

# Measure Theory

Alec Zabel-Mena

**Text**

Real Analysis (4<sup>th</sup> edition)

P.M. Fitzpatrick & H.L. Royden

December 27, 2022



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>The Real Numbers</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Open Sets, and $\sigma$ -Algebras . . . . .	5



# Chapter 1

## The Real Numbers

### 1.1 Open Sets, and $\sigma$ -Algebras

**Definition.** We call a set  $U$  of real numbers **open** provided for any  $x \in U$ , there is an  $r > 0$  such that  $(x - r, x + r) \subseteq U$ .

**Lemma 1.1.1.** *The set of real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$ , together with open sets defines a topology on  $\mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* Notice that both  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\emptyset$  are open sets. Moreover, if  $\{U_n\}$  is a collection of open sets, then so is their union. Now, consider the finite collection  $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^n$  and let  $U = \bigcap_{k=1}^n U_k$ . If  $U$  is empty, we are done. Otherwise, let  $x \in U$ . Then  $x \in U_k$  for every  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and since each  $U_k$  is open, choose an  $r_k > 0$  for which  $(x - r_k, x + r_k) \subseteq U_k$ . Then let  $r = \min\{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ . Then  $r > 0$ , and we have  $(x - r, x + r) \subseteq U$ , which makes  $U$  open in  $\mathbb{R}$ . ■

**Lemma 1.1.2.** *Every nonempty set is the disjoint union of a countable collection of open sets.*

*Proof.* Let  $U$  be nonempty and open in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $x \in U$ . Then there is a  $y > x$  for which  $(x, y) \subseteq U$  and there is a  $z < x$  for which  $(z, x) \subseteq U$ . Now, let  $a_x = \inf\{z : (z, x) \subseteq U\}$  and  $b_x = \sup\{y : (x, y) \subseteq U\}$ , and let  $I_x = (a_x, b_x)$ . Then we have

$$x \in I_x \text{ and } a_x \notin I_x \text{ and } b_x \notin I_x$$

Let  $w \in I_x$  such that  $x < w < b_x$ . Then there is a  $y > w$  such that  $(x, y) \subseteq U$  so that  $w \in U$ . Now, if  $b_x \in U$ , then there is an  $r > 0$  for which  $(b_x - r, b_x + r) \subseteq U$ , in particular,  $(x, b_x + r) \subseteq U$ . But  $b_x$  is the least upperbound of all such numbers, and  $b_x < b_x + r$ , a contradiction. Thus  $b_x \notin U$ , and hence  $b_x \notin I_x$ . A similar argument shows that  $a_x \notin I_x$ .

Consider now the collection  $\{I_x\}_{x \in U}$ . Then  $U = \bigcup I_x$  and since  $a_x, b_x \notin I_x$  for each  $x$ , the collection  $\{I_x\}$  is a disjoint collection. Lastly, by the density of  $\mathbb{Q}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$  there is a 1-1 mapping between this collection and  $\mathbb{Q}$ , making it countable. ■

**Definition.** Let  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  a set. We call a point  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  a **point of closure** of  $E$  if every open interval containing  $x$  also contains a point of  $E$ . We call the collection of all such points the **closure** of  $E$ , and denote it  $\text{cl } E$ . If  $E = \text{cl } E$ , then we say that  $E$  is **closed**.

**Lemma 1.1.3.** *For any set  $E$  of real numbers,  $\text{cl } E$  is closed; i.e.  $\text{cl } E = \text{cl}(\text{cl } E)$ . Moreover,  $\text{cl } E$  is the smallest closed set containing  $E$ .*

**Lemma 1.1.4.** *Every set  $E$  of real numbers is open if, and only if  $\mathbb{R} \setminus E$  is closed.*

**Definition.** Let  $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  a set. We call a collection  $\{E_\lambda\}$  a **cover** of  $E$  if  $E \subseteq \bigcup E_\lambda$ . If each  $E_\lambda$  is open, then we call this collection an **open cover** of  $E$ .

**Theorem 1.1.5** (Heine-Borel). *For any closed and bounded set  $F$  of  $\mathbb{R}$ , every open cover of  $F$  has a finite subcover.*

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $F = [a, b]$ , for  $a \leq b$  real numbers. Then  $F$  is closed and bounded. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an open cover of  $[a, b]$ , and define  $E = \{x \in [a, b] : [a, x] \text{ has a finite subcover by sets in } \mathcal{F}\}$ . Notice that  $a \in E$ , so that  $E$  is nonempty. Now, since  $E$  is bounded by  $b$ , by the completeness of  $\mathbb{R}$ , let  $c = \sup \{E\}$ . Then  $c \in [a, b]$  and there is a set  $U \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $c \in U$ . Since  $U$  is open, there exists an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $(c - \varepsilon, c + \varepsilon) \subseteq U$ . Now,  $c - \varepsilon$  is not an upperbound of  $E$ , so there is an  $x \in E$  with  $c - \varepsilon < x$ , and a finite collection of open sets  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^k$  covering  $[a, x]$ . Then the collection  $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^k \cup U$  covers  $[a, x]$  so that  $c = b$ , and we have found a finite subcover of  $F$ .

Now, let  $F$  be closed and bounded. Then it is contained in a closed bounded interval  $[a, b]$ . Now, let  $U = \mathbb{R} \setminus F$  open and  $\mathcal{F}$  an open cover of  $F$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} \cup U$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  covers  $F$ ,  $\mathcal{F}'$  covers  $[a, b]$ . By above, there is a finite subcover of  $[a, b]$ , and hence of  $F$  by sets in  $\mathcal{F}'$ . Remove  $U$  from  $\mathcal{F}'$ , we get a finite subcover of  $F$  by sets in  $\mathcal{F}$ . ■

**Theorem 1.1.6** (The Nested Set Theorem). *Let  $\{F_n\}$  be a descending collection of nonempty closed sets of  $\mathbb{R}$ , for which  $F_1$  is bounded. Then*

$$\bigcap F_n \neq \emptyset$$

*Proof.* Let  $F = \bigcap F_n$ , and suppose to the contrary that  $F$  is empty. Then for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , there is an  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  for which  $x \notin F_n$ . So that  $x \in U_n = \mathbb{R} \setminus F_n$ . Then  $U_n = \mathbb{R}$ , and each  $U_n$  is open. So  $\{U_n\}$  is an open cover of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and hence  $F_1$ . By the theorem of Heine-Borel, there is an  $N > 0$  such that  $F \subseteq \bigcup_{n=1}^N U_n$ . Since  $\{F_n\}$  is descending, the collection  $\{U_n\}$  is ascending, and hence  $\bigcup U_n = U_N = \mathbb{R} \setminus F_N$  which makes  $F_1 \setminus F_N$ , a contradiction. ■

**Definition.** Let  $X$  be a set. We call a collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $X$   **$\sigma$ -algebra** if

- (1)  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ .
- (2) For any  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $X \setminus A \in \mathcal{A}$ .
- (3) If  $\{A_n\}$  is a countable collection of elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ , then their union is an element of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Lemma 1.1.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  a collection of subsets of a set  $X$ . The intersection of all  $\sigma$ -algebras containing  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Moreover, it is the smallest such  $\sigma$ -algebra.*

**Definition.** We define the **Borel sets** of  $\mathbb{R}$  to be the  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathbb{R}$  containing all open sets in  $\mathbb{R}$

**Lemma 1.1.8.** *Every closed set of  $\mathbb{R}$  is a Borel set.*

**Definition.** We call a countable intersection of open sets of  $\mathbb{R}$  a  **$G_\delta$ -set** and we call a countable union of closed sets of  $\mathbb{R}$  an  **$F_\sigma$ -set**.

# Bibliography

- [1] W. R. Wade, *An introduction to analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, 2004.
- [2] W. Rudin, *Principles of mathematical analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.