MAGIC: Ergodic Theory Lecture 6 - Continuous transformations of compact metric spaces

Charles Walkden

February 28, 2013

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

In the previous lectures we studied:

- (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) , a probability space.
- a measure preserving transformation $T: X \longrightarrow X$.

In this lecture, we fix a transformation $T : X \longrightarrow X$ and consider the space $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ of all *T*-invariant probability measures.

In the previous lectures we studied:

- (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) , a probability space.
- a measure preserving transformation $T: X \longrightarrow X$.

In this lecture, we fix a transformation $T : X \longrightarrow X$ and consider the space $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ of all *T*-invariant probability measures.

In order to equip $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ with some structure, we need some structure on X and T.

In the previous lectures we studied:

- (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) , a probability space.
- a measure preserving transformation $T: X \longrightarrow X$.

In this lecture, we fix a transformation $T : X \longrightarrow X$ and consider the space $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ of all *T*-invariant probability measures.

In order to equip $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ with some structure, we need some structure on X and T. Throughout:

- ► X = a compact metric space.

• $T: X \longrightarrow X$ a continuous transformation.

Define the uniform norm

$$\|f\|=\sup_{x\in X}|f(x)|.$$

Define the uniform norm

 $\|f\| = \sup_{x \in X} |f(x)|.$

With this norm, $C(X, \mathbb{R})$ is a Banach space (a complete normed vector space).

Define the uniform norm

$$\|f\|=\sup_{x\in X}|f(x)|.$$

With this norm, $C(X, \mathbb{R})$ is a Banach space (a complete normed vector space).

Important fact:

X compact metric $\implies C(X, \mathbb{R})$ separable.

Define the uniform norm

$$\|f\|=\sup_{x\in X}|f(x)|.$$

With this norm, $C(X, \mathbb{R})$ is a Banach space (a complete normed vector space).

Important fact:

X compact metric $\implies C(X, \mathbb{R})$ separable.

Recall:

A space is *separable* if there is a countable dense subset.

Definition $\mathcal{M}(X) = \{\mu \mid \mu \text{ is a Borel probability measure}\}.$

Definition $\mathcal{M}(X) = \{\mu \mid \mu \text{ is a Borel probability measure}\}.$ Proposition $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is *convex*:

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Definition $\mathcal{M}(X) = \{\mu \mid \mu \text{ is a Borel probability measure}\}.$

Proposition $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is convex: $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X), 0 \le \alpha \le 1 \Longrightarrow \alpha \mu_1 + (1 - \alpha) \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ $\mu_1 \times \mu_2$

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Definition $\mathcal{M}(X) = \{\mu \mid \mu \text{ is a Borel probability measure}\}.$ Proposition $\mathcal{M}(X) \text{ is convex:}$ $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X), 0 \le \alpha \le 1 \Longrightarrow \alpha \mu_1 + (1 - \alpha) \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ $\mu_1 \times \mu_2$

Proof.

Immediate from definitions.

It will be important to equip $\mathcal{M}(X)$ with a topology.

It will be important to equip $\mathcal{M}(X)$ with a topology. In fact, we will only need to see what it means for a sequence of measures to converge.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

It will be important to equip $\mathcal{M}(X)$ with a topology. In fact, we will only need to see what it means for a sequence of measures to converge.

Definition

Let $\mu_n, \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ if:

$$\int f d\mu_n \longrightarrow \int f d\mu \ \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}).$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

It will be important to equip $\mathcal{M}(X)$ with a topology. In fact, we will only need to see what it means for a sequence of measures to converge.

Definition

Let $\mu_n, \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ if:

$$\int f d\mu_n \longrightarrow \int f d\mu \ \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}).$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Remark

This does not say $\mu_n(B) \longrightarrow \mu(B) \ \forall B \in \mathscr{B}$.

1. One can write down a formula for a metric ρ on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ iff $\rho(\mu_n, \mu) \longrightarrow 0$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- 1. One can write down a formula for a metric ρ on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ iff $\rho(\mu_n, \mu) \longrightarrow 0$.
- 2. Recall that δ_x the Dirac measure at x, is defined by

$$\delta_x(B) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \notin B; \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

- 1. One can write down a formula for a metric ρ on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ iff $\rho(\mu_n, \mu) \longrightarrow 0$.
- 2. Recall that δ_x the Dirac measure at x, is defined by

$$\delta_x(B) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \notin B; \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

There is a continuous embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$ given by $x \longmapsto \delta_x$.

- 1. One can write down a formula for a metric ρ on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ iff $\rho(\mu_n, \mu) \longrightarrow 0$.
- 2. Recall that δ_x the Dirac measure at x, is defined by

$$\delta_x(B) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \notin B; \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

There is a continuous embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$ given by $x \longmapsto \delta_x$. i.e. if $x_n \longrightarrow x$ then $\delta_{x_n} \rightharpoonup \delta_x$.

- 1. One can write down a formula for a metric ρ on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ iff $\rho(\mu_n, \mu) \longrightarrow 0$.
- 2. Recall that δ_x the Dirac measure at x, is defined by

$$\delta_x(B) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \notin B; \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

There is a continuous embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$ given by $x \longmapsto \delta_x$. i.e. if $x_n \longrightarrow x$ then $\delta_{x_n} \rightharpoonup \delta_x$. (Let $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then $\int f \, d\delta_{x_n} = f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x) = \int f \, d\delta_x$.)

- 1. One can write down a formula for a metric ρ on $\mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ iff $\rho(\mu_n, \mu) \longrightarrow 0$.
- 2. Recall that δ_x the Dirac measure at x, is defined by

$$\delta_x(B) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \notin B; \\ 1 & \text{if } x \in B. \end{cases}$$

There is a continuous embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}(X)$ given by $x \longmapsto \delta_x$. i.e. if $x_n \longrightarrow x$ then $\delta_{x_n} \rightharpoonup \delta_x$. (Let $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then $\int f \, d\delta_{x_n} = f(x_n) \rightarrow f(x) = \int f \, d\delta_x$.)

Note that $1/n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $B = \{0\}$. Then $0 = \delta_{1/n}(B) \not\to \delta_0(B) = 1$.

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$.

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then μ can be regarded as a functional

$$\mu: C(X,\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}: f \mapsto \int f d\mu.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then μ can be regarded as a functional

$$\mu: C(X,\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}: f \mapsto \int f d\mu.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Write $\mu(f)$ for $\int f d\mu$.

This functional satisfies the following properties:

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then μ can be regarded as a functional

$$\mu: C(X,\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}: f \mapsto \int f d\mu.$$

Write $\mu(f)$ for $\int f d\mu$.

This functional satisfies the following properties: (1) $\mu(\lambda_1 f_1 + \lambda_2 f_2) = \lambda_1 \mu(f_1) + \lambda_2 \mu(f_2)$

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then μ can be regarded as a functional

$$\mu: C(X,\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}: f \mapsto \int f d\mu.$$

Write $\mu(f)$ for $\int f d\mu$.

This functional satisfies the following properties: (1) linearity: $\mu(\lambda_1 f_1 + \lambda_2 f_2) = \lambda_1 \mu(f_1) + \lambda_2 \mu(f_2)$ (2) continuity/boundedness: $|\mu(f)| \le ||f||_{\infty}$

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then μ can be regarded as a functional

$$\mu: C(X,\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}: f \mapsto \int f d\mu.$$

Write $\mu(f)$ for $\int f d\mu$.

This functional satisfies the following properties:(1)linearity: $\mu(\lambda_1 f_1 + \lambda_2 f_2) = \lambda_1 \mu(f_1) + \lambda_2 \mu(f_2)$ (2)continuity/boundedness: $|\mu(f)| \le ||f||_{\infty}$ (3)positivity: $f \ge 0 \implies \mu(f) \ge 0$

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then μ can be regarded as a functional

$$\mu: C(X,\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}: f \mapsto \int f d\mu.$$

Write $\mu(f)$ for $\int f d\mu$.

This functional satisfies the following properties:

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$. Then μ can be regarded as a functional

$$\mu: C(X,\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}: f \mapsto \int f d\mu.$$

Write $\mu(f)$ for $\int f d\mu$.

This functional satisfies the following properties:

(1) linearity: $\mu(\lambda_1 f_1 + \lambda_2 f_2) = \lambda_1 \mu(f_1) + \lambda_2 \mu(f_2)$ (2) continuity/boundedness: $|\mu(f)| \le ||f||_{\infty}$ (3) positivity: $f \ge 0 \implies \mu(f) \ge 0$ (4) normalised: $\mu(1) = 1$. The Riesz Representation Theorem says that any functional $C(X, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying (1) - (4) is given by integration w.r.t. a suitable Borel probability measure:

Theorem:(Riesz Representation)

Let $\omega : C(X, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a functional satisfying (1) linearity: $\omega(\lambda_1 f_1 + \lambda_2 f_2) = \lambda_1 \omega(f_1) + \lambda_2 \omega(f_2)$ (2) continuity/boundedness: $|\omega(f)| \le ||f||_{\infty}$ (3) positivity: $f \ge 0 \implies \omega(f) \ge 0$ (4) normalised: $\omega(1) = 1$.

Theorem: (Riesz Representation)

Let $\omega : C(X, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a functional satisfying (1) linearity: $\omega(\lambda_1 f_1 + \lambda_2 f_2) = \lambda_1 \omega(f_1) + \lambda_2 \omega(f_2)$ (2) continuity/boundedness: $|\omega(f)| \le ||f||_{\infty}$ (3) positivity: $f \ge 0 \implies \omega(f) \ge 0$ (4) normalised: $\omega(1) = 1$.

Then there exists a *unique* Borel probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ s.t. $\omega(f) = \int f d\mu$.

Connections with functional analysis

Let X be a (real) Hilbert space, X^* the dual of X (= space of continuous linear functionals $X \to \mathbb{R}$).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Connections with functional analysis

Let X be a (real) Hilbert space, X^* the dual of X (= space of continuous linear functionals $X \to \mathbb{R}$). The Riesz Representation Theorem (in the context of Hilbert spaces) tells us that X and X^* are naturally isomorphic via the map

 $X \longrightarrow X^* : x \longmapsto \langle x, \cdot \rangle$.

Connections with functional analysis

Let X be a (real) Hilbert space, X^* the dual of X (= space of continuous linear functionals $X \to \mathbb{R}$). The Riesz Representation Theorem (in the context of Hilbert spaces) tells us that X and X^* are naturally isomorphic via the map

$$X \longrightarrow X^* : x \longmapsto \langle x, \cdot \rangle$$
.

The version of the Riesz Representation Theorem stated above tells us that:
Let X be a (real) Hilbert space, X^* the dual of X (= space of continuous linear functionals $X \to \mathbb{R}$). The Riesz Representation Theorem (in the context of Hilbert spaces) tells us that X and X^* are naturally isomorphic via the map

$$X \longrightarrow X^* : x \longmapsto \langle x, \cdot \rangle$$
.

The version of the Riesz Representation Theorem stated above tells us that:

 $\mathcal{M}(X) = \mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R})^*$

Let X be a (real) Hilbert space, X^* the dual of X (= space of continuous linear functionals $X \to \mathbb{R}$). The Riesz Representation Theorem (in the context of Hilbert spaces) tells us that X and X^* are naturally isomorphic via the map

$$X \longrightarrow X^* : x \longmapsto \langle x, \cdot \rangle$$
.

The version of the Riesz Representation Theorem stated above tells us that:

 $\mathcal{M}(X) = \mathcal{C}(X,\mathbb{R})^* \cap$ positive cone

Let X be a (real) Hilbert space, X^* the dual of X (= space of continuous linear functionals $X \to \mathbb{R}$). The Riesz Representation Theorem (in the context of Hilbert spaces) tells us that X and X^* are naturally isomorphic via the map

$$X \longrightarrow X^* : x \longmapsto \langle x, \cdot \rangle$$
.

The version of the Riesz Representation Theorem stated above tells us that:

$$\mathcal{M}(X) = \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})^* \cap \text{positive cone}$$

 $\{\omega \in \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})^* \mid f \ge 0 \implies \omega(f) \ge 0\}$

Let X be a (real) Hilbert space, X^* the dual of X (= space of continuous linear functionals $X \to \mathbb{R}$). The Riesz Representation Theorem (in the context of Hilbert spaces) tells us that X and X^* are naturally isomorphic via the map

$$X \longrightarrow X^* : x \longmapsto \langle x, \cdot \rangle$$
.

The version of the Riesz Representation Theorem stated above tells us that:

 $\mathcal{M}(X) = \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})^* \cap \text{positive cone } \cap \text{ unit ball}$ $\{\omega \in \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})^* \mid f \ge 0 \implies \omega(f) \ge 0\}$

Let X be a (real) Hilbert space, X^* the dual of X (= space of continuous linear functionals $X \to \mathbb{R}$). The Riesz Representation Theorem (in the context of Hilbert spaces) tells us that X and X^* are naturally isomorphic via the map

$$X \longrightarrow X^* : x \longmapsto \langle x, \cdot \rangle$$
.

The version of the Riesz Representation Theorem stated above tells us that:

$$\mathcal{M}(X) = \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})^* \cap \text{positive cone } \cap \text{ unit ball}$$
$$\{\omega \in \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})^* \mid f \ge 0 \implies \omega(f) \ge 0\}$$
$$\{\omega \in \mathcal{C}(X, \mathbb{R})^* \mid |\omega| = 1\}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{signed}(X) = C(X, \mathbb{R})^*.$$

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

$$\mathcal{M}_{signed}(X) = C(X, \mathbb{R})^*.$$

Recall:

Alaoglu's theorem: Let X be a Banach space. Then the unit ball in X^* is weak-* compact.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

$$\mathcal{M}_{signed}(X) = C(X, \mathbb{R})^*.$$

Recall:

Alaoglu's theorem: Let X be a Banach space. Then the unit ball in X^* is weak-* compact.

Corollary

 $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is weak-* compact.

$$\mathcal{M}_{signed}(X) = C(X, \mathbb{R})^*.$$

Recall:

Alaoglu's theorem: Let X be a Banach space. Then the unit ball in X^* is weak-* compact.

Corollary

 $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is weak-* compact.

Proof.

Use $\mathcal{M}(X) = C(X, \mathbb{R})^* \cap$ positive cone \cap unit ball. The unit ball in $C(X, \mathbb{R})^*$ is weak-* compact by Alaoglu's theorem. The positive cone on $C(X, \mathbb{R})^*$ is weak-* closed.

Let X be a compact metric space and $T : X \to X$ a continuous transformation.

Let X be a compact metric space and $T : X \to X$ a continuous transformation. Then T induces a map on $\mathcal{M}(X)$

$$egin{array}{rll} T_*:\mathcal{M}(X)&\longrightarrow&\mathcal{M}(X),\ T_*\mu(B)&=&\mu(T^{-1}B). \end{array}$$

Let X be a compact metric space and $T : X \to X$ a continuous transformation. Then T induces a map on $\mathcal{M}(X)$

$$egin{array}{rll} T_*:\mathcal{M}(X)&\longrightarrow&\mathcal{M}(X),\ T_*\mu(B)&=&\mu(T^{-1}B). \end{array}$$

Remark

Hence μ is *T*-invariant if and only if $T_*\mu = \mu$.

Let X be a compact metric space and $T : X \to X$ a continuous transformation. Then T induces a map on $\mathcal{M}(X)$

$$egin{array}{rll} T_*:\mathcal{M}(X)&\longrightarrow&\mathcal{M}(X),\ T_*\mu(B)&=&\mu(T^{-1}B). \end{array}$$

Remark

Hence μ is *T*-invariant if and only if $T_*\mu = \mu$.

Definition

Let
$$\mathcal{M}(X, T) = \{ \text{all } T \text{-invariant measures} \}$$

= $\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) \mid T_* \mu = \mu \}.$

Let X be a compact metric space and $T : X \to X$ a continuous transformation. Then T induces a map on $\mathcal{M}(X)$

$$egin{array}{rll} T_*:\mathcal{M}(X)&\longrightarrow&\mathcal{M}(X),\ T_*\mu(B)&=&\mu(T^{-1}B). \end{array}$$

Remark

Hence μ is *T*-invariant if and only if $T_*\mu = \mu$.

Definition

Let
$$\mathcal{M}(X, T) = \{ \text{all } T \text{-invariant measures} \}$$

= $\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) \mid T_*\mu = \mu \}.$

We want to investigate the structure of $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$.

Let X be a compact metric space and $T : X \to X$ a continuous transformation. Then T induces a map on $\mathcal{M}(X)$

$$egin{array}{rll} T_*:\mathcal{M}(X)&\longrightarrow&\mathcal{M}(X),\ T_*\mu(B)&=&\mu(T^{-1}B). \end{array}$$

Remark

Hence μ is *T*-invariant if and only if $T_*\mu = \mu$.

Definition

Let
$$\mathcal{M}(X, T) = \{ \text{all } T \text{-invariant measures} \}$$

= $\{ \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X) \mid T_* \mu = \mu \}.$

We want to investigate the structure of $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$. First we need to integrate with respect to $T_*\mu$.

Lemma 1
$$\int f d(T_*\mu) = \int f \circ T d\mu.$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ ▲□ ● ● ●

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Lemma 1 $\int f d(T_*\mu) = \int f \circ T d\mu.$ Proof. Take $f = \chi_B$. Then $\int \chi_B d(T_*\mu) = T_*\mu(B)$

$$\int \chi_B d(T_*\mu) = T_*\mu(B) = \mu(T^{-1}B)$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

$$\int \chi_B \, d(T_*\mu) = T_*\mu(B) = \mu(T^{-1}B) = \int \chi_{T^{-1}B} \, d\mu$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

$$\int \chi_B d(T_*\mu) = T_*\mu(B) = \mu(T^{-1}B) = \int \chi_{T^{-1}B} d\mu = \int \chi_B \circ T d\mu$$
(easy check that $\chi_{T^{-1}B} = \chi_B \circ T$).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへで

Lemma 1
$$\int f d(T_*\mu) = \int f \circ T d\mu.$$

Proof.
Take $f = \chi_B$. Then

$$\int \chi_B d(T_*\mu) = T_*\mu(B) = \mu(T^{-1}B) = \int \chi_{T^{-1}B} d\mu = \int \chi_B \circ T d\mu$$

(easy check that $\chi_{T^{-1}B} = \chi_B \circ T$).

Hence the lemma is true for linear combinations of characteristic functions, hence for positive measurable functions, hence for integrable functions.

Lemma 2

Let $\ensuremath{\mathcal{T}}$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then

$$\mu = \mathcal{M}(X,T) \Longleftrightarrow \int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu \quad \forall f \in C(X,\mathbb{R}).$$
 (1)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Lemma 2

Let $\ensuremath{\mathcal{T}}$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then

$$\mu = \mathcal{M}(X, T) \Longleftrightarrow \int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu \quad \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}).$$
(1)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Proof.

 \Longrightarrow :

 $\int f \circ T d\mu$

Lemma 2

Let $\ensuremath{\mathcal{T}}$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then

$$\mu = \mathcal{M}(X, T) \Longleftrightarrow \int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu \quad \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}).$$
(1)
Proof.

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

⇒:

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d(T_*\mu)$$
Lemma 1

Lemma 2

Let $\ensuremath{\mathcal{T}}$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then

$$\mu = \mathcal{M}(X, T) \Longleftrightarrow \int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu \quad \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}).$$
(1)
Proof.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

 \Longrightarrow :

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d(T_*\mu) = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

Lemma 2

Let $\ensuremath{\mathcal{T}}$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then

$$\mu = \mathcal{M}(X, T) \Longleftrightarrow \int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu \quad \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}).$$
(1)
Proof.

 \Longrightarrow :

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d(T_*\mu) = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

 \Leftarrow : Use Lemma 1 to rewrite (1) as

$$(T_*\mu)(f) = \mu(f) \ \forall f \in C(X,\mathbb{R}).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Lemma 2

Let $\ensuremath{\mathcal{T}}$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then

$$\mu = \mathcal{M}(X, T) \Longleftrightarrow \int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu \quad \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}).$$
(1)
Proof.

 \Longrightarrow :

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d(T_*\mu) = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

$$\int f \circ T \, d\mu = \int f \, d\mu$$

 \iff : Use Lemma 1 to rewrite (1) as

$$(T_*\mu)(f) = \mu(f) \ \forall f \in C(X, \mathbb{R}).$$

By uniqueness in the Riesz Representation theorem, $T_*\mu = \mu$.

We show that continuous transformation of a compact metric space always has at least one invariant measure.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

We show that continuous transformation of a compact metric space always has at least one invariant measure. (Typically there will be uncountably many. This is the case for example for the doubling map, hyperbolic toral automorphism etc.)

We show that continuous transformation of a compact metric space always has at least one invariant measure. (Typically there will be uncountably many. This is the case for example for the doubling map, hyperbolic toral automorphism etc.)

Theorem $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset.$

Proof that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$

Proof that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$

First note that $T_*: \mathcal{M}(X) \to \mathcal{M}(X)$ is weak-* continuous.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Proof that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$

First note that $T_* : \mathcal{M}(X) \to \mathcal{M}(X)$ is weak-* continuous. To see this, suppose $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$. We want to show $T_*\mu_n \rightharpoonup T_*\mu$.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ
Proof that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$

First note that $T_*: \mathcal{M}(X) \to \mathcal{M}(X)$ is weak-* continuous. To see this, suppose $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$. We want to show $T_*\mu_n \rightharpoonup T_*\mu$.

Let $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Note $f \circ T \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then

$$\int f d(T_*\mu_n) = \int f \circ T d\mu_n \to \int f \circ T d\mu = \int f d(T_*\mu).$$

Proof that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$

First note that $T_*: \mathcal{M}(X) \to \mathcal{M}(X)$ is weak-* continuous. To see this, suppose $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$. We want to show $T_*\mu_n \rightharpoonup T_*\mu$.

Let $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Note $f \circ T \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then

$$\int f d(T_*\mu_n) = \int f \circ T d\mu_n \to \int f \circ T d\mu = \int f d(T_*\mu).$$

Theorem (Schauder-Tychonoff fixed point theorem)

Let K be a compact convex subset of a locally convex space. Let $T: K \rightarrow K$ be continuous. Then T has a fixed point in K.

 $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is a compact convex subset of the locally convex space $C(X, \mathbb{R})^*$. The map T_* is continuous and maps $\mathcal{M}(X)$ to itself.

Hence there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $T_*\mu = \mu$, i.e. $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. Other properties of M(X, T)

 $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ enjoys some other properties:

Other properties of M(X, T)

 $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ enjoys some other properties:

Theorem

1. M(X, T) is convex $(\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, T), 0 \le \alpha \le 1 \implies \alpha \mu_1 + (1 - \alpha) \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)).$

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

2. $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is weak-* compact.

Other properties of M(X, T)

 $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ enjoys some other properties:

Theorem

1. M(X, T) is convex $(\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, T), 0 \le \alpha \le 1 \implies \alpha \mu_1 + (1 - \alpha) \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)).$

2.
$$\mathcal{M}(X, T)$$
 is weak-* compact.

Proof. Unravel the definitions!

Ergodic measures for continuous transformations

We want to characterise the ergodic measures in $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$. We will do this using the convexity of $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$.

Ergodic measures for continuous transformations

We want to characterise the ergodic measures in $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$. We will do this using the convexity of $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$.

Extremal points in convex sets

Let Y be a subset of a vector space. Recall: Y is convex if $\forall y_1, y_2 \in Y, 0 \le \alpha \le 1$ we have $\alpha y_1 + (1 - \alpha)y_2 \in Y$.

Ergodic measures for continuous transformations

We want to characterise the ergodic measures in $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$. We will do this using the convexity of $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$.

Extremal points in convex sets

Let Y be a subset of a vector space. Recall: Y is convex if $\forall y_1, y_2 \in Y, 0 \le \alpha \le 1$ we have $\alpha y_1 + (1 - \alpha)y_2 \in Y.$



A point $y \in Y$ is said to be *extremal* if it cannot be written as a convex combination of another two points in Y,

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

A point $y \in Y$ is said to be *extremal* if it cannot be written as a convex combination of another two points in Y, i.e.

$$y \text{ extremal} \iff \begin{array}{c} y = \alpha y_1 + (1 - \alpha) y_2 \\ \text{for } 0 < \alpha < 1, \ y_1, y_2 \in Y \end{array} \text{ implies } y_1 = y_2 = y.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

A point $y \in Y$ is said to be *extremal* if it cannot be written as a convex combination of another two points in Y, i.e.

$$y \text{ extremal} \iff \begin{array}{c} y = \alpha y_1 + (1 - \alpha) y_2 \\ \text{for } 0 < \alpha < 1, \ y_1, y_2 \in Y \end{array} \text{ implies } y_1 = y_2 = y_2.$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Let $Ext(Y) = \{extremal points\}.$

Y = unit square



Y = unit square



Y = unit square









 $\operatorname{Ext}(Y) = \{ \text{four corners} \}$



(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

 $\operatorname{Ext}(Y) = \{ \text{four corners} \}$



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

 $\operatorname{Ext}(Y) = \{ \text{four corners} \}$



 $\operatorname{Ext}(Y) = \{ \text{four corners} \}$

 $\operatorname{Ext}(Y) = \{\text{boundary}\}\$



Remark

The geometric intuition that the extremal points lie on the boundary fails in infinite dimensions.

Let Z be any subset of a vector space. Then the *convex hull* of Z, Cov(Z), is the smallest closed convex set containing Z.

Let Z be any subset of a vector space. Then the *convex hull* of Z, Cov(Z), is the smallest closed convex set containing Z.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Example

Let Z be any subset of a vector space. Then the *convex hull* of Z, Cov(Z), is the smallest closed convex set containing Z.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Example

Let Z be any subset of a vector space. Then the *convex hull* of Z, Cov(Z), is the smallest closed convex set containing Z.

Example



▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ★ 国▶ ★ 国▶ - 国 - のへで

Let Z be any subset of a vector space. Then the *convex hull* of Z, Cov(Z), is the smallest closed convex set containing Z.

Example



Theorem:(Krein-Milman)

Let X be a topological vector space on which X^* separates points. Let $K \subset X$ be a compact convex subset. Then K is the convex hull of its extremal points:

$$K = \operatorname{Cov}(\operatorname{Ext}(K)).$$

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. Then we know that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there is at least one T-invariant measure.

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. Then we know that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there is at least one T-invariant measure. Is there an ergodic measure?

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. Then we know that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there is at least one T-invariant measure. Is there an ergodic measure? (Recall that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic \Leftrightarrow no non-trivial T-invariant subsets, i.e. $T^{-1}B = B, B \in \mathscr{B}$ implies $\mu(B) = 0$ or 1.)

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. Then we know that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there is at least one T-invariant measure. Is there an ergodic measure? (Recall that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic \Leftrightarrow no non-trivial T-invariant subsets, i.e. $T^{-1}B = B, B \in \mathscr{B}$ implies $\mu(B) = 0$ or 1.)

Theorem 3:

 $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic if and only if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is extremal.

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. Then we know that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there is at least one T-invariant measure. Is there an ergodic measure? (Recall that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic \Leftrightarrow no non-trivial T-invariant subsets, i.e. $T^{-1}B = B, B \in \mathscr{B}$ implies $\mu(B) = 0$ or 1.)

Theorem 3:

 $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic if and only if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is extremal.

Corollary

A continuous transformation of a compact metric has at least one ergodic measure.

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. Then we know that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there is at least one T-invariant measure. Is there an ergodic measure? (Recall that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic \Leftrightarrow no non-trivial T-invariant subsets, i.e. $T^{-1}B = B, B \in \mathscr{B}$ implies $\mu(B) = 0$ or 1.)

Theorem 3:

 $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic if and only if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is extremal.

Corollary

A continuous transformation of a compact metric has at least one ergodic measure.

Thm \implies Corollary: By Krein-Milman, $\mathcal{M}(X, T) = \operatorname{Cov}(\operatorname{Ext}(\mathcal{M}(X, T))).$

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. Then we know that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there is at least one T-invariant measure. Is there an ergodic measure? (Recall that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic \Leftrightarrow no non-trivial T-invariant subsets, i.e. $T^{-1}B = B, B \in \mathscr{B}$ implies $\mu(B) = 0$ or 1.)

Theorem 3:

 $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic if and only if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is extremal.

Corollary

A continuous transformation of a compact metric has at least one ergodic measure.

Thm \implies Corollary: By Krein-Milman, $\mathcal{M}(X, T) = \operatorname{Cov}(\operatorname{Ext}(\mathcal{M}(X, T)))$. As $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $\operatorname{Ext}(\mathcal{M}(X, T)) \neq \emptyset$.

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. Then we know that $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there is at least one T-invariant measure. Is there an ergodic measure? (Recall that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic \Leftrightarrow no non-trivial T-invariant subsets, i.e. $T^{-1}B = B, B \in \mathscr{B}$ implies $\mu(B) = 0$ or 1.)

Theorem 3:

 $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is ergodic if and only if $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is extremal.

Corollary

A continuous transformation of a compact metric has at least one ergodic measure.

Thm \implies Corollary: By Krein-Milman, $\mathcal{M}(X, T) = \operatorname{Cov}(\operatorname{Ext}(\mathcal{M}(X, T)))$. As $\mathcal{M}(X, T) \neq \emptyset$, we have that $\operatorname{Ext}(\mathcal{M}(X, T)) \neq \emptyset$. By the Theorem, these are precisely the ergodic measures. Proof of Theorem: Note: we only make use of the \Leftarrow implication. (Unusually, this is the easier direction!)

Proof of Theorem: Note: we only make use of the \Leftarrow implication. (Unusually, this is the easier direction!) We prove the contrapositive: μ not ergodic $\Rightarrow \mu$ not extremal.

Proof of Theorem: Note: we only make use of the \Leftarrow implication. (Unusually, this is the easier direction!) We prove the contrapositive: μ not ergodic $\Rightarrow \mu$ not extremal.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 μ not ergodic $\implies \exists B \in \mathscr{B}, 0 < \mu(B) < 1, s.t. T^{-1}(B) = B.$
μ not ergodic $\implies \exists B \in \mathscr{B}, 0 < \mu(B) < 1, s.t. T^{-1}(B) = B.$

Let $\alpha = \mu(B)$. Define probability measures

$$\mu_1(\cdot) = \frac{\mu(\cdot \cap B)}{\mu(B)}, \quad \mu_2(\cdot) = \frac{\mu(\cdot \cap B^c)}{\mu(B^c)}.$$

 μ not ergodic $\implies \exists B \in \mathscr{B}, 0 < \mu(B) < 1, s.t. T^{-1}(B) = B.$

Let $\alpha = \mu(B)$. Define probability measures

$$\mu_1(\,\cdot\,)=rac{\mu(\,\cdot\,\cap B)}{\mu(B)},\ \ \mu_2(\,\cdot\,)=rac{\mu(\,\cdot\,\cap B^c)}{\mu(B^c)}.$$

As $T^{-1}B = B$, it is easy to check $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$.

 μ not ergodic $\implies \exists B \in \mathscr{B}, 0 < \mu(B) < 1, s.t. T^{-1}(B) = B.$

Let $\alpha = \mu(B)$. Define probability measures

$$\mu_1(\cdot) = rac{\mu(\cdot \cap B)}{\mu(B)}, \ \ \mu_2(\cdot) = rac{\mu(\cdot \cap B^c)}{\mu(B^c)}.$$

As $T^{-1}B = B$, it is easy to check $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. Clearly, $\mu = \alpha \mu_1 + (1 - \alpha)\mu_2$.

 μ not ergodic $\implies \exists B \in \mathscr{B}, 0 < \mu(B) < 1, s.t. T^{-1}(B) = B.$

Let $\alpha = \mu(B)$. Define probability measures

$$\mu_1(\cdot) = rac{\mu(\cdot \cap B)}{\mu(B)}, \ \ \mu_2(\cdot) = rac{\mu(\cdot \cap B^c)}{\mu(B^c)}.$$

As $T^{-1}B = B$, it is easy to check $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. Clearly, $\mu = \alpha \mu_1 + (1 - \alpha)\mu_2$. As $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, we see that μ is not extremal.

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0, 1). Let N = north pole = (0, 2) and S = south pole = (0, 0).

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:



Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:



Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:



▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:



▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:



Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:



▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:



▲□▶ ▲圖▶ ▲臣▶ ▲臣▶ ―臣 … のへで

Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the circle of radius 1 and centre (0,1). Let N = north pole = (0,2) and S = south pole = (0,0). Define a map $T : X \longrightarrow X$ as indicated:



Then *N*, *S* are fixed points under *T*. Hence $\delta_N, \delta_S \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. We calculate $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$.

We claim: μ (right semicircle) = 0.

We claim: μ (right semicircle) = 0. Choose any $x \in$ right semicircle. Let I = [x, Tx) be the arc of the semicircle:

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?













We claim: $\mu(\text{right semicircle}) = 0$. Choose any $x \in \text{right semicircle}$. Let I = [x, Tx) be the arc of the semicircle:



Then the right semicircle is the disjoint union $\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}I$.

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

 $1 \geq \mu$ (right semicircle)



1
$$\geq \mu$$
(right semicircle) = $\mu \left(\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n} I \right)$



$$1 \geq \mu(\text{right semicircle}) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}I\right)$$
$$= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(T^{-n}I)$$

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

$$1 \geq \mu(\text{right semicircle}) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}I\right)$$
$$= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(T^{-n}I)$$
disjoint union

◆□ → < 個 → < Ξ → < Ξ → < Ξ → の < ⊙</p>

$$1 \geq \mu(\text{right semicircle}) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}I\right)$$
$$= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(T^{-n}I) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(I)$$
disjoint union

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

$$1 \geq \mu(\text{right semicircle}) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}I\right)$$
$$= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(T^{-n}I) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(I)$$
disjoint union

Hence $\mu(I) = 0$. Hence $\mu(\text{right semicircle}) = 0$.

$$1 \geq \mu(\text{right semicircle}) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}I\right)$$
$$= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(T^{-n}I) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(I)$$
disjoint union

Hence $\mu(I) = 0$. Hence $\mu(\text{right semicircle}) = 0$. Similarly, $\mu(\text{left semicircle}) = 0$.

$$1 \geq \mu(\text{right semicircle}) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}I\right)$$
$$= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(T^{-n}I) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(I)$$
disjoint union

Hence $\mu(I) = 0$. Hence $\mu(\text{right semicircle}) = 0$. Similarly, $\mu(\text{left semicircle}) = 0$. Hence μ is supported on *N*, *S* and

$$\mathcal{M}(X,T) = \{\alpha \delta_N + (1-\alpha)\delta_S \mid 0 \le \alpha \le 1\}$$

$$1 \geq \mu(\text{right semicircle}) = \mu\left(\bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}I\right)$$
$$= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(T^{-n}I) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mu(I)$$

disjoint union

Hence $\mu(I) = 0$. Hence $\mu(\text{right semicircle}) = 0$. Similarly, $\mu(\text{left semicircle}) = 0$. Hence μ is supported on *N*, *S* and

$$\mathcal{M}(X,T) = \{\alpha \delta_N + (1-\alpha)\delta_S \mid 0 \le \alpha \le 1\}$$

This has extremal points δ_N , δ_S , which are precisely the ergodic measures.

Remark

Our intuition - which is necessarily finite dimensional! - suggests that the extremal points of a convex set K lie on the boundary of K.

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

Remark

Our intuition - which is necessarily finite dimensional! - suggests that the extremal points of a convex set K lie on the boundary of K.

Whilst this is true for finite dimensional sets, it it not true of infinite dimensional sets.

Remark

Our intuition - which is necessarily finite dimensional! - suggests that the extremal points of a convex set K lie on the boundary of K.

Whilst this is true for finite dimensional sets, it it not true of infinite dimensional sets.

Example

Let T be the doubling map $X \longrightarrow X$. Then $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ is infinite dimensional. The ergodic measures are precisely the extremal points of $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$. However, the set of ergodic measures is also weak-* dense in $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$.
Definition

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Definition

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. We say that T is *uniquely ergodic* if $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ consists of exactly one T-invariant measure.

▲ロト ▲帰ト ▲ヨト ▲ヨト 三日 - の々ぐ

Definition

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. We say that T is *uniquely ergodic* if $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ consists of exactly one T-invariant measure.

Remark

If $\mathcal{M}(X, T) = \{\mu\}$, then μ is necessarily ergodic (it's an extremal point).

Definition

Let T be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space X. We say that T is *uniquely ergodic* if $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ consists of exactly one T-invariant measure.

Remark

If $\mathcal{M}(X, T) = \{\mu\}$, then μ is necessarily ergodic (it's an extremal point).

Unique ergodicity implies the following strong convergence result.

Let $T: X \longrightarrow X$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then the following are equivalent

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Let $T: X \longrightarrow X$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then the following are equivalent

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

1. T is uniquely ergodic.

Let $T: X \longrightarrow X$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then the following are equivalent

- 1. *T* is uniquely ergodic.
- 2. For all $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$, there is a constant c(f), s.t.

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}f(T^jx)\longrightarrow c(f)$$
(2)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

uniformly as $n \to \infty$.

Let $T : X \longrightarrow X$ be a continuous transformation of a compact metric space. Then the following are equivalent

- 1. *T* is uniquely ergodic.
- 2. For all $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$, there is a constant c(f), s.t.

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}f(T^jx)\longrightarrow c(f)$$
(2)

uniformly as $n \to \infty$.

Remark

Thus unique ergodicity holds iff we have uniform convergence $\forall x \in X$ in the ergodic theorem (for continuous observables).

Irrational circle rotations are uniquely ergodic: Let $X = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Fix $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and define

$$T: X \longrightarrow X : x \mapsto x + \alpha \mod 1$$

Irrational circle rotations are uniquely ergodic: Let $X = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Fix $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and define

$$T: X \longrightarrow X : x \mapsto x + \alpha \mod 1$$

We know μ = Lebesgue measure $\in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. We sketch why μ is the only *T*-invariant measure.

Irrational circle rotations are uniquely ergodic: Let $X = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Fix $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and define

$$T: X \longrightarrow X : x \mapsto x + \alpha \mod 1$$

We know μ = Lebesgue measure $\in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. We sketch why μ is the only *T*-invariant measure.

Let
$$e_k(x) = e^{2\pi i k x}$$
, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let also $m = \mathcal{M}(X, T)$.

Irrational circle rotations are uniquely ergodic: Let $X = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Fix $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and define

$$T: X \longrightarrow X : x \mapsto x + \alpha \mod 1$$

We know μ = Lebesgue measure $\in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. We sketch why μ is the only *T*-invariant measure.

Let
$$e_k(x) = e^{2\pi i k x}$$
, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let also $m = \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. Then

$$\int e_k \circ T \, dm \qquad = \qquad \int e_k \, dm$$

Irrational circle rotations are uniquely ergodic: Let $X = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Fix $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and define

$$T: X \longrightarrow X : x \mapsto x + \alpha \mod 1$$

Irrational circle rotations are uniquely ergodic: Let $X = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Fix $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and define

$$T: X \longrightarrow X : x \mapsto x + \alpha \mod 1$$

We know μ = Lebesgue measure $\in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. We sketch why μ is the only T-invariant measure. Let $e_k(x) = e^{2\pi i k x}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let also $m = \mathcal{M}(X, T)$. Then $\int e_k \circ T dm$ ∫ e_k dm = $\int e^{2\pi i k(x+\alpha)} dm$ $\int e^{2\pi i k x} dm$ $e^{2\pi i k \alpha} \int e^{2\pi i k x} dm$

Now $e^{2\pi i k \alpha} \neq 1$ unless k = 0. Hence $\int e^{2\pi i k x} dm = 0$ for $k \neq 0$.

Now $e^{2\pi i k \alpha} \neq 1$ unless k = 0. Hence $\int e^{2\pi i k \alpha} dm = 0$ for $k \neq 0$. Let $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ have Fourier series $\sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{2\pi i n \alpha}$.

Now $e^{2\pi i k \alpha} \neq 1$ unless k = 0. Hence $\int e^{2\pi i k \alpha} dm = 0$ for $k \neq 0$. Let $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ have Fourier series $\sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{2\pi i n \alpha}$. Then

$$\int f \, dm = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} c_n \int e^{2\pi i n x} \, dm = c_0 = \int f \, d\mu$$

Now $e^{2\pi i k \alpha} \neq 1$ unless k = 0. Hence $\int e^{2\pi i k \alpha} dm = 0$ for $k \neq 0$. Let $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ have Fourier series $\sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e^{2\pi i n \alpha}$. Then

$$\int f \, dm = \sum_{-\infty}^{\infty} c_n \int e^{2\pi i n x} \, dm = c_0 = \int f \, d\mu$$

By the Riesz Representation theorem, $m = \mu$.

Next lecture

In the next lecture we study the classification problem in ergodic: when are two measure-preserving transformations 'the same'?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

In the next lecture we study the classification problem in ergodic: when are two measure-preserving transformations 'the same'?

We introduce an isomorphism invariant, the entropy $h_{\mu}(T)$ of a measure-preserving transformation, which turns out to be of independent interest.

In the next lecture we study the classification problem in ergodic: when are two measure-preserving transformations 'the same'?

We introduce an isomorphism invariant, the entropy $h_{\mu}(T)$ of a measure-preserving transformation, which turns out to be of independent interest.

We show how to calculate entropy for a number of examples.