

NOTES ON MATHEMATICS

MANVENDRA SOMVANSHI

manusomvanshi@hotmail.com

Updated on: July 10, 2022

CONTENTS

I

BASICS

| | | |
|-----|-----------------------|---|
| I.1 | ELEMENTARY SET THEORY | 2 |
| I.2 | RELATIONS | 2 |
| I.3 | FUNCTIONS | 3 |
| I.4 | CATEGORIES | 9 |

II

ABSTRACT ALGEBRA

III

TOPOLOGY

IV

MEASURE THEORY

| | | |
|------|--------------------------|----|
| IV.1 | INTUITION OF MEASURE | 13 |
| IV.2 | FORMAL NOTION OF MEASURE | 15 |
| IV.3 | CARATHEODORY THEOREM | 21 |
| IV.4 | LEBERSGUE MEASURE | 27 |
| IV.5 | INTEGRATION | 29 |

1.1 ELEMENTARY SET THEORY

A set S is a collection of objects. The objects of a set are called the elements. The union of two sets S, T contains elements of both sets, and is written as $S \cup T$. The intersection of two sets contains the common elements of the two sets, and is represented $S \cap T$. The complement of a set $A (\subset S)$ with respect to some set S is represented as A' . The difference of set S from T is defined as $T - S = T \cap S'$. The algebra of these operations is as follows

- *Commutativity,*

$$\begin{aligned} A \cup B &= B \cup A \\ A \cap B &= B \cap A \end{aligned}$$

- *Associativity,*

$$\begin{aligned} A \cap (B \cap C) &= (A \cap B) \cap C \\ A \cup (B \cup C) &= (A \cup B) \cup C \end{aligned}$$

- *Distribution,*

$$\begin{aligned} A \cup (B \cap C) &= (A \cup B) \cap (A \cup C) \\ A \cap (B \cup C) &= (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap C) \end{aligned}$$

- *De Morgan's rules,*

$$\begin{aligned} (A \cap B)' &= A' \cup B' \\ (A \cup B)' &= A' \cap B' \end{aligned}$$

DEFINITION 1.1.1 The cartesian product of two sets A and B , denoted $A \times B$, is the set of ordered pairs $\{(a, b) | \forall a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}$.

Other than these operations one can define a set operation called disjoint union, denoted $S \sqcup T$, which is loosely constructed in the following way: we first make copies S' and T' such that $S' \cap T' = \emptyset$ and then take their ordinary union. A more rigorous definition would be constructed later.

1.2 RELATIONS

DEFINITION 1.2.1 A relation on a set A is a subset C of the cartesian product $A \times A$. If $(x, y) \in C$ then it is denoted as xCy .

DEFINITION 1.2.2 An equivalence relation on a set A is a relation C on A such that:

- It is reflexive, i.e. $xCx \forall x \in A$.
- It is symmetric, i.e. if xCy then yCx .
- It is transitive, i.e. if xCy and yCz then xCz .

Generally the symbol \sim is used to denote an equivalence relation. For a given element $x \in A$ we also define a set called the equivalence class as:

$$E = \{y \mid y \sim x\}$$

PROPOSITION I.2.3 Two equivalence classes E and E' are either disjoint or equal.

Proof | Let E be the equivalence class of x and E' be the equivalence class of x' . Assuming that $E \cap E'$ is non-empty, for all $y \in E \cap E'$ it follows that $y \sim x'$ and $y \sim x$. From symmetry and transitivity it follows that $x' \sim x$. Hence every element similar to x' will be similar to x . Hence $E' = E$, whenever $E \cap E'$ is non-empty. ■

DEFINITION I.2.4 A partition of a set A is a collection of disjoint nonempty subsets of A whose union is all of A .

PROPOSITION I.2.5 Given any partition \mathcal{D} of A , there is a unique equivalence relation C on A such that each element of \mathcal{D} is an equivalence class of C .

Proof | Consider a relation C defined as: xCy if both x and y belong to the same element of \mathcal{D} . Since x is always in the same element as itself, xCx is true for all x . If xCy , which means x is in the same subset as y . Since the converse is also true, yCx . If x is in the same subset as y and y is in the subset as z , then x is in the same subset as z . Hence xCy and yCz imply xCz . This means that C is an equivalent relation. Each element of \mathcal{D} can be viewed as an equivalence class of C .

Assume that there exist two equivalence relations C_1 and C_2 such that the set of each their equivalence classes is \mathcal{D} . Let E_1 and E_2 be equivalence classes of x with respect to relations C_1 and C_2 . E_1 and E_2 must be the same since we are claiming that both relations generate the identical collection of sets. Hence if yC_1x then yC_2x which implies that $C_1 = C_2$. ■

DEFINITION I.2.6 The quotient of the set S , denoted S/\sim with respect to the equivalence relation \sim is the set of equivalence classes of S with respect to \sim .

I.3 FUNCTIONS

DEFINITION I.3.1 A rule of assignment is a subset r of the cartesian product $C \times D$ of two sets, having the property that each element of C appears as the first ordinate of at most one ordered pair in r .

From this definition one can easily conclude that, if $r \subset C \times D$ and $(c, d), (c, d') \in r$ then $d = d'$. One can think of r as assigning an element $c \in C$, the element $d \in D$. The set C is called the domain of r and D is called the image set.

DEFINITION I.3.2 A function f is a rule of assignment r , along with a set B which contains the image set of r . The domain of r is also the domain of f . The set B is called the range.

A function having a domain A and range B is written as $f : A \rightarrow B$. Given an element $a \in A$, $f(a)$ denotes a unique element in B , hence $(a, f(a)) \in r$.

DEFINITION I.3.3 Given a function $f : A \rightarrow B$ and a subset $A_0 \subset A$, then a restriction of f to A_0 is the mapping $f|_{A_0} : A_0 \rightarrow B$ with rule:

$$\{(a, f(a)) | a \in A_0\}$$

DEFINITION I.3.4 Given functions $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$, the composite function is defined as $g \circ f : A \rightarrow C$, such that $g \circ f(a) = g(f(a))$. More formally, the rule of the function $g \circ f : A \rightarrow C$ is:

$$\{(a, c) | \forall b \in B, f(a) = b \text{ and } g(b) = c\}$$

DEFINITION I.3.5 A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is said to be injective if,

$$f(a) = f(a') \implies a = a'.$$

The function is called surjective if for each $b \in B$ there exists an $a \in A$ such that $b = f(a)$. If f is both injective and surjective it is said to be bijective.

PROPOSITION I.3.6 For each bijective function $f : A \rightarrow B$, there exists a unique function, called the inverse function, $f^{-1} : B \rightarrow A$ such that $f \circ f^{-1}$ and $f^{-1} \circ f$ are both identity functions.

Proof | Since f is bijective for every $a \in A$ there exists a unique $b \in B$ (from injection), and for every $b \in B$ also there exists an $a \in A$ (from surjectivity). This implies that every $b \in B$ has a unique pre-image in A . Denote this pre-image by $f^{-1}(b)$. The rule of the inverse function is given by:

$$\{(b, f^{-1}(b)) | \forall b \in B\}$$

This proves the existence of inverse. Using the definition of composite function, the rule of the composite function $f \circ f^{-1}$ will be:

$$\{(b, b) | \forall b \in B\}.$$

Hence the composite is the identity function. Similarly the composite function $f^{-1} \circ f$ is also identity.

For proving the uniqueness, consider there exist two inverse functions, f^{-1} and \tilde{f}^{-1} , of f . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} f(f^{-1}(b)) &= b, \\ \implies \tilde{f}^{-1}(f(f^{-1}(b))) &= \tilde{f}^{-1}(b), \end{aligned}$$

But since $\tilde{f}^{-1}(f(a)) = a$,

$$f^{-1}(b) = \tilde{f}^{-1}(b) \quad \forall b \in B$$

Hence the inverse is unique. ■

PROPOSITION I.3.7 The inverse of a bijective function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is also bijective.

Proof | Let the inverse be f^{-1} . Let $b, b' \in B$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(b) &= f^{-1}(b') \\ \implies f(f^{-1}(b)) &= f(f^{-1}(b')) \\ \implies b &= b' \end{aligned}$$

This shows that f^{-1} is injective. For proof of surjectivity, we can show that for each $a \in A$ there exists a $b (= f(a)) \in B$ such that $a = f^{-1}(b)$. This shows that f^{-1} is also bijective. ■

PROPOSITION I.3.8 Let $f : A \rightarrow B$. If there are functions $g : B \rightarrow A$ and $h : B \rightarrow A$ such that $g(f(a)) = a \forall a \in A$ and $f(h(b)) = b \forall b \in B$, then f is bijective and $g = h = f^{-1}$.

Proof | Let $a, a' \in A$, such that

$$f(a) = f(a')$$

Using the function g ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(f(a)) &= g(f(a')), \\ \implies a &= a' \end{aligned}$$

hence f is an injective function. Now coming to surjectivity. Using the existence of h , we can show that for each $b \in B$ there exists $a (= h(b)) \in A$ such that $b = f(a)$. Hence f is a bijective function. For the final part of the proposition, since,

$$\begin{aligned} f(h(b)) &= b, \\ \implies g(f(h(b))) &= g(b), \\ \implies h(b) &= g(b) \quad \forall b \in B. \end{aligned}$$

And since the inverse is unique, they must also be equal to f^{-1} . ■

When there exists a bijection $f : A \rightarrow B$ then A and B are called *isomorphic*. This is sometimes represented as $A \simeq B$. Using the concept of isomorphism the notion of disjoint union can be made more rigorous.

DEFINITION I.3.9 The disjoint union of two sets A and B is determined by constructing sets $A' \simeq A$ and $B' \simeq B$ such that $A' \cup B' = \emptyset$, and then determining the union $A' \cup B'$. Such sets can always be constructed for every set since $\{0\} \times A \simeq A$ and $\{1\} \times B \simeq B$ and $(\{0\} \times A) \cap (\{1\} \times B) = \emptyset$.

A less restrictive notion of invertibility is defined in terms of *left-invertible* and *right-invertible* functions. If for a function $f : A \rightarrow B$ there exists a $g : B \rightarrow A$ such that $g \circ f : A \rightarrow A$ is id_A then f is said to be left invertible. Similarly if there exists $h : B \rightarrow A$ such that $f \circ h : B \rightarrow B$ is id_B then f is called right invertible. The following is more general statement to proposition I.3.8.

PROPOSITION I.3.10 Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a function then:

- 1) f is injective if and only if it is left invertible.
- 2) f is surjective if and only if it is right invertible.

Proof | For statement 1, the forward implication follows from the fact that if f injective then one can construct a $g : B \rightarrow A$ as follows: let $p \in B$ be a fixed point and

$$g(b) = \begin{cases} a, & \text{where } f(a) = b \\ p, & \text{when } b \text{ not in image of } A. \end{cases} \quad (\text{I.3.1})$$

Clearly the function $g \circ f(a) = id_A(a) = a$. The backward implication for statement 1, is true because if a g exists such that:

$$g \circ f(a) = a \quad \forall a \in A$$

then,

$$g \circ f(a) = a \neq a' = g \circ f(a') \implies f(a) \neq f(a')$$

which is the contrapositive of the statement required to prove.

Statement 2 can be proven in a similar way. Assuming that f is surjective, it follows that for each b there is at least one $a \in A$ such that $f(a) = b$. Choosing anyone of these a for each b we can construct the map $h : B \rightarrow A$, $h(b) = a$. Hence it follows that $f \circ h(b) = f(a) = b = id_B(b)$. For the backward implication, assuming that there is an $h : B \rightarrow A$ such that $\forall b \in B, f \circ h(b) = id_B(b) = b$. Since $h(b) = a$ for some $a \in A$, it follows $f(a) = b$ for some $a \in A$. Hence f is surjective. ■

There is another way to look at bijective functions using the concept of monomorphisms and epimorphisms. This is a more fundamental and equivalent approach to defining bijections.

DEFINITION I.3.11 A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is said to be a monomorphism if the following holds:

$$\forall Z, \forall \alpha', \alpha'' : Z \rightarrow A, f \circ \alpha' = f \circ \alpha'' \implies \alpha' = \alpha''$$

PROPOSITION I.3.12 A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a monomorphism if and only if it is injective.

Proof | Consider first the forward implication. Assuming f is a monomorphism, we know that for all sets Z and $\alpha', \alpha'' : Z \rightarrow A$,

$$f \circ \alpha' = f \circ \alpha'' \implies \alpha' = \alpha''$$

if $\alpha'(z) = a$ and $\alpha''(z) = a'$ then the above condition reduces to,

$$f(a) = f(a') \implies a = a'$$

Hence f is injective.

For the backward implication we assume that f is an injective function. Then we know that f is left-invertible, with inverse g . If,

$$\begin{aligned} f \circ \alpha' &= f \circ \alpha'' \\ \implies g \circ f \circ \alpha' &= g \circ f \circ \alpha'' \\ \implies \alpha' &= \alpha'' \end{aligned}$$

DEFINITION I.3.13 A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is said to be an epimorphism if,

$$\forall Z, \forall \beta', \beta'' : B \rightarrow Z, \beta' \circ f = \beta'' \circ f \implies \beta' = \beta''$$

PROPOSITION I.3.14 A function $f : A \rightarrow B$ is an epimorphism if and only if it is surjective.

Proof | Let's first consider the forward implication:

$$(\forall Z, \beta', \beta'' : B \rightarrow Z, \beta' \circ f = \beta'' \circ f \implies \beta' = \beta'') \implies (\forall b \in B \exists a \in A \text{ such that } b = f(a))$$

The contraposition of this statment is:

$$(\exists b \in B, \forall a \in A, b \neq f(a)) \implies (\exists Z, \beta', \beta'' : B \rightarrow Z \text{ such that } \beta' \neq \beta'' \text{ \& } \beta' \circ f = \beta'' \circ f)$$

Assuming there exists $b \in B$ such that b is not in the image of f , let $Z = \{0, 1\}$, $\beta'(b) = 0, \forall b \in B$, and

$$\beta''(b) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } b \text{ is in image of } f \\ 1, & \text{if } b \text{ is not in image of } f \end{cases}$$


Clearly $\beta' \neq \beta''$ but we have $\beta' \circ f = \beta'' \circ f$. Hence the contrapositive is true, therefore proving the forward implication.

For the backward implication, assuming the function is surjective we also know that it would be right invertible. Let h be the right inverse then,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta' \circ f &= \beta'' \circ f \\ \implies \beta' \circ f \circ h &= \beta'' \circ f \circ h \\ \implies \beta' &= \beta'' \end{aligned}$$


Hence completing the proof. ■

Diagrams. Diagrams are graphical representations of a collection of sets and how they are operated on by functions. A diagram is said to be *commutative* if taking different paths between sets result in the same function. For example if $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$, then here is a commutative diagram of A, B, C :



For injective functions a \hookrightarrow is used, for surjective functions \twoheadrightarrow is used, and isomorphisms are represented by $\xrightarrow{\sim}$.

Canonical Decomposition. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a function on A . Define the equivalence relation \sim on A as $a \sim a'$ iff $f(a) = f(a')$. A surjection $g : A \twoheadrightarrow A/\sim$ can be defined as $g(a) = [a]_{\sim}$. Also it is possible to find an injection $h : \text{im } f \hookrightarrow B$, given by $h(b) = b$. Hence we have a diagram:



If we can find an isomorphism $i : A/\sim \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{im } f$ then the above diagram will commute. Consider the following proposition:

PROPOSITION I.3.15 The function $i : A/\sim \rightarrow \text{im } f$ given by $i([a]_{\sim}) = f(a)$ is an isomorphism.

Proof | First we must check if i is a function. Let $[a]_{\sim}, [a']_{\sim} \in A/\sim$ then, $[a] = [a'] \implies f(a) = f(a') \implies i([a]_{\sim}) = i([a']_{\sim})$. This means for each $[a]_{\sim}$ there is a unique image.

Injective. If $i([a]_{\sim}) = i([a']_{\sim})$ then $f(a) = f(a')$ by definition of i . Further it implies that $a \sim a'$ by definition of the equivalence relation. Hence a and a' are in the same equivalence class, or $[a]_{\sim} = [a']_{\sim}$.

Surjective. Let $b \in \text{im} f$. Then there exists an $a \in A$ such that $f(a) = b$. Hence there exists $[a]_{\sim}$ such that $b = i([a]_{\sim})$. ■

As a result of this proposition we have shown that any function f can be decomposed according to the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \downarrow g & & \uparrow h \\ A/\sim & \xrightarrow[\sim]{i} & \text{im} f \end{array}$$

This shows that any function can be written as a composition of injections, surjections, and isomorphisms. This decomposition is called the canonical decompositions.

DEFINITION I.3.16 Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a function, and $A_0 \subset A$. Then define,

$$f(A_0) = \{b \mid b = f(a), a \in A_0\},$$

and

$$f^{-1}(B_0) = \{a \mid f(a) \in B_0\}.$$

Note that this definition is for all functions, not just bijective functions.

PROPOSITION I.3.17 Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a function, and let $A_0 \subset A, B_0 \subset B$ then,

$$A_0 \subset f^{-1}(f(A_0)) \quad \text{and} \quad f(f^{-1}(B_0)) \subset B_0$$

Proof | For the first statement, let $a \in A_0$. Then $f(a) \in f(A_0)$. Which further implies, by definition, that $a \in f^{-1}(f(A_0))$. Hence,

$$\implies A_0 \subset f^{-1}(f(A_0))$$

For the second part of the proposition, let $b \in f(f^{-1}(B_0))$. This means that there exists $a \in f^{-1}(B_0)$ such that $b = f(a)$. Since $a \in f^{-1}(B_0)$, again by definition, $f(a) \in B_0$. Hence $b \in B_0$. Since this is true for any $b \in f(f^{-1}(B_0))$, we conclude that $f(f^{-1}(B_0)) \subset B_0$. ■

PROPOSITION I.3.18 Let $f : A \rightarrow B, A_0, A_1 \subset A$, and $B_0, B_1 \subset B$. Then f^{-1} preserves:

- 1) inclusions
- 2) unions
- 3) intersections
- 4) differences

Proof | Preservation of inclusion: let $B_0 \subset B_1$. From the definition it follows that $f^{-1}(B_0) = \{a \mid f(a) \in B_0\}$. Since $B_0 \subset B_1$, if $f(a) \in B_0$ then $f(a) \in B_1$. Hence if $a \in f^{-1}(B_0)$ then $a \in f^{-1}(B_1)$. Hence $f^{-1}(B_0) \subset f^{-1}(B_1)$.

Proof of preservation of unions: the set $f^{-1}(B_0 \cup B_1) = \{a \mid f(a) \in B_0 \cup B_1\}$. While $f^{-1}(B_i) = \{a \mid f(a) \in B_i\}$. The union $f^{-1}(B_0) \cup f^{-1}(B_1) = \{a \mid f(a) \in B_0 \text{ or } f(a) \in B_1\}$, which is the same as $\{a \mid f(a) \in B_0 \cup B_1\}$. Hence the two sides are equivalent.

Proof for intersections and differences is very similar to the one for unions. ■

Unlike its inverse f only preserves inclusions and unions. Showing this is pretty easy. Also another property of functions is that $(g \circ f)^{-1}(C_0)$ is equivalent to $f^{-1}(g^{-1}(C_0))$ for functions $f : A \rightarrow B$, $g : B \rightarrow C$, and set $C_0 \subset C$.

1.4 CATEGORIES

A category is essentially a collection of 'objects' and of 'morphisms' between these objects, satisfying a list of natural conditions. These objects might be sets, groups, vector spaces, etc. Since there is simply no set of all sets (due to Russell's paradox), this collection of objects is just too 'big' to be called a set. The formal term used is a *class of objects*. The formal definition of categories is as follows.

DEFINITION 1.4.1 A category C consists of:

- 1) a class $\text{Obj}(C)$ of *objects* of the category.
- 2) for every two objects A, B of C , a set $\text{Hom}_C(A, B)$ of morphisms satisfying the following properties:
 - i) for every object A of C there exists (at least) one morphism $1_A \in \text{Hom}_C(A, A)$. This is the identity on A .
 - ii) one can compose morphisms: two morphisms $f \in \text{Hom}_C(A, B)$ and $g \in \text{Hom}_C(B, C)$ determine a morphism $gf \in \text{Hom}_C(A, C)$. For every triplet of objects A, B, C of C there is a function (of sets)

$$\text{Hom}_C(A, B) \times \text{Hom}_C(B, C) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(A, C)$$

- iii) this composition law is associative.
- iv) the identity morphisms are identities with respect to composition, i.e. if $f \in \text{Hom}_C(A, B)$ then

$$f1_A = f, 1_B f = f$$

- v) the sets $\text{Hom}_C(A, B)$ and $\text{Hom}_C(C, D)$ are disjoint unless $A = C$ and $B = D$.

One can make morphism diagrams similar to those of set functions. The set of morphisms from an object to itself are known as endomorphisms and are denoted $\text{End}(A)$. The subscript C will be dropped from now on, unless it is necessary to use it.

EXAMPLE 1.4.2 (Sets) As a first example consider the category Set defined as $\text{Obj}(\text{Set}) =$ the class of all sets, and $\text{Hom}(A, B) =$ the set of all set-functions from A to B . We must verify if this is a category. For every A there is an identity function $1_A : A \rightarrow A$, $1_A(a) = a$. Composition of set-functions is possible, the composition is known to be associative, and the identity function is identity with respect to the composition. The last property is also trially true. Hence Set is indeed a category.

EXAMPLE 1.4.3 Consider this example.


Suppose S is a set and \sim is a reflexive and transitive relation. Then define a category C as:

- objects are elements of S ;
- $\text{Hom}(a, b)$, where a, b are objects, is the set consisting $(a, b) \in S \times S$ if $a \sim b$, and let $\text{Hom}(a, b) = \emptyset$ otherwise.

Verification that this is a category:

- 1) Since $a \sim a$ using reflexive property, $1_a = (a, a) \in \text{Hom}(a, a)$.
- 2) Given two morphisms $f = (a, b) \in \text{Hom}(a, b)$ and $g = (b, c) \in \text{Hom}(b, c)$ then using transitivity we know that $a \sim c$ and hence $gf = (a, c) \in \text{Hom}(a, c)$. Hence a composition exists.
- 3) The composition is clearly associative.
- 4) Let $f = (a, b) \in \text{Hom}(a, b)$, and we know that $1_a = (a, a)$ and $1_b = (b, b)$. Clearly $f1_a = (a, b)$ and $1_b f = (a, b)$.
- 5) Since each $\text{Hom}(a, b)$ has either one element (a, b) or is empty, any two set of morphisms will be disjoint.

As an example of this kind of category consider the set $\{1, 2, 3\}$ along with the ordering \leq . The following is a commutative diagram of this category:



PART II
ABSTRACT ALGEBRA

PART III
TOPOLOGY

IV.1 INTUITION OF MEASURE

Consider any interval of \mathbb{R} , $(a, b]$. Intuitively we define the length of this interval as $\lambda((a, b]) = b - a$. Now is it possible to extend this concept of length to any subset of \mathbb{R} ? For that we would wish to find a function λ such that the following properties are true:

- 1) $\lambda : \mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a set function.
- 2) If $I = (a, b]$ is any interval in \mathbb{R} then $\lambda(I) = b - a$.
- 3) Length of union of two disjoint subsets $A, B \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R})$ must be the sum of their individual lengths, i.e. $\lambda(A + B) = \lambda(A) + \lambda(B)$. This can be extended to any countable union of pairwise disjoint subsets.
- 4) The translation of any subset $A \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R})$ must have the same length, i.e. $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda(A + x) = \lambda(A)$.



CONJECTURE IV.1.1 The function λ as described above does not exist.

To prove this we must first prove some other propositions. We use the following notations: let \sim be an equivalence relation on \mathbb{R} defined as:

$$x \sim y \text{ if } x - y \in \mathbb{Q}$$

Let $[x]$ denote the equivalence classes of x , and let $\Lambda = \mathbb{R} / \sim$.

PROPOSITION IV.1.2 The set Λ is uncountable.

Proof | Let $\alpha \in \Lambda$ be an equivalence class. Let $x \in \alpha$ be a fixed point. Then for each $y \in \alpha$ it is possible to find a unique rational number given by $x - y$. Hence α is a countable set. Since the countable union of countable sets is countable, but \mathbb{R} is uncountable, it follows that Λ must be uncountable. ■

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}$ be set constructed in the following way: for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$ we know that a point can be found between $(0, 1)$; so take one such point from each α and put it in the set Ω . From this construction it is easy to see that $\Omega \subset (0, 1)$.

PROPOSITION IV.1.3 Let $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$, then either $\Omega + q = \Omega + p$ or $\Omega + q \cap \Omega + p = \emptyset$.

Proof | Let's say $\Omega + q \cap \Omega + p \neq \emptyset$. Then for $a, b \in \Omega$ we can find an $x \in \Omega + q \cap \Omega + p$ such that $x = a + p = b + q$. Hence $a - b = q - p$ for all $a, b \in \Omega$. Since $q - p$ is rational, $a - b$ will also be rational. Hence a and b belong to the same equivalence class. But since we only chose one element from each equivalence class in the construction of Ω , we must have $a = b$. Hence $q = p$, making the two sets in question equal. ■

Hence from this proposition we can say that if $q \neq p$ then $\Omega + q \cap \Omega + p = \emptyset$.

PROPOSITION IV.1.4 Let λ be a length function as defined above. If $A \subset B \subset \mathbb{R}$ then $\lambda(A) \leq \lambda(B)$.

Proof | Since $B = A \cup (B - A)$, and A and $B - A$ are disjoint,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(B) &= \lambda(A \cup (B - A)) \\ &= \lambda(A) + \lambda(B - A) \\ &\geq \lambda(A)\end{aligned}$$

Hence proving our claim. ■

Now we are ready to prove conjecture IV.1.1.

proof of conjecture IV.1.1 | Consider the union of sets $\Omega + q$:

$$\bigcup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \Omega + q$$

From proposition IV.1.3 we know that this is a union of disjoint sets. Hence,

$$\lambda \left(\bigcup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \Omega + q \right) = \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \lambda(\Omega + q)$$

Using property 4 of λ ,

$$\lambda \left(\bigcup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \Omega + q \right) = \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \lambda(\Omega) = 0$$

Let $x \in (0, 1)$. Let $a \in \Omega \cap [x]$. Then we know that $x - a = q$ for some rational q . Since $a \in \Omega$ implies $a \in (0, 1)$, the range of q must be $-1 < q < 1$. Hence $x = a + q$ for some $-1 < q < 1$ implying that

$$x \in \bigcup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \Omega + q$$

further implying that,

$$(0, 1) \subset \bigcup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \Omega + q$$

Using proposition IV.1.4,

$$1 \leq \lambda \left(\bigcup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \Omega + q \right)$$

Hence we have arrived at a contradiction. This shows that a function λ with the properties 1,2,3,4 as given above does not exist. ■

Hence this shows that to construct a general notion of length (called the *measure*) we must let go of one of the four properties: 1,2,3, or 4. Since 2,3,4 are essential for a notion of length, we change 1 to be the following:

1) $\lambda : \mathcal{B}(\subset \mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R})) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a set function.

This means that we are discarding the notion that all subsets of \mathbb{R} can be assigned a length.

IV.2 FORMAL NOTION OF MEASURE

DEFINITION IV.2.1 A class of subsets, \mathcal{A} , of a set Ω is said to be a semi-algebra if:

- 1) $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$,
- 2) closed under finite intersections,
- 3) The compliment of any set in \mathcal{A} can be expressed as unions of finite pairwise disjoint sets in \mathcal{A} .

DEFINITION IV.2.2 A class of subsets, \mathcal{A} , of a set Ω is said to be an algebra if:

- 1) $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$,
- 2) closed under finite intersections,
- 3) Closed under compliment.

DEFINITION IV.2.3 A class of subsets, \mathcal{A} , of a set Ω is said to be a σ -algebra if:


- 1) $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$,
- 2) closed under countable intersections,
- 3) Closed under compliment.

PROPOSITION IV.2.4 Let Ω be a set and $\mathcal{A}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{P}(\Omega)$ be algebras, where $\alpha \in I$ (no assumptions have been made on I). Then

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{A}_\alpha$$

is also an algebra.

Proof | Since $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha, \forall \alpha \in I$, implies that $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$. If $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ then $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ for any $\alpha \in I$. Since \mathcal{A}_α is an algebra, it follows that $\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j$ is in \mathcal{A}_α for any $\alpha \in I$; hence it is also in \mathcal{A} . If $A \in \mathcal{A}$ then it is in every \mathcal{A}_α and hence its compliment is in every \mathcal{A}_α . ■

 The above proposition also applies to σ -algebras as well. Essentially the same argument applies, just that instead of finite sets we have countable intersection, i.e. $n \rightarrow \infty$. To denote that something applies to both algebras and σ -algebras we use the notation $(\sigma-)$ algebra.

DEFINITION IV.2.6 A class \mathcal{C} of subsets of set Ω is said to generate an $(\sigma-)$ algebra \mathcal{A} if $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{A}$ and if for any $(\sigma-)$ algebra $\mathcal{A}' \supset \mathcal{C}$ implies that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}'$.

PROPOSITION IV.2.7 Every class $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathfrak{P}(\Omega)$ generates an $(\sigma-)$ algebra.

Proof | Let $\mathcal{A}_\alpha, \alpha \in I$ be all the $(\sigma-)$ algebras which contain the class \mathcal{C} . Then we know that,

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{A}_\alpha$$

is also an $(\sigma-)$ algebra, and it will contain \mathcal{C} . From the definition of intersection it follows that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}_\alpha$. Hence \mathcal{A} is the $(\sigma-)$ algebra generated by \mathcal{C} . ■

LEMMA IV.2.8 If \mathcal{S} is a semi-algebra and \mathcal{A} is the algebra generated by \mathcal{S} then

$$A \in \mathcal{A} \iff \exists \text{ pairwise disjoint } E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{S} \text{ such that } A = \bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j$$

Proof | (\Leftarrow) Assuming that A is finite union of disjoint sets $E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{S}$ we need to show that $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Since E_1, \dots, E_n are in \mathcal{S} it follows that they are also in \mathcal{A} . It further follows that the complement of each $E_j \in \mathcal{A}$. Since

$$\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n E_j^c \right)^c = \bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j,$$

and algebras are closed under finite intersections, $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

(\Rightarrow) Let \mathcal{B} be the class defined as:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{B \mid \text{where } B = \bigcup_{j=1}^n F_j, F_j \in \mathcal{S} \text{ are pairwise disjoint.}\}$$

If we can show that \mathcal{B} is an algebra containing \mathcal{S} then by definition of generated algebras $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$. This shows that any element of \mathcal{A} can be expressed as a finite union of disjoint sets. Hence all that remains is to show that \mathcal{B} is an algebra containing \mathcal{S} .

- 1) Clearly by the definition, any element of \mathcal{S} is also in \mathcal{B} . Hence $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{B}$ and hence $\Omega \in \mathcal{B}$.
- 2) Let $B_1, \dots, B_n \in \mathcal{B}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{j=1}^n B_j &= \bigcap_{j=1}^n \bigcup_{i=1}^m F_{ji} \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^m \bigcap_{j=1}^n F_{ji}, \text{ using definition of } \mathcal{B} \\ &= \bigcup_{i=1}^m E_i, \text{ where, } E_i = \bigcap_{j=1}^n F_{ji} \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{S} is closed under finite intersections, this shows that \mathcal{B} is closed under finite intersections.

- 3) Let $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} B^c &= \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^m F_i \right)^c \\ &= \bigcap_{i=1}^m F_i^c \\ &= \bigcap_{i=1}^m \bigcup_{j=1}^n E_{ij} \text{ (using property 3 of semi-algebras)} \\ &= \bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j, \text{ where } E_j = \bigcap_{i=1}^m E_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathcal{S} is closed under finite intersections, this shows that \mathcal{B} is closed under complement. \mathcal{B} is indeed an algebra containing \mathcal{S} , hence completing our proof. ■

DEFINITION IV.2.9 Let \mathcal{C} be a class of subsets of Ω such that $\emptyset \in \mathcal{C}$, and let $\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function such that:

- 1) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$,
- 2) If $E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{C}$ are pairwise disjoint and if $\bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j \in \mathcal{C}$ then $\mu(\bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(E_j)$.

then μ is said to be an additive measure.


 Observe that if we have a $A \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mu(A) < \infty$ then:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(A \cup \emptyset) &= \mu(A) + \mu(\emptyset) \\ \mu(A) &= \mu(A) + \mu(\emptyset) \\ \implies \mu(\emptyset) &= 0\end{aligned}$$

Hence the first condition is just a consequence of the second if a subset with finite measure exists. Secondly observe that if $E \subset F \in \mathcal{C}$ and $F - E \in \mathcal{C}$ then:

$$\mu(E \cup F - E) = \mu(F) = \mu(E) + \mu(F - E)$$

this means that $\mu(E) \leq \mu(F)$, the equality being true when $\mu(E) = \infty$. In the case where $\mu(E) < \infty$ we have the identity $\mu(F - E) = \mu(F) - \mu(E)$. This property is called monotonicity.

 Observe that if A, B are any sets in \mathcal{C} and $A \cup B \in \mathcal{C}$ then additivity implies that $\mu(A \cup B) \leq \mu(A) + \mu(B)$, since

$$\mu(A \cup B) = \mu(A \cup (B - A)) = \mu(A) + \mu(B - A) \leq \mu(A) + \mu(B). \text{ (using monotonicity)}$$

EXAMPLE IV.2.12 Let Ω be any non-empty set and let $X_1, X_2, \dots \in \Omega$. Also let $a_1, a_2, \dots \geq 0$ be some constants. Then define a measure $\mu : \mathcal{C} \subset (\mathfrak{P}(\Omega)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ as:

$$\mu(A) = \sum_{j \geq 1} a_j 1\{X_j \in A\}$$

where,

$$1\{X_j \in A\} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } X_j \in A \\ 0, & \text{if } X_j \notin A \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that this measure is indeed additive.

DEFINITION IV.2.13 Let \mathcal{C} be a class of subsets of Ω such that $\emptyset \in \mathcal{C}$, and let $\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function such that:

- 1) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$,
- 2) If $E_1, E_2, \dots \in \mathcal{C}$ are pairwise disjoint and if $\bigcup_{j \geq 1} E_j \in \mathcal{C}$ then $\mu(\bigcup_{j \geq 1} E_j) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu(E_j)$.

then μ is said to be a σ -additive measure.

EXAMPLE IV.2.14 Let $\Omega = (0, 1)$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{(a, b] \mid 0 \leq a < b < 1\} \cup \{\emptyset\}$. Define a function $\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ as:

$$\mu(a, b] = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } a = 0 \\ b - a, & \text{if } a \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

Clearly since a subset with finite measure exists $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$. Also since,

$$(a, b] = \bigcup_{j=1}^n (a_j, a_{j+1}], \text{ where } a_1 = a \text{ \& } a_n = b$$

when $a = 0$, $a_1 = 0$ and hence applying the measure on both sides we get ∞ . When $a \neq 0$, so are none of the a_j and hence:

$$\mu(a, b] = b - a = (a_2 - a_1) + \dots + (a_n - a_{n-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(a_j, a_{j+1}]$$


Hence μ is additive. But it is possible to show that μ is not σ -additive. Consider for example the interval $(0, 1/2]$, and let $x_1 = 1/2, x_2, \dots$ be a monotonic decreasing sequence in $(0, 1)$ which converges to 0. Then

$$(0, 1/2] = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} (x_{j+1}, x_j]$$

Clearly $\mu(0, 1/2] = \infty$, but $\mu(x_{j+1}, x_j] = x_{j+1} - x_j$ which is finite.

DEFINITION IV.2.15 Let \mathcal{C} be a class of subsets of Ω and $\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be any set function. Then,

- 1) μ is said to be *continuous from below* at $E \in \mathcal{C}$ if $\forall (E_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \mathcal{C}, E_n \uparrow E \implies \lim \mu(E_n) = \mu(E)$.
- 2) μ is said to be *continuous from above* at $E \in \mathcal{C}$ if $\forall (E_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \mathcal{C}, E_n \downarrow E$ and $\exists n_0$ such that $\mu(E_{n_0}) < \infty$ implies that $\lim \mu(E_n) = \mu(E)$.

 If the condition of existence of n_0 such that $\mu(E_{n_0}) < \infty$ is removed then some unwanted cases arise. For example consider a measure on some class of \mathbb{R} . Consider the sequence of intervals $I_n = [n, \infty)$. Clearly $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} [n, \infty) = \emptyset$, but $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ while $\mu(I_n) = \infty, \forall n$. This shows that no measure can be continuous from above on \mathbb{R} . This leads us to add the condition of existence of some set in the sequence which has finite measure.

LEMMA IV.2.17 Let \mathcal{A} be an algebra and let $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be an additive measure, then:

- 1) μ is σ -additive $\implies \mu$ is continuous.
- 2) μ is continuous from below $\implies \mu$ is σ -additive.
- 3) μ is continuous from above at \emptyset and μ is a finite measure $\implies \mu$ is σ -additive.

Proof | 1) Assume μ is σ -additive, let $E \in \mathcal{C}$, and let $(E_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $E_n \uparrow E$. Let $F_1 = E_1$ and $F_n = E_n - E_{n-1}$. Clearly by this definition $\bigcup_{j \geq 1} F_j = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} E_j = E$. Then,

$$\mu \left(\bigcup_{j \geq 1} F_j \right) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu(F_j) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \geq 2}^n (\mu(E_j) - \mu(E_{j-1})) + \mu(E_1) = \lim \mu(E_n)$$

Hence μ is continuous from below.

For proving continuity from above, let $(E_n)_{n \geq 1} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that some $\mu(E_{n_0}) < \infty$ and $E_n \downarrow E$. Let $G_m = E_{n_0} - E_{n_0+m}$ be a sequence of sets, $\bigcup_{m \geq n_0} G_m = E_{n_0} - E$. Using the fact the μ is continuous from below,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu(G_m) = \mu(E_{n_0}) - \mu(E)$$

hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_{n_0}) - \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_{n_0+m}) &= \mu(E_{n_0}) - \mu(E) \\ \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_{n_0+m}) &= \mu(E) \end{aligned}$$

This is the same as $\lim \mu(E_n) = \mu(E)$.

- 2) Assume that μ is continuous from below. Let $E \in \mathcal{C}$ be represented as the union of pairwise disjoint sets E_1, E_2, \dots . Let F_1, F_2, \dots be a sequence defined as:

$$F_k = \bigcup_{j=1}^k E_j$$

Clearly F_k is a sequence that converges to E from below. Using the fact that μ is additive and continuous from below:

$$\mu(E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(F_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(E_j) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu(E_j)$$

Hence μ is σ -additive.

- 3) Assume that μ is continuous from above at \emptyset . Let $A \in \mathcal{C}$ and let A_1, A_2, \dots be pairwise disjoint sets whose union is A . Define the sets E_1, E_2, \dots as

$$E_n = A - \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j$$

Clearly $E_n \downarrow \emptyset$. Using finiteness, additivity, and continuity from above at \emptyset ,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) &= 0 \\ \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(A - \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j\right) &= 0 \\ \implies \mu(A) &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu(A_j) \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

THEOREM IV.2.18 (Extension Theorem) Let \mathcal{S} be a semi-algebra, $\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be an additive measure, and let \mathcal{A} be the algebra generated by \mathcal{S} . Then there exists a $\nu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, called the *extension* of μ , such that:

- 1) $\nu(A) = \mu(A)$, $\forall A \in \mathcal{S}$.
- 2) ν is additive.

In addition such a measure on \mathcal{A} is unique.

Proof | Let $\nu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function defined in the following way. Using lemma IV.2.8 we know that for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we can find disjoint $E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $A = \bigcup_{j=1}^n E_j$; then define ν as,

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(E_j)$$

First we must show that ν is well defined, since there can be more than one sequence of pairwise disjoint sets whose union is A . Let E_1, \dots, E_n and F_1, \dots, F_m be two sequences of pairwise disjoint sets in \mathcal{S} whose union is A . Then,

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(E_j)$$

and

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{j=1}^m \mu(F_j).$$

Since $A = \bigcup_{k=1}^m F_k$

$$\begin{aligned} \implies E_j &= \bigcup_{k=1}^m F_k \cap E_j \\ \implies \mu(E_j) &= \sum_{k=1}^m \mu(F_k \cap E_j) \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^m \mu(F_k \cap E_j)$$

Similarly it can shown that,

$$\mu(F_j) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(E_k \cap F_j)$$

and therefore

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mu(F_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu(E_j).$$

Hence ν is well defined.

Clearly for $A \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $\nu(A) = \mu(A)$. For additivity, let A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n be pairwise disjoint sets in \mathcal{A} whose union is A . Again from lemma IV.2.8 for each $A_j = \bigcup_{k=1}^{n_j} E_{jk}$ where $E_{j1}, \dots, E_{jn_j} \in \mathcal{S}$ are pairwise disjoint. Let F_1, \dots, F_N , where $N = \sum_{j=1}^n n_j$, be defined as $F_1 = E_{11}, F_2 = E_{12}$ and so on. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \bigcup_{j=1}^N F_j \\ \implies \nu(A) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \mu(F_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \mu(E_{jk}) \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\nu(A_j) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_j} \mu(E_{jk}),$$

$$\implies v(A) = \sum_{j=1}^n v(A_j)$$

Therefore v is additive.

For uniqueness, let's assume that two such functions v_1 and v_2 exist. From property 1 we know that $v_1(A) = v_2(A) \forall A \in \mathcal{S}$. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{S}$ be pairwise disjoint with union A . Then using additivity

$$v_1(A) = \sum_{j=1}^n v_1(A_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n v_2(A_j) = v_2(A)$$

This completes the proof. ■



This is theorem can be easily generalised for σ -additive measures. The only change in the proof would be considering countably many A_j in the proof of additivity.

IV.3 CARATHEODORY THEOREM

Until now we have shown that extension v of σ -additive measure μ on semi-algebra \mathcal{S} is also σ -additive on algebra \mathcal{A} generated by \mathcal{S} . The goal of this section is to show that the extension $\pi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, where \mathcal{F} is the σ -algebra generated by \mathcal{S} is σ -additive and unique. In order to do this we follow the following steps:

- 1) Define a $\pi^* : \mathfrak{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and show that it is something called an *outer measure*.
- 2) Define a class $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathfrak{P}(\Omega)$, and show that it is a σ -algebra.
- 3) Show that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}$. This has the implication that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{M}$.
- 4) Show that $\pi^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is σ -additive and $\pi^*|_{\mathcal{A}} = v$. Hence $\pi^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an extension.
- 5) Finally show that this extension is unique.

DEFINITION IV.3.1 Let $A \subset \Omega$ for some set Ω . Then the collection $\{E_i \subset \Omega \mid i \geq 1\}$ is said to be a covering of A if $A \subset \bigcup_{i \geq 1} E_i$. Note that at least one covering exists for every subset and that is $\{\Omega\}$.

DEFINITION IV.3.2 Let $\pi^* : \mathfrak{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ for some set Ω defined in the following way: let $A \subset \Omega$ and let $\{E_i \in \mathcal{A} \mid i \geq 1\}$ be a covering of A then

$$\pi^*(A) = \inf_{\{E_i\}} \sum_{i \geq 1} v(E_i)$$

This is to be read as infimum of $\sum_{i \geq 1} v(E_i)$ over all coverings of A which are in the algebra \mathcal{A} .

DEFINITION IV.3.3 Let \mathcal{C} be a class of subsets of Ω such that $\emptyset \in \mathcal{C}$, and let $\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a function such that:

- 1) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$,
- 2) μ is monotone, i.e. $E \subset F$ where $E, F \in \mathcal{C} \implies \mu(E) \leq \mu(F)$,
- 3) μ is sub-additive, i.e. $E \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\{E_i \in \mathcal{C} \mid i \geq 1\}$ is a covering of E then $\mu(E) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \mu(E_i)$.

Then μ is said to be an outer measure.

PROPOSITION IV.3.4 The function π^* as defined above is an outer measure.

Proof | Since $\emptyset \subset \Omega$, and it is a subset of every possible covering, clearly for the covering $\{E_i = \emptyset \mid \forall i \geq 1\}$,

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i) = 0$$

and hence $\pi^*(\emptyset) = 0$.

Let $E \subset F$ where $E, F \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $\{F_j \mid j \geq 1\}$ be a covering of F . Since $E \subset F$ any covering of F is also a covering of E . If $E_j = F \cap F_j$ then $E_j \subset F_j$ and $\bigcup_{j \geq 1} E_j = F \cap E = E$. Hence $\{E_j\}$ is a covering of E . Since ν is a σ -additive measure,

$$\nu(E_j) \leq \nu(F_j) \text{ and hence, } \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(F_i).$$

Since for every covering of F a covering of E can be constructed in the above manner such that the above inequality is true, hence π^* is monotone.

For sub-additivity let $E \subset \Omega$ and let $\{E_i \in \mathcal{A} \mid i \geq 1\}$ be a covering of E . In the case when $\pi^*(E_i) = \infty$, clearly $\pi^*(E) \leq \pi^*(E_i)$. In the case when $\pi^*(E_i) < \infty \forall i \geq 1$, for each $\epsilon > 0$ we can find a covering of E_i , say $\{F_{ij} \in \mathcal{A} \mid j \geq 1\}$ such that,

$$\pi^*(E_i) \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu(F_{ij}) \leq \pi^*(E_i) + \frac{\epsilon}{2^i}$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} \pi^*(E_i) \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu\left(\bigcup_{i \geq 1} F_{ij}\right) = \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \pi^*(E_i) + \epsilon$$

Using $\pi^*(E) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i)$, we get

$$\pi^*(E) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \pi^*(E_i) + \epsilon$$

Since this is true for arbitrary ϵ we conclude that π^* is sub-additive. ■

DEFINITION IV.3.5 A set $A \subset \Omega$ is said to be measurable if $\forall E \subset \Omega$,

$$\pi^*(E) = \pi^*(E \cap A) + \pi^*(E \cap A^c)$$

Define \mathcal{M} to be the set of all measurable subsets of Ω .



Using sub-additivity of π^* it is possible to prove that

$$\pi^*(E) \leq \pi^*(E \cap A) + \pi^*(E \cap A^c)$$

since $E = (E \cap A) \cup (E \cap A^c)$. Hence showing that A is measurable just boils down to showing

$$\pi^*(E) \geq \pi^*(E \cap A) + \pi^*(E \cap A^c)$$

PROPOSITION IV.3.7 The algebra \mathcal{A} of subsets of Ω is a subset of \mathcal{M} .

Proof | Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and let $E \in \Omega$. If we can show that A is measurable, we prove the proposition. Let $\{E_i \in \mathcal{A}\}$ be a covering of E , and let $\epsilon > 0$. In the case when $\pi^*(E_i) = \infty$ even for a single i , it is

clear that the inequality

$$\pi^*(E) \geq \pi^*(E \cap A) + \pi^*(E \cap A^c) \quad (\text{IV.3.1})$$

holds. In the case when $\pi^*(E_i) < \infty$ for all $i \geq 1$ let $\epsilon > 0$. Then

$$\pi^*(E) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i) \leq \pi^*(E) + \epsilon$$

Since $E \cap A \subset \bigcup_{i \geq 1} E_i \cap A$,

$$\pi^*(E \cap A) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i \cap A)$$

Using similar arguments for A^c

$$\pi^*(E \cap A^c) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i \cap A^c)$$

Adding these two inequalities

$$\pi^*(E \cap A^c) + \pi^*(E \cap A) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i)$$

Here I have used the additivity of ν since $E_i \cap A$ and $E_i \cap A^c$ are in the algebra. Using inequality (1):

$$\pi^*(E \cap A^c) + \pi^*(E \cap A) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \nu(E_i) \leq \pi^*(E) + \epsilon$$

Since this is true for arbitrary ϵ , we have

$$\pi^*(E \cap A^c) + \pi^*(E \cap A) \leq \pi^*(E)$$

Hence we have shown that A is measurable, completing the proof. ■

PROPOSITION IV.3.8 \mathcal{M} is a σ -algebra.

Proof | Since every algebra is a subset of \mathcal{M} clearly $\Omega \in \mathcal{M}$. Also it is easy to see that if $A \in \mathcal{M}$ then $A^c \in \mathcal{M}$ since replcaing A by A^c in the condition of measurable set does not change the inequality. The only condition that remains to be checked is closure under countable union. First consider the finite case. Let $A, B \in \mathcal{M}$. We are required to show that $\forall E \subset \Omega$,

$$\pi^*(E) \geq \pi^*(E \cap (A \cup B)) + \pi^*(E \cap (A \cup B)^c).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^*(E) &= \pi^*(E \cap A) + \pi^*(E - A), \\ \pi^*(E) &= \pi^*(E \cap B) + \pi^*(E - B) \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^*(E - A) &= \pi^*((E - A) \cap B) + \pi^*((E - A) - B) \\ &= \pi^*(E \cap A^c \cap B) + \pi^*(E - (A \cup B)^c), \end{aligned}$$

implying that

$$\pi^*(E) = \pi^*(E \cap A) + \pi^*(E \cap A^c \cap B) + \pi^*(E - (A \cup B)^c)$$

$$\geq \pi^*(E \cap A \cup B) + \pi^*(E - (A \cup B)^c).$$

The final inequality comes from the sub-additivity of π^* and the fact that $(E \cap A) \cup (E \cap A^c \cap B) = E \cap A \cup B$. Hence $A \cup B \in \mathcal{M}$. Now extending this to the countable case, let $A_j \in \mathcal{M}$, $A = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j$, and $B_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j$. Using closure under finite unions we can say that

$$\pi^*(E) = \pi^*(E \cap B_n) + \pi^*(E - B_n)$$

Since $B_n \subset A \implies E - B_n \supset E - A$. Hence,

$$\pi^*(E) \geq \pi^*(E \cap B_n) + \pi^*(E - A)$$

Define the sets $F_1 = A_1, \dots, F_j = A_j - B_{j-1}, \dots$; and observe that $F_j \in \mathcal{M}$, $A = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} F_j$, and that these sets are pairwise disjoint. If we define $G_n = \bigcup_{j=1}^n F_j$, then using a similar logic as B_n

$$\pi^*(E) \geq \pi^*(E \cap G_n) + \pi^*(E - A).$$

Using induction one can show that

$$\pi^*(E \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n F_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi^*(E \cap F_j).$$

For $n = 1$ it is obviously true. Assuming it to be true for some n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^*(E \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^{n+1} F_j) &= \pi^*(E \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^{n+1} F_j \cap F_{n+1}) + \pi^*(E \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^{n+1} F_j \cap F_{n+1}^c) \\ &= \pi^*(E \cap F_{n+1}) + \pi^*(E \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n F_j) \\ &= \pi^*(E \cap F_{n+1}) + \sum_{j=1}^n \pi^*(E \cap F_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \pi^*(E \cap F_j). \end{aligned}$$

Hence using this property,

$$\pi^*(E) \geq \pi^*(E \cap G_n) + \pi^*(E - A) = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi^*(E \cap F_j) + \pi^*(E - A).$$

Taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\pi^*(E) \geq \sum_{j \geq 1} \pi^*(E \cap F_j) + \pi^*(E - A) \geq \pi^*(E \cap A) + \pi^*(E - A).$$

The final inequality comes from sub-additivity of π^* . This completes the proof that \mathcal{M} is a σ -algebra. ■



Since the algebra \mathcal{A} is a subset of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M} is a σ -algebra it follows that \mathcal{M} contains the σ -algebra generated by \mathcal{A} .

PROPOSITION IV.3.10 $\pi^*(A) = v(A) \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof | Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Consider the covering $\{A_1 = A, A_j = \emptyset \ j \geq 2\}$. Then $\pi^*(A) \leq \nu(A)$ by definition. The opposite inequality can be proved by constructing sets $F_1 = E_1, F_n = E_n - \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} E_j$, where $\{E_n \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is some covering of A . As discussed in the previous proof F_j are pairwise disjoint. Since,

$$\begin{aligned} A &\subset \bigcup_{j \geq 1} F_j \\ \implies A &= \bigcup_{j \geq 1} F_j \cap A \\ \implies \nu(A) &= \nu\left(\bigcup_{j \geq 1} F_j \cap A\right) \\ \implies \nu(A) &= \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu(F_j \cap A) \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu(E_j) \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality comes from the fact that $F_j \cap A \subset E_j$. This inequality shows that $\nu(A)$ is infact the infimum of the sum over all coverings of A . Hence $\pi^*(A) = \nu(A)$. ■

PROPOSITION IV.3.11 $\pi^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$ is σ -additive.

Proof | It is clear that $\pi(\emptyset) = 0$. Let $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{M}$ be pairwise disjoint sets and let their union be A . Since \mathcal{M} is a σ -algebra $A \in \mathcal{M}$. Since we have already shown that for any pairwise disjoint sets $F_1, F_2, \dots \in \mathcal{M}$ and any $E \subset \Omega$

$$\pi^*\left(E \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n F_j\right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi^*(E \cap F_j).$$

Letting $E = A$ and $F_j = A_j$,

$$\pi^*\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j\right) = \pi^*\left(A \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j\right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi^*(A \cap A_j) = \sum_{j=1}^n \pi^*(A_j).$$

Since $\bigcup_{j=1}^n A_j \subset \bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j$, using monotonicity of π^*

$$\pi^*(A) \geq \sum_{j=1}^n \pi^*(A_j).$$

Taking the limit

$$\pi^*(A) \geq \sum_{j \geq 1} \pi^*(A_j).$$

Since using sub-additivity we already know that

$$\pi^*(A) \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \pi^*(A_j)$$


it follows that π^* acting on \mathcal{M} is σ -additive. ■

DEFINITION IV.3.12 A set Ω is said to be σ -finite with respect to a function μ if there exists a sequence $E_1, E_2, \dots \subset \Omega$, such that $E_j \uparrow \Omega \implies \mu(E_j) < \infty$.

DEFINITION IV.3.13 A class $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathfrak{P}(\Omega)$ is said to be a monotone class if all monotonic sequences of sets converge in \mathcal{G} .

PROPOSITION IV.3.14 If \mathcal{G}_α where $\alpha \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$ are monotone classes then the intersection $\bigcap_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{G}_\alpha$ is also a monotone class.

Proof | If A_1, A_2, \dots is any monotone sequence in $\bigcap_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{G}_\alpha$ then it is in all \mathcal{G}_α and hence converge in all \mathcal{G}_α . ■

 Using this proposition one can define the smallest monotone class generated by some class \mathcal{C} as the intersection of all the monotone classes containing \mathcal{C} .

LEMMA IV.3.16 Let \mathcal{A} be any algebra of subsets of Ω , \mathcal{G} be the monotone class generated by \mathcal{A} , and let \mathcal{F} be the σ -algebra generated by \mathcal{A} . Then $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$.

Proof | Let $A_j \in \mathcal{F}$ monotonically increase (decrease) to A ; since the countable union (intersection) of A_j is in \mathcal{A} so A must also be in \mathcal{F} . Since $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}$ it follows that $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$.

All that remains to be shown is $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$. If we can show that \mathcal{G} is an algebra, then for any $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{G}$ let $B_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^i A_j \in \mathcal{G}$ (since if \mathcal{G} is an algebra it will be closed under finite union), it follows that $\bigcup_{j \geq 1} B_j = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j \in \mathcal{G}$ (using the fact that \mathcal{G} is monotone class). To prove that \mathcal{G} is an algebra define $\mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{G}$ the class:

$$\mathcal{M}(A) = \{M \in \mathcal{G} \mid A - M, M - A, A \cap M \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

Clearly $\mathcal{M}(A) \subset \mathcal{G}$. Let $E_1 \subset E_2 \subset \dots \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ converge to some E . Then $E - A = \bigcup_{i \geq 1} (E_i - A)$, but since by definition $E_i - A \in \mathcal{G}$ and $E_i - A \subset E_{i+1} - A$ it follows that $E - A \in \mathcal{G}$ (since \mathcal{G} is monotone class). Similarly it can be shown that $A - E$ and $A \cap E$ are in \mathcal{G} , and thus $E \in \mathcal{M}(A)$. The same argument can be used to show that if $E_1 \supset E_2 \supset \dots \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ converges to E then $E \in \mathcal{M}(A)$, hence concluding that $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is a monotone class. $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is also symmetric in the sense that if $A \in \mathcal{M}(B) \iff B \in \mathcal{M}(A)$, because if $A - B, B - A, A \cap B \in \mathcal{G}$ then both $A \in \mathcal{M}(B)$ and $B \in \mathcal{M}(A)$.

Let $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ then we know that $A - B, B - A, A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence $B \in \mathcal{M}(A)$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, implying that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}(A) \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$. Since \mathcal{G} is the smallest monotone class containing \mathcal{A} , $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{M}(A) \forall A \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $M \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $M \in \mathcal{G}$ using the symmetry it implies that $A \in \mathcal{M}(M)$. Hence $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{M}(M)$. Therefore $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{M}(M)$ for all $M \in \mathcal{G}$. This means that \mathcal{G} is closed under finite difference and intersection, proving that it is an algebra. This completes the proof. ■

THEOREM IV.3.17 (Uniqueness of Extension) Let $\mu_1, \mu_2 : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be σ -additive functions, where \mathcal{F} is the σ -algebra generated by algebra \mathcal{A} of a set Ω which is σ -finite with respect to μ_1 and μ_2 (with the additional condition that the finite sequence exists in \mathcal{A}), be such that $\mu_1|_{\mathcal{A}} = \mu_2|_{\mathcal{A}}$ then $\mu_1 = \mu_2$.

Proof | Let $E_1, E_2, \dots \in \mathcal{A}$ be the sequence such that $\mu_1(E_n) < \infty$ and $\mu_2(E_n) < \infty$ for all n and $E_n \uparrow \Omega$. This sequence is guaranteed by the σ -finiteness of Ω . Define $\mathcal{B}_n = \{E \in \mathcal{F} \mid \mu_1(E \cap E_n) =$

$\mu_2(E \cap E_n)\}$. Clearly $\mathcal{B}_n \subset \mathcal{F}$. If $E \in \mathcal{A}$ then $E \cap E_n \in \mathcal{A}$ and since $\mu_1|_{\mathcal{A}} = \mu_2|_{\mathcal{A}}$ it follows that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}_n$. Let $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{B}$ be a sequence monotonically converging to some A . Since

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1(A_j \cap E_n) &= \mu_2(A_j \cap E_n) \\ \implies \mu_1(A \cap E_n) &= \mu_2(A \cap E_n)\end{aligned}$$

where we have used lemma IV.2.17 and the finiteness of E_n in case of continuity from above. It follows that \mathcal{B}_n is a monotone class. Since it contains the algebra \mathcal{A} as well it must contain the monotone class generated by \mathcal{A} . Using lemma IV.3.16 we can conclude that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{B}_n$ and hence $\mathcal{B}_n = \mathcal{F}$. Let $A \in \mathcal{F}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_1(A \cap E_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_2(A \cap E_n) \\ \implies \mu_1(A) &= \mu_2(A)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the extension is unique. ■

As a result of this theorem we can conclude that the function $\pi^* : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a σ -additive extension of the σ -additive measure $\nu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ on the σ -algebra \mathcal{F} generated by the algebra \mathcal{A} and is uniquely determined. This is known as Caratheodory theorem. The formal statement of this theorem is:

THEOREM IV.3.18 (Caratheodory Theorem) Let \mathcal{A} be an algebra, $\nu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a σ -additive measure, and \mathcal{F} be the σ -algebra generated by \mathcal{A} . Then there exists a unique σ -additive measure $\pi : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $\pi|_{\mathcal{A}} = \nu$. Explicitly this measure is given by restricting the outer measure $\pi^* : \mathfrak{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$,

$$\pi^*(A) = \inf_{\{E_j \in \mathcal{A}\}} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \nu(E_j), \text{ where } \{E_j\} \text{ is a covering of } A$$

on \mathcal{F} ; i.e. $\pi = \pi^*|_{\mathcal{F}}$.

IV.4 LEBESGUE MEASURE

In this section we define a σ -additive measure on a class of subsets \mathbb{R} and formalise the notion of length of subsets of \mathbb{R} . The procedure to do this is as follows:

- 1) Construct a semi-algebra \mathcal{S} and a σ -additive measure $\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$.
- 2) Use theorem IV.2.18 to construct a σ -additive measure ν on the algebra \mathcal{A} generated by \mathcal{S} .
- 3) Use the Caratheodory theorem to determine the σ -measure on \mathcal{F} , the σ -algebra generated by \mathcal{A} .

DEFINITION IV.4.1 Let $\mathcal{S} = \{\emptyset, \mathbb{R}, (a, b], (a, \infty), (-\infty, b]\}$. It is easy to check that \mathcal{S} is a semi-algebra of subsets of \mathbb{R} . Let $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-decreasing function. Then define $\mu_F : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_F(\emptyset) &= 0, & \mu_F(\mathbb{R}) &= F(\infty), & \mu_F((a, b]) &= F(b) - F(a), \\ \mu_F((a, \infty)) &= F(\infty), & \mu_F((-\infty, b]) &= F(b) - F(-\infty).\end{aligned}$$



Observe that if we construct a function $G : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $G(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(x_n)$ when $-\infty < x < \infty$ and $G(\pm\infty) = F(\pm\infty)$, where $x_n \downarrow x$. It is easy to verify that G is non-decreasing, right continuous and

$\mu_G(A) = \mu_F(A)$, $\forall A \in \mathcal{S}$. Hence without loss of generalization it is fair to assume that F is always right continuous. Also observe that μ_F is monotone.

PROPOSITION IV.4.3 μ_F is a σ -additive measure.

Proof | By definition we have that $\mu_F(\emptyset) = 0$. Consider the interval $(a, b] = \bigcup_{j=1}^n (a_j, b_j]$, where $(a_j, b_j]$ are pairwise disjoint. Then it is always possible to reindex the intervals such that $b_j = a_{j+1}$ when $j < n$, $a_{n+1} \equiv b_n = b$, and $a_1 = a$ (this uses both the fact that the intervals are disjoint and their union is $(a, b]$). Since,

$$\begin{aligned} F(b) - F(a) &= F(a_{n+1}) - F(a_1) \\ &= F(a_{n+1}) - F(a_2) + F(a_2) - F(a_1) \\ &= (F(a_{n+1}) - F(a_n)) + \dots + (F(a_2) - F(a_1)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n F(a_{j+1}) - F(a_j) \end{aligned}$$

This sum can again be reindexed such that

$$F(b) - F(a) = \sum_{j=1}^n F(b_j) - F(a_j)$$

This implies that

$$\mu_F((a, b]) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu_F((a_j, b_j])$$

Hence μ_F is additive. Now consider the case when $(a, b] = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} (a_j, b_j]$ where $(a_j, b_j]$ are pairwise disjoint. Using monotonicity and additivity of μ_F

$$\mu_F((a, b]) \geq \mu_F\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k (a_j, b_j]\right) = \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_F((a_j, b_j]).$$

Taking the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mu((a, b]) \geq \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu_F((a_j, b_j]).$$

All that remains to be proven is that the \leq inequality. To prove this fix an $\epsilon > 0$. Choose a $c > a$ such that $F(c) - F(a) < \epsilon$, choose $d_j > b_j$ such that $F(d_j) - F(b_j) < \epsilon/2^j$ and $[c, b] \subset \bigcup_{j \geq 1} (a_j, d_j]$ (such choices are possible since F is continuous from the right). Using Heine-Borel theorem, since $[c, b]$ is closed and bounded and $\{(a_j, d_j)\}$ forms an open cover of $[c, b]$, there exists a finite subcover $\{(a_j, d_j) \mid j \leq k\}$ of $[c, b]$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $c \in (a_1, d_1)$ and $b \in (a_k, d_k)$. Since,

$$\mu_F((a, b]) = F(b) - F(a) < F(b) - F(c) + \epsilon = \mu_F((b, c]) + \epsilon$$

Then using the monotonicity of μ_F ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_F((b, c]) &\leq \mu_F\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^k (a_j, d_j]\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^k \mu_F((a_j, d_j]) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^k F(d_j) - F(a_j) \\
&< \sum_{j=1}^k F(b_j) - F(a_j) + \epsilon \\
&< \sum_{j \geq 1} F(b_j) - F(a_j) + \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus for any $\epsilon > 0$

$$\sum_{j \geq 1} \mu_F((a_j, b_j]) \leq \mu_F((a, b]) < \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu_F((a_j, b_j]) + 2\epsilon$$

Following a similar argument it is possible to show this is true also for intervals $(-\infty, b]$ and (a, ∞) . This proves σ -additivity. ■

Using the extension theorem and then Carathéodory's theorem the function $\mu_F^* : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$

$$\mu_F^*(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_j \mu_F(A_j) \mid A_j \in \mathcal{A} \text{ \& } A \subset \bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j \right\}$$

is a unique σ -additive extension of μ on the σ -algebra \mathcal{F} (to be more general it can be defined on the σ -algebra \mathcal{M}_{μ^*} , which is the set of measurable functions w.r.t. μ^*). The measure space $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mu_F^*)$ is called Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure space. In the case when $F(a) = a$ and hence $\mu((a, b]) \equiv \mu_F((a, b]) = b - a$, $(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{F}, \mu^*)$ is called the Lebesgue measure space.

IV.5 INTEGRATION