

What's so special about Gaussians? One answer:

Def: A probability measure $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ is

infinitely divisible if, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\exists \mu_n \in \text{Prob}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})) \text{ s.t. } \mu = \mu_n^{*n} = \mu_n * \mu_n * \dots * \mu_n.$$

$$\text{I.e. } \exists \{X_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^n \text{ iid s.t. } S_n = X_{n,1} + \dots + X_{n,n} \stackrel{d}{=} \mu$$

$$\text{I.e. } \exists \text{ non-constant characteristic function } \varphi_n \text{ s.t. } \hat{\mu}(\xi) = \varphi_n(\xi)^n \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Eg. If $X_{n,k} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2/n)$ are independent, then

$$\uparrow S_n = X_{n,1} + \dots + X_{n,n} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

$$\begin{aligned} X_{n,k} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} Z \text{ for } Z \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) &\quad \therefore \varphi_{X_{n,k}}(\xi) = \varphi_Z\left(\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}} \xi\right) = e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \xi^2 / 2} \\ &\quad \therefore \varphi_{S_n}(\xi) = \left(e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{n} \xi^2 / 2}\right)^n = e^{-\sigma^2 \xi^2 / 2} \\ &\quad = \varphi_Z(\sigma \xi) \\ &\quad = \varphi_{\sigma Z}(\xi) \\ \Rightarrow S_n \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma Z \stackrel{d}{=} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2). \end{aligned}$$

Eg. If $N_{n,k} \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Poisson}(\lambda/n)$ are independent, $S_n = X_{n,1} + \dots + X_{n,n} \stackrel{d}{=} \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$.

Note: if μ, ν are infinitely divisible,

$$\text{so is } \mu * \nu = (\mu_n * \dots * \mu_n) * (\nu_n * \dots * \nu_n) \\ = (\mu_n * \nu_n)^{*n}$$

Eg. If $\mu = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_1 + \delta_{-1})$, then $\hat{\mu}(\xi) = \cos \xi$.

Suppose $X_1 \stackrel{d}{=} X_2$, independent, s.t. $X_1 + X_2 \stackrel{d}{=} \mu$. $\leftarrow \text{Supp } \mu \subset [-1, 1]$

$$\mathbb{P}(X_1 < -\frac{1}{2})^2 \leq \mathbb{P}(X_1 + X_2 < -1) = 0 = \mathbb{P}(X_1 + X_2 > 1) \geq \mathbb{P}(X_1 > \frac{1}{2})^2 \\ \{X_1 < -\frac{1}{2}\} \cap \{X_2 < -\frac{1}{2}\} \subseteq \{X_1 + X_2 < -1\} \quad \{X_1 + X_2 > 1\} \supseteq \{X_1 > \frac{1}{2}\} \cap \{X_2 > \frac{1}{2}\}$$

$$\Rightarrow |X_1|, |X_2| \leq \frac{1}{2} \text{ a.s.}$$

$\therefore \mu_{X_1} = \mu_{X_2}$ has finite moments of all orders.

$$\therefore \hat{\mu}_{X_1} = \hat{\mu}_{X_2} \in C^\infty$$

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \xi &= \hat{\mu}(\xi) = \hat{\mu}_{X_1}(\xi)^2 \\ &\uparrow \\ 0 &= \cos \frac{\pi}{2} = f\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^2 \end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned} &\downarrow \\ &f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned} \cos \xi &= f(\xi)^2 \\ \Rightarrow -\sin \xi &= 2f(\xi)f'(\xi) \\ -1 &= -\sin \frac{\pi}{2} = 2 \cdot 0 \cdot f'\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right). \quad \checkmark \end{aligned}$$

Theorem: A probability measure $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}))$ is infinitely divisible iff \exists a "triangular array"

$$\{X_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^{m_n} \quad m_n \uparrow \infty, n \in \mathbb{N}$$

of random variables s.t. for each n , $\{X_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^{m_n}$ are i.i.d., and

$$S_n = \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} X_{n,k} \xrightarrow{w} X \stackrel{d}{=} \mu.$$

Don't need equality, only weak convergence.

Pf. (\Rightarrow) If μ is infinitely divisible, can find $\{X_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^n$ i.i.d. s.t. $S_n = X_{n,1} + \dots + X_{n,n} \stackrel{d}{=} \mu$

(\Leftarrow) Step 1 is to show that if such a triangular array exists, so does one with $m_n = n$.

We'll skip this step, which involves some kind of involved tail bound estimates. We'll prove the theorem with $m_n = n$.

We have $\{X_{n,k}\}_{k=1}^n$ iid for each n s.t.

$$S_n = X_{n,1} + \dots + X_{n,n} \xrightarrow{w} X \stackrel{d}{=} \mu.$$

Fix $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider $S_{nl} = \sum_{k=1}^{nl} X_{n,l,k} = \sum_{i=1}^l S_n^i$

iid for $1 \leq i \leq l$ $\rightarrow S_n^i = \sum_{j=n(i-1)+1}^{ni} X_{n,l,j}$

Since $S_{nl} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} X$, we know that $\{\mu_{S_{nl}}\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is tight.

$\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P(|S_{nl}| > r)$ can make $<$ any ε with
 \hookrightarrow decreasing as $r \uparrow \infty$. suff. large $r > 0$.
 $\leq \varepsilon(r) \downarrow 0$ as $r \uparrow \infty$.

$$P(S_n^1 > r)^l = P(S_n^1 > r, \dots, S_n^l > r) \leq P(S_{nl} > lr) \\ \Rightarrow S_{nl} > lr. \leq P(|S_{nl}| > lr) \leq \varepsilon(lr)$$

Similarly $P(-S_n^1 > r)^l \leq \varepsilon(lr)$ $\rightarrow \therefore P(|S_n^1| > r) \leq \varepsilon(lr)^{1/l} \downarrow 0$ as $r \uparrow \infty$
 $\therefore \{\mu_{S_n^i}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is tight.

So $\{S_n^1\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is tight, and \therefore by Helly / Prokhorov,

\exists subsequence $\{n_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ with $S_{n_j}^1 \xrightarrow{w} Y$ for some Y .

\therefore since $S_{n_j}^1, S_n^l$ are iid, can select Y_1, \dots, Y_l iid.

s.t. $S_{n_j}^i \xrightarrow{w} Y_i$

$$\therefore S_{n_j}^l = \sum_{i=1}^l S_{n_j}^i \xrightarrow{w} Y_1 + \dots + Y_l$$

X_n^w

$$\varphi_{S_{n_j}^1 + \dots + S_{n_j}^l}(\xi) = \varphi_{S_{n_j}^1}(\xi) \dots \varphi_{S_{n_j}^l}(\xi)$$

$\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$X_n^w \stackrel{d}{=} Y_1 + \dots + Y_l$$

$$\varphi_{Y_1}(\xi) \dots \varphi_{Y_l}(\xi) = \varphi_{Y_1 + \dots + Y_l}(\xi)$$

iid. \Rightarrow μ_X is inf-div. $|||$

It turns out we can even weaken the iid condition on the "rows" of the triangular array. We'll explore this in the Gaussian case.