Econometric Theory, **20**, 2004, 417–426. Printed in the United States of America.
DOI: 10.1017/S0266466604202079

ISSUES CONCERNING THE APPROXIMATION UNDERLYING THE SPECTRAL REPRESENTATION THEOREM

MARCO LIPPI
Università di Roma "La Sapienza"

In many important textbooks the formal statement of the spectral representation theorem is followed by a process version, usually informal, stating that any stationary stochastic process $\{\xi(t), t \in T\}$ is the limit in quadratic mean of a sequence of processes $\{S(n,t), t \in T\}$, each consisting of a finite sum of harmonic oscillations with stochastic weights. The natural issues, whether the approximation error $\xi(t) - S(n,t)$ is stationary or whether at least it converges to zero uniformly in t, have not been explicitly addressed in the literature. The paper shows that in all relevant cases, for T unbounded the process convergence is not uniform in t (so that $\xi(t) - S(n,t)$ is not stationary). Equivalently, when T is unbounded the number of harmonic oscillations necessary to approximate $\xi(t)$ with a preassigned accuracy depends on t. The conclusion is that the process version of the spectral representation theorem should explicitly mention that in general the approximation of $\xi(t)$ by a finite sum of harmonic oscillations, *given the accuracy*, is valid for t belonging to a bounded subset of the real axis (of the set of integers in the discrete-parameter case).

1. INTRODUCTION

Let us begin by recalling the statement of the spectral representation theorem (SRT). In the continuous-time case, if $\xi(t)$ is a wide-sense stationary process, then *for each fixed t*

$$\xi(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(it\lambda)\, d\zeta(\lambda), \tag{1}$$

the integral being defined as the quadratic mean (q.m.) limit of the integral sums

$$S(n,t) = \sum_{h=1}^{n} \exp(it\lambda_{h-1})[\zeta(\lambda_h) - \zeta(\lambda_{h-1})]. \tag{2}$$

The author is grateful for very useful suggestions to Francesco Battaglia, Gianluca Cubadda, Domenico Marinucci, Enzo Orsingher, Dag Tjøstheim, and Umberto Triacca and also to an anonymous referee and the *Econometric Theory* co-editor Benedikt M. Pötscher. Address correspondence to: Marco Lippi, Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Via Cesalpino 12, I-00161 Roma, Italy; e-mail: marco.lippi@uniroma1.it.

© 2004 Cambridge University Press 0266-4666/04 $12.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The preceding statement is usually followed by a less formal version, implicitly using the notion of convergence of a sequence of stochastic processes. Important examples are Cramér and Leadbetter (1967, p. 129): "the spectral representation (1) shows how the $\xi(t)$ *process* is additively built up by elementary and mutually orthogonal harmonic oscillations"; Anderson (1971, p. 398): "any stationary (wide sense) stochastic *process* can be considered as a weighted sum or integral of trigonometric functions of time with the weights being random variables"; Priestley (1981, p. 245): "any stationary *process* can be represented as (the limit of) the sum of sine and cosine functions with random coefficients." (the emphasis on the word *process* is mine).

Obviously, these *process versions* of the SRT are perfectly correct if convergence of the sequence of stochastic processes $\{S(n,t),\, t \in T\}$ to $\{\xi(t),\, t \in T\}$ simply means that $S(n,t)$ converges to $\xi(t)$ for any t. However—this is the starting point of the present paper—these versions do not address two issues that arise naturally when convergence of stochastic processes is concerned: (i) whether the approximation error $\xi(t) - S(n,t)$ is stationary and, in case it is not, (ii) whether at least $\xi(t) - S(n,t)$ converges to zero uniformly in t. Nor are these issues addressed elsewhere in the literature, the only exception, to the knowledge of the present author, being Doob (1953 p. 528), who maintains that convergence of (2) to (1) is uniform in t:

> Thus Example 3 [Example 3, defined on p. 524, is a finite sum of harmonic oscillations with mutually orthogonal complex random amplitudes, such as (2)] can be used to approximate the general case in the sense that to every $\epsilon > 0$ corresponds a stationary wide sense process of the type in Example 3, with variables $\{x_\epsilon(t)\}$, satisfying
>
> $$\mathrm{E}(|x(t) - x_\epsilon(t)|^2) < \epsilon \qquad -\infty < t < \infty;$$
>
> we need only take as $x_\epsilon(t)$ an appropriate Riemann–Stieltjes sum of the spectral representation of $x(t)$.

The present paper shows that in all relevant cases, i.e., if the spectral distribution function of $\xi(t)$ contains either an absolutely continuous component or a jump function, convergence of the integral sums $S(n,t)$ to $\xi(t)$ is uniform if and only if T is bounded. Among the consequences: $\xi(t) - S(n,t)$ is not stationary; in the discrete-time case, if $T = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\xi(t)$ is a moving average process, convergence of $S(n,t)$ to $\xi(t)$ is not uniform; Doob's statement must be corrected by assuming that $a \leq t \leq b$, with a and b finite.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a summary of the SRT in discrete time and shows that convergence is not uniform for a white noise unless T is bounded. The general results outlined previously are given in Section 3 for the discrete-time case. Section 4 discusses a seemingly paradoxical aspect of the SRT in the discrete-time regular case: a sequence of linearly deterministic processes approximates a process with a positive-variance innovation. A short account of the continuous-time case is given in Section 5. Section 6 concludes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. DISCRETE TIME: THE CASE OF A WHITE NOISE

We consider complex wide-sense stationary processes $\{\xi(t),\ t \in T\}$, where

(a) The first moment of $\xi(t)$ is zero.
(b) The second moment of $\xi(t)$ is positive.
(c) Unless otherwise stated, $T = \mathbb{R}$, or $T = \mathbb{Z}$, for continuous- or discrete-time processes, respectively. This is convenient and has no consequences in terms of generality.

Let us begin with discrete time. In this case the SRT has the specification

$$\xi(t) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(it\lambda)\, d\zeta(\lambda) \tag{3}$$

for any given $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, the right-hand side being defined as a q.m. integral.

Let us first recall the basic elements of the proof of the SRT (the presentation here is based on Cramér and Leadbetter, 1967, Sects. 7.4 and 7.5; see also Brockwell and Davis, 1991, Sects. 4.3 and 4.8). Assume that the complex stochastic variables $\xi(t)$, for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, are defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ and let $\mathcal{H}^{\xi}$ be the minimal closed subspace of $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ containing all the variables $\xi(t)$, for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then consider, first, the spectral distribution function F associated with the process $\xi(t)$, i.e., the nondecreasing right-continuous real function, defined on $[-\pi\ \pi]$, such that $F(-\pi) = 0$ and $\mathrm{E}(\xi(t)\bar{\xi}(t-h)) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(ih\lambda)\, dF(\lambda)$; and, second, the Hilbert space $L^2([-\pi\ \pi], F)$ of all functions $f: [-\pi\ \pi] \to \mathbb{C}$, such that $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |f(\lambda)|^2\, dF(\lambda) < \infty$, with the inner product defined as $\langle f, g\rangle = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(\lambda)\bar{g}(\lambda)\, dF(\lambda)$. It can be shown that the map $\Phi: \mathcal{H}^{\xi} \to L^2([-\pi\ \pi], F)$, defined by linearly extending $\Phi(\xi_t) = \exp(it\cdot)$, is one-to-one and preserves the inner product, i.e., if x and y belong to $\mathcal{H}^{\xi}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x, y\rangle = \mathrm{E}(x\bar{y}) = \int_{\Omega} x(\omega)\bar{y}(\omega)\, dP(\omega) &= \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} [\Phi(x)](\lambda)\overline{[\Phi(y)]}(\lambda)\, dF(\lambda) \\ &= \langle \Phi(x), \Phi(y)\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

(see Brockwell and Davis, 1991, Theorem 4.8.1, p. 144). To define the integral in the SRT, first define the map $\zeta: [-\pi\ \pi] \to H^{\xi}$ as

$$\zeta(a) = \Phi^{-1}(\chi((-\pi\ a])), \tag{5}$$

where $\chi((a_1\ a_2])$ is the indicator function of the interval $(a_1\ a_2]$. The term $\zeta(\lambda)$ is a right-continuous (in q.m.) orthogonal-increment process such that $\|\zeta(b) - \zeta(a)\|^2 = \mathrm{E}(|\zeta(b) - \zeta(a)|^2) = F(b) - F(a)$.

Second, define a subdivision of $[-\pi\ \pi]$ as an n-tuple $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_0\ \lambda_1\ \ldots\ \lambda_n)$, with $-\pi = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \cdots < \lambda_{n-1} < \lambda_n = \pi$. Let $d(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \max_h(\lambda_h - \lambda_{h-1})$. With $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is associated the integral sum

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, t) = \sum_{h=1}^{n} \exp(it\lambda_{h-1})[\zeta(\lambda_h) - \zeta(\lambda_{h-1})] \tag{6}$$

(a slight change of notation with respect to (2)). Given a sequence of subdivisions $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n = (\lambda_{0,n} \ \lambda_{1,n} \ \dots \ \lambda_{n,n})$, we assume throughout that $d(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

As we show subsequently, given $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the sequence of subdivisions $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, the integral sum sequence $\{S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t), n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converges in q.m. to $\xi(t)$. Thus the integral in (3) makes sense, as the common q.m. limit of all sequences of integral sums, and (3) is proved.

To see this observe that by (6) and the definition of Φ and ζ,

$$\Phi[\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)] = \exp(it\cdot) - \sum_{h=1}^{n} \exp(it\lambda_{h-1,n})\chi((\lambda_{h-1,n} \ \lambda_{h,n}]), \tag{7}$$

so that, by (4),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\|^2 &= \sum_{h=1}^{n} \int_{(\lambda_{h-1,n} \ \lambda_{h,n}]} |\exp(it\lambda) - \exp(it\lambda_{h-1,n})|^2 \, dF(\lambda) \\ &\leq \sigma_\xi^2 \max_{h=1,\dots,n} \sup_{\lambda \in (\lambda_{h-1,n} \ \lambda_{h,n}]} |\exp(it\lambda) - \exp(it\lambda_{h-1,n})|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The result follows from uniform continuity of $\exp(it\lambda)$ with respect to $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ for each fixed t.

The definitions and results briefly recalled here allow the following restatement of the SRT.

SRT1. *Given the stationary process* $\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, *let* $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ *be a sequence of subdivisions. For every* $\epsilon > 0$, *there exists a positive real* $\delta(\epsilon, t)$ *such that if* $d(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n) < \delta(\epsilon, t)$, *then* $\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\|^2 < \epsilon$. *(Note that (8) and uniform continuity of* $\exp(it\lambda)$ *with respect to* λ *for each fixed* t *imply that* $\delta(\epsilon, t)$ *can be determined independently of* $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$.*)*

Two issues naturally arise concerning SRT1.

(i) The first is whether $\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ is *stationary*.
(ii) The second, arising if the answer to (i) is negative, is whether the convergence of $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ to $\xi(t)$ is *uniform* with respect to t, i.e., whether the dependence of $\delta(\epsilon, t)$ on t can be dropped.

As regards (i), from the first line in (8):

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, t)\|^2 \\ &= 2\sigma_\xi^2 - 2\Re\left[\sum_{h=1}^{n} \exp(-it\lambda_{h-1,n}) \int_{(\lambda_{h-1,n} \ \lambda_{h,n}]} \exp(it\lambda) \, dF(\lambda)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A cursory inspection of (9) should convince the reader that the answer to (i) is negative in general. However, because obviously a negative answer to (ii) implies a negative answer to (i), and because we are able to construct a simple proof that in all relevant cases $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ does not converge uniformly to $\xi(t)$, a direct treatment of (i) is not necessary.

The answer to both (i) and (ii) is easy when $\xi(t)$ is a white noise, i.e., when $dF(\lambda) = (\sigma_\xi^2/2\pi)d\lambda$. Using (9), a straightforward calculation shows that

$$\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\|^2 = 2\sigma_\xi^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\pi t} \sum_{h=1}^{n} \sin[t(\lambda_{h,n} - \lambda_{h-1,n})]\right).$$

Given $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$, $\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\|^2$ converges to $2\sigma_\xi^2$ for $|t| \to \infty$. Thus t cannot be dropped in $\delta(\epsilon, t)$. In conclusion, given $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ converges in q.m. to $\xi(t)$ for any t but not uniformly in t, and therefore $\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ is not stationary.

To conclude this section, let us observe that no modification of the preceding arguments is needed if we define the integral sums as

$$\sum_{h=1}^{n} \exp(it\rho_{h,n})[\zeta(\lambda_h) - \zeta(\lambda_{h-1})], \tag{10}$$

where $\rho_{h,n} \in [\lambda_{h-1,n}\ \lambda_{h,n}]$.

3. DISCRETE TIME: GENERAL RESULTS

The result obtained for a white noise by directly computing the distance between $\xi(t)$ and $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ can be generalized to any moving average process, i.e., any process $\xi(t)$ such that

$$\xi(t) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a(k)u(t-k),$$

where $u(t)$ is white noise and $\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} |a(k)|^2 < \infty$.

PROPOSITION 1. *Let $\{\xi(t), t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a moving average process and let $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ be any sequence of subdivisions. The q.m. convergence of $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ to $\xi(t)$, as $n \to \infty$, is not uniform in t.*

Proof. Moving average processes are characterized by an absolutely continuous spectral distribution function (see, e.g., Doob, 1953, Ch. X, Sect. 8). Let us indicate by f the derivative of F, existing almost everywhere in $[-\pi\ \pi]$. Given the subdivision $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$,

$$\int_{(\lambda_{h-1,n}\ \lambda_{h,n}]} \exp(it\lambda)\, dF(\lambda) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(it\lambda)\, \chi_{(\lambda_{h-1,n}\ \lambda_{h,n}]}(\lambda) f(\lambda)\, d\lambda.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By the Riemann–Lebesgue Lemma (see Apostol, 1974, p. 313), the preceding integral tends to zero as $t \to \infty$. Thus, using (9), for any given $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$ the squared distance $\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, t)\|^2$ tends to $2\sigma_\xi^2$ for $t \to \infty$. ■

Let us now turn to the opposite extreme, so to speak, i.e., the case of processes whose spectral distribution is a step function. Precisely, let Q be either the set of the first m integers or the whole $\mathbb{N}$, let $\{A_j, j \in Q\}$ be a set of mutually orthogonal, zero-mean, positive-variance random variables with $A_j \in L_2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ and $\sum_{j\in Q} \operatorname{var}(A_j) < \infty$, let $\{\phi_j, j \in Q\}$ be a set of real numbers belonging to $(-\pi\ \pi]$, and let

$$\xi(t) = \sum_{j\in Q} A_j \exp(it\phi_j) \tag{11}$$

for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Defining $r(\lambda)$ as the set of all integers $j \in Q$ such that $\phi_j \leq \lambda$, the spectral distribution function of $\xi(t)$ is

$$F(\lambda) = \sum_{j\in r(\lambda)} \operatorname{var}(A_j).$$

PROPOSITION 2. *Let $\xi(t)$ be defined as in (11) and let $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ be any sequence of subdivisions. The q.m. convergence of $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ to $\xi(t)$, as $n \to \infty$, is not uniform in t.*

Proof. Let us define $s(h, n)$ as the set of all integers $j \in Q$ such that $\lambda_{h-1,n} < \phi_j \leq \lambda_{h,n}$. Moreover, given j, there is exactly one subinterval of the subdivision $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$ containing ϕ_j; we call $\mu_{j,n}$ the lower extreme of such subinterval (of course, $\mu_{j,n}$ coincides with one of the lower extremes $\lambda_{h-1,n}$). Using (9) and defining $\sigma_k^2 = \operatorname{var}(A_k)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\|^2 &= 2\sigma_\xi^2 - 2\Re \sum_{h=1}^{n} \sum_{j\in s(h,n)} \sigma_j^2 \exp(it(\phi_j - \lambda_{h-1,n})) \\
&= 2\sigma_\xi^2 - 2\sum_{h=1}^{n} \sum_{j\in s(h,n)} \sigma_j^2 \cos(t(\phi_j - \lambda_{h-1,n})) \\
&= 2\sigma_\xi^2 - 2\sum_{j\in Q} \sigma_j^2 \cos(t(\phi_j - \mu_{j,n})) \\
&= 2\sum_{j\in Q} \sigma_j^2 (1 - \cos(t(\phi_j - \mu_{j,n}))).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Now consider the term $\sigma_1^2 \cos(t(\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n}))$, appearing in (12). Because the subintervals of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$ have the form $(\lambda_{h-1,n}\ \lambda_{h,n}]$, then $\phi_1 > \mu_{1,n}$. Thus the ratio $\nu_{1,n} = \pi/(\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n})$ makes sense. Denote by $\nu_{1,n}^*$ the greatest integer less or equal to $\nu_{1,n}$. Applying Taylor's formula up to the second derivative, centered at $t = \nu_{1,n}$, to the function $g(t) = \cos(t(\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n}))$ (see, e.g., Apostol, 1974, p. 113),

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$\cos(\nu^*_{1,n}(\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n})) = -1 - \tfrac{1}{2}(\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n})^2 \cos(\tau(\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n}))(\nu^*_{1,n} - \nu_{1,n})^2,$$

where τ lies between $\nu^*_{1,n}$ and $\nu_{1,n}$. On the other hand, $\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus, given η, with $0 < \eta < 2$, there exists $n(\eta)$ such that for $n > n(\eta)$

$$\sigma_1^2(1 - \cos(\nu^*_{1,n}(\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n}))) > \sigma_1^2(2 - \eta) > 0.$$

Using (12), for $n > n(\eta)$,

$$\|\xi(\nu^*_{1,n}) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, \nu^*_{1,n})\|^2 \geq 2\sigma_1^2(1 - \cos(\nu^*_{1,n}(\phi_1 - \mu_{1,n}))) > 2\sigma_1^2(2 - \eta) > 0.$$

Thus for $n > n(\eta)$ the squared distance between $\xi(t)$ and $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ is greater than $2\sigma_1^2(2 - \eta)$ at least for $t = \nu^*_{1,n}$. Therefore the convergence is not uniform. ■

It is crucial for the preceding proof that $\phi_1 > \mu_{1,n}$, which is a consequence of the particular integral sums we are using. However, if the integral sums (10) were used, Proposition 2 would need no more than a minor modification: convergence of the integral sums to $\xi(t)$ is not uniform for sequences of integral sums that are *generic* with respect to $\xi(t)$, i.e., such that $\rho_{h,n} \neq \phi_j$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $h = 1, \ldots, n$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following is an easy consequence of Propositions 1 and 2.

PROPOSITION 3. *Let F be the nondecreasing, right-continuous spectral distribution function of the stationary process $\xi(t)$. The term F can be decomposed as $F = F_1 + F_2 + F_3$, where F_1 is nondecreasing and absolutely continuous, F_2 is a nondecreasing step function (with a finite or countably infinite set of steps), and F_3 is nondecreasing and continuous with $F_3' = 0$ almost everywhere (see, e.g., Riesz and Nagy, 1990, p. 53). If either $F_1 \neq 0$ or $F_2 \neq 0$, then q.m. convergence of $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ to $\xi(t)$ is not uniform in t.*

Proof. Assume $F_1 \neq 0$. Starting with the first line in (8),

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\|^2 &= \sum_{h=1}^{n} \int_{(\lambda_{h-1,n}\, \lambda_{h,n}]} |\exp(it\lambda) - \exp(it\lambda_{h-1,n})|^2 \, dF(\lambda) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{h=1}^{n} \int_{(\lambda_{h-1,n}\, \lambda_{h,n}]} |\exp(it\lambda) - \exp(it\lambda_{h-1,n})|^2 \, dF_j(\lambda) \\
&\geq \sum_{h=1}^{n} \int_{(\lambda_{h-1,n}\, \lambda_{h,n}]} |\exp(it\lambda) - \exp(it\lambda_{h-1,n})|^2 \, dF_1(\lambda).
\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows applying Proposition 1. The same argument applies if $F_2 \neq 0$. ■

Note that the spectral distribution function of regular processes, i.e., processes with a positive-variance innovation, contains an absolutely continuous

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

component (see Brockwell and Davis, 1991, Theorem 5.7.2; p. 190). Therefore Proposition 3 implies that convergence is not uniform for regular processes.

Remark. The SRT is sometimes presented as a consequence of the spectral representation of the linear unitary operator $L : \mathcal{H}^{\xi} \to \mathcal{H}^{\xi}$, defined by linearly extending $L\xi(t) = \xi(t-1)$ (see, e.g., Rozanov, 1967, p. 16). The spectral representation for the operator L^{τ} is

$$L^{\tau} = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \exp(-i\tau\lambda)\, dE(\lambda) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{h=1}^{n} \exp(-i\tau\lambda_{h-1,n})[E(\lambda_{h,n}) - E(\lambda_{h-1,n})],$$

where $\{E(a),\ a \in [-\pi\ \pi]\}$ is a spectral family of projections and the right-hand side converges to L^{τ} in the operator norm (for details and proof, see, e.g., Riesz and Nagy, 1990, Sect. 109). It is possible to show that $\zeta(b) - \zeta(a) = [E(b) - E(a)]\xi(0)$. Thus defining $V(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, \tau) = \sum_{h=1}^{n} \exp(-i\tau\lambda_{h-1,n})[E(\lambda_{h,n}) - E(\lambda_{h-1,n})]$, we have $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t) = V(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, -t)\xi(0)$ and

$$\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\| = \|(L^{-t} - V(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, -t))\xi(0)\| \leq \|L^{-t} - V(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, -t)\|\,\|\xi(0)\|.$$

As a consequence, if the convergence to zero of the operator norm $\|L^{-t} - V(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, -t)\|$ is uniform in t, then $\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\|$ converges to zero uniformly in t. Thus if F fulfills the assumptions of Proposition 3, convergence of $V(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, \tau)$ to L^{τ} is not uniform in τ.

4. HOW CAN LINEARLY DETERMINISTIC PROCESSES APPROXIMATE A REGULAR PROCESS?

Observe first that $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ is linearly deterministic. If $\xi(t)$ is regular, i.e., has a positive-variance innovation, the SRT implies the somewhat puzzling consequence that, whereas $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ approximates $\xi(t)$, the innovation of $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$, which is zero, does not converge to the innovation of $\xi(t)$. On the other hand, the case of a regular process is also one in which convergence of $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ to $\xi(t)$ is not uniform (see the observation following Proposition 3 in Section 3). Thus one may be tempted by the idea that such lack of uniformity is an explanation of the puzzle.

However, it is easy to show that uniform process convergence is neither sufficient nor necessary to ensure convergence of the innovation. Nor does the fact that $S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)$ is deterministic play any special role in the puzzle. In Lippi (2003) an example is provided in which $\xi_n(t)$ and $\xi(t)$ are stationary and (1) $\xi_n(t) - \xi(t)$ is stationary; (2) $\xi_n(t) \to \xi(t)$ in mean square (stationarity of $\xi_n(t) - \xi(t)$ implies that such convergence is uniform); (3) $\xi_n(t)$ and $\xi(t)$ are regular moving average processes (thus they contain no deterministic component); (4) however, the innovation of $\xi_n(t)$ does not converge to the innovation of $\xi(t)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In conclusion, the puzzle pointed out in this section is just an example, among many others, in which intuition based on finite-dimensional euclidean spaces is misleading with infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. In our case, convergence of $\xi_n(t)$ to $\xi(t)$, for any t, obviously implies that $\mathrm{proj}(\xi_n(t)|\xi_n(t-1), \xi_n(t-2), \ldots, \xi_n(m))$ converges to $\mathrm{proj}(\xi(t)|\xi(t-1), \xi(t-2), \ldots, \xi(m))$, for a given finite m, but does not imply that $\mathrm{proj}(\xi_n(t)|\xi_n(t-j), j>0)$ converges to $\mathrm{proj}(\xi(t)|\xi(t-j), j>0)$, irrespective of whether convergence of $\xi_n(t)$ to $\xi(t)$ is uniform in t or not.

5. CONTINUOUS TIME

Extension to continuous time is straightforward and does not call for a detailed treatment. Let us remember that the SRT, i.e., (1), holds in the continuous-time case under the assumption that $\lim_{t-s\to 0}\mathrm{E}(|\xi(t)-\xi(s)|^2)=0$ (see, e.g., Cramér and Leadbetter, 1967, Ch. 7), with the definition of the spectral distribution function $F(\lambda)$ and the stochastic measure $\zeta(\lambda)$ being essentially the same as in the discrete-time case, the domain of both functions extending over the whole real line. In the definition of a subdivision the extremes λ_0 and λ_n may be any real numbers, with $\lambda_0 < \lambda_n$. Moreover, if $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is a sequence of subdivisions we assume that $d(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n)\to 0$, $\lambda_{0,n}\to -\infty$, and $\lambda_{n,n}\to\infty$. The continuous-time version of SRT1 is then obtained using the analogue of (8). The proofs of Propositions 1–3 extend to continuous time with minor modifications.

6. CONCLUSION

The paper has shown what the spectral representation formula (1) is *not*. Indeed, in relevant situations, the Riemann–Stieltjes sums defining the integral are not jointly stationary with $\xi(t)$. Moreover, if T is unbounded, the variance of the approximation error does not converge to zero uniformly in t.

On the other hand, if T is bounded, uniform convergence of the integral sums to $\xi(t)$ is a trivial consequence of (8) (or its continuous-time analogue), and the SRT can be reformulated as follows (the continuous-time version requiring only minor changes).

SRT2. *Given the stationary process* $\{\xi(t), t\in\mathbb{Z}\}$ *and the integers* m_1 *and* m_2, *with* $m_1 < m_2$, *let* $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ *be a sequence of subdivisions. For every* $\epsilon>0$, *there exists a positive real* $\delta(\epsilon, m_1, m_2)$ *such that if* $d(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n) < \delta(\epsilon, m_1, m_2)$, *then*

$$\|\xi(t) - S(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n, t)\| < \epsilon, \quad \textit{for every } t \textit{ such that } m_1 \le t \le m_2.$$

This is the correct process convergence version of the SRT. Though weaker than Doob's statement (see the Introduction) in that the number of harmonic oscillations necessary to achieve a given approximation accuracy ϵ increases as the interval $[m_1\ m_2]$ becomes larger, SRT2 is sufficient to provide a firm basis for the idea of harmonic oscillations as building blocks of stationary processes

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and therefore for the usual interpretation of the spectral measure (the spectral density in the moving average case), for the spectral analysis of linear filters, and for all other frequency-domain results.

REFERENCES

Anderson, T.W. (1971) *The Statistical Analysis of Time Series.* Wiley.
Apostol, T.M. (1974) *Mathematical Analysis*, 2nd ed. Addison-Wesley.
Brockwell, P.J. & R.A. Davis (1991) *Time Series: Theory and Methods.* Springer-Verlag.
Cramér, H. & M.R. Leadbetter (1967) *Stationary and Related Stochastic Processes.* Wiley.
Doob, J.L. (1953) *Stochastic Processes*. Wiley.
Lippi, M. (2003) A Note on Convergence of Stochastic Processes. Working paper, Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Università di Roma "La Sapienza," Rome.
Priestley, M.B. (1981) *Spectral Analysis and Time Series.* Academic Press.
Riesz, F. & B.S. Nagy (1990) *Functional Analysis.* Dover.
Rozanov, Y.A. (1967) *Stationary Random Processes.* Holden-Day.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466604202079 Published online by Cambridge University Press