

## CHAPTER V

### CANTOR PROPERTY OF A CLASS OF SETS

#### I

#### INTRODUCTION

In 1962 Bose Majumder (Bose Majumder, 1962b) defined the terms, an  $SD$ - set and a set having properties  $\sigma$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\delta$ . In the following we shall in general consider subsets of  $E$  ( $0 \leq x \leq 1$ ). We call a set  $S \subset E$  symmetrical (i.e.,  $S$  possesses the property  $\sigma$ ) if for every  $x \in S$ ,  $1-x$  also belongs to  $S$  (taking 1 to be the diameter of  $S$ ). If every point in  $0 < x < 1$  is the mid point of at least one pair of points of  $S$ , then we say that  $S$  has the property  $\mu$ . If every number  $x$  of  $0 < x < 1$  is equal to the difference of at least one pair of points of  $S$ , then we say that  $S$  is an  $SD$ - set (i.e.  $S$  possesses the property  $\delta$ ). If a set  $S$  has all the three properties  $\sigma$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\delta$  then  $S$  is said to possess the Cantor property  $\Pi$ .

It has been shown (Bose Majumder, March, 1962a) that if a linear set  $S \subseteq E$  has the properties  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$  then it possesses the property  $\delta$  also (i.e.,  $S$  possesses the Cantor property  $\Pi$ ); if  $S$  has the properties  $\sigma$  and  $\delta$  then it must possess the property  $\mu$  also. But it has been shown that if  $S$  possesses the properties  $\mu$  and  $\delta$  then  $S$  may or may not possess the property  $\sigma$ .

Now the set  $E$  has obviously all the properties  $\sigma$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\delta$ . The set  $R$  of rationals in  $E$  has the property  $\sigma$  but it cannot obviously have the property  $\mu$  (and hence  $\delta$ ), i.e.,  $R$  does not possess the Cantor property  $\Pi$ . Also the set  $Q$  of irrationals in  $E$  has obviously the properties  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$  (and hence  $\delta$ ), i.e.,  $Q$  possesses the Cantor property  $\Pi$ . Thus we see that if we withdraw from  $E$  the set  $R$  (which is symmetrical, of measure zero and of first category) then the set  $Q$  ( $\equiv E - R$ ) still possesses the Cantor property  $\Pi$  (which  $E$  originally possessed). We know that the Cantor middle third set  $C$  has the property  $\Pi$ . If  $\bar{C}$  is the set complementary to the middle third set  $C$ , then  $E - \bar{C}$  ( $= C$ ) still possesses the Cantor property (where  $\bar{C}$  is symmetrical, of measure 1 and is a set of second category - a residual set).

It is thus seen that if from  $E$  we withdraw a symmetrical set  $F$ , does not matter what its measure is

(it may even be a non-measurable set), what its category is, the set  $E - F$  is still an SD-set, provided it can retain the property  $\mu$ .

We now propose to prove the following theorems.

Theorem 1. The system  $\Sigma$  of sets, all subsets of  $E$  each of which has the property  $\sigma$ , is a ring.

Proof : If  $A \in \Sigma$  and  $B \in \Sigma$  then  $A+B \in \Sigma$ , since if  $x \in A+B$ , then assuming that  $x \in A$  it follows that  $1-x \in A$  as  $A \in \Sigma$  and hence  $1-x \in A+B$ .

Then we show that  $A - B \in \Sigma$

Let  $x \in A - B$  then  $x \in A$  and  $x \notin B$ . Hence  $1-x \in A$  as  $A$  has the property  $\sigma$ . Also  $1-x \notin B$  (since if  $1-x \in B$  then  $x \in B$  as  $B$  has the property  $\sigma$ ). It follows that  $1-x \in A - B$ . Hence  $A - B \in \Sigma$ .

Thus  $A \Delta B (\equiv (A-B) \cup (B-A)) \in \Sigma$  (1)

Again if  $x \in A \cap B$  then  $x \in A$  and  $x \in B$ .

Hence  $1-x \in A$  and  $1-x \in B$  and thus  $1-x \in A \cap B$ .

Therefore  $A \cap B \in \Sigma$ . (2)

From (1) and (2) it follows that  $\Sigma$  is a ring.

Corollary As  $E \in \Sigma$  is obviously a unit of  $\Sigma$ , it follows that  $\Sigma$  is a Borel algebra.

Theorem 2. The system  $M$  of sets, all subsets of  $E$  each of which has the property  $\mu$ , is not a ring.

Proof : If possible, let  $M$  be a ring. Then  $\Sigma \cap M$  is also a ring. Let  $A \in \Sigma \cap M$ , then  $A$  has the properties  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$  and hence  $\delta$ .

Thus all the symmetric  $SD$ -sets of  $E$  form a ring  $S (= \Sigma \cap M)$ . Now as  $Q \in S$ , therefore  $E - Q = R \in S$  i.e., the rational set  $R$  (in  $E$ ) forms an  $SD$ -set, which is absurd. Hence  $M$  cannot form a ring.

Theorem 3. The system  $D$  of sets, all subsets of  $E$  each of which has the property  $\delta$ , is not a ring.

Proof is similar to one given in Theorem 2.

Note : It is obvious that  $M$  or  $D$  do not even form a semiring.

## II

The distance (a real number) between two sets has been defined in various books of real analysis (Copson, 1968). The distance (a real number) between two sets of a ring has

been defined in a different way (Kolmogorov and Fomin, 1961) to make the ring a metric space. In the following we define the distance (which is not a real number, but is a set) between two sets in a manner such that a class of sets (of points) becomes a metric space in a new sense of the term.

Metriizing a Class of Sets : Let us take a class  $S$  of sets. If  $A$  and  $B$  are two elements of  $S$ , then we know that the symmetric difference between  $A$  and  $B$  represented symbolically as  $A \Delta B$  is given by the relation  $A \Delta B = (A - B) \cup (B - A)$ .

Definition : We define the distance  $\rho(A, B)$  between two elements  $A$  and  $B$  of the class  $S$  by the relation  $\rho(A, B) = A \Delta B$ .

Properties of  $\rho$  with Reference to the Class  $S$

We note that  $\rho$  has the following properties :

(i)  $\rho(A, B)$  is a set of points (may be an empty set  $\emptyset$ ) for every pair of elements of  $S$  and

$$\rho(A, B) = \rho(B, A).$$

(ii)  $\rho(A, B) \supseteq \emptyset$  for  $A \in S, B \in S$  and  $\rho(A, B) = \emptyset$  if and only if  $A = B$  (Proof is obvious).

(iii)  $f(A, B) \subseteq f(A, C) \cup f(C, B)$  where  
 $A, B, C$  are any three elements of  $S$ .

Proof : Let  $x \in f(A, B)$ . To be definite let  
 $x \in A$  and  $x \notin B$ . Then there are two possibilities,  
either  $x \in C$  or  $x \notin C$ .

If  $x \in C$  then noting that  $x \notin B$  it follows  
that  $x \in f(C, B)$  and thus  $x \in f(A, C) \cup f(C, B)$   
and the inequality in this case is proved.

Again, if we take  $x \notin C$  then noting that  $x \in A$   
it follows that  $x \in f(A, C)$  and hence  $x \in f(A, C) \cup f(C, B)$ .  
The inequality in (iii) is thus completely proved.

Definition : In view of (i), (ii) and (iii) we  
shall call the set-valued function  $f(A, B)$ , a metric  
on  $S$ .

Note : If  $X$  is any non-empty set of points and  $S$   
is the class of all subsets of  $X$  then  $f(A, B)$  is a  
mapping of  $S \times S$  into  $S$ . It will be shown later  
(Theorem 4) that this mapping is 'onto'.

As in the case of a bounded set of real numbers  
(where we defined an SD-set), we shall define an SD-  
class of sets as follows :

Definition: Let  $S$  be a class of sets with a unit  $X$ . If  $D$  be any subset of  $X$  and if it is possible to find two disjoint elements  $A$  and  $B$  of  $S$  such that  $\rho(A, B) = D$  then we shall call the class  $S$  an SD-class.

If  $A$  be any member of  $S$  and if  $\rho(X, A) (= X - A)$  is also an element of  $S$  then we shall say that the class  $S$  has the property  $\sigma$ .

If  $D$  is any subset of  $X$  and if it is possible to find two disjoint elements  $A$  and  $B$  of  $S$  such that  $(D \cup D) = D = A \cup B$  then we say that the class  $S$  has the property  $\mu$ .

If  $D$  be any subset of  $X$  and if it is possible to find two disjoint elements  $A$  and  $B$  of  $S$  such that  $D = \rho(A, B)$  then we say that the class  $S$  has the property  $\delta$ . In this case  $S$  is an SD-set i.e. set of sets.

The class  $S$  will be said to possess the Cantor property if it possesses all the three properties  $\sigma$ ,  $\mu$  and  $\delta$ .

Note : If  $E$  is a countable class of sets containing  $\emptyset$  then the set  $D = \{\rho(A, B)\}$  of distances between sets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $E$  is also a countable

subclass of the countable class  $\mathcal{R}(E)$  generated by  $E$  (Halmos, 1964).

Theorem 4. If  $X$  is any set of points and  $S$  is the class of all subsets of  $X$  then  $S$  possesses Cantor property and is thus an  $SD$ -class.

Proof : If  $A \in S$  then  $X - A \in S$ . Hence  $S$  has the property  $\sigma$ .

If  $D$  is any subset of  $X$  then  $D$  is an element of  $S$ . We can obviously decompose  $D$  into two disjoint subsets  $A$  and  $B$ . As  $A \in S$ ,  $B \in S$  and  $A \cap B = \emptyset$  it is obvious that  $S$  has the property  $\mu$ .

Let  $D$  be any subset of  $X$  (and thus  $D \in S$ ) and let  $D = A_1 \cup B_1$  where  $A_1 \cap B_1 = \emptyset$  and hence  $D = f(A_1, B_1)$ . Hence  $S$  has the property  $\delta$  and the theorem is completely proved.

Note : The similarity of the facts that the entire space (i.e., the segment  $[0, 1]$ ) is an  $SD$ -set and the class  $S$  of all subsets of a set  $X$  is an  $SD$ -class, is to be noted.

Theorem 5. A class  $S$  of sets (with unit  $X$ ) having the properties  $\sigma$ ,  $\mu$  must necessarily possess the property  $\delta$ .



Proof : As  $S$  has the property  $\mu$ , if  $D (\neq X, \emptyset)$  is any subset of  $X$ , then  $D = A \cup B$  where  $A \in S, B \in S, A \cap B = \emptyset$ .  $\therefore D = f(A, B)$ . If  $D = X$  then if  $A \in S$  then the complementary set to  $A$  viz.,  $\complement A \in S$ .

Hence  $D = X = A \cup \complement A = f(A, \complement A)$ . If  $D = \emptyset$  then  $\emptyset = f(\emptyset, \emptyset)$  as  $\emptyset \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$ . Hence  $S$  has the property  $\delta$ .

Corollary If  $S$  has the properties  $\sigma$  and  $\mu$ ,  $S$  coincides with the class of all subsets of  $X$ .

Theorem 6. A class  $S$  of sets (with unit  $X$ ) having the properties  $\sigma$  and  $\delta$  must possess the property  $\mu$ .

Proof is similar to one given in Theorem 5.

Theorem 7. A necessary and sufficient condition that an algebra  $\mathcal{R}$  of sets (with unit  $X$ ) is an SD-class is that it should coincide with the class of all subsets of  $X$ .

Proof. Sufficiency is obvious.

The necessity follows from the fact that if  $D$  is any subset of  $X$  and  $D = A \cup B, A \cap B = \emptyset$  or  $D = f(A, B)$  where  $A \in \mathcal{R}, B \in \mathcal{R}$  (where  $\mathcal{R}$  is the given algebra of sets), then  $D \in \mathcal{R}$  (by the definition of a ring).

Note : It is now evident that if an algebra of sets is an SD-class, then it is a B-algebra and also a monotone

class (a non-empty class  $M$  of sets is monotone if for every monotone sequence  $\{E_n\}$  of sets in  $M$  we have  $\lim_n E_n \in M$ ) (Halmos, 1964). Also a monotone ring with a unit is an  $\sigma$ -class as a monotone ring is a  $\sigma$ -ring.

Theorem 8. If  $L$  is a lattice of sets, then the set  $\mathcal{D}$  of its distances [i.e.,  $\mathcal{D} = \{F(A, B)\}, A \in L, B \in L$ ] contains a semi-ring.

Proof : We know that (Halmos, 1964, p.25)  $\emptyset \in L$  and if  $E \in L, F \in L$  then  $E \cup F \in L, E \cap F \in L$  and if  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(L)$  be the class of all sets of the form  $F - E$  where  $E \in L, F \in L$  and  $E \subset F$  then  $\mathcal{P}$  is a semiring.

Now  $\rho(E, F) = F \Delta E = F - E$  therefore  $(F - E) \in \mathcal{D}$ .

As  $F - E$  is any element of  $\mathcal{P}$ , hence  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{D}$ .

Thus the theorem is proved.

Theorem 9. If the lattice  $L$  of sets has the property  $\sigma$ , then  $\mathcal{P}(L)$  is an algebra.

Proof : As  $L$  has the property  $\sigma$  and  $\emptyset \in L$  therefore  $X \in L$  where  $X$  is the unit of  $L$ . Also if  $E \in L$  then  $X - E$  belongs to  $L$  i.e.,  $\complement E \in L$ . Thus if  $E \in L, F \in L$  and  $E \subset F$  then by definition  $F - E \in \mathcal{P}(L)$  i.e.,  $F \cap \complement E \in \mathcal{P}(L)$ . But  $F \in L$  and  $\complement E \in L$  therefore  $F \cap \complement E \in L$ . Therefore,

$\mathcal{P}(L) \subseteq L$  . Also if  $A \in L$  then  $A - \emptyset \in L$  .  
But  $A = A - \emptyset \in \mathcal{P}(L)$  . Therefore  $L \subseteq \mathcal{P}(L)$  .

Also  $\mathcal{C}E, \mathcal{C}F$  belong to  $L$  (as  $L$  has the property  $\sigma$  ). Thus

$$E - F = E \cap \mathcal{C}F \in L \quad \text{and} \quad F - E = F \cap \mathcal{C}E \in L$$

$$\therefore E \cap \mathcal{C}F \cup F \cap \mathcal{C}E \in L.$$

Thus  $E \Delta F \in L$  . Hence  $L$  is a ring with a unit  $X$  . Therefore  $L (= \mathcal{P}(L))$  is an algebra.

REFERENCES

Bose Majumder, N. C. - A study of certain properties of the Cantor set and of an (SD) set, Bull. Cal. Math. Soc., 54, 1 (1962a), p.8.

Bose Majumder, N. C. - On the construction of some SD-sets, Bull. Cal. Math. Soc., 54, 3 (1962b), p.163.

Copson, E. T. - Metric spaces, Cambridge University Press, (1968), p.23.

Halmos, P. R. - Measure theory, D. Van Nostrand Co. Inc., (East-West Edition), (1964), p.23 and 25.

Kolmogorov and Fomin - Elements of theory of functions and Functional analysis, Vol.II, Graylock Press, (1961), p.47.