

2.1 A NONMEASURABLE CONVOLUTION

Objektyp: **Chapter**

Zeitschrift: **L'Enseignement Mathématique**

Band (Jahr): **45 (1999)**

Heft 3-4: **L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE**

PDF erstellt am: **24.04.2024**

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

in paragraph 2.1 a simple example of a nonmeasurable F , with the right hand side of (1) being of convolution type. On the other hand, Theorem 3.1 contains a positive result, almost yielding $\mathcal{A}_0$ -measurability of F under additional assumptions.

Now assume that we are also given a σ -finite measure μ on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}_0)$. Let us further assume that the function F from (1) is $\mathcal{A}_0$ -measurable and, similarly, that $G := \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x, \cdot) d\mu(x)$ is $\mathcal{B}$ -measurable. Does it then follow that the “Fubini identity” $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} G(y) d\nu(y) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} F(x) d\mu(x)$ holds? Again, the answer is no, as Sierpiński (1920) remarked, essentially by specializing his construction mentioned above. This counterexample has found its way into a number of books, for example Rudin (1987) and Royden (1988), as showing that the assumption of measurability of f with respect to the product σ -algebra $\mathcal{A}_0 \otimes \mathcal{B}$ in the Fubini theorem is not superfluous. In its construction the axiom of choice is still used. The continuum hypothesis is needed only if one insists on specifying the measure spaces, for example as Lebesgue measure. That something beyond the axiom of choice is really needed in the latter case has been proved by Friedman (1980). Below we give, without using the axiom of choice or the continuum hypothesis, a simple construction of a Borel set $A \subset \mathbf{R}$ and of two σ -finite measures μ and ν , defined on suitable σ -algebras on $\mathbf{R}$, such that

$$(2) \quad \int_{\mathbf{R}} \left[\int_{\mathbf{R}} 1_A(x+y) d\mu(x) \right] d\nu(y) \neq \int_{\mathbf{R}} \left[\int_{\mathbf{R}} 1_A(x+y) d\nu(y) \right] d\mu(x),$$

with both iterated integrals existing.

2. NONMEASURABILITY AND A FUBINI COUNTEREXAMPLE

2.1 A NONMEASURABLE CONVOLUTION

In this section, we show that a convolution

$$(3) \quad F := \int_{\mathbf{R}} g(\cdot - y)h(y) dy,$$

with g being a nonnegative bounded Borel function and h nonnegative continuous with compact support, need not be measurable with respect to

$$(4) \quad \mathcal{A}_0 := \sigma(\{g(\cdot - y) : y \in \mathbf{R}\}),$$

the σ -algebra generated by the translates of g . This yields in particular a counterexample to the measurability of F from (1), with $f(x, y) = g(x-y)h(y)$,

$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbf{R}$, $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0$ from (4), $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}) :=$ Borel σ -algebra on $\mathbf{R}$, and $\nu = \lambda :=$ Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$.

The construction becomes clearer if we first drop the nonnegativity and boundedness conditions imposed on g , for which the necessary modifications are indicated afterwards.

Remember that a set $A \subset \mathbf{R}$ is called *meager* [or of the first category] if there is a sequence of closed and nowhere dense sets $F_n \subset \mathbf{R}$ with $A \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbf{N}} F_n$. Correspondingly, a set $B \subset \mathbf{R}$ is called *comeager* if its complement B^c is meager, which is equivalent to the existence of a sequence of dense open sets $G_n \subset \mathbf{R}$ with $B \supset \bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} G_n$. It is easily checked that

$$(5) \quad \mathcal{A} := \{A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}) : A \text{ meager or comeager}\}$$

is a σ -algebra on $\mathbf{R}$. By Baire's theorem, every comeager set is dense in $\mathbf{R}$. [We have claimed in the introduction not to use the axiom of choice in constructing this example and the one in 2.2. So we have to note here that we are applying Baire's theorem only in $\mathbf{R}$, a *separable* complete metric space, where no form of the axiom of choice is needed in its proof. Compare Oxtoby (1980), page 95.] It follows that, for example, the set $[0, \infty[$ is neither meager nor comeager. Hence we surely have the strict inclusion

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{A} \subsetneq \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R}).$$

Now choose $A \in \mathcal{A}$ meager with $\lambda(A^c) = 0$, for example as in Oxtoby (1980), pages 4–5. Put

$$(7) \quad g(x) := x 1_A(x) \quad (x \in \mathbf{R}),$$

$$(8) \quad h(x) := (1 - |x|)_+ \quad (x \in \mathbf{R}),$$

and define F as in (3) and $\mathcal{A}_0$ as in (4). Then

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A},$$

because every $g(\cdot - y)$ is Borel and vanishes on the comeager set $(y + A)^c$, and is hence $\mathcal{A}$ -measurable. On the other hand, since $\lambda(A^c) = 0$ and $\int h \, dy = 1$, $\int y h(y) \, dy = 0$,

$$(10) \quad F(x) = \int_{\mathbf{R}} (x - y) h(y) \, dy = x \quad (x \in \mathbf{R}).$$

Hence $\sigma(F)$, the σ -algebra generated by F , is just $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$, and by (6), (9) it follows that F is not $\mathcal{A}_0$ -measurable.

To obtain that same conclusion for a nonnegative and bounded g , we may replace g from (7) by $g(x) := (\pi/2 + \arctan x) 1_A(x)$. Instead of calculating F explicitly, we then argue that F is still strictly increasing, and this suffices to deduce that $\sigma(F) = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$.