Existence and Uniqueness of Equilibrium Asset Prices over Infinite Horizons

Jaroslav Borovička and John Stachurski

Prepared for the 26th Annual Symposium of the Society for Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics

March 2018

Downloads

Working paper and these slides at

- github.com/jstac/asset_pricing_public

Reminders

Standard pricing theory:

$$P_t = \mathbb{E}_t M_{t+1} G_{t+1} \tag{1}$$

where

- G_{t+1} is a random payoff
- M_{t+1} is a **stochastic discount factor**
- P_t is current price

M_{t+1} is also called the **state price deflator**

This holds for **any** admissible payoff G_{t+1}

Now consider pricing **dividend stream** $\{D_t\}$

Purchasing the asset today gives (ex-dividend)

- claim to $D_{t+1}, D_{t+1}, \ldots$
- D_{t+1} and the right to sell tomorrow, at P_{t+1}

Hence payoff is $G_{t+1} = D_{t+1} + P_{t+1}$

Hence

$$P_t = \mathbb{E}_t M_{t+1} (D_{t+1} + P_{t+1}) \tag{2}$$

A recursion in prices...

Predictions

A (representative) investor has (unobservable) SDF process $\{M_t\}$

1. Take **any** dividend stream $\{D_t\}$
2. Plug the joint distribution of $\{D_t\}$ into

$$P_t = \mathbb{E}_t M_{t+1}(D_{t+1} + P_{t+1}) \tag{3}$$

3. Recover $\{P_t\}$ and compare with data

Example. How does $\ln(P_{t+1}/P_t)$ compare to observed returns?

A highly falsifiable theory!

Predictions

A (representative) investor has (unobservable) SDF process $\{M_t\}$

1. Take **any** dividend stream $\{D_t\}$
2. Plug the joint distribution of $\{D_t\}$ into

$$P_t = \mathbb{E}_t M_{t+1}(D_{t+1} + P_{t+1}) \tag{3}$$

3. Recover $\{P_t\}$ and compare with data

Example. How does $\ln(P_{t+1}/P_t)$ compare to observed returns?

A highly falsifiable theory!

Testing, in practice

1. Calibrate
2. Log-linearize
3. Compare generated sample moments with observed sample moments

Questions:

- Does the model actually have a solution?
- Is it unique?
- When you log linearize, how big are your errors?

  (If you don't know, doesn't that worry you?)

Testing, in practice

1. Calibrate
2. Log-linearize
3. Compare generated sample moments with observed sample moments

Questions:

- Does the model actually have a solution?
- Is it unique?
- When you log linearize, how big are your errors?

  (If you don't know, doesn't that worry you?)

So, the technical challenge is to

$$\textbf{solve } P_t = \mathbb{E}_t M_{t+1}(D_{t+1} + P_{t+1}) \textbf{ for prices}$$

- Even for highly complex models
    - SDFs generated by recursive pref models / habit formation / etc.
    - Dividend processes with multiple factors, stochastic volatility
- Avoid log linearization

But this agenda raises important questions:

- When does a solution exist?
- When is it unique?
- How can we compute it?

These are the questions we tackle in this study

Problem Statement

If we regard

$$P_t = \mathbb{E}_t \, M_{t+1}(P_{t+1} + D_{t+1}) \quad \text{for all } t \geqslant 0, \tag{4}$$

as a map

- from the joint distribution of $\{D_t, M_t\}$
- to a price process $\{P_t\}$ satisfying (4)

then when—and under what circumstances—is this mapping well defined?

Also, what properties does the solution have when it exists?

Note: We ignore bubbles! (seek only stationary solutions)

Problem Statement

If we regard

$$P_t = \mathbb{E}_t \, M_{t+1}(P_{t+1} + D_{t+1}) \quad \text{for all } t \geqslant 0, \tag{4}$$

as a map

- from the joint distribution of $\{D_t, M_t\}$
- to a price process $\{P_t\}$ satisfying (4)

then when—and under what circumstances—is this mapping well defined?

Also, what properties does the solution have when it exists?

Note: We ignore bubbles! (seek only stationary solutions)

Background: Contractions

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Banach space and let $T\colon \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$

When does T have a unique fixed point in $\mathcal{H}$?

Go-to theory for scientists: when $\exists\, \alpha < 1$ such that

$$\|Tg - Th\| \leqslant \alpha \|g - h\| \quad \text{for all } g, h \in \mathcal{H}$$

Implies existence of a unique $h^* \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $Th^* = h^*$ and

$$T^n h \to h^* \quad \text{as } n \to \infty, \qquad \text{for all } h \in \mathcal{H}$$

Let's apply this to the risk neutral case, where $M_{t+1} = \beta$

$$P_t = \beta \, \mathbb{E}_t \left(P_{t+1} + D_{t+1} \right) \tag{5}$$

Let $D_t = d(X_t)$ where

- $\{X_t\}$ is Markov on $\mathbb{X}$ with

$$\Pi(x, B) := \mathbb{P}\{X_{t+1} \in B \mid X_t = x\}$$

- $d \colon \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$

Here

- $\mathbb{X}$ called the **state space**
- Dividends are stationary (can easily modify)

Now, to solve $P_t = \beta \mathbb{E}_t (P_{t+1} + D_{t+1})$, conjecture that

$$P_t = p^*(X_t) \text{ for some fixed function } p^* \colon \mathbb{X} \to \mathbb{R}$$

Such an **equilibrium price function** must satisfy

$$p^*(x) = \beta \int (p^*(y) + d(y)) \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}y) \qquad (\text{all } x \in \mathbb{X})$$

Corresponding **equilibrium price operator** is

$$Tp(x) = \beta \int (p(y) + d(y)) \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}y)$$

Easy to show that T is a contraction of modulus β

Example. Suppse d is bounded and let $\| \cdot \|$ be the sup norm

$$
\begin{aligned}
|Tg(x) - Th(x)| &= \beta \left| \int (g(y) - h(y)) \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}y) \right| \\
&\leqslant \beta \int |g(y) - h(y)| \, \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}y) \\
&\leqslant \beta \|g - h\|
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\therefore \quad \|Tg - Th\| \leqslant \beta \|g - h\|
$$

But agent's aren't risk neutral!

In general, $M_{t+1} \neq \beta$

That would be fine if

$$\exists \, \alpha < 1 \text{ such that } \mathbb{P}\{M_{t+1} \leqslant \alpha\} = 1$$

But usually this isn't true:

$$M_{t+1} > 1 \text{ with positive probability}$$

We like future payouts in bad states!

So how about the **Lucas case**

$$P_t = \mathbb{E}_t \, \beta \, \frac{u'(C_{t+1})}{u'(C_t)} (P_{t+1} + D_{t+1}) \tag{6}$$

Lucas' clever trick: solve for $Y_t = P_t u'(C_t)$ instead

From (6),

$$Y_t = \beta \mathbb{E}_t (Y_{t+1} + u'(C_{t+1}) D_{t+1}) \tag{7}$$

The rest of the story is similar (contraction of mod β)

Lucas' trick requires that SDF can be **factored** as follows:

$$M_{t+1} = \beta \frac{\Phi_{t+1}}{\Phi_t} \quad \text{where } \{\Phi_t\} \text{ stationary and } \beta < 1$$

But many popular SDFs lack such structure (EZ, etc.)

Also, empirical literature suggests that such SDFs are misspecified

- Borovička, Hansen and Scheinkman (2016, JoF)

We need a more general method!

A General Formulation

Consider generalization

$$Y_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\Phi_{t+1} (Y_{t+1} + G_{t+1}) \right] \quad \text{for all } t \geqslant 0, \tag{8}$$

where

- $\{\Phi_t\}$ and $\{G_t\}$ are given stochastic processes
- $\{Y_t\}$ is endogenous

Example. $\{Y_t\}$ is price, $\{G_t\}$ is cash flow and $\{\Phi_t\}$ is the SDF

Example. $Y_t = P_t / D_t$, $G_t \equiv 1$ and $\Phi_t = M_{t+1} D_{t+1} / D_t$

To repeat,

$$Y_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[\Phi_{t+1}(Y_{t+1} + G_{t+1}) \right]$$

Assume that

$$\Phi_{t+1} = \phi(X_t, X_{t+1}, \eta_{t+1})$$

and

$$G_{t+1} = g(X_t, X_{t+1}, \eta_{t+1})$$

Here

- $\{\eta_t\}$ is an innovation sequence
- ϕ and g are positive Borel measurable maps

Any Markov solution h^* must satisfy

$$h^*(x) = \int \int \phi(x, x', \eta) \left[h^*(x') + g(x, x', \eta)\right] \nu(\mathrm{d}\eta)\Pi(x, \mathrm{d}x')$$

In other words, h^* is a fixed point of the **equilibrium price operator** T defined by

$$Th = Vh + \hat{g}$$

where

$$Vh(x) := \int h(x') \left[\int \phi(x, x', \eta)\nu(\mathrm{d}\eta)\right] \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}x')$$

and

$$\hat{g}(x) := \int \int \phi(x, x', \eta) g(x, x', \eta)\nu(\mathrm{d}\eta)\Pi(x, \mathrm{d}x')$$

One Step Contractions

Hey, I know, let's impose conditions that make T a contraction

Then we'll have a unique equilibrium price function

This is easy to do...

And then our problem will be solved... right??

Example. Suppose g bounded and let $\| \cdot \|$ be the sup norm

Suppose also that

$$\alpha := \sup_{x \in \mathbb{X}} \int \int \phi(x, x', \eta) \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}x) \nu(\mathrm{d}\eta) < 1$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|Tf(x) - Th(x)| &= \left| \int (f(y) - h(y)) \left[\int \phi(x, y, \eta) \nu(\mathrm{d}\eta) \right] \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}y) \right| \\
&\leqslant \int |f(y) - h(y)| \left[\int \phi(x, y, \eta) \nu(\mathrm{d}\eta) \right] \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}y) \\
&\leqslant \alpha \|f - h\|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore \quad \|Tf - Th\| \leqslant \alpha \|f - h\|$$

Let's test this out on **Bansal and Yaron (2004)**

Utility is given by

$$V_t = \left[(1-\beta)C_t^{1-1/\psi} + \beta \left\{\mathcal{R}_t\left(V_{t+1}\right)\right\}^{1-1/\psi}\right]^{1/(1-1/\psi)}$$

where $\{C_t\}$ is the consumption path extending on from time t and

$$\mathcal{R}_t(V_{t+1}) := (\mathbb{E}_t V_{t+1}^{1-\gamma})^{1/(1-\gamma)}$$

- $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is a time discount factor
- γ governs risk aversion and ψ is the EIS

Dividends and consumption grow according to

$$\ln(C_{t+1}/C_t) = \mu_c + z_t + \sigma_t \, \eta_{c,t+1}$$

$$\ln(D_{t+1}/D_t) = \mu_d + a z_t + \phi_d \, \sigma_t \, \eta_{d,t+1}$$

$$z_{t+1} = \rho z_t + \phi_z \, \sigma_t \, \eta_{z,t+1}$$

$$\sigma^2_{t+1} = \max\left\{ v \, \sigma^2_t + d + \phi_\sigma \, \eta_{\sigma,t+1}, \, 0 \right\}$$

Here

- $\{\eta_{i,t}\}$ are IID and standard normal
- The state X_t can be represented as $X_t = (z_t, \sigma_t)$

The SDF is given by

$$M_{t+1} = \beta^{\theta} \left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_t} \right)^{-\gamma} \left(\frac{W_{t+1}}{W_t - 1} \right)^{\theta - 1}$$

where

- W_t is the value of aggregate wealth
- $\theta := (1 - \gamma)/(1 - 1/\psi)$

The growth adjusted SDF is

$$\Phi_{t+1} := M_{t+1} \frac{D_{t+1}}{D_t} = \beta^{\theta} \frac{D_{t+1}}{D_t} \left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_t} \right)^{-\gamma} \left(\frac{W_{t+1}}{W_t - 1} \right)^{\theta - 1}$$

The wealth value process W_t can be represented as $W_t = w(X_t)$, where

$$\beta^\theta \, \mathbb{E}_t \left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_t} \right)^{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{w(X_{t+1})}{w(X_t) - 1} \right)^\theta \right] = 1$$

Strategy:

1. solve this functional equation for w
2. compute

$$\alpha := \sup_x \int \int \phi(x, x', \eta) \Pi(x, \mathrm{d}x) \nu(\mathrm{d}\eta)$$

3. test whether $\alpha < 1$

The results are concerning...


One step contraction coefficient
Bansal-Yaron
1.000
β
γ
0.998
0.996
0.994
0.992
0.990
2
4
6
8
10
12
1.028000
1.024000
1.020000
1.016000
1.012000
1.008000
1.004000
1.000000
0.996000
0.992000



One step contraction coefficient
1.000
Bansal-Yaron
β
μ_d
0.001
0.002
0.003
0.004
0.005
0.006
0.007
0.9800
0.9825
0.9850
0.9875
0.9900
0.9925
0.9950
0.9975
0.985000
0.990000
0.995000
1.000000
1.005000
1.010000
1.015000
1.020000
1.025000
1.030000

So Bansal and Yaron's model **fails** this test

But what does this mean?

The condition is only sufficient

When it fails we get no information...

Similar scenarios arise for other models

For example, **Calin et al.** (2005, ECMA) give a one-step contraction condition for the **habit formation** case

$$M_{t+1}\frac{D_{t+1}}{D_t} = k_0 \exp((1-\gamma)(\rho-\alpha)X_t)$$

where

- $k_0 := \beta \exp(b(1-\gamma) + \sigma^2(\gamma-1)^2/2)$
- α, γ, β are preference parameters
- the state process obeys

$$X_{t+1} = \rho X_t + b + \sigma\eta_{t+1} \quad \text{with} \quad \{\eta_t\} \overset{\text{IID}}{\sim} N(0,1)$$


One step test value
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0.0
σ
0.4
0.5
0.6
0.7
0.8
0.9
β
1.000
5.4
4.8
4.2
3.6
3.0
2.4
1.8
1.2
0.6

Back to the Drawing Board

So, to sum up so far

- Equilib price function is fixed point of $Th = Vh + \hat{g}$
- Requiring contractivity of T is **too strict**

Fortunately, we can do better!

The reason is: V is **linear**

By the **Neumann series lemma**, T has a unique fixed point in $\mathcal{H}$ whenever

$$r(V) < 1, \quad \text{where} \quad r(V) := \text{spectral radius of } V$$

How tight is this condition?

Very close to necessary!

How tight is this condition?

Very close to necessary!

Theorem. If V is compact, then the following statements are **equivalent**:

1. $r(V) < 1$
2. There exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that T^n is a contraction on $\mathcal{H}$
3. There exists a unique equilibrium price function h^* in $\mathcal{H}_+$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} T^n h = h^*$ for every $h \in \mathcal{H}_+$

(Necessity follows from compactness, positivity of V and the Krein–Rutman theorem)

Stable Case

Theorem. If $r(V) < 1$, then

1. The unique equilibrium price function h^* is equal to $\sum_{n \geqslant 0} V^n \hat{g}$
2. The process $\{Y_t^*\}$ defined by $Y_t^* := h^*(X_t)$ for all t is a solution to the forward looking recursion
3. The forward projection

$$Y_t^F := \mathbb{E}_t \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Phi_{t+i} \, G_{t+n} \tag{9}$$

is finite and equal to Y_t^* with probability one

Unstable Case

Theorem. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be such that all strictly positive elements of $\mathcal{H}$ are quasi-interior to $\mathcal{H}_+$

If, in addition, V is compact and $r(V) > 1$, then no equilibrium price function exists in $\mathcal{H}_+$

Intuition

- For any $h > 0$, the dynamics $V^n h$ are similar to the dynamics of $V^n e$, where e is the principal eigenfunction
- If $r(V) > 1$, then $V^n e$ diverges
- Hence $V^n h$ diverges
- Hence $T^n h = V^n h + \sum_{i=1}^n V^i \hat{g}$ diverges

The L_1 Case

Let's return to $P_t = \mathbb{E}_t M_{t+1}(D_{t+1} + P_{t+1})$

Theorem. When $\mathcal{H} = L_1(\pi)$ with $\pi \stackrel{\mathscr{D}}{=} X_t$, we have

$$r(V) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \prod_{t=1}^{n} M_t \right\}^{1/n}$$

Example. (Sanity check) In the risk-neutral case, where $M_t \equiv \beta$,

$$r(V) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \prod_{t=1}^{n} M_t \right\}^{1/n} = \beta$$

Hence unique equilibrium price function exists whenever $\beta < 1$

Since

$$r(V) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \prod_{t=1}^{n} M_t \right\}^{1/n}$$

we have, intuitively,

$$r(V) < 1 \quad \iff \quad \text{"eventual contraction, on average"}$$

Weaker than contraction in one step (essentially necessary)

Let's compute the coefficient $r(V)$ in some applications and see what we get


Spectral radius
1.000
1.000
Bansal-Yaron
0.998
0.996
0.994
0.992
0.990
β
2
4
6
8
10
12
γ
1.002000
1.000000
0.998000
0.996000
0.994000
0.992000
0.990000
0.988000



Spectral radius
0.007
0.006
0.005
0.004
0.003
0.002
0.001
μ_d
0.9800
0.9825
0.9850
0.9875
0.9900
0.9925
0.9950
0.9975
β
1.000
Bansal-Yaron
1.008000
1.004000
1.000000
0.996000
0.992000
0.988000
0.984000
0.980000
0.976000

How does this work for the model studied in Calin et al?



One step test value
Spectral radius $r(V)$
1.000
1.000
σ
β
0.0
0.1
0.2
0.3
0.4
0.5
0.6
0.4
0.5
0.6
0.7
0.8
0.9
0
3
6
9
12
15
18
21
24
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00
1.25
1.50
1.75
2.00
2.25

Conclusion

$$E = mc^2$$