

MATH 589: Advanced Probability Theory 2
Final Exam: 14 December 2021 18:30-21:30

Contents

1	Central Limit Theorem, Characteristic Functions, and Convergence of Probability Measures	1
1.1	Review of Sums of Independent Random Variables	1
1.2	Central Limit Theorems	4
1.3	Weak Convergence of Probability Measures	12
1.4	Tightness of a Family, Class, or Collection of Probability Measures	13
2	Infinitely Divisible Laws	20
2.1	Examples of Infinitely Divisible Laws	20
2.2	Levy Processes	30

1 Central Limit Theorem, Characteristic Functions, and Convergence of Probability Measures

1.1 Review of Sums of Independent Random Variables

Consider $\{X_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ iid random variables with $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$ (WLOG) and $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] = 1$. Set $S_n := \sum_{j=1}^n X_j$. From the SSLN,

$$\frac{S_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely. In other words, $|S_n|$ has sub-linear growth as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In fact, given any sequence $\{b_n \mid n \geq 1\} \subseteq]0, \infty[$ such that $b_n \uparrow \infty$, if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} < \infty,$$

i.e., b_n grows sufficiently fast, then $\frac{S_n}{b_n} \rightarrow 0$ almost surely (by Kronecker's Lemma, c.f. MATH 587). Why?

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}[X_n^2]}{b_n^2} < \infty \Rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{X_n}{b_n} \text{ converges almost surely} \Rightarrow \frac{S_n}{b_n} \rightarrow 0 \text{ almost surely.}$$

Such a sequence $\{b_n\}$ includes:

- $\{n^p\}$ for $p > \frac{1}{2}$.
- $\{\sqrt{n}(\ln(n))^p\}$ for any $p > \frac{1}{2}$.

This means that I can do better than what I know about the LLN. For example, we know that $|S_n|$ grows slower than $\sqrt{n}(\ln(p))^{1/2}$ for any $p > \frac{1}{2}$. Since the inequality is strict, this means you can always do better. There is not a critical level. Now suppose we are interested in the asymptotic behaviour? Can we find a lower bound for the growth rate of S_n ?

On the other hand, if $\{X_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is iid $N(0, 1)$ standard Gaussian random variables. Then, set:

$$\check{S}_n := \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (1)$$

\check{S}_n is again $N(0, 1)$ for all $n \geq 1$. At least, in this case, \check{S}_n doesn't converge to any constant almost surely. In fact, it's easy to see that $\limsup_n \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}} = +\infty$ and $\liminf_n \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}} = -\infty$ almost surely. Why is this? Let's consider the limsup. For all $R > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_n > R) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_R^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx \\ &= p_R \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\limsup_n \check{S}_n \in m\mathcal{T}$ (tail σ -algebra), we have from the Kolmogorov 0-1 Law that $\limsup_n \check{S}_n$ is constant almost surely. What is this constant? Write:

$$\check{S}_n = \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n X_j + \sum_{j=N+1}^n X_j}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

As $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\frac{\sum_{j=1}^n X_j}{\sqrt{n}}$ goes to infinity. Hence, $\limsup_n \check{S}_n = \infty$ almost surely. One can do a similar analysis for the liminf.

Remark that $\check{S}_n \sim N(0, 1)$ is also seen for a more general sequence of random variables. This phenomenon is called the **Central Limit Phenomenon**.

Q: Can I have a better description of the asymptotics of S_n ?

The answer is the **Law of the Iterated Logarithm**.

Theorem 1 (Law of Iterated Logarithm). *Let $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of iid RVs with $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] = 1$. For every $n \geq 1$, set $S_n = \sum_{j=1}^n X_j$, and define Λ_n to be the iterated logarithm:*

$$\Lambda_n := \sqrt{2n \ln(\ln(n \vee 3))}.$$

It turns out that Λ_n will give us the accurate oscillation rate of S_n . Recall that the notation $n \vee 3 = \max\{n, 3\}$. Then, we can conclude:

- $\limsup_n \frac{S_n}{\Lambda_n} = 1$ almost surely.
- $\liminf_n \frac{S_n}{\Lambda_n} = -1$ almost surely.

In fact, for every $c \in [-1, 1]$, for almost every sample point $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists a subsequence $\{n_k\}_\omega \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_{n_k}(\omega)}{\Lambda_{n_k}} = c. \quad (2)$$

The picture you want to have in mind is the following:




Figure 1: The oscillations of S_n will always be in the envelope given by $\pm \Lambda_n$.

In particular, note that $LIL \Rightarrow SLLN$. The LIL is a refinement of the SLLN; Λ_n is sub-linear. Another perspective is by looking at it from the Kolmogorov 0-1 Law perspective: the liminf and limsup are constant almost surely.

Task # 1: Prove the Law of Iterated Logarithm.

Q: What can we say about the distribution?

The Central Limit Theorem will answer this question. For now, we will provide a heuristic overview; in the coming sections, we will rigorously do everything.

Idea: in the study of LLN, we consider $\bar{S}_n := \frac{S_n}{n}$, where $\mathbb{E}[\bar{S}_n] = \mathbb{E}[S_1] = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Here, this means that \bar{S}_n preserves the first moment. In **(CLT)** we will consider $\check{S}_n := \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}}$, where $\mathbb{E}[\check{S}_n] = 0$ (so, $\check{S}_n = \frac{S_n - \mathbb{E}[S_n]}{\sqrt{n}}$, where $\mathbb{E}[\check{S}_n] = 0$). Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\check{S}_n)^2] = \frac{n\mathbb{E}[X_1^2]}{n} = 1.$$

Note that in the CLT, the first and second moments are preserved.

1. The expected value tells us where the mass is centred.
2. The variance measures how the mass is spread out: how random the random variable is.

Heuristically, the CLT studies how the randomness will replace itself under the assumption / condition that the amount of randomness is preserved or fixed. For sure, it will not be going to a constant, and it will resemble a $N(0, 1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We work in the following set-up: $\{X_n\}$ iid random variables with $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] = 1$, and $S_n = \sum_{j=1}^n X_j$.

Remark: by preserving / stabilizing the second moments, \check{S}_n stabilizes all the moments. We can see this with the following computation / proof.

Suppose $X_1 \in L^p$ for all $p \geq 1$. We will show this stabilization by induction. For some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, define:

$$L_j := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[(\check{S}_n)^j] \text{ exists for } 1 \leq j \leq m. \quad (3)$$

Consider the $(m+1)$ st moment of \check{S}_n :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_n^{m+1}] &= \mathbb{E}[S_n S_n^m] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_j (X_j + S_{n \setminus j})^m] \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^m \binom{m}{k} \mathbb{E}[X_j^{k+1}] \mathbb{E}[S_{n \setminus j}^{m-k}] \quad (\text{by the binomial formula}) \\ &= n \left(\mathbb{E}[X_1] \mathbb{E}[S_{n \setminus 1}^m] + m \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[X_1^2]}_{=1} \mathbb{E}[S_{n \setminus 1}^{m-1}] + \sum_{k=2}^m \binom{m}{k} \mathbb{E}[X_1^{k+1}] \mathbb{E}[S_{n \setminus 1}^{m-k}] \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$ means the first term vanishes. Since $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] = 1$, we get, by applying the definition of \check{S}_n :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[(\check{S}_n)^{m+1}\right] &= n^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[S_n^{m+1}\right] \\ &= n^{-\frac{m+1}{2}} \left(m \mathbb{E}\left[S_{n \setminus 1}^{m-1}\right] + \sum_{k=2}^m \binom{m}{k} \mathbb{E}\left[X_1^{k+1}\right] \mathbb{E}\left[S_{n \setminus 1}^{m-k}\right] \right).\end{aligned}$$

Substituting in the definition of \check{S}_n , we obtain:

$$= \left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right)^{\frac{m-1}{2}} m \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[(\check{S}_{n \setminus 1})^{m-1}\right]}_{:=L_{m-1}} + \sum_{k=2}^m \underbrace{\frac{(n-1)^{\frac{m-k}{2}}}{n^{\frac{m-1}{2}}}}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty} \binom{m}{k} \mathbb{E}\left[X_1^{k+1}\right] \underbrace{\mathbb{E}\left[(\check{S}_{n-1})^{m-k}\right]}_{:=L_{m-k}}.$$

So as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain:

$$1 \cdot m \cdot L_{m-1}. \quad (4)$$

This gives us the following recursive relationship: $L_{m+1} = mL_{m-1}$. Since $L_1 = 0$ and $L_2 = 1$, the *second moment stabilizes all the moments*:

$$L_{2m+1} = 0 \text{ (all odd indices)} \quad (5)$$

$$L_{2m} = 1 \cdot 3 \cdot 4 \cdot \dots \cdot (2m-1) \text{ (product of all the odd numbers)} = (2m+1)!! \quad (6)$$

These are the moments of the standard Gaussian. So, the moments of \check{S}_n converge to the corresponding moments of a $N(0,1)$ random variable as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, intuitively, the distribution of \check{S}_n “approximates” $N(0,1)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As a corollary, if φ is a polynomial of any degree, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(\check{S}_n)\right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int \varphi(x) e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx = \gamma_{0,1}(\varphi)$$

where $\gamma_{0,1} = N(0,1)$.

1.2 Central Limit Theorems

Theorem 2 (Lindeberg’s Central Limit Theorem (CLT)). *Assume that $\{X_n\}$ is a sequence of independent square-integrable random variables on a probability space, $\mathbb{E}[X_n] = 0$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set:*

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_n &:= \sqrt{\text{Var}(X_n)} \\ \Sigma_n &:= \sqrt{\text{Var}(S_n)} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^2},\end{aligned}$$

where the final equality is true only if the X_n are independent. Set

$$\check{S}_n = \frac{S_n}{\Sigma_n}$$

(so $\mathbb{E}[\check{S}_n] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\check{S}_n^2] = 1$). For all $\varepsilon > 0$, set:

$$\begin{aligned}g_n(\varepsilon) &:= \frac{1}{\Sigma_n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[X_j^2; |X_j| > \varepsilon \Sigma_n\right] \text{ or} \\ g_n(\varepsilon) &:= \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n}\right)^2; \left|\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n}\right| > \varepsilon\right].\end{aligned}$$

Under this setting, for every $\varphi \in C^3(\mathbb{R})$ with φ'' and φ''' being bounded on \mathbb{R} and for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{S}_n)] - \gamma_{0,1}(\varphi) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon + \sqrt{g_n(\varepsilon)}) \|\varphi'''\|_n + g_n(\varepsilon) \|\varphi''\|_n. \quad (7)$$

In particular, if for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(\varepsilon) = 0, \quad (8)$$

(this is called **Lindeberg's Condition**), then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{S}_n)] = \gamma_{0,1}(\varphi).$$

Before the proof, we first make a quick remark. In the case when $\{X_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is iid with $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[X_1^2] = 1$ for all $n \geq 1$, $\sigma_n = 1$, $\Sigma_n = \sqrt{n}$. Hence,

$$\check{S}_n = \frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}},$$

and so, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_n(\varepsilon) &= \frac{1}{\Sigma_n^2} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} [X_j^2; |X_j| > \varepsilon \Sigma_n] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} [X_j^2; |X_j| > \varepsilon \sqrt{n}] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [X_1^2; |X_1| > \varepsilon \sqrt{n}] \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

So, in this case, Lindeberg's Condition is always satisfied.

Proof. Before the proof, the insight is as follows: as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the contribution of the X_j 's are getting closer and closer to a centered Gaussian $N(0, \sigma_j^2)$ random variable.

Introduce $\{Z_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ iid random variables independent of $\{X_n \mid n \geq 1\}$. For all $n \geq 1$, set $Y_n := \sigma_n Z_n$. Then, as we know Y_n is a $N(0, \sigma_n^2)$ random variable. Further define $\check{T}_n := \frac{1}{\Sigma_n} \sum_{j=1}^n Y_j$. Note that \check{T}_n is a $N(0, 1)$ random variable. Hence,

$$\gamma_{0,1}(\varphi) = \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{T}_n)] \Rightarrow \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{S}_n)] - \gamma_{0,1}(\varphi) = \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{S}_n) - \varphi(\check{T}_n)].$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\check{S}_n) - \varphi(\check{T}_n) &= \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (X_1 + \dots + X_n) \right) - \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (X_1 + \dots + X_{n-1} + Y_n) \right) + \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (X_1 + \dots + X_{n-1} + Y_n) \right) \\ &\quad - \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (X_1 + \dots + Y_{n-1} + Y_n) \right) + \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (X_1 + \dots + Y_{n-1} + Y_n) \right) - \dots \\ &\quad - \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (X_1 + Y_2 + \dots + Y_n) \right) + \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (X_1 + Y_2 + \dots + Y_n) \right) + \varphi \left(\frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (Y_1 + \dots + Y_n) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In light of this representation, for all $1 \leq j \leq n$, set:

$$U_j := \frac{1}{\Sigma_n} (X_1 + \dots + X_{j-1} + X_{j+1} + Y_{j+2} + \dots + Y_n). \quad (9)$$

Then, we can express the above more compactly as:

$$\varphi(\check{S}_n) - \varphi(\check{T}_n) = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\varphi \left(U_j + \frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) - \varphi \left(U_j + \frac{Y_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right)$$

The idea is to now use Taylor expansions: recall that the Taylor Expansion of φ is:

$$\varphi(U_j + \xi) = \varphi(U_j) + \xi \varphi'(U_j) + \frac{\xi^2}{2} \varphi''(U_j) + \dots$$

Set $R_j(\xi) = \varphi(U_j + \xi) - \varphi(U_j) - \xi \varphi'(U_j) - \frac{1}{2} \xi^2 \varphi''(U_j)$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(U_j + \frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[R_j \left(\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] + \mathbb{E} [\varphi(U_j)] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \varphi'(U_j) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{X_j^2}{\Sigma_n^2} \varphi''(U_j) \right].$$

Let's simplify all these terms:

- Since X_j is independent of U_j , we can write:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \varphi'(U_j) \right] &= \frac{1}{\Sigma_n} \mathbb{E} [X_j] \mathbb{E} [\varphi'(U_j)] = 0. \\ \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{X_j^2}{\Sigma_n^2} \varphi''(U_j) \right] &= \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{X_j^2}{\Sigma_n^2} \right] \cdot \mathbb{E} [\varphi''(U_j)] = \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\Sigma_n^2} \mathbb{E} [\varphi''(U_j)] \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\varphi \left(U_j + \frac{Y_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[R_j \left(\frac{Y_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] + \mathbb{E} [\varphi(U_j)] + 0 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\Sigma_n^2} \cdot \mathbb{E} [\varphi''(U_j)].$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{S}_n) - \varphi(\check{T}_n)] \right| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \mathbb{E} \left[R_j \left(\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[R_j \left(\frac{Y_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \mathbb{E} \left[R_j \left(\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] \right| + \left| \mathbb{E} \left[R_j \left(\frac{Y_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] \right| \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $|R_j(\xi)| \leq (\frac{1}{6} \xi^3 \|\varphi'''\|_n) \wedge (\xi^2 \|\varphi''\|_n)$, where the first case happens if ξ is small and the second case happens if ξ is not small. Hence, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we have:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left| \mathbb{E} \left[R_j \left(\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] \right| \leq \frac{1}{6} \|\varphi'''\|_n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|X_j|^3}{\Sigma_n^3}; |X_j| \leq \varepsilon \Sigma_n \right] + \|\varphi''\|_n \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|X_j|^2}{\Sigma_n^2}; \frac{|X_j|}{\Sigma_n} > \varepsilon \right],$$

where the first term in the sum comes from the bound for ξ being small and the second term in the sum comes from the bound for ξ being not so small. Pulling one of the $|X_j|$ out of the fraction in the first term of the sum, and using the bound given, we obtain:

$$\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \|\varphi'''\|_n \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\mathbb{E} [X_j^2]}{\Sigma_n^2} + \|\varphi''\|_n \cdot g_n(\varepsilon),$$

which is good, since we have $\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\Sigma_n^2} = 1$. Hence,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left| \mathbb{E} \left[R_j \left(\frac{X_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right] \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \|\varphi''\|_n + \|\varphi''\|_n \cdot g_n(\varepsilon).$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left| R_j \left(\frac{Y_j}{\Sigma_n} \right) \right| \right] &\leq \frac{1}{6} \|\varphi'''\|_n \mathbb{E} [|Z_n|^3] \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\sigma_j^3}{\Sigma_n^3} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3} \|\varphi'''\|_n \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{\sigma_j}{\Sigma_n} \cdot \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\Sigma_n^2}}_{=1}. \end{aligned}$$

We have that for all $1 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_j^2 &= \mathbb{E} [X_j^2] = \mathbb{E} [X_j^2; |X_j| \leq \varepsilon \Sigma_n] + \mathbb{E} [X_j^2; |X_j| > \varepsilon \Sigma_n] \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \Sigma_n^2 + \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E} [X_l^2; |X_l| > \varepsilon \Sigma_n]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{\sigma_j^2}{\Sigma_n^2} \leq \varepsilon^2 + g_n(\varepsilon) \Rightarrow \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{\sigma_j}{\Sigma_n} \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + g_n(\varepsilon)} \leq \varepsilon + \sqrt{g_n(\varepsilon)}.$$

Collecting all the bounds,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{S}_n)] - \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{T}_n)] \right| &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{6} \|\varphi'''\|_n + g_n(\varepsilon) \|\varphi''\|_n + \frac{1}{3} \|\varphi'''\|_n (\varepsilon + \sqrt{g_n(\varepsilon)}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\varepsilon + \sqrt{g_n(\varepsilon)} \right) \|\varphi'''\|_n + g_n(\varepsilon) \|\varphi''\|_n \end{aligned}$$

which proves the theorem. \square

Corrolary 1. Under the same setting as before, if Lindeberg's condition holds, then for all $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$,


$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [\varphi(\check{S}_n)] = \gamma_{0,1}(\varphi). \quad (10)$$

In particular, we can show that for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(a \leq \check{S}_n \leq b \right) = \gamma_{0,1}([a, b]) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_a^b e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} dx.$$

Proof. The proof only requires a standard fact from analysis, which we will use quite a lot in this course.

Fact. For $[a, b]$ closed, there exists a sequence of functions $\{\varphi_k \mid k \geq 1\} \subseteq C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \leq \varphi_k \leq 1$ for all $k \geq 1$ and $\varphi_k \downarrow \chi_{[a,b]}$. The picture that you want to have in mind is:



Therefore, for all $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\limsup_n \mathbb{P}(\check{S}_n \in [a, b]) \leq \lim_n \mathbb{E}[\varphi_k(\check{S}_n)] = \gamma_{0,1}(\varphi_k),$$

where the final equality follows from the Lindeberg's CLT. As $k \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\gamma_{0,1}(\varphi_k) \rightarrow \gamma_{0,1}([a, b]).$$

Hence, $\limsup_n \mathbb{P}(a \leq \check{S}_n \leq b) \leq \gamma_{0,1}([a, b])$. Similarly, for $]a, b[$, there exists a sequence of functions $\{\psi_k \mid k \geq 1\}$ such that $0 \leq \psi_k \leq 1$ for all $k \geq 1$, $\psi_k \uparrow \chi_{]a, b[}$ (so, we approach the indicator function from below). Then,

$$\liminf_n \mathbb{P}(a < \check{S}_n < b) \geq \lim_n \mathbb{E}[\psi_k(\check{S}_n)] = \gamma_{0,1}(\varphi_k) \rightarrow \gamma_{0,1}(]a, b[).$$

Since $\gamma_{0,1}(]a, b[) = \gamma_{0,1}([a, b])$ we have the desired limit statement. \square

So, now we want to look at smooth functions that approximates the indicator function χ of a set we are interested in studying. Let's first do some preparation.

Definition 1 (Convolution). Given μ and ν , two probability measures on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ given by: for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mu * \nu := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \nu(B - x) \mu(dx), \quad (11)$$

where recall the set $B - x := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid y + x \in B\}$.

Remarks. It's easy to check with Fubini's Theorem that:

1. $x \mapsto \nu(B - x)$ is a measure with respect to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.
2. $\mu * \nu$ is again a probability measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$.
3. $\mu * \nu = \nu * \mu$. If ρ is another probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d , then,

$$(\mu * \nu) * \rho = \mu * (\nu * \rho). \quad (12)$$

In the next proposition, we will see how convolution corresponds to taking the sum of two independent random variables.

Proposition 1. Given X and Y two independent random variables, \mathbb{R}^d -valued, with $\mathcal{L}_X = \mu$ and $\mathcal{L}_Y = \nu$. If X and Y are independent, then

$$\mathcal{L}_{X+Y} = \mu * \nu. \quad (13)$$

Proof. To see this, we first have that since X and Y are independent,

$$\mathcal{L}_{(X,Y)} = \mathcal{L}_X \cdot \mathcal{L}_Y = \mu \times \nu.$$

So, using Fubini's theorem, we obtain that for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(X + Y \in B) &= \iint_{\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d} \chi_B(x + y) (\mu \times \nu) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \chi_B(x + y) \nu(dy) \right) \mu(dx) \\ &= \mu * \nu(B). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Remark. It's also possible to define the convolution of functions. Given f and g two functions on \mathbb{R}^d , for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$f * g(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x-y)g(y)dy,$$

provided that the integral is defined. Similarly, $f * g = g * f$ and $(f * g) * h = f * (g * h)$.

Corollary 2. If X and Y are independent, and X has a density f and Y has a density g , then $X + Y$ has a density $f * g$.

Notation. for every $x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we will denote by (\cdot, \cdot) the dot product:

$$(x, \xi) := \sum_{j=1}^d x_j \xi_j.$$

We will denote by $i := \sqrt{-1}$ the imaginary unit. For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, let \bar{z} be the complex conjugate of z . We consider functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. As we'd expect, φ is Borel \iff the real and imaginary parts of φ are Borel functions in the standard sense. If μ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d , then we write that $\varphi \in L^p(\mu)$ if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\varphi(x)|^p \mu(dx) < \infty.$$

(note that $|\varphi(x)|^2 = \text{Re}^2(\varphi) + \text{Im}^2(\varphi)$). Given two functions ψ and φ , \mathbb{C} -valued on \mathbb{R}^d , their inner product is given by:

$$\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle = (\varphi, \psi)_{L^2} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(x) \overline{\psi(x)} dx.$$

Definition 2 (Characteristic Function). Given a probability measure μ on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, the **characteristic function** of μ , denoted by $\hat{\mu}$, is a function on \mathbb{R}^d such that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i(x, \xi)} \mu(dx). \quad (14)$$

$\hat{\mu} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is well-defined for every ξ , measurable (Fubini) with respect to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $|\hat{\mu}| \leq 1$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We can similarly define the characteristic function of a random variable. If X is a random variable on some probability space such that $\mathcal{L}_X = \mu$, then

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(X, \xi)} \right].$$

We now introduce some remarks on characteristic functions.

1. $\hat{\mu} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a continuous function. (Can easily verify this by taking a sequence ξ_n , and use **(DOM)** since everything is bounded by 1).
2. If μ is symmetric, i.e., $\forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\mu(A) = \mu(-A)$. Then, $\hat{\mu}(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, since by symmetry, the imaginary part will cancel.
3. If μ and ν are two probability measures, then,

$$\mu * \nu(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\xi) \cdot \hat{\nu}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\xi) \cdot \hat{\nu}(\xi),$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. To see this, implement with random variables. Take X and Y independent such that $\mathcal{L}_X = \mu$ and $\mathcal{L}_Y = \nu$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu \hat{*} \nu(\xi) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(X+Y, \xi)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(X, \xi)} e^{i(Y, \xi)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(X, \xi)} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(Y, \xi)} \right] \\ &= \hat{\mu}(\xi) \cdot \hat{\nu}(\xi).\end{aligned}$$

4. $\hat{\mu}$ contains information about “moments”. To see this, assume that X is a random variable such that $\mathcal{L}_X = \mu$ and $\mathbb{E}[|X|^p] < \infty$ for some $p \geq 1$. Then, for every multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ such that $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_d \leq p$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial^\alpha \hat{\mu}(\xi) &:= \partial_1^{\alpha_1} \partial_2^{\alpha_2} \dots \partial_d^{\alpha_d} \hat{\mu}(\xi) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (ix)^\alpha e^{i(x, \xi)} \mu(dx).\end{aligned}$$

This follows from **(DOM)**. The notation $(ix)^\alpha$ means $i^{|\alpha|} x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdot x_2^{\alpha_2} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$. In particular, we have

$$[\partial^\alpha \hat{\mu}(\xi)]_{\xi=0} = i^{|\alpha|} \mathbb{E}[X^\alpha].$$

The $\mathbb{E}[X^\alpha]$ term is called the **cross-moment**. The notation X^α means $X_1^{\alpha_1} X_2^{\alpha_2} \dots X_d^{\alpha_d}$.

- (a) In general, $\hat{\mu} \in C^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ does NOT imply that $\mathbb{E}[|X|^p] < \infty$. For example, consider that μ is the probability measure on \mathbb{R} with density:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| < 2 \\ \frac{c}{x^2 \ln(|x|)} & \text{if } |x| \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) dx = 1$. Now let X be a random variable such that $\mathcal{L}_X = \mu$. On one hand,

$$\mathbb{E}[|X|] = 2 \int_{2^\infty} \frac{dx}{x \ln(x)} \cdot c = \infty \Rightarrow X \notin L^1.$$

On the other hand,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = 2c \int_2^\infty \frac{\cos(x\xi)}{x^2 \ln(x)} dx.$$

One can verify that $\hat{\mu}$ is differentiable at every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\hat{\mu}'(0) = 0$.

Example 1. On \mathbb{R} ,

$$\hat{\partial}_{m, \sigma^2}(\xi) = e^{im\xi} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \xi^2}.$$

On \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$\hat{\partial}_{\vec{m}, c}(\xi) = e^{i(\vec{m}, \xi)} \cdot e^{-\frac{(\xi, c\xi)}{2}},$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Observe that the characteristic functions have super-exponential decay like the densities.

Definition 3. Given a function φ on \mathbb{R}^d , the **Fourier Transform** of φ , denoted by $\hat{\varphi}$, is given by: for all $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\hat{\varphi}(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i(x,\xi)} \varphi(x) dx, \quad (15)$$

provided that the integral is defined. In particular, this means that if μ is a probability measure with density φ , then for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\varphi}(\xi). \quad (16)$$

The next theorem tells us that the characteristic function uniquely defines a probability measure.

Theorem 3. Let μ and ν be two probability measures on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. If $\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\nu}(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mu = \nu$.

The proof will follow from these three lemmas.

Lemma 1. Let μ and ν be two probability measures. If $\mu(\varphi) = \nu(\varphi)$ for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C})$. Then, $\mu = \nu$.

Proof. Since the open sets form a generating π -system, it's sufficient to show that for every open set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mu(B) = \nu(B)$. Take B open, and consider $d(x, B^c) := \inf_{y \in B^c} |x - y|$. Then, we know from analysis that $x \mapsto d(x, B^c)$ is continuous. For all $k \geq 1$, set

$$\varphi_k(x) := \left(\frac{d(x, B^c)}{1 + d(x, B^c)} \right)^{1/k}.$$

Ten, $\varphi_k \in [0, 1]$ and for each k , φ_k is continuous. We have that $\varphi_k \uparrow \chi_B$. Why?

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_k(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d(x, B^c) > 0 \iff x \in B \text{ since closed} \\ 0 & \text{if } d(x, B^c) = 0 \iff x \in B^c. \end{cases}$$

By **(DOM)** or **(MON)**,

$$\mu(B) = \lim_k \mu(\varphi_k) = \lim_k \nu(\varphi_k) = \nu(B).$$

□

Lemma 2. For all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ there exists a sequence $\{\varphi_m \mid m \geq 1\} \subseteq C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\|\varphi_m\|_n \leq \|\varphi_n\|$ for all $m \geq 1$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_m = \varphi$.

(As a result of Lemma 2, $\mu = \nu$ if $\mu(\varphi) = \nu(\varphi)$ for all $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$).

Lemma 3 (A Generalization of Plancherel's Theorem). If $\psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and μ is a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d , then

$$\mu(\psi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x) \mu(dx) = (2\pi)^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \hat{\psi}(\xi) \overline{\hat{\mu}(\xi)} d\xi, \quad (17)$$

i.e., $\mu(\psi) = \langle \hat{\psi}, \hat{\mu} \rangle$.

As a result of Lemma 3, $\mu = \nu$ if $\hat{\mu} = \hat{\nu}$. We will neatly collect this into a theorem.

Theorem 4. Let μ and ν be two probability measures on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu = \nu &\iff \mu(\varphi) = \nu(\varphi) \quad \forall \varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ &\iff \mu(\psi) = \nu(\psi) \quad \forall \psi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ &\iff \hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\nu}(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d. \end{aligned}$$

We can think of $C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and C_c^∞ as classes of test functions that test how measure behaves.

1.3 Weak Convergence of Probability Measures

There are only two types of convergence which will be covered in this course.

Definition 4 (Weak Convergence of Measure). Assume that $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ and μ are probability measures on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We say that μ_n **converges weakly** to μ , and we write “ $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ ” if for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C})$:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\varphi) = \mu(\varphi). \quad (18)$$

We also have convergence in distribution of random variables.

Definition 5. Assume that $\{X_n\}$ and X are \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. X_n converges to X **in distribution**, denoted by “ $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution”, if $\mathcal{L}X_n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}X$, i.e., for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X_n)] = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(X)]. \quad (19)$$

Remark.

1. For two probability measures μ and ν on \mathbb{R}^d , the most natural way of putting a metric on the space of probability measures is the **total variation distance** between μ and ν :

$$\|\mu - \nu\|_{\text{var}} := \sup\{|\mu(A) - \nu(A)| \mid A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\}. \quad (20)$$

2. Given $\{\mu_n\}$ and μ probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d , if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mu_n - \mu\|_{\text{var}} = 0$, then μ_n converges to μ **in the strong sense**.

Exercise. verify that if $\|\mu_n - \mu\|_{\text{var}} \rightarrow 0$ then $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$.

It is often inconvenient to work with strong convergence. For example, we know that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} = 0$. If $\mu_n := \delta_{1/n}$ for all $n \geq 0$, then $\mu = \delta_0$. So, naturally, μ_n should be getting closer and closer to μ . However, if you look at the total variation distance, for all $n \geq 1$, $\|\mu_n - \mu\|_{\text{var}} = 1$. Hence, μ_n does not converge to μ in the strong sense. However, if we relax our standards, $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ because for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R})$, $\mu_n(\varphi) = \varphi\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \varphi(0) = \mu(\varphi)$ where the convergence follows from continuity.

1. Let $\{X_n\}$ and X be \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$.
 - (a) If $X_n \rightarrow X$ in probability, then $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution.
 - (b) If $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution and $X \equiv c$ for some constant c , then $X_n \rightarrow X$ in probability.
2. Let $\{X_n\}$ and X be \mathbb{R} -valued random variables such that X_n has the distribution function F_n for all $n \geq 1$ and X has distribution function F . Then,
 - (a) If $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(x) = F(x)$ at every continuous point x of F .
 - (b) If X_n has density f_n for all $n \geq 1$ and X has density f , and $f_n \rightarrow f$ a.e. with respect to the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R} , then $X_n \rightarrow X$ in distribution.

Proposition 2. Let $\{\mu_n\}$ and μ be probability measures on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. If for every subsequence $\{n_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, there exists a further subsequence, $\{n_{k_l}\} \subseteq \{n_k\}$ such that $\{\mu_{n_{k_l}}\} \Rightarrow \mu$, then $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$.

Proposition 3. If $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d and $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ and $\mu_n \Rightarrow \nu$, then $\mu = \nu$ (the limit of weak convergence is unique).

Proof. We can very briefly sketch the argument: for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\varphi) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\varphi) = \nu(\varphi) \\ &\Rightarrow \text{integrals match on all continuous and bounded functions} \\ &\Rightarrow \mu = \nu. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following proposition will be useful for the homework.

Proposition 4. Suppose $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$. Then:

1. For all open sets $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mu(G) \leq \liminf_n \mu_n(G). \quad (21)$$

2. For all closed sets $F \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mu(F) \geq \limsup_n \mu_n(F). \quad (22)$$

Proof. We will only prove (i). Given an open set $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a sequence $\{\varphi_k \mid k \geq 1\} \subseteq C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\varphi_k \uparrow \chi_G$. By (MON) or (DOM),

$$\mu(G) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu(\varphi_k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\varphi_k) \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(G),$$

where the second equality follows from weak convergence, and the final inequality follows from the fact that for all $k \geq 1$, $\varphi_k \leq \chi_G$. \square

In fact, if $\mu(G) \leq \liminf_n \mu_n(G)$ for every open set $G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$.

1.4 Tightness of a Family, Class, or Collection of Probability Measures

Definition 6. Let $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d . We say that $\{\mu_n\}$ is **tight** if for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $K_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\sup_n \mu_n(K_\varepsilon^c) < \varepsilon. \quad (23)$$

This is telling us that we can make the whole family uniformly small.

Remark. “tightness” means that the mass is concentrated in a way that is uniform for the μ_n ’s. For example:

- $\{\mu_n = \gamma_{0,1/n} \mid n \geq 1\}$ is a tight family (the variance goes down as $n \rightarrow \infty$).
- $\{\nu_n = \gamma_{0,n} \mid n \geq 1\}$ is *not* tight: as n grows, the variance gets more spread out.

Theorem 5 (Prokhorov’s Theorem). *Let $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d . Then:*

1. *If there exists a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$, then $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is tight.*
2. *If $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is tight, then there exists a subsequence $\{n_k \mid n \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d such that along the subsequence, $\mu_{n_k} \Rightarrow \mu$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. (i). Assume that $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$. For a contradiction, assume that $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is not tight: there exists an $\eta > 0$ such that for all compact sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\sup_n \mu_n(K^c) > \eta.$$

We will use this statement to extract a subsequence: for all $k \geq 1$, there exists an n_k such that $\mu_{n_k}(\overline{B(0,k)}^c) > \eta$. Then, for every $R > 0$ when k is sufficiently large, i.e., $k \geq R$, we get from $\mu_{n_k} \Rightarrow \mu$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(B(0,R)) &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_k}(B(0,R)) \quad (\text{weak convergence}) \\ &\leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_k}(B(0,k)) \\ &\leq 1 - \eta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $R > 0$,

$$\mu(B(0, R)) \leq 1 - \eta \Rightarrow \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) < 1 - \eta,$$

where the implication follows from sending $R \rightarrow \infty$ and **(MON)**. However, this is not possible, since $\mu(\mathbb{R}^d) = 1$ since μ is a probability measure. \square

Task: Give a rigorous proof of **(i)** of Prokhorov's Theorem. You may use:

1. Riesz-Representation Theorem
2. Stone-Weierstrass Theorem (separability of space of continuous functions on compact sets).

Theorem 6. Let $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ and μ be probability measures. If $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}_n(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

(so weak convergence of measure gives us convergence of characteristic functions) and this convergence is uniform on compact sets, i.e., for all compact $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\xi \in K} |\hat{\mu}_n(\xi) - \hat{\mu}(\xi)| = 0. \quad (24)$$

Furthermore, for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if $\{\varphi_n \mid n \geq 1\} \subseteq C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\sup_n \|\varphi_n\|_n < \infty$ and $\varphi_n \Rightarrow \varphi$ uniformly on compact sets, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\varphi_n) = \mu(\varphi)$.

Proof. For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the map $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto e^{i(x, \xi)} \in \mathbb{C}$ is continuous and bounded. Hence,

$$\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}_n(\xi) \rightarrow \hat{\mu}(\xi).$$

We will now prove the last statement. Since $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$, the sequence $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is tight for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence, there exists a compact set $K_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\sup_n \mu_n(K_\varepsilon^c) < \varepsilon$ and $\mu(K_\varepsilon^c) < \varepsilon$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_n(\varphi_n) - \mu(\varphi)| &= |\mu_n(\varphi_n) - \mu_n(\varphi)| + \underbrace{|\mu_n(\varphi) - \mu(\varphi)|}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty} \\ &\leq |\mu_n(\chi_{K_\varepsilon} \cdot (\varphi_n - \varphi))| + |\mu_n(\chi_{K_\varepsilon^c} \cdot (\varphi_n - \varphi))| \\ &\leq \underbrace{\sup_{x \in K_\varepsilon} |\varphi_n(x) - \varphi(x)|}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty} \cdot 1 + \underbrace{\sup_n \mu_n(K_\varepsilon^c)}_{< \varepsilon} \cdot \underbrace{(\sup_n \|\varphi_n\|_n + \|\varphi\|_n)}_{< \infty}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first convergence to zero occurs since $\varphi_n \rightarrow \varphi$ uniformly on compact sets K_ε , the second term is assumed to be less than ε and the final term was assumed to be finite. Therefore, $\mu_n(\varphi_n) \rightarrow \mu(\varphi)$.

In particular, if $\{\xi_n \mid n \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\hat{\mu}_n(\xi_n) \rightarrow \hat{\mu}(\xi)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, because we could simply take $\varphi_n = e^{i(\cdot, \xi/n)}$ and $\varphi = e^{i(\cdot, \xi)}$ (*).

We need to now prove that for all compact sets $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\sup_{\xi \in K} |\hat{\mu}_n(\xi) - \hat{\mu}(\xi)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

For a contradiction, assume otherwise: there exists K compact, $\eta > 0$, a subsequence $\{n_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{\xi \in K} |\hat{\mu}_{n_k}(\xi) - \hat{\mu}(\xi)| > \eta.$$

Thus, there exists a subsequence $\xi_{n_k} \in K$ such that

$$|\hat{\mu}_{n_k}(\xi_{n_k}) - \hat{\mu}(\xi_{n_k})| > \eta.$$

Since K is compact, $\{\xi_{n_k} \mid k\} \subseteq K \Rightarrow$ that there exists $\{n_{k_l} \subseteq \{n_k\}$ and there exists a $\xi_0 \in K$ such that $\xi_{n_{k_l}} \rightarrow \xi_0$. Hence,

$$\left| \hat{\mu}_{n_{k_l}}(\xi_{n_{k_l}}) - \mu(\xi_{n_{k_l}}) \right| \leq \underbrace{\left| \hat{\mu}_{n_{k_l}}(\xi_{n_{k_l}}) - \hat{\mu}(\xi_0) \right|}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ by } (*)} + \underbrace{\left| \hat{\mu}(\xi_0) - \hat{\mu}(\xi_{n_{k_l}}) \right|}_{\rightarrow 0 \text{ since } \hat{\mu} \text{ is cts}}$$

Contradiction! Therefore, $\hat{\mu}_n \rightarrow \hat{\mu}$ uniformly on compact sets. \square

Theorem 7. If $\{\mu_n\}$ is a sequence of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d and $\{\mu_n\}$ is tight and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}_n(\xi) = f(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then there exists a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ and $\hat{\mu} = f$.

Proof. For all subsequences $\{n_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, since $\{\mu_{n_k}\}$ is tight, there exists a subsequence $\{n_{k_l} \subseteq \{n_k\}$ and a probability measure $\mu^{\{n_k\}}$ (the existence depends on the choice of $\{n_k\}$, hence the superscript) such that $\mu_{n_{k_l}} \Rightarrow \mu^{\{n_k\}}$. According to the assumption on $\hat{\mu}_n$,

$$\mu^{\{n_k\}} = f(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

i.e., f doesn't depend on the choice of subsequence $\{n_k\}$. Hence, $\mu^{\{n_k\}} = \mu$ is identical for all choices of $\{n_k\}$. Hence, convergence is achieved along the full subsequence:

$$\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu \text{ and } \hat{\mu} = f.$$

\square

Remark. the “tightness” condition is necessary in the previous theorem. To see why, consider the following example to see what happens when the tightness assumption is dropped.

- for all $n \geq 1$, set $\mu_n = \gamma_{(0,n)}$. Clearly, $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is not tight. In the limit, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\hat{\mu}_n = \exp\left(\frac{-n\xi}{2}\right) \rightarrow \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \xi \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \xi = 0. \end{cases}$$

So, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}_n(\xi)$ exists for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. But, we will show that it cannot converge to a probability measure.

- claim: μ_n does not weakly converge to μ for any probability measure μ . For a contradiction, assume otherwise: suppose that there exists a probability measure μ such that $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$. Then, for every $L > 0$,

$$\mu([-L, +L]) \leq \liminf_n \mu_n([-L, +L]) = 0,$$

which is not possible.

The following theorem gives us an alternate, easier way to check if there exists a probability measure such that $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$, since its condition (continuity at zero) is easier to check than checking if a family of measures is tight.

Theorem 8 (Levy's Continuity Theorem). Let $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d such that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}_n(\xi) = f(\xi), \tag{25}$$

exists. Further assume that $f: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is continuous at zero (this is the condition which replaces tightness). Then, there exists a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ and $\hat{\mu} = f$.

Before the proof, we first require a lovely technical lemma.

Lemma 4. Given μ a probability measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, for all $r > 0$, $R > 0$, for all unit vectors $\vec{e} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have the following two estimates:

1. $|1 - \hat{\mu}(r\vec{e})| \leq rR + 2\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |(\vec{x}, \vec{e})| > R\})$
2. set $m(t) := \inf_{|u|>t} \left(1 - \frac{\sin(u)}{u}\right)$ for all $t > 0$. Then,

$$\mu(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |(\vec{x}, \vec{e})| > R\}) \leq \left(\frac{1}{r} \int_0^r |1 - \hat{\mu}(s\vec{e})| ds\right) \cdot \frac{1}{m(rR)} \quad (26)$$

Proof. Will include later. □

Proof. (Proof of Levy's Continuity Theorem). We only need to show that if $\hat{\mu}_n(\xi) \rightarrow f(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and f is continuous at zero, then $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is tight. Obviously,

$$f(0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}_n(0) = 1.$$

By continuity, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for all $|\xi| \leq \delta$, $|1 - f(\xi)| < \varepsilon$. For $j = 1, \dots, d$, let \vec{e}_j be the j th standard basis vector of \mathbb{R}^d . By (ii) of the previous lemma, for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\mu_n \left(\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |(\vec{x}, \vec{e}_j)| > \frac{2}{\delta} \right\} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \int_0^\delta |1 - \hat{\mu}(s\vec{e}_j)| ds \cdot \frac{1}{m(2)} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\delta} \int_0^\delta |1 - f(s\vec{e}_j)| ds \frac{1}{m(t)} \leq 2\varepsilon,$$

where the convergence follows from (DOM). Hence, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an $R = \frac{2}{\delta}$, there exists an $N \geq 1$, such that for all $n \geq N$,

$$\mu_n \left(\overline{B(0, \sqrt{d}R)}^c \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^d \mu_n(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |(\vec{x}, \vec{e}_j)| > R\}) \leq 2d\varepsilon.$$

So, for $n = 1, \dots, N-1$, if necessary, we can make R even larger such that

$$\sup_{1 \leq n \leq N-1} \mu_n \left(\overline{B(0, \sqrt{d}R)}^c \right) \leq 2d\varepsilon.$$

Hence, as long as R is sufficiently large, we have $\sup_{n \geq 1} \mu_n \left(\overline{B(0, \sqrt{d}R)}^c \right) \leq 2d\varepsilon$. Hence, the family $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is tight, and the rest follows. □

Applications and Examples

1. CLT for i.i.d. sequences:

Theorem 9. Let $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of iid random variables, \mathbb{R} -valued, with $\mathbb{E}[X_1] = m$ and $\text{Var}[X_1] = \sigma^2$. If

$$\check{S}_n = \frac{S_n - nm}{\sqrt{n}},$$

then $\mathcal{L}_{\check{S}_n} \Rightarrow \gamma_{0, \sigma^2}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. It suffices to show that if $\mu_n := \mathcal{L}_{S_n}$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mu}_n(\xi) = \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2 \xi^2}{2}\right)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. W.L.O.G., assume that $m = 0$, otherwise re-centre the random variables. Then, for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_n(\xi) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i S_n \cdot \xi} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i S_n \cdot \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{n}}} \right] \\ &= \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{i X_1 \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{n}}} \right] \right)^n \\ &= \left(\rho \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right)^n, \text{ where } \rho(\xi) := \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i X_1 \xi} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\rho'(0) = \mathbb{E}[X_1] = 0$ and $-\rho''(0) = \mathbb{E}[X_1^2] = \sigma^2$, Taylor expand ρ and use this information:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho \left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{n}} \right) &= 1 + \rho'(0) \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\rho''(0)}{2} \frac{\xi^2}{n} + O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \\ &= 1 + 0 - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \frac{\xi^2}{n} + O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \\ \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}_n(\xi) &= \left(1 - \frac{\sigma^2 \xi^2}{2n} + O \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right)^n \rightarrow \exp \left(-\frac{\sigma^2 \xi^2}{2} \right) = \gamma_{0,1}(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

□

2. Characterization of $\gamma_{0,1}$:

Proposition 5. Let X and Y be i.i.d. random variables with $\mu = \mathcal{L}_X = \mathcal{L}_Y$ such that $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = 1$. If $X + Y$ and $X - Y$ are also independent, then $\mu = \gamma_{0,1}$.

Proof. Set $Z := X + Y$ and $W := X - Y$. Then, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i Z \xi} \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(X+Y)\xi} \right] = (\hat{\mu}(\xi))^2 \text{ (where equality follows from independence).} \\ \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i W \xi} \right] &= \hat{\mu}(\xi) \hat{\mu}(-\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Note that according to the definition, $2X = Z + W$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}(2\xi) &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i 2X \xi} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(Z+W)\xi} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i Z \xi} \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i W \xi} \right] \text{ (by independence)} \\ &= (\hat{\mu}(\xi))^3 \hat{\mu}(-\xi). \end{aligned}$$

For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\hat{\mu}(2\xi) = (\hat{\mu}(\xi))^3 \hat{\mu}(-\xi).$$

Similarly,

$$\hat{\mu}(-2\xi) = (\hat{\mu}(-\xi))^3 \hat{\mu}(\xi).$$

Taking the ratio of the two expressions yields,

$$\frac{\hat{\mu}(2\xi)}{\hat{\mu}(-2\xi)} = \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}(\xi)}{\hat{\mu}(-\xi)} \right)^2 \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

If $g(\xi) := \frac{\hat{\mu}(\xi)}{\hat{\mu}(-\xi)}$, then it satisfies $g(2\xi) = (g(\xi))^2$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$. This relationship is the key. Iterating this identity gives

$$g(\xi) = \left(g\left(\frac{\xi}{2}\right) \right)^2 = \dots = \left(g\left(\frac{\xi}{2^n}\right) \right)^{2^n} \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}, n \geq 1.$$

Taylor expand g near zero:

$$g\left(\frac{\xi}{2^n}\right) = g(0) + g'(0)\frac{\xi}{2^n} + O\left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right).$$

Using the fact that $g(0) = 1$ and $g'(0) = 0$, we recover the special limit for e :

$$g(\xi) = \left(1 + 0 + O\left(\frac{1}{2^n}\right) \right)^{2^n} \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, $\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(-\xi)$ for all ξ which gives that $\hat{\mu}$ is even and hence $\hat{\mu}$ is symmetric. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}(2\xi) &= (\hat{\mu}(\xi))^4 \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R} \\ \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}(\xi) &= \left(\hat{\mu}\left(\frac{\xi}{2^n}\right) \right)^{2^{2n}} \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ for all } n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Taylor expanding $\hat{\mu}$ near zero yields:

$$\hat{\mu}\left(\frac{\xi}{2^n}\right) = 1 + 0 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\xi^2}{2^{2n}} + O\left(\frac{1}{2^{2n}}\right).$$

Hence,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \left(1 - \frac{\xi^2}{2} \frac{1}{2^{2n}} + O\left(\frac{1}{2^{2n}}\right) \right)^{2^{2n}} \rightarrow e^{-\frac{\xi^2}{2}} \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

□

The following theorem is another application of Levy's Continuity Theorem.

Theorem 10 (Levy's Equivalence Theorem). *Let $\{X_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ be independent random variables on some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Set $S_n := \sum_{j=1}^n X_j$. Then, the following are equivalent:*

1. S_n converges a.s. to some random variable S , i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^n X_j$ converges almost surely.
2. S_n converges in probability to some random variable S .
3. S_n converges in distribution to S .

The idea of this theorem is that it's very hard for independent random variables to converge, so if they converge in one sense, they converge in all senses.

Proof. This time, we only need to show that (iii) \Rightarrow (ii). Assume that $\mu_n := \mathcal{L}_{S_n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ for some probability measure μ . We will show that $\{S_n\}$ forms a Cauchy sequence in probability. Recall the definition of that:

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N > 1 \text{ s.t. } \sup_{m \geq N} \mathbb{P}(|S_m - S_n| > \varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon.$$

For a contradiction, assume otherwise. Then, there exists an $\eta > 0$ and a subsequence $\{n_k\}$ such that along the subsequence, the Cauchy condition above is violated:

$$\mathbb{P}(|S_{n_{k+1}} - S_{n_k}| > \eta) \geq \eta. \quad (27)$$

For every k , set $v_k := \mathcal{L}_{S_{n_{k+1}} - S_{n_k}} \Rightarrow \mu_{n_{k+1}} = \mu_{n_k} * v_k$ (since this is a sum of independent random variables) (*). Since $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$, the sequence $\{\mu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ is tight \Rightarrow for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_n \mu_n(\overline{B(0, M)})^c \leq \varepsilon.$$

Hence, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_k(\overline{B(0, 2M)})^c &= \mathbb{P}(|S_{n_{k+1}} - S_{n_k}| > 2M) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_n \mathbb{P}(|S_n| > M) \\ &= 2 \sup_n \mu_n(\overline{B(0, M)})^c \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the sequence $\{v_k\}$ is tight. Hence, by the second part of the previous theorem, there exists a subsequence $\{k_l \mid l > 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and a probability measure v such that $v_{k_l} \Rightarrow v$ as $l \rightarrow \infty$ (**). Combining (*) and (**), we obtain that $\mu = \mu * v$.

Proposition / Remark: Let v be a probability measure on \mathbb{R}^d . If there exists a probability measure μ on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\mu = \mu * v$, then $v = \delta_0$.

Proof: For every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}(\xi) \cdot \hat{v}(\xi) \Rightarrow \hat{v}(\xi) = 1 \text{ if } \hat{\mu}(\xi) \neq 0.$$

Hence, there exists some positive number r such that $\hat{\mu}(\xi) \neq 0$ for $\xi \in B(0, r)$. Hence, for all $\xi \in B(0, r)$,

$$\hat{v}(\xi) = 1.$$

Hence, for all $\xi \in B(0, r)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \cos(x, \xi) v(dx) = 1 \Rightarrow (x, \xi) = 0 \bmod 2\pi \text{ for } v\text{-a.e. } x.$$

Given any unit vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$, choose $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in B(0, r)$, ξ_1 and ξ_2 are both along the direction e and $\xi_2 = \rho\xi_1$ where $\rho \notin \mathbb{Q}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow (x, \xi_1) = 0 \bmod 2\pi \text{ for } v \text{ almost every } x. \\ &\Rightarrow (x, \xi_2) = \rho(x, \xi_1) = 0 \bmod 2\pi \text{ for } v \text{ almost every } x. \\ &\Rightarrow (x, \xi_1) = 0 \text{ for } v \text{ almost every } x. \\ &\Rightarrow (x, e) = 0 \text{ } v \text{ almost everywhere for all unit vectors} \\ &\Rightarrow v = \delta_0. \end{aligned}$$

Going back to the main proof, we have therefore proven that $v_{k_l} \Rightarrow \delta_0$, i.e., $S_{n_{k_l+1}} - S_{n_{k_l}} \rightarrow 0$ in distribution. Since this is a constant, we have therefore that

$$S_{n_{k_l+1}} - S_{n_{k_l}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ in probability.}$$

But, this contradicts (27). Hence, we have that $\{S_n\}$ forms a Cauchy sequence in probability $\Rightarrow S_n \rightarrow S$ in probability for some random variable S . \square

2 Infinitely Divisible Laws

Definition 7 (Infinitely Divisible). Let μ be a probability measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Then, we say that μ is **infinitely divisible** if for every $n \geq 1$, there exists a $v_{(n)}$ probability measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that

$$\underbrace{v_{(n)} * v_{(n)} * \dots * v_{(n)}}_{n \text{ times}} = \mu, \quad (28)$$

Equivalently, $(\hat{v}(\xi))^n = \hat{\mu}(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Notation-wise, we write $I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as the collection of all the infinitely divisible laws on \mathbb{R}^d . If $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then we will write $v_{(n)}$ in the definition as $\mu_{1/n}$, i.e., this means that

$$\underbrace{\mu_{1/n} * \mu_{1/n} * \dots * \mu_{1/n}}_{n \text{ copies}} = \mu.$$

We introduce a few remarks:

1. If $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then for every $n \geq 1$,

$$(\hat{\mu}_{1/n}(\xi))^n = \hat{\mu}(\xi) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Heuristically, we want to study the “nth” root of $\hat{\mu}$.

2. If $\mu, \nu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(\mu_{1/n} * \hat{\nu}_{1/n}(\xi))^n = \hat{\mu}(\xi) \cdot \hat{\nu}(\xi) = \mu \hat{*} \nu(\xi).$$

This implies that I is closed under convolution:

$$\mu_{1/n} * \nu_{1/n} = (\mu * \nu)_{1/n} \Rightarrow \mu * \nu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d). \quad (29)$$

3. If $\{\mu_k\}$ is a sequence of infinitely divisible laws, $\mu_k \Rightarrow \mu$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and for all $n \geq 1$, $\mu_{k,1/n} \Rightarrow \nu_{(n)}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some probability measure $\nu_{(n)}$, then $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mu_{1/n} = \nu_{(n)}$.

2.1 Examples of Infinitely Divisible Laws

1. Trivial Examples: for $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\delta_m \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

$$(\delta_m)_{1/n} = \delta_{m/n}.$$

2. Gaussian measures: for all $m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for all $C = (C_{ij})_{d \times d} \geq 0$ (non-negative definite) such that

$$\gamma_{\hat{m}, C}(\xi) = e^{i(m, \xi)} e^{-1/2(\xi, C\xi)}$$

Hence, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(\gamma_{m/n, C/n})^n = \gamma_{m, C}(\xi)$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence, all Gaussian measures are infinitely divisible with $(\gamma_{m, C})_{1/n} = \gamma_{m/n, C/n}$.

3. Poisson Measures.

- (a) Standard Poisson distribution / measure is supported on $\{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Given $\alpha > 0$, let π_α be the Poisson distribution with parameter α , i.e., for all $k \geq 0$,

$$\pi_\alpha(\{k\}) = e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!}$$

Equivalently, write,

$$\pi_\alpha = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} (\delta_k) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} (\delta_1)^{*k}$$

- (b) General Poisson Measure on \mathbb{R}^d :

- i. Given $\alpha > 0$ and a probability measure ν on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$,

$$\pi_{\alpha, \nu} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} \nu^{(*k)}$$

Let's try to understand this from the random variable point of view. Let $\{X_n\}$ be iid random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\mathcal{L}_{X_1} = \nu$. Let N be a random variable on the same probability space independent of $\{X_n\}$, $\mathcal{L}_N = \pi_\alpha$. Define $S = \sum_{i=1}^N X_j$. Hence, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, S is defined point-wise as:

$$S(\omega) = \sum_{j=1}^{N(\omega)} X_j(\omega). \quad (30)$$

Then, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S \in B) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(S \in B, N = k) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^k X_j \in B, N = k\right) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^k X_j \in B\right) \mathbb{P}(N = k) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^k X_j \in B\right) e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} \nu^{*k}(B) \\ &= \pi_{\alpha, \nu}(B). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we have a Taylor expansion of the exponential, and so for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\pi_{\alpha, \hat{\nu}}(\xi) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha^k}{k!} (\hat{\nu}(\xi))^k = e^{-\alpha} e^{\alpha \hat{\nu}(\xi)} = e^{\alpha(\hat{\nu}(\xi) - 1)}.$$

This shows that $\pi_{\alpha, \nu} \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and for all $n \geq 1$,

$$(\pi_{\alpha, \nu})_{1/n} = e^{\alpha/n(\hat{\nu}(\xi) - 1)} = \pi_{\alpha/n, \nu}.$$

Notation. Given $\alpha > 0$, probability measure ν on \mathbb{R}^d ,

$$\hat{\pi}_{\alpha,\nu}(\xi) = \exp(\alpha(\hat{\nu}(\xi) - 1)) = \exp\left(\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(x,\xi)} - 1)\nu(dx)\right)$$

Set $M := \alpha\nu$, $M(\mathbb{R}^d) = \alpha$. Set $\pi_M := \pi_{\alpha,\nu}$, i.e.,

$$\hat{\pi}_M(\xi) = \exp\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(x,\xi)} - 1)M(dx)\right).$$

Further, $M(\{0\})$ does not affect π_M , so WLOG we assume that $M(\{0\}) = 0$. Set

$$\mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{M \mid M \text{ is a finite Borel measure on } (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \text{ such that } M(\{0\}) = 0\}. \quad (31)$$

Remarks.

1. Given $\alpha > 0$, a probability measure ν , set $\tilde{\alpha} = \alpha(1 - \nu(\{0\}))$. Set $\tilde{\mu}$ to be a set function such that for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$:

$$\tilde{\nu}(B) := \frac{\nu(B \setminus \{0\})}{1 - \nu(\{0\})}$$

Then, $\tilde{\nu}$ is a probability measure and $\tilde{\mu}(\{0\}) = 0$. For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_{\alpha,\nu}(\xi) &= \exp\left(\alpha \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(x,\xi)} - 1)\nu(dx)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\tilde{\alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(x,\xi)} - 1)\tilde{\nu}(dx)\right) \\ &= \hat{\pi}_{\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\nu}}(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

WLOG, we can assume, whenever necessary, that $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$. Set $M := \alpha\nu$ and assume that M is a finite measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ with $M(\{0\}) = 0$. Define the following two spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) &:= \{M \mid \text{finite measure } M(\{0\}) = 0\} \\ \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) &:= \{\pi_M \mid M \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)\} \end{aligned}$$

2. Gaussian measures can be obtained through weak convergence from Poisson measures. We can see this in the following proposition.

Proposition 6. Given $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $C = (C_{ij})_{d \times d} \geq 0$, there exists a sequence $\{\alpha_n \mid n \geq 1\} \subseteq]0, \infty[$ and probability measures $\{\nu_n \mid n \geq 1\}$ on \mathbb{R}^d such that

$$\pi_{\alpha_n, \nu_n} \Rightarrow \gamma_{m,C}. \quad (32)$$

Proof. We will only prove it for $d = 1$. Given $m \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma^2 > 0$, set $\alpha_n = 2n$. Then, set the sequence of measures to be:

$$\nu_n = \frac{1}{2} \left[\delta_{\frac{m}{n}} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\delta_{\sigma/\sqrt{n}} + \delta_{-\sigma/\sqrt{n}} \right) \right] \quad (33)$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Now write down the characteristic function: for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_{\alpha_n, \nu_n}(\xi) &= \exp(2n(\hat{\nu}_n - 1)) \\ &= \exp\left(n \left(e^{i\frac{m}{n}\xi} + \cos\left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{n}}\sigma\right) - 2 \right)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(n \left(e^{i\xi\frac{m}{n}} - 1 \right)\right) \cdot \exp\left(n \left(\cos\left(\frac{\xi}{\sqrt{n}}\right) - 1 \right)\right) \\ &\rightarrow \exp(i\xi m) \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\xi^2\right) = \hat{\gamma}_{m,\sigma^2}(\xi) \text{ when we send } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

□

Exercise. Prove the statement in \mathbb{R}^d .

The next theorem tells us that out of Gaussian measures and exponential measures, the Poisson family is more fundamental.

Theorem 11. $I(\mathbb{R}^d) = \overline{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$.

First, we'll need some technical lemmas.

Lemma 5 (Facts about \mathbb{C} -valued functions.). Given $R > 0$, let f be a complex-valued function that is continuous on $\overline{B(0, R)}$, i.e., $f \in C(\overline{B(0, R)}; \mathbb{C})$ and further assume that $f(0) = 1$. Further, assume that $f \neq 0$ on $\overline{B(0, R)}$, and $f_n \rightarrow f$ uniformly on $\overline{B(0, R)}$ for some function $f \in C(\overline{B(0, R)}; \mathbb{C})$ with $f(0) = 1$ and $f \neq 0$ on $\overline{B(0, R)}$. Then, there exists a unique function $\ell_f \in C(\overline{B(0, R)}; \mathbb{C})$ such that

$$e^{\ell_f} = f \text{ on } \overline{B(0, R)} \text{ and } \ell_f(0) = 0.$$

We refer to ℓ_f as the **principle log** of f . Moreover, if $\{f_n\} \subseteq C(\overline{B(0, R)}; \mathbb{C})$ such that $f_n(0) = 1$ and $f_n \neq 0$ on $\overline{B(0, R)}$. Then, if ℓ_{f_n} $n \geq 1$ and ℓ_f are the principal logs of f_n and f , respectively, then

$$\ell_{f_n} \rightarrow \ell_f \text{ uniformly on } \overline{B(0, R)}.$$

Lemma 6. Given $r, T \in]0, \infty[$ with $r < T$, there exists an $N = N_{r,T} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$|1 - \hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{B(0, r)},$$

then $\inf_{\xi \in \overline{B(0, T)}} |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| > 2^{-N}$. Informally, this Lemma is telling us that we can use the value of $\hat{\mu}$ near zero to give a lower bound

Proof. Given $0 < r < T < \infty$, let N be sufficiently large. Assume that $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We have:

$$\left(\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}\right)^n = \hat{\mu}.$$

Further assume that $|1 - \hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $\xi \in \overline{B(0, r)}$.

- Then, $\hat{\mu}(\xi) \neq 0$ and hence $\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}(\xi) \neq 0$ for all $\xi \in \overline{B(0, r)}$.
- by Lemma 1, there exists a unique principal log $\ell_{\hat{\mu}}$ and a unique $\ell_{\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}}$ on $\overline{B(0, r)}$ and $\ell_{\hat{\mu}} = N\ell_{\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}}$.

Observe:

1. On one hand, $\xi \in \overline{B(0, r)}$ and so

$$|1 - \hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \frac{1}{2} \Rightarrow |\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi)| \leq 2 \Rightarrow \left| \ell_{\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}}(\xi) \right| \leq \frac{2}{N} \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{B(0, r)}.$$

2. On the other hand, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\operatorname{Re}(\ell_{\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}}) = \frac{1}{N} \operatorname{Re}(\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi))$.

$$\Rightarrow \operatorname{Re}(\ell_{\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}}(\xi)) = \frac{1}{N} \ln |\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \frac{1}{N} \ln(1) = 0$$

$$\Rightarrow |1 - \ell_{\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}}(\xi)| \leq |\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}(\xi)| \leq \frac{2}{N} \quad \forall \xi \in \overline{B(0, r)}.$$

Where the first inequality in the line above follows from the fact that if $\operatorname{Re}(z) \leq 0$, then $|1 - e^z| \leq |z|$.

Now we use the technical estimates from Lecture 5. For all unit vectors $\vec{e} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for all $R > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\frac{1}{N}}(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |(x, \vec{e})| > R\}) &\leq \frac{1}{m(rR)} \cdot \frac{1}{r} \int_0^r |1 - \hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}(s\vec{e})| ds \\ &\leq \frac{2}{N} \frac{1}{m(rR)}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, for all $0 < \tilde{r} < T$,

$$\begin{aligned} |1 - \hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}(\tilde{r}\vec{e})| &\leq \tilde{r}R + 2\mu_{\frac{1}{N}}(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid |(x, \vec{e})| > R\}) \\ &\leq TR + \frac{4}{N} \frac{1}{m(rR)} \quad (\text{by the estimate above}) \\ &= TR + \frac{4}{Nm(rR)}. \end{aligned}$$

We first choose R such that $TR < \frac{1}{4}$, and then N sufficiently large such that $\frac{4}{N} \frac{1}{m(rR)} \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Therefore, we've proven that for every $\xi \in \overline{B(0, T)}$, $|1 - \hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ whenever N is sufficiently large. Hence, $|\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}| \geq \frac{1}{2}$, which yields the desired conclusion:

$$|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| = |\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}(\xi)|^N \geq 2^{-N}.$$

□

Corrolary 3. If $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $\hat{\mu}(\xi) \neq 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. For such a μ , there exists an $r > 0$ such that $|1 - \hat{\mu}(\xi)| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $\xi \in B(0, r)$, and for all $T > r > 0$, there exists an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \geq 2^{-N}$ for all $\xi \in \overline{B(0, T)}$. Therefore, there exists a unique $\ell_{\hat{\mu}} \in C(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C})$ such that $\hat{\mu} = e^{\ell_{\hat{\mu}}}$. □

Furthermore, for every $n \geq 1$, $\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}(\xi) \neq 0$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence, there exists one $\ell_{\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}}$ which is uniquely the principle log of $\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}$. This yields two important relations:

1. Due to the uniqueness of the principle log: $\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}} = \frac{1}{N} \ell_{\hat{\mu}}$.
2. (1) implies

$$\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{N}}(\xi) = \exp\left(\frac{1}{N} \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi)\right) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Hence,

1. the root $\mu_{\frac{1}{n}}$ is unique for all $n \geq 1$.
2. $\mu_{\frac{1}{n}} \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for all $n \geq 1$. For every $m \geq 1$,

$$\left(\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{nm}}\right)^m = \exp\left(\frac{m}{nm} \ell_{\hat{\mu}}\right) = \hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{n}}$$

Proposition 7. If $\{\mu_k \mid k \geq 1\} \subseteq I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\{\mu_k\} \Rightarrow \mu$ (as $k \rightarrow \infty$) for some probability measure μ on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, then $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and hence $I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is closed under taking weak convergence limits. Furthermore, for every $n \geq 1$, $(\mu_k)_{\frac{1}{n}} \Rightarrow \mu_{\frac{1}{n}}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Since $\mu_k \Rightarrow \mu$, we know that $\hat{\mu}_k \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}$ uniformly on compact sets. Hence, there exists an $r > 0$ positive such that $\forall \xi \in \overline{B(0, r)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |1 - \hat{\mu}_k(\xi)| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \forall k \geq 1 \\ |1 - \hat{\mu}(\xi)| &\leq \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the 2nd technical lemma, for all $T > r > 0$, there exists an $N = N_{T,r}$ such that for all $\xi \in \overline{B(0, T)}$ such that for all $k \geq 1$,

$$|\hat{\mu}_k(\xi)| > 2^{-N}. \quad (34)$$

Since $\hat{\mu}_k \Rightarrow \hat{\mu}$, we also have that $|\hat{\mu}(\xi)| \geq 2^{-N}$. Since T is chosen arbitrarily,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) \neq 0 \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Hence, there exists a unique principal log $\ell_{\hat{\mu}}$. So, for every $k \geq 1$, let $\ell_{\hat{\mu}_k}$ be the principal log of $\hat{\mu}_k$. Then, $\ell_{\hat{\mu}_k} \Rightarrow \ell_{\hat{\mu}}$ uniformly on compact sets (as $k \rightarrow \infty$). Therefore, for every $n \geq 1$,

$$(\hat{\mu}_k)_{\frac{1}{n}} = \exp\left(\frac{1}{n}\ell_{\hat{\mu}_k}\right) \rightarrow \exp\left(\frac{1}{n}\ell_{\hat{\mu}}\right) \quad (\text{uniformly on compact sets}).$$

By **(Levy's continuity theorem)**, there exists a probability measure $\nu_{(n)}$ such that $(\mu_k)_{\frac{1}{n}} \Rightarrow \nu_{(n)}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\hat{\nu}_{(n)} = \exp\left(\frac{1}{n}\ell_{\mu}\right).$$

Obviously,

$$(\hat{\nu}_{(n)})^{(n)} = \hat{\mu} \Rightarrow \mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } \mu_{\frac{1}{n}} = \nu_{(n)},$$

i.e., $(\mu_k)_{\frac{1}{n}} \Rightarrow \mu_{\frac{1}{n}}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. □

Corrolary 4 (Closure under weak convergence). $\overline{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \subseteq I(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proposition 8. $I(\mathbb{R}^d) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)}$ i.e., for all $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists an $\{M_n \mid n \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\mu_{M_n} \Rightarrow \mu$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. For every $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let $\mu_{\frac{1}{n}}$ be the “nth root” of μ for $n \geq 1$. Set M_n to be the finite measure on \mathbb{R}^d such that for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$M_n(B) = n \cdot \mu_{\frac{1}{n}}(B \setminus \{0\}).$$

Clearly, $M_n \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \Rightarrow \pi_{M_n} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for all $n \geq 1$. For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_{M_n}(\xi) &= \exp\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(x,\xi)} - 1)M_n(dx)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(n \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(x,\xi)} - 1)\mu_{\frac{1}{n}}(dx)\right) \quad (\text{by definition of } M_n.) \\ &= \exp\left(n(\hat{\mu}_{\frac{1}{n}}(\xi) - 1)\right) \\ &= \exp\left(n(e^{\frac{1}{n}\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi)} - 1)\right) \rightarrow e^{\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi)} = \hat{\mu}(\xi) \quad (\text{as } n \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\pi_{M_n} \Rightarrow \mu$. □

So the next theorem just follows.

Theorem 12. $\overline{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = I(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

The next theorem gives us an explicit characterization of members in the family $I(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We will start with the two classical families: Gaussian and Poisson

Theorem 13 (Levy-Khintchine Formula). *Given $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $C = (C_{ij})_{d \times d} \geq 0$, $M \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$. If $\mu = \gamma_{m,C}$, $\nu = \pi_M$, then*

$$\mu * \nu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ and } (\mu * \nu)_{\frac{1}{n}} = \mu_{\frac{1}{n}} * \nu_{\frac{1}{n}}.$$

We denote by $\pi_{m,C,M}^{(1)}$ the measure $\mu * \nu$, i.e, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\hat{\pi}_{m,C,M}^{(1)} = \exp\left(\ell_{m,C,M}^{(1)}(\xi)\right)$, where

$$\ell_{m,C,M}^{(1)}(\xi) = i(m, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(x, \xi)} - 1)M(dx), \quad (35)$$

where the first two terms come from the Gaussian, and the final term comes from the Poisson.

Goal: expand the family of all such measures $\hat{\pi}_{m,C,M}^{(1)}$ by weak convergence. The only parameter we can only really expand is M . First, we will set the notation up.

Notation. We denote by $\mathcal{M}_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the family of σ -finite measures M on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that:

$$M(\{0\}) = 0 \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (|y|^\alpha \wedge 1)M(dy) < \infty.$$

This notation in the integrand compactly means

$$\int_{B(0,1)} |y|^\alpha M(dy) < \infty \text{ and } \int_{B(0,1)^c} M(dy) < \infty$$

e.g. if $M(dy) = \left(\frac{1}{|y|}\right)^\rho dy$ on $B(0,1) \setminus \{0\}$, then we require $\rho < \alpha + d$ to remain integrable. Also note that if $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2$, then $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha_1}(\mathbb{R}^d) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\alpha_2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Now, let's expand the family of $\pi_{m,C,M}^{(1)}$:

Step 1: Set $\alpha = 1$. Take $M \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For every $r > 0$, set

$$M_r(dy) = \chi_{\overline{B(0,r)}^c}(y)M(dy). \quad (36)$$

We have that $M_r \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, given any $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for all $C = (C_{ij})_{d \times d} \geq 0$, $\pi_{m,C,M_r}^{(1)} \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\pi_{m,C,M_r}^{(1)}(\xi) = \exp \left[i(m, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B(0,r)}} (e^{i(y, \xi)} - 1)M(dy) \right]. \quad (37)$$

We want to take $r \rightarrow 0$; to do so, we want to use **(DOM)**. To justify this,

$$\left| e^{i(\xi, y)} - 1 \right| \chi_{\overline{B(0,r)}^c} \leq 2\chi_{\overline{B(0,1)}^c} + \chi_{\overline{B(0,1)}} |\xi| |y| \in L^1(M(dy)),$$

because $M \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$. By **(DOM)**, as $r \downarrow 0$,

$$\rightarrow \exp \left[i(m, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(y, \xi)} - 1)M(dy) \right] \quad (38)$$

So set

$$(\mathbf{M1}) := \exp \left[i(m, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{i(y, \xi)} - 1)M(dy) \right] \quad (39)$$

By **(Levy's Continuity Theorem)**, $\pi_{m, C, M_r}^{(1)}$ weakly converges as $r \rightarrow 0$ to a limit measure, which we will denote by $\pi_{m, C, M}^{(1)}$. Hence, $\pi_{m, C, M_r}^{(1)} \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ for every $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $C = (C_{ij}) \geq 0$, $M \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where $\pi_{m, C, M_r}^{(1)}$ is given by **(M1)**. Hence, we have expanded the family of $\pi_{m, C, M_r}^{(1)}$ from $M \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ to $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Step 2: Set $\alpha = 2$. Take $M \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For $r > 0$, consider $M_r(dy)$ the same as above. For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{m, C, M_r}(\xi) &:= i(m, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left[e^{i(y, \xi)} - 1 - i(\xi, y)\chi_{B(0,1)}(y) \right] M_r(dy) \\ &= i(m, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0, r)} \left[e^{i(y, \xi)} - 1 - i(\xi, y)\chi_{B(0,1)}(y) \right] M(dy) \\ &= i \left(\underbrace{m - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0, r)} y M(dy)}_{:= m_r}, \xi \right) - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [e^{i(y, \xi)} - 1] M_r(dy) \\ &= \ell_{m_r, C, M_r}^{(1)}(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $e^{\ell_{m, C, M_r}} = e^{\ell_{m_r, C, M_r}} = \hat{\pi}_{m_r, C, M_r}^{(1)}(\xi)$. Now send $r \rightarrow 0$ in the original expression. Then, by **(DOM)**,

$$\lim_{r \downarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0, r)} [e^{i(\xi, y)} - 1 - i(\xi, y)\chi_{B(0,1)}(y)] M(dy) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [e^{i(\xi, y)} - 1 - i(\xi, y)\chi_{B(0,1)}(y)] M(dy). \quad (40)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \hat{\pi}_{m, C, M_r}^{(1)}(\xi) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \exp(\ell_{m_r, C, M_r}^{(1)}(\xi)) \\ &= \lim_{r \downarrow 0} \exp(\ell_{m, C, M_r}^{(1)}(\xi)) \\ &= \exp(\ell_{m, C, M}(\xi)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\ell_{m, C, M}(\xi) = i(m, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [e^{i(x, \xi)} - 1 - i(\xi, y)\chi_{B(0,1)}(y)] M(dy) := (\mathbf{M2})$$

(Levy's Continuity Theorem) implies that as $r \downarrow 0$, $\pi_{m, C, M_r}^{(1)}$ converges weakly to a limiting measure, denoted by $\pi_{m, C, M}$. Hence, $\pi_{m, C, M} \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\hat{\pi}_{m, C, M} = \exp(\ell_{m, C, M}(\xi))$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition 8 (Levy System / Canonical Representation). Given $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $C = (C_{ij})_{d \times d} \geq 0$, $M \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the triple (m, C, M) is called a **Levy System**. $e^{\ell_{m, C, M}}$ where $\ell_{m, C, M}$ is as in **(M2)** is called the **Canonical Representation** of $\hat{\pi}_{m, C, M}$.

Theorem 14 (Levy Khinchine Formula). Given $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$, there exists a Levy System (m_μ, C_μ, M_μ) such that $\mu = \pi_{m_\mu, C_\mu, M_\mu}$.

Proof. Task. □

Example 2 (Cauchy Distribution on \mathbb{R}). For the Cauchy Distribution, μ is the probability measure on \mathbb{R} with density $\frac{1}{\pi(1+x^2)}$. One can check that for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{e^{ix\xi}}{\pi(1+x^2)} dx = e^{-|\xi|}. \quad (41)$$

For all ≥ 1 ,

$$\hat{\mu}(\xi) = e^{-|\xi|} = \left(e^{-|\frac{\xi}{n}|}\right)^n.$$

If $\nu_{(n)}$ is the distribution of $x \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \frac{1}{n}x$ under distribution μ . In terms of random variables, if X is a Cauchy random variable, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_X = \mu$ and $Y_n := \frac{1}{n}X$, then $\nu_{(n)} = \mathcal{L}_{Y_n}$. For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{(n)}(\xi) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{ix\xi} \nu_{(n)}(dx) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\frac{1}{n}x\xi} \mu(dx) \\ &= \hat{\mu}\left(\frac{\xi}{n}\right) \\ &= e^{-|\frac{\xi}{n}|} \end{aligned}$$

And hence, $(\nu_{(n)})^n = \hat{\mu}$ and $\mu_{\frac{1}{n}} = \nu_{(n)}$. So, by **(LK-Formula)**, should be able to find a Levy System. However, from here it's totally not obvious – we will need to fit it into a canonical representation.

Definition 9. Given $\alpha > 0$, a probability measure μ on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is called an α -**stable law** if there exists a unique principle log $\ell_{\hat{\mu}}$ of $\hat{\mu}$ such that for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for all $t > 0$,

$$\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(t\xi) = t^\alpha \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi). \quad (42)$$

Remark.

1. Cauchy distribution one-dimensional is a 1-stable law.
 - (a) Centred Gaussian measure are 2-stable Laws.
2. If μ is an α -stable law, then $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mu_{\frac{1}{n}}$ is the distribution of $x \mapsto (\frac{1}{n})^{1/\alpha} x$ under μ .
3. Given $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with Levy System (m_μ, C_μ, M_μ) , then for every $t > 0$,

$$t\ell_{\hat{\mu}} = t\ell_{m_\mu, C_\mu, M_\mu} = \ell_{tm_\mu, tC_\mu, tM_\mu}. \quad (43)$$

Hence, there exists a $\mu_t \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\hat{\mu}_t = \exp(\ell_{tm_\mu, tC_\mu, tM_\mu})$. Therefore, μ is an α -stable law $\iff \mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{\delta_0\}$ such that for all $t > 0$, for all $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\mu_t(\varphi) = \mu(\varphi_t) \text{ where } \varphi_t(x) = \varphi(t^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}x) \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

i.e., μ_t is the distribution of $x \mapsto t^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}x$ under μ .

Lemma 7. If $m \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then,

$$\lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [e^{i(y, \xi)} - 1 - i(\xi, y)\chi_{B(0,1)}(y)] M(dy) = 0. \quad (44)$$

In particular, if $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with Levy System (m_μ, C_μ, M_μ) , then for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(\xi, C\xi) = -2 \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(t\xi)}{t^2}.$$

Proof. We re-write the first integral in the first statement as:

$$\underbrace{\frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{B(0,r)} [\dots] M(dy)}_{(L)} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus B(0,r)} [\dots] M(dy)}_{(R)}.$$

We can bound:

$$|(L)| \leq \frac{1}{|\xi|^2} \int_{B(0,r)} |y|^2 |\xi|^2 M(dy) = \int_{B(0,r)} |y|^2 M(dy),$$

by choosing r sufficiently small, which we can do since $M \in \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we can make **(L)** arbitrarily small.

$$|(R)| \leq \frac{2 + |\xi|}{|\xi|^2} M(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0, r)).$$

For the given r as above, we can choose $|\xi|$ sufficiently large such that **(R)** is arbitrarily small. Finally,

$$\ell_{\frac{\mu}{t^2}}(t\xi) = \frac{i(m, t\xi)}{t^2} - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + \frac{|\xi|^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [e^{i(y, t\xi)} - 1 - i(y, t\xi) \chi_{B(0,1)}(y)] M(dy)}{t^2 |\xi|^2},$$

and so as $t \rightarrow \infty$, this term tends to $0 - \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C\xi) + 0$, as desired. \square

Proposition 9. (α -stable laws)

1. There exists *no* (non-trivial, i.e., δ_0) α -stable law for $\alpha > 2$.
2. The only (non-trivial) 2-stable law on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is a centre Gaussian $\gamma_{0,C}$ for $C = (C_{ij}) \geq 0$.
3. If μ is an α -stable law with $\alpha \in]0, 2[$, then $C_\mu = 0$.

Proof. For all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi) &= t^{-\alpha} \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(t\xi) \\ &= t^{-\alpha} \left[\underbrace{i(m_\mu, t\xi) - \frac{1}{2}(t\xi, C_\mu t\xi) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(e^{i(y, t\xi)} - 1 - \chi_{B(0,1)}(y) i(y, \xi) \right) M_\mu(dy)}_{:= (\Delta)} \right] \end{aligned}$$

When $\alpha > 2$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-\alpha}(\Delta) = 0$ for every ξ .

$$\begin{aligned} &\Rightarrow \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi) = 0 \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \\ &\Rightarrow \mu = \delta_0 \text{ (trivial case).} \end{aligned}$$

When $\alpha = 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(\Delta)}{t^2} = \frac{1}{2}(\xi, C_\mu \xi) \\ &\Rightarrow \mu = \gamma_{0,C} \end{aligned}$$

When $\alpha \in]0, 2[$, for all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} &= \lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t^{-\alpha}(\Delta)t^2}{t^2 |\xi|^2} \\ &= \lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t^{2-\alpha}(\Delta)}{t^2 |\xi|^2} \\ &= \lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t^{2-\alpha} \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(t\xi)}{t^2 |\xi|^2} \\ &= \lim_{|\eta| \rightarrow \infty} t^{2-\alpha} \frac{\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\eta)}{|\eta|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

This is only possible if $\lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} = 0$ i.e., $C_\mu = 0$. \square

Homework Problem. prove that for every $\alpha \in]0, 2[$, $f(\xi) = e^{-|\xi|^\alpha}$ is the characteristic function of an α -stable law, i.e., there exists a μ α -stable law such that $\hat{\mu} = f$. Find out the Levy System (m_μ, C_μ, M_μ) for this $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

2.2 Levy Processes

We will start discussing continuous-time stochastic processes. We will first set up the notation that we need.

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{R}^d)^{[0, \infty[} &:= \{f : [0, \infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d\} \\ &= \text{collection of all } \mathbb{R}^d\text{-valued functions defined on } [0, \infty[\end{aligned}$$

For all $t \geq 0$, we define the **coordinate map** or the **projection map**:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_t &: (\mathbb{R}^d)^{[0, \infty[} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \\ \mathcal{T}_t(f) &:= f(t). \end{aligned}$$

Then, we can define the σ -algebra generated by all the projection maps:

$$\Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{[0, \infty[} := \sigma(\{\mathcal{T}_t \mid t \geq 0\}).$$

So, $\Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{[0, \infty[}$ is the smallest σ -algebra such that \mathcal{T}_t is measurable for all $t \geq 0$.

Definition 10 (Stochastic Process). Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, a family of \mathbb{R}^d -valued functions $\{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ is called a **stochastic process** if the mapping

$$X : \omega \in \Omega \mapsto X.(\omega) \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^{[0, \infty[}, \quad (45)$$

is measurable with respect to $\Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{[0, \infty[}$. Here, $X.(\omega)$ denotes a *path*:

$$X.(\omega) = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}. \quad (46)$$

We often say that “ X is a stochastic process” or “ X is an $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{[0, \infty[}$ -valued random variable” or equivalently, for all $t \geq 0$, $\omega \in \Omega \mapsto \mathcal{T}_t \cdot X.(\omega) = X_t(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is an \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable.

Definition 11. Let X be a stochastic processes on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The distribution of X is a probability measure \mathcal{L}_X on $((\mathbb{R}^d)^{[0, \infty[}, \Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{[0, \infty[})$, given by: for all $B \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{[0, \infty[}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_X(B) &:= \mathbb{P}(X \in B) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\{\omega \in \Omega \mid X.(\omega) \in B\}). \end{aligned}$$

For example, one could define:

$$\begin{aligned} B &:= \{f : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \mid f(1) \in B(0, 1)\} \\ B &:= \{f : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \mid |f(1/2)| > |f(1)|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 10. Let X and Y be two $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{[0, \infty[}$ -valued stochastic processes on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Then, X and Y have the same distribution if for all $p \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_p < \infty$, for all $B_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $j = 1, \dots, p$:

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^p \{X_{t_j} \in B_j\}\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcap_{j=1}^p \{Y_{t_j} \in B_j\}\right). \quad (47)$$

This is true because $\{\bigcap_{j=1}^p \mathcal{T}_{t_j}^{-1}(B_j) \mid p \in \mathbb{N}, 0 \leq t_1 < \dots < t_p < \infty, B_1, \dots, B_p \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)\}$ is a generating π -system of $\Sigma_{\mathbb{R}^d}^{[0, \infty[}$.

Definition 12 (Indistinguishible / Modification). Let X and Y be two stochastic processes on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

- We say that X and Y are **indistinguishible** if

$$\mathbb{P}(X = Y) = 1. \quad (48)$$

- We say that X is a **modification** of Y if for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_t = Y_t) = 1. \quad (49)$$

Note that indistinguishible \Rightarrow modification \Rightarrow having the same distribution, but the converse doesn't follow in general.

Definition 13 (RCLL Function). We denote by $D([0, \infty[; \mathbb{R}^d) =: D([0, \infty[)$ the collection of all the \mathbb{R}^d -valued functions f on $[0, \infty[$ such that:

1. for all $t \geq 0$, f is continuous from the right:

$$f(t^+) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t} f(s) = f(t). \quad (50)$$

2. the left-handed limit exists: for all $t \geq 0$,

$$f(t^-) = \lim_{s \rightarrow t^-} f(s) \text{ exists in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

i.e., f is a **RCLL Function**.

We have a few facts about RCLL Functions.

1. **(Boundedness)**. For all $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{U,[0,t]} &:= \sup_{s \in [0,t]} |f(s)| < \infty \\ \|f\|_{n,[0,t]} &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{m \in \{0,1,\dots,2^n\}} |f(m2^{-n}t)| \end{aligned}$$

2. **(Total Variation)**. it's bounded:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{\text{var},[0,t]} &:= \sup \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^p |f(t_j) - f(t_{j-1})| \mid p \in \mathbb{N}, 0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_p = t \right\} < \infty \\ \|f\|_{\text{var},[0,t]} &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{2^n} |f(m2^{-n}t) - f((m-1)2^{-n}t)|. \end{aligned}$$

3. **(Discontinuity Points)**. For all $t \geq 0$, for all $r \geq 0$, set:

$$J(t, r, f) := \{s \in]0, t] \mid |f(s) - f(s^-)| \geq r\}. \quad (51)$$

(This set is collecting all the discontinuity points where the jump size is at least r). Then, $J(t, r, f)$ is a finite set for all $r > 0$, and hence

$$J(t, f) := \{s \in]0, t] \mid f(s) \neq f(s^-)\}, \quad (52)$$

i.e., the set of all discontinuity points, is at most countable.

Hence, for all $t \geq 0$, we can define a set function on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as follows: for all Borel sets $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$j(t, B, f) := \sum_{s \in J(t, f)} \chi_B(f(s) - f(s^-)). \quad (53)$$

In words, $j(t, B, f)$ is the number of jumps such that the amount of jump is in B . Equivalently,

$$j(t, \cdot, f) := \sum_{s \in J(t, f)} \delta_{f(s) - f(s^-)}.$$

It's easy to check that $j(t, \cdot, f)$ is a measure on $(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ (check that it satisfies countable additivity). And, $j(t, \{0\}, f) = 0$. Further, for every $r > 0$, $j(t, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0, r), f) = J(t, r, f) < \infty$. Hence, this implies that

$$j(t, \cdot, f) \in \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{M \mid \sigma\text{-finite measure on } (\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \\ \text{such that } M(\{0\}) = 0 \text{ and } M(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B(0, r)) < \infty \forall r > 0\}.$$

(Recall the ordering we have on these families: $\mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{R}^d) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{R}^d) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\mathcal{M}_i(\mathbb{R}^d)$ allows for i th order singularities). We call $j(t, \cdot, f)$ the **jump measure corresponding to f by time t** .

Given a $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, φ a Borel function that vanishes near zero $\varphi|_{B(0, r)} \equiv 0$ for some $r > 0$. Then, $\varphi \in L^1(j(t, \cdot, f))$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) j(t, dy, f) = \sum_{s \in J(t, r, f)} \varphi(f(s) - f(s^-)).$$

If in addition we assume that $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{C})$, then we can re-write the above as:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) j(t, dy, f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{m=1}^{2^n} \varphi(f(m2^{-n}f) - f((m-1)2^{-n}t)).$$

Furthermore, $t \in]0, \infty[\mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) j(t, dy, f)$ is right continuous and piece-wise constant. To see this, we notice that for every $t > 0$, since f is right-continuous, there exists a $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for all $s, s' \in [t, t + \varepsilon]$, by the triangle inequality:

$$|f(s) - f(s^-)| \leq |f(s) - f(t)| + |f(s') - f(t)| < r/2.$$

This implies that there is no discontinuity in $[t, t + \varepsilon]$ that has jump size at least r . Hence, $j(t, r, f) = j(t + \varepsilon, r, f)$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) j(t, dy, f) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) j(t + \varepsilon, dy, f).$$

Definition 14. Also a Proposition. Set Σ_d to be the σ -algebra of subsets of $D([0, \infty[)$ generated by all the projection maps $\{\mathcal{T}_t \mid t \geq 0\}$. Then, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\|\cdot\|_{U, [0, t]} : f \in D([0, \infty[) \mapsto \|f\|_{U, [0, t]} \text{ is } \Sigma_D\text{-measurable.}$$

$$\|\cdot\|_{\text{var}, [0, t]} : f \in D([0, \infty[) \mapsto \|f\|_{\text{var}, [0, t]} \text{ is } \Sigma_D\text{-measurable.}$$

For all $\varphi \in C_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that φ vanishes near zero,

$$f \in D([0, \infty[) \mapsto \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) j(t, dy, f) \text{ is } \Sigma_D\text{-measurable.}$$

In particular,

$$\{f \in D([0, \infty[\mid f \text{ is continuous on } [0, \infty[\} \in \Sigma_D.$$

Definition 15 (Levy Process). Let $X = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ be a Stochastic process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $X(\omega) \in D([0, \infty])$ (the sample path of X is RCLL). X is called a **Levy Process** if X has independent and homogeneous increments, i.e., for all $0 \leq s < t$, the increment $X_t - X_s$ is *independent* of $\{X_r \mid 0 \leq r \leq s\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{X_t - X_s}$ only depends on $t - s$ (*homogeneous*).

Remark. Given a Levy process $X = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ set $\mu = \mathcal{L}_{X_1}$ (by convention, set $X_0 \equiv 0$). *Claim:* $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$. To see this, for every $n \geq 1$, we may write:

$$X_1 = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(X_{\frac{j}{n}} - X_{\frac{j-1}{n}} \right). \quad (54)$$

We have that the set

$$\left\{ X_{\frac{j}{n}} - X_{\frac{j-1}{n}} \mid j = 1, \dots, n \right\} \quad (55)$$

is iid and have distribution $\mathcal{L}_{X_{\frac{1}{n}}}$. Hence, this implies that

$$\left(\mathcal{L}_{X_{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^n = \hat{\mu} \Rightarrow \mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ with } \mu_{\frac{1}{n}} = \mathcal{L}_{X_{\frac{1}{n}}},$$

(by being homogeneous). For every $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, write $q = \frac{m}{n}$ for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_q} = \left(\mathcal{L}_{X_{\frac{1}{n}}} \right)^m = e^{\frac{m}{n} \ell_{\hat{\mu}}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{X_q} = \mu_q.$$

For $t > 0$, choose $\{q_k \mid k \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^+$ such that $q_k \rightarrow t^+$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(\xi, X_t)} \right] &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(\xi, X_{q_k})} \right] \text{ (by (DOM), (RCLL))} \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{q_k \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi)} \\ &= e^{t \ell_{\hat{\mu}}(\xi)} \\ &= \hat{\mu}_t(\xi). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathcal{L}_{X_t} = \mu_t$, where $\mu = \mathcal{L}_{X_1}$. And further, for all $0 < s < t$, $\mathcal{L}_{X_t - X_s} = \mu_{t-s}$.

Definition 16 (Levy Process Associated with a Measure). We say that X is a **Levy Process Associated with** $\mu \in I(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if

1. X is a Levy process.
2. for all $0 \leq s < t$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{X_t - X_s} = \mu_{t-s}. \quad (56)$$

The next goal is: we want to, given a μ , construct a Levy Process X associated with μ .

Step # 0: Given $\alpha > 0$, let π_α be the Poisson distribution with parameter $\alpha > 0$. We will construct X for this distribution. Let $\{\theta_n\}$ be iid exponential random variables with parameter $\alpha > 0$, i.e., the density function is $\chi_{[0, \infty)}(x) \alpha e^{-\alpha x}$. WLOG, we assume that $T_0 \equiv 0$ for all $n \geq 1$, and set

$$T_n := \sum_{m=1}^n \theta_m. \quad (57)$$

Here, T_n represents the total waiting time by the n th occurrence, and θ_m is the waiting time. T_n has a gamma distribution: its density is

$$\chi_{]0,\infty[}(x) \frac{\alpha^n}{(n-1)!} x^{n-1} e^{-\alpha x}.$$

Set $N_0 \equiv 0$ and for all $t \geq 0$, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, define

$$N_t(\omega) := \max \{n \geq 1 \mid T_n(\omega) \leq t\}. \quad (58)$$

This $N_t(\omega)$ counts how many events occurred by time t . Equivalently,

$$\{N_t = 0\} = \{T_1 > t\} = \{\theta_1 > t\}.$$

For all $n \geq 1$,

$$\{N_t = n\} = \{T_n \leq t, T_{n+1} > t\}. \quad (59)$$

This implies that,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(N_t = 0) &= \mathbb{P}(\theta_1 > t) = e^{-\alpha t} \Rightarrow \forall n \geq 1, \mathbb{P}(N_t = n) = \mathbb{P}(T_n \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(T_{n+1} \leq t) \\ &= \int_0^t \frac{\alpha^n}{(n-1)!} x^{n-1} e^{-\alpha x} dx - \int_0^t \frac{\alpha^{n+1}}{n!} x^n e^{-\alpha x} dx \\ &= \frac{(\alpha t)^n}{n!} e^{-\alpha t}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{L}_{N_t} = \pi_{\alpha t}$, i.e., N_t is a Poisson random variable with parameter αt .

Remark. for all $\omega \in \Omega$, $t \in [0, \infty[\mapsto N_t(\omega) \in \mathbb{N}$ is non-decreasing, piece-wise constant, and right-continuous:

$$N_0(\omega) = \{N_t(\omega) \mid t \geq 0\} \text{ is RCLL.}$$

To see this, e.g.,

$$\{N_t = n, N_{t+\varepsilon} \geq n+1\} \subseteq \{T_n \leq t, t < T_{n+1} \leq t+\varepsilon\}.$$

As $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the limit of such a set is \emptyset . In addition, for all $t > 0$, $N_t - N_{t-} \in \{0, 1\}$.

Proposition 11. $N : \omega \in \Omega \mapsto N(\omega) \in D([0, \infty[; \mathbb{N})$ as a stochastic process is a Levy process associated with π_α .

Proof. It's sufficient to prove that for every $k \geq 1$, $\forall 0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k$, for all $0 = n_0 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k \{N_{t_j} = n_j\} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k \{N_{t_j} - N_{t_{j-1}} = n_j - n_{j-1}\} \right) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1}))^{n_j - n_{j-1}}}{(n_j - n_{j-1})!} e^{-\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1})} \end{aligned}$$

We write the LHS as:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\bigcap_{j=1}^k \{T_{n_j} \leq t_j \leq T_{1+n_j}\} \right).$$

The event concerns $\{\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{1+n_j}\}$ which has the joint density function of

$$\alpha^{1+n_k} e^{-\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{n_k+1} X_j} dx_1 dx_2 \dots dx_{n_k+1}.$$

Hence,

$$\text{LHS} = \int_A \alpha^{1+n_k} e^{-\alpha(x_1 + \dots + x_{1+n_k})} dx_1 \dots dx_{1+n_k},$$

where $A = \{\sum_{m=1}^{n_j} x_m \leq t_j < \sum_{m=1}^{1+n_j} x_m \ \forall 1 \leq j \leq k\}$. Under the change of variables, $u = \sum x_i$, this yields,

$$= e^{\alpha t_k} \alpha^{n_k} \text{Vol}(B),$$

where $\text{Vol}(B) = \{t_k \geq \sum_{m=1}^{n_k} x_m \geq \dots \geq \sum_{m=1}^{1+n_{k-1}} x_m > t_{k-1} \geq \dots\}$. Hence, this becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} &= e^{-\alpha t_k} \alpha^{n_k} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(t_j - t_{j-1})^{n_j - n_{j-1}}}{(n_j - n_{j-1})!} \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{(\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1}))^{n_j - n_{j-1}}}{(n_j - n_{j-1})!} e^{-\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1})}, \end{aligned}$$

which is the probability function of $\pi_{\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1})}$. □

Definition 17 (Simple Poisson Jump Process). We also call $N = \{N_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ the **simple Poisson jump process** associated with π_α .

Now we are ready to move onto the next step.

Step # 1: given $M \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, construct a Levy Process $X = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$.

Write $M = \alpha\nu$, where $\alpha = M(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and ν a probability measure. Let $\{\theta_m \mid m \geq 1\}$ and $N = \{N_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ be the same as in (Step 0). Take $\{Y_k \mid k \geq 1\}$ to be a sequence of iid random variables with distribution ν defined on the same probability space as $\{\theta_m \mid m \geq 1\}$ but independent of the whole family $\{\theta_m \mid m \geq 1\}$.

Set $X_0 \equiv 0$ for all $t > 0$, for all $\omega \in \Omega$, define:

$$X_t(\omega) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_t(\omega)} Y_k(\omega). \tag{60}$$

If $N_t(\omega) = 0$, then by convention $X_t(\omega) = 0$. If $N_t(\omega) = n \geq 1$, then

$$X_t(\omega) = \sum_{k=1}^n Y_k(\omega).$$

Proposition 12. This process $X = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ is a Levy Process associated with π_M .

Proof. We will use the fact that if Z_1, \dots, Z_k are some \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variables, then Z_1, \dots, Z_k are mutually independent \iff for all $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi_1 Z_1 + \dots + i\xi_k Z_k} \right] = \prod_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i\xi_j Z_j} \right].$$

(Note that this last condition is equivalent to saying that the joint distribution of (Z_1, \dots, Z_K) is $\mathcal{L}_{Z_1} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{Z_2} \cdots \mathcal{L}_{Z_K}$). So, for all $k \geq 1$, for all $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_k$, for all $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we need to compute:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \sum_{j=1}^k (X_{t_j} - X_{t_{j-1}}), \xi_j} \right] &= \sum_{\text{all choices of } 0 = n_0 \leq n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_k} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \sum_{j=1}^k (X_{t_j} - X_{t_{j-1}}), \xi_j}; N_{t_1} = n_1, N_{t_2} = n_2, \dots, N_{t_k} = n_k \right] \\
&= \sum_{\text{all choices of } 0 = n_0 \leq n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_k} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\sum_{1+n_j}^{n_j} Y_p, \xi_j \right); N_{t_j} = n_j \ \forall \ 1 \leq j \leq k} \right] \\
&= \sum_{\text{all choices of } 0 = n_0 \leq n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_k} \left(\prod_{j=1}^k (\hat{\nu}(\xi_j))^{n_j - n_{j-1}} \right) \\
&\quad \left(\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\exp(-\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1})) \cdot (\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1}))^{n_j - n_{j-1}}}{(n_j - n_{j-1})!} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\text{all choices of } 0 = n_0 \leq n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_k} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\exp(-\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1}))}{(n_j - n_{j-1})!} \cdot (\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1}) \hat{\nu}(\xi_j))^{n_j - n_{j-1}} \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^k \exp(-\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1})) \cdot \exp(\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1}) \hat{\nu}(\xi_j)) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^k \exp(\alpha(t_j - t_{j-1}) (\hat{\nu}(\xi_j) - 1)) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^k \hat{\pi}_{(t_j - t_{j-1})M}(\xi_j).
\end{aligned}$$

This proves homogeneity. \square

Definition 18 (Compound Poisson Process). We call the process above $X = X_t \mid t \geq 0$ a **compound Poisson Process** with jump rate α and jump distribution ν .

Remarks. How do we deal with σ -finite measures? We want to consider the jump measure associated with the sample path of X . Recall: given a function that has RCLL path in \mathbb{R}^d $\varphi \in D([0, \infty[; \mathbb{R}^d)$, the jump measure associated with φ is: $\forall t > 0$, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$j(t, B, \varphi) := \sum_{s \in J(t, \varphi)} \chi_B(\varphi(s) - \varphi(s^-)).$$

We will consider the jump measures $j(t, \cdot, x)$ (the jump measure associated with the process $X = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$).

1. $j(t, \cdot, X) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} \delta_{Y_k}$: for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $j(t, B, X) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} \chi_B(Y_k) \Rightarrow j(t, \cdot, X)$ is a finite measure ($j(t, \cdot, X) \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$): ($\forall \omega \in \Omega, j(t, \mathbb{R}^d, X)(\omega) = N_t(\omega)$ is finite).
2. $\forall t > 0$, by definition:

$$\begin{aligned}
X_t &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} Y_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y j(t, dy, X). \\
\|X\|_{\text{var}, [0, t]} &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} |Y_k| = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y| j(t, dy, X)
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} [|X_t|]_{\text{var}, [0, t]} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{N_t} |Y_k| \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} [N_t] \mathbb{E} [|Y_1|] \quad (\text{by independence}) \\
 &= \alpha t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y| v(dy) \\
 &= t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y| M(dy)
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y| M(dy) < \infty$, then $\mathbb{E} [X_t] = t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y M(dy)$. Similarly, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^2 M(dy) < \infty$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{E} [|X_t|^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} (Y_j, Y_k) \right] \\
 &= \mathbb{E} [N_t] \mathbb{E} [|Y_1|^2] + \mathbb{E} [N_t^2 - N_t] \cdot |\mathbb{E} [Y_1]|^2 \\
 &= t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^2 M(dy) + t^2 \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y M(dy) \right|^2
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\mathbb{E} [|X_t - \mathbb{E} [X_t]|^2] = t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y|^2 M(dy)$.

3. Given $\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $t > 0$,

$$j(t, \Gamma, X) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} \chi_{\Gamma}(Y_k).$$

Consider this as a path: $\{j(t, \Gamma, X) \mid t \geq 0\}$ is non-decreasing, \mathbb{N} -valued, and RCLL piece-wise constant. Consider $n \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{P}(j(t, \Gamma, X) - j(s, \Gamma, X) = n) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(j(t, \Gamma, X) - j(s, \Gamma, X) = n, N_s = k, N_t - N_s = l) \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\#\{p \mid k+1 \leq p \leq k+l \mid Y_p \in \Gamma\} = n) \mathbb{P}(N_s = k) \mathbb{P}(N_t - N_s = l) \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(N_s = k) \cdot \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\#\{p \mid k+1 \leq p \leq k+l \mid Y_p \in \Gamma\} = n) \cdot \mathbb{P}(N_{t-s} = l) \\
 &= \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(j(t-s, \Gamma, X) = n; N_{t-s} = l) \\
 &= \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(j(t-s, \Gamma, X) = n) \quad (\text{proves independent increments, by rmk 1}) \\
 &= \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \exp(-\alpha(t-s)) \frac{(\alpha(t-s))^l}{l!} \binom{l}{n} (\mathbb{P}(Y_n \in \Gamma))^n (1 - \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \in \Gamma))^{l-n} \quad (\text{rmk 2}) \\
 &= \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} \exp(-\alpha(t-s)) \frac{(\alpha(t-s))^l}{l!} \binom{l}{n} (v(\Gamma))^n (1 - v(\Gamma))^{l-n} \\
 &= \exp(-(t-s)M(\Gamma)) \frac{((t-s)M(\Gamma))^n}{n!} \rightarrow \pi_{(t-s)M(\Gamma)} \quad (\text{in distribution})
 \end{aligned}$$

Still need to prove that the increments are independent. It's an exercise.

Conclusion: the process $\{j(t, \Gamma, X) \mid t \geq 0\}$ is a simple Poisson process with jump rate $M(\Gamma)$.

Remark. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $X = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ be a Levy process associated with π_M and $\{j(t, \cdot, X) \mid t \geq 0\}$ be the jump measure associated with X .

If $\{\Gamma_m \mid m \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\Gamma_m \cap \Gamma_l = \emptyset$ for all $l \neq m$, then $\{j(t, \Gamma_m, X) \mid t \geq 0\}$ is an independent family of stochastic process.

Proof. We will only prove independence for $\{j(t, \Gamma_1, X) \mid t \geq 0\}$ and $\{j(s, \Gamma_2, X) \mid t \geq 0\}$. For all $0 \leq s \leq t$, for all $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} [\exp(i(\xi_1, j(t, \Gamma_1, X)) + i(\xi_2, j(s, \Gamma_2, X)))] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\exp(i(\xi_1, j(t, \Gamma_1, X)) - i(\xi_1, j(s, \Gamma_1, X)) \cdot \exp(i(\xi_1, j(s, \Gamma_1, X)) + i(\xi_2, j(s, \Gamma_2, X)))] \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\exp(i(\xi_1, j(t, \Gamma_1, X) - j(s, \Gamma_1, X)))] \cdot \mathbb{E} [\dots] \\ &= \underbrace{\exp((t-s)M(\Gamma_1)(e^{i\xi_1} - 1))}_{:=(F)} \cdot \underbrace{\sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} [\exp(i(\xi_1, j(s, \Gamma_1, X)) + i(\xi_2, j(s, \Gamma_2, X))); N_s = L]}_{:=(E)} \end{aligned}$$

When $N_s = L$, $X = \sum_{k=1}^L Y_k$ and $j(s, \Gamma, X) = \sum_{k=1}^L \chi_{\Gamma_1}(Y_k)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} (E) &= \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\alpha s} (\alpha s)^L}{L!} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\exp(i\xi_1 \chi_{\Gamma_1}(y) + i\xi_2 \chi_{\Gamma_2}(y))) v(dy) \right)^L \\ &= \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\alpha s} (\alpha s)^L}{L!} \left(e^{i\xi_1} v(\Gamma_1) + e^{i\xi_2} v(\Gamma_2) + 1 - v(\Gamma_1) - v(\Gamma_2) \right)^L \\ &= e^{-\alpha s} \cdot \exp \left(s e^{i\xi_1} M(\Gamma_1) + s e^{i\xi_2} M(\Gamma_2) - \alpha s - SM(\Gamma_1) + SM(\Gamma_2) \right) \end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned} (F) \cdot (E) &= \exp(tM(\Gamma_1)(e^{i\xi_1} - 1)) \cdot \exp(sM(\Gamma_2)(e^{i\xi_2} - 1)) \\ &= \mathbb{E} [\exp(i\xi_1 j(t, \Gamma_1, X))] \cdot \mathbb{E} [\exp(i\xi_2 j(s, \Gamma_2, X))] \end{aligned}$$

□

Now assume that we have a sequence of mutually singular measures, $\{M_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq K\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$, i.e., there exists $\{\Gamma_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq K\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\Gamma_k \cap \Gamma_l = \emptyset$ if $k \neq l$ such that $M_k(\Gamma_k^c) = 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq K$ (the mass of M_k is concentrated in Γ_k). For each $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, there exists a Levy process

$$X^{(k)} = \{X_t^{(k)} \mid t \geq 0\}$$

associated with π_{M_k} . We can take all these processes $\{X^{(k)} \mid 1 \leq k \leq K\}$ to be on the same probability space and to be independent.

Claim. $X = \sum_{k=1}^K X^{(k)}$ is a Levy process associated with π_M , where $M = \sum_{k=1}^K M_k \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Proof. Obviously, $X = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ is RCLL with independent and homogeneous increments. For all

$t \geq 0$ and for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{X_t}(\xi) &= \prod_{k=1}^K \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{X_t^{(k)}}(\xi) \\ &= \exp \left(\sum_{k=1}^K t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(e^{i(\xi, y)} - 1 \right) M_k(dy) \right) \\ &= \exp \left(t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(e^{i(\xi, y)} - 1 \right) M(dy) \right).\end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{L}_{X_t} = \pi_{tM}$, which proves the claim. \square

In particular, if $j(t, \cdot, X)$ is the jump measure associated with X , then:

$$j(t, \cdot, X) = \sum_{k=1}^K j(t, \cdot, X)|_{\Gamma_k} = \sum_{k=1}^K j(t, \cdot, X^{(k)}).$$

In words: any jump of X must be from one and only one $X^{(k)}$. WLOG, assume that $\{\Gamma_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq K\}$ is a partition of \mathbb{R}^d . Now assume that M , $\{M_k \mid k \geq 1\}$, and $\{\Gamma_k \mid k \geq 1\}$ are the same as above. Let $X = \{X_t \mid t \geq 0\}$ be a Levy process associated with π_M . Then, for all $t > 0$, for all $\omega \in \Omega$:

$$\begin{aligned}X_t(\omega) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y j(t, dy, X(\omega)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\Gamma_k} y j(t, dy, X(\omega)) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y j^{(k)}(t, dy, \omega),\end{aligned}$$

where $j^{(k)}(t, \cdot, \omega) = j(t, \cdot, X(\omega))|_{\Gamma_k}$. For every $1 \leq k \leq K$, set

$$X_t^{(k)}(\omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} y j^{(k)}(t, dy, \omega).$$

Claim. $\{X^{(k)} \mid 1 \leq k \leq K\}$ is independent and for every $1 \leq k \leq K$, $\{X_t^{(k)} \mid t \geq 0\}$ is a Levy process associated with π_{M_k} .

Proof. The $X^{(k)}$'s are independent because the $\{j(t, \cdot, X)|_{\Gamma_k} \mid 1 \leq k \leq K\}$ are independent. Moreover, for all $1 \leq k \leq K$, $\{X_t^{(k)} \mid t \geq 0\}$ is RCLL with independent and homogeneous increments. For all $t \geq 0$, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(\xi, X_t^{(k)})} \right] = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{i(\xi, X_t^{(k)})}; N_t = m \right]$$

When $N_t = m$, then $X_t^{(k)} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} Y_j \chi_{\Gamma_k}(Y_j)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}&= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} \frac{(\alpha t)^m}{m!} \cdot \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{i(\xi, y) \chi_{\Gamma_k}(y)} v(dy) \right)^m \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} e^{-\alpha t} \frac{(\alpha t)^m}{m!} \left(\int_{\Gamma_k} e^{i(\xi, y)} v(dy) - 1 - v(\Gamma_k) \right)^m \\ &= \exp \left(t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(e^{i(\xi, y)} - 1 \right) M_k(dy) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathcal{L}_{X_t^{(k)}} = \pi_{tM_k}$. \square

Lemma 8. Given $M \in \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ (i.e., M is σ -finite and $M(\{0\}) = 0$ and for all $r > 0$, $M(B(0, r)^c) < \infty$), there exists a mapping $(t, \omega) \in [0, \infty] \times \Omega \mapsto j(t, \cdot, \omega) \in \mathcal{M}_\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ referred to as the **jump measure corresponding to M** such that:

1. $\forall \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $0 \notin \bar{\Gamma}$, $\{j(t, \Gamma) \mid t \geq 0\}$ is a simple Poisson process with rate $M(\Gamma)$.
2. For all $\{\Gamma_m \mid m \geq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\Gamma_m \cap \Gamma_l = \emptyset$ for all $m \neq l$ and $0 \notin \overline{\bigcup_{m=1}^L \Gamma_m}$ for all $L \geq 1$.
Then,

$$\{\{j(t, \Gamma_m) \mid t \geq 0\} \mid m \geq 1\}$$

is an independent family of stochastic processes.

Proof. Set $A_0 := \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{B(0, 1)}$. Set $A_k := \overline{B(0, 2^{-(k+1)})} \setminus \overline{B(0, 2^{-k})}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (we are cutting the space into annuli, since the origin is the problematic part). For every $k \geq 0$, set $M_k := \chi_{A_k} \cdot M \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then, there exists an $X^{(k)} = \{X_t^{(k)} \mid t \geq 0\}$ a Levy Process associated with π_{M_k} and $\{X^{(k)} \mid k \geq 1\}$ are independent and defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. For all $(t, \omega) \in [0, \infty] \times \Omega$ and for all $\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$j(t, \Gamma, \omega) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} j(t, \Gamma, X^{(k)}(\omega))$$

is well-defined. It's straightforward to check that this $j(t, \cdot, \omega)$ is a measure on \mathbb{R}^d (monotone convergence). Moreover, for every $r > 0$, when k is sufficiently large such that $2^{-k+1} < r$, then:

$$j(t, \overline{B(0, r)}^c, X^{(k)}) = 0 \Rightarrow j(t, \overline{B(0, r)}^c, \omega) < \infty \Rightarrow j(t, \cdot, \omega) \in \mathcal{M}_0(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Proof of **(1)**. Given $\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $0 \notin \bar{\Gamma}$, there exists a k sufficiently large such that $\overline{B(0, 2^{-k})} \cap \bar{\Gamma} = \emptyset$.

$$\Rightarrow j(t, \Gamma, \omega) = \sum_{k=1}^K j(t, \Gamma, X^{(k)}(\omega)).$$

We have shown that $\text{RHS} = j(t, \Gamma, X)$, where $X = \sum_{k=1}^K X^{(k)}$, and X is a Levy process associated with $\pi_{M^{(k)}}$, where

$$M^{(k)} = \sum_{k=1}^K M_k.$$

This implies that $\{j(t, \Gamma) = j(t, \Gamma, X) \mid t \geq 0\}$ is a simple Poisson process with rate $M^{(k)}(\Gamma) = M(\Gamma)$.

Proof of **(2)**: exercise. □