

# Theoretical Foundations of Buffer Stock Saving

November 11, 2020

Christopher D. Carroll<sup>1</sup>

---

## Abstract

This paper builds theoretical foundations for rigorous and intuitive understanding of ‘buffer stock’ saving models, pairing each theoretical result with a quantitative illustration. After describing conditions under which a consumption function exists, the paper shows that a ‘target’ buffer stock exists only under strictly stronger conditions. Under these ‘buffer stock’ conditions, the average growth rate of microeconomic consumers’ spending matches the average growth rate of their permanent income; conditions required for aggregate ‘balanced growth’ can be looser. Together, the (provided) numerical tools and (proven) analytical results constitute a comprehensive toolkit for understanding buffer stock models.

---

**Keywords**    Precautionary saving, buffer stock saving, marginal propensity to consume, permanent income hypothesis, income fluctuation problem

**JEL codes**    D81, D91, E21

Powered by 

**Dashboard:** <https://econ-ark.org/materials/BufferStockTheory?dashboard>  
**PDF:** <https://econ-ark.github.io/BufferStockTheory/BufferStockTheory.pdf>  
**Slides:** <https://econ-ark.github.io/BufferStockTheory/BufferStockTheory-Slides.pdf>  
**html:** <https://econ-ark.github.io/BufferStockTheory>  
**Appendix:** <https://econ-ark.github.io/BufferStockTheory#Appendices>  
**bibtex:** <https://econ-ark.github.io/BufferStockTheory/LaTeX/BufferStockTheory-Self.bib>  
**GitHub:** <https://github.com/econ-ark/BufferStockTheory>

The dashboard will launch a live interactive Jupyter Notebook that uses the Econ-ARK/HARK toolkit to produce all of the paper’s figures (warning: the dashboard may take several minutes to launch).

---

<sup>1</sup>Contact: [ccarroll1@jhu.edu](mailto:ccarroll1@jhu.edu), Department of Economics, 590 Wyman Hall, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218, <http://econ.jhu.edu/people/ccarroll1>, and National Bureau of Economic Research.

# 1 Introduction

In the presence of empirically realistic transitory and permanent shocks to income *a la* Friedman (1957), only one more ingredient is required to construct a testable model of optimal consumption: A description of preferences. Modelers usually assume geometric discounting of a constant relative risk aversion utility function, because, starting with Zeldes (1989), a large literature has constructed numerical solutions whose quantitative predictions match microeconomic evidence reasonably well; results are similar whether or not liquidity constraints are imposed.<sup>1</sup>

A companion theoretical literature has derived analytical properties of limiting “true” (nonnumerical) mathematical solutions – but only for models more complex than the case with just shocks and utility. The extra complexity has been required because standard contraction mapping theorems (beginning with Bellman (1957) and including those building on Stokey et. al. (1989)) cannot be applied when the utility function and resources are both unbounded (see the fuller discussion at the end of section 2.1).

This paper’s first technical contribution is to articulate the (loose) conditions under which the simple problem (without shortcuts like a consumption floor or liquidity constraints) defines a contraction mapping with a nondegenerate consumption function. The interesting requirement is a ‘Finite Value of Autarky’ condition. The paper’s second theoretical contribution is to specify the conditions under which the resulting consumption function implies existence of a ‘target’ wealth-to-permanent-income ratio (the model exhibits ‘buffer stock’ saving behavior). Buffer stock saving arises when the model’s parameters satisfy a “Growth Impatience Condition” that relates preferences and uncertainty to predictable income growth.

Even without a formal proof, target saving has been intuitively understood to underlie central quantitative results from the heterogeneous agent macroeconomics literature; for example, the logic of target saving is central to the explanation by Krueger, Mitman, and Perri (2016) of the fact that, during the Great Recession, middle-class consumers cut their consumption more than the poor or the rich. The theory below explains why: Learning that the future has become more uncertain does not change the urgent imperatives of the poor (their high  $u'(c)$  means they have little room to maneuver). And, increased labor income uncertainty does not change the behavior of the rich because it poses little risk to their consumption. Only people in the middle have both the motivation and the wiggle-room to reduce their discretionary spending.

Conveniently, elements required for the convergence proof also provide analytical foundations for many other results familiar from the numerical literature. Analytical derivations of these results are provided along the way to the proofs, paired with numerically computed illustrations (made using the open-source Econ-ARK toolkit). The main insights of the paper are instantiated in the toolkit, whose buffer stock saving module flags parametric choices under which a problem fails to define a contraction mapping; a target level of wealth does not exist; or the solution is otherwise surprising.

The paper proceeds in three parts.

---

<sup>1</sup>For life cycle models without constraints, see Carroll (1997); Gourinchas and Parker (2002); for an infinite horizon model without constraints that resembles Deaton (1991)’s constrained model, see Carroll (1992).

The first part articulates the conditions required for the problem to define a nondegenerate limiting consumption function, and explains how the model relates to those previously considered in the literature. The conditions required for convergence are interestingly parallel to those required for the **liquidity constrained perfect foresight model**; that parallel is explored and explained. Next, the paper derives limiting properties of the consumption function as resources approach infinity, and as they approach their lower bound; then the theorem is proven explaining when the problem defines a contraction mapping. Finally, a related class of commonly-used models (exemplified by Deaton (1991)) is shown to constitute a particular limit of this paper’s model.

The **next section** examines five key properties of the model. First, as **cash approaches infinity** the expected growth rate of consumption and the marginal propensity to consume (MPC) converge to their values in the perfect foresight case. Second, as **cash approaches zero** the expected growth rate of consumption approaches infinity, and the MPC approaches a simple analytical limit. Third, a theorem explains why, if the consumer is ‘growth impatient,’ a **unique target cash-to-permanent-income ratio** will exist. Fourth, at the target cash ratio, the **expected growth rate of consumption** is slightly less than the expected growth rate of permanent (noncapital) income. Finally, the expected growth rate of consumption **is declining in the level of cash**. The first four propositions are proven under general assumptions about parameter values; the last is shown to hold if there are no transitory shocks, but may fail in extreme cases if there are both transitory and permanent shocks.

The final section discusses conditions under which, even with a fixed aggregate interest rate that differs from the time preference rate, an economy populated by buffer stock consumers converges to a balanced growth equilibrium in which consumption, income, and wealth all converge to the exogenous growth rate of permanent income (equivalent, here, to productivity). In the terms of Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2003), buffer stock saving is a method of ‘closing’ a small open economy model, and one that is attractive because it requires no controversial assumptions: Not even liquidity constraints.

## 2 The Problem

### 2.1 Setup

We are interested in the infinite-horizon solution, which we define as the limit of the solution to a sequence of finite-horizon problems as the horizon becomes arbitrarily large. For expositional purposes, it will be useful to fix a terminal date  $T$  and consider the problem of a consumer who begins life in period  $T - 1$ , then the problem of a consumer who begins life in  $T - 2$ , and so on. Informally, we will say that the problem has a ‘nondegenerate’ infinite horizon solution if there is a limiting consumption function  $c = \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} c_{T-n}$  which is neither zero everywhere nor infinity everywhere.

Specifically, a consumer born  $n$  periods before date  $T$  solves the problem

$$\max \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{i=0}^n \beta^i u(\mathbf{c}_{t+i}) \right]$$

where

$$u(\bullet) = \bullet^{1-\rho} / (1-\rho) \quad (1)$$

is a constant relative risk aversion utility function with  $\rho > 1$ .<sup>2</sup> The consumer's initial condition is defined by market resources  $\mathbf{m}_t$  (Deaton (1991)'s 'cash-on-hand') and permanent noncapital income  $\mathbf{p}_t$ , which both start out strictly positive,  $\{\mathbf{p}_t, \mathbf{m}_t\} \in (0, \infty)$ , and the consumer cannot die in debt,

$$\mathbf{c}_T \leq \mathbf{m}_T. \quad (2)$$

In the usual treatment, a dynamic budget constraint (DBC) incorporates several elements that determine next period's  $\mathbf{m}$  (given this period's choices); for the detailed analysis here, it will be useful to disarticulate the steps so that individual ingredients can be separately examined:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_t &= \mathbf{m}_t - \mathbf{c}_t \\ \mathbf{b}_{t+1} &= \mathbf{a}_t R \\ \mathbf{p}_{t+1} &= \mathbf{p}_t \underbrace{\Gamma \psi_{t+1}}_{\equiv \Gamma_{t+1}} \\ \mathbf{m}_{t+1} &= \mathbf{b}_{t+1} + \mathbf{p}_{t+1} \xi_{t+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_t$  indicates the consumer's assets at the end of period  $t$ , which grow by a fixed interest factor  $R = (1 + r)$  between periods, so that  $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}$  is the consumer's financial ('bank') balances before next period's consumption choice;<sup>3</sup>  $\mathbf{m}_{t+1}$  ('market resources') is the sum of financial wealth  $\mathbf{b}_{t+1}$  and noncapital income  $\mathbf{p}_{t+1} \xi_{t+1}$  (permanent noncapital income  $\mathbf{p}_{t+1}$  multiplied by a mean-one iid transitory income shock factor  $\xi_{t+1}$ ; transitory shocks are assumed to satisfy  $\mathbb{E}_t[\xi_{t+n}] = 1 \ \forall n \geq 1$ ). Permanent noncapital income in  $t+1$  is equal to its previous value, multiplied by a growth factor  $\Gamma$ , modified by a mean-one iid shock  $\psi_{t+1}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_t[\psi_{t+n}] = 1 \ \forall n \geq 1$  satisfying  $\psi \in [\underline{\psi}, \bar{\psi}]$  for  $0 < \underline{\psi} \leq 1 \leq \bar{\psi} < \infty$  (and  $\underline{\psi} = \bar{\psi} = 1$  is the degenerate case with no permanent shocks).<sup>4</sup>

Following Zeldes (1989), in future periods  $t+n \ \forall n \geq 1$  there is a small probability  $\wp$  that income will be zero (a 'zero-income event'),

$$\xi_{t+n} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } \wp > 0 \\ \theta_{t+n}/(1-\wp) & \text{with probability } (1-\wp) \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where  $\theta_{t+n}$  is an iid mean-one random variable ( $\mathbb{E}_t[\theta_{t+n}] = 1 \ \forall n > 0$ ) whose distribution

<sup>2</sup>The main results also hold for logarithmic utility which is the limit as  $\rho \rightarrow 1$  but incorporating the logarithmic special case in the proofs is cumbersome and therefore omitted.

<sup>3</sup>Allowing a stochastic interest factor is straightforward but adds little insight for our purposes; however, see Benhabib, Bisin, and Zhu (2015), Ma and Toda (2020), and Ma, Stachurski, and Toda (2020) for the implications of capital income risk for the distribution of wealth and other questions not considered here.

<sup>4</sup>Hereafter for brevity we occasionally drop time subscripts, e.g.  $\mathbb{E}[\psi^{-\rho}]$  signifies  $\mathbb{E}_t[\psi_{t+1}^{-\rho}]$ .

satisfies  $\theta \in [\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}]$  where  $0 < \underline{\theta} \leq 1 \leq \bar{\theta} < \infty$ .<sup>5</sup> Call the cumulative distribution functions  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$  and  $\mathcal{F}_\theta$  (where  $\mathcal{F}_\xi$  is derived trivially from (4) and  $\mathcal{F}_\theta$ ).

The model looks more special than it is. In particular, the assumption of a positive probability of zero-income events may seem objectionable (though it has empirical support).<sup>6</sup> However, it is easy to show that a model with a nonzero minimum value of  $\xi$  (motivated, for example, by the existence of unemployment insurance) can be redefined by capitalizing the present discounted value of minimum income into current market assets,<sup>7</sup> transforming that model back into this one. And no key results would change if the transitory shocks were persistent but mean-reverting, instead of IID.

This model differs from Bewley’s (1977) classic formulation in several ways. The CRRA utility function does not satisfy Bewley’s assumption that  $u(0)$  is well defined, or that  $u'(0)$  is well defined and finite; indeed, neither the value function nor the marginal value function will be bounded. It differs from Schectman and Escudero (1977) in that they impose liquidity constraints and positive minimum income. It differs from both of these in that it permits permanent growth in income, and also permanent shocks to income, which a large empirical literature finds are quantitatively important in micro data<sup>8</sup> and which since Friedman (1957) have been understood to be far more consequential for household welfare than are transitory fluctuations. It differs from Deaton (1991) because liquidity constraints are absent; there are separate transitory and permanent shocks (*a la* Muth (1960)); and the transitory shocks here can occasionally cause income to reach zero.<sup>9</sup> It differs from models found in Stokey et. al. (1989) because neither liquidity constraints nor bounds on utility or marginal utility are imposed.<sup>10,11</sup> Li and Stachurski (2014) show how to allow unbounded returns by using policy function iteration, but also impose constraints.

The paper with the most in common with this one is Ma, Stachurski, and Toda (2020), henceforth MST, who establish the existence and uniqueness of a solution to a general income fluctuation problem in a Markovian setting. The most important differences are that MST impose liquidity constraints, assume that  $u'(0) = 0$ , and assume that for every possible realization of income  $Y$ , expected marginal utility is finite ( $\mathbb{E}[u'(Y)] < \infty \forall Y$ ). These assumptions are not consistent with the CRRA utility function and income processes used here, whose properties are key to the derivation of the results.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>See Rabault (2002) and Li and Stachurski (2014) for analyses of cases where the shock processes have unbounded support.

<sup>6</sup>We will calibrate this probability to 0.005 percent to match data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (Carroll (1992)).

<sup>7</sup>So long as unemployment benefits are proportional to  $\mathbf{p}_t$ ; see the discussion in section 2.11.

<sup>8</sup>MaCurdy (1982); Abowd and Card (1989); Carroll and Samwick (1997); Jappelli and Pistaferri (2000); Storesletten, Telmer, and Yaron (2004); Blundell, Low, and Preston (2008)

<sup>9</sup>Below it will become clear that the Deaton model is a particular limit of this paper’s model.

<sup>10</sup>Similar restrictions to those in the cited literature are made in the well known papers by Scheinkman and Weiss (1986), Clarida (1987), and Chamberlain and Wilson (2000). See Toche (2005) for an elegant analysis of a related but simpler continuous-time model.

<sup>11</sup>Alvarez and Stokey (1998) relaxed the bounds on the return function, but they address only the deterministic case.

<sup>12</sup>The incorporation of permanent shocks rules out application of the tools of Matkowski and Nowak (2011), who followed and corrected an error in the fundamental work on the local contraction mapping method developed in Rincón-Zapatero and Rodríguez-Palmero (2003). Martins-da Rocha and Vailakis (2010) provides a correction to Rincón-Zapatero and Rodríguez-Palmero (2003), and provides conditions that are easier to verify, but again only addresses the deterministic case.

## 2.2 The Problem Can Be Rewritten in Ratio Form

We establish a bit more notation by reviewing the standard result that in problems of this class (CRRA utility, permanent shocks) the number of relevant state variables can be reduced from two ( $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\mathbf{p}$ ) to one ( $m = \mathbf{m}/\mathbf{p}$ ). Generically defining nonbold variables as the boldface counterpart normalized by  $\mathbf{p}_t$  (as with  $m$ ), assume that value in the last period of life is  $u(\mathbf{m}_T)$ , and consider the problem in the second-to-last period,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_{T-1}(\mathbf{m}_{T-1}, \mathbf{p}_{T-1}) &= \max_{\mathbf{c}_{T-1}} u(\mathbf{c}_{T-1}) + \beta \mathbb{E}_{T-1}[u(\mathbf{m}_T)] \\ &= \max_{c_{T-1}} u(\mathbf{p}_{T-1} c_{T-1}) + \beta \mathbb{E}_{T-1}[u(\mathbf{p}_T m_T)] \\ &= \mathbf{p}_{T-1}^{1-\rho} \left\{ \max_{c_{T-1}} u(c_{T-1}) + \beta \mathbb{E}_{T-1}[u(\Gamma_T m_T)] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the last line follows because for the CRRA utility function (1),  $u(xy) = x^{1-\rho}u(y)$ .

Now, in a one-time deviation from the notational convention established in the last paragraph, define nonbold ‘normalized value’ not as  $\mathbf{v}_t/\mathbf{p}_t$  but as  $v_t = \mathbf{v}_t/\mathbf{p}_t^{1-\rho}$ , because this allows us to exploit features of the related problem,

$$\begin{aligned} v_t(m_t) &= \max_{\{c\}_t^T} u(c_t) + \beta \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(m_{t+1})] \\ &\text{s.t.} \\ a_t &= m_t - c_t \\ b_{t+1} &= (R/\Gamma_{t+1})a_t = \mathcal{R}_{t+1}a_t \\ m_{t+1} &= b_{t+1} + \xi_{t+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_{t+1} \equiv (R/\Gamma_{t+1})$  is a ‘growth-normalized’ return factor, and the new problem’s first order condition is<sup>13</sup>

$$c_t^{-\rho} = R\beta \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}^{-\rho} c_{t+1}^{-\rho}]. \quad (7)$$

Since  $v_T(m_T) = u(m_T)$ , defining  $v_{T-1}(m_{T-1})$  from (6), we obtain

$$\mathbf{v}_{T-1}(\mathbf{m}_{T-1}, \mathbf{p}_{T-1}) = \mathbf{p}_{T-1}^{1-\rho} v_{T-1}(\underbrace{\mathbf{m}_{T-1}/\mathbf{p}_{T-1}}_{=m_{T-1}}).$$

This logic induces to all earlier periods, so that if we solve the normalized one-state-variable problem (6), we will have solutions to the original problem for any  $t < T$  from:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_t(\mathbf{m}_t, \mathbf{p}_t) &= \mathbf{p}_t^{1-\rho} v_t(m_t), \\ \mathbf{c}_t(\mathbf{m}_t, \mathbf{p}_t) &= \mathbf{p}_t c_t(m_t). \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>13</sup>Leaving aside their assumptions about the utility function and liquidity constraints, the normalized problem can be viewed as a special case of the model of Ma, Stachurski, and Toda (2020), with  $\mathcal{R}_{t+1}$  corresponding to their stochastic rate of return on capital and  $\beta\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}$  to their stochastic discount factor, and with the special property that  $\mathcal{R}_{t+1}$  and the modified discount factor are correlated because  $\Gamma_{t+1}$  plays a role in each.

## 2.3 Definition of a Nondegenerate Solution

Formally, we say the problem has a nondegenerate solution if as the horizon  $n$  gets arbitrarily large the solution in the first period of life  $c_{T-n}(m)$  defines a unique  $c(m)$ :

$$c(m) \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_{T-n}(m) \quad (8)$$

that satisfies

$$0 < c(m) < \infty \quad (9)$$

for every  $0 < m < \infty$ . ('Degenerate' limits will be cases where the limiting consumption function is  $c(m) = 0$  or  $c(m) = \infty$ .)

## 2.4 Perfect Foresight Benchmarks

The familiar analytical solution to the perfect foresight model, obtained by setting  $\wp = 0$  and  $\underline{\theta} = \bar{\theta} = \underline{\psi} = \bar{\psi} = 1$ , allows us to define some remaining notation and terminology.

### 2.4.1 Human Wealth

The dynamic budget constraint, strictly positive marginal utility, and the can't-die-in-debt condition (2) imply an exactly-holding intertemporal budget constraint (IBC):

$$\text{PDV}_t(\mathbf{c}) = \overbrace{\mathbf{m}_t - \mathbf{p}_t}^{\mathbf{b}_t} + \overbrace{\text{PDV}_t(\mathbf{p})}^{\mathbf{h}_t}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbf{b}$  is nonhuman wealth and  $\mathbf{h}_t$  is 'human wealth,' and with a constant  $\mathcal{R} \equiv \mathbf{R}/\Gamma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}_t &= \mathbf{p}_t + \mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathbf{p}_t + \mathcal{R}^{-2}\mathbf{p}_t + \dots + \mathcal{R}^{t-T}\mathbf{p}_t \\ &= \underbrace{\left( \frac{1 - \mathcal{R}^{-(T-t+1)}}{1 - \mathcal{R}^{-1}} \right)}_{\equiv h_t} \mathbf{p}_t \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

This equation shows that in order for  $h \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h_{T-n}$  to be finite, we must impose the Finite Human Wealth Condition ('FHW'):

$$\underbrace{\Gamma/\mathbf{R}}_{\equiv \mathcal{R}^{-1}} < 1. \quad (12)$$

Intuitively, for human wealth to be finite, the growth rate of (noncapital) income must be smaller than the interest rate at which that income is being discounted.

### 2.4.2 PF Unconstrained Solution Exists Under RIC and FHW

The consumption Euler equation holds in every period; with  $u'(\mathbf{c}) = \mathbf{c}^{-\rho}$ ,

$$\mathbf{c}_{t+1}/\mathbf{c}_t = (\mathbf{R}\beta)^{1/\rho} \equiv \mathbf{P} \quad (13)$$

where the Old English letter ‘thorn’ represents what we will call the ‘Absolute Patience Factor,’ or APF:<sup>14</sup>

$$\mathfrak{P} = (R\beta)^{1/\rho} \quad (14)$$

The sense in which  $\mathfrak{P}$  captures patience is that if the ‘absolute impatience condition’ (AIC) holds,

$$\mathfrak{P} < 1, \quad (15)$$

the consumer will choose to spend an amount too large to sustain indefinitely (the level of consumption must fall over time). We call such a consumer ‘absolutely impatient.’

We next define a ‘Return Patience Factor’ (RPF) that relates absolute patience to the return factor:

$$\mathfrak{P}_R \equiv \mathfrak{P}/R \quad (16)$$

and since consumption is growing by  $\mathfrak{P}$  but discounted by  $R$ :

$$\text{PDV}_t(\mathbf{c}) = \left( \frac{1 - \mathfrak{P}_R^{T-t+1}}{1 - \mathfrak{P}_R} \right) \mathbf{c}_t \quad (17)$$

from which the IBC (10) implies

$$\mathbf{c}_t = \overbrace{\left( \frac{1 - \mathfrak{P}_R}{1 - \mathfrak{P}_R^{T-t+1}} \right)}^{\equiv \kappa_t} (\mathbf{b}_t + \mathbf{h}_t) \quad (18)$$

which defines a normalized finite-horizon perfect foresight consumption function

$$\bar{\mathbf{c}}_{T-n}(m_{T-n}) = \overbrace{(m_{T-n} - 1 + h_{T-n})}^{\equiv b_{T-n}} \underline{\kappa}_{T-n} \quad (19)$$

where  $\underline{\kappa}_t$  is the marginal propensity to consume (MPC) because it answers the question ‘if the consumer had an extra unit of wealth, how much more would be spent.’ ( $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$ ’s overbar signifies that this function will be an upper bound as we modify the problem to incorporate constraints and uncertainty; analogously, the underbar for  $\kappa$  indicates that  $\underline{\kappa}$  is a lower bound).

Equation (18) makes plain that for the limiting MPC  $\underline{\kappa}$  to be strictly positive as  $n = T - t$  goes to infinity we must impose the Return Impatience Condition (RIC):

$$\mathfrak{P}_R < 1, \quad (20)$$

so that

$$0 < \underline{\kappa} \equiv 1 - \mathfrak{P}_R = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{\kappa}_{T-n}. \quad (21)$$

The RIC thus imposes a second kind of ‘impatience.’ The consumer cannot be so pathologically patient as to wish, in the limit as the horizon approaches infinity, to

---

<sup>14</sup>Impatience conditions of one kind or another have figured in intertemporal optimization problems since such problems were first formalized in economics, most notably by Ramsey (1928). Discussion of these issues has remained central to the literature, and no summary could do justice to the topic; I therefore refrain from even attempting it.



spend nothing today out of an increase in current wealth. That is, the RIC rules out the degenerate limiting solution  $\bar{c}(m) = 0$ . We will say that a consumer who satisfies the RIC is ‘return impatient.’

Given that the RIC holds, and as before defining limiting objects by the absence of a time subscript (e.g.,  $\bar{c}(m) = \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \bar{c}_{T-n}(m)$ ), the limiting consumption function will be

$$\bar{c}(m) = (m + h - 1)\kappa, \quad (22)$$

and we now see that in order to rule out the degenerate limiting solution  $\bar{c}(m) = \infty$  we need  $h$  to be finite; that is, we must impose the finite human wealth condition (12).

Finally, since the perfect foresight growth factor for consumption is  $\mathbf{P}$ , the fact that  $u(xy) = x^{1-\rho}u(y)$  allows us to write an analytical expression for value:

$$\begin{aligned} v_t &= u(c_t) + \beta u(c_t \mathbf{P}) + \beta^2 u(c_t \mathbf{P}^2) + \dots \\ &= u(c_t) (1 + \beta \mathbf{P}^{1-\rho} + (\beta \mathbf{P}^{1-\rho})^2 + \dots) \\ &= u(c_t) \left( \frac{1 - (\beta \mathbf{P}^{1-\rho})^{T-t+1}}{1 - \beta \mathbf{P}^{1-\rho}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which asymptotes to a finite number as  $n = T - t$  approaches  $+\infty$  if  $\beta \mathbf{P}^{1-\rho} < 1$ ;<sup>15</sup> with a bit of algebra, this requirement can be shown to be equivalent to the RIC. Thus, the same conditions that guarantee a nondegenerate limiting consumption function also guarantee a nondegenerate limiting value function (which, interestingly, will *not* be true when we incorporate uncertainty).

Conclusions so far are summarized in the first panel of Table 4: The PF-Unconstrained model will have a nondegenerate solution if we impose the RIC and FHC.

#### 2.4.3 PF Constrained Solution Exists Under RIC or Under $\{\mathbf{P}, \text{PF-GIC}\}$

If a liquidity constraint requiring  $b \geq 0$  is ever to be relevant, it must be relevant at the lowest possible level of market resources,  $m_t = 1$ , which obtains for a consumer who enters period  $t$  with  $b_t = 0$ . The constraint is ‘relevant’ if it prevents the choice that would otherwise be optimal; at  $m_t = 1$  the constraint is relevant if the marginal utility from spending all of today’s resources  $c_t = m_t = 1$ , exceeds the marginal utility from doing the same thing next period,  $c_{t+1} = 1$ ; that is, if such choices would violate the Euler equation (7):

$$1^{-\rho} > R\beta(\Gamma)^{-\rho} 1^{-\rho}. \quad (24)$$

By analogy to the return patience factor, we therefore define a ‘perfect foresight growth patience factor’ (PF-GPF) as

$$\mathbf{P}_\Gamma = \mathbf{P}/\Gamma, \quad (25)$$

and define a ‘perfect foresight growth impatience condition’ (PF-GIC)

$$\mathbf{P}_\Gamma < 1 \quad (26)$$

which is equivalent to (24) (exponentiate both sides by  $1/\rho$ ).

---

<sup>15</sup>This is related to a condition in Alvarez and Stokey (1998).

*PF-GIC and RIC.* If the PF-GIC fails but the RIC (20) holds, appendix A shows that, for some  $0 < m_{\#} < 1$ , an unconstrained consumer behaving according to (22) would choose  $c < m$  for all  $m > m_{\#}$ . In this case the solution to the constrained consumer's problem is simple: For any  $m \geq m_{\#}$  the constraint does not bind (and will never bind in the future) so here the constrained consumption function is identical to the unconstrained one. If the consumer were somehow<sup>16</sup> to arrive at an  $m < m_{\#} < 1$  the constraint would bind and the consumer would consume  $c = m$ . Using the  $\dot{\cdot}$  accent to designate version of a function in the presence of constraints:

$$\dot{c}(m) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } m < m_{\#} \\ \bar{c}(m) & \text{if } m \geq m_{\#}. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

*PF-GIC and RIC.* More useful is the case where the return impatience and PF growth-impatience conditions both hold. In this case appendix A shows that the limiting constrained consumption function is piecewise linear, with  $\dot{c}(m) = m$  up to a first 'kink point' at  $m_{\#}^1 > 1$ , and with discrete declines in the MPC at a set of kink points  $\{m_{\#}^1, m_{\#}^2, \dots\}$ . As  $m \uparrow \infty$  the constrained consumption function  $\dot{c}(m)$  becomes arbitrarily close to the unconstrained  $\bar{c}(m)$ , and the marginal propensity to consume function  $\dot{\kappa}(m) \equiv \dot{c}'(m)$  limits to  $\underline{\kappa}$ . Similarly, the value function  $\dot{v}(m)$  is nondegenerate and limits into the value function of the unconstrained consumer. This logic holds even when the finite human wealth condition fails (*EHWC*): A solution exists because the constraint prevents the consumer from borrowing against infinite human wealth to finance infinite current consumption. Under these circumstances, the consumer who starts with any amount of resources  $b_t > 1$  will, over time, run those resources down so that by some finite number of periods  $n$  in the future the consumer will reach  $b_{t+n} = 0$ , and thereafter will set  $c = m = 1$  for eternity, a policy that will (using the same steps as for equation (23)) yield value of

$$\mathbf{v}_{t+n} = \Gamma^{n(1-\rho)} \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_t) \left( \frac{1 - (\beta \Gamma^{1-\rho})^{T-(t+n)+1}}{1 - \beta \Gamma^{1-\rho}} \right),$$

which will be finite whenever any of these equivalent conditions holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \overbrace{\beta \Gamma^{1-\rho}}^{\equiv \beth} &< 1 \\ \beta R \Gamma^{-\rho} &< R/\Gamma \\ \mathbf{p} &< R^{1/\rho} \Gamma^{1-1/\rho} \\ \mathbf{p}_{\Gamma} &< (R/\Gamma)^{1/\rho}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where we call  $\beth$ <sup>17</sup> the 'Perfect Foresight Finite Value Of Autarky Factor' (PF-FVAF), and (28) is the Perfect Foresight Finite Value of Autarky Condition, PF-FVAC, because it guarantees that a consumer who always spends all permanent income 'has finite autarky value.' Note that the last version of the PF-FVAC in (28) implies the PF-GIC  $\mathbf{p}_{\Gamma} < 1$  whenever *EHWC* ( $R < \Gamma$ ) holds. So, if *EHWC*, value for any finite  $m$  will be the sum of

<sup>16</sup>"Somehow" because  $m < 1$  could only be obtained by entering the period with  $b < 0$  which the constraint forbids.

<sup>17</sup>This is another kind of discount factor, so we use the Hebrew 'bet' which is a cognate of the Greek 'beta'.

two finite numbers: The component due to the unconstrained consumption choice made over the finite horizon leading up to  $b_{t+n} = 0$ , and the finite component due to the value of consuming all  $\mathbf{p}_{t+n}$  thereafter.

*PF-GIC and RIC.* The most peculiar possibility occurs when the RIC fails. Under these circumstances the FHCW must also fail (Appendix A), and the constrained consumption function is nondegenerate. (See appendix Figure 8 for a numerical example). While it is true that  $\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = 0$ , nevertheless the limiting constrained consumption function  $\dot{c}(m)$  is strictly positive and strictly increasing in  $m$ . This result interestingly reconciles the conflicting intuitions from the unconstrained case, where *RIC* would suggest a degenerate limit of  $\dot{c}(m) = 0$  while *FHCW* would suggest a degenerate limit of  $\dot{c}(m) = \infty$ .

Tables 3 and 4 (and appendix table 5) codify these points. Perhaps more useful is the intuitive representation of the relations of the conditions for the unconstrained perfect foresight case presented in Figure 1. Each node represents a quantity considered in the foregoing analysis. The arrow associated with each inequality condition reflects the imposition of that condition. For example, one way we wrote the PF-FVAC in equation (28) is  $\mathbf{D} < R^{1/\rho} \Gamma^{1-1/\rho}$ , so imposition of the PF-FVAC is captured by the diagonal arrow connecting  $\mathbf{D}$  and  $R^{1/\rho} \Gamma^{1-1/\rho}$ . Traversing the diagram clockwise starting at  $\mathbf{D}$  involves imposing first the PF-GIC then the FHCW, and the consequent arrival at the bottom right node tells us that these two conditions jointly imply that the PF-FVAC holds. Reversal of a condition will reverse the arrow's direction; so, for example, the bottommost arrow going from  $R$  to  $R^{1/\rho} \Gamma^{1-1/\rho}$  imposes *FHCW*; but we can cancel the cancellation and reverse the arrow. This would allow us to traverse the diagram in a clockwise direction from  $\mathbf{D}$  to  $R$ , revealing that imposition of PF-GIC and FHCW (and, redundantly, FHCW again) lets us conclude that the RIC holds because the starting point is  $\mathbf{D}$  and the endpoint is  $R$ , and this is a chain of inequalities. (Consult Appendix J for a detailed exposition of diagrams of this type).

We now turn to the case with uncertainty. The model without constraints but with uncertainty will turn out to be a close parallel to the model with constraints but without uncertainty.

## 2.5 Uncertainty-Modified Conditions

### 2.5.1 Impatience

When uncertainty is introduced, the expectation of  $b_{t+1}$  can be rewritten as:

$$\mathbb{E}_t[b_{t+1}] = a_t \mathbb{E}_t[\mathcal{R}_{t+1}] = a_t \mathcal{R} \mathbb{E}_t[\psi_{t+1}^{-1}] \quad (29)$$

where Jensen's inequality guarantees that the expectation of the inverse of the permanent shock is strictly greater than one. It will be convenient to define the object

$$\underline{\psi} \equiv (\mathbb{E}[\psi^{-1}])^{-1}$$



**Figure 1** Relation of PF-GIC, FHWG, RIC, and PF-FVAC

An arrowhead points to the larger of the two quantities being compared. For example, the diagonal arrow indicates that  $\mathbf{P} < R^{1/\rho}\Gamma^{1-1/\rho}$ , which is one way of writing the PF-FVAC, equation (28)

because this permits us to write expressions like the RHS of (29) compactly as, e.g.,  $a_t \mathcal{R}/\underline{\psi}^{-1}$ .<sup>18</sup> We refer to this as the ‘compensated return,’ because it compensates (in a risk-neutral way) for the effect of uncertainty on the expected growth-normalized return (in the sense implicitly defined in (29)).

We can now transparently generalize the PF-GIC (26) by defining a ‘compensated growth factor’

$$\underline{\Gamma} = \Gamma \underline{\psi} \quad (30)$$

and a compensated Growth Patience Factor (GPF):

$$\mathbf{P}_{\underline{\Gamma}} = \mathbf{P}/\underline{\Gamma} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{P}/\Gamma \underline{\psi}] \quad (31)$$

and a straightforward derivation ((45) below) yields the conclusion that

$$\lim_{m_t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] = \mathbf{P}_{\underline{\Gamma}},$$

which implies that if we wish to prevent  $m$  from heading to infinity (that is, if we want  $m$  to be expected to fall for some large enough value of  $m$ ) we must impose a generalized version of the Perfect Foresight Growth Impatience Condition (26); we call the ‘Growth Impatience Condition’ (GIC) the requirement that the Growth Patience Factor (31)

<sup>18</sup>One way to think of  $\underline{\psi}$  is as a particular kind of a ‘certainty equivalent’ of the shock; this captures the intuition that mean-one shock renders a given mean level of income less valuable than if the shock did not exist, so that  $\underline{\psi} < 1$ .

must be less than 1:<sup>19</sup>

$$\mathbf{P}_\Gamma < 1 \quad (32)$$

which is stronger than the perfect foresight version (26) because

$$\underline{\Gamma} < \Gamma \quad (33)$$

(Jensen's inequality implies that  $\underline{\psi} < 1$  for nondegenerate  $\psi$ ).

### 2.5.2 Autarky Value

Analogously to (23), a consumer who spent exactly their permanent income every period would have value determined by the product of the expectation of the (independent) future shocks to permanent income:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_t &= \mathbb{E}_t [\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_t) + \beta \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_t \Gamma_{t+1}) + \dots + \beta^{T-t} \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_t \Gamma_{t+1} \dots \Gamma_T)] \\ &= \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{p}_t) \left( \frac{1 - (\beta \Gamma^{1-\rho} \mathbb{E}[\psi^{1-\rho}])^{T-t+1}}{1 - \beta \Gamma^{1-\rho} \mathbb{E}[\psi^{1-\rho}]} \right) \end{aligned}$$

which invites the definition of a utility-compensated equivalent of the permanent shock,

$$\underline{\underline{\psi}} = (\mathbb{E}[\psi^{1-\rho}])^{1/(1-\rho)}$$

which will satisfy  $\underline{\underline{\psi}} < 1$  for  $\rho > 1$  and nondegenerate  $\psi$  (and  $\underline{\underline{\psi}} < \underline{\psi}$  for the reasonable (though not required) case of  $\rho > 2$ ); defining

$$\underline{\underline{\Gamma}} = \Gamma \underline{\underline{\psi}} \quad (34)$$

we can see that  $\mathbf{v}_t$  will be finite as  $T$  approaches  $\infty$  if

$$\begin{aligned} &\overbrace{\beta \Gamma^{1-\rho}}^{\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}} < 1 \\ &\beta < \underline{\underline{\Gamma}}^{\rho-1} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

which we call the ‘finite value of autarky’ condition (FVAC) because it guarantees that value is finite for a consumer who always consumes their (now stochastic) permanent income (and we will call  $\underline{\underline{\Gamma}}$  the ‘Finite Value of Autarky Factor,’ FVAF).<sup>20</sup> For nondegenerate  $\psi$ , this condition is stronger (harder to satisfy in the sense of requiring lower  $\beta$ ) than the perfect foresight version (28) because  $\underline{\underline{\Gamma}} < \Gamma$ .<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup>Equation (32) is a bit easier to satisfy than the similar condition imposed by Deaton (1991):  $(\mathbb{E}[\psi^{-\rho}])^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_\Gamma < 1$  to guarantee that his problem defined a contraction mapping.

<sup>20</sup>In a stationary environment – that is, with  $\underline{\underline{\Gamma}} = 1$  – this corresponds to an impatience condition imposed by Ma, Stachurski, and Toda (2020); but their remaining conditions do not correspond to those here, because their problem differs and their method of proof differs.

<sup>21</sup>To see this, rewrite (35) as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \mathbf{R} &< \mathbf{R} \underline{\underline{\Gamma}}^{\rho-1} \\ (\beta \mathbf{R})^{1/\rho} &< \mathbf{R}^{1/\rho} \Gamma^{1-1/\rho} \underline{\underline{\psi}}^{1-1/\rho} \\ \mathbf{P}_\Gamma &< (\mathbf{R}/\Gamma)^{1/\rho} \underline{\underline{\psi}}^{1-1/\rho} \end{aligned}$$

**Table 1** Microeconomic Model Calibration

Calibrated Parameters			
Description	Parameter	Value	Source
Permanent Income Growth Factor	$\Gamma$	1.03	PSID: Carroll (1992)
Interest Factor	$R$	1.04	Conventional
Time Preference Factor	$\beta$	0.96	Conventional
Coefficient of Relative Risk Aversion	$\rho$	2	Conventional
Probability of Zero Income	$\wp$	0.005	PSID: Carroll (1992)
Std Dev of Log Permanent Shock	$\sigma_\psi$	0.1	PSID: Carroll (1992)
Std Dev of Log Transitory Shock	$\sigma_\theta$	0.1	PSID: Carroll (1992)

## 2.6 The Baseline Numerical Solution

Figure 2, familiar from the literature, depicts the successive consumption rules that apply in the last period of life ( $c_T(m)$ ), the second-to-last period, and earlier periods under baseline parameter values listed in Table 2. (The 45 degree line is  $c_T(m) = m$  because in the last period of life it is optimal to spend all remaining resources.)

In the figure, the consumption rules appear to converge to a nondegenerate  $c(m)$ . Our next purpose is to show that this appearance is not deceptive.

## 2.7 Concave Consumption Function Characteristics

A precondition for the main proof is that the maximization problem (6) defines a sequence of continuously differentiable strictly increasing strictly concave<sup>22</sup> functions  $\{c_T, c_{T-1}, \dots\}$ . The straightforward but tedious proof is relegated to appendix B. For present purposes, the most important point is that the income process induces what Aiyagari (1994) dubbed a ‘natural borrowing constraint’:  $c_t(m) < m$  for all periods  $t < T$  because a consumer who spent all available resources would arrive in period  $t + 1$  with balances  $b_{t+1}$  of zero, and then might earn zero income over the remaining horizon, requiring the consumer to spend zero, incurring negative infinite utility. To avoid this disaster, the consumer never spends everything. Zeldes (1989) seems to have been the first to argue, based on his numerical results, that the natural borrowing constraint was a quantitatively plausible alternative to ‘artificial’ or ‘ad hoc’ borrowing constraints in a life cycle model.<sup>23</sup>

Strict concavity and continuous differentiability of the consumption function are key elements in many of the arguments below, but are not characteristics of models with

---

where the last equation is the same as the PF-FVAC condition except that the RHS is multiplied by  $\underline{\psi}^{1-1/\rho}$  which is strictly less than 1.

<sup>22</sup>With one obvious exception:  $c_T(m)$  is linear (and so only weakly concave).

<sup>23</sup>Carroll (1992) made the same (numerical) point for infinite horizon models (calibrated to actual empirical data on household income dynamics).

**Table 2** Model Characteristics Calculated from Parameters

Description	Symbol and Formula	Approximate Calculated Value
Finite Human Wealth Factor	$\mathcal{R}^{-1} \equiv \Gamma/R$	0.990
PF Finite Value of Autarky Factor	$\sqsupset \equiv \beta\Gamma^{1-\rho}$	0.932
Growth Compensated Permanent Shock	$\underline{\psi} \equiv (\mathbb{E}[\psi^{-1}])^{-1}$	0.990
Uncertainty-Adjusted Growth	$\underline{\Gamma} \equiv \Gamma\underline{\psi}$	1.020
Utility Compensated Permanent Shock	$\underline{\underline{\psi}} \equiv (\mathbb{E}[\psi^{1-\rho}])^{1/(1-\rho)}$	0.990
Utility Compensated Growth	$\underline{\underline{\Gamma}} \equiv \Gamma\underline{\underline{\psi}}$	1.020
Absolute Patience Factor	$\mathfrak{P} \equiv (R\beta)^{1/\rho}$	0.999
Return Patience Factor	$\mathfrak{P}_R \equiv \mathfrak{P}/R$	0.961
PF Growth Patience Factor	$\mathfrak{P}_\Gamma \equiv \mathfrak{P}/\Gamma$	0.970
Growth Patience Factor	$\mathfrak{P}_{\underline{\Gamma}} \equiv \mathfrak{P}/\underline{\Gamma}$	0.980
Finite Value of Autarky Factor	$\sqsubseteq \equiv \beta\Gamma^{1-\rho}\underline{\underline{\psi}}^{1-\rho}$	0.941
Weak Impatience Factor	$\wp^{1/\rho}\mathfrak{P} \equiv (\wp\beta R)^{1/\rho}$	0.071



**Figure 2** Convergence of the Consumption Rules

‘artificial’ borrowing constraints. The analytical convenience of these features is considerable, even if models with natural borrowing constraints in practice usually give similar results to those with artificial constraints.

## 2.8 Bounds for the Consumption Functions

The consumption functions depicted in Figure 2 appear to have limiting slopes as  $m \downarrow 0$  and as  $m \uparrow \infty$ . This section confirms that impression and derives those slopes, which also turn out to be useful in the contraction mapping proof.<sup>24</sup>

Assume that a continuously differentiable concave consumption function exists in period  $t + 1$ , with an origin at  $c_{t+1}(0) = 0$ , a minimal MPC  $\underline{\kappa}_{t+1} > 0$ , and maximal MPC  $\bar{\kappa}_{t+1} \leq 1$ . (If  $t + 1 = T$  these will be  $\underline{\kappa}_T = \bar{\kappa}_T = 1$ ; for earlier periods they will exist by recursion from the following arguments.)

The MPC bound as wealth approaches infinity is easy to understand: In this case, under our imposed assumption that human wealth is finite, the proportion of consumption that will be financed out of human wealth approaches zero. In consequence, the proportional difference between the solution to the model with uncertainty and the perfect foresight model shrinks to zero. In the course of proving this, appendix F provides a useful recursive expression (used below) for the (inverse of the) limiting MPC:

$$\underline{\kappa}_t^{-1} = 1 + \mathbf{P}_R \underline{\kappa}_{t+1}^{-1}. \quad (36)$$

### 2.8.1 Weak RIC Conditions

There is a parallel expression for the limiting maximal MPC as  $m \downarrow 0$ : appendix equation (84) shows that, as  $m_t \uparrow \infty$ ,

$$\bar{\kappa}_t^{-1} = 1 + \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R \bar{\kappa}_{t+1}^{-1}. \quad (37)$$

where  $\{\bar{\kappa}_{T-n}^{-1}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  is a decreasing convergent sequence if the ‘weak return patience factor’  $\wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R$  satisfies:

$$0 \leq \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R < 1, \quad (38)$$

a condition that we dub the ‘Weak Return Impatience Condition’ (WRIC) because with  $\wp < 1$  it will hold more easily (for a larger set of parameter values) than the RIC ( $\mathbf{P}_R < 1$ ).

The essence of the argument is that as wealth approaches zero, the overriding consideration that limits consumption is the (recursive) fear of the zero-income events. (That is why the probability of the zero income event  $\wp$  appears in the expression.)

We are now in position to observe that the optimal consumption function must satisfy

$$\underline{\kappa}_t m_t \leq c_t(m_t) \leq \bar{\kappa}_t m_t \quad (39)$$

---

<sup>24</sup>Benhabib, Bisin, and Zhu (2015) show that the consumption function becomes linear as wealth approaches infinity in a model with capital income risk and liquidity constraints; Ma and Toda (2020) show that these results generalize to the limits derived here if capital income is added to the model.



because consumption starts at zero and is continuously differentiable (as argued above), is strictly concave (Carroll and Kimball (1996)), and always exhibits a slope between  $\underline{\kappa}_t$  and  $\bar{\kappa}_t$  (the formal proof is provided in appendix D).

## 2.9 Conditions Under Which the Problem Defines a Contraction Mapping

To prove that the consumption rules converge, we need to show that the problem defines a contraction mapping. As mentioned above, this cannot be proven using the standard theorems in the literature following Stokey et. al. (1989), which require marginal utility to be bounded over the space of possible values of  $m$ , because the possibility (however unlikely) of an unbroken string of zero-income events through the end of the horizon means that marginal utility is unbounded. Although a recent literature examines the existence and uniqueness of solutions to Bellman equations in the presence of ‘unbounded returns’ (see, e.g., Matkowski and Nowak (2011)), the techniques in that literature cannot be used to solve the problem here because the required conditions are violated by a problem that incorporates permanent shocks.<sup>25</sup>

Fortunately, Boyd (1990) provided a weighted contraction mapping theorem that Alvarez and Stokey (1998) showed could be used to address the homogeneous case (of which CRRA is an example) in a deterministic framework; later, Durán (2003) showed how to extend the Boyd (1990) approach to the stochastic case.

**Definition 1.** Consider any function  $\bullet \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  where  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  is the space of continuous functions from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$ . Suppose  $F \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  with  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  and  $F > 0$ . Then  $\bullet$  is  $F$ -bounded if the  $F$ -norm of  $\bullet$ ,

$$\|\bullet\|_F = \sup_m \left[ \frac{|\bullet(m)|}{F(m)} \right], \quad (40)$$

is finite.

For  $\mathcal{C}_F(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  defined as the set of functions in  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  that are  $F$ -bounded;  $w, x, y$ , and  $z$  as examples of  $F$ -bounded functions; and using  $\mathbf{0}(m) = 0$  to indicate the function that returns zero for any argument, Boyd (1990) proves the following.

**Boyd’s Weighted Contraction Mapping Theorem.** Let  $T : \mathcal{C}_F(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  such that<sup>26,27</sup>

- (1)  $T$  is non-decreasing, i.e.  $x \leq y \Rightarrow \{Tx\} \leq \{Ty\}$
- (2)  $\{T\mathbf{0}\} \in \mathcal{C}_F(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$
- (3) There exists some real  $0 < \alpha < 1$ , such that
$$\{T(w + \zeta F)\} \leq \{Tw\} + \zeta \alpha F \quad \text{holds for all real } \zeta > 0.$$

<sup>25</sup>See Yao (2012) for a detailed discussion of the reasons the existing literature up through Matkowski and Nowak (2011) cannot handle the problem described here.

<sup>26</sup>We will usually denote the function that results from the mapping as, e.g.,  $\{Tw\}$ .

<sup>27</sup>To non-theorists, this notation may be slightly confusing; the inequality relations in (1) and (3) are taken to mean ‘for any specific element  $\bullet$  in the domain of the functions in question’ so that, e.g.,  $x \leq y$  is short for  $x(\bullet) \leq y(\bullet) \forall \bullet \in \mathcal{A}$ . In this notation,  $\zeta \alpha F$  in (3) is a *function* which can be applied to any argument  $\bullet$  (because  $F$  is a function).

Then  $\mathsf{T}$  defines a contraction with a unique fixed point.

For our problem, take  $\mathcal{A}$  as  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  as  $\mathbb{R}$ , and define

$$\{\mathsf{Ez}\}(a_t) = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho} z(a_t \mathcal{R}_{t+1} + \xi_{t+1}) \right].$$

Using this, we introduce the mapping  $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{C}_F(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ ,<sup>28</sup>

$$\{\mathcal{T}z\}(m_t) = \max_{c_t \in [\underline{\kappa}m_t, \bar{\kappa}m_t]} u(c_t) + \beta (\{\mathsf{Ez}\}(m_t - c_t)). \quad (41)$$

We can show that our operator  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies the conditions that Boyd requires of his operator  $\mathsf{T}$ , if we impose two restrictions on parameter values. The first is the WRIC necessary for convergence of the maximal MPC, equation (38) above. A more serious restriction is the utility-compensated Finite Value of Autarky condition, equation (35). (We discuss the interpretation of these restrictions in detail in section 2.11 below.) Imposing these restrictions, we are now in position to state the central theorem of the paper.

**Theorem 1.**  *$\mathcal{T}$  is a contraction mapping if the restrictions on parameter values (38) and (35) are true (that is, if the weak return impatience condition and the finite value of autarky condition hold).*

Intuitively, Boyd’s theorem shows that if you can find a  $F$  that is everywhere finite but goes to infinity ‘as fast or faster’ than the function you are normalizing with  $F$ , the normalized problem defines a contraction mapping. The intuition for the FVAC condition is just that, with an infinite horizon, with any initial amount of bank balances  $b_0$ , in the limit your value can always be made greater than you would get by consuming exactly the sustainable amount (say, by consuming  $(r/R)b_0 - \epsilon$  for some small  $\epsilon > 0$ ).

The details of the proof are cumbersome, and are therefore relegated to appendix D. Given that the value function converges, appendix D.3 shows that the consumption functions converge.<sup>29</sup>

## 2.10 The Liquidity Constrained Solution as a Limit

This section explains why a related problem commonly considered in the literature (e.g., with a simpler income process, by Deaton (1991)), with a liquidity constraint and a positive minimum value of income, is the limit of the problem considered here as the probability  $\wp$  of the zero-income event approaches zero.

The essence of the argument is easy to state. As noted above, the possibility of earning zero income over the remainder of the horizon prevents the consumer from ending the current period with zero assets because with some finite probability the consumer would be forced to consume zero, which would be infinitely painful.

But the *extent* to which the consumer feels the need to make this precautionary provision depends on the probability that it will turn out to matter. As  $\wp \downarrow 0$ , that

<sup>28</sup>Note that the existence of the maximum is assured by the continuity of  $\{\mathsf{Ez}\}(a_t)$  (it is continuous because it is the sum of continuous  $F$ -bounded functions  $z$ ) and the compactness of  $[\underline{\kappa}m_t, \bar{\kappa}m_t]$ .

<sup>29</sup>MST’s proof is for convergence of the consumption policy function directly, rather than of the value function, which is why their conditions are on  $u'$ , which governs behavior.


probability becomes arbitrarily small, so the amount of precautionary saving approaches zero. But zero precautionary saving is the amount of saving that an impatient liquidity constrained consumer with perfect foresight would choose.

Another way to understand this is just to think of the liquidity constraint as being imposed by specifying a component of the utility function that is zero whenever the consumer ends the period with (strictly) positive assets, but negative infinity if the consumer ends the period with (weakly) negative assets.

See appendix G for the formal proof justifying the foregoing intuitive discussion.

## 2.11 Discussion of Parametric Restrictions

The full relationship among all the conditions articulated above is represented in Figure 3. Though the diagram looks complex, it is merely a modified version of the earlier diagram with further (mostly intermediate) inequalities inserted. Again readers unfamiliar with such diagrams should see Appendix J) for a more detailed explanation.



**Figure 3** Relation of All Inequality Conditions

See Table 2 for Numerical Values of Nodes Under Baseline Parameters

### 2.11.1 Discussion of the RIC

In the perfect foresight unconstrained problem (section 2.4.2), the RIC was required for existence of a nondegenerate solution. It is surprising, therefore, that in the presence of uncertainty, the RIC is neither necessary nor sufficient for a nondegenerate solution. We thus begin our discussion by asking what features the problem must exhibit (given

the FVAC) if the RIC fails (that is,  $R < (R\beta)^{1/\rho}$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}
R &< \overbrace{(R\beta)^{1/\rho} < (R(\Gamma\underline{\psi})^{\rho-1})^{1/\rho}}^{\text{implied by FVAC}} \\
R &< (R/\Gamma)^{1/\rho} \Gamma \underline{\psi}^{1-1/\rho} \\
R/\Gamma &< (R/\Gamma)^{1/\rho} \underline{\psi}^{1-1/\rho} \\
(R/\Gamma)^{1-1/\rho} &< \underline{\psi}^{1-1/\rho}
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

but since  $\underline{\psi} < 1$  and  $0 < 1 - 1/\rho < 1$  (because we have assumed  $\rho > 1$ ), this inequality can hold only if  $R/\Gamma < 1$ ; that is, given the FVAC, the RIC can fail only if human wealth is unbounded. Unbounded human wealth is permitted here, as in the perfect foresight liquidity constrained problem. But, from equation (36), an implication of ~~RIC~~ is that  $\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} c'(m) = 0$ . Thus, interestingly, the presence of uncertainty both permits unlimited human wealth and at the same time prevents that unlimited wealth from resulting in infinite consumption. That is, in the presence of uncertainty, pathological patience (which in the perfect foresight model with finite wealth results in consumption of zero) plus infinite human wealth (which the perfect foresight model prohibits by assumption because it leads to infinite consumption) combine to yield a unique finite MPC for any finite value of  $m$ .<sup>30</sup> Note the close parallel to the conclusion in the perfect foresight liquidity constrained model in the  $\{\text{PF-GIC}, \text{RIC}\}$  case (for detailed analysis of this case see appendix A). There, too, the tension between infinite human wealth and pathological patience was resolved with a nondegenerate consumption function whose limiting MPC was zero.

### 2.11.2 The WRIC

The ‘weakness’ of the additional requirement for contraction, the weak RIC, can be seen by asking ‘under what circumstances would the FVAC hold but the WRIC fail?’ Algebraically, the requirement is

$$\beta \Gamma^{1-\rho} \underline{\psi}^{1-\rho} < 1 < (\wp \beta)^{1/\rho} / R^{1-1/\rho}. \tag{43}$$

If there were no conceivable parameter values that could satisfy both of these inequalities, the WRIC would have no force. And if we require  $R \geq 1$ , the WRIC is indeed redundant because now  $\beta < 1 < R^{\rho-1}$ , so that the RIC (and WRIC) must hold.

But neither theory nor evidence demands that we assume  $R \geq 1$ . We can therefore approach the question of the WRIC’s relevance by asking just how low  $R$  must be for the condition to be relevant. Suppose for illustration that  $\rho = 2$ ,  $\underline{\psi}^{1-\rho} = 1.01$ ,  $\Gamma^{1-\rho} = 1.01^{-1}$  and  $\wp = 0.10$ . In that case (43) reduces to

$$\beta < 1 < (0.1\beta/R)^{1/2}$$

---

<sup>30</sup>Ma and Toda (2020) prove that the limiting MPC is zero in an even more general case where there is also capital income risk.

but since  $\beta < 1$  by assumption, the binding requirement is that

$$R < \beta/10$$

so that for example if  $\beta = 0.96$  we would need  $R < 0.096$  (that is, a perpetual riskfree rate of return of worse than -90 percent a year) in order for the WRIC to bind. The relevance of the WRIC is indeed “Weak.”

Perhaps the best way of thinking about this is to note that the space of parameter values for which the WRIC is relevant shrinks out of existence as  $\wp \rightarrow 0$ , which section 2.10 showed was the precise limiting condition under which behavior becomes arbitrarily close to the liquidity constrained solution (in the absence of other risks). On the other hand, when  $\wp = 1$ , the consumer has no noncapital income (so that the FHCW holds) and with  $\wp = 1$  the WRIC is identical to the RIC; but the RIC is the only condition required for a solution to exist for a perfect foresight consumer with no noncapital income. Thus the WRIC forms a sort of ‘bridge’ between the liquidity constrained and the unconstrained problems as  $\wp$  moves from 0 to 1.

### 2.11.3 When the GIC Fails

If both the GIC and the RIC hold, the arguments above establish that as  $m \uparrow \infty$  the limiting consumption function asymptotes to the consumption function for the perfect foresight unconstrained function. The more interesting case is where the GIC fails. A solution that satisfies the combination FVAC and ~~GIC~~ is depicted in Figure 4. The consumption function is shown along with the  $\mathbb{E}_t[\Delta m_{t+1}] = 0$  locus that identifies the ‘sustainable’ level of spending at which  $m$  is expected to remain unchanged. The diagram suggests a fact that is confirmed by deeper analysis: Under the depicted configuration of parameter values (see the code for details), the consumption function never reaches the  $\mathbb{E}_t[\Delta m_{t+1}] = 0$  locus; indeed, when the RIC holds but the GIC does not, the consumption function’s limiting slope  $(1 - \underline{\mathbf{P}}/R)$  is shallower than that of the sustainable consumption locus  $(1 - \underline{\mathbf{I}}/R)$ ,<sup>31</sup> so the gap between the two actually increases with  $m$  in the limit. Although a nondegenerate consumption function exists, a target level of  $m$  does not (or, rather, the target is  $m = \infty$ ), because no matter how wealthy a consumer becomes, the consumer will always spend less than the amount that would keep  $m$  stable (in expectation).


We have now established the points of comparison promised above between the perfect foresight solutions and the solutions under uncertainty; these are codified in the remaining parts of Tables 3 and 4.

## 3 Analysis of the Converged Consumption Function

Figures 5 and 6a,b capture the main properties of the converged consumption rule when the RIC, GIC, and FHCW all hold.<sup>32</sup> Figure 5 shows the expected consumption growth

<sup>31</sup>This is because  $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] = \mathbb{E}_t[\mathcal{R}_{t+1}(m_t - c_t)] + 1$ ; solve  $m = (m - c)\mathcal{R}\psi^{-1} + 1$  for  $c$  and differentiate.

<sup>32</sup>These figures reflect the converged rule corresponding to the parameter values indicated in Table 2.



**Figure 4** Example Solution when FVAC Holds but GIC Does Not

factor  $\mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{c}_{t+1}/\mathbf{c}_t]$  for a consumer behaving according to the converged consumption rule, while Figures 6a,b illustrate theoretical bounds for the consumption function and the marginal propensity to consume.

Five features of behavior are captured, or suggested, by the figures. First, as  $m_t \uparrow \infty$  the expected consumption growth factor goes to  $\mathbf{P}$ , indicated by the lower bound in Figure 5, and the marginal propensity to consume approaches  $\underline{\kappa} = (1 - \mathbf{P}_R)$  (Figure 6), the same as the perfect foresight MPC. Second, as  $m_t \downarrow 0$  the consumption growth factor approaches  $\infty$  (Figure 5) and the MPC approaches  $\bar{\kappa} = (1 - \wp^{1/\rho}\mathbf{P}_R)$  (Figure 6). Third (Figure 5), there is a target cash-on-hand-to-income ratio  $\tilde{m}$  such that if  $m_t = \tilde{m}$  then  $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] = m_t$ , and (as indicated by the arrows of motion on the  $\mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{c}_{t+1}/\mathbf{c}_t]$  curve), the model's dynamics are 'stable' around the target in the sense that if  $m_t < \tilde{m}$  then cash-on-hand will rise (in expectation), while if  $m_t > \tilde{m}$ , it will fall (in expectation). Fourth (Figure 5), at the target  $m$ , the expected rate of growth of consumption is slightly less than the expected growth rate of permanent noncapital income. The final proposition suggested by Figure 5 is that the expected consumption growth factor is declining in the level of the cash-on-hand ratio  $m_t$ . This turns out to be true in the absence of permanent shocks, but in extreme cases it can be false if permanent shocks are present.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>33</sup>Throughout the remaining analysis I make a final assumption that is not strictly justified by the foregoing. We have seen that the finite-horizon consumption functions  $c_{T-n}(m)$  are twice continuously differentiable and strictly concave, and that they converge to a continuous function  $c(m)$ . It does not strictly follow that the limiting function  $c(m)$  is twice continuously differentiable, but I will assume that it is.



**Figure 5** Target  $m$ , Expected Consumption Growth, and Permanent Income Growth

### 3.1 Limits as $m$ approaches Infinity

Define

$$\underline{c}(m) = \underline{\kappa}m$$

which is the solution to an infinite-horizon problem with no noncapital income ( $\xi_{t+n} = 0 \forall n \geq 1$ ); clearly  $\underline{c}(m) < c(m)$ , since allowing the possibility of future noncapital income cannot reduce current consumption.<sup>34</sup>


Assuming the FHWC holds, the infinite horizon perfect foresight solution (22) constitutes an upper bound on consumption in the presence of uncertainty, since Carroll and Kimball (1996) show that the introduction of uncertainty strictly decreases the level of consumption at any  $m$ .

Thus, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{c}(m) &< c(m) < \bar{c}(m) \\ 1 &< c(m)/\underline{c}(m) < \bar{c}(m)/\underline{c}(m). \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

---

<sup>34</sup>We will assume the RIC holds here and subsequently so that  $\underline{\kappa} > 0$ ; the situation is a bit more complex when the RIC does not hold. In that case the bound on consumption is given by the spending that would be undertaken by a consumer who faced binding liquidity constraints. Detailed analysis of this special case is not sufficiently interesting to warrant inclusion in the paper.



**Figure 6** Limiting MPC's

But

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \bar{c}(m)/\underline{c}(m) &= \lim_{m \uparrow \infty} (m - 1 + h)/m \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

so as  $m \uparrow \infty$ ,  $c(m)/\underline{c}(m) \rightarrow 1$ , and the continuous differentiability and strict concavity of  $c(m)$  therefore implies

$$\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} c'(m) = \underline{c}'(m) = \bar{c}'(m) = \underline{\kappa}$$

because any other fixed limit would eventually lead to a level of consumption either exceeding  $\bar{c}(m)$  or lower than  $\underline{c}(m)$ .

Figure 6 confirms these limits visually. The top plot shows the converged consumption function along with its upper and lower bounds, while the lower plot shows the marginal propensity to consume.


Next we establish the limit of the expected consumption growth factor as  $m_t \uparrow \infty$ :

$$\lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{c}_{t+1}/\mathbf{c}_t] = \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}c_{t+1}/c_t].$$


But

$$\mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}\underline{c}_{t+1}/\bar{c}_t] \leq \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}c_{t+1}/c_t] \leq \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}\bar{c}_{t+1}/\underline{c}_t]$$





(a) Bounds



(b) Target  $m$

**Figure 7** The Consumption Function

and

$$\lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \Gamma_{t+1} \underline{c}(m_{t+1}) / \bar{c}(m_t) = \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \Gamma_{t+1} \bar{c}(m_{t+1}) / \underline{c}(m_t) = \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \Gamma_{t+1} m_{t+1} / m_t,$$

while (for convenience defining  $a(m) = m_t - c(m_t)$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \Gamma_{t+1} m_{t+1} / m_t &= \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \left( \frac{\mathcal{R}a(m_t) + \Gamma_{t+1} \xi_{t+1}}{m_t} \right) \\ &= (\mathcal{R}\beta)^{1/\rho} = \mathbf{P} \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

because  $\lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} a'(m) = \mathbf{P}_R$ <sup>35</sup> and  $\Gamma_{t+1} \xi_{t+1} / m_t \leq (\Gamma \bar{\psi} \bar{\theta} / (1 - \wp)) / m_t$  which goes to zero as  $m_t$  goes to infinity.

Hence we have

$$\mathbf{P} \leq \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{c}_{t+1} / \mathbf{c}_t] \leq \mathbf{P}$$

so as cash goes to infinity, consumption growth approaches its value  $\mathbf{P}$  in the perfect foresight model.

### 3.2 Limits as $m$ Approaches Zero

Now consider the limits of behavior as  $m_t$  gets arbitrarily small.

Equation (37) shows that the limiting value of  $\bar{\kappa}$  is

$$\bar{\kappa} = 1 - \mathcal{R}^{-1}(\wp \mathcal{R} \beta)^{1/\rho}.$$

Defining  $e(m) = c(m)/m$  as before we have

$$\lim_{m \downarrow 0} e(m) = (1 - \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R) = \bar{\kappa}.$$

Now using the continuous differentiability of the consumption function along with L'Hôpital's rule, we have

$$\lim_{m \downarrow 0} c'(m) = \lim_{m \downarrow 0} e(m) = \bar{\kappa}.$$

Figure 6 confirms that the numerical solution method obtains this limit for the MPC as  $m$  approaches zero.

For consumption growth, as  $m \downarrow 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m_t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \frac{c(m_{t+1})}{c(m_t)} \right) \Gamma_{t+1} \right] &> \lim_{m_t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \frac{\underline{c}(\mathcal{R}_{t+1} a(m_t) + \xi_{t+1})}{\bar{\kappa} m_t} \right) \Gamma_{t+1} \right] \\ &= \wp \lim_{m_t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \frac{\underline{c}(\mathcal{R}_{t+1} a(m_t))}{\bar{\kappa} m_t} \right) \Gamma_{t+1} \right] \\ &\quad + (1 - \wp) \lim_{m_t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \frac{\underline{c}(\mathcal{R}_{t+1} a(m_t) + \theta_{t+1} / (1 - \wp))}{\bar{\kappa} m_t} \right) \Gamma_{t+1} \right] \\ &> (1 - \wp) \lim_{m_t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \frac{\underline{c}(\theta_{t+1} / (1 - \wp))}{\bar{\kappa} m_t} \right) \Gamma_{t+1} \right] \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>35</sup>This is because  $\lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} a(m_t) / m_t = 1 - \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} c(m_t) / m_t = 1 - \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} c'(m_t) = \mathbf{P}_R$ .

$$= \infty$$

where the second-to-last line follows because  $\lim_{m_t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \frac{c(\mathcal{R}_{t+1}a(m_t))}{\bar{\kappa}m_t} \right) \Gamma_{t+1} \right]$  is positive, and the last line follows because the minimum possible realization of  $\theta_{t+1}$  is  $\underline{\theta} > 0$  so the minimum possible value of expected next-period consumption is positive.

### 3.3 There Exists Exactly One Target Cash-on-Hand Ratio, which is Stable

We now prove the existence of a target cash-on-hand-to-income ratio  $\check{m}$  towards which an agent's  $m$  is expected to move. (The  $\forall$  accent invokes the fact that this is the value that other  $m$ 's 'point to'.)

**Theorem 2.** *For the problem defined in section 2.1, if the GIC (32), and WRIC (38) hold, there exists a unique cash-on-hand-to-income ratio  $\check{m} > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] = 1 \text{ if } m_t = \check{m}. \quad (46)$$

Moreover,  $\check{m}$  is stable in the sense that

$$\begin{aligned} \forall m_t \in (0, \check{m}), \quad \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] &> m_t \\ \forall m_t \in (\check{m}, \infty), \quad \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] &< m_t. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

The elements of the proof are:

- Existence and continuity of  $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t]$
- Existence of a point where  $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] = 1$
- $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] - m_t$  is monotonically decreasing

#### 3.3.1 Existence and Continuity of $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t]$ .

The consumption function exists because we have imposed the conditions (the WRIC and FVAC) that theorem 1 establishes are sufficient for its existence. (Indeed, Appendix C shows that  $c(m)$  is not just continuous, but twice continuously differentiable.)

Section 2.7 shows that for all  $t$ ,  $a_{t-1} = m_{t-1} - c_{t-1} > 0$ . Since  $m_t = a_{t-1}\mathcal{R}_t + \xi_t$ , even if  $\xi_t$  takes on its minimum value of 0,  $a_{t-1}\mathcal{R}_t > 0$ , since both  $a_{t-1}$  and  $\mathcal{R}_t$  are strictly positive under our foregoing assumptions. With  $m_t > 0$ , the ratio  $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t]$  inherits continuity (and, for that matter, continuous differentiability) from the consumption function.

#### 3.3.2 Existence of a point where $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] = 1$ .

The logic in section 3.2 showing that  $\lim_{m_t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_t[c_{t+1}/c_t] = \infty$  transparently implies the same proposition for  $m_t$ :  $\lim_{m_t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] > 0$  so the ratio is unbounded.

The limit as  $m_t$  goes to infinity is

$$\lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] = \lim_{m_t \uparrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathcal{R}_{t+1}a(m_t) + \xi_{t+1}}{m_t} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}_t[(R/\Gamma_{t+1})\mathbf{P}_R] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{P}/\Gamma_{t+1}] \\
&< 1
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where the last two lines are merely a restatement of the GIC (32).

The Intermediate Value Theorem tells us that if  $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t]$  is continuous, and takes on values above and below 1, there must be at least one point at which it is equal to one.

3.3.3  $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] - m_t$  is monotonically decreasing.

Now define  $\zeta(m_t) \equiv \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] - m_t$  and note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta(m_t) < 0 &\leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] < 1 \\
\zeta(m_t) = 0 &\leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] = 1 \\
\zeta(m_t) > 0 &\leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] > 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

so that  $\zeta(\check{m}) = 0$ . Our goal is to prove that  $\zeta(\bullet)$  is strictly decreasing on  $(0, \infty)$  using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta'(m_t) &\equiv \left(\frac{d}{dm_t}\right) \zeta(m_t) = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left(\frac{d}{dm_t}\right) (\mathcal{R}_{t+1}(m_t - c(m_t)) + \xi_{t+1} - m_t) \right] \\
&= \bar{\mathcal{R}}(1 - c'(m_t)) - 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Note that the statement of theorem 2 did not require the RIC to hold. Now, we show that (given our other assumptions)  $\zeta'(m)$  is decreasing (but for different reasons) whether the RIC holds or fails (~~RIC~~).

**If RIC holds.** Equation (21) indicates that if the RIC holds, then  $\underline{\kappa} > 0$ . We show at the bottom of Section 2.8.1 that if the RIC holds then  $0 < \underline{\kappa} < c'(m_t) < 1$  so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathcal{R}}(1 - c'(m_t)) - 1 &< \bar{\mathcal{R}}(1 - \underbrace{(1 - \mathbf{P}_R)}_{\underline{\kappa}}) - 1 \\
&= \bar{\mathcal{R}}\mathbf{P}_R - 1 \\
&= \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{R}{\Gamma\psi} \frac{\mathbf{P}}{R} \right] - 1 \\
&= \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{P}}{\Gamma\psi} \right]}_{=\mathbf{P}_\Gamma} - 1
\end{aligned}$$

which is negative because the GIC says  $\mathbf{P}_\Gamma < 1$ .

**If RIC fails.** Under ~~RIC~~, recall that  $\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} c'(m) = 0$ . Concavity of the consumption function means that  $c'$  is a decreasing function, so everywhere

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}}(1 - c'(m_t)) < \bar{\mathcal{R}}$$

which means that  $\zeta'(m_t)$  from (50) is guaranteed to be negative if

$$\bar{\mathcal{R}} \equiv \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{R}}{\Gamma\psi} \right] < 1 \quad (51)$$

But the combination of the GIC holding and the RIC failing can be written:

$$\overbrace{\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{P}}{\Gamma\psi} \right]}^{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma} < 1 < \overbrace{\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\mathbf{R}}}^{\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}},$$

and multiplying all three elements by  $\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{P}$  gives

$$\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\mathbf{R}}{\Gamma\psi} \right] < \mathbf{R}/\mathbf{P} < 1$$

which satisfies our requirement in (51).

The foregoing arguments rely on the continuous differentiability of  $c(m)$ , so they do not directly go through for a problem in which the existence of liquidity constraints can lead to discrete changes in the slope  $c'(m)$  at particular values of  $m$ . But we can use the fact that the constrained model is the limit of the baseline model as  $\wp \downarrow 0$  to conclude that there is likely a unique target cash level even in the constrained model.

If consumers are sufficiently impatient, the limiting target level in the constrained model will be  $\check{m} = \mathbb{E}_t[\xi_{t+1}] = 1$ . That is, if a consumer starting with  $m = 1$  will save nothing,  $a(1) = 0$ , then the target level of  $m$  in the constrained model will be 1; if a consumer with  $m = 1$  would choose to save something, then the target level of  $m$  will be greater than the expected level of income.

### 3.4 Expected Consumption Growth at Target $m$ Is Less than Expected Permanent Income Growth

In Figure 5 the intersection of the target cash-on-hand ratio locus at  $\check{m}$  with the expected consumption growth curve lies below the intersection with the horizontal line representing the growth rate of expected permanent income. This can be proven as follows.

Strict concavity of the consumption function implies that if  $\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}] = \check{m} = m_t$  then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \frac{\Gamma_{t+1}c(m_{t+1})}{c(m_t)} \right] &< \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \frac{\Gamma_{t+1}(c(\check{m}) + c'(\check{m})(m_{t+1} - \check{m}))}{c(\check{m})} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Gamma_{t+1} \left( 1 + \left( \frac{c'(\check{m})}{c(\check{m})} \right) (m_{t+1} - \check{m}) \right) \right] \\ &= \Gamma + \left( \frac{c'(\check{m})}{c(\check{m})} \right) \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1} (m_{t+1} - \check{m})] \\ &= \Gamma + \left( \frac{c'(\check{m})}{c(\check{m})} \right) \left[ \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}] \underbrace{\mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1} - \check{m}]}_{=0} + \text{cov}_t(\Gamma_{t+1}, m_{t+1}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

and since  $m_{t+1} = (R/\Gamma_{t+1})a(\check{m}) + \xi_{t+1}$  and  $a(\check{m}) > 0$  it is clear that  $\text{cov}_t(\Gamma_{t+1}, m_{t+1}) < 0$  which implies that the entire term added to  $\Gamma$  in (52) is negative, as required.

### 3.5 Is Expected Consumption Growth Is a Declining Function of $m_t$ ?

Figure 5 depicts the expected consumption growth factor as a strictly declining function of the cash-on-hand ratio. To investigate this, define

$$\Upsilon(m_t) \equiv \Gamma_{t+1}c(\mathcal{R}_{t+1}a(m_t) + \xi_{t+1})/c(m_t) = \mathbf{c}_{t+1}/\mathbf{c}_t$$

and the proposition in which we are interested is

$$(d/dm_t) \mathbb{E}_t[\underbrace{\Upsilon(m_t)}_{\equiv \Upsilon_{t+1}}] < 0$$

or differentiating through the expectations operator, what we want is

$$\mathbb{E}_t \left[ \Gamma_{t+1} \left( \frac{c'(m_{t+1})\mathcal{R}_{t+1}a'(m_t)c(m_t) - c(m_{t+1})c'(m_t)}{c(m_t)^2} \right) \right] < 0. \quad (53)$$

Appendix K shows that the proposition holds true if there are only transitory (and no permanent) shocks. But in the presence of permanent shocks, the software archive associated with this paper presents an example in which this perverse effect dominates. However, extreme assumptions were required (in particular, a very small probability of the zero-income shock) and the region in which  $\Upsilon'_{t+1} > 0$  is tiny. In practice, for plausible parametric choices,  $\mathbb{E}_t[\Upsilon'_{t+1}] < 0$  should generally hold.

## 4 The Aggregate and Idiosyncratic Relationship Between Consumption Growth and Income Growth

This section examines the behavior of large collections of buffer-stock consumers with identical parameter values. Such a collection can be thought of as either a subset of the population within a single country (say, members of a given education or occupation group), or as the whole population in a small open economy.<sup>36</sup>

Until now, for simplicity, we have assumed infinite horizons; and we will continue to omit mortality in section 4.1 because its incorporation does not meaningfully modify any derivations. But a reason for introducing mortality will appear at the end of section 4.2, so the implications of alternative assumptions about mortality are briefly examined in Section 4.3.

Formally, we assume a continuum of *ex ante* identical households on the unit interval, with constant total mass normalized to one and indexed by  $i \in [0, 1]$ , all behaving according to the model specified above. Szeidl (2012) proves that such a population will

---

<sup>36</sup>We will continue to take the aggregate interest rate as exogenous and constant. It is also possible, and only slightly more difficult, to solve for the steady-state of a closed-economy version of the model where the interest rate is endogenous.

be characterized by an invariant distribution of  $m$  that induces invariant distributions for  $c$  and  $a$ ; designate these  $\mathcal{F}^m$ ,  $\mathcal{F}^a$ , and  $\mathcal{F}^c$ .<sup>37</sup>

#### 4.1 Consumption and Income Growth at the Household Level

The operator  $\mathbb{M}[\bullet]$  yields the mean value of its argument in the population, as distinct from the expectations operator  $\mathbb{E}[\bullet]$  which represents beliefs about the future.

An economist with a microeconomic dataset could calculate the average growth rate of idiosyncratic consumption, and would find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{M}[\Delta \log \mathbf{c}_{t+1}] &= \mathbb{M}[\log c_{t+1} \mathbf{p}_{t+1} - \log c_t \mathbf{p}_t] \\ &= \mathbb{M}[\log \mathbf{p}_{t+1} - \log \mathbf{p}_t + \log c_{t+1} - \log c_t] \\ &= \mathbb{M}[\log \mathbf{p}_{t+1} - \log \mathbf{p}_t] + \mathbb{M}[\log c_{t+1} - \log c_t] \\ &= (\gamma - \sigma_\psi^2/2) + \mathbb{M}[\log c_{t+1} - \log c_t] \\ &= (\gamma - \sigma_\psi^2/2)\end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma = \log \Gamma$  and the last equality follows because the invariance of  $\mathcal{F}^c$  (Szeidl (2012)) means that  $\mathbb{M}[\log c_{t+n}] = \mathbb{M}[\log c_t]$ .

Thus, in a population that has reached its invariant distribution, the growth rate of idiosyncratic log consumption matches the growth rate of idiosyncratic log permanent income.

#### 4.2 Balanced Growth of Aggregate Income, Consumption, and Wealth

Attanasio and Weber (1995) point out that concavity of the consumption function (or other nonlinearities) can imply that it is quantitatively important to distinguish between the growth rate of average consumption and the average growth rate of consumption.<sup>38</sup> We have just examined the average growth rate; we now examine the growth rate of the average.

Using boldface capital letters for aggregate variables, the growth factor for aggregate income is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}/\mathbf{Y}_t &= \mathbb{M}[\xi_{t+1} \Gamma \psi_{t+1} \mathbf{p}_t] / \mathbb{M}[\mathbf{p}_t \xi_t] \\ &= \Gamma\end{aligned}$$

because of the independence assumptions we have made about  $\xi$  and  $\psi$ .

From the perspective of period  $t$ , current aggregate assets are nonstochastic,  $\mathbf{A}_t = \mathbb{M}[a_t \mathbf{p}_t]$ , but next period's assets are stochastic,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{A}_{t+1} &= \mathbb{M}[a_{t+1} \mathbf{p}_{t+1}] \\ &= \Gamma \mathbb{M}[(a_t + (a_{t+1} - a_t)) \mathbf{p}_t \psi_{t+1}]\end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>37</sup>Szeidl's proof supplants simulation evidence of ergodicity that appeared in an earlier version of this paper.

<sup>38</sup>Since we assume number of the households are normalized to 1, aggregate and average variables are identical.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \Gamma \left( \underbrace{\mathbb{M}[a_t \mathbf{p}_t \psi_{t+1}]}_{=\mathbf{A}_t} + \underbrace{\mathbb{M}[(a_{t+1} - a_t)]}_{=0 \text{ (Szeidl (2012))}} \mathbb{M}[\mathbf{p}_t \psi_{t+1}] + \text{cov}_t(a_{t+1} - a_t, \mathbf{p}_t \psi_{t+1}) \right) \\
\mathbf{A}_{t+1}/\mathbf{A}_t &= \Gamma \left( 1 + \frac{\text{cov}(a_{t+1}, \mathbf{p}_t \psi_{t+1})}{\mathbb{M}[a_t \mathbf{p}_t]} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Unfortunately, it is clear that the covariance term in the numerator, while generally small, will not in general be zero. This is because the realization of the permanent shock  $\psi_{t+1}$  has a nonlinear effect on  $a_{t+1}$ .

Matters are simpler if there are no permanent shocks; see Appendix E for a proof that in that case the growth rate of assets (and other variables) does eventually converge to the growth rate of aggregate permanent income.

One way of thinking about this problem is that it reflects the fact that, under our assumptions, the  $\mathbf{p}$  variable does not have an ergodic distribution; the distribution of permanent income becomes forever wider and wider over time, because our consumers never die and each immortal person is subject to symmetric shocks to their  $\log \mathbf{p}$ .

### 4.3 Mortality and Redistribution

Most heterogeneous agent models incorporate a constant positive probability of death, following Blanchard (1985). Carroll, Slacalek, Tokuoka, and White (2017) show that for probabilities of death that exceed a threshold that depends on the size of the permanent shocks, the limiting distribution of permanent income has a finite variance. In such cases, numerical results confirm the intuition that, under appropriate impatience conditions, the growth rate of aggregate assets ends up matching the growth rate of permanent income (though a formal proof has been elusive).

But the assumption of finite lifetimes requires us to specify what happens to the assets of the dying consumers.

#### 4.3.1 Blanchard Lives

Blanchard (1985)'s solution is an annuitization scheme in which estates of the dying are redistributed to survivors in proportion to survivors' wealth, giving the recipients a higher effective rate of return. This treatment has several analytical advantages, the most notable of which is that the effect of mortality on the time preference factor is the exact inverse of its effect on the (effective) interest factor: If the probability of remaining alive is  $\aleph$ , then assuming that no utility accrues after death makes the effective discount factor  $\hat{\beta} = \beta \aleph$ ; but the enhancement to the rate of return from the annuity scheme yields an effective interest rate of  $\hat{R}/\aleph$ . Combining these, the effective patience factor in the new economy  $\hat{\mathbf{P}}$  is unchanged from its value in the infinite horizon model:

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}} \equiv (\beta \aleph R / \aleph)^{1/\rho} = (R\beta)^{1/\rho} \equiv \mathbf{P}. \quad (54)$$



The only adjustments this requires to the analysis from prior parts of this paper are therefore to the few elements that involve a role for  $\mathbf{R}$  distinct from its contribution to  $\mathbf{P}$  (principally, the RIC).

#### 4.3.2 Modigliani Lives

Blanchard (1985)'s innovation was useful not only for the insight it provided but also because the prevailing alternative, the Life Cycle model of Modigliani (1966), was difficult to use with the then-available computational technologies. Leaving aside its (considerable) conceptual value, there is no need for Blanchard's analytical solution today, when all quantitatively serious modeling incorporates uncertainty, constraints, and other features that rule out analytical solutions anyway. Computational models can easily handle assumptions more realistic than Blanchard's about the disposition of assets at death.

The simplest such models are those that follow Modigliani in assuming there is no bequest motive; any wealth remaining at death occurs accidentally (not implausible, given the robust finding that for the great majority of households, bequests amount to less than 2 percent of lifetime earnings, Hendricks (2001, 2016)).

Some bequest wealth may be absorbed by an estate tax; modelers have made a variety of assumptions about how any post-estate-tax residue is distributed. We again consider the simplest choice, because it also represents something of a polar alternative to Blanchard: Without a bequest motive, there are no behavioral effects of a 100 percent estate tax, and we assume that the revenues are used to fund marginal government expenditures that yield utility in a form that is separable from utility from personal consumption – say, for public goods (or, equivalently, the resources are thrown in the ocean). In that case, the estate-related wealth effectively vanishes from the economy.

This approach alters the conditions under which the economy has a target wealth-to-income ratio. Effectively, the return on aggregate wealth is lower than the contingent-on-survival return on wealth at the individual level. The condition under which an aggregate target wealth-to-income ratio exists is then obtained simply by multiplying the Growth Impatience Condition by the probability  $\aleph$  that the survivor's assets will still exist:

$$\aleph \mathbf{P}_\Gamma < 1. \tag{55}$$

Intuitively, the condition required to prohibit unbounded growth in the aggregate wealth-to-income ratio is the condition that prevents the wealth-to-income ratio of individual consumers from growing faster than the rate at which mortality diminishes their collective wealth-to-income ratio.

Section 2.11.3 showed that the individual's problem can have a nondegenerate consumption rule for consumers who fail to satisfy the individual version of the GIC. The GIC-Agg therefore provides a bound on preferences which can accommodate a population in which individual consumers have no upper bound on target wealth, but the aggregate economy will nevertheless settle down to an equilibrium aggregate wealth-to-income ratio. Further analysis of these matters is beyond the scope of this paper, but

the above-mentioned work of Carroll, Slacalek, Tokuoka, and White (2017) presents an example of the application of this point (and the associated `toolkit` reports the results not only of tests of the individual but also the aggregate versions of the GIC).

## 5 Conclusions

This paper provides theoretical foundations for many characteristics of buffer stock saving models that have heretofore been observed in numerical solutions but not proven. Perhaps the most important such proposition is the existence of a target cash-to-permanent-income ratio toward which actual resources will move. The intuition provided by the existence of such a target can be a powerful aid to understanding a host of numerical results, including the existence of a ‘balanced growth’ equilibrium in small open economies populated by buffer stock consumers.

Another contribution is integration of the paper’s results with the open-source `Econ-ARK` toolkit, which is used to generate all of the quantitative results of the paper, and which integrally incorporates all of the analytical insights of the paper.

**Table 3** Definitions and Comparisons of Conditions

Perfect Foresight Versions	Uncertainty Versions
Finite Human Wealth Condition (FWHC)	
$\Gamma/R < 1$  The growth factor for permanent income $\Gamma$ must be smaller than the discounting factor $R$ for human wealth to be finite.	$\Gamma/R < 1$  The model's risks are mean-preserving spreads, so the PDV of future income is unchanged by their introduction.
Absolute Impatience Condition (AIC)	
$\mathbf{P} < 1$  The unconstrained consumer is sufficiently impatient that the level of consumption will be declining over time:  $c_{t+1} < c_t$	$\mathbf{P} < 1$  <i>If wealth is large enough, the expectation of consumption next period will be smaller than this period's consumption:</i>  $\lim_{m_t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[c_{t+1}] < c_t$
Return Impatience Conditions	
Return Impatience Condition (RIC)	Weak RIC (WRIC)
$\mathbf{P}/R < 1$  The growth factor for consumption $\mathbf{P}$ must be smaller than the discounting factor $R$ , so that the PDV of current and future consumption will be finite:  $c'(m) = 1 - \mathbf{P}/R < 1$	$\wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}/R < 1$  If the probability of the zero-income event is $\wp = 1$ then income is always zero and the condition becomes identical to the RIC. Otherwise, weaker.  $c'(m) < 1 - \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}/R < 1$
Growth Impatience Conditions	
PF-GIC	GIC
$\mathbf{P}/\Gamma < 1$  Guarantees that for an unconstrained consumer, the ratio of consumption to permanent income will fall over time. For a constrained consumer, guarantees the constraint will eventually be binding.	$\mathbf{P} \mathbb{E}[\psi^{-1}]/\Gamma < 1$  By Jensen's inequality, stronger than the PF-GIC. Ensures consumers will not expect to accumulate $m$ unboundedly.  $\lim_{m_t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_t[m_{t+1}/m_t] = \mathbf{P}_{\Gamma}$
Finite Value of Autarky Conditions	
PF-FVAC	FVAC
$\beta \Gamma^{1-\rho} < 1$ equivalently $\mathbf{P}/\Gamma < (R/\Gamma)^{1/\rho}$  The discounted utility of constrained consumers who spend their permanent income each period should be finite.	$\beta \Gamma^{1-\rho} \mathbb{E}[\psi^{1-\rho}] < 1$  By Jensen's inequality, stronger than the PF-FVAC because for $\rho > 1$ and nondegenerate $\psi$ , $\mathbb{E}[\psi^{1-\rho}] > 1$ .

**Table 4** Sufficient Conditions for Nondegenerate<sup>‡</sup> Solution

Model	Conditions	Comments/Logic
PF Unconstrained Section 2.4.2	RIC, FHCW <sup>°</sup>	RIC $\Rightarrow  v(m)  < \infty$ ; FHCW $\Rightarrow 0 <  v(m) $ RIC prevents $\bar{c}(m) = 0$ FHCW prevents $\bar{c}(m) = \infty$
PF Constrained Section 2.4.3 Appendix A	<del>PF-GIC</del> , RIC	FHCW must hold ( $\Gamma < \mathbf{D} < R \Rightarrow \Gamma < R$ ) Identical to solution to PF Unconstrained for $m > m_{\#}$ for some $0 < m_{\#} < 1$ ; $c(m) = m$ for $m \leq m_{\#}$ ( <del>RIC</del> would yield $m_{\#} = 0$ so degenerate $c(m) = 0$ )
	PF-GIC, RIC	$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \check{c}(m) = \bar{c}(m)$ , $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathring{\kappa}(m) = \underline{\kappa}$ kinks at points where horizon to $b = 0$ changes*
	PF-GIC, <del>RIC</del>	$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathring{\kappa}(m) = 0$ kinks at points where horizon to $b = 0$ changes*
Buffer Stock Model Section 2.5	FVAC, WRIC	FHCW $\Rightarrow \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \check{c}(m) = \bar{c}(m)$ , $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathring{\kappa}(m) = \underline{\kappa}$ <del>FHCW</del> +RIC $\Rightarrow \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathring{\kappa}(m) = \underline{\kappa}$ <del>FHCW</del> + <del>RIC</del> $\Rightarrow \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathring{\kappa}(m) = 0$ GIC guarantees finite target wealth ratio FVAC is stronger than PF-FVAC WRIC is weaker than RIC

<sup>‡</sup>For feasible  $m$  satisfying  $0 < m < \infty$ , a nondegenerate limiting consumption function defines the unique value of  $c$  satisfying  $0 < c(m) < \infty$ ; a nondegenerate limiting value function defines a corresponding unique value of  $-\infty < v(m) < 0$ . <sup>°</sup>RIC, FHCW are necessary as well as sufficient. \*That is, the first kink point in  $c(m)$  is  $m_{\#}$  s.t. for  $m < m_{\#}$  the constraint will bind now, while for  $m > m_{\#}$  the constraint will bind one period in the future. The second kink point corresponds to the  $m$  where the constraint will bind two periods in the future, etc.

# Appendices

## A Perfect Foresight Liquidity Constrained Solution

Under perfect foresight in the presence of a liquidity constraint requiring  $b \geq 0$ , this appendix taxonomizes the varieties of the limiting consumption function  $\dot{c}(m)$  that arise under various parametric conditions. Results are summarized in table 5.

### A.1 If PF-GIC Fails

A consumer is ‘growth patient’ if the perfect foresight growth impatience condition fails (~~PF-GIC~~,  $1 < \mathbf{P}/\Gamma$ ). Under ~~PF-GIC~~ the constraint does not bind at the lowest feasible value of  $m_t = 1$  because  $1 < (\mathbf{R}\beta)^{1/\rho}/\Gamma$  implies that spending everything today (setting  $c_t = m_t = 1$ ) produces lower marginal utility than is obtainable by reallocating a marginal unit of resources to the next period at return  $\mathbf{R}$ .<sup>39</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &< (\mathbf{R}\beta)^{1/\rho}\Gamma^{-1} \\ 1 &< \mathbf{R}\beta\Gamma^{-\rho} \\ u'(1) &< \mathbf{R}\beta u'(\Gamma). \end{aligned}$$

Similar logic shows that under these circumstances the constraint will never bind at  $m = 1$  for a constrained consumer with a finite horizon of  $n$  periods, so for  $m \geq 1$  such a consumer’s consumption function will be the same as for the unconstrained case examined in the main text.

*RIC fails, FHC holds.* If the RIC fails ( $1 < \mathbf{P}_R$ ) while the finite human wealth condition holds, the limiting value of this consumption function as  $n \uparrow \infty$  is the degenerate function

$$\dot{c}_{T-n}(m) = 0(b_t + h). \quad (56)$$

(that is, consumption is zero for any level of human or nonhuman wealth).

*RIC fails, FHC fails.* ~~FHC~~ implies that human wealth limits to  $h = \infty$  so the consumption function limits to either  $\dot{c}_{T-n}(m) = 0$  or  $\dot{c}_{T-n}(m) = \infty$  depending on the relative speeds with which the MPC approaches zero and human wealth approaches  $\infty$ .<sup>40</sup>

Thus, the requirement that the consumption function be nondegenerate implies that for a consumer satisfying ~~PF-GIC~~ we must impose the RIC (and the FHC can be shown to be a consequence of ~~PF-GIC~~ and RIC). In this case, the consumer’s optimal behavior is easy to describe. We can calculate the point at which the unconstrained

---

<sup>39</sup>The point at which the constraint would bind (if that point could be attained) is the  $m = c$  for which  $u'(c_\#) = \mathbf{R}\beta u'(\Gamma)$  which is  $c_\# = \Gamma/(\mathbf{R}\beta)^{1/\rho}$  and the consumption function will be defined by  $\dot{c}(m) = \min[m, c_\# + (m - c_\#)\underline{\kappa}]$ .

<sup>40</sup>The knife-edge case is where  $\mathbf{P} = \Gamma$ , in which case the two quantites counterbalance and the limiting function is  $\dot{c}(m) = \min[m, 1]$ .

consumer would choose  $c = m$  from equation (22):

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\#} &= (m_{\#} - 1 + h)\underline{\kappa} \\ m_{\#}(1 - \underline{\kappa}) &= (h - 1)\underline{\kappa} \\ m_{\#} &= (h - 1) \left( \frac{\underline{\kappa}}{1 - \underline{\kappa}} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

which (under these assumptions) satisfies  $0 < m_{\#} < 1$ .<sup>41</sup> For  $m < m_{\#}$  the unconstrained consumer would choose to consume more than  $m$ ; for such  $m$ , the constrained consumer is obliged to choose  $\bar{c}(m) = m$ .<sup>42</sup> For any  $m > m_{\#}$  the constraint will never bind and the consumer will choose to spend the same amount as the unconstrained consumer,  $\bar{c}(m)$ .

(Stachurski and Toda (2019) obtain a similar lower bound on consumption and use it to study the tail behavior of the wealth distribution.)

## A.2 If PF-GIC Holds

Imposition of the PF-GIC reverses the inequality in (56), and thus reverses the conclusion: A consumer who starts with  $m_t = 1$  will desire to consume more than 1. Such a consumer will be constrained, not only in period  $t$ , but perpetually thereafter.

Now define  $b_{\#}^n$  as the  $b_t$  such that an unconstrained consumer holding  $b_t = b_{\#}^n$  would behave so as to arrive in period  $t + n$  with  $b_{t+n} = 0$  (with  $b_{\#}^0$  trivially equal to 0); for example, a consumer with  $b_{t-1} = b_{\#}^1$  was on the ‘cusp’ of being constrained in period  $t-1$ : Had  $b_{t-1}$  been infinitesimally smaller, the constraint would have been binding (because the consumer would have desired, but been unable, to enter period  $t$  with negative, not zero,  $b$ ). Given the PF-GIC, the constraint certainly binds in period  $t$  (and thereafter) with resources of  $m_t = m_{\#}^0 = 1 + b_{\#}^0 = 1$ : The consumer cannot spend more (because constrained), and will not choose to spend less (because impatient), than  $c_t = c_{\#}^0 = 1$ .

We can construct the entire ‘prehistory’ of this consumer leading up to  $t$  as follows. Maintaining the assumption that the constraint has never bound in the past,  $c$  must have been growing according to  $\mathbf{P}_{\Gamma}$ , so consumption  $n$  periods in the past must have been

$$c_{\#}^n = \mathbf{P}_{\Gamma}^{-n} c_t = \mathbf{P}_{\Gamma}^{-n}. \tag{58}$$

<sup>41</sup>Note that  $0 < m_{\#}$  is implied by RIC and  $m_{\#} < 1$  is implied by ~~PF-GIC~~.

<sup>42</sup>As an illustration, consider a consumer for whom  $\mathbf{P} = 1$ ,  $R = 1.01$  and  $\Gamma = 0.99$ . This consumer will save the amount necessary to ensure that growth in market wealth exactly offsets the decline in human wealth represented by  $\Gamma < 1$ ; total wealth (and therefore total consumption) will remain constant, even as market wealth and human wealth trend in opposite directions.

The PDV of consumption from  $t - n$  until  $t$  can thus be computed as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{C}_{t-n}^t &= c_{t-n}(1 + \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R} + \dots + (\mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R})^n) \\ &= c_{\#}^n(1 + \mathbf{P}_R + \dots + \mathbf{P}_R^n) \\ &= \mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n} \left( \frac{1 - \mathbf{P}_R^{n+1}}{1 - \mathbf{P}_R} \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n} - \mathbf{P}_R}{1 - \mathbf{P}_R} \right)\end{aligned}$$

and note that the consumer's human wealth between  $t - n$  and  $t$  (the relevant time horizon, because from  $t$  onward the consumer will be constrained and unable to access post- $t$  income) is

$$h_{\#}^n = 1 + \dots + \mathcal{R}^{-n} \quad (59)$$

while the intertemporal budget constraint says

$$\mathbb{C}_{t-n}^t = b_{\#}^n + h_{\#}^n$$

from which we can solve for the  $b_{\#}^n$  such that the consumer with  $b_{t-n} = b_{\#}^n$  would unconstrainedly plan (in period  $t - n$ ) to arrive in period  $t$  with  $b_t = 0$ :

$$b_{\#}^n = \mathbb{C}_{t-n}^t - \overbrace{\left( \frac{1 - \mathcal{R}^{-(n+1)}}{1 - \mathcal{R}^{-1}} \right)}^{h_{\#}^n}. \quad (60)$$

Defining  $m_{\#}^n = b_{\#}^n + 1$ , consider the function  $\mathring{c}(m)$  defined by linearly connecting the points  $\{m_{\#}^n, c_{\#}^n\}$  for integer values of  $n \geq 0$  (and setting  $\mathring{c}(m) = m$  for  $m < 1$ ). This function will return, for any value of  $m$ , the optimal value of  $c$  for a liquidity constrained consumer with an infinite horizon. The function is piecewise linear with 'kink points' where the slope discretely changes; for infinitesimal  $\epsilon$  the MPC of a consumer with assets  $m = m_{\#}^n - \epsilon$  is discretely higher than for a consumer with assets  $m = m_{\#}^n + \epsilon$  because the latter consumer will spread a marginal dollar over more periods before exhausting it.

In order for a unique consumption function to be defined by this sequence (60) for the entire domain of positive real values of  $b$ , we need  $b_{\#}^n$  to become arbitrarily large with  $n$ . That is, we need

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{\#}^n = \infty. \quad (61)$$

#### A.2.1 If FHC Holds

The FHC requires  $\mathcal{R}^{-1} < 1$ , in which case the second term in (60) limits to a constant as  $n \uparrow \infty$ , and (61) reduces to a requirement that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n} - (\mathbf{P}_R/\mathbf{P}_\Gamma)^n \mathbf{P}_R}{1 - \mathbf{P}_R} \right) = \infty$$

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n} - \mathcal{R}^{-n} \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}}{1 - \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}} \right) &= \infty \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n}}{1 - \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}} \right) &= \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Given the PF-GIC  $\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-1} > 1$ , this will hold iff the RIC holds,  $\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R} < 1$ . But given that the FHWC  $\mathbf{R} > \Gamma$  holds, the PF-GIC is stronger (harder to satisfy) than the RIC; thus, the FHWC and the PF-GIC together imply the RIC, and so a well-defined solution exists. Furthermore, in the limit as  $n$  approaches infinity, the difference between the limiting constrained consumption function and the unconstrained consumption function becomes vanishingly small, because the date at which the constraint binds becomes arbitrarily distant, so the effect of that constraint on current behavior shrinks to nothing. That is,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \bar{c}(m) - \bar{c}(m) = 0. \quad (62)$$

### A.2.2 If FHWC Fails

If the FHWC fails, matters are a bit more complex.

Given failure of FHWC, (61) requires

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\mathcal{R}^{-n} \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n}}{\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R} - 1} \right) + \left( \frac{1 - \mathcal{R}^{-(n+1)}}{\mathcal{R}^{-1} - 1} \right) &= \infty \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R} - 1} - \frac{\mathcal{R}^{-1}}{\mathcal{R}^{-1} - 1} \right) \mathcal{R}^{-n} - \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n}}{\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R} - 1} \right) &= \infty\end{aligned}$$

**If RIC Holds.** When the RIC holds, rearranging (63) gives

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n}}{1 - \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}} \right) - \mathcal{R}^{-n} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}}{1 - \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}} + \frac{\mathcal{R}^{-1}}{\mathcal{R}^{-1} - 1} \right) = \infty$$

and for this to be true we need

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-1} &> \mathcal{R}^{-1} \\ \Gamma/\mathbf{P} &> \Gamma/\mathbf{R} \\ 1 &> \mathbf{P}/\mathbf{R}\end{aligned}$$

which is merely the RIC again. So the problem has a solution if the RIC holds. Indeed, we can even calculate the limiting MPC from

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa_\#^n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{c_\#^n}{b_\#^n} \right) \quad (63)$$

which with a bit of algebra<sup>43</sup> can be shown to asymptote to the MPC in the perfect

---

<sup>43</sup>Calculate the limit of

$$\left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n}}{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n}/(1 - \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}) - (1 - \mathcal{R}^{-1}\mathcal{R}^{-n})/(1 - \mathcal{R}^{-1})} \right) = \left( \frac{1}{1/(1 - \mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}) + \mathcal{R}^{-n}\mathcal{R}^{-1}/(1 - \mathcal{R}^{-1})} \right) \quad (64)$$



foresight model:<sup>44</sup>

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = 1 - \mathbf{P}_R. \quad (65)$$

**If RIC Fails.** Consider now the  $\mathbf{RIC}^*$  case,  $\mathbf{P}_R > 1$ . We can rearrange (63) as

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_R(\mathcal{R}^{-1} - 1)}{(\mathcal{R}^{-1} - 1)(\mathbf{P}_R - 1)} - \frac{\mathcal{R}^{-1}(\mathbf{P}_R - 1)}{(\mathcal{R}^{-1} - 1)(\mathbf{P}_R - 1)} \right) \mathcal{R}^{-n} - \left( \frac{\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n}}{\mathbf{P}_R - 1} \right) = \infty. \quad (66)$$

which makes clear that with  $\mathbf{EHW}^C \Rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{-1} > 1$  and  $\mathbf{RIC}^* \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}_R > 1$  the numerators and denominators of both terms multiplying  $\mathcal{R}^{-n}$  can be seen transparently to be positive. So, the terms multiplying  $\mathcal{R}^{-n}$  in (63) will be positive if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_R \mathcal{R}^{-1} - \mathbf{P}_R &> \mathcal{R}^{-1} \mathbf{P}_R - \mathcal{R}^{-1} \\ \mathcal{R}^{-1} &> \mathbf{P}_R \\ \Gamma &> \mathbf{P} \end{aligned}$$

which is merely the PF-GIC which we are maintaining. So the first term's limit is  $+\infty$ . The combined limit will be  $+\infty$  if the term involving  $\mathcal{R}^{-n}$  goes to  $+\infty$  faster than the term involving  $-\mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-n}$  goes to  $-\infty$ ; that is, if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}^{-1} &> \mathbf{P}_\Gamma^{-1} \\ \Gamma/R &> \Gamma/\mathbf{P} \\ \mathbf{P}/R &> 1 \end{aligned}$$

which merely confirms the starting assumption that the RIC fails.

What is happening here is that the  $c_\#^n$  term is increasing backward in time at rate dominated in the limit by  $\Gamma/\mathbf{P}$  while the  $b_\#$  term is increasing at a rate dominated by  $\Gamma/R$  term and

$$\Gamma/R > \Gamma/\mathbf{P} \quad (67)$$

because  $\mathbf{RIC}^* \Rightarrow \mathbf{P} > R$ .

Consequently, while  $\lim_{n \uparrow \infty} b_\#^n = \infty$ , the limit of the *ratio*  $c_\#^n/b_\#^n$  in (63) is zero. Thus, surprisingly, the problem has a well defined solution with infinite human wealth if the RIC fails. It remains true that  $\mathbf{RIC}^*$  implies a limiting MPC of zero,


$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = 0, \quad (68)$$

but that limit is approached gradually, starting from a positive value, and consequently the consumption function is *not* the degenerate  $\dot{c}(m) = 0$ . (Figure 8 presents an example for  $\rho = 2$ ,  $R = 0.98$ ,  $\beta = 1.00$ ,  $\Gamma = 0.99$ ; note that the horizontal axis is bank balances  $b = m - 1$ ; the part of the consumption function below the depicted points is uninteresting  $- c = m$  - so not worth plotting).

We can summarize as follows. Given that the PF-GIC holds, the interesting question is whether the FHW holds. If so, the RIC automatically holds, and the solution limits into

---

<sup>44</sup>For an example of this configuration of parameters, see the notebook `doApndxLiqConstr.nb` in the Mathematica software archive.



**Figure 8** Nondegenerate Consumption Function with ~~FHWC~~ and ~~RIC~~

the solution to the unconstrained problem as  $m \uparrow \infty$ . But even if the FHWC fails, the problem has a well-defined and nondegenerate solution, whether or not the RIC holds.

Although these results were derived for the perfect foresight case, we know from work elsewhere in this paper and in other places that the perfect foresight case is an upper bound for the case with uncertainty. If the upper bound of the MPC in the perfect foresight case is zero, it is not possible for the upper bound in the model with uncertainty to be greater than zero, because for any  $\kappa > 0$  the level of consumption in the model with uncertainty would eventually exceed the level of consumption in the absence of uncertainty.

Ma and Toda (2020) characterize the limits of the MPC in a more general framework that allows for capital and labor income risks in a Markovian setting with liquidity constraints, and find that in that much more general framework the limiting MPC is also zero.

## B Existence of a Concave Consumption Function

To show that (6) defines a sequence of continuously differentiable strictly increasing concave functions  $\{c_T, c_{T-1}, \dots, c_{T-k}\}$ , we start with a definition. We will say that a function  $n(z)$  is ‘nice’ if it satisfies

1.  $n(z)$  is well-defined iff  $z > 0$
2.  $n(z)$  is strictly increasing
3.  $n(z)$  is strictly concave
4.  $n(z)$  is  $\mathbf{C}^3$

5.  $n(z) < 0$
6.  $\lim_{z \downarrow 0} n(z) = -\infty$ .

(Notice that an implication of niceness is that  $\lim_{z \downarrow 0} n'(z) = \infty$ .)

Assume that some  $v_{t+1}$  is nice. Our objective is to show that this implies  $v_t$  is also nice; this is sufficient to establish that  $v_{t-n}$  is nice by induction for all  $n > 0$  because  $v_T(m) = u(m)$  and  $u(m) = m^{1-\rho}/(1-\rho)$  is nice by inspection.

Now define an end-of-period value function  $\mathbf{v}_t(a)$  as

$$\mathbf{v}_t(a) = \beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho} v_{t+1}(\mathcal{R}_{t+1}a + \xi_{t+1})]. \quad (69)$$

Since there is a positive probability that  $\xi_{t+1}$  will attain its minimum of zero and since  $\mathcal{R}_{t+1} > 0$ , it is clear that  $\lim_{a \downarrow 0} \mathbf{v}_t(a) = -\infty$  and  $\lim_{a \downarrow 0} \mathbf{v}'_t(a) = \infty$ . So  $\mathbf{v}_t(a)$  is well-defined iff  $a > 0$ ; it is similarly straightforward to show the other properties required for  $\mathbf{v}_t(a)$  to be nice. (See Hiraguchi (2003).)

Next define  $\underline{v}_t(m, c)$  as

$$\underline{v}_t(m, c) = u(c) + \mathbf{v}_t(m - c) \quad (70)$$

which is  $\mathbf{C}^3$  since  $\mathbf{v}_t$  and  $u$  are both  $\mathbf{C}^3$ , and note that our problem's value function defined in (6) can be written as

$$v_t(m) = \max_c \underline{v}_t(m, c). \quad (71)$$

$\underline{v}_t$  is well-defined if and only if  $0 < c < m$ . Furthermore,  $\lim_{c \downarrow 0} \underline{v}_t(m, c) = \lim_{c \uparrow m} \underline{v}_t(m, c) = -\infty$ ,  $\frac{\partial^2 \underline{v}_t(m, c)}{\partial c^2} < 0$ ,  $\lim_{c \downarrow 0} \frac{\partial \underline{v}_t(m, c)}{\partial c} = +\infty$ , and  $\lim_{c \uparrow m} \frac{\partial \underline{v}_t(m, c)}{\partial c} = -\infty$ . It follows that the  $c_t(m)$  defined by

$$c_t(m) = \arg \max_{0 < c < m} \underline{v}_t(m, c) \quad (72)$$

exists and is unique, and (6) has an internal solution that satisfies

$$u'(c_t(m)) = \mathbf{v}'_t(m - c_t(m)). \quad (73)$$

Since both  $u$  and  $\mathbf{v}_t$  are strictly concave, both  $c_t(m)$  and  $a_t(m) = m - c_t(m)$  are strictly increasing. Since both  $u$  and  $\mathbf{v}_t$  are three times continuously differentiable, using (73) we can conclude that  $c_t(m)$  is continuously differentiable and

$$c'_t(m) = \frac{\mathbf{v}''_t(a_t(m))}{u''(c_t(m)) + \mathbf{v}''_t(a_t(m))}. \quad (74)$$

Similarly we can easily show that  $c_t(m)$  is twice continuously differentiable (as is  $a_t(m)$ ) (See Appendix C.) This implies that  $v_t(m)$  is nice, since  $v_t(m) = u(c_t(m)) + \mathbf{v}_t(a_t(m))$ .

## C $c_t(m)$ is Twice Continuously Differentiable

First we show that  $c_t(m)$  is  $\mathbf{C}^1$ . Define  $y$  as  $y \equiv m + dm$ . Since  $u'(c_t(y)) - u'(c_t(m)) = \mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(y)) - \mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(m))$  and  $\frac{a_t(y) - a_t(m)}{dm} = 1 - \frac{c_t(y) - c_t(m)}{dm}$ ,

$$\frac{\mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(y)) - \mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(m))}{a_t(y) - a_t(m)} = \left( \frac{u'(c_t(y)) - u'(c_t(m))}{c_t(y) - c_t(m)} + \frac{\mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(y)) - \mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(m))}{a_t(y) - a_t(m)} \right) \frac{c_t(y) - c_t(m)}{dm}$$

Since  $c_t$  and  $a_t$  are continuous and increasing,  $\lim_{dm \rightarrow +0} \frac{u'(c_t(y)) - u'(c_t(m))}{c_t(y) - c_t(m)} < 0$  and  $\lim_{dm \rightarrow +0} \frac{\mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(y)) - \mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(m))}{a_t(y) - a_t(m)} < 0$  are satisfied. Then  $\frac{u'(c_t(y)) - u'(c_t(m))}{c_t(y) - c_t(m)} + \frac{\mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(y)) - \mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(m))}{a_t(y) - a_t(m)} < 0$  for sufficiently small  $dm$ . Hence we obtain a well-defined equation:

$$\frac{c_t(y) - c_t(m)}{dm} = \frac{\frac{\mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(y)) - \mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(m))}{a_t(y) - a_t(m)}}{\frac{u'(c_t(y)) - u'(c_t(m))}{c_t(y) - c_t(m)} + \frac{\mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(y)) - \mathbf{v}'_t(a_t(m))}{a_t(y) - a_t(m)}}.$$

This implies that the right-derivative,  $c_t^+(m)$  is well-defined and

$$c_t^+(m) = \frac{\mathbf{v}''_t(a_t(m))}{u''(c_t(m)) + \mathbf{v}''_t(a_t(m))}.$$

Similarly we can show that  $c_t^+(m) = c_t^-(m)$ , which means  $c_t'(m)$  exists. Since  $\mathbf{v}_t$  is  $\mathbf{C}^3$ ,  $c_t'(m)$  exists and is continuous.  $c_t'(m)$  is differentiable because  $\mathbf{v}''_t$  is  $\mathbf{C}^1$ ,  $c_t(m)$  is  $\mathbf{C}^1$  and  $u''(c_t(m)) + \mathbf{v}''_t(a_t(m)) < 0$ .  $c_t''(m)$  is given by

$$c_t''(m) = \frac{a'_t(m) \mathbf{v}'''_t(a_t) [u''(c_t) + \mathbf{v}''_t(a_t)] - \mathbf{v}''_t(a_t) [c'_t u'''(c_t) + a'_t \mathbf{v}'''_t(a_t)]}{[u''(c_t) + \mathbf{v}''_t(a_t)]^2}. \quad (75)$$

Since  $\mathbf{v}''_t(a_t(m))$  is continuous,  $c_t''(m)$  is also continuous.

## D Proof that $\mathcal{T}$ Is a Contraction Mapping

We must show that our operator  $\mathcal{T}$  satisfies all of Boyd's conditions.

Boyd's operator  $\mathcal{T}$  maps from  $\mathcal{C}_F(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  to  $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ . A preliminary requirement is therefore that  $\{\mathcal{T}z\}$  be continuous for any  $F$ -bounded  $z$ ,  $\{\mathcal{T}z\} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_{++}, \mathbb{R})$ . This is not difficult to show; see Hiraguchi (2003).

Consider condition (1). For this problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{T}x\}(m_t) &\text{ is } \max_{c_t \in [\underline{\kappa}m_t, \bar{\kappa}m_t]} \{u(c_t) + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho} x(m_{t+1})]\} \\ \{\mathcal{T}y\}(m_t) &\text{ is } \max_{c_t \in [\underline{\kappa}m_t, \bar{\kappa}m_t]} \{u(c_t) + \beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho} y(m_{t+1})]\}, \end{aligned}$$

so  $x(\bullet) \leq y(\bullet)$  implies  $\{\mathcal{T}x\}(m_t) \leq \{\mathcal{T}y\}(m_t)$  by inspection.<sup>45</sup>

Condition (2) requires that  $\{\mathcal{T}0\} \in \mathcal{C}_F(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ . By definition,

$$\{\mathcal{T}0\}(m_t) = \max_{c_t \in [\underline{\kappa}m_t, \bar{\kappa}m_t]} \left\{ \left( \frac{c_t^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} \right) + \beta 0 \right\}$$

---

<sup>45</sup>For a fixed  $m_t$ , recall that  $m_{t+1}$  is just a function of  $c_t$  and the stochastic shocks.

the solution to which is patently  $u(\bar{\kappa}m_t)$ . Thus, condition (2) will hold if  $(\bar{\kappa}m_t)^{1-\rho}$  is  $F$ -bounded. We use the bounding function

$$F(m) = \eta + m^{1-\rho}, \quad (76)$$

for some real scalar  $\eta > 0$  whose value will be determined in the course of the proof. Under this definition of  $F$ ,  $\{\mathcal{T}\mathbf{0}\}(m_t) = u(\bar{\kappa}m_t)$  is clearly  $F$ -bounded.

Finally, we turn to condition (3),  $\{\mathcal{T}(z + \zeta F)\}(m_t) \leq \{\mathcal{T}z\}(m_t) + \zeta\alpha F(m_t)$ . The proof will be more compact if we define  $\check{c}$  and  $\check{a}$  as the consumption and assets functions<sup>46</sup> associated with  $\mathcal{T}z$  and  $\hat{c}$  and  $\hat{a}$  as the functions associated with  $\mathcal{T}(z + \zeta F)$ ; using this notation, condition (3) can be rewritten

$$u(\hat{c}) + \beta\{\mathbf{E}(z + \zeta F)\}(\hat{a}) \leq u(\check{c}) + \beta\{\mathbf{E}z\}(\check{a}) + \zeta\alpha F.$$

Now note that if we force the  $\smile$  consumer to consume the amount that is optimal for the  $\wedge$  consumer, value for the  $\smile$  consumer must decline (at least weakly). That is,

$$u(\hat{c}) + \beta\{\mathbf{E}z\}(\hat{a}) \leq u(\check{c}) + \beta\{\mathbf{E}z\}(\check{a}).$$

Thus, condition (3) will certainly hold under the stronger condition

$$\begin{aligned} u(\hat{c}) + \beta\{\mathbf{E}(z + \zeta F)\}(\hat{a}) &\leq u(\hat{c}) + \beta\{\mathbf{E}z\}(\hat{a}) + \zeta\alpha F \\ \beta\{\mathbf{E}(z + \zeta F)\}(\hat{a}) &\leq \beta\{\mathbf{E}z\}(\hat{a}) + \zeta\alpha F \\ \beta\zeta\{\mathbf{E}F\}(\hat{a}) &\leq \zeta\alpha F \\ \beta\{\mathbf{E}F\}(\hat{a}) &\leq \alpha F \\ \beta\{\mathbf{E}F\}(\hat{a}) &< F. \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows because  $0 < \alpha < 1$  by assumption.<sup>47</sup>

Using  $F(m) = \eta + m^{1-\rho}$  and defining  $\hat{a}_t = \hat{a}(m_t)$ , this condition is

$$\beta \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}(\hat{a}_t \mathcal{R}_{t+1} + \xi_{t+1})^{1-\rho}] - m_t^{1-\rho} < \eta(1 - \underbrace{\beta \mathbb{E}_t \Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}}_{=\beth})$$

which by imposing PF-FVAC (equation (28), which says  $\beth < 1$ ) can be rewritten as:

$$\eta > \frac{\beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}(\hat{a}_t \mathcal{R}_{t+1} + \xi_{t+1})^{1-\rho}] - m_t^{1-\rho}}{1 - \beth}. \quad (77)$$

But since  $\eta$  is an arbitrary constant that we can pick, the proof thus reduces to showing

---

<sup>46</sup>Section 2.7 proves existence of a continuously differentiable consumption function, which implies the existence of a corresponding continuously differentiable assets function.

<sup>47</sup>The remainder of the proof could be reformulated using the second-to-last line at a small cost to intuition.

that the numerator of (77) is bounded from above:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (1 - \wp)\beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}(\hat{a}_t \mathcal{R}_{t+1} + \theta_{t+1}/(1 - \wp))^{1-\rho}] + \wp\beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}(\hat{a}_t \mathcal{R}_{t+1})^{1-\rho}] - m_t^{1-\rho} \\
& \leq (1 - \wp)\beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}((1 - \bar{\kappa})m_t \mathcal{R}_{t+1} + \theta_{t+1}/(1 - \wp))^{1-\rho}] + \wp\beta \mathbf{R}^{1-\rho}((1 - \bar{\kappa})m_t)^{1-\rho} - m_t^{1-\rho} \\
& = (1 - \wp)\beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}((1 - \bar{\kappa})m_t \mathcal{R}_{t+1} + \theta_{t+1}/(1 - \wp))^{1-\rho}] + m_t^{1-\rho} \left( \wp\beta \mathbf{R}^{1-\rho} \left( \wp^{1/\rho} \frac{(\mathbf{R}\beta)^{1/\rho}}{\mathbf{R}} \right)^{1-\rho} - 1 \right) \\
& = (1 - \wp)\beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}((1 - \bar{\kappa})m_t \mathcal{R}_{t+1} + \theta_{t+1}/(1 - \wp))^{1-\rho}] + m_t^{1-\rho} \left( \underbrace{\wp^{1/\rho} \frac{(\mathbf{R}\beta)^{1/\rho}}{\mathbf{R}}}_{<1 \text{ by WRIC}} - 1 \right) \\
& < (1 - \wp)\beta \mathbb{E}_t [\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho}(\underline{\theta}/(1 - \wp))^{1-\rho}] = \beth(1 - \wp)^\rho \underline{\theta}^{1-\rho}.
\end{aligned}$$

We can thus conclude that equation (77) will certainly hold for any:

$$\eta > \underline{\eta} = \frac{\beth(1 - \wp)^\rho \underline{\theta}^{1-\rho}}{1 - \beth} \quad (78)$$

which is a positive finite number under our assumptions.

The proof that  $\mathcal{T}$  defines a contraction mapping under the conditions (38) and (35) is now complete.

## D.1 $\mathcal{T}$ and v

In defining our operator  $\mathcal{T}$  we made the restriction  $\underline{\kappa}m_t \leq c_t \leq \bar{\kappa}m_t$ . However, in the discussion of the consumption function bounds, we showed only (in (39)) that  $\underline{\kappa}_t m_t \leq c_t(m_t) \leq \bar{\kappa}_t m_t$ . (The difference is in the presence or absence of time subscripts on the MPC's.) We have therefore not proven (yet) that the sequence of value functions (6) defines a contraction mapping.

Fortunately, the proof of that proposition is identical to the proof above, except that we must replace  $\bar{\kappa}$  with  $\bar{\kappa}_{T-1}$  and the WRIC must be replaced by a slightly stronger (but still quite weak) condition. The place where these conditions have force is in the step at (78). Consideration of the prior two equations reveals that a sufficient stronger condition is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \wp\beta(\mathbf{R}(1 - \bar{\kappa}_{T-1}))^{1-\rho} < 1 \\
& (\wp\beta)^{1/(1-\rho)}(1 - \bar{\kappa}_{T-1}) > 1 \\
& (\wp\beta)^{1/(1-\rho)}(1 - (1 + \wp^{1/\rho}\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R})^{-1}) > 1
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (37) for  $\bar{\kappa}_{T-1}$  (and in the second step the reversal of the inequality occurs because we have assumed  $\rho > 1$  so that we are exponentiating both sides by the negative number  $1 - \rho$ ). To see that this is a weak condition, note that for small values of  $\wp$  this expression can be further simplified using  $(1 + \wp^{1/\rho}\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R})^{-1} \approx 1 - \wp^{1/\rho}\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R}$  so that it becomes

$$(\wp\beta)^{1/(1-\rho)}\wp^{1/\rho}\mathbf{P}_\mathbf{R} > 1$$

$$(\wp\beta)\wp^{(1-\rho)/\rho}\mathbf{P}_R^{1-\rho} < 1$$

$$\beta\wp^{1/\rho}\mathbf{P}_R^{1-\rho} < 1.$$

Calling the weak return patience factor  $\mathbf{P}_R^\wp = \wp^{1/\rho}\mathbf{P}_R$  and recalling that the WRIC was  $\mathbf{P}_R^\wp < 1$ , the expression on the LHS above is  $\beta\mathbf{P}_R^{\wp\rho}$  times the WRPF. Since we usually assume  $\beta$  not far below 1 and parameter values such that  $\mathbf{P}_R \approx 1$ , this condition is clearly not very different from the WRIC.

The upshot is that under these slightly stronger conditions the value functions for the original problem define a contraction mapping with a unique  $v(m)$ . But since  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{\kappa}_{T-n} = \underline{\kappa}$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\kappa}_{T-n} = \bar{\kappa}$ , it must be the case that the  $v(m)$  toward which these  $v_{T-n}$ 's are converging is the *same*  $v(m)$  that was the endpoint of the contraction defined by our operator  $\mathcal{T}$ . Thus, under our slightly stronger (but still quite weak) conditions, not only do the value functions defined by (6) converge, they converge to the same unique  $v$  defined by  $\mathcal{T}$ .<sup>48</sup>

## D.2 Convergence of $v_t$ in Euclidian Space

Boyd's theorem shows that  $\mathcal{T}$  defines a contraction mapping in a  $F$ -bounded space. We now show that  $\mathcal{T}$  also defines a contraction mapping in Euclidian space.

Calling  $v^*$  the unique fixed point of the operator  $\mathcal{T}$ , since  $v^*(m) = \mathcal{T}v^*(m)$ ,

$$\|v_{T-n+1} - v^*\|_F \leq \alpha^{n-1} \|v_T - v^*\|_F. \quad (79)$$

On the other hand,  $v_T - v^* \in \mathcal{C}_F(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$  and  $\kappa = \|v_T - v^*\|_F < \infty$  because  $v_T$  and  $v^*$  are in  $\mathcal{C}_F(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ . It follows that

$$|v_{T-n+1}(m) - v^*(m)| \leq \kappa \alpha^{n-1} |F(m)|. \quad (80)$$

Then we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_{T-n+1}(m) = v^*(m). \quad (81)$$

Since  $v_T(m) = \frac{m^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho}$ ,  $v_{T-1}(m) \leq \frac{(\bar{\kappa}m)^{1-\rho}}{1-\rho} < v_T(m)$ . On the other hand,  $v_{T-1} \leq v_T$  means  $\mathcal{T}v_{T-1} \leq \mathcal{T}v_T$ , in other words,  $v_{T-2}(m) \leq v_{T-1}(m)$ . Inductively one gets  $v_{T-n}(m) \geq v_{T-n-1}(m)$ . This means that  $\{v_{T-n+1}(m)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  is a decreasing sequence, bounded below by  $v^*$ .

## D.3 Convergence of $c_t$

Given the proof that the value functions converge, we now show the pointwise convergence of consumption functions  $\{c_{T-n+1}(m)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ .

---

<sup>48</sup>It seems likely that convergence of the value functions for the original problem could be proven even if only the WRIC were imposed; but that proof is not an essential part of the enterprise of this paper and is therefore left for future work.

Consider any convergent subsequence  $\{c_{T-n(i)}(m)\}$  of  $\{c_{T-n+1}(m)\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  converging to  $c^*$ . By the definition of  $c_{T-n}(m)$ , we have

$$u(c_{T-n(i)}(m)) + \beta \mathbb{E}_{T-n(i)}[\Gamma_{T-n(i)+1}^{1-\rho} v_{T-n(i)+1}(m)] \geq u(c_{T-n(i)}) + \beta \mathbb{E}_{T-n(i)}[\Gamma_{T-n(i)+1}^{1-\rho} v_{T-n(i)+1}(m)], \quad (82)$$

for any  $c_{T-n(i)} \in [\underline{\kappa}m, \bar{\kappa}m]$ . Now letting  $n(i)$  go to infinity, it follows that the left hand side converges to  $u(c^*) + \beta \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_t^{1-\rho} v(m)]$ , and the right hand side converges to  $u(c_{T-n(i)}) + \beta \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_t^{1-\rho} v(m)]$ . So the limit of the preceding inequality as  $n(i)$  approaches infinity implies

$$u(c^*) + \beta \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho} v(m)] \geq u(c_{T-n(i)}) + \beta \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho} v(m)]. \quad (83)$$

Hence,  $c^* \in \arg \max_{c_{T-n(i)} \in [\underline{\kappa}m, \bar{\kappa}m]} \{u(c_{T-n(i)}) + \beta \mathbb{E}_t[\Gamma_{t+1}^{1-\rho} v(m)]\}$ . By the uniqueness of  $c(m)$ ,  $c^* = c(m)$ .

## E Equality of Aggregate Consumption Growth and Income Growth with Transitory Shocks

Section 4.2 asserted that in the absence of permanent shocks it is possible to prove that the growth factor for aggregate consumption approaches that for aggregate permanent income. This section establishes that result.

First define  $a(m)$  as the function that yields optimal end-of-period assets as a function of  $m$ .

Suppose the population starts in period  $t$  with an arbitrary value for  $\text{cov}_t(a_{t+1,i}, \mathbf{p}_{t+1,i})$ . Then if  $\check{m}$  is the invariant mean level of  $m$  we can define a ‘mean MPS away from  $\check{m}$ ’ function :

$$\bar{a}(\Delta) = \Delta^{-1} \int_{\check{m}}^{\check{m}+\Delta} a'(z) dz$$

where the combination of the bar and the ‘ are meant to signify that this is the average value of the derivative over the interval. Since  $\psi_{t+1,i} = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_{t+1,i}$  is a constant at  $\mathcal{R}$ , if we define  $a$  as the value of  $a$  corresponding to  $m = \check{m}$ , we can write

$$a_{t+1,i} = a + (m_{t+1,i} - \check{m}) \bar{a}(\overbrace{\mathcal{R}a_{t,i} + \xi_{t+1,i} - \check{m}}^{m_{t+1,i}})$$

so

$$\text{cov}_t(a_{t+1,i}, \mathbf{p}_{t+1,i}) = \text{cov}_t(\bar{a}(\mathcal{R}a_{t,i} + \xi_{t+1,i} - \check{m}), \Gamma \mathbf{p}_{t,i}).$$

But since  $R^{-1}(\phi R \beta)^{1/\rho} < \bar{a}(m) < \mathbf{P}_R$ ,

$$|\text{cov}_t((\phi R \beta)^{1/\rho} a_{t+1,i}, \mathbf{p}_{t+1,i})| < |\text{cov}_t(a_{t+1,i}, \mathbf{p}_{t+1,i})| < |\text{cov}_t(\mathbf{P} a_{t+1,i}, \mathbf{p}_{t+1,i})|$$

and for the version of the model with no permanent shocks the GIC says that  $\mathbf{P} < \Gamma$ , while the FHCW says that  $\Gamma < R$

$$|\text{cov}_t(a_{t+1,i}, \mathbf{p}_{t+1,i})| < \Gamma |\text{cov}_t(a_{t,i}, \mathbf{p}_{t,i})|.$$



This means that from any arbitrary starting value, the relative size of the covariance term shrinks to zero over time (compared to the  $A\Gamma^n$  term which is growing steadily by the factor  $\Gamma$ ). Thus,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{A}_{t+n+1}/\mathbf{A}_{t+n} = \Gamma$ .

This logic unfortunately does not go through when there are permanent shocks, because the  $\mathcal{R}_{t+1,i}$  terms are not independent of the permanent income shocks.

To see the problem clearly, define  $\check{\mathcal{R}} = \mathbb{M}[\mathcal{R}_{t+1,i}]$  and consider a first order Taylor expansion of  $\bar{a}(m_{t+1,i})$  around  $\check{m}_{t+1,i} = \check{\mathcal{R}}a_{t,i} + 1$ ,

$$\bar{a}_{t+1,i} \approx \bar{a}(\check{m}_{t+1,i}) + \bar{a}'(\check{m}_{t+1,i})(m_{t+1,i} - \check{m}_{t+1,i}).$$

The problem comes from the  $\bar{a}'$  term. The concavity of the consumption function implies convexity of the  $a$  function, so this term is strictly positive but we have no theory to place bounds on its size as we do for its level  $\bar{a}$ . We cannot rule out by theory that a positive shock to permanent income (which has a negative effect on  $m_{t+1,i}$ ) could have a (locally) unboundedly positive effect on  $\bar{a}'$  (as for instance if it pushes the consumer arbitrarily close to the self-imposed liquidity constraint).

## F The Limiting MPC's

For  $m_t > 0$  we can define  $e_t(m_t) = c_t(m_t)/m_t$  and  $a_t(m_t) = m_t - c_t(m_t)$  and the Euler equation (7) can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} e_t(m_t)^{-\rho} &= \beta R \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( e_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) \left( \frac{\overbrace{Ra_t(m_t) + \Gamma_{t+1}\xi_{t+1}}^{=m_{t+1}\Gamma_{t+1}}}{m_t} \right) \right)^{-\rho} \right] \\ &= (1 - \wp) \beta R m_t^\rho \mathbb{E}_t [(e_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) m_{t+1} \Gamma_{t+1})^{-\rho} \mid \xi_{t+1} > 0] \\ &\quad + \wp \beta R^{1-\rho} \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( e_{t+1}(\mathcal{R}_{t+1} a_t(m_t)) \frac{m_t - c_t(m_t)}{m_t} \right)^{-\rho} \mid \xi_{t+1} = 0 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the first conditional expectation in (84), recalling that if  $\xi_{t+1} > 0$  then  $\xi_{t+1} \equiv \theta_{t+1}/(1 - \wp)$ . Since  $\lim_{m \downarrow 0} a_t(m) = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_t[(e_{t+1}(m_{t+1}) m_{t+1} \Gamma_{t+1})^{-\rho} \mid \xi_{t+1} > 0]$  is contained within bounds defined by  $(e_{t+1}(\underline{\theta}/(1 - \wp)) \Gamma \underline{\psi} \underline{\theta}/(1 - \wp))^{-\rho}$  and  $(e_{t+1}(\bar{\theta}/(1 - \wp)) \Gamma \bar{\psi} \bar{\theta}/(1 - \wp))^{-\rho}$  both of which are finite numbers, implying that the whole term multiplied by  $(1 - \wp)$  goes to zero as  $m_t^\rho$  goes to zero. As  $m_t \downarrow 0$  the expectation in the other term goes to  $\bar{\kappa}_{t+1}^{-\rho} (1 - \bar{\kappa}_t)^{-\rho}$ . (This follows from the strict concavity and differentiability of the consumption function.) It follows that the limiting  $\bar{\kappa}_t$  satisfies  $\bar{\kappa}_t^{-\rho} = \beta \wp R^{1-\rho} \bar{\kappa}_{t+1}^{-\rho} (1 - \bar{\kappa}_t)^{-\rho}$ . Exponentiating by  $\rho$ , we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\kappa}_t &= \wp^{-1/\rho} (\beta R)^{-1/\rho} R (1 - \bar{\kappa}_t) \bar{\kappa}_{t+1} \\ \underbrace{\wp^{1/\rho} R^{-1} (\beta R)^{1/\rho}}_{\equiv \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R} \bar{\kappa}_t &= (1 - \bar{\kappa}_t) \bar{\kappa}_{t+1} \end{aligned}$$

which yields a useful recursive formula for the maximal marginal propensity to consume:

$$\begin{aligned} (\wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R \bar{\kappa}_t)^{-1} &= (1 - \bar{\kappa}_t)^{-1} \bar{\kappa}_{t+1}^{-1} \\ \bar{\kappa}_t^{-1} (1 - \bar{\kappa}_t) &= \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R \bar{\kappa}_{t+1}^{-1} \\ \bar{\kappa}_t^{-1} &= 1 + \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R \bar{\kappa}_{t+1}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

As noted in the main text, we need the WRIC (38) for this to be a convergent sequence:

$$0 \leq \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R < 1, \quad (84)$$

Since  $\bar{\kappa}_T = 1$ , iterating (84) backward to infinity (because we are interested in the limiting consumption function) we obtain:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\kappa}_{T-n} = \bar{\kappa} \equiv 1 - \wp^{1/\rho} \mathbf{P}_R \quad (85)$$

and we will therefore call  $\bar{\kappa}$  the ‘limiting maximal MPC.’

The minimal MPC’s are obtained by considering the case where  $m_t \uparrow \infty$ . If the FHWC holds, then as  $m_t \uparrow \infty$  the proportion of current and future consumption that will be financed out of capital approaches 1. Thus, the terms involving  $\xi_{t+1}$  in (84) can be neglected, leading to a revised limiting Euler equation

$$(m_t e_t(m_t))^{-\rho} = \beta R \mathbb{E}_t [(e_{t+1}(a_t(m_t) \mathcal{R}_{t+1}) (Ra_t(m_t)))^{-\rho}]$$

and we know from L’Hôpital’s rule that  $\lim_{m_t \rightarrow \infty} e_t(m_t) = \underline{\kappa}_t$ , and  $\lim_{m_t \rightarrow \infty} e_{t+1}(a_t(m_t) \mathcal{R}_{t+1}) = \underline{\kappa}_{t+1}$  so a further limit of the Euler equation is

$$\begin{aligned} (m_t \underline{\kappa}_t)^{-\rho} &= \beta R (\underline{\kappa}_{t+1} R (1 - \underline{\kappa}_t) m_t)^{-\rho} \\ \underbrace{R^{-1} \mathbf{P}}_{\equiv \mathbf{P}_R = (1 - \underline{\kappa})} \underline{\kappa}_t &= (1 - \underline{\kappa}_t) \underline{\kappa}_{t+1} \end{aligned}$$

and the same sequence of derivations used above yields the conclusion that if the RIC  $0 \leq \mathbf{P}_R < 1$  holds, then a recursive formula for the minimal marginal propensity to consume is given by

$$\underline{\kappa}_t^{-1} = 1 + \underline{\kappa}_{t+1}^{-1} \mathbf{P}_R \quad (86)$$

so that  $\{\underline{\kappa}_{T-n}^{-1}\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$  is also an increasing convergent sequence, and we define

$$\underline{\kappa}^{-1} \equiv \lim_{n \uparrow \infty} \underline{\kappa}_{T-n}^{-1} \quad (87)$$

as the limiting (inverse) marginal MPC. If the RIC does *not* hold, then  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{\kappa}_{T-n}^{-1} = \infty$  and so the limiting MPC is  $\underline{\kappa} = 0$ .

For the purpose of constructing the limiting perfect foresight consumption function, it is useful further to note that the PDV of consumption is given by

$$\underbrace{c_t (1 + \mathbf{P}_R + \mathbf{P}_R^2 + \dots)}_{= 1 + \mathbf{P}_R (1 + \mathbf{P}_R \underline{\kappa}_{t+2}^{-1}) \dots} = c_t \underline{\kappa}_{T-n}^{-1}.$$

which, combined with the intertemporal budget constraint, yields the usual formula for

the perfect foresight consumption function:

$$c_t = (b_t + h_t)\underline{\kappa}_t \quad (88)$$

## G The Perfect Foresight Liquidity Constrained Solution as a Limit

Formally, suppose we change the description of the problem by making the following two assumptions:

$$\begin{aligned} \wp &= 0 \\ c_t &\leq m_t, \end{aligned}$$

and we designate the solution to this consumer's problem  $\dot{c}_t(m)$ . We will henceforth refer to this as the problem of the 'restrained' consumer (and, to avoid a common confusion, we will refer to the consumer as 'constrained' only in circumstances when the constraint is actually binding).

Redesignate the consumption function that emerges from our original problem for a given fixed  $\wp$  as  $c_t(m; \wp)$  where we separate the arguments by a semicolon to distinguish between  $m$ , which is a state variable, and  $\wp$ , which is not. The proposition we wish to demonstrate is

$$\lim_{\wp \downarrow 0} c_t(m; \wp) = \dot{c}_t(m). \quad (89)$$

We will first examine the problem in period  $T - 1$ , then argue that the desired result propagates to earlier periods. For simplicity, suppose that the interest, growth, and time-preference factors are  $\beta = R = \Gamma = 1$ , and there are no permanent shocks,  $\psi = 1$ ; the results below are easily generalized to the full-fledged version of the problem.

The solution to the restrained consumer's optimization problem can be obtained as follows. Assuming that the consumer's behavior in period  $T$  is given by  $c_T(m)$  (in practice, this will be  $c_T(m) = m$ ), consider the unrestrained optimization problem

$$\dot{a}_{T-1}^*(m) = \arg \max_a \left\{ u(m - a) + \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} v_T(a + \theta) d\mathcal{F}_{\theta} \right\}. \quad (90)$$

As usual, the envelope theorem tells us that  $v'_T(m) = u'(c_T(m))$  so the expected marginal value of ending period  $T - 1$  with assets  $a$  can be defined as

$$\dot{v}'_{T-1}(a) \equiv \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} u'(c_T(a + \theta)) d\mathcal{F}_{\theta},$$

and the solution to (90) will satisfy

$$u'(m - a) = \dot{v}'_{T-1}(a). \quad (91)$$

$\dot{a}_{T-1}^*(m)$  therefore answers the question "With what level of assets would the restrained consumer like to end period  $T - 1$  if the constraint  $c_{T-1} \leq m_{T-1}$  did not exist?" (Note that the restrained consumer's income process remains different from the process for

the unrestrained consumer so long as  $\wp > 0$ .) The restrained consumer's actual asset position will be

$$\hat{a}_{T-1}(m) = \max[0, \hat{a}_{T-1}^*(m)],$$

reflecting the inability of the restrained consumer to spend more than current resources, and note (as pointed out by Deaton (1991)) that

$$m_{\#}^1 = (\mathfrak{v}'_{T-1}(0))^{-1/\rho}$$

is the cusp value of  $m$  at which the constraint makes the transition between binding and non-binding in period  $T - 1$ .

Analogously to (91), defining

$$\mathfrak{v}'_{T-1}(a; \wp) \equiv \left[ \wp a^{-\rho} + (1 - \wp) \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} (c_T(a + \theta/(1 - \wp)))^{-\rho} d\mathcal{F}_{\theta} \right], \quad (92)$$

the Euler equation for the original consumer's problem implies

$$(m - a)^{-\rho} = \mathfrak{v}'_{T-1}(a; \wp) \quad (93)$$

with solution  $\hat{a}_{T-1}^*(m; \wp)$ . Now note that for any fixed  $a > 0$ ,  $\lim_{\wp \downarrow 0} \mathfrak{v}'_{T-1}(a; \wp) = \mathfrak{v}'_{T-1}(a)$ . Since the LHS of (91) and (93) are identical, this means that  $\lim_{\wp \downarrow 0} \hat{a}_{T-1}^*(m; \wp) = \hat{a}_{T-1}^*(m)$ . That is, for any fixed value of  $m > m_{\#}^1$  such that the consumer subject to the restraint would voluntarily choose to end the period with positive assets, the level of end-of-period assets for the unrestrained consumer approaches the level for the restrained consumer as  $\wp \downarrow 0$ . With the same  $a$  and the same  $m$ , the consumers must have the same  $c$ , so the consumption functions are identical in the limit.

Now consider values  $m \leq m_{\#}^1$  for which the restrained consumer is constrained. It is obvious that the baseline consumer will never choose  $a \leq 0$  because the first term in (92) is  $\lim_{a \downarrow 0} \wp a^{-\rho} = \infty$ , while  $\lim_{a \downarrow 0} (m - a)^{-\rho}$  is finite (the marginal value of end-of-period assets approaches infinity as assets approach zero, but the marginal utility of consumption has a finite limit for  $m > 0$ ). The subtler question is whether it is possible to rule out strictly positive  $a$  for the unrestrained consumer.

The answer is yes. Suppose, for some  $m < m_{\#}^1$ , that the unrestrained consumer is considering ending the period with any positive amount of assets  $a = \delta > 0$ . For any such  $\delta$  we have that  $\lim_{\wp \downarrow 0} \mathfrak{v}'_{T-1}(a; \wp) = \mathfrak{v}'_{T-1}(a)$ . But by assumption we are considering a set of circumstances in which  $\hat{a}_{T-1}^*(m) < 0$ , and we showed earlier that  $\lim_{\wp \downarrow 0} \hat{a}_{T-1}^*(m; \wp) = \hat{a}_{T-1}^*(m)$ . So, having assumed  $a = \delta > 0$ , we have proven that the consumer would optimally choose  $a < 0$ , which is a contradiction. A similar argument holds for  $m = m_{\#}^1$ .

These arguments demonstrate that for any  $m > 0$ ,  $\lim_{\wp \downarrow 0} c_{T-1}(m; \wp) = \dot{c}_{T-1}(m)$  which is the period  $T - 1$  version of (89). But given equality of the period  $T - 1$  consumption functions, backwards recursion of the same arguments demonstrates that the limiting consumption functions in previous periods are also identical to the constrained function.

Note finally that another intuitive confirmation of the equivalence between the two problems is that our formula (85) for the maximal marginal propensity to consume

satisfies

$$\lim_{\varphi \downarrow 0} \bar{\kappa} = 1,$$

which makes sense because the marginal propensity to consume for a constrained restrained consumer is 1 by our definitions of ‘constrained’ and ‘restrained.’

## H Endogenous Gridpoints Solution Method

The model is solved using an extension of the method of endogenous gridpoints (Carroll (2006)): A grid of possible values of end-of-period assets  $\vec{a}$  is defined, and at these points, marginal end-of-period- $t$  value is computed as the discounted next-period expected marginal utility of consumption (which the Envelope theorem says matches expected marginal value). The results are then used to identify the corresponding levels of consumption at the beginning of the period:<sup>49</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} u'(\mathbf{c}_t(\vec{a})) &= R\beta \mathbb{E}_t[u'(\Gamma_{t+1}c_{t+1}(\mathcal{R}_{t+1}\vec{a} + \xi_{t+1}))] \\ \vec{c}_t \equiv \mathbf{c}_t(\vec{a}) &= (R\beta \mathbb{E}_t[(\Gamma_{t+1}c_{t+1}(\mathcal{R}_{t+1}\vec{a} + \xi_{t+1}))^{-\rho}])^{-1/\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

The dynamic budget constraint can then be used to generate the corresponding  $m$ ’s:

$$\vec{m}_t = \vec{a} + \vec{c}_t.$$

An approximation to the consumption function could be constructed by linear interpolation between the  $\{\vec{m}, \vec{c}\}$  points. But a vastly more accurate approximation can be made (for a given number of gridpoints) if the interpolation is constructed so that it also matches the marginal propensity to consume at the gridpoints. Differentiating (94) with respect to  $a$  (and dropping policy function arguments for simplicity) yields a marginal propensity to *have consumed*  $\mathbf{c}^a$  at each gridpoint:

$$\begin{aligned} u''(\mathbf{c}_t)\mathbf{c}_t^a &= R\beta \mathbb{E}_t[u''(\Gamma_{t+1}c_{t+1})\Gamma_{t+1}c_{t+1}^m \mathcal{R}_{t+1}] \\ &= R\beta \mathbb{E}_t[u''(\Gamma_{t+1}c_{t+1})Rc_{t+1}^m] \\ \mathbf{c}_t^a &= R\beta \mathbb{E}_t[u''(\Gamma_{t+1}c_{t+1})Rc_{t+1}^m]/u''(\mathbf{c}_t) \end{aligned}$$

and the marginal propensity to consume at the beginning of the period is obtained from the marginal propensity to have consumed by noting that, if we define  $\mathbf{m}(a) = \mathbf{c}(a) - a$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \mathbf{m} - a \\ \mathbf{c}^a + 1 &= \mathbf{m}^a \end{aligned}$$

which, together with the chain rule  $\mathbf{c}^a = c^m \mathbf{m}^a$ , yields the MPC from

$$\begin{aligned} c^m(\mathbf{c}^a + 1) &= \mathbf{c}^a \\ c^m &= \mathbf{c}^a / (1 + \mathbf{c}^a) \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>49</sup>The software can also solve a version of the model with explicit liquidity constraints, where the Envelope condition does not hold.

and we call the vector of MPC's at the  $\vec{m}_t$  gridpoints  $\vec{\kappa}_t$ .

## I The Terminal/Limiting Consumption Function

For any set of parameter values that satisfy the conditions required for convergence, the problem can be solved by setting the terminal consumption function to  $c_T(m) = m$  and constructing  $\{c_{T-1}, c_{T-2}, \dots\}$  by time iteration (a method that will converge to  $c(m)$  by standard theorems). But  $c_T(m) = m$  is very far from the final converged consumption rule  $c(m)$ ,<sup>50</sup> and thus many periods of iteration will likely be required to obtain a candidate rule that even remotely resembles the converged function.

A natural alternative choice for the terminal consumption rule is the solution to the perfect foresight liquidity constrained problem, to which the model's solution converges (under specified parametric restrictions) as all forms of uncertainty approach zero (as discussed in the main text). But a difficulty with this idea is that the perfect foresight liquidity constrained solution is 'kinked.' The slope of the consumption function changes discretely at the points  $\{m_{\#}^1, m_{\#}^2, \dots\}$ . This is a practical problem because it rules out the use of derivatives of the consumption function in the approximate representation of  $c(m)$ , thereby preventing the enormous increase in efficiency obtainable from a higher-order approximation.

Our solution is simple: The formulae in another appendix that identify kink points on  $\check{c}(m)$  for integer values of  $n$  (e.g.,  $c_{\#}^n = \mathbf{D}_{\Gamma}^{-n}$ ) are continuous functions of  $n$ ; the conclusion that  $\check{c}(m)$  is piecewise linear between the kink points does not require that the *terminal consumption rule* (from which time iteration proceeds) also be piecewise linear. Thus, for values  $n \geq 0$  we can construct a smooth function  $\check{c}(m)$  that matches the true perfect foresight liquidity constrained consumption function at the set of points corresponding to integer periods in the future, but satisfies the (continuous, and greater at non-kink points) consumption rule defined from the appendix's formulas by noninteger values of  $n$  at other points.<sup>51</sup>

This strategy generates a smooth limiting consumption function – except at the remaining kink point defined by  $\{m_{\#}^0, c_{\#}^0\}$ . Below this point, the solution must match  $c(m) = m$  because the constraint is binding. At  $m = m_{\#}^0$  the MPC discretely drops (that is,  $\lim_{m \uparrow m_{\#}^0} c'(m) = 1$  while  $\lim_{m \downarrow m_{\#}^0} c'(m) = \kappa_{\#}^0 < 1$ ).

Such a kink point causes substantial problems for numerical solution methods (like the one we use, described below) that rely upon the smoothness of the limiting consumption function.

Our solution is to use, as the terminal consumption rule, a function that is identical to the (smooth) continuous consumption rule  $\check{c}(m)$  above some  $n \geq \underline{n}$ , but to replace  $\check{c}(m)$  between  $m_{\#}^0$  and  $m_{\#}^{\underline{n}}$  with the unique polynomial function  $\hat{c}(m)$  that satisfies the following criteria:

---

<sup>50</sup>Unless  $\beta \approx +0$ .

<sup>51</sup>In practice, we calculate the first and second derivatives of  $\check{c}$  and use piecewise polynomial approximation methods that match the function at these points.

1.  $\hat{c}(m_{\#}^0) = c_{\#}^0$
2.  $\hat{c}'(m_{\#}^0) = 1$
3.  $\hat{c}'(m_{\#}^{\underline{n}}) = (dc_{\#}^n/dn)(dm_{\#}^n/dn)^{-1}|_{n=\underline{n}}$
4.  $\hat{c}''(m_{\#}^{\underline{n}}) = (d^2c_{\#}^n/dn^2)(d^2m_{\#}^n/dn^2)^{-1}|_{n=\underline{n}}$

where  $\underline{n}$  is chosen judgmentally in a way calculated to generate a good compromise between smoothness of the limiting consumption function  $\check{c}(m)$  and fidelity of that function to the  $\hat{c}(m)$  (see the actual code for details).

We thus define the terminal function as

$$c_T(m) = \begin{cases} 0 < m \leq m_{\#}^0 & m \\ m_{\#}^0 < m < m_{\#}^{\underline{n}} & \check{c}(m) \\ m_{\#}^{\underline{n}} < m & \hat{c}(m) \end{cases} \quad (94)$$

Since the precautionary motive implies that in the presence of uncertainty the optimal level of consumption is below the level that is optimal without uncertainty, and since  $\check{c}(m) \geq \hat{c}(m)$ , implicitly defining  $m = e^{\mu}$  (so that  $\mu = \log m$ ), we can construct

$$\chi_t(\mu) = \log(1 - c_t(e^{\mu})/c_T(e^{\mu})) \quad (95)$$

which must be a number between  $-\infty$  and  $+\infty$  (since  $0 < c_t(m) < \check{c}(m)$  for  $m > 0$ ). This function turns out to be much better behaved (as a numerical observation; no formal proof is offered) than the level of the optimal consumption rule  $c_t(m)$ . In particular,  $\chi_t(\mu)$  is well approximated by linear functions both as  $m \downarrow 0$  and as  $m \uparrow \infty$ .

Differentiating with respect to  $\mu$  and dropping consumption function arguments yields

$$\chi_t'(\mu) = \left( \frac{-\left(\frac{c_t'c_T - c_t c_T'}{c_T^2} e^{\mu}\right)}{1 - c_t/c_T} \right) \quad (96)$$

which can be solved for

$$c_t' = (c_t c_T' / c_T) - ((c_T - c_t)/m) \chi_t'. \quad (97)$$


Similarly, we can solve (95) for

$$c_t(m) = (1 - e^{\chi_t(\log m)}) c_T(m). \quad (98)$$

Thus, having approximated  $\chi_t$ , we can recover from it the level and derivative(s) of  $c_t$ .

## J Relational Diagrams for the Inequality Conditions

This appendix explains in detail the paper's ‘inequalities’ diagrams (Figures 1,3).



**Figure 9** Inequality Conditions for Perfect Foresight Model  
(Start at a node and follow arrows)

### J.1 The Unconstrained Perfect Foresight Model

A simple illustration is presented in Figure 9, whose three nodes represent values of the absolute patience factor  $\mathbf{P}$ , the permanent-income growth factor  $\Gamma$ , and the riskfree interest factor  $R$ . The arrows represent imposition of the labeled inequality condition (like, the uppermost arrow, pointing from  $\mathbf{P}$  to  $\Gamma$ , reflects imposition of the **PF-GIC** condition (clicking **PF-GIC** should take you to its definition; definitions of other conditions are also linked below)).<sup>52</sup> Annotations inside parenthetical expressions containing  $\equiv$  are there to make the diagram readable for someone who may not immediately remember terms and definitions from the main text. (Such a reader might also want to be reminded that  $R, \beta$ , and  $\Gamma$  are all in  $\mathbb{R}_{++}$ , and that  $\rho > 1$ ).

Navigation of the diagram is simple: Start at any node, and deduce a chain of inequalities by following any arrow that exits that node, and any arrows that exit from successive nodes. Traversal must stop upon arrival at a node with no exiting arrows. So, for example, we can start at the **P** node and impose the **PF-GIC** and then the **FHWC**, and see that imposition of these conditions allows us to conclude that **P** < R.

One could also impose  $\mathbf{P} < \mathbf{R}$  directly (without imposing **PF-GIC** and **FHWC**) by following the downward-sloping diagonal arrow exiting  $\mathbf{P}$ . Although alternate routes from one node to another all justify the same core conclusion ( $\mathbf{P} < \mathbf{R}$ , in this case),  $\neq$  symbol in the center is meant to convey that these routes are not identical in other respects. This notational convention is used in **category theory diagrams**,<sup>53</sup> to indicate that the diagram is not **commutative**.<sup>54</sup>

Negation of a condition is indicated by the reversal of the corresponding arrow. For example, negation of the **RIC**,  $\overline{\text{RIC}} \equiv \mathbf{P} > \mathbf{R}$ , would be represented by moving the

<sup>52</sup>For convenience, the equivalent ( $\equiv$ ) mathematical statement of each condition is expressed nearby in parentheses.

<sup>53</sup>For a popular introduction to category theory, see [Riehl \(2017\)](#).


<sup>54</sup>But the rest of our notation does not necessarily abide by the other conventions of category theory diagrams.



arrowhead from the bottom right to the top left of the line segment connecting  $\mathbf{D}$  and  $R$ .

If we were to start at  $R$  and then impose ~~FHWC~~, that would reverse the arrow connecting  $R$  and  $\Gamma$ , but the  $\Gamma$  node would then have no exiting arrows so no further deductions could be made. However, if we *also* reversed ~~PF-GIC~~ (that is, if we imposed ~~PF-GIC~~), that would take us to the  $\mathbf{D}$  node, and we could deduce  $R > \mathbf{D}$ . However, we would have to stop traversing the diagram at this point, because the arrow exiting from the  $\mathbf{D}$  node points back to our starting point, which (if valid) would lead us to the conclusion that  $R > R$ . Thus, the reversal of the two earlier conditions (imposition of ~~FHWC~~ and ~~PF-GIC~~) requires us also to reverse the final condition, giving us ~~RIC~~.<sup>55</sup>

Under these conventions, Figure 1 in the main text presents a modified version of the diagram extended to incorporate the ~~PF-FVAC~~ (reproduced here for convenient reference).



**Figure 10** Relation of ~~PF-GIC~~, ~~FHWC~~, ~~RIC~~, and ~~PF-FVAC~~

An arrowhead points to the larger of the two quantities being compared. For example, the diagonal arrow indicates that  $\mathbf{D} < R^{1/\rho}\Gamma^{1-1/\rho}$ , which is an alternative way of writing the ~~PF-FVAC~~, (28)

This diagram can be interpreted, for example, as saying that, starting at the  $\mathbf{D}$  node, it is possible to derive the ~~PF-FVAC~~<sup>56</sup> by imposing both the ~~PF-GIC~~ and the ~~FHWC~~; or by imposing ~~RIC~~ and ~~EHWC~~. Or, starting at the  $\Gamma$  node, we can follow the imposition

<sup>55</sup>The corresponding algebra is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FHWC} &: R < \Gamma \\ \text{PF-GIC} &: \Gamma < \mathbf{D} \\ \Rightarrow \text{RIC} &: R < \mathbf{D}, \end{aligned}$$

<sup>56</sup>in the form  $\mathbf{D} < (R/\Gamma)^{1/\rho}\Gamma$

of the **FHWC** (twice - reversing the arrow labeled **FHWC**) and then **RIC** to reach the conclusion that  $\mathbf{D} < \Gamma$ . Algebraically,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FHWC} : \quad & \Gamma < R \\ \text{RIC} : \quad & R < \mathbf{D} \\ & \Gamma < \mathbf{D} \end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

which leads to the negation of both of the conditions leading into  $\mathbf{D}$ . **PF-GIC** is obtained directly as the last line in (99) and **PF-FVAC** follows if we start by multiplying the Return Patience Factor (RPF= $\mathbf{D}/R$ ) by the FHWF(= $\Gamma/R$ ) raised to the power  $1/\rho - 1$ , which is negative since we imposed  $\rho > 1$ . **FHWC** implies FHWF  $< 1$  so when FHWF is raised to a negative power the result is greater than one. Multiplying the RPF (which exceeds 1 because **RIC**) by another number greater than one yields a product that must be greater than one:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &< \overbrace{\left( \frac{(R\beta)^{1/\rho}}{R} \right)}^{>1 \text{ from RIC}} \overbrace{(\Gamma/R)^{1/\rho-1}}^{>1 \text{ from FHWC}} \\ 1 &< \left( \frac{(R\beta)^{1/\rho}}{(R/\Gamma)^{1/\rho} R \Gamma / R} \right) \\ R^{1/\rho} \Gamma^{1-1/\rho} &= (R/\Gamma)^{1/\rho} \Gamma < \mathbf{D} \end{aligned}$$

which is one way of writing **PF-FVAC**.

The complexity of this algebraic calculation illustrates the usefulness of the diagram, in which one merely needs to follow arrows to reach the same result.

After the warmup of constructing these conditions for the perfect foresight case, we can represent the relationships between all the conditions in both the perfect foresight case and the case with uncertainty as shown in Figure 3 in the paper (reproduced here).

Finally, the next diagram substitutes the values of the various objects in the diagram under the baseline parameter values and verifies that all of the asserted inequality conditions hold true.


## K When Is Consumption Growth Declining in $m$ ?

Henceforth indicating appropriate arguments by the corresponding subscript (e.g.  $c'_{t+1} \equiv c'(m_{t+1})$ ), since  $\Gamma_{t+1} \mathcal{R}_{t+1} = R$ , the portion of the LHS of equation (53) in brackets can be manipulated to yield

$$\begin{aligned} c_t \Upsilon'_{t+1} &= c'_{t+1} a'_t R - c'_t \Gamma_{t+1} c_{t+1} / c_t \\ &= c'_{t+1} a'_t R - c'_t \Upsilon_{t+1}. \end{aligned}$$


$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \mathbf{R}\beta \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}^{-\rho}] \\ 0 &= \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}\mathbf{Y}'_{t+1}] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}] \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{Y}'_{t+1}] + \text{cov}_t(\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}, \mathbf{Y}'_{t+1}) \\ \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{Y}'_{t+1}] &= -\text{cov}_t(\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}, \mathbf{Y}'_{t+1}) / \mathbb{E}_t[\mathbf{Y}_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}] \end{aligned}$$
$$\text{cov}_t(\mathbf{\Upsilon}_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}, \mathbf{\Upsilon}'_{t+1}) > 0$$
$$\text{cov}_t(\mathbf{r}_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}, c'_{t+1}a'_tR - c'_t\mathbf{r}_{t+1}) > 0$$
$$\text{cov}_t(\Upsilon_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}, c'_{t+1}) > 0$$
$$\text{cov}_t(\mathbf{r}_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}, \mathbf{r}_{t+1}) < 0.$$
$$\text{cov}_t \left( (\Gamma \psi_{t+1} c(m_{t+1}))^{-\rho-1}, c'(m_{t+1}) \right) > 0.$$

59



**Figure 12** Numerical Relation of All Inequality Conditions

the proposition, since a higher draw of  $\xi$  both reduces  $c_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}$  and reduces the marginal propensity to consume. However, permanent shocks have conflicting effects. On the one hand, a higher draw of  $\psi_{t+1}$  will reduce  $m_{t+1}$ , thus increasing both  $c_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}$  and  $c'_{t+1}$ . On the other hand, the  $c_{t+1}^{-\rho-1}$  term is multiplied by  $\Gamma\psi_{t+1}$ , so the effect of a higher  $\psi_{t+1}$  could be to decrease the first term in the covariance, leading to a negative covariance with the second term. (Analogously, a lower permanent shock  $\psi_{t+1}$  can also lead a negative correlation.)

**Table 5** Taxonomy of Perfect Foresight Liquidity Constrained Model Outcomes

For constrained  $\dot{c}$  and unconstrained  $\bar{c}$  consumption functions

Main Condition Subcondition	Math	Outcome, Comments or Results
<del>PF-GIC</del>	$1 < \mathbf{P}/\Gamma$	Constraint never binds for $m \geq 1$
and RIC	$\mathbf{P}/R < 1$	FHWC holds ( $R > \Gamma$ ); $\dot{c}(m) = \bar{c}(m)$ for $m \geq 1$
and <del>RIC</del>	$1 < \mathbf{P}/R$	$\dot{c}(m)$ is degenerate: $\dot{c}(m) = 0$
PF-GIC	$\mathbf{P}/\Gamma < 1$	Constraint binds in finite time for any $m$
and RIC	$\mathbf{P}/R < 1$	FHWC may or may not hold
		$\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \bar{c}(m) - \dot{c}(m) = 0$
		$\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = \underline{\kappa}$
and <del>RIC</del>	$1 < \mathbf{P}/R$	<del>FHWC</del>
		$\lim_{m \uparrow \infty} \dot{\kappa}(m) = 0$

Conditions are applied from left to right; for example, the second row indicates conclusions in the case where ~~PF-GIC~~ and RIC both hold, while the third row indicates that when the PF-GIC and the RIC both fail, the consumption function is degenerate; the next row indicates that whenever the PF-GIC holds, the constraint will bind in finite time.

## References

- ABOWD, JOHN M., AND DAVID CARD (1989): “On the Covariance Structure of Earnings and Hours Changes,” *Econometrica*, 57, 411–445.
- AIYAGARI, S. RAO (1994): “Uninsured Idiosyncratic Risk and Aggregate Saving,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109, 659–684.
- ALVAREZ, FERNANDO, AND NANCY L STOKEY (1998): “Dynamic programming with homogeneous functions,” *Journal of economic theory*, 82(1), 167–189.
- ATTANASIO, ORAZIO, AND GUGLIELMO WEBER (1995): “Is Consumption Growth Consistent with Intertemporal Optimization? Evidence from the Consumer Expenditure Survey,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(6), 1121–57.
- BELLMAN, RICHARD (1957): *Dynamic Programming*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA, 1 edn.
- BENHABIB, JESS, ALBERTO BISIN, AND SHENGHAO ZHU (2015): “The wealth distribution in Bewley economies with capital income risk,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 159, 489–515, Available at <https://www.nber.org/papers/w20157.pdf>.
- BEWLEY, TRUMAN (1977): “The Permanent Income Hypothesis: A Theoretical Formulation,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 16, 252–292.
- BLANCHARD, OLIVIER J. (1985): “Debt, Deficits, and Finite Horizons,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 93(2), 223–247.
- BLUNDELL, RICHARD, HAMISH LOW, AND IAN PRESTON (2008): “Decomposing Changes in Income Risk Using Consumption Data,” *Manuscript, University College London*.
- BOYD, JOHN H. (1990): “Recursive Utility and the Ramsey Problem,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 50(2), 326–345.
- CARROLL, CHRISTOPHER D. (1992): “The Buffer-Stock Theory of Saving: Some Macroeconomic Evidence,” *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1992(2), 61–156, <http://econ.jhu.edu/people/ccarroll/BufferStockBPEA.pdf>.
- (1997): “Buffer Stock Saving and the Life Cycle/Permanent Income Hypothesis,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CXII(1), 1–56, <http://econ.jhu.edu/people/ccarroll/BSLCPIH.zip>.
- (2006): “The Method of Endogenous Gridpoints for Solving Dynamic Stochastic Optimization Problems,” *Economics Letters*, 91(3), 312–320, <http://econ.jhu.edu/people/ccarroll/EndogenousGridpoints.pdf>.
- CARROLL, CHRISTOPHER D., AND MILES S. KIMBALL (1996): “On the Concavity of the Consumption Function,” *Econometrica*, 64(4), 981–992, <http://econ.jhu.edu/people/ccarroll/concavity.pdf>.

- CARROLL, CHRISTOPHER D., AND ANDREW A. SAMWICK (1997): “The Nature of Precautionary Wealth,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 40(1), 41–71.
- CARROLL, CHRISTOPHER D., JIRI SLACALEK, KIICHI TOKUOKA, AND MATTHEW N. WHITE (2017): “The Distribution of Wealth and the Marginal Propensity to Consume,” *Quantitative Economics*, 8, 977–1020, At <http://econ.jhu.edu/people/ccarroll/papers/cstwMPC>.
- CHAMBERLAIN, GARY, AND CHARLES A. WILSON (2000): “Optimal Intertemporal Consumption Under Uncertainty,” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 3(3), 365–395.
- CLARIDA, RICHARD H. (1987): “Consumption, Liquidity Constraints, and Asset Accumulation in the Face of Random Fluctuations in Income,” *International Economic Review*, XXVIII, 339–351.
- DEATON, ANGUS S. (1991): “Saving and Liquidity Constraints,” *Econometrica*, 59, 1221–1248, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2938366>.
- DURÁN, JORGE (2003): “Discounting long run average growth in stochastic dynamic programs,” *Economic Theory*, 22(2), 395–413.
- FRIEDMAN, MILTON A. (1957): *A Theory of the Consumption Function*. Princeton University Press.
- GOURINCHAS, PIERRE-OLIVIER, AND JONATHAN PARKER (2002): “Consumption Over the Life Cycle,” *Econometrica*, 70(1), 47–89.
- HENDRICKS, LUTZ (2001): *Bequests and Retirement Wealth in the United States*.
- (2016): “Wealth Distribution and Bequests,” *Lecture Notes, Economics 821, University of North Carolina*.
- HIRAGUCHI, RYOJI (2003): “On the Convergence of Consumption Rules,” *Manuscript, Johns Hopkins University*.
- JAPPELLI, TULLIO, AND LUIGI PISTAFERRI (2000): “Intertemporal Choice and Consumption Mobility,” *Econometric Society World Congress 2000 Contributed Paper Number 0118*.
- KRUEGER, DIRK, KURT MITMAN, AND FABRIZIO PERRI (2016): “Macroeconomics and Household Heterogeneity,” *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, 2, 843–921.
- LI, HUIYU, AND JOHN STACHURSKI (2014): “Solving the income fluctuation problem with unbounded rewards,” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 45, 353–365.
- MA, QINGYIN, JOHN STACHURSKI, AND ALEXIS AKIRA TODA (2020): “The income fluctuation problem and the evolution of wealth,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 187.
- MA, QINGYIN, AND ALEXIS AKIRA TODA (2020): “A Theory of the Saving Rate of the Rich,” .
- MACURDY, THOMAS (1982): “The Use of Time Series Processes to Model the Error Structure of Earnings in a Longitudinal Data Analysis,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 18(1), 83–114.

- MARTINS-DA ROCHA, V FILIPE, AND YIANNIS VAILAKIS (2010): “Existence and uniqueness of a fixed point for local contractions,” *Econometrica*, 78(3), 1127–1141.
- MATKOWSKI, JANUSZ, AND ANDRZEJ S. NOWAK (2011): “On Discounted Dynamic Programming With Unbounded Returns,” *Economic Theory*, 46, 455–474.
- MODIGLIANI, FRANCO (1966): “The Life Cycle Hypothesis, the Demand for Wealth, and the Supply of Capital,” *Social Research*, 33, 160–217.
- MUTH, JOHN F. (1960): “Optimal Properties of Exponentially Weighted Forecasts,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 55(290), 299–306.
- RABAULT, GUILLAUME (2002): “When do borrowing constraints bind? Some new results on the income fluctuation problem,” *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 26(2), 217–245.
- RAMSEY, FRANK (1928): “A Mathematical Theory of Saving,” *Economic Journal*, 38(152), 543–559.
- RIEHL, EMILY (2017): *Category theory in context*. Courier Dover Publications.
- RINCÓN-ZAPATERO, JUAN PABLO, AND CARLOS RODRÍGUEZ-PALMERO (2003): “Existence and uniqueness of solutions to the Bellman equation in the unbounded case,” *Econometrica*, 71(5), 1519–1555.
- SCHECHTMAN, JACK, AND VERA ESCUDERO (1977): “Some results on ‘An Income Fluctuation Problem’,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 16, 151–166.
- SCHEINKMAN, JOSÉ, AND LAURENCE WEISS (1986): “Borrowing Constraints and Aggregate Economic Activity,” *Econometrica*, 54(1), 23–46.
- SCHMITT-GROHÉ, STEPHANIE, AND MARTIN URIBE (2003): “Closing small open economy models,” *Journal of international Economics*, 61(1), 163–185.
- STACHURSKI, JOHN, AND ALEXIS AKIRA TODA (2019): “An Impossibility Theorem for Wealth in Heterogeneous-Agent Models with Limited Heterogeneity,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 182, 1–24.
- STOKEY, NANCY L., ROBERT E. LUCAS, AND EDWARD C. PRESCOTT (1989): *Recursive Methods in Economic Dynamics*. Harvard University Press.
- STORESLETTEN, KJETIL, CHRIS I. TELMER, AND AMIR YARON (2004): “Consumption and Risk Sharing Over the Life Cycle,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 51(3), 609–633.
- SZEIDL, ADAM (2012): “Stable Invariant Distribution in Buffer-Stock Saving and Stochastic Growth Models,” *Manuscript, Central European University*.
- TOCHE, PATRICK (2005): “A Tractable Model of Precautionary Saving in Continuous Time,” *Economics Letters*, 87(2), 267–272, <http://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/ecolet/v87y2005i2p267-272.html>.



YAO, JIAXIONG (2012): “The Theoretical Foundations of Buffer Stock Saving: A Note,”  
*Manuscript, Johns Hopkins University*.

ZELDES, STEPHEN P. (1989): “Optimal Consumption with Stochastic Income: Deviations from  
Certainty Equivalence,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 104(2), 275–298.