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## Issues with Time-Additive Utility

## Timing of uncertainty resolution

- An agent with additive utility is indifferent between early or late resolution of uncertainty.
- Consider two consumption streams
(1) In each period $t=0,1, \ldots, T$, consumption is i.i.d. with

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(C_{t}=\bar{C}\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(C_{t}=\underline{C}\right)=0.5
$$

where $\bar{C}>\underline{C}$.
(2) In each period $t=1,2, \ldots, T, C_{t}^{\prime}=C_{0}$ where

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(C_{0}^{\prime}=\bar{C}\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(C_{0}^{\prime}=\underline{C}\right)=0.5
$$

- With additive utility, both streams generate the same indirect utility (check!).
- If you prefer one of them, you cannot have time-additive utility!


## Issues with Time-Additive Utility

## Intertemporal Substitution vs. Risk Aversion

- Agents typically dislike fluctuations in their consumption streams over time
- Suppose $C=\frac{1}{2}(\bar{C}+\underline{C})$. Consider three consumption streams
(1) Consumption is constant $C_{t}=C$ for all $t=0,1, \ldots, T$
(2) Consumption varies over time $C_{t}^{\prime}=\bar{C}$ if $t=0 \bmod 2$ and $C_{t}^{\prime}=\underline{C}$ if $t=1 \bmod 2$
(3) Consumption varies across states In each period $t=1,2, \ldots, T$, consumption is i.i.d.

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(C_{t}=\bar{C}\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(C_{t}=\underline{C}\right)=0.5
$$

- Agents (typically) prefer $C$ over $C^{\prime}$ due to their aversion against intertemporal variation.
- Agents (typically) prefer $C$ over $C^{\prime \prime}$ due to their aversion against variation across states (risk).


## Issues with Time-Additive Utility III

## Intertemporal Substitution vs. Risk Aversion

- For time additive utility, both is determined by the concavity of the utility function, e.g., CRRA-utility: $u(C)=\frac{1}{1-\gamma} C^{1-\gamma}$.
- Relative risk aversion is given by

$$
R R A=-\frac{C u^{\prime \prime}(C)}{u^{\prime}(C)}=\gamma
$$

- Elasticity of intertemporal substitution measures the responsiveness of the growth rate of consumption to the real interest rate (Hall 1988).

$$
E I S=\frac{\mathrm{d} \Delta c_{t+1}}{\mathrm{~d} r_{t}^{f}}=\cdots=\frac{1}{\gamma}
$$

- Substitution Effect: If $r^{f}$ goes up, the agent might reduce consumption and saves more to increase future consumption.
- Wealth Effect: If $r^{f}$ goes up, the agent might feel wealthier and consumes more.
- Both properties are inseparably tied together.


## Elasiticity of Intertemporal Substitution

## Elasiticity of Intertemporal Substitution

## Elasiticity of Intertemporal Substitution

## Possible Solution

## Recursive Utility

- Recursive Utility is one possible way of addressing some of the previous issues.
- A recursive utility index $\mathcal{U}$ can be expressed as

$$
\mathcal{U}_{t}\left(C_{t}, C_{t+1}, \ldots\right)=W_{t}\left(C_{t}, \mathcal{U}_{t+1}\left(C_{t+1}, C_{t+2}, \ldots\right)\right)
$$

where $W$ is an intertemporal aggregator.

- $W$ describes the aggregation of present consumption and future utility.
- The aggregator takes utility from current consumption $C_{t}$ and expected utility from future consumption $\mathcal{U}_{t+1}$ into account.


## Example: Time-Additive Utility

- Choose the linear aggregator

$$
\mathcal{U}_{t}\left(C_{t}, C_{t+1}, \ldots\right)=u\left(C_{t}\right)+\mathrm{e}^{-\delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathcal{U}_{t+1}\left(C_{t+1}, C_{t+2}, \ldots\right)\right]
$$

- Then, time- $t$ utility is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_{t} & =u\left(C_{t}\right)+\mathrm{e}^{-\delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[u\left(C_{t+1}\right)+\mathrm{e}^{-\delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathcal{U}_{t+2}\right]\right] \\
& =u\left(C_{t}\right)+\mathrm{e}^{-\delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[u\left(C_{t+1}\right)\right]+\mathrm{e}^{-2 \delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[u\left(C_{t+2}\right)+\mathrm{e}^{-\delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathcal{U}_{t+3}\right]\right] \\
& =u\left(C_{t}\right)+\mathrm{e}^{-\delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[u\left(C_{t+1}\right)\right]+\mathrm{e}^{-2 \delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[u\left(C_{t+2}\right)\right]+\mathrm{e}^{-3 \delta} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathcal{U}_{t+3}\right] \\
& =\ldots \\
& =\sum_{k=0}^{T} \mathrm{e}^{-\delta k} \mathbb{E}_{t}\left[u\left(c_{t+k}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

- Standard time-additive utility is a special case of recursive utility for a linear aggregator.
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## Epstein-Zin Utility

- Consider the following CES aggregator

$$
\mathcal{U}_{t}\left(C_{t}, C_{t+1}, \ldots\right)=\left[\alpha C_{t}^{1-\phi}+\beta \mathrm{CE}_{t}\left(\mathcal{U}_{t+1}\right)^{1-\phi}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\phi}}
$$

where $\phi>0$ and

$$
\mathrm{CE}_{t}\left(\mathcal{U}_{t+1}\right)=G^{-1}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[G\left(\mathcal{U}_{t+1}\right)\right]\right)
$$

for increasing and concave functions $G$.

- The more concave $G$ is, and the more uncertain the consumption stream is, the lower is the certainty equivalent.
- Most of the literature assumes $G(x)=\frac{1}{1-\gamma} x^{1-\gamma}$, where $\gamma$ measures risk aversion.
- It is not necessary to assume that the weights $\alpha, \beta$ add up to one. Important choice: $\beta=\mathrm{e}^{-\delta}, \alpha=1-\beta$.


## Epstein-Zin Utility: Certainty Equivalent

## Epstein-Zin Utility: Certainty Equivalent

## Epstein-Zin Utility: Deterministic Case

- If the consumption stream is deterministic, $\mathrm{CE}\left(\mathcal{U}_{t+1}\right)=\mathcal{U}_{t+1}$.

$$
\mathcal{U}_{t}\left(C_{t}, C_{t+1}, \ldots\right)=\left[(1-\beta) C_{t}^{1-\phi}+\beta \mathcal{U}_{t+1}^{1-\phi}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\phi}}
$$

- Iterating implies

$$
\mathcal{U}_{t}\left(C_{t}, C_{t+1}, \ldots\right)=\left[(1-\beta) \sum_{k=0}^{T} \beta^{k} C_{t+1}^{1-\phi}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\phi}}
$$

- For deterministic consumption stream, maximizing $\mathcal{U}_{t}$ is thus equivalent to maximize CRRA-utility

$$
\sum_{t=0}^{T} \beta^{t} C_{t}^{1-\phi}
$$

- $\psi=\frac{1}{\phi}$ is the elasticity of intertemporal substitution.


## Epstein-Zin Utility: Special Case $\gamma=\phi$

- In general, we obtain

$$
\mathcal{U}_{t}\left(C_{t}, C_{t+1}, \ldots\right)=\left[(1-\beta) C_{t}^{1-\phi}+\beta \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{U}_{t+1}^{1-\gamma}\right]^{\frac{1-\phi}{1-\gamma}}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\phi}}
$$

- If $\gamma=\phi$

$$
\mathcal{U}_{t}\left(C_{t}, C_{t+1}, \ldots\right)=\left[(1-\beta) C_{t}^{1-\phi}+\beta \mathbb{E}\left[\mathcal{U}_{t+1}^{1-\phi}\right]\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\phi}}
$$

- Maximizing $\mathcal{U}_{t}$ is thus equivalent to maximize CRRA-utility

$$
\sum_{t=0}^{T} \beta^{t} \mathbb{E}\left[C_{t}^{1-\phi}\right]
$$

- Risk aversion $\gamma$ and EIS are thus related via EIS $=\psi=1 / \gamma$.


## Epstein-Zin Utility: Resolution of Uncertainty

- Consider again the following consumption streams
(1) In each period $t=0,1, \ldots$, consumption is i.i.d. with

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(C_{t}=\bar{C}\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(C_{t}=\underline{C}\right)=0.5
$$

where $\bar{C}>\underline{C}$.
(2) In each period $t=1,2, \ldots, C_{t}^{\prime}=C_{0}$ where

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(C_{0}^{\prime}=\bar{C}\right)=\mathbb{P}\left(C_{0}^{\prime}=\underline{C}\right)=0.5
$$

- Consider the utility of consumption stream 2.
- There are only two possible states. In either state $i \in\{g, b\}$, the consumption stream is constant and $\mathcal{U}_{i, t}=\mathcal{U}_{i, t+1}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}_{i}^{1-\phi} & =(1-\beta) C_{i}^{1-\phi}+\beta\left(\mathcal{U}_{i}^{1-\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1-\phi}{1-\gamma}} \\
& =(1-\beta) C_{i}^{1-\phi}+\beta \mathcal{U}_{i}^{1-\phi} \Longleftrightarrow \mathcal{U}_{i}=C_{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Epstein-Zin Utility: Resolution of Uncertainty

- Therefore, utility of consumption stream $\mathbf{2}$ is

$$
\mathcal{U}_{i}^{1-\phi}=(1-\beta) C_{i}^{1-\phi}+\beta\left(\frac{1}{2} \bar{C}^{1-\gamma}+\frac{1}{2} \underline{C}^{1-\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1-\phi}{1-\gamma}}
$$

- Utility of consumption stream $\mathbf{1}$ is

$$
\mathcal{U}_{i}^{1-\phi}=(1-\beta) C_{i}^{1-\phi}+\beta\left(\frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\gamma}+\frac{1}{2} \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1-\phi}{1-\gamma}}
$$

- Consider the case $\phi>\gamma>1$. Compare the two certainty equivalents (Jensen's inequality):

$$
\left(\frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\gamma}+\frac{1}{2} \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1-\phi}{1-\gamma}} \geq \frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi}+\frac{1}{2} \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi}
$$

## Epstein-Zin Utility: Resolution of Uncertainty

- Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi} \geq(1-\beta) \underline{C}^{1-\phi}+\beta\left(\frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi}+\frac{1}{2} \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi}\right) \\
& \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi} \geq(1-\beta) \bar{C}^{1-\phi}+\beta\left(\frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi}+\frac{1}{2} \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Summing up and rearranging terms yield

$$
\frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi}+\frac{1}{2} \underline{\mathcal{U}}^{1-\phi} \geq \frac{1}{2} \bar{C}^{1-\phi}+\frac{1}{2} \underline{C}^{1-\phi}
$$

- or equivalently $\mathrm{CE}_{1} \geq \mathrm{CE}_{2}$.
- Therefore, if EIS $<1 / \gamma$, the agent prefers the first consumption stream and thus prefers late resolution of uncertainty.
- The opposite is true for EIS $>1 / \gamma$. For CRRA-utility (EIS $=1 / \gamma$ ), the agent is indifferent between early and late resolution of uncertainty.


## Epstein-Zin Utility: Summary

- Time-additive utility is too restrictive to distinguish between EIS and risk aversion or to model preferences for the resolution of uncertrainty.
- Certainty equivalent takes attitudes towards risk into account:
$\mathrm{CE}\left(\mathcal{U}_{t+1}\right)=G^{-1}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[G\left(\mathcal{U}_{t+1}\right)\right]\right)$, where $G(x)=\frac{1}{1-\gamma} x^{1-\gamma}$ where $\gamma$ is risk-aversion.
- Aggregator: CES-function with elasticity of substitution $\psi$.
- Utility Index:

$$
\mathcal{U}_{t}=\left[\alpha C_{t}^{1-1 / \psi}+\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathcal{U}_{t+1}^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1-1 / \psi}{1-\gamma}}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}}
$$

- Typically, $\alpha=(1-\beta)$ and $\beta=\mathrm{e}^{-\delta}$.
- CRRA is special case if $\gamma=\frac{1}{\psi}$.
- For deterministic consumption streams, $\gamma$ does not matter.


## Epstein-Zin Utility: Summary

- $\theta=\frac{1-\gamma}{1-1 / \psi}$ indicates preferences for resolution of uncertainty. If $\theta<1$ $(\theta>1)$
- the agent has preferences for early (late) resolution of uncertainty.
- The agent cares more (less) about uncertainty across states than about smoothing over time.
- CRRA, i.e., $\theta=1$ implies that the agent is indifferent between early and late resolution of uncertainty.
- Risk aversion $\gamma$ determines the optimal investment strategy.
- hedging motive dominates speculation motive
- investor takes a short position in good state variables
- EIS $\psi=1 / \phi$ determines the optimal consumption and saving behavior.
- If $\psi>1$
- variation over time: substitution effect dominates wealth effect
- when investment opportunities improve, the investor saves more and consumes less


## Evidence on RRA and EIS

- It is a common consensus that risk aversion is greater than 1.
- Evidence on EIS is mixed:
- Bansal and Yaron (2004) and Vissing-Joergensen and Attanasio (2003) combine equity and consumption data and estimate an EIS of 1.5 and a risk aversion in the range between 8 and 10 .
- Hall (1988), Campbell (1999), Vissing-Joergenen (2002) estimate an EIS well below one.
- Due to the lack of evidence and for reasons of tractability, many authors use unit EIS.
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## Optimization Problem

- Probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ with filtration $\mathcal{F}=\left(\mathcal{F}_{t}\right)_{t=0, \ldots, T}$ modeling information.
- Agent chooses consumption and investment at $t=0, \ldots, T$ to maximize the utility index $\mathcal{U}$.
- Portfolio holdings $\pi^{i}=\frac{\varphi^{i} S^{i}}{X}$ add up to one

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{n} \pi^{i}=1
$$

- Investor's wealth $X=X^{\varphi, C}$ evolves

$$
X_{t+1}=\left(X_{t}-C_{t}\right) R_{t+1}^{\pi}
$$

- where the portfolio return is given by

$$
R_{t+1}^{\pi}=\sum_{i=0}^{n} \pi_{t+1}^{i} R_{t+1}^{i}=R_{t+1}^{0}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \pi_{t+1}^{i}\left(R_{t+1}^{i}-R_{t+1}^{0}\right)
$$

## Optimization Problem

- The optimization problem is given by

$$
J_{t}=\max _{c, \pi}\left[\alpha C_{t}^{1-1 / \psi}+\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[J_{t+1}^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1-1 / \psi}{1-\gamma}}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}}
$$

- Conjecture: The indirect utility function is given by $J_{t}=h_{t} X_{t}$.
- $h_{t}$ captures dependence on time and state variables.
- The indirect utility function is thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
h_{t} X_{t} & =\left[\alpha C_{t}^{1-1 / \psi}+\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[h_{t+1}^{1-\gamma} X_{t+1}^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}} \\
& =\left[\alpha C_{t}^{1-1 / \psi}+\beta\left(X_{t}-C_{t}\right)^{1-1 / \psi}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(h_{t+1} R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}} \\
& =C_{t}\left[\alpha+\beta\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-1 / \psi}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(h_{t+1} R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## First Order Condition w.r.t. Consumption

- 1.) The FOC is given by

$$
\alpha C_{t}^{-1 / \psi}-\beta\left(X_{t}-C_{t}\right)^{-1 / \psi}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[h_{t+1}^{1-\gamma}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{1 / \theta}=0
$$

- and can be expressed as

$$
\alpha\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1 / \psi}=\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(h_{t+1} R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}
$$

- Remember the indirect utility function

$$
h_{t} X_{t}=C_{t}\left[\alpha+\beta\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-1 / \psi}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(h_{t+1} R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}}
$$

## Indirect Utility Function

- 2.) Substitute the FOC into $J_{t}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
h_{t} X_{t} & =C_{t}\left[\alpha+\alpha\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-1 / \psi}\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1 / \psi}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}} \\
& =C_{t}\left[\alpha+\alpha\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}} \\
& =C_{t}\left[\alpha\left(\frac{X_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Or equivalently

$$
\begin{aligned}
h_{t} & =\frac{C_{t}}{X_{t}}\left[\alpha\left(\frac{X_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}} \\
& =\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}}\left(\frac{C_{t}}{X_{t}}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Indirect Utility Function

- 3.) Express $J_{t}$ in terms of the consumption-wealth ratio. Consequently, the indirect utility function is given by

$$
J_{t}=h_{t} X_{t}=\alpha^{\frac{1}{1-1 / \psi}}\left(\frac{C_{t}}{X_{t}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\psi}} X_{t}
$$

- $h_{t}$ determines how much of the current wealth is used for consumption.
- For $\psi>1$, the indirect utility function is increasing in the wealth-consumption ratio
- assume that investment opportunities have improved
- $\psi>1$ implies: consumption today decreases, consumption tomorrow increases
- thus: wealth-consumption ratio today increases
- consequently: higher wealth-consumption ratio signals better investment opportunities and thus higher indirect utility
- The opposite is true for $\psi<1$.


## First-Order Condition for Consumption

- 4.) Substitute $h_{t+1}$ into the FOC for $C_{t}$ and simplify. Target:

Derive something that looks like an Euler condition.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1 / \psi} & =\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(h_{t+1} R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \\
& =\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\alpha^{\theta}\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{X_{t+1}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Remember the budget constraint

$$
X_{t+1}=\left(X_{t}-C_{t}\right) R_{t+1}^{\pi}
$$

- Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1 / \psi} & =\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\alpha^{\theta}\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{\left(X_{t}-C_{t}\right) R_{t+1}^{\pi}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{1-\gamma}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \\
& =\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\alpha^{\theta}\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{X_{t}-C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## First-Order Condition for Consumption

- Dividing by $\alpha$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{X_{t}-C_{t}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1 / \psi} & =\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{X_{t}-C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \\
& =\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(\frac{C_{t}}{X_{t}-C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \\
& =\beta\left(\frac{C_{t}}{X_{t}-C_{t}}\right)^{-1 / \psi}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1=\beta\left(\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta}\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \\
& 1=\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta}\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

## First-Order Condition for Investment I

- Remember the portfolio return

$$
R_{t+1}^{\pi}=R_{t+1}^{0}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \pi_{t+1}^{i}\left(R_{t+1}^{i}-R_{t+1}^{0}\right)
$$

- 5.) The FOC w.r.t. $\pi^{i}, i=1, \ldots, n$ is given by

$$
\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[h_{t+1}^{1-\gamma}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{-\gamma}\left(R_{t+1}^{i}-R_{t+1}^{0}\right)\right]=0
$$

- substituting the expression for $h_{t+1}$ and the budget constraint and some algebra yields

$$
\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta-1}\left(R_{t+1}^{i}-R_{t+1}^{0}\right)\right]=0
$$

## First-Order Condition for Investment II

- Multiplying by the portfolio weight $\pi_{t}^{i}$ and summing up over $i=0, \ldots, n$

$$
\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta-1}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}-R_{t+1}^{0}\right)\right]=0
$$

- Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta-1} R_{t+1}^{0}\right] & =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta}\right] \\
& =\beta^{-\theta}
\end{aligned}
$$

- where the second $=$ comes from optimal consumption. Hence, the Euler condition for asset 0 is:

$$
1=\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\beta^{\theta}\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta-1} R_{t+1}^{0}\right]
$$

## Pricing Kernel

- Let $\beta=\mathrm{e}^{-\delta}$ and repeat the same steps for the other assets:

$$
1=\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta}\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{1-\gamma-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta-1} R_{t+1}^{i}\right]
$$

for all assets $i=0, \ldots, n$.

- Hence we have proven:


## Pricing Kernel for EZ-Preferences

The pricing kernel for EZ-Preferences is given by

$$
M_{t, t+1}=\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta}\left(\frac{C_{t+1}}{C_{t}}\right)^{-\gamma+1-\theta}\left(R_{t+1}^{\pi}\right)^{\theta-1}
$$

where $(C, \pi)$ denotes the agent's optimal consumption and portfolio strategy.

## Log Pricing Kernel

- The log pricing kernel is thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
m_{t, t+1} & =\log M_{t, t+1} \\
& =-\delta \theta-\frac{\theta}{\psi} \Delta c_{t+1}+(\theta-1) r_{t+1}^{\pi}
\end{aligned}
$$

- where $\Delta c_{t+1}$ is log consumption growth and $r_{t+1}^{\pi}=\Delta x_{t+1}$ is the log return on optimal wealth
- Consumption claim / Optimal wealth is an asset paying consumption as dividends
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## Model Setup

- So far, consumption and investment have been determined endogenously.
- Now, we consider a representative agent with recursive preferences and optimal consumption growth $\Delta c$ which is exogenous.
- Simplest case
- No state variables
- Consumption growth is i.i.d. and follows a normal distribution

$$
\Delta c_{t+1}=\mu_{c}+\eta_{t+1}, \quad \eta_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_{c}^{2}\right)
$$

- Wealth growth is i.i.d. and follows a normal distribution

$$
\Delta x_{t+1}=\mu_{x}+\xi_{t+1}, \quad \xi_{t+1} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_{x}^{2}\right)
$$

## Pricing the Consumption Claim

- Wealth is the price of the consumption claim. Pricing equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{t} & =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[M_{t, t+1} X_{t+1}\right] \\
1 & =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{m_{t, t+1}+\Delta x_{t+1}}\right] \\
& =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta-\frac{\theta}{\psi} \Delta c_{t+1}+(\theta-1) \Delta x_{t+1}+\Delta x_{t+1}}\right] \\
& =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta-\frac{\theta}{\psi} \Delta c_{t+1}+\theta \Delta x_{t+1}}\right] \\
& =\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta-\frac{\theta}{\psi} \mu_{c}+\theta \mu_{x}+0.5 \frac{\theta^{2}}{\psi^{2}} \sigma_{c}^{2}+0.5 \theta^{2} \sigma_{x}^{2}-\frac{\theta^{2}}{\psi} \sigma_{c, x}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Consequently, the following condition must hold

$$
\mu_{x}=\delta+\frac{1}{\psi} \mu_{c}-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta}{\psi^{2}} \sigma_{c}^{2}-\frac{1}{2} \theta \sigma_{x}^{2}+\frac{\theta}{\psi} \sigma_{c, x} .
$$

## Risk-Free Rate

- The risk-free asset satisfies the following pricing equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 & =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{m_{t, t+1}+r_{t}^{f}}\right] \\
& =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta-\frac{\theta}{\psi} \Delta c_{t+1}+(\theta-1) \Delta x_{t+1}+r_{t}^{f}}\right] \\
& =\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta-\frac{\theta}{\psi} \mu_{c}+(\theta-1) \mu_{x}+0.5 \frac{\theta^{2}}{\psi^{2}} \sigma_{c}^{2}+0.5(\theta-1)^{2} \sigma_{x}^{2}-\frac{\theta(\theta-1)}{\psi} \sigma_{c, x}+r_{t}^{f}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Therefore

$$
r_{t}^{f}=\delta \theta+\frac{\theta}{\psi} \mu_{c}-(\theta-1) \mu_{x}-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta^{2}}{\psi^{2}} \sigma_{c}^{2}-\frac{1}{2}(\theta-1)^{2} \sigma_{x}^{2}+\frac{\theta(\theta-1)}{\psi} \sigma_{c, x}
$$

- Substituting $\mu_{x}$ implies (standard as in CRRA, new due to EZ)

$$
r_{t}^{f}=\delta+\frac{1}{\psi} \mu_{c}-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta}{\psi^{2}} \sigma_{c}^{2}-\frac{1}{2}(1-\theta) \sigma_{x}^{2}
$$

## Pricing of an Arbitrary Asset

- Consider an asset with return $r_{t+1}^{i} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{i}, \sigma_{i}^{2}\right)$.
- The pricing equation is

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 & =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{m_{t, t+1}+r_{t}^{i}}\right] \\
& =\mathbb{E}_{t}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\delta \theta-\frac{\theta}{\psi} \Delta c_{t+1}+(\theta-1) \Delta x_{t+1}+r_{t}^{i}}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

- Therefore, its expected return is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu_{i}=\delta \theta & +\frac{\theta}{\psi} \mu_{c}-(\theta-1) \mu_{x}-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta^{2}}{\psi^{2}} \sigma_{c}^{2}-\frac{1}{2}(\theta-1)^{2} \sigma_{x}^{2}-0.5 \sigma_{i}^{2} \\
& +\frac{\theta(\theta-1)}{\psi} \sigma_{c, x}+\frac{\theta}{\psi} \sigma_{i, c}-(\theta-1) \sigma_{i, x}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Substituting $\mu_{x}$ implies (standard as in CRRA, new due to EZ)

$$
\mathrm{rp}_{t}^{i}=\mu_{i}+0.5 \sigma_{i}^{2}-r_{t}^{f}=\frac{\theta}{\psi} \sigma_{i, c}+(1-\theta) \sigma_{i, x}
$$

## Applications of Recursive Utility

- So far we have shown how recursive utility allows to break the link between risk aversion and EIS.
- These preferences are very useful in asset pricing, portfolio choice, and are also prevalent in macroeconomics.
- They can also be used to address the other puzzles mentioned in the literature (Epstein and Zin (1989), Gilboa and Schmeidler (1989,1993), Ghirardato et al. (2004), Andries (2013))
- However
- EZ preferences do not resolve the equity premium puzzle (Weil, 1989)
- We need something more: long-run risk

