} \leq 2^{2^{|X|}} = \kappa$. Put $\lambda = |g(X)|$ and take any bijection $h : g(X) \to \lambda$. Endow $\lambda$ with the topology $\tau = \{ h(U) : U \subset g(X) \text{ is open} \}$ and observe that $h : g(X) \to (\lambda, \tau)$ is a homeomorphism. Consequently, the space $\lambda := (\lambda, \tau)$ is Hausdorff and $\omega$-bounded, and hence $\tau \in T_\lambda$. Consider the continuous map $f = h \circ g : X \to \lambda$, and let $\text{pr}_f : \Pi \to \lambda$ be the coordinate projection. Then $\tilde{g} := h^{-1} \circ \text{pr}_f \mid M_\omega X : M_\omega X \to \overline{g(X)} \subset Y$ is a required continuous map such that $\tilde{g} \circ i_X = h^{-1} \circ \text{pr}_f \circ i_X = h^{-1} \circ f = h^{-1} \circ h \circ g = g$.

The uniqueness of the maximal $\omega$-compactification follows from the definition. 

\[ \square \]

**Problem 3.3.** Characterize topological spaces $X$ for which the map $i_X : X \to M_\omega X$ is a topological embedding.

This problem will be partly answered in Theorem [5.1] using the construction of the Wallman $\omega$-compactification of a topological space, which is introduced in the next section.

4. **The Wallman $\omega$-compactification of a topological space**

We recall [3] §3.6] that the Wallman compactification $W(X)$ of a topological space $X$ consists of closed ultrfilters, i.e., families $U$ of closed subsets of $X$ satisfying the following conditions:

- $\emptyset \notin U$;
- $A \cap B \in U$ for any $A, B \in U$;
- a closed set $F \subset X$ belongs to $U$ if $F \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for every $U \in U$.

The Wallman compactification $W(X)$ of $X$ carries the topology generated by the base consisting of the sets

\[ \langle U \rangle = \{ F \in W(X) : \exists F \in F, F \subset U \} \]

where $U$ runs over open subsets of $X$.

By (the proof of) Theorem [3] 3.6.21, the Wallman compactification $W(X)$ is compact.

Let $j_X : X \to W(X)$ be the map assigning to each point $x \in X$ the principal ultralimit consisting of all closed sets $F \subset X$ containing the point $x$. It is easy to see that the image $j_X(X)$ is dense in $W(X)$. By [3] 3.6.21, for a $T_1$-space $X$ the map $j_X : X \to W(X)$ is a topological embedding.

In the Wallman compactification $W(X)$, consider the subspace

\[ W_\omega X = \bigcup \{ j_X(C) : C \subset X, |C| \leq \omega \} \]

which is the union of closures of countable subsets of $j_X(X)$ in $W(X)$. The space $W_\omega X$ will be called the Wallman $\omega$-compactification of $X$.

**Proposition 4.1.** For any topological space $X$, its Wallman $\omega$-compactification $W_\omega X$ is $\omega$-bounded.

**Proof.** We should prove that for any countable subset $\Omega \subset W_\omega X$ the closure $\overline{\Omega}$ is compact. By the definition of $W_\omega X$, for every ultralimit $u \in \Omega$ there exists a countable set $C_u \subset X$ such that $u \in j_X(C_u)$. Consider the countable set $C = \bigcup_{u \in \Omega} C_u$ and observe that the closure $\overline{j_X(C)}$ in $W(X)$ is compact (by the compactness of $W(X)$). Then the closure $\overline{\Omega}$ of $\Omega$ in $W_\omega X$ coincides with the closure of $\Omega$ in $\overline{j_X(C)}$ and hence is compact. 

The Wallman $\omega$-compactification has the following maximality property.

**Theorem 4.2.** For any continuous map $f : X \to Y$ from a topological space $X$ to a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space $Y$ there exists a unique map $\tilde{f} : W_\omega X \to Y$ such that $\tilde{f} \circ j_X = f$.

**Proof.** Given any ultralimit $u \in W_\omega X$, find a countable set $C \subset X$ such that $u \in j_X(C)$. We claim that the closure $\overline{C}$ of $C$ in $X$ belongs to the ultralimit $u$. Assuming that $\overline{C} \notin u$, we can find a closed set $F \in u$, which is disjoint with $\overline{C}$ (such a set $F$ exists by the maximality of $u$). Then $(X \setminus \overline{C})$ is an open neighborhood of $u$ in $W(X)$, disjoint with the set $j_X(C)$, which contradicts the choice of $C$. Hence $\overline{C} \in u$. By the $\omega$-boundedness of the space $Y$, the image $f(C)$ has compact closure $\overline{f(C)}$ in $Y$. Then the set $\tilde{f}[u] := \bigcap_{F \in u} \overline{f(F \cap C)}$ is not empty. We claim that this set contains a unique point. To derive a contradiction, assume that $\tilde{f}[u]$ contains two
Problem 4.4. For which spaces \(X\) that the space \(\overline{f(C)}\) exists a surjective continuous map \(\bar{f} : X \rightarrow Y\) is well-defined. It is clear that for any \(x \in X\) the set \(\bar{f}[f(x)]\) contains the point \(f(x)\), so \(\bar{f} \circ j_X = f\).

It remains to prove that the function \(\bar{f} : W_\omega X \rightarrow Y\) is continuous. Let \(U \subseteq Y\) be any open set. Since the function \(\bar{f}\) is continuous, the preimage \(V := f^{-1}(U)\) is an open subset of \(X\). We claim that \(\bar{f}^{-1}(U) = \langle V \rangle\). Indeed, for any ultrafilter \(u \in \langle V \rangle \cap W_\omega X\), we can find a closed set \(F \subseteq u\) such that \(F \subseteq V\). Since \(u \in W_\omega X\), there exists a countable set \(C \subseteq X\) such that \(u \in j_X(C)\). Then \(\bar{C} \subseteq u\). By \(\omega\)-boundedness of \(W_\omega X\), the closure \(j_X(C)\) is compact and so is the closure \(j_X(C \cap F)\). But \(j_X(C \cap F) \subseteq \langle V \rangle\). Since the map \(j_X : X \rightarrow W_\omega X\) is an embedding, the set \(\overline{C \cap F} \subseteq \overline{V}\) is compact. By the continuity of \(f\), the image \(\overline{f(C \cap F)} \subseteq U\) is compact and then \(\bar{f}(u) \in \overline{f(C \cap F)} = f(C \cap F) \subseteq U\).

Now assume that \(u \in W_\omega X \setminus \langle V \rangle\). Then \(X \setminus V \subseteq u\) and \(\bar{f}(u) \in \overline{f(X \setminus V)} \subseteq Y \setminus U = Y \setminus U\). Therefore, \(\bar{f}^{-1}(U) = \langle V \rangle\) and the map \(\bar{f}\) is continuous.

The uniqueness of \(\bar{f}\) follows from the density of \(i_X(X)\) in \(W_\omega X\) and the Hausdorff property of \(Y\).

\[\square\]

**Corollary 4.3.** For any maximal \(\omega\)-compactification \((M_\omega X, i_X)\) of a topological space \(X\), there exists a surjective continuous map \(f : W_\omega X \rightarrow M_\omega X\) such that \(f \circ j_X = i_X\).

**Proof.** By Theorem 4.2 there exists a continuous function \(f : W_\omega X \rightarrow M_\omega X\) such that \(f \circ j_X = i_X\). It remains to prove that \(f\) is surjective. Consider the subspace \(M'_\omega X = f(W_\omega X)\) of \(M_\omega X\) and observe that the pair \((M'_\omega X, i_X)\) is a maximal \(\omega\)-compactification of \(X\). Indeed, for every countable set \(C \subseteq M'_\omega X\) we can find a countable set \(D \subseteq W_\omega X\) with \(f(D) = C\). By the \(\omega\)-compactness of \(W_\omega X\), the countable set \(D\) has compact closure \(\overline{D}\) in \(W_\omega X\). By the continuity of \(f\), the image \(\overline{f(D)}\) is compact and by the Hausdorff property of \(M_\omega X\), the set \(\overline{f(D)} \supseteq C\) is closed. Then the closure \(\overline{C}\) of the set \(C\) is contained in the compact set \(\overline{f(D)} \subseteq M'_\omega X\) and hence is compact, witnessing that the space \(M'_\omega X\) is \(\omega\)-compact. To see that \((M'_\omega X, i_X)\) is a maximal \(\omega\)-compactification, take any continuous map \(\varphi : X \rightarrow Y\) to a Hausdorff \(\omega\)-bounded space \(Y\). Since \((M_\omega X, i_X)\) is a maximal \(\omega\)-compactification, there exists a map \(\tilde{\varphi} : M_\omega X \rightarrow Y\) such that \(\tilde{\varphi} \circ i_X = \varphi\). Then \(\tilde{\varphi} := \tilde{\varphi}|_{M'_\omega X} : M'_\omega X \rightarrow Y\) is the required continuous map such that \(\tilde{\varphi} \circ i_X = \varphi\). The uniqueness of \(\tilde{\varphi}\) follows from the density of \(i_X(X) = f \circ j_X(X)\) in \(M'_\omega X\) and the Hausdorff property of \(Y\).

Therefore, \((M'_\omega X, i_X)\) is a maximal \(\omega\)-compactification of \(X\). By the uniqueness of the maximal \(\omega\)-compactification, \(M'_\omega X = M_\omega X\), which means that the map \(f\) is surjective. \[\square\]

Concerning the Wallman \(\omega\)-compactification we can ask the following

**Problem 4.4.** For which spaces \(X\) is the Wallman \(\omega\)-compactification \(W_\omega X\) Hausdorff? For which \(X\) is the pair \((W_\omega X, j_X)\) a maximal \(\omega\)-compactification of \(X\)?

This problem will be partly answered in Main Theorem 5.1 proved in the next section.

5. Main Result

The following theorem answers Problems 4.1 [4.3] [4.4] and is the main result of this paper.

**Theorem 5.1.** For a topological \(T_1\)-space \(X\) consider the conditions:

1. the space \(X\) is \(\omega\)-normal;
2. the Wallman \(\omega\)-compactification \(W_\omega X\) of \(X\) is Hausdorff;
3. the Wallman \(\omega\)-compactification \((W_\omega X, j_X)\) is a maximal \(\omega\)-compactification;
4. the canonical map \(i_X : X \rightarrow M_\omega X\) is a topological embedding;
(5) $X$ is homeomorphic to a subspace of a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space;
(6) the space $X$ is $\omega$-regular.

Then (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) $\iff$ (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) $\iff$ (5) $\Rightarrow$ (6). If each closed separable subspace of $X$ is Lindelöf, then (6) $\Rightarrow$ (1) and hence the conditions (1)--(6) are equivalent.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2). Assuming that the space $X$ is $\omega$-normal, we shall prove that the Wallman $\omega$-compactification $W_\omega X$ is Hausdorff. Given any distinct closed ultrafilters $u, v \in W_\omega X$, use the maximality of $u, v$ and find two disjoint closed sets $F \in u$ and $E \in v$. By definition of $W_\omega X$, there are countable sets $C_u, C_v \subseteq X$ such that $u \in j_X(C_u)$ and $v \in j_X(C_v)$. Then $\overline{C_u} \in u$ and $\overline{C_v} \in v$.

By the $\sigma$-normality of $X$, the disjoint closed sets $F \cap \overline{C_u} \in u$ and $E \cap \overline{C_v} \in v$ have disjoint open neighborhoods $U$ and $V$ in $X$. Then $\langle U \rangle$ and $\langle V \rangle$ are disjoints neighborhoods of the ultrafilters $u$ and $v$ in $W(X)$.

The equivalence (2) $\iff$ (3) follows from Definition 5.1 and Theorem 1.2. The implication (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) follows from the uniqueness of a maximal $\omega$-compactification of $X$ and the fact that $j_X : X \to W_\omega X$ is a topological embedding. The equivalence (4) $\iff$ (5) follows from Definition 5.1. The final implication (5) $\Rightarrow$ (6) follows from Corollary 2.3.

If each closed separable subspace of $X$ is Lindelöf, then (6) $\Rightarrow$ (1) by Proposition 2.1.

Theorem 5.1 implies that each $\omega$-normal space embeds into a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space.

**Problem 5.2.** Does each $\omega$-Tychonoff space embed into a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space?

### 6. Some examples

First, we present an example of a first-countable regular space $M$ which is not functionally Hausdorff but embeds into a Hausdorff $\omega$-bounded space. The space $M$ is a suitable modification of the famous example of Mysior [8].

Let $Q_2 = \{y \in \mathbb{Q} : 0 < y < 2\}$ be the set of rational numbers in the interval $0,2$ and

$M = \{-\infty, +\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R} \cup (\mathbb{R} \times Q_2)$

where $-\infty, +\infty \notin \mathbb{R} \cup (\mathbb{R} \times Q_2)$ are two distinct points. The topology on the space $M$ is generated by the subbase

$$\{\{z\}, M \setminus \{z\} : z \in \mathbb{R} \times Q_2\} \cup \{V_x : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{U_n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{W_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

where

$$V_x = \{x\} \cup \{(x)\} \times Q_2 \cup \{(z, y) : z = x, y \in \mathbb{R} \times Q_2 : y = z - x\}$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$U_n = \{-\infty\} \cup \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x < n\} \cup \{(x, y) : \mathbb{R} \times Q_2 : x < n + 2\}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$W_n = \{+\infty\} \cup \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > n\} \cup \{(x, y) : \mathbb{R} \times Q_2 : x > n\}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

A topological space $X$ is functionally Hausdorff if for any distinct points $x, y \in X$ there exists a continuous function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(x) \neq f(y)$. It is clear that each $\omega$-Tychonoff space is functionally Hausdorff.

**Example 6.1.** The space $M$ is regular, first-countable and $\sigma$-normal, but not functionally Hausdorff and hence is not $\omega$-Tychonoff. The closure of any countable set in $M$ is countable and hence Lindelöf. The Wallman $\omega$-compactification $W_\omega M$ of $M$ is Hausdorff.

Proof. The definition of the topology of $M$ implies that this space in regular and hence $\sigma$-regular. By analogy with [8] (see also [11] and [8] 1.5.9), it can be shown that $f(-\infty) = f(+\infty)$ for any continuous map $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$, which means that the space $M$ is not functionally Hausdorff and hence is not $\omega$-Tychonoff.

The definition of the topology of the space $M$ implies that for any countable set $C \subseteq M$ its closure is contained in the countable set

$$\{-\infty, +\infty\} \cup C \cup \{y, y - z : (y, z) \in C\}.$$ 

By Proposition 2.1 the space $M$ is $\sigma$-normal and by Theorem 5.1 the Wallman $\omega$-compactification $W_\omega M$ of $M$ is Hausdorff.
Remark 6.2. The space $R$ constructed by Raha in [9] has the same properties as the above modification of the Mysior space: the space $R$ is regular, not functionally Hausdorff, but can be embedded into an $\omega$-bounded topological space, because the closure of each countable subset of $R$ is countable.

Next, we are going to present a (consistent) example of a separable sequentially compact scattered space $X$ which is regular but not $\omega$-Tychonoff and hence cannot be embedded into an $\omega$-bounded Hausdorff space.

This example is a combination of van Douwen’s example [2, 7.1] of a locally compact sequentially compact space, based on a regular tower, and the famous example of Tychonoff corkscrew due to Tychonoff, see [13] p.10]. First we recall the necessary definitions related to (regular) towers.

By $[\omega]^\omega$ we denote the family of all infinite subsets of $\omega$. For two subsets $A, B \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ we write $A \subseteq^* B$ if $A \setminus B$ is finite. Also we write $A \subseteq^* B$ if $A \subseteq^* B$ but $B \not\subseteq^* A$. A family $T \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ is called a regular tower if for some regular cardinal $\kappa$ the family $T$ can be written as $T = \{T_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \kappa}$ so that

1. $T_\beta \subseteq^* T_\alpha$ for any ordinals $\alpha < \beta$ in $\kappa$, and
2. for any $I \in [\omega]^\omega$ there exists $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $I \not\subseteq^* T_\alpha$.

The first condition implies that the sets $T_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \kappa$, are distinct and hence $\kappa = |T|$. Also this condition implies that the relation $\supseteq^*$ is a well-order on $T$.

Consider the uncountable cardinals

$$t = \min\{|T| : T \subseteq [\omega]^\omega \text{ is a regular tower}\}$$

$$i = \sup\{|T| : T \subseteq [\omega]^\omega \text{ is a regular tower}\}$$

and observe that $t < i \leq \aleph$. It is well-known that Martin’s Axiom implies the equality $t = i = \aleph$.

Proposition 6.3. The strict inequality $t < i$ is consistent.

Proof. Assume that $\text{MA}+\neg\text{CH}$ holds in the ground model $V$ and let $V'$ be the forcing extension of $V$ obtained by adding $\omega_1$ many Cohen reals. Then $t = b = \omega_1$ in $V'$, which yields a regular tower of length $\omega_1$ in $V'$. On the other hand, any maximal tower from $V$ of length $(2^\omega)V > \omega_1$ (which exists, because in $V$, $t = 2^\omega > \omega_1$) remains regular in $V'$ since it is well-known (and easy to check) that Cohen forcing cannot add infinite pseudointersections to maximal towers. Hence $t < i$ in $V'$. \qed

Let us recall that a topological space $X$ is scattered if every non-empty subspace of $X$ has an isolated point.

A topological space $X$ is called $\omega$-regular if for any open set $U \subseteq X$ and point $x \in U$ there exists a sequence $(U_n)_{n \in \omega}$ of open neighborhoods of $x$ such that $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} U_n \subseteq U$ and $\overline{U_n} \subseteq U_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \omega$. It is easy to see that each completely regular space is $\omega$-regular.

Example 6.4. If $t < i$, then there exists a topological space $X$ such that

1. $X$ is separable, scattered, and sequentially compact;
2. $X$ is regular but not $\omega$-regular and hence not completely regular and not $\omega$-Tychonoff;
3. $X$ does not embed into an $\omega$-bounded Hausdorff space.

Proof. Since $t < i$, there are two regular towers $T_1, T_2 \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ such that $|T_1| < |T_2|$. For every $i \in \{1, 2\}$, consider the space $T_i \cup \omega$ endowed with the topology consisting of the sets $U \subseteq T_i \cup \omega$ such that for any $T \in T_i \cap U$ there exist sets $S \in T_i$ such that $T \subseteq^* S$, $S \setminus T \subseteq^* U$, and the order interval $\{A \in T_i : T \subseteq^* A \subseteq^* S\}$ is contained in $U$. Observe that the subspace topology on $T_i \subseteq T_i \cup \omega$ coincides with the order topology generated by the well-order $\supseteq^*$, which implies that the (closed) subspace $T_i$ of $T_i \cup \omega$ is sequentially compact. We claim that the space $T_i \cup \omega$ is sequentially compact, too. Indeed, for any infinite set $I \subseteq \omega$ we can find a set $T \in T_i$ such that $I \not\subseteq^* T$. Since $\supseteq^*$ is a well-order on $T_i$, we can assume that $T$ is the largest possible and hence $I \subseteq^* S$ for any $S \in T_i$ with $T \subseteq^* S$. Then the infinite set $I \setminus T$ is a sequence convergent to the point $T \in T_i \cup \omega$ in the space $T_i \cup \omega$ by the definition of the topology of $T_i \cup \omega$. This means that
$\mathcal{T}_i \cup \omega$ is sequentially compact. Repeating the argument of Example 7.1 [2] one can check that the space $\mathcal{T}_i \cup \omega$ is separable, scattered and locally compact.

Choose any point $\infty_i \notin \mathcal{T}_i \cup \omega$ and let $X_i = \{\infty_i\} \cup \mathcal{T}_i \cup \omega$ be the one-point compactification of the locally compact space $\mathcal{T}_i \cup \omega$. It is easy to see that the compact space $X_i$ is scattered.

Consider the space $\Pi = (X_1 \times X_2) \setminus \{(\infty_1, \infty_2)\}$. It is easy to check that the space $\Pi$ is separable, scattered and sequentially compact.

Choose any point $\infty \notin \Pi \times \omega$ and consider the space $\Sigma = \{\infty\} \cup (\Pi \times \omega)$ endowed with the topology consisting of the sets $U \subset \Sigma$ satisfying two conditions:

- for any $n \in \omega$ the set $\{z \in \Pi : (z, n) \in U\}$ is open in $\Pi$;
- if $\infty \in U$, then there exists $n \in \omega$ such that $\bigcup_{m \geq n} \Pi \times \{m\} \subset U$.

Taking into account that the space $\Pi$ is separable, scattered and sequentially compact, we conclude that so is the space $\Sigma$. On the space $\Sigma$ consider the smallest equivalence relation $\sim$ such that

$$(x_1, \infty_2, 2n) \sim (x_1, \infty_2, 2n + 1) \text{ and } (\infty_1, x_2, 2n + 1) \sim (\infty_1, x_2, 2n + 2)$$

for any $n \in \omega$ and $x_1, x_2 \in X_i \setminus \{\infty_i\}$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Let $X$ be the quotient space $\Sigma/\sim$ of $\Sigma$ by the equivalence relation $\sim$. Observe that the character of the space $X_1$ at $\infty_1$ is equal to the regular cardinal $|\mathcal{T}_1|$ and is strictly smaller than the pseudocharacter of the space $X_2$ at $\infty_2$, which is equal to the regular cardinal $|\mathcal{T}_2| > |\mathcal{T}_1|$. Using this observation and repeating the classical argument due to Tychonoff (see [10], p.109), it can be shown that the space $X$ is regular but not $\omega$-regular (at the point $\infty$), and hence not Tychonoff and not $\boxdot$-Tychonoff (since for separable spaces the Tychonoff property is equivalent to the $\boxdot$-Tychonoff property). By Proposition 2.3 the separable space $X$ does embed into an $\omega$-bounded Hausdorff space. \hfill $\square$

**Question 6.5.** Does there exists in ZFC an example of a separable regular sequentially compact space which is not Tychonoff?
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