

# A note on arbitrage, approximate arbitrage and the fundamental theorem of asset pricing

Claudio Fontana

► **To cite this version:**

Claudio Fontana. A note on arbitrage, approximate arbitrage and the fundamental theorem of asset pricing. [Research Report] RR-8292, INRIA. 2013. <hal-00818487>

**HAL Id: hal-00818487**

**<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-00818487>**

Submitted on 27 Apr 2013

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



# A note on arbitrage, approximate arbitrage and the fundamental theorem of asset pricing

Claudio Fontana

**RESEARCH  
REPORT**

**N° 8292**

April 2013

Project-Team MATHRISK





## A note on arbitrage, approximate arbitrage and the fundamental theorem of asset pricing

Claudio Fontana

Project-Team MATHRISK

Research Report n° 8292 — April 2013 — 10 pages

**Abstract:** We provide a critical analysis of the proof of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing given in the paper *Arbitrage and approximate arbitrage: the fundamental theorem of asset pricing* by B. Wong and C.C. Heyde (*Stochastics*, 2010) in the context of incomplete Itô-process models. We show that their approach can only work in the known case of a complete financial market and give an explicit counterexample.

**Key-words:** arbitrage; fundamental theorem of asset pricing; Itô-process; complete market; equivalent local martingale measure; martingale deflator

**RESEARCH CENTRE  
PARIS – ROCQUENCOURT**

Domaine de Voluceau, - Rocquencourt  
B.P. 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex

## Arbitrage, Arbitrage approché et théorème fondamental d'évaluation d'actifs

**Résumé :** On donne une analyse critique de la preuve du théorème fondamental d'évaluation d'actifs proposé dans le papier *Arbitrage and approximate arbitrage: the fundamental theorem of asset pricing* par B. Wong et C.C. Heyde (*Stochastics*, 2010) dans le cadre de modèles incomplets dirigés par des processus d'Itô. On démontre que la technique de Wong et Heyde n'est valide que dans le cas bien connu d'un marché complet et on exhibe un contre-exemple explicite.

**Mots-clés :** arbitrage; théorème fondamental d'évaluation; processus d'Itô; marché incomplet; mesure martingale équivalente; martingale deflator

## 1 Introduction

One of the central results of mathematical finance is the *Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing (FTAP)*, which, in the case of locally bounded processes, asserts the equivalence between the *No Free Lunch with Vanishing Risk (NFLVR)* condition (which is equivalent to the notion of *No Approximate Arbitrage* considered in [7, 10] and reinforces the classical *No Arbitrage* condition) and the existence of an *Equivalent Local Martingale Measure (ELMM)* with respect to which discounted asset prices are local martingales (see [1]). Passing from local martingales to  $\sigma$ -martingales, this fundamental result has been then extended to general semimartingales in [3].

Despite its importance, the proof of the FTAP given in [1, 3] for continuous-time models has not been successfully simplified during the last two decades. To the best of our knowledge, the only exceptions are the classical paper [7], where the FTAP is proved by relying on purely probabilistic arguments in the context of a complete Itô-process model, and the recent paper [8], where the author succeeds in presenting a more transparent proof of the FTAP for continuous semimartingales whose characteristics are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Recently, a probabilistic and simple proof of the FTAP in the context of general incomplete financial markets based on Itô-processes has been proposed by [10], thus extending considerably the analysis of [7]. It is well-known that the difficult step in the proof of the FTAP consists in showing that the absence of arbitrage (in the sense of NFLVR) implies the existence of an ELMM. The proof given in [10] relies on a general characterisation of attainable claims together with the closedness under pairwise maximisation of a family of stochastic exponentials (see [10], Sections 3-4).

In the present paper, we show that the approach adopted by [10] fails to provide a new proof of the FTAP. More specifically, we show that the closedness under maximisation of a family of stochastic exponentials claimed in [10] as well as the approach itself of [10] can only yield a proof of the FTAP in the context of complete financial markets, as already considered in [7]. Moreover, we provide an explicit counterexample showing that in general it is not possible to adapt the ideas of [10] in order to develop an alternative proof of the FTAP.

The paper is structured as follows. For the convenience of the reader, Section 2 recalls the financial market model considered in [10]. Section 3 critically analyses the proof of their main result, while Section 4 contains the counterexample. We refer to the survey paper [4] for the properties of general Itô-process models when the NFLVR condition does not necessarily hold.

## 2 The financial market model

On a given probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ , let the process  $W = \{W(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  be an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued Brownian motion, with  $T \in (0, \infty)$  denoting a fixed time horizon, and let  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  be the  $P$ -augmented natural filtration of  $W$ .

It is assumed that  $k+1$  (with  $k \leq d$ ) securities are available for trade, with prices represented by the  $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ -valued continuous semimartingale  $X = \{X(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ . As usual, the 0th security denotes a locally riskless savings account process:

$$X_0(t) = \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r(u) du \right\}, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T],$$

for a progressively measurable interest rate process  $r = \{r(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  satisfying the condition  $\int_0^T |r(t)| dt < \infty$   $P$ -a.s. The remaining  $k$  securities are risky and their prices  $X_1, \dots, X_k$  are

described by the solutions to the following SDEs, for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ :

$$\begin{cases} dX_i(t) = X_i(t) \mu_i(t) dt + X_i(t) \sum_{j=1}^d \sigma_{ij}(t) dW_j(t), \\ X_i(0) = x_i > 0, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mu = \{\mu(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued progressively measurable process such that  $\int_0^T \|\mu(t)\| dt < \infty$   $P$ -a.s. and  $\sigma = \{\sigma(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^{k \times d}$ -valued progressively measurable process satisfying  $\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^d \int_0^T \sigma_{ij}^2(t) dt < \infty$   $P$ -a.s. (note that the square is missing in [10]). These assumptions ensure the existence of a unique strong solution to the system of SDEs (1). Furthermore, as in [10], we suppose that the matrix  $\sigma(t)$  has ( $P$ -a.s.) full rank for every  $t \in [0, T]$ , meaning that the financial market does not contain redundant assets (see also [4], Remark 4.2.2)<sup>1</sup>.

**Definition 2.1.** A progressively measurable process  $\pi = \{\pi(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R}^k$  is said to be an admissible trading strategy if

$$\int_0^T |\pi(t)^\top (\mu(t) - r(t)I_k)| dt < \infty \quad P\text{-a.s.} \quad (2a)$$

$$\int_0^T \|\pi(t)^\top \sigma(t)\|^2 dt < \infty \quad P\text{-a.s.} \quad (2b)$$

and if the process  $\int_0^\cdot X_0(t)^{-1} \pi(t)^\top (\mu(t) - r(t)I_k) dt + \int_0^\cdot X_0(t)^{-1} \pi(t)^\top \sigma(t) dW(t)$  is  $P$ -a.s. uniformly bounded from below, with the superscript  $^\top$  denoting transposition and  $I_k := (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^k$ .

We denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the family of all admissible trading strategies. For  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$ , the term  $\pi_i(t)$  represents the amount of wealth invested on asset  $i$  at time  $t$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, k$  and  $t \in [0, T]$ . As usual, we assume that trading is done in a self-financing way. This amounts to requiring that the  $X_0$ -discounted wealth process  $\bar{V}^{x, \pi} = \{\bar{V}^{x, \pi}(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  associated to a strategy  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$ , starting from an initial endowment of  $x > 0$ , satisfies the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases} d\bar{V}^{x, \pi}(t) = X_0(t)^{-1} \pi(t)^\top (\mu(t) - r(t)I_k) dt + X_0(t)^{-1} \pi(t)^\top \sigma(t) dW(t), \\ \bar{V}^{x, \pi}(0) = x. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

In turn, for  $(\pi, x) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ , this implies that the undiscounted wealth process  $V^{x, \pi} = \{V^{x, \pi}(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  defined by  $V^{x, \pi}(t) := X_0(t) \bar{V}^{x, \pi}(t)$  satisfies  $V^{x, \pi}(0) = x$  and

$$dV^{x, \pi}(t) = r(t)V^{x, \pi}(t) dt + \pi(t)^\top (\mu(t) - r(t)I_k) dt + \pi(t)^\top \sigma(t) dW(t). \quad (4)$$

**Remark 2.2.** We want to point out that [10] do not impose the integrability condition (2a). If condition (6) holds, then (2a) follows from (2b), as can be verified by a simple application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (see e.g. [4], Lemma 4.3.21). However, condition (2a) is in general required in order to ensure that the  $dt$ -integrals appearing in (3) and (4) are  $P$ -a.s. finite.

<sup>1</sup>The assumption that  $\sigma(t)$  has  $P$ -a.s. full rank for every  $t \in [0, T]$  can be relaxed by only assuming that  $\mu(t) - r(t)I_k \in \{\sigma(t)x : x \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$   $P$ -a.s. for every  $t \in [0, T]$  (which corresponds to exclude pathological arbitrage possibilities known as *increasing profits*; see [4], Proposition 4.3.4), where  $I_k := (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , and by replacing  $\sigma(t)^\top (\sigma(t) \sigma(t)^\top)^{-1}$  with the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse of the matrix  $\sigma(t)$  in (5).

**Definition 2.3.** A trading strategy  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$  yields an arbitrage opportunity if  $P(V^{0,\pi}(T) \geq 0) = 1$  and  $P(V^{0,\pi}(T) > 0) > 0$ .

**Remark 2.4.** In Section 2 of [10], a trading strategy  $\pi$  is said to be *tame* if

$$P(\bar{V}^{x,\pi}(t) \geq -1; \forall t \in [0, T]) = 1.$$

As can be easily checked, there exist arbitrage opportunities with tame strategies if and only if there exist arbitrage opportunities with admissible strategies (in the sense of Definition 2.1 and according also to [1, 2, 3, 7]). Note, however, that the candidate arbitrage strategy given in the proof of Theorem 1.1 of [10] is not consistent with their definition of tame strategy.

### 3 An analysis of the main result of [10]

In this section, we critically analyse the proof of the FTAP given in [10]. We first show that stochastic exponentials do not possess the closure property stated in Lemma 3.3 of [10], except for the special case of a complete financial market.

#### 3.1 Market price of risk and martingale deflators

Since the matrix  $\sigma(t)$  is assumed to be of full rank for every  $t \in [0, T]$ , we can define the *market price of risk* process  $\theta = \{\theta(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  as follows, for all  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$\theta(t) := \sigma(t)^\top (\sigma(t) \sigma(t)^\top)^{-1} (\mu(t) - r(t)I_k). \tag{5}$$

As in Sections 3-4 of [10], we introduce the following standing assumption:

$$\int_0^T \|\theta(t)\|^2 dt < \infty \quad P\text{-a.s.} \tag{6}$$

Let us briefly comment on the implications of the above integrability condition.

**Definition 3.1.** A strictly positive local martingale  $Z = \{Z(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  with  $Z(0) = 1$  is said to be a martingale deflator if the product  $Z \bar{V}^{x,\pi}$  is a local martingale, for every  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $x > 0$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{D}$  the set of all martingale deflators.

As long as (6) holds, we can define the strictly positive continuous local martingale  $Z_0 = \{Z_0(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  as the stochastic exponential  $Z_0 := \mathcal{E}(-\int \theta dW)$ . A standard application of the integration by parts formula (see e.g. [4], Proposition 4.3.9), together with (3) and (5), yields that  $Z_0 \in \mathcal{D}$ , thus showing that  $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$  as soon as condition (6) holds.

The next result clarifies the importance of the class of stochastic exponentials studied in [10]. We denote by  $K(\sigma)$  the family of all  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued progressively measurable processes  $\nu = \{\nu(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  such that  $\int_0^T \|\nu(t)\|^2 dt < \infty$   $P$ -a.s. and  $\sigma(t)\nu(t) = 0$   $P$ -a.s. for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** A strictly positive local martingale  $Z = \{Z(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  with  $Z(0) = 1$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}$  if and only if there exists an  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued progressively measurable process  $\nu = \{\nu(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\} \in K(\sigma)$  such that, for all  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$Z(t) = \mathcal{E}\left(-\int (\theta + \nu) dW\right)_t = Z_0(t) \mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu dW\right)_t =: Z_\nu(t). \tag{7}$$

Moreover, an element  $Z \in \mathcal{D}$  is the density process of an ELMM if and only if it is a (uniformly integrable) martingale, i.e., if and only if  $E[Z(T)] = 1$ .



*Proof.* Recalling that the filtration  $\mathbb{F}$  is generated by  $W$ , the claim follows from the martingale representation theorem together with the integration by parts formula, using (3) and (5) (compare with [4], Lemma 4.3.15). The last assertion follows from Bayes' rule together with the supermartingale property of the positive local martingale  $Z_\nu$ , for every  $\nu \in K(\sigma)$ .  $\square$

In their study, [10] crucially rely on the following claim (see their Lemma 3.3): there exists a process  $\lambda = \{\lambda(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\} \in K(\sigma)$  such that

$$Z_\lambda(t) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} Z_\nu(t), \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T]. \quad (8)$$

Unfortunately, property (8) fails to hold, except for the trivial case  $K(\sigma) = \{0\}$ , which, in view of Proposition 3.2, is in turn equivalent to the case  $\mathcal{D} = \{Z_0\}$ . Indeed, in the proof of their Lemma 3.3, [10] attempt to show that the family  $\{Z_\nu(t) : \nu \in K(\sigma)\}$  is closed under pairwise maximisation, for every  $t \in [0, T]$ . However, this is not true, as we are now going to show.

Suppose that  $K(\sigma) \neq \{0\}$  and, for two distinct elements  $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in K(\sigma)$ , define the set  $\chi(t) := \{Z_{\nu_1}(t) \geq Z_{\nu_2}(t)\}$ , for every  $t \in [0, T]$ . Define then the process  $\nu_3 = \{\nu_3(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\} \in K(\sigma)$  as follows, for all  $t \in [0, T]$ :

$$\nu_3(t) := \nu_1(t) \mathbf{1}_{\chi(t)} + \nu_2(t) \mathbf{1}_{\chi(t)^c}.$$

It is clear that  $Z_{\nu_3}(0) = 1$  and, using the notation (7):

$$dZ_{\nu_3}(t) = -Z_{\nu_3}(t)(\theta(t) + \nu_3(t)) dW(t). \quad (9)$$

On the other hand, for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , we have:

$$Z_{\nu_1}(t) \vee Z_{\nu_2}(t) = Z_{\nu_1}(t) \mathbf{1}_{\chi(t)} + Z_{\nu_2}(t) \mathbf{1}_{\chi(t)^c} = Z_{\nu_1}(t) + (Z_{\nu_2}(t) - Z_{\nu_1}(t))^+. \quad (10)$$

By the Tanaka-Meyer formula (see [5], Section 4.1.8), we get the following dynamics:

$$d(Z_{\nu_2}(t) - Z_{\nu_1}(t))^+ = \mathbf{1}_{\{Z_{\nu_2}(t) > Z_{\nu_1}(t)\}} d(Z_{\nu_2}(t) - Z_{\nu_1}(t)) + \frac{1}{2} L_{\nu_1, \nu_2}^0(t) \quad (11)$$

where  $L_{\nu_1, \nu_2}^0 = \{L_{\nu_1, \nu_2}^0(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  denotes the local time of the continuous local martingale  $Z_{\nu_2} - Z_{\nu_1}$  at the level 0. From (10)-(11) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} d(Z_{\nu_1}(t) \vee Z_{\nu_2}(t)) &= -Z_{\nu_2}(t) \mathbf{1}_{\chi(t)^c} (\theta(t) + \nu_2(t)) dW(t) \\ &\quad - Z_{\nu_1}(t) \mathbf{1}_{\chi(t)} (\theta(t) + \nu_1(t)) dW(t) + \frac{1}{2} L_{\nu_1, \nu_2}^0(t) \\ &= -(Z_{\nu_1}(t) \vee Z_{\nu_2}(t)) (\theta(t) + \nu_3(t)) dW(t) + \frac{1}{2} L_{\nu_1, \nu_2}^0(t). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

By comparing (9) with (12), we immediately see that  $Z_{\nu_1}(t) \vee Z_{\nu_2}(t) \neq Z_{\nu_3}(t)$ , thus contradicting the claim on page 193 of [10]. Note also that, as a consequence of Skorohod's lemma (see [5], Lemma 4.1.7.1), the local time  $L_{\nu_1, \nu_2}^0$  vanishes if and only if  $Z_{\nu_1} = Z_{\nu_2}$ , i.e., if and only if  $\nu_1(t) = \nu_2(t)$   $P$ -a.s. for a.e.  $t \in [0, T]$ . This shows that the trivial case  $K(\sigma) = \{0\}$  is the only case where (8) can hold.

More generally, the non-existence of a process  $\lambda \in K(\sigma)$  satisfying (8) can also be deduced from the following (almost trivial) general result.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $M_i = \{M_i(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  be a right-continuous local martingale, for  $i = 1, 2$ , with  $M_1(0) = M_2(0)$   $P$ -a.s. Then  $M := M_1 \vee M_2$  is a local martingale if and only if  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are indistinguishable.*

*Proof.* If  $M$  is a local martingale, then the process  $N = \{N(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  defined by  $N(t) := M(t) - (M_1(t) + M_2(t))/2$ , for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , is a non-negative local martingale and, by Fatou's lemma, also a supermartingale. Since  $N(0) = 0$   $P$ -a.s., the supermartingale property implies  $N(t) = 0$   $P$ -a.s. for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , meaning that  $M_1(t) = M_2(t)$   $P$ -a.s. for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Right-continuity then implies that  $P(M_1(t) = M_2(t), \forall t \in [0, T]) = 1$ . The converse implication is evident.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** Besides the failure of the closedness under pairwise maximisation of the family  $\{Z_\nu(t) : \nu \in K(\sigma)\}$ , the proof of Lemma 3.3 of [10] suffers from an additional technical problem. Indeed, [10] define a process  $Z^* = \{Z^*(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  as  $Z^*(t) := \text{ess sup}_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} Z_\nu(t)$ , for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , and a sequence of  $[0, T]$ -valued random variables  $\{\tau_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  by  $\tau_k := \inf\{t \in [0, T] : Z^*(t) \geq k\} \wedge T$ , for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . However, nothing ensures that  $Z^*$  is right-continuous (or at least admits a right-continuous modification) and, hence,  $\tau_k$  can fail to be a stopping time.

### 3.2 Attainable claims and the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [10]

The proof of the FTAP given in [10] relies on the characterisation of attainable claims. Even though it is not explicitly pointed out by the authors, the definition of attainability adopted in Section 3 of [10] corresponds to the following definition, as can be readily verified by comparing Lemma 3.1 of [10] with (the proof of) Theorem 8.5 of [6]. We always suppose that the standing assumption (6) holds true.

**Definition 3.5.** An  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable positive random variable  $B$  is said to be attainable if there exist  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $x > 0$  such that  $V^{x,\pi}(T) = B$   $P$ -a.s. and if there exists a process  $Z_\nu \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $Z_\nu \bar{V}^{x,\pi}$  is a martingale.

As long as  $\mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$ , the following characterisation of attainability has been established in a general semimartingale setting in Theorem 3.2 of [9]. In particular, note that the existence of an ELMM is not necessarily assumed a priori.

**Proposition 3.6.** Let  $B$  be an  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable positive random variable. Then, under the standing assumption (6), the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $B$  is attainable;
- (ii)  $\exists \lambda \in K(\sigma)$  such that  $E[Z_\lambda(T)B/X_0(T)] = \sup_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} E[Z_\nu(T)B/X_0(T)]$ .

Moreover, the initial capital  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$  needed to replicate an attainable claim  $B$  is given by  $x = \sup_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} E[Z_\nu(T)B/X_0(T)]$ .

In Section 4 of [10], the implication (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) in Proposition 3.6, with  $B := X_0(T)$ , is used together with property (8) in order to get the existence of an element  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $V^{c,\pi}(T) = X_0(T)$   $P$ -a.s., starting from the initial investment  $c := E[Z_\lambda]$ . If there does not exist any ELMM, then  $c < 1$  (see Proposition 3.2) and the portfolio process  $V^{0,\pi} = \{V^{0,\pi}(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  defined as  $V^{0,\pi}(t) := V^{c,\pi}(t) - cX_0(t)$ , for all  $t \in [0, T]$ , realizes an arbitrage opportunity in the sense of Definition 2.3, since  $V^{0,\pi}(T) = (1 - c)X_0(T) > 0$   $P$ -a.s. This would prove that the absence of arbitrage opportunities (together with the standing assumption (6)) implies the existence of an ELMM. Unfortunately, the fact that (8) fails to hold, as shown in Section 3.1, invalidates the proof of the FTAP given in [10].

Actually, it can be shown that property (8) and, hence, the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [10], are valid if and only if the financial market is *complete*, in the sense that any  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable positive random variable is attainable. Indeed, if the financial market is

complete, the results of [9] imply that  $\mathcal{D} = \{Z_0\}$ . Due to Proposition 3.2, the latter property is equivalent to  $K(\sigma) = \{0\}$ , in which case property (8) trivially holds true. Conversely, if property (8) holds, then the implication  $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$  in Proposition 3.6 immediately shows that the financial market is complete. In particular, if the financial market is complete, the payoff  $X_0(T)$  can be replicated by a portfolio  $V^{c,\pi}$  with  $c = E[Z_0(T)]$  and  $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$ . In that case, the same arguments used in Section 4 of [10] allow to prove that the absence of arbitrage opportunities implies that  $Z_0$  is the density process of the (unique) ELMM. We have thus shown that the proof of the FTAP proposed by [10] only works in the context of complete financial markets.

We want to point out that, in view of the implication  $(ii) \Rightarrow (i)$  in Proposition 3.6, the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [10] does not actually need the full strength of the (untrue) property (8), but only the existence of a process  $\lambda \in K(\sigma)$  such that  $E[Z_\lambda(T)] = \sup_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} E[Z_\nu(T)]$ . However, the latter property does not necessarily hold in an incomplete market, as will be shown in Section 4 by means of an explicit counterexample. This means that the approach of [10] (or an extension thereof) cannot yield an alternative proof of the FTAP in the context of general incomplete financial markets.

## 4 A counterexample

This section exhibits a simple model of an incomplete financial market where the FTAP cannot be proved by relying on the techniques used in Section 4 of [10] (or an extension thereof). In view of the discussion at the end of the preceding section, we shall construct a market model for which there does not exist an element  $\lambda \in K(\sigma)$  such that  $E[Z_\lambda(T)] = \sup_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} E[Z_\nu(T)]$ . More precisely, we will show that  $E[Z_\nu(T)] < 1$  for all  $\nu \in K(\sigma)$ , while  $\sup_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} E[Z_\nu(T)] = 1$ .

Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P)$  be a given filtered probability space, where  $\mathbb{F}$  denotes the natural  $P$ -augmented filtration of a 1-dimensional Brownian motion  $W$ , with  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T$ . For a fixed constant  $a > 0$ , define the stopping time  $\tau := \inf\{t \in [0, T] : W(t) \geq a\} \wedge T$ . It is clear that  $P(\tau < T) > 0$ . Suppose that  $r \equiv 0$  and let the price process  $S$  of a single risky asset be given as the solution to the following SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dS(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}}(1/S(t)) dt + \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} dW(t), \\ S(0) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

**Lemma 4.1.** *The SDE (13) admits a unique  $P$ -a.s. strictly positive strong solution  $S = \{S(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ . Moreover,  $E[1/S(T)|\mathcal{F}_\tau] < 1$   $P$ -a.s. on  $\{\tau < T\}$ .*

*Proof.* Let us define the filtration  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}} = (\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  by  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_t := \mathcal{F}_{(\tau+t) \wedge T}$ , for  $t \in [0, T]$ , and the process  $\tilde{W} = \{\tilde{W}(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  by  $\tilde{W}(t) := W((\tau+t) \wedge T) - W(\tau)$ , for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Clearly, the process  $\tilde{W}$  is continuous,  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ -adapted and satisfies  $\tilde{W}(0) = 0$ . Furthermore, for  $s, t \in [0, T - \tau]$  with  $s \leq t$ , we have, for any  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$E\left[e^{iu(\tilde{W}(t) - \tilde{W}(s))} | \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_s\right] = E\left[e^{iu(W(\tau+t) - W(\tau+s))} | \mathcal{F}_{\tau+s}\right] = e^{-\frac{u^2}{2}(t-s)}$$

thus showing that  $\tilde{W}$  is an  $\tilde{\mathbb{F}}$ -Brownian motion (stopped at  $T - \tau$ ). On the filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \tilde{\mathbb{F}}, P)$ , let us consider the following SDE, for  $t \in [0, T - \tau]$ :

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{S}(t) = (1/\tilde{S}(t)) dt + d\tilde{W}(t), \\ \tilde{S}(0) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

The SDE (14) admits a unique strong solution  $\tilde{S} = \{\tilde{S}(t); 0 \leq t \leq T - \tau\}$ , known as the three-dimensional Bessel process (see [5], Section 6.1), satisfying  $\tilde{S}(t) > 0$   $P$ -a.s. for all  $t \in [0, T - \tau]$ .

We can then define a process  $S = \{S(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  by letting  $S(t) := \mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq \tau\}} + \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} \tilde{S}(t - \tau)$ , for all  $t \in [0, T]$ . Clearly, since  $\tau$  is an  $\mathbb{F}$ -stopping time, the process  $S$  is  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted,  $P$ -a.s. strictly positive and satisfies  $S(0) = 1$ . Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} dS(t) &= \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} d\tilde{S}(t - \tau) + \Delta \tilde{S}(t - \tau) d\mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} = \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} d\tilde{S}(t - \tau) \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} (1/\tilde{S}(t - \tau)) dt + \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} d\tilde{W}(t - \tau) = \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} (1/S(t)) dt + \mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}} dW(t) \end{aligned}$$

thus showing that the process  $S$  solves the SDE (13). The second assertion of the lemma can be proved as follows, on the set  $\{\tau < T\}$ :

$$E[1/S(T)|\mathcal{F}_\tau] = E[1/\tilde{S}(T - \tau)|\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0] = E[1/\tilde{S}(u)] \Big|_{u=T-\tau} = 2\Phi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-\tau}}\right) - 1 < 1 \quad (15)$$

where the second equality follows from the independence of  $\tilde{W}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0$ , together with the  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_0$ -measurability of  $\tau$ , and the third equality from Exercise 6.1.5.5 of [5], with  $\Phi(\cdot)$  denoting the distribution function of a standard Gaussian random variable.  $\square$

Using the notation introduced in Section 3.1, the market price of risk process  $\theta$  is given by  $\theta(t) = 1/S(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{t > \tau\}}$ , for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Due to the continuity of  $S$ , the standing assumption (6) is satisfied, and hence, by Itô's formula:

$$Z_0(T) = \exp\left(-\int_\tau^T \frac{1}{S(t)} dW(t) - \frac{1}{2} \int_\tau^T \frac{1}{S(t)^2} dt\right) = \frac{1}{S(T)}. \quad (16)$$

In the context of the present example, a real-valued progressively measurable process  $\nu = \{\nu(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$  belongs to  $K(\sigma)$  if and only if it satisfies  $\nu(t) = \nu(t)\mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq \tau\}}$   $P$ -a.s. for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $\int_0^\tau \nu(t)^2 dt < \infty$   $P$ -a.s. Proposition 3.2, Lemma 4.1 and equation (16) then imply the following, for every  $\nu \in K(\sigma)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E[Z_\nu(T)] &= E\left[Z_0(T) \mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu dW\right)_\tau\right] = E\left[E[Z_0(T)|\mathcal{F}_\tau] \mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu dW\right)_\tau\right] \\ &= E\left[E\left[\frac{1}{S(T)}\right] \mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu dW\right)_\tau\right] < E\left[\mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu dW\right)_\tau\right] \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the supermartingale property of  $\mathcal{E}(-\int \nu dW)$ , for any  $\nu \in K(\sigma)$ . Due to the last assertion of Proposition 3.2, this implies that the financial market model considered in this section does not admit any ELMM<sup>2</sup>.

Moreover, for the model (13) there does not exist an element  $\lambda \in K(\sigma)$  such that  $E[Z_\lambda(T)] = \sup_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} E[Z_\nu(T)]$ , as we are now going to show. For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $\nu_n := n\mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau]}$ . Clearly, we have  $\nu_n \in K(\sigma)$  and  $\mathcal{E}(-\int \nu_n dW)$  is a uniformly integrable martingale (stopped at  $\tau$ ), for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Hence, due to Proposition 3.2 and equations (15)-(16), we get, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} E[Z_{\nu_n}(T)] &= E\left[Z_0(T) \mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu_n dW\right)_\tau\right] = E\left[\frac{1}{S(T)} \mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu_n dW\right)_\tau\right] \\ &= E\left[\mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu_n dW\right)_\tau\right] + E\left[\mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu_n dW\right)_\tau \left(\frac{1}{S(T)} - 1\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}}\right] \\ &= 1 - 2E\left[\mathcal{E}\left(-\int \nu_n dW\right)_\tau \left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-\tau}}\right)\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}}\right] \\ &= 1 - 2E\left[\exp\left(-n\tau\left(\frac{a}{\tau} + \frac{n}{2}\right)\right) \left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-\tau}}\right)\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < T\}}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>2</sup>Models based on three-dimensional Bessel processes are classical examples of financial markets that allow for arbitrage opportunities, see for instance [2] and the example on page 59 of [4].

By dominated convergence, the last equality implies that:

$$1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} E[Z_{\nu_n}(T)] \leq \sup_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} E[Z_\nu(T)] \leq 1,$$

thus showing that  $\sup_{\nu \in K(\sigma)} E[Z_\nu(T)] = 1$  where, in particular, the supremum is not attained by any element  $\nu \in K(\sigma)$ .

## References

- [1] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer, *A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing*, *Mathematische Annalen* 300 (1994), pp. 464–520.
- [2] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer, *Arbitrage possibilities in Bessel processes and their relations to local martingales*, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 102 (1995), pp. 357–366.
- [3] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer, *The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes*, *Mathematische Annalen* 312 (1998), pp. 215–250.
- [4] C. Fontana and W.J. Runggaldier, *Diffusion-based models for financial markets without martingale measures*, in *Risk Measures and Attitudes*, F. Biagini, A. Richter and H. Schlesinger, eds., EAA Series, Springer, London, 2013, pp. 45–81.
- [5] M. Jeanblanc, M. Yor and M. Chesney, *Mathematical Methods for Financial Markets*, Springer, London, 2009.
- [6] I. Karatzas, J.P. Lehoczky, S.E. Shreve and G.-L. Xu, *Martingale and duality methods for utility maximization in an incomplete market*, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization* 29 (1991), pp. 702–730.
- [7] S. Levental and A.V. Skorohod, *A necessary and sufficient condition for absence of arbitrage with tame portfolios*, *Annals of Applied Probability* 5 (1995), pp. 906–925.
- [8] A. Lyasoff, *The two fundamental theorems of asset pricing for a class of continuous-time financial markets*, preprint (2012), to appear in *Mathematical Finance*.
- [9] C. Stricker and J.-A. Yan, *Some remarks on the optional decomposition theorem*, in *Séminaire de Probabilités XXXII*, J. Azéma, M. Emery, M. Ledoux and M. Yor, eds., *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* vol. 1686, Springer, Berlin - Heidelberg - New York, 1998, pp. 56–66.
- [10] B. Wong and C.C. Heyde, *Arbitrage and approximate arbitrage: the fundamental theorem of asset pricing*, *Stochastics* 82 (2010), pp. 189–200.



**RESEARCH CENTRE  
PARIS – ROCQUENCOURT**

Domaine de Voluceau, - Rocquencourt  
B.P. 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex

Publisher  
Inria  
Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt  
BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex  
[inria.fr](http://inria.fr)

ISSN 0249-6399