

Credit Bubbles in Arbitrage Markets: The Geometric Arbitrage Approach to Credit Risk

Simone Farinelli

Core Dynamics GmbH

Scheuchzerstrasse 43

CH-8006 Zurich

Email: simone@coredynamics.ch

and

Hideyuki Takada

Department of Information Science

Narashino Campus, Toho University

2-2-1-Miyama, Funabashi-Shi

J-274-8510 Chiba

Email: hideyuki.takada@is.sci.toho-u.ac.jp

March 2, 2022

Abstract

We apply Geometric Arbitrage Theory to obtain results in mathematical finance for credit markets, which do not need stochastic differential geometry in their formulation. We obtain closed form equations involving default intensities and loss given defaults characterizing the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition for corporate bonds, as well as the generic dynamics for credit market allowing for arbitrage possibilities. Moreover, arbitrage credit bubbles for both base credit assets and credit derivatives are explicitly computed for the market dynamics minimizing the arbitrage.

Contents

1 Introduction

2

2	Geometric Arbitrage Theory Background	4
2.1	The Classical Market Model	5
2.2	Geometric Reformulation of the Market Model: Primitives	8
2.3	Bubbles in Arbitrage Markets	12
3	Generalized Derivatives of Stochastic Processes	18
4	Credit Risk	19
4.1	Classical Credit Risk Models	20
4.2	Geometric Arbitrage Theory Credit Risk Model	25
5	Credit Arbitrage Dynamics and Bubbles	30
6	Conclusion	31

1 Introduction

This paper utilizes a conceptual structure - called in Geometric Arbitrage Theory - to model arbitrage in credit markets. GAT embeds classical stochastic finance into a stochastic differential geometric framework to characterize arbitrage. The main contribution of this approach consists of modeling markets made of basic financial instruments together with their term structures as principal fibre bundles. Financial features of this market - like no arbitrage and equilibrium - are then characterized in terms of standard differential geometric constructions - like curvature - associated to a natural connection in this fibre bundle. Principal fibre bundle theory has been heavily exploited in theoretical physics as the language in which laws of nature can be best formulated by providing an invariant framework to describe physical systems and their dynamics. These ideas can be carried over to mathematical finance and economics. A market is a financial-economic system that can be described by an appropriate principle fibre bundle. A principle like the invariance of market laws under change of numéraire can be seen then as gauge invariance.

The fact that gauge theories are the natural language to describe economics was first proposed by Malaney and Weinstein in the context of the economic index problem ([?], [We06]). Ilinski (see [Il00] and [Il01]) and Young ([Yo99]) proposed to view arbitrage as the curvature of a gauge connection, in analogy to some physical theories. Independently, Cliff and Speed ([SmSp98]) further developed Flesaker and Hughston seminal work ([FlHu96]) and utilized techniques from differential geometry (indirectly

mentioned by allusive wording) to reduce the complexity of asset models before stochastic modeling.

Perhaps due to its borderline nature lying at the intersection between stochastic finance and differential geometry, there was almost no further mathematical research, and the subject, unfairly considered as an exotic topic, remained confined to econophysics, (see [FeJi07], [Mo09] and [DuFiMu00]). In [FFa15, Fa21] Geometric Arbitrage Theory has been given a rigorous mathematical foundation utilizing the formal background of stochastic differential geometry as in Schwartz ([?]), Elworthy ([EE182]), Eméry([Em89]), Hackenbroch and Thalmaier ([HaTh94]), Strock ([St00]) and Hsu ([Hs02]). GAT can bring new insights to mathematical finance by looking at the same concepts from a different perspective, so that the new results can be understood without stochastic differential geometric background. This is the case for the main contributions of this paper, a no arbitrage characterization of credit markets.

More precisely, we assume that there is a market in one currency for both government and corporate bonds for different maturities and we choose the government bond as numéraire. With the formal notation introduced in Subsection 4.2 we will prove following results.

Theorem 1 (No Arbitrage Credit Market). *Let $\lambda = \lambda_t$ and $\text{LGD} = \text{LGD}_t$ be the default intensity and the Loss-Given-Default, respectively, of the corporate bond. Let $P^{\text{Corp. Gov}}$ and $r^{\text{Corp. Gov}}$ be the term structures and short rate for corporate and government bonds. The following assertions are equivalent:*

(i) *The credit market model satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition.*

(ii) *There exists a positive local martingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that deflators and short rates satisfy for all times the condition*

$$\boxed{r_t^{\text{Corp}} - r_t^{\text{Gov}} = \beta_t \text{LGD}_t \lambda_t.} \quad (1)$$

(iii) *There exists a positive local martingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that deflators and term structures satisfy for all times the condition*

$$\boxed{\frac{P_{t,s}^{\text{Corp}}}{P_{t,s}^{\text{Gov}}} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp \left(- \int_t^s du \beta_u \text{LGD}_u \lambda_u \right) \right].} \quad (2)$$

This characterization of no arbitrage credit markets has been known for a long time (see f.i. [Schoe00], page 39) and can be now easily inferred as a consequence of Geometric Arbitrage Theory.

Moreover, we obtain what to our knowledge is a new result for credit markets.

Theorem 2 (Novikov’s Condition). *Let the credit market fullfill*

$$\boxed{r_t^{Corp} - r_t^{Gov} = \beta_t \text{LGD}_t \lambda_t,} \tag{3}$$

for a positive semimartingale $(\beta_t)_t$ and

$$\boxed{\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\exp \left(\int_0^T dt \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda_t \text{LGD}_t}{1 - \text{LGD}_t X_t} - (r_t^{Corp} - r_t^{Gov}) \right)^2 \frac{t}{Q_t(K)} \right) \right] < +\infty,} \tag{4}$$

where

$$\boxed{Q_t(K) := \frac{W_t^\dagger W_t}{t} \sim \chi^2(K).} \tag{5}$$

Then, the credit market satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing risk.

Furthermore, applying recently discovered results about the extension of asset bubbles for markets allowing for arbitrage, in Theorem 47 we can compute explicitly the arbitrage bubble for credit market composed by base assets and credit derivatives. This is again a new result.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews classical stochastic finance and the results of Geometric Arbitrage Theory. A guiding example is provided for a market whose asset prices are Itô processes. Proof are omitted and can be found in [FFa15, Fa21], [FaTa20], [FaTa20Bis] and in [FaTa21]. Section 3 provides the mathematical background to define generalized derivatives of stochastic processes, needed in the following, since the typical processes associated to credit risk have jumps and, in particular do not allow for Nelson’s derivatives in the strong sense. Section 4 reviews the fundamentals of credit risk and introduces the two basic model types, the structural and the reduced form (intensity based) ones. In Section 5 the Geometric Arbitrage Theory toolbox introduced in Section 2 is then utilize to prove results for no arbitrage credit markets. Section 6 concludes.

2 Geometric Arbitrage Theory Background

In this section we explain the main concepts of Geometric Arbitrage Theory introduced in [FFa15, Fa21] and reviewed and extended in [FaTa20], [FaTa20Bis] and [FaTa21], to which we refer for proofs and examples. It can be considered as the GAT reformulation of market risk.

2.1 The Classical Market Model

In this subsection we will summarize the classical set up, which will be rephrased in section (??) in differential geometric terms. We basically follow [HuKe04] and the ultimate reference [DeSc08].

We assume continuous time trading and that the set of trading dates is $[0, +\infty[$. This assumption is general enough to embed the cases of finite and infinite discrete times as well as the one with a finite horizon in continuous time. Note that while it is true that in the real world trading occurs at discrete times only, these are not known a priori and can be virtually any points in the time continuum. This motivates the technical effort of continuous time stochastic finance.

The uncertainty is modelled by a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$, where \mathbb{P} is the statistical (physical) probability measure, $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_t\}_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ an increasing family of sub- σ -algebras of \mathcal{A}_∞ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_\infty, \mathbb{P})$ is a probability space. The filtration \mathcal{A} is assumed to satisfy the usual conditions, that is

- right continuity: $\mathcal{A}_t = \bigcap_{s > t} \mathcal{A}_s$ for all $t \in [0, +\infty[$.
- \mathcal{A}_0 contains all null sets of \mathcal{A}_∞ .

The market consists of finitely many **assets** indexed by $j = 1, \dots, N$, whose **nominal prices** are given by the vector valued semimartingale $S : [0, +\infty[\times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$ denoted by $(S_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ adapted to the filtration \mathcal{A} . The stochastic process $(S_t^j)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ describes the price at time t of the j th asset in terms of unit of cash *at time* $t = 0$. More precisely, we assume the existence of a 0th asset, the **cash**, a strictly positive semimartingale, which evolves according to $S_t^0 = \exp(\int_0^t du r_u^0)$, where the predictable semimartingale $(r_t^0)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ represents the continuous interest rate provided by the cash account: one always knows in advance what the interest rate on the own bank account is, but this can change from time to time. The cash account is therefore considered the locally risk less asset in contrast to the other assets, the risky ones. In the following we will mainly utilize **discounted prices**, defined as $\hat{S}_t^j := S_t^j / S_t^0$, representing the asset prices in terms of *current* unit of cash.

We remark that there is no need to assume that asset prices are positive. But, there must be at least one strictly positive asset, in our case the cash. If we want to renormalize the prices by choosing another asset instead of the cash as reference, i.e. by making it to our **numéraire**, then this asset must have a strictly positive price process. More precisely, a generic numéraire is an asset, whose nominal price is represented by a strictly positive stochastic process $(B_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$, and which is a portfolio of the original assets $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N$. The discounted prices of the original assets are then represented in terms of the numéraire by the semimartingales $\hat{S}_t^j := S_t^j / B_t$.

We assume that there are no transaction costs and that short sales are allowed. Remark that the absence of transaction costs can be a serious limitation for a realistic model. The filtration \mathcal{A} is not

necessarily generated by the price process $(S_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$: other sources of information than prices are allowed. All agents have access to the same information structure, that is to the filtration \mathcal{A} .

A **strategy** is a predictable stochastic process $x : [0, +\infty[\times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$ describing the portfolio holdings. The stochastic process $(x_t^j)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ represents the number of pieces of j th asset portfolio held by the portfolio as time goes by. Remark that the Itô stochastic integral

$$\int_0^t x \cdot dS = \int_0^t x_u \cdot dS_u, \quad (6)$$

and the Stratonovich stochastic integral

$$\int_0^t x \circ dS := \int_0^t x \cdot dS + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t d\langle x, S \rangle = \int_0^t x_u \cdot dS_u + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t d\langle x, S \rangle_u \quad (7)$$

are well defined for this choice of integrator (S) and integrand (x), as long as the strategy is **admissible**, meaning that it is v -admissible for some $v \geq 0$, that is, $x = (x_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ is a predictable semimartingale for which the Itô integral satisfies $\int_0^t x \cdot dS \geq -v$ for all $t \geq 0$. The bracket $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ in (7) denotes the quadratic covariation of two processes. In a general context strategies do not need to be semimartingales, but if we want the quadratic covariation and hence Stratonovich's integral to be well defined, we must require this additional assumption. For details about stochastic integration we refer to Appendix A in [Em89], which summarizes Chapter VII of the authoritative [DeMe80]. The portfolio value is the process $\{V_t\}_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ defined by

$$V_t := V_t^x := x_t \cdot S_t. \quad (8)$$

An admissible strategy x is said to be **self-financing** if and only if the portfolio value at time t is given by

$$V_t = V_0 + \int_0^t x_u \cdot dS_u. \quad (9)$$

This means that the portfolio gain is the Itô integral of the strategy with the price process as integrator: the change of portfolio value is purely due to changes of the assets' values. The self-financing condition can be rewritten in differential form as

$$dV_t = x_t \cdot dS_t. \quad (10)$$

As pointed out in [BjHu05], if we want to utilize Stratonovich's integral to rephrase the self-financing condition, while maintaining its economical interpretation (which is necessary for the subsequent constructions of mathematical finance), we write

$$V_t = V_0 + \int_0^t x_u \circ dS_u - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t d\langle x, S \rangle_u \quad (11)$$

or, equivalently

$$dV_t = x_t \circ dS_t - \frac{1}{2} d\langle x, S \rangle_t. \quad (12)$$

An **arbitrage strategy** (or arbitrage for short) for the market model is an admissible self-financing strategy x , for which one of the following condition holds for some horizon $T > 0$:

- $P[V_0^x < 0] = 1$ and $P[V_T^x \geq 0] = 1$,
- $P[V_0^x \leq 0] = 1$ and $P[V_T^x \geq 0] = 1$ with $P[V_T^x > 0] > 0$.

In Chapter 9 of [DeSc08] the no arbitrage condition is given a topological characterization. In view of the fundamental Theorem of asset pricing, the no-arbitrage condition is substituted by a stronger condition, the so called no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk.

Definition 3 (Arbitrage). *Let the process $(S_t)_{[0,+\infty[}$ be a semimartingale and $(x_t)_{t \in [0,+\infty[}$ be admissible self-financing strategy. Let us consider trading up to time $T \leq \infty$. The portfolio wealth at time t is given by $V_t(x) := V_0 + \int_0^t x_u \cdot dS_u$, and we denote by K_0 the subset of $L^0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_T, P)$ containing all such $V_T(x)$, where x is any admissible self-financing strategy. We define*

- $C_0 := K_0 - L_+^0(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_T, P)$.
- $C := C_0 \cap L_+^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_T, P)$.
- \bar{C} : the closure of C in L^∞ with respect to the norm topology.
- $\mathcal{V}^{V_0} := \{(V_t)_{t \in [0,+\infty[} \mid V_t = V_t(x), \text{ where } x \text{ is } V_0\text{-admissible}\}$.
- $\mathcal{V}_T^{V_0} := \{V_T \mid (V_t)_{t \in [0,+\infty[} \in \mathcal{V}^{V_0}\}$: terminal wealth for V_0 -admissible self-financing strategies.

We say that S satisfies

- **(NA), no arbitrage**, if and only if $C \cap L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_T, P) = \{0\}$.
- **(NFLVR), no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk**, if and only if $\bar{C} \cap L^\infty(\Omega, \mathcal{A}_T, P) = \{0\}$.
- **(NUPBR), no-unbounded-profit-with-bounded-risk**, if and only if $\mathcal{V}_T^{V_0}$ is bounded in L^0 for some $V_0 > 0$.

The relationship between these three different types of arbitrage has been elucidated in [DeSc94] and in [Ka97] with the proof of the following result.

Theorem 4.

$$\boxed{(NFLVR) \Leftrightarrow (NA) + (NUPBR)}. \quad (13)$$

Delbaen and Schachermayer proved in 1994 (see [DeSc08] Chapter 9.4, in particular the main Theorem 9.1.1)

Theorem 5 (First Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing in Continuous Time). *Let $(S_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ and $(\hat{S}_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ be bounded semimartingales. There is an equivalent martingale measure \mathbb{P}^* for the discounted prices \hat{S} if and only if the market model satisfies the (NFLVR).*

This is a generalization for continuous time of the Dalang-Morton-Willinger Theorem proved in 1990 (see [DeSc08], Chapter 6) for the discrete time case, where the (NFLVR) is relaxed to the (NA) condition. The Dalang-Morton-Willinger Theorem generalizes to arbitrary probability spaces the Harrison and Pliska Theorem (see [DeSc08], Chapter 2) which holds true in discrete time for finite probability spaces.

An equivalent alternative to the martingale measure approach for asset pricing purposes is given by the pricing kernel (state price deflator) method.

Definition 6. *Let $(S_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ be a semimartingale describing the price process for the assets of our market model. The positive semimartingale $(\beta_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ is called **pricing kernel (or state price deflator)** for S if and only if $(\beta_t S_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ is a \mathbb{P} -martingale.*

As shown in [HuKe04] (Chapter 7, definitions 7.18, 7.47 and Theorem 7.48), the existence of a pricing kernel is equivalent to the existence of an equivalent martingale measure for a specific choice of numéraire. If we want the numéraire to be arbitrary, like the one we originally choose for the model, then we have to additionally assume that the pricing kernel β is a local \mathbb{P} -martingale.

Theorem 7. *Let $(S_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ and $(\hat{S}_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ be bounded semimartingales. The process \hat{S} admits an equivalent martingale measure \mathbb{P}^* if and only if there is a pricing kernel β for S (or for \hat{S}), which is a local martingale.*

2.2 Geometric Reformulation of the Market Model: Primitives

We are going to introduce a more general representation of the market model introduced in section 2.1, which better suits to the arbitrage modeling task.

Definition 8. *A **gauge** is an ordered pair of two \mathcal{A} -adapted real valued semimartingales (D, P) , where $D = (D_t)_{t \geq 0} : [0, +\infty[\times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is called **deflator** and $P = (P_{t,s})_{t,s} : \mathcal{T} \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$, which is called **term structure**, is considered as a stochastic process with respect to the time t , termed **valuation date** and $\mathcal{T} := \{(t, s) \in [0, +\infty[^2 \mid s \geq t\}$. The parameter $s \geq t$ is referred as **maturity date**. The following properties must be satisfied a.s. for all t, s such that $s \geq t \geq 0$:*

(i) $P_{t,s} > 0$,

(ii) $P_{t,t} = 1$.

Remark 9. Deflators and term structures can be considered outside the context of fixed income. An arbitrary financial instrument is mapped to a gauge (D, P) with the following economic interpretation:

- *Deflator:* D_t is the value of the financial instrument at time t expressed in terms of some numéraire. If we choose the cash account, the 0-th asset as numéraire, then we can set $D_t^j := \hat{S}_t^j = \frac{S_t^j}{S_t^0}$ ($j = 1, \dots, N$).
- *Term structure:* $P_{t,s}$ is the value at time t (expressed in units of deflator at time t) of a synthetic zero coupon bond with maturity s delivering one unit of financial instrument at time s . It represents a term structure of forward prices with respect to the chosen numéraire.

We point out that there is no unique choice for deflators and term structures describing an asset model. For example, if a set of deflators qualifies, then we can multiply every deflator by the same positive semimartingale to obtain another suitable set of deflators. Of course term structures have to be modified accordingly. The term "deflator" is clearly inspired by actuarial mathematics. In the present context it refers to a nominal asset value up division by a strictly positive semimartingale (which can be the state price deflator if this exists and it is made to the numéraire). There is no need to assume that a deflator is a positive process. However, if we want to make an asset to our numéraire, then we have to make sure that the corresponding deflator is a strictly positive stochastic process.

Definition 10. The term structure can be written as a functional of the **instantaneous forward rate** f defined as

$$\boxed{f_{t,s} := -\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \log P_{t,s}, \quad P_{t,s} = \exp\left(-\int_t^s dh f_{t,h}\right)}. \quad (14)$$

and

$$\boxed{r_t := \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} f_{t,s}} \quad (15)$$

is termed **short rate**.

Remark 11. Since $(P_{t,s})_{t,s}$ is a t -stochastic process (semimartingale) depending on a parameter $s \geq t$, the s -derivative can be defined deterministically, and the expressions above make sense pathwise in a both classical and generalized sense. In a generalized sense we will always have a \mathcal{D}' derivative for any $\omega \in \Omega$; this corresponds to a classic s -continuous derivative if $P_{t,s}(\omega)$ is a C^1 -function of s for any fixed $t \geq 0$ and $\omega \in \Omega$.

Remark 12. The special choice of vanishing interest rate $r \equiv 0$ or flat term structure $P \equiv 1$ for all assets corresponds to the classical model, where only asset prices and their dynamics are relevant.

Let us consider -in continuous time- a market with N assets and a numéraire. A general portfolio at time t is described by the vector of nominals $x \in \mathfrak{X}$, for an open set $\mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. Following Definition 8, the asset model induces for $j = 1, \dots, N$ the gauge

$$(D^j, P^j) = ((D_t^j)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}, (P_{t,s}^j)_{s \geq t}), \quad (16)$$

where D^j denotes the deflator and P^j the term structure. This can be written as

$$P_{t,s}^j = \exp\left(-\int_t^s f_{t,u}^j du\right), \quad (17)$$

where f^j is the instantaneous forward rate process for the j -th asset and the corresponding short rate is given by $r_t^j := \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} f_{t,u}^j$. For a portfolio with nominals $x \in \mathfrak{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ we define

$$\boxed{D_t^x := \sum_{j=1}^N x_j D_t^j \quad f_{t,u}^x := \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_j D_t^j}{\sum_{j=1}^N x_j D_t^j} f_{t,u}^j \quad P_{t,s}^x := \exp\left(-\int_t^s f_{t,u}^x du\right)}. \quad (18)$$

The short rate writes

$$\boxed{r_t^x := \lim_{u \rightarrow 0^+} f_{t,u}^x = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{x_j D_t^j}{\sum_{j=1}^N x_j D_t^j} r_t^j}. \quad (19)$$

The image space of all possible strategies reads

$$M := \{(t, x) \in [0, +\infty[\times \mathfrak{X}\}. \quad (20)$$

We can prove following results which characterizes arbitrage as curvature.

Theorem 13 (No Arbitrage). *The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) *The market model satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition.*
- (ii) *There exists a positive local martingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that deflators and short rates satisfy for all times and all portfolio nominals $(t, x) \in M$ the condition*

$$\boxed{r_t^x = -\mathcal{D} \log(\beta_t D_t^x)}. \quad (21)$$

- (iii) *There exists a positive local martingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that deflators and term structures satisfy*

for all times and all portfolio nominals $(t, x) \in M$ the condition

$$\boxed{P_{t,s}^x = \frac{\mathbb{E}_t[\beta_s D_s^x]}{\beta_t D_t^x}}. \quad (22)$$

This motivates the following definition.

Definition 14. *The market model satisfies the **zero curvature condition (ZC)** if and only if the curvature vanishes a.s.*

As proved in [FaTa20], the two weaker notions of arbitrage, the zero curvature and the no-unbounded-profit-with-bounded-risk are equivalent. Together with the well-known results in [DeSc94] and [Ka97] this leads to

Theorem 15.

$$\boxed{(NFLVR) \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} (NUPBR) \Rightarrow (ZC) \\ (NA) \end{cases}} \quad (23)$$

As an example to demonstrate how the most important geometric concepts of Section 2 can be applied we consider an asset model whose dynamics is given by a multidimensional multidimensional Itô-process. Let us consider a market consisting of $N + 1$ assets labeled by $j = 0, 1, \dots, N$, where the 0-th asset is the cash account utilized as a numéraire. Therefore, as explained in the introductory Subsection 2.1, it suffices to model the price dynamics of the other assets $j = 1, \dots, N$ expressed in terms of the 0-th asset. As vector valued semimartingales for the discounted price process $\hat{S} : [0, +\infty[\times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$ and the short rate $r : [0, +\infty[\times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$, we chose the multidimensional Itô-processes given by

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{S}_t &= \hat{S}_t(\alpha_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t) \\ dr_t &= a_t dt + b_t dW_t, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where

- $(W_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ is a standard P -Brownian motion in \mathbf{R}^K , for some $K \in \mathbf{N}$, and,
- $(\sigma_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$, $(\alpha_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ are $\mathbf{R}^{N \times K}$ -, and respectively, \mathbf{R}^N - valued stochastic processes,
- $(b_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$, $(a_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ are $\mathbf{R}^{N \times L}$ -, and respectively, \mathbf{R}^N - valued stochastic processes.

Proposition 16. *Let the dynamics of a market model be specified by following Itô's processes as in (24), where we additionally assume that the coefficients*

- $(\alpha_t)_t, (\sigma_t)_t$, and $(r_t)_t$ satisfy

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathbb{E}_s[\alpha_t] = \alpha_t, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathbb{E}_s[r_t] = r_t, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathbb{E}_s[\sigma_t] = \sigma_t, \quad (25)$$

- $(\sigma_t)_t$ is an Itô's process,
- $(\sigma_t)_t$ and $(W_t)_t$ are independent processes.

Then, the market model satisfies the (ZC) condition if and only if

$$\alpha_t + r_t \in \text{Range}(\sigma_t). \quad (26)$$

Remark 17. In the case of the classical model, where there are no term structures (i.e. $r \equiv 0$), the condition (26) reads as $\alpha_t \in \text{Range}(\sigma_t)$.

The stronger (NFLVR) condition in this guiding example appears in the following result.

Proposition 18. For the market model whose dynamics is specified by the SDEs

$$\begin{aligned} d\hat{S}_t &= \hat{S}_t(\alpha_t dt + \sigma_t dW_t) \\ dr_t &= a_t dt + b_t dW_t, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing risk condition (NFLVR) is satisfied if **Novikov's condition**

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\exp \left(\int_0^T \frac{1}{2} \left| \sigma_t^\dagger (\sigma_t \sigma_t^\dagger)^{-1} (\alpha_t + r_t) \right|^2 du \right) \right] < +\infty, \quad (28)$$

is fulfilled.

2.3 Bubbles in Arbitrage Markets

Asset bubbles were first introduced in [JPS10] for complete markets and have been recently extended to and computed for arbitrage markets in [FaTa20Bis] and in [FaTa21], whose main findings we briefly summarize here below.

Definition 19. The *cash flow bundle* is defined as

$$\mathcal{V} := \underbrace{[0, T] \times \mathfrak{X}}_{=M} \times \mathbb{R}^{[0, +\infty[}. \quad (29)$$

The space of the sections of the cashflow bundle can be made into a scalar product space by introducing, for stochastic sections $f = f(t, x, \omega) = (f_s(t, x, \omega))_{s \in [0, +\infty[}$ and $g = g(t, x, \omega) = (g_s(t, x, \omega))_{s \in [0, +\infty[}$

$$(f, g) := \int_{\Omega} dP \int_X d^N x \int_0^T dt \langle f, g \rangle(t, x, \omega) = \mathbb{E}_0 \left[(f, g)_{L^2(M, \mathbb{R}^{[0, +\infty[})} \right] = (f, g)_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}_0, dP)},$$

where

$$\langle f, g \rangle(t, x, \omega) := \int_0^{+\infty} ds f_s(t, x, \omega) g_s(t, x, \omega). \quad (30)$$

The Hilbert space of integrable sections reads

$$\mathcal{H} := L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}_0, dP) = \left\{ f = f(t, x, \omega) = (f_s(t, x, \omega))_{s \in [0, +\infty[} \mid (f, f)_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}_0, dP)} < +\infty \right\}. \quad (31)$$

Let us extend the coordinate vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with a 0th component given by the time t . Let $X = \sum_{j=0}^N X_j \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ be a vector field over M and $f = (f_s)_s$ a section of the cashflow bundle \mathcal{V} . Then,

$$\boxed{\nabla_X^{\mathcal{V}} f_t := \sum_{j=0}^N \left(\frac{\partial f_t}{\partial x_j} + K_j f_t \right) X_j,} \quad (32)$$

where

$$\boxed{K_0(x) = -r_t^x \quad K_j(x) = \frac{D_t^j}{D_t^x} \quad (1 \leq j \leq N).} \quad (33)$$

defines a covariant derivative on the cash flow bundle \mathcal{V} .

Definition 20 (Spectral Lower Bound). The highest spectral lower bound of the connection Laplacian on the cash flow bundle \mathcal{V} is given by

$$\lambda_0 := \inf_{\substack{\varphi \in C^\infty(M, \mathcal{V}) \\ \varphi \neq 0 \\ B_N(\varphi) = 0}} \frac{(\nabla^{\mathcal{V}} \varphi, \nabla^{\mathcal{V}} \varphi)_{\mathcal{H}}}{(\varphi, \varphi)_{\mathcal{H}}} \quad (34)$$

and it is assumed on the subspace

$$E_{\lambda_0} := \left\{ \varphi \mid \varphi \in C^\infty(M, \mathcal{V}) \cap \mathcal{H}, B_N(\varphi) = 0, (\nabla^{\mathcal{V}} \varphi, \nabla^{\mathcal{V}} \varphi)_{\mathcal{H}} \geq \lambda_0 (\varphi, \varphi)_{\mathcal{H}} \right\}. \quad (35)$$

The space

$$\mathcal{K}_{\lambda_0} := \left\{ \varphi \in E_{\lambda_0} \mid \varphi \geq 0, \mathbb{E}[\varphi] = 1 \right\} \quad (36)$$

contains all candidates for the Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{d\mathbb{P}^*}{d\mathbb{P}} = \varphi, \quad (37)$$

for a probability measure P^* absolutely continuous with respect to the statistical measure P .

Theorem 5, that is the first fundamental theorem of asset pricing can be reformulated as

Proposition 21. *The market model satisfies the (NFLVR) condition if and only if $\lambda_0 = 0$. Any probability measure defined by (37) with $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}_0$ is a risk neutral measure, that is $(D_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a vector valued martingale with respect to P^* , i.e.*

$$\mathbb{E}_t^*[D_s] = D_t \quad \text{for all } s \geq t \text{ in } [0, T]. \quad (38)$$

The market is complete if and only if $\lambda_0 = 0$ and $\dim E_0 = 1$.

For arbitrage markets we have that $\lambda_0 > 0$ and there exists no risk neutral probability measures. Nevertheless it is possible to define a fundamental value, however not in a unique way.

Definition 22 (Basic Assets' Arbitrage Fundamental Prices and Bubbles). *Let $(C_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ the \mathbb{R}^N cash flow stream stochastic process associated to the N assets of the market model with given spectral lower bound λ_0 and Radon-Nikodym candidates' subspace \mathcal{K}_{λ_0} . For a given choice of $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}_{\lambda_0}$ the approximated fundamental value of the assets with stochastic \mathbb{R}^N -valued price process $(S_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is defined as*

$$S_t^{*, \varphi} := \mathbb{E}_t \left[\varphi \left(\int_t^\tau dC_u \exp \left(- \int_t^u r_s^0 ds \right) + S_\tau \exp \left(- \int_t^\tau r_s^0 ds \right) 1_{\{\tau < +\infty\}} \right) \right] 1_{\{t < \tau\}}, \quad (39)$$

where τ denotes the maturity time of all risky assets in the market model, and, the approximated bubble is defined as

$$B_t^\varphi := S_t - S_t^{*, \varphi}. \quad (40)$$

The fundamental price vector for the assets and their asset bubble prices are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} S_t^* &:= S_t^{*, \varphi_0} \\ B_t &:= B_t^{\varphi_0} \\ \varphi_0 &:= \arg \min_{\varphi \in \mathcal{K}_{\lambda_0}} \mathbb{E}_0 \left[\int_0^T ds |B_s^\varphi|^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The probability measure P^* with Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{dP^*}{dP} = \varphi_0 \quad (42)$$

is termed *minimal arbitrage measure*.

Proposition 23. *The assets' fundamental values can be expressed as conditional expectation with respect to the minimal arbitrage measure as*

$$S_t^* := \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\int_t^\tau dC_u \exp \left(- \int_t^u r_s^0 ds \right) + S_\tau \exp \left(- \int_t^\tau r_s^0 ds \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < +\infty\}} \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{t < \tau\}}. \quad (43)$$

Formula (43) can be reformulated in terms of the curvature, by means of which we can extend Jarrow-Protter-Shimbo's results in [JPS10] to the following bubble decomposition and classifications theorems proved in [FaTa20Bis].

Theorem 24 (Bubble decomposition and types). *Let $T = +\infty$ and τ denote the maturity time of all risky assets in the market model. S_t admits a unique (up to P -evanescent set) decomposition*

$$S_t = \tilde{S}_t + B_t, \quad (44)$$

where $B = (B_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a càdlàg process satisfying for all $j = 1, \dots, N$

$$B_t^j = S_t^j - \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\int_t^\tau dC_u^j \exp \left(- \int_t^u ds r_s^0 \right) + \exp \left(\int_t^\tau ds r_s^0 \right) S_\tau^j \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau < +\infty\}} \right] \mathbf{1}_{\{t < \tau\}}, \quad (45)$$

into a sum of fundamental and bubble values.

If there exists a non-trivial bubble B_t^j in an asset's price for $j = 1, \dots, N$, then, there exists a probability measure P^* equivalent to P , for which we have three and only three possibilities:

Type 1: B_t^j is local super- or submartingale with respect to both P and P^* , if $P[\tau = +\infty] > 0$.

Type 2: B_t^j is local super- or submartingale with respect to both P and P^* , but not uniformly integrable super- or submartingale, if B_t^j is unbounded but with $P[\tau < +\infty] = 1$.

Type 3: B_t^j is a strict local super- or sub- P - and P^* -martingale, if τ is a bounded stopping time.

Next we analyze the situation for derivatives.

Definition 25 (Contingent Claim's Arbitrage Fundamental Price and Bubble). *Let us consider in the context of Definition (22) a European option given by the contingent claim with a unique pay*

off $G(S_T)$ at time T for an appropriate real valued function G of N real variables. The contingent claim fundamental price and its corresponding arbitrage bubble is defined in the case of base assets paying no dividends as

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^*(G) &:= \mathbb{E}_t \left[\varphi_0 \exp \left(- \int_t^T r_s^0 ds \right) G(S_T) 1_{\{T < +\infty\}} \right] 1_{\{t < T\}} = \\ &= \mathbb{E}^* \left[\exp \left(- \int_t^T r_s^0 ds \right) G(S_T) 1_{\{T < +\infty\}} \right] 1_{\{t < T\}} \\ B_t(G) &:= V_t(G) - V_t^*(G), \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where φ_0 is the minimizer for the basic assets bubbled defined in (41), P^* the minimal arbitrage measure and $(V_t(G))_{t \in [0, T]}$ is the price process of the European option.

In the case of base assets paying dividends the definition becomes

$$\begin{aligned} V_t^*(G) &:= \mathbb{E}_t \left[\varphi_0 \exp \left(- \int_t^T r_s^0 ds \right) G \left(S_T \exp \left(\frac{C_T}{S_T} (T - t) \right) \right) 1_{\{T < +\infty\}} \right] 1_{\{t < T\}} = \\ &= \mathbb{E}^* \left[\exp \left(- \int_t^T r_s^0 ds \right) G \left(S_T \exp \left(\frac{C_T}{S_T} (T - t) \right) \right) 1_{\{T < +\infty\}} \right] 1_{\{t < T\}} \\ B_t(H) &:= V_t(G) - V_t^*(G), \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\frac{C_j^j}{S_t^j}$ is the instantaneous dividend rate for the j -th asset.

Remark 26. If the market is complete, then $\lambda_0 = 0$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\lambda_0} = \{\varphi_0\}$, where φ_0 is the Radon-Nykodim derivative of the unique risk neutral probability measure with respect to the statistical probability measure. The definitions in (22) and in (24) coincide for the complete market with the definitions of fundamental value and asset bubble price for both base asset and contingent claim introduced by Jarrow, Protter and Shimbo in [JPS10], proving that they are a natural extension to markets allowing for arbitrage opportunities.

Corollary 27. The bubble discounted values for the base assets in Definition 22) and for the contingent claim on the base assets paying dividends in Definition 24

$$\widehat{B}_t := \exp \left(- \int_0^t r_s^0 ds \right) B_t \quad \widehat{B}(G)_t := \exp \left(- \int_0^t r_s^0 ds \right) B(G)_t \quad (48)$$

satisfy the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{B}_t^j &= D_t^j - \left(\mathbb{E}_t^* [D_\tau^j 1_{\{\tau < +\infty\}}] + \mathbb{E}_t^* [\widehat{C}_\tau^j 1_{\{\tau < +\infty\}}] - \widehat{C}_t^j \right) 1_{\{t < \tau\}} \\ \widehat{B}_t(G) &= \widehat{V}_t(G) - \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\widehat{G} \left(S_T \exp \left(\frac{C_T}{S_T} (T - t) \right) \right) 1_{\{T < +\infty\}} \right] 1_{\{t < T\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

where

$$\widehat{C}_t^j := \exp\left(-\int_0^t r_s^0 ds\right) C_t^j \quad \widehat{G} := \exp\left(-\int_0^T r_s^0 ds\right) G \quad \widehat{V}_t(G) := \exp\left(-\int_0^t r_s^0 ds\right) V_t(G) \quad (50)$$

are the discounted cashflow for the j -th asset, the discounted contingent claim payoff, and the discounted value of the derivative.

Theorem 28. *The following statements hold true for any market model with $T \leq +\infty$ allowing for arbitrage:*

- (a) *Market portfolio, asset values and term structures solving the minimal arbitrage problem are identically distributed along time, their returns are centered and serially uncorrelated:*

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} ([x_t; D_t; r_t])_{t \in [0, T]} \text{ is an i.d. process with respect to the statistical probability measure } P, \\ ([\mathcal{D}x_t; \mathcal{D}D_t; \mathcal{D}r_t])_{t \in [0, T]} \text{ is centered and has vanishing autocovariance function,} \end{aligned}} \quad (51)$$

In particular, conditional and total expectations of asset values, nominals and term structures are constant over time:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{lll} \mathbb{E}_0[x_t] \equiv \text{const} & \mathbb{E}_0[D_t] \equiv \text{const} & \mathbb{E}_0[r_t] \equiv \text{const} \\ \mathbb{E}_0[\mathcal{D}x_t] \equiv 0 & \mathbb{E}_0[\mathcal{D}D_t] \equiv 0 & \mathbb{E}_0[\mathcal{D}r_t] \equiv 0. \end{array}} \quad (52)$$

The variances of portfolio nominals are concurrent with those of the deflators:

$$\boxed{\text{Var}_0(D_t^j) \text{Var}_0\left(\frac{x_t^j}{x_t \cdot D_t}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4},} \quad (53)$$

for all indices $j = 1, \dots, N$.

- (b) *Expectation and variance of the bubble discounted value for the j -th asset read*

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0[\widehat{B}_t^j] &= \mathbb{E}_0[D_t^j - \widehat{C}_t^j] - \mathbb{E}_0^* [D_T^j - \widehat{C}_T^j] \\ \text{Var}_0(\widehat{B}_t^j) &= \text{Var}_0(D_t^j - \widehat{C}_t^j) + \text{Var}_0^*(D_T^j - \widehat{C}_T^j) - 2 \text{Cov}_0^*(D_t^j - \widehat{C}_t^j, D_T^j - \widehat{C}_T^j). \end{aligned}} \quad (54)$$

- (c) *Expectation and variance of the bubble discounted value for the contingent claim $G(S_T)$ on the*

base assets read

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_0[\widehat{B}_t(G)] &= \mathbb{E}_0[\widehat{V}_t(G)] - \mathbb{E}_0^* \left[\widehat{G} \left(S_T \exp \left(\frac{C_T}{S_T} (T-t) \right) \right) \right] \\ \text{Var}_0(\widehat{B}_t(G)) &= \text{Var}_0(\widehat{V}_t(G)) + \text{Var}_0^* \left(\widehat{G} \left(S_T \exp \left(\frac{C_T}{S_T} (T-t) \right) \right) \right).\end{aligned}} \quad (55)$$

3 Generalized Derivatives of Stochastic Processes

In stochastic differential geometry one would like to lift the constructions of stochastic analysis from open subsets of \mathbf{R}^N to N dimensional differentiable manifolds. To that aim, chart invariant definitions are needed and hence a stochastic calculus satisfying the usual chain rule and not Itô's Lemma is required, (cf. [HaTh94]), Chapter 7, and the remark in Chapter 4 at the beginning of page 200). That is why the papers about geometric arbitrage theory are mainly concerned in by stochastic integrals and derivatives meant in *Stratonovich's* sense and not in *Itô's*. Of course, at the end of the computation, Stratonovich integrals can be transformed into Itô's. Note that a fundamental portfolio equation, the self-financing condition cannot be directly formally expressed with Stratonovich integrals, but first with Itô's and then transformed into Stratonovich's, because it is a non-anticipative condition.

Definition 29. Let I be a real interval and $Q = (Q_t)_{t \in I}$ be a \mathbf{R}^N -valued stochastic process on the probability space (Ω, \mathcal{A}, P) . The process Q determines three families of σ -subalgebras of the σ -algebra \mathcal{A} :

- (i) "Past" \mathcal{P}_t , generated by the preimages of Borel sets in \mathbf{R}^N by all mappings $Q_s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$ for $0 < s < t$.
- (ii) "Future" \mathcal{F}_t , generated by the preimages of Borel sets in \mathbf{R}^N by all mappings $Q_s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$ for $0 < t < s$.
- (iii) "Present" \mathcal{N}_t , generated by the preimages of Borel sets in \mathbf{R}^N by the mapping $Q_s : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^N$.

Let $Q = (Q_t)_{t \in I}$ be continuous. Assuming that the following limits exist, **Nelson's stochastic derivatives** are defined as

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned}DQ_t &:= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Q_{t+h} - Q_t}{h} \middle| \mathcal{P}_t \right] : \text{forward derivative,} \\ D_*Q_t &:= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{Q_t - Q_{t-h}}{h} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] : \text{backward derivative,} \\ DQ_t &:= \frac{DQ_t + D_*Q_t}{2} : \text{mean derivative.}\end{aligned}} \quad (56)$$

Let $\mathcal{S}^1(I)$ the set of all processes Q such that $t \mapsto Q_t$, $t \mapsto DQ_t$ and $t \mapsto D_*Q_t$ are continuous mappings from I to $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$. Let $\mathcal{C}^1(I)$ the completion of $\mathcal{S}^1(I)$ with respect to the norm

$$\|Q\| := \sup_{t \in I} (\|Q_t\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A})} + \|DQ_t\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A})} + \|D_*Q_t\|_{L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{A})}). \quad (57)$$

Remark 30. The stochastic derivatives D , D_* and \mathcal{D} correspond to Itô's, to the anticipative and, respectively, to Stratonovich's integral (cf. [GG11]). The process space $\mathcal{C}^1(I)$ contains all Itô processes. If Q is a Markov process, then the sigma algebras \mathcal{P}_t ("past") and \mathcal{F}_t ("future") in the definitions of forward and backward derivatives can be substituted by the sigma algebra \mathcal{N}_t ("present"), see Chapter 6.1 and 8.1 in ([GG11]).

Stochastic derivatives can be defined pointwise in $\omega \in \Omega$ outside the class \mathcal{C}^1 in terms of generalized functions.

Definition 31. Let $Q : I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ be a continuous linear functional in the test processes $\varphi : I \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ for $\varphi(\cdot, \omega) \in C_c^\infty(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$. We mean by this that for a fixed $\omega \in \Omega$ the functional $Q(\cdot, \omega) \in \mathcal{D}(I, \mathbb{R}^N)$, the topological vector space of continuous distributions. We can then define **Nelson's generalized stochastic derivatives**:

$$\begin{aligned} DQ(\varphi_t) &:= -Q(D\varphi_t): \text{ forward generalized derivative,} \\ D_*Q(\varphi_t) &:= -Q(D_*\varphi_t): \text{ backward generalized derivative,} \\ \mathcal{D}(\varphi_t) &:= -Q(\mathcal{D}\varphi_t): \text{ mean generalized derivative.} \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

If the generalized derivative is regular, then the process has a derivative in the classic sense. This construction is nothing else than a straightforward pathwise lift of the theory of generalized functions to a wider class stochastic processes which do not a priori allow for Nelson's derivatives in the strong sense. We will utilize this feature in the treatment of credit risk, where many processes with jumps occur.

4 Credit Risk

After having introduced the machinery of Geometric Arbitrage Theory we can tackle the modeling of assets' defaults and their recoveries.

4.1 Classical Credit Risk Models

Here we summarize the standard ways to model credit risk. We follow [JaPr04] and [FrSc11]. There are basically two possibilities for modeling defaults: structural model types on one hand and reduced form (intensity based) model types on the other. The difference between them can be characterized in terms of the information assumed known by the observer. Structural models assume that the observer has the same information set as the firm's manager, i.e. the complete knowledge of all firm's assets and liabilities. In most situations, this knowledge leads to a predictable default time. In contrast, reduced form models assume that the observer has the same information set as the market, i.e. an incomplete knowledge of the firm's condition. In most cases, this imperfect knowledge leads to an inaccessible default time.

As highlighted in [JaPr04] these models are not disconnected and disjoint model types as it was commonly supposed, but rather they are really the same model containing different informational assumptions. The key distinction between structural and reduced form models is not in the characteristic of the default time (predictable vs. inaccessible), but in the information set available to the observer. Indeed, structural models can be transformed into reduced form models as the information set changes and becomes less refined, from that observable by the firm's manager to that which is observed by the market.

Rather than comparing model types on the basis of their forecasting performance, the model type choice should be based on the information set available by the observer. For general risk management purposes the relevant set is the information available in the market, hence a structural model is to be preferred. By contrast, if one is interested in a firm's risky debt or related credit derivatives, then reduced form models are the better approach.

Let us introduce the standard setup by utilizing the market model introduced in Subsection 2 to account for defaults and different information sets. Credit risk management investigates an entity (corporation, bank, individual) that borrows funds, promises to return these funds under a prespecified contractual agreement, and which may default before the funds (in their entirety) are repaid. That for, we introduce a market allowing for two kind of assets (beside the cash account), non-defaultable (e.g. government bonds) and defaultable ones (e.g. corporate bonds).

Definition 32 (Information Structures). *To model uncertainty, there are two filtrations for $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$:*

- **Market Filtration:** *This is the $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathcal{A}_t\}_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ used so far for market risk, representing the information available by all market participants.*
- **Global Filtration:** *This is the $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ representing the information available by the*

management of the bond issuer company.

The global filtration is postulated to contain the market filtration. i.e. $\mathcal{A}_t \subset \mathcal{G}_t$ for all $t \geq 0$. Unless otherwise specified conditional probabilities and expectations refer to the market filtration, i.e. $\mathbb{P}_t[\cdot] = \mathbb{P}[\cdot | \mathcal{A}_t]$ and $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{A}_t]$.

Definition 33 (Default and Recovery Models). Let D_t^{Corp} be the market value of a defaultable asset.

- **Default Indicator:**

$$X_t := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{corporate bond in default state at time } t \\ 0, & \text{corporate bond in non-default state at time } t. \end{cases} \quad (59)$$

- **Time-To-Default:**

$$\tau := \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid X_t = 1\}. \quad (60)$$

- **Conditional Default Probability:**

$$p_{t,s}^A := \mathbb{P}_t[\tau \leq s \mid \tau > t]. \quad (61)$$

- **Structural Model:** Let $(E_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be the corporate equity process with default threshold E_{\min} . The structural model for default is the following specification for the default indicator:

$$X_t := 1_{\{E_t \leq E_{\min}\}}. \quad (62)$$

The corporate equity dynamics is observable in the market, i.e. $\mathcal{A}_t \supset \sigma(\{E_s \mid s \leq t\})$, and it is typically given by an Itô's diffusion with respect to the market filtration

$$dE_t = E_t(\alpha_t^E(E_t) + \sigma_t^E(E_t))dW_t. \quad (63)$$

- **Intensity Model:** The global filtration \mathcal{G} contains the filtration $\sigma(\{\tau, Y_s \mid s \leq t\})$ generated by the Time-To-Default and by a vector of state variables Y_t , which follows an Itô's diffusion. The default indicator is a Cox process induced by τ with a positive intensity process $(\lambda_t)_{t \geq 0}$, which corresponds to the following specification:

$$X_t := 1_{\{\Lambda^{-1}(E) \leq t\}}, \quad (64)$$

where $\Lambda_t := \int_0^t dh \lambda_h$ and $E \sim \text{Exp}(1)$ is an exponentially distributed random variable.

- **Loss-Given-Default:** If there is default at time t , then the recovered value at time t^+ is given by $(1 - \text{LGD}_t)D_{t^-}^{\text{Corp}}$. The stochastic process $(\text{LGD}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is observable in the market filtration.

Proposition 34. *The default probabilities in the two models read:*

- *Structural Model:*

$$\boxed{p_{t,s}^A = \mathbb{P}_t [E_s \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t \geq E_{\min}]} \quad (65)$$

- *Intensity Model:*

$$\boxed{p_{t,s}^G = 1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(- \int_t^s dh \lambda_h \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right]} \quad (66)$$

A known fact about structural credit risk models is summarized by the following proposition.

Proposition 35. *In the structural models Time-To-Default is a predictable stopping time and corresponds to the first hitting time of the barrier*

$$\boxed{\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid E_t \leq E_{\min}\}} \quad (67)$$

Remark 36. *A stopping time τ is a non-negative random variable such that the event $\{\tau \leq t\} \in \mathcal{A}_t$ for every $t \geq 0$. A stopping time is predictable if there exists a sequence of stopping times $(\tau_n)_{n \geq 0}$ such that τ_n is increasing with n , $\tau_n < \tau$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \tau_n = \tau$ almost surely. Intuitively, an event described by a predictable stopping time is "known" to occur "just before" it happens, since it is announced by an increasing sequence of stopping times. This is certainly the situation for structural models with respect to the market filtration. In essence, although default is an uncertain event and thus technically a surprise, it is not a "true surprise" to the global observer, because it can be anticipated with almost certainty by watching the path of company equity value. The key characteristic of a structural model is the observability of the market information set $\mathcal{A}_t \supset \sigma(\{E_s \mid s \leq t\})$ and not the fact that default is predictable.*

Another known fact about reduced form credit risk models (cf. [JaPr04]) is

Proposition 37. *In the reduced form models Time-To-Default is a totally inaccessible stopping time, i.e. for every predictable stopping time S the event $\{\omega \in \Omega \mid \tau(\omega) = S(\omega) < +\infty\}$ vanishes almost surely.*

Now, what are the relationships between structural and reduced form models? The reason for the transformation of the default time τ from a predictable stopping time in Proposition 35 to an inaccessible

stopping time in Proposition 37 is that between the time observations of the company equity value, we do not know how the equity value has evolved. Consequently, prior to our next observation, default could occur unexpectedly (as a complete surprise). If one changes the information set held by the observer from more to less information from \mathcal{G} to \mathcal{A} , then a structural model with default being a predictable stopping time can be transformed into a hazard rate model with default being an inaccessible stopping time:

$$\mathbb{E} [p_{t,s}^{\mathcal{G}} | \mathcal{A}_t] = 1 - \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp \left(- \int_t^s du \lambda_u \right) \right] = 1 - \exp \left(- \int_t^s du h_u \right), \quad (68)$$

where h denotes the deterministic **hazard function**. Thus, the overall relevant structure is that of the two filtrations and how stopping times behave in them. The structural models play a role in the determination of the structure generating the default time. But as soon as the information available to the observer is reduced or obscured, one needs to project onto a smaller filtration, and then the default time becomes totally inaccessible, and the compensator Λ of the one jump point process $1 - X_t$ becomes the object of interest. If the compensator can be written in the form $\Lambda_t = \int_0^t dh \lambda_h$, then the process $(\lambda_t)_{t \geq 0}$ can be interpreted as the instantaneous rate of default, given the observer's information set. In that case, from Proposition 34, we derive

Proposition 38. *Structural and intensity models are related by the following relationship*

$$\lambda_t = \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbb{P}_t [E_s \leq E_{\min} | E_t > E_{\min}]. \quad (69)$$

Proposition 39. *For both structural and reduced for credit model, if the market model satisfies the no-arbitrage-with-vanishing-risk condition, the risk free discounted value of the corporate bond reads for any $s \geq t$*

$$D_t^{\text{Corp}} = \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\left((1 - \text{LGD}_\tau) 1_{\{\tau \leq s\}} + 1_{\{\tau > s\}} \right) D_s^{\text{Corp}} \right]. \quad (70)$$

Proof. Let S_t denote the value of the corporate bond and c_t its cash flow intensity. Then

$$S_t = \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\int_t^{+\infty} dh c_h \exp \left(- \int_t^h du r_u^0 \right) \right]. \quad (71)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} D_t^{\text{Corp}} &= \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\int_t^{+\infty} dh c_h \exp \left(- \int_t^h du r_u^0 \right) \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\int_t^{+\infty} dh \delta(h - \tau) \left((1 - \text{LGD}_h) 1_{\{h \leq s\}} + 1_{\{h > s\}} \right) D_s^{\text{Corp}} \right] = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t^* \left[\left((1 - \text{LGD}_\tau) 1_{\{\tau \leq s\}} + 1_{\{\tau > s\}} \right) D_s^{\text{Corp}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

□

Is it possible to characterize the model type on the basis of Nelson's differentiation property of the default indicator?

Proposition 40. *In the structural model the generalized Nelson forward derivative of the default indicator reads*

$$\boxed{D^A X_t = \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbb{P}_t [E_s \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t > E_{\min}]} \quad (73)$$

Proof. The default probability can be developed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_t [E_s \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t > E_{\min}] &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_t [1_{\{E_s \leq E_{\min}\}} 1_{\{E_t > E_{\min}\}}]}{\mathbb{E}_t [1_{\{E_t > E_{\min}\}}]} = \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t [1_{\{E_s \leq E_{\min}\}}]. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbb{P}_t [E_s \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t > E_{\min}] = \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\mathbb{P}_t [E_{s+h} \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t > E_{\min}] - \mathbb{P}_t [E_s \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t > E_{\min}]}{h} = \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{1_{\{E_{s+h} \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t > E_{\min}\}} - 1_{\{E_s \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t > E_{\min}\}}}{h} \right] = \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} D^A 1_{\{E_s \leq E_{\min} \mid E_t > E_{\min}\}} = D^A X_t, \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

where Nelson's derivative D has to be understood in the generalized sense.

□

Proposition 41. *For the intensity model, with respect to the global filtration, the Nelson forward generalized derivative of the default indicator reads*

$$\boxed{D^G X_t = \lambda_t.} \quad (76)$$

Proof. We can reformulate (64) as a structural model as

$$X_t = 1_{\{\Lambda^{-1}(E) \leq t\}} = 1_{\{-\Lambda_t + (E) \leq 0\}}, \quad (77)$$

and therefore

$$p_{t,s}^G = \mathbb{P} [-\Lambda_s + E \leq 0 \mid \{-\Lambda_t + E > 0\} \cap \mathcal{G}_t] \quad (78)$$

By mimicking the proof of Proposition 40 with these adaptations we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D^{\mathcal{G}}X_t &= \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \mathbb{P}[-\Lambda_s + E \leq 0 \mid \{-\Lambda_t + E > 0\} \cap \mathcal{G}_t] = \\
&= \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left(1 - \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(- \int_t^s dh \lambda_h \right) \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right] \right) \\
&= \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(- \int_t^s dh \lambda_h \right) \lambda_s \middle| \mathcal{G}_t \right] = \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t | \mathcal{G}_t] = \lambda_t.
\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

□

Therefore, by comparing Propositions 38, 40 and 41, we can conclude that

Theorem 42. *Structural models admit an intensity formulation where the intensity is given by the Nelson forward derivative with respect to the market filtration.*

4.2 Geometric Arbitrage Theory Credit Risk Model

Now can carry out the analysis of credit markets described in Subsection 4.1 by utilizing the tools of Geometric Arbitrage Theory introduced in Section 2 and, in particular, Proposition 18.

Definition 43 (Credit Market). *A (simple) credit market consists in a **government asset** $(S_t^{Gov})_{t \in [0, T]}$ with cash flow $(C_t^{Gov})_{t \in [0, T]}$ and a **corporate asset** $(S_t^{Corp})_{t \in [0, T]}$ with cash flow $(C_t^{Corp})_{t \in [0, T]}$. The **credit asset** is defined as a portfolio consisting in a long position in the corporate asset and in a short position in the government asset: $S_t^{Cred} := S_t^{Corp} - S_t^{Gov}$ and $C_t^{Cred} := C_t^{Corp} - C_t^{Gov}$. Following Definition 8, let (D^{Gov}, P^{Gov}) and (D^{Corp}, P^{Corp}) be the gauge corresponding to the government and, respectively, the corporate asset, with their corresponding term structures. The credit gauge (D^{Cred}, P^{Cred}) is defined as*

- **Deflator:** $D_t^{Cred} := D_t^{Corp} - D_t^{Gov} := \exp \left(\int_0^t ds r_s^0 \right) (S_t^{Corp} - S_t^{Gov})$,
- **Discounted Cash Flow:** $\widehat{C}_t^{Cred} := \exp \left(\int_0^t ds r_s^0 \right) (\widehat{C}_t^{Corp} - \widehat{C}_t^{Gov})$,
- **Instantaneous Forward Rate:** $f_{t,s}^{Cred} := f_{t,s}^{Corp} - f_{t,s}^{Gov}$,
- **Short Rate:** $r_t^{Cred} := \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} f_{t,s}^{Cred}$,
- **Term Structure:** $P_{t,s}^{Cred} := \exp \left(- \int_t^s dh f_{t,h}^{Cred} \right)$.

The credit gauge represents all relevant information necessary to model a credit market for bonds with arbitrary maturities and of a given rating in one currency. Different ratings correspond to different credit

gauges. In the vector notation of Definitions 8 and 10 we have, with the choice $x^{Cred} := [-1, +1]^\dagger$,

$$\begin{aligned} D_t &:= [D_t^{Gov}, D_t^{Corp}]^\dagger & r_t &:= [r_t^{Gov}, r_t^{Corp}]^\dagger \\ D_t^{Cred} &= D_t^{x^{Cred}} & r_t^{Cred} &= r_t^{x^{Cred}}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Proposition 44. *The credit asset gauge satisfies following properties:*

- *Deflator:*

$$D_t^{Cred} = (1 - \text{LGD}_t X_t) D_0^{Corp} - D_t^{Gov}. \quad (81)$$

- *Term structure:*

$$P_{t,s}^{Cred} = \frac{P_{t,s}^{Corp}}{P_{t,s}^{Gov}}. \quad (82)$$

- *Short rate:*

$$r_t^{Cred} = r_t^{Corp} - r_t^{Gov}. \quad (83)$$

We can apply Theorem 13 to the credit market to characterize no arbitrage.

Theorem 45 (No Arbitrage Credit Market). *Let $\lambda = \lambda_t$ and $\text{LGD} = \text{LGD}_t$ be the default intensity and the Loss-Given-Default, respectively, of the corporate bond. The following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i) *The credit market model satisfies the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition.*
- (ii) *There exists a positive local martingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that deflators and short rates satisfy for all times the condition*

$$r_t^{Cred} = \beta_t \text{LGD}_t \lambda_t. \quad (84)$$

- (iii) *There exists a positive local martingale $\beta = (\beta_t)_{t \geq 0}$ such that deflators and term structures satisfy for all times the condition*

$$P_{t,s}^{Cred} = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\exp \left(- \int_t^s du \beta_u \text{LGD}_u \lambda_u \right) \right]. \quad (85)$$

Proof. By Theorem 13 (iii) for $N = 2$, government ($x = [1, 0]^\dagger$) and corporate ($x = [0, -1]^\dagger$) the (NFLVR) condition reads

$$\begin{cases} P_{t,s}^{Gov} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_t[\beta_s D_s^{Gov}]}{\beta_t D_t^{Gov}} \\ P_{t,s}^{Corp} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_t[\beta_s D_s^{Corp}]}{\beta_t D_t^{Corp}} \end{cases} \quad (86)$$

By making the Government asset to the numéraire (i.e. $D_t^{Gov} \equiv 1$), we obtain from the first equation $P_{t,s}^{Gov} \equiv 1$ and hence $r_t^{Gov} \equiv 0$. We define an equivalent martingale measure for $(D_t)_t$ by setting the

Radon-Nykodym derivative as

$$\frac{dP^*}{dP} := \beta_T, \quad (87)$$

and rewrite the second equation utilizing $\beta_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\frac{dP^*}{dP} \right]$ as

$$P_{t,s}^{\text{Corp}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}_t[\beta_s D_s^{\text{Corp}}]}{\beta_t D_t^{\text{Corp}}} = \mathbb{E}_t^*[1 - \text{LGD}_s X_s]. \quad (88)$$

By taking on both sides of the equation $-\frac{\partial}{\partial s} \Big|_{s=t}$, we obtain

$$r_t^{\text{Corp}} = \text{LGD}_t \lambda_t^*, \quad (89)$$

because, by rewriting the default indicator by means of the Heaviside function and the time-to-default,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LGD}_t &= \text{LGD}_\tau \Theta(t - \tau) \\ X_t &= \Theta(t - \tau) \\ \mathbb{E}_t^*[D^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{LGD}_t X_t)] &= \mathbb{E}_t^*[\underbrace{D^{\mathcal{A}}(\text{LGD}_t X_t)}_{=\delta(t-\tau)\Theta(t-\tau)=0}] + \text{LGD}_t D^{\mathcal{A}}(X_t) = \text{LGD}_t \lambda_t^*, \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

where λ_t^* is the default intensity with respect to P^* . Therefore, with the government asset as a numéraire

$$r_t^{\text{Cred}} = r_t^{\text{Corp}} = \text{LGD}_t \lambda_t^* = \beta_t \text{LGD}_t \lambda_t, \quad (91)$$

which is (ii), to which (iii) is equivalent. The proof is completed. \square

Theorem 1 follows directly from Theorem 45. We can now apply Proposition 16 and Proposition 18 to the credit market to find the dynamics satisfying the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition.

We have a version where the equivalence of (NFLVR) with (ZC) holds true if Novikov's growth condition for the instantaneous Sharpe ratio is satisfied.

Corollary 46. *For the market with the government bond chosen as numéraire and a corporate bond dynamics $(D_t^{\text{Corp}})_t$ specified by the weak limits $D_t^{\text{Corp}} = \mathcal{D}'\text{-}\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} D_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon}$ and $r_t^{\text{Corp}} = \mathcal{D}'\text{-}\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} r_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon}$ of Itô processes $(D_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon})_t$ $(r_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon})_t$ and satisfying SDE*

$$\begin{aligned} dD_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} &= D_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} (\alpha_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} dt + \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} dW_t) \\ dr_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} &= a_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} dt + b_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} dW_t \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

where

- $(W_t)_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ is a standard P -Brownian motion in \mathbf{R}^K , for some $K \in \mathbf{N}$,
- $(\alpha_t^{Corp, \epsilon})_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$, $(\sigma_t^{Corp, \epsilon})_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ and $(r_t^{Corp, \epsilon})_{t \in [0, +\infty[}$ are \mathbf{R} -, \mathbf{R}^K - and, respectively, \mathbf{R}^K -valued predictable stochastic processes,
- $(\alpha_t)_t$, $(\sigma_t)_t$, and $(r_t)_t$ satisfy

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathbb{E}_s[\alpha_t^{Corp, \epsilon}] = \alpha_t^{Corp, \epsilon}, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathbb{E}_s[r_t^{Corp, \epsilon}] = r_t^{Corp, \epsilon}, \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathbb{E}_s[\sigma_t^{Corp, \epsilon}] = \sigma_t^{Corp, \epsilon}, \quad (93)$$

- $(\sigma_t^{Corp, \epsilon})_t$ is an Itô's process,
- $(\sigma_t^{Corp, \epsilon})_t$ and $(W_t)_t$ are independent processes.

the no-free-lunch-with-vanishing-risk condition is satisfied if Novikov's condition is satisfied, which is the case if and only if the zero-curvature condition is satisfied and

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\exp \left(\int_0^T dt \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda_t \text{LGD}_t}{1 - \text{LGD}_t X_t} - r_t^{Corp} \right)^2 \frac{t}{Q_t(K)} \right) \right] < +\infty, \quad (94)$$

where

$$Q_t(K) := \frac{W_t^\dagger W_t}{t} \sim \chi^2(K), \quad (95)$$

is a chi-squared distributed real random variable.

Theorem 2 follows from Corollary 46, because any \mathcal{D}' process can be regularized by a sequence of Itô's processes satisfying the assumptions of the corollary as

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} D_t^{Corp, \epsilon}(\varphi) = D_t^{Corp}(\varphi) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} r_t^{Corp, \epsilon}(\varphi) = r_t^{Corp}(\varphi) \quad (96)$$

for all $\varphi(\cdot, \omega) \in C_c^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R})$

Proof. The only thing to prove is inequality (94). On one hand

$$\begin{cases} D_t^{Gov} \equiv 1 \\ D_t^{Corp} = (1 - \text{LGD}_t X_t) D_0^{Corp}. \end{cases} \quad (97)$$

On the other, the solution of (92) reads

$$D_t^{Corp, \epsilon} = D_0^{Corp, \epsilon} \exp \left(\int_0^t \left(\alpha_u^{Corp, \epsilon} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_u^{Corp, \epsilon} \sigma_u^{Corp, \epsilon \dagger} \right) du + \int_0^t \sigma_u^{Corp, \epsilon} dW_u \right), \quad (98)$$

and, hence,

$$\mathcal{D} \log(D_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon}) = \alpha_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger} + \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \frac{W_t}{2t}, \quad (99)$$

because

$$\mathcal{D}W_t = \frac{W_t}{2t} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \sigma^{\text{Corp},\epsilon}, W \rangle_t \equiv 0. \quad (100)$$

Since the zero-curvature condition is satisfied we infer that

$$\mathcal{D} \log(D_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon}) + r_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} = \underbrace{\mathcal{D} \log(D_t^{\text{Gov}})}_{\equiv 1} + \underbrace{r_t^{\text{Gov}}}_{=0} = 0, \quad (101)$$

which, inserted into equation (100), leads to

$$\alpha_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} + r_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger} + \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \frac{W_t}{2t} = 0. \quad (102)$$

By applying on both sides $\lim_{s \rightarrow t^+} \mathbb{E}_s[\cdot]$ we conclude that

$$\alpha_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} + r_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger} = 0. \quad (103)$$

Hence, the integrand in formula (28) reads, being the government asset is the numéraire,

$$\left| \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger} \left(\sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger} \right)^{-1} \left(\alpha_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} + r_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \right) \right|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger}. \quad (104)$$

Equation (99) becomes, after having inserted (103)

$$\left(\mathcal{D} \log(D_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon}) + r_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \right)^2 = \sigma_u^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \sigma_u^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger} \frac{W_t^\ddagger W_t}{4t^2}. \quad (105)$$

On the other hand, the second equation in (97) leads to

$$\mathcal{D} \log(D_t^{\text{Corp}}) = -\frac{\text{LGD}_t \lambda_t}{1 - \text{LGD}_t X_t}, \quad (106)$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger} \left(\sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \sigma_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon\ddagger} \right)^{-1} \left(\alpha_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} + r_t^{\text{Corp},\epsilon} \right) \right|^2 = \left(\frac{\text{LGD}_t \lambda_t}{1 - \text{LGD}_t X_t} - r_t^{\text{Corp}} \right)^2 \frac{t}{Q_t(K)}, \quad (107)$$

which inserted into Novikov's condition (28) proves inequality (94).

□

5 Credit Arbitrage Dynamics and Bubbles

We apply now the results for arbitrage market bubbles as recalled in Subsection 2.3 to our simple credit market model consisting in two base asset, a government and a corporate bond. We allow arbitrage and just assume that the total quantity of potential arbitrage is minimized by the market forces, as explained in detail in [Fa21, FaTa21].

Theorem 47 (Credit Arbitrage Dynamics and Arbitrage Bubbles for Credit Markets). *The following statements hold true for the credit market model of Definition 43*

$$D_t := [D_t^{Gov}, D_t^{Cred}]^\dagger \quad r_t := [r_t^{Gov}, r_t^{Cred}]^\dagger \quad x_t := [x_t^{Gov}, x_t^{Cred}]^\dagger \quad (108)$$

with $T \leq +\infty$ allowing for arbitrage:

- (a) *Market portfolio, asset values and term structures solving the minimal arbitrage problem are identically distributed along time, their returns are centered and serially uncorrelated:*

$([x_t; D_t; r_t])_{t \in [0, T]}$ is an i.d. process with respect to P ,

$([\mathcal{D}x_t; \mathcal{D}D_t; \mathcal{D}r_t])_{t \in [0, T]}$ is centered and has vanishing autocovariance function,

(109)

In particular, conditional and total expectations of asset values, nominals and term structures are constant over time:

$$\begin{array}{lll} \mathbb{E}_0[x_t] \equiv \text{const} & \mathbb{E}_0[D_t] \equiv \text{const} & \mathbb{E}_0[r_t] \equiv \text{const} \\ \mathbb{E}_0[\mathcal{D}x_t] \equiv 0 & \mathbb{E}_0[\mathcal{D}D_t] \equiv 0 & \mathbb{E}_0[\mathcal{D}r_t] \equiv 0. \end{array}$$

(110)

The variances of portfolio nominals are concurrent with those of the deflators:

$$\text{Var}_0(D_t^j) \text{Var}_0\left(\frac{x_t^j}{x_t \cdot D_t}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4},$$

(111)

for all indices $j = 1, 2$. For the credit component we have:

$$\mathbb{E}_0[x_t^{Cred}] \equiv \text{const} \quad \mathbb{E}_0[(D_t^{Corp})] \equiv \text{const} \quad \mathbb{E}_0[\lambda_t \text{LGD}_t] \equiv \text{const}.$$

(112)

The variances of portfolio nominals are concurrent with those of the instantaneous short rates:

$$\boxed{\text{Var}_0(D_t^{Cred}) \text{Var}_0\left(\frac{x_t^{Cred}}{x_t^{Gov} D_t^{Gov} + x_t^{Cred} D_t^{Cred}}\right) \geq \frac{1}{4}}, \quad (113)$$

(b) *Expectation and variance of the discounted value for the credit bubble read*

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0[\widehat{B}_t^{Cred}] &= \mathbb{E}_0[D_t^{Cred} - \widehat{C}_t^{Cred}] - \mathbb{E}_0^*[D_T^{Cred} - \widehat{C}_T^{Cred}] \\ \text{Var}_0(\widehat{B}_t^{Cred}) &= \text{Var}_0(D_t^{Cred} - \widehat{C}_t^{Cred}) + \text{Var}_0^*(D_T^{Cred} - \widehat{C}_T^{Cred}) + \\ &\quad - 2 \text{Cov}_0^*(D_t^{Cred} - \widehat{C}_t^{Cred}, D_T^{Cred} - \widehat{C}_T^{Cred}). \end{aligned}} \quad (114)$$

(c) *Expectation and variance of the discounted value for the credit derivative $G(S_T^{Cred})$ on the credit asset read*

$$\boxed{\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_0[\widehat{B}_t^{Cred}(G)] &= \mathbb{E}_0[\widehat{V}_t^{Cred}(G)] - \mathbb{E}_0^*\left[\widehat{G}\left(S_T^{Cred} \exp\left(\frac{C_T^{Cred}}{S_T^{Cred}}(T-t)\right)\right)\right] \\ \text{Var}_0(\widehat{B}_t^{Cred}(G)) &= \text{Var}_0(\widehat{V}_t^{Cred}(G)) + \text{Var}_0^*\left(\widehat{G}\left(S_T \exp\left(\frac{C_T^{Cred}}{S_T^{Cred}}(T-t)\right)\right)\right). \end{aligned}} \quad (115)$$

6 Conclusion

By introducing an appropriate stochastic differential geometric formalism, the classical theory of stochastic finance can be embedded into a conceptual framework called Geometric Arbitrage Theory, where the market is modelled with a principal fibre bundle and arbitrage corresponds to its curvature. The tools developed can be applied to default risk and recovery modeling leading to arbitrage and no arbitrage characterizations for credit markets, as well as the explicit computation for arbitrage credit bubbles and credit market dynamics.

References

- [BjHu05] T. Björk and H. Hult, *A Note on Wick Products and the Fractional Black-Scholes Model*, Finance & Stochastics, **9**, No.2, (197-209), 2005.
- [Bl81] D. Bleecker, *Gauge Theory and Variational Principles*, Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1981, (re-published by Dover 2005).

- [DeSc94] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer, *A General Version of the Fundamental Theorem of Asset Pricing*, *Mathematische Annalen*, Volume 300, (463-520), 1994.
- [DeSc08] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer, *The Mathematics of Arbitrage*, Springer 2008.
- [DuFiMu00] B. Dupoyet, H. R. Fiebig and D. P. Musgrove, *Gauge Invariant Lattice Quantum Field Theory: Implications for Statistical Properties of High Frequency Financial Markets*, *Physica A* **389**, (107-116), 2010.
- [DeMe80] C. Dellachérie and P. A. Meyer, *Probabilité et potentiel II - Théorie des martingales - Chapitres 5 à 8*, Hermann, 1980.
- [EE182] K. D. Elworthy, *Stochastic Differential Equations on Manifolds*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series, 1982.
- [Em89] M. Eméry, *Stochastic Calculus on Manifolds- With an Appendix by P. A. Meyer*, Springer, 1989.
- [FFa15] S. Farinelli, *Geometric Arbitrage Theory and Market Dynamics*, *Journal of Geometric Mechanics*, **7** (4), (431-471), 2015.
- [Fa21] S. Farinelli, *Geometric Arbitrage Theory and Market Dynamics Reloaded*, Preprint, 2021.
- [FaTa20] S. Farinelli and H. Takada, *The Black-Scholes Equation in Presence of Arbitrage*, Preprint, 2020.
- [FaTa20Bis] S. Farinelli and H. Takada, *Can You Hear the Shape of Market? Geometric Arbitrage and Spectral Theory*, Preprint, 2020.
- [FaTa21] S. Farinelli and H. Takada, *When Risks and Uncertainties Collide: Mathematical Finance for Arbitrage Markets in a Quantum Mechanical View*, To appear as chapter 16 in the book dedicated to the memory of L.A. Filshtinsky *Mechanics and Physics of Structured Media*, Elsevier, 2021.
- [FeJi07] M. Fei-Te and M. Jin-Long, *Solitary Wave Solutions of Nonlinear Financial Markets: Data-Modeling-Concept-Practicing*, *Front. Phys. China*, **2**(3), (368-374), 2007.
- [FlHu96] B. Flesaker and L. Hughston, *Positive Interest*, *Risk* **9** (1), (115-124), 1996.
- [FrSc11] R. Frey and T. Schmidt, *Filtering and Incomplete Information in Credit Risk*, Chapter 7 in *Recent Advancements in the Theory and Practice of Credit Derivatives*, Damiano Brigo, Tom Bielecki and Frederic Patras, ed., Wiley, 2011.
- [GG11] Y. E. Gliklikh, *Global and Stochastic Analysis with Applications to Mathematical Physics*, *Theoretical and Mathematical Physics*, Springer, 2011.

- [HaTh94] W. Hackenbroch and A. Thalmaier, *Stochastische Analysis. Eine Einführung in die Theorie der stetigen Semimartingale*, Teubner Verlag, 1994.
- [Ho03] L. Hormänder, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I: Distribution Theory and Fourier Analysis*, Springer, 2003.
- [Hs02] E. P. Hsu, *Stochastic Analysis on Manifolds*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **38**, AMS, 2002.
- [HuKe04] P. J. Hunt and J. E. Kennedy, *Financial Derivatives in Theory and Practice*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, 2004.
- [Il00] K. Ilinski, *Gauge Geometry of Financial Markets*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, (L5-L14), 2000.
- [Il01] K. Ilinski, *Physics of Finance: Gauge Modelling in Non-Equilibrium Pricing*, Wiley, 2001.
- [JaPr04] R. A. Jarrow and Ph. Protter *Structural versus Reduced Form Models: A New Information Based Perspective*, Journal of Investment Management, Vol. 2, No. 2, (1-10), 2004.
- [JPS10] R. Jarrow, P. Protter and K. Shimbo, *Asset Price Bubbles in Incomplete Markets*, Mathematical Finance, 20, Vol. 2, (145-185), 2010.
- [JaLa12] R. Jarrow and M. Larsson, *The Meaning of Market Efficiency*, Mathematical Finance, 22, Vol. 1, (1-30), 2012.
- [Ka97] Y. M. Kabanov, *On the FTAP of Kreps-Delbaen-Schachermayer*, Statistics and control of stochastic processes, Moscow, World Scientific Publishing Company, (191-203), 1997.
- [Ma96] P. N. Malaney, *The Index Number Problem: A Differential Geometric Approach*, PhD Thesis, Harvard University Economics Department, 1996.
- [Mo09] Y. Morisawa, *Toward a Geometric Formulation of Triangular Arbitrage: An Introduction to Gauge Theory of Arbitrage*, Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement **179**, (209-214), 2009.
- [Schoe00] Ph. J. Schönbucher, *Credit Risk Modelling and Credit Derivatives*, Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Grades eines Doktors der Wirtschafts- und Gesellschaftswissenschaften durch die Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, 2000.
- [Schw80] L. Schwartz, *Semi-martingales sur des variétés et martingales conformes sur des variétés analytiques complexes*, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1980.
- [SmSp98] A. Smith and C. Speed, *Gauge Transforms in Stochastic Investment*, Proceedings of the 1998 AFIR Colloquium, Cambridge, England.

- [St00] D. W. Stroock, *An Introduction to the Analysis of Paths on a Riemannian Manifold*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **74**, AMS, 2000.
- [We06] E. Weinstein, *Gauge Theory and Inflation: Enlarging the Wu-Yang Dictionary to a unifying Rosetta Stone for Geometry in Application*, Talk given at Perimeter Institute, 2006.
- [Yo99] K. Young, *Foreign Exchange Market as a Lattice Gauge Theory*, Am. J. Phys. **67**, (862-868), 1999.