

A Continuity Refinement for Rational Expectations Solutions

Bennett T. McCallum

Carnegie Mellon University

and

National Bureau of Economic Research

Preliminary

July 1, 2010, revised September 5, 2011

ABSTRACT: Linear RE models often have more than one dynamically stable solution. Consider, however, the requirement that the solution coefficients must be continuous in the model's structural parameters. In particular, we require that the solutions should be continuous in the limit as those parameters, which express quantitatively the extent to which expectations affect endogenous variables, go to zero. The paper shows that under this condition there is, for a very broad class of linear RE models, only a single solution.

I am grateful to Seonghoon Cho, Robert Lucas, Albert Marcet, and Holger Sieg for helpful comments.

1. Introduction

It is very widely recognized that rational expectations (RE) models typically feature a multiplicity of solutions, i.e., processes for endogenous variables that satisfy all the model's equations and the orthogonality conditions for RE. Various "selection criteria" or "solution refinements" have been proposed over the years, by writers including Blanchard and Kahn (1980), Whiteman (1983), McCallum (1983), Evans (1986), Evans and Honkapohja (2001), Driskill (2006), and Cho and Moreno (2011). None of these proposals, however, has been generally accepted by researchers. The most prominent approach—that of Blanchard-Kahn and Whiteman—is to assume that if there is only a single solution that is dynamically stable then it will prevail; otherwise each stable solution represents a possible outcome. But it too has a number of critics, with various objections being voiced by the other writers listed above plus Bullard (2006), Bullard and Mitra (2002), and Cochrane (2007).¹

In monetary economics the Blanchard-Kahn-Whiteman "determinacy" approach is by far the most popular, partly due to the enormous influence of Woodford (2003, pp. 77-85, 90-96, 252-261). That the issues generated by solution multiplicities are central to the logical foundations of today's mainstream New-Keynesian approach to monetary policy analysis, and that they remain unsettled, is clearly evidenced by the recent exchange between Cochrane (2009) and McCallum (2009b).² The purpose of the present paper, consequently, is to propose a criterion or refinement, one that is based on continuity of solution coefficients with respect to structural parameters. The spirit of the

¹ It should be noted that the current revised version of Cochrane's NBER Working Paper 13409, a version of which has been published as Cochrane (2011), has eliminated most of the discussion that is quoted critically in McCallum (2009b).

² For a brief account, see Appendix C.

undertaking is that the objective in economic modelling is not primarily to conform to some particular definition of equilibrium, but to develop models that are plausible, in terms of their predictions about the consequences of alternative economic arrangements and policies. Throughout the present discussion, the analysis will be limited to linear models.

2. Basic Univariate Case

Consider the following univariate model, assumed to be structural:

$$(1) \quad y_t = aE_t y_{t+1} + cy_{t-1} \quad ac < 0.25 .$$

Here we have for simplicity omitted the constant term and exogenous shocks, which are inessential to the argument.³ The “fundamental” solutions are of the form

$$(2) \quad y_t = \phi y_{t-1}$$

so $E_t y_{t+1} = \phi^2 y_{t-1}$. Then substitution of the latter and (2) into (1) followed by undetermined-coefficient (UC) reasoning indicates that ϕ must satisfy

$$(3) \quad a\phi^2 - \phi + c = 0 .$$

Thus the fundamental solutions are given by (2) with the following two values for ϕ :

$$(4a) \quad \phi^{(-)} = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ac}}{2a}$$

$$(4b) \quad \phi^{(+)} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4ac}}{2a} .$$

The proposed refinement is that ϕ must be continuous in the parameters a and c .

In particular, ϕ must be continuous in ‘ a ’ over intervals of values that include $a = 0$. The rationale is that in this extreme case expectational variables are absent from the model so

³ With respect to exogenous variables, see Appendix A. Note that condition $ac < 1$ is to give real-valued solutions.

the solution is unambiguously $y_t = cy_{t-1}$. In addition, small values of ‘a’ reflect cases in which expectational effects are small, so they should imply solutions with ϕ close to c. Furthermore, continuity of solution parameters is necessary for impulse-response functions to be well behaved when exogenous variables are included in the model.⁴

Clearly, this requirement implies that the solution for model (1) is given by (2) with the limiting value, as $a \rightarrow 0$, of $\phi^{(-)} = c$, as in (4a), and not by $\phi^{(+)} = \pm\infty$, i.e., an infinite discontinuity.⁵ It is useful to note that (with $a \neq 0$) as the parameter $c \rightarrow 0$ we have $\phi^{(-)} \rightarrow 0$, whereas $\phi^{(+)} \rightarrow 1/a$. Thus the refinement leads to the same solution as the minimum state variable (MSV) solution suggested by McCallum (1983).

From the foregoing we see that the proposed refinement leads to a single solution when we are limiting consideration to fundamental solutions. But suppose we admit solutions of the general “sunspot” form

$$(5) \quad y_t = \phi_1 y_{t-1} + \phi_2 y_{t-2} + \phi_3 \xi_t,$$

where ξ_t is a stationary stochastic process with the property $E_t \xi_{t+1} = 0$.⁶ Then we have

$$(6) \quad E_t y_{t+1} = \phi_1 (\phi_1 y_{t-1} + \phi_2 y_{t-2} + \phi_3 \xi_t) + \phi_2 y_{t-1} + 0$$

and substitution into (1) leads to the following UC conditions:

$$(7a) \quad \phi_1 = a\phi_1^2 + a\phi_2 + c$$

$$(7b) \quad \phi_2 = a\phi_1\phi_2$$

$$(7c) \quad \phi_3 = a\phi_1\phi_3.$$

Now, the last two of these require that either $a\phi_1 = 1$ or that $\phi_2 = \phi_3 = 0$. In the latter case

⁴ Again see Appendix A.

⁵ The first of the two limits is obtained by means of l’Hôpital’s rule; see Appendix A.

⁶ It is the case that any RE solution to model (1) can be expressed in this form. See, e.g., Lubik and Schorfheide (2003).

we have the same fundamental solutions as before, but in the former case ϕ_3 can be any real number and then (7a) reduces to

$$(8) \quad \frac{1}{a} = \frac{1}{a} + a\phi_2 + c,$$

that is, to $\phi_2 = -c/a$, which is not contradicted by (7b). So there is a sunspot solution

$$(9) \quad y_t = \frac{1}{a}y_{t-1} - \frac{c}{a}y_{t-2} + \phi_3\xi_t$$

for any finite value of ϕ_3 . Clearly, however, the solution coefficients in (9) are not continuous at $a = 0$.⁷ So the proposed refinement rules out all solutions except (2) with ϕ given by $\phi^{(-)}$. Obviously, to be useful this result must extend to richer models. Even in the present context, however, it is interesting that there is only a single solution that satisfies the continuity principle. More significantly, perhaps, it is the same solution as the one that utilizes a “direction of causality” criterion as developed in McCallum (2009a), as well as the “minimum state variable” solution from McCallum (1983).⁸

One reader has asked why an analyst should be concerned with properties $\phi^{(-)}$ prevailing in the vicinity of $a = 0$ in cases in which it is likely that ‘a’ is not close to 0 (e.g., the model has $a = 0.95$). My response is that what we are concerned with at this methodological step is whether the solution with $\phi^{(-)}$ or the one with $\phi^{(+)}$ is appropriate for models of the specification at hand. Thus we ask whether the functions $\phi^{(-)}$ and $\phi^{(+)}$ imply plausible solutions for all values of ‘a’ and c that are permitted by the model (here, all values such that $ac < 0.25$). For example, how would the two solutions (functions of a

⁷ The coefficient on y_{t-1} in (9) implies that a tiny change in the expectational parameter a—say, from 0.01 to -0.01 —could have an implausibly large effect on the dynamic behavior of y_t .

⁸ The latter has been recognized as a notable concept by several writers, including Evans and Honkapohja (2001), Driskill (2006), and Cho and Moreno (2011).

and c) behave in the case that $a = 0.01$? And the case that $a = -0.01$? Clearly the solution $\phi^{(+)}$ says that ϕ would be huge and positive in one case but huge and negative in the other. It is implausible, I suggest, that this small change in model calibration could have such huge effects on the implied economic behavior of variable y_t , especially since the small absolute value of ‘a’ in both cases indicates that for prices or quantities the effects of expectations about the next-period values should have very little effect—as is, in fact, implied by the solution $\phi^{(-)}$. Methodologically, it is appropriate to decide which solution function is appropriate before turning to the specific parameter values relevant to the economy at hand, ‘a’ and c, for the applied step of forecasting or policy analysis.

Multivariate Extension

We now consider richer models of the form

$$(10) \quad y_t = A E_t y_{t+1} + C y_{t-1} + D u_t,$$

where y_t is a $m \times 1$ vector of endogenous variables, A and C are $m \times m$ matrices of real numbers, D is $m \times n$, and u_t is a $n \times 1$ vector of exogenous variables generated by a dynamically stable process

$$(11) \quad u_t = R u_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t,$$

with ε_t a white noise vector and R a matrix with all eigenvalues less than 1.0 in modulus. It will not be assumed that A is invertible. In this formulation the endogenous variables in y_t are jump variables whereas their lagged values in y_{t-1} are predetermined, that is, dependent only on lagged values of exogenous or endogenous variables. This specification is useful for various reasons, the main one with respect to the issue at hand being that it is very broad and inclusive. In particular, any model satisfying the formulations of King and Watson (1998) or Klein (2001), can (with the use of auxiliary

variables) be written in this form—and the form will accommodate any finite number of lags, expectational leads, and lags of expectational leads.⁹ In that context, we consider fundamental solutions to the model (10)-(11), which are of the form

$$(12) \quad y_t = \Omega y_{t-1} + \Gamma u_t.$$

in which Ω is required to be real.¹⁰ Then we have that $E_t y_{t+1} = \Omega(\Omega y_{t-1} + \Gamma u_t) + \Gamma R u_t$ and straightforward undetermined-coefficient reasoning shows that Ω and Γ must satisfy

$$(13) \quad A\Omega^2 - \Omega + C = O$$

$$(14) \quad \Gamma = A\Omega\Gamma + A\Gamma R + D.$$

For any given Ω , (14) yields a unique Γ generically,¹¹ but there may be many $m \times m$ real matrices that solve (13) for Ω . Accordingly, the following analysis centers around (13), setting $D = O$ for simplicity. For reference below, note that, from (13), each solution will satisfy

$$(15) \quad \Omega = (I - A\Omega)^{-1}C,$$

provided that the inverse exists.

In order to accommodate singular A matrices, we write

$$(16) \quad \begin{bmatrix} A & O \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Omega^2 \\ \Omega \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I & -C \\ I & O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Omega \\ I \end{bmatrix},$$

in which the first row reproduces the matrix quadratic (13). Let the $2m \times 2m$ matrices on the left and right sides of (16) be denoted \bar{A} and \bar{C} , respectively. Then we solve for the (generalized) eigenvalues of the matrix pencil $[\bar{C} - \lambda \bar{A}]$, alternatively termed the

⁹ See McCallum (2007, p. 1379).

¹⁰ A constant term can be defined by the coefficient on an exogenous variable that is a driftless random walk with innovation variance of zero.

¹¹ Generically, $I - R' \otimes [(I - A\Omega)^{-1}A]$ will be invertible, permitting solution for $\text{vec}(\Gamma)$ using the identity $\text{vec}(ABC) = [C' \otimes A] \text{vec}(B)$ that holds for any conformable A , B , and C .

(generalized) eigenvalues of \bar{C} with respect to \bar{A} (e.g., Uhlig (1999)). Specifically, the Schur generalized decomposition theorem establishes that there exist unitary matrices Q and Z of order $2m \times 2m$ such that $Q\bar{C}Z = T$ and $Q\bar{A}Z = S$ with T and S triangular.¹²

Then eigenvalues of the matrix pencil $[\bar{C} - \lambda\bar{A}]$ are defined as t_{ii}/s_{ii} . Some of these eigenvalues may be “infinite,” in the sense that some s_{ii} may equal zero. This will be the case, indeed, whenever A and therefore \bar{A} are of less than full rank since then S is also singular. All of the foregoing is true for any ordering of the eigenvalues and associated columns of Z (and rows of Q). For the moment, let us temporarily focus on the arrangement that places the t_{ii}/s_{ii} in order of decreasing modulus, which will be referred to as the MOD ordering.¹³

To begin the analysis, premultiply (16) by Q . Since $Q\bar{A} = SH$ and $Q\bar{C} = TH$, where $H \equiv Z^{-1}$, the resulting equation can be written as

$$(17) \quad \begin{bmatrix} S_{11} & O \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{21} & H_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Omega^2 \\ \Omega \\ I \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} T_{11} & O \\ T_{21} & T_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H_{11} & H_{12} \\ H_{21} & H_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Omega \\ I \end{bmatrix}.$$

The first row of (17) reduces to

$$(18) \quad S_{11}(H_{11}\Omega + H_{12})\Omega = T_{11}(H_{11}\Omega + H_{12}).$$

Then if H_{11} is invertible the latter can be used to solve for Ω , which is $m \times m$, as

$$(19) \quad \Omega = -H_{11}^{-1}H_{12} = -H_{11}^{-1}(-H_{11}Z_{12}Z_{22}^{-1}) = Z_{12}Z_{22}^{-1},$$

where the second equality uses the upper right-hand submatrix of the identity $HZ = I$,

¹² Provided only that there exists some λ for which $\det[\bar{C} - \lambda\bar{A}] \neq 0$. See Klein (2000) or Golub and Van Loan (1996).

¹³ The discussion proceeds as if none of the t_{ii}/s_{ii} equals 1.0 exactly. If one does, the model can be adjusted, by multiplying some relevant coefficient by (e.g.) 0.9999 or eliminating the variable in favor of its first difference.

provided that H_{11} is invertible, which we assume without significant loss of generality.¹⁴

As mentioned above, there are many fundamental solutions Ω to (13). These correspond to the $(2m)!/(m!)^2$ different combinations of the $2m$ eigenvalues taken m at a time, which result in different groupings of the columns of Z and therefore different compositions of the submatrices Z_{12} and Z_{22} . Here, with the eigenvalues t_{ii}/s_{ii} temporarily arranged in order of decreasing modulus, the diagonal elements of S_{22} will all be non-zero provided that S has at least m non-zero eigenvalues, which we assume to be the case.¹⁵ For any solution under consideration to be dynamically stable, all the eigenvalues of Ω must of course be smaller than 1.0 in modulus. To evaluate them in terms of the ratios t_{ii}/s_{ii} , note that with Ω given by (19), the second row of (17) becomes

$$(20) \quad S_{22}(H_{21}\Omega + H_{22})\Omega = T_{22}(H_{21}\Omega + H_{22}),$$

or

$$(21) \quad S_{22}(H_{22} - H_{21}H_{11}^{-1}H_{12})\Omega = T_{22}(H_{22} - H_{21}H_{11}^{-1}H_{12}).$$

The latter, by virtue of the lower right-hand submatrix of $HZ = I$, is equivalent to

$$(22) \quad S_{22}Z_{22}^{-1}\Omega = T_{22}Z_{22}^{-1}.$$

Therefore we have the result

$$(23) \quad \Omega = Z_{22}S_{22}^{-1}T_{22}Z_{22}^{-1},$$

so Ω has the same eigenvalues as $S_{22}^{-1}T_{22}$. The latter is triangular, moreover, so the relevant eigenvalues are (given the MOD ordering) the m smallest of the $2m$ ratios t_{ii}/s_{ii} .

For dynamic stability, the modulus of each of these ratios must then be less than 1. (In

¹⁴ This invertibility condition, also required by King and Watson (1998) and Klein (2000), obtains except for degenerate special cases of (1) that can be solved by simpler methods than considered here. Note that the invertibility of H_{11} implies the invertibility of Z_{22} , given that H and Z are unitary.

¹⁵ It is obvious that \bar{A} has at least m nonzero eigenvalues so, with Q and Z unitary, S must have rank of at least m . This is not sufficient for S to have at least m nonzero eigenvalues, however; hence the assumption.

many cases, some of the m smallest moduli will equal zero.)

Next we consider alternative fundamental solutions, which will involve departures from the MOD ordering. There are $(2m)!/(m!)^2$ different groupings of system eigenvalues (and associated eigenvectors) that include two groups of m each. It is well known (and is shown in (23)) that m of the system eigenvalues will be the eigenvalues of Ω . The other half of the system eigenvalues are those of the matrix F^{-1} , where $F = (I - A\Omega)^{-1}A$.¹⁶ According to our refinement, we now select the solution for which $\Omega \rightarrow C$ as $A \rightarrow O$. By continuity of eigenvalues with respect to structural parameters (Horn and Johnson, 1985, pp. 539-540), this is the same solution as the MSV solution for which $\Omega \rightarrow O$ as $C \rightarrow O$.¹⁷ It can be identified operationally by replacing C by κC in all equations and then letting the scalar κ decrease continuously from 1 to 0. Examination of a plot or table of the eigenvalues for various κ values will indicate which solution—i.e., which Ω —has this property. [This procedure is mentioned in McCallum (2004) and illustrated in McCallum (2009a).] Let us use Ω_0 to denote the Ω matrix for this particular solution, with the related F matrix being $F_0 = (I - A\Omega_0)^{-1}A$. Furthermore, we observe crucially that any other fundamental solution will have one or more of the eigenvalues of Ω approaching $\pm\infty$ as $A \rightarrow O$. See Appendix B. Thus we have developed the multivariate extension of the argument for fundamentals solutions.

It is important to note that the Ω_0, F_0 solution does not necessarily coincide with the MOD solution. In most cases these two solutions will coincide, but in some cases they differ. This fact, which is mentioned by Uhlig (1999, p. 46), is illustrated in

¹⁶ This result, which is somewhat tedious, is developed in McCallum (2007, pp. 1382-3).

¹⁷ This generalization of the univariate case regarding (4a) and (4b) is implied by the analysis on p. 165 of McCallum (1983), with extension to singular A matrices by noting that they imply eigenvalues of F equal to zero. For details, see Appendix B.

McCallum (2004) and (2009a).¹⁸

Continuing the analysis, sunspot solutions can be considered for model (10)(11) by looking for solutions of the form

$$(24) \quad y_t = \Omega y_{t-1} + \Phi_1 y_{t-2} + \Phi_2 \xi_t$$

where I have used $D = O$ but added y_{t-2} and the $m \times 1$ sunspot vector ξ_t that has the property $E_{t-1} \xi_t = 0$ for all t . Then in this case we have

$$(25) \quad E_t y_{t+1} = \Omega(\Omega y_{t-1} + \Phi_1 y_{t-2} + \Phi_2 \xi_t) + \Phi_1 y_{t-1}$$

and substitution into (10) gives

$$(26) \quad \Omega y_{t-1} + \Phi_1 y_{t-2} + \Phi_2 \xi_t = A[\Omega(\Omega y_{t-1} + \Phi_1 y_{t-2} + \Phi_2 \xi_t) + \Phi_1 y_{t-1}] + C y_{t-1}.$$

Consequently, the implied undetermined coefficient equations are

$$(27a) \quad \Omega = A\Omega^2 + C + A\Phi_1$$

$$(27b) \quad (I - A\Omega)\Phi_1 = O$$

$$(27c) \quad (I - A\Omega)\Phi_2 = O.$$

Now the argument is an extension of that for the univariate case of Section 3. Equations (27b) and (27c) imply that if $(I - A\Omega)$ is nonsingular, then $\Phi_1 = O$, $\Phi_2 = O$, and we again have the solution with $\Omega = \Omega_0$ with no sunspot terms. If on the other hand $(I - A\Omega)$ is singular, (27) admits an infinity of sunspot solutions. But in this case (27b) implies $\det(\Phi_1) = \det(A)\det(\Omega)\det(\Phi_1)$ or $\det(\Omega) = 1/\det(A)$, so as $A \rightarrow 0$ we have $\det(\Omega) \rightarrow \infty$ which implies a discontinuity in the solution for y_t . Therefore, the sunspot solutions do not satisfy our refinement criterion.

¹⁸ Uhlig's objection that "...uniqueness is lost once two or more such paths cross each other ..." is handled by presuming that the slopes of the paths are continuous.

4. Conclusion

We conclude with a very brief description of the paper's argument. Linear RE models typically have more than one solution and fairly often possess more than one dynamically stable solution. Consider, however, the requirement that the solution coefficients should be continuous in the model's structural parameters. In particular, we require that the solution coefficients should be continuous in the limit as certain parameters, which express the extent to which expectations affect endogenous variables, go to zero. (If expectations enter the structural equations very weakly, they should not have much effect on the solution expressions.) The paper shows that, for a very broad class of linear RE models,¹⁹ this requirement is satisfied by only a single solution.

¹⁹ The class is one that permits any finite (i) number of endogenous variables, (ii) lag length, (iii) expectational lead length, and (iv) lag length for expectational leads.

Appendix A

The purpose here is to illustrate that it is sufficient for this paper's argument to examine cases in which exogenous variables are not explicitly included. For the simplest case, suppose that we extend equation (1) to include an exogenous shock z_t that is generated by a stable first-order autoregressive process with coefficient ρ . Then we have

$$(A-1) \quad y_t = aE_t y_{t+1} + cy_{t-1} + dz_t$$

$$(A-2) \quad z_t = \rho z_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$$

where ε_t is white noise. Then fundamental solutions are of the form

$$(A-3) \quad y_t = \phi_1 y_{t-1} + \phi_2 z_t.$$

Consequently, $E_t y_{t+1} = \phi_1^2 y_{t-1} + (\phi_1 + \rho)\phi_2 z_t$. Using the latter and (A-3) in (A-1) we have

$$(A-4) \quad \phi_1 y_{t-1} + \phi_2 z_t = a[\phi_1^2 y_{t-1} + \phi_2(\phi_1 + \rho)z_t] + cy_{t-1} + dz_t$$

so equating coefficients yields

$$(A-5) \quad \phi_1 = a\phi_1^2 + c$$

$$(A-6) \quad \phi_2 = a\phi_2(\phi_1 + \rho) + d.$$

As in Section 2, therefore, from (A-5) we have

$$(A-7a) \quad \phi_1^{(-)} = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ac}}{2a}$$

$$(A-7b) \quad \phi_1^{(+)} = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4ac}}{2a}.$$

Thus as $a \rightarrow 0$ we have $\phi_1^{(-)} \rightarrow c$ and $\phi_1^{(+)} \rightarrow \pm\infty$ as with equations (4a) and (4b).²⁰

Continuing, for $\phi_2^{(-)}$ we have $\phi_2^{(-)}[1 - a\phi_1^{(-)} - a\rho] = d$ or $\phi_2^{(-)} = d/[1 - a\phi_1^{(-)} - a\rho]$

²⁰ In the case of (A-7a), both numerator and denominator approach zero as a approaches zero, but their derivatives approach $2c$ and 2 respectively, so L'Hospital's rule gives a limit of c .

so that $\phi_2^{(-)} = \frac{d}{1 - \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4ac}}{2} - a\rho}$ and

$$(A-8) \quad \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \phi_2^{(-)} = \frac{d}{1 - \frac{1-1}{2} - 0} = d$$

$$\text{Whereas} \quad \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \phi_2^{(+)} = \frac{d}{1 - \frac{1+1}{2} - 0} = \pm\infty$$

Next, the non-fundamental solutions—permitting sunspots—are of form

$$(A-9) \quad y_t = \phi_1 y_{t-1} + \phi_2 z_t + \phi_3 z_{t-1} + \phi_4 \xi_t$$

for any ξ_t with $E_{t-1} \xi_t = 0$. Then $E_t y_{t+1} = \phi_1 (\phi_1 y_{t-1} + \phi_2 z_t + \phi_3 z_{t-1} + \phi_4 \xi_t) + \phi_2 \rho z_t + \phi_3 z_t + 0$

whereby substitution into (A-1) plus equating of coefficients yields

$$(A-10) \quad \phi_1 = a\phi_1^2$$

$$(A-11) \quad \phi_2 = d + a\phi_1\phi_2 + a\rho\phi_2 + a\phi_1\phi_3$$

$$(A-12) \quad \phi_3 = a\phi_1\phi_3$$

$$(A-13) \quad \phi_4 = a\phi_1\phi_4$$

Thus we have either $\phi_1 = \phi_3 = \phi_4 = 0$ in which case $\phi_2 = d / (1 - a\rho)$ and yields the well-

behaved MSV solution (2) with (4a); or else we have $\phi_1 = 1/a$ in which case

$\phi_2 = -(d + \phi_3) / a\rho$ and thus for any arbitrary ϕ_3 (except the zero-measure value of $-d$)

there is an infinite discontinuity in the limit as $a \rightarrow 0$. Accordingly, permitting sunspot solutions does not alter the conclusion that only the MSV solution avoids the implication of an infinite discontinuity in the implied impulse response function.

Appendix B

The object here is to show that the solution (12) to model (10)(11) for which $\Omega \rightarrow C$ as $A \rightarrow O$ is the same solution as the one for which $\Omega \rightarrow O$ as $C \rightarrow O$. Let us begin with the case in which A is nonsingular. Then we can express the crucial matrix quadratic (13) as

$$(B-1) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Omega^2 \\ \Omega \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A^{-1} & -A^{-1}C \\ I & O \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Omega \\ I \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let M denote the square matrix of order $2m \times 2m$. Clearly its eigenvalues are the numbers denoted λ that satisfy

$$(B-2) \quad \det(M - \lambda I) = \det \begin{bmatrix} A^{-1} - \lambda I & -A^{-1}C \\ I & O - \lambda I \end{bmatrix} = 0.$$

An identity for partitioned matrices reported by Johnston (1972, eqn. 4-37, p. 95) is as

follows. If the matrix $B = \begin{bmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{bmatrix}$ with B_{11} nonsingular, then

$$(B-3) \quad \det(B) = \det(B_{11}) \det[B_{22} - B_{21}B_{11}^{-1}B_{12}].$$

The latter then implies that

$$(B-4) \quad \det(M - \lambda I) = \det(A^{-1} - \lambda I) \det[-\lambda I + (A^{-1} - \lambda I)^{-1} A^{-1}C] = 0.$$

Thus we see, from the latter, that half of the eigenvalues of M are the eigenvalues of A^{-1} , while the other half, the eigenvalues of Ω , depend upon both A and C (see McCallum 2007, pp. 1382-3). Then by further inspection of (B-4) we see that when $C = O$, the second half of the λ s are all equal to 0. Thus the single solution given by the particular arrangement for which all eigenvalues of Ω approach zeros as $C \rightarrow O$, simultaneously has the other half of the eigenvalues of M approaching the eigenvalues of A^{-1} .

Now consider the same arrangement but with C held fixed and consider the implication of $A \rightarrow O$. Then the eigenvalues that approached zeros before now approach the eigenvalues of C while the eigenvalues that approached those of A^{-1} before now approach $\pm \infty$. This establishes the result at issue for the case in which A is nonsingular. For any other solution—any other arrangement—as $A \rightarrow O$ we would have a different Ω and one or more of its eigenvalues would approach $\pm \infty$.

When instead A is singular, similar results obtain but with the matrix A being replaced in the argument by the matrix $F = (I - A\Omega)^{-1}A$.²¹ The system eigenvalues then include those of F^{-1} and Ω , instead of those of A^{-1} and Ω . As $C \rightarrow O$, we have the m eigenvalues of Ω approaching zeros and the other m eigenvalues approaching those of F^{-1} . Then with the same arrangement, i.e., the solution such that the eigenvalues of Ω approach zeros as we $C \rightarrow O$, we find that as $A \rightarrow O$ the eigenvalues of F^{-1} each approach $\pm \infty$.

²¹ Again, see McCallum (2007, pp. 1381-1383) for this result.

Appendix C

In recent monetary policy analysis, it has been common practice to view models as possessing *determinacy* if they feature a single RE solution that is dynamically stable. Cochrane (2007) has emphasized that this single-stable-solution (SSS) condition is not sufficient as a criterion of determinacy, however, because in typical New Keynesian models, if the Taylor Principle is satisfied, there exists a dynamically explosive solution that is not ruled out by any transversality condition and accordingly can be eliminated only by an arbitrary dictum. McCallum (2009b) agrees with this specific proposition, but shows that in these models it is typically the case that the explosive solutions in question are not least-squares learnable. Further, he argues that such learnability should be considered a necessary condition for a solution to be regarded as a model's prediction of the depicted economy's behavior since it amounts to a *feasibility* condition that pertains to quantitative information available to individual agents.²² Consequently, he argues that, despite Cochrane's important point, the solution typically utilized in recent policy analysis is in many (but not all) cases the appropriate one. Cochrane's (2009) response contends that there are three weaknesses in McCallum's argument. McCallum's (2009c) rejoinder claims that in all three cases Cochrane's argument is analytically incorrect or inapplicable, as follows. First, the presence of unobserved exogenous shocks does not, in contrast to Cochrane's presumption, overturn learnability conclusions.²³ Second, Cochrane's argument about "hyperinflationary threats" is not consistent with the analytical setting in which the argument is normally conducted, namely, one in which the central bank is following a specified policy rule for an interest-rate instrument. Third, the

²² See the discussion in McCallum (2011).

²³ This is established in McCallum (2009b) by drawing on results of Evans and Honkapohja (1998).

point that a particular structural parameter, concerning the central bank's policy behavior, is not identifiable by an econometrician studying the economy-plus-policy process is not relevant to the learning process for the private-sector agents in the model. Their learning concerns forecasting of inflation and output in the model economy from a reduced form perspective; the identification of a structural parameter by these agents is not necessary for this step.

In his revised WP13409 and (2011), Cochrane emphasizes a distinct argument to the effect that the reasoning utilized by Clarida, Gali, and Gertler (2000), among others, who contend that empirical estimates show that the Taylor Principle was not satisfied in the United States during the "Great Inflation" period of the 1970s, is invalid because the crucial policy parameter is not identified. I agree with this significant point as applied to the particular studies discussed by Cochrane, but withhold judgment on the universality of this non-identification.

References

- Blanchard, O.J., and C.M. Kahn. "The Solution of Linear Difference Models Under Rational Expectations," *Econometrica* 48, 1980, 1305-1311.
- Bullard, J.B. "The Learnability Criterion and Monetary Policy," *Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis Review* 88(3), 2006, 203-217.
- Bullard, J.B., and K. Mitra, "Learning About Monetary Policy Rules," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49, 2002, 1105-1129.
- Cho, S., and Moreno, A. "The Forward Method as a Solution Refinement in Rational Expectations Models," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 35, 2011, 257-272.
- Cochrane, J. H., "Inflation Determination with Taylor Rules: A Critical Review." NBER Working Paper 13409, 2007.
- Cochrane, J.H., "Can Learnability Save New-Keynesian Models?" *Journal of Monetary Economics* 56, 2009, 1109-1103.
- Cochrane, J.H., "Determinacy and Identifiability in New Keynesian Models," *Journal of Political Economy* 2011.
- Driskill, R. "Multiple Equilibria in Dynamic Rational Expectations Models: A Critical Review," *European Economic Review* 50, 2006, 171-210.
- Evans, G.W., "Selection Criteria for Models with Non-uniqueness," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 18, 1986, 147-157.
- Evans, G.W., and S. Honkapohja. *Learning and Expectations in Macroeconomics*. Princeton Univ. Press, 2001.
- Golub, G.H., and C.F. VanLoan. *Matrix Computations*, 3rd ed. Johns Hopkins

- University Press, 1996.
- Horn, R.A., and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Johnston, J. *Econometric Methods*, 2nd ed. McCraw-Hill, 1972.
- King, R.G., and M.W. Watson. "The Solution of Singular Linear Difference Systems Under Rational Expectations," *International Economic Review* 39, 1998, 1015-26.
- Klein, P. "Using the Generalized Schur Form to Solve a Multivariate Linear Rational Expectations Model," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 24, 2000, 1405-1423.
- Lubik, T.A., and F. Schorfheide. "Computing Sunspot Equilibria in Linear Rational Expectations Models," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 28, 2003, 273-285.
- McCallum, B.T. "On Nonuniqueness in Linear Rational Expectations Models: An Attempt at Perspective," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 11, 1983, 139-168.
- _____. "On the Relationship Between Determinate and MSV Solutions in Linear RE Models," *Economics Letters* 84, 2004, 55-60.
- _____. "E-stability vis-a-vis Determinacy Results for a Broad Class of Linear Rational Expectations Models," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 31, 2007, 1376-1391.
- _____. "Causality, Structure, and the Uniqueness of Rational Expectations Equilibria," NBER Working Paper 15234, August 2009(a). Also *Manchester School* 79, 2011, 551-566.
- _____. "Inflation Determination with Taylor rules: Is New-Keynesian Analysis

- Critically Flawed?" *Journal of Monetary Economics* 56, 2009(b), 1101-1108.
- _____. "Rejoinder to Cochrane," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 56, 2009(c), 1114-1115.
- _____. "Issues Concerning Determinacy, Learnability, Plausibility, and the Role of Money in New Keynesian Models," working paper, July 2011.
- Uhlig, H. "A Toolkit for Analyzing Nonlinear Dynamic Stochastic Models Easily," in *Computational Methods for the Study of Dynamic Economies*, R. Marimon and A. Scott, eds. Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Whiteman, C., *Linear Rational Expectations Models: A User's Guide*. University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- Woodford, M., *Interest and Prices: Foundations for a Theory of Monetary Policy*. Princeton University Press, 2003.