

# Topology and Measure Theory Notes

Alexander Richardson

## 1 Definitions

**Topology:** Let  $X$  be a set, then a topology  $\tau$  on  $X$  is a collection of open subsets such that:

1.  $\emptyset$  and  $X$  are open. Or,  $\emptyset, X \in \tau$ .
2. A finite intersection of open sets is open; i.e. for  $U_1, \dots, U_n \in \tau$

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i \in \tau$$

3. An arbitrary union of open sets is open; i.e.  $\forall U \in \tau$

$$\bigcup_{U \in \tau} U \in \tau$$

in any topological space, the closed sets satisfy the following.

1.  $\emptyset$  and  $X$  are closed. Or,  $\emptyset, X \in \tau^c$ .
2. A finite union of closed sets is closed; i.e. for  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \tau^c$

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i \in \tau^c$$

3. An arbitrary intersection of closed sets is closed; i.e.  $\forall A \in \tau^c$

$$\bigcap_{A \in \tau^c} A \in \tau^c$$

**Discrete Space:** A space with the discrete topology; that is, the topology on a set  $X$  where each  $U \subseteq X$  is declared open, in particular each  $\{x\} \in X$  is open.

**Ordinary Topology:** Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$  then a subset  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is open if  $\forall x \in U \exists J = (a, b)$  such that  $x \in J \subseteq U$ .

**Normed Vector Space:** A normed vector space  $V$  over  $\mathbb{R}$  is a vector space with a mapping

$$\begin{aligned} V &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ v &\mapsto \|v\| \end{aligned}$$

such that

1.  $\|v\| \geq 0$  and  $\|v\| = 0 \iff v = 0$ .
2. If  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $v \in V$ , then  $\|cv\| = |c| \cdot \|v\|$ .
3. If  $v, u \in V$ , then

$$\|v + u\| \leq \|v\| + \|u\|$$

denoted  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ .

**Cauchy Sequence:** let  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be any sequence in a normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ . The sequence is cauchy if  $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N$  such that  $\forall n, m \geq N$  we have

$$\|x_n - x_m\| < \epsilon$$

**Converge:** let  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be any sequence in a normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ . The sequence converges to  $v \in V$  if  $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists N$  such that  $\forall n \geq N$  we have

$$\|v - x_n\| < \epsilon$$

**Sup Norm:** Let  $S$  be a set. A map

$$f : S \rightarrow (V, \|\cdot\|)$$

into a normed vector space  $V$  is bounded if  $\exists c \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $c > 0$  such that  $\|f(x)\| \leq c \forall x \in S$ . If  $f$  is bounded, define

$$\|f\|_S := \sup_{x \in S} \|f(x)\|$$

called the sup norm.

**$L^1$ -Norm:** Let  $C([0, 1])$  be the space of continuous functions on  $[0, 1]$ . For  $f \in C([0, 1])$  define

$$\|f\|_1 = \int_0^1 |f(x)| dx$$

then  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is a norm on  $C([0, 1])$  called the  $L^1$ -norm.

**Uniformly Cauchy Map:** A sequence of maps  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $f_n : S \rightarrow (V, \|\cdot\|)$  is uniformly cauchy on a set  $S$  if given  $\epsilon > 0 \exists N$  such that  $\forall n, m \geq N$  we have

$$\|f_n - f_m\|_S < \epsilon$$

**Uniformly Convergent Map:** A sequence of maps  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with

$$f_n : S \rightarrow (V, \|\cdot\|)$$

is uniformly convergent to a map  $f$ , if given  $\epsilon > 0 \exists N$  such that  $\forall n \geq N$  we have

$$\|f_n - f\|_S < \epsilon$$

**Uniformly Continuous:**

$$f : (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$$

is uniformly continuous if  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$  such that

$$d_X(x_1, x_2) < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) < \epsilon$$

**Continuous:**

$$f : (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$$

is continuous at  $x_0 \in X$  if  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$  such that

$$d_X(x, x_0) < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x), f(x_0)) < \epsilon$$

$f$  is continuous on  $X$  if it is continuous at  $x_0$  for all  $x_0 \in X$ .

**Metric Space:** Let  $X$  be a set, a metric on  $X$  is map  $d$  with

$$\begin{aligned} d : X \times X &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (x, y) &\mapsto d(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

such that

1.  $d(x, y) \geq 0 \forall x, y \in X$  and  $d(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y$ .
2.  $\forall x, y \in X$  we have  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ .
3.  $\forall x, y, z \in X$  we have

$$d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$$

a set with a metric is a metric space  $(X, d)$ .

If  $U \subseteq X$  such that  $U \neq \emptyset$  then we can define  $(U, d|_{U \times U})$  as a metric subspace.

For a normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ , the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  induces a metric

$$d(v, u) := \|v - u\|$$

If  $A, B \subseteq V$  then

$$d(A, B) = \inf \|a - b\|, \text{ such that } a \in A, b \in B$$

**Semi-Metric space:** Let  $X$  be a set, a semi-metric on  $X$  is map  $d$  with

$$\begin{aligned} d : X \times X &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (x, y) &\mapsto d(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

such that

1.  $d(x, y) \geq 0 \ \forall \ x, y \in X$  and  $d(x, x) = 0$ . The distinction here being  $d(x, y) = 0 \nRightarrow x = y$
2.  $\forall \ x, y \in X$  we have  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ .
3.  $\forall \ x, y, z \in X$  we have

$$d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$$

a set with a semi-metric is a semi-metric space  $(X, d)$ .

**Isometric:** For metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  a map

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

is isometric if

$$d_X(v, w) = d_Y(f(v), f(w)) \quad \forall \ v, w \in X$$

if in addition  $f$  is surjective, then  $f$  is an **Isometric Isomorphism**.

**Lipschitz:** A function

$$f : (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$$

is Lipschitz if  $\exists \ C \geq 0$  with  $C \in \mathbb{R}$ , such that

$$d_Y(f(x), f(y)) \leq C d_X(x, y) \quad \forall \ x, y \in X$$

the smallest such

$$C := L(f)$$

is the Lipschitz constant.

**Complete:** A metric space  $X$  is complete if every Cauchy sequence converges to a point in  $X$ ; i.e.  $\forall \ \{x_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \in X, \ x_i \rightarrow x \in X$ .

**Completion:** For  $(X, d)$  a metric space, the completion of  $(X, d)$  is a complete metric space  $(X_{\sim}, d_{\sim})$  together with an isometric function

$$f : X \rightarrow X_{\sim}$$

where  $f(X) \subseteq X_{\sim}$  is dense in  $X_{\sim}$ .

**Profinite Topology:** Let  $G$  be a group, then  $U \subseteq G$  is open if  $\forall x \in U \exists$  a subgroup  $H$  of  $G$ , of finite index, such that  $xH \subseteq U$ .

**Ideal Topology:** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity, then  $U \subseteq R$  is open if  $\forall x \in U \exists$  an ideal  $I$  of  $R$  such that  $x + I \subseteq U$ .

**Zariski Topology:** An algebraic topology. For instance let  $X = \mathbb{R}^n$  and

$$f : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

be a polynomial in  $n$  variables,  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a zero of  $f$  if  $f(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ , then a subset  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is closed if  $\exists$  a family  $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$  of polynomials in  $n$  variables such that  $S$  is the zero set of  $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ . That is

$$S = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f_i(\mathbf{a}) = 0 \forall i \in I\}$$

**Boundary Point:** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and  $S \subseteq X$  a subset of  $X$ , then  $x \in X$  is a boundary point of  $S$  if  $\forall U \in \tau$  such that  $x \in U$  we have  $x \neq s \in S$  and  $y \notin S$  such that  $s, y \in U$ . That is,  $U$  contains both a point in  $S$ , and a point not in  $S$ .

**Dense:** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and  $S \subseteq X$ , then  $S$  is dense in  $X$  if  $\bar{S} = X$ .

equivalently,  $S$  is dense iff for each open  $U \subseteq X$  such that  $U \neq \emptyset$  there is some  $s \in S$  such that  $s \in U$ .

In terms of metrics, this is  $\forall x \in X$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists s \in S$  such that  $d(x, s) < \epsilon$

**Base:** A collection  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_\alpha : \alpha \in I\} \subseteq X$  of open subsets is a base for the topology on  $X$  if for every  $U \subseteq X$  open, we have  $U = \cup_{B_\alpha \in \mathcal{B}} B_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in I$ .

If  $X$  is a set and  $\mathcal{B}$  a collection of subsets of  $X$  satisfying

$$1.) X = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$$

$$2.) \text{ if } B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}, x \in B_1 \cap B_2 \implies \exists B_3 \in \mathcal{B} \text{ such that } x \in B_3 \subseteq B_1 \cap B_2$$

Then the collection of all unions of elements in  $\mathcal{B}$  is a unique topology on  $X$  generated by base  $\mathcal{B}$

**Sub-Base:** If  $\mathcal{S}$  is a collection of subsets of  $X$  such that

$$\bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{S}} V = X$$

and the finite intersection of elements of  $\mathcal{S}$  is a base for  $X$ , then  $\mathcal{S}$  is a sub-base for  $\tau$ .

**Refinement:** let  $X$  be a set and  $\tau, \sigma$  topologies on  $X$  then  $\sigma$  is a refinement of  $\tau$  if for each  $U \in \tau$  we also have  $U \in \sigma$ .

This can also be stated as  $\tau$  is coarser than  $\sigma$ .

**Coarse:** Let  $X$  be a topological space and let  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  be two topologies for  $X$ . If  $\tau_1 \subseteq \tau_2$  then  $\tau_1$  is coarser than  $\tau_2$ .

**Fine:** Let  $X$  be a topological space and let  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  be two topologies for  $X$ . If  $\tau_1 \subseteq \tau_2$  then  $\tau_2$  is finer than  $\tau_1$ .

**Quotient Topology:** If  $X$  is a topological space,  $Y$  is a set, and  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  is a surjective map, the Quotient Topology on  $Y$  determined by  $\pi$  is defined by declaring a subset  $U \subseteq Y$  to be open iff  $\pi^{-1}(U) \subseteq X$  is open in  $X$ . or

$$\tau_Y = \{U \subseteq Y : \pi^{-1}(U) \in \tau_X\}$$

we need the surjectiveness here otherwise if  $y \notin \pi(X)$ , then  $\pi^{-1}(\{y\}) = \emptyset \implies \{y\}$  is open.

equivalently if we define  $x_1 \sim x_2$  iff  $\pi(x_1) = \pi(x_2)$  then for  $Y = X/\sim$  we have

$$\pi : X \rightarrow X/\sim$$

is the quotient topology determined by  $\pi$ .

**Final Topology:** Given  $\{(X_\alpha, \tau_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$  and a set  $Y$  the final topology is the finest topology on  $Y$  such that the family

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f_\alpha : X_\alpha \rightarrow Y : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$$

is continuous  $\forall \alpha$ ; i.e.  $U \in \tau_Y$  iff  $f_\alpha^{-1}(U) \in \tau_\alpha \forall \alpha$ .

**Weak Topology:** Let  $Y$  be a topological space and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of mappings

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

let

$$\tau_X = \{f^{-1}(W) \subseteq X : W \subseteq Y \text{ is open ; } f \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

then  $\tau_X$  is the weak topology on  $X$  determined by  $\mathcal{F}$  and is the coarsest topology on  $X$  such that each  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  is continuous.

equivalently, let  $X$  be a set and  $\{Y_\alpha\}$  a family of topological spaces. For each  $\alpha$ , let

$$f_\alpha : X \rightarrow Y_\alpha$$

be a map. The weak topology on  $X$  is the coarsest topology making each  $f_\alpha$  continuous.

Note: the sub-base for the weak topology has all sets of the form  $f_\alpha^{-1}(U)$  where  $U \subseteq Y_\alpha$  is open.

**Relative Topology:** If  $(X, \tau)$  is a topological space and  $S \subseteq X$  is arbitrary, the relative topology is defined by declaring  $U \subseteq S$  to be open iff  $\exists V \in \tau$  such that  $U = V \cap S$ .

**Hausdorff:** Suppose  $X$  is a topological space. If for every pair of distinct points  $x, y \in X$   $\exists U, V \subset X$  open, such that  $U \cap V = \emptyset$  and  $x \in U, y \in V$ , then  $X$  is hausdorff.

**Separable:** A topological  $(X, \tau)$  space is separable if it has a countable base.

If  $(X, d)$  is a metric space, and has a countable dense subset, then  $X$  is separable; i.e. if  $A \subset X$  is a countable dense subset then  $X$  is separable.

**Continuous Map:** Let  $X, Y$  be topological spaces, a map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous if  $\forall$  open  $V \subseteq Y$  we have  $f^{-1}(V) \subseteq X$  is open.

Note, that if  $U \subseteq X$  is open, then  $f(U) \subseteq Y$  may not be open.

**Product Topology:** Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a family of topological spaces and let

$$X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$$

a topology on  $X$  is determined by declaring  $U \subseteq X$  to be open if  $\forall x \in U, \exists$  a finite number of indices  $i_1, \dots, i_n$  and open subsets  $U_{i_j} \subseteq X_{i_j}$  for  $i \leq j \leq n$  such that

$$x \in U_{i_1} \times \dots \times U_{i_n} \times \prod_{i \neq i_1, \dots, i_n} X_i \subseteq U$$

that is the product topology has as base all sets of the form

$$U_{i_1} \times \dots \times U_{i_n} \times \prod_{i \neq i_1, \dots, i_n} X_i$$

which is to say, arbitrary open sets at a finite number of components and the full space in all other components.

The product topology is the coarsest topology on  $X$  such that each projection map

$$\pi_j : X \rightarrow X_j$$

is continuous.

**Regular:** Suppose that one-point sets are closed in  $(X, \tau)$ . Then  $X$  is said to be regular if for each pair consisting of a point  $x$  and a closed set  $A \subset X$  such that  $A \cap x = \emptyset$ , there exist  $U, V \in \tau$  where  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ , such that

$$x \in U, \text{ and } A \subset V$$

i.e. for closed  $A \subseteq X$  with  $x \notin A$ ,  $\exists$  disjoint  $U, V \in \tau$  with  $x \in U$  and  $A \subseteq V$ .

**Normal:** Suppose that one-point sets are closed in  $(X, \tau)$ . Then  $X$  is normal if for  $A, B \subset X$  closed such that  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ ,  $\exists U, V \in \tau$  with  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ , such that

$$A \subset U, \text{ and } B \subset V$$

**Banach Space:** A complete normed vector space.

**Topological Convergence:** A sequence  $\{x_n\}$  in a topological space  $X$  is said to converge to  $x \in X$ , denoted  $x_n \rightarrow x$ , iff for each neighborhood  $U_x$  of  $x$ , there is some positive integer  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n > N \implies x_n \in U_x$ . In this case, we say  $\{x_n\}$  is eventually in  $U_x$ .

**Directed Set:** A set  $\Lambda$  is a directed set iff there is a relation  $\leq$  on  $\Lambda$  satisfying:

1.  $\lambda \leq \lambda$ , for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ .
2. If  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3$  then  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_3$ .
3. If  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda$  then there is some  $\lambda_3 \in \Lambda$  with  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_3$  and  $\lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3$ .

**Net:** A net in a set  $X$  is a function

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda &\rightarrow X \\ \lambda &\rightarrow x_\lambda \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Lambda$  is some directed set.

If  $\{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$  is a net in  $X$ , then  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$  if for each neighborhood  $U_x$  there is some  $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda$  such that

$$\lambda \geq \lambda_0 \implies x_\lambda \in U_x$$

so  $x_\lambda \rightarrow x$  if for every neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  we have  $x_\lambda$  is eventually in  $U$ .

**Cover:** Let  $X$  be a topological space. A cover of  $X$  is a collection  $\mathcal{U}$  of subsets of  $X$  whose union is  $X$ ; i.e.

$$\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U = X$$

a subcover is a subcollection of  $\mathcal{U}$  that is still a cover, i.e.  $\mathcal{U}' \subset \mathcal{U}$  where

$$\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}'} U = X$$



$\mathcal{U}$  is an open cover if each  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  is open.

**Compact:** A topological space  $X$  is compact if every open cover; i.e.  $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U = X$ , has a finite subcover.

A compact subset  $S \subseteq X$  of a topological space  $X$ , is one that is a compact space in the relative topology.

**Finite Intersection Property:** Let  $X$  be a topological space, and  $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$  a family of nonempty subsets of  $X$ . Then  $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$  has the finite intersection property if every finite subcollection of  $\{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$  has nonempty intersection; i.e.  $\{A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_n}\} \subset \{A_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$  gives

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^{i_n} A_{i_j} \neq \emptyset$$

for all subsets such that  $|\{A_{i_1}, \dots, A_{i_n}\}| < \infty$ .

**Disconnected:** A topological space  $X$  is disconnected if it has 2 disjoint nonempty open subsets whose union is  $X$ ; i.e.  $U, V \subset X$  open, such that

$$U \neq \emptyset, \quad V \neq \emptyset, \quad \text{where } U \cap V = \emptyset, \quad \text{and } U \cup V = X$$

**Connected:** A topological space  $X$  is connect if it is not disconnected. Equivalently it is connected iff its' only subsets which are both open and closed are:  $\emptyset$ , and  $X$  itself.

A connected subset of  $X$  is a subset that is a connected space when endowed with the subspace topology.

**Axiom of Choice:** For any collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of non-empty sets, there's is a set that contains exactly one element for each  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ .

**Partially Ordered Set:** A pair  $(P, \leq)$  such that.

1.  $x \leq x \quad \forall x \in P$ .
2.  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq z \implies x \leq z$ .
3. If  $x \leq y$  and  $y \leq x$ , then  $x = y$

a totally ordered set also satisfies:  $\forall x, y \in P$

$$x \leq y \text{ or } y \leq x$$

.

**Chain:** A chain in  $P$  is a subset  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $P$  that is totally ordered in the partial order of  $P$ .

**Inductively Ordered:** Say that  $P$  is inductively ordered if for any chain  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $P$  there is an  $a \in P$ , possibly in  $\mathcal{C}$ , such that  $c \leq a \ \forall c \in \mathcal{C}$  so  $a$  is an upper bound for  $\mathcal{C}$ .

i.e. a partially ordered set  $P$  is inductively ordered if every chain has an upper bound.

**Maximal:**  $m \in P$  is a maximal element if  $a \geq m \implies a = m$ . Not unique, can have many maximal elements.

**Zorn's Lemma:** if a partially ordered set  $P$  is inductively ordered then  $P$  has at least one maximal element.

**Bounded:** let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is bounded if  $\exists C \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$d(x, y) \leq C \quad \forall x, y \in A$$

if  $X$  is a set and  $(Y, d)$  a metric space, then

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

is bounded if  $f(X) \subseteq Y$  is bounded.

**Equicontinuous:** let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and  $(Y, d)$  a metric space, and let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq C(X, Y)$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is equicontinuous at  $x$  if  $\forall \epsilon > 0 \ \exists O_x \in \tau$  such that  $\forall f \in \mathcal{F}$  and any  $y \in O_x$  we have

$$d(f(x), f(y)) < \epsilon$$

$\mathcal{F}$  is equicontinuous if it is equicontinuous at  $x$ ,  $\forall x \in X$ .

**Totally Bounded:** let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space a subset  $A$  is totally bounded if  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ ,  $A$  can be covered by a finite number of open  $\epsilon$ -balls; i.e.

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n B_\epsilon^i$$

Any subset of a totally bounded set is totally bounded.

**Pointwise Totally Bounded:** let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and  $(Y, d)$  a metric space. Given  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x \in X$  if  $\exists g_j \in C_B(X, Y)$  such that

$$d(f(x), g_j(x)) < \epsilon$$

Then  $\{B_\epsilon(g_j(x))\}_{j=1}^n$  covers  $\{f(x) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$  and so  $\mathcal{F}$  is pointwise totally bounded.

**Locally Compact:** let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space. then  $X$  is locally compact if  $\forall x \in X, \exists O \in \tau$  with  $x \in O$  such that  $\overline{O}$  is compact.

**Ring:** Let  $X$  be a set, a nonempty collection of subsets  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a ring if

1.  $E, F \in \mathcal{R} \implies E \cup F \in \mathcal{R}$ . Closure under set union.
  2.  $E, F \in \mathcal{R} \implies E \setminus F \in \mathcal{R}$ . Closure under set difference.
- This also implies that  $\mathcal{R}$  is closed under intersection as

$$\begin{aligned} E \setminus (E \setminus F) &= E \setminus (E \cap F^c) \\ &= E \cap (E \cap F^c)^c \\ &= E \cap (E^c \cup F) \\ &= (E \cap E^c) \cup (E \cap F) \\ &= \emptyset \cup (E \cap F) \\ &= (E \cap F) \end{aligned}$$

This also implies, by induction, that a ring  $\mathcal{R}$  is closed under finite unions and intersections; i.e. if  $E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{R}$  then

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i \in \mathcal{R}$$

and

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n E_i \in \mathcal{R}$$

as well as  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since if  $E \in \mathcal{R}$  then

$$E \setminus E = \emptyset \in \mathcal{R}$$

If, in addition,  $X \in \mathcal{R}$ , then  $\mathcal{R}$  is a **Field** or **Algebra**.

**$\sigma$ -Ring:** Let  $X$  be a set, a nonempty collection of subsets  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring if it is a ring and, in addition, is closed under countable unions; i.e. if  $E_1, E_2, \dots \in \mathcal{S}$  then

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \in \mathcal{S}$$

where this also implies closure under countable intersection since if  $F = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  then

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i = F \setminus \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (F \setminus E_i) \right)$$

If, in addition,  $X \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  **$\sigma$ -Field** or  **$\sigma$ -Algebra**.

**$\sigma$ -Algebra:** Let  $X$  be a set, a collection of subsets  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra in  $X$  if it satisfies

1. Nonemptiness:  $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$ .
2. Closure under Compliments: If  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$ .
3. Closure under Countable Unions: If  $A_1, A_2, \dots \in \mathcal{A}$ , then

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \in \mathcal{A}$$

this also implies closure under countable intersection as

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i = \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i^c \right)^c \in \mathcal{A}$$

**Generated  $\sigma$ -Algebra:** Let  $X$  be a set and  $\mathcal{S}$  a collection of subsets of  $X$ , then the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{S}$  is the intersection of all  $\sigma$ -algebras containing  $\mathcal{S}$  denoted  $\sigma(\mathcal{S})$ ; that is

$$\sigma(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcap_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}} \mathcal{A}$$

**Borel Sets:** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space, then  $\sigma(\tau)$  is the  $\sigma$ -ring of Borel sets of  $X$ .

**Measure:** Let  $X$  be a set with  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{R}$ . A measure is a function

$$\mu : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

satisfying

1.  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ .
2. **Countable Additivity:** If  $E_1, E_2, \dots \in \mathcal{R}$  are mutually disjoint; i.e.  $E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset$  whenever  $i \neq j$ . Then

$$\mu \left( \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i)$$

this also holds for finite additivity; i.e. for  $E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{R}$  mutually disjoint we have  $\mu(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i)$  by simply setting  $E_k = \emptyset \ \forall k > n$ .

**Semiring:** Let  $X$  be a set, a collection of subsets  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a semiring if

1.  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{S}$ .
2. If  $E, F \in \mathcal{S} \implies E \cap F \in \mathcal{S}$ .
3. If  $E, F \in \mathcal{S}$  then  $\exists E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$E \setminus F = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i$$

**Premeasure:** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a semiring, then the function

$$\mu_0 : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

is a premeasure if it is countably additive.

**Monotone:** If  $\mathcal{C}$  is any collection of subsets of a set  $X$ , and if  $\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is any function, we say that  $\mu$  is monotone if whenever  $E, F \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $E \subseteq F$ , then  $\mu(E) \leq \mu(F)$

**Countable Sub-Additive:** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a family of subsets of  $X$  and  $\mu : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  a mapping. We say that  $\mu$  is countably sub-additive if whenever  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j$  not necessarily disjoint with  $E, \{F_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{C}$ , then

$$\mu(E) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu(F_j)$$

**Countably Covered:** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a collection of subsets of the set  $X$ . Then  $A \subset X$  is countably covered by  $\mathcal{S}$  if  $\exists \{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$$

Let  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  be the collection of all sets countably covered by  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring and is **Hereditary** meaning if  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  and  $F \subseteq E$  then  $F \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$ .

**Outer Measure:** Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ , then

$$\mu^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

is an outer measure if

1.  $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$
2.  $\mu^*$  is monotone; i.e. if  $F \subseteq E$  and  $E \in \mathcal{H}$ , then

$$\mu^*(F) \leq \mu^*(E)$$

3.  $\mu^*$  is countably subadditive; i.e. if  $F \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  where  $E_i \in \mathcal{H}$ , then

$$\mu^*(F) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(E_i)$$

If  $\mathcal{S}$  is a semiring and  $\mu_0$  a premeasure on  $\mathcal{S}$ , and  $\mu^*$  the outer measure on  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  determined by  $\mu_0$  then

1.  $\mu^*|_{\sigma(\mathcal{S})}$  is a measure on the  $\sigma$ -ring generated by  $\mathcal{S}$  which extends  $\mu_0$ .

2.  $\mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)}$  is a complete measure on the  $\sigma$ -ring  $M(\mu^*)$  which extends  $\mu^*|_{\sigma(\mathcal{S})}$  and hence  $\mu_0$ .

**Measurable:** Given a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$  and an outer measure  $\mu^*$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $E \in \mathcal{H}$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable if for every  $A \in \mathcal{H}$  we have

$$\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \setminus E)$$

the collection of all  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets is denoted  $M(\mu^*)$ .

Note: by the subadditivity of  $\mu^*$  we always have  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c)$

**Complete Measure:** Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a  $\sigma$ -ring and  $\mu$  a measure on  $\mathcal{R}$ . Then  $\mu$  is complete if whenever  $E \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\mu(E) = 0$ , then for all  $F \subseteq E$  we have  $F \in \mathcal{R}$  and  $\mu(F) = 0$

**$\sigma$ -Finite:** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a collection of subsets of  $X$ , and let  $\mu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  be a set function. Then  $E \subseteq X$  is  $\sigma$ -finite if  $\exists \{F_i\} \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$  and  $\mu(F_i) < \infty \forall i$ .

If each  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, then  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite.

If  $X$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, then  $\mu$  is **Totally  $\sigma$ -Finite**.

**Simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -Measurable Function:** Let  $X$  be a set and  $\mathcal{S}$  a  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ , and  $B$  a Banach Space. Then a function

$$f : X \rightarrow B$$

is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function if

1.  $\text{Im}(f) = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \in B$  is finite.
2. For each  $b_i \in B$  such that  $b_i \neq 0$  we have  $f^{-1}(b_i) = E_i \in \mathcal{S}$ .

the family  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $B$ -valued simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions are functions of the form

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \chi_{E_i}, \text{ with } \chi_{E_i}(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in E_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where the  $b_i$ 's are distinct and the  $E_i$ 's  $\in \mathcal{S}$  are disjoint.

Note: simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $\implies$  simple  $\mu$ -measurable.

**$\mathcal{S}$ -Measurable Function:** Let  $X$  be a set and  $\mathcal{S}$  a  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ , and  $B$  a Banach Space. Then a function

$$f : X \rightarrow B$$

is a  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function if  $\exists \{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise; i.e.  $\forall x \in X$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ .

Note:  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $\implies \mu$ -measurable.

**Null-Set:** Let  $X$  be a set,  $\mathcal{S}$  a  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ , and  $\mu$  a measure on  $\mathcal{S}$ . A subset  $E \subset X$  is a null-set with respect to  $\mu$  if  $\exists F \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E \subseteq F$  and  $\mu(F) = 0$ . The null-sets form a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring denoted  $N(\mu)$ .

that is  $E$  is contained in some set of  $\mathcal{S}$  of measure zero.

**Almost Everywhere:** Let  $X$  be a set,  $\mathcal{S}$  a  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ , and  $\mu$  a measure on  $\mathcal{S}$ . A property  $P$  on  $X$  is said to hold almost everywhere if  $\exists N(\mu)$  such that  $P$  is true  $\forall x \in X \setminus N(\mu)$ .

**Simple  $\mu$ -Measurable:** Let  $X$  be a set,  $\mathcal{S}$  a  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ ,  $\mu$  a measure on  $\mathcal{S}$ , and let  $B$  be a Banach space. Then a function

$$f : X \rightarrow B$$

is a simple  $\mu$ -measurable function if  $f$  is a simple  $(\mathcal{S} \sqcup N(\mu))$ -measurable function. where

$$\mathcal{S} \sqcup N(\mu) = \{E \sqcup F : E \in \mathcal{S}, F \in N(\mu)\}$$

**$\mu$ -Measurable:** Let  $X$  be a set,  $\mathcal{S}$  a  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ ,  $\mu$  a measure on  $\mathcal{S}$ , and let  $B$  be a Banach space. Then a function defined almost everywhere on  $X$

$$f : X \setminus N(\mu) \rightarrow B$$

is a  $\mu$ -measurable function if  $\exists \{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of simple  $\mu$ -measurable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise; i.e.  $\forall x \in X \setminus N(\mu)$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ .

**Carrier:** Let  $X$  be a set and let  $B$  be a Banach space. For any function

$$f : X \rightarrow B$$

the carrier of  $f$  denoted

$$\text{car}(f) = \{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0 \in B\}$$

similar to the support.

**Almost Uniformly:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space, let  $\{f_n\}$  be a sequence of  $\mu$ -measurable functions, and let  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E$ , if  $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists F \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $F \subseteq E$  where

$$\mu(E \setminus F) < \epsilon$$

and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F$ .

By Egoroff's Theorem, if we have a sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of  $\mu$ -measurable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise on a set of finite measure, then  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly; i.e. if  $\forall x \in E \setminus N(\mu)$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ , then  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E$ .

**Almost Uniformly Cauchy:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space, let  $B$  a Banach space, let  $\{f_n\}$  be a sequence of  $\mu$ -measurable functions, and let  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E$ , if  $\forall \epsilon > 0 \exists F \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $F \subseteq E$  where

$$\mu(E \setminus F) < \epsilon$$

such that  $\{f_n\}$  is uniformly Cauchy on  $F$ ; i.e.  $\forall \delta > 0 \exists N$  such that

$$m, n \geq N \implies \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B < \delta \quad \forall x \in F$$

**Converges in Measure:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space with  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , let  $B$  a Banach space, and let  $\{f_n\}$  be a sequence of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $B$ -valued functions, then  $\{f_n\}$  converges in measure on  $E$  to  $f \in \mathcal{S}$ -measurable if  $\forall \epsilon > 0$

$$\mu(\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \epsilon\}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

Note: when dealing with these sets we must have

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x \in E : \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \\ & \subseteq \left\{x \in E : \|f(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{x \in E : \|g(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\} \end{aligned}$$

and NOT

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x \in E : \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \\ & \subseteq \{x \in E : \|f(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \cup \{x \in E : \|g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \end{aligned}$$

consider

$$|a| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ and } |b| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \implies |a + b| \leq |a| + |b| < \epsilon$$

then taking the negation we have

$$|a + b| \geq \epsilon \implies |a| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ or } |b| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for a concrete example in our case note that if  $f(x) = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  and  $g(x) = -\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ , then

$$f(x) - g(x) = \epsilon \implies x \in \{x \in E : \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\}$$

yet

$$x \notin \{x \in E : \|f(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \text{ and } x \notin \{x \in E : \|g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\}$$

and so

$$\{x \in E : \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \supset \{x \in E : \|f(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \cup \{x \in E : \|g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\}$$



**Cauchy in Measure:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space with  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , let  $B$  a Banach space, and let  $\{f_n\}$  be a sequence of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $B$ -valued functions, then  $\{f_n\}$  is cauchy in measure on  $E$  if  $\forall \epsilon > 0$

$$\mu(\{x \in E : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \epsilon\}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n, m \rightarrow \infty$$

**Simple Integrable Function:** Let  $X$  be a set and  $\mathcal{S}$  a  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ , and  $B$  a Banach Space. Then a function

$$f : X \rightarrow B$$

if it is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function and the preimage of each  $b \in \text{Im}(f)$  has finite measure; i.e. for each  $f^{-1}(b) = E \in \mathcal{S}$  we have  $\mu(E) < \infty$ . Then the integral of  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \chi_{E_i}$  is

$$\int f d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \mu(E_i)$$

**$L^1$  Semi-norm:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and let  $B$  a Banach Space. Then a function

$$f : X \rightarrow B$$

that is a simple integrable function, has semi-norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$  defined by

$$\|f\|_1 = \int \|f(x)\|_B d\mu(x)$$

**Mean Cauchy:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and let  $B$  a Banach Space. Then a sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of simple integrable functions is mean cauchy if it is a cauchy sequence with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_1$ ; i.e.

$$\lim_{n,m} \|f_n - f_m\|_1 = 0$$

**$\mu$ -integrable:** Let  $f$  be a  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $B$ -valued function, then  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable if it satisfies one, and hence all, of the conditions.

1. There is a mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of ISFs that converge in measure to  $f$ .
2. There is a mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of ISFs such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly.
3. There is a mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of ISFs such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere.

with the  $\mu$ -integral of  $f$  defined by

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

$\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ : The vector space of  $\mu$ -integrable  $B$ -valued functions; i.e. if  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , then  $\exists$  a mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of simple integrable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in measure, almost uniformly, and pointwise almost everywhere.

If  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  then  $x \mapsto \|f(x)\|_B \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$ .

**Convergence in Mean:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and let  $B$  a Banach Space. Then a sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of simple integrable functions converges in mean to a  $\mu$ -integrable function  $f$  if

$$\lim_n \|f - f_n\|_1 = 0$$

$L^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ : The complete normed vector space defined by

$$L^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B) = \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B) / \sim$$

where  $\sim$  is the equivalence class of simple integrable functions which are mean cauchy.

**Indefinite Integral:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and let  $B$  a Banach Space. for  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  and  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  the indefinite integral of  $f$  is

$$\mu_f(E) = \int_E f(x) d\mu(x) = \int f \chi_E d\mu$$

**$L^p$ -Norm:** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and let  $B$  a Banach Space. For  $0 < p < \infty$  the space of  $\mu$ -measurable,  $B$ -valued functions  $f$  such that  $\|f(\cdot)\|^p$  is  $\mu$ -integrable is denoted  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , then the function

$$\|\cdot\|_p : \mathcal{L}^p(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

defined by

$$\|f\|_p = \left( \int \|f(x)\|^p d\mu(x) \right)^{1/p}$$

is the  $L^p$ -norm.

Note: if  $f \in \mathcal{L}^p(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , then  $x \mapsto \|f(x)\|^p \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ .

## 2 Notes

**Proposition 1.** Isometries are injective and uniformly continuous.

*Proof.* Let

$$f : (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$$

be an isometric map between metric spaces and let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Select  $\delta = \epsilon > 0$ , then for any  $x, y \in X$  such that  $d_X(x, y) < \delta$  gives

$$d_Y(f(x), f(y)) = d_X(x, y) < \delta = \epsilon$$

and therefore  $f$  is uniformly continuous.

Next, take  $a, b \in X$  such that  $f(a) = f(b)$ , then

$$d_X(a, b) = d_Y(f(a), f(b)) = 0 \implies a = b$$

and so  $f$  is injective. □

**Proposition 2.** If

$$f : (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$$

is an isometry, then

$$f^{-1} : (f(X), d_Y) \rightarrow (X, d_X)$$

is an isometry.

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be an isometry and let  $x, y \in f(X)$ , then  $\exists a, b \in X$  such that

$$f(a) = x \text{ and } f(b) = y \implies a = f^{-1}(x) \text{ and } b = f^{-1}(y)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(x, y) &= d_Y(f(a), f(b)) \\ &= d_X(a, b) \\ &= d_X(f^{-1}(x), f^{-1}(y)) \end{aligned} \quad \begin{array}{l} f \text{ is an isometry} \end{array}$$

and hence,  $f^{-1}$  is an isometry. □

**Proposition 3.** If  $(M_1, d_1)$  and  $(M_2, d_2)$  are metric spaces, then Lipschitz continuous implies uniformly continuous.

*Proof.* Let  $(M_1, d_1)$  and  $(M_2, d_2)$  be metric spaces and  $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$  a lipschitz continuous map. Since  $f$  is lipschitz  $\exists L(f) \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that for any  $x, y \in M_1$  we have

$$d_2(f(x), f(y)) \leq L(f) \cdot d_1(x, y)$$

if  $y = x$  then  $d_2(f(x), f(x)) = 0$  as well as  $d_1(x, x) = 0$  so that for any  $\epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$  where we have

$$d_1(x, x) = 0 < \delta \implies L(f)d_2(f(x), f(x)) = 0 < \epsilon$$

so let  $y \neq x$ , then  $d_1(x, y) \neq 0$ , so for  $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$  such that  $d_1(x, y) < \delta(\epsilon)$ , selecting  $\delta(\epsilon) = \frac{\epsilon}{L(f)} > 0$  we have

$$d_2(f(x), f(y)) \leq L(f) \cdot d_1(x, y) < L(f) \cdot \delta(\epsilon) = L(f) \cdot \frac{\epsilon}{L(f)} = \epsilon$$

and so

$$d_1(x, y) < \delta(\epsilon) \implies d_2(f(x), f(y)) < \epsilon$$

and so  $f$  is uniformly continuous.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.**

$$f : (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$$

is continuous iff

$$x_n \rightarrow x \implies f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$$

*Proof.* First suppose  $f$  is continuous and that  $x_n \rightarrow x \in X$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given and  $B_\epsilon(f(x)) \subseteq Y$  be open such that  $f(x) \in B_\epsilon(f(x))$ . Then since  $f$  is continuous  $f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x))) \subseteq X$  is open and contains  $x$ . Then, since  $x_n \rightarrow x, \forall \delta > 0 \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $n \geq N \implies d_X(x_n, x) < \delta$  which implies

$$\begin{aligned} B_\delta(x) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x))) &\implies x_n \in f^{-1}(B_\epsilon(f(x))) \\ &\implies f(x_n) \in B_\epsilon(f(x)) \\ &\implies d_Y(f(x_n), f(x)) < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and so  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$ .

Next suppose  $x_n \rightarrow x \implies f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$ . And assume, for contradiction, that  $f$  is not continuous. Then  $\forall \epsilon > 0$  with  $\delta = \frac{1}{n}$  we have

$$d_X(x_n, x) < \frac{1}{n}$$

yet,

$$d_Y(f(x_n), f(x)) \geq \epsilon$$

and doing this for each  $n$  we have  $d(x_n, x) \rightarrow 0$  while  $d_Y(f(x_n), f(x)) \geq \epsilon \forall n \Rightarrow \Leftarrow$ . And so  $f$  must be continuous.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** If  $S$  is dense in  $X$ , and

$$f, g : X \rightarrow Y$$

are continuous maps such that  $f(s) = g(s) \forall s \in S$ , then  $f = g$  on  $X$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in X \setminus S = S^c$  and let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Then by continuity of  $f$  and  $g$ ,  $\exists \delta > 0$  and by density of  $S$ ,  $\exists s \in S$  such that

$$d_X(x, s) < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x), f(s)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ and } d_Y(g(x), g(s)) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(f(x), g(x)) &\leq d_Y(f(x), f(s)) + d_Y(f(s), g(s)) + d_Y(g(s), g(x)) \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} + 0 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ &= \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and thus  $f(x) = g(x)$ . Since  $x \in S^c$  was arbitrary we conclude  $f = g$  on  $S^c$ , and we are given that  $f = g$  on  $S$ , and since  $X = S \cup S^c$  we conclude that  $f = g$  on  $X$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 6.** If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is uniformly continuous, and  $\{x_n\} \in X$  is a cauchy sequence, then  $\{f(x_n)\}$  is a cauchy sequence in  $Y$ .

*Proof.* Since  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is uniformly continuous,  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists \delta > 0$  such that

$$d_X(x_1, x_2) < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x_1), f(x_2)) < \epsilon$$

so for any cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\} \in X$ ,  $\exists N$  such that  $n, m > N \implies d_X(x_n, x_m) < \delta$ , yet this then gives

$$d_Y(f(x_n), f(x_m)) < \epsilon$$

by uniform continuity, and so  $\{f(x_n)\}$  is cauchy in  $Y$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 7.** If  $\{s_n\}, \{t_n\} \in X$  are cauchy sequences, then  $\{d(s_n, t_n)\}$  converges in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}$  be cauchy sequences in  $X$ , then  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists N_s, N_t$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} n_s, m_s \geq N_s &\implies d(s_{n_s}, s_{m_s}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ n_t, m_t \geq N_t &\implies d(t_{n_t}, t_{m_t}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \end{aligned}$$

so let  $N = \max\{N_s, N_t\}$  then

$$\begin{aligned} n, m \geq N &\implies d(s_n, t_n) \leq d(s_n, s_m) + d(s_m, t_m) + d(t_m, t_n) \\ &\implies |d(s_n, t_n) - d(s_m, t_m)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

with a symmetric argument giving

$$|d(s_m, t_m) - d(s_n, t_n)| < \epsilon$$

and so  $\{d(s_n, t_n)\} \in \mathbb{R}$  is cauchy, and since  $\mathbb{R}$  is complete we can conclude that  $\{d(s_n, t_n)\}$  converges in  $\mathbb{R}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 8.**  $\text{Cauch}(X)$  has  $\{s_n\} \sim \{t_n\}$  iff  $d(s_n, t_n) \rightarrow 0$ .

*Proof.*

Reflexive: Trivially,  $d(s_n, s_n) \rightarrow 0$ , so  $\{s_n\} \sim \{s_n\}$

Symmetric: If  $d(s_n, t_n) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $d(s_n, t_n) = d(t_n, s_n) \rightarrow 0$ . Giving  $\{s_n\} \sim \{t_n\}$ .

Transitive: Suppose  $d(s_n, r_n) \rightarrow 0$  and  $d(r_n, t_n) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\forall n$

$$d(s_n, t_n) \leq d(s_n, r_n) + d(r_n, t_n) \rightarrow 0$$

and so  $\{s_n\} \sim \{t_n\}$ . □

**Lemma 9.** If  $X_\sim = \text{Cauch}(X)/\sim$  then

$$d_\sim : X_\sim \rightarrow [0, \infty), \text{ by } d_\sim(\{s_n\}, \{t_n\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(s_n, t_n)$$

is a metric on  $X_\sim$ .

*Proof.* First, since  $\{d(s_n, t_n)\}$  converges in  $\mathbb{R}$ , we have that  $d_\sim$  is always defined. To see that  $d_\sim$  is well defined, let  $\alpha, \beta \in X_\sim$  with  $\{x_n\}, \{s_n\} \in \alpha$  and  $\{y_n\}, \{t_n\} \in \beta$ . Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, s_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(y_n, t_n) = 0$$

and so  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n \geq N \implies d(x_n, s_n) < \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ and } d(y_n, t_n) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

then for  $n > N$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(s_n, t_n) &\leq d(s_n, x_n) + d(x_n, y_n) + d(y_n, t_n) \\ \implies |d(s_n, t_n) - d(x_n, y_n)| &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

$\therefore \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(s_n, t_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n)$ , or

$$d_\sim(\alpha, \beta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(s_n, t_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n)$$

and so  $d_\sim$  is well-defined.

To see that  $d_\sim$  it is a metric, for symmetry we have

$$d_\sim(\alpha, \beta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(s_n, t_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(t_n, s_n) = d_\sim(\beta, \alpha)$$

now for  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in X_\sim$  with  $\{x_n\} \in \alpha$ ,  $\{y_n\} \in \beta$ ,  $\{z_n\} \in \gamma$ , then  $\forall n$

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_n, y_n) &\leq d(x_n, z_n) + d(z_n, y_n) \\ \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n) &\leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, z_n) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(z_n, y_n) \\ \implies d_\sim(\alpha, \beta) &\leq d_\sim(\alpha, \gamma) + d_\sim(\gamma, \beta) \end{aligned}$$

and so satisfies the triangle inequality.

Next, if  $d_{\sim}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ , then  $\forall \{x_n\} \in \alpha, \{y_n\} \in \beta$  we have

$$\implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n) = 0$$

and so  $\{x_n\} \sim \{y_n\} \implies \{y_n\} \in \alpha$  and thus  $\alpha = \beta$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 10.** The uniform limit of continuous functions is continuous.

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $x, y \in X$ , then  $\forall n$  we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq |f(x) - f_n(x)| + |f_n(x) - f_n(y)| + |f_n(y) - f(y)|$$

then, by uniform continuity  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n \geq N \implies |f(x) - f_n(x)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3} \quad \forall x \in X$$

and by continuity  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$  such that

$$|x - y| < \delta \implies |f_n(x) - f_n(y)| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

and thus  $\forall x, y \in X$  such that  $|x - y| < \delta$  and  $n \geq N$  we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} = \epsilon$$

and so  $f$  is continuous.  $\square$

**Theorem 11.**  $C([0, 1])$  is complete for  $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\{f_n\} \in C([0, 1])$  be a cauchy sequence, then  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n, m \geq N \implies \|f_n - f_m\|_{\infty} < \epsilon$$

Now, for each fixed  $x \in [0, 1]$  we have

$$|f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < \epsilon \quad \forall n, m \geq N$$

and this implies  $\{f_n(x)\}$  is cauchy in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Since  $\mathbb{R}$  is complete  $\{f_n(x)\}$  converges, so set

$$f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x)$$

now, since  $\{f_n\} \in C([0, 1])$  is cauchy  $\exists N$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} & |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| < \epsilon \quad \forall n, m \geq N \\ \implies & |f(x) - f_m(x)| < \epsilon \quad \forall m \geq N; x \in [0, 1] \end{aligned}$$

and this in turn implies that  $f_m \rightarrow f$  uniformly. Since  $f$  is the uniform limit of continuous functions,  $f$  is continuous; that is  $f_n \rightarrow f \in C([0, 1])$ , and so  $C([0, 1])$  is complete.  $\square$

**Proposition 12.** Let  $(X, d_X), (Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces. Then a map

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

is continuous at  $x_0 \in X$  if  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$  such that

$$f(B_\delta(x_0)) \subseteq B_\epsilon(f(x_0))$$

*Proof.* Let  $f(x) \in B_\epsilon(f(x_0))$  for some  $x \in X$ , and let

$$\epsilon' = \epsilon - d(f(x), f(x_0)) > 0$$

then  $B_{\epsilon'}(f(x)) \subseteq B_\epsilon(f(x_0)) \implies \exists \delta' > 0$  such that

$$f(B_{\delta'}(x)) \subseteq B_{\epsilon'}(f(x)) \subseteq B_\epsilon(f(x_0))$$

if  $x_1 \in f^{-1}(B_{\epsilon'}(f(x)))$  then  $\exists B_{\delta'}(x_1)$  such that

$$B_{\delta'}(x_1) \subseteq f^{-1}(B_{\epsilon'}(f(x))) \subseteq X$$

and so is open. □

**Proposition 13.** Let  $(X, \tau_X)$  and  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  be topological spaces, then a map

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

is continuous iff for a base, or sub-base  $\mathcal{B}_Y \subseteq \tau_Y$  we have

$$f^{-1}(B) \subseteq \tau_X \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}_Y$$

*Proof.* First suppose  $f$  is continuous. Then  $\forall B \in \mathcal{B}_Y$  since  $\mathcal{B}_Y$  is a base we have  $B \in \tau_Y$  and so is open, then  $f^{-1}(B) \in \tau_X$  by continuity.

Next suppose that  $f^{-1}(B) \subseteq \tau_X \quad \forall B \in \mathcal{B}_Y$ , and let  $V \in \tau_Y$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}_Y = \{B_i : i \in I\}$  is a base we have

$$V = \bigcup_{B_i \in \mathcal{B}_Y} B_i \quad \text{for some } i \in I$$

then

$$f^{-1}(V) = f^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{B_i \in \mathcal{B}_Y} B_i\right) = \bigcup_{B_i \in \mathcal{B}_Y} f^{-1}(B_i) \in \tau_X$$

and so  $f$  is continuous. □

**Proposition 14.** Let  $X$  be a topological space. If  $A \subseteq X$  is closed and  $C \subseteq A$  is closed in the relative topology of  $A$ , then  $C$  is closed in  $X$ .



*Proof.* Since  $A \setminus C = A \cap C^c$  is open in the relative topology of  $A$ , then  $\exists U \in \tau$  such that

$$A \cap C^c = A \cap U \implies C = A \cap U^c$$

is closed in  $X$ . □

**Proposition 15.** Consider

$$f_i : X \rightarrow Y_i \quad \text{for } i \in I$$

let  $\tau_X$  be the initial/weak topology on  $X$ , let  $(Z, \tau_Z)$  be a topological space and

$$g : Z \rightarrow X$$

then  $g$  is continuous iff

$$f_i \circ g$$

is continuous  $\forall i$ .

*Proof.* First suppose  $f_i \circ g$  is continuous  $\forall i$ . It suffices to check on a sub-base, so let  $U \in \tau_i$  for some  $i$ , then

$$(f_i \circ g)^{-1}(U)$$

is open by the continuity of  $f_i \circ g$ , yet

$$(f_i \circ g)^{-1}(U) = g^{-1}(f_i^{-1}(U))$$

and so  $g^{-1}(f_i^{-1}(U)) \subseteq Z$  is open, and since the topology on  $X$  implies that  $f_i^{-1}(U)$  is open in  $X$ , we then have that the preimage under  $g$  of an open set is open, and so  $g$  must be continuous.

Next suppose that  $g$  is continuous. Then by the continuity of  $g$  and the  $f_i$ 's we have for any  $i \in I$  and  $U \in \tau_i$  that

$$g^{-1}(f_i^{-1}(U)) = (f_i \circ g)^{-1}(U)$$

is open and thus  $f_i \circ g$  is continuous for each  $i$ . □

**Proposition 16.** Every metrizable topological space is normal.

*Proof.* It suffices to consider a metric space  $(M, d)$ . Let  $C_1, C_2 \subseteq M$  be closed and disjoint. For each  $x \in C_1$  choose  $\epsilon_x > 0$  such that

$$B_{\epsilon_x}(x) \subseteq C_2^c$$

and for each  $y \in C_2$  choose  $\epsilon_y > 0$  such that

$$B_{\epsilon_y}(y) \subseteq C_1^c$$

let

$$O_1 = \bigcup_{x \in C_1} B_{\frac{\epsilon_x}{3}}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad O_2 = \bigcup_{y \in C_2} B_{\frac{\epsilon_y}{3}}(y)$$

then  $O_1, O_2$  are open as arbitrary unions of open sets, and since  $C_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset \implies C_1 \subseteq C_2^c$  and  $C_2 \subseteq C_1^c$  so that

$$C_1 \subseteq O_1 \text{ and } C_2 \subseteq O_2$$

so suppose, for contradiction, that  $O_1 \cap O_2 \neq \emptyset \implies \exists z \in O_1 \cap O_2$ . Then  $\exists x' \in C_1$  and  $y' \in C_2$  such that  $z \in B_{\frac{\epsilon_{x'}}{3}}(x')$  and  $z \in B_{\frac{\epsilon_{y'}}{3}}(y')$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} d(x', y') &\leq d(x', z) + d(z, y') \\ &< \frac{\epsilon_{x'}}{3} + \frac{\epsilon_{y'}}{3} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{3} \max\{\epsilon_{x'}, \epsilon_{y'}\} \implies \Leftarrow \end{aligned}$$

as this implies  $z \in C_1 \cap C_2 = \emptyset$ . Thus  $O_1 \cap O_2 = \emptyset$ , and so  $M$  is normal.  $\square$

**Lemma 17.** If  $(X, \tau)$  is normal,  $C \subset X$  is closed and  $O \subseteq X$  is open and  $C \subseteq O$ , then  $\exists U$  open with

$$C \subseteq U \subseteq \overline{U} \subseteq O$$

*Proof.* Since  $O$  is open, then  $O^c$  is closed and  $C \subset O$  gives  $O^c \cap C = \emptyset$ . So, by normality,  $\exists$  open  $U, V$  where  $U \cap V = \emptyset$  such that  $C \subseteq U$ , and  $O^c \subseteq V$ . Then  $O^c \subseteq V \implies V^c \subseteq O$ , and since  $U \cap V = \emptyset$  we must have  $U \subseteq V^c$  where  $V^c$  is closed. So  $\overline{U} \subseteq \overline{V^c} = V^c$ . Then

$$C \subseteq U \subseteq \overline{U} \subseteq O$$

$\square$

**Lemma 18 (Urysohn's Lemma).** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be normal, and let  $C_0, C_1$  be disjoint closed subsets. Then  $\exists f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  continuous such that  $f(C_0) = \{0\}$ ,  $f(C_1) = \{1\}$

*Proof.* Set  $O_1 = X \setminus C_1 = C_1^c$  which is open as  $C_1$  is closed in  $X$ . And since  $C_0 \cap C_1 = \emptyset$  we have  $C_0 \subseteq O_1$ . Then, by Lemma 17  $\exists$  open  $O_0$  such that

$$C_0 \subseteq O_0 \subseteq \overline{O_0} \subseteq O_1$$

Then, by Lemma 17  $\exists$  open  $O_{1/2}$  with

$$C_0 \subseteq O_0 \subseteq \overline{O_0} \subseteq O_{1/2} \subseteq \overline{O_{1/2}} \subseteq O_1$$

so by Lemma 17  $\exists$  open  $O_{1/4}, O_{3/4}$  so that

$$C_0 \subseteq O_0 \subseteq \overline{O_0} \subseteq O_{1/4} \subseteq \overline{O_{1/4}} \subseteq O_{1/2} \subseteq \overline{O_{1/2}} \subseteq O_{3/4} \subseteq \overline{O_{3/4}} \subseteq O_1$$

So by Lemma 17  $\exists$  open  $O_{1/8}, O_{3/8}, O_{5/8}, O_{7/8}$  such that

$$C_0 \subseteq O_0 \subseteq \overline{O}_0 \subseteq O_{1/8} \subseteq \overline{O}_{1/8} \subseteq O_{1/4} \subseteq \overline{O}_{1/4} \subseteq O_{3/8} \subseteq \overline{O}_{3/8} \subseteq \dots$$

so by induction, for each dyadic rational

$$\left\{ \frac{m}{2^n} : 1 \leq m \leq 2^n - 1; n, m \in \mathbb{N} \right\} =: \Delta$$

we get open  $O_{\frac{m}{2^n}}$  such that if  $r, s \in \Delta$ , with  $r < s$  then  $\overline{O}_r \subseteq O_s$  and  $C_0 \subseteq O_r \forall r$ . Define  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \inf\{r \in \Delta : x \in O_r\} \text{ for } x \in O_1 \\ f(x) &= 1 \text{ for } x \in C_1 \end{aligned}$$

Then if  $x \in C_0$ , then  $x \in O_r \forall r \in \Delta$  including  $r = 0$ , so we have  $f(x) = 0$ . To check continuity, use as a sub-base

$$\{(-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{(b, \infty) : b \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

If  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , then

$$f^{-1}((-\infty, a)) = \begin{cases} \emptyset, & a \leq 0 \\ X, & a > 1 \end{cases}$$

Suppose  $0 < a \leq 1$ . If  $x \in X$  and  $f(x) < a \exists r \in \Delta$  such that  $f(x) < r < a$  and so  $x \in O_r$  and thus  $f^{-1}((-\infty, a)) = \bigcup_{r < a} O_r$  which is the union of open sets and hence is open.

If  $f(x) > b$  then

$$f^{-1}((b, \infty)) = \begin{cases} X, & b < 0 \\ \emptyset, & b \geq 1 \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq b < 1$  we claim  $f^{-1}((b, \infty)) = \bigcup_{r > b} \overline{O}_r^c$ .

If  $f(x) > b$ , then  $\exists s \in \Delta$  with  $f(x) > s > b \implies x \notin O_s$ . Then  $\exists r \in \Delta$  such that  $s > r > b$  where  $\overline{O}_r \subseteq O_s$  with  $x \notin \overline{O}_r \implies x \in \overline{O}_r^c$  which is open, and so  $f^{-1}((b, \infty)) = \bigcup_{r > b} \overline{O}_r^c$  which is open as the union of open sets. And so in all cases we see that  $f$  is continuous.  $\square$

**Proposition 19.** If  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  is a banach space, then  $(B(X, V), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  is a banach space. Where  $B(X, V)$  is the set of all bounded functions from  $X$  to  $V$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\{f_n\} \in B(X, V)$  be a cauchy sequence. For each  $x \in X$ ,  $\{f_n(x)\}$  is cauchy in  $V$ , and by the completeness of  $V$  converges in  $V$ , say  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ . Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, since  $\{f_n\}$  is cauchy  $\exists N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n, m \geq N_1 \implies \|f_n - f_m\|_\infty < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

so for  $x \in X$  and  $n, m \geq N$  we have  $\|f_n(x) - f_m(x)\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ , so for fixed  $m > N$  we have

$$\|f_m(x) - f(x)\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

and so  $f$  is bounded. Next, fix  $x \in X$  then since  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x) \exists N_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n \geq N_2 \implies \|f_n(x) - f(x)\|_\infty < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

so for  $n > \max\{N_1, N_2\}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_n - f\|_\infty &\leq \|f_n - f_{n+1}\|_\infty + \|f_{n+1} - f\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|f_n - f_{n+1}\|_\infty + \|f_{n+1}(x) - f(x)\| \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\ &= \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and so  $f_n \rightarrow f \in B(X, V)$ , and hence is complete.  $\square$

**Proposition 20.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and  $Y$  a metric space. Then  $C_B(X, Y)$  is a closed subset of  $(B(X, Y), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\{f_n\} \in C_B(X, Y)$  be a cauchy sequence such that  $f_n \rightarrow f \in B(X, Y)$  under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . We wish to show that  $f \in C_B(X, Y)$ . So let  $\epsilon > 0$  and be given and  $x_0 \in X$  be arbitrary. Then  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n \geq N \implies \|f - f_n\|_\infty < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

Then since  $f_n \in C_B(X, Y)$  is continuous  $\exists$  open  $B_\delta(x_0) \ni x_0$  such that if  $y \in B_\delta(x_0)$  then  $\|f_n(y) - f_n(x_0)\| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(y) - f(x_0)\| &\leq \|f(y) - f_n(y)\| + \|f_n(y) - f_n(x_0)\| + \|f_n(x_0) - f(x_0)\| \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \\ &= \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and thus we have  $f \in C_B(X, Y)$ ; that is  $C_B(X, Y) \subset (B(X, Y), \|\cdot\|_\infty)$  is closed.  $\square$

**Theorem 21 (Tietze Extension Theorem).** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a normal topological space and let  $A \subset X$  be closed, and  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be continuous. Then  $\exists F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  continuous, where  $F|_A = f$ . If  $f(A) \subseteq [a, b]$  then we can arrange  $F(X) \subseteq [a, b]$ .

*Proof.* First, suppose that

$$f : A \rightarrow [-1, 1]$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \{x \in A : f(x) \geq \frac{1}{3}\} = f^{-1}\left(\left[\frac{1}{3}, 1\right]\right) \\ B_1 &= \{x \in A : f(x) \leq -\frac{1}{3}\} = f^{-1}\left(\left[-1, -\frac{1}{3}\right]\right) \end{aligned}$$

where by the continuity of  $f$  we have  $B_1, A_1$  are closed in  $A$  where  $B_1 \cap A_1 = \emptyset$ , and thus are also closed and disjoint in  $X$ . So by Urysohn's lemma we have that there exists continuous

$$f_1 : X \rightarrow \left[-\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}\right]$$

such that

$$f_1(A_1) = \frac{1}{3}, \text{ and } f_1(B_1) = -\frac{1}{3}$$

Thus, for any  $x \in A$  we have  $|f(x) - f_1(x)| \leq \frac{2}{3}$  so that

$$g_1 := f - f_1 : A \rightarrow \left[-\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}\right]$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &= \left\{x \in A : g_1(x) \geq \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\right\} = g_1^{-1} \left(\left[\frac{2}{9}, \frac{2}{3}\right]\right) \\ B_2 &= \left\{x \in A : g_1(x) \leq -\frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\right\} = g_1^{-1} \left(\left[-\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{2}{9}\right]\right) \end{aligned}$$

where by the continuity of  $g_1$  we have  $B_2, A_2$  are closed in  $A$  where  $B_2 \cap A_2 = \emptyset$ , and thus are also closed and disjoint in  $X$ . So by Urysohn's lemma we have that there exists continuous

$$f_2 : X \rightarrow \left[-\frac{2}{9}, \frac{2}{9}\right]$$

such that

$$f_2(A_2) = \frac{2}{9}, \text{ and } f_2(B_2) = -\frac{2}{9}$$

Thus, for any  $x \in A$  we have  $|f(x) - f_1(x) - f_2(x)| \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2$  so that

$$g_2 := f - f_1 - f_2 : A \rightarrow \left[-\frac{4}{9}, \frac{4}{9}\right]$$

continuing inductively we can construct a sequence of continuous functions  $f_1, f_2, \dots$  such that

$$\left|f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(x)\right| \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

on  $A$ , so defining  $F := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} f_i$ , then by construction we have  $F|_A = f$ .

For continuity let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x \in X$  be given, then pick  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^i < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . Then, since each Urysohn function  $f_i$  is continuous on  $X$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$  select  $U_i \in \tau$  such that  $x \in U_i$  where

$$y \in U_i \implies |f_i(x) - f_i(y)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2N}$$

then

$$U := \bigcap_{j=1}^N U_j$$

is open as the finite intersection of open sets and  $y \in U$  implies

$$\begin{aligned}
|F(x) - F(y)| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N |f_i(x) - f_i(y)| + \sum_{i=N+1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^i \\
&< \frac{\epsilon}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&= \frac{\epsilon}{2N} \cdot N + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&= \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

and so  $F$  is continuous as  $x$ , since  $x \in X$  was arbitrary we conclude that  $F$  is continuous on  $X$ .

Now for the case when  $f$  is not bounded, since  $\mathbb{R}$  is homeomorphic to  $(-1, 1)$  via the mapping

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \tan^{-1} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (-1, 1)$$

so let us consider

$$f : A \rightarrow (-1, 1) \subset [-1, 1]$$

Then from above there exists continuous  $\tilde{f} : X \rightarrow [1, -1]$  such that  $\tilde{f}|_A = f$ . So, let

$$B = \tilde{f}^{-1}(\{1\}) \cup \tilde{f}^{-1}(\{-1\})$$

where by the continuity of  $\tilde{f}$  we have that  $B \subset X$  is closed as the union of singletons which are closed, and since

$$\tilde{f}(A) = f(A) \subseteq (-1, 1)$$

we have that  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ . So by Urysohn's lemma there exists continuous

$$g : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

such that

$$g(A) = 1, \text{ and } g(B) = 0$$

so define

$$F := g \cdot \tilde{f} : X \rightarrow (-1, 1)$$

Then  $F$  is continuous as the product of two continuous functions, and for any  $x \in A$  we have

$$F(x) = g(x) \cdot \tilde{f}(x) = 1 \cdot \tilde{f}(x) = f(x)$$

so  $F|_A = f$ . For  $y \in B$  we have

$$F(y) = g(y) \cdot \tilde{f}(y) = 0 \cdot \tilde{f}(y) = 0$$

and for  $z \notin A \cup B$ , then since  $|\tilde{f}(z)| < 1$  we have

$$|F(z)| \leq 1 \cdot |\tilde{f}(z)| < 1$$

and so  $\text{Im}(F) = (-1, 1)$ , and  $F$  is an extension of  $f$ . □

**Proposition 22 (Equivalent Definition of Compact).**

- (a)  $X$  is compact if every open cover of  $X$  has a finite subcover.
- (b) Every collection  $\{K_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$  of closed sets with the finite intersection property, has nonempty intersection; i.e.  $\bigcap_{\alpha \in I} K_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\implies$  (b)

Let  $X$  be compact, and let  $\{K_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$  be a collection of closed sets with the finite intersection property, and assume for contradiction, that  $\bigcap_{\alpha \in I} K_\alpha = \emptyset$ . Then for each  $K_\alpha$  we have  $X \setminus K_\alpha = K_\alpha^c$  is open. So,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{\alpha \in I} K_\alpha &= \emptyset \\ \implies \left( \bigcap_{\alpha \in I} K_\alpha \right)^c &= \emptyset^c \\ \implies \bigcup_{\alpha \in I} K_\alpha^c &= X \end{aligned}$$

That is  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in I} K_\alpha^c$  is an open cover for  $X$ , and since  $X$  is compact, it admits a finite subcover, giving

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{i=1}^n K_{\alpha_i}^c &= X \\ \implies \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^n K_{\alpha_i}^c \right)^c &= X^c \\ \bigcap_{i=1}^n K_{\alpha_i} &= \emptyset \quad \Rightarrow \Leftarrow \end{aligned}$$

A contradiction to our assumption that for finite  $K_\alpha$  we have  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n K_{\alpha_i} \neq \emptyset$ . And therefore we must have  $\bigcap_{\alpha \in I} K_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ .

(b)  $\implies$  (a)

Let  $X$  be a topological space, and suppose that for every collection  $\{K_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$  of closed sets with the finite intersection property, we have  $\bigcap_{\alpha \in I} K_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ . Next let  $\mathcal{U}$  be an open cover of  $X$  and assume, for contradiction, that  $\mathcal{U}$  has no finite subcover of  $X$ . That is

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{i_n} U_{i_j} \neq X$$

so we must have at least one  $p \in X$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
p &\notin \bigcup_{j=1}^{i_n} U_{i_j} \\
\implies p &\in \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{i_n} U_{i_j} \right)^c \\
&= \bigcap_{j=1}^{i_n} U_{i_j}^c \\
\implies \emptyset &\neq \bigcap_{j=1}^{i_n} U_{i_j}^c
\end{aligned}$$

where each  $U_{i_k}^c$  is closed in  $X$ , and since this is true for each finite subcollection of  $\mathcal{U}$ , we have the family  $\{X \setminus U\}_{U \in \mathcal{U}} = \{U^c\}_{U \in \mathcal{U}}$  satisfies the finite intersection property. Where by our assumption we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U^c \neq \emptyset \\
\implies \left( \bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U^c \right)^c &\neq \emptyset^c \\
\implies \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U &\neq X \quad \Rightarrow \Leftarrow
\end{aligned}$$

A contradiction to the assumption that  $\mathcal{U}$  was an open cover for  $X$ . Thus, we conclude that  $\mathcal{U}$  must admit a finite subcover of  $X$ .

Since  $\mathcal{U}$  was an arbitrary open cover for  $X$ , we conclude that every open cover of  $X$  admits a finite subcover, and therefore  $X$  is compact.  $\square$

**Proposition 23.** A topological space  $X$  is connected if and only if every continuous map of  $X$  into a discrete space having at least two elements is constant.

*Proof.* First assume that  $X$  is connected, and that  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a continuous map, where  $Y$  is a discrete space with at least 2 elements. WLOG suppose  $Y = \{y, y'\}$ .

If  $f(X) \neq \text{constant}$ , then  $f(x) = y$  and  $f(x') = y'$  where  $y, y' \in Y$  are disjoint and open by the discrete topology, yet this implies that for  $U_x, U_{x'} \in X$  we have

$$f(U_x) \cap f(U_{x'}) = \emptyset$$

where  $f(U_x), f(U_{x'}) \neq \emptyset$  and so form a separation of  $Y$ , which contradicts the continuity of  $f$ , since the image of a connected set under a continuous map must be connected.



Next suppose that  $X$  is not connected; i.e.  $X = U \cup V$  where  $V, U \neq \emptyset$  are open and  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ . Then let  $p \neq q$  and endow  $\{p, q\}$  with the discrete topology. If we define

$$f : X \rightarrow \{p, q\}, \text{ by } \begin{cases} f(U) = \{p\} \\ f(V) = \{q\} \end{cases}$$

then  $f$  is continuous and non-constant.  $\square$

**Proposition 24.** If a topological space  $(X, \tau)$  is compact, and  $A \subseteq X$  is closed, then  $A$  is compact.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \tau$  be an open cover of  $A$ , then since  $A \subseteq X$  is closed, we have  $A^c \subseteq X$  is open, and so

$$\mathcal{U} \cup A^c$$

is an open cover for  $X$ . Since  $X$  is compact, it admits a finite subcover which must contain  $A$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 25.** Properties of maximal FIP family  $\mathcal{F}^*$

- (a)  $\mathcal{F}^*$  is closed/stable under finite intersections.
- (b) If  $B \subseteq X$  and  $B \cap A \neq \emptyset, \forall A \in \mathcal{F}^*$  then  $B \in \mathcal{F}^*$ .

*Proof.*

- (a) Given  $B, C \in \mathcal{F}^*$ , then taking finite  $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{F}^*$  we have by FIP,

$$(B \cap C) \bigcap (A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_k) \neq \emptyset$$

and so  $\mathcal{F}^* \cup \{B \cap C\}$  is an FIP family, yet by the maximality of  $\mathcal{F}^*$  we must have

$$\mathcal{F}^* = \mathcal{F}^* \cup \{B \cap C\}$$

and so  $B \cap C \in \mathcal{F}^*$ , and  $\mathcal{F}^*$  is stable under finite intersections.

- (b) Consider  $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}^* \cup \{B\}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{F}'$  has FIP, as any finite subcollection of  $\mathcal{F}'$  is either of the form

$$A_1, \dots, A_n$$

which has nonempty intersection, or

$$B, A_1, \dots, A_n$$

where

$$B \bigcap \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j \right) \neq \emptyset$$

and thus by maximality  $\mathcal{F}^* = \mathcal{F}'$ , otherwise  $\mathcal{F}'$  would be a larger set with the FIP property and  $\mathcal{F}^*$  would not be maximal. Thus,  $B \in \mathcal{F}^*$ .

□

**Theorem 26 (Tychonoff's Theorem).** Let  $I$  be some index set. For each  $i \in I$  let  $(X_i, \tau_i)$  be a topological space. If all the  $(X_i, \tau_i)$ 's are compact then

$$X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$$

with the product topology is compact. (Need the axiom of choice)

*Proof.* First, given a set  $X \neq \emptyset$  and some FIP family of closed subsets  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ , consider as a partially ordered set

$$\mathcal{W} := \{\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X) : \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}; \mathcal{F} \text{ is an FIP family on } X\}$$

with the partial ordering on  $\mathcal{W}$  given by set inclusion, and note that  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{W} \implies \mathcal{W} \neq \emptyset$ . Now let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a non-empty chain in  $\mathcal{W}$ , so that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a collection of FIP families in  $\mathcal{W}$  and is totally ordered by inclusion. Let us set

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{F}$$

so let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  be subsets of  $X$  such that  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{F}_0$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_0$  is the union of elements in  $\mathcal{C}$ , for  $A_i \in \mathcal{F}_0$  we must have  $A_i \in \mathcal{F}$  for some  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}$ , and so, for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \exists \mathcal{F}_i \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $A_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$  for each  $i$ . Then, in particular,

$$\{\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n\} \in \mathcal{C}$$

and hence is totally ordered by set inclusion, and so one of  $\{\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_n\}$  must be maximal, let this be  $\mathcal{F}_j$  so that

$$\mathcal{F}_j \supseteq \mathcal{F}_i, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n$$

and thus  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{F}_j$ , and since  $\mathcal{F}_j$  is an FIP family we have

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n A_i \neq \emptyset$$

and since each  $\mathcal{F} \supseteq \mathcal{S}$  we trivially have that  $\mathcal{F}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{S}$  and so  $\mathcal{F}_0 \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{F}$  is an upper bound for the chain  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Since the chain  $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{W}$  was arbitrary we conclude that every chain in  $\mathcal{W}$  has an upper bound in  $\mathcal{W}$ , and hence  $\mathcal{W}$  is inductively ordered.

Thus, by Zorn's Lemma  $\mathcal{W}$  has a maximal element  $\mathcal{F}^*$  which contains  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Now, for each  $i \in I$  consider

$$\mathcal{F}_i = \{\pi_i(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}^*\}$$

then  $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X_i)$ , now for  $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{F}^*$  we have

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j \neq \emptyset$$

which implies that there exists at least one  $x \in \bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j$ , and so

$$\pi_i(x) \in \pi_i\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^n A_j\right) \subseteq \bigcap_{j=1}^n \pi_i(A_j)$$

and so  $\mathcal{F}_i$  is an FIP family on  $X_i$ , and since each  $\pi_i(A_j) \subseteq \overline{\pi_i(A_j)}$  we also have that

$$\left\{ \overline{\pi_i(A)} : A \in \mathcal{F}^* \right\}$$

is an FIP family on  $X_i$  of closed subsets, and since  $X_i$  is compact we have that

$$\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{F}^*} \overline{\pi_i(A)} \neq \emptyset$$

and so by the axiom of choice we may select  $x_i \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{F}^*} \overline{\pi_i(A)} \subseteq X_i$  and set

$$x = (x_i) \in \prod_{i \in I} X_i$$

and let  $O_x$  be an open neighbourhood of  $x$  in  $X$ . It suffices to consider  $O_x$  as a basis element of  $X$  so that

$$x \in O_x = \prod_{i_j \neq \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}} X_{i_j} \times \prod_{j=1}^k U_{i_j}$$

or, equivalently

$$x \in O_x = \bigcap_{j=1}^k \pi_{i_j}^{-1}(U_{i_j})$$

and note for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  we have  $x_{i_j} \in U_{i_j}$  and by construction  $x_{i_j} \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{F}^*} \overline{\pi_{i_j}(A)}$  and since  $U_{i_j} \subseteq X_{i_j}$  is open and contains  $x_{i_j}$  by the definition of a limit point we must have that  $U_{i_j} \cap \pi_{i_j}(A) \neq \emptyset$  for each  $A \in \mathcal{F}^*$  and hence

$$\pi_{i_j}^{-1}(U_{i_j}) \cap A \neq \emptyset, \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{F}^*$$

and hence  $\pi_{i_j}^{-1}(U_{i_j}) \in \mathcal{F}^*$  by maximality for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Where maximality then gives

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^k \pi_{i_j}^{-1}(U_{i_j}) = O_x \in \mathcal{F}^*$$

and therefore  $O_x \cap A \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{F}^*$ , and in particular since  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}^*$  we have that  $O_x \cap A \neq \emptyset$ ,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{S}$  and hence

$$\bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{S}} A \neq \emptyset$$

and thus,  $X$  is compact. □

**Theorem 27.** Tychonoff's Theorem implies the Axiom of Choice.

*Proof.* Let  $\{X_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a non-empty family and let

$$X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$$

let  $\omega$  be some set not in  $X$ .

Next, for each  $i$  set  $Y_i = X_i \cup \{\omega\}$  and define

$$\tau_{Y_i} = \{Y_i, X_i, \{\omega\}, \emptyset\}$$

then  $(Y_i, \tau_{Y_i})$  is finite and hence compact. So let

$$Y = \prod_{i \in I} Y_i$$

which is then compact by Tychonoff's Theorem.

Since  $\omega \in Y_i$  is open, this implies  $\omega^c = X_i$  is closed in  $Y_i$ , and hence is clopen. So by the continuity of the projection maps  $\pi_i$  we have

$$\pi_i^{-1}(X_i) \subseteq Y$$

is closed for each  $i$ . To see that  $\{\pi_i^{-1}(X_i)\}$  has FIP, let  $\pi_{i_1}^{-1}(X_{i_1}), \dots, \pi_{i_n}^{-1}(X_{i_n}) \subset \{\pi_i^{-1}(X_i)\}$  be given and note that  $\exists x_{i_j} \in X_{i_j} \forall i_j$ , so define  $y \in Y$  by

$$y_i = \begin{cases} x_{i_j}, & i = i_j \\ \omega, & i \neq i_j \forall j \end{cases}$$

then

$$y \in \bigcap_{j=1}^n \pi_{i_j}^{-1}(X_{i_j}) \implies \{\pi_i^{-1}(X_i)\} \text{ is FIP}$$

then since  $\{\pi_i^{-1}(X_i)\}$  is an FIP family and  $Y$  is compact this gives

$$\bigcap_{i \in I} \pi_i^{-1}(X_i) \neq \emptyset$$

so let  $z \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \pi_i^{-1}(X_i)$ , then  $z \in X_i$  for each  $i$  and therefore

$$z \in \prod_{i \in I} X_i$$

□

**Proposition 28.** If  $(X, \tau)$  is compact and Hausdorff, then it is normal.

*Proof.* Let  $A, B \subseteq X$  be closed and disjoint. Since  $X$  is compact and  $A, B$  are closed subsets of a compact space we have that  $A, B$  are also compact. Since  $X$  is Hausdorff, it is regular. Thus, for  $x \in A \exists U_x, V_x \in \tau$  disjoint with

$$x \in U_x \text{ and } B \subseteq V_x$$

then  $\{U_x\}_{x \in A}$  is an open cover for  $A$ , and by compactness of  $A$  admits a finite subcover giving

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_{x_i} =: U$$

and

$$V := \bigcap_{i=1}^n V_{x_i} \supseteq B$$

which are both open as the union and finite intersection of open sets, where  $U \cap V = \emptyset$ . Hence,  $X$  is normal.  $\square$

**Theorem 29.** If  $(X, \tau_X)$  is compact and  $(Y, \tau_Y)$  is Hausdorff, and if

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

is continuous, injective and surjective. Then  $f$  is a homeomorphism.

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is continuous, injective and surjective, we have

$$f^{-1} : Y \rightarrow X$$

exists, so let  $A \subseteq X$  be closed, then  $A$  is compact as the closed subset of a compact space, and by the continuity of  $f$  we also have that  $F(A) \subseteq Y$  is compact. Since  $Y$  is Hausdorff  $f(A)$  is closed as a compact set in a Hausdorff space. Since  $f$  is injective and surjective we also have

$$f(A)^c = Y \setminus f(A) = f(X) \setminus f(A) = f(X \setminus A) = f(A^c)$$

where  $f(A)^c = f(A^c)$  is open in  $Y$  and so

$$f^{-1}(f(A^c)) = A^c \subseteq X$$

is open and thus  $f^{-1}$  is continuous. Therefore,  $f$  is a homeomorphism.  $\square$

**Proposition 30.** let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and  $A \subseteq X$  be totally bounded, then  $\overline{A}$  is totally bounded.

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, since  $A$  is totally bounded  $\exists x_1, \dots, x_n \in A$  such that  $\{B_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(x_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  cover  $A$ . For each  $z \in \overline{A} \exists y \in A$  such that  $z \in B_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(y)$ , by the definition of a limit point, and there is some  $j$  such that  $y \in B_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(x_j)$  since the  $B_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(x_j)$ 's cover  $A$  and so

$$d(z, x_j) \leq d(z, y) + d(y, x_j) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon$$

and so  $z \in B_{\epsilon}(x_j)$  and hence  $\{B_{\epsilon}(x_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  cover  $\overline{A}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 31.** let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. If  $X$  is compact, then it is complete.

*Proof.* Let  $\{x_n\} \in X$  be a cauchy sequence and suppose, for contradiction, that  $X$  is not complete. Then  $\{x_n\}$  does not converge in  $X$ . So  $\forall x \in X \exists \epsilon_x > 0$  such that  $\forall N \in \mathbb{N} \exists n \geq N$  where  $d(x, x_n) \geq \epsilon_x$ .

Then since  $\{x_n\}$  is cauchy  $\exists M \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n, m \geq M \implies d(x_n, x_m) < \epsilon_x$$

pick  $M_x > M$  such that  $n_x \geq M_x$  gives  $d(x, x_{n_x}) \geq \epsilon_x$ . So for  $n > M_x$  we have  $d(x, x_n) \geq \frac{\epsilon_x}{2}$ . Thus,  $\forall x \in X, B_{\epsilon_x}(x)$  contains at most finite  $x_i \in \{x_n\}$ . Now  $\{B_{\epsilon_x}(x)\}_{x \in X}$  cover  $X$ , yet it does not admit a finite subcover, contradicting the compactness of  $X$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 32.** let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space. If  $X$  is totally bounded, then it is compact.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be an open cover of  $X$ , and since  $X$  is totally bounded let  $\overline{B}_1^1, \dots, \overline{B}_n^1$  be a finite cover of  $X$  by closed balls of radius 1. Suppose, for contradiction, that  $X$  is not compact. So at least one ball say  $A^1$  has no finite subcover and let  $\overline{B}_1^2, \dots, \overline{B}_{n_2}^2$  be closed balls of radius  $\frac{1}{2}$  covering  $A^1$ , then at least one, say  $B_*^2$  has no finite subcover so let

$$A^2 = A^1 \cap B_*^2$$

let  $\overline{B}_1^3, \dots, \overline{B}_{n_3}^3$  be closed balls of radius  $\frac{1}{4}$  covering  $A^2$ , then at least one has no finite subcover, say  $B_*^3$  so let

$$A^3 = A^2 \cap B_*^3$$

continuing inductively we get a sequence  $\{A^n\}$  such that

$$A^{n+1} \subseteq A^n \quad \forall n$$

and

$$\text{diam}(A^n) \rightarrow 0$$

and each  $A^n$  is not finitely covered.

For each  $n$  select  $x_n \in A^n$ , then  $\{x_n\}$  is cauchy, and by the completeness of  $X$ ,  $\exists x \in X$  such that  $x_n \rightarrow x$ . Since  $\mathcal{U}$  covers  $X$  there exists  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $x \in U$ , then given  $\epsilon > 0 \exists B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq U$ . So choose  $n$  such that  $\text{diam}(A^n) < \epsilon$  then

$$A^n \subset B_\epsilon(x) \subseteq U \implies \Leftarrow$$

contradicting the assumption that  $A^n$  was not finitely covered.  $\square$

**Theorem 33 (Arzela-Ascoli).** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a compact topological space,  $(Y, d)$  be a metric space, and let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq C_B(X, Y)$  be pointwise totally bounded and equicontinuous, then  $\mathcal{F}$  is totally bounded for  $d_\infty$ .

*Proof.* let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is equicontinuous  $\forall x \in X, \exists O_x \ni x$  such that

$$y \in O_x \implies d(f(x), f(y)) < \epsilon \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}$$

since  $X$  is compact  $\exists x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$  such that

$$X \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n O_{x_i}$$

for each  $j$ , since  $\mathcal{F}$  is pointwise totally bounded, we have  $\{f(x_j) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is totally bounded. Let

$$S_j \subseteq \{f(x_j) : f \in \mathcal{F}\} \subseteq Y$$

be a finite subset such that

$$\bigcup_{y \in S_j} B_\epsilon(y) \supseteq \{f(x_j) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

and let

$$S = \bigcup_{j=1}^n S_j$$

also let

$$\Psi = \{\psi : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow S\}$$

which is finite and set

$$B_\psi = \{f \in \mathcal{F} : d(f(x_j), \psi(j)) < \epsilon \quad \forall j\}$$

then

$$\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{\psi \in \Psi} B_\psi$$

So let  $\psi \in \Psi$  be given and let  $f, g \in B_\psi$ , and  $x \in X$  be such that  $x \in O_{x_j}$  for some  $j$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} d(f(x), g(x)) &\leq d(f(x), f(x_j)) + d(f(x_j), g(x_j)) + d(g(x_j), g(x)) \\ &\leq d(f(x), f(x_j)) + d(f(x_j), \psi(j)) + d(\psi(j), g(x_j)) + d(g(x_j), g(x)) \\ &= \epsilon + \epsilon + \epsilon + \epsilon \\ &= 4\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$B_\psi \subseteq \bigcup_{y \in B_\psi} B_{4\epsilon}(y)$$

and since  $\Psi$  is finite,  $\mathcal{F}$  is totally bounded. □

**Corollary 34.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a compact topological space,  $(Y, d)$  be a complete metric space, and let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq C_B(X, Y)$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is compact iff it is pointwise totally bounded, equicontinuous, and closed in  $C_B(X, Y)$ .

**Proposition 35.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a locally compact topological space, and let  $C \subseteq X$  be compact. Then  $\exists O \in \tau$  such that  $C \subseteq O$  where  $\overline{O}$  is compact.

*Proof.*  $\forall x \in C$ , by local compactness  $\exists O_x \in \tau$  with  $x \in O_x$  such that  $\overline{O_x}$  is compact. Then  $\{O_x\}_{x \in C}$  is an open cover for  $C$ , and since  $C$  is compact it admits a finite subcover and so

$$C \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n O_{x_i} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n \overline{O_{x_i}} \subseteq \overline{\bigcup_{i=1}^n O_{x_i}}$$

which is compact as the finite union of compact sets.  $\square$

**Proposition 36.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a locally compact Hausdorff space. Then every  $x \in X$  has a neighborhood base consisting of compact neighborhoods; i.e.  $\forall x \in O_x \exists U \in \tau$ , with  $x \in U$  such that  $\overline{U} \subseteq O_x$  where  $\overline{U}$  is compact.

*Proof.* Given  $x \in O_x$ , let  $V \in \tau$  with  $x \in V$  where  $\overline{V}$  is compact by local compactness. Then we can replace  $O_x$  with

$$O = O_x \cap V \subseteq V$$

so that  $\overline{O}$  is compact as a closed subset of a compact set. Let

$$\partial O := \overline{O} \setminus O$$

which is closed in the relative topology of  $\overline{O}$ , since  $O \notin \partial O \implies x \notin \partial O$ . Since  $\overline{O}$  is compact Hausdorff, it is normal, and hence regular. So  $\exists U, W$  relatively open in  $\overline{O}$  such that  $U \cap W = \emptyset$  with

$$x \in U \text{ and } \partial O \subseteq W$$

then

$$U \cap W = \emptyset \implies W^c = \overline{O} \setminus W \supseteq U$$

and since  $W \supseteq \partial O \implies W^c \subseteq \partial O^c$ , which then implies that  $W^c \subseteq O$ . Now  $\overline{O} \setminus W$  is relatively closed in  $\overline{O}$ , which gives

$$\overline{U} \subseteq \overline{O} \setminus W = W^c \subseteq O$$

so  $\overline{U} \subseteq O$  and hence is compact as a closed subset of a compact set.  $\square$

**Proposition 37.** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let  $C \subseteq X$  be compact, and  $O \in \tau$  with  $C \subseteq O$ . Then  $\exists$  open  $U$  such that

$$C \subseteq U \subseteq \overline{U} \subseteq O$$

with  $\overline{U}$  compact.



*Proof.* Since  $X$  is a locally compact hausdorff space and  $C \subseteq X$  is compact we can find  $V \in \tau$  such that  $C \subseteq V$  with  $\bar{V}$  compact. Then we have both  $C \subseteq V$  and  $C \subseteq O$  so let

$$W = V \cap O$$

then  $C \subseteq W$  and since

$$V \cap O \subseteq V \implies W \subseteq V$$

and so  $\bar{W} \subseteq \bar{V}$  which tells us that  $\bar{W}$  is compact as the closed subset of a compact set. Then  $\partial W$  is closed in the relative topology of  $\bar{W}$  and since  $\partial W = \bar{W} \setminus W$  we have that  $C \not\subseteq \partial W$ , and since  $X$  is Hausdorff,  $\bar{W}$  is compact Hausdorff, and so it is normal. Then as  $C, \partial W$  are closed and disjoint, by normality  $\exists$  disjoint  $U, Q \in \tau$  such that

$$C \subseteq U, \text{ and } \partial W \subseteq Q$$

then since  $U \cap Q = \emptyset$  we have  $Q^c \supseteq U$  and also

$$U \subseteq Q^c \cap \bar{W}$$

which implies

$$\bar{U} \subseteq \overline{Q^c \cap \bar{W}} = Q^c \cap \bar{W}$$

since both  $Q^c, \bar{W}$  are closed, and the intersection of closed sets is closed. Next we note that  $Q^c \cap \bar{W} \subseteq Q^c$  and  $\partial W^c \supseteq Q^c$ , and in the relative topology of  $\bar{W}$  we have

$$\partial W^c = (\bar{W} \cap W^c)^c \cap \bar{W} = (\bar{W}^c \cup W) \cap \bar{W} = W$$

and so we have

$$\bar{U} \subseteq Q^c \subseteq \partial W^c = W$$

and so  $\bar{U}$  will be compact as the closed subset of compact  $\bar{W}$ . And so we have

$$C \subseteq U \subseteq \bar{U} \subseteq W \subseteq O$$

and hence

$$C \subseteq U \subseteq \bar{U} \subseteq O$$

□

**Proposition 38 (Urysohn for Locally Compact Hausdorff).** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a locally compact Hausdorff space, and let  $C \subseteq X$  be compact, and  $O \in \tau$  with  $C \subseteq O$ . Then  $\exists$  continuous  $f : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(C) = \{1\}$ , and  $\text{supp}(f) = \overline{\{x : f(x) \neq 0\}} \subseteq O$  is compact.

*Proof.* Since  $X$  is locally compact Hausdorff and  $C \subseteq X$  is compact, we may choose  $U \in \tau$  such that

$$C \subseteq U \subseteq \overset{\text{compact}}{\bar{U}} \subseteq O$$

where  $C, \partial U$  are closed and disjoint in compact  $\overline{U}$ , so by Urysohn's Lemma  $\exists$  continuous  $g : \overline{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with  $g(C) = \{1\}$  and  $g(\partial U) = \{0\}$ . So set

$$f : X \rightarrow [0, 1], \text{ by } f(x) = \begin{cases} g(x), & x \in \overline{U} \\ 0, & x \notin \overline{U} \end{cases}$$

then  $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \overline{U}$  and is compact as the closed subset of a compact set. So we need to check that  $f$  is continuous on  $X$ .  $f$  is continuous on  $\overline{U}$  and continuous on  $\overline{U}^c$ , if  $x \in \partial U$ , then  $f(x) = g(x) = 0$ . Now  $[0, \epsilon)$  is open in  $[0, 1]$ , where the continuity of  $g$  tells us that  $g^{-1}([0, \epsilon))$  is open in  $\overline{U}$ . And so

$$f^{-1}([0, \epsilon)) = g^{-1}([0, \epsilon)) \cup \overline{U}^c$$

is open as the union of open sets, and so  $f$  is continuous.  $\square$

**Proposition 39.** The intersection of any collection of rings/fields/ $\sigma$ -algebras/ $\sigma$ -rings on a set  $X$  is a ring/field/ $\sigma$ -algebra/ $\sigma$ -ring on  $X$ .

*Proof.* We give a proof for rings with the proofs for the others being similar.

Let  $\{\mathcal{R}_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a collection of rings on  $X$  where  $I$  is an indexing set and let

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathcal{R}_i$$

so if  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$ , then  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}_i, \forall i \in I$  and since each  $\mathcal{R}_i$  is a ring we have

$$E \cup F \in \mathcal{R}_i, \quad \forall i \in I$$

and

$$E \setminus F \in \mathcal{R}_i, \quad \forall i \in I$$

and thus  $E \cup F, E \setminus F \in \mathcal{R}$ , and so  $\mathcal{R}$  is a ring.  $\square$

**Theorem 40.** Let  $\mathcal{P} = \{[a, b) : a < b, a, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and let  $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a non-decreasing left continuous function and define

$$\mu_\alpha : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \text{ by } \mu_\alpha([a, b)) = \alpha(b) - \alpha(a)$$

then  $\mu_\alpha$  is countably additive.

*Proof.* Given  $[a_0, b_0) \in \mathcal{P}$  such that

$$[a_0, b_0) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} [a_i, b_i)$$

we note that for the  $(\geq)$  direction it suffices to show that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$\mu_\alpha([a_0, b_0)) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i))$$

Given any  $n$ , re-index the intervals so that  $a_i < a_{i+1} \forall 1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . Since the intervals are disjoint, we have that  $b_i < a_{i+1}$ . Now since

$$a_0 \leq a_i, b_i \leq b_0 \quad \forall i$$

we have

$$\alpha(b_0) - \alpha(a_0) \geq \alpha(b_n) - \alpha(a_1)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i]) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a_i)) \\ &= \alpha(b_1) - \alpha(a_1) + \alpha(b_2) - \alpha(a_2) + \cdots + \alpha(b_n) - \alpha(a_n) \\ &= \alpha(b_n) - \alpha(a_1) + \alpha(b_1) - \alpha(a_2) + \cdots + \alpha(b_{n-1}) - \alpha(a_n) \\ &= \alpha(b_n) - \alpha(a_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a_{i+1})) \end{aligned}$$

and since each  $b_i < a_{i+1}$  and  $\alpha$  is non-decreasing we have that  $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a_{i+1})) \leq 0$  and therefore

$$\mu_\alpha([a_0, b_0]) = \alpha(b_0) - \alpha(a_0) \geq \alpha(b_n) - \alpha(a_1) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i])$$

Next, let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given and choose  $b'_0 < b_0$  such that

$$\alpha(b'_0) \geq \alpha(b_0) - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

and by the left continuity of  $\alpha$  for each  $i$  choose  $a'_i < a_i$  such that

$$\alpha(a'_i) \geq \alpha(a_i) - \epsilon_i$$

where each  $\epsilon_i > 0$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_i = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . Then we have

$$[a_0, b'_0] \subseteq [a_0, b_0) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} [a_i, b_i) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (a'_i, b_i)$$

then, since  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (a'_i, b_i)$  is an open cover of  $[a_0, b'_0]$  which is compact, we know that  $[a_0, b'_0]$  admits a finite subcover, so that

$$[a_0, b'_0] \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^m (a'_i, b_i)$$

then re-indexing the intervals so that

$$a_0 \in (a'_1, b_1) \text{ and } b_1 \in (a'_2, b_2), \dots, b'_0 \in (a'_m, b_m)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(b_0) - \alpha(a_0) &\leq \alpha(b'_0) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} - \alpha(a_0) & b'_0 < b_0 \\
&\leq \alpha(b_m) - \alpha(a'_1) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} & b'_0 \leq b_m, \ a'_1 \leq a_0 \\
&\leq \alpha(b_m) - \alpha(a'_1) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a'_{i+1})) & b_i \geq a'_{i+1} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a'_i)) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m (\alpha(b_i) - (\alpha(a_i) - \epsilon_i)) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a_i) + \epsilon_i) + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a_i)) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_i + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a_i)) + \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

and since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary we conclude

$$\mu_\alpha([a_0, b_0]) = \alpha(b_0) - \alpha(a_0) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i])$$

and thus we conclude that  $\mu_\alpha([a_0, b_0]) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i])$ . And so  $\mu_\alpha$  is countably additive.  $\square$

**Lemma 41.** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a semiring. If  $E, E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $\exists F_1, \dots, F_k \in \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$((\dots (E \setminus E_1) \setminus E_2) \setminus \dots) \setminus E_n = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^k F_i$$

*Proof.* By induction. Base case: if  $n = 1$  then  $E \setminus E_1 = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^k F_i$  with  $F_1, \dots, F_k \in \mathcal{S}$  by the definition of semiring.

So suppose the result holds for  $n - 1$  with  $n > 1$ . Then  $\exists G_1, \dots, G_m$  such

that

$$\begin{aligned}
((\dots (E \setminus E_1) \setminus E_2) \setminus \dots) \setminus E_{n-1} \setminus E_n &= E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i \\
&= \left( E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-1} E_i \right) \setminus E_n \\
&= \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^m G_i \right) \setminus E_n \\
&= \bigcup_{i=1}^m (G_i \setminus E_n) \\
&= \bigcup_{i=1}^m \bigcup_{j=1}^l G_{ij}
\end{aligned}$$

where by the definition of a semiring we have that each  $G_{ij} \in \mathcal{S}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 42.** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a semiring,  $\mu_0$  a premeasure on  $\mathcal{S}$ , and let  $E, F_i \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$  then

$$\mu_0(E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i)$$

*Proof.* First we note that it is sufficient to show that

$$\mu_0(E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_0(F_i)$$

for each finite  $n$ , that is for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i = E \sqcup \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i \setminus E \right) = E \sqcup \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_2} G_{ij} \right)$$

where each  $G_{ij} \in \mathcal{S}$  and are disjoint by the previous Lemma, and by construction  $E$  and  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_1} \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_2} G_{ij}$  are disjoint, so we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_0(F_i) = \mu_0(E) + \sum_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \mu_0(G_{ij}) \geq \mu_0(E)$$

$\square$

**Lemma 43.** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a semiring,  $\mu_0$  a premeasure on  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $\mu_0$  is countably subadditive; i.e. if  $E, F_i \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$  then

$$\mu_0(E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i)$$

*Proof.* First note that

$$E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (E \cap F_i)$$

letting  $H_i = E \cap F_i$  where by definition we have that each  $H_i \in \mathcal{S}$ , so that by  $E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^k F_i$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} H_i \\ &= H_1 \sqcup (H_2 \setminus H_1) \sqcup \dots \sqcup \left( H_m \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{m-1} H_j \right) \sqcup \dots \\ &= H_1 \sqcup \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_1} G_{2_i} \right) \sqcup \dots \sqcup \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_m} G_{m_i} \right) \sqcup \dots \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\mu_0(E) = \mu_0(H_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \mu_0(G_{2_i}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n_m} \mu_0(G_{m_i}) + \dots$$

yet,

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_m} G_{m_i} \subseteq E \cap F_m \subseteq F_m$$

so that  $\sum_{i=1}^{n_m} \mu_0(G_{m_i}) \leq \mu_0(F_m)$ , and therefore,

$$\mu_0(E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i)$$

□

**Theorem 44.** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a semiring and  $\mu_0$  a premeasure on  $\mathcal{S}$ , then defining

$$\mu^* : \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$$

by

$$\mu^*(A) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(E_i) : A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i; E_i \in \mathcal{S} \right\}$$

then  $\mu^*$  is an outer measure which extends  $\mu_0$ ; i.e.  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{S}} = \mu_0$ .

*Proof.* First, since  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{S}$ , so setting  $E_i = \emptyset \forall i$  gives

$$\mu^*(\emptyset) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(\emptyset) = 0$$

and so  $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$ .

Now, if  $A \subseteq B$  then  $B \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \implies A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$ . So

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^*(A) &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(E_i) : A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i; E_i \in \mathcal{S} \right\} \\ &\leq \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(E_i) : B \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i; E_i \in \mathcal{S} \right\} \\ &= \mu^*(B)\end{aligned}$$

and so  $\mu^*$  is monotone.

Next, given  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  for each  $E_i$  choose  $E_{ij} \in \mathcal{S}$  for each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $E_i \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{ij}$  and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(E_{ij}) \leq \mu^*(E_i) + \frac{\epsilon}{2^i}$$

then

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_{ij}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^*(A) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(E_{ij}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[ \mu^*(E_i) + \frac{\epsilon}{2^i} \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(E_i) + \epsilon\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary we conclude that  $\mu^*(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(E_i)$  and  $\mu^*$  is countably subadditive.

Now let  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , by the definition of  $\mu^*$  we have that

$$\mu^*(E) \leq \mu_0(E)$$

now if  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$  for  $F_i \in \mathcal{S}$ , then by countable subadditivity we have

$$\mu_0(E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i)$$

and in particular this holds for the infimum and so

$$\mu_0(E) \leq \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i) : E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i; F_i \in \mathcal{S} \right\} = \mu^*(E)$$

and thus  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{S}} = \mu_0$  □

**Theorem 45 (Caratheodory's Theorem).** Let  $\mu^*$  be an outer measure on a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $M(\mu^*)$  be the set of  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets in  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $M(\mu^*)$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring and  $\mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)}$  is a measure.

*Proof.* First we show that  $M(\mu^*)$  is a ring, so let  $E, F \in M(\mu^*)$ , and  $A \in \mathcal{H}$  be arbitrary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(A \cap (E \cup F)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \cup F)^c) &= \mu^*((A \cap E) \cup (A \cap F)) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c \cap F^c) \\ &= \mu^*((A \cap E) \sqcup ((A \setminus E) \cap F)) + \mu^*((A \setminus E) \cap F^c) \\ &\leq \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*((A \setminus E) \cap F) + \mu^*((A \setminus E) \cap F^c) \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \setminus E) && F \text{ } \mu^*\text{-measurable} \\ &= \mu^*(A) && E \text{ } \mu^*\text{-measurable} \end{aligned}$$

that is  $\mu^*(A \cap (E \cup F)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \cup F)^c) \leq \mu^*(A)$  and since we always have  $\mu^*(A \cap (E \cup F)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \cup F)^c) \geq \mu^*(A)$  by the subadditivity of  $\mu^*$ , we have

$$\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap (E \cup F)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \cup F)^c)$$

and so  $E \cup F \in M(\mu^*)$ .

Next we check set difference where we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(A \cap (E \setminus F)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \setminus F)^c) &= \mu^*(A \cap (E \cap F^c)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \cap F^c)^c) \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap E \cap F^c) + \mu^*(A \cap (E^c \cup F)) \\ &= \mu^*((A \cap E) \setminus F) + \mu^*((A \cap E^c) \cup (A \cap F)) \\ &= \mu^*((A \cap E) \setminus F) + \mu^*((A \cap E^c) \sqcup ((A \setminus E^c) \cap F)) \\ &\leq \mu^*((A \cap E) \setminus F) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) + \mu^*(A \cap E \cap F) \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) && F \text{ } \mu^*\text{-measurable} \\ &= \mu^*(A) && E \text{ } \mu^*\text{-measurable} \end{aligned}$$

that is  $\mu^*(A \cap (E \setminus F)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \setminus F)^c) \leq \mu^*(A)$  and thus

$$\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap (E \setminus F)) + \mu^*(A \cap (E \setminus F)^c)$$



and so  $E \setminus F \in M(\mu^*)$ .

And so  $M(\mu^*)$  is a ring.

Now we note that if  $E, F \in M(\mu^*)$  are disjoint that

$$\mu^*(A \cap (E \sqcup F)) = \mu^*((A \cap E) \sqcup (A \cap F)) = \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap F)$$

since  $F \sqcup E$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable and  $A \cap (E \sqcup F) \in \mathcal{H}$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(A \cap (E \sqcup F)) &= \mu^*((A \cap (E \sqcup F)) \cap E) + \mu^*((A \cap (E \sqcup F)) \cap E^c) && \text{measurability} \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap ((E \cap E) \sqcup (F \cap E))) + \mu^*(A \cap ((E \cap E^c) \sqcup (F \cap E^c))) \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap (E \sqcup \emptyset)) + \mu^*(A \cap (\emptyset \sqcup F)) && E \cap F = \emptyset \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap F) \end{aligned}$$

Next suppose  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  where each  $E_i \in M(\mu^*)$  defining  $F_1 = E_1$  and  $F_k = E_k \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} E_i$  for each  $k > 1$  we see that

$$E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$$

where each  $F_i \in M(\mu^*)$  since  $M(\mu^*)$  is a ring, and we note

$$E \supseteq \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i \implies E^c \subseteq \left( \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i \right)^c$$

Then for any  $A \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(A) &= \mu^*\left(A \cap \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i\right) + \mu^*\left(A \cap \left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i\right)^c\right) \\ &\geq \mu^*\left(A \cap \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i\right) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) && \text{subadditivity} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mu^*(A \cap F_i) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) \end{aligned}$$

where only the RHS depends on  $n$  to taking the limit to infinity gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(A) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A \cap F_i) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) \\ &\geq \mu^*\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (A \cap F_i)\right) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) && \text{subadditivity} \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore we have that  $E \in M(\mu^*)$  and so  $M(\mu^*)$  is closed under countable unions, and thus  $M(\mu^*)$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring.

Now we note from

$$\mu^*(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A \cap F_i) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) \geq \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c)$$

yet we always have  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c)$ , so that we actually have

$$\mu^*(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(A \cap F_i) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c)$$

Then since this holds for any  $A \in \mathcal{H}$  letting  $A = E = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$  where each  $F_i \in M(\mu^*)$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)} \left( \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i \right) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu^* \left( \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (F_i \cap F_j) \right) + \mu^*(\emptyset) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(F_j) \end{aligned}$$

and thus  $\mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)}$  is a measure on the  $\sigma$ -ring  $M(\mu^*)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 46.** Let  $\mu^*$  be an outer measure on a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then  $\mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)}$  is a complete measure, if  $M(\mu^*) \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to show that if  $\mu^*(E) = 0$  then  $E \in M(\mu^*)$ . So let  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ , then since  $A \cap E \subseteq E$  monotonicity gives  $\mu^*(A \cap E) = 0$  and  $A \cap E^c \subseteq A$  so again by monotonicity we get

$$\mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) = 0 + \mu^*(A \cap E^c) \leq \mu^*(A)$$

and thus

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

and so  $E$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable and hence  $E \in M(\mu^*)$ . And therefore  $\mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)}$  is complete.  $\square$

**Theorem 47.** If  $\mu_0$  is a premeasure on a semiring  $\mathcal{S}$ , and if  $\mu^*$  is the outer measure on  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  determined by  $\mu_0$ , then  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq M(\mu^*)$ .

*Proof.* We must show this if  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $E \in M(\mu^*)$ ; that is,  $\forall A \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$

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

If  $\mu^*(A) = \infty$  then  $\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \cap E^c)$  and we are done.

So let us assume that  $\mu^*(A) < \infty$ . Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , since  $A \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$ , we may select  $F_i \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$  and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i) \leq \mu^*(A) + \epsilon$$

now  $F_i = (F_i \cap E) \sqcup (F_i \setminus E)$ , and since  $\mathcal{S}$  is a semiring  $\exists G_{ij} \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $F_i \setminus E = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n_j} G_{ij}$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0 \left( (F_i \cap E) \sqcup \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n_j} G_{ij} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left[ \mu_0(F_i \cap E) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} \mu_0(G_{ij}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i \cap E) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} \mu_0(G_{ij}) \end{aligned}$$

and  $A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$  implies

$$A \cap E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (F_i \cap E) \quad \text{and} \quad A \setminus E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (F_i \setminus E) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n_j} G_{ij}$$

and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(A) + \epsilon &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i \cap E) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} \mu_0(G_{ij}) \\ &\geq \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i \cap E) : A \cap E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (F_i \cap E); F_i \cap E \in \mathcal{S} \right\} \\ &\quad + \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{n_j} \mu_0(G_{ij}) : A \setminus E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n_j} G_{ij}; G_{ij} \in \mathcal{S} \right\} \\ &= \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \setminus E) \end{aligned}$$

and since  $\epsilon$  is arbitrary we conclude that  $\mu^*(A) \geq \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \setminus E)$  giving

$$\mu^*(A) = \mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \setminus E)$$

and so  $E$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable and thus  $E \in M(\mu^*)$ . And therefore  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq M(\mu^*)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 48.** Let  $\mu_0$  be a premeasure on a semiring  $\mathcal{S}$ , and  $\mu^*$  the outer measure on  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  determined by  $\mu_0$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{H}(M(\mu^*))$  and if  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  then

$$\mu^*(E) = \inf \{ \mu^*|_{\sigma(\mathcal{S})}(F) : E \subseteq F; F \in \sigma(\mathcal{S}) \} = \inf \{ \mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)}(F) : E \subseteq F; F \in M(\mu^*) \}$$

which is to say that  $\mu^*|_{\sigma(\mathcal{S})} = \mu^* = \mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)}$

*Proof.* First since

$$\mathcal{S} \subseteq M(\mu^*) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$$

we have  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{H}(M(\mu^*))$ .

Next, let  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(E) &= \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i) : E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i; F_i \in \mathcal{S} \right\} && \text{def of } \mu^* \\ &\geq \inf \{ \mu^*|_{\sigma(\mathcal{S})}(F) : E \subseteq F; F \in \sigma(\mathcal{S}) \} && \text{countable subadditivity of } \mu^* \\ &\geq \inf \{ \mu^*|_{M(\mu^*)}(F) : E \subseteq F; F \in M(\mu^*) \} && M(\mu^*) \supseteq \sigma(\mathcal{S}) \\ &\geq \mu^*(E) && \text{monotonicity of } \mu^* \end{aligned}$$

and thus the inner inequalities must be equalities.  $\square$

**Theorem 49 (Uniqueness of Extensions).** If  $\mu_0$  is a  $\sigma$ -finite premeasure on a semiring  $\mathcal{S}$ , and if  $\mathcal{R}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring such that  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{R} \subseteq M(\mu^*)$ , and if  $\nu$  is a non-negative extension of  $\mu_0$  to a measure on  $\mathcal{R}$ , then  $\nu = \mu^*|_{\mathcal{R}}$ .

*Proof.* If  $E \in \mathcal{R}$ , and  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$  where each  $F_i \in \mathcal{S}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(E) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \nu(F_i) && \text{non-negative measures are countably subadditive} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(F_i) && \nu \text{ an extension of } \mu_0 \text{ and } F_i \in \mathcal{S} \end{aligned}$$

and thus  $\nu(E) \leq \mu^*(E) \forall E \in \mathcal{R}$ , so it remains to show that  $\nu(E) \geq \mu^*(E) \forall E \in \mathcal{R}$

Case 1: Suppose  $E \in \mathcal{R}$ , and that  $\exists F \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E \subseteq F$ , and  $\mu_0(F) < \infty$ . Then, since

$$F = (F \cap E) \sqcup (F \setminus E) = E \sqcup (F \setminus E)$$

we have, by the measurability of  $E$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(F) &= \nu(E) + \nu(F \setminus E) \\ &\leq \mu^*(E) + \mu^*(F \setminus E) \\ &= \mu^*(F) \\ &= \mu_0(F) \\ &= \nu(F) \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\nu(E) + \nu(F \setminus E) = \mu^*(E) + \mu^*(F \setminus E)$$

yet,

$$\nu(E) \leq \mu^*(E) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(F \setminus E) \leq \mu^*(F \setminus E) < \infty$$

and thus we must have  $\mu^*(E) = \nu(E)$

Case 2: Let  $E \in \mathcal{R}$  be arbitrary. Then, since  $\mu_0$  is assumed to be  $\sigma$ -finite.  $\exists \{F_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu_0(F_i) < \infty$  for each  $i$  and  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty F_i$ , since  $E \in \mathcal{R} \subseteq M(\mu^*) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$  is defined to be the collection of all sets countably covered by elements of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then disjointizing we get  $\{G_{ij}\} \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu_0(G_{ij}) < \infty \forall i, j$ , with  $E \subseteq \bigsqcup_{i,j \geq 1} G_{ij}$  and  $E = \bigsqcup_{i,j \geq 1} (E \cap G_{ij})$ . Then since  $E \cap G_{ij} \subseteq G_{ij}$  so Case 1 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(E) &= \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \nu(E \cap G_{ij}) \\ &= \sum_{i,j \geq 1} \mu^*(E \cap G_{ij}) \\ &= \mu^*(E) \end{aligned}$$

and hence,  $\mu^*(E) = \nu(E)$ .

and therefore we conclude that  $\nu = \mu^*|_{\mathcal{R}}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 50.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. A function  $f$  defined almost everywhere, i.e. defined on  $X \setminus N(\mu)$ , is  $\mu$ -measurable iff  $\exists \{f_n\}$  of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere; i.e.  $\forall x \in X \setminus N(\mu)$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -measurable, then  $\exists \{f_n\}$  of simple  $\mu$ -measurable functions and a null-set  $N_0(\mu)$ , such that  $\forall x \in X \setminus N_0(\mu)$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ . Since each  $f_n$  is simple  $\mu$ -measurable we have for each  $n$  that

$$f_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} b_i^n \chi_{F_i^n}$$

where each  $b_i^n \in B$  and each  $F_i^n \in \mathcal{S} \sqcup N(\mu)$ , that is

$$F_i^n = E_i^n \sqcup N_i^n, \text{ where } E_i^n \in \mathcal{S}, N_i^n \in N(\mu)$$

so let

$$N = N_0(\mu) \cup \left( \bigcup_{n,i} N_i^n \right)$$

then  $N$  is a null-set, and letting

$$\varepsilon_n = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} b_i^n \chi_{E_i^n}$$

then each  $\varepsilon_n$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function.

Then since  $\varepsilon_n|_{X \setminus N} = f_n$ , then  $\forall x \in X \setminus N$  we have  $\varepsilon_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ .

Conversely, if  $\exists \{f_n\}$  of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions such that  $\forall x \in X \setminus N(\mu)$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ , then  $f$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable on  $X \setminus N(\mu)$ . Then since  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable implies  $\mu$ -measurable we have that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -measurable.  $\square$

**Proposition 51.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $f, g$  are simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions, then  $f + g$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function.

*Proof.* First suppose  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \chi_{E_i}$ , and  $g = c \chi_F$ , to get  $F$  contained in the  $E_i$ 's let us set  $E_{n+1} = F \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$  and  $b_{n+1} = 0$ , then

$$F \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} E_i \implies F = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} (F \cap E_i)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i \chi_{E_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i (\chi_{E_i \cap F} + \chi_{E_i \setminus F}) \\ g &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} c \chi_{E_i \cap F} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$f + g = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (b_i + c) \chi_{E_i \cap F} + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i \chi_{E_i \setminus F}$$

and so  $f + g$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. The general case follows inductively.  $\square$

**Proposition 52.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be a measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. Let

$$f, g : X \rightarrow B$$

be  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable/ $\mu$ -measurable functions, and let  $c$  be a scalar. Then  $f + g, cf, \|f(\cdot)\|$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable/ $\mu$ -measurable functions. If  $f$  is scalar valued, then  $fg$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable/ $\mu$ -measurable. If  $f$  and  $g$  are  $\mathbb{R}$  valued functions, then  $\max(f, g)$  and  $\min(f, g)$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable/ $\mu$ -measurable functions.

*Proof.* If  $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}$  are sequences of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable such that  $\forall x \in X$

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(x) &\rightarrow f(x) \\ g_n(x) &\rightarrow g(x) \end{aligned}$$

then  $\forall x \in X$  we have

$$(f_n + g_n)(x) = f_n(x) + g_n(x) \rightarrow f(x) + g(x) = (f + g)(x)$$

the next follows as  $\{cf_n\} = c\{f_n\}$ , and if  $f_n \rightarrow f \forall x \in X$ , then  $\|f_n(x)\| = \sum_{i=1}^n \|b_i\| \chi_{E_i}(x) = \|b_i\| = \|f(x)\|$ . Then  $fg$  follows from  $cf$

the last two follow from the first 4 and the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \max(f, g) &= \frac{f + g + |f - g|}{2} \\ \min(f, g) &= \frac{f + g - |f - g|}{2} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 53.** If  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of functions from a set  $X$  to a Banach space  $B$  which converge to  $f$  pointwise, and if for any open set  $U \subseteq B$  we define

$$U_n = \{y \in U : d(y, U^c) > \frac{1}{n}\}$$

then

$$f^{-1}(U) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{K=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k=K}^{\infty} f_k^{-1}(U_n)$$

for all open  $U \subseteq B$ .

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} x \in f^{-1}(U) &\iff f(x) \in U \\ &\iff \exists n, K \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that} \\ &\quad f_k(x) \in U_n \forall k \geq K \\ &\iff \exists n, K \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that} \\ &\quad x \in f_k^{-1}(U_n) \forall k \geq K \\ &\iff \exists n, K \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} x &\in \bigcap_{k=K}^{\infty} f_k^{-1}(U_n) & \bar{U}_n &\subseteq U_{n+1} \\ &\iff x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{K=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k=K}^{\infty} f_k^{-1}(U_n) \end{aligned}$$

□

**Theorem 54.** Let  $X$  be a set,  $\mathcal{S}$  a  $\sigma$ -ring of subsets of  $X$ ,  $B$  be a Banach space, and let

$$f : X \rightarrow B$$

be a function, then  $f$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable if

1.  $f(X) \subseteq B$  is separable.
2.  $f^{-1}(U) \cap \text{car}(f) \in \mathcal{S}$  for all open  $U \subseteq B$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable, then  $\exists \{f_n\}$  of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions such that  $\forall x \in X$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ . Since each  $f_n$  is simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable its range is finite so for each  $n$  let

$$\text{Im}(f_n) = \{b_1^n, \dots, b_{k_n}^n\}$$

and let

$$R = \overline{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{Im}(f_n)}$$

so given  $\epsilon > 0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} b \in \text{Im}(f) &\iff \exists x \in X \text{ such that } f(x) = b \\ &\iff f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x) = b \\ &\iff \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ such that } \|f_n(x) - b\| < \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $B_\epsilon(b) \cap R \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $b \in \text{Im}(f)$  was arbitrary we conclude that  $\forall b \in \text{Im}(f)$  there is a ball containing  $b$  which has nonempty intersection with  $R$ , and so  $f(X) \subseteq R$ . And for each  $n$  there is some  $A_n \subseteq B$  such that  $A_n \subseteq \text{Im}(f_n)$  is countably dense in the range of  $f_n$ , then

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{Im}(f_n)$$

is countably dense, and so  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{Im}(f_n)$  is separable, and hence so is  $R$ , thereby making  $\text{Im}(f) = f(X)$  separable as the subset of a separable set.

Now let  $U \subseteq B$  be any open set, then since

$$f^{-1}(U) \cap \text{car}(f) = f^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\})$$

it suffices to show that if  $U$  is any open set such that  $U \not\ni 0$ , then  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{S}$ , then with

$$U_n = \{y \in U : d(y, (U \setminus \{0\})^c) > \frac{1}{n}\}$$

we will have each  $U_n \not\ni 0$  and

$$f^{-1}(U) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{K=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k=K}^{\infty} f_k^{-1}(U_n)$$



by the previous lemma, and since the  $f_k$ 's are simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable there preimages  $f_k^{-1}(U_n) \in \mathcal{S}$ , and as  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring, it is closed under countable unions and intersections, and so  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $f$  is such that  $f(X) \subseteq B$  is separable and  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{S}$ . So we may choose a sequence  $\{b_i\} \in B$  which is dense in  $f(X)$  since  $f(X)$  is separable. So let

$$C_{ij} = \left\{ x \in X : x \in \text{car}(f); \|f(x) - b_i\| < \frac{1}{j} \right\} = f^{-1}\left(B_{\frac{1}{j}}(b_i) \setminus \{0\}\right)$$

for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , and since each  $B_{\frac{1}{j}}(b_i) \setminus \{0\} \in B$  is open, by hypothesis we have that  $f^{-1}\left(B_{\frac{1}{j}}(b_i) \setminus \{0\}\right) \in \mathcal{S}$ . Then, ordering the pairs  $(i, j)$  lexicographically; that is

$$(i, j) \leq (k, n) \text{ if } \begin{cases} i < k \\ i = k, \text{ and } j < n \end{cases}$$

so for each fixed  $n$  defining

$$E_{ij}^n = C_{ij} \setminus \bigcup \{C_{kl} : (i, j) < (k, l) \leq (n, n)\}$$

then the sets  $E_{ij}^n$  are disjoint and  $E_{ij}^n \subseteq C_{ij} \forall i, j$ . So let

$$f_n = \sum_{i,j=1}^n b_i \chi_{E_{ij}^n}$$

and suppose we are given  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $x \in X$ . If  $x \notin \text{car}(f)$ , then  $f(x) = 0$  and so  $f_n(x) = 0 \forall n$  and we are done. So suppose that  $x \in \text{car}(f)$ . Choose  $j_0$  such that  $\frac{1}{j_0} < \epsilon$ , and choose  $i_0$  so that

$$\|f(x) - b_{i_0}\| < \frac{1}{j_0}$$

next we note that

$$x \in C_{i_0 j_0} = f^{-1}\left(B_{\frac{1}{j_0}}(b_{i_0}) \setminus \{0\}\right)$$

by the definition of  $j_0$  and  $i_0$ . So setting  $N = \max\{i_0, j_0\}$ , then if  $n > N$  we have  $x \in E_{kl}^n$  where

$$(k, l) = \max \{(i, j) : x \in C_{ij}; (i_0, j_0) \leq (i, j) \leq (n, n)\}$$

then

$$\|f(x) - b_k\| < \frac{1}{l} \leq \frac{1}{j_0} < \epsilon$$

and by construction we have

$$f_n(x) = \sum_{i,j=1}^n b_i \chi_{E_{ij}^n}(x) = b_k$$

so that

$$\|f(x) - b_k\| = \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < \epsilon$$

and so  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise, and thus  $f$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable.  $\square$

**Proposition 55.** If  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable/ $\mu$ -measurable functions which converge to a function  $f$  pointwise/almost everywhere pointwise; i.e.  $\forall x \in X \setminus N(\mu)$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ . Then  $f$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable/ $\mu$ -measurable.

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $\implies \mu$ -measurable we will prove the case with  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions.

Since  $\{f_n\}$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable, for each  $n$  we have that  $f_n(X) \subset B$  is separable. Since the closure of a separable set is separable we also have that  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(X) \subseteq B$  is separable, and

$$f(X) \subseteq \overline{\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(X)}$$

and so  $f(X)$  is separable as the subset of a separable set.

Then since for any open  $U \subseteq B$  we have

$$f^{-1}(U) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{K=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{k=K}^{\infty} f_k^{-1}(U_n)$$

where

$$U_n = \{y \in U : d(y, (U \setminus \{0\})^c) > \frac{1}{n}\}$$

and since the  $f_k$ 's are  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable there preimages  $f_k^{-1}(U_n) \in \mathcal{S}$ , and as  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring, it is closed under countable unions and intersections, and so  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Then since  $f(X)$  is separable, and for each open set  $U \subset B$  we have  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{S}$ , we can conclude that  $f$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable.  $\square$

**Theorem 56 (Egoroff).** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space, if  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu(E) < \infty$  and if  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of  $\mu$ -measurable functions such that  $\forall x \in E \setminus N(\mu)$  we have  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ . Then for every  $\epsilon > 0 \exists$  measurable  $F \subseteq E$ , and so  $F \in \mathcal{S}$ , such that

$$\mu(E \setminus F) < \epsilon$$

and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F$ ; i.e. given  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\exists N$  such that

$$n \geq N \implies \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < \delta \quad \forall x \in F$$

*Proof.* For any  $k$  and  $m$ , let

$$G_m^k = \{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_k(x)\| > \frac{1}{m}\} \in \mathcal{S}$$

$$F_m^n = \bigcup_{k \geq n} G_m^k = \{x \in E : \exists k \geq n; \|f(x) - f_k(x)\| > \frac{1}{m}\} \in \mathcal{S}$$

for fixed  $m$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , since  $f_n \rightarrow f$ , we have  $F_m^n \rightarrow \emptyset$  and therefore

$$\mu(F_m^n) \rightarrow \mu(\emptyset) = 0$$

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given and for each  $m$  choose  $n_m$  such that

$$\mu(F_m^{n_m}) < \frac{\epsilon}{2^m}$$

let  $H = \bigcup_m F_m^{n_m}$ , then

$$\mu(H) = \mu\left(\bigcup_m F_m^{n_m}\right) \leq \sum_m \mu(F_m^{n_m}) < \sum_m \frac{\epsilon}{2^m} = \epsilon$$

let  $F = E \setminus H$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(E \setminus F) &= \mu(E \cap F^c) \\ &= \mu(E \cap (E \cap H^c)^c) \\ &= \mu(E \cap (E^c \cup H)) \\ &= \mu(\emptyset \cup (E \cap H)) \\ &= \mu(H) \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

so let  $\delta > 0$  be given, and choose  $m_0$  such that  $\frac{1}{m_0} < \delta$ . Then  $\forall x \in F$  by the definition of  $F$  we must have  $x \notin H$ , and in particular we have  $x \notin F_{m_0}^{n_{m_0}}$ . Thus, for all  $k \geq n_{m_0}$  we also have that  $x \notin G_{m_0}^k$  which is to say

$$\|f(x) - f_k(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{m_0} < \delta$$

and since this is independent of  $x \in F$  we have that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 57.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of  $\mu$ -measurable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise on  $E \setminus N(\mu)$ .

*Proof.* For each  $m$  choose  $F_m \subseteq E$  such that

$$\mu(E \setminus F_m) < \frac{1}{m}$$

and  $f_m \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F_m$ . Let  $G = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} F_m$ , then

$$E \setminus G \subseteq E \setminus F_m \quad \forall m$$

which implies

$$\mu(E \setminus G) = 0$$

yet  $f_m \rightarrow f$  uniformly on each  $F_m \implies f_m \rightarrow f$  pointwise on each  $F_m$  and so  $f_m \rightarrow f$  pointwise on  $\bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} F_m = G$  and hence on  $E$  almost everywhere.  $\square$

**Proposition 58.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of  $\mu$ -measurable functions which are almost uniformly Cauchy on  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $\exists f$  such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E$ .

*Proof.* Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , then since  $\{f_n\}$  is almost uniformly Cauchy on  $E$ ,  $\exists F \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $F \subseteq E$ ,  $\mu(E \setminus F) < \epsilon$ , and  $\{f_n\}$  is uniformly Cauchy on  $F$ .

Since  $\{f_n\}$  is uniformly Cauchy on  $F$ ,  $\forall x \in F$  we have  $\{f_n(x)\}$  is cauchy in  $B$ . Since  $B$  is a Banach space it is complete, and so  $\{f_n(x)\}$  converges in  $B$ , so define

$$f : E \rightarrow B, \text{ by } f(x) = \begin{cases} \lim f_n(x), & x \in F \\ 0, & x \in E \setminus F \end{cases}$$

to show that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F$ , we note that since  $\{f_n\}$  is uniformly Cauchy on  $F$ , for any  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\exists N_1$  such that

$$n, m \geq N_1 \implies \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B < \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \forall x \in F$$

in addition, for each  $x \in F$  since  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$ ,  $\exists N_2$  such that

$$n \geq N_2 \implies \|f_n(x) - f(x)\|_B < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

so letting  $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ , and fixing  $m > N$ , we have for any  $n \geq N$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B &\leq \|f(x) - f_m(x)\|_B + \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B \\ &\leq \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \\ &= \delta \end{aligned}$$

and so  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F$ , and thus almost uniformly on  $E$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 59.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of  $\mu$ -measurable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $f$  in measure.

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\delta > 0$  be given. Since  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E$ , choose  $F \subseteq E$  such that

$$\mu(E \setminus F) < \delta$$

and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F$ . Since  $B$  is a Banach space it is complete, and so  $\{f_n(x)\}$  converges in  $B$ , say to  $f(x) = \lim f_n(x)$ , for each  $x \in F$ . So  $\exists N$  such that

$$n \geq N \implies \|f_n(x) - f(x)\|_B < \epsilon$$

then for  $n \geq N$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} &\subseteq E \setminus F \\ \mu\left(\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \epsilon\}\right) &\leq \mu(E \setminus F) < \delta \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

and so  $\{f_n\}$  converges in measure to  $f$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 60.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space and let  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ . If  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions such that  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $f$  in measure on  $E$ , and  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $g$  in measure in  $E$ , then  $f = g$  almost everywhere on  $E$ .

*Proof.* By the triangle inequality we have

$$\|f(x) - g(x)\|_B \leq \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B + \|f_n(x) - g(x)\|_B$$

and so for any  $\epsilon > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\{x \in E : \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{x \in E : \|f_n(x) - g(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\} \\ \implies &\mu\left(\{x \in E : \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\}\right) \\ &\leq \mu\left(\left\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) + \mu\left(\left\{x \in E : \|f_n(x) - g(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) \end{aligned}$$

then since  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $f$  in measure on  $E$ , and  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $g$  in measure in  $E$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\left\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \\ \mu\left(\left\{x \in E : \|f_n(x) - g(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

and hence  $\mu\left(\{x \in E : \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B > \epsilon\}\right) \rightarrow 0$ ; i.e.

$$\mu\left(\{x \in E : f(x) \neq g(x)\}\right) \rightarrow 0$$

so that  $f = g$  almost everywhere on  $E$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 61 (Riesz-Weyl).** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space and let  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ . If  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $B$ -valued functions which are cauchy in measure on  $E$ , then there is a subsequence  $\{f_{n_k}\}$  that is almost uniformly cauchy.

*Proof.* Defining the integers  $n_k$  inductively, which we may do since  $\{f_n\}$  is cauchy in measure, by  $n_1 = 1$  and for  $k > 1$  choosing  $n_k$  such that  $n_k > n_{k-1}$ , and so that

$$m, n \geq n_k \implies \mu \left( \left\{ x \in E : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B \geq \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2^k}$$

given  $\epsilon > 0$  select  $K$  such that

$$\sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} < \epsilon$$

and let

$$F = E \setminus \bigcup_{k=K}^{\infty} \left\{ x \in E : \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_{k+1}}(x)\|_B \geq \frac{1}{2^k} \right\}$$

so by constructions we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(E \setminus F) &= \mu \left( E \cap \left( E \cap \left( \bigcup_{k=K}^{\infty} \left\{ x \in E : \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_{k+1}}(x)\|_B \geq \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} \right)^c \right)^c \right) \\ &= \mu \left( E \cap \left( E^c \cup \left( \bigcup_{k=K}^{\infty} \left\{ x \in E : \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_{k+1}}(x)\|_B \geq \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} \right) \right) \right) \\ &= \mu \left( \emptyset \cup \left( \bigcup_{k=K}^{\infty} \left\{ x \in E : \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_{k+1}}(x)\|_B \geq \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} \right) \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \mu \left( \left\{ x \in E : \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_{k+1}}(x)\|_B \geq \frac{1}{2^k} \right\} \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

to see that  $\{f_{n_k}\}$  is uniformly cauchy on  $F$ , let  $\delta > 0$  be given, and choose  $N > K$  such that

$$\sum_{n=N}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} < \delta$$

then for any  $x \in F$  and  $k > l > N$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_l}(x)\|_B &\leq \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_{k-1}}(x)\|_B + \|f_{n_{k-1}}(x) - f_{n_{k-2}}(x)\|_B \\
&\quad + \cdots + \|f_{n_{l+1}}(x) - f_{n_l}(x)\|_B \\
&= \sum_{m=l}^{k-1} \|f_{n_{m+1}}(x) - f_{n_m}(x)\|_B \\
&\leq \sum_{m=l}^{k-1} \frac{1}{2^m} \\
&\leq \sum_{m=N}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^m} \\
&< \delta
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $\{f_{n_k}\}$  is almost uniformly cauchy on  $E$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 62.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space and let  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ . If  $\{f_n\}$  is a sequence of function which are cauchy in measure on  $E$  such that some subsequence  $\{f_{n_k}\}$  converges almost uniformly to  $f$  on  $E$ , then  $\{f_n\}$  converges in measure to  $f$ .

*Proof.* Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \\
\subseteq \left\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_{n_k}(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{x \in E : \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

and since  $f_{n_k} \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E$ , given  $\delta > 0$ ,  $\exists N_1$  such that

$$n_k \geq N_1 \implies \mu\left(\left\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_{n_k}(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

then as  $\{f_n\}$  are cauchy in measure on  $E$ ,  $\exists N_2$  such that

$$n_k, n \geq N_2 \implies \mu\left(\left\{x \in E : \|f_n(x) - f_{n_k}(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

so letting  $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ , and fix  $n_k > N$ , then for any  $n \geq N$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu\left(\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \epsilon\}\right) \\
&\leq \mu\left(\left\{x \in E : \|f(x) - f_{n_k}(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) + \mu\left(\left\{x \in E : \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) \\
&< \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \\
&= \delta \rightarrow 0
\end{aligned}$$

and so  $\{f_n\}$  converges in measure on  $E$  to  $f$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 63.** If  $f, g$  are simple integrable functions then  $f+g$  is simple integrable function and

$$\int (f + g)d\mu = \int fd\mu + \int gd\mu$$

*Proof.* First suppose  $f = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \chi_{E_i}$ , and  $g = c\chi_F$ , to get  $F$  contained in the  $E_i$ 's let us set  $E_{n+1} = F \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i$  and  $b_{n+1} = 0$ , then

$$F \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} E_i \implies F = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} (F \cap E_i)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i \chi_{E_i} = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i (\chi_{E_i \cap F} + \chi_{E_i \setminus F}) \\ g &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} c \chi_{E_i \cap F} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$f + g = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (b_i + c) \chi_{E_i \cap F} + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i \chi_{E_i \setminus F}$$

and so  $f + g$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. The general case follows inductively. Where we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \int (f + g)d\mu &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (b_i + c) \mu(E_i \cap F) + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i \mu(E_i \setminus F) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} b_i [\mu(E_i \cap F) + \mu(E_i \setminus F)] + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} c \mu(E_i \cap F) \\ &= \int fd\mu + \int gd\mu \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 64.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $f, g$  are simple integrable functions then

$$\|f + g\|_1 \leq \|f\|_1 + \|g\|_1$$

*Proof.* First note that for all  $x \in X$  we have

$$\|f(x) + g(x)\|_B \leq \|f(x)\|_B + \|g(x)\|_B$$



and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f + g\|_1 &= \int \|f(x) + g(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\
&\leq \int (\|f(x)\|_B + \|g(x)\|_B) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int \|f(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int \|g(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\
&= \|f\|_1 + \|g\|_1
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 65.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and let  $\{f_n\}$  be a sequence of simple integrable functions that is cauchy for  $\|\cdot\|_1$ . Then  $\{f_n\}$  is cauchy in measure.

*Proof.* Since  $\{f_n\}$  is cauchy for  $\|\cdot\|_1$  we have

$$\|f_n - f_m\|_1 = \int \|f_n(x) - f_m(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n, m \rightarrow \infty$$

let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given and let

$$E_{mn}^\epsilon = \{x \in E : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \epsilon\}$$

then

$$\chi_{E_{mn}^\epsilon} \leq \frac{\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B}{\epsilon}$$

so

$$\mu(E_{mn}^\epsilon) = \int \chi_{E_{mn}^\epsilon} d\mu(x) \leq \int \frac{\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|}{\epsilon} d\mu(x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } m, n \rightarrow \infty$$

and so  $\{f_n\}$  is cauchy in measure on  $E$ . □

**Proposition 66.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}$  are sequences of simple integrable functions which are equivalent under  $\|\cdot\|_1$ ; i.e.

$$\|f_n - g_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

and if  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $f$  in measure, then  $\{g_n\}$  also converges to  $f$  in measure.

*Proof.* Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\{x \in X : \|f(x) - g_n(x)\|_B > \epsilon\} \\
\subseteq \left\{x \in X : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\} \cup \left\{x \in X : \|f_n(x) - g_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

and since  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $f$  in measure we have

$$\mu\left(\left\{x \in X : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

additionally since  $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}$  are equivalent under  $\|\cdot\|_1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\left\{x \in X : \|f_n(x) - g_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) &= \int \chi_{\left\{x \in X : \|f_n(x) - g_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}} d\mu(x) \\ &\leq 2 \int \frac{\|f_n(x) - g_n(x)\|_B}{\epsilon} d\mu(x) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu\left(\left\{x \in X : \|f(x) - g_n(x)\|_B > \epsilon\right\}\right) \\ &\leq \mu\left(\left\{x \in X : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) + \mu\left(\left\{x \in X : \|f_n(x) - g_n(x)\|_B > \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right\}\right) \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

and so  $\{g_n\}$  also converges to  $f$  in measure.  $\square$

**Lemma 67.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $\{f_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow 0$  almost uniformly, then

$$\|f_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0$$

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Then since  $\{f_n\}$  is mean cauchy, choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n, m \geq N \implies \|f_n - f_m\|_1 < \epsilon$$

and let

$$E = \{x \in X : f_N(x) \neq 0\} = \text{car}(f_N)$$

and since  $f_N$  is simple integrable we have  $\mu(E) < \infty$ . Now for  $n \geq N$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{E^c} \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) &= \int_{E^c} \|f_n(x) - 0\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{E^c} \|f_n(x) - f_N(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \quad f_N(x) = 0 \text{ for } x \in E^c \\ &\leq \int_X \|f_n(x) - f_N(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &= \|f_n - f_N\|_1 \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

Now since  $f_n \rightarrow 0$  almost uniformly,  $\exists F \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $F \subseteq E$  where

$$\mu(E \setminus F) < \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \|f_N\|_\infty}$$

and  $f_n \rightarrow 0$  uniformly on  $F$ . And so we may choose  $M > N$  such that for  $n > M$  and  $x \in F$  we have

$$\|f_n(x)\|_B < \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \mu(F)}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_F \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) &\leq \int_F \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \mu(F)} d\mu(x) \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \mu(F)} \cdot \mu(F) \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and lastly, using the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) &\leq \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_n(x) - f_N(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_N(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_X \|f_n(x) - f_N(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_N(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \|f_n - f_N\|_1 + \|f_N\|_\infty \int_{E \setminus F} d\mu(x) \quad \|f_N(x)\|_B \leq \|f_N\|_\infty \\ &= \|f_n - f_N\|_1 + \|f_N\|_\infty \mu(E \setminus F) \\ &< \epsilon + \|f_N\|_\infty \frac{\epsilon}{1 + \|f_N\|_\infty} \\ &< 2\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

then putting all the piece together we get for  $n > M$

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_n\|_1 &= \int_X \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{E^c} \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_F \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &< \epsilon + 2\epsilon + \epsilon \\ &= 4\epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and so  $\|f_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0$ . □

**Proposition 68.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $\{f_n\}$  and  $\{g_n\}$  are mean cauchy sequences of simple integrable functions, such that  $f_n, g_n \rightarrow h$  is measure, then  $\{f_n\}$  and  $\{g_n\}$  are equivalent cauchy sequences; i.e.

$$\lim_{n, m \rightarrow \infty} \|f_n - g_m\|_1 = 0$$

*Proof.* Since  $\{f_n\}, \{g_m\}$  converge in measure to  $h$  and are mean cauchy, Riesz-Weyl says that  $\exists$  subsequences  $\{f_{n_k}\}, \{g_{m_k}\}$  that converge to  $h$  almost uniformly. So it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{n_k} - g_{m_k}\|_1 = 0$$

So define

$$h_k = f_{n_k} - g_{m_k}$$

then  $\{h_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions such that  $h_n \rightarrow 0$  almost uniformly, and from the previous Lemma we then have

$$\|h_k\|_1 \rightarrow 0$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{n_k} - g_{m_k}\|_1 = 0$$

and so  $\{f_n\}$  and  $\{g_m\}$  are equivalent cauchy sequences.  $\square$

**Theorem 69.** Let  $f$  be a  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $B$ -valued function, then the following are equivalent

1. There is a mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of ISFs that converge in measure to  $f$ .
2. There is a mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of ISFs such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly.
3. There is a mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of ISFs such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere.

$f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable if it satisfies one, and hence all, of these conditions.

*Proof.* (1)  $\implies$  (2).

Riesz-Weyl gives a subsequence that converges almost uniformly.

(2)  $\implies$  (3).

Riesz-Weyl gives a subsequence that converges almost uniformly, and hence pointwise.

(3)  $\implies$  (1).

Since  $\{f_n\}$  is mean cauchy we know that  $\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n, m \geq N \implies \|f_n - f_m\|_1 = \int_X \|f_n - f_m\|_B d\mu(x) < \epsilon$$

and hence, for any  $\delta > 0$

$$n, m \geq N \implies \|f_n - f_m\|_1 = \int_X \|f_n - f_m\|_B d\mu(x) < \epsilon\delta$$

so suppose, for contradiction, that  $\{f_n\}$  is not cauchy in measure, this implies that  $\exists \epsilon, \delta$  such that  $\forall N \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists  $m, n \geq N$  where

$$\mu\left(x \in X : \|f_n(x) - f_m(x)\|_B \geq \epsilon\right) \geq \delta$$

let  $A \subset X$  be the set of points which satisfy  $\|f_n(x) - f_m(x)\|_B \geq \epsilon$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \|f_n - f_m\|_B d\mu(x) &\geq \int_A \|f_n - f_m\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\geq \int_A \epsilon d\mu(x) \\ &= \epsilon\mu(A) \\ &\geq \epsilon\delta \implies \Leftarrow \end{aligned}$$

and so we can conclude that  $\{f_n\}$  is cauchy in measure. Then Riesz-Weyl says  $\exists \{f_{n_k}\}$  which converges almost uniformly, and hence almost everywhere and in measure, to an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $g$ . Yet,  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere and thus  $f_{n_k} \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere, and so  $f = g$  almost everywhere. That is  $\{f_{n_k}\}$  converges in measure to  $f$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 70.**  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  is a vector space.

*Proof.* Let  $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , then  $\exists$  sequences  $\{f_n\}, \{g_n\}$  of simple integrable functions which are mean cauchy such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  and  $g_n \rightarrow g$  pointwise almost everywhere. Then  $\{f_n + g_n\}$  is a sequence of simple integrable functions which is mean cauchy and  $f_n + g_n \rightarrow f + g$  pointwise almost everywhere and so

$$\begin{aligned} \int (f + g) d\mu &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int (f_n + g_n) d\mu \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n d\mu \\ &= \int f d\mu + \int g d\mu \end{aligned}$$

and so  $f + g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ .

Next if  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $\{cf_n\}$  is a sequence of simple integrable functions which are mean cauchy such that  $cf_n \rightarrow cf$  pointwise almost everywhere, then

$$\int cf d\mu = c \int f = c \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int cf_n d\mu$$

thus  $cf \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ .

Finally if  $\{O_n\}$  is a sequence of simple integrable functions which are mean cauchy such that  $O_n \rightarrow 0$  pointwise almost everywhere, then

$$0 = \int 0 d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int O_n d\mu$$

and so  $0 \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ .

$\therefore \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  is a vector space.  $\square$

**Lemma 71.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $\{f_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in measure, or almost uniformly, or pointwise almost everywhere, then  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in mean.

*Proof.* For each fixed  $n$   $\{f_m - f_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions such that

$$f_m - f_n \rightarrow f - f_n$$

in measure, or almost uniformly, or pointwise almost everywhere, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f_n\|_1 &= \int \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|f_m - f_n\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

Given  $\epsilon > 0$  choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n, m > N \implies \|f_m - f_n\|_1 < \epsilon$$

that is for  $n > N$  we have

$$\|f - f_n\|_1 < \epsilon$$

and so  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in mean.  $\square$

**Proposition 72.** If  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , then  $\text{car}(f)$  is  $\sigma$ -finite.

*Proof.* Since  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ ,  $\exists$  a mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of simple integrable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere. Let

$$E_n = \text{car}(f_n)$$

then since the  $f_n$ 's are simple integrable functions we have

$$\mu(E_n) < \infty$$

then

$$\text{car}(f) \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{car}(f_n) < \infty$$

and so  $\text{car}(f)$  is  $\sigma$ -finite.  $\square$

**Proposition 73.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , then  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists E \in \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$\mu(E) < \infty$$

and

$$\left\| \int_{X \setminus E} f(x) d\mu(x) \right\|_B < \epsilon$$

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable, and from Lemma 71 this implies convergence in mean so from our mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of simple integrable functions choose  $f_n$  such that

$$\|f - f_n\|_1 = \int \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) < \epsilon$$

since  $f_n$  is a simple integrable function we have

$$\mu(\text{car}(f_n)) < \infty$$

so let  $E = \text{car}(f_n)$ , then since  $f_n(x) = 0 \forall x \in X \setminus E = E^c$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_{X \setminus E} f(x) d\mu(x) \right\|_B &= \left\| \int_{X \setminus E} f(x) d\mu(x) - 0 \right\|_B \\ &= \left\| \int_{X \setminus E} (f(x) - f_n(x)) d\mu(x) \right\|_B \\ &\leq \int_{X \setminus E} \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_X \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &= \|f - f_n\|_1 \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Proposition 74 (Absolute Continuity).** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , then  $\forall \epsilon > 0$ ,  $\exists \delta > 0$  such that if

$$\mu(E) < \delta$$

then

$$\|\mu_f(E)\|_B < \epsilon$$

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given and choose a simple integrable function  $g$  such that

$$\|f - g\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

and select  $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2\|g\|_\infty}$  that is

$$\mu(E) < \frac{\epsilon}{2\|g\|_\infty}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_f(E)\|_B &= \|\mu_f(E) - \mu_g(E) + \mu_g(E)\|_B \\ &\leq \|\mu_f(E) - \mu_g(E)\|_B + \|\mu_g(E)\|_B \\ &= \left\| \int_E f(x) d\mu(x) - \int_E g(x) d\mu(x) \right\|_B + \left\| \int_E g(x) d\mu(x) \right\|_B \\ &\leq \int_E \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_E \|g(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_X \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_E \|g\|_\infty d\mu(x) \\ &= \|f - g\|_1 + \|g\|_\infty \mu(E) \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \|g\|_\infty \frac{\epsilon}{2\|g\|_\infty} \\ &= \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 75.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. If  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , then  $\mu_f$  is a  $B$ -valued measure on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* To do this we must show that  $\mu_f$  is countably additive. First we note that for any  $g, f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  and any  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mu_f(E) - \mu_g(E)\|_B &= \left\| \int_E f(x) d\mu(x) - \int_E g(x) d\mu(x) \right\|_B \\ &\leq \int_E \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_X \|f(x) - g(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &= \|f - g\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

let  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu(E) < \infty$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, and let

$$E = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$$



since  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable, by Lemma 71 this implies convergence in mean so from our mean cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}$  of simple integrable functions choose  $f_n$  such that

$$\|f - f_n\|_1 = \int \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

since  $f_n$  is a simple integrable function  $\mu_{f_n}$  is countably additive, so choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$m > N \implies \left\| \mu_{f_n}(E) - \mu_{f_n}\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i\right) \right\|_B < \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

and so for  $m > N$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mu_f(E) - \mu_f\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i\right) \right\|_B \\ & \leq \left\| \mu_f(E) - \mu_{f_n}(E) \right\|_B + \left\| \mu_{f_n}(E) - \mu_{f_n}\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i\right) \right\|_B + \left\| \mu_{f_n}\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i\right) - \mu_f\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i\right) \right\|_B \\ & = \left\| \int_E f(x) d\mu(x) - \int_E f_n(x) d\mu(x) \right\|_B + \left\| \mu_{f_n}(E) - \mu_{f_n}\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i\right) \right\|_B \\ & \quad + \left\| \int_{\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i} f_n(x) d\mu(x) - \int_{\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i} f(x) d\mu(x) \right\|_B \\ & < \int_E \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \int_{\bigsqcup_{i=1}^m E_i} \|f_n(x) - f(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ & \leq \int_X \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \int_X \|f_n(x) - f(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ & < \|f - f_n\|_1 + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \|f_n - f\|_1 \\ & < \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \\ & = \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

□

**Theorem 76 (Lebesgue Dominated Convergence).** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space, and let  $\{f_n\} \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ ; i.e. a sequence of  $\mu$ -integrable functions, that converge pointwise almost everywhere to a function  $f$ . Suppose there  $\exists g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\|f_n(x)\|_B \leq g(x)$$

for all  $n$  and for all  $x$ , or almost everywhere for each  $n$ . Then  $\{f_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence. And so  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $f$  in mean,  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , and

$$\int f d\mu = \lim \int f_n d\mu$$

*Proof.* Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, then since  $g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  Proposition 73 says  $\exists E \in \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$\mu(E) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \int_{X \setminus E} g(x) d\mu(x) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{6}$$

then  $\forall n, m$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X \setminus E} \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) &\leq \int_{X \setminus E} (\|f_m(x)\|_B + \|f_n(x)\|_B) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{X \setminus E} \|f_m(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_{X \setminus E} \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_{X \setminus E} g(x) d\mu(x) + \int_{X \setminus E} g(x) d\mu(x) \quad \text{since } \|f_n(x)\|_B \leq g(x) \quad \forall n \\ &= 2 \int_{X \setminus E} g(x) d\mu(x) \\ &< 2 \frac{\epsilon}{6} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{3} \end{aligned}$$

Next, since  $g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  we also have that the indefinite integral  $\mu_g$  is absolutely continuous, so we may choose  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $G \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\mu(G) < \delta \implies |\mu_g(G)| = \left| \int_G g(x) d\mu(x) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{6}$$

Now, since  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere and  $\mu(E) < \infty$ , Egoroff's Theorem then says that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly on  $E$ . Therefore we may choose  $F \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $F \subseteq E$  such that

$$\mu(E \setminus F) < \delta$$

and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F$ . Then  $\forall n, m$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) &\leq \int_{E \setminus F} (\|f_m(x)\|_B + \|f_n(x)\|_B) d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_m(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\leq \int_{E \setminus F} g(x) d\mu(x) + \int_{E \setminus F} g(x) d\mu(x) \quad \text{since } \|f_n(x)\|_B \leq g(x) \quad \forall n \\ &= 2 \int_{E \setminus F} g(x) d\mu(x) \\ &= 2\mu_g(E \setminus F) \\ &< 2 \frac{\epsilon}{6} \\ &= \frac{\epsilon}{3} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly on  $F$  we may choose  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n, m \geq N \implies \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B < \frac{\epsilon}{3\mu(F)}$$

then  $\forall x \in F$  and  $\forall n, m > N$  we have

$$\int_F \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) < \int_F \frac{\epsilon}{3\mu(F)} d\mu(x) = \frac{\epsilon}{3\mu(F)} \mu(F) = \frac{\epsilon}{3}$$

and so, for all  $n, m > N$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_n - f_m\|_1 &= \int_X \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &= \int_{X \setminus E} \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) + \int_{E \setminus F} \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &\quad + \int_F \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|_B d\mu(x) \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} + \frac{\epsilon}{3} \\ &= \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

And thus,  $\{f_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence.

Now, since  $\{f_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere then  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable, or  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  and

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

where Lemma 71 then says that  $\{f_n\}$  converges to  $f$  in mean.  $\square$

**Proposition 77.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space, and let  $f$  be a  $\mu$ -measurable  $B$ -valued function. If  $\exists g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\|f(x)\|_B \leq g(x)$$

almost everywhere, then  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ ; i.e.  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable.

*Proof.* Since  $f$  is  $\mu$ -measurable,  $\exists \{f_n\}$  of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost everywhere. For each  $n$  choose

$$E_n = \left\{ x \in X : 2g(x) - \|f_n(x)\|_B \geq 0 \right\}$$

and define

$$h_n(x) = \begin{cases} f_n(x), & \|f_n(x)\|_B \leq 2g(x) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

then

$$h_n = f_n \chi_{E_n}$$

since  $g \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  we have  $\text{car}(g)$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, and so, by construction, for each  $E_n$  we have

$$\mu(E_n) < \infty$$

and so each  $h_n$  is a simple integrable function, and  $\{h_n\} \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ . And note, since  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost everywhere, and the  $h_n$ 's are defined in terms of the  $f_n$ 's this implies that  $h_n \rightarrow f$  almost everywhere, or pointwise almost everywhere. Then since

$$\|h_n(x)\|_B \leq 2g(x)$$

for all  $n$  and for all  $x$ , Lebesgue Dominated Convergence says that  $\{h_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions and therefore the limit function  $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 78 (Monotone Convergence Theorem).** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space, and let  $\{f_n\} \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $f_n \geq 0$  and is non-decreasing; i.e.

$$f_{n+1} \geq f_n \quad \forall n$$

if  $\exists C \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\|f_n\|_1 = \int f_n(x) d\mu(x) < C \quad \forall n$$

then  $\{f_n\}$  is a mean cauchy sequence and  $\exists f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise almost everywhere. That is

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

*Proof.* Since  $f_n \leq f_{n+1} \quad \forall n$  we have

$$\int f_n(x) d\mu \leq \int f_{n+1}(x) d\mu \quad \forall n$$

and since

$$\int f_n(x) d\mu(x) < C \quad \forall n$$

we have  $\{\int f_n d\mu\}$  is a sequence which converges and so is cauchy.

Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given, then  $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$n, m > N \implies \left| \int f_n(x) d\mu - \int f_m(x) d\mu \right| < \epsilon$$

so let  $n > m$ , then since  $f_k > 0 \forall k$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int f_n(x) d\mu - \int f_m(x) d\mu \right| &= \left| \int (f_n(x) - f_m(x)) d\mu \right| \\ &= \int |f_n(x) - f_m(x)| d\mu \\ &= \|f_n - f_m\|_1 \\ &< \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and so  $\{f_n\}$  is mean cauchy. Then since  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  is complete,  $\exists f \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu = \int f d\mu$$

□

**Theorem 79 (More general Monotone Convergence Theorem).** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space with Banach space  $\mathbb{R}$ , and let  $\{f_n\} \in \mathcal{S}$  satisfying

$$0 \leq f_1(x) \leq f_2(x) \leq \cdots f_n(x) \leq \cdots \quad \forall x \in X$$

let

$$f(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x)$$

then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$  and  $\int f d\mu$  both exist and

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

*Proof.* First, since  $f$  is the pointwise limit of measurable functions and

$$f \geq 0$$

$f$  is measurable and

$$\int f d\mu$$

exists in  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ .

Since  $\{f_n(x)\}$  is a monotone increasing sequence and each  $f_n \geq 0$ , the same is true for  $\{\int f_n d\mu\}$ , and so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

exists in  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . Moreover we have

$$\int f_n d\mu \leq \int f_{n+1} d\mu \leq \int f d\mu \quad \forall n$$

and so

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu \leq \int f d\mu$$

For the reverse inequality let

$$g : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$$

be a simple measurable function such that

$$0 \leq g \leq f$$

and fix  $0 < t < 1$ . Then defining

$$E_n = \{x \in X : f_n(x) \geq tg(x)\}$$

we have an increasing sequence of measurable sets such that

$$E_1 \subseteq E_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq X$$

Then, for any  $x \in X$  if

$$f(x) = 0 \implies f_n(x) = 0 \forall n$$

and since  $g \leq f$  we also have

$$tg(x) = 0 \implies x \in E_n \forall n$$

if  $f(x) > 0$ , then

$$f(x) \geq g(x) \implies f(x) > tg(x) \quad \text{since } 0 < t < 1$$

and since  $f_n \rightarrow f$  monotonically  $f_n(x) > tg(x)$  eventually, thus  $x \in E_n$  for some  $n$ . And so, for any  $x \in X$  we have that

$$x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n \implies \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n = X$$

then for every  $n$  we have

$$\int_X f_n d\mu \geq \int_{E_n} f_n d\mu \geq t \int_{E_n} g d\mu$$

and since  $\int_{E_n} g d\mu = \mu_g(E_n)$  where  $\mu_g$  is a measure and hence countably additive, so disjointizing the  $E_n$ 's if necessary, and by the simplicity of  $g = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \chi_{A_i}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_g(E_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \mu(A_i \cap E_n) \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \mu(A_i \cap X) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \mu(A_i) \\ &= \int_X g d\mu \end{aligned}$$

giving

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n d\mu \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t \int_{E_n} g d\mu = t \int_X g d\mu$$

then since  $t \in (0, 1)$  is arbitrary we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n d\mu \geq \int_X g d\mu$$

and since  $g \leq f$  is an arbitrary simple function, taking

$$\sup_g \{g \in \mathcal{S} : 0 \leq g \leq f\}$$

we get

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n d\mu \geq \int_X f d\mu$$

and thus we can conclude

$$\int f d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

□

**Lemma 80 (Fatou's Lemma).** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space, and let  $\{f_n\} \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $f_n \geq 0 \forall n$ . Then

$$\int \liminf \{f_n\} d\mu \leq \liminf \int f_n d\mu$$

*Proof.* Set

$$g_n(x) = \inf \{f_i(x) : n \leq i < \infty\}$$

then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x) = \liminf f_n(x)$$

and since  $g_1(x) \leq g_2(x) \leq \dots$  we have  $\{g_n\}$  is non-decreasing, or monotonic, and so the general version of the Monotone Convergence Theorems says

$$\int \liminf f_n(x) d\mu = \int \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(x) d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n(x) d\mu$$

yet, since  $g_n(x) \leq f_n(x)$  pointwise  $\forall n$  we then have

$$\int g_n(x) d\mu \leq \int f_n(x) d\mu \quad \forall n$$

and thus,

$$\liminf \int f_n(x) d\mu \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int g_n(x) d\mu = \int \liminf f_n(x) d\mu$$

and so we have

$$\int \liminf \{f_n\} d\mu \leq \liminf \int f_n d\mu$$

□

**Theorem 81.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space and  $B$  a Banach space. For  $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ , if  $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^p(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  then  $f+g \in \mathcal{L}^p(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , and so  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  is a vector space of functions.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(x) + g(x)\|^p &\leq (\|f(x)\| + \|g(x)\|)^p \\ &\leq (2 \max\{\|f(x)\|, \|g(x)\|\})^p \\ &\leq 2^p (\|f(x)\|^{p-1} + \|g(x)\|^{p-1}) \in \mathcal{L}^1 \end{aligned}$$

and so  $\|f(x) + g(x)\|^p$  is dominated by an integrable function and so must also be integrable by Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem.  $\square$

**Proposition 82.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  be measure space with Banach space  $\mathbb{R}$ , and let  $f \in \mathcal{L}^2(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{C})$ . Then

$$x \mapsto |f(x)|^2 \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$$

and  $\mathcal{L}^2(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{C})$  satisfies Cauchy-Schwartz; i.e. for  $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^2(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{C})$

$$|\langle f, g \rangle| \leq \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2$$

*Proof.* For  $r, s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (r - s)^2 = r^2 - 2rs + s^2 \\ \implies 2rs &\leq r^2 + s^2 \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$2 \left| \int f(x) \overline{g(x)} d\mu(x) \right| \leq \int |f(x)|^2 d\mu(x) + \int |g(x)|^2 d\mu(x) \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$$

and so by Lebesgue Dominated Convergence  $x \mapsto |f(x) \overline{g(x)}| \in \mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R})$ . So set

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \int f(x) \overline{g(x)} d\mu(x)$$

then

$$2 |\langle f, g \rangle| \leq \int |f(x)|^2 d\mu(x) + \int |g(x)|^2 d\mu(x) = \|f\|_2^2 + \|g\|_2^2$$

if, in addition,  $\|f\|_2 = 1$  and  $\|g\|_2 = 1$ , then

$$|\langle f, g \rangle| \leq 1$$

so for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{L}^2(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{C})$  scale by setting  $f = \frac{f}{\|f\|_2}$  and  $g = \frac{g}{\|g\|_2}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\langle f, g \rangle|}{\|f\|_2 \|g\|_2} &\leq 1 \\ \implies |\langle f, g \rangle| &\leq \|f\|_2 \|g\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$