

difficult to see that such subset must necessarily be  $A \cap B \cap E_0$ ). So the mass

$$\beta_1(E) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } E \notin \mathcal{U}_1 \\ \alpha_1 & \text{if } E \in \mathcal{U}_1 \end{cases}$$

is atomic. Put  $\mu_1 = \mu - \beta_1$ ; if the mass  $\mu_1$  is non-continuous, then

$$\alpha_2 = \inf_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mu_1(E^{(p)}) > 0,$$

and so it is possible to go on in the same fashion.

After  $n$  steps, we get

$$\mu_n = \mu - \sum_{k=1}^n \beta_k$$

and, if  $\mu_n$  is continuous, eq.(4) holds with  $\mu_0 = \mu_n$  and with each  $\beta_k$  null for  $k > n$ . If  $\mu_n$  is non-continuous for any  $n$ , we get a sequence  $(\beta_n)$  such that the corresponding series  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \beta_n(E)$  converges for every  $E \in \mathcal{A}$  (since  $\mu(E) < +\infty$ ). Then  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k = 0$ , and it follows that

$\mu_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n$  is continuous. ■

### 3. Non atomic masses.

In the classical case of a measure, non-atomicity is equivalent to

continuity. This can be seen, for example, as an easy consequence of the following

Theorem 2 (Saks) - Let  $\mu$  be a measure on a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Given any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $p \in \mathcal{D}$  such that each  $E_k \in p$  is either an atom or  $\mu(E_k) < \varepsilon$ .

Proof : see [2], p. 308 . ■

This equivalence cannot be carried over to the general case of a mass: in [1] it is shown (cfr. also the following Theorem 5) that, if  $\mu = \nu + \lambda$ , where  $\nu$  is atomic and  $\lambda$  is continuous, with  $\nu \ll \lambda$  (i.e.  $\nu$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $\lambda$ ), then  $\mu$  is both non-atomic and non-continuous.

In other words, while atomic masses are necessarily non-continuous (see Proposition 2), non-atomic ones can be either continuous or not.

For continuous masses, the following result has been established in [13]:

Theorem 3 - Let  $\mu$  be a continuous mass on a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Then there exists a sequence  $(F_n)$  of mutually disjoint measurable sets, with  $\mu(F_n) > 0$ , such that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(F_n)$  equals any preassigned  $\alpha$ , with  $0 < \alpha < \mu(\Omega)$ , and

$$(5) \quad \alpha = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(F_n) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n\right).$$

So to say, the mass  $\mu$  "behaves" like a measure on each collection  $(F_n)$ : then it would seem interesting a deeper investigation of the family (or of some suitable subfamily) of all such sets obtained when  $\alpha$  ranges

in the open interval from 0 to  $\mu(\Omega)$ .

A simple corollary of Theorem 3 is the following: the range of a continuous  $\mu$  is the whole interval  $[0, \mu(\Omega)]$ . The latter statement is no longer true if  $\mu$  is non-continuous: a counterexample is given in [1]; moreover, there it is shown that the range of  $\mu$  need not even be a closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ , contrary to the classical case of a measure.

As far as continuous masses are concerned, let us quote also a recent result obtained through non-standard methods: a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a continuous mass, which is invariant for a transformation of  $\Omega$  into itself, is given in [16].

We want now to extend Theorem 3 to the more general case of a non-atomic  $\mu$ : the previous remarks show that we can hope, at most, in countable additivity on a suitable sequence of sets (and not also, as in eq. (5), in a beforehand given value of  $\alpha$ ).

Theorem 4 - Let  $\mu$  be a non-atomic mass on a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Then there exists a sequence  $(A_n)$  of mutually disjoint measurable sets, with  $\mu(A_n) > 0$ , such that

$$(6) \quad \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) .$$

Proof - Let  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ , with  $0 < \mu(B) < \mu(\Omega)$ : then also  $B' = \Omega - B$  satisfies  $0 < \mu(B') < \mu(\Omega)$ . At least one of them (call it  $B_1$ ) is such that  $\mu(B_1) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mu(\Omega)$ . Now, let  $B_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $B_2 \subset B_1$ , be such that  $0 < \mu(B_2) < \mu(B_1)$  and  $\mu(B_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mu(B_1)$ . In general, we define  $B_n \subset B_{n-1}$ , with  $0 < \mu(B_n) < \mu(B_{n-1})$  and  $\mu(B_n) \leq \frac{1}{2} \mu(B_{n-1}) \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \mu(\Omega)$ .

Put  $A_n = B_n - B_{n+1}$ : we have  $\mu(A_n) = \mu(B_n) - \mu(B_{n+1}) > 0$  and

$A_i \cap A_j = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ . Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) &= \sum_{n=1}^k \mu(A_n) + \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=k+1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^k \mu(A_n) + \mu(B_{k+1}) \leq \sum_{n=1}^k \mu(A_n) + \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \mu(\Omega) . \end{aligned}$$

As  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we get

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) ,$$

which, taking into account Proposition 1, gives (6). ■

The next theorem will enable us to extend (in Section 4) the previous result also to a particular class of atomic masses.

Theorem 5 - Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  be a  $\sigma$ -algebra,  $\nu$  an atomic mass on  $\mathcal{A}$ , and  $\lambda$  a continuous mass on  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\lambda(A) > 0$  for any atom  $A$  of  $\nu$  (e.g., such that  $\nu \ll \lambda$ ). Then  $\mu = \nu + \lambda$  is non atomic and non-continuous.

Proof : see [1]. ■

Remark - Put  $\nu = \sum_n \beta_n$  in Theorem 1, eq.(4):  $\nu$  need not be atomic

(an example is given in [10], p. 47), and so we may have masses which are at the same time non-atomic and non-continuous, but not of the form given by Theorem 5.

Corollary 1 - Let  $\beta$  be an ultrafilter mass and  $\lambda$  a continuous mass on  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ , with  $\beta \ll \lambda$ . Then  $\mu = \beta + \lambda$  is non-atomic and non-continuous.

Corollary 2 - Let  $\beta$  be an ultrafilter mass on  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  such that  $\beta \ll \lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is a continuous measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then  $\beta$  cannot be a measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Remark - It is interesting also to look at Theorem 5 as another counterexample to known results for measures: in [7] it is shown that, given two measures  $\lambda$  and  $\nu$ , with  $\nu \ll \lambda$  and  $\lambda$  non atomic (i.e. continuous), then  $\nu$  also is non-atomic. Actually, this need not be true if  $\nu$  is only a mass (and not a measure), for example if it is an ultrafilter mass  $\beta$ , as that of Corollary 2. The existence of such a mass (given  $\lambda$ ) can be proved (cfr. [1]) taking an  $\mathcal{A}$ -ultrafilter containing the filter

$$\mathcal{F} = \{E \in \mathcal{A} : \lambda(E) = \lambda(\Omega)\} .$$

#### 4. Atomic masses and measurable cardinals.

Since the mass  $\mu$  occurring in Theorem 5 is non-atomic (and non-continuous), Theorem 4 can be suitably applied to it, giving easily a countably additive sequence of sets also for the atomic mass  $\nu$ .

Theorem 6 - Let  $\nu$  be an atomic mass on a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ , such that  $\nu \ll \lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is a continuous measure on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then there exists a sequence  $(A_n)$  of mutually disjoint measurable sets, such that

$$\nu\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \nu(A_n) .$$