

Integrals of Stieltjes Type.

By

Tôzîrô OGASAWARA.

(Received Sept. 20, 1935.)

The integrals of Stieltjes type hitherto considered are classified in three types as follows :

Type	Point function as integrand	Set function as integrator
1	Real or complex	Real or complex
2	Vector	Real or complex
3	Real or complex	Vector

$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{valued} \\ \text{valued} \end{array} \right\}$

I shall in this paper apply the Kolmogoroffian⁽¹⁾ discussion of the absolutely convergent integral uniformly applicable to any type of integral above mentioned, which shall be equivalent to the usual integral for the 1st type, and to Bochner's⁽²⁾ and Dunford's⁽³⁾ for the 2nd type. In the case of the 3rd type Maeda's integral⁽⁴⁾ contains ours owing to the speciality⁽⁵⁾ of the integrator. I shall also give a definition equivalent to his. Most of the properties which hold for the Lebesgue integral also hold for ours ; hence I shall give certain theorems with which the integrator is concerned.

1. Preliminaries.

Let \mathfrak{R} be a complete linear vector space, and \mathfrak{N} the real or complex number system. Let V be an abstract set, \mathfrak{R} an additive family⁽⁶⁾ of point sets in V , and E a set of \mathfrak{R} . A set function $\alpha(E)$ on \mathfrak{R} to \mathfrak{R} or \mathfrak{N} is said to be completely additive, if for every sequence $\{E_n\}$ of disjoint sets in \mathfrak{R} , $\alpha(\sum_n E_n) = \sum_n \alpha(E_n)$. Let $\beta(E)$ ⁽⁷⁾ be the total varia-

- (1) A. Kolmogoroff, *Math. Ann.* **103** (1930), 654-696.
- (2) S. Bochner, *Fund. Math.* **20** (1933), 262-276.
- (3) N. Dunford, *Transactions A. M. S.* **37** (1935), 441-453.
- (4) F. Maeda, *this journal*, **4** (1934), 60-69.
- (5) F. Maeda, *ibid.*
- (6) S. Saks, *Théorie de L'intégrale*, (1933), 247.
- (7) That is, the maximum of $|\alpha(E_1)| + |\alpha(E_2)| + \dots$, where $E = E_1 + E_2 + \dots$

tion of α on E , and let $\beta(V)$ be finite. If for any set E' there exist two sets $E_1, E_2 \in \mathfrak{R}$ such that

$$(1) \quad E_1 \subset E' \subset E_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta(E_1) = \beta(E_2),$$

then I shall call E' an α -normal set. α -normal sets form a complete⁽¹⁾ additive family over \mathfrak{R} , which we shall denote by \mathfrak{R}_α . If we put $\alpha(E') = \alpha(E)$, $\alpha(E')$ is completely additive on \mathfrak{R}_α . I shall say that an additive family \mathfrak{R}_1 is α -equivalent to \mathfrak{R} if for any set $E \in \mathfrak{R}_1$ there exist two sets $E_1, E_2 \in \mathfrak{R}$ satisfying (1) and conversely. And I shall call E_1 an α -minorant set of E . A function $f(\lambda)$ on V to \mathfrak{R} or \mathfrak{N} is said to be α -measurable⁽²⁾ if $E[f(\lambda) \in \text{any open set in } \mathfrak{R} \text{ or } \mathfrak{N}] \in \mathfrak{R}_\alpha$.

2. Definition of Integral.

Let $f(\lambda)$ be any point function on V to \mathfrak{R} or \mathfrak{N} .

Let \mathfrak{R}_1 be α -equivalent to \mathfrak{R} and \mathfrak{D} a division of V into sets $E_i \in \mathfrak{R}_1$, or symbolically $\mathfrak{D} = (E_1, E_2, \dots)$. Put $\sum_{\mathfrak{D}} f(\lambda) \alpha(E) = \sum_i f(\lambda_i) \alpha(E_i)$, where $\lambda_i \in E_i$. $f(\lambda)$ is said to be integrable on V with respect to α , if

$$(1) \quad \epsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} |f(\lambda)| \beta(E) \quad \text{conv.}^{(3)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(f \cdot E) \beta(E) < \epsilon,^{(4)}$$

where $\text{Osc}(f \cdot E)$ is the oscillation of $f(\lambda)$ on E .

From (1) we have

$$(2) \quad \epsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \mathfrak{D}' \supseteq \mathfrak{D}^{(5)} \quad \left| \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} - \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} f(\lambda) \alpha(E) \right| < \epsilon,$$

hence there exists an element $F \in \mathfrak{R}$ or $\epsilon \mathfrak{N}$ such that

$$(3) \quad \epsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \mathfrak{D}' \supseteq \mathfrak{D}, \quad \left| F - \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} f(\lambda) \alpha(E) \right| < \epsilon,^{(6)}$$

and we call F the integral of $f(\lambda)$ on V , and write it as

(1) That is, \mathfrak{R}_α contains all the subsets of E for which $\beta(E) = 0$.

(2) This definition is equivalent to the ordinary one if $f(\lambda)$ is to \mathfrak{N} .

(3) If $|f(\lambda)|$ is bounded, this condition is superfluous.

(4) This is the abbreviated form of the fact that for any given positive number ϵ there exists a division \mathfrak{D} such that $\sum_{\mathfrak{D}} |f(\lambda)| \beta(E)$ converges and $\sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(f, E) \beta(E) < \epsilon$.

and I shall use similar abbreviations for analogous cases.

(5) That is \mathfrak{D}' is any subdivision of \mathfrak{D} .

(6) If $f(\lambda)$ and $\alpha(E)$ are real, (1) follows from (3) and $\sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} f(\lambda) \alpha(E)$ abs. conv.

$$\int_V f(\lambda) d\alpha(E).$$

In this definition the choice of an α -equivalent family is not essential. For if (1) holds for \mathfrak{R}_1 , it does so also for \mathfrak{R}_α . Conversely if (1) holds for \mathfrak{R}_α , it does so also for \mathfrak{R}_1 by considering α -minorant sets.

THEOREM. The conditions of integrability of $f(\lambda)$ on V with respect to α are

- 1° $|f(\lambda)|$ is integrable on V with respect to β ;
 - 2° $f(\lambda)$ is α -measurable,
- and
- 3° the set of values of $f(\lambda)$ on V , with the possible exception of the β -null set, is separable.

Proof. Let $f(\lambda)$ be integrable.

Since $\text{Osc}(|f|, E) \leq \text{Osc}(f, E)$, $|f(\lambda)|$ is integrable on V with respect to $\beta(E)$.

From (1)

$$(4) \quad \frac{1}{n}, \quad \mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}, \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}} \text{Osc}(f \cdot E) \beta(E) < \frac{1}{n^3},$$

where we may suppose that $\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n+1}}$.

If we put $f_n(\lambda) = f(\lambda_i)$ on $E_i^{(n)}$, $\lambda_i \in E_i^{(n)}$, where λ_i is fixed, and $\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}} = (E_1^{(n)}, E_2^{(n)}, \dots)$, then $f_n(\lambda)$ converges asymptotically to $f(\lambda)$,⁽¹⁾ and the set of the values of $f_n(\lambda)$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) on V is enumerable, and dense in that of $f(\lambda)$ on V , with the possible exception of the values of $f(\lambda)$ on β -null set, that is, the set of values of $f(\lambda)$ on V , with the possible exception of those on β -null set, is separable. Let O be any open set in \mathfrak{R} or \mathfrak{R} . If we put for $D_{\frac{1}{n}} = (E_1^{(n)}, E_2^{(n)}, \dots)$

$$E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}, \frac{1}{n}} = \sum'_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}} E_i^{(n)},$$

where \sum' means the summation of sets of $\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}$ for which $\text{Osc}(f \cdot E_i^{(n)}) \geq \frac{1}{n}$,

(1) Let $E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}, \epsilon}$ be the sum of the sets of $\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}$ for which $\text{Osc}(f, E) \geq \epsilon$, then from (4) $\beta(E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}, \epsilon}) < \frac{1}{n^3 \epsilon}$. Since $E_{\lambda}(|f - f_n| \geq \epsilon) \leq E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}, \epsilon}$, the outer β -measure of $E_{\lambda}(|f - f_n| \geq \epsilon)$ converges to zero when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

and

$$E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}} = \sum_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}}^{\vee} E_i^{(n)},$$

where \sum^{\vee} means the summation of sets of $\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}$ for which values of $f(\lambda)$ on $E_i^{(n)}$ are entirely contained in O .

Then we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}} \subset E_{\lambda}[f(\lambda) \in O] \subset \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}} + \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}}},$$

k being any integer.

Since $\beta(E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}}}) < \frac{1}{n^2}$ from (4), we have

$$\beta\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}}\right) = \beta\left(\prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}}} + \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} E_{\mathfrak{D}_{\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}}}\right)\right);$$

thus $f(\lambda)$ is α -measurable by section 1 (1).

Conversely, if these conditions 1°, 2°, and 3° are satisfied, then we shall have a division satisfying (1) by Lindelöf's covering theorem. Thus we have the theorem.

For the 1st type of integral, if $f(\lambda)$ is integrable in the usual sense, there exists a division satisfying (1); thus $f(\lambda)$ is integrable in our sense. Since both integrals have the same value for any step function, they are equivalent.

For the 2nd type of integral, if $f(\lambda)$ is integrable in Bochner's sense,⁽¹⁾ then $|f(\lambda)|$ is integrable with respect to β , and $f(\lambda)$ is almost everywhere the limit of a sequence of step functions, and is hence integrable in our sense. The converse will hold also by the same reasoning. Thus the two integrals are equivalent. When V is a compact metric space, and \mathfrak{R} is α -equivalent to the family of Borel sets, any continuous function is uniformly continuous, and hence integrable in Dunford's⁽²⁾ and in our sense. Therefore the two integrals will be equivalent.

3. Maeda's Integral.

Where Maeda's integral is concerned, I shall write U and $q(U)$ instead of E and $\alpha(E)$ respectively, where $q(U)$ is on \mathfrak{R} to a Hilbert

(1) S. Bochner, loc. cit.

(2) N. Dunford, loc. cit.

space, and completely additive in his sense.⁽¹⁾ Let $\sigma(U) = \|q(U)\|^2$, then $\sigma(U)$ is completely additive.

F is said to be the integral of $f(\lambda)$ on V , if

$$(1) \quad \varepsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{D}' \geq \mathfrak{D} \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} f(\lambda)q(U) \text{ conv. and } \|F - \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} f(\lambda)q(U)\| < \varepsilon.$$

Then the condition of integrability is

$$(2) \quad \varepsilon, \mathfrak{D} \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} |f(\lambda)|^2 \sigma(U) \text{ conv. and } \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(f \cdot U)^2 \sigma(U) < \varepsilon.$$

As in section 2, Maeda's integral and ours are equivalent and we have the following theorem:

THEOREM. $f(\lambda)$ is integrable on V with respect to $q(U)$ when and only when $f(\lambda)$ is σ -measurable and $|f(\lambda)|^2$ is integrable with respect to σ .

4. Extension of Definition of Integral.

If $f(\lambda)$ is integrable on V , then it is also so on any set $E \in \mathfrak{R}$. Let

$$F(E) = \int_E f(\lambda) d\alpha(E);$$

then $F(E)$ is completely additive.

But when $\alpha(E)$ is not defined for all sets belonging to \mathfrak{R} , or $\beta(E)$ is not finite, we cannot apply our definition. We consider the family of sets of \mathfrak{R} for which $\alpha(E)$ is defined and $\beta(E)$ is finite, and we assume that this family \mathfrak{S} satisfies the conditions:

(1) when $E \in \mathfrak{S}$, any subset of E which belongs to \mathfrak{R} also belongs to \mathfrak{S} ,

(2) when $E = \sum_n E_n, E_n \in \mathfrak{S}$, E belongs to \mathfrak{S} when, and only when, $\sum_n \beta(E_n)$ converges,

and (3) $V = \sum V_n$, where $V_n \in \mathfrak{S}$.

If $f(\lambda)$ is integrable on any set of \mathfrak{S} , and $\int_E |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E) \quad E \in \mathfrak{S}$, is bounded, then we shall say that $f(\lambda)$ is integrable on V with respect to α . Then

(1) $q(U)$ satisfies the conditions: 1° $q(U) = \sum_n q(U_n)$, when $U = \sum_n U_n$, and 2° $(q(U), q(U')) = 0$, when $UU' = 0$. Cf. E. Maeda, loc. cit., 60-61.

$$\epsilon, E, \quad E' \supset E \quad (\epsilon \mathfrak{S}) \quad \int_{E'-E} |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E) < \epsilon. \quad (1)$$

hence $\epsilon, E, \quad E' \supset E \quad (\epsilon \mathfrak{S}) \quad \left| \int_{E'-E} f(\lambda) d\beta(E) \right| < \epsilon$

Thus there exists an element $F \in \mathfrak{R}$ or \mathfrak{R} such that

$$\epsilon, E, \quad E' \supset E \quad (\epsilon \mathfrak{S}) \quad \left| F - \int_{E'} f(\lambda) d\alpha(E) \right| < \epsilon.$$

Then we call F the integral of $f(\lambda)$, and write it as $\int_V f(\lambda) d\alpha(E)$.

For this extension the theorem in section 2 will also hold.⁽²⁾

5. Properties of Integral.

1° If $F(V) = \int_V f(\lambda) d\alpha(E)$ exists, the total variation of $F(E)$ on V , is

$$\int_V |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E)$$

Proof. By section 4 (3) it suffices to prove 1° when $V \in \mathfrak{S}$. First let $f(\lambda)$ be bounded, say $|f(\lambda)| < M$. Then from the definition

$$\epsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \mathfrak{D}' \supseteq \mathfrak{D} \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} |F(E) - f(\lambda)\alpha(E)| < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} (\beta(E) - |\alpha(E)|) < \epsilon.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \mathfrak{D}' \supseteq \mathfrak{D} \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} |f(\lambda)| \beta(E) &= \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} |f(\lambda)| (\beta(E) - |\alpha(E)|) + \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} |f(\lambda)| |\alpha(E)| \\ &< M\epsilon + \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} \left| \int_E f(\lambda) d\alpha(E) - f(\lambda)\alpha(E) \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} \left| \int_E f(\lambda) d\alpha(E) \right| \\ &< (M+1)\epsilon + \sum_{\mathfrak{D}'} \left| \int_E f(\lambda) d\alpha(E) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Let $T(V)$ be the total variation of $F(E)$ on V , then we have from above

(1) That is, for a given positive number ϵ there exists a set $E \in \mathfrak{S}$ such that for any set $E' \supset E$ and $\epsilon \mathfrak{S}$, $\int_{E'-E} |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E) < \epsilon$.

(2) E is α -normal in this case, if EV_n is α -normal in V_n for every n .

$$\varepsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \mathfrak{D}' \geq \mathfrak{D} \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} |f(\lambda)| \beta(E) < (M+1)\varepsilon + T(V)$$

therefore
$$\int_V |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E) \leq T(V).$$

But
$$\left| \int_E f(\lambda) d\alpha(E) \right| \leq \int_E |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E), \quad \text{hence} \quad T(V) \leq \int_V |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E).$$

Thus we have
$$T(V) = \int_V |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E).$$

When $f(\lambda)$ is not bounded, let $E_n = E_\lambda[|f(\lambda)| \leq n]$, then we have

$$T(E_n) = \int_{E_n} |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E);$$

hence
$$T(V) = \int_V |f(\lambda)| d\beta(E).$$

2° Is $F(E) = \int_E f(\lambda) d\alpha(E)$ exists on $E \in \mathfrak{C}$, then

$$(1) \quad \int_V g(\lambda) dF(E) = \int_V f(\lambda) g(\lambda) d\alpha(E),$$

when either side of this equation exists.

Proof. As in 1° there is no loss of generality in supposing that $V \in \mathfrak{C}$. Since \mathfrak{R}_α is F -equivalent to \mathfrak{R} , we use only division into sets of \mathfrak{R}_α .

Then $\varepsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} |f(\lambda)| \beta(E) \text{ conv. and } \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(f \cdot E) \beta(E) < \varepsilon.$

First assume that $g(\lambda)$ is bounded, say $|g(\lambda)| < M$. If $\int_V g(\lambda) dF(E)$ exists, then

$$\varepsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(g \cdot E) T(E) < \varepsilon$$

where $T(E)$ has the same meaning as in the proof of 1°.

Hence $\varepsilon, \mathfrak{D}, \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} |f(\lambda)g(\lambda)| \beta(E) < M |f(\lambda)| \beta(E),$

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(fg, E) \beta(E) < \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(g \cdot E) |f| \beta(E) + M \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(f \cdot E) \beta(E)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(g \cdot E) \left| |f| \beta(E) - T(E) \right| + \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(g \cdot E) T(E) + M\varepsilon \\
&< 2M\varepsilon + \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} \text{Osc}(g \cdot E) T(E) + M\varepsilon \\
&< (3M+1)\varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_V g dF - \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} f \cdot g \alpha(E) \right| &\leq \left| \int_V g dF - \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} g F(E) \right| + \left| \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} g F(E) - \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} f \cdot g \alpha(E) \right| \\
&< \varepsilon + M \sum_{\mathfrak{D}} |F(E) - f \alpha(E)| \\
&< (M+1)\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\int_V f(\lambda)g(\lambda)d\alpha(E)$ exists, and we have (1).

If $\int_V f(\lambda)g(\lambda)d\alpha(E)$ exists, then we shall have (1) by the same reasoning.

When $g(\lambda)$ is not bounded, let $V_0 = E[|f(\lambda)| \neq 0]$, and $E_n = E[|g(\lambda)| \leq n, \lambda \in V_0]$. Then E_n is in \mathfrak{R}_α if either $\int_V g(\lambda)dF(E)$ or $\int_V f(\lambda)g(\lambda)d\alpha(E)$ exists. Hence we have

$$\int_{E_n} g(\lambda)dF(E) = \int_{E_n} f(\lambda)g(\lambda)d\alpha(E),$$

$$\text{From } 1^\circ \quad \int_{E_n} |g(\lambda)| dT(E) = \int_{E_n} |f(\lambda)| |g(\lambda)| d\beta(E);$$

therefore $\int_{V_0} g(\lambda)dF(E) = \int_{V_0} f(\lambda)g(\lambda)d\alpha(E)$. Hence we have (1).

This theorem holds also for Maeda's integral.

2' If $\mathfrak{P}(V) = \int_V f(\lambda)dq(U)$ exists, then

$$\int_V g(\lambda)d\mathfrak{P}(U) = \int_V f(\lambda)g(\lambda)dq(U).$$

when either side of the equation exists.