

pfs12.tex

**Lecture 2.** 10.10.2012

*Definition.* A  $\sigma$ -field (or  $\sigma$ -algebra)  $\mathcal{A}$  is a class containing the whole set, closed under complements, and closed under countable disjoint unions (the " $\sigma$ " here is from the German Summe = sum – the old-fashioned notation for a union is a sum).

The natural domain of definition of a measure is a  $\sigma$ -field:

*Definition.* A *measurable space* is a pair  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $\sigma$ -field of sets  $A \subset \Omega$ .

A *measure space* is a triple  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ , where  $\mu$  is a measure defined on  $\mathcal{A}$  (that is,  $\mu(A)$  is defined on all the sets  $A \subset \Omega$ ).

A *probability measure* is a measure  $P$  of mass 1,  $P(\Omega) = 1$ ; then  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  is a *probability space*.

Axiomatic Probability Theory as Measure Theory for measures of mass 1 is due to A. N. KOLMOGOROV (1903-87) in his 1933 book *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*.

*Examples.* On the real line  $\mathbf{R}$ , the intervals  $I; [a, b]$  are (Lebesgue) measurable, with (Lebesgue) measure

$$\mu([a, b]) := b - a. \quad (L)$$

The  $\sigma$ -field generated by the intervals (= smallest  $\sigma$ -field containing the intervals, = intersection of all  $\sigma$ -fields containing the intervals – this is a  $\sigma$ -field) is called the *Borel*  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{B}$ ; its sets are called the *Borel sets*  $B$  (Emile BOREL (1871-1956, thesis of 1893). One can check that it does not matter whether we use closed intervals  $[a, b]$ , open ones  $(a, b)$ , half-open ones  $(a, b]$ ,  $[a, b)$ , semi-infinite intervals  $(-\infty, a]$ , etc. – they all generate the same  $\sigma$ -field.

A subset of a Borel set of measure 0 need not be a Borel set. Nevertheless, one feels that "a subset of a set of measure 0 should also have measure 0" – or, as we call sets of measure 0 *null sets*, "a subset of a nullset should also be a null set". It turns out that this is true for the  $\sigma$ -field generated by the *intervals and the null sets* together. These are called the *Lebesgue measurable sets*,  $\mathcal{L}$ . This process of including all subsets of null sets as null sets always works, and is called *completion*. Thus  $\mathcal{L}$  is the completion of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

The measure  $\mu$  obtained on  $\mathcal{L}$  from (L) in this way is called *Lebesgue measure*;  $\mathcal{L}$  is the natural domain of definition of  $\mu$ .

Of course, the real line  $\mathbf{R}$  has infinite Lebesgue measure (= length). But, it often suffices in Analysis, and even more in Probability, so work with the

unit interval  $[0, 1]$ . Then  $([0, 1], \mathcal{L}, \lambda)$ , where  $\mathcal{L}$  here denotes the Lebesgue-measurable subsets of  $[0, 1]$  and  $\mu$  Lebesgue measure on them, is called the *Lebesgue probability space* (see below).

*Measurable functions; integrals.* If  $f$  is a function from a measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  to the reals  $(\mathbf{R}, \mathcal{B})$ , one calls  $f$  *measurable* if

$$f^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}$$

– that is, inverse images of Borel sets are measurable.

These are the ‘nice’ functions, and we may restrict ourselves to them.

A (measurable) function of the form

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i I_{(a_i, b_i]}$$

is called a *simple function*. We can define the *integral*  $\int f d\mu$  of a simple function with respect to the measure  $\mu$  by

$$\int f d\mu := \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mu((a_i, b_i])$$

when this is finite; we then say that  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable, and write  $f \in L_1(\mu)$  (L for Lebesgue; 1 for the first power,  $f$ ). When it is  $+\infty$ ,  $\int f d\mu$  is undefined and  $f$  is not  $\mu$ -integrable.

It turns out that a non-negative measurable function  $f$  is always the increasing limit of simple functions  $f_n$ , and that

$$\int f d\mu := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int f_n d\mu$$

defines  $\int f d\mu$  uniquely (there are many such increasing sequences  $f_n$ , but they all give the same limit above).

Writing

$$x_+ := \max(x, 0), \quad x_- := -\min(x, 0)$$

for the *positive part* and *negative part* of  $x$ , we may check that

$$|x| = x_+ + x_-, \quad x = x_+ - x_-.$$

We can extend the definition above from non-negative measurable functions to general measurable functions by linearity:

$$\int f d\mu := \int f_+ d\mu - \int f_- d\mu.$$

Of course, this only holds when both integrals on the right are defined (are finite). So then

$$\int |f| d\mu = \int f_+ d\mu + \int f_- d\mu.$$

Thus  $f$  is  $\mu$ -integrable iff  $|f|$  is: the (measure-theoretic) integral here is an *absolute* integral, as we saw before. Also, the integral is easily seen to be *linear*: if  $f, g \in L_1(\mu)$  and  $a, b$  are constants, then  $af + bg \in L_1(\mu)$  and

$$\int (af + bg) d\mu = a \int f d\mu + b \int g d\mu.$$

As one might suspect from the definition above, one can change the values of  $f$  on a  $\mu$ -null set without changing the value of  $\int f d\mu$ . So: we are really dealing here with, not individual functions  $f$  themselves, but *equivalence classes*, under the equivalence relation

$$f \equiv g \quad \text{iff} \quad f = g \quad \mu - a.e.,$$

where ‘ $\mu$ -a.e.’ (‘ $\mu$ -almost everywhere’ means ‘except on a  $\mu$ -null set’).

For us, our (positive) measure (or integrator)  $\mu$ , a set-function, will be obtained from a (non-decreasing) point function (which to save letters we also write  $\mu$ ), vanishing at some reference point  $x_0$ , by

$$\mu((a, b]) = \mu(b) - \mu(a). \quad (LS)$$

The LS here is for *Lebesgue-Stieltjes* (the  $\mu$  on the left is a LS *measure*, that on the right is a LS *measure function*). Thus for Lebesgue measure  $\mu(x) \equiv x$  and  $x_0 = 0$ ; for probability measures  $P$ , the point function is the distribution function (below), and  $x_0 = -\infty$ .

*Random variables.* When the measure space is a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$ , we call the sets  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  *events*. These are the sets  $A$  whose probabilities  $P(A)$  are defined (this is consistent, both with ordinary speech and with usage in one’s first exposure to Probability). We call a measurable function a *random variable*. In this case, we will use notation such as  $X, Y$  etc. rather than  $f, g$  etc. We call  $\int_{\Omega} X dP$  the *expectation* of  $X$ ,  $E[X]$ :

$$E[X] := \int_{\Omega} X dP.$$

By above, the expectation is *linear*:

$$E[aX + bY] = aE[X] + bE[Y].$$

*Note.* We need an absolute integral, as here, to get linearity of expectation. Without the restriction that  $E[X]$  exists iff  $E[|X|]$  exists, linearity of the expectation may fail. Recall from Analysis: *absolutely* convergent sums, integrals etc. may be rearranged at will. *Conditionally* convergent sums, integrals etc. are very dangerous: they result from ‘cancelling infinities’. Note also that  $a + b$  makes sense, not just for real numbers  $a$  and  $b$ , but for one or both of  $a$  or  $b + \infty$  (then their sum is also  $+\infty$ ); similarly for  $-\infty$ . But we must avoid the meaningless symbol “ $\infty - \infty$ ”. In much the same way, we must avoid the meaningless “ $0/0$ ”, as we know from Calculus.

*Distribution functions.* If  $X$  is a random variable (measurable function), the inverse image  $X^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{A}$  for all Borel sets  $B$  – equivalently, this holds for all  $B$  in some set that generates the Borel  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{B}$ . The half-lines  $(-\infty, x]$  ( $x \in \mathbf{R}$ ) form such a set. So  $X$  is a random variable (rv) iff  $X^{-1}((-\infty, x]) \in \mathcal{A}$  for each  $x$ , that is,  $\{X \leq x\} \in \mathcal{A}$  (is an event), that is, iff

$$F(x) := P(\{X \leq x\})$$

is defined. Now the function  $F$  here (or  $F_X$ , if we need to distinguish between  $F_X$  and  $F_Y$  say) is called the (probability) *distribution function* (or just distribution, or d/n fn) is defined:  *$X$  is a random variable iff its distribution function is defined.*

*Densities.* If for some function  $f \geq 0$  one has

$$F(x) := P(\{X \leq x\}) = \int_{-\infty}^x f(u) du \quad (x \in \mathbf{R}),$$

one calls  $f$  the (probability) *density* (function) of  $F$ , or  $X$ . Call this the *density case*, and such  $F$  *absolutely continuous* (SP L7). Then  $f \geq 0$  corresponds to  $F$  non-decreasing. Then  $F'(x) = f(x)$ , but only a.e. (SP L7).

*Example: the uniform distribution  $U[0, 1]$ .* On the Lebesgue probability space,  $U$  is a uniformly distributed random variable:

$$P(U \in (a, b]) = b - a \quad (0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1)$$

(‘probability = length’). This has distribution and density functions

$$F(x) = 0 \quad (x \leq 0), \quad x \quad (0 \leq x \leq 1), \quad 1 \quad (x \geq 1); \quad f(x) = I_{[0,1]}(x).$$

Here  $F$  fails to be differentiable at the end-points 0 and 1 of the support interval  $[0, 1]$  – but this exceptional set is of measure 0.