

Math/Stat 523, Spring 2020



Jon A. Wellner

Lecture 15

Friday May 22, Monday May 25

Outline, Brownian motion IV

- 1: Change of Time, Lévy's theorem;
Section 3.4
- 2: Burkholder - Davis - Gundy;
Section 3.5
- 3: Martingales adapted to Brownian filtrations; Section 3.6

1. Change of Time, Lévy's theorem; Section 3.4

Here we will prove Lévy's characterization of Brownian motion (4.1), and use it to show that every continuous local martingale is a time change of Brownian motion.

Theorem 4.1: If X_t is a continuous local martingale with $X_0 = 0$ and $\langle X \rangle_t \equiv t$, then X_t is a one dimensional Brownian motion.

Proof: By (4.5) in Chapter 1 it suffices to prove the following Lemma:

Lemma 4.2: For any s and t , $X_{s+t} - X_s$ is independent of \mathcal{F}_s and has a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance t .

Proof of (4.2): Applying the complex version of Itô's formula, (7.9) in Chapter 2, to $Y_r = X_{s+r} - X_s$ and $f(x) = e^{i\theta x}$, we get

$$e^{i\theta Y_t} - 1 = i\theta \int_0^t e^{i\theta Y_u} dY_u - \frac{\theta^2}{2} \int_0^t e^{i\theta Y_u} du.$$

Let $\mathcal{G}_r \equiv \mathcal{F}_{s+r}$ and let $A \in \mathcal{F}_s = \mathcal{G}_0$.

The first term on the right, which we will call Z_t , is a local martingale w.r.t. \mathcal{G}_t . To get rid of that term, let $T_n \nearrow \infty$ be a sequence of stopping times that reduces Z_t , replace t by $t \wedge T_n$, and integrate over A . The definition of conditional expectation implies

$$E(Z_{t \wedge T_n} \mathbf{1}_A) = E(E(Z_{t \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{G}_0) \mathbf{1}_A) = E(Z_0 \mathbf{1}_A) = 0$$

since $Z_0 = 0$. So we have

$$E(e^{i\theta Y_{t \wedge T_n}} \mathbf{1}_A) - P(A) = 0 - \frac{\theta^2}{2} E \left(\int_0^{t \wedge T_n} e^{i\theta Y_u} du \cdot \mathbf{1}_A \right).$$

Since $|e^{i\theta x}| = 1$, letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using the bounded convergence theorem gives

$$\begin{aligned} E(e^{i\theta Y_t} \mathbf{1}_A) - P(A) &= -\frac{\theta^2}{2} E \left(\int_0^t e^{i\theta Y_u} du \cdot \mathbf{1}_A \right) \\ &= -\frac{\theta^2}{2} \int_0^t E(e^{i\theta Y_u} \cdot \mathbf{1}_A) du \end{aligned}$$

by Fubini's theorem (since the integrand is bounded and the two measures are finite). Writing $j(t) = E(e^{i\theta Y_t} \mathbf{1}_A)$, the last equality says

$$j(t) - P(A) = -\frac{\theta^2}{2} \int_0^t j(u) du.$$

Since we know that $|j(s)| \leq 1$, it follows that $|j(t) - j(u)| \leq |t - u|\theta^2/2$, so j is continuous and we can differentiate across the equality in the last display to conclude j is differentiable with

$$j'(t) = -\frac{\theta^2}{2} j(t).$$

Together with $j(0) = P(A)$, this shows that $j(t) = P(A)e^{-\theta^2 t/2}$, or

$$E(e^{i\theta Y_t} \mathbf{1}_A) = e^{-\theta^2 t/2} E \mathbf{1}_A.$$

Since this holds for all $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$ it follows that

$$E(e^{i\theta Y_t} | \mathcal{G}_0) = e^{-\theta^2 t / 2},$$

or, in words, the conditional characteristic function of Y_t is that of the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance t .

To use this to prove (4.2), we first take expected values of both sides to conclude that Y_t has a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance t . The fact that the conditional characteristic function is a constant suggests that Y_t is independent of \mathcal{G}_0 . To turn this intuition into a proof, let g be a C^1 function with compact support, and let

$$\varphi(\theta) = \int e^{i\theta x} g(x) dx$$

be its Fourier transform. We have assumed more than enough to conclude that φ is integrable and hence

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int e^{i\theta x} \varphi(-\theta) d\theta$$

Multiplying both sides of (4.3) by $\varphi(-\theta)$ and integrating shows that $E(g(Y_t)|\mathcal{G}_0)$ is a constant and hence

$$E(g(Y_t)|\mathcal{G}_0) = E g(Y_t).$$

A monotone class argument now shows that the last conclusion holds for any bounded measurable g . Taking $g = 1_B$ and integrating the last equality over $A \in \mathcal{G}_0$ we have

$$P(A)P(Y_t \in B) = \int_A E(1_B(Y_t)|\mathcal{G}_0)dP = P(A \cap [Y_t \in B])$$

by the definition of conditional expectation, so we have proved the claimed independence. \square

Exercise 4.1. Suppose that X_t^i , $1 \leq i \leq d$, are continuous local martingales with $X_0 = 0$ and

$$\langle X^i, X^j \rangle = \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } i = j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $X_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^d)$ is a d -dimensional Brownian motion.

An immediate consequence of (4.1) is:

Theorem 4.4: Every continuous local martingale with $X_0 = 0$ and having $\langle X \rangle_\infty \equiv \infty$ is a time change of Brownian motion: if we let $\gamma(u) \equiv \inf\{t : \langle X \rangle_t > u\}$, then $B_u = X_{\gamma(u)}$ is a Brownian motion and $X_t = B_{\langle X \rangle_t}$.

Proof: Since $\gamma(\langle X \rangle_t) = t$, the second equality is an immediate consequence of the first. To prove the first equality. Recall from Exercise 3.8 of chapter 2 that $u \mapsto B_u$ is continuous, so it suffices to show that B_u and $B_u^2 - u$ are local martingales.

Lemma 4.5: $B_u, \mathcal{F}_{\gamma(u)}$ is a local martingale.

Proof of (4.5): Let $T_n = \inf\{t : |X_t| > n\}$. The optional stopping theorem implies that if $u < v$ then

$$E(X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_{\gamma(u)}) = X_{\gamma(u) \wedge T_n}$$

where we have used Exercise 2.1 in Chapter 2 to replace $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma(u) \wedge T_n}$ by $\mathcal{F}_{\gamma(u)}$. To let $n \rightarrow \infty$ we note that the L^2 maximal inequality, the fact that $X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n}^2 - \langle X \rangle_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n}$ is a martingale, and the definition of $\gamma(v)$ imply

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_n X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n}^2 &\leq 4 \sup_n E X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n}^2 \\ &= 4 \sup_n E \langle X \rangle_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n} \leq 4v \end{aligned}$$

The last result and the dominated convergence theorem imply that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n} \rightarrow X_{\gamma(t)}$ in L^2 for $t = u, v$. Since conditional expectation is a contraction in L^2 , it follows that $E(X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_{\gamma(u)}) \rightarrow_2 E(X_{\gamma(v)} | \mathcal{F}_{\gamma(u)})$ in L^2 , and the proof is complete. \square

To complete the proof of (4.4) it now remains to show:

Lemma 4.6: $B_u^2 - u, \mathcal{F}_{\gamma(v)}$ is a local martingale.

Proof of (4.6): As in the proof of (4.5), the optional stopping theorem implies that if $u < v$ then

$$E(X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n}^2 - \langle X \rangle_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n} | \mathcal{F}_{\gamma(u)}) = X_{\gamma(u) \wedge T_n}^2 - \langle X \rangle_{\gamma(u) \wedge T_n}.$$

To let $n \rightarrow \infty$ we observe that since $(a + b)^2 \leq 2(a^2 + b^2)$, (3.4) and the definition of $\gamma(u)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_n \left(X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n}^2 - \langle X \rangle_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n} \right)^2 &\leq 2E \sup_n X_{\gamma(v) \wedge T_n}^4 + 2E \langle X \rangle_{\gamma(v)}^2 \\ &\leq CE \langle X \rangle_{\gamma(v)}^2 \leq Cv^2. \end{aligned}$$

The proof can now be completed as in (4.5) by using the dominated convergence theorem, and the fact that conditional expectation is a contraction in L^2 . \square

The next goal is to extend (4.4) to X_t with $P(\langle X \rangle_\infty < \infty) > 0$. In this case $X_{\gamma(u)}$ is a Brownian motion run for an amount of time $\langle X \rangle_\infty$. The first step in nailing this down is the following lemma:

Lemma 4.7: $\lim_{t \nearrow \infty} X_t$ exists almost surely on $\{\langle X \rangle_\infty < \infty\}$.

Proof: Let $T_n \equiv \inf\{t : \langle X \rangle_t \geq n\}$. By (3.7) in Chapter 2 it follows that

$$\langle X^{T_n} \rangle_t = \langle X \rangle_{t \wedge T_n} \leq n.$$

Using this with Exercise 4.3 in Chapter 2 we get $X(t \wedge T_n) \in \mathcal{M}^2$, so $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_{t \wedge T_n}$ exists almost surely and in L^2 . This shows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t$ exists almost surely on $\{T_n = \infty\} \supset \{\langle X \rangle_\infty < n\}$. Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ yields (4.7). \square

To prove the promised extension of (4.4), now let $\gamma(u) = \inf\{t : \langle X \rangle_t > u\}$ when $u < \langle X \rangle_\infty$, let $X_\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t$ on $\{\langle X \rangle_\infty < \infty\}$, let B_t be a Brownian motion which is independent of $\{X_t : t > 0\}$, and let

$$Y_u = \begin{cases} X_{\gamma(u)} & u < \langle X \rangle_\infty \\ X_\infty + B(u - \langle X \rangle_\infty) & u \geq \langle X \rangle_\infty. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 4.8: Y is a Brownian motion.

Proof: By (4.1) it suffices to show that Y_u and $Y_u^2 - u$ are local martingales with respect to the filtration $\sigma\{Y_t : t \leq u\}$. This holds on $[0, \langle X \rangle_\infty]$ for reasons indicated in the proof of (4.4). It holds on $[\langle X \rangle_\infty, \infty)$ because B is a Brownian motion independent of X . \square

One reason for interest in (4.8) is because it leads to a converse of (4.7).

Theorem 4.9: The following sets are equal almost surely:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \{\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_t \text{ exists}\} & B &= \{\sup_t |X_t| < \infty\} \\ A &= \{\langle X \rangle_\infty < \infty\} & B_+ &= \{\sup_t X_t < \infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Clearly, $C \subset B \subset B_+$. In section 3.1 we showed that Brownian motion has $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} = \infty$. This and (4.8) implies that $A^c \subset B_c^+$, or $B_+ \subset A$. Finally, (4.7) implies $A \subset C$. \square

The result in (4.8) can be used to justify the assertion we made at the beginning of Sections 2.6 that $\Pi_3(X)$ is the largest possible class of of integrands. Suppose $H \in \Pi$ and let $T = \sup\{t : \int_0^t H_s^2 d\langle X \rangle_s < \infty\}$. Now $(H \cdot X)_t$ can be defined for $t < T$ and has

$$\langle H \cdot X \rangle_t = \int_0^t H_s^2 d\langle X \rangle_s,$$

so on $\{\langle H \cdot X \rangle_T = \infty\} \supset \{T < \infty\}$ we have

$$\limsup_{t \nearrow T} (H \cdot X)_t = \infty, \quad \liminf_{t \nearrow T} (H \cdot X)_t = -\infty$$

and there is no reasonable way to continue to define $(H \cdot X)_t$ for $t \geq T$.

Convergence is not the only property of local martingales that can be studied using (4.9). Almost any almost-sure property concerning the Brownian path can be translated into a corresponding result for local martingales. This immediately gives us a number of theorems about the behavior of paths of local martingales. One example of this is:

Law of the Iterated Logarithm (4.10): Let $L(t) = \sqrt{2t \log \log t}$ for $t \geq e$. Then on $\{\langle X \rangle_\infty = \infty\}$,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{X_t}{L(\langle X \rangle_t)} = 1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Proof: This follows from (4.9) and the result for Brownian motion proved in Section 7.9 of Durrett (1995). \square

Exercise 4.2: Suppose $h : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable and locally bounded. Use (4.4) to generalize Exercise 6.7 in Chapter 2 and conclude that

$$X_t = \int_0^t h_s dB_s \sim N(0, \sigma_h^2(t)) \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma_h^2(t) \equiv \int_0^t h^2(s) ds.$$

2. Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequalities; Section 3.5

Let X_t be a local martingale with $X_0 = 0$ and let $X_t^* = \sup_{s \leq t} |X_s|$. This section is devoted to a proof of the following inequalities.

Theorem 5.1: Burkholder-Davis-Gundy For any $0 < p < \infty$ there are constants $0 < c, C < \infty$ so that

$$cE\langle X \rangle_t^{p/2} \leq E(X_t^*)^p \leq CE\langle X \rangle_t^{p/2}$$

Remark: This pair of inequalities should be contrasted with the L^p maximal inequality for martingales that holds only for $1 < p < \infty$:

$$E(X_t^*)^p \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1} \right)^p E|X_t|^p.$$

Lévy's theorem (4.4) tells us that any continuous local martingale is a time change of Brownian motion B_t , so it suffices to let $B_t^* = \sup_{s \leq t} |B_s|$ and prove the following theorem:

Theorem 5.2: For any $0 < p < \infty$ there are constants $0 < c, C < \infty$ so that for any stopping time τ

$$cE\tau^{p/2} \leq E(B_\tau^*)^p \leq CE\tau^{p/2}.$$

Proof of (5.2): The crux of the proof is the following pair of inequalities:

Lemma (5.3): Let $\beta > 1$ and $\delta > 0$. Then for any $\lambda > 0$:

(a) $P(B_\tau^* > \beta\lambda, \tau^{1/2} \leq \delta\lambda) \leq \frac{\delta^2}{(\beta-1)^2} P(B_\tau^* > \lambda).$

(b) $P(\tau^{1/2} > \beta\lambda, B_\tau^* \leq \delta\lambda) \leq \frac{\delta^2}{\beta^2-1} P(\tau^{1/2} > \lambda).$

3. Martingales adapted to Brownian Filtrations;

Section 3.6

Let $\{\mathcal{B}_t, t \geq 0\}$ be the filtration generated by a d -dimensional Brownian motion B_t with $B_0 = 0$, defined on some probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . In this section we will show:

- (i) all local martingales adapted to $\{\mathcal{B}_t, t \geq 0\}$ are continuous; and
- (ii) Every random variable $X \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\infty, P)$ can be written as a stochastic integral.

Theorem (6.1): All local martingales adapted to $\{\mathcal{B}_t, t \geq 0\}$ are continuous.

Let $B_t = (B_t^1, \dots, B_t^d)$ with $B_0 = 0$ and let $\{\mathcal{B}_t^i, t \geq 0\}$ be the filtrations generated by the coordinates.

Theorem (6.2): For any $X \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\infty, P)$ there are unique $H^i \in \Pi_2(B^i)$ with

$$X = EX + \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^\infty H_s^i dB_s^i \equiv EX + \int_0^\infty \underline{H}_s \cdot d\underline{B}_s.$$