

# SUMMER 2025 READING GROUP ON ERGODIC THEORY

## LECTURE 1 (SAMY LAHLOU): CRASH COURSE ON MEASURE THEORY, PART I

Given a set  $X$ , our goal is to define a map  $\mu : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  that assigns to each subset  $A \subseteq X$  a *measure*  $\mu(A) \in [0, \infty]$  that ‘behaves like the volume of  $A$ ’. This turns out to be impossible in full generality (and we shall see using ergodic-theoretic methods that this impossibility is for good reason), so we instead restrict to special subsets of  $X$  with a nice algebraic (think: ‘constructible’) structure.

**Further reading.** [Anu23, Lectures 1 to 5] and [Fol99, Chapter 1].

**Definition 1.** Let  $X$  be a set. A  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $X$  is a collection  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  of subsets of  $X$  containing  $\emptyset$  and is closed under complements and countable unions. More precisely:

1. (Non-trivial).  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{B}$ .
2. (Closure under complements). For any  $A \in \mathcal{B}$ , we have  $X \setminus A \in \mathcal{B}$ .
3. (Closure under countable unions). For any countable family  $\{A_n \in \mathcal{B} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ , we have  $\bigcup_n A_n \in \mathcal{B}$ .

**Definition 2.** If  $\mathcal{B}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra on a set  $X$ , the pair  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  is said to be a *measurable space*.

A useful way to construct a  $\sigma$ -algebra is to start with an arbitrary family  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  and close<sup>1</sup> it under the above three conditions. Abstractly:

**Definition 3.** The  $\sigma$ -algebra *generated* by  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(X)$  is  $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle_\sigma := \bigcap \{ \mathcal{B} : \mathcal{B} \supseteq \mathcal{C} \text{ is a } \sigma\text{-algebra on } X \}$ .

Note that  $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle_\sigma$  is indeed a  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $X$  since the intersection of  $\sigma$ -algebras is again a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Definition 4.** Let  $X$  be a topological space. The *Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra* on  $X$  is  $\mathcal{B}(X) := \langle \mathcal{T} \rangle_\sigma$ , where  $\mathcal{T}$  is the topology on  $X$ . The elements of  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  are called the *Borel sets* of  $X$ .

Intuitively, for any topological space  $X$ , one would like to ‘measure’ the Borel sets. This is justified since if one wants a measure compatible with the topology, then one must be able to measure the open sets, and hence also closed sets, countable unions of closed sets (called  *$F_\sigma$  sets*), countable intersections of open sets (called  *$G_\delta$  sets*), countable intersections of  $F_\sigma$  sets, countable unions of  $G_\delta$  sets, and so on<sup>2</sup>.

**Definition 5.** A *measure* on a measurable space  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  is a map  $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  such that  $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$  and  $\mu(\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mu(A_n)$  for any pairwise disjoint family  $\{A_n \in \mathcal{B} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .

The triple  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  is then called a *measure space*. A *Borel measure* is a measure defined on some Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Example 6** (Lebesgue). Equip  $\mathbb{R}$  with its usual topology. There is<sup>3</sup> a unique measure  $\lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ , called the *Lebesgue measure*, such that  $\lambda([a, b]) = b - a$  for each  $a \leq b$ .

**Example 7** (Bernoulli). Equip  $2 = \{0, 1\}$  with the discrete topology and consider the product topology on  $2^\mathbb{N}$ . For each  $p \in [0, 1]$ , is a unique measure  $\mu_p : \mathcal{B}(2^\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  on  $2^\mathbb{N}$ , called the *Bernoulli ( $p$ ) measure*, such that for each word  $w \in 2^{<\mathbb{N}}$ , we have  $\mu_p([w]) = p^{n_1}(1-p)^{n_0}$  where  $n_i$  is the number of  $i \in \{0, 1\}$  in  $w$  and  $[w]$  is the set of all sequences in  $2^\mathbb{N}$  containing  $w$  as a prefix.

---

<sup>1</sup>Date: May 7, 2025.

<sup>1</sup>This ‘closure’ operation can be made precise as follows. Starting with  $\mathcal{C}_0 := \mathcal{C}$ , throw in all the subsets of  $X$  that is necessary to satisfy Definition 1 relativized to  $\mathcal{C}_0$  to obtain  $\mathcal{C}_1$  (that is, let  $\mathcal{C}_1$  contain  $\emptyset$  and such that if  $A \in \mathcal{C}_0$ , then  $X \setminus A \in \mathcal{C}_1$ , and similarly for condition 3). Then, let  $\mathcal{C}_2$  be defined by throwing in all the countable unions and complements of sets in  $\mathcal{C}_1$ . Doing so infinitely-many times and taking the union  $\bigcup_\alpha \mathcal{C}_\alpha$  will give us  $\langle \mathcal{C} \rangle_\sigma$ , but beware that this process must proceed into the transfinite up to  $\alpha < \omega_1$ , where  $\omega_1$  is the first uncountable ordinal; ask your local set theorist why.

<sup>2</sup>This goes up the *Borel hierarchy*, studied in *Descriptive Set Theory*; see [Kec95].

<sup>3</sup>We will not prove this fact, but it is an application of Carathéodory’s Extension Theorem; see [Anu23, Lecture 4].

If  $p = 0$  (similarly if  $p = 1$ ), then  $\mu_p(\xi) \in \{0, 1\}$ , and we have  $\mu_p(\xi) = 1$  iff  $(p, p, p, \dots) \in \xi$ . Thus, all of the measure is concentrated at  $(p, p, p, \dots)$ . Measures in which this occurs are called *Dirac measures*.

**Example 8** (Dirac). Let  $X$  be a set and fix  $x \in X$ . The *Dirac measure concentrated at  $x$*  is the measure  $\delta_x : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  defined by  $\delta_x(A) := 1$  iff  $x \in A$ , and  $\delta_x(A) := 0$  iff  $x \notin A$ .

**Definition 9.** A measure  $\mu$  on  $(X, \mathcal{B})$  is said to be *finite* if  $\mu(X) < \infty$ , a *probability measure* if  $\mu(X) = 1$ , and  *$\sigma$ -finite* if there is a partition  $X = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$  such that  $X_n \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\mu(X_n) < \infty$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Unless otherwise stated, all measures are assumed to be  $\sigma$ -finite. In fact, we will usually only deal with probability measures, since we can also normalize a finite measure to a probability measure by  $\mu \mapsto \mu/\mu(X)$ .

Lastly, even though  $\mu$  is only defined on the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$ , we can slightly extend  $\mu$  to a larger  $\sigma$ -algebra.

**Definition 10.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space. A subset  $Z \subseteq X$  is said to be  *$\mu$ -null* if there exists some  $Z' \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $Z \subseteq Z'$  and  $\mu(Z') = 0$ . We write  $\text{Null}_\mu$  for the set of all  $\mu$ -null subsets of  $X$ . A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is said to be  *$\mu$ -conull* if  $X \setminus A$  is  $\mu$ -null.

**Definition 11.** Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a measure space. A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is  *$\mu$ -measurable*<sup>4</sup> if there exists some  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  and some  $\mu$ -null set  $Z$  such that  $A = B \cup Z$ . We write  $\text{Meas}_\mu$  for the set of all  $\mu$ -measurable sets.

It is an exercise that  $\text{Meas}_\mu = \langle \mathcal{B} \cup \text{Null}_\mu \rangle_\sigma$ . Moreover,  $\mu$  admits a unique extension to a map  $\bar{\mu} : \text{Meas}_\mu \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ , called the *completion* of  $\mu$ , and this measure satisfies  $\text{Meas}_{\bar{\mu}} = \text{Meas}_\mu$ . HINT:  $\bar{\mu}(B \cup Z) := \mu(B)$ .

**Definition 12.** A measure  $\mu$  is *complete* if  $\bar{\mu} = \mu$ .

For convenience, we will always assume that measures are complete. Neither measures  $\lambda$  nor  $\mu_p$  in Examples 6 and 7 are complete, so we tacitly extend them.

## REFERENCES

- [Anu23] Anush Tserunyan, *Advanced Real Analysis 1*, available at <https://www.math.mcgill.ca/atserunyan/Courses/2023F.Math564.Analysis1/>.
- [Fol99] Gerald B. Folland, *Real Analysis: Modern Techniques and Their Applications*, 2nd ed., Pure and Applied Mathematics: A Wiley Series of Texts, Monographs and Tracts, John Wiley & Sons, 2013, 1999.
- [Kec95] Alexander S. Kechris, *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer New York, NY, 1995.

---

<sup>4</sup>Very confusing terminology. One might think that elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  are the ‘measurable’ ones, but this removes  $\mu$  from the picture. In general, there are much more  $\mu$ -measurable sets than there are sets in  $\mathcal{B}$ . Indeed, there are  $2^{\aleph_0}$ -many Borel sets on  $\mathbb{R}$ , but there are  $2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$ -many  $\lambda$ -measurable sets!