

SOME ZERO-ONE LAWS FOR GAUSSIAN PROCESSES¹

BY STAMATIS CAMBANIS AND BALRAM S. RAJPUT²

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

It is shown in this paper that the paths of a real separable Gaussian process on an interval have a number of interesting properties with probability zero or one. These properties include boundedness, bounded variation, continuity, uniform continuity, absolute continuity, a Lipschitz property, differentiability, absence of oscillatory discontinuities.

1. Introduction. It is shown that the paths of a Gaussian process have most of the important function properties with probability zero or one (Theorem 2). These results are obtained by using a recently proven zero-one law for Gaussian processes [6], [7], [8]; namely, that for a zero mean Gaussian process of function space type satisfying certain conditions, every measurable subgroup of the function space has probability zero or one. The zero-one law is stated in Theorem 1 for a Gaussian process with arbitrary mean value.

The proofs are collected in Section 3. In Section 4 a simple proof is given for the known expression of the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the translate of a Gaussian measure, which is needed in the sketch of the proof of Theorem 1.

2. Zero-one laws for Gaussian processes. Let $\{\xi(t, \omega), t \in T\}$ be a real Gaussian process defined on the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) with mean function $m(t)$ and covariance function $R(t, s)$; T is any set and \mathcal{F} is the smallest σ -algebra of subsets of Ω with respect to which the functions $\{\xi(t, \omega), t \in T\}$ are measurable. Denote by $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ the completion of \mathcal{F} with respect to P . It is the purpose of this paper to derive classes of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ -measurable events whose P -probability is either zero or one.

Now let X be a set of real functions x on T which contains almost surely $[P]$ the paths of the Gaussian process $\xi(t, \omega)$. Denote by $\mathcal{U}(X)$ the σ -algebra of subsets of X generated by sets of the form $\{x \in X: [x(t_1), \dots, x(t_n)] \in B^n\}$ ($t_1, \dots, t_n \in T$ and B^n is an n -dimensional Borel set). Then the transformation $\phi: (\Omega, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, P) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{U}(X))$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(\omega) &= \xi(\cdot, \omega) & \text{if } \xi(\cdot, \omega) \in X \\ &= 0 & \text{if } \xi(\cdot, \omega) \notin X\end{aligned}$$

is measurable, and induces a probability measure μ on $(X, \mathcal{U}(X))$. The stochastic process $\{x(t), t \in T\}$ defined on the probability space $(X, \mathcal{U}(X), \mu)$ is clearly Gaussian with mean $m(t)$ and covariance function $R(t, s)$. Denote by $\overline{\mathcal{U}}(X)$ the

Received November 17, 1971; revised May 9, 1972.

¹ This research was supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under Grant AFOSR-68-1415 and by the Office of Naval Research under Grant N00014-67A-0321-0006.

² Now at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 60F20, 60G15, 60G17.

Key words and phrases. Zero-one laws, Gaussian processes, path properties.

completion of $\mathcal{U}(X)$ with respect to μ and by $H(R)$ the reproducing kernel Hilbert space determined by the covariance R . The following conditions will be assumed:

- (C1) X is a linear space of functions under the usual operation of addition of functions and multiplication by real scalars;
 (C2) $H(R) \subset X$.

Both conditions (C1) and (C2) are easily seen to be satisfied in the following cases: (1) $X = R^T$, the set of all real functions on T ; (2) T is a measurable set on the real line, $\xi(t, \omega)$ is a measurable process, and X is the set of all real measurable functions on T ; (3) T is a metric space, the paths of ξ are a.s. $[P]$ continuous on T , and $X = C(T)$, the set of all real continuous functions on T .

The following theorem is essentially due to G. Kallianpur.

THEOREM 1. *If conditions (C1) and (C2) are satisfied and G is a $\bar{\mathcal{U}}(X)$ -measurable subgroup of X , then $\mu(G) = 0$ or 1.*

The proof of Theorem 1 for the zero mean case is given by Kallianpur [7], [8] and Jain [6]. Specifically, the zero-one law for $\mathcal{U}(X)$ -measurable modules over the rationals and for $\mathcal{U}(X)$ -measurable groups is proven in [7] with some additional assumptions which are removed in [8]. The extension to $\bar{\mathcal{U}}(X)$ -measurable groups is proven in [6]. The proof of Theorem 1 sketched in Section 3 differs slightly from the one suggested in [8] and follows closely the proof in [7] and [6]; it may be mentioned that this proof was obtained without knowledge of reference [8], which was brought to our attention by the referee.

COROLLARY 1. *Let X be a set of real functions on T which contains the paths of $\xi(t, \omega)$ a.s. $[P]$, and satisfies conditions (C1) and (C2). If $F \in \bar{\mathcal{F}}$ is such that $F = \phi^{-1}(G)$, where G is a $\bar{\mathcal{U}}(X)$ -measurable subgroup of X , then $P(F) = 0$ or 1.*

By applying Corollary 1 we obtain a number of zero-one laws for path properties of a Gaussian process.

THEOREM 2. *Let $\{\xi(t, \omega), t \in T\}$ be real separable Gaussian process on the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) , where T is an interval on the real line. Then with probability zero or one the paths of $\xi(t, \omega)$ are*

- (1) bounded on T
- (2) free of oscillatory discontinuities on T
- (3) of bounded variation on every compact subinterval of T
- (4) continuous on T
- (5) uniformly continuous on T
- (6) absolutely continuous on every compact subinterval of T
- (7) (satisfy) a Lipschitz condition of order $\alpha > 0$ on T
- (8) differentiable on T .

The zero-one law on the boundedness of the paths is known [9]. Under the additional assumption that the process is product measurable, it is shown in [13]

that its paths belong to L_p , $1 \leq p < \infty$, with probability zero or one and necessary and sufficient conditions for the two alternatives are derived. The following sharper results are known for a mean square continuous Gaussian process $\{\xi(t, \omega), t \in T\}$. (1) With probability one the paths of $\xi(t, \omega)$ on T (compact interval) either are continuous or have oscillatory discontinuities (this follows easily from the results in [5]). (2) If $\xi(t, \omega)$ is also stationary, then its paths are either continuous or unbounded on every subinterval of T [1].

In the course of the proof of Theorem 2 it is shown that for a separable process the sets of paths that have each of the stated properties are measurable, and also explicit expressions for these sets are given. This result is of independent interest. It should be remarked that for the measurability of the sets in (1), (2), (4) and (5) separability relative to closed intervals suffices, while for the measurability of the sets in (3) and (6) to (8) the separability relative to closed sets is needed. However, in the particular case of Gaussian processes, the measurability of the sets in (6) to (8) can be shown assuming only separability relative to closed intervals.

Additional zero-one laws can be obtained by using the techniques employed in the proof of Theorem 2. For instance, it is easily seen that with probability zero or one the paths of a separable Gaussian process: (i) vanish at ∞ if $T = [a, \infty)$ (f vanishes at ∞ if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $0 < N(\varepsilon) < +\infty$ such that $|f(t)| < \varepsilon$ whenever $t > N$); (ii) have uniform right (left) limits on T ; (iii) are uniformly right (left) continuous on T ; (iv) are uniformly right (left) differentiable on T .

The problem of finding necessary and sufficient conditions for the two alternatives in the zero-one laws of Theorem 2 is wide open at present and seemingly a difficult one. Sufficient conditions for a number of path properties to hold are known, especially for stationary Gaussian processes, and some are very close to being also necessary.

3. Proofs. The notation and assumptions introduced in Section 2 are used here.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. For zero mean, this theorem is proven in [6], [7] with the additional assumptions that T is a complete separable metric space and that $R(t, s)$ is a continuous function on $T \times T$. These assumptions are used in two places in the proof given in [6], [7].

First they are used in concluding the validity of (i) and (ii) as stated in Section 4; i.e., that $\mu_m \sim \mu_0 (= \mu)$ if and only if $m \in H(R)$ and that the Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ_m with respect to μ_0 is given by (1). However, as explained in Section 4, (i) and (ii) are valid in general with no restrictive assumptions on either T or R .

Secondly, Lemma 6 as stated and proved in [7] employs the separability of $H(R)$, which is implied by the above mentioned assumptions on T and R . If the statement of this Lemma of [7] is modified to read as follows: "If g is a $\mathcal{U}(X)$ -

measurable real function such that for every $m \in H(\mathbb{R})$, $g(x + m) = g(x)$ a.e. $[\mu]$, then $g(x) = \text{constant}$ a.e. $[\mu]$ ", then it is proven as Lemma 6 of [7], the separability of $H(\mathbb{R})$ is not needed, and this modified lemma is precisely what is needed in the course of the proof of this theorem.

This proves the theorem in the zero mean case and a careful inspection of the proof reveals that it remains valid for arbitrary mean value.

By separability of the stochastic process $\{\xi(t, \omega), t \in T\}$ we mean separability relative to closed sets of the extended real line ([2] page 52), unless otherwise specified. This type of separability is equivalent to the following condition: "There exists a set $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ with $P(\Omega_0) = 0$ and a countable dense subset S of T such that for every $\omega \in \Omega - \Omega_0$ and every $t \in T - S$ there exists a sequence $\{s_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in S converging to t such that $\lim_n \xi(s_n, \omega) = \xi(t, \omega)$ " ([2] page 59). This equivalent condition for separability will play an important role in some of the proofs. However, it will be clear from the following proofs that the weaker kind of separability relative to closed intervals of the extended real line is sufficient for some of the zero-one laws.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. If F is the set of $\omega \in \Omega$ for which each property is satisfied we will show that $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $P(F) = 0$ or 1.

Proof of (1). Let $F = \{\omega \in \Omega : \sup_{t \in T} |\xi(t, \omega)| < +\infty\}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} F' &= \{\omega \in \Omega : \sup_{t \in S} |\xi(t, \omega)| < +\infty\} \\ &= \bigcup_{N=1}^\infty \bigcap_{t \in S} \{\omega \in \Omega : |\xi(t, \omega)| \leq N\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $F' \in \mathcal{F}$, and because of the separability of ξ , $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $P(F) = P(F')$. Also if we take $X = \mathbb{R}^T$ and define

$$\begin{aligned} G' &= \{x \in X : \sup_{t \in S} |x(t)| < +\infty\} \\ &= \bigcup_{N=1}^\infty \bigcap_{t \in S} \{x \in X : |x(t)| \leq N\}, \end{aligned}$$

then G' is clearly a $\mathcal{U}(X)$ -measurable subgroup of X and $F' = \phi^{-1}(G')$. Corollary 1 implies that $P(F') = 0$ or 1. Note that separability relative to closed intervals only is used here.

Proof of (2). Let $F = \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is free of oscillatory discontinuities on } T\}$. It is shown in ([11] page 61) that $F \in \mathcal{F}$. Similarly, if $X = \mathbb{R}^T$ and $G = \{x \in X : x(t) \text{ is free of oscillatory discontinuities on } T\}$, then $G \in \mathcal{U}(X)$. Since G is a subgroup of X and $F = \phi^{-1}(G)$, Corollary 1 implies $P(F) = 0$ or 1.

Proof of (3). Let $\{T_k = [a_k, b_k]\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of compact intervals such that $T_k \subset T_{k+1} \subset T$ and $\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty T_k = T$. If $F = \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is of bounded variation on every compact subinterval of } T\}$, then

$$F = \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty \bigcup_{N=1}^\infty \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcap_{\Pi_n(t_i; T_k)} \{\omega \in \Omega : \sum_{i=1}^n |\xi(t_i, \omega) - \xi(t_{i-1}, \omega)| \leq N\},$$

where $\prod_n(t_i; T_k)$ is the class of all sets of points $\{t_i\}_{i=0}^n$ in T_k such that $a_k = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = b_k$. Let F' be given by the same expression as F with T_k replaced

by $T_k \cap S$ (here the separating set S is augmented so as to include all end points $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and $\{b_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$). Then $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F' = \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is of bounded variation on every bounded subset of } S\}$. By the separability of ξ it is shown as in the Proof of (4) that $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $P(F) = P(F')$. If we take $X = R^T$ we have that $G' = \{x \in X : x(t) \text{ is of bounded variation on every bounded subset of } S\} \in \mathcal{U}(X)$ and since G' is a group and $F' = \phi^{-1}(G')$, Corollary 1 implies $P(F') = 0$ or 1 .

Proof of (4). Let $\{T_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of compact intervals such that $T_k \subset T_{k+1} \subset T$ and $\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty T_k = T$. Then, noting that a function is continuous on T if and only if it is uniformly continuous on every T_k , we have

$$F = \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is continuous on } T\} = \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty F_k,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_k &= \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is continuous on } T_k\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sup_{t, t' \in T_k : |t-t'| \leq 1/m} |\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(t', \omega)| \leq \frac{1}{n} \right\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \bigcap_{t \in T_k} \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sup_{t' \in T_k : |t-t'| \leq 1/m} |\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(t', \omega)| \leq \frac{1}{n} \right\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \bigcap_{t \in T_k} E_{n,m}^t(T_k). \end{aligned}$$

Let $F'_k = \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \bigcap_{s \in S_k} E_{n,m}^s(S_k)$, where $S_k = T_k \cap S$, and let $F' = \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty F'_k = \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is continuous on } S\}$. Then clearly $F'_k \in \mathcal{F}$ for all k , and $F' \in \mathcal{F}$. If we take $X = R^T$ we obtain in a similar way that the set $G' = \{x \in X : x(t) \text{ is continuous on } S\}$ is $\mathcal{U}(X)$ -measurable. Since G' is clearly a group and $F' = \phi^{-1}(G')$, Corollary 1 implies $P(F') = 0$ or 1 . Clearly $F_k \subset F'_k$. It will be shown that separability implies $F'_k - F_k \subset \Omega_0$. Then $F_k \in \mathcal{F}$ and $P(F_k) = P(F'_k)$ and thus $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $P(F) = P(F') = 0$ or 1 .

In order to prove $F'_k - F_k \subset \Omega_0$, it suffices to show that $\omega \in F'_k - \Omega_0$ implies $\omega \in F_k$. Fix any $\omega \in F'_k - \Omega_0$. For every fixed n , since $\omega \in F'_k$, there exists m (depending on n) such that for every $s \in S_k$, $\omega \in E_{2n,m}^s(S_k)$; i.e. such that whenever

$$s, s' \in S_k, \quad |s - s'| \leq \frac{1}{m} \quad \text{then} \quad |\xi(s, \omega) - \xi(s', \omega)| \leq \frac{1}{2n}.$$

Let $t \in T_k - S_k$ be arbitrary but fixed. It follows by separability and the fact that $\omega \notin \Omega_0$ that there exists a sequence $\{s_i\}_i$ in S_k such that

$$\lim_i s_i = t \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_i \xi(s_i, \omega) = \xi(t, \omega).$$

Then there exists integer I such that whenever $i \geq I$ then

$$|t - s_i| \leq \frac{1}{2m} \quad \text{and} \quad |\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(s_i, \omega)| \leq \frac{1}{2n}.$$

If $s \in S_k$ with $|t - s| \leq (2m)^{-1}$, then, for $i \geq I$,

$$|s - s_i| \leq |s - t| + |t - s_i| \leq \frac{1}{2m} + \frac{1}{2m} = \frac{1}{m} \quad \text{and}$$

$$|\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(s, \omega)| \leq |\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(s_i, \omega)| + |\xi(s_i, \omega) - \xi(s, \omega)| \leq \frac{1}{2n} + \frac{1}{2n} = \frac{1}{n}.$$

Thus whenever $s \in S_k$ with $|t - s| \leq (2m)^{-1}$ then $|\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(s, \omega)| \leq n^{-1}$, i.e., $\omega \in E_{n,2m}^t(S_k)$. Clearly $E_{n,2m}^t(T_k) \subset E_{n,2m}^t(S_k)$. Since for fixed $t \in T$ the process $\{\xi(t', \omega) - \xi(t, \omega), t' \in T\}$ is separable, it follows that $E_{n,2m}^t(S_k) - E_{n,2m}^t(T_k) \subset \Omega_0$. Hence $\omega \in E_{n,2m}^t(S_k), \omega \notin \Omega_0$ imply $\omega \in E_{n,2m}^t(T_k)$. It is thus seen that for every n there exists m (depending on n) such that for all $t \in T, \omega \in E_{n,2m}^t(T_k)$. Hence $\omega \in \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \bigcap_{t \in T} E_{n,m}^t(T_k) = F_k$ and the proof is complete.

This proof is presented in some detail because it is typical of the use of the separability of the process in proving measurability of path sets and because a similar argument is used again in this paper. It should be remarked however that this proof uses separability relative to closed sets. As pointed out in the Proof of (5), this zero-one law on path continuity can be proven under the weaker kind of separability relative to closed intervals.

Proof of (5). Let $F = \{\omega \in \Omega: \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is uniformly continuous on } T\}$. It follows from the proof of (4), that $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $P(F) = 0$ or 1 . This proof uses separability of ξ relative to closed sets. We now give a proof employing the weaker kind of separability relative to closed intervals. It should be clear then, that under the same weaker separability assumptions, the sets F_k appearing in the Proof of (4) can be similarly shown to belong to \mathcal{F} , which proves the zero-one law (4). Let

$$F' = \{\omega \in \Omega: \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is uniformly continuous on } S\}$$

$$= \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \bigcap_{s,s' \in S; |s-s'| \leq 1/m} \left\{ \omega \in \Omega: |\xi(s, \omega) - \xi(s', \omega)| \leq \frac{1}{n} \right\}.$$

Then $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ and $F \subset F'$. Fix any $\omega \in F' - \Omega_0$. Then $\xi(\cdot, \omega)$ is uniformly continuous on S , and since S is dense in T , it can be uniquely extended to a uniformly continuous function $\hat{\xi}(\cdot, \omega)$ on T . Now let $t \in T - S$ be arbitrary but fixed. Then

$$\hat{\xi}(t, \omega) = \lim_{s \in S; s \rightarrow t} \hat{\xi}(s, \omega) = \lim_{s \in S; s \rightarrow t} \xi(s, \omega)$$

and the separability of ξ relative to closed intervals implies that $\lim_{s \in S; s \rightarrow t} \xi(s, \omega) = \xi(t, \omega)$ ([10] page 505). Hence $\xi(t, \omega) = \hat{\xi}(t, \omega)$, i.e., $\xi(t, \omega)$ is uniformly continuous and $\omega \in F$. It follows that $F' - \Omega_0 \subset F$ which implies $F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $P(F) = P(F')$. If we take $X = R^T$ we obtain in a similar way that the set $G' = \{x \in X: x(t) \text{ is uniformly continuous on } S\}$ is $\mathcal{Z}(X)$ -measurable. Since G' is clearly a group and $F' = \phi^{-1}(G')$, Corollary 1 implies $P(F') = 0$ or 1 which completes the proof.

Proof of (6). Let $\{T_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of compact intervals such that $T_k \subset T_{k+1} \subset T$ and $\bigcup_{k=1}^\infty T_k = T$. If $F = \{\omega \in \Omega: \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is absolutely continuous on every compact subinterval of } T\}$, then

$$F = \bigcap_{k=1}^\infty \bigcap_{N=1}^\infty \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcap_{\Pi_n^m(t_i, t_i'; T_k)} \times \left\{ \omega \in \Omega: \sum_{i=1}^n |\xi(t_i, \omega) - \xi(t_i', \omega)| \leq \frac{1}{N} \right\},$$

where $\prod_n^m(t_i, t'_i; T_k)$ is the class of all sets of points $\{t_i, t'_i\}_{i=1}^n$ in T_k such that the intervals $\{(t_i, t'_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are disjoint and with total length $\leq m^{-1}$. Let also F' be the subset of Ω given by the same expression as F with T_k replaced by $S \cap T_k$. Then $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ and clearly $F' = \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is absolutely continuous on every bounded subset of } S\}$. By the separability of ξ , it is shown as in the Proof of (4) that $F \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ and $P(F) = P(F')$.

This proves that $F \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}$ for every process ξ separable relative to closed sets. For a Gaussian process ξ , by using the already established zero-one law (4), it can be shown that $F \in \mathcal{F}$ under the weaker condition of separability relative to closed intervals. (This applies also to (7) and (8).) Indeed if $P\{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is continuous on } T\} = 0$ then F belongs to the completed σ -field $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$, and $P(F) = 0$. On the other hand if $P\{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is continuous on } T\} = 1$, then clearly ξ is separable relative to closed sets. Thus, since the zero-one law on the continuity of paths is proven under the hypothesis of separability relative to closed interval, the zero-one law of (6) is proven under the same hypothesis.

If we take $X = R^T$ we have that $G' = \{x \in X : x(t) \text{ is absolutely continuous on every bounded subset of } S\} \in \mathcal{U}(X)$ and since G' is a group and $F' = \phi^{-1}(G')$, Corollary 1 implies $P(F') = 0$ or 1 .

Proof of (7). This zero-one law is shown as (4) and (6) by noting that if $F = \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ satisfies a Lipschitz condition of order } \alpha \text{ on } T\}$, for fixed $\alpha > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sup_{t,s \in T; t \neq s} \frac{|\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(s, \omega)|}{|t - s|^\alpha} < +\infty \right\} \\ &= \bigcup_{N=1}^\infty \bigcap_{t \in T} \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \sup_{t \neq s \in T} \frac{|\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(s, \omega)|}{|t - s|^\alpha} \leq N \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (8). This zero-one law is shown as (4) by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \{\omega \in \Omega : \xi(t, \omega) \text{ is differentiable on } T\} \\ &= \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{m=1}^\infty \bigcap_{s,t,\tau \in T; s < t < \tau; |s-\tau| \leq 1/m} \left\{ \omega \in \Omega : \max \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3\} \leq \frac{1}{n} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_1 &= \left| \frac{\xi(s, \omega) - \xi(t, \omega)}{s - t} - \frac{\xi(s, \omega) - \xi(\tau, \omega)}{s - \tau} \right|, \\ \Delta_2 &= \left| \frac{\xi(\tau, \omega) - \xi(t, \omega)}{\tau - t} - \frac{\xi(\tau, \omega) - \xi(s, \omega)}{\tau - s} \right|, \\ \Delta_3 &= \left| \frac{\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(s, \omega)}{t - s} - \frac{\xi(t, \omega) - \xi(\tau, \omega)}{t - \tau} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

4. The Radon–Nikodym derivative of the translate of a Gaussian measure. In this section we discuss the properties of the translates of Gaussian measures used in the proof of Theorem 1.

The notation and assumptions of Section 2 prior to Theorem 1 are adopted

here without further explanation, and it is assumed that the mean of μ is zero. Let us put $P_0 = P$ and $\mu_0 = \mu$ and denote by \mathcal{L}_2 the subspace of $L_2(\mu_0) = L_2(X, \mathcal{U}(X), \mu_0)$ spanned by the random variables $\{x(t), t \in T\}$. It is well known [12] that there is an inner product preserving isomorphism between \mathcal{L}_2 and $H(R)$, denoted by \leftrightarrow , such that $x(t) \leftrightarrow R(\cdot, t)$ for all $t \in T$, and $\eta \leftrightarrow m$ if and only if

$$m(t) = \int_X x(t)\eta(x) d\mu_0(x) \quad \text{for all } t \in T.$$

For $m \in X$ the transformation $\tau_m : (X, \mathcal{U}(X), \mu_0) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{U}(X))$ defined by $\tau_m(x) = x + m$ is clearly measurable and induces a probability measure μ_m on $(X, \mathcal{U}(X))$. The stochastic process $\{x(t), t \in T\}$ on the probability space $(X, \mathcal{U}(X), \mu_m)$ is easily seen to be Gaussian with mean function $m(t)$ and covariance function $R(t, s)$. It is also clear that μ_m is the probability measure induced on $(X, \mathcal{U}(X))$ by the stochastic process $\{\xi(t, \omega) + m(t), t \in T\}$ by means of the measurable transformation $\phi_m : (\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P_0) \rightarrow (X, \mathcal{U}(X))$ defined by $\phi_m(\omega) = \xi(\cdot, \omega) + m(\cdot)$ if $\xi(\cdot, \omega) \in X$ and $\phi_m(\omega) = 0$ if $\xi(\cdot, \omega) \notin X$. It is known that

- (i) μ_m and μ_0 are mutually absolutely continuous if and only if $m \in H(R)$, and
- (ii) if $m \in H(R)$, the Radon-Nikodym derivative p_m of μ_m with respect to μ_0 is given by

$$(1) \quad p_m(x) = \exp [\eta(x) - \frac{1}{2} \|\eta\|^2] \quad \text{a.e. } [\mu_0],$$

where $\eta \leftrightarrow m$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the norm of $L_2(\mu_0)$.

The validity of (i) is established in [4]; it can also be obtained as a straightforward application of the theorem proven in [3]. The validity of (ii) is indicated in [14]. However, since the proof of (ii) is not easily reconstructed from the references cited in [14], an alternative simple proof is given here.

For any subset S of T let $\mathcal{L}_2(S)$ be the subspace of $L_2(\mu_0)$ spanned by the set $\{x(t), t \in S\}$, let $H(R, S)$ be the reproducing kernel Hilbert space of R restricted to $S \times S$, and let $\mathcal{U}(X, S)$ be the σ -algebra of subsets of X with respect to which the functions $\{x(t), t \in S\}$ are measurable. Clearly $\mathcal{L}_2(T) = \mathcal{L}_2, H(R, T) = H(R)$ and $\mathcal{U}(X, T) = \mathcal{U}(X)$. It is well known [12] that there is an inner product preserving isomorphism between $\mathcal{L}_2(S)$ and $H(R, S)$, denoted by \leftrightarrow , such that $x(t) \leftrightarrow R(\cdot, t), t \in S$, and $\zeta \leftrightarrow f$ if and only if $f(t) = \int_X x(t)\zeta(x) d\mu_0(x)$ for all $t \in S$.

Assume now $m \in H(R)$. Then $p_m(x)$ is $\mathcal{U}(X, T)$ -measurable and thus there exists a countable subset S_1 of T such that $p_m(x)$ is $\mathcal{U}(X, S_1)$ -measurable ([2] page 604). Let $\eta \in \mathcal{L}_2$ be such that $\eta \leftrightarrow m$. Then η is the $L_2(\mu_0)$ -limit of a sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of elements of $L_2(\mu_0)$ of the form $\eta_k(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{N_k} c_{k,n} x(t_{k,n})$, where the $c_{k,n}$'s are real numbers and $t_{k,n} \in T$. Hence there exists a countable subset S_2 ($= \bigcup_{1 \leq k} \bigcup_{1 \leq n \leq N_k} \{t_{k,n}\}$) of T such that $\eta \in \mathcal{L}_2(S_2)$. If $S' = S_1 \cup S_2$ then clearly $\eta \in \mathcal{L}_2(S')$ and $p_m(x)$ is $\mathcal{U}(X, S')$ -measurable. Let $S' = \{t_k\}_{k=1}^\infty, t_k \in T$, and let S be the set of those points t_k of S' which are such that the elements $x(t_1), \dots, x(t_k)$ of $L_2(P_0)$ are linearly independent. Then S is a countable subset of $T, \mathcal{L}_2(S) = \mathcal{L}_2(S')$ and $\mathcal{U}(X, S) = \mathcal{U}(X, S')$, where $\mathcal{U}(X, S)$ is the completion of $\mathcal{U}(X, S)$ with respect to μ_0 . It follows that $\eta \in \mathcal{L}_2(S)$ and that $p_m(x)$ is $\mathcal{U}(X, S)$ -

measurable, which implies that $p_m(x)$ is also the Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ_m restricted to $\mathcal{U}(X, S)$ with respect to μ_0 restricted to $\mathcal{U}(X, S)$. Now an application of the martingale convergence theorem [2] to the martingale $\{p_m^n(x), \mathcal{U}(X, S_n), 1 \leq n \leq \infty\}$, where $S_\infty = S = \{s_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, $p_m^\infty(x) = p_m(x)$; and for $1 \leq n < \infty$, $S_n = \{s_k\}_{k=1}^n$ and $p_m^n(x)$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of μ_m restricted to $\mathcal{U}(X, S_n)$ with respect to μ_0 restricted to $\mathcal{U}(X, S_n)$ (or equivalently an application of Theorem 9. A of [12] to the stochastic process $\{x(t), t \in S\}$) gives

$$(2) \quad p_m(x) = \exp \left[\zeta(x) - \frac{1}{2} \|\zeta\|^2 \right] \quad \text{a.e. } [\mu_0],$$

where $\zeta \in \mathcal{L}_2(S)$ and $\zeta \leftrightarrow m_S$; m_S being the restriction of m to S . $\zeta \leftrightarrow m_S$ implies

$$m(t) = \int_X x(t) \zeta(x) d\mu_0(x) \quad \text{for all } t \in S.$$

On the other hand, it follows from $\mathcal{L}_2 \ni \eta \leftrightarrow m \in H(R)$ that

$$m(t) = \int_X x(t) \eta(x) d\mu_0(x) \quad \text{for all } t \in T.$$

It follows now from $\eta, \zeta \in \mathcal{L}_2(S)$ that $\zeta = \eta$ in $L_2(\mu_0)$, and hence (2) implies (1).

Acknowledgment. We wish to thank the referee for calling our attention to reference [8], and Dr. G. Kallianpur for sending us a copy of Chapter VI of [8].

REFERENCES

- [1] BELAYEV, YU. K. (1961). Continuity and Hölder's conditions for sample functions of stationary Gaussian processes. *Proc. Fourth Berkeley Symp. Math. Statist. Prob.* 223-33. Univ. of California Press.
- [2] DOOB, J. L. (1953). *Stochastic Processes*. Wiley, New York.
- [3] FELDMAN, J. (1958). Equivalence and perpendicularity of Gaussian processes. *Pacific J. Math.* 4 699-708.
- [4] HÁJEK, J. (1959). On a simple linear model in Gaussian processes. *Trans. Second Prague Conf. Information Theory* 185-197.
- [5] ITÔ, K. and NISIO, M. (1968). On the oscillation functions of Gaussian processes. *Math. Scand.* 22 209-223.
- [6] JAIN, N. C. (1971). A zero-one law for Gaussian processes. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 29 585-587.
- [7] KALLIANPUR, G. (1970). Zero-one laws for Gaussian processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 149 199-211.
- [8] KALLIANPUR, G. (1969). *Lecture Notes*. Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta.
- [9] LANDAU, H. J. and SHEPP, L. A. (1970). On the supremum of a Gaussian process. *Sankhyā Ser. A* 32 369-378.
- [10] LOÈVE, M. (1963). *Probability Theory*. Van Nostrand, Princeton.
- [11] MEYER, P. A. (1966). *Probability and Potentials*. Blaisdell, Waltham, Mass.
- [12] PARZEN, E. (1959). Statistical inference on time series by Hilbert space methods, I. Technical Report No. 23, Department of Statistics, Stanford Univ. Also in Parzen, E. (1967). *Time Series Analysis Papers*. Holden-Day, San Francisco. 251-382.
- [13] RAJPUT, B. S. (1972). Gaussian measures on L_p spaces, $1 \leq p < \infty$. *J. Multivariate Anal.* 2, in print.
- [14] ROSANOV, YU. A. (1966). Some remarks on the paper "On Gaussian distribution densities and Wiener-Hopf integral equations". *Theor. Probability Appl.* 11 483-485.

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL, N. C. 27514