# **18.175:** Lecture 1 Probability spaces and $\sigma$ -algebras

Scott Sheffield

MIT

Distributions on  $\ensuremath{\mathbb{R}}$ 

Distributions on  ${\mathbb R}$ 

- Probability space is triple (Ω, F, P) where Ω is sample space, F is set of events (the σ-algebra) and P : F → [0, 1] is the probability function.
- σ-algebra is collection of subsets closed under complementation and countable unions. Call (Ω, F) a measure space.
- Measure is function µ : F → ℝ satisfying µ(A) ≥ µ(∅) = 0 for all A ∈ F and countable additivity: µ(∪<sub>i</sub>A<sub>i</sub>) = ∑<sub>i</sub> µ(A<sub>i</sub>) for disjoint A<sub>i</sub>.
- Measure  $\mu$  is probability measure if  $\mu(\Omega) = 1$ .

- monotonicity:  $A \subset B$  implies  $\mu(A) \leq \mu(B)$
- subadditivity:  $A \subset \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} A_m$  implies  $\mu(A) \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_m)$ .
- ► continuity from below: measures of sets A<sub>i</sub> in increasing sequence converge to measure of limit ∪<sub>i</sub>A<sub>i</sub>
- ► continuity from above: measures of sets A<sub>i</sub> in decreasing sequence converge to measure of intersection ∩<sub>i</sub>A<sub>i</sub>

## Why can't $\sigma$ -algebra be all subsets of $\Omega$ ?

- Uniform probability measure on [0, 1) should satisfy translation invariance: If B and a horizontal translation of B are both subsets [0, 1), their probabilities should be equal.
- Consider wrap-around translations  $\tau_r(x) = (x + r) \mod 1$ .
- By translation invariance,  $\tau_r(B)$  has same probability as B.
- Call x, y "equivalent modulo rationals" if x − y is rational (e.g., x = π − 3 and y = π − 9/4). An equivalence class is the set of points in [0, 1) equivalent to some given point.
- There are uncountably many of these classes.
- Let A ⊂ [0, 1) contain one point from each class. For each x ∈ [0, 1), there is one a ∈ A such that r = x − a is rational.
- ▶ Then each x in [0, 1) lies in  $\tau_r(A)$  for **one** rational  $r \in [0, 1)$ .
- Thus  $[0,1) = \cup \tau_r(A)$  as r ranges over rationals in [0,1).
- ▶ If P(A) = 0, then  $P(S) = \sum_{r} P(\tau_r(A)) = 0$ . If P(A) > 0 then  $P(S) = \sum_{r} P(\tau_r(A)) = \infty$ . Contradicts P(S) = 1 axiom.

18.175 Lecture 1

## Three ways to get around this

- 1. Re-examine axioms of mathematics: the very existence of a set A with one element from each equivalence class is consequence of so-called axiom of choice. Removing that axiom makes paradox goes away, since one can just suppose (pretend?) these kinds of sets don't exist.
- 2. Re-examine axioms of probability: Replace countable additivity with finite additivity? (Look up Banach-Tarski.)
- 3. Keep the axiom of choice and countable additivity but don't define probabilities of all sets: Restrict attention to some σ-algebra of measurable sets.
- Most mainstream probability and analysis takes the third approach. But good to be aware of alternatives (e.g., axiom of determinacy which implies that all sets are Lebesgue measurable).

- The Borel σ-algebra B is the smallest σ-algebra containing all open intervals.
- ► Say that B is "generated" by the collection of open intervals.
- Why does this notion make sense? If *F<sub>i</sub>* are σ-fields (for *i* in possibly uncountable index set *I*) does this imply that ∩<sub>i∈I</sub>*F<sub>i</sub>* is a σ-field?

Distributions on  $\ensuremath{\mathbb{R}}$ 

Distributions on  $\ensuremath{\mathbb{R}}$ 

MIT OpenCourseWare http://ocw.mit.edu

18.175 Theory of Probability Spring 2014

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: http://ocw.mit.edu/terms.

MIT OpenCourseWare http://ocw.mit.edu

18.175 Theory of Probability Spring 2014

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: http://ocw.mit.edu/terms.