

ON SEQUENCES OF  $\sigma$ -ALGEBRAS

BY

M. G. NADKARNI, D. RAMACHANDRAN  
AND K. P. S. BHASKARA RAO (CALCUTTA)

**0. Introduction.** Let  $(A_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of  $\sigma$ -algebras in a probability space  $(\Omega, A, P)$  such that

(i)  $A_{n+1} \subseteq A_n$ ,

(ii) for each  $n$ , there is a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $C_n$  independent of  $A_{n+1}$  and together with  $A_{n+1}$  generating  $A_n$ ,

(iii)  $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n$  is trivial in the sense that its elements have the probability zero or one.

When is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by  $(C_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$  equal, up to sets of measure zero, to the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $A_1$ ?

This is one of the questions which presents itself in certain formulations of non-linear prediction theory due to Kallianpur and Wiener [2] and Rosenblatt [7] and [8]. Actually, in their formulation, the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $A_n$  is taken to be the future  $\sigma$ -algebra from time  $n$  on of a purely non-deterministic strictly stationary stochastic process. A succinct account of this theory is given by Masani in [4], p. 89. In this paper we address ourselves to the question raised above, but we do not bring in the notions of probability and of independence of  $\sigma$ -algebras into considerations and instead only require that  $C_n \cap A_{n+1} = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$  and  $C_n \cup A_{n+1}$  generate  $A_n$ . The results, however, do have relevance to the question raised above in the context of probability. The paper contains mainly counter-examples to plausible conjectures.

**1.** Let  $A$  be a  $\sigma$ -algebra of subsets of a set  $\Omega$ . Two subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $\Omega$  are *separated* in  $A$  if there exists a subset  $C \in A$  such that  $A \subseteq C$  and  $B \subseteq \Omega \setminus C$ . We say that  $A$  *separates points* if any two distinct points are separated in  $A$ . A non-empty subset  $A \in A$  is called an *atom* if there is no proper non-empty subset of  $A$  which belongs to  $A$ , and  $A$  is called *atomic* if every non-empty element of  $A$  is a union of atoms of  $A$ . For any

finite collections  $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_n$  of  $\sigma$ -algebras on  $\Omega$ , we write  $A_0 \vee A_1 \vee \dots \vee A_n$  and  $A_0 \wedge A_1 \wedge \dots \wedge A_n$  to denote the  $\sigma$ -algebras generated by  $A_0 \cup A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n$  and  $A_0 \cap A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n$ , respectively.  $\bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  and  $\bigwedge_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  have a similar meaning. We shall need the following theorem due to Blackwell [1] and Mackey [3]:

**BLACKWELL-MACKEY THEOREM.** *Let  $\Omega$  be an analytic set in complete separable metric space and let  $B$  denote its Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra. If  $A$  is a countably generated sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $B$  which separates points, then  $A = B$ .*

**PROPOSITION 1.** *Let  $C_n$  and  $D_n$  ( $n \geq 0$ ) be two sequences of  $\sigma$ -algebras on a set  $\Omega$ , and assume that the sequence  $D_n$  ( $n \geq 0$ ) is decreasing. Let*

$$C = \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n \quad \text{and} \quad D = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n,$$

and let  $x$  and  $y$  be two distinct points of  $\Omega$ .

(i) *If  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C_n \vee D_n$  for every  $n$ , then  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C \vee D$ .*

(ii) *If  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C \vee D$ , then  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C_n \vee D_n$  for some  $n$ .*

**Proof.** (i) If  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C_n \vee D_n$  for every  $n$ , then, for any given  $n$ ,  $x$  and  $y$  are separated either in  $C_n$  or in  $D_n$ . If  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C_n$  for some  $n$ , then, clearly,  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C$ , and hence in  $C \vee D$ . Suppose that  $x$  and  $y$  are not separated in any  $C_n$ . Then  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $D_n$  for every  $n$ , and so, for each  $n \geq 0$ , there is an  $A_n \in D_n$  such that  $x \in A_n$  and  $y \notin A_n$ . Let  $A = \limsup A_n$ . Then  $x \in A$  and  $y \notin A$ , and since  $D_n$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , is a decreasing sequence,  $A \in D_n$  for every  $n$ . Hence  $A \in D$ . Thus  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $D$ , and hence in  $C \vee D$ .

(ii) If  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C \vee D$ , then they are separated either in  $C$  or in  $D$ . If they are separated in  $C$ , they are separated in some  $C_n$ . (For if not, then the collection  $\{A: x, y \in A \text{ or } x, y \in A^c\}$  is a  $\sigma$ -algebra which contains every  $C_n$ , whence  $C$ , and thus  $x$  and  $y$  are not separated in  $C$ .) Hence  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C_n \vee D_n$ . If they are separated in  $D$ , then, in view of  $D \subseteq D_n$ ,  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $D_n$ , and hence in  $C_n \vee D_n$  for every  $n$ .

As immediate consequences of proposition 1 we have the following

**COROLLARY 1.** *Assume, in addition to the hypothesis of proposition 1, that  $C_n$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , is an increasing sequence.*

(i)  *$x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C_n \vee D_n$  for all but finitely many  $n$  if and only if  $x$  and  $y$  are separated in  $C \vee D$ .*

(ii) *If  $C_n \vee D_n$  separates points for all but finitely many  $n$ , then  $C \vee D$  separates points.*

**COROLLARY 2.** *Assume, in addition to the hypothesis of proposition 1, that  $\Omega$  is an analytic subset of a complete separable metric space and that, for each  $n$ ,  $C_n$  and  $D_n$  are countably generated sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $B$  of  $\Omega$ .*

(i) *If  $C_n \vee D_n = B$  for all  $n$ , then  $C \vee D$  separates points.*

(ii) *If  $C_n \vee D_n = B$  for all  $n$  and  $D$  is countably generated, then  $C \vee D = B$ .*

Part (ii) of this corollary follows from the Blackwell-Mackey theorem.

It can be conjectured that if  $C_n$  and  $D_n$  ( $n \geq 0$ ) are increasing and decreasing sequences, respectively, of countably generated sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $B$  of an analytic set  $\Omega$  such that  $C_n \vee D_n = B$  for all  $n$ , then  $C \vee D = B$ . This, however, is not true as illustrated by the following example, the method of which is connected with the problem of complementation of  $\sigma$ -algebras considered by Rao [5]:

**Example 1.** Let  $\Omega = \{0, 1\}^{N_0}$ , where  $\{0, 1\}$  is the additive group of two elements with the discrete topology, and  $N_0$  is the set of non-negative integers. Regard  $\Omega$  as a compact group with coordinatewise addition and product topology.

Let  $Q$  be a subgroup of  $\Omega$  consisting of elements with finitely many ones. Let  $D_n$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra with respect to which all coordinate functions  $f_k$ ,  $k \geq n$ , are measurable. Then  $D_{n+1} \subseteq D_n$ , and

$$D = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} D_n$$

is the sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel sets of  $\Omega$ , invariant under translation by elements of  $Q$ . The algebra  $D$  is not countably generated, it is atomic, and its atoms are precisely the cosets of  $Q$ . Further, by the Kolmogorov zero-one law, every element of  $D$  has Haar measure zero or one.

Let  $F$  be any other sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $B$ . Then

$$\wedge FD \subseteq \{C: C \text{ Borel, and there exists a } D \in F \text{ such that } h(C \Delta D) = 0\},$$

where  $h$  stands for Haar measure on  $\Omega$ . Now let  $a \in \Omega \setminus Q$ , say  $a = (1, 1, 1, \dots)$ , and let  $A = \{\omega: \omega_0 = 0\}$ . Then

$$A + a = \{\omega: \omega_0 = 1\} = A^c,$$

where  $\omega_0$  denotes the 0-th coordinate of  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Now let

$$C = \{B \cup B + a: B \text{ is a Borel set in } A\}.$$

Then  $C$  is a countably generated sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\Omega$ , and its atoms are of type  $\{x, x + a\}$ ,  $x \in A$ . Since  $a \notin Q$ ,  $x$  and  $x + a$  are separated in  $D$ . Thus  $C \vee D$  separates points. But every element of  $C \vee D$  differs from a set in  $C$  by a set of Haar measure zero. Thus the set  $A$  can never belong

to  $C \vee D$ . Now let  $C_n = C$  for all  $n$ . Then  $C_n \vee D_n$  separates points (since  $D \subseteq D_n$ ), and is countably generated (since  $C_n$  and  $D_n$  are countably generated). Hence  $C_n \vee D_n = B \neq C \vee D$  for each  $n$ .

2. Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  be a probability space and let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  be a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{A}$ . In the theory of non-linear prediction one seeks, as a first step, conditions on  $\mathcal{A}_1$  under which there is a sub- $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}_2$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are independent and  $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}$  (this last equality can be required to hold only up to sets of measure zero in the sense that, for every set in  $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$ , there is a set in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that the symmetric difference of both has measure zero). This problem has been considered by Rosenblatt [7] and, earlier, by Rohlin [6] in his study of Lebesgue spaces. In this section we consider  $\sigma$ -algebras of types  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  in the special case where  $\Omega$  can be identified as a product of two sets  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$ , and  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  as  $\sigma$ -algebras of coordinate functions<sup>(1)</sup>. Here  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  are equipped with  $\sigma$ -algebras, and  $\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$  is the given product  $\sigma$ -algebra.

By an *automorphism* of a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  we mean a one-one mapping of  $\mathcal{A}$  onto  $\mathcal{A}$  which preserves countable union and complementations. Let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  be sub- $\sigma$ -algebras of a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ . We say that  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is *isomorphic to  $\mathcal{A}'_1$  modulo  $\mathcal{A}_2$  in  $\mathcal{A}$*  if there is an automorphism  $T$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $T\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}'_1$  and  $T\mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}_2$ . Suppose  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are atomic  $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\Omega$ . Following Rohlin, we say that  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are *crossed* if an atom of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and an atom of  $\mathcal{A}_2$  have always a non-empty intersection. It is easy to see that if  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are crossed, then  $\mathcal{A}_1 \cap \mathcal{A}_2 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}$ , and  $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$  is atomic and its atoms are obtained by taking intersections of atoms of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  with atoms of  $\mathcal{A}_2$ .

PROPOSITION 2. *Let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  be crossed  $\sigma$ -algebras and let  $\mathcal{A}_1$  be isomorphic to  $\mathcal{A}'_1$  modulo  $\mathcal{A}_2$  in  $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$ . Then*

- (i)  $\mathcal{A}'_1$  is atomic;
- (ii)  $\mathcal{A}'_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  are crossed;
- (iii)  $\mathcal{A}'_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$ ;
- (iv) *there is an automorphism  $T$  of  $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$  such that  $T\mathcal{A}_1 = \mathcal{A}'_1$  and  $T$  is an identity on  $\mathcal{A}_2$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{A}'_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1$  is atomic,  $\mathcal{A}'_1$  is atomic. This proves (i).

Let  $T$  be an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{A}_1$  onto  $\mathcal{A}'_1$  modulo  $\mathcal{A}_2$  on  $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$ . Let  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  be atoms of  $\mathcal{A}'_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$ , respectively. Then  $T^{-1}\xi$  and  $T^{-1}\eta$

---

<sup>(1)</sup> It should be emphasized that, given a probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  and independent  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{A}_1$  and  $\mathcal{A}_2$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}$ , it is not necessarily true that  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, P)$  can be identified by a bimeasurable measure preserving-point map  $T$  with a product space  $(\Omega_1 \times \Omega_2, \mathcal{B}_1 \times \mathcal{B}_2, P_1 \times P_2)$  (minus a  $(P_1 \times P_2)$ -null set, if necessary) such that  $T^{-1}(\mathcal{B}_1 \times \Omega_2) = \mathcal{A}_1$  and  $T^{-1}(\Omega_1 \times \mathcal{B}_2) = \mathcal{A}_2$ .

are atoms of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , respectively, and since  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are crossed, they intersect. Since  $T$  is an automorphism,  $TT^{-1}\xi = \xi$  and  $TT^{-1}\eta = \eta$  intersect. This proves (ii).

To prove (iii) we note that

$$A_1 \vee A_2 = T(A_1 \vee A_2) = TA_1 \vee TA_2 = A'_1 \vee A_2.$$

Finally, to prove (iv) fix an atom  $\xi$  of  $A_2$  and let

$$E = \{\xi \cap \alpha : \alpha \text{ is an atom of } A_1\}.$$

Now an atom  $\alpha$  of  $A_1 \vee A_2$  is the intersection of an atom  $\alpha_1$  of  $A_1$  and an atom  $\alpha_2$  of  $A_2$ . Let  $\alpha'_1$  be the atom of  $A'_1$  such that  $\alpha_1 \cap \xi = \alpha'_1 \cap \xi$ , and write  $T(\alpha_1 \cap \alpha_2) = \alpha'_1 \cap \alpha_2$ . It is easy to check that  $T\alpha_2 = \alpha_2$  and  $T\alpha_1 = \alpha'_1$ . Thus  $T$  is an identity on  $A_2$ . Since  $A_1, A'_1$  and  $A_1 \vee A_2$  induce the same  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\xi$ , we see that  $TA_1 = A'_1$ . Finally, if  $A_1 \in A_1$  and  $A_2 \in A_2$ , then

$$T(A_1 \cap A_2) = T(A_1) \cap T(A_2)$$

from which it follows that  $T$  is an automorphism of  $A_1 \vee A_2$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.** *Let  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  be crossed  $\sigma$ -algebras and let  $p$  and  $q$  be atoms of  $A_1 \vee A_2$  which belong to distinct atoms of  $A_2$ . Then in  $A_1 \vee A_2$  there exists an  $A'_1$  isomorphic to  $A_1$  modulo  $A_2$  such that  $p$  and  $q$  belong to the same atom of  $A'_1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\pi$  and  $\chi$  be atoms of  $A_1$  containing  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively. Let  $A'_1$  consist of those sets in  $A_1 \vee A_2$  which are unions of atoms of  $A_1$ , except the atoms  $\pi$  and  $\chi$  which are replaced by  $(\pi \cup q) - \eta \cup \pi$  and  $(\chi - q) \cup (\eta \cap \pi)$ , respectively ( $\eta$  is the atom of  $A_2$  which intersects  $\chi$  in  $q$ ). Since  $p$  and  $q$  belong to distinct atoms of  $A_2$ , we see that

$$p, q \in (\pi \cup q) - \eta \cap \pi \quad \text{and} \quad p, q \notin (\chi - q) \cup (\eta \cap \pi).$$

Thus  $p$  and  $q$  belong to the same atom of  $A'_1$ . Finally, the automorphism

$$Tx = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \neq q \text{ or } \eta \cap \pi, \\ \eta \cap \pi & \text{if } x = q, \\ q & \text{if } x = \eta \cap \pi, \end{cases}$$

sets up an isomorphism of  $A_1$  onto  $A'_1$  modulo  $A_2$  in  $A_1 \vee A_2$ .

Now let  $A_0, A_1, \dots$  be point-separating  $\sigma$ -algebras of  $\Omega_0, \Omega_1, \dots$ , respectively. Let

$$\Omega = \Omega_0 \times \Omega_1 \times \dots \quad \text{and} \quad A = A_0 \times A_1 \times \dots$$

We denote by  $A_k$  also the  $\sigma$ -algebra

$$\Omega_0 \times \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_{k-1} \times A_k \times \Omega_{k+1} \times \dots$$

Let  $D_n = A_n \vee A_{n+1} \vee A_{n+2} \dots$ , and  $C_n = A_0 \vee A_1 \vee \dots \vee A_{n-1}$ . Then  $C_n \vee D_n = A$ . Let  $A'_k$  be isomorphic to  $A_k$  modulo  $A_{k+1}$  in  $A_k$ , and write  $C'_n = A'_0 \dots A'_{n-1}$ . Then  $A = C'_n \vee D_n = C_n \vee D_n$ . The proposition

$$\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n$$

is, in general, not true. To see this we take  $\Omega_n = \{0, 1\}$  and put  $A_n$  to be the discrete  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\{0, 1\}$ . Now take  $p, q \in \Omega$ ,  $p$  and  $q$  belonging to distinct atoms of  $D_\infty$ , where

$$D_\infty = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n$$

(see example 1). Then  $p$  and  $q$  belong to distinct atoms of  $D_n$  for each  $n$  (since  $D_n \supseteq D_\infty$ , atoms of  $D_n$  are contained in atoms of  $D_\infty$ ). Let  $\pi_n$  and  $\chi_n$  be atoms of  $D_n$  which contain  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively. Then  $\pi_n$  and  $\chi_n$  are subsets of distinct atoms of  $D_{n+1}$ . Hence, by proposition 3, there exists in  $D_n$  a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $A'_n$  isomorphic to  $A_n$  modulo  $D_{n+1}$  such that  $\pi_n$  and  $\chi_n$  belong to the same atom of  $A'_n$ . Thus, since  $A'_n$  is defined for each  $n$ , we see that  $p$  and  $q$  are not separated in  $\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} A'_n$  whereas they are separated in  $\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n$ . Hence

$$\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} A'_n \neq \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n.$$

In the case of  $(\Omega_i, A_i)$  being complete separable metric spaces with their Borel  $\sigma$ -algebras, we have the following

PROPOSITION 4. *We have*

$$\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n \text{ if and only if } D_\infty \subseteq \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n.$$

Proof. The necessity is obvious, since

$$D_\infty \subseteq \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n.$$

To prove the sufficiency we note that, since  $C'_n \vee D_n = A$ ,  $D_n$  and  $C'_n$  separate points. Hence, by proposition 1,  $\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n$  and  $D_\infty$  separate points. If, in addition,

$$D_\infty \subseteq \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n,$$

then  $\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n$  separates points and is countably generated. Hence, by the

Blackwell-Mackey theorem,

$$\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n.$$

Though

$$\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n$$

is not in general true, one can suspect that

$$\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n \vee D_{\infty} = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n \vee D_{\infty}.$$

Here we give an example to show that this also need not be true. We make use of example 1 given in section 1.

Take  $\Omega_k = \{0, 1\}$  with  $A_k$  the discrete  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\Omega_k$ . Write also

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &= \Omega_0 \times \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_{k-1} \times A_k \times \Omega_k \times \dots, \\ D_k &= \Omega_0 \times \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_{k-1} \times A_k \times A_{k+1} \times A_{k+2} \times \dots \end{aligned}$$

Take  $A'_k = \{\emptyset, \Omega, A_k, \Omega - A_k\}$ , where  $A_k = A_{k1} \cup A_{k2}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} A_{k1} &= \Omega_0 \times \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_{k-1} \times \{0\} \times \{1\} \times \Omega_{k+2} \times \Omega_{k+3} \times \dots, \\ A_{k2} &= \Omega_0 \times \Omega_1 \times \dots \times \Omega_{k-1} \times \{1\} \times \{0\} \times \Omega_{k+2} \times \Omega_{k+3} \times \dots \end{aligned}$$

Define  $f_k$  by

$$\begin{aligned} f_k(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 0, 1, x_{k+2}, \dots) &= (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 1, 1, x_{k+2}, \dots), \\ f_k(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 1, 0, x_{k+2}, \dots) &= (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 1, 0, x_{k+2}, \dots), \\ f_k(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 1, 1, x_{k+2}, \dots) &= (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 0, 1, x_{k+2}, \dots), \\ f_k(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 0, 0, x_{k+2}, \dots) &= (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}, 0, 0, x_{k+2}, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

It is easily checked that  $f_k: \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$  sets up in  $D_k$  an isomorphism between  $A'_k$  and  $A_k$  modulo  $D_{k+1}$ . Since  $A_k + a = A_k$ , the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} A'_n$ , which is the same as  $\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n$ , is contained in  $C$ , where  $a$  and  $C$  are as in example 1. Thus

$$\left(\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} C'_n\right) \vee D_{\infty} \subseteq C \vee D_{\infty} \neq B.$$

It is worth noting that in this example the collection  $A'_n$ ,  $n \geq 0$ , is independent, and  $A'_n$  and  $A_n$  are both independent complements of  $D_{n+1}$  in  $D_n$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Blackwell, *On a class of probability spaces*, Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Vol. II, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1956, p. 1-6.
- [2] G. Kallianpur and N. Wiener, *Non-linear prediction*, Technical Report No. 1 (1956), Office of Naval Research, Cu. 256, Nonr 266, (39) CIRMIP Project NR - 047, 015.
- [3] G. W. Mackey, *Borel structures in groups and their duals*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 85 (1957), p. 134-165.
- [4] P. Masani, *Wiener's contributions to generalised harmonic analysis. Part II, Prediction theory and filter theory*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society 72 (1966), p. 73-125.
- [5] B. V. Rao, *Lattice of Borel structures*, Colloquium Mathematicum 23 (1971), p. 213-216.
- [6] V. A. Rohlin, *On the fundamental ideas of measure theory*, American Mathematical Society Translations 10 (1962).
- [7] M. Rosenblatt, *Stationary process as shifts of functions of independent random variables*, Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics 8 (1959), p. 665-681.
- [8] — *Stationary Markov chains and independent random variables*, *ibidem* 9 (1960), p. 945-949.

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 10. 5. 1973*

---