

René L. Schilling: **Measures, Integrals, and Martingales (2nd edn)**

Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2017. ISBN: 978–1–316–62024–3

Misprints and smaller changes. Updated: February 3, 2026.

Page, Line	Reads	Should Read
p. 5, Problem 1.5	$S_0, S_2, S_2, \dots$ ; and, next line: $S_\infty := \dots$	$S_0, S_1, S_2, \dots$ ; $S := \dots$
p. 21, Prob. 3.6	<b>Remark.</b> A set $A \dots$	<b>Remark.</b> A set $A \neq \emptyset \dots$
p. 22, Prob. 3.14	which contains $X$	which contains $\emptyset, X$
p. 25, line 1 above	$A \cup B = (A \cup \dots$	$A \cup B = A \cup \dots$ (remove leading brace)
p. 28, Lemmas 4.8, 4.9	measure space (twice)	measurable space (twice)
p. 29, Prob. 4.6	assigns to every interval $[a, b]$ with $b - a > 2$ finite mass	assigns to every interval $[a, b]$ with $b - a > 2$ infinite mass
p. 29, Prob. 4.8	finitely additive	is finitely additive
p. 38, Prob. 5.13	which contains $X$	which contains $\emptyset, X$
p. 38, Prob. 5.13(i)	formation of complements.	formation of complements and finite intersections.
p. 43, line 4 below	$\mu(S_n)$	$\mu(S_i)$
p. 47, line 1,2 above	On the other hand, monotonicity ... entail ... $\leq \lambda[a, b)$ ,	On the other hand, for each $I_n, n = 1, \dots, N$ there is some $I'_n \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $I_n \subset I'_n$ and $\bigcup_{n=1}^N I'_n = [a, b)$ . Monotonicity and finite additivity of $\lambda$ entail $\sum_{n=1}^N \lambda(I_n) \leq \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda(I'_n) = \lambda\left(\bigcup_{n=1}^N I'_n\right) = \lambda[a, b)$
p. 50, Prob. 6.1(ii)	$\forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a < b$	$\forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a \leq b$
p. 50, Prob. 6.4	Recall from Problem 9.14	Recall from Problem 4.15
p. 54, line 2 above	Theorem 5.6	Theorem 5.8
p. 57, line 5 below	linear	affine linear
p. 58, line 4 above	$\tau_x(\lambda^n) \stackrel{7.10}{=} \lambda^n$	$\tau_x(\lambda^n) \stackrel{7.8}{=} \lambda^n$
p. 59, Prob. 7.12	$C_2 = J_2^{00} \cup J_2^{01} \cup J_2^{10} \cup J_2^{11}$	$C_2 = J_2^{00} \cup J_2^{01} \cup J_2^{10} \cup J_2^{11}$
p. 62, line 5 below	$\sum_{j=m}^M$	$\sum_{j=0}^M$ where: $A_0 := (A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_M)^c$
p. 69, line 3 above	$\mathbb{1}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n}$	$\mathbb{1}_{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n}$
p. 79, Problem 9.5	$\int u_n d\mu \uparrow \int u d\mu$	$\int u_{n+K} d\mu \uparrow \int u d\mu$
p. 88, Prob. 10.9.(i)	$\{g^{-1}(B) : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2)\}$	$\{g^{-1}(B) : B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^2)\}$
p. 91, line 12 above	Corollary 11.3	Theorem 10.3(iv) together with Corollary 11.3
p. 92, line 8 below	Theorem 9.6(i)	Theorem 11.2(i)
p. 93, line 6	Corollary 11.7(iii)	Corollary 11.7(ii)
p. 93, Prob. 11.3(vi)	$\mathbb{V}\xi = \int (\xi - \mathbb{E}\xi)^2 d\mathbb{P}$	$\mathbb{V}\xi = \int (\xi - \mathbb{E}\xi)^2 d\mathbb{P}$
p. 98, line 1/2 above	Corollary 11.4(iv)	Corollary 11.4
p. 105, line 8 above	$x \in D$	$x \notin D$
p. 105, line 10 below	Appendix G	Appendix E
p. 120, line 7 above	$\frac{1}{n^p}$	$\frac{1}{n}$
p. 126, line 9 below	$V(\infty) := +\infty$	$V(\infty) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} V(x) \in [-\infty, +\infty]$ Remark: By convexity, $V$ is “finally” monotone.
p. 126, line 4 below	$u \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu), u \geq 0$ , implies	$u \in \mathcal{L}^1(\mu), u \geq 0, V(\infty) = \infty$ , implies

turn over

Page, Line	Reads	Should Read
p. 127, line 2 above	$+\infty \mathbb{1}_{u=\infty}(x)$	$+V(\infty) \mathbb{1}_{u=\infty}(x)$
p. 137, line 6 above	und	and
p. 147, line 8 above	Theorem 12.9(ii)	Theorem 12.9
p. 151, Prob. 14.13	$u : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty]$	$u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$
p. 153, Prob. 14.19(ii)	$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \dots$	$\int_X \dots$
p. 168/9, Proof of L. 16.7, T. 16.4	$\mathcal{F}$ (all instances)	$\mathcal{F}_{\text{rat}}$ (all instances, i.e. rectangles with rational end-points, see p. 19)
p. 171, line 3 above	... such that	... with rational end-points such that
p. 185, Ex. 16.11	Euler's Integrals.	Euler's Integrals
p. 187, Caution	Lemma 17.3 does not hold for $p = \infty$	Lemma 17.2 does not hold for $p = \infty$ if we want that the supports of the simple functions have finite $\mu$ -measure.
p. 190, Thm. 17.8	$\sigma$ -compact	locally compact and $\sigma$ -compact Remark: one needs that $K_n \subset K_{n+1}^\circ \subset K_{n+1} \uparrow X$ , see also Prob. 17.6
p. 192, line 13 above	compact sets	open balls
p. 194, line 11 above	$\ u\ _\infty \mathbb{1}_{\text{supp}u}(x) e^{- z ^2/2}$	$\ u\ _\infty \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n}(x) e^{- z ^2/2}$
p. 200, line 12 below	$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu_\epsilon^*(A_i) \leq \mu^*(A)$	$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu_\epsilon^*(A_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu^*(A_i)$
p. 208, line 5 below	$\pi^{n/2} / \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + 1)$	$\pi^{n/2} / \Gamma(\frac{n}{2} + 1)$
p. 236, line 4 above	$\int  \mathbb{I}_A - u ^2 d\nu$	$\int  \mathbb{I}_A - u  d\nu$
p. 237, lines 11/12 above	$(0 \vee f \wedge 1)^2 = 0 \vee f^2 \wedge 1$ $(0 \vee (1 - f) \wedge 1)^2 = 0 \vee (1 - f)^2 \wedge 1$	$(0 \vee f \wedge 1)^2 \leq 0 \vee f^2 \wedge 1$ $(0 \vee (1 - f) \wedge 1)^2 \leq 0 \vee (1 - f)^2 \wedge 1$
p. 238, line 14 above	$\{u \in C(X) : \lim_{ x  \rightarrow \infty} u(x) = 0\}$	$\{u \in C(X) : \forall \epsilon > 0 \exists K \subset X \text{ compact}$ $\forall x \in K^c :  u(x)  \leq \epsilon\}$
p. 241, line 10 below	add the following sentence $\rightarrow$	If $p = 1$ and $q = \infty$ we use $\text{sgn}(h) \mathbb{I}_{A_n}$ ( $A_n$ is an exhausting sequence) instead of $\text{sgn}(h) h ^q$ . This gives $h \mathbb{I}_{A_n} = 0$ a.e., hence $f = g$ a.e.
p. 243, line 12 below	Yosida [59, Section IV.9, Example 3]	Dunford and Schwartz [15, Section IV.8.1]
p. 243, line 8 below	Rheorem	Theorem
p. 252, line 7 above	In particular,	If $X$ is separable,
p. 267, line 9 below	$\int_{B^+} u d\mu - \int_{B^-} (-u) d\mu$	$\int_{B^+} u d\mu + \int_{B^-} (-u) d\mu$
p. 270, line 5 above	$\int_{K_{n(k)}^c} (-u_{k+1}^-) d\mu$	$\int_{K_{n(k)}^c} u_{k+1}^- d\mu$
p. 299, hint 24.9(iii)	with $\tau_\kappa := \inf\{n :  M_n  > \kappa\} \dots M_{\tau \wedge n_\kappa} \dots A_{\tau \wedge n_\kappa}$	with $\tau_\kappa := \inf\{n :  S_n  > \kappa\} \dots S_{\tau_\kappa \wedge n} \dots A_{\tau_\kappa \wedge n}$
p. 314, line 13 above	$\mu(Q) / \lambda^n(Q)$	$\mu(e + Q) / \lambda^n(Q)$
p. 334, line 11 below	$\ g - P_E g\ $	$\ g - P_E g\ ^2$
p. 362, line 11 above	Theorem 27.19	Corollary 27.20
p. 367, Prob. 27.8	$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}} = \mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}}$	$\mathbb{E}^{\mathcal{E}} = E^{\mathcal{E}}$
p. 385, line 4 above	$\{\chi_{k,j} = \pm 1\}$	$\{\chi_{k,j} = \pm 2^{k/2}\}$
p. 389, line 15 above	Note that $\psi = \psi_{0,1} = \chi_{0,1} \dots$ while $\psi_{0,-1}(x) = \dots$	Note that $\psi = \psi_{0,0} = \chi_{0,1} \dots$ while $\psi_{-1,0}(x) = \dots$
p. 417, line 16 below	$\kappa \leq u_\epsilon \leq \mathbb{1}_{U_\epsilon}$	$\mathbb{1}_K \leq u_\epsilon \leq \mathbb{1}_{U_\epsilon}$
p. 417, line 14 below	$0 \leq w_\epsilon \leq U$	$0 \leq w_\epsilon \leq \mathbb{1}_U$
p. 422, line 3 below	$\dots \stackrel{C.3}{=} \dots$	$\dots \stackrel{7.9}{=} \dots$
p. 442, line 10 above	Obviously ... they satisfy	If $ u(x)  \leq M$ , then they satisfy

turn over

Page, Line	Reads	Should Read
p. 442, line 11 above	$ S_\pi[u]  \leq S_\pi[ u ] \leq M(b-a)$ $ S^\pi[u]  \leq S^\pi[ u ] \leq M(b-a)$	$ S_\pi[u]  \leq M(b-a)$ $ S^\pi[u]  \leq M(b-a)$
p. 442, line 2 below	$\inf_\pi S_\pi[u]$	$\inf_\pi S^\pi[u]$
p. 465–467 References	<i>concerns: page numbers (given in parentheses at the end of each entry) where references are used</i>	<i>by some error, you have to add <math>n \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}</math> to the page numbers given</i>

I am grateful to the following readers who alerted me of misprints: Umberto De Ambroggio, Hallvard Ånestad, Krishna Bhogaonker, Giuseppe Caianiello, Jonas Esser, Panagiotis Flevotomos, René Girard, Tetsu Hirose, Franziska Kühn, Niels Jacob, Hyun-Seung Lee, Julian Lee, Silas Nøstvik, Jiamin Pan, Tomas Prerovsky, Allen Stenger.

## Correction of the proof of Proposition 6.6

The proof of Proposition 6.6 on page 48/49 is incorrect and must be changed as follows.

*Proof of Proposition 6.6.* We have to show that  $\lambda^n(\emptyset) = 0$  and that  $\lambda^n$  is  $\sigma$ -additive on  $\mathcal{F}^n$ . It is clear that  $\lambda^n(\emptyset) = 0$ . To see  $\sigma$ -additivity, we use induction with respect to the dimension  $n$ . Proposition 6.3 covers the case  $n = 1$ . We assume that  $\nu = \lambda^n$  is  $\sigma$ -additive on the rectangles  $\mathcal{F}^n$  for some  $n \geq 1$ .

*Step 0:* In the proof we use repeatedly the fact that sets of the form  $I \setminus (J \cup K)$ ,  $I, J, K \in \mathcal{F}^n$ , can be written as  $I \setminus (J \cup K) = I \cap J^c \cap K^c = (I \setminus J) \setminus K$ . In view of property (S3) of a semiring, each difference can be represented as a finite union of disjoint rectangles and, thus,  $I \setminus (J \cup K)$  is a finite union of disjoint rectangles from  $\mathcal{F}^n$ .

*Step 1:* We first show finite additivity and sub-additivity of  $\lambda^{n+1}$ . Let  $J_1, \dots, J_N \in \mathcal{F}^{n+1}$  such that

$$I = \bigcup_{j=1}^N J_j = I^n \times I^1 \in \mathcal{F}^n \times \mathcal{F}^1 = \mathcal{F}^{n+1}.$$

We can write  $I$  also as a union of disjoint sets from  $\mathcal{F}^{n+1}$ . To do so, consider  $J_1, J_2 \setminus J_1, J_3 \setminus (J_2 \cup J_1), \dots, J_N \setminus (J_{N-1} \cup \dots \cup J_1)$ . Applying to each of these sets Step 0, we find mutually disjoint sets  $I_i = I_i^n \times I_i^1 \in \mathcal{F}^{n+1}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , such that

$$I = \bigcup_{j=1}^N J_j = \bigcup_{i=1}^M I_i = \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^M I_i^n \right) \times \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^M I_i^1 \right) = I^n \times I^1 \in \mathcal{F}^{n+1}.$$

We want to represent also the (cartesian) factors as unions of disjoint sets. Fix  $d \in \{1, n\}$ . Define for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, 2^M$  the sets  $\hat{I}_1^d \cap \hat{I}_2^d \cap \dots \cap \hat{I}_M^d \cap I^d$ , where  $\hat{I}_i^d$  is either  $I_i^d$  or  $(I_i^d)^c$ , making the sets mutually disjoint (note that some of them might be  $\emptyset$ ). By Step 0, each of these sets can be represented as a finite union of disjoint rectangles from  $\mathcal{F}^d$ . In total, we have for suitable  $K_k^d \in \mathcal{F}^d$  and  $d \in \{1, n\}$

$$I = \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^P K_k^n \right) \times \left( \bigcup_{l=1}^Q K_l^1 \right) = \bigcup_{i=1}^M \overbrace{\bigcup_{(k,l): K_k^n \times K_l^1 \subset I_i} K_k^n \times K_l^1}^{=I_i} \quad (*)$$

$$= \bigcup_{j=1}^N \overbrace{\bigcup_{i: I_i \subset J_j} \bigcup_{(k,l): K_k^n \times K_l^1 \subset I_i} K_k^n \times K_l^1}^{=J_j} \quad (\#)$$

Thus,

$$\lambda^{n+1}(I) = \lambda^n \left( \bigcup_{k=1}^P K_k^n \right) \lambda^1 \left( \bigcup_{l=1}^Q K_l^1 \right) = \sum_{k=1}^P \sum_{l=1}^Q \lambda^n(K_k^n) \lambda^1(K_l^1) = \sum_{k=1}^P \sum_{l=1}^Q \lambda^{n+1}(K_k^n \times K_l^1).$$

Now we can use (\*) and (#), and rearrange the double sum to obtain finite (sub-)additivity:

$$\lambda^{n+1}(I) = \sum_{i=1}^M \lambda^{n+1}(I_i) \leq \sum_{j=1}^N \lambda^{n+1}(J_j).$$

Step 2: We assume now that  $(I_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{J}^{n+1}$  are mutually disjoint rectangles  $I_i = I_i^n \times I_i^1$  such that

$$I = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} I_i = I^n \times I^1 \in \mathcal{J}^n \times \mathcal{J}^1 = \mathcal{J}^{n+1}.$$

For every  $\epsilon > 0$  we may circumscribe around each  $I_i$  a rectangle  $I_{i,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{J}^{n+1}$  such that the closure of  $I_i$  is in the open interior of  $I_{i,\epsilon}$ :

$$I_{i,\epsilon}^\circ \supset \overline{I_i} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^{n+1}(I_{i,\epsilon}) - \lambda^{n+1}(I_i) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2^i}.$$

Clearly,  $\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} I_{i,\epsilon}^\circ \supset I \supset \overline{I^\epsilon}$  where  $\overline{I^\epsilon}$  is a closed rectangle inscribed into  $I$ , such that  $\lambda^{n+1}(I) - \lambda^{n+1}(\overline{I^\epsilon}) \leq \epsilon$ . Since  $\overline{I^\epsilon}$  is compact, there is some finite sub-cover, i.e. some  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$I^\epsilon = \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^N I_{i,\epsilon} \right) \cap I^\epsilon = \bigcup_{i=1}^N \underbrace{(I_{i,\epsilon} \cap I^\epsilon)}_{\in \mathcal{J}^{n+1}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda^{n+1}(I) - \epsilon \leq \lambda^{n+1}(I^\epsilon) \stackrel{\text{Step 1}}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda^{n+1}(I_{i,\epsilon} \cap I^\epsilon) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda^{n+1}(I_{i,\epsilon}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda^{n+1}(I_i) + \frac{\epsilon}{2^i} \leq \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{n+1}(I_i).$$

Using repeatedly (S3), we see that  $I \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^N I_i = I \cap I_1^c \cap \dots \cap I_N^c = \bigcup_{k=1}^M R_k$  for mutually disjoint rectangles  $R_k \in \mathcal{J}^{n+1}$ , i.e.  $I = I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_N \cup R_1 \cup \dots \cup R_M$ . Using the finite additivity from Step 1 yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda^{n+1}(I_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda^{n+1}(I_i) + \sum_{k=1}^M \lambda^{n+1}(R_k) = \lambda^{n+1}(I).$$

Letting  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$  finally proves the claimed  $\sigma$ -additivity on  $\mathcal{J}^{n+1}$ . □