arXiv:2008.08754v4 [math.PR] 20 Jun 2023

GENERALIZING THE DE FINETTI–HEWITT–SAVAGE THEOREM

IRFAN ALAM

Abstract. A sequence of random variables is called exchangeable if its joint distribution is invariant under permutations of indices. de Finetti's theorem is a fundamental result on such random variables that shaped the foundations of Bayesian statistics over the last century. The original formulation of de Finetti's theorem roughly says that any exchangeable sequence of $\{0,1\}$-valued random variables can be thought of as a mixture of independent and identically distributed sequences in a certain precise mathematical sense. Interpreting this statement from a convex analytic perspective, Hewitt and Savage were able to obtain the same conclusion for exchangeable sequences of random variables taking values in more general state spaces under some topological conditions. The main contribution of this paper is in providing a new framework that explains the theorem purely as a consequence of the properties of the underlying distribution of the random variables, with no topological conditions (beyond Hausdorffness) on the state space being necessary if the underlying distribution is Radon. This includes and generalizes the previously known versions of de Finetti's theorem.

In view of some relative consistency results from set theory, this also shows that it is consistent with the axioms of ZFC that de Finetti's theorem holds for all sequences of exchangeable random variables taking values in any complete metric space. In fact, a violation of de Finetti's theorem in a complete metric state space would necessarily imply the existence of real-valued measurable cardinals. We are thus able to see de Finetti's theorem as a foundational result not only in statistics, but in mathematics itself.

The framework we use in this work is based on nonstandard analysis from logic. Owing to the foundational significance of our results in both statistics and mathematics, we have provided a self-contained philosophically motivated introduction to nonstandard analysis as an appendix, thus rendering first courses in measure theoretic probability and point-set topology as the only prerequisites for this paper. This introduction aims to develop some new ideologies about the subject that might be of interest to mathematicians, philosophers, and mathematics educators alike.

An overview of the requisite tools from nonstandard measure theory and topological measure theory is also provided in the main body of the paper, with some new perspectives built at the interface between these fields as part of that overview. One highlight of this development is a new generalization of Prokhorov's theorem which is used in our proof in a crucial way. Modulo technical results in nonstandard topological measure theory, our proof relies on properties of the empirical measures induced by hyperfinitely many identically distributed random variables — a feature that allows us to establish de Finetti's theorem in the generality that we seek while still retaining the combinatorial intuition of proofs of simpler versions of de Finetti's theorem.

Date: June 21, 2023.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G09, 28E05, 28A33, 60B05, 00A30, 26E35 (Primary); 54J05, 60C05, 28C15, 03H05, 62A99, 03F25, 01A07, 00A35, 01A67, 03A05 (Secondary).

Key words and phrases. Nonstandard analysis, exchangeability, de Finetti's theorem, topological measure theory, Loeb measures, foundations of mathematics, philosophy of infinitesimals.

Contents

1. Introduction 3
1.1. Introducing de Finetti's theorem and its history 5
1.2. A heuristic strategy motivated by statistics 9
1.3. Ressel's Radon presentability and the ideas behind our proof 11
1.4. Outline of the main body of the paper 15
2. Background from nonstandard and topological measure theory 16
2.1. General topology and measure theory notation 16
2.2. Review of nonstandard measure theory and topology 18
2.3. The Alexandroff topology on the space of probability measures on a topological space 23
2.4. Space of Radon probability measures under the Alexandroff topology 32
2.5. Useful sigma algebras on spaces of probability measures 36
2.6. Generalizing Prokhorov's theorem—tightness implies relative compactness for probability measures on any Hausdorff space 38
3. Hyperfinite empirical measures induced by identically Radon distributed random variables 40
3.1. Hyperfinite empirical measures as random elements in the space of all internal Radon measures 41
3.2. An internal measure induced on the space of all internal Radon probability measures 49
3.3. Almost sure standard parts of hyperfinite empirical measures 52
3.4. Pushing down certain Loeb integrals on the space of all Radon probability measures 56
4. de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem 58
4.1. Uses of exchangeability and a generalization of Ressel's Radon presentability 58
4.2. Generalizing classical de Finetti's theorem 63
4.3. Some proof-theoretic considerations 66
4.3.1. Upshot for the non-set theorist 68
4.4. Conclusion and possible future work 68
Appendix A. A philosophically motivated introduction to nonstandard analysis 69
A.1. Why is nonstandard analysis relevant for the philosophy of mathematics and ethics of mathematics education? 69
A.2. Imagine being Leibniz (How to begin thinking about infinitesimals?) 74
A.2.1. What Leibniz's philosophy informs us about the anthropology and ethics of mathematical knowledge 78

A.3. The "alien intuition" for Robinson's nonstandard analysis 81
A.4. More mathematical details of our alien intuition 87
A.5. Yet more mathematical details: The superstructure framework 92
A.5.1. Loeb probability theory 95
A.5.2. A glimpse of nonstandard topological thinking 97
Appendix B. Concluding the theorem of Hewitt and Savage from the theorem of Ressel 100
Appendix C. A proof of Theorem 4.1 using conditional probabilities 105
Acknowledgments 111
References 112

1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to establish a generalization of de Finetti's theorem, which is a result that famously revived the foundations of Bayesian statistics in the 20^{th} century (see Cifarelli and Regazzini [24, p. 253]). The original formulation of this theorem states that a sequence of exchangeable random variables taking values in $\{0,1\}$ is uniquely representable as a mixture of independent and identically distributed (iid) random variables. We show that the same conclusion holds for any sequence of Radon distributed exchangeable random variables taking values in any Hausdorff space equipped with its Borel sigma algebra (see Theorem 4.7). This includes and extends the current generalizations of de Finetti's theorem following the works of Hewitt and Savage [61] (who proved de Finetti's theorem in the case when the state space is a compact Hausdorff space equipped with its Baire sigma algebra). An analysis of our proof reveals that a slightly weaker condition than Radonness of the underlying common distribution is sufficient—we only need the common distribution of the random variables to be tight and outer regular on compact sets (see the discussion following Theorem 4.7).

Dubins and Freedman [36] had constructed a counterexample that showed that de Finetti's theorem does not hold for a particular exchangeable sequence of Borel measurable random variables taking values in some separable metric space. Thus, one consequence of the current work is to show that the random variables in their counterexample did not have a tight distribution (as any tight probability measure on a metric space is also Radon). In general, there is a large class of Hausdorff spaces such that de Finetti's theorem holds for any sequence of tightly distributed exchangeable random variables taking values in any such Hausdorff space equipped with its Borel sigma algebra (see the discussion following Theorem 4.7).

As de Finetti's theorem was already known for Polish state spaces (that is, for complete separable metric spaces) as a consequence of the work of Hewitt and Savage, the counterexample by Dubins and Freedman in 1979 seemed to put a brake on the program of finding the most general state space for which de Finetti's theorem holds. Our work thus shows that such a program was ill-fated to begin with as we were not necessarily looking at the right objects. Indeed, de Finetti's

theorem can now be understood as a distributional property, and not a consequence of how topologically nice the state space is.

One corollary of our result is that de Finetti's theorem holds whenever the state space is a Radon space equipped with its Borel sigma algebra (see Corollary 4.10). In fact, it is relatively consistent with the axioms of ZFC (Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory together with the axiom of choice) that de Finetti's theorem holds for *all* sequences of exchangeable random variables taking values in *any* complete metric space (as it is consistent with ZFC that all complete metric spaces are Radon spaces) — see Theorem 4.12. This aspect of our work allows us to see de Finetti's theorem as a foundational result not only in statistics, but in mathematics itself.

Our methods blend together topological measure theory and nonstandard analysis. We present some preparatory results from each of these areas through the perspective provided by looking at them jointly. An example of a classical technique benefitting from this joint perspective is the technique of pushing down Loeb measures, which we are able to interpret as the topological operation of finding a standard measure that an internal measure is nearstandard to (with respect to the A-topology on the space of all Borel probability measures on a given topological space). See Theorem 2.28, Remark 2.29, and Theorem 2.36 for more details. This generalizes similar results obtained in the context of the topology of weak convergence by Anderson [9, Proposition 8.4(ii), p. 684], and by Anderson–Rashid [11, Lemma 2, p. 329] (see also Loeb [77]).

The above formulation is useful in proving a generalization of Prokhorov's theorem as an intermediate consequence (see Theorem 2.44 and Theorem 2.46). This version of Prokhorov's theorem postulates the sufficiency of uniform tightness for relative compactness of a subset of the space of Borel probability measures on *any* topological space (such a result was previously known for the space of Radon probability measures on any Hausdorff space). Prokhorov's theorem is used as a tool to allow pushing down certain internal measures on the space of all Radon probability measures on a Hausdorff space (see Theorem 3.11 and Theorem 3.12), which is a key step in preparation for our proof of the generalization to de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem.

At the heart of our argument is a combinatorial result analogous in spirit to the approximate, finite version of de Finetti's theorem obtained by Diaconis and Freedman [33]. Indeed, the topological nonstandard measure theory developed herein establishes a hyperfinite version of such a result (see Theorem 4.1) as a sufficient condition for our proof. Besides a "frequentist" style proof provided in the main body of the paper, this hyperfinite version of the result of Diaconis and Freedman also has a conditional probabilistic proof, which ties in nicely with the relevance of de Finetti's theorem in Bayesian statistics (see the discussion following the statement of Theorem 4.1; see also Appendix C for the alternative proof of Theorem 4.1 along these lines).

Here is one way to think about why nonstandard methods were effective in this project. The finite version of de Finetti theorem, while approximate, has the benefit of not requiring any sort of conditions on the state space. As the approximation becomes arbitrarily good by taking a large enough number of exchangeable random variables, philosophically one always has a de Finetti-style result for any hyperfinite sequence of random variables (in any state space). Obtaining a classical form of de

Finetti's theorem out of such a result then depends on whether we can push certain Loeb measures down in a reasonable manner. This provides us with a natural line of attack to determine more precisely situations in which this can be done, and the current paper can be considered to be an outcome of such an investigation.

In order for the paper to be widely accessible, we have provided a philosophically motivated introduction to nonstandard analysis in Appendix A. It is possible for a patient reader who has never worked with nonstandard analysis to still follow the rest of the paper by first going through that appendix. Indeed, the only prerequisites for the paper are a first course in measure theoretic probability and familiarity with basic concepts from point-set topology. Appendix A is written in a manner that readers already well-versed with nonstandard analysis might still find it ideologically useful, as some of the philosophical and educational aspects we develop there are new in the literature.

The rest of this section is divided into subsections that introduce the above concepts, provide historical context, and also give a more detailed overview of our methods.

1.1. **Introducing de Finetti's theorem and its history.** We begin with the definition of exchangeable random variables.

Definition 1.1. A finite collection $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ of random variables is said to be *exchangeable* if for any permutation $\sigma \in S_n$, the random vectors $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ and $(X_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, X_{\sigma(n)})$ have the same distribution. An infinite sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of random variables is said to be *exchangeable* if any finite subcollection of the X_n is exchangeable.

See Feller [40, pp. 229-230] for some examples of exchangeable random variables. A well-known result of de Finetti says that an exchangeable sequence of Bernoulli random variables (that is, random variables taking values in $\{0,1\}$) is conditionally independent given the value of a random parameter in $[0,1]$ (the parameter being sampled through a unique probability measure on the Borel sigma algebra of the closed interval $[0,1]$). In a more technical language, we say that any exchangeable sequence of Bernoulli random variables is uniquely representable as a *mixture* of independent and identically distributed (iid) sequences of Bernoulli random variables. More precisely, we may write de Finetti's theorem in the following form.

Theorem 1.2 (de Finetti)**.** *Let $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an exchangeable sequence of Bernoulli random variables. There exists a unique Borel probability measure ν on the interval $[0,1]$ such that the following holds:*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 = e_1, \ldots, X_k = e_k) = \int_{[0,1]} p^{\sum_{j=1}^k e_j} (1-p)^{k-\sum_{j=1}^k e_j} d\nu(p) \tag{1.1}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $e_1, \ldots, e_k \in \{0,1\}$.

See de Finetti [28, 29] for the original works of de Finetti on this topic. The work of generalizing de Finetti's theorem from $\{0,1\}$ to more general state spaces has been an enterprise spanning the better part of the twentieth century.

What counts as a generalization of Theorem 1.2? Notice that in equation (1.1), the variable of integration, p, can be identified with the measure induced on $\{0,1\}$

by a coin toss for which the chance of success (with success identified with the state 1) is p. Clearly, all probability measures on the discrete set $\{0,1\}$ are of this form. Thus, ν in (1.1) can be thought of as a measure on the set of all probability measures on $\{0,1\}$. The integrand in (1.1) then represents the probability of getting $\sum_{j=1}^{k} e_j$ successes in k independent coin tosses, while the integral represents the expected value of this probability with respect to ν.

With $S = \{0,1\}$, we can thus interpret (1.1) as saying that the probability that the random vector $(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ is in the Cartesian product $B_1 \times \ldots \times B_k$ of measurable sets $B_1, \ldots, B_k \subseteq S$, is given by the expected value of $\mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k)$ as μ is sampled (according to some distribution ν) from the space of all Borel probability measures on S. Thus, one possible direction in which to generalize Theorem 1.2 is to look for a statement of the following type (although we now know this to be incorrect in such generality following the work of Dubins and Freedman [36], it is still illustrative to explore the kind of statement that we are looking for).

A natural guess for a generalization of de Finetti. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space and let $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an exchangeable sequence of random variables taking values in some measurable space $(S, \mathfrak{S})$ (called the state space). If $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ denotes the set of all probability measures on $(S, \mathfrak{S})$, then there is a unique probability measure $\mathscr{P}$ on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ such that the following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{P}(\mu) \text{ for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathfrak{S}. \tag{1.2}$$

The above statement is crude since we want a probability measure on the underlying set $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$, yet we have not specified what sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ we are working with. We shall soon see that there are multiple natural sigma algebras on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$. Since we want to integrate functions of the type $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ for all $B \in \mathfrak{S}$, the smallest sigma algebra ensuring the measurability of all such functions is appropriate for this discussion. That minimal sigma algebra, which we denote by $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$, is generated by cylinder sets. In other words, $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ is the smallest sigma algebra containing all sets of the type

$$\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}) : \mu(B_1) \in A_1, \ldots, \mu(B_k) \in A_k\},$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N}$; $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathfrak{S}$; and $A_1, \ldots, A_k \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathbb{R}$.

Hewitt and Savage [61, p. 472] called a measurable space $(S, \mathfrak{S})$ *presentable* (or in some usages, the sigma algebra $\mathfrak{S}$ itself is called *presentable*) if for any exchangeable sequence of random variables $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ from $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ to $(S, \mathfrak{S})$, the condition (1.2) holds for some probability measure $\mathscr{P}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$. The *mixing measure* $\mathscr{P}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ corresponding to an exchangeable sequence of random variables, if it exists, is unique—this is shown in Hewitt–Savage [61, Theorem 9.4, p. 489].

Remark 1.3. In the situation when S is a topological space, we will end up using the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ induced by the so-called A-topology. This sigma algebra contains the aforementioned sigma algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ generated by cylinder

sets. While the integrand in (1.2) only "sees" $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$, using the larger Borel sigma algebra induced by the A-topology opens up the possibility to use tools from non-standard topological measure theory. Thus our main result (Theorem 4.7) is stated in terms of measures on this larger sigma algebra, though it includes a corresponding statement in terms of measures on $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$. For the sake of historical consistency, we will continue using the sigma algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ in the context of presentability during this introduction.

In this terminology, the original result of de Finetti [28] thus says that the state space $(\{0,1\}, \mathcal{P}(\{0,1\}))$ is presentable (where by $\mathcal{P}(S)$ we denote the power set of a set S). In [29], de Finetti generalized the result to real-valued random variables and showed that the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathbb{R}$ is presentable. Dynkin [37] also solved the case of real-valued random variables independently.

Hewitt and Savage [61] observed that the methods used so far required some sense of separability of the state space S in an essential way. They were able to overcome this requirement by using new ideas from convexity theory—they looked at the set of exchangeable distributions on the product space S^∞ as a convex set, of which the (coordinate-wise) independent distributions (whose values at $B_1 \times \ldots \times B_k$ are being integrated on the right side of (1.2)) are the extreme points. Using the Krein–Milman–Choquet theorems, they were thus able to extend de Finetti's theorem to the case in which the state space S is a compact Hausdorff space with the sigma algebra $\mathfrak{S}$ being the collection of all Baire subsets of S (see [61, Theorem 7.2, p. 483]). Thus in their terminology, Hewitt and Savage proved that all compact Hausdorff spaces equipped with their Baire sigma algebra are presentable:

Theorem 1.4 (Hewitt–Savage)**.** *Let S be a compact Hausdorff space and let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$ denote the Baire sigma algebra on S (which is the smallest sigma algebra with respect to which any continuous function $f\colon S \to \mathbb{R}$ is measurable). Then $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$ is presentable.*

What does the result of Hewitt and Savage say about the presentability of Borel sigma algebras, as opposed to Baire sigma algebras? As a consequence of their theorem, they were able to show that the Borel sigma algebra of an arbitrary Borel subset of the real numbers is presentable (see [61, p. 484]), generalizing the earlier works of de Finetti [29] and Dynkin [37] (both of whom independently showed the presentability of the Borel sigma algebra on the space of real numbers).

For a topological space T, we will denote its Borel sigma algebra (that is, the smallest sigma algebra containing all open subsets) by $\mathcal{B}(T)$. Recall that a Polish space is a separable topological space that is metrizable with a complete metric. A subset of a Polish space is called an *analytic set* if it is representable as a continuous image of a Borel subset of some (potentially different) Polish space. As pointed out by Varadarajan [111, p. 219], the result of Hewitt and Savage immediately implies that any state space $(S, \mathfrak{S})$ that is *analytic* is also presentable. Here an *analytic* space refers to a measurable space that is isomorphic to $(T, \mathcal{B}(T))$ where T is an *analytic subset* of a Polish space, equipped with the subspace topology (see also, Mackey [82, Theorem 4.1, p. 140]). In particular, all Polish spaces equipped with their Borel sigma algebras are presentable.

Remark 1.5. Note that both Mackey and Varadarajan use the standard conventions in descriptive set theory of referring to a measurable space as a Borel space (thus,

the original conclusion of Varadarajan was stated for "Borel analytic spaces"). We will not use descriptive set theoretic considerations in this work, and hence we decided to not use the adjective 'Borel' in quoting Varadarajan above, so as to avoid confusion with Borel subsets of topological spaces that we will generally consider in this paper.

The above observation of Varadarajan is the state of the art for modern treatments of de Finetti's theorem for Borel sigma algebras on topological state spaces. For example, Diaconis and Freedman [33, Theorem 14, p. 750] reproved the result of Hewitt and Savage using their approximate de Finetti's theorem for finite exchangeable sequences in any state space (wherein they needed a nice topological structure on the state space to be able to take the limit to go from their approximate de Finetti's theorem on finite exchangeable sequences to the exact de Finetti's theorem on infinite exchangeable sequences). They then concluded (see [33, p. 751]) that de Finetti's theorem holds for state spaces that are isomorphic to Borel subsets of a Polish space. Since any Borel subset of a Polish space is also analytic, this observation is a special case of Varadarajan's. In his monograph, Kallenberg [67, Theorem 1.1] has a proof of de Finetti's theorem for any state space that is isomorphic to a Borel subset of the closed interval $[0, 1]$, a formulation that is contained in the above.

As is justified from the above discussion, the generalization of de Finetti's theorem to more general state spaces is sometimes referred to in the literature as the de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem.

Due to a lack of counterexamples at the time, a natural question arising from the work of Hewitt and Savage [61] was whether de Finetti's theorem held without any topological assumptions on the state space S. This was answered in the negative by Dubins and Freedman [36] who constructed a separable metric space S on which de Finetti's theorem does not hold for some exchangeable sequence of S-valued Borel measurable random variables. In terms of the (pushforward) measure induced by the sequence on the countable product S^∞ of the state space, Dubins [35] further showed that the counterexample in [36] is singular to the measure induced by any presentable sequence. This counterexample suggests that some topological conditions are typically needed in order to avoid such pathological cases, though it may be difficult to identify the most general set of conditions that work.

Let us define the following related concept for individual sequences of exchangeable random variables.

Definition 1.6. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, and let $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be an exchangeable sequence of random variables taking values in some state space $(S, \mathfrak{S})$. Then the sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is said to be *presentable* if it satisfies (1.2) for some unique probability measure $\mathscr{P}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$.

Thus a state space $(S, \mathfrak{S})$ is presentable if and only if *all* exchangeable sequences of S-valued random variables are presentable. It is interesting to note that any Borel probability measure on a Polish space (which is the setting for the modern treatments of de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem) is automatically Radon (see Definition 2.3). Curiously enough, the counterexample of Dubins and Freedman was for a state space on which non-Radon measures are theoretically possible. The main result of this paper shows that the Radonness of the common distribution of the

underlying exchangeable random variables is actually sufficient for de Finetti's theorem to hold for any Hausdorff state space (equipped with its Borel sigma algebra). In particular, this implies that the exchangeable random variables constructed in the counterexample of Dubins and Freedman do not have a Radon distribution. Restricting to random variables with Radon distributions (which is actually not that restrictive as many areas of probability theory work under that assumption in any case) shows that there does not exist a non-presentable exchangeable sequence of this type. For brevity of expression, let us make the following definitions.

Definition 1.7. An identically distributed sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of random variables taking values in a Hausdorff space S equipped with its Borel sigma algebra $\mathcal{B}(S)$ is said to be *Radon-distributed* if the pushforward probability measure induced on $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$ by X_1 is Radon. It is said to be *tightly distributed* if this pushforward measure is tight (see also Definition 2.2).

Focusing on Hausdorff state spaces, while the answer to the original question of whether de Finetti's theorem holds without topological assumptions is indeed in the negative (as the counterexample of Dubins and Freedman shows), we are still able to show that the most commonly studied exchangeable sequences (that is, those that are Radon-distributed) taking values in *any* Hausdorff space are presentable, thus establishing an affirmative answer from a different perspective. Ignoring the various technicalities in the statement of our main result (Theorem 4.7), we can thus briefly summarize our contribution to the above question as follows.

Theorem 1.8. *Any Radon-distributed exchangeable sequence of random variables taking values in a Hausdorff space (equipped with its Borel sigma algebra) is presentable.*

A closer inspection of our proof shows that we will not use the full strength of the assumption of Radonness of the common distribution of exchangeable random variables—the theorem is still true for sequences of exchangeable random variables whose common distribution is tight and outer regular on compact sets (see the discussion following Theorem 4.7).

Before we give an overview of our methods, let us first describe a common practice in statistics that is intimately connected to the reasoning behind a statement like equation (1.2) that we are trying to generalize for sequences of Radon-distributed exchangeable random variables.

1.2. **A heuristic strategy motivated by statistics.** Let $\mathfrak{S}$ be a sigma algebra on a state space S. Suppose we devise an experiment to sample values from an identically distributed sequence $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ (where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ can theoretically be as large as we please) of random variables from some underlying probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ to $(S, \mathfrak{S})$. Depending on the way the experiment is conducted, within each iteration of the experiment it might not be justified to assume that the sampled values are independent, but it might be reasonable to still believe that the distribution of $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ is invariant under permutations of indices. Depending on the application, one might be interested in the joint distribution of two (or more) of the X_i, which is difficult to establish without an assumption of independence. However, only under an assumption of exchangeability, it is not very difficult to show the following. (Theorem 4.1 is a nonstandard version of this statement, with

the standard statement having a proof along the same lines—replace the step where we use the hyperfiniteness of N in that proof by an argument about taking limits.)

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}(\mu_{\cdot,n}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu_{\cdot,n}(B_k)) \tag{1.3}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathfrak{S}$, where

$$\mu_{\omega,n}(B) = \frac{\#\{i \in [n] \colon X_i(\omega) \in B\}}{n} \text{ for all } \omega \in \Omega \text{ and } B \in \mathfrak{S}. \tag{1.4}$$

Here $[n]$ denotes the initial segment $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In (statistical) practice, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathfrak{S}$, we do multiple independent iterations of the experiment. For $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we calculate the product $\mu^{(j)}_{\cdot,n}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu^{(j)}_{\cdot,n}(B_k)$ of the "empirical sample means" in the j^{th} iteration of the experiment. The strong law of large numbers (which we can use because of the assumption that the experiments generating samples of $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ are independent) thus implies the following:

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{j\in[m]} \mu^{(j)}_{\cdot,n}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu^{(j)}_{\cdot,n}(B_k)}{m} = \mathbb{E}\left(\mu_{\cdot,n}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu_{\cdot,n}(B_k)\right) \text{ almost surely.} \tag{1.5}$$

By (1.5) and (1.3), we thus obtain the following for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathfrak{S}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{j\in[m]} \mu^{(j)}_{\cdot,n}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu^{(j)}_{\cdot,n}(B_k)}{m}. \tag{1.6}$$

Thus, only under an assumption of exchangeability of the values sampled in each experiment, as long as we have a method to repeat the experiment independently, we have the following heuristic algorithm to statistically approximate the joint probability $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k)$ for any $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathfrak{S}$:

(i) In each iteration of the experiment, sample a large number (this corresponds to n in (1.6)) of values.
(ii) Conduct a large number (this corresponds to m in (1.6)) of such independent experiments.
(iii) The average of the empirical sample means $\mu^{(j)}_{\cdot,n}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu^{(j)}_{\cdot,n}(B_k)$ (as j varies in $[m]$) is then an approximation to $\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k)$.

As hinted earlier, the above heuristic idea is at the heart of the intuition behind de Finetti's theorem as well. How do we make this idea more precise to hopefully get a version of de Finetti theorem of the form (1.2)? Suppose for the moment that we have fixed some sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (we will come back to the issue of which sigma algebra to fix) such that the following natural conditions are met:

(i) For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\omega \mapsto \mu_{\omega,n}$ is a $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$-valued random variable on Ω.
(ii) For each $B \in \mathfrak{S}$, the map $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ is a real-valued random variable on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, this would define a pushforward probability measure ν_n on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ that is supported on $\{\mu_{\omega,n} \colon \omega \in \Omega\} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$, such that

$$\int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \ldots \mu(B_k) d\nu_n(\mu) = \int_\Omega \mu_{\omega,n}(B_1) \ldots \mu_{\omega,n}(B_k) d\mathbb{P}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathfrak{S}. \tag{1.7}$$

Comparing (1.3) and (1.7), it is clear that we are looking for conditions that guarantee there to be a measure ν on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ such that the following holds:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})}\mu(B_1)\dots\mu(B_k)d\nu_n(\mu)=\int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})}\mu(B_1)\dots\mu(B_k)d\nu(\mu)\quad\text{for all } B_1,\dots,B_k\in\mathfrak{S}. \tag{1.8}$$

Intuitively, equation (1.8) is a statement of convergence (in some sense) of ν_n to ν. A naive candidate for ν could come from (1.7) if the following are true:

(1) There exists an almost sure set $\Omega'\subseteq\Omega$ such that for each $B\in\mathfrak{S}$, the limit $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu_{\omega,n}(B)$ exists for all $\omega\in\Omega'$. Up to null sets in Ω, this would thus define a map $\omega\mapsto\mu_\omega$ from Ω to the space of all real-valued functions on $\mathfrak{S}$, where $\mu_\omega(B)=\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu_{\omega,n}(B)$.
(2) The function $\mu_\omega:\mathfrak{S}\to[0,1]$ is actually a probability measure on $(S,\mathfrak{S})$.

Indeed if these two conditions are true, then one may define ν to be the push-forward on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ of the map $\omega\mapsto\mu_\omega$. A weaker version of (1) is often interpreted as a generalization of the strong law of large numbers for exchangeable random variables—see, for instance, Kingman [72, Equation (2.2), p. 185], which can be easily modified to work in the setting of an arbitrary $(S,\mathfrak{S})$ to conclude that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mu_{\omega,n}(B)$ exists for all ω in an almost sure set that depends on B. Of course, an issue with this idea is that if we have too many (that is, uncountably many) different choices for $B\in\mathfrak{S}$, then there is no guarantee that an almost sure set would exist that works for all $B\in\mathfrak{S}$ simultaneously. The condition (2) is even more delicate, as showing countable additivity of μ_ω would require some control on the rates at which the sequences $(\mu_{\omega,n}(B))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converge for different $B\in\mathfrak{S}$.

Thus we seem to have reached a dead end in this heuristic strategy in the absence of having more information about the specific structure of our spaces and measures. We now describe a generalization of a slightly different type before explaining our method of proof.

1.3. **Ressel's Radon presentability and the ideas behind our proof.** As we describe next, our strategy (motivated by the statistical heuristics from Section 1.2) for proving de Finetti's theorem naturally leads to an investigation into a de Finetti style theorem first proved by Ressel in [91]. Ressel studied de Finetti-type theorems using techniques from abstract harmonic analysis. His insight was to look for indirect generalizations of de Finetti's theorem; that is, those generalizations which do not prove (1.2) for a state space in a strict sense, but rather prove an analogous statement applicable to nicer classes of random variables, with the smaller space of Radon probability measures being considered (as opposed to the space of all Borel probability measures). Before we proceed, let us make some of these technicalities more precise.

Definition 1.9. Let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ and $\mathfrak{P}_\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{T})$ respectively denote the sets of all Borel probability measures and Radon probability measures on a Hausdorff space T. The *weak topology* (or *narrow topology*) on either of these sets is the smallest topology under which the maps $\mu\mapsto\mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$ are continuous for each real-valued bounded continuous function $f\colon S\to\mathbb{R}$.

Definition 1.10. Let a sequence of random variables $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ taking values in a Hausdorff space S be called *jointly Radon distributed* if the pushforward measure induced by the sequence on $(S^\infty, \mathcal{B}(S^\infty))$ (the product of countably many copies of S, equipped with its Borel sigma algebra) is Radon.

Definition 1.11. Let a jointly Radon distributed sequence of exchangeable random variables $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be called *Radon presentable* if there is a unique Radon measure $\mathscr{P}$ on the space $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ of all Radon measures on S (equipped with the Borel sigma algebra induced by its weak topology) such that the following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int\limits_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{P}(\mu) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{1.9}$$

Note that (1.9) is an analog of (1.2). This terminology of Ressel is inspired from the similar terminology of presentable spaces introduced by Hewitt and Savage [61].

One of the results that Ressel proved (see [91, Theorem 3, p. 906]) says that all completely regular Hausdorff spaces are Radon presentable. Ressel's theorem, in particular, shows that all Polish spaces and all locally compact Hausdorff spaces are Radon presentable (see [91, p. 907]). In fact, as we show in Appendix B (see Theorem B.6), there is a standard measure theoretic argument by which Ressel's result on completely regular Hausdorff spaces implies the Hewitt–Savage generalization of de Finetti's theorem (Theorem 1.4). Thus, although it appears to be in a slightly different form, Ressel's result indeed is a generalization of the de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem in a strict sense. Prior to the statement of his theorem, he remarked the following (see [91, p. 906]):

> "It might be true that all Hausdorff spaces have this property."

This conjecture of Ressel was confirmed by Winkler [113] using ideas from convexity theory (similar in spirit to Hewitt–Savage [61]). Fremlin showed in his treatise [48] that a stronger statement is actually true. Replacing the requirement of being jointly Radon distributed with the weaker requirement of being jointly quasi-Radon distributed (this notion is defined in Fremlin [48, 411H, p. 5]) and marginally Radon distributed (that is, the individual common distribution of the random variables must be Radon), Fremlin [48, 459H, p. 166] showed that all such exchangeable sequences also satisfy (1.9). One of our main results generalizes this further to situations where no assumptions on the joint distribution of the sequence of exchangeable random variables are needed:

Theorem 4.2. *Let S be a Hausdorff topological space, with $\mathcal{B}(S)$ denoting its Borel sigma algebra. Let $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ be the space of all Radon probability measures on S and $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ with respect to the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$.*

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of exchangeable S-valued random variables such that the common distribution of the X_i is Radon on S. Then there exists a unique probability measure $\mathscr{P}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$ such

that the following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*:*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{P}(\mu)$$
$$\text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{4.14}$$

We have not yet described the concept of A-topology that appears in the above theorem. In general, if S is a topological space and $\mathfrak{S} = \mathcal{B}(S)$ is the Borel sigma algebra on S, then there are natural ways to topologize the space $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$) of Borel probability measures (respectively Radon probability measures) on S, which would thus lead to natural (Borel) sigma algebras on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$). Although we had already established that any such sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ we work with under the aim of showing (1.2) should be at least as large as the cylinder sigma algebra $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$, a potentially larger Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ induced by some topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ would be desirable in order to be able to use tools from topological measure theory (an analogous statement applies for $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ in the context of (1.9)).

For instance, perhaps the most common topology studied in probability theory is the topology of weak convergence (see Definition 1.9). The weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$, however, is interesting only when there are many real-valued continuous functions on S to work with. If S is completely regular (which is true of all the settings in the previous generalizations of de Finetti's theorem), for instance, then the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ is a natural topology to work with. However, if the state space S is not completely regular then the weak topology may actually be too coarse to be of any interest.

Indeed, as extreme cases, there are regular Hausdorff spaces that do not have any nonconstant continuous real-valued functions. Identifying the most general conditions on the topological space S that guarantee the existence of at least one nonconstant continuous real-valued function was part of Urysohn's research program (see [108] where he posed this question). Hewitt [59] and later Herrlich [58] both showed that regularity of the space S is generally not sufficient. In fact, the result of Herrlich dramatically shows that given any Frechét space F (see (T_1) on p. 15 for a definition of Frechét spaces) containing at least two points, there exists a regular Hausdorff space S such that the only continuous functions from S to F are constants. If the topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$) is too coarse, we might not be able to make sense of an equation such as (1.2) (respectively (1.9)), as we would want the induced sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$) to be large enough such that the evaluation maps $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ are measurable for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$.

Thus, we ideally want something finer than the weak topology when working with state spaces that are more general than completely regular spaces. A natural finer topology is the so-called A-topology (named after A.D. Alexandroff [7]) defined through bounded upper (or lower) semicontinuous functions from S to $\mathbb{R}$, as opposed to through bounded continuous functions. Thus, the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ or $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ is the smallest topology such that the maps $\mu \mapsto \mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$ on either space are upper semicontinuous for each bounded upper semicontinuous function $f\colon S \to \mathbb{R}$. With respect to the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ or $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ induced by this topology, the evaluation maps $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ are indeed measurable for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ (see Theorem

2.20 and Theorem 2.33), which is something we necessarily need in order to even write an equation such as (1.2) or (1.9) meaningfully. The next section is devoted to a thorough study of this topology.

How is a generalization of Ressel's theorem in the form of Theorem 4.2 connected to our generalization of the classical de Finetti's theorem as stated in Theorem 1.8 (see Theorem 4.7 for a more precise statement)? The idea is that any sequence of exchangeable random variables satisfying (1.9) must also satisfy the more classical equation (1.2) of de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage (see Theorem 4.6). This follows from elementary topological measure theory arguments that exploit the specific structure of the subspace topology induced by the A-topology. Thus, extending Ressel's theorem to a wider class of exchangeable random variables also proves the classical de Finetti's theorem for that class of exchangeable random variables. Let us now describe the intuition behind our proof idea, which will complete the story by showing that such an idea naturally leads to an investigation into a generalization of Ressel's theorem in the form of Theorem 4.2.

The idea is to carry out the naive strategy from Section 1.2 using hyperfinite numbers from nonstandard analysis as tools to model large sample sizes. Fix a hyperfinite $N > \mathbb{N}$ and study the map $\omega \mapsto \mu_{\omega,N}$ from ${}^*\Omega$ to ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$. This map induces an internal probability measure (through the pushforward) on the space ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ of all internal probability measures on ${}^*S$. That is, this pushforward measure Q_N (say) lives in the space ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$. In view of (1.8) (and the nonstandard characterization of limits), we want to have a standard probability measure $\mathscr{Q}$ on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ that is close to Q_N in the sense that the integral of the function $\mu \mapsto \mu({}^*B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu({}^*B_k)$ with respect to Q_N is infinitesimally close to its integral with respect to ${}^*\mathscr{Q}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S)$.

As the space $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (and hence the space $\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ has a topology on it (namely, the A-topology), a natural way to look for a standard element in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ close to a given element of ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ is to try to see if this given element has a unique standard part (or if it is at least nearstandard). If T is a Hausdorff space, then there are certain natural sufficient conditions for an element in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ to be nearstandard (see Section 2, more specifically Theorem 2.28 and Theorem 2.12). However, in our case, the Hausdorffness of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ is too much to ask for in general (see Corollary 2.31)! We remedy this situation by focusing on a nicer subspace of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$—it is known that if the underlying space S is Hausdorff then the space $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ of all *Radon* probability measures on S is also Hausdorff (see Topsøe [104], or Theorem 2.35 for our proof). The internal measures $\mu_{\omega,N}$ are internally Radon for all $\omega \in {}^*\Omega$ (as they are supported on the hyperfinite sets $\{X_1(\omega), \ldots, X_N(\omega)\}$). Hence, this move from $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ to $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ does not affect our strategy—the pushforward P_N induced by the map $\omega \mapsto {}^*\mu_{\omega,N}$ from Ω to $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ lives in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, in which we try to find its standard part $\mathscr{P}$ in order to complete our proof.

The main tool in finding a standard part of this pushforward is Theorem 2.28, which is used in conjunction with Theorem 2.12 (originally from Albeverio et al. [3, Proposition 3.4.6, p. 89]). This technique is called "pushing down Loeb measures" and is well-known in the nonstandard literature (see, for example, Albeverio et al. [3, Chapter 3.4] or Ross [95, Section 3]). It is often used to construct a standard measure that is close in some sense to an internal (nonstandard) measure. The way we develop the theory of A-topology allows us to interpret this classical technique

of pushing down Loeb measures as actually taking a standard part in a legitimate nonstandard space (of internal measures). See, for example, Theorem 2.28, Remark 2.29, and Theorem 2.36. Similar results were obtained in the context of the topology of weak convergence by Anderson [9, Proposition 8.4(ii), p. 684], and by Anderson–Rashid [11, Lemma 2, p. 329] (see also Loeb [77]).

Using Theorem 2.12 as described above requires us to first show the existence of large compact sets in $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ in some sense, which is shown to be the case in Theorem 3.11 using a version of Prokhorov's theorem in this setting (see Theorem 2.46). It is in this proof that we need the Radonnes of the underlying distribution of X_1, thus explaining how our statistical heuristic naturally leads to an investigation of a generalization of Ressel's theorem to sequences of Radon-distributed exchangeable random variables, rather than the classical presentability of Hewitt and Savage.

After setting up this abstract machinery for pushing down Loeb measures, the main computational result that is sufficient for Theorem 4.2 is Theorem 4.1, which, as mentioned earlier, is the nonstandard version of (1.3) from our statistical heuristic in Section 1.2. The fact that this is a sufficient condition follows naturally from the general topological measure theory of hyperfinitely many identically distributed random variables that is developed in Section 3. It should be pointed out that the proof of Theorem 4.1 uses a similar combinatorial construction as Diaconis–Freedman's proof of the finite, approximate version of de Finetti's theorem in [33]. In fact, the proof shows that the two results are different ways to express the same idea (see also the discussion following the statement of Theorem 4.1). The form of the result presented here can be given an intuitive underpinning based on Bayesian-type ideas (this is made more precise in Appendix C, where an alternative proof of Theorem 4.1 is provided).

In some sense, we prove a highly general de Finetti's theorem using the same underlying basic idea that works for the simplest versions of de Finetti's theorem (that being the idea of approximating using empirical sample means), the technical machinery from topological measure theory and nonstandard analysis notwithstanding. The bulk of this paper (Sections 2 and 3) is devoted to setting up this technical machinery.

For a more thorough introduction to exchangeability, see Aldous [6], Kingman [72], and Kallenberg [67]. Besides a recent paper of the author on a nonstandard proof of de Finetti's theorem for Bernoulli random variables (see Alam [2]), there is some precedence in the use of nonstandard analysis in this field, as Hoover [62, 63] studied the notions of exchangeability for multi-dimensional arrays using nonstandard methods in the guise of ultraproducts. In view of this work, Aldous [6, p. 179] had also expressed the hope of nonstandard analysis being useful in other topics in exchangeability. Another example is Dacunha-Castelle [27] who also used ultraproducts to study exchangeability in Banach spaces.

1.4. **Outline of the main body of the paper.** In Section 2, the main object of study is the space of probability measures $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ on a topological space T. Section 2.2 outlines some standard techniques in nonstandard topology and measure theory that we will be using throughout. The rest of Section 2 develops basic results on the so-called A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$. While some of this material can be viewed as a review of known results in topological measure theory (for which Topsøe [104] is our

main reference), we provide a self-contained exposition that is aided by perspectives provided from nonstandard analysis. This leads to both new proofs of known results as well as some new results. A highlight of this section is a quick nonstandard proof of a generalization of Prokhorov's theorem (see Theorem 2.44; see also Section 2.6 for a historical discussion on Prokhorov's theorem).

In Section 3, we only assume that the sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is identically distributed and derive several useful foundational results as applications of the theory built in Section 2. In particular, we study the structure of the hyperfinite empirical distributions derived from (the nonstandard extension of) an identically distributed sequence of random variables. We also study the properties of the measures that these hyperfinite empirical distributions induce on the space of all Radon probability measures on the state space.

In Section 4, we exploit the added structure provided by exchangeability that allows us to use the results from Section 3 to prove our generalizations of de Finetti's theorem. Section 4.3 introduces some known relative consistency results in set theory and uses them to show that it is consistent with the axioms of ZFC that de Finetti's theorem holds for sequences of exchangeable random variables taking values in *any* complete metric space. Section 4.4 briefly mentions some other possible versions and generalizations of de Finetti's theorem that we did not consider in this paper, along with a discussion on potential future work.

2. Background from nonstandard and topological measure theory

2.1. **General topology and measure theory notation.** All measures considered in this paper are countably additive, and unless otherwise specified, probability measures. We will usually work with probability measures on the Borel sigma algebra $\mathcal{B}(T)$ of a topological space T (thus $\mathcal{B}(T)$ is the smallest sigma algebra that contains all open subsets of T).

Definition 2.1. A subset of a topological space is called a G_δ *set* if it is a countable intersection of open sets. A topological space is called a G_δ *space* if all of its closed subsets are G_δ sets.

Let us recall the various notions of separation in topological spaces (for further topological background, we refer the interested reader to Kelley [71]):

- (T_1) A space T is called *Fréchet* if any singleton subset of T is closed.
- (T_2) A space T is called *Hausdorff* if any two points in it can be separated via open sets. That is, given any two distinct points x and y in T, there exist disjoint open sets G_1 and G_2 such that $x \in G_1$ and $y \in G_2$.
- (T_3) A space T is called *regular* if any closed set and a point outside that closed set can be separated via open sets. That is, given a closed set $F \subseteq T$ and given $x \in T\backslash F$, there exist disjoint open sets G_1 and G_2 such that $x \in G_1$ and $F \subseteq G_2$.
- ($T_{3\frac{1}{2}}$) A space T is called *completely regular* if any closed set and a point outside that closed set can be separated via some bounded real-valued function. That is, given a closed set $F \subseteq T$ and $x \in T\backslash F$, there is a continuous function $f\colon T \to [0,1]$ such that $f(x) = 0$ and $f(y) = 1$ for all $y \in F$.

(T_4) A space T is called *normal* if any two disjoint subsets of T can be separated by open sets. That is, given closed sets $F_1, F_2 \subseteq T$ such that $F_1 \cap F_2 = \emptyset$, there exist disjoint open sets G_1 and G_2 such that $F_1 \subseteq G_1$ and $F_2 \subseteq G_2$.
(T_5) A space T is called *hereditarily normal* if all subsets of T (under the subspace topology) are normal.
(T_6) A space T is called *perfectly normal* if it is a normal G_δ space.

We now recall the definitions of some important classes of probability measures.

Definition 2.2. For a Hausdorff space T, a Borel probability measure μ is called *tight* if given any $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there is a compact subset K_ϵ such that the following holds:

$$\mu(K_\epsilon) > 1 - \epsilon. \tag{2.1}$$

An alternative way to write the above condition for tightness is the following:

$$\mu(T) = \sup\{\mu(K) : K \text{ is a compact subset of } T\}. \tag{2.2}$$

If a measure μ satisfies (2.2) with the occurrence of T replaced by any Borel subset of T, then we call it a Radon measure. More formally we make the following definition (the second line in the equality following from the fact that we are only considering probability, and in particular finite, measures).

Definition 2.3. For a Hausdorff space T, a Borel probability measure μ is called *Radon* if for each Borel set $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu(B) &= \sup\{\mu(K) : K \subseteq B \text{ and } K \text{ is compact}\} \\ &= \inf\{\mu(G) : B \subseteq G \text{ and } G \text{ is open}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that the Hausdorffness of the topological space T was assumed in the previous definitions so as to ensure that the compact sets appearing in them were Borel measurable (as a compact subset of any Hausdorff space is automatically closed). While not typically done (as many results do not generalize to those settings), these definitions can be made for arbitrary topological spaces if we replace the word "compact" by "closed and compact". See Schwarz [97, pp. 82-88] for more details on this generalization (Schwarz uses the phrase 'quasi-compact' instead of 'compact' in this discussion). In this paper, we will always have an underlying assumption of Hausdorffness of T during any discussions involving tight or Radon measures.

Remark 2.4. It is clear that all Radon measures are tight. Note that any Borel probability measure on a σ-compact Hausdorff space (that is, a Hausdorff space that can be written as a countable union of compact spaces) is tight. Vakhania–Tarladze–Chobanyan [109, Proposition 3.5, p. 32] constructs a non-Radon Borel probability measure on a particular compact Hausdorff space (the construction being attributed to Dieudonné). Thus, not all tight measures are Radon.

Definition 2.5. Let T be a topological space and let $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(T)$. We say that a Borel probability measure μ is *outer regular on* $\mathcal{K}$ if we have the following:

$$\mu(B) = \inf\{\mu(G) : B \subseteq G \text{ and } G \text{ is open}\} \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{K}.$$

In our generalization of the de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem, we will work under the assumption that the underlying common distribution of the given exchangeable random variables is tight and outer regular on the collection of compact subsets.

2.2. **Review of nonstandard measure theory and topology.** Assuming familiarity with basic nonstandard concepts at the level of our exposition in Appendix A, we outline here a construction of *Loeb measures*, both to establish the notation we will use and to make the rest of the exposition as self-contained as possible. Loeb measures, first constructed by Peter Loeb [75], are measures in the standard sense that are defined on an internal space in the nonstandard universe, thus allowing us to use the benefits of both standard and nonstandard mathematics simultaneously. One goal of our discussion will be to describe the method of pushing down Loeb measures, which is one of the main tools in our work as it allows us to precisely talk about when a nonstandard measure on the nonstandard extension of a topological space is, in a reasonable sense, infinitesimally close to a standard measure (this idea will be made more precise at the end of our discussion on Alexandroff topology in the next subsection; see, for example, Theorem 2.28 and Remark 2.29).

We first describe some general notation that will be followed in the sequel. For two nonstandard numbers $x, y \in {}^*\mathbb{R}$, we will write $x \approx y$ to denote that $x - y$ is an infinitesimal. The set of finite nonstandard real numbers will be denoted by ${}^*\mathbb{R}_{\text{fin}}$ and the standard part map $\mathbf{st}\colon {}^*\mathbb{R}_{\text{fin}} \to \mathbb{R}$ takes a finite nonstandard real to its closest real number. We follow the superstructure approach to nonstandard extensions, as in Albeverio et al. [3]. In particular, we fix a sufficiently saturated nonstandard extension of a *superstructure* containing all standard mathematical objects under study. The nonstandard extension of a set A (respectively a function f) is denoted by ${}^*A$ (respectively ${}^*f$).

If $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{A}, \nu)$ is an internal probability space (that is, $\mathfrak{T}$ is an internal set, $\mathcal{A}$ is an internal sigma algebra of subsets of $\mathfrak{T}$, and $\nu\colon \mathcal{A} \to {}^*[0,1]$ is an internal finitely additive function with $\nu(\mathfrak{T}) = 1$), then there are multiple equivalent ways to define the *Loeb measure* corresponding to it. We will define it using inner and outer measures obtained through ν (see Albeverio et. al. [3, Remark 3.1.5, p. 66]).[1] Formally, we define, for any $A \subseteq \mathfrak{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\nu}(A) &:= \sup\{\mathbf{st}(\nu(B)) : B \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } B \subseteq A\}, \text{ and} \\ \overline{\nu}(A) &:= \inf\{\mathbf{st}(\nu(B)) : B \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } A \subseteq B\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

The collection of sets for which the inner and outer measures agree form a sigma algebra called the *Loeb sigma algebra* $L(\mathcal{A})$. The common value $\underline{\nu}(A) = \overline{\nu}(A)$ in that case is defined as the Loeb measure of A, written $L\nu(A)$. We call $(\mathfrak{T}, L(\mathcal{A}), L\nu)$ the *Loeb space* of $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{A}, \nu)$. More formally, we have:

$$L(\mathcal{A}) := \{A \subseteq \mathfrak{T} : \underline{\nu}(A) = \overline{\nu}(A)\}, \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$L\nu(A) := \underline{\nu}(A) = \overline{\nu}(A) \text{ for all } A \in L(\mathcal{A}). \tag{2.5}$$

[1] Note that this is different from how we have defined it in our introduction in the appendix, where our exposition used Loeb's original construction via Carathéodory extension theorem, Both approaches are equivalent and construct the same measure.

When the internal measure ν is clear from context, we will frequently write 'Loeb measurable' (in the contexts of both sets and functions) to mean measurable with respect to the corresponding Loeb space $(\mathfrak{T}, L(\mathcal{A}), L\nu)$. Note that the Loeb sigma algebra $L(\mathcal{A})$, as defined above, depends on the original internal measure ν on $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{A})$—we will use appropriate notation such as $L_\nu(\mathcal{A})$ to indicate this dependence if there is any chance of confusion regarding the original measure inducing the Loeb sigma algebra. If we use the notation $L(\mathcal{A})$, then it is understood that a specific internal measure ν has been fixed on $(\mathfrak{T}, \mathcal{A})$ during that discussion.

For the remainder of this section, we work in the case when $\mathfrak{T}$ is the nonstandard extension of a topological space T (that is, $\mathfrak{T} = {}^*T$, and $\mathcal{A}$ is the algebra ${}^*\mathcal{B}(T)$ of internally Borel subsets of ${}^*T$). Note that both here and in the sequel, we will use 'internally' as an adjective to describe nonstandard counterparts of certain standard concepts. For instance, just as the Borel subsets of T are the elements of $\mathcal{B}(T)$, the internally Borel subsets refer to elements of ${}^*\mathcal{B}(T)$. Similarly, an internally finite set will refer to a hyperfinite set, and an internally Radon probability measure on ${}^*T$ will refer to an element of ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_r(T)$, where $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ is the space of Radon probability measures on T.

For a point $y \in T$, we can think of points *infinitesimally close* to y in ${}^*T$ as the set of points that lie in the nonstandard extensions of all open neighborhoods of y. More formally, we define:

$$\mathbf{st}^{-1}(y) := \{x \in {}^*T : x \in {}^*G \text{ for any open set } G \text{ containing } y\}. \tag{2.6}$$

The notation in (2.6) is suggestive—given a point $x \in {}^*T$, we may be interested in knowing if it is infinitesimally close to any standard point $y \in T$, in which case it would be nice to call y as the standard part of x (written $y = \mathbf{st}(x)$). The issue with this is that for a general topological space T, there is no guarantee that if a nonstandard point x is *nearstandard* (that is, if there is a $y \in T$ for which $x \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(y)$) then it is also uniquely nearstandard to only one point of T. This pathological situation is remedied in Hausdorff spaces. Indeed, given two standard points x_1 and x_2 in a Hausdorff space T, one may separate them by open sets (say) G_1 and G_2 respectively, so that ${}^*G_1$ and ${}^*G_2$ are disjoint, thus making $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x_1)$ and $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x_2)$ also disjoint.

Conversely, thinking along the same lines, if the standard inverses of any two distinct points are disjoint, then those points can be separated by disjoint open sets. Thus, we have the following nonstandard characterization of Haudorffness (see also [3, Proposition 2.1.6 (i), p. 48]):

Lemma 2.6. *A topological space T is Hausdorff if and only if for any distinct elements $x, y \in T$, we have $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x) \cap \mathbf{st}^{-1}(y) = \emptyset$.*

Regardless of whether T is Hausdorff or not, (2.6) allows us to naturally talk about $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(A)$ for subsets $A \subseteq T$. That is, we define:

$$\mathbf{st}^{-1}(A) := \{y \in {}^*T : y \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x) \text{ for some } x \in A\}. \tag{2.7}$$

We define the set of *nearstandard points* of ${}^*T$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{Ns}({}^*T) := \mathbf{st}^{-1}(T).$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.6, if T is Hausdorff then $\mathbf{st}\colon\ \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T) \to T$ is a well-defined map.

Using the notation in (2.7), there are succinct nonstandard characterizations of open, closed, and compact sets, which we note next (this is proved in the appendix as Proposition A.14).

Proposition 2.7. *Let T be a topological space.*

(i) A set $G \subseteq T$ is open if and only if $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(G) \subseteq {}^*G$.
(ii) A set $F \subseteq T$ is closed if and only if for all $x \in {}^*F \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)$, the condition $x \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(y)$ implies that $y \in F$.
(iii) A set $K \subseteq T$ is compact if and only if ${}^*K \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)$.

The following technical consequence of Proposition 2.7 will be useful in Section 3.

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose $(F_i)_{i\in I}$ is a collection of closed subsets of a Hausdorff space T (where I is an index set in the standard universe). Suppose that $K := \cap_{i\in I} F_i$ is compact. Then for any open set G with $K \subseteq G$, we have:*

$$ {}^*K \subseteq \left[\left(\bigcap_{i\in I} {}^*F_i \right) \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T) \right] \subseteq {}^*G. \tag{2.8} $$

Proof. The first inclusion in (2.8) is true since ${}^*K \subseteq {}^*F_i$ for all $i \in I$ (which follows because $K \subseteq F_i$ for all $i \in I$), and since K is compact (so that all elements of ${}^*K$ are nearstandard by Proposition 2.7(iii)). To see the second inclusion in (2.8), suppose we take $x \in \cap_{i\in I} ({}^*F_i \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T))$. Since T is Hausdorff, $x \in \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)$ has a unique standard part, say $\mathbf{st}(x) = y \in T$. Since F_i is closed for each $i \in I$, it follows from the nonstandard characterization of closed sets (Proposition 2.7(ii)) that $y \in F_i$ for all $i \in I$. As a consequence, $y \in K \subseteq G$. Thus by the nonstandard characterization of open sets (see Proposition 2.7(i)), it follows that $x \in {}^*G$, thus completing the proof. □

If T is a topological space and $T' \subseteq T$ is viewed as a topological space under the subspace topology (thus a subset $G' \subseteq T'$ is open in T' if and only if $G' = T' \cap G$ for some open subset G of T), then there are multiple ways to interpret (2.7). There is a similar issue in general when we have two topological spaces in which we could be taking standard inverses. We will generally use '$\mathbf{st}$' and '$\mathbf{st}^{-1}$' for all such usages when the underlying topological space is clear from context. If it is not clear from context, then we mention the space in a subscript. Thus in the above situation where $T' \subseteq T$, we denote by $\mathbf{st}_T^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{st}_{T'}^{-1}$ the corresponding set functions on subsets of T and T' respectively. Thus, for subsets $A \subseteq T$ and $A' \subseteq T'$, we have:

$$ \mathbf{st}_T^{-1}(A) = \{x \in {}^*T : \exists y \in A \text{ such that } x \in {}^*G \text{ for all open neighborhoods } G \text{ of } y \text{ in } T\}, $$

and

$$ \mathbf{st}_{T'}^{-1}(A') = \{x \in {}^*T : \exists y \in A' \text{ such that } x \in {}^*G' \text{ for all open neighborhoods } G' \text{ of } y \text{ in } T'\}. $$

The following useful relation is immediate from the fact that the nonstandard extension of a finite intersection of sets is the same as the intersection of the nonstandard extensions.

Lemma 2.9. *Let T be a topological space and let $T' \subseteq T$ be viewed as a topological space under the subspace topology. For a subset $A \subseteq T' \subseteq T$, we have:*

$$^*T' \cap \mathbf{st}_T^{-1}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{st}_{T'}^{-1}(A).$$

Using the notation in (2.7), Lemma 2.6 can be immediately modified to obtain the following nonstandard characterization of Hausdorffness, which will be useful in the sequel.

Lemma 2.10. *A topological space T is Hausdorff if and only if for any disjoint collection $(A_i)_{i\in I}$ of subsets of T (indexed by some set I), we have*

$$\mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(\bigsqcup_{i\in I} A_i\right) = \bigsqcup_{i\in I} \mathbf{st}^{-1}(A_i), \tag{2.9}$$

where $\sqcup$ denotes a disjoint union.

Given an internal probability space $(^*T, ^*\mathcal{B}(T), \nu)$, if we know that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)$ is Loeb measurable with respect to the corresponding Loeb space $(^*T, L(^*\mathcal{B}(T)), L\nu)$ for all Borel sets $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$, then one can define a Borel measure on $(T, \mathcal{B}(T))$ by defining the measure of a Borel set B as $L\nu(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B))$. The fact that this defines a Borel measure in this case is easily checked. This measure is not a probability measure, however, except in the case that the set of nearstandard points $\mathbf{Ns}(^*T) := \mathbf{st}^{-1}(T)$ is Loeb measurable with Loeb measure equaling one.

Thus, in the setting of an internal probability space $(^*T, ^*\mathcal{B}(T), \nu)$, there are two things to ensure in order to obtain a natural standard probability measure on $(T, \mathcal{B}(T))$ corresponding to the internal measure ν:

(i) The set $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)$ must be Loeb measurable for any Borel set $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$.
(ii) It must be the case that $L\nu(\mathbf{Ns}(^*T)) = 1$.

Verifying when $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)$ is Loeb measurable for all Borel sets $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$ is a tricky endeavor in general, and has been studied extensively. It is interesting to note that if the underlying space T is regular, then this condition is equivalent to the Loeb measurability of $\mathbf{Ns}(^*T)$ (this was investigated by Landers and Rogge as part of a larger project on universal Loeb measurability—see [73, Corollary 3, p. 233]; see also Aldaz [4]). Prior to Landers and Rogge, the same result was proved for locally compact Hausdorff spaces by Loeb [77]. Also, Henson [56] gave characterizations for measurability of $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)$ when the underlying space is either completely regular or compact. See also the discussion after Theorem 3.2 in Ross [95] for other relevant results in this context. We will, however, not assume any additional hypotheses on our spaces, and hence we must study sufficient conditions for (i) and (ii) that work for any Hausdorff space.

The results in Albeverio et al. [3, Section 3.4] are appropriate in the general setting of Hausdorff spaces. Their discussion is motivated by the works of Loeb [76, 77] and Anderson [8, 9]. We now outline the key ideas to motivate the main result in this theme (see Theorem 2.12, originally from [3, Theorem 3.4.6, p. 89]), which we will heavily use in the sequel.

If the underlying space T is Hausdorff, then an application of Lemma 2.10 shows that the collection $\{B \in \mathcal{B}(T) : \mathbf{st}^{-1}(B) \in L(^*\mathcal{B}(T))\}$ is a sigma algebra if and only if $\mathbf{Ns}(^*T)$ is Loeb measurable. Thus in that case (that is, when T is Hausdorff), one

would need to show that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)$ is Loeb measurable for all closed subsets $F \subseteq T$ (or the corresponding statement for all open subsets of T).

Thus, under the assumptions that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)$ is Loeb measurable for all closed subsets $F \subseteq T$, and that $L\nu(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)) = 1$, the map $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1} \colon \mathcal{B}(T) \to [0,1]$ does define a probability measure on $(T, \mathcal{B}(T))$ whenever T is Hausdorff. This is the content of [3, Proposition 3.4.2, p. 87], which further uses the completeness of the Loeb measures and some nonstandard topology to show that $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is actually a regular, complete measure on $(T, \mathcal{B}(T))$ in this case. Under what conditions can one guarantee that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)$ is Loeb measurable for all closed subsets $F \subseteq T$? Note that if we replace F by a compact set, then this is always true (for all sufficiently saturated nonstandard extensions):

Lemma 2.11. *Let T be a topological space and let τ be the topology on T. Then we have, for any compact subset $K \subseteq T$:*

$$\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K) = \bigcap \{{}^*O : K \subseteq O \text{ and } O \in \tau\}.$$

As a consequence, for any compact set $K \subseteq T$, the set $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)$ is universally Loeb measurable with respect to $({}^*T, {}^*\mathcal{B}(T))$. That is, for any internal probability measure ν on $({}^*T, {}^*\mathcal{B}(T))$ and any compact $K \subseteq T$, we have $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K) \in L_\nu({}^*\mathcal{B}(T))$. Furthermore, we have:

$$L\nu(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)) = \inf\{LP({}^*O) : K \subseteq O \text{ and } O \in \tau\} \text{ for all compact subsets } K \subseteq T.$$

See [3, Lemma 3.4.4 and Proposition 3.4.5, pp. 88-89] for a proof of Lemma 2.11 (note that T is assumed to be Hausdorff in [3] but is not needed for this proof). Thus, if we require that there are arbitrarily large compact sets with respect to $({}^*T, {}^*\mathcal{B}(T), \nu)$ in the sense that

$$\sup\{L\nu(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)) : K \text{ is a compact subset of } T\} = 1, \tag{2.10}$$

then the completeness of the Loeb space $({}^*T, L({}^*\mathcal{B}(T)), L\nu)$ allows us to conclude that $L\nu(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)) = 1$ and that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)$ is Loeb measurable for all closed sets $F \subseteq T$. In this case, if T is also assumed to be Hausdorff, then $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is thus shown to be a Radon measure on $(T, \mathcal{B}(T))$ (see [3, Corollary 3.4.3, p. 88] for a formal proof). In view of Lemma 2.11, we thus immediately obtain the following result; see also [3, Theorem 3.4.6, p. 89] for a detailed proof of a slightly more general form.

Theorem 2.12. *Let T be a Hausdorff space with $\mathcal{B}(T)$ denoting the Borel sigma algebra on T. Let $({}^*T, {}^*\mathcal{B}(T), \nu)$ be an internal, finitely additive probability space and let $({}^*T, L({}^*\mathcal{B}(T)), L\nu)$ denote the corresponding Loeb space. Let τ denote the topology on T. Then $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K) \in L({}^*\mathcal{B}(T))$ for all compact $K \subseteq T$.*

Assume further that for each $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there is a compact set K_ϵ with

$$\inf\{L\nu({}^*O) : K_\epsilon \subseteq O \text{ and } O \in \tau\} \geq 1 - \epsilon. \tag{2.11}$$

Then $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is a Radon probability measure on T.

Note that Theorem 2.12 is a special case of [3, Theorem 3.4.6, p. 89], which we have chosen to present here in this simplified form because we do not need the full power of the latter result in our current work. In the next section, we will study a natural topology on the space of all Borel probability measures on a topological

space T. It will turn out that under the conditions of Theorem 2.12, the measure ν on $({}^*T, {}^*\mathcal{B}(T))$ is nearstandard to $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ in the nonstandard topological sense (see Theorem 2.28). Also, the subspace of Radon probability measures is always Hausdorff (see Theorem 2.35), so that Theorem 2.12 will allow us to push down, in a unique way, a natural nonstandard measure on the space of all (Radon) probability measures in our proof of de Finetti's theorem. We finish this subsection with a corollary that follows from the definition of tightness.

Corollary 2.13. *Let T be a Hausdorff space and let μ be a tight probability measure on it. Then $L^*\mu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is a Radon probability measure on T.*

2.3. **The Alexandroff topology on the space of probability measures on a topological space.** For a topological space T and a function $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$, we say:

(i) f is *upper semicontinuous* at $x_0 \in T$ if for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\alpha > f(x_0)$, there is an open neighborhood U of x_0 such that $\alpha > f(x)$ for all $x \in U$.
(ii) f is *lower semicontinuous* at $x_0 \in T$ if for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\alpha < f(x_0)$, there is an open neighborhood U of x_0 such that $\alpha < f(x)$ for all $x \in U$.

A function $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *upper (respectively lower) semicontinuous* if f is upper (respectively lower) semicontinuous at every point in T. The following characterization of upper/lower semicontinuity is immediate from the definition.

Lemma 2.14. *A function $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$ is upper semicontinuous if and only if the set $\{x \in T : f(x) < \alpha\}$ is open for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.*

A function $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$ is lower semicontinuous if and only if the set $\{x \in T : f(x) > \alpha\}$ is open for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

As a consequence, a function $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$ is upper semicontinuous if and only if $-f$ is lower semicontinuous.

For a topological space T, we will denote the set of all bounded upper semicontinuous functions on T by $USC_b(T)$. Similarly, $LSC_b(T)$ will denote the set of all bounded lower semicontinuous functions on T.

Remark 2.15. It is immediate from the definition that the indicator function of an open set is lower semicontinuous, and that the indicator function of a closed set is upper semicontinuous.

For a topological space T, let $\mathcal{B}(T)$ denote the Borel sigma algebra of T—that is, $\mathcal{B}(T)$ is the smallest sigma algebra containing all open sets. Consider the set $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ of all Borel probability measures on T. For each bounded measurable $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$, define the map $E_f\colon \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$E_f(\mu) := \mathbb{E}_\mu(f) = \int_T f d\mu. \tag{2.12}$$

Definition 2.16. Let T be a topological space. The *A-topology* on the space of Borel probability measures $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is the weakest topology for which the maps E_f are upper semicontinuous for all $f \in USC_b(T)$.

The "A" in A-topology refers to A.D. Alexandroff [7], who pioneered the study of weak convergence of measures and gave many of the results that we will use. In the

literature, the term 'weak topology' is sometimes used in place of 'A-topology'; see, for instance, Topsøe [104, p. 40]. However, following Kallianpur [68], Blau [18], and Bogachev [20], we will reserve the term weak topology for the smallest topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ that makes the maps E_f continuous for every bounded continuous function $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$. For a bounded Borel measurable function $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, define the following sets:

$$\mathfrak{U}_{f,\alpha} := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mathbb{E}_\mu(f) < \alpha\}, \tag{2.13}$$

$$\text{and } \mathfrak{L}_{f,\alpha} := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mathbb{E}_\mu(f) > \alpha\}. \tag{2.14}$$

By Definition 2.16 and Lemma 2.14, the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is the smallest topology under which $\mathfrak{U}_{f,\alpha}$ is open for all $f \in USC_b(T)$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. More formally, the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is induced by the subbasis $\{\mathfrak{U}_{f,\alpha} : f \in USC_b(T), \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Also, by the last part of Lemma 2.14, this collection is actually equal to the collection $\{\mathfrak{L}_{f,\alpha} : f \in LSC_b(T), \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$. These observations are summarized in the following useful description of the A-topology.

Lemma 2.17. *Let T be a topological space, and $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ be the set of all Borel probability measures on T. The A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is generated by the subbasis*

$$\{\mathfrak{U}_{f,\alpha} : f \in USC_b(T), \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} = \{\mathfrak{L}_{f,\alpha} : f \in LSC_b(T), \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}. \tag{2.15}$$

Remark 2.18. Note that, by Lemma 2.14, a function is continuous if and only if it is both upper and lower semicontinuous. Thus, by Lemma 2.17, the A-topology also makes the maps E_f continuous for every bounded continuous function $f\colon T \to \mathbb{R}$, thus implying that the A-topology is, in general, finer than the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$. The two topologies coincide if T has a rich topological structure. For example, in Kallianpur [68, Theorem 2.1, p. 948], it is proved that the the A-topology and the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ are the same if T is a completely regular Hausdorff space such that it can be embedded as a Borel subset of a compact Hausdorff space. This, in particular, means that the two topologies are the same if the underlying space T is a Polish space (that is, a complete separable metric space) or is a locally compact Hausdorff space.

Remark 2.19. While we are focusing on Borel probability measures on topological spaces, we could have analogously defined the A-topology on the space of all finite Borel measures on a topological space as well. Although we will not work with non-probability measures, we are not losing too much generality in doing so. In fact, Blau [18, Theorem 1, p. 24] shows that the space of finite Borel measures on a topological space T is naturally homeomorphic to the product of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ and the space of positive reals. Thus, from a practical point of view, most results that we will obtain for $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ will also hold for the A-topology on the space of all finite measures (some results such as Prokhorov's theorem that talk about subsets of finite measures will hold in that setting with an added assumption of uniform boundedness that is inherently satisfied by all sets of probability measures).

By Remark 2.15, we know that $\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mu(G) > \alpha\}$ is open for any open subset $G \subseteq T$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$; and similarly, $\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mu(F) < \alpha\}$ is open for any closed subset $F \subseteq T$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Lemma 2.22 will show that the A-topology is generated by either of these types of subbasic open sets as well. We first use the above facts to show that the evaluation maps are Borel measurable with respect to the A-topology.

Theorem 2.20. *Let B be a Borel subset of a topological space T. Let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ be the space of all Borel probability measures on T equipped with the A-topology. Then the evaluation map $e_B\colon \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) \to [0,1]$ defined by $e_B(\mu) := \mu(B)$ is Borel measurable.*

Proof. Consider the collection

$$\mathcal{B} = \{B \in \mathcal{B}(T) : e_B \text{ is Borel measurable}\}.$$

This collection contains T, since f_T is the constant function 1, which is continuous. It is also closed under taking relative complements. That is, if $A \subseteq B$ and $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ then $B \backslash A \in \mathcal{B}$ as well, since $f_{B\backslash A} = f_B - f_A$ in that case. Finally, $\mathcal{B}$ is closed under countable increasing unions. That is, if $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is a sequence of sets such that $B_n \subseteq B_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $B := \cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n \in \mathcal{B}$ as well (this is because $f_B = \lim_{n\to\infty} f_{B_n}$ is a limit of Borel measurable functions in that case). Thus, $\mathcal{B}$ is a Dynkin system.

Furthermore, $\mathcal{B}$ contains all open sets since for any open set $G \subseteq T$, the set $\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mu(G) > \alpha\}$ is Borel measurable (in fact, open) for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, by Dynkin's π-λ theorem, it contains, and hence is equal to, $\mathcal{B}(T)$, completing the proof. □

Lemma 2.22 finds other useful subbases for the A-topology. We first need the following intuitive fact from probability theory as a tool in its proof.

Lemma 2.21. *Suppose $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_2$ are probability measures on the same space and X is a bounded random variable such that*

$$\mathbb{P}_1(X > x) \geq \mathbb{P}_2(X > x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.16}$$

Then, we have $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(X) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(X)$.

Proof. With λ denoting the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$, we have the following representation of the expected value of any bounded random variable X (see, for example, Lo [74, Proposition 2.1]):

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(X) = \int_{(0,\infty)} \mathbb{P}(X > x) d\lambda(x) - \int_{(-\infty,0)} \mathbb{P}(X < x) d\lambda(x). \tag{2.17}$$

Let $\mathbb{P}_1$, $\mathbb{P}_2$ and X be as in the statement of the lemma. Then, using (2.16), we obtain the following for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_1(X < x) &= 1 - \mathbb{P}_1(X \geq x) \\
&= 1 - \mathbb{P}_1\left(\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \left\{X > x - \frac{1}{n}\right\}\right) \\
&= 1 - \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_1\left(X > x - \frac{1}{n}\right) \\
&\leq 1 - \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}_2\left(X > x - \frac{1}{n}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_2(X < x).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Using (2.17), (2.16) and (2.18), we thus obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(X) &= \int_{(0,\infty)} \mathbb{P}_1(X > x)d\lambda(x) - \int_{(-\infty,0)} \mathbb{P}_1(X < x)d\lambda(x)\\ &\geq \int_{(0,\infty)} \mathbb{P}_2(X > x)d\lambda(x) - \int_{(-\infty,0)} \mathbb{P}_2(X < x)d\lambda(x)\\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(X),\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof. □

Lemma 2.22. *For each Borel set $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$, let*

$$\mathfrak{U}_{B,\alpha} := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mu(B) < \alpha\}, \tag{2.19}$$

$$\text{and } \mathfrak{L}_{B,\alpha} := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mu(B) > \alpha\}. \tag{2.20}$$

Then the topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ generated by $\{\mathfrak{U}_{F,\alpha} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and F is closed$\}$ as a subbasis is the same as the topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ generated by $\{\mathfrak{L}_{G,\alpha} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and G is open$\}$ as a subbasis. Both of these topologies equal the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$.

Proof. If G is an open subset of T and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then we have

$$\mathfrak{L}_{G,\alpha} = \bigcup_{\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}} \mathfrak{U}_{T\setminus G, 1-\alpha+\epsilon}. \tag{2.21}$$

Since the complement of an open set is closed, this shows that a basic open set in the topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ generated by $\{\mathfrak{L}_{G,\alpha} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and G is open$\}$ as a subbasis, is a finite intersection of sets that are unions of elements in the collection $\{\mathfrak{U}_{F,\alpha} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and F is closed$\}$. That is, a basic open set in the topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ generated by $\{\mathfrak{L}_{G,\alpha} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and G is open$\}$ as a subbasis, is also open in the topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ generated by $\{\mathfrak{U}_{F,\alpha} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and F is closed$\}$ as a subbasis. A similar argument shows that a basic open set in the latter topology is also open in the former topology, thus proving that the two topologies are equal.

Let τ_1 be the A-topology and τ_2 be the topology induced by $\{\mathfrak{L}_{G,\alpha} : G$ open, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$ as a subbasis. From the discussion preceding this lemma, it is clear that $\tau_2 \subseteq \tau_1$. Conversely, let $U \in \tau_1$ and $\nu \in U$. By Lemma 2.17, there exist finitely many $f_1, \dots f_k \in LSC_b(T)$ and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the following holds:

$$\nu \in \cap_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{L}_{f_i,\beta_i} \subseteq U. \tag{2.22}$$

Let $\mathbb{E}_\nu(f_i) = \delta_i > \beta_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, let $G_{i,\alpha} = \{x \in T : f_i(x) > \alpha\}$, which is an open set by Lemma 2.14. Define

$$\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha,\epsilon} := \cap_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{L}_{G_{i,\alpha}, \nu(G_{i,\alpha})-\epsilon} \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \tag{2.23}$$

Note that $\nu \in \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha,\epsilon}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, where $\mathfrak{L}_{\alpha,\epsilon}$ is a subbasic set for the topology τ_2. Thus it is sufficient to prove the following claim.

Claim 2.23. *There exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that*

$$\cap_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{L}_{\alpha_j,\epsilon_j} \subseteq \cap_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{L}_{f_i,\beta_i} \subseteq U.$$

Proof of Claim 2.23. Suppose, if possible, that the claim is not true. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there must exist some $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ such that $\mu \in \cap_{i=1}^k \mathfrak{L}_{G_{i,\alpha_j}, \nu(G_{i,\alpha_j})-\epsilon_j}$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, but $\mu \notin$

$\cap_{i=1}^{k}\mathfrak{L}_{f_i,\beta_i}$. By transfer, the following internal set is non-empty for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\vec{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\vec{\epsilon} := (\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_n) \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n$.

$$B_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\epsilon}} := \{\mu \in {}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mu({}^*G_{i,\alpha_j}) > \nu(G_{i,\alpha_j}) - \epsilon_j \text{ for all } i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}, j \in \{1,\ldots,n\} \\ \text{but } {}^*\mathbb{E}_\mu({}^*f_i) \leq \beta_i \text{ for some } i \in \{1,\ldots,k\}\}. \tag{2.24}$$

By the same argument (after concatenating different finite sequences of $\vec{\alpha}$'s and $\vec{\epsilon}$'s, we note that the collection $\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\{B_{\vec{\alpha},\vec{\epsilon}} : \vec{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \vec{\epsilon} \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0})^n\}$ has the finite intersection property. By saturation, there exists $\mu \in {}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ such that the following holds:

$$\exists i_o \in \{1,\ldots,k\} \text{ such that } {}^*\mathbb{E}_\mu({}^*f_{i_0}) \leq \beta_{i_0} < \mathbb{E}_\nu(f_{i_0}) \text{ but} \\ \mu({}^*G_{i_0,\alpha}) > \nu(G_{i_0,\alpha}) - \epsilon \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}. \tag{2.25}$$

But this implies that $L\mu({}^*G_{i_0,\alpha}) \geq L^*\nu({}^*G_{i_0,\alpha})$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, which yields:

$$\begin{aligned} L\mu(\mathbf{st}({}^*f_{i_0}) > \alpha) &\geq \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} L\mu({}^*f_{i_0} > \alpha + \epsilon) \\ &\geq \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} L^*\nu({}^*f_{i_0} > \alpha + \epsilon) \\ &= L^*\nu(\mathbf{st}({}^*f_{i_0}) > \alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

By Lemma 2.21 and (2.26), we thus obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}_{L\mu}(\mathbf{st}({}^*f_{i_0})) \geq \mathbb{E}_{L^*\nu}(\mathbf{st}({}^*f_{i_0})). \tag{2.27}$$

However, using the fact that finitely bounded internally measurable functions are S-integrable and that β_{i_0} and $\mathbb{E}_\nu(f_{i_0})$ are real numbers, taking standard parts in the first inequality of (2.25) yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{L\mu}(\mathbf{st}({}^*f_{i_0})) < \mathbb{E}_{L^*\nu}(\mathbf{st}({}^*f_{i_0})),$$

which directly contradicts (2.27), completing the proof.

□

In the rest of the paper, we will interchangeably use either of the collections in Lemma 2.17 and Lemma 2.22 as a sub-basis, depending on convenience.

If T is a topological space, then for any subset $T' \subseteq T$, we can view T' as a topological space under the subspace topology. By routine measure theoretic arguments, it is clear that the Borel sigma algebra on T' with respect to the subspace topology contains precisely those sets that are intersections of T' with Borel subsets of T. That is,

$$\mathcal{B}(T') = \{B \cap T' : B \in \mathcal{B}(T)\} \text{ for all } T' \subseteq T. \tag{2.28}$$

Indeed, the collection on the right side of (2.28) is a sigma algebra that contains all open subsets of T' under the subspace topology (as any open subset of T' is of the type $G \cap T'$ for some open, and hence Borel, subset of T). Using a similar argument, we can show the following functional version of (2.28):

Lemma 2.24. *Let T' be a subspace of a topological space T. For any bounded $\mathcal{B}(T)$-measurable function $f : T \to \mathbb{R}$, its restriction $f\restriction_{T'} : T' \to \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{B}(T')$-measurable.*

Proof. Consider the collection

$$\mathcal{C} := \{f \colon T \to \mathbb{R} : f\restriction_{T'} \text{ is } \mathcal{B}(T')\text{-measurable}\}. \tag{2.29}$$

By (2.28), the collection $\mathcal{C}$ contains the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_B$ of each $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$. The collection $\mathcal{C}$ is clearly an $\mathbb{R}$-vector space closed under increasing limits. Thus $\mathcal{C}$ contains all bounded $\mathcal{B}(T)$-measurable functions by the monotone class theorem. □

Thus if T' is a subspace of a topological space T and $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(T')$, then one can naturally define an "extension" $\mu' \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ of μ as follows:

$$\mu'(B) := \mu(B \cap T') \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}(T). \tag{2.30}$$

That μ' is well-defined follows from (2.28), and the fact that μ' is a Borel probability measure on T follows from the fact that μ is a Borel probability measure on T'. We had put scare quotes around the word 'extension' to emphasize that μ is not necessarily a restriction of its extension μ' in this sense. Indeed, T' could be a non-Borel subset of T or it might not be known whether it is a Borel subset of T, in which cases μ' might not even be defined on a typical Borel subset of T'. This will be the situation in Section 4, when we will have to extend a probability measure defined on the space $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ of all Radon probability measures on a topological space S to a Borel probability measure on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$, the space of all Borel probability measures on S (thus $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ will play the role of T and $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ will play the role of T'). We will study the subspace topology on the space of Radon probability measures in the next subsection. Let us now summarize our discussion on the extension of a Borel measure on a subspace so far and prove a natural correspondence of expected values in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.25. *Let T be a topological space and let $T' \subseteq T$ be a subspace. Let $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(T')$ be a Borel probability measure on T' and let μ' be its extension, as defined in (2.30). Then $\mu' \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$. Furthermore, we have:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu'}(f) = \mathbb{E}_{\mu}\left(f\restriction_{T'}\right) \text{ for all bounded } \mathcal{B}(T)\text{-measurable functions } f \colon T \to \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.31}$$

Proof. Only (2.31) remains to be proven. This follows from (2.30) and the monotone class theorem. □

Before we proceed, let us recall the concept of nets which often play the same role in abstract topological spaces that sequences play in metric spaces. This discussion is mostly borrowed from a combination of Kelley [71, Chapter 2] and Bogachev [20, Chapter 2].

A *directed set* D is a set with a partial order $\succcurlyeq$ on it such that for any pair of elements $i, j \in D$, there exists an element $k \in D$ having the property $k \succcurlyeq i$ and $k \succcurlyeq j$. For a topological space T, a *net* in T is a function f from a directed set D into T, with $f(i)$ usually written as x_i for each $i \in D$. Mimicking the notation for sequences, we denote a generic net by $(x_i)_{i \in D}$.

For a net $(c_i)_{i\in D}$ of real numbers, we define the *superior and inferior limits* as follows:

$$\limsup_{i\in D}(c_i) := \mathbf{lub}\{c\in\mathbb{R}:\ \forall k\in D\ \exists j\succcurlyeq k \text{ such that } c_j\geq c\}, \tag{2.32}$$

$$\text{and } \liminf_{i\in D}(c_i) = -\limsup_{i\in D}(-c_i), \tag{2.33}$$

where $\mathbf{lub}(A)$ (for a set $A\subseteq\mathbb{R}$) denotes the least upper bound of A.

A net $(x_i)_{i\in D}$ in a topological space T is said to *converge* to a point $x\in T$ (written $(x_i)_{i\in D}\to x$) if for each open neighborhood U of x, there exists $k\in D$ such that $x_i\in U$ for all $i\succcurlyeq k$. This definition clearly coincides with the usual definition of convergence of a sequence (thinking of $\mathbb{N}$ as a directed set with the usual order on it). The following generalizes the characterization of closure in metric spaces using sequences to abstract topological spaces using nets (see Kelley [71, Theorem 2.2] for a proof):

Theorem 2.26. *Let T be a topological space and let $A\subseteq T$. A point x belongs to the closure of a A if and only if there is a net in A converging to x.*

With the language of nets, we can prove the following useful characterizations of convergence in the A-topology, originally due to Alexandroff (see Topsøe [104, Theorem 8.1, p. 40] for a similar result).

Theorem 2.27. *Let T be a topological space and $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ be the space of Borel probability measures on T, equipped with the A-topology. For a net $(\mu_i)_{i\in D}$ in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) $(\mu_i)_{i\in D}\to\mu$.
(ii) $\limsup_{i\in D}(\mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}(f))\leq\mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$ *for all* $f\in USC_b(T)$.
(iii) $\liminf_{i\in D}(\mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}(f))\geq\mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$ *for all* $f\in LSC_b(T)$.
(iv) $\limsup_{i\in D}(\mu_i(F))\leq\mu(F)$ *for all closed sets* $F\subseteq T$.
(v) $\liminf_{i\in D}(\mu_i(G))\geq\mu(G)$ *for all open sets* $G\subseteq T$.

Proof. The equivalences *(ii)* $\iff$ *(iii)* and *(iv)* $\iff$ *(v)* are clear from (2.33) and the last part of Lemma 2.14 (along with the fact that a set is open if and only if its complement is closed). We will prove *(i)* $\iff$ *(ii)* and omit the very similar proof of *(i)* $\iff$ *(iv)*.

Throughout this proof, for any function $f\in USC_b(T)$, define

$$S_f := \{c\in\mathbb{R}:\ \forall k\in D\ \exists j\succcurlyeq k \text{ such that } \mathbb{E}_{\mu_j}(f)\geq c\}. \tag{2.34}$$

Proof of ***(i)*** $\implies$ ***(ii)*** Assume (i)—that is, $(\mu_i)_{i\in D}\to\mu$. Let $f\in USC_b(T)$ and $\beta := \mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$. We want to show that β is at least as large as the least upper bound of S_f (see (2.32)). In other words, we want to show that β is an upper bound of S_f. To that end, let $c\in S_f$. Suppose, if possible, that $c>\beta=\mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$. Then μ would be in the subbasic open set $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{c}} = \{\gamma\in\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}):\mathbb{E}_\gamma(f)<c\}$. Since $(\mu_i)_{i\in D}\to\mu$, there would exist a $k\in D$ such that $\mu_i\in\mathfrak{U}_{\mathfrak{f},\mathfrak{c}}$ for all $i\succcurlyeq k$. That is,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}(f)<c \text{ for all } i\succcurlyeq k. \tag{2.35}$$

Since $c \in S_f$, there would also exist $j \succcurlyeq k$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_j}(f) \geq c > \beta$. But this contradicts (2.35), so we know that it is not possible for $c > \beta$ to be true. Since c was an arbitrary element of S_f, it is now clear that $\beta = \mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$ is an upper bound of S_f, completing the proof of *(i)* $\implies$ *(ii)*.

Proof of *(ii)* $\implies$ *(i)* Assume (ii)—that is, $\limsup_{i \in D}(\mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}(f)) \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$ for all $f \in USC_b(T)$. Suppose, if possible, that $(\mu_i)_{i \in D} \not\to \mu$. Then there would exist finitely many maps $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in USC_b(T)$ and real numbers $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$, such that the set

$$U := \bigcap_{t=1}^{n} \{\gamma \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \mathbb{E}_\gamma(f_t) < \alpha_t\}$$

is a basic open neighborhood of μ, and such that for any $k \in D$, one may find $j \succcurlyeq k$ such that $\mu_j \notin U$. Thus:

$$\text{For all } k \in D, \text{ there exists } j \succcurlyeq k \text{ such that } \mathbb{E}_{\mu_j}(f_t) \geq \alpha_t \text{ for some } t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}. \tag{2.36}$$

Since $\limsup_{i \in D}(\mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}(f_t)) \leq \mathbb{E}_\mu(f_t)$, we also know that $\mathbb{E}_\mu(f_t)$ is an upper bound of S_{f_t} for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Since $\mu \in U$, we conclude that α_t is strictly larger than the least upper bound of S_{f_t} for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. In particular, $\alpha_t \notin S_{f_t}$ for any $t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. By the definition of S_{f_t}, this means that for each $t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, there exists a $k_t \in D$ such that for all $j \succcurlyeq k_t$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_j}(f_t) < \alpha_t$. Since D is a directed set, there exists $\tilde{k}$ such that $\tilde{k} \succcurlyeq k_t$ for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We thus conclude:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_j}(f_t) < \alpha_t \text{ for all } j \succcurlyeq \tilde{k} \text{ and } t \in \{1, \ldots, n\}. \tag{2.37}$$

But (2.36) and (2.37) contradict each other, thus showing that the net $(\mu_i)_{i \in D}$ must in fact converge to μ. This completes the proof of *(i)* $\implies$ *(ii)*. □

Returning to the theme of Loeb measures, we are now in a position to show that for any internal probability ν on $({}^*T, {}^*\mathcal{B}(T))$, if $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is a legitimate Borel probability measure on $(T, \mathcal{B}(T))$, then ν is infinitesimally close to $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ in the sense that the former is nearstandard to the latter in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$. Combined with Theorem 2.12, we also have sufficient conditions for when this happens.

Theorem 2.28. *Let T be a Hausdorff space. Suppose $({}^*T, {}^*\mathcal{B}(T), \nu)$ is an internal probability space, and let $({}^*T, L({}^*\mathcal{B}(T)), L\nu)$ be the associated Loeb space. If $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1} \colon \mathcal{B}(T) \to [0, 1]$ is a Borel probability measure on T, then ν is nearstandard in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(T)$ to $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$. That is,*

$$\nu \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}). \tag{2.38}$$

Proof. Let ν be as in the statement of the theorem. Thus, $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1} \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$, which implicitly also requires that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B) \in L({}^*\mathcal{B}(T))$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(T)$. For brevity, denote $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ by μ. Suppose $G_1, \ldots, G_n$ are finitely many open sets

and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$ are such that the set

$$\mathfrak{U} := \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \{\gamma \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \gamma(G_i) > \alpha_i\} \tag{2.39}$$

is a basic open neighborhood of μ in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$.

Note that in a Hausdorff space, a subset G is open if and only if $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(G) \subseteq {}^*G$ (see Proposition 2.7(i)). Since $\mu \in \mathfrak{U}$, we thus obtain:

$$L\nu({}^*G_i) \geq L\nu(\mathbf{st}^{-1}\, G_i) = \mu(G_i) > \alpha_i \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

Since the α_i are real, it thus follows that

$$\nu({}^*G_i) > \alpha_i \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}.$$

By the definition (2.39) of $\mathfrak{U}$, it is thus clear that $\nu \in {}^*\mathfrak{U}$. Since $\mathfrak{U}$ was an arbitrary neighborhood of μ, it thus follows that $\nu \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(\mu)$, completing the proof. □

Remark 2.29. For an internal probability measure ν on ${}^*T$, whenever $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is a probability measure on the underlying topological space T, we typically call the measure $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ as being obtained by "pushing down" the Loeb measure $L\nu$. In fact, Albeverio et al. [3, Section 3.4] denotes $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ by $\mathbf{st}(L\nu)$, calling it the standard part of ν. Theorem 2.28 makes this precise by showing that $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is indeed nearstandard to $\nu \in {}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ when we equip the space of probability measures $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ with a natural topology. In Section 2.4, we show that the subset $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ of Radon probability measures on T is Hausdorff, which will allow us to show that $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is actually *the* standard part of ν as an element of ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ (see Theorem 2.36).

Theorem 2.28 applied together with Corollary 2.13 implies that the nonstandard extension of a tight measure is nearstandard to a Radon measure. Thus, while not all tight measures are Radon, each tight measure is close to a Radon measure from a topological point of view. More precisely, for each tight measure, there is a Radon measure such that the former belongs to each open neighborhood of the latter. We record this as a corollary.

Corollary 2.30. *Let T be a Hausdorff space and μ be a tight probability measure on it. Then there exists a Radon measure μ' on T such that $\mu \in \mathfrak{U}$ for all open neighborhoods $\mathfrak{U}$ of μ' in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$.*

Proof. By Corollary 2.13 and Theorem 2.28, we have that $\mu' := L^*\mu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is a Radon probability measure such that ${}^*\mu \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(\mu')$. Also, by definition of $\mathbf{st}^{-1}$, we have that ${}^*\mu \in {}^*\mathfrak{U}$ for any open neighborhood $\mathfrak{U}$ of μ' in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$. By transfer, we have that $\mu \in \mathfrak{U}$ for any open neighborhood $\mathfrak{U}$ of μ' in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$. □

This, in particular, shows that the A-topology is not always Hausdorff. We end this subsection with this corollary.

Corollary 2.31. *There exists a topological space T such that the A-topology on its space of Borel probability measures $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is not Hausdorff.*

Proof. There is a Hausdorff space T and a Borel probability measure μ on it such that μ is tight but not Radon (in fact, T may be taken to be a compact Hausdorff space; see Vakhania–Tarildaze–Chobanyan[109, Proposition 3.5, p.32] for an example/construction). By Corollary 2.30, there is a Radon probability measure μ' (thus $\mu \neq \mu'$ necessarily) such that μ and μ' cannot be separated by disjoint open sets in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$. As a consequence, $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is not Hausdorff. □

2.4. **Space of Radon probability measures under the Alexandroff topology.** In de Finetti's theorem, one wants to construct a second-order probability—a probability measure with certain properties on a space of probability measures. Our strategy will be to first create a nonstandard internal probability measure on the nonstandard extension of our space of probability measures and then "push it down" to get a standard Borel probability measure with the properties we desire of it. However, as is clear from the discussion in Section 2.3 (see, for example, Theorem 2.12), this general procedure usually requires the underlying space of probability measures that we are constructing our measure on to be Hausdorff. As Corollary 2.31 shows, the space $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ of *all* Borel probability measures that we have studied so far may be too wild! We want to identify a large collection of Borel measures that is Hausdorff under the subspace topology. The subspace of Radon probability measures on a Hausdorff space T that we will focus on in this subsection serves our purposes adequately (see Theorem 2.35).

Recall the concept of Radon probability measures on an arbitrary Hausdorff space T from Definition 2.3. The space of all Radon probability measures on T is denoted by $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$, and we equip it with the subspace topology induced by the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$. We require the Hausdorffness of T to ensure that compact subsets are Borel measurable (as a compact subset of a Hausdorff space is closed).

Being a subspace of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$, a subbasis of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ can be obtained by intersecting all sets of a given subbasis of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ with $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$. Hence, by Lemma 2.17 and Lemma 2.22, we have the following result on various subbases of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$.

Lemma 2.32. *Let T be a Hausdorff space. Then the topology on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ as a subspace of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ under the A-topology is generated by either of the following collections as a subbasis:*

(i) $\{\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) : \mu(G) > \alpha\} : G \text{ an open subset of } T \text{ and } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$.
(ii) $\{\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) : \mu(F) < \alpha\} : F \text{ a closed subset of } T \text{ and } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$.
(iii) $\{\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) : \mathbb{E}_\mu(f) > \alpha\} : f \in LSC_b(T) \text{ and } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$.
(iv) $\{\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) : \mathbb{E}_\mu(f) < \alpha\} : f \in USC_b(T) \text{ and } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Henceforth, we will call the subspace topology on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ as the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$, and we will use either of the subbases from Lemma 2.32 for this topology on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$, depending on convenience. Using these subbases, the proofs of most of the results on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ from Section 2.3 carry over to $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ almost immediately. We state below the analogs of Theorem 2.20 and Theorem 2.27 respectively (with the similar proofs omitted).

Theorem 2.33. *Let B be a Borel subset of a Hausdorff space T. Let $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ be the space of all Radon probability measures on T. Then the evaluation map $e_B \colon \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) \to [0,1]$ defined by $e_B(\mu) := \mu(B)$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}))$-measurable.*

Theorem 2.34. *Let T be a Hausdorff space and $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ be the space of Radon probability measures on T, equipped with the A-topology. For a net $(\mu_i)_{i\in D}$ in $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) $(\mu_i)_{i\in D} \to \mu$.
(ii) $\limsup_{i\in D}(\mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}(f)) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mu}(f)$ *for all* $f \in USC_b(T)$.
(iii) $\liminf_{i\in D}(\mathbb{E}_{\mu_i}(f)) \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mu}(f)$ *for all* $f \in LSC_b(T)$.
(iv) $\limsup_{i\in D}(\mu_i(F)) \leq \mu(F)$ *for all closed sets* $F \subseteq T$.
(v) $\liminf_{i\in D}(\mu_i(G)) \geq \mu(G)$ *for all open sets* $G \subseteq T$.

With these results motivated from the results in Section 2.3 out of the way, we now show why $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ is inherently a better space to work with than $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$—we show that $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ is Hausdorff (see also Topsøe [104, Theorem 11.2, p. 49]).

Theorem 2.35. *If T is a Hausdorff space, then $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ is also Hausdorff.*

Proof. Let T be a Hausdorff space. Suppose μ, ν are two distinct elements of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$. Since they are distinct Borel measures, there exists an open set $G \subseteq T$ such that $\alpha := \nu(G)$ and $\beta := \mu(G)$ are distinct. Without loss of generality, assume $\alpha < \beta$. Since μ and ν are Radon measures, we can find a compact set K such that $K \subseteq G$ and the following holds:

$$\nu(K) \leq \nu(G) = \alpha < \alpha + \frac{3(\beta-\alpha)}{4} < \mu(K) \leq \beta = \mu(G). \tag{2.40}$$

Since T is Hausdorff, all compact subsets of T are closed. In particular, K is closed. Consider the subbasic open set $\mathfrak{V}$ defined by:

$$\mathfrak{V} := \left\{ \gamma \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) : \gamma(K) < \alpha + \frac{\beta-\alpha}{4} \right\}.$$

By (2.40), it is clear that $\nu \in \mathfrak{V}$ and $\mu \notin \mathfrak{V}$. For each $\gamma \in \mathfrak{V}$, by Radonness, there exists an open set G_γ such that $K \subseteq G_\gamma \subseteq G$ and we have:

$$\gamma(G_\gamma) < \alpha + \frac{\beta-\alpha}{2} \text{ for all } \gamma \in \mathfrak{V}. \tag{2.41}$$

Thus the following set, being the complement of a closed set (owing to the fact that an arbitrary intersection of closed sets is closed), is open:

$$\mathfrak{U} := \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{\gamma\in\mathfrak{V}} \left\{ \theta \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) : \theta(G_\gamma) \leq \alpha + \frac{\beta-\alpha}{2} \right\} \right).$$

By (2.40), it is clear that

$$\mu(G_\gamma) \geq \mu(K) > \alpha + \frac{3(\beta-\alpha)}{4} > \alpha + \frac{\beta-\alpha}{2} \text{ for all } \gamma \in \mathfrak{V}.$$

As a consequence, we have $\mu \in \mathfrak{U}$. Furthermore, by (2.41), it is clear that $\mathfrak{V} \cap \mathfrak{U} = \emptyset$, thus completing the proof. □

Since nonstandard extensions of Hausdorff spaces admit unique standard parts (of nearstandard elements), we have the following form of Theorem 2.28 for $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$:

Theorem 2.36. *Let T be a Hausdorff space. Suppose $({}^*T, {}^*\mathcal{B}(T), \nu)$ is an internal probability space, and let $({}^*T, L({}^*\mathcal{B}(T)), L\nu)$ be the associated Loeb space. If $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1} \colon \mathcal{B}(T) \to [0,1]$ is a Radon probability measure on T, then ν is nearstandard in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_r(T)$ to $L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$. That is,*

$$\mathbf{st}(\nu) = L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1} \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})\,. \tag{2.42}$$

Proof. We use $\mathbf{st}^{-1}_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})}$ and $\mathbf{st}^{-1}_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})}$ to denote standard inverses on subsets of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ and $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ respectively. By Theorem 2.28 and the given information, we have that

$$\nu \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})}(L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}) \cap {}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})\,.$$

By Lemma 2.9, we have

$$\nu \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})}(L\nu \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}).$$

Since $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ is Hausdorff, this completes the proof. □

Knowing that $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ is Hausdorff for any Hausdorff space T thus allows us to apply results such as Theorem 2.12 to uniquely push down internal measures on $({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}), {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}))$. In the next section, we will take $T = \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ for a Hausdorff topological space S, and construct a nonstandard measure living in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ that we will be able to push down to a Radon measure on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$.

We begin this theme here with Theorem 2.38, which is a result about the uniqueness of the mixing measure in the context of Radon presentability (see Definition 1.11). This is different from the related uniqueness result of Hewitt–Savage [61, Theorem 9.4, p. 489] in two ways. Firstly, we are now focusing on the space of Radon probability measures (as opposed to the space of Baire probability measures), and secondly, we are working with the sigma algebra induced by the A-topology (as opposed to the cylinder sigma algebra induced by Baire sets). Our proof will use the following generalization of the monotone class theorem (see Dellacherie and Meyer [30, Theorem 21, p. 13-I] for a proof of this result).

Theorem 2.37. *Let $\mathbb{H}$ be an $\mathbb{R}$-vector space of bounded real-valued functions on some set $\mathcal{S}$ such that the following hold:*

(i) $\mathbb{H}$ *contains the constant functions.*
(ii) $\mathbb{H}$ *is closed under uniform convergence.*
(iii) For every uniformly bounded increasing sequence of nonnegative functions $f_n \in \mathbb{H}$, the function $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n$ belongs to $\mathbb{H}$.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{H}$ which is closed under multiplication, then the space $\mathbb{H}$ contains all bounded functions measurable with respect to $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ - the smallest sigma algebra with respect to which all functions in $\mathcal{C}$ are measurable.

Theorem 2.38. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and let $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ be the space of all Radon probability measures on S under the A-topology. Suppose $\mathscr{P}, \mathscr{Q} \in \mathfrak{P}_r(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ are such that the following holds:*

$$\int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_n) d\mathscr{P}(\mu) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_n) d\mathscr{Q}(\mu) \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } B_1, \ldots, B_n \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{2.43}$$

Then it must be the case that $\mathscr{P} = \mathscr{Q}$.

Proof. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{M}([0,1]^m)$ denote the space of all bounded Borel measurable functions $f\colon [0,1]^m \to \mathbb{R}$. For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the following collection of functions:

$$\mathcal{G}_m := \{f \in \mathcal{M}([0,1]^m) : \mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{P}}\left[f\left(\mu(B_1),\ldots,\mu(B_m)\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{Q}}\left[f\left(\mu(B_1),\ldots,\mu(B_m)\right)\right] \text{ for all } B_1,\ldots,B_m \in \mathcal{B}(S)\}.$$

Note that the expected values in the definition of $\mathcal{G}_m$ are well-defined because of Theorem 2.33. It is clear that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the collection $\mathcal{G}_m$ contains all polynomials over m variables. Indeed, the collection $\mathcal{G}_m$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-vector space (that is, closed under finite linear combinations), and for a monomial $f\colon [0,1]^m \to \mathbb{R}$ of the type $f(x_1,\ldots,x_m) = {x_1}^{a_1}\cdot\ldots\cdot{x_m}^{a_m}$ (where $a_1,\ldots,a_m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$), the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{P}}\left[f\left(\mu(B_1),\ldots,\mu(B_m)\right)\right]$ is equal to $\mathbb{E}_{\mathscr{Q}}\left[f\left(\mu(B_1),\ldots,\mu(B_m)\right)\right]$ by (2.43). That $\mathcal{G}_m$ satisfies the conditions in Theorem 2.37 is also clear by dominated convergence theorem. It is straightforward to verify that the smallest sigma algebra on $[0,1]^m$ with respect to which all polynomials are measurable is the Borel sigma algebra on $[0,1]^m$. Since the set of polynomials over m variables is closed under multiplication, it thus follows from Theorem 2.37 that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the collection $\mathcal{G}_m$ contains all bounded Borel measurable functions $f\colon [0,1]^m \to \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the collection of those Borel subsets of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ that are assigned the same measure by $\mathscr{P}$ and $\mathscr{Q}$. More formally, we define:

$$\mathcal{G} := \{\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})) : \mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{B}) = \mathscr{Q}(\mathfrak{B})\}. \tag{2.44}$$

Taking f to be the indicator function of a measurable rectangle in $[0,1]^m$, we have thus shown that $\mathcal{G}$ contains the following collection of cylinder sets:

$$\mathcal{C} := \{C_{(B_1,\ldots,B_m),(A_1,\ldots A_m)} : m \in \mathbb{N}; B_1,\ldots,B_m \in \mathcal{B}(S); A_1,\ldots,A_m \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\}, \tag{2.45}$$

where

$$C_{(B_1,\ldots,B_m),(A_1,\ldots A_m)} := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \mu(B_1) \in A_1,\ldots,\mu(B_m) \in A_m\} \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{N}; B_1,\ldots,B_m \in \mathcal{B}(S); A_1,\ldots,A_m \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}).$$

It is clear that the collection $\mathcal{C}$ contains the basic open subsets with respect to the subbasis (i) in Lemma 2.32. Thus all basic open subsets of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ are elements of $\mathcal{G}$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is a sigma algebra, all finite unions of basic open sets are in $\mathcal{G}$. (In fact, all countable unions are in $\mathcal{G}$, but we do not need this fact here.) Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a compact subset of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ and let $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be given. Since $\mathscr{P}$ and $\mathscr{Q}$ are Radon measures, we find an open subset $\mathfrak{U}$ of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ such that we have $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}$ and

$$\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{U}\backslash\mathfrak{C}) < \epsilon \text{ and } \mathscr{Q}(\mathfrak{U}\backslash\mathfrak{C}) < \epsilon. \tag{2.46}$$

Cover $\mathfrak{C}$ by finitely many basic open subsets contained in $\mathfrak{U}$ and let $\mathfrak{V}$ be the union of these basic open subsets. Then, we have (using (2.46)):

$$\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{V}\backslash\mathfrak{C}) < \epsilon \text{ and } \mathscr{Q}(\mathfrak{V}\backslash\mathfrak{C}) < \epsilon. \tag{2.47}$$

Being, a finite union of basic open sets, we have $\mathfrak{V} \in \mathcal{G}$, or in other words:

$$\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{V}) = \mathscr{Q}(\mathfrak{V}). \tag{2.48}$$

Using (2.47) and (2.48) (and the triangle inequality), we thus obtain:

$$|\mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{C}) - \mathscr{Q}(\mathfrak{C})| < 2\epsilon. \tag{2.49}$$

Since $\mathfrak{C}$ was an arbitrary compact subset of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ was arbitrary, this shows that the measures $\mathscr{P}$ and $\mathscr{Q}$ agree on all compact subsets of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. Since they are Radon measures, it is thus clear now that they agree on all Borel subsets of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$, completing the proof. □

Remark 2.39. Instead of using Theorem 2.37 (after showing that all polynomials in m variables are in $\mathcal{G}_m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$), we could have used the Stone–Weierstrass theorem to first show that all continuous functions on $[0,1]^m$ are in $\mathcal{G}_m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and then approximate indicator functions of open subsets of $[0,1]^m$ by increasing sequences of continuous functions to complete the proof using the monotone class theorem. Theorem 2.37 achieved the same in a quicker manner.

In the above proof, the only place where Radonness was used was in extending the uniqueness result from the cylinder sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ to the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. In particular, the same argument shows that without working with Radon measures, one still has uniqueness if we focus on measures over the smallest sigma algebra generated by cylinder sets. We formally record this as a theorem in the next subsection that is devoted to other sigma algebras on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$.

2.5. **Useful sigma algebras on spaces of probability measures.** Let S be a topological space and $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ be the space of all Borel probability measures on S. So far, we have studied the A-topology and the Borel sigma algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ arising out of it. As Remark 2.18 shows, the A-topology coincides with the more commonly studied weak topology (which is the smallest topology that makes the map $\mu \mapsto \mathbb{E}_\mu(f)$ continuous for each bounded continuous $f\colon S \to \mathbb{R}$) in the cases when S is a Polish space or when S is a locally compact Hausdorff space. Let $\mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ denote the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ with respect to the weak topology.

For general spaces, the A-topology is typically richer than the weak topology, and the corresponding Borel sigma algebra on the space of all probability measures is a very natural sigma algebra to work with from a topological measure theoretic standpoint. However, the Borel sigma algebra arising from the A-topology might be too large in some cases—it might contain more events than we might hope to have a grip on in some applications. There are other sigma algebras on spaces of probability measures on S that are also used in practice, some that make sense even if S is *not* a topological space. In fact, constructing a measurable space out of the space of all probability measures (on some space) is the first foundational step needed to talk about prior distributions in a Bayesian nonparametric setting. In Bayesian nonparametrics, it is generally agreed that any reasonable sigma algebra on the space of all probability measures on some measurable space $(S, \mathfrak{S})$ must make the evaluation functions (that is, the functions $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ for each $B \in \mathfrak{S}$) measurable. Let us give a name for the smallest sigma algebra with this property.

Definition 2.40. Let $(S, \mathfrak{S})$ be a measurable space and let $\mathcal{C}(S)$ be the smallest sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$, the space of all probability measures on S, such that for each $B \in \mathfrak{A}$, the evaluation function $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ is measurable.

As explained above, the sigma algebra $\mathcal{C}(S)$ is ubiquitous in the nonparametric Bayesian analysis literature. To mention just one classic example, this was the sigma algebra used by Ferguson [42] in his pioneering work on the Dirichlet processes.

When the underlying space S has a topological structure, then it is useful to see how this sigma algebra relates to the Borel sigma algebras arising out of the natural topologies on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (namely the A-topology and the weak topology). Theorem 2.20 and Remark 2.18 show that $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ contains both $\mathcal{C}(S)$ and $\mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$. In a metric space, the indicator function of an open set is a pointwise limit of uniformly bounded continuous functions, so that by routine measure theory we obtain the following whenever S is a metric space:

$$\{\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}) : \mu(G) > \alpha\} : G \text{ open in } S \text{ and } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})).$$

In particular, the proof of Theorem 2.20 also shows that if S is a metric space, then $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$. Finally, it is not very difficult to observe (for example, see Gaudard and Hadwin [52, Theorem 2.3, p. 171]) that these two sigma algebras actually coincide if S is a separable metric space. We summarize this discussion in the next theorem.

Theorem 2.41. *Let S be a topological space and let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ denote the space of all Borel probability measures on S. Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ and $\mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the Borel sigma algebras on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ with respect to the A-topology and the weak topology respectively. Let $\mathcal{C}(S)$ be the smallest sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ that makes the evaluation functions measurable. Then we have:*

(i) $\mathcal{C}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ *and* $\mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$.
(ii) If S is metrizable, then $\mathcal{C}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$.
(iii) If S is a separable metric space, then $\mathcal{C}(S) = \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$.
(iv) If S is a complete separable metric space, then $\mathcal{C}(S) = \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) = \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$.

With the requisite terminology now established, we finish this section by formally writing our observations at the end of Section 2.4 as a version of Theorem 2.38 for the space of all probability measures (not necessarily Radon). Theorem 2.41(iii) allows us to say something more in the case when S is a separable metric space.

Theorem 2.42. *Let S be a topological space and let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ be the space of all Borel probability measures on S under the A-topology. Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the smallest sigma algebra such that for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the evaluation function $e_B \colon \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}) \to \mathbb{R}$, defined by $e_B(\nu) = \nu(B)$, is measurable. Then $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$.*

Suppose $\mathscr{P}, \mathscr{Q}$ are two probability measures on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ such that the following holds:

$$\int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_n) d\mathscr{P}(\mu) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_n) d\mathscr{Q}(\mu)$$
$$\text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } B_1, \ldots, B_n \in \mathcal{B}(S).$$

Then it must be the case that $\mathscr{P} = \mathscr{Q}$.

Furthermore, if S is a separable metric space, then $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ in the above result may be replaced by the Borel sigma algebra $\mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ induced by the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$.

2.6. **Generalizing Prokhorov's theorem—tightness implies relative compactness for probability measures on any Hausdorff space.** Prokhorov [90, Theorem 1.12] famously proved that a collection $\mathfrak{A}$ of Borel probability measures on a Polish space T (that is, a complete and separable metric space) is relatively compact (that is, the closure $\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ of $\mathfrak{A}$ is compact) if and only if $\mathfrak{A}$ satisfies the following property that is now known as *tightness* (being a property that is uniformly satisfied by all measures in $\mathfrak{A}$, it is sometimes called "uniform tightness" to avoid confusion with tightness of a particular measure as defined in Definition 2.2).

(Tightness of $\mathfrak{A}$) : For each $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists a compact set $K_\epsilon \subseteq T$ such that
$$\mu(K_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

Those topological spaces T for which a collection $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is relatively compact if and only if $\mathfrak{A}$ is tight are called *Prokhorov spaces*. Thus, Prokhorov [90] proved that all Polish spaces are Prokhorov spaces. Anachronistically, Alexandroff [7, Theorem V.4] had earlier shown that all locally compact Hausdorff spaces are also Prokhorov spaces. What is the topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ that is under consideration in the above results? As is clear from Remark 2.18, there is not a lot of choice in the results described so far, as the A-topology and the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ are the same when T is a Polish space or a locally compact Hausdorff space.

With respect to the A-topology, tightness of a set $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is known to *not* be a necessary condition for the relative compactness of $\mathfrak{A}$. Nice counterexamples were independently constructed by Varadarajan [110], Fernique [43], and Preiss [89]. See Topsøe [105, p. 191] for a description of these counterexamples, and also for further history of Prokhorov's theorem. The situation is slightly better when we restrict to the space of Radon probability measures (and look for relative compactness in that space). For example, Topsøe (see the comments following Theorem 3.1 in [105]) proves Prokhorov's theorem for the space $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ of all Radon probability measures on a regular topological space T. (Thus for a regular space T, the set of probability measures $\mathfrak{A}$ is relatively compact in $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ equipped with the A-topology if and only if it is tight.)

With the knowledge that tightness is not a necessary condition for relative compactness in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ in general, our focus here is on a result in the other direction—to see if tightness is still sufficient for relative compactness without too many additional assumptions. It is in this sense that we are looking for a generalization of Prokhorov's theorem. The sufficiency of tightness seems to be known, in many cases, for the relative compactness on spaces of Radon measures equipped with either the weak topology or the A-topology. For example, Bogachev [19, Theorem 8.6.7, p. 206, vol. 2] shows that tightness is sufficient for relative compactness in the space of Radon probability measures, equipped with the weak topology, on any completely regular Hausdorff space. Under the A-topology, Topsøe [104, Theorem 9.1(iii), p. 43] (see also [103]) has proved that tightness is sufficient for relative compactness in the space of Radon probability measures over any Hausdorff space.

Remark 2.43. The above discussion seems to allude to the fact that relative compactness under the weak topology is a more restrictive notion than under the A-topology. This is technically correct, even though compactness in the weak topology is less restrictive than in the A-topology. Indeed, by Remark 2.18, it is clear that the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ (and hence on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$) is coarser than the A-topology.

Hence any set that is compact in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$) with the A-topology is also compact in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ (respectively to $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$) with the weak topology. On the other hand, the closure of a set with respect to the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$) is contained in the closure of that set with respect to the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$). This last fact, which can be seen by Theorem 2.26 and Remark 2.18, shows that a set that is relatively compact under the A-topology might fail to be so under the weak topology.

Our next result (Theorem 2.44) proves the sufficiency of tightness for relative compactness in the A-topology on the space of all probability measures on a Hausdorff space T. It is a slight variation of the same result that is known for the space of all Radon probability measures, and its proof can be readily adapted to show the latter result as well (see Theorem 2.46). The proof of Theorem 2.44 is short as most of the work has already been done in setting up the convenient framework of topological and nonstandard measure theory in the previous subsections. To the best of the author's knowledge, this generalization of Prokhorov's theorem is new.

Theorem 2.44 (Prokhorov's theorem for the space of probability measures on any Hausdorff space)**.** *Let T be a Hausdorff space, and let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ be the space of all Borel probability measures on T, equipped with the A-topology. Let $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ be such that for any $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists a compact set $K_\epsilon \subseteq T$ for which*

$$\mu(K_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathfrak{A}. \tag{2.50}$$

Then the closure of $\mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ is compact.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be as in the statement of the theorem. Let $\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ be its closure in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$ with respect to the A-topology. By the nonstandard characterization of compactness (see Proposition 2.7(iii)), it suffices to show that ${}^*\bar{\mathfrak{A}} \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(\bar{\mathfrak{A}})$. Since $\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ is closed, any nearstandard element in ${}^*\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ must be nearstandard to an element of $\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ (this follows from the nonstandard characterization of closed sets; see Proposition 2.7(ii)). Thus, it suffices to show that all elements in ${}^*\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ are nearstandard. Toward that end, let $\nu \in {}^*\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$. For each $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, let K_ϵ be as in the statement of the theorem. We now prove the following claim.

Claim 2.45. *$L\nu({}^*K_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.*

Proof of Claim 2.45. Suppose, if possible, that there is some $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $L\nu({}^*K_\epsilon) < 1 - \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, this implies that $\nu({}^*K_\epsilon) < 1 - \epsilon$ as well. By transfer, we conclude that ν belongs to ${}^*\mathfrak{U}$, where $\mathfrak{U}$ is the following subbasic open subset of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$.

$$\mathfrak{U} := \{\gamma \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T}) : \gamma(K_\epsilon) < 1 - \epsilon\}. \tag{2.51}$$

Note that $\mathfrak{U}$ is indeed a subbasic open subset of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{T})$, since K_ϵ, being a compact subset of the Hausdorff space T, is closed in T. By the definition of closure, we know that any open neighborhood of an element in the closure of $\mathfrak{A}$ must have a nonempty intersection with $\mathfrak{A}$. By transfer, we thus find an element $\mu \in \mathfrak{U} \cap \mathfrak{A}$. But this is a contradiction (in view of (2.50) and (2.51)), thus completing the proof of the claim.

Claim 2.45 now completes the proof using Theorems 2.12 and 2.28 (in view of the fact that ${}^*K \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)$ for all compact $K \subseteq T$). □

Using Lemma 2.32, the proof of Theorem 2.44 carries over immediately to give Prokhorov's theorem for the space of Radon probability measures.

Theorem 2.46 (Prokhorov's theorem for the space of Radon probability measures on any Hausdorff space)**.** *Let T be a Hausdorff space and let $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ be the space of all Radon probability measures on T, equipped with the A-topology. Let $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ be such that for any $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists a compact set $K_\epsilon \subseteq T$ for which*

$$\mu(K_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathfrak{A}. \tag{2.52}$$

Then the closure of $\mathfrak{A}$ in $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$ is compact.

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 2.44, it suffices to show that all elements in ${}^*\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ are nearstandard (in the current setting, $\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$ is the closure of $\mathfrak{A}$ in the space $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$, and the nearstandardness in question is with respect to the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T})$).

Toward that end, let $\nu \in {}^*\bar{\mathfrak{A}}$. Then we see that ν is nearstandard by Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.36, in view of the following analog of Claim 2.45 (which has the same proof as that of Claim 2.45, with the subbasic open set $\{\gamma \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{T}) : \gamma(K_\epsilon) < 1-\epsilon\}$ used as the analog of (2.51) from the earlier proof):

$$L\nu({}^*K_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon \text{ for all } \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

□

3. Hyperfinite empirical measures induced by identically Radon distributed random variables

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let S be a Hausdorff space equipped with its Borel sigma algebra $\mathcal{B}(S)$. Suppose $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ is a sequence of identically distributed S-valued random variables on Ω—that is, the pushforward measure $\mathbb{P} \circ {X_i}^{-1}$ on $(S, \mathcal{B}(S))$ is the same for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem requires the stronger condition of exchangeability, which we will assume in the next section when we prove our generalization of that theorem. However, the results in this section are more abstract and preparatory in nature, and they are applicable to all identically distributed sequences of random variables.

Throughout this section, we will further assume that the common distribution of the X_i is Radon. This is for ease of presentation as we will, however, not use the full strength of this hypothesis—we will only have occasion to use the fact that this distribution is tight and outer regular on compact subsets of S. By tightness, there exists an increasing sequence of compact subsets $(K_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of S such that:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in K_n) > 1 - \frac{1}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.1}$$

The results up to Lemma 3.14 only require tightness of the underlying distribution. We will also need outer regularity on compact subsets from Lemma 3.15 onwards.

For each $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define the *empirical measure* $\mu_{\omega,n}$ on $\mathcal{B}(S)$ as follows:

$$\mu_{\omega,n}(B) := \frac{\#\{i \in [n] : X_i(\omega) \in B\}}{n} \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{3.2}$$

Nonstandardly, we also have for each $\omega \in {}^*\Omega$ and each $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, the hyperfinite empirical measure $\mu_{\omega,N}$ defined by the following:

$$\mu_{\omega,N}(B) := \frac{\#\{i \in [N] : X_i(\omega) \in B\}}{N} \text{ for all } B \in {}^*\mathcal{B}(S). \tag{3.3}$$

Although we are calling $\mu_{\omega,N}$ a *hyperfinite* empirical measure because $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, we do not need to assume $N > \mathbb{N}$ (that is, $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$) in this section. Also, we are abusing notation by using (X_i) to denote both the standard sequence $(X_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of random variables and the nonstandard extension of this sequence. More precisely, if $\mathfrak{X}\colon \Omega \times \mathbb{N} \to S$ is defined by $\mathfrak{X}(\omega, i) := X_i(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then for any $i \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, the internal random variable $X_i\colon {}^*\Omega \to {}^*S$ is defined as follows:

$$X_i(\omega) = {}^*\mathfrak{X}(\omega, i) \text{ for all } \omega \in {}^*\Omega \text{ and } i \in {}^*\mathbb{N}.$$

The notation fixed above will be valid for the rest of this section which studies the structure of these empirical measures within the space of all Radon probability measures on S. We divide the exposition into four subsections. Section 3.1 deals with some basic properties that are satisfied by almost all hyperfinite empirical measures. Section 3.2 deals with the study of the pushforward measure induced on the space ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ of internal Radon measures on ${}^*S$ by the map $\omega \mapsto \mu_{\omega,N}$. The goal of Section 3.3 is to show in a precise sense that the standard part of a hyperfinite empirical measure evaluated at a Borel set is almost surely given by the standard part of the measure of the nonstandard extension of that Borel set (see Theorem 3.19). Section 3.4 synthesizes the theory built so far in order to express some Loeb integrals on the space of all internal Radon probability measures in terms of the corresponding integrals on the standard space of Radon probability measures on S.

3.1. **Hyperfinite empirical measures as random elements in the space of all internal Radon measures.** Being supported on a finite set, it is clear that $\mu_{\omega,n}$ is, in fact, a Radon probability measure on S for all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\omega \mapsto \mu_{\omega,n}$ is a measurable function from $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ to $(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$. We record this as a lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\mu_{\cdot,n}\colon \Omega \to \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ defined by (3.2) is Borel measurable. Furthermore, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the map $\mu_{\cdot,n}(B)\colon \Omega \to [0,1]$ (that is, $\omega \mapsto \mu_{\omega,n}(B)$) is Borel measurable for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. The proof is immediate from the measurability of the X_i, in view of the observation that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}, \omega \in \Omega$, and $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, we have:

$$\mu_{\omega,n}(B) = \frac{1}{n}\left(\sum_{i\in[n]} \mathbb{1}_B(X_i(\omega))\right). \tag{3.4}$$

□

By transfer, we obtain the following immediate consequence.

Corollary 3.2. *For each $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, the map $\mu_{\cdot,N}\colon {}^*\Omega \to {}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ is an internally Borel measurable function from ${}^*\Omega$ to ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. That is, $\mu_{\cdot,N}\colon {}^*\Omega \to {}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ is internal and the set $\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N} \in \mathfrak{B}\}$ belongs to ${}^*\mathcal{F}$ whenever $\mathfrak{B} \in {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$. Furthermore, for each $B \in {}^*\mathcal{B}(S)$, the map $\mu_{\cdot,N}(B)\colon {}^*\Omega \to {}^*[0,1]$ is internally Borel measurable.*

By the usual Loeb measure construction, we have a collection of complete probability spaces indexed by ${}^*\Omega$, namely $({}^*S, L_{\omega,N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(S)), L\mu_{\omega,N})_{\omega\in{}^*\Omega}$.

We now prove that with respect to the Loeb measure $L^*\mathbb{P}$, almost all $L\mu_{\omega,N}$ assign full mass to the set $\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)$ of in standard elements of ${}^*S$. This implicitly requires us to first show that for all ω in an $L^*\mathbb{P}$ almost sure subset of ${}^*\Omega$, the set $\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)$ is in the Loeb sigma algebra $L_{\omega,N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(S))$ corresponding to the internal probability space $({}^*S, {}^*\mathcal{B}(S), \mu_{\omega,N})$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. There is a set $E_N \in L({}^*\mathcal{F})$ with $L^*\mathbb{P}(E_N) = 1$ such that for any $\omega \in E_N$, we have $L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)) = 1$.*

Proof. Let $(K_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be as in (3.1). By the transfer of the second part of Lemma 3.1, the function $\omega \mapsto \mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K_n)$ is an internal random variable for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since it is finitely bounded, it is S-integrable with respect to the Loeb measure $L^*\mathbb{P}$. Thus, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the $[0,1]$-valued function $L\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*K_n)$ defined by $\omega \mapsto L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K_n)$, is Loeb measurable, and furthermore we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}(L\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*K_n)) &\approx {}^*\mathbb{E}_{{}^*\mathbb{P}}(\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*K_n)) \\
&= {}^*\mathbb{E}_{{}^*\mathbb{P}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{1}_{{}^*K_n}(X_i)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} {}^*\mathbb{P}(X_i \in {}^*K_n)\right] \\
&> \frac{1}{N}\left[N\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right)\right] \\
&= 1 - \frac{1}{n},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (3.1) and the fact that each X_i has the same distribution.

For each $\omega \in {}^*\Omega$, the upper monotonicity of the measure $L_{\omega,N}$ implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K_n) = L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*K_n\right)$. Thus, being a limit of Loeb measurable functions, $\lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*K_n) = L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*K_n\right)$, is also Loeb measurable. Therefore, by the monotone convergence theorem, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*K_n\right)\right] &= \mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[\lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*K_n)\right] \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}(L\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*K_n)) \\
&\geq \lim_{n\to\infty}\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) = 1. \qquad (3.5)
\end{aligned}$$

But $L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*K_n\right] \leq 1$ for all $\omega \in {}^*\Omega$. Therefore, by (3.5), we get:

$$L^*\mathbb{P}(E_N) = 1, \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$E_N = \{\omega : L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*K_n\right] = 1\} \in L({}^*\mathcal{F}). \tag{3.7}$$

Since each K_n is compact, we have ${}^*K_n \subseteq \mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus for each $\omega \in E_N$, we have the following inequality for the inner measure with respect to $\mu_{\omega,N}$ (see (2.3)):

$$\underline{\mu_{\omega,N}}\left[\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)\right] \geq L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K_n) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

By taking the limit as $n \to \infty$ on the right side and using the definition (3.7) of E_N, we obtain:

$$\underline{\mu_{\omega,N}}\left[\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)\right] \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K_n) = L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*K_n\right] = 1 \text{ for all } \omega \in E_N.$$

Since

$$1 = \underline{\mu_{\omega,N}}\left[\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)\right] \leq \overline{\mu_{\omega,N}}\left[\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)\right] \leq 1,$$

it follows that $\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)$ is Loeb measurable, and that $L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)\right] = 1$ for all $\omega \in E_N$. □

The idea, used in the above proof, of showing that the expected value of a probability is one in order to conclude that the concerned probability is equal to one almost surely, can be turned around and used to show that a certain probability is zero almost surely, by showing that the expected value of that probability is zero. We use this idea to prove next that almost surely, $L_{\omega,N}$ treats the nonstandard extension of a countable disjoint union as if it were the disjoint union of the nonstandard extensions, the leftover portion being assigned zero mass.

Lemma 3.4. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Let $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of disjoint Borel sets. There is a set $E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}} \in L({}^*\mathcal{F})$ with $L^*\mathbb{P}(E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}}) = 1$ such that*

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[{}^*\left(\sqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n\right)\right] = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*B_n\right) \text{ for all } \omega \in E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}}, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\sqcup$ denotes a disjoint union.

Remark 3.5. Note that the above lemma does not follow from the disjoint additivity of the measure $L\mu_{\omega,N}$, because $\sqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*B_n \subseteq {}^*\left(\sqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n\right)$ with equality if and only if the B_n are empty for all but finitely many n. Also, the almost sure set $E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}}$ depends on the sequence $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Since there are potentially uncountably many such sequences, therefore we cannot expect to find a single $L^*\mathbb{P}$-almost sure set on which equation (3.8) is always valid for all disjoint sequences $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of Borel sets.

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Let $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a disjoint sequence of Borel sets and let

$$B := \sqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n.$$

For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $B_{(m)} := \sqcup_{n\in[m]} B_n$. Consider the map $\omega \mapsto \mu_{\omega,N}\left[{}^*\left(B \backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]$, which is internally Borel measurable by Corollary 3.2. Since this map is finitely bounded, it is S-integrable with respect to the Loeb measure $L^*\mathbb{P}$. In particular,

for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the $[0,1]$-valued function $L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]$, defined by $\omega \mapsto L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]$, is Loeb measurable. Taking expected values and using S-integrability, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]\right] &\approx {}^*\mathbb{E}_{*\mathbb{P}}\left[\mu_{\cdot,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]\right] \\
&= {}^*\mathbb{E}_{*\mathbb{P}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{N}\mathbb{1}_{{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)}(X_i)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N}{}^*\mathbb{P}(X_i \in {}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right))\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{N}\left[N{}^*\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in {}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right))\right] \\
&= {}^*\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in {}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B\backslash B_{(m)}) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B) - \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_{(m)}). \qquad (3.9)
\end{aligned}$$

Since the expression in (3.9) is a real number, we have the following equality:

$$\mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]\right] = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B) - \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_{(m)}) \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{N}. \qquad (3.10)$$

Note that for each $\omega \in {}^*\Omega$, the limit

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]$$

exists and is equal to $L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\cap_{m\in\mathbb{N}}{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]$, because $({}^*(B\backslash B_{(m)}))_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence of measurable sets. Also, by the upper monotonicity of the measure induced by X_1 on S, we know that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_{(m)}) = \mathbb{P}\left(X_1 \in \cup_{m\in\mathbb{N}}B_{(m)}\right) = \mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B).$$

Using this in (3.10), followed by an application of the dominated convergence theorem, we thus obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \lim_{m\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[\lim_{m\to\infty}L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right]\right]. \qquad (3.11)
\end{aligned}$$

Also, since $\lim_{m\to\infty}L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right] \geq 0$, it follows from (3.11) that there is an $L^*\mathbb{P}$-almost sure set $E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}}$ such that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty}L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right] = 0 \text{ for all } \omega \in E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}}. \qquad (3.12)$$

But for each $\omega \in E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}}$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[{}^*\left(B\backslash B_{(m)}\right)\right] &= L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B) - L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(B_{(m)}\right) \\
&= L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B) - L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\sqcup_{n\in[m]}B_n\right) \\
&= L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B) - \sum_{n\in[m]}L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B_m) \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{N}. \qquad (3.13)
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed by letting $m \to \infty$ in (3.13), followed by an application of (3.12). □

The specific form of the set E_N allows us to use Theorem 2.12 to show that for each $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, the measure $L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is Radon for all $\omega \in E_N$, and that $\mu_{\omega,N}$ is nearstandard in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ to this measure. This is proved in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let S be a Hausdorff space. Let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ and E_N be as in (3.7). For all $\omega \in E_N$, we have:*

(i) $L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1} \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$.
(ii) $\mu_{\omega,N} \in \mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, *with* $\mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N}) = L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$.

Proof. By the definition (3.7), we know that

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*K_n\right) = 1 \text{ for all } \omega \in E_N,$$

where the K_n are compact subsets of S.

By the upper monotonicity of the probability measure $L\mu_{\omega,N}$ and the fact that $({}^*K_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence, we obtain:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) = 1 \text{ for all } \omega \in E_N. \tag{3.14}$$

Therefore, given $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists an n_ϵ such that $L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K_n) > 1 - \epsilon$ for all $\omega \in E_N$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>n_\epsilon}$. Thus the tightness condition (2.11) holds for $\mu_{\omega,N}$ whenever $\omega \in E_N$. Theorem 2.12 now completes the proof. □

Let $\tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}$ denote the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. For $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$, let τ_μ denote the set of all open neighborhoods of μ in $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. That is,

$$\tau_\mu := \{\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} : \mu \in \mathfrak{U}\}.$$

Also, for any open set $\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}$, let $\tau_{\mathfrak{U}}$ be the subspace topology on $\mathfrak{U}$. In other words, we define

$$\tau_{\mathfrak{U}} := \{\mathfrak{V} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} : \mathfrak{V} = \mathfrak{W} \cap \mathfrak{U} \text{ for some } \mathfrak{W} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}\} = \{\mathfrak{V} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} : \mathfrak{V} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}\}.$$

For internal sets A, B, we use $\mathfrak{F}(A, B)$ to denote the internal set of all internal functions from A to B.

Lemma 3.7. *Let S be Hausdorff and $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Let E_N be as defined in (3.7). For each internal subset $E \subseteq E_N$, there exists an internal function $U_\cdot : E \to {}^*\tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}$ such that*

$$\mu_{\omega,N} \in U_\omega \text{ and } U_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}) \text{ for all } \omega \in E.$$

Proof. Fix an internal set $E \subseteq E_N$. For each open set $\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}$, define the following set of internal functions:

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}} := \left\{f \in \mathfrak{F}(E, {}^*\tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}) : f(\omega) \in {}^*\tau_{\mathfrak{U}} \text{ and } \mu_{\omega,N} \in f(\omega) \text{ for all } \omega \in E \cap {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U})\right\}.$$

Since E is internal and ${\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U})$ is internal by Lemma 3.1, therefore the set $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is internal for all $\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}$ by the internal definition principle (see, for example, Loeb [78, Theorem 2.8.4, p. 54]). Also, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ is nonempty for each $\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}$. Indeed, if $E \cap {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}) = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}} = \mathfrak{F}(E, {}^*\tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})})$. Otherwise, if $\omega \in E \cap {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U})$, then define $f(\omega) := {}^*\mathfrak{U}$, and define f (internally) arbitrarily on the remainder of E. It is clear that this function f is an element of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}}$.

Now let $\mathfrak{U}_1, \mathfrak{U}_2$ be two distinct open subsets of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. Define a function f on E as follows:

$$f(\omega) := \begin{cases} {}^*\mathfrak{U}_1 \cap {}^*\mathfrak{U}_2 & \text{if} \quad \omega \in E \cap {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_1) \cap {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_2) \\ {}^*\mathfrak{U}_1 & \text{if} \quad \omega \in [E \cap {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_1)] \backslash {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_2) \\ {}^*\mathfrak{U}_2 & \text{if} \quad \omega \in [E \cap {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_2)] \backslash {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_1) \\ {}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) & \text{if} \quad \omega \in E \backslash \left[{\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_1) \cup {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_2)\right]. \end{cases}$$

The above function is clearly in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}_1} \cap \mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}_2}$. In general, to show the finite intersection property of the collection $\{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}} : \mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}\}$, the same recipe of "disjointifying" the union of finitely many open sets $\mathfrak{U}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{U}_k$ works. More precisely, for a subset $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$, let $\mathfrak{A}^{(0)}$ denote $\mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{A}^{(1)}$ denote the complement $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) \backslash \mathfrak{A}$. If $\mathfrak{U}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{U}_k$ are finitely many open subsets of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$, then for each $\omega \in E$, define $(i_1(\omega), \ldots, i_k(\omega)) \in \{0,1\}^k$ to be the unique tuple such that $\omega \in E \cap \left(\cap_{j\in[k]} {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U}_j^{(i_j(\omega))})\right)$. Then the function f on E defined as follows is immediately seen to be a member of $\cap_{j\in[k]}\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}_j}$:

$$f(\omega) := \bigcap_{\{j\in[k]: i_j(\omega)=1\}} {}^*\mathfrak{U}_j \text{ for all } \omega \in E.$$

Thus the collection $\{\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}} : \mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}\}$ has the finite intersection property. Let $U_\cdot$ be in the intersection of the $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ (which is nonempty by saturation). It is clear from the definition of the sets $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}}$ that $\mu_{\omega,N} \in U_\omega$ for all $\omega \in E$. We now show that $U_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1})$ for all $\omega \in E$

By Lemma 3.6, we know that $\mu_{\omega,N} \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1})$ for all $\omega \in E$. Thus for each $\omega \in E$, we have $\mu_{\omega,N} \in {}^*\mathfrak{U}$ for all $\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{L\mu_{\omega,N}\circ\mathbf{st}^{-1}}$. Hence, for each $\omega \in E$, we have $\omega \in E \cap {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}({}^*\mathfrak{U})$ for all $\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{L\mu_\omega\circ\mathbf{st}^{-1}}$. Therefore, by the definition of the collections $\mathcal{G}_{\mathfrak{U}}$, we deduce that $U_\omega \in {}^*\tau_{\mathfrak{U}}$ for all $\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{L\mu_{\omega,N}\circ\mathbf{st}^{-1}}$. As a consequence, $U_\omega \subseteq {}^*\mathfrak{U}$ for all $\mathfrak{U} \in \tau_{L\mu_{\omega,N}\circ\mathbf{st}^{-1}}$ and $\omega \in E$. Hence,

$$U_\omega \subseteq \cap_{\mathfrak{U}\in\tau_{L\mu_{\omega,N}\circ\mathbf{st}^{-1}}} {}^*\mathfrak{U} = \mathbf{st}^{-1}(L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}) \text{ for all } \omega \in E,$$

as desired. □

For each $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, since E_N is a Loeb measurable set of (inner) measure equaling one, there exists an increasing sequence $(E_{N,n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of internal subsets of E_N such that the following holds:

$${}^*\mathbb{P}(E_{N,n}) > 1 - \frac{1}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.15}$$

Lemma 3.7 applied to the internal sets $E_{N,n}$ will imply that the pushforward (internal) measure on ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ induced by the random variable $\mu_{\cdot,N}$ is such that its Loeb measure assigns full measure to $\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$. This is the content of our next result.

More precisely, for each $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, define an internal finitely additive probability P_N on $({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$ as follows:

$$P_N(\mathfrak{B}) := {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N} \in \mathfrak{B}\}\right) = {}^*\mathbb{P}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{B})\right) \text{ for all } \mathfrak{B} \in {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})). \tag{3.16}$$

That this is indeed an internal probability follows from Corollary 3.2. As promised, we now show that the corresponding Loeb measure LP_N is concentrated on near-standard elements of ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$.

Theorem 3.8. *Let S be a Hausdorff space. Let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ and let P_N be as in (3.16). Let*

$$({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))), LP_N)$$

be the associated Loeb space. Then the set $\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ is Loeb measurable, with

$$LP_N(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) = 1.$$

Proof. Let E_N be as in (3.7) and let $(E_{N,n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq E_N$ be as in (3.15). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. With $E := E_{N,n}$, apply Lemma 3.7 to obtain an internal function $U_\cdot : E_{N,n} \to {}^*\tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}$ such that

$$\mu_{\omega,N} \in U_\omega \text{ and } U_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}) \text{ for all } \omega \in E_{N,n}.$$

In particular, $U_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ for all $\omega \in F_{N,n}$, so that $\cup_{\omega\in F_{N,n}} U_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$. By transfer (of the fact that if $f : I \to \tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})}$ is a function, then the set $U := \cup_{i\in I} f(i)$, with the membership relation given by $x \in U$ if and only if there exists $i \in I$ with $x \in f(i)$, is open), we have the following conclusions:

$$U := \cup_{\omega\in E_{N,n}} U_\omega \subseteq \mathbf{Ns}({}^*S) \text{ and } U \in {}^*\tau_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \subseteq {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})).$$

Since $\mu_{\omega,N} \in U_\omega$ for all $\omega \in E_{N,n}$, we have $E_{N,n} \subseteq {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(U)$. Hence it follows from (3.16) that

$$\underline{P_N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) \geq LP_N(U) = L^*\mathbb{P}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(U)\right) \geq L^*\mathbb{P}(E_{N,n}).$$

Using (3.15) and observing that $n \in \mathbb{N}$ was arbitrary, we thus obtain the following:

$$\underline{P_N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

This clearly implies that

$$1 = \underline{P_N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) \leq \overline{P_N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) \leq 1,$$

so that $\underline{P_N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) = \overline{P_N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) = 1$. As a consequence, $\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ is Loeb measurable with $LP_N(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) = 1$, completing the proof. □

The next lemma provides a useful dictionary between Loeb integrals with respect to LP_N and those with respect to $L^*\mathbb{P}$:

Lemma 3.9. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Let P_N be as in (3.16). For any bounded LP_N-measurable function $f : {}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) \to \mathbb{R}$, we have:*

$$\int_{{}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} f(\mu) dLP_N(\mu) = \int_{{}^*\Omega} f(\mu_{\omega,N}) dL^*\mathbb{P}(\omega). \tag{3.17}$$

Proof. First fix an internally Borel set $\mathfrak{B} \in {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ and let $f = \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}$. Then the left side of (3.17) is equal to $LP_N(\mathfrak{B}) = \mathbf{st}(P_N(\mathfrak{B}))$, which also equals the following by (3.16):

$$\mathbf{st}\left[{}^*\mathbb{P}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{B})\right)\right] = L^*\mathbb{P}\left[\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N} \in \mathfrak{B}\}\right] = \int_{{}^*\Omega} \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{B}}(\mu_{\omega,N}) dL^*\mathbb{P}(\omega).$$

Thus (3.17) is true when f is the indicator function of an internally Borel subset of ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. That is:

$$LP_N(\mathfrak{B}) = L^*\mathbb{P}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{B})\right) \text{ for all } \mathfrak{B} \in {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})). \tag{3.18}$$

Now, let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a Loeb measurable set—that is, $\mathfrak{A} \in L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$ and $f = \mathbb{1}_{\mathfrak{A}}$. By the fact that the Loeb measure of a Loeb measurable set equals its inner and outer measure with respect to the internal algebra ${}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, we obtain sets $\mathfrak{A}_\epsilon, \mathfrak{A}^\epsilon \in {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ for each $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, such that $\mathfrak{A}_\epsilon \subseteq \mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^\epsilon$ and such that the following holds:

$$LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) - \epsilon < LP_N(\mathfrak{A}_\epsilon) \leq LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) \leq LP_N(\mathfrak{A}^\epsilon) < LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) + \epsilon. \tag{3.19}$$

Using (3.18) in (3.19) yields the following for each $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$:

$$LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) - \epsilon < L^*\mathbb{P}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A}_\epsilon)\right) \leq LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) \leq L^*\mathbb{P}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A}^\epsilon)\right) < LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) + \epsilon. \tag{3.20}$$

Since ${\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A}_\epsilon), {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A}^\epsilon)$ are members of ${}^*\mathcal{F}$ by Lemma 3.1, it follows from (3.20) that for any $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) - \epsilon &\leq \sup\{L^*\mathbb{P}(E) : E \in {}^*\mathcal{F} \text{ and } E \subseteq {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A}_\epsilon)\} \\ &\leq \sup\{L^*\mathbb{P}(E) : E \in {}^*\mathcal{F} \text{ and } E \subseteq {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})\} \\ &= \underline{{}^*\mathbb{P}}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) + \epsilon &\geq \inf\{L^*\mathbb{P}(E) : E \in {}^*\mathcal{F} \text{ and } {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A}^\epsilon) \subseteq E\} \\ &\geq \inf\{L^*\mathbb{P}(E) : E \in {}^*\mathcal{F} \text{ and } {\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A}) \subseteq E\} \\ &= \overline{{}^*\mathbb{P}}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is arbitrary, it thus follows that $\underline{{}^*\mathbb{P}}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})\right) = \overline{{}^*\mathbb{P}}\left({\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})\right)$, both being equal to $LP_N(\mathfrak{A})$. This shows that ${\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})$ is Loeb measurable and that the following holds:

$$LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) = L^*\mathbb{P}\left[{\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})\right] \text{ for all } \mathfrak{A} \in L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))). \tag{3.21}$$

This proves (3.17) for indicator functions of Loeb measurable sets. Since the functions f satisfying (3.17) are clearly closed under taking $\mathbb{R}$-linear combinations, the result is true for simple functions (that is, those Loeb measurable functions that take finitely many values). The result for general bounded Loeb measurable functions follows from this (and the dominated convergence theorem) since any bounded measurable function can be uniformly approximated by a sequence of simple functions. □

The result in (3.21) is interesting and useful in its own right. We record this observation as a corollary of the above proof.

Corollary 3.10. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Let P_N be as in (3.16). For any $\mathfrak{A} \in L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$, the set ${\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})$ is $L^*\mathbb{P}$-measurable. Furthermore, we have:*

$$LP_N(\mathfrak{A}) = L^*\mathbb{P}\left[{\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{A})\right] \text{ for all } \mathfrak{A} \in L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))).$$

3.2. **An internal measure induced on the space of all internal Radon probability measures.** Armed with a way to compute the LP_N measure of a large collection of sets, we are in a position to use Prokhorov's theorem (Theorem 2.46) to verify that P_N satisfies the tightness condition (2.50) from Theorem 2.12.

Theorem 3.11. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Let P_N be as in (3.16). Given $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists a compact set $\mathfrak{K}_{(\epsilon)} \subseteq \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ such that*

$$LP_N({}^*\mathfrak{U}) \geq 1 - \epsilon \text{ for all open sets } \mathfrak{U} \text{ such that } \mathfrak{K}_{(\epsilon)} \subseteq \mathfrak{U}.$$

Proof. Let $(K_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the increasing sequence of compact subsets of S fixed in (3.1). Recall the $L^*\mathbb{P}$ almost sure set E_N from (3.7):

$$\begin{aligned} E_N &= \{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} {}^*K_n\right] = 1\} \\ &= \left\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) = 1\right\} \\ &= \bigcap_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} \left(\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\geq m}} \left\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\ell}\right\}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\left(\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\geq m}} \left\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\ell}\right\}\right)_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence of Loeb measurable sets. Hence the fact that $L^*\mathbb{P}(E_N) = 1$ implies the following:

$$1 = \lim_{\ell\to\infty} L^*\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\geq m}} \left\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\ell}\right\}\right). \tag{3.22}$$

Let $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be given. By (3.22), there exists an $\ell_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that we have

$$L^*\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\geq m}} \left\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\ell}\right\}\right) > 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{4} \text{ for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq \ell_\epsilon}. \tag{3.23}$$

Now $\left(\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\geq m}} \left\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\ell}\right\}\right)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence of Loeb measurable sets. By (3.23), we thus find an $m_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ for which the following holds:

$$L^*\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\geq m}} \left\{\omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{\ell}\right\}\right) > 1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$
$$\text{for all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq \ell_\epsilon} \text{ and } m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq m_\epsilon}. \tag{3.24}$$

Let $n_\epsilon = \max\{\ell_\epsilon, m_\epsilon\} \in \mathbb{N}$. By (3.24), the following internal set contains $\mathbb{N}_{\geq n_\epsilon}$:

$$\mathcal{G}_\epsilon := \left\{ n_0 \in {}^*\mathbb{N}_{\geq n_\epsilon} : {}^*\mathbb{P}\left[\bigcap_{\substack{n\in{}^*\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\leq n\leq n_0}} \left\{ \omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n_0} \right\} \right] > 1-\epsilon \right\}. \tag{3.25}$$

By overflow, we obtain an $N_\epsilon > \mathbb{N}$ in $\mathcal{G}_\epsilon$. As a consequence, we conclude that for any $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq n_\epsilon}$ we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & L^*\mathbb{P}\left[\bigcap_{\substack{n\in{}^*\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\leq n\leq n_0}} \left\{ \omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right\} \right] \\ \geq & L^*\mathbb{P}\left[\bigcap_{\substack{n\in{}^*\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\leq n\leq N_\epsilon}} \left\{ \omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{N_0} \right\} \right] \\ \geq & 1-\epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the set $\mathfrak{F}_n$ defined as follows:

$$\mathfrak{F}_n := \left\{ \gamma \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \gamma(K_n) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \right\}.$$

Since compact subsets of a Hausdorff space are closed, the set $\mathfrak{F}_n$ is the complement of a subbasic open subset of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$, and is hence closed for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the nonstandard extension of a finite intersection is the intersection of the nonstandard extensions, Corollary 3.10 implies that for each $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq n_\epsilon}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} LP_N\left(\bigcap_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\leq n\leq n_0}} {}^*\mathfrak{F}_n \right) &= LP_N\left({}^*\bigcap_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\leq n\leq n_0}} \mathfrak{F}_n \right) \\ &= L^*\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N} \in {}^*\bigcap_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\leq n\leq n_0}} \mathfrak{F}_n \right\} \right) \\ &= L^*\mathbb{P}\left(\left\{ \omega \in {}^*\Omega : \mu_{\omega,N} \in \bigcap_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\leq n\leq n_0}} {}^*\mathfrak{F}_n \right\} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

Using (3.27) and (3.26), we thus conclude the following:

$$LP_N\left(\bigcap_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\leq n\leq n_0}} {}^*\mathfrak{F}_n \right) \geq 1-\epsilon \text{ for all } n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq n_\epsilon}. \tag{3.28}$$

Since LP_N is a finite measure and $\left({}^*\bigcap_{\substack{n\in\mathbb{N}\\ n_\epsilon\le n\le n_0}} \mathfrak{F}_n \right)_{n_0\in\mathbb{N}_{\ge n_\epsilon}}$ is a decreasing sequence of LP_N-measurable sets, we may take the limit as $n_0 \to \infty$ in (3.28) to obtain the following:

$$LP_N\left(\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\ge n_\epsilon}} {}^*\mathfrak{F}_n\right) \ge 1-\epsilon. \tag{3.29}$$

Define $\mathfrak{K}_{(\epsilon)}$ as follows:

$$\mathfrak{K}_{(\epsilon)} := \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\ge n_\epsilon}} \mathfrak{F}_n. \tag{3.30}$$

Since arbitrary intersections of closed sets are closed, it follows that $\mathfrak{K}_{(\epsilon)}$ is a closed subset of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. It is also relatively compact by Theorem 2.46. Being a closed set that is relatively compact, it follows that $\mathfrak{K}_{(\epsilon)}$ is a compact subset of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. Let $\mathfrak{U}$ be any open subset of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ containing $\mathfrak{K}_{(\epsilon)}$. We make the following immediate observation using Lemma 2.8:

$${}^*\mathfrak{K}_{(\epsilon)} \subseteq \left[\left(\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\ge n_\epsilon}} {}^*\mathfrak{F}_n\right) \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))\right] \subseteq {}^*\mathfrak{U}. \tag{3.31}$$

By (3.31) and Theorem 3.8, we thus obtain:

$$LP_N({}^*\mathfrak{U}) \ge LP_N\left[\left(\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\ge n_\epsilon}} {}^*\mathfrak{F}_n\right) \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))\right] = LP_N\left(\bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{N}_{\ge n_\epsilon}} {}^*\mathfrak{F}_n\right).$$

Using (3.29) now shows that $LP_N({}^*\mathfrak{U}) \ge 1-\epsilon$, thus completing the proof. □

Theorem 3.11, Theorem 2.11, and Theorem 2.28 now immediately lead to the following result.

Theorem 3.12. *Suppose that S is a Hausdorff space. Let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ and let P_N be as in (3.16). Let*

$$({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))), LP_N)$$

be the associated Loeb space. Then $LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is a Radon measure on the Hausdorff space $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. Furthermore, P_N is nearstandard to $LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$—that is, we have:

$$P_N \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}) \subseteq {}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})).$$

It is worthwhile to point out two useful observations arising from the statement of Theorem 3.12. Firstly, we were able to say that P_N is nearstandard to $LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ in ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, but we can still not say that the standard part of P_N is $LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$. This is because $\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ is not necessarily Hausdorff, and even though $LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1} \in \mathfrak{P}_r(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, we do not know whether P_N belongs to ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_r(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ or not (so we are not able to use the standard part map $\mathbf{st}\colon \mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_r(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))) \to \mathfrak{P}_r(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ in this context).

Secondly, since $LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ is a measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, it is (in particular) the case that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(\mathfrak{B})$ is LP_N-measurable for all $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$. This observation is useful enough that we record it as a corollary.

Corollary 3.13. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and let P_N be as in (3.16). For each $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, the set $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(\mathfrak{B}) \subseteq {}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ is LP_N-measurable.*

3.3. **Almost sure standard parts of hyperfinite empirical measures.** We now return to studying properties of the measures $L\mu_{\omega,N}$ for $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Corollary 3.13 immediately leads us to the following.

Lemma 3.14. *Let S be a Hausdorff space. Let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ and let E_N be the $L^*\mathbb{P}$-almost sure set fixed in (3.7). Then for each $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the set $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)$ is $L\mu_{\omega,N}$-measurable for all $\omega \in E_N$. Furthermore, for each $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the function $\omega \mapsto L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B))$ thus defines a $[0,1]$-valued random variable almost everywhere on $({}^*\Omega, L({}^*\mathcal{F}), L^*\mathbb{P})$.*

Proof. It was proved as part of Lemma 3.6 that for each $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the set $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)$ is $L\mu_{\omega,N}$-measurable for all $\omega \in E_N$. Thus, the function $\omega \mapsto L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B))$ is defined $L^*\mathbb{P}$-almost surely on ${}^*\Omega$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$.

Now fix $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$. Since $L^*\mathbb{P}(E_N) = 1$ and $({}^*\Omega, L({}^*\mathcal{F}), L^*\mathbb{P})$ is a complete probability space, showing that the map $\omega \mapsto L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B))$ is Loeb measurable is equivalent to showing that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\{\omega \in E_N : L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)\right] > \alpha\}$ is Loeb measurable. Toward that end, fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that by Lemma 3.6, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\{\omega \in E_N : L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)\right] > \alpha\} &= \{\omega \in E_N : [\mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N})](B) > \alpha\} \\ &= E_N \cap \left[{\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(\{\nu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \nu(B) > \alpha\}\right)\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 2.33 and Corollary 3.13, we also have the following:

$$\mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(\{\nu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \nu(B) > \alpha\}\right) \in L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))).$$

The proof is now completed by Corollary 3.10. □

The next two lemmas are preparatory for Theorem 3.18 that shows that for each Borel set $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the $L\mu_{\omega,N}$ measures of $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)$ and ${}^*B$ are almost surely equal to each other.

Lemma 3.15. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Let K be a compact subset of S. Then,*

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)) = L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K) \text{ for } L^*\mathbb{P}\text{-almost all } \omega \in {}^*\Omega.$$

Proof. Let $K \subseteq S$ be a compact set. Let $E_N \subseteq {}^*\Omega$ be as in (3.7). By Lemma 3.6, we know that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)$ is $L\mu_{\omega,N}$-measurable for all $\omega \in E_N$. Since K is compact, we also have ${}^*K \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)$. It is thus clear from the definition of standard parts that the following holds:

$$\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K) \backslash {}^*K \subseteq {}^*O \backslash {}^*K = {}^*(O \backslash K) \text{ for all open sets } O \text{ such that } K \subseteq O. \quad (3.32)$$

Using Lemma 3.14 and Corollary 3.2 respectively, we know that the maps $\omega \mapsto L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K) \backslash {}^*K\right]$ and $\omega \mapsto L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*O \backslash {}^*K)$ are $L^*\mathbb{P}$ measurable for all open sets

O containing K. Taking expected values and using (3.32), we obtain the following for any open set O containing K:

$$\mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)\backslash{}^*K\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left({}^*O\backslash{}^*K\right)\right]. \tag{3.33}$$

But, by S-integrability of the map $\omega \to \mu_{\omega,N}({}^*O\backslash{}^*K)$, we also obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left({}^*O\backslash{}^*K\right)\right] &\approx {}^*\mathbb{E}(\mu_\cdot({}^*O\backslash{}^*K))\\ &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in[N]}\mathbb{P}[X_i \in O\backslash K]\\ &= \mathbb{P}[X_1 \in O\backslash K].\end{aligned}$$

Using this in (3.33), taking infimum as O varies over open sets containing K, and using the fact that the distribution of X_1 is outer regular on compact subsets of S, we obtain the following:

$$\mathbb{E}_{L^*\mathbb{P}}\left[L\mu_{\cdot,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)\backslash{}^*K\right)\right] = 0. \tag{3.34}$$

As a result, there exists a Loeb measurable set $E_{K,N} \in L({}^*\mathcal{F})$ such that

$$\left[L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)\backslash{}^*K\right)\right] = 0 \text{ for all } \omega \in E_{K,N},$$

completing the proof. □

Remark 3.16. So far, we have only used the facts that the common distribution of the random variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ is tight and that it is outer regular on compact subsets of S. Tightness was used in (3.1) and all subsequent results that depended on it, while outer regularity on compact subsets was used to obtain (3.34). The results that follow are consequences of the results obtained so far, and, as such, they also only require the common distribution to be tight and outer regular on compact subsets. For simplicity, however, we will continue working under the assumption that the common distribution of the random variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ is Radon.

We can strengthen Lemma 3.15 to work for all closed sets, as we show next.

Lemma 3.17. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Let F be a closed subset of S. Then we have the following:*

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)) = L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*F) \text{ for } L^*\mathbb{P}\text{-almost all } \omega \in {}^*\Omega. \tag{3.35}$$

Proof. Let $(K_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the increasing sequence of compact subsets of S fixed in (3.1), and let E_N be as in (3.7). Thus, we have:

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}{}^*K_n\right) = 1 \text{ for all } \omega \in E_N.$$

Using the upper monotonicity of $L\mu_{\omega,N}$, we rewrite the above as follows:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*K_n\right) = 1 \text{ for all } \omega \in E_N. \tag{3.36}$$

Let $F \subseteq S$ be closed. Since $F \cap K_n$ is compact for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by Lemma 3.15, there exist $L^*\mathbb{P}$-almost sure sets $(E^{(n)})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that the following holds:

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n)) = L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*F \cap {}^*K_n) \text{ for all } \omega \in E^{(n)}, \text{ where } n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.37}$$

Let $E_F := E_N \cap \left(\cap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} E^{(n)}\right)$. Being a countable intersection of almost sure sets, E_F is also $L^*\mathbb{P}$-almost sure. Letting $\omega \in E_F$ and taking limits as $n \to \infty$ on both sides of (3.37), we obtain the following in view of (3.36):

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n)) = L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*F) \text{ for all } \omega \in E_F. \tag{3.38}$$

Using the upper monotonicity of the measure $L\mu_{\omega,N}$ on the left side of (3.38), we obtain the following:

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\, \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n)\right) = L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*F) \text{ for all } \omega \in E_F. \tag{3.39}$$

But, we also have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\, \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n) &= \mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(F \cap K_n)\right)\\ &= \mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(F \cap \left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} K_n\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)\setminus \cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\, \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n) &= \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)\setminus \mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(F \cap \left(\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} K_n\right)\right)\\ &= \mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(F \cap \left(\cap_{n\in\mathbb{N}} S\setminus K_n\right)\right)\\ &\subseteq \cap_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\, \mathbf{st}^{-1}(S\setminus K_n)\\ &= \cap_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\left[\mathbf{st}^{-1}(S)\setminus \mathbf{st}^{-1}(K_n)\right].\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $\omega \in E_F$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)\setminus \cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\, \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n)\right] &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\mathbf{st}^{-1}(S)\setminus \mathbf{st}^{-1}(K_n))\right]\\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\left[L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)) - L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(K_n))\right]\\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\left[1 - L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K_n)\right], \qquad (3.40)\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from Lemma 3.15 and the fact that $L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{Ns}({}^*S)) = 1$ for all $\omega \in E_F \subseteq E_N$. Using (3.36) and (3.40), we thus obtain the following:

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)\setminus \cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\, \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n)\right] \leq 1 - \lim_{n\to\infty} L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*K_n) = 1 - 1 = 0.$$

Since $\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\, \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n) \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)$, we thus conclude that

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\, \mathbf{st}^{-1}(F \cap K_n)\right] = L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(F)). \tag{3.41}$$

Using (3.41) in (3.39) completes the proof. □

Having proved (3.35) for closed sets, it is easy to generalize it for all Borel sets using the standard measure theory trick of showing that the collection of sets satisfying (3.35) forms a sigma algebra. This is the next result.

Theorem 3.18. *Let S be a Hausdorff space and let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. Let B be a Borel subset of S. Then we have the following:*

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)) = L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B) \text{ for } L^*\mathbb{P}\text{-almost all } \omega \in {}^*\Omega. \tag{3.42}$$

Proof. Let E_N be as in (3.7). By Lemma 3.6, we know that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)$ is $L\mu_{\omega,N}$-measurable for all $\omega \in E_N$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$. Consider the following collection:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{G} := \{B \in \mathcal{B}(S) : \exists E_B \in L({}^*\mathcal{F})\\ [(L^*\mathbb{P}(E_B) = 1) \wedge \left(\forall \omega \in E_B \cap E_N \left(L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)) = L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B)\right)\right)]\}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

By Lemma 3.17, we know that $\mathcal{G}$ contains all closed sets. In order to show that $\mathcal{G}$ contains all Borel sets, by Dynkin's π-λ theorem, it thus suffices to show that $\mathcal{G}$ is a Dynkin system. In other words, it suffices to show the following:

(i) $S \in \mathcal{G}$.
(ii) If $B \in \mathcal{G}$, then $S \backslash B \in \mathcal{G}$ as well.
(iii) If $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of mutually disjoint elements of $\mathcal{G}$, then $\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n \in \mathcal{G}$.

(i) is immediate from Lemma 3.17, with $E_S := E_N$. To see (ii), take $B \in \mathcal{G}$ and let E_B be as (3.43). Note that for any $\omega \in E_B \cap E_N$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*(S\backslash B)\right) &= L\mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*S \backslash {}^*B\right) \\ &= L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*S) - L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B) \\ &= L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(S)) - L\mu_{\omega,N}(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)) \\ &= L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(S) \backslash \mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)\right) \\ &= L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(S\backslash B)\right). \end{aligned}$$

In the above argument, the third line used the fact that S and B are in $\mathcal{G}$, the fourth line used the fact that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B) \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(S)$, and the fifth line used the fact that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(S) \backslash \mathbf{st}^{-1}(B) = \mathbf{st}^{-1}(S\backslash B)$ (which can be seen to follow from Lemma 2.10 since S is Hausdorff).

We now prove (iii). Let $(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of mutually disjoint elements of $\mathcal{G}$ and let $B := \sqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n$. By Lemma 2.10 and the fact that $B_n \in \mathcal{G}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the following for all $\omega \in {}^*\Omega$:

$$\begin{aligned} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)\right) &= L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(\sqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n\right)\right) \\ &= L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\sqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbf{st}^{-1}(B_n)\right) \\ &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B_n)\right) \\ &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L\mu_{\omega,N}\left({}^*B_n\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

Let $E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}}$ be as in Lemma 3.4 and define $E_B := E_{(B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}}$. Using (3.44) and (3.8), we thus obtain the following:

$$L\mu_{\omega,N}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)\right) = L\mu_{\omega,N}\left[{}^*\left(\sqcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} B_n\right)\right] = L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B) \text{ for any } \omega \in E_B \cap E_N,$$

completing the proof. □

Recall that by Lemma 3.6, if S is Hausdorff then $\mu_{\omega,N} \in \mathbf{Ns}({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, with $\mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N}) = L\mu_{\omega,N} \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ for all $\omega \in E_N$. Thus Theorem 3.18 shows the following:


Theorem 3.19. *Let S be a Hausdorff space. For any Borel set $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, we have*

$$\mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B)) = (\mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N}))(B) \text{ for almost all } \omega \in {}^*\Omega. \tag{3.45}$$

We point out an interesting interpretation of Theorem 3.19. For each Borel set $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the Loeb measure $L\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B)$ can almost surely be computed by either of the following two-step procedures:

(i) First find $\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B) \in {}^*[0,1]$ and then take the standard part of this finite nonstandard real number, which is the direct way.
(ii) First take the standard part of the internal measure $\mu_{\omega,N} \in {}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$, and then compute the measure $\mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N})(B)$ of B with respect to this standard part.

Since the intersection of countably many almost sure sets is almost sure, we have thus shown the almost sure commutativity of the following diagram for any countable subset $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(S)$:



It is also interesting to remark that equation (3.42) in the conclusion of Theorem 3.18 is related to the notion of the so-called *standardly distributed* internal measures, first defined in Anderson [9, Definition 8.1, p. 683] as a concept motivated by an application to mathematical economics á la Anderson [10].

Definition 3.20. An internal probability measure ν on $({}^*S, {}^*\mathcal{B}(S))$ is said to be *standardly distributed* if the following holds:

$$L\nu({}^*B) = L\nu(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(B)) \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{3.46}$$

Theorem 3.18 shows that given a particular $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ and $N \in {}^*N$, equation (3.46) holds for ν of the type $\mu_{\omega,N}$ for $L^*\mathbb{P}$-almost all ω. Using a more quantitative approach, Anderson [9, Theorem 8.7(i), p. 685] shows a stronger version of this result with the added hypothesis that the $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are independent.

3.4. **Pushing down certain Loeb integrals on the space of all Radon probability measures.** We finish this section by relating certain nonstandard integrals over the space $({}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), {}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})), P_N)$ to those over $(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})), LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1})$.

Theorem 3.21. *Suppose S is a Hausdorff space. Let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ and let P_N be as in (3.16). Let $({}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))), LP_N)$ be the associated Loeb space. Then for any Borel subset B of S, we have:*

$${}^*\int_{{}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu({}^*B) dP_N(\mu) \approx \int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B) d\mathscr{P}_N(\mu), \tag{3.47}$$

where $\mathscr{P}_N = LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1} \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$.

Proof. Fix $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$. By Corollary 3.2 and (3.16), the function $\mu \mapsto \mu({}^*B)$ is internally Borel measurable on ${}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. Since it is finitely bounded (by one), it is

S-integrable. Using this and Lemma 3.9, we thus obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}{}^*\mathbb{E}_{P_N}(\mu({}^*B)) &\approx \int_{{}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mathbf{st}(\mu({}^*B))dLP_N(\mu)\\ &= \int_{{}^*\Omega} \mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B))dL^*\mathbb{P}(\omega)\\ &= \int_{{}^*\Omega} (\mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N}))(B)dL^*\mathbb{P}(\omega),\end{aligned}$$

where we used Theorem 3.19 in the last line. Writing the last integral as a Lebesgue integral of tail probabilities, we make the following conclusion:

$$\begin{aligned}{}^*\mathbb{E}_{P_N}(\mu({}^*B)) &\approx \int_{[0,1]} L^*\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{st}(\mu_{\omega,N}))(B) > y)d\lambda(y)\\ &= \int_{[0,1]} L^*\mathbb{P}\left[{\mu_{\cdot,N}}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(\{\nu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \nu(B) > y\}\right)\right)\right] d\lambda(y)\\ &= \int_{[0,1]} LP_N\left(\mathbf{st}^{-1}\left(\{\nu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \nu(B) > y\}\right)\right) d\lambda(y),\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from Corollary 3.10. (This also uses the fact that the set $\{\nu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \nu(B) > y\}$ is Borel measurable, in view of Theorem 2.33.)

Defining $\mathscr{P}_N := LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ and noting that $\mathscr{P}_N$ is a Radon probability measure on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ (by Theorem 3.12), we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned}{}^*\mathbb{E}_{P_N}(\mu({}^*B)) &\approx \int_{[0,1]} \mathscr{P}_N\left(\{\nu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \nu(B) > y\}\right) d\lambda(y)\\ &= \int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B)d\mathscr{P}_N(\mu),\end{aligned}$$

thus completing the proof. □

Note that the same proof idea can be used to prove the version of (3.47) for multiple closed sets. Indeed, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.22. *Suppose S is a Hausdorff space. Let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ and let P_N be as in (3.16). Let $({}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))), LP_N)$ be the associated Loeb space. Then for finitely many Borel subsets $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ of S, we have:*

$${}^*\int_{{}^*\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu({}^*B_1)\cdots\mu({}^*B_k)dP_N(\mu) \approx \int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1)\cdots\mu(B_k)d\mathscr{P}_N(\mu), \tag{3.48}$$

where $\mathscr{P}_N = LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$.

The proof goes exactly the same way as that of Theorem 3.21, once we know that the set $\{\nu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \nu(B_1)\cdots\nu(B_k) > y\}$ is Borel measurable in $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ for all $y \in [0,1]$. But this follows from the fact that a product of measurable functions is measurable (and that for each $i \in [k]$, the function $\nu \mapsto \nu(B_i)$ is measurable by Theorem 2.20).

Combining with Lemma 3.9, we can interject a ${}^*\mathbb{P}$-integral in the approximate equation (3.48), which will be useful in our proof of de Finetti's theorem in the next section. We state that as a corollary,

Corollary 3.23. *Suppose S is a Hausdorff space. Let $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ and let P_N be as in (3.16). Let $({}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), L_{P_N}({}^*\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))), LP_N)$ be the associated Loeb space. Let $\mathscr{P}_N = LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$, which is a Radon measure on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. Then for finitely many Borel subsets $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ of S, we have:*

$$ {}^*\int_{{}^*\Omega} \mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B_1) \cdots \mu_{\omega,N}({}^*B_k) d{}^*\mathbb{P}(\omega) \approx \int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdots \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{P}_N(\mu). \quad (3.49) $$

4. de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem

4.1. **Uses of exchangeability and a generalization of Ressel's Radon presentability.** The previous section built a theory of hyperfinite empirical measures arising out of any sequence of identically Radon distributed random variables taking values in a Hausdorff space. If we further require the random variables to be exchangeable, then the theory from Section 3 gives new tools to attack de Finetti style theorems in great generality. Let us first consider an exchangeable sequence of random variables taking values in *any* measurable space S. We define hyperfinite empirical measures $\mu_{\omega,N}$ in the same manner as in the previous section. If $N > \mathbb{N}$, then the joint distribution of any finite subcollection of the random variables is given by the expected values of products of hyperfinite empirical measures. This is proved in the next theorem, which is the main technical result that yields general forms of de Finetti's theorem in view of Corollary 3.23.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of S-valued exchangeable random variables, where $(S, \mathfrak{S})$ is some measurable space. For each $N > \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in {}^*\Omega$, define the internal probability measure $\mu_{\omega,N}$ as follows:*

$$ \mu_{\omega,N}(B) := \frac{\#\{i \in [N] : X_i(\omega) \in B\}}{N} \text{ for all } B \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}. \quad (4.1) $$

Then we have:

$$ {}^*\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) \approx {}^*\int_{{}^*\Omega} \mu_{\omega,N}(B_1) \cdots \mu_{\omega,N}(B_k) d{}^*\mathbb{P}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}. \quad (4.2) $$

It should be pointed out that Theorem 4.1 may be viewed as a consequence of transferring Diaconis–Freedman's finite, approximate version of de Finetti's theorem [32, Theorem (13)] into the hyperfinite setting. We will provide two alternate proofs that underscore other ways of thinking about this result. The proof of Theorem 4.1 in the main body of the paper uses a similar combinatorial construction as Diaconis–Freedman's proof, with a key difference being that we can use inclusion-exclusion to give softer combinatorial arguments while still obtaining the same bounds. This proof does not use the hyperfiniteness of N in an essential way, and, as such, it can actually be thought of as a proof of the aforementioned result in Diaconis–Freedman (see (4.7), (4.10), (4.11), (4.12), and compare with [33, Theorem (13), p. 749]).

Our second proof of Theorem 4.1 is carried out in Appendix C. This proof illustrates an important explanatory advantage of stating Theorem 4.1 as a less

quantitative version of Diaconis–Freedman's result in the hyperfinite setting—such a statement is still strong enough to be sufficient in the proof of the infinitary de Finetti's theorem, while the particular form of the statement ensures that it can be both predicted and understood by conditioning with respect to various possibilities. This nicely ties in with the fact that de Finetti's theorem is often interpreted as a foundational result for Bayesian statistics (see, for example, Savage [96, Section 3.7], and Barlow [16]; see also Orbanz and Roy [87] for a recent discussion in connection with the foundations of statistical modeling).

To better understand this idea, let us analyze (4.2) from the perspective of conditional probability. Instead of the sets $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}$ that appear there, suppose we consider $A_1, \ldots, A_k \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}$ such that any two of them are either disjoint or equal. Let $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ be the distinct sets appearing in the finite sequence $A_1, \ldots, A_k$. In that case, writing the Cartesian product $A_1 \times \ldots \times A_k$ as $\vec{A}$ and the random vector $(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ as $\vec{X}$, the internal total probability expansion (conditioning on the various possible values of the empirical sample means of the distinct sets $C_1, \ldots, C_n$) of the left side of (4.2) is the following:

$$\begin{aligned}&{}^*\mathbb{P}((X_1, \ldots, X_k) \in \vec{A})\\ &= \sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n} {}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) \cdot {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

In this case, assuming that the set C_i appears in the finite sequence $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ with a frequency k_i (where $i \in [n]$), the right side of (4.2) can be written as the following hyperfinite sum by the (transfer of the) definition of expected values:

$$\begin{aligned}&{}^*\int_{{}^*\Omega} \mu_{\omega,N}(A_1) \cdots \mu_{\omega,N}(A_k) d{}^*\mathbb{P}(\omega)\\ &= \sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n} \left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n} \cdot {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

If $t_1, \ldots, t_n > \mathbb{N}$ are such that the corresponding term in the internal sum (4.3) is nonzero, then the ratio of that term with the corresponding term on the right side of (4.4) can be shown to be infinitesimally close to one. By an application of underflow and the fact that the partial sums in (4.3) and (4.4) are both infinitesimals when $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are all bounded by a standard natural number, it can be shown that the two expansions (4.3) and (4.4) are infinitesimally close, proving (4.2) in the case when any two of the measurable sets being considered are either disjoint or equal. This was the idea in the nonstandard proof of de Finetti's theorem for exchangeable Bernoulli random variables in Alam [2]. Such an argument can then be modified to a proof of Theorem 4.1 by writing the event $\{X_1 \in B_k, \ldots, X_k \in B_k\}$ represented by arbitrary sets $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}$ as a finite disjoint union of events represented by sets of the above type.

A conceptual benefit of this approach is that the idea of the proof is in some sense immediate after expressing the expansions (4.3) and (4.4). Indeed, the two expansions should be expected to be close to each other since the "majority" of the

terms are very close to each other, while the rest add up to infinitesimals! While this is a quick way of understanding why Theorem 4.1 holds, the details of the term-by-term comparison between (4.3) and (4.4) may get computationally involved. We therefore present a shorter proof below that replaces the exact combinatorial formulas by simpler estimates using inclusion-exclusion. A complete proof based on the above idea is included in Appendix C as an alternative.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $N > \mathbb{N}$ and $(B_1, \dots, B_k) \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}^k$ be a finite sequence of internal events. Consider the following equation obtained by rewriting the internal product of internal sums on the left as an internal sum of internal products by (the transfer of) distributivity:

$$\prod_{i\in[k]} \left(\sum_{j\in[N]} \mathbb{1}_{B_i}(X_j) \right) = \sum_{(\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k)\in[N]^k} \left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{1}_{B_i}(X_{\ell_i}) \right). \tag{4.5}$$

We separate the terms in the sum on the right of (4.5) according to whether there is any repetition in $(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k)$ or not. Let

$$\mathcal{R} := \{(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k) \in [N]^k : \ell_\alpha = \ell_\beta \text{ for some } \alpha \neq \beta\}.$$

An exact value of $\#(\mathcal{R})$ can be found using the (internal) inclusion-exclusion principle. However, the following immediate combinatorial estimate will be sufficient for our needs (for each of the N numbers in $[N]$, there are at most $\binom{k}{2}N^{k-2}$ elements of $[N]^k$ in which that number is repeated at least twice):

$$\#(\mathcal{R}) \leq N\binom{k}{2}N^{k-2} = \binom{k}{2}N^{k-1}. \tag{4.6}$$

Dividing both sides of (4.5) by N^k and noting that $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j\in[N]} \mathbb{1}_{B_i}(X_j)$ is the same as $\mu_{\cdot,N}(B_i)$ for each $i \in [k]$, we obtain the following:

$$\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu_{\cdot,N}(B_i) = \frac{1}{N^k} \sum_{\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k\in\mathcal{R}} \left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{1}_{B_i}(X_{\ell_i}) \right) + \frac{1}{N^k} \sum_{\ell_1,\dots,\ell_k\in[N]^k\setminus\mathcal{R}} \left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mathbb{1}_{B_i}(X_{\ell_i}) \right).$$

Taking expected values and using (4.6) thus yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \leq & {}^*\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu_{\cdot,N}(B_i)\right) - {}^*\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N^k}\sum_{(\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k)\in[N]^k\setminus\mathcal{R}}\left(\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{1}_{B_i}(X_{\ell_i})\right)\right] \\
= & {}^*\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N^k}\sum_{\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k\in\mathcal{R}}\left(\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{1}_{B_i}(X_{\ell_i})\right)\right] \\
\leq & \frac{\#(\mathcal{R})}{N^k} \\
\leq & \frac{\binom{k}{2}N^{k-1}}{N^k} \\
= & \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{N} \qquad (4.7) \\
\approx & 0. \qquad (4.8)
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of (4.8), and using the linearity of expectation, we thus obtain the following:

$${}^*\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu_{\cdot,N}(A_i)\right) \approx \frac{1}{N^k}\sum_{(\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k)\in[N]^k\setminus\mathcal{R}} {}^*\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{1}_{A_i}(X_{\ell_i})\right). \qquad (4.9)$$

By exchangeability, we also have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^*\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i\in[k]}\mathbb{1}_{B_i}(X_{\ell_i})\right) &= {}^*\mathbb{P}(X_{\ell_1}\in B_1,\ldots,X_{\ell_k}\in B_k) \\
&= {}^*\mathbb{P}(X_1\in B_1,\ldots,X_k\in B_k) \text{ for all } (\ell_1,\ldots,\ell_k)\in[N]^k\setminus\mathcal{R}, \qquad (4.10)
\end{aligned}$$

which allows us to conclude the following from (4.9):

$${}^*\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu_{\cdot,N}(B_i)\right) \approx \frac{\#([N]^k\setminus\mathcal{R})}{N^k}{}^*\mathbb{P}(X_1\in B_1,\ldots,X_k\in B_k). \qquad (4.11)$$

From (4.6), it is clear that

$$1 > \frac{\#([N]^k\setminus\mathcal{R})}{N^k} \geq \frac{N^k-\binom{k}{2}N^{k-1}}{N^k} = 1-\frac{\binom{k}{2}}{N} \approx 1, \qquad (4.12)$$

so that

$$\frac{\#([N]^k\setminus\mathcal{R})}{N^k} \approx 1. \qquad (4.13)$$

Using (4.13) in (4.11) yields the following:

$${}^*\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu_{\cdot,N}(B_i)\right) \approx {}^*\mathbb{P}(X_1\in B_1,\ldots,X_k\in B_k),$$

thus completing the proof. □

We are in a position to prove the following generalization of Ressel [91, Theorem 3, p. 906].

Theorem 4.2. *Let S be a Hausdorff topological space, with $\mathcal{B}(S)$ denoting its Borel sigma algebra. Let $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ be the space of all Radon probability measures on S and $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ with respect to the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$.*

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of exchangeable S-valued random variables such that the common distribution of the X_i is Radon on S. Then there exists a unique probability measure $\mathscr{P}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$ such that the following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{P}(\mu) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{4.14}$$

Proof. Let $N > \mathbb{N}$ and let P_N be as in (3.16). Let $\mathscr{P}$ be $LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$, which is a Radon probability measure on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ by Theorem 3.12. The right side of (4.14) is the same as the right side of (3.49), while the left sides of the two equations are infinitesimally close in view of Theorem 4.1. This shows the existence of a measure $\mathscr{P} \in \mathfrak{P}_r(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ satisfying (4.14). The uniqueness follows from Theorem 2.38. □

We end this subsection with some immediate remarks on the proof of Theorem 4.2.

Remark 4.3. Note that the proof of Theorem 4.2 showed that $\mathscr{P}$ could be taken as $LP_N \circ \mathbf{st}^{-1}$ for any $N > \mathbb{N}$, and all of these would have given the same (Radon) measure on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$. Following Theorem 3.12, this shows that in the nonstandard extension ${}^*\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, the internal measures P_N are nearstandard to $\mathscr{P}$ for *all* $N > \mathbb{N}$. From the nonstandard characterization of limits in topological spaces, it thus follows that $\mathscr{P}$ is a limit of the sequence $(P_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ (and hence in the weak topology as well, since the A-topology is finer than the weak topology), where for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the probability measure P_n on $(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$ is defined as follows (this definition of $(P_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ ensures, by (3.16) and transfer, that P_N is the N^{th} term in the nonstandard extension of the sequence $(P_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ for each $N > \mathbb{N}$):

$$P_n(\mathfrak{B}) := \mathbb{P}\left(\{\omega \in \Omega : \mu_{\omega,n} \in \mathfrak{B}\}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left({\mu_{\cdot,n}}^{-1}(\mathfrak{B})\right) \text{ for all } \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})). \tag{4.15}$$

Thus our proof shows that the canonical (pushforward) measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ induced by the empirical distribution of the first n random variables does converge (as $n \to \infty$) to a (Radon) measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ which witnesses the truth of Radon presentability. This gives a different (standard) way to understand the measure $\mathscr{P}$ in Theorem 4.2, and also connects the proof to the heuristics from statistics described in Section 1.2.

Remark 4.4. While Remark 4.3 shows that the measure $\mathscr{P}$ in Theorem 4.2 can be thought of as *a* limit of the sequence $(P_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, we cannot say that it is *the* limit of this sequence (as the space $\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, where this sequence lives, may not be Hausdorff). While this was not intended, the use of nonstandard analysis allowed

us to canonically find a useful limit point of this sequence using the machinery built in Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.46. The usefulness of nonstandard analysis in this context is thus highlighted by the observation that without invoking this machinery, it is not clear why there should be a Radon limit of this sequence at all.

Remark 4.5. Following Lemma 2.25 (thinking of T' as $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ and T as $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$), we can canonically get a sequence $({P_n}')_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ that can be seen to have $\mathscr{P}' \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ as a limit point. We make this way of thinking precise when we next prove a generalization of the classical version of de Finetti's theorem (as opposed to Ressel's "Radon presentable" version).

4.2. **Generalizing classical de Finetti's theorem.** While Theorem 4.2 is already a generalization of de Finetti's theorem, its conclusion is slightly different from classical statements of de Finetti's theorem that postulate the existence of a probability measure on the space of all probability measures (as opposed to a Radon measure on the space of all Radon measures). This can be easily remedied using ideas from Lemma 2.24 and Lemma 2.25, but at the cost of uniqueness. By Theorem 2.42, we still have uniqueness if we focus on probability measures on the smallest sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ that makes all evaluation functions measurable. As pointed out in Theorem 2.42, this is the same as uniqueness for Borel measures on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ if S is a separable metric space. We prove this generalization next. In fact, we prove a slightly stronger result that has the above conclusion for any sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of random variables satisfying (4.14).

Theorem 4.6. *Let S be a Hausdorff topological space, with $\mathcal{B}(S)$ denoting its Borel sigma algebra. Let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$) be the space of all Borel probability measures (respectively Radon probability measures) on S, and let $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ (respectively $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$) be the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$) with respect to the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ (respectively $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$). Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the smallest sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ such that for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the evaluation function $e_B\colon \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}) \to \mathbb{R}$, defined by $e_B(\nu) = \nu(B)$, is measurable. Also let $\mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the Borel sigma algebra induced by the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$.*

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of S-valued random variables. Suppose that there exists a unique probability measure $\mathscr{P}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$ such that the following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{P}(\mu) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{4.16}$$

Then there exists a probability measure $\mathscr{Q}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ such that the following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{Q}(\mu) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{4.17}$$

Also, there is a unique probability measure $\mathscr{Q}_c$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ satisfying the following for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int\limits_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{Q}_c(\mu) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{4.18}$$

Furthermore, if S is a separable metric space, then $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) = \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$, so that there is a unique probability measure $\mathscr{Q}_c$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ satisfying (4.18).

Proof. Let $\mathscr{P} \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the (Radon) measure obtained in (4.16). Define $\mathscr{Q} \colon \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) \to [0,1]$ as follows:

$$\mathscr{Q}(\mathfrak{B}) := \mathscr{P}(\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})) \text{ for all } \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})). \tag{4.19}$$

By Lemma 2.25, this defines a probability measure on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ (in fact, $\mathscr{Q}$ is the same as $\mathscr{P}'$ in the terminology of Lemma 2.25). Equation (4.17) now follows from (4.16) and (2.31) (within Lemma 2.25).

Call $\mathscr{Q}_c$ the restriction of $\mathscr{Q}$ to $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$. Note that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the map $\mu \mapsto \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k)$ is $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ measurable as well, so that we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int\limits_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{Q}_c(\mu) &= \int_{[0,1]} \mathscr{Q}_c \left[\mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) > y\right] d\lambda(y) \\
&= \int_{[0,1]} \mathscr{Q} \left[\mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) > y\right] d\lambda(y) \\
&= \int\limits_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{Q}_c(\mu).
\end{aligned}$$

Together with Theorem 2.42, this shows that there is a unique probability measure $\mathscr{Q}_c$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ satisfying (4.21). Theorem 2.41(iii) now completes the proof. □

In view of Theorem 4.2, the above result immediately yields our main theorem.

Theorem 4.7. *Let S be a Hausdorff topological space, with $\mathcal{B}(S)$ denoting its Borel sigma algebra. Let $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ be the space of all Borel probability measures on S and $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the Borel sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ with respect to the A-topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$. Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the smallest sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$ such that for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$, the evaluation function $e_B \colon \mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}) \to \mathbb{R}$, defined by $e_B(\nu) = \nu(B)$, is measurable. Also let $\mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$ be the Borel sigma algebra induced by the weak topology on $\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})$.*

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of exchangeable S-valued random variables such that the common distribution of the X_i is Radon on S. Then there exists a probability measure $\mathscr{Q}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ such that the

following holds for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*:*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{Q}(\mu) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{4.20}$$

There is a unique probability measure $\mathscr{Q}_c$ *on* $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ *satisfying the following for all* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*:*

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{Q}_c(\mu) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{4.21}$$

Furthermore, if S *is a separable metric space, then* $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})) = \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}))$*, so that there is a unique probability measure* $\mathscr{Q}_c$ *on* $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}_w(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ *satisfying* (4.21).

As explained in Remark 3.16, our proof of Theorem 4.7 did not use the full strength of the assumption that the common distribution of the exchangeable random variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ is Radon. The same proof would work if we assumed this common distribution to be tight and outer regular on compact subsets of S (indeed, the proof of Theorem 4.2 would go through under these assumptions, while the rest of the steps in our proof of Theorem 4.7 are consequences of the conclusion of Theorem 4.2).

In practice, a natural situation in which the latter condition always holds is when S is a Hausdorff G_δ space—that is, when all closed subsets of S are G_δ sets (as any finite Borel measure on such a space is actually outer regular on all closed subsets, and in particular on all compact subsets).

In the point-set topology literature, G_δ spaces typically arise in discussions on *perfectly normal spaces*. Following are some commonly studied examples of spaces that are perfectly normal (as described in Gartside [51, p. 274], these are actually examples of *stratifiable spaces*, which are automatically perfectly normal):

(i) All CW complexes are perfectly normal. See Lundell and Weingram [80, Proposition 4.3, p. 55].
(ii) All Lašnev spaces (that is, all continuous closed images of metric spaces, where a continuous map $g\colon T \to T'$ is called *closed* if $g(F)$ is closed in T' whenever F is closed in T) are perfectly normal. This, in particular, includes all metric spaces. See Slaughter [100] for more details.
(iii) If T is a compact-covering image of a Polish space (here, a continuous map $f\colon T \to T'$ is called a *compact-covering* if every compact subset of T' is the image of a compact subset of T; see Michael–Nagami 1973 and the references therein for more details on compact-covering images of metric spaces), then the space $C_k(T)$ of continuous real-valued functions on T (equipped with the compact-open topology) is perfectly normal. In particular, this implies that $C_k(T)$ is perfectly normal whenever T is a Polish space. See Gartside and Reznichenko [Theorem 34, p. 111][50].

The above discussion shows that we could have stated Theorem 4.7 for any exchangeable sequence of tightly distributed random variables taking values in a

Hausdorff state space that is either a CW complex, a Lašnev space, or a space of continuous real-valued functions on a Polish space (with the compact-open topology). This, however, would not be a more general statement than that of Theorem 4.7, as it is easy to see that any tight finite measure on a Hausdorff G_δ space is automatically Radon. It is still instructive to keep in mind these settings where one only needs to verify tightness of the common distribution in order for de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem to hold.

Remark 4.8. Dubins and Freedman [36] had constructed an exchangeable sequence of random variables taking values in a separable metric space for which the conclusion of de Finetti's theorem does not hold. An indirect consequence of the above discussion is that any random variable in such an example must not have a tight distribution.

Remark 4.9. We emphasize again that besides tightness of the underlying common distribution, one only needs outer regularity on compact subsets in order for de Finetti-Hewitt–Savage theorem to hold. Though we have not been able to find any natural examples of Hausdorff spaces in which all compact subsets (but not all closed subsets) are G_δ sets, such spaces (if they exist) might yield more classes of examples where de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem holds for any exchangeable sequence of tightly distributed random variables.

Note that all finite Borel measures on any σ-compact space are tight. Combined with the above examples of perfectly normal spaces, this gives us classes of state spaces for which de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem holds unconditionally (namely, any σ-compact perfectly normal space would be an example). While instructive from the point of view of examples, this is not surprising as such spaces are also examples of *Radon spaces* (that is, spaces on which every finite Borel measure is Radon), so that Theorem 4.7 automatically holds for any exchangeable sequence of random variables on such state spaces. Other examples of Radon spaces are Polish spaces, which is the setting for modern treatments of de Finetti's theorem. In this sense, Theorem 4.7 includes and generalizes the currently known versions of de Finetti's theorem for sequences of Borel measurable exchangeable random variables taking values in a Hausdorff state space.

We finish this subsection by recording the observation that Theorem 4.7 theorem holds unconditionally for any Radon state space.

Corollary 4.10. *Let S be a Radon space. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ be a sequence of exchangeable S-valued random variables. Then there exists a probability measure $\mathscr{Q}$ on the space $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ such that (4.20) holds. Also, there is a unique probability measure $\mathscr{Q}_c$ on $(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}(\mathrm{S})))$ such that (4.21) holds.*

4.3. **Some proof-theoretic considerations.** When restricted to the situation when the state space of our random variables is a metric space, there is a bit more that we can say under various set-theoretic conditions. We know that separability alone of a metric space is not a sufficient condition for it to be a Radon space (see Remark 4.8). At the same time, we know that completeness together with separability of a metric space is sufficient for it to be a Radon space. Hence it is natural to ask how important the separability condition is for the truth of the fact

that all Polish spaces are Radon spaces. Under certain set-theoretic considerations, it turns out that separability is not very essential at all. The following theorem is a step in that direction (see, for example, Pantsulaia [88, Remark 8, p. 340] for a proof):

Theorem 4.11. *The following are equivalent:*

(a) All complete metric spaces are Radon spaces.
(b) There does not exist a real-valued measurable cardinal.

There is a lot of metamathematical research done on real-valued measurable cardinals (and whether they exist) in the set theory literature. See Fremlin [47] for a general survey on real-valued measurable cardinals and related topics (see also Fremlin [49, Chapters 54, 55], and Jech [65, Chapter 10]).

As we shall see next, we do not need to closely follow these references for the precise definitions and properties of these cardinals in order to still be able to understand how Theorem 4.11 allows us to connect our work in the rest of this paper with philosophical questions about the foundations of mathematics. Here is a rough overview of some results from this set theory literature relevant to us:

(1) A theorem of Ulam [107], which Ulam also attributes to Tarski (cf. Jech [65, Historical Notes, p. 137]), shows that any real-valued measurable cardinal is at least weakly inaccessible (if not strongly accessible in some cases, though the two concepts coincide if we also assume the generalized continuum hypothesis) [2]. See Fremlin [47, Theorem 1D] or Jech [65, Corollary 10.15] for modern proofs of this statement.
(2) It is consistent with ZFC to assume that there are no weakly inaccessible cardinals (see, for instance, Cohen [25, p. 80]). In other words, if ZFC is consistent, then we cannot prove using ZFC that a weakly inaccessible cardinal exists.
(3) In view of items (2), (1), and Theorem 4.11, it follows that it is consistent with ZFC to assume that all complete metric spaces are Radon spaces.

Note that the results proven using nonstandard methods in this paper are consequences of ZFC. Indeed the superstructure formulation of nonstandard analysis that we used is constructed within ZFC, see for instance the discussion in Chang and Keisler [23, Section 4.4] for more details.

Therefore, by Corollary 4.10, we obtain the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.12. *It is consistent with the axioms of ZFC that de Finetti's theorem holds for any sequence of exchangeable random variables taking values in a completely metrizable state space. Furthermore, the existence of a complete metric state space for which de Finetti's theorem fails implies the existence of weakly inaccessible cardinals.*

While the above argument rested on the fact that it is relatively consistent with ZFC that inaccessible cardinals do not exist, that does not mean that such

[2] Historical remark: Weakly inaccessible cardinals were first formulated by Hausdorff [55] in 1906. Later in 1930 (the same year that real-valued measurable cardinals were studied independently by Ulam [107] and Banach [15]), strongly inaccessible cardinals were formulated independently by Sierpinski and Tarski [98] as well as by Zermelo [114]

cardinals "cannot" exist, as they might exist and ZFC just might not be a strong enough axiom system to be able to detect them. While most modern mathematics is done in the framework of ZFC, there is a perennial debate in the foundations of mathematics about which other axioms (for instance, in this case, an axiom about the existence of inaccessible cardinals which we cannot prove in ZFC, yet for which we do have a rich theory) should also be assumed. The existence (or non-existence) of weakly inaccessible cardinals is a popular candidate for such a new axiom to bolster ZFC with (see, for instance, Maddy [83]). Thus, Theorem 4.12 allows us to see de Finetti's theorem as a foundational result not only in statistics, but in mathematics itself.

4.3.1. *Upshot for the non-set theorist.* The above was a fairly high-level and rough overview of the connections with some set theoretic aspects that the author could find as a non-specialist in set theory. Let us summarize for the average probability theorist not engaged in questions about the foundations of mathematics what they can get out of this discussion.

Firstly, it seems instructive to see whether we can prove de Finetti's theorem for all completely metrizable state spaces. The only known counterexample to de Finetti's theorem (the one in Dubins and Freedman [36]) had a separable but not complete metric space as state space. In view of Theorem 4.11 and Corollary 4.10, we should not hope to expect such a counterexample, within ZFC, with a completely metrizable state space (as that would prove the existence of a real-valued measurable cardinal, something that is not provable in ZFC). However, if it is true, it might still be provable (within ZFC) that de Finetti's theorem is true for all completely metrizable spaces, and it is something worth exploring.

Secondly, for the general mathematician who does not yet have a say in whether they believe in the existence of inaccessible cardinals or not, it is not too bad to assume that de Finetti's theorem holds for all complete metric spaces—we know that *that* is consistent with ZFC, while a necessary condition for its negation involves a statement that cannot be proved without assuming an axiom system that is strictly stronger than ZFC. Since most of the work we do in typical probability theory settings only uses constructions based on ZFC, such an assumption would not be unwarranted, and we might be able to build rich theories with that assumption, as a lot of naturally occuring spaces in which we do probability theory are indeed completely metrizable (for instance, all Banach spaces).

4.4. **Conclusion and possible future work.** Starting from a result on an exchangeable sequence of $\{0,1\}$-valued random variables, de Finetti's theorem has had generalizations in several directions. While the classical form of de Finetti's theorem was known to be true for Polish spaces, Dubins and Freedman [36] had shown that some form of topological condition on the state space is necessary. Theorem 4.7 shows that we actually do not need any topological conditions on the state space besides Hausdorffness as long as we focus on exchangeable sequences of Radon distributed random variables (by the discussion following Theorem 4.7, we actually only need to assume that the common distribution of the random variables is tight and outer regular on compact subsets).

Since properties of the common distribution were crucially used in our proof, the question of the most general state space under which de Finetti's theorem holds

(without any assumptions on the common distribution) is quite natural. Corollary 4.10 provides some answers (in the form of Radon spaces), but the leap from Theorem 4.7 to Corollary 4.10 is rather trivial. It would be instructive to investigate if there are other classes of good state spaces for which de Finetti's theorem holds unconditionally. Our results also show that it would be consistent with the axioms of ZFC if we assumed that all complete metric spaces were examples of such good state spaces (this is Theorem 4.12). Whether all complete metric state spaces actually do satisfy de Finetti's theorem or not (and whether that is a decidable problem under ZFC is thus another natural question coming out of this investigation), an answer to which seems intimately connected with questions about our set-theoretic foundations.

Since all aspects of Radon measures were not fully needed in our proof, another possible future direction would be to find examples of state spaces for which tightness of the underlying common distribution is sufficient for an exchangeable sequence of random variables to be presentable. Radon spaces are again trivial examples, while Hausdorff G_δ spaces (see examples in (i), (ii), and (iii)) provide some non-trivial examples. Remark 4.9 provides a potential strategy for finding more examples, though carrying out this project seems to be beyond the scope of the current paper.

There are other formulations of de Finetti's theorem that we have completely ignored in the present treatment. For example, a useful formulation says that an infinite sequence of exchangeable random variables is conditionally independent with respect to certain sigma algebras. See Kingman [72] for a description of such a version of de Finetti's theorem along with some applications.

Another setting in which de Finetti's theorem is traditionally generalized is the setting of exchangeable arrays, with the main result in that setting sometimes called the Aldous–Hoover–Kallenberg representation theorem (See Aldous [5, 6], Hoover [63, 62], and Kallenberg [66, 67]). This is a highly fruitful setting from the point of view of both theoretical and practical applications. Indeed, it has been recently used in graph limits, random graphs, and ergodic theory (see Diaconis and Janson [34], and also Austin [14]) on one hand, and statistical network modeling (see Caron and Fox [22], as well as Veitch and Roy [112]) on the other. Extending our methods to produce similar results for exchangeable arrays was listed as a possible future direction in the original 2020 preprint of this paper. Since then, Towsner [106] has already settled that direction, also using nonstandard methods (whereby he obtained an Aldous–Hoover–Kallenberg theorem for Radon distributions).

Finally, there are existing generalizations of de Finetti's theorem for random variables indexed by continuous time as well (see Bühlmann [21], Freedman [46], as well as Accardi and Lu [1]), which is yet another area where a nonstandard analytic treatment using hyperfinite time intervals could be useful.

Appendix A. A philosophically motivated introduction to nonstandard analysis

A.1. **Why is nonstandard analysis relevant for the philosophy of mathematics and ethics of mathematics education?** The long name of this first

section of the appendix is a reference to the title of an article of Fenstad [41] from 1985: "Is nonstandard analysis relevant for the philosophy of mathematics?"

Nonstandard analysis is an area of mathematics that provides an alternative way to interpret the abstract object called the *number line* (, the same number line we are used to studying in our classical training in mathematics, where we interpret it as representing the set of so-called real numbers). Under the nonstandard approach to mathematics, in any attempt to (mentally or abstractly) interpret the whole number line as a continuum of numbers, there must also be numbers that are positive but smaller than any positive number we can conceivably mark on the number line. (Such numbers would be called positive *infinitesimals*.) In a rough intuitive sense, the numbers we could physically access as being marked on the number line would correspond to the usual set of real numbers $\mathbb{R}$, while all the numbers (accessible or not) that are identified with points on this abstract line would form a bigger set called ${}^*\mathbb{R}$— the nonstandard real numbers.

Because of how our mathematical foundations developed historically and culturally, most people who learn about nonstandard analysis would typically be first trained in the standard real numbers, and they would usually require a non-trivial amount of training in mathematical logic in order to understand how to think of a *logical extension or completion* of the standard real numbers, which is what the nonstandard real numbers really are in some sense. (Tao [101] is a great reference for the intuition behind this perspective.) Since mathematical logic is another subject that does not feature in a significant number of mathematicians' common training, that prerequisite often practically proves to be a stumbling block for many otherwise capable mathematicians trying to learn about nonstandard analysis.

Thus, writing a research paper (such as this one) on an application of nonstandard analysis in an area of mathematics where the practitioners are not expected to have gone through a training in mathematical logic has several pedagogical challenges. An author could always cite one of the many great introductions to nonstandard analysis available in the library (many of which are cited here: [3, 12, 26, 54, 31]). However, there are practical drawbacks of that approach—such an author's work would end up being understandable to only two categories of mathematicians:

(1) Ones who lie in the intersection of people who already understand nonstandard analysis at a reading level (if not working level) and who are also interested in the specific application in *standard mathematics* (which we define as the mathematics created using foundations under which "the number line" is interpreted to contain no infinitesimals).
(2) Ones who are sufficiently interested in the topic of the application, and who also lie in the small collection of mathematicians who have the time, energy, and resources to learn an entirely different way of thinking about things as fundamental as the numbers that they have all learnt under a certain (standard) perspective throughout their prior mathematics education.

Mathematics is a socio-cultural endeavor, and being able to communicate how one thinks mathematically is a social currency in this enterprise. If there exist mathematicians in the first category above who happen to be more philosophically comfortable with a nonstandard foundation for the continuum after spending some

time pondering about their personal philosophy of mathematics, then they would seldom be able to communicate their ways of thinking to most other mathematicians who might usually be interested in applications to standard mathematics, but who might not be intellectually privileged enough to land in the first category above. The mathematicians in this latter class would have only heard about the existence of nonstandard analysis but would seldom have the time, energy, and resources to pursue it after having already made a career in doing mathematics *standardly*. A mathematician is often socio-culturally, as well as economically, tied to a system of doing mathematics where they are expected to keep publishing in the limited aspects of mathematics that they know about in order to practically sustain a career; therefore having the time, energy, and resources to study nonstandard analysis really is a privilege in an academic system where the infinitesimals are otherwise only presented as non-rigorous (even "not real") mathematical objects in most mathematicians' personal education and conditioning from a young age.

While having the opportunities to learn both the standard and nonstandard foundations of numbers is indeed an intellectual privilege, it has a tendency to become the opposite of privilege socio-culturally to a mathematician who recognizes after the fact that they are now only comfortable in thinking nonstandardly about certain key aspects of the essential standard mathematical objects they are interested in. Based on the author's personal lived experiences (that this article is not getting into), the author suspects that there can be nuances in personal psychological traits that can make such a situation quite possible, but performing research at the interface of psychology, philosophy, mathematics, and education, while quite fascinating, is beyond the scope of the current paper.

Unfortunately, as Ely [38] demonstrates in a remarkable case study of one of his calculus students, such a situation might also be possible among students who only see the standard foundations in their career, whereby they might be thinking nonstandardly without even recognizing it in the absence of their educators validating their thought patterns. Such students practically end up giving up on mathematics as they believe that they do not understand it, but they would have had the ability to do mathematics if the ways of thinking about numbers in our educational system were more inclusive of such students' existing mathematical intuitions.

Sarah, the student in Ely's above-cited paper, had developed her own intuition for the number line that was based on a consistent appeal to infinitesimals. She said that she learned "not from any of her classrooms but that it was her own way of making sense of things." She knew that she was "wrong" and maintained that she did not "know the concepts", primarily because her classroom instruction never vindicated her natural intuitions, which could have been done easily if she was exposed to a course in calculus based in nonstandard foundations (perhaps based on Keisler's landmark book [70]; see also a recent article of Ely [39] that describes some pedagogical approaches).[3] Her mathematical intuitions about infinitesimals should have empowered Sarah to overcome her mathematical difficulties if our mathematics education system was built in a more intellectually inclusive way — yet she struggled in mathematics because our system is not built in such an inclusive way. It was

[3]We also provide a possible way to vindicate her intuition briefly later in this appendix, on p. 95

only a coincidence that Ely found Sarah and her self-realized nonstandard conceptions as attempts to "making sense of things". There could be lots of Sarahs around the world who might have developed similar conceptions while never recognizing that they do not have to be "wrong" if one is able to have the right (nonstandard) perspective.

Besides a socio-cultural enterprise, mathematics is also an art. An abstract artist often has their preferred interpretations of the key objects in their work. Different interpretations can be equally valid, and it would be creatively ableist to not encourage students of the artform to discover their own preferred ways of interpreting the fundamental abstract object we call the number line. In the 17^{th} century, Leibniz was artistic enough to come up with a consistent theory of infinitesimals as "mental fictions" (we will come back to this later when we discuss Leibniz in a bit more detail), but it took about three centuries before someone (Abraham Robinson) vindicated his intuitions rigorously (meanwhile, the standard interpretation had already become mainstream by then). It is an objectively sad state of affairs that imaginative and artistic students such as Sarah are not vindicated now even after the fact that we now have the resources to vindicate them unlike in the time period before Robinson's seminal work [92, 93]. Instead, such students end up thinking that they are not able to understand mathematics.

Spoonfeeding one preferred interpretation, despite the presence of an equally valid alternative interpretation, like we do in our current mathematics education, thus makes the socio-cultural enterprise of mathematics underinclusive to equally capable artists who might give up on the art long before their equally valid interpretations could have a chance to be vindicated. In fact, many of them, like Sarah, might not even recognize their mathematical abilities, thus making the question of what mathematical ability means very nuanced. Perhaps we can make a comparison with left-handedness, which for a long time was considered a wrong way to live in our society despite it being possible to live as well with that "condition" as someone who is right-handed. Our society and culture in the past were underinclusive to alternative interpretations of how to use our own body parts based on what was personally intuitive to us, despite there being nothing wrong with those interpretations. A similar situation arises at a more abstract level when we standardize the number line in our education.

Aside from the above issue of intellectual and artistic underinclusiveness, having only one interpretation of the abstract number line in our education might be detrimental to mathematics itself as a practical science. Indeed, those with a utilitarian mindset toward mathematics might find it intriguing to ponder on the possibility that perhaps we might be holding theoretical physics (and hence one of our most fundamental ways of understanding the physical universe) back in case the nonstandard foundation of the continuum is better equipped to modeling our physical theories at very large and very small scales. Fenstad's article [41], as well as the book [3] he co-authored with Albeverio, Hoegh-Krohn, and Lindstrøm are great references for readers curious about thinking more along this direction.

The way we personally think about the (standard) real numbers as mathematics students or practitioners is something that takes shape through several years of unconscious building of intuition from a young age. We are indirectly told at a relatively early age in our textbooks that "here is a number line—every point on it

describes a number that has some sort of measurable magnitude". The nonstandard interpretation of the number line challenges this belief about the concerned abstract object (that is, the number line) that our educational system tries to promote. Yet, it would be difficult for most people to be open about the alternative nonstandard interpretation even if they do learn about it later on after having spent many years trying to become a mathematician in the standard framework, since they would have already been socio-culturally conditioned to interpret the concerned abstract object one way by then. Thus the topic of nonstandard analysis is intimately connected to an issue of systemic creative suppression, which would perhaps be better discussed in forums devoted to ethics of art and art education, which, while beyond the scope of the current paper, would be a good aspect to keep in mind when thinking about the philosophical implications of nonstandard analysis.

Under the backdrop of the preceding discussion concerning the philosophy of mathematics and ethics of mathematics education, a key motivation behind this appendix is quite selfish of the author. The goal is to present just enough nonstandard mathematical thinking at an intuitive and philosophical level that a mathematician who has never seen nonstandard analysis, but who is interested in the standard results of the main body of the paper, can hopefully follow the main body of the paper on their own after reading this appendix. It is a selfish goal because it underlies a human desire to be understood. While most presentations of nonstandard analysis in mathematics research papers focus on the mathematical construction(s) and/or properties of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ and related (nonstandard) objects, we have (so far) focused on the philosophy of the subject because of the idea that understanding nonstandard analysis effectively seems to require one to fight against years of unconscious socio-cultural conditioning within their mathematics careers—and therefore this author believes that philosophizing about what it is that we are studying is helpful in not succumbing to the intellectually harmful effects of that conditioning.

As the appendix continues, our focus will soon start morphing from philosophical considerations into the more technical mathematical sophistication needed to understand nonstandard analysis. The emphasis in the mathematics we shall present in this appendix will be on building intuition, and therefore we shall be content with understanding how to think about and use nonstandard analysis, as opposed to worrying about its precise model-theoretic foundations which, otherwise, can be both distracting, and not needed, to the mathematicians interested in the subject for either its artistic, philosophical, or utilitarian implications.

This is comparable to how a mathematically talented high school student can (and often does) learn a lot about real analysis without learning how the real numbers are precisely defined — it is enough for them to recognize how what they are learning is describing the reality around them in order to build a good intuition for the axioms of real numbers that they take for granted (oftentimes without precisely knowing what these axioms are, or, indeed, what *'axioms'* are) in their studies at that level. Such students who become enamored with mathematics at a young age are often pulled in by a sense of beauty that these intuitive mathematical arguments and theories exude. Seeing a precise construction of real numbers before seeing what they intuitively are and how we use them in our mathematical thinking can have a tendency of leaving behind confused students who do not follow what it is that they are constructing. An aim of this exposition, therefore, is to not

construct anything and yet build an intuition for why nonstandard analysis can also be a natural way to interpret reality, thus hopefully allowing the patient reader to appreciate nonstandard arguments with the same zeal and vigor of a mathematically interested high school student who gets a thrill out of "understanding" real numbers without ever seeing a definition of the real numbers.

A.2. **Imagine being Leibniz (How to begin thinking about infinitesimals?)** The topic of nonstandard analysis is often met with apprehension by many practicing mathematicians, as is evident from perhaps the most common questions that a researcher using nonstandard methods faces after presenting their work:

> "That's quite good, but can it be done using only standard analysis? In general, can you prove something using nonstandard analysis that cannot be proven using standard analysis? "[4]

As explained earlier, a lot of this apprehension can be thought to arise out of our cultural predisposition to model the geometric (number) line with what we call the *real* numbers. (Fenstad's article [41] is a great further read for this cultural perspective.) We are culturally used to imagining that an abstract straight line can be marked in a way that it can be thought of as *the* set $\mathbb{R}$ — each element of $\mathbb{R}$ occupying its existence on this abstract line; one point being to the right of another if and only if the corresponding number is greater than the other.

The intuition that a straight line can be thought of as a continuum of numbers goes back at least to the time of Descartes, if not much earlier. However, "the continuum of numbers" is only another abstraction to model the abstract straight line, and one needs to make sense of what we mean by it. The (cultural) practice of imagining that this continuum of numbers *precisely* consists of what we call real numbers is not very old. Indeed, real numbers, as we know them, were not precisely identified until after a lot of work in Calculus had already been done using infinitesimal methods.

The history and philosophy of numbers is a fascinating topic, but in the interest of not detracting from our goals too much, we will only point out a few ideas that can help us build intuition for the nonstandard numbers that we will soon start working with mathematically.

At some point in our history, the Greek mathematicians used to think that the continuum of numbers is composed of only the rational numbers. One reasoning behind such a thinking could be that the rational numbers are what we could ever use in our practical measurements in the physical world. (See Arthan [13] for this viewpoint.)

When it was discovered that a right triangle with legs of unit length has a hypotenuse whose length could be shown to be a non-rational number, that was an important moment in our (mathematical) history as it made us feel humbled by the abstraction of the continuum. Earlier we used to think that we *know* it because we could think of numbers in terms of ratios of more tractable whole numbers, but

[4]For the sake of completion, we mention here the work of Keisler and Henson [57], who showed that there do exist results in standard mathematics that can be proven using nonstandard methods (or something equivalent), but not without them. However, in practice, it might be difficult to find an explicit example of such a mathematical result.

now we recognized that we did not *really* know it, as we could not specify what all the numbers in this continuum are anymore. The famous quote by Bertrand Russel seems to be quite relevant in this conversation:

> "Mathematics may be defined as the subject where we never know what we are talking about, nor whether what we are saying is true."

Indeed, we had a general idea of what we were trying to model by the continuum of numbers, but we did not really know what we were talking about if we modeled it by the rational numbers under an assumption that all 'numbers' must be of that type. This assumption could almost be thought of as a belief or faith. Under this faith, we thought what we might have been saying about all numbers must be true, but we had no way of knowing it—other than due to an overconfidence in our invented faith. Yet, that faith was important for the development of mathematics and hence of human civilization itself. Readers interested in this discussion might find the essay "Mathematics and Faith" [86] by Edward Nelson to be thought-provoking. Inspired by Robinson's nonstandard analysis, Nelson notably gave an alternative foundation of mathematics called "Internal Set Theory" [84], in which the infinitesimals were part of the continuum to begin with. Probability Theory under these foundations was developed in Nelson's remarkable book "Radically Elementary Probability Theory" [85].

Hrbáček [64] also developed similar foundations independently of Nelson around the same time. Several other approaches to nonstandard analysis have since been developed. In this paper, we have followed the so-called superstructure formulation (first constructed by Robinson and Zakon [94]) of Robinson's original nonstandard analysis [92, 93], which remains the relatively more common approach among practicing mathematicians. An article by Benci, Forti, and di Nasso [17] discusses this and seven other approaches to nonstandard analysis.

The fact that the superstructure approach that we use in this paper is also the one that is practiced most commonly in contemporary applications of nonstandard analysis to standard mathematics is perhaps another cultural artifact—it proceeds within the same framework we typically do standard analysis in, which means there is less to change for the practicing mathematician already culturally trained in standard mathematics. For example, we start out with the set of standard real numbers $\mathbb{R}$, and we create (using tools available within ZFC) a richer structure containing $\mathbb{R}$, which we call a non-standard extension of the real numbers. The nonstandard extensions of other standard structures are obtained in this framework by including those structures as part of the so-called *standard universe* that we extend in this framework.


Let us take a step back and recognize some of the works prior to Robinson's 1961 breakthrough that led him in the direction of nonstandard analysis. In 1934, Skolem [99] had constructed nonstandard models of Peano arithmetic. Fourteen years later, Hewitt [60] constructed the analog of real numbers under such a nonstandard model of arithmetic, which can be thought of as the first construction of a nonstandard extension of the real numbers. Hewitt's construction relied on a technical object called a *non-principal ultrafilter*, which was made possible by Tarski's work [102] from 1930 that showed that the then-recent set-theoretic foundations of ZFC implied the existence of that object. Hewitt's work anticipated the

more general ultrapower construction from about a decade later in the works of Łoś [79], and of Frayne, Scott, and Tarski [44, 45]. It is this ultrapower construction that most modern treatments of nonstandard analysis use when they present constructions of nonstandard extensions. Originally, Robinson and Zakon [94] also used such an ultrapower foundation for their superstructure framework for Robinson's nonstandard analysis [92, 93] that we are using in this paper. Notably, such a framework was already anticipated in the lecture notes of Luxemburg [81], who also gave an ultrapower foundation to Robinson's nonstandard analysis one year after Robinson's original announcement of his theory.

The above was a very short bibliography of mathematical developments from a very short period in our recent history that led to Robinson's nonstandard analysis. The actual history of infinitesimals is a rather colorful subject that predates these modern works, as mathematicians had been using infinitesimals for many centuries without foundations that were as rigorous, and we shall not attempt to document all those uses here. However, there is one mathematician, Leibniz, whose usage of infinitesimals to discover modern calculus can be thought of as a precursor to Robinon's nonstandard analysis in quite remarkable ways. Therefore before we discuss the mathematical details of Robinson's nonstandard analysis, we shall try to give intuition for it by recalling some of Leibniz's ideas that we build toward next.

As discussed earlier, creating an effective intuition for how to think of nonstandard numbers as modeling the abstract idea of a continuum might require us to try to remove our cultural conditioning of modeling the continuum by what we call real numbers. To that end, let us put ourselves in the shoes of a young student who has not yet been taught about real numbers, but who understands the vague idea of the abstract concept of *numbers*. If you wish, you could mentally travel in time and imagine Leibniz who fits the description, or you could imagine the student Sarah in Ely's mathematics education paper [38] cited earlier.

This student of ours knows that there are things that we call numbers, and she understands examples of some such numbers. She had begun her education by learning about the counting numbers (that is, the elements of $\mathbb{N}$). At some point, she started understanding ratios of those counting numbers (namely the positive rational numbers); and yet a bit later in her education, she learnt that we could also talk about *negatives* of the numbers she had seen before. She has seen a number line in her textbook which, she is told, can be used to abstractly represent *all* numbers. But what really are all the numbers? Practically, she can only ever represent a finite number of numbers before finding it difficult to mark more points. For instance, in the following figure, she has marked the rational numbers $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, and $\frac{1}{8}$, along with a few integers:



To mark more numbers that are closer to zero, she might use a modern device (or perhaps her imagination) to zoom into an image of her existing number line, and thus have more space to work with. At any point of time, she can only zoom by a certain amount—if she "zooms 2x", for instance, then she gets twice as much space to work with. For any natural number n, even if she "zooms nx", while she

might be practically able to "see" (and hence mark) more numbers, she would still only be able to mark a finite number of numbers.

She does know that there are infinitely many numbers, and that there are numbers arbitrarily close to any fixed number. How could she convince herself, even abstractly, that it is sound to assume that every number there exists can be located on this line *simultaneously* when she knows that practically it is not possible to mark them as such?

As discussed earlier, for this student to imagine such a proposition as true is really an exercise in abstract art. Without a description of what we are doing, we merely have a geometric object (namely a straight line) drawn on a piece of paper (or on the screen of an electronic device), which is abstract before interpretation. We have another "mental abstract object", the set of all real numbers which, in the standard interpretation, we bijectively identify with the (infinitely many) points that the straight line is imagined to have been made out of. All of this is a purely mental procedure that allows us to interpret the geometric line as a collection of numbers.

The above was the standard way of interpretation, but a feature of art is that it need not have only one ("correct" or *consistent*) interpretation, and therefore our student could have reached an alternative interpretation of what a continuum of numbers looks like. To better understand such an alternative interpretation, recall that after having already marked a few points on the number line, to mark a much larger (but finite) number of points simultaneously practically requires us to zoom in at a larger (but finite) level. In this way of thinking, an imagination of *all* numbers that are markable being marked *simultaneously* requires us to be able to imagine a level of zoom larger than all natural numbers—a zoom of infinite magnitude, which, once achieved in some abstract sense, can yield logically consistent ways of zooming in more or less, providing us (at least mentally) a whole spectrum of infinite quantities ("zooms") of various magnitudes.

While this description is not rigorous or precise, it could be thought of as being a fairly workable intuition for thinking about infinitesimals. Indeed if one imagines performing an "infinite amount of zoom while focusing their eyes on a particular number" on the number line, then the numbers that would be visible to them would be infinitely close to the original particular number. (In other words, these numbers would have infinitesimal distances from the original particular number.) Keep zooming even more, and one would "see" even more numbers that are yet closer to the original number. Despite the inaccessible nature of these numbers (in terms of not being able to be "marked" by those who can only access finite amounts of zoom) under this view, the numbers at these scales are still like the other numbers occupying their existence on this line, in a continuum from left to right. One can of course never perform an infinite zoom in reality (as we see or interpret it), but one can similarly also never simultaneously mark all numbers on the number line in such an interpretation of reality. For us to imagine that it can be done in an abstract sense is a type of mental fiction, which is exactly how Leibniz viewed his infinitesimals:

> Philosophically speaking, I no more admit magnitudes infinitely small than infinitely great ... I take both for mental fictions, as

> more convenient ways of speaking, and adapted to calculation, just like imaginary roots are in algebra. (Leibniz to Des Bosses, 11 March 1706; in Gerhardt [53], II, p. 305).

The author found the above translation of Leibniz in a seminal article on Leibniz's infinitesimals by Katz and Sherry [69]. In that article, Katz and Sherry explain that for Leibniz (as in the intuition we have been developing in our introduction in this appendix so far), what we call as real numbers are the "assignable" numbers on the abstract number line, while the numbers that are infinitesimals (such as the numbers one would see if one could zoom in at an infinite level while focused at the point representing the number 0) are mere mental fictions. We might not be able to assign numerical values to these mental fictions, but that does not mean that we cannot work with them, for they follow the same structure as the numbers that are assignable — both occupy the same abstract number line and are bound by the structure thereof. The fact that they follow the same structure was one of Leibniz's main tools in his development of Calculus. Called the law of continuity, one of its formulations was summarized by Katz and Sherry [69, p. 579] as follows:

> "The rules of the finite succeed in the infinite, and conversely."

Think of "rules" as "mathematical properties" or "mathematical structure" in some sense that has not been made very precise yet. We can perhaps excuse Leibniz for that as he did not have the language of mathematical logic developed only three hundred years later, which was needed to give a more mathematically precise meaning. Let us interpret "the rules of the finite" as intuitively meaning the mathematical facts about the "finite mathematical universe", by which we mean the mathematical objects culturally created by mathematicians assuming that whatever the abstract object called "number" is can only ever be finite (or accessible, as there would be no infinite or infinitesimal numbers in such a framework). This is essentially *standard* mathematics where the continuum is modeled by standard real numbers—no infinitesimals or other "mental fictions" of Leibniz being allowed.

With this perspective, and with the benefit of an understanding of Robinson's nonstandard analysis that developed three hundred years after Leibniz, we can give a possible anthropological interpretation of Leibniz's law of continuity as follows. (By way of this interpretation, we will also begin describing how Leibniz's ideas are rigorized in Robinson's theory, thus providing us an intuition for Robinson's nonstandard analysis before we start filling in more details in the next section(s).)

A.2.1. *What Leibniz's philosophy informs us about the anthropology and ethics of mathematical knowledge.* Unlike now, mathematicians at the time of Leibniz had not invented a standardized way of understanding the mathematical nature of the abstract number line. There was no precise definition of what it meant to be a *real number*. Philosophically, we knew that what we were modeling had connections with the nature of reality, as we had always used numbers to explain the real world, which we could only access a certain part of. There had been mathematicians (see Section 2 of Katz and Sherry [69]) who had obtained verifiable results about the real world by assuming that the magnitudes (numbers) we could access need not constitute *all* magnitudes. Perhaps some of those mathematicians might

even feel philosophically justified in assuming so because they might have a spiritual or religious belief in the infinitely large, and, logically conequently (by taking reciprocals), the infinitely small.

Leibniz's philosophy entails that even if you do not believe in a metaphysical ontology of the infinitely large or infinitely small, it is possible to logically argue about them as mental fictions. And the logical structure of a mathematical universe in which they are assumed to exist ("the rules of the infinite") would match that in which they are not assumed to exist ("the rules of the finite"). For Leibniz, the infinite (or nonstandard universe in modern terminology) only existed in the mind and played an instrumental role in describing the finite (or standard universe in modern terminology) because there was a correspondence of truths between the two via his law of continuity. This was made precise later by Robinson and his *transfer principle* (to be discussed in the upcoming section) when the language of mathematical logic had developed sufficiently to describe this phenomenon more rigorously.

Culturally, mathematics after the time of Leibniz could have proceeded in a manner in which actual numbers of infinite magnitudes (and, consequently, of infinitesimal magnitudes) would become part of the standardized way of thinking about the number line. Fenstad [41, p. 298] sketches one such idea in which the standard real numbers could have been obtained from the rationals by first extending the rationals to a bigger set consisting of infinitesimals, instead of the other way around that happened in our history. Nelson's internal set theory [84] is another, perhaps much more radical, example of how our mathematics could have proceeded had the developments in mathematical logic from the 20^{th} century happened earlier than when we had settled on our standard interpretation of the continuum.

Even though Leibniz does not believe in such an interpretation of the number line where the infinitesimal and infinite numbers are *real*, his way of working with them as mental fictions using his law of continuity demonstrates that such an alternate-history development of mathematics would be as valid as the canonical development that occurred in an epistemological sense.

In particular, the law of continuity shows that there could be two types of ontologies of the real number line (one in which we think of it as the standard $\mathbb{R}$, and another where we think of an ordered field containing $\mathbb{R}$ but also containing infinitesimals). *Believing* in either of these types of ontologies is a choice that one makes — a personal choice to not believe in infinitesimals does not preclude you from still discovering new mathematics by treating the infinitesimals as mental fictions like Leibniz did, and like Robinson did as well.[5]

Once Robinson was able to provide rigor to Leibniz's idea in his nonstandard analysis, Nelson [84, 85] saw it for what it really was—an alternate interpretation of what our numbers are, and how we are perhaps epistemologically incapable of actually knowing which ontology is the "real" one. He showed that one could truly believe in either ontologies and still arrive at essentially the same knowledge, and yet

[5]The following quote from Katz and Sherry [69, p. 572] captures Robinson's stance on this matter: "Like Leibniz, Robinson denies that infinitary entities are real, yet he promotes the development of mathematics by means of infinitary concepts (Robinson 1966, p. 282; 1970, p. 45). Leibniz's was a remarkably modern insight that mathematical expressions need not have a referent, empirical or otherwise, in order to be meaningful."

one could actually never be sure of either of those beliefs without faith at different levels. Nelson [86] talks about faith at the level of a belief in the consistency of the foundations of mathematics itself—but even someone who does have faith in the general foundations would then still require some amount of faith in their chosen ontology of the numbers, as they can never be sure that they are not living in a universe where infinitesimals are "real" but just not accessible (this is an intuition that we will develop in the next section). Leibniz's law of continuity essentially says that it does not matter which ontology of numbers you personally believe in — if you already believe in the infinite and infinitesimal, then you can attempt to learn more about it by transferring the "rules of the finite" into the realm you cannot access; on the other hand, even if you do not believe in that realm in any metaphysical sense, you have to accept the fact that the truths about your standard accessible universe are still bound by the logical rules of the mental fiction of the infinitesimals.

We should be clear that our emphasis in this article on the socio-cultural nature of how mathematics developed through history and how that impacts the mathematics that we currently work on as mathematicians does not mean that we are debating about the absolute nature of mathematical truths or any such thing. We are not advocating either a platonist or a non-platonist viewpoint of mathematics. We are, in fact, not claiming to know whether infinitesimals exist or not in any real sense.

Indeed, those are messy philosophical debates that one does not have to have strong opinions on in order to still recognize the important fact that mathematics has been an important tool for creating theories that help us better understand the universe throughout human history. Being too overconfident about our current ways of understanding the universe has never been conducive to the seemingly eternal quest of humanity to understand the universe it inhabits. In our past, we used to believe in lots of erroneous things that held us back in our understanding of the universe until new mathematical ideas were needed to get us closer to truth (a belief in geocentrism in various cultures comes to mind). In a sense, the development of Calculus and the "rules of the infinite" have changed the ways in which we understand our universe for the better, yet we are not doing ourselves any favor by standardizing infinity and thus limiting access to the imaginative people such as Ely's student Sarah [38]—such people could have been empowered in their lives and could have empowered mathematics back had mathematics as a socio-cultural endeavor been more inclusive to their equally valid ways of thinking.

Henson and Keisler [57] show that there are truths in arithmetic that can be proven using nonstandard thinking (or something equivalent) but not without. While this proof-theoretic strength of nonstandard analysis is a great feature to have, in an inclusive system of mathematics education it should not matter even if nonstandard analysis was incapable of proving "new" things. The "things" that a mathematics student studies at much lower levels are still things that they struggle with and we, the mathematics educators, have a moral obligation to uphold and empower our students' personal intuitions if it is possible to do so.

We shall provide a more mathematical discussion of Robinson's nonstandard analysis in the remainder of this appendix, but, as we have been trying to emphasize, the ideas that shall be made precise were already philosophically anticipated by Leibniz's law of continuity. Indeed, the basic premise of nonstandard analysis is the

existence of a standard universe which is contained inside a bigger and richer (the technical term will be *saturated*) nonstandard universe that structurally behaves the same in some precise model theoretic sense (a property we shall call the *transfer principle*).

A.3. **The "alien intuition" for Robinson's nonstandard analysis.** As already alluded in the previous paragraph above, Robinson's nonstandard analysis can be thought of as a theory in which the central object of study is a metamathematical correspondence between two abstract mathematical constructions: one called the standard universe and one called the non-standard universe. Using such a correspondence (together with an access to infinitesimals in the latter universe) will allow us to interpret certain standard mathematical concepts (such as those in calculus) in an arguably more intuitive manner allowing us to obtain new results in the standard universe. Philosophically, we are not claiming whether infinitesimals exist or not in a metaphysical sense, and perhaps we would never be able to claim one way or the other as their existence would not cause any *observable* mathematical differences. Let us now make all this a bit more precise mathematically.

Consider the so-called *standard universe* $\mathfrak{S}$, which *(at least)* includes all the standard mathematical objects that appeared in the standard theorems in the main body of this paper; or in general, it may include all mathematical objects that appear in any given standard discourse. Here, we are using the word "standard" as an adjective. Thus, for instance, a *standard discourse* is the type of mathematics that does not involve any nonstandard analysis.

When we write down a mathematical statement about our standard universe, the mathematical symbols used to describe our statement are philosophically just abstract symbols whose meanings depend on how we (mathematically) interpret them. The point we are trying to emphasize will be clearer from a thought experiment.

Consider the following sentence in formal logic:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}((x > 0) \to \exists y \in \mathbb{R}(y = x \cdot x)), \tag{A.1}$$

Imagine communicating it to an alien civilization from a different universe (which we call the *nonstandard universe*). For the sake of discussion, let us pretend that these aliens somehow know how to read formal logic symbols ('$\forall$' ("for all"), '$\exists$' ("there exists"), '$\vee$' ("or"), '$\wedge$' ("and"), '$\to$ ("implies"), '$=$' ("equals"), and punctuation using parentheses ':', '(' and ')'), and suppose further that they know the language of set theory (which just has one additional symbol '$\in$' ("belongs to")). While they know how to interpret these basic foundational symbols, they do not know our standard mathematical practices. In other words, they do not know which set the symbol $\mathbb{R}$ stands for, but they can infer from the sentence (A.1) that it must stand for some set on which there is a binary relation $>$ and a function $\cdot : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$. They can also notice that there is at least one element 0 with the property that anything related to it via the relation $>$ can always be expressed as a square.

If this alien civilization sees this sentence from us and nothing else, then they might think: "Hmm. We also know of many sets in our universe that have this property. For all we know, the set $\mathbb{R}$ could just be a singleton that contains some element that the humans are calling 0." But then they would quickly recognize

their thought as incorrect, as they would soon see some other sentences we have sent about $\mathbb{R}$ that make it clear that it is not just a singleton. For instance, perhaps they next see all the ordered field axioms that $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies. The aliens would recognize that whatever $\mathbb{R}$ is, it must be an ordered field [6], which is a concept they can define using the language of set theory that they know. (And since they remember our first sentence (A.1) that we sent, they further know that $\mathbb{R}$ is an ordered field in which every positive element has a square root.)

They still do not know what the humans meant by $\mathbb{R}$, but they now have a better intuition of how it might *look* like because they understand its *structure* better.

Even though this is not physically possible, imagine for the sake of this discussion that we are able to send *all* of the sentences that we can express about objects in $\mathbb{R}$ (and about other standard objects of interest). In particular, this would include statements about specific numbers such as the following:

$$\begin{aligned} 3.9 &< 4 \\ 3.99 &< 4 \\ 3.999 &< 4 \ldots \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

To make sure that these are sentences about elements of the same set $\mathbb{R}$ which we were talking about earlier, there would also be a sentence $c \in \mathbb{R}$ for each of the uncountably many real numbers c.

It turns out that their (mathematical) universe is actually rich enough to have an interpretation of all of our standard mathematical symbols in a consistent way. So, it is not just that they have at least one set in their universe that is an ordered field with the square root property, but they have a unique set, denoted by ${}^*\mathbb{R}$, which satisfies this and all other properties of $\mathbb{R}$ that we may write as sentences in our standard mathematical language.

Well, perhaps their set is also just the same as our set $\mathbb{R}$, but some general results in model theory guarantee that this is not always the case (as one can show the existence of nonstandard universes with saturation and transfer property that were informally alluded to at the end of the previous section).

Philosophically, both the aliens and the humans are modeling the same abstract idea: the continuum of the number line, but their models will be different because they have different notions of *infinities*. The aliens somehow have access to actual numbers that are bigger than all standard numbers (like how Leibniz had, at least mentally, in his formulation of Calculus), yet the set of all of the aliens' numbers behaves structurally similar to $\mathbb{R}$. Doing nonstandard analysis can be thought of as being a neutral observer living in neither the standard nor the nonstandard universe, but being aware of the facts about both universes, traversing between them as needed. The fact that this traversal of truth between different ideologies of numbers is possible at all is a remarkable achievement of the 20^{th}-century developments in modern mathematical logic.

Psychologically, it might be better to not think of the aliens' universe in the above intuition as a different universe than ours. We could actually imagine that

[6]The aliens would probably not call it an "ordered field" literally, as they would have come up with a different name in their own natural language for the concept of an "ordered field", but we shall not make this pedantic distinction explicit henceforth.

these aliens live in the same physical universe as us, but their cognitive abilities are infinitely higher than us in ways that lets them perceive and measure the world at infinitely finer scales than us. This is perhaps comparable to the popular intuition that a hypothetical being who lives and perceives only in a two-dimensional plane might never know what lies outside their plane of existence, even though there is a three-dimensional world containing that plane. Along similar lines, we can imagine beings (namely the aliens in our intuition) who experience the physical universe at scales incomprehensible by us. When they count something, they obtain a number in ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ and that number may as well be infinite to us (if it is bigger than all of our natural numbers) even though it is finite to them. Just like us, they can think of the set of all counting numbers, but they can never isolate the set $\mathbb{N}$ of *limited counting numbers*, as they do not understand the *limited* adjective that requires a different perception of reality in order to make sense. To them, all elements of ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ are limited.

The discussion in the previous paragraph can be thought of as an intuition for an important nonstandard analytic concept called *internal sets*. Internal sets are what the aliens can construct if they perceive the world in the manner that we have described above.

For instance, for each of *our* counting numbers n, (that is, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$), we can think of, and hence "construct", the set $[n]$ of the first n counting numbers. In the same manner, each element N of ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ is just a number up to which the aliens can count, and so they can internally think of the set $[N] := \{n \in {}^*\mathbb{N} : n \leq N\}$. In this sense, the sets $[N]$ (for each $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$) are internal in the nonstandard universe, while the set $\mathbb{N}$ is not, as the aliens are not capable of mentally visualizing this set at all. This intuition is reflected in the technique called *overflow*, one version of which says that an internal subset of ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ that contains all finite natural numbers must "overflow" and also contain an element from ${}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$, which must necessarily be infinite from the standard/human perspective because of the following simple argument based on the transfer principle that we have informally built so far. The motto for us to understand, like for Leibniz, will be that "the rules of the finite succeed in the infinite, and conversely"!

Proposition A.1. *If $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$, then N is infinite in the sense that $N > n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \subseteq {}^*\mathbb{N}$. We express this by writing $N > \mathbb{N}$, and calling N a hyperfinite natural number.*

Proof. Suppose, if possible, that $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$, yet there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N} \subseteq {}^*\mathbb{N}$ such that $n \leq n_0$. It is true in the standard interpretation of numbers that a counting number less than or equal to the particular counting number n_0 must equal one of the finitely many elements of $[n_0]$. By transfer principle, the same truth must hold in the nonstandard universe. Namely:

$$\forall n \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\left\{(n \leq n_0) \to [(n = 1) \vee \ldots \vee (n = n_0)]\right\}. \tag{A.3}$$

This, when applied to $n = N$, contradicts our assumption that $N \notin \mathbb{N}$. □

Let us analyze the above proof a bit to build intuition for the transfer principle that we will explore in more detail in the upcoming section. The reason that (A.3) is true is because we knew that the following sentence was true about the standard universe:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\left\{(n \leq n_0) \to [(n = 1) \vee \ldots \vee (n = n_0)]\right\}. \tag{A.4}$$

Thus, all we had to do was to identify where we were quantifying over a standard object in (A.4), and then quantify it over the nonstandard interpretation of that object instead: truths about $\mathbb{N}$ expressible in our standard mathematical language using formal logic symbols get transferred and remain true even if our universe of counting numbers is now ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ — the rules of the finite are succeeding in the infinite as Leibniz said!

Note that the fact that n_0 was a particular finite number fixed earlier was useful in this proof as well, as otherwise the "..." in the logical expressions (A.3) and (A.4) could not be made more precise, and so we could not really think of either of those expressions as *well-formed sentences* in our formal language. The intuition to keep in mind is that the statements about the standard universe that we are claiming to be equiveridical to their nonstandard interpretations must be first writable in our standard formal language in a precise and unambiguous way; otherwise exactly what would we be reinterpreting? This would exclude sentences that use imprecise expressions such as "...", unless we can make them precise using finitely many symbols in the specific contexts we are interested in. This is what happened in the above proof.

For instance, if $n_0 = 3$, then the sentence (A.4) is merely an abbreviation of

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}\left\{(n \leq 3) \to [(n = 1) \vee (n = 2) \vee (n = 3)]\right\}, \tag{A.5}$$

and is hence a valid sentence whose truth gets transferred to the nonstandard universe (with a similar reasoning holding for all fixed $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$).

Proposition A.1 showed that if the aliens can perceive any new counting number in their mathematical universe, then the transfer principle would imply that any such number would also be infinite from *our* perspective. We built the intuition for this by being artistic and imagining that these aliens somehow perceive reality at a different scale than us, thus seeing lots of new numbers that are accessible to them, but not to us. However, this is clearly not a mathematical argument. The foundational mathematical reason we can always use this intuition is because we can assume there exist nonstandard universes that are *saturated*, a concept we shall explain in the next section where we convert the intuition presented so far into a bit more rigorous mathematical exposition.

Yet, we do not need to understand saturation to do basic Calculus if we believe in an existence of a bigger nonstandard universe and understand the intuition of transfer principle between the two universes that we presented so far. We will thus be able to finish this section by finally giving an exposition of how to think about concepts from Calculus using the actual infinitesimals provided by nonstandard analysis. For brevity of exposition, we shall focus on understanding limits and continuity from a nonstandard perspective, with the aim of providing a bit more flavor of how transfer principle can be applied to various situations.

Let ${}^*\mathbb{R}_{\text{fin}}$ denote the set of those nonstandard real numbers that are not infinite. One can show that this is a *ring*, but not a *field* (as the multiplicative inverses of nonzero infinitesimals are not in this set). The next result says that one can think of a finite nonstandard real number z as having a real part, and an infinitesimal

part. Intuitively, each finite nonstandard real number must arise by "performing an infinite zoom while focusing" at a specific real number which we call its standard part.

Proposition A.2. *For all $z \in {}^*\mathbb{R}_{fin}$, there is a unique $x \in \mathbb{R}$ (called the standard part of z) such that $(z - x)$ is infinitesimal. We write $\mathbf{st}(z) = x$ or $z \approx x$.*

Proof. Fix $z \in {}^*\mathbb{R}_{\text{fin}}$. Use the least upper bound property of $\mathbb{R}$ in order to find the supremum x of the set $\{y \in \mathbb{R} : y \leq z\}$. We claim that this suffices, but leave the routine verification to the curious reader. □

Remark A.3. It is not difficult to check that $\mathbf{st}(ax + by) = \mathbf{st}(a)\,\mathbf{st}(x) + \mathbf{st}(b)\,\mathbf{st}(y)$ for all $a, b, x, y \in {}^*\mathbb{R}_{\text{fin}}$. For those who are algebraically inclined, we may thus think of the map $\mathbf{st}\colon \mathbb{R}_{\text{fin}} \to \mathbb{R}$ as a surjective ring homomorphism with the infinitesimals as the kernel. This expresses the field of real numbers as a quotient of the ring of finite nonstandard numbers.

For $x, y \in {}^*\mathbb{R}$, we use the notation $x \approx y$ to mean that $(x - y)$ is an infinitesimal. We also say "x and y are infinitely/infinitesimally close".

Recall that for a standard sequence $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of real numbers, we say that $L \in \mathbb{R}$ is a *limit* if for each $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists $n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|a_n - L| < \epsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>n_\epsilon}$. The following nonstandard characterization not only provides rigor to how we intuitively think of limits (basically through the motto that whenever n is "very large", a_n must be "very close to its limit"), but also has the uniqueness of the limit of a sequence (something that one proves separately in the standard way of thinking about limits) essentially built into the characterization.

The key idea is that any sequence of real numbers $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is really just a function, say $a\colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$, and hence has a nonstandard interpretation which is now a function ${}^*a\colon {}^*\mathbb{N} \to {}^*\mathbb{R}$. This nonstandard interpretation agrees with the original interpretation when restricted to the standard natural numbers, because given the real numbers $(a_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, the sentences '$a(n) = a_n$' about the function a transfer and yield '${}^*a(n) = a_n$' in the nonstandard universe for each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Because of this consistency with the original sequence, we can actually drop the asterisk, and just write a_n, always interpreting it as ${}^*a(n)$ without any ambiguity regardless of whether n is finite or hyperfinite. (Recall by Proposition A.1 that any $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$ is hyperfinite which we denote by writing $N > \mathbb{N}$.)

Proposition A.4. *Let $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of real numbers. Then, $\lim a_n = L \iff a_N \approx L$ for all $N > \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. First, suppose $\lim a_n = L$. Fix $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. By the definition of limit, we find an $n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}((n \geq n_\epsilon) \to (|a_n - L| < \epsilon)).$$

Interpreting the truth of this sentence in the nonstandard universe (or transferring), we obtain:

$$\forall n \in {}^*\mathbb{N}((n \geq n_\epsilon) \to (|a_n - L| < \epsilon)).$$

Since any hyperfinite N also satisfies $N > n_\epsilon$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, it follows that $0 \leq |a_N - L| < \epsilon$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $N > \mathbb{N}$. Hence $a_N \approx L$ for all $N > \mathbb{N}$.

Conversely, suppose $a_N \approx L$ for all $N > \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any given $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, the truth of the following sentence in the nonstandard universe is witnessed by any hyperfinite m (and transfer principle then yields the appropriate sentence in the standard universe that we need for this ϵ):

$$\exists m \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\ \forall n \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\,((n \geq m) \to (|a_n - L| < \epsilon))\,.$$

□

Note that in the above proof, the function $|\cdot|$ that appeared in the statements for the nonstandard universe was really the nonstandard interpretation ${}^*|\cdot| : {}^*\mathbb{R} \to {}^*\mathbb{R}$ of the usual standard absolute value function on $\mathbb{R}$, where we had suppressed the asterisk for brevity of exposition, something that was allowed because the nonstandard interpretation must agree with the original function when restricted to the original domain (by transfer). It is a useful fact (an easy verification can be done using transfer) that ${}^*|\cdot|$ agrees with the natural absolute value map on ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ as an ordered field—otherwise, if that were not the case, then dropping this asterisk could have been a source of confusion.

A similar application of transfer in a different context provides us an intuitive nonstandard characterization of continuous functions on the real line. Recall that a function $f\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is called *continuous* at some point $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if for each $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $|y - x| < \delta$ implies $|f(y) - f(x)| < \epsilon$.

The nonstandard characterization says that $f\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous at $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if whenever we take an input infinitesimally close to x, we obtain an output that is infinitesimally close to $f(x)$. (This is a sensible statement because we can work with the nonstandard or alien's interpretation ${}^*f\colon {}^*\mathbb{R} \to {}^*\mathbb{R}$ of the original function, which would agree with f when restricted to $\mathbb{R}$.) More formally, we have:

Proposition A.5. *A function $f\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous at $x \in \mathbb{R}$ if and only if ${}^*f(y) \approx f(x)$ whenever $y \approx x$.*

In view of the map $\mathbf{st}\colon {}^*\mathbb{R}_{fin} \to \mathbb{R}$, we may rewrite this characterization of continuity at x as saying that ${}^*f(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)) \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(f(x))$.

Proof. Suppose f is continuous at $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Fix $y \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$. We want to show that ${}^*f(y) \approx f(x)$. To that end, we fix an arbitrary $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and we now aim to show that $|{}^*f(y) - f(x)| < \epsilon$. Given this $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, the standard definition of continuity yields a number $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that the following is true:

$$\forall z \in \mathbb{R}\{(|z - x| < \delta) \to (|f(z) - f(x)| < \epsilon)\}.$$

Transferring its truth to the nonstandard universe yields (noting that x and $f(x)$ are just real constants, so they are interpreted "as they are"):

$$\forall z \in {}^*\mathbb{R}\{(|z - x| < \delta) \to (|{}^*f(z) - f(x)| < \epsilon)\}.$$

Since $|y - x| < \delta$ is true (in fact, $|y - x| \approx 0$ by assumption, so $|y - x|$ is smaller than all fixed positive real numbers), we obtain $|{}^*f(y) - f(x)| < \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ was arbitrary, we obtain ${}^*f(y) \approx f(x)$, as desired.

Conversely, suppose ${}^*f(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)) \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(f(x))$. Fix $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Then the following is true in the nonstandard universe by assumption (as any positive infinitesimal δ

witnesses its truth):

$$\exists \delta \in {}^*\mathbb{R}_{>0}\, [\forall z \in {}^*\mathbb{R}\{(|z-x| < \delta) \to (|{}^*f(z) - f(x)| < \epsilon)\}]\,.$$

Transferring this sentence to the standard universe shows that there is a standard $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ as well with the requisite property. □

Note that we can, of course, give analogous characterizations if the domain of the function is not all of $\mathbb{R}$. For a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, a function $f\colon A \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous at some $a \in A$ if and only if ${}^*f(y) = f(a)$ for all $y \in {}^*A$ such that $y \approx a$. In fact, we can change both the domain and the co-domain to general topological spaces, and nonstandard interpretations will still allow us to think infinitesimally in that setting despite not having a natural notion of distance or metric (see Proposition A.13). To work with nonstandard ideas in such generality, we need to be more precise about the standard universe we are extending. We build toward that generality by first fleshing out some more mathematical details of our alien intuition next.

A.4. **More mathematical details of our alien intuition.** In technical model theory terms, one thinks of the nonstandard universe as a *saturated elementary extension* of the standard universe in some sense we have not made precise in this article. But we shall not need to understand such model theoretic terminology rigorously in order to understand the gist of what is happening. We shall be able to continue the "alien intuition" from the previous section, while still able to be more rigorous about what is truly happening mathematically!

Here is the gist of transfer principle—if the humans use a symbol A for some specific standard set, whose formal properties have been written among the set of formal sentences that are true in the standard universe, then the aliens would identify a set ${}^*A$ in their universe that would satisfy all the same formal properties.

Let us consider a toy example. For each particular real number c, there is a sentence "$c \in \mathbb{R}$" which is true in our standard theory. By transfer, therefore, the sentence "$c \in {}^*\mathbb{R}$" is true in the nonstandard universe. In this way, ${}^*\mathbb{R}$, called the set of nonstandard real numbers, contains $\mathbb{R}$. Similarly, we have $\mathbb{N} \subseteq {}^*\mathbb{N}$, etc. [7]

Among the properties of $\mathbb{R}$ that we can write down also include second-order properties (that is, those that talk about universal or existential properties of subsets, as opposed to those of elements, of a particular set), but disguised as first-order sentences. For instance, we can quantify over the elements of the power set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ if we want to express a statement about subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. (Recall that we do not have '$\subseteq$'

[7] If this is unsatisfactory because of the usage of the symbol c that is seemingly interpreted the same way in both universes, here is a way to intuitively think about what is happening. For any two constants for which we use the symbols a, b in $\mathbb{R}$ in the standard universe, we must have communicated to the aliens which one of $a = b$, $a < b$, and $a > b$ is true, and thus (, because ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ has the same formal properties as $\mathbb{R}$,) there should be a unique pair $({}^*a, {}^*b) \in {}^*\mathbb{R} \times {}^*\mathbb{R}$ corresponding to each standard pair $(a, b) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that ${}^*a$ and ${}^*b$ satisfy the same sorts of relations (interpreted appropriately in the nonstandard universe) with each other and with the rest of the elements of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ as what a and b have with each other and with the rest of the elements of $\mathbb{R}$. Thus, for example, if $a = b^2$, then so is ${}^*a = {}^*b^2$.

For all intents and purposes, we might as well make the identification that ${}^*a = a$ for any standard real number a. That is, the set

$$\{{}^*a : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq {}^*\mathbb{R} \tag{A.6}$$

is identified as the copy of $\mathbb{R}$ inside ${}^*\mathbb{R}$.

as an allowed symbol in our formal language, but we do have the set-membership relation symbol '$\in$' in it.) Why are we being pedantic about this aspect? Isn't it true that if we can write down a statement about all subsets of $\mathbb{R}$, then transfer should imply that the nonstandard interpretation is true for all subsets of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$? This is actually not true, and understanding why leads us to thinking about what internal sets (introduced more intuitively in the previous section) actually are.

To build intuition before the definition comes, here is a simple statement that says that all elements of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ are *subsets* of $\mathbb{R}$, but without using the '$\subseteq$' symbol:

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})\,(\forall x((x \in A) \to (x \in \mathbb{R})))\,. \tag{A.7}$$

If ${}^*(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$ is the actual object in the nonstandard universe that the aliens must interpret in order to transfer the standard universe truths expressed using the symbols $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ into truths about objects in the nonstandard universe, then transfering the above standard sentence expresses the following truth about the nonstandard universe:

$$\forall A \in {}^*(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))\,(\forall x((x \in A) \to (x \in {}^*\mathbb{R})))\,. \tag{A.8}$$

Thus, whatever object ${}^*(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$ is, its elements are subsets of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$. We often drop the additional parentheses and abbreviate ${}^*(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}))$ as ${}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, so that we can rewrite the sentence (A.8) as saying that ${}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}({}^*\mathbb{R})$. Let us try to understand the structure of ${}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ a bit more.

Here is a slightly more complicated statement which says that every non-empty subset of the real numbers that is bounded above has a least upper bound:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \\
&\langle\, [\exists c \in \mathbb{R}(c \in A) \wedge \exists x \in \mathbb{R}(\forall y \in \mathbb{R}\{(y \in A) \to (y \leq x)\})] \to \\
&\exists z \in \mathbb{R} \\
&\{(\forall y \in \mathbb{R}\ [(y \in A) \to (y \leq z)]) \\
&\qquad\qquad \wedge [\forall w \in \mathbb{R}(\forall y \in \mathbb{R}\{[(y \in A) \to (y \leq w)] \to (z \leq w)\})]\}\,\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

By transferring its truth, all non-empty members of ${}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ that have an upper bound in ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ also have a least upper bound in ${}^*\mathbb{R}$. Note that the boundedness in ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ is being discussed in terms of the binary relation ${}^* <$ on ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ that is interpreted by the aliens whenever they encounter the standard $<$ symbol written by the humans as a binary relation on $\mathbb{R}$. (As is customary for reasons of brevity, we still use the same symbol '$<$' to denote what really is '${}^* <$' if it is clear from context which universe we are interpreting this symbol in.)

In order to think about nonstandard interpretations of relations when we started with an assumption that all sets have such interpretations, we merely need to be more pedantic and recognize that any particular binary relation on $\mathbb{R}$ is just a subset of the Cartesian product $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, and therefore each standard relation on $\mathbb{R}$ does give rise to its nonstandard interpretation as a subset of ${}^*(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}) = {}^*\mathbb{R} \times {}^*\mathbb{R}$ (and hence as a relation on ${}^*\mathbb{R}$).

The above fact that * commutes over Cartesian products can also be seen as a simple consequence of transfer! Indeed, if A and B are standard sets and $\pi_A \colon A \times B \to A$ and $\pi_B \colon A \times B \to B$ are the corresponding projection maps, then the

following is true in the standard universe:

$$\forall x \left\{ x \in (A \times B) \leftrightarrow [(\pi_A(x) \in A) \wedge (\pi_B(x) \in B)] \right\},$$

which transfers to the following:

$$\forall x \left\{ x \in {}^*(A \times B) \leftrightarrow [({}^*(\pi_A)(x) \in {}^*A) \wedge ({}^*(\pi_B)(x) \in B)] \right\}.$$

Here is what is really happening in the above sentence. We can pedantically identify any function with its *graph*, similarly to how we identified relations as subsets of an appropriate Cartesian product. For instance, since $\pi_A \colon A \times B \to A$ is really just the subset $\{(x, y) : x \in A \times B, y = \pi_A(x)\} \subseteq (A \times B) \times A$, there is a nonstandard interpretation ${}^*\pi_A$ of this set, which, due to transfer, can be seen to be (the graph of) a function from ${}^*(A \times B)$ to ${}^*A$. In fact, we can further use transfer to show that ${}^*(\pi_A) = \pi_{{}^*A}$[8] (and similar statement for B), which is what finally allows us to conclude the distributivity of * over Cartesian products that we were trying to prove.

Let us take a step back and re-evaluate what we proved about the nonstandard interpretation of the usual order on $\mathbb{R}$ when we transferred the sentence (A.9). We showed that those non-empty members of ${}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ that happen to be bounded above in ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ must also have a least upper bound in ${}^*\mathbb{R}$. As soon as we have a mathematical reason to believe that ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ contains at least one infinite element N (that is, $N > n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$), we would be able to conclude that the set $\mathbb{N}$ is a counterexample to the least upper bound property in ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ (as $\mathbb{N}$ would then be bounded above by N, but evidently subtracting one from any upper bound of $\mathbb{N}$ would still yield an upper bound of $\mathbb{N}$ due to transfer, thus there being no least upper bound of $\mathbb{N}$).

Therefore, it would follow that $\mathbb{N} \in \mathcal{P}({}^*\mathbb{R}) \backslash {}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$. The elements of ${}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$, are indeed special subsets of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ over which even second-order properties of $\mathbb{R}$ transfer, and not all subsets of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ are as nice as long as ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ has infinite numbers.

So far, nothing non-trivial has happened, as we do not really know if ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ contains even one new element, even if transfer principle is true (recall that our proof of Proposition A.1 relied on an *assumption* that there was a new element), and it could be that the aliens' nonstandard mathematical universe is also the same as our standard universe. Indeed, merely an assumption of transfer principle is not enough to guarantee new elements, much less infinite ones. For instance, using transfer, we were able to prove Proposition A.1 only under the assumption that that there was an $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N} \backslash \mathbb{N}$, but transfer alone cannot prove that there indeed does exist such an N. Fortunately, there are results in model theory (see, for instance, Chang and Keisler [23, Lemma 5.1.4, p. 294 and Exercise 5.1.21, p. 305]) that guarantee that there are nonstandard universes that not only satisfy the transfer principle, but are also *saturated*, which is a compactness-type property that is defined as follows:

Definition A.6. A set in a nonstandard universe is called *internal* if it belongs to ${}^*\mathcal{P}(S)$ for some standard set S (, in which case, it is an internal subset of ${}^*S$, by a reasoning analogous to (A.8)). A nonstandard universe is called saturated [9] if for any index set I in the standard universe, and any collection $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ of internal sets in the nonstandard universe that have the finite intersection property

[8] Just transfer the sentence that says that any element $x \in A \times B$ is equal to $(\pi_A(x), \pi_B(x))$

[9] In the literature, what we are defining is sometimes called *polysaturation*.

(that is, for any finitely many $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in I$, we have $A_{i_1} \cap \ldots \cap A_{i_n} \neq \emptyset$), we have $\cap_{i \in I} A_i \neq \emptyset$.

Note that when we transferred second-order sentences earlier, their truths were only preserved when working with internal sets. For instance, all non-empty internal subsets of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ that have an upper bound have a least upper bound. Also, in particular, the set ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ itself is internal (a fact revealed by transferring the sentence '$\mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$'). Similarly, ${}^*A$ is an internal subset of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ for all $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$. There are internal subsets of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ that are not of this type, but in order to understand how they might look like, we must first finally prove that any saturated nonstandard universe does contain lots of new elements.

Proposition A.7. *In a saturated nonstandard universe, ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ contains infinite numbers (that is, numbers that are bigger than all real numbers, which are viewed as elements of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$), as well as non-zero infinitesimal elements (which are elements whose absolute values are smaller than all positive real numbers).*

Proof. Any element in the non-empty intersection $\cap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{x \in {}^*\mathbb{R} : x > n\}$ (which is non-empty by saturation) must be infinite. The multiplicative inverse of any infinite element is infinitesimal. □

Technical details aside, we want to emphasize the intuition that if there is a *standard collection* (that is, a collection indexable by a set in the standard universe) of statements/conditions that a typical element may or may not satisfy, then just verifying that any finite number of those conditions are satisfiable (by possibly different elements depending on the finite subset of conditions) is enough to justify the existence of a single object that satisfies *all* of the conditions simultaneously. This is very powerful and is indeed the philosophical reason why nonstandard analysis is successful in applications, as it allows one to go from the finite to the infinite (or vice versa) in a logically precise way.

In the above proof, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\{x \in {}^*\mathbb{R} : x > n\}$ was internal because we can write a formal logic sentence that says that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a unique set consisting of those real numbers x that are bigger than n. By transfer, for each $n \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, there is a unique *internal* subset of ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ whose membership criterion can be expressed as '$x > n$'. For any finitely many $n_1, \ldots, n_k \in \mathbb{N}$, the number $n_1 + \ldots + n_k$ is in the finite intersection $A_{n_1} \cap \ldots \cap A_{n_k}$, which is why we could apply saturation.

The details in the preceding paragraph are completely pedantic. The rule of thumb to keep in mind is the following:

Rule of thumb (Internal Definition Principle) :
If there is a formal logic formula (which is just a grammatically correct finite string of symbols) $\phi(x, v_1, \ldots, v_k)$ in which $x, v_1, \ldots, v_k$ are variables and the rest of the symbols appearing in this formula are standard mathematical symbols, then for any fixed members $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ of some internal set, the set of those x (in the nonstandard universe) for which $\phi(x, a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ is true is an internal set. We can think of ϕ as the property that defines this internal set with *parameters* $a_1, \ldots, a_k$. All internal sets arise this way.

The internal definition principle is rigorously proved using induction on how long the formula ϕ is, but we shall only be content with understanding the intuition

of how it allows us to build more internal sets out of the internal sets that are easier to see. For instance, in the proof of Proposition A.7, we used the formula $\phi(x, n) := `x > n'$ in order to define an internal set for each $n \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ (though we only used those internal sets when n took values in $\mathbb{N}$, which is contained in ${}^*\mathbb{N}$). Note that our earlier (alien) intuition of the internal set as being a set that the aliens can "perceive" given that they perceive the universe at scales infinitely finer than us still works. Just like we can define ("perceive") the set of all numbers greater than a fixed number we have access to, so can they in their richer mathematical universe. We will see a more complicated application of the idea of using known internal sets to define other internal sets again when we study overflow and underflow in Proposition A.9.

When one works using nonstandard analysis, as long as we have saturation, the actual nonstandard universe that one has usually does not matter, as any individual formal properties about the standard universe still transfer over to the nonstandard universe (while saturation guarantees that we do get new elements, thus allowing us to work with a richer mathematical structure to prove things in, and hopefully transfer back our conclusions to the standard universe).

In any application of (Robinson's) nonstandard analysis to standard mathematics (and hence in this paper), we fix a saturated nonstandard universe that satisfies the transfer principle, which is what we shall do going forward. This can be made more precise if desired (with the superstructure framework of the next section a step in that direction), but this level of understanding is sufficient to start working with nonstandard analysis.

For the sake of completion, we note the following consequence of saturation which shows that the hypothesis in Proposition A.1 is always true for saturated nonstandard universes.

Proposition A.8. *The set ${}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$ is nonempty.*

Proof. The collection $\{{}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\{n\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a countable collection of internal sets satisfying the finite intersection property. Hence by saturation, there exists $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$. □

As discussed earlier, this implies that $\mathbb{N}$ is not an internal set in the nonstandard universe (as it is bounded by any infinite number, but does not have a least upper bound). While we assumed that $\mathbb{N} \subseteq {}^*\mathbb{N}$ by making the identification that ${}^*n = n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we cannot do the same identification when we talk at the level of (nonstandard extensions of) sets in the standard universe. Indeed, for any $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, we can only use transfer to conclude that ${}^*A \in {}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, where ${}^*A$ contains A but may in general be much bigger than A (it is the same as A if and only if A is finite — another fact that can be proved by transfer and saturation). Thus, we do not have $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \subseteq {}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ in the literal sense, but we do have $\{{}^*A : A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})\} \subseteq {}^*\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$. The reason this was not an issue in saying that $\mathbb{N} \subseteq {}^*\mathbb{N}$ or $\mathbb{R} \subseteq {}^*\mathbb{R}$ was because we hid some technical details under the rug when we identified ${}^*c$ with c for each $c \in \mathbb{R}$, something we shall touch upon a bit when we discuss the superstructure framework in the next section.

In particular, we have been working with a standard universe and a saturated nonstandard universe at an intuitive level, but we have yet not made mathematically

precise what the standard universe is. We postpone that until the next section when we talk about the superstructure framework.

Note that if $N > \mathbb{N}$ (which is our shorthand for $N \in {}^*\mathbb{N}\backslash\mathbb{N}$ in view of Proposition A.1), then $[N] = \{n \in {}^*\mathbb{N} : n \leq N\}$ is an example of an internal subset of ${}^*\mathbb{N}$ that is not of the type ${}^*A$ for any $A \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$.

If ϕ is a property that defines an internal set (possibly with some fixed parameters $a_1, \ldots, a_k$), then that internal set cannot contain all natural numbers without containing a hyperfinite number $N > \mathbb{N}$ (as the set $\mathbb{N}$ is not internal). More roughly, one way to think of this is to recognize the intuition that "if something is true for arbitrarily large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then it must be true for a hyperfinite $N > \mathbb{N}$ (and vice versa)." This or other variations of this technique is called *overflow* (or *underflow* for the reverse direction), a technique that is quite useful in applications.

Proposition A.9. *Let A be an internal set.*

*(i) **[Overflow]** If $\mathbb{N} \subseteq A$, then there is an $N > \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$[N] \subseteq A.$$

*(ii) **[Underflow]** If A contains all hyperfinite natural numbers, then there is an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that ${}^*\mathbb{N}_{\geq n_0} := \{n \in {}^*\mathbb{N} : n \geq n_0\} \subseteq A$.*

Proof. We only prove overflow, as the proof of underflow can be thought of as the dual of this proof, and is hence left as an exercise for the interested reader. Assume $\mathbb{N} \subseteq A$. Since A is internal, and since $[n]$ is internal for each $n \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ the set $\{n \in {}^*\mathbb{N} : \forall x \in [n](x \in A)\}$ is internal by the internal definition principle. We now obtain an element $N > \mathbb{N}$ in this set due to the fact that $\mathbb{N}$ is not internal (and is yet a subset of this internal set). □

A.5. **Yet more mathematical details: The superstructure framework.** The goal of this last section of our introduction is to provide an intuitive sketch of the key features of the superstructure framework of nonstandard analysis, which is the framework that we used in this paper, as it allows us to talk about nonstandard versions of structures other than just the number line (so, we can talk about nonstandard extensions of topological spaces, etc.). It was first developed by Robinson and Zakon [94], following Robinson's original text on nonstandard analysis [93].

In general, we fix a "ground" set $\mathbb{S}$ consisting of atoms (that is, we view each element of $\mathbb{S}$ as an "individual" without any structure, set-theoretic or otherwise), and extend what is called the superstructure $V(\mathbb{S})$ of $\mathbb{S}$, which is defined inductively as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} V_0(\mathbb{S}) & := & \mathbb{S}, \\ V_n(\mathbb{S}) & := & \mathcal{P}(V_{n-1}(\mathbb{S})) \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ V(\mathbb{S}) & := & \displaystyle\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} V_n(\mathbb{S}). \end{array} \tag{A.10}$$

It is the superstructure $V(\mathbb{S})$ that we may think of as what we have so far been informally calling the standard universe $\mathfrak{S}$. For some set $\mathbb{S}'$, We extend the standard universe via a *nonstandard map*,

$${}^*\colon V(\mathbb{S}) \to V(\mathbb{S}'),$$

which, by definition, is any map satisfying the following axioms that were described in the previous section(s):

(i) ${}^*\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}'$,
(ii) Transfer principle holds.
(iii) Saturation holds.

For any $A \in V(\mathbb{S})$, we call ${}^*A$ the nonstandard interpretation or extension of A. Thus, $V({}^*\mathbb{S})$ is our nonstandard universe. We assume that the ground set $\mathbb{S}$ contains (at least) all real numbers as elements, so as to have a rich enough universe to extend. In fact, choosing $\mathbb{S}$ suitably, the superstructure $V(\mathbb{S})$ can be made to contain all mathematical objects relevant for a particular study (say, all standard objects that appeared in the main body of this paper). Indeed, since $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathbb{S}$, all collections of subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ live as objects in $V_2(\mathbb{S}) \subseteq V(\mathbb{S})$. For a finite subset consisting of k objects from $V_m(\mathbb{S})$, the ordered k-tuple of those objects is an element of $V_n(\mathbb{S})$ for some larger n; and hence the set of all k-tuples of objects in $V_m(\mathbb{S})$ lies as an object in $V_{n+1}(\mathbb{S})$. For example, if $x, y \in V_m(\mathbb{S})$, then the ordered pair (x, y) is just the set $\{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\} \in V_{m+2}(\mathbb{S})$. Identifying functions and relations with their graphs, $V(\mathbb{S})$ also contains, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, all functions from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}$, all relations on $\mathbb{R}^n$, etc. If we wish to study a topological space T, we can just include its elements as part of $\mathbb{S}$, and then $T \in \mathcal{P}(S) = V_1(S)$ will have a nonstandard interpretation ${}^*T$.

Since any element a of $\mathbb{S}$ is not assumed to have any additional structure, we can safely identify ${}^*a$ with a. [10] On the other hand, once we start looking at a set A from the standard universe, we can no longer identify A with ${}^*A$ materially (though we can indeed say that ${}^*A$ satisfies the same formal properties, while containing A)—the additional set-theoretic structure of A (along with saturation) forces ${}^*A$ to be a bigger set whenever A is infinite.

Remark A.10. As discussed earlier, in the superstructure framework any standard function, relation, etc. can be identified with a set at an appropriate level of the iterated power sets of the ground set $\mathbb{S}$, and hence we can safely talk about nonstandard extensions of functions, relations, etc. In general, just like internal sets are those sets that are also elements of the nonstandard extension of a standard power set, we can talk about internal functions, internal relations, etc. Indeed, since standard sets have nonstandard extensions, we can see (using transfer) that the nonstandard extension of the graph of a standard function (which is what we are identifying a function with as an element of the superstructure) is again the graph of some function in the nonstandard universe, which we call the *nonstandard*

[10] What we are describing is still a somewhat intuitive picture that captures how we think. Strictly speaking, if we are working in the language of set theory (ZFC) as we have been, then the objects in our (super)structure should also be sets, so how can we think that the elements of the ground set have no set-theoretic structure without going out of the framework of ZFC? Well, this is only a pedantic issue that can be easily worked around by replacing any desired ground set by one that mimics the properties we want in a way that we might as well assume that the new ground set consists of atoms without loss of generality. The property we really require from $\mathbb{S}$ is for it to be a so-called *base set*, which is defined as a set for which $\emptyset \notin \mathbb{S}$, and such that for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$, we have $x \cap V(\mathbb{S}) \neq \emptyset$. Chang and Keisler [23, Section 4.4] outline how to replace any given set with a base set of the same cardinality, which is why we are intuitively allowed to assume without loss of generality that the elements of the ground set $\mathbb{S}$ have no further set-theoretic structure.

extension of the original function (as it matches with the original function when restricted to that domain).

In practice, we are never as pedantic as in the previous remark when studying internal functions. Using the internal definition principle, the informal rule of thumb to keep in mind is that all standard functions have nonstandard extensions, and that in general, there can be other types of internal functions, which can be identified if we are able to define them in terms of an appropriate "defining condition" or "formula".

In fact, without emphasizing it earlier, we had already been working with internal functions when we saw that ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ is an ordered field containing the ordered subfield $\mathbb{R}$ (as, for example, the function $+\colon \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ gets extended to a function ${}^*+\colon {}^*(\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R})\to{}^*\mathbb{R}$ such that the restriction $({}^*+)|_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}} = +$. Note that for standard sets A and B, the set ${}^*(A\times B)$ can be seen to be the same as ${}^*A\times{}^*B$ by transfer (we sketched this on p. 85), so that $+$ (where we drop the asterisk for notational brevity) really is a function on ${}^*\mathbb{R}\times{}^*\mathbb{R}$.

An important class of examples of internal functions that are not the nonstandard extensions of any standard functions are obtained by considering the so-called hyperfinite sets. For each $N\in{}^*\mathbb{N}$, the initial segment $[N]$ is internal by the internal definition principle. If $N>\mathbb{N}$, then the initial segment $[N]$ is technically an infinite set (for instance, it contains $\mathbb{N}$), but it behaves like a finite set and there is a sense in which we can think it has N elements. Let us make this precise in a more general setting.

For any standard set A, let $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(A)$ denote the set of all finite subsets of A. Then there is a map $\#\colon \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(A)\to\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ which we call the cardinality function. The nonstandard extension ${}^*\#\colon {}^*\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(A)\to{}^*\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ will be called the *internal cardinality function*. We typically suppress the asterisk and use the same notation $\#$ in both universes. The members of ${}^*\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(A)$ are called the hyperfinite subsets of ${}^*A$. (Note that a hyperfinite subset can also be finite.)

By transfer of the corresponding statement for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$, we can thus conclude that $\#([N]) = N$. By a slightly more involved, but still routine, transfer argument, we can also show that an internal set H is hyperfinite if and only if there is an $N\in{}^*\mathbb{N}$ and an internal bijection $f\colon H\to\{1,\dots,N\}$.

There is a "sum function" that takes any finite tuple of real numbers as an input and produces the sum of those real numbers. By transfer, we can thus abstractly make sense of "hyperfinite sums" (that is, the sum of hyperfinitely many nonstandard real numbers). For nonstandard real numbers a_i, this is the sense in which we interpret objects such as $\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i$ where $N\in{}^*\mathbb{N}$ (or in general, $\displaystyle\sum_{i\in H} a_i$, where H is a hyperfinite set).

Armed with the knowledge of hyperfinite sums that formally behave just like finite sums, we can go back to the inequalities in (A.2) and recognize that (, in the alien intuition whereby we are communicating our standard mathematical facts,) there would also be a sentence that would include all of those inequalities in a single

statement as follows:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \left[\left(3 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{9}{10^i} \right) < 4 \right]. \tag{A.11}$$

In the nonstandard or alien interpretation, this remains true for all $n \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$. If $N > \mathbb{N}$, then one can prove (using transfer) that $\left[4 - (3 + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{9}{10^i})\right]$ equals $\left[1 - \frac{9}{10} \cdot \frac{1 - \frac{1}{10^N}}{\frac{9}{10}}\right] = \frac{1}{10^N}$. Had nonstandard thinking been more standardized in our mathematics education, this is how Ely's student Sarah could have rigorized her intuition of 4 and "3.999 repeating forever" being "infinitely close" [38, p. 128]. [11]

We finish this appendix by briefly describing how the superstructure framework allows us to use nonstandard thinking in settings much more general than just real analysis. We shall illustrate this in the contexts of topological spaces and probability (measure) theory in the next two subsections, two topics that are used heavily in the main body of the paper.

A.5.1. *Loeb probability theory.* Naively, internal sets have the same formal properties as standard sets, and therefore internal functions (which are just functions whose graphs are internal) have the same formal properties as standard functions. In general, this type of naive thinking can guide us when encountering internal versions of more complicated structures.

In the standard universe, a probability space is a triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ where Ω is a non-empty set, $\mathcal{F}$ is a sigma algebra on Ω, and $\mathbb{P}\colon \mathcal{F} \to [0,1]$ is a function satisfying the well-known probability axioms.

Thus, formally, an internal probability space is a triple $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where Ω is a non-empty internal set, $\mathcal{F}$ is an internal sigma algebra on Ω, and $\mathbb{P}\colon \mathcal{F} \to {}^*[0,1]$ is an internal function satisfying the interpretations of those well-known probability axioms in the nonstandard universe.

There are several complications with the above description. Firstly, one of the axioms for sigma algebras requires one to check closure under countable unions. By transfer, verifying that a collection is an internal sigma algebra requires us to verify closure under *hypercountable unions* — more formally, if there is an internal function $f\colon {}^*\mathbb{N} \to \mathcal{F}$ (which is the nonstandard analog of taking a countable sequence of sets in the standard universe), then we require $\cup_{n \in {}^*\mathbb{N}} f(n) \in \mathcal{F}$. Secondly, the countable additivity axiom for probabilities now gets interpreted as a statement saying that the measure of a hypercountable disjoint union is the appropriate hypercountable sum, where the latter can be defined by interpreting the definition of countable sums in the nonstandard universe. All of this can be too cumbersome to work with, but thanks to Peter Loeb, we can do probability theory in the nonstandard universe

[11] One might incorrectly think that Sarah would have never been able to rigorize her intuition this way because she would have never reached a level of mathematics education where she can see nonstandard analysis as a "research topic" in order to learn these concepts we just described. While one would be, unfortunately, almost certainly correct in this asssessment of Sarah's practical mathematical career in the current system of mathematics education, it would still be an incorrect assessment because it is possible to teach mathematics with infinitesimals rigorously to students at Sarah's (students taking their first Calculus course) level, as Ely [39] and several other educators cited there have recognized.

without worrying about the complicated axioms that an internal probability space must satisfy.

Loeb [75] found a way to convert a finitely additive internal probability on an internal algebra [12] into a legitimate probability measure on a sigma algebra containing the internal algebra, which is usually sufficient for applications. Loeb's method relies on the following consequence of saturation:

Proposition A.11. *A countable union of disjoint internal sets is internal if and only if all but finitely many of them are empty.*

Proof. Suppose $\{A_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a countable collection of disjoint internal sets. Let $A = \cup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} A_i$. If all but finitely many of the A_i are empty, then A being a finite union of internal sets is also internal due to transfer.

Conversely, if A is internal, then $A\backslash A_i$ is internal for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ by transfer. In that case, if all but finitely many of the A_i are not empty, then the collection $\{A\backslash A_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ would satisfy the finite intersection property. By saturation, this would lead to $\cap_{i\in\mathbb{N}}(A\backslash A_i) \neq \emptyset$, which is absurd. This completes the proof by contradiction. □

More precisely, suppose Ω is a nonempty internal set, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be an internal algebra on Ω. If $\mathbb{P}\colon \mathcal{A} \to {}^*[0,1]$ is a finitely additive internal probability on $\mathcal{A}$. Then, using Remark A.3, the function $\mathbf{st}(\mathbb{P})\colon \mathcal{A} \to [0,1]$ is a finitely additive measure on an algebra. Due to Proposition A.11, the hypothesis of Carathéodory's extension theorem is trivially satisfied for the finitely additive measure $\mathbf{st}(\mathbb{P})$ on the algebra $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, by that theorem, there exists a unique probability measure $L\mathbb{P}$ (called the *Loeb measure induced by* $\mathbb{P}$) on a sigma algebra $L(\mathcal{A})$ containing $\mathcal{A}$ such that $(\Omega, L(\mathcal{A}), L\mathbb{P})$ is a complete probability space[13].

If we start with an internal probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, we can simply forget some of its structure (by thinking of $\mathcal{F}$ as an internal algebra as opposed to an internal sigma-algebra, and $\mathbb{P}$ as an internal finitely additive probability on the algebra $\mathcal{F}$ as opposed to an internal probability measure) and construct the corresponding Loeb space $(\Omega, L(\mathcal{F}), L\mathbb{P})$. This is especially useful because of the relation between *internal integrability* and *Loeb integrability*, which we describe next.

For each probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ in the standard universe, there is a corresponding $\mathbb{R}$-vector space $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ of integrable functions, and a corresponding linear map $\int : L^1(\mathbb{P}) \to \mathbb{R}$. We often write $\int_\Omega f d\mathbb{P}$ instead of just $\int f$, in order to emphasize the dependence on the underlying probability space. We shall also use $\mathbb{E}(f)$ or $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}(f)$ to denote the same.

[12] In analogy with our approach of understanding internal objects as having the same formal properties as the corresponding standard objects, we can think of an internal algebra as an internal set $\mathcal{A}$ consisting of internal subsets of some nonstandard sample space Ω such that $\mathcal{A}$ is an algebra of sets in the standard sense. An internal finitely additive probability $\mathbb{P}$ is then an internal function $\mathbb{P}\colon \mathcal{A} \to {}^*[0,1]$ such that:

(i) $\mathbb{P}(A \cup B) = \mathbb{P}(A) + \mathbb{P}(B)$ if $A \cap B = \emptyset$.
(ii) $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) = 1$.

.

[13] Loeb's method works for any finite measure, although we only need it for probability measures.

Interpreting this formally in the nonstandard universe, for each internal probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, there is a corresponding internal ${}^*\mathbb{R}$-vector space ${}^*L^1(\mathbb{P})$ of *internally integrable* functions, and a corresponding linear map ${}^*\int : {}^*L^1(\mathbb{P}) \to {}^*\mathbb{R}$. Analogously, to the standard situation, we often write ${}^*\int_\Omega f d\mathbb{P}$ instead of just ${}^*\int f$, in order to emphasize the dependence on the underlying internal probability space. We shall also use ${}^*\mathbb{E}(f)$ or ${}^*\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(f)$ to denote the same.

Let us fix an internal probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. If we work with an internally integrable function $f : \Omega \to {}^*\mathbb{R}$ such that ${}^*\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}(f) \in {}^*\mathbb{R}_{\text{fin}}$, then $L\mathbb{P}(f \in {}^*\mathbb{R}_{\text{fin}})$ is the same as $\lim_{n\in\mathbb{N}}(1 - L\mathbb{P}(|f| > n))$, which can be shown to be equal to one by transfer of Chebyshev's inequality. In other words, f being internally integrable implies that it takes only finite values Loeb almost surely, in which case $\mathbf{st}(f)$ is well-defined Loeb almost surely. In that situation, it is interesting to see when we have the following equality (which, if true, allows us to use ordinary probability theory methods on nonstandard spaces!):

$$\mathbf{st}\left({}^*\int_\Omega f d\mathbb{P}\right) \stackrel{?}{=} \int_\Omega \mathbf{st}(f) dL\mathbb{P}. \tag{A.12}$$

The internally integrable functions for which the above equality holds are known as *S-integrable* functions. In applications, S-integrability is usually verified by checking one of the other characterizations of (A.12) (see Ross [95, Theorem 6.2, p.110]), one useful characterization being the following condition:

$$\mathbf{st}\left({}^*\int_\Omega |f| \, \mathbb{1}_{\{|f|>M\}} d\nu\right) = 0 \text{ for all } M > \mathbb{N}. \tag{A.13}$$

For the purposes of the applications in this paper, it suffices to observe (using (A.13)) that any internal function that is *standardly bounded* (that is, there exist real numbers a and b such that the range of the function is contained in ${}^*[a, b]$) is S-integrable. More preliminary facts about Loeb measures that we shall need are sketched in Section 2.2, which can be seen to be a natural follow-up to this appendix. We now move on to understanding nonstandard ways to think about topological spaces as our final topic in this introduction.

A.5.2. *A glimpse of nonstandard topological thinking.* If $x \in {}^*\mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$ are such such that $x \approx y$, then one way to think of this situation is that in the nonstandard universe x cannot be separated from y by (the nonstandard interpretation of) any open neighborhood of y. That is, if τ_y denotes the set of open neighborhoods of y, then:

$$x \approx y \iff x \in {}^*U \text{ for all } U \in \tau_y. \tag{A.14}$$

Indeed, if $x \approx y$, then $|x - y| < \epsilon$ for all $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, so that whenever U is an open neighborhood of y, we can first find an $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ small enough for which $(y - \epsilon, y + \epsilon) \subseteq U$, so that by transfer ${}^*(y - \epsilon, y + \epsilon) \subseteq {}^*U$, where the former set equals $\{z \in {}^*\mathbb{R} : y - \epsilon < z < y + \epsilon\}$ (by transfer) and hence contains x by assumption. The converse direction is easier to see by letting U vary over intervals around y with arbitrarily small real radii.

Even though the standard part of a (finite) nonstandard real number x was originally defined as the unique real number at an infinitesimal distance from x, the characterization (2.7) allows us to generalize this thinking about infinitesimal closeness in the setting of nonstandard extensions topological spaces, even if no notion of distance or metric is assumed!

For a topological space T in the standard universe, a point $x \in {}^*T$ is said to be *nearstandard* to some $y \in T$ if x belongs to ${}^*O$ for all open sets O containing y. For a subset $A \subseteq T$, define its "standard inverse" as the set of points nearstandard to elements of A. That is, define

$$\mathbf{st}^{-1}(A) := \{x \in {}^*T : x \text{ is nearstandard to } y \text{ for some } y \in A\}. \tag{A.15}$$

When the set A is a singleton $\{x\}$, we write $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$ in place of $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(\{x\})$. We denote $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(T)$ by $\mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)$, as these are the nearstandard points in the nonstandard universe.

If τ is the topology on T, then we know by transfer (of the sentences $O \in \tau$, one for each such O) that ${}^*O \in {}^*\tau$ for all $O \in \tau$. But these are not all of the elements of ${}^*\tau$. For instance, one can show by transfer that if τ is the usual topology on $\mathbb{R}$, then all intervals under the order on ${}^*\mathbb{R}$ are members of ${}^*\tau$, even those with infinitesimal lengths. The members of ${}^*\tau$ are sometimes called **-open* or *internal open sets*.

In the rest of this subsection, unless otherwise specified, (T, τ) is a topological space in the standard universe. Also, unless otherwise specified, for each $x \in T$, we will denote by τ_x the set of all open neighborhoods of x. While $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$ may in general be non-internal, one can approximate it from inside via internal open sets. This is a very useful feature of saturation as we show next.

Lemma A.12 (Approximation Lemma)**.** *For each $x \in T$, there exists an internal open set $U \in {}^*\tau$ such that $x \in U \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$.*

Proof. Note that we have $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x) = \cap_{O \in \tau_x} {}^*O$ by definition. For each $O \in \tau_x$, consider the collection:

$$\mathcal{G}_O := \{V \in {}^*\tau_x : V \in {}^*\mathcal{P}(O)\}$$

Recall that ${}^*\mathcal{P}(O)$ is the set of all internal subsets of of ${}^*O$. As a set in the nonstandard universe, $\mathcal{G}_O$ is internal for each $O \in \tau_x$ by the internal definition principle. The collection $\{\mathcal{G}_O\}_{O \in \tau_x}$ satisfies the finite intersection property. (Indeed, if $O_1, \ldots, O_n \in \tau_x$ are finitely many open neighborhoods around x, then ${}^*(O_1 \cap \ldots \cap O_n) \in {}^*\tau_x \cap {}^*\mathcal{P}(O_i)$ for each $i \in [n]$.) Now, any $U \in \cap_{O \in \tau_x} \mathcal{G}_O$ (which is non-empty by saturation) suffices. □

Using the approximation lemma allows us to think about general continuous functions nonstandardly in an intuitive manner. Roughly, a function is continuous at a point x if points "close" to x are mapped to points "close" to $f(x)$ (while being "close" to a standard point is made precise via the $\mathbf{st}^{-1}$ operation just like in the case when the topological spaces were $\mathbb{R}$ in Proposition A.5).

Proposition A.13. *Suppose $f\colon (T_1, \tau_1) \to (T_2, \tau_2)$ is a function between two topological spaces. Then, $f\colon T_1 \to T_2$ is continuous at $x \in T_1$ if and only if ${}^*f(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)) \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(f(x))$. (Note that we are using the same symbol $\mathbf{st}^{-1}$ for the*

different set-valued functions on both T_1 and T_2, the usage being unambiguous from context.)

Proof. First suppose that f is continuous at $x \in T_1$ and let $y \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$. If V is an open neighborhood of $f(x)$ in T_2, then continuity at x implies that there exists an open neighborhood U of x in T_1 such that $f(U) \subseteq V$. Since $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x) \subseteq {}^*U$, we obtain ${}^*f(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)) \subseteq {}^*f({}^*U) = {}^*(f(U)) \subseteq {}^*V$. Since $y \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$ and the open neighborhood V of $f(x)$ were arbitrary, this implies that ${}^*f(y) \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(f(x))$ for all $y \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$, as desired.

For the converse direction, suppose that ${}^*f(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)) \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(f(x))$, where $x \in T_1$. Let V be an open neighborhood of $f(x)$ in T_2. Then $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(f(x)) \subseteq {}^*V$, so that ${}^*f(\mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)) \subseteq {}^*V$ by assumption. Also, by the approximation lemma, there exists an internal open set $U \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$ such that $x \in U$. Such a U thus witnesses the truth of the following sentence in the nonstandard universe:

$$\exists W \in {}^*\tau_1 \left\{ (x \in W) \wedge ({}^*f(W) \in {}^*\mathcal{P}(V)) \right\}.$$

Transferring this sentence to the standard universe completes the proof. □

As we show next, we can also give intuitive nonstandard characterizations of various topological properties that a subset may have.

Proposition A.14. *Let T be a topological space.*

(i) A set $G \subseteq T$ is open if and only if $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(G) \subseteq {}^*G$.
(ii) A set $F \subseteq T$ is closed if and only if for all $x \in {}^*F \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)$, the condition $x \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(y)$ implies that $y \in F$.
(iii) A set $K \subseteq T$ is compact if and only if ${}^*K \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(K)$.

Proof. Proof of (i): Suppose G is open and $y \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(G)$. Then there exists an $x \in G$ such that $y \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x) = \cap_{O \in \tau_x} {}^*O$. Since $G \in \tau_x$, we thus immediately obtain $y \in {}^*G$, as desired.

Conversely, suppose $G \subseteq T$ is such that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(G) \subseteq {}^*G$. Let $x \in G$ be arbitrary. In order to show that G is open, it suffices to show that G contains an open neighborhood of x. However, this follows from the combined use of approximation lemma and transfer. Indeed, by approximation lemma, there exists an internal open set $U \in {}^*\tau$ such that $x \in U \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x) \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(G) \subseteq {}^*G$, so that the following statement is true in the nonstandard universe (whose transferred version is what we were looking for):

$$\exists V \in {}^*\tau_x (V \in {}^*\mathcal{P}(G)).$$

Proof of (ii): Suppose F is closed. Suppose, if possible, that there exists an $x \in {}^*F \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)$ such that $x \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(y)$ for some $y \in T \backslash F$. Since $T \backslash F$ is open, the nonstandard characterization (i) for open sets implies that:

$$x \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(y) \subseteq \mathbf{st}^{-1}(T \backslash F) \subseteq {}^*(T \backslash F) = {}^*T \backslash {}^*F,$$

where the last set equality is true by transfer. However, this is a contradiction since we started by assuming that $x \in {}^*F$.

Conversely, suppose $F \subseteq T$ has the property that for all $x \in {}^*F \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)$, the condition $x \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(y)$ implies $y \in F$. We shall show that $T \backslash F$ is open by verifying

that it satisfies the nonstandard characterization (i) for open sets. To that end, we must show that $\mathbf{st}^{-1}(T\backslash F) \subseteq {}^*(T\backslash F) = {}^*T\backslash {}^*F$. Suppose, if possible, that $x \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(T\backslash F)$ but $x \notin {}^*T\backslash {}^*F$. Then there exists $y \in T\backslash F$ such that $x \in \mathbf{st}^{-1}(y)$. But $x \in {}^*F \cap \mathbf{Ns}({}^*T)$ and $y \notin F$, which is a contradiction.

Proof of (iii): Suppose K is a compact subset of T, and let $y \in {}^*K$. If $y \notin \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$ for all $x \in K$, then for each $x \in K$, there is $U_x \in \tau_x$ with $y \notin {}^*U_x$, that is, $y \in {}^*(K\backslash U_x)$. By compactness, $K \subseteq \cup_{x\in B} U_x$ for some $B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(K)$. Thus, ${}^*K \subseteq {}^*(\cup_{x\in B} U_x) = \cup_{x\in B} {}^*U_x$[14], which implies $\cap_{x\in B} {}^*(K\backslash U_x) = \emptyset$, a contradiction since y belongs to this intersection.

For the converse direction, we shall again prove its contrapositive. if K is not compact, there is an open cover $\{U_i : i \in I\}$ of K that does not admit a finite subcover. Thus, for each finite $J \subseteq I$, there is $y_J \in {}^*(K \setminus \cup_{j\in j} U_j)$. By saturation applied to the collection $\{{}^*K\backslash U_i\}_{i\in I}$, we know that there exists $y \in \cap_{i\in I} {}^*K\backslash {}^*U_i$. Then $y \notin \mathbf{st}^{-1}(x)$ for any $x \in K$, as desired. □

The above characterization of compactness is one of the key tools we used at various points in the main body of the paper. It is sometimes called Robinson's characterization of compactness. In this author's opinion, Robinson's characterization of compactness provides one of the most poignant illustrations of the alien intuition for nonstandard analysis we have built. All points in the alien's interpretation of a compact space must be nearstandard to some point in the original space. Thus, as a closing motto, a topological space is compact if and only if even the aliens cannot make it too inaccessible!

Appendix B. Concluding the theorem of Hewitt and Savage from the theorem of Ressel

In this appendix, we prove that the theorem of Ressel showing Radon presentability of completely regular Hausdorff spaces ([91, Theorem 3, p. 906]) implies the theorem of Hewitt and Savage on the presentability of the Baire sigma algebra of compact Hausdorff spaces ([61, Theorem 7.2, p. 483]). Since we will have occasion to talk about the presentability of Baire sigma algebras and Radon presentability in the same context, it is desirable to reduce the risk of confusion by introducing more precise notation for the relevant sigma algebras.

Notation B.1. For a Hausdorff space S, let $\mathcal{B}_{\text{a}}(\text{S})$ denote its Baire sigma algebra, the smallest sigma algebra with respect to which all continuous functions $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$ are measurable). Let $\mathcal{B}(S)$ denote its Borel sigma algebra, the smallest sigma algebra containing all open subsets of S (it is clear that $\mathcal{B}_{\text{a}}(\text{S}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(S)$). Let $\mathfrak{P}_{\text{r}}(\text{S})$ denote the set of all Radon probability measures on S, and let $\mathfrak{P}_{\text{Ba}}(\text{S})$ denote the set of all Baire probability measures on S. Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\text{r}}(\text{S}))$ be the smallest sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}_{\text{r}}(\text{S})$ that makes all maps of the form $\mu \mapsto \mu(B)$ measurable, where $B \in \mathcal{B}(S)$. Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\text{Ba}}(\text{S}))$ be the smallest sigma algebra on $\mathfrak{P}_{\text{Ba}}(\text{S})$ that makes all maps of the form $\mu \mapsto \mu(A)$ measurable, where $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{a}}(\text{S})$.

Note that any compact Hausdorff space is normal (see, for example, Kelley [71, Theorem 9, chapter 5]), and in particular completely regular. The key idea in going

[14]The finiteness of the set B is useful in obtaining this last set equality via transfer.

from Ressel's result to that of Hewitt–Savage is that on any completely regular Hausdorff space, a tight Baire measure has a unique extension to a Radon measure (see Bogachev [19, Theorem 7.3.3, p. 81, vol. 2]). In particular, since every Baire measure on a σ-compact space is tight, it follows that every Baire measure on a completely regular σ-compact Hausdorff space admits a unique extension to a Radon measure on that space. See Bogachev [19, Corollary 7.3.4, p. 81, vol. 2] for this result. Bogachev also has a formula for this unique extension on [19, p. 78, vol. 2]. We record these facts as a lemma.

Lemma B.2. *Let S be a completely regular σ-compact Hausdorff space. For a subset $A \subseteq S$, let $\tau_A(S)$ denote the collection of those open subsets of S that contain A. For every $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(S)$, there is a unique element $\hat{\mu} \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ such that $\hat{\mu}(A) = \mu(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$. Furthermore, $\hat{\mu}$ is precisely given by the following formula:*

$$\hat{\mu}(B) = \inf_{U \in \tau_B(S)} \sup_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S}) \\ A \subseteq U}} \mu(A) \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{B.1}$$

As a consequence, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma B.3. *Let S be a completely regular σ-compact Hausdorff space. Consider the map $\hat{}\colon \mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S}) \to \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ defined by $\hat{}(\mu) = \hat{\mu}$ for all $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S})$ (where $\hat{\mu}$ is as in (B.1)). Then $\hat{}$ is a bijection.*

Furthermore, for a set $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S}))$, define $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ to be its image under $\hat{}$ (thus $\hat{\mathcal{A}} := \{\hat{\mu} : \mu \in \mathcal{A}\}$). Then $\hat{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S}))$.

Proof. If μ and ν are distinct elements of $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S})$, then there exists an $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$ such that $\mu(A) \neq \nu(A)$, which implies $\hat{\mu}(A) \neq \hat{\nu}(A)$, so that $\hat{\mu} \neq \hat{\nu}$. Thus $\hat{}$ is an injection. That it is also a surjection follows from the fact that for any $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$, its restriction $\mu\restriction_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})}$ to the Baire sigma algebra is a Baire measure that has a unique Radon extension by Lemma B.2, so that it must be the case that

$$\mu = \widehat{\mu\restriction_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})}} \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})\,. \tag{B.2}$$

Consider the collection $\mathfrak{G}$ of sets $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}))$ for which $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is an element of $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$, that is,

$$\mathfrak{G} := \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S})) : \hat{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))\}. \tag{B.3}$$

We want to show that $\mathfrak{G}$ equals $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}))$. It is not very difficult to see that for any collection $(A_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}))$, we have the following:

$$\widehat{\cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{A}_n} = \cup_{n\in\mathbb{N}}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_n.$$

Hence, by the fact that $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ is a sigma algebra, it follows that $\mathfrak{G}$ is closed under countable unions. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}))$, then we have the following (the inclusion from left to right follows from the injectivity of $\hat{}$, while the inclusion from right to left follows from the fact that $\hat{}$ is a bijection):

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}) \setminus \mathcal{A}} = \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) \setminus \hat{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{B.4}$$

This shows that $\mathfrak{G}$ is closed under complements as well. Since $\emptyset \in \mathfrak{G}$, it thus follows that $\mathfrak{G}$ is a sigma algebra. Thus by Dynkin's π-λ theorem, it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{G}$ contains a π-system (that is, a collection of sets that is closed under finite

intersections) that generates $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}))$. A convenient π-system of that type is the following (that this is a π-system is trivial, and the fact that the smallest sigma algebra containing it coincides with $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}))$ follows from the fact that any map on $\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S})$ of the type $\mu \mapsto \mu(A)$ for some $A \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S})$ is measurable on the former sigma algebra):

$$\mathfrak{A} := \{\mathfrak{A}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}, A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S}) \text{ and } C_1, \ldots, C_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})\}, \tag{B.5}$$

where for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$ and $C_1, \ldots, C_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$, the set $\mathfrak{A}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n}$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathfrak{A}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n} := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}) : \mu(A_1) \in C_1, \ldots, \mu(A_n) \in C_n\}. \tag{B.6}$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the sets $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathcal{B}(S)$ and $C_1, \ldots, C_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$. Define the collection $\mathfrak{B}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n}$ as follows:

$$\mathfrak{B}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n} := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \mu(A_1) \in C_1, \ldots, \mu(A_n) \in C_n\} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})). \tag{B.7}$$

It thus suffices to show the following claim.

Claim B.4. *We have* $\widehat{\mathfrak{A}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n}} = \mathfrak{B}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n}$ *for all* $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$ *and* $C_1, \ldots, C_n \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof of Claim B.4. Note that for any $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}))$, we have the following (the inclusion from left to right is trivial, while the inclusion from right to left follows from the injectivity of the map $\hat{}$):

$$\widehat{\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}} = \hat{\mathcal{A}} \cap \hat{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{A}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n} = \cap_{i\in[n]}\mathfrak{A}^{A_i}_{C_i}$ and $\mathfrak{B}^{A_1,\ldots,A_n}_{C_1,\ldots,C_n} = \cap_{i\in[n]}\mathfrak{B}^{A_i}_{C_i}$, it suffices to show the following set equality:

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{A}^A_C} = \mathfrak{B}^A_C \text{ for any } C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \text{ and } A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})\,. \tag{B.8}$$

Toward that end, let $C \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$. If $\mu \in \mathfrak{A}^A_C$, then we have $\hat{\mu}(A) = \mu(A) \in C$, so that $\hat{\mu} \in \mathfrak{B}^A_C$. Thus the left side of (B.8) is contained in the right side of (B.8). Conversely, if $\mu \in \mathfrak{B}^A_C$, then $\mu = \widehat{\mu\restriction_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})}}$, where $\mu\restriction_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})} \in \mathfrak{A}^A_C$, completing the proof.

□

As a corollary, we now have a way to define a natural measure on $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}))$ corresponding to any measure on $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$ in the case when S is completely regular, Hausdorff, and σ-compact.

Corollary B.5. *Let S be a completely regular σ-compact Hausdorff space. Let* $\hat{}: \mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S}) \to \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$ *be as in Lemma B.3. Suppose $\mathscr{P}$ is a probability measure on* $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}))$. *Define a map* $\check{\mathscr{P}}: \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S})) \to [0,1]$ *as follows:*

$$\check{\mathscr{P}}(\mathcal{A}) := \mathscr{P}(\hat{\mathcal{A}}) \text{ for all } \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S})). \tag{B.9}$$

Then $\check{\mathscr{P}}$ is a probability measure on $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S}))$.

Proof. The fact that $\check{\mathscr{P}}$ is well-defined follows from Lemma B.3. Its countable additivity follows from that of $\mathscr{P}$ and the fact that the map $\hat{}$ is injective. Finally, the fact that $\check{\mathscr{P}}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S})) = 1$ follows from the surjectivity of the map $\hat{}$ (as we have $\widehat{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S})} = \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})$, whose measure with respect to $\mathscr{P}$ is one). □

We are now able to show that the main result in Hewitt–Savage [61] is a direct consequence of the theorem of Ressel on the Radon presentability of completely regular Hausdorff spaces.

Theorem B.6 (Hewitt–Savage [61, Theorem 7.2, p. 483])**.** *Suppose all completely regular spaces are Radon presentable as in Definition 1.11. Let S be a compact Hausdorff space equipped with its Baire sigma algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$. Suppose $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a probability space and let $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of exchangeable random variables (with respect to the Baire sigma algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})$). In other words, suppose the following holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, \ldots, X_k \in A_k) &= \mathbb{P}(X_{\sigma(1)} \in A_1, \ldots, X_{\sigma(k)} \in A_k)\\ &\text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}, \sigma \in S_k, \text{ and } A_1, \ldots, A_k \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S})\,.\end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

Then there is a unique probability measure $\mathscr{Q}$ on $\mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S}))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, \ldots, X_k \in A_k) = &\int_{\mathfrak{P}_{Ba}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(A_1)\cdot\ldots\cdot\mu(A_k)d\mathscr{Q}(\mu)\\ &\text{for all } A_1, \ldots, A_k \in \mathcal{B}_a(S).\end{aligned} \tag{B.11}$$

Proof. We will only prove the existence of a probability measure $\mathscr{Q}$ on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S}))$ satisfying (B.11), with uniqueness following more elementarily from Hewitt–Savage [61, Theorem 9.4, p. 489].

Since S is compact Hausdorff, so is the countable product S^∞ under the product topology (this follows from Tychonoff's theorem). Furthermore, Bogachev [19, Lemma 6.4.2 (iii), p. 14, vol. 2] implies the following:

$$\mathcal{B}_a(S^\infty) = \bigotimes \mathcal{B}_a(S), \tag{B.12}$$

where $\bigotimes \mathcal{B}_a(S)$ denotes the product sigma algebra on S^∞ induced by the Baire sigma algebra S (thus $\bigotimes \mathcal{B}_a(S)$ is the smallest sigma algebra on S^∞ that makes the projection $\pi_i \colon S^\infty \to S$ Baire measurable for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$). Let $\nu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}^\infty)$ be the distribution of the S^∞-valued Baire measurable random variable $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (the Baire measurability of this random variable follows from the Baire measurability of the X_i together with (B.12)).

Let $\hat{}\colon \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}^\infty) \to \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}^\infty)$ be as in Lemma B.3. Consider $\hat{\nu} \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}^\infty)$. We show in the next claim that the Baire exchangeability of the sequence $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ implies the exchangeability of the measure $\hat{\nu}$. In particular, let $\Omega' := S^\infty$, $\mathcal{F}' := \mathcal{B}(S^\infty)$, and $\mathbb{P}' := \hat{\nu}$. Consider the sequence of Borel measurable S-valued random variables $(Y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ where, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $Y_n \colon \Omega' \to S$ is the projection onto the n^{th} coordinate. Then we have the following claim:

Claim B.7. *The sequence $(Y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a jointly Radon distributed sequence of exchangeable random variables taking values in a completely regular Hausdorff space.*

Proof of Claim B.7. The fact that $(Y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a jointly Radon distributed sequence is immediate from the construction. Thus we only need to check the exchangeability of the $(Y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ as Borel measurable random variables.

To that end, suppose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^k)$. Let $\psi \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{k}})$ be the Borel distribution of $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_k)$. That is, ψ is the measure on $(\mathbb{R}^k, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^k))$ given by the pushforward $\mathbb{P}' \circ (Y_1, \ldots, Y_k)^{-1}$ (which is Radon, being the marginal of a Radon distribution on S^∞). Let ψ' be its restriction to the Baire sigma algebra on S^k—that is, $\psi' := \psi\restriction_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{k}})}$. Let $\sigma \in S_k$, and let ψ_σ be the pushforward $\mathbb{P}' \circ (Y_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, Y_{\sigma(k)}) \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{k}})$ induced by the permuted random vector $(Y_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, Y_{\sigma(k)})$, with $\psi'_\sigma := \psi_\sigma\restriction_{\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{k}})}$ being its restriction to the Baire sigma algebra on S^k. It suffices to show that $\psi = \psi_\sigma$.

Note that for any $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{k}})$, we have the following chain of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi'(A) &= \mathbb{P}'((Y_1, \ldots, Y_k) \in A) \\
&= \hat{\nu}(A) \\
&= \nu(A) \\
&= \mathbb{P}((X_1, \ldots, X_k) \in A) \\
&= \mathbb{P}((X_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, X_{\sigma(k)}) \in A) && \text{(B.13)} \\
&= \mathbb{P}'((Y_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, Y_{\sigma(k)}) \in A), \\
&= \psi_\sigma(A) \\
&= \psi'_\sigma(A). && \text{(B.14)}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above, equation (B.13) follows from the Baire-exchangeability of $(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$, while the other lines follow from the fact that $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{k}})$.

Note that by Lemma B.2, we have $\psi = \hat{\psi'}$ and $\psi_\sigma = \hat{\psi'_\sigma}$. By (B.1), we thus have the following for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(S^k)$ (where we use (B.14) in the third line):

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(B) &= \hat{\psi'}(B) \\
&= \inf_{U \in \tau_B(S^k)} \sup_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{B}_a(S^k) \\ A \subseteq U}} \psi'(A) \\
&= \inf_{U \in \tau_B(S^k)} \sup_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{B}_a(S^k) \\ A \subseteq U}} \psi'_\sigma(A) \\
&= \hat{\psi'_\sigma}(A) \\
&= \psi_\sigma(B) \text{ for all } B \in \mathbb{R}^k,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the claim.

Since completely regular Hausdorff spaces are Radon presentable, we obtain a unique Radon measure $\mathscr{P}$ on $(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}), \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})))$ such that the following holds:

$$\mathbb{P}'(Y_1 \in B_1, \ldots, Y_k \in B_k) = \int_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(B_k) d\mathscr{P}(\mu) \quad \text{for all } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in \mathcal{B}(S). \tag{B.15}$$

Define $\mathscr{Q} := \check{\mathscr{P}} \colon \mathcal{C}(\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}^\infty)) \to [0,1]$ as in Lemma B.5. We claim that $\mathscr{Q}$ satisfies (B.11). Indeed, if $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_1, \ldots, A_k \in \mathcal{B}_a(S)$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, \ldots, X_k \in A_k) &= \nu(A_1 \times \ldots \times A_k) \\
&= \hat{\nu}(A_1 \times \ldots \times A_k) \\
&= \mathbb{P}'(Y_1 \in A_1, \ldots, Y_k \in A_k) \\
&= \int\limits_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(A_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(A_k) d\mathscr{P}(\mu) \\
&= \int_{[0,1]} \mathscr{P}(\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{S}) : \mu(A_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(A_k) > y\}) d\lambda(y) \\
&= \int_{[0,1]} \mathscr{P}(\widehat{\mathfrak{A}_y}) d\lambda(y),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{A}_y := \{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}) : \mu(A_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(A_k) > y\}.$$

As a consequence, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, \ldots, X_k \in A_k) &= \int_{[0,1]} \check{\mathscr{P}}(\mathfrak{A}_y) d\lambda(y) \\
&= \int_{[0,1]} \mathscr{Q}(\{\mu \in \mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S}) : \mu(A_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(A_k) > y\}) d\lambda(y) \\
&= \int\limits_{\mathfrak{P}_{\mathrm{Ba}}(\mathrm{S})} \mu(A_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mu(A_k) d\mathscr{Q}(\mu),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Appendix C. A proof of Theorem 4.1 using conditional probabilities

In this appendix, we will carry out an alternative proof of Theorem 4.1, which was the key ingredient in our proof of the generalization of de Finetti–Hewitt–Savage theorem. The proof that we will present here is a refinement of the key idea from [2]. We restate Theorem 4.1 for convenience.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space. Let $(X_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of S-valued exchangeable random variables, where $(S, \mathfrak{S})$ is some measurable space. For each $N > \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega \in {}^*\Omega$, define the internal probability measure $\mu_{\omega,N}$ as follows:*

$$\mu_{\omega,N}(B) := \frac{\#\{i \in [N] : X_i(\omega) \in B\}}{N} \text{ for all } B \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}. \tag{C.1}$$

Then we have:

$${}^*\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k) \approx {}^*\int\limits_{{}^*\Omega} \mu_{\omega,N}(B_1) \cdots \mu_{\omega,N}(B_k) d{}^*\mathbb{P}(\omega) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } B_1, \ldots, B_k \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}. \tag{C.2}$$

It turns out that one difficulty in a direct generalization of the method in [2] is that the sets B_i were all either $\{0\}$ or $\{1\}$ in [2], while they may have intersections in (C.2). We get around this difficulty by observing that it suffices to prove (C.2)

for tuples $(B_1, \ldots, B_k)$ such that B_i and B_J are either disjoint or equal for all $i, j \in [k]$.

Definition C.1. Call a finite tuple $(B_1, \ldots, B_k)$ of sets *disjointified* if for all $i, j \in [k]$, we have $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$ or $B_i \cap B_j = B_i = B_j$. In the setting of Theorem 4.1, call an event *disjointified* if it is of the type $\{X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k\}$ for some disjointified tuple $(B_1, \ldots, B_k)$.

Lemma C.2. *Let $N > \mathbb{N}$. In the setting of Theorem 4.1, suppose that*

$$ {}^*\mathbb{P}(X_1 \in A_1, \ldots, X_k \in A_k) \approx {}^*\int_{{}^*\Omega} \mu_{\omega,N}(A_1) \cdots \mu_{\omega,N}(A_k) d{}^*\mathbb{P}(\omega) \quad \text{(C.3)} $$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $A_1, \ldots, A_k \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}$ such that $(A_1, \ldots, A_k)$ is disjointified.

Then (C.2) *holds.*

Proof. Suppose (C.3) holds. Let $B_1, \ldots, B_k \in {}^*\mathfrak{S}$ be fixed. We can write the event $\{X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k\}$ as a disjoint union of disjointified events. Indeed, for $d \in \{0, 1\}$ and a set $B \subseteq S$, let B^d be equal to B if $d = 1$, and let it be equal to the complement $S \backslash B$ if $d = 0$. For a tuple $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in \{0, 1\}^k$ of zeros and ones, define the following set:

$$ [B_1, \ldots, B_k]^a := \bigcap_{i \in [k]} {B_i}^{a_i}. \quad \text{(C.4)} $$

Being a finite intersection of *-measurable sets, the set $[B_1, \ldots, B_k]^a$ is *-measurable for all $a \in \{0, 1\}^k$. For $i \in [k]$, define $\mathfrak{D}_i := \{(a_1, \ldots, a_k) \in \{0, 1\}^k : a_i = 1\}$. For a tuple $\tilde{a} = (\tilde{a}_1, \ldots, \tilde{a}_k) \in \mathfrak{D}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathfrak{D}_k$ of k-tuples, we define

$$ [B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{a}} := \{X_1 \in [B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{a}_1}, \ldots, X_k \in [B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{a}_k}\}. \quad \text{(C.5)} $$

It is clear that the event $[B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{a}}$ is disjointified for each $\tilde{a} \in \mathfrak{D}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathfrak{D}_k$, and that

$$ [B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{a}} \cap [B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{b}} = \emptyset \text{ if } \tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \text{ are distinct elements of } \mathfrak{D}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathfrak{D}_k. $$

We thus have the following representation as a disjoint union of disjointified events:

$$ \{X_1 \in B_1, \ldots, X_k \in B_k\} = \bigsqcup_{\tilde{a} \in \mathfrak{D}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathfrak{D}_k} [B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{a}}. \quad \text{(C.6)} $$

For any internal probability measure μ on $({}^*S, {}^*\mathfrak{S})$, its finite additivity yields the following for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$ \mu(B_i) = \mu\left(\bigsqcup_{\tilde{a}_i \in \mathfrak{D}_i} [B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{a}_i} \right) = \sum_{\tilde{a}_i \in \mathfrak{D}_i} \mu\left([B_1, \ldots, B_k]^{\tilde{a}_i} \right) \text{ for each } i \in [k]. \quad \text{(C.7)} $$

Taking the product of the terms in (C.7) as i varies over $[k]$, and switching the order of $\sum$ and $\prod$ using distributivity of multiplication over addition (which

is a legal move since these are finite sums and products), we have the following observation for any internal probability measure μ on $({}^*S, {}^*\mathfrak{S})$:

$$\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu(B_i) = \sum_{\tilde{a}=(\tilde{a}_1,\ldots,\tilde{a}_k)\in \mathfrak{D}_1\times\ldots\times\mathfrak{D}_k} \left[\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu\left([B_1,\ldots,B_k]^{\tilde{a}_i}\right)\right] \text{ for all } k\in\mathbb{N}. \quad \text{(C.8)}$$

Applying (C.8) to the internal measure $\mu_{\omega,N}$ for each $\omega\in\mathbb{N}$ and then (internal) integrating with respect to ${}^*\mathbb{P}$, we obtain the following by the (internal) linearity of the (internal) expectation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&{}^*\int_{{}^*\Omega} \left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu(B_i)\right) d{}^*\mathbb{P}(\omega)\\
&= \sum_{\tilde{a}=(\tilde{a}_1,\ldots,\tilde{a}_k)\in \mathfrak{D}_1\times\ldots\times\mathfrak{D}_k} {}^*\int_{{}^*\Omega} \left(\prod_{i\in[k]} \mu_{\cdot,N}\left([B_1,\ldots,B_k]^{\tilde{a}_i}\right)\right) d{}^*\mathbb{P}(\omega)\\
&= \sum_{\tilde{a}=(\tilde{a}_1,\ldots,\tilde{a}_k)\in \mathfrak{D}_1\times\ldots\times\mathfrak{D}_k} {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(X_1\in[B_1,\ldots,B_k]^{\tilde{a}_1},\ldots,X_k\in[B_1,\ldots,B_k]^{\tilde{a}_k}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the hypothesis of the theorem. The proof is now completed by (C.5) and (C.6). □

For the rest of the paper, we fix the following set-up. Let $N > \mathbb{N}$. We have established in Lemma C.2 that it suffices to show (C.3). Toward that end, let $A_1,\ldots,A_k\in{}^*\mathfrak{S}$ be such that the tuple $(A_1,\ldots,A_k)$ is disjointified. For some $n\in\mathbb{N}$, let $C_1,\ldots,C_n$ be the distinct (disjoint) sets appearing in the tuple $(A_1,\ldots,A_k)$. For each $i\in[n]$, let C_i appear in $(A_1,\ldots,A_k)$ with a frequency k_i. Note that this necessarily implies that $k_1+\ldots+k_n=k$.

For each $i\in[n]$, let $Y_i\colon {}^*\Omega\to[N]$ be defined as follows:

$$Y_i(\omega) := \#\{j\in[N] : X_j(\omega)\in C_i\} = \sum_{j\in[N]} \mathbb{1}_{C_i}(X_j(\omega)) \text{ for all } \omega\in{}^*\Omega. \quad \text{(C.9)}$$

Thus $\mu_{\omega,N}(C_i) = \dfrac{Y_i(\omega)}{N}$ for all $\omega\in{}^*\Omega$.

Let $\vec{A}$, $\vec{X}$, and $\vec{Y}$ denote the tuples $(A_1,\ldots,A_k)$, $(X_1,\ldots,X_k)$, and $(Y_1,\ldots,Y_n)$ respectively. The following lemma follows from elementary combinatorial arguments.

Lemma C.3. *Suppose that $t_i\in{}^*\mathbb{N}$ are such that $t_i\geq k_i$ for all $i\in[n]$, and such that ${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{Y}=(t_1,\ldots,t_n))>0$. Then we have:*

$${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X}\in\vec{A}|\vec{Y}=(t_1,\ldots,t_n)) = \frac{1}{N(N-1)\ldots(N-(k-1))}\cdot\frac{t_1!\ldots t_n!}{(t_1-k_1)!\ldots(t_n-k_n)!}. \quad \text{(C.10)}$$

Proof. Let $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ be as in the statement of the lemma. Define the following event:

$$\begin{aligned} E_{t_1,\ldots,t_n} := \{&X_1, \ldots, X_{t_1} \in C_1; \\ &X_{t_1+1}, \ldots, X_{t_1+t_2} \in C_2; \\ &\ldots; \\ &X_{t_1+\ldots+t_{n-1}+1}, \ldots, X_{t_1+\ldots+t_n} \in C_n; \\ &X_i \in S \backslash C_1 \sqcup \ldots \sqcup C_n \text{ for all other } i \in [N]\}. \end{aligned}$$

By exchangeability and the fact that the C_i are disjoint, we have the following:

$$^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = N_1 {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(E_{t_1,\ldots,t_n}\right), \tag{C.11}$$

$$\text{and } ^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} \text{ and } \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = N_2 {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(E_{t_1,\ldots,t_n}\right), \tag{C.12}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 &= \text{Number of ways to choose } t_i \text{ spots of the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ kind in } [N] \text{ as } i \text{ varies over } [n] \\ &= \binom{N}{t_1}\binom{N-t_1}{t_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot \binom{N-t_1-\ldots-t_{n-1}}{t_n}, \end{aligned} \tag{C.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} N_2 &= \text{Number of ways to choose } (t_i - k_i) \text{ spots of the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ kind in } [N] \text{ as } i \text{ varies over } [n] \\ &= \binom{N-k}{t_1-k_1}\binom{N-k-(t_1-k_1)}{t_2-k_2} \cdot \ldots \cdot \binom{N-k-(t_1+\ldots+t_{n-1}-k_1\ldots-k_{n-1})}{t_n-k_n}. \end{aligned} \tag{C.14}$$

Since it is given that $^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) > 0$, we thus have $^*\mathbb{P}\left(E_{t_1,\ldots,t_n}\right) > 0$ by (C.11). By (C.11), (C.12), (C.13), and (C.14), we therefore obtain (C.10) after simplification. □

Corollary C.4. *Suppose that $t_i \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$ such that $^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) > 0$. Then we have:*

$$^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) \approx \left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n} \text{ for all } (t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in [N]^n. \tag{C.15}$$

Proof. Suppose that the $t_i \in [N]$ are such that $^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) > 0$. If $t_i \geq k_i$ for all $i \in [n]$. Then by Lemma C.3, we obtain the following:

$$\frac{^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n))}{\left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n}} = \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{N}} \cdots \frac{1}{1-\frac{k-1}{N}} \cdot \prod_{i \in [n]} \left(\prod_{j \in [k_i - 1]} \left(1 - \frac{j}{t_i}\right)\right) \tag{C.16}$$

$$< \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{N}} \cdots \frac{1}{1-\frac{k-1}{N}} \approx 1. \tag{C.17}$$

Note that if $t_i > \mathbb{N}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then both $\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{N}} \cdots \frac{1}{1-\frac{k-1}{N}} \approx 1$ and $\prod_{i\in[n]} \left(\prod_{j\in[k_i-1]} \left(1 - \frac{j}{t_i}\right)\right) \approx 1$, so that (C.16) implies that

$$\frac{{}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n))}{\left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n}} \approx 1 \text{ if } t_1, \ldots, t_n > \mathbb{N}, \tag{C.18}$$

which, in particular, implies (C.15) in this case.

Now, if t_j is in $\mathbb{N}$ for some $j \in [n]$ but such that $t_i \geq k$ for all $i \in [n]$ and ${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) > 0$, then the inequality in (C.17) implies that

$${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) < 2\left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n} < 2\left(\frac{t_j}{N}\right)^{k_j} \approx 0,$$

so that

$${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) \approx 0 \approx \left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n},$$

proving (C.15) in that case as well.

Finally, if $t_i < k_i$ for any $i \in [n]$, then ${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = 0$, while $\left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n} \approx 0$ in that case as well. This completes the proof. □

We record (C.18) in the proof of Corollary C.4 as its own result.

Corollary C.5. *Suppose that $t_i > \mathbb{N}$ such that ${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) > 0$. Then we have the following approximate equality:*

$$\frac{{}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n))}{\left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n}} \approx 1 \text{ if } t_1, \ldots, t_n > \mathbb{N}.$$

By (C.17) and underflow applied to Corollary C.5, we obtain the following.

Corollary C.6. *Given $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there is an m_ϵ satisfying the following.*

$$1 - \epsilon < \frac{{}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n))}{\left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n}} < 1 + \epsilon$$

if $t_1, \ldots, t_n > m_\epsilon$ are such that ${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{Y} = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)) > 0$.

The proof of Corollary C.4 also leads to the following observation.

Corollary C.7. *For each $m \in {}^*\mathbb{N}$, define the set*

$$L_m := \{(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \in [N]^n : \text{ there is } j \in [n] \text{ such that } t_j \leq m\}. \tag{C.19}$$

Then, we have the following for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$0 \approx \sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in L_m} {}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1,\ldots,t_n)) {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right)$$
$$\approx \sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in L_m} \left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n} {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right).$$

Proof. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and L_m be as in the statement of the corollary. Noting that the event $\left\{\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right\}$ is the same as the event $\{\vec{Y} = (t_1,\ldots,t_n)\}$, we obtain the following from (C.17) (we also use the fact that if $t_i < k_i$ for any $i \in [n]$, then ${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1,\ldots,t_n)) = 0$):

$$\sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in L_m} {}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1,\ldots,t_n)) \cdot {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right)$$
$$\leq 2 \sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in L_m} \left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n} \cdot {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right)$$
$$\leq 2 \sum_{j\in[n]} \left(\sum_{r\in[m]} \left[\sum_{\substack{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n \\ t_j = r}} \left(\frac{t_j}{N}\right)^{k_j} {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right) \right] \right)$$
$$\leq 2 \sum_{j\in[n]} \left(\left[\sum_{\substack{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n \\ t_j \leq m}} \frac{m}{N} {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right) \right] \right)$$
$$= \frac{2m}{N} \sum_{j\in[n]} {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}({}^*C_j) \leq \frac{m}{N}\right)$$
$$\leq \frac{2mn}{N}$$
$$\approx 0,$$

completing the proof. □

We now have all the ingredients for our proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Conditioning on the various possible values of Y_i as i varies in $[n]$, and noting that the event $\left\{\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right\}$ is the same as the event $\{\vec{Y} = (t_1,\ldots,t_n)\}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &{}^*\mathbb{P}((X_1,\ldots,X_k) \in \vec{A}) \\ &= \sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n} {}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X} \in \vec{A} | \vec{Y} = (t_1,\ldots,t_n)) \cdot {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1) = \frac{t_1}{N}, \ldots, \mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n) = \frac{t_n}{N}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{C.20}$$

Now, by the definition of expected values, we have the following equality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&{}^*\int_{{}^*\Omega} \mu_{\omega,N}(A_1)\cdots\mu_{\omega,N}(A_k)d{}^*\mathbb{P}(\omega) \\
&= \sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n} \left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1}\cdot\ldots\cdot\left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n}\cdot {}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1)=\frac{t_1}{N},\ldots,\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n)=\frac{t_n}{N}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{C.21}$$

Let $\epsilon\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and let $m_\epsilon\in\mathbb{N}$ be as in Corollary C.6. By that corollary, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n} {}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X}\in\vec{A}|\vec{Y}=(t_1,\ldots,t_n))\cdot{}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1)=\frac{t_1}{N},\ldots,\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n)=\frac{t_n}{N}\right) \\
>&\sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in L_{m_\epsilon}} {}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X}\in\vec{A}|\vec{Y}=(t_1,\ldots,t_n))\cdot{}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1)=\frac{t_1}{N},\ldots,\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n)=\frac{t_n}{N}\right) \\
&+(1-\epsilon)\sum_{\substack{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n\\ t_1,\ldots,t_n>m_\epsilon}} \left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1}\cdot\ldots\cdot\left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n}\cdot{}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1)=\frac{t_1}{N},\ldots,\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n)=\frac{t_n}{N}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By taking standard parts and using Corollary C.7, the above yields the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{st}\left[\sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n} {}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X}\in\vec{A}|\vec{Y}=(t_1,\ldots,t_n))\cdot{}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1)=\frac{t_1}{N},\ldots,\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n)=\frac{t_n}{N}\right)\right] \\
\geq&(1-\epsilon)\,\mathbf{st}\left[\sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n}\left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1}\cdot\ldots\cdot\left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n}\cdot{}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1)=\frac{t_1}{N},\ldots,\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n)=\frac{t_n}{N}\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\epsilon\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is arbitrary, we thus obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{st}\left[\sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n} {}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X}\in\vec{A}|\vec{Y}=(t_1,\ldots,t_n))\cdot{}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1)=\frac{t_1}{N},\ldots,\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n)=\frac{t_n}{N}\right)\right] \\
\geq&\,\mathbf{st}\left[\sum_{(t_1,\ldots,t_n)\in[N]^n}\left(\frac{t_1}{N}\right)^{k_1}\cdot\ldots\cdot\left(\frac{t_n}{N}\right)^{k_n}\cdot{}^*\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_1)=\frac{t_1}{N},\ldots,\mu_{\cdot,N}(C_n)=\frac{t_n}{N}\right)\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{C.22}$$

But the reverse inequality to (C.22) is also true because of (C.17) and the fact that ${}^*\mathbb{P}(\vec{X}\in\vec{A}|\vec{Y}=(t_1,\ldots,t_n))=0$ if $t_i<k_i$ for any $i\in[n]$. This completes the proof by (C.20) and (C.21). □

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Karl Mahlburg, Ambar Sengupta, and Robert Anderson for their comments on various versions of this manuscript. The author is grateful to David Ross for pointing to some references on nonstandard topological measure theory.

The philosophical introduction to nonstandard analysis added as an appendix in the 2023 revision of the paper came into being because of a practically uncountable number of conversations that the author has had with various individuals about "how to think nonstandardly". In particular, the author is grateful to all six students in his Spring 2023 class MATH 5710/PHIL 6722 (Topics in Logic) at University of Pennsylvania, which was on this topic. The author also appreciates Frederik Herzberg at Saarland University, and Soumyashant Nayak at Indian Statistical Institute (Bangalore) for their warm hospitality. Traveling to and interacting with their departments under the guise of giving talks gave shape to the eventual write-up before it was written.

References

[1] L. Accardi and Y. G. Lu, *A continuous version of de Finetti's theorem*, Ann. Probab. **21** (1993), no. 3, 1478–1493. MR 1235425

[2] Irfan Alam, *A nonstandard proof of de Finetti's theorem for Bernoulli random variables*, J. Stoch. Anal. **1** (2020), no. 4, Art. 15, 18. MR 4188596

[3] Sergio Albeverio, Raphael Høegh-Krohn, Jens Erik Fenstad, and Tom Lindstrøm, *Nonstandard methods in stochastic analysis and mathematical physics*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 122, Academic Press, Inc., Orlando, FL, 1986. MR 859372

[4] J. M. Aldaz, *A characterization of universal Loeb measurability for completely regular Hausdorff spaces*, Canad. J. Math. **44** (1992), no. 4, 673–690. MR 1178563

[5] David J. Aldous, *Representations for partially exchangeable arrays of random variables*, J. Multivariate Anal. **11** (1981), no. 4, 581–598. MR 637937

[6] ———, *Exchangeability and related topics*, École d'été de probabilités de Saint-Flour, XIII—1983, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1117, Springer, Berlin, 1985, pp. 1–198. MR 883646

[7] A. D. Alexandroff, *Additive set-functions in abstract spaces*, Rec. Math. [Mat. Sbornik] N. S. **8 (50)** (1940), 307–348. MR 0004078

[8] Robert M. Anderson, *STAR-FINITE PROBABILITY THEORY*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1977, Thesis (Ph.D.)–Yale University. MR 2627217

[9] ———, *Star-finite representations of measure spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **271** (1982), no. 2, 667–687. MR 654856

[10] ———, *Strong core theorems with nonconvex preferences*, Econometrica **53** (1985), no. 6, 1283–1294. MR 809911

[11] Robert M. Anderson and Salim Rashid, *A nonstandard characterization of weak convergence*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **69** (1978), no. 2, 327–332. MR 480925

[12] Leif O Arkeryd, Nigel J Cutland, and C Ward Henson, *Nonstandard analysis: Theory and applications*, vol. 493, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

[13] R. D. Arthan, *The eudoxus real numbers*, 2004.

[14] Tim Austin, *On exchangeable random variables and the statistics of large graphs and hypergraphs*, Probab. Surv. **5** (2008), 80–145. MR 2426176

[15] Stefan Banach, *Über additive massfunktionen in abstrakten mengen*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **15** (1930), no. 1, 97–101.

[16] R. E. Barlow, *Introduction to de finetti (1937) foresight: Its logical laws, its subjective sources*, pp. 127–133, Springer New York, New York, NY, 1992.

[17] Vieri Benci, Marco Forti, and Mauro Di Nasso, *The eightfold path to nonstandard analysis*, Nonstandard methods and applications in mathematics, Lect. Notes Log., vol. 25, Assoc. Symbol. Logic, La Jolla, CA, 2006, pp. 3–44. MR 2209073

[18] J. H. Blau, *The space of measures on a given set*, Fund. Math. **38** (1951), 23–34. MR 47117

[19] Vladimir I. Bogachev, *Measure theory. Vol. I, II*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007. MR 2267655

[20] ———, *Weak convergence of measures*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 234, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018. MR 3837546

[21] Hans Bühlmann, *Austauschbare stochastische Variablen und ihre Grenzwertsaetze*, Univ. California Publ. Statist. **3** (1960), 1–35 (1960). MR 117779

[22] François Caron and Emily B. Fox, *Sparse graphs using exchangeable random measures*, J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol. **79** (2017), no. 5, 1295–1366. MR 3731666

[23] C. C. Chang and H. J. Keisler, *Model theory*, third ed., Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 73, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1990. MR 1059055
[24] Donato Michele Cifarelli and Eugenio Regazzini, *De Finetti's contribution to probability and statistics*, Statist. Sci. **11** (1996), no. 4, 253–282. MR 1445983
[25] Paul J. Cohen, *Set theory and the continuum hypothesis*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1966. MR 0232676
[26] Nigel Cutland (ed.), *Nonstandard analysis and its applications*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 10, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988, Papers from a conference held at the University of Hull, Hull, 1986. MR 971063
[27] D. Dacunha-Castelle, *A survey on exchangeable random variables in normed spaces*, Exchangeability in probability and statistics (Rome, 1981), North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1982, pp. 47–60. MR 675964
[28] Bruno de Finetti, *Funzione caratteristica di un fenomeno aleatorio*, Atti del Congresso Internazionale dei Matematici: Bologna del 3 al 10 de settembre di 1928, 1929, pp. 179–190.
[29] ———, *La prévision : ses lois logiques, ses sources subjectives*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré **7** (1937), no. 1, 1–68. MR 1508036
[30] Claude Dellacherie and Paul-André Meyer, *Probabilities and potential*, North-Holland Mathematics Studies, vol. 29, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York; North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1978. MR 521810
[31] Mauro Di Nasso, Isaac Goldbring, and Martino Lupini, *Nonstandard methods in Ramsey theory and combinatorial number theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 2239, Springer, Cham, 2019. MR 3931702
[32] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman, *de Finetti's theorem for Markov chains*, Ann. Probab. **8** (1980), no. 1, 115–130. MR 556418
[33] ———, *Finite exchangeable sequences*, Ann. Probab. **8** (1980), no. 4, 745–764. MR 577313
[34] Persi Diaconis and Svante Janson, *Graph limits and exchangeable random graphs*, Rend. Mat. Appl. (7) **28** (2008), no. 1, 33–61. MR 2463439
[35] Lester E. Dubins, *Some exchangeable probabilities are singular with respect to all presentable probabilities*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete **64** (1983), no. 1, 1–5. MR 710644
[36] Lester E. Dubins and David A. Freedman, *Exchangeable processes need not be mixtures of independent, identically distributed random variables*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete **48** (1979), no. 2, 115–132. MR 534840
[37] E. B. Dynkin, *Classes of equivalent random quantities*, Uspehi Matem. Nauk (N.S.) **8** (1953), no. 2(54), 125–130. MR 0055601
[38] Robert Ely, *Nonstandard student conceptions about infinitesimals*, Journal for Research in Mathematics Education **41** (2010), no. 2, 117–146.
[39] ———, *Teaching calculus with infinitesimals and differentials*, ZDM–Mathematics Education **53** (2021), 591–604.
[40] William Feller, *An introduction to probability theory and its applications. Vol. II*, Second edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney, 1971. MR 0270403
[41] Jens Erik Fenstad, *Is nonstandard analysis relevant for the philosophy of mathematics?*, vol. 62, 1985, The present state of the problem of the foundations of mathematics (Florence, 1981), pp. 289–301. MR 788511
[42] Thomas S. Ferguson, *A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems*, Ann. Statist. **1** (1973), 209–230. MR 350949
[43] Xavier Fernique, *Processus linéaires, processus généralisés*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **17** (1967), no. fasc., fasc. 1, 1–92. MR 221576
[44] T. Frayne, A. C. Morel, and D. S. Scott, *Reduced direct products*, Fund. Math. **51** (1962/63), 195–228. MR 142459
[45] T.E. Frayne, D. S. Scott, and A. Tarski, *Reduced products*, Notices, Amer. Math. Soc. **5** (1958), 673–674.
[46] David A. Freedman, *Invariants under mixing which generalize de Finetti's theorem: Continuous time parameter*, Ann. Math. Statist. **34** (1963), 1194–1216. MR 189111
[47] D. H. Fremlin, *Real-valued-measurable cardinals*, Set theory of the reals (Ramat Gan, 1991), Israel Math. Conf. Proc., vol. 6, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1993, updated version available at author's website: `https://www1.essex.ac.uk/maths/people/fremlin/rvmc.pdf`, pp. 151–304. MR 1234282

[48] ———, *Measure theory. Vol. 4*, Torres Fremlin, Colchester, 2006, Topological measure spaces. Part I, II, Corrected second printing of the 2003 original. MR 2462372
[49] ———, *Measure theory. Vol. 5. Set-theoretic measure theory. Part II*, Torres Fremlin, Colchester, 2015, Corrected reprint of the 2008 original. MR 3723041
[50] P. M. Gartside and E. A. Reznichenko, *Near metric properties of function spaces*, Fund. Math. **164** (2000), no. 2, 97–114. MR 1784703
[51] Paul Gartside, *e-11 - generalized metric spaces, part i*, Encyclopedia of General Topology (Klaas Pieter Hart, Jun iti Nagata, Jerry E. Vaughan, Vitaly V. Fedorchuk, Gary Gruenhage, Heikki J.K. Junnila, Krystyna M. Kuperberg, Jan van Mill, Tsugunori Nogura, Haruto Ohta, Akihiro Okuyama, Roman Pol, and Stephen Watson, eds.), Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2003, pp. 273 – 275.
[52] Marie Gaudard and Donald Hadwin, *Sigma-algebras on spaces of probability measures*, Scand. J. Statist. **16** (1989), no. 2, 169–175. MR 1028976
[53] CJ Gerhardt, *Die philosophischen schriften v. gottfried wilhelm leibniz: 7 bd*, Georg Olms, 1960.
[54] Robert Goldblatt, *Lectures on the hyperreals*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 188, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998, An introduction to nonstandard analysis. MR 1643950
[55] F. Hausdorff, *Grundzüge einer Theorie der geordneten Mengen*, Math. Ann. **65** (1908), no. 4, 435–505. MR 1511478
[56] C. Ward Henson, *Analytic sets, Baire sets and the standard part map*, Canadian J. Math. **31** (1979), no. 3, 663–672. MR 536371
[57] C. Ward Henson and H. Jerome Keisler, *On the strength of nonstandard analysis*, J. Symbolic Logic **51** (1986), no. 2, 377–386. MR 840415
[58] Horst Herrlich, *Wann sind alle stetigen Abbildungen in Y konstant?*, Math. Z. **90** (1965), 152–154. MR 185565
[59] Edwin Hewitt, *On two problems of Urysohn*, Ann. of Math. (2) **47** (1946), 503–509. MR 17527
[60] ———, *Rings of real-valued continuous functions. I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **64** (1948), 45–99. MR 26239
[61] Edwin Hewitt and Leonard J. Savage, *Symmetric measures on Cartesian products*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **80** (1955), 470–501. MR 76206
[62] D. N. Hoover, *Row-column exchangeability and a generalized model for probability*, Exchangeability in probability and statistics (Rome, 1981), North-Holland, Amsterdam-New York, 1982, pp. 281–291. MR 675982
[63] Douglas N Hoover, *Relations on probability spaces and arrays of random variables*, Preprint, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ **2** (1979).
[64] Karel Hrbáček, *Axiomatic foundations for nonstandard analysis*, Fund. Math. **98** (1978), no. 1, 1–19. MR 528351
[65] Thomas Jech, *Set theory*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003, The third millennium edition, revised and expanded. MR 1940513
[66] Olav Kallenberg, *On the representation theorem for exchangeable arrays*, J. Multivariate Anal. **30** (1989), no. 1, 137–154. MR 1003713
[67] ———, *Probabilistic symmetries and invariance principles*, Probability and its Applications (New York), Springer, New York, 2005. MR 2161313
[68] Gopinath Kallianpur, *The topology of weak convergence of probability measures*, J. Math. Mech. **10** (1961), 947–969. MR 0132143
[69] Mikhail G. Katz and David Sherry, *Leibniz?s infinitesimals: Their fictionality, their modern implementations, and their foes from berkeley to russell and beyond*, Erkenntnis **78** (2013), no. 3, 571–625.
[70] H Jerome Keisler, *Elementary calculus: An infinitesimal approach*, Courier Corporation, 2013.
[71] John L. Kelley, *General topology*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1975, Reprint of the 1955 edition [Van Nostrand, Toronto, Ont.], Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 27. MR 0370454
[72] J. F. C. Kingman, *Uses of exchangeability*, Ann. Probability **6** (1978), no. 2, 183–197. MR 494344
[73] D. Landers and L. Rogge, *Universal Loeb-measurability of sets and of the standard part map with applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **304** (1987), no. 1, 229–243. MR 906814

[74] Ambrose Lo, *Demystifying the integrated tail probability expectation formula*, The American Statistician **73** (2019), no. 4, 367–374.
[75] Peter A. Loeb, *Conversion from nonstandard to standard measure spaces and applications in probability theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **211** (1975), 113–122. MR 390154
[76] ———, *Applications of nonstandard analysis to ideal boundaries in potential theory*, Israel J. Math. **25** (1976), no. 1-2, 154–187. MR 457757
[77] ———, *Weak limits of measures and the standard part map*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **77** (1979), no. 1, 128–135. MR 539645
[78] ———, *An introduction to general nonstandard analysis*, Nonstandard analysis for the working mathematician, Springer, Dordrecht, 2015, pp. 37–78. MR 3409513
[79] Jerzy Łoś, *Quelques remarques, thèorémes et problémes sur les classes dèfinissables d'algébres*, Mathematical Interpretation of Formal Systems, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1955, pp. 98–113.
[80] Albert T. Lundell and Stephen Weingram, *The topology of CW complexes*, The University Series in Higher Mathematics, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York, 1969. MR 3822092
[81] Wilhelmus Anthonius Josephus Luxemburg, *Non-standard analysis: lectures on a. robinson's theory of infinitesimals and infinitely large numbers*, (1966).
[82] George W. Mackey, *Borel structure in groups and their duals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (1957), 134–165. MR 89999
[83] Penelope Maddy, *Believing the axioms. I*, J. Symbolic Logic **53** (1988), no. 2, 481–511. MR 947855
[84] Edward Nelson, *Internal set theory: a new approach to nonstandard analysis*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **83** (1977), no. 6, 1165–1198. MR 469763
[85] ———, *Radically elementary probability theory*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 117, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1987. MR 906454
[86] ———, *Mathematics and faith*, URL: http://www. math. princeton. edu/˜ nelson/papers. html (2002).
[87] Peter Orbanz and Daniel M Roy, *Bayesian models of graphs, arrays and other exchangeable random structures*, IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence **37** (2014), no. 2, 437–461.
[88] G. Pantsulaia, *On separation properties for families of probability measures*, vol. 10, 2003, Dedicated to the memory of Professor Revaz Chitashvili, pp. 335–341. MR 2009981
[89] David Preiss, *Metric spaces in which Prohorov's theorem is not valid*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete **27** (1973), 109–116. MR 360979
[90] Yu. V. Prokhorov, *Convergence of random processes and limit theorems in probability theory*, Teor. Veroyatnost. i Primenen. **1** (1956), 177–238. MR 0084896
[91] Paul Ressel, *De Finetti-type theorems: an analytical approach*, Ann. Probab. **13** (1985), no. 3, 898–922. MR 799427
[92] Abraham Robinson, *Non-standard analysis*, Proc. Roy. Acad. Sci. **64** (1961), 432–440.
[93] ———, *Non-standard analysis*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1966. MR 0205854
[94] Abraham Robinson and Elias Zakon, *A set-theoretical characterization of enlargements*, Applications of Model Theory to Algebra, Analysis, and Probability (Internat. Sympos., Pasadena, Calif., 1967), Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1969, pp. 109–122. MR 0239965
[95] David A. Ross, *Loeb measure and probability*, Nonstandard analysis (Edinburgh, 1996), NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., vol. 493, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1997, pp. 91–120. MR 1603231
[96] Leonard J. Savage, *The foundations of statistics*, revised ed., Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1972. MR 0348870
[97] Laurent Schwartz, *Radon measures on arbitrary topological spaces and cylindrical measures*, Published for the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay by Oxford University Press, London, 1973, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Studies in Mathematics, No. 6. MR 0426084
[98] Wacław Sierpiński and Alfred Tarski, *On a characteristic property of inaccessible numbers*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **1** (1930), no. 15, 292–300.

[99] Th Skolem, *Über die nicht-charakterisierbarkeit der zahlenreihe mittels endlich oder abzählbar unendlich vieler aussagen mit ausschliesslich zahlenvariablen*, Fundamenta mathematicae **23** (1934), no. 1, 150–161.
[100] F. G. Slaughter, Jr., *The closed image of a metrizable space is M_1*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **37** (1973), 309–314. MR 310832
[101] Terence Tao, *Nonstandard analysis as a completion of standard analysis*, blog post at `https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2010/11/27/nonstandard-analysis-as-a-completion-of-standard-analysis/`, Nov 2010.
[102] Alfred Tarski, *Une contribution à la théorie de la mesure*, Fundamenta Mathematicae **15** (1930), no. 1, 42–50.
[103] Flemming Topsøe, *Compactness in spaces of measures*, Studia Math. **36** (1970), 195–222. (errata insert). MR 268347
[104] ———, *Topology and measure*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 133, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1970. MR 0422560
[105] ———, *Compactness and tightness in a space of measures with the topology of weak convergence*, Math. Scand. **34** (1974), 187–210. MR 388484
[106] Henry Towsner, *An aldous–hoover theorem for radon distributions*, 2023.
[107] Stanislaw Marcin Ulam, *Zur masstheorie in der allgemeinen mengenlehre*, Uniwersytet, seminarjum matematyczne, 1930.
[108] Paul Urysohn, *Über die Mächtigkeit der zusammenhängenden Mengen*, Math. Ann. **94** (1925), no. 1, 262–295. MR 1512258
[109] N. N. Vakhania, V. I. Tarieladze, and S. A. Chobanyan, *Probability distributions on Banach spaces*, Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), vol. 14, D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht, 1987, Translated from the Russian and with a preface by Wojbor A. Woyczynski. MR 1435288
[110] V. S. Varadarajan, *Measures on topological spaces*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **55 (97)** (1961), 35–100. MR 0148838
[111] ———, *Groups of automorphisms of Borel spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **109** (1963), 191–220. MR 159923
[112] Victor Veitch and Daniel M Roy, *The class of random graphs arising from exchangeable random measures*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.03099 (2015).
[113] Gerhard Winkler, *Simplexes of measures with closed extreme boundary and presentability of Hausdorff spaces*, Math. Nachr. **146** (1990), 47–56. MR 1069046
[114] Ernst Zermelo, *Über grenzzahlen und mengenbereiche: Neue untersuchungen über die grundlagen der mengenlehre*, Fundamenta mathematicae **16** (1930).

Department of Mathematics, University of Pennsylvania, S 209 33rd St, Philadelphia, PA, USA 19104 [15]

Email address: `irfanalamisi@gmail.com`

URL: `https://sites.google.com/view/irfan-alam/`

[15]The original version of the paper was completed when the author was a PhD student at the Department of Mathematics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70802, USA. The current Section 4.3 and Appendix A were added later at the author's current affiliation.