

**Lemma 1.3.7.** (*Nowhere differentiability*) For  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost every  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the Brownian path  $B(\omega)$  is nowhere Hölder continuous with exponent  $\gamma > 1/2$ , i.e., the set

$$\{\omega \in \Omega : \exists t, h_0 \in (0, 1] \text{ s.t. } |B_{t+h}(\omega) - B_t(\omega)| \leq jh^\gamma \text{ for all } h \leq h_0\}$$

is contained in a set  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(F) = 0$ . In particular, the set

$$\{\omega \in \Omega : \text{for each } t \in [0, \infty), \text{ either } D^+B_t(\omega) = \infty \text{ or } D_+B_t(\omega) = -\infty\}$$

contains an event  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(F) = 1$ , which shows that the Brownian path is a.s. nowhere differentiable.

We omit the proof of this result. The interested reader can refer to Theorem 9.18 of Chapter 2 of [4]. Instead, we establish an easier result that is implied by Lemma 1.3.7.

**Lemma 1.3.8.** For  $\mathbb{P}$ -almost every  $\omega \in \Omega$ , the sample path  $B(\omega)$  is monotone in no interval of  $[0, \infty)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $F$  be the set of  $\omega \in \Omega$  with the property that  $B(\omega)$  is monotone in some interval. Since every non-empty interval contains one with rational end-points, we can write

$$F = \bigcup_{s, t \in \mathbb{Q}} \{\omega \mid B(\omega) \text{ is monotone on } [s, t]\}.$$

Since  $F$  is a countable union, to show  $\mathbb{P}(F) = 0$ , it suffices to show that each set in the union has zero measure. We first show that

$$A \doteq \{\omega \mid B(\omega) \text{ is non-decreasing on } [0, 1]\} \in \mathcal{F}$$

and  $\mathbb{P}(A) = 0$ . However,  $A = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \in \mathcal{F}$ , where

$$A_n = \bigcap_{i=0}^{n-1} \{B_{\frac{i+1}{n}} - B_{\frac{i}{n}} \geq 0\}.$$

Since, by the independent increments property and the symmetry of the distribution of  $B_{(i+1)/n} - B_{i/n}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(A_n) = (\frac{1}{2})^n$ , it follows that  $\mathbb{P}(A) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(A_n) = 0$ .  $\square$

We will often be interested in evaluating integrals of the form “ $\int_0^t Y_s dX_s$ ” for some stochastic processes  $X$  and  $Y$ . For example, if  $X$  describes the movement of a stock price and  $Y$  is the number of shares that you hold at time  $s$ , then the integral  $\int_0^t Y_s dX_s$  represents your net profit over the interval  $[0, t]$ . From the theory of Lebesgue-Stieltjes/Riemann-Stieltjes integration, it follows that if  $Y$  is continuous and  $X$  has finite first variation, then one can define this integral pathwise (i.e., for each fixed  $\omega$ ) as a Riemann-Stieltjes integral. This naturally

lead us to investigate the nature of the first variation of stochastic processes and, in particular, Brownian, sample paths.

Given a real-valued function  $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and partition  $\Pi = \{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{k_\Pi} < \dots < \infty\}$  of  $[0, \infty)$ , for each  $t \geq 0$ , let

$$V_t^{(p)}[\Pi](f) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |f(t_i \wedge t) - f(t_{i-1} \wedge t)|^p$$

and let  $\|\Pi\|$  denote the maximum mesh size of  $\Pi$ :

$$\|\Pi\| = \max_{i=1,2,\dots} |t_{i+1} - t_i|.$$

The (classical)  $p^{\text{th}}$ -variation (as defined in analysis) is given by

$$\tilde{V}_t^{(p)}(f) = \sup_{\Pi} V_t^{(p)}[\Pi](f).$$

If  $f$  is continuous and  $p = 1$ , one can equivalently write

$$\tilde{V}_t^{(1)}(f) = \lim_{\|\Pi_n\| \downarrow 0} V_t^{(1)}[\Pi_n](f).$$

Note that if  $f$  is not continuous or  $p > 1$ , this equivalence does not necessarily hold.

We now introduce the notion of the  $p^{\text{th}}$  variation of a stochastic process.

**Definition 1.3.9.** *Given a real-valued stochastic process  $X$ , the  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ -valued stochastic process  $\{V_t^{(p)}(X)\}$  is said to be the  $p^{\text{th}}$ -variation of the stochastic process  $X$  iff for every  $t < \infty$ ,*

$$V_t^{(p)}(X) = \lim_{\|\Pi_n\| \downarrow 0} V_t^{(p)}[\Pi_n](X), \quad t \in [0, \infty),$$

where  $\Pi_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ , is any sequence of partitions of  $[0, \infty)$  such that  $\|\Pi_n\| \downarrow 0$  and the limit is taken in probability.

Note that in many cases the  $p^{\text{th}}$ -variation may be a deterministic process. We will be particularly interested in the case when  $p = 2$ . In a later section, we will show that for certain stochastic processes  $X$  called semimartingales, one can equivalently define the quadratic variation process, denoted  $[X]$ , to be

$$[X]_t = X_t^2 - X_0^2 - 2 \int_0^t X_{s-} dX_s, \quad t \in [0, \infty), \quad (1.7)$$

where the last term is a stochastic integral that we are yet to define.

**Lemma 1.3.10.** *Given a Brownian motion  $\{B_t, \mathcal{F}_t\}$ , its quadratic variation process equals the deterministic function  $f$  given by  $f(t) = t$ . Moreover, Brownian motion a.s. does not have finite first variation on any finite interval  $[0, t]$ .*

*Proof.* Fix a partition  $\Pi = \{0 = t_0 < t_1 < t_2 < \dots\}$  of  $[0, \infty)$  and  $t \in [0, \infty)$ . Then, expanding both  $V_t^{(2)}[\Pi](B)$  and  $t$  as sums over the partition, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}[(V_t^{(2)}[\Pi](B) - t)^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Delta_j \right)^2 \right],$$

where

$$\Delta_j \doteq (B_{t_{j+1} \wedge t} - B_{t_j \wedge t})^2 - (t_{j+1} \wedge t - t_j \wedge t), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots$$

Since  $B_t - B_s \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t - s)$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[|B_t - B_s|^2] = t - s$  and  $\mathbb{E}[|B_t - B_s|^4] = 3(t - s)^2$  for every  $0 \leq s \leq t$ , and hence, for each  $j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Delta_j^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ (B_{t_{j+1} \wedge t} - B_{t_j \wedge t})^4 \right] - 2(t_{j+1} \wedge t - t_j \wedge t) \mathbb{E} \left[ (B_{t_{j+1} \wedge t} - B_{t_j \wedge t})^2 \right] \\ &\quad + (t_{j+1} \wedge t - t_j \wedge t)^2 \\ &= 2(t_{j+1} \wedge t - t_j \wedge t)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for every  $j, k$  with  $j < k$ , since  $\Delta_j$  is  $\mathcal{F}_{t_{j+1}}$ -measurable and, by the independent increments property,  $\mathbb{E}[\Delta_k | \mathcal{F}_{t_{j+1}}] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_k] = 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta_j \Delta_k] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\Delta_k \Delta_j | \mathcal{F}_{t_{j+1}}]] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_j \mathbb{E}[\Delta_k | \mathcal{F}_{t_{j+1}}]] = \mathbb{E}[\Delta_j \mathbb{E}[\Delta_k]] = 0.$$

Combining all these facts, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[(V_t^{(2)}[\Pi](B) - t)^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Delta_j \right)^2 \right] = 2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (t_{j+1} \wedge t - t_j \wedge t)^2 \leq 2|\pi|t.$$

Therefore, given a sequence  $\Pi_n$  such that  $\|\Pi_n\| \rightarrow 0$ , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(V_t^{(2)}[\Pi_n](B) - t)^2] \leq 2|\pi_n|t \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

which shows that  $V_t^{(2)}[\Pi_n]$  converges to  $t$  in  $L^2$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Since convergence in  $L^2$  implies convergence in probability, we conclude  $V_t^{(2)}[\Pi_n]$  converges to  $t$  in probability, and the first assertion of the lemma is established.

In turn, since convergence in probability implies convergence a.s. along a subsequence, we infer that there exists a subsequence  $\{\Pi_{n_k}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  of partitions such that  $V_t^{(2)}[\Pi_{n_k}](B(\omega)) \rightarrow t$  a.s. Now, for a.s. every  $\omega$ , by the definition of  $V^{(p)}$ ,  $p = 1, 2$ , we have

$$V_t^{(1)}[\Pi_{n_k}](B(\omega)) \geq \frac{V_t^{(2)}[\Pi_{n_k}](B(\omega))}{\sup_{t_i \in \Pi_{n_k}} |B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}|}. \quad (1.8)$$

Since  $B$  is a.s. continuous and the interval  $[0, t]$  is compact,  $B$  is a.s. uniformly continuous on  $[0, t]$ . Therefore, as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , the fact that  $\|\Pi_{n_k}\| \rightarrow 0$  implies

$$\sup_{t_i \in \Pi_{n_k}} |B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}| \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, taking limits as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  in (1.8), and using the fact that  $V_t^{(2)}[\Pi_{n_k}](B \cdot(\omega)) \rightarrow t$  a.s., we conclude that for a.s. every  $\omega$ ,  $V_t^{(1)}(B \cdot(\omega)) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} V_t^{(1)}[\Pi_{n_k}](B \cdot(\omega)) = \infty$ . This shows that the first variation is almost surely not finite, and thus completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$