

(10)

Fields and  $\sigma$ -Fields: —Algebra and  $\sigma$ -Algebra: —Let  $\Omega$  be an abstract space.Let  $A, B, C, \dots$  be subsets of  $\Omega$ .Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote some collection of subsets of  $\Omega$ .e.g.  $\mathcal{C} = \{A, B, C\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, A, B\}$  etc. $\mathcal{C}$  can be even empty collection.or  $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset\}$  consists of one set  $\emptyset$ , so this is a non-empty collection.Field:Def: A non-empty collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $\Omega$  is known as a Field or Algebra if it satisfies the following conditions

- (i)  $A \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow A^c \in \mathcal{C}$  i.e.  $A' \in \mathcal{C}$
- (ii)  $A, B \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow A \cup B \in \mathcal{C}$ .

In other words

A non-empty collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $\Omega$  is known as a field if it is closed under complements and finite unions.Remarks: A ~~field~~ field is a non-empty collection.So let  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  then  $A' \in \mathcal{C}$ Also  $\Rightarrow A \cup A' \in \mathcal{C}$ i.e.  $\Omega \in \mathcal{C}$ also  $\Omega' \in \mathcal{C}$  i.e.  $\emptyset \in \mathcal{C}$ 

Thus

(i) Every field always contains  $\emptyset$  and  $\Omega$ .(ii)  $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$  is the smallest ~~field~~ field.(Also known as trivial ~~field~~ field.)(iii) If  $A \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow A' \in \mathcal{C}$ Thus  $\{\emptyset, \Omega, A, A'\}$  is also a field.

(Check?)

(iv) Suppose  $\mathcal{C}$  is a field & suppose  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ ,then  $A' \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $B' \in \mathcal{C}$  $\Rightarrow A \cup B, A \cup B', A' \cup B, A' \cup B' \in \mathcal{C}$ but  $A' \cup B' = (A \cap B)' \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow A \cap B \in \mathcal{C}$  and so on.

(11)

$$\mathcal{C} = \{ \emptyset, \Omega, A, B, A', B', A \cup B, A \cup B', A' \cup B, A' \cup B', A \cap B, \dots \}$$

All possible unions, intersections & compliments have to be in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

—x—

Alternate Def:- A non-empty collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $\Omega$  is a field if it is closed under compliments and finite intersections i.e.

$$A \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow A' \in \mathcal{C} \text{ \& }$$

$$\text{if } A, B \in \mathcal{C} \Rightarrow A \cap B \in \mathcal{C}$$

—x—

Largest Field:-

$$\text{Power set of } \Omega = \mathcal{P}(\Omega) = \{A \mid A \subset \Omega\}.$$

—x—

Notation:- " $\mathcal{F}$ " for a field.

—x—

$\sigma$ -field

Def: A non-empty collection of subsets of  $\Omega$ ,  $(\mathcal{A})$  is called a  $\sigma$ -field (or  $\sigma$ -algebra) if

$$(i) A \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow A' \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$(ii) A_n \in \mathcal{A}, \forall n=1, 2, \dots$$

$$\text{then } \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{A}$$

i.e. closed under compliments and countable unions.

Alternate def: A non-empty collection  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $\Omega$  is called a  $\sigma$ -field if it is closed under compliments and countable intersections.

Properties of  $\sigma$ -field:-

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\sigma$ -field. Let  $A \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow A' \in \mathcal{A}$

$$\text{Choose } A_n \text{ s.t. } A_1 = A' \text{ \& } A_2 = A_3 = \dots = A$$

$$\text{then } \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = A' \cup A = \Omega \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$\text{hence } \Omega' = \emptyset \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Thus every  $\sigma$ -field must contain  $\emptyset$  and  $\Omega$ .

In fact  $\{\emptyset, \Omega\}$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -field and

$\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  is the largest  $\sigma$ -field.

—x—

(12) Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\sigma$ -field.

$$\text{let } \{A_n\} \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow \bigcup_n A_n \in \mathcal{A}.$$

$$\text{also } A_n \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow A_n^c \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$\Rightarrow \bigcup A_n^c \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$\Rightarrow (\bigcap A_n)^c \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$\Rightarrow \bigcap A_n \in \mathcal{A}$$

Thus  $\mathcal{A}$  is closed under countable intersection.

$$\limsup A_n, \liminf A_n \in \mathcal{A}.$$

$$\rightarrow \text{let } A_n \in \mathcal{A} \quad \forall n=1, 2, \dots$$

$$\text{then } \limsup A_n = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} A_n$$

$$\text{let } B_k = \bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} A_n \quad \text{then } B_k \in \mathcal{A} \quad \forall k$$

$$\text{ii } \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} B_k \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$\Rightarrow \limsup A_n \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$\text{Similarly, } \liminf A_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=k}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{A}$$

Further, if  $\lim A_n$  exists, then  $\lim A_n \in \mathcal{A}$

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a  $\sigma$ -field. Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is also a field.

$\rightarrow$  It is sufficient to check that  $A, B \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow A \cup B \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Take  $A_1 = A \neq A_2 = A_3 = A_4 = \dots = B$ , then

$$A_n \in \mathcal{A} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n = A \cup B \in \mathcal{A}$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathcal{A} \text{ is a field.}$$

Thus every  $\sigma$ -field is also a field.

But the converse is not true.

The following example will prove that every field is not necessarily a  $\sigma$ -field.



(13) Let  $\Omega = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$

Define

$$\mathcal{F} = \{A \subset \Omega \mid \text{either } A \text{ or } A^c \text{ is a finite set}\}$$

Claim: i)  $\mathcal{F}$  is non-empty.

Let  $A \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow A^c$  is finite if  $A$  is not finite  
&  $A^c$  is not finite if  $A$  is finite.

Thus  $\forall A \in \mathcal{F}, A^c \in \mathcal{F}$ .

Thus  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under compliments.

Further let  $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ . To prove  $A \cup B \in \mathcal{F}$ .

When  $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ , then one of the following holds.

(i)  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  both finite  $\Rightarrow A \cup B$  is finite.

(ii)  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  &  $B'$  are finite  $\Rightarrow A' \cap B'$  are finite  
 $\Rightarrow (A \cup B)'$  is finite  
 $\Rightarrow A \cup B \in \mathcal{F}$

(iii)  $A' \in \mathcal{F}$  &  $B$  are finite. By similar arguments,  $A \cup B \in \mathcal{F}$ .

(iv)  $A'$  and  $B'$  are finite  $\Rightarrow A' \cap B'$  is finite  
 $\Rightarrow (A \cup B)'$  is finite  
 $\Rightarrow A \cup B \in \mathcal{F}$

Thus  $\mathcal{F}$  is also closed under finite unions.

Thus  $\mathcal{F}$  is a field.

Now define  $A_n$  as  $\{2n\}$

~~$A_n = \{2, 4, 6, \dots\}$  if  $n$  is even~~  $A_n = \{n\}$ , if  $n$  is even  
&  $A_n = \emptyset$  if  $n$  is odd

Then  $A_n \in \mathcal{F} \quad \forall n$ .

$\bigcup A_n = \{2, 4, 6, 8, \dots\}$  not finite

$(\bigcup A_n)' = \{1, 3, 5, 7, \dots\}$  not finite

Thus  $\bigcup A_n \notin \mathcal{F}$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is not closed under countable unions

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is not a  $\sigma$ -field.

—x—

(14) Thm: A finite field is a  $\sigma$ -field.

Proof: Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a finite field.

i.e.  $\mathcal{F}$  is a field containing finite no. of sets

So let  $\mathcal{F} = \{C_1, \dots, C_N\}$  where  $N$  is finite.

Let  $A_n \in \mathcal{F} \quad \forall n$ , then  $A_n$  are some or all of sets  $C_1, \dots, C_N$  & hence

$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  is union of some or all sets  $C_1, \dots, C_N$ .

i.e.  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  is a finite union

$\Rightarrow \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{F} \quad (\because \mathcal{F} \text{ is a field}).$

Hence  $\mathcal{F}$  is also a  $\sigma$ -field.

Thus only finite field is a  $\sigma$ -field.

Def: A non-empty collection  $\mathcal{M}$  of subsets of  $\Omega$  is called a monotone class if  $\mathcal{M}$  is closed under limits of monotone sequences.

i.e.  $A_n \in \mathcal{M}, n=1, 2, \dots \notin \{A_n\}$  is monotone then  $\lim A_n \in \mathcal{M}$ .

Result: Is a  $\sigma$ -field a monotone class?

Yes. Every  $\sigma$ -field is a monotone class, because  $\sigma$ -field is closed under limits of any type of sequence, if it exists.

The Converse is not always true.

i.e. a monotone class is not always a  $\sigma$ -field.

let  $\mathcal{C} = \{I \mid I \text{ is an interval in } \mathbb{R}\}$

i.e. any <sup>type</sup> of the interval  $(a, b), (a, b], [a, b), [a, b], (-\infty, b), (-\infty, b], (a, \infty), [a, \infty)$

then  $\mathcal{C}$  is a monotone class.

e.g. let  $A_n = (a, b - \frac{1}{n}]$ ,  $n \geq 1$

then  $A_n \uparrow \notin \lim A_n = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}$

(15)



Here, we note that  $\mathcal{C}$  is closed under limits of monotone sequences. Hence  $\mathcal{C}$  is a monotone class. But if  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $(a, b)' \notin \mathcal{C}$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is not closed under complements

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is not a  $\sigma$ -field.

Thm:  $\text{---}x\text{---}$   
A monotone field is a  $\sigma$ -field.

i.e. a field which is a monotone class or a monotone class which is a field is also a  $\sigma$ -field.

Proof:- Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a monotone field.

Being a field, it is always closed under complements.

Let  $\{A_n \in \mathcal{C} \mid \forall n=1, 2, \dots\}$

To prove  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{C}$ .

Define  $B_k = \bigcup_{n=1}^k A_n$

then  $B_k \in \mathcal{C} \quad \forall k$

$\nless B_k \uparrow \Rightarrow \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} B_k \in \mathcal{C}$

but  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} B_k = \bigcup_k B_k = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$

$\Rightarrow \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{C}$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is closed under countable unions.

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  is a  $\sigma$ -field.

$\text{---}x\text{---}$



(16) Thus,

Thm:- A field is a  $\sigma$ -field iff it is a monotone class. Also

Thm:- A monotone class is a  $\sigma$ -field iff it is a field.

—x—

let  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$ , let  $A_x = (x, \infty)$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}$

Define  $\mathcal{A}_x = \{\Omega, \emptyset, A_x, A_x'\}$

then  $\mathcal{A}_x$  is a  $\sigma$ -field  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$

Thus on a given space, we can define infinite no. of  $\sigma$ -fields.

So let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  be two  $\sigma$ -fields, of subsets of  $\Omega$ .

Clearly  $\emptyset, \Omega \in (\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2)$

Thus  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$  is non empty.

let  $A \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow A \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $A \in \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow A' \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $A' \in \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow A' \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$  is closed under complementation.

let  $\{A_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow A_n \in \mathcal{A}_1 \forall n$  &  $A_n \in \mathcal{A}_2 \forall n$

$\Rightarrow \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$  is closed under countable unions.

Hence  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2$  is also a  $\sigma$ -field.

—x—

This idea can be extended to intersection of any number of  $\sigma$ -fields.

(17) Let  $\{\mathcal{A}_t, t \in T\}$  be a collection of  $\sigma$ -fields of subsets of  $\mathcal{R}$ .

( $T$  can be finite, infinite, countable or uncountable)

Then  $\bigcap_{t \in T} \mathcal{A}_t$  is also a  $\sigma$ -field.

Is Union of two  $\sigma$ -fields also a  $\sigma$ -field?

No, not necessarily.

e.g. let  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathcal{A} = [0, \infty)$ ,  $\mathcal{B} = (0, \infty)$

then let  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{\emptyset, \mathcal{R}, [0, \infty), (-\infty, 0]\}$

$\mathcal{A}_2 = \{\emptyset, \mathcal{R}, (0, \infty), (-\infty, 0]\}$

then

$\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 = \{\emptyset, \mathcal{R}, [0, \infty), (-\infty, 0], (0, \infty), (-\infty, 0]\}$

Now  $(-\infty, 0] \cap [0, \infty) = \{0\} \notin \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$  is not a  $\sigma$ -field.

Suppose  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are  $\sigma$ -fields. Further suppose  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$  is a  $\sigma$ -field, then what is the relation between  $\mathcal{A}_1$  &  $\mathcal{A}_2$ ?

The relation is either  $\mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{A}_2$  or  $\mathcal{A}_2 \subset \mathcal{A}_1$ .

Proof: If possible suppose  $\mathcal{A}_1 \not\subset \mathcal{A}_2$  or  $\mathcal{A}_2 \not\subset \mathcal{A}_1$

$\Rightarrow \exists$  set  $B_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1$  but  $B_1 \notin \mathcal{A}_2$

$\nexists \exists$  set  $B_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2$  but  $B_2 \notin \mathcal{A}_1$

Now

$B_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \Rightarrow B_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$

$B_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2 \Rightarrow B_2 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$

Now

$B_1 \cup B_2 \in \mathcal{A}_1 \because B_2 \notin \mathcal{A}_1$

$B_1 \cup B_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2 \because B_1 \notin \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow B_1 \cup B_2 \notin \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$  is not closed under finite union

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$  is not a field.



(18)  $\Rightarrow A_1 \cup A_2$  is not a  $\sigma$ -field.

which is a contradiction.

Thus our assumption must be wrong.

$\Rightarrow A_1 \cup A_2$  is a  $\sigma$ -field iff  
either  $A_1 \subset A_2$  or  $A_2 \subset A_1$ .

—x—

Given a class  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $\Omega$ , find the  
smallest  $\sigma$ -field containing  $\mathcal{C}$ .

$\rightarrow$  Note that power set of  $\Omega$  always contains  $\mathcal{C}$ .  
 $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  is a  $\sigma$ -field.

Now to find smallest  $\sigma$ -field containing  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  
let us consider the collection of all  $\sigma$ -fields,  
that contain  $\mathcal{C}$ .

i.e. let  $\{A_t, t \in T\}$  be such that  $A_t \supset \mathcal{C}, \forall t \in T$ .

Let  $A = \bigcap_{t \in T} A_t \supset \mathcal{C}$

We know that  $A$  is also a  $\sigma$ -field.

$\& A \subset A_t \forall t \in T$

Thus  $A$  is the smallest  $\sigma$ -field containing  $\mathcal{C}$ .

—x—

Def:  $\sigma$ -field generated by class  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a non-empty collection of subsets  
of  $\Omega$ . Then the smallest  $\sigma$ -field containing  
the class  $\mathcal{C}$  is called the  $\sigma$ -field generated  
by class  $\mathcal{C}$  & is denoted by  $\sigma(\mathcal{C})$ .

[Remark]: If  $\mathcal{C}$  itself is a  $\sigma$ -field then  
 $\sigma(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}$ .

But if  $\mathcal{C}$  is simply a non-empty  
collection, to reach up to  $\sigma$ -field containing  
 $\mathcal{C}$ , we need to add all possibly required sets,  
such that it becomes a  $\sigma$ -field.

e.g. let  $A \subset \Omega$  &  $\mathcal{C} = \{A\}$

then  $\sigma(\mathcal{C}) = \{A, \phi, \Omega, A'\}$

Thus  $\mathcal{C} \subset \sigma(\mathcal{C})$

—x—

(19) let  $\mathcal{C} = \{A, B\}, A, B \subset \Omega$

then  $\sigma(\mathcal{C}) = \{\emptyset, \Omega, A, B, A', B', A \cup B, A \cap B, A \cup B', A' \cup B, A' \cup B', A \cap B', A' \cap B, A' \cap B', \dots\}$

Borel  $\sigma$ -field : —

let  $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$ . Then the  $\sigma$ -field defined over real line is known as Borel  $\sigma$ -field & is denoted by  $\mathcal{B}$ .

How to generate Borel  $\sigma$ -field?

Define

$$\mathcal{F} = \{A \mid A \text{ is a finite union of sets of the type } (a, b], (-\infty, \alpha], (\beta, \infty)\}$$

$$a \leq b, a, b, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is a field. why?

e.g.  ~~$(-\infty, 5] \cap (5, \infty) = \emptyset$~~

$$(-\infty, 5] \cup (5, \infty) = \mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{F}$$

$$\text{Let } a=5, b=5 \text{ then } (5, 5] = \emptyset \in \mathcal{F}$$

$$\text{Thus } \emptyset, \mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Further  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under finite unions.

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is a field.

Then the  $\sigma$  field generated by  $\mathcal{F}$  i.e.  $\sigma(\mathcal{F})$  is known as the Borel- $\sigma$ -field.

$$\text{Thus } \mathcal{B} = \sigma(\mathcal{F})$$

Borel- $\sigma$ -field can also be generated as follows.

Define the following 4 classes of subsets of  $\mathbb{R}$ .

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \{I \mid I = (a, b), -\infty < a \leq b < \infty\}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_2 = \{I \mid I = [a, b], -\infty < a \leq b < \infty\}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_3 = \{I \mid I = (a, b], -\infty < a \leq b < \infty\}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_4 = \{I \mid I = [a, b), -\infty < a \leq b < \infty\}$$

(20)

Remark: Any member of any class can be written as member of other class.

e.g. let  $A_n = (a, b - \frac{1}{n}]$ ,  $n=1, 2, \dots$

then  $A_n \in \mathcal{C}_3$ . Note that  $A_n \uparrow (a, b)$

$$\text{i.e. } \lim_n A_n = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}_1$$

i.e. set in  $\mathcal{C}_1$  can be written as limits of sets in  $\mathcal{C}_3$ .

Similarly

$$(\alpha, \beta] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\alpha, \beta + \frac{1}{n})$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\in \mathcal{C}_3$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\in \mathcal{C}_1$$

OR

$$[a, b] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a - \frac{1}{n}, b + \frac{1}{n})$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\in \mathcal{C}_2$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\in \mathcal{C}_1$$

Thus it does not matter, among  $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2, \mathcal{C}_3, \mathcal{C}_4$  which one we choose.

$$\text{Then } \sigma(\mathcal{C}_1) = \sigma(\mathcal{C}_2) = \sigma(\mathcal{C}_3) = \sigma(\mathcal{C}_4) = \mathcal{B}.$$

[Smallest  $\sigma$ -field containing  $\mathcal{C}_1$  OR  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\mathcal{C}_1$ ]

This is how Borel  $\sigma$ -field is generated

Extended real line:

Real line  $(-\infty, \infty) = \mathbb{R}$

Extended real line  $[-\infty, \infty] = \bar{\mathbb{R}}$

$\sigma$ -field over  $\mathbb{R}$ : Borel  $\sigma$ -field ( $\mathcal{B}$ )

$\sigma$ -field over  $\bar{\mathbb{R}}$ : extended Borel  $\sigma$ -field ( $\bar{\mathcal{B}}$ )



(21) Def: Set  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  are called Borel sets.

Examples of Borel sets: open sets, closed set, semi-open or semiclosed sets, singleton sets, set of all rationals, set of all irrationals etc are all Borel sets.

\* Remark: Note that Borel sets are always subset of  $\mathcal{Q}$ , but every subset of  $\mathcal{R}$  need not be a Borel set.

\* Remark: To describe a Borel set is highly impossible. We can simply give a number of examples of Borel sets.

—x—

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  be some abstract space & let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a fixed  $\sigma$ -field of subsets of  $\Omega$ .

Then  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  is known as a Measurable space.

Similarly,  $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$  is also a measurable space.

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space. Sets belonging to  $\mathcal{A}$  are known as measurable sets (mble sets).

e.g. let  $A, B \subset \Omega$ .

let  $\mathcal{A}_1 = \{\emptyset, \Omega, A, A'\}$

$\mathcal{A}_2 = \{\emptyset, \Omega, B, B'\}$

then  $A$  is mble w.r.t.  $\mathcal{A}_1$  but not mble w.r.t.  $\mathcal{A}_2$ .

Thus whenever a measurable space is defined, the  $\sigma$ -field has to be kept fixed.

Then the mble sets are also fixed.

Now the question is how to measure a mble set?

For this, we have the concept of set function, which assigns every mble set some value over  $\mathcal{R}$  or  $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ .

Set function:

Def: A function  $\psi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}}$  is known as a set function.

e.g. let  $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{B})$  be a mble space

let  $B = \{5, 7\}$ ,  $C = \{2, 4, 8\}$  etc.

1) define  $\psi(B) = \text{no. of elements in } B \Rightarrow \psi(B) = 2, \psi(C) = 3$  etc.