On the Range of the Risk-Free Interest Rate in Incomplete Markets¹

Chiaki Hara²

Faculty of Economics and Politics
University of Cambridge

Atsushi Kajii

Institute of Policy and Planning Sciences
University of Tsukuba

December 2000

¹The financial support of Zengin Foundation for Studies in Economics and Finance is gratefully acknowledged.

²Correspondent. Mailing address; 35C Churchill College, Cambridge CB3 0DS, United Kingdom; Telephone and Fax: +44(0)1223-336188; Email: ch201@econ.cam.ac.uk

Abstract

In a model of a two-period exchange economy under uncertainty, we find both upper and lower bounds for the risk free interest rate when the agents' utility functions exhibit constant absolute risk aversion. These bounds are independent of the degree of market incompleteness, and so these results show to what extent market incompleteness can explain the risk-free rate puzzle in this class of general equilibrium models with heterogeneous agents. A general method of finding these bounds without the assumption of constant absolute risk aversion is also presented.

JEL Classification Code: D52, D91, E21, E44, G12.

Keywords: The risk-free rate puzzle, constant absolute risk aversion, incomplete markets, general equilibrium.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider a model of an exchange economy under uncertainty with two consumption periods and one physical good, where consumption smoothing over time and uncertainty is done by asset transactions in financial markets. The preference relation of each agent is represented by a time-independent, additively separable utility function and the discount factor is common across them. Markets may be incomplete, and initial endowments may not be marketable.

In this setting, the equilibrium prices depend delicately on the structure of the incomplete markets in general, and exact prices cannot be obtained without knowing specific structure of markets. But even in the situation where it is regarded plausible to assume that the markets are incomplete, the exact structure of markets is difficult to observe in the context of financial markets; it is one thing to find that some markets are missing and so some types of risks cannot be insured, but it is another to identify exactly which type of risk is uninsurable. Thus, in order to learn equilibrium prices, it is desirable to know bounds for equilibrium prices, upper and lower bounds, which do not depend on the fine detail of the market structure. We are interested in finding such bounds.

In this paper we concentrate on bounds for the risk free rate of return. This is of special interest since there has been extensive research under the name of the risk free rate puzzle, given by Weil (1992). Kocherlakota (1996) provides an excellent survey on this topic. So, in this context, just as Weil's (1992) original contribution, our aim is to provide a benchmark for the question of to what extent the market incompleteness can possibly explain the observed risk-free interest rate in general equilibrium models with heterogeneous agents with time separable utility functions.

The contribution of this paper is two fold. The first and main contribution of this paper is to identify the upper and lower bounds for the bond price, which only depend on the primitives of the economy, when every agent's utility function exhibits constant absolute risk aversion (CARA for short). The bounds are succinctly related to the degree of risk aversion and the risk properties of initial endowments, and they are independent of market incompleteness; that is, we do not assume anything as to what kind of risky assets are available for trade.

We shall then discuss a general method of finding upper and lower bounds when there is no condition imposed on the utility functions other than the convexity of derivatives (the prudence of an agent's utility function in Kimball's (1992) sense), and there is no assumption on the incompleteness of markets. As a simple application of this general method, we show that the

equilibrium price of the risk-free bond is no lower than the discount factor, provided the derivative of every agent's utility function is a convex function and the expected aggregate endowment in the second period is no larger than the first-period aggregate endowment.

As far as we know, no existing contribution has clarified bounds on the bond price (or lower bound on the interest rate) in a succinct way. So we believe that not only these results complement Weil's original contribution by further clarifying the theoretical explanatory power of market incompleteness for the risk free rate puzzle, but also these will serve as a valuable tool for finding a rough estimate of equilibrium interest rates, since computation of an equilibrium price system is not necessarily a straightforward task when markets are incomplete.

Levine and Zame (1998, 1999) considered an infinite-horizon economy under uncertainty with heterogeneous agents to investigate how the possibility of intertemporal income transfers weakens equilibrium implications of incomplete markets. A key step of their analysis is to find an upper bound on the interest rate. Our technique is inspired by theirs, though we do not need to make any a priori distinction between the cases with and without the aggregate risk as they did. Willen (1998) uses a similar technique, again for the case without aggregate risk, in the context of international trade between two countries with differing market incompleteness. The bounds with CARA utility functions are obtained as a corollary to the result of Hara (1998), which generalizes an earlier result shown in Elul (1997) on the risk-free rate puzzle, who identified several conditions under which introducing a new security raises the equilibrium risk-free interest rate.

The next section presents the general model of this paper. Section 3 deals with the case of CARA utility functions and find upper and lower bounds for the risk-free bond price. Section 4 discusses a general method of finding bounds on the bond price and shows that the bond price cannot be lower than the common discount factor. Section 5 concludes and suggests a couple of directions of future research.

2 The Model

There are two trading periods, 0 and 1, and there is a single perishable good in each period. There is no uncertainty in the first period, when the consumption good and assets are exchanged. At the beginning of the second period, the assets pay off, and then consumption takes place. The uncertainty in the second period is described by a probability measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$. Denote by $\mathbf{1}$ the function from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$ that takes constant value one. The

function 1 will be interpreted as the risk-free discount bond. Let X be a linear subspace in the set of all measurable functions from Ω to $\mathbb{R}$ such that $1 \in X$. We identify the functions which are μ -equivalent. We take the commodity space to be $\mathbb{R} \times X$ and denote by $\mathbb{E}$ the expectation with respect to μ . A generic element of $\mathbb{R} \times X$ will be denoted by $(x_0, \mathbf{x})$, where x_0 corresponds to consumption in the first period, and $\mathbf{x}$ is a random variable that corresponds to consumption in the second period.

There are H agents in the economy. Each *agent*, indexed $h \in \{1, \dots, H\}$, is characterized by:

- Time invariant von Neumann Morgenstern utility function u^h . It is increasing, strictly concave and continuously differentiable. Its derivative Du^h is assumed to be a convex function [prudence].
- Initial endowment vector $(e_0^h, \mathbf{e}^h) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$.

We assume that the agents have a common discount factor $\delta > 0$. Thus the preference relation of agent h is represented by the expected utility function $U^h : \mathbb{R} \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$U^h(x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h) \equiv u^h(x_0^h) + \delta \int_{\Omega} u^h(\mathbf{x}^h(\omega)) \mu(d\omega) = u^h(x_0^h) + \delta \mathbb{E}(u^h(\mathbf{x}^h)).$$

The agents trade assets in period 0. The *market span* is a linear subspace M of the commodity space X . An element of M corresponds to a vector of returns of some portfolio of the assets. The arbitrage free prices of the portfolios are described by a continuous linear function $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, which is referred to as a *state price function*. Since the prices of underlying assets can be recovered from a state price function, we do not model individual specifications of the assets explicitly. This also facilitates a simpler exposition for our results.

The agents are assumed to be price takers. Agent h 's utility maximization problem is, given state price function p :

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Max} & U^h(x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h) \\ (x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h) \in \mathbb{R} \times X & \\ \text{subject to:} & \mathbf{x}^h - \mathbf{e}^h \in M, \\ & (x_0^h - e_0^h) + p(\mathbf{x}^h - \mathbf{e}^h) = 0. \end{array}$$

The first constraint implies that the net trade vector $\mathbf{x}^h - \mathbf{e}^h$ can be achieved through asset trades, and the second constraint is the budget constraint.

Notice that the first-period consumption is assumed to be the numéraire, whose price equals one.

It is assumed throughout this paper is that utility function U^h is continuously differentiable and the first order necessary and sufficient condition for utility maximization is well defined. The differentiability and concavity of u^h do not guarantee these requirements, so this assumption restricts the nature of the underlying probability space. However, the restriction is very mild and the assumption can be justified in various ways; under our assumptions on u^h , it is satisfied if Ω is a finite set and B is the power set of X ; or X is the linear subspace spanned by finitely many jointly normally distributed random variables. A list of more general sufficient conditions in terms of utility function and the underlying probability space can be found in Nielsen (1993, Proposition 1 and 5).

The case of complete markets corresponds to the case where the market span M coincides with the commodity space X . We emphasize that $e^h \in M$ is *not* required. Since our purpose is to characterize the equilibrium price of bond without reference to the structure of markets, we do not want to relate the market span M to the other primitives of the economy a priori. So an assumption such as $e^h \in M$ must be avoided for our purpose. Besides, the results in section 3 become much simpler if $e^h \in M$.

We write $\bar{e}^h = E(e^h)$, $e = \sum_h e^h$, $\bar{e} = E(e)$, and $e_0 = \sum_h e_0^h$. So $\bar{e}^h$ is agent h 's expected endowment in the second period, e is the aggregate endowment in the second period, which is a random variable, $\bar{e}$ is the expected aggregate endowment in the second period, and e_0 the aggregate endowment in the first period.

We say that a state price function p and a consumption allocation $((y_0^h, y^h))_{h \in \{1, \dots, H\}}$ constitute an *equilibrium* for the economy with market span M if, for every h , (y_0^h, y^h) is a solution to the above maximization problem and $\sum_{h=1}^H (y_0^h, y^h) = \sum_{h=1}^H (e_0^h, e^h)$. It can then be shown that the asset markets clear automatically. So the equilibrium price of the risk-free discount bond is $p(1)$ and the equilibrium risk-free interest rate is $p(1)^{-1} - 1$. Hence a lower interest rate means a higher bond price, and vice versa. Note that the first order condition for utility maximization implies that the equilibrium bond price is equal to the discounted expected marginal utility; that is,

$$\delta \frac{E(Du^h(x^h))}{Du^h(x_0^h)} = p(1) \quad (1)$$

holds in equilibrium.

To conclude section, a couple of remarks on the model are due. First, note that the time-separability and time-invariance of the utility functions

U^h are maintained. Dropping these properties and using recursive or habit-formation utility functions would result in a different equilibrium level of the risk-free interest rate, a method of solving the risk-free rate puzzle that we shall not pursue here. Secondly, the linearity of M and p means that there are no transaction costs; in particular there is no short sales constraint. This is an important assumption of this model, because introducing transaction costs is known to partially solve the equity premium and risk-free rate puzzles.

3 Bounds with CARA Utility Functions

In this section, we consider the case of CARA utility functions. We start with such a restrictive class because sharper results obtain in this case, and these also provide intuitions for general cases considered in the next section.

We assume that von Neumann Morgenstern utility function u^h has a constant coefficient $\alpha^h > 0$ of absolute risk aversion, so that $u^h(w) = -\exp(-\alpha^h w)$ for every h . Thus the utility function can now be written as

$$U^h(x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h) = -\exp(-\alpha^h x_0^h) - \delta E(\exp(-\alpha^h \mathbf{x}^h)).$$

Notice that $Du^h(w) = \alpha^h \exp(-\alpha^h w)$ is a convex function, and so the prudence assumption of the previous section is met. We shall obtain a lower and an upper bounds for the risk free rate. For this purpose, we rely on the following proposition proved in Hara (1998), which generalized Proposition 1 of Elul (1997).

Proposition 1 *Let M and N be two market spans such that $1 \in M \subset N$. Let $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium state price function for M and a state price function $q : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium state price function for N . Then $p(1) \geq q(1)$.*

This theorem implies that the less complete the markets M are, the lower the risk-free interest rate is. In particular, the equilibrium risk-free interest rate is highest when $M = X$, i.e., the markets are complete, and it is lowest when M coincides with the line spanned by 1, i.e., the risk-free bond is the only asset traded in markets. In order to find the upper and lower bounds on the interest rates that are independent of market spans, therefore, it is sufficient to identify those rates with the complete markets and with the least complete markets, which we shall do in the following subsections.

3.1 Bond Price with the Complete Markets

For the risk-free bond price with the complete markets, the mutual fund theorem enables us to obtain an explicit formula for the bond price, which depends on the initial endowments only through the aggregate values e_0 and e ; and the aggregate risk tolerance $\sum_h 1/\alpha^h$; how they are distributed among the agents is irrelevant for the complete market bond price. So we can use the explicit formula to obtain a desired bound.

Proposition 2 *Denote $\gamma^h = 1/\alpha^h$ and $\gamma = \sum_h \gamma^h$. Let $p : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium state price function for the complete market span X , then*

$$p(1) = \delta \mathbb{E} (\exp(-(1/\gamma)(e - e_0 1))).$$

Proof. We shall explicitly construct an equilibrium where the price of bond is given as in the statement. This is sufficient since it can be shown that an equilibrium is unique, which is, in turn, because the agents' preferences are quasi-linear with respect to $(1, 1)$ and their utility functions are smooth by assumption.

First for each h , find $(x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$ such that

$$\mathbf{x}^h - x_0^h 1 = (\gamma^h / \gamma) (e - e_0 1), \quad (2)$$

and

$$x_0^h + \delta \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{x}^h \exp(-(1/\gamma)(e - e_0 1))) = e_0^h + \delta \mathbb{E} (e^h \exp(-(1/\gamma)(e - e_0 1))), \quad (3)$$

hold simultaneously. Such an $(x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h)$ exists uniquely, since if we substitute $\mathbf{x}^h$ in (3) with $\mathbf{x}^h = x_0^h 1 + (\gamma^h / \gamma) (e - e_0 1)$, the left hand side is increasing in x_0^h , and it goes to $+\infty$ or $-\infty$ as x_0^h approaches to $+\infty$ or $-\infty$. We shall show that the profile of consumption bundles, $((x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h))_{h \in \{1, \dots, H\}}$, and the state price function given by

$$z \mapsto \delta \mathbb{E} (z \exp(-(1/\gamma)(e - e_0 1))). \quad (4)$$

constitute an equilibrium.

Take the summation of both sides of equalities (2), and we have

$$\sum_h \mathbf{x}^h - e = \left(\sum_h x_0^h - e_0 \right) 1. \quad (5)$$

From (3), we have

$$\delta \mathbb{E} ((\mathbf{x}^h - e^h) \exp(-(1/\gamma)(e - e_0 1))) = -(x_0^h - e_0^h),$$

for each h , and so summing these up, and using (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\sum_h \mathbf{x}^h - \mathbf{e} \right) \exp \left(- (1/\gamma) (\mathbf{e} - e_0 \mathbf{1}) \right) \right) \\ &= \delta \left(\sum_h x_0^h - e_0 \right) \mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left(- (1/\gamma) (\mathbf{e} - e_0 \mathbf{1}) \right) \right) \\ &= - \left(\sum_h x_0^h - e_0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left(- (1/\gamma) (\mathbf{e} - e_0 \mathbf{1}) \right) \right) > 0$, this equality imply $\sum_h x_0^h = e_0$, and so that $\sum_h \mathbf{x}^h = \mathbf{e}$ from (5). Hence the allocation is feasible.

The equality (2) also implies that, for all h ,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \frac{Du^h(\mathbf{x}^h)}{Du^h(x_0^h)} &= \delta \exp \left(-\alpha^h (\mathbf{x}^h - x_0^h \mathbf{1}) \right) \\ &= \delta \exp \left(-\alpha^h (\gamma^h / \gamma) (\mathbf{e} - e_0 \mathbf{1}) \right) \\ &= \delta \exp \left(- (1/\gamma) (\mathbf{e} - e_0 \mathbf{1}) \right), \end{aligned}$$

which does not depend on h . Thus the allocation $((x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h))_{h \in \{1, \dots, H\}}$ is Pareto efficient and its supporting state price function coincides with the state price function defined by (4). Finally, the equality (3) implies that every agent's budget constraint is satisfied. Hence the state price function is an equilibrium price function. The proof is thus completed. ■

3.2 Bond Price with the Least Complete Markets

Let us now consider the lowest risk free rate, for the case where M is equal to the line spanned by $\mathbf{1}$. i.e., the risk free asset is the only marketable asset.

For future reference, for each h , define

$$c^h \equiv \frac{\mathbb{E} (Du^h(\mathbf{e}^h))}{Du^h(\bar{\mathbf{e}}^h)} = \frac{\mathbb{E} (\exp (-\alpha^h \mathbf{e}^h))}{\exp (-\alpha^h \bar{\mathbf{e}}^h)}.$$

So c^h is proportional to the first order condition (1) evaluated at the (average) endowment vector. We shall see in the next section that c^h measures agent h 's prudence evaluated at his initial endowment. Another way to look at this number is to apply the second-order Taylor approximation $\exp(w) \approx 1 + w + 2^{-1}w^2$. Then $c^h \approx 1 + 2^{-1}(\alpha^h)^2 \text{Var}(\mathbf{e}_h)$, or $\alpha^h S(\mathbf{e}_h) \approx (2(c^h - 1))^{1/2}$,

where S denotes the standard deviation. The numbers c^h thus measure the variability of his second-period initial endowments weighted by the constant coefficients of absolute risk aversion. As shown by Duffie and Jackson (1990), Demange and Laroque (1995), Ohashi (1995), Rahi (1995), and others, they help provide a necessary and sufficient condition for the optimal asset structure when only a limited number of assets can be traded in markets.

Now we are ready to state our result for the lowest risk free rate: let $\alpha_{\max} = \max\{\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^H\}$ and $\alpha_{\min} = \min\{\alpha^1, \dots, \alpha^H\}$, and set

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \exp\left(-\alpha_{\max} \frac{\bar{e} - e_0}{H}\right), \text{ if } \bar{e} - e_0 \leq 0, \\ &= \exp\left(-\alpha_{\min} \frac{\bar{e} - e_0}{H}\right), \text{ if } \bar{e} - e_0 > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Proposition 3 *Let M be the line spanned by 1 and $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium state price function for M . Then:*

1. $p(1) \leq \delta b \max\{c^1, \dots, c^H\}$.
2. If, furthermore, $e^0 = \bar{e}$ and $c^1 = \dots = c^H$, then $p(1) = \delta c^h$ for every h .

Proof. Let $((x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h))_{h=1}^H$ be the associated equilibrium allocation.

1. From the resource constraint there exists an h such that $\bar{x}^h - x_0^h \geq (\bar{e} - e_0)/H$. Then for that h ,

$$\frac{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}{Du^h(x_0^h)} = \frac{\exp[-\alpha^h \bar{x}^h]}{\exp[-\alpha^h x_0^h]} = \exp[-\alpha^h (\bar{x}^h - x_0^h)] \leq \exp\left[-\frac{\alpha^h (\bar{e} - e_0)}{H}\right]. \quad (7)$$

By the definition of b , we have

$$\exp\left[-\frac{\alpha^h (\bar{e} - e_0)}{H}\right] \leq b.$$

Hence

$$\frac{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}{Du^h(x_0^h)} \leq b \quad (8)$$

for some h .

On the other hand, since M is spanned by 1, we can write $\mathbf{x}^h = e^h + y^h 1$ for some $y^h \in \mathbb{R}$. By construction $\bar{x}^h = \bar{e}^h + y^h$, and so we have $\mathbf{x}^h - \bar{x}^h 1 = e^h -$

$\bar{e}^h 1$. Hence

$$\frac{E(Du^h(x^h))}{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)} = \frac{E[\exp(-\alpha^h x^h)]}{\exp(-\alpha^h \bar{x}^h)} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{E[\exp(-\alpha^h e^h) \exp(-\alpha^h y^h 1)]}{\exp(-\alpha^h \bar{e}^h) \exp(-\alpha^h y^h)} \\ &= \frac{E(\exp(-\alpha^h e^h))}{\exp(-\alpha^h \bar{e}^h)} \\ &= c^h \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

for every h .

By the first-order condition for the bond demand, we have

$$p(1) = \delta \frac{E(Du^h(x^h))}{Du^h(x_0^h)} = \delta \frac{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}{Du^h(x_0^h)} \frac{E(Du^h(x^h))}{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}.$$

By (8) and (10), therefore,

$$p(1) \leq \delta bc.$$

2. The symmetric argument is applicable. Since $e^0 = \bar{e}$, we have $b = 1$ and

$$\frac{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}{Du^h(x_0^h)} \geq 1$$

for some h . By equality (10), we have $p(1) \geq \delta c^h$. Thus

$$p(1) \geq \delta \min\{c^1, \dots, c^H\}.$$

Since $\min\{c^1, \dots, c^H\} = \max\{c^1, \dots, c^H\}$, this and the first part establish the second part. ■

The second part of this proposition states that the upper bound of the bond price in the first part is indeed attained if the expected aggregate endowment is constant over time, and all agents have the same c^h . An important implication of this result is that the equilibrium bond price in incomplete markets can be arbitrarily large (so the rate of interest is even negative - recall that the good is not storable) while the bond price in the complete markets stays at the discount factor δ . Although this is a digression from the purpose of this paper, it may be worthwhile to formally present a way to construct such an example.

Example 4 Suppose that an economy consisting of H agents, $h \in \{1, \dots, H\}$, with initial endowments $(e_0^h, e^h) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$ and constant coefficients $\alpha^h > 0$ of absolute risk aversion has the following properties:

1. The e^h have the same distribution with a positive variance.
2. $e = e_0 1$.
3. $\alpha^1 = \dots = \alpha^H$.

Then, for each $s > 0$, define the s -stretched economy as the economy consisting of the H agents, with initial endowments $(e_0^h, e^h + s(e^h - \bar{e}^h 1)) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$ and the same constant coefficients α^h of absolute risk aversion as before.

Note that the aggregate endowment of the s -stretched economy equals (e_0, e) for every $s > 0$. An example of the initial endowments that satisfies the first two conditions is that $\Omega = \{1, \dots, H\}$, $\mu(\omega) = 1/H$, $e^h(\omega) = 1$ if $\omega = h$ and $e^h(\omega) = 0$ otherwise, and $e_0^h = 1$ for every h .

Proposition 5 Let M be the line spanned by 1 and $p_s : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium state price function for M and let $q_s : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium state price function with the complete markets of the s -stretched economy in Example 4. Then:

1. $p_s(1) \rightarrow \infty$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$.
2. $q_s(1) = \delta$ for every $s > 0$.

Part 1 of this proposition claims that the equilibrium bond price with the least complete market becomes unboundedly large, while the bond price in the complete markets is equal to δ regardless of the values of s . In particular, even when the bond price equals to the common discount factor δ at the complete-market equilibrium, the bond price may be greater than one and the risk-free interest rate may well be negative.

Proof. 1. For each agent h and $s > 0$, define

$$\begin{aligned} c^h(s) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\alpha^h(e^h + s(e^h - \bar{e}^h 1))))}{\exp(-\alpha^h \mathbb{E}(e^h + s(e^h - \bar{e}^h 1)))} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}(\exp(-\alpha^h(e^h + s(e^h - \bar{e}^h 1))))}{\exp(-\alpha^h \bar{e}^h)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since all the $e^h + s(e^h - \bar{e}^h 1)$ have the same distribution and all the α^h are equal, the $c^h(s)$ do not depend on s and h . Part 2 of Proposition 3 implies that

$p_s(1) = \delta c^h(s)$ for every h and s . Moreover, writing $B = \{\omega \in \Omega | e^h(\omega) - \bar{e}^h \leq 0\} \in \mathcal{B}$, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} c^h(s) &= E \left(\exp \left(-\alpha^h (s+1) (e^h - \bar{e}^h 1) \right) \right) \\ &\geq \mu(B) E \left(\exp \left(\alpha^h (s+1) (\bar{e}^h 1 - e^h) \right) | B \right) \\ &\geq \mu(B) E \left(\alpha^h (s+1) (\bar{e}^h 1 - e^h) | B \right) \\ &\geq \mu(B) \alpha^h (s+1) E (\bar{e}^h 1 - e^h | B) \end{aligned}$$

Since e^h has a positive variance, $\mu(B) > 0$ and $E(\bar{e}^h 1 - e^h | B) > 0$. Hence $\mu(B) \alpha^h (s+1) E(\bar{e}^h 1 - e^h | B)$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Thus $c^h(s) \rightarrow \infty$ as $s \rightarrow \infty$.

2. Since the aggregate endowment of the s -stretched economy equals (e_0, e) for every $s > 0$, Proposition 2 implies that

$$p_s(1) = \delta E \left(\exp \left(-(1/\gamma) (e - e_0 1) \right) \right).$$

Since $e = e_0 1$ by Condition 2 of Example 4, $p_s(1) = \delta$. ■

3.3 Upper and Lower Bounds on the Bond Price

By gathering the preceding results, we can now give the upper and lower bounds on the equilibrium bond price.

Proposition 6 *Let M be a market span such that $1 \in M$ and $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an equilibrium state price function for M , then*

$$\delta E \left(\exp \left(-(1/\gamma) (e - e_0 1) \right) \right) \leq p(1) \leq \delta b \max\{c^1, \dots, c^H\}.$$

Proof. This can be obtained by combining Propositions 1, 2, and 3. ■

4 A General Method of Finding Bounds

In this section, inspired by the proof of Proposition 3, we discuss a general method of finding upper and lower bounds for the risk-free interest rate, without assuming constant absolute risk aversion. As an easy consequence of this is that if the expected aggregate endowment is non-increasing over time, then the equilibrium risk-free bond price is not higher than the common discount factor δ .

Recall that the first order condition (1) holds under our maintained assumption, which can be rewritten as, for *every* agent h ,

$$p(1) = \delta \frac{E(Du^h(x^h))}{Du^h(x_0^h)} = \delta \frac{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}{Du^h(x_0^h)} \frac{E(Du^h(x^h))}{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}, \quad (11)$$

where $\bar{x}^h = E(x^h)$. Since the equality holds for all h , if we can find bounds for $E(Du^h(x^h))/Du^h(x_0^h)$ for *some* h , these bounds serve as bounds for the equilibrium risk-free interest rate, or, equivalently, for the risk-free bond price. The right-hand side of (11) shows that it is the product of two factors, and we shall discuss the properties of these in turns.

The first factor $Du^h(\bar{x}^h)/Du^h(x_0^h)$ is the intertemporal marginal rate of substitution. If $e_0 \geq \bar{e}$, then $x_0^h \geq \bar{x}^h$ for *some* h and hence this factor is no smaller than 1 for this h . Similarly, if $e_0 \leq \bar{e}$, then this factor is no larger than 1 for *some* h . By closely examining the risk attitude of this agent, we can find a bound better than 1.

Note first that if a von Neumann Morgenstern utility function u is more risk averse than another v , then, for every w_0 and w_1 with $w_0 \geq w_1$, we have

$$\frac{Du(w_1)}{Du(w_0)} \geq \frac{Dv(w_1)}{Dv(w_0)}.$$

Let $e_0 \geq \bar{e}$, then the agents must consume more in the first period in equilibrium, and so there is an agent who does so more than the average; that is, there is an $\bar{h}$ such that $x_0^{\bar{h}} - \bar{x}^{\bar{h}} \geq H^{-1}(e_0 - \bar{e}) \geq 0$. If agent $\bar{h}$ is more risk averse than an agent with constant absolute risk aversion with coefficient α on the interval $[\bar{x}^{\bar{h}}, x_0^{\bar{h}}]$ then using the inequality above for $v(w) = -\exp(-\alpha w)$, we have

$$\frac{Du^{\bar{h}}(\bar{x}^{\bar{h}})}{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}})} \geq \frac{\exp[-\alpha \bar{x}^{\bar{h}}]}{\exp[-\alpha x_0^{\bar{h}}]} \geq \exp\left(\alpha \frac{e_0 - \bar{e}}{H}\right) \geq 1.$$

So the general recipe for finding a tighter lower bound for the term $Du^{\bar{h}}(\bar{x}^{\bar{h}})/Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}})$ when $e_0 \geq \bar{e}$ is to identify agent $\bar{h}$ who consumes more in the first period relative to the other agents and measure the minimum degree α of risk aversion on the interval $[\bar{x}^{\bar{h}}, x_0^{\bar{h}}]$. Then the lower bound for the bond price is improved from one to $\exp(\alpha H^{-1}(e_0 - \bar{e}))$.

For some utility functions, the coefficients of *relative* risk aversion vary in a much narrower range over relevant wealth levels than the coefficients of absolute risk aversions. We can then improve the above bound by using the intertemporal ratio $e_0/\bar{e}$ of aggregate endowments. Indeed, if the (generally non-constant) coefficients of *relative* risk aversions of $u^{\bar{h}}$ are larger than α , then we have

$$\frac{Du^{\bar{h}}(\bar{x}^{\bar{h}})}{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}})} \geq \left(\frac{e_0}{\bar{e}}\right)^\alpha \geq 1.$$

Symmetric bounds can be obtained for the case of $e_0 \leq \bar{e}$, though we then need to use the *maximum* degree of risk aversions. We shall be precise on this point in the proof of Proposition 7.

The second factor $E(Du^h(\mathbf{x}^h)) / Du^h(\bar{x}^h)$ shows how much, in ratio, the marginal utility from the bond is increased by the risk present in the second-period consumption. By Jensen's Inequality, this is no smaller than 1. It measures the degree of prudence of Kimball (1990). Indeed, if a von Neumann Morgenstern utility function u is more risk averse and more prudent than another v , then, for every $\mathbf{x} \in X$ with $E(\mathbf{x}) = \bar{x}$, it can be shown that

$$\frac{E(Du(\mathbf{x}))}{Du(\bar{x})} \geq \frac{E(Dv(\mathbf{x}))}{Dv(\bar{x})}.$$

Once, for example, we know that the (generally non-constant) coefficients of absolute risk aversions and prudence of *every* u^h lie in an interval $[\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}]$, we can conclude that

$$\frac{E(\exp(-\alpha_{\min} \mathbf{x}^h))}{\exp(-\alpha_{\min} \bar{x}^h)} \leq \frac{E(Du^h(\mathbf{x}^h))}{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)} \leq \frac{E(\exp(-\alpha_{\max} \mathbf{x}^h))}{\exp(-\alpha_{\max} \bar{x}^h)}$$

for *every* h , which provides both the upper and lower bounds of $E(Du^h(\mathbf{x}^h)) / Du^h(\bar{x}^h)$.

We have thus obtained bounds for the second factor $E(Du^h(\mathbf{x}^h)) / Du^h(\bar{x}^h)$ for *every* h and bounds for the first factor $Du^h(\bar{x}^h) / Du^h(x_0^h)$ for *some* h . By multiplication, we can obtain bounds for the bond price $p(1)$. The following proposition is a straightforward consequence of the above method.

Proposition 7 *Let M be a market span such that $1 \in M$. Also let a state price function $p : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a consumption allocation $((x_0^h, \mathbf{x}^h))_{h \in \{1, \dots, H\}}$ constitute an equilibrium for M . Suppose that, for every h , the coefficients of absolute risk aversions over the interval $[\bar{x}^h, x_0^h]$ lie in the interval $[\alpha_{\min}, \alpha_{\max}]$ and define $b \geq 1$ as in 6. Then $p(1) \geq \delta b$.*

If $e_0 \geq \bar{e}$, then $b \geq 1$ and hence $p(1) \geq \delta$, that is, the equilibrium bond price may be higher than the common discount factor δ . It is easy to show that if $\sum_h e^h = e_0 1$ (i.e., the total endowments are time independent and there is no aggregate uncertainty) and the markets are complete, then $p(1) = \delta$. This proposition thus implies that if the aggregate endowment is deterministic and stationary, then the incompleteness of the markets lower the risk-free interest rate.

Proof of Proposition 7. Since Du^h is convex for every h , we have

$$\frac{E(Du^h(\mathbf{x}^h))}{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)} \geq 1. \tag{12}$$

Let $h = \bar{h}$ be such that $\bar{x}^{\bar{h}} - x_0^{\bar{h}} \leq H^{-1}(\bar{e} - e_0)$, and thus

$$\frac{Du^{\bar{h}}(\bar{x}^{\bar{h}})}{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}})} \geq \frac{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}} + H^{-1}(\bar{e} - e_0))}{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}})}. \quad (13)$$

If $\bar{e} - e_0 \geq 0$, then

$$\frac{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}} + H^{-1}(\bar{e} - e_0))}{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}})} \geq \exp\left(-\alpha_{\max} \frac{\bar{e} - e_0}{H}\right).$$

If $e_0 - \bar{e} < 0$, then

$$\frac{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}} + H^{-1}(\bar{e} - e_0))}{Du^{\bar{h}}(x_0^{\bar{h}})} \geq \exp\left(-\alpha_{\min} \frac{\bar{e} - e_0}{H}\right)$$

Hence, by plugging (12) and (13) into (11), we complete the proof. $\forall$

Notice that the equality (11) shows that if $e_0 \leq \bar{e}$ and the Du^h are *concave* in the relevant interval of wealth levels, then $p(1) \leq \delta$ would follow. The more interesting case, however, is where the Du^h are *convex* as assumed earlier, because most frequently applied utility functions, such as those exhibiting constant absolute or relative risk aversions, have this property.

Note that, in the proof of Proposition 7, we did not use any bound on the prudence measure $\frac{E(Du^h(x^h))}{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}$ except that it is no less than 1; in particular, we did not use any information of the second-period equilibrium allocation $(x^1, \dots, x^H)$. The general approach we described above, however, shows that such a piece of information would improve the lower bound on the equilibrium bond price. For this reason, the bounds obtained in Proposition 7 should not be expected to be tight. The task of finding the equilibrium allocation or the (bounds for) prudence measure $\frac{E(Du^h(x^h))}{Du^h(\bar{x}^h)}$ is not straightforward in general. The reason why sharper results obtain for the case of CARA utility is that the equilibrium prudence measure above is the same as that at the initial endowments for CARA functions.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have found the upper and lower bounds on the risk-free interest rates in a two-period model with incomplete asset markets. The upper bound was given for general utility functions, while the lower bound was

only for CARA utility functions. We also discussed a general method of finding upper and lower bounds. These results will be useful in illustrating the risk-free rate puzzle in tractable general equilibrium models with incomplete asset markets.

As mentioned at the end of Section 4, an obstacle to obtaining bounds on the risk-free interest rate with general utility functions was that we cannot find bounds for the prudence $E(Du^h(x^h)) / Du^h(\bar{x}^h)$ at the second-period equilibrium consumption bundle x^h . Finding these bounds is a good future research topic.

The crucial expression for the bond price was equality (11). It was useful because it identified the two determinants of the bond price, the intertemporal marginal rate of substitution and the prudence. This suggests the following extensions of our approach. The first step is to the case of time-separable, but time-dependent von Neumann Morgenstern utility functions. The next step is to the case of recursive utility functions.

References

- [1] Demange, Gabrielle, and Guy Laroque, 1995, "Private Information and the Design of Securities," *Journal of Economic Theory* 65: 233-57.
- [2] Duffie, Darrell, and Matthew Jackson, 1990, Optimal innovation of futures contracts, *Review of Financial Studies* 2, 275-296.
- [3] Elul, Ronel, 1997, Financial innovation, precautionary saving and the risk-free rate, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* 27: 113-31.
- [4] Hara, Chiaki, 1998, Risk-free interest rates with negative exponential utility functions and incomplete markets, manuscript, University of Cambridge.
- [5] Kimball, Miles, S., 1990, Precautionary saving in the small and in the large, *Econometrica* 58: 53-73.
- [6] Kocherlakota, Narayana R, 1996, The equity premium: It's still a puzzle, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34, 42-71.
- [7] Levine, David, and William Zame, 1998, Risk Sharing and Market Incompleteness, UCLA Discussion paper, University of California, Los Angeles.
- [8] Levine, David, and William Zame, 1999, Does Market Incompleteness Matter?, UCLA Discussion paper, University of California, Los Angeles.

- [9] Nielsen, Lars, 1993, The expected utility of portfolios of assets, *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 22, 439-461.
- [10] Ohashi, Kazuhiko, 1995, Endogenous determination of the degree of market-incompleteness in futures innovation, *Journal of Economic Theory* 65: 198-217.
- [11] Rahi, Rohit, 1995, Optimal incomplete markets with asymmetric information, *Journal of Economic Theory* 65: 171-97.
- [12] Weil, Phillipe, 1992, Equilibrium asset prices with undiversifiable labor income risk, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 16, 769-790.
- [13] Willen, Paul, S., 1996, The Effect of Financial Sophistication on the Trade Balance, mimeo, Princeton University.