

Math 4121
February 22, 2021 Lecture

Steven G. Krantz

February 12, 2021



Figure: This is your instructor.

The Lebesgue Integral

A New Look at Measurable Sets

Identifying Measurable Sets

In our first go-around, we decided what a measurable set was by fiat. More precisely, we defined the concept of σ -algebra and then declared, “This is the σ -algebra of measurable sets.” Now, in our new development, the point of view is different. Here we will understand measurable sets by more of a discovery method. And the measurable sets defined with our new technique will have all the desirable properties of a measure—including countable additivity.

We begin by recalling the definition of σ -algebra. We shall make considerable use of this concept in our current discussion. Compare with our consideration of σ -algebras in earlier lectures.

Definition: Let X be any set. Then a family \mathcal{X} of subsets of X is said to be a σ -*algebra* in X if these conditions are satisfied:

- (i) \emptyset and X both belong to \mathcal{X} ;
- (ii) if $E \in \mathcal{X}$, then the complement $X \setminus E$ also belongs to \mathcal{X} ;
- (iii) if $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of sets in \mathcal{X} , then the union $\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j$ also belongs to \mathcal{X} .

Remark: We note the following points.

- (a) If \mathcal{X} is a σ -algebra of subsets of X , then the intersection of a sequence of sets in \mathcal{X} also belongs to \mathcal{X} . This is an immediate consequence of de Morgan's laws.
- (b) If X is any set, then $\{\emptyset, X\}$ is a trivial example of a σ -algebra.
- (c) If X is any set and $E \subseteq X$, then $\mathcal{X} \equiv \{\emptyset, E, {}^c E, X\}$ is a σ -algebra.
- (d) If X is any set, then the power set $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is a σ -algebra.
- (e) If X is any set and if \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 are σ -algebras of subsets of X , then $\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{X}_2$ is also a σ -algebra.

Definition: Let X be a set and let \mathcal{X} be a σ -algebra of subsets of X . Then an $\widehat{\mathbb{R}}$ -valued function μ with domain \mathcal{X} is said to be a *measure* provided that

- (i) $\mu(\emptyset) = 0$;
- (ii) $0 \leq \mu(E) \leq +\infty$ for all $E \in \mathcal{X}$;
- (iii) if $\{E_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of sets in \mathcal{X} that are pairwise disjoint, then

$$\mu\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu(E_j). \quad (1)$$

Example: If $X = \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{X} = \{\text{all subsets of } X\}$, then define $\mu(E)$ to be the number of elements in E if E is a finite set and to be $+\infty$ if E is an infinite set. Then μ is a measure on \mathcal{X} . It is called the *counting measure* on \mathbb{N} .

Now we have reached a crucial juncture. We are going to explicitly define the criterion for measurability of a set.

Definition: Let m^* be the outer measure defined on all subsets of \mathbb{R} . A set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is said to satisfy the *Carathéodory condition* in case

$$m^*(A) = m^*(A \cap E) + m^*(A \setminus E) = m^*(A \cap E) + m^*(A \cap {}^c E)$$

for all subsets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. See the figure. The collection of all such sets will be denoted by \mathcal{L} .

