

A CONDITIONAL VERSION OF THE SECOND FUNDAMENTAL THEOREM OF ASSET PRICING IN DISCRETE TIME

LARS NIEMANN AND THORSTEN SCHMIDT

ABSTRACT. The second fundamental theorem of asset pricing characterizes completeness of a financial market by uniqueness of prices of financial claims. The associated super- and sub-hedging dualities give upper and lower bounds of the no-arbitrage interval. In this article we provide conditional versions of these results in discrete time.

The main tool we use are consistency properties of dynamic non-linear expectations, which we apply to the super- and sub-hedging prices. The obtained results extend existing results in the literature, where the conditional setting is in most cases considered only on finite probability spaces. Using non-linear expectations we also provide a new perspective on the optional decomposition theorem.

Keywords: asset pricing, fundamental theorems, super- and sub-hedging duality, nonlinear expectation, risk measures, optional decomposition.

1. INTRODUCTION

The mathematical analysis of financial markets starts with the remarkable thesis of Bachelier, submitted to the Academy of Paris in 1900. More than half a century later, the search for a precise theory of option valuation was continued in [Samuelson \(1965\)](#) and encompassed with the observation that replication is a key to pricing in the famous works [Black and Scholes \(1973\)](#), and [Merton \(1973\)](#) (honoured by the Nobel prize in Economics in 1991).

The connection to martingales and martingale measures was started in the works [Harrison and Kreps \(1979\)](#) and [Harrison and Pliska \(1981\)](#), which builds the foundation for what we nowadays call the fundamental theorems of asset pricing. In continuous time, semimartingales turned out to play the central role and the fundamental theorems in this setting were established in a series of papers, see [Delbaen and Schachermayer \(1994, 1998, 2006\)](#) and references therein.

While the study of arbitrage in continuous time requires subtle arguments using semimartingale theory, the results simplify significantly in discrete time. In this realm, the first fundamental theorem of asset pricing characterizes absence of arbitrage of a financial market by the existence of an equivalent martingale measure. It is the core of modern financial mathematics.

The second fundamental theorem considers the more special case when a market is complete, i.e. when every European contingent claim can be replicated perfectly

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL STOCHASTICS, UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG, GERMANY
E-mail addresses: Lars.Niemann@stochastik.uni-freiburg.de,

Thorsten.Schmidt@stochastik.uni-freiburg.de.

Date: February 17, 2022.

Financial support from the DFG in project SCHM 2160/13-1 is gratefully acknowledged.

by a trading strategy, see [Biagini \(2010\)](#) for an overview and literature. It characterizes completeness by uniqueness of the prices for claims. This well-known result dates back to [Harrison and Kreps \(1979\)](#), [Harrison and Pliska \(1981, 1983\)](#), although in the realm of continuous processes which excludes discrete time. In discrete time it was proven on a finite probability space in [Taqqu and Willinger \(1987\)](#), see also [Föllmer and Schied \(2011\)](#). These results however consider only the initial time point 0 and a conditional version is lacking.

This is the topic of the present article. We will provide a self-contained proof of a conditional formulation of the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing together with a conditional version of the associated sub-hedging and super-hedging dualities. These results were shown in [Delbaen and Schachermayer \(2006\)](#), however under the strong simplification of a finite probability space.

Consider a finite number of time points which we denote without loss of generality by $\{0, \dots, T\}$. In this setting we study a financial market which is free of arbitrage. Our first main result, [Theorem 5.5](#), shows the following two (among four) equivalent conditions and hence is a conditional version of the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing.

Theorem 1.1. *For any $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The market is complete at time t , i.e. every European contingent claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is attainable at time t .*
- (ii) *Every European contingent claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ has a unique price at time t .*

Equally important is the characterization of the no-arbitrage interval and the associated duality results. In the unconditional case, the no-arbitrage interval of a contingent claim collapses to a singleton if and only if the claim can be replicated by a self-financing trading strategy, which is called attainability (see [Section 5.1](#) for details). Here, we generalize this to the conditional setting. First, for any random variable H denote by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) &:= \text{ess sup}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e^H\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) &:= \text{ess inf}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e^H\} \end{aligned}$$

the upper and the lower (conditional) bound of the no-arbitrage interval; here \mathcal{M}_e^H denotes the set of equivalent martingale measures under which H is integrable. In [Theorem 5.4](#) we show the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ be a European contingent claim. Then H is attainable at time t if and only if*

$$\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H),$$

i.e. when there is a unique arbitrage free price at time t . If H is not attainable at time t , then $\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H)$ and $\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)$ are not arbitrage free prices at time t .

The associated super- and sub-hedging dualities state that the upper (lower) bound of the no-arbitrage interval equals the smallest super-hedging price, or the largest sub-hedging price, respectively. The conditional version of this result will be proven in [Propositions 3.11](#) and [3.14](#). The smallest super-hedging price gives rise to a non-linear expectation, which will be the main tool for this proof. We therefore start with a small exposition of non-linear expectations in a dynamic setting and provide a series of useful results in this regard.

Non-linear dynamic expectations and their counterpart dynamic risk measures have been studied in many places in the literature. Introduced in Peng (2005), non-linear expectations allow for a concise description of model uncertainty. This includes the g -expectation, a Brownian Motion with uncertain drift parameter (see Coquet et al. (2002)), and the G -Brownian Motion (see Peng (2007)) describing a Brownian Motion with uncertain volatility. For applications of non-linear expectations in the study of financial markets in discrete time under uncertainty, we refer to Nutz (2014) and Bouchard et al. (2015).

Regarding the intensively studied topic of risk measures, we refer to the seminal article Artzner et al. (1999), to Delbaen (2002) for unconditional risk measures, and to Detlefsen and Scandolo (2005), Acciaio and Penner (2011) for conditional and dynamic risk measures, amongst many others of course.

The paper is structured as follows: in Section 2 we introduce dynamic non-linear expectations and derive related results on sensitivity and consistency. In Section 3 we study super- and sub-hedging and provide a new perspective on the optional decomposition theorem based on those. In Section 4 we show that the set of arbitrage-free prices is indeed an interval and study further properties. Section 5 is the core of the paper provides a detailed study of attainability and the conditional version of the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing. Section 6 concludes the paper. An appendix provides some references and results for non-linear expectations and symmetry.

2. NONLINEAR EXPECTATIONS

In this section we present the appropriate notion of conditional non-linear expectations and related properties. Let $T \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the final time horizon and let (Ω, \mathcal{F}) be a measurable space with a filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$. We assume $\mathcal{F}_T = \mathcal{F}$ and that \mathcal{F}_0 is trivial.

Denote by $\text{ca}_+^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ the space of probability measures (i.e. countably additive measures with total mass 1) on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) and consider a set of probability measures $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \text{ca}_+^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. The classical case with one fixed probability measure is contained as special case by considering $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$ with a probability measure P on (Ω, \mathcal{F}) .

A P -null set $A \subseteq \Omega$ is a possibly not measurable set being a subset of a measurable set $A' \in \mathcal{F}$ with $P(A') = 0$. A set $A \subseteq \Omega$ is called a \mathcal{P} -polar set, if A is a P -null set for every $P \in \mathcal{P}$. We denote the collection of \mathcal{P} -polar sets by $\text{Pol}(\mathcal{P})$. We say a property holds \mathcal{P} -a.s., if it holds outside a \mathcal{P} -polar set. If $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$, we write short $\text{Pol}(P)$ instead of $\text{Pol}(\{P\})$.

For two subsets of $\text{ca}_+^1(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} , we call \mathcal{Q} *absolutely continuous* with respect to \mathcal{P} , denoted by $\mathcal{Q} \ll \mathcal{P}$, if $\text{Pol}(\mathcal{P}) \subseteq \text{Pol}(\mathcal{Q})$. We write $\mathcal{Q} \sim \mathcal{P}$, if $\mathcal{Q} \ll \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P} \ll \mathcal{Q}$.

Remark 2.1 (Absolute continuity does not imply total continuity). Unlike the case of singletons, absolute continuity does in general not imply total continuity: consider $\mathcal{P} = \{\delta_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. For $P := \sum_n 2^{-n} \delta_n$ we have $\mathcal{P} \sim \{P\}$. However, the sequence $A_n = \{n\}$ fulfils

$$P(A_n) = 2^{-n} \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{P}(A_n) := \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P(A_n) = 1.$$

As a consequence, if $\mathcal{Q} \ll \mathcal{P}$, there exists a well-defined mapping $L^0(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow L^0(\mathcal{Q})$. However, this mapping is in general not continuous, as absolute continuity does not imply total continuity, which was just shown. \diamond

On $\mathcal{L}^0 := \mathcal{L}^0(\Omega, \mathcal{F}) := \{X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid X \text{ } \mathcal{F}\text{-measurable}\}$ we introduce the equivalence relation $\sim_{\mathcal{P}}$ by $X \sim_{\mathcal{P}} Y$ if and only if $X = Y$ \mathcal{P} -a.s.. Then we set $L^0 := \mathcal{L}^0/\mathcal{P}$, for $p \in (1, \infty)$, $L^p := \{X \in L^0 : \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} E_P[|X|^p] < \infty\}$ and $L^\infty := \{X \in L^0 : \exists C > 0 : |X| \leq C \text{ } \mathcal{P}\text{-a.s.}\}$. With this notation, Proposition 14 in Denis et al. (2011) shows that for each $p \in [1, \infty]$, L^p is a Banach space.

The space L^0 can be equipped with a metric by

$$d : L^0 \times L^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+, (X, Y) \mapsto \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} E_P[|X - Y| \wedge 1]$$

and this metric describes robust convergence in probability.

We consider a set $\mathcal{H} \subseteq L^0$ containing all constants and set for $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$

$$\mathcal{H}_t := \mathcal{H} \cap L^0(\mathcal{F}_t).$$

The following definition introduces the notion of a conditional non-linear expectation and the associated notion of a non-linear dynamic expectation which is a set of conditional non-linear expectations. In the classical, linear case, i.e. when $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$ we recover the notion of conditional expectation.

Definition 2.2. We call a mapping $\mathcal{E}_t : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t$ an \mathcal{F}_t -conditional non-linear expectation, if

- (i) \mathcal{E}_t is *monotone*: for $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$ the condition $X \leq Y$ implies $\mathcal{E}_t(X) \leq \mathcal{E}_t(Y)$,
- (ii) \mathcal{E}_t *preserves measurable functions*: for $X_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$ we have $\mathcal{E}_t(X_t) = X_t$.

We call $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{E}_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ a *non-linear dynamic expectation*, if for every $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ the mapping $\mathcal{E}_t : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -conditional non-linear expectation.

We introduce further properties which will be of interest in the context of dynamic non-linear expectations. First, we introduce some well-known properties regarding the set \mathcal{H} , all in an appropriate conditional formulation. Denote $\mathcal{H}_t^+ := \{X \in \mathcal{H}_t : X \geq 0\}$. We call \mathcal{H}

- (i) *additive*, if $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$.
- (ii) *\mathcal{F}_t -translation-invariant*, if $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}_t \subseteq \mathcal{H}$.
- (iii) *\mathcal{F}_t -convex*, if for $\lambda_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$ with $0 \leq \lambda_t \leq 1$ we have

$$\lambda_t \mathcal{H} + (1 - \lambda_t) \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$$

- (iv) *\mathcal{F}_t -positively homogeneous*, if $\mathcal{H}_t^+ \cdot \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$.
- (v) *\mathcal{F}_t -local*, if $\mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ for every $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$.

Finally, we call \mathcal{H} *translation-invariant*, if it is \mathcal{F}_t -translation-invariant for every $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ and do so in a similar fashion for the other properties.

Next, we introduce well-known properties of non-linear conditional expectations, all in an appropriate conditional formulation which are frequently used for example in the context of risk measures. An \mathcal{F}_t -conditional expectation \mathcal{E}_t is called

- (i) *subadditive*, if \mathcal{H} is additive and $\mathcal{E}_t(X + Y) \leq \mathcal{E}_t(X) + \mathcal{E}_t(Y)$ holds for $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$.
- (ii) *\mathcal{F}_t -translation-invariant*, if \mathcal{H} is \mathcal{F}_t -translation-invariant and

$$\mathcal{E}_t(X + X_t) = \mathcal{E}_t(X) + X_t$$

holds for any $X \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $X_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$.

- (iii) *\mathcal{F}_t -convex*, if \mathcal{H} is \mathcal{F}_t -convex and for $\lambda_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$ with $0 \leq \lambda_t \leq 1$ and $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$ the inequality

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\lambda_t X + (1 - \lambda_t)Y) \leq \lambda_t \mathcal{E}_t(X) + (1 - \lambda_t) \mathcal{E}_t(Y)$$

holds.

(iv) \mathcal{F}_t -positively homogeneous, if \mathcal{H} is \mathcal{F}_t -positively homogeneous and

$$\mathcal{E}_t(X_t X) = X_t \mathcal{E}_t(X)$$

holds for any $X \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $X_t \in \mathcal{H}_t^+$.

(v) \mathcal{F}_t -sublinear, if it is subadditive and \mathcal{F}_t -positively homogeneous.

(vi) \mathcal{F}_t -local, if \mathcal{H} is \mathcal{F}_t local and

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X) = \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(X)$$

for any $X \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$.

Finally, we call a dynamic expectation $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{E}_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ translation-invariant, sub-additive, convex or positively homogeneous, if for every $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ the \mathcal{F}_t -conditional expectation \mathcal{E}_t has the corresponding property.

2.1. Sensitivity and Consistency. In contrast to a classical expectation, a non-linear expectation might contain only little information on underlying random variables. Sensitivity is a property which allows at least to separate zero from positive random variables: we call an \mathcal{F}_t -conditional non-linear expectation \mathcal{E}_t *sensitive*, if for every $X \in \mathcal{H}$ with $X \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{E}_t(X) = 0$ we have $X = 0$. Similarly, we call the dynamic non-linear expectation \mathcal{E} sensitive, if all \mathcal{E}_t , $t = 0, \dots, T$ are sensitive.

Remark 2.3 (Sensitivity in the context of risk measures). For risk-measures there is also the notion of sensitivity. A conditional risk measure ρ_t on $L^\infty(P)$ is called sensitive, if for $A \in \mathcal{F}$ with $P(A) > 0$ and every $\delta > 0$ the set

$$\{\rho_t(-\delta \mathbb{1}_A) > 0\}$$

has positive probability. Under the bijection $\rho_t \mapsto (X \mapsto \rho_t(-X))$ between risk measures and translation-invariant expectations, both notions coincide. Indeed, if \mathcal{H} is local, then \mathcal{E}_t is sensitive if and only if for every $A \in \mathcal{F}$ with $A \notin \text{Pol}(\mathcal{P})$ and $\delta > 0$ one has

$$\{\mathcal{E}_t(\delta \mathbb{1}_A) > 0\} \notin \text{Pol}(\mathcal{P}) \quad \diamond$$

Time-consistency is an important property in the context of dynamic risk measures, which has been intensively studied, see [Acciaio and Penner \(2011\)](#) We introduce an appropriate generalization for dynamic non-linear expectations: we call a dynamic expectation \mathcal{E} *consistent*, if for $s, t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ with $s \leq t$ the equality

$$\mathcal{E}_s = \mathcal{E}_s \circ \mathcal{E}_t$$

holds.

Since $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T$, \mathcal{E}_T is the identity and hence, every expectation is consistent between $T - 1$ and T , i.e.

$$\mathcal{E}_{T-1} \circ \mathcal{E}_T = \mathcal{E}_{T-1}.$$

Remark 2.4 (Extension of consistency to stopping times). For simplicity, we restrict our definition of consistency to deterministic times $s, t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. This can easily be generalized: indeed, let τ be a stopping time with values in $\{0, \dots, T\}$. Given $(\mathcal{E}_t)_t$, we define

$$\mathcal{E}_\tau(H) := \sum_s \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau=s\}} \mathcal{E}_s(H).$$

If $(\mathcal{E}_t)_t$ is consistent, then for any two such stopping times σ, τ with $\sigma \leq \tau$, the equality

$$\mathcal{E}_\sigma \circ \mathcal{E}_\tau = \mathcal{E}_\sigma$$

holds whenever \mathcal{E} is translation-invariant and local. \diamond

The remarkable connection between sensitivity and consistency can already be seen from the simple observation that a consistent dynamic expectation is already sensitive, if \mathcal{E}_0 is sensitive.

Remark 2.5. Given two sets of probability measures \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} , the non-linear expectation $\mathcal{E} := \sup_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} E_Q$ is well-defined on $L^\infty(\mathcal{P})$ if and only if $\mathcal{Q} \ll \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, sensitivity of \mathcal{E} is equivalent to $\mathcal{Q} \sim \mathcal{P}$. \diamond

Lemma 2.6 below generalizes the well-known result that the acceptance sets of consistent expectations are decreasing: if \mathcal{E} is consistent, then

$$\{\mathcal{E}_s \leq 0\} \supseteq \{\mathcal{E}_t \leq 0\}$$

for $s \leq t$. See (Föllmer and Schied, 2011, Lemma 11.11) for the corresponding risk-measure result, and note that only preservation of constants is needed for the proof.

Lemma 2.6. *Let \mathcal{E} be a consistent, local non-linear dynamic expectation and $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. Then, for $H \in \mathcal{H}$ the condition $\mathcal{E}_t(H) \leq 0$ implies $\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbb{1}_A H) \leq 0$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$ and all $s \leq t$. If \mathcal{E}_0 is sensitive, then the converse is also true.*

Proof. First, locality implies that $\mathcal{E}_t(H \mathbb{1}_A) = \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(H) \leq 0$. Together with monotonicity we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbb{1}_A H) = \mathcal{E}_s(\mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(H)) \leq 0.$$

Now, suppose \mathcal{E}_0 is sensitive. Then \mathcal{E}_s is sensitive. To show that $\mathcal{E}_t(H) \leq 0$, it thus suffices to show

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(H)) = 0$$

for $A := \{\mathcal{E}_t(H) \geq 0\} \in \mathcal{F}_t$. However, as above,

$$\mathcal{E}_s(\mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(H)) = \mathcal{E}_s(\mathbb{1}_A H)$$

and the latter vanishes by assumption. \square

The following Lemma clarifies and generalizes previous uniqueness results, such as (Cohen et al., 2012, Lemma 1) showing that every coherent expectation has at most one coherent and consistent extension. Here, uniqueness is understood as uniqueness up to a polar-set, where the set of reference measures comes from the representation of \mathcal{E}_0 in the sense of (Peng, 2010, Theorem I.2.1.). Regarding the mentioned result, note that for any collection \mathcal{P} of probability measures, the associated non-linear expectation $\sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} E_P[\cdot]$ is sensitive; see Remark 2.5.

A space \mathcal{H} is called symmetric, if $-\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}$. In Section A.2 we study this concept in more detail.

The essential infimum appearing in the following Lemma is the infimum with respect to the order induced by the polar sets. Hence it lacks the well-known properties from the dominated case as, for example, it might not exist, and it has no countable representation. To emphasize this, we denote it by $\mathcal{P} - \text{ess inf}$. See Cohen et al. (2012) for further details.

Lemma 2.7. *Every sensitive \mathcal{F}_0 -conditional expectation \mathcal{E}_0 on a symmetric space has at most one translation-invariant, local, consistent extension $(\mathcal{E}_t)_t$. If it exists, it is given by*

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) = \mathcal{P} - \text{ess inf}\{H_t \in \mathcal{H}_t : H - H_t \in A_t\}$$

where

$$A_t := \{H \in \mathcal{H} : \mathcal{E}_0(\mathbb{1}_A H) \leq 0, \forall A \in \mathcal{F}_t\}.$$

Proof. Lemma 2.6 characterizes for $t \geq 1$ the acceptance set $A_t := \{\mathcal{E}_t \leq 0\}$ solely in terms of \mathcal{E}_0 and \mathbb{F} . Indeed, it yields that

$$A_t = \{H \in \mathcal{H} : \mathcal{E}_0(\mathbb{1}_A H) \leq 0 \forall A \in \mathcal{F}_t\}.$$

This allows to recover every translation-invariant non-linear expectation on a symmetric space from its acceptance set through the representation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_t(H) &= \mathcal{P} - \text{ess inf}\{H_t \in \mathcal{H}_t : H_t \geq \mathcal{E}_t(H)\} \\ &= \mathcal{P} - \text{ess inf}\{H_t \in \mathcal{H}_t : H - H_t \in A_t\}. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing, we have not only shown uniqueness of the extension, but even obtained an explicit expression. \square

In the appendix we show in Proposition A.4, that translation-invariance implies locality if $\mathcal{H} \subseteq L^\infty$. In particular, every dynamic risk-measure on L^∞ in the sense of (Föllmer and Schied, 2011, Section 11) has at most one consistent extension. Moreover, one can show that not every coherent risk measure has a consistent extension.

Remark 2.8. Consider the non-linear expectations $\mathcal{E}_t(\cdot) := \text{ess sup}_{\mathcal{Q}} E_Q[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_t]$, $t = 0, \dots, T$, for some collection of equivalent measures \mathcal{Q} . Up to some continuity constraints, every sublinear expectation is of this form. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{E}_t \leq 0\} &= \{H \in \mathcal{H} : E_Q[H | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq 0 \forall Q \in \mathcal{Q}\} \\ &= \{H \in \mathcal{H} : E_Q[H \mathbb{1}_A] \leq 0 \forall Q \in \mathcal{Q}, \forall A \in \mathcal{F}_t\} \\ &= \{H \in \mathcal{H} : H \mathbb{1}_A \in \{\mathcal{E}_0 \leq 0\} \forall A \in \mathcal{F}_t\} \end{aligned}$$

However, $(\mathcal{E}_t)_t$ is only consistent if \mathcal{Q} is stable under pasting. See also Artzner et al. (2007). \diamond

3. SUPER- AND SUB-HEDGING

Before we consider the second fundamental theorem, we provide some results regarding super- and sub-hedging in a classical, finite-dimensional financial market in discrete time.

In this regard, fix a single probability measure P and consider a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}})$. Furthermore, assume that \mathcal{F}_0 is trivial and $\mathcal{F}_T = \mathcal{F}$. We directly work on discounted prices which are described through the d -dimensional discounted price process $X = (X_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$. Denote by Pred the collection of d -dimensional predictable processes.

Self-financing trading strategies can be identified with predictable processes. Hence, throughout the paper, we identify a self-financing trading strategy with a predictable process, $\xi \in \text{Pred}$. For such ξ and $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, we write

$$(\xi \cdot X)_t = \sum_{k=1}^t \xi_k (X_k - X_{k-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^t \xi_k \Delta X_k,$$

for the gains from self-financing trading in X until t .

Denote by $\mathcal{M}_e := \mathcal{M}_e(P)$ the set of martingale measures equivalent to P . We assume that the market is free of arbitrage, or equivalently, that $\mathcal{M}_e \neq \emptyset$.

Arbitrage-free prices will be studied in more detail in Section 4.1. In particular, as a consequence from the first fundamental theorem, the set of arbitrage-free prices of a European contingent claim is given by its expectations under all equivalent martingale measures.

In this section we study the upper bound of the set of no-arbitrage prices in more detail. It is given by

$$(3.1) \quad \bar{\mathcal{E}}_t(H) := \text{ess sup}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\},$$

for $H \in L^\infty(P)$. We will show soon that $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is indeed a consistent, dynamic non-linear expectation. We also revisit the well-known fact that the upper bound of the no-arbitrage interval $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is equal to the smallest super-hedging price,

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{E}_t(H) := \text{ess inf}\{H_t \in L_t^0 : \exists \xi \in \text{Pred} : H_t + G_t(\xi) \geq H\},$$

where $G_t(\xi) := (\xi \cdot X)_T - (\xi \cdot X)_t$.

For a proof of this result we refer to (Föllmer and Schied, 2011, Corollary 7.18). While $\mathcal{E}_0 = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_0$ is easy to show, the case $t \geq 1$ requires more sophisticated methods. In case of a finite probability space, the proof simplifies as in (Delbaen and Schachermayer, 2006, Theorem 2.4.4). Here, we give a new method for the proof and derive the super-hedging duality directly from the extension result Lemma 2.7.

As for processes, we will also need a notation for the dynamic conditional expectation. In this regard, we will denote $\mathcal{E}(H)$ for the process $(\mathcal{E}_t(H))_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ and use a similar notation for the other dynamic non-linear expectations.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $t = 0, \dots, T$, the super-hedging price \mathcal{E}_t defined in (3.2) is a sensitive, sub-linear expectation on L^∞ .*

Proof. First, we show that $\mathcal{E}_t(H)$ is bounded for $H \in L^\infty(P)$. The inequality $\mathcal{E}_t(H) \leq \|H\|$ follows by definition. If $H_t \in L_t^0$ is a superhedging price, choose $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ with $H_t + G_t(\xi) \geq H$. Consider the set $A := \{H_t < -\|H\|\} \in \mathcal{F}_t$. Then there exists $\eta \in \text{Pred}$ with $G_t(\eta) \geq \mathbb{1}_A(H - H_t) \geq 0$ and therefore $P(A) = 0$ by absence of arbitrage. We conclude that $-\|H\| \leq \mathcal{E}_t(H) \leq \|H\|$.

Second, one easily checks the properties of a sublinear expectation. The sensitivity of \mathcal{E}_t follows from the no-arbitrage assumption. \square

Up to now we treated only bounded random variables, which excludes for example European calls. More generally, we are interested in *European contingent claims* (claims for short) which are simply non-negative random variables, i.e. elements of $L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$. This however has a major downside, as the space $L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is of course not symmetric. Symmetry allows us to associate to the dynamic expectation \mathcal{E} another dynamic expectation $\mathcal{E}^* = (\mathcal{E}_t^*)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ by

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{E}_t^*(X) := -\mathcal{E}_t(-X).$$

For properties we refer to the appendix. This tool will play a major role in our analysis of perfect hedges.

In this regard, we extend the non-linear expectation \mathcal{E}_t to the symmetric space $\mathcal{H} = L^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Note that the properties stated in Lemma 3.1 transfer to this larger space. However, for unbounded H the non-linear expectation $\mathcal{E}_t(H)$ is in general

not real-valued. To be precise, it takes values in $(-\infty, +\infty]$. The same holds true for $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_t$ by Proposition 4.1.

Likewise, the associated expectations $\mathcal{E}_t^*, (\bar{\mathcal{E}}_t)^*$ take values in $[-\infty, \infty)$. In particular, if $H \in L^0$ is symmetric with respect \mathcal{E}_t , then $\mathcal{E}_t(H)$ is real-valued.

3.1. Super-hedging and sub-hedging dualities. At time $t < T$, an \mathcal{F}_t -measurable random variable π_t is a superhedging price for the European claim H due at time T , if there is a self-financing trading strategy which provides always a terminal wealth greater than H . This is equivalent to the existence of a predictable process ξ , such that

$$\pi_t + G_t(\xi) \geq H.$$

Remark 3.2. For every $H \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, and every $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ one has the orthogonality

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{E}_t(H + G_t(\xi)) = \mathcal{E}_t(H).$$

Indeed, for every $H \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, and every $\xi \in \text{Pred}$, the set of superhedging prices for H coincides with the set of superhedging prices for $H + G_t(\xi)$. This follows from linearity of $\text{Pred} \ni \xi \mapsto G_t(\xi)$. Note that, in view of Lemma 5.2, this is a special case of Proposition A.14, as every $G_t(\xi)$ for $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ is clearly attainable at time t . \diamond

The following result shows that $\mathcal{E}_t(H)$ from Equation (3.2) is actually a superhedging price.

Lemma 3.3. *Fix $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. For every $H \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $\mathcal{E}_t(H)$ is a superhedging price for H .*

Proof. The set $M := \{H_t \in L_t^0 : \exists \xi \in \text{Pred} : H_t + G_t(\xi) \geq H\}$ of superhedging prices is directed downwards. Hence, by (Föllmer and Schied, 2011, Theorem A.33) there exists a sequence $(H_t^n)_n \subseteq M$ with $H_t^n \downarrow \mathcal{E}_t(H)$ a.s. By construction, we may write for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$H = H_t^n + G_t(\xi^n) - U^n$$

for some $\xi^n \in \text{Pred}$ and $U^n \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$. As the cone $\{G_t(\xi) - U : \xi \in \text{Pred}, U \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)\}$ is closed due to the no-arbitrage assumption, the claim follows. \square

Lemma 3.4. *For every bounded European contingent claim $H \in L^\infty(P)$, the process of super-hedging prices $\mathcal{E}(H)$ is an \mathcal{M}_e -supermartingale.*

Proof. Fix $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$. Using Lemma 3.3, we may choose $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ with

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) + G_t(\xi) \geq H.$$

Next, we apply \mathcal{E}_{t+1} to this inequality. Note that $G_t(\xi) = G_{t+1}(\xi) + \xi_{t+1} \Delta X_{t+1}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(\mathcal{E}_t(H)) = \mathcal{E}_t(H)$. From Equation (3.4) it follows that $\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(G_t(\xi)) = \xi_{t+1} \Delta X_{t+1}$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) + \xi_{t+1} \Delta X_{t+1} \geq \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H).$$

For the ξ chosen above, $\xi_{t+1} \Delta X_{t+1}$ is bounded from below. Thus, its conditional expectation under Q vanishes for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$. We obtain the inequality

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) \geq E_Q[\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H) \mid \mathcal{F}_t],$$

for each $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$ and each $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ which implies the claim. \square

Corollary 5.3 proved below will allow to study the martingale property of $\mathcal{E}(H)$. It will establish that for any $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, the process $(\mathcal{E}_s(H))_{s \geq t}$ is an \mathcal{M}_e -martingale, if and only if H is attainable at time t and therefore allows to characterize the martingale property in terms of attainability.

For the following result, recall from Equation (3.2) that the dynamic non-linear expectation on $L^\infty(P)$ given by the smallest super-hedging price was denoted by

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) := \text{ess inf} \{H_t \in L_t^0 : \exists \xi \in \text{Pred} : H_t + G_t(\xi) \geq H\},$$

with $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ and $H \in L^\infty(P)$.

Theorem 3.5. *The dynamic non-linear expectation $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{E}_t)_{t=0, \dots, T}$, defined in Equation (3.2) is consistent on L^∞ .*

Proof. First, applying Lemma 3.3 to the European contingent claims $\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H)$ and H allows to choose strategies $\xi, \eta \in \text{Pred}$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H)) + G_t(\xi) \geq \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H)$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H) + G_{t+1}(\eta) \geq H.$$

Combining both inequalities yields

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H)) + G_t(\xi) + G_{t+1}(\eta) \geq H.$$

Note that the sum $G_t(\xi) + G_{t+1}(\eta)$ can be seen as the gains process of a strategy from time t on. Hence, the claim H can be super-replicated at time t at price $\mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H))$. As $\mathcal{E}_t(H)$ is by definition the smallest super-hedging price for claim H at time t , we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H)) \geq \mathcal{E}_t(H).$$

Second, analogously to the second inequality above, we obtain from Lemma 3.3 the existence of $\theta \in \text{Pred}$, such that

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) + G_t(\theta) \geq H.$$

Applying \mathcal{E}_{t+1} to this inequality gives

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) + \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(G_t(\theta)) \geq \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H).$$

Again using the orthogonality relation as introduced in Remark 3.2, in particular Equation (3.4), we obtain that

$$\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(G_t(\theta)) = \theta_{t+1} \Delta X_{t+1} + \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(G_{t+1}(\theta)) = \theta_{t+1} \Delta X_{t+1}.$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) + \theta_{t+1} \Delta X_{t+1} \geq \mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H).$$

Similarly as above we conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{E}_{t+1}(H)) \leq \mathcal{E}_t(H)$$

and the result is proven. \square

Remark 3.6 (Consistency of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$). Consistency of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is related to the stability of \mathcal{M}_e . A set of equivalent probability measures \mathcal{M} is said to be *stable under pasting*, if for any two measures Q^1, Q^2 , and every $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, the pasting $Q^1 \odot_t Q^2$ of Q^1 and Q^2 in t , defined by

$$(3.5) \quad Q^1 \odot_t Q^2(A) := E_{Q^1}[Q^2(A \mid \mathcal{F}_t)] \quad (A \in \mathcal{F}_T)$$

is contained in \mathcal{M} . In case of \mathcal{M}_e this is easily verified, see Proposition 6.42 in Föllmer and Schied (2011), as for any $s, t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$ one has

$$E_{Q^1 \circledast_t Q^2}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_s] = E_{Q^1}[E_{Q^2}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_{s \vee t}] | \mathcal{F}_s],$$

by (Föllmer and Schied, 2011, Lemma 6.41). (Föllmer and Schied, 2011, Theorem 11.22) now shows that the expectation $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ is consistent. See Section 3.2 for a related discussion. \diamond

Corollary 3.7. *For every $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, and every $H \in L^\infty(P)$, the superhedging-duality*

$$(3.6) \quad \mathcal{E}_t(H) = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_t(H)$$

holds.

Proof. In view of Theorem 3.5 and Remark 3.6, Lemma 2.7 already implies the claim. \square

Remark 3.8. It is worth to recall how the equality $\mathcal{E}_0 = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_0$ is usually established, as it allows for a non-linear interpretation. To ease the argument, assume, for the moment, that the price process is (locally) bounded. Denote by $K_0 := \{G_0(\xi) : \xi \in \text{Pred}\}$ the set of claims attainable at price 0, and by $C := (K_0 - L_+^0) \cap L^\infty(P)$ the corresponding cone. By the very definition of C , a measure $Q \sim P$ is contained in \mathcal{M}_e if and only if $E_Q[H] \leq 0$ for every $H \in C$. The Bipolar Theorem then implies that $H \in C$ if and only if $E_Q[H] \leq 0$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$. This can also be read as: the acceptance set $\{\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0 \leq 0\}$ of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0$ coincides with C . One readily verifies that by construction $C = \{\mathcal{E}_0 \leq 0\}$, and translation-invariance of both \mathcal{E}_0 and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_0$ implies $\mathcal{E}_0 = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_0$. \diamond

Corollary 3.9. *For every $H \in L^\infty(P)$ the subhedging-duality*

$$(3.7) \quad \text{ess sup}\{H_t \in L_t^0 : \exists \xi \in \text{Pred} : H_t + G_t(\xi) \leq H\} = \text{ess inf}\{E_Q[H | \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\},$$

holds.

Proof. This follows from Corollary 3.7, as

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{E}_t^*(H) = \text{ess sup}\{H_t \in L_t^0 : \exists \xi \in \text{Pred} : H_t + G_t(\xi) \leq H\}$$

and

$$(\bar{\mathcal{E}}_t)^*(H) = \text{ess inf}\{E_Q[H | \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\}. \quad \square$$

Up to now, super- and subhedging dualities were only established for bounded European claims. The next result shows continuity from below of the non-linear conditional expectations \mathcal{E} and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$, which allows to extend the dualities to European claims bounded from below (or bounded from above).

Lemma 3.10. *The expectations \mathcal{E} and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ are continuous from below on $L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$.*

Proof. Let $(H_n) \subseteq L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ with $H_n \uparrow H \in L_+^0$. We start with $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$. Choose a sequence $(Q^m) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_e$ with

$$\sup_m E_{Q^m}[H | \mathcal{F}_t] = \text{ess sup}_{\mathcal{M}_e} E_Q[H | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Monotone convergence then implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_n \bar{\mathcal{E}}_t(H^n) &= \sup_n \sup_m E_{Q^m}[H^n \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= \sup_m E_{Q^m}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_t(H). \end{aligned}$$

For \mathcal{E} , one proceeds similar as in the proof of Lemma 3.3, to obtain $\sup_n \mathcal{E}_t(H^n) \geq \mathcal{E}_t(H)$. \square

Proposition 3.11. *The superhedging-duality (3.6), and consistency of \mathcal{E} extends to claims, i.e. to $L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$.*

Proof. In view of Corollary 3.7, and Theorem 3.5 this follows from Lemma 3.10. \square

In the context of Remark 3.8, Proposition 3.11 allows us to state the following conditional version of the Bipolar relationship: a claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ can be super-replicated at time t at price zero, if and only if $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \leq 0$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$.

It is worth to recall the classical way to prove the superhedging-duality. Usually, one proves the \mathcal{M}_e -supermartingale property of $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$. Then, one relies on the optional decomposition, to show the difficult inequality $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_t \geq \mathcal{E}_t$.

In continuous time, the optional decomposition theorem, and the resulting construction of superhedging strategies were first obtained in El Karoui and Quenez (1995) in the setting of continuous processes. The extension to general locally bounded semimartingales was achieved in Kramkov (1996). Later, the assumption of local boundedness was removed, see Föllmer and Kabanov (1997), Delbaen and Schachermayer (1999) and references therein. For the statement in discrete time, we refer to Föllmer and Kabanov (1997), Theorem 2, and Föllmer and Schied (2011), Theorem 7.5. The case of a finite probability space in discrete time is treated in Delbaen and Schachermayer (2006), Theorem 2.6.1.

While it is possible to derive consistency of the super-hedging prices \mathcal{E} using the optional decomposition, by taking advantage of the \mathcal{M}_e -supermartingale property of \mathcal{E} established in Lemma 3.4, let us mention that the superhedging-duality in Proposition 3.11 allows us to prove the optional decomposition with little effort. We record this in Theorem 3.12 below, whose proof is similar to the proof of Delbaen and Schachermayer (2006), Theorem 2.6.1.

Theorem 3.12. *Let $V = (V_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ be a non-negative \mathcal{M}_e -supermartingale. Then there exists an adapted increasing process C with $C_0 = 0$, and a strategy $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ such that*

$$V_t = V_0 + (\xi \cdot X)_t - C_t.$$

Proof. For every $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$, and every $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$ the inequality

$$E_Q[V_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] \leq V_{t-1}$$

holds. Equivalently, this can be written in terms of the non-linear expectation $\bar{\mathcal{E}}$ as $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{t-1}(V_t) \leq V_{t-1}$. Applying the superhedging-duality Proposition 3.11 to the claim $V_t \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_t)$, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{E}_{t-1}(\Delta V_t) \leq 0.$$

Hence, for $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ there exists a strategy $\xi^{(t)} \in \text{Pred}$ such that

$$\Delta V_t \leq G_{t-1}(\xi^{(t)}).$$

Using the orthogonality relation as introduced in Remark 3.2, in particular Equation (3.4), an application of \mathcal{E}_t yields

$$\Delta V_t \leq \xi_t^{(t)} \Delta X_t.$$

Summing over $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, we obtain $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ such that $(\xi \cdot X) - V$ is increasing. \square

Lemma 3.13. *For every claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $\mathcal{E}_t^*(H)$ defined in (3.8) is a subhedging price for H .*

Proof. Similar to Lemma 3.3. \square

Proposition 3.14. *Consider the claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$. If $\mathcal{E}_t(H)$ is finite, then the subhedging-duality (3.7) holds at time t .*

Proof. Pick $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ with $\mathcal{E}_t(H) + G_t(\xi) \geq H$, and consider the claim $\tilde{H} := \mathcal{E}_t(H) + G_t(\xi) - H$. Applying the superhedging-duality in form of Proposition 3.11 to \tilde{H} yields

$$\mathcal{E}_t(\mathcal{E}_t(H) + G_t(\xi) - H) = \bar{\mathcal{E}}_t(\mathcal{E}_t(H) + G_t(\xi) - H).$$

Using translation in conjunction with Remark 3.2, in particular Equation (3.4), gives

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) + \mathcal{E}_t(-H) = \mathcal{E}_t(H) + \bar{\mathcal{E}}_t(-H)$$

and the claim follows. \square

We briefly collect the associated symmetric statements of Lemma 3.10, Proposition 3.11 and Proposition 3.14.

Proposition 3.15. *The following statements hold true:*

- (i) *The expectations \mathcal{E}^* and $(\bar{\mathcal{E}})^*$ are continuous from above on $L_-^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$.*
- (ii) *The subhedging-duality (3.7), and consistency of (\mathcal{E}_t^*) extends to $L_-^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$.*
- (iii) *Consider $H \in L_-^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$. If $\mathcal{E}_t^*(H)$ is finite, then the superhedging-duality (3.6) holds at time t .*

3.2. Implications of the super-hedging duality. We end this section discussing the implications and limitations of the super-hedging-duality. Recall from Remark 3.2 that $\mathcal{E}_t(G_t(\xi)) = 0$ for every trading strategy $\xi \in \text{Pred}$, simply by linearity of $\xi \mapsto G_t(\xi)$.

By duality, this implies for every claim $H = H_t + G_t(\xi)$ attainable at time t that $E_Q[G_t(\xi) \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = 0$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$, and every replicating strategy ξ .

Here, the conditional setting fundamentally differs from the unconditional one. Indeed, a claim H attainable at time zero can always be replicated by a bounded initial investment since \mathcal{F}_0 is trivial. This is no longer the case for $t > 0$. Here, one has to pay a finite, but not necessarily bounded, price. In particular, the gains $G_t(\xi) = H - H_t$ might be unbounded from below and expectations might no longer exist. This of course relates to the observation that for arbitrary $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ the stochastic integral $((\xi \cdot X)_t)_{t \in \{0, \dots, T\}}$ is in general only a local martingale under $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$ due to lacking integrability.

This is of course well known, the link between integrability and the martingale property is discussed in Jacod and Shiryaev (1998), Meyer (2006) in detail. As mentioned above, the superhedging-duality implies the desired integrability of $G_t(\xi)$ for replicating strategies of claims.

This can also be checked directly. Indeed, if $0 \leq H = H_t + G_t(\xi)$, set for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A^n := \{H_t \leq n\}$, reducing the problem to the bounded case. By monotone convergence we obtain $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = H_t$ for every $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$. However, note that this hinges on the boundedness of H from below; this indicates that the superhedging-duality does not hold in L^0 .

Finally, we mention that this is in contrast to robust versions of the superhedging-duality, as in [Bouchard et al. \(2015\)](#) or [Burzoni et al. \(2017\)](#), where the superhedging-duality is known to hold on L^0 . In these robust approaches, the duality gap is usually closed by enlarging the set of pricing measures. We refer to [Obloj and Wiesel \(2018\)](#) for a detailed discussion.

4. THE CONDITIONAL NO-ARBITRAGE INTERVAL

This section studies the conditional no-arbitrage interval and we begin with some results on pricing conditional on past information. It seems to be worthwhile pointing out that in case of a finite probability space, conditional pricing can be reduced to the unconditional setting by exploiting the structure of the set of equivalent martingale measures.

The no-arbitrage interval has been intensively studied, but in the unconditional case with $t = 0$. We refer once more to [Föllmer and Schied \(2011\)](#), Section 5 for a detailed treatment of this case. In the following, we extend the notions and results therein to arbitrary $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$.

4.1. Structure of arbitrage-free prices. The main goal in computing arbitrage-free prices relying on the fundamental theorem of asset pricing is to obtain a price process for a new security which can be added to the market without violating absence of arbitrage.

In this spirit, a random variable $\pi_t \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_t)$ is called *arbitrage-free price* at time t of a European contingent claim $H \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ if there exists an adapted process X^{d+1} such that $X_t^{d+1} = \pi_t$, $X_T^{d+1} = H$ and the market (X, X^{d+1}) extended with X^{d+1} is free of arbitrage. Denote by $\Pi_t(H)$ the collection of arbitrage free prices.

For every claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ we define

$$\mathcal{M}_e^H := \{Q \in \mathcal{M}_e : H \in L^1(Q)\}.$$

Note that for an attainable claim H , $\mathcal{M}_e^H = \mathcal{M}_e$. The fundamental theorem of asset pricing implies immediately that the set of arbitrage-free prices is given by expectations under the risk-neutral measures, which we state here for clarity¹. It is an immediate consequence from the first fundamental theorem of asset pricing.

Proposition 4.1. *For every claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$,*

$$\Pi_t(H) = \{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e^H\},$$

and the set of arbitrage-free prices is non-empty.

The following lemma shows that already when a risk-neutral conditional expectation has finite values, it is an arbitrage-free price.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$. If $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ is finite-valued, then it is an arbitrage-free price.*

¹The unconditional version of this result is, for example, given in Theorem 5.29 in [Föllmer and Schied \(2011\)](#).

Proof. If $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ is finite, it is in $L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, and by Proposition 4.1 there exists $\tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_e$ such that $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ is integrable with respect to \tilde{Q} . We now paste Q and \tilde{Q} . As mentioned in Remark 3.6, the pasting $\tilde{Q} \odot_t Q$ of \tilde{Q} with Q in \mathcal{F}_t given by (3.5) is again an equivalent martingale measure. By construction, we even have $\tilde{Q} \odot_t Q \in \mathcal{M}_e^H$. Moreover, it follows that

$$E_{\tilde{Q} \odot_t Q}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t].$$

This is an arbitrage-free price by Proposition 4.1. \square

Denote the upper and the lower bound of the no-arbitrage set at time t by

$$\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) := \text{ess sup } \Pi_t(H), \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) := \text{ess inf } \Pi_t(H).$$

At the moment it is unclear if $\Pi_t(H)$ is actually an interval: indeed, since $P \mapsto E_P[H \mid \mathcal{G}]$ is in general not linear when \mathcal{G} is not trivial, convexity of $\Pi_t(H)$ is no longer an immediate consequence. However, we will prove (conditional) convexity in Corollary 4.8. An explicit description of $\Pi_t(H)$ in terms of $\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)$ and $\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H)$ will be given in Theorem 5.8.

Remark 4.3. The essential supremum in the definition of $\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)$ can be taken in either \mathcal{F}_t or \mathcal{F}_T . As $\Pi_t(H) \subseteq L^0(\mathcal{F}_t)$ they both coincide, since the essential supremum has a countable representation. \diamond

To achieve countable convexity of the set of equivalent martingale measures we exploit nonnegativity of the price process and triviality of the initial σ -algebra \mathcal{F}_0 in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.4. \mathcal{M}_e is countably convex.

Proof. Let $(Q^n) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_e$ and $(\lambda^n)_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\sum_n \lambda^n = 1$. Set $Q^* := \sum_n \lambda^n Q^n$. Obviously, $Q^* \sim P$. For every $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ we have by monotone convergence

$$E_{Q^*}[X_t] = \sum_n \lambda^n E_{Q^n}[X_t] = \sum_n \lambda^n X_0 = X_0 < \infty$$

and hence $X_T \in L^1(Q^*)$. Similarly, for $A \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$,

$$E_{Q^*}[X_t \mathbb{1}_A] = \sum_n \lambda^n E_{Q^n}[X_t \mathbb{1}_A] = \sum_n \lambda^n E_{Q^n}[X_{t-1} \mathbb{1}_A] = E_{Q^*}[X_{t-1} \mathbb{1}_A]$$

and therefore $E^*[X_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] = X_{t-1}$. \square

It is important to acknowledge that, in the notation of Lemma 4.4, we typically do not have

$$E_{Q^*}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = \sum_n \lambda^n E_{Q^n}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$$

for bounded H , while we have it, as just shown, for H replaced by X_T^i , $i = 1, \dots, d$ due to the Q^n -martingale property of X . In general, this equality holds only if all measures Q^n agree on \mathcal{F}_t . We will exploit this observation in the proof of Proposition 4.5.

Proposition 4.5. For every $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, and for every $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ the set

$$\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\}$$

is \mathcal{F}_t -countably convex.

Proof. Let $(Q^n) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_e$. By pasting we may assume that all Q^n agree on \mathcal{F}_t . This will be used throughout.²

Set $Q^* := \sum_n 2^{-n} Q^n$. By Lemma 4.4, $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e$. Denote by $Z^n := dQ^n/dQ^*$ the associated densities. As $Q^* = Q^n$ on \mathcal{F}_t for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$Z_t^n = E_{Q^*}[Z^n \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = 1.$$

Since $H \geq 0$, monotone convergence implies for a sequence $(\lambda_t^n) \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_t)$ with $\sum_n \lambda_t^n = 1$, that

$$\sum_n \lambda_t^n E_{Q^n}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = E_{Q^*}\left[H \sum_n \lambda_t^n Z^n \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right].$$

Set $Z := \sum_n \lambda_t^n Z^n > 0$. Note that

$$E_{Q^*}\left[\sum_n \lambda_t^n Z^n \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right] = \sum_n \lambda_t^n = 1$$

and we may therefore define the measure Q by

$$dQ/dQ^* := Z.$$

Then,

$$E_{Q^*}\left[H \sum_n \lambda_t^n Z^n \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right] = E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t].$$

It remains to verify that Q is indeed a martingale measure after t (recall that Q and Q^* agree on \mathcal{F}_t). As the price process is nonnegative, its conditional expectation is well-defined, and we obtain by monotone convergence for $s \geq t$

$$\begin{aligned} E_Q[X_{s+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] &= E_{Q^*}\left[\frac{Z}{Z_s} X_{s+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_s\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_s} \sum_n \lambda_t^n E_{Q^*}[Z^n X_{s+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_s} \sum_n \lambda_t^n Z_s^n E_{Q^n}[X_{s+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_s] = X_s. \end{aligned}$$

This allows to conclude $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$. \square

Remark 4.6. The \mathcal{F}_t -convexity is easier to establish, since for finitely many measures $Q^1, \dots, Q^n \in \mathcal{M}_e$ there exists $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e$ such that the densities dQ^k/dQ^* are uniformly bounded. In particular, it is not needed that the Q^k agree on \mathcal{F}_t . \diamond

Note that, due to the integrability conditions, $\Pi_t(H)$ is not \mathcal{F}_t -countably convex for every claim H . Even in the unconditional case this fails.

Corollary 4.7. Consider a claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, let $(Q^n) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_e^H$ and $(\lambda_t^n) \subseteq L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_t)$ with $\sum_n \lambda_t^n = 1$. If $\sum_n \lambda_t^n E_{Q^n}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ is finite-valued, it is contained in $\Pi_t(H)$.

Proof. Due to Proposition 4.5, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$ with

$$\sum_n \lambda_t^n E_{Q^n}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Now the claim follows by Lemma 4.2. \square

Corollary 4.8. Consider $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. Then

²Note that this always holds for $t = 0$.

- (i) $\Pi_t(H)$ is \mathcal{F}_t -convex for every claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$,
- (ii) $\Pi_t(H)$ is directed upward for every claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$,
- (iii) $\Pi_t(H)$ is \mathcal{F}_t -countably convex for every bounded claim $H \in L^\infty(P)$, and,
- (iv) for $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, any partition $(A^n) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_t$, and any sequence $(Q^n) \subseteq \mathcal{M}_e^H(P)$,

$$\sum_n \mathbb{1}_{A^n} E_{Q^n}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \in \Pi_t(H).$$

This observation will imply that the no-arbitrage set $\Pi_t(H)$ is indeed an (of course random) interval for any $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. We will give a precise proof in Theorem 5.8.

Lemma 4.9. For $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$, $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$ and $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$, it holds that

$$\Pi_t(\mathbb{1}_A H) = \mathbb{1}_A \Pi_t(H).$$

Proof. Let $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$ such that $H \mathbb{1}_A$ is integrable with respect to Q . By Proposition 4.1, we may pick $\tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_e$ such that $H \mathbb{1}_{A^c}$ is integrable with respect to \tilde{Q} . By construction $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \mathbb{1}_A + E_{\tilde{Q}}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \mathbb{1}_{A^c}$ is finite, and by Corollary 4.8 and Lemma 4.2 there exists $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e^H$ with

$$E_{Q^*}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \mathbb{1}_A + E_{\tilde{Q}}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \mathbb{1}_{A^c}$$

and therefore

$$E_{Q^*}[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] \mathbb{1}_A = E_Q[H \mathbb{1}_A \mid \mathcal{F}_t]. \quad \square$$

The next Proposition shows that, for every claim H , the non-linear expectation $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(H) = \text{ess sup}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\}$ can be computed by considering a subset of \mathcal{M}_e only: one can restrict to the set of martingale measure $\mathcal{M}_e^H(P)$ under which H is integrable. In particular, for every claim H , the non-linear expectation $\bar{\mathcal{E}}(H)$ agrees with the upper bound of the no-arbitrage interval $\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)$. This links the superhedging-duality Proposition 3.11 with the pricing in financial markets.

Proposition 4.10. For every $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ we have the equalities

$$\text{ess sup}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\} = \text{ess sup}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e^H\}$$

and

$$\text{ess inf}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\} = \text{ess inf}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e^H\}$$

Proof. Due to Proposition 4.1, it remains to show the first equality. Using Lemma 4.9 and Lemma 4.2, it suffices to show the following: if there exists $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$ with $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = +\infty$, then $\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) = +\infty$.

In this regard, consider $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$ with $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = +\infty$ and some $Y_t \in L_t^0$. Since $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = +\infty$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\{Y_t \leq E_Q[H \wedge n \mid \mathcal{F}_t]\}$ has positive probability. By the fundamental theorem of asset pricing and Proposition 4.1 we find $\pi_t \in \Pi_t(H)$ such that $\{Y_t \leq \pi_t\}$ has positive probability.

Since Y_t was arbitrary, it follows that $\pi_t^{\text{sup}} = +\infty$ with positive probability. Now set $A := \{\pi_t^{\text{sup}} < +\infty\}$. Using Lemma 4.9, and arguing as above for the claim $H \mathbb{1}_A$, we deduce that $P(A) = 0$. \square

In view of Lemma 2.7, Proposition 4.10 is not an immediate consequence of the unconditional case, as the set \mathcal{M}_e^H is not stable. Moreover, as $L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is not symmetric, one has to show both equalities in Proposition 4.10.

5. A CONDITIONAL VERSION OF THE SECOND FUNDAMENTAL THEOREM

Equipped with efficient tools for non-linear expectations we now prove a conditional version of the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing. We begin by studying those contingent claims which are attainable, i.e. claims which can be perfectly replicated by a hedging strategy.

5.1. Attainability of Claims. A European contingent claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is called *attainable* (replicable) at time t if there exists $\xi \in \text{Pred}$ and $H_t \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_t)$ such that $H = H_t + G_t(\xi)$. In this case, we say that the strategy ξ *replicates* the claim H .

Remark 5.1. Some immediate observations are due.

- (i) If $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is attainable at time s , then H is attainable at time t for every $t \geq s$.
- (ii) The converse is not true. Using consistency of π^{sup} established in Theorem 3.5 and Proposition 4.10, we have

$$\pi_s^{\text{sup}}(H) = \pi_s^{\text{sup}}(\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H))$$

and

$$\pi_s^{\text{inf}}(H) = \pi_s^{\text{inf}}(\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H))$$

so, by Theorem 5.4, established below, H attainable at time t is attainable at time $s \leq t$ if and only if $\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) = \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H)$ is attainable at time s . \diamond

Recall that $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is called *symmetric* with respect to \mathcal{E}_t , if

$$\mathcal{E}_t(H) = -\mathcal{E}_t(-H).$$

In the following we show that for an attainable claim the non-linear expectation for $-H$ is well defined and coincides with $-\mathcal{E}_t(H)$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Then H is symmetric with respect to \mathcal{E}_t if and only if H is attainable at time t .*

Proof. Recall that by definition (3.3) $\mathcal{E}_t^*(\cdot) = -\mathcal{E}_t(-\cdot)$ and hence, as already established in Equation (3.8),

$$\mathcal{E}_t^*(H) = \text{ess sup}\{H_t \in L_t^0 : \exists \xi \in \text{Pred} : H_t + G_t(\xi) \leq H\}$$

is the largest sub-hedging price. Due to Lemma 3.13, $\mathcal{E}_t^*(H)$ is itself a sub-hedging price.

Now, suppose first that H is attainable at time t , i.e. $H = H_t + G_t(\xi)$ for some $\xi \in \text{Pred}$. By Remark 3.2, we obtain

$$\mathcal{E}_t^*(H) = \mathcal{E}_t^*(H_t) + \mathcal{E}_t^*(G_t(\xi)) = H_t = \mathcal{E}_t(H_t + G_t(\xi)) = \mathcal{E}_t(H).$$

Second, let $\xi, \eta \in \text{Pred}$ such that

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{E}_t^*(H) + G_t(\xi) \leq H \leq \mathcal{E}_t(H) + G_t(\eta).$$

If H is symmetric, then $\mathcal{E}_t(H) = \mathcal{E}_t^*(H)$ is finite and this implies

$$0 \leq H - \mathcal{E}_t(H) - G_t(\xi) \leq G_t(\eta - \xi).$$

The no-arbitrage assumption yields $G_t(\eta) = G_t(\xi)$. Since $\mathcal{E}_t(H) = \mathcal{E}_t^*(H)$, Equation (5.1) yields that $H = \mathcal{E}_t(H) + G_t(H)$ and therefore H is attainable. \square

Corollary 5.3. *Consider $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$. H is attainable at time t if and only if $\mathcal{M}_e \ni Q \mapsto E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ is constant.*

Proof. Using the dualities established in Proposition 3.11 and Proposition 3.14, Lemma 5.2 shows that H is attainable at time t if and only if H is symmetric with respect to \mathcal{E}_t^π . Now, $(\mathcal{E}_t^\pi)^*(H) = \text{ess inf}\{E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t] : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\}$ and symmetry $(\mathcal{E}_t^\pi)^*(H) = \mathcal{E}_t^\pi(H)$ is therefore equivalent to the constancy of $E_Q[H \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ over $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$. \square

In view of Proposition 4.1, Corollary 5.3 extends the well-known result, that a claim is attainable if and only if it has a unique arbitrage free price, to a conditional setting. See (Föllmer and Schied, 2011, Theorem 5.32) for the classical case.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ be a European contingent claim. Then H is attainable at time t if and only if*

$$\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H),$$

i.e. when there is a unique arbitrage free price at time t . If H is not attainable at time t , then $\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H)$ and $\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)$ are not arbitrage free prices at time t .

Proof. The first part, as just remarked, follows from Corollary 5.3. The second part follows from the dualities Proposition 3.11 and Proposition 3.14. \square

We obtain the following conditional version of the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing. To do so, we introduce the notation

$$\mathcal{M}_e \odot_t Q^* := \{Q \odot_t Q^* : Q \in \mathcal{M}_e\}.$$

Theorem 5.5. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) *The market is complete at time t , i.e. every European contingent claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is attainable at time t .*
- (ii) *Every European contingent claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ has a unique price at time t .*
- (iii) *There exists $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e$ such that $\mathcal{M}_e = \mathcal{M}_e \odot_t Q^*$.*
- (iv) *For every $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e(P)$ the equality $\mathcal{M}_e = \mathcal{M}_e \odot_t Q^*$ holds.*

Proof. Theorem 5.4 provides the equivalence between market completeness at time t , and uniqueness of arbitrage-free prices at time t .

As already mentioned in the Remark 3.6, the set of equivalent martingale measures is stable. This implies the inclusion $\mathcal{M}_e \odot_t Q^* \subseteq \mathcal{M}_e$ for every $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e$.

Now, let us first assume that every European contingent claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ has a unique price at time t , and pick $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e$. We show the inclusion $\mathcal{M}_e \subseteq \mathcal{M}_e \odot_t Q^*$. Given $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e$, we define the measure $\tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_e \odot_t Q^*$ by $\tilde{Q} := Q \odot_t Q^*$. Using Remark 3.6, we compute, for every $A \in \mathcal{F}_T$,

$$E_{\tilde{Q}}[\mathbb{1}_A] = E_Q[E_{Q^*}[\mathbb{1}_A \mid \mathcal{F}_t]].$$

By assumption, the claim $\mathbb{1}_A \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ has a unique arbitrage-free price at time t . In particular, the prices $E_{Q^*}[\mathbb{1}_A \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ and $E_Q[\mathbb{1}_A \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ do agree. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\tilde{Q}}[\mathbb{1}_A] &= E_Q[E_Q[\mathbb{1}_A \mid \mathcal{F}_t]] \\ &= E_Q[\mathbb{1}_A] \end{aligned}$$

and thus $Q = \tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_e \odot_t Q^*$, as desired. As $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e$ was arbitrary, we conclude that (iv) holds.

Second, suppose that the equality $\mathcal{M}_e = \mathcal{M}_e \odot_t Q^*$ holds for some $Q^* \in \mathcal{M}_e(P)$. We finish the proof by showing that every European contingent claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ has a unique price at time t , i.e. constancy of $\mathcal{M}_e \ni Q \mapsto E_Q[H | \mathcal{F}_t]$. To this end, let $\tilde{Q} \in \mathcal{M}_e$. By assumption, there exists $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e(P)$ such that $\tilde{Q} = Q \odot_t Q^*$. Using Remark 3.6 again, we obtain, for every $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$,

$$E_{\tilde{Q}}[H | \mathcal{F}_t] = E_{Q^*}[H | \mathcal{F}_t],$$

and thus $\Pi_t(H)$ is indeed a singleton. \square

Remark 5.6.

- (i) Note that $\mathcal{M}_e = \mathcal{M}_e \odot_T Q^*$ trivially holds, as $Q^1 \odot_T Q^2 = Q^1$ for any two measures Q^1, Q^2 . This is in line with the observation that every claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is attainable at time T .
- (ii) As $Q^1 \odot_0 Q^2 = Q^2$ for any two measures Q^1, Q^2 , we recover the classical version of the second fundamental theorem of asset pricing: market completeness is equivalent to the existence of exactly one equivalent martingale measure. \diamond

Lemma 5.7. *Let $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ be a claim. If $Y \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_t)$, and $Y \mathbb{1}_A < \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) \mathbb{1}_A$ for some \mathcal{F}_t -measurable subset A with $P(A) > 0$. Then there exists a \mathcal{F}_t -measurable set $B \subseteq A$ with $P(B) > 0$ and $\pi_t \in \Pi_t(H)$ such that*

$$Y \mathbb{1}_B < \pi_t \mathbb{1}_B$$

Proof. First, by assumption,

$$Y \mathbb{1}_A < \mathbb{1}_A \text{ ess sup } \Pi_t(H) = \text{ess sup } \mathbb{1}_A \Pi_t(H).$$

By definition of the essential supremum, there exists $\pi_t \in \Pi_t(H)$ and a measurable subset $B \subseteq A$ with positive probability such that

$$Y \mathbb{1}_B < \pi_t \mathbb{1}_B$$

and the claim follows. \square

As an intuition for the above proof, it is interesting to note that π_t^{sup} inherits locality from Π_t , which was shown in Lemma 4.9, i.e.

$$\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) \mathbb{1}_A = \text{ess sup } \Pi_t(H) \mathbb{1}_A = \text{ess sup } \Pi_t(H \mathbb{1}_A) = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H \mathbb{1}_A).$$

Theorem 5.8. *The set of arbitrage-free prices $\Pi_t(H)$ of a claim $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is an \mathcal{F}_t -measurable random interval, i.e.*

$$\Pi_t(H) = \{\lambda_t \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) + (1 - \lambda_t) \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) : \lambda_t \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_t), 0 < \lambda_t < 1\}.$$

In the case where H is attainable, the (random) interval of arbitrage-free prices hence collapses to the singleton $\{E_Q[H | \mathcal{F}_t]\}$ with any $Q \in \mathcal{M}_e(P)$. When H is not attainable, this interval is given by $(\pi_t^{\text{inf}}, \pi_t^{\text{sup}})$.

Proof. We start with the inclusion

$$\Pi_t(H) \subseteq \{\lambda_t \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) + (1 - \lambda_t) \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) : \lambda_t \in L^0(\mathcal{F}_t), 0 < \lambda_t < 1\}.$$

Let $\pi_t \in \Pi_t(H)$. Theorem 5.4 implies together with Lemma 4.9 the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \{\pi_t = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)\} &= \{\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) = \pi_t = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)\}, \\ \{\pi_t < \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)\} &= \{\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) < \pi_t = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we find $0 < \lambda_t < 1$, where

$$\lambda_t := \frac{\pi_t - \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H)}{\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) - \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H)} \mathbb{1}_{\{\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) > \pi_t\}} + \delta \mathbb{1}_{\{\pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) = \pi_t\}}$$

for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$. By construction,

$$\pi_t = \lambda_t \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) + (1 - \lambda_t) \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H).$$

To show the other inclusion we may assume, by Theorem 5.4 that H is not attainable. Using Lemma 4.9 and Corollary 4.8, we may even assume that $\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) < \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)$, see also the remark following this proof. Next, let $\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) < Y < \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)$. We claim that there exists $\pi_t \in \Pi_t(H)$ such that $Y \leq \pi_t$. If this is shown, then similarly

$$\tilde{\pi}_t \leq Y \leq \pi_t$$

for $\tilde{\pi}_t \in \Pi_t(H)$ and conditional convexity of $\Pi_t(H)$ implies $Y \in \Pi_t(H)$.

To show the existence of π_t , we use a Halmos-Savage argument. Set $\alpha := \sup\{P(\{\pi_t \geq Y\}) : \pi_t \in \Pi_t(H)\}$. By Lemma 5.7, $\alpha > 0$. Pick a sequence π_t^n such that $P(\{\pi_t^n \geq Y\})$ converges to α , and set $A^n := \{\pi_t^n \geq Y\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $B^n := A^n \setminus \cup_{k < n} A^k$ and set

$$\pi_t := \sum_n \pi_t^n \mathbb{1}_{B^n} + \pi_t^1 \mathbb{1}_{A^c}$$

where $A = \cup_n A^n$. By Corollary 4.8, $\pi_t \in \Pi_t(H)$. As $\{\pi_t \geq Y\} \supseteq A^n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $P(\{\pi_t \geq Y\}) = \alpha$. It remains to show that $\alpha = 1$. Suppose $\{\pi_t < Y\}$ has positive probability. By Lemma 5.7, there exists $\tilde{\pi}_t \in \Pi_t(H)$ with

$$\mathbb{1}_C Y \leq \mathbb{1}_C \tilde{\pi}_t$$

with $C \subseteq \{\pi_t < Y\} \subseteq A^c$. Setting

$$\hat{\pi}_t := \sum_n \pi_t^n \mathbb{1}_{B^n} + \tilde{\pi}_t \mathbb{1}_C + \pi_t^1 \mathbb{1}_{A^c \setminus C}$$

yields an arbitrage-free price with $P(\{\hat{\pi}_t \geq Y\}) > P(\{\pi_t \geq Y\}) = \alpha$, a contradiction. \square

We end this section with some clarifying remarks regarding attainability of claims in the conditional setting. Let $t \in \{0, \dots, T\}$. Note that every claim H decomposes as $H = H^A + H^B$, where H^A is attainable at time t , and H^B captures the non-attainability of H in the sense that

$$\{\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H^B) = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H^B)\} = \{\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) < \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)\}.$$

Indeed, let $A := \{\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H)\}$ and set

$$H^A := H \mathbb{1}_A \text{ and } H^B := H \mathbb{1}_{A^c}.$$

Using locality,

$$\pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H^A) = \mathbb{1}_A \pi_t^{\text{inf}}(H) = \mathbb{1}_A \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H) = \pi_t^{\text{sup}}(H^A),$$

whence H^A is attainable at time t by Theorem 5.4. Using this decomposition, and Theorem 5.4, one ends up with a tool for easy detection of prices yielding arbitrage, as captured in the following corollary.

Corollary 5.9. *Let $H \in L_+^0(\mathcal{F}_t)$ be a European contingent claim, and let π_t be an \mathcal{F}_t -measurable random variable.*

- (i) If $\{\pi_t > \pi_t^{sup}(H)\}$ has positive probability, then $\pi_t \notin \Pi_t(H)$.
- (ii) If $\{\pi_t = \pi_t^{sup}(H)\} \cap \{\pi_t^{inf}(H) < \pi_t^{sup}(H)\}$ has positive probability, then $\pi_t \notin \Pi_t(H)$.

6. CONCLUSION

In this article we provided a conditional version of the second fundamental theorem in discrete time. We have shown that at any time t , completeness of the financial market is characterized by uniqueness of the prices of all financial claims. In this regard, we provided a detailed study of the arbitrage-free price interval at t , showing conditional convexity together with the associated super-hedging and sub-hedging dualities. The latter give upper and lower bounds of the no-arbitrage interval, and are, as usual, not arbitrage-free prices if the interval is a true interval. We also provided a new perspective on the optional decomposition theorem based on non-linear expectations.

APPENDIX A. NON-LINEAR EXPECTATIONS

For the convenience of the reader we collect several well-known properties of non-linear expectations.

A.1. Basic properties.

Lemma A.1. *Every subadditive conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}_t : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t$ is \mathcal{F}_t -translation-invariant.*

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}_t \subseteq \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ holds. For $X \in \mathcal{H}$ and $X_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$, subadditivity yields

$$\mathcal{E}_t(X + X_t) \leq \mathcal{E}_t(X) + \mathcal{E}_t(X_t) = \mathcal{E}_t(X) + X_t$$

As $X = X + X_t - X_t$ we also have

$$\mathcal{E}_t(X) + X_t \leq (\mathcal{E}_t(X + X_t) - X_t) + X_t = \mathcal{E}_t(X + X_t).$$

□

Lemma A.2 (Detlefsen and Scandolo (2005)). *Let \mathcal{H} be additive and \mathcal{F}_t -local. For a \mathcal{F}_t -conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}_t : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_t$ the following are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathcal{E}_t is \mathcal{F}_t -local.
- (ii) For $X \in \mathcal{H}$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$ the equality $\mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X) = \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(X)$ holds.
- (iii) For $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$ the equality $\mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X + \mathbb{1}_{A^c} Y) = \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(X) + \mathbb{1}_{A^c} \mathcal{E}_t(Y)$ holds.

Proposition A.3. *Every convex expectation is local.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{E}_t)_t$ be convex. Note that \mathcal{H} is local as $\mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{H} = \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{H} + \mathbb{1}_{A^c} 0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Now proceed as in (Detlefsen and Scandolo, 2005, Proposition 2). □

Proposition A.4. *Every translation-invariant expectation on a local set $\mathcal{H} \subseteq L^\infty$ is local.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{E}_t be translation-invariant and $A \in \mathcal{F}_t$. The inequality

$$\mathbb{1}_A X - \mathbb{1}_{A^c} \|X\| \leq X \leq \mathbb{1}_A X + \mathbb{1}_{A^c} \|X\|$$

yields

$$\mathcal{E}_t(X) \geq \mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X - \mathbb{1}_{A^c} \|X\|)$$

and additionally

$$\mathcal{E}_t(X) \leq \mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X + \mathbb{1}_{A^c} \|X\|)$$

Note that $\mathbb{R} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Multiplying both inequalities with $\mathbb{1}_A$ gives

$$\mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(X) = \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X) &= \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X) + \mathbb{1}_{A^c} \mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(X) + \mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{1}_{A^c} \mathcal{E}_t(\mathbb{1}_A X) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_A \mathcal{E}_t(X) \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Remark A.5. Proposition A.4 sharpens (Detlefsen and Scandolo, 2005, Proposition 2). Every conditional risk measure on L^∞ is local; there is no need for convexity. \diamond

Lemma A.6. Every translation-invariant expectation on $\mathcal{H} \subseteq L^\infty$ is 1-Lipschitz with respect to $\|\cdot\|_\infty$.

Lemma A.7. Let \mathcal{E} be a dynamic expectation on \mathcal{H} . The following are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{E} is consistent
- (ii) For every $t \in \{0, \dots, T-1\}$ we have $\mathcal{E}_t = \mathcal{E}_t \circ \mathcal{E}_{t+1}$.
- (iii) For every $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$ and $s \leq t$ the condition $\mathcal{E}_t(X) \leq \mathcal{E}_t(Y)$ implies $\mathcal{E}_s(X) \leq \mathcal{E}_s(Y)$.
- (iv) For every $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$ and $s \leq t$ the condition $\mathcal{E}_t(X) = \mathcal{E}_t(Y)$ implies $\mathcal{E}_s(X) = \mathcal{E}_s(Y)$.

Proof. As in (Föllmer and Schied, 2011, Lemma 11.11). Note that no translation-invariance is needed. \square

A.2. Symmetry. A space \mathcal{H} is called symmetric, if $-\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}$.

Proposition A.8. Let $(\mathcal{E}_t)_t$ be a dynamic expectation on the symmetric set \mathcal{H} . We define another dynamic expectation $(\mathcal{E}_t^*)_t$ by

$$\mathcal{E}_t^*(X) := -\mathcal{E}_t(-X)$$

Remark A.9. If \mathcal{E}_t is a subadditive expectation on symmetric \mathcal{H} , then

$$\mathcal{E}_t \geq \mathcal{E}_t^*$$

Indeed, for $X \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$0 = \mathcal{E}_t(0) = \mathcal{E}_t(X - X) \leq \mathcal{E}_t(X) + \mathcal{E}_t(-X)$$

\diamond

Remark A.10. If \mathcal{H} is symmetric, the mapping $\mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathcal{E}^*$ is a bijection on the collection of dynamic expectations on \mathcal{H} . For every dynamic expectation we have $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^{**}$. A dynamic expectation \mathcal{E} with $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^*$ is called symmetric. \diamond

Proposition A.11. A dynamic expectation is linear if and only if it is symmetric and sublinear.

Definition A.12 (Definition 4.3 in Cohen et al. (2011)). Let \mathcal{H} be symmetric and let \mathcal{E}_t be a \mathcal{F}_t -conditional expectation. We call $X \in \mathcal{H}$ symmetric (with respect to \mathcal{E}_t), if

$$\mathcal{E}_t(X) = \mathcal{E}_t^*(X)$$

holds. This extends as usual to dynamic expectations.

Lemma A.13.

- (i) $X \in \mathcal{H}$ is symmetric if and only if $(-X)$ is symmetric.
(ii) $X \in \mathcal{H}$ is symmetric with respect to \mathcal{E} if and only if it is symmetric with respect to \mathcal{E}^* .

Proposition A.14 (Lemma 2.2 in Cohen et al. (2011)). Let \mathcal{H} be symmetric and additive, and let \mathcal{E}_t be a positive homogeneous \mathcal{F}_t -conditional expectation. Let $Y \in \mathcal{H}$ be symmetric and $m_t \in \mathcal{H}_t$ with $m_t Y \in \mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\mathcal{E}_t(m_t Y) = m_t \mathcal{E}_t(Y)$$

If \mathcal{E}_t is additionally sublinear, then for $X \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\mathcal{E}_t(X + m_t Y) = \mathcal{E}_t(X) + m_t \mathcal{E}_t(Y)$$

Corollary A.15 (Lemma 4.8 in Cohen et al. (2011)). Let \mathcal{H} be symmetric and let \mathcal{E}_t be a sublinear \mathcal{F}_t -conditional expectation. The collection of symmetric elements forms a \mathbb{R} -linear space.

REFERENCES

- Acciaio, B. and Penner, I. (2011), Dynamic risk measures, in ‘Advanced mathematical methods for finance’, Springer, pp. 1–34.
- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.-M. and Heath, D. (1999), ‘Coherent measures of risk’, *Mathematical finance* **9**(3), 203–228.
- Artzner, P., Delbaen, F., Eber, J.-M., Heath, D. and Ku, H. (2007), ‘Coherent multiperiod risk adjusted values and bellman’s principle’, *Annals of Operations Research* **152**(1), 5–22.
- Bachelier, L. (1900), Théorie de la spéculation, in ‘Annales scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure’, Vol. 17, pp. 21–86.
- Biagini, F. (2010), ‘Second fundamental theorem of asset pricing’, *Encyclopedia of Quantitative Finance*.
- Black, F. and Scholes, M. (1973), ‘The pricing of options and corporate liabilities’, *Journal of political economy* **81**(3), 637–654.
- Bouchard, B., Nutz, M. et al. (2015), ‘Arbitrage and duality in nondominated discrete-time models’, *Annals of Applied Probability* **25**(2), 823–859.
- Burzoni, M., Frittelli, M., Maggis, M. et al. (2017), ‘Model-free superhedging duality’, *Annals of Applied Probability* **27**(3), 1452–1477.
- Cohen, S., Ji, S. and Peng, S. (2011), ‘Sublinear expectations and martingales in discrete time’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1104.5390*.
- Cohen, S. et al. (2012), ‘Quasi-sure analysis, aggregation and dual representations of sublinear expectations in general spaces’, *Electronic Journal of Probability* **17**.
- Coquet, F., Hu, Y., Mémin, J. and Peng, S. (2002), ‘Filtration-consistent nonlinear expectations and related g-expectations’, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **123**(1), 1–27.
- Delbaen, F. (2002), Coherent risk measures on general probability spaces, in ‘Advances in finance and stochastics’, Springer, pp. 1–37.
- Delbaen, F. and Schachermayer, W. (1994), ‘A general version of the fundamental theorem of asset pricing’, *Mathematische Annalen* **300**(1), 463–520.
- Delbaen, F. and Schachermayer, W. (1998), ‘The fundamental theorem of asset pricing for unbounded stochastic processes’, *Mathematische Annalen* **312**(2), 215–250.

- Delbaen, F. and Schachermayer, W. (1999), A compactness principle for bounded sequences of martingales with applications, in ‘Seminar on stochastic analysis, random fields and applications’, Springer, pp. 137–173.
- Delbaen, F. and Schachermayer, W. (2006), *The mathematics of arbitrage*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- Denis, L., Hu, M. and Peng, S. (2011), ‘Function spaces and capacity related to a sublinear expectation: application to G-Brownian motion paths’, *Potential Analysis* **34**(2), 139–161.
- Detlefsen, K. and Scandolo, G. (2005), ‘Conditional and dynamic convex risk measures’, *Finance and Stochastics* **9**(4), 539–561.
- El Karoui, N. and Quenez, M.-C. (1995), ‘Dynamic programming and pricing of contingent claims in an incomplete market’, *SIAM journal on Control and Optimization* **33**(1), 29–66.
- Föllmer, H. and Kabanov, Y. M. (1997), ‘Optional decomposition and Lagrange multipliers’, *Finance and Stochastics* **2**(1), 69–81.
- Föllmer, H. and Schied, A. (2011), *Stochastic finance: an introduction in discrete time*, Walter de Gruyter.
- Harrison, J. M. and Kreps, D. M. (1979), ‘Martingales and arbitrage in multiperiod securities markets’, *Journal of Economic theory* **20**(3), 381–408.
- Harrison, J. M. and Pliska, S. R. (1981), ‘Martingales and stochastic integrals in the theory of continuous trading’, *Stochastic processes and their applications* **11**(3), 215–260.
- Harrison, J. M. and Pliska, S. R. (1983), ‘A stochastic calculus model of continuous trading: complete markets’, *Stochastic processes and their applications* **15**(3), 313–316.
- Jacod, J. and Shiryaev, A. N. (1998), ‘Local martingales and the fundamental asset pricing theorems in the discrete-time case’, *Finance and stochastics* **2**(3), 259–273.
- Kramkov, D. O. (1996), ‘Optional decomposition of supermartingales and hedging contingent claims in incomplete security markets’, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **105**(4), 459–479.
- Merton, R. C. (1973), ‘Theory of rational option pricing’, *The Bell Journal of economics and management science* pp. 141–183.
- Meyer, P.-A. (2006), *Martingales and stochastic integrals I*, Vol. 284, Springer.
- Nutz, M. (2014), ‘Superreplication under model uncertainty in discrete time’, *Finance and Stochastics* **18**(4), 791–803.
- Obloj, J. and Wiesel, J. (2018), ‘A unified framework for robust modelling of financial markets in discrete time’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06430*.
- Peng, S. (2005), ‘Nonlinear expectations and nonlinear Markov chains’, *Chinese Annals of Mathematics* **26**(02), 159–184.
- Peng, S. (2007), G-expectation, G-Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus of Itô type, in ‘Stochastic analysis and applications’, Springer, pp. 541–567.
- Peng, S. (2010), ‘Nonlinear expectations and stochastic calculus under uncertainty’, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1002.4546* **24**.
- Samuelson, P. A. (1965), ‘Rational theory of warrant pricing’, *Industrial Management Review* **6**, 13 – 39.
- Taqqu, M. S. and Willinger, W. (1987), ‘The analysis of finite security markets using martingales’, *Advances in Applied Probability* pp. 1–25.