

Remark on measures in almost-independent fields

by

HENRY HELSON (Cambridge, Mass.).

Let X be a set of points and let M_t be a family of fields of sub-sets of X , where t runs through some set S . Suppose a measure μ_t is defined in each M_t , such that $\mu_t(X) = 1$ for each t .

The measure μ defined in the smallest field M containing all the M_t will be called a *stochastic extension* of the μ_t if

$$\mu(A_1 \cdots A_n) = \mu_1(A_1) \cdots \mu_n(A_n) \quad \text{whenever } A_i \in M_{t_i} \quad (i=1, \dots, n).$$

It is easy to see that the stochastic extension is uniquely defined if there is one. In particular $\mu(A) = \mu_s(A)$ for $A \in M_s$, every s .

The following theorems have been proved¹⁾:

(i) *The μ_t have a stochastic extension μ if and only if the fields M_t are almost-independent with respect to the measures μ_t ²⁾.*

(ii) *If the M_t are denumerably independent, and each M_t and μ_t is denumerably additive, then μ is denumerably additive³⁾.*

MARCZEWSKI has shown⁴⁾ that independence is not a necessary condition for the denumerable additivity of μ , and that at least for the case of a finite number of fields, weaker conditions are sufficient. Two conditions are suggested for study⁵⁾, both of which reduce to almost-independence for a finite number of fields.

The purpose of this note⁶⁾ is to show that neither of these conditions is strong enough to replace independence in the

¹⁾ Definitions are given by E. Marczewski, *Indépendance d'ensembles et prolongement de mesures*, Colloquium Mathematicum I (1948), pp. 122-152.

²⁾ E. Marczewski, *Mesures dans les corps presque indépendants*. Fundamenta Mathematicae 36 (to appear).

³⁾ Proved in the paper of S. Banach, this volume, p. 159-177.

⁴⁾ E. Marczewski, Colloquium Mathematicum, loco cit., p. 150.

⁵⁾ Cf. ibidem, p. 150, P 24.

⁶⁾ Written at the University of Wrocław while the author held a Sheldon Travelling Fellowship from Harvard University.

hypothesis of (ii), by giving an example of two denumerably additive, almost-independent fields M_1, M_2 , whose measures μ_1, μ_2 are denumerably additive, such that the stochastic extension μ of μ_1, μ_2 is not denumerably additive.

The construction is based on a set T constructed by STEINHAUS, with the following properties: T is a subset of the unit square I^2 , has plane measure less than 1, but intersects every Cartesian product $A \times B$, where A and B are linear sets of positive measure. Let, namely, T be the set of points (x, y) of I^2 such that $y - x$ is rational. By a theorem of STEINHAUS⁶⁾, the linear set of points of the form $y - x$ for $x \in A, y \in B$, covers some interval, and hence contains a rational point, provided A and B have positive measure, so that T actually intersects $A \times B$. (STEINHAUS has used the same principle to construct a number of sets with additional interesting properties).

Let the elements of M_1 be the plane sets of the form $T \cdot (A \times I)$, and the elements of M_2 — the sets of the form $T \cdot (I \times B)$, where I is the unit interval, and A and B are measurable subsets of I . Set $\mu_1[T \cdot (A \times I)] = m(A)$, $\mu_2[T \cdot (I \times B)] = m(B)$, where m is linear Lebesgue measure. It is easy to see that the measures are defined uniquely, and are denumerably additive. Furthermore, M_1 and M_2 are almost-independent.

Since the measure of T is smaller than 1, we can find a sum $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \times B_i$ of disjoint measurable terms, covering T and of measure smaller than 1. Assuming μ , the stochastic extension of μ_1, μ_2 , denumerably additive, we should have

$$T \subset \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \times B_i = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (A_i \times B_i) \cdot T = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} T \cdot (A_i \times I) \cdot (I \times B_i),$$

and hence

$$\mu(T) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} m(A_i) \cdot m(B_i) < 1.$$

However, $T = T \cdot (I \times I)$, so that $\mu(T) = m(I) = 1$. This contradiction shows that μ is not denumerably additive.

⁶⁾ H. Steinhaus, *Sur les distances des points des ensembles de mesure positive*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 1 (1920), pp. 95-104, Théorème VII.