

集中講義「数理特論 I」

— 数理ファイナンスの基本定理について —

一橋大学 高岡浩一郎教授 *

2017 年 10 月 30 日

第 I 部

離散時間，有限証券，有限終端の設定

1 設定

まずは，第 1 部を通じての設定を列挙することから始めよう．

- (i) $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $T \in \mathbb{N}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$. T denotes the terminal time and d does the number of asset prices in a market.
- (ii) $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \{0, 1, \dots, T\}})$: a filtered probability space.
- (iii) An \mathbb{R}^d -dimensional adapted process $S = (S_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ is called a price process. . This denotes the price process of d kinds of risky assets. In addition, we suppose that cash is also traded in the market.
- (iv) An \mathbb{R}^d -valued predictable process $H = (H_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ is called a (trading) strategy or a portfolio process . For fixed t , the \mathbb{R}^d -valued random variable H_t is called the portfolio at time t .
- (v) For a price process S and a strategy H , we define a new process $H \bullet S$ as follows.

$$(H \bullet S)_0 = 0,$$
$$(H \bullet S)_t = \sum_{u=1}^t H_u \cdot \Delta S_u = \sum_{u=1}^t H_u \cdot (S_u - S_{u-1}) \quad t \in \{1, \dots, T\},$$

where \cdot is the usual inner product of \mathbb{R}^d . $H \bullet S$ is often called the discrete stochastic integral or martingale transform of H by S . This can be interpreted as the accumulated wealth process of the portfolio trading strategy H with initial valued 0.

* このノートは平井祐紀（大阪大学大学院基礎工学研究科後期博士課程所属）による

(vi) An *arbitrage* is a strategy H which satisfies

$$(H \bullet S)_T \geq 0 \text{ a.s.} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}[(H \bullet S)_T > 0] > 0.$$

If there is no arbitrage, we say that S satisfies the *No Arbitrage (NA)* condition.

(vii) A probability measure \mathbb{Q} equivalent to \mathbb{P} is called a *equivalent martingale measure (EMM)* of S if S is a \mathbb{Q} -martingale.

(viii) $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty[$, $\mathbb{R}_{++} =]0, \infty[$.

(ix) Given a class of real random variables \mathcal{A} , we define subsets of \mathcal{A} as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_+ &= \{X \in \mathcal{A} \mid X \geq 0 \text{ a.s.}\} \\ \mathcal{A}_{++} &= \{X \in \mathcal{A} \mid X > 0 \text{ a.s.}\} \\ \mathcal{A}_- &= \{X \in \mathcal{A} \mid X \leq 0 \text{ a.s.}\} \end{aligned}$$

(x) A $\{0, \dots, T\} \cup \infty$ -valued random variable τ is called a stopping time if

$$\forall t \in \{0, \dots, T\} \quad \{\omega \in \Omega \mid \tau(\omega) \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t.$$

(xi) $a \wedge b = \min\{a, b\}$, $a \vee b = \max\{a, b\}$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$.

(xii) Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ be a subset of an algebra. We define the Minkowski addition (subtraction, product) $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ ($\mathcal{A}_1 - \mathcal{A}_2$, $\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{m}{\times} \mathcal{A}_2$, respectively) by the following formulae.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2 &= \{a + b \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_1, b \in \mathcal{A}_2\} \\ \mathcal{A}_1 - \mathcal{A}_2 &= \{a - b \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_1, b \in \mathcal{A}_2\} \\ \mathcal{A}_1 \overset{m}{\times} \mathcal{A}_2 &= \{ab \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_1, b \in \mathcal{A}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

2 The fundamental theorem of asset pricing on finite probability spaces (The Harrison-Kreps theorem)

定理 2.1 (Harrison and Kreps [10]). On a finite probability space, the following conditions are equivalent.

- (i) S satisfies (NA).
- (ii) S has an EMM.

証明. Step 1: (ii) \implies (i). Let \mathbb{Q} be a EMM for S . Then $K \bullet S$ is again a \mathbb{Q} -martingale for any strategy K . ^{*1}. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[(K \bullet S)_T] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[(K \bullet S)_0] = 0. \quad (1)$$

holds for every strategy K . Choose a strategy H such that $(H \bullet S)_T \geq 0$ \mathbb{Q} -a.s.. By (1) and nonnegativeness of $(H \bullet S)_T$, we get $(H \bullet S)_T = 0$ \mathbb{P} -a.s.. Since \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} are equivalent, we see that

$$(H \bullet S)_T \geq 0, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \implies (H \bullet S)_T = 0, \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2)$$

^{*1} All predictable process is bounded because Ω is finite.

holds for all the strategies.

Step 2: (i) \implies (ii). We can assume, without loss of generality, that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T = 2^\Omega$ and $\mathbb{P}(\{\omega\}) > 0$ holds for all $\omega \in \Omega$. Let $\#\Omega = n$ and let us identify a random variable: $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with an element of \mathbb{R}^n . Moreover, a probability measure \mathbb{P} is identified with a vector $(\mathbb{P}(\omega))_{\omega \in \Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. From now on we use $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ to denote his probability vector. Then the expectation of a random variable $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by the probability p is equal to the inner product $x \cdot p$.

We define a subset \mathcal{A} of \mathbb{R}^n as

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(H \bullet S)_T \mid H \text{ is predictable}\}.$$

\mathcal{A} is a closed^{*2} vector subspace^{*3} of \mathbb{R}^n , and, in addition, convex^{*4}. Let $(e_k)_{k \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ be a standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n and \mathcal{B} be the convex hull of $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ ^{*5}. \mathcal{B} is clearly bounded and closed, and hence, compact. Since $x \in \mathcal{B}$ are nonnegative and satisfies $x \cdot p > 0$, we have $P(x > 0) > 0$. Then by the condition (NA), we know that $x \notin \mathcal{A}$. Therefore $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B} = \emptyset$. Here we use the following Hahn-Banach separation theorem.

— Hahn-Banach Separation Theorem —

Let X be a locally convex TVS. We consider two nonempty disjoint subsets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} of X . Suppose that \mathcal{A} is nonempty, closed, and convex, and \mathcal{B} is nonempty, compact, convex. Then there exists a $g \in X^*$ such that $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{B}} g(x) > \sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}} g(x)$.

The linear form g is represented by a vector $q = (q_1, \dots, q_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as $g(x) = q \cdot x$. Since \mathcal{A} is a vector subspace, we have for any $x \in \mathcal{A}$

$$g(\mathcal{A}) = \{q \cdot y \mid y \in \mathcal{A}\} \supset \{\lambda(q \cdot x) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\} = \mathbb{R}(q \cdot x).$$

This inclusion and the upper boundedness of $g(\mathcal{A})$ ^{*6} implies that $g(x) = q \cdot x = 0$ holds for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence, $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}} g(x) = 0$ and $q \in \mathcal{A}^\perp$ follows. We can deduce $q \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ from the following inequality.

$$q_k = q \cdot e_k \geq \inf_{x \in \mathcal{B}} q \cdot x > 0 = \sup_{x \in \mathcal{A}} q \cdot x \quad k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$$

Thus q can be identified with a probability measure \mathbb{Q} equivalent to \mathbb{P} ^{*7}.

It remains to prove that S is a \mathbb{Q} -martingale. Since q belongs to \mathcal{A}^+ , we see that $\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q}[(H \bullet S)_T] = 0$ holds for any strategy H . Choose $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, and $B \in \mathcal{F}_t$ arbitrary. We define a strategy $H^{(j)}$ by the equation

$$H^{(j)} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{1}_{B \times \{t+1, \dots, T\}} & i = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

^{*2} Every finite dimensional topological vector subspace is closed.

^{*3} This follows from the linearity of martingale transformation.

^{*4} Every vector subspace is convex.

^{*5} That is

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \alpha_k e_k \mid \alpha_k \geq 0, \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} \alpha_k = 1 \right\}.$$

^{*6} $\inf_{x \in \mathcal{B}} g(x)$ is an upper bound.

^{*7} $\mathbb{P}' \sim \mathbb{P}$ is equivalent to the condition " $\forall \omega \in \Omega, \mathbb{P}'(\omega) > 0$ " because $\mathbb{P}(\omega) > 0$ holds for all ω .

This strategy obviously satisfies

$$(H \bullet S)_T = \mathbb{1}_B(S_T^{(i)} - S_t^{(i)}).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\mathbb{1}_B(S_T^{(i)} - S_t^{(i)})] = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[(H \bullet S)_T] = 0.$$

This proves that S satisfies $S_t^{(i)} = \mathbb{E}[S_T^{(i)} | \mathcal{F}_t]$ for ann i, t , and consequently S is a \mathbb{Q} -martingale. \square

注意 2.2. Theorem 2.1 is equivalent to the following ‘‘Gordan’s theorem (or Stiemke’s lemma), which is known as a theorem of linear algebra.

— Gordan’s Theorem —

Let \mathcal{A} be a vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^n . Then the following two conditions are equivalent.

- (i) $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n = \{0\}$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{A}^\perp \cap \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \neq \emptyset$.

注意 2.3. The discussion in the proof of Theorem 2.1 does not work if Ω is infinite. We need to apply the Hahn-Banach theorem to a different object. Let

$$\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{A} - \mathbb{R}_+^n = \mathcal{A} + \mathbb{R}_-^n.$$

Under the situation of Theorem 2.1 \mathcal{C} is a finitely generated convex cone ^{*8} ^{*9}. and hence, closed ^{*10}.

定理 2.4 (Kreps-Yan). Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be an arbitrary probability space, and E be a locally convex TVS that includes $L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$. Suppose that every element of the dual E^* is identified with a continuous linear form defined by a element of some Banach space $F \subset L^1(\mathbb{P})$ ^{*11}; i.e. any bounded linear form on E has the following representation.

$$E \ni X \mapsto E^{\mathbb{P}}[ZX] \in \mathbb{R}$$

where Z is a proper random variable of F . We consider a closed convex cone $\mathcal{C} \subset E$ that satisfies $\mathcal{C} \supset E_-$ and $\mathcal{C} \cap E_+ = \{0\}$. There there exists a probability measure \mathbb{Q} on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) such that $\mathbb{P} \sim \mathbb{Q}$, $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \in F$ and for any $X \in \mathcal{C}$, $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[X] \leq 0$.

証明. Let us define a nonempty convex cone \mathcal{D} of F as the following.

$$\mathcal{D} = \{Y \in F_+ \mid \forall X \in \mathcal{C} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[YX] \leq 0\}.$$

Zero element obviously belongs to \mathcal{D} . We will show that \mathcal{D} has non-zero elements. Since the constant function $1 \in E_+$ does not belongs to \mathcal{C} , we have $\{1\} \cap \mathcal{C} = \emptyset$. The set $\{1\}$ is clearly compact and \mathcal{C} is, by

^{*8} A cone is a subset of a vector space which is closed under nonnegative scalar multiplication.

^{*9} \mathcal{C} is a finitely generated convex cone if there are elements x_1, \dots, x_k such that

$$\mathcal{C} = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j x_j \mid \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \geq 0 \right\},$$

^{*10} Every finitely generated convex cone is closed.

^{*11} F does not need to be the ‘‘topological’’ subspace of $L^1(\mathbb{P})$.

assumption, closed and convex. Therefore by the Hahn-Banach separation theorem, there is a $g_0 \in E^*$ such that

$$g_0(1) > \sup_{X \in \mathcal{C}} g_0(X).$$

Take a unique element $Z_0 \in F$ that satisfies

$$g_0(X) = \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z_0 X] \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z_0] > \sup_{X \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z_0 X]. \quad (3)$$

We see that

$$\forall X \in \mathcal{C} \quad \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z_0 X] \leq 0 \quad (4)$$

because the image $g_0(\mathcal{C})$ of the cone \mathcal{C} is upper bounded. For any $A \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $-\mathbb{1}_A \in L^\infty \subset E_- \subset \mathcal{C}$, and hence, $\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z_0 \mathbb{1}_A] \geq 0$ follows. This implies that Z_0 is nonnegative, and $Z_0 \in \mathcal{D}$. Combinig (3) and (4), we get

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z_0] > \sup_{X \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z_0 X] = 0.$$

Consequently $Z_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ is not 0.

The next step of this proof is to construct a r.v. $Z \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] = \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{P}[Y > 0] > 0.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, choose an element Y_k of \mathcal{D} that satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}[Y_k > 0] > \left(-\frac{1}{k} + \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{P}[Y > 0] \right) \vee 0.$$

Note that these Y_k 's are not the zero element of F ^{*12}. Let

$$Z = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{Y_k}{\|Y_k\|_F}.$$

This series converges absolutely, and therefore converges with respect to the norm of F . We want to prove that Z is in \mathcal{D} . A partial sum

$$Z^k = \sum_{1 \leq l \leq k} \frac{1}{2^l} \frac{Y_l}{\|Y_l\|_F}$$

of Z satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z^k X] = \sum_{1 \leq l \leq k} \frac{1}{2^l \|Y_l\|_F} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Y_l X] \leq 0 \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{C}.$$

Then $Z^k \in \mathcal{D}$. Since the sequence (Z^k) converges to Z with respect to the norm of F , it converges in weak*-topology. In particular we have

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z^k X] \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[Z X] \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{C}.$$

^{*12} By assumption the zero element of F is also zero of $L^1(\mathbb{P})$. These Y_k 's are not, however, zero of $L^1(\mathbb{P})$.

This prove that $\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[ZX] \leq 0$ holds for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$. Consequently, $Z \in \mathcal{D}$. By the definition of Z and Y_k , we see that $\{Y_k > 0\} \subset \{Z > 0\}$ and

$$\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] \geq \mathbb{P}[Y_k > 0] \geq \left(-\frac{1}{k} + \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{P}[Y > 0] \right) \vee 0.$$

Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] \geq \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{P}[Y > 0].$$

The inverse of this inequality follow from the fact that $Z \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus Z satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] = \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{P}[Y > 0] > 0.$$

We will next show that Z is almost surely positive. Assume $\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] < 1$. Since Z is nonnegative, $\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] < 1$ implies $\mathbb{1}_{\{Z=0\}} \neq 0$. Then, as in the discussion of the first paragraph of this proof, we can pick a $\tilde{Z} \in \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[\tilde{Z} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z=0\}}] > \sup_{X \in \mathcal{C}} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[\tilde{Z}X] = 0.$$

Now we have $\mathbb{P}[Z = 0, \tilde{Z} > 0] > 0$, and hence

$$\mathbb{P}[Z + \tilde{Z} > 0] = \mathbb{P}[Z = 0, \tilde{Z} > 0] + \mathbb{P}[Z > 0] > \mathbb{P}[Z > 0].$$

On the other hand, from $\tilde{Z} + Z \in \mathcal{D}$, we can deduce

$$\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] = \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{D}} \mathbb{P}[Y > 0] \geq \mathbb{P}[Z + \tilde{Z} > 0].$$

In consequence, we see that the following inequality holds.

$$\mathbb{P}[Z + \tilde{Z} > 0] > \mathbb{P}[Z > 0] \geq \mathbb{P}[Z + \tilde{Z} > 0]$$

This is a contradiction, which proves $\mathbb{P}[Z > 0] = 1$.

Let $c = 1/\mathbb{E}[Z] > 0$ and

$$\mathbb{Q}(A) = \int_{\Omega} cZ(\omega) \mathbb{P}(d\omega).$$

Then \mathbb{Q} is a probability measure absolutely continuous w.r.t. \mathbb{P} . Since $Z \in F$ is almost surely positive valued, \mathbb{Q} is, in fact, equivalent to \mathbb{P} . Recall that Z is a element of \mathcal{D} , by definition. cZ also belongs to \mathcal{D} because \mathcal{D} is a cone. Therefore \mathbb{Q} satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}^\mathbb{Q}[X] = \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}[(cZ)X] \leq 0 \quad \forall X \in \mathcal{C}.$$

This completes the proof. □

注意 2.5. (i) The Minkowski addition $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ of two convex cones $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is again a convex cone, but not necessarily closed. Here is a counter example. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_1 &= \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid \sqrt{x^2 + y^2} \leq z\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_2 &= \{-t(1, 0, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}. \end{aligned}$$

Though they are closed convex cones, $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ is not closed.

(ii) Assume that two closed cones^{*13} \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 of \mathbb{R}^n satisfy^{*14}

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{A}_1 \forall y \in \mathcal{A}_2 (x + y = 0 \implies x = y = 0).$$

Then $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ is a closed cone.

\therefore Suppose that a sequence $(z_k) = (x_k + y_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ ($x_k \in \mathcal{A}_1, y_k \in \mathcal{A}_2$) converges to $z_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded, we get $x_\infty := \lim_l x_{k_l} \in \mathcal{A}_1$ by taking a convergent subsequence $(x_{k_l})_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then $(y_{k_l}) = (z_{k_l} - x_{k_l})$ also converges, and its limit $y_\infty := \lim_l y_{k_l}$ belongs to \mathcal{A}_2 . Therefore we have $z_\infty = x_\infty + y_\infty \in \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$. Similarly we see that $z_\infty \in \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ if (y_k) is bounded.

We consider the case where (x_k) and (y_k) are unbounded. Let us choose a subsequence such that $x_{k_l}, y_{k_l} \neq 0$ and $\|x_{k_l}\|, \|y_{k_l}\| \rightarrow \infty$. By the assumption $x_k + y_k$ are bounded^{*15}, and hence

$$\frac{x_{k_l} + y_{k_l}}{\|x_{k_l}\|} \xrightarrow{l \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (5)$$

^{*16} Now we have $x_{k_l}/\|x_{k_l}\| \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $y_{k_l}/\|x_{k_l}\| \in \mathcal{A}_2$ because \mathcal{A}_1 are \mathcal{A}_2 cones. A bounded sequence $x_{k_l}/\|x_{k_l}\|$ has a convergent subsequence and its limit belongs to \mathcal{A}_1 ^{*17}. Since the norm of each $x_{k_l}/\|x_{k_l}\|$ is equal to 1, the limit of a convergent subsequence has the same norm. However, by (5) and positively semi-independence, it must holds that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{x_k}{\|x_k\|} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{y_k}{\|x_k\|} = 0.$$

This is a contradiction and hence, one of (x_k) and (y_k) is bounded.

From the discussion above, we see that the limit of a convergent sequence of $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ still belongs to $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$. Consequently $\mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2$ is closed.

3 Remarks on martingales and local martingales

In this section we review some important notions in the theory of martingales with a discrete time parameter. We assume that a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}, \mathbb{P})$ is given throughout this section.

An adapted process $(M_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ is called a *martingale* if

- (i) for all $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, M_t is integrable,
- (ii) $E[M_t | \mathcal{F}_s] = M_s$ (a.s.) holds for all $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$.

We say that M is a *local martingale* if there exists a sequence of stopping times $(\tau_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

- (i) $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty$ a.s.,
- (ii) $M^{\tau_n} - M_0$ is a martingale.

命題 3.1. Every martingale M is a H^1 martingale. That is, $\mathbb{E} [\max_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}} |M_t|] < \infty$ is satisfied.

^{*13} It does not need to be convex.

^{*14} This condition is sometimes called “positively semi-independent”.

^{*15} It is supposed to be a convergent sequence.

^{*16} Recall that $\|x_{k_l}\| \rightarrow \infty$.

^{*17} Because \mathcal{A}_1 is closed.

証明. We have the inequality

$$\max_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}} |M_t(\omega)| \leq \sum_{t=0}^T |M_t(\omega)|$$

for all ω , and therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}} |M_t| \right] \leq \sum_{t=0}^T \mathbb{E} [|M_t|] < \infty.$$

□

命題 3.2. Let X be a real local martingale. If X_t is integrable for all t , X is indeed a martingale.

証明. Pick a localizing sequence (τ_n) of X such that

$$\mathbb{E} [X_t^{\tau_n} | \mathcal{F}_s] = X_s^{\tau_n} \quad s \leq t \quad (6)$$

for all n . We can easily prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}} |X_t| \right] < \infty$$

as same as in the proof of Proposition 3.1. Note that $|X_t^{\tau_n}| \leq \max_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}} |X_t|$ holds for all n . Applying the dominated convergence theorem for conditional expectation to (6), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} [X_t | \mathcal{F}_s] = X_s.$$

□

定義 3.3. A real adapted process X is called a σ -martingale if it is represented as $X = X_0 + H \bullet X$ by a predictable process H and a martingale M .

定理 3.4. Let $X = (X_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ be a adapted process. There is a equivalence between:

- (i) X is a local martingale;
- (ii) X is a σ -martingale;
- (iii) there exist a predictable process H and a local martingale M such that $X = X_0 + H \bullet M$.

証明. It is sufficient to prove when $X_0 = 0$.

(i) \implies (ii). Let (τ_n) be a localizing sequence for X and $E_{t,n} := \{t \leq \tau_n\}$ for $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$. Then $E_{t,n}$ is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable and it satisfies

$$\mathbb{E} [|X_t| 1_{E_{t,n}}] = \mathbb{E} [|X_t^{\tau_n}| 1_{\{t \leq \tau_n\}}] < \infty.$$

Therefore X_t is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} - σ -integrable ^{*18}, and so is $\Delta X_t = X_t - X_{t-1}$. This shows that the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E} [|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]$ is almost surely finite ^{*19}.

Let us define a strictly positive predicable process K by the following formula.

$$K_t = \frac{1}{1 + \mathbb{E} [|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]}.$$

^{*18} A random variable Y is \mathcal{G} - σ -integrable if there exists a sequence (E_n) of \mathcal{G} such that $\Omega = \bigcup_n E_n$ and $\mathbb{E} [Y | 1_{E_n}] < \infty$.

^{*19} $\mathbb{E} [Y | \mathcal{G}]$ is a.s. finite if and only if Y is \mathcal{G} -integrable. See He, Wang, and Yan [12, 1.17 Theorem]

It satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|K_t \Delta X_t|] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{\Delta X_t}{1 + \mathbb{E}[|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]}\right|\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\Delta X_t|}{1 + \mathbb{E}[|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\Delta X_t|}{1 + \mathbb{E}[|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right]\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\mathbb{E}[|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]}{1 + \mathbb{E}[|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]}\right] \\
&\leq 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Set $M = K \bullet X$. We will now show that M is a martingale. M is clearly adapted to (\mathcal{F}_t) . The integrability of M follows from (7). For $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[M_t^{\tau_n} - M_{t-1}^{\tau_n} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] &= \mathbb{E}[K_t \Delta X_t^{\tau_n} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta X_t^{\tau_n}}{1 + \mathbb{E}[|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]} \middle| \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right] \\
&= \frac{\mathbb{E}[\Delta X_t^{\tau_n} | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]}{1 + \mathbb{E}[|\Delta X_t| | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]} \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The process M is, hence, a local martingale. By Proposition 3.2, it is in fact a martingale. The associativity of discrete stochastic integration implies

$$\frac{1}{K} \bullet M = \frac{1}{K} \bullet (K \bullet X) = \left(\frac{1}{K} K\right) \bullet X = X,$$

which shows X is a σ -martingale.

(ii) \implies (iii). Trivial.

(iii) \implies (ii). Suppose X is represented as $X = H \bullet M$ where H is predictable and M is a local martingale. We can assume, without loss of generality, $M_0 = 0$. Take a localizing sequence (τ_n) for M . We define another sequence of stopping times by

$$\tau_n = \inf\{t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\} \mid |H_{t+1}| > k\}.$$

Let $\sigma_n = \tau_n \wedge \tau'_n$. Then (σ_n) is again a localizing sequence for the local martingale M . Using a property of discrete stochastic integration, we have

$$X^{\sigma_n} = (H \bullet M)^{\sigma_n} = H^{\sigma_n} \bullet M^{\sigma_n}.$$

Since H^{σ_n} is bounded and M^{σ_n} is a martingale, X^{σ_n} is also a martingale. In consequence, X is a local martingale with a localizing sequence (σ_n) . \square

4 L^0 Spaces

In this section, we study some fundamental (topological) properties of L^0 spaces, the space of all random variables.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ a probability space. The space $L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ (or simply, L^0) denotes the set of all random variables. As usual, an element X of L^0 is identified with another element Y if they are \mathbb{P} -almost surely equal.

命題 4.1. Suppose that a function $f: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is non-decreasing, bounded, continuous, concave and satisfies the following condition.

$$f(x) = 0 \iff x = 0.$$

Let us define a function $d: L^0 \times L^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by the following formula.

$$d_f(X, Y) = \mathbb{E}[f(|X - Y|)] \quad \text{for } X, Y \in L^0.$$

Then (L^0, d) is a complete metric space.

証明. Step 1: “ d is a metric”. Only the triangular inequality is not clear. We first prove the sub-additivity of f . Let $0 \leq a \leq b$. If $a = 0$, the inequality $f(a + b) \leq f(a) + f(b)$ is obvious. If not, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(b) &= f\left(\frac{b-a}{b}(a+b) - \frac{a}{b}a\right) \geq \frac{b-a}{b}f(a+b) + \frac{a}{b}f(a) = f(a+b) - \frac{a}{b}\{f(a+b) - f(a)\} \\ f(a) &\geq f\left(\frac{a}{a+b}(a+b) + \frac{b}{a+b}0\right) \geq \frac{a}{a+b}f(a+b) + \frac{b}{a+b}f(0) \geq \frac{a}{a+b}f(a+b) \end{aligned}$$

by the concavity of f . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} f(a+b) &\leq f(b) + \frac{a}{b}\{f(a+b) - f(a)\} \\ &\leq f(b) + \frac{a}{b}\left\{\frac{a+b}{a}f(a) - f(a)\right\} \\ &= f(a) + f(b). \end{aligned}$$

We return to the proof of the triangular inequality. For any $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} f(|x - z|) &\leq f(|x - y| + |y - z|) \quad (\because f \text{ is non-decreasing}) \\ &\leq f(|x - y|) + f(|y - z|) \quad (\because \text{sub-additivity of } f). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this and the linearity of expectations, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[f(|X - Z|)] \leq \mathbb{E}[f(|X - Y|)] + \mathbb{E}[f(|Y - Z|)].$$

Thus the function d_f is a metric.

Step 2: completeness. Let $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a Cauchy sequence of (L^0, d_f) . Choose a subsequence $(X_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad d_f(X_{n_k}, X_{n_{k+1}}) < \frac{1}{2^k}.$$

By the monotone convergence theorem, we have

$$E\left[\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} f(|X_{n_{k+1}} - X_{n_k}|)\right] = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} d_f(X_{n_k}, X_{n_{k+1}}) < \infty.$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} f(|X_{n_{k+1}}(\omega) - X_{n_k}(\omega)|) < \infty \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.e.}\omega. \quad (8)$$

Note that there exists a $M: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}$ ^{*20} such that

$$|X_{n_{k+1}}(\omega) - X_{n_k}(\omega)| \leq M(\omega) f(|X_{n_{k+1}}(\omega) - X_{n_k}(\omega)|) \quad \text{for a.a. } \omega. \quad (9)$$

Indeed,

$$M(\omega) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{f'_+ (\sup_k |X_{n_{k+1}}(\omega) - X_{n_k}(\omega)|)} & \text{if } 0 < \sup_k |X_{n_{k+1}}(\omega) - X_{n_k}(\omega)| < \infty, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

satisfies (9)^{*21}. We can deduce from (8) and (9) that

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |X_{n_{k+1}}(\omega) - X_{n_k}(\omega)| < \infty \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Hence, $(X_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converges almost surely to a random variable, denoted by X_∞ . Since f is a bounded continuous function,

$$f(|X_{n_k} - X_\infty|) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \text{and} \quad f(|X_{n_k} - X_\infty|) \leq \sup_x f(x) < \infty.$$

Applying the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} d_f(X_{n_k} - X_\infty) = \mathbb{E} \left[\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} f(|X_{n_k} - X_\infty|) \right] = 0.$$

Consequently the subsequence (X_{n_k}) converges almost surely, and so the original Cauchy sequence (X_n) . \square

命題 4.2. Under the same assumptions as in Proposition 4.1, “convergence in (L^0, d_f) ” is equivalent to “convergence in probability”.

証明. Step 1: the proof of “in (L^0, d_f) \implies in prob.”. Suppose that (X_n) converges to X in (L^0, d_f) . Then by Chebyshev’s inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|X_n - X| \geq c] &= \mathbb{P}[f(|X_n - X|) \geq f(c)] \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[f(|X_n - X|)]}{f(c)} \end{aligned}$$

for any $c > 0$. Let $n \rightarrow \infty$, and we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}[|X_n - X| \geq c] \leq \frac{1}{f(c)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f(|X_n - X|)] = 0.$$

Hence (X_n) converges to X in probability.

^{*20} It need not be measurable

^{*21} f'_+ denotes the right derivative of f .

Step 2: the proof of “in prob. \implies in (L^0, d_f) .” Assume that (X_n) converges to X in probability. Take $c > 0$ arbitrary. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[f(|X_n - X|)] &= \mathbb{E}[f(|X_n - X|)\mathbb{1}_{\{|X_n - X| \leq c\}}] + \mathbb{E}[f(|X_n - X|)\mathbb{1}_{\{|X_n - X| > c\}}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[f(c)\mathbb{1}_{\{|X_n - X| \leq c\}}] + \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}_+} f(x)\right)\mathbb{1}_{\{|X_n - X| > c\}}\right] \\ &\leq f(c) + \left(\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}_+} f(x)\right)\mathbb{E}[|X_n - X| > c].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f(|X_n - X|)] \leq f(c)$$

for all $c > 0$. This shows

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[f(|X_n - X|)] = 0.$$

□

As a consequence of Proposition 4.2, any metric d_f defined by a function f satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 4.1 generates the same topology. From now on, we use the function defined by

$$f(x) = x \wedge 1 \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

注意 4.3. If Ω is countable, L^0 space is locally convex TVS. In general case, however, the space L^0 is not necessarily locally convex. See Schaefer [16, Chapter 1, Section 4].

命題 4.4. The topology of a L^0 space is invariant under equivalent change of probability measures.

証明. Let (Ω, \mathcal{F}) be a measurable space and \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q} be two equivalent probability measures on it. Let Z denotes a version of the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}$. We will show that the identity map $L^0(\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow L^0(\mathbb{Q})$ is a homeomorphism. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ arbitrary. Then we can choose a positive number C such that $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[Z\mathbb{1}_{\{Z > C\}}] < \varepsilon/2$ ^{*22}. If $X, Y \in L^0$ satisfy $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[1 \wedge |X - Y|] < \varepsilon/(2C)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[|X - Y| \wedge 1] &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[(|X - Y| \wedge 1)Z] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[(|X - Y| \wedge 1)Z\mathbb{1}_{\{Z > C\}}] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[(|X - Y| \wedge 1)Z\mathbb{1}_{\{Z \leq C\}}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[Z\mathbb{1}_{\{Z > C\}}] + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X - Y| \wedge 1] \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + C\frac{\varepsilon}{2C} = \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the identity map $L^0(\mathbb{P}) \rightarrow L^0(\mathbb{Q})$ is continuous. The continuity of the inverse is proved similarly. □

定義 4.5. A subset \mathcal{A} of $L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is *bounded* if for any neighborhood U of 0 there exists a $c > 0$ such that $c^{-1}\mathcal{A} \subset U$.

命題 4.6. $\mathcal{A} \subset L^0(\mathbb{P})$ is bounded if and only if the following condition is satisfied.

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{X \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{P}[|X| > c] = 0.$$

^{*22} By the integrability of Z .

命題 4.7. Let $\mathcal{A} \subset L^0$.

- (i) If \mathcal{A} is almost surely bounded, then it is bounded in L^0 .
- (ii) If \mathcal{A} is L^p bounded for some $p \in (0, \infty)$, then it is L^0 -bounded.

命題 4.8. Assume that a sequence $(B_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of \mathcal{F} -measurable set satisfies the following conditions.

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} B_i\right) = 1, \quad \mathbb{P}(B_i \cap B_j) = 0 \text{ (if } i \neq j\text{)}.$$

Then,

- (i) a sequence (X_n) converges to Y in L^0 if and only if $(X_n \mathbb{1}_{B_i})$ converges to $Y \mathbb{1}_{B_i}$ for all i .
- (ii) $\mathcal{A} \subset L^0$ is bounded in L^0 if and only if $\{X \mathbb{1}_{B_i} \mid X \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is L^0 -bounded for all i .

命題 4.9. Let $g: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function and $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$ be L^0 -bounded subsets. Then,

$$g_*(\mathcal{A}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_k) = \{g(X_1, \dots, X_k) \mid X_i \in \mathcal{A}_i \ \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}\}$$

is L^0 -bounded. In particular any finite Minkowski sums and Mikowski products of L^0 bounded sets are L^0 -bounded.

命題 4.10. Let $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of L^0 -bounded and $\tau: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a random variable. Then,

$$\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} X_i \mid X_i \in \mathcal{A}_i \ \forall i \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{\tau} X_i \mid X_i \in \mathcal{A}_i \ \forall i \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

are bounded in L^0 .

命題 4.11 (Delbaen and Schachermayer [5, Lemma A 1.1], D-S [7, Lemma 9.8]). Let $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of \mathbb{R}_+ -valued random variables. Then there exists $[0, \infty]$ -valued random variables (Y_n) such that $Y_n \in \text{Conv}(X_n, X_{n+1}, \dots)$ and (Y_n) converges almost surely. If $\text{Conv}(\{X_n; n \in \mathbb{N}\})$ is L^0 -bounded, the limit of (Y_n) is almost surely finite. Moreover if (X_n) satisfies the following condition, the limit of (Y_n) is not zero.

$$\exists \alpha > 0 \quad \exists \delta > 0 \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \quad \mathbb{P}[X_n > 0] > \delta.$$

5 一般の確率空間での基本定理 (Dalang-Morton-Willinger の定理)

本節の目標は、次の二つの定理の証明である。

定理 5.1. 任意の価格過程 S について、

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(H \bullet S)_T \mid H: \text{predictable}\}$$

は L^0 の閉集合である。

定理 5.2 (Dalang-Morton-Willinger [3]). 任意の価格過程 S について、次の 4 条件は同値である。

- (i) (NA)

- (ii) (NA) が成立し、さらに $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{A} - L_+^0$ は L^0 の閉集合である。
- (iii) S の EMM が存在する。
- (iv) EMM \mathbb{Q} で、特に $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}} \in L^\infty$ を満たすようなものが存在する。

注意 5.3. (NA) 条件を仮定しないと、 \mathcal{C} は L^0 閉集合でない場合がある。以下の例は Delbaen and Schachermayer [7, p. 94] からとったものである。 $d = 1$ および $T = 1$ とする。可測空間 $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}) = ((0, 1], \mathcal{B}((0, 1]))$ 上の Lebesgue 測度 \mathbb{P} を考える。この確率空間上のフィルトレーション $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \{0,1\}}$ を

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}.$$

と定義しよう。さらに、価格過程 S を

$$S_0 = 0, \quad S_1(\omega) = \omega.$$

と定める。この設定化では、可予測過程 H は

$$H_t(\omega) = a_0 1_{\{0\}}(t) + a_1 1_{\{1\}}(t), \quad a_0, a_1 \in \mathbb{R} \quad (10)$$

の形をしていることに注意されたい。(10) の形の H に対して、

$$(H \bullet S)_1(\omega) = H_1(\omega) \{S_1(\omega) - S_0(\omega)\} = a_1 \omega$$

が成り立つ。このとき 1 は \mathcal{C} の元ではない。実際、

$$a_1 \omega - X(\omega) = 1$$

を満たす $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ を考えれば、十分小さい $\omega \in]0, 1]$ に対して $X(\omega) = a_1 \omega - 1 < \infty$ となる。ゆえに $X \notin L_+^0$ となり、 $1 \notin \mathcal{C}$ がわかる。一方で、実は $1 \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ が成り立っている。なぜなら、次のようにして \mathcal{C} における 1 の近似列を構成することが出来るからである。確率変数列 (f_n) を $f_n = n 1_{]0, \frac{1}{n}]} S_1 + 1_{] \frac{1}{n}, 1]}$ と定義する。このとき、

$$f_n \leq g_n := n \Delta S \in \mathcal{A}$$

が成り立つ。ゆえに $f_n = g_n - (g_n - f_n) \in \mathcal{C}$ である。いま (f_n) は明らかに定数関数 1 に各点収束（よって確率収束）するので、 $1 \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ となる。以上の議論により $1 \in \overline{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \mathcal{C}$ がわかるので、 \mathcal{C} は L^0 で閉ではない。

補題 5.4 (Delbaen and Schachermayer [7, Proposition 6.3.3 and 6.3.4]). (\mathcal{K}, d) をコンパクト距離空間とし、 (X_n) を \mathcal{K} -値確率変数列とする。

- (i) 狭義に増加的な \mathbb{N} -値確率変数列 (ν_k) で、 (X_{ν_k}) が概収束するようなものが存在する。
- (ii) $x \in \mathcal{K}$ および

$$B_x = \{\omega \in \Omega \mid x \text{ is an accumulation point of } (X_n(\omega))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\}.$$

とする。このとき、(i) の列で

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} X_{\nu_k}(\omega) = x \quad \text{for all } \omega \in B_x.$$

を満たすようなものがとれる。

証明. (i) \mathcal{K} の有限開被覆 $A_1^n, \dots, A_{N_n}^n$ で, 半径 $1/n$ 以下のものをとる. 確率変数列 (ν_k) を以下のように定めよう.

$$\begin{aligned} I^0 &= \mathbb{N}, \\ j_k(\omega) &= \min \{j \in \{1, \dots, N_k\} \mid A_j^k \text{ contains infinitely many points of } (X_n(\omega))_{n \in I^{k-1}(\omega)}\} \\ I^k(\omega) &= \{n \in I^{k-1}(\omega) \mid X_n(\omega) \in A_{j_k}^k(\omega)\} \\ \nu_k(\omega) &= \text{the } k\text{-th element of } I^k(\omega) \end{aligned}$$

このとき ν_k は可測関数であり, (X_{n_k}) は概収束することがわかる.

(2) It suffices to choose the coverings (A_j^n) in the proof of (1) such that $x \in A_1^n$ for all n . □

以上の補題を用いて, 定理 5.1 の証明を行おう.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Step 1 : $H \mapsto (H \bullet S)_T$ が単射の場合. まずは, 線形写像 $H \mapsto (H \bullet S)_T \in L^0$ が単射の場合, すなわち,

$$(H \bullet S)_T = 0 \text{ a.s.} \implies H = 0 \text{ a.s.}$$

が成り立っている場合に示す. (H^n) を戦略の列で

$$(H^n \bullet S)_T \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{in prob.}} \exists Z.$$

を満たすようなものとする. 必要ならば適当な部分列を取り直すことにより, この収束を概収束に置き換えても良い. 我々の目標は, $Z = (K \bullet S)_T$ を満たす戦略 K を見つけ出すことである.

Case 1 : (H^n) が a.s. で有界な場合.

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \quad \forall t \in \{0, \dots, T\} \quad \text{for a.e. } \omega \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |H_t^{n, (i)}(\omega)| < \infty$$

が成り立っていると仮定する. By Lemma 5.4, we can choose a sequence of \mathbb{N} -valued \mathcal{F}_0 measurable functions $(\nu_{1,k})$ such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} H_1^{\nu_{1,k}} = \exists K_1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

The sequence $(H^{\nu_{1,k}})$ satisfies the following properties.

- For each $t \in \{2, \dots, T\}$, $H_t^{\nu_{1,k}}$ is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable.
- $(H^{\nu_{1,k}} \bullet S)_T \rightarrow Z$ a.s.

Let $\widehat{H}^n = K_1 \mathbb{1}_{\{1\}} + H^{\nu_{1,n}} \mathbb{1}_{\{2, \dots, T\}}$. Then we see that

$$(\widehat{H}^n \bullet S)_T = (H^{\nu_{1,n}} \bullet S)_T + (K_1 - H_1^{\nu_{1,n}})(S_1 - S_0) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.s.}} Z.$$

Next, take a sequence $(\nu_{2,k})$ such that

- each $\nu_{2,k}$ is \mathcal{F}_1 -measurable \mathbb{N} -valued r.v.,
- $\widehat{H}_2^{\nu_{2,k}} \rightarrow \exists K_2$ a.s.
- For each $t \in \{3, \dots, T\}$, $\widehat{H}_t^{\nu_{2,k}}$ is \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable.
- $(\widehat{H}^{\nu_{2,k}} \bullet S)_T \rightarrow Z$ a.s.

Inductively we define a process $K = (K_t)_{t \in \{1, \dots, T\}}$. This is what we need to construct.

Case 2: the case (H^n) is not bounded. Let

$$t^* = \min\{t \in \{0, \dots, T\} \mid (H_t^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ not a.s. bounded}\}.$$

We can define, in the same way as Case 1, a predictable process $(\hat{H}_t)_{t \in \{1, \dots, T\}}$ such that

- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\hat{H}^n \bullet S)_T = Z$ a.s.
- $\hat{H}_u^n = K_u$ for $u < t^*$,
- $(\hat{H}_{t^*}^n)$ is not a.s. bounded.

By assumption, the event

$$B = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \mid \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} |\hat{H}_t^n(\omega)| = \infty \right\} \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$$

has positive probability,. Then, by Lemma 5.4, there exists a sequence of \mathcal{F}_{t-1} -measurable random variables (τ_k) such that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\hat{H}_{t^*}^{\tau_k}| = \infty \quad \text{a.s. on } B.$$

Define a process \tilde{H} by

$$\tilde{H}_u^k = \begin{cases} 1_B \frac{\hat{H}_u^{\tau_k}}{|\hat{H}_{t^*}^{\tau_k}|} & \text{on } \{\hat{H}^{\tau_k} \neq 0\} \times \{t^*, \dots, T\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The process \tilde{H} is predictable and it satisfies

$$(\tilde{H}^k \bullet S)_T = \frac{1_B}{|\hat{H}_{t^*}^{\tau_k}|} \left\{ (\hat{H}^{\tau_k} \bullet S)_T - (\hat{H}^{\tau_k} \bullet S)_{t^*-1} \right\}.$$

Since $(\hat{H}^{\tau_k} \bullet S)_T$ converges a.s. to Z , we have

$$\frac{1_B}{|\hat{H}_{t^*}^{\tau_k}|} (\hat{H}^{\tau_k} \bullet S)_T \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.s.}} 0.$$

By definition $\tilde{H}_u^{\tau_k}$ ($u < t^*$) does not depend on k , and hence

$$\frac{1_B}{|\hat{H}_{t^*}^{\tau_k}|} (\hat{H}^{\tau_k} \bullet S)_{t^*-1} \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.s.}} 0.$$

Consequently,

$$(\tilde{H}^k \bullet S)_T \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow \infty]{\text{a.s.}} 0.$$

Now we got a sequence (\tilde{H}^k) which satisfies

- (i) $(\tilde{H}^k \bullet S)_T \rightarrow 0$,
- (ii) For any $t \in \{0, \dots, t^*\}$ and for almost all ω , the sequence $(\tilde{H}_t^k(\omega))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded .

By a similar discussion as above, we can obtain a predictable process \tilde{K} such that

- (i) $\tilde{K}_{t^*} \neq 0$ with positive probability,
- (ii) $(\tilde{K} \bullet S)_T = 0$ a.s.

This contradicts the assumption in Step 1.

Step 2: general cases.

□

6 The NUPBR condition

定義 6.1. Let $a \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. A strategy H is a -admissible if

$$(H \bullet S)_t \geq -a \quad \forall t \in \{0, \dots, T\} \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

We say that H is *admissible for S* if it is a -admissible for some a .

定義 6.2. We say that S satisfies the (NUPBR) condition if

$$\mathcal{K}_1 = \{(H \bullet S)_T \mid H \text{ is 1-admissible for } S\}$$

is bounded in L^0 .

注意 6.3. There is a case where $\mathcal{K}_1 = \{0\}$.

命題 6.4. In a discrete time model, the condition (NUPBR) is equivalent to the four conditions in Theorem 5.2.

7 Numeraire

第 II 部

Continuous time, finite assets, finite terminal models

8 Difficulties in continuous time settings and some examples

There are some important difference between continuous time models and discrete time modes such as

- traders can choose the “doubling strategy” even in a finite time interval—“admissibility”,
- local martingales and martingales are essentially different.

例 8.1. Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and a 1-dimensional BM $W = (W_{t \in [0, T]})$. The filtration $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is supposed to be generated by W . We define a process S by

$$S_t = W_t + 2\sqrt{T-t}.$$

Then there is no EMM for S in this model. Let

$$X_t = -1 + \exp\left(-\int_0^t \frac{dW_u}{\sqrt{T-u}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \frac{du}{T-u}\right) \quad t < T.$$

9 Semimartingales, stochastic integrals, local martingales and σ -martingales

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P})$ a filtered probability space with the usual hypothesis.

Stopping times

定義 9.1. A random variable $\tau: \Omega \rightarrow [0, T] \cup \{\infty\}$ is called a stopping time if it satisfies

$$\forall t \in [0, T] \quad \{\omega \in \Omega \mid \tau(\omega) \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t$$

Local martingales

定義 9.2. A càdlàg adapted process $M = (M_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a local martingale if there exists a sequence of stopping times that satisfies the following conditions.

- (i) $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \rightarrow \infty$ a.s..
- (ii) $M^{\tau_n} - M_0$ is a local martingale.

命題 9.3. Suppose that a local martingale X is bounded from below and satisfies $X_0 \in L_1(\mathbb{P})$. Then X is a super martingale.

証明. We can assume that X is nonnegative without loss of generality ^{*23}. Pick a localizing sequence (τ_n) of X . We have for any n and $s \leq t$

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t^{\tau_n} | \mathcal{F}_s] = M_s^{\tau_n} \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (11)$$

Let $s = 0$ in (9.7) and we obtain, by Fatou's lemma,

$$\mathbb{E}[|X_t|] = \mathbb{E}[X_t] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_t^{\tau_n}] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X_{\tau_n \wedge 0}] = \mathbb{E}[X_0] < \infty.$$

This implies the integrability of each X_t . Applying Fatou's lemma for conditional expectations to (9.7), we can verify the following inequality.

$$\mathbb{E}[X_t | \mathcal{F}_s] \leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[X^{\tau_n} | \mathcal{F}_s] = M_s \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Therefore (X_t) is a supermartingale. □

定義 9.4. Two local martingales M and N is said to be *orthogonal* if MN is a local martingale and $M_0 N_0 = 0$. A *purely discontinuous martingale* is a local martingale which is orthogonal to all continuous local martingales.

命題 9.5. A local martingale M is uniquely decomposed as follow.

$$M = M_0 + M^c + M^d$$

where M^c is a continuous local martingale, M^d is a purely discontinuous local martingale, and $M_0^c = M_0^d = 0$.

^{*23} If not, it is enough to consider the process $X - a$ where a is a lower bound of X .

For any locally square integrable martingale M , there exists a unique predictable increasing process, denoted by $\langle M, M \rangle$, such that $M^2 - M_0^2 - \langle M, M \rangle$ is a locally integrable martingale that starts from 0. If M is square integrable, this is a direct consequence of the Doob-Meyer decomposition theorem. The general case is proved by localization.

定義 9.6. Let M be a local martingale. We define the *quadratic variation* of M by

$$[M, M] = \langle M^c, M^c \rangle + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq \cdot} (\Delta M_s)^2$$

where M^c denotes the continuous part of M in the sense of Proposition 9.5.

The process $[M, M]$ is a unique adapted increasing process such that $M^2 - M_0^2 - [M, M]$ is a local martingale with initial value 0, and $\Delta[M, M] = (\Delta M)^2$. If M is locally square integrable, $\langle M, M \rangle$ is the predictable compensator of $[M, M]$. We define, more generally, the *predictable quadratic variation* $\langle M, M \rangle$ of M as the predictable compensator of $[M, M]$ in the case where $[M, M]$ is locally integrable ^{*24}.

命題 9.7. Let M be a local martingale. Then $M - M_0$ and $[M, M]^{1/2}$ are locally integrable ^{*25}.

An \mathbb{R}^d -valued process X is called a \mathbb{R}^d -valued local martingale if every components of X is a local martingale.

Semimartingales

定義 9.8. A semimartingale is a càdlàg adapted process X written in the form $X = X_0 + M + A$ where

- (i) M is a local martingale satisfying $M_0 = 0$,
- (ii) A is a càdlàg adapted process with $A_0 = 0$ whose paths have finite variation.

The decomposition of semimartingale into a local martingale and a process of finite variation is not unique. For example, a compensated Poisson process $X_t = N_t - \lambda t$ is both a martingale and a process of finite variation.

定義 9.9. A semimartingale X is called a *special semimartingale* if we can choose a decomposition $X = X_0 + M + A$ such that A is predictable.

A decomposition of a special semimartingale $X = X_0 + M + A$ such that A is predictable is, indeed, unique. Consider two decompositions

$$X = X_0 + M + A = X_0 + \widetilde{M} + \widetilde{A}$$

where A and \widetilde{A} are predictable. Then the process $M - \widetilde{M} = \widetilde{A} - A$ is a predictable local martingale of finite variation, and hence a constant process. Because the initial valued of this process is 0, we see

^{*24} Every adapted process of locally integrable variation has the predictable compensator. See, He, Wang, Yan [12] or Jacod and Shiryaev [13].

^{*25} Recall that a process $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is locally integrable if there exists a localizing sequence (τ_n) such that $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t^{7n}|$ is integrable for all n .

that it is evanescent^{*26}. This unique decomposition is called the canonical decomposition of a special semimartingale.

命題 9.10. A semimartingale X is special if and only if $X - X_0$ is locally integrable. In particular every continuous semimartingale is special and both M and A of its canonical decomposition $X = X_0 + M + A$ are continuous.

定理 9.11 (Delbaen and Schachermayer [], Delbaen and Schachermayer [7, Theorem 9.2.3]). Let X be a semimartingale such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\Delta X_t|^p \right] < \infty.$$

holds for some $p \in (0, \infty)$. Then X is a special martingale and it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\Delta A_t|^p \right] &\leq \frac{p}{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\Delta X_t|^p \right] \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\Delta M_t|^p \right] &\leq \frac{2p-1}{p-1} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\Delta X_t|^p \right] \end{aligned}$$

for its canonical decomposition $X = X_0 + M + A$.

命題 9.12. Let X be a semimartingale on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P})$. If a probability measure \mathbb{Q} is measure absolutely continuous with respect to \mathbb{P} , X is again a semimartingale under \mathbb{Q} .

An \mathbb{R}^d -valued process $X = (X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(d)})$ is called a \mathbb{R}^d -valued semimartingale if all $X^{(i)}$ are real semimartingales.

Stochastic Integration

We will define a metric on the space of all semimartingales. Let

$$d(X, Y) = \sup_{\substack{K: \text{predictable} \\ |K| \leq 1}} \mathbb{E} [1 \wedge |K \bullet (X - Y)_T|].$$

This is indeed a metric on the set of all semimartingales and the space endowed with this metric is complete. The topology generated by this metric is called the semimartingale topology or the Emery topology.

10 Settings

- (i) $T \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (ii) $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}, \mathbb{P})$: a filtered probability space satisfying the usual hypothesis
- (iii) $S = (S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$: an \mathbb{R}^d -valued semimartingale

^{*26} i.e. indistinguishable from 0.

- (iv) Let $a \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. We say that a strategy $H = (H_t)_{t \in (0, T]}$ is *a-admissible for S* if it is *S*-integrable and its a.e. path satisfies

$$(H \bullet S)_t \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

H is *admissible for S* if there exists a constant a such that H is *a*-admissible for S .

- (v) $\mathcal{K}_a = \{(H \bullet S)_T \mid H \text{ is } a\text{-admissible}\}$
- (vi) S satisfies the *No Arbitrage (NA)* condition if it satisfies $\mathcal{K}_1 \cap L_+^0 = \{0\}$
- (vii) We say that S satisfies the condition of *No Unbounded Profit with Bounded Risk (NUPBR)* if \mathcal{K}_1 is L^0 -bounded.
- (viii) We say that S satisfies the condition of *No Free Lunch with Vanishing Risk (NFLVR)* if both (NA) and (NUPBR) are satisfied.
- (ix) An *equivalent martingale measure (EMM)* \mathbb{Q} for S is a probability measure which is equivalent to \mathbb{P} and under which S is a martingale. We also define an ELMM and an ESMM replacing the word “martingale” in the above condition with “local martingale” and “ σ -martingale”, respectively.
- (x) An \mathbb{R}_{++} -valued process Z is called a *strict martingale density* if $Z_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{P})$ and ZS is a \mathbb{R}^d -valued σ -martingale ^{*27}.

11 The Choulli-Stricker Theorem for Continuous Processes

12 The Delbaen-Schachermayer Theorem

13 Change of Numeraire

付録 A Complements to Functional Analysis

A.1 The Hahn-Banach Separation Theorem

References

- [1] W. Brannath and W. Schachermayer. “A bipolar theorem for $L_+^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ ”. In: *Séminaire de Probabilités XXXIII*. Ed. by Jacques Azéma et al. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1709. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1999, pp. 349–354. ISBN: 978-3-540-48407-3. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0096525](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0096525). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BFb0096525>.

^{*27} If Z itself is a martingale, Z is a strict martingale density iff it is a ESMM.

- [2] Tahir Choulli and Christophe Stricker. “Deux applications de la décomposition de Galtchouk-Kunita-Watanabe”. In: *Séminaire de Probabilités XXX*. Ed. by Jacques Azéma, Marc Yor, and Michel Emery. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1996, pp. 12–23. ISBN: 978-3-540-68463-3. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0094638](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0094638). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BFb0094638>.
- [3] Robert C. Dalang, Andrew Morton, and Walter Willinger. “Equivalent Martingale Measures and No-Arbitrage in Stochastic Securities Market Models”. In: *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports* 29.2 (1990), pp. 185–201.
- [4] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer. “The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 312.2 (1998), pp. 215–250. ISSN: 1432-1807. DOI: [10.1007/s002080050220](https://doi.org/10.1007/s002080050220). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s002080050220>.
- [5] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. “A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing.” In: *Mathematische Annalen* 300.3 (1994), pp. 463–520. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/165264>.
- [6] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. “The Existence of Absolutely Continuous Local Martingale Measures”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 5.4 (1995), pp. 926–945. ISSN: 10505164. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2245099>.
- [7] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. *The Mathematics of Arbitrage*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2006. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-31299-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-31299-4).
- [8] Freddy Delbaen and Walter Schachermayer. “The no-arbitrage property under a change of numéraire”. In: *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports* 53.3–4 (1995), pp. 213–226. DOI: [10.1080/17442509508833990](https://doi.org/10.1080/17442509508833990). URL: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17442509508833990>.
- [9] Freddy Delbaen and Hiroshi Shirakawa. “A note on the no arbitrage condition for international financial markets”. In: *Financial Engineering and the Japanese Markets* 3.3 (1996), pp. 239–251. ISSN: 1573-6946. DOI: [10.1007/BF02425803](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02425803). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02425803>.
- [10] J. Michael Harrison and David M. Kreps. “Martingales and Arbitrage in Multiperiod Securities Markets”. In: *Journal of Economic Theory* (1979).
- [11] J. Michael Harrison and Stanley R. Pliska. “Martingales and stochastic integrals in the theory of continuous trading”. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 11.3 (1981), pp. 215–260. ISSN: 0304-4149. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-4149\(81\)90026-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4149(81)90026-0). URL: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304414981900260>.
- [12] Sheng-wu He, Jia-gang Wang, and Jia-an Yan. *Semimartingale Theory and Stochastic Calculus*. Science Press and CRC Press, 1992. URL: <https://www.crcpress.com/Semimartingale-Theory-and-Stochastic-Calculus/eWangyan/p/book/9780849377150>.
- [13] Jean Jacod and Albert N. Shiryaev. *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 288. Springer-Verlag, 1987.
- [14] Ioannis Karatzas and Constantinos Kardaras. “The numéraire portfolio in semimartingale financial models”. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 11.4 (2007), pp. 447–493. ISSN: 1432-1122. DOI: [10.1007/s00780-007-0047-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00780-007-0047-3). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00780-007-0047-3>.

- [15] Constantinos Kardaras. “Market viability via absence of arbitrage of the first kind”. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 16.4 (2012), pp. 651–667. ISSN: 1432-1122. DOI: [10.1007/s00780-012-0172-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00780-012-0172-5). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00780-012-0172-5>.
- [16] H. H. Schaefer. *Topological Vector Spaces*. 2nd ed. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 3. Springer-Verlag New York, 1999.
- [17] C. Stricker and J. A. Yan. “Some remarks on the optional decomposition theorem”. In: *Séminaire de Probabilités XXXII*. Ed. by Jacques Azéma et al. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1998, pp. 56–66. ISBN: 978-3-540-69762-6. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0101750](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0101750). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BFb0101750>.
- [18] Christophe Stricker. “Arbitrage et lois de martingale”. fre. In: *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré Probabilités et Statistiques* 26.3 (1990), pp. 451–460. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/77389>.
- [19] Koichiro Takaoka and Martin Schweizer. “A note on the condition of no unbounded profit with bounded risk”. In: *Finance and Stochastics* 18.2 (2014), pp. 393–405. ISSN: 1432-1122. DOI: [10.1007/s00780-014-0229-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00780-014-0229-8). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00780-014-0229-8>.
- [20] Jia-An Yan. “Caracterisation d’une classe d’ensembles convexes de l_1 ou h_1 ”. In: *Séminaire de Probabilités XIV 1978/79*. Ed. by Jacques Azéma and Marc Yor. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 784. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1980, pp. 220–222. ISBN: 978-3-540-38642-1. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0089488](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0089488). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BFb0089488>.

索引

$L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, 10
[M, M], 19
 \mathcal{K}_a , 20
(NUPBR), 17

 a -admissible, 16
admissible, 16, 20
arbitrage, 2

canonical decomposition (of a special semimartingale), 19

discrete stochastic integral, 1

ELMM, 21
EMM, 2, 21
equivalent local martingale measure, 21
equivalent martingale measure, 2, 21
equivalent σ -martingale measure, 21
ESMM, 21

 L^0 -bounded, 13
local martingale, 8, 18

martingale, 7
martingale transform, 1

(NA), 2, 21
(NFLVR), 21
No Arbitrage, 2
No Arbitrage condition, 21
No Free Lunch with Vanishing Risk, 21
(NUPBR), 21

orthogonal, 18

portfolio process, 1
predictable quadratic variation, 19
price process, 1
purely discontinuous martingale, 18

quadratic variation, 18, 19

 σ -martingale, 8
special semimartingale, 19
stopping time, 17
strategy, 1