

Thm 2 A finite single-period financial market is arbitrage-free iff \exists a prob. P^* on $(\Omega, 2^\Omega)$ st $P^*(\{\omega\}) > 0$ for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $E^*\left(\frac{S_1}{1+r}\right) = S_0$
 i.e., the process $\{S_t(1+r)^{-t}\}_{t=0,1}$ is a MG under P^*

pf: $n=2$ $\tilde{S}_t = (S_t^1, S_t^2)$, $t=0,1$
 two risky assets

$$\text{Set } D := \text{conv} \left\{ \frac{\tilde{S}_1(\omega_1)}{1+r}, \dots, \frac{\tilde{S}_1(\omega_N)}{1+r} \right\}$$

Two possibilities: either (I) $\underline{S}_0 \in D_0$ or (II) $\underline{S}_0 \notin D_0$

We will prove that \rightarrow equiv. martingale measures
 $NA \Leftrightarrow \exists \text{ EMM in three steps}$

Step 1 shows $\exists \text{ EMM} \Leftrightarrow (I)$, \checkmark

Step 2 proves $\exists \text{ EMM} \Rightarrow NA$ \checkmark

and step 3 " $NA \Rightarrow (I)$ \checkmark

Step 1: $\underline{S}_0 \in D_0$
 $\therefore S_0 = \sum_{k=1}^N p_k^* \frac{\tilde{S}_1(\omega_k)}{1+r} =: E^*\left(\frac{\tilde{S}_1}{1+r}\right)$
 \therefore step 1 holds \checkmark

Step 2: Assume $\exists \text{ EMM}$, but NA does not hold

If NA does not hold, \exists arbitrage opportunity

(A.6) ...

$$(\underline{\cdot}, \underline{\cdot}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad V_t = \underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_t + b_t$$

Start with $V_0 \equiv \underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_0 + b = 0 \Leftrightarrow b = -\underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_0$

$$V_1(\omega) \equiv \underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_1(\omega) + b(1+r)$$

$$= \underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_1(\omega) - \underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_0(1+r) \begin{cases} \geq 0, \forall \omega \\ > 0 \text{ for at least one } \omega \end{cases}$$

Consider

$$\underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_0 \stackrel{\text{Step 2}}{=} \underline{\Delta} \cdot E^* \left(\frac{\underline{s}_1}{1+r} \right) = E^* \left(\frac{\underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_1}{1+r} \right)$$

NA does not hold

$$= \sum_{k=1}^N p_k^* \frac{\underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_1(\omega_k)}{1+r}$$

$$\stackrel{\text{why } (*)}{>} \sum_{k=1}^N p_k^* \underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_0$$

$$= \underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{s}_0 \quad \text{a contradiction, so}$$

our assumption was wrong; implying $\exists \text{ EMM} \Rightarrow \text{NA}$.

\therefore step 2 holds

Step 3

Suppose NA holds, but (I) does not

i.e., (II) holds $\underline{s}_0 \notin D_0$

then by the separation thm \exists a st. line L

separating \underline{s}_0 from D_0 . Denoting by $\Delta := (\Delta^1, \Delta^2)$

a normal to L vector "pointing" in the direction

of D_0 , we have

$$\underline{\Delta} \cdot (\underline{x} - S_0) > 0, \quad x \in D_0$$

$$\underline{\Delta} \cdot \left(\frac{S_1(\omega)}{1+r} - S_0 \right) \begin{cases} \geq 0, & \forall \omega \\ > 0 & \text{for at least one } \omega. \end{cases}$$

This means arbitrage opportunity.

Contradiction to NA conditions.

—X—

Thm 3 (The arbitrage pricing thm): In a single

-period arbitrage-free market, the discounted value process $\{V_t(1+r)^{-t}\}_{t=0,1}$ of any trading

strategy $(\underline{\Delta}, b)$ is an MG under any EMM P^*

$$E^* \left(\frac{V_1}{1+r} \right) = V_0. \quad \text{--- (1) } \checkmark$$

In particular, if X is an attainable claim in the market then its time $t=0$ value is

$$\text{given by } X^* := E^* \left(\frac{X}{1+r} \right) \quad \text{--- (2)}$$

where the RHS does not depend on the choice of EMM P^* .

So

$$(\underline{\Delta}, b)$$

$$E^* \left(\frac{V_1}{1+r} \right) = E^* \left(\frac{\underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{S}_1 + b(1+r)}{1+r} \right)$$

$$= E^* \frac{\underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{S}_1}{1+r} + b$$

$$= \underline{\Delta} \cdot E^* \left(\frac{S_1}{1+r} \right) + b$$

$$= \underline{\Delta} \cdot \underline{S}_0 + b \quad | \text{ using thm 2}$$

$$= V_0 \quad \text{--- (3)} \quad \therefore \text{ (1) holds}$$

Now suppose X is an attainable claim, i.e.,
for some portfolio $(\underline{\Delta}, b)$ one has

$$V_1(\omega) = X(\omega) \quad , \quad \omega \in \Omega$$

$$t=0 \quad (b_1, b_1) \quad t=1 \quad \underline{\Delta}_1 \cdot \underline{S}_1 + b_1(1+r) = \underline{\Delta}_2 \cdot \underline{S}_1 + b_2(1+r)$$

A strategy $(\underline{\Delta}_t, \underline{S}_t)$ is called self financing

$$t=0, (\underline{\Delta}_1, b_1) \quad \underline{\Delta}_t \cdot \underline{S}_t + b_t(1+r)^t = \underline{\Delta}_{t+1} \cdot \underline{S}_t + b_{t+1}(1+r)^t \quad t=1, 2, \dots, T-1$$

(1) & (2) implies

$$V_0 = E^* \left(\frac{V_1}{1+r} \right) = E^* \left(\frac{X}{1+r} \right) = X^* \quad \text{--- X ---}$$

Thm 3 provides one with the arbitrage-free price for any attainable claim. It turns out that, in the general case, not all claims are attainable in a financial market. A market with property that any claim is

attainable in it is said to be complete.

Single-period NA binomial market is complete.

Thm 1 (The completeness thm) An arbitrage-free market is complete iff \exists a unique EMM.

pf: Observation 1 using thm 2 $\exists p^*$ st $E^*\left(\frac{\tilde{S}_1}{1+r}\right) = \tilde{S}_0$

$$p_1^* S_1^1(\omega_1) + \dots + p_N^* S_1^1(\omega_N) = (1+r) S_0^1$$

$$p_1^* S_1^n(\omega_1) + \dots + p_N^* S_1^n(\omega_N) = (1+r) S_0^n$$

$$p_1^* + \dots + p_N^* = 1$$

So as the EMM is unique, the above system has unique solⁿ.

$$n+1=N \quad ; \quad \underset{\substack{\text{system} \\ \text{matrix}}}{A} = \begin{pmatrix} S_1^1(\omega_1) & S_1^1(\omega_2) & \dots & S_1^1(\omega_N) \\ S_1^2(\omega_1) & S_1^2(\omega_2) & \dots & S_1^2(\omega_N) \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ S_1^n(\omega_1) & S_1^n(\omega_2) & \dots & S_1^n(\omega_N) \\ 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

A is non-singular ; $\det A \neq 0$ and hence $\exists A^{-1}$.

Observation 2 \rightarrow Claim $X = X(\omega)$ can be replicated when

\exists portfolio $(\underline{\Delta}, b)$, $\underline{\Delta} = (\Delta^1, \dots, \Delta^n)$ st

$$\Delta^1 S_1^1(\omega_1) + \dots + \Delta^n S_1^n(\omega_N) + b(1+r) = X(\omega_1) \quad \} \star$$

$$\Delta^1 S_1^1(\omega_1) + \dots + \Delta^N S_1^N(\omega_N) + b(1+r) = X(\omega_N) \quad \Bigg| \cdot 0$$

system N linear equations for $n+1$ unknown $\Delta^1, \dots, \Delta^N, b(1+r)$
 system matrix is A^T

(\Leftarrow) Suppose \exists unique EMM; then observe 1

A is nonsingular $\det A = \det A^T \neq 0$

\therefore For any claim X , there is unique replicating strategy in the market, which proves that market is complete

(\Rightarrow) ^{well known} Thm 2 for an NA market \exists an EMM.

So we just have to show that if market is complete then EMM is unique.

Let \exists two EMM $\tilde{p}^*, \tilde{\tilde{p}}^*$.

Due to completeness, by thm 3, we have for any claim

$$E^{\tilde{p}^*} \frac{X}{1+r} = E^{\tilde{\tilde{p}}^*} \frac{X}{1+r}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_{k=1}^N \tilde{p}_k^* X(\omega_k) = \sum_{k=1}^N \tilde{\tilde{p}}_k^* X(\omega_k) \quad \text{--- } \star_1$$

Consider separate case $X_i^1(\omega_k) := \delta_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k=i \\ 0 & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}, i=1, \dots, N$

$$\begin{aligned}
 p_i^* &= \sum_{k=1}^N p_k^* \delta_{ik} = \sum_{k=1}^N p_k^* X_i(\omega_k) \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^N \tilde{p}_k^* X_i(\omega_k) \quad | \text{ Using } \star_j \\
 &= \sum_{k=1}^N \tilde{p}_k^* \delta_{ik} = \tilde{p}_i^*
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore \underline{\tilde{p}}^* = \underline{p}^*, \text{ i.e., EM is unique}$$