

Aubry-Mather theory for homeomorphisms

Albert Fathi & Pierre Pageault

Abstract

In this paper, we develop a variational approach to study the dynamic of a homeomorphism on a compact metric space. In particular, we describe orbits along which any Lipschitz Lyapunov function has to be constant via a non-negative Lipschitz semi-distance. We give the link with Auslander's notion of generalized recurrence, and recover in a different way some parts of a more recent work of Akin and Auslander.

1 Definitions and background

1.1 Introduction

In the 1960's, Auslander introduced a notion of generalized recurrence in dynamical systems to develop a theory of stability for a closed invariant set. The definition relies on the set of continuous real valued functions which are non-increasing along every orbit i.e. continuous Lyapunov functions. The union of those orbits along which all such functions are constant, which includes the periodic, non-wandering and chain-recurrent points, is called the generalized recurrent set. Auslander gave a topological description of this set by means of orbits prolongation which is essentially a way of continuing orbits beyond their omega limit sets. Since generalized recurrent sets of topologically conjugated dynamical systems are homeomorphic, generalized recurrence cannot be used to distinguish between topologically conjugated dynamics. The aim of this paper is to develop a similar theory in the realm of Lipschitz conjugacy, allowing this distinction. In particular, when the ambient space is endowed with a metric, our main purpose is to describe orbits along which all Lipschitz Lyapunov functions are constant. We will call this set a metrical Aubry set in a clear reference to the methods of the paper which are based on a variational approach. Namely, whereas Auslander techniques are a mix between general topology and set theory, the metrical Aubry set will arise as the set of minimum points of a non-negative Lipschitz semi-distance, in as much as the classical Aubry set in Mather's theory arises as the minimum set of the Peierl's barrier.

The remaining part of section 1 is devoted to definitions and settings. In particular, the important notions of neutral set and neutral values of a

Lyapunov function are given in 1.6 and the link with usual chain-recurrence is studied in 1.4. Section 2 contains the core of the article. The variational setting is defined in 2.1 and the metrical Aubry set of a homeomorphism on a compact metric space is introduced. The link with Lipschitz Lyapunov function is then studied in 2.2 where the main results of the paper are proved, namely theorem 2.6 and corollary 2.7. In section 3, we give a new characterisation of the generalized recurrent set of Auslander as the intersection of all metrical Aubry sets, and we introduced a natural counterpart of the Mañe set in Mather theory by considering the union of all metrical Aubry sets. We then characterize this Mañe set of a homeomorphism in terms of chain-recurrence.

The authors would like to thank referees for their careful reading of the manuscript, helpful comments and suggestions. This project was supported by ANR KAM faible (ANR-07-BLAN-0361-02), and ANR WKBHJ (ANR-12-BS01-0020).


1.2 Positive interval examples

Akin [Aki93, Chapter II] introduced a useful family of dynamical systems on the circle called *positive interval examples*. Every example presented in this paper will be of this type. The definition is the following. Let K be a closed subset of $I = [0, 1]$ with $\{0, 1\} \subset K$. Let u be a real valued function on I such that $u \geq 0$ and $u^{-1}(0) = K$. The differential equation

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = u(x)$$

determines a flow on I with time-one map $h : I \rightarrow I$. We have $\text{Fix}(h) = K$ and the dynamic is right-directed on $I \setminus K$ where $u > 0$. Since $\{0, 1\} \subset K$ the homeomorphism h induces a homeomorphism of the circle obtained from I by identifying 0 and 1. The induced homeomorphism will still be denoted by h . Such examples will always be drawn with a North pole corresponding to the point $\frac{1}{2}$ and a South pole corresponding to the point obtained by identifying 0 and 1. Moreover, arrows will indicate direction from x to $h(x)$ and bold points will identify fixed points. The first half part $[0, 1/2]$ of the segment I then corresponds to the left part of the circle while the right part corresponds to the second half part $[1/2, 1]$ of I .

Example 1.1. This example is the case $K = \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$. The resulting dynamic has two fixed points, North and South pole.




1.3 Neutral set of a Lyapunov function

Throughout this paper, (X, d) will denote a compact metric space and h will denote a homeomorphism of X . A *Lyapunov function* for h is a real-valued function $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\theta \circ h \leq \theta$ i.e. the function θ is non-increasing along orbits of h . Constant functions are always Lyapunov functions, we will call them *trivial* Lyapunov functions. Given a Lyapunov function θ for h , we will say that a point $x \in X$ is a *neutral point* of θ if $\theta(h(x)) = \theta(x)$. We denote by $N(\theta)$ the set of neutral points of θ , that is

$$N(\theta) = \{x \in X \mid \theta(h(x)) = \theta(x)\}.$$

We define the *neutral values* of θ as the images under θ of neutral points. Notice that the neutral set of a continuous Lyapunov function θ on a compact set is never empty since minimum points of θ are neutral points. A Lyapunov function is useful if we can get an a priori description of its neutral set. Of course, the neutral set of a continuous Lyapunov function always contains fixed points of h as well as periodic points or even non-wandering points of h . Nevertheless, these inclusions may be strict.

Example 1.2. Consider the case $K = \{0, 1/2, 1\}$.




The non-wandering points are the two fixed points. Nevertheless, any continuous Lyapunov function must be constant, by continuity, and therefore admits the whole circle as neutral set.

One of the main purpose of this paper is to give a sharp description of the neutral set of a Lipschitz Lyapunov function. More precisely, we are going to construct in section 2 a closed invariant subset $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ of X such that

- (i) any Lyapunov function θ which is Lipschitz for the metric d satisfies $\mathcal{A}_d(h) \subset N(\theta)$,
- (ii) there is a Lipschitz Lyapunov function θ for which $\mathcal{A}_d(h) = N(\theta)$.

Notice that the terminology of critical points rather than neutral points is sometime used but it may cause confusion. Indeed, when the function θ turns out to be differentiable, critical points are usually these points where the derivative of θ is zero. In general they do not coincide with neutral points, as shown in the following example.

Example 1.3. Consider the case $K = [0, 1/2] \cup \{1\}$.



The height function θ is a C^∞ Lyapunov function for which neutral points coincide with half circle of fixed points, while critical points are reduced to North and South pole. Moreover, if we compose the height function θ with an increasing diffeomorphism of the real line with critical points in the image of θ , we can obtain critical points that are not neutral points.

1.4 Chain-recurrence, neutral set and Conley's theorem

This section is devoted to the study of the (not so well known) link between chain-recurrence and neutral set of a continuous Lyapunov function. As we will see in proposition 1.8 and corollary 1.9, the topology of the neutral values is the relevant factor.

Let $x, y \in X$ and let $\varepsilon > 0$. A *chain* from x to y is a finite sequence x_0, \dots, x_n , $n \geq 1$, in X such that $x_0 = x$ and $x_n = y$. Such a chain is said to be an ε -*chain* for h if it satisfies the additional condition $d(h(x_i), x_{i+1}) < \varepsilon$ for every $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. A point $x \in X$ is said to be *chain-recurrent* for h if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find an ε -chain from x back to x . We denote by $\mathcal{R}(h)$ the set of chain-recurrent points of h . This set does not depend on the metric since we assumed X to be compact. We define a preorder on $\mathcal{R}(h)$ by $x \geq y$ if and only if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an ε -chain for h from x to y . This preorder induces an equivalence relation \sim on $\mathcal{R}(h)$ by $x \sim y$ if and only if $x \geq y$ and $y \geq x$, that is, for every positive ε , we can find an ε -chain from x to y and conversely. The corresponding equivalence classes are called the *chain-transitive components* of h .

Chain-recurrence can also be recovered through the *Conley Barrier*, that is the function $S : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$ defined by

$$S(x, y) = \inf \left\{ \max_{i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}} d(h(x_i), x_{i+1}) \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken among all chains $x_0 = x, \dots, x_n = y$, $n \geq 1$, from x to y . We briefly mentioned this approach since it is in the same line with the rest of the paper. We refer the reader to [Pag09] for a comprehensive introduction. It follows from the definition of S that $S(x, y) = 0$ if and only if, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an ε -chain from x to y . In particular, we have the following characterisation of the chain-recurrent set of h

$$\mathcal{R}(h) = \{x \in X, S(x, x) = 0\},$$

and the preorder \geq on $\mathcal{R}(h)$ can be defined by

$$\forall x, y \in \mathcal{R}(h), \quad x \geq y \Leftrightarrow S(x, y) = 0.$$

Moreover, since S is non-negative, the equivalence relation \sim becomes

$$\forall x, y \in \mathcal{R}(h), \quad x \sim y \Leftrightarrow \max(S(x, y), S(y, x)) = 0.$$

If the reader is familiar with classical Aubry-Mather theory, he will recognize an analogy with the definition of the projected Aubry set of a Tonelli Hamiltonian through Peierls barrier, see [Mat93, §7, page 1372].

A famous theorem of Conley [Con78, Chapter II, Section 6.4] asserts that we can always find a continuous Lyapunov function θ for h such that the neutral set of θ coincides with the chain-recurrent set of h .


Theorem 1.4 (Conley). *There is a continuous Lyapunov function $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with*

$$N(\theta) = \mathcal{R}(h)$$

and such that the neutral values of θ are nowhere dense in \mathbb{R} . Moreover, the function θ is constant on every chain-transitive components of h and takes different values on different chain-transitive components.

We also refer to [Pag09, Theorem 2.18] for a proof based on the Conley barrier. This result turns out to be sharp because of the hypothesis made on the set of neutral values of θ , see corollary 1.9. Nevertheless, in a general way, there is no relation between the neutral set of a Lyapunov function θ and the chain-recurrent set of h . In particular, the inclusion $\mathcal{R}(h) \subset N(\theta)$ is in general wrong if the neutral values of θ do not have empty interior, even if the function θ is extremely regular.

Example 1.5. We consider again the case $K = [0, 1/2] \cup \{1\}$, together with the height function.



Here every point is chain-recurrent while the height function θ is a C^∞ Lyapunov function for which neutral points coincide only with the half circle of fixed points. Notice that the neutral values of the height function is then a whole non-trivial closed segment of \mathbb{R} .

Lemma 1.6. *Let $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous Lyapunov function for h and let $x, y \in X$. Assume that $S(x, y) = 0$. Then if $\theta(x) \leq \theta(y)$ we have*

$$[\theta(x), \theta(y)] \subset \theta(N(\theta) \cap I_{x,y}) \subset \theta(N(\theta)),$$

where

$$I_{x,y} = \{x, y\} \cup \{z \in X, S(x, z) + S(z, y) = 0\}.$$

In particular, the segment $[\theta(x), \theta(y)]$ is an interval of neutral values of θ .

Proof. Assume that $S(x, y) = 0$ and $\theta(y) \geq \theta(x)$. Let $t \in [\theta(x), \theta(y)]$. Since $S(x, y) = 0$, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we can find an ε -chain $\{x_0^\varepsilon, \dots, x_{n_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon\}$, $n_\varepsilon \geq 1$, from x to y . Since $\theta(x) \leq t \leq \theta(y)$, there is $k_\varepsilon \in \{0, \dots, n_\varepsilon - 1\}$ such that

$$\theta(x_{k_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) \leq t \leq \theta(x_{k_\varepsilon+1}^\varepsilon). \quad (1.4.1)$$

Moreover, we have

$$d(h(x_{k_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon), x_{k_\varepsilon+1}^\varepsilon) < \varepsilon. \quad (1.4.2)$$

Let ω_θ be a modulus of continuity of θ . Since θ is a Lyapunov function for h , we get

$$\theta(x_{k_\varepsilon+1}^\varepsilon) \leq \theta(h(x_{k_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon)) + \omega_\theta(\varepsilon) \leq \theta(x_{k_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon) + \omega_\theta(\varepsilon). \quad (1.4.3)$$

Let (x_∞, y_∞) be an accumulation point of the family $(x_{k_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, x_{k_\varepsilon+1}^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Passing to the limit in 1.4.1, 1.4.2 and 1.4.3, we get

$$\theta(x_\infty) \leq t \leq \theta(y_\infty), \quad h(x_\infty) = y_\infty, \quad \theta(y_\infty) \leq \theta(x_\infty).$$

Hence we have $\theta(x_\infty) = \theta(y_\infty) = \theta(h(x_\infty)) = t$ and thus $x_\infty \in N(\theta)$. If $x_\infty = x$ then $x_\infty \in N(\theta) \cap I_{x,y}$. Otherwise, we can assume that $k_\varepsilon \geq 1$ for ε small enough and we also have $x_\infty \in I_{x,y}$ as seen by considering chains $\{x_0^\varepsilon, \dots, x_{k_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon\}$ and $\{x_{k_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon, \dots, x_{n_\varepsilon}^\varepsilon\}$ when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

Remark 1.7. If x is chain-recurrent i.e. $S(x, x) = 0$, we get in particular that $\theta(x)$ is a neutral value of θ . Hence, images of chain-recurrent points by θ are neutral values of θ . This fact is specified in proposition 1.10.

Lemma 1.6 directly leads to the following proposition.

Proposition 1.8. *Let $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous Lyapunov function for h and assume that $\theta(N(\theta))$ is totally disconnected. Then θ is non-decreasing with respect to S i.e.*

$$\forall x, y \in X, \quad S(x, y) = 0 \Rightarrow \theta(x) \geq \theta(y).$$

Any function $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is non-decreasing with respect to S is constant on every chain-transitive component of h . Since they are invariant by h and form a partition of $\mathcal{R}(h)$, we deduce the following corollary.

Corollary 1.9. *Let $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous Lyapunov function for h and assume that $\theta(N(\theta))$ is totally disconnected. Then*

$$\mathcal{R}(h) \subset N(\theta).$$

Lemma 1.6 also leads to the following general result.

Proposition 1.10. *Let $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous Lyapunov function for h and let C be a chain-transitive component of h . Then $\theta(C)$ is an interval of neutral values of θ and $\theta(C) = \theta(N(\theta) \cap C)$.*

Proof. Let $t, t' \in \theta(C)$ with $t \leq t'$ and let $x, y \in C$ be such that $\theta(x) = t$ and $\theta(y) = t'$. Since C is a chain-transitive component of h , we have $C = I_{x,y}$ and we deduce from lemma 1.6 and $t \leq t'$ that $[t, t'] \subset \theta(N(\theta) \cap C)$. Hence $\theta(C)$ is an interval and $\theta(C) \subset \theta(N(\theta) \cap C)$. The result follows. \square

Remark 1.11. The fact that $\theta(C)$ is an interval is well known in the settings of flows because chain-transitive components are then connected, see [Con88, Theorem 3.6D].

2 Metrical Aubry set of a homeomorphism

2.1 The d -Mather barrier

We will denote by $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ the set of chains from x to y , that is finite sequences $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$, $n \geq 1$, such that $x_0 = x$ and $x_n = y$. We define the d -defect of a chain $C = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ by

$$l_d(C) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d(h(x_i), x_{i+1}).$$

The d -Mather barrier is the function

$$L_d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$$

defined by

$$L_d(x, y) = \inf_{C \in \mathcal{C}(x, y)} l_d(C).$$

Main properties of the d -Mather barrier are gathered in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1. *The d -Mather barrier satisfies the following properties*

(i) *for every x, y, z in X we have*

$$L_d(x, y) \leq L_d(x, z) + L_d(z, y),$$

(ii) *for every x in X we have*

$$L_d(x, h(x)) = 0,$$

(iii) *for a given x in X we have*

$$L_d(x, x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow L_d(h(x), h(x)) = 0 \Leftrightarrow L_d(h(x), x) = 0,$$

(iv) *for every x, y, z in X we have*

$$|L_d(x, y) - L_d(x, z)| \leq d(y, z),$$

and

$$|L_d(x, y) - L_d(z, y)| \leq d(h(x), h(z)).$$

In particular, the d -Mather barrier is continuous.

Proof. Let $x, y, z \in X$. A chain from x to z and a chain from z to y can always be concatenated to obtain a chain from x to y . Triangular inequality (i) is a consequence of this remark. Property (ii) is straightforward by considering the chain $\{x, h(x)\}$ from x to $h(x)$. Let C be a chain from x to y . The chain \tilde{C} obtained by changing the last term of C into z is then a chain from x to z such that $l_d(\tilde{C}) \leq l_d(C) + d(y, z)$. Hence we get $L_d(x, z) \leq l_d(C) + d(y, z)$. First part of property (iv) follows by taking the infimum on chains C from x to y . Second part is proved similarly. It remains to prove property (iii). Let ω be a modulus of continuity of h and let $C = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ be a chain from x to x . Concatenating the chain C with itself if needed, we can assume that $n \geq 2$. The chain $\hat{C} = \{h(x), x_2, \dots, x_n, h(x)\}$ is then a chain from $h(x)$ to $h(x)$ such that $l_d(\hat{C}) \leq l_d(C) + \omega(l_d(C))$. Hence, if $L_d(x, x) = 0$ then $L_d(h(x), h(x)) = 0$. We prove similarly that $L_d(h(x), x) = 0$ whenever $L_d(h(x), h(x)) = 0$. Last, we have $0 \leq L_d(x, x) \leq L_d(x, h(x)) + L_d(h(x), x) \leq L_d(h(x), x)$ and $L_d(x, x) = 0$ if $L_d(h(x), x) = 0$. \square

The d -Aubry set of h is the subset $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ of X defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_d(h) = \{x \in X, L_d(x, x) = 0\}.$$

It follows from proposition 2.1 that the d -Aubry set is a closed invariant subset of X . Moreover, since $0 \leq S \leq L_d$ we have

$$\mathcal{A}_d(h) \subset \mathcal{R}(h).$$

Since the d -Mather barrier is non-negative and satisfies the triangular inequality, we define a closed preorder \succeq_d on $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ in the following way

$$x \succeq_d y \Leftrightarrow L_d(x, y) = 0.$$

The preorder \succeq_d naturally induces an equivalence relation \sim_d on $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ by $x \sim_d y$ if and only if $x \succeq_d y$ and $y \succeq_d x$. The equivalence classes of \sim_d are called the d -Mather classes of h . It follows from proposition 2.1 that they are closed invariant subsets of X . Moreover, they form a partition of $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$. The quotient space is called the d -Mather quotient of h and will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$. The function


$$L_d^*(x, y) = \max(L_d(x, y), L_d(y, x))$$

then induces a metric on $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$, which defines the quotient topology. Moreover, the canonical projection

$$\pi_d : (\mathcal{A}_d(h), d) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_d(h), L_d^*)$$

is 1-Lipschitz. Indeed, for every $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_d(h)$ we have $|L_d(x, y)| = |L_d(x, y) - L_d(x, x)| \leq d(x, y)$.

Example 2.2. We consider the case where K is a Cantor set and we assume that the circle is endowed with the usual flat metric d .



If K has vanishing Lebesgue measure, it can be covered by open balls whose sum of radiuses is arbitrary small. Hence, starting from an arbitrary point x , we can reach any other point y by following the dynamics and jumping points of K through chains with arbitrary small d -defects. Hence $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ is the whole circle and $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$ is reduced to a point. If K has non-vanishing Lebesgue measure, we will see in the next section that we have on the contrary $\mathcal{A}_d(h) = K$ and $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$ is homeomorphic to K .

2.2 L_d -domination and Lipschitz Lyapunov function

A function $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *non-decreasing with respect to L_d* if for every $x, y \in X$

$$L_d(x, y) = 0 \Rightarrow u(x) \geq u(y).$$

The function u is said to be *(K, L_d) -dominated* for some $K \geq 0$ (or *L_d -dominated* for short) if for every x, y in X we have

$$u(y) - u(x) \leq KL_d(x, y).$$

Notice that a function which is L_d -dominated is non-decreasing with respect to L_d . The function u is said to be *strict* at a point $x \in X$ if the inequality above is strict for every $y \in X$. The function u is then said to be strict on a subset $A \subset X$ if it is strict at every point $x \in A$. Notice that an L_d -dominated function cannot be strict at a point $x \in \mathcal{A}_d(h)$ where $L_d(x, x) = 0$. As shown by the following proposition, this is the only obstruction.

Proposition 2.3. *There is a Lipschitz L_d -dominated function $u : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is strict outside $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$.*

Proof. Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a dense sequence in X . We set

$$u(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} L_d(x_n, x).$$

The function u is well defined and continuous because L_d is bounded on the compact set $X \times X$. Using triangular inequality of L_d we get, for every $x, y \in X$

$$\begin{aligned} u(y) - u(x) &= \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} (L_d(x_n, y) - L_d(x_n, x)), \\ &\leq \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} L_d(x, y), \\ &\leq 2L_d(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the function u is $(2, L_d)$ -dominated. It is also 2-Lipschitz because for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $|L_d(x_n, y) - L_d(x_n, x)| \leq d(x, y)$. It remains to show that u is strict outside the Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$. Let $x \in X \setminus \mathcal{A}_d(h)$. We then have $L_d(x, x) > 0$. By density of the sequence $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, there is at least one $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L_d(x_n, y) - L_d(x_n, x) < L_d(x, y)$ and thus $u(y) - u(x) < 2L_d(x, y)$. \square

Since any L_d -dominated function is non-decreasing with respect to L_d , it is non-decreasing with respect to the preorder \succeq_d . In particular, it is constant on every d -Mather classes. The following proposition is then straightforward.

Proposition 2.4. *Any (K, L_d) -dominated function $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is constant on every d -Mather class and induces a K -Lipschitz function on the d -Mather quotient $(\mathcal{M}_d(h), L_d^*)$.*

The link between L_d -domination and Lyapunov functions is given in the following fundamental lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Any L_d -dominated function is a Lyapunov function for h . Conversely, any K -Lipschitz function which is Lyapunov for h is (K, L_d) -dominated.*

Proof. Let $u : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a L_d -dominated function. Then, for some $K \geq 0$ and every $x \in X$, we have $u(h(x)) - u(x) \leq KL_d(x, h(x)) = 0$. Hence u is a Lyapunov function for h . Conversely, let $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a K -Lipschitz Lyapunov function for h . Let $x, y \in X$ and let $C = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ be a chain from x to y . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(x_{i+1}) - \theta(x_i) &\leq \theta(x_{i+1}) - \theta(h(x_i)), \\ &\leq Kd(h(x_i), x_{i+1}). \end{aligned}$$

If we sum these inequalities for $i = 0$ to $n - 1$, we get $\theta(y) - \theta(x) \leq Kl_d(C)$. Taking infimum on chains C from x to y then leads to the desired result. \square

Theorem 2.6. Any Lipschitz Lyapunov function $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$\mathcal{A}_d(h) \subset N(\theta).$$

Moreover, there is a Lipschitz Lyapunov function $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_d(h) = N(\theta).$$

Proof. Any Lipschitz Lyapunov function $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is L_d -dominated by lemma 2.5. Hence, it is constant on every d -Mather class by proposition 2.4. Since the d -Mather classes form a partition of $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ and are invariant under h , we have $\mathcal{A}_d(h) \subset N(\theta)$. Let $u : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz (K, L_d) -dominated function which is strict outside $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$. Such a function exists by proposition 2.3 and is a Lipschitz Lyapunov function for h by lemma 2.5. Moreover, for $x \in X \setminus \mathcal{A}_d(h)$ we have

$$u(h(x)) - u(x) < KL_d(x, h(x)) = 0.$$

Hence $N(u) \subset \mathcal{A}_d(h)$ and thus $N(u) = \mathcal{A}_d(h)$. \square

Corollary 2.7. We have

$$\mathcal{A}_d(h) = \bigcap_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}_d(h)} N(\theta)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_d(h)$ denotes the set of Lipschitz Lyapunov function $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for h . Moreover we have

$$\mathcal{A}_d(h) \subset \text{Fix}(h) \cup \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))}).$$

Proof. First part of the corollary follows from theorem 2.6. To prove the second part, it suffices to find a Lipschitz Lyapunov function $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$N(\theta) = \text{Fix}(h) \cup \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))}).$$

Let $(x_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a dense sequence in $X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))$. As shown in [Pag09, Theorem 2.15, Remark 2.23] the function $\theta : (X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h)), d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\theta(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} S(x_n, x)$$

is then a Lipschitz Lyapunov function for $h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))}$. For the existence of θ , we could also have invoked Conley's construction that can easily be done in the realm of Lipschitz functions. This function θ can then be extended to the whole of X to a Lipschitz function $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\theta(x) = \inf_{y \in X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))} \theta(y) + \text{Lip}(\theta)d(x, y).$$

Notice that the function θ is still a Lyapunov function for h on X because the condition $\theta \circ h \leq \theta$ is automatically satisfied on the subset $\text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))$. Moreover, we have

$$N(\theta) = \text{Fix}(h) \cup \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))}),$$

as desired. \square

Proposition 2.8. *For every $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_d(h)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} L_d(x, y) &= \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}_d^1(h)} \theta(y) - \theta(x), \\ L_d^*(x, y) &= \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}_d^1(h)} |\theta(y) - \theta(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_d^1(h)$ is the set of 1-Lipschitz Lyapunov functions $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for h .

Proof. Let $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_d(h)$ and let $\theta \in \mathcal{L}_d^1(h)$. It follows from lemma 2.5 that θ is $(1, L_d)$ -dominated and thus $\theta(y) - \theta(x) \leq L_d(x, y)$. Hence, we have

$$L_d(x, y) \geq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}_d^1(h)} \theta(y) - \theta(x).$$

For the converse inequality, consider the function $\theta_x = L_d(x, \cdot)$. It is a 1-Lipschitz $(1, L_d)$ -dominated function for h for which $L_d(x, y) = \theta_x(y) - \theta_x(x)$ because $L_d(x, x) = 0$. The equality $L_d^*(x, y) = \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}_d^1(h)} |\theta(y) - \theta(x)|$ is proved similarly. \square

Proposition 2.4 and lemma 2.5 then lead to the following corollary.


Corollary 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{L}_d(h)$ be the set of Lipschitz Lyapunov functions $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for h . Any function $\theta \in \mathcal{L}_d(h)$ is constant on every d -Mather classes and induces a Lipschitz function $\bar{\theta}$ on $(\mathcal{M}_d(h), L_d^*)$. Moreover, the family of functions $\{\bar{\theta} \mid \theta \in \mathcal{L}_d(h)\}$ separates points of $(\mathcal{M}_d(h), L_d^*)$.*

We thus obtain a criteria for the existence of non-trivial Lipschitz Lyapunov function in terms of the d -Mather quotient.

Theorem 2.10. *The only Lipschitz Lyapunov functions $\theta : (X, d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for h are the constants if and only if the d -Mather quotient $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$ is trivial i.e. is reduced to a point. In that case, we have $\mathcal{A}_d(h) = X$.*

Proof. If every Lipschitz Lyapunov function for h is constant on X then $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$ is reduced to a point by the previous corollary. Conversely, suppose that $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$ is reduced to point. The d -Aubry set $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ is then made of a single d -Mather class and any Lipschitz Lyapunov function for h is constant on $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$. Let $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Lipschitz Lyapunov function for h . Since the alpha and omega limit set of every $x \in X$ are contained in $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ where θ is constant and θ is a Lyapunov function for h , then θ is constant on X . Last part of the statement follows from theorem 2.6. \square

Example 2.11. We come back to example 2.2.



If K has vanishing Lebesgue measure, we saw that $\mathcal{A}_d(h)$ is the whole circle S^1 and there is only one d -Mather class. Hence, any Lipschitz Lyapunov function for h must be constant. If K has non-vanishing Lebesgue measure, we can find $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\beta \lambda_{Leb}(K) - \lambda_{Leb}(S^1 \setminus K) = 0.$$

The function

$$\theta(t) = \int_0^t (\beta \chi_K(u) - \chi_{S^1 \setminus K}(u)) du$$

then induces a Lipschitz Lyapunov function for h on S^1 such that

$$N(\theta) = K = \mathcal{A}_d(h).$$

Notice that the function $Id - \theta$ is nothing else than a so-called *devil's staircase*, that is a continuous non-decreasing function which goes from 0 to 1 while being constant on each interval in the complement of K . Now let x, y be two distinct points of K . The subset $S^1 \setminus \{x, y\}$ is made of two non-trivial segments I_1 and I_2 and one of them, say I_1 , must satisfy

$$\lambda_{Leb}(I_1 \cap K) > 0.$$

We set $K_1 = K \cap I_1$. Let $\alpha > 0$ be such that

$$\alpha \lambda_{Leb}(K_1) - \lambda_{Leb}(S^1 \setminus K_1) = 0.$$

The function defined by

$$\psi(t) = \int_0^t (\alpha \chi_{K_1}(u) - \chi_{S^1 \setminus K_1}(u)) du$$

is then a Lipschitz Lyapunov function for h such that $\psi(x) \neq \psi(y)$. The d -Mather classes of h are then reduced to singletons and $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$ is homeomorphic to K .

Remark 2.12. Contrary to Conley's theorem, we cannot assume that the function θ given by theorem 2.6 separates d -Mather classes i.e. induces a one-to-one map $\bar{\theta}$ on $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$. In that case, the function $\bar{\theta}$ would induce a homeomorphism between $\mathcal{M}_d(h)$ and the neutral values $\theta(N(\theta))$ of θ . But these set might have different topologies. In the previous example for instance, when K has non-vanishing Lebesgue measure, the d -Mather quotient of h is homeomorphic to K and hence is totally disconnected. Nevertheless, the neutral values of θ cannot be totally disconnected because every point is chain-recurrent, see corollary 1.9.

3 Topological Aubry set and Mañé set

In the 1960's, Auslander [Aus64] introduced the *generalised recurrent set* of a continuous flow as the set of orbits along which any continuous Lyapunov function has to be constant. In the setting of a homeomorphism h of X , the generalized recurrent set $\mathcal{RG}(h)$ of h is the set of point x in X such that, for every continuous Lyapunov function θ for h , and for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\theta(h^n(x)) = \theta(x)$. Since for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the function $\theta \circ h^n$ is still a continuous Lyapunov function for h , the generalised recurrent set of h eventually reduces to the intersection of all neutral sets of continuous Lyapunov functions for h i.e.

$$\mathcal{RG}(h) = \bigcap_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)} N(\theta),$$

where $\mathcal{L}(h)$ denotes the set of continuous Lyapunov functions for h . This set also appears in the book of Akin [Aki93, Chapter I] as the *generalized non-wandering set* of h . The definition is different and uses the smallest closed and transitive relation containing the graph of h . A unified approach can be found in [AA10]. In this section, we explain why the generalised recurrent set of Auslander and Akin can be obtained as the intersection of all metrical Aubry sets. This is the object of theorem 3.1. By analogy with classical Aubry-Mather theory, this set will rather be called a topological Aubry set and will be denoted by $\mathcal{A}(h)$. By a happy coincidence, the letter \mathcal{A} could there stand for Auslander, Akin and Aubry.

Let \mathcal{D} be set of all metrics compatible with the topology of X . The *topological Aubry set* of h is the subset $\mathcal{A}(h)$ of X defined by

$$\mathcal{A}(h) = \bigcap_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{A}_d(h),$$

while the *Mañé set* of h is the subset $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(h)$ of X defined by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(h) = \bigcup_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{A}_d(h).$$

There is a natural partition of the topological Aubry set $\mathcal{A}(h)$ by equivalence classes of the relation \sim_h given by: $x \sim_h y$ if and only if $x \sim_d y$ for every metric $d \in \mathcal{D}$. The equivalence classes of the relation \sim_h are called the *Mather classes* of h . They are closed invariant subsets of X . The corresponding quotient space $\mathcal{A}(h)/\sim_h$ is called the *Mather quotient* of h and will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}(h)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{L}(h)$ be the set of continuous Lyapunov functions for h . The family $\{N(\theta) \mid \theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)\}$ is stable under (finite or infinite) intersection and we have*

$$\mathcal{A}(h) = \bigcap_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)} N(\theta).$$

In particular, there is $\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)$ such that $N(\theta) = \mathcal{A}(h)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{L}(h)$ be a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{L}(h)$. Open subsets of a compact metric space X satisfy Lindelöf property. Hence, there is an at most countable family $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathcal{F} such that

$$\bigcup_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}} X \setminus N(\theta) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X \setminus N(\theta_n).$$

Thus

$$\bigcap_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}} N(\theta) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} N(\theta_n).$$

For every $\lambda > 0$ and $\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)$ we have $\lambda\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)$ and $N(\lambda\theta) = N(\theta)$. Hence, we can assume that the family $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, is equi-bounded. The function

$$\theta = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{2^n} \theta_n$$

then satisfies $\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)$ and $N(\theta) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} N(\theta_n) = \bigcap_{\theta \in \mathcal{F}} N(\theta)$. This show that the family $\{N(\theta) \mid \theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)\}$ is stable under intersection. It follows from corollary 2.7 that

$$\mathcal{A}(h) = \bigcap_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \mathcal{A}_d(h) = \bigcap_{d \in \mathcal{D}} \bigcap_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}_d(h)} N(\theta).$$

Since any continuous Lyapunov function $\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)$ is Lipschitz for the compatible metric

$$d_\theta(x, y) = d(x, y) + |\theta(y) - \theta(x)|$$

we deduce that

$$\mathcal{A}(h) = \bigcap_{\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)} N(\theta).$$

□


Proposition 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}(h)$ be the set of continuous Lyapunov functions for h . Any function $\theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)$ is constant on every Mather class of h and therefore induces a continuous function $\bar{\theta}$ on the Mather quotient $\mathcal{M}(h)$. Moreover, the family of functions $\{\bar{\theta}, \theta \in \mathcal{L}(h)\}$ separates points of $\mathcal{M}(h)$.*

Proof. Let $\theta : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous Lyapunov function for h . The function θ is Lipschitz for the compatible metric

$$d_\theta(x, y) = d(x, y) + |\theta(x) - \theta(y)|$$

Hence, the function θ is constant on every d_θ -Mather class and is therefore constant on every Mather class. Let $[x], [y]$ be two distinct Mather classes. For some metric δ on X , the δ -Mather classes of x and y are then different and by corollary 2.9, there is a Lipschitz (and hence continuous) Lyapunov function $\theta : (X, \delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\theta(x) \neq \theta(y)$. \square

Example 3.3. We consider again example 2.2.



If K has non-vanishing Lebesgue measure, we have $\mathcal{A}_d(h) = K = \text{Fix}(h) \subset \mathcal{A}(h)$ and thus $\mathcal{A}(h) = K$. Moreover, Mather classes of h are then reduced to singletons because it is already the case of d -Mather classes. Hence $\mathcal{M}(h)$ is homeomorphic to K . If K has vanishing Lebesgue measure, that dynamical system is topologically conjugated to the case $\lambda_{Leb}(K) > 0$ and same conclusions hold. In particular, we can always find a continuous Lyapunov function θ for h such that $N(\theta) = K$, even if K has vanishing Lebesgue measure. As in example 2.11, this function is obtained from a continuous non-decreasing devil's staircase ψ which is constant on each interval on the complement of K , by considering $\text{Id} - \psi$.

Remark 3.4. As in remark 2.12, we cannot assume that the function θ given by theorem 3.1 separates Mather classes. Indeed, in the previous example, such a function would induce a homeomorphism between K and the neutral values $\theta(N(\theta))$ of θ , but that set cannot be totally disconnected because every point is chain-recurrent, see corollary 1.9.

To finish, we give a description of the Mañé set of h in terms of chain-recurrence.

Theorem 3.5. *We have*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(h) = \text{Fix}(h) \cup \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))}).$$

Proof. The proof of this result is rather long and technical. So, we postpone it to the Appendix. \square

Appendix

This section is devoted to the proof of theorem 3.5. The proof relies on the fact that any compact metric space can be topologically embedded into a real infinite dimensional Hilbert space and on a contraction lemma. In the following, $(H, \|\cdot\|)$ will denote a real infinite dimensional Hilbert space and $\text{Isol}(X)$ will denote the set of isolated points of X . Since theorem 3.5 is obvious when $X = \text{Isol}(X)$, which implies that X is finite, we will suppose that $X \setminus \text{Isol}(X)$ is not empty.

3.1 A contraction lemma

Lemma 3.6. *Let $a, b \in H$ and let U be an open neighborhood of the closed segment $[a, b]$. There is a C^∞ diffeomorphism φ of H with $\text{Supp}(\varphi) \subset U$ such that both φ and φ^{-1} are Lipschitz and $\varphi(a) = b$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that $a = 0$. If $b = a = 0$, the identity map will do the job. Otherwise, let F be the orthogonal complement of the vector space spanned by b

$$H = F \oplus \mathbb{R}b.$$

A point of H will then be denoted by (x, s) , $x \in F$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Let B_ε , $\varepsilon > 0$, be the open ball in F of radius ε centered in 0. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that

$$B_\varepsilon \times]-\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon[\subset U.$$

Let $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a C^∞ function with support in $]-\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon[$ and such that $\psi|_{[0, 1]} = 1$. We denote by Φ the flow on \mathbb{R} of the differential equation

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = \psi(\gamma(t))$$

that is

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \Phi(s, t) = \psi(\Phi(s, t)), \\ \Phi(s, 0) = s. \end{cases}$$

The flow Φ is defined for every time because the function ψ has compact support. Moreover, since $\psi|_{[0,1]} = 1$ we have $\Phi(0, 1) = 1$. Let $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a C^∞ function with support in $] -\varepsilon^2, \varepsilon^2[$ and such that $\rho(0) = 1$. We set $g(x) = \rho(\|x\|^2)$. The function g is C^∞ and $\text{Supp}(g) \subset B_\varepsilon$. We set

$$\varphi(x, s) = (x, \Phi(s, g(x))).$$

The map φ is then a diffeomorphism of H such that

$$\text{Supp}(\varphi) \subset B_\varepsilon \times] -\varepsilon, 1 + \varepsilon[\subset U$$

and φ sends $a = (0, 0)$ to $b = (0, 1)$. Both diffeomorphisms φ and φ^{-1} are Lipschitz because g and Φ are. \square

Lemma 3.7 (Contraction lemma). *Let $\{x_k, y_k\}$, $k = 1, \dots, r$, be pairs of points of H such that $\{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$ are pairwise disjoint and*

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \cap \{y_1, \dots, y_r\} = \emptyset.$$

Let F be a finite subset of H such that

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \cap F = \emptyset.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose that we have for every k in $\{1, \dots, r\}$,

$$\|x_k - y_k\| < \varepsilon.$$

Then for every $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ we can find a C^∞ diffeomorphism φ of H such that $\varphi|_F = \text{Id}|_F$ and for every k in $\{1, \dots, r\}$,

$$\|\varphi(x_k) - \varphi(y_k)\| < \delta.$$

Moreover, we can suppose that both φ and φ^{-1} are Lipschitz and

$$\|\varphi - \text{Id}\|_\infty < \varepsilon, \quad \|\varphi^{-1} - \text{Id}\|_\infty < \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Let E be the vector space spanned by $F \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$. Since H is infinite dimensional, we can find a linearly independent family $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ orthogonal to E . For $\eta > 0$ small enough, the family $\{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_k\}$ defined by

$$\tilde{y}_i = y_i + \eta v_i$$

is then made of pairwise disjoint points of H such that

$$\{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_k\} \cap (F \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_r\} \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_r\}) = \emptyset$$

and for every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,

$$\|\tilde{y}_k - y_k\| < \delta, \quad \|\tilde{y}_k - x_k\| < \varepsilon.$$

Moreover, the closed segments $[x_k, \tilde{y}_k]$, $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, are disjoint and neither meet F nor $\{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$. Let U_1, \dots, U_r be disjoint open neighborhoods of the segments $[x_1, \tilde{y}_1], \dots, [x_r, \tilde{y}_r]$ such that, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have

$$U_k \cap (F \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_r\}) = \emptyset.$$

Since $\|x_k - \tilde{y}_k\| < \varepsilon$, we can also suppose that every open subset U_k has diameter less than ε . By the previous lemma, there are C^∞ diffeomorphisms $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_r$ such that, for every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, both φ_k and φ_k^{-1} are Lipschitz, $\text{Supp}(\varphi_k) \subset U_k$ and $\varphi_k(x_k) = \tilde{y}_k$. We then set

$$\varphi = \varphi_r \circ \dots \circ \varphi_1.$$

Since supports of the diffeomorphisms φ_k are disjoint and do not meet the set $F \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$, we have

$$\varphi|_F = \text{Id}|_F$$

and for every $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$,

$$\varphi(x_k) = \tilde{y}_k, \quad \varphi(y_k) = y_k.$$

Moreover, since supports of the diffeomorphisms φ_k are disjoint and have diameter less than ε , we have

$$\|\varphi - \text{Id}\|_\infty < \varepsilon, \quad \|\varphi^{-1} - \text{Id}\| < \varepsilon.$$

Last, since every diffeomorphism φ_k (resp. φ_k^{-1}) is Lipschitz, so is φ (resp. φ^{-1}). \square

Remark 3.8. The case where H is finite dimensional is well-known and slightly more involved, see [Oxt77], or [Shu87] for the easier $\dim(H) \geq 3$ case.

3.2 Proof of theorem 3.5

We define the *essential points* $\mathcal{E}(C)$ of a chain $C = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ of X by

$$\mathcal{E}(C) = \{x_{k+1} \in C, 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \mid x_{k+1} \neq h(x_k)\}.$$

Lemma 3.9. *Let F be a finite subset of X and let d be a metric on X defining the topology of X . There is $\varepsilon(F) > 0$ such that*

$$\forall x \in F \cap \text{Isol}(X), \quad d(x, X \setminus \{x\}) \geq \varepsilon(F) > 0.$$

Proof. If $F \cap \text{Isol}(X) = \emptyset$, any positive $\varepsilon(F)$ will be fine. Otherwise, the set $F \cap \text{Isol}(X)$ consists in a finite number of isolated points of X . Take $\varepsilon(F) > 0$ such that

$$\forall x \in F \cap \text{Isol}(X), \quad B_d(x, \varepsilon(F)) = \{x\}.$$

\square

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\eta > 0$ and let d be a metric on X defining the topology of X . There is $\varepsilon(\eta) > 0$ such that every essential point x of any $\varepsilon(\eta)$ -chain for d satisfies $d(x, X \setminus \text{Isol}(X)) < \eta$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary. We can then find a sequence $(C_r)_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ of ε_r -chains for d with $\varepsilon_r \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow +\infty$ and essential points $x_{k_r} \in C_r$ such that

$$d(x_{k_r}, X \setminus \text{Isol}(X)) \geq \eta.$$

By compactness of X , we can assume that $x_{k_r} \rightarrow x_\infty$ as $r \rightarrow +\infty$. We then have

$$d(x_\infty, X \setminus \text{Isol}(X)) \geq \eta.$$

Hence, the point x_∞ does not belong to the closed set $X \setminus \text{Isol}(X)$ i.e. x_∞ is an isolated point of X . In particular, the converging sequence of essential points $(x_{k_r})_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ is eventually stationary to x_∞ . Hence, for r large enough we have

$$0 < d(x_{k_r}, h(x_{k_r-1})) = d(x_\infty, h(x_{k_r-1})) < \varepsilon_r$$

and we deduce from $\varepsilon_r \rightarrow 0$ that the point x_∞ is not isolated in X , which is a contradiction. □

Proposition 3.11. *Let F be a finite subset of X and let $x \in \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))})$. Let d be a metric on X defining the topology of X . For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an ε -chain $C = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ for d such that*

- (i) *essential points $\mathcal{E}(C)$ of C are pairwise disjoint,*
- (ii) *we have $\mathcal{E}(C) \cap (F \cup h(C)) = \emptyset$,*
- (iii) *we have $x_0 = x$ and $d(x_n, x) < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))})$. The set

$$Y = X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))$$

is a compact metric space and the restriction $h|_Y$ induces a homeomorphism of Y such that $\text{Fix}(h|_Y)$ has no interior in Y . Hence, working on the metric space Y instead, we can suppose that $x \in \mathcal{R}(h)$ and that $\text{Fix}(h)$ has no interior. Let $\varepsilon(F) > 0$ given by lemma 3.9. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. The homeomorphism h is uniformly continuous on X . Thus, there is $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{d(x,y) < \eta} d(h(x), h(y)) < \min\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \frac{\varepsilon(F)}{2}\right).$$

Moreover, we can suppose that

$$0 < \eta < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Let $\varepsilon(\eta) > 0$ given by lemma 3.10. Let $\rho > 0$ such that

$$0 < \rho < \min\left(\eta, \varepsilon(\eta), \frac{\varepsilon(F)}{2}\right).$$

Since the point x is chain-recurrent, there is a ρ -chain $C = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ from x to x for d . Reducing the chain if necessary, we can suppose that

$$\forall p, q \in \{0, \dots, n\}, x_p = x_q \Rightarrow p = q \pmod n. \quad (3.2.1)$$

Let $x_{k+1} \in C$, $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. If $x_{k+1} \in \mathcal{E}(C)$, then by lemma 3.10 we can find a point $z \in X \setminus \text{Isol}(X)$ such that $d(x_{k+1}, z) < \eta$. Since z is not isolated in X and $\text{Fix}(h)$ has no interior, we can find a point y_{k+1} in the neighborhood of z satisfying

$$d(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) < \eta \text{ and } y_{k+1} \notin F \cup h(\tilde{C}) \cup h^{-1}(\tilde{C}).$$

The existence of such a point y_{k+1} also holds in the straightforward case $x_{k+1} \in X \setminus \text{Isol}(X)$. We can thus define a new chain $\tilde{C} = \{\tilde{x}_0, \dots, \tilde{x}_n\}$ with $\tilde{x}_0 = x_0 = x$ in the following way: for every $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$,

(1) if $x_{k+1} \in \mathcal{E}(C)$ or if $x_{k+1} \in X \setminus \text{Isol}(X)$ then $\tilde{x}_{k+1} = y_{k+1}$ with

$$d(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) < \eta \text{ and } y_{k+1} \notin F \cup h(\tilde{C}) \cup h^{-1}(\tilde{C}),$$

(2) if $x_{k+1} \notin \mathcal{E}(C)$ and $x_{k+1} \in \text{Isol}(X)$ then $\tilde{x}_{k+1} = x_{k+1}$.

First, notice that for every $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ we have

$$d(\tilde{x}_k, x_k) < \eta < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

In particular $d(\tilde{x}_n, x) < \varepsilon$. Moreover, for every $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(h(\tilde{x}_k), \tilde{x}_{k+1}) &\leq d(h(\tilde{x}_k), h(x_k)) + d(h(x_k), x_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + d(x_{k+1}, \tilde{x}_{k+1}), \\ &< \sup_{d(x,y) < \eta} d(h(x), h(y)) + \rho + \eta < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the chain \tilde{C} is an ε -chain for d satisfying property (iii). We now claim that the chain \tilde{C} satisfies property (ii). Let $\tilde{x}_{k+1} \in \mathcal{E}(\tilde{C})$. If we are in the case (1), that is $\tilde{x}_{k+1} = y_{k+1}$, we indeed have $\tilde{x}_{k+1} \notin F \cup h(\tilde{C})$. In the case (2), we have

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} = x_{k+1} \in \text{Isol}(X)$$

and $x_{k+1} \notin \mathcal{E}(C)$, hence

$$h(x_k) = x_{k+1}.$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} d(\tilde{x}_{k+1}, h(\tilde{x}_k)) &= d(h(x_k), h(\tilde{x}_k)), \\ &\leq \sup_{d(x,y) < \eta} d(h(x), h(y)) < \varepsilon(F). \end{aligned}$$

But $\tilde{x}_{k+1} \in \mathcal{E}(\tilde{C})$ hence $h(\tilde{x}_k) \neq \tilde{x}_{k+1}$ and thus

$$0 < d(\tilde{x}_{k+1}, h(\tilde{x}_k)) < \varepsilon(F).$$

Since $\tilde{x}_{k+1} \in \text{Isol}(X)$, we deduce from lemma 3.9 that

$$\tilde{x}_{k+1} \notin F.$$

Now, suppose that $\tilde{x}_{k+1} = h(\tilde{x}_p) \in h(\tilde{C})$. Since $h(x_k) = x_{k+1} = \tilde{x}_{k+1}$, the injectivity of h implies that $\tilde{x}_p = x_k$. Since $h(\tilde{x}_k) \neq \tilde{x}_{k+1} = h(x_k)$, the same injectivity argument implies that $\tilde{x}_k \neq x_k$. Now since $\tilde{x}_p \in h^{-1}(\tilde{C})$, the point \tilde{x}_p is obtained from the case (2), that is $\tilde{x}_p = x_p$. Thus we have $x_p = x_k$. Since $k \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$, we deduce from 3.2.1 that either $p = k$ or $k = 0$ and $p = n$. If $p = k$ then the equality $\tilde{x}_p = x_p$ contradicts the fact that $\tilde{x}_k \neq x_k$. If $k = 0$ then the equality $\tilde{x}_0 = x_0$ contradicts again $\tilde{x}_k \neq x_k$. In both cases we obtain a contradiction and thus $\tilde{x}_{k+1} \notin h(\tilde{C})$. Hence property (ii) is satisfied. Now, reducing the chain if necessary, we can assume that points of $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{C})$ are pairwise disjoint, so that property (i) holds. \square

Proof of theorem 3.5. The inclusion

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}(h) \subset \text{Fix}(h) \cup \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))})$$

follows from corollary 2.7. Conversely, let $x \in \text{Fix}(h) \cup \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))})$. If $x \in \text{Fix}(h)$ then of course $x \in \tilde{\mathcal{N}}(h)$. Hence, we will suppose that $x \in \mathcal{R}(h|_{X \setminus \text{int}(\text{Fix}(h))})$. Any compact metric space can be topologically embedded into the Hilbert's cube, see [HW41, Theorem V.4]. Hence, there is no loss of generality to assume that X is a subspace of an infinite real dimensional Hilbert space $(H, \|\cdot\|)$. Using induction, we will construct a sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of finite subsets of X and a sequence $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of Lipschitz diffeomorphisms of H such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

(i) $F_n \subset F_{n+1}$,

(ii) $\phi_{n+1}|_{F_n} = \phi_n|_{F_n}$,

(iii) $\|\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$ and $\|\phi_{n+1}^{-1} - \phi_n^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$,

(iv) for every $n \geq 1$, there is a chain $\{x_0^n = x, \dots, x_{l_n}^n\}$ in F_n such that

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{l_n-1} \|\phi_n(x_{k+1}^n) - \phi_n(h(x_k^n))\| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}, \\ \|\phi_n(x_{l_n}^n) - \phi_n(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}, \end{cases}$$

(v) both diffeomorphisms ϕ_n and ϕ_n^{-1} are Lipschitz.

We set $F_0 = \{x\}$, $\phi_0 = Id$. Suppose that the subsets F_i and the diffeomorphisms ϕ_i have been constructed for $i = 0, \dots, n$. We consider the metric

$$d(x, y) = \|\phi_n(x) - \phi_n(y)\|$$

on X . Let $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$. By previous proposition used with the metric d , there is a chain

$$C_{n+1} = \{x_0^{n+1} = x, \dots, x_{l_{n+1}}^{n+1}\}$$

in X with the properties that

- (1) $\mathcal{E}(C_{n+1}) \cap (F_n \cup h(C_{n+1})) = \emptyset$,
- (2) Points of $\mathcal{E}(C_{n+1})$ are pairwise disjoint,
- (3) for every $k \in \{0, \dots, l_{n+1} - 1\}$ we have

$$\|\phi_n(x_{k+1}^{n+1}) - \phi_n(h(x_k^{n+1}))\| < \varepsilon,$$

- (4) $\|\phi_n(x_{l_{n+1}}^{n+1}) - \phi_n(x)\| < \varepsilon$.

Using lemma 3.7 with the pairs

$$\{\phi_n(h(x_k^{n+1})), \phi_n(x_{k+1}^{n+1})\}, x_{k+1}^{n+1} \in \mathcal{E}(C_{n+1}),$$

and the finite set $\phi_n(F_n)$, we can find a diffeomorphism φ of H such that both φ and φ^{-1} are Lipschitz and

- (a) for every $x_{k+1}^{n+1} \in \mathcal{E}(C_{n+1})$,

$$\|\varphi(\phi_n(x_{k+1}^{n+1})) - \varphi(\phi_n(h(x_k^{n+1})))\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{l_{n+1}}.$$

- (b) $\varphi|_{\phi_n(F_n)} = Id|_{\phi_n(F_n)}$,

- (c) $\|\varphi - Id\|_\infty < \varepsilon$ and $\|\varphi^{-1} - Id\|_\infty < \varepsilon$.

We set

$$\phi_{n+1} = \varphi \circ \phi_n,$$

and

$$F_{n+1} = F_n \cup C_{n+1}.$$

We then have, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough,

1. $\sum_{k=0}^{l_{n+1}-1} \|\phi_{n+1}(x_{k+1}^{n+1}) - \phi_{n+1}(h(x_k^{n+1}))\| \leq l_{n+1} \frac{\varepsilon}{l_{n+1}} < \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$,
2. $\|\phi_{n+1} - \phi_n\|_\infty \leq \|\varphi - Id\|_\infty < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}$,

$$3. \|\phi_{n+1}^{-1} - \phi_n^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \text{Lip}(\phi_n^{-1})\|\varphi^{-1} - Id\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon \text{Lip}(\phi_n^{-1}) < \frac{1}{2^{n+1}},$$

4.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi_{n+1}(x_{l_{n+1}}^{n+1}) - \phi_{n+1}(x)\| &\leq \|\phi_{n+1}(x_{l_{n+1}}^{n+1}) - \phi_n(x_{l_{n+1}}^{n+1})\| \\ &\quad + \|\phi_n(x_{l_{n+1}}^{n+1}) - \phi_n(x)\| \\ &\quad + \|\phi_n(x) - \phi_{n+1}(x)\|, \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$5. \phi_{n+1}|_{F_n} = \phi_n|_{F_n},$$

6. both diffeomorphisms ϕ_{n+1} and ϕ_{n+1}^{-1} are Lipschitz.

This complete the induction step and proves the existence of the families $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. By property (iii), the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_n(x), \\ \phi^{-1}(x) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_n^{-1}(x), \end{aligned}$$

are well defined. Since the convergences are uniform, they are both continuous and reciprocal one of each others. The map ϕ is thus a homeomorphism of H . Moreover, it follows from properties (i), (ii) and (iv) that for every $n \geq 1$, the chain $\{x_0^n = x, \dots, x_{l_n}^n\}$ satisfies

$$\sum_{k=0}^{l_n-1} \|\phi(x_{k+1}^n) - \phi(h(x_k^n))\| = \sum_{k=0}^{l_n-1} \|\phi_n(x_{k+1}^n) - \phi_n(h(x_k^n))\| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$$

and

$$\|\phi(x_{l_n}^n) - \phi(x)\| = \|\phi_n(x_{l_n}^n) - \phi_n(x)\| \leq \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

Thus the chain obtained by changing x_{l_n} into x is a chain from x to x satisfying

$$\sum_{k=0}^{l_n-1} \|\phi(x_{k+1}^n) - \phi(h(x_k^n))\| \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}.$$

Since $n \geq 1$ is arbitrary we have $x \in \mathcal{A}_\delta(h)$ for the compatible metric

$$\delta(x, y) = \|\phi(x) - \phi(y)\|.$$

and $x \in \mathcal{N}(h)$. □

References

- [Aki93] Ethan Akin, *The general topology of dynamical systems*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 1, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993.
- [AA10] Ethan Akin and Joseph Auslander, *Generalized recurrence, compactifications, and the Lyapunov topology*, *Studia Math.* **201** (2010), no. 1, 49–63.
- [Aus64] Joseph Auslander, *Generalized recurrence in dynamical systems*, *Contributions to Differential Equations* **3** (1964), 65–74.
- [Con78] Charles Conley, *Isolated invariant sets and the Morse index*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 38, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1978.
- [Con88] C. Conley, *The gradient structure of a flow. I*, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **8*** (1988), no. Charles Conley Memorial Issue, 11–26, 9. With a comment by R. Moeckel.
- [HW41] Witold Hurewicz and Henry Wallman, *Dimension Theory*, Princeton Mathematical Series, v. 4, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1941.
- [Mat93] John N. Mather, *Variational construction of connecting orbits*, *Ann. Inst. Fourier* **43** (1993), no. 5, 1349–1386.
- [Oxt77] John C. Oxtoby, *Diameters of arcs and the gerrymandering problem*, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **84** (1977), no. 3, 155–162.
- [Pag09] Pierre Pageault, *Conley barriers and their applications: chain-recurrence and Lyapunov functions*, *Topology Appl.* **156** (2009), no. 15, 2426–2442.
- [Shu87] Michael Shub, *Global stability of dynamical systems*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1987. With the collaboration of Albert Fathi and Rémi Langevin; Translated from the French by Joseph Christy.

Albert Fathi, Institut universitaire de France, Unité de mathématiques pures et appliquées, CNRS UMR 5669 & École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 46 allée d’Italie, 69364 Lyon, France

`albert.fathi@ens-lyon.fr`

Pierre Pageault, Unité de mathématiques pures et appliquées, CNRS UMR 5669 & École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 46 allée d’Italie, 69364 Lyon, France

`ppageault@gmail.com`