

LEBESGUE-STIELTJES INTEGRATION

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Mathematics

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

George O. Golightly

August, 1968

454392

LEBESGUE-STIELTJES INTEGRATION

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Mathematics
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
George O. Golightly

August, 1968

ABSTRACT

In the following, we shall develop enough of the theory of Lebesgue-Stieltjes integration to define the measure of a number set with respect to a non-decreasing function. Our development partially parallels that of F. Riesz's development of the Lebesgue integral.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	The Class $C_0(a)$	1
II	The Class $C_1(a)$	15
III	The Class $C_2(a)$; a -measurable Sets	21

CHAPTER I

THE CLASS $C_0(a)$

We shall begin by stating two preliminary assumptions and establishing some notation used in the sequel.

Assumption I. If a is a non-decreasing function from the set of all real numbers then there are at most countably many numbers x at which a is not continuous and for each such number x the limits $a(x+)$ and $a(x-)$ exist.

Assumption II. If M is a closed, bounded number set and f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots is a non-increasing sequence of non-negative functions, whose restrictions to M are continuous, and if the sequence (f_i) converges on M to the zero function then (f_i) converges uniformly on M .

Henceforth, all functions are assumed to be real-valued and to have domain the set of all real numbers. We shall use the letter "a" to denote some non-decreasing function.

If S is a collection, S^* denotes the union of the elements of S . If M is a number set, \overline{M} denotes the closure of M .

The statement that f is a step function means that f is a function and there is a finite collection H of

mutually exclusive open intervals such that $\overline{H^*}$ fills up some closed interval $[c,d]$, a is continuous at each end-number of an open interval in H , f is constant on each interval of H and zero off $[c,d]$. Such a collection H will be called a defining collection for the function f . The collection of all step functions will be denoted $C_0(a)$.

The a -length of the open interval (p,q) is the number $a(q-)-a(p+)$ and is denoted $l_a((p,q))$. The statement that N is an a -null set means that N is the empty set or N is a number set such that if c is a positive number there is a collection G of open intervals covering N such that the sum of the a -lengths of the elements in any finite subcollection of G is less than c .

Note 0. Suppose (A_i) is a sequence of a -null sets. Then $\{A_i \mid i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$ is an a -null set.

Note 1. Suppose H and K are defining collections for the function f . Then

$$\sum (f(t_{pq})[a(q-)-a(p+)] , \text{ where } t_{pq} \text{ is in } (p,q) \mid (p,q) \text{ in } H) = \sum (f(t_{pq})[a(q-)-a(p+)] , \text{ where } t_{pq} \text{ is in } (p,q) \mid (p,q) \text{ in } K).$$

The statement that j is an a -integral for the function f in $C_0(a)$ means that there is a defining collection H such that j is

$$\sum (f(t_{pq})[a(q-)-a(p+)] , \text{ with } t_{pq} \text{ in } (p,q) \mid (p,q) \text{ in } H).$$

The a -integral for the function f in $C_0(a)$ will be denoted $L_a(f)$.

Note 2. Note 1 shows that a function f in $C_0(a)$ has only one a -integral. If b is a number and f is a function in $C_0(a)$, then bf is a function in $C_0(a)$ and $L_a(bf)$ is $bL_a(f)$. Furthermore, if f and g are functions in $C_0(a)$, then $f+g$ is a function in $C_0(a)$ and $L_a(f+g)$ is $L_a(f)+L_a(g)$, $\max(f,g)$ and $\min(f,g)$ are functions in $C_0(a)$, and, in consequence, $|f|$ is a function in $C_0(a)$. If f is a non-negative function in $C_0(a)$, $L_a(f)$ is non-negative.

Suppose H_1, \dots, H_n are finite collections of open intervals. Suppose that if i is a positive integer in $[1, n]$ N_i denotes the set of end-numbers of open intervals in H_i . $\{N_1, \dots, N_n\}^*$ is a finite number set $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$, where $a_i < a_j$ if $i < j$ and i and j are integers in $[1, m]$. The collection $\{(a_i, a_{i+1}) \mid i \text{ an integer in } [1, m-1]\}$ will be denoted $H_1 \circ H_2 \circ \dots \circ H_n$.

Note 3. Suppose H is a collection of open intervals and c is a positive number such that if K is a finite sub-collection of H then $\sum(L_a(k) \mid k \text{ in } K) \leq c$. If P is a finite collection of mutually exclusive open intervals, each of which is a subset of H^* , then $\sum(L_a(t) \mid t \text{ in } P) \leq c$.

Proof. Suppose there is a finite collection P , of

mutually exclusive open intervals, each of which is a subset of H^* , such that $\sum (\ell_a(t) \mid t \text{ in } P) \geq c$.

There is a finite collection, T , of mutually exclusive open intervals, the closure of each member of which is a subset of P^* , such that $\sum (\ell_a(t) \mid t \text{ in } T) \geq c$.

There is a finite subcollection, $\{(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_m, b_m)\}$, of H covering $\overline{T^*}$ such that no proper subcollection of $\{(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_m, b_m)\}$ covers $\overline{T^*}$.

There is a collection, $\{(c_i, d_i) \mid i \text{ an integer in } [1, m]\}$, of open intervals at each end-number of which a is continuous such that if i is an integer in $[1, m]$ then (c_i, d_i) is a subset of (a_i, b_i) and such that $\overline{T^*}$ is a subset of $\{(c_i, d_i) \mid i \text{ an integer in } [1, m]\}^*$.

There is a finite collection, I , of mutually exclusive open intervals, each of which is a subset of some member of T and of only one member of $\{(c_i, d_i) \mid i \text{ an integer in } [1, m]\}$, such that $\overline{I^*}$ is $\overline{T^*}$ and $\sum (\ell_a(i) \mid i \text{ in } I) = \sum (\ell_a(t) \mid t \text{ in } T)$.

Note that if (a, b) is an open interval and S is a finite collection of mutually exclusive open intervals, each of which is a subset of (a, b) , $\sum (\ell_a(s) \mid s \text{ in } S) \leq \ell_a((a, b))$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Thus, } \sum (\lambda_a(i) | i \text{ in } I) &= \\ \sum (\sum (\lambda_a(i) | i \text{ in } I \text{ and } i \in (c_j, d_j)) | j \text{ an integer in } [1, m]) &\leq \\ \sum (\lambda_a((c_j, d_j)) | j \text{ an integer in } [1, m]) &\leq \\ \sum (\lambda_a((a_j, b_j)) | j \text{ an integer in } [1, m]) &\leq c. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction.

Theorem A. Suppose f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots , is a non-increasing sequence of non-negative functions in $C_0(a)$. Then the following two statements are equivalent:

- (1) The sequence $(L_a(f_j))$ has limit zero.
- (2) There exists an a -null set N such that if x is a number not in N the sequence $(f_j(x))$ has limit zero.

Proof. (1) implies (2). Suppose there is a sequence, (f_j) , for which (1) holds and (2) does not hold. Suppose N denotes the set of all numbers x such that the sequence $(f_j(x))$ does not converge to zero. Then N is not an a -null set. If x is a number in N , there is a positive integer i such that if n is a positive integer $f_n(x) > 1/i$. Suppose that N_i is the set of all numbers x such that if n is a positive integer $f_n(x) > 1/i$.

Since the star of a countable collection of a -null sets is an a -null set, there is a positive integer, i , such that N_i is not an a -null set. Thus there is a positive number, c , such that if G is a collection of open intervals

covering N_i there is some finite subcollection of G , the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of which is greater than c . There is a positive integer, m , such that $L_a(f_m) < c/i$.

Suppose B is a defining collection for f_m . N_i is a subset of $\overline{B^*}$. $\overline{(B^*)} - B^*$ is an a -null set. If G is a collection of open intervals covering the common part of N_i and B^* , then there is a finite subcollection of G , the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of which is not less than c . Let D be the subcollection of B to which t belongs only in case t intersects N_i . D covers the common part of B^* and N_i . $L_a(f_m) \geq \sum (f_m(t)) \lambda_a(t) \{t \text{ in } D\} \geq (1/i) \sum (\lambda_a(t) \{t \text{ in } D\}) > c/i$.

This is a contradiction. Thus, (1) implies (2).

(2) implies (1). Suppose (2) is true and (1) is not true. Then, since $(L_a(f_i))$ is a non-increasing sequence of positive numbers, there is a positive number, c , to which the sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ converges.

Suppose T is an a -null set such that if y is a number not in T the sequence $(f_i(y))$ has limit zero. Suppose G is a collection of open intervals covering T , the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of any finite subcollection of which is less than $c/(4M)$, where M is a number such

that if x is a number $|f_1(x)| < M$.

If i is a positive integer, let K_i be a defining collection for the function f_i and N_i a finite collection of open intervals covering the collection of end-numbers of open intervals in K_i such that $\sum_i (L_a(t) | t \text{ in } N_i) < c/(2^{i+3}M)$.

By assumption II, there is a positive integer, p , such that if x is a number in the complement of G^* and of $\{N_i^* | i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$, $f_p(x) < c/(4\sum_i (L_a(k) | k \text{ in } K_1))$.

Suppose O denotes the subcollection of K_p to which s belongs only in case s intersects the intersection of the complement of G^* and of $\{N_i^* | i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$. Then, $\sum (f_p(x_t) \dot{L}_a(t), \text{ with } x_t \text{ in } t | t \text{ in } O) < (c/(4\sum_i (L_a(k) | k \text{ in } K_1))) \sum_i (L_a(k) | k \text{ in } K_1)$. Also, $\sum (f_p(x_t) \dot{L}_a(t) | t \text{ in } K_p - O) < (c/2M)M$. Thus, $\sum_i (f_p(x_t) \dot{L}_a(t), \text{ with } x_t \text{ in } t | t \text{ in } O) + \sum_i (f_p(x_t) \dot{L}_a(t) | t \text{ in } K_p - O) = L_a(f_p) < c$. Since $L_a(f_p) \geq c$, this is a contradiction and the proof is complete.

Theorem B. Suppose (f_i) is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_0(a)$ and there is a number, K , such that if i is a positive integer $L_a(f_i) < K$. Then there is an a -null set N such that if x is a number not in N the number sequence $(f_i(x))$ converges.

Proof. Suppose that for each positive integer i C_i is a defining collection for the function f_i and M_i is the set of end-numbers of open intervals in C_i . Let N_0 be $\{M_i \mid i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$. Suppose B is the least upper bound of $\{L_a(f_i) \mid i \text{ a positive integer}\}$. Further, suppose N is the set of all numbers x such that the sequence $(f_i(x))$ diverges.

Suppose e is a positive number and n is a positive integer such that $B - L_a(f_n) < e/2$. Let N_e be the set of all numbers x such that there is a positive integer i for which $f_i(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. Note that N is a subset of $\{N_0, N_e - N_0\}^*$. Since N_0 is an a -null set, if $N_e - N_0$ is covered by a collection of open intervals, the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of any finite subcollection of which is less than $e/2$, then N is covered by a collection of open intervals, the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of any finite subcollection of which is less than e . We shall assume in the following that $N_e - N_0$ is not the empty set.

We assert the existence of a sequence, K_1, K_2, \dots , of finite collections of open intervals such that the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of any finite subcollection of $\{K_i \mid i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$ is less than $e/2$, and such

that $\{K_i \mid i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$ covers $N_e - N_0$. To support the assertion, we shall construct K_1, K_2 , and K_3 .

Let m_1 be the least positive integer i such that there is a number x not in $\{M_1, \dots, M_i\}^*$ for which $f_i(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. Then $m_1 > n$. Let Z be the set of all numbers x not in $\{M_1, \dots, M_{m_1}\}^*$ such that $f_{m_1}(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. There is a finite collection, X , of mutually exclusive open intervals such that X^* is Z and such that X is a subset of $C_1 \circ \dots \circ C_{m_1}$. Since $C_1 \circ \dots \circ C_{m_1}$ is a defining collection for $f_{m_1} - f_n$, since $f_{m_1} > f_n$, and since $L_a(f_{m_1}) - L_a(f_n) < e/2$, the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of X is less than $e/2$.

Let K_1 be X .

If K_1 covers $N_e - N_0$, let K_2 be K_1 and m_2 be $m_1 + 1$. Suppose K_1 does not cover $N_e - N_0$. There is a positive integer $i > m_1$ and a number x not in K_1^* and not in $\{M_1, \dots, M_i\}^*$ such that $f_i(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. Let m_2 be the least such positive integer i and let Z be the set of all numbers x not in $\{M_1, \dots, M_{m_2}\}^*$ and not in K_1^* for which $f_{m_2}(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. Note that $m_2 > m_1$.

There is a finite collection, X , of mutually exclusive open intervals whose star is Z . For if x is a number in Z then x is in some open interval s of $C_1 \circ \dots \circ C_{m_2}$ and every number in s is in Z . Let K_2 be X .

$\{K_1, K_2\}^*$ covers the set of all numbers x not in N_0 such that there is a positive integer $i \leq m_2$ for which $f_i(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. $\{K_2^*, K_1^* - M_{m_2}\}^*$ is the star of a finite collection, Y , of mutually exclusive open intervals, the sum of whose a -lengths is the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of $\{K_1, K_2\}^*$. Further, Y is a subset of a defining collection for $f_{m_2} - f_n$ and on each open interval of Y $f_{m_2} - f_n > 1$. Since $f_{m_2} > f_n$ and since $L_a(f_{m_2}) - L_a(f_n) < e/2$ the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of $\{K_1, K_2\}^*$ is less than $e/2$.

Suppose $\{K_1, K_2\}^*$ does not cover $N_e - N_0$. There is a positive integer i such that there is a number x not in $\{M_1, \dots, M_i\}^*$ and not in K_1^* or in K_2^* for which $f_i(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. Suppose m_3 is the least such positive integer i . Then $m_3 > m_2$. Suppose Z is the set of all numbers x such that x is not in $\{M_1, \dots, M_{m_3}\}^*$ and not in K_1^* or in K_2^* and such that $f_{m_3}(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. There is a finite collection, X of mutually exclusive open intervals such that X^* is Z . Let K_3 be X . If $\{K_1, K_2\}^*$ covers $N_e - N_0$, let m_3 be $m_2 + 1$ and K_3 be K_2 .

The collection $\{K_1, K_2, K_3\}^*$ covers the set of all numbers x not in N_0 such that there is a positive integer $i \leq m_3$ for which $f_i(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. The sum of the a -lengths

of the elements of $\{K_1, K_2, K_3\}^*$ $< e/2$.

Thus, if $N_e - N_0$ is not the empty set there is a sequence, K_1, K_2, K_3, \dots , of finite collections of open intervals and an increasing sequence, m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots , positive integers such that if i is a positive integer the sum of the a -lengths of the open intervals in $\{K_1, \dots, K_i\}^*$ is less than $e/2$, and $\{K_1, \dots, K_i\}^*$ covers the set of all numbers x such that x is not in N_0 and such that there is a positive integer j in $[1, m_i]$ for which $f_j(x) > f_n(x) + 1$.

Suppose x is a number in $N_e - N_0$. Let L be the least positive integer i such that $f_i(x) > f_n(x) + 1$. Note that $m_L \geq L$. Thus, x is in $\{K_1^*, \dots, K_L^*\}$. The collection $\{K_i \mid i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$ covers $N_e - N_0$ and the sum of the a -lengths of the elements in any finite subcollection of $\{K_i \mid i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$ is less than $e/2$.

We have shown that either there is a positive number e such that $N_e - N_0$ is the empty set or that given any positive number e there is a collection of open intervals covering $N_e - N_0$, the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of any finite subcollection of which is less than $e/2$. If there is a positive number e such that $N_e - N_0$ is the empty set, then N is an a -null set. If the other case holds, then if e is a positive number there is a collection of open

intervals covering N , the sum of the a -lengths of the elements of any finite subcollection of which is less than ϵ . We conclude that N is an a -null set.

Note 4. Suppose N is an a -null set. Then there is a non-decreasing sequence f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots of functions in $C_0(a)$ and a number K such that if i is a positive integer $L_a(f_i) < K$ and (f_i) diverges on N .

Proof. We wish to show first that if i is a positive integer there is a countably infinite collection s_i of open intervals covering N such that a is continuous at each end-number of an open interval in s_i and such that the sum of the a -lengths of the elements in any finite subcollection of s_i is less than $1/2^i$.

Suppose i is a positive integer. There is a collection, G , of open intervals such that countably many of the elements of G have non-zero a -length, such that G covers N , and such that the sum of the a -lengths of the elements in any finite subcollection of G is less than $1/(2^{i+4})$.

Suppose the star of the set of all members of G having zero a -length is not the empty set. Then it is the star of a countably infinite collection, $\{B_k \mid k \text{ a positive integer}\}$, of open intervals, each of which has zero a -length and at the end-numbers of each of which a is

continuous.

The subcollection, U , of G to which s belongs only in case $\lambda_a(s)$ is positive is countable. Suppose that M is a set of positive integers and (t_p) a sequence such that if p and j are positive integers in M then t_p and t_j are in U and t_p is not t_j . If k is a positive integer in M , there is a countably infinite collection, $\{I_{kj} \mid j \text{ a positive integer}\}$, of open intervals such that $\{I_{kj} \mid j \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$ is t_k , such that a is continuous at each end-number of an open interval in the collection, and such that the sum of the a -lengths of the elements in any finite subcollection of it is less than $1/2^{k+i+4} \lambda_a(t_k)$.

If the star of the set of all members of G having zero a -length is the empty set, let s_i be $\{I_{kj} \mid k \text{ in } M \text{ and } j \text{ a positive integer}\}$. If it is not the empty set, let s_i be the collection of all open intervals in $\{I_{kj} \mid k \text{ in } M \text{ and } j \text{ a positive integer}\}$ or in $\{B_k \mid k \text{ a positive integer}\}$. s_i is a countably infinite collection of open intervals covering N , the sum of the a -lengths of the elements in any finite subcollection of which is less than $1/2^i$, and a is continuous at each end-number of an open interval in s_i .

Suppose that if i is a positive integer s_i is $\{s_{ij} \mid j \text{ a positive integer}\}$. If i and j are positive

integers $\{s_{ik} \mid k \text{ an integer in } [1, j]\}^*$ is the star of a finite collection, X , of non-overlapping open intervals and the sum of the a -lengths of the open intervals in X does not exceed the sum of the a -lengths of the open intervals in $\{s_{ik} \mid k \text{ an integer in } [1, j]\}^*$. Note that f is continuous at each end-number of an open interval in X . Thus, if we define f_{ij} to be 1 on X^* and 0 elsewhere, then f_{ij} is in $C_0(a)$ and X is a defining collection for f_{ij} . Further, $L_a(f_{ij}) \leq 1/2^i$. Note that the sequence whose j th term is (f_{ij}) is a non-decreasing sequence.

Define f_i to be $\sum (f_{ji} \mid j \text{ an integer in } [1, i])$. The sequence (f_i) is non-decreasing. If i is a positive integer, $L_a(f_i) \leq 2$. Also, if x is a number in N , there is an increasing sequence m_1, m_2, \dots , of positive integers such that if i is a positive integer x belongs to s_{i, m_i} . Suppose that M is a positive number. There is a positive integer $K > M$. There is a positive integer $J > K$ such that if z is an integer in $[1, K]$ then $m_z \leq J$.

$f_J(x) > K > M$.

Thus, (f_i) diverges on N . This completes the verification.

CHAPTER II

THE CLASS $C_1(a)$

Let $C_1(a)$ denote the set such that f belongs to it only in case f is a function and there exists a non-decreasing sequence (f_i) of functions in $C_0(a)$, a number K such that if n is a positive integer $L_a(f_n) \leq K$, and an a -null set N such that if x is a number not in N the sequence $(f_i(x))$ converges to $f(x)$.

Theorem C. Suppose s and t are functions in $C_1(a)$, (s_i) and (t_i) are non-decreasing sequences of functions in $C_0(a)$, K is a number such that if n is a positive integer $L_a(s_n) \leq K$ and $L_a(t_n) \leq K$, and N is an a -null set such that if x is a number not in N the sequence $(s_i(x))$ converges to $s(x)$, the sequence $(t_i(x))$ converges to $t(x)$, and $s(x) \leq t(x)$. Then the number sequence $(L_a(s_i))$ converges to a number J_1 , the number sequence $(L_a(t_i))$ converges to a number J_2 , and $J_1 \leq J_2$.

Proof. Note that each of $(L_a(s_i))$ and $(L_a(t_i))$ is a non-decreasing sequence of numbers which is bounded above by the number, K . Thus, $(L_a(s_i))$ converges to a number, J_1 , and $(L_a(t_i))$ converges to a number, J_2 .

Suppose N is a positive integer. The sequence

$(s_n - \min(t_i, s_n))$ is a non-increasing sequence of non-negative functions in $C_0(a)$ such that if x is a number not in N the sequence $(s_n(x) - \min(t_i(x), s_n(x)))$ converges to 0. By Theorem A, the sequence $(L_a(s_n - \min(t_i, s_n)))$ converges to 0. The i th term of this sequence is $L_a(s_n) - L_a(\min(t_i, s_n))$. Thus, the number sequence $(L_a(\min(t_i, s_n)))$ converges to $L_a(s_n)$. Since the i th term of the sequence $(L_a(t_i))$ is not less than the i th term of the sequence $(L_a(\min(t_i, s_n)))$, the number, J_2 , must be at least as great as $L_a(s_n)$. Thus, if n is a positive integer, $L_a(s_n) \leq J_2$. The limit, J_1 , of the sequence $(L_a(s_n))$ does not exceed J_2 . This completes the proof.

The phrase, "almost everywhere," has the same meaning as the phrase, "except on an a -null set".

Definition. The statement that j is an a -integral for the function f in $C_1(a)$ means that j is a number and there is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_0(a)$ converging almost everywhere to f such that j is the limit of the corresponding sequence of a -integrals.

Note that if f is a function in $C_1(a)$ and (f_i) and (g_i) are non-decreasing sequences of functions in $C_0(a)$ converging almost everywhere to f such that both the

sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ and the sequence $(L_a(g_i))$ converge then the limit of the sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ is the limit of the sequence $(L_a(g_i))$. This justifies the assertion that there is at most one a -integral for a function f in $C_1(a)$.

Theorem B shows that each member of $C_1(a)$ has an a -integral.

Also note that each function f in $C_0(a)$ is in $C_1(a)$ and that the a -integral for f according to the preceding definition is the same as the a -integral for f according to the earlier definition. If f is in $C_1(a)$, $L_a(f)$ will denote the a -integral of f .

We wish to show that if f and g are functions in $C_1(a)$, then $\max(f, g)$ is in $C_1(a)$. There are non-decreasing sequences, f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots and g_1, g_2, g_3, \dots , of functions in $C_0(a)$ such that (1.) there is a number K such that if i is a positive integer $L_a(f_i) < K$ and $L_a(g_i) < K$ and such that (2.) there is an a -null set N such that if x is a number not in N the number sequence $(f_i(x))$ converges to $f(x)$ and $(g_i(x))$ converges to $g(x)$. The sequence $(\max(f_i, g_i))$ is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_0(a)$ converging almost everywhere to $\max(f, g)$. If i is a positive integer,

$$L_a(\max(f_i, g_i)) \leq L_a(|f_i| + |g_i|) \leq L_a(f_i + 2|f_i|) + L_a(g_i + 2|g_i|) <$$

$$2(K + L_a(|f_i| + |g_i|)), \text{ since } |f_i| \leq 2|f_i| + f_i \text{ and } |g_i| \leq 2|g_i| + g_i.$$

We conclude that $\max(f, g)$ is in $C_1(a)$. The minimum of f

and g is also in $C_1(a)$.

Note 5. If c and d are non-negative numbers and f and g are functions in $C_1(a)$, then $cf+dg$ is a function in $C_1(a)$ and $L_a(cf+dg)$ is $cL_a(f)+dL_a(g)$. If g is a function in $C_1(a)$ and g is non-negative almost everywhere, $L_a(g)$ is non-negative. If g is a function in $C_1(a)$ and f is a function which agrees with g almost everywhere, f is a function in $C_1(a)$ and $L_a(f)$ is $L_a(g)$.

Theorem D. Suppose f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots , is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_1(a)$ and that there is a number, K , such that for every positive integer n $L_a(f_n) < K$. Then there is a function f in $C_1(a)$ such that the function sequence (f_i) converges almost everywhere to f and the number sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ converges to the number $L_a(f)$.

Proof. If i is a positive integer, there is a non-decreasing sequence, $(f(i, j))$, of functions in $C_0(a)$ which converges almost everywhere to f_i such that the sequence $(L_a(f(i, j)))$ converges to $L_a(f_i)$.

Suppose that for each positive integer i N_i is an a -null set such that if x is a number not in N_i the number sequence $(f(i, j)(x))$ converges to $f_i(x)$.

Suppose that if i is a positive integer s_i is defined to be $\max(f(1, i), \dots, f(i, i))$. Then (s_i) is a non-decreasing

sequence of functions in $C_0(a)$.

Suppose i is a positive integer. If x is a number not in $\{N_j \mid j \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$, then $s_i(x) \leq f_i(x)$. By Theorem C, $L_a(s_i) \leq L_a(f_i)$.

Thus, for i and j positive integers and $j \leq i$, we have $L_a(f(j,i)) \leq L_a(s_i) \leq L_a(f_i) \leq K$.

The sequence (s_i) converges almost everywhere to a function, g , in $C_1(a)$ and the sequence $(L_a(s_i))$ converges to $L_a(g)$.

Suppose N is an a -null set such that if x is a number not in N the sequence $(s_i(x))$ converges to $g(x)$. Suppose x is a number not in N or in $\{N_i \mid i \text{ a positive integer}\}^*$. If i and j are positive integers and $i \leq j$, then $s_j(x) \geq f(i,j)(x)$. The limit of the sequence $(s_j(x))$ must be at least as great as the limit of the sequence whose j th term is $f(i,j)(x)$. That is, $f_i(x) \leq g(x)$. Thus, the sequence $(f_i(x))$ has a limit. On the other hand, for each positive integer i , $f_i(x) \geq s_i(x)$. Thus, the limit of the sequence $(f_i(x))$ is $g(x)$. The sequence (f_i) converges to g almost everywhere.

For each positive integer i , $f_i \leq g$ almost everywhere. Thus, $L_a(f_i) \leq L_a(g)$. The limit of the non-decreasing sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ exists and is less than or equal to $L_a(g)$.

If i is a positive integer, $L_a(s_i) \leq L_a(f_i)$. As the sequence $(L_a(s_i))$ converges to $L_a(g)$, we conclude that the limit of the sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ is $L_a(g)$. This completes the proof.

CHAPTER III

THE CLASS $C_2(a)$

Note 6. Suppose each of f_1, f_2, g_1 and g_2 is a function in $C_1(a)$. If $f_1 - f_2 = g_1 - g_2$, then $L_a(f_1) - L_a(f_2) = L_a(g_1) - L_a(g_2)$.

$C_2(a)$ is the set of all functions f for which there is a function f_1 in $C_1(a)$ and a function f_2 in $C_1(a)$ such that f is $f_1 - f_2$. In this case, an a -integral for f is $L_a(f_1) - L_a(f_2)$.

Note 7. Note 6 shows that there is only one a -integral for a function f in $C_2(a)$. Each function f in $C_1(a)$ is in $C_2(a)$ and the a -integral for the function f according to the preceding definition is the same as the a -integral for f according to the earlier definition. The a -integral of a function f in $C_2(a)$ will be denoted $L_a(f)$.

If c and d are numbers and f and g are functions in $C_2(a)$, then $cf + dg$ is a function in $C_2(a)$ and $L_a(cf + dg) = cL_a(f) + dL_a(g)$. If each of f and g is a function in $C_2(a)$, then $\max(f, g)$ and $\min(f, g)$ are functions in $C_2(a)$. If f is a function in $C_2(a)$ which is non-negative almost everywhere, then $L_a(f)$ is non-negative. If f is a function in $C_2(a)$ and g is a function which agrees with f almost everywhere then g is in $C_2(a)$ and $L_a(f) = L_a(g)$.

Theorem E. Suppose (f_i) is a non-decreasing sequence

of functions in $C_2(a)$ and there is a number, K , such that for each positive integer i $L_a(f_i) \leq K$. Then there is a function f in $C_2(a)$ such that the sequence (f_i) converges almost everywhere to f and the sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ converges to $L_a(f)$.

Proof. $(f_i - f_1)$ is a non-decreasing sequence of non-negative functions in $C_2(a)$. If there is a function g in $C_2(a)$ such that $(f_i - f_1)$ converges almost everywhere to g and $(L_a(f_i - f_1))$ converges to $L_a(g)$, then (f_i) converges almost everywhere to $g + f_1$ and $(L_a(f_i))$ converges to $L_a(g + f_1)$.

We first prove that if f is in $C_2(a)$, f is non-negative, and ϵ is a positive number, then there are functions, ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , in $C_1(a)$, each of which is non-negative, such that $L_a(\phi_2) < \epsilon$ and f is $\phi_1 - \phi_2$.

To show this, we note that there are functions, h_1 and h_2 , in $C_1(a)$ such that $f = h_1 - h_2$. Since h_2 is in $C_1(a)$, there is a non-decreasing sequence $(h(2, j))$, of functions in $C_0(a)$ converging almost everywhere to h_2 such that the sequence $(L_a(h(2, j)))$ converges to $L_a(h_2)$. Suppose that N is an a -null set and if x is a number not in N the sequence $(h(2, j)(x))$ converges to $h_2(x)$. Further, suppose n is a positive integer such that $L_a(h_2) - L_a(h(2, n)) < \epsilon$. If

x is a number not in N , let $\ell_2(x)$ be $h_2(x) - h(2,n)(x)$. If x is in N , then let $\ell_2(x)$ be 0. Since $(h(2,j) - h(2,n))$ is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_0(a)$ converging almost everywhere to $h_2 - h(2,n)$ and since there is a bound for the corresponding sequence of a -integrals, $h_2 - h(2,n)$ is in $C_1(a)$. Since ℓ_2 agrees with $h_2 - h(2,n)$ almost everywhere, ℓ_2 is in $C_1(a)$. Finally, ℓ_2 is non-negative and $L_a(\ell_2) < \epsilon$.

Suppose x is a number in N . Let $\ell_1(x)$ be $f(x)$. If x is a number not in N , let $\ell_1(x)$ be $h_1(x) - h(2,n)(x)$. Note that if x is a number in N , $\ell_1(x) \geq 0$. Suppose x is a number not in N . $h_1(x) \geq h_2(x) \geq h(2,n)(x)$. Thus, $\ell_1(x) \geq 0$. We conclude that ℓ_1 is non-negative. ℓ_1 is in $C_1(a)$. As f is $\ell_1 - \ell_2$, we conclude the justification.

Suppose i is a positive integer. Let g_i be $f_i - f_1$. $L_a(g_i) \leq K + |L_a(f_1)|$. The sequence $g_1, g_2 - g_1, g_3 - g_2, \dots$ is a non-decreasing sequence of non-negative functions in $C_2(a)$. If j is a positive integer, let h_j and k_j be non-negative functions in $C_1(a)$ such that $g_{j+i} - g_j = h_j - k_j$ and $L_a(k_j) < 1/2^{j+1}$. Further, suppose h_0 and k_0 are non-negative functions in $C_1(a)$ such that $g_1 = h_0 - k_0$ and $L_a(k_0) < 1/2$. The sequence $(\sum(h_j | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i]))$ is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_1(a)$. $L_a(\sum(h_j | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i])) - 1 \leq L_a(\sum((h_j - k_j) | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i])) = L_a(g_i) \leq K + |L_a(f_1)|$.

If i is a positive integer, $L_a(\sum(k_j | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i])) \leq 1$.
 k_0, k_0+k_1, \dots is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_1(a)$. The sequence $(\sum(k_j | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i]))$ converges almost everywhere to a function, P , in $C_1(a)$ and the sequence $(L_a(\sum(k_j | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i])))$ converges to $L_a(P)$. The sequence $(\sum(h_j | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i]))$ converges almost everywhere to a function, H , in $C_1(a)$ and the sequence $(L_a(\sum(h_j | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i])))$ converges to $L_a(H)$.

If i is a positive integer, $g_i = \sum(g_{k+1} - g_k | k \text{ an integer in } [1, i-1]) + g_1 = \sum(h_j - k_j | j \text{ an integer in } [0, i])$. The sequence (g_i) converges almost everywhere to the function $H - P$ in $C_2(a)$ and the sequence $(L_a(g_i))$ converges to $L_a(H) - L_a(P)$. This completes the proof

Corollary to Theorem E. If f_1, f_2, f_3, \dots is a monotonic sequence of functions in $C_2(a)$ which converges almost everywhere to the function, f , in $C_2(a)$, then $(L_a(f_i))$ converges to $L_a(f)$.

Proof. Suppose the sequence (f_i) is non-decreasing. Then if i is a positive integer, $L_a(f_i) \leq L_a(f)$. By Theorem E, there is a function g in $C_2(a)$ to which the sequence (f_i) converges almost everywhere and the sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ converges to $L_a(g)$. Since g is f almost everywhere, $L_a(g)$ is $L_a(f)$. Thus, the corollary is true for this case.

Now suppose (f_i) is a non-increasing sequence of functions. Then $(f - (f_i - f))$ is a non-decreasing sequence of functions converging almost everywhere to f . Thus, $(L_a(f) - L_a(f_i - f))$ converges to $L_a(f)$. So the sequence $(L_a(f_i - f))$ converges to 0 and the sequence $(L_a(f_i))$ converges to $L_a(f)$. This completes the justification of the corollary.

Theorem F. Suppose (f_i) is a sequence of functions in $C_2(a)$ which converges almost everywhere to the function, f , and there exists a function, g , in $C_2(a)$ such that for each positive integer n $|f_n| \leq g$. Then (1.) for each positive integer n the function, g_n , where g_n is $\sup\{f_n, f_{n+1}, \dots\}$, is in $C_2(a)$ and the function h_n , where h_n is $\inf\{f_n, f_{n+1}, \dots\}$, is in $C_2(a)$, (2.) the function sequences (g_i) and (h_i) converge almost everywhere to f , (3.) f is in $C_2(a)$, and (4.) the number sequences $(L_a(h_i))$, $(L_a(g_i))$, and $(L_a(f_i))$ all converge to $L_a(f)$.

Proof. (1.) Note that if h is a function in $C_2(a)$ and k is a function and h is k almost everywhere, then k is in $C_2(a)$ and $L_a(h)$ is $L_a(k)$. Suppose n is a positive integer. Let k_1 be f_n and for each positive integer i let k_{i+1} be $\sup\{k_i, f_{n+i}\}$. If i is a positive integer, $k_i \leq g$ and, thus,

$L_a(k_i) \leq L_a(g)$. (k_i) is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_2(a)$. There is a function k in $C_2(a)$ such that (k_i) converges almost everywhere to k . k is g_n almost everywhere. Thus, g_n is in $C_2(a)$. Since $\inf\{f_n, f_{n+1}, \dots\}$ is $-\sup\{-f_n, -f_{n+1}, \dots\}$, h_n is in $C_2(a)$. (2.) There is an a -null set, N , such that if x is a number not in N then $(f_i(x))$ converges to $f(x)$. Suppose x is such a number and ϵ is a positive number. There is a positive integer m such that if n is a positive integer and $n \geq m$ then $|f(x) - f_n(x)| < \epsilon/4$. Suppose n is a positive integer and $n \geq m$. There is a positive integer $p \geq n$ such that $|f_p(x) - g_n(x)| < \epsilon/4$. Then $|f(x) - g_n(x)| \leq |f(x) - f_p(x)| + |f_p(x) - g_n(x)| < \epsilon/2$. Thus, $(g_n(x))$ converges to $f(x)$. Also, $(h_n(x))$ converges to $f(x)$. Thus, (2.) is established. (3.) The sequence (h_i) is a non-decreasing sequence of functions in $C_2(a)$ converging almost everywhere to a function k in $C_2(a)$ and the sequence $(L_a(h_i))$ converges to $L_a(k)$. k is f almost everywhere. Thus f is in $C_2(a)$. In establishing (4.), note that $L_a(k)$ is $L_a(f)$. Thus, $(L_a(h_i))$ converges to $L_a(f)$. By the corollary to Theorem E, $(L_a(g_i))$ converges to $L_a(f)$. If i is a positive integer, $L_a(h_i) \leq L_a(f_i) \leq L_a(g_i)$. Thus, $L_a(f_i)$ converges to $L_a(f)$.

The statement that f is an a -integrable function

means that f is in $C_2(a)$. If M is a number set, the characteristic function of M is the function f such that $f(x)$ is 1 if x is in M and $f(x)$ is zero if x is a number not in M . The statement that a number set is a -integrable means that its characteristic function is a -integrable. If M is an a -integrable number set, the a -measure of M , denoted $m_a(M)$, is the a -integral of the characteristic function of M . The set of all a -integrable number sets is a \mathcal{S} -ring of sets and the function m_a is a measure on this \mathcal{S} -ring in the following sense: (1.) If A and B are a -integrable number sets, $\{A, B\}^*$ is a -integrable and if, in addition, A and B are disjoint $m_a(\{A, B\}^*)$ is $m_a(A) + m_a(B)$. (2.) If A and B are a -integrable number sets and A is not a subset of B , $A - B$ is an a -integrable number set. (3.) If (A_i) is a non-increasing sequence of a -integrable number sets, the intersection of the sets A_i is a -integrable and the a -measure of this intersection is the limit of the sequence $(m_a(A_i))$.

The statement that a function f is a -measurable means that there exists a sequence of functions in $C_0(a)$ converging to f almost everywhere. The statement that a number set is a -measurable means that its characteristic function is a -measurable.

If A is an α -measurable number set, f belongs to the collection $L_2(\alpha, A)$ only in case f is a function, f is zero off A , and f and f^2 are α -integrable.

Suppose in the following that A is an α -measurable number set.

We shall quote a collection of definitions together with a collection of results that we have not obtained.

If f and g are functions in $L_2(\alpha, A)$ and if c is a number, then $f+g$ and cf are in $L_2(\alpha, A)$.

If f and g are in $L_2(\alpha, A)$, fg is in $C_2(\alpha)$.

If f and g are functions in $L_2(\alpha, A)$, then the inner product of f with g , denoted $\langle f, g \rangle$, is the number $L_\alpha(fg)$. The norm of the function f in $L_2(\alpha, A)$, denoted $\|f\|$ is the non-negative square root of $\langle f, f \rangle$.

If c is a number and each of f, g , and h is a function in $L_2(\alpha, A)$, then (1.) $\langle f, g \rangle$ is a number, (2.) $\langle f, f \rangle > 0$ unless f is the zero function almost everywhere, (3.) $\langle f, g+h \rangle = \langle f, g \rangle + \langle f, h \rangle$, (4.) $\langle cf, g \rangle = c \langle f, g \rangle$, (5.) $\langle f, g \rangle = \langle g, f \rangle$, (6.) $\|f\| > 0$ unless f is the zero function almost everywhere, (7.) $\|cf\| = |c| \|f\|$, and (8.) $\|f+g\| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$.

Theorem. If (f_i) is a sequence of functions in $L_2(\alpha, A)$, then the following two statements are equivalent:
 (1.) There exists a function f in $L_2(\alpha, A)$ such that the

sequence $(\|f - f_i\|)$ has limit zero. (2.) For each positive number ϵ there is a positive integer n such that if p and q are positive integers greater than n then $\|f_p - f_q\| < \epsilon$.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Riesz, Frigyes, and Sz-Nagy, Bela,
Functional Analysis, Frederick Ungar
Publishing Co., New York, 1955.