

**Option 1: Exercises on measure spaces****Exercise [1.1.4]**

1.  $A$  and  $B \setminus A$  are disjoint with  $B = A \cup (B \setminus A)$  so  $\mathbf{P}(A) + \mathbf{P}(B \setminus A) = \mathbf{P}(B)$  and rearranging gives the desired result.
2. Let  $A'_n = A_n \cap A$ ,  $B_1 = A'_1$  and for  $n > 1$ ,  $B_n = A'_n \setminus \cup_{m=1}^{n-1} A'_m$ . Since the  $B_n$  are disjoint and have union  $A$  we have using (a) and  $B_m \subseteq A_m$

$$\mathbf{P}(A) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(B_m) \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(A_m)$$

3. Consider the disjoint sets  $B_n = A_n \setminus A_{n-1}$  for which  $\cup_{m=1}^{\infty} B_m = A$ , and  $\cup_{m=1}^n B_m = A_n$ . Then,

$$\mathbf{P}(A) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(B_m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{P}(B_m) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(A_n)$$

4.  $A_n^c \uparrow A^c$ , so (c) implies  $\mathbf{P}(A_n^c) \uparrow \mathbf{P}(A^c)$ . Since  $\mathbf{P}(B^c) = 1 - \mathbf{P}(B)$  it follows that  $\mathbf{P}(A_n) \downarrow \mathbf{P}(A)$ .

**Exercise [1.1.13]**

- (a) Let  $\mathcal{G} = \bigcap_{\alpha} \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$ , with each  $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$  a  $\sigma$ -algebra. Since  $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$  a  $\sigma$ -algebra, we have that  $\Omega \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$ , and as this applies for all  $\alpha$ , it follows that  $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}$ . Suppose now that  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ . That is,  $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha$ . Since each  $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra, it follows that  $A^c \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha$ , and hence  $A^c \in \mathcal{G}$ . Similarly, let  $A = \bigcup_i A_i$  for some countable collection  $A_1, A_2, \dots$  of elements of  $\mathcal{G}$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{G}$ , necessarily  $A_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$  for all  $i$  and every  $\alpha$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra, we deduce that  $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha}$ , and as this applies for all  $\alpha$ , it follows that  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ .
- (b) We verify the conditions for  $\sigma$ -algebra.
  - (a)  $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}$  and  $\Omega \cap H = H \in \mathcal{H}$ . Hence  $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}^H$ .
  - (b) Suppose  $A \in \mathcal{H}^H$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra and  $A \in \mathcal{G}$ , we have  $A^c \in \mathcal{G}$ . Note that  $A^c \cap H = (A \cap H)^c \cap H$ . Since by definition  $A \cap H \in \mathcal{H}$ , we have  $A^c \cap H \in \mathcal{H}$  as well. Hence  $A^c \in \mathcal{H}^H$ .
  - (c) Suppose  $A_i \in \mathcal{H}^H$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $A_i \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\bigcup_i A_i \in \mathcal{G}$ . Also,  $(\bigcup_i A_i) \cap H = \bigcup_i (A_i \cap H) \in \mathcal{H}$  since each component  $A_i \cap H \in \mathcal{H}$ . Thus,  $\bigcup_i A_i \in \mathcal{H}^H$ .

Therefore,  $\mathcal{H}^H$  as defined is a  $\sigma$ -algebra.

- (c) Suppose we have  $H_1 \subseteq H_2$ . We want to show that  $\mathcal{H}^{H_2} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{H_1}$ . In fact, given any  $A \in \mathcal{H}^{H_2}$ , since  $H_1 \subseteq H_2$ , we have  $A \cap H_1 = (A \cap H_2) \cap H_1$ .  $A \cap H_2 \in \mathcal{H}$  by definition and we also know  $H_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ . This implies  $A \cap H_1 \in \mathcal{H}$ . Also,  $A \in \mathcal{G}$  by definition. Thus,  $A \in \mathcal{H}^{H_1}$ . Since the choice of  $A$  is arbitrary, we

conclude  $\mathcal{H}^{H_2} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{H_1}$ .

$\mathcal{H}^\Omega = \{A \in \mathcal{G} : A \cap \Omega \in \mathcal{H}\} = \{A \in \mathcal{G} : A \in \mathcal{H}\} = \mathcal{H}$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{H}^\emptyset = \{A \in \mathcal{G} : A \cap \emptyset \in \mathcal{H}\} = \{A \in \mathcal{G} : \emptyset \in \mathcal{H}\} = \mathcal{G}$  due to the fact that whichever  $A$  is chosen in  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\emptyset$  is always in  $\mathcal{H}$ .

First note  $H \subseteq H \cup H'$ . By the monotonicity derived above,  $\mathcal{H}^{H \cup H'} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^H$ . For the same reason,  $\mathcal{H}^{H \cup H'} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{H'}$ . This results in one direction,  $\mathcal{H}^{H \cup H'} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^H \cap \mathcal{H}^{H'}$ . We are left to prove the other direction. In fact, if  $A \in \mathcal{H}^H \cap \mathcal{H}^{H'}$ , we have  $A \cap H \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $A \cap H' \in \mathcal{H}$ , and thus  $A \cap (H \cup H') = (A \cap H) \cup (A \cap H') \in \mathcal{H}$ . By definition, we know  $A \in \mathcal{H}^{H \cup H'}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{H}^H \cap \mathcal{H}^{H'} \subseteq \mathcal{H}^{H \cup H'}$ . We conclude  $\mathcal{H}^H \cap \mathcal{H}^{H'} = \mathcal{H}^{H \cup H'}$ .

### Exercise [1.1.21]

It suffices to show that if  $\mathcal{F}$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $\{(a_1, b_1) \times \cdots \times (a_d, b_d)\}$ , then  $\mathcal{F}$  contains (a) the open sets and (b) all sets of the form  $A_1 \times \cdots \times A_d$  where  $A_i \in \mathcal{B}$ . For (a), note that if  $G$  is open and  $x \in G$  then there is a set of the form  $(a_1, b_1) \times \cdots \times (a_d, b_d)$  with  $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Q}$  that contains  $x$  and lies in  $G$ , so any open set is a countable union of these basic sets ( $(a_1, b_1) \times \cdots \times (a_d, b_d)$  with  $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ ). In this argument we relied on the fact that there are only countably many such basic sets, hence we are not bothered by the fact that there are uncountably many points  $x$  in  $G$ .

For (b), fix  $A_2, \dots, A_d$  and let  $\mathcal{G} = \{A : A \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_d \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra it is easy to see that if  $\mathbb{R} \in \mathcal{G}$  then  $\mathcal{G}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra so if  $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \mathcal{A}$  then  $\mathcal{G} \supseteq \sigma(\mathcal{A})$ . Applying this for  $A_i = (a_i, b_i)$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, d$  it follows that if  $A_1 \in \mathcal{B}$  then  $A_1 \times (a_2, b_2) \times \cdots \times (a_d, b_d) \in \mathcal{F}$ . Repeating now the preceding argument for  $\mathcal{G} = \{A : A_1 \times A \times A_3 \times \cdots \times A_d \in \mathcal{F}\}$ ,  $A_1 \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $A_i = (a_i, b_i)$ ,  $i = 3, \dots, d$ , shows that if  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ , then  $A_1 \times A_2 \times (a_3, b_3) \times \cdots \times (a_d, b_d) \in \mathcal{F}$ . Applying this type of argument  $d-2$  more times, proves the assertion (b).

### Exercise [1.1.22]

We have  $\mathcal{F} = \sigma(A_\alpha, \alpha \in \Gamma)$ , and want to show that every set  $B$  in  $\mathcal{F}$  has a certain property. The property in this problem is  $B \in \sigma(\{A_{\alpha_j}, j \geq 1\})$ , for some countable  $\{\alpha_j\} \subset \Gamma$ , but ignore that for now, because the method indicated here applies very generally, and will be used again. Notice first that every set  $A_\alpha$  in the generating class has the property. Now consider the class  $\mathcal{C}$  of all sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  that have the property. We have already shown that each  $A_\alpha$  is in this class; the problem is to show that all sets in  $\mathcal{F}$  are in this class. Luckily, the “property” is such that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra (check: this is the only calculation in this problem). So  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra which contains all the  $A_\alpha$ , hence it contains  $\mathcal{F}$ , because  $\mathcal{F}$  is the intersection of all  $\sigma$ -algebras that contain all the  $A_\alpha$ .

### Exercise [1.1.33]

Let  $\Omega = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and  $\mathcal{A} = \{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \Omega\}$  for which  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) = 2^\Omega$ . Define  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  by  $\mu(\{1\}) = \mu(\{2\}) = \mu(\{3\}) = \mu(\{4\}) = 1/4$  and  $\nu(\{1\}) = \nu(\{2\}) = 1/3$ ,  $\nu(\{3\}) = \nu(\{4\}) = 1/6$ .

## Option 2: The Banach-Tarski paradox in one dimension

### A1

For the first direction, let  $f : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be an equidecomposition. and define  $B_i = f(A_i) = B_i + t_i$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since  $\{A_i\}$  is a countable partition of  $A$ , it is sufficient to show that  $\{B_i\}$  is a countable partition of  $B$ . Indeed  $B_i \cap B_j = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$  follows from the injectivity of  $f$  (because otherwise there would be  $y \in B_i \cap B_j$  whence  $y = f(x_i)$ , and  $y = f(x_j)$  for some  $x_i \in A_i$ ,  $x_j \in A_j$  distinct). Further,  $f(A) = \bigcup_i f(A_i) = \bigcup_i B_i$ , and since  $f$  is surjective,  $f(A) = B$ .

To prove the converse, assume  $\{A_i\}$  and  $\{B_i\}$  to be partitions (respectively) of  $A$  and  $B$ , and let  $\{t_i\}$  be the such that  $B_i = A_i + t_i$ . Define  $f$  by letting  $f|_{A_i} = R_{t_i}|_{A_i}$ . This map is clearly bijective (with  $f^{-1}|_{B_i} = R_{-t_i}|_{A_i}$ ).

## A2

Let  $A' \subseteq A$ ,  $B' \subseteq B$ , and consider the bijective equidecompositions  $f : A \rightarrow B'$  and  $g : B \rightarrow A'$ .

As suggested, we define  $A^{(0)} \equiv A \setminus g(B)$ , and  $A^{(*)} \equiv \cup_{n=0}^{\infty} (g \circ f)^n(A^{(0)})$ . Let  $h : A \rightarrow B$  be defined by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in A^{(*)}, \\ g^{-1}(x) & \text{if } x \in A \setminus A^{(*)}. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Notice that  $h$  is well defined because  $A \setminus A^{(*)} \subseteq A \setminus A^{(0)} = g(B)$ . Further, it is a countable equidecomposition. To prove this, consider the partitions  $A = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i$  and  $B = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} B_i$ , with respect to which  $f$  and  $g$  are (respectively) equidecompositions with translation parameters  $\{t_i\}$  and  $\{s_i\}$ . Then

$$A = \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (A_i \cap A^{(*)}) \right\} \cup \left\{ \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} (g(B_i) \cap (A \setminus A^{(*)})) \right\} \quad (2)$$

is a countable partition of  $A$  and it is easy to check that  $h$  is an equidecomposition with respect to this partition. Indeed  $h|_{A_i \cap A^{(*)}} = f|_{A_i \cap A^{(*)}} = R_{t_i}|_{A_i \cap A^{(*)}}$  and  $h|_{g(B_i) \cap (A \setminus A^{(*)})} = g^{-1}|_{g(B_i) \cap (A \setminus A^{(*)})} = R_{-s_i}|_{g(B_i) \cap (A \setminus A^{(*)})}$ .

It remains to prove that  $h$  is bijective. To this end, define the mapping  $l : B \rightarrow A$  by

$$l(y) = \begin{cases} f^{-1}(y) & \text{if } g(y) \in A^{(*)}, \\ g(y) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

It is not hard to prove that  $l$  is the inverse of  $h$ . Indeed, if  $x \equiv g(y) \notin A^{(*)}$ , then  $h(x) = g^{-1}(x) = y$ . On the other hand, if  $g(y) \in A^{(*)}$ , then  $g(y) = (g \circ f)^k(A^{(0)})$  for some  $k \geq 1$  (because  $A^{(0)} \cap g(B) = \emptyset$ ). By injectivity of  $g$ ,  $y = f((g \circ f)^{k-1}(x_0))$  for some  $x_0 \in A^{(0)}$ . If we let  $x = l(y) = f^{-1}(y)$ , then  $x \in A^{(*)}$  as well, whence  $h(x) = f(x) = y$ .

## B1

Consider the equivalence relation  $x \sim y$  if  $(x - y) \in \mathbb{Q}$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}$  denote the collection of its equivalence classes. For every  $E \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $E \cap [0, 1/2]$  is non-empty and by the axiom of choice, there exist a choice function  $E \mapsto x_E$  such that  $x_E \in E \cap [0, 1/2]$  for each  $E$ . Obviously  $E = x_E + \mathbb{Q}$ . Therefore

$$\mathbb{R} = \cup_{E \in \mathcal{E}} E = \cup_{E \in \mathcal{E}} \{x_E + \mathbb{Q}\} = \cup_{x \in C} \{x + \mathbb{Q}\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $C = \{x_E\}_{E \in \mathcal{E}}$ .

## B2

Since the rationals are countable, there exist partitions in isolated points

$$\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1/2] = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{q_i\}, \quad \mathbb{Q} = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{p_i\}. \quad (5)$$

Of course, for any  $i$ ,  $\{p_i\} = R_{t_i}(\{q_i\})$  if we set  $t_i = p_i - q_i$ .

## B3

Using the enumerations of  $\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1/2]$  and of  $\mathbb{Q}$  at the previous point, we get

$$A \equiv \cup_{x \in C} \{x + (\mathbb{Q} \cap [0, 1/2])\} = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{q_i + C\}, \quad \mathbb{R} = \cup_{x \in C} \{x + \mathbb{Q}\} = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{p_i + C\}. \quad (6)$$

We have  $\{p_i + C\} = R_{t_i}(\{q_i + C\})$  if we set  $t_i = p_i - q_i$  as above.

## B4

Clearly  $[0, 1]$  is equidecomposable with  $[0, 1] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  (via the identity mapping). On the other hand  $\mathbb{R}$  is equidecomposable with  $A \subseteq [0, 1]$ . By points A1, A2, this implies that  $[0, 1]$  is equidecomposable with  $\mathbb{R}$ .

This implies that there exists no measure on  $\mathbb{R}$  satisfying the following requirements

1. The measure is countably additive (As it should be).
2.  $\mu([0, 1]) \notin \{0, \infty\}$ .
3. Any set is measurable.
4.  $\mu(S) = \mu(R_t S)$  for any measurable set  $S$ .