

# ON $\kappa$ -PSEUDOCOMPACTNESS AND UNIFORM HOMEOMORPHISMS OF FUNCTION SPACES

MIKOŁAJ KRUPSKI

ABSTRACT. A Tychonoff space  $X$  is called  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact if for every continuous mapping  $f$  of  $X$  into  $\mathbb{R}^\kappa$  the image  $f(X)$  is compact. This notion generalizes pseudocompactness and gives a stratification of spaces lying between pseudocompact and compact spaces. It is well known that pseudocompactness of  $X$  is determined by the uniform structure of the function space  $C_p(X)$  of continuous real-valued functions on  $X$  endowed with the pointwise topology. In respect of that A.V. Arhangel'skii asked in [Topology Appl., 89 (1998)] if analogous assertion is true for  $\kappa$ -pseudocompactness. We provide an affirmative answer to this question.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this note, by a space we mean a Tychonoff topological space. For a space  $X$ , by  $C_p(X)$  we denote the space of all continuous real-valued functions on  $X$  endowed with the pointwise topology. The symbol  $C_p^*(X)$  stands for the subspace of  $C_p(X)$  consisting of all *bounded* continuous functions. Recall that  $X$  is *pseudocompact* if  $C_p(X) = C_p^*(X)$ , i.e. every real-valued continuous function on  $X$  is bounded. In 1962 J.F. Kennison [7] introduced the following generalization of pseudocompactness. Let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal. A space  $X$  is called  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact if for every continuous mapping  $f$  of  $X$  into  $\mathbb{R}^\kappa$  the image  $f(X)$  is compact. Clearly,  $\kappa$ -pseudocompactness implies  $\lambda$ -pseudocompactness for every infinite cardinal  $\lambda \leq \kappa$ . It is also clear that  $\omega$ -pseudocompactness is precisely pseudocompactness. In particular any  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact space is pseudocompact. It was established by Uspenskiĭ in [12] that pseudocompactness of  $X$  is determined by the uniform structure of the function space  $C_p(X)$  (see [4] for a different proof of this result). In respect of that A.V. Arhangel'skii asked in 1998 if analogous result holds for  $\kappa$ -pseudocompactness (see [3, Question 13] or [11, Problem 4.4.2]).

The aim of the present note is to provide an affirmative answer to this question by proving the following extension of Uspenskiĭ's theorem:

**Theorem 1.1.** *For any infinite cardinal  $\kappa$ , if  $C_p(X)$  and  $C_p(Y)$  are uniformly homeomorphic, then  $X$  is  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact if and only if  $Y$  is  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact.*

Let us recall that that a map  $\varphi : C_p(X) \rightarrow C_p(Y)$  is *uniformly continuous* if for each open neighborhood  $U$  of the zero function in  $C_p(Y)$ , there is an open neighborhood  $V$  of the zero function in  $C_p(X)$  such that  $(f - g) \in V$  implies

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 54C35, 54D30, 54E15.

*Key words and phrases.* Function space, pointwise convergence topology,  $C_p(X)$  space,  $u$ -equivalence, uniform homeomorphism,  $\kappa$ -pseudocompactness.

The author was partially supported by the NCN (National Science Centre, Poland) research Grant no. 2020/37/B/ST1/02613.

$(\varphi(f) - \varphi(g)) \in U$ . Spaces  $C_p(X)$  and  $C_p(Y)$  are *uniformly homeomorphic* if there is a homeomorphism  $\varphi$  between them such that both  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi^{-1}$  are uniformly continuous.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is inspired by author's recent work [8] concerned with linear homeomorphisms of function spaces. The basic idea in [8] relies on the fact that certain topological properties of a space  $X$  can be conveniently characterized by the way  $X$  is positioned in its Čech-Stone compactification  $\beta X$ ;  $\kappa$ -pseudocompactness is one of such properties. Indeed, Hewitt [6] gave the following description of pseudocompactness (cf. [1, Theorem 1.3.3]).

**Theorem 1.2.** (*Hewitt*) *A space  $X$  is pseudocompact if and only if every nonempty  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $\beta X$  meets  $X$ .*

It was noted by Retta in [10] that the above result easily extends to  $\kappa$ -pseudocompactness. We need the following notation. Let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal. A subset  $A$  of a space  $Z$  is a  $G_\kappa$ -set if it is an intersection of at most  $\kappa$ -many open subsets of  $Z$ . The  $G_\omega$ -sets are called  $G_\delta$ -sets and the complement of a  $G_\delta$ -set is called  $F_\sigma$ -set. We have (see [10, Theorem 1]):

**Theorem 1.3.** (*Retta*) *Let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal. A space  $X$  is  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact if and only if every nonempty  $G_\kappa$ -subset of  $\beta X$  meets  $X$ .*

The uniform structure of spaces of continuous functions was studied by many authors; the interested reader should consult the book [11]. For our purposes, the most important are some ideas developed by Gul'ko in [5].

## 2. RESULTS

For a space  $Z$  and a function  $f \in C_p^*(Z)$  the function  $\widetilde{f} : \beta Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the unique continuous extension of  $f$  over the Čech-Stone compactification  $\beta Z$  of  $Z$ . Let  $\varphi : C_p^*(X) \rightarrow C_p^*(Y)$  be a uniformly continuous surjection. For  $y \in \beta Y$  and a subset  $K$  of  $\beta X$  we define

$$a(y, K) = \sup\{|\widetilde{\varphi(f)}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(g)}(y)| : f, g \in C_p^*(X) \text{ such that} \\ |\widetilde{f}(x) - \widetilde{g}(x)| < 1 \text{ for every } x \in K\}$$

Note that  $a(y, \emptyset) = \infty$  since  $\varphi$  is onto.

For  $y \in \beta Y$  define the family

$$\mathcal{A}(y) = \{K \subseteq \beta X : K \text{ is compact and } a(y, K) < \infty\}.$$

Similarly, for  $y \in \beta Y$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let

$$\mathcal{A}_n(y) = \{K \subseteq \beta X : K \text{ is compact and } a(y, K) \leq n\}.$$

It may happen that for some  $n$  the family  $\mathcal{A}_n(y)$  is empty. However, we have the following:

**Proposition 2.1.** *For every  $y \in Y$ , there exists  $n$  for which  $\mathcal{A}_n(y)$  contains a nonempty finite subset of  $X$ . In particular, for this  $n$  the family  $\mathcal{A}_n(y)$  is nonempty.*

*Proof.* By uniform continuity of  $\varphi$ , there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and a finite subset  $F$  of  $X$  such that

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{if } |f(x) - g(x)| < 1/n \text{ for every } x \in F, \\ & \text{then } |\varphi(f)(y) - \varphi(g)(y)| < 1. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that  $F \in \mathcal{A}_n(y)$ . To see this, take arbitrary functions  $f, g \in C_p^*(X)$  such that  $|f(x) - g(x)| < 1$ , for every  $x \in F$ . Put  $f_k = f + \frac{k}{n}(g - f)$ , for  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ . Then  $f_0 = f$ ,  $f_n = g$  and  $|f_k(x) - f_{k+1}(x)| < 1/n$  for  $x \in F$ . Hence, by (1) we get

$$\begin{aligned} |\varphi(f)(y) - \varphi(g)(y)| &\leq \\ |\varphi(f_0)(y) - \varphi(f_1)(y)| + \dots + |\varphi(f_{n-1})(y) - \varphi(f_n)(y)| &< n, \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

Clearly, for every  $y \in \beta Y$  we have  $\mathcal{A}(y) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_n(y)$ . In particular, for  $y \in Y$  the family  $\mathcal{A}(y)$  is always nonempty.

For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we set

$$Y_n = \{y \in \beta Y : \mathcal{A}_n(y) \text{ is nonempty}\}.$$

Note that  $y \in Y_n$  if and only if  $\beta X \in \mathcal{A}_n(y)$ . Using this observation it is easy to show the following:

**Lemma 2.2.** *For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the set  $Y_n$  is closed in  $\beta Y$ ; hence compact.*

*Proof.* Pick  $y \in \beta Y \setminus Y_n$ . Since  $\beta X \notin \mathcal{A}_n(y)$ , there are functions  $f, g \in C_p^*(X)$  satisfying  $|\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| < 1$  for every  $x \in \beta X$ , and  $|\widetilde{\varphi(f)}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(g)}(y)| > n$ . The set

$$U = \{z \in \beta Y : |\widetilde{\varphi(f)}(z) - \widetilde{\varphi(g)}(z)| > n\}$$

is an open neighborhood of  $y$  in  $\beta Y$ . Moreover if  $z \in U$ , then  $f$  and  $g$  witness that  $\beta X \notin \mathcal{A}_n(z)$ ; thus  $U \cap Y_n = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

For a space  $X$  and a positive integer  $m$ , we denote by  $[X]^{\leq m}$  the space of all nonempty at most  $m$ -element subsets of  $X$  endowed with the Vietoris topology, i.e. basic open sets in  $[X]^{\leq m}$  are of the form

$$\langle U_1, \dots, U_k \rangle = \{F \in [X]^{\leq m} : \forall i \leq k \quad F \cap U_i \neq \emptyset \text{ and } F \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^k U_i\},$$

where  $\{U_1, \dots, U_k\}$  is a finite collection of open subset of  $X$ .

For any positive integers  $n, m$  we define

$$Y_{n,m} = \{y \in \beta Y : \mathcal{A}_n(y) \cap [\beta X]^{\leq m} \neq \emptyset\}$$

Note that  $Y_{n,m} \subseteq Y_n$  and by Proposition 2.1 we have

$$(2) \quad Y \subseteq \bigcup_{n,m} Y_{n,m}$$

We claim that  $Y_{n,m}$  is closed in  $Y_n$  and hence it is compact:

**Lemma 2.3.** *The set  $Y_{n,m}$  is closed in  $Y_n$ , hence it is compact.*

*Proof.* Consider the following subset  $Z$  of the product  $Y_n \times [\beta X]^{\leq m}$

$$Z = \{(y, F) \in Y_n \times [\beta X]^{\leq m} : F \in \mathcal{A}_n(y)\}.$$

We show that  $Z$  is closed. Pick  $(y, F) \in (Y_n \times [\beta X]^{\leq m}) \setminus Z$ . Then  $F \notin \mathcal{A}_n(y)$  and thus there are  $f, g \in C_p^*(X)$  satisfying  $|\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| < 1$  for every  $x \in F$ , and  $|\widetilde{\varphi(f)}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(g)}(y)| > n$ . Let  $U = \{x \in \beta X : |\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| < 1\}$  and  $V = \{z \in Y_n : |\widetilde{\varphi(f)}(z) - \widetilde{\varphi(g)}(z)| > n\}$ . The set  $V \times \langle U \rangle$  is an open neighborhood of  $(y, F)$  in  $Y_n \times [\beta X]^{\leq m}$  disjoint from  $Z$ .

The set  $Z$ , being closed in the compact space  $Y_n \times [\beta X]^{\leq m}$ , is compact. Since the set  $Y_{n,m}$  is the image of  $Z$  under the projection map it must be compact.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.4.** *Suppose that  $Y$  is pseudocompact and let  $\varphi : C_p^*(X) \rightarrow C_p^*(Y)$  be a uniformly continuous surjection. For every  $y \in \beta Y$ , there exist  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $y \in Y_{n,m}$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.3, the set  $\bigcup_{n,m} Y_{n,m}$  is  $F_\sigma$  in  $\beta Y$  and contains  $Y$ , by (2). It follows from Theorem 1.2 that  $\bigcup_{n,m} Y_{n,m} = \beta Y$ .  $\square$

For  $y \in \bigcup_{n,m} Y_{n,m}$  we define

$$K(y) = \bigcap \mathcal{A}(y).$$

**Remark.** For  $y \in Y$  the set  $K(y)$  is the support introduced by Gul'ko in [5] (see also [9], [2], [4]).

**Lemma 2.5.** *For every  $y \in \bigcup_{n,m} Y_{n,m}$  the set  $K(y)$  is a nonempty finite subset of  $\beta X$ . Moreover,  $K(y) \in \mathcal{A}(y)$ . If  $y \in Y$ , then  $K(y)$  is a subset of  $X$ .*

*Proof.* We show that the family  $\mathcal{A}(y)$  is closed under finite intersections. Pick  $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{A}(y)$  and let  $f, g \in C_p^*(X)$  be such that  $|\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| < 1$  for every  $x \in K_1 \cap K_2$ . Let

$$U = \{x \in \beta X : |\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| < 1\}.$$

The set  $U$  is open in  $\beta X$  and  $K_1 \cap K_2 \subseteq U$ .

Since  $K_1$  and  $K_2 \setminus U$  are disjoint closed subsets of the compact space  $\beta X$ , by Urysohn's lemma there is a continuous function  $u : \beta X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } x \in K_1 \\ 0 & \text{for } x \in K_2 \setminus U \end{cases}$$

Let

$$\tilde{h} = u \cdot (\tilde{f} - \tilde{g}) + \tilde{g}$$

and let  $h \in C_p^*(X)$  be the restriction of  $\tilde{h}$  to  $X$ . We have:

- $\tilde{h}(x) = \tilde{f}(x)$  for  $x \in K_1$ ,
- $\tilde{h}(x) = \tilde{g}(x)$  for  $x \in K_2 \setminus U$  and
- if  $x \in U$ , then  $|\tilde{h}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| = |u(x)| \cdot |\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| < 1$ , by definition of  $U$  and the fact that  $u$  maps into  $[0, 1]$ .

In particular, since  $K_1 \cap K_2 \subseteq U$ , we get

- $|\tilde{h}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| < 1$  for  $x \in K_2$ .

Since  $K_1 \in \mathcal{A}(y)$  and  $\tilde{h}(x) = \tilde{f}(x)$  for  $x \in K_1$ , we get  $|\widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{f})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{h})}(y)| \leq a(y, K_1) < \infty$ . Similarly, since  $|\tilde{h}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| < 1$  for  $x \in K_2$  and  $K_2 \in \mathcal{A}(y)$ , we have  $|\widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{g})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{h})}(y)| \leq a(y, K_2) < \infty$ . Hence,

$$|\widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{f})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{g})}(y)| \leq |\widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{f})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{h})}(y)| + |\widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{h})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\tilde{g})}(y)| \leq a(y, K_1) + a(y, K_2).$$

So  $a(y, K_1 \cap K_2) \leq a(y, K_1) + a(y, K_2)$  and thus  $K_1 \cap K_2 \in \mathcal{A}(y)$ . By induction the result follows for any finite intersection.

The family  $\mathcal{A}(y)$ , consisting of closed subsets of  $\beta X$ , is closed under finite intersections and  $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}(y)$  so by compactness the intersection  $\bigcap \mathcal{A}(y)$  must be

nonempty. It is finite because  $y \in Y_{n,m}$  guarantees that the family  $\mathcal{A}(y)$  contains a subset of  $\beta X$  which is at most  $m$ -element.

Since  $\mathcal{A}(y)$  contains a finite subset  $F$  of  $\beta X$ , the set  $K(y) \subseteq F$  is an intersection of finitely many elements of  $\mathcal{A}(y)$  so the first part of the proof implies that  $K(y) \in \mathcal{A}(y)$ .

Finally, if  $y \in Y$  then  $y \in \bigcup_{n,m} Y_{n,m}$ , by (2). So  $K(y)$  is well defined. The inclusion  $K(y) \subseteq X$  follows from Proposition 2.1.  $\square$

For  $y \in \bigcup_{n,m} Y_{n,m}$  we define

$$a(y) = a(y, K(y))$$

By the Lemma 2.5,  $K(y) \in \mathcal{A}(y)$  so  $a(y) < \infty$ . For a subset  $A$  of  $\beta X$  we set

$$K^{-1}(A) = \left\{ y \in \bigcup_{n,m} Y_{n,m} : K(y) \cap A \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

Combining Corollary 2.4 and Lemma 2.5 we get

**Proposition 2.6.** *Suppose that  $\varphi : C_p^*(X) \rightarrow C_p^*(Y)$  is a uniformly continuous surjection. If  $Y$  is pseudocompact then, for every  $y \in \beta Y$ , the set  $K(y)$  is a well-defined nonempty finite subset of  $\beta X$  that belongs to the family  $\mathcal{A}(y)$ . Also,  $a(y)$  is a well-defined number, for every  $y \in \beta Y$ .*

The proof of the next lemma is analogous to the proof of [2, Lemma 1.3].

**Lemma 2.7.** *Suppose that  $U \subseteq \beta X$  is open and let  $n$  be a positive integer. For every  $y \in K^{-1}(U) \cap Y_n$  there exists an open neighborhood  $V$  of  $y$  in  $\beta Y$  such that for every  $z \in V \cap Y_n$  and every  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n(z)$  we have  $A \cap U \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $x_0 \in K(y) \cap U$  witnessing  $y \in K^{-1}(U)$ . Since  $K(y)$  is finite, shrinking  $U$  if necessary we can assume that  $U \cap K(y) = \{x_0\}$ . Note that  $\beta X \setminus U \notin \mathcal{A}(y)$  for otherwise  $K(y)$  would be a subset of  $\beta X \setminus U$  and this is not the case because  $x_0 \in K(y) \cap U$ . It follows that there are  $f, g \in C_p^*(X)$  such that

$$(3) \quad |\widetilde{f}(x) - \widetilde{g}(x)| < 1 \text{ for every } x \in \beta X \setminus U \text{ and}$$

$$(4) \quad |\widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{f})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{g})}(y)| > a(y) + n$$

Let  $\widetilde{h} \in C_p(\beta X)$  be a function satisfying

$$(5) \quad \widetilde{h}(x) = \widetilde{f}(x) \text{ for every } x \in \beta X \setminus U, \text{ and } \widetilde{h}(x_0) = \widetilde{g}(x_0),$$

and let  $h \in C_p^*(X)$  be the restriction of  $\widetilde{h}$ .

Note that by (3) and (5),  $|\widetilde{h}(x) - \widetilde{g}(x)| < 1$  for every  $x \in K(y)$ . Therefore,

$$(6) \quad |\widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{h})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{g})}(y)| \leq a(y).$$

According to (4) and (6) we have

$$(7) \quad |\widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{f})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{h})}(y)| \geq |\widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{f})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{g})}(y)| - |\widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{h})}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{g})}(y)| > n.$$

Let

$$V = \{z \in \beta Y : |\widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{f})}(z) - \widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{h})}(z)| > n\}.$$

The set  $V$  is open and  $y \in V$ , by (7). We show that  $V$  is as required.

Take  $z \in V \cap Y_n$  and let  $A \in \mathcal{A}_n(z)$ . If  $A \cap U = \emptyset$  then  $\widetilde{h}(x) = \widetilde{f}(x)$  for every  $x \in A$ , by (5). So  $|\widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{f})}(z) - \widetilde{\varphi(\widetilde{h})}(z)| \leq n$ , contradicting  $z \in V$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.8.** *Suppose that  $Y$  is pseudocompact. If  $U \subseteq \beta X$  is open, then the set  $K^{-1}(U)$  is a  $G_\delta$ -subset of  $\beta Y$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.6, for every  $y \in \beta Y$ , the set  $K(y)$  is a nonempty finite subset of  $\beta X$ . For  $n = 1, 2, \dots$ , let

$$L_n = K^{-1}(U) \cap Y_n.$$

For  $y \in L_n$  let  $V_n^y$  be an open neighborhood of  $y$  in  $\beta Y$  provided by Lemma 2.7, i.e.

$$(8) \quad \text{if } z \in V_n^y \cap Y_n \text{ and } A \in \mathcal{A}_n(z), \text{ then } A \cap U \neq \emptyset.$$

Let

$$V_n = \bigcup \{V_n^y : y \in L_n\}.$$

We claim that

$$K^{-1}(U) = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} V_n.$$

Indeed, pick  $y \in K^{-1}(U)$  and fix an arbitrary  $m \geq 1$ . Since  $\beta Y = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} Y_n$  (cf. Corollary 2.4), there is  $i$  such that  $y \in Y_i$ . Since  $Y_n \subseteq Y_{n+1}$ , we can assume that  $i > m$ . We have  $y \in L_i$  whence  $y \in V_i^y \subseteq V_i \subseteq \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} V_n$ , because  $i > m$ .

To prove the opposite inclusion, take  $z \in \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} V_n$ . Again, there is  $i$  such that  $z \in Y_i$ . Let  $j$  be a positive integer satisfying  $j > \max\{a(z), i\}$ . By our assumption,  $z \in \bigcup_{n=j}^{\infty} V_n$ , so there is  $k \geq j$  such that  $z \in V_k$ . Clearly,  $z \in Y_k$  and since  $k > a(z)$  we have

$$(9) \quad K(z) \in \mathcal{A}_k(z).$$

By definition of  $V_k$ , there is  $y \in L_k$  such that  $z \in V_k^y$ . Now, from (8) and (9) we get  $z \in K^{-1}(U)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.9.** If  $\varphi : C_p(X) \rightarrow C_p(Y)$  is a uniform homeomorphism, we may consider the inverse map  $\varphi^{-1} : C_p(Y) \rightarrow C_p(X)$  and apply all of the above results to  $\varphi^{-1}$ . In particular, if  $X$  is pseudocompact, then for every  $x \in \beta X$  we can define the set  $K(x) \subseteq \beta Y$  and the real number  $a(x)$  simply by interchanging the roles of  $X$  and  $Y$  above.

**Lemma 2.10.** *Suppose that both  $X$  and  $Y$  are pseudocompact spaces. Let  $\varphi : C_p^*(X) \rightarrow C_p^*(Y)$  be a uniform homeomorphism. For any  $x \in \beta X$  there is  $y \in K(x)$  such that  $x \in K(y)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \beta X$ . Applying Proposition 2.6, first to  $\varphi^{-1}$  and then to  $\varphi$ , we infer that the set  $F = \bigcup \{K(y) : y \in K(x)\} \subseteq \beta X$  is finite being a finite union of finite sets. Let  $M$  be a positive integer such that

$$M > \max\{a(y) : y \in K(x)\}.$$

Striving for a contradiction, suppose that  $x \notin F$ . Let  $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in C_p(\beta X)$  be functions satisfying

$$(10) \quad \tilde{f}(z) = \tilde{g}(z) \text{ for every } z \in F \text{ and } |\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{g}(x)| > M \cdot a(x).$$

Let  $f \in C_p^*(X)$  and  $g \in C_p^*(X)$  be the restrictions of  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$ , respectively. Since for every  $y \in K(x)$  the functions  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  agree on  $K(y) \subseteq F$ , we have

$$(11) \quad |\widetilde{\varphi(f)}(y) - \widetilde{\varphi(g)}(y)| \leq a(y) < M, \text{ for every } y \in K(x).$$

For  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$  define a function  $\widetilde{h}_k \in C_p(\beta Y)$  by the formula

$$\widetilde{h}_k = \widetilde{\varphi}(f) + \frac{k}{M} \left( \widetilde{\varphi}(g) - \widetilde{\varphi}(f) \right).$$

Obviously,  $\widetilde{h}_0 = \widetilde{\varphi}(f)$  and  $\widetilde{h}_M = \widetilde{\varphi}(g)$ . Moreover, by (11), we have

$$(12) \quad |\widetilde{h}_{k+1}(y) - \widetilde{h}_k(y)| = \frac{1}{M} |\widetilde{\varphi}(g)(y) - \widetilde{\varphi}(f)(y)| < 1, \text{ for every } y \in K(x).$$

For  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, M\}$  let  $h_k \in C_p^*(Y)$  be the restriction of  $\widetilde{h}_k$ . Using (12) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} |\widetilde{f}(x) - \widetilde{g}(x)| &= |\varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{\varphi}(f))(x) - \varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{\varphi}(g))(x)| = |\varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{h}_0)(x) - \varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{h}_M)(x)| \leq \\ &|\varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{h}_0)(x) - \varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{h}_1)(x)| + \dots + |\varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{h}_{M-1})(x) - \varphi^{-1}(\widetilde{h}_M)(x)| \leq M \cdot a(x) \end{aligned}$$

This however contradicts (10).  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove of our main result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $\kappa$  be an infinite cardinal and let  $\varphi : C_p(X) \rightarrow C_p(Y)$  be a uniform homeomorphism. By symmetry it is enough to show that if  $Y$  is  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact then so is  $X$ . So let us assume that  $Y$  is  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact. Then, in particular  $Y$  is pseudocompact and hence by Uspenskiĭ's theorem [12, Corollary] (cf. [11, V.136]), so is  $X$ . Hence,  $C_p(Y) = C_p^*(Y)$  and  $C_p(X) = C_p^*(X)$ . In order to prove that  $X$  is  $\kappa$ -pseudocompact we will employ Theorem 1.3. For this purpose fix a nonempty  $G_\kappa$ -subset  $G$  of  $\beta X$ . It suffices to prove that  $G \cap X \neq \emptyset$ .

**Claim 1.** The set  $K^{-1}(G) = \{y \in \beta Y : K(y) \cap G \neq \emptyset\}$  is nonempty.

*Proof.* The set  $G$  is nonempty so let us fix  $x \in G$ . According to Lemma 2.10 there is  $y \in K(x)$  such that  $x \in K(y)$ . In particular,  $y \in K^{-1}(G)$ .  $\square$

**Claim 2.** The set  $K^{-1}(G) = \{y \in \beta Y : K(y) \cap G \neq \emptyset\}$  is a  $G_\kappa$ -set in  $\beta Y$ .

*Proof.* Write  $G = \bigcap \{U_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ , where each  $U_\alpha$  is an open subset of  $\beta X$ . We can also assume that the family  $\{U_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$  is closed under finite intersections. It follows from Proposition 2.8 that for each  $\alpha < \kappa$ , the set  $K^{-1}(U_\alpha)$  is  $G_\delta$  in  $\beta Y$ . Thus, it is enough to show that

$$K^{-1}(G) = \bigcap_{\alpha < \kappa} K^{-1}(U_\alpha).$$

To this end, take  $y \in \bigcap_{\alpha < \kappa} K^{-1}(U_\alpha)$ . According to Proposition 2.6, the set  $K(y)$  is a nonempty finite subset of  $\beta X$ . Enumerate  $K(y) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ , where  $k$  is a positive integer. If  $y \notin K^{-1}(G)$ , then for every  $i \leq k$  there is  $\alpha_i < \kappa$  such that

$$(13) \quad x_i \notin U_{\alpha_i}.$$

The family  $\{U_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$  is closed under finite intersections, so there is  $\gamma < \kappa$  with  $U_\gamma = U_{\alpha_1} \cap \dots \cap U_{\alpha_k}$ . But  $y \in \bigcap_{\alpha < \kappa} K^{-1}(U_\alpha) \subseteq K^{-1}(U_\gamma)$ . Hence, there is  $j \leq k$  such that  $x_j \in U_\gamma \subseteq U_{\alpha_j}$ , which is a contradiction with (13). Therefore, we must have  $y \in K^{-1}(G)$ . This provides the inclusion  $K^{-1}(G) \supseteq \bigcap_{\alpha < \kappa} K^{-1}(U_\alpha)$ . The opposite inclusion is immediate.  $\square$

It follows from Claims 1 and 2 that the  $K^{-1}(G)$  is a nonempty  $G_\kappa$ -subset of  $\beta Y$ . Hence, by Theorem 1.3, there exists  $p \in K^{-1}(G) \cap Y$ . We have  $K(p) \cap G \neq \emptyset$  and since  $p \in Y$ , we infer from Lemma 2.5 that  $K(p)$  is a nonempty finite subset of  $X$ . Therefore,  $\emptyset \neq K(p) \cap G \subseteq X \cap G$ .  $\square$

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author was partially supported by the NCN (National Science Centre, Poland) research Grant no. 2020/37/B/ST1/02613

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. ANGOA-AMADOR, A. CONTRERAS-CARRETO, M. IBARRA-CONTRERAS, AND A. TAMARIZ-MASCARÚA, *Basic and classic results on pseudocompact spaces*, in Pseudocompact topological spaces, vol. 55 of Dev. Math., Springer, Cham, 2018, pp. 1–38.
- [2] A. V. ARBIT, *The Lindelöf number greater than continuum is  $u$ -invariant*, Serdica Math. J., 37 (2011), pp. 143–162.
- [3] A. V. ARHANGEL'SKII, *Strongly  $\tau$ -pseudocompact spaces*, Topology Appl., 89 (1998), pp. 285–298.
- [4] R. GÓRAK, M. KRUPSKI, AND W. MARCISZEWSKI, *On uniformly continuous maps between function spaces*, Fund. Math., 246 (2019), pp. 257–274.
- [5] S. P. GUL'KO, *On uniform homeomorphisms of spaces of continuous functions*, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov., 193 (1992), pp. 82–88.
- [6] E. HEWITT, *Rings of real-valued continuous functions. I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 64 (1948), pp. 45–99.
- [7] J. F. KENNISON,  *$m$ -pseudocompactness*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 104 (1962), pp. 436–442.
- [8] M. KRUPSKI, *Linear homeomorphisms of function spaces and the position of a space in its compactification*. arXiv:2208.05547 [math.GN], preprint 2022.
- [9] W. MARCISZEWSKI AND J. PELANT, *Absolute Borel sets and function spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 349 (1997), pp. 3585–3596.
- [10] T. RETTA, *Some cardinal generalizations of pseudocompactness*, Czechoslovak Math. J., 43(118) (1993), pp. 385–390.
- [11] V. V. TKACHUK, *A  $C_p$ -theory problem book. Functional equivalencies*, Problem Books in Mathematics, Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [12] V. V. USPENSKIĬ, *A characterization of compactness in terms of the uniform structure in a space of functions*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk, 37 (1982), pp. 183–184.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW, UL. BANACHA 2, 02–097 WARSZAWA, POLAND

*Email address:* mkrupski@mimuw.edu.pl