arXiv:1408.1423v4 [math.PR] 4 Apr 2016

WEAK FUNCTIONAL ITÔ CALCULUS AND APPLICATIONS

DORIVAL LEÃO, ALBERTO OHASHI, AND ALEXANDRE B. SIMAS

Abstract. We introduce a variational theory for processes adapted to the multi-dimensional Brownian motion filtration. The theory provides a differential structure which describes the infinitesimal evolution of Wiener functionals at very small scales. The Markov property is replaced by a finite-dimensional approximation procedure based on controlled inter-arrival times and jumps of approximating martingales. The theory reveals that a large class of adapted processes follow a differential rule which is similar in nature to a fundamental theorem of calculus in the context of Wiener functionals. Null stochastic derivative term turns out to be a non-Markovian version of the classical second order parabolic operator and connections with theory of local-times and (p, q)-variation regularity are established. The framework extends the pathwise functional calculus and it opens the way to obtain variational principles for processes. Applications to semi-linear variational equations and stochastic variational inequalities are presented. In particular, we provide a feasible dynamic programming principle for fully non-Markovian/non-semimartingale optimal stopping problems.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Main Setup and contributions 3
2. Preliminaries 7
2.1. Notation 8
3. Weak differential structure of Wiener functionals 9
3.1. Good Approximating Sequences 12
3.2. Differential structure 14
3.3. Local description of the stochastic derivative 23
4. Weak Derivatives from General GAS 24
4.1. Stochastic infinitesimal generator 25
4.2. Local description of the stochastic infinitesimal generator 29
4.3. Semilinear variational equations and variational principles 30
4.4. Comparison with other approaches 33
5. Splitting the Stochastic Infinitesimal Generator: Functional Calculus and Local times 37
5.1. Splitting stochastic infinitesimal generators 38
5.2. Comparison with the pathwise functional Itô calculus 41
5.3. Local Time Representation for Path-Dependent Functionals 43
6. Application to Stochastic Optimal Control 46
6.1. Path-dependent optimal stopping 48
6.2. A non-Markovian and non-semimartingale example 59
7. Examples of weakly differentiable non-semimartingale functionals of the Brownian motion 60
7.1. Example 67
References 68

Date: April 5, 2016.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: C02; Secondary: G12.

Key words and phrases. Functional stochastic calculus, Feynman-Kac representations, optimal stopping time, variational inequalities, Young integral.

The authors would like to thank Francesco Russo, Evelina Shamarova, Marcelo Fragoso and Ernesto Mordecki for stimulating discussions and suggestions.

1. Introduction

A classical result in stochastic analysis is the unique decomposition of special semimartingales X into the following form

$$X(t) = X(0) + M(t) + V(t) \ a.s; \ 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where M is an $\mathbb{F}$-local martingale and V is an $\mathbb{F}$-predictable bounded variation process where $\mathbb{F} := \{\mathcal{F}_t; 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is a complete filtration satisfying the usual conditions. In some particular cases, one can identify the pair (M, V) in terms of an underlying differential structure. For instance, if $X(t) = f(t, Y(t)); t \geq 0$ is a smooth transformation of a semimartingale Y then the classical Itô formula allows us to retrieve (M, V) in terms of the first and second order derivative operator of f. In case Y is a Markov diffusion, then there is a well-known connection between X and parabolic PDEs via Kolmogorov equations. In general, backward SDEs (henceforth abbreviated by BSDEs) have deep connections with PDEs via nonlinear Feynman-Kac-type formulas (see e.g Pardoux and Peng [58]). Recently, there has been a considerable effort in trying to understand the infinitesimal evolution of processes beyond the Markovian case. The pioneering work seems to be Ahn [1] who considers path-dependent representations for semimartingales under Frechet differentiability. See also Mohammed [52] for a study of functional dependent stochastic differential equations.

More recently, Dupire [23] introduces the so-called horizontal (∇^h), vertical (∇^v) and second-order vertical derivative operators ($\nabla^{v,2}$) which describe pathwise smooth $\mathbb{F}$-adapted semimartigales which can be written in the form

$$F_t(Y_t) = F(Y_0) + \int_0^t \nabla^h F_s(Y_s) ds + \int_0^t \nabla^v F_s(Y_s) dY(s) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t tr \nabla^{v,2} F_s(Y_s) d[Y, Y](s) \tag{1.1}$$

where $F = \{F_t; t \geq 0\}$ is a family of non-anticipative mappings acting on $\Omega_t := C([0, t]; \mathbb{R}^p) := \{f : [0, t] \to \mathbb{R}^p \text{ continuous}\}; t \geq 0$, $Y_t := \{Y(r); 0 \leq r \leq t\}; t \geq 0$ and $[Y, Y]$ is the usual quadratic variation of an underlying semimartingale Y which generates the filtration $\mathbb{F}$. See also Cont and Fournié [10, 11] for a more systematic exposition. Buckdhan, Ma and Zhang [6] attempt to develop a weak differential structure in the Brownian filtration setting for a particular class of Itô processes. They apply these representations to study Taylor expansions for random fields. A similar notion is introduced by Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [27, 26] for a family of semimartingale measures under pathwise continuity assumption in $(\omega, t) \in \Omega_T \times [0, T]$. See also Peng and Yong [60] and Cont [12] for weaker concepts of functional calculus based on smooth approximations of the form (1.1).

By realizing a process as an infinite-dimensional variable, a Banach space-valued stochastic calculus via regularization is introduced in a series of works by Di Girolami and Russo (see e.g [21, 22]) which is similar in spirit to the functional calculus. Beyond the semimartingale case, Keller and Zhang [44] establish a calculus for path-dependent functionals driven by a rough path and Ohashi, Shamarova and Shamarov [57] study Itô-type formulas for path-dependent functionals of continuous semimartingales under (p, q)-variation regularity.

One of the main issues in path-dependent stochastic calculus is the development of path-dependent differential-type equations describing the evolution of adapted process. In this direction, to our best knowledge Peng [59] was the first who established the link between BSDEs with path-dependent terminal conditions and pathwise classical solutions of PDEs defined in terms of $(\nabla^h, \nabla^v, \nabla^{v,2})$, thus establishing a path-dependent-type Feynman-Kac formula. See also the recent works by Cosso and Russo [15] and Flandoli and Zanco [37] who address path-dependent PDEs (henceforth abbreviated by PPDE) in terms of Banach space-valued calculus.

Classical (strict) solutions of PPDEs rarely exists. In this direction, the study of suitable notions of viscosity-type solutions for PPDEs has been attracted a great interest. Ekren, Keller, Touzi and Zhang [25] and Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [27, 26] replace the classical minimum/maximum property, which appears in the standard definition of viscosity solution, with a sound optimal stopping problem under

nonlinear expectation. In this framework, fully nonlinear PPDEs solutions can be fairly constructed under some uniform continuity assumptions on terminal conditions. A different notion of semilinear PPDEs based on pointwise limits of strict solutions has been introduced by Cosso and Russo [14] based on the regularization approach. In short, PPDEs should be really interpreted as a parameterized (by $\omega \in \Omega_T$) family of PDEs rather than truly PDEs on path spaces. In this case, the existing notions of PPDEs look for purely pathwise differential representations under uniform regularity assumptions on terminal conditions.

In this paper, we present a novel approach for path-dependent stochastic calculus by considering a more probabilistic perspective based on suitable discrete approximations and energy estimates which yield an intrinsic differential calculus on space of processes. Our chief goal is to study differential properties of processes w.r.t noise under the Wiener measure. More precisely, based on a version of a fundamental theorem of calculus, we aim to study solutions of general stochastic decompositions driven by truly differential operators which describe the infinitesimal evolution of Wiener functionals w.r.t a multi-dimensional Brownian motion $B = \{B^i(t); t \geq 0, i = 1 \dots, p\}$ at very small scales.

1.1. **Main Setup and contributions.** In the present paper, we develop an intrinsic differential theory for adapted processes without relying on a priory regularity assumptions on their functional representations $F_t : \Omega_t \to \mathbb{R}$. The novelty of our approach is twofold: (i) We introduce a very weak version of stochastic functional calculus which accommodates a large class of functionals which is not covered by previous works. (ii) Our approach is based on a concrete finite-dimensional approximation procedure which is supposed to be a replacement of the Markov property in path-dependent problems.

The starting point of the theory is inspired by Leão and Ohashi [49]. In this article, we continue the analysis developed by [49]. We decompose a Brownian path into two main components: Inter-arrival times $\mathcal{J}^\epsilon := \{T_n^{\epsilon,i}; n \geq 0, 1 \leq i \leq p\}$ and jumps of approximating martingales controlled by $\epsilon > 0$. Based on these two components, we propose to consider a class of simple processes that we call *good approximating sequences* (for short GAS) of the form

$$X^\epsilon(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} X^\epsilon(T_n^\epsilon) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^\epsilon \leq t\}}; t \geq 0 \tag{1.2}$$

where X^ϵ is a functional of a stepwise constant martingale $A^\epsilon = \left(A^{\epsilon,1}, \dots, A^{\epsilon,p}\right)$ which generates a jumping filtration $\{\mathbb{F}^\epsilon; \epsilon > 0\}$ in the spirit of [43]. The random inter-arrival times $(T_n^\epsilon)_{n\geq 0}$ (composed by $\mathcal{J}^\epsilon$) is a refining sequence of hitting times which is known to be amenable to concrete Monte Carlo simulation schemes (see Burq and Jones [7]). Limiting processes of GAS are subject to a mild growth condition that we call *finite energy*.

In contrast to the common interpretation of an adapted process as a functional (or abstract limit of smooth functionals) acting on the infinite-dimensional spaces of paths $\Omega_t; t > 0$ (see e.g [23, 12, 11, 10, 14, 15, 16, 25, 27, 26, 60]), we construct concrete finite-dimensional approximations based on the spaces

$$\mathbb{S}^n := \oplus_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{R}_+^p \times \{-1, 0, 1\}^p\right); n \geq 1.$$

Conceptually, our construction can be regarded as a measure theoretic approach to the pathwise functional stochastic calculus, where test processes of the form (1.2) only depend on Borel functions $\mathbb{V}_i^\epsilon : \mathbb{S}^i \to \mathbb{R}$ (henceforth denominated by finite-dimensional approximating functions) realizing

$$X^\epsilon(T_n^\epsilon) = \mathbb{V}_n^\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_n^\epsilon); n \geq 1, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_n^\epsilon := \left(T_i^{\epsilon,j} \wedge T_n^\epsilon, \epsilon^{-1}\Delta A^{\epsilon,j}(T_i^{\epsilon,j} \wedge T_n^\epsilon); 1 \leq j \leq p; 1 \leq i \leq n\right); n \geq 1$. In this direction, the philosophy of our approach is the interpretation of an adapted process X as a limit of discrete-type differential forms

$$X^{\epsilon}(\cdot) = X^{\epsilon}(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \oint_0^{\cdot} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,j} X(s) dA^{\epsilon,j}(s) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^{\cdot} U^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,j} X(s) d\langle A^{\epsilon,j}, A^{\epsilon,j}\rangle(s) \tag{1.4}$$

where any GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^{\epsilon}; \epsilon > 0\}$ carries a canonical differential structure which is fully described by a pair of differential operators $(\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon}X, U^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon}X)$: The operator $\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon}X := (\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,1}X, \ldots, \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,p}X)$ represents the stochastic variation of X w.r.t Brownian motion, while $U^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon}X := (U^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,1}X, \ldots, U^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,p}X)$ represents the stochastic variation of X which is orthogonal in some sense to the Brownian motion.

We consider the approximation strategy described above as the most important aspect of our approach: At first, the asymptotic limit of differential forms (1.4) takes place under rather weak conditions and none pathwise regularity is required as opposed to some recent viscosity solution concepts for semilinear PPDEs (see [14, 16, 25, 64]) and Banach space-valued solutions (see [37]). Secondly, our approach yields a very concrete description of adapted processes based on a finite-dimensional approximation of the form (1.3) which is supposed to be a replacement of the Markov property by means of the information flow $\mathcal{A}_n^{\epsilon}; n \geq 1, \epsilon > 0$. This has great importance in the study of the infinitesimal evolution of non-Markovian systems arising in applications to the stochastic control theory, stochastic calculus of variations, numerical methods for stochastic processes, etc. Lastly, the above procedure gives rise to a version of a fundamental theorem of calculus for Wiener functionals

$$X = X(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int \mathcal{D}_j X dB^j + \mathcal{I}^{\perp} X \tag{1.5}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_j X = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,j} X; 1 \leq j \leq p$ in a suitable weak sense and $\mathcal{Y}$ is the canonical GAS for X (see (3.14)). The object $\mathcal{D}X := (\mathcal{D}_1 X, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_p X)$ is a differential operator which measures variation rate of X w.r.t Brownian motion at very small scales and $\mathcal{D}_j\big(\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X\big) = 0; 1 \leq j \leq p$. The components $(\mathcal{D}_j X, \mathcal{I}^{\perp}X); j = 1, \ldots, p$ which constitute formula (1.5) are real-valued adapted processes.

Adapted processes X admitting $\mathcal{D}X$ will be called weakly differentiable functionals. We show that this class is very large and it contains, in particular, Dirichlet processes adapted to the Brownian filtration. The null derivative component is given by

$$\mathcal{I}^{\perp} X(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \int_0^{\cdot} U^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,j} X(s) d\langle A^{\epsilon,j}, A^{\epsilon,j}\rangle(s) \tag{1.6}$$

in a suitable weak sense, where $\mathcal{Y}$ is the canonical GAS of X. The orthogonal operator $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X$ in (1.5) encodes different types of regularity of X w.r.t Brownian coordinate and generalizes the remainder term $\int_0^{\cdot} \nabla^h F_s(Y_s) ds + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\cdot} tr\nabla^{v,2} F_s(Y_s) d[Y,Y](s)$ responsible for the bounded variation component in the works [23, 10, 11, 12, 6, 60].

By writing $X = F(Y)$ in terms of an equivalence class X of functionals of the Brownian motion, $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X$ is a functional F^X of the Brownian local time ℓ

$$\mathcal{I}^{\perp} X(t) = F_t^X(\ell); t \geq 0.$$

For instance, under weak regularity condition in the sense of (p,q)-variation (see e.g Friz and Victoir [39] and Young [65]), X is weakly differentiable and $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X$ can be described as a two-parameter Young integral. The operator $X \mapsto \mathcal{I}^{\perp}X$ takes weakly differentiable processes into bounded variation processes in the semimartingale case. Under additional regularity conditions,

$$\mathcal{U}X = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,j} X$$

in a suitable weak sense, where $\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon}X = \left(\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,1}X,\dots,\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon,p}X\right)$ is the stepwise constant version of $U^{\mathcal{Y},\epsilon}X$ computed in terms of the canonical GAS and, in this case,

$$\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(t) = \int_0^t \mathcal{U}X(s)ds; 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

When the adapted process is a continuous semimartingale, then the underlying differential structure can be obtained by any GAS subject to growth conditions. Moreover, under strong path regularity assumptions, we can locally describe the pair $(\mathcal{D}X(t),\mathcal{U}X(t))$ around the Brownian coordinate $B(t)$ for a regular time $t \geq 0$. In addition, under pathwise functional ([23, 10, 11]) or Sobolev-type ([60, 6, 12]) regularity, $\mathcal{U}X$ can be described in terms of $(\nabla^h, \nabla^{v,2})$.

The realization of weakly differentiable processes as the asymptotic limit of differential equations of the form (1.4) opens the door to a deeper understanding of variational principles of Wiener functionals w.r.t the underlying Brownian noise, both from a theoretical and numerical perspective. In order to illustrate this point, let us briefly consider two examples treated in this article: BSDEs and one application to stochastic optimal control. Let us consider general backward stochastic equations of the following form

$$X(t) = \xi - \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_t^T \mathcal{D}_j X(s)dB^j(s) + \Big(\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(T) - \mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(t)\Big); 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{1.7}$$

where ξ is a given $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable. The stochastic backward problem (1.7) summarizes classical concepts of backward equations depending on the smoothness and desired properties on the null derivative component $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X$ we like to impose.

Semilinear variational equations. For instance, in the BSDE case, we look for a single X in such way that $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(\cdot) = \int_0^{\cdot} f(s,X(s),\mathcal{D}X(s))ds$. If we start from a solution of (1.7), then Theorem 4.1 yields the existence of a GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^{\epsilon}; \epsilon > 0\}$ for X satisfying energy-type estimates which provides convergent subsequences in such way that $\lim_{\eta\to 0^+} X^{\eta} = X, \lim_{\eta\to 0^+} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},\eta}X = \mathcal{D}X,\ \lim_{\eta\to 0^+} \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},\eta}X = \mathcal{U}X$ in suitable weak topologies. The fundamental theorem of calculus (1.5) and uniqueness of semimartingale decomposition yields

$$\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(\cdot) = \int_0^{\cdot} \mathcal{U}X(s)ds \tag{1.8}$$

and in this case, X is a solution of the following semi-linear equation

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{U}X(t) + f(t,X(t),\mathcal{D}X(t)) = 0, \quad 0 \leq t < T, \\ X(T) = \xi. \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

Solution of (1.9) is a variational interpretation of the BSDE. In Proposition 4.3, we show that

$$X \text{ is solution of (1.9)} \iff \mathcal{D}X \text{ minimizes energy in the sense of (4.21).}$$

Therefore, the control component $\mathcal{D}X$ which is explicitly computed as the stochastic derivative of X w.r.t Brownian component turns out to provide the minimal energy along all Itô processes satisfying a suitable final value problem (See Proposition 4.3).

The fact that abstract weakly differentiable Wiener functionals can be interpreted as asymptotic limits of differential forms (1.4) has great importance in concrete applications. In order to illustrate this remark, in Section 6 we make a complete study of a class of stochastic optimal control problems, namely the optimal stopping.

Application to path-dependent optimal stopping problems. The optimal stopping problem is well-posed under rather general assumptions on the obstacle X by using the concept of Snell envelope (see e.g [19]). However, in order to solve such control problem one has to characterize the value process and optimal stopping times. In the classical Markovian case, one has the well-known connection between optimal stopping and variational inequalities written in terms of semi-linear parabolic PDEs on Euclidean spaces (see e.g [63] and other references therein). Moreover, stopping regions can be readily obtained by approximation methods based on PDEs and Markov chains. The general non-Markovian/non-semimartingale case is much more delicate for two reasons:

- The intrinsic infinite-dimensionality of the problem due to the path-dependence prevents the use of standard PDE technique on finite-dimensional spaces.
- Probabilistic techniques are problematic due to the inability of representing the value process and optimal stopping times in a concrete way.

In Section 6, we study this problem in a rather general framework by using our notion of weak functional calculus. To our best knowledge, only few articles have been made some progress in non-Markovian optimal stopping problems. Chang, Pang and Yong [9] provide a backward stochastic partial variational inequality for optimal stopping induced by SDEs with random coefficients. Ekren [28] proves that the value functional defined via second order Reflected BSDE is the unique viscosity solution (in the sense of [25, 27, 26]) of a fully nonlinear variational inequality provided that the terminal variable and generator is uniformly continuous w.r.t the noise. Very recently, Fuhrman, Pham and Zeni [41] present an alternative representation for valued processes in terms of a modified BSDE.

We apply weak functional calculus developed in the first part of this article to establish feasible finite-dimensional approximations for value processes and optimal stopping for fully path-dependent optimal stopping problems. At first, we prove the Snell envelope S of an arbitrary non-negative bounded and continuous adapted process X is the unique stochastic weak solution (in a sense to be defined in Section 6) of

$$\begin{cases} max\{\mathcal{U}S, X - S\} = 0 \\ S(T) = X(T) \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

More importantly, starting with a concrete GAS $\{X^\epsilon; \epsilon > 0\}$ for the obstacle X, we are able to construct finite-dimensional approximating value functions $\mathbb{V}_i^\epsilon : \mathbb{S}^i \to \mathbb{R}$ which solve a feasible dynamic programming algorithm over a finite and increasing (as $\epsilon \to 0^+$) number of steps $en(\epsilon, T)$ for $0 \leq i \leq en(\epsilon, T)$. Here, $en(\epsilon, T)$ is proportional to the expected number of hitting times $(T_n^\epsilon)_{n\geq 0}$ on the interval $[0, T]$ and $\mathbb{S}^0 := \{0\}$. The methodology yields the approximation of the optimal stopping for fully path-dependent problems.

We then provide a full characterization of a generic optimal stopping problem which is similar in nature to the classical Markovian case. We stress the differential calculus introduced in this paper plays a major role in solving and numerically evaluating the path-dependent control problem. In particular, the asymptotic results of this article allow us to state that the dimension reduction $\{\mathbb{V}_n^\epsilon; n = 0, \ldots, en(\epsilon, T)\}$ is consistent to the continuous-time original control problem as $\epsilon \to 0^+$.

Assuming the Brownian filtration as the reference information, we demonstrate that the pathwise functional Itô calculus introduced by Dupire [23], Cont and Fournie [10, 11] and the functional Sobolev-type structure proposed by Peng and Song [60], Buckdhan, Ma and Zhang [6], Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [25] and Cont [12] are particular cases of our approach. Two typical classes of Wiener functionals which are covered by the present work and are not covered by the previous papers are: Square-integrable semimartingales without absolutely continuous components and, more generally, processes which may heavily depend on trajectories of Brownian local-times $(x, t) \mapsto \ell^x(t)$ such as

$$\int_{-\infty}^{B(t)} H((\ell^x(t))_{x\in\mathbb{R}}, y)dy,$$

where $(y,t) \mapsto H((\ell^x(t))_{x\in\mathbb{R}}, y)$ is a rough functional with finite (p,q)-variation norm on $\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]$ in the sense of [39, 65]. Our version of fundamental theorem of calculus (1.5) allows us to characterize such cases by means of limits of up-downcrossings of approximating random walks and their associated functionals under pathwise finite (p,q)-variation regularity.

This work is organized as follows. The next section introduces some necessary notations and we present the basic underlying discrete structure of this article. In Section 3, abstract differential representations for adapted processes are provided. In Section 4, we study stochastic infinitesimal generators. Section 5 presents the framework from a more functional perspective. In Section 6, we illustrate the theory with an application to stochastic optimal control. Section 7 present an example of a nontrivial nonsemimartingale process which is weakly differentiable.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout this article, we are going to fix a p-dimensional Brownian motion $B = \{B^1, \dots, B^p\}$ on the usual stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathbb{F}, \mathbb{P})$, where Ω is the space $C([0,+\infty);\mathbb{R}^p) := \{f : [0,+\infty) \to \mathbb{R}^p \text{ continuous}\}$, $\mathbb{P}$ is the Wiener measure on Ω such that $\mathbb{P}\{B(0)=0\} = 1$ and $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is the usual $\mathbb{P}$-augmentation of the natural filtration generated by the Brownian motion. In the sequel, we briefly recall the random skeleton introduced by Leão and Ohashi [49] in the one-dimensional case. The weak functional stochastic calculus developed in this paper will be constructed from this skeleton. We refer the reader to [49] for more details and all unexplained arguments.

For a fixed positive constant $\epsilon > 0$ and for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, we define $T_0^{\epsilon,j} := 0$ a.s. and we set

$$T_n^{\epsilon,j} := \inf\{T_{n-1}^{\epsilon,j} < t < \infty; |B^j(t) - B^j(T_{n-1}^{\epsilon,j})| = \varepsilon\}, \quad n \geq 1. \tag{2.1}$$

For each $j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, the family $(T_n^{\epsilon,j})_{n\geq 0}$ is a sequence of $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times where the increments $\{T_n^{\epsilon,j} - T_{n-1}^{\epsilon,j}; n \geq 1\}$ is an i.i.d sequence with the same distribution as $T_1^{\epsilon,j}$. For each $j \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, $T_1^{\epsilon,j} < \infty$ a.s for every $\epsilon > 0$ so an iterated application of the strong Markov property yields $\cap_{j=1}^p \cap_{n,k\geq 1} \{T_n^{\epsilon_k,j} < \infty\}$ has full probability for every sequence $\epsilon_k \downarrow 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

From this family of stopping times, we define $A^\epsilon := (A^{\epsilon,1}, \dots, A^{\epsilon,p})$ as the p-dimensional step process whose components are given by

$$A^{\epsilon,j}(t) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \epsilon\ \eta_n^{\epsilon,j} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{\epsilon,j} \leq t\}};\ t \geq 0, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\eta_n^{\epsilon,j} := \begin{cases} 1; & \text{if } B^j(T_n^{\epsilon,j}) - B^j(T_{n-1}^{\epsilon,j}) > 0 \\ -1; & \text{if } B^j(T_n^{\epsilon,j}) - B^j(T_{n-1}^{\epsilon,j}) < 0 \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

for $\epsilon, n \geq 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, p$. Let $\mathbb{F}^{\epsilon,j} := \{\mathcal{F}_t^{\epsilon,j}; t \geq 0\}$ be the natural filtration generated by $\{A^{\epsilon,j}(t); t \geq 0\}$. One should notice that $\mathbb{F}^{\epsilon,j}$ is a jumping filtration (see [43]) in the sense that

$$\mathcal{F}_t^{\epsilon,j} = \Big\{ \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{\infty} D_\ell \cap \{T_\ell^{\epsilon,j} \leq t < T_{\ell+1}^{\epsilon,j}\}; D_\ell \in \mathcal{F}_{T_\ell^{\epsilon,j}}^{\epsilon,j} \text{ for } \ell \geq 0 \Big\},\ t \geq 0,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_0^{\epsilon,j} = \{\Omega, \emptyset\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{T_m^{\epsilon,j}}^{\epsilon,j} = \sigma(T_1^{\epsilon,j}, \dots, T_m^{\epsilon,j}, \eta_1^{\epsilon,j}, \dots, \eta_m^{\epsilon,j})$ for $m \geq 1$ and $j = 1, \dots, p$. Then

$$\mathcal{F}_{T_m^{\epsilon,j}}^{\epsilon,j} = \mathcal{F}_t^{\epsilon,j} \text{ a.s on } \big\{T_m^{\epsilon,j} \leq t < T_{m+1}^{\epsilon,j}\big\},$$

for each $m \geq 0$ and $j = 1, \dots, p$. With a slight abuse of notation, we write $\mathcal{F}_t^{\epsilon,j}$ to denote its $\mathbb{P}$-augmentation satisfying the usual conditions.

Let $\mathcal{F}_{T_n^{\epsilon,j}-}^{\epsilon,j} := \mathcal{F}_{T_{n-1}^{\epsilon,j}}^{\epsilon,j} \vee \sigma(T_n^{\epsilon,j})$. By applying strong Markov property, we see that

$$\mathbb{E}[B^j(T_n^{\epsilon,j}) - B^j(T_{n-1}^{\epsilon,j})|\mathcal{F}^{\epsilon,j}_{T_n^{\epsilon,j}-}] = 0 \ a.s$$

for each $\epsilon, n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq p$. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|A^{\epsilon,j}(s)|^2 < \infty$ for every $0 < T < \infty$. Then, $A^{\epsilon,j}$ is an $\mathbb{F}^{\epsilon,j}$-square-integrable martingale over compact sets for every $\epsilon \geq 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq p$.

The multi-dimensional filtration generated by A^ϵ is naturally characterized as follows. Let $\mathbb{F}^\epsilon := \{\mathcal{F}_t^\epsilon; 0 \leq t < \infty\}$ be the product filtration given by $\mathcal{F}_t^\epsilon := \mathcal{F}_t^{\epsilon,1} \otimes \mathcal{F}_t^{\epsilon,2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{F}_t^{\epsilon,p}$ for $t \geq 0$. Let $\mathcal{T}^\epsilon := \{T_m^\epsilon; m \geq 0\}$ be the order statistics obtained from the family of random variables $\{T_\ell^{\epsilon,j}; \ell \geq 0; j = 1, \ldots, p\}$. That is, we set $T_0^\epsilon := 0$,

$$T_1^\epsilon := \inf_{1\leq j\leq p}\Big\{T_1^{\epsilon,j}\Big\}, \quad T_n^\epsilon := \inf_{\substack{1\leq j\leq p\\ m\geq 1}}\Big\{T_m^{\epsilon,j}; T_m^{\epsilon,j} \geq T_{n-1}^\epsilon\Big\}$$

for $n \geq 1$. In this case, $\mathcal{T}^\epsilon$ is the partition generated by all stopping times defined in (2.1). The finite-dimensional distribution of B^j is absolutely continuous for each $j = 1, \ldots, p$ and therefore the elements of $\mathcal{T}^\epsilon$ are almost surely distinct for every $\epsilon > 0$.

Let us present the notation that will be used throughout this article. At first, in order to keep notation simple, we are going to work with a sequence $\epsilon_k \downarrow 0$ as $k \to \infty$. More precisely, we are going to fix $\varepsilon_k = 2^{-k}; k \geq 1$. With a slight abuse of notation, we write

$$\mathbb{F}^k := (\mathcal{F}_t^k)_{t\geq 0} := (\mathcal{F}_t^{\epsilon_k})_{t\geq 0}, \ A^k(t) := A^{\epsilon_k}(t), \ T_n^{k,j} := T_n^{\epsilon_k,j}; \ T_n^k := T_n^{\epsilon_k},$$

for $n \geq 0, t \geq 0$ and $1 \leq j \leq p$.

Remark 2.1. *We stress that all results of this article hold true for a generic sequence $\{\varepsilon_k; k \geq 1\}$ such that $\varepsilon_k \downarrow 0$ as $k \to \infty$. The reason for this invariance is essentially because for any ε_k, the increments of the stopping times $T_n^{k,j} - T_{n-1}^{k,j}$ constitute an i.i.d sequence of random variables with mean $\varepsilon_k^2; k \geq 1$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, p$. Moreover, the strong Markov property of the Brownian motion yields the independence between $T_n^{k,j} - T_{n-1}^{k,j}$ and $\mathcal{F}^j_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, p$ and $k, n \geq 1$.*

2.1. **Notation.** In the remainder of this paper, we make use of the following notation on stochastic processes: $[\cdot,\cdot]$ and $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denote the usual quadratic variation and the predictable bracket between semimartingales, respectively. The $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable (optional) projections will be denoted by ${}^{p,k}(\cdot)$ (${}^{o,k}(\cdot)$) while $\mathbb{F}^k$-dual predictable projections will be denoted by $(\cdot)^{p,k}$. The $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable sigma algebra on $\Omega \times [0, +\infty)$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}^k$. Inequalities between random variables are understood in the $\mathbb{P}$-a.s sense. Inequalities between processes are understood up to evanescent sets, otherwise, it will be up to $Leb \times \mathbb{P}$-null sets, where Leb is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$. If V is a Borel set, then we denote $\mathbb{B}(V)$ as the Borel sigma algebra of V.

The usual jump of a process is denoted by $\Delta Y(t) := Y(t) - Y(t-)$ where $Y(t-)$ is the left-hand limit of a càdlàg process Y. Moreover, for any two stopping times S and J, we denote the stochastic intervals $[[S, J[[:= \{(\omega, t); S(\omega) \leq t < J(\omega)\}$, $[[S, S]] := \{(\omega, t); S(\omega) = t\}$ and so on. For a given $x \geq 0$, $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer which is greater or equal to x.

Frequently, we need to stress that we are working with a functional representation in the spirit of functional calculus (see e.g [23, 10]). We denote $D([0, t]; \mathbb{R}^p)$ by the linear space of $\mathbb{R}^p$-valued càdlàg paths on $[0, t]$ and we set $\Lambda := \cup_{t\geq 0} D([0, t]; \mathbb{R}^p)$. Similarly, we denote by $C([0, t]; \mathbb{R}^p)$ the linear space of continuous paths on $[0, t]$ and we set $\hat{\Lambda} := \cup_{t\geq 0} C([0, t]; \mathbb{R}^p)$. We also denote

$$\mathbb{S}^n := \oplus_{i=1}^n \big(\mathbb{R}_+^p \times \{-1, 0, 1\}^p\big); n \geq 1.$$

In order to make clear the information encoded by a path $x \in D([0, t]; \mathbb{R}^p)$ up to a given time $0 \leq r \leq t$, we denote $x_r := \{x(s) : 0 \leq s \leq r\}$ and the value of x at time $0 \leq u \leq t$ is denoted by $x(u)$. This notation is naturally extended to processes. We denote

$$N^{k,j}(t) := max\{n; T_n^{k,j} \leq t\}, \ \tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t) := max\{T_n^{k,j}; T_n^{k,j} \leq t\}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq p, t \geq 0$. To keep notation simple, in the one-dimensional case, we set $N^k(t) := N^{k,1}(t)$ and $\tilde{\eta}^k(t) := \tilde{\eta}^{k,1}(t); t \geq 0$.

3. Weak differential structure of Wiener functionals

In this section, we present the basic structure of the differential theory developed in this article. At first, we provide some basic properties of the filtration $\mathbb{F}^k$ and the random partition $(T_n^k)_{n,k\geq 1}$.

Lemma 3.1. *For each $k \geq 1$, $(T_n^k)_{n\geq 0}$ is a sequence of $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping times such that $T_n^k < \infty$ a.s for every $k, n \geq 1$ and $T_n^k \uparrow +\infty$ a.s as $n \to \infty$. Moreover, the filtration $\mathbb{F}^k$ satisfies*

$$\mathcal{F}_t^k \cap \{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\} = \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k \cap \{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\} \ a.s; t \geq 0 \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k = \sigma(A^{k,j}(s \wedge T_n^k); s \geq 0, 1 \leq j \leq p)$ for each $n \geq 0$. Moreover, for every $0 < T < \infty$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{F}^k = \mathbb{F} \quad \textit{weakly over } [0,T] \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \left\|B^j(t) - A^{k,j}(t)\right\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon_k, \quad k \geq 1, \ j = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the usual norm on the space $L^\infty(\mathbb{P})$.

Proof. We fix $k \geq 1$. At first, since $T_n^{k,j} < \infty$ a.s for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $n \geq 1$, then it is clear that $T_n^k < \infty$ a.s for every $n \geq 1$. We will show that T_n^k is a sequence of $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping times by using induction over n. It is clear that T_1^k is an $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping time. Suppose now that T_{n-1}^k is an $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping time. For a given $t \geq 0$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \{T_n^k > t\} &= \left[\{T_n^k > t\} \cap \{T_{n-1}^k > t\}\right] \cup \left[\{T_n^k > t\} \cap \{T_{n-1}^k \leq t\}\right] \\ &= \{T_{n-1}^k > t\} \cup \left[\{T_n^k > t\} \cap \{T_{n-1}^k \leq t\}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

The induction assumption yields $\{T_{n-1}^k > t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t^k$. We now show that $\{T_n^k > t\} \cap \{T_{n-1}^k \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t^k$. Note that

$$\{T_n^k > t\} \cap \{T_{n-1}^k \leq t\} = \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{I}_{n-1}} \left[\bigcap_{(j,m)\in I} \{T_m^{k,j} \leq t\} \cap \bigcap_{(j,m)\in I^c} \{T_m^{k,j} > t\}\right],$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{n-1} = \{I \subset \{1, \ldots, p\} \times \mathbb{N} \text{ with } \#I = n-1; \text{ if } (j,m) \in I, \text{ then, } \forall \tilde{m} \leq m, (j,\tilde{m}) \in I\}$. Since each $\{T_m^{k,j} \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t^k$ and each $\{T_m^{k,j} > t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t^k$, it is clear that $\{T_n^k > t\} \cap \{T_{n-1}^k \leq t\} \in \mathcal{F}_t^k$, and thus, T_n^k is a $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping time.

Let us now fix $t \geq 0$. By the very definition, $A^{k,j}(s \wedge t) = A^{k,j}(s \wedge T_n^k)$ on $\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}$ for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $s \geq 0$ and $n \geq 0$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{F}_t^k = \bigotimes_{j=1}^p \mathcal{F}_t^{k,j} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^p \sigma(A^{k,j}(s \wedge t); s \geq 0)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_t^k \cap \{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\} &= \bigotimes_{j=1}^p \sigma(A^{k,j}(s \wedge t); s \geq 0) \cap \{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\} \\ &= \bigotimes_{j=1}^p \sigma(A^{k,j}(s \wedge T_n^k); s \geq 0) \cap \{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\} \ a.s \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

We set $\mathcal{G}_n^k := \sigma(A^{k,j}(s \wedge T_n^k); s \geq 0; 1 \leq j \leq p)$. By construction T_n^k is $\mathcal{G}_n^k$-measurable for every $n \geq 1$ and

$$\mathcal{F}_t^k = \Big\{ \bigcup_{\ell=0}^{\infty} D_\ell \cap \{T_\ell^k \leq t < T_{\ell+1}^k\}; D_\ell \in \mathcal{G}_\ell^k \text{ for } \ell \geq 0 \Big\},\ t \geq 0.$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{F}^k$ is a filtration of discrete type (see e.g [43]). By Cor. 5.57 in [42], we conclude $\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k = \mathcal{G}_n^k$ for each $n \geq 0$ and (3.4) concludes (3.1). The estimate (3.3) is given in Lemma 2.1 in [49]. It remains to check (3.2). Let $A = A_1 \times \ldots \times A_p \in \mathcal{F}_T = \mathcal{F}_T^1 \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathcal{F}_T^p$. By using the tower property and the definition of the product filtration, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_A|\mathcal{F}_t^k] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{A_1}|\mathcal{F}_t^{k,1}] \times \ldots \times \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{A_p}|\mathcal{F}_t^{k,p}]; 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

The one-dimensional case treated in Lemma 2.2 in [49] and the fact that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_A|\mathcal{F}_\cdot]$ is a continuous process yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_A|\mathcal{F}_\cdot^k] \to \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{A_1}|\mathcal{F}_\cdot^1] \times \ldots \times \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{A_p}|\mathcal{F}_\cdot^p] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_A|\mathcal{F}_\cdot] \tag{3.5}$$

in probability as $k \to \infty$ in the Skorohod metric, i.e., uniformly in probability. By a standard monotone class argument, the limit (3.5) holds for every $A \in \mathcal{F}_T$. This shows that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{F}^k = \mathbb{F}$ weakly (see e.g [13]). Lastly, the statement for each $k \geq 1$, $T_n^k \uparrow +\infty$ a.s as $n \to +\infty$ is just a simple consequence of the strong Markov property of the Brownian motion. □

The following elementary remark is very useful for the approach taken in this work.

Remark 3.1. *From Lemma 3.1 and the strong Markov property of the p-dimensional Brownian motion along the augmented filtration $\mathbb{F}$, we recall that $B(\cdot + T_{n-1}^k) - B(T_{n-1}^k)$ is a p-dimensional Brownian motion which is independent from $\mathcal{F}_{T_{n-1}^k}$ for each $n, k \geq 1$. In particular,*

$$\mathcal{F}_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}} \text{ is independent from } (\eta_n^{k,j}, T_n^{k,j} - T_{n-1}^{k,j})$$

for each $k, n \geq 1$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$.

The next property shows that $\{T_n^k; n \geq 1\}$ constitutes a refining random partition over compact sets.

Lemma 3.2. *For any positive constant $0 < T < \infty$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \max_{1\leq j\leq d} \max_{n\geq 1} |T_n^{k,j} - T_{n-1}^{k,j}| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k,j} \leq T\}} \to 0$$

as $k \to \infty$.

Proof. Let us denote $\Delta T_n^{k,j} := T_n^{k,j} - T_{n-1}^{k,j}; n, k \geq 1, 1 \leq j \leq p$ and we fix $0 < T < \infty$. It is sufficient to check $\mathbb{E} \max_{n\geq 1} |\Delta T_n^{k,j}| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k,j} \leq T\}} \to 0$ for a given $j = 1, \ldots, p$. Let $\{\tau_i; i \geq 1\}$ be an i.i.d sequence with the same law of $\tau := \inf\{t > 0; |W(t)| = 1\}$ for a real-valued Brownian motion W. We know that $\Delta T_n^{k,j} = 2^{-2k}\tau_n$ (in law); $n \geq 1$. In the sequel, we write $\vee_{i=1}^m a_i := \max\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$ for $(a_i)_{i=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}^m; m \geq 1$. By noting that $\Delta T_i^{k,j}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, are independent and that τ_i, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ are also independent, we see that their joint law also coincides. Thus, for a given $k \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Big[\vee_{i=1}^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil} \Delta T_i^{k,j} \Big] &= \mathbb{E}\Big[\vee_{i=1}^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil} 2^{-2k}\tau_i \Big] \\ &= 2^{-2k} \int_0^\infty x \lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil f_\tau(x)(F_\tau(x))^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil - 1} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where $n f_\tau(x)(F_\tau(x))^{n-1}$ is the density of the random variable $\vee_{i=1}^n \tau_i; n \geq 1$, f_τ is the density of τ and F_τ is the associated distribution function. We notice that $\lim_{k\to\infty} 2^{-2k}\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil = T$. We claim that

$$\int_0^\infty x f_\tau(x)(F_\tau(x))^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil-1}dx \to 0 \tag{3.6}$$

as $k\to\infty$. Indeed, it is known (see Lemma 3 in [7]) that for any $\epsilon>0$, we have $f_\tau(x)=o(e^{-(\gamma-\epsilon)x})$ as $x\to\infty$ where $\gamma=\frac{\pi^2}{8}$. So, fix some positive $\epsilon<\gamma$ and for a given $M>0$, we split

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty x f_\tau(x)(F_\tau(x))^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil-1}dx &= \int_0^M x f_\tau(x)(F_\tau(x))^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil-1}dx\\ &+ \int_M^{+\infty} x f_\tau(x)(F_\tau(x))^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil-1}dx =: I_M^{k,1}+I_M^{k,2}.\end{aligned}$$

By noticing that $F_\tau(x)\le 1$ for every $x\ge 0$ and the right tail asymptotics of f_τ, there exists two constants C and M_0 such that

$$I_M^{k,2}\le C\int_M^\infty y e^{-(\gamma-\epsilon)y}(F_\tau(y))^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil-1}dy \le C\int_M^\infty y e^{-(\gamma-\epsilon)y}dy \tag{3.7}$$

for every $M\ge M_0$ and $k\ge 1$. Since, $\int_0^\infty y e^{-(\gamma-\epsilon)y}dy<\infty$, then from (3.7), for a given $\eta>0$, there exists M_0' such that if $M\ge M_0'$ then $I_M^{k,2}<\frac{\eta}{2}$ uniformly in $k\ge 1$. For a given $M\ge M_0'$, we notice that $F_\tau(x)<1\ \forall x\in[0,M]$ so we shall take $k\ge 1$ large enough so that $I_M^{k,1}<\frac{\eta}{2}$. This shows that (3.6) holds. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\vee_{i=1}^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}\Delta T_i^{k,j}\Big]=2^{-2k}\int_0^\infty x\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil f_\tau(x)(F_\tau(x))^{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil-1}dx\to 0$$

as $k\to\infty$. We now write

$$\vee_{n=1}^{N^{k,j}(T)}\Delta T_n^{k,j}=\Big(\vee_{n=1}^{N^{k,j}(T)}\Delta T_n^{k,j}\Big)\mathbb{1}_{\{N^{k,j}(T)<2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil\}}+\Big(\vee_{n=1}^{N^{k,j}(T)}\Delta T_n^{k,j}\Big)\mathbb{1}_{\{N^{k,j}(T)\ge 2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil\}}=:J_1^k+J_2^k.$$

The previous step of the proof yields

$$\mathbb{E}J_1^k\le\mathbb{E}\vee_{n=1}^{2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}\Delta T_n^{k,j}\to 0 \tag{3.8}$$

as $k\to\infty$. Lastly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}J_2^k &= \Big[\Big(\vee_{n=1}^{2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}\Delta T_n^{k,j}\Big)\vee\Big(\vee_{i=2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}^{N^{k,j}(T)}\Delta T_i^{k,j}\Big)\Big]\mathbb{1}_{\{N^{k,j}(T)\ge 2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil\}}\\ &\le \Big(\vee_{n=1}^{2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}\Delta T_n^{k,j}\Big)\vee\Big(\vee_{i=2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}^{N^{k,j}(T)}\Delta T_i^{k,j}\Big)\mathbb{1}_{\{N^{k,j}(T)\ge 2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil\}}\\ &\le \vee_{n=1}^{2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}\Delta T_n^{k,j}+T\mathbb{1}_{\{N^{k,j}(T)\ge 2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil\}} \qquad (3.9)\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6.12 in [62], we know that $\lim_{k\to\infty}[A^{k,j},A^{k,j}]_T=T\ a.s$ and hence,

$$\mathbb{P}\{N^{k,j}(T)\ge 2\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil\}=\mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{N^{k,j}(T)}{\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}\ge 2\right\}=\mathbb{P}\left\{\frac{[A^{k,j},A^{k,j}]_T}{2^{-2k}\lceil 2^{2k}T\rceil}\ge 2\right\}\to 0 \tag{3.10}$$

as $k\to\infty$. Summing up (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10), we conclude the proof. □

Throughout this paper, we employ the following terminology.

Definition 3.1. *We say that a real-valued process X is a* ***Wiener functional*** *if it has càdlàg paths, it is adapted w.r.t to the Brownian filtration and $\mathbb{E}|X(T_n^k)| < \infty$ for every $k, n \geq 1$.*

The asymptotic limits of this article will be based on the weak topology $\sigma(\mathbf{B}^p, \mathrm{M}^q)$ of the space $\mathbf{B}^p(\mathbb{F})$ constituted of Wiener functionals X such that

$$\mathbb{E}|X^*|^p < \infty, \tag{3.11}$$

where $X^* := \sup_{t\geq 0} |X(t)|$ and $1 \leq p, q < \infty$ with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. Of course, $\mathrm{B}^p(\mathbb{F})$ endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{B}^p}$ is a Banach space, where the subspace $\mathrm{H}^p(\mathbb{F})$ of the $\mathbb{F}$ - martingales starting from zero is closed. Recall that the topological dual $\mathrm{M}^q(\mathbb{F})$ of $\mathrm{B}^p(\mathbb{F})$ is the space of processes $A = (A^{pr}, A^{pd})$ such that

(i) A^{pr} and A^{pd} are right-continuous of bounded variation such that A^{pr} is $\mathbb{F}$ - predictable with $A_0^{pr} = 0$ and A^{pd} is $\mathbb{F}$ - optional and purely discontinuous.

(ii) $Var(A^{pd}) + Var(A^{pr}) \in L^q$; $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$,

where $Var(\cdot)$ denotes the total variation of a bounded variation process over the interval $[0, +\infty)$. The space $\mathrm{M}^q(\mathbb{F})$ has the strong topology given by

$$\|A\|_{M^q} := \|Var(A^{pr})\|_{L^q} + \|Var(A^{pd})\|_{L^q}.$$

The duality pair is given by

$$(A, X) := \mathbb{E}\int_0^{+\infty} X(s-)dA^{pr}(s) + \mathbb{E}\int_0^{+\infty} X(s)dA^{pd}(s); \quad X \in \mathrm{B}^p(\mathbb{F}),$$

where the following estimate holds

$$|(A, X)| \leq \|A\|_{M^q}\|X\|_{\mathrm{B}^p},$$

for every $A \in \mathrm{M}^q(\mathbb{F})$, $X \in \mathrm{B}^p(\mathbb{F})$ such that $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. We denote $\sigma(\mathrm{B}^p, \mathrm{M}^q)$ the weak topology of $\mathrm{B}^p(\mathbb{F})$. We refer the reader to e.g [19, 49] for more details on this topology. We also denote $\mathbf{H}^p(\mathbb{F})$ as the linear space of p-integrable $\mathbb{F}$-martingales starting at zero. We will see that the $\sigma(\mathbf{B}^p, \mathrm{M}^q)$-topology will be quite natural for the asymptotic limits of this article.

3.1. **Good Approximating Sequences.** The starting point of our construction towards a weak differential calculus is the study of the following class of processes.

Definition 3.2. *A family $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ in $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ is called a* ***good approximating sequence*** *for a Wiener functional X if for each $k \geq 1$, X^k is an $\mathbb{F}^k$-adapted process with càdlàg paths admitting a representation*

$$X^k(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} X^k(T_n^k)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}}; \quad t \geq 0, \tag{3.12}$$

and $\lim_{k\to\infty} X^k = X$ weakly on $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$.

By the Doob-Dynkin's theorem, for a given initial condition $X^k(0) \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists a sequence of functions $\mathbb{V}_n^k : \mathbb{S}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ which fully describes a given GAS $\{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ as follows

$$\mathbb{V}_n^k(\mathcal{A}_n^k) = X^k(T_n^k); n \geq 1 \tag{3.13}$$

where $\mathcal{A}_n^k := \big(T_i^{k,j} \wedge T_n^k, 2^k \Delta A^{k,j}(T_i^{k,j} \wedge T_n^k); 1 \leq j \leq p; 1 \leq i \leq n\big); n \geq 1$.

Remark 3.2. *A large part of this paper is devoted to show that the analysis of a GAS w.r.t a Wiener functional X is sufficient to recover all the infinitesimal evolution of X w.r.t Brownian motion as $k \to \infty$. Since a GAS is completely characterized by $\{X^k(T_n^k); n, k \geq 1\}$ in (3.13), then this procedure can be viewed as a finite-dimensional approximation for a path-dependent functional where the noise spaces $C([0,t];\mathbb{R}^p); t > 0$ are replaced by the finite-dimensional spaces $\mathbb{S}^i; i \geq 1$. See Theorem 6.1 for a concrete application of this philosophy in a stochastic optimal control problem.*

Throughout this article, the analysis will be performed on a fixed finite terminal time $0 < T < \infty$ and we assume that all Wiener functionals belong to the space $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ over the compact set $[0,T]$. By routine localization arguments, all results can be translated without this integrability assumption. For simplicity of notation, the subspace topology over the set of Wiener functionals X defined on $[0,T]$ such that $\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|X(t)|^p < \infty$ will still be denoted by $\mathbf{B}^p(\mathbb{F})$.

There are several examples of good approximating sequences. In order to shorten notation, in the remainder of this article we abbreviate good approximating sequence by GAS.

Canonical Embedding. One example of GAS is given by the following embedding: If X is a Wiener functional then

$$\delta^k X(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\Big[X(T_n^k)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\Big]\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{3.14}$$

This GAS was studied by [49]. In [4], concrete numerical schemes are constructed in the pure martingale case.

Lemma 3.3. *If $X \in \boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ has continuous paths, then $\delta^k X \to X$ uniformly in probability over $[0,T]$ as $k \to \infty$. Moreover, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \delta^k X = X$ weakly in $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$.*

Proof. Let us denote $X^k := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} X(T_n^k)\mathbb{1}_{[[T_n^k, T_{n+1}^k[[}$. Triangle inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta^k X(t) - X(t)| &\leq |\delta^k X(t) - X^k(t)| + |X^k(t) - X(t)| \leq \sup_{n\geq 1}\big|\mathbb{E}[X(T_n^k)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] - X(T_n^k)|\big|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq T\}} \\ &+ \sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|X^k(t) - X(t)| =: J_1^k + J_2^k; 0 \leq t \leq T. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

From (3.2) and Th. 1 in [13], we have $\lim_{k\to\infty} J_1^k = 0$ in probability. By the very definition, for a given $\epsilon > 0$

$$\{\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|X^k(t) - X(t)| > \epsilon\} = \{\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\max_{n\geq 1}|X^k(T_n^k) - X(t)|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}} > \epsilon\}.$$

Lemma 3.2 and the path continuity of X allow us to conclude $\lim_{k\to\infty} J_2^k = 0$ in probability.

From (3.15), we shall apply Doob's maximal inequality on the martingale $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|X(t)||\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]; n \geq 1$ to get

$$\sup_{k\geq 1}\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|\delta^k X(t) - X(t)|^2 \leq C\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|X(t)|^2 < \infty$$

and hence $\lim_{k\to\infty}\delta^k X = X$ strongly in $\mathbf{B}^1(\mathbb{F})$. Lastly, $\{\delta^k X; k \geq 1\}$ is bounded in $L^2(\Omega; E)$ where E is the Banach space of cadlag functions from $[0,T]$ to $\mathbb{R}$ equipped with the sup norm. Since $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R})$ is reflexive, then we shall apply Th 2.1 and Corollary 3.3 in [20] to state that $\{\delta^k X; k \geq 1\} \subset \mathbf{B}^2 \subset L^2(\Omega; E)$ is weakly-relatively compact w.r.t $L^2(\Omega; E)$-topology. Since $\mathbf{B}^2 \subset L^2(\Omega; E)$ ($\mathbf{B}^2$ been closed) and $\lim_{k\to\infty}\delta^k X = X$ stronlgy in $\mathbf{B}^1$, then all $\mathbf{B}^2$-weak limit points of $\{\delta^k X; k \geq 1\}$ are equal and hence we do have weak convergence in $\mathbf{B}^2$. □

Functional GAS. Another example of a GAS can be constructed starting with a fixed functional representation. If X is a Wiener functional, then there exists a functional $F = \{F_t; 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ defined on Λ which realizes

$$X(t) = F_t(B_t);\ 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Then, we shall define the following sequence of processes $\mathcal{F} := \{\mathbf{F}^k; k \geq 1\}$

$$\mathbf{F}^k(t) := \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} F_{T_\ell^k}(A^k_{T_\ell^k}) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_\ell^k \leq t < T_{\ell+1}^k\}},\ 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{3.16}$$

The reader should not confuse $F(A^k)$ with $\mathbf{F}^k$ because $\{\mathbf{F}^k(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is a pure jump process while $\{F_t(A_t^k); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ does not necessarily has this property. Under continuity assumptions in the sense of pathwise functional calculus, one can show that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{F}^k = F(B)$ weakly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ (see Lemma 5.2) so that $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{F}^k; k \geq 1\}$ is a GAS for the Wiener functional $F(B)$.

In some applications, it is natural to mix different GAS.

Snell Envelope. Let X be a bounded positive Wiener functional X. Let S be the Snell envelope of X given by

$$S(t) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \geq t} \mathbb{E}\left[X(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{3.17}$$

where ess sup in (3.17) stands for the essential supremum of the family $\mathbb{E}[X(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_t]$ over the set of all $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times τ such that $t \leq \tau \leq T$ a.s. For a given $n \geq 0$, let $\mathbb{I}_n^k$ be the class of all $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping times of the form $\tau \wedge T$ where $[[\tau, \tau]] \subset \cup_{j\geq n}[[T_j^k, T_j^k]]$. For a given GAS $\{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ for X, let us define

$$S^{k,\varphi(k)}(T_n^k) := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^k} \mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau \wedge T^k_{\varphi(k)}) \mid \mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}\right];\ n \geq 0, \tag{3.18}$$

where $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is a strictly increasing function such that $\varphi(k) \uparrow +\infty$ as $k \to \infty$. We set $S^{k,\varphi(k)}(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} S^{k,\varphi(k)}(T_n^k)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}}; 0 \leq t \leq T$. Under mild regularity assumptions on X (e.g path continuity), one can choose a suitable speed φ in such way that $\{S^{k,\varphi(k)}; k \geq 1\}$ is a GAS for S (see Lemma 6.3).

3.2. **Differential structure.** In this section, we present the basic differential structure which is the basis for the development of the weak functional stochastic calculus of this article. In the sequel, we fix a GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ for a Wiener functional X (see Remark **??**). At first, Doob-Meyer decomposition yields a unique $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable process $N^{\mathcal{Y},k}$ with locally integrable variation such that

$$X^k(t) - X^k(0) - N^{\mathcal{Y},k}(t) =: M^{\mathcal{Y},k}(t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{3.19}$$

is an $\mathbb{F}^k$- local martingale. By the very definition, X^k is a pure-jump $\mathbb{F}^k$-semimartingale and hence, we shall write it as

$$X^k(t) = X^k(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j} X(u) dA^{k,j}(u) \tag{3.20}$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta X^k(T_\ell^{k,j})}{\Delta A^{k,j}(T_\ell^{k,j})} \mathbb{1}_{[[T_\ell^{k,j},T_\ell^{k,j}]]}, \quad \mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\},$$

and the integral in (3.20) is interpreted in the Lebesgue-Stieltjes sense.

Explicit Doob-Meyer Decomposition. Let us now provide an explicit characterization of the elements $(M^{\mathcal{Y},k}, N^{\mathcal{Y},k})$ in (3.19) for a given GAS $\mathcal{Y}$. The strategy is essentially the same as given by [49] for the particular case of the canonical GAS. For sake of clarity, we give the details here. In this article, we need the flexibility to work with different GAS in such way that they provide the same asymptotic behavior under suitable conditions.

At first, let us identify the martingale component. By the very definition, for each $n, k \geq 1$

$$[[T_n^k, T_{n+1}^k[[\subset \cup_{j=1}^p \cup_{\ell=1}^{\infty} [[T_\ell^{k,j}, T_{\ell+1}^{k,j}[[,$$

and hence if

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{m} |\Delta X^k(T_n^k)|^2 < \infty \quad \forall m, k \geq 1, \tag{3.21}$$

then the $\mathbb{F}^k$-optional stochastic integral

$$\oint_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s) := \int_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s) - \Big(\int_0^{\cdot} \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s)\Big)^{p,k}(t),$$

is a well-defined $\mathbb{F}^k$-local martingale, where $\int_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s)$ is interpreted in the Lebesgue-Stieltjes sense. The stochastic integral $\oint$ is the $\mathbb{F}^k$-optional integral as introduced by Dellacherie and Meyer [19]. We refer the reader to the works [19, 42] for a detailed exposition of stochastic integrals w.r.t optional integrands. By setting

$$\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(t) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(T_\ell^k)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_\ell^k \leq t < T_{\ell+1}^k\}};\ 0 \leq t \leq T;\ j = 1, \ldots, p, \tag{3.22}$$

we then have

$$M^{\mathcal{Y},k}(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \oint_0^{\cdot} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s) \quad \text{and} \quad N^{\mathcal{Y},k}(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \left(\int_0^{\cdot} \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s)\right)^{p,k}(\cdot).$$

Remark 3.3. *Of course, $\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X$ is the unique $\mathbb{F}^k$-optional process which represents the martingale $M^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}$ as an optional stochastic integral with respect to the martingale $A^{k,j}$. Moreover, we recall that there is no $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable representation w.r.t A^k since $\mathbb{F}^{k,j}$ is not a completely continuous filtration for $j = 1, \ldots, p$. See Remark 2.3 and Lemma 2.1 in* [49] *and Th.13.42 in* [42] *for more details.*

Let us now characterize the non-martingale predictable component in decomposition (3.19). In the sequel, we recall that $\mathcal{F}^k_{T_m^{k,j}-}$ is the left-hand side limit of the filtration $\mathbb{F}^k$ at the stopping time $T_m^{k,j}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ be a GAS for a Wiener functional X. The $\mathbb{F}^k$-dual predictable projection of $X^k - X^k(0)$ is given by the absolutely continuous process*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^t U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)d\langle A^{k,j}, A^{k,j}\rangle(s), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where $U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X := \mathbb{E}_{[A^{k,j}]}\big[\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X/\Delta A^{k,j}\big|\ \mathcal{P}^k\big]$. *Here* $\mathbb{E}_{[A^{k,j}]}\big[\,\cdot\,|\,\mathcal{P}^k\big]$ *denotes the conditional expectation with respect to* $\mathcal{P}^k$ *under the Doléans measure generated by* $[A^{k,j},A^{k,j}]$, *for every* $j=1,\dots,p$. *Moreover, for each* $j=1,\dots,p$ *the following representation holds*

(3.23)
$$U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(T_m^{k,j})\mathbb{1}_{\{T_m^{k,j}\leq T\}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta X^k(T_n^k)}{2^{-2k}}\Big|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^k};T_n^k\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{T_m^{k,j}=T_n^k\}} = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\Delta X^k(T_m^{k,j})}{2^{-2k}}\Big|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_m^{k,j}-}\right];$$

for $m\geq 1$.

Proof. The argument follows the same lines of the proof of Lemma 2.3 in [49], so we omit the details. □

Remark 3.4. *The process* $U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X; j=1,\dots,p$ *is reminiscent from the so-called "Laplacian approximation method" introduced by Meyer* [51] *in the context of the French school of "general theory of processes". In Section 5, we interpret this operator in terms of functional representations. In particular, we shall split it into two component related to horizontal and second-order vertical perturbations which are similar in nature to the standard pathwise functional stochastic calculus.*

Summing up the above results, we arrive at the following representation for a given GAS $\mathcal{Y}=\{X^k;k\geq 1\}$ which will be the basis for differential representations of Wiener functionals.

Proposition 3.1. *Let* $\mathcal{Y}=\{X^k;k\geq 1\}$ *be a GAS for a Wiener functional* X *which satisfies the quadratic growth condition (3.21). Then the* $\mathbb{F}^k$*-special semimartingale decomposition of* X^k *is given by*

$$X^k(t) = X^k(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p}\oint_0^t \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s) + \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_0^t U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)d\langle A^{k,j},A^{k,j}\rangle(s),\quad 0\leq t\leq T.$$

Let us now present two concepts which were already introduced in [49] in the context of the particular case of a canonical GAS of type (3.14).

Definition 3.3. *Let* $\mathcal{Y}=\{X^k;k\geq 1\}$ *be a GAS for a Wiener functional* X. *We say that* X *has* $\mathcal{Y}$***-finite energy*** *along the filtration family* $(\mathbb{F}^k)_{k\geq 1}$ *if*

$$\mathcal{E}^{2,\mathcal{Y}}(X) := \sup_{k\geq 1}\mathbb{E}\sum_{n\geq 1}|\Delta X^k(T_n^k)|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}} < \infty.$$

Definition 3.4. *Let* $\mathcal{Y}=\{X^k;k\geq 1\}$ *be a GAS for a Wiener functional* X. *We say that* X *admits the* $\mathcal{Y}$***-covariation*** *w.r.t to j-th component of the Brownian motion* B *if the limit*

$$\langle X,B^j\rangle^{\mathcal{Y}}(t) := \lim_{k\to\infty}[X^k,A^{k,j}](t)$$

exists weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ *for each* $t\in[0,T]$.

In the remainder of this article, if $\mathcal{Y}=\{\delta^k X;k\geq 1\}$ is the canonical GAS for a given Wiener functional X, then the operators $\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X$ and $U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X$ and $U^{k,j}X$, respectively. Similarly, $\mathcal{E}^{2,\mathcal{Y}}(X), \langle X,B^j\rangle^{\mathcal{Y}}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{E}^2(X)$ and $\langle X,B^j\rangle^{\delta}$, respectively.

Leão and Ohashi [49] have studied the finite energy and covariation concepts w.r.t the canonical GAS in the one-dimensional case. In particular, they have shown a close relation between these two concepts and the existence of orthogonal decompositions. One fundamental concept introduced in [49] is the following notion of orthogonality

Definition 3.5. *We say that a Wiener functional* X *is orthogonal to Brownian motion when* $\langle X,B^j\rangle^{\delta}=0$ *for* $j=1,\dots,p$.

Remark 3.5. *In general, the bracket $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle^{\delta}$ does not coincide with usual brackets $[X,B^j]$ computed in terms of limits over refining partitions like the ones used in weak Dirichlet processes and regularization procedures. However, if X is a continuous square-integrable semimartingale then $\langle X,B^j\rangle^{\delta}=[X,B^j];\ j=1,\dots,p$. See Proposition 3.2 below.*

Let us now present the definition of the stochastic derivative w.r.t Brownian motion. At first, we need a couple of lemmas.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a GAS for a Wiener functional X. Then $\{\|\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k}X\|_{\mathbb{R}^p};k\geq 1\}$ is bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$ if, and only if, X has $\mathcal{Y}$-finite energy.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Y}=\{X^k;k\geq 1\}$ be a GAS for X. By the very definition,

(3.24)
$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\|\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k}X(s)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^p}ds=\mathbb{E}[X^k,X^k](T)-\mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(T_n^{k,j})|^2(T_{n+1}^{k,j}-T)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k,j}\leq T<T_{n+1}^{k,j}\}},$$

for every $k\geq 1$. We recall that $T_{n+1}^{k,j}-T_n^{k,j}$ is independent from $\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^{k,j}}$ (see Remark 3.1) and $\mathbb{E}[T_{n+1}^{k,j}-T_n^{k,j}]=2^{-2k}$ for every $k,n\geq 1$ and $j=1,\dots,p$. Then the second component in the right-hand side of (3.24) is bounded. This completes the proof. □

The following two lemmas are immediate consequences of Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4 in [50], respectively.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a GAS for a Wiener functional X. If $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{Y},2}(X)<\infty$ then $\{M^{\mathcal{Y},k};k\geq 1\}$ is $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$-weakly relatively sequentially compact where all limit points are $\mathbb{F}$-square-integrable martingales.*

Lemma 3.7. *Let X be a $\mathcal{Y}$-finite energy Wiener functional with a GAS $\mathcal{Y}=\{X^k;k\geq 1\}$. Let $(M^{\mathcal{Y},k},N^{\mathcal{Y},k})$ be the $\mathbb{F}^k$-special semimartingale decomposition of X^k. Let $\{M^{\mathcal{Y},k_i};i\geq 1\}$ be a $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$-weakly convergent subsequence obtained from Lemma 3.6 such that $\lim_{i\to\infty}M^{\mathcal{Y},k_i}=Z$ where $Z\in\boldsymbol{H}^2(\mathbb{F})$. Then,*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}[M^{\mathcal{Y},k_i},A^{k_i,j}](t)=[Z,B^j](t)\quad \textit{weakly in}\ \ L^1(\mathbb{P})$$

for each $t\in[0,T]$ and $j=1\dots,p$. In particular, if $\langle X,B^j\rangle^{\mathcal{Y}};\ j=1,\dots,p$ exists for some finite energy GAS $\mathcal{Y}$, then $M=\lim_{k\to\infty}M^{\mathcal{Y},k}$ exists weakly in $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ and $\langle X,B^j\rangle^{\mathcal{Y}}=[M,B^j];\ j=1,\dots,p$.

Lemma 3.8. *If $g\in L^{\infty}$, then*

$$\sup_{n\geq 1}|\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}]-\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^k}]|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}}\to 0$$

in $L^p(\mathbb{P})$ as $k\to\infty$ for every $p>1$.

Proof. Let $X(t)=\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_t];0\leq t\leq T$. By the very definition, we have $\delta^kX_{T_n^k}=\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}]$. Since X is bounded, Proposition 3.4 yields $\lim_{k\to\infty}\delta^kX=X$ strongly in $\mathbf{B}^p(\mathbb{F})$ for every $p\geq 1$. Do the same splitting as in equation (4.2) in [49],

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{n\geq 1}|\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}]-\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^k}]|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}}\leq\\ &\quad\sup_{n\geq 1}|\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}]-X(T_n^k)|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}}+\\ &\quad\sup_{n\geq 1}|\mathbb{E}[X(T_n^k)-X(T_{n-1}^k)|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}}+\\ &\quad\sup_{n\geq 1}|\mathbb{E}[\delta^kX(T_{n-1}^k)-X(T_{n-1}^k)|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}}.\end{aligned}$$

Since X is bounded, then $I^k := \sup_{n\geq 1} |X(T_n^k) - X(T_{n-1}^k)| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq T\}}$ is uniformly integrable. Therefore, every sequence in $\{I^k; k \geq 1\}$ admits a weakly convergent subsequence in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$. Take then two $L^1(\mathbb{P})$-weakly convergent subsequences and we set

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathbb{E} g I^{k_i} = \mathbb{E} g Z_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j\to\infty} \mathbb{E} g I^{k_j} = \mathbb{E} g Z_2$$

where $g \in L^\infty$, $Z_1, Z_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{P})$. For (k_i), Lemma 3.2 yields the existence of a subsequence say $k_i^{'}$ such that $\lim_{i\to\infty} \max_{n\geq 1} |\Delta T_n^{k_i^{'}}| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k_i^{'}} \leq T\}} = 0$ $a.s$ (see the proof of Lemma 3.2 for the notation $\Delta T_n^{k,j}$). For (k_j) there exists a subsequence say $(k_j^{'})$ such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} \max_{n\geq 1} |\Delta T_n^{k_j^{'}}| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k_j^{'}} \leq T\}} = 0$ $a.s$.

From the path continuity of X over the compact set $[0,T]$, for a given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta(\epsilon, \omega)$ such that whenever $|t-s| < \delta(\epsilon,\omega)$ we have that $|X_t(\omega) - X_s(\omega)| < \epsilon$. Then, we get the following inequality holding pathwise

$$\max_{n\geq 1} |X(T_n^{k_i^{'}}) - X(T_{n-1}^{k_i^{'}})| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k_i^{'}} \leq T\}} < \epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{n\geq 1} |X(T_n^{k_j^{'}}) - X(T_{n-1}^{k_j^{'}})| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k_j^{'}} \leq T\}} < \epsilon$$

for every i and j sufficiently large. In other words, $\lim_{i\to\infty} I^{k_i^{'}} = 0$ and $\lim_{j\to\infty} I^{k_j^{'}} = 0$ almost surely. Dominated convergence theorem yields

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathbb{E} I^{k_i^{'}} = 0, \lim_{j\to\infty} \mathbb{E} I^{k_j^{'}} = 0$$

which implies that $Z_1 = Z_2 = 0$. Therefore, we must have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{E} I^k = 0.$$

Since X is bounded, then we must have convergence in L^p for every $p > 1$. □

We are now able to present the main result of this section. It is an almost straightforward multi-dimensional extension of Theorems 3.1 and 4.1 in [49].

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a Wiener functional admitting the canonical GAS $\{\delta^k X; k \geq 1\}$. Then $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{k,j} X$ exists weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$ for each $j = 1,\dots,p$ if, and only if, there exists a unique $M \in \boldsymbol{H}^2(\mathbb{F})$ such that*

$$X - X(0) - M \tag{3.25}$$

is orthogonal to Brownian motion. Moreover, $X - X(0) - M = \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^p \int U^{k,j} X(s) d\langle A^{k,j}, A^{k,j}\rangle(s)$ weakly in $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$, $M = \sum_{j=1}^p \int H^j dB^j$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{k,j} X = H^j$ weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$ for each $j = 1,\dots,p$.

Proof. We fix the canonical GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{\delta^k X; k \geq 1\}$. In the sequel, we use the notation $\Delta T_n^{k,j}$ defined in the proof of Lemma 3.2. The proof is composed in several steps. Assume that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{k,j} X$ exists weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$ for each $j = 1,\dots,p$. Then $\{\|\mathbb{D}^k X\|_{\mathbb{R}^p}; k \geq 1\}$ is bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$ and from Lemma 3.5, we know that it has $\mathcal{Y}$-finite energy. From Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 3.1, we know that

$$M^{\mathcal{Y},k} = \sum_{j=1}^p \oint_0 \mathbb{D}^{k,j} X dA^{k,j}(s); k \geq 1$$

is a $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$-weakly relatively sequentially compact set where all limit points are square-integrable $\mathbb{F}$-martingales.

STEP 1: We claim that $\langle X, B^j\rangle^\delta$ exists for each $j = 1, \dots, p$. Indeed, let us fix $g \in L^\infty$, $t \in [0,T]$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. By the very definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t \mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(s)ds &= \mathbb{E}g\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}} \\
&- \mathbb{E}g\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})(T_n^{k,j}-t)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}<t\le T_n^{k,j}\}} \\
&=: I^{k,j,1}(t) + I^{k,j,2}(t) \qquad (3.26)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta T_n^{k,j}$ is independent from $\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}$ (see Remark 3.1) and $\mathbb{E}\Delta T_n^{k,j} = 2^{-2k}$ for every $n \ge 1$, we shall estimate

$$|I^{k,j,2}(t)| \le C2^{-k}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}|\Delta\delta^k X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t<T_n^{k,j}\}} \to 0$$

as $k \to \infty$. We claim

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[g\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}g_n^{k,j}\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k}\le t\}}\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left[g\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\Delta\delta^k X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta A^{k,j}(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\right] \qquad (3.27)
\end{aligned}$$

where $g_n^{k,j} := \mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^{k,j}}] - \mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}]; n \ge 1$. Indeed, for each $n, k \ge 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}} g\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}d\mathbb{P} &= \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\mathbb{E}\Big[g\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^{k,j}}\Big]d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^{k,j}}]\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}d\mathbb{P} \\
&- \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}]\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}d\mathbb{P} \\
&+ \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}]\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}d\mathbb{P}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall $\Delta T_n^{k,j}$ is independent from $\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}^{k,j}]\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}d\mathbb{P} &= \int_\Omega \mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}]\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \int_\Omega \mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}]\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})2^{-2k}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}]\Delta\delta^k X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta A^{k,j}(T_{n-1}^{k,j})d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}}\mathbb{E}[g\Delta\delta^k X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta A^{k,j}(T_{n-1}^{k,j})|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^{k,j}}]d\mathbb{P} \\
&= \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\le t\}} g\Delta\delta^k X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta A^{k,j}(T_{n-1}^{k,j})d\mathbb{P}
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\leq t\}} g\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}d\mathbb{P} &= \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\leq t\}} g_n^{k,j}\mathbb{D}X^{k,j}(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}d\mathbb{P}\\ &+ \int_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\leq t\}} g\Delta\delta^k X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta A^{k,j}(T_{n-1}^{k,j})d\mathbb{P}\end{aligned}$$

This shows that (3.27) holds. We shall write

$$\begin{aligned}I^{k,j,1}(t) &= \mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g_n^{k,j}\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta T_n^{k,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\leq t\}}\\ &+ \mathbb{E}g\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\Delta\delta^k X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\Delta A^{k,j}(T_{n-1}^{k,j})\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\leq t\}}\\ &=: I_1^{k,j,1}(t)+I_2^{k,j,1}(t).\end{aligned}$$

Let us write $\Delta T_n^{k,j}=(\Delta T_n^{k,j})^{1/2}(\Delta T_n^{k,j})^{1/2}; n\geq 1$. Then, Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and Lemma 3.8 yield

$$\begin{aligned}|I_1^{k,j,1}(t)| &\leq \Big(\mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|g_n^{k,j}|^2\Delta T_n^{k,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\leq T\}}\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\times\Big(\mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(T_{n-1}^{k,j})|^2\Delta T_n^{k,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\leq T\}}\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\leq \Big(T\mathbb{E}\sup_{n\geq 1}|g_n^{k,j}|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{n-1}^{k,j}\leq T\}}\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\mathcal{E}^2(X)\Big)^{1/2}\to 0\end{aligned}$$

as $k\to\infty$. Therefore, we arrive at the following conclusion

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(s)ds \quad\text{exists}\Longleftrightarrow\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}g[\delta^k X,A^{k,j}](t)\quad\text{exists};\ j=1,\ldots,p. \tag{3.28}$$

and, in this case,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(s)ds=\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}g[\delta^k X,A^{k,j}](t);\ j=1,\ldots,p. \tag{3.29}$$

By Lemma 3.7, we then have $\langle X,B^j\rangle^\delta$ exists for each $j=1,\ldots,p$ and, more importantly, $\lim_{k\to\infty}M^{\mathcal{Y},k}$ exists in $\sigma(\mathbf{B}^2,\mathrm{M}^2)$. In this case, there exists $M\in\mathbf{H}^2(\mathbb{F})$ and $N\in\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ realizing a decomposition

$$X=X(0)+M+N$$

STEP 2: We claim that $\langle N,B^j\rangle^\delta=0; 1\leq j\leq p$. We fix $j\in\{1,\ldots,p\}$. Indeed, $[\delta^k N,A^{k,j}]=[M^{\mathcal{Y},k}-\delta^k M,A^{k,j}]$. Lemma 3.7 yields $[M^{\mathcal{Y},k},A^{k,j}](t)\to[M,B^j](t)$ weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ for each $t\in[0,T]$. Let $M^{mart,\mathcal{Y},k}$ be the $\mathbb{F}^k$-martingale component of $\delta^k M$. By noticing that $[\delta^k M,A^{k,j}]=[M^{mart,\mathcal{Y},k},A^{k,j}](t); 0\leq t\leq T$, we shall apply Lemma 2.1 in [50] to state that $\lim_{k\to\infty}M^{mart,\mathcal{Y},k}=M$ weakly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$. By applying Lemma 3.7 again, we then get $\lim_{k\to\infty}[\delta^k M,A^{k,j}](t)=[M,B^j](t)$ weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ for every $t\in[0,T]$. Hence, $\langle N,B^j\rangle^\delta=0$. The uniqueness of the decomposition is now just a simple consequence of the martingale representation of the Brownian motion jointly with Lemma 2.1 in [50]. Moreover, if $M=\sum_{j=1}^p\int H^j dB^j$, then from (3.28), we then have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t\mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(s)ds=\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}g[\delta^k X,A^{k,j}](t)=\mathbb{E}g[M,B^j](t)=\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t H^j ds;\ j=1,\ldots,p \tag{3.30}$$

for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $g \in L^\infty$. Identity (3.30) and the fact that $\langle N, B^j \rangle^\delta = 0$ allow us to conclude that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{k,j} X = H^j, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{k,j} N = 0 \text{ weakly } L^2(\mathbb{P} \times Leb) \tag{3.31}$$

for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$.

STEP 3: Reciprocally, let us assume the existence of a decomposition (3.32). Then, $\mathcal{E}^2(X) < \infty$ and by applying Lemma 2.1 in [50] and Lemma 3.7, we get

$$[\delta^k X, A^{k,j}](t) = [\delta^k M, A^{k,j}](t) + [\delta^k N, A^{k,j}](t) \to [M, B^j](t)$$

weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ as $k \to \infty$, so that $\langle X, B^j \rangle^\delta$ exists for each $j = 1, \ldots, p$. By using (3.28), we conclude $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{k,j} X = H^j$ weakly $L^2(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$.

□

Theorem 3.1 suggests the following definition.

Definition 3.6. *We say that X is a **weakly differentiable** Wiener functional when there exists $M \in \boldsymbol{H}^2(\mathbb{F})$ such that (3.25) holds.*

Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the space of weakly differentiable Wiener functionals. For a given $X \in \mathcal{W}$, we shall write

$$\mathcal{D}_j X := \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{k,j} X; \ j = 1 \ldots, p \text{ weakly in } L^2(Leb \times \mathbb{P}),$$

and we set $\mathcal{D}X := (\mathcal{D}_1 X, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_p X)$. Then, Theorem 3.1 and (3.31) allow us to state that any $X \in \mathcal{W}$ admits a unique differential decomposition

$$X = X(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int \mathcal{D}_j X(s) dB^j(s) + \mathcal{I}^\perp X, \tag{3.32}$$

where the orthogonal integral operator is explicitly characterized in terms of

$$\mathcal{I}^\perp X := \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int U^{k,j} X(s) d\langle A^{k,j}, A^{k,j} \rangle(s) \text{ weakly in } \mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F}),$$

and $\mathcal{D}_j \mathcal{I}^\perp X = 0; 1 \leq j \leq p$.

Remark 3.6. *Formula (3.32) can be interpreted as a version of a fundamental theorem of calculus in the Wiener space. Usual derivatives are interpreted in terms of $\mathcal{D}$ and constants are interpreted in terms of processes with null stochastic derivative such as bounded variation processes or more generally occupation time processes depending on local-times. See Proposition 3.2 and Section 5.3 for details.*

Let us now provide a concrete class of weakly differentiable Wiener functionals. For this purpose, next we provide the multi-dimensional extension of Lemma 3.1 in [49]. At first, we recall one elementary result. In the sequel, $\mathcal{A}_1 \perp \mathcal{A}_2$ means that $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are independent sigma-algebras. Moreover, $\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2$ denotes the smallest sigma algebra generated by the union $\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be sub sigma-algebras of Ω such that $\mathcal{A}_1 \perp \mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{H} \perp \mathcal{A}_2$, where $\mathcal{A}_1 \subset \mathcal{H}$. Then, for every $X \in L^1(\mathcal{H})$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{A}_1 \vee \mathcal{A}_2] = \mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{A}_1] \ a.s$$

Proof. The proof is elementary so we omit the details. □

Lemma 3.10. *If X is a Wiener functional then*

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|\Delta\delta^k X(T_n^k)|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}}\leq \mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|X(T_n^k)-X(T_{n-1}^k)|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}} \tag{3.33}$$

for every $k\geq 1$.

Proof. By the very definition

$$[\delta^k X,\delta^k X](T)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mid\Delta\delta^k X(T_n^k)\mid^2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}},$$

where $\Delta\delta^k X(T_n^k)=\mathbb{E}[X(T_n^k)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}]-\mathbb{E}[X(T_{n-1}^k)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^k}]$ $a.s$ for every $k,n\geq 1$. One should notice that (recall the definition of $\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}$ in Lemma 3.1)

$$\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}=\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^k}\vee\sigma\big(T_n^k-T_{n-1}^k,\mathbb{A}_{k,n}\big)$$

where $\mathbb{A}_{k,n}:=\{\Delta A^{k,j}(T_n^k);1\leq j\leq p\}$. Indeed, in a typical realization ω, the p-dimensional vector $\mathbb{A}_{k,n}(\omega)$ consists of zeroes in all, but one, coordinates. The non-zero coordinate is precisely the coordinate where the jump occurred, and, furthermore, the sign of its value is the sign of the jump.

The strong Markov property of the multidimensional Brownian motion B (see Remark 3.1) yields $\mathcal{F}_{T_{n-1}^k}$ is independent from $\sigma\big(T_n^k-T_{n-1}^k,\mathbb{A}_{k,n}\big)$. Then, we shall use Lemma 3.9 to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\big|\Delta\delta^k X(T_n^k)\mid^2 &= \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[X(T_n^k)\mid\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}\Big]-\mathbb{E}\Big[X(T_{n-1}^k)\mid\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^k}\Big]\Big|^2\\
&= \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[X(T_n^k)\mid\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}\Big]-\mathbb{E}\Big[X(T_{n-1}^k)\mid\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{n-1}^k}\vee\sigma\big(T_n^k-T_{n-1}^k,\mathbb{A}_{k,n}\big)\Big]\Big|^2\\
&= \Big|\mathbb{E}\Big[X(T_n^k)\mid\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}\Big]-\mathbb{E}\Big[X(T_{n-1}^k)\mid\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}\Big]\Big|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Jensen inequality yields

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta^k X,\delta^k X](T)\leq\mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|\mathbb{E}|X(T_n^k)-X(T_{n-1}^k)|^2|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_n^k}]\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}}\leq\mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}|X(T_n^k)-X(T_{n-1}^k)|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq T\}}$$

This concludes the proof. □

The next result shows that any continuous strong Dirichlet process (see e.g Bertoin [3]) is weakly differentiable.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $X=X(0)+M+N$ be a strong Dirichlet process with continuous paths with canonical decomposition (M,N) where $M=\sum_{j=1}^p\int H^j dB^j\in\boldsymbol{H}^2(\mathbb{F})$ and N is a zero energy process. Then it is weakly differentiable, $\mathcal{D}X=(H^1,\ldots,H^p)$ and $\langle X,B^j\rangle^\delta=[X,B^j];j=1\ldots,p$. In particular, the differential decomposition (3.32) and the Dirichlet decomposition coincide.*

Proof. Let $X=X(0)+M+N$ be the Dirichlet decomposition of X where by Brownian motion predictable representation, we can select $M=\sum_{j=1}^p M^j$ where $M^j=\int H^j dB^j;\ j=1,\ldots,p$ for $H^j\in L^2(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$. By definition, $\delta^k X=X(0)+\delta^k M+\delta^k N$ and from Lemma 3.3, we know that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\delta^k X=X$ weakly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$. By applying Lemma 2.1 in [50] and Lemma 3.7 for each $j=1,\ldots,p$, we have

$$\langle X,B^j\rangle^\delta(t) = \lim_{k\to\infty}[\delta^k M,A^{k,j}](t)+\lim_{k\to\infty}[\delta^k N,A^{k,j}](t)$$

$$= \quad [M^j, B^j](t) + \lim_{k\to\infty}[\delta^k N, A^{k,j}](t);\ 0 \le t \le T, \tag{3.34}$$

weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ as long as the second component in the right-hand side of (3.34) converges. Let us check the L^1-weak convergence of $[\delta^k N, A^{k,j}](t)$. From Lemmas 3.10 and 3.2 and the assumption that X is a strong Dirichlet process, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(\Delta\delta^k X(T_n^k))^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \le T\}} < \infty.$$

Then X has finite energy along the canonical GAS. By applying Kunita-Watanabe inequality, we get for each $t \in [0,T]$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|[\delta^k N, A^{k,j}](t)| &\le (\mathbb{E}[\delta^k N, \delta^k N](t))^{1/2} \times (\mathbb{E}[A^{k,j}, A^{k,j}](t))^{1/2} \\ &\le C\Big(\mathbb{E}[\delta^k N, \delta^k N](t)\Big)^{1/2} \to 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

as $k \to \infty$, where $C = (\max_{1\le j\le p}\sup_{k\ge 1}\mathbb{E}[A^{k,j}, A^{k,j}](T))^{1/2} < \infty$. In (3.35), $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}[\delta^k N, \delta^k N](t) = 0$ due to (3.33) and the fact that N has zero energy in the sense of ([3]). From (3.34) and (3.35), we have $\langle X, B^j\rangle^\delta = [M^j, B^j]; j = 1, \dots, p$. The limit (3.35) shows that N is orthogonal to Brownian motion in the sense of Definition 3.5. Hence, Theorem 3.1 allows us to conclude that (M, N) coincides with (3.32) and $\mathcal{D}X = (H^1, \dots, H^p)$. □

An immediate consequence of Proposition 3.2 is the following result.

Corollary 3.1. *Any square-integrable continuous semimartingale is weakly differentiable and it satisfies the differential representation (3.32).*

Section 7 provides a nontrivial example of weakly differentiable process in terms of pathwise 2D Young integrals when a given Wiener functional X admits a rough dependence w.r.t Brownian motion in the sense of p-variation. So the space $\mathcal{W}$ is actually much larger than the space of semimartingales.

3.3. **Local description of the stochastic derivative.** . Under regularity conditions, there exists a local description of $\mathcal{D}_j X$ which justifies the name weak derivative. For a given $t \ge 0$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we set

$$T^{t,\epsilon,j} := \inf\{s \ge 0; |B^j(t+s) - B^j(t)| = \epsilon\}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$. The stopping time $T^{t,\epsilon,j}$ localizes the j-th Brownian motion around the point t. The proof of the following result is straightforward, but for sake of clarity we give the details of the proof.

Proposition 3.3. *Let X be a real-valued square-integrable $\mathbb{F}$-semimartingale of the form*

$$X(t) = X(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_0^t \mathcal{D}_j X(s) dB^j(s) + \mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(t); t \ge 0,$$

where $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(t) = \int_0^t V(s)ds; t \ge 0$ for some $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process satisfying $\mathbb{E}\int_0^T |V(s)|^2 ds < \infty$. Assume that $\mathcal{D}_j X$ has cadlag paths for $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Then,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0+}\frac{X(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}) - X(t)}{B^j(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}) - B^j(t)} = \mathcal{D}_j X(t) \quad \textit{in probability.}$$

for every $t \ge 0$ and $1 \le j \le p$.

Proof. Let us fix $1 \leq j \leq p$ and $t \geq 0$. To shorten notation, we denote $\Delta Y(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}) := Y(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}) - Y(t)$ for an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process. We have,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Delta X(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j})}{\Delta B^j(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j})} &= \frac{1}{\Delta B^j(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j})}\sum_{i=1}^{p}\int_{t_0}^{t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}} \mathcal{D}_i X(s)dB^i(s) \\ &+ \frac{1}{\Delta B^j(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j})}\int_{t}^{t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}} V(s)ds =: I^{1,\epsilon,j}(t) + I^{2,\epsilon,j}(t).\end{aligned}$$

The fact that

$$I^{1,\epsilon,j}(t) \to \mathcal{D}_j X(t) \text{ in probability as } \epsilon \to 0^+$$

is a direct consequence of Davis [17]. Applying Cauchy -Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|I^{2,\epsilon}(t)| &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\mathbb{E}\int_t^{t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}} |V(s)|ds = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\mathbb{E}\int_t^{t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}} |V(s)|\mathbb{1}_{(t,t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}]}ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\frac{1}{\epsilon}\Big(\int_t^{t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}} |V(s)|^2 ds\Big)^{1/2}(T^{t,\epsilon,j})^{1/2} \\ &\leq \Big(\mathbb{E}\int_t^{t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}} |V(s)|^2 ds\Big)^{1/2}\big(\mathbb{E}T^{t,\epsilon,j}\epsilon^{-2}\big)^{1/2} \\ &= \Big(\mathbb{E}\int_t^{t+T^{t,\epsilon,j}} |V(s)|^2 ds\Big)^{1/2} \to 0\end{aligned}$$

as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. This concludes the proof. □

4. Weak Derivatives from General GAS

In concrete examples, it is highly desirable to compute weak derivatives not directly on the canonical GAS but rather in a different GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$. In fact, shortly it will become clear that applications to functional Itô calculus, BSDE and stochastic optimal control theory require this type of flexibility. In this section, we give some criteria to compute $\mathcal{D}X$ based on distinct GAS for X.

Essentially, we would like to prove a similar result as stated in Theorem 3.1 for limits $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X$ where $\mathcal{Y}$ is a general GAS for a given Wiener functional X. What we are going to show is that GAS share differentiability in some sense. In the sequel, we set

$$\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k}X := (\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,1}X, \ldots, \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,p}X),$$

and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X := \big(\mathcal{D}_1^{\mathcal{Y}}X, \ldots, \mathcal{D}_p^{\mathcal{Y}}X\big)$ where

$$\mathcal{D}_j^{\mathcal{Y}}X := \lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X;\ j = 1, \ldots, p \tag{4.1}$$

whenever the right-hand side limit in (4.1) exists weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$. Of course, by definition $\mathcal{D}X = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X$ if $\mathcal{Y}$ is the canonical GAS for X. However, in general, they may not coincide. See Remark 4.1. In fact, the following result holds true.

Proposition 4.1. *Let X be a Wiener functional admitting a GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$. Then $\mathcal{E}^{\mathcal{Y},2}(X) < \infty$ and $\langle X, B^j\rangle^{\mathcal{Y}}$ exists for $j = 1, \ldots, p$ if, and only if, $\mathcal{D}_j^{\mathcal{Y}}X;\ j = 1, \ldots, p$ exists. Moreover, in this case $M = \lim_{k\to\infty} M^{\mathcal{Y},k}$ exists weakly in $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ and $[M, B^j] = \int \mathcal{D}_j^{\mathcal{Y}}X ds$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p$.*

Proof. The proof follows the same lines of the proof of Theorem 3.1, so we omit the details. □

Corollary 4.1. *Let X be a Wiener functional admitting a GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ such that $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}_j X$ exists for $j = 1,\dots,p$. Then X admits a decomposition*

$$X(t) = X(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}_j X(s) dB^j(s) + V(t); t \geq 0, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\langle V, B^j\rangle^{\mathcal{R}} = 0;\ j = 1,\dots,p$ for a GAS $\mathcal{R} = \{X^k - \delta^k M; k \geq 1\}$ w.r.t V, where $M = \sum_{j=1}^p \int \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}_j X(s) dB^j(s)$.

Proof. The existence of (4.2) is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.1. Property $\langle V, B^j\rangle^{\mathcal{R}} = 0;\ j = 1,\dots,p$ is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.7. □

Remark 4.1. *There exists one delicate point when computing $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X$ rather than $\mathcal{D}X$ for a non-canonical GAS $\mathcal{Y}$: It is not clear whether $\mathcal{D}X = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X$ whenever $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X$ exists. The non-martingale sequence $\{N^{\mathcal{Y},k}; k \geq 1\}$ which converges to V in (4.2) may lack suitable compactness properties in such way that $\mathcal{D}X$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X$ may not coincide. Nevertheless, we are able to provide readable compactness conditions on a GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ in such way that $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X = \mathcal{D}X$ when X is a square-integrable continuous semimartingale. See e.g Theorem 4.1 for a concrete example.*

4.1. **Stochastic infinitesimal generator.** In this section, we characterize an important subset of $\mathcal{W}$ constituted by weakly differentiable Wiener functionals with absolutely continuous orthogonal component $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}$. In order to keep the whole information concentrated only at the hitting times, let us now define a stepwise predictable version of $U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}$ as follows. If $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ is a GAS for X, then we set

$$\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X := \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(T^{k,j}_{\ell}) \mathbb{1}_{\{T^{k,j}_{\ell} < t \leq T^{k,j}_{\ell+1}\}},\ 0 \leq t \leq T,\ j = 1,\dots,p. \tag{4.3}$$

Let us now define an operator which will play a key role in stochastic backward problems as described in (1.7). We say that $\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}X \in L^1(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$ exists if

$$\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}X := \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X \text{ weakly in } L^1(\mathbb{P} \times Leb).$$

In the remainder of this article, if $\mathcal{Y}$ is the canonical GAS of X, then we write $\mathcal{U}X$.

In the sequel, we say that $X \in \mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ is a square-integrable Itô process, if there exist $\mathbb{F}$-adapted processes $H^1,\dots,H^p, V$ such that

$$X(t) = X(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^t H^j(s) dB^j(s) + \int_0^t V(s) ds;\ 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T |H^j(s)|^2 ds < \infty, \quad \mathbb{E}\Big(\int_0^T |V(s)| ds\Big)^2 < \infty$$

for every $j = 1,\dots,p$. The following result characterizes the class of Itô processes in terms of $(\mathcal{D}X, \mathcal{U}X)$.

Theorem 4.1. *If there exists a GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ for $X \in \boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ such that*

$$\sup_{k\geq 1} \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \|\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k}X(s)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^p} ds < \infty \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\{\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X; 1 \leq j \leq p, k \geq 1\} \text{ is uniformly integrable in } L^1(Leb \times \mathbb{P}), \tag{4.6}$$

then X is an Itô process. In particular, any square-integrable Itô process X is uniquely written in the following differential form

$$X(t) = X(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_j X(s) dB^j(s) + \int_0^t \mathcal{U}X(s) ds;\ 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{4.7}$$

where $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X = \int \mathcal{U}X(s)ds$. Moreover, $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X = \mathcal{D}X$ and $\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}X = \mathcal{U}X$ for any GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ satisfying (4.5) and (4.6).

Proof. Throughout this proof, C is a generic constant which may defer from line to line. Let $X \in \mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ be a Wiener functional admitting a GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ satisfying (4.5) and (4.6). Then $\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X;\ j = 1, \ldots, p$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p} \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,i}X$ are weakly relatively sequentially compact sequences in $L^2(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$ and $L^1(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$, respectively. Then we shall extract common weakly convergent subsequences. With a slight abuse of notation, we still denote them by $\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X;\ j = 1, \ldots, p$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p} \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,i}X$. By applying Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 along the convergent subsequence $\{\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X; k \geq 1\}$, there exists adapted $H^j \in L^2(\mathbb{P} \times Leb); j = 1, \ldots, p$ and there exists $N \in \mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ such that

$$X(t) = X(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^t H^j(s) dB^j(s) + N(t);\ 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

We claim that $N(t) = \int_0^t \gamma(s)ds;\ 0 \leq t \leq T$ where $\gamma := \lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{p} \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,i}X$ weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$. From Proposition 3.1, we already know that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^{\cdot} U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s) d\langle A^{k,j}, A^{k,j}\rangle(s) = N(\cdot)$$

weakly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$. By construction, N is $\mathbb{F}$-adapted and it has càdlàg paths. Hence, in order to show that N and $\int \gamma(s)ds$ are indistinguishable, one only has to check they are modifications from each other. It is sufficient to check for a given $g \in L^{\infty}$ ($\mathcal{F}_T$ - measurable) and $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$\mathbb{E}gN(t) = \mathbb{E}g \int_0^t \gamma(s)ds. \tag{4.8}$$

For a given $j = 1, \ldots, p$, we set (recall notation in section 2.1)

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{o,k,j}(g)(s) &:= {}^{o,k}(g)(T_n^{k,j}) \quad \text{on } \{T_n^{k,j} \leq s < T_{n+1}^{k,j}\} \\ {}^{p,k,j}(g)(s) &:= {}^{p,k}(g)(T_n^{k,j}) \quad \text{on } \{T_n^{k,j} < s \leq T_{n+1}^{k,j}\};\ n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, we shall apply the $\mathbb{F}^k$-dual predictable projection and Remark 3.1 to get the following identity

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}g \int_0^t U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s) d\langle A^{k,j}, A^{k,j}\rangle(s) &= \mathbb{E} \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[g|\mathcal{F}_{s-}^k] U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s) d[A^{k,j}, A^{k,j}](s) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} {}^{p,k}(g)(T_n^{k,j}) U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(T_n^{k,j}) 2^{-2k} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k,j} \leq t\}} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} {}^{p,k}(g)(T_n^{k,j}) U^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(T_n^{k,j}) (T_{n+1}^{k,j} - T_n^{k,j}) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k,j} \leq t\}} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\int_0^t {}^{p,k,j}(g)(s)\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)ds \tag{4.9}$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\int_t^{T_{\ell+1}^{k,j}} {}^{p,k,j}(g)(s)\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)ds\mathbb{1}_{\{T_\ell^{k,j}<t\leq T_{\ell+1}^{k,j}\}},$$

for each $j=1,\dots,p$. Since $\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X$ is $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable, we shall use $\mathbb{F}^k$-dual predictable projection for each $j\in\{1,\dots,p\}$ and we take advantage of the existence of γ to get

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}\int_0^t {}^{p,k,j}(g)(s)\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)ds = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}g\int_0^t \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X(s)ds \to \mathbb{E}g\int_0^t \gamma(s)ds$$

as $k\to\infty$. By assumption $\{\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X; k\geq 1, 1\leq j\leq p\}$ is uniformly integrable and Lemma 3.2 yields $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\max_{n\geq 1}|T_n^{k,j}-T_{n-1}^{k,j}|\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^{k,j}\leq T\}}=0$. Therefore, the second component in (4.9) vanishes and hence (4.8) holds.

Now let us check the second part of the theorem. Let us assume that X is a square-integrable Itô process of the form (4.4). Let us now check that $(\mathcal{D}X,\mathcal{U}X)$ exists. From Proposition 3.2, we already know that $X\in\mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{D}X=(H^1,\dots,H^p)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$.

Claim $\mathcal{U}X=V$ and $\mathcal{I}^\perp X=\int\mathcal{U}Xds$. To shorten notation, let us denote $M:=\sum_{j=1}^p\int H^j dB^j$ and $Y:=\int V(s)ds$. The $\mathbb{F}^k$-semimartingale decomposition based on the canonical GAS is

$$\delta^k X(t)=X(0)+\sum_{j=1}^p\oint_0^t \mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s)+\sum_{j=1}^p\int_0^t U^{k,j}X(s)d\langle A^{k,j},A^{k,j}\rangle(s); 0\leq t\leq T.$$

Proposition 3.2 yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^p\oint_0^\cdot \mathbb{D}^{k,j}X(s)dA^{k,j}(s)\to M \text{ and } \sum_{j=1}^p\int_0^\cdot U^{k,j}X(s)d\langle A^{k,j},A^{k,j}\rangle(s)\to Y$$

weakly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ as $k\to\infty$. In particular, by taking $g\in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $t\in[0,T]$, we shall consider the bounded linear functional $S=g\mathbb{1}_{[0,t]}\in\mathrm{M}^2$ to get

$$\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t\sum_{j=1}^p\int_0^t U^{k,j}X(s)d\langle A^{k,j},A^{k,j}\rangle(s)\to\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t V(s)ds \tag{4.10}$$

as $k\to\infty$ for each for $g\in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $t\in[0,T]$. By using (4.9) based on the canonical GAS, we have

$$\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t U^{k,j}X(s)d\langle A^{k,j},A^{k,j}\rangle(s) = \mathbb{E}\int_0^t {}^{p,k,j}(g)(s)\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(s)ds$$

$$+ \mathbb{E}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\int_t^{T_{\ell+1}^{k,j}} {}^{p,k,j}(g)(s)\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(s)ds\mathbb{1}_{\{T_\ell^{k,j}<t\leq T_{\ell+1}^{k,j}\}}. \tag{4.11}$$

In the sequel, we fix $t\in(0,T]$ and $g\in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Let $\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)=\max\{T_n^{k,j};T_n^{k,j}\leq t\}$ and $\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+):=\min\{T_n^{k,j};T_n^{k,j}>t\}$. Clearly, $\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)$ is an $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping time and $\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)<\infty$ a.s for every $k\geq 1$ and $j\in\{1,\dots,p\}$. Let $W_t^{k,j}(u)=B^j(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)+u)-B^j(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t));u\geq 0$ be the Brownian motion which is independent from $\mathcal{F}^j_{\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)}$. By the very definition,

$$\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+)-\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)=\inf\{u\geq 0;|W_t^{k,j}(u)|=2^{-k}\}\ a.s.$$

Since $W_t^{k,j}$ is a Brownian motion, then $\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+)-\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)$ has the same law of $T_1^{k,j}$ so that $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+)-\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)|=2^{-2k}$. Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\int_t^{T_{\ell+1}^{k,j}} |^{p,k,j}(g)(s)\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(s)|ds\mathbb{1}_{\{T_\ell^{k,j}<t\leq T_{\ell+1}^{k,j}\}} &\leq \mathbb{E}\int_{\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)}^{\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+)} |^{p,k,j}(g)(s)\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(s)|ds \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}|^{p,k,j}(g)(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))|(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+)-\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)) \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}\big|\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+)-\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))\big| \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}|\Delta\delta^k X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))| \qquad (4.12)
\end{aligned}$$

where in (4.12), we apply the strong Markov property of the Brownian motion to get $\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+)-\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)$ is independent from $\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))$ and $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t+)-\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)|=2^{-2k}$. Triangle and Jensen inequalities combined with the path continuity of X yield

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Delta\delta^k X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))|^2 &\leq C|\delta^k X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))-X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))|^2+C|\delta^k X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)-)-X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)-)|^2 \\
&\leq C\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|X(s)|^2+C|\delta^k X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)-)|^2 \\
&+ C\big(\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|X(s)||\mathcal{F}^k_{\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)}]\big)^2 \\
&\leq C\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|X(s)|^2+C\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|X(s)|^2|\mathcal{F}^k_{\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)}] \\
&+ C\sum_{p=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|X(s)|^2|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_{p-1}}]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_p=\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t)\}}
\end{aligned}$$

so that $\{|\Delta\delta^k X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))|;k\geq 1\}$ is uniformly integrable. Since $|\Delta\delta^k X(\tilde{\eta}^{k,j}(t))|\leq 2\sup_{0\leq s\leq T}|\delta^k X(s)-X(s)|\to 0$ in probability as $k\to\infty$, then the right-hand side of (4.12) vanishes. By summing up (4.11), (4.12) and (4.10), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathbb{E}\int_0^t {}^{p,k,j}(g)(s)\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(s)ds=\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t\sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathbb{U}^{k,j}X(s)ds\to\mathbb{E}g\int_0^t V(s)ds \qquad (4.13)$$

as $k\to\infty$. Since $g\in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $t\in[0,T]$ are arbitrary, then (4.13) allows us to state the $\mathcal{U}X=V$

Lastly, if $\mathcal{Y}$ is a GAS for a square-integrable Itô process X such that $\mathcal{Y}$ satisfies (4.5) and (4.6), then from Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, we know that $\{M^{\mathcal{Y},k};k\geq 1\}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^p\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,j}X$ are weakly sequentially compact w.r.t to $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ and $L^1(\mathbb{P}\times Leb)$, respectively. By applying Proposition 4.1 and the same argument given in (4.9) on any convergent subsequence, we conclude from the uniqueness of the semimartingale decomposition that $\mathcal{U}^{\mathcal{Y}}X=\mathcal{U}X$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}}X=\mathcal{D}X$. This concludes the proof. □

The differential operator $\mathcal{U}X$ basically describes the mean of any square-integrable Itô process in an infinitesimal time interval

$$\mathbb{E}X(t)\sim\mathbb{E}X(0)+t\mathbb{E}\,\mathcal{U}X(t)\quad\text{for small } t>0.$$

Of course, when $X(\cdot)=g(\cdot,W(\cdot))$ is a smooth transformation of a Markovian diffusion W, then $\mathcal{U}X(t)=\partial_t g(t,W(t))+\mathcal{L}g(t,W(t))$, where $\mathcal{L}$ is the infinitesimal generator of W. This justifies the following definition.

Definition 4.1. *A Wiener functional $X \in \mathcal{W}$ admits a stochastic infinitesimal generator when $\mathcal{U}X$ exists.*

In the remainder of this article, $\mathcal{WG}$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{W}$ given by square-integrable Itô processes.

4.2. **Local description of the stochastic infinitesimal generator.** Not surprisingly, under strong regularity conditions, there exists a local description of the infinitesimal generator.

Proposition 4.2. *Let X be a real-valued square-integrable $\mathbb{F}$-semimartingale of the form*

$$X(t) = X(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_j X(s) dB^j(s) + \int_0^t \mathcal{U}X(s) ds; t \geq 0.$$

where $\mathcal{D}_j X$ has absolutely continuous paths for $1 \leq j \leq p$. Assume that both the weak derivative $\nabla^w \mathcal{D}_j X$ and $\mathcal{U}X$ are a.s continuous at t_0 for $1 \leq j \leq p$. Then, for any $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{X(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) - X(t_0)}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \big| \mathcal{F}_{t_0} \vee \sigma(T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \right] = \mathcal{U}X(t_0) \quad \textit{in probability.}$$

Proof. We fix $j \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. To shorten notation, we denote $\Delta Y(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) := Y(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) - Y(t_0)$ for an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process Y. At first, we notice that $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} T^{t_0,\epsilon,j} = 0$ in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$. We shall write

$$\frac{\Delta X(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j})}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} = \frac{1}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \mathcal{U}X(s) ds + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \frac{1}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \mathcal{D}_i X(s) B^i(s)$$

Since $\mathcal{U}X$ is continuous at t_0 a.s, then $\frac{1}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \mathcal{U}X(s) ds \to \mathcal{U}X(t_0)$ in probability as $\epsilon \to 0^+$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{t_0} \vee \sigma(T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \to \mathcal{F}_{t_0}$ weakly as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, then we shall use Doob inequality for martingales to state that (see e.g [13])

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon}} \mathcal{U}X(s) ds | \mathcal{F}_{t_0} \vee \sigma(T^{t_0,\epsilon}) \right] = \mathcal{U}X(t_0) \quad \text{in probability.} \tag{4.14}$$

We now claim that for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \mathcal{D}_i X(s) dB^i(s) \big| \mathcal{F}_{t_0} \vee \sigma(T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \right] = 0 \quad \text{in probability.} \tag{4.15}$$

We fix $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. By assumption $\mathcal{D}_i X$ has absolutely continuous paths and $\nabla^w \mathcal{D}_i X(\cdot)$ is continuous at t_0 a.s. In this case, integration by parts yields

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \mathcal{D}_i X(s) dB^i(s) = B^i(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \mathcal{D}_i X(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) - B^i(t_0) \mathcal{D}_i X(t_0) - \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} B^i(s) \nabla^w \mathcal{D}_i X(s) ds$$

Similarly to (4.14), we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} B^i(s) \nabla^w \mathcal{D}_i X(s) ds \big| \mathcal{F}_{t_0} \vee \sigma(T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \right] = B^i(t_0) \nabla^w \mathcal{D} X(t_0), \tag{4.16}$$

in probability. Let us write

$$\begin{aligned} B^i(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \mathcal{D}_i X(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) - B^i(t_0) \mathcal{D}_i X(t_0) &= B^i(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \int_{t_0}^{t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \nabla^w \mathcal{D}_i X(s) ds \\ &+ \mathcal{D}_i X(t_0) \Delta B^i(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to (4.14) and by using the regularity assumption of $\nabla^w \mathcal{D}_i X$ at t_0, we know that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \mathbb{E}\Big[B^i(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) \frac{1}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \int_{t_0}^{t_0+T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \nabla^w \mathcal{D}_i X(s) ds | \mathcal{F}_{t_0} \vee \sigma(T^{t_0,\epsilon,j})\Big] = B^i(t_0) \nabla^w \mathcal{D}_i X(t_0)$$

in probability. The strong Markov property of the Brownian motion yields

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{\mathcal{D}_i X(t_0)}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \Delta B^i(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) | \mathcal{F}_{t_0} \vee \sigma(T^{t_0,\epsilon,j})\Big] = \frac{\mathcal{D}_i X(t_0)}{T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Delta B^i(t_0 + T^{t_0,\epsilon,j}) | \mathcal{F}_{t_0} \vee \sigma(T^{t_0,\epsilon,j})\Big] = 0 \ a.s$$

From (4.16), we then have shown that (4.15) holds true. This concludes the proof.

□

Under strong regularity condition, we then have the following local description of the stochastic infinitesimal generator

$$\mathcal{U}X(t) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{X(t + T^{t,\epsilon,j}) - X(t)}{T^{t,\epsilon,j}} \big| \mathcal{F}_t \vee \sigma(T^{t,\epsilon,j})\right] \quad \text{in probability.} \tag{4.17}$$

for any $1 \leq j \leq p$, whenever $X \in \mathcal{WG}$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 4.2.

4.3. **Semilinear variational equations and variational principles.** The differential structure developed in the last section allows us to describe variational principles w.r.t a large class of Wiener functionals.

Example: *Backward SDE (BSDE).* Let us consider a well-posed Backward SDE:

$$Y(t) = \xi + \int_t^T g(r, Y(r), Z(r)) dr - \sum_{j=1}^p \int_t^T Z^j(r) dB^j(r), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{4.18}$$

where $g : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ is a suitable generator of the Backward SDE and $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$. A strong solution of the Backward SDE (4.18) is an $(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p)$-valued $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process (Y, Z) which satisfies (4.18) almost surely. For a given $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and under suitable technical assumptions on f, it is well known (see e.g [58]) that there exist a unique solution (Y, Z). Then, one can easily check that Y is a square-integrable Itô process and by Theorem 4.1, we arrive at the following result.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ be a fixed terminal condition. A pair (Y, Z) is a strong solution of (4.18) if, and only if, $Y \in \mathcal{WG}$, $Z = \mathcal{D}Y$ and*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{U}Y(t) + g(t, Y(t), \mathcal{D}Y(t)) = 0, \quad 0 \leq t < T, \ a.s \\ Y(T) = \xi \ a.s. \end{cases} \tag{4.19}$$

In particular, $Y(0) = \mathbb{E}[\xi] - \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \mathcal{U}Y(s) ds$.

Proof. Assume that (Y, Z) is a strong solution of (4.18). Then, Y is a square-integrable Itô process of the form

$$Y(t) = Y(0) + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_0^t Z^j(s) dB^j(s) - \int_0^t g(s, Y(s), Z(s)) ds; 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

By using Theorem 4.1, we must have $\mathcal{D}_j Y = Z^j; 1 \leq j \leq p$ and the following identity holds true

$$\mathcal{U}Y + g(t, Y(t), \mathcal{D}Y(t)) = 0; 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

This shows (4.19). Reciprocally, if $Y \in \mathcal{WG}$ satisfies (4.19), then applying again Theorem 4.1, we must have

$$Y(t) = Y(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_j Y(s) dB^j(s) - \int_0^t g(s, Y(s), \mathcal{D}Y(s)) ds; 0 \leq t \leq T$$

where $Y(T) = \xi$ a.s. This shows that Y solves (4.18). In particular, the initial condition is

$$Y(0) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\xi + \int_0^T g(s, Y(s), \mathcal{D}Y(s) ds\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\xi - \int_0^T \mathcal{U}Y(s) ds\Big].$$

□

Let us now present a variational principle related to (4.19). For this purpose, let us recall the variational characterization of martingales. We refer the reader to the pioneering work of Émery [34]. Let $\mathbf{H}$ be the Cameron-Martin space associated to the one-dimensional Wiener measure and let $L_a^2(\Omega; \mathbf{H})$ be the $\mathbb{P}$-equivalent class of $\mathbf{H}$-valued random variables such that

$$\mathbb{E}\|u\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2 := \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\dot{u}(s)|^2 ds < \infty$$

where the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\dot{u}$ is $\mathbb{F}$-adapted. One can readily see that the linear operator

$$m : L^2(\mathcal{F}_T) \to L_a^2(\Omega; \mathbf{H}) : F \mapsto m(F) := \int_0^{\cdot} \mathbb{E}[F|\mathcal{F}_s] ds$$

is bounded and its adjoint m^* is given by $m^*(u) := \int_0^T \dot{u}(s) ds$. Therefore, we have the following orthogonal decomposition

$$L_a^2(\Omega; \mathbf{H}) = (ker\ m^*) \bigoplus (ker\ m^*)^{\perp} \tag{4.20}$$

In particular, the subspace $(ker\ m^*)^{\perp} = \overline{m(L^2(\mathcal{F}_T))}$ in $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is given by (see [34])

$$(ker\ m^*)^{\perp} = \{Y \in L_a^2(\Omega; \mathbf{H}); \dot{Y} \text{ is an } \mathbb{F} - \text{martingale}\}.$$

Therefore, for each $X \in L_a^2(\Omega; \mathbf{H})$, there exists a unique pair (M^X, N^X) which realizes

$$X(\cdot) = \int_0^{\cdot} M^X(s) ds + \int_0^{\cdot} N^X(s) ds$$

where M^X is an $\mathbb{F}$-martingale and $\int_0^T N^X(s) ds = 0$ *a.s.* In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}\|X\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2 = \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |M^X(s)|^2 ds + \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |N^X(s)|^2 ds; X \in L_a^2(\Omega; \mathbf{H}).$$

Now, for a given pair (ξ, g), let $Y \in \mathcal{WG}$ be an Itô process such that $Y(T) = \xi$ a.s and we set

$$\Lambda(Y, g, \xi)(\cdot) := Y(t) - Y(0) + \int_0^t g(s, \mathcal{D}Y(s), Y(s)\big) ds,$$

$$\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}(t) := \int_0^t \Lambda(Y, g, \xi)(s) ds; 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

By Theorem 4.1, one should notice that $Y(0) = \mathbb{E}[\xi] - \mathbb{E} \int_0^T \mathcal{U}Y(s) ds$.

Proposition 4.3. *For a given pair (g, ξ), $Y \in \mathcal{WG}$ is a solution of (4.19) if, and only if,*

$$\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)} = \arg \min_{X \in L_a^2(\Omega; \boldsymbol{H}); X(T) = \mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}(T)} \mathbb{E}\|X\|_{\boldsymbol{H}}^2,$$

or, in other words,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{p}\mathbb{E}\int_0^T\int_0^s|\mathcal{D}_jY(r)|^2drds=\min_{X\in L_a^2(\Omega;\boldsymbol{H});X(T)=\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}(T)}\mathbb{E}\int_0^T|\dot{X}(s)|^2ds. \tag{4.21}$$

Proof. Let $G(g,\xi):=\{X\in L_a^2(\Omega;\mathbf{H});X(T)=\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}(T)\}$. Of course, $G(g,\xi)$ is not empty. Let $Y\in\mathcal{WG}$ be a solution of (4.19). Then, $\mathcal{U}Y+g(Y,\mathcal{D}Y)=0$ and hence applying Theorem 4.1, we get

$$Y(\cdot)-Y(0)+\int_0^{\cdot}g(s,Y(s),\mathcal{D}Y(s))ds \text{ is a martingale.}$$

Therefore, $\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}\in(ker\ m^*)^{\perp}$. By the very definition, $m^*(X)=m^*(\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)})$ for every $X\in G(g,\xi)$ and hence $X-\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}\in ker\ m^*\ \forall X\in G(g,\xi)$. By writing $X=X-\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}+\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}$, we then have

$$\mathbb{E}\|X\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2=\mathbb{E}\|X-\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2+\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2\geq\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2\ \forall X\in G(g,\xi).$$

Reciprocally, suppose that

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2=\mathbb{E}\int_0^T|\Lambda(Y,g,\xi)(s)|^2ds\leq\mathbb{E}\|X\|_{\mathbf{H}}^2\ \forall X\in G(g,\xi).$$

Then, the orthogonal decomposition (4.20) yields $\mathbb{Y}^{(g,\xi)}(\cdot)=\int_0^{\cdot}M^W(s)ds$ for some $W\in L_a^2(\Omega;\mathbf{H})$ which implies that $\Lambda(Y,g,\xi)$ is a martingale. By applying Theorem 4.1, we conclude that Y is a solution of (4.19). □

One should notice that the variational representation (4.19) encodes a martingale problem which solves the associated BSDE as follows: By Theorem 4.1, the following identity holds true

$$\begin{aligned}Y\text{ is solution of (4.19)}\iff&\ Y(\cdot)-Y(0)+\int_0^{\cdot}g(s,\mathcal{D}Y(s),Y(s))ds\text{ is a martingale}\\\iff&\ \sum_{j=1}^{p}\int_0^{\cdot}\mathcal{D}_jY(s)dB^j(s)+\int_0^{\cdot}\mathcal{U}Y(s)+g(s,Y(s),\mathcal{D}Y(s))ds\\&\text{is a martingale}\iff\mathcal{D}Y\text{ minimizes energy in the sense of (4.21).}\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, if the solution of (4.19) turns out to be a smooth Itô process, then we have a pointwise interpretation. Let

$$\Delta_t^{\epsilon}(g,X,j):=\mathbb{E}[X(t+T^{t,\epsilon,j})-X(t)|\mathcal{F}_t\vee\sigma(T^{t,\epsilon,j})]+g(t,\mathcal{D}X(t),X(t))T^{t,\epsilon,j}$$

for $0\leq t\leq T$ and $1\leq j\leq p$. Of course, for every square-integrable Itô process X and g, we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to0^+}\Delta_t^{\epsilon}(g,X,j)=0\quad\text{in }L^1(P)\ \forall t\geq0,1\leq j\leq p.$$

Let $\mathcal{WG}_{\mathrm{r}}$ be the set of square-integrable Itô processes X such that $\mathcal{D}X$ has absolutely continuous paths. The following result is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.2

Corollary 4.3. *If $Y\in\mathcal{WG}_r$ is a solution of (4.19), the weak derivative $\nabla^w\mathcal{D}_jY$ and $\mathcal{U}Y$ are continuous at t for $1\leq j\leq p$, then*

$$\Delta_t^{\epsilon}(g,Y,j)=o_{\mathbb{P}}(T^{t,\epsilon,j}) \tag{4.22}$$

as $\epsilon\to0^+$ for any $j\in\{1,\ldots,p\}$.

Example: *Reflected-Backward SDE (RBSDE).* Let us consider a well-posed RBSDE:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(4.23)\qquad & Y(t) = \xi + \int_t^T f(r, Y(r), Z(r))dr - \sum_{j=1}^{p} \int_t^T Z^j(r) dB^j(r) + K(T) - K(t), \quad 0 \le t \le T \\
& Y(t) \ge X(t); 0 \le t \le T \\
& \{K_t\} \text{ is continuous and increasing, } K(0) = 0 \text{ and } \int_0^T (Y(s) - X(s)) dK(s) = 0
\end{aligned}
$$

where $f : \Omega \times [0,T] \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R}$ is a suitable generator of the RBSDE, $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and $X \in \mathbb{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ is a continuous process. A strong solution of the RBSDE (4.23) is an $(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^p) \times \mathbb{R}_+$-valued $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process (Y, Z, K) which satisfies (4.23) almost surely. For a given $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ and under suitable technical assumptions on f, it is well known (see e.g [29]) that there exist a unique solution (Y, Z, K). In the sequel, ∇^w is the weak derivative process of an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted absolutely continuous process.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $\xi \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ be a fixed terminal condition and we assume that X is an Itô process. A triple (Y, Z, K) is a solution of (4.23) if, and only if, $Y \in \mathcal{WG}, \mathcal{D}Y = Z$, $\mathcal{U}Y = -f(Y, \mathcal{D}Y) - \nabla^w K$ and*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(4.24)\qquad \max\{\mathcal{U}Y + f(Y, \mathcal{D}Y); X - Y\} &= 0 \ a.s \\
Y(T) &= X(T) \ a.s
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. The proof is a straightforward consequence of the definition of the RBSDE solution, Proposition 4.2 and Remark 4.3 in [29] and the differential representation given in Theorem 4.1, so we omit the details. □

Remark 4.2. *We recall that in general, we cannot ensure that K has absolutely continuous paths, so that a priori we only have $Y \in \mathcal{W}$ and $\mathcal{U}Y$ may not exist. In this case, the variational inequality (4.24) has to be interpreted in a weak sense. We refer the reader to Definition 6.2 and Remark 6.4 in Section 6.1, where we discuss the case $f = 0$.*

4.4. **Comparison with other approaches.** In this section, we compare the differential calculus of this paper with other approaches dealing with path-dependent calculus. At first, let us compare the semilinear variational equations presented in the last section with other approaches dealing with path-dependent equations.

Viscosity approach versus weak functional calculus. We now compare our approach with the viscosity solution concept introduced by [25, 26]. We restrict the discussion to the semilinear case. In [25], the authors introduce a viscosity solution concept for the following path-dependent PDE

$$
(4.25)\qquad \begin{cases} -\partial_t u(t,\omega) - G\big(t, \omega, u(t,\omega), \partial_\omega u(t,\omega), \partial^2_{\omega\omega} u(\omega,t)\big) = 0, \quad 0 \le t < T, \omega \in \Omega \\ u(T,\omega) = \xi(\omega) \ a.s. \end{cases}
$$

where the path-derivatives are defined for regular Itô-type processes with coefficients having continuity properties in $(\omega, t) \in \Omega \times [0,T]$, ξ is uniformly continuous w.r.t ω and G satisfies some regularity conditions in (ω, t) as well. In this approach, the path space is equipped with a family of semimartimgale measures.

For readers who are familiar with this concept, we recall that it is based on the tangency condition

$$
(4.26)\qquad \min_{\tau} \mathbb{E}[(\varphi - u)(\tau \wedge J)|\mathcal{C}_{t_0}](\omega), \quad \text{for some stopping time } J > t_0
$$

where min is computed over all stopping times $\tau \geq t_0$ w.r.t canonical filtration $(\mathcal{C}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ over the path space Ω. Condition (4.26) is checked by means of Itô-type test processes φ admitting differentials $(\partial_t\varphi(t,\omega), \partial_\omega\varphi(t,\omega)), \partial^2_{\omega\omega}\varphi(t,\omega))$ which are continuous processes in $(t,\omega) \in [0,T]\times\Omega$. In the viscosity solution concept of path-dependent semilinear equations (see also Cosso and Russo [14, 16]), pathwise differentiability is replaced by uniform continuity in $(t,\omega) \in [0,T]\times\Omega$ so that the equation (4.25) is interpreted as a PDE parameterized by the path, and not a general PDE on the path space. In other words, in general $(\partial_t u(t,\omega), \partial_\omega u(t,\omega)), \partial^2_{\omega\omega}u(t,\omega))$ does not correspond to differential operators acting on $\mathcal{C}$-progressive processes.

The approach taken in this section can be interpreted as a weak-type solution based on the following steps:

- (E_1) Construction of approximating solutions u_N.
- (E_2) Derivation of energy estimates for approximating solutions u_N.
- (E_3) Convergence of approximating solutions u_N to a solution.

Step (E2) is based on

$$\sup_{k\geq 1}\Big(\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \|\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k}Y^k(s)\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^p}ds + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \varphi\Big(\|\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k}Y^k(t)\|_{\mathbb{R}^p}\Big)dt\Big) < \infty \tag{4.27}$$

for some moderate strictly increasing convex function φ. The energy estimate (4.27) gives rise to a weakly convergent subsequence in such way that

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} Y^\ell = Y, \lim_{\ell\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},\ell}Y = \mathcal{D}Y, \lim_{\ell\to\infty} \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},\ell}Y = \mathcal{U}Y$$

in suitable weak topologies. A version of fundamental theorem of calculus and uniqueness of semi-martingale decomposition yields Y is a solution of the semi-linear equation (4.19) (the same holds for (4.24)).

The estimate (4.27) is reminiscent from Sobolev-type energy estimates in classical PDEs, steps (E_1) and (E_3) are replaced by the concept of GAS and the weak compactness/robustness results presented in this article, respectively. Conceptually speaking, there are four major differences between [25, 26, 16] and our approach:

- Assuming the Brownian filtration as the reference information, the differential calculus behind the semilinear equations (4.19) and (4.24) is more general than the pathwise functional calculus [23, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16] and other weaker concepts ([6, 60, 12]). See Examples 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4 for simple illustrative examples.
- All differential operators are interpreted as truly differential objects measuring infinitesimal variation w.r.t the whole path of the noise, thus giving physical meaning to all path-dependent dynamics. In particular, under strong regularity condition on $\mathcal{D}Y$, one can describe it point-wisely.
- Instead of equipping Ω with semimartingale measures, we work with the Wiener measure and we do not assume any type of ω-regularity.
- In contrast to maximum-type and comparison principles, our solutions should be interpreted as martingale problems and they minimize energy in the sense of (4.21).

Lastly, we want to stress that the absence of ω-regularity in our framework is not just a technical improvement, but it allows us to treat path-dependent functionals even beyond semimartingales.

About ω-regularity. The article shows that ω-regularity assumed in the semilinear case treated by Ekren, Keller, Touzi and Zhang [25] (see also Section 4.2 in Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [27]) and Cosso and Russo [15] can be relaxed if one interprets path-dependent PDEs through a stochastic variational formulation as describe above. In order to appreciate the importance of relaxing such assumption, one may think the standard payoff of a binary option

$$H(S) := \mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} S(t)>K\}}$$

where S is the canonical process in the path space Ω. The function $H : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is not pointwise continuous and hence there is no semimartingale measure $\mathbb{Q}$ on the path space Ω in such way that the resulting random variable $S \mapsto H(S)$ is continuous.

Another typical example is given by variational inequalities like

$$\begin{cases} \max\left\{\mathcal{U}Y(t) + f(t, Y(t), \mathcal{D}Y(t)); X(t) - Y(t)\right\} = 0, \quad 0 \leq t < T, \\ Y(T) = X(T). \end{cases} \tag{4.28}$$

where the obstacle X is a functional of the fractional Brownian motion B_H with $H \neq 1/2$. For instance, if $f = 0$, g is a smooth functional and $X = g(B_H)$, then (4.28) describes an optimal stopping time problem in a non-Markovian and non-semimartingale context. One should notice that even if g is smooth, there is no semimartingale measure on path space such that $X(T)$ is uniformly continuous. Indeed, the fractional Brownian motion is not a semimartingale when $H \neq 1/2$, so that we are forced to use the Wiener measure on the path space. In this case, one can readily observe that the Wiener integral composed with the classical fractional kernel $\{K_H(t,s); 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\}$

$$\omega \mapsto B_H(\omega, t) = \int_0^t K_H(t,s) dB(\omega, s)$$

is not continuous on path space for any $H \neq 1/2$ and $t \in [0, T]$. For a more complete description of this example, see Section 6.1.

Generality of the approach. We recall that the pathwise approach given by Dupire [23] requires $\mathbb{C}^{1,2}$-pathwise smoothness in the sense of vertical and horizontal derivatives so that the works [23, 10] are restricted to the class of Itô-type semimartingale processes. In Cont and Fournié [11], the reference filtration can be induced by a Dirichlet process but the functionals originated by semimartingales are not Dirichlet processes with zero energy components of unbounded variation, moreover, functionals should be $\mathbb{C}^{1,2}$ in a pathwise sense. The weaker concepts of differential calculus given by Peng and Wong [60], Buckdhan, Ma and Zhang [6], Ekren, Touzi and Zhang [26] and Cont [12] are restricted to Itô-type processes.

Now, let us give two simple examples which illustrate the generality of the weak differential structure described in Section 3.

Example 4.1. *Assume that X is a square-integrable $\mathbb{F}$-semimartingale where the bounded variation component does not have absolutely continuous paths. Then X does not admit second-order vertical and horizontal derivatives in the sense of Dupire* [23]*, Cont and Fournié* [11]*, Peng and Wong* [60]*, Buckdhan, Ma and Zhang* [6]*, Ekren, Touzi and Zhang* [26] *and Cont* [12]*. Nevertheless, X is weakly differentiable in the sense of Definition 3.6. For instance, if B is the one-dimensional Brownian motion, then*

$$\sup_{0\leq s\leq \cdot} B(s) \in \mathcal{W} \tag{4.29}$$

but it is not differentiable in the sense of the works [23, 10, 11, 26, 60, 6, 12].

Proof. If X admits second-order vertical and horizontal derivatives in the sense of [23, 11, 60, 6, 26, 12], then it is an Itô-type process. From Proposition 3.2, we know that $X \in \mathcal{W}$. Concerning (4.29), recall (see Example 3.3 in [57]) that

$$\sup_{0\leq s\leq t} B(s) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\ell}^0(t) \ a.s; t \geq 0,$$

where $\tilde{\ell}^0(\cdot)$ is the local time of $B(\cdot) - \sup_{0\leq s\leq \cdot} B(s)$. Then, this increasing process is not an Itô process but it belongs to $\mathcal{W}$. □

Example 4.2. *One typical example of semimartingale which is beyond the scope of the articles* [23, 10, 11, 12, 60, 6, 26] *but it is weakly differentiable in the sense of Definition 3.6 is the value functional S of a general optimal stopping problem. Indeed, in case the obstacle X is not an Itô-type process, then the associated value process is an $\mathbb{F}$-supermartingale whose bounded variation decreasing component does not have absolutely continuous paths. See also Remark 6.4.*

Example 4.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a locally Lipschitz function and we set $F_t(c_t) = f(c(t)); t \geq 0, c \in \Lambda$. In general, F is not vertically differentiable in the sense of Dupire* [23] *and Cont and Fournié* [10]*. Moreover, if $X(t) = f(B(t)); t \geq 0$, then X is not path differentiable in the sense of Buckdhan, Ma and Zhang* [6]*, Peng and Wong* [60]*, Cont and Fournié* [11]*, Cont* [12] *and Ekren, Touzi and Zhang* [26].

Proof. Indeed, let us consider $f(x) = \max\{0, x\}; x \in \mathbb{R}$ and take $F_t(\eta_t) = f(\eta(t)); \eta \in \Lambda$. Then the right-hand vertical derivative $\nabla^v_+ F_t(\eta_t)$ equals to 1 while the left-hand vertical derivative $\nabla^v_- F_t(\eta_t)$ equals to 0 whenever $\eta(t) = 0$. Then, $F_t(\eta_t) = f(\eta(t)); \eta \in \Lambda$ is not vertically differentiable on Λ in the sense of [23, 10]. If f is locally Lipschitz, then $f(B)$ is a Dirichlet process (see [5]) and therefore (in general) it is not differentiable in the sense of [6, 60, 12]. By the same reason, if one fixes the Wiener measure on the set $\mathcal{P}^0_\infty$ (see Section 2.3 in [26]), then we see that $f(B)$ is not differentiable in the sense of [26]. Lastly, we notice that functionals of semimartingales in [11] can not contain unbounded variation components. □

Let $\mathrm{H}^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ be the space of absolutely continuous functions with weak derivatives $\nabla f \in L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$. Of course, locally Lipschitz functions as described in Example 4.3 belongs to $\mathrm{H}^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$. In the sequel, we prove that functionals of the form

$$B \mapsto f(B)$$

are weakly differentiable in the sense of Definition 3.6 for *every* $f \in \mathrm{H}^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$.

For this purpose, $\{\ell^x(t); (x,t) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0,T]\}$ denotes the usual Brownian local-time and the $d_x\ell^x(t)$-integration below is considered in $L^2(\mathbb{P})$-sense (see e.g [24]). The reader is urged to compare the next example with the classical case $f(B(t))$ where $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. See also Remark 3.4 in Cont and Fournie [10] in relation to the pathwise functional calculus. The next simple non-path dependent example illustrates the generality of the differential calculus given in Section 3 in relation to the works [23, 10, 11, 6, 60, 26].

Example 4.4. *Let B be a one-dimensional Brownian motion and let $f \in H^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$. If $X = f(B)$, then $X \in \mathcal{W}_{loc}$ where*

$$\mathcal{D}X = \nabla f(B), \quad \mathcal{I}^\perp X = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \nabla f(x) d_x\ell^x.$$

Proof. We claim that $F_t(B_t) = f(B(t)); 0 \leq t \leq T$ is locally weakly differentiable if $f \in \mathrm{H}^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$. For a given $m \geq 1$, let $S_m := \inf\{t > 0; |B(t)| \geq 2^m\}$. One should notice that S_m is an $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping time for every $k \geq 1$. With a slightly abuse of notation, we are going to denote B and A^k as, respectively, the stopped Brownian motion and the random walk (2.2) at S_m. Then $f(B) \in \mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$. We claim that $f(B)$ has $\mathcal{Y}$-finite energy w.r.t the canonical GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{f(A^k); k \geq 1\}$. We obviously have $f(A^k) \to f(B)$ strongly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ as $k \to \infty$. In the sequel, we need to introduce some additional notation. Let $\eta^k(t, j2^{-k})$ be $2^{-k} \times$ number of crossings made by A^k across the interval $\big((j-1)2^{-k}, j2^{-k}\big)$ in $[0,t]$. Let us denote

$$\Lambda^k(t) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \eta^k(t, j2^{-k}) \mathbb{1}_{\left((j-1)2^{-k}, j2^{-k}\right]}; \ t \in [0,T].$$

Let $\nabla^k f(\cdot) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{\Delta^k_j}{2^{-k}} \mathbb{1}_{\left((j-1)2^{-k}, j2^{-k}\right]}$ where $\Delta^k_j := f(j2^{-k}) - f((j-1)2^{-k}); \ j \in \mathbb{Z}$. By the very definition,

$$[f(A^k), f(A^k)](T) = \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} |\nabla^k f(x)|^2 \Lambda^k(T,x)dx \ a.s$$

for every $k \geq 1$. By assumption, $f \in \mathrm{H}^{1,2}_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$ so that we shall use [Prop 1.50 in [39]] and [Th. 1 in [2]] to get

$$\sup_{k\geq 1} \mathbb{E}[f(A^k), f(A^k)](T) \leq \sup_{r\geq 1} \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} |\nabla^r f(x)|^2 dx \ \sup_{r\geq 1} \mathbb{E} \sup_{x\in[-2^m,2^m]} \Lambda^r(T,x) < \infty.$$

This shows that $f(B)$ has $\mathcal{Y}$-finite energy. Now, let us fix an arbitrary $t \in [0,T]$. By the very definition

$$[f(A^k), A^k](t) = \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \nabla^k f(x)\Lambda^k(t,x)dx \ a.s; \ k \geq 1.$$

Lebesgue differentiation theorem and Trotter's theorem (see e.g Th. 6.19 in [62]) yield the pointwise convergence $\lim_{k\to\infty} \nabla^k f(x)\Lambda^k(t,x) = \nabla f(x)\ell^x(t)$ a.s for a.a x w.r.t Lebesgue measure. Theorem 1 in [2] and Prop 1.50 in [39] yield

$$\mathbb{E}\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} |\nabla^k f(x)\Lambda^k(t,x)|^2 dx \leq \sup_{r\geq 1} \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} |\nabla^r f(x)|^2 dx \times \sup_{r\geq 1} \mathbb{E} \sup_{x\in[-2^m,2^m]} |\Lambda^r(t,x)|^2 < \infty.$$

Then

$$[f(A^k), A^k](t) = \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \nabla^k f(x)\Lambda^k(t,x)dx \to \int_0^t \nabla f(B(s))ds,$$

weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ as $k \to \infty$. By applying Proposition 4.1 on the canonical GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ and Theorem 3.1, we conclude $f(B) \in \mathcal{W}_{loc}$ where $\mathcal{D}X = \nabla f(B)$.

It is well-known that X is a strong Dirichlet process where the non-martingale component is given by the local-time integral process $\int \nabla f(x) d_x \ell^x(t)$ (see e.g [24]). In particular, by Proposition 3.2, we have $\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \nabla f(x) d_x \ell^x(\cdot) = \mathcal{I}^{\perp} X(\cdot)$ on $[[0, S_m[[$ for each $m \geq 1$. This concludes the proof. □

Remark 4.3. *For any $f \in H^{1,2}_{loc}$, the existence of $\mathcal{D}f(B)$ does not require pointwise existence of ∇f as in Dupire* [23] *and Cont and Fournié* [10]*. Moreover, the existence of $\mathcal{I}^{\perp} f(B)$ does not require existence of Δf as in Cont and Fournié* [11]*, Cont* [12]*, Peng and Wong* [60]*, Buckdhan, Ma and Zhang* [6] *and Ekren, Touzi and Zhang* [26]*. While these examples are essentially trivial, it is nonetheless instructive to illustrate our results in this simplest possible setting.*

Remark 4.4. *One typical obstruction to weak differentiability is the infinite energy property which can be found in some classes of functionals of Gaussian processes like the fractional Brownian motion with exponent $0 < H < 1/2$ and non-path dependent functionals of the form $f(B)$ where $f \in H^{1,q}_{loc}$ for $1 \leq q < 2$.*

5. Splitting the Stochastic Infinitesimal Generator: Functional Calculus and Local times

In this section, we interpret $(\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,1}X, \ldots, \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,p}X)$ and $(\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,1}X, \ldots, \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k,p}X)$ in terms of functionals acting on the set $\Lambda = \cup_{0\leq t\leq T} D([0,t];\mathbb{R}^p)$, for a given GAS $\mathcal{Y}$. For simplicity of exposition, we only consider the one-dimensional case $p = 1$. The general multi-dimensional case easily follows from this case by noticing that

$$\cup_{\ell=0}^{\infty}[[T_\ell^k, T_\ell^k]] = \cup_{j=1}^{p} \cup_{\ell=0}^{\infty} [[T_\ell^{k,j}, T_\ell^{k,j}]].$$

In this section, we connect the pathwise functional calculus (see [23],[10]) to our weak differential structure. In the sequel, we recall the following notation: if x is a càdlàg path, then $x_t = \{x(r); 0 \leq r \leq t\}$ where $x(r)$ is the value of x at time $r \in [0,T]$. This notation is extended to stochastic processes.

5.1. **Splitting stochastic infinitesimal generators.** Let X be a Wiener functional and let $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ be a GAS for X. By Doob's Theorem, there exist functionals $\hat{F} = \{\hat{F}_t; 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ and $F^k = \{F^k_t; 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ defined on $\hat{\Lambda}$ and Λ, respectively, such that

$$\hat{F}_t(B_t) = X(t), \quad F^k_t(A^k_t) = X^k(t);\ 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{5.1}$$

In the remainder of the paper, when we write $F(B)$ for a given family $F_t : D([0,t];\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}; 0 \leq t \leq T$ it is implicitly assumed that we are fixing a functional $\{F_t; 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ which is consistent to $\{\hat{F}_t; 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ in the sense that

$$F_t(x_t) = \hat{F}_t(x_t) \text{ for every } x \in \hat{\Lambda}.$$

Since we are dealing only with adapted processes, throughout this section we assume that all functionals are non-anticipative in the following sense. In the sequel, $(\mathcal{B}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is the canonical filtration on $D([0,t];\mathbb{R});\ t \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{B}[0,T]$ is the Borel-sigma algebra on $[0,T]$.

Definition 5.1. *A **non-anticipative functional** $\{F_t; 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is a family of mappings such that*

$$F_t : D([0,t];\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$$

is $\mathcal{B}_t$-measurable for each $t \in [0,T]$.

Let X be a Wiener functional equipped with a GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$. Let F and F^k be fixed functional representations of X and X^k, respectively, which realize (5.1). Let $(\mathbb{D}^{k,\mathcal{Y}}F(B), U^{k,\mathcal{Y}}F(B))$ be the operators defined in (3.22) and (3.23), respectively. We now want to split $U^{k,\mathcal{Y}}F(B)$ into two components which encode different modes of regularity. In the sequel, it is convenient to introduce the following perturbation scheme

$$A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{t-}(u) := A^k(u),\ 0 \leq u < t \quad \text{and } A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{t-}(t) := A^k(t-) + i2^{-k},$$

for $i = -1, 0, 1$ and to shorten notation, we denote $A^k_{t-} := A^{k,0}_{t-}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$. Since X^k is a pure jump process, then

$$F^k_t(A^k_t) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} F^k_{T^k_\ell}(A^k_{T^k_\ell}) \mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell \leq t < T^k_{\ell+1}\}},\ 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{5.2}$$

A simple calculation based on the i.i.d family $\{B(T^k_n) - B(T^k_{n-1}); n, k \geq 1\}$ of Bernoulli variables with parameter $1/2$ yields the following splitting.

Lemma 5.1. *For any GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ for X with a functional representation (5.1), we have*

$$U^{\mathcal{Y},k}F(B) = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F(B) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F(B)$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F_t(B_t) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{-2k}}[F^k_t(A^k_{t-}) - F^k_{T^k_{n-1}}(A^k_{T^k_{n-1}})]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{n-1} < t \leq T^k_n\}} \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_t(B_t) := \frac{1}{2^{-2k}}[F^k_t(A^{k,2^{-k}}_{t-}) + F^k_t(A^{k,-2^{-k}}_{t-}) - 2F^k_t(A^k_{t-})];\ 0 \leq t \leq T \tag{5.4}$$

are $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable processes.

Proof. The proof is a simple computation as follows: For $t > 0$ and $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
U^{\mathcal{Y},k}F_t(B_t) &= \frac{1}{2^{-2k}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}[F^k_{T^k_n}(A^k_{T^k_n}) - F^k_{T^k_{n-1}}(A^k_{T^k_{n-1}})|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_{n-1}}; T^k_n = t]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{n-1}<t\leq T^k_n\}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^{-2k}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathbb{E}[F^k_t(A^k_t) - F^k_{T^k_{n-1}}(A^k_{T^k_{n-1}})|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_{n-1}}; T^k_n = t]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{n-1}<t\leq T^k_n\}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2^{-2k}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2}\Big[F^k_t(A^{k,2^{-k}}_{t^-}) + F^k_t(A^{k,-2^{-k}}_{t^-}) - 2F^k_t(A^k_{t^-}) \\
&+ 2F^k_t(A^k_{t^-}) - 2F^k_{T^k_{n-1}}(A^k_{T^k_{n-1}})\Big]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{n-1}<t\leq T^k_n\}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\frac{[F^k_t(A^{k,2^{-k}}_{t^-}) + F^k_t(A^{k,-2^{-k}}_{t^-}) - 2F^k_t(A^k_{t^-})]}{2^{-2k}} \\
&+ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^{-2k}}[F^k_t(A^k_{t-} - F^k_{T^k_{n-1}}(A^k_{T^k_{n-1}})]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{n-1}<t\leq T^k_n\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now check $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictability. For each $n, k \geq 1$, we define

$$A^{k,\infty}_{T^k_{n-1}}(u) := \begin{cases} A^k(u); & \text{if } 0 \leq u < T^k_{n-1} \\ A^k(T^k_{n-1}); & \text{if } T^k_{n-1} \leq u < \infty \end{cases}$$

and we set $A^{k,\infty}_{T^k_{n-1},t} :=$ restriction of $A^{k,\infty}_{T^k_{n-1}}$ over the interval $[0,t]$. We also define

$$A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{T^k_{n-1},t}(u) := \begin{cases} A^{k,\infty}_{T^k_{n-1},t}(u); & \text{if } 0 \leq u < t \\ A^k(T^k_{n-1}) + i2^{-k}; & \text{if } u = t \end{cases}$$

where $i = -1, 0, 1$ and we denote $A^k_{T^k_{n-1},t} = A^{k,0}_{T^k_{n-1},t}; n, k \geq 1$. By the very definition,

$$A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{t^-} = A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{T^k_{n-1},t} \text{ on } \{T^k_{n-1} < t \leq T^k_n\}$$

and $F^k_\cdot(A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{T^k_{n-1},\cdot})$ is $\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_{n-1}} \otimes \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)$-measurable for every $k, n \geq 1$ and $i = -1, 0, 1$. Therefore, $F^k_t(A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{t^-}) = F^k_t(A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{T^k_{n-1},t})$ on $\{T^k_{n-1} < t \leq T^k_n\}$ for every $k, n \geq 1$ and hence, we shall write

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F_t(B_t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^{-2k}}[F^k_t(A^k_{T^k_{n-1},t}) - F^k_{T^k_{n-1}}(A^k_{T^k_{n-1}})]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{n-1}<t\leq T^k_n\}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_t(B_t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{2^{-2k}}[F^k_t(A^{k,2^{-k}}_{T^k_{n-1},t}) + F^k_t(A^{k,-2^{-k}}_{T^k_{n-1},t}) - 2F^k_t(A^k_{T^k_{n-1},t})]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{n-1}<t\leq T^k_n\}}.$$

Now we may conclude (see e.g Th 5.5 in [42]) that both $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F(B)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F(B)$ are $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable processes.

□

If $\mathcal{Y}$ is the canonical GAS for a given Wiener functional $X = F(B)$, then we write $\mathcal{D}^{k,h}F(B)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{k,2}F(B)$ so that

$$U^kF(B) = \mathcal{D}^{k,h}F(B) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{k,2}F(B).$$

Remark 5.1. *The operators $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}$ encode variation in the same spirit of the horizontal and second order vertical derivatives used in the pathwise functional calculus, but with one fundamental difference: In contrast to the pathwise calculus where shifts are deterministic, the increments in the operators (5.3) and (5.4) are driven by the stopping times $\{T_n^k; n \geq 1\}$ and the Bernoulli variables $\{B(T_n^k) - B(T_{n-1}^k); n \geq 1\}$.*

Example: For a given $F \in \Lambda$, let $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{F}^k; k \geq 1\}$ be the sequence of pure jump processes given in (3.16). Under mild conditions (see Lemma 5.2), this is a GAS for $F(B)$. Since for any functional representation $\{F^k; k \geq 1\}$ for $\mathcal{F}$ which satisfies (5.1) and (5.2), we have $F^k_{T^k_n}(A^k_{T^k_n}) = F_{T^k_n}(A^k_{T^k_n})$, then from the computation in the proof of Lemma 5.1 we readily see that

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,h}F_t(B_t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{-2k}}[F_t(A^k_{t-}) - F_{T^k_{n-1}}(A^k_{T^k_{n-1}})]\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{n-1} < t \leq T^k_n\}}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,2}F_t(B_t) = \frac{1}{2^{-2k}}[F_t(A^{k,2^{-k}}_{t-}) + F_t(A^{k,-2^{-k}}_{t-}) - 2F_t(A^k_{t-})];\ 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Corollary 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{Y}$ be a GAS for X with functional representations given by (5.1) and (5.2). Under the assumption of Proposition 3.1, Lemma 5.1 yields the following functional representation of the GAS $\mathcal{Y}$: If*

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^T |\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_s(B_s)|d\langle A^k, A^k\rangle(s) < \infty;\ k \geq 1, \tag{5.5}$$

then

$$F^k_t(A^k_t) = F^k_0(A^k_0) + \oint_0^t \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k}F_s(B_s)dA^k(s) + \int_0^t \Big(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F_s(B_s) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_s(B_s)\Big)d\langle A^k, A^k\rangle(s)$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$, $k \geq 1$.

It is convenient to concentrate the whole information on the hitting times as follows. Let us define

$$\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F(B) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F_{T^k_n}(B_{T^k_n})\mathbb{1}_{]]T^k_n, T^k_{n+1}]]}, \quad \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F(B) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_{T^k_n}(B_{T^k_n})\mathbb{1}_{]]T^k_n, T^k_{n+1}]]},$$

so that $\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{Y},k}F(B) = \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F(B) + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F(B)$.

Let $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}$ be the set of Wiener functionals $F(B) \in \mathcal{WG}$ such that there exists a $\mathcal{Y}$-finite energy GAS such that both

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},h}F(B) := \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F(B), \quad \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},2}F(B) := \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F(B) \tag{5.6}$$

exist weakly in $L^1(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$. Theorem 4.1 and the definition of $\mathcal{W}^{1.2}$ lead to

$$\mathcal{W}^{1,2} \subset \mathcal{WG} \subset \mathcal{W}$$

and the following result.

Proposition 5.1. *If $F(B) \in \mathcal{W}^{1,2}$ then the resulting semimartingale decomposition is given by*

$$F_t(B_t) = F_0(B_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}F_s(B_s)dB(s) + \int_0^t \mathcal{U}F_s(B_s)ds;\ 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$\mathcal{U}F(B) = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},h}F(B) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},2}F(B),$$

for every $\mathcal{Y}$-finite energy GAS of $F(B)$ such that both $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},h}F(B)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},2}F(B)$ exist.

Remark 5.2. *(i) It is not difficult to see the splitting $(\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},h}F(B), \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},2}F(B))$ really depends on the GAS. It may happen that a given process $X = F(B)$ may admit two GAS such that both $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}^1,h}F(B)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}^2,h}F(B)$ exist but they are not indistinguishable. A similar remark holds for $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}^1,2}F(B)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y}^2,2}F(B)$. Examples of this fact can be easily constructed from the cases discussed by Oberhauser* [54]*. (ii) We do not require $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{D}F(B)) = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},2}F(B)$ for a GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ w.r.t $F(B)$, although this is true in typical cases. See Proposition 5.2.*

Let us continue to investigate the relation between the weak differential structure developed in Section 3 and the standard pathwise Itô calculus introduced by Dupire [23].

5.2. **Comparison with the pathwise functional Itô calculus.** In the sequel, $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}_{loc}$ and $L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$ denote the localization of the linear spaces $\mathcal{W}^{1,2}$ and $L^2(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$, respectively. In the sequel, we recall that ∇^h, ∇^v and $\nabla^{v,(2)}$ denote the horizontal, vertical and the second order derivative, respectively, in the sense of pathwise functional calculus. We refer the reader to Dupire [23] and Cont and Fournie [10] for details about these operators. For reader's convenience, let us recall some basic objects of the functional calculus. A natural metric on Λ is given by

$$d_\infty\big((t,w);(s,v)\big) := |t-s| + \sup_{0\le u\le T} |w_{t,T-t}(u) - v_{s,T-s}(u)|;$$

for (w,v) in $\Lambda \times \Lambda$. Here and in the sequel, we denote

$$w_{t,\gamma}(u) := w(u); 0 \le u \le t \quad \text{and } w_{t,\gamma}(u) := w(t); t < u \le t+\gamma,$$

$$w^h_t(u) := w(u); 0 \le u < t \quad \text{and } w^h_t(t) := w(t) + h;$$

and

$$w^h_{t-}(u) := w(u); 0 \le u < t \quad \text{and } w^h_{t-}(t) := w(t-) + h;$$

for $h \in \mathbb{R}, \gamma > 0$ and $w \in \Lambda$. In the sequel, continuity of functionals is defined as follows (see e.g [10]):

Definition 5.2. *A functional $F = \{F_t; 0 \le t \le T\}$ is said to be continuous at $x \in \Lambda$ if $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta(x,\varepsilon) = \delta > 0$ such that if $y \in \Lambda$ satisfies $d_\infty((t,x);,(s,y)) < \delta$ then $|F_t(x) - F_s(y)| < \varepsilon$. We say that F is continuous if it is continuous for each $x \in \Lambda$. We say that F is uniformly continuous if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $|F_t(x) - F_s(y)| < \varepsilon$ whenever $d_\infty((t,x);(s,y)) < \delta$.*

The following assumptions will be sufficient for the construction of a GAS which connects with the pathwise functional calculus introduced by Dupire.

(H1) $F = \{F_t; 0 \le t \le T\}$ is a continuous functional.

We also recall a suitable notion of "boundedness-preserving" property as follows.

Definition 5.3. *We say that a functional F is a boundedness-preserving functional if for every compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}$, there exist $C_K > 0$ such that $|F_\cdot(x_\cdot)| \le C_K$ for every $x_\cdot \in D([0,\cdot]; K)$.*

Such notion will be important for the construction of natural GAS starting with a given functional F, so we consider the following assumption

(H2) $F = \{F_t; 0 \le t \le T\}$ is a boundedness-preserving functional.

For a given functional $F \in \Lambda$, let us now recall the sequence $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{F}^k; k \geq 1\}$ introduced in (3.16) given by

$$\mathbf{F}^k(t) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} F_{T_\ell^k}(A^k_{T_\ell^k}) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_\ell^k \leq t < T_{\ell+1}^k\}},\ 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Lemma 5.2. *Let F be a representative functional of a Wiener functional X which satisfies (**H1-H2**). Then $\mathcal{F} = \{\boldsymbol{F}^k; k \geq 1\}$ is a GAS of $F(B)$.*

Proof. We only need to prove that $\mathbf{F}^k \to F(B)$ weakly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ as $k \to \infty$. By assumption **(H2)** holds, so by stopping, we shall assume that $\sup_k \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\mathbf{F}^k(t)|$ and $\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |F_t(B_t)|$ are bounded. Then $\{\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\mathbf{F}^k(t)\ |; k \geq 1\}$ is a sequence of uniformly integrable random variables. From (3.3), **(H1)** and Lemma 3.2, for any bounded $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time S, we have

$$\mathbf{F}^k(S) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_{T_n^k}(A^k_{T_n^k}) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq S < T_{n+1}^k\}} \to F_S(B_S)$$

strongly in L^1 as $k \to \infty$. Then, from Remark 3.2 in [49] we know that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{F}^k = F(B)$ weakly in $\mathbf{B}^1(\mathbb{F})$ over $[0, T]$. Since $\{\mathbf{F}^k; k \geq 1\}$ is bounded in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$, then we shall apply Th 2.1 and Corollary 3.2 in [20] to conclude weak convergence in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$.

□

Let $C_b^{1,2}(\Lambda)$ be the set of functionals satisfying **(H1-H2)** and which are pathwise horizontally and twice vertically differentiable in Λ such that all these derivatives are continuous functionals and preserve boundedness, such that $\nabla^{v,(2)}F$ is uniformly continuous.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $F \in C_b^{1,2}(\Lambda)$ and let $\mathcal{F} = \{\boldsymbol{F}^k(t); 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ be the GAS of $F(B)$ given by (3.16). Assume that $\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,h}F(B)$ and $\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,2}F(B)$ are locally bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$. Then $F(B) \in \mathcal{W}_{loc}^{1,2}$ and*

$$\nabla^v F(B) = \mathcal{D}F(B), \quad \nabla^h F(B) = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},h}F(B) \quad \text{and} \quad \nabla^{v,(2)}F(B) = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},2}F(B).$$

Proof. By assumption $F \in C_b^{1,2}(\Lambda)$ and from Theorem 1 in [23], we know that $F(B)$ is a locally-square integrable Itô process. By a routine localization procedure, we shall assume that it is actually square-integrable and Theorem 4.1 says that $F(B)$ satisfies (4.7). Therefore, by uniqueness of the special semimartigale decomposition, we must have

$$\mathcal{D}F(B) = \nabla^v F(B) \quad \text{and}\ \mathcal{U}F(B) = \nabla^h F(B) + \nabla^{v,(2)}F(B).$$

Let us now check that $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},h}F(B) = \nabla^h F(B)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},2}F(B) = \nabla^{v,(2)}F(B)$. By linearity, it is sufficient to show that $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},2}F(B)$ and $\nabla^{v,(2)}F(B)$ are indistinguishable. To keep notation simple, we set $\varphi(u) := F_{T_n^k}(A^{k,u}_{T_n^k-});\ u \in \mathbb{R}$. By assumption $F \in C_b^{1,2}(\Lambda)$ so that $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$. For a given $h > 0$, the usual mean value theorem provides a bounded random function $u \mapsto \zeta(\varphi, h, u)$ $(0 < \zeta(\varphi, h, u) < 1\ a.s\ \forall h > 0,\ u \in \mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\frac{1}{h^2}\big(\varphi(h) + \varphi(-h) - 2\varphi(0)\big) = \frac{1}{h}\int_0^h \Delta\varphi\big((u-h) + \zeta(\varphi, h, u)h\big)du\ a.s \tag{5.8}$$

To shorten notation, let us define the random paths $a_n^k(u) := A^{k,(u-2^{-k})+\zeta(2^{-k},u)}_{T_n^k-}$ for $u \in \mathbb{R}; k, n \geq 1$. From (5.8), we shall write

$$\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,2}F_t(B_t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{-k}} \int_0^{2^{-k}} \nabla^{v,(2)}F_{T_n^k}(a_n^k(u))du \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k < t \leq T_{n+1}^k\}};\ 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Let us fix $t \in (0,T]$. Let $\tilde{\eta}^k(t) = \max\{T^k_\ell; T^k_\ell \leq t\}$ and $\tilde{\eta}^k(t+) = \min\{T^k_\ell; T^k_\ell > t\}$. By the very definition,

$$|\tilde{\eta}^k(t) - \tilde{\eta}^k(t+)| \leq |\tilde{\eta}^k(t) - t| + |t - \tilde{\eta}^k(t+)| \leq 2|T^k_{\lceil 2^{2k}t \rceil} - t| \ a.s; k \geq 1. \tag{5.9}$$

Lemma 6.12 in [62] and (5.9) yield

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} |\tilde{\eta}^k(t+) - \tilde{\eta}^k(t)| = 0 \ a.s \tag{5.10}$$

On the one hand, Lebesgue differentiation theorem and the fact that $u \mapsto \nabla^{v,(2)} F_t(B^u_t)$ is continuous yield the following a.s convergence $\frac{1}{2^{-k}} \int_0^{2^{-k}} \nabla^{v,(2)} F_t(B^u_t) du \to \nabla^{v,(2)} F_t(B_t)$ as $k \to \infty$. On the other hand, for a given $\frac{\varepsilon}{2} > 0$, let $\delta > 0$ be the constant such that $|\nabla^{v,(2)} F_r(x_r) - \nabla^{v,(2)} F_s(y_s)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ whenever $d_\infty((r,x);(s,y)) < \delta$. Now we observe that $(u - 2^{-k}) + \zeta(n, 2^{-k}, u)2^{-k} \to u$ a.s as $k \to \infty$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}$. Then we shall take advantage of (3.3) and (5.10) to state that for a given ω in a set of probability 1, we shall find $k \geq 1$ large enough such that

$$\left| \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,2} F_t(B_t)(\omega) - \frac{1}{2^{-k}} \int_0^{2^{-k}} \nabla^{v,(2)} F_t(B^u_t(\omega)) du \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Triangle inequality yields $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,2} F_t(B_t)(\omega) = \nabla^{v,(2)} F_t(B_t(\omega))$ for almost all $(\omega,t) \in \Omega \times [0,T]$ and therefore, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,2} F(B) = \nabla^{v,(2)} F(B)$ weakly in $L^2(\mathbb{P} \times Leb)$ if, and only if, the boundedness assumption $\sup_{k\geq 1} \mathbb{E} \int_0^T |\mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,2} F_t(B_t)|^2 dt < \infty$ holds. This concludes the proof. □

5.3. **Local Time Representation for Path-Dependent Functionals.** In this section, we explore weak differentiability when there is no stochastic infinitesimal generator in the sense of Section 4.1, so we go back to the largest space $\mathcal{W}$. The first step towards a local time representation for a path-dependent Wiener functional is to represent the second-order derivative operator (5.4) into a first order one combined with suitable occupation times of the pure jump process A^k. To this end, let us introduce a pathwise modification of the terminal values of a given path as follows. In the sequel, for a given $s \in [0,T]$, let us define

$$D([0,s];\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R} \to D([0,s];\mathbb{R})$$
$$(\eta, x) \mapsto \mathbf{t}(\eta_s, x)$$

where we set

$$\mathbf{t}(\eta_s, x)(u) := \begin{cases} \eta(u); & \text{if } 0 \leq u < s \\ x; & \text{if } u = s. \end{cases}$$

Based on this operation, we shall define the following $\mathbb{F}^k$-adapted pathwise "terminal value" modification of A^k as follows

$$\mathbf{t}(A^k_s, (j+i)2^{-k}) = \begin{cases} A^k(u); & \text{if } 0 \leq u < s \\ (j+i)2^{-k}; & \text{if } u = s \end{cases}$$

for $0 \leq s \leq T$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $i = -1, 0, 1$. With these objects at hand, if $F(B)$ admits a GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ with a given functional representation (5.1), then we define

$$\nabla^{\mathcal{Y},k,v} F_s(B_s) := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{F^k_s(\mathbf{t}(A^k_s, j2^{-k})) - F^k_s(\mathbf{t}(A^k_s, (j-1)2^{-k}))}{2^{-k}} \mathbb{1}_{((j-1)2^{-k}, j2^{-k}]}; \ k \geq 1, \tag{5.11}$$

for $0 \leq s \leq T$. For instance, if we take the associated functional GAS $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{F}^k; k \geq 1\}$, then

$$\nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v}F_s(B_s) := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{F_s(\mathbf{t}(A^k_s, j2^{-k})) - F_s(\mathbf{t}(A^k_s,(j-1)2^{-k}))}{2^{-k}} \mathbb{1}_{((j-1)2^{-k},j2^{-k}]};\ k\geq 1,$$

for $0\leq s\leq T$. If the GAS $\mathcal{Y}$ for a given Wiener functional $F(B)$ is the canonical one, then we write $\nabla^{k,v}F(B)$.

Remark 5.3. *The operator $\nabla^{\mathcal{Y},k,v}$ is reminiscent from the vertical derivative introduced by Dupire* [23] *but with one fundamental difference: We are localizing the terminal values on $\mathbb{R}$ by a refining partition and, more importantly, the past of the Brownian motion up to these terminal values is replaced by the stepwise martingale A^k. In doing this, we can take advantage of the weak differential structure induced by $(A^k,\mathbb{F}^k)$.*

In order to switch second-order derivative $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}$ into (5.11), the following natural notion of occupation times plays a key role

$$\mathbb{L}^k(t) := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \ell^{k,j2^{-k}}(t)\mathbb{1}_{((j-1)2^{-k},j2^{-k}]}$$

$$\ell^{k,x}(t) := \frac{1}{2^{-k}}\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{|A^k(s-)-x|<2^{-k}\}} d\langle A^k,A^k\rangle(s);\ k\geq 1,\ x\in\mathbb{R},\ 0\leq t\leq T. \tag{5.12}$$

Instead of Lebesgue measure, the occupation time (5.12) is computed by a different clock $\langle A^k\rangle$ which has absolutely continuous paths. See Lemma 2.4 in [49] for more details.

In order to express our preliminary functional Itô formula, we need a natural notion of integration w.r.t the occupation times ℓ^k. If $H=\{H(t,x);(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}\}$ is a simple random field of the form

$$H(t) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \alpha_j(t)\mathbb{1}_{((j-1)2^{-k},j2^{-k}]}$$

for some measurable process $\alpha_j:\Omega\times[0,T]\to\mathbb{R}$ then integration w.r.t $\Big\{\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(t);x\in\mathbb{R},t\in[0,T]\Big\}$ is naturally defined by

$$\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{R}} H(s,x)d_{(s,x)}\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s) := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\int_0^t \alpha_j(s)\Big[d_s\ell^{k,j2^{-k}}(s) - d_s\ell^{k,(j-1)2^{-k}}(s)\Big] \tag{5.13}$$

for $0\leq t\leq T$, whenever the right-hand side of (5.13) is finite a.s.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $X=F(B)$ be a Wiener functional satisfying the assumption of Proposition 3.1 and let $\mathcal{Y}=\{X^k;k\geq 1\}$ be a GAS for $F(B)$ with a functional representation (5.2) satisfying (5.5). Then*

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_s(B_s)d\langle A^k,A^k\rangle(s) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\nabla^{\mathcal{Y},k,v}F_s(B_s,x)d_{(s,x)}\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s);\ 0\leq t\leq T, \tag{5.14}$$

and hence, the following decomposition holds

$$\begin{aligned} F^k_t(A^k_t) &= F^k_0(B_0) + \oint_0^t \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k}F_s(B_s)dA^k(s) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F_s(B_s)d\langle A^k,A^k\rangle(s) \\ &- \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\nabla^{\mathcal{Y},k,v}F_s(B_s,x)d_{(s,x)}\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s);\ 0\leq t\leq T, \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

for each $k\geq 1$.

Proof. Let us fix $k \geq 1$. By the very definition, for a given $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $s \in [0,T]$, $\mathbf{t}(A^k_s,(j+i)2^{-k}) = A^{k,i2^{-k}}_{s-}$ on $\{A^k(s-) = j2^{-k}\}$ for each $i = -1,0,1$. To shorten notation, let us introduce the following notation

$$\Delta F_{s,j,k} := F^k_s(\mathbf{t}(A^k_s,(j+1)2^{-k})) - F^k_s(\mathbf{t}(A^k_s,j2^{-k})), \quad b^{k,j}(s) := \frac{1}{2^{-k}}\mathbb{1}_{\{|A^k(s-)-j2^{-k}|<2^{-k}\}} \tag{5.16}$$

for $k \geq 1,\ j \in \mathbb{Z},\ 0 \leq s \leq T$. By the very definition, we shall write

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_s(B_s) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}\left(\frac{\Delta F_{s,j,k} - \Delta F_{s,j-1,k}}{2^{-k}}\right)\frac{1}{2^{-k}}\mathbb{1}_{\{A^k(s-)=j2^{-k}\}}\ a.s;\ 0 \leq s \leq T.$$

For a given positive integer $m \geq 1$, let $S^k_m := \inf\{0 \leq s \leq T; |A^k(s)| > 2^m\}$. Then

$$\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_s(B_s) = \sum_{j=-2^{k+m}}^{2^{k+m}}\left(\frac{\Delta F_{s,j,k} - \Delta F_{s,j-1,k}}{2^{-k}}\right)\frac{1}{2^{-k}}\mathbb{1}_{\{A^k(s-)=j2^{-k}\}}\ a.s;\ 0 \leq s < S^k_m.$$

For a given $0 \leq s < S^k_m$, we perform a pathwise summation by parts on the set $[-2^m,2^m]\cap\mathbb{Z}2^{-k}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=-2^{k+m}-1}^{2^{k+m}-1}\Big(\frac{\Delta F_{s,j+1,k}-\Delta F_{s,j,k}}{2^{-k}}\Big)b^{k,j+1}(s) &= \frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{\Delta F_{s,2^{m+k},k}}{2^{-k}}b^{k,2^{m+k}}(s) - \frac{\Delta F_{s,-2^{m+k}-1,k}}{2^{-k}}b^{k,-2^{m+k}-1}(s)\right]\\ &- \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=-2^{k+m}-1}^{2^{k+m}-1}\frac{\Delta F_{s,j,k}}{2^{-k}}\left[b^{k,j+1}(s) - b^{k,j}(s)\right]\ a.s,\end{aligned}$$

where $b^{k,2^{k+m}}(s,\omega) = b^{k,2^{k+m-1}}(s,\omega) = 0$ if $0 \leq s < S^k_m(\omega)$. Then

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=-2^{k+m}-1}^{2^{k+m}-1}\Big(\frac{\Delta F_{s,j+1,k}-\Delta F_{s,j,k}}{2^{-k}}\Big)b^{k,j+1}(s) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=-2^{k+m}-1}^{2^{k+m}-1}\frac{\Delta F_{s,j,k}}{2^{-k}}\left[b^{k,j+1}(s) - b^{k,j}(s)\right] \tag{5.17}$$

a.s for $0 \leq s < S^k_m$. For a given $0 \leq t \leq T$, (5.17) yields

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{[0,S^k_m\wedge t)}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,2}F_s(B_s)d\langle A^k,A^k\rangle(s) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{[0,S^k_m\wedge t)}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty}\nabla^{\mathcal{Y},k,v}F_s(B_s,x)d_{(s,x)}\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s)\ a.s \tag{5.18}$$

for each $m \geq 1$. By taking $m \to \infty$ in (5.18), we conclude the proof. □

A straightforward consequence of Proposition 5.3 is the following Tanaka-Meyer-Wang type representation for the occupation time $\ell^{k,x}$. In the sequel, for a given $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $j_k(x)$ be the unique integer such that $(j_k(x)-1)2^{-k} < x \leq j_k(x)2^{-k}$. Moreover, we set $f^k_x(y) := |y - j_k(x)2^{-k}|;\ y \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\mathbb{D}^k f^k_x(B) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{f^k_x(B(T^k_n)) - f^k_x(B(T^k_{n-1}))}{B(T^k_n) - B(T^k_{n-1})}\mathbb{1}_{[[T^k_n,T^k_{n+1}[[}.$$

A simple computation based on formulas (5.14) and (5.15) yields

Corollary 5.2. *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $k \geq 1$, the following representation holds*

$$\ell^{k,j_k(x)2^{-k}}(t) = |A^k(t) - j_k(x)2^{-k}| - |A^k(0) - j_k(x)2^{-k}| - \oint_0^t \mathbb{D}^k f^k_x(B)(s)dA^k(s);\ 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Weakly differentiable Wiener functionals can also be characterized in terms of horizontal perturbations and local-time space-time integrals. The following corollary reveals a broad connection between local-times and weak functional differentiability of path-dependent functionals.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $X \in \mathcal{W}$ be a weakly differentiable Wiener functional with orthogonal decomposition*

$$X(t) = X(0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}X(s)dB(s) + \mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(t)\ 0; \leq t \leq T.$$

Assume that a Wiener functional X satisfies the assumptions in Proposition 5.3 for a functional representation $\mathcal{Y} = \{F^k; k \geq 1\}$ of the canonical GAS. Then, the orthogonal integral operator is characterized as follows

$$\mathcal{I}^{\perp}X(\cdot) = \lim_{k\to\infty}\left[\int_0^{\cdot} \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{Y},k,h}F_s(B_s)d\langle A^k, A^k\rangle(s) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\cdot}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \nabla^{\mathcal{Y},k,v}F_s(B_s,x)d_{(s,x)}\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s)\right] \tag{5.19}$$

weakly in $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$.

Proof. If $X \in \mathcal{W}$, then (3.32) together with representation (5.15) yield the result. □

A direct computation of the limit (5.19) is actually nontrivial without knowing a priori the probabilistic structure of the Wiener functional, i.e., semimartingale, weak Dirichlet structures, etc. In Section 7, we show how to overcome this inherent difficulty provided that the underlying functional is smooth in the sense of p-variation.

6. Application to Stochastic Optimal Control

In this section, we discuss in detail how the theory developed in the last sections can be applied to the complete description of fully non-Markovian optimal stopping problems. Before this, it is instructive to explain the role played by our differential structure in a general stochastic optimal control problem.

For a given Borel space U, let U_s^t be the set of control processes, where each control $u \in U_s^t$ is an U-valued $\mathbb{F}$-predictable process over $\Omega \times (s,t]$. We assume that any control $u \in U_0^T$ determines an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted continuous process X^u defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. For any controls $u, v \in U_0^t$ such that $u = v$, we assume that $X^u(s) = X^v(s)$ for every $s \leq t$. Let $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable mapping. The problem is to find and characterize $u^\star \in U_0^T$ which maximizes $J(u) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^u)]$. We also assume that the class of controls $\{U_s^t : 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\}$ satisfies the usual hypothesis of restriction, concatenation and finite mixing (see e.g [18, 30] for more details). Therefore, given two controls $u, v \in U_0^T$, we define $(u \otimes_t v) \in U_0^T$ as follows

$$(u \otimes_t v)(s) := \begin{cases} u(s), & s < t \\ v(s), & s \geq t, \end{cases}$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$. In this setup, it is well known that the value process

$$V(t,u) := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{v \in U_t^T} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^{(u\otimes_t v)})|\mathcal{F}_t], \quad \mathbb{P}-a.s$$

is a $\mathbb{P}$-supermartingale for every $u \in U_0^T$ so that

$$V(t,u) = V^\star + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_j V(s,u)dB^j(s) + \mathcal{I}^{\perp}V(t,u); \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

where $V^* := \sup_{v\in U_0^T} \mathbb{E}\Phi[X^u]$ and $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}V(\cdot,u)$ is decreasing. Moreover, the control $u^\star \in U_0^T$ is optimal if, and only if, the value process $V(\cdot,u^\star)$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-martingale (see e.g El Karoui [30]), i.e., $\mathcal{I}^{\perp}V(\cdot,u^\star) = 0$. In particular, if the value process $V(\cdot,u)$ is an Itô process for each $u \in U_0^T$, then we obtain that

$$V(t,u) = V^\star + \sum_{j=1}^p \int_0^t \mathcal{D}_j V(s,u)dB^j(s) + \int_0^t \mathcal{U}V(s,u)ds, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Therefore, under regularity conditions, we arrive at the following characterization

$\mathcal{U}V(u) \leq 0,\ (Leb\times\mathbb{P})-a.s\ \forall u \in U_0^T$ and $u^\star \in U_0^T$ is optimal if and only if $\mathcal{U}V(u^\star) = 0,\ (Leb\times\mathbb{P})-a.s$

Of course, in the classical Markovian case, all the structure can be summarized by fully non-linear PDEs. A similar approach can be used for drift control problems by using the Hamiltonian function (see e.g [33]). The differential calculus developed in this article yields a concrete and full description of generic stochastic optimal control problems. For this purpose, we work directly on space of control processes U_t^T. Let $U_{\ell_1}^{k,\ell_2}$ be the class of $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable U-valued processes satisfying

$$u^k(t) = \sum_{n=\ell_1}^{\ell_2} u_n^k \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k < t \leq T_{n+1}^k\}}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where $0 \leq \ell_1 \leq \ell_2 \leq en(k,T)$. The number of steps $en(k,T)$ should be proportional to the expected number of hitting times on $[0,T]$ (see Remark 6.1). Firstly, we are forced to assume the existence of an extension Φ' on the space of cadlag paths $D(\mathbb{R}_+;\mathbb{R}^p)$ such that $\Phi' = \Phi$ on $C(\mathbb{R}_+;\mathbb{R}^p)$. Secondly, it easy to verify the family $\{U_{\ell_1}^{k,\ell_2} : 0 \leq \ell_1 \leq \ell_2 \leq en(k,T)\}$ satisfies the usual hypotheses of restriction, concatenation and finite mixing. In the sequel, for $u^k \in U_0^{k,m}$, the restriction is defined by $u^{k,n} := (u_0,\dots,u_n); n = 0,\dots,en(k,T)-1$. Moreover, for a given $\psi^k \in U_{\ell_1}^{k,j}$ and $\phi^k \in U_n^{k,\ell_2}$ such that $0 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 < m$ and $n-1 \leq j$, the concatenation of ϕ^k with ψ^k at step n is defined by

$$\psi^k \otimes_n \phi^k := (\psi_{\ell_1}^k,\dots\psi_{n-1}^k,\phi_n^k,\dots\phi_{\ell_2}^k) \in U_{\ell_1}^{k,\ell_2}.$$

In the sequel, $X^{(u^k\otimes_n v^k)}$ denotes a GAS for a Wiener functional $X^{(u\otimes v)}$ depending on a concatenation $(u^k \otimes_n v^k)$. It is standard to prove that the value process given by

$$\begin{cases} V^k(T_n^k,u^k) := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{v^k\in U_n^{k,en(k,T)-1}} \mathbb{E}\left[\Phi(X^{(u^k\otimes_n v^k)}) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]; n = 0,\dots,en(k,T)-1 \\ V^k(T_{en(k,T)}^k,u^k) := \Phi(X^{u^k}); u^k \in U_0^{k,en(k,T)-1} \end{cases}$$

satisfies the dynamic programming principle,

$$\begin{cases} V^k(T_n^k,u^k) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\theta_n^k\in U_n^{k,n}} \mathbb{E}\Big[V^k\left(T_{n+1}^k,(u^{k,n-1}\otimes_n\theta_n^k)\right) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\Big]; n = 0,\dots,en(k,T)-1 \\ V^k(T_{en(k,T)}^k,u^k) = \Phi(X^{u^k}); u^k \in U_0^{k,en(k,T)-1} \end{cases}$$

with the notation that $u^{k,-1}\otimes_0\theta_0^k := \theta_0^k$. With the dynamic programming equation at hand, we arrive at the following discrete time HJB equation

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\theta_n^k\in U_n^{k,n}} \mathbb{E}\Big[U^{\mathcal{Y},k}V\left(T_{n+1}^k,(u^{k,n-1}\otimes_n\theta_n^k)\right) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\Big] = 0, \quad n = 0,\dots,en(k,T)-1.$$

where

$$U^{\mathcal{Y},k}V(T_{n+1}^k,\psi^{k,n}) := \frac{1}{2^{-2k}}\mathbb{E}\Big[V^k(T_{n+1}^k,\psi^{k,n}) - V^k(T_n^k,\psi^{k,n-1})|\mathcal{F}_{T_{n+1}^k-}^k\Big]; 0 \leq n \leq en(k,T)-1,$$

with the convention that $V^k(0,\psi^{k,-1}) := V^k(0,\psi^k)$ for $\psi^k \in U_0^{k,en(k,T)-1}$. Here, $\mathcal{Y} = \{V^k(\cdot,u^k)\}$ is a candidate to be a GAS for $V(\cdot,u)$ defined in terms of a sequence of controls u^k such that $u^k \to u$ uniformly in probability as $k \to \infty$.

The most important contribution of our calculus to the stochastic optimal control theory is the obtention of finite-dimensional approximations for general stochastic control problems driven by the Brownian filtration, including non-Markovian and non-semimartingale ones. The philosophy is to study the continuous-time system imbedded in a discrete-time filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k)_{n=0}^{en(k,T)}$ as $k \to \infty$. In this discrete setup, we may apply the classical theory of analytic sets to prove that under suitable

technical conditions, a typical GAS for the value process admits a sequence of finite-dimensional approximating value functionals $\mathbb{V}_n^k$ defined on $\mathbb{S}^n \times U^n$ which is upper semianalytic and

$$V^k(T_n^k, u^k) = \mathbb{V}_n^k(\mathcal{A}_n^k, u_0^k, \dots, u_{n-1}^k); n = 0, \dots, en(k,T) - 1.$$

On the other hand, for more elementary cases such as optimal stopping problems, we may derive a dynamic programming principle without the theory of analytic sets. With the dynamic programming equation described by our differential operators at hand, we may obtain concrete finite-dimensional approximating value functionals and optimal (or ϵ-optimal) controls. Lastly, we need to prove robustness, i.e., $V^k(\cdot, u^k) \to V(\cdot, u)$ uniformly in probability as $k \to \infty$.

The next section presents a detailed application of the differential theory of this article to one of the simplest and most important cases of stochastic optimal control problem: Optimal stopping. Other classes of control problems including controlled non-Markovian SDEs and other examples driven by Gaussian processes will be treated in a future paper.

6.1. **Path-dependent optimal stopping.** In this section, we illustrate the use of the weak differential calculus w.r.t Brownian motion with a concrete stochastic optimal control problem. The goal is to solve a fully path dependent optimal stopping problem: (i) We aim to characterize the value functional in a very explicit way by means of suitable variational inequalities. (ii) More importantly, we aim to provide a concrete dynamic programming principle which is similar in nature to the classical Markovian case. This will allow us to obtain epsilon-optimal stopping times in a path-dependent optimal stopping problem.

We set $f = 0$ in the variational equation (4.24) where the obstacle X is an arbitrary bounded Wiener functional with continuous paths. For simplicity of exposition, we restrict the discussion to the one-dimensional case, but all the results in this section can be extended to the multi-dimensional case without any significant difficulty. At first, let us define a subclass of Wiener functionals admitting stronger approximations.

Definition 6.1. *We say that a Wiener functional X admits a strong GAS $\{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ if it satisfies (3.12) and $X^k \to X$ strongly in $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ over $[0,T]$ as $k \to \infty$.*

For example, if a Wiener functional X has continuous paths, then the canonical GAS $\{\delta^k X : k \geq 1\}$ is a strong one. Let us now introduce the following concept of solution which will play a key role in this section. In the sequel, it is convenient to introduce the following notation. For a GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y^k; k \geq 1\}$ w.r.t a given Wiener functional Y, we set

$$U^{\mathcal{Y},k,\mathbf{P}}Y(T_i^k) := \mathbb{E}[U^{\mathcal{Y},k}Y(T_{i+1}^k)|\mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}^k] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{\Delta Y^k(T_{i+1}^k)}{2^{-2k}}|\mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}^k\Big]; i \geq 0.$$

Throughout this section, we denote $en(k,T) := \lceil 2^{2k}T \rceil; k \geq 1$.

Remark 6.1. *The sequence $en(k,T)$ will play a key role in determining a concrete dynamic programming principle for a finite-dimensional approximation for the value process. The number $en(k,T) = \lceil 2^{2k}T \rceil$ is proportional to the expected number of times where A^k has jumped between $[0,T]$. Moreover, it is known $\lim_{k\to\infty} T_{en(k,T)}^k = T$ a.s and in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$. See e.g Lemma 2.2 in* [46] *or Lemma 6.12 in* [62]*. It will be the optimal number of steps to be analyzed in the control problem over $[0,T]$ when imbedding it into the discrete structure generated by the discrete-time filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k)_{n\geq 0}$.*

Definition 6.2. *For a given non-negative Wiener functional X, we say that $Y \in \mathcal{W}$ is a* ***stochastic weak solution*** *of the following variational inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\mathcal{U}Y; X - Y\} &= 0 \\ Y(T) &= X(T) \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

if there exist a GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y^k; k \geq 1\}$ for Y and a nonnegative strong GAS $\mathcal{X} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ for X which solve the following obstacle problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max\left\{U^{\mathcal{Y},k,p}Y(T_n^k); X^k(T_n^k \wedge T) - Y^k(T_n^k)\right\} &= 0 \quad n = 0, \ldots, en(k,T) - 1,\ \mathbb{P} - a.s \\ Y^k(T_{en(k,T)}^k) &= X^k(T \wedge T_{en(k,T)}^k)\ \mathbb{P} - a.s. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

*A Wiener functional $Y \in \mathcal{W}$ is a **stochastic classical solution** of (6.1) if $\mathcal{U}Y$ exists and (6.1) holds true up to $Leb \times \mathbb{P}$-null sets.*

Remark 6.2. *Definition 6.2 is strongly motivated by a concrete numerical scheme to compute the solution of (6.1) solely based on the information flow $(\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k)_{n\geq 0}$. Our definition of stochastic weak solution based on limits of approximating classical solutions is similar in nature to the concept of strong-viscosity solution introduced by Cosso and Russo* [14] *in the context of path-dependent Kolmogorov equations. Unless $Y \in \mathcal{W}$ has additional regularity, we stress that $\mathcal{U}Y$ in (6.1) does not exists so that the limiting object Y may not be smooth in typical cases. This justifies the name "weak solution".*

The remainder of this section is devoted to the development of a discrete dynamic programming equation. As a consequence, we will derive a characterization of the Snell envelope of a non-negative Wiener functional X as the unique stochastic weak solution of the obstacle problem (6.1). It will provide the non-Markovian/non-semimartingale variational representation counterpart of the classical characterization of the Snell envelope given by El Karoui et.al [29] in terms of reflected BSDEs. We postpone to a future work, the study of stochastic weak solutions for more general types of equations of type (4.24) for non-smooth generators f.

For $n \geq 0$, we denote by $ST_{k,n}(\mathbb{F})$ the class of all $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times τ such that $T_n^k \leq \tau \leq T$ a.s. To shorten notation, we set $ST_{k,n} := ST_{k,n}(\mathbb{F})$ and $ST_0 := ST_{k,0}; k \geq 1$. In order to characterize the infinitesimal behavior of the Snell envelope S (see (3.17)) of X given by

$$S(t) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{t\leq\tau} \mathbb{E}\left[X(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_t\right], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,\ \tau \in ST_0,$$

we make use of the example given in (3.18).

Throughout this section, $\overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k$ is the set of all $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping times of the form

$$\tau = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} T_i^k \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau = T_i^k\}}$$

and $\mathbb{I}_n^k = \{\eta \wedge T; \eta \in \overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k\}$.

The first step towards the solution of (6.1) is to solve (6.2) at a discrete level. Indeed, for a given Wiener functional X equipped with a GAS $\mathcal{X} = \{X^k; k \geq 1\}$, the natural candidate for Y^k to solve (6.2) is the Snell envelope

$$S_e^k(t) := \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_t^k]; 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{6.3}$$

where $ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)$ is the set of all $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping times τ such that $t \leq \tau \leq T$ *a.s.* However, we will see that S_e^k contains more information than we really need it. At first, let us give one characterization.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $\{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of non-negative pure jump process of the form (3.12). Then, the cadlag modification of the Snell envelope of X^k is given by*

$$S_e^k(t) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} ess\sup_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_\ell^k} \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{\ell+1}^k > t\}}|\mathcal{F}_{T_\ell^k}^k]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{T_{\ell+1}^k > t\}}|\mathcal{F}_{T_\ell^k}^k]} \right) \mathbb{1}_{\{T_\ell^k \leq t < T_{\ell+1}^k\}}; 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Proof. From Th.5.5 in [42], we know there exists a sequence $Z^{k,\ell}$ of processes with the following measurability property: $Z^{k,\ell}$ is $\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_\ell}\times\mathbb{B}[0,T]$-measurable for each $\ell\geq 0, k\geq 1$ and

$$S^k_e(t)=\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}Z^{k,\ell}(t)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell\leq t<T^k_{\ell+1}\}};0\leq t\leq T. \tag{6.4}$$

Let us characterize $Z^{k,\ell}$ above. In the sequel, we make use of the notation $\tilde{\eta}^k(t)$ introduced in Section 2.1. At first, we claim that for each $t\in[0,T]$ and $\ell\geq 0$,

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)}\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}\mid\mathcal{F}^k_t\right]=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}^k_\ell}\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_t]\ a.s. \tag{6.5}$$

Let us fix $t\in[0,T]$ and $\ell\geq 0$. Since X^k is a pure jump process of the form (3.12), then

$$\left\{\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}\mid\mathcal{F}^k_t];\tau\in ST_{T^k_\ell,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)\right\}=\left\{\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}\mid\mathcal{F}^k_t];\tau\in\mathbb{I}^k_\ell\right\}$$

and hence

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)}\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}\mid\mathcal{F}^k_t\right]\leq\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}^k_\ell}\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_t]\ a.s.$$

Now, let $\eta=\left(\sum_{i\geq\ell}T^k_i\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau=T^k_i\}}\right)\wedge T\in\mathbb{I}^k_\ell$ for some $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping time such that $[[\tau,\tau]]\subset\cup_{i\geq\ell}[[T^k_i,T^k_i]]$. We define $\bar{\eta}=t\wedge T$ on $\{\tau=T^k_\ell\}$ and $\bar{\eta}=T^k_{\ell+i}\wedge T$ on $\{\tau=T^k_{\ell+i}\};i\geq 1$. Then $\bar{\eta}\in ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)$ and $\mathbb{E}[X^k(\eta)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_t]=\mathbb{E}[X^k(\bar{\eta})\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_t]$. This shows that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)}\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}\mid\mathcal{F}^k_t\right]\geq\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}^k_\ell}\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_t]\ a.s.$$

so that (6.5) holds true.

By noticing that $\{\tilde{\eta}^k(t)=T^k_\ell\}=\{T^k_\ell\leq t<T^k_{\ell+1}\}\in\mathcal{F}^k_t$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)}\left(\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}^k_t]\right)\mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\eta}^k(t)=T^k_\ell\}}&=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)}\left(\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}^k_t]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\eta}^k(t)=T^k_\ell\}}\right)\\&=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in ST_{t,T}(\mathbb{F}^k)}\left(\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_t]\right)\\&=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}^k_\ell}\left(\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_\ell=\tilde{\eta}^k(t)\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_t]\right)\ a.s,\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

where in (6.6) we apply identity (6.5). From Corollary 5.68 in [42], we know

$$\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}^k_t]\mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\eta}^k(t)=T^k_\ell\}}=\frac{\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{\ell+1}>t\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_\ell}]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{\ell+1}>t\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_\ell}]}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tilde{\eta}^k(t)=T^k_\ell\}}\ a.s \tag{6.7}$$

for $\tau\in\mathbb{I}^k_\ell$. Identities (6.4), (6.6) and (6.7) show that we can choose

$$Z^{k,\ell}(t)=\operatorname*{ess\ sup}_{\tau\in\mathbb{I}^k_\ell}\frac{\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{\ell+1}>t\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_\ell}]}{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}_{\{T^k_{\ell+1}>t\}}|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_\ell}]};0\leq t\leq T.$$

□

In order to solve (6.1), for a given $m \geq 1$, we define

$$S^{k,m}(T_n^k) := \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k} \mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau \wedge T_m^k \wedge T) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]; n \geq 0, \tag{6.8}$$

and

$$S^k(T_n^k) := S^{k,\infty}(T_n^k) = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^k} \mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]; n \geq 0.$$

By the very definition, $S^{k,m}(T_r^k) = X^k(T_m^k \wedge T); r \geq m$ and as a consequence of Lemma 6.1, we have $S^k(T_n^k) = S_e^k(T_n^k); n \geq 0$. In order to simplify notation, we do not emphasize the dependence of $S^{k,m}$ on $\{X^k; k \geq 1\}$, but we stress here that $S^{k,m}$ heavily depends on X^k. In the sequel, we show that working with $S^{k,m}$ is enough to describe the stochastic weak/strong solutions of (6.1).

Lemma 6.2. *Let X^k be a nonnegative pure jump process of the form (3.12). For each $n \geq 0$ and $k \geq 1$,*

$$ess \sup_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^k} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] = ess \sup_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \ a.s \tag{6.9}$$

Proof. Take $n \geq 0$. Let $\overline{ST}_{k,n}$ be the set of all $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times such that $\tau \geq T_n^k$ $a.s.$ By stopping, (6.9) is equivalent to

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] = \operatorname*{ess} \sup_{\tau \in \overline{ST}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \ a.s$$

Of course, $\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \leq \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \overline{ST}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]$ $a.s.$ In the sequel, $\widetilde{ST}_{k,n}$ denotes the set of all $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times of the form $\eta = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} T_j^k \mathbb{1}_{\{\eta = T_j^k\}}$. Let us take an arbitrary $\tau \in \overline{ST}_{k,n}$. We shall write

$$1 = \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{\{T_m^k \leq \tau < T_{m+1}^k\}} \ a.s.$$

Based on this partition, let us define

$$\bar{\tau} := T_m^k \quad \text{on } \{T_m^k \leq \tau < T_{m+1}^k\},$$

so that $\{\bar{\tau} = T_m^k\} = \{T_m^k \leq \tau < T_{m+1}^k\}; m \geq n$. Then, we have

$$\bar{\tau} = \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} T_m^k \mathbb{1}_{\{T_m^k = \bar{\tau}\}} \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,n}$$

where $\bar{\tau} \leq T$ $a.s.$ More importantly,

$$\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] = \mathbb{E}[X^k(\bar{\tau} \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \leq \operatorname*{ess} \sup_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \ a.s$$

and since $\tau \in \overline{ST}_{k,n}$ is arbitrary, we conclude

$$\operatorname*{ess} \sup_{\tau \in \overline{ST}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] = \operatorname*{ess} \sup_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k], a.s \quad n \geq 0. \tag{6.10}$$

We claim for each $(j,n) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $j > n$ there exists $\tau_n^{k,j} \in \overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k$ such that

$$\operatorname*{ess} \sup_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] = \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_n^{k,j} \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \ a.s. \tag{6.11}$$

In order to construct such $\tau_n^{k,j} \in \overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k$, we make use of a backward induction argument. In fact, what we are going to show is the existence of a finite sequence $\{\tau_\ell^{k,j}; n \leq \ell \leq j\} \subset \overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k$ which realizes

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,\ell}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_\ell^k}] = \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_\ell^{k,j} \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_\ell^k}]\ a.s \quad \text{for } n \leq \ell \leq j. \tag{6.12}$$

Let us take $n < j$. In the sequel, the induction variable will be denoted by ℓ. At first, we notice for each $\ell \in \{n, n+1, \ldots, j\}$, the family of random variables $\{\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_\ell^k}]; \tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,\ell}\}$ satisfies the lattice property and hence

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,\ell}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_\ell^k}] = \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,\ell}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k) \wedge T|\mathcal{F}_{T_\ell^k}]\big|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_\ell^k}\right]\ a.s. \tag{6.13}$$

For $\ell = j$, identity (6.12) clearly holds true. Indeed,

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,j}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_j^k}] = X^k(T_j^k \wedge T) = \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_j^{k,j} \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_j^k}]\ a.s,$$

so we shall take $\tau_j^{k,j} := T_j^k$. Next, we apply a dynamic programming principle argument as follows. Let $Q_{k,j-1}$ be the set of all $\mathbb{N}$-valued $(\mathcal{F}_{T_{r-1}^k})_{r\geq 1}$-stopping times such that $(j-1) \leq \eta < \infty$. There exists an isomorphism as follows. For each $\tau = \sum_{i\geq j-1} T_i^k \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau = T_i^k\}} \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,j-1}$, we define $\bar{\tau} = i$ on $\{\tau = T_i^k\}; i \geq j-1$, and we set

$$\bar{\tau} := \sum_{i \geq j-1} i \mathbb{1}_{\{\bar{\tau} = i\}} \in Q_{k,j-1}.$$

By setting $Y_j^k(i) := X^k(T_i^k \wedge T_j^k \wedge T); i \geq j-1$, one should notice that

$$Y_j^k(\bar{\tau}) = X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k \wedge T)\ a.s$$

for every $\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,j-1}$ so that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\eta \in Q_{k,j-1}} \mathbb{E}[Y_j^k(\eta)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}] = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,j-1}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}]\ a.s$$

Based on this argument, if $\ell = j-1$, then the dynamic programming principle applied to the discrete-time filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}; i \geq 0\}$ (see e.g Prop VI-1-2 in [53]) and lattice property yield

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \widetilde{ST}_{k,j-1}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_j^k \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}] = \max\left\{X^k(T_{j-1}^k \wedge T), \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_j^{k,j} \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}]\right\}\ a.s. \tag{6.14}$$

We recall that $\mathcal{F}^k_{T_j^k} = \sigma(\Delta T_1^k, \ldots, \Delta T_{j-1}^k, \Delta T_j^k, \eta_1^k, \ldots, \eta_{j-1}^k, \eta_j^k)$ so that Doob-Dynkin's lemma yields the existence of a Borel function $g_k : \mathbb{R}_+^j \times \{-1,1\}^j \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $g_k(\Delta\tilde{T}_{j-1}^k, \Delta T_j^k, \tilde{\eta}_{j-1}^k, \eta_j^k) = X^k(\eta_j^{k,j} \wedge T)$ where we set $\Delta\tilde{T}_{j-1}^k := (\Delta T_1^k, \ldots, \Delta T_{j-1}^k)$ and $\tilde{\eta}_{j-1}^k := (\eta_1^k, \ldots, \eta_{j-1}^k)$. By the very definition of $\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}$ and $\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{j-1}^k}$, there exists a class of subsets $\mathcal{D}_{j-1}^k \subset \mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k} = \mathcal{F}^k_{T_{j-1}^k} \vee \mathcal{D}_{j-1}^k$. Since $\{\Delta T_j^k, \eta_j^k\}$ is independent from $\mathcal{D}_{j-1}^k$ (see Remark 3.1), then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_j^{k,j} \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}] &= \mathbb{E}[g_k(\Delta\tilde{T}_{j-1}^k, \Delta T_j^k, \tilde{\eta}_{j-1}^k, \eta_j^k)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{j-1}^k} \vee \mathcal{D}_{j-1}^k] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[g_k(\Delta\tilde{T}_{j-1}^k, \Delta T_j^k, \tilde{\eta}_{j-1}^k, \eta_j^k)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{j-1}^k}] = \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_j^{k,j} \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}^k_{T_{j-1}^k}]\ a.s.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

By applying (6.14) and (6.15), we arrive at the following identity

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\widetilde{ST}_{k,j-1}}\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau\wedge T_j^k\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}]=\max\left\{X^k(T_{j-1}^k\wedge T),\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_j^{k,j}\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}^k]\right\}\ a.s$$

In this case, we define

$$\tau_{j-1}^{k,j}:=\tau_j^{k,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{X^k(T_{j-1}^k\wedge T)<\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_j^{k,j}\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}^k]\}}+T_{j-1}^k\mathbb{1}_{\{X^k(T_{j-1}^k\wedge T)\geq\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_j^{k,j}\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}^k]\}}\in\overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k.$$

With this definition at hand, we have

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\widetilde{ST}_{k,j-1}}\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau\wedge T_j^k\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}]=\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau_{j-1}^{k,j}\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_{j-1}^k}^k]\ a.s,$$

and hence (6.13) allows us to conclude that (6.12) holds for $\ell=j-1$. By backward induction and applying (6.13), we clearly see that we shall define $\tau_\ell^{k,j}$ for $\ell=j-2,j-3,\ldots,n$ in such way that (6.12) holds. This allows us conclude that (6.11) holds true. From (6.11), if $\tau\in\widetilde{ST}_{k,n}$ then we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau\wedge T_j^k\wedge T)\mid\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]\leq\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau_n^{k,j}\wedge T)\mid\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]\leq\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\eta\in\overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k}\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\eta\wedge T)\mid\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]\ a.s$$

for every $j>n$. Hence,

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\eta\in\overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k}\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\eta\wedge T)\mid\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]\geq\lim_{j\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau\wedge T_j^k\wedge T)\mid\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]=\mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau\wedge T)\mid\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]\ a.s,\tag{6.16}$$

for every $\tau\in\widetilde{ST}_{k,n}$. By (6.10) and (6.16), we conclude that

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\overline{\mathbb{I}}_n^k}\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]\geq\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\widetilde{ST}_{k,n}}\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\in\overline{ST}_{k,n}}\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau\wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]\ a.s.$$

This concludes the proof. □

Next, we provide a strong approximation result for the Snell envelope. In the sequel, for a given GAS $\{X^k;k\geq1\}$, we set $m=en(k,T)$ in (6.8) and

$$S^{k,en(k,T)}(t):=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}S^{k,en(k,T)}(T_n^k)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq t<T_{n+1}^k\}};t\geq0.\tag{6.17}$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let X be a bounded non-negative Wiener functional with continuous paths admitting a strong nonnegative GAS $\mathcal{X}=\{X^k;k\geq1\}$ and let S be the Snell envelope of X. Then $\lim_{k\to\infty}S^{k,en(k,T)}=S$ strongly in $\boldsymbol{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ over $[0,T]$.*

Proof. Throughout this proof, C is a generic constant which may defer from line to line. Let us define

$$S^k(t)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}S^k(T_n^k)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq t<T_{n+1}^k\}};0\leq t\leq T.$$

To keep notation simple, we set $X^{k,en(k,T)}(t):=X^k(t\wedge T_{en(k,T)}^k\wedge T);t\geq0$. In the present setting, it is well known that the Snell envelope S has continuous paths and hence from Remark 3.3 and the fact that X is bounded, we know that $\lim_{k\to\infty}\delta^kS=S$ strongly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ over $[0,T]$, where $\{\delta^kS;k\geq1\}$ is the canonical GAS for S. We first prove that $(S^k-\delta^kS)$ vanishes strongly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$. One can easily check that $\{\mathbb{E}\left[X(\tau)\mid\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}\right];\tau\in ST_{k,n}\}$ has the lattice property. Therefore, the tower property yields

$$\delta^k S(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[S(T_n^k) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right] \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}\left[X(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right] \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}} \ a.s,$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$. On the other hand, from Lemma 6.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} S^k(t) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^k} \mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right] \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}}, \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right] \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}} \ a.s \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq T$. We shall use triangle inequality, the definition of the essential supremum and the non-negativeness of X^k and X to get

$$\mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \leq \mathbb{E}[|X^k(\tau) - X(\tau)||\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] + \mathbb{E}[X(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \ a.s,$$

and then

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \leq \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[|X^k(\tau) - X(\tau)||\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] + \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \ a.s. \tag{6.18}$$

Similarly,

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \leq \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[|X(\tau) - X^k(\tau)||\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] + \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] \ a.s. \tag{6.19}$$

This allows us to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |S^k(t) - \delta^k S(t)| &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left|\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right] - \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in ST_{k,n}} \mathbb{E}\left[X(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]\right| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |X(s) - X^k(s)|\Big|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\Big] \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}} \ a.s, 0 \leq t \leq T. \end{aligned}$$

By applying Doob maximal inequality in the closable discrete-time martingale $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t) - X^k(t)|\big|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]; n \geq 0$ and Jensen inequality, we can find a positive constant C such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |S^k(t) - \delta^k S(t)|^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \sup_{n \geq 0} \left|\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t) - X^k(t)|\big|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]\right|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq T\}} \\ &\leq C\mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |X(t) - X^k(t)|^2 \to 0 \end{aligned} \tag{6.20}$$

as $k \to \infty$. Let us check that $\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |S^{k,en(k,T)}(t) - S^k(t)|^2 = 0$. Similar to (6.18) and (6.19), we shall use triangle inequality, the definition of the essential supremum and the non-negativeness of X^k to get

$$\begin{aligned} |S^{k,en(k,T)}(t) - S^k(t)| &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left|\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^k} \mathbb{E}\left[X^k(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right] - \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^k} \mathbb{E}\left[X^{k,en(k,T)}(\tau) \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\right]\right| \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}} \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |X^{k,en(k,T)}(s) - X^k(s)|\Big|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k\Big] \mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}} \ a.s, 0 \leq t \leq T. \end{aligned}$$

Again, by using Doob maximal and Jensen inequalities, we can find a positive constant C such that

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|S^{k,en(k,T)}(t)-S^k(t)|^2\leq C\mathbb{E}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|X^{k,en(k,T)}(t)-X^k(t)|^2; k\geq 1. \tag{6.21}$$

Let us now prove the right-hand side of (6.21) vanishes as $k\to\infty$. By definition,

$$X^{k,en(k,T)}(t)=\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}X^k(T_n^k\wedge T^k_{en(k,T)}\wedge T)\mathbb{1}_{\{T_n^k\leq t<T_{n+1}^k\}\cap\{t<T^k_{en(k,T)}\}}+X^k(T^k_{en(k,T)}\wedge T)\mathbb{1}_{\{t\geq T^k_{en(k,T)}\}}$$

so that

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\left|X^k(t)-X^{k,en(k,T)}(t)\right|=\sup_{\ell\geq 1}|X^k(T_\ell^k)-X^k(T^k_{en(k,T)})|\mathbb{1}_{\{en(k,T)\leq\ell\leq N^k(T)\}}\ a.s. \tag{6.22}$$

From triangle inequality

$$|X^k(T_\ell^k)-X^k(T^k_{en(k,T)})|\leq|X^k(T_\ell^k)-X(T_\ell^k)|+|X(T_\ell^k)-X(T^k_{en(k,T)})|+|X(T^k_{en(k,T)})-X^k(T^k_{en(k,T)})|, \tag{6.23}$$

so by using the estimates (6.22) and (6.23), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\left|X^k(t)-X^{k,en(k,T)}(t)\right|^2 &\leq C\sup_{\ell\geq 1}|X^k(T_\ell^k)-X(T_\ell^k)|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{en(k,T)\leq\ell\leq N^k(T)\}}\\ &+ C\sup_{\ell\geq 1}|X(T^k_{en(k,T)})-X^k(T^k_{en(k,T)})|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{en(k,T)\leq\ell\leq N^k(T)\}}\\ &+ C\sup_{\ell\geq 1}|X(T_\ell^k)-X(T^k_{en(k,T)})|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{en(k,T)\leq\ell\leq N^k(T)\}}\\ &\leq 2C\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|X^k(t)-X(t)|^2\\ &+ C\sup_{\ell\geq 1}|X(T_\ell^k)-X(T^k_{en(k,T)})|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{en(k,T)\leq\ell\leq N^k(T)\}}=:I_1^k+I_2^k\ a.s.\end{aligned} \tag{6.24}$$

Since X^k is a GAS for X, we have $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}I_1^k=0$. In order to treat I_2^k, we proceed pathwise. By using the modulus of continuity

$$m^T(\omega,\delta):=\sup_{|t-s|\leq\delta,0\leq s,t\leq T}|X(t,\omega)-X(s,\omega)|$$

of $t\mapsto X(t,\omega)$ and observing that $X(\cdot,\omega)$ is uniformly continuous on the compact set $[0,T]$, we have

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}m^T(\omega,\delta)=0, \tag{6.25}$$

for almost every ω. Now, we notice that

$$I_2^k\leq\left|m^T(\cdot,T-T^k_{en(k,T)})\right|^2\mathbb{1}_{\{N^k(T)\geq T^k_{en(k,T)}\}}\ a.s.; k\geq 1. \tag{6.26}$$

From Lemma 6.12 of [62], we know that $\lim_{k\to\infty}T^k_{en(k,T)}=T$ a.s.. Therefore (6.26) and (6.25) yield $\lim_{k\to\infty}I_2^k=0$ a.s., and the fact that X is bounded allows us to use the bounded convergence theorem to conclude that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{E}I_2^k=0. \tag{6.27}$$

Summing up the estimates (6.20), (6.21), (6.24) and (6.27), we may conclude the proof. □

Proposition 6.1. *Let X be a non-negative and bounded Wiener functional with continuous paths. The Snell envelope S associated to X is the unique stochastic weak solution of the variational inequality*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\Big\{\mathcal{U}S; X-S\Big\} &= 0 \\ X(T) &= S(T)\ a.s. \end{aligned} \tag{6.28}$$

Proof. We divide the proof into two steps. Let us start with the existence. Let S be the Snell envelope associated to a given non-negative and bounded Wiener functional X. Then, S is a square-integrable $\mathbb{F}$-supermartingale so that Proposition 3.2 yields $S \in \mathcal{W}$. Let $\{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ be a strong GAS for X and let $\{S^{k,m}; k \geq 1\}$ be the discrete-time process defined in (6.8). For an explicit example of X^k, we shall take the canonical GAS $X^k = \delta^k X$ (see Lemma 3.3). We set $H = \{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2; 0 \leq i \leq j\}$ and for each $(n,m) \in H$, let $\mathbb{I}_n^{k,m}$ be the set of all $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping times of the form

$$\tau = \sum_{i=n}^{\infty} (T_i^k \wedge T_m^k) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau = T_i^k\}}.$$

We notice we shall write

$$S^{k,m}(T_n^k) = \operatorname{ess}\sup_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^k} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T_m^k)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] = \operatorname{ess}\sup_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^{k,m}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k];\ a.s, 0 \leq n \leq m.$$

Next, we want to apply the dynamic programming principle along the discrete-time filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}^k)_{i=0}^m$. For this purpose, we make a similar isomorphism as presented in the proof of Lemma 6.2. For the sake of clarity, we repeat the argument here. Let us define $Y^k(i) := X^k(T_i^k \wedge T); i \geq 0$ and let $J_n^{k,m}$ be the set of all $(\mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}^k)_{i=0}^m$-stopping times taking values on $\{n, n+1, \ldots, m\}$ for a given $(n,m) \in H$. That is, $\tau \in J_n^{k,m}$ if, and only if, τ is a $(\mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}^k)_{i=0}^m$-stopping time having the form

$$\tau = \sum_{i=n}^{m} i \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau = i\}}. \tag{6.29}$$

We claim there exists a bijection between the spaces $\mathbb{I}_n^{k,m}$ and $J_n^{k,m}$ for every $(n,m) \in H$. Indeed, for a given $\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^{k,m}$, we define $\bar{\tau}(\omega) := i$ if $\omega \in \{\tau = T_i^k\}; n \leq i \leq m$. Since $\cup_{i=n}^m \{\tau = T_i^k\} = \Omega$ and $\{\tau = T_i^k\} \in \mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}^k; n \leq i \leq m$, we then have $\bar{\tau} \in J_n^{k,m}$. It obvious from our construction that this operation is a bijection between $\mathbb{I}_n^{k,m}$ and $J_n^{k,m}$. More importantly,

$$\operatorname{ess}\sup_{\eta \in J_n^{k,m}} \mathbb{E}[Y^k(\eta)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k] = \operatorname{ess}\sup_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_n^{k,m}} \mathbb{E}[X^k(\tau \wedge T)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]\ a.s \tag{6.30}$$

for every $(n,m) \in H$. A direct application of dynamic programming principle (see e.g Prop. VI-1-2 in [53]) over $(\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k)_{n=0}^m$ for each $k, m \geq 1$ and (6.30) yield

$$\begin{aligned} S^{k,m}(T_n^k) &= max\{X^k(T_n^k \wedge T); \mathbb{E}[S^{k,m}(T_{n+1}^k)|\mathcal{F}_{T_n^k}^k]\};\ n = m-1, m-2, \ldots, 0,\ \mathbb{P}-a.s \\ S^{k,m}(T_m^k) &= X^k(T_m^k \wedge T). \end{aligned} \tag{6.31}$$

By using the elementary fact that $\max\{x,y\} = 0; y \leq 0$ is equivalent to $\max\{2^{2k}x; y\} = 0; y \leq 0$ and the identity (6.31), the GAS $S^{k,en(k,T)}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \max\left\{\mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{\Delta S^{k,m}(T_{i+1}^k)}{2^{-2k}}|\mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}^k\Big]; X^k(T_i^k \wedge T) - S^{k,m}(T_i^k)\right\} &= 0 \quad i = m-1, \ldots, 0,\ \mathbb{P}-a.s \\ S^{k,m}(T_m^k) &= X^k(T_m^k \wedge T)\ \mathbb{P}-a.s. \end{aligned}$$

By taking $m = en(k,T) = \lceil 2^{2k}T \rceil$ and using Lemma 6.3, we conclude the existence.

Let us now prove uniqueness. Let us assume Y is a stochastic weak solution of (6.28). Then, there exists a GAS $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y^k; k \geq 1\}$ for Y and a strong nonnegative GAS $\mathcal{X} = \{\tilde{X}^k; k \geq 1\}$ for X and they satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \max\Big\{\mathbb{E}\big[U^{\mathcal{Y},k}Y(T^k_{i+1})|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_i}\big]; \tilde{X}^k(T^k_i \wedge T) - Y^k(T^k_i)\Big\} &= 0 \quad i = en(k,T)-1,\dots,0,\ \mathbb{P}-a.s \\ \tilde{X}^k(T \wedge T^k_{en(k,T)}) &= Y^k(T^k_{en(k,T)})\ \mathbb{P}-a.s. \end{aligned} \tag{6.32}$$

In one hand, solution (6.32) implies

$$\begin{aligned} Y^k(T^k_n) &= max\{\tilde{X}^k(T^k_n \wedge T); \mathbb{E}[Y^k(T^k_{n+1})|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_n}]\};\ n = en(k,T)-1,\dots,0,\ \mathbb{P}-a.s \\ Y^k(T^k_{en(k,T)}) &= \tilde{X}^k(T^k_{en(k,T)} \wedge T). \end{aligned} \tag{6.33}$$

On the other hand, (6.33) and a completely similar argument as described in (6.29) allow us to apply dynamic programming principle over $(\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_n})_{n=0}^{en(k,T)}$ to conclude

$$Y^k(T^k_n) = \text{ess}\sup_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}^k_n} \mathbb{E}[\tilde{X}^k(\tau \wedge T^k_{en(k,T)})|\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_n}]; 0 \leq n \leq en(k,T).$$

Since $\{\tilde{X}^k; k \geq 1\}$ is a nonnegative strong GAS for X, then Lemma 6.3 allows us to conclude $Y = X$. □

From Proposition 6.1, we can actually derive a non-Markovian version of the classical dynamic programming principle. For this purpose, we need to introduce some notation. Let us agree to write s_i as a generic element of the i-th product $\mathbb{S}^i$ where we set $\mathbb{S}^0 := \{0\}$ and $\mathbb{S}_0^{en(k,T)} := \mathbb{S}^0 \times \mathbb{S}^{en(k,T)}$. For a given $(s_0,\dots,s_{en(k,T)}) \in \mathbb{S}_0^{en(k,T)}$, we write $\bar{s}_i := (s_0,\dots,s_i); 0 \leq i \leq en(k,T)$ as the projection onto the i-th coordinate. Let us recall the random element $\mathcal{A}^k_j : \Omega \to \mathbb{S}^j; \mathcal{A}^k_j = \{(T^k_\ell, \eta^k_\ell); \ell = 1,\dots,j\}; 1 \leq j \leq en(k,T)$ defined in (3.13) and we set $\mathcal{A}^k_0 := 0$. By construction, $\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_j} = (\mathcal{A}^k_j)^{-1}(\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{S}^j))$ for every $j = 1,\dots,en(k,T)$.

We are now able to present the main results of this section.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $\{X^k; k \geq 1\}$ be a GAS w.r.t a given bounded Wiener functional X with continuous paths. Let $\mathbb{Z}^k_i : \mathbb{S}^i \to \mathbb{R}; 0 \leq i \leq en(k,T)$ be a sequence of Borel functions which realizes*

$$\mathbb{Z}^k_i(\mathcal{A}^k_i) = X^k(T^k_i \wedge T)\ a.s; 0 \leq i \leq en(k,T). \tag{6.34}$$

Then, the associated GAS $S^{k,en(k,T)}$ given by (6.17) of the Snell envelope S of X satisfies

$$S^{k,en(k,T)}(T^k_i) = \mathbb{V}^k_i(\mathcal{A}^k_i)\ a.s; i = 0,\dots,en(k,T), \tag{6.35}$$

where $\mathbb{V}^k_i : \mathbb{S}^i \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}^k_i(\bar{s}_i) &= max\Big\{\mathbb{Z}^k_i(\bar{s}_i); \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{V}^k_{i+1}(\mathcal{A}^k_{i+1})|\mathcal{A}^k_i = \bar{s}_i\big]\Big\};\ 0 \leq i \leq en(k,T)-1 \\ \mathbb{V}^k_{en(k,T)}(\bar{s}_{en(k,T)}) &= \mathbb{Z}^k_{en(k,T)}(\bar{s}_{en(k,T)}), \end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

for each $\bar{s}_{en(k,T)} = (s_0,\dots,s_{en(k,T)}) \in \mathbb{S}_0^{en(k,T)}; k \geq 1$.

Proof. Since $X^k(T^k_i \wedge T)$ is $\mathcal{F}^k_{T^k_i}$-measurable for each $i = 0,\dots,en(k,T)$, then Doob-Dynkin's theorem yields the existence of a sequence of Borel functions $\mathbb{Z}^k_i$ satisfying (6.34). Similarly for the sequence $\mathbb{V}^k_i$ satisfying (6.35). By using (6.31), the GAS $S^{k,en(k,T)}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_i^k(\mathcal{A}_i^k) &= max\Big\{\mathbb{Z}_i^k(\mathcal{A}_i^k); \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}_{i+1}^k(\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^k)|\mathcal{A}_i^k]\Big\};\ i = en(k,T)-1,\dots,0,\ \mathbb{P}-a.s \\ \mathbb{V}_{en(k,T)}^k(\mathcal{A}_{en(k,T)}^k) &= \mathbb{Z}_{en(k,T)}^k(\mathcal{A}_{en(k,T)}^k). \end{aligned} \tag{6.37}$$

From (6.37), we conclude that (6.36) holds true. □

Despite the lack of Markov property for the obstacle X, Theorem 6.1 provides a path-dependent dynamic programming principle which is similar in nature to the classical Markovian case but with one fundamental difference: In contrast to the study of functions of initial points of an underlying Markov process, we reduce the analysis to points in the finite-dimensional space $\mathbb{S}_0^{en(k,T)}$ which supports all the random inter-arrival times and the sign of the jumps.

Theorem 6.1 allows us to define the stopping and continuation region as follows

$$\mathbf{S}(i,k) := \Big\{\bar{s}_i \in \mathbb{S}_0^i; \mathbb{Z}_i^k(\bar{s}_i) = \mathbb{V}_i^k(\bar{s}_i)\Big\} \quad \text{(stopping region)}$$

$$\mathbf{D}(i,k) := \Big\{\bar{s}_i \in \mathbb{S}_0^i; \mathbb{V}_i^k(\bar{s}_i) > \mathbb{Z}_i^k(\bar{s}_i)\Big\} \quad \text{(continuation region)}$$

where $0 \leq i \leq en(k,T)$. An $(\mathcal{F}_{T_i^k}^k)_{i=0}^{en(k,T)}$-optimal stopping-time is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^{*,k} &:= \min\Big\{0 \leq j \leq en(k,T); \mathcal{A}_j^k \in \mathbf{S}(j,k)\Big\} \\ &= \min\Big\{0 \leq j \leq en(k,T); S^{k,en(k,T)}(T_j^k) = X^k(T_j^k \wedge T)\Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{6.38}$$

which is finite a.s by construction. Moreover, the dynamic programming principle can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \tau_{en(k,T)}^{*,k} := en(k,T) \\ \tau_j^{*,k} := j\mathbb{1}_{G_j^k} + \tau_{j+1}^{*,k}\mathbb{1}_{(G_j^k)^c}; 0 \leq j \leq en(k,T)-1 \end{cases} \tag{6.39}$$

where $G_j^k := \{\mathbb{Z}_j^k(\mathcal{A}_j^k) \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{Z}_{\tau_{j+1}^{*,k}}^k(\mathcal{A}_{\tau_{j+1}^{*,k}}^k)|\mathcal{A}_j^k]\}; 0 \leq j \leq en(k,T)-1$ and $\tau^{*,k} = \tau_0^{*,k}$. The value functional which gives the best payoff can be reconstructed by means of our dynamic programming principle over the $en(k,T)$-steps in such way that

$$\mathbb{V}_0^k(0) = \max\{\mathbb{Z}_0^k(0); \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{V}_1^k(\mathcal{A}_1^k)]\}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}X^k(T_{\tau^{*,k}}^k \wedge T) &= \sup_{\tau \in \mathbb{I}_0^k} \mathbb{E}X^k(\tau \wedge T_{en(k,T)}^k) \\ &= \sup_{\tau \in ST_0} \mathbb{E}X^k(\tau \wedge T_{en(k,T)}^k) \end{aligned} \tag{6.40}$$

where identity (6.40) is due to Lemma 6.2. By using the fact that $\lim_{k\to\infty} X^k = \lim_{k\to\infty} X^{k,en(k,T)} = X$ strongly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$ (see the proof of Lemma 6.3), triangle inequality and (6.40), we are able to state the following result: For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $k_0(\epsilon)$ such that

$$\sup_{\tau \in ST_0} \mathbb{E}X(\tau) - \epsilon < \mathbb{E}X(T_{\tau^{*,k}}^k \wedge T)$$

for every $k \geq k_0(\epsilon)$. In other words, $T_{\tau^{*,k}}^k \wedge T$ is an ϵ-optimal stopping time whenever $k \geq k_0(\epsilon)$.

Remark 6.3. *The effectiveness of the dynamic programming algorithm (Theorem 6.1) lies on the fact that even though the mesh is random, the required number of steps $en(k,T)$ to recover the value functional is deterministic. Moreover, the finite-dimensional approximating value functional $S^{k,en(k,T)}$ converges strongly to the original value process S as $k \to \infty$. These results substantially extend section 6.1 in* [49] *and completely describes fully non-Markovian optimal stopping problems based on a flow of finite-dimensional spaces $\mathbb{S}_0^{en(k,T)}$ as $k \to \infty$.*

The next corollary is a simple consequence of our results when X is restricted to be Itô processes.

Corollary 6.1. *If $X \in \mathcal{W}$ is a square-integrable Itô process, then there exists a unique classical solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\mathcal{U}Y; X - Y\} &= 0 \quad Leb \times \mathbb{P} - a.s \\ X(T) &= Y(T) \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \end{aligned} \tag{6.41}$$

Proof. If X is a square-integrable Itô process, then the associated Snell envelope S is an Itô process (see Prop.4.2 and Remark 4.3 in [29]). From Th.2.3.9 in [48], we know that S is the unique semimartingale satisfying (6.1).

□

Remark 6.4. *We stress that in general it is not possible to ensure that a classical solution of (6.41) indeed exists without requiring the obstacle to be an Itô process (see Remark 4.3 in* [29]*).*

6.2. **A non-Markovian and non-semimartingale example.** Let us give an example of a fully non-Markovian optimal stopping problem with fractional Brownian motion. Let

$$X_H(t) = e^{-rt} f(W_H(t)); 0 \le t \le T,$$

where r is a positive constant, $f \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is a non-negative real-valued function and

$$dW_H(t) = \mu(t) W_H(t) dt + \sigma W_H(t) dB_H(t)$$

where B_H is the fractional Brownian motion (henceforth abbreviated by FBM) with exponent $0 < H < 1$ and $\sigma > 0$. For simplicity, we take $1/2 < H < 1$ since the argument for $0 < H \le 1/2$ is entirely analogous. In this case, the differential can be interpreted in terms of Riemman-Stieltjes and

$$W_H(t) = W_H(0) \exp\{\int_0^t \mu(s) ds + \sigma B_H(t)\}.$$

For simplicity we set $\mu = \alpha$ as a constant. At first, we need to choose a GAS for the FBM. In principle, any representation of the FBM can be used by replacing the underlying Brownian motion by (2.2). In the sequel, for simplicity of exposition, we choose the FBM representation as described in Corollary 5 in [8]. Let S_H be the Snell envelope associated to X_H. Then S_H is the unique stochastic weak solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \max\{\mathcal{U}S_H; X_H - S_H\} &= 0 \\ X_H(T) &= S_H(T) \end{aligned}$$

One natural GAS for X_H can be constructed as follows. Let B_H^k be a pure jump process defined by

$$B_H^k(T_n^k) := \frac{\sin \pi(H - \frac{1}{2})}{\pi} \int_0^{+\infty} x^{\frac{1}{2}-H} \int_0^{T_n^k} \ell^{H-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^{\ell} e^{-x(\ell - s)} s^{\frac{1}{2}-H} dA^k(s) d\ell dx \tag{6.42}$$

The integral in (6.42) is interpreted in the Lebesgue-Stieltjes sense. By using (3.3), one can easily check that $\{B_H^k; k \ge 1\}$ is indeed a strong GAS for B_H so that we shall define a nonnegative strong GAS for X_H as follows $X_H^k(t) := e^{-rT_n^k} f(W_H^k(T_n^k))$ on $\{T_n^k \le t < T_{n+1}^k\}; n \ge 0, k \ge 1, t \ge 0$, where

$$W_H^k(T_n^k) := \exp\{\alpha T_n^k + \sigma B_H^k(T_n^k)\} \text{ on } \{T_n^k \leq t < T_{n+1}^k\}.$$

In the sequel, projections of elements of $\mathbb{S}_0^{en(k,T)}$ onto $\mathbb{S}_0^m$ will be denoted by

$$\bar{s}_m := \Big(0, \Delta_1, i_1, \Delta_2, i_2, \ldots, \Delta_m, i_m\Big); 1 \leq m \leq en(k,T)$$

where $\Delta_\ell \in [0,\infty), i_\ell \in \{-1,1\}$ for each $\ell \in \{1,\ldots,en(k,T)\}$. For a given $(\Delta_1,\ldots,\Delta_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$, we set $t_m := \sum_{i=1}^m (\Delta_i - \Delta_{i-1})$ where $\Delta_0 := 0$. For a given configuration $\bar{s}_m$, we define the following stepwise real-valued function $a^k(\bar{s}_m) : [0,t_m] \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$a^k(\bar{s}_m) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{m-1} 2^{-k} i_\ell \mathbb{1}_{\left[t_\ell, t_{\ell+1}\right)} + 2^{-k} i_m \mathbb{1}_{[t_m]}.$$

We then set $\mathbb{Z}_0^k(0) := f(W_H(0))$ and $\mathbb{Z}_\ell^k(\bar{s}_\ell) := e^{-rt_\ell} f\big(w_H^k(\bar{s}_\ell)\big)$ where

$$w_H^k(\bar{s}_\ell) := \exp\{\alpha t_\ell + \sigma b_H^k(\bar{s}_\ell)\},$$

$$b_H^k(\bar{s}_\ell) := \frac{\sin \pi(H-\frac{1}{2})}{\pi} \int_0^{+\infty} x^{\frac{1}{2}-H} \int_0^{t_\ell} y^{H-\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^y e^{-x(y-s)} s^{\frac{1}{2}-H} da^k(\bar{s}_\ell, s) dy dx; 1 \leq \ell \leq en(k,T).$$

From Theorem 6.1, the value functional satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_i^k(\bar{s}_i) &= max\Big\{\mathbb{Z}_i^k(\bar{s}_i); \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{V}_{i+1}^k(\mathcal{A}_{i+1}^k)|\mathcal{A}_i^k = \bar{s}_i\big]\Big\};\ 0 \leq i \leq en(k,T)-1 \\ \mathbb{V}_{en(k,T)}^k(\bar{s}_{en(k,T)}) &= \mathbb{Z}_{en(k,T)}^k(\bar{s}_{en(k,T)}), \end{aligned}$$

for each $(s_0,\ldots,s_i,\ldots,s_{en(k,T)}) \in \mathbb{S}_0^{en(k,T)}; k \geq 1$.

7. Examples of weakly differentiable non-semimartingale functionals of the Brownian motion

In this section, we provide readable conditions on a Wiener functional $F(B) \in \mathcal{W}$ in such way that the orthogonal integral operator (5.19) is characterized in terms of limits along a functional GAS $\mathcal{F}$ as follows

$$\mathcal{I}^\perp F(B)(t) = \int_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},h} F_s(B_s) ds - \frac{1}{2} \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v} F_s(B_s,x) d_{(s,x)} \mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s);\ 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{7.1}$$

where the limit in the right-hand side of (7.1) will be interpreted as a 2D Young integral ([66]). There are some possibilities for the characterization of the above limit. In this section, we focus our attention to Young's approach and the analysis of other possible characterizations depending on the smoothness of F will be discussed elsewhere.

The precise identification of the limit of local-time integrals in the right-hand side of (7.1) is not a trivial task. In terms of Young integration theory (see e.g [66, 39]), the first obstacle towards the asymptotic limit (7.1) is to handle two-dimensional variation of $(\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(t), \ell^x(t))$ over $\mathbb{R}\times[0,T]$ simultaneously with the infinitesimal behavior of the past of a Brownian path composed with the functional F. To prove convergence of the local-time integrals in (7.1), sharp maximal estimates on the number of crossings and the 2D Young integrals play key roles (see [55, 56]) for the obtention of the limit.

We fix once and for all, a functional GAS $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{F}^k; k \geq 1\}$ of the form (3.16). In the sequel, $d_{(s,x)}$ and d_x are computed in the sense of a 2D and 1D Young integral, respectively. See the seminal L.C Young's articles [65, 66] for further details. In this section, it will be more convenient to work with processes defined on the whole period $[0,+\infty)$ but keeping in mind that we are just interested on the bounded interval $[0,T]$. For this reason, all processes are assumed to be defined over $[0,+\infty)$ but they vanish after the finite time T.

In the sequel, it will be more convenient to work with the following "clock" modification of $\mathbb{L}^k$ as follows

$$L^k(t) := \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} l^{k,j2^{-k}}(t)\mathbb{1}_{((j-1)2^{-k},j2^{-k}]},$$

where

$$l^{k,x}(t) := \frac{1}{2^{-k}}\int_0^t \mathbb{1}_{\{|A^k(s-)-x|<2^{-k}\}}d[A^k,A^k](s);\ k\geq 1,\ x\in\mathbb{R},\ 0\leq t<+\infty.$$

For each $k\geq 1$ and $x\in\mathbb{R}$, let $j_k(x)$ be the unique integer such that $(j_k(x)-1)2^{-k}<x\leq j_k(x)2^{-k}$ and $N^k(t)=\max\{n;T_n^k\leq t\}$ is the length of the embedded random walk until time t. By the very definition, $L^{k,x}(t)=l^{k,j_k(x)2^{-k}}(t);\ (x,t)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,\infty)$. More precisely ,

$$\begin{aligned} L^{k,x}(t) &= 2^{-k}\#\left\{n\in\{1,\ldots,N^k(t)-1\};A^k(T_n^k)=j_k(x)2^{-k}\right\} \\ &= 2^{-k}\Big(u(j_k(x)2^{-k},k,t)+d(j_k(x)2^{-k},k,t)\Big);\ (x,t)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,+\infty) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$u(j_k(x)2^{-k},k,t) := \#\left\{n\in\{1,\ldots,N^k(t)-1\};A^k(T_{n-1}^k)=(j_k(x)-1)2^{-k},A^k(T_n^k)=j_k(x)2^{-k}\right\};$$

$$d(j_k(x)2^{-k},k,t) := \#\left\{n\in\{1,\ldots,N^k(t)-1\};A^k(T_{n-1}^k)=(j_k(x)+1)2^{-k},A^k(T_n^k)=j_k(x)2^{-k}\right\};$$

for $x\in\mathbb{R},k\geq 1,0\leq t<\infty$.

In the sequel, we denote $\{\ell^x(t);(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}\times[0,+\infty)\}$ as the standard Brownian local-time, i.e., it is the unique jointly continuous random field which realizes

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x)\ell^x(t)dx=\int_0^t f(B(s))ds\quad \forall t>0 \text{ and measurable } f:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}.$$

In the remainder of this section, we are going to denote the usual p-variation norm over a compact set $[a,b]$ by $\|\cdot\|_{[a,b];p}$ where $1\leq p<\infty$. We refer the reader to Young [65, 66] for further details. In the sequel, we state a result which plays a key role for establishing the existence of the 2D Young integral. In the remainder of this section, we set $I_m:=[-2^m,2^m]$ for a positive integer $m\geq 1$.

Lemma 7.1. *For each $m\geq 1$, the following properties hold:*

(i) $L^{k,x}(t)\to\ell^x(t)$ *a.s uniformly in* $(x,t)\in I_m\times[0,T]$ *as* $k\to\infty$.

(ii) $\sup_{k\geq 1}\mathbb{E}\sup_{x\in I_m}\|L^{k,x}(\cdot)\|_{[0,T];1}^p<\infty$ *and* $\sup_{k\geq 1}\sup_{x\in I_m}\|L^{k,x}(\cdot)\|_{[0,T];1}<\infty$ *a.s for every* $p\geq 1$.

(iii) $\sup_{k\geq 1}\mathbb{E}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|L^k(t)\|_{I_m;2+\delta}^{2+\delta}<\infty$ *and* $\sup_{k\geq 1}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|L^k(t)\|_{I_m;2+\delta}^{2+\delta}<\infty$ *a.s for every* $\delta>0$.

Proof. The component $2^{-k}u(j_k(x)2^{-k},k,t)\to\frac{1}{2}\ell^x(t)$ a.s uniformly over $(x,t)\in I_m\times[0,T]$ due to the classical Th. 4.1 in [47]. By writing $2^{-k}d(j_k(x)2^{-k},k,t)-\frac{1}{2}\ell^x(t)=2^{-k}d(j_k(x)2^{-k},k,t)-2^{-k}d((j_k(x)-1)2^{-k},k,t)+2^{-k}d((j_k(x)-1)2^{-k},k,t)-\frac{1}{2}\ell^x(t)$ and using Lemma 6.23 in [62], we conclude that item (i) holds. The proof of (ii) is quite simple because $L^{k,x}(\cdot)$ has increasing paths a.s for each $k\geq 1$ and $x\in I_m$. In fact, Th.1 in [2] yields

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{k\geq 1}\sup_{x\in I_m}\left|\sup_{\Pi}\sum_{t_i\in\Pi}|L^{k,x}(t_i)-L^{k,x}(t_{i-1})|\right|^p\leq \mathbb{E}\sup_{r\geq 1}\sup_{x\in I_m}|L^{r,x}(T)|^p<\infty,$$

for every $p\geq 1$. This shows that (ii) holds. For the proof of item (iii), it will be sufficient to check only for the upcrossing component of L^k. Let us fix $M,\delta>0$. For a given partition $\Pi=\{x_i\}_{i=0}^N$ of the interval I_m, let us define the following subset $\Lambda(\Pi,k):=\{x_i\in\Pi;(j_k(x_i)-j_k(x_{i-1}))2^{-k}>0\}$. We notice that $\#\ \Lambda(\Pi,k)\leq 22^{k+m}$ for every partition Π of I_m. To shorten notation, let us write $U_p^k(t,x):=2^{-k}u^k(j_k(x)2^{-k},t);\ (x,t)\in I_m\times[0,T]$. We readily see that

$$\sum_{x_i\in\Pi}|U_p^k(t,x_i)-U_p^k(t,x_{i-1})|^{2+\delta}\leq\sum_{x_i\in\Lambda(\Pi,k)}|U_p^k(t,x_i)-U_p^k(t,x_{i-1})|^{2+\delta}\ a.s, \tag{7.2}$$

for every partition Π of I_m. By writing $|U_p^k(t,x_i)-U_p^k(t,x_{i-1})|=|U_p^k(t,x_i)-1/2\ell^{x_i}(t)+1/2\ell^{x_i}(t)-1/2\ell^{x_{i-1}}(t)+1/2\ell^{x_{i-1}}(t)-U_p^k(t,x_{i-1})|;\ x_i\in\Lambda(\Pi,k)$ and applying the standard inequality $|\alpha-\beta|^{2+\delta}\leq 2^{1+\delta}\{|\alpha|^{2+\delta}+|\beta|^{2+\delta}\};\ \alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{R}$, the bound (7.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\|U_p^k(t)\|^{2+\delta}_{I_m;2+\delta}&\leq 2^{1+\delta}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\|1/2\ell^x(t)\|^{2+\delta}_{I_m;2+\delta}+2^{1+\delta}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\sup_{\Pi}\sum_{x_i\in\Lambda(\Pi,k)}|U_p^k(t,x_i)-1/2\ell^{x_i}(t)|^{2+\delta}\\&+2^{1+\delta}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\sup_{\Pi}\sum_{x_i\in\Lambda(\Pi,k)}|U_p^k(t,x_{i-1})-1/2\ell^{x_{i-1}}(t)|^{2+\delta}\ a.s \text{ for every } k\geq 1.\end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

An inspection in the proof of Lemma 2.1 in [35] yields $\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\|\ell^x(t)\|^{2+\delta}_{I_m;2+\delta}<\infty$. By applying Th. 1.4 and Remark 1.7.1 in [45], we get for every k larger than a positive random number, the following bound

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\sup_{\Pi}\sum_{x_i\in\Lambda(\Pi,k)}|U_p^k(t,x_i)-1/2\ell^{x_i}(t)|^{2+\delta}&\leq\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\sup_{x\in I_m}|U_p^k(x,t)-1/2\ell^x(t)|^{2+\delta}2^{2k+m}\\&\leq 22^{k+m}2^{-\frac{k}{2}(2+\delta)}k^{\frac{2+\delta}{2}}(log(2))^{\frac{2++\delta}{2}}\Big(M+\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\sqrt{2}\sqrt{\ell^*(t)}\Big)^{2+\delta}\\&\leq (C+C\ell^*(T)^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}})2^{-\frac{k\delta}{2}}k^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where C is a positive constant which only depends on (M,n) and $\ell^*(t):=\sup_{x\in I_m}\ell^x(t);\ 0\leq t\leq T$. The last term in (7.3) can be treated similarly. By using the fact that $2^{-\frac{k\delta}{2}}k^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}}=O(1)$ and $\ell^*(T)<\infty$ a.s, we conclude that $\sup_{k\geq 1}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|L^k(t)\|^{2+\delta}_{I_m;2+\delta}<\infty\ a.s$ for every $\delta>0$. It remains to check the $L^{2+\delta}$-bound in (iii) which is more delicate than the related almost sure bound. We refer the reader to Corollary 2.1 in [56] for a detailed proof of this bound. □

In order to get an explicit limit for the space-time local time integrals in terms of a 2D Young integral, we need to assume some minimal smoothness in the sense of pathwise calculus. More precisely, let $\mathcal{C}^1$ be the set of non-anticipative functionals $\{F_t;0\leq t\leq T\}$ such that $x\mapsto F_s(\mathbf{t}(c_s,x))$ is $C^1(U;\mathbb{R})$ for each $c\in\Lambda$, $s\in[0,T]$ and a bounded open set $U\subset\mathbb{R}$.

Remark 7.1. *Any functional in $\mathcal{C}^1$ admits a representation $F_t(c_t)=\int_{-\infty}^{c(t)}H_t(c_t;y)dy$ for some functional H such that $y\mapsto H_t(c_t,y)$ is continuous for every $t\in[0,T]$ and $c\in\Lambda$. Moreover,*

$$\nabla^v F_t(B_t)=\partial_x F_t(\boldsymbol{t}(B_t,B(t)))=H_t(B_t,B(t));\ 0\leq t\leq T,$$

where ∇^v denotes the pathwise vertical derivative.

Assumption **(L1)**: For every càdlàg function c, the map $c \mapsto \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(c_s, x))$ is continuous uniformly in the time variable s, i.e., for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T} |c(s) - d(s)| < \delta \Longrightarrow \sup_{0\leq s\leq T} \sup_{x\in K} |\partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(c_s, x)) - \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(d_s, x))| < \varepsilon$.

Remark 7.2. *One should notice that this implies, in particular, that if c^k is a sequence of càdlàg functions such that $\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |c^k(t) - d(t)| \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, then $\sup_{0\leq s\leq T} \sup_{x\in K} |\partial_x F_s(\boldsymbol{t}(c^k_s, x)) - \partial_x F_s(\boldsymbol{t}(d_s, x))| \to 0$, as $k \to \infty$ for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$.*

The following lemma is straightforward in view of the definitions. We left the details of the proof to the reader.

Lemma 7.2. *If $F \in \mathcal{C}^1$ satisfies **(L1)**, then $\nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k} F_s(B_s, x) \to \partial_x F_s(\boldsymbol{t}(B_s, x))$ a.s uniformly in $(x, s) \in I_m \times [0, T]$ for every $m \geq 1$.*

Let us now introduce additional hypotheses in order to work with 2D-Young integrals. We refer the reader to Young [66] for further background. In the sequel, $\Delta_i h(t_i, x_j) := h(t_i, x_j) - h(t_{i-1}, x_j)$ denotes the first difference operator acting on the variable t of a given function $h : [0, T] \times [-L, L] \to \mathbb{R}$.

Assumption **(L2.1)**: Assume for every $L > 0$, there exists a positive constant M such that

$$|\Delta_i \Delta_j \partial_x F_{t_i}(\mathbf{t}(B_{t_i}, x_j))| \leq M |t_i - t_{i-1}|^{\frac{1}{q_1}} |x_j - x_{j-1}|^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \ a.s \tag{7.4}$$

for every partition $\Pi = \{t_i\}_{i=0}^N \times \{x_j\}_{j=0}^{N'}$ of $[0, T] \times [-L, L]$, where $q_1, q_2 > 1$. There exists $\alpha \in (0, 1), \delta > 0, p \geq 1$ such that $\min\{\alpha + \frac{1}{q_1}, \frac{1-\alpha}{2+\delta} + \frac{1}{q_2}\} > 1$, $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{2+\delta} > 1$ and

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|\partial_x F_t(\mathbf{t}(B_t, \cdot))\|_{[-L,L];p} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P}), \tag{7.5}$$

for every $L > 0$.

Assumption (**L2.2**): In addition to assumption **(L2.1)**, let us assume $\forall L > 0$, there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{k\geq 1} |\Delta_i \Delta_j \nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k} F_{t_i}(B_{t_i}, x_j)| \leq M |t_i - t_{i-1}|^{\frac{1}{q_1}} |x_j - x_{j-1}|^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \ a.s. \tag{7.6}$$

for every partition $\Pi = \{t_i\}_{i=0}^N \times \{x_j\}_{j=0}^{N'}$ of $[0, T] \times [-L, L]$, and

$$\sup_{k\geq 1} \sup_{0\leq t\leq T} \|\nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k} F_t(B_t, \cdot)\|_{[-L,L],p} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P}). \tag{7.7}$$

Remark 7.3. *In the language of rough path theory, assumption (7.4) precisely says that if $q = q_1 = q_2$ then $\partial_x F_t(\boldsymbol{t}(B_t, x))$ admits a 2D-control $\omega([t_1, t_2] \times [x_1, x_2]) = |t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{1}{q}} |x_1 - x_2|^{\frac{1}{q}}$ so that (7.4) trivially implies that $(t, x) \mapsto \partial_x F_t(\boldsymbol{t}(B_t, x))$ has q-joint variation in the sense of* [39]. *Assumptions **(L2.1-L2.2)** are sufficiently rich to accommodate a large class of examples. In order to extend Theorem 7.1 towards more general types of 2D-controls, more refined estimates than developed by* [55] *on the joint variation of $\{(L^{k,x}(t), \ell^x(t)); (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+\}$ are required.*

We are now in position to state our first approximation result which makes heavily use of the pathwise 2D Young integral in the context of the so-called (p, q)-bivariation rather than joint variation. We refer the reader to the seminal Young article [65](section 6) for further details.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $F \in \mathcal{C}^1$ satisfy assumptions **(L1,L2.1, L2.2)**. Then, for every $t \in [0, T]$ and $m \geq 1$, we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_0^t\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}\nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k}F_r(B_r,x)d_{(r,x)}L^{k,x}(r)=\int_0^t\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}\partial_xF_r(\mathbf{t}(B_r,x))d_{(r,x)}\ell^x(r)\quad a.s, \tag{7.8}$$

where the right-hand side of (7.8) is interpreted as the pathwise 2D Young integral.

Proof. Let us fix $t\in[0,T]$ and a positive integer m. Let $\{0=s_0<s_1<\ldots<s_p=t\}$ and $\{-2^m=x_0<x_1<\ldots<x_l=2^m\}$ be partitions of $[0,t]$ and $[-2^m,2^m]$, respectively. Similar to identity (4.5) in [35], we shall write

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{l-1}\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\partial_xF_{s_j}(\mathbf{t}(B_{s_j},x_i))\Delta_i\Delta_j\ell^{x_{i+1}}(s_j+1) &= \sum_{i=1}^{l}\sum_{j=1}^{p}\ell^{x_i}(s_j)\Delta_i\Delta_j\partial_xF_{s_j}(\mathbf{t}(B_{s_j},x_i))\\ &- \sum_{i=1}^{l}\ell^{x_i}(t)\Delta_iF_t(\mathbf{t}(B_t,x_i))\end{aligned}$$

From Lemmas 2.1, 2.2 in [35], we know that $\{\ell^x(s);0\le s\le T;x\in I_m\}$ has $(1,2+\delta)$-bivariations a.s for every $\delta>0$ (See Young [66], p. 583 for further details). Then by applying Th. 6.3 in [66] and the one dimensional existence theorem in [65] together with **L2.1**, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}\partial_xF_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x))d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s) &= \int_0^t\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}\ell^x(s)d_{(s,x)}\partial_xF_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x))\\ &- \int_{-2^m}^{2^m}\ell^x(t)d_x\partial_xF_t(\mathbf{t}(B_t,x))\ a.s.\end{aligned}$$

We do the same argument to write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}\nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v}F_s(B_s,x)d_{(s,x)}L^{k,x}(s) &= \int_0^t\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}L^{k,x}(s)d_{(s,x)}\nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v}F_s(B_s,x)\\ &- \int_{-2^m}^{2^m}L^{k,x}(t)d_x\nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v}F_t(B_t,x);a.s\ 0\le t\le T;k\ge1.\end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

Now we apply **(L1-L2.1-L2.2)**, Lemma 7.1 together with Th. 6.3, 6.4 in [66] and the term by term integration theorem in [65] to conclude that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_0^t\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}L^{k,x}(s)d_{(s,x)}\nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v}F_s(B_s,x)=\int_0^t\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}\partial_xF_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x))d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s)\ a.s$$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}L^{k,x}(t)d_x\nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v}F_t(B_t,x)=\int_{-2^m}^{2^m}\ell^x(t)d_x\partial_xF_t(\mathbf{t}(B_t,x))\ a.s$$

up to some vanishing conditions on the boundaries $t=0$ and $x=-2^m$. They clearly vanish for $t=0$. For $x=-2^m$ we have to work a little. In fact, we will enlarge our domain in x, from $[-2^m,2^m]$ to $[-2^m-1,2^m]$, and define for all functions with $-2^m-1\le x<-2^m$, the value 0, that is, for the functions $L^{k,x}(s),\ell^x(s),\partial_xF_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x))$ and $\nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k}F_s(B_s,x)$ we put the value 0, whenever $x\in[-2^m-1,-2^m)$. Then, it is easy to see, that all the conclusions of Lemmas 7.1 and 7.2 still hold true, and in this case, $L^{k,-2^m-1}(s)=0$ and $\ell^{-2^m-1}(s)=0$ for all s. Thus, we can apply Theorems 6.3 and 6.4 in [66] on the interval $[0,t]\times[-2^m-1,2^m]$. This concludes the proof. □

Next, we need to translate convergence (7.8) into L^1 convergence. The maximal inequality derived by [55] (see Th. 1.3 and Corollary 1.1) based on bivariations plays a crucial role in the proof of the following lemma. See Remark 7.3.

Proposition 7.2. *Assume that $F \in \mathcal{C}^1$ satisfies assumptions **(L1-L2.1-L2.2)**. Then, for every non-negative random variable J, we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_0^J \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k} F_r(B_r,x) d_{(r,x)} L^{k,x}(r) = \int_0^J \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \partial_x F_r(\boldsymbol{t}(B_r,x)) d_{(r,x)} \ell^x(t) \tag{7.10}$$

strongly in $L^1(\mathbb{P})$ for every $m \geq 1$.

Proof. Let us fix a positive random variable J. In view of (7.9) and Proposition 7.1, it is sufficient to check that $|\int_0^J \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} L^{k,x}(s) d_{(s,x)} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v} F_s(B_s,x)| + |\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} L^{k,x}(J) d_x \nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v} F_J(B_J,x)| =: I_1^k + I_2^k; k \geq 1$, is uniformly integrable. By the classical Young inequality based on simple functions, the following bound holds

$$I_2^k \leq C_1 \Big(L^{k,-2^m}(J) + \|L^k(J)\|_{[-2^m,2^m];2+\delta} \Big) \ a.s$$

where C_1 is a constant depending on δ and (7.7). From Th. 1 in [2] and item (ii) in Lemma 7.1, we conclude that $\{I_2^k; k \geq 1\}$ is uniformly integrable.

A direct application of Cor. 1.1 in [55] together with **(L2.2)** yield

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \int_0^J \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} L^{k,x}(s) d_{(s,x)} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v} F_s(B_s,x) \Big| \quad &\leq \quad K_0 L^{k,2^m}(T) + K \|L^k\|_{time,1}^{\alpha} \|L^k\|_{space,2+\delta}^{1-\alpha} \\ &+ \quad K_1 \|L^k\|_{time,1} + K_2 \|L^k\|_{space,2+\delta} \end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

where

$$\|L^k\|_{space,2+\delta} := \sup_{(t,s)\in[0,T]^2} \|L^k(t) - L^k(s)\|_{I_m;2+\delta},$$

$$\|L^k\|_{time,1} := \sup_{(x,y)\in I_m \times I_m} \|L^{k,x} - L^{k,y}\|_{[0,T];1}.$$

Here K_0 is a constant which comes from assumption (7.6) and K, K_1, K_2 are positive constants which only depend on the constants of assumption **(L2.1, L2.2)** namely $\alpha, q_1, q_2, \delta, T \wedge J, m$. From Lemma 7.1, we have $\sup_{k\geq 1} \mathbb{E}\|L^k\|_{space,2+\delta}^{2+\delta} < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}\sup_{k\geq 1} \|L^k\|_{time,1}^q < \infty$ for every $q \geq 1$. Again Th.1 in [2] yields the uniform integrability of $\{L^{k,2^m}(T); k \geq 1\}$. So we only need to check uniform integrability of $\{\|L^k\|_{time,1}^{\alpha} \|L^k\|_{space,2+\delta}^{1-\alpha}; k \geq 1\}$ in (7.11). For $\beta > 1$, we apply Holder inequality to get

$$\mathbb{E}\|L^k\|_{time,1}^{\beta\alpha} \|L^k\|_{space,2+\delta}^{(1-\alpha)\beta} \leq \big(\sup_{r\geq 1} \mathbb{E}\|L^r\|_{space;2+\delta} \big)^{1/p} \big(\sup_{r\geq 1} \mathbb{E}\|L^r\|_{time;1}^{\alpha\beta q} \big)^{1/q}; \ k \geq 1$$

where $p = \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)\beta} > 1$, $q = \frac{p}{p-1} = \frac{1}{1-(1-\alpha)\beta}$ with $\alpha \in (0,1)$. By applying Lemma 7.1, we conclude that $\{I_1^k; k \geq 1\}$ is uniformly integrable. Finally, Proposition 7.1 allows us to conclude that (7.10) holds.

□

Lemma 7.3. *For every $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time S, there exists a sequence of non-negative random variables $\{J^k; k \geq 1\}$ such that J^k is an $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable stopping time for each $k \geq 1$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} J^k = S$ a.s.*

Proof. We can repeat the same steps of the proof of Lemma 2.2 in [49], to get for a given $\mathbb{F}$-predictable set O, a sequence O^k of $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable set such that $\mathbb{P}[\pi(O) - \pi(O^k)] \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, where π is the usual projection of $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega$ onto Ω. Apply the usual Section Theorem (see e.g [42]) on each O^k and on the graph $[[S, S]]$ as in [Lemma 3.3; [49]] to get a sequence $\bar{J}^k$ of $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable stopping times such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{J}_k = J$ *a.s* on $\{J < \infty\}$. By defining, $J^k := \bar{J}^k$ on $\{J < \infty\}$ and $J^k := +\infty$ on $\{J = +\infty\}$, we get the desired sequence. □

Now we are in position to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $F \in \mathcal{C}^1$ be a non-anticipative functional such that $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F}}F(B) = \mathcal{D}F(B)$ for the associated functional GAS $\mathcal{F}$. If $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},h}F(B)$ exist, F satisfies assumptions **(L1, L2.1, L2.2)** and (5.5) holds for $\mathcal{F}$, then the differential representation of $F(B) \in \mathcal{W}$ is given by*

$$F_t(B_t) = F_0(B_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}F_s(B_s)dB(s) + \int_0^t \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},h}F_s(B_s)ds - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \partial_x F_s(\boldsymbol{t}(B_s, x))d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s)$$

for $0 \le t \le T$.

Proof. By assumption, $F(B) \in \mathcal{W}$, $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F}}F(B) = \mathcal{D}F(B)$ and (5.5) holds. The combination of Corollaries 4.1, 5.3 and Propositions 4.1 and 5.3 yield

$$F(B) = F_0(B_0) + \int \mathcal{D}F_s(B_s)dB(s) + \mathcal{I}^{\perp}F(B)$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}^{\perp}F(B)(\cdot) = \lim_{k\to\infty}\left[\int_0^{\cdot} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,h}F_s(B_s)d\langle A^k, A^k\rangle(s) - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\cdot}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k}F_s(B_s, x)d_{(s,x)}\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s)\right] \tag{7.12}$$

weakly in $\mathbf{B}^2(\mathbb{F})$. By using Lemma 7.3 and the existence of $\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},h}F(B)$, we can argue in the same way as in the proof of the convergence (4.8) in Theorem 4.1 to conclude that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_0^{\cdot} \mathbb{D}^{\mathcal{F},k,h}F_s(B_s)d\langle A^k, A^k\rangle(s) = \int_0^{\cdot} \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},h}F_t(B_t)dt$$

weakly in $\mathbf{B}^1(\mathbb{F})$. Then $R(\cdot) := \lim_{k\to\infty}\int_0^{\cdot}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},k,v}F_s(B_s, x)d_{(s,x)}\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s)$ weakly in $\mathbf{B}^1(\mathbb{F})$. We claim that

$$R(t) = \int_0^t \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s, x))d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s) \ a.s; \ 0 \le t < \infty. \tag{7.13}$$

Let us consider the stopping time

$$S_m := \inf\{0 \le t < \infty; |B(t)| \ge 2^m\}; \ m \ge 1. \tag{7.14}$$

One should notice that S_m is an $\mathbb{F}^k$-stopping time for every $k \ge 1$. Then, by the very definition $R(\cdot \wedge S_m) = \lim_{k\to\infty}\int_0^{\cdot}\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k}F_s(B_s, x)d_{(s,x)}\mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s \wedge S_m)$ weakly in $\mathbf{B}^1(\mathbb{F})$. For a given arbitrary $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time J (bounded or not), let J^ℓ be a sequence of $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times from Lemma 7.3 such that J^ℓ is an $\mathbb{F}^\ell$-stopping time for each $\ell \ge 1$ and $\lim_{\ell\to\infty} J^\ell = J$ *a.s*. Initially, we set $k > \ell > m$ and let us denote $A^{k,m}$ by the stopped process A^k at S_m.

By taking the functional GAS for $F(B)$, we readily see that $\frac{\Delta F_{\cdot,j,k}}{2^{-k}}(b^k_{\cdot}(j) - b^k_{\cdot}(j-1))$ is $\mathbb{F}^k$-predictable for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ (recall the notation in (5.16)). Then, we shall use $\mathbb{F}^k$-dual predictable projection on the stochastic set $]]0, J^\ell]]$ (see Th. 5.26 in [42]) to get

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^{J^\ell} \frac{\Delta F_{s,j,k}}{2^{-k}}\big(b^k_s(j) - b^k_s(j-1)\big)d[A^{k,m}, A^{k,m}](s) = \mathbb{E}\int_0^{J^\ell} \frac{\Delta F_{s,j,k}}{2^{-k}}\big(b^k_s(j) - b^k_s(j-1)\big)d\langle A^{k,m}, A^{k.m}\rangle(s);$$

for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, so that

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^{J^\ell}\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k} F_s(B_s,x) d_{(s,x)} L^{k,x}(s\wedge S_m) = \mathbb{E}\int_0^{J^\ell}\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \nabla^{\mathcal{F},v,k} F_s(B_s,x) d_{(s,x)} \mathbb{L}^{k,x}(s\wedge S_m). \tag{7.15}$$

The fact that $S_m < \infty$ a.s, Proposition 7.2 and Lemma (7.15) yield

$$\mathbb{E}\int_0^{J^\ell}\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x)) d_{(s,x)} \ell^x(s\wedge S_m) = \mathbb{E}R(J^\ell \wedge S_m);\ m \geq 1, \tag{7.16}$$

for every $\ell \geq 1$. Since $R \in \mathbf{B}^1(\mathbb{F})$ has continuous paths, we actually have

$$\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \mathbb{E}R(J^\ell \wedge S_m) = \mathbb{E}R(J\wedge S_m), \tag{7.17}$$

for every $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time J. We also know that the 2D Young integral $\int_0^\cdot \int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x)) d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s\wedge S_m)$ has continuous paths for every $m \geq 1$. Moreover, by applying the inequality given in [[55];Corollary 1.1] together with **(L2.1)**, we readily see that it belongs to $\mathbf{B}^1(\mathbb{F})$. The bounded convergence theorem and relations (7.16) and (7.17) yield

$$\mathbb{E}R(J\wedge S_m) = \mathbb{E}\int_0^{J\wedge S_m}\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x)) d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s), \tag{7.18}$$

for every $m \geq 1$. We shall write, $\mathbb{E}R(J\wedge S_m) = \mathbb{E}R(S_m)\mathbb{1}_{\{J=+\infty\}} + \mathbb{E}R(J\wedge S_m)\mathbb{1}_{\{J<+\infty\}}$. The path continuity of $R \in \mathbf{B}^1(\mathbb{F})$ and the fact that all processes are assumed to be null after time $0 < T < \infty$ yield

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}R(J\wedge S_m) = \mathbb{E}R(J)\mathbb{1}_{\{J<+\infty\}}. \tag{7.19}$$

By using the fact that the Brownian local time has compact support, we do the same argument to get

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\int_0^{J\wedge S_m}\int_{-2^m}^{2^m} \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x)) d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s) = \mathbb{E}\int_0^{J}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x)) d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s)\mathbb{1}_{\{J<+\infty\}} \tag{7.20}$$

Summing up (7.18), (7.19) and (7.20), we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}R(J)\mathbb{1}_{\{J<+\infty\}} = \mathbb{E}\int_0^{J}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x)) d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s)\mathbb{1}_{\{J<+\infty\}}. \tag{7.21}$$

Lastly, from Corollary 4.13 in [42], we shall conclude that both $R(\cdot)$ and $\int_0^\cdot \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \partial_x F_s(\mathbf{t}(B_s,x)) d_{(s,x)}\ell^x(s)$ are indistinguishable.

□

7.1. **Example.** Let us give a concrete example of Wiener functional which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 7.1. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function which satisfies the following hypotheses:

(E1) For every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$, there exist constants M_1 and M_2 such that for every $a, z \in K$,

$$|\varphi(a,x) - \varphi(a,y)| \leq M_1|x-y|^{\gamma_1},$$

and

$$|\varphi(c,z) - \varphi(d,z)| \leq M_2|c-d|^{\gamma_2},$$

where $\gamma_1 \in \left(\frac{1+\delta}{2+\delta}, 1\right]$, $\gamma_2 \in (0,1]$ and $\delta > 0$.

(E2) For every compact set $V_1 \subset \mathbb{R}$ there exists a compact set V_2 such that $\{x; \varphi(a,x) \neq 0\} \subset V_2$ for every $a \in V_1$

(E3) For every continuous path $c \in C([0,T];\mathbb{R})$, $\int_{[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}} |\varphi(c(s),y)|dsdy < \infty$.

For such a kernel φ, we consider

$$F_t(c_t) := \int_{-\infty}^{c(t)} \int_0^t \varphi(c(s),y)dsdy;\ 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{7.22}$$

if $c \in \Lambda$. By the very definition, $F_t(\mathbf{t}(c_t,x)) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} \int_0^t \varphi(c(s),y)dsdy;\ 0 \leq t \leq T, x \in \mathbb{R}, c \in \Lambda$.

Remark 7.4. *A simple computation reveals that if F satisfies **(E1-E2-E3)**, then it is vertically and horizontally differentiable in the sense of pathwise functional calculus, where*

$$\nabla^v F_t(B_t) = \int_0^t \varphi(B(s),B(t))ds, \quad \nabla^h F_t(B_t) = \int_{-\infty}^{B(t)} \varphi(B(t),y)dy; 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

*In general, F is not pathwise twice vertically differentiable due to the Hölder condition **(E1)**.*

One can show that $F \in \mathcal{W}_{loc}$ is weakly differentiable where $\nabla^v F(B) = \mathcal{D}F(B)$ and $\nabla^h F(B) = \mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{F},h}F(B)$. We left the details of this fact to the reader.

References

[1] Ahn, H. (1997). Semimartingale integral representation. *Ann. of Probab,* **25**, 2, 997-1010.

[2] Barlow, M. (1984). A maximal inequality for upcrossings of a continuous martingale. *Z. Wahrch. Verw. Gebiete*, **67**, 2, 169-173.

[3] Bertoin, J. (1986). Les processus de Dirichlet en tant qu'espace de Banach. *Stochastics*, **18**, 155-168.

[4] Bonetti, D., Leão, D., Ohashi, A. and Siqueira, V. (2015). A general multidimensional Monte Carlo approach for dynamic hedging under stochastic volatility. *Int. J. Stoch. Anal*, **v** 2015.

[5] Bouleau, N, and Yor, M. (1981). Sur la variation quadratique des temps locaux de certains semimartingales. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser I, Math.* **292**, 491-494.

[6] Buckdahn, R., Ma, J. and Zhang, J. (2015). Pathwise Taylor Expansions for Random Fields on Multiple Dimensional Paths. *Stochastic Process. Appl*, **125**, 2820-2855.

[7] Burq, Z. A. and Jones, O. D. (2008). Simulation of brownian motion at first-passage times. *Math. Comput. Simul.* **77**, 1, 64-71.

[8] Carmona, P., Coutin, L. and Montseny, G. (2000). Approximation of some Gaussian processes. *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes,* **3**, 161-171.

[9] Chang, M., Pang, T. and Yong, J. (2010). Optimal stopping problem for stochastic differential equations with random coecients, *SIAM J. Control Optim*, **48**, 941-971.

[10] Cont, R. and Fournié, D.-A. (2013). Functional Itô calculus and stochastic integral representation of martingales. *Ann. Probab*, **41**, 1, 109-133.

[11] Cont, R. and Fournié,D. A. (2010). Change of variable formulas for non-anticipative functional on path space. *J. Funct. Anal.*, **259**, 10431072.

[12] Cont, R. Functional Itô calculus and functional Kolmogorov equations, in: V Bally et al: Stochastic integration by parts and Functional Ito calculus (Lectures Notes of the Barcelona Summer School on Stochastic Analysis, Centro de Recerca de Matematica, July 2012), Springer: 2016.

[13] Coquet, F., Mémin, J. and Slominski, L. (2001). On weak convergence of filtrations. In *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXV. Lecture Notes in Math.* **1755**, 306328.

[14] Cosso, A. and Russo, F. Strong-viscosity solutions: Semilinear parabolic PDEs and path-dependent PDEs. arXiv: arXiv:1505.02927

[15] Cosso, A. and Russo, F. Functional Itô versus banach space stochastic calculus and strict solutions of semilinear path-dependent equations. arXiv:1505.02926.

[16] Cosso, A. and Russo, F. (2015). Functional and Banach Space Stochastic Calculi: Path-Dependent Kolmogorov Equations Associated with the Frame of a Brownian Motion. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics and Statistics. F.E. Benth and G. Di Nunno (eds.), Stochastics of Environmental and Financial Economics.

[17] Davis, M. On stochastic differentiation. *SIAM Theory of Probability and its applications,* **22**, 4.

[18] Davis, M. Martingale methods in stochastic control, in Stochastic Control and Stochastic Differential Systems, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences 16 Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1979.
[19] Dellacherie, C. and Meyer, P. A. *Probability and Potential B*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
[20] Diestel, J., Ruess, W.M. and Schachermayer, W. (1993). Weak compactness in $L^1(\mu, X)$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.***118**, 2, 447-453.
[21] Di Girolami, C. and Russo, F. (2014). Generalized covariation for Banach space valued processes, Ito formula and applications. *Osaka Journal of Mathematics*, 51(3).
[22] Di Girolami, C. and Russo, F. (2012). Generalized covariation and extended Fukushima decomposition for Banach space-valued processes. Applications to windows of Dirichlet processes. *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top*, 15(2), 1250007, 50.
[23] Dupire, B. *Functional Itô calculus*. Portfolio Research Paper 2009-04. Bloomberg.
[24] Eisenbaum, N. (2000). Integration with respect to local time. *Potential Analysis*. **13**, 303-328.
[25] Ekren, I., Keller, C., Touzi, N. and Zhang, J. (2014). On Viscosity Solutions of Path Dependent PDEs. *Ann. Probab.* , **42**, 1, 204-236.
[26] Ekren, I., Touzi, N. and Zhang, J. Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Parabolic Path Dependent PDEs: Part I, arXiv:1210.0006v2. Forthcoming to Ann. Probab.
[27] Ekren, I., Touzi, N. and Zhang, J. Viscosity Solutions of Fully Nonlinear Parabolic Path Dependent PDEs: Part II, arXiv:1210.0007v2. Forthcoming to Ann. Probab.
[28] Ekren, I. Viscosity solutions of obstacle problems for fully nonlinear path-dependent PDEs. arXiv: 1306.3631v3.
[29] El Karoui, N., Kapoudjian, C., Pardoux, E., Peng, S.and Quenez, M.C. (1997). Solutions of backward SDE's, and related obstacle problems for PDE's . *Ann. Probab.* 25, **2**, 702-737.
[30] El Karoui, N. *Les Aspects Probabilistes Du Controle Stochastique*. Ecole dÉté de Probabilit 'es de Saint-Flour IX-1979. Volume 876 of the series Lecture Notes in Mathematics pp 73-238.
[31] El Karoui, N. and Tan, X. Capacities, Measurable Selection and Dynamic Programming Part I: Abstract Framework. arXiv: 1310.3363v1.
[32] El Karoui, N. and Tan, X. Capacities, Measurable Selection and Dynamic Programming Part II: Application in Stochastic Control Problems. arXiv: 1310.3364v2.
[33] Elliot, R.J. *Stochastic Calculus and Applications*. Springer-New-York, 1982.
[34] Émery, M. (1988). En cherchant une caractérisation variationnelle des martingales. *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg*, **22**, 147-154.
[35] Feng, C. and Zhao, H. (2006). Two-parameter p, q-variation Paths and Integrations of Local-Times. *Potential Anal*, **25**, 165-204
[36] Feng, C. and Zao, H. (2008). Rough path integral of local time. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I*, **346**, 431-434.
[37] Flandoli. F and Zanco, G. An infinite-dimensional approach to path-dependent Kolmogorov's equations. arXiv:1312.6165, 2013. Forthcoming to Ann. Probab.
[38] Follmer, H., Protter, P.and Shiryaev, A.S. (1995). Quadratic Covariation and an Extension of Ito's Formula, *Bernoulli*, **1**, 149-169.
[39] Friz, P. Victoir, N. *Multidimensional stochastic processes as rough paths. Theory and Applications*. Cambridge University Press. 2011.
[40] Fuhrman, H. and Pham, H. (2015). Randomized and backward SDE representation for optimal control of non-Markovian SDEs. *Ann. Appl. Probab*, **25**, 4, 2134-2167.
[41] Fuhrman, M., Pham, H. and Zeni, F. Non-Markovian optimal stopping problems and constrained BSDEs with jump. arXiv: 1502.05422v1.
[42] He, S-w., Wang, J-g., and Yan, J-a. *Semimartingale Theory and Stochastic Calculus*, CRC Press, 1992.
[43] Jacod, J., and Skohorod. A.V. (1994). Jumping filtrations and martingales with finite variation. *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1583**, 21-35. Springer.
[44] Keller, C. and Zhang, J. Pathwise Itô Calculus for Rough Paths and Rough PDEs with Path Dependent Coefficients. arXiv: 1412.7464. Forthcoming to Stochastic Process. Appl.
[45] Khoshnevisan, D. (1994). Exact Rates of Convergence to Brownian Local Time. *Ann. Probab.* **22**, 3, 1295-1330.
[46] Khoshnevisan, D. and Lewis, T.M. (1999). Stochastic calculus for Brownian motion on a Brownian fracture. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **9**, 3, 629-667.
[47] Knight, F. (1963). Random walk and a sojourn density process of Brownnian motion. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc*, **109**, 56-86.
[48] Lamberton, D. Optimal stopping and American options, Daiwa Lecture Ser., Kyoto, 2008.
[49] Leão, D. and Ohashi, A. (2013). Weak approximations for Wiener functionals. *Ann. Appl. Probab,* 23, **4**, 1660-1691.
[50] Leão, D. and Ohashi, A. Corrigendum to " Weak approximations for Wiener functionals"[Ann. Appl. Probab, 2013, 23, 4, 1660-1691]. arXiv: 1508.07317.
[51] Meyer, P. Probabilités et Potentiel. Hermann-Paris, 1966.
[52] Mohammed, S. E. A. *Stochastic functional differential equations*, volume 99 of Research Notes in Mathematics. Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, MA, 1984.
[53] Neveu, J. *Discrete-parameter Martingales*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1975.

[54] Oberhauser, H. An extension of the functional Itô formula under a family of non-dominated measures. *arXiv*:1212.1414.
[55] Ohashi, A. and Simas, A.B. A maximal inequality of the 2D Young integral based on bivariations. arXiv:1408.1428.
[56] Ohashi, A. and Simas, A.B. (2015). A note on the sharp L^p-convergence rate of upcrossings to the Brownian local-time. *Statist. Probab. Lett*, **100**, 135-141.
[57] Ohashi, A., Shamarova, E. and Shamarov, N.N. (2016). Path-dependent Itô formulas under (p, q)-variations. *Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, **13**, 1-31.
[58] Pardoux, E. and Peng, S. *Backward Stochastic Differential Equations and Quasilinear Parabolic Stochastic Differential Equations*, **vol**, 176, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
[59] Peng, S. and Wang, F. BSDE, Path-dependent PDE and Nonlinear Feynman-Kac Formula. arXiv:1108.4317v1.
[60] Peng, S. and Song, Y. G-expectation Weighted Sobolev Spaces, Backward SDE and Path-Dependent PDE. arXiv:1305.4722v2.
[61] Peng, S. Note on viscosity solution of path-dependent PDE and G martingales. arXiv:1106.1144v1.
[62] Peres, Y. and Morters, P. *Brownian Motion*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics, Volume 30.
[63] Peskir, G. and Shiryaev, A. (2006). *Optimal Stopping and Free-Boundary Problems*. Lecture in Mathematics. ETH Zurich. Birkhauser.
[64] Ren, Z., Touzi, N. and Zhang, J. (2014). An Overview of Viscosity Solutions of Path Dependent PDEs. Stochastic Analysis and Applications, in Honnor of Terry Lyons, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics and Statisctics.
[65] Young, L.C. (1936). An inequality of Holder type, connected with Stieltjes integration. *Acta Math*, **67**, 251-282.
[66] Young, L.C. (1937). General inequalities for Stieltjes integrals and the convergence of Fourier series. *Mathematische Annalen*, 581-612.

Departamento de Matemática Aplicada e Estatística. Universidade de São Paulo, 13560-970, São Carlos - SP, Brazil
E-mail address: leao@icmc.usp.br

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 13560-970, João Pessoa - Paraíba, Brazil
E-mail address: amfohashi@gmail.com

Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 13560-970, João Pessoa - Paraíba, Brazil
E-mail address: alexandre@mat.ufpb.br