

# Asset Markets

Daisuke Oyama

Microeconomics I

July 17, 2012

# Environment

- ▶  $\ell = 1, \dots, L$ : physical commodities
- ▶  $i = 1, \dots, I$ : consumers
- ▶  $s = 1, \dots, S$ : states of the world
- ▶  $\succsim_i$ :  $i$ 's preference relation on  $\mathbb{R}_+^{LS}$   
with a utility function representation  $U_i$   
(assumed to be strongly monotone)
- ▶ After uncertainty is resolved, spot markets open at  $t = 1$ .
- ▶ A price vector at state  $s$  is denoted by  $p_s \in \mathbb{R}^L$ ,  
and the overall price vector by  $p \in \mathbb{R}^{LS}$ .

# Assets

Asset markets open at  $t = 0$ .

We consider *real* assets,  
where returns are in units of commodity 1.

- ▶ An *asset* is identified with its return vector:

$$r = (r_1, \dots, r_S)' \in \mathbb{R}^S.$$

(Here we always consider vectors as column vectors.)

- ▶ Examples:
  - ▶  $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)'$ : “commodity futures”
  - ▶  $e_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)'$  ( $i$ th unit vector):  
called an “Arrow security”.

## Example: Derivative Assets

- ▶ The *call option* on an asset  $r \in \mathbb{R}^S$  (“primary asset”) at the strike price  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ :

$$r(c) = (\max\{0, r_1 - c\}, \dots, \max\{0, r_S - c\})'.$$

It gives the option to buy a unit of  $r$  at price  $c$  *after the state is realized*.

- ▶ For example, if  $S = 4$  and  $r = (4, 3, 2, 1)'$ ,

$$r(3.5) = (0.5, 0, 0, 0)',$$

$$r(2.5) = (1.5, 0.5, 0, 0)',$$

$$r(1.5) = (2.5, 1.5, 0.5, 0)'.$$

# Return Matrix

- ▶ We fix  $K$  assets,  $r_1, \dots, r_K \in \mathbb{R}^S$ , as given.

We assume that  $r_k \geq 0$ ,  $r_k \neq 0$  for all  $k$ .

- ▶ The  $S \times K$  matrix

$$R = (r_1 \quad \cdots \quad r_K) = \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & \cdots & r_{1K} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{S1} & \cdots & r_{SK} \end{pmatrix}$$

is called the *return matrix*.

- ▶ A vector of trades in these assets,  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_K)' \in \mathbb{R}^K$ , is called a *portfolio*.
- ▶ An asset price vector is denoted by  $q = (q_1, \dots, q_K)' \in \mathbb{R}^K$ .

# Equilibrium

## Definition 1

$(q, p, (z_i^*)_{i=1}^I, (x_i^*)_{i=1}^I) \in \mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^{LS} \times (\mathbb{R}^K)^I \times (\mathbb{R}_+^{LS})^I$   
is a *Radner equilibrium* if:

(i) for all  $i$ ,  $(z_i^*, x_i^*)$  solves

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{z_i \in \mathbb{R}^K, x_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{LS}} U_i(x_i) \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_k q_k z_{ki} \leq 0 \\ & \quad p'_s x_{si} \leq p'_s \omega_{si} + \sum_k p_{1s} z_{ki} r_{sk} \text{ for all } s; \end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $\sum_i z_i^* \leq 0$  and  $\sum_i x_i^* \leq \sum_i \omega_i$ .

# Price Normalization and Budget Constraint

- ▶ Normalize  $p_s = 1$  for all  $s$ .
- ▶ Budget constraint of  $i$ :

$$B_i(q, p, R) = \{x_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{LS} \mid \exists z_i \in \mathbb{R}^K \text{ s.t.} \\ q'z_i \leq 0 \text{ and } m_i \leq Rz_i\},$$

where

$$m_i = (p'_1(x_{1i} - \omega_{1i}), \dots, p'_S(x_{Si} - \omega_{Si}))' \in \mathbb{R}^S.$$

# State Prices

## Proposition 1

*If  $q \in \mathbb{R}^K$  is an asset price vector in a Radner equilibrium, then there exists  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^S$  such that  $q' = \mu' R$ .*

►  $q$  is called a state price vector.

►  $q' = \mu' R \iff$

$$\begin{aligned}(q_1 \quad \cdots \quad q_K) &= (\mu_1 \quad \cdots \quad \mu_S) \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & \cdots & r_{1K} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ r_{S1} & \cdots & r_{SK} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \left( \sum_s \mu_s r_{s1} \quad \cdots \quad \sum_s \mu_s r_{sK} \right).\end{aligned}$$



## Proof 1 (1/2)

- ▶  $q' \in \mathbb{R}^K$  is *arbitrage free* if there is no portfolio  $z \in \mathbb{R}^K$  such that  $q'z \leq 0$ ,  $Rz \geq 0$ , and  $Rz \neq 0$

(i.e., there is no portfolio that is budgetarily feasible and that yields a nonnegative return in every state and a strictly positive return in some state).

- ▶ Under strongly monotone preferences, an equilibrium asset price vector  $q \in \mathbb{R}^K$  is arbitrage free.
- ▶ Proposition 1 follows from the following lemma.

## Proof 1 (2/2)

### Lemma 1

*$q \in \mathbb{R}^K$  is arbitrage free if and only if there exists  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^S$  such that  $q' = \mu' R$ .*

- Proof by “Stiemke’s Lemma”.

## Proof 2 (1/2)

- ▶ Choose any consumer  $i$ . Assume that  $U_i$  has a representation  $U_i(x_{1i}, \dots, x_{Si}) = \sum_s \pi_{si} u_{si}(x_{si})$  ( $\pi_{si} > 0$ ) where  $u_{si}$  are concave, strictly increasing, and differentiable.
- ▶ Denote by  $v_{si}$  the indirect utility function derived from  $u_{si}$ .
- ▶ Let  $q, p$  be the equilibrium prices, and consider

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z_i \in \mathbb{R}^K} \quad & \sum_s \pi_{si} v_{si}(p_s, p'_s \omega_{si} + \sum_k r_{sk} z_{ki}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_k q_k z_{ki} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ The equilibrium portfolio plan  $z_i^*$  must satisfy the FOC with some  $\alpha_i > 0$  (Lagrange multiplier):

$$\sum_s \pi_{si} \frac{\partial v_{si}}{\partial w_{si}}(p_s, w_{si}^*) r_{sk} = \alpha_i q_k \text{ for all } k,$$

where  $w_{si}^* = p'_s \omega_{si} + \sum_k r_{sk} z_{ki}^*$ .

## Proof 2 (2/2)

- ▶ Define  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^S$  by

$$\mu_s = \frac{\pi_{si}}{\alpha_i} \frac{\partial v_{si}}{\partial w_{si}}(p_s, w_{si}^*).$$

- ▶ This satisfies  $q' = \mu' R$ .
- ▶ Note: choice of a different consumer may lead to a different  $\mu$ .

# Complete Markets

## Definition 2

An asset structure with an  $S \times K$  return matrix  $R$  is *complete* if  $\text{rank } R = S$ , i.e.,

$$\{v \in \mathbb{R}^S \mid v = Rz \text{ for some } z \in \mathbb{R}^K\} = \mathbb{R}^S.$$

► Example:

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is not complete.

No portfolio can give, for example, a return vector  $(0, 0, 1)'$ .

# Equivalence between Radner and Arrow-Debreu Equilibria

## Proposition 2

*Assume that the asset structure is complete.*

- (i) *If  $(p, x^*) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^{LS} \times (\mathbb{R}_+^{LS})^I$  is an Arrow-Debreu equilibrium, then there  $q \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^K$  and  $z^* \in (\mathbb{R}^K)^I$  such that  $(q, p, z^*, x^*)$  is a Radner equilibrium.*
- (ii) *If  $(q, p, z^*, x^*) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^K \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^{LS} \times (\mathbb{R}^K)^I \times (\mathbb{R}_+^{LS})^I$  is a Radner equilibrium, then there exists  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^S$  such that  $((\mu_1 p_1, \dots, \mu_S p_S), x^*)$  is an Arrow-Debreu equilibrium.*

# Sketch of the Proof (1/4)

► Denote

$$B_i^{\text{AD}}(p) = \{x_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{LS} \mid \sum_s p'_s(x_{si} - \omega_{si}) \leq 0\}$$

and

$$B_i^{\text{R}}(q, p) = \{x_i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{LS} \mid \exists z_i \in \mathbb{R}^K \text{ s.t.} \\ q'z_i \leq 0 \text{ and } m_i \leq Rz_i\},$$

where

$$m_i = (p'_1(x_{1i} - \omega_{1i}), \dots, p'_S(x_{Si} - \omega_{Si}))' \in \mathbb{R}^S.$$

## Sketch of the Proof (2/4)

(i) Let  $(p, x^*)$  be an Arrow-Debreu equilibrium.

► Denote

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} p_{11} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & p_{1S} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\Lambda R = \begin{pmatrix} p_{11}r_{11} & \cdots & p_{11}r_{1K} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ p_{1S}r_{S1} & \cdots & p_{1S}r_{SK} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

$$q' = \mathbf{1}' \Lambda R \quad \left( \Longleftrightarrow q_k = \sum_s p_{1s} r_{sk} \ \forall k \right).$$



## Sketch of the Proof (3/4)

- ▶ WTS:  $x_i^* \in B_i^R(q, p)$  and  $x_i \in B_i^R(q, p) \Rightarrow x_i \in B_i^{\text{AD}}(p)$ .
- ▶ Let

$$m_i^* = (p'_1(x_{1i}^* - \omega_{1i}), \dots, p'_S(x_{Si}^* - \omega_{Si}))' \in \mathbb{R}^S.$$

- ▶ Since  $\text{rank } \Lambda R = S$  by completeness, for each  $i = 1, \dots, I - 1$ , there exists  $z_i^*$  such that

$$m_i^* = \Lambda R z_i^*.$$

Define

$$z_I^* = -(z_1^* + \dots + z_{I-1}^*).$$

- ▶ Show  $x_i^* \in B_i^R(q, p)$ .

## Sketch of the Proof (4/4)

(ii) Let  $(q, p, z^*, x^*)$  be a Radner equilibrium.

Assume without loss of generality that  $p_{1s} = 1$  for all  $s$ .

- ▶ By Proposition 1, there exists  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^S$  such that  $q' = \mu' R$ .
- ▶ WTS:  $x_i^* \in B_i^{\text{AD}}(q, p)$  and  
 $x_i \in B_i^{\text{AD}}(q, p) \Rightarrow x_i \in B_i^{\text{R}}(\mu_1 p_1, \dots, \mu_S p_S)$ .
- ▶ For the former,

$$\sum_s \mu_s p'_s (x_{si} - \omega_{si}) \leq \sum_s \mu_s (Rz_i)_s = \mu' Rz_i = q' z_i \leq 0.$$

- ▶ For the latter,  
by the completeness, there exists  $z_i$  such that  $m_i = Rz_i$ .

Then,

$$q' z_i = \mu' Rz_i = \mu' m_i \leq 0.$$