

BÁLINT TÓTH:
LIMIT THEOREMS OF PROBABILITY THEORY
LECTURE NOTES

CONTENTS

Stationary sequences, ergodic theorems	p. 3
Convergence in distribution, weak convergence	p. 40
With bare hands	p. 51
Method of moments, method of characteristic functions	p. 70
Lindeberg's theorem with applications	p. 100
Stable distributions and stable limits	p. 116
Infinitely divisible distributions and Lévy processes	p. 162

I.
STATIONARY SEQUENCES, ERGODIC THEOREMS

STATIONARY SEQUENCES OF RANDOM VARIABLES

$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ a probability space

(S, \mathcal{S}) a measurable space

$\xi_j : \Omega \rightarrow S$ measurable functions, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ (or $j \in \mathbb{Z}$)

Definition. *The sequence of (S -valued) random variables ξ_j is **stationary** iff $(\forall k \in \mathbb{N})$ (or $(\forall k \in \mathbb{Z})$) and $(\forall l \geq 0)$:*

$$\text{distrib}(\xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_l) = \text{distrib}(\xi_k, \xi_{k+1}, \dots, \xi_{k+l})$$

Elementary remarks:

1. A stationary sequence $(\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ can always be embedded into a stationary sequence $(\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

2. If $(\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary sequence of (S, \mathcal{S}) -valued random variables, $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}})$ is another measurable space, $g : S^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \tilde{S}$ is measurable map, and

$$\tilde{\xi}_j := g(\dots, \xi_{j-1}, \xi_j, \xi_{j+1}, \dots)$$

Then: $(\tilde{\xi}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary sequence of $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}})$ -valued random variables

The **essential content** of ergodic theorems: **generalizations of the laws of large numbers**

If $(X_j)_{j=0}^{\infty}$ is a stationary sequence of \mathbb{R} -valued random variables, such that $\mathbf{E}(|X_j|) < \infty$, then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} X_j \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(X_1)$$

asymptotic time averages = state-space averages

- almost surely and in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ (Birkhoff, difficult)
- in $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$, (von Neumann, easier)

Examples of stationary sequences:

Ex 1: I.i.d. sequences:

$(\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ i.i.d. sequence of (S, \mathcal{S}) -valued random variables.

Ex 2: Finitely dependent sequences:

Let $(\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ i.i.d. sequence of (S, \mathcal{S}) -valued random variables, $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}})$ another measurable space, $m \geq 0$ (fixed), $g : S^{m+1} \rightarrow \tilde{S}$ measurable map. Then

$$\tilde{\xi}_j := g(\xi_j, \dots, \xi_{j+m})$$

is a $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{\mathcal{S}})$ -valued stationary sequence.

E.g. ξ_j i.i.d. Bernoulli, $\tilde{\xi}_j := \max\{\xi_j, \xi_{j+1}\}$.

Ex 3a,3b:

$(\xi_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ i.i.d. Bernoulli, $\mathbf{P}(\xi_j = 0) = 1/2 = \mathbf{P}(\xi_j = 1)$.

$$\zeta_j := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k-1} \xi_{j+k}$$

$$\eta_j := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{-k-1} \xi_{j-k}$$

Then:

$$\text{distrib}(\zeta_j) = \text{UNI}[0, 1] = \text{distrib}(\eta_j).$$

Remarks:

$$\zeta_{j+1} = \{2\zeta_j\} := 2\zeta_j - [2\zeta_j] \quad \text{deterministically!}$$

$(\eta_j)_{j \geq 0}$ is a Markov chain on $[0, 1]$.

Ex 4: Stationary Markov chains

Let S be a finite or countable state space, $P = (P_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha,\beta \in S}$ stochastic matrix, $\pi : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $\sum_{\alpha \in S} \pi(\alpha) = 1$ stationary for P :

$$\sum_{\alpha \in S} \pi(\alpha) P_{\alpha,\beta} = \pi(\beta).$$

$(\xi_j)_{j \geq 0}$ the stationary Markov chain:

$$\mathbf{P}(\xi_0 = \alpha_0, \xi_1 = \alpha_1, \dots, \xi_l = \alpha_l) = \pi(\alpha_0) P_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1} \cdots P_{\alpha_{l-1}, \alpha_l}$$

Ex 5:

Rotations of the circle: $S = [0, 1)$, $\mathcal{S} = \text{Borel}$, $\mathbf{P} = \text{Lebesgue}$.

$$\theta \in (0, 1) \text{ (fixed),} \quad \xi_j(\omega) := \{\omega + \theta\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Ex 6:

“Bernoulli shift”: (see also Ex 3a) $S = [0, 1)$, $\mathcal{S} = \text{Borel}$, $\mathbf{P} = \text{Lebesgue}$.

$$\xi_j(\omega) := \{2^j \omega\} = 2^j \omega - [2^j \omega], \quad j \geq 0$$

MEASURE PRESERVING TRANSFORMATIONS, DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ be a probability space. The $T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega$ measurable transformation is **measure preserving** if

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{F} : \quad \mathbf{P}(T^{-1}A) = \mathbf{P}(A)$$

We call $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ an **endomorphism** or a **dynamical system**. If T is a.s. invertible we call it an **automorphism**

Let (S, \mathcal{S}) be another measurable space and $g : \Omega \rightarrow S$ a measurable function. Then

$$\xi_j := g(T^j \omega)$$

is a stationary sequence of S -valued random variables.

Remark: Any stationary sequence of random variables can be realized this way!

(S, \mathcal{S}) measurable space, $(\xi_j)_{j=0}^{\infty}$ stationary sequence of S -valued random variables.

$$\Omega := S^{\mathbb{N}} = \{\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) : \omega_j \in S\}$$

$$\mathcal{F} := \sigma(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \dots)$$

\mathbf{P} = joint distribution of $(\xi_j)_{j=0}^{\infty}$

$$T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega, \quad (T\omega)_j = \omega_{j+1}$$

$$g : \Omega \rightarrow S, \quad g(\omega) := \omega_0$$

The invariant sigma-algebra, ergodicity:

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ be an endomorphism. Then

$$\mathcal{I} := \{A \in \mathcal{F} : \mathbf{P}(A \circ T^{-1}A) = 0\} \subset \mathcal{F}$$

is the **sub-sigma-algebra of invariant sets**.

Definition. The dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is **ergodic** iff the invariant sigma-algebra \mathcal{I} is trivial with respect to \mathbf{P} :

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{I} : \quad \mathbf{P}(A) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Equivalently: $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic iff for $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ measurable

$$\{f(T\omega) = f(\omega) \text{ a.s.}\} \Leftrightarrow \{f(\omega) = \text{const. a.s.}\}$$

Ex1: I.i.d. sequence: $(S, \mathcal{S}, \mathbf{P}_1)$ a probability space,

$$\Omega := S^{\mathbb{N}} = \{\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) : \omega_j \in S\}$$

$$\mathcal{F} := \sigma(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \dots)$$

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}_1 \times \mathbf{P}_1 \times \mathbf{P}_1 \times \dots$$

$$T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega, \quad (T\omega)_j = \omega_{j+1}$$

Theorem. *The endomorphism $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic.*

Proof. The **tail sigma-algebra** is

$$\mathcal{T} := \bigcap_n \sigma(\omega_n, \omega_{n+1}, \omega_{n+2}, \dots)$$

Fact: $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{T}$. Not very difficult.

Kolmogorov's 0-1 law: \mathcal{T} is \mathbf{P} -trivial. □

Ex 2, 3: Factors:

$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ and $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{T})$ dynamical systems, $\varphi : \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega}$ measurable, such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\varphi^{-1}(A)) = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}(A) \quad \forall A \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$$

$$\varphi \circ T = \tilde{T} \circ \varphi \quad \mathbf{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

then $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{T})$ is a **factor** of $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$.

Theorem. *If $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{T})$ is a factor of $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic then so is $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{T})$.*

Proof. Homework



Ex 4: Ergodic Markov chains:

The state space: (S, \mathcal{S}) finite or countable

The stochastic matrix $P = (P_{\alpha, \beta})_{\alpha, \beta \in S}$,

π probability measure on S , stationary for P : $\pi P = \pi$.

$$\Omega := S^{\mathbb{N}} = \{\omega = (\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots) : \omega_j \in S\}$$

$$\mathcal{F} := \sigma(\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \dots)$$

$$\mathbf{P}(\omega_0, \omega_1, \dots, \omega_l) = \pi(\omega_0) P_{\omega_0, \omega_1} \cdots P_{\omega_{l-1}, \omega_l}$$

$$T : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega, \quad (T\omega)_j = \omega_{j+1}$$

Theorem. *The dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic iff P is irreducible.*

Proof. : Proof of \Rightarrow : trivial

Proof of \Leftarrow : Denote $\mathcal{F}_n := \sigma(\omega_0, \dots, \omega_n)$ and let $A \in \mathcal{I}$.

Then $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_A | \mathcal{F}_n)$ is a bdd martingale w.r.t. the filtration \mathcal{F}_n and

$$\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_A | \mathcal{F}_n)(\omega) \stackrel{(1)}{=} \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_A \circ T^n | \mathcal{F}_n)(\omega) \stackrel{(2)}{=} h(\omega_n)$$

(1): due to invariance of A

(2): due to the Markov property

Due to the martingale convergence theorem

$$h(\omega_n) = \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_A | \mathcal{F}_n)(\omega) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbf{E}(\mathbf{1}_A | \mathcal{F}_\infty)(\omega) = \mathbf{1}_A(\omega)$$

This can hold only if $h \equiv \text{const.}$



Ex 5: Rotations of the circle:

$\Omega = [0, 1)$, $\mathcal{F} = \text{Borel}$, $\mathbf{P} = \text{Lebesgue}$, $T\omega := \{\omega + \theta\}$

Theorem. *The dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic iff θ is irrational.*

Proof. Fourier method: let $f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$.

$$f(\omega) \stackrel{L^2}{=} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} c_k e^{i2\pi k\omega}, \quad c_k = \int_0^1 e^{-i2\pi k\omega} f(\omega) d\omega$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \{f(\omega) = f(T\omega) \quad \text{a.s.}\} &\Leftrightarrow \{\forall k \in \mathbb{Z} : c_k (e^{i2\pi k\theta} - 1) = 0\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \theta \notin \mathbb{Q} : \quad c_k = \delta_{k,0} \\ \theta = \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q} : \quad c_k = c_k \mathbf{1}_{\{k=mq\}} \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

□

Ex 6: “Bernoulli shift”:

$\Omega = [0, 1)$, $\mathcal{F} = \text{Borel}$, $\mathbf{P} = \text{Lebesgue}$, $T\omega := \{2\omega\}$

Theorem. *The dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic.*

Proof. (See Ex1) Let $\tilde{\Omega} = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = \dots$, $\tilde{\mathbf{P}} = \left(\frac{1}{2} : \frac{1}{2}\right)$ -Bernoulli,
 $\tilde{T} = \text{left shift}$

$$\varphi : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \Omega \qquad \varphi(\tilde{\omega}) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{-j-1} \tilde{\omega}_j$$

$$\varphi^{-1} : \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\Omega} \qquad \varphi^{-1}(\omega)_j := [2^j \omega] \bmod 2$$

Then $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T) \xleftrightarrow{\varphi:1-1} (\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{T})$, and $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbf{P}}, \tilde{T})$ is ergodic, according to Ex1. □

Alternative proof: by Fourier method (Home work).

Ex 7: Algebraic automorphism of the 2-d torus:

$\Omega = [0, 1) \times [0, 1)$, $\mathcal{F} = \text{Borel}$, $\mathbf{P} = \text{Lebesgue}$,

$T(x, y) := (\{x + 2y\}, \{x + y\})$ (picture on blackboard)

Ex 8: The “Baker’s Transformation”:

$\Omega = [0, 1) \times [0, 1)$, $\mathcal{F} = \text{Borel}$, $\mathbf{P} = \text{Lebesgue}$,

$T(x, y) := (\{2x\}, \{2x + y/2\})$ (picture on blackboard)

In both examples:

Theorem. *The dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic.*

Proof 1. Fourier method

Proof 2. “Markov partition”



Ex 9: Statistical physics:

Ω = phase space of physical particle system,

\mathcal{F} = Borel,

\mathbf{P} = Liouville measure

= Lebesgue meas. restricted to manifold of conserved quantities,

$T_t :=$ Newtonian dynamical flow

Theorem (Liouville's theorem). *The dynamical flow $t \mapsto T_t$ conserves the measure. I.e. $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T_t)$ is a continuous time dynamical system.*

Ludwig Boltzmann's ergodic hypothesis: In physically relevant cases $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T_t)$ is ergodic.

Major open question! Answer known in very few cases.

KOOPMANISM AND VON NEUMANN'S (MEAN, L^2) ERGODIC THEOREM

$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$: dynamical system,

$\mathcal{F} \supset \mathcal{I}$: its invariant sigma-algebra,

$\mathcal{H} := L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$: Hilbert space of square integrable functions,

$\mathcal{K} := L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{I}, \mathbf{P}) = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : f(T\omega) = f(\omega) \text{ P-a.s.}\}$: subspace of T -invariant L^2 -functions.

Two linear operators:

$$\Pi : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}, \quad \Pi f(\omega) := \mathbf{E}(f | \mathcal{I})(\omega)$$

$$U : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}, \quad Uf(\omega) := f(T\omega)$$

Π is the orthogonal projection to the subspace \mathcal{K}

U is Koopman's representation of the action T .

$$\mathcal{K} = \text{Ker}(U - I) = \{f \in \mathcal{H} : Uf = f\}$$

Lemma. U is a (partial) isometry.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}(Uf, Ug) &= \int_{\Omega} \overline{f(T\omega)} g(T\omega) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{=} \int_{\Omega} \overline{f(\omega)} g(\omega) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) = (f, g)\end{aligned}$$

(1): due to invariance of the measure under the action T .



Remark: If T is a.s. invertible then U is unitary.

Theorem (von Neumann's mean ergodic theorem). *Let*

\mathcal{H} : *a separable Hilbert space,*

$U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$: *a (partial) isometry,*

$\mathcal{K} := \text{Ker}(U - I)$,

Π : *the orthogonal projection to the closed subspace \mathcal{K} .*

Then

$$\text{st-} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} U^j = \Pi,$$

That is,

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{H} : \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} U^j f - \Pi f \right\| = 0$$

Corollary. $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$: a dynamical system, \mathcal{I} : its invariant sigma-algebra.

If $f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j \omega) - \mathbf{E}(f | \mathcal{I})(\omega) \right|^2 d\mathbf{P}(\omega) = 0.$$

In particular, if $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic then

$$L^2\text{-}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j \omega) = \int_{\Omega} f d\mathbf{P}.$$

Proof. Proof of von Neumann's mean ergodic theorem:

$$\mathcal{H} \stackrel{(1)}{=} \overline{\text{Ran}(U - I)} \oplus \text{Ker}(U^* - I)$$

$$\stackrel{(2)}{=} \overline{\text{Ran}(U - I)} \oplus \text{Ker}(U - I)$$

(1): $\forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \mathcal{H} = \overline{\text{Ran}A} \oplus \text{Ker}A^*$

(2): Since $U \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is an isometry, $\text{Ker}(U^* - I) = \text{Ker}(U - I)$.
(Homework)

For $f \in \text{Ker}(U - I)$:

$$Uf = f = \Pi f \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} U^j f = \Pi f$$

For $f \in \overline{\text{Ran}(U - I)}$: $(\forall \varepsilon > 0) (\exists g, h \in \mathcal{H})$ such that

$$\|h\| < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad f = Ug - g + h.$$

Thus:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} U^j f = \frac{1}{n} (U^n g - g) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} U^j h$$

and hence

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} U^j f \right\| \leq \left(\frac{2}{n} + \varepsilon \right) \|g\|$$

□

BIRKHOFF'S "INDIVIDUAL" (POINTWISE, ALMOST SURE) ERGODIC THEOREM

Theorem (Birkhoff's individual ergodic theorem).

$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$: a dynamical system, \mathcal{I} : its invariant sigma-algebra.

If $f \in L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j \cdot) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(f | \mathcal{I})(\cdot)$$

\mathbf{P} -a.s. and in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$.

In particular, if $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P}, T)$ is ergodic then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j \cdot) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} f d\mathbf{P}$$

\mathbf{P} -a.s. and in $L^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$.

Proof. [Birkhoff 1931, Yosida & Kakutani 1939, Garsia 1965]

$$X_j = X_j(\omega) := f(T^j\omega), \quad X := X_0,$$

$$S_k = S_k(\omega) := \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j(\omega), \quad S_0 = 0,$$

$$M_k = M_k(\omega) := \max\{S_j(\omega) : j = 0, 1, \dots, k\}, \quad M_0 = 0.$$

Lemma (The maximal ergodic lemma).

$$\mathbf{E}\left(X \mathbf{1}_{\{M_k > 0\}} \right) \geq 0$$

Explicitly spelled out:

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{\{M_k(\omega) > 0\}} d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \geq 0$$

Mind the **strict inequality**: $M_k > 0$!

Proof of the maximal lemma (Garsia 1965)

$$\begin{aligned} X(\omega) &\stackrel{(1)}{=} \max\{S_j(\omega) : j = 1, \dots, k + 1\} - \max\{S_j(T\omega) : j = 0, \dots, k\} \\ &\geq \max\{S_j(\omega) : j = 1, \dots, k\} - \max\{S_j(T\omega) : j = 0, \dots, k\} \\ &= \max\{S_j(\omega) : j = 1, \dots, k\} - M_k(T\omega) \end{aligned}$$

(1): Since $S_{j+1}(\omega) = X(\omega) + S_j(T\omega)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots$.

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} X(\omega) \mathbf{1}_{\{M_k(\omega) > 0\}} d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\ & \geq \int_{\Omega} \left(\max\{S_j(\omega) : j = 1, \dots, k\} - M_k(T\omega) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{M_k(\omega) > 0\}} d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\ & \stackrel{(2)}{=} \int_{\Omega} \left(M_k(\omega) - M_k(T\omega) \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{M_k(\omega) > 0\}} d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \\ & \geq \int_{\Omega} \left(M_k(\omega) - M_k(T\omega) \right) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \stackrel{(3)}{=} 0. \end{aligned}$$

(2): Here we use the **strict** inequality $M_k > 0$.

(3): Due to invariance of the measure under the action T .

□

Proof of Birkhoff's theorem:

Without loss of generality assume $\mathbf{E}(f | \mathcal{I}) = 0$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and define

$$L(\omega) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{S_n(\omega)}{n}, \quad D^\varepsilon := \{\omega : L(\omega) > \varepsilon\} \in \mathcal{I},$$

$$X^\varepsilon(\omega) := (X(\omega) - \varepsilon) \mathbf{1}_{D^\varepsilon}(\omega), \quad S_k^\varepsilon(\omega) := \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} X_j^\varepsilon(\omega),$$

$$M_k^\varepsilon(\omega) := \max\{S_j^\varepsilon(\omega) : j = 0, \dots, k\}, \quad F^\varepsilon := \cup_k \{\omega : M_k^\varepsilon(\omega) > 0\}.$$

Note that

$$F^\varepsilon = \{\omega : \sup_k M_k^\varepsilon(\omega) > 0\} = \{\omega : \sup_k S_k^\varepsilon(\omega) > 0\} = D^\varepsilon$$

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \mathbf{E}\left(X^\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{\{M_n^\varepsilon > 0\}}\right) \stackrel{(2)}{\rightarrow} \mathbf{E}\left(X^\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{F^\varepsilon}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(3)}{=} \mathbf{E}\left(X^\varepsilon \mathbf{1}_{D^\varepsilon}\right) \stackrel{(4)}{=} \mathbf{E}\left((X - \varepsilon) \mathbf{1}_{D^\varepsilon}\right) \stackrel{(5)}{=} -\varepsilon \mathbf{P}\left(D^\varepsilon\right)
\end{aligned}$$

(1): due to the maximal lemma

(2): dominated convergence

(3): since $F^\varepsilon = D^\varepsilon$

(4): by definition of X^ε

(5): since $D^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathbf{E}(X | \mathcal{I}) = 0$.

It follows that $\forall \varepsilon > 0 : \mathbf{P}(D^\varepsilon) = 0$, and

$$\mathbf{P}(L > 0) = \mathbf{P}\left(\cup_{\varepsilon > 0} D^\varepsilon\right) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{P}(D^\varepsilon) = 0.$$

□

BACK TO THE EXAMPLES

Ex 1: I.i.d. sequence: X_j , i.i.d., $\mathbf{E}(|X_j|) < \infty$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} X_j \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(X_j)$$

Laws of large numbers.

Ex 2, 3: Factors: Laws of large numbers for factors of i.i.d. sequences.

Ex 4: Stationary denumerable Markov chains:

ξ_j : stationary MC on $S = \cup_m S^{(m)}$, ($S^{(m)}$ irred. comp.)

$$f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : \quad \sum_{\alpha \in S} \pi(\alpha) |f(\alpha)| < \infty$$

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(\xi_j) \rightarrow \sum_m \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_0 \in S^{(m)}\}} \frac{\sum_{\alpha \in S^{(m)}} \pi(\alpha) f(\alpha)}{\sum_{\alpha \in S^{(m)}} \pi(\alpha)}$$

Law of large numbers for MC

Ex 5: Rotations of the circle: $\theta \notin \mathbb{Q}$, $f \in L^1([0, 1), \mathcal{B}, d\omega)$:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(\cdot + j\theta) \rightarrow \int_0^1 f(\omega) d\omega, \quad \text{a.s. and in } L^1.$$

Remark: For $f := \mathbb{1}_{[a,b)}$ stronger:

$$\forall \omega \in [0, 1) : \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{[a,b)}(\omega + j\theta) \rightarrow b - a.$$

Proof: Homework.

A consequence:

Fix $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 9\}$. Then

$$\frac{\#\{m < n : 2^m = k \dots \text{ in dec.}\}}{n} \rightarrow \frac{\log(k+1) - \log k}{\log 10}$$

Proof. Let $\theta := \frac{\log 2}{\log 10} \notin \mathbb{Q}$.

$$\{2^m = k \dots \text{ in dec.}\} \Leftrightarrow \{\{m\theta\} \in A_k := [\log k / \log 10, \log(k+1) / \log 10)\}$$

□

Ex 6: Bernoulli shift:

$$\omega \in [0, 1), \quad \text{binary expansion:} \quad \omega = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \omega_j 2^{-j}$$

Theorem. For Lebesgue-a.e. $\omega \in [0, 1)$ any fixed $\{0, 1\}$ string $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_k)$ occurs with its natural proper density 2^{-k} .

I.e. “Almost all real numbers are **normal**.”

Statistical physics:

Ergodicity



{ time averages = phase space averages }

At the **heart** of statistical physics.

II.
CONVERGENCE IN DISTRIBUTION, WEAK CONVERGENCE

CONVERGENCE IN DISTRIBUTION, BASICS

(S, d) complete, separable metric space,

\mathcal{S} its Borel-sigma-algebra

e.g. \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{R}^n with Euclidean distance,

$C([0, 1])$, $C([0, \infty))$ with sup-norm distance

Definition. A probability measure ν on (S, \mathcal{S}) is *regular* if

$(\forall A \in \mathcal{S})$

$$\nu(A) = \sup\{\nu(K) : K \subseteq A, K \text{ compact}\}$$

$$= \inf\{\nu(O) : A \subseteq O, O \text{ open}\}$$

All measures considered will be assumed regular.

μ_n , $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and μ regular probability measures on (S, \mathcal{S}) .

Y_n , $n = 1, 2, \dots$ and Y S -valued r.v. with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(Y_n \in A) = \mu_n(A), \quad \mathbf{P}(Y \in A) = \mu(A), \quad A \in \mathcal{S}$$

not necessarily jointly defined.

Definition (Weak convergence of probability measures). $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$,
or $Y_n \Rightarrow Y$, iff $\forall f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous and bounded

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_S f d\mu_n = \int_S f d\mu, \quad \text{or} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(f(Y_n)) = \mathbf{E}(f(Y)).$$

Theorem (Equiv. characterizations, “portmanteau thm”). .

$(a) \equiv (b) \equiv (c) \equiv (d)$

(a)

$\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu.$

(b) $(\forall A \in \mathcal{S}), A$ open:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) \geq \mu(A).$$

(c) $(\forall A \in \mathcal{S}), A$ closed:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) \leq \mu(A).$$

(d) $(\forall A \in \mathcal{S}),$ such that $\mu(\partial A) = 0:$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(A) = \mu(A).$$

Proof. Probability 2.



THE SPECIAL CASE OF \mathbb{R} (OR \mathbb{R}^d)

The **distribution function** helps:

$$F_n(x) := \mathbf{P}(Y_n < x) = \mu_n((-\infty, x)),$$

$$F(x) := \mathbf{P}(Y < x) = \mu((-\infty, x)).$$

Theorem. $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ (also denoted $F_n \Rightarrow F$) iff

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F_n(x) = F(x), \quad \text{at all points of continuity of } F.$$

Proof. Probability 2.



EXAMPLES FOR WEAK CONVERGENCE

EX1: Convergence in probability (*Probability 2, Analysis*)— this is **NOT** the typical case: $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$

$Y_n, Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on the **same** probab. sp., $Y_n \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} Y$

EX2: Poisson approximation of binomial (*Probability 1*):

$$Y_n \sim \text{BIN}(p_n, n), \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} np_n = \lambda \in (0, \infty), \quad Y \sim \text{POI}(\lambda).$$

EX3: De Moivre's CLT (*Probability 1*):

$$\tilde{Y}_n \sim \text{BIN}(p, n), \quad Y_n := \frac{\tilde{Y}_n - pn}{\sqrt{p(1-p)n}}, \quad Y \sim N(0, 1).$$

EX4: De Moivre's-type CLT for gamma-distributions
(*Probability 2*):

$$\tilde{Y}_n \sim \text{GAM}(\lambda, n), \quad Y_n := \frac{\tilde{Y}_n - \lambda^{-1}n}{\sqrt{\lambda^{-1}n}}, \quad Y \sim N(0, 1).$$

EX5: General CLT for sums of i.i.d. r.v.-s (*Probability 2*) —
the **typical** case:

$$X_n \text{ i.i.d. r.v.-s,} \quad m := \mathbf{E}(X_j), \quad \sigma^2 := \mathbf{Var}(X_j),$$
$$Y_n := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n (X_j - m)}{\sigma\sqrt{n}}, \quad Y \sim N(0, 1)$$

TIGHTNESS

Definition. The sequence of probability measures μ_n on (S, \mathcal{S}) , or the sequence of S -valued random variables Y_n , is **tight**, if $(\forall \varepsilon > 0) (\exists K \in S)$ such that

$$(\forall n) : \quad \mu_n(S \setminus K) < \varepsilon,$$

or $\mathbf{P}(Y_n \notin K) < \varepsilon.$

In the $S = \mathbb{R}$ case $(\forall \varepsilon > 0) (\exists K < \infty)$ such that

$$(\forall n) : \quad \mu_n\left((-\infty, -K) \cup (K, \infty)\right) < \varepsilon,$$

or $\mathbf{P}(|Y_n| > K) < \varepsilon.$

Proposition. If $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu$ then the sequence μ_n is tight.

Proof. Easy, if S is locally compact!

Choose

$$\tilde{K} \in K \in S \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mu(S \setminus \tilde{K}) < \varepsilon/2$$

and

$$f : S \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad \text{cont., s.t.} \quad f|_{\tilde{K}} = 0, \quad f|_{S \setminus K} = 1.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(S \setminus K) &\leq \int_S f d\mu_n \leq \mu_n(S \setminus \tilde{K}) \\ &\quad \downarrow \\ \mu(S \setminus K) &\leq \int_S f d\mu \leq \mu(S \setminus \tilde{K}) < \varepsilon/2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(\exists n_0 < \infty)$ such that $(\forall n \geq n_0) : \mu_n(S \setminus K) < \varepsilon.$ □

Theorem (Helly's theorem). Let $\{\mu_n/F_n/Y_n\}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, be a *tight* sequence of {probability measures / probability distribution functions / random variables} on \mathbb{R} . Then one can extract a weakly convergent subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k}/F_{n_k}/Y_{n_k}\}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$:

$$\left\{ \mu_{n_k} \Rightarrow \mu \quad / \quad F_{n_k} \Rightarrow F \quad / \quad Y_{n_k} \Rightarrow Y \quad \right\} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Theorem (Prohorov's theorem). Let $\{\mu_n / Y_n\}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, be a *tight* sequence of {probability measures / random variables} on the complete separable metric space S . Then one can extract a weakly convergent subsequence $\{\mu_{n_k} / Y_{n_k}\}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots$:

$$\left\{ \mu_{n_k} \Rightarrow \mu \quad / \quad Y_{n_k} \Rightarrow Y \quad \right\} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

For proof of both Thms see: *Probability 2*.

METHODS FOR PROVING WEAK CONVERGENCE

General scheme:

- (1) prove **tightness**
- (2) prove **uniqueness** of possible limits
- (3) **identify** the limit

Methods:

(A) With bare hands

(e.g. De Moivre, Poisson, maxima of i.i.d.)

(B) Method of moments

(C) Method of characteristic functions

(e.g. Markov-Lévy CLT)

(D) Coupling

(E) Mixed methods

**III.
WITH BARE HANDS
(ARCSINE LAWS AND RELATED STUFF)**

X_n simple symmetric random walk on \mathbb{Z} ($d = 1!$):

$$X_0 = 0, \quad \mathbf{P}\left(X_{n+1} = i \pm 1 \mid X_n = i\right) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Some relevant random variables:

The maximum: $M_n := \max\{X_j : j \in [0, n]\},$

First hitting of $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$: $T_r := \inf\{n > 0 : X_n = r\},$

Return times $k \in \mathbb{N}$: $R_0 = 0, \quad R_{k+1} := \inf\{n > R_k : X_n = 0\},$

Local time at $0 \in \mathbb{Z}$: $L_n := \#\{j \in (0, n] : X_j = 0\},$

Last visit to $0 \in \mathbb{Z}$: $\lambda_n := \max\{j \in (0, n] : X_j = 0\},$

Time spent on \mathbb{Z}_+ : $\pi_n := \#\{j \in (0, n] : \frac{X_{j-1} + X_j}{2} > 0\}.$

Theorem (Limit theorem for the maximum).

(i) *Discrete, microscopic version: $0 \leq r \leq n$ fixed:*

$$\mathbf{P}(M_n = r) = \mathbf{P}(X_n = r) + \mathbf{P}(X_n = r + 1).$$

(ii) *Local limit theorem: $0 \leq u$ fixed, $1 \ll n$:*

$$n^{1/2} \mathbf{P}(M_n = \lfloor n^{1/2} u \rfloor) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} e^{-u^2/2} \mathbf{1}_{u>0} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$$

(iii) *Global (integrated) limit theorem: $0 \leq x$ fixed:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(n^{-1/2} M_n < x) &= \mathbf{1}_{x>0} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^x e^{-u^2/2} du \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{x>0} (2\Phi(x) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of part (i).

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(M_n \geq r) &= \mathbf{P}(M_n \geq r, X_n \neq r) + \mathbf{P}(M_n \geq r, X_n = r) \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} 2\mathbf{P}(M_n \geq r, X_n > r) + \mathbf{P}(M_n \geq r, X_n = r) \\ &= 2\mathbf{P}(X_n \geq r) - \mathbf{P}(X_n = r).\end{aligned}$$

*: due to the reflection principle.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(M_n = r) &= \mathbf{P}(M_n \geq r) - \mathbf{P}(M_n \geq r + 1) \\ &= 2\mathbf{P}(X_n \geq r) - 2\mathbf{P}(X_n \geq r + 1) - \\ &\quad -\mathbf{P}(X_n = r) + \mathbf{P}(X_n = r + 1) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(X_n = r) + \mathbf{P}(X_n = r + 1)\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of parts (ii) and (iii).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\left(M_n = \lfloor \sqrt{nu} \rfloor\right) &= \mathbf{P}\left(X_n = \lfloor \sqrt{nu} \rfloor\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(X_n = \lfloor \sqrt{nu} \rfloor + 1\right) \\ &\stackrel{**}{=} n^{-1/2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} e^{-u^2/2} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

******: due to **De Moivre**.

(iii) Integrated version follows from local version + Fatou + Riemannian integration.



Theorem (Limit theorem for the hitting times).

(i) *Discrete, microscopic version*: $0 < r \leq n$ fixed:

$$\mathbf{P}(T_r = n) = \frac{r}{n} \binom{n}{(n+r)/2} 2^{-n}$$

(ii) *Local limit theorem*: $0 < s$ fixed, $1 \ll r$:

$$r^2 \mathbf{P}(T_r = [r^2 s]) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} s^{-3/2} e^{-1/(2s)} \mathbf{1}_{s>0} + \mathcal{O}(r^{-1}).$$

(iii) *Global (integrated) limit theorem*: $0 < t$ fixed:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(r^{-2} T_r < t) &= \mathbf{1}_{t>0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^t s^{-3/2} e^{-1/(2s)} ds \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{t>0} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_{1/\sqrt{t}}^{\infty} e^{-u^2/2} du. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of part (i).

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(T_r = n) &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{P}\left(\left\{\max_{j \leq n-2} X_j \leq r-1\right\} \wedge \left\{X_{n-1} = r-1\right\}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{P}\left(X_{n-1} = r-1\right) - \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{P}\left(\left\{\max_{j \leq n-2} X_j \geq r\right\} \wedge \left\{X_{n-1} = r-1\right\}\right) \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{P}\left(X_{n-1} = r-1\right) - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{P}\left(X_{n-1} = r+1\right) \\ &= \frac{r}{n} \binom{n}{(n+r)/2} 2^{-n}\end{aligned}$$

*: due to the reflection principle. □

Proof of parts (ii) and (iii).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(T_r = [r^2 s]) &= \frac{r}{[r^2 s]} \binom{[r^2 s]}{([r^2 s] + r)/2} 2^{-[r^2 s]} \\ &\stackrel{**}{=} r^{-2} \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} s^{-3/2} e^{-1/(2s)} + \mathcal{O}(r^{-3}) \end{aligned}$$

******: due to **Stirling**.

(iii) Integrated version: local version + Fatou + Riemannian integration. □

Theorem (Limit theorem for the return times).

(i) *Discrete, microscopic version: $0 < k \leq n$ fixed:*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(R_k = k + n\right) = \frac{k}{n} \binom{n}{(n+k)/2} 2^{-n}$$

(ii) *Local limit theorem: $0 < s$ fixed:*

$$k^2 \mathbf{P}\left(R_k = [k^2 s]\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} s^{-3/2} e^{-1/(2s)} \mathbf{1}_{s>0} + \mathcal{O}(k^{-1}).$$

(ii) *Global (integrated) version: $0 < t$ fixed:*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(k^{-2} R_k < t\right) &= \mathbf{1}_{t>0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^t s^{-3/2} e^{-1/(2s)} ds. \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{t>0} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_{1/\sqrt{t}}^{\infty} e^{-u^2/2} du. \end{aligned}$$

Proof.

$$R_k \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} T_k + k.$$



Remarks on the last two limit theorems:

(1) I.i.d. sums:

$$T_r = \xi_1 + \xi_2 + \cdots + \xi_r, \quad R_k = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + \cdots + \zeta_k,$$

where ξ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots$ and ζ_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots$ are sequences of **i.i.d.** r.v.-s with

$$\xi_i \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} T_1, \quad \zeta_i \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} R_1 \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} T_1 + 1.$$

(2) Stability:

$$f_1(s) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} s^{-3/2} e^{-1/(2s)} \mathbb{1}_{s>0}, \quad f_a(s) := a f_1(as), \quad a > 0.$$

Then

$$f_a * f_b = f_{(\sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b})^2}$$

Homework.

Theorem (Limit theorem for the local time at zero.).
Global (integrated) version:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(n^{-1/2}L_n < t\right) = \mathbb{1}_{t>0} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^t e^{-u^2/2} du.$$

Proof.

$$\{L_n < k\} = \{R_k > n\}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(L_n < n^{1/2}t\right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(R_{n^{1/2}t} > n\right) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(R_m > m^2/t^2\right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \int_0^t e^{-u^2/2} du. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark: Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(n^{-1/2} |X_n| < u\right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(n^{-1/2} L_n < u\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(n^{-1/2} M_n < u\right)\end{aligned}$$

For a simple symmetric random walk X_n (on \mathbb{Z}) denote

$$u(n) := \mathbf{P}(X_n = 0) = \binom{n}{n/2} 2^{-n}$$

$$f(n) := \mathbf{P}(\min\{m \geq 1 : X_m = X_0\} = n)$$

Recall the identity:

$$u(n) = \sum_{m=0}^n f(m)u(n-m).$$

Theorem (Paul Lévy's arcsine theorem).

(i) *Discrete, microscopic version: $0 \leq k \leq n$:*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\lambda_{2n+1} = 2k\right) \stackrel{\checkmark}{=} \mathbf{P}\left(\lambda_{2n} = 2k\right) = u(2k)u(2n - 2k),$$

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\pi_{2n+1} \in \{2k, 2k + 1\}\right) \stackrel{\checkmark}{=} \mathbf{P}\left(\pi_{2n} = 2k\right) = u(2k)u(2n - 2k),$$

$$\left(\mathbf{P}\left(\lambda_{2n} = 2k + 1\right) \stackrel{\checkmark}{=} \mathbf{P}\left(\lambda_{2n+1} = 2k + 1\right) \stackrel{\checkmark}{=} \mathbf{P}\left(\pi_{2n} = 2k + 1\right) \stackrel{\checkmark}{=} 0\right)$$

(ii) *Local limit theorem: $y \in (0, 1)$ fixed $1 \ll n$:*

$$n\mathbf{P}\left(\lambda_{2n} = 2[ny]\right) = n\mathbf{P}\left(\pi_{2n} = 2[ny]\right) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{y(1-y)}} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$$

(ii) *Global (integrated) limit theorem: $x \in (0, 1)$ fixed*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(n^{-1}\lambda_n < x\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(n^{-1}\pi_n < x\right) = \mathbf{1}_{0 < x < 1} \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin \sqrt{x}.$$

Lemma.

$$\mathbf{P}\left(X_j \neq 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2n\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(X_{2n} = 0\right) =: u(2n).$$

Proof of the Lemma.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}\left(X_j \neq 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2n\right) &= 2\mathbf{P}\left(X_j > 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2n\right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\{X_j > 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2n - 1\} \wedge \{X_{2n} = 2r\}\right) \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} 2 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{P}\left(X_{2n-1} = 2r - 1\right) - \mathbf{P}\left(X_{2n-1} = 2r + 1\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbf{P}\left(X_{2n-1} = 1\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(X_{2n} = 0\right).\end{aligned}$$

*: due to the reflection principle. □

Proof of the Theorem

(i) For λ_n :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(\lambda_{2n} = 2k) &= \mathbf{P}(\{X_{2k}=0\} \wedge \{X_j \neq 0, j = 2k + 1, \dots, 2n\}) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(X_{2k}=0) \mathbf{P}(X_j \neq 0, j = 1, \dots, 2n - 2k) \\ &= u(2k)u(2n - 2k).\end{aligned}$$

For π_n by induction. Note that

$$\mathbf{P}(\pi_{2n} = 2k) = \mathbf{P}(\pi_{2n} = 2n - 2k).$$

For $k = 0$ or $k = n$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(\pi_{2n} = 0) &= \mathbf{P}(X_j \geq 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2n) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(X_j \geq 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2n - 1) \\ &= 2\mathbf{P}(X_j > 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, 2n) = u(2n)u(0)\end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$b(2n, 2k) := \mathbf{P}(\pi_{2n} = 2k) = b(2n, 2n - 2k)$$

For $1 \leq k \leq n$ there is a **first excursion** to the left or to the right:

$$b(2n, 2k) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^k f(2r) b(2n-2r, 2k-2r) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=1}^{n-k} f(2r) b(2n-2r, 2k)$$

By the induction assumption:

$$\begin{aligned} b(2n, 2k) &= \frac{1}{2} u(2n - 2k) \sum_{r=1}^k f(2r) u(2k - 2r) + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} u(2k) \sum_{r=1}^{n-k} f(2r) u(2n - 2k - 2r) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} u(2n - 2k) u(2k) + \frac{1}{2} u(2k) u(2n - 2k) = u(2k) u(2n - 2k) \end{aligned}$$

(ii)

$$u(2[ny])u(2[n(1-y)]) \stackrel{**}{=} n^{-1} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{y(1-y)}} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-3/2})$$

** : due to **Stirling**.

(iii) Integrated version: local version + Fatou + Riemannian integration.



IV.
THE METHOD OF MOMENTS AND
THE METHOD OF CHARACTERISTIC FUNCTIONS

**RECALL EVERYTHING
YOU LEARNT ABOUT
CHARACTERISTIC FUNCTIONS**

PROBABILITY II.

THE METHOD OF MOMENTS

Let X be a random variable, its **absolute moments** and its **moments** are assumed finite:

$$A_k := \mathbf{E}\left(|X|^k\right) < \infty, \quad M_k := \mathbf{E}\left(X^k\right)$$

Remark: In order that the sequences A_k and M_k be the sequences of (absolute) moments of a random variable X it must satisfy an **infinite set of** (Jensen-type) **inequalities**: in particular, if $k_1 + \cdots + k_m = k$, respectively, if $k_1 + \cdots + k_m = 2k$ then

$$\prod_{j=1}^m A_{k_j} \leq A_k, \quad \prod_{j=1}^m |M_{k_j}| \leq M_{2k},$$

The “Moment problem”: Given a sequence of moments M_k , does it determine **uniquely** the distribution of a random variable?

Theorem. *If M_k is a sequence of moments such that*

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{|M_k|}{k!} \right)^{1/k} := R^{-1} < \infty$$

then it determines a unique random variable X (or: probability distribution) such that $M_k = \mathbf{E}(X^k)$.

Proof. The power series of the characteristic function

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{M_k}{k!} (iu)^k$$

will have radius of convergence $R > 0$, and thus it will be uniquely determined. □

Examples: Compute all moments of all remarkable distributions.
Eg.

$$X \sim EXP(\lambda) : \quad M_k = A_k = \lambda^{-k} k!$$

$$X \sim N(0, \sigma) : \quad A_{2k} = \sigma^{2k} \frac{2k!}{2^k k!} = M_{2k},$$

$$A_{2k+1} = \sigma^{2k+1} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} 2^k k!, \quad M_{2k+1} = 0$$

A counterexample: the *log-normal* distribution (HW!).

Weak limit from convergence of moments:

Theorem. Let Z_n be a sequence of random variables which have all moments finite and denote

$$M_{n,k} := \mathbf{E}\left(Z_n^k\right).$$

If $(\forall k)$ the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_{n,k} =: M_k$ exists and the sequence of moments M_k determines uniquely a distribution/random variable Z , then $Z_n \Rightarrow Z$.

Remark: The sequence M_k is a sequence of moments.

Proof (1) Tightness:

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|Z_n| > K\right) \leq \frac{M_{n,2}}{K^2} \leq \frac{\sup_n M_{n,2}}{K^2}.$$

(2) Identification of the limit: Assume $Z_{n'} \Rightarrow \tilde{Z}$. For $K < \infty$ let $\varphi_K : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\varphi_K(x) := x \mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq K} + \operatorname{sgn}(x) K \mathbf{1}_{|x| > K}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(\tilde{Z}^k) &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(\varphi_K(\tilde{Z})^k) \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(\varphi_K(Z_{n'})^k) && \text{(due to weak cvg.)} \\ &= \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \left(\mathbf{E}(Z_{n'}^k) - \mathbf{E}(Z_{n'}^k - \varphi_K(Z_{n'})^k) \right) \\ &= \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} M_{n',k} - \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(Z_{n'}^k - \varphi_K(Z_{n'})^k) \end{aligned}$$

But:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbf{E} \left(Z_{n'}^k - \varphi_K(Z_{n'})^k \right) \right| &\leq \mathbf{E} \left(\left| Z_{n'} \right|^k \mathbf{1}_{\left| Z_{n'} \right| > K} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \sqrt{M_{n',2k}} \sqrt{\mathbf{P} \left(\left| Z_{n'} \right| > K \right)} \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\leq} \frac{\sqrt{M_{n',2k}} \sqrt{M_{n',2}}}{K} \end{aligned}$$

(1): due to Schwarz's inequality

(2): due to Markov's inequality

Altogether:

$$\mathbf{E} \left(\tilde{Z}^k \right) = M_k.$$



Appl 1: CLT with the method of moments: Sheds light on the *combinatorial aspects* of the CLT. Let ξ_j be i.i.d. with all moments finite, $\mathbf{E}(\xi_j^k) =: m_k$, $m_1 = 0$, $m_2 =: \sigma^2$,

$$Z_n := \frac{\xi_1 + \cdots + \xi_n}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Then, with fixed k :

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_n^{2k}) = n^{-k} \binom{n}{k} \sigma^{2k} \frac{2k!}{2^k} + o(1) \rightarrow \sigma^{2k} \frac{2k!}{2^k k!},$$

$$\mathbf{E}(Z_n^{2k+1}) = o(1) \rightarrow 0,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (with k fixed).

THE METHOD OF CHARACTERISTIC FUNCTIONS (Repeat from Probability II.)

Theorem. Let Z_n be a sequence of random variables and $\varphi_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ their characteristic functions,

$$\varphi_n(u) := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp(iuZ_n)\right).$$

If

$$(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_n(u) = \varphi(u) \quad (\text{pointwise!})$$

and $u \mapsto \varphi(u)$ is continuous at $u = 0$, then φ is characteristic function of a random variable Z and $Z_n \Rightarrow Z$.

Proof:

(1) Tightness:

Lemma (Paul Lévy). Let Y be a random variable and $\psi(u) := \mathbf{E}(\exp(iuY))$ its characteristic function. Then for any $K < \infty$

$$\mathbf{P}(|Y| > K) \leq \frac{K}{2} \int_{-2/K}^{2/K} (1 - \psi(u)) du.$$

Proof of the Lemma:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K}{2} \int_{-2/K}^{2/K} (1 - \psi(u)) du &= \frac{K}{2} \int_{-2/K}^{2/K} \mathbf{E}(1 - e^{iuY}) du \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{=} 2\mathbf{E}\left(1 - \frac{\sin(2Y/K)}{2Y/K}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\geq} 2\mathbf{E}\left(\left(1 - \frac{\sin(2Y/K)}{2Y/K}\right) \mathbf{1}_{|Y|>K}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(3)}{\geq} 2\mathbf{E}\left(\left(1 - \frac{K}{2|Y|}\right) \mathbf{1}_{|Y|>K}\right) \\ &\geq \mathbf{P}(|Y| > K). \end{aligned}$$

(1): Fubini,

(2): $|\sin \alpha / \alpha| \leq 1$,

(3): $\sin \alpha / \alpha \leq 1 / |\alpha|$.

□

Proof of the Theorem continued:

From continuity of $u \mapsto \varphi(u)$ at $u = 0$:

$$(\exists K < \infty) : \quad \frac{K}{2} \int_{-2/K}^{2/K} (1 - \varphi(u)) du < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

From pointwise convergence (and uniform boundedness of φ_n)

$$(\exists n_0 < \infty) : \quad (\forall n \geq n_0) : \quad \frac{K}{2} \int_{-2/K}^{2/K} (1 - \varphi_n(u)) du < \varepsilon.$$

Hence tightness, by the Lemma.

(2) Identification of the limit: Assume $Z_{n'} \Rightarrow \tilde{Z}$, then

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\exp(iu\tilde{Z})\right) = \lim_{n' \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}\left(\exp(iuZ_{n'})\right) = \varphi(u).$$

□

ERDŐS-KAC THEOREM: CLT FOR NUMBER OF PRIME DIVISORS (a mixture of the method of characteristic functions and method of moments)

Denote by \mathbb{P} the set of primes and

$$g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, \quad g(m) := \#\{p \in \mathbb{P} : p \mid m\}.$$

Theorem (Paul Erdős & Marc Kac, 1940).

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \#\left\{m \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} : \frac{g(m) - \log \log n}{\sqrt{\log \log n}} < x\right\} = \int_{-\infty}^x \frac{e^{-y^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} dy.$$

Probabilistic setup: Let ω_n be randomly sampled from $(\{1, 2, \dots, n\}, UNI)$ and $Z_n := g(\omega_n)$. Then

$$\frac{Z_n - \log \log n}{\sqrt{\log \log n}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1).$$

Proof:

We will use

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}: p \leq n} \frac{1}{p} = \log \log n + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Define the random variables $Y_{n,p}$, $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

$$Y_{n,p} := \mathbb{1}_{p|\omega_n}, \quad \text{where } \omega_n \sim \text{UNI}(\{1, 2, \dots, n\}).$$

Mind that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed $(Y_{n,p})_{p \in \mathbb{P}}$ are **jointly defined**.

Then

$$Z_n = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} Y_{n,p}.$$

Note that for any $k < \infty$ and $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k \in \mathbb{P}$ fixed

$$(Y_{n,p_1}, Y_{n,p_2}, \dots, Y_{n,p_k}) \Rightarrow (X_{p_1}, X_{p_2}, \dots, X_{p_k})$$

where X_p , $p \in \mathbb{P}$, are (jointly defined) *independent* random variables with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(X_p = 1) = \frac{1}{p} = 1 - \mathbf{P}(X_p = 0).$$

How to **guess** the result? Let

$$\alpha_n \rightarrow \infty, \quad S_n := \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}: p \leq \alpha_n} X_p.$$

Then

$$S_n^* := \frac{S_n - \log \log \alpha_n}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1).$$

Note that

$$\frac{S_n - \log \log \alpha_n}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}} = \frac{S_n - \mathbf{E}(S_n)}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}} + \frac{\mathbf{E}(S_n) - \log \log \alpha_n}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}}$$

and

$$\frac{\mathbf{E}(S_n) - \log \log \alpha_n}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}} = \frac{\log \log \log \alpha_n + \mathcal{O}(1)}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}} \rightarrow 0$$

The weak convergence

$$\frac{S_n - \mathbf{E}(S_n)}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

is proved with method of characteristic functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left(\exp(iuS_n^*)\right) &= \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}: p \leq \alpha_n} \left(\frac{1}{p} \exp\left\{\frac{iu(p-1)/p}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}}\right\} + \frac{p-1}{p} \exp\left\{\frac{-iu/p}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}}\right\} \right) \\ &\rightarrow \exp\{-u^2/2\} \qquad \text{HW!} \end{aligned}$$

Let:

$$\alpha_n := n^{1/\log \log n}$$

$$\log \alpha_n = \frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$$

$$\log \log \alpha_n = \log \log n - \log \log \log n.$$

Note that

$$(1): \quad (\forall \varepsilon > 0) : \alpha_n = o(n^\varepsilon),$$

$$(2): \quad \sum_{\alpha_n < p \leq n} \frac{1}{p} = \log \log \log n + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Let

$$S_n := \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}: p \leq \alpha_n} X_p,$$

$$S_n^* := \frac{S_n - \log \log \alpha_n}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}}$$

$$T_n := \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}: p \leq \alpha_n} Y_{n,p},$$

$$T_n^* := \frac{T_n - \log \log \alpha_n}{\sqrt{\log \log \alpha_n}}$$

$$Z_n := \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}: p \leq n} Y_{n,p} = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} Y_{n,p},$$

$$Z_n^* := \frac{Z_n - \log \log n}{\sqrt{\log \log n}}$$

We know that $S_n^* \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$ and we want to prove $Z_n^* \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$.

Step 1.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\left(|Z_n - T_n|\right) &= \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}: \alpha_n < p \leq n} \mathbf{E}\left(Y_{n,p}\right) \leq \sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}: \alpha_n < p \leq n} \frac{1}{p} \\ &= \log \log \log n + \mathcal{O}(1) = o(\sqrt{\log \log n})\end{aligned}$$

$$|\log \log n - \log \log \alpha_n| = \log \log \log n + \mathcal{O}(1) = o(\sqrt{\log \log n})$$

Hence

$$|T_n^* - Z_n^*| \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0.$$

Step 2. We prove $T_n^* \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$ with method of moments.

By computation:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(S_n^k) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-y^2/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} y^k dy =: M_k. \quad \text{HW!}$$

For $1 < p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_l \leq \alpha_n$ and $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l \geq 1$:

$$\mathbf{E}(X_{p_1}^{k_1} X_{p_2}^{k_2} \dots X_{p_l}^{k_l}) = \mathbf{E}(X_{p_1} X_{p_2} \dots X_{p_l}) = \frac{1}{p_1 p_2 \dots p_l}$$

$$\mathbf{E}(Y_{n,p_1}^{k_1} Y_{n,p_2}^{k_2} \dots Y_{n,p_l}^{k_l}) = \mathbf{E}(Y_{n,p_1} Y_{n,p_2} \dots Y_{n,p_l}) = \frac{1}{n} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \dots p_l} \right\rfloor.$$

Hence:

$$\left| \mathbf{E} \left(X_{p_1}^{k_1} X_{p_2}^{k_2} \cdots X_{p_l}^{k_l} \right) - \mathbf{E} \left(Y_{n,p_1}^{k_1} Y_{n,p_2}^{k_2} \cdots Y_{n,p_l}^{k_l} \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

Using this and

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_N)^k &= \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^N \sum_{\substack{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l \geq 1 \\ k_1 + k_2 + \cdots + k_l = k}} \sum_{1 \leq m_1 < m_2 < \cdots < m_l \leq N} C(l; k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l) x_{m_1}^{k_1} x_{m_2}^{k_2} \cdots x_{m_l}^{k_l} \end{aligned}$$

we readily obtain

$$\left| \mathbf{E} \left(S_n^k \right) - \mathbf{E} \left(T_n^k \right) \right| \leq \frac{\alpha_n^k}{n} = o(1)$$

and thus

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(T_n^k) = M_k.$$

Hence:

$$T_n^* \Rightarrow N(0, 1),$$

which together with “Step 1” implies

$$Z_n^* \Rightarrow N(0, 1),$$



LIMIT THEOREM FOR THE COUPON COLLECTOR

(mixture of “bare hands” and characteristic/generating function method)

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\xi_{n,k}$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ be independent geometrically distributed random variables with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_{n,k} = m\right) = \left(\frac{k}{n}\right)^m \frac{n-k}{n}, \quad m = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

and

$$V_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \xi_{n,k}$$

Then

$$\mathbf{E}(\xi_{n,k}) = \frac{k}{n-k},$$

$$\mathbf{Var}(\xi_{n,k}) = \frac{nk}{(n-k)^2}$$

$$\mathbf{E}(V_n) = n \log n + \mathcal{O}(n), \quad \mathbf{Var}(V_n) = \frac{\pi^2}{6}n^2 + \mathcal{O}(n \log n).$$

Theorem.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\frac{V_n - n \log n}{n} < x \right) = \exp\{-e^{-x}\}.$$

Remark: The (two-parameter family of) distributions

$$F_{a,b}(x) := \exp\{-e^{-ax+b}\}, \quad a \in \mathbb{R}_+, b \in \mathbb{R},$$

$$f_{a,b}(x) := \frac{d}{dx} F_{a,b}(x) = a \exp\{-e^{-ax+b} - ax + b\}$$

are called **Type-1 Gumbel distributions** and appear in extreme value theory.

Proof: Let $\zeta_{n,k} := \xi_{n,n-k}$, $k = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$Z_n := \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\frac{\zeta_{n,k}}{n} - \frac{1}{k} \right) = \frac{V_n - n \log n}{n} - \gamma + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}).$$

where γ is **Euler's constant**

$$\gamma := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n k^{-1} - \log n \right) \approx 0.5772 \dots$$

Lemma. Let $p_n \searrow 0$ so that $np_n \rightarrow \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and ζ_n be a sequence of geometrically distributed random variables with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(\zeta_n = r) = (1 - p_n)^r p_n.$$

Then $\zeta_n/n \Rightarrow EXP(\lambda)$.

Proof. Straightforward elementary computation. □

Thus

$$\left(\frac{\zeta_{n,1}}{n}, \frac{\zeta_{n,2}}{n}, \dots \right) \Rightarrow (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots)$$

where ζ_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots$ are independent $EXP(k)$ -distributed,

$$\mathbf{E}(\zeta_k) = \frac{1}{k}, \quad \mathbf{Var}(\zeta_k) = \frac{1}{k^2}, \quad \tilde{\zeta}_k := \zeta_k - \mathbf{E}(\zeta_k).$$

It follows that

$$Z_n \Rightarrow Z := \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^K \tilde{\zeta}_k$$

Note that the limit defining Z exists a.s. due to Kolmogorov's inequality (see Probability II.)

Computing the distribution of Z : Let $\Phi : (-1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the moment generating function (Laplace transform) of Z :

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(u) &:= \mathbf{E}\left(\exp(-uZ)\right) = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}\left(\exp(-u\tilde{\zeta}_k)\right) = \dots \\ &= \exp \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\log \frac{k}{k+u} + \frac{u}{k}\right)\end{aligned}$$

(Mind that the sum is absolutely convergent!)

Analiticity of $(-1, \infty) \ni u \mapsto \Phi(u)$ and the identities

$$\Phi(0) = 1, \quad \Phi(u+1) = e^{\gamma}(u+1)\Phi(u) \quad \text{HW!}$$

determine

$$\Phi(u) = e^{\gamma u} \Gamma(u+1).$$

On the other hand:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-uy} d \exp\{-e^{-(y+\gamma)}\} &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-uy} \exp\{-e^{-(y+\gamma)}\} e^{-(y+\gamma)} dy \\ &= e^{\gamma u} \int_0^{\infty} z^u e^{-z} dz \\ &= e^{\gamma u} \Gamma(u+1).\end{aligned}$$



V.
LINDBERBERG'S THEOREM
AND ITS APPLICATIONS

TRIANGULAR ARRAYS OF RANDOM VARIABLES:

Let $N_n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N_n = \infty$ and

$$\xi_{n,k}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, N_n, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

random variables. Explicitly:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \xi_{1,1}, & \dots, & \xi_{1,N_1} & & & \\ \xi_{2,1}, & \xi_{2,2}, & \dots, & \xi_{2,N_2} & & \\ \xi_{3,1}, & \xi_{3,2}, & \xi_{3,3}, & \dots, & \xi_{3,N_3} & \\ \dots, & \dots, & \dots, & \dots, & \dots & \dots \\ \xi_{n,1}, & \xi_{n,2}, & \xi_{n,3}, & \xi_{n,4}, & \xi_{n,5}, & \dots, & \xi_{n,N_n} \\ \dots, & \dots, & \dots, & \dots, & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{array}$$

which are **row-wise independent**. (Different rows are not even jointly defined.)

Assume:

$$\mathbf{E}(\xi_{n,k}) = 0, \quad \mathbf{Var}(\xi_{n,k}) =: \sigma_{n,k}^2 < \infty$$

and denote their characteristic functions

$$\varphi_{n,k}(u) := \mathbf{E}(\exp\{iu\xi_{n,k}\}).$$

Let

$$S_n := \xi_{n,1} + \xi_{n,2} + \cdots + \xi_{n,N_n}.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{E}(S_n) = 0,$$

$$\mathbf{Var}(S_n) = \sigma_{n,1}^2 + \sigma_{n,2}^2 + \cdots + \sigma_{n,N_n}^2 =: \sigma_n^2$$

Question: CLT for $\frac{S_n}{\sigma_n}$?

Theorem (Lindeberg, 1922). *If* $(\forall \varepsilon > 0)$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \mathbf{E} \left(|\xi_{n,k}|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{n,k}| > \varepsilon \sigma_n} \right) = 0 \quad (***)$$

then

$$\frac{S_n}{\sigma_n} \Rightarrow N(0, 1).$$

Comments, remarks:

(1) Condition (***) is **Lindeberg's condition**.

(2) W.l.o.g we may assume $(\forall n) : \sigma_n = 1$.

(3) The “meaning” of Lindeberg's condition:

“All components $\xi_{n,k}$ are negligibly tiny compared with S_n .”

In particular it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{1 \leq k \leq N_n} \frac{\sigma_{n,k}^2}{\sigma_n^2} = 0. \quad (*)$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{n,k}^2 &= \mathbf{E}\left(\xi_{n,k}^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{n,k}| \leq \varepsilon \sigma_n}\right) + \mathbf{E}\left(\xi_{n,k}^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{n,k}| > \varepsilon \sigma_n}\right) \\ &\leq \varepsilon^2 \sigma_n^2 + \mathbf{E}\left(\xi_{n,k}^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{n,k}| > \varepsilon \sigma_n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

BUT: condition (*) is genuinely weaker than (***) and it is not sufficient for the CLT to hold!

(4) The old CLT for sums of i.i.d random variables ζ_k follows with $\xi_{n,k} := \zeta_k$.

(5) In a very precise sense: Condition (***) is sufficient and **necessary** for the CLT to hold (**W. Feller**).

Proof. W.l.o.g. we assume $(\forall n) : \sigma_n = 1$ and plan to prove:

$$(\forall u) : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{k=1}^{N_n} \varphi_{n,k}(u) = e^{-u^2/2}.$$

Lemma.

$$(\forall t \in \mathbb{R}) : \left| e^{it} - \sum_{l=0}^m \frac{(it)^l}{l!} \right| \leq \min \left\{ \frac{|t|^{m+1}}{(m+1)!}, \frac{2|t|^m}{m!} \right\}.$$

Proof of the Lemma. By induction on m :

$$\begin{aligned} e^{it} - \sum_{l=0}^m \frac{(it)^l}{l!} &= \frac{i^{m+1}}{m!} \int_0^t (t-s)^m e^{is} ds \\ &= \frac{i^m}{(m-1)!} \int_0^t (t-s)^{m-1} (e^{is} - 1) ds \end{aligned}$$

□

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \varphi_{n,k}(u) - 1 + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right| &= \left| \mathbf{E} \left(e^{iu\xi_{n,k}} - \sum_{l=0}^2 \frac{(iu\xi_{n,k})^l}{l!} \right) \right| \\
&\leq \mathbf{E} \left(\left| e^{iu\xi_{n,k}} - \sum_{l=0}^2 \frac{(iu\xi_{n,k})^l}{l!} \right| \right) \\
&\leq \mathbf{E} \left(\min \{ |u\xi_{n,k}|^3 / 6, |u\xi_{n,k}|^2 \} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{|u|^3}{6} \mathbf{E} \left(|\xi_{n,k}|^3 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{n,k}| \leq \varepsilon} \right) + \\
&\quad + |u|^2 \mathbf{E} \left(|\xi_{n,k}|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{n,k}| > \varepsilon} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon |u|^3}{6} \sigma_{n,k}^2 + |u|^2 \mathbf{E} \left(|\xi_{n,k}|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{n,k}| > \varepsilon} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (***) ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \left| \varphi_{n,k}(u) - 1 + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right| = 0. \quad (1)$$

This is the main point of the proof!

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \log \varphi_{n,k}(u) + \frac{u^2}{2} \right| &= \left| \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \left(\log \varphi_{n,k}(u) + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \left| \log \varphi_{n,k}(u) + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \left| \log \varphi_{n,k}(u) + (1 - \varphi_{n,k}(u)) \right| + \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \left| \varphi_{n,k}(u) - 1 + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right| \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

We show that the last two sums go to zero, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

From (1) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{1 \leq k \leq N_n} \left| \varphi_{n,k}(u) - 1 \right| \leq \\
& \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{1 \leq k \leq N_n} \left| \varphi_{n,k}(u) - 1 + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right| + \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{1 \leq k \leq N_n} \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \\
& = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

This implies that for $n \geq n_0$ and $1 \leq k \leq N_n$:

$$|\varphi_{n,k}(u) - 1| < 1/2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \log \varphi_{n,k}(u) + 1 - \varphi_{n,k}(u) \right| \leq |1 - \varphi_{n,k}(u)|^2 \leq \\
& \leq \left(\max_{1 \leq k' \leq N_n} |1 - \varphi_{n,k'}(u)| \right) \left(\left| \varphi_{n,k}(u) - 1 + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right| + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \left| \log \varphi_{n,k}(u) + (1 - \varphi_{n,k}(u)) \right| &\leq \\ &\leq \left(\max_{1 \leq k' \leq N_n} |1 - \varphi_{n,k'}(u)| \right) \left(\sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \left| \varphi_{n,k}(u) - 1 + \frac{u^2 \sigma_{n,k}^2}{2} \right| + \frac{u^2}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (1), (2) and (3) it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \log \varphi_{n,k}(u) + \frac{u^2}{2} \right| = 0.$$

□

Application 1: CLT for the number of records.

Let $\eta_k, k = 1, 2, \dots$ be i.i.d., $\eta_k > 0$, with **continuous distrib.**, and

$$\xi_1 = 1, \quad \xi_k := \mathbb{1}_{\eta_k > \max_{1 \leq j < k} \eta_j}, \quad k > 1, \quad S_n := \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_n.$$

Then $\xi_k, k = 1, 2, \dots$ are *independent* (**HW!**) with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(\xi_k = 1) = \frac{1}{k} = 1 - \mathbf{P}(\xi_k = 0),$$

$$\mathbf{E}(\xi_k) = \frac{1}{k}, \quad \mathbf{Var}(\xi_k) = \frac{k-1}{k^2},$$

$$\mathbf{E}(S_n) = \log n + \mathcal{O}(1), \quad \mathbf{Var}(S_n) = \log n + \mathcal{O}(1).$$

Theorem.

$$\frac{S_n - \log n}{\sqrt{\log n}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1).$$

Application 2: CLT in the “borderline” case.

Let η_k , $k = 1, 2, \dots$ i.i.d. with distribution density

$$\frac{d}{dx} \mathbf{P}(\eta_j < x) =: f(x) = |x|^{-3} \mathbf{1}_{|x| > 1}.$$

Then

$$(\forall \varepsilon > 0) : \mathbf{E}(|\eta_j|^{2-\varepsilon}) < \infty, \quad \mathbf{E}(\eta_j) = 0, \quad \mathbf{E}(|\eta_j|^2) = \infty.$$

Theorem.

$$\frac{\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1).$$

Proof: Define

$$\xi_{n,k} := \eta_k \mathbf{1}_{|\eta_k| < \sqrt{n} \log \log n}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

And apply Lindeberg's Theorem for the triangular array $\xi_{n,k}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$.

Mind that $(\forall n) : \xi_{n,k}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ are i.i.d.

$$\mathbf{E}(\xi_{n,k}) = 0,$$

$$\sigma_{n,k}^2 = \sigma_{n,1}^2 = \log n + 2 \log \log \log n,$$

$$\sigma_n^2 = n\sigma_{n,1}^2.$$

Lindeberg's condition (***):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sigma_{n,1}^2} \mathbf{E} \left(|\xi_{n,1}|^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_{n,1}|^2 > \varepsilon n \sigma_{n,1}^2} \right) = 0$$

holds because

$$|\xi_{n,1}|^2 < n(\log \log n)^2 < \varepsilon n \sigma_{n,1}^2.$$

So:

$$\frac{\xi_{n,1} + \cdots + \xi_{n,n}}{\sqrt{n \log n}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1). \quad (4)$$

What is the error made with the cutoff?

$$\mathbf{P}\left((\exists k \leq n) : \xi_{n,k} \neq \eta_k \right) \leq n \mathbf{P}\left(\xi_{n,1} \neq \eta_1 \right) = \frac{1}{(\log \log n)^2} \rightarrow 0$$

Hence

$$\sum_{k=1}^n |\eta_k - \xi_{n,k}| \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0. \quad (5)$$

The theorem follows from (4) and (5). □

VI.
STABLE DISTRIBUTIONS AND STABLE LIMITS

AFFINE EQUIVALENCE:

Definition: The probability distributions $F_1, F_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ are *affine-equivalent* iff

$$\left(\exists a \in (0, \infty), b \in \mathbb{R} \right) : \quad \left(\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \right) : \quad F_2(x) = F_1(ax + b).$$

Remarks: (1) This is clearly an equivalence relation. A class of equivalence can be parametrized as

$$(0, \infty) \times (-\infty, \infty) \ni (a, b) \mapsto F_{a,b}(\cdot) := F_{1,0}(a \cdot + b).$$

(2) In terms of the random variables X_1, X_2 (of disrib. F_1, F_2):

$$\left(\exists a \in (0, \infty), b \in \mathbb{R} \right) : \quad X_2 \sim aX_1 + b.$$

(3) In terms of the characteristic functions φ_1, φ_2 (of the distributions F_1, F_2):

$$\left(\exists a \in (0, \infty), b \in \mathbb{R} \right) : \quad \left(\forall u \in \mathbb{R} \right) : \quad \varphi_2(u) = e^{ibu} \varphi_1(au).$$

STABILITY:

Definition: An affine-equivalent class of distributions is *stable* iff it is closed under convolution.

A distribution is called *stable* if it belongs to a stable class: the distribution F is stable iff

$$\left(\forall a_1, a_2 > 0\right) : \left(\exists a_3 > 0, b_3 \in \mathbb{R}\right) : F(a_1 \cdot) * F(a_2 \cdot) = F(a_3 \cdot + b_3).$$

Remarks: (1) In terms of the random variables:

$$\left(\forall a_1, a_2 > 0\right) : \left(\exists a_3 > 0, b_3 \in \mathbb{R}\right) : a_1 X_1 + a_2 X_2 = a_3 X_3 + b_3,$$

where $X_1, X_2, X_3 \sim F$ and X_1, X_2 are *independent*.

(2) In terms of the characteristic function:

$$\left(\forall a_1, a_2 > 0\right) : \left(\exists a_3 > 0, b_3 \in \mathbb{R}\right) : \varphi(a_1 u) \varphi(a_2 u) = e^{ib_3 u} \varphi(a_3 u).$$

(3) By induction it follows that

$$\left(\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, a_1, \dots, a_k > 0\right) : \quad \left(\exists a_{k+1} > 0, b_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}\right) :$$

$$a_1 X_1 + \dots + a_k X_k = a_{k+1} X_{k+1} + b_{k+1},$$

where $X_1, \dots, X_k, X_{k+1} \sim F$ and X_1, \dots, X_k are *independent*.

EXAMPLES:

EX1: (counterexample): Discrete distributions **CAN'T BE** stable. Actually: a stable distribution doesn't have point mass. (Obvious!)

EX2: The class of Gaussian (normal) distributions is stable:

$$\sigma > 0, m \in \mathbb{R} : f_{\sigma,m}(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\{-(x-m)^2/(2\sigma^2)\},$$

$$\varphi_{\sigma,m}(u) = \exp\{imu - \frac{\sigma^2 u^2}{2}\}.$$

Indeed, for $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0$ and $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$f_{\sigma_1,m_1} * f_{\sigma_2,m_2} = f_{\sigma_3,m_3}, \quad \varphi_{\sigma_1,m_1} \varphi_{\sigma_2,m_2} = \varphi_{\sigma_3,m_3},$$

with

$$\sigma_3 = (\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)^{1/2}, \quad m_3 = m_1 + m_2.$$

EX3: The class of Cauchy distributions is stable:

$$\tau > 0, m \in \mathbb{R} : f_{\tau,m}(x) := \frac{1}{\pi\tau} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + (x - m)^2/\tau^2},$$
$$\varphi_{\tau,m}(u) = \exp\{imu - \tau|u|\}.$$

Indeed, for $\tau_1, \tau_2 > 0$ and $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{R}$

$$f_{\tau_1,m_1} * f_{\tau_2,m_2} = f_{\tau_3,m_3}, \quad \varphi_{\tau_1,m_1}\varphi_{\tau_2,m_2} = \varphi_{\tau_3,m_3},$$

with

$$\tau_3 = \tau_1 + \tau_2, \quad m_3 = m_1 + m_2.$$

EX4: Recall the distribution of first hitting times of Brownian motion: B_t standard $1d$ Brownian motion, $B_0 = 0$.

$$T_r := \inf\{t : B_t = r\} \stackrel{(1)}{\sim} r^2 \inf\{t : B_t = 1\}$$

$$f_{\alpha,0}(s) := \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbf{P}(T_{\sqrt{\alpha}} < s) = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbf{P}(T_1 < s/\alpha).$$

(1): By scaling of Brownian motion.

Then,

$$\alpha > 0, m = 0 : \quad f_{\alpha,0}(s) \stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha}} (s/\alpha)^{-3/2} e^{-\alpha/(2s)} \mathbf{1}_{s>0},$$

$$\varphi_{\alpha,0}(u) \stackrel{(3)}{=} \exp\{-(1+i)\alpha^{1/2}|u|^{1/2}\}.$$

(2): See earlier work. (Max. and hitting times of RW and BM.)

(3): Computation. Will be done later. Try it as **HW**.

Indeed, for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 0$

$$f_{\alpha_1,0} * f_{\alpha_2,0} \stackrel{(4)}{=} f_{\alpha_3,0}, \quad \varphi_{\alpha_1,0} \varphi_{\alpha_2,0} = \varphi_{\alpha_3,0},$$

with

$$\alpha_3 = (\alpha_1^{1/2} + \alpha_2^{1/2})^2.$$

(4): By independent + stationary increments and scaling of Brownian motion:

$$(r_1 + r_2)^2 T_1 \sim T_{r_1+r_2} \sim T_{r_1} + T'_{r_2} \sim r_1^2 T_1 + r_2^2 T'_1$$

where T_{r_1} and T'_{r_2} , respectively, T_1 and T'_1 are *independent*.

HW: Let (X_t, Y_t) be standard $2d$ Brownian motion, starting from $(X_0, Y_0) = (0, 0)$, and $T_1 := \inf\{t : X_t = 1\}$. Compute the distribution of Y_{T_1} .

Proposition. *The distribution F is stable if and only if for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $\alpha_k > 0, \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$X_1 + \cdots + X_k = \alpha_k X + \beta_k,$$

where $X_1, \dots, X_k, X \sim F$ and X_1, \dots, X_k are independent.

Proof of the Proposition: Later. □

Limit laws of centred and normed sums of i.i.d. random variables are always stable:

Theorem. *Let X_1, X_2, \dots be i.i.d. random variables and $S_n := X_1 + \cdots + X_n$. If there exist (deterministic) sequences $a_n > 0$ and $b_n \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$Z_n := \frac{S_n - b_n}{a_n} \Rightarrow Y,$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then the distribution of Y is **stable**.

Proof. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and denote,

$$\sum_{i=n(j-1)+1}^{nj} X_i =: S_n^{(j)} \sim S_n. \quad j = 1, \dots, k.$$

Then

$$S_{kn} = S_n^{(1)} + \dots + S_n^{(k)}$$

and

$$\frac{a_{kn}}{a_n} Z_{kn} - \frac{kb_n - b_{kn}}{a_n} = Z_n^{(1)} + \dots + Z_n^{(k)},$$

where $Z_n^{(1)}, \dots, Z_n^{(k)} \sim Z_n$ are i.i.d. Thus:

$$Z_{kn} \Rightarrow Y, \quad Z_n^{(1)} + \dots + Z_n^{(k)} \Rightarrow Y^{(1)} + \dots + Y^{(k)},$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(k)} \sim Y$ are i.i.d.

Lemma. Let W_n be a sequence of random variables, $\alpha_n > 0$, $\beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ (deterministic) sequences, and $W'_n := \alpha_n W_n + \beta_n$. If both $W_n \Rightarrow W$ and $W'_n \Rightarrow W'$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ where W and W' are both *nondegenerate* random variables, then the limits $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n =: \alpha > 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \beta_n =: \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ exist.

Proof of the Lemma. Easy: write the characteristic functions. □

By the Lemma the limits

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_{kn}}{a_n} =: \alpha_k > 0, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{kb_n - b_{kn}}{a_n} =: \beta_k \in \mathbb{R}$$

exist, and thus

$$Y^{(1)} + \dots + Y^{(k)} \sim \alpha_k Y - \beta_k.$$

The Theorem follows from the Proposition. □

SYMMETRIC STABLE LAWS (easier than the general case)

Theorem. (i) Let $c > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2]$. The function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$\varphi(u) := \exp\{-c|u|^\alpha\} \quad (6)$$

is characteristic function of a symmetric stable distribution.

(ii) The characteristic function of a symmetric stable distribution is of the form (6), with some $c > 0$ and $\alpha \in (0, 2]$.

Remarks: (1) The parameter $c > 0$ can be changed by scaling. The parameter $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ is essential. It is called the **index** of the stable law.

(2) $u \mapsto \varphi(u)$ of (6) obviously satisfies the stability condition. It is to be checked that

- It is indeed a characteristic function.
- There are no other chf-s of symmetric stable laws.

(3) Examples: $\alpha = 2$: Gaussian; $\alpha = 1$: Cauchy.

No explicit formula for the distribution function/density in other cases.

(4) In the symmetric stable case:

$$a_1 X_1 + a_2 X_2 \sim (a_1^\alpha + a_2^\alpha)^{1/\alpha} X.$$

Proof of (i), for $\alpha \in (0, 1]$:

Theorem (György Pólya's construction). *Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfy:*

- $\lim_{u \rightarrow 0} \varphi(u) = 1,$
- $\varphi(-u) = \varphi(u),$
- $[0, \infty) \ni u \mapsto \varphi(u)$ *convex.*

Then φ is a characteristic function.

If $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, then $\varphi(u)$ of (6) is of this form. □

Proof of Pólya's theorem.

$$\psi_1(u) := (1 - |u|)_+ = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iux} \frac{1 - \cos x}{\pi x^2} dx,$$

$$\psi_a(u) := \psi_1(au) = (1 - a|u|)_+, \quad a > 0,$$

are characteristic functions. The functions of the theorem are *pointwise limits* of functions of the form

$$u \mapsto \sum_{k=1}^K p_k \psi_{a_k}(u),$$

with

$$a_1, \dots, a_K > 0; \quad p_1, \dots, p_K \in [0, 1], \quad p_1 + \dots + p_K = 1,$$

which are themselves characteristic functions. □

Proof of (i), for $\alpha \in (0, 2)$:

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be i.i.d. with symmetric distribution density f :

$$f(x) := \frac{\alpha}{2|x|^{\alpha+1}} \mathbf{1}_{|x|>1},$$

and characteristic function ψ . Then

$$1 - \psi(u) = \alpha \int_1^\infty \frac{1 - \cos(ux)}{x^{\alpha+1}} dx = \alpha |u|^\alpha \int_{|u|}^\infty \frac{1 - \cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy$$

Since $0 < \alpha < 2$ (!):

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{1 - \cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy =: \frac{c}{\alpha} < \infty,$$

$$\int_0^{|u|} \frac{1 - \cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy = \mathcal{O}(|u|^{2-\alpha}).$$

Thus,

$$\psi(u) = 1 - c|u|^\alpha + \mathcal{O}(|u|^2),$$

and hence, for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$ fixed

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\left\{iu\frac{S_n}{n^{1/\alpha}}\right\}\right) &= \psi(un^{-1/\alpha})^n \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{c|u|^\alpha}{n} + \mathcal{O}(n^{-2/\alpha})\right)^n \rightarrow e^{-c|u|^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

We have proved that $u \mapsto e^{-c|u|^\alpha}$ is the characteristic function of a symmetric stable distribution F and the limit theorem

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{S_n}{n^{1/\alpha}} < x\right) = F(x).$$

□

Proof of (ii). We prove that if φ is characteristic function of a symmetric stable law then it is of the form (6).

Let F be a symmetric stable law and φ its characteristic function.

Lemma (Some basic facts about φ). (i)

$$(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \quad \varphi(u) = \overline{\varphi(u)} = \varphi(-u).$$

(ii)

$$(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \quad \varphi(u) > 0.$$

(iii) If $b > a > 0$ then

$$(\exists u \in \mathbb{R}) : \quad \varphi(bu) \neq \varphi(au).$$

Proof of the Lemma.

(i) follows from symmetry of the distribution F .

(ii) Due to symmetry and stability,

$$\left(\exists c \in (0, 1) \cup (1, \infty)\right) : \left(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}\right) : \varphi(u)^2 = \varphi(cu)$$

(If $c = 1$ then $(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \varphi(u)^2 = \varphi(u)$, and, by continuity at $u = 0$, $\varphi(u) \equiv 1$. This case is excluded.)

$$\{\varphi(u_0) = 0\} \Rightarrow \left\{(\forall k \in \mathbb{Z}) : \varphi(c^k u_0) = 0\right\}.$$

This is impossible, due to continuity at $u = 0$.

(iii) This holds for any characteristic function.

Let $c := a/b < 1$. By continuity at $u = 0$

$$\left\{(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \varphi(u) = \varphi(cu)\right\} \Rightarrow \{\varphi(u) \equiv 1\}.$$

But this case is excluded. □

By symmetric stability there exists

$$\gamma : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \varphi(u)^n = \varphi(\gamma(n)u).$$

We get

$$(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \varphi(\gamma(nm)u) = \varphi(u)^{nm} = \varphi(\gamma(n)\gamma(m)u)$$

Hence, by (iii) of the Lemma

$$\gamma(nm) = \gamma(n)\gamma(m).$$

Extend

$$\gamma : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \gamma(n/m) := \gamma(n)/\gamma(m).$$

Then

$$(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \varphi(u)^{n/m} = \dots = \varphi(\gamma(n/m)u)$$

Let $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $r_n \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_n = r$.

Then

$$\varphi(\gamma(r_n)u) = \varphi(u)^{r_n} \rightarrow \varphi(u)^r.$$

$\gamma(r_{n'}) \rightarrow 0$ or $\gamma(r_{n'}) \rightarrow \infty$ implies $\varphi(u) \equiv 1$ – impossible.

Similarly, if $\gamma(r_{n'}) \rightarrow g' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma(r_{n''}) \rightarrow g'' \in \mathbb{R}$ then again by (iii) of the Lemma $g' = g''$. So, we extend $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that

$$(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \varphi(u)^r = \varphi(\gamma(r)u) \tag{7}$$

$$\gamma(rs) = \gamma(r)\gamma(s). \tag{8}$$

$$r \mapsto \gamma(r) \quad \text{is continuous.} \tag{9}$$

Lemma (“Cauchy’s problem”). Let $\gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ satisfy (8) and (9). Then $\gamma(r) = r^\beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$.

From (7) it follows that $\varphi(u) = \exp\{-c|u|^\alpha\}$ with $\alpha = 1/\beta$.
 $c \leq 0$ or $\alpha \notin (0, 2]$ are a priori excluded. □

Remarks:

(1) The symmetric stable distributions are absolutely continuous with C^∞ density functions.

(2) “Heavy tail”: For $\alpha \in (0, 2)$:

$$f'(x) =: f(x) \sim C(\alpha)|x|^{-\alpha-1}, \quad \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty$$

(3) In particular

$$\begin{aligned} (\forall \varepsilon > 0) : \mathbf{E}\left(|X|^{\alpha-\varepsilon}\right) < \infty, \\ \mathbf{E}\left(|X|^\alpha\right) = \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem. Let X_1, X_2, \dots be i.i.d. random variables. Denote their (common) distribution function by F and $S_n := X_1 + \dots + X_n$. Assume that the distribution F is symmetric

$$F(-x) = 1 - F(x + 0),$$

and the tail of the distribution has regular power-law asymptotics

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^\alpha (1 - F(x)) = b,$$

with $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $b \in (0, \infty)$. Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left(\exp\{iuS_n/n^{1/\alpha}\} \right) = e^{-c|u|^\alpha},$$

with

$$c = 2b\alpha \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - \cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy.$$

Remark: This Theorem extends the earlier construction. A more general Theorem will be stated later.

Proof. We prove for $|u| \ll 1$

$$\psi(u) := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX_j\}\right) = 1 - c|u|^\alpha + o(|u|^\alpha), \quad (***)$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuS_n/n^{1/\alpha}\}\right) &= \left(\psi(u/n^{1/\alpha})\right)^n \\ &= \left(1 - c|u|^\alpha/n + o(1/n)\right)^n \rightarrow e^{-c|u|^\alpha}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of (***) follows:

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, at the end of the proof we let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \psi(u) &= 2 \int_0^\infty (1 - \cos(ux)) dF(x) \\ &= 2 \int_0^{1/(\varepsilon u)} (1 - \cos(ux)) dF(x) + 2 \int_{1/(\varepsilon u)}^\infty (1 - \cos(ux)) dF(x). \end{aligned}$$

Further,

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_0^{1/(\varepsilon u)} (1 - \cos ux) dF(x) &= 2 \int_0^{1/(\varepsilon u)} (1 - \cos ux) d(F(x) - 1) = \\ &= 2(1 - \cos(1/\varepsilon))(F(1/(\varepsilon u)) - 1) + 2u \int_0^{1/(\varepsilon u)} (1 - F(x)) \sin(ux) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Altogether

$$1 - \psi(u) = A(u, \varepsilon) + B(u, \varepsilon) + C(u, \varepsilon),$$

where

$$A(u, \varepsilon) := 2 \int_{1/(\varepsilon u)}^{\infty} (1 - \cos(ux)) dF(x),$$

$$B(u, \varepsilon) := 2(1 - \cos(1/\varepsilon))(F(1/(\varepsilon u)) - 1),$$

$$C(u, \varepsilon) := 2u \int_0^{1/(\varepsilon u)} (1 - F(x)) \sin(ux) dx.$$

We keep $\varepsilon > 0$ fixed. Then clearly,

$$\max\{|A(u, \varepsilon)|, |B(u, \varepsilon)|\} \leq 4(1 - F(1/(\varepsilon u))) = 4b\varepsilon^\alpha |u|^\alpha + o(|u|^\alpha).$$

$$C(u, \varepsilon) \stackrel{(1)}{=} 2|u|^\alpha \int_0^{1/\varepsilon} (y/u)^\alpha (1 - F(y/u)) \frac{\sin y}{y^\alpha} dy$$

$$\stackrel{(2)}{=} 2b|u|^\alpha \int_0^{1/\varepsilon} \frac{\sin y}{y^\alpha} dy + o(|u|^\alpha)$$

$$\stackrel{(3)}{=} 2b\alpha|u|^\alpha \int_0^{1/\varepsilon} \frac{1 - \cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy + 2b|u|^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha (1 - \cos(1/\varepsilon)) + o(|u|^\alpha)$$

$$\stackrel{(4)}{=} 2b\alpha|u|^\alpha \int_0^\infty \frac{1 - \cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy - 2b\alpha|u|^\alpha \int_{1/\varepsilon}^\infty \frac{1 - \cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy + \\ + 2b|u|^\alpha \varepsilon^\alpha (1 - \cos(1/\varepsilon)) + o(|u|^\alpha)$$

(1): Change of variable $y := ux$

(3): Integration by parts.

(2): Dominated convergence.

(4): Absolute integrability.

Altogether, with *any* $\varepsilon > 0$ fixed:

$$\left| 1 - \psi(u) - c|u|^\alpha \right| \leq o(|u|^\alpha) + 16b\varepsilon^\alpha |u|^\alpha.$$

Hence (***) .



EXAMPLES, APPLICATIONS

EX 1: Sums of reciprocals of absolutely continuous i.i.d. r.v.-s.

Let X_1, X_2, \dots be i.i.d. random variables with absolutely continuous distribution. Denote their density function f and assume that f is continuous at $x = 0$ and $f(0) \in (0, \infty)$. Then

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{X_k} \Rightarrow CAU(0, \tau),$$

with some $\tau \in (0, \infty)$.

EX 2: Holtzmark's first (one dimensional) problem.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n}$ be i.i.d. $UNI[-n/2, n/2]$. These are “positions of stars or charges”. A star/charge located at $x \in \mathbb{R}$ generates at the origin the force

$$F(x) = \operatorname{sgn}(x)|x|^{-p}.$$

So, the resulting *total force* generated by the system of n randomly positioned stars at the origin is

$$R_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \operatorname{sgn}(X_{n,k})|X_{n,k}|^{-p}.$$

Question: Does R_n have a limiting distribution, as $n \rightarrow \infty$?

Theorem. *If $1/2 < p < \infty$ then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E} \left(\exp\{iuR_n\} \right) = e^{-c|u|^{1/p}}$$

with

$$c = HW!.$$

Proof.

Let Y_1, Y_2, \dots be i.i.d. $UNI[-1/2, 1/2]$ -distributed. Then

$$\{X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n}\} \sim \{nY_1, \dots, nY_n\}$$

$$R_n \sim n^{-p} \sum_{k=1}^n \operatorname{sgn}(Y_k) |Y_k|^{-p}.$$

Note that $\xi_k := \operatorname{sgn}(Y_k) |Y_k|^{-p}$, $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ are i.i.d., symmetric and

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\operatorname{sgn}(Y_k) |Y_k|^{-p} > x\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(0 < Y_k < x^{-1/p}\right) = x^{-1/p}$$

and the limit theorem is applied. □

EX 3: Holtzmark's second (multi-dimensional) problem.

Identical stars/charges are located in \mathbb{R}^d according to a homogeneous Poisson point process (PPP) of density ρ . Denote their locations $\vec{X}_1^{(\rho)}, \vec{X}_2^{(\rho)}, \dots$ in some (arbitrary) ordering. A star/charge located at $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \vec{0}$ generates at the origin the force

$$\vec{F}(\vec{x}) = |\vec{x}|^{-p-1} \vec{x} = \text{sgn}(\vec{x}) |\vec{x}|^{-p}.$$

Denote by $\vec{R}^{(\rho)}$ the resulting total force generated at the origin by all stars/charges. Formally:

$$\vec{R}^{(\rho)} = \sum_i \vec{F}(\vec{X}_i^{(\rho)}).$$

Note that convergence problems may arise.

Question: Assuming that $\vec{R}^{(\rho)}$ makes some sense, can we say something about its distribution?

1. Scaling:

$$\left(\vec{X}_1^{(\rho)}, \vec{X}_2^{(\rho)}, \dots\right) \sim \left(\rho^{-1/d} \vec{X}_1^{(1)}, \rho^{-1/d} \vec{X}_2^{(1)}, \dots\right)$$

$$(\forall a > 0) : \quad \vec{F}(a\vec{x}) = a^{-p} \vec{F}(\vec{x})$$

It follows that

$$\vec{R}(\rho) \sim \rho^{p/d} \vec{R}(1) \quad (10)$$

2. “Independent increments”:

If $PPP(\rho_1)$ and $PPP(\rho_2)$ are two *independent* Poisson point processes of density ρ_1 , respectively, ρ_2 then

$$PPP(\rho_1) \cup PPP(\rho_2) \sim PPP(\rho_1 + \rho_2). \quad (11)$$

From (10) and (11) it follows that:

$$\rho_1^{p/d} \vec{R}' + \rho_2^{p/d} \vec{R}'' = (\rho_1 + \rho_2)^{p/d} \vec{R}'''$$

where $\vec{R}' \sim \vec{R}'' \sim \vec{R}''' \sim \vec{R}^{(1)}$, \vec{R}' and \vec{R}'' are independent, and $\rho_1, \rho_2 > 0$.

If $\vec{R}^{(\rho)}$ does make sense then it has symmetric stable distribution of index

$$\alpha = \frac{d}{p}, \quad \frac{d}{2} < p < \infty.$$

Remarks.

(1) The summation should be done as

$$\vec{R} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i \vec{F}(\vec{X}_i) \mathbb{1}_{\vec{X}_i \in \Lambda_n},$$

where Λ_n is a sequence of increasing, *symmetric* domains, $\cup_n \Lambda_n = \mathbb{R}^d$.

(2) If $p > d/2$ then the limit exists a.s., if $p \leq d/2$ then far-away charges/stars have divergent effect.

(3) Case of Coulomb or gravitational forces: In

$$d \geq 3 : \quad p = d - 1 > d/2, \quad \text{OK!}$$

Towards more general limit theorems:

Definition. The function $L : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is *slowly varying* (at infinity) iff

$$(\forall a > 0) : \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(ax)}{L(x)} = 1.$$

Examples, remarks, **HWs**:

- (1) If $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} L(x) = b \in (0, \infty)$ then obviously L is s.v.
- (2) For any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $L(x) := (\log x)^\beta$ is s.v.
- (3) Show that for $\beta < 1$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $L(x) := \exp\{c(\log x)^\beta\}$ is s.v.
- (4) Construct a s.v. function L for which

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} L(x) = 0, \quad \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} L(x) = \infty.$$

Theorem. Let X_1, X_2, \dots be i.i.d. with symmetric distribution F for which

$$1 - F(x) = x^{-\alpha}L(x), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ and $L(x)$ is slowly varying at infinity. Let

$$a_n := \inf\{x : 1 - F(x) \leq 1/n\}.$$

Then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuS_n/a_n\}\right) = \exp\{-c|u|^\alpha\}$$

with some $c \in (0, \infty)$.

Remarks:

- (1) This extends (quite far) the previous limit theorems.
- (2) The proof is more technical. We omit it.

WITHOUT SYMMETRY:

Stable distributions are parametrized by:

- the **index** $\alpha \in (0, 2]$;
- the **skewness** $\kappa \in [-1, 1]$;
- the **scale** $c \in (0, \infty)$
- the **shift** $b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remarks:

- (1) The scale and shift change with affine transformations. We will choose them later $c = 1, b = 0$.
- (2) The index and skewness are *relevant*.
- (3) Notation: $STAB(\alpha, \kappa, c, b)$

Theorem. *The characteristic functions of stable distributions are*

$$\alpha \neq 1 : \quad \varphi(u) = \exp \left\{ ibu - c|u|^\alpha \left(1 - i \operatorname{sgn}(u) \kappa \tan \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} \right) \right\}$$

$$\alpha = 1 : \quad \varphi(u) = \exp \left\{ ibu - c|u| \left(1 + i \operatorname{sgn}(u) \kappa \frac{2 \log |u|}{\pi} \right) \right\}.$$

Remarks:

(1) *Symmetric* stable laws: $\kappa = 0$.

(2) No skewness for $\alpha = 2$.

(3) All stable laws are absolutely continuous with C^∞ density. Follows from fast decay of the chf. as $|u| \rightarrow \infty$.

(4) No explicit formula for the distribution/density function, except for the (already known) cases:

$\alpha = 2$ (Gauss); $\alpha = 1, \kappa = 0$ (Cauchy); $\alpha = 1/2, \kappa = \pm 1$ (Lévy).

(5) Let $X, Y \sim STAB(\alpha, \kappa = 1, c = 1, b = 0)$ be i.i.d. and $p, q \geq 0$ such that $p^{-\alpha} + q^{-\alpha} = 1$. Then

$$pX - qY \sim STAB(\alpha, \kappa = p^{-\alpha} - q^{-\alpha}, c = 1, b = 0).$$

(6) “Heavy tail”: From the type of singularity of $\varphi(u)$ at $u = 0$ it follows that

$$(\forall \varepsilon > 0) : \mathbf{E}\left(|X|^{\alpha-\varepsilon}\right) < \infty,$$

$$(\forall \varepsilon \geq 0) : \mathbf{E}\left(|X|^{\alpha+\varepsilon}\right) = \infty.$$

More precisely:

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|X| > x\right) \sim Cx^{-\alpha}$$

(7) “Lower tail” in the totally skew ($\kappa = 1$) case:

Fix: $b = 0$ (✓), $c = 1$ (✓), $\kappa = 1$ (!):

Then the chf

$$\alpha \neq 1 : \quad \varphi(u) = \exp \left\{ -|u|^\alpha \left(1 - i \operatorname{sgn}(u) \tan \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} \right) \right\}$$

$$\alpha = 1 : \quad \varphi(u) = \exp \left\{ -|u| \left(1 + i \operatorname{sgn}(u) \frac{2 \log |u|}{\pi} \right) \right\}.$$

can be continued analytically into the complex upper half-plane $\mathbb{C}_+ := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Re(z) > 0\}$, as $\varphi_+ : \mathbb{C}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$\alpha \neq 1 : \quad \varphi_+(z) = \exp \left\{ -\cos(\alpha\pi/2)^{-1} (-iz)^\alpha \right\}$$

$$\alpha = 1 : \quad \varphi_+(z) = \exp \left\{ \left(i - \frac{2}{\pi} \log(z) \right) (iz) \right\}$$

No analytic continuation (matching both halflines $u > 0$ and $u < 0$) into the lower half plane!

Theorem. Let $X \sim STAB(\alpha, \kappa = +1, c = 1, b = 0)$. The “moment generating function” $\tilde{\varphi} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\tilde{\varphi}(u) := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{-uX\}\right) = \varphi_+(iu)$$

is

$$\alpha \neq 1 : \quad \tilde{\varphi}(u) = \exp\left\{-\cos(\alpha\pi/2)^{-1} u^\alpha\right\}$$

$$\alpha = 1 : \quad \tilde{\varphi}(u) = \exp\left\{\frac{2}{\pi} u \log(u)\right\}.$$

Proof. Just done. □

Corollary. (i) For $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:

$$\mathbf{P}(X > 0) = 1,$$

$$\frac{d}{dx}\mathbf{P}(0 < X < x) \sim c(\alpha)e^{-1/x}x^{-(\alpha+1)}, \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow 0.$$

(ii) For $\alpha = 1$:

$$\mathbf{P}(X < -x) < \exp\{-ce^x\}$$

(iii) For $\alpha \in (1, 2)$:

$$\mathbf{P}(X < -x) < \exp\{-cx^{\alpha/(\alpha-1)}\}$$

Proof. Tauberian arguments. . . .



Theorem (Limit theorem in the non-symmetric case.). Let X_1, X_2, \dots be i.i.d. random variables. Assume

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{P}\left(|X_j| > x\right) = x^{-\alpha}L(x) \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha \in (0, 2),$$

$$(2) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}\left(X_j > x\right)}{\mathbf{P}\left(X_j < -x\right)} =: \frac{1 + \kappa}{1 - \kappa} \in [0, \infty] \quad \text{exists.}$$

Define

$$a_n := \inf\{x : \mathbf{P}\left(|X_j| > x\right) < n^{-1}\},$$

$$b_n := n\mathbf{E}\left(X_j \mathbf{1}_{|X_j| \leq a_n}\right).$$

Then

$$\frac{S_n - b_n}{a_n} \Rightarrow STAB(\alpha, \kappa, c, b),$$

with some $c \in (0, \infty)$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark: Note that

$$a_n = n^{1/\alpha} \tilde{L}(n),$$

with \tilde{L} slowly varying at infinity.

VII.
INFINITELY DIVISIBLE DISTRIBUTIONS

INFINITE DIVISIBILITY:

Definition: The probability distribution F is *infinitely divisible* iff for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a probability distribution F_n so that

$$F = (F_n)^{*n}.$$

Remarks:

(1) In terms of the random variables: X is infinitely divisible iff for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there are $X_{n,1}, X_{n,2}, \dots, X_{n,n}$ *i.i.d.* so that

$$X \sim X_{n,1} + X_{n,2} + \dots + X_{n,n}.$$

(2) In terms of the characteristic functions: $\varphi(u)$ is an infinitely divisible chf. iff for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a chf. $\varphi_n(u)$ so that

$$\varphi(u) = (\varphi_n(u))^n.$$

EXAMPLES:

EX1: The normal distribution:

$$N(0, \sigma^2 = t) = N(0, \sigma^2 = t/n)^{*n}.$$

$$f_t(y) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} e^{-y^2/(2t)}, \quad \varphi_t(u) = \exp\{-tu^2/2\}$$

EX2: The Cauchy distributions:

$$CAU(0, \tau = t) = N(0, \tau = t/n)^{*n}.$$

$$f_t(y) = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{t}{t^2 + y^2}, \quad \varphi_t(u) = \exp\{-t|u|\}$$

EX3: Stable distributions in general: If

$X \sim STAB(\alpha, \kappa, c = t, b = 0)$, and

$X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n} \sim STAB(\alpha, \kappa, c = t/n, b = 0)$ are i.i.d. Then

$$X \sim n^{-\alpha} (X_{n,1} + \dots + X_{n,n}) = \frac{X_{n,1}}{n^\alpha} + \dots + \frac{X_{n,n}}{n^\alpha}.$$

The density and characteristic functions (for $\alpha \neq 1$):

$$f_t(y) = ???, \quad \varphi_t(u) = \exp \left\{ -t|u|^\alpha \left(1 - i \operatorname{sgn}(u) \kappa \tan \frac{\alpha\pi}{2} \right) \right\}.$$

EX4: Poisson (Not stable!):

$$POI(\rho t) = POI(\rho t/n)^{*n}.$$

$$p_t(k) = e^{-t\rho} \frac{(t\rho)^k}{k!}, \quad \varphi_t(u) = \exp \left\{ t\rho(e^{iu} - 1) \right\}$$

EX5: The gamma distributions (Not stable!):

$$GAM(t) = GAM(t/n)^{*n}.$$

$$f_t(y) = \Gamma(t)^{-1} e^{-y} y^{t-1}, \quad \varphi_t(u) = \exp \left\{ -t \log(1 - iu) \right\}.$$

EX6: The negative binomial distributions (Not stable!):

$$NB(p, t) = NB(p, t/n)^{*n}.$$

$$p_t(k) = (-1)^k \binom{-t}{k} (1-p)^t p^k, \quad \varphi_t(u) = \exp \left\{ -t \log \frac{1 - pe^{iu}}{1-p} \right\}.$$

where, for $r \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\binom{r}{k} := \frac{r(r-1)\cdots(r-k+1)}{k!}, \quad \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{r}{k} x^k = (1+x)^r.$$

EX7a: The **compound Poisson distribution (CPOI)**: Let $\xi_1, \xi_2 \dots$ be i.i.d. with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(\xi_j < x) = G(x),$$

and $\nu \sim POI(\varrho)$ independent of the ξ_j -s. Then we call

$$X := \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \xi_j \sim CPOI(G, \varrho).$$

Then:

$$CPOI(G, \varrho t) = CPOI(G, \varrho t/n)^{*n}$$

follows from infinite divisibility of Poisson: Let N_t be a Poisson process of intensity $\varrho > 0$, independent of the ξ_j -s and

$$X_t := \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \xi_j = \sum_{m=1}^n \left(X_{mt/n} - X_{(m-1)t/n} \right).$$

where $X_{mt/n} - X_{(m-1)t/n}$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, n$, are i.i.d.

The characteristic function of $CPOI(G, \varrho t)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_t(u) &= \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX_t\}\right) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} e^{-\varrho t} \frac{(\varrho t)^m}{m!} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iuy} dG(y)\right)^m \\ &= \exp\left\{\varrho t \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1) dG(y)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

EX7b: The **centred compound Poisson distribution (CCPOI)**:
 Let $\xi_1, \xi_2 \dots$ be i.i.d. with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(\xi_j < x) = G(x),$$

and $\nu \sim POI(\varrho)$ independent of the ξ_j -s. Then we call

$$\tilde{X} := \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \xi_j - \varrho \mathbf{E}(\xi_j) \sim CCPOI(G, \varrho).$$

Remark: Mind that $CCPOI(G, \varrho) \neq CPOI(\tilde{G}, \varrho)$! (Here \tilde{G} is the centred distribution.)

Then:

$$CCPOI(G, \varrho t) = CCPOI(G, \varrho t/n)^{*n}$$

follows from infinite divisibility of Poisson:

Let N_t be a Poisson process of intensity $\varrho > 0$, independent of the ξ_j -s and

$$\widetilde{X}_t := \sum_{j=1}^{N_t} \xi_j - \varrho t \mathbf{E}(\xi) = \sum_{m=1}^n \left(\widetilde{X}_{mt/n} - \widetilde{X}_{(m-1)t/n} \right).$$

where $\widetilde{X}_{mt/n} - \widetilde{X}_{(m-1)t/n}$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, n$, are i.i.d.

The characteristic function of $CCPOI(G, \varrho t)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_t(u) &= \mathbf{E} \left(\exp \{ iu \widetilde{X}_t \} \right) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} e^{-\varrho t} \frac{(\varrho t)^m}{m!} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iuy} dG(y) \right)^m \exp \left\{ -iu\varrho t \mathbf{E}(\xi) \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \varrho t \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) dG(y) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

REMARKS:

REM1: In all examples we have seen a **one parameter family** of random variables $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$X_t \sim \sum_{m=1}^n X'_{t/n,m}$$

where $X'_{t/n,1}, X'_{t/n,2}, \dots, X'_{t/n,n} \sim X_{t/n}$ are i.i.d.

It is reasonable to expect the existence of a **process** $t \mapsto X_t$ with **stationary and independent increments** and $X_0 = 0$
= a Lévy process.

[Mind the difference between a one-parameter family of random variables and a process: process = consistent family of joint distributions of finite dimensional marginals.]

EX1: $t \mapsto X_t$ is standard **Brownian motion**.

EX2: The **Cauchy process**: Let (ξ_s, η_s) two-dim. Brownian motion, $(\xi_0, \eta_0) = (0, 0)$. Let

$$\tau_t := \inf\{s : \xi_s = t\}, \quad X_t := \eta_{\tau_t}.$$

EX3: **Stable processes**. E.g. for $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}, \kappa = 1$:

$$X_t := \tau_t \quad \text{of the previous example.}$$

EX4: X_t is the **Poisson process**.

EX5, EX6: later

EX7: Defined from start as a process: the **compound Poisson process**.

REM2: If X and Y are infinitely divisible and independent then $Z := X + Y$ is infinitely divisible. (HW!)

If X_t and Y_t are two independent Lévy processes then $Z_t := X_t + Y_t$ is also a Lévy process. (HW!)

REM3:

Lemma. If X is infinitely divisible and $\varphi(u) := \mathbf{E}(\exp\{iuX\})$ then $(\forall u \in \mathbb{R}) : \varphi(u) \neq 0$.

Proof. Let $X_{n,1}, \dots, X_{n,n}$ be i.i.d. so that $X \sim X_{n,1} + \dots + X_{n,n}$. Then $X_{n,1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (HW!). It follows that for any $u \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(u)^{1/n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}(\exp\{iuX_{n,1}\}) = 1. \quad \square$$

Thus: $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $\psi(u) := \log \varphi(u)$ is well defined.

REM4: If $t \mapsto X_t$ is a Lévy process with $X_1 \sim X$, then

$$\varphi_t(u) := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX_t\}\right) = \exp\{t\psi(u)\}.$$

REM5: If X is infinitely divisible and $\varphi(u) := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX\}\right)$ then for any $a > 0$ and $\beta > 0$:

$$\tilde{\varphi}(u) := \left(\varphi(au)\right)^\beta$$

is infinitely divisible chf.

If $t \mapsto X_t$ is a Lévy process then so is $t \mapsto \tilde{X}_t := aX_{\beta t}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\varphi}_t(u) &= \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iu\tilde{X}_t\}\right) = \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuaX_{\beta t}\}\right) \\ &= \exp\{\beta t\psi(au)\} = \left(\varphi_t(au)\right)^\beta.\end{aligned}$$

REM6: If $X_n, n = 1, 2, \dots$ are infinitely divisible and $X_n \Rightarrow X$ then X is also infinitely divisible. (HW!)

REM7: If X is infinitely divisible then for any $K < \infty$:
 $P(|X| > K) > 0$. (HW!)

BACK TO THE EXAMPLES:

All the previous examples are derived in some way from the compound Poisson.

EX1, Normal:

$\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$ i.i.d. with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)} = \pm\varepsilon\right) = 1/2.$$

$N_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ Poisson process of intensity ε^{-2} , independent of the $\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$ -s.

CPOI process and its chf.:

$$X_t^{(\varepsilon)} := \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(\varepsilon)}} \xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}, \quad \exp\{t\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)\} := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX_t^{(\varepsilon)}\}\right).$$

Compute $\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)$ and its $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$:

$$\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u) = \varepsilon^{-2}(\cos(\varepsilon u) - 1) \rightarrow -\frac{u^2}{2}.$$

EX2, Symmetric stable of index $\alpha \in (0, 2)$:

$\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$ i.i.d. with symmetric distribution

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}| > |y|\right) = \min\{(|y|/\varepsilon)^{-\alpha}, 1\}$$

$$\frac{d}{dy}\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)} < y\right) = \frac{1}{2}\alpha\varepsilon^\alpha|y|^{-\alpha-1}\mathbf{1}_{|y|>\varepsilon}.$$

$N_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ Poisson process of intensity $\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$, independent of the $\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$ -s.

CPOI process and its chf.:

$$X_t^{(\varepsilon)} := \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(\varepsilon)}} \xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}, \quad \exp\{t\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)\} := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX_t^{(\varepsilon)}\}\right).$$

Compute $\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)$ and its $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u) &= \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \int_{|y| > \varepsilon} (e^{iuy} - 1) \frac{1}{2} \alpha \varepsilon^\alpha |y|^{-\alpha-1} dy \\ &= \alpha \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} (\cos(uy) - 1) y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\ &\xrightarrow{(1)} \alpha \int_0^{\infty} (\cos(uy) - 1) y^{-\alpha-1} dy = -c |u|^\alpha,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$c := \alpha \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1 - \cos y}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy.$$

(1): absolute integrability at 0 and at ∞ .

EX3, Skew stable: later, **EX4, Poisson:** nothing to prove,

EX5, Gamma:

$\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$ i.i.d. with distribution density

$$\frac{d}{dy} \mathbf{P}(\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)} < y) = \frac{1}{\varrho(\varepsilon)} \frac{e^{-y}}{y} \mathbf{1}_{y>\varepsilon}, \quad \text{with} \quad \varrho(\varepsilon) := \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-y}}{y} dy.$$

$N_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ Poisson process of intensity $\varrho(\varepsilon)$, independent of the $\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$ -s.

CPOI process and its chf.:

$$X_t^{(\varepsilon)} := \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(\varepsilon)}} \xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}, \quad \exp\{t\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)\} := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX_t^{(\varepsilon)}\}\right).$$

Compute $\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)$ and its $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u) &= \varrho(\varepsilon) \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1) \varrho(\varepsilon)^{-1} \frac{e^{-y}}{y} dy \\ &= \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1) \frac{e^{-y}}{y} dy \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\longrightarrow} \int_0^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1) \frac{e^{-y}}{y} dy \stackrel{(2)}{=} -\log(1 - iu)\end{aligned}$$

(1): absolute integrability at 0.

(2): HW!

EX6, Negative binomial: HW: Construct $NB(p, t)$ as compound Poisson.

EX3a, Skew stable, $STAB(\alpha, \kappa = 1, c, 0)$, with $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:

$\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$ i.i.d. with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)} > y\right) = \min\{(y/\varepsilon)^{-\alpha}, 1\}, \quad y > 0,$$

$$\frac{d}{dy}\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)} < y\right) = \alpha\varepsilon^\alpha|y|^{-\alpha-1}\mathbf{1}_{y>\varepsilon}, \quad y > 0.$$

$N_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ Poisson process of intensity $\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$, independent of the $\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$ -s.

CPOI process and its chf.:

$$X_t^{(\varepsilon)} := \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(\varepsilon)}} \xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}, \quad \exp\{t\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)\} := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX_t^{(\varepsilon)}\}\right).$$

Compute $\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)$ and its $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$:

$$\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u) = \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1) \alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha} y^{-\alpha-1} dy$$

$$= \alpha \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1) y^{-\alpha-1} dy$$

$$\stackrel{(1)}{\longrightarrow} \alpha \int_0^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1) y^{-\alpha-1} dy$$

$$\stackrel{(2)}{=} -\Gamma(1 - \alpha) \cos \frac{\pi\alpha}{2} \left(1 - i \tan \frac{\pi\alpha}{2} \operatorname{sgn}(u) \right) |u|^{\alpha}.$$

(1): The real part is absolutely integrable at ∞ and at 0 for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ ✓.

The imaginary part is absolutely integrable at ∞ for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ ✓, but at 0 only for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$!!!

(2) Computation on next page.

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \int_0^\infty (e^{iy} - 1)y^{-\alpha-1} dy &\stackrel{(1)}{=} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha \int_0^\infty (e^{-(\varepsilon-i)y} - 1)y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\
&= - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (\varepsilon - i) \alpha \int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^y e^{-(\varepsilon-i)z} dz \right) y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\
&\stackrel{(2)}{=} - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (\varepsilon - i) \int_0^\infty \left(\alpha \int_z^\infty y^{-\alpha-1} dy \right) e^{-(\varepsilon-i)z} dz \\
&= - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (\varepsilon - i) \int_0^\infty e^{-(\varepsilon-i)z} z^{-\alpha} dz \\
&\stackrel{(3)}{=} - \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (\varepsilon - i)^\alpha \int_0^\infty e^{-z} z^{-\alpha} dz \\
&= -\Gamma(1 - \alpha) e^{-i\pi\alpha/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

- (1): DC, valid only for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$!!!; (2): Fubini;
(3): Change of integration path in \mathbb{C} (HW!).

EX3b, Skew stable, $STAB(\alpha, \kappa = 1, c, 0)$, with $\alpha \in (1, 2)$:

Centre!

$\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots$ i.i.d. with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)} > y\right) = \min\{(y/\varepsilon)^{-\alpha}, 1\}, \quad y > 0,$$

$$\frac{d}{dy}\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)} < y\right) = \alpha\varepsilon^\alpha|y|^{-\alpha-1}\mathbf{1}_{y>\varepsilon}, \quad y > 0.$$

$N_t^{(\varepsilon)}$ Poisson process of intensity $\varepsilon^{-\alpha}$, independent of the $\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}$ -s.

CCPOI process and its chf.:

$$\widetilde{X}_t^{(\varepsilon)} := \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(\varepsilon)}} \xi_j^{(\varepsilon)} - \mathbf{E}\left(N_t^{(\varepsilon)}\right)\mathbf{E}\left(\xi_j^{(\varepsilon)}\right), \quad \exp\{t\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)\} := \mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iu\widetilde{X}_t^{(\varepsilon)}\}\right).$$

Compute $\psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u)$ and its $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \psi^{(\varepsilon)}(u) &= \varepsilon^{-\alpha} \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) \alpha \varepsilon^{\alpha} y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\
 &= \alpha \int_{\varepsilon}^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\
 &\stackrel{(1)}{\longrightarrow} \alpha \int_0^{\infty} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\
 &\stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{\Gamma(2-\alpha)}{\alpha-1} \cos \frac{\pi\alpha}{2} \left(1 - i \tan \frac{\pi\alpha}{2} \operatorname{sgn}(u) \right) |u|^{\alpha}.
 \end{aligned}$$

(1): The real part is absolutely integrable at 0 and at ∞ for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ ✓.

The **centred** imaginary part is absolutely integrable at 0 for any $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ ✓, **but at ∞ only for $\alpha \in (1, 2)$!!!**

(2) Computation on next page.

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \int_0^\infty (e^{iy} - 1 - iy)y^{-\alpha-1} dy &= i\alpha \int_0^\infty \left(\int_0^y (e^{iz} - 1) dz \right) y^{-\alpha-1} dy \\
&\stackrel{(1)}{=} i \int_0^\infty \left(\alpha \int_z^\infty y^{-\alpha-1} dy \right) (e^{iz} - 1) dz \\
&= i \int_0^\infty (e^{iz} - 1) z^{-\alpha} dz \\
&\stackrel{(2)}{=} \frac{-1}{\alpha - 1} \int_0^\infty e^{iz} z^{1-\alpha} dz \\
&\stackrel{(3)}{=} \frac{i^{-\alpha}}{\alpha - 1} \int_0^\infty e^{-z} z^{1-\alpha} dz \\
&= \Gamma(2 - \alpha) / (\alpha - 1) e^{-i\pi\alpha/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

(1): Fubini;

(2): integration by parts;

(3): Change of integration path in \mathbb{C} (HW!).

Definition. A non-negative sigma-finite measure on \mathbb{R} for which

$$(1) : \quad \mu((-\infty, -1] \cup [1, \infty)) < \infty,$$

$$(2) : \quad \int y^2 \mathbb{1}_{|y|<1} d\mu(y) < \infty,$$

$$(3) : \quad \mu(0) = 0,$$

is called *Lévy measure*.

Theorem (Aleksandr Yakovlevich Khinchin, Paul Lévy). Characteristic functions of infinitely divisible distributions are exactly the functions of the form $\varphi_t(u) = \exp\{t\psi(u)\}$ with

$$\psi(u) = ibu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}u^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy\mathbb{1}_{|y|<1}) d\mu(y), \quad (\text{LH})$$

where $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma^2 \geq 0$, and μ is a Lévy measure.

Remarks:

REM1: The parameters b , σ^2 and μ are uniquely determined.

REM2: (LH) is the **Lévy-Khinchin formula**.

REM3: If $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |y \mathbf{1}_{|y|<1} - g(y)| d\mu(y) < \infty$$

then the Lévy-Khinchin formula can be written

$$\psi(u) = ib'u - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}u^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iug(y)) d\mu(y),$$

with

$$b' = b - \int_{\mathbb{R}} (y \mathbf{1}_{|y|<1} - g(y)) d\mu(y)$$

REM4: Another usual conventional choice

$$\psi(u) = ibu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}u^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(e^{iuy} - 1 - iu \frac{y}{1+y^2} \right) d\mu(y),$$

REM5: If

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |y| d\mu(y) < \infty$$

then the Lévy-Khinchin formula can be written

$$\psi(u) = ibu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}u^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iuy} - 1) d\mu(y),$$

Proof.

We prove that functions $\varphi_t(u) = \exp\{t\psi(u)\}$ with $\psi(u)$ given by (LH) are indeed chf-s of infinitely divisible distributions. We write $\psi(u) = \psi_1(u) + \psi_2(u) + \psi_2(u) + \psi_4(u)$, with

$$\psi_1(u) = ibu, \quad \psi_2(u) = -\frac{\sigma^2}{2}u^2$$

$$\psi_3(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iuy} - 1) \mathbf{1}_{|y| \geq 1} d\mu(y)$$

$$\psi_4(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) \mathbf{1}_{|y| < 1} d\mu(y)$$

Then:

- $\psi_1(u)$ comes from a simple shift by b .
- $\psi_2(u)$ comes from a Gaussian $\sim N(0, \sigma^2)$.

– $\psi_3(u)$ comes from a compound Poisson $CPOI(\varrho, F)$ with

$$\varrho = \mu(\{y : |y| \geq 1\}), \quad dF(y) = \varrho^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{|y| \geq 1} d\mu(y).$$

– $\psi_4(u)$ comes as weak limit of a sequence of $CCPOI(\varrho^{(\varepsilon)}, G^{(\varepsilon)})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) \mathbf{1}_{|y| < 1} d\mu(y) &= \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon < |y| < 1} d\mu(y) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varrho^{(\varepsilon)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon < |y| < 1} dG^{(\varepsilon)}(y) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\varrho^{(\varepsilon)} := \mu(\{y : \varepsilon < |y| < 1\}), \quad dG^{(\varepsilon)}(y) = (\varrho^{(\varepsilon)})^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\varepsilon < |y| < 1} d\mu(y).$$

□

LÉVY MEASURE OF STABLE LAWS:

For $STAB(\alpha, \kappa, c, b)$

$$\psi(u) = ibu + c \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy \mathbb{1}_{|y| < 1} \right) d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y),$$

$$d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y) := \left(\frac{1 + \kappa}{2} \mathbb{1}_{y > 0} + \frac{1 - \kappa}{2} \mathbb{1}_{y < 0} \right) \frac{1}{|y|^{\alpha+1}} dy.$$

Remarks:

REM1: These are the only **homogeneous** Lévy measures.

REM2: Alternative forms:

$$\alpha \in (0, 1) : \quad \psi(u) = ib'u + c \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(e^{iuy} - 1 \right) d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y),$$

$$\alpha \in (1, 2) : \quad \psi(u) = ib'u + c \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy \right) d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y),$$

Proof. If

$$\psi(u) = ibu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}u^2 + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy\mathbf{1}_{|y|<1} \right) d\mu(y),$$

and $a > 0$ then

$$\tilde{\psi}(u) := \psi(au) = i\tilde{b}u - \frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{2}u^2 + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy\mathbf{1}_{|y|<1} \right) d\tilde{\mu}(y),$$

with

$$\tilde{b} = ab - a \int y \left(\mathbf{1}_{|y|<1} - \mathbf{1}_{|y|<a^{-1}} \right) d\mu(y), \quad \tilde{\sigma}^2 = a^2\sigma^2, \quad d\tilde{\mu}(y) = d\mu(y/a).$$

Stability: $(\forall a_1, a_2 > 0) (\exists a_3 > 0, b_3 \in \mathbb{R})$ such that:

$$\psi(a_1u) + \psi(a_2u) = ib_3u + \psi(a_3u).$$

It follows that

$$(1) \quad d\mu(y/a_1) + d\mu(y/a_2) = d\mu(y/a_3),$$

$$(2) \quad (a_1^2 + a_2^2)\sigma^2 = a_3^2\sigma^2.$$

(1) implies homogeneity of μ :

with some $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ and $C_+, C_- \geq 0$

$$d\mu(y) = (C_+ \mathbb{1}_{y>0} + C_- \mathbb{1}_{y<0}) \frac{1}{|y|^{\alpha+1}} dy,$$

and

$$\{C_+ + C_- > 0\} \implies \{a_1^\alpha + a_2^\alpha = a_3^\alpha\}.$$

From (2) it follows that either $\sigma^2 = 0$ or $C_+ = 0 = C_-$. □

POISSON POINT PROCESSES:

Let (S, d) be a complete, separable, locally compact metric space.
E.g. $S = \mathbb{R}^n$, or $S = (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \infty)$ with properly chosen metrization.

The space of **locally finite point systems**:

$$\Pi = \Pi(S) := \{ \mathcal{X} \subset S : (\forall K \in S) : |\mathcal{X} \cap K| < \infty \}.$$

$\Pi(S)$ is endowed with a natural metric topology, . . . , Borel sigma algebra \mathcal{F} .

Counting functions: for $K \in S$

$$m_K : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{N}, \quad m_K(\mathcal{X}) := |\mathcal{X} \cap K|.$$

Definition. A *(random) point process on (S, d)* is a (Π, \mathcal{F}) -valued random variable, Ξ . I.e. it is a probability measure on (Π, \mathcal{F}) .

Definition. Let μ be a sigma-finite, tight positive measure on S . The *Poisson point process with intensity measure μ* – denoted $PPP(\mu)$ – is the unique point process Ξ on (S, d) satisfying the following: If $K_1, \dots, K_n \in S$ are disjoint then $(m_{K_1}(\Xi), \dots, m_{K_n}(\Xi))$ are independent, and $m_{K_j}(\Xi) \sim POI(\mu(K_j))$.

Remarks:

Existence of $PPP(\mu)$: see constructions on next page.

Uniqueness of $PPP(\mu)$:

CONSTRUCTION FOR $\mu(S) < \infty$:

Let $\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots \in S$ be i.i.d., and $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ independent of the ξ_j -s, with distribution

$$\mathbf{P}(\xi_j \in A) = \frac{\mu(A)}{\mu(S)}, \quad \nu \sim \text{POI}(\mu(S)).$$

Then $\Xi := \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_\nu\}$ is $PPP(\mu)$. (HW!).

CONSTRUCTION FOR $\mu(S) = \infty$:

Let $S = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} S_k$, with disjoint S_k -s and $(\forall k) : \mu(S_k) < \infty$.

Let $\mu_k(\cdot) := \mu(\cdot \cap S_k)$, and $\Xi_k \sim PPP(\mu_k)$ as defined above.

Then $\Xi := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Xi_k$ is $PPP(\mu)$. (HW!).

REM1: A theorem of Rényi:

Theorem. Let μ be a *non-atomic* measure on S . (That is: $(\forall x \in S) : \mu(\{x\}) = 0$.) Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{P}(S)$ generate the Borel-algebra of (S, d) . If for a point process \mathcal{X} the following holds:

$$(\forall A \in \mathcal{A}, \text{ with } \mu(A) < \infty) : \quad m_A(\mathcal{X}) \sim \text{POI}(\mu(A)),$$

then $\mathcal{X} \sim \text{PPP}(\mu)$.

HW: Give counterexample with atomic μ !

REM2: Relation to $C\text{POI}(\varrho, G)$: For $S = \mathbb{R}$, $\varrho := \mu(S) < \infty$,
 $dG(y) := \varrho^{-1} d\mu(y)$:

$$\sum_{\xi \in \Xi} \xi =: X \sim C\text{POI}(\varrho, G).$$

REM3: Relation to Lévy measure, Lévy-Khinchin formula – summable case: $S = (0, \infty)$.

If

$$(1): \int_1^\infty d\mu(y) < \infty, \quad (2): \int_0^1 y d\mu(y) < \infty,$$

let

$$X_1 := \sum_{\xi \in \Xi \cap [1, \infty)} \xi, \quad X_2 := \sum_{\xi \in \Xi \cap (0, 1)} \xi,$$

Then

$$\mathbf{P}(X_1 < \infty) = 1 \quad (\checkmark),$$

$$\mathbf{E}(X_2) = \int_0^1 y d\mu(y) < \infty. \quad (\text{HW!})$$

The characteristic function of $X := X_1 + X_2$ is:

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuX\}\right) = \exp\left\{\int_0^\infty (e^{iuy} - 1)d\mu(y)\right\}.$$

REM4: Relation to Lévy measure, Lévy-Khinchin formula – non-summable case: $S = (0, \infty)$.

If

$$(1): \int_1^\infty d\mu(y) < \infty, \quad (2): \int_0^1 y^2 d\mu(y) < \infty,$$

let

$$X_1 := \sum_{\xi \in \Xi \cap [1, \infty)} \xi, \quad X_{2,\varepsilon} := \sum_{\xi \in \Xi \cap (\varepsilon, 1)} \xi - \int_\varepsilon^1 y d\mu(y).$$

Then

$$\mathbf{P}(X_1 < \infty) = 1 \quad (\checkmark),$$

$$\mathbf{P}(\exists \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} X_{2,\varepsilon} =: X_2) = 1, \quad (HW!)$$

(Hint: Compute $\mathbf{Var}(X_{2,\varepsilon})$ and use Kolmogorov's criterion.)

The characteristic function is of $X := X_1 + X_2$ is:

$$\mathbf{E}(\exp\{iuX\}) = \exp\left\{\int_0^\infty (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy\mathbb{1}_{0 < y < 1})d\mu(y)\right\}.$$

BACK TO STABLE CONVERGENCE:

Definition. The function $L : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is *slowly varying* (at infinity) iff

$$(\forall a > 0) : \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(ax)}{L(x)} = 1.$$

Examples, remarks, **HWs**:

- (1) If $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} L(x) = b \in (0, \infty)$ then obviously L is s.v.
- (2) For any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $L(x) := (\log x)^\beta$ is s.v.
- (3) Show that for $\beta < 1$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $L(x) := \exp\{c(\log x)^\beta\}$ is s.v.
- (4) Construct a s.v. function L for which

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} L(x) = 0, \quad \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} L(x) = \infty.$$

Definition. The function $U : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ is *regularly varying* (at infinity) iff

$$(\forall a > 0) : \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U(ax)}{U(x)} \quad \text{exists}$$

Fact: The function $x \mapsto U(x)$ is regularly varying at ∞ if and only if $U(x) = x^\beta L(x)$ with some $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $L(x)$ slowly varying.
(HW!)

Some basic facts about slowly varying functions:

(1) If $\beta > -1$ then

$$\int_1^x y^\beta L(y) dy = \left(\frac{1}{\beta + 1} + o(1) \right) x^{\beta+1} L(x).$$

(2) If $\beta < -1$ then

$$\int_x^\infty y^\beta L(y) dy = - \left(\frac{1}{\beta + 1} + o(1) \right) x^{\beta+1} L(x).$$

(3)

$$L(x) = a(x) \exp \left\{ \int_1^x \frac{\epsilon(y)}{y} dy \right\}$$

where $\exists \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} a(y) =: c, \quad \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon(y) = 0.$

Theorem (Skew stable limit theorem.). Let ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots be i.i.d. random variables. Assume

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1| > x\right) = x^{-\alpha}L(x) \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha \in (0, 1) \cup (1, 2),$$

$$(2) \quad \exists \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_1 > x\right)}{\mathbf{P}\left(\xi_1 < -x\right)} =: \frac{1 + \kappa}{1 - \kappa} \in [0, \infty].$$

Define

$$a_n := \inf\{x : \mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1| > x\right) < n^{-1}\} = n^{1/\alpha} \tilde{L}(n).$$

(i) $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ case:

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iuS_n/a_n\}\right) \rightarrow \exp\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(e^{iuy} - 1\right) d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y)\right\}.$$

(ii) $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ case:

$$\mathbf{E}\left(\exp\{iu(S_n - n\mathbf{E}(\xi_1))/a_n\}\right) \rightarrow \exp\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy\right) d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y)\right\}.$$

Proof:

Lemma (1).

$$\left\{ \frac{\xi_1}{a_n}, \frac{\xi_2}{a_n}, \dots, \frac{\xi_n}{a_n} \right\} =: \Xi_n \Rightarrow PPP(\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}).$$

Lemma (2). Let X_n , $n = 1, 2, \dots$, be a sequence of random variables and assume that for any $r = 1, 2, \dots$, X_n is decomposed as $X_n = Y_{n,r} + Z_{n,r}$. If

$$Y_{n,r} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} Y_{\infty,r} \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} Y,$$

and

$$(\forall \delta > 0) : \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(|Z_{n,r}| \geq \delta) = 0,$$

Then $X_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} Y$.

Case $\alpha \in (0, 1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} X_n &:= \frac{S_n}{a_n} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\xi_j}{a_n} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\xi_j}{a_n} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{|\xi_j|}{a_n} \geq r^{-1}} + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\xi_j}{a_n} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{|\xi_j|}{a_n} < r^{-1}} \\ &=: Y_{n,r} + Z_{n,r}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}\left(e^{iuY_{n,r}}\right) &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left\{ \int (e^{iuy} - 1) \mathbf{1}_{|y| \geq r^{-1}} d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y) \right\} \\ &\xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left\{ \int (e^{iuy} - 1) d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\left(|Z_{n,r}|\right) &\leq na_n^{-1}\mathbf{E}\left(|\xi_1|\mathbf{1}_{|\xi_1|<a_n/r}\right) \\
&= na_n^{-1}\int_0^{a_n/r}xd\mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1|<x\right) \\
&= na_n^{-1}\int_0^{a_n/r}\left\{\mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1|>x\right)-\mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1|>a_n/r\right)\right\}dx \\
&= na_n^{-1}\left\{\int_0^{a_n/r}x^{-\alpha}L(x)dx-(a_n/r)^{1-\alpha}L(a_n/r)\right\} \\
&= na_n^{-1}(a_n/r)^{1-\alpha}L(a_n/r)\left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}+o(1)\right) \\
&= \left\{na_n^{-\alpha}L(a_n)\right\}\frac{L(a_n/r)}{L(a_n)}\left(\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}+o(1)\right)r^{\alpha-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence: $\lim_{r\rightarrow\infty}\limsup_{n\rightarrow\infty}\mathbf{E}\left(|Z_{n,r}|\right)=0$.

Case $\alpha \in (1, 2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} X_n &:= \frac{S_n - n\mathbf{E}(\xi_1)}{a_n} = \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\xi_j}{a_n} - \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{\xi_j}{a_n}\right) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\xi_j}{a_n} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{|\xi_j|}{a_n} \geq r^{-1}} - \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{\xi_j}{a_n} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{|\xi_j|}{a_n} \geq r^{-1}}\right) \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \frac{\xi_j}{a_n} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{|\xi_j|}{a_n} < r^{-1}} - \mathbf{E}\left(\frac{\xi_j}{a_n} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{|\xi_j|}{a_n} < r^{-1}}\right) \right\} \\ &=: Y_{n,r} + Z_{n,r}. \end{aligned}$$

$$Y_{n,r} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\xi_j}{a_n} \mathbf{1}_{\frac{|\xi_j|}{a_n} \geq r-1} - na_n^{-1} \mathbf{E} \left(\xi_1 \mathbf{1}_{\frac{\xi_1}{a_n} \geq r-1} \right) \\ - na_n^{-1} \mathbf{E} \left(\xi_1 \mathbf{1}_{\frac{\xi_1}{a_n} \leq -r-1} \right),$$

$$\mathbf{E} \left(e^{iuY_{n,r}} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left\{ \int (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) \mathbf{1}_{|y| \geq r-1} d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y) \right\} \\ \xrightarrow{r \rightarrow \infty} \exp \left\{ \int (e^{iuy} - 1 - iuy) d\mu_{\alpha, \kappa}(y) \right\}$$

Computation on next page.

$$\begin{aligned}
na_n^{-1}\mathbf{E}\left(\xi_1 \mathbb{1}_{\frac{\xi_1}{a_n} \geq r^{-1}}\right) &= na_n^{-1} \int_{a_n/r}^{\infty} x d\mathbf{P}(\xi_1 < x) \\
&= na_n^{-1} \int_{a_n/r}^{\infty} \left\{ -d(x\mathbf{P}(\xi_1 \geq x)) + \mathbf{P}(\xi_1 \geq x) dx \right\} \\
&= na_n^{-1} \left\{ (a_n/r)^{1-\alpha} L^+(a_n/r) + \int_{a_n/r}^{\infty} x^{-\alpha} L^+(x) dx \right\} \\
&= na_n^{-\alpha} L(a_n) \frac{L^+(a_n/r)}{L(a_n)} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} + o(1) \right) r^{\alpha-1} \\
&\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\kappa+1}{2} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} r^{\alpha-1} \\
&= \frac{\kappa+1}{2} \int_{1/r}^{\infty} y \frac{\alpha}{y^{\alpha+1}} dy \quad (\checkmark).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\left(Z_{n,r}^2\right) &\leq na_n^{-2}\left\{\mathbf{E}\left(\xi_1^2 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_1| < a_n/r}\right) - \mathbf{E}\left(\xi_1 \mathbf{1}_{|\xi_1| < a_n/r}\right)^2\right\} \\
&= na_n^{-2}\left\{\int_0^{a_n/r} x^2 d\mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1| < x\right) - \left(\int_0^{a_n/r} x d\mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1| < x\right)\right)^2\right\} \\
&\leq na_n^{-2} \int_0^{a_n/r} x^2 d\mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1| < x\right) \\
&= na_n^{-2}\left\{-\left(a_n/r\right)^2 \mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1| \geq a_n/r\right) + \int_0^{a_n/r} 2x \mathbf{P}\left(|\xi_1| \geq x\right) dx\right\} \\
&= na_n^{-2}\left\{-\left(a_n/r\right)^{2-\alpha} L\left(a_n/r\right) + \left(\frac{2}{2-\alpha} + o(1)\right)\left(a_n/r\right)^{2-\alpha} L\left(a_n/r\right)\right\} \\
&= \left\{na_n^{-\alpha} L\left(a_n\right)\right\} \frac{L\left(a_n/r\right)}{L\left(a_n\right)} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha} + o(1)\right) r^{\alpha-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence: $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{E}\left(Z_{n,r}^2\right) = 0.$