A portfolio - consumption pain (h,c) is called self-financing if the value process vh satisfies the condition

$$dV_t^h = \sum_{i=1}^{N} h_i^i \left\{ dS_t^i + dD_t^i \right\} - C_t dt,$$

i.e., if
$$dv_t^h = h_t ds_t + h_t dD_t - c_t dt$$
.

(5) The postfolio h is said to be Markovian if it is of the $R_{+} = R(+,S(+))$

for some function $f: \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$.

Defi: Fon a given pontfolio & the connesponding nelative pontfolio on pontfolio weights a is given by

$$\omega_t^i = \frac{\hat{h}_t^i \hat{S}_t^i}{V_t \hat{h}}, i=1,2,-,N$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{\omega}_t^i = 1$.

where we have $\sum_{i=1}^{N} \omega_t^i = 1$.

Lemma: - A postfolio - consumption pairs (h,c) is self-financing if and only if

$$dV_{t}^{h} = V_{t}^{h} \cdot \sum \omega_{t}^{i} \frac{dS_{t}^{i} + dD_{t}^{i}}{S_{t}^{i}} - c_{t}dt.$$

Remark! If $D_t \equiv 0$ and $C_t \equiv 0$ then

$$dv_t^{k} = k_t ds_t = \sum_{i=1}^{N} k_t^{i} ds_t^{i}$$

and
$$dv_t^h = v_t^h \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N w_t^i \frac{dS_t^i}{S_t^i}$$

Let us considers a financial market consisting of only two assets: a risk free asset with price process B(+) and a stock with price process S(+).

The price process BH is the price of a risk free asset it has the dynamics

dB(+)=n(+)B(+)d+

where n(+) is any adapted process.

 \Rightarrow B(+) = B(0) exp $\{\int_{a}^{t} n(s)ds\}$

We assume that the stock price S(+) is given by ds(+) = s(+) M(+,s(+))d++s(+)6(+,s(+))dW(+).

Whene W is a Wienen Process (Brownian motion) and Mand 6 are given functions. The function 6 known as the volatility of S, and is the local mean rate of return of S.

Defin: consider a financial market with vector price process S. A contingent claim with date of maturity (exencise date) T, also called a T-claim, is any nandom variable $X \in \mathcal{F}_{T}^{S}$, where $f_T^S = 6 \{ S_t : 0 \le t \le T \}$. A contingent claim x is called a simple claim if it is of the form $x = \phi(st)$. The function ϕ is called the contract function.

Example: The European call is a simple contingent claim, for which the contract function is given by $\phi(x) = \max \{ x - K, 0 \}$

- our main problem is to determine a fair price for the claim, and we will use the notation T(t,X) for the price process of the claim X, where we suppress the X. In the case of a simple claim we will sometimes write $T(t,\Phi)$.

Note that for any contingent claim x are have the relation T(T,x)=x.

and in the particular case of a simple claim $x = \phi(s(\tau))$ $\pi(\tau, x) = \phi(s(\tau))$.

Defi:- An ambitmage possibility on a financial market is a self-financed portfolio h such that

Vh(0) = 0

 $\mathbb{P}\big(V_{\overline{v}}^{h}(\tau) \geq 0\big) = 1 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}\big(V_{\overline{v}}(\tau) > 0\big) > 0.$

we say that the manket is ambitmage free if there is are no ambitmage possibilities.

Assumption: We assume that the price process $T(4, \chi)$ is such that there are no ambitrage possibilities on the market consisting $G(B(4), S(4), T(4, \chi))$.

We intempet an ambitmage possibility as a senious case of mispricing in the market, and our main assumption is that the market is efficient in the sense that no ambitmage is possible

- A natural question is how we can identify an ambitrage possibility.

Proposition: suppose that there exists a self-financing portfolio h, such that the value process vh has the dynamics $dv^h(t) = K(t)vh(t)dt$,

where k is an adapted process. Then it must hold that k(+)=n(+) for all t, on there exists an ambitrage possibility.

Proof!- For simplicity assume that k and no are constant and

K7n. Then we can bonnow money from the bank at the nate n. This money is immediately invested in the portfolio strategy R where it will grow at the nate K with K7n.

Thus the net investment at t=0 is zero, whereas our wealth at any time t>0 will be positive. In other words we have an arbitrage.

on the other hand if n>K, we sell the portfolio h short and invest this money in the bank, and again there is an ambitnage.

The main point of the above is that if a portfolio has a value process whose dynamics contain no driving whenen process, i.e., a locally risk free portfolio, then the nate of neturn of that portfolio must equal to the short rate of interest.

we assume that the given market consists of two assets with price dynamics given by

dBH=nBH)dt

ds(+) = s(+) /u(+,s(+))d++s(+)6(+,s(+))dw(+)

We consider a simple contingent claim $x = \phi(s(t))$ We assume that this claim can be traded on a market and its price process T(+,+) has the form

 $\pi(4, \phi) = F(4, s(4)) := \pi(4)$

for some smooth function F.

 $d\pi(t) = dF(t,s(t)) = F_t(t,s(t))dt + F_x(t,s(t))ds(t)$ +/2 Fxx (+, s(+)) ds(+) ds(+)

= $(F_t + \mu S F_x + \frac{1}{6} 6^2 S^2 F_{xx}) (t, S(t)) dt$ + (6 S Fx)(+, S(+)) dW(+)

 $d\pi(t) = \mu_{\pi}(t) \pi(t) dt + 100 6_{\pi}(t) \pi(t) dw(t)$

Where $M_{\pi}(t) = \frac{F_t + \mu s F_x + \frac{1}{2} 6^2 s^2 F_{xx}}{E}$

 $6\pi (t) = \frac{68 Fx}{E}$ (shorthand notation) $=\frac{6(4,8(+))}{5(4)}\frac{F_{2}(4,8(+))}{F_{2}(4,8(+))}$

F(+,S(+)).

Let us now form a portfolio based on two assets: the underlying stock and the derivative asset. Denoting the relative portfolio by (Us, Un). Then the value VQ the portfolio is

$$\Rightarrow$$
 $dV(t) = V(t) \left[u_s u + u_{\pi} u_{\pi} \right] dt + V(t) \left[u_s 6 + u_{\pi} 6_{\pi} \right] dW$

The only nestriction on the relative postfolio is that we must have $U_S + U_{\pi} = 1$

Let us define the relative postfolio by the linear system of equations

Then $dv(t) = V(t) \left[u_s M + u_{\pi} M_{\pi} \right] dt$

Thus we have obtained a locally niskless portfolio and the market is arbitrage free, hence we must have

Also we have
$$U_S = \frac{6\pi}{6\pi - 6} = \frac{6SF_X/F}{6SF_X/F - 6} = \frac{S(+)F_X(+,S(+))}{S(+)F_X(+,S(+)) - F(+,S(+))}$$

$$U_{\pi} = \frac{-6}{6\pi - 6} = \frac{-F(4,S(4))}{S(4)F_{\chi}(4,S(4)) - F(4,S(4))} - --2$$

NOW we substitute 0 &@ into into @, then we obtain

$$\frac{SF_{\chi}}{SF_{\chi}-F} \mu + \left(\frac{-\cancel{F}}{SF_{\chi}-F}\right) \left(\frac{F_{t} + \mu SF_{\chi} + \frac{1}{2}6^{2}s^{2}F_{\chi\chi}}{\cancel{F}}\right) = 70$$

$$\Rightarrow \mu s \not = \chi \otimes - F_t - \mu s \not = \chi - \frac{1}{2} \delta^2 s^2 F_{XX} = n s F_X - n F$$

 \Rightarrow F_t + nSF_x + ½ 6²s²F_{xx} = nF Also, we must have the nelation $\pi(\tau, \phi) = \phi(s(\tau))$.

So, F has to satisfy the following PDE

$$F_{t}(t,x) + nx F_{x}(t,x) + \frac{1}{2}6^{2}x^{2} F_{xx}(t,x) = nF(t,x)$$

Definition: We say that a T-claim X can be neplicated, alternatively that it is neachable on hedgeable, if there exists a self-financing portfolio h such that

In this case are say that h is a hedge against X. Alternatively, his called a neplicating on hedging portfolio. If every contingent claim is neachable are say that the market is complete.

Meta-theorem: Let M denote the number of underlying traded assets in the do model excluding the risk-free asset, and let R denote the number of random sources. Generically we then have the following relations:

- 1) The model is ambitmage free iff M≤R
- 2) The model is complete if and only if M > R
- 3) The model is complete and ambitmage finee iff M=R.
 As an example are take the Blace-scholes model, where we have

one underlying asset S plus the risk-free asset so M=1. We have one chriving wieners process, giving us R=1, so in fact M=R. Using the meta-theorem above are expect the Black-scholes model to be arbetrage free ass well as complete and this is indeed the case.

Incomplete Manket:

We know from the meta-theorem that makets generically are incomplete when there are more nandom sources than there are traded assets and this can occur in an if infinite number of ways, so there is no "cononical" way of writing down a model of an incomplete market. Here are study a particular type of incomple market, namely a "factor model", i.e., a market where are some non-traded underlying objects. Before we go on to the formal description of the model let us briefly necall what we may expect in an incomplete market model

- since the manuel is imcomplete we will not be able to hedge a generic contingent claim.
- In particular there will not be a unique price for a generic derivative.

Here we consider a simplest possible imcomplete market, namely a market where the only nandomnesss comes from a stochastic process x(t) which is not the frace of a traded asset. The model is as follows $\begin{cases} dx(t) = \mu(t, x(t))dt + 6(t, x(t))dw(t) \\ dB(t) = n(t)dt \end{cases}$