

Revisiting Black-Scholes Equation

D. F. Wang[†]

University of Waterloo

(April, 1998)

Abstract

In common finance literature, Black-Scholes partial differential equation of option pricing is usually derived with no-arbitrage principle. Considering an asset market, Merton applied the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman techniques of his continuous-time consumption-portfolio problem, deriving general equilibrium relationships among the securities in the asset market. In special case where the interest rate is constant, he rederived the Black-Scholes partial differential equation from the general equilibrium asset market. In this work, I follow Cox-Ingersoll-Ross formulation to consider an economy which includes (1) uncertain production processes, and (2) the random technology change. Assuming a random production stochastic process of constant drift and variance, and assuming a random technology change to follow a log normal process, the equilibrium point of this economy will lead to the Black-Scholes partial differential equation for option pricing.

PACS number:

I. INTRODUCTION

There are two important concepts in theories of asset pricing in modern finance. The first is the principle of no arbitrage, and the second one is the idea of general equilibrium [1,2,4]. In financial world, one is not expected to gain a riskless free lunch out of nothing. This is the basic idea of no arbitrage. Mathematically, in a complete financial market, no arbitrage implies the existence of a unique risk neutral probability measure Q , and vice versa. In this system, any contingent claim discounted by the bank account process will form a martingale in the probability space of risk neutral measure (Ω, F, Q) , that is, $X_t/B_t = E^Q(X_T/B_T|F_t)$, with $t < T$ and F_t as filtration. The principle of no-arbitrage has considerable applications in asset pricing, and many useful asset pricing models are derived using this idea. Within this approach, one does not have to know the investor's risk preferences explicitly. Intuitively, one can understand why this principle should hold in pricing assets. Imagine a financial world in which the prices of some assets are such that some riskless gain can be obtained by investors of zero initial wealth. Investors will rush to the position to take advantage of this arbitrage opportunity, and a dynamic process in which the asset prices will adjust themselves will take place, so that the arbitrage opportunity no longer exists. In other words, the asset prices are determined by the condition that no arbitrage exists. This principle is in analogy to the physics idea that no machine can produce non-zero energy out of nothing.

Apart from this no-arbitrage concept, the second important approach is application of the concept of general equilibrium. Within the framework, we consider an economy of homogeneous individuals, so that a representative agent's economical behavior is studied. Contingent claims are sold and bought by the representative agent in the economy. When the equilibrium is attained, the representative agent should maximize his/her expected utility function, and he/she will have no more intention to trade contingent claims. Such equilibrium condition will determine the prices of the contingent claims in terms of the fundamental parameters which specify the economy. Theoretically, this approach relates the asset prices to the fundamentals of the economy in which the agent is living. In academic sense, this

appears to be an approach more fundamental than the first one of applying no-arbitrage argument. Within the framework of general equilibrium, one starts with the risk preferences of the representative agent.

Besides considerable numerical efforts in asset pricing, such as the well-known MC method of pricing derivatives pioneered by Boyle [3], theoretical and analytical studies for closed form of pricing formula of derivatives have been of considerable interests to both academic researchers and practioners. The option pricing model of Black-Scholes has been very popular, since it was developed by Black and Scholes [6]. Computationally, the model is simple to handle, and the closed forms of European call and put options can be obtained explicitly. In common financial literature, the Black-Scholes partial differential equation is derived using the concept of no-arbitrage [7]. By introducing a continuously rebalanced risk-free portfolio consisting of an option and underlying stocks, the return of such a portfolio should match the return on risk-free bonds, in absence of arbitrage. This will give rise to the partial differential equation satisfied by the option price [8]. An alternative way of using no-arbitrage principle is to replicate an option's return stream by continuously rebalancing a self-financing portfolio containing stocks and bonds.

It is nature to ask whether one can derive the Black-Scholes partial differential equation, instead of using the previous no-arbitrage approach, but using the principle of general equilibrium. Merton applied the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman technique of his continuous-time consumption-portfolio problem [9,10] to an asset market, and he derived general equilibrium relationships among the securities in the asset market [5]. In the special case where the interest rate is constant, he rederived the Black-Scholes partial differential equation from the equilibrium asset market [5]. In this work, I follow Cox-Ingersoll-Ross formulation [11,12] to consider an economy which includes (1) uncertain production processes, and (2) random technology change. Assuming a random production stochastic process of constant drift and variance, and for the random technology change following a log normal process, it is shown that the equilibrium point of this economy will lead to the Black-Scholes partial differential equation for option pricing.

II. GENERAL EQUILIBRIUM

In this section, we use the formalism of the works of Cox, Ingersoll and Ross [11,12]. They considered a general equilibrium problem of an agent investing and consuming in a continuous time fashion, where uncertain production and a random technology change are taken into account. In a similar way as in Merton's problem [4,5,9,10], they derived the optimal consumption-investment control equation with Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman technique. Assume that $a_i(s)W(s)$ is the investment in the i -th production plan, and $b_i(s)W(s)$ the investment in the i -th contingent claim. At the general equilibrium, the market clearing conditions require that $b_i = 0$ for all i , and $\sum_i a_i = 1$ [11,12]. CIR used this general equilibrium concept to propose their well-known interest rate model. The price of the corresponding zero-coupon bond is shown to satisfy a partial differential equation.

On the other hand, we know that within the framework of Black-Scholes, a deterministic interest rate r is used in the derivation based on no-arbitrage principle. Therefore, our idea is to find what type of uncertain production process and random technology change will give rise to an economy whose general equilibrium point is a constant interest rate. For such economy, the price of any contingent claim will satisfy the Black-Schole partial differential equation.

Let us first review the work of Cox, Ingersoll and Ross and we follow the notations used by them [11,12]. Suppose that the utility function of the representative agent is additive. Consider the following value function:

$$K(v, W(t), Y(t), t) = E\left[\int_t^T U(v(s), Y(s), s)ds\right], \quad (2.1)$$

where $v(t)$ is an admissible feedback control, and the expectation is conditional on that information before or equal to time t is known to the investor. U is the van-Neumann-Morganstern utility function. The control is $v = (a(s)W(s), b(s)W(s), C(s))$ with $C(s)$ as the consumption rate. Y is the state variable representing the uncertain technology. The indirect utility function $J(W, Y, t)$ is $\max K(v, W(t), Y(t), t)$ among all possible controls

$v \in V$, as defined in the works of CIR. The indirect utility function can be easily shown to be an increasing and concave function of the current wealth.

In this economy, the production process of the system is defined to be

$$d\eta(t) = I_\eta \alpha(Y, t)dt + I_\eta G(Y, t)d\omega(t), \quad (2.2)$$

and random technology change Y takes the following form

$$dY(t) = \mu(Y, t)dt + S(Y, t)d\omega(t), \quad (2.3)$$

where $\omega(t)$ is a standard $(n + k)$ -dimensional Brownian motion. Given the control (aW, bW, C) , the budget constrain of the agent is given by

$$dW = \left[\sum_{i=1}^n a_i W (\alpha_i - r) + \sum_{i=1}^k b_i W (\beta_i - r) + rW - C \right] dt + \sum_{i=1}^n a_i W \sum_{j=1}^{n+k} (g_{ij} d\omega_j) + W \sum_{i=1}^k b_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n+k} h_{ij} d\omega_j \right), \quad (2.4)$$

The optimal control is given by the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation, and we therefore have the following first order conditions:

$$\Psi_C = U_C - J_W \leq 0, \quad (2.5)$$

$$C\Psi_C = 0, \quad (2.6)$$

$$\Psi_a = [\alpha - r1]W J_W + [GG'a + GH'b]W^2 J_{WW} + GS'W J_{WY} \leq 0 \quad (2.7)$$

$$a'\Psi_a = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

$$\Psi_b = [\beta - r1]W J_W + [HG'a + HH'b]W^2 J_{WW} + HS'W J_{WY} = 0, \quad (2.9)$$

where the subscripts denote partial derivatives. It is important to note that we must have $C(t) \geq 0$ and $W(t) \geq 0$ to satisfy feasibility conditions [13,4].

The market clearing conditions require that $\sum_i a_i(s) = 1$ and $b_i(s) = 0, \forall i$ for the system. These conditions combined with the above optimal control equations will enable us to find the corresponding production investment a^* and the optimal consumption C^* . The interest rate, as a function of the wealth $W(s)$, the state variable $Y(s)$ and time s , was found to be:

$$r(W, Y, t) = (a^*)' \alpha - \left(\frac{-J_{WW}}{J_W} \right) \left(\frac{\text{var}W}{W} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{-J_{WY_i}}{J_W} \frac{\text{Cov}(W, Y_i)}{W}. \quad (2.10)$$

At the point of general equilibrium, the price of any contingent claim $F(W, Y, t)$ should satisfy the following partial differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2}(\text{var}W)F_{WW} + \sum_{i=1}^k \text{Cov}(W, Y_i)F_{WY_i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k \text{Cov}(Y_i, Y_j)F_{Y_i Y_j} + [r(W, Y, t)W - C^*(W, Y, t)]F_W \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^k F_{Y_i} [\mu_i - \left(\frac{-J_{WW}}{J_W} \text{Cov}(W, Y_i) \right) - \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{-J_{WY_i}}{J_W} \text{Cov}(Y_i, Y_j)] + F_t - r(W, Y, t)F + \delta(W, Y, t) = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

This last equation is the Theorem 3 proved in the paper of Cox-Ingersoll-Ross [11]. It is the fundamental valuation equation for the contingent claims.

Now, let us assume that the risk preference of the consumer-investor is Bernoulli logarithmic utility function, $U(C(s), Y(s), s) = e^{-\rho t} \ln C(s)$, with some time discount prefactor. This risk preference was discussed in previous works [9,10]. In the following, I use the scaling argument of physics-type to rederive some functional form of the indirect utility function, consumption rate, and so on [14]. Consider a scaling transformation defined below:

$$\begin{aligned} W(s) & \rightarrow AW(s) \\ C(s) & \rightarrow AC(s) \\ a(s) & \rightarrow a(s) \\ b(s) & \rightarrow b(s) \\ r(s) & \rightarrow r(s) \\ Y(s) & \rightarrow Y(s) \\ \eta(s) & \rightarrow \eta(s), \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

where A is any positive constant, and $t \leq s \leq T$. Under this scaling transformation, the budget constrain Eq. (2.4) will remain unchanged. The value function $K(v, W, Y, t)$ will scale in the following way:

$$K(v, W, Y, t) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\rho} [e^{-\rho t} - e^{-\rho T}] \ln A + K(v, W, Y, t), \quad (2.13)$$

which can be verified easily. Therefore, at the optimal control, we shall have the scaling laws for the indirect utility function, the optimal investment and consumption rate as below:

$$\begin{aligned}
J(AW, Y, t) &= \frac{1}{\rho}(e^{-\rho t} - e^{-\rho T})\ln A + J(W, Y, t), \\
C^*(AW, Y, t) &= AC^*(W, Y, t), \\
a^*(AW, Y, t) &= a^*(W, Y, t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

which holds for any positive constant A . Since these scaling laws hold for any positive constant A , we can solve these equations to find the functional dependence on the wealth W . It is straightforward to find the following relationships:

$$\begin{aligned}
J(W, Y, t) &= \frac{1}{\rho}[e^{-t\rho} - e^{-T\rho}]\ln W + f_1(Y, t), \\
C^*(W, Y, t) &= f_2(Y, t)W, \\
a^*(W, Y, t) &= f_3(Y, t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where the functions $f_1(Y, t)$, $f_2(Y, t)$ and $f_3(Y, t)$ are solely dependent on the variable Y and time t , and $f_1(Y, T) = 0$. These relations hold for the consumer-investor with the Bernoulli logarithmic utility function, and for any random technology change and random production processes. In this case, we have $J_{WW}W/(J_W) = -1$ and $J_{WY} = 0$.

For this consumer-investor of Bernoulli logarithmic utility function, we further assume that the random production processes have constant drift and constant variance:

$$\begin{aligned}
d\eta(t) &= I_\eta\alpha(Y, t)dt + I_\eta G(Y, t)d\omega(t) \\
&= I_\eta\alpha dt + I_\eta G d\omega(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

where both α and G are time independent constants. With the first order optimal conditions, market clearing conditions, and using the scaling properties of the indirect utility functions, one can derive the investment rate

$$a^* = (GG')^{-1}\alpha + \frac{[1 - 1'(GG')\alpha]}{1'(GG')1}(GG'), \tag{2.17}$$

which is also a time independent constant. The interest rate $r(W, Y, t)$ is given as

$$r(W, Y, t) = (a^*)'\alpha + (a^*)'(GG')a^*(-1), \quad (2.18)$$

which is a time independent constant. Therefore, we see that for a random production process of constant drift and constant variance, the consumer-investor of Bernoulli logarithmic utility function will have a constant interest rate r when the general equilibrium is reached, consistent with our intuitive expectation.

Furthermore, we assume that the state variable Y describing random technological change is one dimensional, and it follows a stochastic process given by

$$\begin{aligned} dY &= \mu(Y, t)dt + S(Y, t)d\omega(t) \\ &= Y\mu_0dt + Y\sigma_0d\omega(t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

where both μ_0 and σ_0 are time independent constants. We further assume that μ_0 and σ_0 are related by the equation $\mu_0 = r + (\sigma'_0 a^* G) = (a^*)'\alpha + (a^*)'(GG')a^*(-1) + (\sigma'_0 a^* G)$. For any contingent claim $F = F(Y, t)$ having no explicit wealth dependence, the valuation partial differential equation Eq. (2.11) will simplify considerably:

$$\frac{1}{2}[tr(\sigma'_0\sigma_0)]Y^2F_{YY} + rF_Y Y + F_t = rF, \quad (2.20)$$

which holds for the economy which has a random production process and random technological change as described above.

Suppose that the underlying stock for the contingent claim follows a geometric Brownian motion

$$\begin{aligned} dS &= S\mu_0dt + S\sigma_0d\omega(t) \\ &= S\mu_0dt + S\sigma dZ(t), \end{aligned} \quad (2.21)$$

where $\sigma^2 = tr(\sigma'_0\sigma_0)$ and $Z(t)$ is a one dimensional standard Wiener process. With this, the partial differential equation for the contingent claim $F(Y, t) = F(S, t)$ can be rewritten in the following way:

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 S^2 F_{SS} + rF_S S + F_t = rF, \quad (2.22)$$

which is just Black-Scholes partial differential equation. Therefore, we have use general equilibrium point of the economy including random production processes and uncertain technological change to derive the Black-Scholes partial differential equation for contingent claim pricing. Boundary conditions on various contingent claims may be imposed to solve the above partial differential equation.

III. SUMMARY

In summary, I have considered an economy which includes uncertain production process and the random technological change. When the uncertain production process has constant drift and variance, and the random technological change follows a stochastic log-normal process, it is shown that the general equilibrium of such economy will lead to Black-Scholes partial differential equation satisfied by option prices. With slightest modification, one could generalize this general equilibrium of random production and uncertain technology economy to derive various partial differential equations for option pricing when the underlying stocks have stochastic volatility. Such generalizations will be quite straightforward.

IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am indebted to Professors P. Boyle and D. McLeish for introducing me to the field of modern finance. Encouragements from Dr. Y. Zhao, and my former physics classmates of Princeton University Dr. R. Khuri and Dr. James T. Liu, are gratefully acknowledged. I am also grateful to Dr. Daiwei Li, Dr. Jacqueline Faridani, Dr. Chonghui Liu, Dr. Craig Liu, Dr. Z. Yang and Dr. Z. Jiang for interactions. Any errors in this article are solely due to myself.

† Email address: d6wang@barrow.uwaterloo.ca. Current address is Toronto Dominion Bank. This paper has been submitted to Journal of Financial Studies, Chinese Finance Association, for publication.

REFERENCES

- [1] For introduction, see P. Boyle etc., “Financial Economics”, (lecture notes, Univ. of Waterloo), 1997; and C. H. Huang and R. Litzenberger, “Foundations for Financial Economics”.
- [2] S. Pliska, “Introduction to Mathematical Finance”, published by Blackwell (1997).
- [3] P. Boyle, “Options: a Monte-Carlo approach”, *J. Finan. Econom.* **4**, 323-338 (1977).
- [4] R. Merton, “Continuous Time Finance”, published by Blackwell (1990).
- [5] R. Merton, “A dynamic general equilibrium model of the asset market and its application to the pricing of the capital structure of the firm”, working paper No. 497-70, A. P. Sloan School of Management, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1970. Also see Chapter 11 of his book “Continuous Time Finance” (Blackwell (1990)).
- [6] F. Black and M. Scholes, “The pricing of options and corporate liabilities”, *J. of Political Economy*, **81**, 637-659 (1973).
- [7] See the book by M. Musiela and M. Rutkowski, “Martingale methods in financial modelling”, published by Springer (1997), and references therein.
- [8] This portfolio appears to violate self-financing constraint. See the book of M. Musiela and M. Rutkowski for details.
- [9] R. Merton, “Life time portfolio selection under uncertainty: the continuous time model”, *Rev. Econom. Stat.* **51**, 247-257 (1969).
- [10] R. Merton, “Optimum consumption and portfolio rules in a continuous time model”, *J. Econom. Theory* **71**, 373-413 (1971).
- [11] J. C. Cox, J. E. Ingersoll and S. A. Ross, “An intertemporal general equilibrium of asset prices”, *Econometrica* **53**, 363-384 (1985).

- [12] J. C. Cox, J. E. Ingersoll and S. A. Ross, “A theory of the term structure of interest rates”. *Econometrica* **53**, 385-407 (1985).
- [13] J. C. Cox and C. F. Huang, “Optimum consumption and portfolio policies when asset prices follow a diffusion process”, *J. of Economic Theory*, **49**, 33-83 (1989). Relevant references therein.
- [14] Such scaling argument can easily apply to the case where the van-Neumann-Morganstern utility function is power utility function.