

Balancing art and money in pursuit of a Kelly-type optimality

R. Rastegar* A. Roitershtein† V. Roytershteyn‡ V. Seetharam§

March 26, 2024

Abstract

We introduce and study a mathematical model of an art collector. In our model, the collector is a rational agent whose actions in the art market are driven by two competing long-term objectives, namely sustainable financial health and maintaining the collection. Mathematically, our model is a two-dimensional random linear dynamical system with transformation matrix of a peculiar type. In some examples we are able to show that within the Kelly-type optimization paradigm, that is optimizing the system’s Lyapunov exponent over a set of policy parameters, the dilemma “art or money” can be successfully resolved, namely the optimal policy creates a coexistence equilibrium where the value of both is increasing over the time.

MSC2010: Primary 91B74; 37N40; 37M25 Secondary: 91B70; 37H12; 91B32

Keywords: art markets, Kelly optimization, Lyapunov exponent, passion investment, random iterations, portfolio optimization

1 Introduction

Collecting as an economic behavior. Individual collecting is a routine human behavior which from the economics perspective manifests itself as a blend of luxury consumption with a form of *alternative investment* [9, 16, 25, 45]. Collecting is a growing phenomenon, its global surge, in particular among Generation Y, has been facilitated in the past two decades by networking of new information, media and communication technologies [50, 67, 71] as well as the emergence of new markets [36, 103, 110]. Previous studies indicate that one out of every three Americans might be collecting something [46, 51]. Credit Suisse estimated in 2020 the value of its client’s privately owned collectibles at over US\$1 Trillion in 2020 [66]. In 2018 the size of the art market was estimated to be US\$67.4 billion worldwide [36], illuminating its increasing role as a niche market for financial investment, accepted as legitimate by mainstream finance and by economists [21, 26, 66, 71, 99]. According to a survey conducted by Barclays in 2012, high-net-worth individuals had in average almost 2% of their wealth invested in artworks and 8% in other *emotional assets* or *investments of passion* [21, 26].

Collecting reflects a multitude of sociological, psychological, economic, and possibly biological motives, including leisure, aesthetics, competition, fantasy, prestige, sensual gratification, extending the self, legacy, and more [8, 50, 65, 67, 74]. Collector’s demographics as well as their peculiar

*Occidental Petroleum Corporation, Houston, TX 77046, USA; e-mail: reza_rastegar2@oxy.com

†Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA;
e-mail: alexander@stat.tamu.edu

‡Space Science Institute, Boulder, CO 80301, USA; e-mail: vroitershteyn@spacescience.org

§Department of Computer Science, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843, USA;
e-mail: seetharamg@tamu.edu

personality traits have been examined in [9, 67, 74] and more recently in [45] and [46], the latter reference being specifically focusing on collectors with economic motives. A sociological portrait of art collectors along with a review of the literature on this topic can be found in [67, 85], and a more historical and economic-anthropological perspective on collectors and their motives is offered in [25, 75]; see also [50] for a systematic review of various aspects of collecting behavior.

It has been observed by many researchers that “the distinction between purchasing collectibles for pleasure or for pecuniary reasons is ambiguous and thus difficult to dissociate” [66]. For instance, the authors of [50] single out Financial Value as one of six main themes in their classification of collector’s motivations (five others are Achievement through Collecting Goals; Social Membership; Cooperation and Competition; Societal and Personal Memories; Legacy) and remark that “it would be prudent to recognise the financial value of collecting and acknowledge it as a potential motivation for consumers in combination with psychological motivations”. A category of collectors that we are interested in are individuals who buy and sell art in ways meant to increase both their status and financial position, they are referred to as *passionate investors* in [3], *investor collectors* in [45], *inquisitive collectors* in [67], and *hierarchically oriented collectors* in [85]. For example, in a 2013 survey in Germany, initially fielded with 316,500 panelists, among 4042 responded individuals 225 indicated consistently in their answers that they hold collectibles at least partly for investment purposes [45]. When viewed as investors, this group of individuals is not purely financially motivated and thereby considers collectibles as a form of alternative investment, that is a way to diversify their investment portfolio [46].

The model: variables of interest. We assume a discrete time, $n = 0, 1, \dots$, and at any time point n describe the state of the collector by two numerical variables, a portion of her capital X_n potentially available for an acquisition in the art market and the current value of her art collection Y_n . Rather than to consider the composition of the financial capital and art collection in details, we focus on the evolution of the *macrostate* (X_n, Y_n) and, specifically, the question of the balancing between two conflicting goals, namely long-term maximization of Y_n and minimization of the probability of a *drawdown event* (that is, exhausting to a nearly zero level) of X_n . In the model that we propose, these two goals can in principle be reconciled, in particular the associated art collection process can be sustainingly self-funding in a realistic market behavior scenario.

We assume that while X_n is measured in a regular currency units, say American dollars, Y_n embraces both emotional and financial value of the art collection in the eyes of the owner, and is measured in some different intrinsic units. We are making a simplifying condition that there is no re-stocking of the initial financial capital X_0 and that the art collector is a rational agent in the art market acting to enhance her collection. The variable X_n can be thought of as the balance at time n in a bank account servicing the art collector’s operation.

The art market is an example of a market for “singular goods” whose value in the eyes of the collector is determined by aesthetic judgments rather than by any commonly accessible measurable metric [43, 91]. In contrast to a financial asset which has a market price determined by a demand and supply mechanism, a unique artwork is valued differently by different potential owners. The magnitude of this *private value* [35] is determined by the interaction of the artwork with collector’s emotional world, the strength of its attachment to her socio-technological world, potential resale benefits [55, 70, 88]. The latter, financial part of the valuation, is itself endogenously related to the distribution of tastes and information among potential buyers at the time of resale and therefore can hardly be determined objectively and with certainty [7, 48].

The enjoyment associated with art ownership is multi-faceted, the emotional benefits that individuals derive from owning an artwork can take different forms, including viewing pleasure, the

admiration of artistic skill or genius, feeling connected to the artist, the pride, appropriation of the art object’s “aura”, and social signaling [88, 91]. Moreover, collector’s decisions are often driven by unconscious emotions (such as excitement, anxiety and denial), fantasies, needs, and desires [88].

The emotions contribute to the part of the utility that sometimes referred in the literature as *emotional dividends* [26, 55, 71] or *psychic returns* [26, 29, 30, 31]. Without these emotional benefits individuals would be reluctant to allocate their resources to artwork, given other alternatives (such as, for instance, bonds, equities, and real estate) [68, 84, 97]. Furthermore, the existence of the non-financial component of the potential buyer’s utility has been used to explain certain peculiarities of the art market, such as, for instance, calendar anomalies [29, 31, 80], set completion prices [17], and the reluctance of dealers in contemporary art to consider outright price decreases even when it would serve the profit maximization goal. For example, it is argued in [47, 61, 98] that the subordinate role of the price elasticity concept in everyday models of the art market and taboo on decreasing prices can be understood by taking into account, respectively, the observation that collectors infer judgments about the quality of the artwork from its relative price or from a price change and the conspicuous consumption phenomenon.

The model: steps of the stochastic process. The stochastic process $(X_n, Y_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is assumed to be governed as follows by two *policy parameters* $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$. The parameters are fixed, not changing with time once they are chosen at the beginning of the process. At the beginning of the n -th period of time, the collector is investing a portion λX_n of her available wealth X_n in the art market. This investment is translated into the addition of $\lambda X_n \varepsilon_n$ to her collection’s value, where ε_n is a non-negative random variable. To finance her future purchases, the collector is then selling a portion θ of her art collection which is worth now $Y_n + \lambda X_n \varepsilon_n$. The profit from this sell, $\theta(Y_n + \lambda X_n \varepsilon_n) \delta_n$, where δ_n is another non-negative random variable is then added to the portion of her wealth $(1 - \lambda)X_n$ which was put aside at the beginning of the time period; cf. Fig.1.

Thus, the evolution of the process (X_n, Y_n) is governed by the matrix equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_{n+1} \\ Y_{n+1} \end{pmatrix} = M_n \begin{pmatrix} X_n \\ Y_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$M_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda + \lambda \theta \varepsilon_n \delta_n & \theta \delta_n \\ \lambda(1 - \theta) \varepsilon_n & 1 - \theta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

The underlying random matrices can be factorized as follows:

$$M_n = \begin{pmatrix} \theta \delta_n & 1 \\ 1 - \theta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \varepsilon_n & 1 \\ 1 - \lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

The factorization can be directly related to the above verbal description of the two-step process, see also the flowchart depicted in Fig. 1. Throughout the paper we assume that

$$\lambda + \theta > 0, \quad (4)$$

precluding the trivial case where both X_n and Y_n were never altered.




Figure 1: The flowchart of the $(n+1)$ -th iteration of the process. By “transforming” a homogeneous portfolio of assets (either all capital or all art), we mean converting a portion of the portfolio into assets of a different kind while retaining the remaining part. The policy variables (λ, θ) are assumed to be determined at the beginning of the process and remain unchanged during its evolution.

Dual, (Y, X) versus (X, Y) , representation of the model. The following modified description of the model highlights a symmetry between the X_n and Y_n variables, and in particular shows that the order of the “buy” and “sell” operations in Fig. 1 is inconsequential for the study of mathematical properties of the model. Suppose that $\theta \neq 1$ and let $\tilde{X}_0 = (1 - \lambda)X_0$, $\tilde{Y}_0 = Y_0 + \lambda\varepsilon_0X_0$. Denote by \tilde{X}_n and by \tilde{Y}_n , respectively, the value of the wealth and the art value at the beginning of the n -th period of time in a variant of our model where the collector is first selling a portion of her collection valued at $\theta\tilde{Y}_n$ to convert it into a financial capital valued $\theta\tilde{Y}_n\delta_n$ and then invest the portion λ of the resulting $(\tilde{X}_n + \theta\tilde{Y}_n\delta_n)$ -valued financial resource to acquire new art valued $\lambda(\tilde{X}_n + \theta\tilde{Y}_n\delta_n)\varepsilon_{n+1}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{X}_{n+1} &= (1 - \lambda)(\tilde{X}_n + \theta\tilde{Y}_n\delta_n) \\ \tilde{Y}_{n+1} &= (1 - \theta)\tilde{Y}_n + \lambda(\tilde{X}_n + \theta\tilde{Y}_n\delta_n)\varepsilon_{n+1}.\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{Y}_{n+1} \\ \tilde{X}_{n+1} \end{pmatrix} = \tilde{M}_n \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{Y}_n \\ \tilde{X}_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\tilde{M}_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \theta + \lambda\theta\delta_n\varepsilon_{n+1} & \lambda\varepsilon_{n+1} \\ (1 - \lambda)\theta\delta_n & 1 - \lambda \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda\varepsilon_{n+1} & 1 \\ 1 - \lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \theta\delta_n & 1 \\ 1 - \theta & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\tilde{X}_n = (1 - \lambda)X_n \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{Y}_n = Y_{n+1}(1 - \theta)^{-1}. \quad (6)$$

We will use this dual construction in Section 5.

Interpretation of the $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)$ variables. The random variables ε_n and δ_n serve as forecasted exchange rates between the idiosyncratic private value and monetary market price for, respectively, buying and selling artworks. The following are among several factors contributing to the intricate variability (in time as well as across the population) and random nature of these elusive indexes. First, art prices are correlated to some degree with the general economy state, they tend to decline during crises, they are also affected by fashions and fads [9, 45]. Secondly, collector’s own tastes and enthusiasm for collectibles might evolve and fluctuate with time [26]. Moreover, bidding behavior and consequently auction prices are impacted by immediate emotions (for instance, community and competition related) and moods of the bidders [1, 22]. Thirdly, art market is characterized by heterogeneity, low liquidity, limited and asymmetric (enabling insider’s edge) information [82, 98]. Strong evidences supporting the hypothesis of the art markets inefficiency have been found in several studies; see [4, 76] and references therein. Additionally, collector’s estimation of an artwork’s potential monetary value often relies on quality signals emerging from experts such as gallery owners, curators, art dealers, and critics [7], which along with endowment effect (overvaluation of an art object owned) and the sunk cost effect (past efforts of building up a collection tend to become a part of its valuation), routinely leads to an inadequate perception of the collection’s economic value by the owner [2, 8, 31, 69, 96]. Lastly, collectibles are subject to costs and risks such as maintenance, storage, theft, counterfeiting or physical destruction, which apply to a much lesser extent to traditional investment assets [46, 66].

In view of a low liquidity of art markets [4, 21, 26, 47], it would be interesting to study a modification of the model with a sparser and perhaps more sporadic over the time market activity. One possibility to achieve such an effect is to make the parameters (λ, θ) into a stochastic process. For instance, at time n , one can replace λ with λi_n and θ with θj_n , where i_n and j_n are, possibly correlated, Bernoulli variables. This is the topic of our forthcoming paper [87].

Dependence structure of the sequence $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$. In the bulk of the paper we suppose that the pairs $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)$ form a stationary ergodic sequence and do not make any further specific assumptions on its dependence structures (see Assumption 3.1 below for details). Only in Section 2 and examples throughout the paper, we assume that $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a sequence of i. i. d. pairs (see Assumption 2.1 for details). Echoing a sentiment expressed in [38], we remark that though a Markov setup is a natural starting point (cf. [53, 55]), nothing in our approach precludes looking at more general probabilistic specifications; see, for instance, [27, 92, 100] for some examples of non-Markovian econometric time series models. For purely technical reasons, it will be convenient to extend $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ into a double-sided stationary and ergodic sequence $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

Optimal policy. It is observed in [67] that while the motivations behind collecting are complex and multifaceted, many of the major motives revolve the development of a more positive sense of self. The authors of [67] further postulate that “collectors are drawn to collecting as a means of bolstering the self by setting up goals that are tangible and attainable and provide the collector with concrete feedback of progress”. Furthermore, it is suggested in [31] that collectors systematically deviate from the von Neumann-Morgenstern axioms of rational behavior and, in particular, from subjective expected utility maximization.

We reinterpret these insights by assuming that our collector, at the “macro-level” that we consider, is seeking to achieve two long-term goals: 1) to maximize the asymptotic growth rate of Y_n ; and 2) to maximize the asymptotic growth rate of X_n . Under mild assumptions on the sequence $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ (see Assumption 3.1), these seemingly contradictory goals can be reconciled by optimizing the *Lyapunov exponent*

$$\nu(\lambda, \theta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln X_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln Y_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln X_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln Y_n),$$

where the identities follow from the fundamental results of [33]. We thus assume that the goal of the collector is to identify an *optimal policy* (not necessarily unique) (λ^*, θ^*) such that

$$\nu(\lambda^*, \theta^*) = \max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in [0, 1]^2} \nu(\lambda, \theta). \quad (7)$$

The model offers a combination of basic realistic features along with a certain degree of analytical tractability, we study it both theoretically and numerically. Technically, our model is a two-dimensional twist on the classical Kelly’s capital market scheme [44, 58]. In fact, under our assumptions (cf. (56) below),

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\left(\ln \frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n}\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E\left(\ln \frac{Y_{n+1}}{Y_n}\right).$$

That is, similarly to the Kelly’s scheme, the collector is optimizing her (in our case, infinite horizon equilibrium rather than the current) logarithmic utility of the immediate investment return. We notice that (7) is a one-time infinite-horizon optimization rather than a control problem where the policy may be adjusted at any given time. Thus, the decision maker we consider is “naive” or “myopic” in the sense of [54, 72, 89] and [56, 58] about taking into account the possibility that their future selves might benefit from adjusting the policy due to either personal changes or evolution of the market as the whole. Interestingly enough, the optimization rule (7), as well as many other Kelly-type criteria maximizing an logarithmic utility’s growth rate (see, for instance, [18, 42, 49, 57, 94, 107] for a discussion and interpretations), is a natural example of the ergodicity economics optimization paradigm [78].

Our contribution. In two instances (see Section 4.5 and Section 5.4), using numerical simulations, we show that our model exhibits a two-dimensional analogy of Kelly’s effect, namely the optimal policy (λ^*, θ^*) is an interior point of the parameter’s domain, rather than a point on its boundary (cf. [44]). More specifically, in these two specific examples we show that

$$\arg \max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in [0, 1]^2} \nu(\lambda, \theta) \subset (0, 1)^2. \quad (8)$$

To show (8), we use a number of theoretical “piecemeal” insights into the asymptotic behavior of the model, which are collected in Section 3, 4, and 5. In addition, some illuminating general lower and upper bounds for $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ for arbitrary values of the parameters (λ, θ) are obtained in Section 5.

Article’s organization. The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we obtain the asymptotic of the expectations $E(X_n)$ and $E(Y_n)$. This is later compared with the asymptotic growth rate $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$, formally introduced in Section 3.1. In general, Section 3 is a survey of fundamental properties of ν . Section 3.2 is a brief survey of the literature on Kelly-type models. In Section 3.3 we state some basic properties of the model whereas the discussion of more advanced featured is postponed to Section 5, where are main results are presented. In Section 4 we calculate

the Lyapunov exponent $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ on the boundary of the policy domain, that is when at least one of the parameters λ, θ is either zero or one. Sections 4.5 and 5.4 report our numerical studies for some examples when we can reliably claim that (8) takes place. Throughout the paper, auxiliary and technical proofs are deferred to Section 6 which plays the role of an appendix.

2 Rate of the expected growth

In this section we are concerned with the asymptotic behavior of the expected values $E(X_n)$ and $E(Y_n)$. The results are stated in a sequence of propositions detailing the long-term behavior of $E(X_n)$ and $E(Y_n)$, with proofs (being a straightforward calculus exercise) either omitted or deferred to Section 6. While the strategic decision-making of our collector may not be based on the optimization of an affine utility function, the evolution of the mean values is an illuminating feature of the model. A key takeaway from the results presented in this section is the ultimate dependence of the asymptotic behavior of the means on a single stochastic parameter of the model, namely γ introduced in (12) below, in addition to the deterministic policy variables (λ, θ) . This observation is particularly interesting because γ turns out to govern in a similar way the qualitative behavior of the model under the optimal policies introduced in (7), cf. Proposition 3.4.

Recall (2) and let

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= E(\varepsilon_n) & \text{and} & & \beta &= E(\delta_n), \\ U_n &= E(X_n) & \text{and} & & V_n &= E(Y_n), \quad n \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Throughout the paper we will assume the following trivial non-degeneracy condition:

$$\alpha > 0, \quad \beta > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad U_0 + V_0 > 0. \quad (9)$$

In this section we will combine it with a condition of independence of the underlying variables:

Assumption 2.1. *Let (4) and (9) hold. Assume in addition that*

- (i) *The pairs of random variables $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)$, $n \geq 0$, are independent of each other.*
- (ii) *For each fixed $n \geq 0$, random variables ε_n and δ_n are independent of each other.*

The assumptions on the dependence structure of the underlying variables will be considerably relaxed when we will study the almost sure growth rate of the model, cf. Assumption 3.1. Some of the results of this section are relevant even under these more general conditions, see the very end of Section 3.3 and in particular (27) for details.

It follows from (1) that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{pmatrix} U_{n+1} \\ V_{n+1} \end{pmatrix} = M \begin{pmatrix} U_n \\ V_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$M := E(M_n) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda + \alpha\beta\lambda\theta & \beta\theta \\ \alpha\lambda(1 - \theta) & 1 - \theta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

First, for the sake of completeness, we consider extreme cases when either $\lambda\theta = 0$ or $\theta = 1$. A common feature of these trivial scenarios is that one of the sequences U_n and V_n saturates to a constant limit level rather than grows/decays exponentially. More precisely, it is easy to check that (10) and (11) imply the following:

Proposition 2.2. *Let Assumption 2.1 hold.*

(i) *If $\theta = 0$, then, for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$U_n = (1 - \lambda)^n U_0 \quad \text{and} \quad V_n = \alpha(1 - (1 - \lambda)^n)U_0 + V_0.$$

In particular, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n = 0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n = \alpha U_0 + V_0$.

(ii) *If $\lambda = 0$, then, for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$U_n = U_0 + \beta(1 - (1 - \theta)^n)V_0 \quad \text{and} \quad V_n = (1 - \theta)^n V_0.$$

In particular, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n = U_0 + \beta V_0$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n = 0$.

(iii) *If $\theta = 1$, then, for all $n \geq 1$,*

$$U_n = (1 - \lambda + \gamma\lambda)^n U_0 + (1 - \lambda + \gamma\lambda)^{n-1} \beta V_0 \quad \text{and} \quad V_n = 0,$$

where

$$\gamma = \alpha\beta. \tag{12}$$

The proof of the proposition is straightforward, and therefore omitted.

The money-art-money “exchange rate” γ introduced in (12) turns out to be the key parameter governing the asymptotic behavior of the sequences U_n and V_n also in the general case. Let μ denote the largest eigenvalue of M , that is

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \frac{1}{2} \left(2 - \lambda - \theta + \gamma\lambda\theta + \sqrt{(\theta - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma)^2 + 4\lambda\theta(1 - \theta)\gamma} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(2 - \lambda - \theta + \gamma\lambda\theta + \sqrt{(\lambda + \theta - \gamma\lambda\theta)^2 + 4(\gamma - 1)\lambda\theta} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Notice that $\mu(\lambda, \theta) = \mu(\theta, \lambda)$ and that

$$\mu = 1 \text{ when } \lambda\theta = 0, \quad \mu = 1 - \theta + \theta\gamma \text{ if } \lambda = 1, \quad \mu = 1 - \lambda + \lambda\gamma \text{ if } \theta = 1. \tag{14}$$

We note in passing that in general, if part (i) in Assumption 2.1 is removed, then with γ now understood as $E(\varepsilon_0\delta_0)$ (cf. (19) below),

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2} \left(2 - \lambda - \theta + \gamma\lambda\theta + \sqrt{(\theta - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma)^2 + 4\lambda\theta(1 - \theta)\alpha\beta} \right).$$

If $\lambda\theta \neq 0$ and $\theta \neq 1$, all entries of matrix M are strictly positive, μ is its Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue, and therefore, under Assumption 2.1,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln U_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln V_n = \ln \mu. \tag{15}$$

The existence of the limits and the identities in (15) is a standard linear algebra result, it is an immediate consequence of the fact that (even if either $U_0 = 0$ or $V_0 = 0$) for some constant $c > 0$, $\frac{x}{c} < U_1 < cx$ and $\frac{y}{c} < V_1 < cy$, where $(x, y)^T$ is the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of M . We have:

Proposition 2.3. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds, $\lambda\theta \neq 0$, and $\theta \neq 1$. Then, μ is monotone on both λ and θ . More specifically,*

$$\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \lambda} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \theta} > 0 \quad \text{if } \gamma > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \lambda} < 0, \quad \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \theta} < 0 \quad \text{if } \gamma < 1.$$

Furthermore, if $\gamma = 1$ then $\mu = 1$ for all values of the parameters λ and θ .

The proof of the proposition is given in Section 6.1 below. The monotonicity along with (14) imply that for all $(\lambda, \theta) \in (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$,

$$\mu \in (\gamma, 1) \text{ if } \gamma < 1; \quad \mu = 1 \text{ if } \gamma = 1; \quad \text{and} \quad \mu \in (1, \gamma) \text{ if } \gamma > 1. \quad (16)$$

Notice that (16) can be expressed as

$$\min\{1, \gamma\} \leq \mu \leq \max\{1, \gamma\}, \quad (17)$$

where, under the conditions of the proposition, the equalities are in fact strict unless $\gamma = 1$. Intuitively, the monotonicity reflects the dichotomic nature of the phase transition at $\gamma = 1$: as far as the expected payoff is concerned, either the collector's enterprise is profitable both financially and emotionally in which case the larger are "transaction rates" λ and θ the better, or it is not, in which case avoiding the adversary economic environment whatsoever by setting $\lambda = \theta = 0$ is the best policy for the collector.

Our next result highlights the asymptotic mean-field dynamics in the case when $\gamma = 1$.

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds and $\gamma = 1$. Then, for any initial values $U_0 \geq 0$, and $V_0 \geq 0$ and parameter values $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $\theta \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} U_n = \frac{\theta}{\theta + \lambda(1 - \theta)}(U_0 + \beta V_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n = \frac{\lambda(1 - \theta)}{\theta + \lambda(1 - \theta)}(\alpha U_0 + V_0).$$

Moreover, $\alpha U_n + V_n$ as well as its β -multiplier $U_n + \beta V_n$ is a constant sequence (i. e., independent of n), while

(i) U_n is strictly increasing and V_n is strictly decreasing if $\lambda < \frac{\beta\theta}{1-\theta} \frac{V_0}{U_0}$,

(i) U_n is strictly decreasing and V_n is strictly increasing if $\lambda > \frac{\beta\theta}{1-\theta} \frac{V_0}{U_0}$,

(i) both U_n and V_n remain constant if $\lambda = \frac{\beta\theta}{1-\theta} \frac{V_0}{U_0}$,

where $\frac{\beta\theta}{1-\theta} \frac{V_0}{U_0}$ is understood to be infinity if either $U_0 = 0$ or $\theta = 1$.

The proof of the proposition is deferred to Section 6.2. We conclude this section with the following immediate consequence of (13).

Proposition 2.5. *Let Assumption (2.1) holds and denote $\xi = \gamma - 1$. Then,*

$$\mu = 1 + \frac{\xi\lambda\theta}{\lambda + \theta - \lambda\theta} + o(\xi),$$

where we used the standard "little-o" notation, that is $o(\cdot)$ is a function such that $\lim_{\xi \rightarrow 0} \frac{o(\xi)}{\xi} = 0$.

3 Long-term rate of growth and logarithmic utility

In the remainder of the paper we adopt the following modification of Assumption 2.1:

Assumption 3.1.

(i) *The sequence of pairs of random variables $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)$, $n \geq 0$, is stationary and ergodic.*

(ii) There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$P(C^{-1} < \min\{\varepsilon_n, \delta_n\} \leq \max\{\varepsilon_n, \delta_n\} < C) = 1. \quad (18)$$

(iii) X_0 and Y_0 are deterministic (non-random) non-negative numbers, not both are zero.

Note that the marginal distributions in the pair $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)$ are not required to be independent under this assumption. Consequently, (12) will be substituted in the remainder of the paper with a more general definition

$$\gamma = E(\varepsilon_0 \delta_0), \quad (19)$$

which is consistent with (12) in the particular case when the sequences $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and $(\delta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ are independent.

The rest of this section is structured as follows. In Section 3.1 we formally introduce the main subject of our study, the Lyapunov exponent $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ associated with the model. Section 3.2 contains a brief discussion of the Kelly's optimal policy paradigm for investment and betting. Finally, Section 3.3 introduces some basic properties of the Lyapunov exponent pertinent to our model. In particular, Proposition 3.2 shows that $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ is a continuous functions of its parameters, and hence the arg max in (8) is well defined (cf. Corollary 3.3), Proposition 3.5 states an important symmetry property of ν , and Proposition 3.4 exhibits a phase transition at $\gamma = 1$ in the qualitative behavior of the optimal value $\nu(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ defined in (7).

3.1 Underlying Lyapunov exponent

A classical result of [33] (see Corollary to Lemma 2 on p. 462 of [33]) ensures that if Assumption 3.1 holds and $\lambda, \theta \in (0, 1)$, then with probability one the following two limits exist and are equal and finite:

$$\nu = \nu(\lambda, \theta) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln X_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln Y_n. \quad (20)$$

Alternatively [33],

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln X_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln Y_n). \quad (21)$$

The common limit in (20) and (21) is the (top) Lyapunov exponent of the sequence of random matrices M_n introduced in (1), that is, with probability one,

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \max\{X_n, Y_n\} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \|M_n \cdots M_1\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln \|M_n \cdots M_1\|), \quad (22)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is any matrix norm in dimension 2. Part (ii) of Assumption 3.1 ensures (20), whereas the existence of the limits and the identities in (22) are guaranteed under a weaker assumption (see Theorem 2 in [33]) $E(\ln(1 + \|M_0\|)) < \infty$. Under this condition, the limits in (20) would still exist by the Oseledets multiplicative ergodic theorem (see, for instance, Theorem 1.2 in [37]), but they would not be necessarily equal. In the absence of (20), maximizing ν would mean an infinite horizon optimization of the “most successful among two assets, monetary X_n and passion Y_n ”, compared to optimizing both assets simultaneously when the equality in (20) is in place. We remark that a study of the dependence of $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \min\{X_n, Y_n\}$ on the parameters (λ, θ) under

more general than Assumption 3.1 conditions appears to be an interesting direction for a further investigation of our model.

Let

$$\Omega = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq x \leq 1, 0 \leq y \leq 1\}$$

and

$$\Omega^\circ = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < x < 1, 0 < y < 1\}, \quad \partial\Omega = \Omega/\Omega^\circ.$$

Using numerical simulations, it is shown in Sections 4.5 and 5.4 that in some examples (8) holds true, that is the optimal policy (λ, θ) is an interior point of Ω . Heuristically, keeping the least profitable asset in the portfolio might mitigate the risk of the “gambler’s ruin” and thus be beneficial in a long-term. This is compared to the following corollary to Proposition 2.3:

$$\max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega} \mu(\lambda, \theta) = \max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in \partial\Omega} \mu(\lambda, \theta) = \sup_{(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ} \mu(\lambda, \theta),$$

where μ is defined in (13). We conjecture, but were unable to prove it, that under Assumption 3.1, $\arg \max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega} \nu(\lambda, \theta) \subset \Omega^\circ$ if $\gamma > 1$, $P(\varepsilon_0 < 1, \delta_0 < 1) > 0$, and the distribution of $(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0)$ is sufficiently volatile, for instance “nearly uniform” on $(-1, a) \times (-1, b) \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ for some $a, b > 2$.

3.2 Relation to the Kelly capital growth model

The classical Kelly capital growth model can formally be described as the following one-dimensional version of (1):

$$Z_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda)Z_n + \lambda\varepsilon_n Z_n, \tag{23}$$

where Z_n is the value of an investment portfolio at time n , λ is the parameter reflecting the decision of the investor on what portion of her capital (i. e., λZ_n) to invest and what portion (i. e., $(1 - \lambda)Z_n$) to put off each period of time, and ε_n is the factor representing the growth of the investment during the n -th time period. Thus, assuming that ε_n are i. i. d. variables with a finite mean, $\ln Z_n$ is a classical random walk:

$$\ln Z_{n+1} = \ln Z_n + \ln(1 - \lambda + \lambda\varepsilon_n).$$

The asymptotic speed of the walk is given by the formula

$$\nu_z(\lambda) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln Z_n = E\left(\ln \frac{Z_{n+1}}{Z_n}\right) = E(\ln(1 - \lambda + \lambda\varepsilon_n)). \tag{24}$$

Furthermore, provided that $E(\varepsilon_n) > 1$ while $P(\varepsilon_0 < 1) > 0$, the asymptotic speed ν_z is maximal at a unique point $\lambda^* \in (0, 1)$ such that [14, 44]

$$E\left(\frac{\varepsilon_n - 1}{1 + \lambda^*(\varepsilon_n - 1)}\right) = 0.$$

In particular, for any $\lambda \neq \lambda^*$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_n(\lambda^*)}{Z_n(\lambda)} = +\infty, \quad \text{a. s.},$$

where $Z_n(\lambda)$ is defined in (23) and $Z_n(\lambda^*)$ is its analogue defined by a similar random recurrence with the same sequence ε_n and the same initial condition $Z_0(\lambda^*) = Z_0(\lambda)$, but using λ^* instead of λ as the investment policy. The criterion for evaluating investment strategy λ seeking to maximize ν_z is sometimes referred to as the *Kelly optimal criterion*. By virtue of (24), this policy can be viewed as the maximization of the logarithmic utility $E(\ln \cdot)$ of the immediate capital return Z_{n+1}/Z_n .

Kelly's original article [44] offers a somewhat surprising interpretation of the optimal investment policy λ^* in terms of the information theory. Breiman [13, 14] (see also [86] for an excellent summary account), provided several important characterizations of λ^* . For a more recent modifications focusing on alternative interpretations of Kelly's criterion see, for instance, [15, 28, 105].

Heuristically, optimizing the speed of the random walk $\ln Z_n$ yields the fastest (in average, over possible realizations of the sequence $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 0}$) way to achieve preassigned high values of Z_n (see Theorem 1 in [14] for a formal statement). The often criticized downside of such an aggressive policy is the high risk it bears for the investor. The risk is manifested in the typically high volatility of the time-series trajectory $(Z_n)_{n \geq 0}$ and the consequent, recurrent discrepancy between the long-term sustainability of the model and its local short-term performance, see [18, 107] for an illuminating discussion and partial rebuttal of the criticism. For a recent work augmenting Kelly's criterion with constraints based on utilizing finite-horizon performance metrics and measures of risk-aversion, see [59, 73, 102]. We remark that while the volatility of model's trajectories poses even more severe challenges in higher dimensions (in particular, the Lyapunov exponent ν is difficult to estimate even numerically [41, 81, 90]), the aggressive investment strategy it entitles is arguably particularly well-suited for a passion investment model discussed in our paper [26, 58, 109].

Kelly's original model has been extended in several ways over the years, with some of the generalizations being directly motivated by applications to economics, decision theory, and financial mathematics. For instance, (24) readily extends to stationary and ergodic sequences ε_n . For an authoritative review of the literature published prior to 2011, see [57]. Thorp's article [95] offers a superb guide into properties of the original Kelly's model and its applications; see also [108] for a brief and light summary account. For some interesting recent results and literature review, see, for instance, [10, 40, 59, 106].

3.3 Basic properties of the Lyapunov exponent

We begin with the following observation.

Proposition 3.2. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then, $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ is continuous on Ω .*

Corollary 3.3. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then, there exists*

$$\nu^* := \max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega} \nu(\lambda, \theta). \quad (25)$$

The proof of the proposition is given in Section 6.3 below. While the continuity in the interior of the domain Ω and on the part of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ where $\lambda\theta = 0$ follows immediately from general results (see [11]), the case when either $\lambda = 1$ or $\theta = 1$ requires an ad-hoc arguments. The argument that we give in Section 6.3 relies on the explicit formulae for $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ on the boundary along with bounds for it within the interior.

Our next result gives necessary and sufficient conditions for ν^* introduced in (25) to be larger than one. The proof of the following proposition is included in Section 6.4.

Proposition 3.4. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold.*

- (a) *Suppose that $\gamma \leq 1$. If in addition, $\text{COV}(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n) \geq 0$, then $\nu(\lambda, \theta) \leq 0$ for all $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega$.*

(b) Suppose that $\gamma > 1$. Then, $\nu(\lambda, \theta) > 0$ within an open neighborhood of any point of Ω in the form $(\lambda, 1)$ for all $\lambda > 0$ small enough.

The following symmetry result follows immediately from (3). Denote

$$\Xi = (\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_1 = (\delta_n, \varepsilon_{n+1})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}.$$

Thus, the sequence Ξ_1 is obtained from the original random environment Ξ by first reversing the roles of the margins ε_n δ_n , and then shifting the latter sequence one time unit forward. To emphasize the dependence of the Lyapunov exponent on the distribution of ε_n and δ_n we will write ν_{Ξ} for ν .

Proposition 3.5. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then, $\nu_{\Xi}(\lambda, \theta) = \nu_{\Xi_1}(\theta, \lambda)$ for all $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega$.*

The equality $\nu_{\Xi}(\lambda, \theta) = \nu_{\Xi_1}(\theta, \lambda)$ can be obtained by removing

$$\begin{pmatrix} \theta \delta_n & 1 \\ 1 - \theta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \varepsilon_0 & 1 \\ 1 - \lambda & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

from the product $M_n \cdots M_0$ considered as a product of $2(n+1)$ factors using (3). Alternatively, at least for $\theta \neq 1$, it can be derived directly from (5) and (6).

We conclude this section with a simple classical upper bound for ν . Let μ_n be the spectral norm of matrix M_n , that is the Perron-Frobenius (largest) eigenvalue of M_n . Then, similarly to (13),

$$\mu_n = \frac{1}{2} \left(2 - \lambda - \theta + \gamma_n \lambda \theta + \sqrt{(\theta - \lambda + \lambda \theta \gamma_n)^2 + 4 \lambda \theta (1 - \theta) \gamma_n} \right)$$

where

$$\gamma_n = \varepsilon_n \delta_n. \tag{26}$$

By virtue of (22) and the ergodic theorem, we have

Proposition 3.6. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then, $\nu \leq E(\ln \mu_0)$.*

In particular, an analogue of (17) for μ_n implies that

$$\nu \leq E(\ln^+ \gamma_0), \tag{27}$$

where $\ln^+ x$ stands for $\max\{0, \ln x\}$.

4 Four boundary regimes and their perturbations

In this section we study the model with parameters (λ, θ) chosen on the boundary of the domain Ω . In particular, we suitably extend the definition of ν from the interior Ω° to the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of the domain Ω in the cases where the Lyapunov exponent of the two-dimensional linear system is not defined by (20), that is the asymptotic growth rates of X_n and Y_n are different. The explicit formulas for ν on the boundary are used in the proof of the continuity result in Proposition 3.2 (see Section 6.3 below) and, in addition, facilitate our analysis of the Kelly effect in Sections 4.5 and 5.4 below (Example 5.10 in the latter).

4.1 Speculator regime: $\theta = 1$

Suppose that $\theta = 1$. By (2), $Y_n = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$, and, for all $n \geq 2$,

$$X_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda)X_n + \lambda X_n \gamma_n,$$

where γ_n is introduced in (26). Therefore,

$$\frac{X_n}{X_1} = \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (1 - \lambda + \lambda \gamma_k).$$

Hence, by the ergodic theorem,

$$\nu(\lambda) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln X_n = E(\ln(1 - \lambda + \lambda \gamma_0)), \quad \text{a. s.} \quad (28)$$

Notice that by Jensen's inequality, assuming that γ_0 is not degenerate (non-constant),

$$\nu < \ln(1 - \lambda + \lambda \gamma),$$

where γ is introduced in (19). In particular, $\nu < 0$ for all $\lambda > 0$ if $\gamma \leq 1$. Furthermore, by the dominated convergence theorem,

$$\frac{\partial \nu}{\partial \lambda} = E\left(\frac{\gamma_0 - 1}{1 - \lambda + \lambda \gamma_0}\right),$$

and hence

$$\frac{\partial^2 \nu}{\partial \lambda^2} < 0, \quad \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial \lambda}(0) = \gamma - 1, \quad \frac{\partial \nu}{\partial \lambda}(1) = 1 - E(\gamma_0^{-1}).$$

We summarize the above results as follows.

Proposition 4.1. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and assume, in addition, that $\theta = 1$. Then, the Lyapunov exponent $\nu(\lambda, 1) = \nu(\lambda)$ is given by (28). Furthermore, the following holds for the maximum value of $\nu(\lambda)$:*

(i) *If $\gamma \leq 1$, then $\nu(0) = 0$ and $\nu(\lambda) < 0$ for all $\lambda > 0$.*

(ii) *If $\gamma > 1$ and $E(\gamma_0^{-1}) > 1$, then there exists a unique $\lambda^* \in (0, 1)$ such that*

$$E\left(\frac{1}{1 - \lambda^* + \lambda^* \gamma_0}\right) = 1,$$

in which case

$$\nu(0) = 0 < \nu(\lambda) < \nu(\lambda^*) = E(\ln(1 - \lambda^* + \lambda^* \gamma_0)).$$

for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda^)$, and $\nu(1) < \nu(\lambda) < \nu(\lambda^*)$ for all $\lambda \in (\lambda^*, 1)$.*

(iii) *If $\gamma > 1$ and $E(\gamma_0^{-1}) \leq 1$, then*

$$\nu(0) = 0 < \nu(\lambda) < \nu(1) = E(\ln \gamma_0).$$

for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$.

In the rest of the paper, we will occasionally use the following framework for our examples. Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1)$, and $\eta > 1$ be three given numbers.

Assumption 4.2. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds and, in addition,*

- all variables ε_n and δ_n , $n \geq 0$, are independent of each other,
- ε_n is either ε or η with equal probabilities.
- δ_n is either δ or η with equal probabilities.

We will refer to the model in Assumption 4.2 as $\text{BERN}(\varepsilon, \delta; \eta)$. This class of Bernoulli models is simple, flexible, arguably contains a range of realistic scenarios for an actual art collection, amenable to exact calculations, and hence efficiently illustrates general ideas,

Example 4.3. *For a $\text{BERN}(\varepsilon, \delta; \eta)$ model, we have*

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{4}(\varepsilon + \eta)(\delta + \eta).$$

Furthermore,

$$\Delta := E(\gamma_0^{-1}) = \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon\eta} + \frac{1}{\eta\delta} + \frac{1}{\eta^2} \right).$$

For instance, for $\text{BERN}(0.95, 0.95; 1.1)$, $\gamma = 1.050625 > 1$ and $\Delta \approx 0.962089 < 1$. Therefore, by Proposition 4.1, the ν -maximizer for $\theta = 1$ is $\lambda = 1$, and

$$\max_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \nu(\lambda, 1) = \nu(1, 1) = E(\ln \gamma_0) \approx 0.044314,$$

while, by Proposition 2.3, $\max_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \mu(\lambda, 1) = \mu(1, 1) = \gamma = 1.050625$.

On the contrary, for $\text{BERN}(0.75, 0.75; 1.3)$, $\gamma = 1.050625 > 1$ and $\Delta \approx 1.105194 > 1$. Therefore, by Proposition 4.1, the ν -maximizer for $\theta = 1$ is the unique solution to the equation

$$\frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \lambda^* + \lambda^* \cdot 0.75^2} + \frac{2}{1 - \lambda^* + \lambda^* \cdot 0.75 \cdot 1.3} + \frac{1}{1 - \lambda^* + \lambda^* \cdot 1.3^2} \right) = 1,$$

which yields $\lambda^* \approx 0.3305$. Thus, in this case,

$$\max_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \nu(\lambda, 1) = \nu(\lambda^*, 1) = E(\ln(1 - \lambda^* + \lambda^* \gamma_0)) \approx 0.016326,$$

while, similarly to the previous example, $\max_{\lambda \in [0,1]} \mu(\lambda, 1) = \mu(1, 1) = \gamma = 1.050625$.

Notice that in this example, as expected, increasing the volatility in the model while keeping γ unchanged leads to an inferior long-term performance of the model.

We will next analyze $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ in the asymptotic regime $\theta = 1 - \xi$ as $\xi \rightarrow 0$. Using the notation $\xi = 1 - \theta$, one can rewrite (2) as

$$M_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda + (1 - \xi)\lambda\varepsilon_n\delta_n & (1 - \xi)\delta_n \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \xi \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \lambda\varepsilon_n & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, $X_n \geq \prod_{k=0}^n (1 - \lambda + (1 - \xi)\lambda\gamma_k)$, and we have

Proposition 4.4. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then, for any $\lambda, \xi \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\nu(\lambda, 1 - \xi) \geq E(\ln(1 - \lambda + (1 - \xi)\lambda\gamma_0)). \quad (29)$$

Note that the bound in (29) is asymptotically exact, that is, in view of (28), the right-hand side converges to $\nu(\lambda, 1)$ when ξ approaches zero.

4.2 Hoarder regime: $\theta = 0$

Assume now that $\theta = 0$. Then, by (2),

$$X_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda)X_n \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{n+1} = Y_n + \lambda X_n \varepsilon_n.$$

In particular, the evolution dynamics of X_n is deterministic, namely $X_n = (1 - \lambda)^n X_0$. For the art value Y_n we therefore have:

$$Y_{n+1} = Y_n + \lambda(1 - \lambda)^n \varepsilon_n X_0 = Y_0 + \lambda X_0 \sum_{k=0}^n (1 - \lambda)^k \varepsilon_k.$$

In particular, Y_n converges almost surely, as n approaches infinity, to the limit

$$Y_\infty := Y_0 + \lambda X_0 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 - \lambda)^k \varepsilon_k.$$

Since $E(Y_\infty) = Y_0 + X_0 E(\varepsilon_0) < \infty$, the limit is finite with probability one. Accordingly, we append (20) with the following formal definition

$$\nu(\lambda, 0) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in [0, 1]. \quad (30)$$

Notice that, since $\mu_0 = 1$ when $\theta = 0$, Proposition 3.6 provides an asymptotically tight upper bound for $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ when $\theta \rightarrow 0$. We remark that the case when ε_0 and δ_0 are both close to one corresponds to the *weak disorder* regime studied in [23] (see, for instance, [93] and references therein for later developments).

4.3 Eccentric: $\lambda = 1$

Suppose that $\lambda = 1$. Then, (2) yields

$$X_{n+1} = \theta(Y_n + X_n \varepsilon_n) \delta_n \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{n+1} = (1 - \theta)(Y_n + X_n \varepsilon_n).$$

It follows that $\frac{Y_{n+1}}{X_{n+1}} = \frac{1-\theta}{\theta\delta_n}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{(1 - \theta)X_{n+1}}{\theta\delta_n} = Y_{n+1} = (1 - \theta)(Y_n + \lambda X_n \varepsilon_n) = (1 - \theta) \left(\frac{(1 - \theta)X_n}{\theta\delta_{n-1}} + \lambda X_n \varepsilon_n \right),$$

which implies

$$\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n} = (1 - \theta) \frac{\delta_n}{\delta_{n-1}} + \theta \varepsilon_n \delta_n. \quad (31)$$

Let

$$d_n = \frac{\delta_n}{\delta_{n-1}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (32)$$

Using this notation, we can rewrite (31) as an explicit formula for X_{n+1} and Y_{n+1} :

$$X_{n+1} = X_0 \prod_{k=0}^n ((1 - \theta)d_k + \theta\gamma_k), \quad Y_{n+1} = \frac{X_{n+1}(1 - \theta)}{\theta\delta_n}.$$

It follows from (31) that

$$\begin{aligned}\nu(\theta) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln X_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln Y_n = E \left(\ln \left(\frac{(1-\theta)\delta_n}{\delta_{n-1}} + \theta\varepsilon_n\delta_n \right) \right) \\ &= E(\ln(1-\theta + \theta\varepsilon_1\delta_0)), \quad \text{a. s.}\end{aligned}$$

The result is of course consistent with (28) and Proposition 3.5. For future reference, we state the following as a formal remark. Let

$$\zeta_n = \varepsilon_n \delta_{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad e_n = \frac{\varepsilon_n}{\varepsilon_{n-1}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (33)$$

Note that γ_n and ζ_n are identically distribute under Assumption 2.1, but not in general.

Remark 4.5. *Using Proposition 3.5, the analogues of Propositions 4.1 and 4.4 for $\lambda = 1$ can be obtain by formally exchanging the roles of λ and θ and replacing γ_0 with ζ_0 in their statements.*

4.4 Slow liquidation of an inherited collection: $\lambda = 0$

Assume now that $\lambda = 0$. In this case, the art collection serves to finance the owner. This can be, for instance, the case for an inherited art collection whose items are sold per re nata by new owners. In this extreme case, (2) yields

$$X_{n+1} = X_n + \theta\delta_n Y_n \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{n+1} = (1-\theta)Y_n.$$

Therefore, $Y_n = (1-\theta)^n Y_0$ and

$$X_{n+1} = X_n + \theta(1-\theta)^n \delta_n Y_0 = X_0 + \theta Y_0 \sum_{k=0}^n (1-\theta)^k \delta_k.$$

It follows that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, X_n converges almost surely to

$$X_\infty := X_0 + \theta Y_0 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1-\theta)^k \delta_k.$$

Since $E(X_\infty) < \infty$, the limit is a finite random variable. Accordingly, we append (20) with the following formal definition

$$\nu(0, \theta) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \theta \in [0, 1]. \quad (34)$$

Of course, (34) is consistent with (30) and the symmetry result stated in Proposition 3.5.

4.5 Numerical example when ‘‘Kelly’s effect’’ holds true

Recall BERN($\varepsilon, \delta; \eta$) framework from Assumption 4.2. Fig. 2 below summarizes the results of our numerical study for BERN(0.3, 0.2; 2) described in detail in Section 6.8 below (see (68) in particular).

Note that while $\gamma = 1.2515 > 1$ and, consequently (cf. Proposition 2.3), $\ln \mu > 0$ for all $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ$, the simulations suggest that $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ is negative in a sizable portion of the domain Ω° in a neighborhood of the point $(\lambda, \theta) = (1, 1)$. This is consistent with the the result in part (ii) of Proposition 4.1, given the fact that $E(\gamma_0^{-1}) = 5.2708 > 1$ and $E(\ln \gamma_0) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{6}{100} < 0$.

The computation suggests that the maximum of $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ in Ω is attained at

$$\lambda^* = 0.265 \pm 0.02 \quad \text{and} \quad \theta^* = 0.284 \pm 0.02, \quad (35)$$

and is equal to

$$\nu(\lambda^*, \theta^*) = 0.0199\dots \quad (36)$$

This to be compared with

$$\max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in \partial\Omega} \nu(\lambda, \theta) = \nu(0.132304, 1) = 0.0160933, \quad (37)$$

computed using part (ii) of Proposition 4.1 (see Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 below). In Section 6.8 below we estimated theoretically the difference between the actual value of $\nu(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ and the one computed in simulations and shown in (36). The outcome is given in (73) below, it is considerably smaller than the gap between the estimates in (36) and (37), effectively proving that (8) holds true for BERN(0.3, 0.2; 2).

The simulation study reported in Fig. 2 is done using a simple direct method described in Section 6.8 below, using a grid of 50×50 equidistantly covering the interior of rectangle Ω . The number of iterations $n = n(\lambda, \theta)$ at each point of the grid is determined by the following stopping rule: stop when $\left| \frac{\nu_n - \nu_{n-1}}{\nu_n} \right| < 10^{-3}$, where $\nu_k = \nu_k(\lambda, \theta)$ is the approximation of the value of $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ computed at iteration k .

We then ran separately 20 iterations of the same method at the point (λ^*, θ^*) given in (35). The values $\nu_k(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ for $k = 11, \dots, 20$ are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{11} &= 0.019915518445, & \nu_{12} &= 0.019917137593, & \nu_{13} &= 0.019918021008, & \nu_{14} &= 0.019918502880, \\ \nu_{15} &= 0.019918765678, & \nu_{16} &= 0.019918908984, & \nu_{17} &= 0.019918987124, & \nu_{18} &= 0.019919029729, \\ \nu_{19} &= 0.019919052953, & \nu_{20} &= 0.019919065598. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The graphs of $\nu_n(\lambda^*, \theta^*) - \nu_{20}(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ and $\nu_n(\lambda^*, \theta^*) - \nu_{n-1}(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ (on a logarithmic scale) for this simulation run are plotted in, respectively, Fig 3 and Fig 4 below.

Finally, to further verify our simulations result for BERN(0.3, 0.2; 2) at the point (λ^*, θ^*) given in (35), we also ran 16 rounds of iterations of the method for computation Lyapunov exponents introduced in [41]. The values $\nu_k(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ for $k = 10, \dots, 16$ are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{10} &= 0.020386826647, & \nu_{11} &= 0.019882803069, & \nu_{12} &= 0.019921362049, & \nu_{13} &= 0.019918963924, \\ \nu_{14} &= 0.019919085714, & \nu_{15} &= 0.019919080635, & \nu_{16} &= 0.019919081020. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

The graphs of $\nu_n(\lambda^*, \theta^*) - \nu_{20}(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ and $\nu_n(\lambda^*, \theta^*) - \nu_{n-1}(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ (on a logarithmic scale) for this simulation run are plotted in, respectively, Fig 7 and Fig 8 below.

5 Upper and lower bounds for $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$

The goal of this section is to obtain several bounds for the Lyapunov exponent ν . These bounds are obtained by using several different techniques, each utilizing an amalgam of a classical approach to the study of products of i. i. d. matrices with ad-hoc estimates based on the peculiar structure of our matrices.

The distinct structure of the underlying matrices M_n not only enables simultaneous implementation of these classical methods in a single setting, but also allows us to investigate the model in a general ergodic setting of Assumption 3.1 rather than making a standard i.,i.,d. or Markov-dependence assumptions for the underlying sequence of matrices $(M_n)_{n \geq 0}$.




Figure 2: The heatmap represents the values of the Lyapunov exponent ν for the BERN(0.3, 0.2; 2) model for a grid of parameters (λ, θ) equidistantly covering the rectangle Ω . The white area in the picture corresponds to negative values of ν .




Figure 3: A plot of time series differences $\nu_n(\lambda^*, \theta^*) - \nu_{20}(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ obtained in the simulations reported in (38).




Figure 4: Assuming that $\nu_n = \nu_0 - \kappa_1 e^{-\kappa_2 n}$, we fitted the differences $\nu_n - \nu_{n-1}$, $n = 11, \dots, 20$, using the least square method, and obtained the estimates $\kappa_2 = 0.606395$, $\kappa_1 = 0.00280925$.

The rest of this section is organized as follows. In Section 5.1 we obtain an equivalent representation of the model as a system of two linear second order recursions and exploit it to obtain upper and lower bounds for $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ (Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.2). In Section 5.2 we use the above recursions to obtain a continued fraction representation for $\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n} \frac{Y_{n+1}}{Y_n}$, and consequently for ν . The basic limit results for these fractions is stated in Theorem 5.3, it yields an exponentially fast converging series representation and new upper and lower bounds for ν (see Proposition 5.4, Corollary 5.5, and Proposition 5.6). A different method, utilizing a representation of matrices M_n as actions in the projective space and the interplay between continued fractions and linear fractional maps (cd. [6]), is employed in Section 5.3 to obtain an alternative continued fraction representation




Figure 5: Graph of the Lyapunov exponent $\nu(\lambda, 1)$ for the BERN(0.3, 0.2; 2) model.




Figure 6: Graph of the Lyapunov exponent $\nu(\lambda, 1)$ for the BERN(0.3, 0.2; 2) model zoomed-in in a neighborhood of the maximum.




Figure 7: Comparison of the simulations results shown in (38) and (39) (the latter is using the method introduced in [41]). The yellow line corresponds to the time series in (39) and the blue line to that in (38).




Figure 8: The differences $\nu_n - \nu_{n-1}$, $n = 11, 12, \dots, 16$, for the simulation results reported in (39), computing $\nu(\lambda^*, \theta^*)$ using the method introduced in [41].

for ν , the result is stated as Proposition 5.8. Finally, in Section 5.4 we consider a special example, a modification of the one given in [52], where an integral formula (easily computable using standard numerical methods) can be given for the “diagonal elements” $\nu(\lambda, \lambda)$. Does it give us an example when (8) holds true?

5.1 Decoupling the 2-dim system into 2 autoregressive recursions

The aim of this subsection is to obtain an autoregressive representation [83] of the model which decouples the underlying two-dimensional dynamical system into two independent second-order linear recursions, see equations (43) and (47) below. We note that such a representation is not available in general for two-dimensional linear systems, and its existence for our model reflects a peculiar structure of matrices M_n . The decoupling yields a new continued fraction representation

of the Lyapunov exponent ν (Theorem 5.3) as well as new explicit bounds for it (Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.2).

Write (2) explicitly as a system of linear equations:

$$X_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda)X_n + \lambda\theta\varepsilon_n\delta_n X_n + \theta\delta_n Y_n, \quad (40)$$

$$Y_{n+1} = (1 - \theta)Y_n + \lambda(1 - \theta)\varepsilon_n X_n. \quad (41)$$

Iterating (41), we get

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n+1} &= (1 - \theta)Y_n + \lambda(1 - \theta)\varepsilon_n X_n \\ &= (1 - \theta)^2 Y_{n-1} + \lambda(1 - \theta)^2 \varepsilon_{n-1} X_{n-1} + \lambda(1 - \theta)\varepsilon_n X_n \\ &= \dots = (1 - \theta)^{n+1} Y_0 + \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda(1 - \theta)^{n+1-k} \varepsilon_k X_k. \end{aligned}$$

The last identity reflects the fact that each item in the art collection either was a part of the original collection at time zero or its origin can be traced to a time $k \geq 0$ when it was acquired with funds λX_k and never sold thereafter (and hence the factor $(1 - \theta)^{n+1-k}$). Plugging-in the corresponding expression for Y_n into (40), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} X_{n+1} &= (1 - \lambda)X_n + \lambda\theta\delta_n\varepsilon_n X_n + \theta\delta_n Y_n \\ &= (1 - \lambda)X_n + \theta(1 - \theta)^n \delta_n Y_0 + \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda\theta(1 - \theta)^{n-k} \delta_n \varepsilon_k X_k \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{X_{n+1} - (1 - \lambda)X_n}{(1 - \theta)^n \delta_n} &= \theta Y_0 + \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda\theta(1 - \theta)^{-k} \varepsilon_k X_k \\ &= \lambda\theta(1 - \theta)^{-n} \varepsilon_n X_n + \frac{X_n - (1 - \lambda)X_{n-1}}{(1 - \theta)^{n-1} \delta_{n-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

which, using the notation introduced in (26) and (32), can be rewritten as the following linear recursion (*generalized autoregressive model of order 2 with random coefficients* [83]):

$$X_{n+1} = (1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_n + (1 - \theta)d_n)X_n - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)d_n X_{n-1}. \quad (43)$$

It follows from this recursion that

$$X_n \leq (1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1} + (1 - \theta)d_{n-1})X_{n-1}, \quad (44)$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n} &\leq 1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_n + (1 - \theta)d_n - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)d_n (1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1} + (1 - \theta)d_{n-1})^{-1} \\ &= 1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_n + (1 - \theta)d_n \frac{\lambda\theta\zeta_{n-1} + 1 - \theta}{(1 - \lambda)d_{n-1}^{-1} + \lambda\theta\zeta_{n-1} + 1 - \theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\nu \leq E\left(\ln\left(1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_n + (1 - \theta)d_n \frac{\lambda\theta\zeta_{n-1} + 1 - \theta}{(1 - \lambda)d_{n-1}^{-1} + \lambda\theta\zeta_{n-1} + 1 - \theta}\right)\right). \quad (45)$$

An alternative bound for $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ can be obtained from (43) and (44) as follows. By plugging-in the bound for X_n from (44) into the first term in the right-hand side of (43), we obtain

$$\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_{n-1}} \leq (1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_n + (1 - \theta)d_n)(1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1} + (1 - \theta)d_{n-1}) - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)d_n,$$

and, consequently,

$$\nu^2 \leq E(\ln \{(1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_n + (1 - \theta)d_n)(1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1} + (1 - \theta)d_{n-1}) - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)d_n\}). \quad (46)$$

On the other hand, it follows from (42) that

$$\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n} = 1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\varepsilon_n\delta_n + \theta\delta_n \frac{Y_n}{X_n}.$$

Furthermore, by virtue of (2),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{Y_n}{X_n} &\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\lambda(1 - \theta)\varepsilon_{n-1}}{1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\varepsilon_{n-1}\delta_{n-1}}, \frac{1 - \theta}{\theta\delta_{n-1}} \right\} \\ &= \frac{\lambda(1 - \theta)\varepsilon_{n-1}}{1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\varepsilon_{n-1}\delta_{n-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n} \geq 1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\delta_n\varepsilon_n + \frac{(1 - \theta)\lambda\theta\delta_n\varepsilon_{n-1}}{1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\varepsilon_{n-1}\delta_{n-1}}.$$

The results of this subsection so far can be summarized as follows:

Theorem 5.1. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then, for any interior point $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ$:*

- (i) *The sequence X_n obeys the linear recursion (43).*
- (ii) *The following lower bound holds for the Lyapunov exponent ν :*

$$\nu \geq E \left(\ln \left(1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_n + (1 - \theta)d_n \frac{\lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1}}{1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1}} \right) \right).$$

- (iii) *The upper bounds in (45) and (46) hold for the Lyapunov exponent ν .*

Utilizing the notation introduced in (33) and Proposition 3.5, we obtain

Corollary 5.2. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then, for any interior point $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ$:*

- (i) *The sequence Y_n obeys the linear recursion*

$$Y_{n+1} = (1 - \theta + \lambda\theta\zeta_n + (1 - \lambda)e_n)Y_n - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)e_n Y_{n-1}. \quad (47)$$

- (ii) *The following lower bound holds for the Lyapunov exponent ν :*

$$\nu \geq E \left(\ln \left(1 - \theta + \lambda\theta\zeta_n + (1 - \lambda)e_n \frac{\lambda\theta\zeta_{n-1}}{1 - \theta + \lambda\theta\zeta_{n-1}} \right) \right).$$

- (iii) *The following two upper bounds hold for the Lyapunov exponent ν :*

$$\nu \leq E \left(\ln \left(1 - \theta + \lambda\theta\zeta_n + (1 - \lambda)e_n \frac{1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1}}{1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1} + (1 - \theta)e_{n-1}^{-1}} \right) \right),$$

$$\nu^2 \leq E(\ln \{(1 - \theta + \lambda\theta\zeta_n + (1 - \lambda)e_n)(1 - \theta + \lambda\theta\zeta_{n-1} + (1 - \lambda)e_{n-1}) - (1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)e_n\}).$$

5.2 Continued fraction representation of ν

Recall (26), (32), and (33). For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, using the double-infinite version of the stationary sequence $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)$, let

$$\begin{aligned} p_n &= 1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_n + (1 - \theta)d_n & \text{and} & & q_n &= -(1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)d_n, \\ r_n &= 1 - \theta + \lambda\theta\zeta_n + (1 - \lambda)e_n & \text{and} & & s_n &= -(1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)e_n. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Thus, for $n \geq 1$,

$$X_{n+1} = p_n X_n + q_n X_{n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{n+1} = r_n Y_n + s_n Y_{n-1}. \quad (49)$$

Equivalently,

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_{n+1} \\ X_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p_n & q_n \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_n \\ X_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} Y_{n+1} \\ Y_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} r_n & s_n \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y_n \\ Y_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (50)$$

Fibonacci-like random recursions in the form similar to (49) have been studied by many authors, see for instance [60] and references therein. The reduction from (1) to (50) enables us to exploit a well-known relation between random Fibonacci sequences and continuous fractions in order to obtain a new representation for the Lyapunov exponent ν see (Theorem 5.3 below).

For any integer $n \geq 0$ and real $\mathfrak{z} \geq 0$ define continued fractions

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(\mathfrak{z}) &= p_0 + \frac{q_0}{p_{-1} + \frac{q_{-1}}{p_{-2} + \dots}} \\ &\quad \dots \\ &\quad + \frac{q_{n-2}}{p_{-(n-1)} + \frac{q_{-(n-1)}}{p_{-n} + q_{-n}\mathfrak{z}}} \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v_n(\mathfrak{z}) &= r_0 + \frac{s_0}{r_{-1} + \frac{s_{-1}}{r_{-2} + \dots}} \\ &\quad \dots \\ &\quad + \frac{s_{-(n-2)}}{r_{-(n-1)} + \frac{s_{-(n-1)}}{r_{-n} + s_{-n}\mathfrak{z}}} \end{aligned}$$

Notice that

$$p_n + q_n\mathfrak{z} > 0 \text{ for } 0 \leq \mathfrak{z} < (1 - \lambda)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad r_n + s_n\mathfrak{z} > 0 \text{ for } 0 \leq \mathfrak{z} < (1 - \theta)^{-1}.$$

It is easy to verify that both $u_n(\mathfrak{z})$ and $v_n(\mathfrak{z})$ are monotone decreasing sequence for, respectively, for $0 \leq \mathfrak{z} < (1 - \lambda)^{-1}$, and for $0 \leq \mathfrak{z} < (1 - \theta)^{-1}$, and hence converging almost surely to a limit within these ranges of the initial value \mathfrak{z} . In fact, once the existence of the Lyapunov exponent ν has been established independently, the bulk of the argument in [39] can be carried over to obtain the following result (see also Lemma 5.7 below for an extension).

Theorem 5.3. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold, and let*

$$u(\mathfrak{z}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n(\mathfrak{z}) \text{ for } 0 \leq \mathfrak{z} < (1 - \lambda)^{-1}, \quad v(\mathfrak{z}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n(\mathfrak{z}) \text{ for } 0 \leq \mathfrak{z} < (1 - \theta)^{-1}.$$

Denote $u_n = u_n(0)$, $v_n = v_n(0)$, $u = u(0)$, and $v = v(0)$. Then,

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\ln u_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\ln v_n) = E(\ln u) = E(\ln v).$$

A short proof of Theorem 5.3 is included in Section 6.5. The result gives yet another equivalent expression for ν . The expected values of $\ln u$ and $\ln v$ can be calculated numerically, at least in principle. In particular, though we do not pursue the line of model's investigation in this paper, it seems plausible that the algorithm introduced in [104] can be adopted for a class of continuous distributions $(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0)$. In fact, we have the following:

Proposition 5.4. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and denote*

$$C_0 := C^2 \frac{1 - \lambda + (1 - \theta + \lambda\theta)C^2}{1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta C^{-2}}, \quad (52)$$

where C is the constant introduced in (18). Then, for all $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ$,

$$0 < E(\ln u_n) - \nu < C_0 \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} E \left(\prod_{k=0}^m \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)}{(1-\lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_k)^2} \right). \quad (53)$$

The proof of the proposition is included in Section 6.6. Notice that if the pairs $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)$ are independent of each other, (53) yields the error bound

$$0 < E(\ln u_n) - \nu < \frac{C_0}{1-h} h^{n+1},$$

where

$$h := \begin{cases} E \left(\left(\frac{1-\lambda}{1-\lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_0} \right)^2 \right) & \text{if } \lambda \leq \theta, \\ E \left(\left(\frac{1-\theta}{1-\theta + \lambda\theta\gamma_0} \right)^2 \right) & \text{if } \lambda \geq \theta. \end{cases} \quad (54)$$

We remark that an exponential rate of convergence is generic for iteration of random i. i. d. maps (see, for instance, Theorem 1.1 in [24]). The bound in (53) implies the exponential convergence in the general case when the sequence of pairs $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is stationary and ergodic, but not necessarily i. i. d. Indeed, $\frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)}{(1-\lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_k)^2} \leq h_0$, where

$$h_0 := \begin{cases} \left(\frac{1-\lambda}{1-\lambda + \lambda\theta C^{-2}} \right)^2 & \text{if } \lambda \leq \theta, \\ \left(\frac{1-\theta}{1-\theta + \lambda\theta C^{-2}} \right)^2 & \text{if } \lambda \geq \theta. \end{cases} \quad (55)$$

Thus, we have

Corollary 5.5. *Under Assumption 3.1, for all $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ$,*

$$0 < E(\ln u_n) - \nu < \frac{C_0}{1-h_0} h_0^{n+1},$$

where constants C_0 and h_0 are defined, respectively, in (52) and (55).

The following proposition is an analogue of Proposition 5.4 for the sequence v_n .

Proposition 5.6. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and denote*

$$\tilde{C}_0 := C^2 \frac{1 - \theta + (1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta)C^2}{1 - \theta + \lambda\theta C^{-2}}.$$

Then, for all $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ$,

$$0 < E(\ln v_n) - \nu < \tilde{C}_0 \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} E \left(\prod_{k=0}^m \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)}{(1-\lambda + \lambda\theta\zeta_k)^2} \right) < \frac{\tilde{C}_0}{1-h_0} h_0^{n+1},$$

where h_0 is defined in (55). If the pairs $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)$ are i. i. d., then the bound can be improved to

$$0 < E(\ln v_n) - \nu < \frac{\tilde{C}_0}{1-h} h^{n+1},$$

where h is defined in (54).

We conclude this section with a brief general discussion of Theorem 5.3. The theorem is closely related to several results that are known for fairly general class of random matrix products in the i. i. d. case, see for instance [60] for a brief summary. First, we observe the following. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let \mathcal{F}_n and \mathcal{G}_n denote the σ -algebras generated by, respectively, $(p_k, q_k)_{k \leq n}$ and $(r_k, s_k)_{k \leq n}$.

Lemma 5.7. *Suppose that Assumption 3.1 is satisfied, and let $u(\mathfrak{z})$, $v(\mathfrak{z})$, u , and v be as defined in the statement of Theorem 5.3. Then, the following holds true:*

- (i) $u(\mathfrak{z})$ is independent of \mathfrak{z} for $0 \leq \mathfrak{z} < (1-\lambda)^{-1}$.
- (ii) $v(\mathfrak{z})$ is independent of \mathfrak{z} for $0 \leq \mathfrak{z} < (1-\theta)^{-1}$.
- (iii) Let $z_0 = u$ and define z_n for $n \geq 1$ recursively by the formula $z_n = p_n + q_n/z_{n-1}$. Then, $(z_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a strictly positive, stationary and ergodic sequence. Furthermore, u is the unique distribution of $z_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ with this property.
- (iv) Let $t_0 = v$ and define t_n for $n \geq 1$ recursively by the formula $t_n = r_n + s_n/t_{n-1}$. Then, $(t_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a strictly positive, stationary and ergodic sequence. Furthermore, v is the unique distribution of $t_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0$ with this property.

The proof of the lemma is given in Section 6.7. In view of (49), the lemma describes the stationary distributions of the ratios $\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n}$ and $\frac{Y_{n+1}}{Y_n}$. Thus, Theorem 5.3 implies that

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left(\ln \frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n} \right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left(\ln \frac{Y_{n+1}}{Y_n} \right). \quad (56)$$

We remark that part (iii) (respectively, (iv)) of the lemma is a consequence of part (i) (correspondingly, (ii)) combined with a variation of Letac contraction principle identifying stationary distributions of (originally) Markov chains; see, for instance, Proposition 1 in [19].

Similar to (56) results for a general class of i. i. d. 2×2 matrices follow, for instance, Theorem 5.1 in [62] and the results in Appendix C of [63] (see also more general and abstract Proposition 3.3 in [12], Proposition 4.1 in [34], and Lemma 4.3 in [37]). Using (1), one can express the limiting (and hence, unique stationary) distribution of $\frac{Y_n}{X_n}$ in terms of either u or v , cf. (58) below. The limiting distribution of $\frac{Y_n}{X_n}$, call it ψ , can be then used to obtain another formal expression for ν , see Proposition 5.8 below. We remark that ψ is a central object of study of [62]. Relations between continuous fractions, long-term behavior of matrix products and related invariant measures have been studied by many authors starting with [32]. In particular, [32] gives a similar to Theorem 5.3 result for a general i. i. d. case with $p_n q_n < 0$, see the corollary on pp. 387-388 there. A brief account of major results for 2×2 i. i. d. matrices can be found, for instance, in the introductory sections of the monograph [12] and research articles [60, 62].

5.3 Alternative continued fractions representation of ν

Let \mathbb{R}_+ denote the set of strictly positive real numbers. For a 2×2 matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ with strictly positive entries define a function (“real-valued Möbius map”, cf. [19, 20]) $T_A : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ by setting

$$T_A(x) = \frac{a_{11}x + a_{12}}{a_{21}x + a_{22}}.$$

It is easy to verify that $T_{AB}(x) = T_A(T_B(x))$ (the group property of Möbius transformations [6]). Using this fact and induction, we obtain (cf. [20])

$$T_{M_n \cdots M_0}(x) = \frac{\theta \delta_n}{1 - \theta} + \frac{(1 - \theta)^{-1}}{\frac{\lambda \varepsilon_n}{1 - \lambda} + \frac{\theta \delta_{n-1}}{1 - \theta} + \cdots + \frac{(1 - \theta)^{-1}}{\frac{\lambda \varepsilon_0}{1 - \lambda} + \frac{(1 - \lambda)^{-1}}{x}}}. \quad (57)$$

In particular, assuming that $Y_0 = 0$,

$$T_{M_n \cdots M_0}(+\infty) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} T_{M_n \cdots M_0}(x) = \frac{(M_n \cdots M_0)_{11}}{(M_n \cdots M_0)_{21}} = \frac{X_{n+1}}{Y_{n+1}}.$$

The ratio $\frac{X_{n+1}}{Y_{n+1}}$ converges in distribution to a non-degenerate random variable under some general conditions (see, for instance, Theorem 4.2 in [62]). Since by (2),

$$\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n} = 1 - \lambda + \lambda \theta \varepsilon_n \delta_n + \theta \delta_n \frac{Y_n}{X_n}, \quad (58)$$

this convergence would imply that

$$1 - \lambda + \lambda \theta \gamma_0 + \frac{\theta \delta_0}{T_{M_{-1} \cdots M_{-(n+1)}}(+\infty)}$$

converges to the stationary distribution of $\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n}$. In our case, the convergence of $\frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n}$ has been established in Theorem 5.3, and can be used along with (58) to claim the convergence in distribution of $\frac{Y_n}{X_n}$. Thus, we have proved the following:

Proposition 5.8. *Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then, the following holds for all $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ$:*

(i) $T_{M_{-1} \cdots M_{-(n+1)}}(+\infty)$ converges, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, to the stationary distribution of $\frac{Y_n}{X_n}$.

(ii) Moreover,

$$\nu(\lambda, \theta) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E \left(\ln \left(1 - \lambda + \lambda \theta \gamma_0 + \frac{\theta \delta_0}{T_{M_{-1} \cdots M_{-(n+1)}}(+\infty)} \right) \right).$$

Note that under our assumptions, the second part of the proposition follows from part (i) by the bounded convergence theorem. As usual, a counterpart of the proposition for matrices \widehat{M}_n can be obtained by using (5) and (6) in place of (1).

5.4 A special case when $\nu(\lambda, \lambda)$ can be calculated

In this subsection we calculate $\nu(\lambda, \lambda)$ for a special case when both ε_0 and θ_0 are both gamma-distributed. The example is a straightforward modification of a part of Theorem 1 in [52] and Theorem 7.1 in [62]. If X is a positive absolutely continuous random variable, we write either $X \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} f$ or $f \stackrel{df \rightarrow rv}{\sim} X$ to indicate that the distribution of X has density f .

Recall that a positive absolutely continuous random variable ξ is gamma-distributed with parameters $h, a > 0$ if its probability density function is

$$f_{h,a}(x) = \frac{a^{-h}}{\Gamma(h)} x^{h-1} e^{-\frac{x}{a}}, \quad x > 0,$$

where Γ is the usual gamma function, that is $\Gamma(h) = \int_0^\infty t^{h-1} e^{-t} dt$. If h is integer and $\xi \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} f_{h,a}$, then ξ is distributed as a sum of h independent exponential distributions with mean a . Consider now the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution [5] with density

$$g_{h,a,b}(x) = \frac{a^{\frac{h}{2}} b^{-\frac{h}{2}}}{2K_{|h|}(\sqrt{ab})} x^{h-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(ax + \frac{b}{x}\right)}, \quad x > 0,$$

where $h \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a, b > 0$ are parameters and K_h is the hyperbolic Bessel function of the second kind, that is for $h > 0$ we have [101]:

$$K_h(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \Gamma\left(h + \frac{1}{2}\right) (2x)^h \int_0^\infty \frac{\cos t dt}{(t^2 + x^2)^{h+1/2}}.$$

For any constants $h, a, b, c > 0$, we have [52]:

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \text{if } \xi \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} f_{h,a} \text{ and } \eta \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} g_{h,a,b}, \text{ then } c\xi \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} f_{h,ac} \text{ and } c\eta \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} g_{h, \frac{a}{c}, bc} \\ (ii) \quad & \xi \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} g_{h,a,b} \text{ if and only if } \frac{1}{\xi} \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} g_{-h,b,a} \\ (iii) \quad & g_{h,a,b} = g_{-h,a,b} * f_{h, \frac{2}{a}}, \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where $f * g$, as usual, denotes the convolution: $f * g(x) = \int_0^x f(t)g(x-t)dt$, $x > 0$.

Suppose now that ε_0 and δ_0 are independent of each other and, furthermore, for some constants $h, a, b, c > 0$, the pair $(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0)$ is independent of a random variable ξ such that $c(1-\lambda)\xi \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} g_{h,a,b}$, $\frac{\lambda\varepsilon_0}{c(1-\lambda)} \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} f_{h, \frac{2}{b}}$, and $c\lambda\delta_0 \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} f_{h, \frac{2}{a}}$. Then, by virtue of (59),

$$\frac{\lambda\varepsilon_0}{1-\lambda} + \frac{(1-\lambda)^{-1}}{\xi} \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} g_{h, \frac{b}{c}, ac},$$

and

$$c(1-\lambda) \left(\frac{\lambda\delta_0}{1-\lambda} + \frac{(1-\lambda)^{-1}}{\frac{\lambda\varepsilon_0}{1-\lambda} + \frac{(1-\lambda)^{-1}}{\xi}} \right) \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} f_{h, \frac{2}{a}} * g_{-h,a,b} = g_{h,a,b} \stackrel{df \rightarrow rv}{\sim} c(1-\lambda)\xi.$$

Hence, by virtue of (57) and Proposition 5.8, ξ is the stationary distribution of $\frac{Y_n}{X_n}$. Note that the uniqueness of the latter follows, for instance, from (58) and part (iii) of Lemma 5.7 (alternatively, and more directly, from (57) and the same Letac contraction principle we used to prove Lemma 5.7). Thus, in view of (58), we have proved the following:

Theorem 5.9. *Let Assumptions 2.1 hold. Suppose in addition that*

$$\varepsilon_0 \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} f_{h, \frac{2}{r}} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_0 \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} g_{h, \frac{2}{s}}$$

for some constants $h, r, s > 0$. Then,

$$\nu(\lambda, \lambda) = E(\ln(1 - \lambda + \lambda^2 \varepsilon_0 \delta_0 + \lambda \delta_0 \xi)),$$

where $\xi \stackrel{rv \rightarrow df}{\sim} g_{-h, a, b}$ with $a = \frac{r}{\lambda}$, $b = \frac{s(1-\lambda)}{\lambda}$, and ξ is independent of $(\varepsilon_0, \delta_0)$.

Note that the distribution of ξ defined in the statement of the theorem depends on the value of the parameter λ . In the case when ε_0 and δ_0 are identically distributed, similar random continuous fractions (referred to as random Stieltjes functions) have been considered in [63] and [64]. In particular, in the case $r = s$, an explicit formula for ν in terms of Bessel functions can be obtained using Theorem 4 of [63]. In fact, using the fact that the two matrices in factorization (3) are i. i. d. when $r = s$ in the conditions of Theorem 5.9, one can show that in that case

$$\nu(\lambda, \lambda) = \frac{(1-\lambda)^{-h/2}}{K_{|h|}\left(\frac{s\sqrt{1-\lambda}}{\lambda}\right)} \int_0^\infty x^{h-1} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{sx}{\lambda} + \frac{s(1-\lambda)}{\lambda x}\right)\right) \ln x \, dx.$$

Example 5.10. *Consider the setting of Theorem 5.9 with $r = s = 8$ and $h = 4.5$. Then*

$$\nu(0.69, 0.69) \approx 0.062518,$$

while, utilizing the results of Section 4, in particular part (ii) of Proposition 4.1,

$$\max_{(\lambda, \theta) \in \partial\Omega} \nu(\lambda, \theta) = \nu(0.53\dots, 1) = \nu(1, 0.53\dots) \approx 0.061395.$$

This provides another example, in addition to the one given in Section 4.5, when “Kelly’s effect” (8) holds true.

6 Appendix: Proofs

6.1 Proof of Proposition 2.3

Since $\mu(\lambda, \theta) = \mu(\theta, \lambda)$, it is sufficient to prove the monotonicity of μ in λ . It follows from (13) that

$$\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\gamma \theta - 1 + \frac{(1 - \gamma \theta)(\lambda + \theta - \gamma \lambda \theta) + 2(\gamma - 1)\theta}{\sqrt{(\lambda + \theta - \gamma \lambda \theta)^2 + 4(\gamma - 1)\lambda \theta}} \right). \quad (60)$$

Therefore, $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \lambda} = 0$ would yield (note that $1 - \gamma \theta = 0$ along with $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \lambda} = 0$ would imply $(\gamma - 1)\theta = 0$, which is precluded by the conditions of the proposition)

$$\left((\lambda + \theta - \gamma \lambda \theta) + 2 \frac{(\gamma - 1)\theta}{1 - \gamma \theta} \right)^2 = (\lambda + \theta - \gamma \lambda \theta)^2 + 4(\gamma - 1)\lambda \theta,$$

or, equivalently,

$$\theta(1 - \gamma \theta)(\lambda + \theta - \gamma \lambda \theta) + (\gamma - 1)\theta^2 = \lambda \theta(1 - \gamma \theta)^2.$$

This yields $\gamma \theta(1 - \theta) = 0$, which is impossible under the conditions of the proposition. Thus, $\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \lambda}$ never changes the sign. To complete the proof of the proposition, observe that for any fixed $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we have $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \lambda} = (\gamma - 1)$ by virtue of (60). \square

6.2 Proof of Proposition 2.4

Assuming that $\gamma = 1$, and hence $\beta = \alpha^{-1}$, we obtain from (10) and (11) that

$$\begin{aligned} W_{n+1} - W_n &= -\lambda(1 - \theta)W_n + \theta V_n, \\ V_{n+1} - V_n &= \lambda(1 - \theta)W_n - \theta V_n, \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

where

$$W_n := \alpha U_n. \tag{62}$$

Thus, $W_{n+1} + V_{n+1} = W_n + V_n$. Hence, at equilibrium, when both the differences at (61) are zeroes for all $n \geq 0$, we must have

$$\lambda = \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta} \frac{V_0}{W_0}.$$

On the other hand, if for some $n \geq 0$, the inequality $\lambda > \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta} \frac{V_n}{W_n}$ holds true, then, taking into account that $V_{n+1} - V_n = -(W_{n+1} - W_n)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta} \frac{V_{n+1}}{W_{n+1}} &= \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta} \frac{\lambda(1 - \theta)W_n + (1 - \theta)V_n}{W_n - \lambda(1 - \theta)W_n + \theta V_n} = \frac{\lambda\theta + \theta \frac{V_n}{W_n}}{1 - \lambda(1 - \theta) + \theta \frac{V_n}{W_n}} \\ &< \frac{\lambda\theta + \lambda(1 - \theta)}{1 - \lambda(1 - \theta) + \lambda(1 - \theta)} = \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $\lambda < \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta} \frac{V_n}{W_n}$ then $\lambda < \frac{\theta}{1 - \theta} \frac{V_{n+1}}{W_{n+1}}$. By induction, in either case, both the sequences W_n and V_n are monotone, and hence the limits (possibly infinite)

$$U = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} W_n \quad \text{and} \quad V = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n$$

exist. Taking the limits on both sides of (61) then yields $\frac{V}{W} = \lambda \frac{1 - \theta}{\theta}$, completing the proof of the proposition in view of (62). \square

6.3 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Let

$$\Omega_{-1} = \{(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega : (1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta) \neq 0\}.$$

Observe that $\det M_n = (1 - \lambda)(1 - \theta)$ is strictly positive when $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega_{-1}$. Thus, M_n is an invertible matrix with probability one on Ω_{-1} . Furthermore, due to (18), $\|M_n\|$ and $\|M_n^{-1}\|$ are bounded on Ω_{-1} for any sub-multiplicative matrix norm $\|\cdot\|$. That is, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$P(c^{-1} \leq \|M_n\| \leq c) = 1.$$

This follows, for instance, from the fact that for $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega^\circ$, the spectral norm $\|M_n\|_2$ is the logarithm of the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of M_n , and hence is bounded from below by the minimal and from above by the maximal entry of the matrix. Moreover, $\|M_n\|_2 = 1$ when $\lambda\theta = 0$.

Hence, $\nu(\lambda, \theta)$ is a continuous function of its parameters on Ω_{-1} by Theorem C in [11]. It remains to extend this claim to the case when either $\lambda = 1$ or $\theta = 1$. Toward this end, for $\eta > 0$, define

$$M_{n,\eta} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda + \lambda(\theta + \eta)\varepsilon_n\delta_n & (\theta + \eta)\delta_n \\ \lambda(1 - \theta)\varepsilon_n & 1 + \eta - \theta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, by virtue of (18),

$$\det M_{n,\eta} = (1 - \lambda)(1 - \eta) + \eta(1 - \lambda) + \eta\lambda(\theta + \eta)\varepsilon_n\delta_n > 0$$

for all $\eta > 0$ and $(\lambda, \theta) \in \Omega$. Let $\nu_\eta(\lambda, \theta)$ be the top Lyapunov exponent of $M_{n,\eta}$, that is

$$\nu_\eta = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \|M_{n,\eta} \cdots M_{1,\eta}\| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln \|M_{n,\eta} \cdots M_{1,\eta}\|).$$

By Theorem C in [11], $\nu_\eta(\lambda, \theta)$ is a continuous function on the whole domain Ω for all $\eta > 0$. Therefore, using the non-negativity of the matrices under consideration and a standard sub-additivity argument, we obtain that for all $(\lambda_0, \theta_0) \in \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{(\lambda,\theta) \rightarrow (\lambda_0,\theta_0)} \nu(\lambda, \theta) &\leq \limsup_{(\lambda,\theta) \rightarrow (\lambda_0,\theta_0)} \nu_\eta(\theta, \lambda) = \limsup_{(\lambda,\theta) \rightarrow (\lambda_0,\theta_0)} \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln \|M_{n,\eta} \cdots M_{1,\eta}\|) \\ &\leq \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} \limsup_{(\lambda,\theta) \rightarrow (\lambda_0,\theta_0)} E(\ln \|M_{n,\eta} \cdots M_{1,\eta}\|) = \nu_\eta(\lambda_0, \theta_0). \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

In the above argument we used Kingman's sub-ergodic theorem to write

$$\nu_\eta(\lambda, \theta) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln \|M_{n,\eta} \cdots M_{1,\eta}\|)$$

and the bounded convergence theorem to establish the convergence of $E(\ln \|M_{n,\eta} \cdots M_{1,\eta}\|)$ when (λ, θ) approaches (λ_0, θ_0) .

Next, we observe that when $\theta = 1$, $M_{n,\eta}$ are upper triangular matrices, and therefore [79]

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_\eta(\lambda, 1) &= \max \{ \ln M_{n,\eta}(1, 1), \ln M_{n,\eta}(2, 2) \} \\ &= \max \{ E(\ln(1 - \lambda + \lambda(1 + \eta)\varepsilon_n\delta_n)), \ln \eta \}. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Since $\eta > 0$ is arbitrary, in view of (63), we can conclude that for any $\lambda_0 \in [0, 1]$,

$$\limsup_{(\lambda,\theta) \rightarrow (\lambda_0,1)} \nu_\eta(\lambda, \theta) \leq E(\ln(1 - \lambda + \lambda\varepsilon_n\delta_n)). \quad (65)$$

On the other hand, with K_n defined as

$$K_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta\varepsilon_n\delta_n & \theta\delta_n \\ 0 & 1 - \theta \end{pmatrix},$$

we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\theta, \lambda) &\geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln \|K_n \cdots K_1\|) \\ &= \max \{ E(\ln(1 - \lambda + \lambda\varepsilon_n\delta_n)), \ln(1 - \theta) \}, \end{aligned}$$

where, similarly to (64), we used the explicit formula for the Lyapunov exponent of triangular matrices in terms of the maximum of the expected values of the logarithm of their diagonal terms. The last formula implies that

$$\lim_{(\lambda,\theta) \rightarrow (\lambda_0,1)} \nu(\lambda, \theta) \geq E(\ln(1 - \lambda_0 + \lambda_0\varepsilon_n\delta_n)).$$

Combining this lower bound with (65), we conclude that

$$\lim_{(\lambda,\theta) \rightarrow (\lambda_0,1)} \nu(\lambda, \theta) = \ln E((1 - \lambda_0 + \lambda_0\varepsilon_n\delta_n)) = \nu(\lambda_0, 1),$$

where the last identity is another application of the formula for the Lyapunov exponent of triangular matrices.

To conclude the proof, it remains to observe that the case $\lambda = 1$ can be handled by using the counterpart for $\theta = 1$ and appealing to the symmetry identity stated in Proposition 3.5. \square

6.4 Proof of Proposition 3.4

(a) For a 2×2 matrix A , let $\|A\|$ denote its spectral norm. It follows from (22), Jensen's inequality, and (10) that

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} E(\ln X_n) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln E(X_n) = \ln \|M\|,$$

where $M = E(M_0)$ as in (11). It is easy to see that if $COV(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n) \leq 0$, then

$$\|M\| \leq \mu,$$

where μ is $\|M\|$ in the case when $COV(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n) = 0$, and is calculated in (13). Thus, by virtue of (17), $\nu \leq \ln \mu \leq 0$ when $\gamma \leq 1$. This completes the proof of part (a) of the proposition.

(b) The claim follows from Propositions 4.1 and Proposition 3.2. \square

6.5 Proof of Theorem 5.3

We will only prove the claim for the sequence u_n , the proof for v_n is similar. Let $z_n = \frac{X_{n+1}}{X_n}$ and recall (48). It follows from (1) and (2), that using a suitable Y_0 , we can set z_0 to be any desired positive number given any $X_0 > 0$. We will therefore assume, without loss of generality, that $X_0 = 1$ and $z_0 = p_0$, that is $Y_0 = (1 - \theta)^{-1} \delta_{-1}^{-1}$. By "without loss of generality" we mean that the convergence in (20) and (21) remains to occur with probability one. It follows then from (43) that $z_{n+1} = p_n + \frac{q_n}{z_n}$, and hence, taking in account that $z_0 = p_0$,

$$z_{n+1} = p_n + \frac{q_n}{p_{n-1} + \frac{q_{n-1}}{p_{n-2} + \dots + \frac{q_2}{p_1 + \frac{q_1}{p_0}}}}$$

In view of (20) and (21), taking in account our assumption that $X_0 = 1$,

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \ln z_k = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E(\ln z_k) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E(\ln u_k), \quad \text{a. s.}$$

where the sequence u_k is defined in (51), and the last equality holds because u_k and z_k are identically distributed for any fixed $k \geq 0$.

It is easy to verify that, since $q_n < 0$ with probability one, u_n is a monotone decreasing sequence. Therefore, $u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n$ exists with probability one. Furthermore, using the continuity property of probability measures and the monotonicity of the u_k sequence,

$$\begin{aligned} P(u < 0) &= P\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{u_k < 0\}\right) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P\left(\bigcup_{k=1}^n \{u_k < 0\}\right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(u_k < 0) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(z_k < 0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\ln u$ is well-defined if we use the convention that $\ln 0 = -\infty$. Moreover, by the monotone convergence theorem, $E(\ln u) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(\ln u_n)$, where the left-hand side in principle can be $-\infty$. The claim follows now from the Cesàro's mean convergence theorem which yields

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n E(\ln u_k) = E(\ln u), \quad \text{a. s.}$$

Since we already know that ν is finite under Assumption 3.1, the last identity guarantees that in fact $P(u > 0) = 1$. \square

6.6 Proof of Proposition 5.4

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $-(1-\theta)d_{n-1} < x < 0$, define $f_n(x) = \frac{q_n}{p_{n-1}+x}$. Then,

$$u_{n+1}(\mathfrak{z}) = p_0 + f_0(f_{-1}(\cdots f_{-(n-1)}(q_{-n}\mathfrak{z}) \cdots)). \quad (66)$$

Notice that, since $\mathfrak{z} < (1-\lambda)^{-1}$ by the assumptions of the theorem,

$$q_{-n}\mathfrak{z} = -(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)d_{-n}\mathfrak{z} > -(1-\theta)d_{-n}.$$

Furthermore, if $-(1-\theta)d_{-n} < x \leq 0$, then $f_{-(n-1)}(x) < 0$ and

$$f_{-(n-1)}(x) = \frac{q_{-(n-1)}}{p_{-n}+x} > \frac{q_{-(n-1)}}{p_{-n}-(1-\theta)d_{-n}} = \frac{-(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)d_{-(n-1)}}{1-\lambda+\lambda\theta\gamma_{-n}} > -(1-\theta)d_{-(n-1)}.$$

Thus, by the induction on n , the expression in the right-hand side of (66) is well-defined. Moreover, for $-(1-\theta)d_{n-1} < x < 0$, we have

$$f'_n(x) = \frac{|q_n|}{(p_{n-1}+x)^2} < \frac{|q_n|}{(p_{n-1}-(1-\theta)d_{n-1})^2} = \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)d_n}{(1-\lambda+\lambda\theta\gamma_{n-1})^2}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< u_n(\mathfrak{z}) - u_{n+1}(\mathfrak{z}) < \prod_{k=0}^{n-2} \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)d_{-k}}{(1-\lambda+\lambda\theta\gamma_{-k-1})^2} \cdot |f_{-(n-1)}(q_{-n}/p_{-n-1}) - f_{-(n-1)}(0)| \\ &< \frac{q_{-n}}{p_{-n-1}} \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)d_{-k}}{(1-\lambda+\lambda\theta\gamma_{-k-1})^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

By virtue of part (ii) of Assumption 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< u_n - u_{n+1} < (1-\lambda+\lambda\theta C^2 + (1-\theta)C^2) \prod_{k=0}^n \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)d_{-k}}{(1-\lambda+\lambda\theta\gamma_{-k-1})^2} \\ &< (1-\lambda+\lambda\theta C^2 + (1-\theta)C^2)(1-\lambda)^{n+1}(1-\theta)^{n+1} C^2 \prod_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{(1-\lambda+\lambda\theta\gamma_{-k-1})^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (66) and the above induction argument that

$$u \geq p_0 - (1-\theta)d_0 \geq 1 - \lambda + \lambda\theta C^{-2},$$

and hence, with C_0 introduced in (52), we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< E(\ln u_n) - E(\ln u) = E\left(\ln\left(1 + \frac{u_n - u}{u}\right)\right) < E\left(\frac{u_n - u}{u}\right) \\ &< C_0 \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} E\left(\prod_{j=0}^k \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)}{(1-\lambda+\lambda\theta\gamma_{-j-1})^2}\right) = C_0 \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} E\left(\prod_{j=0}^k \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)}{(1-\lambda+\lambda\theta\gamma_j)^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

6.7 Proof of Lemma 5.7

We will only prove parts (i) and (iii), parts (ii) and (iv) are proved similarly.

(i) Similarly to (67),

$$0 < |u_n(\mathfrak{z}_1) - u_n(\mathfrak{z}_2)| < \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{(1-\lambda)(1-\theta)d_{-k}}{(1-\lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_{-k-1})^2} \cdot |\mathfrak{z}_2 - \mathfrak{z}_1|,$$

and hence

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} |u_n(\mathfrak{z}_1) - u_n(\mathfrak{z}_2)| \leq \ln((1-\lambda)(1-\theta)) - 2E(\ln(1-\lambda + \lambda\theta\gamma_0)) \leq \ln h_0 < 0,$$

where $h_0 \in (0, 1)$ is a constant defined in (55). Since both sequences $u_n(\mathfrak{z}_1)$ and $u_n(\mathfrak{z}_2)$ converge, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the limit is common and is equal to u introduced in the statement of Theorem 5.3.

(iii) By induction, it follows from (51) that $z_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and that $(z_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is a stationary sequence. In fact, the Markov chain argument of Letac (see, for instance, Proposition 1 in [19]) can be applied verbatim to the “background Markov chain” $W_n = (\varepsilon_k, \delta_k)_{k \leq n}$. Since the sequence of pairs $(\varepsilon_n, \delta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is assumed to be ergodic, $z_n \in \mathcal{F}_n$ proves the ergodicity of $(Z_n)_{n \geq 0}$. Finally, again just as in the original Letac contraction principle, the claimed uniqueness property of the stationary distribution follows from the fact that with any initial distribution z_0 such that $P(z_0 > 1 - \lambda) = 1$, Theorem 5.3 insures the weak convergence of z_n to the distribution of u . \square

6.8 Numerical algorithm and error bounds for BERN(0.3, 0.2; 2) in Section 4.5

In what follows we adopt some notation of [77], that we now proceed to introduce within our specific two-dimensional content. Suppose that, as in BERN($\varepsilon, \delta; \eta$) of Assumption 4.2, each of the variables ε_0 and δ_0 takes value in a finite set. Consequently, the distribution of matrices M_n is supported on a finite set $\{A_1, \dots, A_b\}$. For in instance, $b = 4$ in all instances of BERN($\varepsilon, \delta; \eta$). Denote $p_i = P(M_0 = A_i)$. For $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, let $\|x\| = \max_i |x_i|$ and, for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, let \bar{x} denote the direction of x . Let \mathbb{P}_+ be the “positive quadrant” in the projective space of $(\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|)$, that is

$$\mathbb{P}_+ = \{\bar{x} : x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2, x_i > 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2\}.$$

In other words, \mathbb{P}_+ is the space of the equivalence classes of non-zero vectors in the positive cone of $(\mathbb{R}^2, \|\cdot\|)$, where two vectors are considered to be equivalent if they share the same direction. For any practical purpose in this paper, \bar{x} can be thought as the unit vector $\frac{x}{\|x\|}$, and \mathbb{P}_+ can be identified with the first quadrant arch of the unit circle in \mathbb{R}^2 . With any of our matrices A_j , one can associate an operator $A_{j\bullet} : \mathbb{P}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_+$ as follows: $A_{j\bullet}\bar{x} = \overline{A_j x}$. Notice that

$$(AB)_{\bullet}\bar{x} = \overline{(AB)x} = \overline{A(Bx)} = \overline{A(\overline{Bx})} = A_{\bullet}(B_{\bullet}\bar{x}),$$

that is $A_{\bullet}B_{\bullet} = (AB)_{\bullet}$. Let \mathcal{C}_2 be the space of complex-valued functions on \mathbb{P}_+ , and introduce a *transfer operator* $T : \mathcal{C}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ by setting

$$(Tf)(\bar{x}) = E(f(M_{0\bullet}\bar{x})) = \sum_{j=1}^b p_j f(A_{j\bullet}\bar{x}), \quad \bar{x} \in \mathbb{P}_+.$$

It turns out that, with $f_j(\bar{x}) = \log \|A_j \bar{x}\|$,

$$\nu = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j=1}^b p_j (T^n f_j)(\bar{x}), \quad \forall \bar{x} \in \mathbb{P}_+. \quad (68)$$

Indeed,

$$\sum_{j=1}^b p_j (T f_j)(\bar{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^b p_j E(f_j(M_{0\bullet} \bar{x})) = E(\log \|M_{1\bullet} M_{0\bullet} \bar{x}\|),$$

and, more generally, by induction,

$$\sum_{j=1}^b p_j (T^n f_j)(\bar{x}) = E(\log \|M_{n\bullet} \cdots M_{0\bullet} \bar{x}\|) = E(\log \|(M_n \cdots M_0)_{\bullet} \bar{x}\|).$$

Furthermore (see p. 135 in [77]), for all $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{P}_+$ we have

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^b p_j (T^n f_j)(\bar{x}) - \sum_{j=1}^b p_j (T^n f_j)(\bar{y}) \right| \leq \vartheta^n m h(\bar{x}, \bar{y}),$$

where

$$\vartheta = \sum_{j=1}^b p_j \tau(A_j) < 1, \quad (69)$$

$$m = \max_{j=1, \dots, b} \sup_{\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{P}_+} \frac{|f_j(\bar{x}) - f_j(\bar{y})|}{h(\bar{x}, \bar{y})},$$

with

$$h(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \log \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2} \frac{x_i y_j}{x_j y_i}$$

and

$$\tau(A_j) = \sup \left\{ \frac{h(A_{j\bullet} \bar{x}, A_{j\bullet} \bar{y})}{h(\bar{x}, \bar{y})} : \bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{P}_+, \bar{x} \neq \bar{y} \right\}.$$

By Birkhoff's formula (see (8) in [77]),

$$\tau(A_j) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{\psi_j}}{1 + \sqrt{\psi_j}}, \quad (70)$$

where

$$\psi_j = \min_{i, k, m, n} = \frac{A_j(i, k) A_j(m, n)}{A_j(i, n) A_j(m, k)}. \quad (71)$$

It is not hard to check that $m \leq 1$ (see p. 142 in [77]), and hence, for any $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{P}_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \nu - \sum_{j=1}^b p_j (T^n f_j)(\bar{y}) \right| &\leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{j=1}^b p_j (T^{k+1} f_j)(\bar{x}) - \sum_{j=1}^b p_j (T^k f_j)(\bar{x}) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^b p_j \left| (T^{k+1} f_j)(\bar{x}) - (T^k f_j)(\bar{x}) \right| \leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^b p_j \sum_{\ell=1}^b p_{\ell} \left| (T^k f_j)(A_{\ell \bullet} \bar{x}) - (T^k f_j)(\bar{x}) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^b p_j \sum_{\ell=1}^b p_{\ell} \vartheta^k h(\bar{x}, A_{\ell \bullet} \bar{x}) = \frac{\vartheta^n}{1 - \vartheta} \sum_{\ell=1}^b p_{\ell} h(\bar{x}, A_{\ell \bullet} \bar{x}) \\
&= \frac{\vartheta^n}{1 - \vartheta} \sum_{\ell=1}^b p_{\ell} \log \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2} \frac{x_i(A_{\ell} x)_j}{x_j(A_{\ell} x)_i}. \tag{72}
\end{aligned}$$

Recall (2). If $\bar{x} = (1, 1)$, then

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2} \frac{x_i(M_n x)_j}{x_j(M_n x)_i} = \max \left\{ \frac{1 - \lambda + \theta \delta_n [\lambda \varepsilon_n + 1]}{(1 - \theta) [\lambda \varepsilon_n + 1]}, \frac{(1 - \theta) [\lambda \varepsilon_n + 1]}{1 - \lambda + \theta \delta_n [\lambda \varepsilon_n + 1]} \right\}$$

Moreover, using (71),

$$\psi(M_n) = \frac{\lambda \theta \varepsilon_n \delta_n}{1 - \lambda + \lambda \theta \varepsilon_n \delta_n}.$$

Combining this formulas together with (69), (70), and (72), we obtain that for BERN(0.3, 0.2; 2),

$$\vartheta = 0.6088577,$$

and, for 20 iterations,

$$\left| \nu - \sum_{j=1}^4 p_j (T^{20} f_j)(\bar{y}) \right| \leq 0.00003004159, \tag{73}$$

which, as desired, considerably smaller than the gap between the values shown in (36) and (37).

References

- [1] M. T. Adam, P. J. Astor, and J. Krämer, *Affective images, emotion regulation and bidding behavior: An experiment on the influence of competition and community emotions in internet auctions*, J. Interact. Mark. **35** (2016), 56–69.
- [2] F. Angelini, M. Castellani, and L. Zirulia, *Overconfidence in the art market: a bargaining pricing model with asymmetric disinformation*, Econ. Polit. **39** (2022), 961–988.
- [3] O. Ashenfelter and K. Graddy, *Auctions and the price of art*, J. Econ. Lit. **41** (2003), 763–786.
- [4] A. Assaf, L. Kristoufek, E. Demir, and S. K. Mitra, *Market efficiency in the art markets using a combination of long memory, fractal dimension, and approximate entropy measures*, J. Int. Financial Mark. Inst. Money **71** (2021), 101312.
- [5] O. Barndorff-Nielsen and Ch. Halgreen, *Infinite divisibility of the hyperbolic and generalized inverse Gaussian distributions*, Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **38** (1977), 309–311.

- [6] A. F. Beardon, *Continued fractions, discrete groups and complex dynamics*, *Comput. Methods Funct. Theory* **1** (2001), 535–594.
- [7] J. Beckert and J. Rössel, *The price of art: Uncertainty and reputation in the art field*, *Eur. Soc.* **15** (2013), 178–195.
- [8] R. W. Belk, *Collecting In A Consumer Society*, Routledge, 1995.
- [9] R. W. Belk, *Collecting as luxury consumption: Effects on individuals and households*, *J. Econ. Psychol.* **16** (1995), 477–490.
- [10] H. P. Bermin and M. Holm, *Kelly trading and market equilibrium*, *Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finances* **26** (2023), 2350001.
- [11] C. Bocker-Neto and M. Vianna, *Continuity of Lyapunov exponents for random two-dimensional matrices*, *Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys.* **37** (2017), 1413–1442.
- [12] P. Bougerol and J. Lacroix, *Products of random matrices with applications to Schrödinger operators*, *Progress in Probability and Statistics*, vol. 8, Birkhäuser, 1985.
- [13] L. Breiman, *Investment policies for expanding businesses optimal in a long-run sense*, *Nav. Res. Logist. Q.* **7** (1960), 647–651.
- [14] L. Breiman, *Optimal gambling systems for favorable games*, In: *Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, vol. 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*, University of California Press (1961), pp. 65–78.
- [15] S. Browne and W. Whitt, *Portfolio choice and the Bayesian Kelly criterion*, *Adv. Appl. Prob.* **28** (1996), 1145–1176.
- [16] R. A. J. Campbell, *Art as a financial investment*, *J. Altern. Invest.* **10** (2008), 64–81.
- [17] C. Carey, *Modeling collecting behavior: The role of set completion*, *J. Econ. Psychol.* **29** (2008), 336–347.
- [18] P. Carr and U. Cherubini, *Generalized compounding and growth optimal portfolios reconciling Kelly and Samuelson*, *J. Deriv.* **30** (2022), 74–93.
- [19] J. F. Chamayou and G. Letac, *Explicit stationary distributions for compositions of random functions and products of random matrices*, *J. Theor. Probab.* **4** (1991), 3–36.
- [20] P. Chassaing, G. Letac, and M. Mora, *Brocot sequences and random walks in $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$* , In: H. Heyer (ed.), *Probability Measures on Groups VII*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol 1064, Springer, 1984.
- [21] E. Coslor and C. Spaenjers, *Organizational and epistemic change: The growth of the art investment field*, *Account. Organ. Soc.* **55** (2016), 48–62.
- [22] D. G. De Silva, R. A. J. Pownall, and L. Wolk, *Does the sun ‘shine’ on art prices?*, *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.* **82** (2012), 167–178.
- [23] B. Derrida, K. Mecheri and J. L. Pichard, *Lyapunov exponents of products of random matrices: weak disorder expansion. Applications to localisation*, *J. Physique* **48** (1987), 733–740.
- [24] P. Diaconis and D. Freedman, *Iterated random functions*, *SIAM Review* **41** (1999), 45–76
- [25] A. Dillon, *Collecting as routine human behavior: Personal identity and control in the material and digital world*, *Inf. Cult.* **54** (2019), 255–280.
- [26] E. Dimson and C. Spaenjers, *Investing in emotional assets*, *Financ. Anal. J.* **70** (2014), 20–25,
- [27] R. F. Engle, E. Ghysels, and B. Sohn, *Stock market volatility and macroeconomic fundamentals*, *Rev. Econ. Stat.* **95** (2013), 776–797.
- [28] S. Ethier, *The Kelly system maximizes median fortune*, *J. Appl. Probab* **41** (2004), 1230–1236.
- [29] B. S. Frey, *Art markets and economics: Introduction*, *J. Cult. Econ.* **21** (1997), 165–173.

- [30] B. S. Frey and R. Cueni, *Why invest in art?* Econ. Voice **10** (2013), 1–6.
- [31] B. S. Frey and R. Eichenberger, *On the rate of return in the art market: Survey and evaluation*, Eur. Econ. Rev. **39** (1995), 528–537.
- [32] H. Furstenberg, *Noncommuting random products*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **108** (1963), 377–428.
- [33] H. Furstenberg and H. Kesten, *Products of random matrices*, Ann. Math. Stat. **31** (1960), 457–469.
- [34] H. Furstenberg and Y. Kifer, *Random matrix products and measures on projective spaces*, Israel J. Math. **46** (1983), 12–32.
- [35] T. Gagnon-Bartsch, M. Pagnozzi, and A. Rosato, *Projection of private values in auctions*, Am. Econ. Rev. **111** (2021), 3256–3298.
- [36] U. Garay, *Determinants of art prices and performance by movements: Long-run evidence from an emerging market*, Journal of Business Research **127** (2021), 413–426.
- [37] I. Ya. Gol'dsheid and G. A. Margulis, *Lyapunov indices of a product of random matrices*, Russ. Math. Surv. **44** (1989), 11–71.
- [38] J. D. Hamilton, *Regime-switching models*, In: S. Durlauf and L. Blume (eds.), *New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd. edn., Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.
- [39] P. Hope, *Exponential growth of random Fibonacci sequences*, Fibonacci Q. **33** (1995), 164–168.
- [40] C.-H. Hsieh, *On asymptotic log-optimal portfolio optimization*, Automatica **151** (2023), 110901.
- [41] N. Jurga and I. Morris, *Effective estimates on the top Lyapunov exponents for random matrix products*, Nonlinearity **32** (2019), 4117.
- [42] J. B. Kadane, *Partial-Kelly strategies and expected utility: Small-edge asymptotics*, Decis. Anal. **8** (2011), 4–9.
- [43] L. Karpik, *Valuing the Unique. The Economics of Singularities*, Princeton University Press, 2010.
- [44] J. L. Kelly, *A new interpretation of information rate*, Bell Syst. Tech. J. **35** (1956), 917–926.
- [45] J. Kleine, T. Peschke, and N. Wagner, *Rich men's hobby or question of personality: who considers collectibles as alternative investment?* Fin. Res. Lett. **35** (2020), p. 101307.
- [46] J. Kleine, T. Peschke, and N. Wagner, *Collectors: Personality between consumption and investment*, J. Behav. Exp. Finance **32** (2021), p. 100566.
- [47] A. Korteweg, R. Kräussl, and P. Verwijmeren, *Does it pay to invest in art? A selection-corrected returns perspective*, Rev. Financ. Stud. **29** (2016), 007–1038.
- [48] R. Kraeussl and C. Wiehenkamp, *A call on art investments*, Rev. Deriv. Res. **15** (2012), 1–23.
- [49] P. Laureti, M. Medo, and Y.-C. Zhang, *Analysis of Kelly-optimal portfolios*, Quant. Finance **10** (2010), 689–697.
- [50] C. Lee, S. Brennan, and J. Wyllie, *Consumer collecting behaviour: A systematic review and future research agenda*, Int. J. Consum. Stud. **46** (2022), 2020–2040.
- [51] E. Le Fur, *Collectors' motives in the context of wealth management*, J. Asset. Manag. **22** (2021), 326–337.
- [52] G. Letac and V. Seshadri, *A characterization of the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution by continued fractions*, Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **62** (1983), 485–489.
- [53] Y. Li, M. X. Ma, and L. Renneboog, *Pricing art and the art of pricing: On returns and risk in art auction markets*, Eur. Financ. Manag. **28** (2022), 1139–1198.
- [54] D. Laibson, *Golden eggs and hyperbolic discounting*, Q. J. Econ. **112** (1997), 443–478.
- [55] S. Lovo and C. Spaenjers, *A model of trading in the art market*, Am. Econ. Rev. **108** (2018), 744–774.

- [56] L. C. MacLean, R. O. Thorp, and W. T. Ziemba, *Long-term capital growth: the good and bad properties of the Kelly and fractional Kelly capital growth criteria*, *Quant. Finance* **10** (2010), 681–687.
- [57] L. C. MacLean, R. O. Thorp, Y. Zhao, and W. T. Ziemba, *How does the fortune’s formula Kelly capital growth model perform?*, *J. Portf. Manag.* **37** (2011), 96–111.
- [58] L. C. MacLean, E. O. Thorp, and W. T. Ziemba (eds.), *The Kelly Capital Growth Investment Criterion Theory and Practice*, World Scientific, 2011.
- [59] L. C. MacLean and Y. Zhao, *Kelly investing with downside risk control in a regime-switching market*, *Quant. Finance* **22** (2022), 75–94,
- [60] R. Majumdar, P. Mariano, H. Panzo, L. Peng, and A. Sisti, *Lyapunov exponent and variance in the CLT for products of random matrices related to random Fibonacci sequences*, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser A* **25** (2020), 4779–4799.
- [61] B. R. Mandel, *Art as an investment and conspicuous consumption good*, *Am. Econ. Rev.* **99** (2009), 1653–1663.
- [62] D. Mannion, *Products of 2×2 random matrices*, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **3** (1993), 1189–1218.
- [63] J. Marklof, Y. Tourigny, and L. Wołowski, *Explicit invariant measures for products of random matrices*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **360** (2008), 3391–3427.
- [64] J. Marklof, Y. Tourigny, and L. Wołowski, *Padé approximants of random Stieltjes series*, *Proc. Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **463** (2007), 2813–2832.
- [65] P. Martin, *Popular Collecting and the Everyday Self: The Reinvention of Museums?* Leicester University Press, 1999.
- [66] P. Masset and J. P. Weiskopf, *When rationality meets passion: on the financial performance of collectibles*, *J. Altern. Invest.* **21** (2018), 66–83.
- [67] W. D. McIntosh and B. Schneichel, *Collectors and collecting: A social psychological perspective*, *Leis. Sci.* **26** (2004), 85–97.
- [68] J. Mei and M. Moses, *Art as an investment and the underperformance of masterpieces*, *Am. Econ. Rev.* **92** (2022), 1656–1668.
- [69] J. Mei and M. Moses, *Vested interest and biased price estimates: Evidence from an auction market*, *J. Finance* **60** (2005), 2409–2435.
- [70] C. Musselin and C. Paradeise, *Quality: a debate*, *Sociol. Trav.* **47** (2005), 89–123.
- [71] M. Nozari, *Investment horizon for private-value assets: Evidence from the art market*, *J. Financial Res.* **45** (2022), 229–246.
- [72] T. O’Donoghue and M. Rabin, *Doing it now or later*, *Am. Econ. Rev.* **89**(1999), 103–124.
- [73] T. Okabe and J. Yoshimura, *A new long-term measure of sustainable growth under uncertainty*, *PNAS Nexus* **1** (2022), pgac228.
- [74] S. M. Pearce, *Museums, Objects, and Collections: A Cultural Study*, Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993.
- [75] S. M. Pearce, *On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition*, Routledge, 2013.
- [76] J. Pénasse and L. Renneboog, *Speculative trading and bubbles: Evidence from the art market*, *Manag. Sci.* **68** (2022), 4939–4963.
- [77] Y. Peres, *Domains of analytic continuation for the top Lyapunov exponent*, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **28** (1992), 131–148.
- [78] O. Peters, *The ergodicity problem in economics*, *Nat. Phys.* **15** (2019), 1216–1221.

- [79] S. Pincus, *Strong laws of large numbers for products of random matrices*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **287** (1985), 65–89.
- [80] A. Plastun, E. Bouri, A. Havrylina, and Q. Ji, *Calendar anomalies in passion investments: Price patterns and profit opportunities*, Res. Int. Bus. Finance **61** (2022), p. 101678.
- [81] M. Pollicott, *Effective estimates of Lyapunov exponents for random products of positive matrices*, Nonlinearity **34** (2021), 6705.
- [82] J. Prieto-Rodriguez and M. Vecco, *Reading between the lines in the art market: Lack of transparency and price heterogeneity as an indicator of multiple equilibria*, Econ. Model. **102** (2021), p. 105587
- [83] M. Regis, P. Serra, and E. R. van den Heuvel, *Random autoregressive models: A structured overview*, Econom. Rev. **41** (2022), 207–230.
- [84] L. Renneboog and C. Spaenjers, *Buying beauty: on prices and returns in the art market*, Manag. Sci. **59** (2013), 3–53.
- [85] F. Rojas and P. Lista, *A sociological theory of contemporary art collectors*, J. Arts Manag. Law Soc. **52** (2022) , 88–100.
- [86] L. M. Rotando and E. O. Thorp, *The Kelly criterion and the stock market*, Amer. Math. Monthly **99** (1992), 922–931.
- [87] V. Seetharam, R. Rastegar, A. Roitershtein, and V. Roytershteyn, in preparation.
- [88] C. Spaenjers, W. N. Goetzmann, and E. Mamonova, *The economics of aesthetics and record prices for art since 1701*, Explor. Econ. Hist. **57** (2015), 79–94.
- [89] R. H. Strotz, *Myopia and inconsistency in dynamic utility maximization*, Rev. Econ. Stud. **23** (1955), 165–180.
- [90] D. Sutter, O. Fawzi, and R. Renner, *Bounds on Lyapunov exponents via entropy accumulation*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **67** (2020), 10–24.
- [91] R. Taffler, *Emotional finance: investment and the unconscious*, Eur. J. Finance **24** (2018), 630–653.
- [92] V. E. Tarasov, *On history of mathematical economics: Application of fractional calculus*, Mathematics **7** (2019), 509.
- [93] C. Texier, *Fluctuations of the product of random matrices and generalized Lyapunov exponent*, J. Stat. Phys. **181** (2020), 990–1051.
- [94] E. O. Thorp, *Understanding the Kelly criterion*, In: L. C. MacLean, E. O. Thorp, and W. T. Ziemba (eds.), *The Kelly Capital Growth Investment Criterion Theory and Practice*, World Scientific (2011). pp. 509–523.
- [95] E. O. Thorp, *The Kelly criterion in blackjack sports betting, and the stock market*, In: L. C. MacLean, E. O. Thorp, and W. T. Ziemba (eds.), *The Kelly Capital Growth Investment Criterion Theory and Practice*, World Scientific (2011). pp. 789–832.
- [96] P. Van Der Grijp, *Passion and profit: The world of amateur traders in Philately*, J. Mater. Cult. **7** (2002), 23–47.
- [97] O. Velthuis, *Symbolic meanings of prices: constructing the value of contemporary art in Amsterdam and New York galleries*, Theory Soc. **32** (2003), 181–215.
- [98] O. Velthuis, *An interpretive approach to meanings of prices*, Rev. Austrian Econ. **17** (2004), 371–386.
- [99] O. Velthuis and E. Coslor, *The financialization of art*, In K. Knorr Cetina and A. Preda (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Finance*, Oxford Academic Books, 2012.
- [100] R. Vilela Mendes, R. Lima, and T. Araújo, *A process-reconstruction analysis of market fluctuations*, Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance **5** (2002), 797–821.

- [101] G. N. Watson, *A Treatise on the Theory of Bessel Functions*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- [102] N. Wesselhöfft and W. K. Härdle, *Risk-constrained Kelly portfolios under alpha-stable laws*, *Comput. Econ.* **55** (2020), 801–826.
- [103] A. C. Worthington and H. Higgs, *Art as an investment: Risk, return and portfolio diversification in major painting markets*, *Account. Finance* **44** (2004), 257–271.
- [104] T. G. Wright and L. N. Trefethen, *Computing Lyapunov constants for random recurrences with smooth coefficients*, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **132** (2001), 331–340.
- [105] M.-E. Wu and W.-H. Chung, *A novel approach of option portfolio construction using the Kelly criterion*, *IEEE Access* **6** (2018), 53044–53052.
- [106] M.-E. Wu, J. H. Syu, and C. M. Chen, *Kelly-based options trading strategies on settlement date via supervised learning algorithms*, *Comput Econ* **59** (2022), 1627–1644.
- [107] W. T. Ziemba, *A response to Professor Paul A. Samuelson’s objections to Kelly capital growth investing*, *J. Portf. Manag.* **42** (2015), 153–167.
- [108] W. T. Ziemba, *Understanding the Kelly capital growth investment strategy*, *Invest. Strateg. Quart.* **3** (2016), 49–55.
- [109] W. T. Ziemba, *The symmetric downside risk Sharpe ratio and the evaluation of great investors and speculators*, In: W. T. Ziemba, *Great Investment Ideas*, World Scientific, 2016, pp. 65–91.
- [110] L. Zou, A. De Bruin, J. Wu, and Y. Yuan, *Art for art’s sake? An exploration of the Chinese art market*, *Appl. Econ.* **53** (2021), 5429–5447.