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Abstract
The benchmark theory of mathematical finance is the Black–Scholes–Merton theory, based on Brownian motion as the driving noise process for asset prices. Here the distributions of returns of the assets in a portfolio are multivariate normal. The two most obvious limitations here concern symmetry and thin tails, neither being consistent with real data. The most common replacements for the multinormal are parametric—stable, generalized hyperbolic, variance gamma. In this paper we advocate the use of semi-parametric models for distributions, where the mean vector \( \mu \) and covariance \( \Sigma \) are parametric components and the so-called density generator (function) \( g \) is the non-parametric component. We work mainly within the family of elliptically contoured distributions, focusing particularly on normal variance mixtures with self-decomposable mixing distributions. We show how the parametric cases can be treated in a unified, systematic way within the non-parametric framework and obtain the density generators for the most important cases.

1. Introduction
The benchmark theory in mathematical finance—the Black–Scholes–Merton theory—is based on normal (or Gaussian) driving noise. This theory leads to Gaussian asset return distributions—normal models or Gaussian models—and has much to recommend it, by way of mathematical tractability, familiarity and completeness of markets (at least in the standard set-up). Its limitations are equally well known: it commits one to symmetry and to very thin tails, neither consistent with the reality of financial data. This has motivated numerous proposals for alternative models. The first—stable models—suggests replacing the Gaussian noise (Wiener process) by a stable process, thereby giving tails that decay like a power rather than log–quadratic decay. This proposal goes back to Mandelbrot (1963); for monograph treatments, see e.g. Mandelbrot (1997), part IV or Rachev and Mittnik (2000).

The length of the time-interval over which returns are calculated comes into play here—long intervals lead to the Gaussian model, at least approximately, by aggregational Gaussianity. Stable distributions preserve the type of distribution under time aggregation, a perfectly natural property from the economic standpoint. However, stable distributions are so heavy-tailed that the second moment is infinite, a fact that is inconsistent with empirical findings for most financial time series. An alternative uses models based on the generalized hyperbolic distribution, advocated by Eberlein and others, see e.g. Eberlein (2001) for an overview. Here a driving Lévy process—hyperbolic Lévy motion—is constructed with one-period return distributions from the class of generalized hyperbolic distributions fitted...
to the empirical observed returns. As well as allowing for heavy-tailed and skewed returns, these models are also reasonably consistent under time aggregation. Let us mention that the variance gamma model, proposed by Madan and Seneta (1990) and extended in Carr et al (2000), where the driving Brownian motion is time-changed by a gamma process, can be subsumed within the above framework. All these are examples of parametric models. These have the advantages of mathematical tractability, but the drawback that complex reality cannot be captured accurately by a small number of parameters.

More generally, one can work non-parametrically, with an arbitrary infinitely-divisible distribution, and correspondingly, by the Lévy–Khintchine formula, with an arbitrary Lévy process as driving noise, in place of the Gaussian noise in the classical case. This leads to the notion of general Lévy models for asset returns. The principal drawbacks here are greater mathematical complexity, and the independent increments assumption involved in using Lévy processes to model the driving noise. In reality, the noise terms over contiguous intervals will certainly be dependent (particularly in periods of market turbulence, which are atypical but crucial). Lévy processes are also well adapted to the modelling of stochastic volatility; for a treatment focusing on the dynamic (time-series) aspects here, we refer to Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard (2001a).

The aim of the paper is to set up a general framework for Lévy-type models, with particular reference to the multidimensional case. This is relevant to portfolio theory, and to questions of asset allocation. We advocate a semi-parametric approach to combine the advantages of the parametric and non-parametric approaches. We use a parametric component, incorporating the mean vector $\mu$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma$, and a non-parametric component, modelling the shape of the distribution, specifically, questions of tail-decay (kurtosis). Here, shape, which we can think of as a density on $[0, \infty)$, incorporates what remains when we work up to location and scatter, that is modulo affine transformations, while $(\mu, \Sigma)$ represents the affine part. Hodgson et al (2000) also study semi-parametric modelling in a similar setting, from the point of view of empirical testing of the capital asset pricing model (CAPM).

In section 2 we discuss normal variance-mean mixtures as a general class for the underlying return distributions. We show that all parametric classes of distributions used to set up the above-mentioned Lévy models fall within this class.

In section 3 we turn to the framework of elliptical models or of elliptically contoured distributions (Bickel et al 1998, sections 4.2, 6.3, 7.2, 7.8, Fang et al 1990, ch 2, 3, see section 3). This has a number of important advantages.

1. The roles of $\mu$ and $\Sigma$ are preserved, and the shape component is flexible enough to handle anisotropy (though not general asymmetry) and any desired tail decay.
2. The benchmark normal/Gaussian theory, and the major special case ($\beta = 0$, section 2) of its principal competitor, the hyperbolic/normal inverse Gaussian (NIG) theory, are conveniently contained and extensively generalized.

3. Adaptive estimation is possible, that is ignorance of one of the parametric and non-parametric components need not extract no price in efficiency when estimating the other (Bickel et al 1998).

4. Elliptical models have linear regression (Fang et al 1990, Embrechts et al 2001). This enables the methods and results of classical statistics—the linear model and regression—to be brought to bear.

Elliptical models are well adapted to incorporate infinite divisibility, a concept which we discuss in section 4. Both the normal/Gaussian and hyperbolic/NIG models are infinitely divisible. Infinite divisibility is the key feature of a distribution that allows the introduction of Lévy processes to model the driving noise, generalizing the $r$-dimensional Brownian motion in the Black–Scholes–Merton model (albeit at the cost of market completeness). Within the family of infinitely divisible laws, the self-decomposable laws are particularly important. Our main focus is on self-decomposable elliptic distributions; both the normal/Gaussian and hyperbolic/NIG families (for $\beta = 0$—see below) are included here (Halgreen 1979). Self-decomposable distributions are also important in the time-series (dynamic) aspects, rather than the static distributional aspects studied here. We turn in section 5 to the important class of distributions generated as normal variance mixtures and characterize those distributions which can be used to construct Lévy-type models. In section 6 we discuss the class of generalized hyperbolic distributions within our framework and obtain an explicit expression for the density generator of distributions within this class. We also provide the decay rate for the density generator, an important quantity for value-at-risk (VaR) considerations. We close in section 7 with an outline of how to implement and apply the semi-parametric model. A detailed analysis of the econometric properties and applications to risk management will be contained in a forthcoming paper (Bingham et al 2002).

2. Normal variance-mean mixtures

If $U$ is a random variable on $[0, \infty)$ with law $F$, and

$X| (U = u) \sim N_r (\mu + u\beta, u\Delta),$

where $\Delta$ is a symmetric positive definite $r \times r$ matrix with determinant one and $\mu, \beta$ are $r$ vectors, then the distribution of $X$ is called a normal variance-mean mixture with position $\mu$, drift $\beta$, structure matrix $\Delta$ ($|\Delta| = 1$ is imposed to ensure identifiability) and mixing distribution $F$. If $\beta = 0$, a case studied in more detail later, $X$ is a normal variance mixture. The density $f_X(x)$ of $X$ is

$\exp \left[ \frac{(x - \mu)^T \Delta^{-1} \beta}{2} \right] \times \frac{1}{(2\pi u)^r} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} (x - \mu)^T (u\Delta)^{-1} (x - \mu) \right] dF(u),$

where $\Delta^T \Sigma \Delta^{-1}$.
and its characteristic function (CF) is
\[
\psi_X(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \exp(it^T x) f_X(x) \, dx
\]
\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx \exp(it^T x) \int_0^{\infty} f_{X|U}(x|u) \, dF(u) = \int_0^{\infty} dF(u) \exp[it^T \mu + it^T \beta u - \frac{1}{2} t^T \Delta u t],
\]
interchanging the order of integration and using \( X|(U = u) \sim N_t(\mu + \beta u, u \Delta) \). Thus if
\[
\phi(s) := \int_0^{\infty} e^{-su} dF(u) \quad (s > 0)
\]
is the Laplace–Stieltjes transform of \( U \),
\[
\psi_X(t) = \exp(it^T \mu) \phi(\frac{1}{2} t^T \Delta t - it^T \beta). \quad (\text{NVMM})
\]
The distribution is isotropic iff \( \beta = 0 \) and \( \Delta = I \).

We see immediately that \( \psi \) is infinitely divisible iff \( \phi \) is. Self-decomposability transfers from \( F \), \( \phi \) to \( \psi \) only for \( \beta = 0 \) in general.

For \( \beta = 0 \), the distribution has elliptical symmetry, as with the multivariate normal. This is very convenient technically; see below. However, this comes at the price of being able to model asymmetry.

One prime example is that of \( F \) the generalized inverse Gaussian (GIG) distribution. Recall the Bessel function \( K_\lambda \) of the third kind (or Macdonald function) and its integral representation
\[
K_\lambda(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\infty} u^{\lambda-1} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( u + \frac{1}{u} \right) \right\} \, du \quad (x > 0)
\]
(Watson 1944, sections 3.7 and 6.22, (8)). Observe that \( K_\lambda = K_{-\lambda} \), on writing \( 1/u \) for \( u \); also \( K_{\lambda+\frac{1}{2}}(x) = \sqrt{\pi/(2x)} e^{-x} \). Then for \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \delta, \gamma > 0 \)
\[
f(x) = \left( \frac{\gamma/\delta}{2 K_\lambda(\delta \gamma)} \right)^{\lambda-1} \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \gamma^2 + \frac{\delta^2}{x} \right) \right\} \quad (x > 0)
\]
is a probability density on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \). Its Laplace transform is
\[
\xi(s) = \left( \frac{\delta^2}{\gamma^2 + 2s} \right)^{\lambda-1} K_\lambda(\delta \sqrt{\gamma^2 + 2s}) \quad (s > 0), \quad (K_\lambda)
\]
which we shall refer to as the \((K_\lambda)\)-formula. Of course, this functional form is to be expected since \( f \) belongs to an exponential family; see e.g. Barndorff-Nielsen (1978), section 8.1. This law is called the GIG or GIG\(_{\lambda,\delta,\gamma}\) (and we use \( d_{\text{GIG}}(x; \lambda, \delta, \gamma) \) as notation for its density). The inverse Gaussian case is \( \lambda = 1 \): \( IG_{\delta,\gamma} = GIG_{1,\delta,\gamma} \). The name arises because these are the first hitting-time distributions for drifting Brownian motion; see Barndorff-Nielsen et al (1978) for hitting times, Jørgensen (1982) for a monograph treatment of statistical aspects. It was shown by Barndorff-Nielsen and Halgreen (1977) that GIG is infinitely divisible, and by Halgreen (1979) that GIG is self-decomposable.

We now form normal mean-variance mixtures, using the GIG laws as mixing distributions. The resulting normal mean-variance mixture has density
\[
f(x) = \frac{(\gamma/\delta)^{\lambda}}{(2\pi)^{\frac{\lambda}{2}} \alpha^{\frac{\lambda}{2}} \Gamma_\lambda(\delta \gamma)} \times (\delta^2 + (x - \mu)^T \Delta^{-1} (x - \mu))^{(\lambda-1)/2} \times K_\lambda^{-\lambda} \left( \alpha \sqrt{\delta^2 + (x - \mu)^T \Delta^{-1} (x - \mu)} \right) \times \exp[\beta^T (x - \mu)]
\]
where
\[
\alpha^2 := \gamma^2 + \beta^T \Delta^{-1} \beta.
\]
The class of distributions with these densities is called the generalized hyperbolic distributions. In the univariate case \( (r = 1) \) the densities depend on five parameters (recall \( |\Delta| = 1 \) with the following interpretation: \( \alpha > 0 \) determines the shape; \( 0 < |\beta| < \alpha \) is a skewness parameter; \( \mu \in \mathbb{R} \) determines the location; \( \delta \) is a scaling parameter comparable to \( \sigma \); \( \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \) describes some subclasses. Affine-invariant (no change under change of location and scale) parametrizations are given by
\[
\xi = \delta \sqrt{\alpha^2 - \beta^2}, \quad \rho = \frac{\beta}{\alpha},
\]
and
\[
\xi = (1 + \xi)^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \chi = \xi \rho.
\]
Since \( 0 \leq |\chi| < \xi < 1 \) the distribution parametrized by \( \chi \) and \( \xi \) can be represented by points of a triangle, the so-called shape triangle (see Shiryaev (1999) for further discussion). The simplest case is the univariate case \( r = 1 \) with \( \lambda = 1 \). Then as \( K_1(x) = \sqrt{\pi/(2x)} e^{-x} \), \( f \) simplifies to
\[
f(x) = \frac{\gamma}{2\alpha \delta K_1(\delta \gamma)} \exp\left\{ -\alpha \sqrt{\delta^2 + (x - \mu)^2} + \beta (x - \mu) \right\}.\]
The log-density has graph
\[
y = c - \alpha \sqrt{\delta^2 + (x - \mu)^2} + \beta (x - \mu)
\]
for some constant \( c \), which is the lower branch of a hyperbola, with asymptotes
\[
y = c - (\beta \pm \alpha)(x - \mu).
\]
Note that \( \beta \neq 0 \) is needed to obtain asymptotes with asymmetric slopes, that is not of the form \( \pm \alpha \).

Now the empirical findings of Bagnold (1941) were that, for the distribution of sizes of particles of sand, if log-density is plotted against log-size, one obtains an approximation to a smooth unimodal curve approaching two linear asymptotes (with asymmetric slopes in general) at \( \pm \alpha \). The simplest such curve is the lower branch of a hyperbola, and this motivates the definition of the generalized hyperbolic distribution above and its interpretation as a normal variance-mean mixture.
A further important case is the NIG, where \( \lambda = -1/2 \) and the density is
\[
d_{\text{NIG}}(x) = \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \exp\left\{\delta \sqrt{\alpha^2 - \beta^2} + \beta (x - \mu)\right\} \times \frac{K_1\left(\alpha \delta \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{x - \mu}{\delta}\right)^2}\right)}{\sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{x - \mu}{\delta}\right)^2}}.
\]
The NIG distributions form the only subclass of the generalized hyperbolic laws which are closed under convolution:
\[
\text{NIG}(\alpha, \beta, \delta_1, \mu_1) \ast \text{NIG}(\alpha, \beta, \delta_2, \mu_2) = \text{NIG}(\alpha, \beta, \delta_1 + \delta_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2).
\]
Finally let us mention the variance gamma distribution obtained by using a gamma distribution as its mixing distribution, which is the special case \( \lambda > 0, \delta = 0 \) and \( \gamma > 0 \) in the above framework:
\[
d_{\text{VGD}}(x) = \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\right)^{-\lambda} \Gamma(\lambda) x^{\lambda-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 x^2\right\}, \quad x > 0.
\]
These distributions have been used in the context of variance-gamma models in Madan and Seneta (1990), Carr et al. (1998).

We now have some choice as to how to proceed. We can use normal-mean-variance mixtures (general \( \beta \)). This gives a semi-parametric model, extending the hyperbolic model of Bagnold, Barndorff-Nielsen, Eberlein and others above. This allows us to model asymmetry, but complicates the estimation theory. Alternatively, we can specialize to \( \beta = 0 \), that is, to normal variance mixtures. This restricts us to ellipsoidal symmetry (as with the multivariate normal)—though not to isotropy. However, because the distribution is now elliptically contoured, it is much easier to handle and the estimation is much simplified.

We restrict attention to the elliptically contoured case \( \beta = 0 \) below. Here we can give a fairly complete treatment. The case of general \( \beta \)—as in the extension of Korsholm (2000) to higher dimensions, and the dynamic aspects, we propose to discuss elsewhere.

### 3. Elliptical models

An \( r \)-dimensional distribution is spherically symmetric if it is invariant under the action of the orthogonal group \( O(r) \). The density \( f \) is then a function of \( x := \|x\| \) rather than of \( x \), and similarly the CF \( \psi \) is a function of \( t := \|t\| \) rather than of \( t \).

An \( r \)-dimensional distribution is elliptically contoured if it is the image of a spherically symmetric distribution under an affine transformation. We shall confine attention, for simplicity, to the absolutely continuous, full-rank, \( L_2 \) case. Then the mean vector \( \mu \) and covariance matrix \( \Sigma \) are defined, \( \Sigma \) is non-singular, and the density \( f \) is a function of the quadratic form \( Q := (x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu) \):

\[
f(x) = |\Sigma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} g(Q) = |\Sigma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} g((x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu)). \quad (\text{EC})
\]

We write \( f \sim EC_r(\mu, \Sigma; g) \), and call \( g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+ \) the density generator of \( f \), or ‘shape’. Then \( \theta := (\mu, \Sigma) \) is the parameter, or parametric part, of the model, \( g \) the non-parametric part. The CF \( \psi \) of \( f \) is of the form
\[
\psi(t) := \mathbb{E} \exp[it^T X] = \exp[it^T \mu] \phi(t^T \Sigma t) \quad (\text{EC})
\]
for some scalar function \( \phi \) called the characteristic generator of \( \psi \), or \( f \) (Fang et al 1990 ch 2, Cambanis et al 1981). It is convenient to write here \( f \sim EC_r(\mu, \Sigma; \phi) \) also.

To see the link between \( g \) in (EC) and \( \phi \) in (EC), pass to the standardized variable \( Y := \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} (X - \mu) \) with mean vector \( 0 \) and covariance matrix \( I \). Then
\[
\phi(t^2) = \phi(t^T t) = \psi_Y(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^r} \exp[it^T y] g(y^T y) \, dy
\]
\[
= \int_{\mathbb{R}^r} \exp[it^T y] g(y^2) \, dy.
\]
Thus \( g(y^2) \) is the density \( f_Y(y) \) of \( Y \), which being a function of \( y \) only we can write as \( f_Y(y) \). The density generator thus satisfies
\[
g(y^2) = f_Y(y) = f_Y(y).
\]
One has the stochastic representation
\[
x = \mu + RA^T u, \quad A^T A = \Sigma, \quad (\text{SR})
\]
where \( u \) is uniformly distributed on the unit \( r \)-sphere and \( R > 0 \) is a scalar random variable with
\[
Q(x) = (x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu) = R^2 = \|y\|^2 = y^2, \quad (\text{QF})
\]

In terms of the standardized variables above. Thus (EC) says that the quadratic form \( Q = R^2 \) is what matters. Its density \( h \) is given in terms of the density generator \( g \) by
\[
h(u) = \frac{\pi^{r/2}}{\Gamma(r/2)} u^{r/2-1} g(u). \quad (\text{hg})
\]

Scaling and identifiability. In (EC), one can absorb a scale-factor \( c > 0 \) in the quadratic form \( Q \) on the right, adjusting \( g \) accordingly. If one passes from one representation \( (\mu, \Sigma, g) \) of \( f \) to another, say \( (\mu^*, \Sigma^*, g^*) \), in this way, the transformation formulae are
\[
\mu^* = \mu, \quad \Sigma^* = c \Sigma,
\]
\[
\phi^*(.) = \phi(./c), \quad g^*(.) = c^{-\frac{1}{2}} g(c.).
\]
The covariance matrix and the matrix parameter \( \Sigma \) are linked by
\[
\text{cov}(x) = -2\phi'(0) \Sigma = \frac{\mathbb{E}(R^2)}{r} \Sigma = \frac{\mathbb{E}(Q)}{r} \Sigma.
\]

One thus has some choice as to scaling. Because we wish to maintain the direct link to the Markowitz mean-variance theory, the natural choice of scale for us is to take, throughout,
\[
\text{cov}(x) = \Sigma
\]
(or \( \mathbb{E}(R^2) = r \) and we shall do this. The above ambiguity of scale then disappears, and the model (EC) becomes identifiable.

The elliptically contoured framework applies more generally than above (densities need not exist, nor need means
and covariances, \( \Sigma \) may be singular. We restrict as above for convenience and interpretability; see Fang et al (1990) section 2.5 for further detail and references.

**Curse of dimensionality.** The dimensionality in which we work is the number of different assets in our portfolio, which may be large. Even reducing from individual stocks to equity indices may still leave the dimensionality high. For instance, work on asset allocation for a world equity portfolio, Bodie et al (1999) considers 48 equity indices. One of the principal advantages of our elliptically contoured model is that, although our insistence on retaining the Markowitzian interpretations of \( \mu \) and \( \Sigma \) dictates the dimensionality of the parametric part, the harder—non-parametric—part \( g \) of our model, being a scalar function, escapes the curse of dimensionality. This is extremely convenient from a computational viewpoint; see the simulation studies in Bingham and Kiesel (2001a) and the treatment of real financial data in Bingham et al (2002).

**Radial characteristic functions.** There are two ways to handle the vector \( u \) in (SR) uniformly distributed on the unit sphere. One way is to use \( u^T u = 1 \), leading to (QF) and (DG) above. The other, to which we now turn, is to integrate over the unit sphere.

In the presence of radial symmetry, the \( r \)-dimensional Fourier transform above decomposes into two parts, the radial part, which carries the information, and the spherical part. This decomposition gives rise to a variant on the Hankel transform, an integral transform with kernel the modified Bessel function

\[
\Lambda_v(u) := \frac{J_v(u\Gamma(v+1))}{(\frac{u}{r})^v}, \quad v := \frac{1}{2}(r-2).
\]

Then (see Bochner and Chandrasekharan 1949 IV.5, Kingman 1963) the CF is

\[
\mathbb{E}\Lambda_v(iY) = \int_0^\infty \Lambda_v(ty) \, dH(y),
\]

where \( H \) is the distribution function of \( Y \). This is called the *radial CF*, \( \Psi(t) \) say, of the radial distribution \( H \):

\[
\Psi(t) = \int_0^\infty \Lambda_v(ty) \, dH(y).
\]

Then

\[
\Psi(t) = \phi(t^2) = \int_0^\infty \exp(\imath ty)g(y^2) \, dy
\]

\[
= \int_0^\infty \Lambda_v(ty) \, dH(y).
\]

**Unimodality.** We are interested here in modelling densities \( f\_x(x) \) that have a unique mode at \( x = \mu \). This is ensured by restricting the density generator \( g \) in (EC) to be decreasing on \([0, \infty)\), and we shall do this throughout (equivalently, we restrict to \( f\_y(y) \) decreasing in \( y \)).

**Decomposition.** The elliptically contoured form (EC) conveniently splits the functional form of \( f \) into two parts, which behave differently with respect to affine transformations. The density generator \( g \)—the non-parametric part—governs the *shape* of \( f \), which is what remains when we work modulo affine transformations. The parametric part \( \theta = (\mu, \Sigma) \) may be thought of as the affine part of the model, and a desirable property of estimators of it is *affine equivariance*, that is commutability with affine transformations, or changes of location and scatter. For background, see e.g. Lopuha¨a (1991), Lopuha¨a (1999).

**Examples.**

1. **The normal/Gaussian case.** The density generator of the multivariate normal distribution is given by

\[
g(u) = (2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \exp(-\frac{1}{2}u^T \Sigma u).
\]

The CF is

\[
\psi(t) = \exp(\imath t^T \mu - \frac{1}{2}t^T \Sigma t),
\]

so

\[
\phi(u) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2}u^2).
\]

The multivariate normal is a member (the \( N = s = 1, t = \frac{1}{2} \) case) of the class of symmetric Kotz-type distributions, which are characterized by exponentially decaying density generators of form

\[
g(u) = C_r u^{N-1} \exp(-tu^\gamma), \quad s, t > 0, 2N + r > 2,
\]

where \( C_r \) is a constant.

2. **The multivariate \( t \) distribution.** For the multivariate \( t \) distribution with \( m \) degrees of freedom the density generator exhibits power decay. It is a member (the \( N = \frac{1}{2}(r+m), m \) an integer case) of the class of symmetric multivariate Pearson type VII distributions with density generators

\[
g(u) = (\pi m)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \Gamma(N) \Gamma(N - r/2) (1 + u^2/m)^{-N}, \quad \text{if } N > r/2, m > 0.
\]

**Limitations.** We point out three limitations of the elliptical model.

1. **(1) No real data will be exactly elliptical (though we can test for ellipsoidal symmetry: Beran (1979), Li et al (1997)).** Within the family of all distributions, any neighbourhood of an elliptical distribution will contain non-elliptical ones. Because of this, Hampel et al (1986, remark 2, p 273) go so far as to describe the generalization beyond the parametric case as ‘spurious’. This criticism could, in principle, be levelled against any semi-parametric model. We prefer to make use of the modelling advantages of the elliptical approach, while bearing robustness questions in mind when estimating the component parts of the model.

2. **(2) Elliptical distributions have linear regression.** While this is technically very convenient, and reasonable for portfolios of stocks, it is less suitable for portfolios containing options. Since options have value—they convey rights, but not obligations (and so are examples of ‘contingent claims’)—they are assets in their own right and can be traded. Indeed, the prices at which options are traded in the market provide us with the means to estimate the ‘implied volatility’ of the underlying
4. Infinite divisibility and self-decomposability

We recall that infinitely divisible distributions are characterized through their CFs via the Lévy–Khintchine formula, and are the marginal laws of Lévy processes, i.e. stochastic processes with stationary independent increments. For a full account of both aspects, we refer to the monographs of Bertoin (1996) and Sato (1999).

Infinitely divisible laws are those obtained as limit laws of asymptotically negligible triangular arrays. Consequently, infinite divisibility is preserved under affine transformations. Thus in testing an elliptically contoured distribution for infinite divisibility, we may without loss take \( \mu = 0, \Sigma = I \), which reduces matters to \( g \) or \( \phi \). So an elliptically contoured distribution is infinitely divisible iff, for each \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \), its characteristic generator satisfies

\[
\phi = \phi_k^G
\]

with \( \phi_k \) also a characteristic generator (example: the normal case, with \( \phi_k = \exp(-\frac{1}{2} k^2) \)).

Unfortunately, we have no such way of testing for infinite divisibility using the density generator \( g \), although this is of more direct concern from the modelling point of view and more accessible statistically. Indeed, we know from the form of the Lévy–Khintchine formula that describing the class of infinite divisibility radial CFs

\[
\Psi(t) = \exp\left\{-c \int_0^\infty \left(1 - \Lambda_x(tx)\right) \frac{(1 + x^2)}{x^2} dG(x)\right\}
\]

with \( c > 0 \) and \( G \) a probability distribution on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \). This is analogous to the form \( \phi(s) = \exp\left[-c \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-sx})((1 + x)/x) dG(x)\right] \) for infinitely divisible Laplace–Stieltjes transforms on \( \mathbb{R}_+ \) (section 5 below and Feller 1971, XIII.7). Both are instances of more general formulae for Urbanik’s theory of generalized convolution algebras. For details and references, see Urbanik (1964), Bingham (1971, 1984).

Of course, recognizing infinite divisibility from this criterion may be difficult given a specific \( \Psi \) or \( \psi \), and impossible given a specific \( g \). This underlines the importance of structural aspects such as self-decomposability, which ensures infinite divisibility, or the normal variance mixture property (section 5), which makes it easier to recognize.

Lévy-type models of financial markets. Recall the standard Black–Scholes model defined via the SDE

\[
dS_t = S_t (\mu dt + \sigma dW_t),
\]
with constant coefficients and a standard Brownian motion $W$. The solution of the SDE is

$$S_t = S_0 \exp \left\{ \mu t - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} t + \sigma W_t \right\}.$$

One can consider a general exponential Lévy process model for stock prices

$$S_t = S_0 \exp(L_t),$$

with a Lévy process $L$. Now the distribution of a Lévy process is uniquely determined by any of its one-dimensional marginal distributions, so we may use the distribution of $L_1$, i.e. $F_1$. Then $F_1$ is infinitely divisible and its CF is given by the Lévy–Khintchine formula as

$$\mathbb{E}(\exp[iuL_1]) = \exp(-\psi(u)),$$

with the Lévy exponent $\psi$ of $L_1$ given by

$$\psi(u) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} u^2 - i \alpha u + \int_{|x| < 1} (1 - e^{-iux} - iux) \mu(dx) + \int_{|x| \geq 1} (1 - e^{-iux}) \mu(dx),$$

with $\alpha, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu$ a $\sigma$-finite measure on $\mathbb{R}/[0]$, the Lévy measure, satisfying

$$\int \min(1, x^2) \mu(dx) < \infty.$$

The Lévy–Khintchine formula can now be used to read off properties of the corresponding Lévy process $L_t$, see Protter (1992), I.4. Examples of such models using the distributions introduced above are

(ii) NIG distributions, see Barndorff-Nielsen (1997, 1998).
(iii) Generalized hyperbolic distributions, see Eberlein (2001).
(iv) Variance-gamma model, see Madan and Seneta (1990) and Carr et al (1998) and its extension the CGMY model, see Carr et al (2000).

The normal variance-mean framework unifies the above approaches. Instead of specifying a parametric family, such as the GIG laws for the underlying mixing distribution $F$, we can estimate $F$ (or its density) non-parametrically. The corresponding estimation problem has been treated by Korsholm (2000) in the one-parametric case.

### 5. Normal variance mixtures

Suppose that $U$ has law $F$ on $(0, \infty)$, and that given $U = u$, $x$ is $r$-variate normal with mean $\mu$ and covariance matrix $u \Sigma$:

$$X|(U = u) \sim N_r(\mu, u \Sigma).$$

Then $X$ is called a normal variance mixture. Such mixtures have been studied in, e.g. Barndorff-Nielsen et al (1982) (taking $\beta = 0$ there) and Fang et al (1990) section 2.6. From (NVMM) we find that their CFs have the form

$$\psi_X(t) = \exp[i\theta^T \mu + \frac{1}{2} t^T \Sigma t],$$

(NVM)

where $\phi_M(s) := \int_0^\infty e^{-sm}dF(u)(s > 0)$ (we use the suffix $M$ for ‘mixture’, rather than introduce another Greek letter) is the Laplace–Stieltjes transform of $U$. Comparing with (EC'), we see that all normal variance mixtures are elliptically contoured, with characteristic generator

$$\phi(s) = \phi_M(s/2),$$

Conversely, any elliptically contoured distribution whose characteristic generator is completely monotone (or, by Bernstein’s theorem, is a Laplace–Stieltjes transform) can arise in this way. This is essentially the content of Schoenberg’s theorem (see Bingham 1973). The possible $\phi$, or $\phi_M$, that can arise belong to

$$\Phi_\infty := \cap_{n=1}^\infty \Phi_n,$$

where

$$\Phi_n := \{ \phi : h(t^2 + \cdots + r^2) \text{ is an } n \text{-dimensional characteristic function} \}.$$

Then $\phi \in \Phi_\infty$ iff $\phi$ is of the form

$$\phi(x) = \int_0^\infty e^{-r^2} dG(r),$$

for some law $G$ on $(0, \infty)$ (that is under the change of variable $r^2 = u$, $\phi$ is completely monotone, as above).

**Infinite divisibility.** The question of infinite divisibility, or self-decomposability, of normal variance mixtures thus transfers, by (NVM), to $\phi_M$, or the mixing law $F$: the law of $X$ is infinitely divisible if $F$ is, etc. Now the infinitely divisible laws on $[0, \infty)$ are known: their Laplace transforms are of the form $\phi(s) = \exp(-h(s))$, where $h(0) = 0$ and $h'$ is completely monotone (see e.g. Feller 1971, XIII.7). That is, the infinitely divisible $\phi$ are

$$\phi(s) = \exp\left\{ -\int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-x^2}) d\mu(x) \right\},$$

where the Lévy measure $\mu$ satisfies $\int_0^\infty x d\mu(x) < \infty$. Infinite divisibility of normal variance mixtures was studied by Kelker (1971).

**Self-decomposability.** The further restriction to self-decomposability requires further that the Lévy measure be absolutely continuous, with density $v(x) = k(x)/x$ with $k(.)$ decreasing (Santo 1999, corollary 15.11).

**Simulation.** Given any decreasing $k$ on $\mathbb{R}$, integrable at the origin, we can form the Lévy measure $k(dx)/x$, and simulate random variables $U$ from it, using the method of Bondesson (1982) involving shot-noise processes. We can simulate $Z \sim \mathcal{N}_r((0, I)$ as a vector $(Z_1, \ldots, Z_r)$ of independent standard normal variates, and then simulate $X$ as $\mu + U^\top \Sigma Z$. We thus have a wealth of examples of self-decomposable normal variance mixtures to hand, one for each decreasing $k$, from which we can simulate at will.
6. The hyperbolic and NIG models

We now return to the discussion of the generalized hyperbolic distributions, \( GH = \text{GH}_{\gamma, \delta, \mu, \Sigma} \) in the framework of normal variance mixtures, using the GIG laws as mixing distributions (with \( \beta = 0 \), see section 2). By sections 3–5, the CF is

\[
\psi(t) = \exp(it^T \mu) \zeta(t^T \Sigma t)
\]

with \( \zeta \) as in the \( K_0 \) formula, and the laws \( GH \) are elliptically contoured, infinitely divisible and self-decomposable.

In the notation of section 2, we have \( \phi = \zeta \), \( F = \text{GIG} \). From section 5, the infinite divisibility and self-decomposability of GIG transfer to \( GH \): the generalized hyperbolic laws \( GH \) are infinitely divisible and self-decomposable. Being normal variance mixtures, their characteristic generators are completely monotone, and in particular are decreasing.

**Density generator.** Since \( X \mid (U = u) \sim N_c(\mu, u \Sigma) \), one has, writing \( Q := (x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu) \) as before,

\[
f_{X \mid U}(x \mid u) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} u^{-1} Q \right\}.
\]

So

\[
f_X(x) = \int_0^\infty f_{X \mid U}(x \mid u) du = \int_0^\infty f_{X \mid U}(x \mid u) f_U(u) du = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} \times \int_0^\infty u^{-\frac{D}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} u^{-1} Q \right\} \left\{ \frac{(\gamma/\delta)^\lambda}{2K_\lambda(\gamma/\delta)} \right\} du \times \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} 2K_\lambda(\gamma/\delta) \times \int_0^\infty u^{\frac{D}{2} - \frac{D}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 u + \frac{\delta^2 + Q}{u} \right\} \frac{(\delta^2 + Q)^{\frac{\lambda - 1}{2}}}{\Gamma(\lambda)} \right\} du.
\]

The integrand is the density of \( \text{GIG}_{\lambda, \gamma, \delta, \sqrt{\delta^2 + Q}} \) to within normalization, so the integral is \( 2 \left( \sqrt{\delta^2 + Q} \right)^{\lambda - 1} \times \left( \frac{\gamma^2}{\sqrt{\delta^2 + Q}} \right)^{\lambda - 1} \frac{K_{\lambda - 1/2}(\gamma \sqrt{\delta^2 + Q})}{\Gamma(\lambda - 1/2)} \).

\[
f_X(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2} |\Sigma|^{1/2}} 2K_\lambda(\gamma/\delta) \left( \frac{\gamma^2}{\sqrt{\delta^2 + Q}} \right)^{\lambda - 1} K_{\lambda - 1/2}(\gamma \sqrt{\delta^2 + Q})\frac{\lambda - 1/2}{\Gamma(\lambda - 1/2)} \times \frac{(\gamma/\delta)^\lambda}{2K_\lambda(\gamma/\delta)}.
\]

From (EC), \( f_X(x) = |\Sigma|^{-\frac{1}{2}} g(Q) \), with \( g \) the density generator. Comparing, the density generator of the generalized hyperbolic law \( GH = \text{GH}_{\gamma, \delta, \mu, \Sigma} \) is

\[
g(u) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2} K_\lambda(\gamma/\delta)} \left( \frac{\gamma^2}{\sqrt{\delta^2 + u}} \right)^{\lambda - 1} \frac{K_{\lambda - 1/2}(\gamma \sqrt{\delta^2 + u})}{\Gamma(\lambda - 1/2)}, \quad u > 0.
\]

Now the function \( \zeta \) above, being a Laplace transform, is completely monotone, so in particular is decreasing. To within constants, \( g \) has the same functional form as \( \zeta \) (with \( \lambda - \frac{1}{2} \) in place of \( \lambda \)), apart from interchange of

(i) \( K_{\lambda - 1/2} \) with \( K_{-(\lambda - 1/2)} \),

(ii) \( \gamma \) with \( \delta \).

Now (i) has no effect (recall \( K_{\nu} = K_{-\nu} \) from the integral representation) and (ii) amounts to a reparametrization. Thus \( g \) inherits the complete monotonicity of \( \zeta \): the density generator \( g \) of the generalized hyperbolic law \( GH \) is completely monotone, in particular is decreasing.

One can read off the decay rate of \( g \):

\[
K_\nu(x) \sim \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2x}} e^{-x} \quad (x \to \infty)
\]

(Watson 1944, section 3.71 (13)): thus all \( K_\nu \) decay like \( K_{\frac{1}{2}}(x) = \sqrt{\pi/(2x)} e^{-x} \), so

\[
g(u) \sim u^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}} \exp\left\{ -\gamma \sqrt{\delta^2 + u} \right\} \quad (u \to \infty).
\]

Since the argument \( u \) replaces the quadratic form \( Q = (x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu) \), this shows again that \( GH \) has log-linear tail-decay. This should be compared with the log-quadratic tail decay in the normal/Gaussian case, where \( g(u) = \text{const} \exp(-\frac{u}{2}) \).

**Quadratic surfaces.** We can now clearly see the two main qualitative features of the generalized hyperbolic distribution, which motivate its definition and place it in context.

(i) The density \( f(x) \), being a smooth and decreasing function of \( Q = (x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu) \), is a unimodal \( r \)-variate density with mode \( \mu \), and is elliptically contoured (infinitely divisible, self-decomposable).

(ii) The tail decay is dominated by the term \( \exp\left\{ -\gamma \sqrt{\delta^2 + Q} \right\} \).

Normalizing this term to obtain a density, the corresponding log-density

\[
y = \text{const} - \gamma \sqrt{\delta^2 + Q} \]

\[
y = \text{const} - \gamma \sqrt{\delta^2 + (x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu)}
\]

gives the lower sheet of a hyperboloid of two sheets, a quadric surface in \( \mathbb{R}^{r+1} \). This explains the name, and the interplay between the ‘elliptic’ and ‘hyperbolic’ aspects. For background on quadrics, see e.g. Kendall (1961, sections 34–38), Brannan et al (1999, section 1.4).

In the univariate case \( r = 1 \), the most symmetrical case gives

\[
f(x) = \text{const} \exp \left\{ -\xi \sqrt{1 + (x/\delta)^2} \right\},
\]

called the hyperbolic distribution \( \text{hyp}_{\xi, \delta} \) in Bingham and Kiesel (2001b).

**Asymptotic cone.** As \( x \to \infty \), \( y \sim -\gamma \sqrt{\delta^2} \). Thus \( y \) is asymptotic to the cone

\[
y = -\gamma \sqrt{(x - \mu)^T \Sigma^{-1} (x - \mu)}
\]

(a right circular cone, if we make the affine transformation to standardized variables). This is the analogue in \( (r + 1) \)-space of the two linear asymptotes that the log-density of the univariate hyperbolic distribution approaches.

**NIG distribution.** This is a relative of the univariate hyperbolic distribution, introduced by Barndorff-Nielsen (1998,
1997) and studied by Rydberg (1997). It is defined as the distribution of one coordinate of a (drifting) bivariate Brownian motion when the other coordinate first hits a linear barrier. It seems that the NIG and hyperbolic models are broadly similar, with NIG providing if anything a better empirical fit to data. Since our main emphasis is not specific to any parametric model, we refer to the sources above for further detail.

7. Conclusions

The problem addressed here is the modelling of stock-price and asset-return distributions in higher dimensions, motivated by questions of portfolio selection and risk management in finance. We propose a semi-parametric model, which uses elliptically contoured distributions, specifically normal variance mixtures with self-decomposable mixing distributions, with particular emphasis on the density generator $g$. For applications, we have to estimate two components, the parametric part $(\mu, \Sigma)$ and the non-parametric part $g$. For $(\mu, \Sigma)$ standard methods suffice; to estimate the density generator $g$ we rely on non-parametric function estimation, see e.g. Härdle (1990). It turns out that the tail decay of $g$ is an indicator of the likelihood of extreme events and thus the whole density generator $g$ is informative about risk and risk-management questions assuming that risk is measured by the portfolio VaR (which is coherent in the sense of Artzner et al (1999) for elliptically distributed risks). An application of the proposed technique, together with a detailed analysis of the econometric properties of the model, is contained in a forthcoming paper Bingham et al (2002).
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