

Remarks on Measurable Sets and Functions

Roy O. Davies¹

(October 19, 1965)

A. J. Goldman (On measurable sets and functions, J. Res. NBS **69B** (Math. and Math. Phys.) Nos. 1 and 2, 99–100 (1965)) conjectured that the Borel sets are characterized by their property of having measurable inverse images under all Lebesgue measurable functions: here it is pointed out that the existence of analytic non-Borel sets refutes this and a related conjecture. Also an error in Goldman's Theorem 2 is corrected.

Key Words: Measure, integration, real function.

We deal exclusively with subsets of the real line R , and with real-valued functions having R as domain. Let (BS) and (BF) denote the respective families of Borel sets and Borel-measurable functions, while (LS) and (LF) denote the respective families of Lebesgue-measurable sets and functions. Then $f \in (LF)$ if and only if

$$f^{-1}(B) \in (LS) \quad \text{for all } B \in (BS). \quad (1)$$

Recently Goldman² asked whether (1) characterized (BS) , in the sense of the following

CONJECTURE: *If S is not in (BS) , then there is an $f \in (LF)$ such that $f^{-1}(S)$ is not in (LS) .*

We can *disprove* this conjecture as follows. Let

$$n = \{n(1), n(2), \dots\}$$

be generic notation for an infinite sequence of positive integers. If $\tilde{\gamma}$ is a family of sets, then any set

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} F(n(1), \dots, n(r)),$$

where each $F(n(1), \dots, n(r)) \in \tilde{\gamma}$, is said to be "obtained from $\tilde{\gamma}$ by operation (\mathcal{A}) ". If $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\gamma})$ consists of all sets obtainable from $\tilde{\gamma}$ by operation (\mathcal{A}) , then for any function f ,

$$f^{-1}(\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\gamma})) = \mathcal{A}(f^{-1}(\tilde{\gamma})). \quad (2)$$

When $\tilde{\gamma} = (BS)$, $\mathcal{A}(\tilde{\gamma})$ is called the class of *analytic sets*, and it is known³ that

$$(BS) \subset \mathcal{A}(BS) \text{ but } (BS) \neq \mathcal{A}(BS). \quad (3)$$

For any $f \in (LF)$, it follows from (1) and (2) that

$$f^{-1}(\mathcal{A}(BS)) \subset \mathcal{A}(LS). \quad (4)$$

It is also known⁴ that (LS) is closed under operation (\mathcal{A}) , so that (4) implies

$$f^{-1}(\mathcal{A}(BS)) \subset (LS) \quad \text{for all } f \in (LF). \quad (5)$$

Considering $S \in \mathcal{A}(BS) - (BS)$, as permitted by (3), we are led *via* (5) to a contradiction of the conjecture.

Denote functional composition by an asterisk $((f * g)(x) = f(g(x)))$, and let (LCF) be the class of functions f such that

$$g \in (LF) \text{ implies } f * g \in (LF).$$

Goldman (Theorem 4, *op cit*) also showed that we should have

$$(BF) = (LCF) \quad (6)$$

if the Conjecture were true. That (6) fails together with the Conjecture can be proved by choosing as f the characteristic function of some $S \in \mathcal{A}(BS) - (BS)$; clearly f is not in (BF) , but for any $B \in (BS)$ we have $f^{-1}(B)$ a member of $\mathcal{A}(BS)$, namely R or \emptyset or S or $R - S$,

¹ Department of Mathematics, The University, Leicester, United Kingdom.

² A. J. Goldman, On measurable sets and functions, J. Res. NBS **69B** (Math. and Math. Phys.) Nos. 1 and 2, 99–100 (1965).

³ K. Kuratowski, *Topologie* **1**, 2d ed. (Warsaw, 1948), p. 391.

⁴ K. Kuratowski, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

so that for any $g \in (LF)$ it follows from (5) that

$$(f * g)^{-1}(B) = g^{-1}(f^{-1}(B)) \in (LS),$$

proving $f * g \in (LF)$ and hence $f \in (LCF)$.

Thus the problem of finding a satisfactory characterization of (LCF) remains open. If (QS) is the class of sets Q such that

$$g^{-1}(Q) \in (LS) \quad \text{for all } g \in (LF),$$

then $f \in (LCF)$ if and only if

$$f^{-1}(B) \in (QS) \quad \text{for all } B \in (BS).$$

Hence characterizing (LCF) is closely related to characterizing (QS) .

Finally, Goldman's Theorem 2 (*op cit*) should be amended to read as follows:

THEOREM: For any $B \in (BS)$ and $L \in (LS)$, with sole exceptions $(B = \phi, L \neq \phi)$ and $(B = R, L \neq R)$, there is an $f \in (LF)$ such that $L = f^{-1}(B)$.

PROOF: If $B = \phi$ and $L = \phi$, or $B = R$ and $L = R$, then any $f \in (LF)$ will do. If $B = \phi$ and $L \neq \phi$, or $B = R$ and $L \neq R$, then no f will do. Finally, if $B \neq \phi$ and $B \neq R$, then we can define f on L so that $f(L) \subset B$, and on $R - L$ so that $f(R - L) \subset R - B$.

(Paper 70B1-169)