

On Variational Principle and the Metrics Associated with a Potential of Bounded Variation

by

Masamichi YOSHIDA

(Received August 26, 1997)

Abstract. We introduce a “family of metrics” associated with a potential and give another proof of the variational characterization of Gibbs measures without the use of “local specification property”.

1. Introduction

In [2], F. Ledrappier showed using the Ruelle’s nonlinear ergodic theorem ([4]) for a C^2 map on an interval that the absolutely continuous invariant measures are characterized by a variational principle. When one considers the behavior of a one-sided shift under a given potential, one can define the Gibbs measure associated with the potential and show that this measure is also characterized by a variational principle ([1]). Indeed, R. Bowen showed this characterization using the “local specification property” of Gibbs measures ([1] Theorem 1.2). In this paper using Ledrappier’s technique and a “family of metrics associated with a potential” one can give another proof of the variational characterization of Gibbs measures without the use of “local specification property”. This “family of metrics” inform us of the unstable nature of a one-sided shift under a given potential. Following Ledrappier’s technique one can find the density of the associated Gibbs measure.

2. Family on metrics associated with potential

The set-up is the following. Let $B = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}^+}$ and T be the one-sided shift on B , that is, $(Tb)_n = b_{n+1}$ for each $b \in B$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. In order to consider the natural extension of (B, T) , prepare “source space” $X = \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and the one-sided shift S on X . So the natural extension of (B, T) is $\tilde{B} = B \times X$. Here we shall write an element of X as $x = x_1 x_2 \cdots$, of B as $b = \cdots b_1 b_0$, and of \tilde{B} as $[b, x] = \cdots b_1 b_0 x_1 x_2 \cdots$. Let σ be the two-sided shift on \tilde{B} i.e. $\sigma: [b, x] \mapsto [Tb, b_0 x]$ where $b_0 x = b_0 x_1 x_2 \cdots \in X$. Define the holonomy mapping from $b \in B$ to $c \in B$ by

$$h_b(c): [c, X] \rightarrow [b, X]: [c, x] \mapsto [b, x].$$

When a potential on the original space B is given, we can define the ‘‘Jacobian’’ of the holonomy with respect to this potential as follows.

Let $\mathbf{D}(B)$ be the space of functions on B with bounded logarithmic variations. Thus a positive-valued function $f: B \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ belongs to $\mathbf{D}(B)$ if there are constants $C > 0$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ so that $\text{var}_k(f) = \sup\{|\log f(b) - \log f(c)| : b_n = c_n \text{ for all } n \leq k\} \leq C\alpha^k$ for each $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$. In this paper we shall regard $\mathbf{D}(B)$ as the space of potentials (Usually $\{\log f \mid f \in \mathbf{D}(B)\}$ is the space of potentials [1]). Associated with $f \in \mathbf{D}(B)$ we can define its cocycle by the formula $f(0, b) = 1$ and $f(n, b) = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^i b)$ and put a metric on each $[c, X]$ in the following way. Fix $\beta \in (0, 1)$ and set $\hat{f} = \beta \frac{f}{\|f\|}$ where $\|f\|$ is the sup-norm on B . For two distinct points x, y in X , one can define their initial common word $w(x, y)$ and its length $l(x, y)$, that is, $l(x, y) = \min\{n \in \mathbf{N} : x_{n+1} \neq y_{n+1}\}$ and $w(x, y) = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{l(x, y)}$ where it is empty word if $l(x, y) = 0$. Put a metric on $[c, X]$ such that for $x, y \in X$,

$$d_c(x, y) = \begin{cases} \hat{f}(l(x, y), cw(x, y)), & \text{if } x \neq y \\ 0, & \text{if } x = y \end{cases}$$

where $cw(x, y) = \cdots c_1 c_0 x_1 x_2 \cdots x_{l(x, y)} \in B$. Notice that if f is constant, the associated metrics are usual one. Indeed we can show that these are metrics.

LEMMA 1. For each $c \in B$, d_c is a metric on X .

Proof. We show that d_c is a non-archimedean metric i.e. $d_c(x, z) \leq \max\{d_c(x, y), d_c(y, z)\}$. If $l(x, z) > l(x, y)$, then $T^{l(x, z) - l(x, y)}(cw(x, z)) = cw(x, y)$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} d_c(x, z) &= \left(\frac{\beta}{\|f\|} \right)^{l(x, z)} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{l(x, z) - l(x, y) - 1} f(T^i(cw(x, z))) \right) \prod_{j=l(x, z) - l(x, y)}^{l(x, z) - 1} f(T^j(cw(x, z))) \\ &\leq \beta^{l(x, z) - l(x, y)} \left(\frac{\beta}{\|f\|} \right)^{l(x, y)} \left(\prod_{k=0}^{l(x, y) - 1} f(T^k(cw(x, y))) \right) < d_c(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

If $l(x, z) = l(x, y)$, then $w(x, z) = w(x, y)$ and $d_c(x, z) = d_c(x, y)$. If $l(x, z) < l(x, y)$, then $l(x, z) = l(y, z)$ and hence $w(x, z) = w(y, z)$ and $d_c(x, z) = d_c(y, z)$. ■

Next we define the ‘‘Jacobian’’ $D_{[b, x]}(c)$ of the mapping $h_b(c)$ at $[c, x]$ by the formula $D_{[b, x]}(c) = \lim_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{d_b(x, y)}{d_c(x, y)}$ where ‘‘ $y \rightarrow x$ ’’ means the convergence with respect to the product topology of X . In fact the above limit exists.

LEMMA 2. For each $b, c \in B$, $D_{[b, x]}(c)$ exists and equals to $\prod_{n \geq 1} \frac{f(bx_1 \cdots x_n)}{f(cx_1 \cdots x_n)}$ where $bx_1 \cdots x_n = \cdots b_1 b_0 x_1 \cdots x_n \in B$.

Proof. Let $x \neq y \in X$ be arbitrarily given.

$$\frac{d_b(x, y)}{d_c(x, y)} = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{l(x, y) - 1} f(bx_1 \cdots x_{l(x, y) - i})}{\prod_{i=0}^{l(x, y) - 1} f(cx_1 \cdots x_{l(x, y) - i})} = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{l(x, y)} f(bx_1 \cdots x_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{l(x, y)} f(cx_1 \cdots x_j)}$$

by letting $j=l(x, y)-i$. Since $l(x, y) \rightarrow \infty$ as $y \rightarrow x$ and $f \in \mathbf{D}(B)$, we get the desired result. \blacksquare

LEMMA 3. For each $b, c \in B$ and $x \in X$,

$$D_{[b, x]}(cb_{n-1} \cdots b_0) = D_{\sigma^n[b, x]}(c) \frac{f(n, cb_{n-1} \cdots b_0)}{f(n, b)}.$$

Proof. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} D_{[b, x]}(cb_{n-1} \cdots b_0) &= \prod_{k \geq 1} \frac{f((T^k b)b_{n-1} \cdots b_0 x_1 \cdots x_k)}{f(cb_{n-1} \cdots b_0 x_1 \cdots x_k)} \\ &= \left(\prod_{k \geq 1} \frac{f((T^k b)b_{n-1} \cdots b_0 x_1 \cdots x_k)}{f(cb_{n-1} \cdots b_0 x_1 \cdots x_k)} \right) \left(\prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{f((T^i b)b_{n-1} \cdots b_i)}{f(cb_{n-1} \cdots b_i)} \right) \frac{f(n, cb_{n-1} \cdots b_0)}{f(n, b)} \\ &= D_{\sigma^n[b, x]}(c) \frac{f(n, cb_{n-1} \cdots b_0)}{f(n, b)}. \end{aligned}$$

3. Proof of the variational principle

One can define the exponential pressure $\lambda_f \geq 0$ and f -conformal measure ν_f on B of a potential f ([1]). They satisfies the following condition. For each $i \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$\frac{d\nu_f \circ T|_{[i]_0}}{d\nu_f}(b) = \lambda_f f(b) \quad \nu_f\text{-a.e. } b \in [i]_0$$

where $[i]_0 = \{b \in B : b_0 = i\}$ and $\nu_f \circ T|_{[i]_0}(E) = \nu_f(TE)$ for each Borel subset $E \subset [i]_0$ (Notice that TE is a Borel subset of B since $T|_{[i]_0} : [i]_0 \rightarrow B$ is continuous injective). So the f -conformality implies that T is strongly non-singular i.e. $\nu_f(TE) = 0$ for each Borel subset $E \subset [i]_0$ with $\nu_f(E) = 0$ and that the distortion of T with respect to ν_f is f up to multiplication by a constant. For the completeness we shall prove the existence of λ_f and ν_f (See [1] theorem 1.7, p. 14). First define L_f on the space

of continuous functions on B in the following way: $(L_f \phi)(b) = \sum_{c \in T^{-1}(b)} \frac{\phi(c)}{f(c)} = \sum_{i=0}^1 \frac{\phi(bi)}{f(bi)}$. So L_f is a positive linear operator and one can define the dual operator

L_f^* on the space of finite Borel measures on B and its normalization \mathcal{L}_f on the space of probability measures on B , that is, $\mathcal{L}_f \nu = L_f^* \nu / L_f^* \nu(B)$. Since \mathcal{L}_f is continuous on $P(B)$, \mathcal{L}_f has a fixed point ν_f by the Schauder-Tychonoff's theorem. Let $\lambda_f = L_f^* \nu_f(B)$. Then λ_f and ν_f satisfies the above condition. Indeed for each subcylinder $C \subset [i]_0$,

$$\int_C \lambda_f f d\nu_f = \int_B \chi_C f dL_f^* \nu_f = \int_B L_f(\chi_C f) d\nu_f = \int_B \chi_C(bi) d\nu_f(b) = \int_C d\nu_f \circ T|_{[i]_0}$$

where χ_C is the characteristic function of C (this is continuous). Here we remark that $\lambda_f = \exp P(T, -\log f)$ where $P(T, -\log f)$ is the ‘‘pressure’’ of $-\log f$ (See [1], p. 30). To any T -invariant probability measure μ on B we assign a σ -invariant measure $\tilde{\mu}$ on \tilde{B} in a homogeneous way i.e. for each cylinder $\tilde{C} = \{[b, x] : b \in [i_{l-1} \cdots i_0]_0^{l-1} \text{ and } x_1 \cdots x_n = j_1 \cdots j_n\}$ (where $i_{l-1}, \dots, i_0, j_1, \dots, j_n \in \{0, 1\}$ and $[i_{l-1} \cdots i_0]_0^{l-1} = \{b \in B \mid b_{l-1} \cdots b_0 = i_{l-1} \cdots i_0\}$), $\tilde{\mu}(\tilde{C}) = \mu(\pi(\sigma^{-n}\tilde{C}))$ where $\pi: \tilde{B} \rightarrow B$ is the natural projection. Consider the refining and generating sequence of partitions of \tilde{B} given by

$$L_0 = \{[B, x] : x \in X\},$$

$$L_n = \sigma^{-n}L_0 = \{[Bx_1 \cdots x_n, S^n x] : x \in X\}.$$

We write the element of L_n containing $[b, x]$ as $L_n[b, x]$, that is, $L_n[b, x] = \{[c, x] : c \in [b_{n-1} \cdots b_0]_0^{n-1}\}$. By lemma 3, we can show the following.

LEMMA 4. For each T -invariant probability measure μ on B and $n \geq 1$,

$$n \int_B \log(\lambda_f f) d\mu = - \int_{\tilde{B}} \log \int_{\pi L_n[b, x]} \frac{D_{[b, x]}}{v_f(D_{[b, x]})} dv_f d\tilde{\mu}([b, x])$$

$$\text{where } v_f(D_{[b, x]}) = \int_B D_{[b, x]} dv_f.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & - \int_{\tilde{B}} \log \int_{\pi L_n[b, x]} \frac{D_{[b, x]}}{v_f(D_{[b, x]})} dv_f d\tilde{\mu}([b, x]) \\ &= - \int_{\tilde{B}} \log \int_{[b_{n-1} \cdots b_0]_0^{n-1}} \frac{1}{\lambda_f^n v_f(D_{[b, x]})} \frac{D_{[b, x]}(d)}{f(n, d)} dv_f \circ T^n|_{[b_{n-1} \cdots b_0]_0^{n-1}}(d) d\tilde{\mu}([b, x]) \\ &= n \log \lambda_f + \int_{\tilde{B}} \log v_f(D_{[b, x]}) d\tilde{\mu}([b, x]) - \int_{\tilde{B}} \log \int_B \frac{D_{\sigma^n[b, x]}(c)}{f(n, b)} dv_f(c) d\tilde{\mu}([b, x]) \\ & \quad (\text{by letting } d = cb_{n-1} \cdots b_0 \text{ and lemma 3}) \\ &= n \int_B \log(\lambda_f f) d\mu \text{ (by the invariance of } \mu \text{ and } \tilde{\mu}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can give another proof of the variational characterization of Gibbs measures. We write the conditional probability of $E \subset \tilde{B}$ at $[b, x]$ about the Borel σ -algebra $\mathbf{B}(L_n)$ generated by L_n with respect to $\tilde{\mu}$ as $\tilde{\mu}[E | L_n]([b, x])$, the conditional entropy of L_n under L_0 with respect to $\tilde{\mu}$ as $H_{\tilde{\mu}}(L_n | L_0)$, the entropy of T with respect to μ as $h_\mu(T)$ and the entropy of σ with respect to $\tilde{\mu}$ as $h_{\tilde{\mu}}(\sigma)$.

THEOREM 5. Let μ be a T -invariant probability measure on B .

If μ satisfies the formula $h_\mu(T) = \int_B \log(\lambda_f f) d\mu$, then μ is equivalent to v_f .

Proof. By the assumption and lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned}
-\int_{\tilde{B}} \log \int_{\pi L_n[b, x]} \frac{D_{[b, x]}}{v_f(D_{[b, x]})} dv_f d\tilde{\mu}([b, x]) &= nh_\mu(T) = nh_{\tilde{\mu}}(\sigma) = h_{\tilde{\mu}}(\sigma^n) \\
&= H_{\tilde{\mu}}(L_n | L_0) \quad (\text{since } \{L_n\}_{n \geq 0} \text{ is generating}) \\
&= -\int_{\tilde{B}} \log \tilde{\mu}[L_n[b, x] | L_0([b, x])] d\tilde{\mu}([b, x]).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\int_{\tilde{B}} \log \frac{\int_{\pi L_n[b, x]} \frac{D_{[b, x]}}{v_f(D_{[b, x]})} dv_f}{\tilde{\mu}[L_n[b, x] | L_0([b, x])]} d\tilde{\mu}([b, x]) = 0.$$

Accordingly if we define a probability measure $\tilde{\nu}$ on $B(L_n)$ so that

$$\tilde{\nu}(\tilde{E}) = \int_{\tilde{B}} \int_{\pi \tilde{E}} \frac{D_{[b, x]}}{v_f(D_{[b, x]})} dv_f d\tilde{\mu}([b, x]) \quad \text{for each } E \in B(L_n),$$

then $\int_{\tilde{B}} \log(d\tilde{\nu}/d\tilde{\mu})d\tilde{\mu} = 0$. By the concavity of the logarithm, $\tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\mu}$ on $B(L_n)$. Since $\{L_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is generating, we can extend $\tilde{\nu}$ to a probability measure on the Borel σ -algebra of \tilde{B} and $\tilde{\nu} = \tilde{\mu}$. Here for each Borel subset $E \subset B$, $\mu(E) = \tilde{\mu}(\pi^{-1}E) = \tilde{\nu}(\pi^{-1}E)$. Therefore $\mu \ll v_f$ by the definition of $\tilde{\nu}$. Conversely if $\mu(E) = 0$, then $\int_E (D_{[b, x]}/v_f(D_{[b, x]})) dv_f = 0$ $\tilde{\mu}$ -a.e. $[b, x] \in \tilde{B}$ and hence $v_f(E) = 0$. ■

Finally one can prove that if v_f is non-atomic and ergodic under T and μ is a T -invariant probability measure equivalent to v_f (such μ is unique by the ergodicity), then μ satisfies the formula $h_\mu(T) = \int_B \log(\lambda_{f,f}) d\mu$ ([3] corollary 3).

So we get the variational characterization of Gibbs measures.

References

- [1] R. Bowen; *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms*. Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 470. Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer 1975.
- [2] F. Ledrappier; Some properties of absolutely continuous invariant measures on an interval. *Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys.* **1** (1981), 77–93.
- [3] W. Parry; On Rohlin's formula for entropy. *Acta math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **15** (1964), 107–113.
- [4] D. Ruelle; Ergodic theory of differentiable dynamical systems. *Publ. Math. IHES* **50** (1979), 27–58.

Department of Mathematics
Osaka City University, 3–3–138
Sugimoto Sumiyoshi-ku, Osaka 558, Japan
E-mail address: yoshida@sci.osaka-cu.ac.jp