

# Measure Theory

Claudio Landim

January 12, 2020

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction: a non-measurable set</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Classes of subsets</b>	<b>3</b>

# 1 Introduction: a non-measurable set

Suppose we want a measure that satisfies:

0.  $\lambda : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$
1.  $\lambda((a, b]) = b - a$
2.  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}, A + x = \{x + y : y \in A\}$

$$\forall A \subseteq \mathbb{R} \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda(A + x) = \lambda(A)$$

3.  $A = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j, A_j \cap A_k = \emptyset$

$$\lambda(A) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \lambda(A_k)$$

Define  $x \sim y$  for  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  if  $y - x \in \mathbb{Q}$ .  $\Lambda = \mathbb{R} / \sim$  and  $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ .  $\Gamma$  is uncountable since each equivalent class is countable.

By the **Axiom of Choice**, we have a  $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  s.t. for each  $[x] \in \mathbb{R} / \sim$ , there is a  $x \in [x]$  s.t.  $x \in \Omega$ . Hence we can assume  $\Omega \subseteq (0, 1)$ .

**Claim:** For  $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$ , either  $\Omega + p = \Omega + q$  or  $\Omega + p \cap \Omega + q = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $(\Omega + p) \cap (\Omega + q) \neq \emptyset, x = \alpha + p = \beta + q$ . Hence  $\alpha - \beta = q - p \in \mathbb{Q}$ , which implies  $\alpha = \beta$ .  $\square$

**Claim:**  $\Omega + q \subseteq (-1, 2)$  since  $-1 < q < 1$ .

In particular,

$$\bigcup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} (\Omega + q) \subseteq (-1, 2)$$

**Claim:** If  $E \subseteq F$ , then  $\lambda(E) \leq \lambda(F)$

*Proof.*  $\lambda(F) = \lambda(E \cup (F - E)) = \lambda(E) + \lambda(F - E)$   $\square$

If  $q \neq p$ ,

$$\lambda\left(\bigcup_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} (\Omega + q)\right) = \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \lambda(\Omega + q) = \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathbb{Q} \\ -1 < q < 1}} \lambda(\Omega) \leq \lambda((-1, 2)) = 3$$

Hence  $\lambda(\Omega) = 0$

**Claim:**  $(0, 1) \subseteq \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Q}, -1 < q < 1} (\Omega + q)$

*Proof.* Fix  $x \in [0, 1], \exists \alpha \in [x] \cap \Omega$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Hence  $\alpha - x = q \in \mathbb{Q}$ . Then  $x \in \Omega + q$   $\square$

Hence we have a contradiction and there is no such  $\lambda$  function.

## 2 Classes of subsets

**Definition 2.1.** For  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$  is a **semi-algebra** if

1.  $\Omega \in \mathcal{S}$
2. If  $A, B \in \mathcal{S}$ , then  $A \cap B \in \mathcal{S}$
3. For all  $A \in \mathcal{S}$ , there are  $E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{S}$  s.t.  $A^c = \sqcup E_j$

**Example 2.1.** If  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} = & \mathbb{R} \cup \{(a, b] : a < b, a, b \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ & \cup \{(-\infty, b] : b \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ & \cup \{(a, \infty) : a \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ & \cup \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

then  $\mathcal{S}$  is a semi-algebra

**Definition 2.2.** Take  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is an **algebra** if

1.  $\Omega \in \mathcal{A}$
2. If  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}$
3. If  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$

If  $\mathcal{A}$  is an algebra, then it is also semi-algebra.

**Definition 2.3.**  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  is a  **$\sigma$ -algebra** if

1.  $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}$
2. If  $A_j \in \mathcal{F}$  for  $j \geq 1$ , then  $\bigcap_{j \geq 1} A_j \in \mathcal{F}$
3. If  $A \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $A^c \in \mathcal{F}$

**Proposition 2.4.** Suppose  $\mathcal{A}_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_\alpha$  is an algebra,  $\alpha \in I$ . Then  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{\alpha \in I} \mathcal{A}_\alpha$  is an algebra