

Charles Arthur Coppin\*, Department of Mathematics, University of Dallas,  
Irving, Texas 75062

## PROPERTIES OF A GENERALIZED STIELTJES INTEGRAL DEFINED ON DENSE SUBSETS OF AN INTERVAL

### 1. Introduction

For real-valued functions  $f$  and  $g$  with domain including a closed interval  $[a, b]$ , we investigate an integral of  $f$  with respect to  $g$  defined on certain dense subsets of  $[a, b]$  ( $\Delta = \{M : a \text{ and } b \text{ belong to } M \text{ and } \overline{M} = [a, b]\}$ ). This concept was defined independently by Coppin [2] and Vance [4]. In 1972, we [1] showed the following: Suppose  $f$  and  $g$  are functions with domain  $[a, b]$  and  $M$  belongs to  $\Delta$ . Then  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M$  and  $f|_M$  and  $g|_M$  have no common points of discontinuity if and only if for any countable member  $M'$  of  $\Delta$  which is a subset of  $M$ ,  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M'$ .

### 2. Preliminary Definitions, Theorems and Notation

Herein, all functions are real-valued functions.

Throughout this paper,  $[a, b]$  denotes a closed number interval and  $\Delta$  denotes the set of all subsets of  $[a, b]$  whose closure is  $[a, b]$  and which contains  $a$  and  $b$ . In general, an interval (or an interval of  $M$ ) is a set  $[c, d]_M = [c, d] \cap M$  where  $M$  is a member of  $\Delta$ ,  $[c, d]$  is a subinterval of  $[a, b]$  and  $c$  and  $d$  belong to  $M$ .

Two intervals,  $A$  and  $B$ , are said to be nonoverlapping if and only if  $A \cap B$  does not contain an interval. A nonempty collection of intervals is said to be nonoverlapping if and only if each two distinct members of the collection is nonoverlapping.

---

\*The author was partially supported by the O'Hara Chemical Sciences Institute at the University of Dallas. He expresses appreciation to the Department of Mathematical Sciences at the United States Air Force Academy for the use of its library during the author's tenure as Distinguished Visiting Professor at the Academy for AY 1990-1991.

Received by the editors October 5, 1992

If  $M$  is a member of  $\Delta$ , then  $D$  is said to be a partition of  $M$  if and only if  $D$  is a finite collection of non-overlapping subintervals of  $M$  whose union is  $M$ . By  $E(D)$  we mean the set of end points of members of  $D$ .  $D'$  is said to be a refinement of the partition  $D$  if and only if  $D'$  itself is a partition of  $M$  and  $E(D) \subseteq E(D')$ . We say that  $\delta$  is a choice function on  $D$  if and only if  $\delta$  is a function with domain  $D$  where  $\delta(d) \in d$  for each  $d$  in  $D$ .

By the notation,  $\Sigma(f, g, D, \delta)$ , we mean

$$\Sigma(f, g, D, \delta) = \sum_{\text{all } [p, q]_M \in D} f(\delta([p, q]_M)) \cdot [g(q) - g(p)].$$

where  $D$  is a partition of a member of  $\Delta$ ,  $\delta$  is a choice function on  $D$ , and  $f$  and  $g$  are functions with domain including  $\cup D$ .

Suppose that  $M$  is a member of  $\Delta$  and  $f$  and  $g$  are functions with domain including  $M$ . Then  $f$  is said to be  $g$ -integrable on  $M$  if and only if there exists a number  $W$  (called "an integral of  $f$  with respect to  $g$ " and denoted by  $\int_M f dg$ ) such that for each positive number  $\epsilon$ , there is a partition  $D$  of  $M$  such that

$$|W - \Sigma(f, g, D', \delta)| < \epsilon$$

for each refinement  $D'$  of  $D$  and each choice function  $\delta$  on  $D'$ .

The following Stieltjes analogues will be used at various points in this paper. No proofs of these theorems are given because of similarity to their Stieltjes counterparts.

**Theorem 2.1** *If  $f$  and  $g$  are functions with domain including  $M \in \Delta$  and each of  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  is an integral of  $f$  with respect to  $g$  on  $M$ , then  $W_1 = W_2$ .*

**Theorem 2.2** *If  $f$  and  $g$  are functions with domain including  $M$  a member of  $\Delta$  and  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M$ , then  $f|_M$  and  $g|_M$  have no common discontinuities on either side of any member of  $M$ .*

**Theorem 2.3** *Suppose  $f$  and  $g$  are functions with domain including  $M$  a member of  $\Delta$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

(a)  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M$

(b) If  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a partition  $D$  of  $M$  such that, if  $D'$  is a refinement of  $D$ , then

$$|\Sigma(f, g, D, \delta) - \Sigma(f, g, D', \delta')| < \epsilon$$

for each choice function  $\delta$  on  $D$  and each choice function  $\delta'$  on  $D'$ .

### 3. Results

The proof of the following theorem is made easier by using the Cauchy criterion of limits. From McLeod [3], we see that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow z} (h|M)(x)$  exists if and only if for each  $\epsilon > 0$  there exists some  $\alpha > 0$  such that  $|h(x_1) - h(x_2)| < \epsilon$  for all  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  in  $(z - \alpha, z + \alpha) \cap M$ . If we add the requirement that  $x_1 < z < x_2$ , an equivalent statement results that serves our purposes very well.

**Theorem 3.1** *If  $f$  and  $g$  are functions with domain including  $M \cup \{z\}$  where  $z$  belongs to  $[a, b] - M$  and  $M$  is a member of  $\Delta$ , and  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M$ , then  $f|M$  or  $g|M$  has a limit at  $z$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $f$  and  $g$  do not have limits at  $z$ .

Then, there is  $k > 0$  such that for each  $\alpha > 0$ , we have

$$(1) \quad |g(v) - g(u)| > k \text{ and } |f(x) - f(y)| > k$$

for some  $u, v, x, y$  in  $M$  where  $z - \alpha < u < z < v < z + \alpha$ ,  $u < x < z < y < v$ .

Because  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable and (1), there is a partition  $D$  of  $M$  such that

- (a) there is an element  $[u, v]_M$  of  $D$  which has the property that  $u < z < v$  and  $|g(u) - g(v)| > k$  and there are elements  $x$  and  $y$  in  $M$  and between  $u < x < z < y < v$  such that  $|f(x) - f(y)| > k$ ,
- (b)  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  are choice functions on  $D$  which are equal everywhere on  $D$  except that  $\delta_1([u, v]_M) = x$  and  $\delta_2([u, v]_M) = y$ , and
- (c)  $|\int_M f dg - \sum(f, g, D, \delta)| < \frac{k^2}{2}$  where  $\delta = \delta_1$  or  $\delta = \delta_2$ .

In (c), setting  $\delta = \delta_1$  and  $\delta = \delta_2$ , and combining the two resultant inequalities, we obtain

$$(2) \quad |f(x) - f(y)| \cdot |g(v) - g(u)| < k^2.$$

But, (2) is in contradiction with (a). Therefore,  $f$  or  $g$  has a limit at  $z$ .

**Theorem 3.2** *Suppose that  $f$  and  $g$  are functions with domain including  $M$  such that*

- (a)  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M$ ,
- (b)  $M' \subseteq M$  where  $M' \in \Delta$ , and
- (c) if  $z$  belongs to  $M - M'$  and  $\epsilon$  is a positive number, then there is an open interval  $s$  containing  $z$  such that  $|f(x) - f(z)||g(v) - g(u)| < \epsilon$  where each of  $u, v$ , and  $x$  is in  $s \cap M$ ,  $u < z < v$ , and  $u \leq x \leq v$ .

Then  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M'$ , and  $\int_M f dg = \int_{M'} f dg$ .

Proof. Suppose  $\epsilon > 0$ . Since  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M$ , there is a partition  $D$  of  $M$  such that, if  $D'$  is a refinement of  $D$ , then

$$(3) \quad \left| \int_M f dg - \sum (f, g, D', \delta) \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for each choice function  $\delta$  on  $D'$ .

If  $E(D) \subseteq M'$ , the proof is straightforward. Thus, let us suppose that an element of  $D$  has an end point not belonging to  $M'$ .

Suppose  $A = E(D) \cap (M')^c$  which can be written as

$$A = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_N\}.$$

There is a collection  $G = \{(r_i, s_i) : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  of disjoint open intervals each of which contains exactly one element of  $A$ , contains no point of  $E(D) \cap M'$ , has end points in  $M'$ , and, by hypothesis, if  $x_i$  belongs to  $A$ , then

$$(4) \quad |f(x) - f(x_i)| |g(v) - g(u)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2N}$$

for each  $u, v$  and  $x$  in  $(r_i, s_i) \cap M$  where  $u < x_i < v$ ,  $u \leq x \leq v$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ .

Let  $D''$  denote a refinement of  $D$  such that

$$E(D'') = E(D) \cup \{r_1, s_1, r_2, s_2, \dots, r_N, s_N\}.$$

Let  $P$  denote a partition of  $M'$  such that  $E(P) = E(D'') \cap M'$ . Suppose that  $P'$  is a refinement of  $P$ . Let  $[c_i, d_i]_{M'}$  denote the element of  $P'$  such that  $c_i < x_i < d_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ .

From (4), since  $c_i, d_i$  and  $x_i$  are in  $(r_i, s_i) \cap M$ , we have

$$(5) \quad |f(x)[g(d_i) - g(c_i)] - f(x_i)[g(x_i) - g(c_i)] - f(x_i)[g(d_i) - g(x_i)]| < \frac{\epsilon}{2N}$$

where  $x$  is any number in  $[c_i, d_i]_{M'}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Since there are  $N$  elements in  $A$ , then, from (5) we have

$$(6) \quad \left| \sum_{i=1}^N f(x)[g(d_i) - g(c_i)] - \sum_{i=1}^N f(x_i)[g(x_i) - g(c_i)] - \sum_{i=1}^N f(x_i)[g(d_i) - g(x_i)] \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Now, let  $\delta''$  be an arbitrary choice function on  $D'$ . In addition, let  $D'''$  denote a refinement of  $D$  such that  $E(D''') = E(P') \cup E(D)$ . Then, we have from (3)

$$(7) \quad \left| \int_M f dg - \sum(f, g, D''', \delta') \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for a choice function  $\delta'$  on  $D'''$  where  $\delta'([p, q]_M) = \delta''([p, q]_{M'})$  for each  $[p, q]_M$  in  $P$  such that no point of  $A$  is in  $[p, q]$  and  $\delta'([c_i, x_i]_M) = \delta'([x_i, d_i]_M) = x_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ .

Combining (7) and (6), we have

$$\left| \int_M f dg - \sum(f, g, P', \delta') \right| < \epsilon$$

for each choice function  $\delta'$  on  $P'$ .

Therefore, by definition,  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M'$  and, by Theorem 2.1,  $\int_M f dg = \int_{M'} f dg$ .

**Theorem 3.3** *If  $f$  and  $g$  are real-valued functions with domain including  $[a, b]$  such that  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on some uncountable member of  $\Delta$ , then  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on uncountably many members of  $\Delta$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on some uncountable member  $M$  of  $\Delta$  and  $T$  is the collection of all members of  $\Delta$  over which  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable. If  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M - \{x\}$  for each  $x \in M$ , then  $T$  is uncountable.

Let  $Q = \{z : z \in M \text{ and } f \text{ is not } g\text{-integrable on } M - \{z\}\}$ .

If  $Q$  is void or countable, then  $T$  is uncountable. We show that  $Q$  cannot be uncountable.

Assume that  $Q$  is uncountable. If  $z$  is a member of  $Q$ , then the property described in part (c) of Theorem 3.2 where  $M' = M - \{z\}$  cannot be true of  $f$  and  $g$  at  $z$ . This means there is a positive integer  $n$  such that, if  $s$  is an open interval containing  $z$ , then

$$|f(x) - f(z)||g(v) - g(u)| > \frac{1}{n}$$

for some  $u, v$ , and  $x$  in  $s \cap M$  where  $u < z < v$  and  $u \leq x \leq v$ . In fact, because  $Q$  is uncountable, we know that there exists some positive integer  $n$  where this inequality holds for infinitely many values of  $z$ . We denote this set by  $C$ .

Let  $N$  denote a positive integer so that  $\frac{N}{n} > 1$ .

There is a partition  $D$  of  $M$  such that, if  $D'$  is a refinement of  $D$ , then

$$(8) \quad \left| \int_M f dg - \sum (f, g, D', \delta) \right| < \frac{1}{2}$$

for each choice function  $\delta$  on  $D'$ . Since  $C$  is infinite, there is a member  $[c, d]_M$  of  $D$  which contains infinitely many members of  $C$ . Let  $A$  denote a finite subset of  $C \cap (c, d)$  such that  $A$  has exactly  $N$  elements. Let  $A = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N\}$  where  $z_1 < z_2 < z_3 < \dots < z_N$ . And, let  $F$  denote a partition of  $[c, d]_M$  such that  $F = \{[c, u_1]_M, [u_1, v_1]_M, [v_1, u_2]_M, \dots, [u_N, v_N]_M, [v_N, d]_M\}$ . While constructing  $F$ , remembering the defining characteristics of  $C$ , we choose  $u_i, v_i$ , and  $x_i$  from  $M$  so that

$$|f(x_i) - f(z_i)| |g(u_i) - g(v_i)| > \frac{1}{n}$$

where  $u_i < z_i < v_i$  and  $u_i < x_i < v_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$

Let  $P$  denote a refinement of  $D$  such that

$$E(P) = E(D) \cup \{u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2, \dots, u_N, v_N\}.$$

Therefore, from (8), we have

$$(9) \quad \left| \int_M f dg - \sum (f, g, P - F, \delta) - \sum_{i=1}^N f(r_i)[g(v_i) - g(u_i)] \right| < \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$(10) \quad \left| \int_M f dg - \sum (f, g, P - F, \delta) - \sum_{i=1}^N f(s_i)[g(v_i) - g(u_i)] \right| < \frac{1}{2}$$

where  $\delta$  is some choice function on  $P - F$ ,  $r_i = x_i$  and  $s_i = z_i$  if  $[f(x_i) - f(z_i)][g(v_i) - g(u_i)] > 0$  or  $r_i = z_i$  and  $s_i = x_i$  if  $[f(x_i) - f(z_i)][g(v_i) - g(u_i)] < 0$ . Combining (9) and (10), we have

$$(11) \quad 1 < \frac{N}{n} < \sum_{i=1}^N [g(r_i) - g(s_i)][f(v_i) - f(u_i)] < 1$$

Obviously, the preceding is a contradiction and so  $Q$  is countable. Therefore  $T$  is uncountable.

**Corollary 3.4** *If  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on a member  $M$  of  $\Delta$  and no other member of  $\Delta$ , then  $M$  is countable.*

**Theorem 3.5** *If  $M$  is a countable member of  $\Delta$ , then there are real-valued functions  $f$  and  $g$  with domain  $[a, b]$  such that  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M$  and no other member of  $\Delta$ .*

Proof. Suppose  $M$  is a countable set in  $\Delta$ . Thus, we let  $M - \{a, b\} = \{r_1, r_2, r_3, \dots\}$  and  $r_0 = b$ .

Let  $\phi$  and  $\theta$  denote functions with domain  $M$  such that  $\phi(a) = \theta(a) = 0$ ,  $\phi(b) = \theta(b) = 1$ , and

$$(12) \quad \theta(r_n) = \sum_{\text{all } p \text{ where } r_p < r_n} \frac{1}{2^p} \text{ for each } r_n \text{ in } M - \{a, b\}$$

and

$$(13) \quad \phi(r_n) = \sum_{\text{all } p \text{ where } r_p \leq r_n} \frac{1}{2^p} \text{ for each } r_n \text{ in } M - \{a, b\}.$$

Clearly, both  $\phi$  and  $\theta$  are increasing functions. As a consequence,  $\phi(r_n^-)$ ,  $\phi(r_n^+)$ ,  $\theta(r_n^-)$  and  $\theta(r_n^+)$  exist for each positive integer  $n$ . From the definition of  $\phi$ , we know that  $|\phi(r_n) - \phi(r_n^-)| = \frac{1}{2^n}$  and that  $\phi$  is continuous on the right at each  $r_n \in M - \{a, b\}$ . Likewise, From the definition of  $\theta$ , we know that  $|\theta(r_n^+) - \theta(r_n)| = \frac{1}{2^n}$  and that  $\theta$  is continuous on the left at each  $r_n \in M - \{a, b\}$ . We know that  $\theta$  is continuous on the left at  $b$ .

Let  $f$  and  $g$  denote functions with domain the interval  $[a, b]$  such that

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \phi(x) & \text{if } x \text{ belongs to } M \\ 2 & \text{if } x \text{ belongs to } [a, b] - M \end{cases}$$

and

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \theta(x) & \text{if } x \text{ belongs to } M \\ 2 & \text{if } x \text{ belongs to } [a, b] - M \end{cases}$$

Suppose  $\epsilon > 0$ .

There is a positive integer  $N$  such that  $\frac{1}{2^N} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ . Let

$$Q = \{r_i : i \text{ is a nonnegative integer and } i \leq N\}.$$

If  $r_i$  is an element of  $Q$ , since  $\theta$  is continuous on the left at  $r_i$ , there is a number  $t_i$  of  $M$  such that no element of  $Q$  is between  $t_i$  and  $r_i$ ,  $t_i < r_i$ , and

$$|\theta(r) - \theta(s)| < \frac{\epsilon}{6(N + 2)} \text{ for all } r \text{ and } s \text{ in } [t_i, r_i]_M.$$

Let  $D$  denote a partition of  $M$  where

$$E(D) = Q \cup \{a, b\} \cup \{t_i : i \text{ is a nonnegative integer and } i \leq N\}.$$

Suppose  $D'$  is a refinement of  $D$ . Let  $c$  and  $d$  denote any two consecutive elements of  $Q \cup \{a\}$  with  $c < d = r_i$ ,  $t_i$  is as described above, and  $s$  is the largest member of  $E(D')$  which is less than  $d$ . The following four inequalities hold:

$$(14) \quad |\phi(x)[\theta(t_i) - \theta(c)] - \phi(x)[\theta(s) - \theta(c)]| = |\phi(x)||\theta(t_i) - \theta(s)|$$

$$(15) \quad < \frac{\epsilon}{6(N+2)}$$

where  $x$  is any element of  $[c, t_i]_M$ .

$$(16) \quad |\phi(u)[\theta(d) - \theta(s)]| < \frac{\epsilon}{6(N+2)}$$

where  $u$  is any element of  $[s, d]_M$ .

$$(17) \quad |\phi(v)[\theta(d) - \theta(t_i)]| < \frac{\epsilon}{6(N+2)}$$

where  $v$  is any element of  $[t_i, d]_M$ .

$$(18) \quad |\phi(x)[\theta(s) - \theta(c)] - \sum \phi(z)[\theta(w) - \theta(r)]| < [\phi(d^-) - \phi(c)]$$

where the sum is taken over all  $[r, w]_M$  in  $D'$  where  $c \leq r < w \leq s$ , and  $z$  is any member of  $[r, w]_M$ .

Adding (14), (16), (17) and (18) we have

$$|\sum \phi(x)[\theta(q) - \theta(p)] - \sum \phi(y)[\theta(w) - \theta(r)]| < \frac{\epsilon}{2(N+2)} + [\phi(d^-) - \phi(c)]$$

where the first sum is taken over all  $[p, q]_M$  in  $D$  such that  $c \leq p < q \leq d$  and  $x$  is any element of  $[p, q]_M$ , and the second sum is taken over all  $[r, w]_M$  in  $D'$  such that  $c \leq r < w \leq d$  and  $y$  is any element of  $[r, w]_M$ . Therefore,

$$|\sum \phi(x)[\theta(q) - \theta(p)] - \sum \phi(y)[\theta(w) - \theta(r)]| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \sum [\phi(d^-) - \phi(c)]$$

where the first sum is taken over all  $[p, q]_M$  in  $D$  where  $x$  is any member of  $[p, q]_M$ , the second sum is taken over all  $[r, w]_M$  in  $D'$  where  $y$  is any member



of  $[r, w]_M$ , and the third sum is taken over all consecutive  $c$  and  $d$  of  $Q$ . Note that

$$\sum[\phi(d^-) - \phi(c)] + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{2^k} = 1$$

and, therefore,

$$\sum[\phi(d^-) - \phi(c)] = \frac{1}{2^N} < \frac{\epsilon}{4}$$

where the sum is over all  $c$  and  $d$  of  $Q$ . Now,

$$|\sum \phi(x)[\theta(q) - \theta(p)] - \sum \phi(y)[\theta(w) - \theta(r)]| < \epsilon$$

where the first sum is taken over all  $[p, q]_M$  in  $D$  where  $x$  is any member of  $[p, q]_M$  and the second sum is taken over all  $[r, w]_M$  in  $D'$  where  $y$  is any member of  $[r, w]_M$ .

What has been shown is that, if  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a partition  $D$  of  $M$  such that, if  $D'$  is a refinement of  $D$ , then

$$|\sum(f, g, D, \delta) - \sum(f, g, D', \delta')| < \epsilon$$

for each choice function  $\delta$  on  $D$  and each choice function  $\delta'$  on  $D'$ . Remember that  $f(x) = \phi(x)$  and  $g(x) = \theta(x)$  if  $x$  belongs to  $M$ . By Theorem 2.3 this means that  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M$ .

Now, we must show that  $f$  is not integrable with respect to  $g$  on any other member of  $\Delta$ .

Assume there is a member  $M'$  of  $\Delta$  such that  $M \neq M'$  and  $f$  is  $g$ -integrable on  $M'$ . There are two cases.

Case 1.  $M'$  contains a point not in  $M$ . Let  $A = M' - M$ .  $A$  is bounded below by  $a$ . Thus, let  $K$  denote the greatest lower bound of  $A$ . Since  $f(a) = 0$  and, by Theorem 2.2, both  $f|M'$  and  $g|M'$  cannot have right discontinuities at  $a$ , the number  $a$  cannot be a limit point of  $M' - M$ . Therefore,  $K > a$ . The members of  $M'$  less than  $K$  are members of  $M$  only. Thus,  $f|M'(x) < 1$  and  $g|M'(x) < 1$  for each  $x$  in  $M' \cap [a, K)$

Assume  $K$  belongs to  $M'$ . Let  $K \notin M$ . Then  $f(K) = g(K)$ . We have that  $f|M'$  and  $g|M'$  are discontinuous on the left at  $K$ . By Theorem 2.2,  $f$  is not  $g$ -integrable on  $M'$ . Now, let  $K \in M$ . Then  $f|M'$  and  $g|M'$  are discontinuous on the right at  $K$ . Again, by Theorem 2.2,  $f$  is not  $g$ -integrable on  $M'$ .

Now, assume  $K$  does not belong to  $M'$ , by Theorem 3.1,  $f$  is not  $g$ -integrable on  $M'$  for neither  $f$  nor  $g$  has a limit at  $K$ .

Case 2.  $M'$  is a proper subset of  $M$ . There is a positive integer  $N$  such that  $r_N$  belongs to  $M$  but not  $M'$ . Recollect that on  $M$ ,  $f$  and  $g$  are  $\phi$  and  $\theta$ ,

respectively. Earlier, we learned that  $\phi$  and  $\theta$  do not have limits at  $r_N$ . This contradicts Theorem 3.1. Thus,  $f$  is not  $g$ -integrable on  $M'$ .

Therefore  $f$  is not  $g$ -integrable on any member of  $\Delta$  distinct from  $M$ .

**Acknowledgment.** The author wishes to thank the referees for their helpful comments. This paper is better because of their time and effort.

## References

- [1] Charles A. Coppin and Joseph F. Vance, *On A Generalized Riemann-Stieltjes Integral*, *Rivista Di Matematica Della Universita Di Parma* (3) 1 (1972), 73-78.
- [2] Charles A. Coppin, *Concerning and Integral and Number Sets Dense in an Interval*, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Texas Library Austin, Texas, 1968.
- [3] Robert M. McLeod, *The Generalized Riemann Integral*, The Mathematical Association of America, Washington, D. C., 1980.
- [4] Joseph F. Vance, *A Representation Theorem for Bounded Linear Functionals*, Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Texas Library, Austin, Texas, 1967.