

### Abstract

We detail the construction and some of the properties of the Lebesgue measure.

## Premeasures, Outer Measures, and Measures

Consider a set-function  $\lambda: P(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  that satisfies

- $\lambda(\emptyset) = 0$ ;
- for any finite or infinite sequence of disjoint sets,  $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ , we have

$$\lambda\left(\bigsqcup_{j=1}^\infty E_j\right) = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda(E_j);$$

- $\lambda(I) = b - a$ , where  $I$  is an interval (either open, closed, or a half-interval);
- $\lambda(s + E) = \lambda(E)$ .

Unfortunately, such a set-function doesn't exist.

In order to construct a set function on a restricted domain  $\lambda: \mathcal{L} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ , we need to define a particular class of measurable subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ . This is where the concept of an *outer measure* comes in.

**Definition.** Let  $X$  be a set, and let  $\mu^*: P(X) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  be a set function. We say  $\mu^*$  is an *outer measure* if

- $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$ ;
- $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(B)$  if  $A \subseteq B$ ;
- $\mu^*\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^\infty A_j\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^\infty \mu^*(A_j)$ .

We will obtain an outer measure on the entirety of  $P(X)$  by defining a notion of measure on some “satisfactory” subfamily  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq P(X)$ , then by approximating other subsets using this family.

**Proposition:** Let  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq P(X)$  be a family of subsets such that  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $X \in \mathcal{E}$ , and let  $\rho: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  be a set function such that  $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$ . For any  $A \subseteq X$ , define

$$\mu^*(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 1} \rho(E_j) \mid E_j \in \mathcal{E}, A \subseteq \bigcup_{j \geq 1} E_j \right\}.$$

Then,  $\mu^*$  is an outer measure.

*Proof.* We start by showing well-definedness, which stems from the fact that we may select  $E_j = X$  for all  $j$ .

Since we may take  $E_j = \emptyset$  for all  $j$ , we must have  $\mu^*(\emptyset) = 0$ . Furthermore, if  $A \subseteq B$ , since the set over which the infimum is taken for the definition of  $\mu^*(A)$  includes the corresponding set for  $B$ , we must have  $\mu^*(A) \leq \mu^*(B)$ .

Finally, let  $\{A_j\}_{j \geq 1} \subseteq P(X)$ , and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . For each  $j$ , there exists  $\{E_{j,k}\}_{k \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$  such that  $A_j \subseteq \bigcup_{k \geq 1} E_{j,k}$  and  $\sum_{k \geq 1} \rho(E_{j,k}) \leq \mu^*(A_j) + \varepsilon 2^{-j}$ .

Then, if  $A = \bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j$ , we have  $A \subseteq \bigcup_{j,k \geq 1} E_{j,k}$ , and  $\sum_{j,k \geq 1} \rho(E_{j,k}) \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu^*(A_j) + \varepsilon$ , so that  $\mu^*(A) \leq \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu^*(A_j) + \varepsilon$ . Since  $\varepsilon$  is arbitrary, we are done.  $\square$

**Definition.** A subset  $A \subseteq X$  is said to be  $\mu^*$ -measurable if for any  $E \subseteq X$ ,  $A$  serves as a good “cookie cutter” for  $E$ , in that

$$\mu^*(E) = \mu^*(E \cap A) + \mu^*(E \cap A^c).$$

Equivalently, due to subadditivity, we have  $A$  is measurable if and only if for all  $E \subseteq X$ ,

$$\mu^*(E) \geq \mu^*(E \cap A) + \mu^*(E \cap A^c).$$

**Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra of subsets of  $X$ . We call a set function  $\mu_0: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, \infty]$  a *premeasure* if

- $\mu_0(\emptyset) = 0$ ;
- for a collection of disjoint elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$  where  $\bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j \in \mathcal{A}$ , we have

$$\mu_0\left(\bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j\right) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu_0(A_j).$$

Every premeasure gives rise to an outer measure by taking

$$\mu^*(E) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{j \geq 1} \mu_0(A_j) \mid A_j \in \mathcal{A}, E \subseteq \bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j \right\}. \quad (*)$$

A remarkable result by Caratheodory allows us to extend premeasures from algebras to measures on  $\sigma$ -algebras. To start, there is a little bit of build-up.

**Proposition:** Let  $\mu_0$  be a premeasure on  $\mathcal{A}$ , with  $\mu^*$  defined by  $(*)$ . Then,

- (a)  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{A}} = \mu_0$ ;
- (b) every set in  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mu^*$ -measurable.

*Proof.* Suppose  $E \in \mathcal{A}$ . If  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{j \geq 1} A_j$  with  $A_j \in \mathcal{A}$ , we let  $B_n = E \cap (A_n \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{n-1} A_j)$ . The  $B_n$  are disjoint members of  $\mathcal{A}$  whose union is  $E$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0(E) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(B_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(A_j). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $\mu_0(E) \leq \mu^*(E)$ . The reverse inequality is clear from the fact that we may specify  $A_1 = E$  and  $A_{j>1} = \emptyset$ .

Meanwhile, if  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $E \subseteq X$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , then there is a collection  $\{B_j\}_{j \geq 1} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  with  $E \subseteq \bigcup_{j \geq 1} B_j$  and  $\sum_{j \geq 1} \mu_0(B_j) \leq \mu^*(E) + \varepsilon$ . By additivity on  $\mathcal{A}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^*(E) + \varepsilon &\geq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_0(B_j \cap A) + \mu_0(B_j \cap A^c) \\ &\geq \mu^*(E \cap A) + \mu^*(E \cap A^c), \end{aligned}$$

so  $A$  is measurable. □

**Theorem** (Caratheodory's Theorem): Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq P(X)$  be an algebra, let  $\mu_0$  be a premeasure on  $\mathcal{A}$ , and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\mathcal{A}$ . There exists a measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  whose restriction to  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\mu_0$  — namely,  $\mu - \mu^*|_{\mathcal{M}}$ , where  $\mu^*$  is given by  $(*)$ .

If  $\nu$  is another measure on  $\mathcal{M}$  that extends  $\mu_0$ , then  $\nu(E) \leq \mu(E)$ , with equality for all  $\mu(E) < \infty$ . Furthermore, if  $\mu_0$  is  $\sigma$ -finite, then  $\mu$  is unique.

*Proof.* We start by showing that if  $\mu^*$  is an outer measure, then if  $\mathcal{M}^*$  is the collection of  $\mu^*$ -measurable sets,  $\mathcal{M}^*$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra and  $\mu^*|_{\mathcal{M}^*}$  is a complete measure.<sup>I</sup>

By definition,  $\mathcal{M}^*$  is closed under complements, as the definition of  $\mu^*$ -measurability is symmetric in  $A$  and  $A^c$ . To show finite additivity, if  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}^*$  and  $E \subseteq X$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^*(E) &= \mu^*(E \cap A) + \mu^*(E \cap A^c) \\ &= \mu^*(E \cap A \cap B) + \mu^*(E \cap A \cap B^c) \\ &\quad + \mu^*(E \cap A^c \cap B) + \mu^*(E \cap A^c \cap B^c).\end{aligned}$$

We note that  $A \cup B = (A \cap B) \cup (A \cap B^c) \cup (A^c \cap B)$ , so subadditivity gives

$$\mu^*(E \cap A \cap B) + \mu^*(E \cap A \cap B^c) + \mu^*(E \cap A^c \cap B) \geq \mu^*(E \cap (A \cup B)).$$

Therefore,

$$\mu^*(E) \geq \mu^*(E \cap (A \cup B)) + \mu^*(E \cap (A \cup B)^c).$$

Therefore,  $A \cup B \in \mathcal{M}^*$ , so  $\mathcal{M}^*$  is an algebra. Moreover, if  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}^*$  are disjoint, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^*(A \cup B) &= \mu^*((A \cup B) \cap A) + \mu^*((A \cup B) \cap A^c) \\ &= \mu^*(A) + \mu^*(B).\end{aligned}$$

To show that  $\mathcal{M}^*$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra, we show that  $\mathcal{M}^*$  is closed under countable *disjoint* unions. Let  $\{A_j\}_{j \geq 1}$  be a sequence of disjoint sets in  $\mathcal{M}^*$ , and let  $B_n = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^n A_j$ , with  $B = \bigsqcup_{j \geq 1} A_j$ . Then, for any  $E \subseteq X$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^*(E \cap B_n) &= \mu^*(E \cap B_n \cap A_n) + \mu^*(E \cap B_n \cap A_n^c) \\ &= \mu^*(E \cap A_n) + \mu^*(E \cap B_{n-1}),\end{aligned}$$

so by induction, we have

$$\mu^*(E \cap B_n) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mu^*(E \cap A_j).$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mu^*(E) &= \mu^*(E \cap B_n) + \mu^*(E \cap B_n^c) \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n \mu^*(E \cap A_j) + \mu^*(E \cap B^c),\end{aligned}$$

and taking  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\mu^*(E) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu^*(E \cap A_j) + \mu^*(E \cap B^c)$$

---

<sup>I</sup>This is Theorem 1.11 in Folland's *Real Analysis*.

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \mu^* \left( \bigsqcup_{j \geq 1} E \cap A_j \right) + \mu^*(E \cap B^c) \\ &= \mu^*(E \cap B) + \mu^*(E \cap B^c) \\ &\geq \mu^*(E). \end{aligned}$$

□