

A MARTINGALE CONVERGENCE THEOREM OF WARD'S TYPE

BY
Y. S. CHOW

Introduction

The martingale convergence theorems were first utilized by Doob [2, p. 343] in giving a new proof of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem of functions of bounded variation on a real line. Later Chow [1] gave a proof of the Lebesgue differentiation theorem of interval functions of bounded variation by applying convergence theorems of partially ordered martingales. In 1959, Ward's differentiation theorem [8, p. 137, p. 141], among other things, has been generalized by Rutowitz [7] to cell functions by introducing the concept of the p -bordering property. In this paper, by following Doob's approach in [3], we are able to obtain a convergence theorem (Theorem 1), which includes some martingale convergence theorems and extends a theorem of Rutowitz [7, Theorem II] to the case of a non-atomic basis. Theorem 4 puts the above cited Ward's theorem into martingale setting.

1. Definitions and notation

Suppose that (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) is a complete measure space with $P(\Omega) = 1$. A stochastic basis $(\mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ is a net, where Δ is a directed set, \mathcal{F}_δ is a sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{F} for each $\delta \in \Delta$, and $\mathcal{F}_\delta \subset \mathcal{F}_{\delta'}$ if $\delta < \delta'$. A stochastic process $(x_\delta, \mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ is a triple, where $(\mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ is a stochastic basis and x_δ is an \mathcal{F}_δ -measurable function. P^* is the outer measure induced by P and the integral $\int_A x$ will mean $\int_A x dP$. For a set A , the \mathcal{F}_δ -cover of A is denoted by A_δ^* and the \mathcal{F} -cover by A^* . $A - B$ will be the proper difference of sets A and B , and $I(A)$ the indicator (or characteristic) function of the set A . The function x_δ is sometimes written as $x(\delta)$. $\|x\|_q$ is the L_q -norm of x . For sets A and B , $A \in \mathcal{F}_\delta B$, if $A \subset B$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_\delta$.

DEFINITION 1. A stochastic basis is said to satisfy the Vitali condition V_q for $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, every set A and every net (K_δ, Δ) of \mathcal{F}_δ -sets such that $\limsup_\Delta K_\delta \supset A$ a.e., there exist $\delta_i > \delta$ for any given δ , and \mathcal{F}_{δ_i} -sets $L_i \subset K_{\delta_i}$ so that

$$(1.1) \quad P^*(A - B) < \varepsilon$$

where $B = \bigcup_1^n L_i$, and so that

$$(1.2) \quad \left\| \sum_1^n I(L_i) - I(B) \right\|_q < \varepsilon.$$

The conditions V_1 and V_∞ are called respectively the weak and the strong

Vitali conditions. If Δ is a countable linearly ordered set, then any stochastic basis $(\mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ satisfies V_∞ . The ordinary differentiation basis satisfies the strong Vitali condition V_∞ (see [1] or [4, p. 209]; in [1] V_∞ has been denoted by V_0), and the strong differentiation basis has the property V_1 (see [4, p. 210]).

A stochastic basis is said to satisfy the Vitali condition V_q^* , if it satisfies the conditions of Definition 1, replacing $\lim \sup$ by $\text{ess } \lim \sup$ and A by A^* . Both definitions of V_q and V_q^* are due to Krickeberg [5], [6]. (He denotes V_q and V_q^* by V_q^* and V_q .)

DEFINITION 2. Let $b > 0$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $W = [\sup_\Delta |x(\delta)| < b]$. $(x_\delta, \mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ is said to satisfy the condition $(A, b)_q$, if for every $\delta_0 \in \Delta$ there exists $0 < c < \infty$ such that for any given $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m$ in $\Delta(\delta > \delta_0)$ and $L_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\delta_i}^* \mathcal{F}_{\delta_i}$, there are $\eta \geq \delta_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m$) and \mathcal{F}_η -measurable functions $y' = y'(\eta)$, $y'' = y''(\eta)$ with $\|y'\|_q \leq c$, $\|y''\|_q \leq c$ so that there exist $\eta_{i,1} = \delta_i \leq \eta_{i,2} \leq \dots \leq \eta_{i,k_i} = \eta$ and \mathcal{F}_η -measurable functions $x'_i = x'_i(\eta)$, $x''_i = x''_i(\eta)$ satisfying for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $j = n + 1, \dots, m$

$$(1.3) \quad x'_i = x(\eta) = x''_j \text{ in } W, \quad x'_i \leq c \text{ in } L_i, \quad x''_j \geq -c \text{ in } L_j,$$

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{L_i} x(\delta_i) \leq \int_{L_i A_i} y' + \int_{L_i - A_i} x'_i,$$

$$(1.5) \quad \int_{L_j} x(\delta_j) \geq \int_{L_j B_j} y'' + \int_{L_j - B_j} x''_j,$$

where $A_i = [\max_{k \leq k_i} x(\eta_{i,k}) \geq b]$ and $B_j = [\min_{k \leq k_j} x(\eta_{j,k}) \leq -b]$.

DEFINITION 3. A stochastic process $(x_\delta, \mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ is a martingale, if x_δ is integrable, and if for $\delta' \leq \delta$ $E(x_\delta | \mathcal{F}_{\delta'}) = x_{\delta'}$, a.e., where $E(x_\delta | \mathcal{F}_{\delta'})$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of the integral of x_δ relative to $\mathcal{F}_{\delta'}$.

If $(x_\delta, \mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ is a martingale and $\sup_\Delta \|x_\delta\|_q \leq K < \infty$, then the condition $(A, b)_q$ is satisfied for every $b > 0$, by taking $\eta \geq \delta_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m$), $y' = y'' = x(\eta)$, $\eta_{i,2} = \eta$, $x'_i = \min [x(\eta), b]$, $x''_i = \max [x(\eta), -b]$, and $c > \max [b, K]$.

2. Martingale convergence theorems

THEOREM 1. If $1 \leq q < \infty$, $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$ and $(x_\delta, \mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ is a stochastic process satisfying the Vitali condition V_q , then x_δ converges a.e. where

$$\sup_\Delta |x_\delta| < b,$$

provided $(A, b)_p$ is satisfied for some $b > 0$.

Proof. Suppose that it is false and $\delta_0 \in \Delta$. Then there exist two real numbers $a < d$ and a set W with $P^*(W) > 0$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad \sup_\Delta |x_\delta| < b, \quad \lim \sup_\Delta x_\delta > d > a > \lim \inf_\Delta x_\delta$$

on W . Put

$$(2.2) \quad K_\delta = W_\delta^* (x_\delta > d).$$

Then $\limsup K_\delta \supset W$. By the Vitali condition V_q , for $1 > \varepsilon > 0$ there exist $\delta_i > \delta_0$ and $L_i \in K_{\delta_i} \mathfrak{F}_{\delta_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that

$$(2.3) \quad P^*(W - A) < \varepsilon, \quad \left\| \sum_1^n I(L_i) - I(A) \right\|_q < \varepsilon,$$

where $A = \bigcup_1^n L_i$. Put

$$(2.4) \quad H_\delta = AW_\delta^* (x_\delta < a).$$

By V_q again, for $\delta'_0 > \delta_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, there exist $\delta_j > \delta'_0$ and $L_j \in H_{\delta_j} \mathfrak{F}_{\delta_j}$, $j = n + 1, \dots, m$, such that

$$(2.5) \quad P^*(AW - B) < \varepsilon, \quad \left\| \sum_{n+1}^m I(L_j) - I(B) \right\|_q < \varepsilon,$$

where $B = \bigcup_{n+1}^m L_j$. By the condition $(A, b)_p$, there exist $c, \eta, y', y'', x'_i, x''_i$ and $\eta_{i,k}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n, \dots, m; k = 1, \dots, k_i$) satisfying the conditions in $(A, b)_p$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let s_i be the first $k \leq k_i$ such that $x(\eta_{i,k}) \geq b$ if there is one, and $s_i = \infty$ otherwise. Then for $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{L_i} x(\delta_i) \leq \int_{L_i(s_i < \infty)} y' + \int_{L_i(s_i = \infty)} x'_i,$$

$$d \sum_1^n P(L_i) \leq \sum_1^n \int_{L_i(s_i < \infty)} y' + \sum_1^n \int_{L_i(s_i = \infty)} x'_i.$$

Choose δ_0 so large such that $P(W_{\delta_0}^* - W_\delta^*) < \varepsilon$ for $\delta > \delta_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_1^n \int_{L_i[(s_i = \infty) - W_\eta^*]} x'_i &\leq c \sum_1^n P(L_i[(s_i = \infty) - W_\eta^*]) \\ &\quad - cP(\bigcup_1^n L_i[(s_i = \infty) - W_\eta^*]) \\ &\quad + cP(\bigcup_1^n L_i[(s_i = \infty) - W_\eta^*]) \\ &\leq c[\sum_1^n P(L_i) - P(A)] \\ &\quad + cP(\bigcup_1^n L_i[(s_i = \infty) - W_\eta^*]) \\ &< c\varepsilon + cP(A - W_\eta^*) \\ &\leq c\varepsilon + cP(W_{\delta_0}^* - W_\eta^*) < 2c\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_1^n \int_{L_i[(s_i = \infty) - W_\eta^*]} x'_i < 2c\varepsilon.$$

Since $q < \infty$, we can assume that δ_0 is so large that $P(W_{\delta_0}^* - W_\delta^*) < \varepsilon^q$ for every $\delta > \delta_0$. Then

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{W_{\delta_0}^* - W_\eta^*} |y'| \leq \|y'\|_p \varepsilon \leq c\varepsilon.$$

Put $D = \bigcup_1^n L_i (s_i < \infty)$. Since $W_\eta^* \subset (s_i = \infty)$ for each i and $D \subset A \subset W_{\delta_0}^*$,

$$\int_D y' \leq \int_{A-W_\eta^*} |y'| \leq \int_{W_{\delta_0}^*-W_\eta^*} |y'| \leq c\varepsilon.$$

By (2.3),

$$\sum_1^n \int_{L_i(s_i < \infty)} y' - \int_D y' \leq \left\| \sum_1^n I(L_i) - I(A) \right\|_q \|y'\|_p < c\varepsilon.$$

Hence

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_1^n \int_{L_i(s_i < \infty)} y' < 2c\varepsilon.$$

From (2.9), (2.7) and (2.6),

$$(2.10) \quad d \sum_1^n P(L_i) \leq 4c\varepsilon + \sum_1^n \int_{L_i W_\eta^*} x'_i.$$

Similarly,

$$(2.11) \quad a \sum_{n+1}^m P(L_j) \geq -4c\varepsilon + \sum_{n+1}^m \int_{L_j W_\eta^*} x''_j.$$

Put $L'_1 = L_1$ and $L'_i = L_i - \bigcup_1^{i-1} L'_k$ for $i = 2, \dots, n$ and $L'_{n+1} = L_{n+1}$ and $L'_j = L_j - \bigcup_{n+1}^{j-1} L'_k$ for $j = n+2, \dots, m$. Define $z' = x'_i$ on each L'_i and $z'' = x''_j$ on each L'_j . Then

$$(2.12) \quad \sum_1^n \int_{L_i W_\eta^*} x'_i \leq \int_{A W_\eta^*} z' + c \left[\sum_1^n P(L_i) - P(A) \right] \leq \int_{A W_\eta^*} z' + c\varepsilon.$$

Similarly,

$$(2.13) \quad \sum_{n+1}^m \int_{L_j W_\eta^*} x''_j \geq \int_{B W_\eta^*} z'' - c\varepsilon.$$

Hence

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{A W_\eta^*} z' - \int_{B W_\eta^*} z'' &\leq cP[(A - B)W_\eta^*] \\ &\leq cP(A - B) \\ &\leq P^*(AW - B) + P^*(A - W) < 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.10)–(2.14), we have

$$(2.15) \quad d \sum_1^n P(L_i) - a \sum_{n+1}^m P(L_j) < 12c\varepsilon.$$

Thus we completed the proof.

THEOREM 2. Let $(\mathfrak{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ satisfy the Vitali condition V_q and $(x_\delta, \mathfrak{F}_\delta, \Delta)$ be a martingale with $\sup_\Delta \|x_\delta\|_p < \infty$, where $p \geq 1$ and $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$. Then x_δ converges a.e.

Proof. For $p = 1$, it follows immediately from Theorem 4.2 of [1] that $\lim_{\Delta} x_{\delta}$ exists a.e., and for $p > 1$ states that $\lim_{\Delta} x_{\delta}$ exists a.e. where both $\limsup_{\Delta} x_{\delta}$ and $\liminf_{\Delta} x_{\delta}$ are finite. Hence we need only to prove that under the conditions of Theorem 2, both $\limsup_{\Delta} x_{\delta}$ and $\liminf_{\Delta} x_{\delta}$ are finite a.e.

Assume that $W = (\limsup_{\Delta} x_{\delta} = \infty)$ and $P^*(W) > a > 0$. Then by V_a , for any $0 < K < \infty$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\delta_0 \in \Delta$, there exist $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_m$ and \mathcal{F}_{δ_i} - sets $L_i \subset [x(\delta_i) > K]$ such that $\delta_i > \delta_0$ and

$$(2.16) \quad P(A) > a, \quad \left\| \sum_1^m I(L_i) - I(A) \right\|_a < \varepsilon,$$

where $A = \bigcup_1^m L_i$. Take $\eta > \delta_i (i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} KA &\leq \sum_1^m \int_{L_i} x(\delta_i) = \sum_1^m \int_{L_i} x(\eta) \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_1^m I(L_i) - I(A) \right\|_a \|x(\eta)\|_p + \|x(\eta)\|_p \\ &\leq (1 + \varepsilon) \|x(\eta)\|_p. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we arrive at a contradiction and $P(W) = 0$. Similarly,

$$P(\liminf_{\Delta} x_{\delta} = -\infty) = 0.$$

From the previous proofs, immediately we have

COROLLARY 1. *Both Theorems 1 and 2 hold, if we replace V_a by V_a^* , sup by ess sup and convergence by essential convergence.*

Corollary 1 completes a theorem due to Krickeberg [5, Theorem 3.5] on essential convergence of martingales of decreasing stochastic basis.

Added in proof. In a recent paper of K. Krickeberg and C. Pauc (Bull. Soc. Math. France, vol. 91 (1963), pp. 455-543), the essential convergence part of Corollary 1 was proved by a different method.

3. A convergence theorem for martingales generated by cell functions

Let \mathcal{G} be a family of \mathcal{F} -sets with positive measures. Each element in \mathcal{G} is called a cell. Two cells are said to be non-overlapping, if their intersection is a null set. A partition of a set $X \subset \Omega$ is a sequence of non-overlapping cells I_n with $\bigcup_1^{\infty} I_n = X$ and any cell meets at most a finite number of I_n . For a family \mathcal{G} of cells, each cell in \mathcal{G} is called a \mathcal{G} -cell. $A(\mathcal{G})$ will be the union of all \mathcal{G} -cells, \mathcal{G}^u the family of cells which are finite unions of \mathcal{G} -cells, and for a set X , $\mathcal{G}X$ is the family of all \mathcal{G} -cells which are subsets of X . A complex \mathcal{K} is a finite family of non-overlapping cells. For a complex \mathcal{K} , define $P(\mathcal{K}) = P(A(\mathcal{K}))$. For two families \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} of cells, if $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{H}^u$, we say that \mathcal{H} refines \mathcal{G} , or \mathcal{H} is \mathcal{G} -fine, denoted by $\mathcal{G} < \mathcal{H}$. For two complexes \mathcal{K}

and $\mathcal{K}^b, \mathcal{K}^b$ is said to be a bordering complex of \mathcal{K} , if every \mathcal{K} -cell is contained in some \mathcal{K}^b -cell and no \mathcal{K}^b -cell is included in \mathcal{K}^u . For a cell I , a partition η of I is said to be p -bordering ($p > 1$), if for each cell $J \in \eta^u$ and each complex $\mathcal{K} \subset \eta^u J$ with $A(\mathcal{K}) \neq J$, there exists a bordering complex \mathcal{K}^b of \mathcal{K} with $\mathcal{K}^b \subset \eta^u J$ and $P(\mathcal{K}^b) \leq pP(\mathcal{K})$. \mathcal{g} will be said to have the p -bordering property, if to every cell I and every complex \mathcal{K} of subcells of I , there corresponds a \mathcal{K} -fine p -bordering partition of I .

Assume that the family Λ of all partitions λ of Ω forms a directed set with respect to the order $>$ (refinement). For each $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let \mathcal{F}_λ be the σ -algebra generated by the λ -cells.

THEOREM 3. *Let $(x_\lambda, \mathcal{F}_\lambda, \Lambda)$ be a martingale and \mathcal{g} have the p -bordering property with $1 < p < \infty$. Let B be an \mathcal{F}_{λ_0} -cell, $W = [\sup_{\lambda > \lambda_0} |x_\lambda| < b]$ for $0 < b < \infty$, and $c = 2pb$. For any given $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n, \dots, \lambda_m$ in*

$$\Lambda(\lambda > \lambda_0)$$

and \mathcal{F}_{λ_i} -sets $L_i \subset BW_{\lambda_i}^*$, there exists $\eta > \lambda_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ in Λ such that

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{L_i} x(\lambda_i) \leq cP[L_i(x(\eta) \geq b)] + \int_{L_i[|x(\eta)| < b]} x^{(i)}(\eta), \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{L_j} x(\lambda_j) \geq -cP[L_j(x(\eta) \leq -b)] + \int_{L_j[|x(\eta)| > -b]} x^{(j)}(\eta),$$

$$j = n + 1, \dots, m,$$

where

$$(3.3) \quad x_\eta^{(i)}(\omega) = x_\eta(\omega) = x_\eta^{(j)}(\omega) \quad \text{if } \omega \in I \in \eta, IW \neq \emptyset,$$

$$i = 1, \dots, n; \quad j = n + 1, \dots, m,$$

$$(3.4) \quad x_\eta^{(i)}(\omega) = c = -x_\eta^{(j)}(\omega) \quad \text{if } \omega \in I \in \eta, IW = \emptyset,$$

$$i = 1, \dots, n; \quad j = n + 1, \dots, m.$$

Proof. We can and will assume that each L_i is an \mathcal{F}_{λ_i} -cell. Let η' be a partition of Ω such that $\eta' > \lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, n, \dots, m$. Let $\mathcal{g} = \eta' B$. Then \mathcal{g} is a complex and $L_i \in \mathcal{g}^u$ for each $i = 1, \dots, m$. By the p -bordering property of \mathcal{g} , there exists a \mathcal{g} -fine, p -bordering partition δ of B . Put

$$\eta = \eta'(\Omega - B) \cup \delta.$$

Then, $\eta \in \Lambda$ and $\eta > \eta' > \lambda_i, i = 1, \dots, m$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\mathcal{K}_i = [I \mid I \in \eta L_i, IW = \emptyset]$. If $\mathcal{K}_i = \emptyset$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{L_i} x(\lambda_i) &= \int_{L_i} x(\eta) = \int_{L_i[|x(\eta)| < b]} x(\eta) = \int_{L_i[|x(\eta)| < b]} x^{(i)}(\eta) \\ &= \int_{L_i[|x(\eta)| < b]} x^{(i)}(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

If $A(\mathcal{K}_i) = L_i$, then since $L_i \subset W_{\lambda_i}^*$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{L_i} x(\lambda_i) &\leq cP(L_i) = cP[L_i(x(\eta) \geq b)] + cP[L_i(x(\eta) \leq -b)] \\ &\leq cP[L_i(x(\eta) \geq b)] + \int_{L_i\{x(\eta) \leq -b\}} x^{(i)}(\eta) \\ &= cP[L_i(x(\eta) \geq b)] + \int_{L_i\{x(\eta) < b\}} x^{(i)}(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Now assume that $\mathcal{K}_i \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{K}_i \neq \eta L_i$. Since $A(\mathcal{K}_i) \neq L_i \in \delta^u$ and $\mathcal{K}_i \subset \delta^u L_i$, by the p -bordering property of δ , there exists a complex $\mathcal{K}_i^b \subset \delta^u L_i$ such that every \mathcal{K}_i -cell is contained in some \mathcal{K}_i^b -cell, $IW \neq \emptyset$ for every \mathcal{K}_i^b -cell I , and $P(\mathcal{K}_i^b) \leq pP(\mathcal{K}_i)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A(\mathcal{K}_i)} x(\eta) &= \int_{A(\mathcal{K}_i^b)} x(\eta) - \int_{A(\mathcal{K}_i^b) - A(\mathcal{K}_i)} x(\eta) \\ &\leq bP(\mathcal{K}_i^b) + b[P(\mathcal{K}_i^b) - P(\mathcal{K}_i)] \leq 2bP(\mathcal{K}_i^b) \leq cP(\mathcal{K}_i). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{L_i} x(\lambda_i) &= \int_{L_i} x(\eta) = \int_{A(\mathcal{K}_i)} x(\eta) + \int_{L_i - A(\mathcal{K}_i)} x(\eta) \\ &\leq cP(\mathcal{K}_i) + \int_{L_i - A(\mathcal{K}_i)} x(\eta) \\ &\leq cP[A(\mathcal{K}_i)(|x(\eta)| \geq b)] + cP[A(\mathcal{K}_i)(|x(\eta)| < b)] \\ &\quad + \int_{[L_i - A(\mathcal{K}_i)]\{|x(\eta)| < b\}} x(\eta) \\ &\leq cP[L_i(|x(\eta)| < b)] + \int_{L_i\{|x(\eta)| < b\}} x^{(i)}(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Since by (3.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{L_i\{x(\eta) \geq -b\}} x^{(i)}(\eta) &= cP[L_i(x(\eta) \leq -b)], \\ \int_{L_i} x(\lambda) &\leq cP[L_i(x(\eta) \geq b)] + \int_{L_i\{x(\eta) < b\}} x^{(i)}(\eta). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can prove (3.2).

THEOREM 4. *Let $(x_\lambda, \mathcal{F}_\lambda, \Lambda)$ be a martingale satisfying the weak Vitali condition V_1 and \mathcal{g} have the p -bordering property with $1 < p < \infty$. Then x_λ converges a.e. where $\sup |x_\lambda| < \infty$.*

Proof. Theorem 3 states that $(x_\lambda, \mathcal{F}_\lambda, \Lambda)$ satisfies the condition $(A, b)_\infty$ for every $b > 0$. Therefore, Theorem 4 follows from Theorem 1 immediately.

Theorem 3 includes Theorem II of Rutowitz' [7], which in turn (See [7, p. 29]) includes a theorem of Ward [8, p. 141].

Acknowledgment. The author would like to express his gratitude to Professors K. Krickeberg, C. Y. Pauc, and J. L. Doob, for many of their helpful suggestions and valuable discussions. He also wishes to thank the Institute of Mathematics of the University of Heidelberg and the University of Aarhus for their support and the use of their facilities.

REFERENCES

1. Y. S. CHOW, *Martingales in a σ -finite measure space indexed by directed sets*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 97 (1960) pp. 254-285.
2. J. L. DOOB, *Stochastic processes*, New York, Wiley, 1953.
3. ———, *Notes on martingales theory*, Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1960, pp. 95-102.
4. O. HAUPT, G. AUMANN, AND C. Y. PAUC, *Differential-und Integralrechnung*, 2nd ed., vol. III, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1955.
5. K. KRICKEBERG, *Absteigende Semimartingale mit filtrierenden Parameterbereich*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg, vol. 24 (1960) pp. 109-125.
6. ———, *Notwendige Konvergenzbedingungen bei Martingalen und verwandten Prozessen*, Transactions of the Second Prague Conference on Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes, 1960, pp. 279-306.
7. D. RUTOWITZ, *Theory of Ward for cell functions*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., vol. 47 (1959), pp. 1-33.
8. S. SAKS, *Theory of the integral*, Warszawa-Lwow, 1937; New York, Stechert-Hafner, 1952.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
LAFAYETTE, INDIANA