

## ERRATUM TO "MEASURE-THEORETIC QUANTIFIERS AND HAAR MEASURE"

RUSSELL LYONS

Dr. Henry Schaerf has kindly pointed out the following gap in the application of Proposition 1 of [1] to the main example of a measurable predicate, " $st \notin E$ ", where  $E$  is a Borel subset of a topological group  $G$ . Namely, this predicate is measurable with respect to the Borel subsets  $\mathcal{B}(G \times G)$  of  $G \times G$ , but not necessarily with respect to  $\mathcal{B}(G) \times \mathcal{B}(G)$ , the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing  $\{E \times F: E, F \in \mathcal{B}(G)\}$ . Hence Proposition 1 does not apply. (An example where  $\mathcal{B}(X \times X) \neq \mathcal{B}(X) \times \mathcal{B}(X)$  for a topological space (though, admittedly, not for a group) is given in [2, p. 222, (17-17)].) Since this mistake is clearly easy to make (see also [4]) and yet the needed form of Fubini's theorem is difficult to find, it seems worthwhile to make a careful correction.

The easiest rectifying assumption to make is that all groups in [1] satisfy the second axiom of countability. It is then easy to show that  $\mathcal{B}(G \times G) = \mathcal{B}(G) \times \mathcal{B}(G)$  and a standard form of the Fubini-Tonelli theorem [3] applies.

Another way to rectify [1] is to assume that all spaces are locally compact Hausdorff and that all measures on them are complete and regular (as well as  $\sigma$ -finite). Here, we are using the following

DEFINITION [2, p. 109]. If  $X$  is a locally compact Hausdorff space,  $\mathcal{M}$  a  $\sigma$ -algebra in  $X$ , and  $\mu$  a positive measure on  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $\mu$  is called *regular* if the following conditions hold:

- (i)  $\mathcal{M}$  contains all open sets;
- (ii)  $\mu F < \infty$  if  $F$  is compact;
- (iii) if  $G$  is open,  $\mu G = \sup\{\mu F: F \subset G, F \text{ compact}\}$ ;
- (iv) if  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mu A = \inf\{\mu G: A \subset G, G \text{ open}\}$ .

A complex measure  $\mu$  is *regular* if  $|\mu|$  is.

We call a function  $f$  on a positive measure space  $(X, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$   $\mu$ -*summable* if  $f$  is  $\mathcal{M}$ -measurable and  $\int_X |f| d\mu < \infty$ . From [2, Theorems 17.12 and 17.13 on p. 215, Theorem 17.8 on p. 212, and pp. 199-200], we have the following form of

THE FUBINI-TONELLI THEOREM. *Let  $X_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) be locally compact Hausdorff spaces and  $X = X_1 \times X_2$  with the product topology. Let  $\mu_i$  be positive complete regular  $\sigma$ -finite measures on  $X_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then there exists a unique complete regular  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\nu$  on  $X$  such that:*

- (i) *If  $f$  is a  $\nu$ -summable function on  $X$ , then  $\forall^e y [\mu_2] f(x, y)$  is  $\mu_1$ -summable as a function of  $x$ ;  $\int_{X_1} f(x, y) d\mu_1(x)$ , which is defined a.e.  $[\mu_2]$ , is  $\mu_2$ -summable; likewise with the roles of  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  reversed; and*

---

Received by the editors July 26, 1983.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 43A05.

*Key words and phrases*. Fubini's theorem, Borel sets.

©1984 American Mathematical Society  
0002-9939/84 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

$$\begin{aligned}
 (*) \quad \int_X f \, d\nu &= \int_{X_2} \left( \int_{X_1} f(x, y) \, d\mu_1(x) \right) d\mu_2(y) \\
 &= \int_{X_1} \left( \int_{X_2} f(x, y) \, d\mu_2(y) \right) d\mu_1(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) If  $f$  is a nonnegative  $\nu$ -measurable function on  $X$ , then  $\forall^e y[\mu_2]$   $f(x, y)$  is  $\mu_1$ -measurable as a function of  $x$ ;  $\int_{X_1} f(x, y) \, d\mu_1(x)$ , which is defined as an extended real number a.e.  $[\mu_2]$ , is  $\mu_2$ -measurable; likewise with the roles of  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  reversed; and  $(*)$  holds in the extended reals.

This form of the Fubini-Tonelli theorem gives a new form of Proposition 1 of [1] which, with the above assumption of having complete regular measures on locally compact groups, validates the other results of [1].

Finally, we note a typographical error in the statement of Proposition 1 of [1]: “ $\forall^e[\mu]$ ” should be “ $\forall^e x[\mu]$ ”. Also, “left” should be “right” in lines 3 and 5 of p. 69 of [1].

#### REFERENCES

1. Russell Lyons, *Measure-theoretic quantifiers and Haar measure*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **86** (1982), 67–70.
2. Washek F. Pfeffer, *Integrals and measures*, Dekker, New York, 1977.
3. Walter Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974, p. 150.
4. Harold Widom, *Lectures on measure and integration*, Van Nostrand, New York, 1969, p. 52.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48109

*Current address:* Bâtiment de Mathématique, N° 425, Université de Paris-Sud, 91405 Orsay, France