

Lee Tuo-Yeong, Department of Mathematics, National University of
Singapore, Singapore 119260

MULTIPLIERS FOR SOME NON-ABSOLUTE INTEGRALS IN EUCLIDEAN SPACES

Abstract

In this paper we prove a uniform boundedness theorem and use it to show that if fg is non-absolutely integrable on an interval in Euclidean space for each non-absolute integrable function f , then g is almost everywhere a function of strongly bounded variation on E .

1 Introduction

A general form of a bounded linear functional on the space of all Henstock integrable function was first given in [7, Theorem 3.2] and was used to show that if fg is Henstock integrable on a compact interval E in Euclidean space for each Henstock integrable function f , then g is almost everywhere a function of strongly bounded variation on E . The integration by parts formula [7, Theorem 3.1, equation (4)] is a key tool used to prove [7, Theorem 3.2]. However it is not clear whether integration by parts holds for other non-absolute integrals, and so the method used in [7] does not seem to generalize easily to other non-absolute integrals. In this paper, we shall prove a uniform boundedness theorem and use it to extend [7, Theorem 5.1] to some other non-absolute integrals.

2 Preliminaries

By \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^+ we denote the real line and the positive real line respectively. Let m be a fixed positive integer. The m -dimensional Euclidean space is denoted

Mathematical Reviews subject classification: 26A39
Received by the editors October 26, 1996

by \mathbb{R}^m . Let $E = \prod_{i=1}^m [a_i, b_i]$ be a compact interval in \mathbb{R}^m with $a_i < b_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. By an interval E_0 we mean a compact set of the form $\prod_{i=1}^m [s_i, t_i]$ with $s_i < t_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. If $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$, then $\text{int}(X)$, $\text{diam } X$, \overline{X} and χ_X denote the interior, the diameter, the closure, the characteristic function of X respectively. If Z is a subset of E and $\xi \in E$, then $\text{dist}(\xi, Z)$ denotes the distance of ξ from Z . The m -dimensional Lebesgue measure of the set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is denoted by $|X|$. We shall say that the intervals E_1 and E_2 are non-overlapping if $\text{int}(E_1) \cap \text{int}(E_2) = \emptyset$. A *figure* is a finite union of non-overlapping intervals. Also, $B(\xi, r)$ denotes the open ball with center ξ and radius r in \mathbb{R}^m . If the intervals $I_i \subseteq E$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ are non-overlapping, then we say that the set $D = \{I_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$ is a partial division of E . If, in addition, $\cup_{i=1}^k I_i = E$, we say that D is a division of E . Given a function $\delta : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ and a partial division D , we say that D is δ -fine if for each interval I from D we have $I \subseteq B(\xi, \delta(\xi))$ where ξ is a vertex of I , and we write $D = \{(I, \xi)\}$. In [2, p.42], it is shown that a δ -fine division of E exists for each $\delta : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$. Let G be an open set in E . A figure I_0 is called a non-absolute subset of G if there exists $\delta : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that I_0 is the complement of a δ -fine cover of $E \setminus G$.

All functions considered in this paper will be real-valued. A function $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Henstock integrable on E if there is a real number A with the following property: for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $|(D) \sum f(\xi) |I| - A| < \varepsilon$ for each δ -fine division $D = \{(I, \xi)\}$ of E , and we write $A = \int_E f$. The family of all Henstock integrable functions on E will be denoted by $H(E)$. If I is a subinterval of E , we denote the Henstock integral of f on I by $\int_I f$. We denote by $L(E)$ the family of all Lebesgue integrable functions f on E , or equivalently, the family of all absolutely Henstock integrable functions on E . It is known that $L(E) \subset H(E)$ (see, for example, [2, p.37]).

For each measurable function $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the set of all non-absolute integrability points of f is defined to be

$$\text{NA}(f) = \{x \in E : f \notin L(J) \text{ for each } J \text{ with } x \notin \text{int } J\}.$$

In [1], it is shown that for each $f \in H(E)$, f is Lebesgue integrable on a portion of E , so we see that $\text{NA}(f)$ is a proper closed subset of E . We say that f is Cauchy-Lebesgue integrable on E if $f \in CL(E)$, where

$$CL(E) = \{f \in H(E) : \text{NA}(f) \text{ is a finite set}\}.$$

It is easy to see that $L(E) \subset CL(E) \subset H(E)$.

An interval function F is said to satisfy the (SL) condition if for each subset $W \subset E$ of measure zero and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta : W \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for any δ -fine partial division $D = \{(I, \xi)\}$ of W , we have $(D) \sum |F(I)| < \varepsilon$.

For a definition of strongly bounded variation, see [3, Definition 1.1.4]. For the two dimensional definition of strongly bounded variation, see [7, Section 3].

3 Main Results

In this section, we prove a Banach-Steinhaus Theorem (Theorem 3.6), and an application will be given in section 4. We begin with a definition.

Definition 3.1. Let $\{c_k\} \subset E$, where $c_k = (c_k^{(1)}, c_k^{(2)}, c_k^{(3)}, \dots, c_k^{(m)})$. For a nondegenerate subinterval $E_k \subset E$ with opposite vertices c_k, c_{k+1} , we write $E_k = \langle c_k, c_{k+1} \rangle$. We say that $\{E_k\}$ is monotone if $\{c_k^{(j)}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is strictly monotone for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. In this case, we say that $\{c_k\}$ is strictly monotone.

We remark that the two-dimensional version of Definition 3.1 is given in [7, Section 4].

Throughout this paper, $\langle u, v \rangle$ will denote a subinterval of E .

Let X be a linear space of integrable functions whose domain is E , and equip X with a norm $\|\cdot\|_X$. Suppose the following axioms hold for X .

- (I) If $f \in X$, then $f\chi_I \in X$ for each subinterval I of E .
- (II) Every $f \in X$ is measurable.
- (III) G is a dense linear subspace of X , and if $f \in G$, then so is $f\chi_I$.
- (IV) If $\{I_n\}$ is a monotone sequence of subintervals of E , and $\{f_n\} \subset G$, where $f_n(x) = 0$ for each $x \notin I_n$, and the series $\sum_{k=1}^\infty \|f_k\|_X$ converges, then $f = \sum_{k=1}^\infty f_k \in X$.
- (V) For each $f \in X$, $\|f\chi_{\langle c, c_n \rangle} - f\chi_{\langle c, d \rangle}\|_X \rightarrow 0$ as $c_n \rightarrow d$.
- (VI) For each $f \in X$, $\|f\chi_I\|_X \rightarrow 0$ as $|I| \rightarrow 0$, where I is a subinterval of E .
- (VII) There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\|f\chi_I\|_X \leq \gamma\|f\|_X$ for every subinterval I of E .

Two functions $f_1, f_2 \in X$ are regarded as identical if $f_1 = f_2$ almost everywhere in E . For each subinterval J of E , we let

$$X(J) = \{f \in X : f \text{ vanishes outside } J\}.$$

and

$$G(J) = \{f \in G : f \text{ vanishes outside } J\}.$$

A function g defined on E is said to be a multiplier for X if $fg \in X$ for each $f \in X$. Let Y be a normed space.

Definition 3.2. A linear operator $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be nice if the following conditions are satisfied.

(N1) Given any subinterval J of E and $f \in X(J)$, there exists $\{f_n^*\} \subset G(J)$ such that $\|f_n^* - f\|_X \rightarrow 0$ and $\|T(f_n^* \chi_I) - T(f \chi_I)\|_Y \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each subinterval I of J .

(N2) Let $c, d \in E$. If $\{c_n\} \subset \text{int}(< c, d >)$ is strictly monotone with $c_n \rightarrow d$. Then

$$\|T(f \chi_{< c, c_n >}) - T(f \chi_{< c, d >})\|_Y \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(N3) If $f \in X$, then $\|T(f \chi_I)\|_Y \rightarrow 0$ as $|I| \rightarrow 0$.

If $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is a nice operator, we write $T \in \mathcal{N}(X, Y)$. We shall use the concept of nice operator to prove a uniform boundedness theorem for X . We need some lemmas and theorems.

Lemma 3.3. Let $T : X \rightarrow Y$ be a nice operator. If p_0 is a positive integer and $f \in X(< c, d >)$ with $\|f\|_X < 1$ and $\|T(f)\|_Y > 4^{p_0}$, then there exist $c_p \in \text{int}(< c, d >)$ and $f_p \in G(< c, c_p >)$ such that

$$(i) \quad \|f_p\|_X < \frac{1}{2^{p_0}}.$$

$$(ii) \quad \|T(f_p)\|_Y > 2^{p_0}.$$

PROOF. Let $\{c_n\} \subset \text{int}(< c, d >)$ be strictly monotone with $c_n \rightarrow d$. Since T is a nice operator, by (N2) condition,

$$\|T(f \chi_{< c, c_n >}) - T(f \chi_{< c, d >})\|_Y \rightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, (1) implies that

$$\|T(f \chi_{< c, c_n >})\|_Y \rightarrow \|T(f \chi_{< c, d >})\|_Y \quad (2)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, By Axiom (V), we have

$$\|f\chi_{\langle c, c_n \rangle} - f\chi_{\langle c, d \rangle}\|_X \rightarrow 0 \quad (3)$$

as $c_n \rightarrow d$. From (3), we have

$$\|f\chi_{\langle c, c_n \rangle}\|_X \rightarrow \|f\chi_{\langle c, d \rangle}\|_X \quad (4)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

By our hypothesis, $\|f\|_X < 1$ and $\|T(f\chi_{\langle c, d \rangle})\|_Y > 4^{p_0}$, so by (4) and (2), we may choose a sufficiently large integer, say p , so that

$$\|f\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle}\|_X < 1 \quad (5)$$

and

$$\|T(f\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle})\|_Y > 4^{p_0}. \quad (6)$$

Then $c_p \in \text{int}(\langle c, d \rangle)$. Since T is a nice operator, by (N1) condition, there exists $\{f_n^*\} \subset G(\langle c, c_p \rangle)$ such that

$$\|f_n^* - f\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle}\|_X \rightarrow 0 \quad (7)$$

and

$$\|T(f_n^*\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle}) - T(f\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle})\|_Y \rightarrow 0 \quad (8)$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From (7), we have

$$\|f_n^*\|_X \rightarrow \|f\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle}\|_X \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (9)$$

From (8), we have

$$\|T(f_n^*\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle})\|_Y \rightarrow \|T(f\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle})\|_Y \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (10)$$

By (5), (9), (6) and (10), we may choose a sufficient large integer $N = N(p, p_0)$ so that $\|f_N^*\|_X < 1$ and $\|T(f_N^*\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle})\|_Y > 4^{p_0}$. Put $f_p = \frac{1}{2^{p_0}} f_N^*\chi_{\langle c, c_p \rangle}$. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a division of E and Y a normed space. If $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{N}(X, Y)$ satisfies $\sup\{\|T\| : T \in \mathcal{T}\} = \infty$, then there exists I_p such that*

$$\sup\{\|T\|_{X(I_p)} : T \in \mathcal{T}\} = \infty.$$

PROOF. Suppose not. Then for each $1 \leq p \leq k$, we have

$$\sup\{\|T\|_{X(I_p)} : T \in \mathcal{T}\} < \infty. \quad (11)$$

Recall that every two elements of X almost everywhere equal on E are regarded as identical, and $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a division of E , we have

$$T(f) = \sum_{i=1}^k T(f\chi_{I_i}) \quad (12)$$

and thus by (12) $\|T(f)\|_Y \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \|T\|_{X(I_i)} \|f\|_X$ and so $\sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|T\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|T\|_{X(I_i)} < \infty$ by (11) a contradiction to our original hypothesis. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let Y be a normed space. If $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{N}(X, Y)$ satisfies*

$$\sup\{\|T\| : T \in \mathcal{T}\} < \infty,$$

then for each subinterval E_0 of E , we have $\sup\{\|T\|_{X(E_0)} : T \in \mathcal{T}\} < \infty$.

PROOF. Note that by (I), $f\chi_{E_0} \in X$ for each $f \in X$. Then we have for each $T \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\|T\|_{X(E_0)}(f) = \|T(f\chi_{E_0})\|_Y \leq \|T\| \|f\chi_{E_0}\|_X \leq \gamma \|T\| \|f\|_X \text{ by (VII).}$$

Consequently, $\sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|T\|_{X(E_0)} \leq \gamma \sup_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \|T\| < \infty$. \square

Theorem 3.6. *Let Y be a normed space. If $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(X, Y)$ such that for each $f \in X$, $M(f) = \sup\{\|T(f)\|_Y : T \in \mathcal{T}\} < \infty$, then $\sup\{\|T\| : T \in \mathcal{T}\} < \infty$.*

PROOF. Suppose the conclusion is false. By Lemma 3.4, there exists a subinterval J_1 of E such that $\sup\{\|T\|_{X(J_1)} : T \in \mathcal{T}\} = \infty$. By Lemma 3.4, there exists a subinterval J_2 of J_1 such that $\sup\{\|T\|_{X(J_2)} : T \in \mathcal{T}\} = \infty$. By induction, we can construct a decreasing sequence $\{J_i\}$ of subintervals of E with $\bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} J_i = \{y\}$ and for each i ,

$$\sup\{\|T\|_{X(J_i)} : T \in \mathcal{T}\} = \infty. \quad (13)$$

We may choose $x_0 \in E$ so that $|\langle x_0, y \rangle \cap J_i| > 0$ and

$$\sup\left\{\left\|T\right\|_{X(\langle x_0, y \rangle \cap J_i)} : T \in \mathcal{T}\right\} = \infty \quad (14)$$

for infinitely many i . Put

$$l = \min\{i : |\langle x_0, y \rangle \cap J_i| > 0 \text{ and (14) holds for infinitely many } i\}.$$

Then for each $w \in \text{int}(\langle x_0, y \rangle \cap J_l)$, we have $\langle w, y \rangle \supset \langle x_0, y \rangle \cap J_p$ for some p and (14) holds with $i = p$. By (14) and Lemma 3.5,

$$\sup\left\{\left\|T\right\|_{X(\langle w, y \rangle)} : T \in \mathcal{T}\right\} = \infty. \quad (15)$$

Choose $x_1 \in \text{int}(\langle x_0, y \rangle)$. Then by (15) with $w = x_1$, there exists $f_1^* \in X(\langle x_1, y \rangle)$ and $T_1 \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\|f_1^*\|_X < 1$ and $\|T_1(f_1^*)\|_Y > 4$. By Lemma 3.3 with $p_0 = 1$, there exists $x_2 \in \text{int}(\langle x_1, y \rangle)$, $f_1 \in G(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle)$ such that $\|f_1\|_X < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\|T_1(f_1)\|_Y > 2$. By (15) with $w = x_2$, there exists $f_2^* \in X(\langle x_2, y \rangle)$ and $T_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\|f_2^*\|_X < 1$ and $\|T_2(f_2^*)\|_Y > 4^2$. By Lemma 3.3 with $p_0 = 2$, there exists $x_3 \in \text{int}(\langle x_2, y \rangle)$, $f_2 \in G(\langle x_2, x_3 \rangle)$ such that $\|f_2\|_X < \frac{1}{2^2}$ and $\|T_2(f_2)\|_Y > 2^2$. Proceeding in this way and by Lemma 3.3, we can construct

- (i) a strictly monotone sequence of points $\{x_n\}$ in $(\langle x_1, y \rangle)$ converging to y with $x_{n+1} \in \text{int}(\langle x_n, y \rangle)$ and
- (ii) a sequence $\{f_n\} \subset G$ and $\{T_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ such that $f_n \in G(\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle)$ with $\|f_n\|_X < \frac{1}{2^n}$ and $\|T_n(f_n)\|_Y > 2^n$.

Since $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|f_k\|_X < \infty$, by (i), (ii) and (IV), we have $f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k \in X$. Claim.

There is a subsequence $\{f_{n_k}\}$ such that for $k \geq 1$:

- (a) $\|T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_{k+1}})\|_Y > 1 + k + \sum_{j=1}^k M(f_{n_j})$ and
- (b) $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq k} \|T_{n_i}(f_{n_{k+1}})\|_Y < 2^{-k-1}$.

The proof of the claim is done by induction. Choose $n_1 = 1$. Since $f \in X$, and $|\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by (VI), $\|f\chi_{\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle}\|_X \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By (N3), $\|T(f\chi_{\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle})\|_Y \rightarrow 0$ for each $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Note that we have $f_n =$

$f\chi_{\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle}$ for all n . Recall also that $\|T_n(f_n)\|_Y > 2^n$ for all $n \geq 1$. We may choose $f_{n_2} \in \{f_n\}$ and T_{n_2} such that

$$\|T_{n_2}(f_{n_2})\|_Y > 1 + 1 + M(f_1) \text{ and } \|T_{n_1}(f_{n_2})\|_Y < 2^{-1-1};$$

so the claim holds when $k = 1$.

Now suppose that the claim is valid for some positive integer $k = q$ for some $\{f_1, f_{n_2}, \dots, f_{n_q}, f_{n_{q+1}}\}$ and $\{T_1, T_{n_2}, \dots, T_{n_{q+1}}\}$. Since $f \in X$, and $|\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, by (VI), $\|f\chi_{\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle}\|_X \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By (N3), $\|T(f\chi_{\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle})\|_Y \rightarrow 0$ for each $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Note that $f_n = f\chi_{\langle x_n, x_{n+1} \rangle}$ and $\|T_n(f_n)\|_Y > 2^n$ for all $n \geq 1$. We may choose $f_{n_{q+2}} \in \{f_n\}$ and $T_{n_{q+2}}$ such that

$$\|T_{n_{q+2}}(f_{n_{q+2}})\|_Y > 1 + q + 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{q+1} M(f_{n_j}) \text{ and } \sup_{1 \leq i \leq q+1} \|T_{n_i}(f_{n_{q+2}})\|_Y < 2^{-(1+q)-1}$$

so the claim holds when $k = q + 1$. By induction, the claim is proved.

Since $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|f_k\|_X < \infty$, the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|f_{n_k}\|_X < \infty$, so by Axiom (IV), $f_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_{n_k} \in X$. Now, for $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{n_{k+1}}(f_0)\|_Y &= \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_j}) + T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_{k+1}}) + \sum_{j=k+2}^{\infty} T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_j}) \right\|_Y \\ &= \|T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_{k+1}}) - \left\{ -\sum_{j=1}^k T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_j}) - \sum_{j=k+2}^{\infty} T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_j}) \right\}\|_Y \\ &\geq \|T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_{k+1}})\|_Y - \left\| \sum_{j=1}^k T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_j}) + \sum_{j=k+2}^{\infty} T_{n_{k+1}}(f_{n_j}) \right\|_Y \\ &\geq 1 + k + \sum_{j=1}^k M(f_{n_j}) - \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k M(f_{n_j}) + \left\| \sum_{j=k+2}^{\infty} T_{n_{k+1}} f_{n_j} \right\|_Y \right\} \\ &\geq 1 + k - \sum_{j=k+2}^{\infty} 2^{-j-1} \geq k. \end{aligned}$$

So we have $M(f_0) \geq \sup_{k \geq 1} \|T_{n_{k+1}}(f_0)\| = \infty$ a contradiction. \square

In Section 4, we shall give an application in which Theorem 3.6 holds but the classical Banach-Steinhaus Theorem (Corollary 3.7) does not seem to

apply. Denoting the space of all bounded linear operators from X into Y by $\mathcal{B}(X, Y)$, we have the following assertion.

Corollary 3.7. *Let Y be a normed space. If $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X, Y)$ such that for each $f \in X$, $M(f) = \sup\{\|T(f)\|_Y : T \in \mathcal{T}\} < \infty$, then $\sup\{\|T\| : T \in \mathcal{T}\} < \infty$.*

PROOF. By (I), (III), (V), (VI) and (VII), every bounded linear operator is nice. \square

4 An Application

Definition 4.1. An interval function F is said to be *continuous* if whenever $|I| \rightarrow 0$, we have $|F(I)| \rightarrow 0$.

By using [8, Theorem 6], it is easy to see that if $f \in H(E)$, then the interval function F defined by $F(I) = \int_I f$ is continuous on E . Hence the space $H(E)$ as well as its subspace $CL(E)$ can be equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|$, where $\|f\| = \sup_I |\int_I f|$ for each $f \in H(E)$, where the supremum is taken over all subinterval I of E .

The next result gives a characterization of all Cauchy-Lebesgue integrable functions on E .

Lemma 4.2. $f \in CL(E) \iff$ *there exists an additive continuous interval function F and a finite subset Q of E such that f is Lebesgue integrable on every subinterval J with $\int_J f = F(J)$, where $J \cap Q = \emptyset$.*

PROOF. (\implies) For each $f \in CL(E)$, we let $F(I) = (CL) \int_I f$ for every interval $I \subset E$, and $Q = \text{NA}(f)$.

(\impliedby) Since Q is finite and since F is continuous, it is easy to verify that F satisfies (SL) condition on Q . Hence for $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for any δ -fine partial division $D = \{(I, \xi)\}$ of Q , we have $(D) \sum |F(I)| < \varepsilon$. We claim that [6, Theorem 3] applies here. Define $\delta_0 : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by $\delta_0(\xi) = \delta(\xi)$ if $\xi \in Q$ and $\delta_0(\xi) = \text{dist}(\xi, Q)$ otherwise. Take $A = F(E)$ and $G = E - Q$. Then for any non-absolute subset I_0 of G involving δ_0 , we have for some δ_0 -fine cover $D_0 = \{(I, \xi)\}$ of Q ,

$$|F(I_0) - F(E)| = \left| (D_0) \sum F(I) \right| \leq (D_0) \sum |F(I)| < \varepsilon$$

since F is an additive interval function satisfying (SL). Since f is Lebesgue integrable on every subinterval J with $\int_J f = F(J)$, where $J \cap Q = \emptyset$, [6,

Theorem 3] holds. Thus f is Henstock integrable on E with $F(I) = \int_I f$ for each subinterval I of E . Hence $Q = \text{NA}(f)$ and consequently $f \in CL(E)$.

Lemma 4.2. *If $f \in CL(E)$, then there exists a sequence $\{K_n\}$ of figures such that for all n , $K_n \subset K_{n+1} \subset E$ with $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = E$, $f \in L(K_n)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f\chi_{K_n} - f\| = 0$.*

PROOF. Let $F(I) = (CL) \int_I f$ and $Q = \text{NA}(f) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\}$. Since F satisfies (SL) on Q , for each n , there exists $\delta_n : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for any δ_n -fine division D_n of Q , we have $(D_n) \sum |F(I)| < \frac{1}{n}$. We may assume that $\delta_1 > \delta_2 > \dots > \delta_n > \dots$. For each n , we fix a δ_n -fine division D_n of Q . Put $P_n = \bigcup \{J : (J, x) \in D_n\}$. Then there are at most $l2^m$ interval-point pairs in each D_n , and $|\partial P_n| = 0$. Put $K_n = E - P_n$. Then $\{K_n\}$ is a sequence of figures with $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = E$. Note that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $|P_n| = |E - K_n| \rightarrow 0$. Consequently, by the continuity of F , we have $\|f\chi_{K_n} - f\| = \|f\chi_{P_n}\| \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 4.3. *If g is a multiplier for $CL(E)$, and $\{K_n\}$ be given as in Lemma 4.2. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|fg\chi_{K_n} - fg\| = 0$.*

PROOF. Repeat the proof of Lemma 4.2 with the following modifications.

- (a) f is replaced by fg and
- (b) $F(I) = \int_I f$ is replaced by $F_1(I) = (CL) \int_I fg$.

Observing that F_1 satisfies (SL) on Q , we have the result. \square

We shall next apply our uniform boundedness theorem (Theorem 3.6) to prove Theorem 4.5. Note that Corollary 3.7 does not seem to apply.

Theorem 4.4. *If g is a multiplier for $CL(E)$, then $T : CL(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $T(f) = \int_E fg$ is a bounded linear functional on $CL(E)$.*

PROOF. We first show that $T : CL(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a nice operator (see Definition 3.2) with $G = L(E)$, $X = CL(E)$ and $Y = \mathbb{R}$. Since each $f \in CL(E) \subset H(E)$, we see that T satisfies conditions (N2), (N3) of definition 3.2. It remains to verify that condition (N1) holds for T . Now, let J be any subinterval of E and for any subinterval I of J , $|\int_I f\chi_{K_n} - \int_I f| \leq \|f\chi_{K_n} - f\|$ which tends to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by Lemma 4.3. So the first condition of (N1) is satisfied.

Next we will prove that the second condition of (N1) is satisfied. We observe that

$$|T(f\chi_{K_n}\chi_I) - T(f\chi_I)| = \left| \int_I f\chi_{K_n}g - \int_I fg \right| \leq \|f\chi_{K_n}g - fg\|$$

which tends to zero by Lemma 4.4. Thus (N1) condition is satisfied. The theorem then follows from Theorem 3.6 with $X(E) = CL(E)$, $G(E) = L(E)$, Axioms (I) to (VII) hold and note that Axiom (IV) holds by [7, Lemma 4.1] and Lemma 4.2. \square

Corollary 4.5. *If $fg \in CL(E)$ for each $f \in CL(E)$, then g is almost everywhere a function of strongly bounded variation on E .*

PROOF. By Theorem 4.5, the linear functional $T : CL(E) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $T(f) = \int_E fg$ is bounded on $CL(E)$. Although the spaces $(CL(E), \|\cdot\|)$ and $(H(E), \|\cdot\|)$ are not complete, we may still apply the Hahn-Banach Theorem to normed spaces. See, for example, [9, Theorem 3.3]. By Hahn-Banach Theorem [9, Theorem 3.3.], there exists a bounded linear functional T_1 on $H(E)$ such that $T(f) = T_1(f)$ for all $f \in CL(E)$. By [7, Theorem 3.2], there exists a function g_0 of strongly bounded variation on E such that

$$T_1(f) = \int_E fg_0 \text{ for all } f \in H(E).$$

As $T(f) = T_1(f)$ for all $f \in L(E) \subset CL(E)$, we have $\int_E fg = \int_E fg_0$ for all $f \in L(E)$. Hence $g = g_0$ almost everywhere on E and we are done. \square

From the proof of Corollary 4.6, we also have the following.

Corollary 4.6. *If $T \in CL(E)^*$, the conjugate space of $CL(E)$, then there exists a function of strongly bounded variation on E such that $T(f) = \int_E fg$ for all $f \in CL(E)$.*

We can now give the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose $CL(E) \subset X(E)$. If g is a multiplier for X , then g is almost everywhere a function of strongly bounded variation on E .*

PROOF. By (II) and repeating the proof of [5, Theorem 12.8], g is almost everywhere bounded on E . Since g is almost everywhere bounded on E , we can verify that $NA(fg) \subset NA(f)$. Note that $f \in CL(E)$, $NA(f)$ is a finite set and so is $NA(fg)$. By the continuity of the X -primitive of fg ((VI)) and Lemma 4.2, $fg \in CL(E)$. By Corollary 4.6, we have the result. \square

5 Remarks on One Dimensional Results

The first theorem is well known.

Theorem 5.1. *If $g \in BV([a, b])$ and F is continuous on $[a, b]$, then g is Riemann-Stieltjes integrable with respect to F on $[a, b]$ with*

$$(RS) \int_a^b g \, dF = F(b)g(b) - F(a)g(a) - (RS) \int_a^b F dg.$$

By using the integration by substitution theorem for non-absolute integral (see for example [4, page 186, Exercise 2], we have the next theorem.

Remark 5.2. Every function of bounded variation on $[a, b]$ is a multiplier for non-absolute integral (with a continuous primitive).

By Corollary 4.6 and Remark 5.2, we see that the multipliers for non-absolute integrals (with a continuous primitive) are essentially the space of all essentially bounded variation on $[a, b]$.

Acknowledgment. I would like to thank Dr. Chew Tuan-Seng for his help and advice.

References

- [1] Z. Buczolic, *Henstock integrable functions are Lebesgue integrable on a portion*, Proc. American Math Soc. **111** (1991), 127–129.
- [2] R. Henstock, *Lectures on the theory of integration*, World Scientific, 1988.
- [3] J. Kurweil, *On multiplication of Perron-integrable functions*, Czech. Math J. **23** (1973), 542–566.
- [4] R. M. McLeod, *The generalized Riemann integral*, Carus Math Monographs 20 (1980), MAA.
- [5] Lee Peng Yee, *Lanzhou Lectures on Henstock Integration*, World Scientific, 1989.
- [6] Lee Peng Yee, *Harnack extension for the Henstock integral in the Euclidean space*, Journal of Mathematical Study Vol **27** (1), 5–8.
- [7] Lee Tuo Yeong, Chew Tuan Seng and Lee Peng Yee, *Characterization of multipliers for the double Henstock integrals*, to appear in Bulletin of the Australian Math. Soc.
- [8] Lee Tuo Yeong, Chew Tuan Seng and Lee Peng Yee, *On Henstock integrability in Euclidean space*, Real Analysis Exchange, **22** (1996–97), 382–389.
- [9] Walter Rudin, *Functional Analysis*, MacGraw-Hill, 1991.