

# 202A: Introduction to Topology and Analysis

Nir Elber

Fall 2022

# CONTENTS

---

<b>Contents</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1 Metric Spaces</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 August 24	5
1.1.1 Administrative Notes	5
1.1.2 Metric Spaces	6
1.1.3 Norms on Vector Spaces	7
1.1.4 A Hint of $L^p$ Spaces	10
1.2 August 26	11
1.2.1 Isometries	11
1.2.2 Lipschitz Continuity	13
1.2.3 Fun with Continuity	15
1.2.4 Convergence and Completeness	16
1.2.5 Existence of Completions	18
1.2.6 Uniqueness of Completions	20
1.3 August 29	22
1.3.1 Some Examples	22
<b>I Topology</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>2 Building Topologies</b>	<b>26</b>
2.1 August 29	26
2.1.1 Metric Topology	26
2.1.2 Open Sets	28
2.2 August 31	30
2.2.1 Intersections of Topologies	30
2.2.2 Sub-bases	31
2.2.3 Bases	34
2.2.4 Induced Topologies	36
2.3 September 2	37
2.3.1 Closed Sets	37
2.3.2 Closures	38
2.3.3 The Product Topology	40
2.3.4 Comments on the Dual Space	43
2.4 September 7	45
2.4.1 Quotient Spaces	45

2.4.2	Homeomorphism	47
2.4.3	Group Actions	48
<b>3</b>	<b>Building Functions</b>	<b>50</b>
3.1	September 9	50
3.1.1	Normal Spaces	50
3.1.2	Urysohn's Lemma: Metric Spaces	52
3.1.3	Urysohn's Lemma: The General Case	53
3.2	September 12	54
3.2.1	Urysohn's Lemma: The General Case	54
3.2.2	Bounded Functions	55
3.3	September 14	57
3.3.1	The Tietze Extension Theorem	57
3.4	September 16	59
3.4.1	The Tietze Extension Theorem: Proof	59
3.4.2	Existence of Completions, Again	60
<b>4</b>	<b>Compactness</b>	<b>61</b>
4.1	September 16	61
4.1.1	Compactness	61
4.2	September 19	63
4.2.1	Compact Hausdorff Spaces	63
4.2.2	Compact Images	65
4.2.3	Compactness via Closed Sets	66
4.3	September 21	67
4.3.1	Comments on Choice	67
4.4	September 23	69
4.4.1	Tychonoff's Theorem	69
4.5	September 26	71
4.5.1	Remarks on Tychonoff's Theorem	71
4.5.2	Tychonoff's Theorem and Choice	72
4.6	September 28	73
4.6.1	Totally Bounded Spaces	73
4.6.2	Nets	75
4.6.3	A "Metric" Completeness	76
4.7	September 30	77
4.7.1	Totally Bounded for Function Spaces	77
4.7.2	Arzelà–Ascoli's Theorem	78
4.8	October 3	79
4.8.1	Locally Compact Spaces	79
4.8.2	Supports	81
<b>II</b>	<b>Measure Theory</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Defining Measures</b>	<b>85</b>
5.1	October 5	85
5.1.1	Evaluation Maps	85
5.1.2	The Gelfand–Naimark Theorem	86
5.1.3	Finitely Additive Measures	87
5.2	October 7	89
5.2.1	$\sigma$ -Things	89
5.2.2	Measures	91
5.2.3	Premeasures	92

5.3	October 10	93
5.3.1	The Lebesgue Premeasure	93
5.4	October 12	96
5.4.1	Premeasure Subtraction	96
5.4.2	Finite Subadditivity	97
<b>6</b>	<b>Building Measures</b>	<b>99</b>
6.1	October 14	99
6.1.1	Countable Subadditivity	99
6.1.2	Hereditary Rings	100
6.1.3	Outer Measures	102
6.2	October 17	104
6.2.1	Restricting Outer Measures	104
6.2.2	Completeness	107
6.3	October 21	107
6.3.1	Miscellaneous Outer Measures	107
6.3.2	Uniqueness of Extensions	109
6.4	October 24	110
6.4.1	Continuity Properties	110
6.4.2	Borel Measures	112
6.4.3	The Haar Measure	114
6.5	October 26	115
6.5.1	A Non-measurable Set	115
<b>7</b>	<b>Integration</b>	<b>117</b>
7.1	October 26	117
7.1.1	Simple Measurable Functions	117
7.1.2	Simple Integrable Functions	121
7.2	October 28	122
7.2.1	Measurable Functions	122
7.2.2	Properties of Simple Measurable Functions	123
7.2.3	Properties Preserved by Limits	125
7.3	October 31	127
7.3.1	A Better Measurable	127
7.4	November 2	128
7.4.1	Some Measurable Facts	128
7.4.2	Integrating Simple Functions	129
7.4.3	Convergence in Measure	132
7.5	November 4	133
7.5.1	Sequences Converging in Measure	134
7.5.2	Restricting Measurable Functions	137
7.5.3	Almost Uniform Convergence	139
7.6	November 7	142
7.6.1	Rapidly Cauchy Intermission	142
7.6.2	The Riesz–Weyl Theorem	143
7.7	November 9	144
7.7.1	Integrable Functions	144
7.7.2	Completeness of $\mathcal{L}^1$	146
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>147</b>
	<b>List of Definitions</b>	<b>148</b>

# THEME 1

## METRIC SPACES

---

*My personal view on spaces is that every space I ever work with is either metrizable or is the Zariski topology.*

—Evan Chen, [Che22]

### 1.1 August 24

Good morning everyone. This is my first class of the semester.

#### 1.1.1 Administrative Notes

Here are some housekeeping remarks.

- The webpage for this class is [math.berkeley.edu/~rieffel/202AannF22.html](https://math.berkeley.edu/~rieffel/202AannF22.html).
- The midterm date is negotiable. We will have a vote on Friday. The possible dates are Friday 14 October, Monday 17 October, or Wednesday 19 October.
- There will be no vote on the final exam. It is on 15 December at 7PM.
- Homework will be due Fridays by midnight, approximately every week.
- There is no particular text for this course, and any given text covers more than we have time for. That said, we will (very) loosely follow [Lan12], but it is helpful to have a number of different expositions around.
- Please wear a mask during lectures and office hours.

Here is a summary of the course.

- We will spend the next couple of lectures talking about metric spaces.
- We will then spend the first half of the course on general topology. The second half of the course will be on measure and integration.
- Throughout we will see a little on functional analysis.

### 1.1.2 Metric Spaces

Hopefully we remember something about metric spaces. Here's the definition.

**Definition 1.1 (Metric).** A metric  $d$  on a set  $X$  is a function  $d: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  satisfying the following rules for any  $x, y, z \in X$ .

- (a) Zero:  $d(x, x) = 0$ .
- (b) Zero:  $d(x, y) = 0$  implies  $x = y$ .
- (c) Symmetry:  $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ .
- (d) Triangle inequality:  $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$ .

We call  $(X, d)$  a *metric space*.

**Remark 1.2.** It is occasionally helpful to think about a “reversed” triangle inequality: note  $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$  implies  $d(x, z) - d(x, y) \leq d(y, z)$ . Similarly,  $d(x, y) - d(x, z) \leq d(y, z)$ , so it follows

$$|d(y, x) - d(x, z)| \leq d(y, z).$$

We will want some “almost” metrics as well. Here are their names.

**Definition 1.3 (Semi-metric).** A semi-metric  $d$  on a set  $X$  satisfies (a), (c), and (d) of Definition 1.1. We call  $(X, d)$  a *semi-metric space*.

**Definition 1.4 (Extended metric).** An extended metric  $d$  on a set  $X$  is a function  $d: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\infty}$  satisfying (a)–(d) of Definition 1.1. We call  $(X, d)$  an *extended metric space*.

Intuitively, we might want extended metrics if we have points that we never want to be able to get to from other ones.

We can turn spaces with a semi-metric into a space with a metric.

**Lemma 1.5.** Fix a semi-metric space  $(X, d)$ , and define the relation  $\sim$  on  $X$  by  $x \sim y$  if and only if  $d(x, y) = 0$ . Then  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation.

*Proof.* We run these checks by hand. Fix any  $x, y, z \in X$ .

- Reflexive:  $d(x, x) = 0$  means that  $x \sim x$ .
- Symmetry: if  $x \sim y$ , then  $d(x, y) = 0$ , so  $d(y, x) = 0$ , so  $y \sim x$ .
- Transitive: if  $x \sim y$  and  $y \sim z$ , then

$$0 \leq d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z) = 0,$$

so  $d(x, z) = 0$ , so  $x \sim z$ . ■

As such, given a semi-metric space  $(X, d)$ , we may look at the set of equivalence classes under  $\sim$ , which we will denote  $X/\sim$ .<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The notation of  $/\sim$  is intended to make us think of quotients.

**Proposition 1.6.** Fix a semi-metric space  $(X, d)$  and define  $\sim$  as in Lemma 1.5. Then  $d$  naturally descends to a metric  $\tilde{d}$  on  $X/\sim$ .

*Proof.* Let  $[x]$  denote the equivalence class of  $x \in X$  under  $\sim$ . We claim that the function

$$\tilde{d}([x], [y]) := d(x, y)$$

is a well-defined metric. We have the following checks; fix any  $x, y, z \in X$ .

- Well-defined: if  $x \sim x'$  and  $y \sim y'$ , then note that

$$d(x, y) \leq d(x, x') + d(x', y) = d(x', y) \leq d(x', y') + d(y', y) = d(x', y').$$

By symmetry, we also have  $d(x', y') \leq d(x, y)$ , so equality follows. So  $d$  does descent properly to the quotient  $X/\sim$ .

- Zero: note that  $\tilde{d}([x], [y]) = 0$  if and only if  $d(x, y) = 0$  if and only if  $x \sim y$  if and only if  $[x] = [y]$ .
- Symmetry: note that

$$\tilde{d}([x], [y]) = d(x, y) = d(y, x) = \tilde{d}([y], [x]).$$

- Triangle inequality: note that

$$\tilde{d}([x], [z]) = d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z) = \tilde{d}([x], [y]) + \tilde{d}([y], [z]),$$

which finishes. ■

Here are some examples of metric spaces.

**Example 1.7.** Given a connected graph  $G = (V, E)$  with a weighting function  $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , we can build a metric as follows: define the “shortest-path” function  $d: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  sending two vertices  $v, w \in V$  to the length of the shortest path. If the graph  $G$  is not connected, we merely have an extended metric.

**Example 1.8 (Euclidean metric).** The function  $d: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$

$$d((x_1, \dots, x_n), (y_1, \dots, y_n)) := \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - y_i)^2}$$

is a metric.

Observe that it is not completely obvious that Example 1.8 satisfies the triangle inequality, but this will follow from the theory of the next subsections.

### 1.1.3 Norms on Vector Spaces

Norms provide convenient ways to build metrics.

**Definition 1.9 (Norm).** Fix a vector space  $V$  over a normed field  $(k, |\cdot|)$ . A norm  $\|\cdot\|: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a function satisfying the following, for any  $r \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $v, w \in V$ .

- Zero:  $\|0\| = 0$ .
- Zero: if  $\|v\| = 0$ , then  $v = 0$ .
- Scaling:  $\|rv\| = |r| \cdot \|v\|$ .
- Triangle inequality:  $\|v + w\| \leq \|v\| + \|w\|$ .

**Remark 1.10.** We can probably work with a more general normed field instead of “merely”  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ .

There is also an analogous notion of “semi-norm.”

**Definition 1.11 (Semi-norm).** Fix a vector space  $V$  over  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ . A *semi-norm*  $\|\cdot\| : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  is a function satisfying (a), (c), and (d) of [Definition 1.9](#).

And here is our result.

**Proposition 1.12.** Given a vector space  $V$  with a (semi-)norm  $\|\cdot\| : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , then the function

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

defines a (semi-)metric on  $V$ .

*Proof.* We run the checks directly. Let  $x, y, z \in V$  be points. Quickly, we note that  $d(x, y) = \|x - y\| \geq 0$  by hypothesis on  $\|\cdot\|$ .

(a) Zero: note that  $d(x, x) = 0$  because  $d(x, x) = \|x - x\| = \|0\| = 0$ .

(b) Zero: if  $d(x, y) = 0$ , then  $\|x - y\| = 0$ , so  $x - y = 0$ , so  $x = y$ .

(c) Symmetry: note that

$$d(x, y) = \|x - y\| = |-1| \cdot \|y - x\| = 1 \cdot \|y - x\| = d(y, x).$$

(d) Triangle inequality: note that

$$d(x, z) = \|x - z\| = \|(x - y) + (y - z)\| \leq \|x - y\| + \|y - z\| = d(x, y) + d(y, z),$$

which finishes the check.

Thus, if  $\|\cdot\|$  is a full norm, then  $d$  is a full metric. But if  $\|\cdot\|$  is only a semi-norm satisfying (a), (c), and (d) of [Definition 1.9](#), then the corresponding  $d$  only satisfies (a), (c), and (d) of [Definition 1.1](#) and makes a semi-metric. ■

As an aside, we note that what’s nice about semi-norms is that they will “algebraically” encode the equivalence relation of [Lemma 1.5](#).

**Proposition 1.13.** Fix a vector space  $V$  over a normed field  $(k, |\cdot|)$  and a semi-norm  $\|\cdot\|$  on  $V$ . Then the set  $N := \{v \in V : \|v\| = 0\}$  is a subspace of  $V$ . In fact, the semi-norm  $\|\cdot\|$  descends to a well-defined norm on  $V/N$ .

*Proof.* To show that  $N \subseteq V$  is a subspace, we pick up  $v, w \in N$  and scalars  $r, s \in k$ . Then we note

$$\|rv + sw\| \leq \|rv\| + \|sw\| = |r| \cdot \|v\| + |s| \cdot \|w\| = 0,$$

so it follows  $\|rv + sw\| = 0$  and so  $rv + sw \in N$ .

It remains to descend  $\|\cdot\|$  to  $V/N$ . Here are our checks; fix  $v, w \in V$  and  $r \in k$ .

- Well-defined: if  $v + N = w + N$ , we need  $\|v\| = \|w\|$ . Well,  $v + N = w + N$  tells us that there is some  $z \in N$  with  $v = w + z$  and so

$$\|v\| = \|w + z\| \leq \|w\| + \|z\| = \|w\|.$$

Similarly,  $v + (-z) = w$  implies that  $\|w\| \leq \|v\|$ , so  $\|v\| = \|w\|$  follows.



- **Zero:** note that  $v + N = 0 + N$  implies that  $\|v + N\| = \|0 + N\| = \|0\| = 0$ .
- **Zero:** if  $\|v + N\| = 0$ , then  $\|v\| = 0$ , so  $v \in N$ , so  $v + N = 0 + N$ .
- **Scaling:** note  $\|r(v + N)\| = \|rv + N\| = \|rv\| = |r| \cdot \|v\| = |r| \cdot \|v + N\|$ .
- **Triangle inequality:** note  $\|(v + N) + (w + N)\| = \|(v + w) + N\| = \|v + w\| \leq \|v\| + \|w\| = \|v + N\| + \|w + N\|$ .

■

Here are the usual examples.

**Example 1.14.** Set  $V := \mathbb{R}^n$  or  $V := \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then the following are norms on  $V$ .

- $\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_2 := (\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2)^{1/2}$ .
- $\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_1 := \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$ .

Here are some more esoteric examples.

**Example 1.15.** Set  $V := \mathbb{R}^n$  or  $V := \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then

$$\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_\infty := \sup\{|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|\}$$

provides a norm on  $V$ .

**Example 1.16.** Set  $V := \mathbb{R}^n$  or  $V := \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then, given  $p \geq 1$ ,

$$\|(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|_p := \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

provides a norm on  $V$ .

**Remark 1.17.** Taking the limit as  $p \rightarrow \infty$  of  $\|f\|_p$  gives  $\|f\|_\infty$ . This justifies the notation.

**Remark 1.18.** Despite having lots of examples, all of these norms are equivalent in a topological sense.

These normed vector spaces actually allow us to define a metric on any subset.

**Proposition 1.19.** Given a metric space  $(X, d)$  and a subset  $Y \subseteq X$ , the restriction of  $d$  to  $Y \times Y$  is a metric.

*Proof.* All the requirements for  $d$  on  $Y \times Y$  are satisfied for any points in  $X$ , so we are done by doing no work. ■

**Example 1.20.** Any subset  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  has an induced metric by restricting the (say) Euclidean metric.

### 1.1.4 A Hint of $L^p$ Spaces

Here is a more complicated example of a metric.

**Example 1.21.** Define  $V := C([0, 1])$  to be the  $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space of  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued (or  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued) continuous functions on  $[0, 1]$ . The following are norms.

- $\|f\|_\infty := \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in [0, 1]\}$ .
- $\|f\|_1 := \int_0^1 |f(t)| dt$ .
- $\|f\|_2 := \left(\int_0^1 |f(t)|^2 dt\right)^{1/2}$ .
- More generally, given  $p \geq 1$

$$\|f\|_p := \left(\int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt\right)^{1/p}.$$

These integrals are finite because  $[0, 1]$  is compact, forcing  $f$  to achieve a finite maximum on  $[0, 1]$ .

**Remark 1.22.** We can tell the same story for  $C(X)$ , for any measurable compact space  $X$ .

**Remark 1.23.** Note the analogy of [Example 1.21](#) with [Example 1.16](#). To see this more rigorously, set  $X$  to be the finite set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  so that  $C(X) = \mathbb{R}^n$ .

We should probably justify the claims of this subsection, so here is our result.

**Proposition 1.24.** Define  $V := C([0, 1])$  to be the vector space of  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued (or  $\mathbb{C}$ -valued) continuous functions on  $[0, 1]$ . Then, given  $p \geq 1$ , the function  $\|\cdot\|_p : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  by

$$\|f\| := \left(\int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt\right)^{1/p}$$

is a norm.

*Proof.* We run the checks directly.

- Zero: if  $f = 0$ , then of course  $\int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt = 0$ .
- Zero: suppose that  $f \in C([0, 1])$  has  $f(t_0) \neq 0$  for any  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$ ; set  $y := f(t_0)$ . Then  $f^{-1}((y/2, 3y/2))$  is a nonempty open subset of  $X$  and hence contains a nonempty open interval  $(a, b)$  with  $a < b$ . As such,

$$\int_X |f(t)|^p dt \geq \int_a^b |f(t)|^p dt \geq \int_a^b |y/2|^p dt > 0,$$

so we are done.

- Scaling: given  $f \in C([0, 1])$  and a scalar  $r$ , we have

$$\|rf\| = \left(\int_0^1 |rf(t)|^p dt\right)^{1/p} = \left(|r|^p \int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt\right)^{1/p} = |r| \cdot \|f\|.$$

- Triangle inequality: we borrow from [Tao09]. Given  $f, g \in C([0, 1])$ , for psychological reasons we will assume that  $f$  and  $g$  are nonzero (else this is clear); then  $\|f\|, \|g\| \neq 0$ , so we may scale everything so that  $\|f\| + \|g\| = 1$ . In fact, we may again use scaling to find  $a, b \in V$  such that

$$f = (1 - \theta)a \quad \text{and} \quad g = \theta b$$

where  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  and  $\|a\| = \|b\| = 1$ . Now, the triangle inequality translates into showing

$$\int_0^1 |(1-\theta)a(t) + \theta b(t)|^p dt = \|(1-\theta)a + \theta b\|_p^p \stackrel{?}{\leq} \left( \|(1-\theta)a\|_p + \|\theta b\|_p \right)^p = 1.$$

Well, because  $p \geq 1$ , the function  $t \mapsto t^p$  is convex, so we get to write

$$\int_0^1 |(1-\theta)a(t) + \theta b(t)|^p dt \leq (1-\theta) \int_0^1 |a(t)|^p dt + \theta \int_0^1 |b(t)|^p dt,$$

which is what we wanted.

The above checks complete the proof; note that the proof of the triangle inequality was nontrivial. ■

**Remark 1.25.** Now, to show [Remark 1.23](#), replace all  $\int_0^1$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n$  and adjust all the language accordingly. The point is that “integrating over  $[0, 1]$ ” is analogous to “integrating over  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ .” A more thorough understanding of measure theory will allow us to rigorize this.

Next class we will talk about completeness.

## 1.2 August 26

Today we’re talking about completeness of metric spaces.

### 1.2.1 Isometries

In mathematics, we are interested in objects not in isolation but as they relate to each other. Namely, we are interested also in the maps between our objects.

The philosophy here comes from category theory, where one is really most interested in the “morphisms” between “objects” instead of the objects themselves. For concreteness, here is a definition of a category.

**Definition 1.26 (Category).** A category  $\mathcal{C}$  consists of a class of objects  $\text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$  and class of morphisms  $\text{Mor } \mathcal{C}$  such that any two objects  $A, B \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$  have a morphism class  $\text{Mor}(A, B)$ . This data satisfy the following properties.

- Composition: given objects  $A, B, C \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$ , there is a binary composition operation

$$\circ: \text{Mor}(B, C) \times \text{Mor}(A, B) \rightarrow \text{Mor}(A, C).$$

Explicitly, given  $f \in \text{Mor}(A, B)$  and  $g \in \text{Mor}(B, C)$ , there is a composition  $(g \circ f) \in \text{Mor}(A, C)$ .

- Given  $A \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{C}$ , there is an identity morphism  $\text{id}_A \in \text{Mor}(A, A)$ .
- Identity: any  $f \in \text{Mor}(A, B)$  has  $f \circ \text{id}_A = f = \text{id}_B \circ f$ .
- Associativity: any  $f \in \text{Mor}(A, B)$  and  $g \in \text{Mor}(B, C)$  and  $h \in \text{Mor}(C, D)$  has  $(h \circ g) \circ f = h \circ (g \circ f)$ .

**Example 1.27.** There is a category of groups, where the morphisms are group homomorphisms. The identity function gives the identity morphism, and composition of functions gives the required composition.

For completeness, we check that composition is well-defined: given homomorphisms  $f: A \rightarrow B$  and  $g: B \rightarrow C$ , we need  $(g \circ f): A \rightarrow C$  to be a group homomorphism. Well,

$$(g \circ f)(a \cdot a') = g(f(a \cdot a')) = g(f(a) \cdot f(a')) = g(f(a)) \cdot g(f(a')) = (g \circ f)(a) \cdot (g \circ f)(a').$$

In our discussion of metric spaces, there are many possible kinds of morphisms for us to consider. Here is the strongest type.

**Definition 1.28 (Isometry).** Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , an *isometry* is a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  preserving the metric as

$$d_Y(f(x), f(x')) = d_X(x, x').$$

**Example 1.29.** The  $90^\circ$  rotation  $r: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  given by  $r(x, y) \mapsto (y, -x)$  is an isometry, where  $\mathbb{R}^2$  is given the Euclidean metric. Indeed, any  $(x, y), (x', y') \in \mathbb{R}^2$  have

$$\begin{aligned} d(r(x, y), r(x', y')) &= d((y, -x), (y', -x')) \\ &= \sqrt{(y - y')^2 + (-x - -x')^2} \\ &= \sqrt{(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2} \\ &= d((x, y), (x', y')). \end{aligned}$$

**Notation 1.30.** Fix two metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ . Given a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  with extra structure respecting some aspect of the metric, we might write  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  to emphasize this.

To show that isometries are valid morphisms, we need to check that the identity function  $\text{id}_X: X \rightarrow X$  is an isometry (which of course it is) and that the composition of two isometries is an isometry. We check this last one in a quick lemma.

**Lemma 1.31.** Given two isometries  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  and  $g: (Y, d_Y) \rightarrow (Z, d_Z)$ , the composition  $g \circ f$  is an isometry.

*Proof.* Well, any two points  $x, x' \in X$  have

$$d_Z(g(f(x)), g(f(x'))) = d_Y(f(x), f(x')) = d_X(x, x'),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

One can restrict further to surjective isometries, where the main point is that (again) the composition of two surjective functions remains surjective. (Note that the identity is of course surjective.) The following is the reason why a surjective isometry is a good notion.

**Lemma 1.32.** A surjective isometry  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  is bijective, and its inverse function is also an isometry.

*Proof.* To see that  $f$  is bijective, we only need to know that  $f$  is injective. Well, given  $x, x' \in X$ , note that  $f(x) = f(x')$  if and only if  $d_Y(f(x), f(x')) = 0$  if and only if  $d_X(x, x') = 0$  if and only if  $x = x'$ .<sup>2</sup>

Thus,  $f$  is indeed bijective; let  $g: Y \rightarrow X$  be its inverse. We now need to show that  $g$  is an isometry. Well, given  $y, y' \in Y$ , we may find  $x, x' \in X$  such that  $f(x) = y$  and  $f(x') = y'$ . Then

$$d_X(g(y), g(y')) = d_X((g \circ f)(x), (g \circ f)(x')) = d_X(x, x') \stackrel{*}{=} d_Y(f(x), f(x')) = d_Y(y, y'),$$

where in  $\stackrel{*}{=}$  we have used the fact that  $f$  is an isometry. ■

<sup>2</sup> In fact, this argument shows that all isometries are injective. We will shortly see that all actually Lipschitz continuous functions are injective.

**Remark 1.33.** The above result is somewhat subtle in its importance: the inverse function of a bijection is only an inverse in the category of sets. The above result is saying that this inverse morphism in the category of sets is lifting to an inverse morphism in the category of metric spaces with isometries as morphisms. In general, it is not always true that bijective morphisms are invertible, as we shall soon see.

### 1.2.2 Lipschitz Continuity

Isometries are somewhat restrictive, so we might weaken this as follows.

**Definition 1.34** (Lipschitz continuous). Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a *Lipschitz continuous* if and only if there is a constant  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq c \cdot d_X(x, x').$$

**Remark 1.35.** Equivalently, we are asking for the ratio

$$\frac{d_Y(f(x), f(x'))}{d_X(x, x')}$$

to be uniformly bounded above for all  $x \neq x'$ . Notably, the inequality is trivially satisfied whenever  $x = x'$ , or equivalently whenever  $d(x, x') = 0$ .

**Example 1.36.** Any isometry  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  is Lipschitz continuous: indeed, set  $c := 1$  so that, for any  $x, x' \in X$ ,

$$d_Y(f(x), f(x')) = d_X(x, x') \leq 1 \cdot d_X(x, x').$$

**Example 1.37.** Provide  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{R}^2$  their usual Euclidean metrics. Then the projection  $\pi: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\pi: (x, y) \mapsto x$  is Lipschitz continuous: indeed, set  $c := 1$  so that, for any  $(x, y), (x', y') \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , we have

$$d_{\mathbb{R}^2}((x, y), (x', y')) = \sqrt{(x - x')^2 + (y - y')^2} \geq \sqrt{(x - x')^2} = d_{\mathbb{R}}(x, x') = d_{\mathbb{R}}(\pi((x, y)), \pi((x', y'))).$$

Again, one can see that the identity function  $\text{id}_X: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (X, d_X)$  is Lipschitz continuous (with  $c := 1$ ), and here is our composition check.

**Lemma 1.38.** If  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  and  $g: (Y, d_Y) \rightarrow (Z, d_Z)$  are Lipschitz continuous, then the composition  $(g \circ f): (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Z, d_Z)$  is also Lipschitz continuous.

*Proof.* We are given constants  $c$  and  $d$  such that any  $x, x' \in X$  and  $y, y' \in Y$  have

$$d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq c \cdot d_X(x, x') \quad \text{and} \quad d_Z(g(y), g(y')) \leq d \cdot d_Y(y, y').$$

As such, we use the constant  $cd$  to witness our Lipschitz continuity: any  $x, x' \in X$  have

$$d_Z(g(f(x)), g(f(x'))) \leq d \cdot d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq cd \cdot d_X(x, x'),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

It will be shortly worth our time to talk about the constant  $c$  appearing in [Definition 1.34](#).

**Lemma 1.39.** Fix a Lipschitz continuous function  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$ . Then there exists a constant  $c_f$  (possibly  $-\infty$ ) such that any real number  $c \geq c_f$  is equivalent to the following property: any  $x, x' \in X$  have

$$d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq c \cdot d_X(x, x').$$

*Proof.* Let  $S$  denote the set of all constants  $c$  such that any  $x, x' \in X$  have

$$d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq c \cdot d_X(x, x').$$

Equivalently, using [Remark 1.35](#),  $S$  is the set of upper-bounds for

$$R := \left\{ \frac{d_Y(f(x), f(x'))}{d_X(x, x')} : x, x' \in X, x \neq x' \right\}.$$

Now,  $S$  is nonempty because  $f$  is Lipschitz continuity, so we set  $c_f := \sup R$  to be the least upper bound for  $R$ —observe that  $c_f = -\infty$  is permissible when  $X$  has one point. It is now pretty clear that  $S = [c_f, \infty)$ . ■

Note that  $c_f$  the property stated in the lemma automatically implies that  $c_f$  is the least possible constant and is unique. Being least is immediate (by the backwards direction), and being unique follows from being least. So because we have some uniqueness, we get a definition.

**Definition 1.40 (Lipschitz constant).** Given a Lipschitz continuous function  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$ , the *Lipschitz constant*  $c_f$  for  $f$  is the least real number  $c$  such that

$$d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq c \cdot d_X(x, x').$$

We could, as before, look at surjective Lipschitz continuous functions, but these need not be bijective anymore as shown by [Example 1.37](#). What's worse is that, as warned possible in [Remark 1.33](#), bijective Lipschitz continuous functions need not even have a Lipschitz continuous inverse.

**Exercise 1.41.** We exhibit a function between metric spaces which is bijective and Lipschitz continuous, but its inverse function is not Lipschitz continuous.

*Proof.* Set  $X := (0, 1)$  and  $Y := (1, \infty)$ , both metric spaces with the Euclidean (subspace) metric, and set  $f: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  by  $f: x \mapsto 1/x$ . Notably,  $x \in X$  implies  $f(x) \in Y$ , and  $y \in Y$  implies  $f(y) \in X$ .

- Note  $f|_Y$  is bijective with inverse  $f|_X$  because  $f(f(x)) = f(1/x) = x$  for all  $x \in (0, \infty)$ .
- Note  $f|_Y$  is Lipschitz continuous: set  $c := 1$  and note that any  $y, y' \in Y$  have

$$|f(y) - f(y')| = \left| \frac{1}{y} - \frac{1}{y'} \right| = \left| \frac{y - y'}{yy'} \right| \leq |y - y'|.$$

- But  $f|_X$  is not Lipschitz continuous: suppose for contradiction that  $f|_X$  is Lipschitz continuous, and use [Lemma 1.39](#) to recover the needed constant  $c_0$ . Then set  $c := \max\{c_0, 4\}$ , which must also work as a constant, and set  $x := 1/c$  and  $x' := 1/(3c)$  so that

$$|f(x) - f(x')| = |c - 3c| = 2c > c \cdot |x - x'|.$$

This is a contradiction, so we are done. ■

**Remark 1.42 (Nir).** In some sense, the problem here is that the definition of Lipschitz continuity allows  $d_Y(f(x), f(x'))$  to be “too small,” which permits the inverse function to have distances which blow up.

In light of [Exercise 1.41](#), we introduce a new definition.

**Definition 1.43** (Lipschitz isomorphism). Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a *Lipschitz isomorphism* if and only if  $f$  is Lipschitz continuous and has an inverse function which is also Lipschitz continuous.

**Remark 1.44.** A good reason to care about this notion of continuity (and isomorphism) is that all normed  $\mathbb{R}$ -vector spaces of some finite dimension  $n$  are Lipschitz isomorphic.

### 1.2.3 Fun with Continuity

Here is yet a weaker notion of morphism.

**Definition 1.45** (Uniformly continuous). Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is *uniformly continuous* if and only if every  $\varepsilon > 0$  has some  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$d_X(x, x') < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \varepsilon$$

for all  $x, x' \in X$ .

**Example 1.46.** Any Lipschitz continuous function  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  is also uniformly continuous: indeed, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , set  $\delta := \max\{c_f, 1\}\varepsilon > 0$  (where  $c_f$  is the Lipschitz constant) so that

$$d_X(x, x') < \varepsilon \implies d_Y(f(x), f(x')) \leq c_f \cdot d(x, x') < \delta.$$

**Example 1.47.** Give  $[0, 1]$  the Euclidean (subspace) metric, and set  $f: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by  $f(x) := \sqrt{x}$ .

- Note  $f$  is uniformly continuous because it is continuous on a compact set.
- However,  $f$  is not Lipschitz continuous: for any constant  $c > 0$ , set  $x = 1/(c+1)^2$  and  $x' = 0$  so that

$$\left| \frac{f(x) - f(x')}{x - x'} \right| = \left| \frac{1/(c+1)}{1/(c+1)^2} \right| = |c+1| > c,$$

so [Remark 1.35](#) tells us that we are not Lipschitz continuous.

By rearranging quantifiers, we get another useful (but weaker) notion.

**Definition 1.48** (Continuous). Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is *continuous at  $x \in X$*  if and only if all  $\varepsilon > 0$  have some  $\delta_x > 0$  such that

$$d_X(x, x') < \delta_x \implies d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \varepsilon.$$

Then  $f$  is *continuous* if and only if it is continuous at all  $x \in X$ .

**Example 1.49.** All uniformly continuous functions  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  are continuous. Indeed, at any  $x_0 \in X$  with  $\varepsilon > 0$ , uniform continuity promises  $\delta > 0$  so that

$$|x - x'| < \delta \implies |f(x) - f(x')| < \varepsilon$$

for all  $x, x' \in X$ . Setting  $x'$  to  $x_0$  recovers continuity.

**Example 1.50.** Give  $\mathbb{R}$  the usual Euclidean metric, and set  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f(x) := x^2$ .

- Note  $f(x)$  is continuous because it is a polynomial.
- However,  $f(x)$  is not uniformly continuous: take  $\varepsilon = 1$ . Now, for any  $\delta > 0$ , set  $x = 1/\delta$  and  $x' = 1/\delta + \delta/2$  so that  $|x - x'| < \delta$ , but

$$|f(x) - f(x')| = \left(\frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{\delta^2} = 1 + \frac{\delta^2}{4} > \varepsilon.$$

As usual, the identity function is uniformly continuous and continuous (it's an isometry), and these continuities are preserved by composition. We will have a different way to see that continuous functions remain continuous under composition later, so for now we will focus on uniform continuity.

**Lemma 1.51.** Fix uniformly continuous morphisms  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  and  $g: (Y, d_Y) \rightarrow (Z, d_Z)$ . Then the function  $(g \circ f)$  is uniformly continuous.

*Proof.* For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the uniform continuity of  $g$  promises  $\delta_g > 0$  such that

$$d_Y(y, y') < \delta_g \implies d_Z(g(y), g(y')) < \varepsilon$$

for any  $y, y' \in Y$ . Continuing, the uniform continuity of  $f$  promises  $\delta_f > 0$  such that

$$d_X(x, x') < \delta_f \implies d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \delta_g \implies d_Z(g(f(x)), g(f(x'))) < \varepsilon$$

for any  $x, x' \in X$ , which is what we wanted. ■

**Remark 1.52.** In some sense, isometries and Lipschitz continuous functions have their definition fundamentally interrelated with the metric. In contrast, the weaker notion of continuity will readily generalize to general topological spaces. Uniform continuity also generalizes to “uniformities,” which is a different notion.

## 1.2.4 Convergence and Completeness

To discuss completeness, we need to talk about convergence.

**Definition 1.53 (Converge).** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . A sequence of points  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$  converges to  $x \in X$  if and only if, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find  $N > 0$  such that

$$n > N \implies d(x_n, x) < \varepsilon.$$

We might write this as “ $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ” or “ $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$ .” In this event, we may say that the sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges, and its limit is  $x$ .

**Remark 1.54 (Nir).** As a sanity check, the limit of a sequence is unique: if  $x_n \rightarrow x$  and  $x_n \rightarrow x'$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then any  $\varepsilon > 0$  can find some large  $n$  so that  $d(x_n, x), d(x_n, x') < \varepsilon/2$ . As such,

$$d(x, x') < d(x_n, x) + d(x_n, x') = \varepsilon$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , so  $d(x, x') = 0$  and thus  $x = x'$  is forced.

We have no reason yet to be convinced that any of our morphisms described previously are good notions, so let's start with continuity.



**Lemma 1.55.** Fix a continuous function between metric spaces  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$ . Then, if the sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$  converges to  $x \in X$ , then the sequence  $\{f(x_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq Y$  converges to  $f(x) \in Y$ .

*Proof.* For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the continuity of  $f$  implies that we can find  $\delta_x > 0$  so that

$$d_X(x_n, x) < \delta_x \implies d_Y(f(x_n), f(x)) < \varepsilon$$

for any  $x_n$ . But the fact that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  means that there is  $N > 0$  so that

$$n > N \implies d_X(x_n, x) < \delta_x \implies d_Y(f(x_n), f(x)) < \varepsilon,$$

so indeed,  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . ■

In fact, the converse also holds.

**Lemma 1.56.** Fix metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , and fix a point  $x \in X$ . Then suppose a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  satisfies that any convergent sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  has  $f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then  $f$  is continuous at  $x$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by contraposition. If  $f$  is not continuous at  $x$ , then any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  can find  $x_n$  such that  $d_X(x, x_n) < 1/n$  even though  $d_Y(f(x_n), f(x)) \geq 1$ . In particular,  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (for any  $\varepsilon$ , choose  $N = 1/\varepsilon$ ), but the sequence  $\{f(x_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  does not converge to  $f(x)$  because no  $n$  has  $d_Y(f(x), f(x_n)) < 1$ . ■

We would like a notion of convergence which only uses data internal to the sequence, and this leads to the following definition.

**Definition 1.57 (Cauchy).** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . A sequence of points  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$  is a *Cauchy sequence* if and only if, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find  $N > 0$  such that

$$n, m > N \implies d(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon.$$

It would be rude if continuity was always the best kind of morphism, so this time around preserving Cauchyness requires something stronger.

**Lemma 1.58.** Fix a uniformly continuous function between metric spaces  $f: (X, d_X) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$ . Then, if the sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$  is Cauchy, then the sequence  $\{f(x_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq Y$  is also Cauchy.

*Proof.* For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the uniform continuity of  $f$  promises  $\delta > 0$  so that

$$d_X(x_n, x_m) < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x_n), f(x_m)) < \varepsilon$$

for any  $x_n, x_m$ . However, the fact that  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy promises  $N$  so that

$$n, m > N \implies d_X(x_n, x_m) < \delta \implies d_Y(f(x_n), f(x_m)) < \varepsilon,$$

which is what we wanted. ■

**Example 1.59.** Continuous functions do not need to preserve Cauchy sequences:  $f: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  by  $f(x) := 1/x$  is continuous, and the sequence  $\{1/n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq (0, \infty)$  is Cauchy (it converges to 0 in  $\mathbb{R}$ ) even though  $\{f(1/n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \{n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  certainly does not converge.

Anyway, it is quick to check that convergent sequences are Cauchy.

**Lemma 1.60.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then all convergent sequences are Cauchy.

*Proof.* Suppose that the sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq X$  converges to  $x \in X$ . Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , find  $N$  so that

$$d(x_n, x) < \varepsilon/2$$

for all  $n > N$ . Then any  $n, m > N$  has

$$d(x_n, x_m) \leq d(x_n, x) + d(x_m, x) < \varepsilon,$$

so the sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy. ■

We in general hope that our Cauchy sequences converge. As such, we have the following definition.

**Definition 1.61 (Complete).** A metric space  $(X, d)$  is *complete* if and only if every Cauchy sequence in  $X$  converges to a point in  $X$ .

We are sad when a metric space is not complete, so we hope to have a way to make it complete. The most natural way to do this is by using the notion of density.

**Definition 1.62 (Dense).** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then  $S \subseteq X$  is *dense* if and only if, given any  $x \in X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we may find  $x' \in S$  with  $d(x, x') < \varepsilon$ .

And here is our completion.

**Definition 1.63 (Completion).** A *completion* of the metric space  $(X, d)$  is a metric space  $(\overline{X}, \overline{d})$  equipped with an isometry  $\iota: X \rightarrow \overline{X}$  such that  $(\overline{X}, \overline{d})$  is complete and  $\text{im } \iota$  is dense in  $\overline{X}$ .

One can show that any metric space has a completion and that they are all isometric and therefore in some sense the same. We'll do these separately.

## 1.2.5 Existence of Completions

Let's start with existence.

**Theorem 1.64.** Any metric space  $(X, d)$  has a completion.

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{X}$  denote the set of all Cauchy sequences in  $X$ . We hope to make  $\tilde{X}$  into our completion, but this requires a little care. To begin, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.65.** Given a metric space  $(X, d)$  with two Cauchy sequences  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , then the sequence

$$\{d(x_n, y_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$$

converges.

*Proof.* Because  $\mathbb{R}$  is a complete metric space, it suffices to show that the sequence  $\{d(x_n, y_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy. Well, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , find a sufficiently large  $N$  so that

$$n, m > N \implies d(x_n, x_m), d(y_n, y_m) < \varepsilon/2.$$

Then any  $n, m > N$  has

$$d(x_n, y_n) \leq d(x_n, x_m) + d(x_m, y_m) + d(y_m, y_n) < \varepsilon + d(y_m, y_n),$$

and  $d(x_m, y_m) < d(x_n, y_n) + \varepsilon$  as well by symmetry. It follows that any  $n, m > N$  has

$$|d(x_n, y_n) - d(x_m, y_m)| < \varepsilon,$$

verifying that our sequence is Cauchy. ■

**Remark 1.66.** Here is a quick motivational remark for the definition of our metric below: if  $(X, d)$  is a metric space with  $x_n \rightarrow x$  and  $y_n \rightarrow y$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then we claim  $d(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow d(x, y)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Indeed, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find  $N$  large enough so that  $d(x_n, x), d(y_n, y) < \varepsilon/2$  for any  $n > N$ . As such,

$$d(x_n, y_n) \leq d(x_n, x) + d(x, y) + d(y, y_n) < d(x, y) + \varepsilon.$$

By symmetry, we get  $d(x, y) \leq d(x_n, y_n) + \varepsilon$  as well, finishing.

Thus, we define  $\tilde{d}: \tilde{X} \times \tilde{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  by

$$\tilde{d}(\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n).$$

We claim that  $\tilde{d}$  is a semi-metric on  $\tilde{X}$ . We have the following checks; fix Cauchy sequences  $\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}, \{z_n\}$ .

- Zero: note

$$\tilde{d}(\{x_n\}, \{x_n\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_n) = 0.$$

- Symmetry: note

$$\tilde{d}(\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(y_n, x_n) = \tilde{d}(\{y_n\}, \{x_n\}).$$

- Triangle inequality: note

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}(\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}) + \tilde{d}(\{y_n\}, \{z_n\}) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, y_n) + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(y_n, z_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (d(x_n, y_n) + d(y_n, z_n)) \\ &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, z_n) \\ &= \tilde{d}(\{x_n\}, \{z_n\}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have implicitly used a number of limit laws.

So because  $\tilde{d}$  is a semi-metric, [Proposition 1.6](#) tells us that  $\tilde{d}$  will descend naturally to a metric  $\bar{d}$  on  $\bar{X} := \tilde{X}/\sim$ , where  $\{x_n\} \sim \{y_n\}$  if and only if  $\tilde{d}(\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}) = 0$ . We will let  $[\{x_n\}]$  denote the equivalence class of the Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\} \in \tilde{X}$  in  $\bar{X}$ .

We now show that  $(\bar{X}, \bar{d})$  can be made into a completion for  $X$ .

- Given  $x \in X$ , note that the constant sequence  $\{x\}$  is Cauchy (for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , set  $N = 0$ ), so we define  $\iota: X \rightarrow \bar{X}$  by

$$\iota(x) := [\{x\}].$$

To see that  $\iota$  is an isometry, note any  $x, x' \in X$  have

$$\bar{d}(\iota(x), \iota(x')) = \tilde{d}(\{x\}, \{x'\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x, x') = d(x, x').$$

- We show that  $\text{im } \iota$  is dense in  $\bar{X}$ . Indeed, fix some  $[\{x_n\}] \in \bar{X}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then there is some  $N$  so that  $n, m > N$  has

$$d(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon/2.$$

Fixing a particular  $n_0$  with  $n_0 > N$ , we set  $x := x_{n_0}$  so that

$$\bar{d}([\{x_n\}], \iota(x)) = \tilde{d}(\{x_n\}, \{x_{n_0}\}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(x_n, x_{n_0}).$$

Now, for  $n > N$ , we have  $d(x_n, x_{n_0}) < \varepsilon/2$ , so we conclude that this limit must be less than  $\varepsilon$ .

- We show that  $(\overline{X}, \overline{d})$  is a complete metric space. Fix a Cauchy sequence  $\{\overline{x}_k\}$  in  $\overline{X}$ . To find the Cauchy sequence we are supposed to converge to, we use our density result: for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we can find  $y_k \in X$  such that  $\overline{d}(\overline{x}_k, \iota(y_k)) < 1/k$ .

We claim that  $\{y_k\}$  is Cauchy. Indeed, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find  $N$  such that  $k, \ell > N_0$  has

$$\overline{d}(\overline{x}_k, \overline{x}_\ell) < \varepsilon/3.$$

Then, setting  $N := \max\{3/\varepsilon, N_0\}$ , we note that  $k, \ell > N$  has

$$d(y_k, y_\ell) = \overline{d}(\iota(y_k), \iota(y_\ell)) \leq \overline{d}(\overline{x}_k, \iota(y_k)) + \overline{d}(\overline{x}_\ell, \iota(y_\ell)) + \overline{d}(\overline{x}_k, \overline{x}_\ell) < \varepsilon.$$

Lastly, we claim that  $\overline{x}_k \rightarrow [\{y_n\}]$  in  $\overline{X}$ . Indeed, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , find some sufficiently large  $N$  so that

$$k, \ell > N \implies d(y_k, y_\ell) < \varepsilon/2.$$

Then  $k > \max\{N, 2/\varepsilon\}$  has

$$\overline{d}(\overline{x}_k, [\{y_n\}]) \leq \overline{d}(\overline{x}_k, \iota(y_k)) + \overline{d}([\{y_n\}], \iota(y_k)) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(y_n, y_k).$$

Because  $k > N$ , we have  $d(y_n, y_k) < \varepsilon/2$  for any  $n > N$ , so the entire right-hand side must be upper-bounded by  $\varepsilon$ . This finishes.

The above checks complete the proof. ■

**Remark 1.67 (Nir).** One might complain that we used the completeness of  $\mathbb{R}$  in this proof because one common way to construct the real numbers is as the completion of  $\mathbb{Q}$  under the Euclidean metric. To remedy this, one ought to define the equivalence relation on Cauchy sequences more directly, saying that two Cauchy sequences  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{y_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of real numbers are equivalent under  $\sim$  if and only if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{\mathbb{R}}(x_n, y_n) = 0.$$

### 1.2.6 Uniqueness of Completions

We now show that any two completions of a metric space  $(X, d)$  are isometric, which is our uniqueness result. Here is the main intermediate result.

**Lemma 1.68.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$  and a completion  $(\overline{X}, \overline{d})$  with its isometry  $\iota: (X, d) \rightarrow (\overline{X}, \overline{d})$ . Then, for any complete metric space  $(Y, d')$  and isometry  $\varphi: (X, d) \rightarrow (Y, d')$ , there is a unique isometry  $\psi: (\overline{X}, \overline{d}) \rightarrow (Y, d')$  making the following diagram commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \overline{X} \\ & \searrow \varphi & \downarrow \psi \\ & & Y \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We start by showing the uniqueness of  $\psi$ . Well, for any  $\overline{x} \in \overline{X}$ , note that any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  allows us to find  $x_n \in X$  with

$$\overline{d}(\overline{x}, \iota(x_n)) < 1/n$$

because  $\text{im } \iota$  is dense in  $\overline{X}$ . Now, we notice that  $\iota(x_n) \rightarrow \overline{x}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because any  $\varepsilon > 0$  can set  $N = 1/\varepsilon$ . As such, we see that Lemma 1.55 applied to any possible  $\psi: \overline{X} \rightarrow Y$  forces

$$\psi(\overline{x}) = \psi\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iota(x_n)\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \psi(\iota(x_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n).$$

Note that, a priori, we do not know if the sequence  $\{\varphi(x_n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges, but this argument tells us that it must; the limit is unique by [Remark 1.54](#), so  $\psi(\bar{x})$  is unique as well.

We now show that  $\psi$  exists. As before, any  $\bar{x} \in \bar{X}$  can find a sequence  $\{x_n\} \subseteq X$  such that  $\iota(x_n) \rightarrow \bar{x}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, we note that  $\{\varphi(x_n)\}$  is Cauchy by [Lemma 1.58](#), so the completeness of  $Y$  gives it a limit; we set

$$\psi(\bar{x}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n).$$

We have the following checks on  $\psi$ .

- Well-defined: if we have two sequences  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{x'_n\}$  such that  $\iota(x_n) \rightarrow x$  and  $\iota(x'_n) \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we need to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x'_n).$$

For brevity, set  $y$  and  $y'$  to be the limits of  $\{\varphi(x_n)\}$  and  $\{\varphi(x'_n)\}$ , respectively. Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we note that there is a sufficiently large  $N$  such that

$$n > N \implies d_Y(y, \varphi(x_n)), d_Y(y', \varphi(x'_n)) < \varepsilon/4.$$

Further, we can make  $N$  even larger so that

$$n > N \implies \bar{d}(\bar{x}, \iota(x_n)), \bar{d}(\bar{x}, \iota(x'_n)) < \varepsilon/4.$$

As such, any  $n > N$  has

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(y, y') &\leq d_Y(y, \varphi(x_n)) + d_Y(\varphi(x_n), \varphi(x'_n)) + d_Y(y', \varphi(x'_n)) \\ &< \varepsilon/4 + d_X(x_n, x'_n) + \varepsilon/4 \\ &= \varepsilon/2 + \bar{d}(\iota(x_n), \iota(x'_n)) \\ &\leq \varepsilon/2 + \bar{d}(\bar{x}, \iota(x_n)) + \bar{d}(\bar{x}, \iota(x'_n)) \\ &< \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

It follows  $d_Y(y, y') = 0$ , so  $y = y'$ .

- Isometry: given  $\bar{x}, \bar{x}' \in \bar{X}$ , find sequences  $\{x_n\}$  and  $\{x'_n\}$  in  $X$  so that  $\iota(x_n) \rightarrow \bar{x}$  and  $\iota(x'_n) \rightarrow \bar{x}'$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_Y(\psi(\bar{x}), \psi(\bar{x}')) &= d_Y\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x_n), \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x'_n)\right) \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_Y(\varphi(x_n), \varphi(x'_n)) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_X(x_n, x'_n) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{d}(\iota(x_n), \iota(x'_n)) \\ &= \bar{d}\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iota(x_n), \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \iota(x'_n)\right) \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} \bar{d}(\bar{x}, \bar{x}'), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used [Remark 1.66](#) at the  $\stackrel{*}{=}$ .

- For any  $x \in X$ , we see that the (constant) Cauchy sequence  $\{\iota(x)\}$  converges to  $\iota(x)$ , so

$$\psi(\iota(x)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x) = \varphi(x).$$

It follows  $\psi \circ \iota = \varphi$ .

Thus, we have finished establishing the existence of an isometry  $\psi: \bar{X} \rightarrow Y$  such that  $\varphi = \psi \circ \iota$ . ■

**Remark 1.69.** One can also replace all isometries with uniformly continuous functions in the statement.

And here is our uniqueness result.

**Theorem 1.70.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$  and two completions  $\iota: (X, d) \rightarrow (\overline{X}, \overline{d})$  and  $\iota': (X, d) \rightarrow (\overline{X}', \overline{d}')$ . Then there is a surjective isometry  $\psi: (\overline{X}, \overline{d}) \rightarrow (\overline{X}', \overline{d}')$ .

*Proof.* Applying [Lemma 1.68](#) twice, we get isometries  $\psi: (\overline{X}, \overline{d}) \rightarrow (\overline{X}', \overline{d}')$  and  $\psi': (\overline{X}', \overline{d}') \rightarrow (\overline{X}, \overline{d})$  making the following diagrams commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \overline{X} \\ & \searrow \iota' & \downarrow \psi \\ & & \overline{X}' \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\iota'} & \overline{X}' \\ & \searrow \iota & \downarrow \psi' \\ & & \overline{X} \end{array}$$

In particular, we see that  $\psi' \circ \psi$  makes the following diagram commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \overline{X} \\ & \searrow \iota & \downarrow \psi' \circ \psi \\ & & \overline{X} \end{array}$$

However, using [Lemma 1.68](#) again, this isometry  $\psi' \circ \psi$  is unique to make the diagram commute, and we could of course put the isometry  $\text{id}_{\overline{X}}$  here if we wanted to. Thus,

$$\psi' \circ \psi = \text{id}_{\overline{X}}.$$

By symmetry,  $\psi \circ \psi' = \text{id}_{\overline{X}'}$ , so we do see that  $\psi$  and  $\psi'$  are inverse isometries. This finishes the proof. ■

## 1.3 August 29

Good morning everyone.

### 1.3.1 Some Examples

Let's give some more examples of metric spaces. Let's start with spaces of continuous functions.

**Definition 1.71.** Given a (normed) topological field  $k$ , such as  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ , we denote the  $k$ -vector space of  $k$ -valued continuous function from a topological space  $X$  as  $C(X)$ . By convention, we will take  $k = \mathbb{C}$  unless otherwise specified.

And here are our two examples. The first is of a complete metric space.

**Exercise 1.72.** Give  $V := C([0, 1])$  the uniform norm

$$\|f\|_{\infty} := \sup\{|f(t)| : t \in [0, 1]\}.$$

Then  $V$  is complete.

*Proof.* This is merely the statement that a sequence of continuous functions which are uniformly Cauchy will converge uniformly to a continuous function. We will prove this for completeness. Fix a sequence of

continuous function  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which are Cauchy with respect to  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . In other words, for each  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N_\varepsilon$  so that

$$n, m > N_\varepsilon \implies \|f_n - f_m\|_\infty < \varepsilon,$$

which means that  $|f_n(t) - f_m(t)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$ .

In particular, for any fixed  $t \in [0, 1]$ , the sequence  $\{f_n(t)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in  $\mathbb{R}$  (using the same  $N_\varepsilon$ ), so we use the completeness of  $\mathbb{R}$  to let this sequence converge to  $f(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ . We have the following checks.

- To see that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (under our metric), select any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and then find  $N$  so that

$$n, m > N \implies \|f_n - f_m\|_\infty < \varepsilon/3.$$

Further, for any  $t \in [0, 1]$ , we see that we can find a large enough  $n_t > N$  so that  $|f(t) - f_{n_t}(t)| < \varepsilon/3$ . But then  $n > N$  has

$$|f_n(t) - f(t)| \leq |f_n(t) - f_{n_t}(t)| + |f_{n_t}(t) - f(t)| < 2\varepsilon/3,$$

so  $\|f - f_n\|_\infty \leq 2\varepsilon/3 < \varepsilon$ .

- To see that  $f$  is continuous, fix  $t \in [0, 1]$  so that we want to show  $f$  is continuous at  $t$ . Well, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , find  $N$  large enough so that

$$n, m > N \implies \|f_n - f_m\|_\infty < \varepsilon/4.$$

Now, select  $n_t > N$  large enough so that  $|f(t) - f_{n_t}(t)| < \varepsilon/4$ , and the continuity of  $f_{n_t}$  promises us  $\delta > 0$  so that

$$|t - t'| < \delta \implies |f_{n_t}(t) - f_{n_t}(t')| < \varepsilon/4.$$

In particular, for any  $t'$  with  $|t - t'| < \delta$ , find  $n_{t'} > N$  large enough so that  $|f(t') - f_{n_{t'}}(t')| < \varepsilon/4$ , and then we see

$$|f(t) - f(t')| \leq |f(t) - f_{n_t}(t)| + |f_{n_t}(t) - f_{n_t}(t')| + |f_{n_t}(t') - f_{n_{t'}}(t')| + |f_{n_{t'}}(t') - f(t')| < \varepsilon,$$

which is what we wanted. ■

The second example is the same space, but it is no longer complete.

**Example 1.73.** Fix  $p \geq 1$  finite. Give  $V := C([0, 1])$  the  $L^p$  norm as


$$\|f\|_p := \left( \int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt \right)^{1/p}.$$

Then  $V$  is not complete.

*Proof.* For each  $n \geq 2$ , define  $f_n$  as the piecewise continuous function

$$f_n(t) := \begin{cases} 0 & 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ n(t - \frac{1}{2}) & \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n}, \\ 1 & \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n} \leq t \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Here is the image.



The point is that  $f_n$  is trying to converge to a discontinuous function. To help us with the proof here, we pick up the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.74.** Fix  $V := C([0, 1])$  and some finite  $p \geq 1$ . If we have a convergent sequence  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  in the  $\|\cdot\|_p$  metric, and  $f_n(t) = g(t)$  for all sufficiently large  $n$  and  $t \in U$  for some open  $U \subseteq C([0, 1])$ , then  $f|_U(t) = g(t)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose for the sake of contradiction that we have  $t_0 \in U$  with  $f(t_0) \neq g(t_0)$ ; we show that  $\{f_n\}$  does not converge to  $f$ . Set  $\varepsilon := |f(t_0) - g(t_0)|$ , which is nonzero. The continuity of  $f - g$  now promises that there is  $\delta > 0$  for which

$$|t - t_0| < \delta \implies |(f - g)(t_0) - (f - g)(t)| < \varepsilon/2,$$

so in particular  $|(f - g)(t)| \geq \varepsilon/2$ . It follows that, for sufficiently large  $n$ , we have

$$\|f - f_n\|_p^p = \int_0^1 |f(t) - f_n(t)|^p dt \geq \int_U |(f - g)(t)|^p dt \geq \int_{U \cap (t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta)} \frac{\varepsilon^p}{2^p} dt.$$

Because  $U \cap (t_0 - \delta, t_0 + \delta)$  is open, it has nonzero measure, so this entire right-hand quantity is nonzero, thus violating that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . ■

Now suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for some  $f \in V$ . Then, using  $U = (0, 1/2)$ , we conclude that  $f(t) = 0$  for all  $t \in (0, 1/2)$ . Similarly, for any  $n$ , we set  $U_n = (1/2 + 1/n, 1)$ , so  $f_m|_{U_n}$  returns 1 always for sufficiently large  $m$ ; this then implies  $f(t) = 1$  for any  $t \in U_n$  for any  $n$ , so  $f(t) = 1$  for any  $t \in (1/2, 1)$ .

However, the sequences  $a_n := \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n}$  and  $b_n := \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n}$  (for  $n \geq 3$ ) have  $a_n \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$  and  $b_n \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$  both as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  while the continuity of  $f$  would require

$$0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(a_n) = f(1/2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f(b_n) = 1,$$

which is a contradiction. ■

**Remark 1.75.** In an attempt to make this metric space complete, we can try to specify which functions we want to look at, which motivates the theory of measure and integration.

**Remark 1.76.** The  $\|\cdot\|_2$  norm on  $C(X)$  for some (say) subset  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  with finite measure as coming from an inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle := \int_X f(t) \overline{g(t)} dt.$$

When  $\|\cdot\|_2$  is complete, we would then get a Hilbert space, which are very nice normed vector spaces, and we'll see more of them in Math 202B.

**Remark 1.77** (Nir). In contrast to the finite case, we see that the  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  norm induces a different (metric) topology on  $C([0, 1])$  than the  $\|\cdot\|_p$  norms with  $p$  finite because the former is complete while the latter are not. In fact, all the norms  $\|\cdot\|_p$  induce different topologies on  $C([0, 1])$ .



**PART I**

# **TOPOLOGY**

## THEME 2

# BUILDING TOPOLOGIES

---

Sets are not doors.

—Munkres

## 2.1 August 29

We continue lecture by shifting to topology.

### 2.1.1 Metric Topology

We close our discussion of metric spaces with a taste of topology. Recall the following definition.

**Definition 1.48 (Continuous).** Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is *continuous at*  $x \in X$  if and only if all  $\varepsilon > 0$  have some  $\delta_x > 0$  such that

$$d_X(x, x') < \delta_x \implies d_Y(f(x), f(x')) < \varepsilon.$$

Then  $f$  is *continuous* if and only if it is continuous at all  $x \in X$ .

We are going to want to extend this definition to more general topological spaces. To step in that direction, we will want to talk about open sets, so we start with open balls.

**Definition 2.1 (Ball).** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then the *open ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $x_0 \in X$*  is

$$B(x_0, r) := \{x \in X : d(x, x_0) < r\}.$$

The *closed ball* is  $\overline{B(x_0, r)} := \{x \in X : d(x, x_0) \leq r\}$ .

We can now restate continuity as follows.

**Definition 2.2 (Continuous).** Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is *continuous at*  $x \in X$  if and only if, given any nonempty open ball  $B(f(x_0), \varepsilon)$ , there exists a nonempty open ball  $B(x_0, \delta)$  such that

$$f(B(x_0, \delta)) \subseteq B(f(x_0), \varepsilon).$$

Namely, we've really only restated our inequalities.

To continue our generalization, we define the pre-image.

**Definition 2.3 (Pre-image).** Fix a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ . Then we define the *pre-image*  $f^{-1}: \mathcal{P}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X)$  by

$$f^{-1}(B) := \{x \in X : f(x) \in B\}.$$

Note that our pre-image notation matches with the notation of an inverse function. In general, no confusion will arise by confusing these two.

As such, let's restate continuity again: observe that  $A \subseteq X$  and  $B \subseteq Y$  has  $f(A) \subseteq B$  if and only if all  $a \in A$  have  $f(a) \in B$  if and only if all  $a \in A$  have  $a \in f^{-1}(B)$  if and only if  $A \subseteq f^{-1}(B)$ .

**Definition 2.4 (Continuous).** Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is *continuous* at  $x \in X$  if and only if, given any nonempty open ball  $B(f(x), \varepsilon)$ , there exists a nonempty open ball  $B(x, \delta)$  such that

$$B(x, \delta) \subseteq f^{-1}(B(f(x), \varepsilon)).$$


We defined open balls and promised open sets, so now let's define our open sets.

**Definition 2.5 (Open set).** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then a subset  $U \subseteq X$  is *open* if and only if, for each  $x \in U$ , there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U$ . In other words, each point in  $U$  has an open ball around it.

**Example 2.6.** Open balls are open sets. Indeed, given an open ball  $B(x, r)$ , note that any  $x_0 \in B(x, r)$  has  $d(x_0, x) < r$ , so we take  $\varepsilon := r - d(x_0, x)$ . To see this works, observe  $x' \in B(x_0, \varepsilon)$  will have

$$d(x', x) \leq d(x', x_0) + d(x_0, x) < \varepsilon + (r - \varepsilon) = r,$$

so  $B(x_0, \varepsilon) \subseteq B(x, r)$  follows. Here is the image for what just happened.



And here is our definition of corresponding definition of continuity.

**Lemma 2.7.** Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous at  $x \in X$  if and only if, given any open set  $U \subseteq Y$  with  $f(x) \in U$ , there is an open ball  $B(x, \delta)$ , such that

$$B(x, \delta) \subseteq f^{-1}(U).$$

*Proof.* Taking  $f$  to be continuous, note that we can find  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(f(x), \varepsilon) \subseteq U$  because  $U$  is open. Thus, continuity promises  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$B(x, \delta) \subseteq f^{-1}(B(f(x), \varepsilon)) \subseteq f^{-1}(U).$$

Conversely, if  $f$  satisfies the conclusion of the statement, we can take  $U = B(f(x), \varepsilon)$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  by [Example 2.6](#), and the conclusion promises  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$B(x, \delta) \subseteq f^{-1}(U) = f^{-1}(B(f(x), \varepsilon)),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

It is cleaner to talk about the entire function being continuous instead of at a point.

**Lemma 2.8.** Given metric spaces  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$ , a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous if and only if, given any open set  $U \subseteq Y$  with  $f(x) \in U$ , the pre-image  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open.

*Proof.* This is a matter of rearranging our quantifiers correctly. [Lemma 2.7](#) tells us that, for all  $x \in X$ , all open  $U \subseteq Y$  with  $f(x) \in U$  has some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $B(x, \delta) \subseteq U$ . Equivalently, for all open  $U \subseteq Y$ , any  $x \in X$  with  $x \in f^{-1}(U)$  has some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $B(x, \delta) \subseteq U$ . But by definition of being open, we're just saying that all open  $U \subseteq Y$  has  $f^{-1}(U)$  also open. ■

So we have the following definition.

**Definition 2.9 (Continuous).** A function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  between metric spaces is *continuous* if and only if, for any open set  $U \subseteq Y$ , the pre-image  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open.

The philosophy here is to try to understand open sets instead of trying to understand the metrics. This is the idea of topology.

## 2.1.2 Open Sets

Thus, we are motivated to understand open sets. Here are some basic properties.

**Proposition 2.10.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ , and let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the collection of open sets.

- (a) We have  $X \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{T}$ .
- (b) Arbitrary union: given a collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , the arbitrary union

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

is open.

- (c) Finite intersection: given a finite collection  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \in \mathcal{T}$ , we have

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

is open.

*Proof.* We go in sequence.

- (a) To show  $X \in \mathcal{T}$ , note that any  $x \in X$  has  $B(x, 1) \subseteq X$  by definition. To show  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{T}$ , note that any  $x \in \emptyset$  has  $B(x, 1) \subseteq \emptyset$  because there is no  $x \in \emptyset$  at all.
- (b) For any  $x \in \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U$ , we have  $x \in V$  for some particular  $V \in \mathcal{U}$ . Then the openness of  $V$  tells us we can find  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq V \subseteq \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U,$$

which finishes.

- (c) Fix  $x$  in the common intersection. Then, for any  $i$ , we have  $x \in U_i$ , so we have some  $\varepsilon_i > 0$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon_i) \subseteq U_i$ , and so we set

$$\varepsilon := \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \varepsilon_i.$$

In particular,  $\varepsilon > 0$  because  $n$  is finite, and we have

$$B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq B(x, \varepsilon_i) \subseteq U_i$$

for each  $i$ , so  $B(x, \varepsilon)$  is a subset of our intersection. ■

**Remark 2.11.** The arbitrary intersection of open sets need not be open: working in  $\mathbb{R}$  with the usual metric,

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} B(0, 1/n) = \{0\},$$

which is not open. (Namely, no  $\varepsilon > 0$  has  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq \{0\}$ .)

Motivated by [Proposition 2.10](#), we have the following definition.

**Definition 2.12 (Topology).** Fix a set  $X$ . Then a *topology*  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $X$  is a collection of subsets  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  satisfying the following.

- (a) We have  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $X \in \mathcal{T}$ .
- (b) Arbitrary union: given a collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , the arbitrary union  $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U$  lives in  $\mathcal{T}$ .
- (c) Finite intersection: given a finite collection  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , the intersection  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i$  lives in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

We will say that the ordered pair  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is a *topological space*. We say that the sets in  $\mathcal{T}$  are *open*.

**Example 2.13.** By [Proposition 2.10](#), metric spaces with their open sets form a topological space.

Here are some more basic examples.

**Definition 2.14 (Discrete topology).** Given a set  $X$ , the *discrete topology* is the topology  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ .

**Definition 2.15 (Indiscrete topology).** Given a set  $X$ , the *indiscrete topology* is the topology  $\{\emptyset, X\}$ .

It is fairly routine to check that the above collections form topologies. In fact, they are closed under both arbitrary union and arbitrary intersection.

**Remark 2.16.** The discrete topology can be defined by the metric  $d: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  by

$$d(x, x') := \begin{cases} 1 & x \neq x', \\ 0 & x = x'. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, for any  $x \in X$ , we see  $B(x, 1/2) = \{x\}$ , so any subset  $U \subseteq X$  is the open set

$$U = \bigcup_{x \in U} \{x\} = \bigcup_{x \in U} B(x, 1/2).$$

**Remark 2.17.** If  $\#X \geq 2$ , the indiscrete topology cannot be given a metric. Indeed, find distinct points  $a, b \in X$  and set  $r := d(a, b)$ , so  $a \neq b$  implies  $r > 0$ . Now,  $a \in B(a, r)$ , but  $b \notin B(a, r)$ , so  $B(a, r)$  is an open set distinct from both  $\emptyset$  and  $X$ .

**Remark 2.18.** One can give topologies a partial order by inclusion. Then the discrete topology is the maximal one (definitionally, any topology is a subset of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ ), and the indiscrete topology is the minimal one (definitionally, any topology contains  $\emptyset$  and  $X$ ).

And so here is our general definition of continuity.

**Definition 2.19 (Continuous).** Fix topological spaces  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$ . Then a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is *continuous* if and only if, for any  $U_Y \in \mathcal{T}_Y$ , we have  $f^{-1}(U_Y) \in \mathcal{T}_X$ .

## 2.2 August 31

It is once again the morning.

### 2.2.1 Intersections of Topologies

We will want to have lots of topologies to work with. Here is a basic way to build them.

**Proposition 2.20.** Let  $X$  be a set, and pick up some collection of topologies  $\{\mathcal{T}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ . Then the intersection

$$\mathcal{T} := \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \mathcal{T}_\alpha$$

is also a topology on  $X$ .

*Proof.* This is mostly a matter of writing out the axioms.

(a) Note that  $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha$ , so  $\emptyset, X \in \mathcal{T}$ .

(b) Arbitrary union: given a collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , we have  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha$ , so  $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha$ , so

$$\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U \in \mathcal{T}$$

as well.

(c) Finite intersection: given a finite collection  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , we have  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha$ , so  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha$ , so

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

follows. ■

**Corollary 2.21.** Fix a set  $X$ . Given a collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ , there is a smallest topology  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $\mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* Certainly there is some topology containing  $\mathcal{S}$ , namely the discrete topology  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . Thus, we can set our topology to be

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}) := \bigcap_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \supseteq \mathcal{S} \\ \mathcal{T} \text{ a topology}}} \mathcal{T},$$

which is a topology (by [Proposition 2.20](#)) which contains  $\mathcal{S}$  (because each topology in the intersection contains  $\mathcal{S}$ ), and of course any topology  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $\mathcal{S}$  will have  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ . ■

To codify this idea, we have the following idea.

**Definition 2.22 (Generated topology).** Fix a set  $X$ . We say that a collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  generates its smallest topology  $\mathcal{T}$ . We will write  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})$  for this topology.

**Remark 2.23 (Nir).** The topology  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})$  is unique. Indeed, suppose two topologies  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are minimal topologies containing  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}'$  is also a topology containing  $\mathcal{S}$  by [Proposition 2.20](#), but  $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'$  forces  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T}'$ .

**Remark 2.24 (Nir).** Given collections  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}'$ , then  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}')$ . Indeed, we have

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}) = \bigcap_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \supseteq \mathcal{S} \\ \mathcal{T} \text{ a topology}}} \mathcal{T} \subseteq \bigcap_{\substack{\mathcal{T} \supseteq \mathcal{S}' \\ \mathcal{T} \text{ a topology}}} \mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}').$$

**Remark 2.25 (Nir).** If  $\mathcal{T}$  is already a topology on  $X$ , then  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}$ . Indeed, of course  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T})$ , but then also

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigcap_{\substack{\mathcal{T}' \supseteq \mathcal{T} \\ \mathcal{T}' \text{ a topology}}} \mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$$

because  $\mathcal{T}$  is a topology containing  $\mathcal{T}$ .

## 2.2.2 Sub-bases

On the other side of things, we pick up the following definition.

**Definition 2.26 (Sub-base).** Let  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  be a topological space. A collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  is a *sub-base* for  $\mathcal{T}$  if and only if the following hold.

- (a)  $\mathcal{S}$  covers  $X$ , in that  $X = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{S}} U$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{T}$  is generated by  $\mathcal{S}$ .

The point is that collections  $\mathcal{S}$  are easy to find, so we have therefore found many topologies.

It will be useful to give a more concrete description of the topology generated by a collection  $\mathcal{S}$ . We start by taking finite intersections.

**Lemma 2.27.** Fix a set  $X$  and a collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  with  $X = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{S}} U$ . Then set

$$\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}} := \left\{ \bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i : \{U_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{S} \right\}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  and  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  is closed under finite intersection. Further, the topology generated by  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  is also the topology generated by  $\mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* We show the claims in sequence

- That  $\{U\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  for any  $U \in \mathcal{S}$  implies that  $U \in \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  for any  $U \in \mathcal{S}$ , so  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  follows.
- To show  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  is closed under finite intersection, pick up some finite collection  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$ . Then, for each  $i$ , we can find some finite collection  $\mathcal{U}_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  such that

$$U_i = \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{U}_i} V.$$

Setting  $\mathcal{U} := \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{U}_i$ , we see that  $\mathcal{U}$  is finite and that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{U}_i} V = \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{U}} V$$

must live in  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$ .

- Because  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , [Remark 2.24](#) tells us  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}})$ . In the other direction, note that any finite collection  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  also lives in  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})$ , so

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}).$$

It follows  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})$ , so  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})$  by [Remark 2.25](#). ■

After taking finite intersections, we take arbitrary unions.

**Lemma 2.28.** Fix a set  $X$  and a collection  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  closed under finite intersection with  $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{I}} U = X$ . Then the collection of (arbitrary) unions of elements in  $\mathcal{I}$ , denoted

$$\mathcal{T} := \left\{ \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U : \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{I} \right\},$$

is  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{I})$ .

*Proof.* If  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a topology containing  $\mathcal{I}$ , then note any collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  lives in  $\mathcal{T}'$ , so the arbitrary union

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

lives in  $\mathcal{T}'$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{T}'$ , so

$$\mathcal{T} \subseteq \bigcap_{\substack{\mathcal{T}' \supseteq \mathcal{T} \\ \mathcal{T}' \text{ a topology}}} \mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{I}).$$

Thus, it remains to show that  $\mathcal{T}$  is in fact a topology, which will imply from  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  that  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{T}$  by [Remark 2.24](#). Here are our checks.

- Setting  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ , we see that  $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U = \emptyset$ , so  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{T}$ . Also, by hypothesis, we have

$$X = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{I}} U \in \mathcal{T}.$$



- Arbitrary union: let  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  be a subcollection. For any  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , we can find a collection  $\mathcal{V}_U \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  such that

$$U = \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}_U} V.$$

Now, we set  $\mathcal{V}$  to be the union of all the collections of  $\mathcal{V}_U$  for each  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , which is still contained in  $\mathcal{I}$ , so that

$$\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}_U} V = \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V \in \mathcal{T}.$$

- Finite intersection: by induction, it suffices to pick up two sets  $U, V \in \mathcal{T}$  and show  $U \cap V \in \mathcal{T}$ . Well, we can find collections  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$  such that

$$U = \bigcup_{U' \in \mathcal{U}} U' \quad \text{and} \quad V = \bigcup_{V' \in \mathcal{V}} V',$$

from which it follows (by distribution) that

$$U \cap V = \left( \bigcup_{U' \in \mathcal{U}} U' \right) \cap \left( \bigcup_{V' \in \mathcal{V}} V' \right) = \bigcup_{U' \in \mathcal{U}} \left( U' \cap \bigcup_{V' \in \mathcal{V}} V' \right) = \bigcup_{\substack{U' \in \mathcal{U} \\ V' \in \mathcal{V}}} (U' \cap V').$$

Now,  $\mathcal{I}$  is closed under finite intersection, so  $U' \cap V' \in \mathcal{I}$ , so we have witnessed  $U \cap V$  as an arbitrary union of elements of  $\mathcal{I}$ , so  $U \cap V \in \mathcal{T}$  follows. ■

**Corollary 2.29.** Fix a set  $X$  and a collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  with  $X = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{S}} U$ . Letting  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  be the collection of finite intersections of  $\mathcal{S}$  and then  $\mathcal{T}$  be the collection of arbitrary unions of  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$ , we have that  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.27, we have  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}})$ . Plugging  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  into Lemma 2.28 (which applies because  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  is closed under finite intersection and covers  $X$  because  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$ ), we see that  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}) = \mathcal{T}$ , finishing. ■

We quickly point out that the point of discussing sub-bases is that we will be allowed to check continuity on only a sub-base.

**Lemma 2.30.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and a set  $Y$ . Given a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ , the collection

$$\mathcal{T}(f) := \{U \subseteq Y : f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{T}_X\}$$

forms a topology on  $Y$ .

*Proof.* Here are our checks.

- Note  $f^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset \in \mathcal{T}_X$ , so  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{T}(f)$ . Also,  $f^{-1}(Y) = X \in \mathcal{T}_X$ , so  $Y \in \mathcal{T}(f)$ .
- Arbitrary union: given a collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(f)$ , we see that

$$f^{-1}\left(\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U\right) = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} f^{-1}(U)$$

is a union of elements of  $\mathcal{T}_X$  and therefore in  $\mathcal{T}_X$ . Thus,  $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U \in \mathcal{T}(f)$ .

- Finite intersection: this is identical to the previous check. Given a finite collection  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \in \mathcal{T}(f)$ , we see that

$$f^{-1}\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i\right) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n f^{-1}(U_i)$$

is a finite intersection of elements of  $\mathcal{T}_X$  and therefore in  $\mathcal{T}_X$ . Thus,  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i \in \mathcal{T}(f)$ . ■

**Proposition 2.31.** Fix topological spaces  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$ , and let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a sub-base for  $\mathcal{T}_Y$ . Then a function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous if and only if

$$f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{T}_X$$

for all  $U \in \mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* Certainly if  $f$  is continuous then the pre-image of any open set  $U \in \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_Y$  must be open. On the other hand, let  $\mathcal{T}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{P}(Y)$  be the collection of subsets  $U$  for which  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{T}_X$ . This is a topology by [Lemma 2.30](#), and it contains  $\mathcal{S}$  by hypothesis, so it follows

$$\mathcal{T}_Y = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(f).$$

Thus,  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{T}_X$  for any  $U \in \mathcal{T}_Y$ , so  $f$  is continuous. ■

### 2.2.3 Bases

Having defined a sub-base, we should be rightly upset that we have not defined a base.


**Definition 2.32 (Base).** Fix a set  $X$ . A collection  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a *base* (for a topology on  $X$ ) if and only if the collection of arbitrary unions of  $\mathcal{B}$  form a topology on  $X$ .

This definition is a little hard to access because we still don't have a good notion of what a topology is.

**Example 2.33.** Fix a set  $X$ . Given any collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ , the collection of finite intersections  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  is a base by [Lemma 2.28](#).

However, in general we do not require a base to be closed under finite intersection.

**Example 2.34.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then the collection of open balls  $\mathcal{B}$  forms a topology by [Example 2.13](#). Notably, the intersection of two open balls need not be an open ball, as follows.



Even though bases are not closed under finite intersection, we do have the following.

**Proposition 2.35.** Fix a set  $X$  and a collection  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then  $\mathcal{B}$  is a base if and only if

- (a)  $X = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$ , and
- (b) any  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  has some collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  such that

$$B_1 \cap B_2 = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{U}} B.$$

*Proof.* In one direction, suppose that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a base generating the topology  $\mathcal{T}$ .

(a) Because  $X \in \mathcal{T}$ , we see that  $X$  is the union of some subcollection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , so it follows

$$X = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U \subseteq \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B \subseteq X.$$

(b) Given  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , we see that  $B_1 \cap B_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ , so because  $\mathcal{T}$  is made of arbitrary unions of  $\mathcal{B}$ , there is a collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  such that

$$B_1 \cap B_2 = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{U}} B.$$

We now go in the other direction. Suppose  $\mathcal{B}$  satisfies (a) and (b), and define

$$\mathcal{T} := \left\{ \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U : \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \right\}.$$

We now check that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a topology.

- Using  $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , so we see that  $\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U = \emptyset$  is in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Also, by (a), we have

$$X = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B \in \mathcal{T}.$$

- Arbitrary union: this is the same as the check in [Lemma 2.28](#). Given a collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , each  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  has some collection  $\mathcal{V}_U \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  such that  $\bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}_U} V = U$ . Letting  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  be the union of all the  $\mathcal{V}_U$ , we see

$$\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}_U} V = \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V$$

lives in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

- Finite intersection: by induction, it suffices to pick up  $U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{T}$  and show  $U_1 \cap U_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ . Well, find  $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  such that

$$U_1 = \bigcup_{B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1} B_1 \quad \text{and} \quad U_2 = \bigcup_{B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2} B_2,$$

which implies

$$U_1 \cap U_2 = \bigcup_{\substack{B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1 \\ B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2}} (B_1 \cap B_2).$$

Now, (b) implies that  $B_1 \cap B_2$  for any  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  is a union of elements in  $\mathcal{B}$ , so  $B_1 \cap B_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ . Thus,  $U_1 \cap U_2$  is the arbitrary union of elements in  $\mathcal{T}$ , so  $U_1 \cap U_2 \in \mathcal{T}$  by the previous check. ■

**Remark 2.36** (Nir). Careful readers might realize that we could rearrange the given exposition to show that, given a sub-base  $\mathcal{S}$ , the collection of finite intersections  $\mathcal{I}^{\mathcal{S}}$  is a base instead of going through [Lemma 2.28](#).

**Remark 2.37.** Of course, any base is also a sub-base. Notably, sub-bases only require that  $X = \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{S}} U$ , which must be satisfied for bases.

**Example 2.38.** Set  $X = \mathbb{R}$  with the usual topology  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then the collection  $\mathcal{B}$  of open intervals  $(a, b)$  form a base for the usual topology (these are our open balls). In contrast, the collection

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(-\infty, a) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \cup \{(a, \infty) : a \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

forms a sub-base for the usual topology. Namely, certainly  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ , and  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})$  because of the finite intersection  $(-\infty, b) \cap (a, \infty) = (a, b)$  for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Namely,  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})$  follows.

### 2.2.4 Induced Topologies

We start with the following motivating example.

**Example 2.39.** Fix a set  $X$ , and give it the discrete topology. Then, for any topological space  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$ , any function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is continuous because the pre-image of any open subset  $U_Y \subseteq Y$  is open in  $X$ .

In general, we might have some smallish collection of functions which we want to force to be continuous, so we might ask what topology is forced by their continuity.

**Definition 2.40 (Induced topology).** Fix a set  $X$  and a collection of topologies  $\{(Y_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  with some functions  $f_\alpha: X \rightarrow Y_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in \lambda$ . Then

$$\bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} \{f_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha) : U_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha\}$$

is a sub-base for an *induced topology*.

The one thing to check is that  $X$  belongs to the arbitrary unions of our collection, which is clear because  $X = f_\alpha^{-1}(Y_\alpha)$ .

**Definition 2.41 (Relative topology).** Fix  $(Y, \mathcal{T})$  a topological space. Then the *relative topology* for a subset  $X \subseteq Y$  is the topology induced by the natural embedding  $\iota: X \hookrightarrow Y$ .

We have the following more concrete description.

**Lemma 2.42.** Fix  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  a topological space. Then the relative topology for a subset  $X \subseteq Y$  consists of the subsets

$$\{X \cap U : U \in \mathcal{T}_Y\}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\iota: X \hookrightarrow Y$  be the natural embedding. Then we are given the sub-base

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\iota^{-1}(U) : U \in \mathcal{T}_Y\}.$$

Now,  $\iota^{-1}(U) = X \cap U$ , and then we can check directly that this collection  $\mathcal{S}$  gives a topology and finish by [Remark 2.25](#). Here are the checks, which should be completely routine by now.

- Note  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{T}_Y$  implies  $\emptyset = X \cap \emptyset \in \mathcal{S}$ . Also,  $Y \in \mathcal{T}_Y$  implies  $X = X \cap Y \in \mathcal{S}$ .
- Arbitrary union: given a collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , for each  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  find  $U_Y \in \mathcal{T}_Y$  such that  $U = X \cap U_Y$ . Then

$$\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U = X \cap \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U_Y = X \cap \underbrace{\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U_Y}_{\in \mathcal{T}_Y}$$

lives in  $\mathcal{S}$ .

- Finite intersection: given a finite collection  $\{U_1, \dots, U_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , find  $V_i \in \mathcal{T}_Y$  such that  $U_i = X \cap V_i$ . Then

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^n (X \cap V_i) = X \cap \underbrace{\bigcap_{i=1}^n V_i}_{\in \mathcal{T}_Y}$$

lives in  $\mathcal{S}$ . ■

## 2.3 September 2

There are no questions about anything.

### 2.3.1 Closed Sets

We begin, as always, with a definition.

**Definition 2.43 (Closed).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . A subset  $V \subseteq X$  is *closed* if and only if  $(X \setminus V) \in \mathcal{T}$ .

Here are some basic properties.

**Lemma 2.44.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ .

- (a) The set  $\emptyset$  and  $X$  are both closed.
- (b) Arbitrary intersection: given a collection of closed sets  $\mathcal{V}$ , the intersection  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V$  is closed.
- (c) Finite union: given a finite collection of closed sets  $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ , the union  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n V_i$  is closed.

*Proof.* We proceed in sequence.

- (a) Note that  $X \setminus \emptyset = X$  and  $X \setminus X = \emptyset$  are both open so  $\emptyset$  and  $X$  are closed.
- (b) Arbitrary intersection: observe that

$$X \setminus \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V = \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} (X \setminus V)$$

is an arbitrary union of open sets and therefore open. Thus,  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V$  is closed.

- (c) Finite union: observe that

$$X \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^n (X \setminus V_i)$$

is the finite intersection of open sets and therefore open. Thus,  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n V_i$  is closed. ■

**Remark 2.45.** Observe that both  $X$  and  $\emptyset$  are both open and closed. This is allowed.

**Example 2.46.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then any closed ball  $\overline{B(x_0, r)}$  is closed: we need to show

$$U := X \setminus \overline{B(x_0, r)} = \{x \in X : d(x, x_0) > r\}$$

is open. Well, for any  $y \in U$ , we see  $d(y, x_0) > r$ , so set  $\varepsilon_y := d(y, x_0) - r$ , so  $y' \in B(y, \varepsilon_y)$  has  $d(x_0, y') \geq d(x_0, y) - d(y, y') > r$ . Thus, any  $y \in U$  has  $B(y, \varepsilon_y) \subseteq U$ , finishing.

**Remark 2.47.** In  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with the Euclidean metric,

$$\bigcup_{\varepsilon < 1} \overline{B(0, \varepsilon)} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : d(0, x) < \varepsilon \text{ for some } \varepsilon < 1\} = B(0, 1)$$

is not closed. Indeed, we need to show  $U := X \setminus B(0, 1) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : d(0, x) \geq 1\}$  is not open. Well, note  $(1, 0) \in U$ , but any  $\varepsilon > 0$  has  $(1 - \varepsilon/2, 0) \in B((1, 0), \varepsilon)$  despite  $(1 - \varepsilon/2, 0) \notin U$ . Thus,  $U$  is not open.

**Remark 2.48.** One can define a topology by defining its closed sets to satisfy the axioms of [Lemma 2.44](#). Then one defines the open sets as the complements of open sets.

**Remark 2.49.** Aligned with [Remark 2.48](#), one can show that a function  $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  is continuous if and only if  $f^{-1}(V)$  is closed for all closed subsets  $V \subseteq Y$ .

- If  $f$  is continuous, then note any closed subset  $V \subseteq Y$  has  $Y \setminus V$  open, so  $f^{-1}(Y \setminus V) = X \setminus f^{-1}(V)$  is open, so  $f^{-1}(V)$  is closed.
- If  $f$  preserves closed sets, then any open subset  $U \subseteq Y$  has  $Y \setminus U$  closed, so  $f^{-1}(Y \setminus U) = X \setminus f^{-1}(U)$  is closed, so  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open.

In the case of metric spaces, we also have the following characterization of metric spaces.

**Lemma 2.50.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$  and  $V \subseteq X$ . The following are equivalent.

- $V$  is closed.
- Any sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $V$  which converges to a point  $x \in X$  actually converges to  $x \in V$ .

*Proof.* In one direction, suppose  $V$  is closed, and suppose  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  with  $x \notin V$ . Then we show that some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  has  $x_n \notin V$ . Well,  $x \in X \setminus V$ , and  $X \setminus V$  is open, so there is some  $\varepsilon > 0$  with

$$B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq X \setminus V.$$

However,  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  promises some large  $n$  such that  $d(x, x_n) < \varepsilon$ , implying that  $x_n \in X \setminus V$  and so  $x_n \notin V$ .

In the other direction, suppose  $V$  is not closed. Then  $X \setminus V$  is not open, so we can find  $x \in X \setminus V$  for which there is no  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq X \setminus V$ . As such,  $x \notin V$  but  $B(x, 1/n) \cap V \neq \emptyset$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so just pick up some

$$x_n \in B(x, 1/n) \cap V$$

for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . As such,  $d(x, x_n) < 1/n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (take  $N = 1/\varepsilon$ ), and  $x_n \in V$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , but the limit  $x$  does not live in  $V$ . ■

**Remark 2.51.** The reason we are not generalizing the above lemma to arbitrary topological spaces is because we haven't generalized convergence yet.

**Corollary 2.52.** Fix a complete metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then a closed subset  $V \subseteq X$  given the restricted metric is also complete.

*Proof.* Suppose a sequence of points  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $V$  is Cauchy. Embedding back in  $X$ , this sequence is still Cauchy in  $X$ , so it has a limit  $x \in X$ . But [Lemma 2.50](#) then promises  $x \in V$ , so  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  does in fact have a limit  $x$  in  $V$ . ■

### 2.3.2 Closures

Given a general set, we can define the closure as follows.

**Definition 2.53 (Closure).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Given a subset  $S \subseteq X$ , we define the *closure* as

$$\bar{S} := \bigcap_{\substack{V \supseteq S \\ V \text{ closed}}} V.$$

**Lemma 2.54.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Given a subset  $S \subseteq X$ , the closure  $\bar{S}$  is the unique smallest closed set containing  $S$ .

*Proof.* Note that

$$\bar{S} := \bigcap_{\substack{V \supseteq S \\ V \text{ closed}}} V$$

is closed as the arbitrary intersection of closed sets, by [Lemma 2.44](#). To see that  $\bar{S}$  is a minimal such closed set, note that any closed  $V$  containing  $S$  must have  $\bar{S} \subseteq V$  by definition of  $\bar{S}$ .

Lastly, to see that  $\bar{S}$  is unique, note that if we have two minimal closed sets  $\bar{S}_1$  and  $\bar{S}_2$  containing  $S$ , then note  $\bar{S}_1 \cap \bar{S}_2$  are both closed sets containing  $S$  by [Lemma 2.44](#), so minimality forces  $\bar{S}_1 = \bar{S}_1 \cap \bar{S}_2 = \bar{S}_2$ . ■

**Example 2.55.** If  $S \subseteq X$  is closed, then we see

$$S \subseteq \bigcap_{\substack{V \supseteq S \\ V \text{ closed}}} V \subseteq S$$

because  $S$  is a closed set containing  $S$ . Thus,  $S = \bar{S}$ .

Here is a more concrete way to work with the closure.

**Lemma 2.56.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a subset  $A \subseteq X$ . Then  $x \in \bar{A}$  if and only if every open subset  $U \subseteq X$  containing  $x$  has  $U \cap A \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* In one direction, if there exists an open subset  $U \subseteq X$  containing  $x$  such that  $U \cap A \neq \emptyset$ , then  $A \subseteq X \setminus U$ . By definition of the closure, it follows  $\bar{A} \subseteq X \setminus U$ , so  $x \notin X \setminus U$  ensures  $x \notin \bar{A}$ .

In the other direction, suppose  $x \notin \bar{A}$ . Then  $X \setminus \bar{A}$  is an open subset containing  $x$  (note  $\bar{A}$  is closed by [Lemma 2.54](#)), and

$$A \cap (X \setminus \bar{A}) \subseteq \bar{A} \cap (X \setminus \bar{A}) = \emptyset,$$

so we have found an open set containing  $x$  disjoint from  $A$ . ■

With the notation, we note that we can move our notion of density from metric spaces to general topology.

**Lemma 2.57.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then  $S \subseteq X$  is dense if and only if  $\bar{S} = X$ .

*Proof.* In one direction, suppose that  $S$  is not dense in  $X$ , and we show  $\bar{S} \subsetneq X$ . Well, we are granted  $x \in X$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $S \cap B(x, \varepsilon) = \emptyset$ , so  $S \subseteq X \setminus B(x, \varepsilon)$ . However,  $X \setminus B(x, \varepsilon)$  is closed, so

$$\bar{S} \subseteq X \setminus B(x, \varepsilon) \subsetneq X,$$

as needed.

In the other direction, suppose  $\bar{S} \subsetneq X$ , and we show that  $S$  is not dense in  $X$ . Well, find  $x \in X \setminus \bar{S}$ . Because  $X \setminus \bar{S}$  is open, we may find  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq X \setminus \bar{S}$ , implying that

$$B(x, \varepsilon) \cap S \subseteq B(x, \varepsilon) \cap \bar{S} = \emptyset,$$

making  $S$  not dense in  $X$ . ■

Thus, we can generalize our definition as follows.

**Definition 2.58 (Dense).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Given subsets  $A \subseteq B$ , we say  $A$  is *dense* in  $B$  if and only if  $B \subseteq \bar{A}$ .

**Remark 2.59.** We are not requiring that  $B$  be closed for the definition of density. For example,  $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is dense in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

### 2.3.3 The Product Topology

Let's see more examples of induced topologies. We start with the easiest example of the product topology.

**Definition 2.60 (Product topology).** Fix topological spaces  $(X_1, \mathcal{T}_1)$  and  $(X_2, \mathcal{T}_2)$ . The *product topology* on  $X_1 \times X_2$  is the topology induced by the canonical projection mappings

$$\pi_1: X_1 \times X_2 \rightarrow X_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_2: X_1 \times X_2 \rightarrow X_2.$$

We now give the following more concrete description of the product topology.

**Lemma 2.61.** Fix topological spaces  $(X_1, \mathcal{T}_1)$  and  $(X_2, \mathcal{T}_2)$ . The product topology  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $X := X_1 \times X_2$  has a base given by

$$\mathcal{B} := \{U_1 \times U_2 : U_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2\}.$$

*Proof.* The product topology is the minimal topology making  $\pi_1: X_1 \times X_2 \rightarrow X_1$  and  $\pi_2: X_1 \times X_2 \rightarrow X_2$  continuous. Namely, the product topology has a sub-base given by the sets

$$\pi_1^{-1}(U_1) = U_1 \times X_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_2^{-1}(U_2) = X_1 \times U_2$$

for any  $U_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1$  and  $U_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2$ . Using [Example 2.33](#), we let  $\mathcal{I}$  denote the finite intersections of these open sets and note  $\mathcal{I}$  is a base for our topology.

Now, we finish by claiming  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I}$ . On one hand, any  $U_1 \times U_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $U_1 \in \mathcal{T}_1$  and  $U_2 \in \mathcal{T}_2$  can be written as the finite intersection

$$U_1 \times U_2 = (U_1 \times X_2) \cap (X_1 \times U_2) = \pi_1^{-1}(U_1) \cap \pi_2^{-1}(U_2) \in \mathcal{I}.$$

On the other hand, pick finitely many sets of the form  $\pi_1^{-1}(U_1)$  and  $\pi_2^{-1}(U_2)$ ; dividing them into their classes, we can write our finite collection of sets as in  $\{U_1^{(i)} \times X_2\}_{i=1}^m$  or  $\{X_1 \times U_2^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^n$ . Their intersection is

$$\left( \bigcap_{i=1}^m U_1^{(i)} \times X_2 \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{j=1}^n X_1 \times U_2^{(j)} \right) = \underbrace{\left( \bigcap_{i=1}^m U_1^{(i)} \right)}_{U_1 :=} \cap \underbrace{\left( \bigcap_{j=1}^n U_2^{(j)} \right)}_{U_2 :=}.$$

Now,  $U_1 \subseteq X_1$  and  $U_2 \subseteq X_2$  are finite intersection of open sets and therefore open, so our finite intersection takes the form  $U_1 \times U_2$  and thus lives in  $\mathcal{B}$ . ■



**Remark 2.62.** Later in life we will discuss measurable sets, which are not quite topologies but will have similar ideas in spirit. For example, they will also care deeply about “rectangles.”

We can define this more generally.

**Definition 2.63 (Product topology).** Fix a collection of topological spaces  $\{(X_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ . The *product topology* on  $X := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_\alpha$  is induced by the canonical projection maps

$$\pi_\alpha: X \rightarrow X_\alpha.$$

Here is our more concrete description.

**Lemma 2.64.** Fix a collection of topological spaces  $\{(X_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ . Then the product topology on  $X := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_\alpha$  has a base

$$\mathcal{B} := \left\{ \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} U_\alpha : U_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha, U_\alpha = X_\alpha \text{ for all but finitely many } \alpha \right\}.$$

*Proof.* We are immediately given the sub-base of  $\mathcal{S} := \{\pi_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha) : U_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha\}$ . Using [Example 2.33](#), we let  $\mathcal{I}$  denote the finite intersections of  $\mathcal{S}$  so that  $\mathcal{I}$  is a base for our product topology.

As before, we finish by claiming  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{B}$ . To stay organized, we proceed in steps.

- We show  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ . Namely, for any  $\prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} U_\alpha$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , we set  $\lambda' := \{\alpha : U_\alpha \neq X_\alpha\}$ , which we know must be finite. Then

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} U_\alpha = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \pi_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha) = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda'} \pi_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha)$$

because  $\pi_\alpha^{-1}(X_\alpha) = X$ . The right-hand side is indeed a finite intersection of elements of  $\mathcal{S}$  and therefore in  $\mathcal{I}$ .

- We show  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ . For a given  $\beta$  and  $U_\beta \in \mathcal{T}_\beta$ , set  $U_\alpha := X_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \neq \beta$ . Then we see that

$$\pi_\beta^{-1}(U_\beta) = \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} U_\alpha$$

is in  $\mathcal{B}$  because  $U_\alpha = X_\alpha$  for all but a single  $\alpha \in \lambda$ .

- We show  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed under finite intersection. By induction, it suffices to pick up  $U, U' \in \mathcal{B}$  and show that  $U \cap U' \in \mathcal{B}$ . Indeed, write

$$U = \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} U_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad U' = \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} U'_\alpha,$$

where  $\lambda_0 = \{\alpha : U_\alpha \neq X_\alpha\}$  and  $\lambda'_0 = \{\alpha : U'_\alpha \neq X_\alpha\}$  are both finite. Then

$$U \cap U' = \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} (U_\alpha \cap U'_\alpha),$$

and we have  $U_\alpha \cap U'_\alpha = X_\alpha$  whenever  $\alpha \notin (\lambda_0 \cup \lambda'_0)$ , which is only finitely many exceptions because both  $\lambda_0$  and  $\lambda'_0$  are finite.

- We show  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ . Indeed,  $\mathcal{I}$  is made of the finite intersections of  $\mathcal{S}$ , and we see that  $\mathcal{B}$  does indeed contain the finite intersections of  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $\mathcal{B}$  contains the finite intersections of itself, and  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ . ■

**Remark 2.65.** If  $\lambda$  is finite, then the arguments of [Lemma 2.61](#) generalize to give the cleaner base

$$\left\{ \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} U_{\alpha} : U_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha} \right\}.$$

This also follows directly from [Lemma 2.64](#), where we note that the “finitely many exceptions” actually permits all  $\alpha \in \lambda$  to be an exception because  $\lambda$  is finite.

**Example 2.66.** Give  $\{0, 1\}$  the discrete topology. Then the space  $X := \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$  given the product topology does not have

$$U := \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{0\}$$

open in  $X$  even though  $\{0\} \subseteq \{0, 1\}$  is always open. To see this, we note  $U$  has only a single element. On the other hand, for  $U$  to be open, [Lemma 2.64](#) tells us  $U$  must contain a basis element  $B$  of the form

$$B := \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} U_n$$

where  $U_n = \{0, 1\}$  for all but finitely many  $n$ . However,  $B$  is infinite as the infinite product of sets containing more than 1 element, so  $B \not\subseteq U$ .

We quickly remark that the product topology satisfies the following universal property.

**Lemma 2.67.** Fix a collection of topological spaces  $\{(X_{\alpha}, \mathcal{T}_{\alpha})\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ , and give the product  $X := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_{\alpha}$  the projections  $\pi_{\alpha}: X \rightarrow X_{\alpha}$  and the product topology  $\mathcal{T}$ . Given a topological space  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  and continuous maps  $f_{\alpha}: Y \rightarrow X_{\alpha}$ , there is a unique continuous map  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  such that  $f_{\alpha} = \pi_{\alpha} \circ f$  for each  $\alpha \in \lambda$ .

*Proof.* We show uniqueness and existence separately.

- Uniqueness: suppose both  $f$  and  $f'$  satisfy that  $f_{\alpha} = \pi_{\alpha} \circ f = \pi_{\alpha} \circ f'$  for each  $\alpha \in \lambda$ . Then, for some  $y \in Y$ , we see that  $f(y) = (x_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  and  $f'(y) = (x'_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  have

$$x_{\beta} = (\pi_{\beta} \circ f)(y) = f_{\beta}(y) = (\pi_{\beta} \circ f')(y) = x'_{\beta}$$

for each  $\beta \in \lambda$ . So we conclude that  $f(y) = f'(y)$  on all inputs. Observe that we have not used continuity anywhere.

- Existence: define  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  by

$$f(y) := (f_{\alpha}(y))_{\alpha \in \lambda}.$$

We now need to check that  $f$  is continuous. By [Proposition 2.31](#), it suffices to check this on the subbase of [Lemma 2.64](#). In particular, pick up some finite  $\lambda' \subseteq \lambda$  and set  $U_{\alpha} \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha}$  for each  $\alpha \in \lambda'$  while  $U_{\alpha} = X_{\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \notin \lambda'$ . Then our basis element is

$$U := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} U_{\alpha}.$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} f^{-1}(U) &= \{y \in Y : f_{\alpha}(y) \in U_{\alpha} \text{ for all } \alpha \in \lambda\} \\ &= \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} f_{\alpha}^{-1}(U_{\alpha}) \\ &= \left( \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda'} f_{\alpha}^{-1}(U_{\alpha}) \right) \cap \left( \bigcap_{\alpha \notin \lambda'} f_{\alpha}^{-1}(U_{\alpha}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is open because the left term is a finite intersection of open sets and the right term is just  $Y$ . ■

**Corollary 2.68.** Fix a collection of topological spaces  $\{(X_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ . Give the product  $X := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_\alpha$  the projections  $\pi_\alpha: X \rightarrow X_\alpha$  and the product topology  $\mathcal{T}$ . Given a topological space  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$ , a function  $f: Y \rightarrow X$  is continuous if and only if the compositions  $\pi_\alpha \circ f$  are continuous.

*Proof.* Certainly if  $f$  is continuous, then the continuity of  $\pi_\alpha$  means that each  $\pi_\alpha \circ f$  is continuous.

Conversely, set  $f_\alpha := \pi_\alpha \circ f$  to be a continuous map  $f_\alpha: Y \rightarrow X_\alpha$ . Then [Lemma 2.67](#) promises us a unique continuous map  $\tilde{f}: Y \rightarrow X$  such that

$$\pi_\alpha \circ \tilde{f} = f_\alpha = \pi_\alpha \circ f.$$

However, the uniqueness proof of [Lemma 2.67](#) showed that there is in fact one unique map of sets whose projections under  $\pi_\alpha$  are  $f_\alpha$ , so we conclude  $\tilde{f} = f$ . Thus,  $f$  is continuous. ■

### 2.3.4 Comments on the Dual Space

Given a vector space  $V$  with a norm  $\|\cdot\|$ , we might be interested in the linear functionals on  $V$ , but because  $V$  is a metric space, we should actually be looking at the continuous linear functional. One can show (in Math 202B) that one has “plenty” of continuous linear functionals. Here is a lemma we will use a few times.

**Lemma 2.69.** Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be a norm on an  $\mathbb{R}$ -vector space  $V$ . Then a linear functional  $f: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous if and only if there exists a real number  $c > 0$  such that

$$|f(v)| \leq c \|v\| \tag{2.1}$$

for all  $v \in V$ .

*Proof.* In one direction, suppose that we can find a real number  $c > 0$  satisfying (2.1) for all  $v \in V$ . To show  $f$  is continuous, we use [Lemma 1.56](#): suppose that we have a sequence  $\{v_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $v_n \rightarrow v$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , find  $N$  such that  $n > N$  implies

$$\|v - v_n\| < \varepsilon/c$$

so that

$$|f(v) - f(v_n)| \leq c \|v - v_n\| < \varepsilon.$$

Conversely, suppose that  $f$  is continuous. Note that we don't have to worry about  $v = 0$  because this gives equality. Now, we can find  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\|v\| < \delta$  implies  $|f(v)| < 1$ . It follows that any nonzero  $v \in V$  will have

$$\left\| \frac{\delta}{2\|v\|} v \right\| < \delta,$$

so we see

$$|f(v)| = \frac{2\|v\|}{\delta} \left| f \left( \frac{\delta}{2\|v\|} v \right) \right| \leq \frac{2}{\delta} \cdot \|v\|,$$

so  $c := 2/\delta$  will do the trick. ■

Here is an example.

**Exercise 2.70.** Give  $V := C([0, 1])$  a  $p$ -norm  $\|\cdot\|_p$  for some  $p \geq 1$  or  $p = \infty$ . Then  $g \in C([0, 1])$  defines a continuous linear functional

$$\varphi_g: f \mapsto \int_0^1 f(t)g(t) dt.$$

*Proof.* To show  $\varphi_g$  is linear, pick up any  $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $f_1, f_2 \in V$ ; then

$$\varphi_g(r_1 f_1 + r_2 f_2) = \int_0^1 (r_1 f_1 + r_2 f_2)(t) g(t) dt = r_1 \int_0^1 f_1(t) g(t) dt + r_2 \int_0^1 f_2(t) g(t) dt = r_1 \varphi_g(f_1) + r_2 \varphi_g(f_2).$$

Checking continuity is a little more involved. Note  $|g|$  is a continuous function on a compact set  $[0, 1]$  and therefore has a maximum  $M$ . We now use [Lemma 2.69](#); we have two cases.

- Suppose  $p = \infty$ . Then, for any  $f \in V$ , we see

$$|\varphi_g(f)| = \left| \int_0^1 f(t) g(t) dt \right| \leq M \int_0^1 |f(t)| dt \leq M \|f\|_\infty,$$

which finishes by [Lemma 2.69](#).

- Suppose  $p \geq 1$  is finite. To begin, we note

$$|\varphi_g(f)| = \left| \int_0^1 f(t) g(t) dt \right| \leq M \int_0^1 |f(t)| dt.$$

Now, because the function  $x \mapsto x^p$  is convex, we see that

$$\left( \int_0^1 |f(t)| dt \right)^p \leq \int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt = \|f\|_p^p,$$

so  $|\varphi_g(f)| \leq M \|f\|_p$ . [Lemma 2.69](#) finishes. ■

Even though the linear functionals we found were continuous for all  $\|\cdot\|_p$ , it is possible to find linear functionals continuous for some of our norms but not others.

**Exercise 2.71.** Fix  $V := C([0, 1])$ , and select some  $t_0 \in [0, 1]$ . Then

$$\varphi: f \mapsto f(t_0)$$

defines a linear functional on  $V$  which is continuous for  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  but not for  $\|\cdot\|_p$  for any finite  $p \geq 1$ .

*Proof.* To see continuity with  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ , we note that any  $f \in V$  has

$$|\varphi(f)| = |f(t_0)| \leq \|f\|_\infty,$$

so [Lemma 2.69](#) finishes.

We now show that  $\varphi$  is not continuous for a fixed  $\|\cdot\|_p$ , where  $p \geq 1$  is finite. Using [Lemma 2.69](#), we just have to show that the ratio  $|\varphi(v)| / \|v\|_p$  is unbounded for  $v \in V$ . For this, we define  $f_c: [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$f(t) := \max \{0, c - c^{2p+1}(t - t_0)^2\}.$$

The idea here is that  $f$  has a sharp bump at  $t_0$ . Now,  $f$  is a continuous function on  $[0, 1]$  because it is the composition of continuous functions, so  $f \in V$ . We can compute

$$\|f\|_p = \left( \int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt \right)^{1/p}.$$

Now,  $f(t)$  will only be nonzero when  $c - c^{2p+1}(t - t_0)^2 \geq 0$ , which is equivalent to  $t - t_0 \in (-c^{-p}, c^{-p})$ , so we bound

$$\|f\|_p^p = \int_0^1 |f(t)|^p dt \leq \int_{-c^{-p}}^{c^{-p}} (c - c^{2p+1}z^2)^p dz \leq 2c^{1-p}.$$

Notably, as  $c \rightarrow \infty$ , we have that  $\|f\|_p \leq 2^{1/p} \cdot c^{1/p-1}$  is bounded, but  $|\varphi(f)| = c$  grows unbounded. Thus,  $\varphi$  is discontinuous. ■

**Remark 2.72.** Now, we have exhibited many continuous functions

$$\varphi_g: C([0, 1]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

so we can ask for the topology on  $C([0, 1])$  induced by these. It turns out that this induced topology is much weaker than any individual norm topology; this topology is often called the weak topology determined by  $C([0, 1])$ .

**Remark 2.73.** By the end of the class, we will have a reasonable notion of the dual space of  $\|\cdot\|_1$  and  $\|\cdot\|_2$ . The dual space for  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$  will come up in Math 202B.

**Remark 2.74.** Still working with  $C([0, 1])$  given a specific norm  $\|\cdot\|_p$ , one can show that any  $g \in C([0, 1])$  has some  $r_g \in \mathbb{R}$  with

$$\varphi_g(B(0, 1)) \subseteq B(0, r_g).$$

It turns out to be helpful to be able to consider the product topology on the (very large) product

$$\prod_{g \in C([0, 1])} B(0, r_g).$$

## 2.4 September 7

It's another day of sun.

### 2.4.1 Quotient Spaces

Here is a different way to induce a topology, the reverse of the induced topology.

**Definition 2.75 (Final topology).** Fix a set  $Y$  and some topological spaces  $\{(X_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ . Given functions  $f_\alpha: X_\alpha \rightarrow Y$ , we define the *final topology* on  $Y$  to be the “strongest” (i.e., with the most open sets) making the  $f_\alpha$  continuous.

**Remark 2.76.** Note that certainly some topology on  $Y$  exists making the  $f_\alpha$  continuous because we can give  $Y$  the indiscrete topology, where  $f_\alpha^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$  and  $f_\alpha^{-1}(Y) = X_\alpha$  are open for each  $\alpha \in \lambda$ .

Here is a more concrete description.

**Lemma 2.77.** Fix a set  $Y$  and some topological spaces  $\{(X_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ , with functions  $f_\alpha: X_\alpha \rightarrow Y$ . Then the final topology is

$$\mathcal{T} := \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \{S \subseteq Y : f_\alpha^{-1}(S) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha\}.$$

*Proof.* Certainly each  $\{S \subseteq Y : f_\alpha^{-1}(S) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha\}$  is a topology by [Lemma 2.30](#), as is their intersection by [Proposition 2.20](#). Thus,  $\mathcal{T}$  is a topology.

It remains to show that  $\mathcal{T}$  is the strongest topology making each of the  $f_\alpha$  continuous. Well, suppose  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a topology making each of the  $f_\alpha$  continuous. Then, for each  $U \in \mathcal{T}'$ , we have

$$f_\alpha^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha \text{ for each } \alpha \in \lambda,$$

so  $U \in \mathcal{T}$  follows. Thus,  $\mathcal{T}' \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ . ■

We will be primarily interested in the case with just one function.

**Remark 2.78.** In the case of one function, which is [Lemma 2.30](#), note that we might as well assume that  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is onto for otherwise we might as well just pass to the relative topology on  $\text{im } f$ . To be explicit, we see  $U \subseteq Y$  is open if and only if  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open if and only if  $f^{-1}(U \cap \text{im } f)$  is open if and only if  $U \cap \text{im } f$  is open.

We are now ready to define the quotient space.

**Lemma 2.79.** Given sets  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ , there is an equivalence relation  $\sim$  on  $X$  with  $x \sim x'$  if and only if  $f(x) = f(x')$ .

*Proof.* We check the conditions one at a time. Find  $x, x', x'' \in X$ .

- Reflexive: note  $f(x) = f(x)$ , so  $x \sim x$ .
- Symmetric: if  $x \sim x'$ , then  $f(x) = f(x')$ , so  $f(x') = f(x)$ , so  $x' \sim x$ .
- Transitive: if  $x \sim x'$  and  $x' \sim x''$ , then  $f(x) = f(x') = f(x'')$ , so  $f(x) = f(x'')$ , so  $x \sim x''$ . ■

With an equivalence relation, we may consider the set of equivalence classes  $X/\sim$ .

**Remark 2.80.** Conversely, given some partition  $P \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  of  $X$ , we can define  $f: X \rightarrow P$  by  $f: x \mapsto [x]$ , where  $[x] \in P$  is the element of  $P$  containing  $x$ . (Note  $[x] \in P$  exists and is well-defined because  $P$  is a partition.) The point is that surjective functions give rise to equivalence relations, and equivalence relations give rise to surjective functions.

Anyway, here is our definition.

**Definition 2.81** (Quotient topology). Fix an equivalence relation  $\sim$  on a set  $X$  with a topology  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then the *quotient topology* on  $X/\sim$  is the final topology for the natural projection  $X \twoheadrightarrow X/\sim$ .

It turns out that we can talk about the quotient space by universal property as well.

**Proposition 2.82.** Fix an equivalence relation  $\sim$  on a set  $X$  with a topology  $\mathcal{T}$ ; let  $\pi: X \twoheadrightarrow (X/\sim)$  be the natural projection. Then, for any continuous map  $f: X \rightarrow Z$  such that any  $x \sim x'$  has  $f(x) = f(x')$ , there is a unique continuous map  $\bar{f}: (X/\sim) \rightarrow Z$  such that

$$f = \bar{f} \circ \pi.$$

*Proof.* We show uniqueness and existence separately.

- Uniqueness: for any  $[x] \in (X/\sim)$ , we see that we must have

$$\bar{f}([x]) = \bar{f}(\pi(x)) = f(x),$$

so  $\bar{f}([x])$  is forced by our other data.

- Existence: for each  $[x] \in (X/\sim)$ , define  $\bar{f}([x]) := f(x)$ . Note that this is well-defined: if  $[x] = [x']$ , then  $x \sim x'$ , so  $f(x) = f(x')$  by hypothesis.

It remains to show that  $\bar{f}$  is continuous. Well, for an open set  $U \subseteq Z$ , we note that

$$\bar{f}^{-1}(U) = \{[x] : \bar{f}([x]) \in U\} = \{[x] : f(x) \in U\} = \pi(f^{-1}(U)).$$

Now,  $\pi^{-1}(\pi(f^{-1}(U))) = f^{-1}(U)$  because  $x \in \pi^{-1}(\pi(f^{-1}(U)))$  if and only if  $\pi(x) \in \pi(f^{-1}(U))$ , which is equivalent to there being  $x' \in f^{-1}(U)$  with  $\pi(x) = \pi(x')$ , which is equivalent to there being  $x'$  with  $x \sim x'$  while  $f(x) = f(x') \in U$ .

Thus,  $\pi^{-1}(\pi(f^{-1}(U)))$  is open, so it follows  $\pi(f^{-1}(U)) \subseteq (X/\sim)$  is open. ■

### 2.4.2 Homeomorphism

Homeomorphisms are isomorphisms in our category  $\text{Top}$ . To be technical, here is our definition.

**Definition 2.83 (Homeomorphism).** A function  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  between topological spaces  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  is a *homeomorphism* if and only if  $f$  is continuous and has a continuous inverse. Formally, we require a continuous map  $g: Y \rightarrow X$  such that

$$f \circ g = \text{id}_Y \quad \text{and} \quad g \circ f = \text{id}_X.$$



**Warning 2.84.** It is not enough for  $f$  to be continuous and bijective to be a homeomorphism. The hypothesis that the inverse function be continuous is necessary.

**Remark 2.85.** The definition above does not require that  $f$  be bijective, but this follows from  $f$  having an inverse.

Here are some examples.

**Example 2.86.** Fix a nonzero real number  $a$  and a real number  $b$ . Then the function  $\varphi_{a,b}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\varphi_{a,b}(x) := ax + b$  is continuous: checking this on the subbase (which is enough by [Proposition 2.31](#)), we compute  $\varphi_{a,b}^{-1}((c, d)) = ((c-b)/a, (d-b)/a)$ . The inverse function is  $\varphi_{1/a, -b/a}$ —note  $\varphi_{1/a, -b/a}(\varphi_{a,b}(x)) = \varphi_{a,b}(\varphi_{1/a, -b/a}(x)) = x$ —which is continuous for the same reason, so this function  $\varphi_{a,b}$  is a homeomorphism.

**Lemma 2.87.** Fix a homeomorphism  $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$ . Further, for any subset  $S \subseteq X$ , give  $S$  and  $f(S)$  their respective relative topologies. Then the restriction  $f|_S: S \rightarrow f(S)$  is a homeomorphism.

*Proof.* For clarity, let  $g: Y \rightarrow X$  be the inverse function for  $f$ ; note that  $g(f(S)) = \{g(f(x)) : x \in S\} = S$ , so  $g|_{f(S)}: f(S) \rightarrow S$ . Observe that we still have  $g(f(x)) = x$  and  $f(g(y)) = y$  for each  $x \in X$  and  $y \in Y$ , so  $f|_S$  and  $g|_{f(S)}$  are inverse functions by restricting these equations.

It remains to see that  $f$  and  $g$  are continuous. We will show that  $f$  is continuous, and  $g$  will follow by symmetry. Well, for an open subset  $U \cap f(S) \subseteq f(S)$  (where  $U \subseteq X$  is open), we see

$$f|_S^{-1}(U \cap f(S)) = \{x \in S : f(x) \in U \cap f(S)\} = S \cap \{x \in X : f(x) \in U\} \cap \{x \in S : f(x) \in f(S)\} = S \cap f^{-1}(U),$$

which is indeed open in the relative topology of  $S$ . ■

**Example 2.88.** Fix real numbers  $b > a$ . Continuing from [Example 2.86](#),  $\varphi_{a,b}: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  restricts by [Lemma 2.87](#) to a homeomorphism

$$\varphi_{b-a,a}|_{[0,1]}: [0,1] \rightarrow [a,b].$$

Namely,  $x \in [0,1]$  if and only if  $0 \leq x \leq 1$  if and only if  $a \leq (b-a)x + a \leq b$  if and only if  $\varphi_{b-a,a}(x) \in [a,b]$ .

**Example 2.89.** Give  $\mathbb{R}$  the Euclidean topology, and let  $\mathbb{R}_d$  be the real numbers with the discrete topology. Then the identity function  $\iota: \mathbb{R}_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous because all functions from the discrete topology are continuous. However,  $\iota$  is its own inverse, and the inverse function

$$\pi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_d$$

(which is also the identity on  $\mathbb{R}$ ) is not continuous. For example,  $\pi^{-1}(\{0\}) = \{0\}$  is not open in  $\mathbb{R}$  (by [Remark 2.11](#)) even though  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_d$  is open.

Here are some more exotic examples.

**Exercise 2.90.** Give  $X := [0, 1]$  the subspace topology, and define the equivalence relation  $\sim$  as having equivalence classes  $\{0, 1\}$  and  $\{r\}$  for each  $r \in (0, 1)$ . Then the quotient topology  $X/\sim$  is homeomorphic to  $S^1 \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ .

*Proof.* We note that  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation because its equivalence classes are a partition. Now, we define the maps


$$\begin{aligned} (X/\sim) &\cong S^1 \\ t &\mapsto e^{2\pi it} \\ \theta/2\pi &\mapsto e^{i\theta} \end{aligned}$$

which we can see to be well-defined inverse. Note that  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by  $t \mapsto e^{it}$  is continuous by complex analysis (it's in fact holomorphic). Restricting, we get the continuous map  $[0, 1] \rightarrow S^1$ , and then we can see that we can mod out by  $0 \sim 1$  because they both go to the same place (using [Proposition 2.82](#)). One can check by hand that the inverse map is continuous, but we won't bother. ■

**Remark 2.91** (Nir). Here is a quick way to see that the inverse map is continuous: any continuous bijection  $f: (X/\sim) \rightarrow S^1$  with  $(X/\sim)$  compact—which is true because  $X$  is compact—and  $S^1$  Hausdorff will send closed subsets  $V \subseteq (X/\sim)$  (which are compact) to compact subsets of  $S^1$  (which are closed). Thus,  $f$  is a closed map, so its inverse is continuous because  $f$  is bijective.

For the next few examples, we won't be very rigorous because we haven't provided good definitions of the relevant spaces.

**Example 2.92.** Give  $X := [0, 2] \times [0, 1]$  the subspace topology, and define the equivalence relation  $\sim$  as requiring  $(0, r) \sim (2, r)$  only. Then  $X$  is homeomorphic to a cylinder by gluing its edges. One might draw  $X$  as follows.



**Example 2.93.** Continuing with the drawing style of [Example 2.92](#), we have that



is the Möbius strip.

**Remark 2.94.** Note that these homeomorphisms do not care for the metric of our spaces. All that matters is the continuity.

**Example 2.95.** Let  $X$  be the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with the subspace topology, and define the equivalence relation on  $X$  by equivalence classes  $\{v, -v\}$  for each  $v \in X$ . Then  $X/\sim$  turns out to be  $\mathbb{RP}^2$ , which is hard to visualize.

### 2.4.3 Group Actions

A space might even have interesting homeomorphisms to itself.



**Example 2.96.** Fix a real number  $\theta$ . The circle  $S^1$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  (given the subspace topology) has the rotation homeomorphism

$$r_\theta: e^{it} \mapsto e^{i(t+\theta)}.$$

**Remark 2.97.** In general, given a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , we can make the group of homeomorphisms  $\text{Aut}(X)$  of homeomorphisms whose operation is composition.

This gives the following definition.

**Definition 2.98 (Group action).** A *group action* by a group  $G$  on a topological space  $X$  is a group homomorphism

$$\varphi_\bullet: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X).$$

**Example 2.99.** The group  $\langle \sigma \rangle \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  acts on a normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  by sending  $\sigma^k$  to

$$\varphi_{\sigma^k} \cdot v := (-1)^k v.$$

Notably,  $\varphi_{\sigma^k}$  is continuous and its own inverse for any  $k$ , so it is a homeomorphism. In fact, we can see directly that  $\varphi_{\sigma^k} \circ \varphi_{\sigma^\ell} = \varphi_{\sigma^{k+\ell}}$ .

Notably, with a group action comes a partition.

**Definition 2.100 (Orbit).** Let  $G$  act on a topological space  $X$  by  $\varphi_\bullet: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(X)$ . Then the  $G$ -orbit  $Gx$  of a point  $x \in X$  is the set

$$Gx := \{\varphi_g(x) : g \in G\}.$$

We denote the set of all orbits  $\mathcal{O}_x$  be  $X/G$ .

**Remark 2.101.** Note that the map  $x \mapsto \mathcal{O}_x$  is a well-defined (surjective) map  $X \rightarrow X/G$ . In particular, we need to know that  $x \in \mathcal{O}_{x'}$  implies that  $\mathcal{O}_x = \mathcal{O}_{x'}$  so that there is exactly one orbit containing  $x$ . Well,  $x \in \mathcal{O}_{x'}$  means we can find  $g_0 \in G$  such that  $x = \varphi_{g_0}(x')$ , so

$$\mathcal{O}_x = \{\varphi_g(x) : g \in G\} = \{\varphi_g(\varphi_{g_0}(x')) : g \in G\} = \{\varphi_{gg_0}(x') : g \in G\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{x'}.$$

Conversely, we note that  $x' = \varphi_{g_0^{-1}}(x)$ , so  $\mathcal{O}_{x'} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_x$  follows, giving equality.

Thus, the  $G$ -orbits partition  $X$ , so we can give the set  $X/G$  the quotient topology as the final topology of the natural projection  $X \twoheadrightarrow X/G$ .

## THEME 3

# BUILDING FUNCTIONS

---

*I can assure you, at any rate, that my intentions are honourable and my results invariant, probably canonical, perhaps even functorial.*

—Andre Weil, [Wei59]

### 3.1 September 9

The fun continues. The next problem set is going to be long but only in words, not in what we actually have to prove. We are being told not to be intimidated.

**Remark 3.1.** We are about to transition from making topologies to coming up with adjectives which will give “lots” of continuous maps to, say, the real numbers. A rigorization of this shall be provided shortly.

#### 3.1.1 Normal Spaces

Last class we briefly mentioned the Hausdorff property.


**Definition 3.2 (Hausdorff).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is *Hausdorff* if and only if, for any two distinct points  $x, x' \in X$ , there are disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $U'$  such that  $x \in U$  and  $x' \in U'$ .

**Example 3.3.** A metric space  $(X, d)$  is Hausdorff. Indeed, given distinct points  $x, x' \in X$ , we have  $d(x, x') > 0$ , so we set  $r := \frac{1}{2}d(x, x')$ . Then  $x \in B(x, r)$  and  $x' \in B(x', r)$  (which are open sets by [Example 2.6](#)), we see  $B(x, r) \cap B(x', r) = \emptyset$ . Indeed, if we had  $y \in B(x, r) \cap B(x', r)$ , then we must have

$$d(x, x') \leq d(x, y) + d(x', y) < 2r = d(x, x'),$$

which is a contradiction.

Here is the image



Here is another adjective.


**Definition 3.4 (Normal).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is *Hausdorff* if and only if, for any two disjoint closed sets  $V, V' \subseteq X$ , there are disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $U'$  such that  $V \subseteq U$  and  $V' \subseteq U'$ .

**Remark 3.5.** Intuitively, Hausdorff is approximately the normal property with singleton sets. In particular, some authors require “Hausdorff” in the definition of a normal space. We will not do this.

**Example 3.6.** Any set  $X$  given the indiscrete topology is normal. The problem here is that the only closed sets  $\{\emptyset, X\}$ , so the only possible pair of disjoint closed sets are  $V_1 := \emptyset$  and  $V_2 := \emptyset$ , for which the open sets  $U_1 := \emptyset$  and  $U_2 := \emptyset$  are disjoint and cover these.

**Example 3.7.** A set  $X$  with more than 2 elements is normal, as shown in the previous example, but it is not Hausdorff. Namely, finding distinct points  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ , the only open subset of  $X$  containing  $x_1$  or  $x_2$  is  $X$ , so there are no disjoint open subsets  $U_1$  containing  $x_1$  and  $U_2$  containing  $x_2$ .

Here is the image.



It is not completely obvious that metric spaces are normal, but we will see that they are.

Here is the main result for today.

**Theorem 3.8 (Urysohn’s lemma).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . If  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is normal, then for any disjoint closed subsets  $V_0, V_1 \subseteq X$ , there is a continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(V_0) = \{0\}$  and  $f(V_1) = \{1\}$ .

So the point here is to realize [Remark 3.1](#), where being normal is implying that we have “lots” of continuous functions.

**Remark 3.9.** Certainly if a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  satisfies the conclusion of [Theorem 3.8](#), then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is normal. Indeed, for any disjoint closed subsets  $V_0, V_1 \subseteq X$ , pick up the promised continuous function  $f$ . Then

$$V_0 \subseteq f^{-1}((-1/2, 1/2)) \quad \text{and} \quad V_1 \subseteq f^{-1}((1/2, 3/2))$$

are disjoint open sets; namely, these are open because  $f$  is continuous, and they are disjoint because  $f^{-1}((-1/2, 1/2)) \cap f^{-1}((1/2, 3/2)) = f^{-1}((-1/2, 1/2) \cap (1/2, 3/2)) = f^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ .

### 3.1.2 Urysohn's Lemma: Metric Spaces


Let's see [Theorem 3.8](#) for metric spaces, which will prove that metric spaces are normal by [Remark 3.9](#). We pick up the following definition.

**Definition 3.10.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then we define, for any  $x \in X$  and nonempty subset  $A \subseteq X$ ,

$$d_A(x) := \inf_{a \in A} d(x, a).$$

**Remark 3.11.** The infimum here exists because  $A$  is nonempty, so the set  $\{d(x, a) : a \in A\}$  is nonempty (and bounded below by 0).

The image is that  $d_A(x)$  is the distance from  $x$  to  $A$ .



We have the following continuity check.

**Lemma 3.12.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then, for any nonempty subset  $A \subseteq X$ , the function  $d_A : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is Lipschitz continuous.

*Proof.* Fix any  $x, y \in X$ . Then, for any given  $a \in A$ , we find that

$$d_A(x) \leq d(x, a) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, a).$$

Thus,  $d_A(x) - d(x, y) \leq d(y, a)$  for all  $a \in A$ , so we conclude that

$$d_A(x) - d(x, y) \leq \inf_{a \in A} d(y, a) = d_A(y),$$

so  $d_A(x) - d_A(y) \leq d(x, y)$ . By symmetry, we also have  $d_A(y) - d_A(x) \leq d(x, y)$ , so it follows

$$|d_A(x) - d_A(y)| \leq d(x, y),$$

which is what we need for our Lipschitz continuous. ■

As a sanity-check that this function behaves like it should, we pick up the following.

**Lemma 3.13.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then, for any nonempty subset  $A \subseteq X$ , we have

$$d_A^{-1}(\{0\}) = \overline{A}.$$

*Proof.* Certainly  $A \subseteq d_A^{-1}(\{0\})$  because  $d_A(a) = 0$  for all  $a \in A$ . (In particular,  $d_A(x) \geq 0$  everywhere, and  $a \in A$  implies that  $d_A(a) \leq d(a, a) = 0$ .) Because  $d_A$  is continuous by [Lemma 3.12](#), we see  $d_A^{-1}(\{0\})$  is closed, so containing  $A$  forces

$$\overline{A} \subseteq d_A^{-1}(\{0\}).$$

Conversely, suppose that  $x \notin \overline{A}$ , and we show that  $d_A(x) > 0$ . Indeed,  $X \setminus \overline{A}$  is open, so there is some open ball  $B(x, \varepsilon)$  with  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq X \setminus \overline{A}$ . It follows  $B(x, \varepsilon) \cap \overline{A} = \emptyset$ , so

$$d(a, x) \geq \varepsilon$$

for all  $a \in A$ . Thus,  $d_A(x) \geq \varepsilon > 0$ , so  $d_A(x) \neq 0$ . ■

**Example 3.14.** If  $A \subseteq X$  is a dense subset, then  $\overline{A} = X$ , so  $d_A: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the constantly zero function.

**Example 3.15.** If  $A \subseteq X$  is closed, then  $\overline{A} = A$  by [Example 2.55](#), so  $d_A^{-1}(\{0\}) = A$ . In other words, we have  $x \in A$  if and only if  $d_A(x) = 0$ .

Let's now show [Theorem 3.8](#) for metric spaces.

**Proposition 3.16.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . For any disjoint closed subsets  $V_0, V_1 \subseteq X$ , there is a continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(V_0) = \{0\}$  and  $f(V_1) = \{1\}$ .

*Proof.* The point is to use the Lipschitz continuous functions  $d_{V_0}, d_{V_1}$ . Then we define

$$f(x) := \frac{d_{V_0}(x)}{d_{V_0}(x) + d_{V_1}(x)}.$$

Note that defining  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  does not have division-by-zero problems: because  $d_{V_0}(x), d_{V_1}(x) \geq 0$ , the only way to get zero in the denominator is by  $d_{V_0}(x) = d_{V_1}(x) = 0$ . However, this forces  $x \in V_0 \cap V_1$  by [Lemma 3.13](#) because  $V_0$  and  $V_1$  are closed, but in fact  $V_0 \cap V_1 = \emptyset$ .

We now run our checks on  $f$ .

- Because the quotient of two continuous functions is still continuous, we see that  $f$  is continuous.
- Using the fact that  $d_A(x) \geq 0$  for any nonempty  $A \subseteq X$  and  $x \in X$ , we find

$$f(x) = \frac{d_{V_0}(x)}{d_{V_0}(x) + d_{V_1}(x)} \geq 0,$$

and

$$f(x) = 1 - \frac{d_{V_1}(x)}{d_{V_0}(x) + d_{V_1}(x)} \leq 1,$$

so  $\text{im } f \subseteq [0, 1]$ .

- If  $x \in V_0$ , then  $d_{V_0}(x) = 0$ , so  $f(x) = 0/(0 + d_{V_1}(x)) = 0$ . If  $x \in V_1$ , then  $d_{V_1}(x) = 0$ , so  $f(x) = d_{V_0}(x)/(d_{V_0}(x) + 0) = 1$ . ■

And here is our check.

**Corollary 3.17.** Any metric space  $(X, d)$  is normal.

*Proof.* Plug [Proposition 3.16](#) into [Remark 3.9](#). ■

### 3.1.3 Urysohn's Lemma: The General Case

We will not prove the general case of [Theorem 3.8](#) today, but we will make some progress. Here is a useful lemma.

**Lemma 3.18.** Fix a normal topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Given a closed subset  $V \subseteq X$  and an open subset  $U_0 \subseteq X$  with  $V \subseteq U_0$ , there is an open set  $U$  such that

$$V \subseteq U \subseteq \overline{U} \subseteq U_0.$$

*Proof.* Because  $V \subseteq U_0$ , we define  $V' := X \setminus U_0$ , which is closed because  $U_0$  is open. Further,  $V' \subseteq X \setminus U_0 \subseteq X \setminus V$  forces  $V \cap V' = \emptyset$ . Thus, using the normality of  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , we are promised disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $U'$  such that

$$V \subseteq U \quad \text{and} \quad V' \subseteq U'.$$

In particular, we see that

$$U \subseteq X \setminus U'$$

while  $X \setminus U'$  is closed by definition. Thus, by definition of the closure,  $\overline{U} \subseteq X \setminus U' \subseteq X \setminus V' = U_0$ . This finishes the proof. ■

## 3.2 September 12

There are still no questions.

### 3.2.1 Urysohn's Lemma: The General Case

We continue the proof from last class.

**Theorem 3.8 (Urysohn's lemma).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . If  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is normal, then for any disjoint closed subsets  $V_0, V_1 \subseteq X$ , there is a continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $f(V_0) = \{0\}$  and  $f(V_1) = \{1\}$ .

*Proof.* To begin, define  $U_1 := X \setminus V_1$ , which is open because  $V_1$  is closed; notably  $V_0 \subseteq U_1$ . The idea here is that the points of  $U_1$  will take value at most 1. Now, by [Lemma 3.18](#), we find  $U_{1/2}$  with

$$V_0 \subseteq U_{1/2} \subseteq \overline{U_{1/2}} \subseteq U_1.$$

Intuitively, we are going to let  $f$  take values at most  $1/2$  on  $U_{1/2}$ . Using [Lemma 3.18](#) again, we can find  $U_{1/4}$  with

$$V_0 \subseteq U_{1/4} \subseteq \overline{U_{1/4}} \subseteq U_{1/2},$$

and now our function will take values at most  $1/4$  on  $U_{1/4}$ . On the other side, we can use the containment  $\overline{U_{1/2}} \subseteq U_1$  in [Lemma 3.18](#) to find  $U_{3/4}$  such that

$$\overline{U_{1/2}} \subseteq U_{3/4} \subseteq \overline{U_{3/4}} \subseteq U_1,$$

and here  $U_{3/4}$  our function should take values less than  $3/4$ .

We can then continue the process for eighths and then off to infinity. Let's describe what we have at the end of this inductive process. Set  $\Delta := \{k/2^n : 0 < k \leq 2^n\}$  to be the set of "dyadic" rationals in  $(0, 1]$ ; notably  $\Delta$  is dense in  $[0, 1]$ .<sup>1</sup> Then each  $r \in \Delta$ , we get an open set  $U_r \subseteq X$ . These have the following properties.

- Any  $r, s \in \Delta$  with  $r < s$  has  $\overline{U_r} \subseteq U_s$ .
- By construction  $U_1 = X \setminus V_1$ .
- Also,  $V_0 \subseteq U_r$  for all  $r \in \Delta$ .

We now define

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & x \in V_1, \\ \inf\{r \in \Delta : x \in U_r\} & x \notin V_1, \end{cases}$$

where  $x \notin V_1$  in the second case promises  $x \in U_1$  so that the infimum in the second line makes sense. We now run the following checks on  $f$ .

<sup>1</sup> The fact we need is that  $a, b \in [0, 1]$  with  $a < b$  have  $r \in \Delta$  between them. Well, multiply  $b - a$  by a suitably large power of 2 so that  $2^n(b - a) > 1$ , so there is an integer  $k$  in this interval between  $2^n a$  and  $2^n b$ , so  $a < k/2^n < b$ .

- Note that  $\text{im } f(x) \subseteq \overline{\Delta} = [0, 1]$ .
- By the construction of these open sets, we have  $f(x) = 1$  if  $x \in V_1$ .
- Further,  $f(x) < r$  for all  $r \in \Delta$  if  $x \in V_0$ , so  $f(x) = 0$  for  $x \in V_0$ .
- It remains to check that  $f$  is continuous. For this, we use [Proposition 2.31](#) to check the continuity on a subbase. Specifically, we use sets of the form  $[0, a)$  and  $(a, 1]$  for  $a \in (0, 1)$ . Indeed, note  $[0, a) \cap (b, 1] = (a, b)$ , so intersections of these can give all open intervals strictly contained  $[0, 1]$ ; adding in the “open” intervals  $[0, a)$  and  $(a, 1]$  make all the open intervals in  $[0, 1]$ , which are a basis for our topology.

We now proceed with our check; fix some  $a \in (0, 1)$ .

- Note that  $x \in X$  has  $f(x) < a$  if and only if there is some  $r \in \Delta$  such that  $f(x) < r < a$  (by density of  $\Delta$ ) if and only if there is some  $r \in \Delta$  such that  $x \in U_r$  and  $r < a$  (by definition of the infimum). As such,

$$f^{-1}([0, a)) = \bigcup_{r < a} U_r.$$

- Note that  $x \in X$  has  $f(x) > a$  if and only if there is an  $r, s \in \Delta$  with  $f(x) > r > s > a$  (by density). It follows  $x \notin U_r$ , which contains  $\overline{U_s}$ , so  $x \notin \overline{U_s}$  for some  $s \in \Delta$  with  $s > a$ .

On the other hand,  $x \notin \overline{U_s}$  for some  $s \in \Delta$  with  $s > a$  implies that  $x \notin U_r$  for any  $r \in \Delta$  with  $r > s > a$ , so it follows  $f(x) \geq s > a$ .

Thus,  $f(x) > a$  if and only if  $x \notin \overline{U_s}$  for  $s \in \Delta$  with  $s > a$ , implying

$$f^{-1}((a, 1]) = \bigcup_{s > a} (X \setminus \overline{U_s}).$$

The above checks complete the proof. ■

**Remark 3.19.** We could not have  $f$  output to  $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1]$  because we used the completeness of  $\mathbb{R}$  in the construction of  $f$ .

**Remark 3.20.** It is somewhat noticeable that we have not discussed sequences at all in this class yet, even though they were featured prominently in metric space topology. The reason we have been avoiding them is that we prefer to use open sets and not points to study general topological spaces.

### 3.2.2 Bounded Functions

We are going to want a little functional analysis before we continue.

**Definition 3.21 (Bounded).** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$  and a nonempty set  $A$ . A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is *bounded* if and only if there is an open ball  $B(x, r)$  containing  $A$ . More generally, a function  $f: A \rightarrow X$  is *bounded* if and only if  $\text{im } f \subseteq X$  is bounded, and we let  $B(A, X)$  denote the set of all bounded functions  $f: A \rightarrow X$ .

We will be particularly interested in the case where  $X$  is a normed vector space.

The point of defining bounded functions is that we can provide them with a metric.

**Definition 3.22 (Uniform metric).** Fix a nonempty set  $X$  and a metric space  $(Y, d)$ . Then the *uniform metric* is the function  $d_u: B(X, Y)^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  defined by

$$d_u(f, g) := \sup\{d(f(x), g(x)) : x \in X\}.$$

**Lemma 3.23.** Fix a set  $X$  and a metric space  $(Y, d)$ . Then the uniform metric  $d_u$  on  $B(X, Y)$  is a metric.

*Proof.* Here are our checks; fix  $f, g, h \in B(X, Y)$ .

- Well-defined: because  $f$  and  $g$  bounded, we can find open balls  $B(a, r)$  and  $B(b, s)$  containing  $\text{im } f$  and  $\text{im } g$  respectively. It follows that, for any  $x \in X$ , we have

$$d(f(x), g(x)) \leq d(f(x), a) + d(a, b) + d(b, g(x)) \leq r + d(a, b) + s,$$

so the set  $\{d(f(x), g(x)) : x \in X\}$  has an upper bound and hence a supremum.

- Nonnegative: fixing a particular  $x \in X$ , note  $d_u(f, g) \geq d(f(x), g(x)) \geq 0$ .
- Zero: note  $d_u(f, f)$  is  $\sup\{d(f(x), f(x)) : x \in X\} = \sup\{0 : x \in X\} = 0$ .
- Zero: note  $d_u(f, g) = 0$  implies that  $\sup\{d(f(x), g(x)) : x \in X\} = 0$ , so  $d(f(x), g(x)) \leq 0$  for all  $x \in X$ , so  $d(f(x), g(x)) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ , so  $f(x) = g(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ .
- Symmetric: note

$$d_u(f, g) = \sup\{d(f(x), g(x)) : x \in X\} = \sup\{d(g(x), f(x)) : x \in X\} = d_u(g, f).$$

- Triangle inequality: note that

$$d(f(x), h(x)) \leq d(f(x), g(x)) + d(g(x), h(x)) = d_u(f, g) + d_u(g, h)$$

for all  $x \in X$ , so it follows  $d_u(f, h) \leq d_u(f, g) + d_u(g, h)$  by taking the supremum. ■

Here is why we like this metric.

**Proposition 3.24.** Fix a set  $X$  and a complete metric space  $(Y, d)$ . Then  $B(X, Y)$  given the uniform metric is complete.

*Proof.* Fix a Cauchy sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $B(X, Y)$ . Namely, for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists some  $N$  so that

$$n, m > N \implies d(f_n(x), f_m(x)) < \varepsilon$$

for all  $x \in X$ . In particular, fixing some particular  $x \in X$ , we see that  $\{f_n(x)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $Y$ , so the completeness of  $Y$  promises some limit  $f(x)$ .

It remains to check that the data of  $f$  assembles to a function  $f \in B(X, Y)$ . Well, any (fixed)  $\varepsilon > 0$  promises an  $N$  so that  $n, m > N$  forces  $d(f_n(x), f_m(x)) < \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in X$ . Now, fixing some  $x \in X$ , any  $\delta > 0$  has some  $N'$  large enough so that  $m > N'$  has  $d(f_m(x), f(x)) < \delta$ , meaning that  $n, m > \max\{N, N'\}$  gives

$$d(f_n(x), f(x)) \leq d(f_n(x), f_m(x)) + d(f_m(x), f(x)) < \varepsilon + \delta$$

for all  $\delta > 0$ . Thus, fixing some  $n > N$ , we see  $d(f_n(x), f(x)) \leq \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in X$ .

To finish, we note  $f_n \in B(X, Y)$  is bounded, so there is an open ball  $B(a, r)$  containing  $\text{im } f_n$ . Thus, for all  $x \in X$ ,

$$d(a, f(x)) \leq d(a, f_n(x)) + d(f_n(x), f(x)) < r + \varepsilon,$$

so  $\text{im } f \subseteq B(a, r + \varepsilon)$ . ■

We close with the following result.



**Proposition 3.25.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a metric space  $(Y, d)$ . Let  $B_c(X, Y) \subseteq B(X, Y)$  denote the metric subspace of bounded continuous functions  $f: X \rightarrow Y$ . Then  $B_c(X, Y)$  is a closed subspace of  $B(X, Y)$ . In particular, if  $(Y, d)$  is complete, then  $B_c(X, Y)$  is also complete.

*Proof.* Note that the second claim follows from the first claim by [Corollary 2.52](#); thus, we focus on the first claim. For this, we use [Lemma 2.50](#): fix a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of bounded continuous functions such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  where  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is just some bounded function. We need to show that  $f$  is continuous.

Well, fix an open set  $U \subseteq Y$  so that we need to show  $f^{-1}(U) \subseteq X$  is open. For this, we pick up any element  $x \in f^{-1}(U)$ , and we find an open neighborhood  $U_x \subseteq f^{-1}(U)$  containing  $x$ ; this will finish because it shows

$$f^{-1}(U) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in U} U_x \subseteq f^{-1}(U),$$

so  $f^{-1}(U)$  is the arbitrary union of open sets.

We now proceed with the proof directly.

1. Because  $f(x) \in U$ , and  $U$  is open, there is some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(f(x), \varepsilon) \subseteq U$ .
2. Because  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to  $f$ , there is a sufficiently large  $N$  so that  $n > N$  has  $d(f_n(y), f(y)) < \varepsilon/2$  for all  $y \in X$ . Fix some  $n > N$ .
3. Now, for all  $y \in f_n^{-1}(B(f(x), \varepsilon/2))$ , we see

$$d(f(y), f(x)) \leq d(f(y), f_n(y)) + d(f_n(y), f(x)) < \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon,$$

so  $f(y) \in U$ . As such, we see that  $f_n^{-1}(B(f(x), \varepsilon/2))$  is open (because  $f_n$  is continuous), it contains  $x$ , and it is contained in  $f^{-1}(U)$ .

The above open neighborhood completes the proof of the first claim. ■

## 3.3 September 14

The march continues.

### 3.3.1 The Tietze Extension Theorem

Here is the main result for today.

**Theorem 3.26 (Tietze extension).** Fix a normal topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , and give some closed subset  $A \subseteq X$  the relative topology from  $X$ . Given a continuous function  $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a continuous function  $\tilde{f}: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\tilde{f}|_A = f$ . In fact, if  $\text{im } f \subseteq [a, b]$ , then we may enforce  $\text{im } \tilde{f} \subseteq [a, b]$  as well.

This property is quite special to  $\mathbb{R}$  shared by a few other spaces.

**Example 3.27.** Take  $X := \overline{B(0, 1)} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  given the relative topology, and let  $A = \partial X$  be the boundary, which is the unit circle. Then the identity function  $\text{id}_A: A \rightarrow A$  does not extend continuously to a function  $\widetilde{\text{id}_A}: X \rightarrow A$ . To see this rigorously, take a course in algebraic topology.

**Example 3.28.** Of course, any set  $Y$  given the indiscrete topology will be such that a continuous function  $f: A \rightarrow Y$  can be extended to continuously to a function  $\tilde{f}: X \rightarrow Y$  because all functions to  $Y$  are continuous for free.

**Remark 3.29.** The condition of  $\text{im } f \subseteq [a, b]$  might as well be replaced by  $\text{im } f \subseteq [0, 1]$  by using the homeomorphism  $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $x \mapsto (x - a)/(b - a)$  which will send  $[a, b]$  to  $[0, 1]$ .

Here is a lemma which will help the proof of [Theorem 3.26](#).

**Lemma 3.30.** Fix a normal topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , and give some closed subset  $A \subseteq X$  the relative topology from  $X$ . Given a continuous function  $f: A \rightarrow [0, r]$  (where  $r > 0$ ), there exists a continuous function  $g: X \rightarrow [0, r/3]$  such that

$$0 \leq f(a) - g(a) \leq 2r/3$$

for each  $a \in A$ .

*Proof.* Set  $B := \{x \in A : f(x) \leq r/3\} = f^{-1}([0, r/3])$  and  $C := \{x \in A : f(x) \geq 2r/3\} = f^{-1}([2r/3, r])$ . Both  $B, C \subseteq A$  and  $C$  are closed because they are the pre-image of closed subsets under  $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . In fact, by the relative topology, we can write  $B = B' \cap A$  where  $B' \subseteq X$  is closed. However,  $B'$  and  $A$  are both closed in  $X$ , so  $B \subseteq X$  is closed. Similar holds for  $C$ .

Thus, so Urysohn's lemma provides ([Theorem 3.8](#)) a continuous function  $g: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $g|_B = 0$  and  $g|_C = 1$ . As such, we define  $g: X \rightarrow [0, r/3]$  by

$$g(x) := (r/3) \cdot g(x),$$

which is still continuous because the map  $x \mapsto (r/3)x$  is a homeomorphism  $[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, r/3]$  by [Example 2.88](#). We can now see that  $g$  satisfies the needed properties. Fix some  $a \in A$ .

- If  $a \in B$ , then  $g(a) = 0$  while  $f(a) \leq r/3$ , so  $0 \leq f(a) - g(a) \leq r/3$ .
- If  $a \in C$ , then  $g(a) = r/3$  while  $f(a) \in [2r/3, r]$ , so  $0 \leq f(a) - g(a) \leq 2r/3$ .
- Lastly,  $a \notin B$  and  $a \notin C$  means that  $r/3 < f(a) < 2r/3$  while  $0 \leq g(a) \leq r/3$ , so it follows  $0 \leq f(a) - g(a) \leq 2r/3$  still.

The above checks finish. ■

We now show the following special case of [Theorem 3.26](#).

**Proposition 3.31.** Fix a normal topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , and give some closed subset  $A \subseteq X$  the relative topology from  $X$ . Given a continuous function  $f: A \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , there exists a continuous function  $\tilde{f}: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\tilde{f}|_A = f$ .

*Proof.* For brevity, define  $\sigma := 2/3$ . Taking  $r = 1$  in [Lemma 3.30](#), we get a function  $g_1: X \rightarrow [0, 1/3]$  with

$$0 \leq f(a) - g_1(a) \leq \sigma$$

for all  $a \in A$ , so define  $\tilde{f}_1 := g_1$ . Next applying [Lemma 3.30](#) to  $(f - \tilde{f}_1)|_A: A \rightarrow [0, \sigma]$  with  $r = \sigma$ , we get promised a function  $g_2: X \rightarrow [0, \sigma/3]$  with

$$0 \leq f(a) - \tilde{f}_1(a) - g_2(a) \leq \sigma^2$$

for any  $a \in A$ , so define  $\tilde{f}_2 := \tilde{f}_1 + g_2$ .

In general, suppose given a function  $\tilde{f}_n: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with

$$0 \leq f(a) - \tilde{f}_n(a) \leq \sigma^n$$

for  $a \in A$ , we can use [Lemma 3.30](#) to  $(f - \tilde{f}_n)|_A: A \rightarrow [0, \sigma^n]$  to get a function  $g_{n+1}: X \rightarrow [0, \sigma^n/3]$  with

$$0 \leq f(a) - \tilde{f}_n(a) - g_{n+1}(a) \leq \sigma^{n+1}$$

for  $a \in A$ , allowing us to then set  $\tilde{f}_{n+1} := \tilde{f}_n + g_{n+1}$ .

Applying the above process inductively, we get a function

$$\tilde{f}_n = \sum_{k=1}^n g_k$$

going to  $[0, 1]$  such that  $\|g_k\|_\infty \leq \sigma^{k-1}/3$  and  $0 \leq f(a) - \tilde{f}_n(a) \leq (2/3)^n$  for each  $a \in A$  and  $n \geq 1$ . Notably, using the uniform metric  $d_u$ , we see that any  $n \geq m$  has

$$d_u(\tilde{f}_n, \tilde{f}_m) = \sup_{x \in X} \left( \sum_{k=m+1}^n g_k(x) \right) \leq \sum_{k=m+1}^n \frac{1}{3} \sigma^{k-1} \leq \frac{\sigma^m}{3} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sigma^k = \frac{\sigma^m}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\sigma} = \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^m,$$

which gets arbitrarily small. Thus,  $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence: for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we can find  $N$  with  $n > N$  having  $(2/3)^n < \varepsilon$ , meaning  $n, m \geq N$  will have  $d_u(\tilde{f}_n, \tilde{f}_m) < \varepsilon$ . Now, because  $[0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is a closed subset of a complete metric space and hence complete by [Corollary 2.52](#), the sequence  $\{\tilde{f}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to a continuous function  $\tilde{f}: X \rightarrow [0, 1]$  by [Proposition 3.25](#).

It remains to check that  $\tilde{f}|_A = f$ . Well, any  $a \in A$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  have

$$|f(a) - \tilde{f}(a)| \leq |f(a) - \tilde{f}_n(a)| + |\tilde{f}_n(a) - \tilde{f}(a)| \leq \left( \frac{2}{3} \right)^n + |\tilde{f}_n(a) - f(a)|.$$

Because  $\tilde{f}_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  under the metric  $d_u$ , we see that  $|\tilde{f}_n(a) - f(a)| \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Additionally,  $(2/3)^n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , so the entire right-hand side goes to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , meaning that  $|f(a) - \tilde{f}(a)| < \varepsilon$  for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Thus,  $f(a) = \tilde{f}(a)$  for each  $a \in A$ . ■

## 3.4 September 16

We continue the proof from last class.

### 3.4.1 The Tietze Extension Theorem: Proof

And here is the proof of the general case of [Theorem 3.26](#).

**Theorem 3.26 (Tietze extension).** Fix a normal topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , and give some closed subset  $A \subseteq X$  the relative topology from  $X$ . Given a continuous function  $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , there exists a continuous function  $\tilde{f}: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\tilde{f}|_A = f$ . In fact, if  $\text{im } f \subseteq [a, b]$ , then we may enforce  $\text{im } \tilde{f} \subseteq [a, b]$  as well.

*Proof.* Fix a continuous function  $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Note that there is a homeomorphism  $\varphi: \mathbb{R} \cong (-1, 1)$ , so we name composite

$$A \xrightarrow{f} \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\varphi} (-1, 1) \subseteq [0, 1]$$

$g$  and then extend it to a function  $\tilde{g}_0: X \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  by [Proposition 3.31](#). We would like to go back to  $(-1, 1)$  and then back to  $\mathbb{R}$ , but it is possible for  $-1, 1 \in \text{im } g_0$ .

Isolating the problem, we set  $B := \tilde{g}_0^{-1}(\{-1, 1\})$  and note that  $A \cap (B_0 \cup B_1) = \emptyset$  because  $\tilde{g}_0(A) = g(A) \subseteq (-1, 1)$ . Now, by normality of  $X$ , we get promised by [Theorem 3.8](#) a continuous function  $\delta: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\delta|_B = 0$  and  $\delta|_A = 1$ . Thus, we define

$$\tilde{g}(x) := \delta(x)\tilde{g}_0(x).$$

Notably,  $\tilde{g}|_A = \delta|_A \cdot \tilde{g}_0|_A = 1 \cdot g = g$ . But now  $|\tilde{g}(x)| = 1$  would force  $|\tilde{g}_0(x)| = 1$ , but this implies  $\delta(x) = 0$  by construction and so  $\tilde{g}(x) = 0$ ; thus,  $\pm 1 \notin \text{im } \tilde{g}$ , so we can pull back  $\tilde{g}$  through  $\varphi: \mathbb{R} \cong (-1, 1)$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . ■

### 3.4.2 Existence of Completions, Again

We quickly provide another proof of the existence of completions. We begin with the following example.

**Example 3.32.** Given any topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , the metric space  $(B_c(X, \mathbb{R}), d_u)$  of bounded continuous functions is complete by [Proposition 3.25](#) because  $\mathbb{R}$  is complete.

More generally, we will want to remember the following definition.

**Definition 3.33 (Banach space).** A normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  is a *Banach space* if and only if it is complete.

As such, we pick up the following tool.

**Lemma 3.34.** Fix an isometry  $f: (X, d) \rightarrow (Y, d_Y)$  of metric spaces such that  $(Y, d_Y)$  is complete. Then  $\overline{f(X)}$  equipped with the induced metric from  $Y$  is a complete metric space, and it is actually a completion of  $(X, d)$  when equipped with the natural embedding  $\iota: X \rightarrow \overline{f(X)}$  from  $f$ .

*Proof.* For brevity, define  $\overline{X} := \overline{f(X)}$  and set  $\bar{d}$  to be the metric on  $\overline{X}$  induced by  $(Y, d_Y)$ . In particular,  $\overline{X} \subseteq Y$  is a closed subset, and so  $(\overline{X}, \bar{d})$  is complete by [Corollary 2.52](#). Now, note that  $\iota: (X, d) \rightarrow (\overline{X}, \bar{d})$  is an isometry because, for any  $x, x' \in X$ ,

$$d(x, x') = d_Y(f(x), f(x')) = d_Y(\iota(x), \iota(x')) = \bar{d}(\iota(x), \iota(x'))$$

using our various restriction maps.

Lastly, we have to show that  $\text{im } \iota \subseteq \overline{X}$  is dense. Well, by [Lemma 2.57](#), it suffices to note

$$\overline{\text{im } \iota} = \overline{f(X)} = \overline{X},$$

which is what we wanted. ■

We are now ready to prove [Theorem 1.64](#).

**Theorem 1.64.** Any metric space  $(X, d)$  has a completion.

*Proof.* Let our metric space be  $(X, d)$ . For each  $x \in X$ , define  $f_x(y) := d(x, y)$ . To embed  $f_x$  into  $B_c(X, \mathbb{R})$ , we would need  $f_x$  to be bounded, but it need not be. To fix this, we choose a base-point  $x_0 \in X$ , and define

$$h_x := f_x - f_{x_0}.$$

In particular, any  $y \in X$  will have  $|h_x(y)| = |d(x, y) - d(x_0, y)| \leq d(x, x_0)$ , so  $h_x$  is bounded, and it is continuous as the sum of two continuous functions. More explicitly, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , take  $\delta = \varepsilon$  so that  $d(x_1, x_2) < \delta$  implies

$$|h_x(x_1) - h_x(x_2)| = |d(x, x_1) - d(x, x_2)| \leq d(x_1, x_2) < \delta = \varepsilon.$$

We now need to show that the map  $h_\bullet: (X, d) \rightarrow (B_c(X, \mathbb{R}), d_u)$  is an isometry. Indeed,

$$d_u(h_{x_1}, h_{x_2}) = \sup_{x \in X} \{h_{x_1}(x) - h_{x_2}(x)\} = \sup_{x \in X} \{d(x_1, x) - d(x_2, x)\}.$$

This is certainly upper-bounded by  $d(x_1, x_2)$  by the triangle inequality, and we do achieve  $d(x_1, x_2)$  at  $x = x_2$  because  $d(x_1, x_2) - d(x_2, x_2) = d(x_1, x_2)$ . So indeed,  $d_u(h_{x_1}, h_{x_2}) = d(x_1, x_2)$ .

Thus, we have provided an isometry  $h_\bullet: (X, d) \rightarrow (B_c(X, \mathbb{R}), d_u)$  from  $(X, d)$  to the complete metric space  $(B_c(X, \mathbb{R}), d_u)$  (see [Example 3.32](#)), so  $h_\bullet(X)$  is a completion for  $(X, d)$  by [Lemma 3.34](#). ■

**Remark 3.35.** Despite the above construction, it is actually fairly non-obvious what functions really are in  $h_\bullet(X)$ .

## THEME 4

# COMPACTNESS

---

*That something so small could be so beautiful.*

—Anthony Doerr, [Doe14]

### 4.1 September 16

We continue the lecture, into compactness.

#### 4.1.1 Compactness

The following is perhaps the most important definition in point-set topology.

**Definition 4.1 (Open cover).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . An *open cover* of  $X$  is a collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  of open sets such that

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

**Definition 4.2 (Open subcover).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . An *(open) subcover*  $\mathcal{U}'$  of an open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open cover  $\mathcal{U}'$  of  $X$  such that  $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ .

And here is the relevant definition.

**Definition 4.3 (Compact).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . We say that  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is *compact* if and only if every open cover of  $X$  has a finite subcover.

**Example 4.4.** The subset  $[0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  given the relative topology is compact.

In light of the previous example, it is helpful to extend our definition to subsets of a topological space.

**Definition 4.5 (Compact).** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is *compact* if and only if  $A$  is compact when given the relative topology from  $X$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then  $A$  is compact if and only if any  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  covering  $A$  has a finite subcover covering  $A$ .

*Proof.* The point is to use Lemma 2.42. In one direction, suppose  $A$  is compact. Then a cover  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  of  $A$  provides the open cover by

$$V_\alpha := A \cap U_\alpha$$

of  $A$ . Indeed,  $A \cap U_\alpha \subseteq A$  is open, and  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} (A \cap U_\alpha) = A$ . Thus, compactness provides a finite subset  $\lambda' \subseteq \lambda$  such that  $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda'}$  still covers  $A$ , so

$$A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda'} (A \cap U_\alpha) \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda'} U_\alpha,$$

meaning that the finite subcover  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda'} \subseteq \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  still covers  $A$ .

In the other direction, suppose that each open cover of  $A$  from  $\mathcal{T}$  has a finite subcover. Now, give  $A$  some open cover  $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  from the relative topology on  $A$ . Each open subset  $V_\alpha$  can be written as  $U_\alpha \cap A$  where  $U_\alpha \subseteq X$  is open by Lemma 2.42, so we define

$$\mathcal{U} := \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}.$$

Notably,  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} U_\alpha$  contains  $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} V_\alpha$ , which is  $A$ , so  $\mathcal{U}$  covers  $A$  and hence has a finite subset  $\lambda' \subseteq \lambda$  such that  $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda'}$  covers  $A$ . But then

$$A = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda'} (A \cap U_\alpha) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda'} V_\alpha,$$

so  $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda'}$  provides a finite subcover of  $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ . ■

In light of the above proof, it will be helpful to extend our notion of an open cover.

**Notation 4.7.** Given a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , we will say that some open sets  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  form an open cover for a subset  $A \subseteq X$  if and only if

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U.$$

**Remark 4.8.** We will freely use Lemma 4.6 as a “definition” of compactness without reference.

**Example 4.9.** Given compact subsets  $A_1, A_2 \subseteq X$  of a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , we see that  $A_1 \cup A_2$  is also compact. Indeed, given an open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $A_1 \cup A_2$ , we see that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open cover for both  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , so we can find our finite subcovers  $\mathcal{U}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{U}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  by the compactness of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , respectively. Thus,  $\mathcal{U}_1 \cup \mathcal{U}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  is a finite collection covering  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  and therefore covering  $A_1 \cup A_2$ .

Here is a quick fact about compactness.

**Lemma 4.10.** Fix a compact topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then any closed subset  $A \subseteq X$  is compact.

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.6, pick up an open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $A$ , and we would like to find a finite subcover. Then we set

$$\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{U} \cup \{X \setminus A\}.$$

Notably,  $X \setminus A$  is open in  $X$  because  $A$  is closed, so we see

$$\bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{V}} U = (X \setminus A) \cup \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U \supseteq (X \setminus A) \cup A = X,$$

so  $\mathcal{V}$  is an open cover for  $X$ . As such, we can find a finite subcover  $\mathcal{V}'$  for  $X$ , and we set  $\mathcal{U}' := \mathcal{V} \cap \mathcal{U}$ .

We claim that  $\mathcal{U}'$  is a finite subcover of  $\mathcal{U}$ ; indeed,  $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  is finite, and  $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  is a subset. It remains to check that  $\mathcal{U}'$  covers  $A$ . Well, for any  $a \in A$ , we can find some  $U' \in \mathcal{V}'$  containing  $a$  because  $\mathcal{V}'$  covers  $X$ . However,  $a \notin X \setminus A$ , so  $U' \neq X \setminus A$ , so actually  $U' \in \mathcal{U}'$ . Thus,

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{U}'} U,$$

which is what we wanted. ■

**Example 4.11.** Give  $X = \mathbb{R}$  the indiscrete topology. Then  $X$  has only two open sets, so any nonempty subset  $S \subseteq X$  can only be covered by  $\{X\}$ , which is its own finite subcover. For example,  $\{0\}$  is compact in  $X$ , but it is not closed because  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$  is not open.

## 4.2 September 19

There are questions today.

### 4.2.1 Compact Hausdorff Spaces

Last class we saw in [Example 4.11](#) that compact subsets of a topological space need not be compact. It turns out that compact subsets of Hausdorff spaces are in fact closed. Let's see this.

**Lemma 4.12.** Fix a Hausdorff topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , and let  $A \subseteq X$  be compact. Then, for any  $x \notin A$ , there are disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $V$  with  $A \subseteq U$  and  $x \in V$ .

*Proof.* For each  $y \in (X \setminus A)$ , the Hausdorff condition promises disjoint open sets  $V_y$  and  $U_y$  such that  $y \in U_y$  and  $x \in V_y$ . We would like to take the union of all the  $U_y$  and the intersection of all the  $V_y$ , but the arbitrary intersection of open sets need not be open.

To fix this, we note that  $\{U_y\}_{y \in A}$  are some open sets which cover  $A$ , so the compactness of  $A$  allows us some finite subset  $Y \subseteq A$  such that  $\{U_y\}_{y \in Y}$  covers  $A$ . As such, we set

$$U := \bigcup_{y \in Y} U_y \quad \text{and} \quad V := \bigcap_{y \in Y} V_y.$$

Here are our checks.

- Both  $U$  and  $V$  are open because these are a finite union and a finite intersection of open sets, respectively.
- By construction of  $Y$ , we see that  $A \subseteq U$ .
- Note  $x \in V_y$  for all  $y \in Y \subseteq A$ , so  $x \in V$  as well.
- Lastly, we see that  $U$  and  $V$  are disjoint: for each  $z \in U$ , we can find some  $y \in Y$  such that  $z \in U_y$ , but then  $z \notin V_y$  by construction, so  $z \notin V$ . ■

**Corollary 4.13.** Fix a Hausdorff topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , and let  $A \subseteq X$  be compact. Then  $A$  is closed.

*Proof.* For each  $x \notin A$ , [Lemma 4.12](#) grants us an open subset  $V_x$  containing  $x$  which is disjoint from  $A$ . It follows  $V_x \subseteq X \setminus A$ , so we may say

$$(X \setminus A) \subseteq \bigcup_{y \in X \setminus A} V_y \subseteq \bigcup_{y \in X \setminus A} (X \setminus A) = X \setminus A,$$

so  $X \setminus A = \bigcup_{y \in X \setminus A} V_y$  shows that  $X \setminus A$  is a union of open sets and therefore open. It follows that  $A$  is closed. ■

**Corollary 4.14.** Fix a compact Hausdorff topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then all closed subsets  $A \subseteq X$  and  $x \notin A$  have disjoint open subsets  $U$  and  $V$  with  $A \subseteq U$  and  $x \in V$ .

*Proof.* [Lemma 4.10](#) says that  $A$  is compact, so [Lemma 4.12](#) finishes. ■

The above property is useful enough to deserve a definition.

**Definition 4.15 (Regular).** A topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is *regular* if and only if each closed subset  $A \subseteq X$  and  $x \notin A$  have disjoint open subsets  $U$  and  $V$  with  $A \subseteq U$  and  $x \in V$ .

**Example 4.16.** Every compact Hausdorff space is regular by [Corollary 4.14](#).

**Example 4.17.** Any normal, Hausdorff space is regular. For example, metric spaces are regular.

In fact, compact Hausdorff spaces are not just regular but also normal.

**Proposition 4.18.** Fix a compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is normal.

*Proof.* Fix disjoint closed subsets  $A$  and  $B$ . Then  $A$  and  $B$  are compact by [Lemma 4.10](#).

Now, for any  $y \in B$ , we see  $y \notin A$ , so [Lemma 4.12](#) grants us disjoint open subsets  $U_y$  and  $V_y$  such that  $U_y$  contains  $A$  and  $V_y$  contains  $y$ . As before, we see  $\{V_y\}_{y \in B}$  forms an open cover of  $B$ , so the compactness of  $B$  promises a finite subset  $Y \subseteq B$  such that  $\{V_y\}_{y \in Y}$  still covers  $B$ . Thus, we set

$$U := \bigcap_{y \in Y} U_y \quad \text{and} \quad V := \bigcup_{y \in Y} V_y.$$

Here are our checks again.

- Note  $U$  is open as a finite intersection of open sets. Similarly,  $V$  is open as a union of open sets.
- By construction  $A \subseteq U_y$  for each  $y$ , so  $A \subseteq U$ .
- By construction  $\{V_y\}_{y \in Y}$  covers  $B$ , so  $B \subseteq V$ .
- Lastly, to see that  $U$  and  $V$  are disjoint, note that any  $z \in V$  has  $z \in V_y$  for some  $y \in Y$ , so  $z \notin U_y$ , so  $z \notin U$ . ■



### 4.2.2 Compact Images

We continue our fact-collection for compact spaces.

**Lemma 4.19.** Fix a continuous map  $f: (X, \mathcal{T}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$ . If  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  is compact, then  $\text{im } f \subseteq Y$  is also compact.

*Proof.* For psychological reasons, we may assume that  $\text{im } f = Y$ , though we will not do this.

Suppose we have an open cover  $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_Y$  for  $\text{im } f$ . Then we set

$$\mathcal{U} := \{f^{-1}(V_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$$

In particular, the continuity of  $f$  promises that everyone in  $\mathcal{U}$  is open. We claim  $\mathcal{U}$  covers  $X$ : for any  $x \in X$ , we see  $f(x) \in \text{im } f$ , so  $f(x) \in V_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in \lambda$ , so  $x \in f^{-1}(V_\alpha) \in \mathcal{U}$ .

Thus, the compactness of  $X$  promises a finite subset  $\lambda' \subseteq \lambda$  so that  $\{f^{-1}(V_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda'}$  is still an open cover for  $X$ . Thus, we can see that the finite collection of open subsets

$$\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda'} \subseteq \{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$$

still covers  $\text{im } f$ . Indeed, for any  $y \in \text{im } f$ , find  $x \in X$  with  $f(x) = y$ , so place  $x \in f^{-1}(V_\alpha)$  for some  $\alpha \in \lambda'$ , so  $y \in V_\alpha$ . ■

**Corollary 4.20.** Fix a continuous function  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then, for any closed interval  $[a, b]$ ,  $f$  achieves its maximum on  $[a, b]$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $f([a, b])$  is compact, and  $\mathbb{R}$  is Hausdorff, so  $f([a, b])$  is also closed. Further,  $f([a, b])$  is bounded because it is compact. Thus,  $f([a, b])$  has all of its limit points and in particular contains its supremum. ■

We take a moment to use this machinery to build an easier test for homeomorphisms; namely, we manifest [Remark 2.91](#).

**Proposition 4.21.** Fix a compact topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and a Hausdorff topological space  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$ . Then any continuous bijection  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is a homeomorphism.

*Proof.* The bijectivity of  $f$  promises some inverse function  $g: Y \rightarrow X$ , which we need to show is continuous. Well, for an open subset  $U \subseteq X$ , we need to show that  $g^{-1}(U)$  is open. But because  $g$  is the inverse of  $f$ , we see

$$g^{-1}(U) = \{y \in Y : g(y) \in U\} = \{f(x) \in Y : g(f(x)) \in U\} = f(U),$$

so we need to show that  $f(U)$  is open. Taking compliments, we set  $A := X \setminus U$  so that  $A$  is closed, and we will show that  $f(A)$  is closed; this will finish because the bijectivity of  $f$  forces

$$f(U) = f(X \setminus A) = f(X) \setminus f(A) = Y \setminus f(A)$$

to be open.

We are now ready to finish the proof. Because  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  is compact,  $A$  being closed implies that  $A$  is compact by [Lemma 4.10](#). It follows by [Lemma 4.19](#) that  $f(A)$  is compact, so because  $(Y, \mathcal{T}_Y)$  is Hausdorff, we see [Lemma 4.12](#) forces  $f(A)$  to be closed. This finishes. ■

### 4.2.3 Compactness via Closed Sets

It will be helpful to be able to discuss compact sets in terms of closed sets.

**Lemma 4.22.** A set  $X$  is covered by a collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  if and only if

$$\bigcap_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (X \setminus S) = \emptyset.$$

*Proof.* Note

$$\bigcap_{S \in \mathcal{S}} (X \setminus S) = X \setminus \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S,$$

which is empty if and only if  $\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S = X$ . ■

**Corollary 4.23.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is compact if and only if any collection of closed subsets  $\mathcal{V}$  with  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V = \emptyset$  has some finite subcollection  $\mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  with  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}'} V = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* If  $X$  is compact, then note any collection of closed subsets  $\mathcal{V}$  with  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V = \emptyset$  has

$$X = X \setminus \bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V = \bigcup_{V \in \mathcal{V}} (X \setminus V),$$

so  $\mathcal{U} = \{(X \setminus V) : V \in \mathcal{V}\}$  is an open cover. Thus, we can find a finite subset  $\mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  such that  $\mathcal{U}' = \{(X \setminus V) : V \in \mathcal{V}'\}$  covers  $X$ , so it follows that  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}'} V = \emptyset$  by taking complements, as above.

Conversely, we show that  $X$  is compact. Well, pick up an open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$ . Then **Lemma 4.22** says that  $\mathcal{V} = \{(X \setminus U) : U \in \mathcal{U}\}$  has  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V = \emptyset$ . By hypothesis on  $X$ , we get some finite subcollection  $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{U}'} (X \setminus U) = \emptyset$ , so **Lemma 4.22** says  $\mathcal{U}'$  covers  $X$ . ■

It will be useful to have some language to describe this.

**Definition 4.24** (Finite intersection property). Fix a set  $X$ . A collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  has the *finite intersection property* if and only if any nonempty finite subcollection  $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  has

$$\bigcap_{S \in \mathcal{S}'} S \neq \emptyset.$$

In particular, we get the following.

**Proposition 4.25.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is compact if and only if any collection  $\mathcal{V}$  of closed subsets with the finite intersection property has

$$\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V \neq \emptyset.$$

*Proof.* Applying contraposition to the conclusion, we are saying that any collection  $\mathcal{V}$  with  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V = \emptyset$  has some finite subcollection  $\mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  with  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}'} V = \emptyset$ . This is equivalent to  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  being compact by **Corollary 4.23**. ■

**Remark 4.26.** It is somewhat important to notice that the proof of **Proposition 4.25** does not require the Axiom of Choice to prove. It is purely moving around definitions cleverly.

## 4.3 September 21

Today we begin talking about Tychonoff's theorem.

### 4.3.1 Comments on Choice

Here is our main result for today.

**Theorem 4.27 (Tychonoff).** Fix a collection  $\{(X_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  of compact topological spaces, and give the product space  $X := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_\alpha$  the product topology. Then  $X$  is compact.

Notably, we are not requiring the spaces  $X_\alpha$  to be Hausdorff.



**Warning 4.28.** The proof of Theorem 4.27 will be the hardest part of this course.

**Remark 4.29.** The reason for Warning 4.28 is that we need to at least know that  $X$  is nonempty to say anything about  $X$  at all, and an arbitrary product being nonempty is equivalent to the Axiom of Choice. In fact, Theorem 4.27 (notably not assuming that the  $X_\alpha$  are Hausdorff!) actually implies the Axiom of Choice, as shown by John Kelly.

To prepare ourselves, we will point out a few of the main ingredients we will use. We will use the Axiom of Choice, which we will go ahead and state now.

**Axiom 4.30 (Choice).** Given a collection of nonempty sets  $\{S_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$ , the product  $\prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} S_\alpha$  is nonempty.

We will also use Zorn's lemma. To state Zorn's lemma, we begin by defining a partially ordered set and its chains.

**Definition 4.31 (Poset).** A *partially ordered set* or *poset* is a set  $P$  equipped with a reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive relation  $\leq \subseteq P \times P$ .

**Example 4.32.** Given a set  $X$ , the power set  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is a partially ordered set under inclusion  $\subseteq$ . Here are the checks.

- Reflexive: for  $A \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ , we see  $A \subseteq A$ .
- Antisymmetric: for  $A, B \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ , we see  $A \subseteq B$  and  $B \subseteq A$  implies  $A = B$ .
- Transitive: for  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ , we see  $A \subseteq B$  and  $B \subseteq C$  implies  $A \subseteq C$ .

Replacing all the  $\subseteq$ s with  $\supseteq$ s shows that  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is also a partially ordered set under containment  $\supseteq$ .

Posets have very natural subposets.

**Definition 4.33 (Subposet).** Given a partially ordered  $(P, \leq)$ , a *subposet* is a subset  $S \subseteq P$  equipped with the restricted partial order  $\leq \cap (S \times S)$ .

All the checks for  $(S, \leq \cap (S \times S))$  being a partially ordered set are inherited directly from  $P$ , so the proof amounts to just writing them down.

**Example 4.34.** Given a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ , we see that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a subposet of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ , where  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  can be given the partial order  $\subseteq$  or  $\supseteq$  from Example 4.32.

And here are our chains.

**Definition 4.35 (Chain).** Fix a partially ordered set  $(P, \leq)$ . Then a *chain* is a subset  $C \subseteq P$  such that the subposet  $(C, \leq)$  is totally ordered.

Zorn's lemma is interested in special kinds of partially ordered sets.

**Definition 4.36 (Inductively ordered).** A partially ordered set  $(P, \leq)$  is *inductively ordered* if and only if every chain  $C \subseteq P$  has an upper bound in  $P$ . In other words, there is an element  $p \in P$  such that  $c \leq p$  for all  $c \in C$ .

And here is Zorn's lemma.

**Axiom 4.37 (Zorn's lemma).** An inductively ordered partially ordered set  $(P, \leq)$  has a maximal element.

**Remark 4.38.** It turns out that the Axiom of Choice (in the form of Zorn's lemma) is also equivalent to every vector space having a basis. (In one direction, given a vector space  $V$ , one can build a basis by taking a maximal linearly independent set of vectors in  $V$ .) One can get a feeling for the other direction because the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector space  $\mathbb{R}$  doesn't have any "constructible" basis.

**Remark 4.39.** The fact that every (commutative) ring has a maximal ideal containing any given proper ideal is also equivalent to the Axiom of Choice (in the form of Zorn's lemma). Here are two examples.

- Given any set  $S$ , finding a maximal ideal of the ring  $R := \mathbb{F}_2^S$  (whose operations are pointwise from  $\mathbb{F}_2$ ) which contains the ideal  $\mathbb{F}_2^{\oplus S}$  requires knowing that  $R$  is nonempty.
- The ring  $R := C([0, \infty))$  of continuous  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued functions has the ideal

$$I := \left\{ f \in R : \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f(x) = 0 \right\}$$

doesn't have any constructible maximal ideals containing it.

For our next example, we define a filter.

**Definition 4.40 (Filter).** Fix a set  $X$ . A *filter*  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $X$  is a collection of nonempty subsets of  $X$  satisfying the following conditions.

- $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under finite intersection.
- If  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $A \subseteq B \subseteq X$ , then  $B \in \mathcal{F}$ .

**Example 4.41.** Given a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a subset  $A \subseteq X$ , the subposet  $\mathcal{T}$  of  $(\mathcal{P}(X), \subseteq)$  has a filter  $\mathcal{F}$  of all those open subsets containing  $A$ .

**Example 4.42.** Given a set  $X$ , the collection of subsets containing a given point  $p \in X$  is a filter and in fact a "maximal" filter.

The point is that Zorn's lemma automatically promises us maximal filters, or "ultrafilters."

**Example 4.43.** Fix  $X := [0, \infty)$ . Then the collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of the subsets of  $A \subseteq X$  which contain  $[n, \infty)$  for some integer  $n$  is a filter. However, there is no obvious maximal filter.

## 4.4 September 23

We continue discussing Tychonoff's theorem.

### 4.4.1 Tychonoff's Theorem

Here is our statement.

**Theorem 4.27 (Tychonoff).** Fix a collection  $\{(X_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  of compact topological spaces, and give the product space  $X := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_\alpha$  the product topology. Then  $X$  is compact.

*Proof.* We will use [Proposition 4.25](#). For each  $\alpha$ , let  $\pi_\alpha: X \rightarrow X_\alpha$  denote the canonical projection. Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be a collection of closed subsets of  $X$  satisfying the finite intersection property, and we will show that  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V$  is nonempty. We proceed in steps.

1. The beginning of this proof does not use topology. Let  $\Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$  be the collection of families of subsets  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $X$  which contain  $\mathcal{V}$  and have the finite intersection property. We claim that  $\Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$  is inductively ordered under  $\supseteq$ .

Well, let  $\Omega \subseteq \Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$  be some chain, and we define the collection

$$\mathcal{U} := \bigcup_{\mathcal{F} \in \Omega} \mathcal{F},$$

which we claim is the required upper bound for  $\Omega$ . Of course, each  $\mathcal{F}$  contains  $\mathcal{V}$ , and  $\mathcal{U} \supseteq \mathcal{F}$  for each  $\mathcal{F}$ , so  $\mathcal{U}$  both contains  $\mathcal{V}$  and is an upper bound for  $\Omega$ . It remains to show  $\mathcal{U} \in \Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$ , for which we need to show that  $\mathcal{U}$  has the finite intersection property.

For this, find some finite subcollection of nonempty subsets  $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{U}$  which we would like to show have nonempty intersection. Now, for each  $k$ , there is some  $\mathcal{F}_k \in \Omega$  containing  $A_k$ , by construction of  $\mathcal{U}$  as the union over  $\Omega$ . Because the number of subsets is finite, and because  $\Omega$  is totally ordered, we may find the largest of the  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , which we call  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Now,  $\mathcal{F} \in \Omega \subseteq \Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$  must have the finite intersection property, so  $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  forces

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^n A_k \neq \emptyset,$$

which is what we wanted. This completes the proof.

2. From the previous step, Zorn's lemma promises a maximal family  $\mathcal{M}$ . We claim that  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under taking finite intersections. Indeed, define  $\mathcal{M}'$  as the set of all finite intersections of  $\mathcal{M}$ , and we will show that  $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}$ .

Well, certainly  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}'$  because intersections of exactly one set  $F \in \mathcal{M}$  will just recover  $F \in \mathcal{M}$ . Thus, if we can show  $\mathcal{M}' \in \Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$ , the desired equality  $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}$  will follow by maximality.

Certainly, we of course have  $\mathcal{M} \supseteq \mathcal{V}$ , so  $\mathcal{M}' \supseteq \mathcal{V}$  as well. So to show  $\mathcal{M}' \in \Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$ , it remains to show the finite intersection property. Well, let  $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{M}'$  be some finite subcollection of nonempty subsets, and we show their intersection is nonempty. By definition of  $\mathcal{M}'$ , each  $k$  lets us write

$$A_k = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{n_k} B_{k,\ell}$$

for some subsets  $B_{k,\ell} \in \mathcal{M}$ ; because  $A_k \in \mathcal{M}'$  is nonempty, we see that  $B_{k,\ell} \in \mathcal{M}$  is nonempty, so the finite intersection property on  $\mathcal{M}$  tells us that

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^n A_k = \bigcap_{k=1}^n \bigcap_{\ell=1}^{n_k} B_{k,\ell}$$

is nonempty, which is what we wanted.

3. We claim that if a subset  $B \subseteq X$  has  $B \cap A \neq \emptyset$  for each  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ , then in fact  $B \in \mathcal{M}$ . Indeed, define  $\mathcal{M}'' := \mathcal{M} \cup \{B\}$ , and we show  $\mathcal{M}'' = \mathcal{M}$ .

Certainly  $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}''$ , so it is enough by maximality of  $\mathcal{M}$  to show  $\mathcal{M}'' \in \Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$ . Certainly  $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}''$ , so it remains to show that  $\mathcal{M}''$  satisfies the finite intersection property.

For this, pick up some finite subcollection of nonempty subsets  $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{M}''$ , and we show their intersection is nonempty. If none of these subsets are  $B$ , then in fact  $\{A_k\}_{k=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ , so the finite intersection property for  $\mathcal{M}$  forces

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^n A_k \neq \emptyset.$$

Otherwise, say  $B = A_1$  without loss of generality. Then we may assume  $B \neq A_k$  for each  $k > 1$ , so  $A_k \in \mathcal{M}$  for each  $k > 1$ , so we note

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^n A_k = B \cap \bigcap_{k=2}^n A_k.$$

However,  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under finite intersection, so in fact  $\bigcap_{k=2}^n A_k \in \mathcal{M}$ , and by the finite intersection property, we have that  $\bigcap_{k=2}^n A_k$  is nonempty. Thus, by hypothesis on  $B$ , we see

$$B \cap \bigcap_{k=2}^n A_k \neq \emptyset,$$

which is what we wanted.

4. We now begin touching our product. For given  $\alpha \in \lambda$  and  $\mathcal{F} \in \Omega_{\mathcal{V}}$ , we claim that

$$\pi_{\alpha}(\mathcal{F}) := \{\pi_{\alpha}(A) : A \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

satisfies the finite intersection property. Fix a finite subcollection of nonempty subsets  $\{\pi_{\alpha}(A_k)\}_{k=1}^n$  of  $\pi_{\alpha}(\mathcal{F})$ , and we will show its intersection is nonempty. Then we must have  $A_k$  being nonempty for each  $k$ , so the finite intersection property on  $\mathcal{F}$  forces

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^n A_k \neq \emptyset.$$

Finding some  $a$  in this intersection, we see  $\pi_{\alpha}(a) \in \pi_{\alpha}(A_k)$  for each  $k$ , so  $\pi_{\alpha}(a)$  belongs in

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^n \pi_{\alpha}(A_k),$$

thus making this intersection nonempty.

5. And now the topology begins. For given  $\alpha$ , note that

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha} := \{\overline{\pi_{\alpha}(A)} : A \in \mathcal{M}\}$$

has the finite intersection property by the previous step. Namely, any finite subcollection of nonempty subsets  $\{\pi_{\alpha}(A_k)\}_{k=1}^n$  has a nonempty intersection, so writing

$$\emptyset \neq \bigcap_{k=1}^n \pi_{\alpha}(A_k) \subseteq \bigcap_{k=1}^n \overline{\pi_{\alpha}(A_k)}$$

gives what we want. However,  $X_{\alpha}$  is compact (!), so [Proposition 4.25](#) tells us that

$$\bigcap_{A \in \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\alpha}} A \neq \emptyset.$$

6. Directly invoking the Axiom of Choice, we may find some  $x_\alpha \in \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{M}_\alpha} A$  for each  $\alpha$ . Set  $x := (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  to be the corresponding element of  $X$ .

We claim that each nonempty  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  has  $x \in \overline{A}$ . By [Lemma 2.56](#), it suffices to show that every open subset  $U$  containing  $x$  has nonempty intersection with  $A$ . Because each open subset  $U$  containing  $x$  has a(n open) basis set  $B \subseteq U$  containing  $x$ , it suffices to check  $B \cap A \neq \emptyset$  for basis elements, and  $B \cap A \subseteq U \cap A$  will give the result.

There are three steps. Observe that we must invoke the definition of the product topology on  $X$  to talk topologically about  $X$ , so we do so here.

- (a) We begin by checking this on the sub-base. For each  $\alpha \in \lambda$ , fix some sub-base element  $\pi_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha)$  (where  $U_\alpha \subseteq X_\alpha$  is open) containing  $x$ , and we claim

$$\pi_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha) \cap A \stackrel{?}{\neq} \emptyset.$$

Well,  $x \in \pi_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha)$  requires  $x_\alpha \in U_\alpha$ , but  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  forces  $x_\alpha \in \overline{\pi_\alpha(A)}$ . Thus,  $U_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(A) \neq \emptyset$  by [Lemma 2.56](#), so there is some  $a \in A$  with  $\pi_\alpha(a) \in U_\alpha$ , so  $\pi_\alpha^{-1}(U_\alpha) \cap A$  is in fact nonempty.

- (b) We show that each basis set containing  $x$  lives in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Part (a) above added to [item 3](#) directly shows that every sub-base open set containing  $x$  lives in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Thus, [item 2](#) tells us that any finite intersection of sub-basic sets containing  $x$  live in  $\mathcal{M}$  as well, but these are exactly the basic sets containing  $x$ . (Namely, any basic set is the intersection of sub-basic sets, and  $x$  living in the basic set forces  $x$  to still live in those sub-basic sets.)
- (c) It follows from the finite intersection property for  $\mathcal{M}$  that any basic set  $B$  containing  $x$  has  $B \in \mathcal{M}$  and therefore  $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$  because  $A$  is nonempty.

The above steps finish this part.

7. We finish the proof. Any  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  is closed and has  $V \in \mathcal{M}$ . By the above point, we see  $x \in \overline{V}$ , so  $x \in V$  by [Example 2.55](#), so we have exhibited

$$\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V \neq \emptyset.$$

The above steps have showed that  $\bigcap_{V \in \mathcal{V}} V \neq \emptyset$  from  $\mathcal{V}$  having the finite intersection property, so we conclude that  $X$  is compact by [Proposition 4.25](#). ■

## 4.5 September 26

We begin class by finishing the proof of Tychonoff's theorem ([Theorem 4.27](#)). I have gone ahead and just edited Friday's lecture for continuity.

### 4.5.1 Remarks on Tychonoff's Theorem

Here are some remarks.

**Remark 4.44.** Intuitively, the maximal element  $\mathcal{M}$  is constructed in order to become some filter focused around the single point  $x$ . Similar to maximal ideals corresponding to points, adding in all the "maximality" constraints for  $\mathcal{M}$  hones in our focus to the single constructed point  $x$ .

**Remark 4.45.** Here is an application of [Theorem 4.27](#). One can show that any normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$  has “lots” of continuous functionals by extending those found on a finite-dimensional subspace; let  $V'$  be the complete normed vector space of continuous linear functionals. (The norm of some  $v' \in V'$  is its Lipschitz constant, using [Lemma 2.69](#).) Fixing the unit ball  $B$  of  $V'$ , one can give  $V'$  the weakest topology making all the linear functionals “from  $V$ ” continuous (this is the weak- $*$  topology), which one can show is both Hausdorff and compact (!). This is the Banach–Alaoglu theorem, and it follows from [Theorem 4.27](#) by showing the space we want is a closed subspace of the compact space

$$\prod_{v \in V} [-\|v\|, \|v\|].$$

**Remark 4.46** ( $\beta$ -compactification). Let  $A := C([0, \infty))$  be the space of bounded continuous function  $[0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which we can see directly is an  $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra by taking  $r$  to the constant function  $r$ . Let  $A'$  be the set of continuous functions  $A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Notably, any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  gives a continuous ring homomorphism  $A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $f \mapsto f(x)$ , so we let  $Y$  be the set of all homomorphisms  $A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Again,  $A'$  is compact using the weak- $*$  topology, and so  $Y$  as a closed subset of  $A'$  can be given a compact topology. Then one can show that  $A$  is homeomorphic to  $C(Y)$ .

## 4.5.2 Tychonoff’s Theorem and Choice

We now show that Tychonoff’s theorem implies the Axiom of Choice.

**Theorem 4.47** (Kelley). Tychonoff’s theorem implies the Axiom of Choice.

*Proof.* Assume [Theorem 4.27](#) is true. Let  $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  be a collection of nonempty sets. We want to show that

$$X := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_\alpha$$

is nonempty.

The trick is to enlarge the  $X_\alpha$  to be able to give them a suitable topology. Choose some (set)  $\omega$  which does not live in  $\bigcup_\alpha X_\alpha$ ; for example, setting  $\omega$  to be equal to this set will do (using the Axiom of Foundation). Then we set

$$Y_\alpha := X_\alpha \cup \{\omega\},$$

which we give the topology  $\mathcal{T}_\alpha := \{Y_\alpha, \emptyset, X_\alpha, \{\omega\}\}$ . We quickly check that this is a topology.

- Note  $\emptyset$  and  $Y_\alpha$  are open.
- Arbitrary union: let  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  be a collection. Note that  $\mathcal{U}$  is necessarily finite, so it suffices by induction to show that  $U \cup U' \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  for any  $U, U' \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ . We have the following cases.
  - If  $U = \emptyset$  or  $U' = \emptyset$ , then we get  $U \cup U' \in \{U, U'\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ .
  - If  $U = Y_\alpha$  or  $U' = Y_\alpha$ , then  $U \cup U' = Y_\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ .
  - Note  $U = U'$  gives  $U \cup U' = U \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$ .
  - We have left to deal with  $\{U, U'\} \subseteq \{X_\alpha, \{\omega\}\}$  where  $U$  and  $U'$  are distinct, which means we just have to check  $\mathcal{T}_\alpha \cup \{\omega\} = Y_\alpha$  is open.
- Finite intersection: note that  $U \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  implies  $Y_\alpha \setminus U \in \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  because  $Y_\alpha \setminus \{\omega\} = X_\alpha$  and  $Y_\alpha \setminus \emptyset = Y_\alpha$ , and the other checks follow. Thus, we note any finite collection  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\alpha$  has

$$Y_\alpha \setminus \bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{U}} U = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \lambda} (Y_\alpha \setminus U)$$

is a union of open sets and hence open. It follows that our intersection also lives in  $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$ .



Additionally, because  $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$  has only finitely many sets, the space  $(Y_\alpha, \mathcal{T}_\alpha)$  is compact: any subcollection of  $\mathcal{T}_\alpha$  is finite, so all open covers of  $Y_\alpha$  are automatically finite. It follows that the product

$$Y := \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} Y_\alpha$$

is compact by applying [Theorem 4.27](#) (!).

We will now extract out our element of  $X$  using compactness of  $Y$  via [Proposition 4.25](#). Let  $\pi_\alpha: Y \rightarrow Y_\alpha$  be the canonical projection. Note that  $Y_\alpha \setminus X_\alpha = \{\omega\}$  is open in  $Y_\alpha$ , so  $X_\alpha \subseteq Y_\alpha$  is closed, so  $V_\alpha := \pi_\alpha^{-1}(X_\alpha)$  is a closed subset of  $Y$  by the continuity of  $\pi_\alpha$  (using [Remark 2.49](#)).

We now claim that the closed sets  $\{V_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  satisfy the finite intersection property: given a finite subcollection  $\{V_{\alpha_i}\}_{i=1}^n$ , one may finitely (!) choose a point  $x_{\alpha_i} \in X_{\alpha_i}$ . So we define

$$y_\alpha := \begin{cases} x_{\alpha_i} & \alpha \in \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}, \\ \omega & \alpha \notin \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}, \end{cases}$$

so the point  $(y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \lambda} \in Y$  has  $\pi_{\alpha_i}(y) \in X_{\alpha_i}$  for each  $\alpha_i$ , so  $y_{\alpha_i} \in \pi_{\alpha_i}^{-1}(X_{\alpha_i}) = V_{\alpha_i}$ , so

$$y \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n V_{\alpha_i}.$$

So we have verified the finite intersection property.

It follows from [Proposition 4.25](#) that we can find

$$y \in \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} V_\alpha.$$

However, this implies that each  $\alpha \in \lambda$  has  $y \in V_\alpha$  and so  $\pi_\alpha(y) \in X_\alpha$ . It follows that

$$y \in \prod_{\alpha \in \lambda} X_\alpha,$$

which finishes the proof. ■

**Remark 4.48.** The topology on  $Y_\alpha$  need not be Hausdorff, so we needed [Theorem 4.27](#) to allow non-Hausdorff spaces.

## 4.6 September 28

Today we discuss compactness for metric spaces.

### 4.6.1 Totally Bounded Spaces

Here is a quick lemma.

**Lemma 4.49.** Fix a compact metric space  $(X, d)$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there are finitely many points  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$  such that

$$X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(x_i, \varepsilon).$$

*Proof.* Note that of course

$$X = \bigcup_{x \in X} \{x\} \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in X} B(x, \varepsilon) = X,$$

so  $\{B(x, \varepsilon)\}_{x \in X}$  is an open cover for  $X$  (see [Example 2.6](#)). The result follows by extracting a finite subcover. ■

This is a pretty nice finiteness property for a metric space to have, so we give it a name.

**Definition 4.50 (Totally bounded).** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is *totally bounded* if and only if any  $\varepsilon > 0$  has a finite set  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq A$  for which

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(x_i, \varepsilon).$$

If  $X$  is totally bounded, we say that  $(X, d)$  is totally bounded.

**Example 4.51.** Any compact metric space is totally bounded by [Lemma 4.49](#).

It's going to turn out that totally bounded is pretty close to compactness. Here is a quick sanity check.

**Lemma 4.52.** A totally bounded metric space  $(X, d)$ , and  $A \subseteq X$ , then  $A$  with the induced metric is totally bounded.

*Proof.* For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we see that there is a finite set  $S \subseteq X$  for which

$$X = \bigcup_{x \in S} B(x, \varepsilon)$$

because  $(X, d)$  is totally bounded. Now, let  $T \subseteq S$  be the subset for which  $B(x, \varepsilon) \cap A \neq \emptyset$  for each  $x \in S$ , and we then find some  $y_x \in B(x, \varepsilon) \cap A$  for each  $x \in T$ . We now claim that

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in T} B(y_x, \varepsilon),$$

which will finish the proof. Indeed, if  $a \in A$ , then  $a \in X$ , so we can find some  $x_0 \in S$  with  $a \in B(x_0, \varepsilon/2)$ . It follows that

$$d(a, y_{x_0}) \leq d(a, x_0) + d(x_0, y_{x_0}) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon,$$

so we get

$$a \in B(y_{x_0}, \varepsilon) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in T} B(y_x, \varepsilon),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

**Lemma 4.53.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$  and a subset  $A \subseteq X$  which is totally bounded. Then  $\bar{A}$  is also totally bounded.

*Proof.* Fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Because  $A$  is totally bounded, we may find  $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq A$  for which

$$A \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(a_i, \varepsilon/2).$$

We now claim that

$$\overline{A} \stackrel{?}{\subseteq} \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(a_i, \varepsilon),$$

which will finish the proof. Indeed, if  $x \in \overline{A}$ , then [Lemma 2.56](#) tells us that  $B(x, \varepsilon/2) \cap \overline{A}$  is nonempty, so place  $a \in A \cap B(x, \varepsilon/2)$ . By hypothesis on the  $a_i$ , there exists some  $a_i$  such that  $a \in B(a_i, \varepsilon/2)$  as well, so

$$d(x, a_i) \leq d(x, a) + d(a, a_i) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon,$$

so

$$x \in B(a_i, \varepsilon) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(a_i, \varepsilon).$$

The claim follows. ■

## 4.6.2 Nets

It will be beneficial to us to be able to talk about nets for convergence instead of just sequences.

**Definition 4.54** (Directed set). A partially ordered set  $\Lambda$  is a *directed set* if and only if any  $a, b \in \Lambda$  have some  $c \in \Lambda$  for which  $c \geq a, b$ .

**Example 4.55.** Any totally ordered set is a directed set. In particular, any  $a, b \in \Lambda$  will have  $a \geq b$  or  $b \geq a$ , so we just set  $c$  to be the larger of the two.

**Definition 4.56** (Net). Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Given a directed set  $\Lambda$ , a net is a  $\Lambda$ -indexed sequence  $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$  in  $X$ .

**Definition 4.57** (Cluster point). Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a net  $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ . Then  $x \in X$  is a *cluster point* if and only if, for any open subset  $U$  containing  $x$  and  $\alpha \in \Lambda$ , there is some  $\alpha' > \alpha$  for which  $x_{\alpha'} \in U$ .

**Remark 4.58.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then a cluster point  $x$  of a Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $X$  is in fact a limit point. Indeed, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , find some  $N_1$  for which  $m, n \geq N_1$  has  $d(x_m, x_n) < \varepsilon/2$ . Additionally, being a cluster point means there is  $N_2$  with  $d(x, x_{N_2}) < \varepsilon/2$ . Thus, setting  $N := \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ , any  $n > \max\{N_1, N_2\}$  has

$$d(x_n, x) \leq d(x_n, x_{N_2}) + d(x_{N_2}, x) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

Here is the application to metric spaces.

**Proposition 4.59.** Fix a compact topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then any net  $\{x_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$  has a cluster point.

*Proof.* Define

$$A_\alpha := \{x_\beta : \beta > \alpha\}.$$

Observe  $\beta \geq \alpha$  implies  $A_\beta \subseteq A_\alpha$ , so  $A_\beta \subseteq \overline{A_\alpha}$ , so  $\overline{A_\beta} \subseteq \overline{A_\alpha}$ .

Additionally, we note that any finite subset of the  $A_\alpha$  have a nonempty intersection. Indeed, for any finite  $S \subseteq \Lambda$ , inductively applying the fact that  $\Lambda$  is a directed set promises us some  $\omega \in \Lambda$  with  $\omega \geq \alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in S$ . It follows that  $x_\omega \in A_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in S$ , so

$$\bigcap_{n \in S} A_n,$$

contains  $x_\omega$  and hence is not empty.

Now, because  $A_\alpha \subseteq \overline{A_\alpha}$ , we see that the  $\overline{A_\alpha}$  also have the finite intersection property: for any finite  $S \subseteq \Lambda$ , see

$$\emptyset \neq \bigcap_{\alpha \in S} A_\alpha \subseteq \bigcap_{\alpha \in S} \overline{A_\alpha},$$

But now the  $\overline{A_\alpha}$  are closed, so the compactness of  $X$  (!) tells us that there is an element

$$x \in \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Lambda} \overline{A_\alpha}$$

by [Proposition 4.25](#).

It remains to check that  $x$  is a cluster point. Indeed, for any open set  $U$  containing  $x$ , we see that  $x \in \overline{A_\alpha}$  and so  $U \cap A_\alpha \neq \emptyset$  for each  $\alpha$  by [Lemma 2.56](#). As such, for any  $\alpha \in \Lambda$ , we are being promised  $U \cap A_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ , so there is  $x_\beta$  with  $\beta \geq \alpha$  with  $x_\beta \in U$ . This finishes. ■

**Corollary 4.60.** Any compact metric space  $(X, d)$  is complete.

*Proof.* Fix a Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $X$ . Because  $X$  is compact as a topological space, [Proposition 4.59](#) promises us some cluster point  $x \in X$ . But then  $x$  is our limit point by [Remark 4.58](#). ■

### 4.6.3 A “Metric” Completeness

Here is our capstone result: a converse for [Lemma 4.49](#) combined with [Corollary 4.60](#).

**Theorem 4.61.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . If  $X$  is complete and totally bounded, then  $X$  is compact.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $X$  is not compact and totally bounded. We show that  $X$  is not complete. Because  $X$  is not compact, we can find an open cover  $\mathcal{U}$  of  $X$  with no finite subcover.

Notice that, for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , being totally bounded means we can find some finite  $S \subseteq X$  for which  $X$  is covered by the  $\{B(x, \varepsilon)\}_{x \in S}$ . If it were the case that each  $x \in S$  has  $B(x, \varepsilon)$  covered by some finite cover  $\{U_{x,i}\}_{i=1}^{n_x} \in \mathcal{U}$ , then we could write

$$X \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in S} B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in S} \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_x} U_{x,i} \right),$$

giving our finite subcover of  $\mathcal{U}$ . However, this violates the fact that  $\mathcal{U}$  has no finite subcover, so there must be some  $x \in S$  not covered by any finite subset of  $\mathcal{U}$ .

We can run the above argument starting with  $\varepsilon = 1/2$  and find our  $x_1$ . Then we replace  $X$  with  $B(x_1, 1/2)$  where  $B(x_1, 1/2)$  has no finite subcover by  $\mathcal{U}$ , so running the argument with  $\varepsilon = 1/2^2$  on the totally bounded space  $B(x_1, 1/2)$  grants us  $x_2 \in B(x_1, 1/2)$  such that  $B(x_2, 1/2^2)$  still has no finite subcover by  $\mathcal{U}$ . Going again, we run the argument with  $\varepsilon = 1/2^3$  on the totally bounded space  $B(x_2, 1/2^2)$ , so we get a totally bounded ball  $B(x_3, 1/2^3)$  with no finite subcover by  $\mathcal{U}$ .

We can continue this process inductively, which gives a sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  has  $B(x_n, 1/2^n)$  with no finite cover by  $\mathcal{U}$  and

$$d(x_n, x_{n+1}) \leq 1/2^n.$$

A standard argument shows that  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a Cauchy sequence.<sup>1</sup> To finish the proof, we claim that it has no limit point.

<sup>1</sup> For any  $m \geq n$ , note that  $d(x_m, x_n) \leq \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} d(x_{k+1}, x_k) \leq \sum_{k=n}^{m-1} 1/2^k < \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} 1/2^k = 1/2^{n-1}$ . Namely, we see that  $m, n \rightarrow \infty$  makes  $d(x_m, x_n) \rightarrow 0$ .

Indeed, suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $x_n \rightarrow x$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then we find some  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  containing  $x$ , and by definition of a set being open, we can find some open ball  $B(x, \varepsilon)$  contained in  $U$ . We now find some  $n$  large enough so that  $1/2^n < \varepsilon/2$  and  $d(x_n, x) < \varepsilon/2$  so that any  $y \in B(x_n, 1/2^n)$  has

$$d(x, y) \leq d(x, x_n) + d(x_n, y) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon,$$

so  $y \in B(x, \varepsilon)$ . It follows  $B(x_n, 1/2^n) \subseteq B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U$ , which is a contradiction to the construction of  $B(x_n, 1/2^n)$ . This completes the proof. ■

**Corollary 4.62.** Fix a complete metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then a subset  $A \subseteq X$  is compact if and only if  $A$  is closed and totally bounded.

*Proof.* In the forward direction, if  $A$  is compact, then  $A$  is totally bounded by [Lemma 4.49](#), and  $A$  is closed by [Corollary 4.13](#) because  $(X, d)$  is a metric space and thus Hausdorff. In the reverse direction, if  $A$  is closed and totally bounded, then  $A$  is complete by [Corollary 2.52](#) and therefore compact by [Theorem 4.61](#). ■

## 4.7 September 30

There are no questions.

### 4.7.1 Totally Bounded for Function Spaces

We continue our discussion of compactness in metric spaces. Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a metric space  $(M, d)$  so that we can give the space of bounded continuous functions  $B_c(X, M)$  the uniform metric  $d_u$  by [Proposition 3.25](#). We would like to understand the compact subset of  $B_c(X, M)$ , so [Corollary 4.62](#) tells us that we are really interested in totally bounded subsets, and we'll take the closure afterward to get our compact sets.

Here are a few lemmas.

**Lemma 4.63.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a metric space  $(M, d)$  so that we can give the space of bounded continuous functions  $B_c(X, M)$  the uniform metric  $d_u$ . Fixing a totally bounded subset  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq B_c(X, M)$ , the set

$$\{s(x) : s \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

totally bounded for any fixed  $x \in X$ .

*Proof.* For any  $\varepsilon > 0$  has a finite set  $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  so that  $\mathcal{F}$  is covered by the  $B(s_i, \varepsilon/2)$ . This is equivalent to saying that any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  has some  $f_i$  with

$$d(f(x), f_i(x)) \leq \varepsilon/2$$

for all  $x \in X$ , so

$$\{f(x) : s \in \mathcal{F}\} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n B(f_i(x), \varepsilon),$$

so the claim follows. ■

[Lemma 4.63](#) motivates the following definition.

**Definition 4.64** (Pointwise totally bounded). Fix topological spaces  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and a metric space  $(M, d)$ , and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of continuous functions  $f: X \rightarrow M$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is *pointwise totally bounded* if and only if any  $x \in X$  makes the set

$$\{f(x) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

totally bounded.

**Example 4.65.** By Lemma 4.66, any totally bounded subset of  $B_c(X, M)$  is pointwise totally bounded.

**Lemma 4.66.** Fix a topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a metric space  $(M, d)$  so that we can give the space of bounded continuous functions  $B_c(X, M)$  the uniform metric  $d_u$ . Fixing a totally bounded subset  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq B_c(X, M)$  and a point  $x \in X$ , any  $\varepsilon > 0$  has some open subset  $U \subseteq X$  containing  $x$  such that

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

for any  $y \in U$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ .

*Proof.* Fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and use our totally boundedness to extract  $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  such that the  $B(f_i, \varepsilon/3)$  cover  $\mathcal{F}$ . Now, for any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , find some  $f_i$  with  $d(f_i, f) < \varepsilon/3$ , we see that any  $y \in U$  can write

$$d(f(x), f(y)) \leq d(f(x), f_i(x)) + d(f_i(x), f_i(y)) + d(f_i(y), f(y)) \leq 2\varepsilon/3 + d(f_i(x), f_i(y)).$$

Now, by the continuity of  $f_i$ , we see that there is an open subset  $U_i$  containing  $x$  such that  $y \in U_i$  implies  $d(f_i(x), f_i(y)) < \varepsilon/3$ , so  $d(f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon$  follows.

We now let  $f$  vary, which allows the  $U_i$  to vary. Defining

$$U := \bigcap_{i=1}^n U_i,$$

we see  $U$  is an open subset of  $X$  containing  $x$ , and each  $y \in U$  has  $d(f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon$  for any (!)  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . ■

Lemma 4.66 motivates the following definition.

**Definition 4.67** (Equicontinuous). Fix topological spaces  $(X, \mathcal{T}_X)$  and a metric space  $(M, d)$ , and let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a family of continuous functions  $f: X \rightarrow M$ . We say that the family  $\mathcal{F}$  is *equicontinuous* at some  $x \in X$  if and only if any  $\varepsilon > 0$  has some open subset  $U \subseteq X$  such that  $y \in U$  has

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

for all  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . The entire family  $\mathcal{F}$  is *equicontinuous* if and only if it is equicontinuous at all  $x \in X$ .

**Example 4.68.** By Lemma 4.66, any totally bounded subset of  $B_c(X, M)$  is equicontinuous.

## 4.7.2 Arzelà–Ascoli’s Theorem

We might hope for a converse of our given lemmas. Here is the result.

**Theorem 4.69** (Arzelà–Ascoli). Fix a compact topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a metric space  $(M, d)$  so that we can give the space of bounded continuous functions  $B_c(X, M)$  the uniform metric  $d_u$ . Then any equicontinuous and pointwise totally bounded family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq B_c(X, M)$  is totally bounded.

*Proof.* Fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that we want to cover  $\mathcal{F}$  with finitely balls of radius  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

The point is to use compactness on the equicontinuous statement. Indeed, for any  $x \in X$ , we are promised an open subset  $U_x \subseteq X$  such that any  $y \in U_x$  and  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  has  $d(f(x), f(y)) < \varepsilon/4$ . However, this means

$$X \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in X} U_x$$

gives us an open cover of  $X$ , so compactness tells us that there is some finite sequence of points  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$  such that the  $U_i := U_{x_i}$  cover  $X$ .

Now, fixing any particular  $i$ , we use the pointwise totally bounded condition to note

$$\{f(x_i) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$$

is totally bounded, so we get a finite subset  $S_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  such that

$$\{f(x_i) : f \in \mathcal{F}\} \subseteq \bigcup_{f \in S_i} B(f(x_i), \varepsilon/4).$$

We now define  $S$  as the union of all the  $S_i$ , which is finite as the finite union of finite sets.

To finish the proof, we will need to do a little bookkeeping. Let  $\Psi$  denote the set of functions from  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  to  $S$  so that we can set

$$\mathcal{F}_\psi := \{f \in \mathcal{F} : f(x_i) \in B(\psi(i), \varepsilon/4) \text{ for each } 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

for any  $\psi \in \Psi$ . By construction, the  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  cover  $\mathcal{F}$ : fix some  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . Note that any  $y \in U_i$  implies that  $d(f(y), f(x_i)) \leq \varepsilon/4$  by construction of  $U_i$ , and for any given  $f(x_i)$ , there is an element  $s_i \in S_i$  such that  $d(f(x_i), s_i) < \varepsilon/4$  by construction of the  $S_i \subseteq S$ . Defining  $\psi$  by  $\psi(i) := s_i$  for this particular  $s_i$ , we see that any  $y \in U_i$  for any  $i$  has

$$d(f(y), f(x_i)) \leq d(f(y), s_i) + d(s_i, f(x_i)) \leq \varepsilon/2.$$

Letting  $i$  vary, we recall that the  $U_i$  cover  $X$ , so we have found  $\psi \in \Psi$  with  $f \in \mathcal{F}_\psi$ , which is what we wanted.

We will finish upon showing that  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  has diameter less than  $\varepsilon$ . Well, for any  $f, g \in \mathcal{F}_\psi$ , we need to show that  $d_u(f, g) < \varepsilon$ . Well, fix any  $x \in X$  and find some  $j$  with  $x \in U_j$ . Then we see

$$d(f(x), g(x)) \leq d(f(x), f(x_j)) + d(f(x_j), g(x_j)) + d(g(x_j), g(x)) \leq \varepsilon/2 + d(f(x_j), g(x_j)).$$

Now, by construction of  $\psi$ , we see

$$d(f(x_j), g(x_j)) \leq d(f(x_j), \psi(j)) + d(\psi(j), g(x_j)) < \varepsilon/2,$$

so we see that  $d(f(x), g(x)) < \varepsilon$  in total. It follows  $\|f - g\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ , so, say, dividing all  $\varepsilon$ s by two will give  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  all with radius less than  $\varepsilon$ . ■

## 4.8 October 3

It's spooky season. We begin class by finishing the proof of [Theorem 4.69](#). I have edited the proof from yesterday for continuity reasons.

### 4.8.1 Locally Compact Spaces

Here is our definition.

**Definition 4.70 (Locally compact).** A topological space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  is *locally compact* if and only if each point  $x \in X$  has some open subset  $U \in \mathcal{T}$  containing  $x$  such that  $\overline{U}$  is compact.

**Example 4.71.** The set of real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$  with the usual topology is locally compact. Indeed, any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  has the open neighborhood  $(x - 1, x + 1)$  with closure  $[x - 1, x + 1]$ , and  $[x - 1, x + 1]$  is compact.

**Example 4.72.** For the same reason, the space  $[a, b)$  is also locally compact.

**Remark 4.73.** Even though compact Hausdorff spaces are normal (by [Proposition 4.18](#)), locally compact Hausdorff spaces do not have to be.

For today, we are going to look at only locally compact Hausdorff spaces.

**Lemma 4.74.** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$ . Then any  $x \in X$  and open subset  $U \in \mathcal{T}$  containing  $x$  has some open subset  $U_x \subseteq U$  containing  $x$  such that  $\overline{U_x}$  is compact and  $\overline{U_x} \subseteq U$ .

*Proof.* We begin by finding our promised  $U'$  containing  $x$  with  $\overline{U'}$  compact. Thus, it suffices to find some open subset  $V$  containing  $x$  such that  $\overline{V}$  is compact and  $\overline{V} \subseteq U \cap U'$ , but now we see that

$$\overline{U \cap U'} \subseteq \overline{U'}$$

is a closed subset of the compact space  $\overline{U'}$  and therefore compact by [Lemma 4.10](#). In particular, we can replace  $U$  with  $U \cap U'$  and assume that  $\overline{U}$  is compact.

Now, let  $\partial U := \overline{U} \setminus U$  be the boundary of  $U$ . Notably,  $\partial U$  is a closed subset of the compact space  $\overline{U}$ , so  $\partial U$  is compact by [Lemma 4.10](#). Because  $\{x\}$  is a closed subset in  $U$  (note  $X \setminus \{x\}$  is open, so  $U \setminus \{x\}$  is open in the relative topology), the fact that compact Hausdorff spaces are normal ([Proposition 4.18](#)) grants open subsets  $U_x$  and  $U_\partial$  of  $\overline{U}$  with  $x \in U_x$  and  $\partial U \subseteq U_\partial$ .

Now,  $U_x \subseteq \overline{U} \setminus U_\partial \subseteq \overline{U} \setminus \partial U$ , so we see  $\overline{U_x} \subseteq \overline{U} \setminus U_\partial$  because  $\overline{U} \setminus U_\partial$  is a closed subset of  $\overline{U}$ . Further,  $\overline{U_x}$  is a closed subset of a compact space  $\overline{U}$ , so  $\overline{U_x}$  is compact by [Lemma 4.10](#), so we are done. ■

**Remark 4.75.** [Lemma 4.74](#) basically says that open subspaces of locally compact Hausdorff spaces are locally compact.

We can extend the previous result past points to full compact sets.

**Proposition 4.76.** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and some compact subset  $C \subseteq X$ . Then any open subset  $U$  containing  $C$  has some open subset  $U_C$  containing  $C$  such that  $\overline{U_C}$  is compact and  $\overline{U_C} \subseteq U$ .

*Proof.* We use [Lemma 4.74](#). For each  $x \in C$ , find some  $U_x$  by [Lemma 4.74](#) with  $U_x$  containing  $x$  with  $\overline{U_x}$  compact and  $\overline{U_x} \subseteq U$ . Then we see that

$$C \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in C} U_x,$$

so we have provided an open cover for  $C$ , so we can choose finitely many  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq C$  with  $U_i := U_{x_i}$  so that

$$C \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i \subseteq U_C.$$

Now, we see that

$$\overline{\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \overline{U_i}$$

is a compact subset of  $U$  because being compact is closed under finite unions (by inductively applying [Example 4.9](#)), so  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n U_i$  is the required open subset. ■



### 4.8.2 Supports

A nice thing about locally compact Hausdorff spaces is that they let us talk about supports.

**Definition 4.77 (Support).** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ . Then the *support* of a continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow V$  is

$$\text{supp } f := \overline{\{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0\}}.$$

Notably,  $\{x \in X : f(x) \neq 0\} = f^{-1}(V \setminus \{0\})$  is the pre-image of an open subset and is therefore open by the continuity of  $f$ . In particular, normed vector spaces are metric spaces and therefore Hausdorff, so  $\{0\} \subseteq V$  is in fact a closed subset.

Here are some quick checks about the support.

**Lemma 4.78.** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a normed  $k$ -vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ . Then, given two continuous functions  $f, g \in C(X, V)$  and  $a, b \in k$ , we have that

$$\text{supp}(af + bg) \subseteq (\text{supp } f \cup \text{supp } g)$$

*Proof.* Because  $\text{supp } f \cup \text{supp } g$  is the union of two closed sets, it's closed, so it suffices by definition of the closure to show that

$$\{x \in X : (af + bg)(x) \neq 0\} \stackrel{?}{\subseteq} (\text{supp } f \cup \text{supp } g).$$

Well, if  $f(x) = 0$  and  $g(x) = 0$ , then we see  $(af + bg)(x) = af(x) + bg(x) = 0$ , so  $x \notin \text{supp}(af + bg)$ . Applying contraposition, we see  $x \in \text{supp}(af + bg)$  implies  $f(x) \neq 0$  or  $g(x) \neq 0$ , so  $x \in \text{supp } f$  or  $x \in \text{supp } g$ . ■

**Lemma 4.79.** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a normed  $k$ -algebra  $(R, \|\cdot\|)$ . Then, given two continuous functions  $f, g \in C(X, R)$  and  $a, b \in k$ , we have that

$$\text{supp } fg \subseteq (\text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } g)$$

*Proof.* Again, because  $\text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } g$  is the intersection of closed sets, it's closed, so it suffices to show that

$$\{x \in X : (fg)(x) \neq 0\} \stackrel{?}{\subseteq} (\text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } g).$$

Well, if  $f(x) = 0$  or  $g(x) = 0$ , then  $(fg)(x) = f(x)g(x) = 0$ . Thus, by contraposition, if  $(fg)(x) \neq 0$ , then  $f(x) \neq 0$  and  $g(x) \neq 0$ , so  $x \in (\text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } g)$ . ■

We tend to like small things, so here are our small functions.

**Definition 4.80 (Compact support).** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ . A continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow V$  has *compact support* if and only if its support is compact. We let  $C_c(X, V)$  denote the continuous functions of compact support.

Here is a quick sanity check.

**Lemma 4.81.** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a normed  $k$ -vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ . Then  $C_c(X, V)$  is a  $k$ -subspace of  $C(X, V)$ . If  $V$  is a normed  $k$ -algebra, then  $C_c(X, V)$  is a  $k$ -subalgebra.

*Proof.* We have the following checks.

- Zero: note that the zero function  $z: X \rightarrow V$  by  $z(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$  has

$$\{x \in X : z(x) \neq 0\} = \emptyset.$$

The closure of the empty set is still empty (certainly  $\overline{\emptyset} \subseteq \emptyset$  by definition of the closure), so we conclude that  $\text{supp } z = \emptyset$ . Now,  $\emptyset$  is compact because any open cover can take the empty subcover, which is certainly finite. Thus,  $z \in C_c(X, V)$ .

- Linear combination: given  $f, g \in C_c(X, V)$  and  $a, b \in k$ , we see from [Lemma 4.78](#) that  $\text{supp}(af + bg)$  is a closed subset of  $\text{supp } f \cup \text{supp } g$ . However,  $\text{supp } f \cup \text{supp } g$  is the union of two compact sets and therefore compact by [Example 4.9](#), so  $\text{supp}(af + bg)$  is a closed subset of a compact space and hence compact by [Lemma 4.10](#).

- Multiplication: given  $f, g \in C_c(X, V)$ , we see from [Lemma 4.79](#) that  $\text{supp}(fg)$  is a closed subset of

$$\text{supp } f \cap \text{supp } g \subseteq \text{supp } f.$$

However,  $\text{supp } f$  is compact, so  $\text{supp } fg$  is a closed subset of a compact space and hence compact by [Lemma 4.10](#).

The first two checks tell us that we have a subspace, and the last check uses the algebra structure to get a subalgebra. ■

Of course, we would like to know that there are a nontrivial number of functions of compact support, so here we go.

**Proposition 4.82.** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $(X, \mathcal{T})$  and a normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ . For any compact subset  $C \subseteq X$  and open subset  $U \subseteq X$  containing  $C$ , there is a continuous function  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of compact support such that  $f|_C = 1$  and  $f|_{X \setminus U} = 0$ .

*Proof.* The point is to apply [Theorem 3.8](#). By [Proposition 4.76](#), we may find an open subset  $V$  containing  $C$  such that  $\overline{V}$  is compact and  $\overline{V} \subseteq U$ . Then we see  $C$  and  $\overline{V} \setminus V$  are disjoint closed subsets of  $\overline{V}$ —note  $C$  is closed because  $X$  is Hausdorff, using [Corollary 4.13](#).

Thus, because  $\overline{V}$  is a normal space (it's compact and Hausdorff, so [Proposition 4.18](#) applies), we are promised a continuous function  $f_{\overline{V}}: \overline{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f_{\overline{V}}|_C = 1$  and  $f_{\overline{V}}|_{\overline{V} \setminus V} = 0$ . We now extend  $f_{\overline{V}}$  to all of  $X$  by

$$f(x) := \begin{cases} f_{\overline{V}}(x) & x \in \overline{V}, \\ 0 & x \notin \overline{V}. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, if  $x \in C$ , we see  $x \in \overline{V}$ , so  $f(x) = 1$ ; similarly, if  $x \notin U$ , then  $x \notin \overline{V}$  and so  $f(x) = 0$ . Lastly, to see that  $f$  is continuous, we pick up some open closed  $W \subseteq V$ ; we have the following cases.

- If  $0 \notin W$ , then we see that  $f(x) \in W$  forces  $x \in \overline{V}$ , so

$$f^{-1}(W) = f_{\overline{V}}^{-1}(W)$$

is a closed subset of  $\overline{V}$  by the continuity of  $f_{\overline{V}}$ . Closed subsets of closed subspaces are still closed, though, so we see that  $f^{-1}(W)$  is closed in  $X$ .

- If  $0 \in W$ , then we do casework. If  $x \in \overline{V}$ , then actually  $x \in f_{\overline{V}}^{-1}(W)$ , which is closed in  $\overline{V}$  and hence closed in  $X$  by continuity of  $f_{\overline{V}}$ . Otherwise,  $x \notin \overline{V}$ , but then we see that  $x \in X \setminus V$  as well; conversely, if  $x \in \overline{V} \setminus V$ , then either  $x \in \overline{V}$  and so  $f_{\overline{V}}(x) = 0 \in W$ , or  $x \notin \overline{V}$  and so  $f(x) = 0 \in W$ .

In total, we see

$$f^{-1}(\{0\}) = f_{\overline{V}}^{-1}(W) \cup (X \setminus V)$$

is the union of closed sets and thus closed.

Lastly, we see that  $\text{supp } f \subseteq \overline{V}$ , so  $\text{supp } f$  is a closed subset of a compact set, so we conclude  $\text{supp } f$  is compact by [Lemma 4.10](#), so  $f$  has compact support. ■

**Remark 4.83.** By [Proposition 3.25](#), the space of bounded continuous functions  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is complete under  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ . We note that  $C_c(X, \mathbb{R})$  is a subalgebra, but it is not a closed subset. It turns out that its closure is  $C_\infty(X, \mathbb{R})$ , which is the space of functions which vanish at infinity: namely, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a compact set  $C \subseteq X$  such that  $|f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$  for each  $x \notin C$ .

## **PART II**

# **MEASURE THEORY**

## THEME 5

# DEFINING MEASURES

---

*One fish, two fish, red fish, blue fish.*

—Dr. Suess, [Gei60]

### 5.1 October 5

We begin today by making some motivating remarks on  $C^*$ -algebras and the like. I hope it's not important because I didn't understand it very well.

#### 5.1.1 Evaluation Maps

For this subsection, we will want to work with the fields  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{C}$  at the same time, so we pick up the following definition.

**Definition 5.1.** An archimedean field is either  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ .

We now recall the following piece of notation, which we will state in the case we now care about.

**Notation 5.2.** Fix an archimedean field  $k$  and a compact Hausdorff space  $X$ . Then we let  $C(X)$  denote the continuous functions  $X \rightarrow k$ .

**Remark 5.3.** Note that  $C(X)$  is a  $k$ -subalgebra of  $k^X$  because the constantly one function is continuous and the sum and product of two continuous functions is still continuous.

It will turn out that  $C(X)$  can tell us a lot about  $X$ . For example, homomorphisms we can use  $X$  to build homomorphisms  $C(X) \rightarrow k$ .

**Example 5.4.** Given any  $x \in X$ , the function  $\text{ev}_x: C(X) \rightarrow k$  by  $f \mapsto f(x)$  is a homomorphism. To see that this is a homomorphism, note that  $\text{ev}_x(1) = 1$ , and  $\text{ev}_x(f + g) = (f + g)(x) = f(x) + g(x)$ , and  $\text{ev}_x(fg)(x) = (fg)(x) = f(x)g(x)$ .

In fact, these are all the homomorphisms!

**Theorem 5.5.** Fix an archimedean field  $k$  and a compact Hausdorff space  $X$ . Then all homomorphisms  $C(X) \rightarrow k$  take the form  $\text{ev}_x$  for some  $x \in X$ .

*Proof.* Fix some homomorphism  $\varphi: C(X) \rightarrow k$ , and suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $\varphi \neq \text{ev}_x$  for each  $x \in X$ . To relate our geometry and our algebra, we will use the fact that the “algebraic” set  $k \setminus \{0\}$  is open.

Now, we can find  $f_x \in C(X)$  with  $\varphi(f_x) \neq f_x(x)$  for each  $x \in X$ . However,  $(f_x - \varphi(f_x)1_X): X \rightarrow k$  is a continuous function, so

$$U_x := \{y \in X : (f_x - \varphi(f_x)1_X)(y) \neq 0\}$$

is the preimage of the open subset  $k \setminus \{0\}$  through the continuous function  $(f_x - \varphi(f_x)1_X)$ .

Further,  $x \in U_x$  because  $(\varphi(f_x)1_X)(x) = \varphi(f_x) \neq f_x(x)$ , so the open sets  $\{U_x\}_{x \in X}$  produce an open cover of  $X$ , so we can finitely many of these points in  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  so that the open sets  $U_i := U_{x_i}$  cover  $X$ . Thus, the function

$$f := \sum_{i=1}^n (f_{x_i} - \varphi(f_{x_i})1_X)^2$$

is nonzero everywhere and thus a unit in  $C(X)$ . On the other hand,  $\varphi(f_{x_i} - \varphi(f_{x_i})1_X) = \varphi(f_{x_i}) - \varphi(f_{x_i})\varphi(1_X) = 0$ , so summing gives  $\varphi(f) = 0$ , which is a contradiction because ring homomorphisms send units to units! ■

This motivates us to work in a little more generality: fix a local field  $k$ . Given a  $k$ -algebra  $A$ , set  $A^* := \text{Hom}_k(A, k)$ , and given  $a \in A$ , define the homomorphism  $\text{ev}_a: A^* \rightarrow k$  by  $f \mapsto f(a)$ . Then, by convention, we will give  $A^*$  the weakest topology making the  $a \mapsto \text{ev}_a$  continuous.

**Example 5.6.** Using the  $k$ -algebra  $A = C(X)$ , the map  $X \rightarrow A^*$  by  $x \mapsto \text{ev}_x$  is a homeomorphism. Namely, this is a bijection by Theorem 5.5, and it is a homeomorphism essentially by the definition of the topology on  $A^*$ .

The point of the above example is that the algebra  $C(X)$  and its evaluation maps are able to fully recover the topological space  $X$ !

### 5.1.2 The Gelfand–Naimark Theorem

By adding in a little more data, we can read even more information off  $C(X)$ .

**Remark 5.7.** With  $k = \mathbb{C}$ , note that complex conjugation extends to a function  $C(X) \rightarrow C(X)$  by  $f \mapsto \bar{f}$ . Then one can check that

$$\|\bar{f} \cdot f\|_\infty = \|f\|_\infty^2.$$

In fact, the converse is true!

**Theorem 5.8 (Gelfand–Naimark).** Suppose that  $A$  is a commutative Banach  $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra or  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra equipped with an involution  $a \mapsto a^*$  such that  $\|aa^*\| = \|a\|^2$ . Then there is an isomorphism

$$A \simeq C(A^*).$$

In particular, all of these Banach algebras come from a topological space!

**Example 5.9.** When  $X$  is locally compact, set  $C_\infty(X)$  to be the set of continuous functions  $X \rightarrow k$  which vanish at infinity. Even though  $C_\infty(X)$  has no multiplicative unit, it is still the case that  $C_\infty(A^*) \cong C_\infty(X)$ , and in fact  $A^* \cong X$ . Not having a unit turns out to not be a problem because we can have a function be 1 over a large interval, which is topologically close enough to a unit.

**Example 5.10.** In contrast, the bounded continuous functions  $A := C_b(X)$  have  $A \cong C(A^*)$  still, even though  $A^*$  is compact. This is weird: the embedding  $X \hookrightarrow A^*$  is going to have elements not live in the image, but the elements outside the image require the Axiom of Choice to see.

The above example is why we prefer to work with  $C_\infty(X)$  when we talk about locally compact spaces  $X$ . Before jumping into measure theory, we will want to pick up the following definition.


**Definition 5.11.** A Hilbert space is a complete inner product  $\mathbb{R}$ - or  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space.

**Example 5.12.** Given a Hilbert space  $H$ , the set of linear operators  $B(H)$  on  $H$  has a conjugation again, giving us an involution  $T \mapsto \bar{T}$ . One still has  $\|T\bar{T}\| = \|\bar{T}\|^2$ , so [Theorem 5.8](#) applies, and we can think about these spaces as spaces of functions.

The above example will generalize to the study of  $C^*$  algebras, but we won't discuss this further.

### 5.1.3 Finitely Additive Measures

We begin with a motivating example. Consider the set of functions  $f_n: [0, 2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , given by the following image.



More precisely, we can write

$$f_n(x) := \min\{1, \max\{0, 1 - n(x - 1)\}\}.$$

These functions are all continuous by definition, but we can also give them a piecewise definition as

$$f_n(x) := \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq 1, \\ 1 - n(x - 1) & 1 \leq x \leq 1 + 1/n, \\ 0 & 1 + 1/n \leq x \leq 2. \end{cases}$$

In particular, we can see that  $f_n \rightarrow 1_{[0,1]}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  with respect to the  $\|\cdot\|_p$  norm for  $p \in [1, \infty)$ : the error is

$$\|1_{[0,1]} - f_n\|_p^p = \int_0^2 |1_{[0,1/2]}(t) - f_n(t)|^p dt = \int_1^{1+1/n} |f_n(t)|^p dt \leq \int_1^{1+1/n} dt = 1/n,$$

which goes to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Namely, to complete the set of our continuous functions  $C([0, 1])$  equipped with  $\|\cdot\|_p$  for  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , we need to add in these indicator functions. Nonetheless, we just integrated over  $1_{[0,1]}$  just fine above, so we will want to build a class of functions which includes  $1_{[0,1]}$  both for completeness reasons but also for integration reasons.

It turns out that not all sets should be able to be integrated over; this leads to the notion of measurable sets. So we will have some collection of subsets  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  and then some measuring function  $\mu: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  (we must allow infinity!). Let's discuss what we want to be true of  $\mu$ .

- **Additivity:** if  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$  are disjoint, then  $E \sqcup F$  should be in  $\mathcal{R}$ , and we had better have  $\mu(E \sqcup F) = \mu(E) + \mu(F)$ . Namely, the sum of the sizes of two disjoint sets had better just be size of the disjoint union.

- Splitting: if  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$  with  $F \subseteq E$ , then we want (from the above)

$$\mu(E) = \mu(E \cap F) + \mu(E \setminus F),$$

where the idea is that we can look at just the size of  $E \cap F$  and  $E \setminus F$  individually to more locally compute our sizes.

We can view the above rules as first dictating what sets should be measured at all. As such, we have the following definition.

**Definition 5.13 (Ring).** Fix a set  $X$ . A ring is a nonempty collection  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  with the following properties.

- Union: if  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$ , then  $E \cup F \in \mathcal{R}$ .
- Subtraction: if  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$ , then  $E \setminus F \in \mathcal{R}$ .

**Example 5.14.** Of course, the full collection  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is a ring. More generally, given a subset  $S \subseteq X$ , the collection of subsets of  $S$  is a ring: if  $E, F$  are subsets of  $S$ , we see  $E \cup F$  and  $E \setminus F$  are both subsets of  $S$ .

**Example 5.15.** Of course,  $\{\emptyset\}$  is a ring.

**Example 5.16.** The set of all finite subsets of  $X$  is a ring. Indeed, if  $E, F \subseteq X$  are finite, then both  $E \cup F$  and  $E \setminus F$  are finite as well.

**Remark 5.17.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{R}$  and some  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$ . Note that  $E \cap F = E \setminus (E \setminus F)$ , so  $E \cap F \in \mathcal{R}$  as well.

**Remark 5.18.** Given a ring  $\mathcal{R}$ , we note that  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{R}$ : we know there is some  $E \in \mathcal{R}$ , so it follows  $\emptyset = E \setminus E \in \mathcal{R}$ .

Adding in the desired properties for our  $\mu$ , we can now define “small” measures.

**Definition 5.19 (Finitely additive measure).** Fix a set  $X$  and ring  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then a *finitely additive measure* is a function  $\mu: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that any disjoint  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$  have

$$\mu(E \sqcup F) = \mu(E) + \mu(F)$$

**Remark 5.20.** Note that  $\mu(\emptyset) = \mu(\emptyset \sqcup \emptyset) = 2\mu(\emptyset)$ , so it follows  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ .

**Remark 5.21.** Note that being finitely additive tells us that  $E \subseteq F$  implies  $E = F \sqcup (E \setminus F)$  because an element of  $E$  is either in  $F$  or not in  $F$ . Thus, we see  $\mu(E) = \mu(F) + \mu(E \setminus F)$ , so if  $\mu(F) < \infty$ , we may write  $\mu(E \setminus F) = \mu(E) - \mu(F)$ .

It turns out that being finitely additive is not good enough.



**Example 5.22.** We use the usual measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Fix a sequence of disjoint intervals  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  in  $[0, 1]$ , and we see that we should have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i) < \infty.$$

Defining  $F_n := \bigcup_{i \leq n} E_i$  and  $F := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$ , we see that the characteristic functions  $1_{F_n}$  is a Cauchy sequence converging to  $1_F$ , but we don't immediately have access to  $1_F$  because it's an infinite union!

So next class we will discuss how adding a countably additive condition will help us.

## 5.2 October 7

We continue our discussion into measure theory.

### 5.2.1 $\sigma$ -Things

Motivated by [Example 5.22](#), we see that we want to be able to measure countable unions. As such, we have the following definitions.

**Definition 5.23 ( $\sigma$ -ring).** Fix a set  $X$ . Then a ring  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring if and only if  $\mathcal{R}$  is closed under countable unions.

**Remark 5.24.** As in [Remark 5.17](#), we note  $\sigma$ -rings  $\mathcal{S}$  have countable intersections. Fix some  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ . Then we note

$$E_1 \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (E_1 \setminus E_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (E_1 \setminus (E_1 \setminus E_i)) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} (E_1 \cap E_i) = E_1 \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$$

lives in  $\mathcal{S}$ , finishing.

**Definition 5.25 ( $\sigma$ -algebra).** Fix a set  $X$ . Then a ring  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra if and only if  $\mathcal{R}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring and contains  $X$ .

**Example 5.26.** Given a set  $X$ , we see  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring because a countable union of subsets of  $X$  is still a subset of  $X$ . Further,  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra because  $X \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ .

**Example 5.27.** Fix a set  $X$ . Then the collection  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  of countable subsets of  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring; here are our checks.

- Countable union: suppose  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ . Then

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

is the countable union of countable subsets of  $X$  and therefore countable. It follows that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \in \mathcal{S}$ .

- Subtraction: if  $E, F \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $E$  and  $F$  are both countable, so  $E \setminus F \subseteq E$  is still countable, so  $E \setminus F \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Notably, if  $X$  itself is not an uncountable set, then  $X \notin \mathcal{S}$ , so  $\mathcal{S}$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

As usual, we may give the collection of all  $\sigma$ -rings (and  $\sigma$ -algebras) the subposet structure coming from inclusion on  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ . For example,  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  is the largest collection in  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  and is thus the largest  $\sigma$ -ring and also the largest  $\sigma$ -algebra.

Analogous to our discussion of topologies in [Proposition 2.20](#), we pick up the following lemma to make our  $\sigma$ -rings smaller.

**Lemma 5.28.** Fix a set  $X$ , and fix a collection  $\Sigma$  of rings,  $\sigma$ -rings, or  $\sigma$ -algebra. Then

$$\mathcal{S} := \bigcap_{\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma} \mathcal{R}$$

is another ring,  $\sigma$ -ring, or  $\sigma$ -algebra, respectively.

*Proof.* We show the axioms get inherited individually.

- (a) Suppose that each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$  is closed under finite unions. Then for any  $E, F \in \mathcal{S}$ , we see  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$  for each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$ , so  $E \cup F \in \mathcal{R}$  for each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$ , so  $E \cup F \in \mathcal{S}$ .
- (b) Suppose that each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$  is closed under subtraction. Then for any  $E, F \in \mathcal{S}$ , we see  $E, F \in \mathcal{R}$  for each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$ , so  $E \setminus F \in \mathcal{R}$  for each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$ , so  $E \setminus F \in \mathcal{S}$ .
- (c) Suppose that each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$  is closed under countable union. Then for any countable collection  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{S}$ , we see  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \in \mathcal{R}$  for each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$ , so  $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i \in \mathcal{R}$  for each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$ , so  $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i \in \mathcal{S}$ .
- (d) Suppose that each  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$  contains  $X$ . Then  $X \in \mathcal{S}$ .

The above checks complete the proof. For example, if  $\Sigma$  contains  $\sigma$ -rings, then checks (a)–(c) show  $\mathcal{S}$  is still a  $\sigma$ -ring. ■

**Corollary 5.29.** Fix a set  $X$  and a collection  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then there is a unique smallest ring,  $\sigma$ -ring, or  $\sigma$ -algebra containing  $\mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\Sigma$  denote the collection of all rings,  $\sigma$ -rings, or  $\sigma$ -algebras containing  $\mathcal{C}$ . We want to show that  $\Sigma$  contains a unique minimum element. Well, we set

$$\mathcal{S} := \bigcap_{\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma} \mathcal{R}.$$

Notably,  $\mathcal{S} \in \Sigma$  by [Lemma 5.28](#), and  $\mathcal{S}$  is its minimum somewhat directly: for any  $\mathcal{R} \in \Sigma$ , we have  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  by construction of  $\mathcal{S}$ . ■

This gives us the following definition.

**Definition 5.30** ( $\sigma$ -ring generated by). Fix a set  $X$ . Then give a collection  $\mathcal{C}$ , we let  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C})$  denote the  $\sigma$ -ring generated by  $\mathcal{C}$ , as conjured by [Corollary 5.29](#).

There are analogous definitions for ring and  $\sigma$ -algebra, but we won't state them explicitly.

**Remark 5.31.** As usual, we note that  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$  implies  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C}')$  because  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C}')$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring containing  $\mathcal{C}$ .

**Remark 5.32.** Also as usual, if  $\mathcal{S}$  is already a  $\sigma$ -ring, then  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{S}$ . Of course,  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S})$ , but also  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring containing  $\mathcal{S}$ , so  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  follows.

**Example 5.33.** Fix a set  $X$ . We claim  $\sigma$ -ring generated by the collection  $\mathcal{F}$  finite subsets of  $X$  is the  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  of countable subsets of  $X$ . Certainly  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  because  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring by [Example 5.27](#). On the other hand, any countable subset  $E \subseteq X$  has

$$E = \bigcup_{x \in E} \{x\}$$

while  $\{x\} \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$  and therefore  $E \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{F})$ .

## 5.2.2 Measures

We are now ready to define measures.

**Definition 5.34 (Countably additive).** Fix a set  $X$  and a collection of subsets  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . A function  $\mu: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is *countably additive* if and only if any pairwise disjoint subcollection  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  with  $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \in \mathcal{C}$  has

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

Notably, we are allowed to have the right-hand side diverge to  $\infty$  if the left-hand side is  $\infty$ .

**Remark 5.35.** In general, it is pretty difficult to actually show that a function is countably additive, but one can take advantage of the fact that

$$\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$$

might not actually be in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

And here is our definition.

**Definition 5.36 (Measure).** Fix a set  $X$  and  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then a *measure* on  $\mathcal{S}$  is a function  $\mu: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  which is countably additive.

**Remark 5.37.** Note that the countable unions of sets in  $\mathcal{S}$  to check the countably additive condition are always in  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring. Namely, the trick suggested in [Remark 5.35](#) doesn't help us.

**Remark 5.38.** In general, it is not a good idea to ask for unions larger than countable. Approximately speaking, we really want to have countable unions, but we need to be careful adding any other infinities. The main problem is that those infinite sums don't have easy notions of convergence. Even if we don't want to work with something like nets to allow larger convergences, then allowing arbitrary unions for  $E \subseteq X$  gives

$$\mu(E) = \sum_{x \in X} \mu(\{x\}),$$

which intuitively should vanish if we make our points have measure 0.

**Remark 5.39.** Fix a set  $X$  and measure  $\mu: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . If  $\mu(\emptyset) < \infty$ , then note  $\emptyset = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \emptyset$  implies that the sum  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(\emptyset) = \mu(\emptyset)$  converges, so  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  is forced. Otherwise, if  $\mu(\emptyset) = \infty$ , then any  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  has  $E = E \sqcup \emptyset$ , so  $\mu(E) = \mu(E) + \mu(\emptyset) = \infty$ .

**Remark 5.40.** If  $\mu$  is a measure on a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $\mu|_{\mathcal{T}}$  remains a measure on any  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ . Indeed, any pairwise disjoint subcollection  $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$  also lives in  $\mathcal{S}$ , so we maintain having

$$\mu|_{\mathcal{T}}\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} T_i\right) = \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} T_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(T_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu|_{\mathcal{T}}(T_i).$$

Let's see some examples.

**Exercise 5.41.** More generally, fix a set  $X$  using the  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{P}(X)$  of countable subsets of  $X$ . For a function  $f: X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , we define

$$\mu_f(E) := \sum_{x \in E} f(x)$$

for each countable subset  $E \subseteq X$ . Then  $\mu_f$  is a measure.

*Proof.* Note that the order of the sum over  $x \in X$  doesn't matter because if the sum converges, then it absolutely converges because all the terms in the sum are positive. Now, to see that we have a measure, pick up some countably many pairwise disjoint countable subsets  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  of  $X$ . Then

$$\mu_f\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i\right) = \sum_{x \in \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i} f(x) \stackrel{*}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{x \in E_i} f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_f(E_i),$$

where  $\stackrel{*}{=}$  holds because each  $x \in \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  lives in exactly one of the  $E_i$ . ■

**Example 5.42.** Fix a set  $X$  with  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then we set  $\mu(E) := \#E$  for each  $E \subseteq X$ ; namely, if  $\mu(E) = \infty$  if and only if  $E$  is infinite. We claim that  $\mu$  is a measure: if  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  is a countable collection of pairwise disjoint subsets of  $X$ , then it's a property of cardinality that the cardinality of the (disjoint) union is the sum of the cardinalities.

### 5.2.3 Premeasures

We are going to want to build measures, but this is somewhat difficult. So we begin with something a little weaker. We begin by weakening our rings.

**Definition 5.43 (Prering).** Fix a set  $X$ . A *prering* of a set  $X$  is a nonempty collection  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  satisfying the following.

- Intersection: if  $E, F \in \mathcal{P}$ , then  $E \cap F \in \mathcal{P}$ .
- Decomposition: if  $E, F \in \mathcal{P}$ , then we can write

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

for some finite disjoint union on the right-hand side with  $G_i \in \mathcal{P}$  for each  $i$ .

**Remark 5.44.** Fix a prering  $\mathcal{P}$ . Note any  $E \in \mathcal{P}$  has  $E \setminus E = \emptyset$ , so  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{P}$  always because  $\mathcal{P}$  is required to be nonempty.

And now here are our weaker measures.

**Definition 5.45 (Premeasure).** Fix a set  $X$  and a prering  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . A *premeasure* on  $\mathcal{P}$  is a countably additive function  $\mu: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ .

It will turn out that premeasures on prering will give measures on the generated  $\sigma$ -ring. This is nicer because the countably additive condition might be easier to check on a prering, using ideas of [Remark 5.35](#).

Here is our main example.

**Exercise 5.46.** Fix our set  $X := \mathbb{R}$ , and let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the collection of half-open intervals  $[a, b)$  where  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}$  is a prering.

*Proof.* We begin by checking that  $\mathcal{P}$  is a prering.

- **Intersection:** suppose that  $[a, b), [a', b') \in \mathcal{P}$ ; without loss of generality, take  $a \leq a'$  so that  $x \in [a, b) \cap [a', b')$  requires  $a' \leq x$ . Now, note

$$\begin{aligned} [a, b) \cap [a', b') &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a \leq x \text{ and } a' \leq x \text{ and } x < b \text{ and } x < b'\} \\ &= [\max\{a, a'\}, \min\{b, b'\}). \end{aligned}$$

- **Decomposition:** suppose that  $[a, b), [a', b') \in \mathcal{P}$ . Now, note

$$\begin{aligned} [a, b) \setminus [a', b') &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a \leq x \text{ and } x < b \text{ and } (a' > x \text{ or } x \geq b')\} \\ &= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a \leq x \text{ and } x < b \text{ and } x < a'\} \cup \{x \in \mathbb{R} : a \leq x \text{ and } x < b \text{ and } b' \leq x\} \\ &= [a, \min\{b, a'\}) \cup [\max\{a, b'\}, b). \end{aligned}$$

The above checks complete the proof. ■

Continuing from [Exercise 5.46](#), it will turn out that the function  $\mu: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\mu([a, b)) := b - a$$

will give a premeasure, but we will not show this today. (We will say that one should use ideas of [Exercise 5.46](#).) This is surprisingly annoying to prove.

**Example 5.47.** Give  $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1)$  an enumeration  $\{q_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Then define the interval  $F_k := [q_k, q_{k+1}) \cup [q_{k+1}, q_k)$  and “disjoint-ize” these intervals by taking

$$E_k := F_k \setminus \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{k-1} F_\ell$$

and then decompose  $E_k$  into a finite disjoint union of  $G_k$ s so that the  $G_k$ s are now disjoint. Any proof that  $\mu$  is a premeasure must account for pathologies like this.

## 5.3 October 10

The midterm exam is coming. It will cover topology things.

### 5.3.1 The Lebesgue Premeasure

We continue with our attempts to construct measures.

**Proposition 5.48.** Fix a left-continuous, increasing function  $\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and let  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$  as the prering of half-open intervals  $[a, b)$  for  $a < b$ . Then

$$\mu_\alpha([a, b)) := \alpha(b) - \alpha(a)$$

is a premeasure on  $\mathcal{P}$ .

*Proof.* Quickly, note that the fact that  $\alpha$  is increasing implies that  $\mu([a, b)) = \alpha(b) - \alpha(a) \geq 0$  for any  $[a, b) \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Fix some  $[a, b) \in \mathcal{P}$  which has been decomposed into an infinite disjoint union

$$[a, b) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} [a_i, b_i).$$

We need to show that  $\mu_\alpha([a, b))$  is the sum of all the  $\mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i))$ s. We will show our two inequalities separately.

- In the easy direction, we show  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i)) \leq \mu_\alpha([a, b))$ . It suffices to show that, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i)) \stackrel{?}{\leq} \mu_\alpha([a, b)),$$

which will finish by taking the limit as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Well, let  $\sigma: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  be the permutation such that  $a_{\sigma(1)} \leq a_{\sigma(2)} \leq \dots \leq a_{\sigma(n)}$ . Notably,  $a_{\sigma(i)} \leq a_{\sigma(i+1)}$  implies that  $b_{\sigma(i)} \leq a_{\sigma(i+1)}$  because  $[a_{\sigma(i)}, b_{\sigma(i)}) \cap [a_{\sigma(i+1)}, b_{\sigma(i+1)}) = \emptyset$  requires  $a_{\sigma(i+1)} \notin [a_{\sigma(i)}, b_{\sigma(i)})$ .

Thus,  $b_{\sigma(i)} \leq a_{\sigma(i+1)}$  implies  $\alpha(b_{\sigma(i)}) \leq \alpha(a_{\sigma(i+1)})$ , so

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i)) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha(b_{\sigma(i)}) - \alpha(a_{\sigma(i)})) = -\alpha(a_{\sigma(1)}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (-\alpha(a_{\sigma(i)}) + \alpha(b_{\sigma(i+1)})) + \alpha(b_{\sigma(n)})$$

has  $-\alpha(a_{\sigma(i)}) + \alpha(b_{\sigma(i+1)}) \leq 0$  for each  $i$ . Finishing up,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i)) \leq -\alpha(a_{\sigma(1)}) + \alpha(b_{\sigma(n)}) \leq \alpha(b) - \alpha(a) = \mu_\alpha([a, b)),$$

where we have used  $a \leq a_{\sigma(1)}$  and  $b_{\sigma(n)} \leq b$  in our bounding.

- In the difficult direction, we show  $\mu_\alpha([a, b)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i))$ . Fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and we will actually show  $\mu_\alpha([a, b)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_\alpha([a_i, b_i)) + \varepsilon$ , which will be enough upon sending  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ .

To set up the proof, set  $\varepsilon_i := \varepsilon/2^{i+1}$  so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\varepsilon}{2^{i+1}} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^i} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

(This is a surprise tool which will help us later.)

We now proceed in steps. The idea, is to approximate all of our  $[a_i, b_i)$  by open intervals to use compactness of closed intervals.

1. Find some  $b' \leq b$  such that  $\alpha(b) - \varepsilon/2 \leq \alpha(b') \leq \alpha(b)$ , using the left-continuity of  $\alpha$ . Similarly, for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , we may select  $a'_i < a_i$  such that  $\alpha(a_i) - \varepsilon_i \leq \alpha(a'_i) \leq \alpha(a_i)$ . Thus,

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (a'_i, b_i) \supseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} [a_i, b_i) \supseteq [a, b) \supseteq [a, b'].$$

Thus, we have given  $[a, b']$  a countable open cover! So compactness (!) provides us with a finite subcover given by indices  $\{i_1, \dots, i_n\}$ . Letting  $N$  be the largest of the indices, then, we see that

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^N (a'_i, b_i) \supseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^n (a'_{i_k}, b_{i_k}) \supseteq [a, b'].$$

2. We now inductively relabel our intervals. Some open interval must contain  $a$ , so we find  $j_1 \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  so that  $a \in (a'_{j_1}, b_{j_1})$ . If  $b_{j_1} > b'$ , then we are done because we have covered  $[a, b']$ . Otherwise,  $b_{j_1} \in [a, b']$ , so we find  $j_2 \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  so that  $b_{j_1} \in (a'_{j_2}, b_{j_2})$ . If  $b_{j_2} > b'$ , then we are done because we have covered  $[a, b']$ ; otherwise we find  $j_3$  and continue.

The above inductive process must terminate because each of the  $j_i$  are distinct—at each point,  $b_{j_i}$  is strictly greater than all previous  $b_{j_k}$ s—and we were already promised that the indices up to  $N$  will produce a finite subcover. So we have produced some open cover

$$\bigcup_{k=1}^m (a'_{j_k}, b_{j_k}) \supseteq [a, b'].$$

3. We are finally able to give the argument that everyone always wants to. Observe that

$$\sum_{k=1}^m (\alpha(b_{j_k}) - \alpha(a'_{j_k})) = -\alpha(a'_{j_1}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} (\alpha(b_{j_k}) - \alpha(a'_{j_{k+1}})) + \alpha(b_{j_m})$$

by some re-indexing. However,  $a'_{j_{k+1}} < b_{j_k}$ , so  $\alpha(b_{j_k}) - \alpha(a'_{j_{k+1}}) \geq 0$  always, so

$$\sum_{k=1}^m (\alpha(b_{j_k}) - \alpha(a'_{j_k})) \geq \alpha(b_{j_m}) - \alpha(a'_{j_1}) \geq \alpha(b') - \alpha(a),$$

where at the end we have used the fact that  $b_{j_m} \geq b'$  and  $a' \geq a_{j_1}$ . But now  $\alpha(b') \geq \alpha(b) - \varepsilon/2$ , so we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^m (\alpha(b_{j_k}) - \alpha(a'_{j_k})) \geq \alpha(b) - \alpha(a) - \varepsilon/2. \quad (5.1)$$

4. Now, on the other side, we write

$$\sum_{k=1}^m (\alpha(b_{j_k}) - \alpha(a'_{j_k})) \leq \sum_{k=1}^m (\alpha(b_{j_k}) - \alpha(a_{j_k}) + \varepsilon_{j_k}) 2,$$

using the fact that  $\alpha(a'_{j_k}) \geq \alpha(a_{j_k}) - \varepsilon_{j_k}$ . We can now just add in all the indices to get

$$\sum_{k=1}^m (\alpha(b_{j_k}) - \alpha(a'_{j_k})) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\alpha(b_i) - \alpha(a_i)) + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \varepsilon_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_{\alpha}([a_i, b_i)) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \quad (5.2)$$

5. In total, we combine (5.1) and (5.2) to get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_{\alpha}([a_i, b_i)) + \varepsilon \geq \mu_{\alpha}([a, b]).$$

Sending  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$  finishes the proof. ■

**Remark 5.49.** The “easy” part of the above proof works fine without using the completeness of  $\mathbb{R}$ , but it is very necessary for the harder part.

## 5.4 October 12

The midterm exam is still coming. It is closed-book. Only bring writing implements. He might ask for definitions, statements of theorems, proofs of theorems, and relatively quick applications of theorems.

### 5.4.1 Premeasure Subtraction

Last class, in [Proposition 5.48](#), we showed that  $\mu_\alpha: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  gave a suitable premeasure. We are now going to embark on a somewhat long story to show that  $\mu_\alpha$  (and premeasures in general) can turn into a full measure.

To begin our journey, we pick up some annoying facts about prerings and premeasures.

**Lemma 5.50.** Fix a set  $X$  and a prering  $\mathcal{P}$ . For any set  $E \in \mathcal{P}$  and some  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^m \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ , there exist finitely many  $\{F_j\}_{j=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  which are pairwise disjoint and satisfy

$$E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m E_i = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^n F_j.$$

*Proof.* We induct on  $m$ , using the prering condition. When  $m = 0$ , set  $F_1 = E$ , and there is nothing else to say.

Now suppose that we can write

$$E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m E_i = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^n F_j.$$

Picking up some other  $E_{m+1} \in \mathcal{P}$ , we note

$$E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+1} E_i = \left( E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^m E_i \right) \setminus E_{m+1} = \left( \bigsqcup_{j=1}^n F_j \right) \cap (X \setminus E_{m+1}) \stackrel{*}{=} \bigcup_{j=1}^n (F_j \cap (X \setminus E_{m+1})) = \bigcup_{j=1}^n (F_j \setminus E_{m+1})$$

where we have used the distributivity of intersection over union in  $\stackrel{*}{=}$ . For each  $j$ , because  $\mathcal{P}$  is a prering, we may find pairwise disjoint  $\{G_{j,k}\}_{k=1}^{m_j} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that

$$F_j \setminus E_{m+1} = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^{m_j} G_{j,k}$$

so that

$$E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+1} E_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^n \bigcup_{k=1}^{m_j} G_{j,k}.$$

We now claim that the  $\{G_{j,k}\}$  are pairwise disjoint, which will finish the proof. Indeed, if we can find  $x \in G_{j,k} \cap G_{j',k'}$ , then  $G_{j,k} \subseteq F_j$  and  $G_{j',k'} \subseteq F_{j'}$  tells us  $x \in F_j \cap F_{j'}$ , so  $j = j'$  because the  $F_\bullet$  are pairwise disjoint. Thus,  $x \in G_{j,k} \cap G_{j,k'}$  further implies  $k = k'$  because the  $G_{j,\bullet}$  are pairwise disjoint. So  $(j, k) = (j', k')$ , and we are done. ■

**Lemma 5.51.** Fix a prering  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $X$  and a finitely additive function  $\mu: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . Given  $E, F \in \mathcal{P}$ , then  $\mu(E) \geq \mu(E \cap F)$ . In particular, if  $E \supseteq F$ , then  $\mu(E) \geq \mu(F)$ .

*Proof.* Note that an element of  $E$  is always exactly one of in  $F$  or not, so  $E = (E \cap F) \sqcup (E \setminus F)$ . Now, we use the prering condition on  $\mathcal{P}$  to write

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



for some pairwise disjoint  $G_1, \dots, G_n \in \mathcal{P}$ . We also note that  $G_i \subseteq X \setminus F$  for each  $i$ , so  $G_i \cap (E \cap F) = \emptyset$  for each  $i$ , so the sets  $(E \cap F), G_1, \dots, G_n$  are pairwise disjoint and grant

$$\mu(E) = \mu(E \cap F) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(G_i).$$

However,  $\mu(G_i) \geq 0$  always, so the first assertion follows. The second assertion follows upon noticing  $E \supseteq F$  implies  $E \cap F = F$ . ■

The above result motivates the following definition.

**Definition 5.52 (Monotone).** Fix a collection  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets of a set  $X$ . A function  $\mu: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is *monotone* if and only if any  $E, F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $E \subseteq F$  have  $\mu(E) \leq \mu(F)$ .

**Example 5.53.** Finitely additive premeasures on prerings are monotone by [Lemma 5.51](#).

## 5.4.2 Finite Subadditivity

We now pick up some subadditivity lemmas.

**Lemma 5.54.** Fix a prering  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $X$  and a finitely additive function  $\mu: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . Given  $E \in \mathcal{P}$  and some pairwise disjoint  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that  $E_i \subseteq E$  for such  $i$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i) \leq \mu(E).$$

*Proof.* By [Lemma 5.50](#), we note that we may write

$$E \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^m F_j$$

for pairwise disjoint  $\{F_j\}_{j=1}^m \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ . We now note that all the  $E_i$  and  $F_j$  are pairwise disjoint from each other: note that  $E_i \cap E_j \neq \emptyset$  implies  $i = j$  by hypothesis on the  $E_\bullet$ , and  $F_i \cap F_j \neq \emptyset$  implies  $i = j$  by hypothesis on the  $F_\bullet$ . Further, we note that  $E_i \cap F_j \subseteq E_i \cap (E \setminus E_i) = \emptyset$  for each  $i$  and  $j$ , by construction of the  $F_j$ .

In total, we see that we have a disjoint union

$$E = \left( \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i \right) \sqcup \left( \bigsqcup_{j=1}^m F_j \right),$$

so the finite additivity of  $\mu$  tells us

$$\mu(E) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i) + \sum_{j=1}^m \mu(F_j) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(E_i),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

**Lemma 5.55.** Fix a prering  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $X$  and a finitely additive function  $\mu: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . Given  $E \in \mathcal{P}$  and some  $\{F_j\}_{j=1}^m \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  covering  $E$ , we have

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

*Proof.* To begin, we note  $E = \bigcup_{j=1}^m (E \cap F_j)$ , so we note that it suffices for

$$\mu(E) \leq \sum_{k=1}^m \mu(E \cap F_j),$$

which will finish because  $\mu(E \cap F_j) \leq \mu(F_j)$  for each  $j$  by [Lemma 5.51](#). Thus, we just replace each  $F_j$  with  $E \cap F_j$  so that  $E = \bigcup_{j=1}^m F_j$ .

Next, we force the  $F_j$  to be disjoint, using [Lemma 5.50](#) to write

$$H_j := F_j \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{j-1} F_k = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^{n_j} G_{j,k}$$

where the  $G_{j,k} \subseteq H_j$  live in  $\mathcal{P}$  and are pairwise disjoint for each fixed  $j$ . Now, we note that each  $x \in E$  will live in some  $F_j$  with least  $j$ , so  $x \in H_j$  for this  $j$ , so the  $H_j$  cover  $E$ .

We now note that all the  $G_{j,k}$  are disjoint. Indeed, if  $x \in G_{j,k} \cap G_{j',k'}$ , we see that  $G_{j,k} \subseteq H_j$  and  $G_{j',k'} \subseteq H_{j'}$ , so  $x \in H_j \subseteq H_{j'}$ . If  $j \neq j'$ , say that  $j < j'$  without loss of generality, so  $x \in H_j \subseteq F_j$  while  $x \in H_{j'}$  has  $H_{j'}$  disjoint from  $F_j$ , so we have a contradiction. So instead we see  $j = j'$ , so  $x \in G_{j,k} \cap G_{j,k'}$ , and it follows that  $k = k'$  because the  $G_{j,\bullet}$  are disjoint.

In total, we see that

$$E = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^m \bigsqcup_{k=1}^{n_j} G_{j,k},$$

so the finitely additive condition tells us that

$$\mu(E) = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n_k} \mu(G_{j,k}).$$

However, we note that the  $G_{j,k}$  are disjoint for any fixed  $j$  and have  $G_{j,k} \subseteq F_j$  for each  $k$ , so we see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_k} \mu(G_{j,k}) \leq \mu(F_j)$$

for each  $j$  by [Lemma 5.54](#), so we conclude

$$\mu(E) = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n_k} \mu(G_{j,k}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \mu(F_j),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

# THEME 6

## BUILDING MEASURES

*So the man gave him the bricks, and he built his house with them.*

—Joseph Jacobs, “The Story of the Three Little Pigs” [Jac90]

### 6.1 October 14

We will probably still have homework next week, despite the midterm.

#### 6.1.1 Countable Subadditivity

Continuing our story from last time, we pick up the following definition. The above result motivates the following definition.

**Definition 6.1** (Countably subadditive). Fix a set  $X$  and a collection  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . A function  $\mu: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is *countably subadditive* if and only if

$$E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \implies \mu(E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i)$$

for any  $E \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** Fix a prering  $\mathcal{P}$  on a set  $X$ , and let  $\mu$  be a premeasure on  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then  $\mu$  is countably subadditive.

*Proof.* We repeat the proof of [Lemma 5.55](#), essentially verbatim, replacing the bound  $m$  with  $\infty$ . Indeed, pick up any  $E \in \mathcal{P}$  and some  $\{F_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  with  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j$ , and we want to show that

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

To begin, we note  $E = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} (E \cap F_j)$ , so we note that it suffices for

$$\mu(E) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(E \cap F_j),$$

which will finish because  $\mu(E \cap F_j) \leq \mu(F_j)$  for each  $j$  by [Lemma 5.51](#). Thus, we just replace each  $F_j$  with  $E \cap F_j$  so that  $E = \bigcup_{j=1}^m F_j$ .

Next, we force the  $F_j$  to be disjoint, using [Lemma 5.50](#) to write

$$H_j := F_j \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{j-1} F_k = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^{n_j} G_{j,k}$$

where the  $G_{j,k} \subseteq H_j$  live in  $\mathcal{P}$  and are pairwise disjoint for each fixed  $j$ . Now, we note that each  $x \in E$  will live in some  $F_j$  with least  $j$ , so  $x \in H_j$  for this  $j$ , so the  $H_j$  cover  $E$ .

We now note that all the  $G_{j,k}$  are disjoint. Indeed, if  $x \in G_{j,k} \cap G_{j',k'}$ , we see that  $G_{j,k} \subseteq H_j$  and  $G_{j',k'} \subseteq H_{j'}$ , so  $x \in H_j \subseteq H_{j'}$ . If  $j \neq j'$ , say that  $j < j'$  without loss of generality, so  $x \in H_j \subseteq F_j$  while  $x \in H_{j'}$  has  $H_{j'}$  disjoint from  $F_j$ , so we have a contradiction. So instead we see  $j = j'$ , so  $x \in G_{j,k} \cap G_{j,k'}$ , and it follows that  $k = k'$  because the  $G_{j,\bullet}$  are disjoint.

In total, we see that

$$E = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \bigsqcup_{k=1}^{n_j} G_{j,k},$$

so the finitely additive condition tells us that

$$\mu(E) = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{n_k} \mu(G_{j,k}).$$

However, we note that the  $G_{j,k}$  are disjoint for any fixed  $j$  and have  $G_{j,k} \subseteq F_j$  for each  $k$ , so we see that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_k} \mu(G_{j,k}) \leq \mu(F_j)$$

for each  $j$  by [Lemma 5.54](#), so we conclude

$$\mu(E) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n_k} \mu(G_{j,k}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \mu(F_j),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

### 6.1.2 Hereditary Rings

We continue trying to move from premeasures to measures. Our next step is to add in lots and lots of sets to our pre-ring, which we will later filter out to get our actual measure.

**Definition 6.3** (Hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring). Fix a set  $X$  and nonempty family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then the *hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring*  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  generated by  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of all subsets  $E \subseteq X$  such that there exists a countable subcollection  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  such that

$$E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i.$$

**Remark 6.4.** Because  $\mathcal{F}$  is nonempty, find some  $E \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then  $\emptyset \subseteq E \subseteq X$  tells us that  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ .

Here's a quick sanity check.

**Lemma 6.5.** Fix a set  $X$  and a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring.

*Proof.* Here are our checks.

- Union: suppose  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ . Then, for each  $i$ , we can write

$$E_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty F_{ij}$$

where  $F_{ij} \in \mathcal{F}$  for each  $j$ . So

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty F_{ij}$$

shows that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i$  is contained in a countable union of elements  $F_{ij} \in \mathcal{F}$ , so  $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ .

- Subtraction: suppose  $E, F \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ . Indeed, we can write  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i$  for some  $E_i \in \mathcal{F}$ , so

$$E \setminus F \subseteq E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i$$

has covered  $E \setminus F$  by countably many elements  $E_i$  of  $\mathcal{F}$ , so we conclude  $E \setminus F \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ . ■

**Example 6.6.** Take  $X = \mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  the pre-ring from [Exercise 5.46](#). But now we see that

$$\mathbb{R} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} [i, i+1),$$

so any subset  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R} \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} [i, i+1)$  is contained in a countable union of elements from  $\mathcal{P}$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ .

**Example 6.7.** Fix a set  $X$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  the pre-ring of finite set of  $X$ . Then any set in  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$  is countable as contained in a countable union of finite sets, and conversely any countable subset  $E \subseteq X$  can write

$$E = \bigcup_{x \in E} \{x\}$$

to show that  $E$  is covered by countably many finite sets  $\{x\} \in \mathcal{P}$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$  contains exactly the countable subsets of  $X$ .

It might feel like taking all the subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  makes us too big, but there are measures here anyway.

**Example 6.8.** Fix a set  $X$  and an element  $x \in X$ . Then we define the measure  $\delta_x : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  by

$$\delta_x(E) := \begin{cases} 1 & x \in E, \\ 0 & x \notin E. \end{cases}$$

To see that this is a measure, fix disjoint  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ , and set  $E := \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i$ . We have two cases.

- If  $x \notin E_i$  for each  $i$ , then  $x \notin E$ , so  $\delta_x(E) = 0 = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_x(E_i)$ .
- If  $x \in E_{i_0}$  for some  $i_0$ , then note  $x \in E_i$  for exactly one  $i$  because the  $E_i$  are disjoint. Also,  $x \in E$  because  $E_{i_0} \subseteq E$ , so  $\delta_x(E) = 1 = \delta_x(E_{i_0}) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \delta_x(E_i)$ .

The term “hereditary” comes from the following definition.

**Definition 6.9 (Hereditary).** Fix a set  $X$  and nonempty family  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then  $\mathcal{G}$  is *hereditary* if and only if  $A \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $A' \subseteq A$  implies  $A' \in \mathcal{G}$ .

**Example 6.10.** Indeed, given a collection  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ , we can see that  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  is hereditary. To see this, note  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  can be contained as  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  for some  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ , but then any  $E' \subseteq E$  has

$$E' \subseteq E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i,$$

so  $E'$  is covered by a countable union of elements of  $\mathcal{F}$ , so  $E' \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ .

**Remark 6.11.** Note that the intersection of hereditary rings is still hereditary. Indeed, fixing our set  $X$  for hereditary rings  $\{\mathcal{H}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  of  $X$ , we need to show

$$\mathcal{H} := \bigcap_{\alpha \in \lambda} \mathcal{H}_\alpha$$

is still hereditary. Well, for any  $E \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $E' \subseteq E$ , we see  $E \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in \lambda$ , so  $E' \subseteq E$  forces  $E' \in \mathcal{H}_\alpha$  for each  $\alpha \in \lambda$ , so actually  $E' \in \mathcal{H}$ .

**Remark 6.12.** Thus, we can see that the hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  generated by a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is in fact the smallest hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$  containing  $\mathcal{F}$ , where  $\mathcal{H}$  is the intersection of all the hereditary  $\sigma$ -rings containing  $\mathcal{F}$ . (Note  $\mathcal{H}$  is hereditary by [Remark 6.11](#) and a  $\sigma$ -ring by [Lemma 5.28](#).)

- Certainly  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring by [Lemma 6.5](#), and  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  is hereditary by [Example 6.10](#), so  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ .
- Conversely, any  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  is contained in some countable union as  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  where  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ . But then  $E_i \in \mathcal{H}$  for each  $i$ , so  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \in \mathcal{H}$  because  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring, so  $E \in \mathcal{H}$  because  $\mathcal{H}$  is hereditary.

### 6.1.3 Outer Measures

We now have the following construction.

**Notation 6.13.** Fix a set  $X$  and nonempty family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then give  $\mu: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ , we will define  $\mu^*: \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  by

$$\mu^*(E) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i) : \{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \text{ and } E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \right\}.$$

**Remark 6.14.** Note that  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  tells us that the set we are taking the infimum of is in fact nonempty because  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  is contained in some countable collection of elements from  $\mathcal{F}$ . And in fact, for any subcollection  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  covering  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ , we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i) \geq 0$$

by definition of  $\mu$ , so  $\mu^*(E) \geq 0$  for any  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ .

Here are some quick facts.

**Lemma 6.15.** Fix a set  $X$  and nonempty family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Further, fix some  $\mu: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . Then we have the following.

- (a)  $\mu^*(E) \leq \mu(E)$  for any  $E \in \mathcal{F}$ .
- (b)  $\mu^*$  is monotone.
- (c)  $\mu^*$  is countably subadditive.

*Proof.* Here we go.

- (a) Note that  $\{E\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  covers  $E$ , so  $\mu^*(E) \leq \mu(E)$  follows.
- (b) Suppose  $E \subseteq F$  with  $E, F \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$ . We need to show  $\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^*(F)$ ; certainly, if  $\mu^*(F) = \infty$ , then there is nothing to say. Otherwise, pick up any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and we show

$$\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^*(F) + \varepsilon,$$

which will be enough upon sending  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ .

Now, the definition of  $\mu^*(F)$  as an infimum promises some countable subcollection  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  covering  $F$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(F_i) < \mu^*(F) + \varepsilon.$$

But now  $E \subseteq F \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty F_i$ , so the definition of  $\mu^*$  lets us conclude

$$\mu^*(E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(F_i) < \mu^*(F) + \varepsilon,$$

which finishes because we may now take  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ .

- (c) This requires some effort. Suppose that  $A \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  and some  $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{F})$  covering  $A$ . We need to show that

$$\mu^*(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu^*(B_i).$$

Well, fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and we will actually show that

$$\mu^*(A) \leq \varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu^*(B_i),$$

which will be enough upon sending  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Certainly if  $\mu^*(B_i)$  is infinite for any  $i$ , then there is nothing to say. Otherwise, each  $\mu^*(B_i)$  is finite, so we may use the definition of  $\mu^*$  as an infimum to find some countable subcollection  $\{E_{ij}\}_{j=1}^\infty$  such that

$$B_i \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty E_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu(E_{ij}) \leq \mu^*(B_i) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2^i}$$

because  $\varepsilon/2^i > 0$  always. It follows that

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

so the definition of  $\mu^*$  lets us say

$$\mu^*(A) \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu(E_{ij}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{2^i} + \mu^*(B_i) \right) = \varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu^*(B_i),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

It seems somewhat frustrating that we don't get equality in part (a) of [Lemma 6.15](#), but we need a few more adjectives to make the proof go through.

**Lemma 6.16.** Fix a set  $X$  and a pre-ring  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $X$  equipped with a premeasure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then  $\mu^*(E) = \mu(E)$  for any  $E \in \mathcal{P}$ .

*Proof.* Fix some  $E \in \mathcal{F}$ . Note that  $\mu^*(E) \leq \mu(E)$  already from [Lemma 6.15](#), so we just need the other inequality. Well, for any cover

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

where  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ , countable subadditivity tells us that

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

by [Lemma 6.2](#). Thus,  $\mu(E) \leq \mu^*(E)$ , which is what we wanted. ■

The above results motivate the following definition.

**Definition 6.17 (Outer measure).** Fix a set  $X$  and a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$ . An *outer measure* is a function  $\mu^*: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  which is monotone and countably subadditive.

**Example 6.18.** From [Lemma 6.15](#), we note that if  $\mu$  is a premeasure on a pre-ring  $\mathcal{P}$ , then  $\mu^*$  is an outer measure on the hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$ .

## 6.2 October 17

Please write neatly on the exam.

### 6.2.1 Restricting Outer Measures

Last time, in [Example 6.18](#), we constructed an outer measure from a premeasure. We might hope that this outer measure is actually countably additive, thus giving us our measure, but most of the time it is not.

Instead, we are going to restrict our outer measure to some " $\sigma$ -subring" which will then be a measure. The following definition is due to Carathéodory.

**Definition 6.19.** Fix a set  $X$  and a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $X$ , and fix an outer measure  $\nu: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . Then a set  $E \subseteq \mathcal{H}$  is  $\nu$ -*measurable* if and only if

$$\nu(A) = \nu(A \cap E) + \nu(A \setminus E)$$

for any  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ . We will let  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  denote the set of  $\nu$ -measurable sets.

**Remark 6.20.** Because  $\nu$  is already an outer measure, it is countably subadditive, so  $\nu(A) \leq \nu(A \cap E) + \nu(A \setminus E)$ . Thus, we really only need to focus on proving

$$\nu(A) \geq \nu(A \cap E) + \nu(A \setminus E).$$

Here are the main results.



**Theorem 6.21.** Fix a set  $X$  and a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $X$ , and fix an outer measure  $\nu: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ . If nonempty,  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring, and  $\nu|_{\mathcal{M}(\nu)}$  is a measure.

**Remark 6.22.** Later, we will also show that, given a premeasure  $\mu$  on a pre-ring  $\mathcal{P}$ , we will see  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mu^*)$ , so  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P})}$  will be a measure on  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{P})$  extending  $\mu$ . We won't be precise about this until we need to, but we do want to see that we are close to the finish line.

**Remark 6.23.** It is indeed possible for  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  to be empty. For example, the outer measure  $\nu: \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  by  $\nu(E) := 1$  for any  $E \subseteq X$  has no  $\nu$ -measurable sets.

Let's begin our proof.

*Proof of Theorem 6.21.* We proceed in steps.

1. Finite union: given  $E, F \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ , we show  $E \cup F \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ . Well, for any  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(A \cap (E \cup F)) + \nu(A \setminus (E \cup F)) &= \nu((A \cap E) \sqcup ((A \setminus E) \cap F)) + \nu((A \setminus E) \setminus F) \\ &\leq \nu(A \cap E) + \nu((A \setminus E) \cap F) + \nu((A \setminus E) \setminus F), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used subadditivity at the end.

Because  $F$  is  $\nu$ -measurable, the last two pieces become  $\nu(A \setminus E)$ , where we note  $A \setminus E \subseteq E \in \mathcal{H}$  implies  $A \setminus E \in \mathcal{H}$ . Thus, because  $E$  is  $\nu$ -measurable, this in total collapses down to  $\nu(A)$ , which is enough by [Remark 6.20](#).

2. Subtraction: given  $E, F \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ , we show  $E \setminus F \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ . Well, for any  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(A \cap (E \setminus F)) + \nu(A \setminus (E \setminus F)) &= \nu((A \cap E) \setminus F) + \nu((A \setminus E) \sqcup (A \cap E \cap F)) \\ &\leq \nu((A \cap E) \setminus F) + \nu(A \setminus E) + \nu((A \cap E) \cap F), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used subadditivity at the end.

Now, because  $F$  is  $\nu$ -measurable, we see  $\nu((A \cap E) \setminus F) + \nu((A \cap E) \cap F) = \nu(A \cap E)$ , where  $A \cap E \subseteq E$  is in  $\mathcal{H}$  because  $E \in \mathcal{H}$ . Thus, because  $E$  is  $\nu$ -measurable, this in total collapses down to  $\nu(A)$ , which is enough by [Remark 6.20](#).

3. Strong finitely additive: for any  $A \in \mathcal{H}$  and disjoint  $E, F \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ , we claim

$$\nu(A \cap (E \sqcup F)) \stackrel{?}{=} \nu(A \cap E) + \nu(A \cap F).$$

Well, because  $E$  is measurable, we note  $A \cap (E \sqcup F) \subseteq A$  must live in  $\mathcal{H}$  and so

$$\nu(A \cap (E \sqcup F)) = \nu(A \cap (E \sqcup F) \cap E) + \nu(A \cap (E \sqcup F) \setminus E) = \nu(A \cap E) + \nu(A \cap F),$$

where the last equality has used the fact that  $E \cap F = \emptyset$ .

By induction, for finitely many pairwise disjoint  $\nu$ -measurable subsets  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ , we see

$$\nu\left(A \cap \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu(A \cap E_i).$$

4. Finitely additive: we show  $\nu|_{\mathcal{M}(\nu)}$  is finitely additive: for finitely many pairwise disjoint  $\nu$ -measurable subsets  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ , we note  $A := \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$  because  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  is preserved by finite unions, so we set  $A := \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i$  to give

$$\nu\left(\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i\right) = \nu\left(A \cap \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu(A \cap E_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu(E_i).$$

5. Countable union: given some countable subcollection  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ , and let  $F$  be their union. Now, we set

$$F_i := E_i \setminus \bigcup_{j < i} E_j$$

so that  $F$  is the union of the  $F_i$  (certainly  $F_i \subseteq E_i \subseteq F$  for any  $i$ , and conversely any  $x \in F$  is in some  $E_i$ , for  $i$  as small as possible, so  $x \in F_i$ ), and the  $F_i$  are pairwise disjoint (if  $i \neq j$ , then  $i < j$  without loss of generality, so  $F_i \subseteq E_i \setminus F_j$  is disjoint from  $F_j$ ). The point is that we are now dealing with pairwise disjoint subsets.

We now need to show that  $F$  is  $\nu$ -measurable. Well, fix any  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ . Then, for any  $n$ , we note that  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  is already a ring, so  $\bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i$  is in  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  for any finite  $n$ , so

$$\nu(A) = \nu\left(A \cap \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i\right) + \nu\left(A \setminus \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu(A \cap F_i) + \nu\left(A \setminus \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i\right),$$

where we have used finite additivity. Because  $\nu$  is monotone, we may lower-bound this by

$$\nu(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \nu(A \cap F_i) + \nu(A \setminus F)$$

for any  $n$ . Sending  $n \rightarrow \infty$  now, we see

$$\nu(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \nu(A \cap F_i) + \nu(A \setminus F),$$

but then countable subadditivity of  $\nu$  kicks in and tells us that

$$\nu(A) \geq \nu(A \cap F) + \nu(A \setminus F),$$

so we are done by [Remark 6.20](#).

6. Countably additive: we show  $\nu|_{\mathcal{M}(\nu)}$  is countably additive. Well, given some countable pairwise disjoint collection of  $\nu$ -measurable sets  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\nu)$ , we see that the previous step has told us

$$\nu(A) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \nu(A \cap E_i) + \nu\left(A \setminus \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i\right) \geq \nu\left(A \cap \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i\right) + \nu\left(A \setminus \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n E_i\right) \geq \nu(A).$$

But  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring, so may set  $A := \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  so that the above equalities actually read

$$\nu(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \nu(E_i),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

The previous theorem has an annoying hypothesis that  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  is nonempty. In the cases we're interested in, this is no issue.

**Theorem 6.24.** Fix a set  $X$  and a pre-ring  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $X$  equipped with a premeasure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mu^*)$ .

*Proof.* Fix some  $E \in \mathcal{P}$ , and we need to show that  $E \in \mathcal{M}(\mu^*)$ . By [Remark 6.20](#), it suffices to pick up any  $A \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$  and show

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

If  $\mu^*(A) = \infty$ , then there is nothing to say. Otherwise, we have  $\mu^*(A) < \infty$ . As usual, fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and we will show that  $\mu^*(A \cap E) + \mu^*(A \setminus E) \leq \mu^*(A) + \varepsilon$ .

Well, by definition of  $\mu^*(A)$ , we can find some collection  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  such that

$$\mu^*(A) + \varepsilon > \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(E_i).$$

We now decompose each  $\mu(E_i)$ . Note that  $E_i = (E_i \cap E) \sqcup (E_i \setminus E)$  is a disjoint union because an element of  $E_i$  is exactly one of in  $E$  or not. Further, by the preing property, we can write

$$E \setminus E_i = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n_i} F_{ij}$$

for some disjoint  $\{F_{ij}\}_{j=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ . In total, we see that  $E_i = (E_i \cap E) \sqcup \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n_i} F_{ij}$  is a disjoint union because  $E_i \cap E$  is certainly disjoint from each of the  $F_{ij} \subseteq E \setminus E_i$ , and the  $F_{ij}$  are disjoint from each other by construction. In total, we use the countable additivity of  $\mu$  to write

$$\mu^*(A) + \varepsilon > \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(E_i) \geq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \left( \mu(E_i \cap E) + \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \mu(F_{ij}) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(E_i \cap E) + \sum_{i=1}^\infty \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \mu(F_{ij}).$$

Now, we note that  $A \cap E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty (E_i \cap E)$  and  $A \setminus E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty (E_i \setminus E) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_i} F_{ij}$ , so countable subadditivity of  $\mu^*$  (by [Lemma 6.15](#)) lets us conclude

$$\mu^*(A) + \varepsilon > \mu(A \cap E) + \mu(A \setminus E).$$

Note that we have implicitly used the fact that  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{P}} = \mu$  from [Lemma 6.16](#). Anyway, sending  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$  completes the proof. ■

## 6.2.2 Completeness

We have a notion of completeness for our measures; here is the definition.

**Definition 6.25 (Complete).** Fix a set  $X$  and a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$ . Then a function  $\nu: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  is *complete* if and only if any  $E \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $F \subseteq E$  and  $\nu(E) = 0$  must have  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\nu(F) = 0$ .

**Remark 6.26.** If  $\mu$  is a complete measure on a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ , then we claim that any countable subset in  $\mathcal{S}$  has measure zero. Indeed, if  $A \in \mathcal{S}$  is countable, we can write

$$\mu(A) = \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{a \in A} \{a\}\right) = \sum_{a \in A} \mu(\{a\}) = \sum_{a \in A} 0 = 0.$$

We will continue this after the midterm.

## 6.3 October 21

I did poorly on the midterm, and I'm too tired to be okay with it.

### 6.3.1 Miscellaneous Outer Measures

We quickly complete an example from last class.

**Lemma 6.27.** Fix an outer measure  $\nu$  on a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then any set  $E \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $\nu(E) = 0$  is  $\nu$ -measurable.

*Proof.* Fix any  $A \in \mathcal{H}$ . Because outer measures are monotone, we see

$$\nu(A \setminus E) + \nu(A \cap E) \leq \nu(A) + \nu(E) = \nu(A),$$

so we conclude that  $\nu(A \setminus F) + \nu(A \cap F) = \nu(A)$  by [Remark 6.20](#). ■

**Lemma 6.28.** If  $\nu$  is an outer measure on a hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{H}$ , then  $\nu|_{\mathcal{M}(\nu)}$  is complete when  $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$  is nonempty.

*Proof.* Given  $E \in \mathcal{M}(\nu)$  with  $\nu(E) = 0$ , we note that any  $F \subseteq E$  is  $\nu$ -measurable and has  $\nu(F) = 0$ . Well, we certainly have  $0 \leq \nu(F)$ , and then we see that  $\nu(F) \leq \nu(E) = 0$  because  $\nu$  is monotone, so we conclude that  $\nu(F) = 0$ . Thus,  $F$  is  $\nu$ -measurable by [Lemma 6.27](#). ■

We take a moment to acknowledge that our restricted outer measures are in fact extending our premeasures when appropriate.

**Lemma 6.29.** Fix a premeasure  $\mu$  on a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  (viewed as a prering). Then, for any  $B \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{S})$ , there exists some  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $B \subseteq E$  and  $\mu^*(B) = \mu(E)$ .

*Proof.* Recall that

$$\mu^*(B) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i) : \{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \text{ and } B \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \right\}.$$

Notably, if we have some  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$  covering  $B$ , then we are told that  $\mu^*(B) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_i)$ , but in fact  $\mathcal{S}$  being a  $\sigma$ -ring forces  $E := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$  to be in  $\mathcal{S}$ , so  $B \subseteq E$  forces the stronger inequality

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

Note that we have used countable subadditivity from [Lemma 6.2](#) and  $\mu^*(E) = \mu(E)$  from [Lemma 6.16](#). It follows that  $\inf\{\mu(E) : B \subseteq E\} \leq \mu^*(B)$ . But of course  $B \subseteq E$  forces  $\mu^*(B) \leq \mu(E)$  from definition of  $\mu^*$ , so in fact

$$\mu^*(B) = \inf\{\mu(E) : B \subseteq E\}. \tag{6.1}$$

It remains to show that this infimum is achievable. Certainly if  $\mu^*(B) = \infty$ , then any  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $B \subseteq E$  will have  $\mu^*(E) = \infty$ , finishing.

Otherwise, take  $\mu^*(B) < \infty$ . From [\(6.1\)](#), we can a sequence  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E_i \subseteq B$  and  $\mu(E_i) < \mu^*(B) + \frac{1}{i}$  for each  $i$ . We now define

$$E := \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i,$$

which is an element of  $\mathcal{S}$  by [Remark 5.24](#). However, because  $\mu^*$  is monotone by [Lemma 6.15](#), we see that  $B \subseteq E$  forces  $\mu^*(B) \leq \mu^*(E)$  while  $E \subseteq E_i$  for each  $i$  forces

$$\mu^*(E) \leq \mu^*(E_i) < \mu^*(B) + 1/i$$

for each  $i$ . Sending  $i \rightarrow \infty$  recovers  $\mu(E) = \mu^*(E) = \mu^*(B)$ , where we have used [Lemma 6.16](#) to finish. ■

### 6.3.2 Uniqueness of Extensions

It is not always true that the extension of a measure must be unique.

**Example 6.30.** Give an uncountable set  $X$  the discrete topology, and let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the  $\sigma$ -ring of countable sets. Then the zero function  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{S}$  is a measure; however, we have the following two extensions  $\nu$  to a measure on all of  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ .

- We could set  $\nu(E) = 0$  for any uncountable  $E$ .
- We could set  $\nu(E) = \infty$  for any uncountable  $E$ .

**Example 6.31.** Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the pre-ring of right-half-open intervals of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then the measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{P}$  by  $\mu([a, b)) = \infty$  for  $a < b$  while  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$ . Then here are two extensions of  $\mu$ .

- We could set  $\mu$  to be infinite for any nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ .
- We could set  $\mu(E)$  be the counting measure on  $\mathbb{R}$ .

The issue in these examples is that there is too much allowed  $\infty$ . To deal with this, we have the following definition.

**Definition 6.32 ( $\sigma$ -finite).** Fix a set  $X$  and a pre-ring  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $X$ . Then a premeasure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{P}$  is  $\sigma$ -finite if and only if  $E \in \mathcal{P}$  has some countable collection  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  with  $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty E_i$  and  $\mu(E_i) < \infty$  for each  $i$ .

**Remark 6.33.** In the above situation, we note that any  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$  can be covered by  $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  with  $\mu(G_i) < \infty$  for each  $i$ . Indeed, we can at least cover  $E \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$  by some  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ , and then each  $E_i$  has a cover

$$E_i \subseteq \bigcup_{j=1}^\infty F_{ij}$$

where  $\mu(F_{ij}) < \infty$  because  $\mu$  is  $\sigma$ -finite. Reordering our countable union of countable unions covering  $E$  into some sequence  $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ , we see  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty G_i$  while  $\mu(G_i) < \infty$ .

It will now turn out that  $\sigma$ -finite things have unique extensions. Let's first see that our outer measure extension is special, though it need not be the only extension yet.

**Lemma 6.34.** Fix a set  $X$  and a pre-ring  $\mathcal{P}$  on  $X$  equipped with a premeasure  $\mu$ . Then for any  $\sigma$ -ring containing  $\mathcal{P}$  and contained in  $\mathcal{M}(\mu^*)$ , we have  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{S}}$  is the largest measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  extending  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{P}$ . In other words, if  $\nu$  is any measure extending  $\mu$  to  $\mathcal{S}$ , then  $\nu(E) \leq \mu^*(E)$  for any  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $\mu^*$  extends  $\mu$  by [Lemma 6.16](#).

Now, suppose that  $\nu$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  extending the premeasure  $\nu$  on  $\mathcal{P}$ . Now, for any  $G \in \mathcal{S}$  the fact that  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{P})$ , we may find some  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  contained in  $\mathcal{P}$  covering  $G$ . This tells us

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

Taking the infimum allows us to conclude  $\nu(G) \leq \mu^*(G)$ . ■

Now, here is our main result.

**Theorem 6.35.** Fix a set  $X$  and a premeasure  $\mu$  on  $X$  equipped with a  $\sigma$ -finite premeasure  $\mu$  on  $X$ . Then, for some  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mu^*)$ , our  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{S}}$  is the unique extension of  $\mu$  to a measure on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\nu$  be some measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  extending  $\mu$ . Note that we really only have one inequality here, thanks to Lemma 6.34. Anyway, we proceed in steps. Fix any  $G \in \mathcal{S}$ .

1. If  $G \in \mathcal{S}$  has  $\nu(G) = \infty$ , then our bound  $\mu^*(G) \geq \nu(G)$  from Lemma 6.34 forces equality. So we may now assume that  $\nu(G) < \infty$ .
2. Otherwise, we take  $\nu(G) < \infty$ . Suppose that  $G \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $G \subseteq E$  where  $E \in \mathcal{P}$ . Note that we at least still know  $\nu(G) \leq \mu^*(G) \leq \mu^*(E) = \mu(E)$  because  $\mu^*$  is monotone by Lemma 6.15. On the other hand, we know that  $E \in \mathcal{P}$  is measurable by Theorem 6.24, so we can use additivity to write

$$\nu(E) = \nu(G) + \nu(E \setminus G) \leq \mu^*(G) + \mu^*(E \setminus G) = \mu^*(E) \stackrel{*}{=} \mu(E) = \nu(E).$$

Note that we have used Lemma 6.16 in  $\stackrel{*}{=}$ . Thus, equalities must follow everywhere, so in particular  $\nu(G) = \mu^*(G)$  is forced.

3. Lastly, we take  $\nu(G) < \infty$  with any  $G \in \mathcal{S}$ . We now use the  $\sigma$ -finite hypothesis: by Remark 6.33, we may cover  $G$  with a countable collection  $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  covering  $G$  such that  $\nu(F_i) < \infty$  for each  $i$ .

Now, as usual, we set

$$F'_i := F_i \setminus \bigcup_{j < i} F_j$$

so that the  $F'_i$  are now disjoint (if  $i \neq i'$ , say with  $i < i'$  without loss of generality, then  $F'_{i'} \subseteq F_{i'} \setminus F_i$ ) even though  $G$  is still covered by the  $F'_i$  (any  $x \in G$  lives in some least  $F_i$ , so  $x \in F'_i$  follows). Additionally,  $F'_i \in \mathcal{S}$  by Remark 5.24, so the previous step tells us that  $G \cap F'_i \subseteq F'_i$  implies  $\nu(G \cap F'_i) = \mu^*(G \cap F'_i)$  and thus

$$\nu(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \nu(G \cap F'_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(G \cap F'_i) = \mu^*(G)$$

by using additivity. ■

## 6.4 October 24

The midterms were all graded. The mean was 15.68, and the standard deviation was 7.64. Roughly speaking, a score of 15 (and continuing to work at that level for the rest of the class) should roughly correspond to a B+.

We completed the proof of Theorem 6.35 from last class, but I have simply completed the proof there for continuity reasons.

### 6.4.1 Continuity Properties

Let's discuss continuity a little.

**Proposition 6.36.** Fix a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ . A collection  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  such that  $E_n \subseteq E_{n+1}$  for each  $i$  will have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i\right).$$

*Proof.* Set  $E := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i$ , for brevity, and we define

$$F_i := E_i \setminus E_{i-1},$$

where  $E_0 := \emptyset$ . Note that the  $F_i$  are now pairwise disjoint: if  $i \neq j$ , then without loss of generality say  $i < j$ , so  $F_i \subseteq E_i \subseteq E_{j-1}$  while  $F_j = E_j \setminus E_{j-1}$  is disjoint from  $E_{j-1}$ , so  $F_i \cap F_j = \emptyset$ . Thus, we note that

$$E_n = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^n F_k.$$

Indeed, certainly each  $k \leq n$  has  $F_k \subseteq E_k \subseteq E_n$ ; and conversely any  $x \in E_n$  belongs to some  $E_k$  with  $k \leq n$  minimal, implying  $x \notin F_{k-1}$  and so  $x \in F_k$ . In particular, we note that

$$E = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n F_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n \geq i} F_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$$

is still a disjoint union because the  $F_i$  are pairwise disjoint.

Thus, by the countable additivity of  $\mu$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{k=1}^n F_k\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(F_k) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(F_k) \\ &= \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k\right) \\ &= \mu(E), \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted. ■

**Corollary 6.37.** Fix a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Suppose we have a collection  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu(E_1) < \infty$  and  $E_n \supseteq E_{n+1}$  for each  $i$ . Then we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) = \mu\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i\right).$$

*Proof.* Set

$$E := \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i.$$

Then we define  $F_i := E_1 \setminus E_i$  so that

$$F := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (E_1 \setminus E_i) = E_1 \setminus \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i = E_1 \setminus E.$$

On the other hand, we note  $E_i \supseteq E_{i+1}$  implies  $E_1 \setminus E_i \supseteq E_1 \setminus E_{i+1}$ , so  $F_i \subseteq F_{i+1}$ .

Thus, applying [Proposition 6.36](#), we see

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(F_n) = \mu(F).$$

Rearranging gets the needed result. However, we note that  $\mu(E_i) \leq \mu(E_1) < \infty$  for each  $i$  because  $\mu$  is monotone by [Lemma 5.51](#), so we can say

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_1 \setminus F_n) \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mu(E_1) - \mu(F_n)) \\ &= \mu(E_1) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(F_n) = \mu(E_1) - \mu(F) \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} \mu(E_1 \setminus F) = \mu(E), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used [Remark 5.21](#) at each  $\stackrel{*}{=}$ . This finishes. ■

**Remark 6.38.** If we do not require  $\mu(E_1) < \infty$ , then the statement is false: set  $\alpha(t) := t$  be an increasing, left-continuous function, and let  $\mu$  be the corresponding measure coming as a restricted outer measure from the premeasure measure  $\mu_\alpha$  of [Proposition 5.48](#).

Then set  $E_i := [i, \infty)$ , which is measurable by [Theorem 6.24](#). Here are our checks.

- Note  $\mu(E_i) = \infty$ . Indeed, for any positive integer  $N$ , we note that  $\mu(E_i) \geq \mu([i, i + N)) = N$  because  $\mu$  is monotone by [Lemma 5.51](#) and restricts properly by [Lemma 6.16](#). It follows  $\mu(E_i) > \infty$ .
- On the other hand, note  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i = \emptyset$  because no real number is larger than every positive integer, and  $\mu(\emptyset) = \mu([0, 0)) = 0$  using [Lemma 6.16](#).

## 6.4.2 Borel Measures

We take a moment to recognize that we've actually built a measure.

**Definition 6.39** (Lebesgue–Stieltjes measure). Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the pre-ring of [Exercise 5.46](#) and some increasing, left-continuous function  $\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Then the measure  $\mu_\alpha^*|_{\mathcal{M}(\mu_\alpha^*)}$  restricted by [Remark 5.40](#) from the premeasure of [Proposition 5.48](#) is the *Lebesgue–Stieltjes measure*. The *Lebesgue measure* is the measure coming from  $\alpha(t) = t$ .

The measurable sets for each  $\mu_\alpha$  might be difficult to handle, so let's find some subsets which are always measurable.

**Definition 6.40** (Borel set). The  $\sigma$ -ring generated by the pre-ring  $\mathcal{P}$  of [Exercise 5.46](#) is called the  $\sigma$ -ring of *Borel sets*. A measure on the Borel sets is called a *Borel measure*.

Let's go find some Borel sets.

**Example 6.41.** Here are some Borel sets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

- Note  $(-\infty, a) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [a - n, a)$ , so  $(-\infty, a)$  is a Borel set.
- Note  $(a, \infty) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} [a + 1/i, a + i)$ , so  $(a, \infty)$  is a Borel set. Namely, if  $b > a$ , then there is some positive integer  $i > \max\{1/(b - a), b - a\}$ , so  $b \in [a + 1/i, a + i)$ .
- From [Remark 5.24](#), we note that  $(a, b) = (-\infty, b) \cap (a, \infty)$  is a Borel set.

**Exercise 6.42.** Any open subset  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is a Borel set.



*Proof.* If  $U = \mathbb{R}$ , there is nothing to say because  $\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, 1] \cup [1, \infty)$ , so we are done by [Example 6.41](#). Thus, suppose that we have some  $y \in \mathbb{R} \setminus U$ .

Otherwise, given some  $x \in U$ , we note that there is some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U$ . Note that  $\varepsilon < |x - y|$  because  $\varepsilon > |x - y|$  will force  $y \in B(x, \varepsilon) \setminus U$ . As such, we may let  $r_x$  be the supremum of all such  $\varepsilon$ , which we see is finite. Note  $r_x > 0$  because  $\varepsilon > 0$  always.

We now note that  $B(x, r_x) \subseteq U$ . Indeed, if  $x' \in B(x, r_x)$ , then

$$|x - x'| < r_x$$

implies that  $|x - x'|$  is not an upper-bound for our set of  $\varepsilon$ s, so we can find some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U$  and  $|x - x'| < \varepsilon$ , so  $x' \in B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U$ .

We now proceed with the proof directly. The rationals are countable, so enumerate the rationals in  $U$  as  $\{q_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ . For each  $q_n$ , set  $r_n := r_{q_n}$ . We now claim that

$$U \stackrel{?}{=} \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B(q_n, r_n).$$

Certainly  $B(q_n, r_n) \subseteq U$  for each  $n$ , as shown above. Conversely, if  $x \in U$ , find  $r > 0$  such that  $B(x, r) \subseteq U$ . Because the rationals are dense in  $\mathbb{R}$ , we may find some rational  $q \in B(x, r/3)$ . But now we see that

$$B(q, 2r/3) \subseteq B(x, r) \subseteq U,$$

so  $r_q \geq 2r/3$ . Thus,  $x \in B(q, 2r/3) \subseteq B(q, r_q)$ , so  $x \in \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} B(q_n, r_n)$  follows because each rational  $q$  is some  $q_n$ . ■

**Example 6.43.** Any closed subset  $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  has  $V = \mathbb{R} \setminus U$  for some open  $U$ , so  $V$  is a measurable set by [Exercise 6.42](#).

**Definition 6.44 (Borel–Stieltjes measure).** Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the  $\sigma$ -ring of Borel sets. Given some increasing, left-continuous function  $\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we note that  $\mathcal{M}(\mu_{\alpha}^*)$  contains  $\mathcal{P}$  by [Theorem 6.24](#) and is a  $\sigma$ -ring by [Theorem 6.21](#) and thus contains  $\mathcal{S}$  by definition of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Thus, we define  $\mu_{\alpha}^*|_{\mathcal{S}}$  (which is a measure from [Remark 5.40](#)) to be the corresponding *Borel–Stieltjes measure*.

We now note that these are actually all the measures.

**Proposition 6.45.** Fix a Borel measure  $\mu$  on the Borel sets  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mu([a, b]) < \infty$  for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then there exists an increasing, left-continuous function  $\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\mu = \mu_{\alpha}$ .

*Proof.* Define the function  $\alpha: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\alpha(t) := \begin{cases} \mu([0, t)) & t \geq 0, \\ -\mu([t, 0)) & t \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Notably, at  $t = 0$ ,  $\mu([0, 0)) = 0 = -\mu([0, 0))$ . We now run our checks.

- Suppose  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  has  $a \leq b$ . We claim  $\mu([a, b]) = \alpha(b) - \alpha(a)$ ; there's nothing to say if  $a = b$ . We have the following cases.
  - If  $a \geq 0$ , then we note  $b \geq a \geq 0$ , so

$$\mu([a, b]) = \mu([0, b] \setminus [0, a]) \stackrel{*}{=} \mu([0, b]) - \mu([0, a]) = \alpha(b) - \alpha(a),$$

where  $\stackrel{*}{=}$  is by [Remark 5.21](#).

- If  $b \geq 0 \geq a$ , then

$$\mu([a, b]) = \mu([a, 0] \sqcup [0, b]) = \mu([a, 0]) + \mu([0, b]) = -\alpha(a) + \alpha(b).$$

- Lastly, if  $0 \geq b \geq a$ , then

$$\mu([a, b]) = \mu([a, 0] \setminus [b, 0]) \stackrel{*}{=} \mu([a, 0]) - \mu([b, 0]) = -\alpha(a) + \alpha(b),$$

where  $\stackrel{*}{=}$  is by [Remark 5.21](#).

- Increasing: given real numbers  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $a \leq b$ , then we note  $\alpha(b) - \alpha(a) = \mu([a, b]) \geq 0$ , so  $\alpha(b) \geq \alpha(a)$  follows.
- Left-continuous: fix some real number  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  and some  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that we need some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $b - \delta < a \leq b$  implies  $|\alpha(b) - \alpha(a)| < \varepsilon$ . To begin, we at least note that  $\alpha(a) \leq \alpha(b)$ , so  $\alpha(b) - \alpha(a) \geq 0 > -\varepsilon$ , so it suffices for

$$b - \delta < a \leq b \implies \mu([a, b]) = \alpha(b) - \alpha(a) < \varepsilon.$$

To begin, we note  $\mu([b - 1, b]) < \infty$  by hypothesis on  $\mu$  (here is where we use this hypothesis!), so we set  $a_n := b - \frac{1}{n}$  and  $E_n := [a_n, b]$  so that  $\mu(E_1) < \infty$  and  $E_n \supseteq E_{n+1}$  for each  $n$ . It follows from [Corollary 6.37](#) that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_n) = \mu\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i\right) = \mu(\emptyset) = 0.$$

Indeed, we note that  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i = \emptyset$  because any  $x \in E_i$  for each  $i$  must have  $x < b$ , but then any  $i > 1/(b - x)$  will force  $x \notin E_i$ . And also,  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  by [Remark 5.39](#) because  $\mu(\emptyset) \leq \mu([b - 1, b]) < \infty$ , where we are using the fact that  $\mu$  is monotone from [Lemma 5.51](#).

In total, we see that there is some  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies  $\mu(E_n) < \varepsilon$ . Set  $\delta := \frac{1}{N}$  so that  $b - \delta < a \leq b$  implies that  $a \in E_N$ , so  $[a, b] \subseteq E_N$ , so

$$\mu([a, b]) \leq \mu(E_N) < \varepsilon$$

by [Lemma 5.51](#).

- Lastly, we show  $\mu = \mu_\alpha|_{\mathcal{B}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the pre-ring of right-half-open intervals. Note that  $\mu_\alpha$  at least makes sense from the above checks, so the fact that  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mu_\alpha^*)$  as discussed in the definition of the Borel–Stieltjes measure  $\mu_\alpha^*|_{\mathcal{B}}$ .

Now, we note that  $\mu_\alpha([a, b]) = \alpha(b) - \alpha(a) = \mu([a, b])$  as checked above (we have used [Lemma 6.16](#)), so  $\mu_\alpha^*|_{\mathcal{B}}$  and  $\mu$  are both extensions of the premeasure  $\mu_\alpha$  on  $\mathcal{P}$ , so [Theorem 6.35](#) follows  $\mu_\alpha^*|_{\mathcal{B}} = \mu$ . This finishes. ■

### 6.4.3 The Haar Measure

Let's build up to talking about the Haar measure.

**Remark 6.46.** We'll show on the homework that the Lebesgue measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  is translation-invariant: if  $E$  is measurable, and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $E + t = \{r + t : r \in E\}$  is measurable has the same measure as  $E$ . In fact, any translation-invariant measure on the Borel sets is a multiple of  $\mu$ .

There is a different definition of Borel sets is a little different in general.

**Definition 6.47 (Borel set).** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff space  $X$ . Then the  $\sigma$ -ring of Borel sets is the  $\sigma$ -ring generated by the compact subsets of  $X$ . A Borel measure is a measure on the Borel sets of  $X$ .

**Example 6.48.** Certainly any compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  is closed by [Corollary 4.13](#) and thus Borel by [Example 6.43](#), so the Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$  coming from the above definition are indeed Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Conversely, for any  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , we note that  $[a, b) = [a, b + 1] \setminus [b, b + 1]$  is a Borel subset from the above definition, so Borel subsets from the above definition are indeed Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

We quickly note that we have the following uniqueness result.

**Theorem 6.49 (Haar).** Fix a locally compact Hausdorff topological group  $G$ . Then there is a (nonzero) Borel measure, unique up to scaling, which is finite on compact subsets of  $X$  and invariant under left-translation.

In some sense, the above result explains [Remark 6.46](#).

**Remark 6.50.** On the homework, we construct the Haar measure on the circle group  $S^1$ .

In fact, we have the following converse to [Theorem 6.49](#).

**Theorem 6.51 (Weil).** Fix a group  $G$  and a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $G$  equipped with a  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\mu$  and some extra separating property. Given that both  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mu$  are suitably translation-invariant, there is a topology  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $G$  making  $G$  into a locally compact Hausdorff topological group where  $\mu$  is a Haar measure for  $G$ .

Despite all our work, it's not even obvious which sets are Lebesgue-measurable or even that there are sets which are not Lebesgue-measurable. We will be able to answer at least this second question in the negative next class.

## 6.5 October 26

Today we explain why we keep marking our sets as being measurable.

### 6.5.1 A Non-measurable Set

Here is our result.

**Exercise 6.52 (Vitali).** Let  $T = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  be the circle group, and let  $\mu$  be the translation-invariant measure on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  with  $\mu(T) = 1$ . It turns out that  $\mu$  is complete. We produce a subset of  $T$  which is not  $\mu$ -measurable.

*Proof.* Let  $T_{\text{tors}}$  be the torsion subgroup of  $T$ . Namely,  $r \in T_{\text{tors}}$  if and only if there exists some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  for which  $nr = 0$  in  $T$ , which means that  $nr = k$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  for some integer  $k$  and so  $r = k/n$ . Thus,  $T_{\text{tors}} = \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ ; the important point is that  $T_{\text{tors}}$  is countable.

Now, for each coset in  $T/T_{\text{tors}}$ , let  $V \subseteq T$  be a set of representatives of these cosets.<sup>1</sup> In particular, it follows that

$$T = \bigsqcup_{q \in T_{\text{tors}}} (q + V).$$

Indeed, there are two checks.

- To see the union, for any  $r \in T$ , we see that  $r \in x + T_{\text{tors}}$  for some  $x \in V$ , so  $r = xq$  for some  $q \in T_{\text{tors}}$ , so  $r \in qV$ .
- To see that the union is disjoint, suppose  $q_1 + V = q_2 + V$ . Then we can find  $r_1, r_2 \in V$  such that  $q_1 + r_1 = q_2 + r_2$ . It follows that  $r_1 = r_2 + (q_2 - q_1) \in r_2 + T_{\text{tors}}$ , so  $r_1 + T_{\text{tors}} = r_2 + T_{\text{tors}}$ , so  $r_1 = r_2$  because  $V$  is made of representatives of  $T/T_{\text{tors}}$ . Thus,  $q_1 + r_1 = q_2 + r_2$  has forced  $q_1 = q_2$ .

<sup>1</sup> Note that we have used the Axiom of Choice here.

We are now ready to complete the proof. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $V$  is measurable. It follows that

$$1 = \mu(T) = \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{q \in T_{\text{tors}}} (x + V)\right) = \sum_{q \in T_{\text{tors}}} \mu(q + V) \stackrel{*}{=} \sum_{q \in T_{\text{tors}}} \mu(V).$$

Note that we have used the translation-invariance of  $\mu$  in  $\stackrel{*}{=}$ . However, this is impossible: if  $\mu(V) > 0$ , then the rightmost sum does not converge, and if  $\mu(V) = 0$ , then the rightmost sum vanishes, so it is impossible for the sum to actually equal 1. ■

**Remark 6.53.** The above proof used the Axiom of Choice to construct  $V$ . It is a result of Solovay that there are models of the real numbers where all subsets are measurable. Of course, the model does not include the Axiom of Choice.

# THEME 7

## INTEGRATION

*Having thus refreshed ourselves in the oasis of a proof, we now turn again into the desert of definitions*

—Theodor Bröcker and Klaus Jänich, [BJ82]

### 7.1 October 26

We now transition to integration. Here is a warning about our exposition.



**Warning 7.1.** We are going to do integration valued in general Banach spaces instead of just  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ .

The above convention is non-standard. See [Lan12] for perhaps another treatment along these lines, but Professor Rieffel doesn't like Lang's exposition.

**Example 7.2.** The Banach spaces we care about will essentially all be  $\mathbb{R}^n$  or  $\mathbb{C}^n$  for some integer  $n$ .

**Example 7.3.** We may also use any completion of a normed vector space  $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ , such as the  $p$ -adic rationals  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  or  $C([0, 1])$  using the  $p$ -norm  $\|\cdot\|_p$ .

#### 7.1.1 Simple Measurable Functions

Let's begin with the easiest possible functions we might hope to integrate.

**Definition 7.4** (Simple measurable function). Fix a ring  $S$  on a set  $X$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . Then a *simple  $S$ -measurable  $B$ -valued function* is a function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  such that  $\text{im } f$  is finite and  $f^{-1}(\{y\}) \in S$  for any  $y \in B \setminus \{0\}$ .

**Remark 7.5.** It is possible to tell a lot of this story by allowing  $B$  to be any metric space with a chosen point  $0 \in B$ . (In other words, we may allow  $B$  to be a "pointed metric space.") Professor Rieffel made some comments about this, but I do not think that keeping track of this is particularly important.

**Example 7.6.** Given any  $y \in B$  and  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ , the function  $y1_E$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. For one, the image is  $\{0, y\}$ , which is finite. Further, if  $b \in B \setminus \{0\}$ , then either  $b \neq y$  as well and so  $f^{-1}(\{b\}) = \emptyset \in \mathcal{S}$  or  $f^{-1}(\{y\}) = E \in \mathcal{S}$ .

As from the above example, it turns out that we should think of simple measurable functions as just linear combinations of indicators.

**Lemma 7.7.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . Then any simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  can be written as

$$f = \sum_{y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} y 1_{f^{-1}(\{y\})}.$$

*Proof.* Fix any  $x_0 \in X$ , and we want to show that

$$f(x_0) = \sum_{y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} y 1_{f^{-1}(\{y\})}(x_0).$$

Well, if  $f(x_0) = 0$ , then note that  $x_0 \notin f^{-1}(\{y\})$  for any  $y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$ , so the right-hand sum vanishes.

Otherwise, say that  $f(x_0) = y_0$  where  $y_0 \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$ . Then note that  $x_0 \in f^{-1}(\{y_0\})$ , and further we see that  $x_0 \in f^{-1}(\{y\})$  forces  $y = f(x_0) = y_0$ , so  $y_0$  is the only  $y$  for which  $x_0 \in f^{-1}(\{y_0\})$ , so

$$\sum_{y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} y 1_{f^{-1}(\{y\})}(x_0) = y_0 1_{f^{-1}(\{y_0\})}(x_0) = y_0 = f(x_0),$$

which is what we wanted. ■

**Lemma 7.8.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . Then any simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  can be written as

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i 1_{E_i}$$

where the  $y_i \in B$  are distinct and nonzero and the  $E_i \in \mathcal{S}$  are pairwise disjoint. In fact, we must have  $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\} = (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$  and  $E_i = f^{-1}(\{y_i\})$ .

*Proof.* We show the claims in sequence.

- Existence: by [Lemma 7.7](#), we can write

$$f = \sum_{y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} y 1_{f^{-1}(\{y\})}.$$

Here, the elements of  $(\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$  are surely distinct, and there are finitely many of them, so we enumerate them by  $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ . Then we set  $E_i := f^{-1}(\{y_i\})$ , which is in  $\mathcal{S}$  by hypothesis on  $f$ .

Lastly, we note that the  $E_i$  are pairwise disjoint: if  $x \in E_i$ , then  $f(x) = y_i$ , so if  $x \in E_i \cap E_j$ , then  $f(x) = y_i = y_j$ , so  $y_i = y_j$ , so  $i = j$  because the  $y_i$  are distinct.

- Uniqueness: suppose we can write

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i 1_{E_i}$$

where the  $y_i \in B$  are distinct and nonzero, and the  $E_i \in \mathcal{S}$  are pairwise disjoint. We claim that  $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\} = (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$  and  $E_i = f^{-1}(\{y_i\})$  for each  $i$ .

Certainly  $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\} \subseteq (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$ . Indeed, if  $x \in E_i$ , then

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i 1_{E_i}(x) = y_i 1_{E_i}(x) = y_i$$

because the  $E_i$  are pairwise disjoint, so  $y_i \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$ . In fact, observe that we have also shown that  $x \in E_i$  implies  $f(x) = y_i$ .

Conversely, if  $y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$ , then find  $x \in X$  with  $f(x) = y$ . Because  $f(x) \neq 0$ , some term in the sum of

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i 1_{E_i}(x)$$

must be nonzero, so say that  $y_i 1_{E_i}(x) \neq 0$ , so  $x \in E_i$ . However,  $x \in E_i$  now forces  $f(x) = y_i$  as we saw above, so  $y \in \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ . In fact, observe that we have also shown that  $f(x) \neq 0$  implies  $x \in E_j$  for some  $j$ .

It remains to show that  $E_i = f^{-1}(\{y_i\})$ . Well, above we showed that  $x \in E_i$  implies  $f(x) = y_i$ . Conversely, we showed that  $f(x) = y_i \neq 0$  implies that  $x \in E_j$  for some  $j$ . But then  $f(x) = y_j$  from the above, so  $y_j = y_i$ , so  $i = j$  because the  $y_i$  are distinct, so  $x \in E_i$ . ■

Here's a sanity check.

**Lemma 7.9.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  and a normed  $k$ -vector space  $B$ . Then the simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions valued in  $B$  form a  $k$ -vector space.

*Proof.* We know that the set of all functions  $X \rightarrow B$  forms a  $k$ -vector space under the pointwise operations, so we just need to check that we form a subspace. Here are those checks.

- Scalar multiplication: suppose  $f$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function, and let  $r \in k$ , and we show  $rf$  is still a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. Well, if  $r = 0$ , then  $rf = 0$ , so  $rf = 0 \cdot 1_\emptyset$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function by [Example 7.6](#).

Otherwise, take  $r \neq 0$ . For one, note that

$$\text{im}(rf) = \{rf(x) : x \in X\} = \{ry : y \in \text{im } f\}$$

is still finite, with cardinality upper-bounded by  $\#(\text{im } f)$ .

Further, we need to show that  $y \in B \setminus \{0\}$  will have  $f^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$ . Well, we compute

$$(rf)^{-1}(\{y\}) = \{x \in X : rf(x) = y\} = \{x \in X : f(x) = 1/r \cdot y\} = f^{-1}(\{1/r \cdot y\}),$$

where we are using the fact that  $r \neq 0$ . Because  $y \neq 0$ , we see  $1/r \cdot y \neq 0$ , so  $f^{-1}(\{1/r \cdot y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  still.

- Addition: suppose  $f$  and  $g$  are simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable so that we want to show  $f + g$  is still a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. Indeed, we claim that

$$\text{im}(f + g) \subseteq \{b + c : b \in \text{im } f \text{ and } c \in \text{im } g\}.$$

To see this note that any element of  $\text{im}(f + g)$  can be written as  $(f + g)(x) = f(x) + g(x)$ , which does take the form  $b + c$  where  $b = f(x) \in \text{im } f$  and  $c = g(x) \in \text{im } g$ . Thus, we do indeed see that  $\text{im}(f + g)$  is finite, with cardinality at most  $\#(\text{im } f) \cdot \#(\text{im } g)$ .

Now, suppose that  $y \in B \setminus \{0\}$ , and we show  $(f + g)^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$ . Indeed, we see that  $f(x) + g(x) = y$  is equivalent to  $f(x) = y - g(x)$ , so

$$(f + g)^{-1}(\{y\}) = \bigcup_{c \in \text{im } g} (f^{-1}(\{y - c\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\})).$$

Because  $\sigma$ -rings are closed under finite unions, it suffices to show that  $f^{-1}(\{y - c\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for each  $c \in \text{im } g$ . We have three cases.

- If  $y \neq c$  and  $c \neq 0$ , then we see that  $f^{-1}(\{y - c\}), g^{-1}(\{c\}) \in \mathcal{S}$ , so their intersection remains in  $\mathcal{S}$  by [Remark 5.24](#).
- If  $y = c$ , then note that  $c = y \neq 0$ . Here, we are showing  $f^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$ . Well,  $f^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{y\})$  is

$$\left( X \setminus \bigcup_{b \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} f^{-1}(\{b\}) \right) \cap g^{-1}(\{y\}) = g^{-1}(\{y\}) \setminus \bigcup_{b \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} f^{-1}(\{b\}).$$

Well,  $f^{-1}(\{b\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for each of the finitely many  $b \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$ , so the full union lives in  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring. Lastly, the subtraction still lives in  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $g^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$ , and  $\mathcal{S}$  is still a  $\sigma$ -ring.

- If  $c = 0$ , then we still have  $y \neq 0$ . Here, we are showing that  $f^{-1}(\{y\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{0\}) \in \mathcal{S}$ , so we may just reverse the roles of  $f$  and  $g$  in the above case to finish.

The above cases finish the proof. ■

**Corollary 7.10.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . For any sets  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^n \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  and outputs  $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^n \in B$ , the function

$$\sum_{i=1}^n y_i 1_{E_i}$$

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

*Proof.* Note that each  $y_i 1_{E_i}$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function by [Example 7.6](#), so the finite sum of these remains a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function by [Lemma 7.9](#). ■

**Lemma 7.11.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  and a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$ . If  $f$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function, then the function  $x \mapsto \|f(x)\|$  is as well.

*Proof.* Set  $g(x) := \|f(x)\|$  to be a function  $g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Because  $\text{im } f$  is finite, it follows that  $\text{im } g = \{\|y\| : y \in \text{im } f\}$  is still finite, so it remains to check our fibers. Fix some  $r \in (\text{im } g) \setminus \{0\}$ . Because  $\text{im } f$  is finite, we note that

$$B_r := \{y \in \text{im } f : \|y\| = r\}$$

is still finite; notably, each  $y \in B_r$  is nonzero because  $r$  is nonzero. Now,

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-1}(\{r\}) &= \{x \in X : \|f(x)\| = r\} \\ &= \bigcup_{y \in (\text{im } f)} \{x \in X : f(x) = y \text{ and } \|y\| = r\} \\ &= \bigcup_{y \in B_r} \{x \in X : f(x) = y\} \\ &= \bigcup_{y \in B_r} f^{-1}(\{y\}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $g^{-1}(\{y\})$  is the finite union of sets of the form  $f^{-1}(\{y\})$  with  $y \neq 0$ , which are in  $\mathcal{S}$  by definition of  $f$ . In particular,  $g^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  as well. ■



### 7.1.2 Simple Integrable Functions

We are finally ready to define integrals.

**Definition 7.12** (Simple integrable function). Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  and a metric space  $B$ . Further, let  $\mu$  be a finitely additive measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Then a function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  is a *simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -integrable function* if and only if  $\text{im } f$  is finite, and  $f^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  has finite measure for each  $y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$ .

**Definition 7.13** (Integral). Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  and a metric space  $B$ . Further, let  $\mu$  be a finitely additive measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{S}$ . Given a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function  $f$ , we define the *integral*

$$\int_X f \, d\mu := \sum_{y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} \mu(f^{-1}(\{y\})) y.$$

Note this is a finite sum with  $\mu(f^{-1}(\{y\}))$  finite, so  $\int_X f \, d\mu$  is finite.

**Example 7.14.** Given some  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  with  $\mu(E) < \infty$ , we note  $\int_X 1_E \, d\mu = \mu(E)$ . This function is simple  $\mu$ -integrable:  $\text{im}(1_E) = \{0, 1\}$ , and  $1_E^{-1}(\{1\}) = E$  has  $\mu(E) < \infty$ . Thus,

$$\int_X 1_E \, d\mu = 1\mu(E) = \mu(E),$$

as desired.

Note that the sum in the above definition is a finite sum by definition of  $f$ , and each  $f^{-1}(\{y\})$  is also in  $\mathcal{S}$  by definition of  $f$  again.

Here are the usual sanity checks once we've defined some functions.

**Lemma 7.15.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a finitely additive measure  $\mu$  and a normed  $k$ -vector space  $B$ . Then the simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions valued in  $B$  form a  $k$ -vector space.

*Proof.* By definition, note that simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions are also simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions, so it suffices to show that we form a  $k$ -subspace of the space of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions (see [Lemma 7.9](#)). We use ideas from [Lemma 7.9](#) to run our checks.

- **Scalar multiplication:** fix a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function  $f$ , and let  $r \in k$ , and we show  $rf$  is still a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function. As usual,  $r = 0$  gives  $rf = 0$ , so checking  $f^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  with finite measure for  $y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$  is vacuous.

Otherwise, we have  $r \neq 0$ . We showed in [Lemma 7.9](#) that any  $y \in (\text{im } rf) \setminus \{0\}$  will have

$$(rf)^{-1}(\{y\}) = f^{-1}(\{1/r \cdot y\}).$$

Thus, if  $y \in (\text{im } rf) \setminus \{0\}$  so that the left-hand side is nonempty, then  $1/r \cdot y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$  as well; notably,  $1/r \cdot y = 0$  would force  $y = 0$ , so we must have  $1/r \cdot y \neq 0$ . Now,  $f^{-1}(\{1/r \cdot y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  has finite measure by hypothesis on  $f$ , so  $(rf)^{-1}(\{y\})$  has finite measure as well.

- **Addition:** suppose  $f$  and  $g$  are simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions so that we want to show  $f + g$  is still a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function. We showed in [Lemma 7.9](#) that any  $y \in B \setminus \{0\}$  will have

$$(f + g)^{-1}(\{y\}) = \bigcup_{c \in (\text{im } g)} (f^{-1}(\{y - c\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\})).$$

In particular,  $(f + g)^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  as we discussed in [Lemma 7.9](#), and then [Lemma 5.55](#) tells us that

$$\mu((f + g)^{-1}(\{y\})) \leq \sum_{c \in (\text{im } g)} \mu(g^{-1}(\{c\})),$$

which is a finite sum of finite real numbers and therefore finite. It follows that  $f + g$  is in fact a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function. ■

**Lemma 7.16.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a finitely additive measure  $\mu$  and a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$ . If  $f$  is a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function, then  $x \mapsto \|f(x)\|$  is also a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function.

*Proof.* As before, we continue from [Lemma 7.11](#). Namely, we set  $g(x) := \|f(x)\|$ , and we know that  $g$  is already a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function.

Thus, we pick up any  $r \in (\text{im } g) \setminus \{0\}$ , and we need to show that  $g^{-1}(\{r\})$  has finite measure. Well, in [Lemma 7.11](#), we defined

$$B_r := \{y \in \text{im } f : \|y\| = r\}$$

and showed that

$$g^{-1}(\{r\}) = \bigcup_{y \in B_r} f^{-1}(\{y\}).$$

Now, each  $f^{-1}(\{y\})$  has finite measure by hypothesis on  $f$ , so the total finite union  $g^{-1}(\{r\})$  will have finite measure by [Lemma 5.55](#). ■

## 7.2 October 28

We continue our story with integration by defining what we mean by a measurable function.

### 7.2.1 Measurable Functions

The following definition is non-standard but is how to think about our integrals in practice.

**Definition 7.17 (Measurable function).** Fix a set  $X$  and a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . Given a normed vector space  $B$ , an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function is a function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  such that there is a sequence of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which converge to  $f$  pointwise.

**Remark 7.18.** Later in life, when we take  $B = \mathbb{R}$ , we will allow the functions  $f_n$  to output at  $\infty$ , but we will not do so while we allow  $B$  to be a normed vector space.

Sometimes we won't converge "on the nose," so we will want a little freedom.

**Definition 7.19 (Null set).** Fix a set  $X$  and a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$  equipped with a measure  $\mu$ . A null set is a subset  $N \subseteq X$  such that there is some  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $N \subseteq E$  and  $\mu(E) = 0$ .

**Definition 7.20 (Converges almost everywhere).** Fix a set  $X$  and a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$  equipped with a measure  $\mu$ . Given a metric space  $B$ , a sequence of functions  $f_n: X \rightarrow B$  with  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  converges to a function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  almost everywhere if and only if there is a null set  $N$  such that  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $x \in X \setminus N$ .

**Definition 7.21 (Measurable function).** Fix a set  $X$  and a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$  equipped with a measure  $\mu$ . Given a metric space  $B$ , a  $\mu$ -measurable function is a function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  such that there is a sequence of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which converge to  $f$  almost everywhere.

Here is the usual sanity check.

**Lemma 7.22.** Fix a normed  $k$ -vector space  $B$  and a set  $X$  with a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . Then the set of all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions forms a  $k$ -vector space under pointwise operations.

*Proof.* We already know that the set of all functions  $X \rightarrow B$  will form a  $k$ -vector space under the pointwise operations, so we just need to show that we have a subspace. Well, pick up  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $f$  and  $g$  and some scalars  $a, b \in k$ . We show that  $h := af + bg$  is still  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable.

Well,  $f$  being  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable promises simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise; similarly, we get simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $g_n \rightarrow g$  pointwise. Now, we define

$$h_n := af_n + bg_n,$$

which is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function by [Lemma 7.9](#).

It remains to check that  $h_n \rightarrow h$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Let  $|\cdot|$  be the norm on  $k$ , and let  $\|\cdot\|$  be the norm on  $B$ , and fix some  $x \in X$ . Now, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , find  $N_f > 0$  such that

$$n > N_f \implies \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2(\|a\| + 1)},$$

where we note that  $|a| + 1 > 0$  makes this division legal. Similarly, we find  $N_g > 0$  such that

$$n > N_g \implies \|g(x) - g_n(x)\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2(\|b\| + 1)}.$$

Thus,  $n > \max\{N_f, N_g\}$  will have

$$\|h(x) - h_n(x)\| \leq |a| \cdot \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| + |b| \cdot \|g(x) - g_n(x)\| < |a| \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{2(\|a\| + 1)} + |b| \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{2(\|b\| + 1)} < \varepsilon,$$

which finishes. ■

## 7.2.2 Properties of Simple Measurable Functions

Something annoying about our definition is that we can only work simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions “directly.” One might wonder, for example, if a looking at limits  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  where each  $f_n$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable might give a function  $f$  which is not  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable. This turns out to not be the case, but it will take some work to prove.

In particular, we will want a better description of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions. For today, we will content ourselves with necessary conditions.

**Definition 7.23 (Separable).** A topological space  $M$  is *separable* if and only if there is a countable dense subset of  $M$ . As such, a subset  $A \subseteq M$  is *separable* if and only if  $A$  is separable with the restricted metric; in other words,  $A \subseteq M$  is separable if and only if there is a countable subset  $B \subseteq A$  such that  $A \subseteq \overline{B}$ .

**Example 7.24.** If  $A \subseteq M$  is countable, then we can see that  $A \subseteq \overline{A}$  by definition of the closure, so  $A$  is a countable dense subset with  $A \subseteq \overline{A}$ .

Here is a quick sanity check.

**Lemma 7.25.** Fix a metric space  $(M, d)$ . A subset  $A \subseteq M$  is separable if and only if there is a countable subset  $B \subseteq M$  such that  $A \subseteq \overline{B}$ .

*Proof.* In the forward direction, having a countable subset  $B \subseteq A$  with  $A \subseteq \overline{B}$  will certainly imply having a countable subset  $B \subseteq M$  with  $A \subseteq \overline{B}$ .

In the reverse direction, we begin with a countable subset  $B \subseteq M$  with  $A \subseteq \overline{B}$ . For now, fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then each  $a \in A$  has  $B(a, \varepsilon/2) \cap B \neq \emptyset$  by Lemma 2.57, so choose some  $b_a \in B$  with  $d(a, b_a) < \varepsilon/2$ . Now, the subset

$$B_\varepsilon := \{b_{\varepsilon,a} : a \in A\} \subseteq B$$

must be countable, so enumerate its elements by  $B_\varepsilon = \{b_{\varepsilon,1}, b_{\varepsilon,2}, \dots\}$ , and for each  $b_{\varepsilon,k}$ , we select some  $a_{\varepsilon,k} \in A$  such that  $d(b_{\varepsilon,k}, a_{\varepsilon,k}) < \varepsilon/2$ , which exists by construction of  $B_\varepsilon$ .

We now go back to letting  $\varepsilon > 0$  vary. As our countable subset, we now set

$$B' := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{a_{1/n,k} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}.$$

Indeed, we claim that  $A \subseteq \overline{B'}$ , which shows density by Lemma 2.57. For this, we pick up any  $a \in A$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and we show that  $B(a, \varepsilon) \cap B' \neq \emptyset$ . Well, find some  $N$  with  $N > 1/\varepsilon$ . By construction of  $B_{1/N}$ , we may find some  $k$  with  $b_{1/N,k} = b_{1/N,a}$ , which means that

$$d(a, a_{1/N,k}) \leq d(a, b_{1/N,k}) + d(b_{1/N,k}, a_{1/N,k}) < \frac{1}{2N} + \frac{1}{2N} < \varepsilon.$$

Thus,  $a_{1/N,k} \in B'$  is the element we are looking for. ■

**Example 7.26.** We give  $\mathbb{R}$  the usual metric. Then any subset  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is separable: set  $B := \mathbb{Q}$ . Then  $\overline{B} = \mathbb{R}$  contains  $A$ , but  $B$  is countable, so we are done by Lemma 7.25.

**Remark 7.27.** To help our intuition that this should be a smallness condition, we note that if  $M$  is a separable space, then any subspace  $A \subseteq M$  is still separable. Indeed, there is some countable subset  $B \subseteq M$  with  $\overline{B} = M$ , so  $A \subseteq \overline{B}$  follows.

**Example 7.28.** Given countably many separable subsets  $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of a metric space  $B$ , the union  $A := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n$  is separable. Indeed, each  $A_n$  has a countable  $B_n \subseteq M$  with  $A_n \subseteq \overline{B_n}$ .

Now, set  $B := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$ , which is countable; we claim that  $A \subseteq \overline{B}$ , which will finish. Because  $B_n \subseteq B \subseteq \overline{B}$ , we see that  $\overline{B}$  is a closed subset containing  $B_n$ , so  $A_n \subseteq \overline{B_n} \subseteq \overline{B}$  follows. Thus,  $A \subseteq \overline{B}$ .

Here is why we just defined separable subsets.

**Lemma 7.29.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a set  $X$  with  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . Any simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  has  $\text{im } f \subseteq B$  separable.

*Proof.* By definition of simple measurable functions,  $\text{im } f$  is finite and hence separable by Example 7.24. ■

Here are a few other moderately silly checks.

**Lemma 7.30.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a set  $X$  with  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . Any simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  has  $f^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for any open  $U \subseteq X$ .

*Proof.* Recall that  $\text{im } f$  is finite by definition, so enumerate  $\text{im } f$  by  $(\text{im } f) \cap (U \setminus \{0\}) = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ . Then we note that

$$f^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\}) = f^{-1}((\text{im } f) \cap (U \setminus \{0\})) = \bigcup_{k=1}^n f^{-1}(\{y_k\}).$$

However,  $f^{-1}(\{y_k\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for each  $k$ , so the total union lives in  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $\mathcal{S}$  is a ring. ■

### 7.2.3 Properties Preserved by Limits

Now, to upgrade from simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions to  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions, we take limits. Here is the separability check.

**Lemma 7.31.** Fix a metric space  $M$  and a set  $X$ . Suppose a sequence of functions  $f_n: X \rightarrow B$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  have a pointwise limit  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If each  $\text{im } f_n \subseteq M$  is separable, then  $\text{im } f \subseteq M$  is separable as well.

*Proof.* For each  $n$ , find the countable subset  $C_n \subseteq \text{im } f_n$  with  $\text{im } f_n \subseteq \overline{C_n}$ . Then we set

$$C := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n,$$

and we note that  $C$  is the countable union of countable subsets and hence countable. We thus claim that  $\text{im } f \subseteq \overline{C}$ , which will finish by [Lemma 7.25](#).

Well, fix any  $y \in \text{im } f$ , and find some  $x \in X$  with  $y = f(x)$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we need to show that  $B(y, \varepsilon) \cap C \neq \emptyset$ ; this is enough by [Lemma 2.57](#). For this, we note that there is some  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies

$$d(f(x), f_n(x)) < \varepsilon/2,$$

where  $d$  is the metric of  $M$ ; set  $n := N$ . Further, we recall  $\text{im } f_n \subseteq \overline{C_n}$ , so [Lemma 2.57](#) promises us some  $c \in C_n$  such that  $d(f_n(x), c) < \varepsilon/2$ . In total,

$$d(y, c) \leq d(f(x), f_n(x)) + d(f_n(x), c) < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon,$$

which is what we wanted. ■

**Corollary 7.32.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a set  $X$  with  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . Any  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  has  $\text{im } f \subseteq B$  separable.

*Proof.* By definition of being  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable, there is a sequence of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $f_n: X \rightarrow B$  with  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  pointwise. Each  $f_n$  has  $\text{im } f_n$  separable by [Lemma 7.29](#), so  $f$  does as well by [Lemma 7.31](#). ■

Making [Lemma 7.30](#) work in limits requires a little more care.

**Lemma 7.33.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a set  $X$  with  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . Suppose that a sequence of functions  $f_n: X \rightarrow B$  have  $f_n^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for each open  $U \subseteq B$ . Then satisfy the following conditions for each  $f_n$ . If  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $f^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for each open  $U \subseteq B$  as well.

*Proof.* This is a little tricky. We will replace  $U$  with  $U \setminus \{0\}$  and simply remember that  $0 \notin U$ .

The main point is that any  $x \in f^{-1}(U)$  will have  $f(x) \in U$ , and elements of  $U$  should have some small positive distance away from  $B \setminus U$ . Namely, we set

$$U_m := \{x \in U : d(x, B \setminus U) > 1/m\}$$

for any  $m \geq 1$ ; here,  $d$  is the metric of  $B$ , and  $d(x, B \setminus U) = \inf_{y \in B \setminus U} d(x, y)$ . Here are a few checks.

- As an intermediate claim, we note that  $d(x, y) + d(y, B \setminus U) \geq d(x, B \setminus U)$ . Indeed, for any  $a \in B \setminus U$ , note that

$$d(x, y) + d(y, a) \geq d(b, a) \geq d(x, B \setminus U),$$

so

$$d(y, a) \geq d(x, B \setminus U) - d(x, y).$$

Letting  $a \in B \setminus U$  vary in this last inequality tells us that  $d(y, B \setminus U) \geq d(x, B \setminus U) - d(x, y)$ .

- Note that each  $U_m$  is open. Indeed, if  $x \in U_m$ , then set  $\varepsilon := 1/m - d(x, B \setminus U) > 0$ . This means that  $d(x, y) < \varepsilon$  implies, from the previous check,

$$d(y, B \setminus U) \leq d(x, y) + d(x, B \setminus U) < \varepsilon + d(x, B \setminus U) = 1/m,$$

so  $y \in U_m$ . Thus,  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U$ .

- We claim

$$U \stackrel{?}{=} \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} U_m.$$

In one direction,  $x \in U_m$  implies  $d(x, B \setminus U) \neq 0$ , so  $x \notin B \setminus U$ , so  $x \in U$ .

In the other direction, note  $x \in U$  implies there is some  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U$ , so  $B(x, \varepsilon) \cap (B \setminus U) = \emptyset$ , so  $d(x, B \setminus U) > \varepsilon$ . Thus, there is some  $m > 1/\varepsilon$  with  $d(x, B \setminus U) > 1/m$  and so  $x \in U_m$  for this  $m$ .

- From the above claim, we note that  $0 \notin U_m$  for each  $m$  because  $0 \notin U$ .
- We claim  $\overline{U_m} \subseteq U_{m+1}$  for each  $m$ ; set  $\varepsilon := \frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{m+1} > 0$ . Now, if  $x \in \overline{U_m}$ , then we see  $B(x, \varepsilon) \cap U_m \neq \emptyset$  by [Lemma 2.57](#), so we may find  $y \in U_m$  with  $d(x, y) < \varepsilon$ . It follows from the first check that

$$d(x, B \setminus U) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, B \setminus U) < \varepsilon + \frac{1}{m} = \frac{1}{m+1},$$

so  $x \in U_{m+1}$  follows.

Now, we see from the above that

$$f^{-1}(U) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} f^{-1}(U_m).$$

Thus,  $x \in f^{-1}(U_m)$  implies that there is some  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U_m$ ; because  $f_n \rightarrow f$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  pointwise (!), there is some  $N$  for which  $f_n(x) \in B(x, \varepsilon) \subseteq U_m$  for each  $n \geq N$ , so

$$f^{-1}(U) \subseteq \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n \geq N} f_n^{-1}(U_m).$$

Conversely, if  $x$  lives in this right-hand set, we have some  $m$  and  $N$  with  $f_n(x) \in U_m \subseteq \overline{U_m}$  for all  $n \geq N$ . So  $f(x) \in \overline{U_m}$  by [Lemma 2.50](#), so  $f(x) \in U_{m+1} \subseteq U$  follows. Thus, equality in the above containment follows.

In total, we see that

$$f^{-1}(U) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n \geq N} f_n^{-1}(U_m).$$

Notably,  $f_n^{-1}(U_m) \cap E \in \mathcal{S}$  for each  $n$  and  $m$ , by construction of the  $f_n$ s, so this full union of unions of intersections is still in  $\mathcal{S}$ , using the fact that  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring and [Remark 5.24](#). ■

**Corollary 7.34.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a set  $X$  with  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . Any  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  has  $f^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for each open  $U \subseteq B$ .

*Proof.* Any simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function satisfies the conclusion by [Lemma 7.30](#). However, because  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions are limits of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions,  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions satisfy the conclusion as well by [Lemma 7.33](#). ■

**Remark 7.35.** Note that the case of  $B = \mathbb{R}$ , we see that  $f^{-1}(U)$  is measurable for any open  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , where  $f$  is an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. By taking unions and complements appropriately, we in fact see that  $f^{-1}(U)$  is measurable for any Borel set  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ . This is the usual definition of a (Borel) measurable function  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and we will show it is equivalent to the one we gave next class.

## 7.3 October 31

We continue our discussion of measurable functions by giving an alternate definition.

### 7.3.1 A Better Measurable

Last class, we saw that measurable functions have some nice properties. Today we show that these properties actually characterize our measurable functions.

**Theorem 7.36.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a set  $X$  with a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . Then a function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable if and only if

- (i)  $\text{im } f$  is separable, and
- (ii) for any open  $U \subseteq B$ , we have  $f^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\}) \in \mathcal{S}$ .

**Remark 7.37.** Using ideas of [Proposition 2.31](#), it suffices to check (ii) on a sub-base for the topology on  $B$ . In particular, it suffices to check (ii) on open balls.

*Proof.* Last class we provided the forward direction; namely, (i) follows from [Corollary 7.32](#), and (ii) follows from [Corollary 7.34](#). Today we show that (i) and (ii) imply that  $f$  is the limit of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions. There are two steps.

1. We construct our simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Because  $\text{im } f$  is separable by (i), we may find some countable subset  $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subseteq \text{im } f$  dense in  $\text{im } f$ . Now, for each  $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$C_{ji} := f^{-1}(B(b_i, 1/j) \setminus \{0\}),$$

which is always in  $\mathcal{S}$  by (ii). Our goal is to carefully make the  $C_{ji}$  disjoint in order to define our sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions, and we prefer  $C_{ji}$  with  $j$  large because these will give a finer approximation of  $f$ . In particular, we order  $C_{ji}$  lexicographically by  $(j, i)$ : namely,  $(j, i) < (\ell, k)$  if and only if  $j < \ell$  or  $j = \ell$  and  $i < k$ .

We now fix  $n$  and define our  $f_n$ . To make our  $C_{ji}$  appropriately disjoint, we will focus on the  $(j, i)$  bounded above by  $(n, n)$ . Namely, for  $(j, i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}^2$ , we set

$$E_{ji}^n := C_{ji} \setminus \bigcup_{\substack{(j,i) < (\ell,k) \\ 1 \leq \ell, k \leq n}} C_{\ell k}.$$

For example,  $E_{nn}^n = C_{nn}$  and  $E_{n,n-1} = C_{n,n-1} \setminus C_{n,n}$  and  $E_{n,n-2} = C_{n,n-2} \setminus (C_{n,n} \cup C_{n,n-1})$  and so on.

Notably,  $E_{ji}^n \subseteq C_{ji}$  always, which means that the  $E_{ji}^n$  are all disjoint: note  $(j, i) \neq (j', i')$  implies that  $(j, i) < (j', i')$  or  $(j', i') < (j, i)$ . Taking  $(j, i) < (j', i')$  without loss of generality, we see that  $E_{ji}^n \subseteq C_{ji} \setminus C_{j'i'}$  is disjoint from  $E_{j'i'}^n \subseteq C_{j'i'}$ .

With this in mind, we define

$$f_n := \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n b_i 1_{E_{ji}^n}.$$

Note that  $\text{im } f_n = \{0, b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  because the  $E_{ji}^n$  are disjoint, which we see is finite. Further, for any  $b_i$ , we can compute

$$f_n^{-1}(\{b_i\}) = \bigcup_{j=1}^n E_{ji}^n,$$

which is in  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $\mathcal{S}$  is a ring. Thus,  $f_n$  is in fact a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function.

2. It remains to check that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $x \notin f^{-1}(B \setminus \{0\})$ , then  $f(x) = 0$  while  $x \notin C_{ji}$  always and so  $x \notin E_{ji}^n$  always and so  $f_n(x) = 0$  for all  $n$ ; so  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$  follows with nothing to say in this case. Thus, we may assume  $f(x) \neq 0$ .

Now, take  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and we need to find  $N$  such that  $n > N$  implies  $|f(x) - f_n(x)| < \varepsilon$  for  $n > N$ . This has two steps: first, take some  $j$  with  $\frac{1}{j} < \varepsilon$ , and second, we choose  $i_0$  by density such that  $f(x) \in B(b_{i_0}, 1/j)$ .<sup>1</sup> As such, set  $N := \max\{j, i_0\} + 1$  so that  $\frac{1}{N} < \frac{1}{j} < \varepsilon$  and  $i_0 < N$ . Notably,  $f(x) \in B(b_{i_0}, 1/h) \setminus \{0\}$  implies that

$$x \in C_{j_0 i_0}.$$

We now begin our check. If  $n > N$ , then  $x \in E_{\ell k}^n$ , where

$$(\ell, k) := \max\{(j, i) : x \in C_{ji} \text{ and } 1 \leq j, i \leq n\}.$$

Namely, there is certainly some  $(j, i)$  with  $x \in C_{ji}$  and  $1 \leq j, i \leq n$  because  $x \in C_{j_0 i_0}$  while  $j_0, i_0 < N < n$ , so the maximum certainly exists. And we see  $x \in E_{\ell k}^n$  because having  $(j, i) > (\ell, k)$  with  $1 \leq j, i \leq n$  will imply that  $x \notin C_{ji}$  by maximality of  $(\ell, k)$ .

Now,  $f_n(x) = b_k$  by construction, and  $(j_0, i_0) \leq (\ell, k)$  by maximality implies that  $j_0 \leq \ell$  and so

$$f(x) \in B(b_k, 1/\ell) \subseteq B(b_k, 1/j_0) \subseteq B(b_k, \varepsilon),$$

so  $|f(x) - f_n(x)| < \varepsilon$  follows.

The above steps complete the proof. ■

## 7.4 November 2

We begin class by finishing the proof of [Theorem 7.36](#). I have simply edited that proof for continuity reasons.

### 7.4.1 Some Measurable Facts

We now use [Theorem 7.36](#) for fun and profit.

**Corollary 7.38.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a set  $X$  with a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . If a sequence of functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable, and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  pointwise as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $f$  is also  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable.

*Proof.* By [Theorem 7.36](#), we have two checks.

- (i) We show that  $\text{im } f$  is separable. Well, each  $\text{im } f_n$  is separable by [Theorem 7.36](#), so this follows from [Lemma 7.31](#).
- (ii) We show that  $f^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for each open  $U \subseteq B$ . Well, each  $f_n$  has  $f_n^{-1}(U \setminus \{0\}) \in \mathcal{S}$  for each open  $U \subseteq B$ , so the same holds for  $f$  by [Lemma 7.31](#).

The above checks show that  $f$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Theorem 7.36](#). ■

<sup>1</sup> Note that  $B(f(x), 1/j) \cap \{b_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is nonempty because  $\text{im } f \subseteq \overline{\{b_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}}$ ; we are choosing  $i_0$  with  $b_{i_0} \in B(f(x), 1/j)$ , which means  $f(x) \in B(b_{i_0}, 1/j)$



**Lemma 7.39.** Fix a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$ . Then the function  $\|\cdot\| : B \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous.

*Proof.* We proceed directly; in fact, we claim that  $\|\cdot\|$  is Lipschitz continuous, which will be enough by [Example 1.46](#) and [Example 1.49](#).

Well, observe that  $\|x\| \leq \|x - y\| + \|y\|$ , so by symmetry, it follows that

$$|\|x\| - \|y\|| \leq \|x - y\|.$$

This finishes. ■

**Corollary 7.40.** Fix a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a set  $X$  with a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on  $X$ . If  $f$  is an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function, then  $x \mapsto \|f(x)\|$  is as well.

*Proof.* For brevity, set  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $g(x) := \|f(x)\|$ . By [Theorem 7.36](#), there are two checks.

(i) Note that  $\text{im } g \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  must be separable by [Example 7.26](#), so there is nothing more to say here.

(ii) For any open  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ , we see that

$$U' := \{x \in B : \|x\| \in U\}$$

is open in  $B$  because  $x \mapsto \|x\|$  is continuous by [Lemma 7.39](#). Thus,  $g^{-1}(U) = f^{-1}(U') \in \mathcal{S}$  because  $f$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable. ■

## 7.4.2 Integrating Simple Functions

We begin by picking up some facts about our integral.

**Lemma 7.41.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a finitely additive measure  $\mu$ . Then the mapping

$$f \mapsto \int_X f d\mu$$

from simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions to  $B$  is  $k$ -linear.

*Proof.* Unsurprisingly, we use the ideas of [Lemma 7.15](#) to compute our integrals. We have two checks.

- Scalar multiplication: fix a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function  $f$  and a scalar  $r \in k$ . If  $r = 0$ , then  $rf = 0$ , so  $\int_X (rf) d\mu = 0 = r \int_X f d\mu$  vacuously, so there is nothing more to say.

Otherwise, we have  $r \neq 0$ , and we remarked in [Lemma 7.15](#) that we have

$$(rf)^{-1}(\{y\}) = f^{-1}(\{1/r \cdot y\}).$$

In other words,  $\text{im } rf = \{ry : y \in \text{im } f\}$  with  $(rf)^{-1}(\{ry\}) = f^{-1}(\{y\})$  for each  $y \in \text{im } f$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X (rf) d\mu &= \sum_{y \in (\text{im } rf) \setminus \{0\}} \mu((rf)^{-1}(\{y\})) y \\ &= \sum_{ry \in (\text{im } rf) \setminus \{0\}} \mu((rf)^{-1}(\{ry\})) \cdot ry \\ &= r \sum_{y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} \mu(f^{-1}(\{y\})) y \\ &= r \int_X f d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

- Addition: fix simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions  $f$  and  $g$ . We remarked in [Lemma 7.15](#) that any  $y \in B \setminus \{0\}$  will have

$$(f+g)^{-1}(\{y\}) = \bigcup_{c \in (\text{im } g)} (f^{-1}(\{y-c\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{y\})) = \bigcup_{\substack{b \in (\text{im } f), c \in (\text{im } g) \\ b+c=y}} (f^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\})).$$

Now, note that this union is in fact disjoint because the fibers  $f^{-1}(\{b\})$  are disjoint. Thus, we may say that

$$\mu((f+g)^{-1}(\{y\})) = \sum_{\substack{b \in (\text{im } f), c \in (\text{im } g) \\ b+c=y}} \mu(f^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\})).$$

Looping through all  $y$ , we see

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X (f+g) d\mu &= \sum_{y \in \text{im}(f+g) \setminus \{0\}} \mu((f+g)^{-1}(\{y\})) y \\ &= \sum_{y \in \text{im}(f+g) \setminus \{0\}} \sum_{\substack{b \in (\text{im } f), c \in (\text{im } g) \\ b+c=y}} \mu(f^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\})) (b+c) \\ &= \sum_{b \in (\text{im } f)} \sum_{c \in (\text{im } g)} \mu(f^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\})) (b+c) \\ &= \sum_{b \in (\text{im } f)} \sum_{c \in (\text{im } g)} \mu(f^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\})) b + \sum_{c \in (\text{im } g)} \sum_{b \in (\text{im } f)} \mu(f^{-1}(\{b\}) \cap g^{-1}(\{c\})) c. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we note that

$$\bigsqcup_{b \in (\text{im } f)} f^{-1}(\{b\}) = X \quad \text{and} \quad \bigsqcup_{c \in (\text{im } g)} g^{-1}(\{c\}) = X$$

because the fibers should cover the domain and are disjoint. It follows that from the finite additivity of  $\mu$  that

$$\int_X (f+g) d\mu = \sum_{b \in (\text{im } f)} \mu(f^{-1}(\{b\})) b + \sum_{c \in (\text{im } g)} \mu(g^{-1}(\{c\})) c,$$

which is  $\int_X f d\mu + \int_X g d\mu$ , which is what we wanted. ■

**Lemma 7.42.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a finitely additive measure  $\mu$ . If a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function  $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  has  $f(x) \geq 0$  for each  $x \in X$ , then

$$\int_X f d\mu \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* Note that each  $y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}$  has  $y \geq 0$  and so

$$\int_X f d\mu = \sum_{y \in (\text{im } f) \setminus \{0\}} \mu(f^{-1}(\{y\})) y$$

is nonnegative term-by-term, so  $\int_X f d\mu \geq 0$  follows. ■

**Corollary 7.43.** Fix a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a finitely additive measure  $\mu$ . Given simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions  $f, g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , if  $f(x) \geq g(x)$  for each  $x$ , then  $\int f d\mu \geq \int g d\mu$ .

*Proof.* Set  $h(x) := f(x) - g(x)$ , which is a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function by [Lemma 7.15](#). Note  $h(x) \geq 0$  for each  $x$ , so [Lemma 7.42](#) tells us that

$$\int_X h(x) d\mu \geq 0.$$

However, by [Lemma 7.41](#), we conclude that

$$\int_X h(x) d\mu = \int_X f(x) d\mu - \int_X g(x) d\mu,$$

so  $\int_X f(x) d\mu \geq \int_X g(x) d\mu$  follows. ■

The above positivity result suggests a semi-norm on our space.

**Notation 7.44.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a finitely additive measure  $\mu$ . Given a simple integrable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$ , we define

$$\|f\|_1 := \int_X \|f\| d\mu.$$

Note  $\|f\|$  is in fact a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function by [Lemma 7.16](#).

**Lemma 7.45.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a finitely additive measure  $\mu$ . Then the function  $f \mapsto \|f\|_1$  on simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions defines a semi-norm on the space of simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions.

*Proof.* Note that simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions already form a space by [Lemma 7.9](#). Here are our checks.

- **Positivity:** given a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function  $f$ , note that  $\|f(x)\| \geq 0$  for any  $x \in X$ , so [Lemma 7.42](#) tells us that  $\int_X \|f\| d\mu \geq 0$ .
- **Zero:** we show  $\|z\|_1 = 0$ , where  $z: X \rightarrow B$  is the zero function. Well,  $\|0\|$  is the zero function  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  because  $\|0\| = 0$ , so the linearity of [Lemma 7.41](#) forces  $\int_X \|z\| d\mu = 0$ .
- **Scaling:** given a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  and some scalar  $r$ , we need  $\|rf\|_1 = \|r\| \cdot \|f\|_1$ . Well,  $rf$  is still a simple integrable function by [Lemma 7.15](#), as is  $\|rf\|$  by [Lemma 7.16](#). However, the main point is that  $\|rf\| = \|r\| \cdot \|f\|$  by checking pointwise: any  $x \in X$  has

$$\|rf\|(x) = \|rf(x)\| = \|r\| \cdot \|f(x)\| = (\|r\| \cdot \|f\|)(x).$$

Thus, linearity of [Lemma 7.41](#) forces

$$\int_X \|rf\| d\mu = \int_X (\|r\| \cdot \|f\|) d\mu = \|r\| \cdot \int_X \|f\| d\mu.$$

- **Triangle inequality:** given simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions  $f, g: X \rightarrow B$ , we note that the triangle inequality gives

$$\|f + g\|(x) = \|f(x) + g(x)\| \leq \|f(x)\| + \|g(x)\| = (\|f\| + \|g\|)(x)$$

for any  $x \in X$ . Thus, noting as usual that  $f + g$  and hence  $\|f + g\|$  are both simple  $\mu$ -integrable, we note [Corollary 7.43](#) tells us

$$\int_X \|f + g\| d\mu \leq \int_X (\|f\| + \|g\|) d\mu.$$

As such, linearity of the integral from [Lemma 7.41](#) tells us that  $\|f + g\|_1 \leq \|f\|_1 + \|g\|_1$ , which is what we wanted. ■

To make this a norm, we need to remove the problematic functions.

**Notation 7.46.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a finitely additive measure  $\mu$ . We define

$$\mathcal{N}(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B) = \{f \text{ simple integrable} : \|f\|_1 = 0\}.$$

Thus, [Proposition 1.13](#) tells us that we're going to get a norm on the quotient of all simple integrable functions by  $\mathcal{N}(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . In our story of integration, we are essentially interested in the completion of this normed vector space.

**Example 7.47.** Give  $[0, 1]$  the usual Lebesgue measure  $\mu$ , and let  $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be pairwise disjoint Borel subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mu(E_i) \leq 4^{-i}$  for each  $i$ . Then we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n 1_{E_i} \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^\infty 1_{E_i}$$

as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , but the function on the right may be potentially quite hard to handle. Namely, we want

$$\int_X \left( \sum_{i=1}^\infty 1_{E_i} \right) d\mu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \left( \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{E_i} \right) d\mu = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(E_i),$$

but changing the order of this integral and sum is somewhat tricky.

### 7.4.3 Convergence in Measure

In order to avoid the constant repetition of hypotheses, we pick up the following definition.

**Definition 7.48 (Measure space).** A *measure space* is a triple  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring and  $\mu$  is a measure on  $\mathcal{S}$ . We also require  $\mu(\emptyset) < \infty$  so that  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  by [Remark 5.39](#).

Now, let me tell you the bad news.



**Warning 7.49.** A sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of simple integrable functions which is Cauchy for  $\|\cdot\|_1$  need not converge pointwise, at any point!

**Example 7.50.** Give  $[0, 1]$  the usual Lebesgue measure  $\mu$ , and for  $k \geq 1$ , define  $E_k := \left[ \frac{k-2^n}{2^n}, \frac{k+1-2^n}{2^n} \right)$ , where  $n$  is the integer such that  $2^n \leq k < 2^{n+1}$ . Then the sequence of functions  $\{1_{E_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$  approaches 0 according to  $\|\cdot\|_1$ , but it does not converge to 0 pointwise anywhere! We will be brief.

- To see  $1_{E_k} \rightarrow 0$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  according to  $\|\cdot\|_1$ , we note  $\|1_{E_k}\|_1 = 1/2^n$  by [Example 7.14](#), which goes to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . (Namely,  $n = \lfloor \log_2 k \rfloor \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .)
- However, at particular  $x \in [0, 1]$ , there are infinitely many  $k$  for which  $x \in E_k$  (so that  $1_{E_k}(x) = 1$ ) and  $x \notin E_k$  (so that  $1_{E_k}(x) = 0$ ), meaning  $1_{E_k}(x)$  does not converge pointwise.

Indeed, fix any  $N$ , and we find some  $k \geq N$  with  $x \in E_k$  and some  $k \geq N$  with  $x \notin E_k$ . Well, choose any  $n \geq \max\{N, 2\}$ , and we see that the sets  $E_{2^n}, E_{2^n+1}, \dots, E_{2^{n+1}-1}$  are disjoint and cover  $[0, 1]$  by construction, so  $x$  will live in exactly one of them.

The main point of the above example is that our functions are allowed to look small according to  $\|\cdot\|_1$  but be relatively large for (say)  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ .

To fix this bad news, we have the following definition.

**Definition 7.51** (Converge in measure). Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$ . Then a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions converges in measure to an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f$  if and only if all  $\varepsilon > 0$  have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x \in X : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) = 0.$$

**Remark 7.52.** Notably,  $f$  and  $f_n$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable, so  $f - f_n$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by Lemma 7.22, so  $g := \|f - f_n\|$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by Corollary 7.40, so

$$\{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\} = g^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty)) = g^{-1}((0, \infty)) \setminus g^{-1}((0, \varepsilon))$$

is in fact in  $\mathcal{S}$  by Corollary 7.34. In particular, the limit in Definition 7.51 actually makes sense.

**Example 7.53.** The sequence from Example 7.50 converges in measure to the zero function. Indeed, for any  $k$ , we see

$$\mu(\{x \in X : \|0 - 1_{E_k}(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) = \mu(E_k) = \frac{1}{2^{\lfloor \log_2 k \rfloor}}$$

by Example 7.14, which goes to 0 as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

Of course, with a notion of convergence, we also have a notion of being Cauchy.

**Definition 7.54** (Cauchy in measure). Fix a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a  $\sigma$ -ring  $\mathcal{S}$  on a set  $X$  equipped with a measure  $\mu$ . Then a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions is Cauchy in measure if and only if all  $\varepsilon > 0$  have

$$\lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x \in X : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) = 0.$$

**Remark 7.55.** Again, we note that  $f_n - f_m$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by Lemma 7.22, so  $g := \|f_m - f_n\|$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by Corollary 7.40, so

$$\{x : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\} = g^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty)) = g^{-1}((0, \infty)) \setminus g^{-1}((0, \varepsilon))$$

is in fact in  $\mathcal{S}$  by Corollary 7.34. So we do see the limit in Definition 7.51 actually makes sense.

**Remark 7.56.** In fact, if  $f_m$  and  $f_n$  are simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions, then  $f_m - f_n$  is also by Lemma 7.15, as is  $g := \|f_m - f_n\|$  by Lemma 7.16. Thus,

$$g^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty)) = \bigcup_{y \in (\text{im } g) \cap [\varepsilon, \infty)} g^{-1}(\{y\})$$

is a finite union of sets  $g^{-1}(\{y\})$  of finite measure, so  $\mu(g^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty)))$  is finite by Lemma 5.55.

## 7.5 November 4

We continue our journey towards integrating functions.

### 7.5.1 Sequences Converging in Measure

Here is our convergence result, which convinces us that convergence in measure will be one that we can work with; note this generalizes [Example 7.53](#).

**Definition 7.57 (Mean Cauchy).** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . A sequence of simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is *mean Cauchy* if and only if it is Cauchy for the semi-norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$ . In other words, we require

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

**Lemma 7.58.** Fix a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Then a sequence of simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions  $f_n : X \rightarrow B$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  which is mean Cauchy is also Cauchy in measure.

*Proof.* Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$  and set

$$E_{m,n}^\varepsilon := \{x \in X : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\},$$

which has finite measure by [Remark 7.56](#). We need to show that

$$\lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(E_{m,n}^\varepsilon) \stackrel{?}{=} 0.$$

Notably, for each  $x \in X$ , we must have

$$1_{E_{m,n}^\varepsilon}(x) \leq \frac{\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|}{\varepsilon} \tag{7.1}$$

by definition of  $E_{m,n}^\varepsilon$ . Now, both sides of this equation are simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions:  $1_{E_{m,n}^\varepsilon}$  is by [Example 7.6](#); and  $f_m - f_n$  is simple  $\mu$ -integrable by [Lemma 7.15](#), as is  $\|f_m - f_n\|$  by [Lemma 7.16](#), so  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|f_m - f_n\|$  is simple  $\mu$ -integrable by [Lemma 7.15](#) again.

Thus, we may integrate, for which [Corollary 7.43](#) tells us

$$\mu(E_{m,n}^\varepsilon) = \int_X 1_{E_{m,n}^\varepsilon} d\mu \leq \int_X \frac{\|f_m - f_n\|}{\varepsilon} d\mu = \frac{\|f_m - f_n\|_1}{\varepsilon},$$

where the first integral was computed using [Example 7.14](#). But as  $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ , the right-hand value goes to 0 because  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy for  $\|\cdot\|_1$ , so the left-hand value must also go to 0. ■

**Remark 7.59.** A similar proof works for when we are Cauchy for  $\|\cdot\|_p$  for finite  $p$  by taking  $p$ th powers of (7.1). For example, in probability theory, the result for  $\|\cdot\|_2$  is essentially Chebyshev's inequality.

Here are some quick sanity checks our convergence.

**Lemma 7.60.** Fix a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Now, suppose a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions converges to both  $f$  and  $g$  in measure, where  $f$  and  $g$  are both  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable. Then  $f = g$  almost everywhere; i.e.,  $\{x \in X : f(x) \neq g(x)\}$  is a null set.

*Proof.* Before we do anything at all, we note that  $f - g$  is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Lemma 7.22](#), so

$$N := \{x \in X : f(x) \neq g(x)\} = (f - g)^{-1}(B \setminus \{0\})$$

is  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Corollary 7.34](#).

Now, fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ ; we show  $\mu(N) < \varepsilon$ . The key observation is that

$$\|f(x) - g(x)\| \leq \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| + \|f_n(x) - g(x)\|,$$

so it follows that  $\|f(x) - g(x)\| \geq \varepsilon$  forces  $\|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2$  or  $\|g(x) - g_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2$ . Thus,

$$\{x : \|f(x) - g(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\} \cup \{x : \|g(x) - g_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\},$$

so [Lemma 5.55](#) tells us

$$\mu(\{x \in X : \|f(x) - g(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq \mu(\{x \in X : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}) + \mu(\{x \in X : \|g(x) - g_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}).$$

But now, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we see that the right-hand side goes to  $0 + 0 = 0$  because  $f_n \rightarrow f$  and  $g_n \rightarrow g$  in measure, so it follows that

$$\mu(\{x \in X : \|f(x) - g(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) = 0. \quad (7.2)$$

We now send  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ . Namely, we see  $f(x) \neq g(x)$  is equivalent to  $\|f(x) - g(x)\| > 0$  is equivalent to  $\|f(x) - g(x)\| \geq 1/n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , so

$$N := \{x \in X : f(x) \neq g(x)\} = \{x \in X : \|f(x) - g(x)\| > 0\} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x \in X : \|f(x) - g(x)\| \geq 1/n\}.$$

Thus,

$$\mu(N) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(\{x \in X : \|f(x) - g(x)\| \geq 1/n\}) \stackrel{*}{=} \sum_{x \in X} 0 = 0,$$

so  $N$  is in fact a null set. Notably,  $\stackrel{*}{=}$  has used [\(7.2\)](#). ■

**Lemma 7.61.** Fix a normed  $k$ -vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Fix sequences of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $f_n \rightarrow f$  and  $g_n \rightarrow g$  in measure as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

- (a) We have  $f_n + g_n \rightarrow f + g$  in measure.
- (b) Given some scalar  $a \in k$ , we have  $af_n \rightarrow af$  in measure.
- (c) We have  $\|f_n\| \rightarrow \|f\|$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* We go ahead and let  $\|\cdot\|$  denote the norm on base field  $k$  of  $B$ .

- (a) Note that the  $f_n + g_n$  and  $f + g$  are all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Lemma 7.22](#).

Now, by the triangle inequality, we see

$$\|(f(x) + g(x)) - (f_n(x) + g_n(x))\| \leq \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| + \|g(x) - g_n(x)\|.$$

We now proceed as in [Lemma 7.60](#). Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . If the left-hand side exceeds  $\varepsilon$ , then one of the terms on the right-hand side must exceed  $\varepsilon/2$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \{x : \|(f(x) + g(x)) - (f_n(x) + g_n(x))\| \geq \varepsilon\} &\subseteq \{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\} \\ &\cup \{x : \|g(x) - g_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, [Lemma 5.55](#) tells us

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x : \|(f(x) + g(x)) - (f_n(x) + g_n(x))\| \geq \varepsilon\}) &\leq \mu(\{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}) \\ &\quad + \mu(\{x : \|g(x) - g_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}). \end{aligned}$$

However,  $\varepsilon/2 > 0$ , so taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and using our convergence in measure tells us that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : \|(f(x) + g(x)) - (f_n(x) + g_n(x))\| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq 0 + 0 = 0,$$

so we are done after noting that  $\mu$  will only output nonnegative values, so the limit is at least nonnegative.

(b) Note that the  $af_n$  and  $af$  are all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Lemma 7.22](#).

Now, fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that we want to show that

$$L := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x \in X : \|af_n(x) - af(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) \stackrel{?}{=} 0.$$

If  $a = 0$ , then  $af_n(x) = af(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ , so  $\{x \in X : \|af_n(x) - af(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}$  is empty, so the result follows.

Otherwise, take  $a \neq 0$  so that  $|a| > 0$ . Now, note  $\|af_n(x) - af(x)\| = |a| \cdot \|f_n(x) - f(x)\|$ , so it follows  $\|af_n(x) - af(x)\| \geq \varepsilon$  if and only if  $\|f_n(x) - f(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/|a|$ . Thus,

$$L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x \in X : \|f_n(x) - f(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/|a|\}).$$

However,  $\varepsilon/|a| > 0$  because  $\varepsilon > 0$ , so the above limit vanishes because  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in measure as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

(c) Observe that the  $g_n$  and  $g$  are all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Corollary 7.40](#).

Now, fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the (reverse) triangle inequality,

$$|\|f(x)\| - \|f_n(x)\|| \leq \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|,$$

so any  $\varepsilon > 0$  has

$$\{x : |\|f(x)\| - \|f_n(x)\|| \geq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

Thus, [Lemma 5.51](#) tells us

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : |\|f(x)\| - \|f_n(x)\|| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}).$$

The right-hand limit vanishes because  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in measure, so the left-hand limit must vanish as well because the limit's terms are nonnegative. ■

Here is the analogous result for sequences Cauchy in measure.

**Lemma 7.62.** Fix a normed  $k$ -vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Fix sequences of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which are Cauchy in measure.

- (a) The sequence  $\{f_n + g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in measure.
- (b) Given some scalar  $a \in k$ , the sequence  $\{af_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in measure.
- (c) The sequence of functions  $\{\|f_n\|\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in measure.

*Proof.* These proofs are essentially the same as [Lemma 7.61](#) with the appropriate names changed. Again, we let  $|\cdot|$  denote the norm on base field  $k$  of  $B$ .

(a) Note that the  $f_n + g_n$  are all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Lemma 7.22](#).

Now, by the triangle inequality, we see

$$\|(f_m(x) + g_m(x)) - (f_n(x) + g_n(x))\| \leq \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| + \|g_m(x) - g_n(x)\|.$$

Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . As usual

$$\begin{aligned} \{x : \|(f_m(x) + g_m(x)) - (f_n(x) + g_n(x))\| \geq \varepsilon\} &\subseteq \{x : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\} \\ &\cup \{x : \|g_m(x) - g_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}, \end{aligned}$$

so [Lemma 5.55](#) tells us

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{x : \|(f_m(x) + g_m(x)) - (f_n(x) + g_n(x))\| \geq \varepsilon\}) &\leq \mu(\{x : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}) \\ &\quad + \mu(\{x : \|g_m(x) - g_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}). \end{aligned}$$



However,  $\varepsilon/2 > 0$ , so taking  $m, n \rightarrow \infty$  and using our Cauchy in measure conditions tells us that

$$\lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : \|(f_m(x) + g_m(x)) - (f_n(x) + g_n(x))\| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq 0 + 0 = 0,$$

so we are done after noting that  $\mu$  will only output nonnegative values, so the limit is at least nonnegative.

(b) Note that the  $af_n$  are all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Lemma 7.22](#).

Now, fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$  so that we want to show that

$$L := \lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x \in X : \|af_m(x) - af_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) \stackrel{?}{=} 0.$$

If  $a = 0$ , then  $af_n(x) = af(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in X$ , so  $\{x \in X : \|af_m(x) - af_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}$  is empty, so the result follows.

Otherwise, take  $a \neq 0$  so that  $|a| > 0$ . Now, note  $\|af_m(x) - af_n(x)\| = |a| \cdot \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|$ , so it follows  $\|af_m(x) - af_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon$  if and only if  $\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/|a|$ . Thus,

$$L = \lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x \in X : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/|a|\}).$$

However,  $\varepsilon/|a| > 0$  because  $\varepsilon > 0$ , so the above limit vanishes because  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in measure.

(c) Observe that the  $g_n$  are all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Corollary 7.40](#).

Now, fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the (reverse) triangle inequality,

$$|\|f_m(x)\| - \|f_n(x)\|| \leq \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|,$$

so any  $\varepsilon > 0$  has

$$\{x : |\|f_m(x)\| - \|f_n(x)\|| \geq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{x : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}.$$

Thus, [Lemma 5.51](#) tells us

$$\lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : |\|f_m(x)\| - \|f_n(x)\|| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq \lim_{m, n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}).$$

The right-hand limit vanishes because  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in measure, so the left-hand limit must vanish as well because the limit's terms are also nonnegative. ■

## 7.5.2 Restricting Measurable Functions

We begin by introducing the construction we will be interested in.

**Lemma 7.63.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a set  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ . If  $f: X \rightarrow B$  is simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable or  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable or simple  $\mu$ -integrable, then  $f1_E$  is as well.

*Proof.* Omitted. Before doing anything, we pick up a few facts. Note that

$$\text{im } f1_E = \{f(x)1_E(x) : x \in X\} \subseteq \{0\} \cup \{f(x) : x \in E\} \subseteq \{0\} \cup \text{im } f.$$

Also, if  $S \subseteq B \setminus \{0\}$ , then we claim

$$(f1_E)^{-1}(S) = E \cap f^{-1}(S).$$

In one direction, note  $x \in E \cap f^{-1}(S)$  implies that  $(f1_E)(x) = f(x) \in S$ . In the other direction, if  $x \in (f1_E)^{-1}(S)$ , then note  $x \in E$  is forced because otherwise  $f(x) = 0 \notin S$ . Thus, with  $x \in E$ , we have  $(f1_E)(x) = f(x)$ , so  $(f1_E)(x) \in S$  forces  $x \in f^{-1}(S)$  as well.

We now note that we actually have three claims to show, which we show in sequence.

- Suppose that  $f$  is a simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. As such,  $\text{im } f$  is finite, so  $\text{im } f1_E \subseteq \{0\} \cup \text{im } f$  is also finite.

Further, for each  $y \in (\text{im } f1_E) \setminus \{0\}$ , we see that  $(f1_E)^{-1}(\{y\}) = E \cap f^{-1}(\{y\})$  as discussed above, which lives in  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $f^{-1}(\{y\}) \in \mathcal{S}$ .

- Suppose that  $f$  is an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function. Then  $\text{im } f$  is separable, so it follows  $\{0\} \cup \text{im } f$  is separable (by [Example 7.28](#)), so  $\text{im } f1_E \subseteq \{0\} \cup \text{im } f$  is separable (by [Remark 7.27](#)).

Now, for any open subset  $U \subseteq B \setminus \{0\}$ , we see  $(f1_E)^{-1}(U) = E \cap f^{-1}(U)$  as discussed above, which lives in  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $f^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{S}$ .

- Suppose that  $f$  is a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function. As before,  $\text{im } f$  is finite implies that  $\text{im } f1_E \subseteq \{0\} \cup \text{im } f$  is still finite.

Further, for each  $y \in (\text{im } f1_E) \setminus \{0\}$ , we see  $(f1_E)^{-1}(\{y\}) = E \cap f^{-1}(\{y\})$ , which saw in our first point to live in  $\mathcal{S}$ , but now we note that [Lemma 5.51](#) tells us

$$\mu((f1_E)^{-1}(\{y\})) \leq \mu(f^{-1}(\{y\})) < \infty$$

is finite. ■

Analogously to [Lemma 7.61](#) and [Lemma 7.62](#), we have the following.

**Lemma 7.64.** Fix a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ , and fix some  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ . Given a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions with  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in measure as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $f_n1_E \rightarrow f1_E$  in measure as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* Note that the  $f_n1_E$  and  $f1_E$  are all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Lemma 7.63](#), so the claim at least makes sense. For brevity, we set  $g_n := \|f1_E - f_n1_E\|$  for each  $n$ . We would like to show

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(g_n^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty))) \stackrel{?}{=} 0.$$

If  $x \notin E$ , then note  $g_n(x) = 0$ ; otherwise,  $g_n(x) = \|f(x) - f_n(x)\|$  because  $1_E(x) = 1$ . As such, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we see  $x \in g_n^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty))$  requires  $x \in E$  and then  $\|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon$ ; conversely,  $x \in E$  with  $\|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon$  does give  $g_n(x) \geq \varepsilon$ .

Thus, we note that

$$g_n^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty)) \subseteq \{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\},$$

so [Lemma 5.51](#) tells us

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(g_n^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty))) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}),$$

where the right-hand limit vanishes because  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in measure as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, the left-hand limit also vanishes because the terms of the limit are nonnegative. ■

**Lemma 7.65.** Fix a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ , and fix some  $E \in \mathcal{S}$ . Given a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions which is Cauchy in measure, then  $\{f_n1_E\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is still Cauchy in measure.

*Proof.* As usual, the proof is exactly the same as before. Note that the  $f_n1_E$  and  $f1_E$  are all  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable by [Lemma 7.63](#), so the claim at least makes sense.

For brevity, we set  $g_{m,n} := \|f_m1_E - f_n1_E\|$  for each  $m$  and  $n$ . We would like to show

$$\lim_{m,n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(g_{m,n}^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty))) \stackrel{?}{=} 0.$$

If  $x \notin E$ , then note  $g_{m,n}(x) = 0$ ; otherwise,  $g_{m,n}(x) = \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\|$  because  $1_E(x) = 1$ . As such, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we see  $x \in g_{m,n}^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty))$  requires  $x \in E$  and then  $\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon$ ; conversely,  $x \in E$  with  $\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon$  does give  $g_{m,n}(x) \geq \varepsilon$ .

Thus, we note that

$$g_{m,n}^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty)) \subseteq \{x : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\},$$

so Lemma 5.51 tells us

$$\lim_{m,n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(g_{m,n}^{-1}([\varepsilon, \infty))) \leq \lim_{m,n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}),$$

where the right-hand limit vanishes because  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in measure. Thus, the left-hand limit also vanishes because the terms of the limit are nonnegative. ■

The above corollary promises the following notation.

**Notation 7.66.** Fix a normed vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Then a simple integrable function  $f$  on  $X$  and  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  will have

$$\int_E f d\mu := \int_X f 1_E d\mu.$$

**Remark 7.67.** One can define

$$\mu_f(E) := \int_E f d\mu,$$

and it is not too hard to check that this defines a measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  which is valued in  $B$ . This  $\mu_f$  will later be called the “indefinite integral for  $f$ .” We will postpone writing this out until we are ready to talk about what this looks like when  $f$  is a general  $\mu$ -integrable function instead of a simple  $\mu$ -integrable function.

### 7.5.3 Almost Uniform Convergence

As we tend to do, we now return to a context which is perhaps too general.

**Definition 7.68 (Almost uniformly).** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Then a sequence of functions  $f_n : X \rightarrow B$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  converges *almost uniformly* to  $f$  if and only if every  $\varepsilon > 0$  has some  $E^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu(E^\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$  and  $f_n|_{X \setminus E^\varepsilon} \rightarrow f|_{X \setminus E^\varepsilon}$  uniformly.

**Remark 7.69.** The term “almost” above is different from the “almost everywhere” that we’ve been seeing.

As usual, with a convergence definition, we have a Cauchy definition.

**Definition 7.70 (Almost uniformly Cauchy).** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . Then a sequence of functions  $f_n : X \rightarrow B$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is *almost uniformly Cauchy* if and only if every  $\varepsilon > 0$  has some  $E^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu(E^\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$  and  $\{f_n|_{X \setminus E^\varepsilon}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy.

We take a deep breath and run some of our usual checks.

**Lemma 7.71.** Fix a normed vector space  $B$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Now, suppose a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges almost uniformly to both  $f$  and  $g$ . Then  $f = g$  almost everywhere.

*Proof.* Define  $N := \{x \in X : f(x) \neq g(x)\}$ , and we show that  $N$  is a null set. Well, for any  $d > 0$ , we are promised subsets  $F_d, G_d \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu(F_d), \mu(G_d) < 1/d$  and  $f_n|_{X \setminus F_d} \rightarrow f|_{X \setminus F_d}$  and  $f_n|_{X \setminus G_d} \rightarrow g|_{X \setminus G_d}$  uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

In particular, if  $x \notin (F_d \cup G_d)$ , then our uniform convergence will imply pointwise convergence at  $x$ , so  $f_n(x) \rightarrow f(x)$  and  $f_n(x) \rightarrow g(x)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . It follows that  $f(x) = g(x)$  by properties of convergence. Apply contraposition, we conclude that  $N \subseteq F_d \cup G_d$ ; as such, we use [Lemma 5.55](#) to note that

$$\mu(F_d \cup G_d) \leq \mu(F_d) + \mu(G_d) < \frac{2}{d}.$$

We now send  $d \rightarrow \infty$ . Define

$$E := \bigcap_{d \geq 1} (F_d \cup G_d),$$

which lives in  $\mathcal{S}$  because  $\mathcal{S}$  is a  $\sigma$ -ring. As above, we see that  $N \subseteq F_d \cup G_d$  for each  $d$ , so  $N \subseteq E$ . Further,  $E \subseteq F_d \cup G_d$  tells us by [Lemma 5.51](#) that

$$\mu(E) \leq \mu(F_d \cup G_d) < \frac{2}{d}$$

for any positive integer  $d$ . In particular, sending  $d \rightarrow \infty$  forces  $\mu(E) = 0$ , which finishes the proof that  $N$  is a null set.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 7.72.** Fix a normed  $k$ -vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Fix sequences of functions  $f_n: X \rightarrow B$  and  $g_n: X \rightarrow B$  with  $f_n \rightarrow f$  and  $g_n \rightarrow g$  almost uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

- (a) We have  $f_n + g_n \rightarrow f + g$  almost uniformly.
- (b) Given some scalar  $a \in k$ , we have  $af_n \rightarrow af$  almost uniformly.
- (c) We have  $\|f_n\| \rightarrow \|f\|$  almost uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* We go ahead and let  $|\cdot|$  denote the norm on  $k$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we will also go ahead and let  $F_\varepsilon, G_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$  denote the subsets of  $X$  with  $\mu(F_\varepsilon), \mu(G_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$  for which  $f_n|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon} \rightarrow f|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}$  and  $g_n|_{X \setminus G_\varepsilon} \rightarrow g|_{X \setminus G_\varepsilon}$  uniformly.

- (a) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define  $E_\varepsilon := F_{\varepsilon/2} \cup G_{\varepsilon/2}$ . Namely,  $E_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$ , and by [Lemma 5.55](#), we see

$$\mu(E_\varepsilon) \leq \mu(F_{\varepsilon/2}) + \mu(G_{\varepsilon/2}) = \varepsilon.$$

As such, we claim that  $(f_n + g_n)|_{X \setminus E_\varepsilon} \rightarrow (f + g)|_{X \setminus E_\varepsilon}$  uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Well, for any  $\delta > 0$ , we are promised  $N_f$  such that any  $n \geq N_f$  and  $x \notin F_{\varepsilon/2}$  will have

$$\|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < \delta/2.$$

We are promised an analogous constant  $N_g$  for  $g_n$  going to  $g$ , so we set  $N := \max\{N_f, N_g\}$ . Then  $n \geq N$  implies  $n \geq N_f$  and  $n \geq N_g$ ; as such, if  $x \notin E_\varepsilon$ , then  $x \notin F_{\varepsilon/2}$  and  $x \notin G_{\varepsilon/2}$ , so

$$\|(f + g)(x) - (f_n + g_n)(x)\| \leq \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| + \|g(x) - g_n(x)\| < \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} = \delta.$$

- (b) If  $a = 0$ , then we see that  $af_n = af = 0$ . As such, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we set  $E = \emptyset$  so that  $\mu(E) = 0$  while  $af_n \rightarrow af$  uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because  $af_n(x) = 0 = af(x)$  for any  $x \in X$ .

Otherwise, we have  $a \neq 0$  and so  $|a| > 0$ . Thus, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we note  $F_\varepsilon$  will have  $\mu(F_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$ , so we claim that  $(af_n)|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon} \rightarrow (af)|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}$  uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Well, we already know that  $f_n|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon} \rightarrow f|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}$  uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, for any  $\delta > 0$ , there is a constant  $N$  so that any  $n \geq N$  and  $x \notin F_\varepsilon$  will have

$$\|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < \frac{\delta}{|a|}.$$

It follows that  $n \geq N$  and  $x \notin F_\varepsilon$  gives

$$\|(af)(x) - (af_n)(x)\| = |a| \cdot \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < |a| \cdot \frac{\delta}{|a|} = \delta.$$

- (c) Unsurprisingly, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we note that  $F_\varepsilon$  has  $\mu(F_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$ , so we claim that  $\|f\|_n|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon} \rightarrow \|f\|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}$  almost uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Well, we know that  $f_n|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon} \rightarrow f|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, for any  $\delta > 0$ , we are promised a constant  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  and  $x \notin F_\varepsilon$  will have

$$\|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < \delta.$$

As such, we note that the (reverse) triangle inequality gives

$$|\|f(x)\| - \|f_n(x)\|| \leq \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < \delta,$$

which finishes. ■

**Lemma 7.73.** Fix a normed  $k$ -vector space  $(B, \|\cdot\|)$  and a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ . Fix sequences of functions  $f_n: X \rightarrow B$  and  $g_n: X \rightarrow B$  which are almost uniformly Cauchy.

- (a) The sequence  $\{f_n + g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is almost uniformly Cauchy.
- (b) Given some scalar  $a \in k$ , the sequence  $\{af_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is almost uniformly Cauchy.
- (c) The sequence  $\{\|f_n\|\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is almost uniformly Cauchy.

*Proof.* As usual, these proofs are basically the same.

We go ahead and let  $|\cdot|$  denote the norm on  $k$ . For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we will also go ahead and let  $F_\varepsilon, G_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$  denote the subsets of  $X$  with  $\mu(F_\varepsilon), \mu(G_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$  for which  $\{f_n|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_n|_{X \setminus G_\varepsilon}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are uniformly Cauchy.

- (a) For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , define  $E_\varepsilon := F_{\varepsilon/2} \cup G_{\varepsilon/2}$ . Namely,  $E_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{S}$ , and by [Lemma 5.55](#), we see

$$\mu(E_\varepsilon) \leq \mu(F_{\varepsilon/2}) + \mu(G_{\varepsilon/2}) = \varepsilon.$$

As such, we claim that  $\{(f_n + g_n)|_{X \setminus E_\varepsilon}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy.

Well, for any  $\delta > 0$ , we are promised  $N_f$  such that any  $m, n \geq N_f$  and  $x \notin F_{\varepsilon/2}$  will have

$$\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| < \delta/2.$$

We are promised an analogous constant  $N_g$  for  $g_n$  going to  $g$ , so we set  $N := \max\{N_f, N_g\}$ . Then  $m, n \geq N$  implies  $m, n \geq N_f$  and  $m, n \geq N_g$ ; as such, if  $x \notin E_\varepsilon$ , then  $x \notin F_{\varepsilon/2}$  and  $x \notin G_{\varepsilon/2}$ , so

$$\|(f_m + g_m)(x) - (f_n + g_n)(x)\| \leq \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| + \|g_m(x) - g_n(x)\| < \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} = \delta.$$

- (b) If  $a = 0$ , then we see that  $af_n = af_m = 0$ . As such, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we set  $E = \emptyset$  so that  $\mu(E) = 0$  while  $\{af_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy because  $af_n(x) = 0 = af_m(x)$  for any  $x \in X$ .

Otherwise, we have  $a \neq 0$  and so  $|a| > 0$ . Thus, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we note  $F_\varepsilon$  will have  $\mu(F_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$ , so we claim that  $\{(af_n)|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy.

Well, we already know that  $\{f_n|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy. Thus, for any  $\delta > 0$ , there is a constant  $N$  so that any  $m, n \geq N$  and  $x \notin F_\varepsilon$  will have

$$\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| < \frac{\delta}{|a|}.$$

It follows that  $m, n \geq N$  and  $x \notin F_\varepsilon$  gives

$$\|(af_m)(x) - (af_n)(x)\| = |a| \cdot \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| < |a| \cdot \frac{\delta}{|a|} = \delta.$$

- (c) Unsurprisingly, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we note that  $F_\varepsilon$  has  $\mu(F_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon$ , so we claim that  $\{\|f\|_n |_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy.

Well, we know that  $\{f_n|_{X \setminus F_\varepsilon}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy. Thus, for any  $\delta > 0$ , we are promised a constant  $N$  such that  $m, n \geq N$  and  $x \notin F_\varepsilon$  will have

$$\|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| < \delta.$$

As such, we note that the (reverse) triangle inequality gives

$$|\|f_m(x)\| - \|f_n(x)\|| \leq \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| < \delta,$$

which finishes. ■

Now, here is the main result, which we will not prove today.

**Theorem 7.74 (Riesz–Weyl).** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . Let  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $B$ -valued functions which are Cauchy in measure. Then there is a subsequence  $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  which is almost uniformly Cauchy.

In particular, we will be able to define a limit function for the sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  outside some null set, which will finally allow us to take limits of simple integrable functions in a way that makes sense.

## 7.6 November 7

Today we prove [Theorem 7.74](#).

### 7.6.1 Rapidly Cauchy Intermission

The main idea to the proof of [Theorem 7.74](#) is similar to what we have from the following definition.

**Definition 7.75 (Rapidly Cauchy).** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then a sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  in  $X$  is *rapidly Cauchy* if and only if all  $\varepsilon > 0$  have some  $N$  for which

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d(x_i, x_{i+1}) < \infty.$$

**Remark 7.76.** Of course, being rapidly Cauchy implies that any  $\varepsilon > 0$  has some  $N$  for which

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} d(x_i, x_{i+1}) - \sum_{i \leq N} d(x_i, x_{i+1}) < \varepsilon.$$

Thus,  $i > j > N$  implies

$$d(x_i, x_j) \leq \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} d(x_k, x_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{k > N} d(x_k, x_{k+1}) < \varepsilon,$$

so the sequence is Cauchy.

However, we have the following fact.

**Proposition 7.77.** Fix a metric space  $(X, d)$ . Then any Cauchy sequence  $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a rapidly Cauchy subsequence.

*Proof.* We proceed inductively. Set  $n_1 = 1$ . Then once given  $n_j$ , we find  $n_{j+1} > n_j$  such that  $m, n \geq n_{j+1}$  such that  $d(x_m, x_n) < 2^{-j}$  by using the Cauchy condition. Then we can check directly that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} d(x_j, x_{j+1}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{-j} = 1 < \infty,$$

which is what we wanted. ■

## 7.6.2 The Riesz–Weyl Theorem

And now for the main event.

**Theorem 7.74 (Riesz–Weyl).** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . Let  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $B$ -valued functions which are Cauchy in measure. Then there is a subsequence  $\{f_{n_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  which is almost uniformly Cauchy.

*Proof.* We proceed as in [Proposition 7.77](#). Namely, set  $n_1 = 1$ . Then we proceed inductively: note that

$$\mu(\{x \in X : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| > 2^{-j}\}) \rightarrow 0$$

as  $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ , so we can find  $n_{j+1} > n_j$  so that  $m, n > n_{j+1}$  gives

$$\mu(\{x \in X : \|f_m(x) - f_n(x)\| > 2^{-j}\}) < 2^{-j}.$$

We now claim that the sequence  $\{f_{n_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is almost uniformly Cauchy. Well, fix any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then choose  $N$  for which

$$\sum_{j \geq N} 2^{-j} = 2^{-N+1} < \varepsilon.$$

As such, we set

$$E_j := \{x \in X : \|f_{n_j}(x) - f_{n_{j+1}}(x)\| \geq 2^{-j}\}$$

so that  $\mu(E_j) < 2^{-j}$  by construction. Thus, we define our  $E$  as

$$E := \bigcup_{j \geq N} E_j$$

so that  $\mu(E) < \varepsilon$  by construction of  $N$ .

It remains to show that  $\{f_{n_j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy. Well, given  $\delta > 0$ , we need  $M$  so that  $i, j > M$  implies  $\|f_{n_i}(x) - f_{n_j}(x)\| < \delta$  for all  $x \notin E$ . Well, we set  $M > N$  so that

$$\sum_{j \geq M} 2^{-j} = 2^{-M+1} < \delta.$$

In particular, it follows that any  $j > i > M$  will have

$$\|f_{n_i}(x) - f_{n_j}(x)\| \leq \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} \|f_{n_k}(x) - f_{n_{k+1}}(x)\| \leq \sum_{k=i}^{j-1} 2^{-k} < \sum_{k \geq M} 2^{-k} < \varepsilon,$$

which is what we wanted. ■

**Example 7.78.** Even in [Example 7.50](#), there is a subsequence which is almost uniformly converging to 0.

We are now ready to use the condition that we are integrating into a Banach space.

**Lemma 7.79.** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a Banach space  $B$ . A sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable  $B$ -valued functions which is almost uniformly Cauchy. Then there is an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  such that  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In fact, this  $f$  is unique almost everywhere.

*Proof.* For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we get some  $E_n$  such that  $\mu(E_n) < 1/n$  and such that  $\{f_i|_{X \setminus E_n}\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is uniformly Cauchy. We now set

$$E := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} E_n$$

so that  $\mu(E) = 0$  because  $\mu(E) \leq \mu(E_n)$  for each  $n$  and  $\mu(E_n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now, for any  $x \in X \setminus E$ , we can find  $n$  for which  $x \notin E_n$ , so the sequence  $\{f_i(x)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy and allows us to define  $f(x)$  to be the limit. Note we have used the fact that  $B$  is a Banach space here! Thus far we have defined  $f$  on  $X \setminus E$ ; it doesn't matter what we do on  $E$ , so we will just define  $f(x) = 0$  for  $x \in E$ . Because  $f$  is the limit of some  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions, we conclude that  $f$  is still  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable.<sup>2</sup> We note that this construction is unique.

We now check that  $f_i \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Well, for  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we see that  $\{f_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  is almost uniformly Cauchy on  $X \setminus E_n$ , where we choose  $n$  with  $n < 2/\varepsilon$ . Then for any  $x \in E_n$  and  $\delta > 0$ , we see

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

for any  $m$ . However, we can force  $m$  to be large enough so that  $\|f_m(x) - f(x)\| < \delta/2$  and  $\|f_n(x) - f_m(x)\| < \delta/2$  by the uniformity. This finishes. ■

## 7.7 November 9

Today we define integrable functions. We went through this discussion quickly last class but are now going through it in more detail, so I have just moved the exposition to today.

### 7.7.1 Integrable Functions

Here is the payoff to our hard work.

**Definition 7.80 (Mean Cauchy).** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . Then a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of simple integrable functions is *mean Cauchy* if and only if  $\|f_n - f_m\|_1 \rightarrow 0$  as  $m, n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Lemma 7.81.** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a Banach space  $B$ . Further, fix a sequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions.

- (a) If  $f_n \rightarrow f$  almost uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $f_n \rightarrow f$  in measure.
- (b) If  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is almost uniformly Cauchy, then  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy in measure.

*Proof.* We show (a); the proof of (b) is similar. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and we would like to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) \stackrel{?}{=} 0.$$

Well, for any  $\delta > 0$ , we need  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  has

$$\mu(\{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) < \delta.$$

<sup>2</sup> Technically, we should redefine the  $f_i$  to vanish on  $E$ .



Because the  $f_\bullet$  are  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable, we may find some  $E \in \mathcal{S}$  containing each  $f_n^{-1}(B \setminus \{0\})$ .

Now, by the almost uniform convergence, we are promised  $F \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $\mu(F) < \delta$  and  $f_n \rightarrow f$  uniformly as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  on  $X \setminus F$ . As such, we choose  $N$  such that  $n \geq N$  implies

$$\|f(x) - f_n(x)\| < \varepsilon.$$

In particular, for  $n \geq N$ , we see

$$\mu(\{x : \|f(x) - f_n(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\}) \leq \mu(X \setminus F) < \delta,$$

which finishes. ■

**Theorem 7.82.** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a Banach space  $B$ . Given an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f$ , the following are equivalent.

- (a) There is a mean Cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions that converges to  $f$  in measure.
- (b) There is a mean Cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions that converges to  $f$  almost uniformly.
- (c) There is a mean Cauchy sequence of simple integrable functions that converges to  $f$  almost everywhere.

*Proof.* We show our implications in sequence.

- We show (a) implies (b). This holds from [Theorem 7.74](#): namely, our mean Cauchy sequence converging in measure will have a subsequence which is almost uniformly Cauchy. Then we note that the limits are the same by checking almost everywhere.
- We show (b) implies (c). Well, converging almost uniformly automatically forces us to converge both in measure and almost everywhere.
- We show (c) implies (a). Well, if  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is mean Cauchy, then the sequence is Cauchy in measure and therefore has a subsequence which is almost uniformly Cauchy. However, this subsequence will then converge to some  $g$  almost everywhere, and we see that  $f = g$  almost everywhere, so this subsequence actually converges to  $f$  almost everywhere. ■

As such, we have the following definition.

**Definition 7.83 (Integrable).** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed vector space  $B$ . Then an  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable function  $f: X \rightarrow B$  is  $\mu$ -integrable if and only if one of the equivalent conditions from [Theorem 7.82](#) is satisfied. This set of integrable functions is often denoted  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$ , where some data might be omitted when we want to.

**Remark 7.84.** Later on, we will define

$$\int_X f \, d\mu := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_X f_n \, d\mu.$$

However, we have not yet checked that this definition is well-defined.

**Remark 7.85.** Later on we will also define  $\mathcal{L}^\infty(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  as the bounded  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions as well as more general  $\mathcal{L}^p(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  for finite  $p$  where

$$\int_X \|f\|^p d\mu.$$

As an example fact, we can see that  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  is a module over  $\mathcal{L}^\infty(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, k)$ , where  $B$  is a normed  $k$ -vector space.

Here are the usual checks.

**Lemma 7.86.** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed  $k$ -vector space  $B$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  forms a  $k$ -vector space.

*Proof.* Just take linear combinations of the requested sequences in [Theorem 7.82](#). ■

### 7.7.2 Completeness of $\mathcal{L}^1$

We would like for our  $\mathcal{L}^1$  to actually be a completion for our simple integrable functions.

**Lemma 7.87.** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed  $k$ -vector space  $B$ . Further, fix a sequence of simple  $\mathcal{S}$ -measurable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which is Cauchy in measure. If a subsequence  $\{f_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  converges to a function  $f$  in measure, then  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  fully converges to  $f$  in measure.

*Proof.* Fix some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then we note that any  $k$  will have

$$\{x \in X : \|f_n(x) - f(x)\| \geq \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{x \in X : \|f_{n_k}(x) - f(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\} \cup \{x \in X : \|f_n(x) - f_{n_k}(x)\| \geq \varepsilon/2\}.$$

Now taking  $k$  large enough recovers the result; notably, the left term is small because our subsequence converges in measure, and the right term is small because our sequence is Cauchy in measure. ■

**Lemma 7.88.** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed  $k$ -vector space  $B$ . Further, fix mean Cauchy sequences of simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  which converges to  $f$  and  $g$  in measure, respectively. If  $\|f_n - g_n\|_1 \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $f = g$  almost everywhere.

*Proof.* The sequence  $f_1, g_1, f_2, g_2, \dots$  is mean Cauchy and hence Cauchy in measure. However, the subsequence  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  tells us that the sequence converges to  $f$  in measure by [Lemma 7.87](#); similarly, the subsequence  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  tells us that the sequence converges to  $g$  in measure as well. Thus, our single sequence converges to both  $f$  and  $g$  in measure, so  $f = g$  almost everywhere. ■

The point here is that we can take equivalence classes in  $\mathcal{L}^1(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu, B)$  to get a bona fide norm from our semi-norm  $\|\cdot\|_1$ .

To finish our discussion of completeness, we will need the following result, which we will state but not prove today.

**Proposition 7.89.** Fix a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$  and a normed  $k$ -vector space  $B$ . Suppose that  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are mean Cauchy sequences of simple  $\mu$ -integrable functions which both converge to some function  $f$  in measure. Then the sequences  $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  are equivalent mean Cauchy sequences.

In particular, this will imply that the integral  $\int_X f d\mu$  is well-defined.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- [Jac90] Joseph Jacobs. *English Fairy Tales*. English Fairy Tales. David Nutt, 1890.
- [Wei59] Andre Weil. "Correspondence". In: *Annals of Mathematics* 69.1 (1959), pp. 247–251.
- [Gei60] Theodor Geisel. *One Fish, Two Fish, Red Fish, Blue Fish*. Beginner Books. Beginner Books, 1960.
- [BJ82] Theodor Bröcker and Klaus Jänich. *Introduction to Differential Topology*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [Tao09] Terrence Tao. *245B, notes 3:  $L^p$  spaces*. 2009. URL: <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2009/01/09/245b-notes-3-lp-spaces/>.
- [Lan12] Serge Lang. *Real and Functional Analysis*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2012. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=KOM1BQAAQBAJ>.
- [Doe14] Anthony Doerr. *All the Light We Cannot See*. Scribner, 2014.
- [Che22] Evan Chen. *An Infinitely Large Napkin*. 2022. URL: <https://venhance.github.io/napkin/Napkin.pdf>.

# LIST OF DEFINITIONS

---

Almost uniformly, 139  
Almost uniformly Cauchy, 139

Ball, 26  
Banach space, 60  
Base, 34  
Borel set, 112, 114  
Borel–Stieltjes measure, 113  
Bounded, 55

Category, 11  
Cauchy, 17  
Cauchy in measure, 133  
Chain, 68  
Closed, 37  
Closure, 39  
Cluster point, 75  
Compact, 61, 61  
Compact support, 81  
Complete, 107  
Complete, 18  
Completion, 18  
Continuous, 15, 28, 30  
    Lipschitz continuous, 13  
    Lipschitz constant, 14  
    Lipschitz isomorphism, 15  
    Uniformly continuous, 15  
Converge, 16  
Converge in measure, 133  
Converges almost everywhere, 122  
Countably additive, 91  
Countably subadditive, 99

Dense, 18, 40  
Directed set, 75

Equicontinuous, 78

Filter, 68  
Finite intersection property, 66  
Finitely additive measure, 88

Group action, 49

Hausdorff, 50  
Hereditary, 101  
Hereditary  $\sigma$ -ring, 100  
Homeomorphism, 47

Inductively ordered, 68  
Integrable, 145  
Integral, 121  
Isometry, 12  
Lebesgue–Stieltjes measure, 112  
Locally compact, 79

Mean Cauchy, 134, 144  
Measurable function, 122, 123  
Measure, 91  
Measure space, 132  
Metric, 6  
    Extended metric, 6  
    Semi-metric, 6  
Monotone, 97

Net, 75  
Norm, 7  
Normal, 51  
Null set, 122

Open cover, 61  
Open set, 27  
Open subcover, 61  
Orbit, 49  
Outer measure, 104

Pointwise totally bounded, 78

Poset, [67](#)  
Pre-image, [27](#)  
Premeasure, [93](#)  
Prering, [92](#)  
  
Rapidly Cauchy, [142](#)  
Regular, [64](#)  
Ring, [88](#)  
  
Semi-norm, [8](#)  
Separable, [123](#)  
 $\sigma$ -algebra, [89](#)  
 $\sigma$ -finite, [109](#)  
 $\sigma$ -ring, [89](#)  
    Generated  $\sigma$ -ring, [90](#)  
Simple integrable function, [121](#)  
Simple measurable function, [117](#)

Sub-base, [31](#)  
Subposet, [67](#)  
Support, [81](#)  
  
Topology, [29](#)  
    Discrete topology, [29](#)  
    Final topology, [45](#)  
    Generated topology, [31](#)  
    Indiscrete topology, [29](#)  
    Induced topology, [36](#)  
    Product topology, [41](#)  
    Quotient topology, [46](#)  
    Relative topology, [36](#)  
Totally bounded, [74](#)  
  
Uniform metric, [55](#)