

Working Paper 9214

ON MARKOVIAN REPRESENTATIONS OF THE TERM STRUCTURE

by Peter Ritchken and
L. Sankarasubramanian

Peter Ritchken is a professor at the Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, and L. Sankarasubramanian is an assistant professor in the School of Business Administration, University of Southern California. For helpful comments, the authors would like to thank seminar participants at the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, the University of Southern California, the University of British Columbia, and Queens University.

Working papers of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland are preliminary materials circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comment. The views stated herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland or of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

December 1992

Abstract

The linkages between term structures separated by finite time periods can be complex. Indeed, in general, the dynamics of the term structure could depend on the *entire set* of information revealed since the earlier date. This path dependence, which causes difficulties in pricing interest rate claims, is usually *eliminated* by making specific assumptions on investment behavior or on the evolution of interest rates. In contrast, this article identifies the class of volatility structures that permits the path dependence to be *captured* by a single sufficient statistic. An equilibrium framework is provided where beliefs and technologies are restricted so that the resulting term structures have volatilities that belong to the restricted class. The models themselves can be characterized by a parsimonious set of parameters and can be initialized to an observed term structure without the introduction of ad-hoc time-varying parameters. Furthermore, since the dynamics of the resulting term structures are two-state Markovian, simple pricing mechanisms can be developed for interest rate claims.

I. Introduction

In an economy with continuous trading, the linkages between term structures of interest rates separated by a finite time period can be quite complex, even when uncertainty is generated by a single source. In particular, even though all bonds are *instantaneously* perfectly correlated, over finite time periods this perfect relationship may break down. Indeed, to characterize the term structure at any date *relative* to the term structure at an earlier date, *all* the information revealed in the interim period may be required. This feature appears, for example, in the general Heath, Jarrow and Morton (hereafter HJM) [1992] paradigm of the term structure. In their approach, the evolution of the term structure is influenced by the entire history of the process, and this history generally cannot be summarized by a finite number of state variables. This path dependence is endemic to all models of the term structure and can only be eliminated if specific structure is imposed, either directly or indirectly, on forward rate volatilities.

One way to eliminate path dependence is to impose sufficient structure on the economy to ensure that, at every date, the level and shape of the term structure can be described by a few state variables. For example, in the single-factor equilibrium model of Cox, Ingersoll and Ross (hereafter CIR) [1985], the entire term structure at each date can be described by the spot interest rate.¹ Such models have the property that whenever the interest rate returns to a previous level, so do all other forward rates. Hence, unless time-varying parameters are used, these models impose restrictions on the shapes that term structures can take.

A second approach that eliminates path dependence involves restricting volatilities of all spot and forward rates to being deterministic. Under this structure, the path dependence issues disappear, and all forward interest rates are perfectly correlated over finite time horizons. Consequently, knowing any one rate is sufficient to characterize the rest of the term structure. Examples of such approaches are provided by HJM [1992] and Jamshidian [1989], who assume dynamically complete markets, and by Turnbull and Milne [1991], who establish general equilibrium pricing models for interest rate claims. In both approaches, the initial term structure is supplied exogenously. The fact that the term structure can be initialized, coupled with the simplicity of the resulting expressions, has led to the popularity of these models, especially for valuing claims that have prices quoted relative to an observed term structure.^{2,3} Unfortunately, recent empirical evidence does not support the deterministic volatility structure for interest rates. For example, Chan, Karolyi, Longstaff and

¹ Additional examples of such models include Brennan and Schwartz [1977], CIR [1980], Cox and Ross [1976], Dothan [1978] and Vasicek [1977].

² Such pricing problems have become increasingly more important, primarily due to the rapid growth of the over-the-counter market, where the majority of prices are quoted relative to the term structure. Indeed, in 1991, over-the-counter trading comprised a larger than \$4 trillion market of notional principal. This exceeded the \$2.2 trillion interest rate futures market and the \$77 billion stock index futures market.

³ Examples of such approaches include Amin and Jarrow [1991], Musiela, Turnbull and Wakeman [1992] and Ritchken and Sankarasubramanian [1992].

Sanders [1992] find that spot rate volatility appears to be highly sensitive to the level of the spot rate itself, and they conclude that models with deterministic volatilities are misspecified.

This article considers an alternative approach to dealing with path dependence. In particular, rather than structure the economy so that the path dependence is completely eliminated, we identify situations where it can be captured by a single sufficient statistic, common across all bonds. To do this, we first derive the conditions that must prevail if path dependence is to be captured by a single statistic. We then demonstrate that in all these cases, the intertemporal linkages between term structures can be completely characterized in terms of two state variables. That is, given any initial term structure, all future term structures are determined by the values of two state variables. The first of these is shown to be the spot rate; the second is a path dependent statistic that accumulates information along the path in such a way that no information is lost.⁴ This simplification of the intertemporal relationships between term structures is attained not by constraining the volatility structure for the spot interest rate, but rather by restricting the linkage between forward rate volatilities and spot rate volatilities.

Our framework has several useful properties. First, models for pricing interest rate claims can be developed in which the volatility structures for spot and forward rates are not deterministic, yet the term structure can be initialized to any exogenous specification. In this respect, these models generalize the *Markovian* models presented in HJM [1992] and in Turnbull and Milne [1991]. Second, unlike existing single-factor models in which interest rates have nondeterministic volatility, our models can be initialized to a term structure without requiring the ad-hoc introduction of time dependent parameters.⁵ Finally, since the structure for the spot rate volatility is unrestricted, our framework permits the term structure to be modelled by a large class of processes. Since a general equilibrium approach is used, the resulting models suffer no internal inconsistencies and admit no dynamic arbitrage opportunities.

The paper proceeds as follows. In the next section we develop a simple economy with a single representative investor and a single production technology. Within this framework, we then establish the intertemporal linkages between term structures and identify the path dependence issues that arise. Section III provides the main theorem, which identifies conditions that must be

⁴ Since path dependence is not eliminated in our approach, bond prices are not perfectly related over finite time horizons, even though they are perfectly instantaneously correlated.

⁵ To initialize almost all existing single-state models of the term structure to an arbitrary initial term structure usually requires the introduction of time-varying parameters in the evolution of the spot interest rate. These are then estimated by inverting the term structure. Unfortunately, these inversions are nontrivial, computationally difficult, and, if the term structure is observed with measurement error, the estimates may be unreliable. Indeed, using time-varying parameters has come under some criticism. Dybvig [1989] discusses the ad-hoc nature of using time-varying parameters to initialize the term structure. For further details on inversion procedures, see CIR [1985], Hull and White [1990] and Jarrow [1988].

In contrast, our approach deals only with the intertemporal linkages between term structures, and not with their levels or shapes. As a result, the parameters of our model are specified independent of the term structure.

satisfied if the path dependence is to be captured by a single sufficient statistic, regardless of the volatility structure of the spot rate. The consequences of this result are then fully explored. In particular, we make explicit the intertemporal linkages of the term structure and its evolution. Section IV focuses on an economy in which technology innovations follow a square root process, similar to that considered by CIR [1985]. We demonstrate that in this economy, path dependence can be captured by a single statistic, provided restrictions are imposed on the manner by which investors revise their beliefs about future levels of technology, in response to current technological innovations. Section V summarizes the paper.

II. The Intertemporal Linkages of Bond Prices

Assume all physical investment is performed by a single stochastic constant-returns-to-scale technology that produces a good that is either consumed or invested in production. The return on physical investment is governed by

$$\frac{dQ(t)}{Q(t)} = \alpha X(t, t) dt + \sigma_1 \sqrt{X(t, t)} dz_1(t) \quad (1)$$

Here, $X(t, t)$ is the level of technology at date t , with dynamics given by

$$dX(t, t) = \mu_X(t, t) dt + \sigma_X(t, t) dz_2(t) \quad (2)$$

where $dz_1(t)$ and $dz_2(t)$ are standard Wiener increments with $\mathbf{E}[dz_1(t) dz_2(t)] = \theta dt$. We assume that the structure for $\sigma_X(t, t)$ is given. For example, $\sigma_X(t, t)$ could be proportional to the square root of $X(t, t)$, in which case its structure would be identical to that of CIR [1985].

The drift term, $\mu_X(t, t)$, is not directly specified. Rather, we assume that at date t , investor beliefs about the level of technology for each future date, τ , are provided. In particular, let $\mathcal{I}(t)$ denote the belief set at date t . Specifically,

$$\mathcal{I}(t) = \{X(t, \tau) | \tau \geq t\} \quad (3)$$

where

$$X(t, \tau) = \mathbf{E}_t[X(\tau, \tau)] \quad (4)$$

Here, $X(t, \tau)$ represents the date t assessment of the level of technology for date τ .⁶

⁶ Note that if the drift term is specified as in the CIR model by

$$\mu_X(t, t) = \beta[\mu - X(t, t)],$$

then it can be shown that

$$X(t, \tau) = \mu - [\mu - X(t, t)]e^{-\beta(\tau-t)} \quad (F6.1)$$

Rather than specify the drift term directly, the CIR model could have been obtained by specifying this belief structure. The drift term would then be recovered using equation (6).

From equations (2) and (4), it follows that

$$\frac{\partial X(t, T)}{\partial T} = \mathbf{E}_t[\mu_X(T, T)] \quad (5a)$$

$$\left. \frac{\partial X(t, T)}{\partial T} \right|_{T=t} = \mu_X(t, t) \quad (5b)$$

That is, if a structure for the belief set is given, then the drift term for the technology process could be recovered. The volatility term, $\sigma_X(t, t)$, captures the sensitivity of technological innovations to the Brownian disturbances, $dz_2(t)$. Changes in this technology level cause investors to alter their beliefs about its future level. Let $\sigma_X(t, T)$ measure the sensitivity of beliefs for date T to the Brownian disturbance. In particular, we have

$$dX(t, T) = \sigma_X(t, T) dz_2(t) \quad \text{for } T > t \quad (6)$$

If the structure for $X(t, T)$ were given (or equivalently, if the drift term in equation (2) were provided) then the exact relationship between $\sigma_X(t, T)$ and $\sigma_X(t, t)$ could be recovered.⁷ Let $\omega(t, T)$ be defined as

$$\omega(t, T) = \frac{\sigma_X(t, T)}{\sigma_X(t, t)} \quad (7)$$

$\omega(t, T)$ is referred to as the *belief revision scheme*, since it identifies the manner by which beliefs about future levels of technology, $X(t, T)$, are revised in response to a change in the current level, $X(t, t)$.

We assume that the economy is composed of identical individuals, each of whom seeks to maximize an objective function of the form

$$\mathbf{E}_t \left\{ \int_t^\infty e^{-\rho(x-t)} \ln[C(x)] dx \right\} \quad (8)$$

Here, $C(x)$ represents time x consumption and ρ is the discount rate reflecting time preferences. Markets are assumed to be perfectly competitive and frictionless. Furthermore, traders can borrow or lend at the riskless rate, as well as trade in other types of contingent claims.

An exact specification of the belief set, $\mathcal{I}(t)$, is essential to characterize the term structure. However, our objective is not to characterize the term structure itself, but rather to develop the intertemporal relationships that exist between term structures separated by finite time horizons. Hence, at this juncture we leave the exact structure for $\mathcal{I}(t)$ unspecified.

⁷ In our case, an exact structure for $X(t, T)$ is not provided. In the CIR model, however, from footnote 6 we can apply Ito's lemma to equation (F6.1) to identify the volatility structure. In particular, we obtain

$$dX(t, T) = e^{-\beta(T-t)} \sigma_X(t, t) dz_2(t)$$

Hence, in the CIR model, the Brownian disturbance affects future beliefs in an exponentially dampened fashion.

In this economy, the investor's problem is completely determined by the belief set, $\mathcal{I}(t)$, and the investor's wealth, $W(t)$. Following Merton (1973), the investor's derived utility of wealth function is partially separable in wealth and in the elements of the belief set. Setting up the Bellman optimization problem, establishing the first-order conditions, and imposing the market clearing condition that all wealth is invested in physical production then leads to

$$C(t) = \rho W(t) \quad (9a)$$

$$r(t) = a X(t, t) \quad (9b)$$

where $a = \alpha - \sigma_1^2$ and $r(t)$ denotes the spot interest rate at date t . We also assume that $\alpha > \sigma_1^2$ to ensure that $r(t)$ and $X(t, t)$ are positively related. From this it follows that the dynamics of the spot interest rate can be obtained as

$$dr(t) = \mu_r(t) dt + \sigma_r(t) dz_2(t) \quad (10a)$$

where $\mu_r(t) = a \mu_X(t, t) \quad (10b)$

and $\sigma_r(t) = a \sigma_X(t, t) \quad (10c)$

Further, from equation (5) we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_t[\mu_r(T)] = a \left[\frac{\partial X(t, T)}{\partial T} \right]$$

Hence, the belief set, $\mathcal{I}(t)$, permits unbiased expectations of the drift terms of future interest rates to be computed.

Let $P(t, T)$ be the date t price of a default-free pure discount bond that matures at date T . In addition, denote by $f(t, T)$ the forward rate at date t for the time increment $[T, T + dT]$, with $f(t, t) \equiv r(t)$. By definition, bond prices are related to forward rates as

$$P(t, T) = e^{-\int_t^T f(t, s) ds} \quad (11)$$

Since forward rates and bond prices do not depend on the level of wealth in this economy, their dynamics can be represented by

$$df(t, T) = \mu_f(t, T) dt + \sigma_f(t, T) dz_2(t), \quad \text{for } T > t, \quad (12a)$$

and $\frac{dP(t, T)}{P(t, T)} = \mu_p(t, T) dt + \sigma_p(t, T) dz_2(t), \quad \text{for } T > t \quad (12b)$

where $\mu_f(t, T)$, $\mu_p(t, T)$, $\sigma_f(t, T)$ and $\sigma_p(t, T)$ are the instantaneous drift and volatility terms, which in general could depend on the level of all the state variables in the belief set, $\mathcal{I}(t)$.

Including bonds in the representative investor's portfolio choice problem leads to the following

additional restriction :

$$\frac{\mu_p(t, T) - r(t)}{\sigma_p(t, T)} = \frac{\theta\sigma_1\sqrt{r(t)}}{\sqrt{a}} \equiv \lambda(t) \quad (13)$$

Using equations (13) and (11), it is then readily established that⁸

$$\mu_f(t, T) = \sigma_f(t, T)[\lambda(t) - \sigma_p(t, T)] \quad (14a)$$

and
$$\sigma_f(t, T) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\sigma_p(t, T) \quad (14b)$$

or equivalently,
$$\sigma_p(t, T) = -\int_t^T \sigma_f(t, u) du \quad (14c)$$

Substituting equation (14a) into (12b) and computing the dynamics of the spot rate using the relationship

$$dr(t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial u}f(u, t)\Big|_{u=t} dt + \frac{\partial}{\partial u}f(t, u)\Big|_{u=t} dt$$

then leads to

$$dr(t) = \mu_r(t) + \sigma_r(t)dz_2(t) \quad (15a)$$

where
$$\mu_r(t) = \lambda(t)\sigma_r(t) + \frac{\partial}{\partial u}f(t, u)\Big|_{u=t} \quad (15b)$$

Equations (15a-b) highlight the relationships that exist between the drift and volatility terms, the market price of risk, and the shape of the term structure. In the CIR model, the drift and volatility terms are given, as is the market price of risk. From equation (15b), this information uniquely

⁸ These results were also obtained by HJM [1992] using arbitrage arguments. To see these results, note from equation (11) that $f(t, T) = -\partial \ln[P(t, T)]/\partial T$, and that using Ito's lemma yields

$$df(t, T) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial T}[\mu_p(t, T) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_p^2(t, T)]dt - \frac{\partial}{\partial T}[\sigma_p(t, T)]dz_2(t)$$

Hence,
$$\sigma_f(t, T) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial T}\sigma_p(t, T)$$

or equivalently,
$$\sigma_p(t, T) = -\int_t^T \sigma_f(t, u) du$$

and
$$\mu_f(t, T) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial T}[\mu_p(t, T) - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_p^2(t, T)] = -\frac{\partial}{\partial T}[\mu_p(t, T)] - \sigma_f(t, T)\sigma_p(t, T)$$

From equation (13) we then obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial T}[\mu_p(t, T)] = \lambda(t)\frac{\partial}{\partial T}[\sigma_p(t, T)] = -\lambda(t)\sigma_f(t, T)$$

Equation (14a) then follows.

defines the shape of the term structure. In contrast, in what follows, the drift term is defined by the volatility structure, the market price of risk and the shape of the term structure through equation (15b).

Finally, using equations (14a), (12a-b) and (11) leads to

$$f(t, T) = f(0, T) + \int_0^t \sigma_f(u, T) [\lambda(u) - \sigma_p(u, T)] du + \int_0^t \sigma_f(u, T) dz_2(u) \quad (16a)$$

and

$$P(t, T) = \left[\frac{P(0, T)}{P(0, t)} \right] e^{\int_t^T \int_0^s \sigma_f(u, s) [\sigma_p(u, s) - \lambda(u)] du ds - \int_t^T \left[\int_0^s \sigma_f(u, s) dz_2(u) \right] ds} \quad (16b)$$

Equations (16a-b) establish the intertemporal linkages between term structures. In particular, the term structure at date t depends on the setting at date 0, together with all the Brownian disturbances over the period $[0, t]$. Note that knowledge of the term structure at date 0, together with a single point on the term structure at date t is not generally sufficient to uniquely characterize the term structure at date t . Indeed, to establish the term structure at date t , all the path information over the period $[0, t]$ may be required. This path dependent feature also appears in the general HJM [1992] framework. In their approach, the evolution of the term structure is influenced by the entire history of the process, and this history cannot, in general, be summarized into a finite number of state variables. As a result, for quite general volatility structures, the lattice methods described by HJM [1990] grow exponentially. Due to this computational complexity, empirical tests have been lacking for all but the simplest of the HJM option models. Equations (16a-b) also highlight the fact that path dependence is endemic to all models of the term structure and can only be eliminated if additional assumptions are made on the volatilities of all forward rates.

As mentioned earlier, path dependence in the term structure can be eliminated if sufficient structure is imposed to ensure that the evolution and setting of all bond prices can be described, at all dates, by a finite number of points on the term structure. For example, in the equilibrium single-factor model of CIR [1985], as well as in the arbitrage models of Vasicek [1977], Dothan [1978] and others, a single state variable is either explicitly or implicitly assumed to determine the level and shape of the term structure at all times. This variable is usually chosen, without any loss of generality, to be the spot interest rate. This assumption imposes a deterministic relationship between all bond returns *over finite intervals of time*. Empirical research, however, has not provided strong support for any of them.

The second approach commonly used to eliminate path dependence involves restricting the volatilities of all spot and forward rate volatilities to being deterministic. It can be readily verified from equation (16a) that under a deterministic volatility structure for spot and forward interest rates, the forward rate, $f(t, T)$, can be expressed as a simple linear function of the spot rate, $r(t)$, with deterministic coefficients. This implies that changes in forward rates are perfectly correlated over finite time intervals. While this simplification allows the term structure to be initialized to an

exogenous structure, without requiring time-varying parameters, the volatility structure required to accomplish this has not been supported by recent empirical analyses.

In the next section, we consider an alternative approach to deal with path dependence. The idea is not to eliminate it outright, but rather to capture it by a single sufficient statistic, common across bonds of all maturities. In the resulting framework, the term structure is fully determined by two state variables. Unlike other single-factor Markovian models, our models do not have deterministic relationships between the returns on any two bonds over finite time intervals.

III. Path Dependent Models of the Term Structure

In this section, we first identify the relationship that must prevail between the volatilities of spot and forward rates if path dependence in the intertemporal linkages between term structures is to be captured by a single statistic, without imposing restrictions on either the spot rate volatility or the shape of the term structure itself. We then demonstrate that whenever this relationship prevails, a *two-state* Markovian representation of the term structure will result.

Theorem 1

To capture the path dependence illustrated in equations (16a-b) by a single statistic, without imposing any additional assumptions on the volatility of spot interest rates or on the shape of the term structure, it is necessary that the volatilities of all forward rates be related to each other as

$$\sigma_f(t, T) = \sigma_r(t) e^{-\int_t^T \kappa(x) dx} \quad \text{for all } T \geq t \quad (17)$$

where $\sigma_r(t) = \sigma_f(t, t)$ is the volatility of the spot interest rate, and $\kappa(x)$ is some deterministic function.

Proof See Appendix 1.

Theorem 1 implies that if the volatility structure of forward rates does not satisfy equation (17), then, without making more assumptions about either the spot rate volatility or the shape of the term structure, it is not possible for a single sufficient statistic to capture the path dependence.⁹ The volatility of the spot rate, $\sigma_r(t)$, is itself unrestricted and could depend on the entire term structure

⁹ Of course, forward rate volatilities that do not satisfy equation (17) may, in conjunction with specific structures for the volatility of the spot rate, lead to one- or two-state Markovian term structure models. However, the restriction imposed by equation (17) is the only one that works with *all* spot rate volatility specifications. This result hence permits the development of models where the structure for the spot rate volatility is itself treated as a “free parameter.” For example, the spot rate volatility could be described by $\sigma_r(t) = \sigma r(t)^\eta$, where both σ and η are empirically estimable parameters.

at date t . From equation (10c), this implies that in order to eliminate the path dependence in bond prices, no assumptions are needed on the volatility of technological innovations, $\sigma_X(t, t)$, in the economy.

The exponential term in equation (17) identifies the mechanism by which uncertainty at one end of the term structure is transmitted to the rest of the term structure. This transmission scheme is completely described by the deterministic function $\kappa(\cdot)$. This function may be specified exogenously and need not be restricted to attain a Markovian representation of the term structure.¹⁰ As we demonstrate in the next section, $\kappa(\cdot)$ is fully determined by the manner in which investors revise their beliefs about future levels of technology, $X(t, T)$, in response to information that alters the current level, $X(t, t)$. Specifically, $\kappa(\cdot)$ is determined by the belief revision scheme, $\omega(\cdot, \cdot)$. In contrast to the volatility of $X(t, t)$, which is left unrestricted, bond prices will be path dependent unless the belief revision scheme is curtailed.

The class of term structure models that result from equation (17) have the property that forward rates are linear in the state variables. The exact form of the bond prices, which is provided below, establishes that the restriction in equation (17) is also sufficient to obtain a two-state Markovian representation of the term structure.

Theorem 2

Under the restriction imposed by equation (17), the price of a bond at any future date t can be represented in terms of its forward price at date 0, the short interest rate at date t , and the path of interest rates as

$$P(t, T) = \left(\frac{P(0, T)}{P(0, t)} \right) e^{-\beta(t, T) \left(r(t) - f(0, t) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \beta^2(t, T) \phi(0, t)} \quad (18a)$$

where $\beta(t, T)$ is given by

$$\beta(t, T) = - \frac{\sigma_p(t, T)}{\sigma_r(t)} = \frac{1}{\kappa(t)} - \frac{1}{\kappa(T)} e^{-\int_t^T \kappa(x) dx} \quad (18b)$$

and $\phi(0, t)$, the state variable that captures path dependence, is given by

$$\phi(0, t) = \int_0^t \sigma_f^2(u, t) du \quad (18c)$$

Proof See Appendix 2.

¹⁰ As we show later in this section, $\kappa(\cdot)$ measures the degree of mean reversion in spot interest rates. In many models of the term structure, this is assumed to be constant. Other models, however, achieve term structure matching by selecting the mean reversion function appropriately. This is in contrast to our approach, where the choice of $\kappa(\cdot)$ does not alter the term structure at date 0. Hence, $\kappa(\cdot)$ could be assumed constant.

As the bond pricing equation above illustrates, the two state variables, $r(t)$ and $\phi(0, t)$, capture all relevant information required to update the entire term structure relative to an earlier term structure. The first state variable, $r(t)$, is the stochastic spot interest rate that appears in most other single-factor models. The second state variable, $\phi(0, t)$, is a statistic that captures information revealed over the time interval $[0, t]$. Even though the latter is uncertain viewed from date 0, it is locally deterministic and its evolution does not contain a stochastic component. To see this, substitute from equation (17) into equation (18c) and use Ito's rule to obtain

$$d\phi(0, t) = \left(\sigma_r^2(t) - 2\kappa(t)\phi(0, t) \right) dt$$

Hence, at date t , once the levels of the state variables, $r(t)$ and $\phi(0, t)$, are observed, the value of $\phi(0, t + dt)$ can be predicted with certainty. All the uncertainty in the term structure over the time increment $[t, t + dt]$ is hence captured by the change in the spot rate, $dr(t)$. To gain a better understanding of the uncertainty revealed by $\phi(0, t)$, consider the term structure at date 0. At that initial date, investors reflect their beliefs about the future spot interest rate, $r(t)$, and its volatility, in the term structure and, in particular, in the forward rate, $f(0, t)$. The evolution of this forward rate ultimately culminates, at date t , in the spot rate, $r(t)$. Unless the volatility, $\sigma_f(u, t)$, is deterministic, investors cannot predict with perfect certainty the accumulated volatility of this rate. It is exactly this uncertainty that is revealed by $\phi(0, t)$ and that is reflected in the term structure at date t .

In practice, it is extremely difficult to compute the value of $\phi(0, t)$ directly. Fortunately, any two points on the term structure at date t can be used to reconstruct the entire yield curve. To see this, set $\tau = s$, take logarithms on both sides of equation (18a) and differentiate with respect to s to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(0, t) \beta(t, s) &= f(0, t) - r(t) + [f(t, s) - f(0, s)] \frac{\sigma(r, t)}{\sigma_f(t, s)} \\ &= f(0, t) - r(t) + [f(t, s) - f(0, s)] e^{\int_t^s \kappa(x) dx} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the state variable, $\phi(0, t)$, can be replaced in the bond pricing equation by any other forward rate, $f(t, s)$.¹¹ Further, regardless of the volatility structure of spot interest rates, a linear relationship exists between all forward and spot interest rates.

Since forward rates are two-state Markovian, we can recover the drift of the spot rate, $\mu(r, t)$. Its form is summarized below.

¹¹ If the second state variable, $\phi(0, t)$, is constant, then bond prices collapse to a single-state Markov representation. From equation (18c), this occurs if the volatility of the spot rate, $\sigma_r(u)$, is deterministic for all u .

