Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete © by Springer-Verlag 1977

# **Induced Weak Convergence and Random Measures**

David Pollard

The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

## §1. Introduction

Let  $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{T})$  be an arbitrary topological space, with Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathscr{R}$  (generated by  $\mathscr{T}$ ).  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X})$  denotes the space of all non-negative finite Borel measures on  $\mathscr{X}$ . Equip  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X})$  with its *weak topology*, defined [16] as the weakest topology making the map  $\mu \to \mu(\mathscr{X})$  continuous and each of the maps  $\mu \to \mu(G)$ , where  $G \in \mathscr{T}$ , lower semicontinuous. Convergence in this topology is denoted by  $\Rightarrow$ . When  $\mathscr{T}$  is metrisable this is just the usual topology of weak convergence used, for example, by Billingsley [2].

Suppose  $(\mathscr{X}_i, \mathscr{T}_i)_{i \in I}$  is a family of topological spaces (with Borel  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathscr{B}_i$ ), and that Borel measurable maps  $T_i: \mathscr{X} \to \mathscr{X}_i$  are given (i.e.  $T_i^{-1}\mathscr{B}_i \subseteq \mathscr{B}$ ). We seek conditions under which the weak convergence  $\mu_{\alpha} \Rightarrow \mu$  in  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X})$  is implied by the weak convergence of the induced measures  $\mu_{\alpha}^i \Rightarrow \mu^i$  in  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X}_i)$  for each *i*, where for any  $v \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X})$  we write  $v^i$  for the measure in  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X}_i)$  defined by  $v^i(A) = v(T_i^{-1}A)$ . There are a number of applications for a result of this form. For example, in Section 4 it will be shown that weak convergence of measures on the function space  $D[0, \infty)$  follows from convergence of the measures induced on the spaces D[0, t]. As with all the applications which we shall cite, this is a well-known result; our aim is merely to point out, and exploit, the simple underlying structure which they have in common.

In Section 2 we begin with the simplest case: if the maps  $T_i$  are continuous and if they generate the topology on  $\mathscr{X}$ , then we give some easily checkable conditions which ensure that  $\mu_{\alpha}^i \Rightarrow \mu^i$  for each *i* implies  $\mu_{\alpha} \Rightarrow \mu$ . This is applied to rederive results for weak convergence on the spaces  $\mathbb{R}^{\infty}$  and  $C[0, \infty)$ , and in Section 3 we examine the more interesting case of weak convergence of random measures on a locally compact space. An extension to non-continuous  $T_i$ 's is proved in Section 4.

#### §2. Weak Convergence Induced by Continuous Maps

To prove our first result on induced weak convergence we shall need to make two assumptions. First we need the target measure  $\mu$  to be  $\tau$ -additive: for every

downward filtering family  $\{F_{\beta}\}$  of closed sets  $\mu(\bigcap_{\beta} F_{\beta}) = \inf_{\beta} \mu(F_{\beta})$ . See [16] for some of the nice properties of the space  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{X}, \tau)$  of all  $\tau$ -additive members of  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{X})$ . [If  $\mathcal{X}$ is a separable metric space or, more generally, if there is a countable base to the topology  $\mathcal{T}$ , then it is easy to show that every member of  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{X})$  is  $\tau$ -additive.] The other assumption constitutes a slight extension of the concept of a family of maps generating a topology. The family  $\{T_i: i \in I\}$  is said to  $\cup f$ -generate the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  if the class  $\{T_i^{-1}G: G \in \mathcal{T}_i, i \in I\}$  forms a basis for  $\mathcal{T}$  which is closed under finite unions.

If the  $T_i$ 's only generate the topology in the usual sense, a  $\cup f$ -generating family can be obtained by forming the larger family of maps  $T_J$ , from  $\mathscr{X}$  into  $\mathscr{X}_J = \prod \mathscr{X}_i$ ,

defined by taking the *i*-th coordinate of  $T_J x$  to be  $T_i x$ . Here J runs through the family  $\neq I$  of all finite subsets of I. The induced measure  $\mu \cdot T_J^{-1}$  will be denoted by  $\mu^J$ .

**Theorem 1.** Suppose the family  $\{T_i: i \in I\}$  of continuous maps  $\cup$  *f*-generates the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $\mathscr{X}$  and that the target measure  $\mu$  is  $\tau$ -additive. Then  $\mu_{\alpha} \Rightarrow \mu$  iff  $\mu_{\alpha}^i \Rightarrow \mu^i$  for every  $i \in I$ .

*Proof.* The proof of necessity requires but a simple modification of the well-known continuous mapping theorem [2].

If  $\mu_{\alpha}^{i} \Rightarrow \mu^{i}$  for every  $i \in I$ , then it is clear that  $\mu_{\alpha}(\mathscr{X}) \to \mu(\mathscr{X})$ . Thus it suffices to prove that  $\liminf_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha}(H) \ge \mu(H)$  for every  $H \in \mathscr{T}$ . By definition of the  $\bigcirc f$ -generating property, the family of open subsets of H of the form  $T_{i}^{-1}G$ , where  $G \in \mathscr{T}_{i}$  for some i, filters up to H. Use  $\tau$ -additivity of  $\mu$  to find such a set for which  $\mu(H) < \mu(T_{i}^{-1}G) + \varepsilon$ . Then

$$\liminf_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha}(H) \geq \liminf_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha}(T_{i}^{-1}G)$$
$$= \liminf_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha}^{i}(G)$$
$$\geq \mu^{i}(G) \quad \text{since } \mu_{\alpha}^{i} \Rightarrow \mu^{i}$$
$$> \mu(H) - \varepsilon. \quad \Box$$

**Corollary 1.** If the family  $\{T_i: i \in I\}$  of continuous maps generates the topology  $\mathscr{T}$  (but not necessarily  $\cup f$ -generates it), and if  $\mu$  is  $\tau$ -additive, then  $\mu_{\alpha} \Rightarrow \mu$  iff  $\mu_{\alpha}^J \Rightarrow \mu^J$  for every  $J \in \mathscr{I}$ .

*Proof.*  $\{T_I: J \in \not I\}$  satisfies the conditions of the theorem.  $\Box$ 

**Corollary 2.** If  $\{T_i: i \in I\}$  is a family of continuous maps  $\cup f$ -generating (generating) the topology on  $\mathscr{X}$  then the family of maps  $\{\mu \to \mu^i: i \in I\}$  ( $\{\mu \to \mu^J: J \in \not fI\}$ ) generates the weak topology on  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X}, \tau)$ .  $\Box$ 

Example 1 (cf. [2, p. 19]). Let  $\mathscr{X} = \mathbb{R}^{\infty}$  (a countable product of real lines), equipped with the product topology. Since  $\mathscr{X}$  is separable and metrisable,  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X})$  $= \mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X}, \tau)$ . Let  $T_i$  denote the projection map of  $\mathscr{X}$  onto the *i*-th coordinate space. If, for a net  $\{\mu_{\alpha}\}$  in  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X}), \{\mu_{\alpha}^J\}$  converges weakly to some  $\mu^J \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^J)$  for each finite  $J \subseteq \{1, 2, ...\}$  then the  $\mu^{Js}$  can easily be shown to form a consistent family of distributions. By the Kolmogorov extension theorem, there exists a  $\mu \in \mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X})$  having these  $\mu^{J}$ 's as its finite dimensional distributions. It follows immediately from Theorem 1 that  $\mu_{\alpha} \Rightarrow \mu$ . A similar analysis can be given for more general product spaces.  $\Box$ 

*Example 2* (cf. [18]). Let  $C[0, \infty)$  be the space of continuous real functions on  $[0, \infty)$ , equipped with the topology of uniform convergence on compacta. This is a separable metrisable topology. For every  $t \in (0, \infty)$  define the continuous map  $T_t$  from  $C[0, \infty)$  onto C[0, t] by:  $T_t(x)$  = the restriction of x to [0, t]. It is easy to verify that the family  $\{T_t: 0 < t < \infty\}$ , or even  $\{T_{t_n}: \{t_n\}$  is some sequence of real numbers  $\uparrow \infty$ }, satisfies the conditions of Theorem 1. So weak convergence of measures on  $C[0, \infty)$  is equivalent to convergence of the measures which they induce on the spaces C[0, t], where  $0 < t < \infty$  or even  $t \in \{t_1, t_2, \ldots\}$ .

### §3. Random Measures

In this section we show that weak convergence of random measures on a locally compact space is equivalent to convergence of the so-called finite dimensional distributions (fidis). When the underlying space is second countable further simplifications can be achieved by invoking an existence theorem for random measures (Theorem 3); the argument is similar to that of Example1. Some comparison is made with the alternative approaches which are to be found in the literature.

Let  $\mathscr{S}$  be a locally compact Hausdorff space. Take  $\mathscr{X}$  as the space of nonnegative Radon measures on  $\mathscr{S}$ , i.e. the non-negative linear functionals on  $\mathscr{C}$  (= the continuous real functions on  $\mathscr{S}$  having compact support). Equip  $\mathscr{X}$  with its vague topology  $\mathscr{T}$ , the weak topology induced by the maps  $x \to x(g)$ ,  $g \in \mathscr{C}$ , thus making  $(\mathscr{X}, \mathscr{T})$  a completely regular Hausdorff space. A random measure on  $\mathscr{S}$  is defined to be a tight (= inner regular with respect to compact sets) Borel probability measure on  $\mathscr{X}$ . The space  $\mathscr{Q}$  of all such random measures is a subset of  $\mathscr{M}^+(\mathscr{X}, \tau)$  from which it inherits the relativised topology of weak convergence. This topology on  $\mathscr{Q}$  is the same as that employed in [7] and [9] (see [16, p. 40]).

For any finite subset  $\Gamma = \{g_1, ..., g_k\}$  of  $\mathscr{C}$  write  $T_{\Gamma}$  for the map from  $\mathscr{X}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^{\Gamma}$ such that  $T_{\Gamma}(x)$  has  $g_i$ -th coordinate  $x(g_i)$ . Also, if  $\Gamma_2 \subseteq \Gamma_1$ , write  $T_{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2}$  for the canonical projection of  $\mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_1}$  onto  $\mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_2}$ . Notice that each  $T_{\Gamma}, T_{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2}$  is continuous and that the family of all such  $T_{\Gamma}$ 's  $\cup f$ -generates the vague topology on  $\mathscr{X}$ . Thus the following result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1. We write  $P^{\Gamma}$  for the induced measure  $P \cdot T_{\Gamma}^{-1}$ ; the class of all such  $P^{\Gamma}$ 's constitutes the *finite dimensional distributions* of the random measure P.

**Theorem 2.** A net  $\{P_{\alpha}\}$  of random measures converges weakly to  $P \in \mathcal{Q}$  iff  $P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma} \Rightarrow P^{\Gamma}$  for every finite  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathscr{C}$ .  $\Box$ 

Now let us assume that  $\mathscr{S}$  is second countable, i.e. there is a countable base for the topology on  $\mathscr{S}$ . This places us in the setting adopted by Jagers [7] and Kallenberg [9] amongst others. It can be shown that under this extra assumption each of the spaces  $\mathscr{S}$ ,  $\mathscr{X}$  and  $\mathscr{Q}$  is Polish (cf. [1, pp. 224, 241]). By using these separability properties we can strengthen Theorem 2; it is no longer necessary for the target random measure P to be given a priori. It can actually be constructed from the limiting fidi measures by means of the following existence theorem. The construction is based on a method of Le Cam [12] and Prohorov [14]. We write  $\mathscr{C}^+$ for  $\{g \in \mathscr{C} : g \ge 0\}$ .

**Theorem 3.** Given Borel probabilities  $P^{\Gamma}$  on  $[0, \infty)^{\Gamma}$ , for  $\Gamma$  a finite subset of  $\mathscr{C}^+$ , there is a uniquely determined random measure P having these as fidis iff:

(i)  $\Gamma_2 \subseteq \Gamma_1$  implies that  $P^{\Gamma_2} = P^{\Gamma_1} \cdot T_{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2}^{-1}$ ; (ii) if  $\Gamma = \{g_1, g_2, g_1 + g_2\}$  then  $P^{\Gamma}$  is concentrated on the closed set  $\{\psi \in [0, \infty)^{\Gamma}$ :  $\psi(g_1 + g_2) = \psi(g_1) + \psi(g_2)$ 

Proof. Clearly the two conditions are necessary.

Second countability of  $\mathcal S$  implies the existence of a countable subset of  $\mathcal C$  which is dense with respect to the topology of uniform convergence ([1, p. 224]). Without loss of generality it can be supposed that this subset forms a vector lattice over the field of rational numbers. Let  $\mathscr{D}$  be its positive cone, and  $\mathscr{Y}$  the set of  $[0, \infty)$ -valued functions on  $\mathcal{D}$  which satisfy the additivity condition:  $y(g_1 + g_2) = y(g_1) + y(g_2)$  for  $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ . Equip  $\mathcal{Y}$  with the weakest topology making each of the maps  $y \to y(g)$ continuous,  $g \in \mathcal{D}$ . It is routine to show that the obvious correspondence between  $\mathcal{Y}$ and  $\mathscr{X}$  establishes a homeomorphism between the two spaces.

From (i) and the Kolmogorov extension theorem, there exists a tight Borel probability measure  $P_0$  on  $[0,\infty)^{\mathscr{D}}$  having the required finite dimensional distributions  $P^{\Gamma}$  for  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . [Notice that the product  $\sigma$ -algebra coincides with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $[0, \infty)^{\mathscr{D}}$ , since  $\mathscr{D}$  is countable.]

 $\mathscr{Y}$  is a topological subspace of  $[0,\infty)^{\mathscr{D}}$ , being a countable intersection of closed cylinder sets of the form  $\{\psi \in [0, \infty)^{\mathscr{D}} : \psi(g_1 + g_2) = \psi(g_1) + \psi(g_2)\}$  where  $g_1, g_2 \in \mathscr{D}$ . From (ii) each of these closed cylinder sets has  $P_0$  measure one, hence  $P_0(\mathcal{Y}) = 1$  also. The required random measure P is obtained by transferring  $P_0$  from  $\mathscr{Y}$  to the homeomorphic space  $\mathscr{X}$ .

This P has the desired fidis for  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ . A simple approximation argument can now be used to prove that not only is P uniquely determined, but also that it has the required fidis for every  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathscr{C}^+$ . [Use the tightness of P and the fact that the maps  $x \to x(g), g \in \mathcal{D}$ , generate the topology on  $\mathscr{X}$ .] 

Random measures can also be constructed from the family of setwise fidis  $P^{A_1,\ldots,A_k}$  induced by the measurable maps  $x \to [x(A_1),\ldots,x(A_k)]$ , where the sets  $A_1, \ldots, A_k$  run through a suitably large class of bounded Borel subsets of  $\mathcal{S}$ . Such a method has been employed by Jagers [7] for the locally compact case, Harris [5, 6] and Kerstan, Matthes & Mecke [11] for Polish spaces, and Jiřina [8] in an abstract setting. With our method, a random non-negative linear functional on & (a Radon measure) is constructed; this corresponds to a random countable additive measure on  $\mathcal{S}$  since Radon measures automatically possess the countable additivity property. When working from the setwise fidis it is also straightforward to construct a random *finitely* additive measure, but the countable additivity is no longer automatic. An extra condition is needed to convert finite additivity to countable additivity. The appropriate property-inner approximation by a compact system of sets – is guaranteed by a continuity condition on the setwise fidis [7, p. 193, (2)]. Kallenberg [9] has given yet another existence proof for random measures on a locally compact space, based on a number of preliminary results on weak convergence; but his method is not as direct as ours.

With our existence theorem we can now improve upon Theorem 2. We write  $P_{\alpha}^{g}$  instead of  $P_{\alpha}^{(g)}$ .

**Theorem 4.** Let  $\{P_{\alpha}\}$  be a net of random measures on a second countable locally compact Hausdorff space  $\mathscr{G}$ . Then  $\{P_{\alpha}\}$  is weakly convergent in 2 iff  $\{P_{\alpha}^{g}\}$  converges to a probability measure on  $[0, \infty)$  for each  $g \in \mathscr{C}^+$ . [Notice that no target random measure is specified.]

Proof (cf. [11, p.233]). In view of Theorem 2 it suffices to find a  $P \in \mathcal{Q}$  such that  $P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma} \Rightarrow P^{\Gamma}$  for every  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathscr{C}^+$ . For if  $\Gamma = \{g_1, ..., g_k\}$  and if  $P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma*} \Rightarrow P^{\Gamma*}$  where  $\Gamma^* = \{g_1^+, g_1^-, ..., g_k^+, g_k^-\}$  then the continuity of  $T_{\Gamma^*\Gamma}$  implies that  $P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma} \Rightarrow P^{\Gamma}$ . So choose  $\Gamma = \{g_1, ..., g_k\} \subseteq \mathscr{C}^+$ . Then by considering  $\{P_{\alpha}^{P}\}$  for  $g = s_1 g_1 + \cdots + s_k g_k, s_i \ge 0$ , we see that the Laplace transforms of  $\{P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma}\}$  converge pointwise to a function which is continuous along each ray  $\{s e : s \ge 0\}$ , where  $e \ge 0$ . The multivariate version of the continuity theorem for Laplace transforms [4, p. 431] is thus applicable (even for nets, unlike the corresponding pointwise convergence result for characteristic functions), and it follows that there exists a probability measure  $P^{\Gamma}$  such that  $P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma} \Rightarrow P^{\Gamma}$  for each such  $\Gamma$ . These  $P^{\Gamma}$ 's satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3: if F represents any of the closed sets in condition (ii),  $P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma} \Rightarrow P^{\Gamma}$  implies that  $P^{\Gamma}(F) \ge \lim_{\alpha \to \infty} P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma}(F) = 1$ ; and the continuity of  $T_{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2}$  takes care of (i). Thus they are the

fidis of some  $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ . It follows that  $P_{\alpha} \Rightarrow P$ .  $\Box$ 

Various versions of this result are to be found in the literature: see for example [14] (general compact spaces), [17] ( $\sigma$ -compact, locally compact spaces), [6] and [11] (Polish spaces), and [7] and [9] (second countable locally compact spaces). In [6] the problem was transformed to one involving  $\mathbb{R}^{\infty}$  where the result described in our Example 1 could be used, while an argument similar to that which we employed in Theorem 1 was given in [11, pp. 231–232]. The other authors proceeded by demonstrating that tightness (or relative compactness) of a family of random measures is equivalent to the same property for the families of fidis. In Theorem 5 below we show that this result is itself a simple consequence of our Theorems 2 and 3.

It is also possible to characterise weak convergence of random measures in terms of the setwise fidis. But since the maps  $x \to x(A)$ , A a bounded Borel subset of  $\mathscr{G}$ , are not necessarily continuous an extra condition such as  $P\{x: x(\partial A) > 0\} = 0$  is required. Here  $\partial A$  denotes the boundary of A. Notice that the target random measure P must therefore be specified in advance. It is interesting to note that this result for random measures on Polish spaces was proved in [11] by showing that convergence of suitably many of the setwise fidis implies convergence of the fidis induced by certain continuous maps; arguments like those in our Theorem 1 can then be used. The alternative methods of [7] and [9] (based on deducing relative compactness of  $\{P_n\}$  from convergence of the setwise fidis) can be viewed, in the light of our next theorem, as an example of proof by the standard "relative compactness plus convergence on a separating class" type of argument (cf. [3, p. 165]—in this case the separating class consists of almost surely continuous functions).

**Theorem 5.** Let  $\mathscr{S}$  be second countable. Then  $\mathscr{P} \subseteq \mathscr{Q}$  is relatively compact in  $\mathscr{Q}$  iff  $\mathscr{P}^{\Gamma}(=\{P^{\Gamma}: P \in \mathscr{P}\})$  is relatively compact in  $\mathscr{M}^{+}(\mathbb{R}^{\Gamma})$  for every finite  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathscr{C}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose the closure  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  is compact. Then  $\mathcal{P}^{\Gamma} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}}^{\Gamma}$  = the continuous image of the compact set  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$  under the continuous map  $P \to P^{\Gamma}$ . Thus  $\overline{\mathcal{P}}^{\Gamma}$  is a compact subset of  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{\Gamma})$  containing  $\mathcal{P}^{\Gamma}$ , as required.

Conversely, we use a possibly little known result valid for any regular Hausdorff space E:  $A \subseteq E$  is relatively compact in E iff every universal net  $\{e_a\}$  on A is convergent in E (see [10, pp. 81, 136] and [16, prelim 7]). If  $\{P_{\alpha}\}$  is a universal net on  $\mathscr{P}$ , then the image net  $\{P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma}\}$  is a universal net on  $\mathscr{P}^{\Gamma}$ , for each  $\Gamma \in \mathscr{I} \mathscr{C}$  [10, p. 81], which is therefore convergent in  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{\Gamma})$  if  $\mathscr{P}^{\Gamma}$  is relatively compact in  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^{\Gamma})$ . Say  $P_{\alpha}^{\Gamma} \Rightarrow P^{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^{\Gamma})$ . Then the  $P^{\Gamma}$ 's are the fidis of a random measure, as in the proof of Theorem 4; and the result follows from Theorem 2.

Notice that the relative compactness of  $\mathcal{P}$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$  is in fact equivalent to the relative compactness of  $\mathscr{P}^{g}$  in  $\mathscr{M}^{+}([0,\infty))$  for all  $g \in \mathscr{C}^{+}$ , by virtue of Theorem 4. This also follows directly from Theorem 5, by noting that  $\{P: P \in \mathcal{P}\}$  is tight iff  $\{P^{g}: P \in \mathscr{P}\}$  is tight, where  $g = \sum_{i \in F} |g_{i}|$ .

#### §4. Weak Convergence Induced by Non-Continuous Maps

In this section we extend Theorem 1 to cover the case of noncontinuous  $T_i$ 's: it then suffices to have arbitrarily large pieces  $A_{\varepsilon}$  of the space for which the maps  $T_i|_{A_{\varepsilon}}$ (= the restriction of  $T_i$  to the domain  $A_{\varepsilon}$ ) are continuous in the relative topology on  $A_{e}$ , and so that they  $\cup f$ -generate that topology. Notice that continuity of  $T_{i}|_{A}$  is a weaker requirement than continuity of  $T_i$  at each point of A. We write  $\mu_*, \mu_{\alpha*}$  for the inner measures associated with  $\mu$  and  $\mu_{\alpha}$ .

**Theorem 6.** Given a net  $\{\mu_{\alpha}\}$  in  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{X})$  and a  $\tau$ -additive target measure  $\mu$ , if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is an  $A_{\varepsilon} \subseteq \mathscr{X}$  such that:

(i)  $\mu_*(\mathscr{X} \smallsetminus A_{\varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$  and  $\limsup \mu_{\alpha*}(\mathscr{X} \smallsetminus A_{\varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$ ,

- (ii) for every i∈I, T<sub>i</sub>|<sub>A<sub>e</sub></sub> is continous in the relative topology on A<sub>e</sub>,
  (iii) {T<sub>i</sub>|<sub>A<sub>e</sub></sub>: i∈I} ∪f-generates the relative topology on A<sub>e</sub>,

then  $\mu_a^i \Rightarrow \mu^i$  for every  $i \in I$  implies that  $\mu_a \Rightarrow \mu$ .

*Proof.* The argument is conceptually the same as for Theorem 1. Trivially  $\mu_{\alpha}(\mathscr{X}) \rightarrow \mu(\mathscr{X})$ , thus we have only to prove that  $\liminf \mu_{\alpha}(H) \geq \mu(H)$  for each  $H \in \mathscr{T}$ . For such an  $H, A_{\varepsilon} \cap H$  is a relatively open subset of  $A_{\varepsilon}$  and hence it is the union of an upward filtering (by (iii)) family  $\{H_{\beta}\}$  of relatively open subsets of  $A_{\varepsilon}$  of the form  $T_i|_{A_{\varepsilon}}^{-1}G_{\beta}(=A_{\varepsilon}\cap T_i^{-1}G_{\beta})$ , where  $G_{\beta}\in\mathscr{T}_i$  for some *i* depending on  $\beta$ . Let  $H_{\beta}^*$ =  $\operatorname{int}(A_{\varepsilon}^{c}\cup H_{\beta})$ , so that  $\{H_{\beta}^*\}$  is an upward filtering family in  $\mathscr{T}$  for which  $A_{\varepsilon}\cap H_{\beta}^*$ =  $H_{\beta}$ . Since  $\mu$  is  $\tau$ -additive, there exists a  $\beta_0$  such that  $\mu(H^*_{\beta_0}) \ge \mu(H^*) - \varepsilon$ , where  $H^*$  $=\bigcup_{\beta}H_{\beta}^{*}.$ 

As  $A_{\varepsilon} \cap H^*_{\beta_0} = H_{\beta_0} = A_{\varepsilon} \cap T_i^{-1} G_{\beta_0}$ , the symmetric difference  $T_i^{-1} G_{\beta_0} \Delta H^*_{\beta_0}$  is a Borel measurable subset of  $\mathscr{X} \setminus A_{\varepsilon}$ . Similarly  $A_{\varepsilon} \cap H^* = \bigcup_{\theta} (A_{\varepsilon} \cap H^*_{\theta}) = A_{\varepsilon} \cap H$ 

implies that  $H \Delta H^*$  is also a Borel measurable subset of  $\mathscr{X} \smallsetminus A_{\varepsilon}$ . Thus from (i)

$$\liminf_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha}(H) \ge \liminf_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha}(H^{*}) - \varepsilon$$
$$\ge \liminf_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha}(H^{*}_{\beta_{0}}) - \varepsilon$$
$$\ge \liminf_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha}(T_{i}^{-1}G_{\beta_{0}}) - 2\varepsilon$$
$$= \liminf_{\alpha} \mu^{i}_{\alpha}(G_{\beta_{0}}) - 2\varepsilon$$
$$\ge \mu^{i}(G_{\beta_{0}}) - 2\varepsilon$$

since  $\mu_{\alpha}^{i} \Rightarrow \mu^{i}$ . Similarly

$$\mu^{i}(G_{\beta_{0}}) = \mu(T_{i}^{-1} G_{\beta_{0}})$$

$$\geq \mu(H_{\beta_{0}}^{*}) - \varepsilon$$

$$\geq \mu(H^{*}) - 2\varepsilon$$

$$\geq \mu(H) - 3\varepsilon$$

and the result follows.  $\Box$ 

As with Theorem 1, condition (iii) can be relaxed by requiring only that  $\{T_i|_{A_e}: i \in I\}$  generates the relative topology on  $A_e$  in the usual sense, but then we would need  $\mu_{\alpha}^J \Rightarrow \mu^J$  for every  $J \in \not \in I$  in order to deduce that  $\mu_{\alpha} \Rightarrow \mu$ .

We conclude with two illustrations of the use of Theorem 6.

*Example 3* (cf. [13], [19]). Let  $\mathscr{X} = D[0, \infty)$ , the space of all real valued functions  $x(\cdot)$  on  $[0, \infty)$  which are right continuous and have left limits at every point. We equip  $\mathscr{X}$  with Stone's [15] separable metric topology, for which  $x_n$  converges to x iff there are continuous strictly increasing maps  $\lambda_n$  of  $[0, \infty)$  onto  $[0, \infty)$  such that  $x_n(\lambda_n(\cdot))$  converges uniformly to  $x(\cdot)$ , and  $\lambda_n(t)$  converges uniformly to t, on the compact subsets of  $[0, \infty)$ .

For any probability  $P \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{X})$  define  $C_P$  as the set of those  $t \in [0, \infty)$  for which  $P\{x: x \text{ is continuous at } t\} = 1$ . It is easy to prove that  $[0, \infty) \setminus C_P$  is denumerable and that the restriction map  $T_t: x \to x|_{[0,t]}$  of  $D[0, \infty)$  onto D[0, t] is continuous P a.e. for every  $t \in C_P$  [2, p. 124], [13], [19]. So for any sequence of probabilities  $\{P_n\}$  in  $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{X})$  such that  $P_n \Rightarrow P$ ,  $P_n T_t^{-1} \Rightarrow P T_t^{-1}$  for every  $t \in C_P$ . Conversely, if  $P_n T_t^{-1} \Rightarrow P T_t^{-1}$  for every  $t \in C_P$ , then  $P_n \Rightarrow P$ . This results from

Conversely, if  $P_n T_t^{-1} \Rightarrow P T_t^{-1}$  for every  $t \in C_P$ , then  $P_n \Rightarrow P$ . This results from an application of Theorem 6. For if *C* is any countable, unbounded subset of  $(\bigcap_n C_{P_n}) \cap C_P$ , then  $A = \{x \in D[0, \infty): x \text{ is continuous at each } t \in C\}$  is a Borel measurable subset of  $D[0, \infty)$  for which  $P(A) = P_n(A) = 1$  for n = 1, 2, ... Also straight from the definition of Stone's topology (cf. Theorem 2.1 of [19]) it follows that the family  $\{T_t|_A: t \in C\}$  generates the topology on *A*, and in fact  $\cup f$ -generates it: if  $t_1 < t_2$  both belong to *C* then the restriction map  $T_{t_2t_1}: z \to z|_{[0,t_1]}$  is a continuous map from  $D[0, t_2] \cap T_{t_2}(A)$  onto  $D[0, t_1] \cap T_{t_1}(A)$ , satisfying  $T_{t_1}|_A = T_{t_2t_1} \circ T_{t_2}|_A$ .  $\Box$ 

*Example 4* (cf. [2, p. 54]). Let  $\mathscr{X} = C[0, 1]$ , equipped with the uniform topology. For every finite  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ , where  $0 \leq s < \dots < s_k \leq 1$ , the fidi projection  $T_S$  is defined

on  $\mathscr{X}$  by  $T_S(x) = (x(s_1), \ldots, x(s_k)) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . Suppose  $\{P, P_n : n = 1, 2, \ldots\}$  is uniformly tight [2, p. 37] and that  $P_n T_S^{-1} \Rightarrow PT_S^{-1}$  for every  $T_S$ . Uniform tightness means that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists a compact  $K_{\varepsilon}$  such that  $P(\mathscr{X} \setminus K_{\varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$ ,  $P_n(\mathscr{X} \setminus K_{\varepsilon}) < \varepsilon$ ,  $n = 1, 2, \ldots$  Each of the maps  $T_S$  is continuous on  $\mathscr{X}$  and the family of  $T_S|_{K_{\varepsilon}}$ 's  $\cup f$ -generates the uniform topology on  $K_{\varepsilon}$  since pointwise and uniform convergence are equivalent on the compact subsets of C[0, 1] (the pointwise topology on  $K_{\varepsilon}$  is a Hausdorff topology weaker than the uniform topology, therefore these two topologies must coincide on  $K_{\varepsilon}$  [10, p. 141]). From Theorem 6,  $P_n \Rightarrow P$ .

#### References

- 1. Bauer, H.: Probability Theory and Elements of Measure Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1972
- 2. Billingsley, P.: Convergence of Probability Measures. New York: Wiley 1968
- 3. Breiman, L.: Probability. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley 1968
- Feller, W.: An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications II. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley 1970
- 5. Harris, T.: Counting measures, monotone random set functions. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete 10, 102–119 (1968)
- Harris, T.: Random measures and motions of point processes. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete 18, 85–115 (1971)
- 7. Jagers, P.: Aspects of random measures and point processes. Advances in Probability and Related Topics. **3**, 179–239 (1974)
- Jiřina, M.: Convergence in distribution of random measures. Ann. Math. Statist. 43, 1727–1731 (1972)
- Kallenberg, O.: Random Measures. Schriftenreihe des Zentralinstituts f
  ür Mathematik und Mechanik bei der Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR. Heft 23. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1975.
- 10. Kelley, J.: General Topology. New York: Van Nostrand 1955
- Kerstan, J., Matthes, K., Mecke, J.: Unbegrenzt teilbare Punktprozesse. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1974
- LeCam, L.: A stochastic description of precipitation. Proc. 4th Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. Probab. 3, 165–186 (1961)
- Lindvall, T.: Weak convergence of probability measures and random functions in the function space D[0, ∞). J. Appl. Probability 10, 109–121 (1973)
- 14. Prohorov, Yu.: Random measures on a compactum. Soviet Math. Dokl. 2, 539-541 (1961)
- Stone, C.: Weak convergence of stochastic processes defined on a semi-infinite time interval. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 14, 694–696 (1963)
- 16. Topsøe, F.: Topology and Measure. Lecture Notes in Maths. 133. Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer-Verlag 1970
- Waldenfels, W. von: Charakteristische Funktionale zufälliger Masse. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete 10, 279–283 (1968)
- 18. Whitt, W.: Weak convergence of probability measures on the function space  $C[0, \infty)$ . Ann. Math. Statist. **41**, 939–944 (1970)
- 19. Whitt, W.: Weak convergence of probability measures on the function space  $D[0, \infty)$ . Technical report. Yale University (1971)

Received October 15, 1975; in revised from July 30, 1976