

A Martingale Convergence Theorem of Ward's Type

by

Y. S. Chow

Purdue University

Department of Statistics

Division of Mathematical Sciences

Mimeograph Series Number 12

March 1964

# 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, have 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 I], which includes some martingale convergence theorems and extends a theorem of Rutowitz [7; Theorem II] to non-atomic basis. Theorem IV puts the above cited Ward's theorem into Martingale setting.

## 1. Definitions and notation.

Suppose that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$  is a complete measure space with  $P(\Omega) = 1$ . A stochastic basis  $(\mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$  is a net, where  $\Delta$  is a directed set,  $\mathcal{F}_\delta$  is a sub- $\sigma$ -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  $x_\delta$  is an  $\mathcal{F}_\delta$ -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  $\mathcal{F}_\delta$ -cover of  $A$  is denoted by  $A_\delta^*$  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  $x_\delta$  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  $\epsilon > 0$ , every set  $A$  and every net  $(K_\delta, \Delta)$  of  $\mathcal{F}_\delta$ -sets such that  $\limsup_{\Delta} K_\delta \supseteq A$  a.e., there exist  $\delta_1 > \delta$  for any given  $\delta$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_{\delta_1}$ -sets  $L_1 \subset K_{\delta_1}$  so that

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

where  $B = \bigcup_{l=1}^n L_l$ , and that

$$(1.2) \quad \left\| \sum_{l=1}^n I(L_l) - I(B) \right\|_q < \epsilon.$$

The conditions  $V_1$  and  $V_\infty$  are called respectively the weak and the strong Vitali conditions. If  $\Delta$  is a countable linearly ordered set, then any stochastic basis  $(\mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$  satisfies  $V_\infty$ . The ordinary differentiation basis satisfies the strong Vitali condition  $V_\infty$  (See [1] or [4; p.209], in [1]  $V_\infty$  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  $\limsup$  by  $\text{ess } \limsup$  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  $V = \{ \sup |x(\delta)| < b \}$ .

$(x_\delta, \mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$  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  $L_i \in V_{\delta_i}^* \mathcal{F}_{\delta_i}$ , there are  $\eta \geq \delta_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ) and  $\mathcal{F}_\eta$ -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  $\mathcal{F}_\eta$ -measurable functions  $x_i' = x_i'(\eta)$ ,  $x_i'' = x_i''(\eta)$  satisfying for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $j = n+1, \dots, m$

$$(1.3) \quad x_i' = x(\eta) = x_j'' \text{ in } V, \quad x_i' \leq c \text{ in } L_i, \quad x_j'' \geq c \text{ in } L_j,$$

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{L_1} x(\delta_1) \leq \int_{L_1 \cap A_1} y' + \int_{L_1 - A_1} x_1',$$

$$(1.5) \quad \int_{A_j} x(\delta_j) \geq \int_{L_j B_j} y'' + \int_{L_j - B_j} x_1'' ,$$

where  $A_j = \left\{ \max_{k \leq k_j} x(\eta_{j,k}) \geq b \right\}$  and  $B_j = \left\{ \min_{k \leq k_j} x(\eta_{j,k}) \leq -b \right\}$ .

**Definition 3.** A stochastic process  $(x_\delta, \mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$  is a martingale, if  $(\mathcal{F}_\delta, \Delta)$  is a stochastic basis,  $x_\delta$  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  $x_\delta$  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  $\eta \geq \delta_1$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ),  $y' = y'' \cdot x(\eta)$ ,  $\eta_{1,2} = \eta$ ,  $x_1'' = \min [x(\eta), b]$ ,  $x_1' = \max [x(\eta), -b]$ , 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  $x_\delta$  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  $V$  with  $P^*(V) > 0$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad \sup_{\Delta} |x_\delta| < b, \quad \limsup_{\Delta} x_\delta > d > a > \liminf_{\Delta} x_\delta$$

on  $V$ . Put

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

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

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

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

$$(2.4) \quad H_{\delta_0} = AV_{\delta_0}^* (x_{\delta_0} < a).$$

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

$$(2.5) \quad P^*(AV - B) < \epsilon, \quad \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m I(L_j) - I(E) \right\|_q < \epsilon,$$

where  $B = \bigcup_{n+1}^m L_j$ . By the condition  $(A, b)_p$ , there exist  $c, \eta, y', y'', x'_i$  and  $n_{i,k}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n, \dots, m; k = 1, \dots, k_i$ ) 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  $x(n_{i,k}) \geq b$  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  $\delta_0$  so large such that  $P(V_{\delta_0}^* - V_{\delta}^*) < \epsilon$  for  $\delta > \delta_0$ . Then

$$\sum_1^n \int_{L_i} [(s_i = \infty) - V_{\eta}^*] x'_i \leq c \sum_1^n P(L_i \{s_i = \infty\} - V_{\eta}^*) - c P(\bigcup_1^n L_i \{s_i = \infty\} - V_{\eta}^*)$$

$$+ c P(\bigcup_1^n L_i \{(s_i = \infty) - V_{\eta}^*\})$$

$$\leq c \left[ \sum_1^n P(L_i) - P(A) \right] + c P(\bigcup_1^n L_i \{(s_i = \infty) - V_{\eta}^*\})$$

$$< c\epsilon + c P(A - V_{\eta}^*) \leq c\epsilon + c P(V_{\delta_0}^* - V_{\eta}^*) < 2c\epsilon.$$

Hence:

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

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

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

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

$$\int_D y' \leq \int_{A \setminus V_{\eta}^*} |y'| \leq \int_{V_{\delta_0}^* - V_{\eta}^*} |y'| \leq c\epsilon.$$

By (2.3),

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

Hence

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

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

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

Similarly,

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

Put  $L_1^i = L_1$  and  $L_i^i = L_i - \bigcup_1^{i-1} L_k^i$  for  $i = 2, \dots, n$  and  $L_{n+1}^i = L_{n+1}$  and

$L_j^i = L_j - \bigcup_{n+1}^{j-1} L_k^i$  for  $j = n+2, \dots, m$ . Define  $z^i = x'_i$  on each  $L_i^i$  and  $z^{i'} = x'_{j'}$

on each  $L_j^i$ . Then

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

Similarly,

$$(2.13) \quad \sum_{n+1}^m \int_{L_j} V_{\eta}^* x_j' \geq \int_{BV_{\eta}^*} z'' - c\epsilon.$$

Hence

$$(2.14) \quad \int_{AV_{\eta}^*} z' - \int_{BV_{\eta}^*} z'' \leq cP[(A-B)V_{\eta}^*] \leq c P(A-B) \\ \leq P^*(AV-B) + P^*(A-V) < 2\epsilon.$$

From (2.10)-(2.14), we have

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

Thus we completed the proof.

Theorem 2. Let  $(\mathcal{F}_{\delta}, \Delta)$  satisfy the Vitali condition  $V_q$  and  $(x_{\delta}, \mathcal{F}_{\delta}, \Delta)$  be a martingale with  $\sup_{\Delta} \|x_{\delta}\|_p < \infty$ , where  $p \geq 1$  and  $p^{-1} + q^{-1} = 1$ . Then  $x_{\delta}$  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  $p > 1$  Theorem 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  $V = (\limsup_{\Delta} x_{\delta} = \infty)$  and  $P^*(V) > a > 0$ . Then by  $V_q$ , for any  $0 < K < \infty$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $\delta_0 \in \Delta$ , there exist  $\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_m$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{\delta_i}$ -sets  $L_i \subset [x(\delta_i) > K]$  such that  $\delta_i > \delta_0$  and

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

where  $A = \bigcup_1^m L_i$ . Take  $\eta > \delta_1$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ). Then

$$K_a \leq \sum_1^m \int_{L_1} x(\delta_1) = \sum_1^m \int_{L_1} x(\eta) \leq \left\| \sum_1^m I(\delta_1) - I(A) \right\|_q \left\| x(\eta) \right\|_p + \left\| x(\eta) \right\|_p$$

$$\leq (1 + \epsilon) \left\| x(\eta) \right\|_p.$$

Hence we arrive at a contradiction and  $P(V) = 0$ . 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  $V_q$  by  $V_q^*$ , 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.

### 3. A convergence theorem of martingales generated by cell function.

Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a family of  $\mathcal{F}$ -sets with positive measures. Each element in is called a cell. 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  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{G}^u X$  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 contained in  $\mathcal{K}^u$  (or equivalently  $A(\mathcal{K})$ ). For a cell  $I$ , a partition  $\eta$  of  $I$  is said to be  $p$ -bordering ( $p \geq 1$ ), 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  $P(\mathcal{K}^b) \leq p P(\mathcal{K})$ .  $\mathcal{Q}$  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  $\mathcal{A}$  of all partitions  $\lambda$  of  $\Omega$  forms a directed set with respect to the order  $>$  (refinement). For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_\lambda$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the  $\lambda$ -cells.

Theorem 3. Let  $(x_\lambda, \mathcal{F}_\lambda, \mathcal{A})$  be a martingale and  $\mathcal{A}$  have the  $p$ -bordering property with  $1 < p < \infty$ . Let  $B$  be an  $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_0}$ -cell  $V = [\sup_{\lambda > \lambda_0} |x_\lambda| < b]$  for

$0 < b < \infty$ , and  $c = 2pb$ . For any given  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n, \dots, \lambda_m$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  ( $\lambda > \lambda_1$ ) and  $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}$ -sets  $L_i \subset BV_{\lambda_i}^*$ , there exists  $\eta > \lambda_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that

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

$$(3.2) \quad \int_{L_j} x(\lambda_j) \geq -cP[L_j(x(\eta) \leq -b)] + \int_{L_j[x(\eta) > -b]} x^{(j)}(\eta), \quad j=n+1, \dots, m,$$

where

$$(3.3) \quad x_{\eta}^{(i)}(\omega) = x_{\eta}(\omega) = x_{\eta}^{(j)}(\omega) \quad \text{if } \omega \in I \cap \eta, \quad IV \neq \emptyset, \\ i = 1, \dots, n; \quad j = n+1, \dots, m,$$

$$(3.4) \quad x_{\eta}^{(i)}(\omega) = c = -x_{\eta}^{(j)}(\omega) \quad \text{if } \omega \in I \cap \eta, \quad IV = \emptyset, \quad i=1, \dots, n; \\ j = n+1, \dots, m.$$

Proof. We can and will assume that each  $L_i$  is an  $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda_i}$ -cell. Let  $\eta'$  be a partition of  $\Omega$  such that  $\eta' > \lambda_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n, \dots, m$ . Let  $\mathcal{J} = \eta'B$ . Then  $\mathcal{J}$  is a complex and  $L_i \in \mathcal{J}^u$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . By the  $p$ -bordering property of  $\mathcal{A}$ , there exists a  $\mathcal{J}$ -fine,  $p$ -bordering partition  $\delta$  of  $B$ . Put  $\eta = \eta'(\Omega - B) \cup \delta$ . Then,  $\eta \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\eta > \eta' > \lambda_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . For each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $K_i = [I | I \in \eta L_i, IV = \emptyset]$ . If  $K_i = \emptyset$ , then

$$\int_{L_i} x(\lambda_i) = \int_{L_i} x(\eta) = \int_{L_i} [|\mathbf{x}(\eta)| < b] x(\eta) = \int_{L_i} [|\mathbf{x}(\eta)| < b] x^{(i)}(\eta)$$

$$= \int_{L_i} [|\mathbf{x}(\eta)| < b] x^{(i)}(\eta).$$

If  $K_i = L_i$ , then since  $L_i \subset V_{\lambda_i}^*$

$$\int_{L_i} x(\lambda_i) \leq cP(L_i) = cP[L_i(x(\eta) \geq b)] + cP[L_i(x(\eta) \leq -b)]$$

$$\leq cP[L_i(x(\eta) \geq b)] + \int_{L_i} [x(\eta) \leq -b] x^{(i)}(\eta) = cP[L_i(x(\eta) \geq b)] +$$

$$+ \int_{L_i} [x(\eta) < -b] x^{(i)}(\eta).$$

Now assume that  $P(L_i) \neq 0$  and  $K_i \neq \emptyset \cap L_i$ . Since  $A(K_i) \neq L_i \in \delta^u$  and

$K_i \subset \delta^u L_i$ , by the  $p$ -bordering property of  $\delta$ , there exists a complex

$K_i^b \subset \delta^u L_i$  such that every  $K_i$ -cell is contained in some  $K_i^b$ -cell,  $IV \neq \emptyset$  for every  $K_i^b$ -cell  $I$ , and that  $P(K_i^b) \leq pP(K_i)$ . Hence

$$\int_{A(K_i)} x(\eta) = \int_{A(K_i^b)} x(\eta) - \int_{A(K_i^b) - A(K_i)} x(\eta)$$

$$\leq bP(K_i^b) + b[P(K_i^b) - P(K_i)] \leq 2bP(K_i^b) \leq cP(K_i).$$

Therefore

$$\int_{L_i} x(\lambda_i) = \int_{L_i} x(\eta) = \int_{A(K_i)} x(\eta) + \int_{L_i - A(K_i)} x(\eta)$$

$$\leq cP(K_i) + \int_{L_i - A(K_i)} x(\eta)$$

$$\leq cP[A(K_i)(|\mathbf{x}(\eta)| \geq b)] + cP[A(K_i)(|\mathbf{x}(\eta)| < b)] +$$

$$\int_{(L_i - A(K_i))(|\mathbf{x}(\eta)| < b)} x(\eta) \leq cP[L_i(|\mathbf{x}(\eta)| < b)] +$$

$$+ \int_{L_1} [ |x(\eta)| < b ] x^{(1)}(\eta).$$

Since by (3.4)

$$\int_{L_1} [x(\eta) \leq -b] x^{(2)}(\eta) = cP[L_1(x(\eta) \leq -b)],$$

$$\int_{L_1} x(\lambda_1) \leq cP[L_1(x(\eta) \geq b)] + \int_{L_1} [x(\eta) < b] x^{(1)}(\eta).$$

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  $\mathcal{A}$  have the  $p$ -bordering property with  $1 < p < \infty$ . Then  $x_\lambda$  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].

Acknowledgement. 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  $\sigma$ -finite measure space indexed by directed sets, Trans. Amer. Soc. 97 (1960) pp. 254-285.
2. J.L. Doob, Stochastic processes, New York, Wiley (1953)
3. J.L. Doob, Notes on Martingales theory, Proc., Fourth Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. and Prob., 1960, pp. 95-102.
4. O. Haupt, G. Aumann, C. Y. Pauc, Differential-und Integralrechnung 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. vol. III, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1955.
5. K. Krickeberg, Absteigende Semimartingale mit filtrierenden Parameterbereich, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg, 24(1960) pp. 109-125.
6. K. Krickeberg, Notwendige Konvergenzbedingungen bei Martingalen und verwandten Prozessen, Trans. Second Prague Conference on information theory, and etc. (1960), pp. 279-306.
7. D. Rutowitz, Theory of Ward for cell functions, Ann. di Mat pura ed app. 47(1959), pp. 1-33.
8. S. Saks, Theory of the integral, Warszawa-Lwow, 1937, Reprinted New York, Stechert - Hafner, 1952.