

Measure Algebras

Thomas Jech
e-mail: jech@math.psu.edu

May 3, 2017

These notes for the 2016 Winter School in Hejnice contain the complete proof of the following result [6]:

Theorem 0.1. *A Boolean σ -algebra B is a measure algebra if and only if it is weakly distributive and uniformly concentrated.*

1 Boolean σ -algebras

A *Boolean algebra* is an algebra B of subsets of a given nonempty set S , with Boolean operations $a \cup b$, $a \cap b$, $-a = S - a$, and the zero and unit elements $\mathbf{0} = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{1} = S$. A *Boolean σ -algebra* is a Boolean algebra B such that every countable set $A \subset B$ has a supremum $\sup A = \bigvee A$ (and an infimum $\inf A = \bigwedge A$) in the partial ordering of B by inclusion.

Definition 1.1. *A measure (a strictly positive σ -additive probability measure) on a Boolean σ -algebra B is a real valued function m on B such that*

- (i) $m(\mathbf{0}) = 0$, $m(a) > 0$ for $a \neq \mathbf{0}$, and $m(\mathbf{1}) = 1$
- (ii) $m(a) \leq m(b)$ if $a \subset b$
- (iii) $m(a \cup b) = m(a) + m(b)$ if $a \cap b = \mathbf{0}$
- (iv) $m(\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} m(a_n)$ whenever the a_n are pairwise disjoint.

A measure algebra is a Boolean σ -algebra that carries a measure.

A function m that satisfies (i), (ii) and (iii) above is called a (*strictly positive*) *finitely additive measure*. And m satisfies (iv) if and only if it is *continuous*:

(iv) if $\{a_n\}_n$ is a decreasing sequence in B with $\bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = \mathbf{0}$ then $\lim_n m(a_n) = \mathbf{0}$.

Let B be a Boolean algebra and let $B^+ = B - \{\mathbf{0}\}$. A set $A \subset B^+$ is an *antichain* if $a \cap b = \mathbf{0}$ whenever a and b are distinct elements of A . A *partition* W (of $\mathbf{1}$) is a maximal antichain, i.e. an antichain with $\bigvee W = \mathbf{1}$. B satisfies the *countable chain condition* (ccc) if it has no uncountable antichains. Every measure algebra is ccc because $B^+ = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{C_n\}_n$ where $C_n = \{a : m(a) \geq 1/n\}$ and every antichain in C_n has size at most n .

If $\{a_n\}_n$ is a sequence in a Boolean σ -algebra B , one defines

$$\limsup_n a_n = \bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigvee_{k=n}^{\infty} a_k \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_n a_n = \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigwedge_{k=n}^{\infty} a_k,$$

and if $\limsup_n a_n = \liminf_n a_n = a$, then a is the *limit* of the sequence, denoted $\lim_n a_n$.

A sequence $\{a_n\}_n$ converges to $\mathbf{0}$ if and only if $\limsup_n a_n = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if there exist $b_n \geq a_n$, b_n decreasing, with $\bigwedge_n b_n = \mathbf{0}$. A sequence $\{a_n\}_n$ converges to $\mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\liminf_n a_n = \mathbf{1}$. (Exercise: If $\lim a_n = \lim b_n = \mathbf{0}$ then $\lim(a_n \cup b_n) = \mathbf{0}$).

If $\{a_n\}_n$ is an antichain then $\lim a_n = \mathbf{0}$.

In a measure algebra, if $\lim a_n = \mathbf{0}$ then $\lim m(a_n) = 0$. If $\sum m(a_n) < \infty$ then $\lim a_n = \mathbf{0}$.

Definition 1.2. A Boolean σ -algebra B is *weakly distributive* if whenever $\{W_n\}_n$ is a sequence of countable maximal antichains then each W_n has a finite subset E_n such that $\lim_n \bigcup E_n = \mathbf{1}$.

Equivalently, if for every k , $\{a_{kn}\}_n$ is an increasing sequence with $\bigvee_n a_{kn} = \mathbf{1}$ then there exists a function $f : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\lim a_{k,f(k)} = \mathbf{1}$.

Or, if for every k , $\{a_{kn}\}_n$ is a decreasing sequence with $\bigwedge_n a_{kn} = \mathbf{0}$ then there exists a function $f : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\lim a_{k,f(k)} = \mathbf{0}$.

Definition 1.3. A Boolean σ -algebra B is *uniformly weakly distributive* if there exists a sequence of functions $\{F_n\}_n$ such that for each countable maximal antichain W , $F_n(W)$ is a finite subset of W , and if $\{W_n\}_n$ is a sequence of countable maximal antichains then $\lim_n \bigcup F_n(W_n) = \mathbf{1}$.

If B is a measure algebra then B is uniformly weakly distributive: For every n , if W is a countable maximal antichain, let $F_n(W) = E \subset W$ be such that $m(\bigcup E) \geq 1 - 1/2^n$.

Definition 1.4. A Boolean σ -algebra B is concentrated if for every sequence $\{A_n\}$ of finite antichains with $|A_n| \geq 2^n$ there exist $a_n \in A_n$ such that $\lim a_n = \mathbf{0}$.

B is uniformly concentrated if there exists a function F such that for each finite antichain A , $F(A)$ is an element of A , and if A_n is a sequence of finite antichains with $|A_n| \geq 2^n$ then $\lim_n F(A_n) = \mathbf{0}$.

A measure algebra is uniformly concentrated: if A is a finite antichain, let $F(A)$ be an element of A of least measure (then $m(F(A)) \leq 1/|A|$.)

Theorem 1.5. A Boolean σ -algebra B is a measure algebra if and only if it is weakly distributive and uniformly concentrated.

2 Fragmentations

Definition 2.1. A fragmentation of B is a sequence of subsets $C_1 \subset C_2 \subset \dots \subset C_n \subset \dots$ such that $\bigcup_n C_n = B^+$ and for every n , if $a \in C_n$ and $a \leq b$ then $b \in C_n$.

A fragmentation is σ -finite cc if for every n , every antichain $A \subset C_n$ is finite.

A fragmentation is σ -bounded cc if for every n there is a constant K_n such that every antichain $A \subset C_n$ has size $\leq K_n$.

A fragmentation is G_δ if for every n , no sequence in C_n converges to $\mathbf{0}$.

A fragmentation is tight if whenever $\{a_n\}_n$ is a sequence such that $a_n \notin C_n$ for every n , then $\lim a_n = \mathbf{0}$.

A fragmentation is graded if for every n , whenever $a \cup b \in C_n$ then either $a \in C_{n+1}$ or $b \in C_{n+1}$.

(The name G_δ comes from the fact that if B is weakly distributive and the fragmentation is G_δ then the set $\{\mathbf{0}\}$ is a G_δ set in the convergence topology.) A G_δ fragmentation is σ -finite cc.

In a measure algebra, the fragmentation defined by $C_n = \{a : m(a) \geq 1/2^n\}$ has all the above properties.

Lemma 2.2. (a) *If B is uniformly concentrated then B has a tight σ -bounded cc fragmentation.*

(b) *If B is weakly distributive and has a tight σ -finite cc fragmentation then B is uniformly weakly distributive.*

Consequently, a weakly distributive, uniformly concentrated σ -algebra is uniformly weakly distributive.

Proof. (a) Let F be a function on finite antichains that witnesses that B is uniformly concentrated. For every n let C_n be the set of all $a \neq \mathbf{0}$ such that there is no antichain A with $|A| \geq 2^n$ and $a \leq F(A)$.

It is easy to see that C_n is a fragmentation: If $a \notin \bigcup_n C_n$ then for every n there exists an antichain A_n with $|A_n| \geq 2^n$ and $a \leq F(A_n)$. Hence $a \leq \lim F(A_n) = \mathbf{0}$, and so $a = \mathbf{0}$. The fragmentation is tight because if $a_n \notin C_n$ then $a_n \leq F(A_n)$ for some A_n and so $\lim a_n = \mathbf{0}$.

It is σ -bounded cc because if $A \subset C_n$ is an antichain then $F(A) \in C_n$ and so $|A| < 2^n$.

(b) Let B be weakly distributive and let $\{C_n\}_n$ be a tight σ -finite cc fragmentation; we shall find the functions F_n witnessing that B is uniformly weakly distributive.

Let $n \in N$, and let W be a countable maximal antichain. We claim that there exists a finite set $E \subset W$ such that for every finite $E' \subset W - E$, $\bigcup E' \notin C_n$: otherwise we find an infinite sequence $\{E_k\}_k$ of pairwise disjoint nonempty subsets of W with $\bigcup E_k \in C_n$, an infinite antichain in C_n . We let $F_n(W)$ be this E .

Now let $W_n, n \in N$, be countable maximal antichains. We claim that $\lim \bigcup F_n(W_n) = \mathbf{1}$. Since B is weakly distributive, there exist finite sets $E_n \subset W_n$ such that $\lim \bigcup E_n = \mathbf{1}$. For each n let $a_n = \bigcup E_n - \bigcup F_n(W_n)$. By the claim above, $a_n \notin C_n$. Because $\{C_n\}_n$ is tight, we have $\lim a_n = \mathbf{0}$, and because $\bigcup F_n(W_n) \geq \bigcup E_n \cap (-a_n)$, we have $\lim \bigcup F_n(W_n) = \lim \bigcup E_n = \lim -a_n = \mathbf{1}$. □

Lemma 2.3. *A Boolean σ -algebra is uniformly weakly distributive if and only if it has a tight G_δ fragmentation.*

Proof. First assume that B is uniformly weakly distributive and let F_n be functions witnessing it. For each n we let C_n be the set of all a such that for some $k \leq n$ $a \cap \bigcup F_k(W) \neq \mathbf{0}$ for every countable maximal antichain W .

To show that $\{C_n\}_n$ is a fragmentation, we show that $\bigcup_n C_n = B^+$: if $a \notin C_n$ for all n then for all k there is a W_k such that $a \cap \bigcup F_k(W_k) = \mathbf{0}$, and because $\lim(a \cap \bigcup F_k(W_k)) = a$ we have $a = \mathbf{0}$.

To show that $\{C_n\}_n$ is tight, let $a_n \notin C_n$ for each n . For each n there is a W_n such that $a_n \cap b_n = \mathbf{0}$ where $b_n = \bigcup F_n(W_n)$. Since $\lim b_n = \mathbf{1}$, we have $\lim -b_n = \mathbf{0}$, and because $a_n \leq -b_n$, it follows that $\lim a_n = \mathbf{0}$.

To show that $\{C_n\}_n$ is G_δ , let $n \in N$ and let $\lim a_k = \mathbf{0}$; it suffices to find a $k \in N$ such that $a_k \notin C_n$. We may assume that $\{a_k\}_k$ is strictly decreasing and let W be the maximal antichain $\{a_{k-1} - a_k\}_k$ where $a_0 = \mathbf{1}$. Let $E = F_1(W) \cup \dots \cup F_n(W)$. There exists a k large enough so that $a_k \cap \bigcup E = \mathbf{0}$. It follows that $a_k \notin C_n$.

For the converse, let $\{C_n\}_n$ be a tight G_δ fragmentation. In view of Lemma 2.2 (b) it suffices to show that B is weakly distributive. For every k , let $\{a_{kn}\}_n$ be a decreasing sequence with $\bigwedge_n a_{kn} = \mathbf{0}$. We shall find a function $f : N \rightarrow N$ such that $\lim a_{k,f(k)} = \mathbf{0}$. Given $k \in N$, there is some $f(k)$ such that $a_{k,f(k)} \notin C_k$, as $\{C_n\}_n$ is G_δ . Because $\{C_n\}_n$ is tight, $\lim a_{k,f(k)} = \mathbf{0}$ follows. □

A tight G_δ fragmentation is essentially unique: if C_n and C'_n are such, then for each n there is a k such that $C_n \subset C'_k$. (If not, there exists an n such that for all k there is some $a_k \in C_n - C'_k$ and so $\lim a_k = \mathbf{0}$).

In the appendix we use a tight G_δ fragmentation to construct a continuous submeasure, thus showing that B is uniformly weakly distributive if and only if B is a Maharam algebra. The construction of a measure (in the next two chapters) is considerably more difficult.

Lemma 2.4. *If $\{C_n\}_n$ is a G_δ fragmentation of B and if B is concentrated then $\{C_n\}_n$ is σ -bounded cc.*

Proof. By contradiction, assume that for some n , there exist arbitrarily large finite antichains in C_n , and for each k , let A_k be an antichain in C_n of size $\geq 2^k$. Since B is concentrated, there exist $a_k \in A_k$ with $\lim a_k = \mathbf{0}$, a contradiction. □

Lemma 2.5. *If $\{C_n\}_n$ is a tight G_δ fragmentation then for every n there exists a $k > n$ such that for every $c \in C_n$, if $c = a \cup b$ then either $a \in C_k$ or $b \in C_k$.*

Thus if B has a tight G_δ fragmentation then B has one that is also graded (i.e. $a \cup b \in C_n$ implies that either $a \in C_{n+1}$ or $b \in C_{n+1}$.)

Proof. Otherwise, for every $k > n$ there exist $c_k = a_k \cup b_k \in C_n$ such that $a_k \notin C_k$ and $b_k \notin C_k$. By tightness, $\lim a_k = \lim b_k = \mathbf{0}$ and so $\lim c_k = \mathbf{0}$, a contradiction. \square

In conclusion, we proved in this chapter that a weakly distributive uniformly concentrated Boolean σ -algebra has a graded σ -bounded cc fragmentation. In the next two chapters we construct a measure on B under the assumption that B is weakly distributive and has a graded σ -bounded cc fragmentation.

3 Kelley's Theorem

In this Section we introduce Kelley's condition for the existence of finitely additive measure on a Boolean algebra. But first we show how the measure problem reduces to finitely additive measures.

Theorem 3.1. (*Pinsker, Kelley*) *A Boolean σ -algebra B carries a measure if and only if it is weakly distributive and carries a finitely additive measure.*

Proof. Let m be a finitely additive measure on B . We let

$$\mu(b) = \inf \left\{ \lim_n m(b \cap u_n) \right\}$$

where the infimum is taken over all increasing sequences $\{u_n\}_n$ with $\bigvee_n u_n = \mathbf{1}$.

We show that μ is a σ -additive measure, and if B is weakly distributive then μ is strictly positive.

First show that $\mu(a \cup b) = \mu(a) + \mu(b)$ if $a \cap b = \mathbf{0}$. If $s = \{u_n\}_n$, let $\mu_s(x) = \lim_n m(x \cap u_n)$. Clearly, $\mu_s(a \cup b) = \mu_s(a) + \mu_s(b)$, and so $\mu(a) + \mu(b) \leq \mu_s(a \cup b)$. Hence $\mu(a) + \mu(b) \leq \mu(a \cup b)$.

For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a sequence $s = s_a = \{u_n\}_n$ such that $\mu_s(a) \leq \mu(a) + \varepsilon$, and similarly $s_b = \{v_n\}_n$. Let $s = \{u_n \cap v_n\}_n$. Then $\mu(a \cup b) \leq \mu_s(a \cup b) = \mu_s(a) + \mu_s(b) \leq \mu_{s_a}(a) + \mu_{s_b}(b) \leq \mu(a) + \mu(b) + 2\varepsilon$, and the equality follows.

To show the continuity of μ , let a_n be a decreasing sequence with $\bigwedge_n a_n = \mathbf{0}$; we show that $\lim \mu(a_n) = 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$.

Let $M = \lim m(a_n)$, and let K be such that $m(a_K) - M < \varepsilon$. Let $s = \{u_n\}_n$ where $u_n = -a_n$. As for all $k, n \geq K$, $m(a_k - a_n) < \varepsilon$, we have,

for every $k \geq K$, $\mu_s(a_k) = \lim_n m(a_k \cap u_n) = \lim_n m(a_k - a_n) \leq \varepsilon$, and hence $\mu(a_k) \leq \varepsilon$.

Finally, assume that B is weakly distributive, and let $b \in B$ be such that $\mu(b) = 0$; we show that $b = \mathbf{0}$. As $\mu(b) = 0$, there is for each k an increasing sequence $\{u_{kn}\}_n$ with $\bigvee_n u_{kn} = \mathbf{1}$ such that $\lim_n m(b \cap u_{kn}) < 1/k$.

By weak distributivity there is a function f such that $\lim u_{k,f(k)} = \mathbf{1}$. Hence $\bigvee_n \bigwedge_{k \geq n} u_{k,f(k)} = \mathbf{1}$. For each k let $a_k = b \cap u_{k,f(k)}$. We have $\bigvee_n \bigwedge_{k \geq n} a_k = b$. But because $m(a_k) < 1/k$, it follows that $\bigwedge_{k \geq n} a_k = \mathbf{0}$, and so $b = \bigvee_n \bigwedge_{k \geq n} a_k = \mathbf{0}$. \square

In order to state and prove Kelley's Theorem, we now work with Boolean set algebras, and use the term "finitely additive" for measures that are not necessarily strictly positive - when we need the condition $m(a) > 0$ if $a \neq \mathbf{0}$ we call m strictly positive.

Let B be a Boolean set algebra, $B \subset P(S)$ for some set S .

Definition 3.2. *Let C be a subset of B^+ . For every finite sequence $s = \langle c_1, \dots, c_n \rangle$ in C , let $\kappa_s = k/n$ where k is the largest size of a subset $J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\bigcap_{i \in J} c_i$ is nonempty. The intersection number of C is the infimum $\kappa = \inf \kappa_s$ over all finite sequences s in C .*

The sequences s do not have to be nonrepeating.

Note that for any n_0 , the infimum $\inf \kappa_s$ taken over all sequences s of length $n \geq n_0$ is still κ : if s is a sequence of length $n < n_0$, let t be such that $t \cdot n \geq n_0$, and let s^* be a sequence we get when repeating each term of s t -times. Then $\kappa_{s^*} = \kappa_s$.

To better understand the significance of the intersection number, assume that m is a finitely additive measure on B , and let $C \subset B^+$. Let M be such that $m(c) \geq M$ for all $c \in C$. We show that the intersection number κ of C is at least M .

Let $s = \langle c_1, \dots, c_n \rangle$ be a sequence in C . For each $i \leq n$, let K_i be the characteristic function of c_i , i.e. $K_i(x) = 1$ if $x \in c_i$ and $= 0$ if $x \notin c_i$. Let $g = \sum_{i=1}^n K_i$ and consider $I_s = \int g dm$, the area below the graph of g . Since $\int K_i = m(c_i)$, we have $I_s = \sum_i m(c_i) \geq M \cdot n$ and so (because $m(S) = 1$) $\|g\| = \max_{x \in S} g(x) \geq I_s \geq M \cdot n$.

Thus there exists some $x \in S$ such that $\sum_i K_i(x) \geq M \cdot n$; in other words, x belongs to at least $M \cdot n$ members of the sequence. Hence $\kappa_s \geq M \cdot n/n = M$ and consequently $\kappa \geq M$.

Theorem 3.3. (Kelley) Let $C \subset B^+$ have a positive intersection number κ . Then there exists a finitely additive measure m on B such that $m(c) \geq \kappa$ for all $c \in C$.

Corollary 3.4. If a Boolean algebra B has a fragmentation $\{C_n\}$ such that each C_n has a positive intersection number, then B carries a strictly positive finitely additive measure.

Proof. (of Corollary) For each n let m_n be positive on C_n . If we let $m(a) = \sum_n m_n(a)/2^n$, m is a strictly positive, finitely additive measure on B . \square

To prove Kelley's Theorem and construct a finitely additive measure on B we shall consider the vector space of all bounded functions on S (including all characteristic functions K_a for all $a \in B$) and find a linear functional F such that $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$, $F(K_a) \geq 0$, and $F(K_c) \geq \kappa$ for all $c \in C$. Then we let $m(a) = F(K_a)$ for all $a \in B$.

To find the linear functional we use the Hahn-Banach Theorem (for a proof, see Appendix):

Theorem 3.5. Let p be a function such that $p(x) \geq 0$ for all x , $p(x + y) \leq p(x) + p(y)$, $p(\alpha x) = \alpha p(x)$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$, and $p(\mathbf{1}) \geq 1$.

Then there exists a linear functional F such that $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ and $F(x) \leq p(x)$ for all x .

In the rest of this Chapter we give a proof of Kelley's Theorem:

Proof. Let $C \subset B^+ \subset P(S)$ and let κ be the intersection number of C . Let V be the vector space of all bounded functions on S with the supremum norm $\|f\| = \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in S\}$. We shall find a linear functional F on V such that $0 \leq F(K_a) \leq 1$ for all $a \in B$, $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ and $F(K_c) \geq \kappa$ for all $c \in C$.

Consider the convex hull of the set $\{K_c : c \in C\}$:

$$G = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{i=m} \alpha_i K_{c_i} : c_i \in C, 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq 1, \sum \alpha_i = 1 \right\}$$

Lemma 3.6. For every $g \in G$, $\|g\| \geq \kappa$.

Proof. First consider rational coefficients α_i : for each $i \leq m$, $\alpha_i = l_i/n$ with $\sum_i l_i = n$, and $g(x) = f(x)/n$ where $f = \sum_i l_i \cdot K_{c_i}$.

Consider the sequence s in C of length n where each c_i is repeated l_i times. By definition of κ there are k terms of s with nonempty intersection

such that $k/n \geq \kappa$. Let x be a point in the intersection; it follows that $f(x) \geq k$. Hence $g(x) \geq k/n \geq \kappa$.

For arbitrary α_i let $\varepsilon > 0$. There are rational approximations β_i of the α_i such that $\kappa \leq \|\sum \beta_i K_{c_i}\| \leq \|\sum \alpha_i K_{c_i}\| + \varepsilon$. Hence $\|g\| \geq \kappa - \varepsilon$, and so $\|g\| \geq \kappa$. \square

Now let

$$Q = \{\alpha(g - \kappa) + f : g \in G, \alpha \geq 0, f \geq \mathbf{0}\}.$$

The set Q contains all K_b , $b \in B$, (because $K_b \geq \mathbf{0}$) and is convex: if f and g are in Q and $\alpha + \beta = 1$ ($\alpha, \beta > 0$) then $\alpha f + \beta g \in Q$. Clearly, it suffices to verify this for f and g in G and that is easy.

Let $\delta = 1 - \kappa$, and let U be the open ball $\{h : \|h\| < \delta\}$ of radius δ . Using the vector space convention $A - B = \{a - b : a \in A, b \in B\}$, consider the set

$$U - Q = \{h - \alpha(g - \kappa) - f : \|h\| < \delta, g \in G, \alpha \geq 0, f \geq \mathbf{0}\}.$$

The set $U - Q$ is convex, and because $\mathbf{0} \in Q$, we have $U \subset U - Q$, and so for every $v \in V$ there exists a positive number α such that $\alpha v \in U \subset U - Q$. Now define

$$p(v) = \inf\{\gamma > 0 : \frac{v}{\gamma} \in U - Q\}.$$

If $\gamma = \alpha + \beta$ and $\frac{x}{\alpha}, \frac{y}{\beta} \in U - Q$ then $\frac{x+y}{\gamma} = \frac{\alpha}{\gamma}(\frac{x}{\alpha}) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma}(\frac{y}{\beta}) \in U - Q$ by convexity, and so $p(x+y) \leq p(x) + p(y)$.

Clearly, $p(\alpha v) = \alpha p(v)$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$. Finally, let $\gamma \leq 1$; we show that $1/\gamma \notin U - Q$, hence $p(\mathbf{1}) \geq 1$. If $1/\gamma \in U - Q$ then $1/\gamma = h - f$ (and $h = f + 1/\gamma$) where $h \in U$ and $f \in Q$. Since $f \in Q$, there exists, by the Lemma, some $x \in S$ such that $f(x) \geq 0$, and so $f(x) + 1/\gamma \geq 1/\gamma \geq 1$. But $h(x) < \delta \leq 1$.

Now we apply the Hahn-Banach Theorem to this function p . Note that for all $f \in Q$, $-f \in U - Q$ and hence $p(-f) \leq 1$.

There exists a linear functional F such that $F(\mathbf{1}) = 1$ and $F(x) \leq p(x)$ for all $x \in V$. If $f \in Q$, then $F(-f) \leq p(-f) \leq 1$ and so $F(f) \geq -1$. As this is true for all $f \in Q$ and Q is closed under multiples by all $\alpha \geq 0$, it must be the case that $F(f) \geq 0$ for all $f \in Q$. In particular, $F(K_b) \geq 0$ for all $b \in B$.

Also, if $g \in G$, then $g - \kappa \in Q$ and hence $F(g - \kappa) \geq 0$, i.e. $F(g) \geq \kappa$. Consequently, $F(K_c) \geq \kappa$ for all $c \in C$.

When we let $m(b) = F(K_b)$ for all $b \in B$, m is a finitely additive measure on B with $m(c) \geq \kappa$ for all $c \in C$. □

4 The Kalton-Roberts Proof

We complete the proof by showing that Kelley's condition applies:

Theorem 4.1. *Let B be a Boolean algebra that has a graded σ -bounded cc fragmentation $\{C_n\}$. Then for every n , C_n has a positive intersection number.*

To prove the theorem, we adapt the Kalton-Roberts proof, an ingenious combinatorial argument that converts finite bounds for the size of antichains into positive intersection numbers.

Lemma 4.2. *Let M and P be finite sets with $|M| = m$ and $|P| = p \leq m$, and let k , $3 \leq k \leq p$ be an integer such that $p/k \geq 15 \cdot m/p$. Then there exists an indexed family $\{A_i : i \in M\}$ such that each A_i is a three point subset of P and such that for every $I \subset M$ with $|I| \leq k$,*

$$|\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i| > |I|.$$

It follows that for every $I \subset M$ with $|I| \leq k$ there exists a one-to-one choice function f_I on $\{A_i : i \in I\}$.

The last statement of the lemma follows by Hall's "Marriage Theorem":

Theorem 4.3. *A family $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ of finite sets has a set of distinct representatives if and only if $|\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i| \geq |I|$ for every $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$.*

For a proof of Hall's Theorem, see Appendix.

The proof of the lemma uses a counting argument:

Proof. Consider the families $\{A_i : i \in M\}$ of three point subsets of P . Let us call such a family *bad* if $|\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i| \leq |I|$ for some $I \subset M$, $|I| \leq k$. If a family is bad then for some n , $3 \leq n \leq k$, there exist sets $I \subset M$ and $J \subset P$, $|I| = |J| = n$ such that $A_i \subset J$ for every $i \in I$.

There are $\binom{p}{3}$ three-point subsets of P and $\binom{n}{3}$ three-point subsets of J . Of the $\binom{p}{3}^n$ families $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ with domain I , $\binom{n}{3}^n$ are such that $\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \subset J$. The ratio of such families (for $3 \leq n \leq p$) is $(\binom{n}{3}/\binom{p}{3})^n \leq (n^3/p^3)^n = n^{3n}/p^{3n}$ because $\binom{n}{3}/\binom{p}{3} \leq n^3/p^3$.

Because there are $\binom{m}{n}$ subsets $I \subset M$ of size n and $\binom{p}{n}$ subsets $J \subset P$ of size n , the probability that a family $\{A_i\}_{i \in M}$ is bad is at most

$$\Pi = \sum_{n=3}^{n=k} \binom{m}{n} \binom{p}{n} \frac{n^{3n}}{p^{3n}}.$$

We have $\binom{m}{n} \cdot \binom{p}{n} \cdot n^{3n}/p^{3n} \leq m^n/n! \cdot p^n/n! \cdot n^{3n}/p^{3n}$. Using $e^x > x^n/n!$ we get $e^n n! > n^n$, hence $1/n! < e^n/n^n$, and so

$$\frac{m^n}{n!} \cdot \frac{p^n}{n!} \cdot \frac{n^{3n}}{p^{3n}} < \frac{e^{2n} n^n m^n}{p^{2n}} = \left(e^2 \cdot \frac{n}{p} \cdot \frac{m}{p}\right)^n.$$

For $n \leq k$ we have $e^2 \cdot n/p \cdot m/p \leq e^2 \cdot k/p \cdot m/p \leq e^2/15 < 1/2$ because we assumed $p/k \geq 15m/p$ and because $2e^2 < 15$. Therefore

$$\Pi < \sum_{n=3}^{n=k} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n < 1.$$

Consequently, there exists a family $\{A_i : i \in M\}$ that is not bad, and so $|\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i| > |I|$ for every $I \subset M$ of size $\leq k$. □

We shall now apply the Kalton-Roberts method to prove Theorem 4.1:

Proof. Let $\{C_n\}$ be a graded σ -bounded cc fragmentation of a Boolean algebra B , and let us fix an integer n . We prove that the intersection number of each C_n is positive, namely $\geq 1/(30K^2)$ where $K = K_{n+2}$ is the maximal size of an antichain in C_{n+2} .

We show that for every $m \geq 100K^2$, and every sequence $\{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ in C_n there exists some $J \subset m$ of size $\geq m/(30K^2)$ such that $\bigcap_{i \in J} c_i$ is nonempty.

Let $M = \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $m \geq 100K^2$ and let $c_1, \dots, c_m \in C_n$. For each $I \subset M$, let

$$b_I = \bigcap \{c_i : i \in I\} \cap \bigcap \{-c_i : i \notin I\}.$$

The sets b_I are pairwise disjoint (some may be empty) and $\bigcup\{b_I : I \subset M\} = \mathbf{1}$. Note that for each $i \in M$, $\bigcup\{b_I : i \in I\} = c_i$. We shall find a sufficiently large set $J \subset M$ with nonempty b_J .

We shall apply Lemma 4.2. First let $k \geq 3$ be the largest k such that $k/m < 1/(30K^2)$ (there is such because $3/m \leq 3/(100K^2)$). We have $k < m$ and $(k+1)/m \geq 1/(30K^2)$. Then let p be the largest $p \geq k$ such that $p/m < 1/K$ (there is such because $k/m < 1/K$.)

We verify the assumption of the lemma, $p/k \geq 15m/p$ (using $p/(p+1) \geq 3/4$):

$$\frac{p}{k} = \frac{p}{p+1} \cdot \frac{p+1}{m} \cdot \frac{m}{k} \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{K} \cdot 30K^2 \geq 20K$$

and

$$15\frac{m}{p} \leq 15 \cdot \frac{p+1}{p} \cdot \frac{m}{p+1} \leq 15 \cdot \frac{4}{3} \cdot K = 20K.$$

Now we apply the Lemma: Let $P = \{1, \dots, p\}$. There exist three point sets $A_i \subset P$, $i \in M$, and one-to-one functions f_I on all $I \subset M$ of size $\leq k$ with $f_I(i) \in A_i$ for all $i \in I$.

We shall prove that there exists a $J \subset M$ of size $\geq k+1$ (and hence $\geq m/(30K^2)$) such that b_J is nonempty. By contradiction, assume that there is no such J . Then

$$\bigcup\{b_I : |I| \leq k\} = \mathbf{1} \text{ and for each } i \in M, c_i = \bigcup\{b_I : |I| \leq k \text{ and } i \in I\}.$$

For each $i \in M$ and $j \in P$ let

$$a_{ij} = \bigcup\{b_I : |I| \leq k, i \in I \text{ and } f_I(i) = j\}.$$

Note that for each $i \in M$, $c_i = a_{i,j_1} \cup a_{i,j_2} \cup a_{i,j_3}$ where $A_i = \{j_1, j_2, j_3\}$.

Let $j \in P$. We claim that the a_{ij} , $i \in M$, are pairwise disjoint: If $a_{i_1,j} \cap a_{i_2,j}$ is nonempty, then because the b_I are pairwise disjoint there is some I such that $i_1 \in I$ and $i_2 \in I$, and because $f_I(i_1) = j = f_I(i_2)$ and f_I is one-to-one, we have $i_1 = i_2$. Hence the a_{ij} , $i \in M$, are pairwise disjoint, and so only at most K of them belong to C_{n+2} .

Consequently, at most $p \cdot K$ of the a_{ij} belong to C_{n+2} and because $pK < m$, there exists an i such that $a_{ij} \notin C_{n+2}$ for all (three) $j \in A_i$.

But then $c_i = a_{i,j_1} \cup a_{i,j_2} \cup a_{i,j_3} \notin C_n$ because the fragmentation is graded. This contradicts the assumption that $c_i \in C_n$. □

5 Appendix

Theorem 5.1. *Let V be a real vector space and let p be a function on V such that $p(x) \geq 0$ for all x , $p(x + y) \leq p(x) + p(y)$, $p(\alpha x) = \alpha p(x)$ for all $\alpha \geq 0$.*

Let W be a subspace of V and f a linear functional on W such that $f(x) \leq p(x)$ on W .

Then there exists a linear functional F such that $F(x) = f(x)$ for all $x \in W$, and $F(x) \leq p(x)$ for all x .

See Walter Rudin: “Functional Analysis”, Second Edition (1991), pp. 57-58.

Proof. Using Zorn’s Lemma it suffices to extend f one more dimension: let $u \notin W$ and show that there exists an F extending f on the subspace $\{x + \alpha u : \alpha \in \mathbf{R}\}$.

Let $u \notin W$. For every $x \in W$ we have $f(x) \leq p(x) \leq p(x - u) + p(u)$ and so

$$f(x) - p(x - u) \leq p(u).$$

Let γ be the supremum of the left hand side of the inequality taken over all $x \in W$. We let $F(u) = \gamma$, and $F(x + \alpha u) = f(x) + \alpha\gamma$, for $x \in W$ and $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$. F is a linear functional and it remains to show that $F(x + \alpha u) \leq p(x + \alpha u)$. Note that this follows from these two inequalities:

$$f(x) + \gamma \leq p(x + u),$$

$$f(x) - \gamma \leq p(x - u).$$

(Then use $x \pm \alpha u = \alpha(x/\alpha \pm u)$ for $\alpha > 0$).

The second inequality is immediate. For the first one, note that for every $y \in W$, $f(x + y) \leq p(x + u) + p(y - u)$, hence $f(x + y) - p(y - u) \leq p(x + u)$, and so

$$f(x) + \gamma = f(x) + \sup_y (f(y) - p(y - u)) = \sup_y (f(x + y) - p(y - u)) \leq p(x + u).$$

□

6 Appendix

Theorem 6.1. *A family $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ of finite sets has a set of distinct representatives if and only if $|\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i| \geq |I|$ for every $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$.*

See Béla Bollobás: “Modern Graph Theory” (1998), pp. 77-78.

Proof. The condition is clearly necessary; we prove the sufficiency by induction. As $n = 1$ is obvious, assume that the theorem is true for all $k < n$ and let $\{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be a sequence of finite sets that satisfy the condition.

Suppose first that for any $k < n$, for any $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ with $|I| = k$, $|\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i| \geq k + 1$. Then we choose $a_n \in A_n$ arbitrarily, and apply the induction hypothesis to the family $\{A_1 - \{a_n\}, \dots, A_{n-1} - \{a_n\}\}$ to get distinct representatives a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} for A_1, \dots, A_{n-1} .

Otherwise, there exists a set $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ of size $k < n$ such that $|\bigcup_{i \in S} A_i| = k$. Let $A = \bigcup_{i \in S} A_i$. Consider the family $\{A_i - A : i \notin S\}$. This family of $n - k$ sets satisfies the condition of the theorem: if $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\} - S$ has size m then $|\bigcup_{i \in I} A_i - A| \geq m$ because $|\bigcup_{i \in I \cup S} A_i| \geq k + m$. Thus the family has a set of distinct representatives, all $\notin A$, and since $\{A_i : i \in S\}$ has distinct representatives in A , we can combine these two sets. □

7 Appendix

Definition 7.1. *A continuous strictly positive submeasure on a Boolean σ -algebra B is a real valued function m on B such that*

- (i) $m(\mathbf{0}) = 0$, $m(a) > 0$ for $a \neq \mathbf{0}$, and $m(\mathbf{1}) = 1$
- (ii) $m(a) \leq m(b)$ if $a \subset b$
- (iii) $m(a \cup b) \leq m(a) + m(b)$
- (iv) if $\{a_n\}_n$ is a decreasing sequence in B with $\bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = \mathbf{0}$ then $\lim_n m(a_n) = \mathbf{0}$.

A Maharam algebra is a Boolean σ -algebra that carries a continuous strictly positive submeasure.

Theorem 7.2. *(Balcar-Jech) B is a Maharam algebra if and only if it is uniformly weakly distributive.*

Proof. The proof that a Maharam algebra is uniformly weakly distributive is exactly the same as for a measure algebra. To show that the condition is sufficient let B be a σ -algebra and assume that B has a graded G_δ fragmentation $\{C_n\}$. We shall define a submeasure on B .

For each n let $U_n = B - C_n$ and $U_0 = B$; we have $U_0 \supset U_1 \supset \dots \supset U_n \supset \dots$ and $\bigcap_n U_n = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. For $X, Y \subset B$, let $X \vee Y$ denote the set $\{x \cup y : x \in X, y \in Y\}$. As the fragmentation is graded, we have

$$U_{n+1} \vee U_{n+1} \subset U_n$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Consequently, if $n_1 < \dots < n_k$ then

$$U_{n_1+1} \vee \dots \vee U_{n_k+1} \subset U_{n_1}.$$

This is proved by induction on k .

Let D be the set of all $r = \sum_{i=1}^k 1/2^{n_i}$ where $0 < n_1 < \dots < n_k$. For each $r \in D$ we let $V_r = U_{n_1} \vee \dots \vee U_{n_k}$ and $V_1 = U_0 = B$. For each $a \in B$ define

$$m(a) = \inf\{r \in D \cup \{1\} : a \in V_r\}.$$

Using the above property of the U_n , it follows that $V_r \subset V_s$ if $r < s$, and $V_r \vee V_s \subset V_{r+s}$ when $r + s \leq 1$. From this we have $m(a) \leq m(b)$ if $a \subset b$, and $m(a \cup b) \leq m(a) + m(b)$.

The submeasure m is strictly positive because if $a \neq \mathbf{0}$ then for some n , $a \notin U_n$, and hence $m(a) \geq 1/2^n$.

The submeasure m is continuous because the fragmentation is G_δ : If $\{a_n\}_n$ is a decreasing sequence in B converging to $\mathbf{0}$ then for every k , eventually all a_n are in U_k , hence $m(a_n) \leq 1/2^k$ for eventually all n , and so $\lim_n m(a_n) = 0$. □

References

- [1] B. Balcar, W. Główczyński, and T. Jech. The sequential topology on complete Boolean algebras. *Fund. Math.*, 155(1):59–78, 1998.
- [2] B. Balcar, T. Jech, and T. Pazák. Complete ccc Boolean algebras, the order sequential topology and a problem of von Neumann. *Bull. London Math. Society*, 37:885–898, 2005.

- [3] Bohuslav Balcar and Thomas Jech. Weak distributivity, a problem of von Neumann and the mystery of measurability. *Bull. Symbolic Logic*, 12(2):241–266, 2006.
- [4] D. H. Fremlin. Measure algebras. In *Handbook of Boolean algebras. Vol. 3*, pages 877–980. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989.
- [5] A. Horn and A. Tarski. Measures in Boolean algebras. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 64:467–497, 1948.
- [6] T. Jech. Algebraic characterizations of measure algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 136:1285–1294, 2008.
- [7] N. J. Kalton and J. W. Roberts. Uniformly exhaustive submeasures and nearly additive set functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 278:803–816, 1983.
- [8] L. V. Kantorovič, B. Z. Vulikh, and A. G. Pinsker. *Functional Analysis in Partially Ordered Spaces*. 1950. (in Russian).
- [9] J. L. Kelley. Measures on Boolean algebras. *Pacific J. Math.*, 9:1165–1177, 1959.
- [10] D. Maharam. An algebraic characterization of measure algebras. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 48:154–167, 1947.
- [11] D. Mauldin, editor. *The Scottish Book*. Birkhäuser Boston, Mass., 1981.
- [12] J. D. Monk, editor. *Handbook of Boolean algebras*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1989.
- [13] M. Talagrand. Maharam’s Problem. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 168:981–1009, 2008.
- [14] S. Todorćevic. A dichotomy for P-ideals of countable sets. *Fund. Math.*, 166(3):251–267, 2000.
- [15] S. Todorćevic. A problem of von Neumann and Maharam about algebras supporting continuous submeasures. *Fund. Math.*, 183:169–183, 2004.