# JOÃO B. PROLLA SAMUEL NAVARRO Approximation results in the strict topology

Annales mathématiques Blaise Pascal, tome 4, nº 2 (1997), p. 61-82 <a href="http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AMBP\_1997\_4\_2\_61\_0>">http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AMBP\_1997\_4\_2\_61\_0></a>

© Annales mathématiques Blaise Pascal, 1997, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales mathématiques Blaise Pascal » (http: //math.univ-bpclermont.fr/ambp/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/legal.php). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

# $\mathcal{N}$ umdam

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques http://www.numdam.org/

## Approximation Results in the Strict Topology

João B. Prolla and Samuel Navarro\*

Abstract: In this paper we prove results of the Weierstrass-Stone type for subsets W of the vector space V of all continuous and bounded functions from a topological space X into a real normed space E, when V is equipped with the strict topology  $\beta$ . Our main results characterize the  $\beta$ -closure of W when (1) W is  $\beta$ truncation stable; (2)  $E = \mathbb{R}$  and W is a subalgebra; (3)  $E = \mathbb{R}$  and W is the convex cone of all positive elements of some algebra; (4) W is uniformly bounded; (5) X is a completely regular Hausdorff space and W is convex.

### $\S1.$ Introduction and definitions

Let X be a topological space and let E be a real normed space. We denote by B(X; E) the normed space of all bounded E-valued functions on X, equipped with the supremum norm

 $||f||_X = \sup\{||f(x)||; x \in X\}$ 

<sup>\*</sup>Partially supported by FONDECYT grant 1950546 and DICYT-USACH

for each  $f \in B(X; E)$ . We denote by  $B_0(X; E)$  the subset of all  $f \in B(X; E)$  that vanish at infinity, i.e., those f such that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the set  $K = \{t \in X; ||f(t)|| \ge \varepsilon\}$  is compact (or empty). And we denote by  $B_{00}(X; E)$ the subset of all  $f \in B(X; E)$  which have compact support. We denote by C(X; E)the vector space of all continuous E-valued functions on X, and set

$$C_b(X; E) = C(X; E) \cap B(X; E),$$
  

$$C_0(X; E) = C(X; E) \cap B_0(X; E),$$
  

$$C_{00}(X; E) = C(X; E) \cap B_{00}(X; E)$$

We denote by I(X) the set of all  $\varphi \in B(X; \mathbb{R})$  such that  $0 \leq \varphi(x) \leq 1$ , for all  $x \in X$ . We then define

$$D(X) = C_b(X; \mathbb{R}) \cap I(X),$$
  
$$D_0(X) = B_0(X; \mathbb{R}) \cap I(X).$$

The strict topology  $\beta$  on  $C_b(X; E)$  is the locally convex topology determined by the family of seminorms

$$p_{\varphi}(f) = \sup\{\varphi(x) || f(x) ||; x \in X\}$$

for  $f \in C_b(X; E)$ , when  $\varphi$  ranges over  $D_0(X)$ . Clearly, given  $\varphi \in D_0(X)$  there is a compact subset K such that  $\varphi(x) < \varepsilon$  for all  $x \notin K$ . Therefore, our strict topology is coarser than the strict topology introduced by R. Giles [3]. To see that they actually coincide, let  $\psi \in B(X; \mathbb{R})$  be such that, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a compact subset K such that  $\psi(x) < \varepsilon$  for all  $x \notin K$ . We may assume  $||\psi||_X < 1$ . Choose compact sets  $K_n$  with  $\phi = K_0 \subset K_1 \subset K_2 \subset ...$  such that  $|\psi(x)| < 2^{-n}$ , for all  $x \notin K_n$ .

Let  $\psi_n \in B_0(X; \mathbb{R})$  be the characteristic function of  $K_n$  multiplied by  $2^{-n}$ , i.e.,  $\psi_n(x) = 2^{-n}$ , if  $x \in K_n$ ; and  $\psi_n(x) = 0$  if  $x \notin K_n$ . Let  $\varphi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \psi_n$ . For each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we claim that the set  $K = \{x \in X; \varphi(x) \ge \varepsilon\}$  is compact (or empty). If  $\varepsilon > 1$ , then  $K = \phi$ . If  $\varepsilon = 1$ , then  $K = K_1$ , because  $\varphi(t) = 1$  precisely for  $t \in K_1$ . If  $\varepsilon < 1$ , Approximation Results in the Strict Topology.

let  $n \ge 0$  be such that  $2^{-(n+1)} \le \varepsilon < 2^{-n}$ . Then  $K = K_{n+1}$ . Hence  $\varphi \in D_0(X)$ . We claim now that  $\psi(x) \le \varphi(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ . We first notice that  $\varphi(x) = 0$  if, and only if  $x \notin \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$ . Indeed, if the point  $x \notin \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$ , then  $\psi_k(x) = 0$  for all  $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ , and so  $\varphi(x) = 0$ . Conversely, if  $\varphi(x) = 0$ , then  $\psi_n(x) = 0$  for all  $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$  and therefore  $x \notin K_n$  for all  $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ . Hence  $x \notin \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$ . Let now  $x \in X$ . If  $\varphi(x) = 0$ , then  $x \notin K_n$  for all  $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$  and so  $|\psi(x)| < 2^{-n}$ for all  $n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ . Hence  $\psi(x) = 0$  and so  $\psi(x) = \varphi(x)$ . Suppose now  $\varphi(x) > 0$ . Then  $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n$ . Let N be the smallest positive integer  $n \ge 1$  such that  $x \in K_n$ . If N = 1, then  $x \in K_1$  and so  $\varphi(x) = 1 > \psi(x)$ . If N > 1, then  $x \notin K_N$  and  $x \notin K_{N-1}$ . Hence

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{n=N}^{\infty} 2^{-n} = 2^{-(N-1)}$$

and  $\psi(x) < 2^{-(N-1)}$ , since  $x \notin K_{N-1}$ . Therefore  $\psi(x) < \varphi(x)$ , whenever  $\varphi(x) > 0$ .

Given any non-empty subset  $S \subset C(X; E)$  we denote by  $x \equiv y \pmod{S}$  the equivalence relation defined by f(x) = f(y) for all  $f \in S$ . For each  $x \in X$ , the equivalence class of  $x \pmod{S}$  is denoted by  $[x]_S$ , i.e.,

$$[x]_S = \{t \in X ; x \equiv t \pmod{S}\}$$

For any non-empty subset  $K \subset X$  and any  $f : X \to E$ , we denote by  $f_K$  its restriction to K. If  $S \subset C(X; E)$  and  $K \subset X$ , then for each  $x \in K$  one has

$$[x]_{S_K} = K \cap [x]_S.$$

If  $S \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$ , we define  $S^+$  by

$$S^+ = \{ f \in S \ ; \ f \ge 0 \}.$$

If  $S = C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$ , we write  $S^+ = C_b^+(X; \mathbb{R})$ .

**Definition 1.** Let  $S \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  and let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be given. We say that W is  $\beta$ -localizable under S if, for every  $f \in C_b(X; E)$ , the following are equivalent:

- (1) f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W;
- (2) for every φ ∈ D<sub>0</sub>(X), every ε > 0 and every x ∈ X, there is some g<sub>x</sub> ∈ W such that φ(t)||f(t) − g<sub>x</sub>(t)|| < ε for all t ∈ [x]<sub>S</sub>.

**Remark.** Clearly,  $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$  in any case. Hence a set W is  $\beta$ -localizable under S if, and only if,  $(2) \Rightarrow (1)$ . Notice also that if W is  $\beta$ -localizable under S and  $T \subset S$ , then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under T. Indeed,  $T \subset S$  implies  $[x]_S \subset [x]_T$ .

**Definition 2.** We say that a set  $W \subset C_b(X, E)$  is  $\beta$ -truncation stable if, for every  $f \in W$  and every M > 0, the function  $T_M \circ f$  belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W, where  $T_M : E \to E$  is the mapping defined by

$$T_M(v) = v, \text{ if } ||v|| < 2M;$$
  

$$T_M(v) = \frac{v}{||v||} \cdot 2M, \text{ if } ||v|| \ge 2M$$

Notice that, when  $E = \mathbb{R}$ , the mapping  $T_M : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$T_M(r) = r$$
, if  $||r|| < 2M$ ;  
 $T_M(r) = 2M$ , if  $r > 2M$ ;  
 $T_M(r) = -2M$ , if  $r > -2M$ 

Remark that, for every  $f \in C_b(X; E)$ , one has  $||T_M \circ f||_X \leq 2M$ .

Notice that when  $W \subset C_b^+(X; \mathbb{R})$ , then W is  $\beta$ -truncation stable if, for every  $f \in W$  and every constant M > 0, the function  $P_M \circ f$  belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W, where  $P_M : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$  is the mapping defined by  $P_M = \max(0, T_M)$ , i.e.,

$$P_M(r) = 0, \text{ if } r < 0;$$
  
 $P_M(r) = r, \text{ if } 0 \le r \le 2M;$   
 $P_M(r) = 2M, \text{ if } r > 2M.$ 

**Definition 3.** Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a non-empty subset. A function  $\psi \in D(X)$  is called a multiplier of W if  $\psi f + (1 - \psi)g$  belongs to W, for each pair, f and g, of elements of W.

**Definition 4.** A subset  $S \subset D(X)$  is said to have property V if

(a)  $\psi \in S$  implies  $(1 - \psi) \in S$ ;

(b) the product  $\varphi \psi$  belongs to S, for any pair,  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ , of elements of S.

Notice that the set of all multipliers of a subset  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  has property V. Indeed, condition (a) is clear and the equation

$$(\varphi\psi)f + (1-\varphi\psi)g = \varphi[\psi f + (1-\psi)g] + (1-\varphi)g$$

show that (b) holds as well.

When X is locally compact, R.C. Buck [1] proved a Weierstrass-Stone Theorem for subalgebras of  $C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  equipped with the strict topology. This result was extended and generalized by Glicksberg [4], Todd [7], Wells [8] and Giles [3]. See also Buck [2], where modules are dealt with, and Prolla [5], where the strict topology is considered as an example of weighted spaces.

Our versions of the Weierstrass-Stone Theorem are analogues of Chapter 4 of Prolla [6] for arbitrary subsets of C(X; E) equipped with the uniform convergence topology, X compact. Whereas the previous results dealt only with algebras or vector spaces which are modules over an algebra, our results now go much further: we are able to cover the case of convex sets (when X is completely regular) or  $\beta$ truncation stable sets (when X is just a topological space). The latter case cover both algebras and the convex cones obtained by taking the set of positive elements of an algebra.

#### §2. $\beta$ -truncation stable subsets

**Theorem 1.** Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a  $\beta$ -truncation stable non-empty subset, and let A be the set of all multipliers of W. Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A.

**Proof.** Let  $f \in C_b(X; E)$  be given and assume condition (2) of Definition 1, with S = A. Let  $\varphi \in D_0(X)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\varphi$  is not identically zero. Choose M > 0 so big that  $M > ||f||_X, M > \varepsilon$  and the compact set  $K = \{t \in X; \varphi(t) \ge \varepsilon/(6M)\}$  is non-empty. Consider the non-empty subset  $W_K \subset C(K; E)$ . Clearly, the set  $A_K \subset D(K)$  is a set of multipliers of  $W_K$ . Take a point  $x \in K$ . By condition (2) applied to  $\varepsilon^2/(12M)$ , there exists  $g_x \in W$  such that  $\varphi(t)||f(t) - g_x(t)|| < \varepsilon^2/(12M)$  for all  $t \in [x]_A$ . Let  $M \subset D(K)$  be the set of all multipliers of  $W_K \subset C(K; E)$ . Then M has property V. Now  $A_K \subset M$  implies

$$[x]_M \subset [x]_{A_K} = [x]_A \cap K.$$

Hence  $\varphi(t)||f(t) - g_x(t)|| < \varepsilon^2/(12M)$  holds for all  $t \in K$  such that  $t \in [x]_M$ . Now  $\varphi(t) \ge \varepsilon/(6M)$  for all  $t \in K$  and therefore

$$||f(t) - g_x(t)|| < \varepsilon/2$$

for all  $t \in [x]_M$ . By Theorem 1, Chapter 4, of Prolla [6] applied to  $W_K \subset C(K; E)$ and to the set  $M \subset D(K)$ , there is  $g_1 \in W$  such that

$$||f(t) - g_1(t)|| < \varepsilon/2$$

for all  $t \in K$ . Let  $h = T_M \circ g_1$ . By hypothesis, h belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W, and there is  $g \in W$  such that  $p_{\varphi}(h-g) < \varepsilon/2$ . We claim that  $p_{\varphi}(f-h) < \varepsilon/2$ . Let Approximation Results in the Strict Topology.

 $t \in K$ . Then

$$||g_1(t)|| \le ||f(t) - g_1(t)|| + ||f(t)|| < \varepsilon/2 + M < 2M$$

and so  $h(t) = T_M(g_1(t)) = g_1(t)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(t)||f(t) - h(t)|| &= \varphi(t)||f(t) - g_1(t)|| \\ &\leq ||f(t) - g_1(t)|| < \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now  $t \notin K$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(t)||f(t) - h(t)|| &< \frac{\varepsilon}{6M} ||f(t) - h(t)|| \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6M} \Big( ||f||_X + ||h||_X \Big) < \frac{\varepsilon}{6M} \cdot 3M = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} , \end{aligned}$$

because  $||h||_X \leq 2M$ , and  $||f||_X < M$ .

This establishes our claim that  $p_{\varphi}(f-h) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ . Hence  $p_{\varphi}(f-g) < \varepsilon$ , and f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W.

**Theorem 2.** Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a  $\beta$ -truncation stable non-empty subset, and let B be any non-empty set of multipliers of W. Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under B.

**Proof.** Let A be the set of all multipliers of W. By Theorem 1 the set W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A. Now  $B \subset A$ , so W is also  $\beta$ -localizable under B.

#### $\S3$ . The case of subalgebras

**Lemma 1.** If  $B \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  is a uniformly closed subalgebra, and  $T : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous mapping, with T(0) = 0, then  $T \circ f$  belongs to B, for every  $f \in B$ .

**Proof.** Let  $f \in B$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Choose  $k \ge ||f||_X$ . By Weierstrass' Theorem, there exists an algebraic polynomial p such that  $|T(t) - p(t)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $|t| \le k$ , and we may assume p(0) = T(0) = 0. Hence, for every  $x \in X$ , we have  $|T(f(x)) - p(f(x))| < \varepsilon$ , because  $|f(x)| \le k$ . Now  $p \circ f$  belongs to B, and therefore  $T \circ f$  belongs to the uniform closure of B, that is B itself.

Corollary 1. Every subalgebra  $W \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  is  $\beta$ -truncation stable.

**Proof.** Let  $f \in W$  and M > 0 be given. Let B be the  $\beta$ -closure of W in  $C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$ . We know that B is then a uniformly closed subalgebra. By Lemma 1 applied to  $T = T_M$ , we see that  $T_M \circ f$  belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W as claimed.

Corollary 2. Every uniformly closed subalgebra of  $C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  is a lattice.

**Proof.** Since

$$\max(f,g) = \frac{1}{2} \Big[ f + g + |f - g| \Big]$$
  
$$\min(f,g) = \frac{1}{2} \Big[ f + g - |f - g| \Big]$$

it suffices to show that  $|f| \in B$ , for every  $f \in B$ . This follows from Lemma 1, by taking  $T : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  to be the mapping T(t) = |t|, for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Theorem 3.** Every subalgebra  $W \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  is  $\beta$ -localizable under itself.

**Proof.** Let  $f \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  and assume that condition (2) of Definition 1 holds with S = W. Notice that for every  $x \in X$  one has

$$[x]_W = [x]_B$$

where B is the  $\beta$ -closure of W. Let now

$$V = \{\psi \in B; ||\psi||_X \le 1\}$$
 and  $A = \{\psi \in B; 0 \le \psi \le 1\}.$ 

It is easy to see that

$$[x]_B = [x]_V \subset [x]_A$$

for each  $x \in X$ . Notice that, by Corollary 2, every  $\psi \in V$  can be written in the form  $\psi = \psi^+ - \psi^-$ , with  $\psi^+$  and  $\psi^-$  in A. Hence  $[x]_A \subset [x]_V$  is also true. Hence f satisfies condition (2) of Definition 1 with respect to S = A. Now A is a set of multipliers of B, and the algebra B, by Corollary 1, is  $\beta$ -truncation stable. Hence, by Theorem 3, the function f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of B, that is B itself. We have proved that f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W. Hence W is  $\beta$ -localizable under S = W.

Corollary 3. Let  $W \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  be a subalgebra, and let  $f \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  be given. Then f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W if, and only if, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) for each pair, x and y, of elements of X such that  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ , there is some  $g \in W$  such that  $g(x) \neq g(y)$ ;
- (2) for each  $x \in X$  such that  $f(x) \neq 0$  there is some  $g \in W$  such that  $g(x) \neq 0$ .

**Proof.** Clearly, if  $f \in \overline{W}^{\beta}$ , then (1) and (2) are satisfied. Conversely, assume that conditions (1) and (2) are verified.

Let  $x \in X$  be given. By condition (1) the function f is constant on  $[x]_W$ . Let f(x) be its value. If f(x) = 0, then  $g_x = 0$  belongs to W and  $f(t) = f(x) = 0 = g_x(t)$  for all  $t \in [x]_W$ . If  $f(x) \neq 0$ , by condition (2) there is  $g \in W$  such that  $g(x) \neq 0$ . Define  $g_x = [f(x)/g(x)]g$ . Then  $g_x \in W$  and  $g_x(t) = f(x) = f(t)$  for all  $t \in [x]_W$ . Hence f satisfies condition (2) of Definition 1 with respect to S = W. By Theorem 3, we conclude that f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W.

Corollary 3 implies the following results.

Corollary 4. Let A be a subalgebra of  $C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  which for each  $x \in X$  contains a function g with  $g(x) \neq 0$ , and let  $f \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  be given. Then f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of A if, and only if, for each pair, x and y, of elements of X such that  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ , there is some  $g \in A$  such that  $g(x) \neq g(y)$ .

Corollary 5. Let A be a subalgebra of  $C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  which separates the points of X and for each  $x \in X$  contains a function g with  $g(x) \neq 0$ . Then A is  $\beta$ -dense in  $C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$ .

Corollary 6. If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space, then  $C_{00}(X; \mathbb{R})$  is  $\beta$ -dense in  $C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$ .

Lemma 2. Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  be a continuous function such that  $f(t) \ge 0$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and f(0) = 0. If k > 0 and  $\varepsilon > 0$  are given, there is a real algebraic polynomial p such that  $p(t) \ge 0$  for all  $0 \le t \le k$ , p(0) = 0 and  $|p(t) - f(t)| \le \varepsilon$  for all  $0 \le t \le k$ .

**Proof.** Define  $g:[0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$  by setting g(u) = f(ku), for each  $u \in [0,1]$ . Clearly,  $g(u) \ge 0$ , for all  $0 \le u \le 1$  and g(0) = 0. Now, given  $\varepsilon > 0$ , choose *n* so that the *n*-th Bernstein polynomial of *g*, written  $B_ng$ , is such that

$$|(B_ng)(u)-g(u)|<\varepsilon$$

for all  $0 \le u \le 1$ . For  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , define  $p(t) = (B_n g)(t/k)$ . Since  $B_n g \ge 0$  in [0,1], it follows that  $p(t) \ge 0$ , for  $t \in [0, k]$ . Since  $(B_n g)(0) = g(0) = f(0) = 0$ , we see that p(0) = 0. It remains to notice that, for any  $0 \le t \le k$  we have  $0 \le t/k \le 1$  and

$$|p(t) - f(t)| = |(B_n g)(t/k) - g(t/k)| < \varepsilon \qquad \Box$$

Lemma 3. If  $A \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  is a subalgebra, then  $A^+$  is  $\beta$ -truncation stable.

**Proof.** Let  $f \in A^+$  and M > 0 be given. We claim that  $P_M \circ f$  belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of  $A^+$ . Let k > 0 be such that  $0 \leq f(x) \leq k$  for all  $x \in X$ . Let  $\varphi \in D_0(X)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. By Lemma 2 above there exists a polynomial  $p : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$  such that  $p(t) \geq 0$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq k, p(0) = 0$  and  $|p(t) - P_M(t)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq k$ . Let  $x \in X$ . Then  $\varphi(x) \leq 1$  and so  $\varphi(x)|p(f(x)) - P_M(f(x))| < \varepsilon$ . Now  $p \circ f$  belongs to A (since p(0) = 0) and  $p(f(x)) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in X$ , since  $0 \leq f(x) \leq k$ . Hence  $p \circ f \in A^+$ . This ends the proof that  $P_M \circ f$  belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of  $A^+$  as claimed.

**Theorem 4.** If  $A \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  is a subalgebra, then  $A^+$  is localizable under itself.

**Proof.** Let  $f \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  be given satisfying condition (2) of Definition 1 with respect to  $S = A^+$ . Define  $B = \{f \in A; 0 \le f \le 1\}$ . It is easy to see that  $[x]_S = [x]_B$ , for every  $x \in X$ . Hence f satisfies condition (2) of Definition 1 with respect to B, which is a set of multipliers of  $A^+$ . By Lemma 3, the set  $A^+$  is  $\beta$ -truncation stable. Therefore  $A^+$  is  $\beta$ -localizable under B, by Theorem 2. Hence f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of  $A^+$ .

**Theorem 4.** Let  $A \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  be a subalgebra and let  $f \in C_b^+(X; \mathbb{R})$  be given. Then f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of  $A^+$  if, and only if, the following two conditions hold:

- (1) for each pair, x and y, of elements of X such that  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ , there is some  $g \in A^+$  such that  $g(x) \neq g(y)$ ;
- (2) for each  $x \in X$  such that f(x) > 0 there is some  $g \in A^+$  such that g(x) > 0.

**Proof.** If f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of  $A^+$  the two conditions (1) and (2) above are easily seen to hold. Conversely, assume that conditions (1) and (2) above hold. Let  $x \in X$  be given. By condition (1), the function f is constant on  $[x]_S$  where  $S = A^+$ . Let  $f(x) \ge 0$  be its constant value. If f(x) = 0, then  $g_x = 0$  belongs to  $A^+$  and  $f(t) = f(x) = 0 = g_x(t)$  for all  $t \in [x]_S$ . If f(x) > 0, then by condition (2) there is  $g_x \in A^+$  such that g(x) > 0. Let  $g_x = [f(x)/g(x)]g$ . Then  $g_x \in A^+$  and  $g_x(t) = f(x) = f(t)$  for all  $t \in [x]_S$ . Hence f satisfies condition (2) of Definition 1 with respect to  $W = A^+$  and  $S = A^+$ . By Theorem 4, we conclude that f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of  $A^+$ .

#### $\S4$ . The case of uniformly bounded subsets

**Theorem 5.** Let W be a uniformly bounded subset of  $C_b(X; E)$  and let A be the set of all multipliers of W. Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A.

**Proof.** Let  $f \in C_b(X; E)$  be given and assume that condition (2) of Definition 1 holds with S = A. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\varphi \in D_0(X)$  be given. Choose M > 0 so big that  $M > ||f||_X$  and  $M > k = \sup\{||g||_X; g \in W\}$ , and the compact set  $K = \{t \in X; \varphi(t) \ge \varepsilon/(2M)\}$  is non-empty. (Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\varphi$  is not identically zero). Consider the non-empty set  $W_K \subset C(K; E)$ . Clearly, the set  $A_K$  is a set of multipliers of  $W_K$ . Take a point  $x \in K$ . By condition (2) applied to  $\varepsilon^2/(2M)$ , there exists some  $g_x \in W$  such that

$$|\varphi(t)||f(t) - g_x(t)|| < \varepsilon^2/(2M)$$

for all  $t \in [x]_A$ . Hence  $||f(t) - g_x(t)|| < \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in [x]_{A_K}$ , since  $\varphi(t) \ge \varepsilon/(2M)$ for all  $t \in K$ . Let now M be the set of all multipliers of  $W_K \subset C(K; E)$ . Since  $A_K \subset M$ , it follows that  $[x]_M \subset [x]_{A_K}$  and so  $||f(t) - g_x(t)|| < \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in [x]_M$ . By Theorem 1, Chapter 4 of Prolla [6] there is  $g \in W$  such that  $||f(t) - g(t)|| < \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in K$ . We claim that  $p_{\varphi}(t-g) < \varepsilon$ . Let  $x \in X$ . If  $x \in K$ , then  $\varphi(x) \le 1$  and

$$\varphi(x)||f(x) - g(x)|| \le ||f(x) - g(x)|| < \varepsilon.$$

If  $x \notin K$ , then

$$\varphi(x)||f(x) - g(x)|| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2M}[||f||_X + ||g||_X] < \varepsilon.$$

Hence f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W and so W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A.

**Theorem 6.** Let W be a uniformly bounded subset of  $C_b(X; E)$  and let B be any non-empty set of multipliers of W. Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under B.

**Proof.** Let A be the set of all multipliers of W. Since  $B \subset A$  and by Theorem 5 the set W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A, it follows that W is also  $\beta$ -localizable under  $B_{\Box}$ 

**Theorem 7.** Let A be a non-empty subset of D(X) with property V and let  $f \in D(X)$ . Then f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of A if, and only if, the following two conditions hold:

- (1) for every pair of points, x and y, of X such that  $f(x) \neq f(y)$ , there exists  $g \in A$  such that  $g(x) \neq g(y)$ ;
- (2) for every  $x \in X$  such that 0 < f(x) < 1, there exists  $g \in A$  such that 0 < g(x) < 1.

**Proof.** It is easy to see that conditions (1) and (2) are necessary for f to belong to the  $\beta$ -closure of A. Conversely, assume that f satisifies conditions (1) and (2).

Let  $\varphi \in D_0(X)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\varphi$  is not identically zero. Choose  $\delta > 0$  so small that  $2\delta < \varepsilon$  and the compact set  $K = \{t \in X; \varphi(t) \ge \delta\}$  is non-empty. Clearly,  $A_K$  has property V. Since conditions (1) and (2) hold, we may apply Theorem 1, Chapter 8, Prolla [6] to conclude that  $f_K$  belongs to the uniform closure of  $A_K$ . Hence there is some  $g \in A$  such that  $|f(t) - g(t)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in K$ . We claim that  $p_{\varphi}(f - g) < \varepsilon$ . Let  $x \in X$ . If  $x \in K$ , then  $\varphi(x) \le 1$  and  $\varphi(x)|f(x) - g(x)| \le |f(x) - g(x)| < \varepsilon$ .

If  $x \notin K$ , then  $\varphi(x) < \delta$  and

$$\varphi(x)|f(x) - g(x)| \leq \delta[||f||_X + ||g||_X] \leq 2\delta < \varepsilon.$$

Hence f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of A.

**Remark.** We say that a subset  $A \subset D(X)$  has property VN if  $fg + (1 - f)h \in A$ 

for all  $f, g, h \in A$ . Clearly, if A has property VN and contains 0 and 1, then A has property V.

Corollary 6. Let A be a non-empty subset of D(X) with property V, and let W be its  $\beta$ -closure. Then W has property VN and W is a lattice.

**Proof.** (a) W has property VN: Let  $f, g, \varphi$  belong to W, and let  $h = \varphi f + (1 - \varphi)g$ . Assume  $h(x) \neq h(y)$ . Then at least one of the following three equalities is necessarily false:  $\varphi(x) = \varphi(y), f(x) = f(y)$  and g(x) = g(y). Since  $\varphi, f$  and g belong all three to W, there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $a(x) \neq a(y)$ . Hence h satisfies condition (1) of Theorem 7. Suppose now that 0 < h(x) < 1. If  $0 < \varphi(x) < 1$ , then 0 < a(x) < 1for some  $a \in A$ , because  $\varphi$  belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of A. Assume that  $\varphi(x) = 0$ . Then h(x) = g(x) and so 0 < g(x) < 1. Since  $g \in W$ , it follows that 0 < a(x) < 1for some  $a \in A$ . Similarly, if  $\varphi(x) = 1$  then h(x) = f(x) and so 0 < f(x) < 1. Since  $f \in W$ , there is  $a \in A$  such that 0 < a(x) < 1. Hence h satisfies condition (2) of Theorem 7. By Theorem 7 above, the function h belongs to W.

(b) W is lattice: Let f and g belong to W. Let  $h = \max(f, g)$ . Let x and y be a pair of points of X such that  $h(x) \neq h(y)$ . Then at least one of the two equalities f(x) = f(y), g(x) = g(y) must be false. Since f and g both belong to the  $\beta$ -closure of A, there exists  $a \in A$  such that  $a(x) \neq a(y)$ . On the other hand, let  $x \in X$  be such that 0 < h(x) < 1. If  $f(x) \ge g(x)$ , then h(x) = f(x) and so 0 < f(x) < 1. Since  $f \in W$ , there exists  $a \in A$  such that 0 < a(x) < 1. Assume now f(x) < g(x). Then h(x) = g(x) and so 0 < g(x) < 1. Since  $g \in W$ , there exists  $a \in A$  such that 0 < a(x) < 1. By Theorem 7 above, the function h belongs to W. Similarly, one shows that the function  $\min(f, g)$  belongs to W.

**Corollary 7.** Let A be a  $\beta$ -closed non-empty subset of D(X) with property V. Then A has property VN and A is a lattice.

**Proof.** Immediate from Corollary 6.

### $\S5.$ The case of convex subsets

In this section we suppose that X is a completely regular Hausdorff space. We denote its Stone-Čech compactification by  $\beta X$ , and by  $\beta : C_b(X; \mathbb{R}) \to C(\beta X; \mathbb{R})$ the linear isometry which to each  $f \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  assigns its (unique) continuous extension to  $\beta X$ . Since  $\beta$  is an algebra (and lattice) isomorphism, the image  $\beta(A)$  of any subset  $A \subset C_b(X, \mathbb{R})$  with property V is contained in  $D(\beta X)$  and has property V. If  $B = \beta(A)$ , then for each  $x \in X$  one has

$$[x]_A = [x]_B \cap X.$$

If Y denotes the quotient space of  $\beta X$  by the equivalence relation  $x \equiv y$  if and only if  $\varphi(x) = \varphi(y)$ , for all  $\varphi \in B$ , then Y is a compact Hausdorff space.

If  $x \in X$  and  $K_x \subset X$  is a compact subset disjoint from  $[x]_A$ , then  $\pi(K_x)$ is a compact subset in Y which does not contain the point  $\pi(x)$ . (Here we have denoted by  $\pi$  the canonical projection  $\pi : \beta X \to Y$ . Indeed, if  $\pi(x) \in \pi(K_x)$ , then  $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$  for some  $y \in K_x$ . Now  $y \in [x]_B$  because that  $y \in [x]_A$ . But  $K_x \cap [x]_A = \phi$ , and we have reached a contradiction. Hence  $\pi(x) \notin \pi(K_x)$ . We will apply these remarks in the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 4. Let  $A \subset D(X)$  be a subset with property V and containing some constant 0 < c < 1. Let  $x \in X$  and let  $K_x \subset X$  be a compact subset, disjoint from  $[x]_A$ . Then, there exists an open neighborhood W(x) of  $[x]_A$  in X, disjoint from  $K_x$  and such that given  $0 < \delta < 1$  there is  $\varphi \in A$  such that

- (1)  $\varphi(t) < \delta$ , for all  $t \in K_x$ ; (2)  $\varphi(t) > 1 \delta$ , for all  $t \in W(x)$ .

**Proof.** Let N(x) be the complement of  $K_x$  in  $\beta X$ . Then N(x) is an open neighbor

borhood of  $[x]_A$  in  $\beta X$ . We know that  $\pi(K_x)$  is a compact subset of Y which does not contain the point  $y = \pi(x)$ . Let  $f \in C(Y; \mathbb{R})$  be a mapping such that  $0 \leq f \leq 1, f(y) = 0$  and f(t) = 1 for all  $t \in \pi(K_x)$ . Let  $g = f \circ \pi$ . By Theorem 1, Chapter 8, Prolla [6], the function g belongs to the uniform closure of B in  $D(\beta X)$ . Notice that a(x) = 0 and g(u) = 1, for all  $u \in K_x$ . Define  $N(x) = \{t \in \beta X; g(t) < 1/4\}$ . Clearly,  $[x]_B \subset N(x)$ , since g(t) = 0 for all  $t \in [x]_B$ . It is also clear that N(x) is disjoint from  $K_x$ . Let us define  $W(x) = N(x) \cap X$ . Then W(x) is an open neighborhood of  $[x]_A$  in X, which is disjoint from  $K_x$ .

Given  $0 < \delta < 1$ , let p be a polynomial determined by Lemma 1, Chapter 1, Prolla [6], applied to a = 1/4 and b = 3/4, and  $\varepsilon = \delta/2$ . Let h(t) = p(g(t)), for all  $t \in \beta X$ . Since  $\overline{B}$  has property V, it follows that  $h \in \overline{B}$ . If  $t \in K_x$ , then g(t) = 1and so  $h(t) < \delta/2$ . If  $t \in W(x)$ , then g(t) < 1/4 and so  $h(t) > 1 - \delta/2$ . Choose now  $\psi \in B$  with  $||\psi - h||_X < \delta/2$ , and let  $\varphi \in A$  be such that  $\beta(\varphi) = \psi$ . Then  $\varphi \in A$ satisfies conditions (1) and (2).

**Theorem 8.** Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a non-empty subset and let A be a set of multipliers of W which has property V and contains some constant 0 < c < 1. Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A.

**Proof.** Assume that condition (2) of Definition 1 is true with S = A. For each  $x \in X$ , there is some  $g_x \in W$  such that, for all  $t \in [x]_A$ , one has  $\varphi(t)||f(t) - g_x(t)|| < \varepsilon/2$ . Consider the compact subset  $K_x$  of X defined by

$$K_x = \{t \in X; \varphi(t) || f(t) - g_x(t) || \ge \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \}.$$

Clearly,  $K_x$  is disjoint from  $[x]_A$ . Now for each  $x \in X$ , select an open neighborhood W(x) of  $[x]_A$ , disjoint from  $K_x$ , according to Lemma 4.

Select and fix a point  $x_1 \in X$ . Let  $K = K_{x_1}$ . By compactness of K, there exists a finite set  $\{x_2, \ldots, x_m\} \subset K$  such that

$$K \subset W(x_2) \cup W(x_3) \cup \ldots \cup W(x_m)$$

Let  $k = \sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{\varphi}(f - g_{x_i})$  and let  $0 < \delta < 1$  be so small that  $\delta k < \varepsilon/2$ . By Lemma 4, there are  $\varphi_2, \ldots, \varphi_m \in A$  such that (a)  $\varphi_i(t) < \delta$ , for all  $t \in K_{x_i}$ ; (b)  $\varphi_i(t) > 1 - \delta$ , for all  $t \in W(x_i)$ for  $i = 2, \ldots, m$ . Define

$$\begin{split} \psi_2 &= \varphi_2 \\ \psi_3 &= (1 - \varphi_2)\varphi_3 \\ \dots \\ \psi_m &= (1 - \varphi_2)(1 - \varphi_3) \dots (1 - \varphi_{m-1})\varphi_m. \end{split}$$

Clearly,  $\psi_i \in A$  for all  $i = 2, \ldots, m$ . Now

 $\psi_2 + \ldots + \psi_j = 1 - (1 - \varphi_2)(1 - \varphi_3) \ldots (1 - \varphi_j)$ 

for all  $j \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$ , can be easily seen by induction. Define

$$\psi_1 = (1 - \varphi_2)(1 - \varphi_3) \dots (1 - \varphi_m)$$

then  $\psi_1 \in A$  and  $\psi_1 + \psi_2 + \ldots + \psi_m = 1$ .

Notice that

(c)  $\psi_i(t) < \delta$  for all  $t \in K_{x_i}$ 

for each i = 1, 2, ..., m. Indeed, if  $i \ge 2$  then (c) follows from (a). If i = 1, then for  $t \in K$ , we have  $t \in W(x_j)$  for some j = 2, ..., m. By (b), one has  $1 - \varphi_j(t) < \delta$  and so

$$\psi_1(t) = (1 - \varphi_j(t)) \prod_{i \neq j} (1 - \varphi_i(t)) < \delta.$$

Let us write  $g_i = g_{x_i}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$ .

Define  $g = \psi_1 g_1 + \psi_2 g_2 + \ldots + \psi_m g_m$ . Notice that

$$g = \varphi_2 g_2 + (1 - \varphi_2) [\varphi_3 g_3 + (1 - \varphi_3) [\varphi_4 g_4 + \ldots + (1 - \varphi_{m-1}) [\varphi_m g_m + (1 - \varphi_m) g_1] \ldots]].$$

Hence  $g \in W$ . Let  $x \in X$  be given. Then

$$\begin{array}{lll} \varphi(x)||f(x) - g(x)|| &= & \varphi(x)||\sum_{i=1}^{m} \psi_i(x)(f(x) - g_i(x))|| \\ &\leq & \varphi(x)||\sum_{i=1}^{m} \psi_i(x)||(f(x) - g_i(x))|| \end{array}$$

Define  $I = \{1 \le \tau \le m; x \notin K_{x_i}\}; J = \{1 \le i \le m; x \in K_{x_i}\}.$ If  $i \in I$ , then  $x \notin K_{x_i}$  and

$$|\varphi(x)||f(x)-g_i(x)|| < rac{arepsilon}{2}$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (*)\sum_{i\in I}\varphi(x)\psi_i(x)||f(x) - g_i(x)|| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\sum_{i\in I}\psi_i(x) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.\\ \text{If } i\in J, \text{ then by (c), }\psi_i(x) < \delta \text{ and so}\\ (**)\sum_{i\in J}\varphi(x)\psi_i(x)||f(x) - g_i(x)|| &\leq \delta k < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

From (\*) and (\*\*) we get  $\varphi(x)||f(x) - q(x)|| < \varepsilon$ .

**Theorem 9.** Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a non-empty convex subset and let A be the set of all multipliers of W. Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A.

**Proof.** The set A has property V and, since W is convex, every constant 0 < c < 1 belongs to A.

**Theorem 10.** Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  b a non-empty convex subset and let B be any non-empty set of multipliers of W. Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under B.

Proof. Similar to that of Theorem 6, using now Theorem 9 instead of Theorem 5.

Corollary 8. Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a non-empty convex subset such that the set of all multipliers of W separates the points of X. Then, for each  $f \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  the following are equivalent:

- (1) f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W;
- (2) for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  and each  $x \in X$ , there is some  $g \in W$  such that  $||f(x) g(x)|| < \varepsilon$ .

**Proof.** Clearly,  $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ . Suppose now that (2) holds. Let  $\varphi \in D_0(X), \varepsilon > 0$ and  $x \in X$  be given. Notice that  $[x]_W = \{x\}$ . If  $\varphi(x) = 0$ , for any  $g \in W$  one has  $\varphi(x)||f(x) - q(x)|| = 0 < \varepsilon$ . If  $\varphi(x) > 0$ , by (2) there is  $g \in W$  such that  $||f(x) - g(x)|| < \varepsilon/\varphi(x)$ . Hence  $\varphi(x)||f(x) - q(x)|| < \varepsilon$ , and by Theorem 9, (1) is true.

Corollary 9. Let  $S \subset X$  be a non-empty closed subset and let  $V \subset E$  be a non-empty convex subset. Let  $W = \{g \in C_b(X; E); g(S) \subset V\}$ . Then, for each  $f \in C_b(X; E)$  the following are equivalent:

- (1) f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W;
- (2) for each  $x \in S$ , f(x) belongs to the closure of V in E

Hence,  $\overline{W}^{\beta} = \{f \in C_b(X; E); f(S) \subset \overline{V}\}$ , where  $\overline{V}$  is the closure of V in E.

**Proof.** Clearly,  $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ . Conversely, assume that (2) holds. Clearly, W is a convex set such that D(X) is the set of all multipliers of W. Since X is a completely regular Hausdorff space, D(X) separates the points of X. Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $x \in X$  be given. If  $x \in S$  there is  $v \in V$  such that  $||f(x) - v|| < \varepsilon$ , and the constant mapping on X whose value is v belongs to W and g(x) = v. If  $x \notin S$ , choose  $\varphi \in C_b(X; \mathbb{R}), 0 \le \varphi \le 1, \varphi(t) = 1$  for all  $t \in S$  and  $\varphi(x) = 0$ ; and let  $g \in C_b(X; E)$ 

o

be defined by  $g = \varphi \otimes v_0 + (1 - \varphi) \otimes f(x)$ , where  $v_0 \in V$  is chosen arbitrarily. Then  $g(t) = v_0$  for all  $t \in S$ , and therefore  $g \in W$ , and g(x) = f(x). Hence (2) of Corollary 8 is verified and so f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W.

Corollary 10. Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a non-empty convex subset such that the set of all multipliers of W separates the points of X and, for each  $x \in X$ , the set  $W(x) = \{g(x); g \in W\}$  is dense in E. Then W is  $\beta$ -dense in  $C_b(X; E)$ .

**Proof.** Apply Corollary 8.

Corollary 11. The vector subspace  $W = C_b(X; \mathbb{R}) \otimes E$  is  $\beta$ -dense in  $C_b(X; E)$ .

**Proof.** The set A of all multipliers of W is D(X), and W(x) = E, for each  $x \in X$ . It remains to apply Corollary 10.

**Corollary 12.** If X is a locally compact Hausdorff space, then  $C_{00}(X; \mathbb{R}) \otimes E$  is  $\beta$ -dense in  $C_b(X; E)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $W = C_{00}(X; \mathbb{R}) \otimes E$ . As in the previous corollary, the set A of all multipliers of W is D(X), and for each  $x \in X, W(x) = E$ .

**Theorem 11.** Let  $A \subset C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  be a subalgebra and let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a vector subspace which is an A-module, i.e.,  $AW \subset W$ . Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A.

**Proof.** Let  $f \in C_b(X; E)$  be given. Assume that condition (2) of Definition 1 holds with S = A. Without loss of generality we may assume that A is  $\beta$ -closed and contains the constants. Let M be the set of all multipliers of W. We claim that, for each  $x \in X$ , one has  $[x]_M \subset [x]_A$ . Indeed, let  $t \in [x]_M$  and let  $\varphi \in A$ . If  $\varphi = 0$ , then  $\varphi \in M$  and  $\varphi(t) = \varphi(x)$ . Assume  $\varphi \neq 0$ . Write  $\varphi = \varphi^+ - \varphi^-$ ,

where  $\varphi^+ = \max(\varphi, 0)$  and  $\varphi^- = \max(-\varphi, 0)$ . By Corollary 2, §3, both  $\varphi^+$  and  $\varphi^$ belong to A. If  $\varphi^+ = 0$ , then  $\varphi^+$  belongs to M and  $\varphi^+(t) = \varphi^+(x)$ . If  $\varphi^+ \neq 0$ , let  $\psi = \varphi^+/||\varphi^+||_X$ . Now  $\psi$  belongs to A and  $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$ . Hence  $\psi \in M$  and therefore  $\psi(t) = \psi(x)$ . Consequently, one has  $\varphi^+(t) = \varphi^+(x)$ . Similarly, one proves that  $\varphi^-(t) = \varphi^-(x)$ . Hence  $\varphi(t) = \varphi(x)$ . This ends the proof that  $[x]_M \subset [x]_A$  for all  $x \in X$ . Hence condition (2) of Definition 1 is verified with S = M. By Theorem 9, W is  $\beta$ -localizable under M. Hence f belongs to the  $\beta$ -closure of W.

Corollary 13. Let  $W \subset C_b(X; E)$  be a vector subspace, and let

$$A = \{ \psi \in C_b(X; I\!\!R); \psi g \in W \text{ for all } g \in W \}.$$

Then W is  $\beta$ -localizable under A.

**Proof.** Clearly A is a subalgebra of  $C_b(X; \mathbb{R})$  and W is an A-module.

#### References

- R.C. Buck, Bounded continuous functions on a locally compact space, Michigan Math. J. 5 (1958), 95-104.
- R.C. Buck, Approximation properties of vector-valued functions, Pacific J. Math. 53 (1974), 85-94.
- [3] R. Giles, A generalization of the strict topology, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 161 (1971), 467-474.
- [4] I. Glicksberg, Bishop's generalized Stone-Weierstrass Theorem for the strict topology, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 14 (1963), 329-333.
- [5] J.B. Prolla, Approximation of Vector Valued Function. North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, 1977.

- [6] J.B. Prolla, Weierstrass-Stone, the Theorem. Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1993.
- [7] C. Todd, Stone-Weirstrass theorems for the strict topology, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 16 (1965), 654-659.
- [8] J. Wells, Bounded continuous vector-valued functions on a locally compact space, *Michigan Math. J.* **12** (1965), 119-126.

João B. Prolla IMECC-UNICAMP Caixa Postal 6065 13083-970 Campinas SP Brasil Samuel Navarro Departamento de Matematicas Universidad de Santiago Casilla 5659 C-2 Santiago Chile

Manuscrit reçu en Janvier 1997