

# THE SIMPLE YIELD CURVE MODELS

ETHAN AKIN AND MORTON DAVIS

ABSTRACT. With  $P_t$  the price in current dollars of a dollar delivered  $t$  time units from now, we assume that  $P$  is a decreasing function defined for  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $P_0 = 1$ . The negative logarithmic derivative,  $-\dot{P}_t/P_t$  defines the yield curve function  $Y_t$ . An  $n$  parameter linear yield curve model selects as allowable yield curves  $Y_t(r) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i Y_t^i$  with the functions  $Y^i$  fixed and with  $r$  varying over an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  on which  $Y_t(r) \geq 0$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . For example, the flat yield curve model with  $P_t(r) = e^{-rt}$  is a one parameter linear model with  $Y_t^1(r) = r > 0$ . We impose two natural economic requirements on the model: (SPA) static prices allowed, i.e. it is always possible that as time moves forward, relative prices do not change, and (NLA) no local arbitrage, i.e. there does not exist a self-financing bundle of futures such that the zero present value is a local minimum with respect to small changes in the space of admissible yield curves. In that case the model always contains one of four simple models. If we impose the additional requirement (LRE) long rates exist, i.e. for every  $r$   $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t(r)$  exists as a finite limit, then the number of simple models is reduced to two.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Yield Curve Models	5
2.1. Static Prices Allowed (SPA)	8
2.2. No Local Arbitrage (NLA)	12
2.3. Linearity (LIN)	15
2.4. Long Rates Exist (LRE)	18
2.5. Main Results	19
3. Arbitrage in Linear Models	22
References	40

---

*Date:* September 2015, March 2024.

*2010 Mathematical Subject Classification* 91B02, 91G10, 91G30, 97M30.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Acknowledgement: We would like to express our thanks to our colleague Eli Amzallag for helpful discussions about this work.

Notation: As usual, we use  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\mathbb{C}$  for the real and complex fields and  $\mathbb{Z}$  for the ring of integers. We use  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to denote the set of non-negative reals. That is,  $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$ .

When the interest rate is  $r$ , dollars delivered  $t$  years in the future are discounted by the factor  $e^{-rt}$ . To put this another way the price  $P_t$  of one dollar delivered  $t$  years from now is  $e^{-rt}$  in current dollars. Here  $t$  varies continuously in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . Thus, the yield curve  $Y_t$ , defined to be the negative logarithmic derivative of  $P_t$ , i.e.  $Y_t = -\dot{P}_t / P_t$ , is the constant  $r$ . Even if we ignore risk, which induces a price spread among  $t$  futures for fixed  $t$ , the price curve  $P_t$  may not exhibit this simple shape. To describe the pattern of interest rates we then need the entire yield curve  $Y_t$  instead of the single number  $r$ .

Nonetheless, when we think of interest rates as unchanging, the flat yield curve model with its single interest rate is a simple and useful tool adequate for many theoretical purposes. However, when we begin to consider change in interest rates, the flat model won't do. This paper had its origin in our discovery of its flaws.

We had, in fact, rediscovered an odd phenomenon well-known among financial economists who consider the notion of *duration* for a bond.

Consider a finite set  $D$  consisting of several future times. For each time  $t \in D$  allot  $z_t > 0$  current dollars for  $t$  futures ( $z_t$  is defined to be 0 for  $t \notin D$ ). If the current interest rate is  $r^*$ , this allocation buys a bond paying  $x_t$  dollars  $t$  years from now where

$$(1.1) \quad z_t = e^{-r^*t} x_t.$$

The present value of the basket of futures is

$$(1.2) \quad V_0 = \sum_t z_t = \sum_t e^{-r^*t} x_t.$$

Following [5] (see also [2]) we define the duration  $T$  of the basket of futures as the weighted average of the payment times:

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} T &= (\sum_t t z_t) / (\sum_t z_t) \\ &= (\sum_t t e^{-tr^*} x_t) / (\sum_t e^{-tr^*} x_t). \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, we can define the duration as the unique time  $T$  satisfying the -equivalent- equations

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_t (T-t)z_t, \\ 0 &= \sum_t (T-t)e^{(T-t)r^*} x_t. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we finance this bond by a single sale of  $V_0$  worth of time  $T$  futures. That is, define

$$(1.5) \quad \tilde{x}_s = \begin{cases} x_s & s \neq T \\ x_T - \sum_t e^{(T-t)r^*} x_t & s = T \end{cases}$$

or, equivalently,

$$(1.6) \quad \tilde{z}_s = \begin{cases} z_s & s \neq T \\ z_T - (\sum_t z_t) & s = T, \end{cases}$$

The investment  $\tilde{x}_t$  is self-financing, i.e. its present value,  $\tilde{V}_0$  is zero.

Fisher and Weil in [1] point out that this sale immunizes the investor against loss when interest rates change. To see this, suppose that a period  $h$  has passed, short enough that none of the payments are due at or before  $h$ , and that the new interest rate is now  $r$ . The quantity  $\tilde{x}_t$  is a payment occurring  $t-h$  in the future. So the new present value is:

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_h &= \sum_t e^{-(t-h)r} \tilde{x}_t = \\ &e^{-(T-h)r} \left[ \sum_t e^{(T-t)r} x_t - \sum_t e^{(T-t)r^*} x_t \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By applying (1.4) we can write this as

$$(1.8) \quad \tilde{V}_h = e^{-(T-h)r} \left[ \sum_t e^{(T-t)r^*} x_t [e^{(T-t)(r-r^*)} - 1 - (T-t)(r-r^*)] \right].$$

Observe that  $e^a - 1 - a = \int_0^a (e^s - 1) ds$  is nonnegative for all  $a$ , vanishing only when  $a = 0$ . Thus, we obtain  $\tilde{V}_h \geq 0$  vanishing only when  $r = r^*$ .

As Ingersoll, Shelton and Weil remark, [3] page 635, this result is “too good”. It is an arbitrage opportunity which exists at any interest rate. In fact, (1.3) shows that  $T$  can be defined using the current dollar quantities  $z_t$  in a way independent of the interest rate.

Arbitrage opportunities do happen. Noticing such an investment, a speculator can reap the associated profit. However, the transactions involved cause compensating price movements which tend to wipe out the original opportunity. Here, however, as long as the yield curve

remains flat and will continue to do so the arbitrage possibilities described above remain as well. Such speculations in the futures market would, instead, bend the yield curve.

A yield curve model selects as admissible certain special curves together with their associated price curves. For example, for the flat yield curve model the positive constants are the admissible yield curves. An arbitrage opportunity for a model is an investment with no possibility of loss when the prices curves are restricted to those admissible according to the model. Our first condition on a yield curve model is that even local versions of such arbitrages do not occur.

The second condition is that the model allows static prices. That is, starting from an admissible price curve the possibility that relative prices among futures do not change is not excluded from the menu of choices offered by the family of admissible price curves. In the next section, we will examine in some detail what this means.

Our third condition is linearity. This is a mathematical convenience rather than an economic imperative. The flat yield curve model is described by  $Y_t(r) = r \cdot 1$  with a single positive parameter. An  $n$  parameter linear model is of the form  $Y_t(r_1, \dots, r_n) = r_1 Y_t^1 + \dots + r_n Y_t^n$  where  $(r_1, \dots, r_n)$  varies over some open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and the curves  $Y_t^1, \dots, Y_t^n$  are fixed for the model.

The infinitesimal or short rate for the yield curve  $Y_t$  is  $Y_0$ . The limit or long rate is  $\text{Lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t$  if the limit exists. We say the model admits long rates if this limit exists as a finite real number for any admissible yield curve.

Our main result is that an  $n$  parameter linear model allows static prices, admits no local arbitrage, contains the flat yield curves and admits long rates if and only if it contains, in a natural way to be described later, one of the following two models:

$$(1.9) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3) = r_1 + r_2 e^{-\rho t} + r_3 e^{-2\rho t}$$

where  $\rho$  is a fixed positive constant, or

$$(1.10) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4) = r_1 + r_2 e^{-\rho t} \cos \omega t + r_3 e^{-\rho t} \sin \omega t + r_4 e^{-2\rho t}$$

where  $\rho$  and  $\omega$  are fixed positive constants.

In each case  $r_1$  is the long rate. If we further demand that the approach to the long rate be eventually monotonic then the damped oscillation of (1.10) is excluded and we are left with (1.9).

If we omit the long rate demand and allow the yield curves to be unbounded then the constant  $\rho$  in (1.9) can be negative, and we have two further possible models:

$$(1.11) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2) = r_1 + r_2 t,$$

$$Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, r_5) = r_1 + r_2 \cos \omega_1 t + r_3 \sin \omega_1 t + r_4 \cos \omega_2 t + r_5 \sin \omega_2 t.$$

where  $\omega_1, \omega_2$  are positive constants such that  $\omega_1/\omega_2$  is irrational.

A wide variety of yield curve models arise as diffusion models. Each of these is an  $n$  parameter linear model for some  $n$ . There is an additional dynamic structure in that the change in prices over time is governed by a diffusion stochastic process in the parameter space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

This is not how diffusion models are usually presented. Instead (e.g. see Ingersoll, Shelton and Weil (1978) pages 637ff.) from diffusion equations for general assets the yield curve at each parameter point is obtained by solving an associated partial differential equation. The result is a linear yield curve model with no local arbitrage.

These models do not usually satisfy the static price condition. This is not serious because the static price condition can always be obtained by introducing an additional translation parameter (see Section 1 below). However, in most diffusion models the new parameter enters in a nonlinear fashion. Thus, the new enlarged model no longer satisfies linearity.

It is the interplay between these three conditions which limits the range of possible models. If we impose the additional condition that each yield curve approaches a nonzero long rate limit in a monotone fashion then by rescaling time we can assume  $\rho$  in (1.9) is 1. We thus obtain the unique simple yield curve model, the three parameter linear model

$$(1.12) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3) = r_1 + r_2 e^{-t} + r_3 e^{-2t},$$

where  $(r_1, r_2, r_3)$  varies over the open set in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  such that

$$(1.13) \quad \inf_{t \geq 0} Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3) > 0.$$

## 2. YIELD CURVE MODELS

In general, *price* describes the exchange ratio between quantities of two commodities in a market. If among many commodities we choose one, say corn, as *numeraire* then the price  $p_i$  of commodity  $i$  is an amount of corn for which a unit quantity of  $i$  exchanges. A basket of commodities is described by a vector  $x$  such that coordinate  $x_i$  is the

quantity of  $i$  in the basket. The cost or *value* of such a basket, given by

$$(2.1) \quad V(x) = \sum_i p_i x_i,$$

is the quantity of corn for which the entire basket can be exchanged. In (2.1)  $x_i$  can be positive or negative. We interpret a negative  $x_i$  as a liability, a commitment to deliver quantity  $|x_i|$  of good  $i$ . So  $V(x)$  is the net value summed over the goods coming in and going out. To change numeraire from corn to gold, observe that if  $p_g$  is the corn price of gold then  $p_i/p_g$  is the gold price of commodity  $i$ . So we get the gold value of basket  $x$  by dividing  $V(x)$  by  $p_g$ .

We assume that all prices are nonnegative. This is a consequence of the (often tacit) assumption of *free disposal*. Similarly, the assumption that choice, as well as disposal, is costless implies that the market evaluates a choice between goods  $A$  and  $B$  as at least as valuable as good  $A$  alone. For mathematical convenience we will assume that prices are nonzero as well and so are strictly positive.

We are also ignoring transaction costs and are assuming that there is a single price to buy or to sell a commodity in the market.

The description of a commodity requires a specification of time and place of delivery. We will ignore place but for futures markets the date of delivery is exactly the central concern. Thus, the *price curve* for dollar futures is defined by:

$P_t$  = the current dollar price of one  
dollar delivered  $t$  time units from now.

The *present value* of a finite bundle of payments  $x = \{x_t\}$  is the value in current dollars computed as in (2.1).

$$(2.2) \quad V(x) = \sum_t P_t x_t.$$

As before  $x_t$  is positive or negative according to whether the quantity  $|x_t|$  of dollars is incoming or outgoing  $t$  time units from now.

The present value is a sum rather than an integral because  $x$  consists of a finite number of discrete payments rather than a continuous flow. For any set  $T$ , we call  $x : T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a *finite function* when the *support* of  $x$ , denoted  $\text{supp}(x)$ , is a finite subset of  $T$ , where

$$(2.3) \quad \text{supp}(x) = \{ t : x_t \neq 0 \}.$$

So a bundle of payments  $x$  is a finite function on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . We call  $x$  a *bundle of futures* when  $x_0 = 0$ , i.e.  $0 \notin \text{supp}(x)$ , so that no current payments are involved.

Observe that we use continuous variables for time and later for interest rate parameters. In contrast with our finite payment functions, the price functions are assumed to be *smooth*. That is, continuous partial derivatives of all orders exist.

The numeraire for our price function  $P$  is current dollars and so  $P_0 = 1$ , the current dollar price of one current dollar. Furthermore, the price function is nonincreasing. This follows from the free disposal assumption and the further assumption of *free storage*. To each consumer a dollar delivered at an early date is at least as valuable as a later one because one could always store the former and so obtain the latter at no additional cost. In other words, if we regard the late dollar as good  $A$  then the early dollar represents a choice between good  $A$ , obtained by storage, and good  $B$ , the consumption of the dollar during the intervening time. In particular, writing  $\dot{P}_t$  for the derivative at time  $t$ , we have that  $\dot{P}_t$  is nonpositive. We will assume it is always negative. Thus, we have the following conditions on the price curves, defined for all  $t \geq 0$ :

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 \geq P_t > 0 \quad \text{with} \quad P_0 = 1, \\ \dot{P}_t < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Associated with the price function there are several related curves. The *log-price* is defined by

$$(2.5) \quad L_t = -\ln P_t,$$

(where  $\ln$  is the natural log) and its derivative, the *yield curve* is defined by

$$(2.6) \quad Y_t = \dot{L}_t = -\dot{P}_t / P_t.$$

These satisfy the conditions

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} L_t \geq 0 \quad \text{with} \quad L_0 = 0, \\ Y_t > 0. \end{aligned}$$

From the initial conditions  $P_0 = 1$ , or equivalently  $L_0 = 0$ , we can recover the price from the yield curve

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} L_t &= \int_0^t Y_s ds, \\ P_t &= \exp(-L_t). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that we are using the phrase “yield curve” for the marginal value of the log-price. It is sometimes used instead to refer to the average value  $L_t/t$ . The two concepts agree exactly when the yield

curve is a constant. In this, the *flat yield curve* case, with  $Y_t = r > 0$ , we have  $L_t = rt$  and  $P_t = \exp(-rt)$ . This is the classical price curve when “the interest rate” is  $r$ .

A *yield curve model* picks out from the set of all smooth, positive real valued functions on  $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$  a subset, the *admissible yield curves*, with associated price curves given by (2.8). An *n parameter yield curve model* associates to each admissible yield curve a unique vector  $r$  in some subset  $O$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . To be more precise, such a model is a function  $Y$  from  $O$  to the vector space  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$  of real valued functions on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , with special assumptions as follows:

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $n$  be a positive integer and  $O$  be a nonempty open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . An  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on  $O$  is a smooth, positive real valued function in  $n + 1$  real variables,  $Y_t(r_1, \dots, r_n)$  defined for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$  in  $O$ . Regarded as a function from  $O$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$ , we assume that  $Y$  is injective. That is, if for  $r, r' \in O$ ,  $Y_t(r) = Y_t(r')$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , then  $r = r'$ .*

For example, the *flat yield curve model* is the one parameter model  $Y_t(r_1) = r_1$  defined on  $O = (0, \infty)$ .

Changing prices is represented as continuous motion in the set of admissible yield curves. For an  $n$  parameter model defined on  $O$ , such change in time is described by smooth motion of the parameter  $r$  in the set  $O$ .

We now describe the conditions which we will require of a good model.

**2.1. Static Prices Allowed (SPA).** If  $Y_t$  is an admissible yield curve whose associated price curve  $P_t$  represents prices in the current market, then we want the model to include the possibility that over time relative prices do not change. We are not claiming that this sort of stasis is at all likely, but we do not want it ruled out a priori by the model.

At first glance this condition appears to be trivially satisfied. We are fixing the set of admissible curves in a time independent way so if  $Y_t$  is admissible today, then it is admissible tomorrow. However, an unchanging yield curve is usually not the same thing as unchanging prices. The confusion between these two concepts comes from the two different roles played by time in the futures market.

On the one hand, each instant on the time line is a *date*,  $d$ , a moment on the calendar. The date is the label attached to our commodities. For precision we will use the notation

$$(2.9) \quad \$_d \equiv \text{a dollar delivered at date } d.$$

On the other hand, between two dates is an interval of time. Suppose that from a date  $d_0$  we move to a date  $h$  time units later which we will denote  $d_h$ . Then,

$$(2.10) \quad d_h = d_0 + h \quad \text{and} \quad h = d_h - d_0.$$

The variable  $t$  in the price and yield curves is this interval length measuring the wait from now,  $d_0$ , to a later date  $d_t = d_0 + t$ . Thus, if  $P$  is the price function now at  $d_0$ , then  $P_t$  is the price of  $\$_{d_0+t}$  in current dollars, i.e. in  $\$_{d_0}$ .

Suppose that when we move from the date  $d_0$  to the date  $d_h$  the price, log-price and yield functions change from  $P$ ,  $L$ ,  $Y$  to new ones  $P^h$ ,  $L^h$ ,  $Y^h$ .

The numeraire has changed from  $\$_{d_0}$  to  $\$_{d_h}$ .  $P_t^h$  is the price of  $\$_{d_h+t}$  in the new numeraire  $\$_{d_h}$ . In the old price system the commodity  $\$_{d_h+t} = \$_{d_0+h+t}$  is priced at  $P_{t+h}$  valued in  $d_0$  dollars,  $\$_{d_0}$ .

Similarly, suppose that we purchased at date  $d_0$  a bundle of futures  $x$  and that no payments have occurred in the interval from  $d_0$  to  $d_h$ , that is

$$(2.11) \quad x_t = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq t \leq h$$

or equivalently,  $[0, h] \cap \text{supp}(x) = \emptyset$ .

For each  $t$ ,  $x$  describes the quantity  $x_t$  of commodity  $\$_{d_0+t}$ . At date  $d_h$  the asset remains the same but is described by the new finite function  $x^h$  with

$$(2.12) \quad x_{t-h}^h = x_t,$$

that is, the wait for each commodity has been reduced by  $h$ . The  $d_h$  present value is now

$$(2.13) \quad V^h = \sum_t P_t^h x_t^h = \sum_t P_{t-h}^h x_t.$$

Notice that  $x_t = 0$  for  $0 \leq t < h$  implies that although  $P_{t-h}^h$  is undefined for  $t$  in this range we can still regard both sums with  $t$  varying in  $\mathbb{R}_+$ .

*Unchanging prices* means that the relative prices of goods  $\$_d$  with  $d \geq d_h$  are the same with respect to the price function  $P^h$  as they were

with respect to  $P$ . That is, for all  $t \geq 0$

$$(2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} P_t^h &= P_{t+h}/P_h, \\ L_t^h &= L_{t+h} - L_h, \\ Y_t^h &= Y_{t+h}. \end{aligned}$$

The first equation describes unchanging relative prices. We are merely changing the numeraire from  $\$_{d_0}$  to  $\$_{d_h}$ . The second equation follows by taking logs and the third, in turn, by taking the derivative with respect to  $t$  because the derivative of the constant  $-L_h$  is zero. On the other hand, by using (2.8) we can recover the first, price, equation from the third, yield, equation in (2.14).

Thus, the SPA condition says that if  $Y$  is an admissible curve, then for any  $h > 0$  the  $h$  translated curve  $\Phi_h(Y)$  is also admissible where

$$(2.15) \quad \Phi_h(Y)_t \equiv Y_{t+h} \quad t, h \geq 0.$$

For an  $n$  parameter model defined on  $O$  the  $h$  translate of the curve  $Y(r)$  for  $r \in O$  must then correspond to a unique parameter value which we denote  $\varphi_h(r)$ . That is,

$$(2.16) \quad \Phi_h(Y(r)) = Y(\varphi_h(r))$$

We assume the function  $\varphi$  is smooth. Thus, we are led to

**Definition 2.2.** *Let  $Y_t(r)$  be an  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined for  $(t, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times O \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , with associated log-price and price curves:  $L_t(r) = \int_0^t Y_s(r) ds$  and  $P_t(r) = \exp[-L_t(r)]$ . We say that the model allows static prices, or satisfies condition SPA, if there is a smooth function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times O \rightarrow O$  such that for all  $(t, h, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times O$*

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} P_t(\varphi_h(r)) &= P_{t+h}(r)/P_h(r) \\ L_t(\varphi_h(r)) &= L_{t+h}(r) - L_h(r) \\ Y_t(\varphi_h(r)) &= Y_{t+h}(r). \end{aligned}$$

**Remark.** As with (2.14) the three equations in (2.17) are equivalent. By Definition 2.1 the association from parameters to yield curves is assumed injective and so the parameter value  $\varphi_h(r)$  is uniquely determined for each  $(h, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times O$  by the yield curve equation in  $t$  of (2.17).

From the remark above we obtain the Kolmogorov flow conditions

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi_0(r) &= r; \\ \varphi_{h_1}(\varphi_{h_2}(r)) &= \varphi_{h_1+h_2}(r) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $r \in O$  and  $h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Observe that the two sides of each equation have the same yield curve. We will call the function  $\varphi$  the *static price flow* on  $O$ .

Notice that if we define the *short rate function*  $Y_0 : O \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  by setting  $t = 0$  in  $Y_t(r)$  then we can recover the full yield curve from the short rate function and the static price flow  $\varphi$  by using (2.17):

$$(2.19) \quad Y_t(r) = Y_0(\varphi_t(r))$$

for all  $(t, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times O$ .

Translation of a function by  $h$  leaves the function unchanged for all positive  $h$  if and only if the function is constant. Thus, the flat yield curve is the one case where the notions of unchanging yield curve and unchanging prices agree. In particular, the one parameter flat yield curve model allows static prices with  $\varphi_h(r_1) = r_1$  for all  $(h, r_1) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \infty)$ .

A smooth flow like  $\varphi$  is the solution of a smooth system of ordinary differential equations. For each  $r \in O$  let  $\dot{\varphi}_h(r)$  denote the derivative  $d\varphi_h(r)/dh$ , i.e. the velocity vector of the path in  $O$ ,  $\varphi_h(r)$ , obtained by fixing  $r$  and letting  $h$  vary. The vector field  $\xi : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is obtained by taking the velocity vector at  $h = 0$ , that is,

$$(2.20) \quad \xi(r) = \dot{\varphi}_0(r).$$

Differentiating (2.18) with respect to  $h_1$  and setting  $h_2 = h$ , we see that  $\varphi_h(r)$  is the solution of the smooth initial value problem

$$(2.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi_0(r) &= r \\ \dot{\varphi}_h(r) &= \xi(\varphi_h(r)). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.2 includes the assumption that this solution path is defined for all positive  $h$ . In o.d.e. terminology this says that the vector field  $\xi$  is *complete* in the positive direction.

With  $O$  an open set, we can use this characterization of the flow to extend  $\varphi_h(r)$  to some negative values of  $h$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $Y_t(r)$  be an  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on an open subset  $O$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , with  $P_t(r)$  and  $L_t(r)$  the associated price and log-price curves. Assume that the model satisfies SPA with  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times O \rightarrow O$  the static price flow. There exists an open subset  $\tilde{O}$  of*

$\mathbb{R} \times O$  which contains  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times O$ , and a smooth function  $\tilde{\varphi} : \tilde{O} \rightarrow O$  which extends  $\varphi$ , and for  $(t, -h, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \tilde{O}$  such that  $h, t - h \geq 0$

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{aligned} P_{t-h}(r) &= P_t(\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r)) / P_h(\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r)) \\ L_{t-h}(r) &= L_t(\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r)) - L_h(\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r)) \\ Y_{t-h}(r) &= Y_t(\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r)). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The constructions and proof of the existence and uniqueness theorem for o.d.e.'s yield the following results, see, for example, [4] Chapter IV Sections 1 and 2. The solution flow for the vectorfield  $\xi$  is a smooth function  $\tilde{\varphi} : \tilde{O} \rightarrow O$  with  $\tilde{O}$  an open subset of  $\mathbb{R} \times O$ . For each  $r \in O$ ,  $\{h : (h, r) \in \tilde{O}\}$  is an open interval containing 0. It is the maximum open interval on which the unique solution path of the initial value problem (2.21) is defined. This interval thus includes  $\mathbb{R}_+$  because  $\xi$  is assumed positively complete. Furthermore, by uniqueness,  $\tilde{\varphi}$  extends  $\varphi$ . Finally, the flow equation (2.18) for  $\tilde{\varphi}$  holds in the sense that if the left side is defined then the right side is as well.

In particular, if  $(t, -h, r)$  is in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \tilde{O}$  with  $h, t - h \geq 0$ , then  $\varphi_h(\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r)) = r$ . Now let  $\tilde{r} = \tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r)$ ,  $\tilde{t} = t - h$  and apply equations (2.17) to  $(\tilde{t}, h, \tilde{r})$ . Since  $\tilde{t} + h = t$  and  $\varphi_h(\tilde{r}) = r$ , we get (2.22).

□

Thus, condition SPA imposes some structure upon an  $n$  parameter model. On the other hand, Joe Langsam pointed out that we can always obtain SPA by throwing in another parameter.

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}_t(r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+1}) &= Y_{t+r_{n+1}}(r_1, \dots, r_n) \\ \tilde{\varphi}(r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+1}, h) &= (r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+1} + h) \end{aligned}$$

is an  $n + 1$  parameter model on  $O \times \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $\tilde{\varphi}$  the required static price flow.

**2.2. No Local Arbitrage (NLA).** A bundle of futures  $x$  is called a *self-financing investment* if at current prices the present value is zero. This means that the worth of the assets and liabilities in the bundle exactly balance and no current cash is required for  $x$ . Since we are ignoring transaction costs, anyone can obtain  $x$  in the current market.

Suppose that  $h$  is small enough that no payments occur during the initial  $h$  time interval, i.e. condition (2.11) holds. The bundle  $x$ , now labeled  $x^h$ , is worth  $V^h$  computed using the new price curve  $P_t^h$ , cf. equations (2.12) and (2.13). For example, if relative prices are unchanged so that  $P^h$  is related to  $P$  by equation (2.14) then the value

$V^h$  is still zero. We have merely changed the numeraire from  $\$_{d_0}$  to  $\$_{d_h}$ . In general, when prices have changed  $V^h$  is pure profit when positive, and loss when negative, measured in now current dollars  $\$_{d_h}$ .

For a yield curve model a bundle of futures  $x$  is an arbitrage for an admissible price function  $P$  if it has present value zero with respect to  $P$  and if for any  $h$  satisfying (2.11) and for any admissible price function  $P^h$  the value  $V^h$  given by (2.13) is nonnegative. Thus,  $x$  is a self-financing investment at current prices and no admissible pattern of price movements returns a loss on the investment. As described in the Introduction the occurrence of such arbitrage possibilities is a serious flaw in a yield curve model. We want to exclude even the local versions of such arbitrage.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $Y_t(r)$  be an  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on  $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  with associated price curve  $P_t(r) = \exp[-\int_0^t Y_s(r) ds]$ . Let  $x$  be a bundle of futures, i.e. a finite function  $x : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $x_0 = 0$ .  $x$  is called self-financing at  $r \in O$  if

$$(2.24) \quad \sum_t P_t(r)x_t = 0.$$

$x$  is called a null investment at  $r$  if for all  $(h, r')$  in some neighborhood  $[0, \epsilon] \times U$  of  $(0, r)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times O$  with  $[0, \epsilon] \cap \text{supp}(x) = \emptyset$

$$(2.25) \quad \sum_t P_{t-h}(r')x_t = 0.$$

$x$  is called a local arbitrage at  $r$  if  $x$  is self-financing at  $r$  and if for all  $(h, r')$  in some neighborhood  $[0, \epsilon] \times U$  of  $(0, r)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times O$  with  $[0, \epsilon] \cap \text{supp}(x) = \emptyset$

$$(2.26) \quad \sum_t P_{t-h}(r')x_t \geq 0.$$

We say that the model allows no local arbitrage, or satisfies condition NLA, if the zero function,  $x_t = 0$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , is the only local arbitrage at any  $r \in O$ .

Thus, condition NLA has two aspects. First, it requires that 0 is the only null investment. This means that any two different bundles of futures can be distinguished by some price movement near  $r$  in the market. Notice that two bundles of futures have the same value not only now with respect to  $P_t(r)$  but at time  $h$  from now at  $P_t(r')$ , for all  $(h, r')$  near  $(0, r)$ , exactly when the difference between the two bundles

is null. Secondly, the condition excludes entirely true arbitrage opportunities, investments self-financing now for which no local motion leads to a loss and some local motion leads to a profit.

When the model satisfies condition SPA the description of a local arbitrage can be simplified.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let  $Y_t(r)$  be an  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on the open set  $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . Assume that the model satisfies condition SPA with  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times O \rightarrow O$  the static price flow for the model. Let  $x$  be a self-financing investment at  $r \in O$ .*

*The bundle  $x$  is a null investment at  $r$  if and only if for all  $r'$  in some neighborhood of  $r$  in  $O$*

$$(2.27) \quad \sum_t P_t(r')x_t = 0.$$

*The bundle  $x$  is a local arbitrage at  $r$  if and only if for all  $r'$  in some neighborhood of  $r$  in  $O$*

$$(2.28) \quad \sum_t P_t(r')x_t \geq 0.$$

**Proof.** We obtain (2.27) and (2.28) from (2.25) and (2.26) respectively by setting  $h = 0$ . Thus, (2.27) and (2.28) are always necessary. To prove sufficiency in the SPA case we apply Lemma 2.3 to get  $\tilde{\varphi} : \tilde{O} \rightarrow O$ , the extension of the static price flow  $\varphi$ . Now let  $U_0$  be a neighborhood of  $r$  in  $O$  such that  $r' \in U_0$  implies (2.27) or (2.28) holds. We can choose  $\epsilon > 0$  and a neighborhood  $U$  of  $r$  such that for  $(h, r') \in (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \times U$ ,  $\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r') \in U_0$ . Shrinking  $\epsilon > 0$  we can assume that  $x_t = 0$  for  $t \leq \epsilon$ . Now for  $(h, r') \in [0, \epsilon) \times U$  apply (2.27) or (2.28) with  $r'$  replaced by  $\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r')$ . Divide through by the common factor  $P_h(\tilde{\varphi}_{-h}(r'))$  and apply (2.22) to get (2.25) or (2.26).  $\square$

Let  $x$  be a bundle of futures. For an  $n$  parameter yield curve model on  $O$  we define the *value function* of  $x$ ,  $V : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$(2.29) \quad V(r) = \sum_t P_t(r)x_t.$$

If  $O$  is an open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and the yield curve model allows static prices then Proposition 2.5 says that  $x$  is a local arbitrage at  $r$  exactly when  $V(r) = 0$  and the value function  $V$  has a local minimum at  $r$ . Recall that if  $V$  has a local minimum at  $r$  then the partial derivatives  $\partial V / \partial r_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) vanish at  $r$ , i.e.  $r$  is a *critical point* for  $V$ , and the

*Hessian*, the matrix of second partials  $(\partial^2 V / \partial r_i \partial r_j)$ , is positive semi-definite at  $r$ . Conversely, if  $r$  is a critical point for  $V$  and the Hessian matrix at  $r$  is positive definite then  $V$  has a strict local minimum at  $r$ .

**2.3. Linearity (LIN).** We call a yield curve model *linear* when the set of admissible yield functions is convex in the vector space of all smooth real functions on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . Recall that a subset  $O$  of a real vector space is *convex* when  $r_0, r_1$  in  $O$  implies the segment between them is contained in  $O$ , i.e.  $(1-t)r_0 + tr_1 \in O$  for all  $0 \leq t \leq 1$ . For an  $n$  parameter model we want the parametrization itself to be a linear function.

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $Y_t(r)$  be an  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on  $O$ . We say that the model is linear, or satisfies condition LIN, if  $O$  is a convex open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and for each  $t$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+$  the function  $r \mapsto Y_t(r)$  is the restriction to  $O$  of a real-valued linear function from  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ .

Notice that if  $F : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is the restriction to  $O$ , open in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , of a linear function, then  $F^i = \partial F / \partial r_i$  is constant on  $O$  and  $F(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i F^i$ . So if  $Y_t(r)$  is a linear  $n$  parameter yield curve model on  $O$  then  $Y_t^i = \partial Y_t(r) / \partial r_i$  is a smooth real valued function of  $t$  which is independent of  $r$  in  $O$ . Furthermore, for  $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n)$  in  $O$ :

$$(2.30) \quad Y_t(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i Y_t^i.$$

**Lemma 2.7.** For a set  $T$  let  $\mathbb{R}^T$  denote the vector space of real valued functions defined on  $T$ . Let  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  be a list of functions in  $\mathbb{R}^T$  for some positive integer  $n$  and let  $O$  be a nonempty open subset of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For  $r \in O$  define  $Y(r) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i Y^i$  in  $\mathbb{R}^T$ . The following conditions are equivalent

- i. The list  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  is linearly independent in  $\mathbb{R}^T$ .
- ii. The function  $r \mapsto Y(r)$  from  $O$  to  $\mathbb{R}^T$  is injective.
- iii. The set of vectors  $\{(Y_t^1, \dots, Y_t^n) : t \in T\}$  spans  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii): If  $Y(r) = Y(r')$  then  $\sum_i c_i Y^i = 0$  where  $c_i = r_i - r'_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ). Conversely, if  $\sum_i c_i Y^i = 0$  and  $r \in O$  then because  $O$  is open there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough that  $r_\epsilon = r + \epsilon c \in O$ . Clearly,  $Y(r) = Y(r_\epsilon)$ .

(i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii): The set of vectors  $\{(Y_t^1, \dots, Y_t^n)\}$  does not span  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and only if there is a nonzero vector  $c$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  perpendicular to all of them, i.e. satisfying  $\sum_i c_i Y_t^i = 0$  for all  $t \in T$ .

□

**Remark.** With the same proof we can replace the real field  $\mathbb{R}$  with the complex field  $\mathbb{C}$  in the above lemma.

**Definition 2.8.** For a linearly independent list  $\{Y^i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$  of smooth functions in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  the associated linear model is the linear map  $Y : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  given by (2.30), i.e.  $Y(r) = \sum_i r_i Y^i$ .

The associated positive domain and strict positive domain are the subsets  $O$  and  $O_+$  defined by

$$(2.31) \quad \begin{aligned} O(Y^1, \dots, Y^n) &= \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : Y_t^i(r) > 0 \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}_+, i = 1, \dots, n\} \\ O_+(Y^1, \dots, Y^n) &= \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : \inf_t Y_t^i(r) > 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

So  $r \in O_+(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  exactly when for some  $\delta > 0$ ,  $Y_t^i(r) \geq \delta$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+, i = 1, \dots, n$ . It easily follows that  $O(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  and  $O_+(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  are convex subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** If  $\{Y^i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$  is a linearly independent list of bounded, smooth functions in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$ , then  $O_+(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  is open as well as convex.

*Proof.* Assume  $|Y_t^i| \leq M$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . If  $Y_t^i(r) \geq \delta$  for all  $t$  with  $\delta > 0$  and  $|r'_i - r_i| < \delta/2nM$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , then  $Y_t^i(r') \geq \delta/2$  for all  $t$ .

□

**Proposition 2.10.** If  $Y_t(r)$  is a linear  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on a convex open set  $O$ , then the list  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  of smooth functions in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  defined by

$$(2.32) \quad Y_t^i = \partial Y_t(r) / \partial r_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, n)$$

is linearly independent.

Conversely, if  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  is a linearly independent list of smooth functions in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  then the associated linear model defines a linear yield curve model on any nonempty, convex, open set  $O$  contained in the positive domain  $O(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.8 the map  $Y : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  is injective iff  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  is linearly independent. The results then follow from Definition 1.

□

**Remark.** It follows that for any linear yield curve model the function  $Y : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  extends uniquely as a linear map from  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$ . Thus, we use the formula (2.30) to define  $Y(r)$  for all  $r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . In particular, a linearly independent list  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  defines a linear yield curve model for some  $O$  exactly when the interior of  $O(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is nonempty.

To combine conditions SPA and LIN we recall that for an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A = (A_j^i)$  the smooth matrix function defined for  $h \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$(2.33) \quad E_h = \exp[hA] = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} (hA)^N / N!$$

is the *fundamental solution* for the linear system associated with  $A$ . That is, differentiating with respect to  $h$ :

$$(2.34) \quad \begin{aligned} E_0 &= I, \text{ the identity matrix} \\ \dot{E}_h &= E_h A = A E_h, \text{ i.e.} \\ \dot{E}_{jh}^i &= \sum_{k=1}^n E_{kh}^i A_j^k = \sum_{k=1}^n A_k^i E_{jh}^k. \end{aligned}$$

For  $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , define  $\psi_h(r) = r E_h$  so that  $\psi_h(r)_j = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i E_{jh}^i$ . Then  $\psi_h(r)$  is the solution of the linear initial value problem on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

$$(2.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_0(r) &= r \\ \dot{\psi}_h(r) &= \psi_h(r) A \end{aligned}$$

That is, regarded as a function from  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\psi$  is the linear solution flow for the linear vectorfield defined by  $\xi(r) = rA$ .

**Proposition 2.11.** *Suppose that  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \times O \rightarrow O$  is the static price flow of a linear  $n$  parameter yield curve which is defined on the open convex set  $O$  and which satisfies condition SPA. For each  $h \geq 0$ ,  $\varphi_h$  is the restriction to  $O$  of some linear automorphism of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . In fact, there is an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  such that for  $(h, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times O$ ,  $\varphi_h(r) = r E_h$  where  $E$  is the fundamental solution for the matrix differential equation associated with  $A$ .*

*Proof.* By hypothesis the map  $Y : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$  associating to  $r$  the function  $Y(r)$  is the restriction of a linear map  $\tilde{Y} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$ , and  $\tilde{Y}$  is injective because its restriction to  $O$  is (apply Lemma 2.7). For  $h \geq 0$  the translation map  $\Phi_h : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$  defined by (2.15) is clearly linear. Because  $\Phi_h \circ Y = Y \circ \varphi_h$  on  $O$  by (2.16) we can define the linear map  $\tilde{Y}^{-1} \circ \Phi_h \circ \tilde{Y} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  which restricts to  $\varphi_h$  on  $O$ .

Because  $\varphi_h$  is linear in the  $r$  variables for each  $h$ , the same is true of the derivative, the vectorfield  $\xi : O \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  defined by (2.20). That is, there exists an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  such that

$$(2.36) \quad \xi(r) = rA.$$

Comparing (2.35) with (2.21), we see that uniqueness for solutions of smooth differential equations implies that  $\varphi_h$  is the restriction to  $O$  of  $\psi_h$ .

□

**Corollary 2.12.** *Let  $Y_t(r)$  be a linear  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on  $O$  which satisfies condition SPA. Let  $A$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix whose fundamental solution  $E$  defines the static price flow as described in Proposition 2.11. There is a vector  $(Y_0^1, \dots, Y_0^n)$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that the short rate function  $Y_0(r)$  is given by  $\sum_{i=1}^n r_i Y_0^i$  and for all  $(t, r) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times O$ , and the basic yield curves satisfy:*

$$(2.37) \quad \begin{aligned} Y_t^i &= \sum_{k=1}^n E_{kt}^i Y_0^k \\ \dot{Y}_t^i &= \sum_{k=1}^n A_k^i Y_t^k. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* For the short rate apply (2.30) with  $t = 0$ . For the first equation of (2.37) apply (2.19) with  $\varphi(r) = rE_t$ . Then use the second equation in (2.34) to compute  $\dot{Y}_t^i$ .

□

**2.4. Long Rates Exist (LRE).** For any yield curve  $Y_t$  the *short rate* is the positive number  $Y_0$ . We define the *long rate* to be  $\text{Lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t$  if this limit exists as a finite real number. If the long rate exists then  $Y$  is bounded on  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . A bounded function may however fail to have a limit  $t$  as  $t$  approaches infinity. The function may instead oscillate.

**Definition 2.13.** Let  $Y_t(r)$  be an  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on  $O$ . We say that the model has long rates, or satisfies condition LRE, if for each  $r \in O$

$$(2.38) \quad Y_\infty(r) \equiv \text{Lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t(r)$$

exists and is finite.

**Remark.** If the model satisfies LRE then for each  $r \in O$ ,  $Y(r)$  is a bounded smooth function in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$ .

As usual, for the linear case there are special results.

**Proposition 2.14.** Let  $Y_t(r) = \sum_i r_i Y_t^i$  be a linear  $n$  parameter yield curve model. The model has long rates if and only if for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , the limit  $Y_\infty^i = \text{Lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y_t^i$  exists. In that case the function  $Y_\infty(r)$  is well defined by (2.38) for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and

$$(2.39) \quad Y_\infty(r) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i Y_\infty^i.$$

*Proof.* Those  $Y$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  for which the limit  $Y_\infty$  exists constitute a linear subspace. This subspace contains the image of the linear map from  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  given by the model when it contains the  $Y(r)$ 's as  $r$  varies over some basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . So containing the  $Y^i$ 's is sufficient as is containing the  $Y(r)$ 's for  $r$  varying over some open set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Equation (2.39) is then clear from the linearity of taking limits.

□

**2.5. Main Results.** In comparing two yield curve models we say that the first is included in the second if every yield curve admissible with respect to the first model is admissible for the second. In comparing two linear models we have special results.

**Definition 2.15.** Assume that  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  and  $\{\tilde{Y}^1, \dots, \tilde{Y}^m\}$  are linearly independent lists of smooth functions in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  with associated linear models  $Y_t(r) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i Y_t^i$  and  $\tilde{Y}_t(s) = \sum_{j=1}^m s_j \tilde{Y}_t^j$ . We say that the  $\tilde{Y}_t(s)$  model includes the  $Y_t(r)$  model when the following equivalent conditions hold.

- (1) *There exists a nonempty open subset  $O_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that for each  $r \in O_1$  there exists  $s \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $Y_t(r) = \tilde{Y}_t(s)$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .*
- (2) *There is an injective linear mapping  $S : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  such that for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $Y(r) = \tilde{Y}(S(r))$ .*

*In that case,  $S$  maps  $O(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  into  $O(\tilde{Y}^1, \dots, \tilde{Y}^m)$  and  $O_+(Y^1, \dots, Y^n)$  into  $O_+(\tilde{Y}^1, \dots, \tilde{Y}^m)$ .*

**Proof of equivalence.** (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2): By assumption the linear maps  $Y : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$  and  $\tilde{Y} : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$  are injective. Assumption (1) says that on the nonempty open set  $O_1$  the map  $\tilde{Y}^{-1} \circ Y$  is well-defined. As  $O_1$  spans  $\mathbb{R}^n$  the image of  $Y$  must lie in the image of  $\tilde{Y}$  by linearity. Hence,  $\tilde{Y}^{-1} \circ Y : O_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  extends to define the linear map  $S$ .

The converse is obvious.

Since  $Y(r) = \tilde{Y}(S(r))$  it is clear that  $r$  is in  $O$  or  $O_+$  if and only if  $S(r)$  is.

□

We are now ready to state our main results.

**Theorem 2.16.** *Let  $Y_t(r)$  be an  $n$  parameter yield curve model which is linear and allows static prices, i.e.  $Y_t(r)$  satisfies SPA and LIN. If the model allows no local arbitrage, i.e. satisfies condition NLA, then it includes one of the following four linear models:*

- (1) *With  $\rho \neq 0$  fixed, let*

$$(2.40) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2) = r_1 e^{\rho t} + r_2 e^{2\rho t}.$$

- (2) *With  $\rho \neq 0$  and  $\omega > 0$  fixed, let*

$$(2.41) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3) = r_1 e^{\rho t} \cos \omega t + r_2 e^{\rho t} \sin \omega t + r_3 e^{2\rho t}.$$

- (3) *Let*

$$(2.42) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2) = r_1 + r_2 t.$$

- (4) *With  $\omega > 0$  fixed, let*

$$(2.43) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3) = r_1 \cos \omega t + r_2 \sin \omega t.$$

*Conversely, if the yield curve model includes either model (1), (2) or (3) then it satisfies NLA.*

The proof of all this occupies the next section. We will also describe the oddities associated with model (4). Because model (3) contains unbounded functions and model (4) has undamped oscillation we regard them as anomalous. Also in (1) and (2),  $\rho > 0$  leads to unbounded functions.

There are some positivity problems in the above linear models. In (1) if  $\rho$  is negative, the set  $O_+(e^{\rho t}, e^{2\rho t})$  is empty, although  $\{(r_1, r_2) : r_1, r_2 > 0\}$  is contained in  $O(e^{\rho t}, e^{2\rho t})$ . In (2) we can write  $(r_1, r_2)$  in polar coordinates as  $(a \cos \phi, a \sin \phi)$  and then model (2) can be written as  $e^{\rho t}[a \cos(\omega t - \phi) + r_3 e^{\rho t}]$ . It follows that if  $\rho$  is negative, then  $O(e^{\rho t} \cos \omega t, e^{\rho t} \sin \omega t, e^{2\rho t})$  is empty. Similarly, in (4)  $O(\cos \omega t, \sin \omega t)$  is empty. These problems are eliminated if we also demand that the model includes the flat rate model. That is,

$$(2.44) \quad \begin{aligned} &O_+(1, e^{\rho t}, e^{2\rho t}), \\ &O_+(1, e^{\rho t} \cos \omega t, e^{\rho t} \sin \omega t, e^{2\rho t}), \\ &O_+(1, t) \quad \text{and} \quad O_+(1, \cos \omega t, \sin \omega t) \end{aligned}$$

are nonempty for all  $\rho$  and  $\omega$ .

The two simple yield curve models in the title come from the following:

**Corollary 2.17.** *Let  $Y_t(r)$  be an  $n$  parameter yield curve model which is linear, allows static prices and has long rates, i.e.  $Y_t(r)$  satisfies SPA, LIN and LRE. The model contains the flat yield curve model and allows no local arbitrage, i.e. satisfies NLA, if and only if it includes one of the following two yield curve models.*

(1) **Exponential Model** (3 parameters): *With  $\rho > 0$  fixed, let*

$$(2.45) \quad Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3) = r_1 + r_2 e^{-\rho t} + r_3 e^{-2\rho t},$$

*defined on the open convex set  $O_+(1, e^{-\rho t}, e^{-2\rho t})$ . The short rate is  $r_1 + r_2 + r_3$  and the long rate is  $r_1$ .*

(2) **Exponential-Oscillation Model** (4 parameters): *With  $\rho, \omega > 0$  fixed, let*

$$(2.46) \quad \begin{aligned} Y_t(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4) = &r_1 + r_2 e^{-\rho t} \cos \omega t + \\ &r_3 e^{-\rho t} \sin \omega t + r_4 e^{-2\rho t}, \end{aligned}$$

*defined on the open convex set  $O_+(1, e^{-\rho t} \cos \omega t, e^{-\rho t} \sin \omega t, e^{-2\rho t})$ . The short rate is  $r_1 + r_2 + r_4$  and the long rate is  $r_1$ .*

*By choosing time units property, i.e. by a constant rescaling, we can assume  $\rho = 1$  in the models.*

*Proof.* In each case the  $r_1$  coordinate comes from the assumption that the flat yield curve model is included. Theorem 2.16 says that any model which includes one of these satisfies NLA because (1) and (2) here contain (1) and (2) of the theorem, respectively. Conversely, condition LRE excludes unbounded growth, i.e. model (3) of the theorem and  $\rho > 0$  in models (1) and (2). It also excludes the undamped oscillation of model (4). So the theorem implies either model (1) or (2) here is included.

The rescaling in the last paragraph is the replacement of the time variable  $t$  by  $\rho t$ .  $\square$

### 3. ARBITRAGE IN LINEAR MODELS

Linear models occur as subspaces of the real vector space  $\mathbb{R}^T$  for some set  $T$ . As  $\mathbb{R}$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{C}$ , we can regard  $\mathbb{R}^T$  as a real subspace of the complex vector space  $\mathbb{C}^T$ . For  $g \in \mathbb{C}^T$  we can write  $g = f_1 + \mathbf{i}f_2$ , with  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{R}^T$  and we write  $f_1 = \text{Re}(g)$ ,  $f_2 = \text{Im}(g)$  with the conjugate  $\bar{g} = f_1 - \mathbf{i}f_2$ .

For  $V$  a subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^T$  we define  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  to be the complex subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^T$  given by:

$$(3.1) \quad V_{\mathbb{C}} = \{f_1 + \mathbf{i}f_2 : f_1, f_2 \in V\}.$$

So, for example,  $\mathbb{C}^T = (\mathbb{R}^T)_{\mathbb{C}}$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $W$  be a complex subspace of  $\mathbb{C}^T$ . There exists a real subspace  $V$  of  $\mathbb{R}^T$  such that  $W = V_{\mathbb{C}}$  if and only if  $W$  satisfies the following equivalent conditions.*

- (i) *If  $g \in W$ , then  $\bar{g} \in W$ .*
- (ii) *If  $g \in W$ , then  $\text{Re}(g) \in W$ .*
- (iii) *If  $g \in W$ , then  $\text{Re}(g), \text{Im}(g) \in W$ .*

*In that case,*

$$(3.2) \quad V = W \cap \mathbb{R}^T = \{\text{Re}(g) : g \in W\} = \{\text{Re}(g), \text{Im}(g) : g \in W\},$$

*and for any index set  $I$ , if  $\{g_i : i \in I\}$  spans  $W$ , then  $\{\text{Re}(g_i), \text{Im}(g_i) : i \in I\}$  spans  $V$ .*

**Proof:** (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii):  $\text{Re}(g) = \frac{1}{2}(g + \bar{g})$ .  
(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii):  $\text{Im}(g) = -\text{Re}(\mathbf{i}g)$ .  
(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i):  $\bar{g} = \text{Re}(g) - \mathbf{i}\text{Im}(g)$ .

Clearly,  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  satisfies (iii). On the other hand, given (i)-(iii) it is clear that  $W = V_{\mathbb{C}}$  for  $V$  given by (3.2).

Finally,  $g = \sum_i a_i g_i$  implies  $Re(g) = \sum_i Re(a_i)Re(g_i) - Im(a_i)Im(g_i)$  (with  $a_i = 0$  except for finitely many  $i \in I$ ).

□

Throughout this section we consider linear models of the form  $Y_t(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i Y_t^i$ , which we regard as a linear mapping  $Y : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  with  $\{Y_t^1(r), \dots, Y_t^n(r)\}$  a linearly independent list of smooth functions in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$ . For a yield curve model, we restrict to some nonempty convex open set  $O \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $r \in O$  implies  $Y_t^i(r) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We can regard the log-price as the linear function  $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  given by

$$(3.3) \quad L_t(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i L_t^i$$

$$L_t^i = \int_0^t Y_s^i ds.$$

So, in particular,  $L_0(r) = 0$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . The price-function extends as well to a nonlinear function  $P : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  by

$$(3.4) \quad P_t(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \exp\left[-\sum_{i=1}^n r_i L_t^i\right].$$

For  $r \in O$  the price and log-price curves satisfy (2.4) and (2.7).

Because of the linear structure of the models we can describe investment procedures which might lead to an arbitrage possibility at every  $r \in O$ .

Let  $z_t$  be a finite function on  $(0, \infty)$ . That is, it is a real-valued function on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  whose support is a finite subset excluding 0. Since the function  $z_t$ , once chosen, will be fixed during some extended arguments it will be useful to introduce the notation:

$$(3.5) \quad \langle f \rangle = \sum_t z_t f(t)$$

for any function  $f$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  or in  $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$ .

Think of  $z_t$  as the positive or negative amount of current dollars which we allocate to futures  $t$  time units from now. If the current price curve is  $P_t(r^*)$  then the quantity  $x_t$  of time  $t$  futures with current worth  $z_t$  is given by

$$(3.6) \quad x_t = z_t / P_t(r^*).$$

So the present value of the bundle of futures  $x_t$  is given by

$$(3.7) \quad \sum x_t P_t(r^*) = \langle 1 \rangle.$$

For any  $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$  the value function, defined by (2.29), is at  $r$  given by

$$(3.8) \quad V(r) = \langle P(r - r^*) \rangle$$

because for each  $t$   $P_t(r) = P_t(r^*)P_t(r - r^*)$  by (3.4). Taking the partial derivative with respect to  $r_i$  we see that

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{\partial V}{\partial r_i} \Big|_{r=r^*} = -\langle L^i \rangle$$

and the Hessian matrix is given by

$$(3.10) \quad \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial r_i \partial r_j} \Big|_{r=r^*} = \langle L^i L^j \rangle.$$

Thus, when  $r = r^*$  the investment  $x_t$  is self-financing provided  $\langle 1 \rangle = 0$ . It is then a critical point for the value function when  $\langle L^i \rangle = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . It is a strict local minimum when the  $n \times n$  Hessian matrix  $\langle L^i L^j \rangle$  is positive definite. By Proposition 2.5, if the linear yield curve model satisfies SPA, then for  $r^* \in O$  such a local minimum is a local arbitrage for the model.

We can reverse this analysis as well. If  $x_t$  is a bundle of futures with current prices given by  $P_t(r^*)$  we can use (3.6) to define the finite function  $z_t$ .

The following *No Arbitrage Lemma* does not require the SPA condition. We postpone the proof.

**Lemma 3.2.** *For the  $n$  parameter linear yield curve model whose log-price function  $L$  is given by (3.3) let  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  be the linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  which is the image of  $L$ . Assume that for some positive integer  $p$  there exist functions  $F^1, \dots, F^p$  in  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  which satisfy the following conditions:*

- (1) *The function  $t \mapsto (F_t^1, \dots, F_t^p)$  is an injective function from  $\mathbb{R}_+$  to  $\mathbb{R}^p$ , i.e. if  $t_1 \neq t_2$  then for some  $j = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $F_{t_1}^j \neq F_{t_2}^j$ .*
- (2) *The function  $\sum_{j=1}^p (F^j)^2$ , the sum of the squares, is in the subspace  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .*

*The model satisfies condition NLA. In fact, if  $z_t$  is a finite function on  $(0, \infty)$  not identically zero but satisfying  $\langle 1 \rangle = 0$  and  $\langle L^i \rangle = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , then for any  $r^*$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the value function defined by using  $x_t = z_t/P_t(r^*)$  has a critical point at  $r = r^*$  which is not a local minimum.*

Now we assume that the linear model satisfies condition SPA. By Corollary 2.12 the yield functions are solutions of linear ordinary differential equations with constant coefficients. For such functions it is useful to introduce some special notation.

In the additive group  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{C}$  the set of *exponents*  $\mathcal{E}$  consists of the elements whose integer coordinate is nonnegative. So an exponent  $q$  is a pair  $(m, \lambda)$  with  $m$  a nonnegative integer and  $\lambda$  a complex number. For  $q = (m, \lambda)$  with  $\lambda = a + ib$  we define the *conjugate*  $\bar{q} = (m, \bar{\lambda})$ , the *real part*  $\rho(q) = (m, a)$  and the *imaginary part*  $\omega(q) = b$ . Define

$$(3.11) \quad q' = (\max(0, m-1), \lambda) \quad \text{for } q = (m, \lambda).$$

so that  $q' = q$  when  $q = (0, \lambda)$ .

For the exponent  $q = (m, \lambda)$  define the function  $f^q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} f^q(t) &= t^m \exp(\lambda t) \\ &= f^{\rho(q)}(t) [\cos(\omega(q)t) + i \sin(\omega(q)t)]. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly  $f^{\bar{q}} = \overline{f^q}$  and  $f^{q_1+q_2} = f^{q_1} \cdot f^{q_2}$  for  $q, q_1, q_2 \in \mathcal{E}$ . In addition, the derivative satisfies

$$(3.13) \quad \dot{f}^q = \lambda f^q + m f^{q'} \quad (q = (m, \lambda)).$$

A *closed set* of exponents  $Q$  is a finite subset of  $\mathcal{E}$  such that  $q \in Q$  implies  $\bar{q}, q' \in Q$ . For a closed set  $Q$  and a complex number  $\lambda$  we define the *multiplicity* of  $\lambda$  in  $Q$  to be

$$(3.14) \quad \min\{m \geq 0 : (m, \lambda) \notin Q\}.$$

**Lemma 3.3.** (a) *Let  $Q$  be any finite subset of  $\mathcal{E}$  and  $T$  be any nonempty open subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . The set of restrictions to  $T$  of the functions  $\{f^q : q \in Q\}$  is linearly independent in the complex vector space  $\mathbb{C}^T$ .*

(b) *Let  $V$  be a finite dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$  consisting of differentiable functions. If  $V$  is spanned by  $\{\operatorname{Re}(f^q), \operatorname{Im}(f^q) : q \in Q\}$  for some closed set of exponents  $Q$ , then  $V$  is closed under differentiation, i.e.  $f \in V$  implies  $\dot{f} \in V$ . Conversely, if  $V$  is closed under differentiation, then  $Q = \{q \in \mathcal{E} : \operatorname{Re}(f^q), \operatorname{Im}(f^q) \in V\}$  is a closed set of exponents such that  $\{\operatorname{Re}(f^q), \operatorname{Im}(f^q) : q \in Q\}$  spans  $V$ . In particular, if  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  is a list of differentiable functions such that*

$$(3.15) \quad \dot{Y}_t^i = \sum_{k=1}^n A_k^i Y_t^k \quad (i = 1, \dots, n),$$

then the vector space  $V$  spanned by  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  is spanned by the real and imaginary parts of  $f^q$  for  $q$  varying in such a closed set of exponents.

*Proof.* (a) Denote by  $D$  the derivative operator on the subspace of differentiable functions in  $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{R}^+}$ , i.e.  $Df = \dot{f}$ . Suppose that  $\sum c_q f^q$  is identically zero on the open set  $T$ . Let  $q_0 = (m_0, \lambda_0)$  be an exponent such that  $c_{q_0} \neq 0$ . For each  $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$  apply the operator  $(D - \lambda)$   $m$  times where  $m$  is the multiplicity of  $\lambda$  in  $Q$ , and  $D - \lambda_0$   $m_0 - 1$  times. The only term remaining in the relation is  $c_{q_0}$  times a nonzero number times  $f^{(0, \lambda_0)}$ . This term is not identically zero on  $T$  unless  $c_{q_0} = 0$  after all.

(b) The first statement is obvious by (3.13). For the converse, assume  $V$  is closed under differentiation so that the complex subspace  $V_{\mathbb{C}} = \{g \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{R}^+} : \text{Re}(g), \text{Im}(g) \in V\}$  and  $Q = \{q \in \mathcal{E} : f^q \in V_{\mathbb{C}}\}$ . Since  $V$  and hence  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  are finite dimensional  $Q$  is a finite subset of  $\mathcal{E}$  by (a). If  $q \in Q$ , then  $\bar{q} \in Q$  because  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  is closed under conjugation. By (3.13)  $q' \in Q$  when  $m > 0$ . Since  $q' = q$  when  $m = 0$ , it follows that  $Q$  is closed.

The differentiation operator  $D$  is a linear map of  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  to itself and so we can choose a basis  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  so that  $D$  is represented by a matrix in Jordan canonical form or, to be more precise, so that each  $k \times k$  Jordan bloc is of the form

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & k-1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & k-2 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & \dots & \lambda \end{pmatrix}.$$

So we see from (3.13) that each  $Y^i$  can be chosen a function  $f^q$  with  $q = (m, \lambda)$  and  $\lambda$  an eigenvalue of the matrix. Consequently, the  $f^q$ 's span  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  and so the  $\text{Re}(f^q)$ 's and  $\text{Im}(f^q)$ 's span  $V$  by Lemma 3.1.

□

**Remark.** Regard  $q \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$  as column vectors i.e.  $n \times 1$  matrices, and define

$$(3.17) \quad F^q(t) = \exp[q^T t] = \exp\left[\sum_{i=1}^n q_i t_i\right].$$

For any finite subset  $Q$  of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and any nonempty open subset  $O$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  the set of restrictions to  $O$  of the functions  $\{F^q : q \in Q\}$  is linearly

independent in the complex vector space  $\mathbb{C}^O$ . The proof proceeds as in (a) using partial derivative operators.

**Corollary 3.4.** *For the  $n$  parameter linear yield curve model whose yield function is  $Y : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$ , let  $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$  denote the linear subspace of  $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$  which is the image of  $Y$ . If the model satisfies condition SPA, then there is a closed set of exponents  $Q$  such that*

$$(3.18) \quad \{f^q : q \in Q \text{ with } \omega(q) = 0\} \cup \{\operatorname{Re}(f^q), \operatorname{Im}(f^q) : q \in Q \text{ with } \omega(q) > 0\}$$

is a basis for  $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

*Proof.* The yield curve function is given by (2.30) with  $\{Y^1, \dots, Y^n\}$  linearly independent by Proposition 2.10. So letting  $V = Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$  we see that  $V$  is an  $n$  dimensional subspace of functions to which part (b) of the lemma applies because Corollary 2.12 implies (3.15). It follows that there is a closed set of exponents  $Q$  such that the functions listed in (3.18) span  $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . The functions  $\{f^q : q \in Q\}$  span the complex space  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  and so by part (a) of the lemma they form a basis for  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$ . If  $\omega(q) = 0$  then  $f^q$  is a real function and if  $\omega(q) > 0$  then  $\operatorname{Re}(f^q) = (f^q + f^{\bar{q}})/2$  while  $\operatorname{Im}(f^q) = (f^q - f^{\bar{q}})/2i$ . So the real functions listed in (3.18) form a linearly independent set as well.

□

The set  $Q$  of exponents in Corollary 3.4 is given by:

$$(3.19) \quad Q = \{q \in \mathcal{E} : \operatorname{Re}(f^q), \operatorname{Im}(f^q) \in Y(\mathbb{R}^n)\}.$$

We call this set the *exponent set* for the linear yield curve model  $Y_t(r)$ , defined when the model satisfies SPA.

Now for any exponent  $q$  define the exponent  $\tilde{q}$  by

$$(3.20) \quad \tilde{q} = \begin{cases} q & \text{if } q = (m, \lambda) \text{ with } \lambda \neq 0 \\ (m+1, 0) & \text{if } q = (m, 0) \end{cases}$$

In particular,  $\tilde{0} = (1, 0)$ . For any set of exponents  $Q$  let  $\tilde{Q} = \{\tilde{q} : q \in Q\}$ . Clearly,  $0 \notin \tilde{Q}$ .

For  $q$  any nonzero exponent, i.e.  $q \neq (0, 0)$ , define

$$(3.21) \quad l^q(t) = f^q(t) - f^q(0),$$

so that  $l^q = f^q$  if  $m > 0$  and  $l^q = f^q - 1$  if  $m = 0$ .

**Lemma 3.5.** *Assume that  $Y : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$  and  $L : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{R}_+}$  are the yield and log-price functions for a linear yield curve model satisfying SPA. Let  $Q$  be the exponent set for the yield curve model.*

$$(3.22) \quad \{l^q : q \in \tilde{Q} \text{ with } \omega(q) = 0\} \cup \{\operatorname{Re}(l^q), \operatorname{Im}(l^q) : q \in \tilde{Q} \text{ with } \omega(q) > 0\}$$

is a basis for  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

*Proof.* From (3.13) we have, for  $q = (m, \lambda)$ :

$$(3.23) \quad l^q(t) = \lambda \int_0^t f^q(s) ds + m \int_0^t f^{q'}(s) ds.$$

Using induction on  $m$ , it easily follows that  $\{l^q : q \in \tilde{Q}\}$  is a basis for the complex vector space  $V_{\mathbb{C}}$  where  $V = L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . So the list in (3.22) is a basis for the real vector space  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  just as in Corollary 3.4.

□

We will call  $\tilde{Q}$  the *adjusted exponent set* for the yield curve model when  $Q$  is the exponent set.

We are now ready to state our second technical result, the *Arbitrage Everywhere Lemma*.

**Lemma 3.6.** *For a linear  $n$  parameter yield curve model defined on  $O$  and which satisfies SPA, let  $\tilde{Q}$  be the adjusted exponent set. Assume that for all  $q \in \tilde{Q}$ ,  $q + \bar{q} \notin \tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}$ . The model admits strict local arbitrage at every parameter value  $r \in O$ . In fact, there is a finite function  $z_t$  whose support is a subset of  $(0, \infty)$  consisting of at most  $\frac{1}{2}(n+1)(n+2)$  times, so that for any  $r^*$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  the value function defined using  $x_t = z_t/P_t(r^*)$  has a strict local minimum at  $r = r^*$ .*

□

Again we postpone the proof, first showing how Lemmas 3.2 and 3.6 yield the main result, stated in the previous section.

**Proof of Theorem 2.16:** Since the model is linear and satisfies SPA we can apply the contrapositive of Lemma 3.6. When the model satisfies NLA there must exist  $q \in \tilde{Q}$  such that  $q + \bar{q} \in \tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}$ . Suppose  $q = (m, \lambda)$  so that  $q + \bar{q} = (2m, \lambda + \bar{\lambda})$ . Let  $q_0 = (0, \lambda)$ . We number the four possibilities following the statement of the theorem.

(1)  $\lambda = \rho + i0$  with  $\rho \neq 0$ : By (3.20)  $q = (m, \rho)$  and  $q + \bar{q} = (2m, 2\rho)$  are in  $Q$  which is closed. Hence,  $q_0 = (0, \rho)$  and  $q_0 + \bar{q}_0 = (0, 2\rho)$  are in  $Q$ .  $f^{q_0}(t) = \exp(\rho t)$  and  $f^{q_0 + \bar{q}_0}(t) = \exp(2\rho t)$  are in  $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

(2)  $\lambda = \rho + i\omega$  with  $\rho \neq 0$  and  $\omega \neq 0$ : Replacing  $q$  by  $\bar{q}$  if necessary we may assume  $\omega > 0$ . Again  $q$  and  $q + \bar{q} = (2m, 2\rho)$  are in  $Q$ , and again  $q_0$  and  $q_0 + \bar{q}_0 = (0, 2\rho)$  are in  $Q$ . Hence,  $\operatorname{Re}(f^{q_0}(t)) = \exp(\rho t) \cos \omega t$ ,  $\operatorname{Im}(f^{q_0}(t)) = \exp(\rho t) \sin \omega t$  and  $f^{q_0 + \bar{q}_0}(t) = \exp(2\rho t)$  are in  $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

(4)  $\lambda = 0 + i\omega$  with  $\omega \neq 0$ : Again we can assume  $\omega > 0$  and as before  $q$  and  $q_0 = (0, i\omega)$  are in  $Q$ . Hence,  $\operatorname{Re}(f^{q_0}(t)) = \cos \omega t$  and  $\operatorname{Im}(f^{q_0}(t)) = \sin \omega t$  are in  $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

(3)  $\lambda = 0 + i0$ : Since  $q = (m, 0) \in \tilde{Q}$ ,  $m \geq 1$ . Furthermore,  $q + \bar{q} = (2m, 0) \in \tilde{Q}$ . By (3.20),  $(m-1, 0)$  and  $(2m-1, 0)$  are in  $Q$ . Because  $Q$  is closed  $(0, 0)$  and  $(1, 0)$  are in  $Q$ . Hence,  $1 = t^0 \exp(0t)$  and  $t = t^1 \exp(0t)$  are in  $Y(\mathbb{R}^n)$ .

To show that models which contain (1), (2) and (3) satisfy the NLA condition we apply Lemma 3.2 using the basis in each case given by Lemma 3.5.

(1) With  $q = (0, \rho)$ , let  $F = l^q$  so that  $F(t) = \exp(\rho t) - 1$ .  $(F(t))^2 = (\exp(2\rho t) - 1) - 2(\exp(\rho t) - 1) = l^{q+\bar{q}}(t) - 2l^q(t)$ . Hence,  $F, (F)^2 \in L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Furthermore,  $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is injective.

(2) With  $q = (0, \rho + i\omega)$ , let  $F_1(t) = \operatorname{Re}(l^q(t)) = \exp(\rho t)[\cos(\omega t)] - 1$  and  $F_2(t) = \operatorname{Im}(l^q(t)) = \exp(\rho t)[\sin(\omega t)]$ .  $(F_1(t))^2 + (F_2(t))^2 = l^{q+\bar{q}}(t) - 2F_1(t)$ . Hence,  $F_1, F_2$  and  $(F_1)^2 + (F_2)^2$  are in  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Since  $l^{q+\bar{q}} : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is injective it follows that  $(F_1, F_2) : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is injective.

(3) With  $(0, 0)$  and  $q = (1, 0)$  in  $Q$ ,  $q$  and  $q' = (2, 0)$  are in  $\tilde{Q}$ . Let  $F(t) = l^q(t) = t$  so that  $(F(t))^2 = t^2 = l^{q'}(t)$ . Hence,  $F$  and  $(F)^2$  are in  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . Clearly,  $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is injective.

(4) With  $q = (0, i\omega)$ , let  $F_1(t) = \operatorname{Re}(l^q(t)) = \cos(\omega t) - 1$  and  $F_2(t) = \operatorname{Im}(l^q(t)) = \sin \omega t$ .  $(F_1(t))^2 + (F_2(t))^2 = -2F_1(t)$ . Hence,  $F_1, F_2$  and  $(F_1)^2 + (F_2)^2$  are in  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . However,  $(F_1, F_2) : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$  is not injective because  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are  $2\pi/\omega$  periodic.

Thus, Lemma 3.3 applies to cases (1), (2) and (3) but not to case (4).

□

**Remark.** If  $\omega_1, \omega_2 > 0$  and the ratio  $\omega_1/\omega_2$  is irrational then with  $q_\alpha = (0, i\omega_\alpha)$  ( $\alpha = 1, 2$ ) we define  $F_1(t) + iF_2(t) = l^{q_1}(t)$  and  $F_3(t) + iF_4(t) = l^{q_2}(t)$ .  $\sum_{k=1}^4 (F_k(t))^2 = -2F_1(t) - 2F_3(t)$ . Furthermore,  $(l^{q_1}, l^{q_2}) : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$  is injective. So Lemma 3.2 shows that any linear yield curve model which satisfies SPA and which contains the four

parameter linear model

$$(3.24) \quad Y(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4) = r_1 \cos \omega_1 t + r_2 \sin \omega_1 t + r_3 \cos \omega_2 t + r_4 \sin \omega_2 t$$

satisfies NLA.

**Proof of Lemma 3.6:** Define  $Q^2 = \{q_1 + q_2 : q_1, q_2 \in \tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}\}$  and  $Q^\# = \{q + \bar{q} : q \in \tilde{Q}\}$ . Clearly,  $Q^\#$  consists of real exponents only.  $Q^2$  and  $\tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}$  are closed because  $Q$  is closed.  $Q^2$  contains both  $Q^\#$  and  $\tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}$ . The hypothesis of the lemma says exactly that  $Q^\#$  and  $\tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}$  are disjoint, i.e.

$$(3.25) \quad \tilde{Q} \cup \{0\} \subset Q^2 \setminus Q^\#.$$

Notice first that the assumptions imply that

$$(3.26) \quad \begin{aligned} (m, \mathbf{i}\omega) &\notin Q \quad \text{with } \omega \neq 0, \\ (m, 0) &\notin Q \quad \text{with } m \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

If  $q = (m, \mathbf{i}\omega) \in Q$  then  $q_0 = (0, \mathbf{i}\omega) \in \tilde{Q}$  and  $(0, 0) = q_0 + \bar{q}_0 \in \tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}$ . If  $q = (m, 0) \in Q$  with  $m \geq 1$ , then  $(0, 0), (1, 0) \in Q$  and so  $(1, 0), (2, 0) \in \tilde{Q}$ . With  $q_0 = (1, 0) \in \tilde{Q}$ ,  $(2, 0) = q_0 + \bar{q}_0 \in \tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}$ .

By Lemma 3.3a, the set  $\{f^q : q \in Q^2\}$  restricts to a linearly independent set in the complex vector space  $\mathbb{C}^T$  for  $T$  any nonempty open set in  $\mathbb{R}$ . By Corollary 3.4 the exponent set  $Q$  for the  $n$  parameter model has  $n$  elements. So  $Q^2$  has at most  $\frac{1}{2}(n+1)(n+2)$  elements. By Lemma 2.7 and the Remark thereafter, the set  $\{f^q(t) : t \in T\}$  spans the vector space  $\mathbb{C}^{(Q^2)}$ . Thus, if we select for each  $q \in Q^\#$  a positive number  $C_q$ , then we can choose a finite function  $z_t$  whose support consists of at most  $\frac{1}{2}(n+1)(n+2)$  times in  $T$ , which we assume is contained in  $(0, \infty)$ , such that

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle f^q(t) \rangle &= 0 \quad q \in Q^2 \setminus Q^\# \\ \langle f^q(t) \rangle &= C_q \quad q \in Q^\#. \end{aligned}$$

Here we are using the notation of (3.5)  $\langle f(t) \rangle = \sum_t z_t f(t)$ . It will be convenient to write  $\langle f(t) \rangle$  rather than  $\langle f \rangle$  in these arguments.

A priori the numbers  $z_t$  may be complex. But  $f^q(t)$  is a real function for  $q \in Q^\#$  and  $\overline{f^q(t)} = f^{\bar{q}}(t)$ . So  $Q^2 - Q^\#$  closed under conjugation implies that the conjugate vector  $\bar{z}_t$  would yield equations (3.27) as well. Hence, so would  $\{\text{Re}(z_t) = \frac{1}{2}(z_t + \bar{z}_t)\}$ . Thus, we can choose  $z_t$  to be a real vector.

Now let  $\tilde{Q}_0 = \{q \in \tilde{Q} : \omega(q) = 0\}$  and  $\tilde{Q}_+ = \{q \in \tilde{Q} : \omega(q) > 0\}$ . From (3.25) and (3.27) we can take real and imaginary parts to get:

$$(3.28) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle 1 \rangle &= 0, & \langle f^q(t) \rangle &= 0 \quad q \in \tilde{Q}_0 \\ \langle f^{\rho(q)}(t) \cos(\omega(q)t) \rangle &= \langle f^{\rho(q)}(t) \sin(\omega(q)t) \rangle = 0 & q \in \tilde{Q}_+. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we will now prove that

$$(3.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle (f^q(t))^2 \rangle &= C_{2q} \quad q \in \tilde{Q}_0. \\ \langle [f^{\rho(q)}(t) \cos(\omega(q)t)]^2 \rangle &= \langle [f^{\rho(q)}(t) \sin(\omega(q)t)]^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} C_{q+\bar{q}}, \\ \langle [f^{\rho(q)}(t) \cos(\omega(q)t)][f^{\rho(q)}(t) \sin(\omega(q)t)] \rangle &= 0 \quad q \in \tilde{Q}_+. \end{aligned}$$

For  $q \in \tilde{Q}_0$ ,  $2q = q + \bar{q} \in Q^\#$  and  $(f^q(t))^2 = f^{2q}(t)$ . So the first equation follows from (3.27) for  $2q$ .

For  $q \in \tilde{Q}_+$ ,  $q + \bar{q} = 2\rho(q) \in Q^\#$  and so  $\sin^2 + \cos^2 = 1$  implies

$$(3.30) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle [f^{\rho(q)}(t) \cos(\omega(q)t)]^2 \rangle + \langle [f^{\rho(q)}(t) \sin(\omega(q)t)]^2 \rangle \\ = \langle f^{q+\bar{q}}(t) \rangle = C_{q+\bar{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since  $q+q$  is not real it is in  $Q^2 \setminus Q^\#$  and so  $\langle f^{2q}(t) \rangle = 0$ . Taking real and imaginary points we have

$$(3.31) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \langle f^{2\rho(q)}(t) \cos(2\omega(q)t) \rangle = \\ &= \langle [f^{\rho(q)}(t) \cos(\omega(q)t)]^2 \rangle - \langle [f^{\rho(q)}(t) \sin(\omega(q)t)]^2 \rangle. \\ 0 &= \langle [f^{2\rho(q)}(t) \sin(2\omega(q)t)] \rangle = 2\langle [f^{\rho(q)}(t) \cos(\omega(q)t)][f^{\rho(q)}(t) \sin(\omega(q)t)] \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (3.30) these imply the rest of (3.29).

By Lemma 3.5 we can use as the basis  $\{L^i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$  for  $L(\mathbb{R}^n)$  the set  $\{l^q : q \in \tilde{Q}_0\} \cup \{\text{Re}(l^q), \text{Im}(l^q) : q \in \tilde{Q}_+\}$  listed in any order. Recall from (3.21) that  $l^q(t) = f^q(t) - f^q(0)$ . Thus, up to an added constant, the basis  $\{L^i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$  consists of the set  $\{f^q : q \in \tilde{Q}_0\} \cup \{\text{Re}(f^q), \text{Im}(f^q) : q \in \tilde{Q}_+\}$  listed in the same order. Thus (3.28) implies  $\langle 1 \rangle = 0$  and  $\langle L^i \rangle = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We show that for some choice of positive constants  $C_q$  the Hessian matrix  $\langle L^i L^j \rangle$  is positive definite. Again in computing the Hessian we may replace each  $l^q$  by the corresponding  $f^q$ .

As an example, consider the case  $Q = \{(0, 0)\}$ , which is the flat yield curve example. Here  $\tilde{Q} = \{(1, 0)\}$ ,  $Q^\# = \{(2, 0)\}$  and  $Q^2$  is the disjoint union of  $Q^\#$  and  $\tilde{Q} \cup \{0\}$ .  $L(\mathbb{R})$  is one dimensional with basis  $l^{(1,0)}(t) = t$ . Any positive choice for  $C_{(2,0)}$  yields a positive definite  $1 \times 1$  Hessian.

Returning to the general case, we see that the equations (3.29) imply that the diagonal entries are positive and that many of the off-diagonal entries are zero. However, they need not all be zero and this is why we have to be a bit careful about the choice of  $C_q$ 's.

To illustrate this consider the case

$$(3.32) \quad Q = \tilde{Q} = \{(0, -1), (0, -3), (0, -5)\}.$$

Write  $C_a$  for  $C_{(0,-a)}$  ( $a = 2, 6, 10$ ). The Hessian matrix in this case is

$$(3.33) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} C_2 & 0 & C_6 \\ 0 & C_6 & 0 \\ C_6 & 0 & C_{10} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now if we simply chose  $C_a = 1$  for  $a = 2, 6, 10$  then  $B$  would not be positive definite. The remainder of the proof is exemplified here by the idea that if  $C_2 > 0$  and  $C_6 > 0$  are already chosen then  $B$  is always positive definite provided that  $C_{10}$  is chosen large enough.

We complete the proof that  $C_q$ 's can always be chosen so that the Hessian is positive definite by using induction on the number of points in  $Q$ .

Begin by choosing a set of extreme points  $Q^*$  of  $Q$  as follows. Among the nonnegative numbers  $\{|\operatorname{Re}(\lambda)| : (m, \lambda) \in Q\}$  choose the largest and denote it by  $a^*$ . If  $a^* = 0$ , then (3.26) implies that  $Q = \{(0, 0)\}$ , the flat yield curve case we considered above, and so we may assume that  $a^* > 0$ .

At least one of the sets  $\{(m, \lambda) \in Q : \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) = a^*\}$  and  $\{(m, \lambda) \in Q : \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) = -a^*\}$  is nonempty. We will suppose that the first one is nonempty and let  $m^* = \max\{m : (m, \lambda) \in \tilde{Q} \text{ and } \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) = a^*\}$ . Now let  $Q^* = \{(m^*, \lambda) \in \tilde{Q} : \operatorname{Re}(\lambda) = a^*\}$ . Since  $a^* > 0$ ,  $Q^* \subset Q$ . Notice that  $q^* \in Q^*$  implies  $q^* + \bar{q}^* = (2m^*, 2a^*)$  which we will denote by  $\rho^*$ .

Define  $Q' = Q \setminus Q^*$  and notice that  $Q'$  is a smaller closed subset still satisfying the hypothesis of the Theorem, i.e.  $\tilde{Q}' \cup \{0\} \subset Q'^2 \setminus Q'^{\#}$ . Furthermore,  $\rho^* \notin Q'^{\#}$ . In fact, we have

$$(3.34) \quad \rho^* \notin \{\operatorname{Re}(q_1 + q_2) : q_1 \in \tilde{Q}' \text{ and } q_2 \in \tilde{Q}\}.$$

For suppose  $q_1 = (m_1, \lambda_1)$  and  $q_2 = (m_2, \lambda_2)$ . By construction either  $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_1) < a^*$  or  $m_1 < m^*$ . Furthermore,  $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_2) \leq a^*$  and if  $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_2) = a^*$ , then  $m_2 \leq m^*$ . Hence,  $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) \leq 2a^*$  and if  $\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) = 2a^*$ , then  $m_1 + m_2 < 2m^*$ .

Now arrange the list  $\{L^i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$  so that the functions  $l^a$  with  $q \in Q^*$  occur at the end. The Hessian matrix  $B$  has the bloc form.

$$(3.35) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B' & U \\ U^T & B^* \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $B'$  is the matrix associated with  $Q'$ . By inductive hypothesis we can choose  $C_q > 0$  for  $q \in Q'^{\#}$  so that  $B'$  is positive definite.

Now some of the  $C_q$ 's or  $\frac{1}{2}C_q$ 's may also appear in  $U$  and  $U^T$  for  $q \in \tilde{Q}'$ . This is what happened in the above example. However, (3.34) implies that  $q_1 + q_2$  in  $Q^2$  can equal  $\rho^*$  only for  $q_1, q_2$  in  $\tilde{Q}^*$ . Thus, if the  $C_q$ 's have been chosen for  $q \in Q'^2$  so that  $B'$  is positive definite, then  $U$  is also determined.

Furthermore,  $B^*$  is a positive diagonal matrix. By (3.29) every diagonal entry is either  $C_{\rho^*}$  or  $\frac{1}{2}C_{\rho^*}$ . If  $Q^*$  consists of the real exponent  $(m^*, a^*)$  alone then  $B^*$  is the  $1 \times 1$  matrix  $(C_{\rho^*})$ . Otherwise the off-diagonal entries are all zero because if  $q_1, q_2 \in \tilde{Q}^*$  is not a conjugate pair then  $q_1 + q_2$  is not real and so is not in  $Q^{\#}$ . By (3.27),  $\langle f^{q_1+q_2} \rangle$  and its conjugate are zero.

In detail, suppose that  $q_1 = (m^*, a^* + \mathbf{i}\omega_1), q_2 = (m^*, a^* + \mathbf{i}\omega_2)$  so that  $q_1 + q_2 = (2m^*, 2a^* + \mathbf{i}(\omega_1 + \omega_2)), q_1 + \bar{q}_2 = (2m^*, 2a^* + \mathbf{i}(\omega_1 - \omega_2))$ . It follows that  $\langle f^{2\rho^*}(t) \cos(\omega_1 + \omega_2)t \rangle = 0 = \langle f^{2\rho^*}(t) \cos(\omega_1 - \omega_2)t \rangle$  and  $\langle f^{2\rho^*}(t) \sin(\omega_1 + \omega_2)t \rangle = 0 = \langle f^{2\rho^*}(t) \sin(\omega_1 - \omega_2)t \rangle$ . Now apply the sum formulae for sine and cosine.

It follows that  $B^* = C_{\rho^*}\Delta$  where  $\Delta$  is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries all 1 or  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

In the special case where  $Q = Q^*$ ,  $B = B^*$  and any positive choice of  $C_{\rho^*}$  will do. This includes the initial step for the induction.

In general  $B$  is positive definite provided  $C_{\rho^*}$  is now chosen large enough. This comes from the following lemma whose proof completes the proof of Lemma 3.6.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $B'$  be a  $k \times k$  positive definite symmetric matrix,  $D$  be a  $n - k \times n - k$  positive definite symmetric matrix and  $U$  be a  $k \times n - k$  matrix. If  $C > 0$  is chosen sufficiently large then*

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} B' & U \\ U^T & CD \end{pmatrix}$$

*is positive definite.*

*Proof.* Write  $z$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as  $z = (x, y)$  where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ . Then

$$z^T B z = x^T B' x + 2x^T U y + C y^T D y.$$

We want to choose  $C > 0$  large enough that  $z \neq 0$  implies  $z^T B z > 0$ .

Because  $B'$  and  $D$  are positive definite we can find  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $M > 0$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} x^T B' x &\geq \epsilon \|x\|^2 \\ y^T D y &\geq \epsilon \|y\|^2 \\ |2x^T U y| &\leq M \|x\| \|y\|. \end{aligned}$$

Now if  $\epsilon M^{-1} \|x\| > \|y\|$  then

$$\begin{aligned} z^T B z &\geq x^T B' x - |2x^T U y| \\ &> \epsilon \|x\|^2 - M \|x\| (\epsilon M^{-1} \|x\|) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,  $C\epsilon M^{-1} \|y\| > \|x\|$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} z^T B z &> C y^T D y - |2x^T U y| \\ &> C\epsilon \|y\|^2 - M(C\epsilon M^{-1} \|y\|) \|y\| = 0. \end{aligned}$$

If we choose  $C > (M/\epsilon)^2$  then for any  $z \neq 0$  at least one of the two inequalities will hold, i.e. if  $\|y\| \geq \epsilon M^{-1} \|x\|$  and  $\|y\| > 0$  then  $C\epsilon M^{-1} \|y\| > M\epsilon^{-1} \|y\| \geq \|x\|$ .

□

**Proof of Lemma 3.2:** For  $j = 1, \dots, p$  there exist real constants  $u_i^j$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) such that  $F^j = \sum_i u_i^j L^i$  and  $u_i^{p+1}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) such that  $\sum_j (F^j)^2 = \sum_i u_i^{p+1} L^i$ . For  $s \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $S \in \mathbb{R}$  define  $r(s, S)$  by  $r(s, S)_i = -\sum_j s_j u_i^j - S u_i^{p+1}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ).

Suppose we are given a finite function  $z_t$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+$  such that  $z_0 = 0$  and  $\langle 1 \rangle = \langle L^i \rangle = 0$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 1 \rangle &= 0 \\ \langle F^j \rangle &= 0 \quad (j = 1, \dots, p) \\ (3.36) \quad \langle \sum_{j=1}^p (F^j)^2 \rangle &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now given  $r^*$  we define the basket of futures  $x_t$  by (3.6), i.e.  $x_t = z_t/P_t(r^*)$ . Then from (3.8) we have for  $r = r^* + r(s, S)$  that  $V(r)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V(s, S) &\equiv \langle \exp[\sum_{j=1}^p s_j F^j + S \sum_{j=1}^p (F^j)^2] \rangle \\ (3.37) \quad &= \langle \exp[s^T F + S F^T F] \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For the last expression we are regarding  $s$  and each  $F_t$  as column vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . By (3.7) and (3.9),  $x_t$  is a self-financing basket of futures with respect to the original price curve  $P_t(r^*)$  and  $r = r^*$  is a critical point

for the value function  $V(r)$ . In particular, at the origin  $(s, S) = (0, 0)$   $V(0, 0)$  equals zero. For  $s$  a nonzero vector in  $\mathbb{R}^p$  define

$$(3.38) \quad \epsilon = \|s\| = (s^T s)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = s / \|s\|.$$

Thus,  $\theta$  is a variable on the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ .

For  $\epsilon \neq 0$  we define  $M = S/\epsilon^2$ . So we have the change of variables:

$$(3.39) \quad s = \epsilon\theta \quad \text{and} \quad S = M\epsilon^2.$$

We prove there exist  $(\theta_+, M_+)$  and  $(\theta_-, M_-)$  such that for  $\epsilon > 0$  small enough

$$(3.40) \quad \begin{aligned} V(\epsilon\theta_+, \epsilon^2 M_+) &> 0 \\ V(\epsilon\theta_-, \epsilon^2 M_-) &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the origin is not a local minimum (or local maximum) point for  $V(s, S)$  and so  $r^*$  is not for  $V(r)$ .

Notice first that  $V(s, S)$  does not vanish identically on any neighborhood  $O$  of the origin. For if  $\sum z_t \exp[s^T F_t + S F_t^T F_t] = 0$  as a function on  $O$  then by the Remark after Lemma 3.3 it would have to be true that for some  $t_1 \neq t_2$  both in the support of  $\{z_t\}$ .  $F_{t_1}^j = F_{t_2}^j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ). This contradicts the assumption of condition (1) in the statement of Lemma 3.2. That is, by that assumption  $(F_{t_1}^1, \dots, F_{t_1}^p) \neq (F_{t_2}^1, \dots, F_{t_2}^p)$  for  $t_1 \neq t_2$  in the support of  $z$  and so the functions  $\exp[s^T F_t + S F_t^T F_t]$  of  $(s, S) \in O$  are linearly independent and we would not have  $\sum z_t \exp[s^T F_t + S F_t^T F_t] = 0$  on  $O$ .

Now we use the series expansion for the exponential and the binomial theorem.

$$(3.41) \quad \begin{aligned} V(s, S) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \langle (s^T F + S F^T F)^n \rangle \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{k!(n-k)!} \langle (s^T F)^{n-k} S^k (F^T F)^k \rangle \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{M^k}{k!(n-k)!} \epsilon^{n+k} \langle (\theta^T F)^{n-k} (F^T F)^k \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\langle 1 \rangle = 0$  implies we can begin the series with the  $n = 1$  term. Having used the polar coordinate change (3.40) we similarly write, with  $\|F\| = (F^T F)^{1/2}$ ,

$$(3.42) \quad F = \|F\| \omega, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \omega = F / \|F\| \quad (\|F\| \neq 0),$$

and change variables in the sum letting  $N = n + k$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(s, S) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{M^k}{k!(n-k)!} \epsilon^{n+k} \langle \|F\|^{n+k} (\theta^T \omega)^{n-k} \rangle \\
 (3.43) \quad &= \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^N \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor} \frac{M^k}{k!(N-2k)!} \langle \|F\|^N (\theta^T \omega)^{N-2k} \rangle,
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\lfloor N/2 \rfloor$  is the greatest integer less than or equal to  $N/2$ .

Because this series does not vanish identically there is a smallest positive value  $N = N^*$  such that

$$(3.44) \quad V_{N^*}(\theta, M) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor N^*/2 \rfloor} \frac{M^k}{k!(N^*-2k)!} \langle \|F\|^{N^*} (\theta^T \omega)^{N^*-2k} \rangle$$

is not identically zero. Furthermore, absolute convergence of the series implies for any  $(\theta, M)$  such that  $V_{N^*}(\theta, M) \neq 0$  the sign of  $V(\epsilon\theta, \epsilon^2 M)$  is the same as the sign of  $V_{N^*}(\theta, M)$  provided  $\epsilon > 0$  is sufficiently small. Thus, it suffices to find  $(\theta_+, M_+)$  and  $(\theta_-, M_-)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.45) \quad &V_{N^*}(\theta_+, M_+) > 0 \\
 &V_{N^*}(\theta_-, M_-) < 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then (3.40) follows for  $\epsilon > 0$  sufficiently small.

We proceed by averaging the  $\theta$  variable over the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^p$ . There are two cases:

**Case i:**  $\int_{S^{p-1}} V_{N^*}(\theta, M) d\theta$  vanishes for all  $M$ .

In this case, there is some  $M_0$  such that  $V_{N^*}(\theta, M_0)$  is not identically zero as a function of  $\theta$  by choice of  $N^*$ . Since the average in  $\theta$  is 0 at  $M_0$ , there must exist values  $\theta_+$  and  $\theta_-$  satisfying (3.45) with  $M_+ = M_0 = M_-$ .

**Case ii:**  $\int_{S^{p-1}} V_{N^*}(\theta, M) d\theta$  does not vanish identically.

In this case we compute the average. The results depend on whether  $p = 1$  or  $p > 1$ .

When  $p = 1$ ,  $\theta$  and  $\omega$  are each  $\pm 1$ . For each  $\omega$ , the function  $\theta^T \omega$  takes the two values  $\pm 1$ , each weighted  $1/2$ . So the average of  $(\theta^T \omega)^{N^*-2k}$  is 0 when  $N^*$  is odd and is 1 when  $N^*$  is even.

Thus, when  $p = 1$ , we have

$$(3.46) \quad \int V_{N^*}(\theta, M)d\theta = \begin{cases} 0 & N^* \text{ odd} \\ P_R(M) \cdot \langle \| F \|^{N^*} \rangle & N^* = 2R \end{cases}$$

where

$$(3.47) \quad P_R(M) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^R \frac{M^k}{k!(2R-2k)!}.$$

When  $p > 1$ , we let  $\alpha$  denote the angle between  $\omega$ , fixed on  $S^{p-1}$ , and  $\theta$ . Thus,

$$(3.48) \quad \theta = (\cos \alpha)\omega + (\sin \alpha)\psi$$

where  $\psi$  varies on the  $p-2$  sphere equatorial with respect to the pole at  $\omega$ . We normalize so that

$$(3.49) \quad 1 = \int_{S^{p-1}} 1d\theta = \int_{S^{p-2}} \int_0^\pi d\alpha d\psi = \pi \int_{S^{p-2}} d\psi.$$

It follows that

$$(3.50) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{S^{p-1}} (\theta^T \omega)^{N^*-2k} d\theta &= \int_{S^{p-2}} \int_0^\pi (\cos \alpha)^{N^*-2k} d\alpha d\psi \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi (\cos \alpha)^{N^*-2k} d\alpha = \frac{1}{\pi} \begin{cases} 0 & N^* \text{ odd} \\ \frac{(N^*-2k-1)!!}{(N^*-2k)!!} & N^* \text{ even} \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

The formula for  $\int_0^\pi (\cos \alpha)^R d\alpha$  is proved by using induction on  $R$  and the formula

$$(3.51) \quad \frac{d^2}{d\alpha^2} (\cos \alpha)^R = R(R-1)(\cos \alpha)^{R-2} - R^2(\cos \alpha)^R.$$

The *semi-factorial*  $R!!$  for a positive integer  $R$  is  $R \cdot (R-2) \dots$  descending to 1 or 2. In particular,  $(2R-2k-1)!!/(2R-2k)! = 1/(2R-2k)!!$ .

Thus, when  $p > 1$ , we have

$$(3.52) \quad \int V_{N^*}(\theta, M)d\theta = \begin{cases} 0 & N^* \text{ odd} \\ \tilde{P}_R(M) \langle \| F \|^{N^*} \rangle / \pi & N^* = 2R \end{cases}.$$

where

$$(3.53) \quad \tilde{P}_R(M) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^R \frac{M^k}{k![(2R-2k)!!]^2}.$$

Thus, for any positive integer  $p$ , if  $N^*$  is odd or  $\langle \| F \|^{N^*} \rangle = 0$ , then we return to case *i*.

When  $N^* = 2R$  and  $\langle \| F \|^{N^*} \rangle \neq 0$  we complete the proof by using Lemma 7 below. When  $p = 1$  it says that we can choose  $M_+$  and  $M_-$  so that

$$(3.54) \quad P_R(M_+) \langle \| F \|^{N^*} \rangle > 0 \text{ and } P_R(M_-) \langle \| F \|^{N^*} \rangle < 0.$$

When the average of a function of  $\theta$  is nonzero there will certainly exist values having the same sign as the average. So by (3.46) we can choose  $\theta_+$  and  $\theta_-$  to satisfy (3.45). When  $p > 1$  we use the same argument, replacing  $P_R$  by  $\tilde{P}_R$  in (3.54) and replacing (3.46) by (3.52). So the proof of the following lemma completes the proof of Lemma 3.2.

**Lemma 3.8.** *For every positive integer  $R$  define the polynomials of degree  $R$ :*

$$P_R(M) = \sum_{k=0}^R \frac{M^k}{k!(2R-2k)!}$$

$$\tilde{P}_R(M) = \sum_{k=0}^R \frac{M^k}{k![(2R-2k)!!]^2}.$$

*If  $M \geq 0$  then  $P_R(M), \tilde{P}_R(M) > 0$  and for every  $R$  there exist negative numbers  $M, \tilde{M}$  such that  $P_R(M) < 0$  and  $\tilde{P}_R(\tilde{M}) < 0$ .*

*Proof.* Because the coefficients are positive it is clear that  $P_R(M) \geq P_R(0) > 0$  when  $M > 0$ . Furthermore if  $R$  is odd then  $\lim_{M \rightarrow -\infty} P_R(M) = -\infty$  and so  $P_R(M) < 0$  for  $M < 0$  with  $|M|$  sufficiently large. We complete the proof for  $P_R$  by finding a range of negative values  $M$  where  $P_R(M)$  has the same sign as the  $R - 1$  term of the sum. When  $R$  is even this term is negative.

Let  $T_k$  denote the  $k^{\text{th}}$  term and  $S_k$  the  $k^{\text{th}}$  partial sum:

$$(3.55) \quad T_k = \frac{M^k}{k!(2R-2k)!}$$

$$(3.56) \quad S_k = \sum_{j=0}^k T_j = S_{k-1} + T_k.$$

Define the absolute ratio ( $k = 1, \dots, R$ ):

$$(3.57) \quad \frac{|T_{k-1}|}{|T_k|} = \frac{k}{(2R-2k+2)(2R-2k+1)|M|} = \mu_k.$$

Notice that  $\mu_k$  increases monotonically with  $k$  provided  $|M|$  is fixed. If  $|M| > (R-1)/6$ , then  $\mu_{R-1} < 1/2$  (direct computation) implies  $\mu_k < 1/2$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, R-1$ .

By induction on  $k$  we then prove that with  $M$  negative and  $|M| > (R-1)/6$ :

$$(3.58) \quad \frac{1}{2} < \frac{S_k}{T_k} \leq 1 \quad k = 0, \dots, R-1.$$

Because  $S_0 = T_0 \neq 0$  the initial step is clear. Inductively,

$$(3.59) \quad \frac{S_k}{T_k} = \frac{S_{k-1} + T_k}{T_k} = 1 + \frac{S_{k-1}}{T_k}.$$

Because  $M$  is negative the terms of the series alternate in sign and so  $T_{k-1}/T_k = -\mu_k$ . Thus,

$$(3.60) \quad \frac{S_k}{T_k} = 1 - \mu_k \frac{S_{k-1}}{T_{k-1}}.$$

Now  $\mu_k > 0$  and  $S_{k-1}/T_{k-1} > 0$  (in fact  $> 1/2$ ) imply  $S_k/T_k < 1$ . Also,  $\mu_k < 1/2$  and  $S_{k-1}/T_{k-1} \leq 1$  imply  $S_k/T_k > 1/2$ .

Now choose  $M$  negative and so that  $(R-1)/6 < |M| < R/4$ .  $S_R$  satisfies

$$(3.61) \quad S_R = S_{R-1} + T_R = S_{R-1} - \frac{1}{\mu_R} T_{R-1}$$

and so

$$(3.62) \quad \frac{S_R}{T_{R-1}} = \frac{S_{R-1}}{T_{R-1}} - \frac{1}{\mu_R}.$$

By (3.59)  $S_{R-1}/T_{R-1} > 1/2$ . On the other hand  $|M| < R/4$  implies by direct computation again that  $\mu_R > 2$  and so  $1/\mu_R < 1/2$ . So with  $M$  negative in the range  $(R-1)/6 < |M| < R/4$

$$(3.63) \quad \frac{S_R}{T_{R-1}} > 0.$$

That is,  $P_R(M) = S_R$  has the same sign as  $T_{R-1}$ . This sign is negative when  $R$  is even.

For  $\tilde{P}_R(M)$  the proof follows exactly the same pattern. Equation (3.57) is replaced by

$$(3.64) \quad \frac{|T_{k-1}|}{|T_k|} = \frac{k}{(2R-2k+2)^2|M|} \equiv \mu_k.$$

The required range for  $\tilde{M}$  negative such that  $\tilde{P}_R(\tilde{M})$  has the same sign as its  $R-1$  term as above is  $(R-1)/8 < |\tilde{M}| < R/8$ .

□

## REFERENCES

1. L. Fisher and R. Weil, "Coping with the Risk of Interest Rate Fluctuations: Returns to Bondholders from Naive and Optima Strategies", *J. of Business* (1971), **44**:408-431.
2. J. Hicks, "Value and Capital," Oxford U. Press, Oxford, 1939.
3. J. Ingersoll, Jr., J. Skelton, and R. Weil, "Duration Forty Years Later" *J. of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, (1978), 627-650.
4. S. Lang, *Differential and Riemannian Manifolds*, (1995) Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York.
5. F. Macauley, "Some Theoretical Problems Suggested by the Movement of Interest Rates, Bond Yields, and Stock Prices in the United States Since 1856", Columbia U. Press, New York, 1938.
6. R. Weil, "Macauley's Duration: An appreciation", *J. of Business* (1973), **46**:589-592.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, THE CITY COLLEGE, 137 STREET AND CONVENT AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY, NY 10031, USA

*Email address:* ethanakin@earthlink.net, mortdavis@att.net