

# Involutions and associated partitions of a measure space into two congruent nonmeasurable sets

Alexander Kharazishvili

**Abstract.** Under certain conditions, it is shown that if a ground set  $E$  is equipped with an involution  $s$  and with a measure  $\mu$ , then there exists a partition of  $E$  into two  $s$ -congruent  $\mu$ -nonmeasurable subsets. On the other hand, no such partition consists of sets which are absolutely nonmeasurable with respect to the class  $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ .

**2020 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 28A05, 28A20

**Key words and phrases:** Involution, invariant measure, nonmeasurable set.

Let  $E$  be a ground set and let  $f$  be a mapping of  $E$  into itself such that  $f(x) \neq x$  for all  $x \in E$ . It is easy to check that the following two assertions are equivalent:

(\*)  $f$  is an involution (i.e.,  $f^2 = \text{Id}_E$ );

(\*\*) the family of sets  $\{\{x, f(x)\} : x \in E\}$  forms a partition of  $E$  into two-element subsets.

Conversely, if one has a partition  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $E$  into two-element subsets of  $E$ , then  $\mathcal{P}$  uniquely determines an involution  $f : E \rightarrow E$  without fixed elements such that  $\mathcal{P} = \{\{x, f(x)\} : x \in E\}$ . This fact is a theorem of **ZF** set theory, i.e., it does not need the Axiom of Choice (**AC**).

**Example 1.** Let  $(\mathbf{R}, +)$  denote the additive group of reals, let  $(\mathbf{Q}, +)$  denote the subgroup of all rationals, and let  $\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Q}$  be the quotient group. In [6] Sierpiński considered the ground set  $E = \mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Q} \setminus \{\mathbf{Q}\}$  and a canonically associated with  $E$  involution  $s : E \rightarrow E$  defined by

$$s(z + \mathbf{Q}) = -z + \mathbf{Q} \quad (z \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}).$$

Using this involution, it was shown in [6] that the existence of a selector of the family of two-element sets

$$\{\{z + \mathbf{Q}, -z + \mathbf{Q}\} : z \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \mathbf{Q}\}$$

implies (in **ZF** & **DC** theory) the existence of a non-Lebesgue measurable subset of  $\mathbf{R}$ . In particular, it is impossible to define (in the same theory) a linear ordering of the family  $\{z + \mathbf{Q} : z \in \mathbf{R}\}$ .

Usual examples of involutions in geometry of the  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space  $\mathbf{R}^n$  are various kinds of symmetries. In particular, the central symmetry  $s : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n$  is given by the formula  $s(x) = -x$ . The analogous formula describes the central symmetry of the  $n$ -dimensional unit sphere  $\mathbf{S}^n$  in  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$ . The symmetry of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  has a unique fixed point 0 and the symmetry of  $\mathbf{S}^n$  does not possess fixed points in  $\mathbf{S}^n$ .

A. Kolmogorov conjectured that the circle group  $\mathbf{S}_1$  does not admit a partition into two congruent nonmeasurable subsets, where nonmeasurability is meant with respect to the standard Lebesgue measure  $\lambda_1$  on  $\mathbf{S}_1$ . V. Uspensky disproved Kolmogorov's conjecture by giving an example of such a partition of  $\mathbf{S}_1$  (for more details about this fact, see e.g. [8]; as far as we know, Uspensky's example was never published). Since one of the elements of  $\mathbf{S}_1$  is the symmetry (corresponding to angle  $\pi$ ), it makes sense to consider a more general situation when there are given a ground set  $E$  instead of  $\mathbf{S}_1$ , an involution  $s$  of  $E$  and a nonzero  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\mu$  on  $E$ .

It turns out that if the triple  $(E, s, \mu)$  satisfies certain conditions, then Uspensky's example admits a substantial generalization. A few preliminary notions are necessary to formulate the generalized result.

A family  $\{X_i : i \in I\}$  of  $\mu$ -measurable subsets of  $E$  is called a pseudo-base of  $\mu$  if  $\mu(X_i) > 0$  for each index  $i \in I$  and, for every  $\mu$ -measurable set  $Y$  with  $\mu(Y) > 0$ , there exists an index  $j = j(Y) \in I$  such that  $X_j \subset Y$ .

Accordingly, the pseudo-weight of  $\mu$  is defined as the minimum of the cardinalities of all pseudo-bases of  $\mu$ .

A subset  $Z$  of  $E$  is called  $\mu$ -thick (or  $\mu$ -massive) if the equality  $\mu_*(E \setminus Z) = 0$  holds true, where  $\mu_*$  denotes the inner measure on  $E$  produced by  $\mu$ .

It is not hard to see that if  $\{P, Q\}$  is a partition of  $E$  into two  $\mu$ -thick subsets, then both members  $P$  and  $Q$  of this partition are nonmeasurable with respect to  $\mu$ . The converse assertion is not true in general.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that  $(E, s, \mu)$  satisfies the following conditions:*

(1)  *$E$  is an infinite ground set and  $s$  is an involution of  $E$  without fixed elements;*

(2)  *$\mu$  is a nonzero  $\sigma$ -finite  $s$ -quasi-invariant measure on  $E$  whose pseudo-weight does not exceed  $\text{card}(E)$ ;*

(3) *for every  $\mu$ -measurable set  $Z$  with  $\mu(Z) > 0$ , one has  $\text{card}(Z) = \text{card}(E)$ .*

*Then there exists a partition  $\{P_1, P_2\}$  of  $E$  such that:*

(a)  *$s(P_1) = P_2$  (hence  $s(P_2) = P_1$ );*

(b) *both sets  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are  $\mu$ -thick in  $E$  (so none of them is  $\mu$ -measurable).*

The proof of this theorem uses a Bernstein type argument based on the method of transfinite induction.

**Example 2.** Fix a nonzero natural number  $n$ , consider the unit sphere  $\mathbf{S}_n$  in the space  $\mathbf{R}^{n+1}$  and equip  $\mathbf{S}_n$  with the standard Lebesgue measure  $\lambda_n$ . For this sphere, we have a canonical involution  $s : \mathbf{S}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_n$  given by the formula  $s(x) = -x$ . Obviously,  $s$  is an isometric transformation of  $\mathbf{S}_n$  onto itself, without fixed points. The conditions of Theorem 1 are trivially fulfilled for

$$E = \mathbf{S}_n, \quad s : \mathbf{S}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_n, \quad \mu = \lambda_n,$$

so we come to a partition of  $\mathbf{S}_n$  into two  $s$ -congruent  $\lambda_n$ -thick subsets.

**Example 3.** Following the argument of [7], denote by  $\mathbf{Z}$  the set of all integers and let  $\mathbf{Q}$  stand again for the set of all rationals. Consider a selector  $K$  of the quotient group  $\mathbf{Q}/\mathbf{Z}$  and define

$$A_1 = \cup\{K + 2n : n \in \mathbf{Z}\}, \quad A_2 = \cup\{K + 2n + 1 : n \in \mathbf{Z}\}.$$

Clearly, we have

$$A_1 \cup A_2 = \mathbf{Q}, \quad A_1 \cap A_2 = \emptyset, \quad A_1 + 1 = A_2.$$

Further, since  $(\mathbf{Q}, +)$  is a divisible subgroup of  $(\mathbf{R}, +)$ , it follows that  $(\mathbf{Q}, +)$  is a direct summand in  $(\mathbf{R}, +)$ . Therefore, we come to a representation

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{Q} + V \quad (\mathbf{Q} \cap V = \{0\}),$$

where  $V$  is a vector subspace (over  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) of  $\mathbf{R}$ . In fact,  $V$  is a Vitali subset of  $\mathbf{R}$  (see, e.g., [1], [2], [4], [5], [9], [10] for more detailed information about properties of Vitali sets). It is not difficult to verify that the two sets

$$P_1 = A_1 + V, \quad P_2 = A_2 + V$$

satisfy the following relations:

- (1)  $P_1 \cup P_2 = \mathbf{R}$  and  $P_1 \cap P_2 = \emptyset$ ;
- (2)  $P_1 + 1 = P_2$ ;
- (3) both sets  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are thick with respect to the standard Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbf{R}$  (hence none of them is measurable with respect to this measure).

Using a similar argument, it can be proved that, for every natural number  $k > 1$ , there exists a partition  $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\}$  of  $\mathbf{R}$  such that all sets  $P_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ) are pairwise translation-congruent and thick with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbf{R}$ . Moreover, arguing analogously one obtains a partition of  $\mathbf{R}$  of the form  $\{P_i : i \in I\}$ , where  $1 < \text{card}(I) \leq \text{card}(\mathbf{R})$ , all sets  $P_i$  are pairwise translation-congruent and thick with respect to the same Lebesgue

measure on  $\mathbf{R}$ . In [11] closely related questions are discussed for the more general case of uncountable non-discrete locally compact commutative topological groups (cf. also [3]).

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $E$  be an infinite ground set equipped with a bijection  $f : E \rightarrow E$  and with a  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $\mu$ . Suppose also that a partition  $\{P_1, P_2\}$  of  $E$  satisfies the equality  $f(P_1) = P_2$  (hence  $f(P_2) = P_1$  and  $\{P_1, P_2\}$  is an invariant partition with respect to the group  $G_f$  of transformations of  $E$ , generated by  $\{f\}$ ).*

*If one of the sets  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  is  $\mu$ -nonmeasurable in  $E$ , then there exists a measure  $\mu'$  on  $E$  such that:*

- (a)  $\mu'$  extends  $\mu$ ;
- (b)  $\{P_1, P_2\} \subset \text{dom}(\mu')$ ;
- (c) *if the initial measure  $\mu$  is  $G_f$ -invariant (respectively  $G_f$ -quasi-invariant), then  $\mu'$  is also  $G_f$ -invariant (respectively,  $G_f$ -quasi-invariant).*

Let  $E$  be a ground set and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a class of measures on  $E$  (the domains of members of  $\mathcal{M}$  may be various  $\sigma$ -algebras of subsets of  $E$ ). By definition, a subset  $X$  of  $E$  is relatively measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{M}$  if there exists at least one measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $X \in \text{dom}(\nu)$ . Otherwise,  $X$  is called absolutely nonmeasurable with respect to  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**Example 4.** Let  $E$  be a ground set equipped with a transformation group  $G$  and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the class of all nonzero  $\sigma$ -finite  $G$ -invariant ( $G$ -quasi-invariant) measures on  $E$ . Any subset of  $E$  absolutely nonmeasurable with respect to this  $\mathcal{M}$  is called  $G$ -absolutely nonmeasurable. If  $E$  itself is an uncountable commutative group identified with the group of all its translations, then there exist  $E$ -absolutely nonmeasurable subsets of  $E$  (see [2]).

As a consequence of Theorem 2, one obtains

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $E$  be an infinite ground set equipped with a bijection  $f$ , let  $G_f$  denote the group of transformations of  $E$  generated by  $\{f\}$ , and let  $\mu$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite  $G_f$ -invariant ( $G_f$ -quasi-invariant) measure on  $E$ .*

*Further, let  $\{P_1, P_2\}$  be a partition of  $E$  such that  $f(P_1) = P_2$  and let  $\mathcal{M}_\mu$  denote the class of all those  $G_f$ -invariant ( $G_f$ -quasi-invariant) measures on  $E$  which extend  $\mu$ .*

*Then both sets  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are relatively measurable with respect to  $\mathcal{M}_\mu$ .*

In terms of absolute nonmeasurability, Kolmogorov's conjecture may be reformulated as follows: there does not exist a partition  $\{P_1, P_2\}$  of  $E$  which satisfies  $f(P_1) = P_2$  and both members of which are  $G_f$ -absolutely nonmeasurable.

In fact, if  $\theta$  is a nonzero finite finitely additive  $G_f$ -invariant measure on  $E$  and  $\{P_1, P_2\}$  is a  $G_f$ -invariant partition of  $E$ , then there exists a finitely additive

$G_f$ -invariant measure  $\theta'$  on  $E$  extending  $\theta$  and satisfying  $\{P_1, P_2\} \subset \text{dom}(\theta')$ . Moreover,  $\theta'$  can be defined for all subsets of  $E$  (see [10]).

**Example 5.** Let  $E$  be an uncountable ground set,  $G$  be a group of transformations of  $E$  generated by two distinct bijections of  $E$  onto itself, and let  $\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}$  be a partition of  $E$  into three  $G$ -congruent subsets. From the classical result of Hausdorff (widely known as Hausdorff paradox; see e.g. [10]) one can conclude that a situation is realizable where each of the sets  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $P_3$  is absolutely nonmeasurable with respect to the class of all nonzero finite finitely additive  $G$ -invariant measures on  $E$ .

### References

- [1] B. R. Gelbaum, J. M. H. Olmsted, *Counterexamples in Analysis*, Holden-Day, San Francisco, 1964.
- [2] A. Kharazishvili, *Nonmeasurable Sets and Functions*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2004.
- [3] A. Kharazishvili, *On countable almost invariant partitions of  $G$ -spaces*, Ukrain. Math. Journal, v. 66, n. 4, 2014, pp. 510–517.
- [4] J. C. Morgan II, *Point Set Theory*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., Basel-New York, 1990.
- [5] J. C. Oxtoby, *Measure and Category*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971.
- [6] W. Sierpiński, *L'axiome de M. Zermelo et son rôle dans la Théorie des Ensembles et l'Analyse*, Bull. Intern. Acad. Sci. Cracovie, Ser. A, 1918, pp. 97–152.
- [7] W. Sierpiński, *Sur la question de la mesurabilité de la base de M. Hamel*, Fund. Math., vol. 1, 1920, pp. 105–111.
- [8] V. Uspensky, *Kolmogorov as I remember him*, in: Kolmogorov in the Memoirs of his Students, The Publishing House of MCCME, 2006 (Russian).
- [9] G. Vitali, *Sul problema della misura dei gruppi di punti di una retta*, Tip. Gamberini e Parmeggiani, Bologna, 1905.
- [10] S. Wagon, *The Banach–Tarski Paradox*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985.
- [11] H. Weber, E. Zoli, *Finite partitions of topological groups into congruent thick subsets*, Journal of Applied Analysis, v. 14, n. 1, 2008, pp. 1–12.

Author's Address:

A. Razmadze Mathematical Institute,  
2 Merab Aleksidze II Lane,

Tbilisi 0193,  
Georgia  
I. Vekua Institute of Applied Mathematics,  
University Street, 2,  
Tbilisi 0186,  
Georgia  
e-mail: kharaz2@yahoo.com