

## WITH RESPECT TO TAIL SIGMA FIELDS, STANDARD MEASURES POSSESS MEASURABLE DISINTEGRATIONS

LESTER E. DUBINS<sup>1</sup> AND DAVID HEATH

ABSTRACT. Let  $P$  be a countably additive probability on a standard space, and let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a tail subfield. Though no disintegration of  $P$  with respect to  $\mathcal{Q}$  that is countably additive need exist, there always is one which is finitely additive.

A surprising discovery of de Finetti, [5, p. 205] (see also [4]), leads to the conclusion that probability measures which are not countably additive need not possess any disintegration with respect to certain partitions. Even countably additive, fair-coin-tossing measure possesses no proper, measurable, countably additive disintegration with respect to the usual tail field [3]. One of the questions that then arises concerns the existence of *any* disintegration for this and similar situations. For standard measures and tail fields, an affirmative answer is provided by the theorem below. But first a little notation and two or three definitions are needed.

Throughout this note,  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a subsigma field of a sigma field  $\mathfrak{B}$  of subsets of a set  $\Omega$ , and  $P$  is a countably additive probability defined for  $\mathfrak{B}$ . For each  $\omega \in \Omega$ , let  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega)$  be the intersection of all  $A$  such that  $\omega \in A \in \mathcal{Q}$ . Whether or not  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega) \in \mathcal{Q}$ , call  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega)$  an  $\mathcal{Q}$ -atom, and verify that the  $\mathcal{Q}$ -atoms constitute a partition  $\Pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$  of  $\Omega$ . A function  $\sigma$  of two variables,  $h \in \Pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$ ,  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$  is a *measurable disintegration* of  $P$  given  $\mathcal{Q}$  if:

- (i) For each  $h$ ,  $\sigma(\cdot | h)$  is a probability on  $\mathfrak{B}$ , possibly finitely additive, which is supported by  $h$ ;
- (ii) For each  $B$ ,  $\sigma(B | \mathcal{Q}(\omega))$  is a version of the usual  $P$ -conditional-expectation of  $B$  given  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

A *tail field* is the intersection of a decreasing sequence of subsigma fields of  $\mathfrak{B}$  each of which is countably generated.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathfrak{B})$  be a standard space or, more generally, a Lusin space, and let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a tail subfield of  $\mathfrak{B}$ . Then every countably additive probability,  $P$ , on  $\mathfrak{B}$  possesses a measurable disintegration given  $\mathcal{Q}$ .*

If the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds for  $\mathcal{Q}$ , call  $\mathcal{Q}$  *tame*.

**LEMMA 1.** *Countably generated  $\mathcal{Q}$ 's in Lusin spaces are tame.*

---

Received by the editors July 6, 1982 and, in revised form, October 6, 1982.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 28A35, 28A50, 60G05.

*Key words and phrases*. Conglomerability, disintegrations, finite additivity.

<sup>1</sup>Research supported by NSF Grant MCS-80-02535.

PROOF. In a stronger form, this assertion is contained in [2, Theorem 2] which, in turn, was seen as a simple corollary to [1, Theorem 5].  $\square$

In view of Lemma 1, to establish Theorem 1, it suffices to establish

PROPOSITION 1. *The intersection of a decreasing sequence of sigma fields, each of which is tame, is tame.*

It is helpful to restate Proposition 1 in a more informative form, as in the next lemma, in which a diffuse mixture of disintegrations plays a role. A probability on the integers is *diffuse* if each finite set is of probability zero.

LEMMA 2. *Let  $P$  be a countably additive probability on  $\mathfrak{B}$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}$  the intersection of a decreasing sequence of tame fields  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ ,  $\sigma_n$  a measurable disintegration of  $P$  given  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ ,  $\mu$  a diffuse probability on the positive integers, and  $\sigma_\mu$  defined for  $B \in \mathfrak{B}$ ,  $\omega \in \Omega$  by*

$$(1) \quad \sigma_\mu(B | \mathcal{Q}(\omega)) = \int \sigma_n(B | \mathcal{Q}_n(\omega)) \mu(dn).$$

Then  $\sigma_\mu$  is a measurable disintegration of  $P$  given  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

The proof of Lemma 2 requires two preliminary facts.

SCHOLIUM 1. *Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the intersection of sigma fields  $\mathcal{Q}_1 \supset \mathcal{Q}_2 \supset \dots$ , and let  $A_n \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ . Then  $\liminf A_n \in \mathcal{Q}$ .*

PROOF. Let  $B_j = \bigcap A_n$  ( $n \geq j$ ). Plainly, since  $B_i \in \mathcal{Q}_i \subset \mathcal{Q}_j$  for  $i > j$ ,  $\bigcup B_i$  ( $i \geq j$ )  $\in \mathcal{Q}_j$ . And since this union is  $\liminf A_n$ , independent of  $j$ , it belongs to every  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ , that is, it belongs to  $\mathcal{Q}$ .  $\square$

SCHOLIUM 2. *If  $\mathcal{Q}$  is the intersection of sigma fields  $\mathcal{Q}_1 \supset \mathcal{Q}_2 \supset \dots$ , then, for each  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,*

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{Q}(\omega) = \bigcup \mathcal{Q}_n(\omega).$$

PROOF. Since  $\mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{Q}_n$ ,  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega) \supset \mathcal{Q}_n(\omega)$  for all  $n$ , the left-hand side of (2) includes the right-hand side. It suffices to see, therefore, that unless  $\omega' \in \Omega$  belongs to one of the  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\omega)$ , it does not belong to  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega)$ . So assume that  $\exists A_n \in \mathcal{Q}_n$  which separates  $\omega$  from  $\omega'$ , say  $\omega \in A_n$ ,  $\omega' \in A_n^c$  for all  $n$ . Let  $A = \liminf A_n$ . Then  $A$  obviously separates  $\omega$  from  $\omega'$  and, by Scholium 1,  $A \in \mathcal{Q}$ . So  $\omega' \notin \mathcal{Q}(\omega)$ .  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA 2. If  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega) = \mathcal{Q}(\omega')$ , then, by Scholium 2,  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\omega) = \mathcal{Q}_n(\omega')$  for some  $n$  and, hence, for all but a finite set of  $n$ . So, since  $\mu$  is diffuse,  $\sigma_\mu(B | \omega) = \sigma_\mu(B | \omega')$ , that is,  $\sigma_\mu(\cdot | \omega)$  depends only on  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega)$ , and may therefore be written as  $\sigma_\mu(\cdot | \mathcal{Q}(\omega))$ . Since  $\sigma_n(\cdot | \mathcal{Q}_n(\omega))$  is supported by  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\omega)$ , and  $\mathcal{Q}_n(\omega) \subset \mathcal{Q}(\omega)$ , it is, for all  $n$ , certainly supported by  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega)$ .

Therefore,  $\sigma_\mu(\cdot | \mathcal{Q}(\omega))$ , too, is supported by  $\mathcal{Q}(\omega)$ . Hence, (i) is satisfied by  $\sigma_\mu$ . To verify (ii), note that  $\sigma_n(B | \mathcal{Q}_n(\omega))$ , being a version of the  $P$ -conditional probability of  $B$  given  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ , converges, by the reversed martingale convergence theorem, for all  $\omega$  not in a  $P$ -null set, to a limit  $X(\omega)$ , where  $X$  is a version of  $P(B | \mathcal{Q})$ . Since  $\mu$  is a diffuse probability, for all such  $\omega$ , the right-hand side of (1) is  $X(\omega)$ . So  $\sigma_\mu(B | \mathcal{Q}(\omega))$  satisfies (ii).  $\square$

Plainly, Theorem 1 implies that countably additive probabilities possess measurable disintegrations given the usual tail fields as well as fields of the form  $\mathcal{G}_{t+}$  familiar in the usual theory of continuous-path processes. The same conclusion holds for the subfield of Borel sets invariant under a group which is the union of an increasing sequence of finite groups as is, for example, the group of periodic rotations of a circle. In particular, the usual fair-coin probability possesses a measurable disintegration given the tail sigma-field which, at the time [3] was written, seemed unlikely. Since, as reported there, all such disintegrations are purely finitely additive, the conclusion of Theorem 1 cannot be strengthened to assert the existence of measurable disintegrations which are countably additive. That the hypothesis that  $P$  is countably additive cannot be dropped can be seen by means of an example [4, Theorem 2].

Whether the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds if  $\mathcal{Q}$  consists of the Borel subsets of the unit circle invariant under a nonperiodic rotation, we do not know. Indeed, whether the hypothesis of Theorem 1, that  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a tail field, can be considerably weakened, if not entirely eliminated, we must leave open. To us, this seems dubious even if "measurable" is deleted from the conclusion.

#### REFERENCES

1. David Blackwell, *On a class of probability spaces*, Proc. Third Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. and Prob. 1-6, University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1955.
2. David Blackwell and Lester E. Dubins, *On existence and non-existence of proper, regular, conditional distributions*, Ann. Probab. 3 (1975), 741-752.
3. Lester E. Dubins, *Measurable, tail disintegrations of the Haar integral are purely finitely additive*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 62 (1977), 34-36.
4. \_\_\_\_\_, *Finitely additive conditional probabilities, conglomerability and disintegrations*, Ann. Probab. 3 (1975), 89-99.
5. B. de Finetti, *Probability, induction, and statistics*, Wiley, New York, 1972.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

DEPARTMENT OF OPERATIONS RESEARCH AND INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK 14853