

ANALITICITY OF THE LYAPUNOV EXPONENTS OF RANDOM PRODUCTS OF MATRICES

ARTUR AMORIM, MARCELO DURÃES, AND ALINE MELO

ABSTRACT. This paper is concerned with the study of random (Bernoulli and Markovian) product of matrices on a compact space of symbols. We establish the analyticity of the maximal Lyapunov exponent as a function of the transition probabilities, thus extending the results and methods of Y. Peres from a finite to an infinite (but compact) space of symbols. Our approach combines the spectral properties of the associated Markov operator with the theory of holomorphic functions in Banach spaces.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	5
2.1. Holomorphic functions in Banach spaces	5
2.2. Markov operators and convolution of measures	7
3. Proof of Theorem 1.1	11
3.1. The convergence of the iterates of the Markov operator	11
3.2. The domain of holomorphy	14
3.3. Corollaries and remarks	17
4. Analytic dependence on Markovian transitions	19
Acknowledgments	25
References	25

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Sigma \subset \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be a compact subset and let $X := \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the space of sequences $g = \{g_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on Σ . Denote by $\text{Prob}(\Sigma)$ the set of probability measures on Σ .

Given $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$, let $g = \{g_n\}_n$ be an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) multiplicative process with law μ . By Furstenberg-Kesten's theorem, there is a number $L_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, called the first (or maximal) *Lyapunov exponent* of the process such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \|g_{n-1} \cdots g_0\| \rightarrow L_1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Replacing the norm (or largest singular value) of the product $g_{n-1} \cdots g_0$ by the other singular values, we obtain all the other Lyapunov exponents L_2, \dots, L_d .

An important question in the study of Lyapunov exponents is concerned with its regularity. The study of the continuity or the modulus of continuity of the Lyapunov exponent with respect to the underlying data.

Furstenberg, Kifer [11] and Hennion [12] proved the continuity of the Lyapunov exponent with respect to the distribution μ assuming an irreducibility condition. Bocker and Viana [4] proved its continuity without any irreducibility condition for random products of $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ matrices. This result was generalized to the Markov case by Malheiro and Viana [16] and, more recently, to $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ matrices by Avila, Eskin, and Viana [1].

Regarding quantitative results, Le Page [15] proved Hölder continuous for a one-parameter family (with some conditions) which was generalized by Duarte and Klein [7, Chapter 5]. Duarte and Klein [9] proved a weak Hölder modulus of continuity in dimension 2, that is for $d = 2$, even without any irreducibility hypothesis just assuming that L_1 is simple. Also in dimension 2, Tall and Viana [18] proved that, assuming just the simplicity hypothesis, the Lyapunov exponent is pointwise Hölder continuous and that even when the Lyapunov exponent is not simple, it is at least pointwise log-Hölder continuous.

Moreover, a higher modulus of continuity was proved by Peres [17]. He showed that when Σ is finite and L_1 is simple, the Lyapunov exponent is an analytic function of the probability weights. Bezerra, Sanchez, and Tall [3] extended this result to random products of quasi-periodic cocycles. Moreover, Baraviera and Duarte [2] obtained an extension of Peres in another direction. They proved that for a compact, but possibly infinite Σ , under quasi-irreducibility hypothesis, the Lyapunov exponent is Lipschitz with respect to the total variation norm.

By putting together ideas of Peres, Baraviera and Duarte and tools of complex analysis in Banach spaces, we establish the analyticity of the top Lyapunov exponent with respect to the total variation norm

in two different settings. (Precise definitions of analyticity and total variation will be given in section 2).

In the first one, we assume a quasi-irreducibility hypothesis, which means the absence of proper invariant subspaces where the Lyapunov exponent restricted to it is not maximal. In other words, we assume that either there are no proper invariant subspaces or, if there exists such a subspace, then the Lyapunov exponent restricted to its direction is maximal. In the second one, instead of quasi-irreducibility, we assume that the probability measure has full support (which is an analogue of the assumption that each matrix has a positive probability in the finite support case of Peres [17]). More precisely, we establish the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Sigma \subset \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ be a compact subset, $\mu_0 \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$ and assume that $L_1(\mu_0) > L_2(\mu_0)$.*

- (1) *If μ_0 is quasi-irreducible, then $\mu \mapsto L_1(\mu)$ is real analytic with respect to the total variation norm in a neighbourhood of μ_0 .*
- (2) *If $\text{supp}(\mu_0) = \Sigma$, then $\mu \mapsto L_1(\mu)$ is real analytic with respect to the total variation norm in a neighbourhood of μ_0 .*

Remark 1.1. Similar results hold for absolutely continuous measures and for random locally constant linear cocycles whose domain Σ is an arbitrary compact set mapped to $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ by a measurable and bounded function (see Section 3.3).

Remark 1.2. In section 3.3 we include an example where Σ is not compact and the Lyapunov exponent is not even continuous.

It turns out that a similar statement holds for locally constant Markov linear cocycles, that is, linear cocycles over a Markov shift on a compact, possibly infinite space of symbols. Let us formally introduce the concept of Markov cocycles.

A Markov transition kernel $K: \Sigma \rightarrow \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$ generalizes the concept of stochastic matrix that appears in the sub-shift of finite type. We will consider it to be continuous in the sense that given any Borel measurable set $E \subset \Sigma$, the map $x \mapsto K_x(E)$ is continuous.

A measure $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$ is called K -stationary if for all Borel sets E , $\mu(E) = \int_{\Sigma} K_x(E) d\mu(x)$. The iterated Markov kernels K^n , $n \geq 1$ are defined inductively by $K^1 = K$ and $K_x^{n+1}(E) = \int_{\Sigma} K_y^n(E) dK_x(y)$, for all $x \in \Sigma$ and all Borel sets $E \subset \Sigma$. We assume that the kernel K is *uniformly ergodic*, meaning that K_x^n converges to μ uniformly (in $x \in \Sigma$) relative to the total variation distance. In this case the convergence is necessarily exponential and the K -stationary measure

$\mu = \mu_K$ is unique. This is the analogue of the stochastic matrix being primitive, in the finite setting.

Let K be a uniformly ergodic Markov kernel in Σ , μ be its unique stationary measure and let $\mathbb{P}_K = \mathbb{P}_{K, \mu_K}$ be the Markov measure on X with initial distribution μ_K and transition kernel K . Given a continuous function $A: \Sigma \times \Sigma \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and its extension to a locally constant fiber map on X , consider the corresponding skew product map $F_A: X \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow X \times \mathbb{R}^d$, $F_A(\omega, v) = (\sigma\omega, A(\omega_1, \omega_0)v)$, where σ denotes the forward shift. We regard F_A as a linear cocycle over the Markov shift (σ, \mathbb{P}_K) and refer to this dynamical system as a *Markov linear cocycle*. Its iterates are given by $F_A^n(\omega, v) = (\sigma^n\omega, A^n(\omega)v)$, where

$$A^n(\omega) = A(\omega_n, \omega_{n-1}) \dots A(\omega_2, \omega_1)A(\omega_1, \omega_0).$$

Similarly to the i.i.d product of matrices, there exists a number $L_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ which is called the top Lyapunov exponent of the process such that

$$\frac{1}{n} \log \|A^n(\omega)v\| \rightarrow L_1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

We fix A and denote it by $L_1(K)$ to emphasize the dependence on the kernel K .

We call a transition kernel K quasi-irreducible if the corresponding Markov cocycle F_A is quasi-irreducible, meaning that there is no proper, invariant measurable section $\mathcal{V}: \Sigma \rightarrow \text{Gr}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that the top Lyapunov exponent restricted to it is not maximal. $\text{Gr}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the Grassmannian manifold of \mathbb{R}^d and an invariant section \mathcal{V} is a map satisfying $A(\omega_1, \omega_0)\mathcal{V}(\omega_0) = \mathcal{V}(\omega_1)$.

Given two kernels K and L , we may consider a partial order relation between their supports. We say that $\text{supp}(L) \leq \text{supp}(K)$ if $\text{supp}(L_\omega) \subset \text{supp}(K_\omega)$ for every $\omega \in \Sigma$. For any fixed kernel K , we may define the set of continuous kernels whose supports are contained in the support of K as the following:

$$\mathcal{S}(K) := \{L \in \mathcal{K}(\Sigma) : \text{supp}(L) \leq \text{supp}(K)\}.$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let K_0 be a uniformly ergodic kernel on Σ such that $L_1(K_0) > L_2(K_0)$.*

- (1) *If K_0 is quasi-irreducible, then $K \mapsto L_1(K)$ is real analytic in a neighbourhood of K_0 .*
- (2) *The map $K \mapsto L_1(K)$ is real analytic in a neighbourhood of K_0 in $\mathcal{S}(K_0)$.*

The main ideas in the proof of the Markov setting are analogous to the ones that appear in the i.i.d case, but we need to use tools from [5] and [7] to deal with it.

Remark 1.3. If we assume that the Lyapunov spectrum is simple, then item 2 of both theorems holds for all the Lyapunov exponents.

Additionally, if all exterior powers $\wedge_k g$, $1 \leq k < d$ of the sequence $g = \{g_n\}$ are quasi-irreducible, then item 1 of both results also holds for all the other Lyapunov exponents, as long as they are simple.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the concept of holomorphy in Banach spaces and a useful characterization of it, which will play a very important role in our proof. Moreover, we introduce the Markov operator Q_μ and describe its general properties. In Section 3 we study the convergence of the iterates of the Markov operator. When μ is a probability, there is a suitable observable, such that the iterates of the Markov operator applied to it converge to the top Lyapunov exponent L_1 . More generally, when μ is any complex measure, we show that there is a domain where the limit function is holomorphic, which proves theorem 1.1. In Section 4 we extend the previous results to the Markov setting and prove theorem 1.2.

2. PRELIMINARIES

This section is divided in two parts, both of which serve the purpose of constructing a setting that permits a generalization of Peres's arguments. The first part recalls the concept of analyticity in infinite dimensional Banach spaces as well as a useful criteria thereof. The second part is devoted to the study of Markov operators defined by probabilities and the relationship with the convolution of measures. We define the average Hölder constant associated to a measure and derive a few estimates related to this quantity, which will be essential in chapter 3. A general reference for these concepts is [6].

Throughout this chapter, M and N will denote Banach spaces over \mathbb{C} and U will denote an open subset of M .

2.1. Holomorphic functions in Banach spaces. A function $f: U \rightarrow N$ is said to be *holomorphic at a point* $a \in U$ if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an n -linear symmetric continuous map $T_n: M \times \cdots \times M \rightarrow N$ (T_0 is identically equal to a vector) such that:

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} T_n(x-a)^n,$$

for every $x \in B(a, r) \subset U$ (for some $r > 0$), where $T_n y^n$ denotes $T_n(y, y, \dots, y)$. If f is holomorphic at every point of U , then f is said to be *holomorphic on* U .

We introduce the following notation:

$$U(a, b) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : a + zb \in U\}.$$

Definition 2.1. A map $f: U \rightarrow N$ is said to be *Gâteaux holomorphic* (or *G-holomorphic*) if for every $a \in U$ and for every $b \in M$, the map

$$z \mapsto f(a + zb)$$

is holomorphic on $U(a, b) \subset \mathbb{C}$.

It is clear that every holomorphic map is also *G-holomorphic*. However the converse in general is not true when M is infinite dimensional. The following theorem provides a criteria for when the converse holds.

Theorem 2.1. [6, Chapter 14] *Let U be an open subset of a Banach space and let $f: U \rightarrow N$. The following are equivalent:*

- (i) f is holomorphic on U .
- (ii) f is *G-holomorphic* and continuous on U .

The *variation* of a complex measure μ is defined as

$$|\mu| := \sup_{\pi} \sum_{A \in \pi} |\mu(A)|$$

where the supremum is taken over all partitions π of a measurable set E into a countable number of disjoint measurable sets.

Another characterization of the variation of a complex measure is the following:

$$|\mu|(E) = \sup \left\{ \left| \int_E f(g) d\mu(g) \right| : f \in L^\infty(\mu) \text{ and } \|f\|_\infty \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Note that if $f \in L^1(\mu)$, then:

$$\left| \int_\Sigma f(x) d\mu(x) \right| \leq \int_\Sigma |f(x)| d|\mu|(x).$$

Let Σ be a compact metric space. The total variation of a complex measure is defined as $\|\mu\| := |\mu|(\Sigma)$. If a measure satisfies $\|\mu\| < \infty$, then we say that μ is finite or that is of bounded variation.

We will consider Σ to be a compact (but possibly infinite) space of symbols. We denote by $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ the set of complex valued measures over Σ with bounded variation. The set $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$, endowed with the total variation norm, will play the role of the Banach space M .

In this paper, we consider slightly more general definitions of holomorphy and *G-holomorphy*, in which the domain could also be a translation of a Banach subspace. The following construction shows how one

can transfer the holomorphic structure from Banach spaces to affine subspaces via translation.

Let $V \subset M$ be a closed subspace, $v_0 \in M$ and consider a closed affine subspace $V_0 = V + v_0$ of M . Let $U_0 \subset V_0$ be an open set of V_0 . We consider a function $f_0 : U_0 \rightarrow N$ to be holomorphic (G-holomorphic) at $x_0 \in U_0$ if there exists a function $f : U = U_0 - v_0 \rightarrow N$ which is holomorphic (G-holomorphic) at $x_0 - v_0$, such that $f(x) = f_0(x + v_0)$ for every $x \in U$. Moreover, if f is holomorphic (G-holomorphic) in every point of its domain, then so is f_0 .

It is then immediate that Theorem 2.1 also holds in this context.

2.2. Markov operators and convolution of measures. Next, we present the definition of the convolution of measures in a more general setting for measures on groups.

Definition 2.2. Let G be a group that acts on a set S . Let μ be a measure in G and ν be a measure in S . Then we define the convolution of μ and ν as the measure $\mu * \nu$ on S such that

$$(\mu * \nu)(E) = \int_G \int_S 1_E(gx) d\nu(x) d\mu(g)$$

for every measurable set $E \subset S$. By standard arguments of measure theory, in the same context,

$$\int_M f(x) d(\mu * \nu)(x) = \int_G \int_S f(gx) d\nu(x) d\mu(g)$$

for every $f \in L^1(S)$.

Given $k \geq 2$ and a measure $\mu \in \text{Prob}(G)$, we define

$$\mu^{*k} := \mu * \cdots * \mu \quad (k \text{ times})$$

the k -th convolution of μ with itself.

Let us make two observations about the convolutions of measures. First, the convolution is associative, which makes μ^{*k} well defined. Second, it is a known result that the product of independent real measurable functions with distributions μ and ν has distribution $\mu * \nu$. From this, it follows that μ^{*n} is the distribution of the product of n i.i.d. real random variables with distribution μ . This observation shows that, in the usual cases, the convolution of measures corresponds to the product of i.i.d. random variables. However, the convolution of measures encompasses more general cases, which justifies its use, instead of the use of cocycles.

Let μ be a probability measure on Σ that is, $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$. Then we can define the Markov operator $Q_\mu: L^\infty(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ associated to μ as follows:

$$Q_\mu(\varphi)(\hat{v}) = \int_{\Sigma} \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) d\mu(g),$$

where $\hat{g}: \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the projective action of g defined by $\widehat{g\hat{v}} = \hat{g}\hat{v}$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denote the projective space of dimension d over \mathbb{R} .

The Markov operator Q_μ is a positive, bounded, linear operator that preserves constant functions. A general reference for this and related concepts in this section is [8].

We may also consider small perturbations of μ given by complex measures $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ and their associated operators Q_ν . Although Q_μ is a Markov operator, Q_ν may not be a Markov operator. This can happen because when ν is not a probability measure, it does not fix constants.

Moreover, we say that a measure $\eta \in \text{Prob}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is stationary with respect to μ , or μ -stationary, if it satisfies:

$$\eta(B) = \int \eta(\hat{g}^{-1}(B)) d\mu(g)$$

for every measurable set $B \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where \hat{g} is the projective action of g . It turns out that a measure η is μ -stationary if, and only if, for every continuous function $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} Q_\mu(\varphi) d\eta = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \varphi d\eta.$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ be a complex measure with bounded variation. Then,*

$$Q_{\mu^{*n}} = Q_\mu^n.$$

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction. Let $\varphi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \mathbb{C})$ and $\hat{v} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The case is trivial when $n = 1$. For $n = 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Q_\mu)^2(\varphi)(\hat{v}) &= \int_{\Sigma} \int_{\Sigma} \varphi(\hat{g}_1\hat{g}_0\hat{v}) d\mu(g_1)d\mu(g_0) \\ &= \int_{\Sigma} \int_{\Sigma} \varphi(\widehat{g_1g_0}\hat{v}) d\mu(g_1)d\mu(g_0) \\ &= \int_{\Sigma} \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) d\mu^{*2}(g) = Q_{\mu^{*2}}(\varphi)(\hat{v}). \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that it is true for every $k \leq n - 1$. We are going to prove that is also true when $k = n$.

$$\begin{aligned} (Q_\mu)^n(\varphi)(\hat{v}) &= \int_\Sigma \cdots \int_\Sigma \varphi(g_{n-1} \hat{v} \cdots \hat{g}_0 \hat{v}) d\mu(g_{n-1}) \cdots d\mu(g_0) \\ &= \int_\Sigma \int_\Sigma \varphi(\hat{g}(\hat{g}_0 \hat{v})) d\mu^{*(n-1)}(g) d\mu(g_0) \\ &= \int_\Sigma \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) d\mu^{*n}(g) = Q_{\mu^{*n}}(\varphi)(\hat{v}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Given $\hat{p}, \hat{q} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, denote by $\delta: \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ the projective distance on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$:

$$\delta(\hat{p}, \hat{q}) := \frac{\|p \wedge q\|}{\|p\| \|q\|} \quad (2.1)$$

Definition 2.3. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ be a complex measure of bounded variation. We define the average Hölder constant of the projective action $\hat{g}_0: \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$k_\alpha(\mu) := \sup_{v_1 \neq v_2} \int_\Sigma \left(\frac{\delta(\hat{g}_0 \hat{v}_1, \hat{g}_0 \hat{v}_2)}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)} \right)^\alpha d|\mu|(g_0).$$

Lemma 2.2. For every two complex measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$, it holds that $|\mu * \nu| \leq |\mu| |\nu|$. In particular, for every $\varphi \in L^\infty(\mu^{*n})$, we have that $|\int \varphi d\mu^{*n}| \leq \int |\varphi| d|\mu^{*n}| \leq \int |\varphi| d|\mu|^{*n}$.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in L^\infty(\mu * \nu)$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_\Sigma \varphi(x) d\mu * \nu(x) \right| &= \left| \int_\Sigma \int_\Sigma \varphi(gx) d\nu(x) d\mu(g) \right| \\ &\leq \int_\Sigma \int_\Sigma |\varphi(gx)| d|\nu|(x) d|\mu|(g) \\ &= \int_\Sigma |\varphi(x)| d|\mu| * |\nu|(x) \end{aligned}$$

By restricting it to $\|\varphi\|_\infty \leq 1$ and taking the supremum on both sides, it follows that $|\mu * \nu| \leq |\mu| |\nu|$. Moreover, applying the inequality above multiple times with $\nu = \mu$ concludes the result. □

Lemma 2.3. The sequence $k_\alpha(\mu^{*n})$ is sub-multiplicative:

$$k_\alpha(\mu^{*(m+n)}) \leq k_\alpha(\mu^{*m}) k_\alpha(\mu^{*n}).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
k_\alpha(\mu^{(m+n)}) &= \sup_{v_1 \neq v_2} \int_\Sigma \left(\frac{\delta(\hat{g}v_1, \hat{g}v_2)}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)} \right)^\alpha d|\mu^{*(m+n)}|(g) \\
&\leq \sup_{v_1 \neq v_2} \int_\Sigma \left(\frac{\delta(\hat{g}v_1, \hat{g}v_2)}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)} \right)^\alpha d|\mu^{*n}| * |\mu^{*m}|(g) \\
&= \sup_{v_1 \neq v_2} \int_\Sigma \int_\Sigma \left(\frac{\delta(\hat{g}_2\hat{g}_1\hat{v}_1, \hat{g}_2\hat{g}_1\hat{v}_2)}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)} \right)^\alpha d|\mu^{*m}|(g_1) d|\mu^{*n}|(g_2) \\
&= \sup_{v_1 \neq v_2} \int_\Sigma \int_\Sigma \left(\frac{\delta(\hat{g}_2\hat{g}_1\hat{v}_1, \hat{g}_2\hat{g}_1\hat{v}_2)}{\delta(\hat{g}_1\hat{v}_1, \hat{g}_1\hat{v}_2)} \cdot \frac{\delta(\hat{g}_1\hat{v}_1, \hat{g}_1\hat{v}_2)}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)} \right)^\alpha d|\mu^{*m}|(g_1) d|\mu^{*n}|(g_2) \\
&\leq \sup_{v_1 \neq v_2} \int_\Sigma \left(\frac{\delta(\hat{g}_1\hat{v}_1, \hat{g}_1\hat{v}_2)}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)} \right)^\alpha k_\alpha(\mu^{*n}) d|\mu^{*m}|(g_1) = k_\alpha(\mu^{*m}) k_\alpha(\mu^{*n}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Given $\varphi \in L^\infty(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ we define

$$v_\alpha(\varphi) := \sup_{\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2} \frac{|\varphi(\hat{v}_1) - \varphi(\hat{v}_2)|}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha}.$$

If $v_\alpha(\varphi) < \infty$ then φ is α -Hölder continuous. Let $C^\alpha(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ be the space of all Hölder continuous functions, which we endowed with its natural norm $\|\cdot\|_\alpha = \|\cdot\|_\infty + v_\alpha(\cdot)$.

Lemma 2.4. *For every $n \geq 1$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ and $\varphi \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, the following inequality holds:*

$$v_\alpha(Q_\mu^n(\varphi)) \leq k_\alpha(\mu^{*n}) v_\alpha(\varphi).$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}_1) - Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}_2)|}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} &= \frac{\left| \int_\Sigma \varphi(\hat{g}v_1) d\mu^{*n}(g) - \int_\Sigma \varphi(\hat{g}v_2) d\mu^{*n}(g) \right|}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} \\
&= \left| \int_\Sigma \frac{\varphi(\hat{g}v_1) - \varphi(\hat{g}v_2)}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} d\mu^{*n}(g) \right| \\
&\leq \int_\Sigma \frac{|\varphi(\hat{g}v_1) - \varphi(\hat{g}v_2)|}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} d|\mu^{*n}|(g) \\
&\leq v_\alpha(\varphi) \int_\Sigma \frac{\delta(\hat{g}v_1, \hat{g}v_2)^\alpha}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} d|\mu^{*n}|(g)
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude the lemma by applying the supremum in $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2$ to both sides. □

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

This section is divided into three parts. The first one is devoted to proving that the ideas in [2] still hold for complex measures. We show that the powers of the Markov operator Q_μ converge to a number which, when μ is a probability measure, is the Lyapunov exponent. In the second part we use the concept of Gâteaux holomorphy to write the Markov operator as a polynomial. Therefore, we are able to use ideas of [17] to prove Theorem 1.1. In the last part, we present some consequences of this result and we include one example that shows the importance of the compactness of the support of the measure.

3.1. The convergence of the iterates of the Markov operator.

A linear subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is called μ -invariant if $gV = V$ for μ -a.e. $g \in \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$. One can restrict the cocycle to the subspace V and consider the induced cocycle, with top Lyapunov exponent $L_1(\mu|_V)$. We call a probability measure μ *quasi-irreducible* if there is no proper μ -invariant linear subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $L_1(\mu|_V) < L_1(\mu)$.

Note that the quasi-irreducibility of μ_0 implies that Kifer's non random filtration ([14, Chapter 3, Theorem 1.2]) is trivial, that is, for every $v \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mu_0^{\mathbb{N}}$ -almost every $\{g_n\}_n \in X$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|g_{n-1} \dots g_1 g_0 v\| = L_1(\mu_0).$$

Moreover, together with the hypothesis that $L_1(\mu_0) > L_2(\mu_0)$, a consequence of the previous fact is that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\Sigma} \log \|gv\| d\mu_0^{*n}(g) = L_1(\mu_0), \quad (3.1)$$

with uniform convergence in $\hat{v} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. For a more detailed proof of this consequence, see [10, Proposition 5.2.2].

Lemma 3.1. *For every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ and every $\alpha > 0$,*

$$k_\alpha(\mu) \leq \sup_{\hat{v} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{s_1(g)s_2(g)}{\|gv\|^2} \right)^\alpha d|\mu|(g),$$

where $s_1(g)$ and $s_2(g)$ are the first and second singular values of a matrix $g \in \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. Recall that

$$\|gp \wedge gq\| = s_1(g)s_2(g)\|p \wedge q\|.$$

Hence, by (2.1), given $\alpha > 0$, two points $\hat{p}, \hat{q} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and any $g \in \Sigma$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\frac{\delta(\hat{g}\hat{p}, \hat{g}\hat{q})}{\delta(\hat{p}, \hat{q})} \right]^\alpha &= \left[(s_1(g)s_2(g)) \frac{\|p\|\|q\|}{\|gp\|\|gq\|} \right]^\alpha \\ &\leq \frac{[s_1(g)s_2(g)]^\alpha}{2} \left[\frac{1}{\|gp\|^{2\alpha}} + \frac{1}{\|gq\|^{2\alpha}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

since the geometric mean is less or equal the arithmetic mean.

Note that if we integrate with respect to the measure $|\mu|$ and take the supremum in $\hat{p} \neq \hat{q}$ on both sides of this inequality, we conclude the lemma. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that $\mu_0 \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$ is quasi-irreducible and $L_1(\mu_0) > L_2(\mu_0)$. Then, there exist $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\theta > 1$, $C > 0$ and a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ of μ_0 with respect to the total variation distance, such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $\mu \in V$,*

$$k_\alpha(\mu^{*n}) \leq C\theta^{-n}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. We follow the argument in [7]. By equation (3.1) it holds that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\Sigma} \log \|gv\|^{-2} d\mu_0^{*n} = -2L_1(\mu_0),$$

with uniform convergence in $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

Hence choosing ϵ small enough, say $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}(L_1(\mu_0) - L_2(\mu_0))$, and choosing n sufficiently large, we have that

$$\int_{\Sigma} \log \|gv\|^{-2} d\mu_0^{*n} \leq n(-2L_1(\mu_0) + \epsilon).$$

Given a matrix $g \in \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, let $\wedge_2 g \in \text{GL}_{\binom{d}{2}}(\mathbb{R})$ denote the second exterior power of g . Note that $\|\wedge_2 g\| = s_1(g)s_2(g)$.

Then for n large enough and for all $\omega \in \Sigma$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \int_{\Sigma} \log(s_1(g)s_2(g)) d\mu_0^{*n} &= \frac{1}{n} \int_{\Sigma} \log \|(\wedge_2 g)\| d\mu_0^{*n} \\ &\leq L_1(\wedge_2 g, \mu_0) + \epsilon = L_1(\mu_0) + L_2(\mu_0) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous estimates, for all $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} \log \left(\frac{s_1(g)s_2(g)}{\|gv\|^2} \right) d\mu_0^{*n} &\leq n(L_1(\mu_0) + L_2(\mu_0) + \epsilon) + n(-2L_1(\mu_0) + \epsilon) \\ &= -n \frac{1}{2} (L_1(\mu_0) - L_2(\mu_0)) < -1, \end{aligned}$$

since $L_1(\mu_0) > L_2(\mu_0)$ and provided that n is large enough.

Using the inequality $\exp x \leq 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2} \exp |x|$, we conclude that for every $v \in \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$ and n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{s_1(g)s_2(g)}{\|gv\|^2} \right)^{\alpha} d\mu_0^{*n} &= \int_{\Sigma} \exp \left(\alpha \log \frac{s_1(g)s_2(g)}{\|gv\|^2} \right) d\mu_0^{*n} \\ &\leq 1 + \int_{\Sigma} \left(\alpha \log \frac{s_1(g)s_2(g)}{\|gv\|^2} \right) d\mu_0^{*n} \\ &\quad + \int_{\Sigma} \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2} \log^2 \frac{s_1(g)s_2(g)}{\|gv\|^2} \exp \frac{\alpha \log s_1(g)s_2(g)}{\|gv\|^2} \right) d\mu_0^{*n} \\ &\leq 1 - \alpha + C \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \end{aligned}$$

for some finite constant C that depends only on g, μ_0 and n .

Thus, fixing n_0 sufficiently large and considering α small enough, we conclude by Lemma 3.1 that

$$k_{\alpha}(\mu_0^{*n_0}) \leq 1 - \alpha + C \frac{\alpha^2}{2} < 1.$$

Note that for a fixed n , the quantity $\int \left(\frac{s_1(g)s_2(g)}{\|gv\|^2} \right)^{\alpha} d|\mu_0|^{*n}$ which bounds from above $k_{\alpha}(\mu_0^{*n})$, depends continuously on the measure. Then the previous inequality extends to a neighbourhood of μ_0 . There exists $\kappa < 1$ and a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ of μ_0 with respect to the total variation distance, such that $k_{\alpha}(\mu^{*n_0}) \leq \kappa < 1$ for every $\mu \in V$.

Because of the sub-multiplicative property of k_{α} , we conclude that there exists $C > 0$ and $\theta > 1$, such that inequality 3.2 holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Corollary 3.3. *Assume that $\mu_0 \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$ is quasi-irreducible and $L_1(\mu_0) > L_2(\mu_0)$. Then there exists $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\theta > 1$, $C > 0$ and a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ of μ_0 with respect to the total variation distance, such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for every $\mu \in V$ and every $\varphi \in C^{\alpha}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$,*

$$v_{\alpha}(Q_{\mu}^n \varphi) \leq C\theta^{-n}.$$

Proof. By proposition 3.2, there exist $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\theta > 1$, $C > 0$ and a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ of μ_0 with respect to the total variation distance, such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $\mu \in V$, we have that $k_{\alpha}(\mu^{*n}) \leq C\theta^{-n}$. Together with lemma 2.4, we conclude that

$$v_{\alpha}(Q_{\mu}^n(\varphi)) \leq k_{\alpha}(\mu^{*n}) v_{\alpha}(\varphi) \leq C\theta^{-n}.$$

\square

When μ is a probability measure on Σ , a consequence of corollary 3.3 is that there exist $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $C < \infty$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\varphi \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$,

$$\left\| Q_\mu^n \varphi - \int \varphi d\eta_\mu \right\|_\alpha \leq C\theta^n \|\varphi\|_\alpha, \quad (3.3)$$

where η_μ is a μ -stationary measure on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. That is because

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \varphi - \int \varphi d\eta \right\|_\infty &= \left| \varphi(\hat{v}) - \int \varphi(\hat{p}) d\eta(\hat{p}) \right| \\ &\leq \int |\varphi(\hat{v}) - \varphi(\hat{p})| d\eta(\hat{p}) \leq v_0(\varphi) \leq v_\alpha(\varphi). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since η_μ is Q_μ stationary,

$$\left\| Q^n \varphi - \int \varphi d\eta_\mu \right\|_\infty = \left\| Q^n \varphi - \int Q_\mu^n \varphi d\eta_\mu \right\|_\infty \leq v_\alpha(Q_\mu^n \varphi) \leq C\theta^{-n}.$$

It follows from the inequality (3.3) that η_μ is the unique μ -stationary measure of this cocycle.

Consider the observable $\varphi: \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\varphi(\hat{v}) = \int_\Sigma \log \frac{\|gv\|}{\|v\|} d\mu(g). \quad (3.4)$$

If μ is a probability measure, then, by Furstenberg's formula,

$$\int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \varphi(\hat{v}) d\eta_\mu = L_1(\mu).$$

Remark 3.1. When μ is a probability measure, for a fixed $\hat{v} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the iterates $Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v})$ converge uniformly to the top Lyapunov exponent $L_1(\mu)$.

3.2. The domain of holomorphy. Now we establish a holomorphic extension of the Lyapunov exponent L_1 . We start by defining the domain where L_1 will be shown to be analytic.

Let $\mathcal{M}_0(\Sigma)$ be the set of finite complex measures that give measure zero to Σ . Therefore, every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_0(\Sigma)$ satisfies $\mu(\Sigma) = 0$.

Lemma 3.4. $\mathcal{M}_0(\Sigma)$ is a Banach space.

Proof. First note that $\mathcal{M}_0(\Sigma)$ is a vector subspace of $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$. Moreover, it is the kernel of the linear functional that assigns to each finite measure, its measure of the whole space: $\nu \mapsto \nu(\Sigma)$. Therefore, it is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$, hence it is also a Banach space. \square

Let $\mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ denote the set of finite complex measures that give measure one to Σ . Note that $\mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ is an affine subspace of $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$, namely $\mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma) = \mathcal{M}_0(\Sigma) + \mu_0$, for some $\mu_0 \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$. Therefore $\mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ can be endowed with an analytic structure as seen in section 2.1.

We are going to prove that L_1 admits a holomorphic extension to $V \cap \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$, where V is the neighbourhood of μ_0 from proposition 3.2. In fact, all the proofs from the previous sections were done in $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$, but could have been done directly in $\mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$. Thus, from now on, we are going to consider the neighbourhood V to be in $\mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ and we will write just V instead of $V \cap \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$.

Lemma 3.5. *For every $\mu \in V \subset \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$, $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\varphi \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ we have that*

$$|Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}_1) - Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}_2)| \leq C\theta^{-n}. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. By lemma 2.4, for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ and every $\varphi \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, we have $v_\alpha(Q_\mu^n \varphi) \leq v_\alpha(\varphi)k_\alpha(\mu^{*n})$.

Therefore, it also holds that for every $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$|Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}_1) - Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}_2)| \leq v_\alpha(\varphi)k_\alpha(\mu^{*n}).$$

Then, by proposition 3.2, we conclude the proof. \square

Proposition 3.6. *For every $\mu \in V \subset \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ and $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$|Q_\mu^{n+1} \varphi(\hat{v}) - Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v})| \leq C\theta^{-n}.$$

Proof. Note that for every $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$|Q_\mu^{n+1} \varphi(\hat{v}) - Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v})| = \left| \int_\Sigma Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) d\mu - Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}) \right|.$$

Moreover, for every $\mu \in V \subset \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ and $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\left| \int_\Sigma Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) d\mu - Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}) \right| = \left| \int_\Sigma Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) - Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v}) d\mu \right| \leq Ce^{-n}.$$

\square

Note that for a fixed \hat{v} and φ given in equation 3.4, the sequence $\{Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v})\}_n$ is Cauchy. Therefore its limit, denoted by $Q_\mu^\infty \varphi(\hat{v})$, exists. Moreover, note that $\mu \mapsto Q_\mu^n \varphi(\hat{v})$ is continuous. Since $\mu \mapsto Q_\mu^\infty \varphi(\hat{v})$ is a uniform limit of continuous functions, it is also continuous. Furthermore, when μ is a probability measure, $Q_\mu^\infty \varphi(\hat{v}) = L_1(\mu)$, the top Lyapunov exponent (as shown in remark 3.1).

We want to prove that $\mu \mapsto Q_\mu^\infty \varphi(\hat{v})$ is holomorphic. For this, we are going to use theorem 2.1. Since we already know that the limit is continuous, it suffices to prove that it is also G-holomorphic.

As we stated, $\mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ is not a Banach space, therefore, we need to transfer the holomorphic structure from $\mathcal{M}_0(\Sigma)$ to it. Intuitively, G-holomorphy means to be holomorphic along complex lines, hence to say that the map $\mu \mapsto Q_\mu^\infty \varphi(\hat{v})$ from $V \subset \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ to \mathbb{C} is Gâteaux holomorphic means that $\forall \mu \in V, \forall \nu \in \mathcal{M}_0(\Sigma)$, the map $z \mapsto Q_{\mu+z\nu}^\infty \varphi(\hat{v})$ is holomorphic on $V(\mu, \nu) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \mu + z\nu \in V\}$.

Consider measures μ_z of the form $\mu_z = \mu + z\nu$, where $\mu \in V$ and ν is any finite complex measure with $\nu(\Sigma) = 0$. Note that, since $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$, we have that $\mu_z \in \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Consider small perturbations of the Markov operator in the following sense: for each $z \in \mathbb{C}$, let the operator $Q_{\mu+z\nu}: L^\infty(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d), \mathbb{C})$ be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\mu+z\nu}(\varphi)(\hat{v}) &= \int_{\Sigma} \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) d(\mu + z\nu)(g) \\ &= \int_{\Sigma} \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) d(\mu) + z \int_{\Sigma} \varphi(\hat{g}\hat{v}) d(\nu) \\ &= Q_\mu(\varphi)(\hat{v}) + zQ_\nu(\varphi)(\hat{v}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that, for a fixed vector \hat{v} , each $Q_{\mu_z}^n(\varphi)(\hat{v})$ is a polynomial of degree smaller or equal to n , in particular, the map $z \mapsto Q_{\mu_z}^n(\varphi)(\hat{v})$ is holomorphic for $\mu_z \in V$. Therefore, for every $z \in V(\mu, \nu)$, the limit function is a uniform limit of holomorphic functions, hence $z \mapsto Q_{\mu_z}^\infty \varphi(\hat{v})$ is holomorphic. In other words, the Lyapunov exponent is G-holomorphic in the neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ of μ_0 . Together with the continuity, we conclude that it is indeed holomorphic. This concludes the proof of theorem 1.1 item (1).

Now we prove item (2) of theorem 1.1. We drop the assumption of irreducibility of μ_0 and instead we assume that $\text{supp}\mu_0 = \Sigma$. Let W be a non trivial vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^d that is invariant for μ_0 almost every matrix g . The measure μ_0 defines the measures $\mu_{0,W}$ and $\mu_{0,\mathbb{R}^d/W}$ in $\text{GL}_d(W)$ and $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}^d/W)$. Moreover, they induce the linear cocycles restricted to W and to \mathbb{R}^d/W , with Lyapunov exponents $L_1(\mu_{0,W})$ and $L_1(\mu_{0,\mathbb{R}^d/W})$.

By lemma 3.6 of [11], $L_1(\mu_0) = \max\{L_1(\mu_{0,W}), L_1(\mu_{0,\mathbb{R}^d/W})\}$.

Without loss of generality we may suppose that $L_1(\mu_0) = L_1(\mu_{0,W})$. The other case is similar. The fact that we consider $\text{supp}\mu_0 = \Sigma$ implies that $gW = W \forall g \in \Sigma$. Therefore, for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_1(\Sigma)$ also satisfies $gW = W$ for μ -a.e g .

By corollary B of [17], if $\mu_n \rightarrow \mu_0$ in the weak star topology and $\text{supp}\mu_n \subset \text{supp}\mu_0$ for every n , then $L_1(\mu_n) \rightarrow L_1(\mu_0)$. Therefore, the continuity of the Lyapunov exponents imply that for every μ sufficiently

close to μ_0 , it holds that $L_1(\mu) = L_1(\mu_W)$. This happens because $L_1(\mu) = \max\{L_1(\mu_W), L_1(\mu_{\mathbb{R}^d/W})\}$.

If $\mu_{0,W}$ is irreducible, then the map $\mu \mapsto L_1(\mu_W)$ is holomorphic. Since $L_1(\mu) = L_1(\mu_W)$ in a neighbourhood of μ_0 , we conclude that $\mu \mapsto L_1(\mu)$ is also holomorphic in a neighbourhood of μ_0 .

If $\mu_{0,W}$ is not irreducible, there exists another non trivial invariant subspace $W' \subset W$. The measure $\mu_{0,W}$ defines measures $\mu_{0,W'}$ and $\mu_{0,W/W'}$. Then we do the same procedure. Since the invariant subspaces are of decreasing dimension, this process must stop after a finite number of steps. Therefore, we conclude the proof of theorem 1.1.

3.3. Corollaries and remarks. Let Σ be an abstract compact space, $X = \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\sigma: X \rightarrow X$ be the forward shift on X . We fix a measurable and bounded function $A: \Sigma \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and denote also by A the locally constant (fiber) map $A: X \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ given by $A((x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}) = A(x_0)$.

Given $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$, let $\mu^{\mathbb{N}}$ be the product (Bernoulli) measure on X . A random (Bernoulli) locally constant linear cocycle $F_A: X \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow X \times \mathbb{R}^d$ relative to the product measure $\mu^{\mathbb{N}}$ is a skew product transformation such that

$$F_A(\omega, v) = (\sigma(\omega), A(x)v).$$

Its iterates are given by

$$F_A^n(\omega, v) = (\sigma^n(\omega), A^n(\omega)v),$$

where $A^n(\omega) := A(\omega_{n-1}) \dots A(\omega_1)A(\omega_0)$.

A seminal result from Furstenberg and Kesten states that under the integrability condition $\log^+ \|A^\pm\| \in L^1(\mu)$, the limit

$$L_1(A, \mu) = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \log \|A^n(\omega)\|$$

exists μ a.e. and it is called the top Lyapunov exponent of this cocycle. Consider the push forward measure on $\text{Prob}(\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}))$ given by $A_*\mu$. By the boundness of A , the support of $A_*\mu$ remains compact, and therefore its Lyapunov exponent is well defined. A straightforward computation shows that the Lyapunov exponent $L_1(A_*\mu)$ associated to the measure $A_*\mu$ is equal to $L_1(A, \mu)$. Moreover, the application $A_*: \mathcal{M}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}))$ is a linear continuous (and, therefore, analytic) mapping that preserves probabilities. Since the composition on analytic maps is analytic, it follows by Theorem 1.1 that the map $L_1(A, \mu) = L_1(A_*\mu)$ is analytic with respect to μ , which guarantees that the result holds for arbitrary locally constant linear cocycles.

A second corollary is an analogue of the finite case, in which the support of the measure is a fixed compact set on $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ and we look at the dependence on the probability weights. Let $\mu_0 \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$

be a reference measure of full support. We restrict to the measures in Σ which are absolutely continuous with respect to μ_0 .

By the Radon-Nikodym Theorem, this space is identified with the space $L^1(\mu_0)$ of integrable complex functions with respect to μ_0 through the map $I : L^1(\mu_0) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ given by

$$I(f)(E) = \int_E f(x) d\mu_0(x)$$

for every measurable set E . The map I is an isomorphism between $L^1(\mu_0)$ and the measures on $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$ which are absolutely continuous with respect to μ_0 . Observe that, given $f, g \in L^1(\mu_0)$, it follows that

$$\|I(f) - I(g)\|_{TV} \leq \|f - g\|_1 \leq \|f - g\|_p,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$ denotes the total variation norm, $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the L^1 norm and $\|\cdot\|_p$ denotes the L^p norm, with $p \in [1, +\infty]$. This fact guarantees that, given $r > 0$, it follows that $B_p(f, r) \subset B_1(f, r) \subset B_{TV}(I(f), r)$, where each of the previous sets denotes an open ball on its respective norm.

This observation, aligned with the Theorem 1.1, proves the following.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\mu_0 \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$ have full support and assume that $L_1(\mu_0) > L_2(\mu_0)$. For $p \in [1, +\infty]$, define*

$$L_1^p(\mu_0) := \left\{ f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : f \in L^p(\mu_0) \text{ and } \int f(x) d\mu_0(x) = 1 \right\}.$$

Then, the Lyapunov exponent $L_1 : L_1^p(\mu_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is locally a real analytic function of μ_0 with respect to the L^p norm.

We now regard the set in which L_1 is analytical. We say that a measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}))$ is *irreducible* if there is no proper subspace $V \subset \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ such that $gV = V$ for μ -a.e.g. Notice that every irreducible measure is quasi-irreducible.

Observe that irreducibility is a dense property with respect to the total variation norm. Indeed, let μ_0 be a probability in $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, and let ν be another probability in $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, with compact support. If ν is irreducible and given $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\mu_\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon)\mu + \varepsilon\nu$ is an irreducible probability in $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$. To see this, let V be a proper subspace of $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$. Since ν is irreducible, there exists a borelian set $B \subset \text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\nu(B) > 0$ and $gV \neq V$ for every $g \in B$. Notice that $\mu_\varepsilon(B) = (1 - \varepsilon)\mu(B) + \varepsilon\nu(B) \geq \varepsilon\nu(B) > 0$, so it follows that μ_ε is irreducible.

Notice also that $|\mu_\varepsilon - \mu| = |\varepsilon\nu - \varepsilon\mu| \leq 2\varepsilon$, so we can choose ε sufficiently small such that μ_ε is arbitrarily close to μ . Moreover, $\text{supp } \mu_\varepsilon = \text{supp } \mu \cup \text{supp } \nu$, so if μ has compact support, μ_ε also has compact support, and if $\text{supp } \mu, \text{supp } \nu \subset \Sigma$, then $\text{supp } \mu_\varepsilon \subset \Sigma$.

We also observe that, on [13], Kifer proved that being irreducible was an open property on $\text{Prob}(\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}))$ with respect to the weak* topology. Since the total variation norm generates a finer topology than the weak* topology, it follows that being irreducible is also an open property with respect to the total variation norm. Therefore, by the first result of 1.1, we can conclude that L_1 is analytical on the set of compactly supported irreducible measures on $\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R})$, which is a dense open set on the space $\text{Prob}(\text{GL}_d(\mathbb{R}))$ with respect to the total variation norm.

To conclude this section, we make the observation that the restriction of the probabilities to a compact set Σ in 1.1 cannot be removed. Indeed, let $\mu \in \text{Prob}(\text{GL}(d))$ be a compactly supported measure with $L_1(\mu) > L_2(\mu)$. Let $a, \varepsilon > 0$ and consider the measure $\mu_{a,\varepsilon} := (1-\varepsilon)\mu + \varepsilon\delta_{aI}$, where I is the identity matrix. By a previous comment, the measure $\mu_{a,\varepsilon}$ is a compactly supported measure such that $|\mu_{a,\varepsilon} - \mu| < 2\varepsilon$. The identity:

$$L_1(\nu) + \dots + L_d(\nu) = \int \log |\det g| d\nu(g),$$

which is true for any compactly supported measure on $\text{GL}(d)$, gives us:

$$L_1(\mu_{a,\varepsilon}) \geq \frac{L_1(\mu_{a,\varepsilon}) + \dots + L_d(\mu_{a,\varepsilon})}{d} = \frac{1}{d} \int \log |\det g| d\mu_{a,\varepsilon}(g)$$

Now, given $\delta > 0$, let $0 < \varepsilon < \delta/2$, so that $\mu_{a,\varepsilon} \in B(\mu, \delta)$ for every $a > 0$. Observe that:

$$\frac{1}{d} \int \log |\det g| d\mu_{a,\varepsilon}(g) = \varepsilon \log a + \frac{(1-\varepsilon) \int \log |\det g| d\mu(g)}{d}$$

Then, choose a sufficiently big, such that:

$$\log a > \frac{L_1(\mu) + 1 + \frac{\varepsilon - 1}{d} \int \log |\det g| d\mu(g)}{\varepsilon}.$$

The previous inequality then guarantees that $L_1(\mu_{a,\varepsilon}) > L_1(\mu) + 1$. In particular, L_1 cannot be continuous in μ , much less analytic. The problem relies on the fact that, as we shrink the neighborhood of μ , the value of ε decreases, which causes the choice of a above to become increasingly larger. Restricting ourselves to a compact set limits the size of a , which make this construction fail for small enough δ .

4. ANALYTIC DEPENDENCE ON MARKOVIAN TRANSITIONS

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.2, which is the Markovian analogue of Theorem 1.1. A Markov kernel $K: \Sigma \rightarrow \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$

gives the transition probabilities of the dynamics and is the natural generalization of the concept of stochastic matrix for sub-shifts of finite type. Similarly to the previous section, where we considered complex valued measures, we are going to consider complex Markov kernels $K: \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ the set of continuous and complex Markov kernels over Σ such that for every $\omega \in \Sigma$, $K_\omega(\Sigma)$ has bounded variation. We denote by $\mathcal{K}_{\text{Prob}}(\Sigma)$ the set of (continuous) Markov kernels K over Σ , such that for every $\omega \in \Sigma$, $K_\omega \in \text{Prob}(\Sigma)$ and K_ω has bounded variation.

Consider the following norm in $\mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$:

$$\|K\| := \sup_{\omega \in \Sigma} \|K_\omega\|_{TV}.$$

Proposition 4.1. *The set $\mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is a Banach space.*

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ is a normed vector space. Note that if $\{K_n\}_n$ is a Cauchy sequence in $(\mathcal{K}(\Sigma), \|\cdot\|)$, then for every $\omega \in \Sigma$, K_ω is also Cauchy. Since $(\mathcal{M}(\Sigma), \|\cdot\|_{TV})$ is complete, for each ω , $(K_{\omega,n})_n$ converges to some complex measure in $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma)$. Hence $(K_n)_n \rightarrow K^*$ which is defined as $K_\omega^* := \lim_n K_{\omega,n}$. \square

Given a continuous Markov Kernel $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Prob}}(\Sigma)$, we can define the Markov operator $Q_K: L^\infty(\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \rightarrow L^\infty(\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ as follows:

$$Q_K(\varphi)(\omega_0, \hat{v}) = \int_{\Sigma} \varphi(\omega_1, A(\omega_1, \omega_0)v) dK_{\omega_0}(\omega_1).$$

The Markov operator Q_K is a positive, bounded, linear operator that preserves constants.

Definition 4.1. We say that a Markov kernel $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Prob}}(\Sigma)$ is *uniformly ergodic* if K_ω^n converges uniformly in ω to its stationary measure μ with respect to the total variation norm.

Moreover, K being uniformly ergodic is equivalent to the existence of constants $C < \infty$ and $0 < \rho < 1$ such that

$$\left\| Q_K^n \varphi - \int \varphi d\mu \right\|_\infty \leq C \rho^{-n} \|\varphi\|_\infty \quad \forall \varphi \in L^\infty(\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)), \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Similar to i.i.d. case, we may also consider small perturbations of $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Prob}}(\Sigma)$ given by complex valued Markov kernels $L \in \mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ and their associated operators Q_L . Although Q_K is a Markov operator, Q_L may not be a Markov operator. This can happen because when L_ω is not a probability measure, for some $\omega \in \Sigma$, it does not fix constants.

Given $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $\varphi \in L^\infty(\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, we define the Hölder seminorm v_α , the Hölder norm $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ and the space $C^\alpha(\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ of Hölder continuous observables (in the projective variable) by:

$$\begin{aligned} v_\alpha(\varphi) &= \sup_{\substack{\omega_0 \in \Sigma \\ \hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2}} \frac{|\varphi(\omega_0, \hat{v}_1) - \varphi(\omega_0, \hat{v}_2)|}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha}, \\ \|\varphi\|_\alpha &= v_\alpha(\varphi) + \|\varphi\|_\infty, \\ C^\alpha(\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)) &= \{\varphi \in L^\infty(\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)) : \|\varphi\|_\alpha < \infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, given a Markov kernel K , we consider \mathbb{P}_{ω_0} the Markov measure with initial distribution δ_{ω_0} and transition given by the Markov kernel K . We consider the Markovian analogue of definition 2.3, the average Hölder constant:

$$\begin{aligned} k_\alpha(F_{A,K}) &= \sup_{\substack{\omega_0 \in \Sigma \\ \hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2}} \int \frac{\delta(\hat{A}(\omega)\hat{v}_1, \hat{A}(\omega)\hat{v}_2)^\alpha}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} d|\mathbb{P}_{\omega_0}|(\omega) \\ &= \sup_{\substack{\omega_0 \in \Sigma \\ \hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2}} \int \frac{\delta(\hat{A}(\omega_1, \omega_0)\hat{v}_1, \hat{A}(\omega_1, \omega_0)\hat{v}_2)^\alpha}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} d|K_{\omega_0}|(\omega_1). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that the same properties that we proved in the Bernoulli case, also hold for Markov cocycles. We prove the analogous of lemma 2.4.

Lemma 4.2. *For every $n \geq 1$, $K \in \mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ and $\varphi \in C^\alpha(\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, the following inequality holds:*

$$v_\alpha(Q_K^n(\varphi)) \leq k_\alpha(F_{A^n, K^n}) v_\alpha(\varphi).$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} v_\alpha(Q_K(\varphi)) &= \sup_{\substack{\omega_0 \in \Sigma \\ \hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2}} \frac{\left| \int \varphi(\omega_1, \hat{A}(\omega_1, \omega_0)\hat{v}_1) - \varphi(\omega_1, \hat{A}(\omega_1, \omega_0)\hat{v}_2) dK_{\omega_0}(\omega_1) \right|}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{\omega_0 \in \Sigma \\ \hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2}} \frac{\int \left| \varphi(\omega_1, \hat{A}(\omega_1, \omega_0)\hat{v}_1) - \varphi(\omega_1, \hat{A}(\omega_1, \omega_0)\hat{v}_2) \right| d|K_{\omega_0}|(\omega_1)}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} \\ &\leq v_\alpha(\varphi) \sup_{\substack{\omega_0 \in \Sigma \\ \hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2}} \int \frac{\delta(\hat{A}(\omega_1, \omega_0)\hat{v}_1, \hat{A}(\omega_1, \omega_0)\hat{v}_2)^\alpha}{\delta(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)^\alpha} d|K_{\omega_0}|(\omega_1) \\ &\leq v_\alpha(\varphi) k_\alpha(F_{A,K}). \end{aligned}$$

To conclude the lemma it is sufficient to notice that $Q_K^n = Q_{K^n}$. \square

We proceed to prove theorem 1.2. Let $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Prob}}(\Sigma)$ be uniformly ergodic, assume that $L_1(K_0) > L_2(K_0)$ and that K_0 is quasi-irreducible.

We say that K_0 is quasi-irreducible if the associated Markov cocycle F_A is quasi-irreducible. In other words, there is no proper invariant section $\mathcal{V}: \Sigma \rightarrow \text{Gr}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that the top Lyapunov exponent restricted to it is not maximal (the Lyapunov exponent is defined almost everywhere with respect to the Markov measure \mathbb{P}_{K_0, μ_0} with initial distribution given by the unique stationary measure μ_0 and transition kernel K_0).

Note that if K_0 is quasi-irreducible, then Kifer's non-random filtration is trivial (see [5, Corollary 3.8]). In particular, for all $v \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \setminus \{0\}$ and for \mathbb{P}_{K_0, μ_0} -a.e ω ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \|A^n(\omega)v\| = L_1(A, K_0).$$

Moreover, by [5, Theorem 3.5] we also have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \int \log \|A^n(\omega)v\| d\mathbb{P}_{\omega_0} = L_1(A, K_0), \quad (4.1)$$

with uniform convergence in $(\omega_0, \hat{v}) \in \Sigma \times \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$.

Furthermore, we also have the exponential contraction of k_α and v_α semi-norm for nearby kernels.

Proposition 4.3. *Assume that (A, K_0) is quasi-irreducible and that $L_1(A, K_0) > L_2(A, K_0)$. Then, there exists $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, $\theta > 1$, $C > 0$ and a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ of K_0 with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$, such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for every $K \in V$,*

$$v_\alpha(Q_K^n \varphi) \leq C\theta^{-n}. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Since $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Prob}}(\Sigma)$, it follows by [5, Proposition 4.4] that there exists $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k_\alpha(F_{A^{n_0}, K_0^{n_0}}) < \sigma < 1$. Using the sub-multiplicative property of k_α , we conclude that there exists $\theta > 1$ and $C > 0$ such that $k_\alpha(F_{A^n, K_0^n}) \leq C\theta^{-n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For a fixed n , the quantity $\int \left(\frac{s_1(A^n) s_2(A^n)}{\|A^n v\|^2} \right)^\alpha d|\mathbb{P}_{\omega_0}|$, which bounds $k_\alpha(F_{A, K}^n)$ from above, depends continuously on the kernel. Then, the inequality extends to a neighborhood of K_0 , that is, there exists a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ of K_0 with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$, such that $k_\alpha(F_{A^n, K^n}) \leq C\theta^{-n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we conclude the proof by applying lemma 4.2. \square

Similarly to the Bernoulli case, a consequence of proposition 4.3 is that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, $\theta \in (0, 1)$ and $C < \infty$ such that for every

$n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $\varphi \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$,

$$\left\| Q_K^n \varphi - \int \varphi d\eta_K \right\|_\alpha \leq C\theta^n \|\varphi\|_\alpha, \quad (4.3)$$

where η_K is the unique $\mathbb{P}_{K,\mu}$ -stationary measure. The proof of this fact is the same as in the Bernoulli case.

Consider the observable $\varphi: \Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\varphi(\omega_0, \hat{v}) = \int_\Sigma \log \frac{\|A(\omega)v\|}{\|v\|} dK_{\omega_0}(\omega_1).$$

When $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\text{Prob}}(\Sigma)$, Furstenberg's formula says that,

$$\int_{\Sigma \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \varphi(\omega_0, \hat{v}) d(\eta_K) = L_1(A, K).$$

In this case, for a fixed $\hat{v} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the iterates $Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v})$ converge to the top Lyapunov exponent $L_1(K)$.

Denote by $\mathcal{K}_0(\Sigma)$ the set of (continuous) complex valued Markov Kernels such that for every $\omega \in \Sigma$, K_ω is a complex measure satisfying $K_\omega(\Sigma) = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{K}_0(\Sigma)$ is a closed subspace of $\mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$, therefore it is also a Banach space.

Denote by $\mathcal{K}_1(\Sigma)$ the set of complex Markov kernels such that for every $\omega \in \Sigma$, $K_\omega(\Sigma) = 1$. It is not a Banach space, but we can consider it as a translation of $\mathcal{K}_0(\Sigma)$ and endow it with an analytic structure.

Proposition 4.4. *For every $K \in \mathcal{K}_1(\Sigma)$ sufficiently close to K_0 and $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$|Q_K^{n+1} \varphi(\hat{v}) - Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v})| \leq Ce^{-n}.$$

Proof. First note that by lemma 4.2, for every $K \in \mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ and every $\varphi \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$, we have $v_\alpha(Q_K^n \varphi) \leq v_\alpha(\varphi)k_\alpha(F_{A^n, K^n})$.

Therefore, it also holds that for every $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$|Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v}_1) - Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v}_2)| \leq v_\alpha(\varphi)k_\alpha(F_{A^n, K^n}).$$

Then, by proposition 4.3, we conclude that for every $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\varphi \in C^\alpha(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ and for $K \in \mathcal{K}(\Sigma)$ sufficiently close to K_0

$$|Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v}_1) - Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v}_2)| \leq Ce^{-n}. \quad (4.4)$$

Note that for every $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$|Q_K^{n+1} \varphi(\hat{v}) - Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v})| = \left| \int_\Sigma Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{A}(\omega)\hat{v}) d\mu - Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v}) \right|.$$

Moreover, for every $K \in \mathcal{K}_1(\Sigma)$ sufficiently close to K_0 and $\hat{v}_1 \neq \hat{v}_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Sigma} Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{A}(\omega)\hat{v}) dK_{\omega_0}(\omega_1) - Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v}) \right| = \\ & = \left| \int_{\Sigma} Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{A}(\omega)\hat{v}) - Q_K^n \varphi(\hat{v}) dK_{\omega_0}(\omega_1) \right| \leq Ce^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Therefore, the limit function $K \mapsto Q_K^\infty \varphi(\hat{v})$ exists and is continuous, because it is a uniform limit of continuous functions.

Similarly to the Bernoulli case, we note that proposition 4.3 could have been done directly in $\mathcal{K}_1(\Sigma)$. Thus, we consider the neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{K}_1(\Sigma)$ from that proposition for what follows.

Consider kernels of the form $K + zL$, where $K \in V \subset \mathcal{K}_1(\Sigma)$ and $L \in \mathcal{K}_0(\Sigma)$. For a fixed \hat{v} , the iterates $Q_{K+zL}^n \varphi(\hat{v})$ form a polynomial in z with degree less or equal to n . Thus, for every $z \in V(K, L)$, the map $z \mapsto Q_{K+zL}^\infty \varphi(\hat{v})$ is a uniform limit of holomorphic functions, hence it is holomorphic.

Thus, we conclude that the Lyapunov exponent is G-holomorphic in a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{K}_1(\Sigma)$ of K_0 . Together with continuity, this implies that it is holomorphic.

Now we proceed to prove item 2 of theorem 1.2. For any fixed kernel K , we may define the set of continuous kernels whose supports are contained in the support of K as follows

$$\mathcal{S}(K) = \{L \in \mathcal{K}(\Sigma) : \text{supp}(L) \leq \text{supp}(K)\}.$$

Note that, endowed with the norm defined above, $\mathcal{S}(K)$ is a Banach space. Similarly to what we did before, we consider the sets

$$\mathcal{S}_0(K) = \{L \in \mathcal{K}(\Sigma) : \text{supp}(L) \leq \text{supp}(K) \text{ and } L_\omega(\Sigma) = 0 \forall \omega\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{S}_1(K) = \{L \in \mathcal{K}(\Sigma) : \text{supp}(L) \leq \text{supp}(K) \text{ and } L_\omega(\Sigma) = 1 \forall \omega\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}_0(K)$ is also a Banach space and $\mathcal{S}_1(K)$ is a translation of a Banach space, therefore we may endow it with an analytic structure. Moreover, the proof of item 1 also holds similarly when we restrict the ambient domain to be $\mathcal{S}_1(K_0)$ instead of $\mathcal{K}_1(\Sigma)$.

Now, we drop the assumption of irreducibility of K_0 . Let $\mathcal{V} : \Sigma \rightarrow \text{Gr}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be a non trivial invariant section. Then the corresponding vector sub-bundle

$$\mathbb{V} = \{(\omega, v) : \omega \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}, v \in \mathcal{V}(\omega_0)\}$$

is F_A invariant, hence we can restrict the cocycle to the sub-bundle \mathbb{V} . Therefore we can consider the induced cocycle $F_{\mathcal{V}}: \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$. Similarly, we can consider the quotient vector bundle

$$\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R}^d / \mathbb{V}: = \bigcup_{\omega \in \Sigma^{\mathbb{N}}} \{\omega\} \times \mathbb{R}^d / \mathcal{V}(\omega_0).$$

Also, there is the quotient cocycle $F_{\mathbb{R}^d / \mathcal{V}}$ on the vector bundle $\Sigma^{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{R}^d / \mathbb{V}$. We denote by $L_1(K_0, \mathcal{V})$ and $L_1(K_0, \mathbb{R}^d / \mathcal{V})$ their top Lyapunov exponents, respectively. Note that

$$L_1(K_0) = \max\{L_1(K_0, \mathcal{V}), L_1(K_0, \mathbb{R}^d / \mathcal{V})\}.$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $L_1(K_0) = L_1(K_0, \mathcal{V})$. The other case is similar. Note that for every K in a neighbourhood $V \subset \mathcal{S}_1(K_0)$ of K_0 , it holds that $\text{supp}K \leq \text{supp}K_0$, which implies that \mathcal{V} is also invariant for K .

Adapting the continuity result of Furstenberg and Kifer to the Markov scenario, if $K_n \rightarrow K_0$ and $\text{supp}(K_n)_\omega \subset \text{supp}(K_0)_\omega$ for every n and ω , then $L_1(K_n) \rightarrow L_1(K_0)$. Therefore, the continuity of the Lyapunov exponents imply that for every K sufficiently close to K_0 , it holds that $L_1(K) = L_1(K, \mathcal{V})$.

If K_0 is irreducible for $F_{\mathcal{V}}$, then the map $K \mapsto L_1(K, \mathcal{V})$ is holomorphic. Since $L_1(K) = L_1(K, \mathcal{V})$ in a neighbourhood of K_0 , we conclude that $K \mapsto L_1(K)$ is also holomorphic in a neighbourhood of K_0 .

If K_0 is not irreducible for $F_{\mathcal{V}}$, there exists another non trivial invariant section $\mathcal{V}' \subset \mathcal{V}$. Hence consider the induced cocycles $F_{\mathcal{V}'}$ and $F_{\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{V}'}$. Then we do the same procedure. Since the invariant sections are of decreasing dimension, this process must stop after a finite number of steps. Therefore, we conclude the proof of theorem 1.2.

Acknowledgments. We are most grateful to A. Cai, S. Klein and M. Viana for the discussions and numerous suggestions on the text. A.A. was supported by a CAPES doctoral fellowship. M.D. was supported by a CNPq doctoral fellowship and A.M was supported by a Serrapilheira postdoctoral grant.

This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brasil (CAPES) – Finance Code 001.

REFERENCES

1. Artur Avila, Alex Eskin, and Marcelo Viana, *Continuity of the lyapunov exponents of random matrix products*, 2023.

2. Alexandre Baraviera and Pedro Duarte, *Approximating Lyapunov exponents and stationary measures*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations **31** (2019), no. 1, 25–48. MR 3935134
3. Jamerson Bezerra, Adriana Sánchez, and El Hadji Yaya Tall, *Analyticity of the Lyapunov exponents of random products of quasi-periodic cocycles*, Nonlinearity **36** (2023), no. 6, 3467–3482. MR 4594749
4. Carlos Bocker-Neto and Marcelo Viana, *Continuity of Lyapunov exponents for random two-dimensional matrices*, Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems (2016), 1–30.
5. Ao Cai, Marcelo Durães, Silvius Klein, and Aline Melo, *Hölder continuity of the Lyapunov exponent for Markov cocycles via Furstenberg’s formula*, 2022.
6. Soo Bong Chae, *Holomorphy and calculus in normed spaces*, Pure Appl. Math., Marcel Dekker, vol. 92, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, NY, 1985 (English).
7. Pedro Duarte and Silvius Klein, *Lyapunov exponents of linear cocycles; continuity via large deviations*, Atlantis Studies in Dynamical Systems, vol. 3, Atlantis Press, 2016.
8. ———, *Continuity of the Lyapunov exponents of linear cocycles*, Publicações Matemáticas do IMPA. [IMPA Mathematical Publications], Instituto Nacional de Matemática Pura e Aplicada (IMPA), Rio de Janeiro, 2017, 31o Colóquio Brasileiro de Matemática. MR 3893723
9. ———, *Large deviations for products of random two dimensional matrices*, Comm. Math. Phys. **375** (2020), no. 3, 2191–2257.
10. Marcelo Durães, *Hölder continuity for Lyapunov exponents of random linear cocycles*, <https://www.maxwell.vrac.puc-rio.br/52950/52950.PDF>, 2021, Master dissertation.
11. H. Furstenberg and Yu. Kifer, *Random matrix products and measures in projective spaces*, Israel J. Math **10** (1983), 12–32.
12. H. Hennion, *Loi des grands nombres et perturbations pour des produits réductibles de matrices aléatoires indépendantes*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete **67** (1984), 265–278.
13. Yuri Kifer, *Perturbations of random matrix products*, Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete **61** (1982), no. 1, 83–95.
14. Yuri Kifer, *Ergodic theory of random transformations*, Progress in probability and statistics, Birkhäuser, 1986.
15. Émile Le Page, *Régularité du plus grand exposant caractéristique des produits de matrices aléatoires indépendantes et applications*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **25** (1989), no. 2, 109–142.
16. Elaís C. Malheiro and Marcelo Viana, *Lyapunov exponents of linear cocycles over markov shifts*, Stochastics and Dynamics **15** (2015), no. 03, 1550020.
17. Y. Peres, *Analytic dependence of Lyapunov exponents on transition probabilities*, Lyapunov exponents (Oberwolfach, 1990), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1486, Springer-Verlag, 1991, pp. 64–80.
18. El Hadji Yaya Tall and Marcelo Viana, *Moduli of continuity for the Lyapunov exponents of random $GL(2)$ -cocycles*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **373** (2020), no. 2, 1343–1383.

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA (IMPA), BRAZIL

Email address: `artur.amorim@impa.br`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, PONTIFÍCIA UNIVERSIDADE CATÓLICA DO
RIO DE JANEIRO (PUC-RIO), BRAZIL

Email address: `accp95@gmail.com`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO CEARÁ (UFC),
BRAZIL

Email address: `alinedemelo.m@gmail.com`