

For \mathcal{A} a sigma algebra, $E \in \mathcal{A}$, define $\mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A}) := \{\{E_k \in \mathcal{A}; k \in \mathbb{N}\}; E = \cup_k E_k, E_i \cap E_j = \emptyset \forall i \neq j\}$. Always $\{\phi, E\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$, so $\mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$ is never empty, and also $\mathcal{P}^*(\phi, \mathcal{A}) = \{\phi\}$.

A complex or a signed and finite measure on a measurable space (X, \mathcal{A}) is a function, ν , from \mathcal{A} to \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} such that

- 1) $\nu(\phi) = 0$
- 2) $\nu(\cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} E_k) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \nu(E_k)$, $E_k \in \mathcal{A}$, disjoint.

Because the union in (2) is independent of the labeling of the $\{E_k\}$, the sum in (2) is rearrangement-invariant, which implies that it converges iff it does so to absolutely, and does to the same number.

Alternatively, a complex measure ν on (X, \mathcal{A}) is a complex function on \mathcal{A} such that

- 3) $\nu(E) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \nu(E_k)$, for all $\{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$.

$$(3 \Rightarrow 1), \phi = E = \cup_k E_k \Rightarrow E_k = \phi. \Rightarrow \nu(\phi) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \nu(\phi) \Rightarrow \nu(\phi) = 0. (3 \Leftrightarrow 2), E := \cup_k E_k.$$

Write $\mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$ or $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$ for the set of all complex or signed and finite measures on \mathcal{A} . Write $\mathcal{M}^\pm(X, \mathcal{A})$ or $\mathcal{M}^\pm(\mathcal{A})$ for the set of all signed and finite measures on \mathcal{A} . Write $\mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$ or $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{A})$ for the set of all positive measures on \mathcal{A} . Positive measures need not be finite, so $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{A}) \not\subset \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$.

If $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{A})$, then we say that $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ iff $\mu_1(E) \leq \mu_2(E)$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$.

Given $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$, we wish to find the smallest $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{A})$ s.t.

$$\mu(E) \geq |\nu(E)| \text{ for all } E \in \mathcal{A}^{(\dagger_1)},$$

smallest in the sense of the previous point. When (\dagger_1) holds we say that μ dominates ν . Let $\{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$ arbitrarily, we then have that $|\nu(E_k)| \leq \mu(E_k)$ for all E_k by (\dagger_1) , summing these gives

$$\mu(E) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(E_k) \geq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(E_k)| \geq |\nu(E)|, \text{ for all } \{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A}).$$

Thus, for any μ dominating ν , we can find a $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(E_k)|$ not strictly between any $\mu(E)$ and $|\nu(E)|$. So the best we could do, in the sense of minimizing (\dagger_1) , is $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(E_k)|$, for some $\{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$ which minimizes this quantity. This suggests the definition

$$|\nu|(E) := \sup \left\{ \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(E_k)|; \{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A}) \right\}.$$

Briefly, (\dagger_1) holds because this sup is an upper bound, and the “smallest” criterion holds because the sup is the smallest such upper bound. This quantity is called the total variation measure of ν .

(X, \mathcal{A}) measurable, $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, then $|\nu| \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, and $|\nu| \leq \mu$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$ satisfying $\mu(E) \geq |\nu(E)|$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}^{(\dagger_1)}$.

Proof:

First, for $E \in \mathcal{A}$, let $F = \{\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(E_k)|; \{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})\}$ is a well defined set, because $\mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A}) \subset \mathcal{A}$, so that these sums are well defined. Note that $F \subset \mathbb{R}$, if F is unbounded, then $|\nu|(E) = \infty$, otherwise F is bounded and this $\sup(F) \in \mathbb{R}$ exists.

$$\mathcal{P}^*(\phi, \mathcal{A}) = \{\phi\} \Rightarrow |\nu|(\phi) = |\nu(\phi)| = 0.$$

For any $\{E_i\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$, that $|\nu|(E) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu|(E_i)$ follows by “ \leq ” and “ \geq ” cases.

“ \geq ”: If $|\nu|(E) = \infty$ then this case always holds, so assume $|\nu|(E) < \infty$. $\{E_i\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$ is given. Pick $\{t_i \in \mathbb{R}; i \in \mathbb{N}, t_i \geq 0\}$ such that $t_i < |\nu|(E_i)$, but if $|\nu|(E_i) = 0$, then let $t_i = 0$. Given each t_i we can find a partition of E_i , $\{A_{i,j}\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E_i, \mathcal{A})$, such that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(A_{i,j})| \geq t_i$. Each E_i has atleast one well defined partition; at a minimum $\{E_i, \phi\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E_i, \mathcal{A})$. If this is the only partition in $\mathcal{P}^*(E_i, \mathcal{A})$, then $|\nu|(E_i) = |\nu(E_i)|$, and in this case $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(A_{i,j})| = |\nu(E_i)| = |\nu|(E_i) > t_i$. Now we have that $\{A_{i,j}; i, j \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$, so that by the sup in the difinition of $|\nu|$, summing over i ,

$$|\nu|(E) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\nu(A_{i,j})| \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} t_i.$$

Lemma about \mathbb{R} , Let $L \in \mathbb{R}, \{a_k \in \mathbb{R}; k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^n t_k \leq L \text{ for all } \{t_k\} \in \mathbb{R}^n, t_k \leq a_k, n \in \mathbb{N} \right) \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \leq L.$$

If $n = 1$, suppose $a > L$, then can find some $t \in \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $L < t \leq a$, so the statement ($t \leq L \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, t \leq a$) contradicts $a > L$, but either $a > L$ or $a \leq L$. Suppose the lemma is true for the case $n \in \mathbb{N}$, fixed, then $\sum_{k=1}^{n+1} t_k \leq L$ for all $\{t_k\} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, t_k \leq a_k \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^n t_k \leq L - t_{k+1}$ for all $\{t_k\} \in \mathbb{R}^n, t_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}, t_k \leq a_k \Rightarrow$ (by statement is true for $n \in \mathbb{N}$) $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k \leq L - t_{k+1}, t_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}, t_{k+1} \leq a_{k+1} \Rightarrow t_{k+1} \leq L - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k, t_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}, t_{k+1} \leq a_{k+1} \Rightarrow$ (by statement is true for $n = 1$) $a_{k+1} \leq L - \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} a_k \leq L$.

Now, using this lemma, with $L = |\nu|(E)$, $a_k = |\nu|(E_k)$, and t_k chosen so that $t_k < |\nu|(E_k)$ as previously, and relying on the result that $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} t_k \leq |\nu|(E)$, we have that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\nu|(E_k) \leq |\nu|(E).$$

“ \leq ”: $\{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$ is given. Then for all $\{A_j\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$, $\{A_j \cap E_k; k \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(A_j, \mathcal{A})$, then

$$\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(A_j)| = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \nu(A_j \cap E_k) \right| \leq \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(A_j \cap E_k)| = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(A_j \cap E_k)| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu|(E_k),$$

by $\{A_j \cap E_k; j \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E_k, \mathcal{A})$. This was for all $\{A_j\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$, so is true for the sup in the definition of $|\nu|$, so

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\nu|(E_k) \geq |\nu|(E).$$

So we have that $|\nu| \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$. That $|\nu|(E) \geq |\nu(E)|$ follows by noting that $\{E, \phi\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$ so that $|\nu|(E) \geq |\nu(E)| + |\nu(\phi)| = |\nu(E)|$. Suppose $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{A})$ was another positive measure satisfying (\dagger_1) , then for $\{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$ arbitrarily, applying (\dagger_1) and summing, $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\nu(E_k)| \leq \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(E_k) = \mu(E)$, now by its definition, $|\nu|(E)$ is the sup of numbers of the form on the LHS, and by this inequality, $\mu(E)$ is an upper bound for such numbers, thus $|\nu|(E) \leq \mu(E)$, for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$. \square

$\mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a vector space, with respect to measure addition, $(\nu_1 + \nu_2)(E) = \nu_1(E) + \nu_2(E)$, scaling, $\lambda(\nu)(E) = (\lambda\nu)(E)$, the zero measure, $0(E) = 0$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$. The details to this are obvious.

$$\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A}), \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \text{ or } \mathbb{C} \text{ then } |\nu_1 + \nu_2| \leq |\nu_1| + |\nu_2|, |\lambda\nu_1| = |\lambda| |\nu_1|.$$

Proof: For all $E \in \mathcal{A}$, $|(\nu_1 + \nu_2)(E)| = |\nu_1(E) + \nu_2(E)| \leq |\nu_1(E)| + |\nu_2(E)| \leq |\nu_1|(E) + |\nu_2|(E) = (|\nu_1| + |\nu_2|)(E)$. Scaling follows by $|\lambda\nu_1(E)| = |\lambda||\nu_1(E)|$, and for any $A \subset \mathbb{R}, a \in \mathbb{R}, A \neq \emptyset, a > 0$ $\sup\{ax : x \in A\} = a \sup A$.

Theorem 6.4 in Rudin: If $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, then $|\nu|(X) < \infty$.

$\mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a normed space w.r.t. $\|\nu\| := |\nu|(X)$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$.

Proof: $\|\nu_1 + \nu_2\| = |\nu_1 + \nu_2|(X) \leq |\nu_1|(X) + |\nu_2|(X) = \|\nu_1\| + \|\nu_2\|$. $\|\lambda\nu\| = |\lambda\nu|(X) = |\lambda||\nu|(X) = |\lambda|\|\nu\|$. $\|\nu\|(X) = |\nu|(X) \geq 0$, $\|\nu\| = 0 \Rightarrow |\nu|(X) = 0 \Rightarrow 0 = |\nu|(X) \geq |\nu|(E) \geq |\nu(E)|$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \nu = 0$.

$\mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a complete metric space with respect to the canonical metric induced by the norm: $d(\nu_1, \nu_2) = (\nu_1 - \nu_2)(X)$. Thus $\mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$ is a Banach space.

Proof: ADD

For all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^\pm(X, \mathcal{A})$, define $\nu^+ = \frac{1}{2}(|\nu| + \nu)$, $\nu^- = \frac{1}{2}(|\nu| - \nu)$. Then $\nu^+, \nu^- \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, $\nu = \nu^+ - \nu^-$, $|\nu| = \nu^+ + \nu^-$. This is the Jordan decomposition of ν , and is unique. Further, if $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, then define $\text{Re}(\nu)(E) = \text{Re}(\nu(E))$, $\text{Im}(\nu)(E) = \text{Im}(\nu(E))$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$, then $\text{Re}(\nu), \text{Im}(\nu) \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, and so $\nu = \sum_{k=0}^3 i^k \nu_k$, where each $\nu_k \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, $i = \sqrt{-1}$.

Proof: ADD

For all $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, \mathcal{A} -measurable, $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, say that f is ν -integrable if it is $|\nu|$ -integrable, so $f \in \mathcal{L}(X, |\nu|)$. Write $\nu_0 = \text{Re}(\nu)^+$, $\nu_1 = \text{Re}(\nu)^-$, $\nu_2 = \text{Im}(\nu)^+$, $\nu_3 = \text{Im}(\nu)^-$, then

$$\int_X f d\nu = \sum_{k=0}^3 i^k \int_X f d\nu_k$$

and $f \in \mathcal{L}(X, |\nu|)$ iff $|f| \in \mathcal{L}(X, |\nu|)$ iff $|f| \in \mathcal{L}(X, |\nu|)$ iff $|f| \in \mathcal{L}(X, \nu_k)$ iff $f \in \mathcal{L}(X, \nu_k)$, for all $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.

Proof: ADD

For $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, say that ν is concentrated on $A \in \mathcal{A}$ if $\nu(E) = \nu(A \cap E)$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$.

This is equivalent to $\nu(E) = 0$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}, E \subset A^c$, by $\nu(E) = \nu(E \cap A) + \nu(E \cap A^c) = \nu(E \cap A) \Leftrightarrow \nu(E \cap A^c) = 0$. Not equivalently that $\nu(A^c) = 0$.

If $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, and ν is concentrated on both A, B , then $\nu(A \setminus B) = \nu(A \cap B^c) = \nu((A \cap B^c) \cap B) = \nu(\phi) = 0$, thus $\nu(A \Delta B) = 0$. So sets on which a measure concentrate differ by at most sets of measure zero.

If $A, T \in \mathcal{A}$, and ν is concentrated on A , $A \cap T = \phi$, then $\nu(T) = 0$, and for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$, $\nu(E) = \nu(E \cap A) + 0 = \nu(E \cap A) + \nu(E \cap T) = \nu(E \cap (A \cup T))$. So if ν is concentrated on A , and $B \in \mathcal{A}$ is any other set which contains A , then ν is concentrated on B also.

Then, if $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A})$, ν_1 concentrated on A_1 , ν_2 on A_2 , then ν_1 and ν_2 both concentrated on $A_1 \cup A_2$, so for $\nu = \nu_1 + \nu_2$, $\nu(E) = \nu_1(E) + \nu_2(E) = \nu_1(E \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)) + \nu_2(E \cap (A_1 \cup A_2)) = \nu(E \cap (A_1 \cup A_2))$, so ν concentrated on $A_1 \cup A_2$. Clearly sets of concentration don't change when scaling a measure by non-zero scalar.

This all suggests the following construction.

$$\bigcap \{A \in \mathcal{A}; \nu(E) = \nu(E \cap A) \text{ for all } E \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

Is this set well defined? Need to show that it is in \mathcal{A} .

For $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, say that ν is absolutely continuous w.r.t. μ if $\mu(E) = 0 \Rightarrow \nu(E) = 0$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$, and write $\nu \ll \mu$.

For $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, say ν_1 and ν_2 are mutually singular if they are concentrated on disjoint sets, and write $\nu_1 \perp \nu_2$.

If $\nu \perp \nu$, then for any sets $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ on which ν concentrates, $A \cap B = \phi$, but $\nu(A \Delta B) = 0$, so $\nu(A \cup B) = 0$, so ν concentrates only on ν -null sets, so $\nu = 0$.

(Rudin 6.8) For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, $\nu, \nu_1, \nu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$,

a) ν concentrated on $A \Rightarrow |\nu|$ concentrated on A .

b) $\nu_1 \perp \nu_2 \Rightarrow |\nu_1| \perp |\nu_2|$.

c) $\nu_1 \perp \mu, \nu_2 \perp \mu \Rightarrow \nu_1 + \nu_2 \perp \mu$.

d) $\nu_1 \ll \mu, \nu_2 \ll \mu \Rightarrow \nu_1 + \nu_2 \ll \mu$.

e) $\nu \ll \mu \Rightarrow |\nu| \ll \mu$.

f) $\nu_1 \ll \mu, \nu_2 \perp \mu \Rightarrow \nu_1 \perp \nu_2$.

g) $\nu \ll \mu, \nu \perp \mu \Rightarrow \nu = 0$.

a) Let $E \subset A^c$, $\{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$, then $\nu(E_k) = 0$, $\{E_k\}$ is arbitrary, so $|\nu|(E) = 0$.

b) If ν_1 is concentrated on A_1 , ν_2 on A_2 , then $|\nu_1|$ on A_1 , and $|\nu_2|$ on A_2 by (a). The hypothesis is that A_1 and A_2 are disjoint, this is then what is needed for the conclusion.

c) ν_1 concentrated on A_1 , μ on B_1 , ν_2 on A_2 , and μ on B_2 , so the hypothesis is that that $A_1 \cap B_1 = \phi$, $A_2 \cap B_2 = \phi$, but $\nu_1 + \nu_2$ is concentrated on $A_1 \cup A_2$, and μ on $B_1 \cup B_2$, and $(A_1 \cup A_2) \cap (B_1 \cup B_2) = (A_1 \cap B_1) \cup (A_2 \cap B_2) = \phi$.

d) If $\mu(E) = 0$, then $\nu_1(E) = 0 = \nu_2(E)$, so $\nu_1(E) + \nu_2(E) = (\nu_1 + \nu_2)(E) = 0$.

e) If $\mu(E) = 0$, then for any $\{E_k\} \in \mathcal{P}^*(E, \mathcal{A})$, $\mu(E_k) = 0$, thus $\nu(E_k) = 0$ for all E_k by hypothesis, and thus $|\nu|(E) = 0$.

f) Since $\nu_2 \perp \mu$, there is an $A \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(A) = 0$, and ν_2 concentrated on A . $\nu_1(E) = 0$ for all $E \subset A$, $E \in \mathcal{A}$ by $\mu(E) = 0$, thus ν_1 concentrates on A^c .

g) by (f), $\nu \perp \nu$, so $\nu = 0$.

(Rudin 6.9) For $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, σ -finite, then there is a function $w \in L^1(\mu)$ s.t. $w(x) \in (0, 1)$ for all $x \in X$. Thus $\tilde{\mu}(E) := \int_E w d\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, and $\mu(E) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \tilde{\mu}(E) = 0$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tilde{\mu}(X) \leq 1 < \infty$.

Proof: $X = \cup_k E_k$, $E_k \in \mathcal{A}$, $\mu(E_k) < \infty$. Let $w_k(x) = \chi_{E_k}(x) 2^{-k} / (1 + \mu(E_k))$. Then on E_k , $1 + \mu(E_k) \in (1, \infty)$, $1/(1 + \mu(E_k)) \in (0, 1)$. Then $w(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k(x) \in (0, 1)$. Each w_k is the product of a measurable characteristic function, and a number, and so is measurable, and then by Beppo-Levi,

$$\tilde{\mu}(X) = \int_X \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k(x) d\mu(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_X w_k(x) d\mu(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{-k}}{(1 + \mu(E_k))} \mu(E_k) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k} = 1.$$

$$\tilde{\mu}(E) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_X \chi_{E_k}(x) \frac{\chi_{E_k}(x) 2^{-k}}{(1 + \mu(E_k))} d\mu(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(E \cap E_k)}{1 + \mu(E_k)} 2^{-k} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mu(E) = 0$$

because $\mu(E) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu(E \cap E_k)$.

(Rudin 1.40) $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{A})$, $\mu(X) < \infty$, $f \in L^1(\mu)$, $S \subset \mathbb{C}$, closed, and define the averages

$$A_E(f) = \frac{1}{\mu(E)} \int_E f d\mu.$$

If $A_E(f) \in S$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mu(E) > 0$, then $f(x) \in S$ for a.e. $x \in X$.

Proof: ADD

(Rudin 6.10) (X, \mathcal{A}) a measurable space, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, σ -finite.

a) Lebesgue Decomposition Theorem (LDT):

For all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, there exist unique $\nu_a, \nu_s \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$ such that $\nu = \nu_a + \nu_s$, $\nu_a \ll \mu$, $\nu_s \perp \mu$, $\nu_a \perp \nu_s$.

b) Radon-Nikodym Theorem (RNT):

For all $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$ such that $\nu \ll \mu$, there exists a unique $h \in L^1(\mu)$ such that $\nu(E) = \int_E h d\mu$, $E \in \mathcal{A}$.

Remarks:

In the LDT, we can apply the RNT to ν_s , and if $\nu \ll \mu$, then $\nu_s = 0$.

In the LDT, $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A}) \Rightarrow \nu_a, \nu_s \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$.

In the RNT, if $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(X, \mathcal{A})$, then $h \geq 0$ μ -a.e.

Proof:

Uniqueness: In LDT, if (ν'_a, ν'_s) another pair of measures from LDT, then $\nu'_a - \nu_a = \nu_s - \nu'_s$, $\nu'_a - \nu_a \ll \mu$, and $\nu_s - \nu'_s \perp \mu$, hence both sides here are 0, by c,d,g from preliminary propositions. In RNT, if $\nu(E) = \int_E h d\mu = \int_E h' d\mu$, then $\int_E (h - h') d\mu = 0$, $E \in \mathcal{A}$, and then by the vanishing principle, $h = h'$ μ -a.e..

Step 1: If $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X, \mathcal{A})$, $\nu(X) < \infty$, then apply Rudin 6.9 to μ to obtain $w \in L^1(\mu)$, $w(x) \in (0, 1)$ for all $x \in X$. Then $\varphi(E) := \nu(E) + \int_E w d\mu$ is a positive finite measure on \mathcal{A} , and $\varphi \geq \nu$. Then for any \mathcal{A} -measurable function $f : X \rightarrow [0, \infty]$,

$$\int_X f d\varphi = \int_X f d\nu + \int_X fw d\mu,$$

by following the standrad steps in the construction of the integral. If $f \in L^2(\mu)$,

$$\int_X |f| d\nu \leq \int_X |f| d\varphi \leq \left(\int_X 1 d\varphi \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_X |f|^2 d\varphi \right)^{1/2} = \varphi(X)^{1/2} \left(\int_X |f|^2 d\varphi \right)^{1/2} < \infty$$

by the Schwarz inequalty, so $f \in L^1(\nu)$, $f \in L^1(\varphi)$, similarly, $fw \in L^1(\mu)$. Thus, $f \mapsto \int_X f d\nu$ is a linear functional, bounded (by $\sqrt{\varphi(X)}$) on $L^2(\varphi)$. Hence by $L^2(\varphi)$ being a Hilbert space, and Riesz representation, there exists a $g \in L^2(\varphi)$ so that

$$\int_X f d\nu = \int_X fg d\varphi, \text{ for all } f \in L^2(\varphi).$$

Then, for $f = \chi_E$, for any $E \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\varphi(E) > 0$, $\lambda(E) = \int_E g d\varphi$, and because $0 \leq \lambda \leq \varphi$, $0 \leq \lambda(E)/\varphi(E) \leq \varphi(E)/\varphi(E) = 1$,

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{\varphi(E)} \int_E g d\varphi \leq 1, \text{ for all } E \in \mathcal{A}.$$

So by Rudin 1.40, $g \in [0, 1]$ φ -a.e. so wlog, $g(x) \in [0, 1]$ for all $x \in X$.

Define $A = g^{-1}([0, 1))$, $B = g^{-1}(\{1\})$, then $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ by $g \in L^2(\varphi) \Rightarrow g$ is \mathcal{A} -measurable, $A \cup B = X$, $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Define $\nu_a(E) = \nu(A \cap E)$, $\nu_s(E) = \nu(B \cap E)$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$. Notice $\nu_a(E) + \nu_s(E) = \nu(E \cap A) + \nu(E \cap B) = \nu(E \cap X) = \nu(E)$ for all $E \in \mathcal{A}$, so $\nu = \nu_a + \nu_s$, and by definition, ν_s is concentrated on A , ν_a on B so $\nu_a \perp \nu_s$.

Now, rewriting,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X f d\nu &= \int_X fg d\varphi = \int_X fg d\nu + \int_X fgw d\mu \rightarrow \\ &\int_X (1 - g)f d\nu = \int_X fgw d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f = \chi_B$, then the LHS is 0, and the RHS is $\int_X w d\mu$, and since $w > 0$, $\mu(B) = 0$, so μ is concentrated on $B^c = A$, so that $\nu_s \perp \mu$. Next, let $f = \chi_E \sum_{k=0}^n g^k$, then $f \geq 0$, $f \in L^2(\varphi)$. Then,

$$\int_E (1 - g)f d\nu = \int_E fgw d\mu \rightarrow \int_E (1 - g^{n+1}) d\nu = \int_E \sum_{k=0}^n g^{k+1} w d\mu.$$

Let

$$h(x) = w(x)g(x) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} g^k(x).$$

For $x \in A$, $g^k(x)$ decreases monotonically, so the partial sums in h increase monotonically, and $h(x) = \frac{g(x)w(x)}{1-g(x)}$. So, taking the limit of the equation, gives by LMCT

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E \cap A} (1 - g^{n+1}) d\nu &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{E \cap A} \sum_{k=0}^n g^{k+1} w d\mu = \\ \int_{E \cap A} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 - g^{n+1}) d\nu &= \int_{E \cap A} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^n g^{k+1} w d\mu = \\ \int_{E \cap A} 1 d\nu &= \int_{E \cap A} h d\mu = \nu(E \cap A) = \nu_a(E). \end{aligned}$$

For $x \in B$, $g(x) = g^k(x) = 1$, so $1 - g^{n+1}(x) = 0$, so

$$\int_{E \cap B} h d\nu = \int_{E \cap B} 0 d\nu = 0.$$

not finished.