

# SÉMINAIRE DE PROBABILITÉS (STRASBOURG)

LESTER E. DUBINS

## **Paths of finitely additive brownian motion need not be bizarre**

*Séminaire de probabilités (Strasbourg)*, tome 33 (1999), p. 395-396

[<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=SPS\\_1999\\_\\_33\\_\\_395\\_0>](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=SPS_1999__33__395_0)

© Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1999, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives du séminaire de probabilités (Strasbourg) (<http://portail.mathdoc.fr/SemProba/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme  
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques  
<http://www.numdam.org/>

# PATHS OF FINITELY ADDITIVE BROWNIAN MOTION NEED NOT BE BIZARRE

by  
Lester E. Dubins

**Abstract.** Each stochastic process, in particular the Wiener process, has a finitely additive cousin whose paths are polynomials, and another cousin whose paths are step functions.

**Notation.**  $R$  is the real line;  $T$  is the half-ray of nonnegative moments of time; a path,  $w$ , is a mapping of  $T$  into  $R$ ;  $W$  is the set of paths;  $I$  is the identity map of  $W$  onto itself.

Plainly,  $I$  is essentially the same as the one-parameter family of evaluation maps,  $I(t)$  or  $I(t, \cdot)$ , defined for  $t$  in  $T$ , by  $I(t, w) = w(t)$ .

Of course, once  $W$ , the space of paths, is endowed with a sufficiently rich probability measure,  $I$  becomes a stochastic process. Probabilities in this note are not required to be countably additive; those on  $W$  are assumed to be defined (at least) on  $F$ , the set of finite-dimensional (Borel) subsets of  $W$ . As always, to a stochastic process,  $X$ , is associated its family  $J = J(X)$  of finite-dimensional joint distributions, one such distribution  $J(t)$  for each  $n$ -tuple  $t$  of distinct moments of time. Of course,  $J(X)$  is a consistent family, which has the usual meaning that, if  $t$  is a subsequence of  $t'$ , then  $J(t)$  is the  $t$ -marginal of  $J(t')$ .

**Definition.** Two stochastic processes are *cousins* if the  $J$  of one of the processes is the same as the  $J$  of the other process.

Of interest herein are those subsets  $H$  of  $W$  that satisfy:

Condition \*. Each stochastic process  $X$  has a cousin almost all of whose paths are in  $H$ .

Throughout this note,  $J$  designates a consistent family of finite-dimensional joint distributions, and a stochastic process  $X$  is a  $J$ -process if  $J(X) = J$ .

Record here the following alternative formulation of Condition \*.

Condition \*\*. For each  $J$ , there is a  $J$ -process almost all of whose paths are in  $H$ .

That \*\* suffices for \* is a triviality. That \* suffices for \*\* becomes a triviality once one recalls that, for each  $J$ , there is a  $J$ -process. So the conditions are equivalent.

As a preliminary to characterizing the  $H$  that satisfy Condition \*, introduce for each  $n$ -tuple  $t$  of distinct time-points,  $t = (t_1, \dots, t_n)$ , and each  $n$ -tuple  $x$  of possible positions,  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , the set  $S[t, x]$  of all paths  $w$  such that, for each  $i$  from 1 to  $n$ ,  $w(t_i)$  is  $x_i$ .

Condition \*\*\*.  $H$  has a nonempty intersection with each  $S[t, x]$ .

**Proposition 1.** A set  $H$  of paths satisfies Condition \* if and only if it satisfies Condition \*\*\*.

Proof. Suppose  $H$  satisfies  $*$ . Then, for each probability  $P$  on  $F$ , these three equivalent conditions hold: [i] There is a probability  $Q$  that agrees with  $P$  on  $F$  for which  $QH = 1$ ; [ii]  $H$  has outer  $P$ -probability 1; [iii] the inner  $P$ -probability of the complement of  $H$  is zero. As [iii] implies, for no finite-dimensional set  $S$  disjoint from  $H$  is  $P(S)$  strictly positive. A fortiori, for no such  $S$  does  $P(S) = 1$ . In particular, no  $S[t, x]$  disjoint from  $H$  has  $P$ -probability 1. This implies that there is no  $S[t, x]$  disjoint from  $H$ . For, as is easily verified, for each  $S[t, x]$  there is a  $P$  under which  $S[t, x]$  has probability 1. Consequently, each  $S[t, x]$  has nonempty intersection with  $H$ , or, what is the same thing,  $H$  satisfies  $***$ .

For the converse, suppose that  $H$  satisfies  $***$ , or equivalently, that no  $S[t, x]$  is included in the complement,  $H'$  of  $H$ . Surely then, no nonempty union of the  $S[t, x]$  is included in  $H'$ . Since, as is easily verified, each finite-dimensional set is such a union, no nonempty, finite-dimensional set is included in  $H'$ . Since the empty set is the only finite-dimensional set included in  $H'$ , the only finite-dimensional set that includes  $H$  is the complement of the empty set, namely,  $W$ . Now fix a consistent family  $J$ , and let  $P$  be the corresponding probability on  $F$ . For this  $P$ , as for all  $P$  on  $F$ , the outer  $P$ -probability of  $H$  is necessarily 1. Therefore,  $P$  has an extension that assigns probability 1 to  $H$ . Equivalently, there is a  $J$ -process, almost all of whose paths are in  $H$ . So  $H$  satisfies  $*$ . ■

A step function is one that, on each bounded time-interval, has only a finite number of values, each assumed on a finite union of intervals.

**Theorem 1.** *Each stochastic process, in particular the Wiener process, has a cousin almost all of whose paths are polynomials, another cousin almost all of whose paths are step functions that are continuous on the right (on the left), and a fourth cousin almost all of whose paths are continuous, piecewise-linear functions.*

Proof of Theorem 1. Plainly, each of the four sets of paths satisfies Condition  $***$ . Therefore, Proposition 1 applies. ■

**A remark** (informal). The (strong) Markov property need not be inherited by a cousin of a process, or, as is closely related, the existence of proper disintegrations (proper conditional distributions) of the future given the past need not transfer to the cousin. An example is provided by a cousin of Brownian Motion whose paths are polynomials. On the other hand, those properties are inheritable by those cousins of Brownian Motion whose paths are step functions, or piecewise-linear functions. Definition of proper, and of disintegration, may, amongst other places, be seen in the two references.

## References

- [1] David Blackwell and Lester Dubins. On existence and non-existence of proper, regular, conditional distributions. *Ann. Prob.* 3 (1975), 741–752.
- [2] Lester Dubins and Karel Prickry. On the existence of disintegrations. *Séminaire de Probabilités XXIX* (1995), 248–259.