

# Problem Set 2

## Real Analysis I

Bennett Rennier  
barennier@gmail.com

January 15, 2018

**Exercise 2.1.** Find an example of a set  $X$  and a monotone class  $\mathcal{M}$  consisting of subsets of  $X$  such that  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{M}, X \in \mathcal{M}$ , but  $\mathcal{M}$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

*Proof.* Let  $X = \mathbb{R}$ . Consider the monotone class  $\mathcal{M}$  which is the set of unbounded intervals of  $\mathbb{R}$  along with the empty set. We see that this trivially includes  $\emptyset$  and  $\mathbb{R}$ . This is definitely a monotone class. If we have a sequence of  $A_i \in \mathcal{M}$ , where  $A_{i+1} \subseteq A_i$ , look at  $A_i \downarrow A$ . Say that  $A$  is nonempty and bounded below by  $\alpha$  and above by  $\beta$ . This means for some  $A_j \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $A_j$  is bounded above by  $\beta$  and for some  $A_k$ ,  $A_k$  is bounded below by  $\alpha$ , thus  $A_{\max(j,k)}$  is bounded above by  $\beta$  and below by  $\alpha$  and is nonempty. This means that it's not in  $\mathcal{M}$  which is a contradiction. Thus,  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Similarly, let's say we have a sequence of  $A_i \in \mathcal{M}$ , where  $A_i \subseteq A_{i+1}$ , and look at  $A_i \uparrow A$ . The union of unbounded intervals is definitely unbounded, thus  $A \in \mathcal{M}$ .

However, say that  $a \leq b$ , then this means that  $(a, \infty) \cap (-\infty, b) = (a, b)$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{M}$  is not closed under finite intersection, which means that  $\mathcal{M}$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra.  $\square$

**Exercise 2.2.** Find an example of a set  $X$  and two  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ , each consisting of subsets of  $X$ , such that  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$  is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

*Proof.* Let  $X = \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Then we see that  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{\emptyset, X, \{1\}, \{2, 3\}\}$  and that  $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{\emptyset, X, \{2\}, \{1, 3\}\}$ . We can clearly see that these are closed under complementation and contained  $X$  and  $\emptyset$ . It's also easy to check that they are closed under countable intersection. However,  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 = \{\emptyset, X, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 3\}\}$ , which is not a  $\sigma$ -algebra, as  $\{1\} \cup \{2\} = \{1, 2\} \notin \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$ .  $\square$

**Exercise 2.3.** Suppose  $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2 \subseteq \dots$  are  $\sigma$ -algebras consisting of subsets of a set  $X$ . Is  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_i$  necessarily a  $\sigma$ -algebra? If not, give a counterexample.

*Proof.*  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_i$  is not necessarily a  $\sigma$ -algebra. For a counterexample, let  $\mathcal{A}_n = \mathcal{P}(\{1, \dots, n\})$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the powerset function. These are trivially  $\sigma$ -algebras. We also see easily that  $\mathcal{A}_i \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$ . Look at  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_i$ . We know that  $\{n\} \in \mathcal{A}_n$ , as  $\{n\}$  is a subset of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . However,  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \{n\} = \mathbb{N}$ . Since all the members of each  $\mathcal{A}_i$  are finite, this means that  $\mathbb{N}$  is not a member of any  $\mathcal{A}_i$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{N} \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{A}_i$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{A}$  is not closed under countable union.  $\square$

**Exercise 2.5.** Let  $(Y, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space and let  $f$  map  $X$  into  $Y$ , but do not assume that  $f$  is one-to-one. Define  $\mathcal{B} = \{f^{-1}(A) \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . Prove that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra of subsets of  $X$ .

*Proof.* Firstly, we see that since  $Y \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $f^{-1}(Y) = X \in \mathcal{B}$ . Also, since  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $f^{-1}(\emptyset) = \emptyset \in \mathcal{B}$ .

Now, let  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ . This means  $B = f^{-1}(A_1)$  for some  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Since  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , then  $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$ . Thus,  $f^{-1}(A^c) \in \mathcal{B}$ . We shall prove that  $f^{-1}(A^c) = f^{-1}(A)^c$ . Let  $x \in f^{-1}(A^c)$ . This means that  $f(x) \in A^c$ , which means that  $f(x) \notin A$ . This means that  $x \notin f^{-1}(A)$ , and finally we see that  $x \in f^{-1}(A)^c$ . This shows that  $f^{-1}(A^c) \subseteq f^{-1}(A)^c$ . Using the same reasoning in the opposite order, we conclude that  $f^{-1}(A^c) = f^{-1}(A)^c$ . Thus, this  $f^{-1}(A^c) \in \mathcal{B}$ , is actually equal to  $f^{-1}(A)^c = B^c \in \mathcal{B}$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed under complements.

Now, let  $B_i \in \mathcal{B}$ , where  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . This means that  $B_i = f^{-1}(A_i)$  for some  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ . This means that  $\cup_i A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ , which means  $f^{-1}(\cup_i A_i) \in \mathcal{B}$ . Let  $x \in f^{-1}(\cup_i A_i)$ . This means that  $f(x) \in \cup_i A_i$ . This means that  $f(x) \in A_n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus,  $x \in f^{-1}(A_n)$ , which means that  $x \in \cup_i f^{-1}(A_i)$ . Let  $x \in \cup_i f^{-1}(A_i)$ . Then this means that  $x \in f^{-1}(A_n)$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus,  $f(x) \in A_n$ , which means that  $f(x) \in \cup_i A_i$ . Thus,  $x \in f^{-1}(\cup_i A_i)$ . This proves that  $f^{-1}(\cup_i A_i)$  which is in  $\mathcal{B}$ , is equal to  $\cup_i f^{-1}(A_i) = \cup_i B_i \in \mathcal{B}$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{B}$  is closed under countable union. This shows that  $\mathcal{B}$  is indeed a  $\sigma$ -algebra.  $\square$

**Exercise 2.6.** Suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra with the property that whenever  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  is non-empty, there exist  $B, C \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $B \cap C = \emptyset$ ,  $B \cup C = A$ , and neither  $B$  nor  $C$  is empty. Prove that  $\mathcal{A}$  is uncountable.

*Proof.* First off, a simple counterexample is if  $\mathcal{A} = \{\emptyset\}$  is the trivial  $\sigma$ -algebra over  $X = \emptyset$ . Excluding this, though, we continue on:

Assume that  $|\mathcal{A}| = n$ . And let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  be any nonempty element. This means there exists sets  $B, C \in \mathcal{A}$ , such that they are nonempty and disjoint and their union is equal to  $A$ . Do this same thing to the set  $B \in \mathcal{A}$ . These two sets that union to  $B$  and are nonempty can neither be  $C$  nor  $A$ . As if one were either of these two sets, the union of such two sets would contain elements not in  $B$ , which is a contradiction as their union is exactly  $B$ . Do this  $n$  times. This gives us more than  $n$  elements which must be in  $\mathcal{A}$ , which is a contradiction, as  $|\mathcal{A}| = n$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{A}$  is not finite. Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is not finite, by Exe 2.8,  $\mathcal{A}$  is not countable. Thus,  $\mathcal{A}$  must be uncountable.  $\square$

**Exercise 2.7.** Suppose  $\mathcal{F}$  is a collection of real-valued functions on  $X$  such that the constant functions are in  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $f + g$ ,  $fg$ , and  $cf$  are in  $\mathcal{F}$  whenever  $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  whenever  $f_n \rightarrow f$  and each  $f_n \in \mathcal{F}$ . Define the function

$$\chi_A(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in A \\ 0 & x \notin A \end{cases}$$

Prove that  $\mathcal{A} = \{A \subseteq X \mid \chi_A \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

*Proof.* We see that  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}$  as  $\chi_\emptyset = 0$ , a constant function, which we assumed to be in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Also,  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ , as  $\chi_X = 1$ , also a constant function which we assumed to be in  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . This means that  $\chi_A \in \mathcal{F}$ . Look at the function  $-(\chi_A - 1)$ . We see that this function is in  $\mathcal{F}$ , as  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under function addition and scalar multiplication. Also, one sees that this function is equivalent to  $\chi_{A^c}$ . Thus, since this means  $\chi_{A^c} \in \mathcal{F}$ , we know that  $A^c \in \mathcal{A}$ . This shows closure under addition.

Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ . Thus  $\chi_A, \chi_B \in \mathcal{F}$ . We see that  $\chi_A \chi_B$  is one iff  $x \in A$  and  $x \in B$  or, in other words,  $x \in A \cap B$ . Thus,  $\chi_A \chi_B = \chi_{A \cap B}$ . We also see that  $\chi_{A \cup B} = \chi_A + \chi_B - \chi_{A \cap B}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under addition, multiplication, and scalar multiplication, we see that  $\chi_{A \cup B} \in \mathcal{F}$ , which means that  $A \cup B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then let  $B_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i$ . We see that  $B_2 = A_1 \cup A_2$  is in  $\mathcal{A}$ , as proven by the last paragraph. By induction,  $B_n = A_n \cup B_{n-1}$  is in  $\mathcal{A}$ , as  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $B_{n-1} \in \mathcal{A}$  by the inductive hypothesis. Thus,  $B_n \in \mathcal{A}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We see that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty A_i = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} B_i$ . Since  $B_i \in \mathcal{A}$ , this means that  $\chi_{B_i} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Thus, since  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under limits, this means that  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \chi_{B_i} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Thus,  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} B_i \in \mathcal{F}$ , which shows that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under countable union. This shows that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.  $\square$

**Exercise 2.8.** Does there exist a  $\sigma$ -algebra which has countably many elements, but not finitely many?

*Proof.* Let's assume that  $\mathcal{A}$  is an infinitely countable  $\sigma$ -algebra on a set  $X$ . If  $X$  were finite, then  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  would be finite, and since a  $\sigma$ -algebra is a collection of subsets of  $X$ , this is means  $\mathcal{A}$  is finite, a contradiction. Thus,  $X$  must be infinite. Define  $B_x = \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{A}, x \in A} A$ . That is, the intersection of all members of  $\mathcal{A}$  that contain  $x$ . We see that this is well-defined, as there are only countably infinitely many members of  $\mathcal{A}$ , which means the intersection is a countable intersection.

We see that  $\{B_x\}_{x \in X}$  is a collection of subsets of  $X$ . Claim: This collection defines a partition of  $X$ . We see that obviously  $\{B_x\}_{x \in X}$  covers  $X$ , as  $x \in B_x$  for all  $x \in X$ . Now let  $x, y \in X$ , and look at the intersection of  $B_x$  and  $B_y$ . If  $x \notin B_y$ , then this means that  $B_x \setminus B_y \in \mathcal{A}$  is a smaller set in  $\mathcal{A}$  that contains  $x$ . This is a contradiction to the definition of  $B_x$ . This means that  $x \in B_y$ . By similar argument, we see that  $y \in B_x$ . Since these are the smallest sets that contain  $x$  and  $y$  respectively, we see that  $x \in B_x \subseteq B_y$  and that  $y \in B_y \subseteq B_x$ . This proves that  $B_x = B_y$ , which means that  $\{B_x\}_{x \in X}$  are a set of disjoint sets that union to all of  $X$ . This also shows that  $\{B_x\}_{x \in X}$  is a partition.

Let  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . We see obviously that  $A \subseteq \bigcup_{x \in A} B_x$ , as each  $B_x$  contains  $x$ . Now, say there is a  $y$  in  $\bigcup_{x \in X} B_x$  that isn't in  $A$ , that is that containment is strict. This means that  $y \in B_x$  for some  $x$ . Since  $x \in A$  and  $y \notin A$ , this means that  $x \in A \cap B_x$  is strictly smaller set than  $B_x$  that contains  $x$ , as it doesn't contain  $y$ . This is a contradiction to the definition of  $B_x$ , thus the containment is not strict, that is that  $\bigcup_{x \in A} B_x = A$ . Thus, every  $A$  can be written in this form.

Since every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  can be written as a union of sets of the form  $B_x$ . This means that if  $\{B_x\}_{x \in X}$  were finite, then  $\mathcal{A}$  would be finite as well, which is a contradiction. Thus, this partition is not finite and must be countably infinite, as it's a subset of  $\mathcal{A}$ . However, we know that  $\mathcal{A}$  contains all possible unions of the sets in  $\{B_x\}_{x \in X}$ . Since all of these sets are disjoint, and there's countably infinitely many of them, the number of possible unions

is equal to the number of elements in the powerset of  $\{B_x\}_{x \in X}$  (each subset corresponding to which combination of elements to union together). Since the powerset must be strictly greater in cardinality than the already countably infinite set  $\{B_x\}_{x \in X}$ , we see that it must result in an uncountably infinite set. Since these are all in  $\mathcal{A}$ , as  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under countable unions, we see that  $\mathcal{A}$  is uncountably infinite.  $\square$