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Abstract

This paper reveals a partition theorem over finite nonatomic measure spaces that can be interpreted as a continuous variation of Hall’s matching theorem. In fact, the techniques used to prove the main partition theorem are derived from clever applications of Hall’s theorem and are relatively elementary.

1 Background

1.1 Nonatomic Measures

Let \((\Omega, S, \nu)\) be a \(\sigma\)-finite measure. Then an atom of \(\nu\) is a set \(A \in S\) with \(\nu(A) > 0\) such that for all \(C \in S\) with \(C \subset A\), either \(\nu(C) = 0\) or \(\nu(C) = \nu(A)\). By \(\sigma\)-finiteness, we have \(\nu(A) < \infty\). \((\Omega, S, \nu)\) or \(\nu\) is called nonatomic if it has no atoms. Equivalently, \((\Omega, S, \nu)\) or \(\nu\) is called nonatomic if for any measurable set \(A\) with \(\nu(A) > 0\) there exists a measurable subset \(B\) of \(A\) such that \(\nu(A) > \nu(B) > 0\).

The following corollary is a consequence of Proposition A.1 in \cite{3}. This is coincidentally the theorem proved first by Waclaw Sierpiński, see \cite{1, 2}.

Corollary 1.1.1. Let \((\Omega, S, \nu)\) be a nonatomic finite measure with \(\nu(\Omega) > 0\). Then if \(A\) is a measurable set in \(S\) with \(\nu(A) > 0\), then for any real number \(c\) with \(\nu(A) \geq c \geq 0\) there exists a measurable subset \(B\) of \(A\) such that \(\nu(B) = c\).

We also have another corollary following from Proposition A.2 in \cite{3}.
Corollary 1.1.2. Let \((\Omega, S, \nu)\) be a finite nonatomic measure and \(A\) a measurable set in \(S\) with \(\nu(A) > 0\). Let \(r_i\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, n\) be numbers with \(r_i > 0\) and \(\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i = \nu(A)\). Then \(A\) can be decomposed as a union of disjoint sets \(R_i \in S\) with \(\nu(R_i) = r_i\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, n\).

1.2 Generalizations of Hall’s Matching Theorem

In addition to Corollaries 1.1.1 and 1.1.2, we also need to use Hall’s Matching Theorem, see (4, Theorem 2.1.2 in 5). Hall’s theorem itself will not be covered in this write-up as there is a lot of literature already in existence, not to mention it would require me writing a few pages of elementary graph theory to cover the requisite background to make the statement of the theorem understandable.

For the rest of the write up: \(2^Q\) is the power set of a set \(Q\), \(|Q|\) denotes the cardinality of a set \(Q\), \([n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}\), and \(\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots\}\) are the natural numbers.

The following corollary is a generalization of Hall’s Matching Theorem. It is in fact Exercise 2.9 on p.54 in 5 and it is proven with a clever application of Hall’s Matching Theorem.

Corollary 1.2.1. Let \(A\) be a finite set with subsets \(A_1, \ldots, A_n\), and let \(d_1, \ldots, d_n \in \mathbb{N}\). Then there are disjoint subsets \(D_k \subseteq A_k\), with \(|D_k| = d_k\) for all \(k \in [n]\), if and only if

\[
\left| \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right| \geq \sum_{i \in I} d_i
\]

for all \(I \subseteq [n]\).

The above claim is a generalization of Hall’s Matching Theorem because if we set \(d_i = 1\) for all \(i \in [n]\), then it would be an equivalent statement. If we consider the case where each point has the same weight of \(\xi > 0\), then we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2.2. Let \(A\) be a finite set with subsets \(A_1, \ldots, A_n\) and let \(d_1, \ldots, d_n \in \mathbb{N}\). Given a real \(\xi > 0\), let \((A, 2^A, \eta)\) be a discrete measure defined as \(\eta(X) = \xi |X|\) for all \(X \in 2^A\).
Then there are disjoint subsets $D_k \subseteq A_k$, with $\eta(D_k) = \xi d_k$ for all $k \in [n]$, if and only if

$$\eta \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right) = \xi \left| \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right| \geq \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$.

If $\xi = 1$, then will obtain Corollary 1.2.1. So, the above Corollary 1.2.2 is a generalization of Corollary 1.2.1.

If we replace weighted discrete points with disjoint subsets with the same measure and apply that to Corollary 1.2.2, we obtain the next corollary.

**Corollary 1.2.3.** Given a real $\xi > 0$, let $(\Omega, S, \nu)$ be a finite measure and $A = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_\ell\}$ be a finite collection of disjoint measurable sets in $S$ where $\nu(A_i) = \xi$. Also let $d_1, \ldots, d_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \subseteq A$.

Then there are disjoint subsets $D_k \subseteq \alpha_k$, with $\nu \left( \bigcup_{D \in D_k} D \right) = \xi d_k$ for all $k \in [n]$, if and only if

$$\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} \left( \bigcup_{B \in \alpha_i} B \right) \right) = \xi \left| \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i \right| \geq \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$.

*Proof. Let $(A, 2^A, \eta)$ be a discrete measure defined as $\eta(X) = \xi |X|$ for all $X \in 2^A$. Then by Corollary 1.2.2, there are disjoint subsets $D_k \subseteq \alpha_k$, with $\eta(D_k) = \xi d_k$ for all $k \in [n]$, if and only if

$$\eta \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i \right) = \xi \left| \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i \right| \geq \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_i$$

for all $I \subseteq [n]$. 
Since $\bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i$ is a finite collection of disjoint measurable sets, then

$$
\eta \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i \right) = \eta \left( \bigcup_{B \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i} \{B\} \right) \\
= \sum_{B \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i} \eta(\{B\}) \\
= \sum_{B \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i} \nu(B) \\
= \nu \left( \bigcup_{B \in \bigcup_{i \in I} \alpha_i} B \right) \\
= \nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} \left( \bigcup_{B \in \alpha_i} B \right) \right).
$$

\[\square\]

It also good to mention that Corollary 1.2.3 is a generalization of Corollary 1.2.2. As 1.2.3 deals with disjoint sets with measure, while 1.2.2 exclusively deals with the case where each set is a single point.

## 2 Continuous Analogue to Hall’s Matching Theorem

These results help us prove the following claim.

**Theorem 2.0.1.** Let $(\Omega, S, \nu)$ be a finite nonatomic measure and $A$ a measurable set in $S$ with $\nu(A) > 0$ and subsets $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n$ and let $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n > 0$.

Then there are disjoint subsets $B_k \subseteq A_k$ with $\nu(B_k) = m_k$ for all $k \in [n]$ if and only if

$$
\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right) \geq \sum_{i \in I} m_i
$$
for all $I \subseteq [n]$. 

Proof. If such $B_k$'s exist, then for all $I$, $\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right) \geq \sum_{i \in I} m_i$.

Conversely, let $Q$ be a nonempty subset of $[n]$, then we can define

$$S_Q = \left( \bigcap_{i \in Q} A_i \right) \setminus \left( \bigcap_{i \notin Q} A_i \right).$$

Note that if $P$ is also a nonempty subset of $[n]$ and $Q \neq P$, then $S_Q \cap S_P = \emptyset$. It would also be helpful to note that

$$A_k = \bigcup_{Q \in \{P \in 2^{[n]} | k \in P\}} S_Q$$

and

$$\bigcup_{i \in [n]} A_i = \bigcup_{Q \in 2^{[n]} \setminus \{\emptyset\}} S_Q.$$

Assume $\xi > 0$. Then by Corollary 1.1.1, for each nonempty $Q \subseteq [n]$ there exists a subset of $S_Q$ of measure $\xi \left\lfloor \frac{\nu(S_Q)}{\xi} \right\rfloor$; let this subset be denoted as $E_{Q,\xi}$. Then by Corollary 1.1.2, $E_{Q,\xi}$ can be partitioned into $\left\lfloor \frac{\nu(S_Q)}{\xi} \right\rfloor$ subsets of measure $\xi$. We can now define a set

$$A_{k,\xi} = \bigcup_{Q \in \{P \in 2^{[n]} | k \in P\}} E_{Q,\xi}.$$ 

Now consider the number $\left\lfloor \frac{m_k}{\xi} \right\rfloor$, we are given $m_k$ by the theorem statement, which by Corollaries 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 is the maximum number of disjoint subsets of measure $\xi$ for a set of measure $m_k$ and define $d_{k,\xi} = \left\lfloor \frac{m_k}{\xi} \right\rfloor - 2^{n+1}$. We want $d_{k,\xi}$ to be positive integers, so note that if $0 < \xi \leq \frac{m_k}{2^{n+1}+1}$, then $d_{k,\xi} > 0$. 

5
Observe that given a nonempty $Q \subseteq [n]$ we have that

$$
\left| \nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) - \nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i, \xi} \right) \right| = \left| \nu \left( \bigcup_{P \in \{ T \in 2^n | T \cap Q \neq \emptyset \}} S_P \right) - \nu \left( \bigcup_{P \in \{ T \in 2^n | T \cap Q \neq \emptyset \}} E_{P, \xi} \right) \right|
$$

$$
= \left| \sum_{P \in \{ T \in 2^n | T \cap Q \neq \emptyset \}} \nu(S_P) - \sum_{P \in \{ T \in 2^n | T \cap Q \neq \emptyset \}} \nu(E_{P, \xi}) \right|
$$

$$
= \left| \sum_{P \in \{ T \in 2^n | T \cap Q \neq \emptyset \}} [\nu(S_P) - \nu(E_{P, \xi})] \right|
$$

$$
< \left| \sum_{P \in \{ T \in 2^n | T \cap Q \neq \emptyset \}} \xi \right| = \xi (2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}).
$$

Thus as $\xi \to 0$, $\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i, \xi} \right) \to \nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right)$.

Also note that

$$
\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) \geq \nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i, \xi} \right).
$$

We use $d_{k, \xi}$ because if we are given a nonempty $Q \subseteq [n]$ then by the work we did previously, $\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i, \xi} \right) > \nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) - \xi (2^n - 2^{n-|Q|})$.

Since the theorem hypothesis states that $\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) \geq \sum_{i \in Q} m_i$, then
\[
\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) - \xi (2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}) \geq \left( \sum_{i \in Q} m_i \right) - \xi (2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}) \\
\geq \xi \left( \sum_{i \in Q} \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor \right) - \xi (2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}) \\
\geq \xi \left( \sum_{i \in Q} \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor \right) - 2^{n+1} \xi \\
\geq \xi \sum_{i \in Q} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor - 2^{n+1} \right) = \xi \sum_{i \in Q} d_{i, \xi}.
\]

In summary, for sufficiently small \( \xi \),

\[
\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_{i, \xi} \right) > \nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in Q} A_i \right) - \xi (2^n - 2^{n-|Q|}) \geq \xi \sum_{i \in Q} d_{i, \xi} > 0.
\]

Therefore for all \( I \subseteq [n] \) and a sufficiently small \( \xi \) we have

\[
\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i, \xi} \right) > \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_{i, \xi} > 0.
\]

Therefore by Corollary 1.2.3, for sufficiently small \( \xi \) there exists disjoint subsets \( B_{k, \xi} \subseteq A_{k, \xi} \) such that \( \nu(B_{k, \xi}) = \xi d_{k, \xi} \) for all \( k \in [n] \).

Given a nonempty \( Q \subseteq [n] \) we have that \( \sum_{i \in Q} m_i \geq \xi \sum_{i \in Q} d_{i, \xi} \). Therefore
\[
\sum_{i \in Q} m_i - \xi \sum_{i \in Q} d_{i,\xi} = \sum_{i \in Q} (m_i - \xi d_{i,\xi})
\]

\[
= \sum_{i \in Q} \left( m_i - \xi \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor + \xi 2^{n+1} \right)
\]

\[
= 2^{n+1} \xi |Q| + \sum_{i \in Q} \left( m_i - \xi \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor \right)
\].

Keep in mind that \(\lim_{\xi \to 0} m_i - |\xi| \leq \lim_{\xi \to 0} \xi \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor \leq \lim_{\xi \to 0} m_i + |\xi|\). Therefore \(\lim_{\xi \to 0} \xi \left\lfloor \frac{m_i}{\xi} \right\rfloor = m_i\).

Thus as \(\xi \to 0\) we have that \(\nu(B_{k,\xi}) = \xi d_{k,\xi} \to m_k\) for all \(k \in [n]\) and

\[
\nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_{i,\xi} \right) > \xi \sum_{i \in I} d_{i,\xi} \to \nu \left( \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i \right) \geq \sum_{i \in I} m_i
\]

for all \(I \subseteq [n]\).

Given a sufficiently small \(\xi > 0\), let us define \(\xi_i = \frac{\xi}{2^i}\) for \(i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\). So for each \(k \in [n]\) we can now create a sequence \(\{\nu(B_{k,\xi_i})\}_{i=0}^{\infty}\). Since this sequence is monotonically increasing, by our previous work and Corollary [1.1.1] for every \(k \in [n]\) there exists a sequence of sets

\[B_{k,\xi_0} \subseteq B_{k,\xi_1} \subseteq B_{k,\xi_2} \subseteq \cdots\]

such that for every \(i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\): \(B_{k,\xi_i} \subseteq A_k\), \(\nu(B_{k,\xi_i}) = \xi_i d_{k,\xi_i}\), and \(B_{k,\xi_i} \cap B_{k',\xi_i} = \emptyset\) when \(k \neq k'\). Let us define

\[B_{k,0} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} B_{k,\xi_i}\].
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By our previous work, we know that $m_k = \nu(B_{k,0})$. We now need to prove two more things:

1. there exists a set $B_k \subseteq B_{k,0}$ such that $B_k \subseteq A_k$ and $\nu(B_k) = \nu(B_{k,0})$

2. there exists sets $B_{k_1} \subseteq B_{k_1,0}$ and $B_{k_2} \subseteq B_{k_2,0}$ where $B_{k_1} \cap B_{k_2} = \emptyset$, $\nu(B_{k_1}) = \nu(B_{k_1,0})$ and $\nu(B_{k_2}) = \nu(B_{k_2,0})$ when $k_1 \neq k_2$.

If $B_{k,0}$ is not a subset of $A_k$ then $B_{k,0} \cap A^c_k \neq \emptyset$. If $\nu(B_{k,0} \cap A^c_k) > 0$, then there exits an $\alpha \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $\nu(B_{k,\xi\alpha} \cap A^c_k) > 0$, which contradicts $B_{k,\xi\alpha} \subseteq A_k$. Therefore $\nu(B_{k,0} \cap A^c_k) = 0$. Thus there exists a set of measure zero $N_k$ such that $\nu(B_{k,0} \setminus N_k) = m_k$ and $B_{k,0} \setminus N_k \subseteq A_k$.

Similarly if we are given distinct $k_1, k_2 \in [n]$ and $B_{k_1,0} \cap B_{k_2,0} \neq \emptyset$, then if $\nu(B_{k_1,0} \cap B_{k_2,0}) > 0$, then there exits an $\alpha \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $\nu(B_{k_1,\xi\alpha} \cap B_{k_2,\xi\alpha}) > 0$. This contradicts $B_{k_1,\xi\alpha} \cap B_{k_2,\xi\alpha} = \emptyset$, thus $\nu(B_{k_1,0} \cap B_{k_2,0}) = 0$. Thus there exists sets of measure zero $E_{k_1}$ and $E_{k_2}$ such that $(B_{k,0} \setminus E_{k_1}) \cap (B_{k',0} \setminus E_{k_2}) = \emptyset$ if $k_1 \neq k_2$.

So there exists disjoint sets $B_k \subseteq A_k$ such that $\nu(B_k) = m_k$ for all $k \in [n]$. Our proof is complete.

$\square$
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