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This survey is devoted to smooth dynamical systems, which are in our context diffeomorphisms and smooth flows on compact manifolds. We call a flow or a diffeomorphism hyperbolic if all of its Lyapunov exponents are different from zero (except the one in the flow direction, which has to be
zero). This means that the tangent vectors asymptotically expand or contract exponentially fast in time. For many reasons, it is convenient to assume more than just asymptotic expansion or contraction, namely that the expansion and contraction of tangent vectors happens uniformly in time. Such hyperbolic systems are said to be uniformly hyperbolic.

Historically, uniformly hyperbolic flows and diffeomorphisms were studied as early as in mid-sixties: it was done by D. Anosov [2] and S. Smale [77], who introduced his Axiom A. In the seventies, Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms and flows attracted much attention from different directions: physics, topology, and geometry. This actually started in 1968 when Ya. Sinai constructed Markov partitions [74, 75] that allowed a symbolic representation of the dynamics, which matched the existing lattice models in statistical mechanics. As a result, the theory of Gibbs measures for one-dimensional lattices was carried over to Anosov and Axiom A dynamical systems. This was done in fundamental works by Ya. Sinai [76], D. Ruelle [67] and R. Bowen [11] in 1972-76. The resulting theory was a fascinating alloy of physical, measure-theoretic, geometric, and topological ideas and methods. For a while, it was the most active topic in the theory of dynamical systems. By 1980, the theory of Anosov and Axiom A systems was completed almost to perfection.

In the eighties, researchers turned their attention to nonuniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphisms and flows. Basic results in this direction were obtained by Ya. Pesin already in mid-seventies [56, 57]. However, those systems happened to be not nearly as nice or easy to study as uniformly hyperbolic ones. The progress in this direction is due to works by M. Benedics, L. Carleson, M. Jakobson, A. Katok, F. Ledrappier, Ya. Pesin, D. Ruelle, M. Viana, L.-S. Young and others in the eighties and nineties. By now it seems that we gained some reasonably good understanding of nonuniformly hyperbolic dynamics, even though there are still more open questions than answers in this area.

At the same time, a revival of the interest to Anosov and Axiom A systems occurred in statistical mechanics in the nineties. It was discovered that several physical phenomena of nonequilibrium origin can be modelled with the help of Anosov and Axiom A systems. Most notably, those are entropy production and chaotic scattering studies by G. Gallavotti, P. Gaspard, D. Ruelle, and others. This new interest led to new results about old Anosov and Axiom A systems, for example, Gallavotti-Cohen fluctuation theorem for entropy production rates, and escape-rate formula for Axiom A maps and Anosov dif-
feomorphisms with holes. Also motivated by applications in physics, new results on the decay of correlations for Anosov flows were obtained.

The survey is organized as follows. Section 1 contains the construction of Markov partitions and symbolic dynamics – this is the very basis for the theory of Gibbs measures. Section 2 thoroughly covers the theory of Gibbs measures for Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms. It is divided into three subsections. One (2.1) gives the classical theory of Gibbs measures for one-dimensional lattices in statistical mechanics. Based on this, Subsection 2.2 develops the modern theory of Gibbs measures for Anosov and Axiom A maps. Subsection 2.3 contains many properties of Gibbs measures – statistical, topological, and other (some of them very recent). Section 3 is devoted to one special Gibbs measure – the so called Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen (SRB) measure. The theory of Gibbs measures in Sections 2 and 3 is presented in great detail and with complete proofs. We feel that this is appropriate in view of the recent revival of interest to the subject, and given that very few books and surveys give full coverage of the topic (probably none since 1980). Sections 2 and 3 can be used by graduate students to study the theory of Gibbs measures. Many remarks and examples can be regarded are good exercises.

Section 4 covers Anosov and Axiom A flows and their Gibbs measures, including SRB measures. It also contains recent results on the decay of correlations. Section 5 is devoted to the volume compression in Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms, it is motivated by the entropy production studies in statistical mechanics. Section 6 contains the discussion of nonuniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphisms and recent studies of the leakage of mass near Axiom A basic sets and Anosov diffeomorphisms with holes, including the escape-rate formula and conditionally invariant measures.

1 Markov partitions

Let $T : M \to M$ be an Anosov diffeomorphism of class $C^{1+\alpha}$ of a compact $C^\infty$ smooth Riemannian manifold $M$. For any point $x \in M$ we denote by $E^s_x, E^u_x$ the stable and unstable linear subspaces in $T_xM$, and by $W^s(x), W^u(x)$ the local stable and unstable manifolds through the point $x$. For exact definitions, see 6.4.a in [44] and more in [38]

**Definition.** A subset $R \subset M$ is called a rectangle if its diameter is small
(compared to the shortest closed geodesic on $M$) and for any $x, y \in R$

$$[x, y] := W^s(x) \cap W^u(y) \in R$$

For $x \in R$, let

$$W^s(x, R) = W^s(x) \cap R \quad \text{and} \quad W^u(x, R) = W^u(x) \cap R$$

Any rectangle $R$ has a direct product structure in the following sense. Pick $z \in R$ and put $C = W^u(z, R)$ and $D = W^s(z, R)$. Then

$$R = [C, D] := \{[x, y] : x \in C, y \in D\}$$

Also, for every $x \in R$ there is a unique representation $x = [x^u, x^s]$, where $x^u \in C$ and $x^s \in D$, so the sets $C$ and $D$ play the role of coordinate axes in $R$. Observe that $x \in \text{int} R$ if and only if $x^u \in \text{int} C$ and $x^s \in \text{int} D$. In particular, $R$ is open (closed) if both $C$ and $D$ are open (closed).

A rectangle $R$ is said to be proper, if it is closed and $R = \text{int} R$. In the above notations, $R$ is proper if and only if $C = \text{int} C$ and $D = \text{int} D$ as subsets of the manifolds $W^u(x)$ and $W^s(x)$, respectively.

The intersection of a finite number of open (closed) rectangles is an open (closed) rectangle. It is not true, however, that the intersection of proper rectangles is a proper one.

A subset $R' \subset R$ of a proper rectangle $R$ is called a u-subrectangle if it is a proper rectangle itself and $W^u(x, R') = W^u(x, R)$ for all $x \in R'$. A u-subrectangle $R' \subset R$ stretches completely across $R$ in the unstable direction(s). Similarly, s-subrectangles are defined.

We say that a finite collection $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \ldots, R_m\}$ of proper rectangles makes a partition of $M$, if $\cup R_i$ covers $M$ and $\text{int} R_i \cap \text{int} R_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$.

**Definition.** A partition $\mathcal{R}$ of $M$ into proper rectangles is called a Markov partition if it satisfies the following Markov property:

$$TW^s(x, R_i) \subset W^s(Tx, R_j) \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$T^{-1}W^u(Tx, R_j) \subset W^u(x, R_i) \quad (1.2)$$

for $x \in \text{int} R_i \cap T^{-1}(\text{int} R_j)$.
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Let $x \in \text{int} R_i \cap T^{-1}(\text{int} R_j)$. Then $TW^s(x, R_i)$ may not coincide with $W^s(Tx, TR_i \cap R_j)$, if $R_i$ if not small enough – the set $TR_i$ may somehow wrap around the manifold $M$ and ‘cross $R_j$ twice’. We will always assume that the diameter of every rectangle is small enough, so the above ‘double crossing’ will not be possible. Thus, we can sharpen (1.1) and (1.2):

$$TW^s(x, R_i) = W^s(Tx, TR_i \cap R_j)$$ (1.3)

and

$$T^{-1}W^u(Tx, R_j) = W^u(x, R_i \cap T^{-1}R_j)$$ (1.4)

for all $x \in \text{int} R_i \cap T^{-1}(\text{int} R_j)$. Therefore,

$$R_i \cap T^{-1}R_j = [T^{-1}W^u(Tx, R_j), W^s(x, R_i)]$$ (1.5)

and

$$TR_i \cap R_j = [W^u(Tx, R_j), TW^s(x, R_i)]$$ (1.6)

Based on this, one can verify that $R_i \cap T^{-1}R_j$ is a proper rectangle. Hence, $R_i \cap T^{-1}R_j$ is an s-subrectangle in $R_i$, and $TR_i \cap R_j$ is a u-subrectangle in $R_j$. By using continuity arguments, one can show that the above identities (1.1)-(1.4) hold also for any point $x \in R_i \cap T^{-1}R_j$ provided $\text{int} R_i \cap T^{-1}(\text{int} R_j) \neq \emptyset$.

**Remark 1.1.** The Markov property (1.1), (1.2) is equivalent to the following one: $TR_i \cap R_j$ is a u-subrectangle in $R_j$ and $R_i \cap T^{-1}R_j$ is an s-subrectangle in $R_i$ whenever $\text{int} R_i \cap T^{-1}(\text{int} R_j) \neq \emptyset$.

We note that if $\text{int} R_i \cap T^{-1}(\text{int} R_j) \neq \emptyset$, then for any u-subrectangle $R' \subset R_i$ the set $TR' \cap R_j$ is a u-subrectangle in $R_j$. Similarly, any s-subrectangle $R'' \subset R_j$ the set $R_i \cap T^{-1}R''$ is an s-subrectangle in $R_i$.

One can verify directly that for any closed rectangle $R$

$$\partial R = \partial^s R \cup \partial^u R$$

where

$$\partial^s R = \bigcup_{x \in R} \partial W^u(x, R)$$

$$\partial^u R = \bigcup_{x \in R} \partial W^s(x, R)$$

for $W^u(x, R)$ and $W^s(x, R)$ as subsets of the manifolds $W^u(x)$ and $W^s(x)$, respectively.
We put $\partial^u R = \bigcup_i \partial^u R_i$ and $\partial^s R = \bigcup_i \partial^s R_i$. Also, $\partial R = \partial^u R \cup \partial^s R$.

Observe that for any partition $\mathcal{R}$ of $M$ into proper rectangles the set $\partial \mathcal{R}$ is closed and nowhere dense.

One can now verify directly, that if $\mathcal{R}$ is a Markov partition, then

$$T (\partial^s R) \subset \partial^s R \quad \text{and} \quad T^{-1} (\partial^u R) \subset \partial^u R \quad (1.7)$$

**Remark 1.2.** Assume that int $R_i$ is connected for each $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$. Then (1.7) implies the Markov property. The connectedness of int $R_i$ is actually essential.

**Remark 1.3.** Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a Markov partition. Assume that int $R_i$ has a finite number of connected components for each $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$. Then the closures of the connected components of all $R_i$, $R_i \in \mathcal{R}$, are proper rectangles which make another (finer) Markov partition. It will satisfy the assumptions of the previous remark.

Let $T : M \to M$ be an Axiom A diffeomorphism, see 6.4.a in [44] and [38] for exact definitions and basic properties. We follow here earlier notation by Bowen [11]. Denote by $\Omega(T)$ the set of its nonwandering points. According to Smale’s decomposition theorem,

$$\Omega(T) = \Omega_1 \cup \cdots \cup \Omega_s$$

where $\Omega_i$ are basic sets. Let $\Omega_r$ be a basic set for $T$. One can define rectangles $R \subset \Omega_r$ and Markov partitions of $\Omega_r$ in exactly the same way as above. All the results (except Remarks 1.2 and 1.3) hold true for basic sets of Axiom A diffeomorphisms almost without change. The openness and closedness of a rectangle $R$ and sets $W^{u,s}(x,R)$ is understood as of subsets of $\Omega_r$ and $W^{u,s}(x) \cap \Omega_r$, respectively. Exact definitions and detailed proofs can be found in [11]. Remarks 1.2 and 1.3 make no sense in the Axiom A case, since basic sets are often totally disconnected (this is best illustrated by Smale’s horseshoe).

Furthermore, let $\Omega$ be a compact locally maximal topologically transitive hyperbolic set, see 6.4.a in [44]. Then $\Omega$ has all the characteristic properties of an Axiom A basic set. Hence, rectangles and Markov partitions are defined for $\Omega$ just as well. Since we will only work on basic sets, hyperbolic locally maximal transitive sets will not be different from Axiom A basic sets. So, we also call them Axiom A basic sets.
In our further discussion, we cover both types of diffeomorphisms, Anosov and Axiom A (it goes without saying that the latter includes compact locally maximal transitive hyperbolic sets). Whenever necessary, we separate these cases, however.

Define a transition matrix \( A = A(R) \) by

\[
A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } \text{int } R_i \cap T^{-1}(\text{int } R_j) \neq \emptyset \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]  

(1.8)

**Proposition 1.1** Let \( i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_n \) be an arbitrary sequence such that \( A_{i_r, i_{r+1}} = 1 \) for all \( 0 \leq r \leq n - 1 \). Then the set \( R' = \cap_{r=0}^{n} T^{-r} R_{i_r} \) is an \( s \)-subrectangle in \( R_{i_0} \), and

\[
W^u(x, R') = T^{-n} W^u(T^n x, R_{i_n}), \quad \forall x \in R'
\]  

(1.9)

Similarly, the set \( R'' = \cap_{r=0}^{n} T^{n-r} R_{i_r} \) is a \( u \)-subrectangle in \( R_{i_n} \), and

\[
W^s(y, R'') = T^n W^s(T^{-n} y, R_{i_0}), \quad \forall y \in R''
\]  

(1.10)

**Proof.** See (1.5), (1.6), Remark 1.1 and use induction on \( n \). \( \square \)

**Remark 1.4.** Observe that the sets given in (1.9) and (1.10) are closed and their diameters do not exceed \( C \lambda^n \text{diam } R \), where \( \text{diam } R = \max_i \text{diam } R_i \).

**Example 1.1.** Let \( T : \mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2 \) be the hyperbolic toral automorphism defined by the matrix \( A_T = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \). It is often colloquially called “Arnold’s cat map”. A Markov partition for \( T \) consisting of three rectangles is shown in Fig. 1. For an exercise, the reader may want to find the transition matrix for this partition.

If the matrix \( A_T \) is not symmetric, the stable and unstable lines for \( T \) on the torus \( \mathbb{T}^2 \) may not be orthogonal. Then, the atoms of Markov partitions are, geometrically, parallelograms rather than rectangles. In early works on Markov partitions, \([74, 75]\), the term ‘parallelogram’ was used instead of ‘rectangle’.

Next, let \( R' = \{ R'_i \} \) and \( R'' = \{ R''_j \} \) be two partitions of \( M \) into proper rectangles. For any \( i, j \) the intersection \( R'_i \cap R''_j \) is a rectangle, which is not necessarily a proper one. However, the set \( R_{ij} = \text{int} (R'_i \cap R''_j) \) is a proper
Figure 1: A Markov partition for a hyperbolic toral automorphism.
rectangle (or empty). Then the collection of nonempty rectangles \( \{ R_{ij} \} \) makes a partition into proper rectangles, the fact one can verify directly. We denote this partition by \( R' \lor R'' \).

Observe that if \( R' \) and \( R'' \) are Markov partitions, then so is \( R' \lor R'' \). Hence, if \( R' \) is a Markov partition, then for any \( m, n \geq 0 \) the partition \( \lor_{i=-m}^{n} T^i R' \) is a Markov one, as well.

Let \( m \geq 1 \). Assume that \( R' \) is a Markov partition for the diffeomorphism \( T^m \). One can verify directly that

\[
R = R' \lor T^{-1} R' \lor \cdots \lor T^{-m+1} R'
\]

is a Markov partition for \( T \).

**Theorem 1.2** Let \( T : M \to M \) be an Anosov diffeomorphism or \( T : \Omega \to \Omega \) a map on an Axiom A basic set. Then for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is a Markov partition of \( M \) (resp., \( \Omega \)) whose rectangles have diameters less than \( \varepsilon \).

Two proofs of this theorem exist. The original (but little known) proof by Sinai [75] works only for Anosov diffeomorphisms, but is more explicit and provides a somewhat better control on the construction of Markov partitions. It was first to be extended to hyperbolic dynamical systems of physical interest, such as billiards [14, 15]. The other proof, by Bowen [11], is based on the shadowing property. It is very elegant, works for Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms, and was recently extended to very general hyperbolic systems with singularities [45] and nonuniformly hyperbolic systems [46]. We outline both proofs.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2: Anosov case.** For simplicity, we assume that \( \dim M = 2 \), so that the manifolds \( W^u \) and \( W^s \) are one-dimensional (we call them fibers). For any curve \( \gamma \subset M \) denote by \( |\gamma| \) its length. For any two points \( x, y \) on the same local stable or unstable fiber denote by \( W^s(x, y) \) and \( W^u(x, y) \), respectively, the segment of that fiber between \( x \) and \( y \).

Let \( \delta_0 \ll \delta_1 \ll 1 \). Let \( \mathcal{N}_\delta = \{ x_1, \ldots, x_n \} \) be a \( \delta_0 \)-dense set in \( M \). For each \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) let \( y_{i,1}, y_{i,2} \) be two points on the local stable fiber \( W^s(x_i) \) that are the distance \( \delta_1 \) from \( x_i \), i.e. \( |W^s(y_{i,1}, y_{i,2})| = 2 \delta_1 \) and \( |W^s(x_i, y_{i,j})| = \delta_1 \) for \( j = 1, 2 \). Let \( x_{i,1}, x_{i,2} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_0} \) be two points that are \( \delta_0 \)-close to \( y_{i,1}, y_{i,2} \), respectively. Put \( z_{i,j} = [x_i, x_{ij}] \) for \( j = 1, 2 \), \( W_{i,0}^s = W^s(z_{i,1}, z_{i,2}) \), and \( S_0 = \cup_{i=1}^{n} W_{i,0}^s \). Similarly, define unstable segments \( W_{i,0}^u \) and put \( U_0 = \cup_{i=1}^{n} W_{i,0}^u \).
Due to the compactness of $M$, there is a constant $\kappa = \kappa(M, T) > 0$ such that $|W^s(y_{i,j}, z_{i,j})| \leq \kappa \delta_0$ and $|W^u(x_{i,j}, z_{i,j})| \leq \kappa \delta_0$ for $j = 1, 2$. We then have the following facts:

(i) $2\delta_1 - \kappa \delta_0 \leq |W^u_{i,0}| \leq 2\delta_1 + \kappa \delta_0$;

(ii) each curve $W^s_{i,0}$ terminates on two curves $W^u_{i,0}, W^u_{i,0} \subset U_0$, and the distance from the endpoints of $W^s_{i,0}$ to the corresponding endpoints of $W^u_{i,0}$ and $W^u_{i,0}$ is $\geq \delta_1 - 2\kappa \delta_0$.

These facts, of course, hold true if one interchanges the superscripts $u$ and $s$. We assume that $\kappa \delta_0 < \delta_1/100$.

According to the previous observations, it is enough to show the existence of Markov partitions for $T^m$ with very large values of $m$. The set $S_0 \cup U_0$ defines a partition $\mathcal{R}_0$ of $M$ into proper connected rectangles with $\partial^u\mathcal{R}_0 = S_0$ and $\partial^u\mathcal{R}_0 = U_0$, which is not a Markov partition for $T^m$ yet. We will also need that $T^mS_0 \subset S_0$ and $T^mU_0 \subset U_0$ (according to Remark 1.2, this will be enough). We will adjust the curves in $S_0$ and $U_0$ to ensure the above inclusions.

Let $m$ be so large that $C\lambda^m < \delta_0/\delta_1$. Then, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$, $|T^mW^s_{i,0}| < 3\delta_0$ and $|T^mW^u_{i,0}| > \delta_1^2/\delta_0 > 100\delta_1$ for $j = 1, 2$. The curves $T^mW^u_{i,0}, j = 1, 2$, are like long parallel railroad tracks on which the short curve $T^mW^s_{i,0}$ can be moved back and forth to allow adjustment. Let $x_{i,0} \in \mathcal{N}_{\delta_0}$ be a point $\delta_0$-close to $T^mW^s_{i,0}$. Put $z_{i,j}' = W^s_{i,0} \cap T^mW^u_{i,0}$ for $j = 1, 2$ and $W_{i,1} = T^{-m}W^s(z_{i,1}', z_{i,2}')$. Observe that, for each $i$, two parallel stable fibers $W^s_{i,1}$ and $W^s_{i,0}$ lie just the distance $\leq \text{const} \cdot \delta_0 C\lambda^m < \text{const} \cdot \delta_0^2/\delta_1$ apart, which is $< \delta_0/100$ provided $\delta_0/\delta_1$ is small enough.

Similarly, one can define $W^s_{i,1}$. Note, however, that the new curves $W^s_{i,1}$ and $W^s_{i,2}$ may not terminate on each other, so we have to cut back or extend them slightly (by no more than $\delta_0/100$ to restore that property.

Put $S_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^n W^s_{i,1}$ and $U_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^n W^u_{i,1}$. Observe that $T^mS_1 \subset S_0$ and $T^mU_1 \subset U_0$. The above adjustment is just the first step of an iterational procedure. Having two systems of curves $\{W^s_{i,p}\}$ and $\{W^u_{i,p}\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, for some $p \geq 0$, we can adjust them by the above algorithm and get two new systems $\{W^s_{i,p+1}\}$ and $\{W^u_{i,p+1}\}$. Observe that $T^mS_{p+1} \subset S_p$ and $T^mU_{p+1} \subset U_p$, where the meaning of the notations is clear.

It is not so hard to verify that our iterational procedure converges (exponentially fast in $p$), and we arrive at two limit systems of stable and unstable fibers, $\{W^s_{i,\infty}\}$ and $\{W^u_{i,\infty}\}$, that satisfy the required inclusions, $T^mS_\infty \subset S_\infty$. 10
and $T^{-m}U_\infty \subset U_\infty$. These define a Markov partition for $T^m$. The theorem is proved.

**Remark 1.5.** We produced a Markov partition into connected rectangles. Each one is a domain in $M$ bounded by two local stable and two local unstable fibers. Since $\partial^s\mathcal{R}$ consists of a finite number of local stable fibers and we have the invariance (1.7), the set $K^s = \cap_n T^n(\partial^s\mathcal{R})$ is finite and $T$-invariant. So, $K^s$ consists of a finite number of periodic points, whose stable fibers contain the entire set $\partial^s\mathcal{R}$. The same goes to the set $K^u = \cap_n T^{-n}(\partial^u\mathcal{R})$. The finite set $K^s \cup K^u$ is called the core of the partition $\mathcal{R}$. For the partition shown in Fig. 1, the core is just one fixed point $(0,0)$. We note also that for Anosov diffeomorphisms on two-dimensional tori there is a direct construction of Markov partitions by Adler and Weiss [5].

**Multidimensional Anosov case.** The above proof can be carried out in any dimensions, along the lines of [75], but we will not do that here. We only point out a new problem arising in higher dimensions. To illustrate it, assume that $\dim W^u(x) = 2$ and $\dim W^s(x) = 1$ for all $x \in M$. Again, the first step of the proof is to take a partition $\mathcal{R}_0$ of $M$ into nice piecewise smooth connected rectangles, for example, 3-D boxes of more or less the same size. To ensure the Markov property, an iterational procedure of adjustments of the boundaries of the boxes is used. Let $R_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0$, fix an $x \in R_0$ and put $C_0 = W^u(x, R_0)$. If $m$ is large, the surface $T^mC_0$ will be large in all directions, and its boundary $\partial(T^mC_0)$ will go through many boxes $R \in \mathcal{R}_0$. The first adjustment consists of carving a new boundary curve on the surface $W^u(x)$, close to $\partial C_0$, whose image under $T^m$ will fall into $\partial^s\mathcal{R}_0$. That new curve will enclose a new region, $C_1 \subset W^u(x)$. Observe that the new boundary curve, $\partial C_1$, is far more irregular than the old one, $\partial C_0$, since it has to mimic, on a small scale, the boundaries of the boxes $R \in \mathcal{R}_0$ that $T^m(\partial C_0)$ goes through. Further adjustments will create more and more fractal type irregularities on the boundary curves $\partial C_n$, $n \geq 1$, on smaller and smaller scales. As a result, the limit region $C_\infty = \lim_{n \to \infty} C_n$ will have boundary that is not smooth at any single point. The careful construction of $C_\infty$, therefore, requires lengthy and delicate work, see [75]. The nonsmoothness of the boundaries of Markov partitions in high dimensions was first noticed by Bowen and proved in [12] by a different technique (counting periodic points).

**Proof of Theorem 1.2: Axiom A case.** We outline the proof leaving the verification of some claims as exercises. A detailed proof is available in ref.
Let $\Omega_r$ be an Axiom A basic set. For a small $\beta > 0$ find an $\alpha > 0$ such that any $\alpha$-pseudo-orbit is $\beta$-shadowed by an orbit in $\Omega_r$. Find a $\gamma < \alpha/2$ such that $\text{dist}(Tx, Ty) < \alpha/2$ when $\text{dist}(x, y) < \gamma$. Let $P = \{p_1, \ldots, p_r\}$ be a $\gamma$-dense set in $\Omega_r$. Note that

$$
\Sigma(P) = \{\omega \in \prod_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \{1, \ldots, r\} : \text{dist}(Tp_{\omega_i}, p_{\omega_{i+1}}) < \alpha \ \forall \ i \in \mathbb{Z}\}
$$

is a topological Markov chain of finite type. For each $\alpha$-pseudo-orbit $\omega \in \Sigma(P)$ there is a unique point $\pi(\omega) \in \Omega_r$ that $\beta$-shadows it.

Claim. The map $\pi : \Sigma(P) \to \Omega_r$ is surjective and continuous. Hint: prove the continuity by way of contradiction, using the expansiveness of $T : \Omega_r \to \Omega_r$.

As a result, the sets $V_i := \pi(C_i)$, where $C_i = \{\omega : \omega_0 = i\}$ is a cylinder whose 0-th coordinate is set to $i$, are closed for all $1 \leq i \leq r$. For $\omega, \omega' \in C_i$ define $\omega^* = [\omega, \omega']$ by

$$
\omega^*_j = \begin{cases} 
\omega_j & \text{for } j \geq 0 \\
\omega'_j & \text{for } j \leq 0 
\end{cases}
$$

Then $[\cdot, \cdot]$ commutes with $\pi$, that is $\pi([\omega, \omega']) \in W^s(\pi(\omega)) \cap W^u(\pi(\omega')) = [\pi(\omega), \pi(\omega')]$. Hence, $V_i$ are closed rectangles. They cover $\Omega_r$.

Claim. The cover $\{V_i\}$ satisfies the following semi-Markov property: if $x = \pi(\omega)$ for $\omega \in \Sigma(P)$, then

$$
TW^s(x, V_0) \subset W^s(Tx, V_0) \quad \text{and} \quad T^{-1}W^u(Tx, V_0) \subset W^u(x, V_0) \quad (1.11)
$$

To prove this, note that for any $y = \pi(\omega') \in W^s(x, V_0)$ with $\omega'_0 = \omega_0$ we have $y = [x, y] = \pi(\omega, \omega')$.

The rectangles $V_i$ may overlap and not be proper, so we have to cut them into smaller pieces. For each $x \in \Omega_r$ put $\mathcal{V}(x) = \{V_j : x \in V_j\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^*(x) = \{V_k : V_k \cap V_j \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } V_j \in \mathcal{V}(x)\}$. The collection $\{V_i\}$ makes a finite cover of $\Omega_r$ by closed sets, so $\cup \partial V_i$ is nowhere dense in $\Omega_r$. Moreover, the set

$$
Z^* = \{x \in \Omega_r : W^s(x) \cap \partial^s V = \emptyset, \ W^u(x) \cap \partial^u V = \emptyset, \ \forall V \in \mathcal{V}(x) \cup \mathcal{V}^*(x)\}
$$

is open and dense in $\Omega_r$. 

Figure 2: (a) The cutting; (b) A contradiction.
For \( V_j \cap V_k \neq \emptyset \) we put (Fig. 2a)

\[
\begin{align*}
V^1_{j,k} &= \{ x \in V_j : W^u(x, V_j) \cap V_k \neq \emptyset, \ W^s(x, V_j) \cap V_k \neq \emptyset \} = V_j \cap V_k \\
V^2_{j,k} &= \{ x \in V_j : W^u(x, V_j) \cap V_k = \emptyset, \ W^s(x, V_j) \cap V_k \neq \emptyset \} \\
V^3_{j,k} &= \{ x \in V_j : W^u(x, V_j) \cap V_k \neq \emptyset, \ W^s(x, V_j) \cap V_k = \emptyset \} \\
V^4_{j,k} &= \{ x \in V_j : W^u(x, V_j) \cap V_k = \emptyset, \ W^s(x, V_j) \cap V_k = \emptyset \}
\end{align*}
\]

Claim. Each \( V^t_{j,k} \) is a rectangle, and for each \( x \in V_j \cap Z^* \) and \( V_k \in \mathcal{V}^*(x) \) we have \( x \in \text{int} V^t_{j,k} \) for some \( t \). The proof is a direct inspection.

For \( x \in Z^* \), we put

\[
R(x) = \bigcap \{ \text{int} V^t_{j,k} : x \in V^t_{j,k} \}
\]

and

\[
\mathcal{R} = \{ \overline{R(x)} : x \in Z^* \} := \{ R_1, \ldots, R_m \}
\]

which will be the desired Markov partition.

Claim. Each \( R_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq m \), is a proper rectangle, because it is a closure of an open set, \( R(x) \).

Claim. The union \( \bigcup R_i \) covers \( \Omega_r \), since each point \( x \) of the dense open set \( Z^* \) is covered by \( \overline{R(x)} \in \mathcal{R} \).

Claim. The sets \( \text{int} R_1, \ldots, \text{int} R_m \) are disjoint. To prove this, show that if \( y \in R(x) \cap Z^* \), then \( R(y) = R(x) \). First check that \( \mathcal{V}(y) = \mathcal{V}(x) \), then note that \( y \) must belong in the same sets \( V^t_{k,j} \) as \( x \) does.

It remains to verify the Markov property (1.1), after that (1.2) will follow by considering \( T^{-1} \).

Let \( x, y \in Z^* \cap T^{-1}Z^* \) and \( y \in W^s(x, R(x)) \). We want to show that \( R(Tx) = R(Ty) \).

Claim. \( \mathcal{V}(Tx) = \mathcal{V}(Ty) \). Indeed, assume that \( Tx \in V_j \), find an \( \omega \in \pi^{-1}(x) \) such that \( \omega_1 = j \), and use the semi-Markov property (1.11) to show that \( Ty \in V_j \).

Claim. \( Tx \) and \( Ty \) belong in the same rectangles \( V^t_{j,k} \). If not, then \( \exists V_k \in \mathcal{V}^*(Tx) \) such that \( W^u(Ty, V_j) \cap V_k = \emptyset \) while \( \exists z : Tz \in W^u(Tx, V_j) \cap V_k \), see Fig. 2b. Find an \( \omega \in \pi^{-1}(x) \) such that \( \omega_1 = j \) and an \( \omega' \in \pi^{-1}(z) \) such that \( \omega'_1 = k \). Use the semi-Markov property (1.11) to show that \( z \in W^u(x, V_{a_0}) \). Hence, \( V_{\omega'_0} \in \mathcal{V}^*(x) \), and the fact \( R(x) = R(y) \) implies that \( z' := [z, y] \in V_{\omega'_0} \). Use (1.11) again to show that \( Tz' \in V_k \), a contradiction.
The last two claims imply that for \( x \in Z^* \cap T^{-1}Z^* \)
\[
T\left(W^s(x, R(x)) \cap Z^* \cap T^{-1}Z^*\right) \subset W^s(Tx, R(Tx))
\]
Now (1.1) follows by continuity, since the set \( W^s(x, R(x)) \cap Z^* \cap T^{-1}Z^* \) is open and dense as a subset of \( W^s(x, R(x)) \) and the set \( Z^* \cap T^{-1}Z^* \) is open and dense in every rectangle \( R_i \in \mathcal{R} \).

**Symbolic dynamics.** Let \( \mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \ldots, R_m\} \) be a Markov partition and \( A \) its transition matrix (1.8). The latter defines a topological Markov chain (TMC)

\[
\Sigma_A = \{ \omega \in \prod_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} \{1, \ldots, m\} : A_{\omega_i \omega_{i+1}} = 1 \text{ for all } -\infty < i < \infty \}
\]

with a left shift homeomorphism \( \sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A \) defined by \( (\sigma(\omega))_i = \omega_{i+1} \).

**Theorem 1.3** For any sequence \( \omega \in \Sigma_A \) the set \( \cap_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}R_{\omega_n} \) consists of exactly one point that we denote by \( \pi(\omega) \). The map \( \pi : \Sigma_A \to M \) is continuous, surjective, \( \pi \circ \sigma = T \circ \pi \) and \( \pi^{-1} \) is one-to-one on the \( T \)-invariant residual set \( M \setminus M^\# \), where

\[
M^\# := \bigcup_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^n(\partial \mathcal{R})
\]
is a countable union of closed nowhere dense sets.

The theorem is stated for Anosov systems. Its statement for Axiom A basic sets is obtained by replacing \( M \) with \( \Omega_r \).

**Proof.** The existence and uniqueness of the point \( \pi(\omega) \) follows from Proposition 1.1 and Remark 1.4. The rest can be verified directly.

Let \( -\infty < n' \leq n'' < \infty \) and \( \omega_{[n',n'']} = \omega_{n'} \omega_{n'+1} \cdots \omega_{n''} \) be an admissible word, which means that \( A_{\omega_i \omega_{i+1}} = 1 \) for all \( n' \leq i < n'' \). The set

\[
C(\omega_{[n',n'']}) = \{ \omega' \in \Sigma_A : \omega'_i = \omega_i \text{ for all } n' \leq i \leq n'' \}
\]
is called a cylinder. Observe that \( \pi(C(\omega_{[n',n'']})) \) is a proper rectangle. In particular, for any \( n \geq 1 \) the set \( \pi(C(\omega_{[0,n]})) \) is an \( s \)-subrectangle in \( R_{\omega_0} \) and \( \pi(C(\omega_{[-n,0]})) \) is a \( u \)-subrectangle in \( R_{\omega_0} \). By allowing either \( n' = -\infty \) or \( n'' = \infty \) (but not both) in the above definition, we get a one-sided infinite sequence
\(\omega(-\infty,n]\) or \(\omega[n,\infty)\), respectively. Then for any \(n \in \mathbb{Z}\) the set \(\pi(C(\omega(-\infty,n]))\) is a compact subset of a global unstable manifold, and \(\pi(C(\omega[n,\infty)))\) is a compact subset of a global stable manifold.

**Remark 1.6.** Let \(x \in M \setminus M^\#\) and \(\omega = \pi^{-1}x\). For every \(n \in \mathbb{Z}\) denote by \(\omega(-\infty,n] = \{\omega_i\}_{-\infty}^{n}\) and \(\omega[n,\infty) = \{\omega_i\}_{n}^{\infty}\) one-sided subsequences of \(\omega\). Then \(\bigcup_n \pi(C(\omega(-\infty,n]))\) is the global unstable manifold through the point \(x\), and \(\bigcup_n \pi(C(\omega[n,\infty)))\) is the global stable manifold through the point \(x\). This is not necessarily true if \(x \in M^\#\).

The space \(\Sigma_A\) is equipped with the product topology, in which \(\sigma\) is a homeomorphism. Following some authors, e.g. [28], we will say that the shift \(\sigma: \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A\) is topologically transitive if there is a dense *positive semi-orbit* (rather than a dense orbit, as in some standard definitions of topological transitivity). A TMC \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) is then topologically transitive if for any \(1 \leq i, j \leq m\) there is an admissible word that starts with \(i\) and ends with \(j\). In terms of the matrix \(A\), the transitivity means that for all \(i, j\) there is \(k = k_{ij} \geq 1\) such that the \((i, j)\)-th entry of \(A^k\) is positive, in which case \(A\) is called an *irreducible* matrix. The TMC \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) is topologically mixing if there is \(k \geq 1\) such that for all \(i, j\) one can find an admissible word that starts with \(i\) and end with \(j\) and has length \(k\), i.e. the length of the connecting word is independent of \(i, j\). In this case \(A^k > 0\), i.e. \(A^k\) contains no zeroes, and \(A\) is said to be *aperiodic* or *primitive*.

Let \(\Omega_r\) be an Axiom A basic set and \(R\) its Markov partition. The topological properties of \(T: \Omega_r \to \Omega_r\) are related to those of the corresponding TMC \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) with the help of Smale’s decomposition theorem. One can verify directly that \(\sigma\) is always topologically transitive, and furthermore, it is topologically mixing if and only if so is the map \(T: \Omega_r \to \Omega_r\).

Consider now an Anosov diffeomorphism \(T: M \to M\) and its Markov partition \(R\). Just as above, one can verified directly that the corresponding TMC \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) is topologically transitive if and only if so is \(T: M \to M\), in which case the set of nonwandering points \(\Omega(T)\) for the diffeomorphism \(T\) is the entire manifold \(M\). It is not known if nontransitive Anosov diffeomorphisms (such that \(\Omega(T) \neq M\)) exist. In any case, our first proof of Theorem 1.2 provides a Markov partition of \(M\) without assuming that \(\Omega(T) = M\).

Let \(T: M \to M\) be a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism. Then \(\Omega(T) = M\), and it follows from Smale’s decomposition theorem that \(T: M \to M\), and...
hence $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$, is topologically mixing, because $M$ cannot be possibly decomposed into a finite union of disjoint closed sets.

Finally, we note that for a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism $T : M \to M$ every global stable manifold $W^s$ is dense in $M$ (this follows from Remark 1.6).

# 2 Gibbs Measures

We now turn to invariant measures for Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a Markov partition for an Anosov diffeomorphism $T : M \to M$ or an Axiom A basic set $\Omega_r$. Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be the corresponding symbolic system, i.e. a topological Markov chain (TMC). Let $\rho$ be any $\sigma$-invariant measure on $\Sigma_A$. Then its projection on $M(\Omega_r)$ will be a $T$-invariant measure. This easily follows from Theorem 1.3. It is therefore natural to study $\sigma$-invariant measures on TMC’s first.

It so happened that such studies originally started in statistical physics, for quite different reasons. Gibbs states were introduced in statistical physics by Dobrushin [23, 24, 25] in the end of sixties and were later rediscovered by Lanford and Ruelle [47]. Because of its origin in physics, the theory of $\sigma$-invariant measures on TMC’s carries a strong physics flavor and uses terminology borrowed from mechanics, such as energy, potential, pressure, etc.

We present here two independent (but equivalent) versions of the theory of Gibbs measures. One is the original, born in statistical physics, it defines Gibbs states through interactions, Gibbs ensembles and thermodynamic limit. We do this in Subsection 2.1. The other is a later version adopted to the needs of dynamical system theory, it defines Gibbs measures through potentials and topological pressure. This is done in Subsection 2.2, where we also prove the equivalence of both versions for topologically mixing TMC’s. The two versions complement each other and both are necessary to prove the whole spectrum of fascinating properties of Gibbs measures, which are collected in our Subsection 2.3.

## 2.1 Gibbs states

We introduce basic terminology and notation used throughout this section, for the convenience of future references.
**Notation.** We fix a finite set $S = \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Let $\Omega = S^{\mathbb{Z}}$ denote the space of doubly infinite sequences of elements of $S$ equipped with the product topology. For any $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ put $\Omega_\Lambda = S^\Lambda$. We denote by $\omega_\Lambda$ elements of $\Omega_\Lambda$ (one can think of $\omega_\Lambda$ as a function $\Lambda \to S$, or as a sequence $\{\omega_i\}$ labelled by $i \in \Lambda$). For any $X \subset \Lambda$ we denote by $\omega_\Lambda |_X \in \Omega_X$ the restriction of $\omega_\Lambda$ to $X$. For any $\omega \in \Omega$ denote by $\omega|_X$ the restriction of $\omega$ to $X$. For $X \subset \Lambda$, the map $\pi_{XA} : \omega_\Lambda \mapsto \omega_\Lambda|_X$ is a projection $\Omega_\Lambda \to \Omega_X$. For brevity, we write $\pi_\Lambda$ for $\pi_{\Lambda Z}$, i.e. $\pi_\Lambda : \omega \mapsto \omega|_\Lambda$. For two disjoint subsets $X, Y \subset \mathbb{Z}$ we denote by $\omega_X \vee \omega_Y$ an element of $\Omega_{X \cup Y}$ whose restrictions on $X$ and $Y$ coincide with $\omega_X$ and $\omega_Y$, respectively. We also put $\text{dist}(X, Y) = \min\{ |i - j| : i \in X, j \in Y \}$. Let $\Lambda^c = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \Lambda$. For $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we put $\Lambda - k = \{ i - k : i \in \Lambda \}$ the translate of $\Lambda$ and denote by $\sigma^k(\omega_\Lambda) \in \Omega_{\Lambda - k}$ the corresponding translate of $\omega_\Lambda \in \Omega_\Lambda$. If $\Lambda = [n', n''] := \{ n', n' + 1, \ldots, n'' \}$ for some $n' \leq n''$, we call $\Lambda$ an *interval* (in $\mathbb{Z}$) of length $|\Lambda| := n'' - n' + 1$. Observe that $\pi_{\Lambda^{-1}}(\omega_\Lambda) = C(\omega_\Lambda)$ is a cylinder, as it was defined in the previous section. We denote by $F$ the set of all finite nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$, and by $F \subset F$ the set of all intervals in $\mathbb{Z}$ (including intervals of length one, i.e. single point sets $\{ i \} \subset \mathbb{Z}$). We call elements $s \in S$ *states*, and elements $\omega_\Lambda \in \Omega_\Lambda$ *configurations* (of states) on $\Lambda$. In physics interpretation, this means that each site $i \in \Lambda$ is in a certain state, $\omega_i \in S$.

Denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the space of Borel probability measures on $\Omega$. For any $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ let $\mathcal{M}_\Lambda$ denote the space of Borel probability measures on $\Omega_\Lambda$. For any $X \subset \Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ the projection $\pi_{XA} : \Omega_\Lambda \to \Omega_X$ defines a map $\mathcal{M}_\Lambda \to \mathcal{M}_X$ that we denote by the same symbol, $\pi_{XA}$. Again, we write $\pi_\Lambda$ instead of $\pi_{\Lambda Z}$, for brevity. Obviously, any measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ is uniquely determined by the set of its ‘finite-dimensional’ projections $\{ \pi_{\Lambda H} : \Lambda \in F \}$. Furthermore, any collection of measures $\{ \mu_\Lambda \}$, $\mu_\Lambda \in \mathcal{M}_\Lambda$, for all finite $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$, determines a unique measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ (in the sense $\pi_{\Lambda H} \mu = \mu_\Lambda$) if and only if the ‘finite dimensional distributions’ agree, i.e. iff $\pi_{X \Lambda} \mu_\Lambda = \mu_X$ whenever $X \subset \Lambda$.

Now, let $A$ be an $m \times m$ transition matrix that defines the space $\Sigma_\Lambda \subset \Omega$. For any $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}$ let

$$\Sigma_\Lambda := \pi_\Lambda(\Sigma_A)$$

This is the set of configurations on $\Lambda$ that can be extended to admissible sequences in $\Sigma_A$.

We note that, from the standpoint of modern statistical mechanics, we only cover Gibbs measures on a one-dimensional lattice $\mathbb{Z}$. The theory of
Gibbs measures on higher-dimensional lattices $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 2$, is substantially different and more complicated, see, e.g. a discussion in [68].

Now we introduce the very basic definitions.

**Interactions.** An interaction is a real valued function $\Phi$ on $\cup_{\Lambda \in I} \Sigma_\Lambda$, i.e. on the set of all admissible configurations on intervals. We have two standing assumptions on interactions:

1. (Φ1) $\Phi$ is shift invariant, i.e. for all $\Lambda \in I$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $\Phi(\sigma^k \omega_\Lambda) = \Phi(\omega_\Lambda)$.
2. (Φ2) $\Phi$ decays exponentially, i.e.

$$||\Phi|| := \sup_n \theta^{-n} \sup \{|\Phi(\omega_\Lambda)| : \Lambda \in I, |\Lambda| = n\} < +\infty \quad (2.1)$$

for some $0 < \theta < 1$.

We now fix an interaction $\Phi$ satisfying (Φ1) and (Φ2) with some $\theta$.

**Energy.** Let $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$. The energy of a configuration $\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda$ is

$$U(\omega_\Lambda) = \sum_{X \subset \Lambda, X \in I} \Phi(\omega_\Lambda|_X)$$

Next, let $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ and $M \subset \Lambda^c$ such that $\text{dist}(\Lambda, M) = 1$. Let $\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda$ and $\omega_M \in \Sigma_M$ be two configurations such that $\omega_\Lambda \vee \omega_M \in \Sigma_{\Lambda \cup M}$. Then the energy of interaction between $\omega_\Lambda$ and $\omega_M$ is defined by

$$W(\omega_\Lambda, \omega_M) = \sum_{X \in I}^* \Phi(\omega_\Lambda \vee \omega_M|_X) \quad (2.2)$$

where $\Sigma^*$ is taken over intervals $X \subset \Lambda \cup M$ such that $X \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset$ and $X \cap M \neq \emptyset$. If $\text{dist}(\Lambda, M) \geq 2$, then the sum (2.2) is empty. In this case we define another quantity similar to (2.2) as follows. Fix an ‘external’ configuration $\xi \in \Sigma_{(\Lambda \cup M)^c}$ such that $\omega_\Lambda \vee \omega_M \vee \xi \in \Sigma_\Lambda$. Now define the full energy of interaction between $\omega_\Lambda$ and $\omega_M$, given the external configuration $\xi$, by

$$E(\omega_\Lambda, \omega_M, \xi) = \sum_{X \in I}^{**} \Phi(\omega_\Lambda \vee \omega_M \vee \xi|_X)$$

where $\Sigma^{**}$ is taken over all intervals $X \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that $X \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset$ and $X \cap M \neq \emptyset$. 
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Lemma 2.1 Let $\Lambda \in \mathcal{I}$ be any interval of length $|\Lambda| = n$. Then

$$|U(\omega_\Lambda)| \leq n||\Phi||(1 - \theta)^{-1}$$

(2.3)

for any $\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda$. Next, let $M \cap \Lambda = \emptyset$ and $\text{dist}(\Lambda, M) = 1$. Then

$$|W(\omega_\Lambda, \omega_M)| \leq 2||\Phi||(\theta + 2\theta^2 + 3\theta^3 + \cdots)$$

$$= 2||\Phi||\theta(1 - \theta)^{-2}$$

(2.4)

for any $\omega_M \in \Omega_M$ such that $\omega_\Lambda \lor \omega_M \in \Sigma_{\Lambda \cup M}$. Also, let $\text{dist}(\Lambda, M) = d \geq 2$. Then

$$|E(\omega_\Lambda, \omega_M, \xi)| \leq 2||\Phi||\theta^d(1 - \theta)^{-2}$$

(2.5)

for any $\xi \in \Sigma_{(\Lambda \cup M)^c}$ such that $\omega_\Lambda \lor \omega_M \lor \xi \in \Sigma_A$. Observe that (2.3) grows at most linearly in $n$, while (2.4) is uniformly bounded, and (2.5) is uniformly small as $d \to \infty$.

The proof is left as an exercise.

Gibbs ensembles. Let $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ be a finite set. The Gibbs ensemble (without boundary condition) is a probability measure on the finite set $\Sigma_\Lambda$ defined by

$$\mu_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda) = Z^{-1}_\Lambda \exp \left[-U(\omega_\Lambda)\right]$$

(2.6)

where $Z_\Lambda$ is the normalizing factor called the partition function:

$$Z_\Lambda = \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda} \exp \left[-U(\omega_\Lambda)\right]$$

Observe that $\mu_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda) > 0$ for all $\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda$.

Now, let $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$, and $\xi \in \Sigma_{\Lambda^c}$. The Gibbs ensemble with boundary condition $\xi$ is a probability measure on the set $\Sigma_\Lambda$ defined by

$$\mu_{\Lambda,\xi}(\omega_\Lambda) = Z^{-1}_{\Lambda,\xi} \exp \left[-U(\omega_\Lambda) - W(\omega_\Lambda, \xi)\right]$$

(2.7)

where we set $W(\omega_\Lambda, \xi) = +\infty$ in the case $\omega_\Lambda \lor \xi \notin \Sigma_A$. Here again $Z_{\Lambda,\xi}$ is the normalizing factor:

$$Z_{\Lambda,\xi} = \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda} \exp \left[-U(\omega_\Lambda) - W(\omega_\Lambda, \xi)\right]$$
For any $\xi \in \Sigma_A$, let
\[
\Sigma_{A,\xi} := \{\omega_A \in \Sigma_A : \omega_A \lor \xi \in \Sigma_A\}
\]

Observe that $\mu_{A,\xi}(\omega_A) > 0$ if and only if $\omega_A \in \Sigma_{A,\xi}$, i.e. the support of the measure $\mu_{A,\xi}$ is $\Sigma_{A,\xi} \subset \Sigma_A$.

**Remark 2.1.** We can extend both measures $\mu_A$ and $\mu_{A,\xi}$ from $\Sigma_A$ to $\Omega_A$ by setting $\mu_A(\omega) = \mu_{A,\xi}(\omega) = 0$ for all $\omega \in \Omega_A \setminus \Sigma_A$.

**Thermodynamic limits.** Let $\{\Lambda_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$. We write $\Lambda_i \to \mathbb{Z}$, as $i \to \infty$, if for any finite $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_i$ for all $i \geq i_\Lambda$.

Let $\Lambda_i \to \mathbb{Z}$. Consider the Gibbs ensembles $\mu_{\Lambda_i}$. For every $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ the measure $\pi_{\Lambda_i,\mu_{\Lambda_i}} \in \mathcal{M}_\Lambda$ is defined whenever $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_i$, i.e. for all sufficiently large $i$. We call a measure $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$ a thermodynamic limit of the Gibbs ensembles $\{\mu_{\Lambda_i}\}$ if for each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ the sequence of measures $\{\pi_{\Lambda_i,\mu_{\Lambda_i}}\}$ weakly converges to the measure $\pi_{\Lambda,\rho}$.

Next, let $\xi \in \Sigma_A$ be a fixed configuration, and again $\Lambda_i \to \mathbb{Z}$. For each $i$, put $\xi_i = \xi|_{\Lambda_i^c}$ and consider the Gibbs ensemble $\mu_{\Lambda_i,\xi_i}$ with boundary condition $\xi_i$. We call a measure $\rho_{\xi} \in \mathcal{M}$ a thermodynamic limit of Gibbs ensembles $\mu_{\Lambda_i,\xi_i}$ if for each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ the sequence of measures $\{\pi_{\Lambda_i,\mu_{\Lambda_i,\xi_i}}\}$ weakly converges to the measure $\pi_{\Lambda,\rho_{\xi}}$.

**Remark 2.2.** One can easily verify that any thermodynamic limit measure $\rho$ is concentrated on $\Sigma_A$, i.e. $\rho(\Sigma_A) = 1$. The same is true for any $\rho_{\xi}$. Indeed, note that $(\pi_{\Lambda,\mu_{\Lambda}})(\Sigma_A) = 1$, hence $(\pi_{\Lambda,\rho})(\Sigma_A) = \rho(\pi_{\Lambda}^{-1}(\Sigma_A)) = 1$, and $\Sigma_A = \cap\{\pi_{\Lambda}^{-1}\Sigma_A : \Lambda \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

**Theorem 2.2** There is at least one thermodynamic limit measure $\rho$. For each $\xi \in \Sigma_A$, at least one thermodynamic limit measure $\rho_{\xi}$ exists.

**Proof.** Let $\Lambda_i \to \mathbb{Z}$. For each $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ the sequence of measures $\{\pi_{\Lambda_i,\mu_{\Lambda_i}}\}$ on the finite set $\Sigma_A$ contains a subsequence that converges to a probability measure on $\Sigma_A$. Since there are countably many $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$, we can apply a standard diagonal argument and find a subsequence $\{i_k\}$ such that for every finite $\Lambda$ the sequence of measures $\{\pi_{\Lambda_{i_k},\mu_{\Lambda_{i_k}}}\}$ converges to a probability measure, $\rho_{\Lambda}$, on $\Sigma_A$. The measures $\{\rho_{\Lambda}\}$ obviously agree, i.e. $\pi_{\Lambda M,\rho_{M}} = \rho_{\Lambda}$ for all finite $\Lambda \subset M$. Hence, the collection $\{\rho_{\Lambda}\}$ defines a unique probability.
measure $\rho \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\pi_\Lambda \rho = \rho_\Lambda$ for all $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$. The measure $\rho$ is a thermodynamic limit of the Gibbs ensembles $\mu_{\Lambda_k}$. The existence of $\rho_\xi$ is proved by exact same argument. □

Remark 2.3. Later we will see that for any mixing TMC there is in fact exactly one thermodynamic limit measure, $\rho = \rho_\xi$, independent of the boundary condition $\xi$. It only depends on the interaction $\Phi$. We will arrive at this conclusion much later, however.

The picture is quite different for nonmixing TMC’s, as the following examples show.

Example 2.1. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The set $\Sigma_A$ consists of just two sequences of alternating 1’s and 2’s. Call them $\omega^{(1)}$ and $\omega^{(2)}$ so that $\omega_0^{(i)} = i$. The shift $\sigma$ is transitive but not mixing. For simplicity, let $\Phi \equiv 0$. Then $\rho(\omega^{(1)}) = \rho(\omega^{(2)}) = 1/2$. But the measure $\rho_\xi$ depends on $\xi \in \Sigma_A$. Check that $\rho_\xi(\xi) = 1$ for each $\xi \in \Sigma_A$. Note that $\rho_\xi$ is not $\sigma$-invariant for either $\xi = \omega^{(1)}$ or $\xi = \omega^{(2)}$.

Example 2.2. Let $A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. The set $\Sigma_A$ is now countable, it contains all sequences starting with all ones and ending with all twos. It also contains two constant sequences, call them $\omega^{(1)}$ and $\omega^{(2)}$, consisting of all ones and all twos, respectively. The shift $\sigma$ is topologically transitive in the regular sense (a dense orbit exists) but not in the sense of our version of transitivity: there is no dense semi-orbit, the matrix $A$ is not irreducible. For simplicity, let $\Phi \equiv 0$. Now $\rho$ is not unique, and depending on the sequence $\omega_A$ one can get any measure $\rho$ such that $\rho(\omega^{(1)}) = p$ and $\rho(\omega^{(2)}) = q$ with $p + q = 1$. The same is true for $\rho_\xi$, if only $\xi \neq \omega^{(1)}$ and $\xi \neq \omega^{(2)}$.

Gibbs states. A probability measure $\nu$ on $\Omega$ is called a Gibbs state if for every $\Lambda \in \mathcal{F}$ there exists a probability measure $\nu_{\Lambda^c}$ on $\Sigma_{\Lambda^c}$ such that for all $\omega_\Lambda \in \Omega_\Lambda$

$$
(\pi_\Lambda \nu)(\omega_\Lambda) = \int_{\Sigma_{\Lambda^c}} \mu_{\Lambda,\omega'}(\omega_\Lambda) \, d\nu_{\Lambda^c}(\omega')
$$

where $\mu_{\Lambda,\omega'}$ is the Gibbs ensemble with boundary condition, as defined by (2.7). Here $\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda^c}$ is the variable of integration.

Remark 2.4. Note that $\nu(\Sigma_A) = 1$ for any Gibbs state $\nu$. One can argue as in Remark 2.2.
Lemma 2.3  (i) Let $f_i : \Sigma_{\Lambda_i} \to \mathbb{R}$ be some functions. Assume that the sequence of functions $f_i \circ \pi_{\Lambda_i}$ on $\Sigma_{A}$ uniformly converges to a continuous function $f : \Sigma_A \to \mathbb{R}$ as $i \to \infty$ (and $\Lambda_i \to \mathbb{Z}$). Then

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i}} f_i(\omega) \mu_{\Lambda_i}(\omega) = \int_{\Sigma_A} f(\omega) \, d\rho(\omega) \quad (2.9)$$

(ii) Furthermore, (2.9) remains true if we substitute $\mu_{\Lambda_i} \mapsto \mu_{\Lambda_i,\xi_i}$ and $\rho \mapsto \rho_{\xi}$. An important note: in the case (ii) the functions $f_i$ need only be defined on $\Sigma_{\Lambda_i,\xi_i}$, which is the support of the measure $\mu_{\Lambda_i,\xi_i}$. The uniform convergence is then understood in the sense $\sup_{\Sigma_{\Lambda_i,\xi_i}} |f_i - f| \to 0$.

The proof is left as an exercise.

Theorem 2.4  Any thermodynamic limit measure $\rho$ of Gibbs ensembles $\mu_{\Lambda_i}$ is a Gibbs state. For every configuration $\xi \in \Sigma_A$, any thermodynamic limit measure $\rho_{\xi}$ of Gibbs ensembles $\mu_{\Lambda_i,\xi_i}$ with boundary condition $\xi_i = \xi \mid_{\Lambda_i^c}$ is a Gibbs state.

Proof. To prove the first statement, we let $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_i$, $\omega \in \Sigma_\Lambda$ and write

$$(\pi_{\Lambda \Lambda_i} \mu_{\Lambda})(\omega) = \sum_{\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i \setminus \Lambda}} \mu_{\Lambda_i}(\omega \vee \omega')$$

$$= \sum_{\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i \setminus \Lambda}} \left[ Z_{\Lambda_i}^{-1} e^{-U(\omega')} \right] \exp \left[ -U(\omega) - W(\omega, \omega') \right]$$

$$= \sum_{\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i \setminus \Lambda}} \left[ (\pi_{\Lambda_i \setminus \Lambda_i} \mu_{\Lambda_i})(\omega') \right] \mu_{\Lambda \omega'}(\omega) \quad (2.10)$$

where for each $\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i \setminus \Lambda}$

$$\mu_{\Lambda \omega'}(\omega) := Z_{\Lambda_i}^{-1} \omega' \exp \left[ -U(\omega) - W(\omega', \omega') \right]$$

(assuming that $\mu_{\Lambda \omega'}(\omega) = 0$ if $\omega \vee \omega' \notin \Sigma_{\Lambda_i}$) and $Z_{\Lambda_i \omega'}$ is the normalizing factor:

$$Z_{\Lambda_i \omega'} := \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_\Lambda} \exp \left[ -U(\omega) - W(\omega, \omega') \right]$$

Observe that the functions on $\Sigma_{\Lambda_i}$ defined by $\omega' \mapsto \mu_{\Lambda_i,\pi_{\Lambda_i \setminus \Lambda_i}(\omega')}(\omega)$ uniformly converge, as $i \to \infty$, to the continuous function $\omega' \mapsto \mu_{\Lambda \omega'}(\omega)$. Then we
apply the result of Lemma 2.3 (i), adapted to the set $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \Lambda$ instead of $\mathbb{Z}$, and get

$$
\lim_{i \to \infty} (\pi_{\Lambda \Lambda_i, \mu_{\Lambda}}(\omega_\Lambda)) = \int_{\Sigma_\Lambda} \mu_{\Lambda, \omega'}(\omega_\Lambda) d(\pi_{\Lambda^e, \rho})(\omega')
$$

This is equivalent to (2.8) by the definition of $\rho$. Observe that we can set $\nu_{\Lambda^e} = \pi_{\Lambda^e, \rho}$ in (2.8). This proves the first statement of Theorem 2.4.

To prove the second one, we use our handy notation $\xi_i = \xi_{|\Lambda_i}$ and write

$$
(\pi_{\Lambda \Lambda_i, \mu_{\Lambda_i}}(\omega_\Lambda)) = \sum_{\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i} \setminus \Lambda} \mu_{\Lambda_i, \xi_i}(\omega_\Lambda \cup \omega')
$$

$$
= \sum_{\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i} \setminus \Lambda} \left[ Z_{\Lambda_i, \xi_i}^{-1} e^{-U(\omega') - W(\omega', \xi_i)} \right] \times
$$

$$
\times \exp \left[ -U(\omega_\Lambda) - W(\omega_\Lambda, \omega') - E(\omega_\Lambda, \xi_i, \omega') \right]
$$

$$
= \sum_{\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i} \setminus \Lambda} \left[ (\pi_{\Lambda \Lambda_i, \Lambda_i} \mu_{\Lambda_i, \xi_i})(\omega_\Lambda') \right] \mu_{\Lambda_i, \omega', \xi_i}(\omega_\Lambda)
$$

(2.11)

where for each $\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_i} \setminus \Lambda$

$$
\mu_{\Lambda_i, \omega', \xi_i}(\omega_\Lambda) := Z_{\Lambda_i, \omega', \xi_i}^{-1} \exp \left[ -U(\omega_\Lambda) - W(\omega_\Lambda, \omega') - E(\omega_\Lambda, \xi_i, \omega') \right]
$$

(assuming that $\mu_{\Lambda_i, \omega', \xi_i}(\omega_\Lambda) = 0$ if $\omega_\Lambda \cup \omega' \cup \xi_i \notin \Sigma_\Lambda$) and $Z_{\Lambda_i, \omega', \xi_i}$ is the normalizing factor:

$$
Z_{\Lambda, \omega', \xi_i} := \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda} \exp \left[ -U(\omega_\Lambda) - W(\omega_\Lambda, \omega') - E(\omega_\Lambda, \xi_i, \omega') \right]
$$

Then we use Lemma 2.3 (ii). Note that the new extra term $E(\omega_\Lambda, \xi_i, \omega')$ is uniformly small as $i \to \infty$, cf. Lemma 2.1. $\square$

We will see that the Gibbs state is unique for any topologically mixing TMC. For nonmixing TMC’s, there may be more than one Gibbs state, as Examples 2.1 and 2.2 show. In this case one can show that the set of Gibbs states is a compact convex subset of $\mathcal{M}$, see [68] for further discussion.

Despite the assumed shift invariance of the interaction $\Phi$, Gibbs states may not be $\sigma$-invariant, as Example 2.1 shows. For mixing TMC’s, the (unique) Gibbs state is, indeed, $\sigma$-invariant, but this fact will be established much later.

**Lemma 2.5** If $\nu$ is a Gibbs state, then its image under $\sigma$, call it $\nu^* = \sigma^* \nu$, is a Gibbs state. Hence, the set of all Gibbs states is $\sigma$-invariant.
Proof. Since \((\pi_A \nu^*)(\omega_A) = (\pi_{A+1} \nu)(\sigma^{-1} \omega_A)\), it is enough to note that \(\mu_{A,\omega'}(\omega_A) = \mu_{A+1,\sigma^{-1},\omega'}(\sigma^{-1} \omega_A)\) and put \(\nu^*_A = \nu_{A+1}^*\). The details are left to the reader. \(\Box\)

The equation (2.8) is remarkable in that it gives an exact formula for the measures of cylinders, \(\nu(C(\omega_A))\), for any Gibbs state \(\nu\). This has many important consequences.

**Theorem 2.6**  A probability measure \(\nu\) on \(\Omega\) is a Gibbs state if and only if for any finite \(\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}\) and two configurations \(\omega_A \in \Omega_\Lambda\) and \(\omega' \in \Omega_{\Lambda'}\), the conditional \(\nu\)-probability that \(\omega|_\Lambda = \omega_A\), given that \(\omega|_{\Lambda'} = \omega'\), is \(\mu_{A,\omega'}(\omega_A)\).

**Proof.** Let \(\Lambda_n = [-n, n]\). For large \(n\), such that \(\Lambda \subset \Lambda_n\), put \(\omega'_n := \omega'|_{\Lambda_n \setminus \Lambda}\).

It is enough to prove that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\nu(\omega_A \lor \omega'_n)}{\sum_{\omega'_n \in \Omega_\Lambda} \nu(\omega'_n \lor \omega'_n)} \to \mu_{A,\omega'}(\omega_A)
\]

Put \(\Sigma_{\Lambda_n,\omega'_n} = \{\xi \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_n^c} : \omega_n' \lor \xi \in \Sigma_{\Lambda'}\}\). According to (2.8), it is enough to prove that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\xi \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_n,\omega'_n}} \left| \frac{\mu_{\Lambda_n,\xi}(\omega_A \lor \omega'_n)}{\sum_{\omega'_n \in \Omega_\Lambda} \mu_{\Lambda_n,\xi}(\omega'_n \lor \omega'_n)} - \mu_{A,\omega'}(\omega_A) \right| \to 0 \tag{2.12}
\]

In virtue of (2.7),

\[
\frac{\mu_{\Lambda_n,\xi}(\omega_A \lor \omega'_n)}{\sum_{\omega'_n \in \Omega_\Lambda} \mu_{\Lambda_n,\xi}(\omega'_n \lor \omega'_n)} = \frac{\exp[-U(\omega_A \lor \omega'_n) - W(\omega_A \lor \omega'_n, \xi)]}{\sum_{\omega'_n \in \Omega_\Lambda} \exp[-U(\omega_A' \lor \omega'_n) - W(\omega_A' \lor \omega'_n, \xi)]}
\]

\[
= \frac{\exp[-U(\omega_A) - W(\omega_A, \omega'_n)]}{\sum_{\omega'_n \in \Omega_\Lambda} \exp[-U(\omega_A') - W(\omega_A', \omega'_n) - E(\omega_A, \xi, \omega'_n)]}
\]

\[
\to \frac{\exp[-U(\omega_A) - W(\omega_A, \omega')]}{\sum_{\omega'_n \in \Omega_\Lambda} \exp[-U(\omega_A') - W(\omega_A', \omega')]}\]

as \(n \to \infty\), uniformly in \(\xi \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_n,\omega'_n}\) (again, employ Lemma 2.1). This proves (2.12) and Theorem 2.6. \(\Box\)

In physics, Gibbs states are measures given by their conditional distributions on finite configurations, as in Theorem 2.6, or by a set of equations, such as (2.8), called DLR equations [68].
The following examples cover a few rare cases where the thermodynamic limit measures can be computed directly.

**Example 2.3.** Assume that $a_{ij} \equiv 1$, so that $(\Sigma_A, \sigma) = (\Omega, \sigma)$ is a full shift. Let $\Phi(\{i\}) = \psi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $\Phi(\omega_\Lambda) = 0$ for all intervals $\Lambda$ of length $\geq 2$. Then the only thermodynamic limit measure $\rho$ is a Bernoulli measure on $\Omega$, i.e. a direct product of identical measures, $p$, on $S$, such that $p(i) = e^{-\psi_i}/\sum_j e^{-\psi_j}$.

**Example 2.4.** Assume again that $\Sigma_A = \Omega$, a full shift. Let $\Phi(\omega_\Lambda) = 0$ unless $\Lambda = \{n, n+1\}$ is an interval of length two. Put $\Phi(\omega_0, \omega_{n+1}) = \psi_{\omega_0, \omega_{n+1}}$, so that the $m \times m$ matrix $(\psi_{ij})$ completely determines the interaction $\Phi$. Now the only thermodynamic limit measure $\rho$ is a Markov measure on $\Omega$. To see that, consider the $m \times m$ matrix with entries $b_{ij} = e^{-\psi_{ij}}$. Its entries are positive, so the Perron-Frobenius theorem for positive matrices [33, 73] implies that its largest eigenvalue $\lambda$ is real positive and simple, and the corresponding left and right eigenvectors, call them $U = (u_i)$ and $V = (v_i)$, respectively, have positive components. Assume that $U$ and $V$ are normalized so that $\sum_i u_i v_i = 1$. By taking a thermodynamic limit one can show that for any word $\omega_0 \cdots \omega_n \in \Omega_{[0,n]}$ 

$$(\pi_{[0,n]}\rho)(\omega_0 \cdots \omega_n) = \lambda^{-n} u_{\omega_0} b_{\omega_0 \omega_1} b_{\omega_1 \omega_2} \cdots b_{\omega_{n-1} \omega_n} v_{\omega_n}$$

This is obviously a Markov measure with transition probabilities $\pi_{ij} = \lambda^{-1} b_{ij} v_j / v_i$ and stationary vector $p_i = u_i v_i$.

**Example 2.5.** We can adapt the previous example to any proper subshift, $\Sigma_A \neq \Omega$, which is mixing. In this case the characteristic matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ has entries $b_{ij} = a_{ij} e^{-\psi_{ij}}$. The Perron-Frobenius theorem applies since $B^k > 0$ for some $k > 0$. In particular, for $\Phi \equiv 0$ we obtain a Markov measure, also called Parry measure, on $\Sigma_A$, cf. 3.3.f in [44]. For this measure $\lambda$ is the largest eigenvalue of the transition matrix $A$, since $B = A$.

We now discuss more detailed properties of Gibbs states. The discussion is restricted to topologically mixing TMC’s, which we call just mixing, for brevity. Recall that $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ is mixing iff $A^k > 0$ for some $k \geq 1$.

The following lemma is a modification of a standard one, see Lemma 1.18 in [11].

**Lemma 2.7** Let $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of real numbers such that $|a_{m+n} -$
\( a_m - a_n \leq R \) for all \( m, n \geq 1 \) and some constant \( R > 0 \). Then \( P := \lim_{n \to \infty} a_n/n \) exists. Furthermore, \( |a_n - Pn| \leq 2R \) for all \( n \).

\textit{Proof.} Fix an \( m \geq 1 \). For \( n \geq 1 \), write \( n = km + l \) with \( 0 \leq l \leq m - 1 \). Then it follows by induction on \( k \) that \( |a_n - ka_m - a_l| \leq kR \). Hence,

\[
\left| \frac{a_n}{n} - \frac{ka_m}{km + l} - \frac{a_l}{km + l} \right| \leq \frac{kR}{km + l}
\]

Letting \( n \to \infty \) gives

\[
\frac{a_m}{m} - \frac{R}{m} \leq \liminf_{n} \frac{a_n}{n} \leq \limsup_{n} \frac{a_n}{n} \leq \frac{a_m}{m} + \frac{R}{m}
\]

Hence, \( P := \lim a_n/n \) exists. Next, assume that \( a_m > Pm + 2R \) for some \( m \). Then \( a_{2^n m} > 2^n mP + (2^n + 1)R \) which follows by induction on \( n \). Hence \( \lim sup a_n/n \geq P + R/m \), a contradiction. A similar contradiction results from the assumption \( a_m < Pm - 2R \). \( \square \)

Let \( F \) and \( G \) be any variable quantities. We adopt notation

\[
F \asymp G \iff C_1 \leq F/G \leq C_2
\]

for some constants \( C_1, C_2 > 0 \), that only depend on the interaction \( \Phi \) and the transition matrix \( A \).

\textbf{Theorem 2.8 (Partition functions)} Let \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) be mixing. For \( n \geq 1 \), put \( \Lambda_n = [0, n-1] \), an interval of length \( n \). There is a finite limit

\[
P = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln Z_{\Lambda_n} \tag{2.13}
\]

Moreover,

\[
Z_{\Lambda_n} \asymp e^{Pn} \tag{2.14}
\]

and

\[
Z_{\Lambda_n, \xi} \asymp e^{Pn} \tag{2.15}
\]

for any \( \xi \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_n} \).
**Definition.** We call the number $P = P_{\Phi}$ the *(topological)* pressure of the interaction $\Phi$ for the TMC $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$.

**Proof.** To prove (2.13) and (2.14) it is enough to show that

$$R := \sup_{m,n} |\ln Z_{\Lambda_{m+n}} - \ln Z_{\Lambda_m} - \ln Z_{\Lambda_n}| < \infty$$

and apply the previous lemma to the sequence $a_n = \ln Z_{\Lambda_n}$. So, we need to show that

$$Z_{\Lambda_{m+n}} \asymp Z_{\Lambda_m} Z_{\Lambda_n} \quad (2.16)$$

For fixed $n, m$, put $\Lambda_n = [0, n-1], \Lambda'_n = [n, n+k-1], \text{ and } \Lambda'_m = [n+k, n+k+m-1]$, so that $\Lambda_n \cup \Lambda'_n \cup \Lambda'_m = \Lambda_{n+k+m} := [0, n+m+k-1]$. Since $A^k > 0$ is an entirely positive matrix, then for any $\omega_1 \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_n}$ and $\omega_2 \in \Sigma_{\Lambda'_m}$ there is an $\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda'_n}$ such that $\omega_1 \vee \omega' \vee \omega_2 \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_{n+m+k}}$. The number of configurations $\omega'$ satisfying the above condition is obviously $\leq |\mathcal{S}|^k = \text{const}$. Therefore

$$Z_{\Lambda_{n+k+m}} = \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_{n+k+m}}} \exp[-U(\omega)]$$

$$= \sum_{\omega_1 \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_n}} \sum_{\omega_2 \in \Sigma_{\Lambda'_m}} \exp[-U(\omega_1)] \exp[-U(\omega_2)] \times$$

$$\times \sum_{\omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda'_n}} \ast \sum_{\omega'' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda'_m}} \ast \exp[-U(\omega') - U(\omega'') - W(\omega, \omega_1 \vee \omega_2)]$$

where the inner sum $\sum\ast$ is taken over $\omega'$ such that $\omega_1 \vee \omega' \vee \omega_2 \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_{n+k+m}}$. The last exponential is uniformly bounded away from 0 and $\infty$, cf. Lemma 2.1. Hence $Z_{\Lambda_{n+k+m}} \asymp Z_{\Lambda_m} Z_{\Lambda_n}$. Redoing the above calculation with $m = 0$ shows that $Z_{\Lambda_{n+k}} \asymp Z_{\Lambda_n}$. Hence $Z_{\Lambda_{m+n+k}} \asymp Z_{\Lambda_{m+n}}$. This proves (2.16), hence (2.13) and (2.14).

To prove (2.15), it is enough to show that

$$Z_{\Lambda_{n,\xi}} \asymp Z_{\Lambda_{n-2k}} \quad (2.17)$$

because $Z_{\Lambda_{n-2k}} \asymp Z_{\Lambda_n}$. We have

$$Z_{\Lambda_{n,\xi}} = \sum_{\omega \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_{n,\xi}}} \exp[-U(\omega) - W(\omega, \xi)]$$

$$= \sum_{\omega_1 \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_{n-2k}}} \exp[-U(\omega_1)] \times$$

$$\times \sum_{\omega' \in \Sigma_{[0,k,\omega]} \omega'' \in \Sigma_{[n-k, n-1]}} \ast \sum\ast \exp[-U(\omega') - U(\omega'') - W(\omega', \omega_1 \vee \omega'') - W(\omega, \xi)]$$
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where the inner sums are taken over \( \omega', \omega'' \) such that \( \omega' \lor \omega_1 \lor \omega'' \in \Sigma_\Lambda \). The last exponential \footnote{Where the inner sums are taken over \( \omega', \omega'' \) such that \( \omega' \lor \omega_1 \lor \omega'' \in \Sigma_\Lambda \). The last exponential is uniformly bounded away from 0 and \( \infty \) (we employ again Lemma 2.1). There is at least one \( \omega' \) and at least one \( \omega'' \) in the last two sums, and there are no more than \( |S|^{2k} = \text{const} \) of pairs of \( \omega', \omega'' \). This proves (2.17) and (2.15).} is uniformly bounded away from 0 and \( \infty \) (we employ again Lemma 2.1). There is at least one \( \omega' \) and at least one \( \omega'' \) in the last two sums, and there are no more than \( |S|^{2k} = \text{const} \) of pairs of \( \omega', \omega'' \). This proves (2.17) and (2.15). \( \square \)

The exact formula (2.8) is very helpful, but it has a shortcoming: the integrand may be zero, which happens exactly when \( \omega_\Lambda \lor \omega' \notin \Sigma_A \). For mixing TMC’s, there is the following improvement of (2.8):

\[ (\pi_\Lambda \nu)(\omega_\Lambda) = \int_{\Sigma_{M^c}} (\pi_{\Lambda M^c} \mu_{M,\xi})(\omega_\Lambda) \, d\nu_{M^c}(\xi) \quad (2.18) \]

Here

\[ (\pi_{\Lambda M^c} \mu_{M,\xi})(\omega_\Lambda) = \sum' \sum'' \mu_{M,\xi}(\omega_\Lambda \lor \omega' \lor \omega'') \quad (2.19) \]

where the sums are taken over \( \omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda'} \) and \( \omega'' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda''} \) such that \( \omega_\Lambda \lor \omega' \lor \omega'' \in \Sigma_A \). Furthermore,

\[ (\pi_{\Lambda M^c} \mu_{M,\xi})(\omega_\Lambda) \propto \exp[-Pn - U(\omega_\Lambda)] \quad (2.20) \]

for any \( \xi \in \Sigma_{M^c} \). In particular, the integrand in (2.18) is never zero.

**Proof.** The equations (2.18) and (2.19) follow from (2.8) immediately. To prove (2.20), we observe three facts: (i) for each pair \( \omega', \omega'' \) in (2.19)

\[ \exp[-U(\omega_\Lambda \lor \omega' \lor \omega'') - W(\omega_\Lambda \lor \omega' \lor \omega'', \xi)] \propto \exp[-U(\omega_\Lambda)] \]

by the Lemma 2.1, (ii) \( Z_{M,\xi} \asymp e^{Pn+2Pk} \preceq e^{Pn} \) due to (2.15). In addition, the mixing of \( (\Sigma_A, \sigma) \) implies that (iii) for every \( \xi \in \Sigma_{M^c} \) there is at least one pair of \( \omega', \omega'' \) in (2.19), and the total number of such pairs does not exceed \( |S|^{2k} = \text{const} \). Now (2.20) follows from the facts (i)-(iii) easily. \( \square \)
Theorem 2.10 Let \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) be mixing and \(\nu\) be a Gibbs state. There are constants \(c_1, c_2 > 0\) such that for any interval \(\Lambda \in \mathcal{I}\) of length \(|\Lambda| = n\) and \(\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda\)

\[
c_1 \leq \frac{\nu(C(\omega_\Lambda))}{\exp[-P_n - U(\omega_\Lambda)]} \leq c_2
\]  

(2.21)

where \(C(\omega_\Lambda) = \pi^{1}_\Lambda(\omega_\Lambda)\) is a cylinder for the configuration \(\omega_\Lambda\).

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.9, because the integration in (2.18) is just averaging, which preserves the upper and lower uniform bounds obtained in (2.20). \(\square\)

Remark 2.5 The \(\nu\)-measure of every cylinder \(C(\omega_\Lambda) \subset \Sigma_A\) is positive due to (2.21). Hence \(\nu(U) > 0\) for every open set \(U \subset \Sigma_A\), i.e. \(\nu\) has full support on \(\Sigma_A\).

Theorem 2.11 (Uniqueness of Gibbs states) Let \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) be mixing. Then the Gibbs state \(\nu = \nu_\Phi\) is unique.

Proof. Let \(\nu, \nu'\) be two distinct Gibbs states. Then \(\nu - \nu'\) is a signed measure on \(\Sigma_A\) with norm \(\|\nu - \nu'\| > 0\). Note that

\[
\|\nu - \nu'\| = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda} |(\nu - \nu')(C(\omega_\Lambda))|
\]

(2.22)

\[
= \lim_n \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda} \left| \int_{\Sigma_{M_n}} (\pi_{\Lambda_n M_n} \mu_{M_n, \xi})(\omega_\Lambda) d(\nu_{M_n} - \nu'_{M_n})(\xi) \right|
\]

where \(\Lambda_n = [-n, n], M = [-n - k, n + k]\), and we used (2.18).

We now need two lemmas on signed measures.

Lemma 2.12. Let \(\mu\) be a signed measure, \(||\mu|| < \infty\), on a measurable space \(X\). Let \(f_1, \ldots, f_N\) be nonnegative real-valued measurable functions on \(X\) such that \(f_1 + \cdots + f_n = K = \text{const}\). Then \(|\mu(f_1)| + \cdots + |\mu(f_N)| \leq K||\mu||\).

Proof. By the Hahn decomposition theorem [66], there is a partition \(X = X_+ \cup X_-\), \(X_+ \cap X_- = \emptyset\) such that \(\mu = \mu_+ - \mu_-\), where \(\mu_+\) and \(\mu_-\) are (nonnegative) measures concentrated on \(X_+\) and \(X_-\), respectively, and \(||\mu|| =
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\[ \|\mu_+\| + \|\mu_-\|. \]

Let \( f_i = f_{i+} + f_{i-} \), where \( f_{i+} \equiv 0 \) on \( X_- \) and \( f_{i-} \equiv 0 \) on \( X_+ \). Then \( \mu(f_i) = \mu_+(f_{i+}) - \mu_-(f_{i-}) \), and the lemma follows from

\[ \sum_i |\mu(f_i)| \leq \sum_i \mu_+(f_{i+}) + \sum_i \mu_-(f_{i-}) = K\|\mu_+\| + K\|\mu_-\| \]

**Lemma 2.13.** Under the conditions of the previous lemma, let \( \mu(X) = 0 \) and let \( f_i(x) \geq \varepsilon f_i(x') \) for all \( x, x' \in X, \ 1 \leq i \leq N \), and some constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Then \( |\mu(f_1)| + \cdots + |\mu(f_N)| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)K\|\mu\| \).

**Proof.** Fix an \( x' \in X \) and define \( g_i(x) = f_i(x) - \varepsilon f_i(x') \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq N \). Note that \( g_i \geq 0 \) and \( \sum_i g_i = (1 - \varepsilon)K \). Since \( \mu(X) = 0 \), we have \( \mu(g_i) = \mu(f_i) \). Then we just apply the previous lemma to the functions \( g_i \).

We now get back to (2.22). Observe that for each \( \omega_{\Lambda_n} \in \Sigma_{\Lambda_n} \)

\[ (\pi_{\Lambda_n,M_n}\mu_{M_n,\xi})(\omega_{\Lambda}) \geq \varepsilon \cdot (\pi_{\Lambda_n,M_n}\mu_{M_n,\xi'})(\omega_{\Lambda}) \]

for all \( \xi, \xi' \in \Sigma_{M_n} \) and some constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \), due to (2.20). Then the last lemma implies

\[ ||\nu - \nu'|| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)||\nu_{M_n} - \nu'_{M_n}|| \leq (1 - \varepsilon)||\nu - \nu'|| \]

hence \( ||\nu - \nu'|| = 0 \), so that \( \nu = \nu' \). Theorem 2.11 is proved. \( \square \)

**Corollary 2.14** Let \( (\Sigma_A, \sigma) \) be mixing. Then the unique Gibbs state \( \nu \) is \( \sigma \)-invariant.

**Proof:** see Lemma 2.5.

**Theorem 2.15** Let \( (\Sigma_A, \sigma) \) be mixing. Then the unique Gibbs state \( \nu \) is ergodic.
The proof will be based solely on the relation (2.21) and the σ-invariance of \( \nu \) (the last corollary). This generality of the argument will be essential later.

We will show that for any measurable sets \( C_1, C_2 \subset \Sigma_A \)

\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \nu(C_1 \cap \sigma^{-n}C_2) \geq \nu(C_1)\nu(C_2) \quad (2.23)
\]

From this, the ergodicity follows immediately.

As usual, it is enough to prove the so called cluster property (2.23) for cylinders, so we assume that \( C_1 = C(\omega_{\Lambda_1}) \) and \( C_2 = C(\omega_{\Lambda_2}) \) for some intervals \( \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \) of lengths \( |\Lambda_1| = n_1, |\Lambda_2| = n_2 \) and admissible configurations \( \omega_{\Lambda_1}, \omega_{\Lambda_2} \).

For large \( n \), we have \( l_n := \text{dist}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 + n) > 2k \). Then we partition the interval between \( \Lambda_1 \) and \( \Lambda_2 + n \) into three subintervals: the left one (adjacent to \( \Lambda_1 \)) of length \( k \), call it \( \Lambda' \), the right one (adjacent to \( \Lambda_2 + n \)) of length \( k \), call it \( \Lambda'' \), and the middle one in between of length \( l_n - 2k \), call it \( \Lambda \). Then

\[
\nu(C(\omega_{\Lambda_1}) \cap \sigma^{-n}C(\omega_{\Lambda_2})) = \sum_{\omega_{\Lambda} \in \Sigma_A} \sum_{\omega'} \sum_{\omega''} \nu(C(\omega_{\Lambda_1} \lor \omega' \lor \omega_\Lambda \lor \omega'' \lor \sigma^{-n}\omega_{\Lambda_2}))
\]

\[
\simeq \sum_{\omega_{\Lambda} \in \Sigma_A} \sum_{\omega'} \sum_{\omega''} \exp[-P(n_1 + n_2 + l_n)
\quad - U(\omega_{\Lambda_1} \lor \omega' \lor \omega_\Lambda \lor \omega'' \lor \sigma^{-n}\omega_{\Lambda_2})] \quad (2.24)
\]

where the inner sums are taken over \( \omega' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda'} \) and \( \omega'' \in \Sigma_{\Lambda''} \) such that the configuration \( \omega_{\Lambda_1} \lor \omega' \lor \omega_\Lambda \lor \omega'' \lor \sigma^{-n}\omega_{\Lambda_2} \) is admissible. There is at least one such pair of \( \omega', \omega'' \), and the number of such pairs is \( \leq |S|^{2k} \) = const. Now, observe that

\[
|U(\omega_{\Lambda_1} \lor \omega' \lor \omega_\Lambda \lor \omega'' \lor \sigma^{-n}\omega_{\Lambda_2}) - U(\omega_{\Lambda_1}) - U(\omega_\Lambda) - U(\omega_{\Lambda_2})| \leq \text{const}
\]

by Lemma 2.1. Also, \( e^{-Pl_n} \simeq e^{-P(l_n-2k)} \), and

\[
\sum_{\omega_{\Lambda} \in \Sigma_A} \exp[-P(l_n-2k) - U(\omega_\Lambda)] \simeq \sum_{\omega_{\Lambda} \in \Sigma_A} \nu(C(\omega_{\Lambda})) = 1
\]

due to (2.21). Combining these facts and (2.24) proves (2.23) and Theorem 2.15.

Remark 2.6. The relation (2.23) actually implies more than ergodicity for \( \nu \), it is equivalent to the strong mixing of \( \nu \), cf. Proposition 20.3.6 in [43]. We do not need this for the moment, and will later obtain an even stronger property – exponential mixing.
Corollary 2.16 If \( \Phi_1 \) and \( \Phi_2 \) are two interactions satisfying \((\Phi_1)\) and \((\Phi_2)\), then their Gibbs states \( \nu_{\Phi_1} \) and \( \nu_{\Phi_2} \) either coincide or are mutually singular. The latter means that there is a \( B \subset \Sigma_A \) such that \( \nu_{\Phi_1}(B) = 1 \) and \( \nu_{\Phi_2}(B) = 0 \) (of course, the set \( B \) can be neither open nor closed).

2.2 Gibbs measures

The machinery of Gibbs states developed in statistical physics was adapted to hyperbolic dynamical systems with Markov partitions by Sinai [76], Bowen [11] and Ruelle [68]. In their works, an alternative construction of Gibbs measures was developed.

Hölder continuous functions. Let \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) be a TMC and \( \varphi \in C(\Sigma_A) \) a real-valued continuous function. For each \( n \geq 1 \) put

\[
\text{var}_n \varphi = \sup \{|\varphi(\omega) - \varphi(\omega')| : \omega_i = \omega'_i, \forall |i| \leq n\}
\]

Since \( \varphi \) is uniformly continuous, \( \text{var}_n \varphi \to 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \).

We introduce the class of Hölder continuous functions on \( \Sigma_A \). For any \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \) define a metric \( d_\alpha \) on \( \Sigma_A \) such that \( d_\alpha(\omega, \omega') = \alpha^n \), where \( n = 1 + \max\{n \geq 0 : \omega_i = \omega'_i, \forall |i| < n\} \) (in the case \( \omega_0 \neq \omega'_0 \) we set \( n = 0 \)). A function \( \varphi \) on \( \Sigma_A \) will be Hölder continuous with respect to any (and then all) \( d_\alpha \) if \( \text{var}_n \varphi \leq b \theta^n \) for some \( b > 0 \) and \( \theta \in (0, 1) \) and all \( n \geq 0 \). For \( 0 < \theta < 1 \), let

\[
H_\theta(\Sigma_A) = \{ \varphi : \sup_n \theta^{-n} \text{var}_n \varphi < +\infty \}
\]

Obviously, \( H_{\theta_1}(\Sigma_A) \subset H_{\theta_2}(\Sigma_A) \) if \( \theta_1 < \theta_2 \). This gives a “filtration” of the space of all Hölder continuous functions

\[
H(\Sigma_A) = \bigcup_{0 < \theta < 1} H_\theta(\Sigma_A)
\]

For \( n \geq 0 \), denote by \( S_n \varphi \) the function

\[
S_n \varphi(\omega) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(\sigma^i \omega)
\]

called a partial (or ergodic) sum.

Next, let \( n \geq 0 \) and

\[
\mathcal{FR}_n(\Sigma_A) = \{ \varphi : \varphi(\omega) = \varphi(\omega') \text{ if } \omega_i = \omega'_i, \forall |i| \leq n \}
\]
Then \( \mathcal{FR}(\Sigma_A) = \bigcup_n \mathcal{FR}_n(\Sigma_A) \) is the class of all “finite range” functions.

**Definition of Gibbs measures.** Let \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) be mixing and \(\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)\). A \(\sigma\)-invariant Borel probability measure \(\rho\) on \(\Sigma_A\) is called a **Gibbs measure** for the potential function \(\varphi\) if there are constants \(c_1, c_2 > 0\) and \(P\) such that for any interval \(\Lambda = [0, n-1]\) of length \(n\) and \(\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_A\)

\[
c_1 \leq \frac{\rho(C(\omega_\Lambda))}{\exp[-Pn + S_n\varphi(\omega_\Lambda)]} \leq c_2
\]

(2.25)

with any \(\omega \in C(\omega_\Lambda)\).

**Remark 2.7.** Let \(\Lambda = [0, n-1]\) and \(\omega, \omega' \in C(\omega_\Lambda)\). Suppose that \(\text{var}_n \varphi \leq b\theta^n\) for all \(n \geq 1\). Then

\[
|S_n\varphi(\omega) - S_n\varphi(\omega')| \leq 2b/(1 - \theta) = \text{const}
\]

This explains why the choice of \(\omega \in C(\omega_\Lambda)\) in (2.25) does not matter.

**Remark 2.8** The requirement of \(\sigma\)-invariance cannot be dropped: there is a measure \(\rho\) on some \(\Sigma_A\) that satisfies (2.25) and is not \(\sigma\)-invariant. For example, let \(\Sigma_A = \Omega\), a full shift, and \(\varphi \equiv 0\). Let \(\rho_0\) be the Bernoulli measure with uniform distribution, i.e. \(\rho_0(C(i)) = 1/|S|\) for all \(1 \leq i \leq |S|\). Then take \(\rho = g\rho_0\), where \(g\) is any positive density on \(\Omega\) bounded away from 0 and \(\infty\) and normalized by \(\rho_0(g) = 1\).

**Definition.** Let \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) be mixing and \(\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)\). Let \(n \geq 1, \Lambda = [0, n-1]\), and

\[
Z_n(\varphi) = \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_A} \exp[\sup_{C(\omega_\Lambda)} S_n\varphi]
\]

(2.26)

Then the number

\[
P_\varphi = \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln Z_n(\varphi)
\]

(2.27)

is called the (topological) pressure of the function \(\varphi\) on \(\Sigma_A\).

**Lemma 2.17** Let \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) be mixing, \(\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)\) and \(\rho\) a Gibbs measure for the potential \(\varphi\). Then the value \(P\) in (2.25) coincides with \(P_\varphi\). Moreover, if we redefine (2.26), more generally, by picking an arbitrary point \(\omega\) in every cylinder \(C(\omega_\Lambda)\) and setting

\[
Z_n(\varphi) = \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_A, \omega \in C(\omega_\Lambda)} \exp[S_n\varphi(\omega)]
\]
then
\[ Z_n(\varphi) \asymp e^{P_n} \tag{2.28} \]

In particular, \( P_\varphi = \lim_n \frac{1}{n} \ln Z_n(\varphi) \) in (2.27).

**Proof.** Note that
\[ \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda} \rho(C(\omega_\Lambda)) = 1 \]
hence (2.25) implies
\[ \sum_{\omega_\Lambda \in \Sigma_\Lambda} \exp[-P_n + S_n \varphi(\omega)] \asymp 1 \]
which proves (2.28) with \( P = P_\varphi \). Lemma 2.17 follows. \( \square \)

**Theorem 2.18** Let \( (\Sigma_A, \sigma) \) be mixing, \( \varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A) \) and \( \rho \) a Gibbs measure for the potential \( \varphi \). Then the measure-theoretic entropy of \( \rho \) is given by
\[ h_\rho(\sigma) = P_\varphi - \int_{\Sigma_A} \varphi(\omega) \, d\rho \]

**Proof.** Let \( \xi \) be the partition of \( \Sigma_A \) into cylinders \( C(i) = \{ \omega \in \Sigma_A : \omega_0 = i \} \), and put
\[ \xi_n = \xi \vee \sigma^{-1} \xi \vee \cdots \vee \sigma^{-n+1} \xi \]
Since \( \xi \) is a generating partition, then \( h_\rho(\sigma) = \lim_{n \to \infty} n^{-1} H_\rho(\xi_n) \).

Note that each atom \( B \in \xi_n \) is a cylinder, \( B = C(\omega_0, n-1) \) based on the interval \([0, n-1]\). Therefore, \( \rho(B) \asymp \exp[-P_n + S_n \varphi(\omega_B)] \) where \( \omega_B \in B \) is an arbitrary point, and we have
\[
H_\rho(\xi_n) = -\sum_{B \in \xi_n} \rho(B) \ln \rho(B) \\
= -\sum_{B \in \xi_n} \rho(B) [-P_n + S_n \varphi(\omega_B)] + O(1) \\
= Pn - \int_{\Sigma_A} S_n \varphi(\omega) \, d\rho + O(1) \tag{2.29}
\]
where \( O(1) \) stands for a uniformly bounded quantity. At the last step, we used Remark 2.7.
Since $\rho$ is $\sigma$-invariant, we have

$$\int_{\Sigma_A} S_n \varphi(\omega) \, d\rho = n \int_{\Sigma_A} \varphi(\omega) \, d\rho$$

Substituting this in (2.29), dividing by $n$ and letting $n \to \infty$ proves the theorem. □

There is a remarkable similarity between the relations (2.21) and (2.25). In addition, both measures, $\nu$ in (2.21) and $\rho$ in (2.25), are $\sigma$-invariant. We will use this analogy to prove the following:

**Theorem 2.19** Any Gibbs measure $\rho$ for a potential $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$ is ergodic.

**Proof.** Just like (2.21) and the $\sigma$-invariance of $\nu$ implied the ergodicity of $\nu$ in the proof of Theorem 2.15, we now obtain the ergodicity of $\rho$. The proof of Theorem 2.15 carries over with only minor technical modifications, which we leave out. □

**Theorem 2.20 (Existence and uniqueness of Gibbs measures)** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing. For any $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$ there is a unique Gibbs measure $\rho = \rho_\varphi$.

**Proof.** We prove the uniqueness first. Let $\rho$ and $\rho'$ be two Gibbs measures for the same potential $\varphi$. Then they have the same value $P = P_\varphi$, due to Lemma 2.17. Hence, (2.25), which holds for both $\rho$ and $\rho'$, implies

$$\frac{c_1}{c_2} \leq \frac{\rho(C(\omega_A))}{\rho'(C(\omega_A)))} \leq \frac{c_2}{c_1}$$

for any cylinder $C(\omega_A) \subset \Sigma_A$. Thus, the measures $\rho$ and $\rho'$ are equivalent (absolutely continuous with respect to each other). Since both are ergodic, they must coincide, cf. 3.6.a in [44].

The existence of $\rho$ will follow from the next theorem. □

**Theorem 2.21 (Gibbs measures = Gibbs states)** The class of Gibbs states $\{\nu_\Phi\}$ on $\Sigma_A$ coincides with that of Gibbs measures $\{\rho_\varphi\}$ in the following sense. For any interaction $\Phi$ satisfying (Φ1) and (Φ2) there is a potential $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$ such that $\rho_\varphi$ exists, $\rho_\varphi = \nu_\Phi$ and $P_\varphi = P_\Phi$. Conversely, for any potential $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$ there is an interaction $\Phi$ satisfying (Φ1) and (Φ2) such that $\nu_\Phi$ is the Gibbs measure $\rho_\varphi$ and $P_\Phi = P_\varphi$.
Proof. Let \( \Phi \) be an interaction. Put
\[
\varphi(\omega) = -\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Phi(\omega|_{[0,n]})
\] (2.30)
Observe that for \( \Lambda = [0, n-1] \) we have \( S_n \varphi(\omega) = -U(\omega|_{\Lambda}) - W(\omega|_{\Lambda}, \omega|_{[n,+\infty)}) \).
Since the \( W \) term is uniformly bounded, cf. Lemma 2.1, we have \( \exp[S_n \varphi(\omega)] \approx \exp[-U(\omega|_{\Lambda})] \). Now (2.25) follows from (2.21), hence \( \rho_\varphi \) exists and coincides with \( \nu_\Phi \).

Conversely, let \( \varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A) \) be a potential function. We can write \( \varphi = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \varphi_n \) where \( \varphi_n \in \mathcal{F} \mathcal{R}_n(\Sigma_A) \) and \( |\varphi_n| \leq \text{var}_{n-1} \varphi \) for all \( n \geq 1 \). The functions \( \varphi_n \) can be defined inductively in the following way. Given \( \varphi_0, \ldots, \varphi_{n-1} \) and a cylinder \( C = C(\omega|_{[-n,n]}) \subset \Sigma_A \), we pick an arbitrary \( \omega' \in C \) and put \( \varphi_n(\omega) \equiv \varphi(\omega') - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi_i(\omega') \) for all \( \omega \in C \).

Next, we set \( \Phi(\omega|_{[-n,n]}) = -\varphi_n(\omega) \) for any \( \omega \in C(\omega|_{\Lambda}) \). This defines \( \Phi \) on all intervals \([n,n]\) and then on their translates \([-n+k,n+k] \) by the property (\( \Phi_1 \)). On all the intervals of even length we set \( \Phi \) to zero. One can easily verify that if \( \varphi \in \mathcal{H}_{\theta'}(\Sigma_A) \), then \( \Phi \) satisfies (\( \Phi_2 \)) with \( \theta = \theta'^{1/2} \). Then the interaction \( \Phi \) has a Gibbs state, \( \nu_\Phi \).

Next, observe that
\[
S_n \varphi(\omega) = -\sum_{\Lambda} \Phi(\omega|_{\Lambda})
\]
where \( \sum_{\Lambda} \) extends over intervals \( \Lambda \) such that \( |\Lambda \cap [0,n-1]| > |\Lambda|/2 \). It then follows from Lemma 2.1 that
\[
|S_n \varphi(\omega) + U(\omega|_{[0,n-1]})| \leq \text{const}
\]
Now (2.25) with \( \rho = \nu_\Phi \) follows from (2.21), hence \( \nu_\Phi \) is the Gibbs measure for the potential \( \varphi \). Note that this proves the existence of a Gibbs measure for any \( \varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A) \).

Remark 2.9. Given an interaction, \( \Phi \), there are many ways to define a potential \( \varphi \) with the same Gibbs measure. For example, we can set \( \varphi(\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Phi(\omega|_{\Lambda_n}) \) where \( \{\Lambda_n\} \) is any sequence of intervals of length \( |\Lambda_n| = n \) that contain 0. Alternatively, one can put \( \varphi(\omega) = \sum_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{I}, 0 \in \Lambda} |\Lambda|^{-1} \Phi(\omega|_{\Lambda}) \).
Similarly, there are many ways to define an interaction \( \Phi \) given a potential \( \varphi \), with the same Gibbs state.

Remark 2.10. The definition (2.30) has an advantage that the potential \( \varphi \) depends only on nonnegative coordinates, i.e. \( \varphi(\omega) = \varphi(\omega') \) if \( \omega_i = \omega'_i \) for
all $i \geq 0$. Therefore, for any potential function $\varphi' \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$ there exists another function, $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$, that depends only on nonnegative coordinates and such that $\rho_{\varphi} = \rho_{\varphi'}$.

Theorems 2.19 and 2.20 have an immediate corollary.

**Corollary 2.22** If $\varphi$ and $\psi$ are two potential functions, then their Gibbs measures $\rho_{\varphi}$ and $\rho_{\psi}$ either coincide or are mutually singular.

It is interesting to know when $\rho_{\varphi} = \rho_{\psi}$.

**Definition.** We call two functions $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$ cohomologous (with respect to the shift $\sigma$), denoted by $\varphi \sim \psi$ if

$$\varphi = \psi + K - u + u \circ \sigma$$

for some constant $K$ and some function $u : \Sigma_A \to \mathbb{R}$. This is obviously an equivalence relation on $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$.

**Theorem 2.23** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing, and $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$. The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) $\rho_{\varphi} = \rho_{\psi}$.

(ii) There is a constant $K$ such that $S_n\varphi(\omega) - S_n\psi(\omega) = nK$ whenever $\sigma^n \omega = \omega$.

(iii) $\varphi \sim \psi$ in the sense (2.31) with some Hölder continuous function $u$; see also remarks after the proof.

(iv) There are constant $K$ and $L$ such that $|S_n\varphi(\omega) - S_n\psi(\omega) - nK| \leq L$ for all $\omega$ and $n \geq 1$.

If these conditions hold, then $K = P_{\varphi} - P_{\psi}$.

**Proof.** The implication (iii)$\Rightarrow$(iv) is obvious. To prove (iv)$\Rightarrow$(i), replace $S_n\varphi$ by $S_n\psi$ in (2.25) and observe that $c_1, c_2$ change by at most a factor of $e^K$, $P$ decreases by $K$, and $\rho$ will remain unchanged.

We now prove (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii). Let $\sigma^n \omega = \omega$ and $j \geq 1$. The bounds (2.25) imply

$$\frac{c_1}{c_2} \leq \frac{\exp[-P_{\varphi}j + S_j\varphi(\omega)]}{\exp[-P_{\psi}j + S_j\psi(\omega)]} \leq \frac{c_2}{c_1}$$

(2.32)

Now put $j = nr, r \geq 1$, and notice that $S_j\varphi(\omega) = rS_n\varphi(\omega)$. Substituting these in (2.32) and letting $r \to \infty$ gives (ii) with $K = P_{\varphi} - P_{\psi}$.
Lastly, we prove (ii)⇒(iii). Since the shift $\sigma : \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$ is mixing, there is an $\omega \in \Sigma_A$ whose positive semi-orbit $O_+^{\omega} := \{\sigma^n \omega\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is dense in $\Sigma_A$. Denote $v = \varphi - \psi - K \in H(\Sigma_A)$. We define $u : O_+^{\omega} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u(\sigma^n \omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} v(\sigma^j \omega)$$

Note that $\omega$ cannot be a periodic point, so the function $u$ is well defined on $O_+^{\omega}$. There is a standard ‘closing’ argument showing that $u$ extends to $\Sigma_A$ by continuity and becomes a Hölder continuous function. It is enough to check that whenever $\sigma^p \omega$ and $\sigma^q \omega$ agree in places $-r$ to $r$ (i.e. belong in one cylinder $C(\omega[-r,r]) \subset \Sigma_A$), then

$$|u(\sigma^p \omega) - u(\sigma^q \omega)| = \left|\sum_{j=p}^{q-1} v(\sigma^j \omega)\right| \leq b \theta^r$$

(2.33)

for some constants $b > 0$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$ (we assume, without loss of generality, $p < q$). Consider a periodic point $\omega^* \in \Sigma_A$ defined by

$$\omega^*_i = \omega_t \quad \text{for } i \equiv t \pmod{q-p}$$

where $p \leq t < q$. Since $\omega^*$ is periodic with period $q-p$, we have $\sum_{j=p}^{q-1} v(\sigma^j \omega^*) = 0$ by (ii). For each $j = p, \ldots, q - 1$, the sequences $\sigma^j \omega$ and $\sigma^j \omega^*$ agree in places $p - r - j$ through $q + r - j$, hence

$$|v(\sigma^j \omega) - v(\sigma^j \omega^*)| \leq b_1 \theta_1^{\min\{r+j-p,r+q-j\}}$$

with some $b_1 > 0$ and $\theta_1 \in (0, 1)$, by the Hölder continuity of $v$. Adding up for $j = p, \ldots, q - 1$ gives (2.33). Hence, indeed, the extension of $u$ to $\Sigma_A$ is Hölder continuous. Lastly, note that

$$u(\sigma \omega') - u(\omega') = v(\omega')$$

for all $\omega' \in O_+^{\omega}$, and this equation extends to $\Sigma_A$ by continuity. □

It is also interesting to investigate the equation (2.31) for $u$, assuming that $\varphi, \psi \in H(\Sigma_A)$ are given. Then (2.31) is called a cohomological equation.

Let (2.31) hold with an arbitrary function $u$ (maybe not even measurable!). Then (2.31) has a Hölder continuous solution $u$. Indeed, it is enough to verify the condition (ii) of the above theorem.
Next, assume that \( u, u' \) are two solutions of the equation (2.31). By inspection one can show that the difference \( u - u' \) is constant on each orbit \( \{ \sigma^n \omega \}_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \). This observation has a few interesting implications:

(a) A Hölder continuous solution \( u \) of the equation (2.31) is unique, up to an additive constant.

(b) If a solution \( u \) is continuous, then it is Hölder continuous.

(c) Let \( u \) be measurable, and \( \nu \) any \( \sigma \)-invariant ergodic measure on \( \Sigma_A \). Then \( u \) is Hölder continuous mod 0, i.e. up to a set of \( \nu \)-measure zero. (This follows from the Birkhoff ergodic theorem.)

**Remark 2.11.** As it follows now from Remark 2.10, for any potential \( \psi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A) \) there is a cohomologous potential \( \varphi \sim \psi \) that depends only on non-negative coordinates. A direct proof of this fact is given by Bowen [11].

**Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operator.** We will prove more advanced properties of Gibbs measures, and that requires a different apparatus. Consider the symbolic space

\[
\Sigma_A^+ = \{ \bar{x} \in \prod_{i=0}^{\infty} \{1, \ldots, m\} : A_{x_i x_{i+1}} = 1 \text{ for all } i \geq 0 \}
\]

of one-sided admissible sequences, with the shift \( \sigma : \Sigma_A^+ \to \Sigma_A^+ \) defined by \( (\sigma(\bar{x}))[i] = x_{i+1} \). Now \( \sigma \) is a finite-to-one continuous map of \( \Sigma_A^+ \) onto itself. Note that \( \sigma : \Sigma_A^+ \to \Sigma_A^+ \) is mixing iff \( A^k > 0 \) for some \( k \geq 1 \). Denote by \( C(\Sigma_A^+) \) the space of continuous functions on \( \Sigma_A^+ \). Any function \( f \in C(\Sigma_A^+) \) can be naturally extended to \( \Sigma_A \) by \( f(\omega) := f(\omega|_{[0, +\infty)}) \), so that \( C(\Sigma_A^+) \) is identified with a subspace of \( C(\Sigma_A) \) consisting of functions depending on nonnegative coordinates. Then we put \( \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A^+) = C(\Sigma_A^+) \cap \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A) \), the space of Hölder continuous functions on \( \Sigma_A^+ \). Similarly, \( \mathcal{FR}_n(\Sigma_A^+) = C(\Sigma_A^+) \cap \mathcal{FR}_n(\Sigma_A) \).

For any \( \Lambda \subset [0, +\infty) \) we denote by \( C^+(\omega_\Lambda) \subset \Sigma_A^+ \) the cylinder for a given configuration \( \omega_\Lambda \).

**Remark 2.12.** Let \( (\Sigma_A^+, \sigma) \) be mixing and \( C^+(\omega_{[0, n)}) \subset \Sigma_A^+ \) a cylinder. Then \( \sigma^{n+k}C^+(\omega_{[0, n)}) = \Sigma_A^+ \).

Let \( \varphi \in C(\Sigma_A^+) \). We define the Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius operator \( \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_\varphi \) on the space \( C(\Sigma_A^+) \) by

\[
(\mathcal{L}_\varphi f)(\bar{x}) = \sum_{y \in \sigma^{-1}\bar{x}} e^{\varphi(y)} f(y)
\]

(2.34)
It has an adjoint operator, $\mathcal{L}^*$, on the space $\mathcal{C}^*(\Sigma_A^+)$ of linear functionals on $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_A^+)$ defined by

$$(\mathcal{L}^* g)(f) = g(\mathcal{L}f)$$

for all $g \in \mathcal{C}^*(\Sigma_A^+)$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_A^+)$. Observe that $\mathcal{L}$ takes positive functions to positive functions, hence $\mathcal{L}^*$ takes measures to measures. However, neither $\mathcal{L}$ nor $\mathcal{L}^*$ preserves norm in the corresponding space.

**Remark 2.13.** By induction on $n$, one can show that

$$(\mathcal{L}_n \phi f)(x) = \sum_{y \in \sigma^{-n}x} e^{S_n \varphi(y)} f(y)$$

(2.35)

In particular, if $\chi_C$ is the characteristic function of a cylinder $C = C^+(\omega_{[0,n]}) \subset \Sigma_A^+$, then one can use (2.35) to obtain that

$$\mathcal{L}_n^j \chi_C \geq e^{-j\|\varphi\|} > 0$$

(2.36)

for all $j \geq n + k$.

**Remark 2.14.** It is a simple exercise to check that for any $f, g \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_A^+)$ we have $\mathcal{L}(f \cdot (g \circ \sigma)) = (\mathcal{L}f) \cdot g$. Hence, by induction, $\mathcal{L}^n(f \cdot (g \circ \sigma^n)) = (\mathcal{L}^n f) \cdot g$.

**Remark 2.15.** The operator (2.34) is a generalization of the classical Perron-Frobenius operator for interval maps. The term $e^{\varphi(y)}$ plays the role of the reciprocal of the derivative, and $f$ plays the role of a density.

**Theorem 2.24 (Ruelle-Perron-Frobenius)** Let $(\Sigma_A^+, \sigma)$ be mixing, $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A^+)$, and $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_\varphi$ as defined above. There is a $\lambda > 0$, a function $h \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_A^+)$, $h > 0$, and a probability measure $\nu$ on $\Sigma_A^+$ such that

$$\mathcal{L} h = \lambda h \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}^* \nu = \lambda \nu$$

(2.37)

and $\nu(h) = 1$. Furthermore,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} ||\lambda^{-n} \mathcal{L}^n g - \nu(g) \cdot h|| = 0$$

(2.38)

for all $g \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_A^+)$. 
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Note similarities between this theorem and Examples 2.7 and 2.8. The value \( \lambda > 0 \) is the largest (leading) eigenvalue of \( L \). The function \( h > 0 \) is the corresponding (right) eigenvector, and the positive functional \( \nu (= \text{measure}) \) is the corresponding adjoint (left) eigenvector. The eigenvectors \( h \) and \( \nu \) are normalized so that \( \nu(h) = 1 \). We will see later that the invariant (Gibbs) measure is \( \rho = h\nu \), which means that \( \rho \) is a measure with density \( h \) with respect to the (reference) measure \( \nu \). In addition, we will show that \( P_\varphi = \ln \lambda \).

**Proof.** Consider a continuous (nonlinear) map \( \mu \mapsto ||L^*\mu||^{-1}L^*\mu \) on the space \( \mathcal{M}^+ \) of Borel probability measures on \( \Sigma^+ \). Since \( \mathcal{M}^+ \) is a compact convex subset of the linear space \( \mathcal{C}^*(\Sigma^+_A) \), this continuous map has a fixed point according to the Schauder-Tychonoff theorem, see [27] p. 456. Hence, there exist a measure \( \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+ \) such that \( L^*\nu = \lambda \nu \) for some \( \lambda > 0 \). We will see later that the fixed point \( \nu \) is actually unique.

**Remark 2.16.** For any cylinder \( C = C^+(\omega_{[0,n)}) \subset \Sigma^+_A \)

\[
\nu(C) \geq \lambda^{-n-k}e^{-(n+k)||\varphi||} > 0 \quad (2.39)
\]

Indeed, \( \nu(C) = \nu(\chi_C) = \lambda^{-j}L^j\nu(\chi_C) = \lambda^{-j}\nu(L^j\chi_C) \), then we can use (2.36).

**Remark 2.17.** Let \( f \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma^+_A) \), \( f \geq 0 \) and \( \nu(f) = 1 \). Consider the probability measure \( \mu = f\nu \) (i.e. \( \mu(g) = \nu(fg) \) for all \( g \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma^+_A) \)). Let \( \sigma^*\mu \) be the image of \( \mu \) under \( \sigma \). Then \( \sigma^*\mu = (\lambda^{-1}Lf)\nu \), i.e. \( \lambda^{-1}Lf \) is the density of the measure \( \sigma^*\mu \). (Note, in particular, that \( \nu(\lambda^{-1}Lf) = \nu(f) = 1 \).) Thus, the operator \( \lambda^{-1}L \) transforms the densities of measures with respect to \( \nu \) under the shift \( \sigma \), just like the regular Perron-Frobenius operator for interval maps transforms the densities with respect to the Lebesgue measure. To prove this note:

\[
(\sigma^*\mu)(g) = \mu(go) = \nu(f.(go)) = \lambda^{-1}(L^*\nu)(\cdot(g\circ\sigma)) = \lambda^{-1}\nu(L(f.(g\circ\sigma))),
\]

then use Remark 2.14.

Now we have to find a function \( h > 0 \) such that \( Lh = \lambda h \). It suffices to find a nonempty compact convex set \( \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{C}(\Sigma^+_A) \) invariant under the linear continuous operator \( \lambda^{-1}L \) and then employ the Schauder-Tychonoff fixed point theorem again. Since \( \varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma^+_A) \), there are \( \theta \in (0,1) \) and \( b > 0 \) such that \( \text{var}_n\varphi \leq b\theta^n \) for all \( n \geq 0 \). Put

\[
B_n = \exp \left[ \sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} 2b\theta^i \right]
\]
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We will write \( x \sim^{n} y \) if the points \( x, y \) belong in one cylinder \( C^+(\omega_{[0,n]}) \subset \Sigma_{A_{x}}^{+} \), i.e. if the first \( n+1 \) symbols of \( x \) and \( y \) coincide. In particular, \( x^{0} \sim y \) means \( x_{0} = y_{0} \). We define \( D \) to be the set of functions \( f \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_{A_{x}}^{+}) \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
(D1) \quad & f \geq 0; \\
(D2) \quad & \nu(f) = 1; \\
(D3) \quad & f(x) \leq B_{n}f(x') \quad \text{for} \quad x \sim^{n} x'.
\end{align*}
\]

Claim 1. \( D \) is a nonempty compact convex set. Clearly, \( f \equiv 1 \) is in \( D \). The convexity is obvious. For compactness, we first prove that \( D \) is uniformly bounded:

\[
||f|| \leq K := B_{0}\lambda^{k}e^{k||\varphi||} \quad \text{for all} \quad f \in D \quad \tag{2.40}
\]

To prove this, note that for any \( x \sim^{0} x' \) we have \( f(x) \geq B_{0}^{-1}f(x') \) by \( (D3) \), hence \( f(x) \geq B_{0}^{-1}f(x')\chi_{C^+(x_{0})} \) for all \( x' \), and so \( 1 = \nu(f) \geq B_{0}^{-1}f(x')\nu(C^+(x_{0})) \), and then we use (2.39). So, \( D \) is uniformly bounded. Furthermore, for any \( x \sim^{n} x' \) and \( f \in D \) we have

\[
|f(x) - f(x')| \leq (B_n - 1)K \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad n \rightarrow \infty
\]

by \( (D3) \) and (2.40), so that \( D \) is equicontinuous. Thus, \( D \) is compact by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem.

Claim 2. \( (\lambda^{-1}\mathcal{L})D \subset D \). The preservation of \( (D1) \) and \( (D2) \) by the operator \( \lambda^{-1}\mathcal{L} \) follows from Remark 2.17. The preservation of \( (D3) \) is verified by direct calculation: for \( x \sim^{n} x' \) we have

\[
\mathcal{L}f(x) = \sum_{y \in \sigma^{-1}x} e^{\varphi(y)}f(y) \\
\leq \sum_{y' \in \sigma^{-1}x'} e^{\varphi(y') + B_{n+1}f(y')} \\
= e^{B_{n+1}}B_{n+1}\mathcal{L}f(x') \quad \tag{2.41}
\]

\[
\leq B_{n}\mathcal{L}f(x') \quad \tag{2.42}
\]

(Note that the sequences \( y \in \sigma^{-1}x \) start with symbols \( \{i\} \) such that \( A_{ix_{0}} = 1 \), and the same is true for \( y' \in \sigma^{-1}x' \) since \( x_{0} = x_{0}' \). Therefore, there is a one-to-one correspondence between points \( y \in \sigma^{-1}x \) and \( y' \in \sigma^{-1}x' \), and \( y \sim^{n} y' \) for the corresponding \( y, y' \).)

Now we have a continuous map, \( \lambda^{-1}\mathcal{L} \) By the Schauder-Tychonoff theorem, a function \( h \in D \) exists such that \( \mathcal{L}h = \lambda h \).
To complete the proof of Theorem 2.24, we need to derive (2.38), which will be done by a series of claims.

Claim 3. For any $f \in \mathcal{D}$ we have $\min_{x} \lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f(x) \geq K^{-1}$. To prove this, find an $x'$ such that $f(x') \geq 1$ (one exists due to the property (ii)). Then for any point $x \sim x'$ we have $f(x) \geq B_0^{-1}$, hence $f \geq B_0^{-1} \chi_{C(x)}$. Now the claim follows from (2.36).

Next, we want to show that $\lambda^{-n} \mathcal{L}^n f$ converges to $h$ for any $f \in \mathcal{D}$. The fact that $\lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f$ is uniformly bounded below suggests the following trick. We want to find an $\eta > 0$ such that the function $g := \lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f - \eta h$ will belong in $\mathcal{D}$, up to a normalizing factor. Note that $g$ is positive for any $\eta ||h|| \leq K^{-1}$.

Claim 4. There is an $\eta > 0$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{D}$ we have $g/(1 - \eta) \in \mathcal{D}$ for $g = \lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f - \eta h$. We need to verify (D3), i.e. to show that $g(\bar{x}) \leq B_n g(\bar{x}')$ for all $\bar{x} \sim \bar{x}'$, or equivalently,

$$\eta (B_n h(\bar{x}') - h(\bar{x})) \leq B_n \lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f(\bar{x}') - \lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f(\bar{x})$$

(2.43)

Applying (2.42) to the function $\lambda^{-k+1} \mathcal{L}^{k-1} f$ gives

$$\lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f(\bar{x}) \leq e^{b\theta n+1} B_{n+1} \lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f(\bar{x}')$$

Note that, $h(\bar{x}) \geq B_n^{-1} h(\bar{x}')$, because $h \in \mathcal{D}$. To prove (2.43) it is therefore enough to have

$$\eta (B_n - B_n^{-1}) h(\bar{x}') \leq (B_n - e^{b\theta n+1} B_{n+1}) \lambda^{-k} \mathcal{L}^k f(\bar{x}')$$

or

$$\eta (B_n - B_n^{-1}) ||h|| \leq (B_n - e^{b\theta n+1} B_{n+1}) K^{-1}$$

A direct inspection now shows that an $\eta > 0$ exists such that the above inequality holds uniformly in $n$. This proves the claim.

Claim 5. There are constants $c > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$||\lambda^{-n} \mathcal{L}^n f - h|| \leq c \beta^n$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{D}, n \geq 0$.

This is a clear implication of the previous claim. Every $k$ iterations of the operator $\lambda^{-1} \mathcal{L}$ allow us to subtract $\eta h$ from the function we have at that time. Then $\eta h$ will stay invariant under $\lambda^{-1} \mathcal{L}$, while the norm of the
difference is reduced by the factor $1 - \eta$. As a result, after $kN$ iterations, $N \geq 1$, 
$$
\lambda^{-kN} L^{kN} f = (1 - (1 - \eta)^N) h + (1 - \eta)^N \cdot f'
$$
for some $f' \in \mathcal{D}$. Then the claim follows for all $n = kN$. We leave it to the reader to verify the claim for $n \neq kN$.

Claim 6. Let $f \in FR_r(\Sigma_\lambda^+)$ for some $r \geq 0$, and $g \in \mathcal{D}$. Suppose that $f \geq 0$ and $fg$ is not identically zero. Then $g_r := \nu(fg)^{-1} \lambda^{-r} \mathcal{L}^r(fg) \in \mathcal{D}$.

Note that $fg$ is positive on some cylinder, hence $\nu(fg) > 0$ by Remark 2.16. The properties (D1) and (D2) for $g_r$ follow from Remark 2.17. The proof of (D3) for $g_r$ goes by a direct calculation that is based on Remark 2.13 and generalizes the proof of Claim 2. We leave it to the reader.

Claim 7. Let $f \in FR_r(\Sigma_\lambda^+)$ and $g \in \mathcal{D}$. Then for $n \geq 0$
$$
||\lambda^{-n-r} L^{n+r}(fg) - \nu(fg)h|| \leq c\nu(|fg|) \beta^n
$$
To prove this, let $f = f^+ - f^-$, where $f^+, f^- \geq 0$ and $f^+, f^- \in FR_r(\Sigma_\lambda^+)$. Combining Claims 6 and 5, we prove the above bound for $f^+$ and $f^-$ separately (note that in the case $f^\pm g \equiv 0$ the bound is trivial), then we add up the two bounds and complete the proof of the claim.

The last claim implies (2.38) by the standard approximation techniques. Theorem 2.24 is now proved. \Box

Let $\varphi = \psi + K - u + u \circ \sigma$ for some $\varphi, \psi, u \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_\lambda^+)$ and a constant $K$, just as in (2.31). Then
$$
\mathcal{L}_\psi(e^{-u}f) = e^{-K} e^{-u} \mathcal{L}_\varphi(f)
$$
for all $f, g \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_\lambda^+)$. In particular, choosing $K = \ln \lambda$ and $u = \ln h$ and setting $f = h$ gives $\mathcal{L}_\psi 1 = 1$, where $1$ is the function identically equal to one. Hence, for any potential $\varphi$ there is a cohomologous potential $\psi \sim \varphi$ such that $\mathcal{L}_\psi$ has the leading eigenvalue $\lambda = 1$ with a constant eigenfunction. We say that $\mathcal{L}_\psi$ (or $\psi$) is normalized. Note that $\mathcal{L}_\psi$ is a partial inverse to the operator $\sigma^* : f \mapsto f \circ \sigma$, i.e. $\mathcal{L}_\psi \circ \sigma^* =$identity.

Remark 2.18. Let $\varphi$ be a normalized potential for a Gibbs measure $\rho$. One can use (2.34) to prove that $\varphi \leq 0$ and $S_k \varphi < 0$.

The use of normalized potentials can simplify the proofs of many properties of Gibbs measures, this observation is used in [55].
Theorem 2.25  With notation and assumptions of the previous theorem, the probability measure \( \rho = h\nu \) on \( \Sigma^+_A \) is \( \sigma \)-invariant. Its values on cylinders \( C^+(\omega_A) \subset \Sigma^+_A, \Lambda = [0, n-1] \), satisfy
\[
0 < c_1 \leq \frac{\rho(C^+(\omega_A))}{\exp[-Pn + S_n\varphi(\bar{x})]} \leq c_2 < \infty \tag{2.44}
\]
with any \( \bar{x} \in C^+(\omega_A) \). Here \( P = \ln \lambda \) and \( c_1, c_2 \) are independent of \( \bar{x}, C(\omega_A) \) and \( n \).

Proof. The \( \sigma \)-invariance of \( \rho \) follows from (2.37) and Remark 2.17. To prove (2.44), put \( C = C^+(\omega_A) \) and write
\[
\rho(C) = \rho(\chi_C) = \nu(h\chi_C) = \lambda^{-n} \mathcal{L}^n\nu(h\chi_C) = \lambda^{-n} \nu(\mathcal{L}^n(h\chi_C))
\]
Applying Remark 2.13 gives
\[
\mathcal{L}^n(h\chi_C)(\bar{x}) = \sum_{y \in \sigma^{-n}\bar{x}} e^{S_n\varphi(y)} h(y) \chi_C(y)
\]
Note that for any \( \bar{x} \in \Sigma^+_A \) there is at most one \( y \in \sigma^{-n}\bar{x} \) such that \( y \in C = C(\omega_A) \). This observation and Remark 2.7 give an upper bound,
\[
\rho(C) \leq \text{const} \cdot \lambda^{-n} e^{S_n\varphi(\bar{x})}||h|| = \text{const} \cdot \exp[-Pn + S_n\varphi(\bar{x}')]
\]
again \( \bar{x}' \in C \) is an arbitrary point and \( P = \ln \lambda \).
To get a lower bound on \( \rho(C) \), we write
\[
\rho(C) = \nu(h\chi_C) = \lambda^{-n-k} \mathcal{L}^{n+k}\nu(h\chi_C) = \lambda^{-n-k} \nu(\mathcal{L}^{n+k}(h\chi_C))
\]
with
\[
\mathcal{L}^{n+k}(h\chi_C)(\bar{x}) = \sum_{y \in \sigma^{-n-k}\bar{x}} e^{S_{n+k}\varphi(y)} h(y) \chi_C(y)
\]
Now, for any \( \bar{x} \in \Sigma^+_A \) there is at least one \( y \in \sigma^{-n-k}\bar{x} \) such that \( y \in C \). This observation and Remark 2.7 give a lower bound,
\[
\rho(C) \geq \text{const} \cdot \lambda^{-n-k} e^{S_{n+k}\varphi(\bar{x}')}||h|| = \text{const} \cdot \exp[-Pn + S_n\varphi(\bar{x}')]
\]
where \( \bar{x}' \in C \) is an arbitrary point and \( P = \ln \lambda \). Here we used two facts: \( \lambda^{-k} = \text{const} \) (independent of \( C, n, \rho \)) and
\[
\exp[S_{n+k}\varphi(\bar{x}) - S_n\varphi(\bar{x})] \leq e^{k||\varphi||} = \text{const}
\]
Thus we proved (2.44) and Theorem 2.25.

The measure $\rho$ is not a Gibbs measure yet because it is defined on the “wrong” space, $\Sigma_A^+$. It can be naturally extended to a $\sigma$-invariant measure on $\Sigma_A$ by setting $\rho(C(\omega_{[q,r]})) = \rho(C^+(\omega_{[q,r]}))$ for all $0 \leq q \leq r$, and then $\rho(C(\omega_{[q,r]})) = \rho(\sigma^qC(\omega_{[q,r]}))$ for all $q < 0$. A direct inspection shows that $\rho$ is then a $\sigma$-invariant probability measure on $\Sigma_A$.

**Corollary 2.26** The measure $\rho$ on $\Sigma_A$ is a Gibbs measure with potential $\varphi$.

**Remark 2.19.** The value $\lambda$ in Theorem 2.24 is unique, for a given potential $\varphi$, since $\lambda = e^{P\varphi}$. The uniqueness of the function $h$ follows from (2.38). Now the measure $\nu = h^{-1}\rho$ is unique, since so is the Gibbs measure $\rho$.

### 2.3 Properties of Gibbs measures

We have already proved some very basic properties of Gibbs measures, e.g., ergodicity. We now turn to more advanced properties that are particularly important in many applications.

**Theorem 2.27 (Exponential cluster property)** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing and $\rho$ be the Gibbs measure for a potential $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$. There are constants $c > 0, \beta \in (0, 1)$ such that for any two cylinders $C = C(\omega_{[0,s]})$ and $D = C(\omega_{[0,r]})$ we have

$$|\rho(C \cap \sigma^{-n}D) - \rho(C)\rho(D)| \leq c\rho(C)\rho(D)\beta^{n-s}$$

(2.45)

Note that $n - s$ is the gap between the intervals on which the cylinders $C$ and $\sigma^{-n}D$ are based.

**Proof.** It is enough to work in $\Sigma_A^+$ and prove the theorem for $C = C^+(\omega_{[0,s]})$ and $D = C^+(\omega_{[0,r]})$. First, we have

$$\rho(C \cap \sigma^{-n}D) = \rho(\chi_C \cdot (\chi_D \circ \sigma^n))$$

$$= \nu(h\chi_C \cdot (\chi_D \circ \sigma^n))$$

$$= \lambda^{-n}\mathcal{L}^n\nu(h\chi_C \cdot (\chi_D \circ \sigma^n))$$

$$= \nu(\lambda^{-n}\mathcal{L}^n(h\chi_C \cdot (\chi_D \circ \sigma^n)))$$

$$= \nu(\lambda^{-n}\mathcal{L}^n(h\chi_C \cdot \chi_D))$$
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At the last step we used Remark 2.14. Now
\[
|\rho(C \cap \sigma^{-n}D) - \rho(C)\rho(D)| = |\rho(C \cap \sigma^{-n}D) - \nu(h\chi_C)\nu(h\chi_D)|
\]
\[
= |\nu((\lambda^{-n}\mathcal{L}^n(h\chi_C) - \nu(h\chi_C)h)\chi_D)|
\]
\[
\leq ||\lambda^{-n}\mathcal{L}^n(h\chi_C) - \nu(h\chi_C)h|| \cdot \nu(h\chi_D)
\]
We now apply the crucial Claim 7 in the proof of Theorem 2.24 to the function \(\chi_C \in \mathcal{FR}_s(\Sigma_A^+)\) and get
\[
||\lambda^{-n}\mathcal{L}^n(h\chi_C) - \nu(h\chi_C)h|| \leq c\rho(C)\beta^{n-s}
\]
Note that \(\nu(h\chi_D) \leq (\min h)^{-1} \rho(D)\). Therefore,
\[
|\rho(C \cap \sigma^{-n}D) - \rho(C)\rho(D)| \leq c'\rho(C)\rho(D)\beta^{n-s}
\]
with \(c' = cK\), because \(\min h \geq K^{-1}\). \(\square\)

**Corollary 2.28** Every Gibbs measure \(\rho\) is mixing.

A dynamical system is said to be Bernoulli if it is isomorphic to a Bernoulli shift. The Bernoulli property is the highest one in the hierarchy of ergodic properties, it implies mixing of any order and K-mixing.

**Theorem 2.29 (Bernoulli property)** Let \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) be mixing. Then for any potential \(\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)\) the Gibbs measure \(\rho_\varphi\) is Bernoulli.

**Proof.** Two finite or countable partitions \(\xi, \eta\) of \(\Sigma_A\) are said to be \(\varepsilon\)-independent if
\[
\sum_{A \in \xi, B \in \eta} |\rho(A \cap B) - \rho(A)\rho(B)| \leq \varepsilon
\]
A partition \(\xi\) is said to be *weak Bernoulli* (for \(\sigma\) and \(\rho\)) if for any \(\varepsilon > 0\) there is an \(N \geq 1\) such that the partitions \(\xi \vee \sigma^{-1}\xi \vee \cdots \vee \sigma^{-s}\xi\) and \(\sigma^{-n}\xi \vee \sigma^{-n-1}\xi \vee \cdots \vee \sigma^{-n-r}\xi\) are \(\varepsilon\)-independent for all \(s, r \geq 0\) and \(n \geq s + N\). A theorem by Friedman and Ornstein [30] asserts that if there exists a weak Bernoulli, generating partition \(\xi\), then the dynamical system is Bernoulli, cf. also [78].

In our case, the partition \(\xi\) into cylinders \(C(i) = \{\omega \in \Sigma_A : \omega_0 = i\}\) is a generating one. Theorem 2.27 immediately implies that the partitions
\(\xi \lor \sigma^{-1}\xi \lor \cdots \lor \sigma^{-s}\xi\) and \(\sigma^{-n}\xi \lor \sigma^{-n-1}\xi \lor \cdots \lor \sigma^{-n-r}\xi\) are \((c\beta^{n-s})\)-independent, hence \(\xi\) is weak Bernoulli.

**Statistical properties.** Let \(T : M \to M\) be a dynamical system preserving a probability measure \(\nu\) and \(f : M \to \mathbb{R}\) a measurable function. Then the sequence \(\xi_n = f \circ T^n\) is a stationary stochastic process defined on the probability space \((M, \nu)\) (its stationarity follows from the invariance of the measure \(\nu\)). Many basic results of probability theory can be carried over to stochastic processes generated by dynamical systems. The two most important ones are the asymptotics of the correlation function

\[ C_f(n) = \nu(f \cdot (f \circ T^n)) - [\nu(f)]^2 \quad (2.46) \]

and the central limit theorem

\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \nu \left\{ \frac{S_n f(x) - n\nu(f)}{\sqrt{n}} < z \right\} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_f} \int_{-\infty}^{z} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_f^2}} dx \quad (2.47) \]

for all \(-\infty < z < \infty\). Here \(S_n f(x) = f(x) + \cdots + f(T^{n-1}x)\) and \(\sigma_f \geq 0\) (in the case \(\sigma_f = 0\) the integral on the right equals 0 for \(z < 0\) and 1 for \(z > 0\)). The property (2.47) is equivalent, in the language of probability theory, to the convergence of \(n^{-1/2}(S_n f(x) - n\nu(f))\) in distribution to the normal random variable \(N(0, \sigma_f^2)\). Note that this property is a refinement of the Birkhoff ergodic theorem. It tells us that the typical deviations of the ergodic sum \(S_n f\) from its average value, \(n\nu(f)\), are of order \(\sqrt{n}\), and their distribution is asymptotically Gaussian. The variance \(\sigma_f^2\) is normally given by

\[ \sigma_f^2 = C_f(0) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} C_f(n) \quad (2.48) \]

Furthermore, in typical cases

\[ \sigma_f^2 = 0 \iff f(x) = g(x) - g(Tx) + K \quad (2.49) \]

for some \(g(x) \in L^2(M)\) and a constant \(K\) (such functions \(f\) are also called coboundary, compare to (2.31)). It is also common to study the asymptotics of more general correlation functions than (2.46):

\[ C_{f,g}(n) = \nu(f \cdot (g \circ T^n)) - \nu(f)\nu(g) \quad (2.50) \]
where $g : M \to \mathbb{R}$ is another measurable function. We know that $C_{f,g}(n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ for all $f,g \in L_2(M)$ if and only if the dynamical system $(M, T, \nu)$ is mixing, cf. 3.6.h in [44]. No degree of ergodicity (not even the Bernoulli property) can enforce any speed of convergence of $C_{f,g}(n)$ to zero for generic $L_2$-function $f,g$. Even for most chaotic dynamical systems (such as expanding interval maps or hyperbolic toral automorphisms) and generic continuous (!) functions $f,g$ the convergence of $C_{f,g}(n)$ to zero appears to be arbitrarily slow, and, furthermore, the central limit theorem (2.47) fails. To obtain affirmative results, one has to assume certain degree of smoothness for the functions $f,g$, such as Hölder continuity.

**Theorem 2.30 (Exponential decay of correlations)** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing and $\rho$ be the Gibbs measure for a potential $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_\varphi(\Sigma_A)$. For any $f,g \in \mathcal{H}_\varphi(\Sigma_A)$ we have

$$|\rho(f \cdot (g \circ \sigma^n)) - \rho(f)\rho(g)| \leq c_{f,g} \cdot \gamma^n$$

with some $c_{f,g} > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ that depends only on $\varphi$ and $\theta'$.

**Proof.** For $j \geq 1$ and any $f \in \mathcal{H}_\varphi(\Sigma_A)$, denote by $f_j$ the conditional expectation of $f$ on the partition of $\Sigma_A$ into cylinders $C(\omega_L), \Lambda = [-j,j]$. This means that $f_j \equiv \rho(f\chi_C)/\rho(\chi_C)$ on every cylinder $C$ in this partition. Then $f_j \in \mathcal{F}R_j(\Sigma_A), \rho(f_j) = \rho(f)$ and $||f - f_j|| \leq b_f \theta^j$. Applying the triangle inequality gives

$$|\rho(f \cdot (g \circ \sigma^n)) - \rho(f)\rho(g)| \leq |\rho(f_j \cdot (g_j \circ \sigma^n)) - \rho(f_j)\rho(g_j)| + 2b_f b_g \theta^j$$

Now $f_j$ and $g_j$ are constant on cylinders $C(\omega_L), \Lambda = [-j,j]$. A direct application of Theorem 2.27 then gives

$$|\rho(f_j \cdot (g_j \circ \sigma^n)) - \rho(f_j)\rho(g_j)| \leq c ||f|| ||g|| \beta^{n-2j}$$

Letting $j = [n/3]$ we get the result with $\gamma = \max\{(\theta')^{1/3}, \beta^{1/3}\}$. $\square$

**Theorem 2.31 (Central limit theorem)** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing and $\rho$ be the Gibbs measure for a potential $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$. For any $f \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$ the central limit theorem holds in the sense of (2.47)-(2.49).
There are several ways to prove this theorem, but they involve advanced methods of probability theory, such as martingales or characteristic functions and the continuity theorem. These are all beyond the scope of this survey, and we refer the reader to [64].

**Remark 2.20.** M. Denker extended [22] the central limit theorem from Hölder continuous functions to all functions $f \in L_2(\Sigma_A)$ such that

$$
\sum_{j\geq 0} \left( \rho(f - f_j)^2 \right)^{1/2} < \infty
$$

where $f_j$ is, as in the proof of Theorem 2.30, the conditional expectation of $f$ on the partition into cylinders $C(\omega|_{-j,j}) \subset \Sigma_A$. This class of functions is much larger than $\mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$. From Denker’s arguments, it seems rather unlikely that this class could be enlarged much further.

Many more advanced statistical properties have been proven for Gibbs measures: the local central limit theorem, the functional central limit theorem (the convergence to the Wiener process), the law of iterated logarithms, the renewal theorems, etc. These are all beyond the scope of this survey, and we refer the reader to [36, 59] for exact statements and proofs.

While all these statistical properties are similar to the classical limit theorems in probability theory, the following one is unusual, it is specific for Gibbs measures.

**Theorem 2.32 (Large deviations)** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing and $\rho$ be the Gibbs measure for a potential $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$. For any $f \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$ there is a real analytic strictly concave function $\eta(p)$ on an open interval $(p^*_1, p^*_2)$ such that for every interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$

$$
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \rho \left\{ \frac{1}{n} S_n f(x) \in I \right\} = \sup_{p \in I \cap (p^*_1, p^*_2)} \eta(p)
$$

provided $I \cap (p^*_1, p^*_2) \neq \emptyset$.

It is easy to see that the function $\eta(p)$ takes its maximum value $\eta(p) = 0$ at $p = \rho(f)$. In physics, the function $\eta(p)$ is called free energy. Note that if $f \sim \text{const}$ ($f$ cohomologous to a constant), then $|S_n f - n\rho(f)| \leq \text{const}$, and the above theorem degenerates to $p^*_1 = p^*_2$. 51
Both the central limit theorem 2.31 and the above theorem 2.32 describe the fluctuations of $S_n f$ around its mean value $\rho(S_n f) = n \rho(f)$. The difference is that the CLT applies when $S_n f - n \rho(f) = O(\sqrt{n})$ and 2.32 applies to much larger deviations, when $S_n f - n \rho(f) = O(n)$.

**Equilibrium states and Gibbs measures.** An important property of Gibbs measures is that they are (unique) *equilibrium states* for their potential functions. Let $\varphi \in C(\Sigma_A)$ and $P_\varphi$ denote the topological pressure of the function $\varphi$. The variational principle, cf. 4.4.d in [44], states that

$$P_\varphi = \sup_{\mu} [h_\mu(\sigma) + \mu(\varphi)] \quad (2.51)$$

where the supremum is taken over all $\sigma$-invariant measures $\mu$ on $\Sigma_A$. Here $h_\mu(\sigma)$ is the measure-theoretic entropy (also called Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy) of the measure $\mu$. Any measure $\mu$ which maximizes the right hand side of (2.51) is called an *equilibrium state* for the function $\varphi$.

**Theorem 2.33** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(\Sigma_A)$. Then the Gibbs measure $\rho_\varphi$ is the only equilibrium state for the function $\varphi$.

**Proof.** Theorem 2.18 immediately implies that $\rho$ is an equilibrium state. The uniqueness follows from a general theorem saying that equilibrium states are unique for expansive homeomorphisms of compact metric spaces provided they satisfy the so called specification property, see 4.4.f in [44]. The verification of the expansiveness and specification property is an easy exercise that we leave to the reader. Note that there is also a direct proof of the uniqueness, see Bowen’s book [11]. □

The topological pressure of the zero function $\varphi \equiv 0$ is the *topological entropy* of $\sigma$, i.e. $P_0 = h_{\text{top}}(\sigma)$, cf. 2.5.k in [44]. Then (2.51) becomes

$$P_0 = h_{\text{top}}(\sigma) = \sup_{\mu} h_\mu(\sigma) \quad (2.52)$$

Hence, the Gibbs measure $\rho_0$ for the potential $\varphi \equiv 0$ is the only measure of maximal entropy for the TMC $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$. We have seen in Example 2.8 that the measure $\rho_0$ is a Markov measure, called also the Parry measure.

**Remark 2.21.** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing and $\lambda_A > 0$ the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $A$. Then $h_{\text{top}}(\sigma) = \ln \lambda_A$. Indeed, one can use the explicit
description of the measure $\rho_0$ in Examples 2.7 and 2.8, and a remark about $\lambda$ in Example 2.8.

The Parry measure $\rho_0$ is, in a sense, the most “chaotic” invariant measure on $\Sigma_A$, if one takes the entropy as the measure of chaoticity. Its other important property is that it describes the distribution of periodic points in $\Sigma_A$, as we see below.

**Statistics of periodic orbits.** Consider
\[
\text{Fix}(\sigma^n, \Sigma_A) = \{ \omega \in \Sigma_A : \sigma^n \omega = \omega \}
\]
the set of periodic points of period $n$ in $\Sigma_A$. Each point $\omega \in \text{Fix}(\sigma^n, \Sigma_A)$ is, of course, a periodic symbolic sequence with period $n$. The number of such sequences starting with $\omega_0 = i$ coincides with the number of allowable words of length $n + 1$ such that $\omega_0 = \omega_{n+1} = i$. One can easily see that this number is equal to the $i$-th diagonal entry of the matrix $A^n$. Hence, the total number of periodic sequences of period $n$ is

\[
\text{Per}_n(\Sigma_A) := \text{Card}[\text{Fix}(\sigma^n, \Sigma_A)] = \text{tr} A^n
\]

Then we have a simple and exact formula
\[
\text{Per}_n(\Sigma_A) = \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i^n
\]
where $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m$ are all the eigenvalues of $A$. (Note that for a typical matrix $A$, the eigenvalues are irrational or even complex, still the above sum is a nonnegative integer for each $n$.) Asymptotically, of course, $\text{Per}_n(\Sigma_A) = \lambda_1^n + O(|\lambda'|^n)$, where $\lambda'$ is the second largest (in absolute value) eigenvalue of $A$.

The complete information about the sequence $\{\text{Per}_n(\Sigma_A)\}$ is encoded in the so-called *dynamical zeta-function*
\[
\zeta(z) = \exp \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{z^n}{n} \text{Per}_n(\Sigma_A)
\]
(similarly, the dynamical zeta-function can be defined for continuous time dynamical systems, see 2.5.d in [44]). It easily follows from (2.53) that
\[
\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{\det(I - zA)}
\]
so that the zeta-function $\zeta(z)$ is rational on $\mathbb{C}$ and analytic in the open disc $|z| < 1/\lambda_+$. 

For the proofs of the following two theorems we refer the reader to [68], see also Theorem 20.3.7 in [43].

**Theorem 2.34** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing and $\rho_0$ the (unique) measure of maximal entropy, i.e. the Parry measure. For any $B \subset \Sigma_A$, let $\text{Per}_n(B)$ denote the number of periodic points of period $n$ contained in $B$. If $\rho_0(\partial B) = 0$, then

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\text{Per}_n(B)}{\text{Per}_n(\Sigma_A)} = \rho_0(B)$$

(2.55)

(in particular, this holds if $B$ is any cylinder, in this case $\partial B = \emptyset$).

This theorem allows us to approximate the measure $\rho_0$ by finite measures supported on periodic orbits. Let $\nu_n$ be a finite atomic measure that assigns equal weights, $1/\text{Per}_n(\Sigma_A)$ to each periodic point $x \in \text{Fix}(\sigma^n, \Sigma_A)$. Then the measure $\nu_n$ weakly converges to $\rho_0$, as $n \to \infty$. (This is exactly what the above proposition states!) Note that every measure $\nu_n$ has zero entropy, while $h_{\rho_0}(\sigma) = \ln \lambda_+ > 0$, so the entropy is not continuous on the space of invariant measures. It is, however, upper-semicontinuous.

It is possible to approximate any Gibbs measure $\rho_\varphi$ on $\Sigma_A$ in a similar way, by finite atomic measures on periodic orbits. One only has to assign weights properly.

**Theorem 2.35** Let $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$ be mixing and $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$ a Hölder continuous function. For $n \geq 1$, let $\nu_n$ be the finite atomic measure concentrated on $\text{Fix}(\sigma^n, \Sigma_A)$ that assigns weight

$$\nu_n(\omega) = Z^{-1} \exp \left[ \varphi(\omega) + \cdots + \varphi(\sigma^{n-1}\omega) \right]$$

(2.56)

to each point $\omega \in \text{Fix}(\sigma^n, \Sigma_A)$ (here $Z$ is the normalizing factor). Then $\nu_n$ weakly converges to $\rho_\varphi$, as $n \to \infty$.

Note that Theorem 2.34 is a particular case of 2.35, since for $\varphi \equiv 0$ we have $\nu_n(\omega) = Z^{-1} = 1/\text{Per}_n(\Sigma_A)$ in (2.56).

**A few additional properties.** We have seen that Gibbs measures are positive on all cylinders in $\Sigma_+$. In fact, there is an exponential lower bound

$$\rho(C) \geq c_1 \theta_1^n$$
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for every cylinder $C = C(\omega_{[0,n]}) \subset \Sigma_A$, where $c_1 > 0$ and $\theta_1 \in (0,1)$ only depend on $\rho$ (cf. Remark 2.16). Furthermore, if $C' = C(\omega_{[-p,n+q]}) \subset C = C(\omega_{[0,n]})$ with some $p, q \geq 0$, then

$$\rho(C') \geq c_1 \theta_1^{p+q} \rho(C)$$

There are similar exponential upper bounds:

$$\rho(C) \leq c_2 \theta_2^n$$

and

$$\rho(C') \leq c_2 \theta_2^{n+q} \rho(C)$$

in the same notation, with some $c_2 > 0$ and $\theta_2 \in (0,1)$ only depending on $\rho$. These bounds can be obtained with the help of normalized potentials, see Remark 2.18, we leave the proofs to the reader.

Based on the above bounds, for any two Gibbs measures $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$, there are $c > 1$ and $a > 1$ such that for all cylinders $C \subset \Sigma_A$

$$c^{-1}[\rho_1(C)]^a \leq \rho_2(C) \leq c[\rho_1(C)]^{1/a}$$

Hence, even though distinct Gibbs measures are mutually singular, their mutual singularity is under certain control.

Another useful property of Gibbs measures is their almost direct product structure. Fix an $\omega \in \Sigma_A$. Let $\Lambda = [n', n'']$ be an interval in $\mathbb{Z}$ and $C = C(\omega|_\Lambda) \subset \Sigma_A$ a cylinder. Clearly, $C$ has a topological product structure: $C = C^+ \times C^-$, where $C^+ = C(\omega|_{(-\infty, n'']})$ and $C^- = C(\omega|_{n', \infty})$. Now, for any Gibbs measure $\rho$ there are two Borel probability measures $\rho^\pm$ defined on $C^\pm$, respectively, such that

$$\left| \frac{1}{\rho(C)} \cdot \frac{d\rho}{d(\rho^+ \times \rho^-)} - 1 \right| \leq c \theta^{n'' - n'}$$

where $c > 0$ and $\theta < 1$ only depend on $\rho$. Note that $1/\rho(C)$ is just a normalizing factor, because $\rho(C) < 1$ and $[\rho^+ \times \rho^-](C) = 1$. This bound follows from the definition of Gibbs states through interactions, see more details in [39, 17].

Moreover, let $n' \to -\infty$, so that $C$ will shrink to $C^+$. Then the measure $\rho^+$ will weakly converge to a limit measure on $C^+$. This is the conditional measure induced by $\rho$ on $C^+$. Similarly, as $n'' \to \infty$, the measure $\rho^-$ will weakly converge to the conditional measure on $C^-$ induced by $\rho$. 
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3 Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen measures

We turn back to the smooth hyperbolic systems – Anosov diffeomorphisms $T : M \to M$ and Axiom A maps on basic sets $T : \Omega_r \to \Omega_r$ (as we remarked in Section 1, the latter includes compact locally maximal transitive hyperbolic sets of more general diffeomorphisms). We assume topological mixing for $T$ in all cases.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a Markov partition of $M$ (resp., $\Omega_r$). It produces a topological Markov chain $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$. Now let $\varphi : \Sigma_A \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function. It produces a Gibbs measure $\nu_\varphi$ on $\Sigma_A$. The projection of $\nu_\varphi$ under $\pi : \Sigma_A \to M$ is a $T$-invariant measure on $M$. First we check that this measure inherits the properties of the measure $\nu_\varphi$.

**Proposition 3.1** The projection $\pi : \Sigma_A \to M$ is $\nu_\varphi$-almost everywhere one-to-one. Hence, the ergodic and statistical properties of the measure $\nu_\varphi$ and those of its image on $M$ are the same.

**Proof.** Recall that $\pi^{-1}$ fails to be one-to-one on the subset $M^\# = \bigcup_n T^n(\partial \mathcal{R})$, where $\partial \mathcal{R} = \partial^s \mathcal{R} \cup \partial^u \mathcal{R}$. Now let $D^{u,s} = \pi^{-1}(\partial^{u,s} \mathcal{R})$. The sets $D^u, D^s$ are closed subsets of $\Sigma_A$ such that $\sigma(D^s) \subset D^s$ and $\sigma^{-1}(D^u) \subset D^u$ (this follows from the Markov property). Since the measure $\nu_\varphi$ is $\sigma$-invariant, we have $\nu_\varphi(\sigma D^s) = \nu_\varphi(D^s)$, i.e. the set $D^s$ is $\sigma$-invariant (mod 0). Since $\nu_\varphi$ is ergodic, then $D^s$ has measure 0 or 1. The latter is impossible since $D^s$ is nowhere dense, according to Remark 2.5. Similarly, $\nu_\varphi(D^u) = 0$, hence we have $\nu_\varphi(\pi^{-1}M^\#) = 0$. \qed

**Corollary 3.2** Let $\Sigma_A^s = \pi^{-1}(M \setminus M^\#)$. Then $\nu_\varphi(\Sigma_A^s) = 1$ for all Gibbs measures $\nu_\varphi$.

**Remark 3.1.** It is interesting that any $T$-invariant measure on $M$ (resp., $\Omega_r$) can be lifted to a (not necessarily unique) $\sigma$-invariant measure on $\Sigma_A$. The proof involves the Hahn-Banach theorem, i.e. is based on the Axiom of choice, see 4.3 in [11].

Now we have a class of $T$-invariant measures associated with Hölder continuous functions on $\Sigma_A$. It would be more natural to associate measures with functions on $M$ (or just $\Omega_r$) rather than with functions on $\Sigma_A$. 
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Let $\psi : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function. Then for any Markov partition $\mathcal{R}$ the function $\varphi = \psi \circ \pi$ is a Hölder continuous function on $\Sigma_A$ (its Hölder continuity follows by direct calculation based on the hyperbolicity of $T$, it is left as an exercise). Now one can associate the measure $\mu_\psi := \pi_* \rho_\varphi$ with the ‘potential’ function $\psi$ and the Markov partition $\mathcal{R}$.

**Proposition 3.3** The measure $\mu_\psi$ does not depend on the choice of the Markov partition $\mathcal{R}$. Moreover, $\mu_\psi$ is the unique equilibrium state for the function $\psi$, i.e. the unique measure on which the following supremum is attained

$$P_\psi = \sup_{\mu} (h_\mu(T) + \mu(\psi))$$

(3.1)

where the supremum is taken over all $T$-invariant measures on $\Omega_r$, $h_\mu(T)$ is the measure-theoretic entropy of the system $(\Omega_r, T, \mu)$ and $P_\psi$ is the topological pressure of the function $\psi$ with respect to the map $T : \Omega_r \to \Omega_r$.

The first claim follows from the second. The second basically follows from Theorem 2.33, with some little extra work. We refer the reader to [11], Sect. 4A.

**Definition.** The measure $\mu_\psi$ is called the Gibbs measure corresponding to the potential function $\psi$ on $M$ (resp. $\Omega_r$).

The following is a direct analogue of Theorem 2.23 and can be proved similarly:

**Proposition 3.4 (see [11])** Let $T$ be an Anosov diffeomorphism on $M$ or an Axiom A diffeomorphism restricted to a basic set $\Omega_r$. Let $\varphi, \psi$ be Hölder continuous on $M$, resp. $\Omega_r$. The following are equivalent:

(i) $\mu_\varphi = \mu_\psi$.

(ii) There is a Hölder continuous function $u$ on $M$, resp. $\Omega_r$, and a constant $K$ such that $\varphi - \psi = K + u \circ T - u$.

(iii) There is a constant $K$ such that $S_n \varphi(x) - S_n \psi(x) = nK$ whenever $T^n x = x$.

If these conditions hold, then $K = P_\varphi - P_\psi$.

One can now see that there are uncountably many Gibbs measures for any Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphism. There is one special measure,
however, associated with the the Riemannian volume on the manifold \( M \), on which we concentrate next.

**The function \( \varphi^u \).** Let \( J_x^u \) be the Jacobian of the linear map

\[
DT : E^u_x \to E^u_{T_x}
\]

Since the map \( x \mapsto E^u_x \) is Hölder continuous (see 6.4.a in [44]) and the map \( E^u_x \to J_x^u \) is differentiable, then the function \( J_x^u \) is Hölder continuous. We denote by

\[
\mu^+ = \mu_{\varphi^u}
\]

the Gibbs measure for the potential \( \varphi^u = -\ln J_x^u \). It is called a \( u \)-Gibbs measure, now it is often referred to as *generalized Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen measure*. Below we study its properties.

We note that the measure \( \mu^+ \) and the value of \( P_x \varphi^u \) are independent of the choice of an equivalent Riemannian metric on \( M \). Indeed, for every periodic point \( x = T^n x \) the value of

\[
S_n \varphi^u(x) = -\ln \text{Jac}(DT^n : E^u_x \to E^u_{T^n x})
\]

does not depend on the metric, and then we can use Proposition 3.4. (Here Jac is the absolute value of the Jacobian determinant.)

The potential \( \varphi^u \) and the measure \( \mu^+ \) are intimately connected with the Riemannian volume \( \text{Vol}(\cdot) \) on the manifold \( M \). In particular, they can be used to estimate the volume of the so-called \((\varepsilon,n)\)-balls. For \( x \in \Omega_r \) let

\[
B_x(\varepsilon,n) = \{ y \in M : d(T^ix, T^iy) \leq \varepsilon \ \forall i \in [0,n) \}
\]

where \( d(\cdot, \cdot) \) is the Riemannian distance on \( M \). Also, let \( B(\varepsilon,n) = \cup_x B_x(\varepsilon,n) \), where the union is taken over \( x \in M \) (resp., \( x \in \Omega_r \)). We state a few technical lemmas without proofs.

**Lemma 3.5 (First volume lemma)** For any small \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there is a \( C_\varepsilon > 1 \) such that for all \( x \in M \)

\[
C_\varepsilon^{-1} \exp[S_n \varphi^u(x)] \leq \text{Vol} B_x(\varepsilon,n) \leq C_\varepsilon \exp[S_n \varphi^u(x)]
\]

We will denote this by

\[
\text{Vol} B_x(\varepsilon,n) \asymp_\varepsilon \exp[S_n \varphi^u(x)]
\]
Lemma 3.6 (Second volume lemma) For any small \( \varepsilon, \delta > 0 \) there is a \( C = C(\varepsilon, \delta) > 0 \) such that for all \( x \in \Omega_r \) and \( y \in B_x(\varepsilon, n) \)
\[
\text{Vol } B_y(\delta, n) \geq C \cdot \text{Vol } B_x(\varepsilon, n)
\]

Lemma 3.7 (Pressure) For small \( \varepsilon > 0 \), we have on any basic set \( \Omega_r \)
\[
P_{\varepsilon^u} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \text{Vol } B(\varepsilon, n) \leq 0
\]
In particular, for an Anosov diffeomorphism, \( B(\varepsilon, n) = M \) and \( P_{\varepsilon^u} = 0 \).

Corollary 3.8 Let \( T \) be an Anosov diffeomorphism, \( \mathcal{R} \) a Markov partition. For \( x \in M \) and \( i \geq 0 \), denote by \( R_{x,i} \in \mathcal{R} \) the rectangle containing \( T^i x \). Then
\[
\text{Vol } B_x(\varepsilon, n) \asymp_\varepsilon \mu^+ (R_{x,0} \cap T^{-1} R_{x,1} \cap \cdots \cap T^{-n+1} R_{x,n-1})
\]
This shows certain ‘equivalence’ of the volume on \( M \) and the measure \( \mu^+ \). In the above formula, \( \asymp_\varepsilon \) means that the ratio of the two quantities is bounded by some \( C_\varepsilon < \infty \).

The above lemmas can be proved by somewhat involved calculations, we refer the reader to [11]. Note that, by 3.7, \( P_{\varepsilon^u} \) is the exponential rate of decrease of the volume of \( B(\varepsilon, n) \), i.e. the exponential rate of ‘escape’ of the mass from the vicinity of the basic set \( \Omega_r \).

Attractors. The measure \( \mu^+ \) has especially remarkable properties for Anosov diffeomorphisms and Axiom A attractors. By definition, an Axiom A basic set \( \Omega_r \) is an attractor if there is an open set \( U \ni X_r \) such that \( \cap_{n \geq 0} T^n U = X_r \). Equivalently, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is an open neighborhood \( U \ni \Omega_r \) such that \( U \subset B_\varepsilon(X_r) \) and \( TU \subset U \). Here we denote by \( B_\varepsilon(x) \) an open ball of radius \( \varepsilon > 0 \) centered at \( x \in M \) and set \( B_\varepsilon(X) = \cup_{x \in X} B_\varepsilon(x) \) for \( X \subset M \).

Before we study Axiom A attractors, we prove some related properties. We set \( W^u_\varepsilon(x) = W^u(x) \cap B_\varepsilon(x) \). We agree to use the so-called Lyapunov (or adapted) metric in \( M \), see [11] and 6.4.a in [44]. In particular, \( TW^u_\varepsilon(x) \subset W^p_\varepsilon(Tx) \), etc.

Lemma 3.9 Let \( \Omega_r \) be a basic set. There is an \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that \( \cap_{n = -\infty}^{\infty} T^n B_\varepsilon(\Omega_r) = \Omega_r \).
Proof. Let \( y \in \bigcap_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^n B_\varepsilon(\Omega_r) \). For \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \), pick an \( x_n \in \Omega_r \) so that \( d(x_n, T^n y) < \varepsilon \). Recall that the shadowing lemma says that every \( \alpha \)-pseudo-orbit is \( \beta \)-shadowed by an orbit, cf. 6.6.c in [44]. If \( \varepsilon \) is small, then \( \{x_n\} \) is an \( \alpha \)-pseudo-orbit that is \( \beta \)-shadowed by an orbit \( \{T^n x\} \) in \( \Omega_r \). Now, \( d(T^n y, T^n x) < \varepsilon + \beta \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \), hence \( y = x \). □

Similarly, there is an \( \varepsilon > 0 \) such that \( \bigcap_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^n B_\varepsilon(\Omega) = \Omega \) for the entire set of nonwandering points. The open set \( B_\varepsilon(\Omega) \) is called a fundamental neighborhood of \( \Omega \).

Let
\[
W^s(\Omega_r) = \{ y \in M : d(T^n y, \Omega_r) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty \}
\]
\[
W^u(\Omega_r) = \{ y \in M : d(T^{-n} y, \Omega_r) \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty \}
\]
Using the definition of nonwandering set it is easy to check that \( T^n x \to \Omega \) and \( T^{-n} x \to \Omega \) as \( n \to \infty \) for every \( x \in M \). As \( \Omega = \bigcup \Omega_r \) is a disjoint union of basic sets, then
\[
M = \bigcup_r W^s(\Omega_r) = \bigcup_r W^u(\Omega_r)
\]
and these are disjoint unions.

**Lemma 3.10** We have
\[
W^{u,s}(\Omega_r) = \bigcup_{x \in \Omega_r} W^{u,s}(x)
\]
For \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there is a neighborhood \( U_r \) of \( \Omega_r \) such that
\[
\bigcap_{n \geq 0} T^{-n} U_r \subset W^s_\varepsilon(\Omega_r) := \bigcup_{x \in \Omega_r} W^s_\varepsilon(x)
\]
\[
\bigcap_{n \geq 0} T^n U_r \subset W^u_\varepsilon(\Omega_r) := \bigcup_{x \in \Omega_r} W^u_\varepsilon(x)
\]
**Proof.** Just like in the previous proof, let \( T^n y \to \Omega_r \), i.e. \( d(T^n y, \Omega_r) < \varepsilon \) for all \( n \geq N \). Pick \( x_n \in \Omega_r \) so that \( d(x_n, T^n y) < \varepsilon \) for \( n \geq N \). For \( n < N \), let \( x_n = T^{n-N} x_N \). Then \( \{x_n\} \) is a pseudo-orbit shadowed by an orbit \( \{T^n x\} \), and then \( y \in W^s(x) \). □

**Lemma 3.11** A basic set \( \Omega_r \) is an attractor if and only if \( \Omega_r = \bigcup_{x \in \Omega_r} W^u(x) \), i.e. \( \Omega_r \) is a union of (global) unstable manifolds of its points.
Proof. If $\Omega_r$ is an attractor, then for every $x \in \Omega_r$ the subset $W^u(x) \cap \Omega_r$ is both open and closed in the interior topology of $W^u(x)$ induced by the Riemannian metric on $W^u(x)$. The closedness follows from that of $\Omega_r$. The openness follows from the definition of attractor and Lemma 3.9. Hence, $W^u(x) \subset \Omega_r$.

Conversely, if $W^u(x) \subset \Omega_r$ for all $x \in \Omega_r$, then obviously the set $U = \bigcup_{y \in \Omega_r} W^s(y)$ is an open neighborhood of $\Omega_r$, and $TU \subset U$. □

Lemma 3.12 (i) If $W^u_\varepsilon(x) \subset \Omega_r$ for some $x \in \Omega_r$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\Omega_r$ is an attractor.
(ii) If $\Omega_r$ is not an attractor, then there is a $\delta > 0$ such that for every $x \in \Omega_r$ there is a $y \in W^u_\varepsilon(x)$ with $d(y, \Omega_r) > \delta$ (i.e., every unstable manifold of size $\varepsilon$ ‘sticks out’ of $\Omega_r$ by at least $\delta$).

Proof. Let $W^u_\varepsilon(x) \subset \Omega_r$. Obviously, $W^u_\varepsilon(T^n x) \subset \Omega_r$ for all $n \geq 0$. It is enough to prove that $W^u_{\varepsilon/4}(y) \subset \Omega_r$ for all $y \in \Omega_r$. For each $n \geq 0$, due to the local hyperbolic product structure in $\Omega_r$, there is a small ball $B_\delta(T^n x)$ with $\delta \ll \varepsilon$ about $T^n x$ such that for all $y \in B_\delta(T^n x) \cap \Omega_r$ we have $W^u_{\varepsilon/2}(y) \subset \Omega_r$. If the semiorbit $\{T^n x\}_0^\infty$ is dense in $\Omega_r$, we are done. If not, there is a point $y \in B(x)\Omega_r$ with a dense future semiorbit, and we apply the same argument to it.

To prove (ii), assume that for every $\delta = n^{-1}$ there is an $x_n \in \Omega_r$ such that $W^u_\varepsilon(x_n) \cap \Omega_r$ is $n^{-1}$-dense in $W^u_\varepsilon(x_n)$. Take a limit point $x_{nk} \to x \in \Omega_r$ and get $W^u_\varepsilon(x) \subset \Omega_r$, then apply (i). □

The following theorem describes attractors in terms of the measure $\mu^+$:

Theorem 3.13 Let $\Omega_r$ be a basic set. The following are equivalent:
(a) $\Omega_r$ is an attractor
(b) $\text{Vol}(W^s(\Omega_r)) > 0$
(c) $P_{\varphi^n} = 0$ and $h_{\mu^+}(T) = -\mu^+(\varphi^n)$, with respect to $T : \Omega_r \to \Omega_r$.

Proof. The implication (a)⇒(b) follows from Lemma 3.11. The implication (b)⇒(c) follows from Lemma 3.7 and (3.1). The proof of the implication (c)⇒(a) is based on the following observation: if $\Omega_r$ is not an attractor, then the mass escapes from any vicinity of $\Omega_r$ exponentially fast (due to part (ii) of Lemma 3.12), and so $P_{\varphi^n} < 0$ (Lemma 3.7). The exact argument involves
some calculations and the second volume lemma, and we omit it, see [11], Sect. 4B. □

Since $M = \bigcup_r W^s(\Omega_r)$, the previous theorem implies that the future semi-orbit of almost every point $x \in M$ (with respect to the Riemannian volume) approaches some attractor. For any attractor $\Omega_r$, the open set $W^s(\Omega_r)$ is called the \textit{basin of attraction}. We will see now that the measure $\mu^+$ on $\Omega_r$ describes the asymptotic distribution of the semi-orbits of points $x \in W^s(\Omega_r)$. Let $\delta_x$ be the $\delta$-measure concentrated at the point $x$, and

$$
\delta_{x,n} = \frac{1}{n}(\delta_x + \delta_{Tx} + \cdots + \delta_{T^{n-1}x})
$$

\textbf{Theorem 3.14} Let $\Omega_r$ be an attractor. For almost all points $x \in W^s(\Omega_r)$ in the basin of attraction (with respect to the Riemannian volume on $M$) the measure $\delta_{x,n}$ weakly converges to $\mu^+$ (one says in this case that $x$ is a $\mu^+$-generic point). In other words, for any continuous function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$
\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x) + f(Tx) + \cdots + f(T^{n-1}x)}{n} = \int f \, d\mu^+ \quad (3.2)
$$

We only outline the proof. It is enough to prove the theorem for a.e. $x \in W^s(\Omega_r)$, since the orbit of any other point $x$ will eventually come to $W^s(\Omega_r)$, and the preimages of sets of zero volume under $T$ are sets of zero volume. Next, since $\mu^+$ is an ergodic measure, the ergodic theorem guarantees the weak convergence of $\delta_{x,n}$ to $\mu^+$ for $\mu^+$-almost all $x \in W^s(\Omega_r)$. It remains to prove that the Riemannian volume is ‘similar enough’ to the measure $\mu^+$ within the set $W^u_\varepsilon$. This can be done with the help of First Volume Lemma 3.5, see also Corollary 3.8. The exact argument is quite involved, though, we refer the reader to [11], Sect. 4C.

\textbf{Corollary 3.15} Let $\nu$ be an absolutely continuous probability measure on the basin of attraction $W^s(\Omega_r)$. Then the measure $n^{-1}(\nu + T\nu + \cdots + T^{n-1}\nu)$ weakly converges to $\mu^+$.

\textbf{Remark 3.2.} In the case of topologically mixing basic sets $\Omega_r$, as well as Anosov diffeomorphisms, the measure $T^n\nu$ weakly converges to $\mu^+$. This can be proved based on two facts: (i) the ‘equivalence’ of the Lebesgue
volume and the measure $\mu^+$ proclaimed by Corollary 3.8 and (ii) the Bernoulli property of the measure $\mu^+$. We refer the reader to 5.3 in [13], where a similar statement was proved for Axiom A flows.

**Definition.** The measure $\mu^+$ on an Axiom A attractor or a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism is called a *Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen (SRB) measure*. (See also a more general definition of SRB measures in Section 6.)

The above theorem shows that the SRB measure $\mu^+$ is the only *physically observable* measure. In numerical experiments with physical models, one picks an initial point $x \in M$ at random (with respect to the volume, of course) and follows its orbit $T^nx$, $n \geq 0$. The identity between the time averages and space averages proclaimed by (3.2) is the basic property that characterizes physically meaningful measures, *steady states*, in statistical mechanics. Note that any absolutely continuous ergodic measure is physically observable.

**Lyapunov exponents.** Let $T : M \to M$ be a diffeomorphism. Oseledec’ theorem [54] implies that for any $T$-invariant probability measure $\mu$ and for $\mu$-almost every point $x \in M$ there are Lyapunov exponents $\lambda_1 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{\dim M}$ at $x$. They describe exponential expansion rates of tangent vectors for $\lambda_i > 0$, contraction rates for $\lambda_i < 0$. Zero exponents correspond to neutral vectors (neither expanding nor contracting exponentially). If $\mu$ is ergodic, then the Lyapunov spectrum $\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{\dim M}\}$ is the same at $\mu$-almost every $x \in M$.

In the case of Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms there are no zero Lyapunov exponents. All positive Lyapunov exponents correspond to unstable tangent vectors $v \in E^u_x$ and all negative Lyapunov exponents to stable tangent vectors $v \in E^s_x$. While different points may have different Lyapunov exponents (or no Lyapunov exponents at all), for every Gibbs measure $\mu$ the Lyapunov exponents exist almost everywhere, and are a.e. constant on $M$.

For an ergodic measure $\mu$, let

$$\Lambda^+_\mu = \Sigma^+ \lambda_i \quad \mu\text{-a.e.}$$

be the sum of positive Lyapunov exponents (which are $\mu$-almost everywhere constant). We need the following technical lemma whose proof is left to the reader.

**Lemma 3.16** For every ergodic measure $\mu$ of an Axiom A or Anosov diffeomorphism we have $\Lambda^+_\mu = -\mu(\varphi^\mu)$. 
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The variational principle (2.51) applies to the present context, cf. 4.4.d in [44], and so we get \( P_{\varphi^s} = \sup_\mu [h_\mu(T) - \Lambda^+_\mu] \). Now Lemma 3.7 and Theorem 3.13 imply

**Theorem 3.17** Let \( \Omega_r \) be a basic set and \( \mu \) an ergodic measure on \( \Omega_r \). Then \( h_\mu(T) \leq \Lambda^+_\mu \). We have

\[
h_\mu(T) = \Lambda^+_\mu
\]

(3.3)

if and only if \( \Omega_r \) is an attractor and \( \mu = \mu^+ \) the SRB measure.

Hence, the identity (3.3), known as Pesin’s formula, is another characteristic property of SRB measures.

**Smooth and SRB measures**. We discuss here Anosov diffeomorphisms that preserve a smooth measure. It follows immediately from Corollary 3.15 that if \( T \) preserves an absolutely continuous probability measure \( \nu \), then \( \nu = \mu^+ \) is the SRB measure.

**Theorem 3.18** Let \( T : M \to M \) be a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism. The following are equivalent:

(a) \( T \) preserves an absolutely continuous measure \( \mu \)
(b) \( T \) admits an invariant measure whose density is Hölder continuous
(c) for every periodic point \( x = T^n x \) the map \( DT^n : T_xM \to T_xM \) has determinant \( \pm 1 \), i.e. the volume is (locally) preserved along every periodic orbit.

**Proof.** Clearly, (b) implies (a). Assume that (a) holds, then \( \mu = \mu^+ \). Note that \( T^{-1} \) is also an Anosov diffeomorphism, with \( E^u_{x,T^{-1}} = E^s_{x,T} \). Consider the function \( \varphi^s(x) = \ln J_s^x \) where \( J_s^x \) is the Jacobian of the linear map \( DT : E^s_x \to E^s_{Tx} \). That function is cohomologous to the function \( \varphi^u_{T^{-1}}(x) \). Denote by \( \mu^- \) the Gibbs measure for the function \( \varphi^s \), it corresponds to the \( \mu^+ \) measure for \( T^{-1} \). Thus, \( \mu^+ = \mu = \mu^- \) and \( P_{\varphi^s} = 0 = P_{\varphi^u} \). By Proposition 3.4, for \( T^n x = x \) we have \( S_n \varphi^u(x) - S_n \varphi^s(x) = 0 \). Exponentiating gives (c).

Lastly, let (c) hold. Consider the smooth function \( \psi(x) = \ln \text{Jac}(DT : T_xM \to T_{Tx}M) \). Then for every periodic point \( T^n x = x \) we have \( S_n \psi(x) = 0 \). Proposition 3.4 implies that \( \psi = u \circ T - u \) for some Hölder continuous function \( u \) on \( M \). Then any measure whose density is proportional to \( e^{u(x)} \) is \( T \)-invariant.
Remark 3.3. In fact, the density of the invariant measure $\mu$ in the above theorem is $C^1$ rather than just Hölder continuous, see [51, 52].

Corollary 3.19 In the space of transitive $C^2$ Anosov diffeomorphisms, those without absolutely continuous invariant measures form an open dense subset.

Proof. To prove the corollary one needs the structural stability of Anosov diffeomorphisms: any $C^2$ perturbation $T_1$ of an Anosov diffeomorphism $T$ is also an Anosov diffeomorphism, whose trajectories are close to those of $T$, see [2, 43]. In particular, if $T^n x = x$, then there is a point $x_1$ close to $x$ such that $T_1^n x_1 = x_1$. Now, if $\text{Jac} DT^n(x) = 1$, then there is a small perturbation $T_1$ such that $\text{Jac} DT_1^n(x_1) \neq 1$, which proves the density claim. If $\text{Jac} DT^n(x) \neq 1$ for some $n \geq 1$ and $T^n x = x$, then for any small perturbation $T_1$ we have $\text{Jac} DT_1^n(x_1) \neq 1$. This proves the openness.

In some models of mathematical physics, smooth invariant measures correspond to the so called equilibrium states, which are usually established in classical Hamiltonian systems in the absence of external forces. On the contrary, small external forces or other perturbations of Hamiltonian equations of motion often destroy smooth invariant measures and create nonequilibrium dynamics. In that case natural measures describing the dynamics are those satisfying (3.2) for typical points $x$ in the phase space. Such measures are called nonequilibrium steady states. We have seen that for Anosov diffeomorphisms and Axiom A attractors without smooth invariant measures, nonequilibrium steady states are SRB measures.

Smoothness of SRB measures. The SRB measures have another remarkable property. Their conditional distributions on unstable manifolds are smooth with respect to the interior Lebesgue measure on those manifolds. This was first observed by Sinai for Anosov systems. He constructed invariant measures with smooth distributions on unstable manifolds in [74] and later proved that those measures are Gibbs measures with potential $\varphi^u$, i.e. SRB measures, see [76]. Sinai’s original proofs are quite involved, we outline a simpler but less rigorous argument.

Let $W^u \subset M$ be an unstable manifold and $\mathcal{R}$ a Markov partition. Take a rectangle $R \in \mathcal{R}$, a point $x \in W^u \cap R$ and consider $W^u_0 := W^u(x) \cap R$. Note that $W^u_0 = \text{int} \overline{W^u_0}$. The conditional measure induced by the SRB measure $\mu^+$ on $W^u_0$ (let us call that measure $\nu^u_0$) is the weak limit of the conditional
measures induced by $\mu^+$ on thin $u$-subrectangles of $R$ converging to $W_0^u$. The existence of that limit was shown in the end of Section 2.

Symbolically, $W_0^u$ corresponds to a one-sided sequence $\xi \in \Sigma_{(-\infty,0)}$. Then the measure $\nu_0^u$ on $W_0^u$ can be lifted to a measure on the ‘cylinder’ $C(\xi) = \pi_{(-\infty,0)}^{-1}(\xi) \subset \Sigma_A$, that new measure will be denoted by the same symbol, $\nu_0^u$. It is characterized by its values

$$\nu_0^u(C(\xi) \cap C(\omega[0,m])) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \mu^+(C(\xi[[-n,0]) \cap C(\omega[0,m]))/\mu^+(C(\xi[[-n,0]))$$

on subsets $C(\xi) \cap C(\omega[0,m])$ of $C(\xi)$. The Eq. (2.25) and the fact that, on attractors, $P_{\varphi^u} = 0$ imply that

$$\nu_0^u(C(\xi) \cap C(\omega[0,m])) \prec \exp [S_m\varphi^u(\omega)] \quad (3.4)$$

for an arbitrary $\omega \in C(\xi) \cap C(\omega[0,m])$. On the other hand, the set $T^m\pi(C(\xi) \cap C(\omega[0,m]))$ is a closed domain in the unstable manifold $W^u(T^mx)$ that stretches across some rectangle of the partition $R$. Hence, its Lebesgue volume is of order one. Recall that $\exp [S_m\varphi^u(\omega)] = 1/\text{Jac}(DT^m : E^u_x \to E^u_{T^mx})$ whenever $x = \pi(\omega)$, and the same holds for all points $x \in W_0^u$. Applying Remark 2.7 to get the uniformity in $x$, we arrive at

$$\text{Vol}^u(\pi(C(\xi) \cap C(\omega[0,m]))) \prec \exp [S_m\varphi^u(\omega)] \quad (3.5)$$

where $\text{Vol}^u$ is the interior Lebesgue volume on $W_0^u$. Comparing (3.4) and (3.5) shows that the measure $\nu_0^u$ on $W_0^u$ is equivalent to the Lebesgue volume.

**u-SRB measures.** One can actually compute the density of the measure $\nu_0^u$ with respect to the Lebesgue volume on $W_0^u$, let us denote it by $f_0(x)$. Let $\nu$ be any measure on $M$ equivalent to the Lebesgue volume. Its conditional distributions on unstable manifolds are continuous and have positive densities. Let $x, y \in W_0^u$. According to Corollary 3.15,

$$f_0(x)/f_0(y) = \lim_{n \to \infty} g_0(x) + \cdots + g_{n-1}(x)$$

where $g_i$ is the conditional density of the measure $T^i\nu$ on $W_0^u$. Clearly,

$$\frac{g_i(x)}{g_i(y)} = \frac{g(T^{-i}x)}{g(T^{-i}y)} \frac{J_{T^{i-1}y}}{J_{T^{i-1}x}} \cdots \frac{J_{T^{i-1}y}}{J_{T^{i-1}x}}$$

66
where \( g \) stands for the conditional density of the measure \( \nu \) on the corresponding unstable manifolds. Since the function \( J_u^x \) is uniformly smooth on unstable manifolds and the past trajectories \( \{ T^{-i}x \}, \{ T^{-i}y \} \) converge to each other exponentially as \( i \to \infty \), there is a limit

\[
F(x, y) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{J_u^{T^{-n}y} \cdots J_u^{T^{-1}y}}{J_u^{T^{-n}x} \cdots J_u^{T^{-1}x}} \tag{3.6}
\]

It then follows that \( f_0(x)/f_0(y) = F(x, y) \) for all \( x, y \in W_u^0 \). This, together with the normalization of the measure \( \nu_u^0 \), determines its density \( f_0 \) on \( W_u^0 \) completely.

**Remark 3.4.** It is easy to see from the above argument that the density \( f_0 \) is Lipschitz continuous. A more careful analysis shows that if \( T \) is \( C^r \), then actually \( f_0 \) is \( C^{r-1} \) smooth (at the same time the unstable and stable manifolds are as smooth as \( T \), i.e. \( C^r \)).

The formula (3.6) for smooth hyperbolic maps was first found by Anosov and Sinai [4].

**Definition.** Let \( W_u^a \) be a local unstable manifold, i.e. a compact domain on a global unstable manifold. Then the unique probability measure \( \nu_u^a \) on \( W_u^a \) whose density \( f(x) \) with respect to the induced Lebesgue volume on \( W_u^a \) satisfies the equation

\[
f(x)/f(y) = F(x, y) \quad \forall x, y \in W_u^a
\]

is called the \( u \)-SRB measure (on \( W_u^a \)).

## 4 Gibbs measures for Anosov and Axiom A flows

This section is devoted to hyperbolic systems with continuous time – flows. We will explain how the theory of Gibbs measures and particularly SRB measures extends to smooth hyperbolic flows. First we define appropriate classes of flows.

Let \( \varphi^t : M \to M \) be a \( C^2 \) smooth flow on a \( C^\infty \) smooth compact Riemannian manifold \( M \). This means that the trajectories of \( \varphi^t \) are defined by
ordinary differential equations $d\varphi^t/dt = v(x)$, where $v(x)$ is a $C^2$ vector field on $M$. Fixed points of $\varphi^t$ correspond to zeroes of the field $v$.

A $\varphi^t$-invariant subset $X \subset M$ without fixed points is said to be (uniformly) hyperbolic if for all $x \in X$ there exists a $D\varphi^t$-invariant decomposition

$$T_x M = E_x^c \oplus E_x^u \oplus E_x^s$$

(4.1)
such that

(i) $E_x^c$ is a one-dimensional subspace spanned by the vector $v(x)$;
(ii) $\dim E_x^{u,s} \neq 0$ and there are $C > 0$ and $\lambda < 1$ such that

$$||D\varphi^t(w)|| \leq C\lambda^t ||w|| \quad \text{for } w \in E_x^s, \ t \geq 0$$

$$||D\varphi^{-t}(w)|| \leq C\lambda^t ||w|| \quad \text{for } w \in E_x^u, \ t \geq 0$$

There is always a metric on $M$ (called Lyapunov or adapted metric) in which $C = 1$, i.e. the above contraction of tangent vectors is monotone in time.

It is easy to see that the splitting (4.1) depends on $x$ continuously. The space $E_x^c$ depends on $x$ smoothly, but this is not true for $E_x^{u,s}$. In fact, just like for Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms, the spaces $E_x^{u,s}$ depend on $x$ Hölder continuously, see [3, 43]. Anosov [2] showed that $E_x^{u,s}$ may not be differentiable, even if $v(x)$ is real analytic. The original Anosov’s argument worked in high dimensions only, but later Plante [60] showed that $E_x^{u,s}$ were not necessarily differentiable even in the simplest case $\dim E_x^u = \dim E_x^s = 1$. In this last case, however, the two-dimensional families $E_x^u \oplus E_x^c$ and $E_x^s \oplus E_x^c$ are $C^1$ smooth, see [38] for more.

**Definition.** A flow $\varphi^t : M \to M$ is called an Anosov flow if the entire manifold $M$ is a uniformly hyperbolic set (in particular, the flow has no fixed points in $M$).

**Definition.** A flow $\varphi^t : M \to M$ satisfies Smale’s Axiom A if the set of nonwandering points $\Omega \subset M$ is a disjoint union $\Omega = X \cup F$, where $X$ is a closed uniformly hyperbolic set in which periodic orbits of the flow are dense, and $F$ is a finite set consisting of isolated hyperbolic fixed points.

**Theorem 4.1 (Smale’s spectral decomposition)** For an Axiom A flow, we have $X = X_1 \cup \cdots \cup X_m$, where $X_i$ are disjoint closed $\varphi^t$-invariant subsets such that

68
(a) the flow $\varphi^t : X_i \to X_i$ is transitive (i.e. there is a dense orbit in each $X_i$);
(b) there is an open set $U_i \supset X_i$ such that $X_i = \cap_{t=-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi^t(U_i)$.

The sets $X_i$ are called the basic sets of the flow.

An Anosov flow is transitive if there is a dense orbit in $M$. In that case 4.1 implies that the entire manifold $M$ is a single basic set of the flow.

Recall that the transitivity of all Anosov diffeomorphisms is still an open problem at present, and we had to assume the transitivity for Anosov diffeomorphisms in Sections 1–3 to obtain reasonable results. The corresponding open problem for Anosov flows was solved by J. Franks and R. Williams in the late 70-s [29]: they found examples of nontransitive Anosov flows! So, they justifiably called such Anosov flows ‘anomalous’. To avoid such anomalies, we will always assume transitivity for Anosov flows discussed in this section.

Gibbs measures can be defined for Anosov and Axiom A flows. The constructions of Gibbs measures for these two classes of flows are almost identical, the two cases only differ in relatively minor technical details. For brevity, we often mention just Anosov flows, but everything goes through for Axiom A flows as well. Furthermore, compact locally maximal topologically transitive hyperbolic sets of any smooth flow have all the characteristic properties of Axiom A flow basic sets, so our constructions apply as well.

The first step in the construction of Gibbs measures is to define a version of Markov partitions and symbolic dynamics for Anosov flows.

**Markov sections.** For every $x \in M$ and $\delta > 0$ denote by $W^s_\delta(x)$ and $W^u_\delta(x)$ the local stable and unstable manifolds (of size $\delta$) through $x$. For small $\varepsilon > 0$, consider

$$W^{wu}(x) := \varphi[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon] W^u_\delta(x) \quad \text{and} \quad W^{ws}(x) := \varphi[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon] W^s_\delta(x)$$

the so called local weakly unstable and weakly stable manifolds, respectively. Here and further on we adopt Bowen’s notation

$$\varphi^{[a,b]} A := \cup_{a \leq t \leq b} \varphi^t A$$

for any $A \subset M$. Weakly unstable and stable manifolds have one extra dimension as compared to $W^u(x)$ and $W^s(x)$. The manifolds $W^u(x)$ and $W^s(x)$ are often called, accordingly, strongly unstable and stable manifolds.
A closed subset $R \subset M$ is called a rectangle if there is a small closed codimension one smooth disk $D \subset M$ transversal to the flow $\varphi^t$, such that $R \subset D$, and for any $x, y \in R$ the point 

$$[x, y]_R := D \cap W^{ws}(x) \cap W^{wu}(y)$$

exists and also belongs to $R$. A rectangle $R$ is said to be proper if $R = \overline{\text{int} R}$ in the internal topology of $D$. For any rectangle $R$ and $x \in R$ we put 

$$W^u(x, R) := R \cap W^{wu}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad W^s(x, R) := R \cap W^{ws}(x)$$

Then $R$ is a direct product of the sets $W^u(x, R)$ and $W^s(x, R)$ in the sense of the map $(y, z) \mapsto [y, z]_R$ for $y, z \in R$.

**Definition** (cf. [10]). A finite collection of closed sets $R = \{R_1, \ldots, R_m\}$ is said to be a proper family of size $\alpha > 0$ if

(i) $M = \varphi^{-\alpha, 0}(S)$, where $S = R_1 \cup \cdots \cup R_m$;

and there are disks $D_1, \ldots, D_m$ containing these sets such that for every $i$

(ii) $\text{diam} D_i < \alpha$;

(iii) $R_i = \overline{\text{int} R_i}$;

(iv) for any $i \neq j$ at least one of the two sets $D_i \cap \varphi^{[0,\alpha]} D_j$ and $D_j \cap \varphi^{[0,\alpha]} D_i$ is empty; in particular, $D_i \cap D_j = \emptyset$.

It follows from (i) that for any $x \in S$ there is a smallest positive return time $l(x)$ such that $\varphi^{l(x)}(x) \in S$. According to (i) and (iv), the function $l(x)$ is bounded from above and below: $0 < l_{\text{min}} \leq l(x) \leq l_{\text{max}} < \infty$. The set $S$ is called a cross-section of the flow $\varphi^t$. It generates the first return map on $S$ (Poincaré map) defined by $T(x) = \varphi^{l(x)}(x)$. Note that $T : S \to S$ is a one-to-one map. It is easy to check that the functions $l(x)$ and $T(x)$ are locally as smooth as the flow $\varphi^t$, i.e. of class $C^2$. They are not continuous globally on $S$; see below.

We note that $l(x)$ and $T(x)$ are smooth at all $x \in (\cup_i \text{int} R_i) \setminus \cup_i (T^{-1} \partial R_i)$. All the iterations of $T$ are continuous on the $T$-invariant set 

$$S^* = \{x \in S : T^k x \in \cup_{i=1}^m \text{int} R_i \ \text{for all} \ k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

**Definition** (cf. [10]). A proper family of sets $R = \{R_1, \ldots, R_m\}$ of a small size $\alpha$ is said to be a Markov section (or a Markov family), if

(i) every $R_i \in R$ is a (proper) rectangle;

(ii) we have the Markov property: if $x \in \text{int} R_i \cap T^{-1}(\text{int} R_j)$, then 

$$W^s(x, R_i) \subset T^{-1}(W^s(Tx, R_j)) \quad \text{and} \quad T(W^u(x, R_i)) \supset W^u(Tx, R_j)$$
Theorem 4.2 Any transitive Anosov flow \( \varphi^t : M \to M \) has Markov sections of arbitrary small size. The same is true for the restriction of an Axiom A flow to any basic set.

One can modify the construction of Markov partitions for Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms to prove this theorem. This was done by Bowen, and we refer the reader to his paper [10] for details.

We will explain next that the theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms, at least in its essential parts, applies to the map \( T : S \to S \).

Just like for Anosov diffeomorphisms, we introduce the following notation for flows. For any rectangle \( R \) put \( \partial R = \partial^s R \cup \partial^u R \), where \( \partial^s R = \bigcup_{x \in R} \partial W^s(x, R) \) and \( \partial^u R = \bigcup_{x \in R} \partial W^u(x, R) \). We put \( \partial^s S = \bigcup_i \partial^s R_i \) and \( \partial^u S = \bigcup_i \partial^u R_i \), then \( \partial S = \partial^u S \cup \partial^s S \). Now we have, as in (1.7), that \( T(\partial^s S) \subset \partial^s S \) and \( T^{-1}(\partial^u S) \subset \partial^u S \). Note that \( \partial S \cup T^{\pm 1} \partial S \) is a closed nowhere dense subset of \( S \), so the set \( S^* \) above is a residual set. The set \( S^* \) will be essential for us, while what happens in the complement \( S \setminus S^* \) will not be so essential, see Remark 4.1 below.

The cross-section \( S \) is now a submanifold of codimension one in \( M \), it is a finite union of connected submanifolds with boundary. The function \( l(x) \) and the Poincaré map \( T \) are piecewise smooth (of class at least \( C^2 \)) on \( S \). The discontinuities of \( l(x) \) and \( T \) are in \( T^{-1}(\partial^u S) \).

For every \( R_i \in \mathcal{R} \) and \( x \in R_i \) let \( E_x^{s,u} \) be the tangent planes to \( W_x^{s,u}(x, R_i) \), respectively. The splitting
\[
T_x S = E_x^s \oplus E_x^u
\]  
(4.2)
is \( DT \)-invariant and there are constants \( C_T > 0 \) and \( \lambda_T \in (0, 1) \) such that
\[
\|DT^n(v)\| \leq C_T \lambda_T^n \|v\| \quad \text{for } v \in E_x^s, \ n \geq 0
\]
\[
\|DT^{-n}(v)\| \leq C_T \lambda_T^n \|v\| \quad \text{for } v \in E_x^u, \ n \geq 0.
\]  
(4.3)
(at singular points \( x \in \partial S \cup T^{-1}(\partial^u S) \) a one-sided derivative \( DT \) can be used in (4.3)). The splitting (4.2) is Hölder continuous in \( x \), since so is the splitting (4.1). The sets \( W_x^{s,u}(x, R_i) \) are stable and unstable manifolds for \( T \), respectively.

It is important to note that the map \( T : S \to S \) is not exactly an Anosov diffeomorphism, since \( S \) is disconnected and has boundary, and \( T \) has singularities on \( S \cap T^{-1}(\partial^u S) \). Nonetheless, the restriction of \( T \) to the set \( S^* \)
behaves exactly like the restriction of an Anosov diffeomorphism \( T : M \to M \) to the essential set \( M \setminus M^\# \) defined in Section 1, cf. Theorem 1.3. Thus, the partition \( \mathcal{R} \) of \( S \) has all essential properties of a Markov partition for an Anosov diffeomorphism. Some minor technical differences can be easily taken care of, see also below.

**Symbolic dynamics.** The Markov partition \( \mathcal{R} \) of \( S \) produces a topological Markov chain \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\) with a transition matrix \( A \) of size \( m \times m \) defined by (1.8).

Some constructions of Section 1 have to be slightly modified, this concerns the boundary \( \partial S \), which looks and behaves differently from \( \partial \mathcal{R} \) in Sect. 1. In particular, the projection \( \pi : \Sigma_A \to S \) must now be defined as follows:

(i) for every \( x \in S^* \), let \( \omega = \{\omega_n\} \in \Sigma_A \) be defined by \( T^n x \in R_{\omega_n} \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \), then we set \( \pi(\omega) = x \). This defines \( \pi \) continuously on a dense residual subset

\[ \Sigma_A^* := \pi^{-1}S^* \subset \Sigma_A \]

(ii) on the set \( \Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_A^* \), the map \( \pi \) is simply extended by continuity.

**Lemma 4.3** (i) The map \( \pi \) is surjective and one-to-one on \( \Sigma_A^* = \pi^{-1}(S^*) \).

(ii) Also, \( \pi \) is Hölder continuous on \( \Sigma_A \) in any metric \( d_\alpha \), see Sect. 2. (iii) Lastly, \( \pi(\omega) = \bigcap_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} T^{-n}R_{\omega_n} \) for all \( \omega \in \Sigma_A^* \). (This does not necessarily hold for \( \omega \in \Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_A^* \).)

The proof is left as an exercise.

**Remark 4.1.** We have \( \rho(\Sigma_A^*) = 1 \) for every Gibbs measure \( \rho \) on \( \Sigma_A \) (recall Corollary 3.2).

The last remark indeed shows that the set \( S \setminus S^* \) is not so essential and can be neglected in measure-theoretic considerations.

**Remark 4.2.** The identity \( T \circ \pi = \pi \circ \sigma \) holds on \( \Sigma_A^* \) but may fail on \( \Sigma_A \setminus \Sigma_A^* \). However, it is possible to redefine slightly the function \( l(x) \) (and hence the map \( T(x) = \varphi^{l(x)}(x) \)) on \( \partial S \) so that the identity \( T \circ \pi = \pi \circ \sigma \) will hold on the entire set \( \Sigma_A \). This was observed by Bowen [10].

Since the flow \( \varphi^t : M \to M \) (or the restriction of \( \varphi^t \) to \( X_r \) in the Axiom A case) is topologically transitive, then the map \( T : S \to S \), and hence the TMC \((\Sigma_A, \sigma)\), are transitive as well. However, the TMC need not be mixing (even...
if the flow $\varphi^t$ is) for the reason being clear from the following argument. We claim that it is always possible to find a Markov section $\mathcal{R}$ that produces a mixing TMC $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$, even if the flow $\varphi^t$ is not topologically mixing. Indeed, let $\sigma$, and hence the map $T: \mathcal{S}^* \to \mathcal{S}^*$ be not topologically mixing. Then $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}^{(1)} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{S}^{(k)}$, with $\mathcal{S}^{(i)} \cap \mathcal{S}^{(j)} = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, and $T(\mathcal{S}^{(i)}) = \mathcal{S}^{(i+1)}$ (with $\mathcal{S}^{(k+1)} := \mathcal{S}^{(1)}$), and every $\mathcal{S}^{(i)}$ is a union of some rectangles of $\mathcal{R}$, and the map $T^k$ is mixing on $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$. Then we replace $\mathcal{S}$ by $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$, the function $l(x)$ by $l(x) + \cdots + l(T^{k-1}x)$ and the map $T$ by $T^k$. Now the new map $T$, and hence the corresponding TMC $(\Sigma_A, \sigma)$, are topologically mixing. The above trick was described by Bowen and Ruelle [13].

Now we define symbolic dynamics for the flow $\varphi^t$. Consider the function $\tau: \Sigma_A \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\tau(\omega) := l(\pi(\omega))$ on $\Sigma_A^*$ and extended by continuity to the entire set $\Sigma_A$. Since $l(x)$ is smooth at all $x \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and $\pi$ is H"older continuous, the function $\tau(x)$ is H"older continuous on $\Sigma_A^*$, hence also on $\Sigma_A$. It is also bounded above and below just because so is $l(x)$, i.e. $0 < l_{\min} \leq \tau(\omega) \leq l_{\max} < \infty$.

Note that $\varphi^{\tau(\omega)}\pi(\omega) = \pi(\sigma(\omega))$ for all $\omega \in \Sigma_A$. To check this, first consider $\omega \in \Sigma_A$ and then use the continuity of both $\tau$ and $\pi$.

**Definition.** We say that $\psi^t: Y \to Y$ is a suspension flow with the base transformation $\sigma: \Sigma_A \to \Sigma_A$ and the ceiling function $\tau(x)$, if

$$Y = \{ (\omega, s) : \omega \in \Sigma_A, 0 \leq s \leq \tau(\omega) \}$$

with identification of points $(\omega, \tau(\omega))$ and $(\sigma(\omega), 0)$, and $\psi^t$ acts as

$$\psi^t(\omega, s) = (\omega, s + t)$$

(with the above identification). Note that the space $Y$ is compact, and the flow $\psi^t$ is continuous.

Define a projection $\tilde{\pi}: Y \to M$ by

$$\tilde{\pi} : (\omega, s) \mapsto \varphi^s\pi(\omega)$$

The map $\tilde{\pi}$ is well defined on $Y$ for all $s$ due to the identification $(\omega, \tau(\omega)) = (\sigma(\omega), 0)$ and the identity $\varphi^{\tau(\omega)}\pi(\omega) = \pi(\sigma(\omega))$ proved above. One can verify by direct inspection that $\tilde{\pi}$ is continuous and surjective and commutes with our flows, i.e.

$$\varphi^t \circ \tilde{\pi} = \tilde{\pi} \circ \psi^t$$
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The suspension flow $\psi^t: Y \to Y$ is a symbolic representation of the flow $\varphi^t: M \to M$. It has many other nice properties that we will not need here. For example, it is at most $k$-to-one for some finite $k$, any orbit of $\psi^t$ is periodic if and only if so is its image under $\tilde{\pi}$, etc. We refer the reader to [10] for proofs of these and further properties.

**Gibbs measures.** First, we define Gibbs measures for the symbolic flow $\psi^t: Y \to Y$.

We start with an important observation: there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between $\psi^t$-invariant probability measures on $Y$ and $\sigma$-invariant probability measures on the base $\Sigma_A$. Let a measure $\nu$ on $\Sigma_A$ be $\sigma$-invariant and denote by $m$ the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$. Then the measure $\mu_\nu$ first defined by $\nu \times m$, then restricted to $Y$ and normalized, is $\varphi^t$-invariant (note that the identification $(\omega, \tau(\omega)) = (\sigma(\omega), 0)$ only affects a subset of $\mu_\nu$-measure zero). One can easily check that $\nu \mapsto \mu_\nu$ is a one-to-one correspondence between the space of $\sigma$-invariant probability measures, call it $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma_A)$, and that of $\psi^t$-invariant probability measures, call it $\mathcal{M}(Y)$. It is also easy to check that $\nu$ is ergodic if and only if so is $\mu_\nu$. This correspondence between $\mathcal{M}(\Sigma_A)$ and $\mathcal{M}(Y)$ will be very helpful.

Now, for any Hölder continuous function $g: \Sigma_A \to \mathbb{R}$ consider the Gibbs measure $\rho_g$ on $\Sigma_A$. By the above correspondence, $\rho_g$ produces a $\psi^t$-invariant measure, $\mu_{\rho_g}$, on $Y$. We can construct Gibbs measures on $Y$ in this way. It will be, however, more natural to associate Gibbs measures on $Y$ with functions on $Y$ rather than with functions on $\Sigma_A$.

**Definition.** Assume that the function $f: Y \to \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and the function

$$F(\omega) = \int_0^{\tau(\omega)} f(\omega, s) \, ds$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.4)

is Hölder continuous on $\Sigma_A$. Then the function

$$g(\omega) = F(\omega) - P_f \cdot \tau(\omega)$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.5)

is also Hölder continuous on $\Sigma_A$. Here $P_f$ is the topological pressure of the function $f$ for the flow $\psi^t$, cf. 2.5.k in [44]. Now, the measure $\mu_f := \mu_{\rho_g}$ is called the *Gibbs measure* for the flow $\psi^t$ associated with the potential $f$.

Note that the function $f(x)$ on $Y$ has to be converted into a potential $g(\omega)$ on $\Sigma_A$ by the rules (4.4)-(4.5) in order to define the measure $\mu_f$.  
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Theorem 4.4 (Equilibrium states)  
(i) The Gibbs measure $\mu_f$ is the unique equilibrium state for the function $f$, i.e. the unique measure on which the following supremum is attained:

$$P_f = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(Y)} \left( h_\mu(\psi^t) + \int_Y f \, d\mu \right)$$

(ii) The measure $\mu_f$ is ergodic and positive on every open set.

Proof. Recall that every measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(Y)$ is $\mu = \nu$ for some $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_A)$. Now

$$\int_Y f \, d\mu = \int_{\Sigma_A} F \, d\nu$$

and, according to Abramov’s formula [1],

$$h_\mu(\psi^t) = \frac{h_\nu(\sigma)}{\int_{\Sigma_A} \tau \, d\nu}$$

Therefore,

$$P_f = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(Y)} \left( h_\mu(\psi^t) + \int_Y f \, d\mu \right) = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_A)} \frac{h_\nu(\sigma) + \int_{\Sigma_A} F \, d\nu}{\int_{\Sigma_A} \tau \, d\nu}$$

This implies that

$$P_g = \sup_{\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\Sigma_A)} \left( h_\nu(\sigma) + \int_{\Sigma_A} (F - P_f \tau) \, d\nu \right) = 0$$

We know from Section 3 that the above supremum is attained on a unique measure, the Gibbs measure $\nu = \rho_g$. This proves (i). The properties of $\mu_f$ claimed in (ii) immediately follow from similar properties of the Gibbs measure $\rho_g$ on $\Sigma_A$. □

Theorem 4.5 For any Gibbs measure $\mu_f$ on $Y$ the projection $\tilde{\pi} : Y \to M$ is $\mu_f$-almost everywhere one-to-one. Therefore, the ergodic and statistical properties of the measure $\mu_f$ and its image $\tilde{\pi}_* \mu_f$ on $M$ are identical. In particular, the measure $\tilde{\pi}_* \mu_f$ is ergodic and positive on open subsets (of $M$ for Anosov flows and of $X_r$ for Axiom A flows).
The proof is based on Remark 4.1. See also a more direct proof in [13].

Let $p : M \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Hölder continuous function. Then the function $f = p \circ \tilde{\pi}$ is continuous on $Y$ and the function $F(\omega) = \int_0^\tau(\omega) f(\omega, s) \, ds$ is Hölder continuous on $\Sigma_A$. The Hölder continuity of $F$ follows by direct calculation based on the hyperbolicity of $\varphi^t$ and the Hölder continuity of $\tau(\omega)$. We leave it as an exercise, see also 3.3 in [13]. Now one can associate the measure

$$\mu_p := \tilde{\pi}_* \mu_f$$

with the potential function $p(x)$ and the Markov section $\mathcal{R}$.

**Proposition 4.6** The measure $\mu_p$ does not depend on the choice of the Markov section $\mathcal{R}$. Furthermore, $\mu_p$ is the unique equilibrium state for the function $p(x)$, i.e. the unique measure on which the following supremum is attained

$$P_p = \sup_{\mu} \left( h_\mu(\varphi^t) + \int_M p \, d\mu \right) \quad (4.6)$$

where the supremum is taken over all $\varphi^t$-invariant measures on $M$ and $P_p$ is the topological pressure of the function $p$ with respect to the flow $\varphi^t$.

This is a direct analogue of Proposition 3.3, and can be proved similarly, see details in [13].

**Remark 4.3.** It can be also shown that $P_p = P_f$ where $f = p \circ \tilde{\pi}$.

**Definition.** The measure $\mu_p$ is called the Gibbs measure for an Anosov (Axiom A) flow corresponding to the potential function $p(x)$ on $M$ (resp., $X_r$).

We emphasize the correspondence between the measures

$$\mu_p \text{ on } M \leftrightarrow \mu_f \text{ on } Y \leftrightarrow \rho_g \text{ on } \Sigma_A \quad (4.7)$$

with

$$f = p \circ \tilde{\pi} \quad \text{and} \quad g = \int_0^\tau f \, ds - P_f \cdot \tau$$

All the measures in (4.7) are Gibbs measures.

Let $p_1, p_2$ be two Hölder continuous functions on $M$, and $\mathcal{R}$ a Markov section. Obviously, the two Gibbs measures $\mu_{p_1}, \mu_{p_2}$ on $M$ coincide iff the measures $\mu_{f_1}$ and $\mu_{f_2}$ on $Y$ coincide, with $f_i = p_i \circ \tilde{\pi}$. The latter happens iff
the measures $\rho_{g_1}, \rho_{g_2}$ on $\Sigma_A$ coincide, with $g_i = \int_0^\tau f_i \, ds - \tau P f_i$. Those two are Gibbs measures on a mixing TMC, and we can apply Theorem 2.23. Thus, we arrive at the following criterion.

**Proposition 4.7** The two Gibbs measures $\mu_{\rho_i}$ and $\mu_{\rho_2}$ coincide if and only if for any (and thus for every) Markov section $\mathcal{R}$ the functions

$$G_1(x) = \int_0^{l(x)} p_1(\varphi^t x) \, dt - P_{\rho_1} l(x) \quad \text{and} \quad G_2(x) = \int_0^{l(x)} p_2(\varphi^t x) \, dt - P_{\rho_2} l(x)$$

are cohomologous on $S$, i.e.

$$G_1(x) - G_2(x) = u(Tx) - u(x)$$

for some Hölder continuous function $u(x)$ on $S$. (Note: there is no constant $K$ in the above cohomological equation, since $K = P_{G_1} - P_{G_2}$ and $P_{G_1} = P_{G_2} = 0$, see the proof of 4.4).

Hence, there are uncountably many Gibbs measures for any Anosov and Axiom A flow.

A critical reader may notice that our discussion starts repeating that in Section 3, in particular Propositions 3.3 and 3.4. The only difference is the object of the discussion – now it is flows rather than diffeomorphisms. Essentially, though, the situation is very much the same, and the rest of the Section 3 – the theory of SRB measures – carries over to flows with very few changes. Below we summarize the main results of this theory in the case of flows, emphasizing the differences and connection between flows and diffeomorphisms. We do not provide the proofs which differ little from those in Section 3, the reader can adapt them easily.

**The potential function $p^u$ and SRB measures.** Let $\Lambda^u_x(t)$ be the Jacobian of the linear map $D\varphi^t : E^u_x \to E^u_{\varphi^t x}$ and

$$p^u(x) = - \frac{d \ln \Lambda^u_x(t)}{dt} \bigg|_{t=0} = - \frac{d\Lambda^u_x(t)}{dt} \bigg|_{t=0}$$

Since the map $x \mapsto E^u_x$ is Hölder continuous and the map $E^u_x \to p^u(x)$ is differentiable, then the function $p^u(x)$ is Hölder continuous.

**Definition.** The Gibbs measure $\mu^+ = \mu_{p^u}$ is called a $u$-Gibbs or a generalized Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen measure for the flow $\varphi^t$. 77
Proposition 4.8. For any \( t > 0 \) we have \( \int_0^t p^\mu(\varphi^s x) \, ds = -\ln \Lambda^\mu_x(t) \).

The proof is left as an exercise.

**Attractors.** A basic set \( X_r \) of an Axiom A flow is called an attractor if there is an open neighborhood \( U \) of \( X_r \) such that \( \cap_{t > 0} \varphi^t U = X_r \). In particular, for transitive Anosov flows, the entire manifold \( M \) is an attractor.

A basic set \( X_r \) is an attractor if and only if \( X_r = \bigcup_{x \in X_r} W^u(x) \), i.e. \( X_r \) is the union of (global) unstable manifolds of its points. Equivalently, \( X_r = \bigcup_{x \in X_r} W^{uW}(x) \), i.e. \( X_r \) is the union of weakly unstable manifolds of its points. Furthermore, \( X_r \) is an attractor if \( W^s_x(x) \subset X_r \) for some \( x \in X_r \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \), i.e. \( X_r \) contains a small open ball of an unstable manifold.

Let \( W^s(X_r) = \{ y \in M : d(\varphi^t y, X_r) \to 0 \text{ as } t \to \infty \} \)

Then \( M = \cup_r W^s(X_r) \), and this is a disjoint union (here the hyperbolic fixed points \( x \in F \) are also considered as basic sets). It is also true that

\[
W^s(X_r) = \bigcup_{x \in X_r} W^s(x) = \bigcup_{x \in X_r} W^{uW}(x)
\]

The following are equivalent:

(a) \( X_r \) is an attractor
(b) \( \text{Vol} (W^s(X_r)) > 0 \)
(c) The set \( W^s(X_r) \) is open
(d) \( P^u = 0 \) with respect to the flow \( \varphi^t : X_r \to X_r \).

Let \( X_r \) be an attractor and \( R \) a Markov section in \( X_r \). We denote by \( J^u_x \) the absolute value of the Jacobian of the linear map \( DT : E^u_x \to E^u_{T^t x} \) and put \( \varphi^u(x) = -\ln J^u_x \) on \( S \). Consider the measure

\[
\rho^+ := \rho_{\varphi^u \circ \pi}
\]

on \( \Sigma_A \). In a sense, \( \rho^+ \) is the SRB measure for the map \( T : S \to S \) (which is not exactly an Axiom A attractor, but possesses all essential properties of Axiom A attractors as explained after Theorem 4.2).

**Proposition 4.9.** Let \( X_r \) be an attractor and \( R \) a Markov section in \( X_r \). The generalized SRB measure \( \mu^+ \) on \( X_r \) corresponds to the measure \( \rho^+ \), in the sense of (4.7). This also holds for transitive Anosov flows.
Proof. Proposition 4.8 implies that
\[ \int_0^{\tau(\omega)} f^u \circ \tilde{\pi}(s) \, ds = -\ln \Lambda^u_{\pi(\omega)}(\tau(\omega)) =: g^+(\omega) \]

Since \( P_p^u = P^u_{p \circ \tilde{\pi}} = 0 \) (cf. Remark 4.3), the measure \( \mu^+ \) corresponds to the Gibbs measure \( \rho^+ \) on \( \Sigma_A \). One can easily verify that the function \( g^+ \) is cohomologous to \( \varphi^u \circ \pi \) on \( \Sigma_A^* \). Hence, \( \rho^+ = \rho^+ \). \( \square \)

**Definition.** The measure \( \mu^+ \) on an attractor \( X_r \) of an Axiom A flow (respectively, on \( M \) for a transitive Anosov flow) is called the *Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen (SRB) measure*.

Since \( M = \bigcup_r W^s(X_r) \), the future semi-orbit of almost every point \( x \in M \) (with respect to the Riemannian volume) approaches some attractor. For any attractor \( X_r \), the open set \( W^s(X_r) \) is called the *basin of attraction*. The measure \( \mu^+ \) on the attractor \( X_r \) describes the asymptotic distribution of the semi-orbits of generic points \( x \in W^s(X_r) \) in the following sense. For almost every point \( x \in W^s(X_r) \) and any continuous function \( q : M \to \mathbb{R} \) we have
\[ \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T q(\varphi^t x) \, dt = \int q \, d\mu^+ \]  
(4.8)

Furthermore, if the restriction of the flow \( \varphi^t \) to \( X_r \) is topologically mixing, then for any absolutely continuous probability measure \( \nu \) on the basin of attraction \( W^s(X_r) \) the measure \( \varphi^t \nu \) weakly converges to \( \mu^+ \), see a proof in [13]. In that case \( \mu^+ \) is K-mixing and Bernoulli, see also Theorem 4.11 below.

In the sense of (4.8), the SRB measures on attractors are the only physically observable measures. Adopting physical terminology, one can call them steady states for Anosov and Axiom A flows.

**Anosov flows and SRB measures.** Let \( \varphi^t : M \to M \) be a transitive Anosov flow. If \( \varphi^t \) preserves an absolutely continuous probability measure \( \mu \), then certainly \( \mu = \mu^+ \). In this case the density of \( \mu \) with respect to the Riemannian volume is \( C^1 \) smooth. The Anosov flow \( \varphi^t \) preserves a smooth measure if and only if for every periodic orbit \( \varphi^t x = x \) (of period \( t \)) we have \( D\varphi^t(x) = 1 \), i.e. the volume is locally preserved along that orbit. In the space of transitive \( C^2 \) Anosov flows, those without absolutely continuous invariant measures form an open dense subset.
The SRB measures for Anosov flows and Axiom A attractors have smooth conditional distributions on unstable manifolds. For any local unstable manifold \( W^u \subset M \) (resp., \( W^u \subset X_r \)) the density \( f(x) \) of the conditional distribution of \( \mu^+ \) on \( W^u \) satisfies

\[
\frac{f(x)}{f(y)} = \lim_{t \to -\infty} \frac{\Lambda^u_x(t)}{\Lambda^u_y(t)}
\]

We can also call the unique probability measure on \( W^u \) satisfying the above condition the \( u \)-SRB measure on \( W^u \).

All the above properties can be proved in the same way as those of Anosov diffeomorphisms.

This concludes the extension of the results of Section 3 to hyperbolic flows.

**Mixing flows versus cycles.** There is a serious difference between hyperbolic flows and diffeomorphisms: some flows are not topologically mixing for one reason that is specific for flows, as illustrated below.

**Example 4.1.** Let \( T : M_1 \to M_1 \) be a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism and \( c > 0 \). Consider the suspension flow over the base \( M_1 \) under a constant ceiling function \( \tau(x) \equiv c \). It is defined on the compact space \( M = M_1 \times [0, c] \) with the usual identification of points \( (x, c) = (Tx, 0) \). The space \( M \) can be endowed with a metric in which it will be a smooth compact manifold without boundary, and the suspension flow \( \varphi^t \) will be Anosov. It is clearly transitive but not mixing. No \( \varphi^t \)-invariant measure can be mixing either. In the \( t \)-direction, the flow is just a circle rotation.

**Definition.** We call a smooth flow \( \varphi^t : M \to M \) a **cycle** if it admits a smooth cross-section with a constant return function. Cycles can never be topologically mixing.

**Example 4.2.** In Example 4.1, one can slightly refine the ceiling function, retaining the nontransitivity. Assume that \( \tau(x) \) takes values commensurate to a constant, i.e. \( \tau(x) = a n(x) \), where \( a > 0 \) is a constant and \( n(x) > 0 \) is an integer-valued function. In this case one can easily find another Markov section in \( M \) so that the suspension flow will again have a constant return function, so \( \varphi^t \) is a cycle.

**Remark 4.4.** Let a flow \( \varphi^t \) have a cross-section \( S \) with return function \( l(x) \) and the return map \( T(x) = \varphi^{l(x)}(x) \) on \( S \). Assume that \( l(x) = l_0(x) + u(Tx) -
$u(x)$, where $l_0$ is commensurate to a constant and $u(x)$ is a smooth function on $S$. Then $\varphi^t$ is a cycle. To show this, just consider new cross-section $S_1 = \{\varphi^{u(x)}(x) : x \in S\}$.

**Theorem 4.10 (Anosov alternative)** Let $\varphi^t : M \to M$ be a transitive Anosov flow. Then either
(i) $\varphi^t$ is a cycle, or
(ii) the global unstable manifold $W^u(x)$ and the global stable manifold $W^s(x)$ are both dense in $M$ for every $x \in M$. In this case the flow is topologically mixing.

The proof of this theorem involves topological considerations and resembles that of Smale’s spectral decomposition 4.1. We refer the reader to a well written Plante’s paper [60].

**Remark 4.5.** In the cycle case (i) above, for any Markov section $\mathcal{R}$ in $M$ the return function $l(x)$ on $S$ is cohomologous to a function whose values are commensurate to a constant. This follows from some general results by Gurevich [37] on suspension flows. So, Examples 4.1, 4.2 and Remark 4.4 essentially describe all types of cycles.

It is interesting to note that if an Anosov flow has two periodic orbits with incommensurate periods, then it is topologically mixing.

**Remark 4.6.** The property claimed in (ii) of Theorem 4.10 is often taken as a definition of topological mixing for Anosov flows.

**Geodesic flows.** There is a well studied class of Anosov flows. Every geodesic flow on a smooth compact connected Riemannian manifold with negative sectional curvatures is a topologically mixing Anosov flow. Hyperbolic properties of these geodesic flows were observed by Hopf [41], who also proved the ergodicity for these flows. Actually, motivated by that, Anosov introduced his class of flows, which he originally called C-flows, they are now called Anosov flows. Arnold proved [6, 7] that the above geodesic flows are always topologically mixing, see also Anosov [2]. In addition, they are K-mixing and Bernoulli with respect to the natural smooth invariant measures.

**Theorem 4.11 ([76, 53, 65])** Let $\varphi^t$ be a topologically mixing Anosov or Axiom A flow on a basic set $X_r$. Then every Gibbs measure $\mu_p$ on $M$ (resp., $X_r$) is mixing, K-mixing and Bernoulli.
Joint integrability. Let \( \varphi^t : M \to M \) be an Anosov flow. The spaces \( E^u_x, E^s_x \) are said to be jointly integrable if the family of hyperplanes \( E^u_x \oplus E^s_x \) in \( TM \) is integrable, i.e. if there is a \( C^1 \) foliation of \( M \) by codimension one submanifolds tangent to \( E^u_x \oplus E^s_x \). In this case every unstable and stable manifold wholly lies in one leaf of that foliation. Clearly, this is the case for cycles. Indeed, if \( S \) is a cross-section with a constant return function \( l(x) \), then all the hyperplanes \( E^u_x \oplus E^s_x \) are tangent to level surfaces \( l(x) = \text{const.} \).

A simple geometric construction can be used to detect the joint integrability of \( E^u_x, E^s_x \), see Fig. 3. Let \( x \in M \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Take a point \( y \in W^u_\varepsilon(x) \) and a point \( z \in W^s_\varepsilon(x) \), both at distance \( \varepsilon \) from \( x \). Consider

\[
y' = W^s_\delta(y) \cap W^{wu}_\delta(z) \quad \text{and} \quad z' = W^{ws}_\delta(y) \cap W^{wu}_\delta(z)
\]

If \( \delta > 2\varepsilon \), but small enough, each of the above intersections consists of one point. One can see that the points \( y', z' \) belong in the same orbit, i.e. \( z' = \varphi^\tau y' \) for some small \( \tau \). Clearly, for jointly integrable spaces \( E^u_x, E^s_x \) we have \( \tau \equiv 0 \) for all \( x \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \). As Plante showed for Anosov flows [60], if only \( \tau \equiv 0 \) in a small open set and all small \( \varepsilon > 0 \), then the flow \( \varphi^t \) is a cycle. On the other hand, if \( \tau \neq 0 \) for at least one \( x \), then \( \varphi^t \) is topological mixing. Thus, even local joint integrability of \( E^u_x, E^s_x \) is equivalent to the cycle property for Anosov flows (but not for Axiom A flows, see below).

The joint nonintegrability of stable and unstable subspaces for a geodesic flow on a manifold \( M_0 \) of negative sectional curvature can now be verified as follows. It is known that each unstable manifold \( W^u \) is a smooth strictly convex hypersurface in \( M_0 \) equipped with outward unit normal vectors. Likewise, each stable manifold \( W^s \) is a smooth strictly convex hypersurface in \( M_0 \) equipped with inward unit normal vectors. By using the convexity, one easily observes that \( \tau \neq 0 \) in a neighborhood of any point. It is interesting that a similar convexity argument works for some mechanical systems with hyperbolic behavior, in particular for dispersing billiards as was noted by Sinai.

Central Limit Theorem (CLT) for our flows says that for every Gibbs measure \( \mu \) and every Hölder continuous function \( q(x) \) on \( M \)

\[
\lim_{T \to \infty} \mu \left\{ \int_0^T q(\varphi^t x) \, dt - T \mu(q) \right\} < z \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi} \sigma_q} \int_{-\infty}^z e^{-x^2/(2\sigma_q^2)} \, dx \quad (4.9)
\]

for all \(-\infty < z < \infty\) and some constant \( \sigma_q \geq 0 \).
Figure 3: Joint nonintegrability of stable and unstable foliations.
It is interesting that the CLT holds for all hyperbolic flows, including cycles, it is even easier to prove in the case of cycles. Let $\varphi^t$ be a cycle and $\mathcal{S}$ a Markov section with a constant return function $l(x) \equiv c$. Then (4.9) easily reduces to the CLT for the Gibbs measure $\rho_g$ on $\mathcal{S}$ corresponding to $\mu$ and the Hölder continuous function $\int_0^c q(\varphi^t x) \, dt$ on $\mathcal{S}$. Note that the Gibbs measure $\mu$ is not even mixing in this case, still the CLT holds! Strangely enough, for mixing flows the proof of the CLT is somewhat more complicated. We refer the reader to [64].

**Decay of correlations.** Let $\varphi^t$ be an Anosov or Axiom A flow and $\mu$ a Gibbs measure. The correlation function for a Hölder continuous function $q(x)$ is defined by

$$C_q(t) = \mu(q \cdot (q \circ \varphi^t)) - [\mu(q)]^2$$

(4.10)

It is standard that $C_q(t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$ for all $q(x) \in L^2(\mu)$ if and only if the measure $\mu$ is mixing, or equivalently the flow $\varphi^t$ is topologically mixing. If $\varphi^t$ is a cycle, then $C_q(t)$ is easily seen to be a periodic function in $t$. In 1975 Bowen and Ruelle [13, 68] raised a question:

**What is the speed of convergence of $C_q(t)$ to zero for mixing Axiom A flows? Is it exponential in $t$?**

A negative answer was given by Ruelle [70] and strengthened by Pollicott [62] who found mixing Axiom A flows with correlations decaying arbitrarily slowly. Their example is quite instructive, we describe it next.

Consider the baker’s transformation $T(x, y)$ on the unit square $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ defined by $T(x, y) = (2x, y/2)$ for $x \leq 1/2$ and $T(x, y) = (2x - 1, (y + 1)/2)$ for $x > 1/2$. It has a finite Markov partition $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, R_2\}$ with $R_1 = [0, 1/2] \times [0, 1]$ and $R_2 = [1/2, 1] \times [0, 1]$. Since $T$ is only discontinuous on $\partial R_1 \cup \partial R_2$, the map $T$ has all the essential properties of Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms (the situation here is very similar to that for the return map on a Markov section of an Anosov flow, as we explained after Theorem 4.2). Now consider the ceiling function $l(x) \equiv 1$ on $R_1$ and $l(x) \equiv \alpha$ on $R_2$. Of course, for any rational $\alpha$ the suspension flow is a cycle. Pollicott showed that if $\alpha$ is irrational but allows good approximations by rationals, then the correlation function $C_q(t)$ will decrease as slowly as one wishes.

Note that the ceiling function $l(x)$ in the above example is locally constant, so locally (but not globally) the spaces $E^u_x, E^s_x$ are jointly integrable.
Hence, one can have local joint integrability for topologically mixing Axiom A flows (this is impossible for Anosov flows, as we said above).

Recall that local joint integrability of $E^u_x, E^s_x$ is characterized by $\tau = 0$, where $\tau$ is introduced in the construction illustrated on Fig. 3. It is unknown if Axiom A or Anosov flows with $\tau \neq 0$ have exponential decay of correlations. At least, by requiring a certain lower bound on $\tau/\varepsilon^2$ (again in terms of the construction shown on Fig. 3), one can ensure a rapid decay of correlations:

**Theorem 4.12 (Chernov [17])** Let $\varphi^t : M^3 \to M^3$ be an Anosov flow and $|\tau| \geq c\varepsilon^2$ where $c > 0$ is a constant, then $|C_q(t)| \leq C e^{-a t^{1/2}}$ with some constants $C > 0$ and $a > 0$ for the SRB measure $\mu = \mu^\tau$.

Alternatively, by requiring an extra smoothness of the flow $\varphi^t$ and the spaces $E^u_x, E^s_x$ (as functions of $x$) one can obtain even an exponential decay of correlations:

**Theorem 4.13 (Dolgopyat [26])** Let $\varphi^t : M \to M$ be a $C^{2+\varepsilon}$ mixing Anosov flow, for which the spaces $E^u_x, E^s_x$ are $C^1$ functions of $x$. Then $|C_q(t)| \leq C e^{-a t}$ with some constants $C > 0$ and $a > 0$ for the SRB measure $\mu = \mu^\tau$.

**Remark 4.7.** The last theorem covers geodesic flows on compact surfaces of negative curvature, because the spaces $E^u_x, E^s_x$ are known to be $C^1$ for such geodesic flows [40].

For generic Anosov flows, not much is known, but we have the following mild bound on correlations:

**Theorem 4.14 (Dolgopyat [26])** Let $\varphi^t : M \to M$ be a mixing Anosov flow. Then $|C_q(t)|$ decays rapidly in the sense of Schwartz. In particular, it decays faster than any power function $t^{-a}$, $a > 0$. This is true for any Gibbs measure $\mu$.

More discussions of this issue can be found in the survey [63]. It is still unknown if $|C_q(t)|$ decays exponentially for any mixing Anosov flow. It remains yet to explore the speed of the decay of correlations for generic Anosov and Axiom A flows.
5 Volume compression

Here we concentrate on hyperbolic diffeomorphisms that do not preserve absolutely continuous measures.

Let $T : M \to M$ be an Anosov or Axiom A diffeomorphism. For $x \in M$ and $n \geq 1$ the map $T^n$ compresses the phase volume (locally) at $x$ at the exponential rate

$$R_n(x) = -\ln |DT^n(x)| = -\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \ln |DT^i(x)|$$

Consider again the functions $\varphi^u(x) = -\ln J^u_x$ and $\varphi^s(x) = \ln J^s_x$, where $J^u_x$ and $J^s_x$ are the Jacobians of the linear maps $DT : E^u_x \to E^u_{Tx}$ and $DT : E^s_x \to E^s_{Tx}$, respectively. Note that $\varphi^{u,s} < 0$ in the Lyapunov metric on $M$. In addition, let $\alpha_x$ be the angle between $E^u_x$ and $E^s_x$ in the tangent space $T_x M$, and put $u(x) = -\ln \sin \alpha_x$. Then

$$-\ln |DT(x)| = \varphi^u(x) - \varphi^s(x) + u(Tx) - u(x)$$

Hence,

$$R_n(x) = S_n \varphi^u(x) - S_n \varphi^s(x) + u(T^n x) - u(x) \quad (5.1)$$

Let $\delta_x$ be the $\delta$-measure concentrated at the point $x$. Suppose that the sequence of measures $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \delta_{T^i x}$ weakly converges to a $T$-invariant measure $\mu$. Then we can define the volume compression rate per unit time by

$$\bar{R}(x) := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} R_n(x) = \int [\varphi^u - \varphi^s] d\mu = -\int \ln |DT| d\mu$$

We now recall Theorem 3.14 and obtain

**Proposition 5.1** Let $\Omega$ be an Axiom A attractor. Then for almost every point $x$ in the basin of attraction (with respect to the Riemannian volume) we have

$$\bar{R}(x) = \bar{R} := \int_{\Omega} [\varphi^u - \varphi^s] d\mu^+$$

where $\mu^+$ is the SRB measure on $\Omega$. The same holds for almost every point $x \in M$ if $T$ is a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism (in which case, of course, $\Omega = M$).
We call the above quantity $\bar{R}$ the volume compression rate.

**Theorem 5.2** Let $\Omega$ be an attractor. Then $\bar{R} \geq 0$. The following conditions are equivalent:

(i) $\bar{R} = 0$

(ii) $\Omega$ is an open set and the SRB measure $\mu^+$ is absolutely continuous on $\Omega$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ be the space of $T$-invariant probability measures on $\Omega$. The variational principle says that

$$P_{\varphi^s} = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)} \left( h_\mu(T) + \int_\Omega \varphi^s d\mu \right)$$

(5.2)

and the supremum is attained on a unique measure, the Gibbs measure $\mu^s := \mu_{\varphi^s}$. We also have $P_{\varphi^s} \leq 0$ by Lemma 3.7. (Note that the function $\varphi^s$ plays the same role for $T^{-1}$ as the function $\varphi^u$ for $T$, so Lemma 3.7 applies.) On the other hand, we know that

$$0 = P_{\varphi^u} = h_{\mu^+}(T) + \int_\Omega \varphi^u d\mu^+$$

(5.3)

Substituting $\mu = \mu^+$ in (5.2) and subtracting (5.3) from (5.2) gives $\bar{R} \geq 0$. The case $\bar{R} = 0$ is only possible when $P_{\varphi^s} = 0$ and $\mu^+ = \mu^-$, i.e. the functions $\varphi^u$ and $\varphi^s$ are cohomologous. The fact $P_{\varphi^s} = 0$ implies that $\Omega$ is an attractor for $T^{-1}$, i.e. $\Omega$ is a union of stable manifolds (by Theorem 3.13 and Lemma 3.11 applied to $T^{-1}$). Since $\Omega$ is also a union of unstable manifolds by the same Lemma 3.11, it must be an open set. Next, the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.18 gives the absolute continuity of $\mu^+$. One can also deduce the absolute continuity of $\mu^+$ combining its absolute continuity on unstable manifolds and that on stable manifolds (the latter follows from the fact $\mu^+ = \mu^-$, but we omit details). □

**Remark 5.1.** Note that

$$-\bar{R} = \sum \lambda_i \quad \mu^+-\text{a.e.}$$

the sum of all Lyapunov exponents, which is constant $\mu^+$-almost everywhere. This follows from Lemma 3.16 and its counterpart for $\varphi^s$ and negative exponents.
Entropy production. The volume compression rate $\bar{R}$ is closely related to entropy production in statistical mechanics. The latter is defined as follows [71]. Let $\nu$ be an absolutely continuous probability measure on the basin of attraction of an attractor $\Omega$, with density $g(x)$. The statistical mechanics entropy, or Gibbs entropy, associated with $g(x)$ is

$$S(g) = -\int g(x) \ln g(x) \, dx = \nu(-\ln g)$$

The measure $T_*\nu$ has density $g_1(x) = g(T^{-1}x)|DT(T^{-1}x)|^{-1}$. Hence,

$$S(g_1) = -\int g(T^{-1}x)|DT(T^{-1}x)|^{-1} \left( \log g(T^{-1}x) - \ln |DT(T^{-1}x)| \right) \, dx$$

$$= -\int g(x) \left( \log g(x) - \ln |DT(x)| \right) \, dx$$

Hence, the Gibbs entropy of the system decreases by the amount

$$S(g) - S(g_1) = -\int g(x) \ln |DT(x)| \, dx = \nu(-\ln |DT|)$$

In physical terms, this means that the system produces this much entropy and gives it to the outside world (or the entropy is pumped out of the system).

The entropy produced by the system during $n$ iterations of $T$ is then

$$S(g) - S(g_n) = -\int g(x) \ln |DT^n(x)| \, dx = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \nu_i(-\ln |DT|)$$

where $\nu_n = T_*^n \nu$ and $g_n(x)$ is the density of the measure $\nu_n$.

We now combine the above equation with Proposition 5.1 and Corollary 3.15.

**Corollary 5.3** The asymptotic entropy production rate per unit time is

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} (S(g) - S(g_n)) = \bar{R}$$

where $\bar{R}$ is our volume compression rate.

We can interpret the results of Corollary 5.3 and Theorem 5.2 as follows. We see that Anosov diffeomorphisms and Axiom A attractors with absolutely continuous invariant measures do not produce Gibbs entropy ($\bar{R} = 0$).
Recall that they serve as models of equilibrium dynamics in statistical mechanics. On the contrary, Anosov diffeomorphisms and Axiom A attractors without absolutely continuous invariant measures (whose SRB measure is singular) do produce Gibbs entropy \( (\bar{R} > 0) \). These serve as models of nonequilibrium dynamics in statistical mechanics. Therefore, positive entropy production characterizes nonequilibrium dynamics, as opposed to zero entropy production in equilibrium systems. This is a basic fact known in statistical mechanics [72].

**Fluctuation theorem.** The value of \( \bar{R} \) gives the asymptotic volume compression rate. It is of interest, particularly in numerical experiments, to study finite time compression rates \( \tilde{R}_n(x) := \frac{1}{n} R_n(x) \). In view of (5.1), for large \( n \) we have

\[
\tilde{R}_n(x) = \frac{S_n \varphi^u(x)}{n} - \frac{S_n \varphi^s(x)}{n} + O(1/n)
\]

Obviously, \( \mu^+(\tilde{R}_n(x)) = \bar{R} \) for any \( n \). The deviations of \( \tilde{R}_n(x) \) from its mean value \( \bar{R} \) are described by the central limit theorem and the large deviation theorem, see Section 2. There is a remarkable specification of the large deviation theorem for the quantity \( \tilde{R}_n(x) \) under an additional physically motivated assumption.

Let \( T : M \to M \) be a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism. Assume that there is a smooth involution \( \mathcal{I} : M \to M \) (i.e. \( \mathcal{I}^2 = \text{identity} \)) such that \( \mathcal{I} \circ T = T^{-1} \circ \mathcal{I} \), i.e. \( \mathcal{I} \) anticommutes with \( T \). Applying \( \mathcal{I} \) then amounts to conjugating \( T \) to \( T^{-1} \), i.e. reversing the time. We will call such Anosov diffeomorphisms *time reversible*. We can also choose a Riemannian metric on \( M \) invariant under \( \mathcal{I} \).

As a simple example, let \( T : M \to M \) be an Anosov diffeomorphism, then the map \((x, y) \mapsto (Tx, T^{-1}y)\) is an Anosov diffeomorphism of the manifold \( M \times M \). Then the involution \( \mathcal{I}(x, y) = (y, x) \) will anticommute with this map.

In Hamiltonian mechanics, a natural involution on the phase space is defined by reversing the velocity vectors of all moving particles in the system. Then each particle will trace its past trajectory backwards under the same equations of motion, so the involution will anticommute with the dynamics. This property is called *time reversibility* in mechanics. Many physical models, both at equilibrium and nonequilibrium, naturally have the time reversibility feature, so the interest to time reversible Anosov diffeomorphism
Theorem 5.4 (Gallavotti-Cohen Fluctuation Theorem [32, 72]) Let $T : M \to M$ be a transitive time reversible Anosov diffeomorphism. Assume that its SRB measure $\mu^+$ is singular (hence $\bar{R} > 0$). Then there is a $p^* > 0$ such that
\begin{equation}
 p - \delta \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{R_n} \ln \frac{\mu^+ \{ \bar{R}_n(x) / \bar{R} \in (p - \delta, p + \delta) \}}{\mu^+ \{ \bar{R}_n(x) / \bar{R} \in (-p - \delta, -p + \delta) \}} \leq p + \delta
\end{equation}
for all $p$, $|p| \leq p^*$, and $\delta > 0$.

A loose interpretation of the theorem is the following. For $p > 0$, the probability of observing the value $\bar{R}_n \approx p \bar{R}$ is approximately $e^{p \bar{R}}$ times higher than the probability of observing the value $\bar{R}_n \approx -p \bar{R}$. Let $f_n(p)$ be the probability density function of the variable $\bar{R}_n(x) / \bar{R}$, i.e. let
\begin{equation}
 \mu^+ \{ p < \bar{R}_n(x) / \bar{R} < p + \delta \} = f_n(p) \delta + o(\delta)
\end{equation}
The theorem can be, again loosely, stated as
\begin{equation}
 f_n(p) / f_n(-p) \approx e^{p \bar{R}_n} \quad (5.4)
\end{equation}
This theorem can be verified by a numerical experiment as follows. One fixes $n$ (e.g., $n = 50$ or $n = 100$, not too large) and picks a random point $x \in M$ (with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $M$) and computes its orbit $\{ T^i x \}$, $0 \leq i \leq N$ for a very large $N \gg n$. One also computes the values $\bar{R}_n(i) := \bar{R}_n(T^m x)$ for some $m \geq n$ and $0 \leq i \leq J := [N/m] - 1$. This gives the values of the time $n$ volume compression rate along $J + 1$ nonoverlapping segments of length $n$ on the orbit $\{ T^i x \}$. Note that time averages along the orbit $\{ T^i x \}_{i=0}^N$ are very close to the space averages with respect to $\mu^+$, if $N$ is large, by Theorem 3.14. So we can estimate $\bar{R} = \mu^+(\bar{R}_n)$ by $[\bar{R}_n(0) + \cdots + \bar{R}_n(J)] / (J + 1)$. Then one can histogram the values of $\bar{R}_n(i) / \bar{R}$ to approximate the function $f_n(p)$ defined above. To verify (5.4) one fits a linear function $y = ap + b$ to the experimental values of the function $[\ln f_n(p) - \ln f_n(-p)] / R_n$ and checks that $a \approx 1$ and $b \approx 0$.

Such numerical experiments can be effectively done for many nonequilibrium mechanical models with time reversibility, which are far more general than Anosov diffeomorphisms. For many such systems a rigorous proof of
the above theorem is lacking, even the existence of SRB measures or mere hyperbolicity cannot be rigorously established. On the other hand, a positive result of the test (i.e., if \( a \approx 1 \) and \( b \approx 0 \)) can be then interpreted as a certain similarity of the underlying mechanical system and Anosov diffeomorphisms with a singular SRB measure. Such a similarity plays a crucial role in the modern understanding of nonequilibrium statistical mechanics, see the so called Axiom C and more extended discussions of the topic in [31, 72].

We provide a formal, heuristic argument supporting Theorem 5.4. A rigorous proof is based on the large deviation theorem 2.32, we refer the reader to [32, 72] for details.

**Lemma 5.5** The involution \( I \) maps unstable manifolds to stable manifolds and vice versa. As a result,

\[
S_n \varphi^u(x) = S_n \varphi^s(I \circ T^n x) + O(1) \quad \text{and} \quad S_n \varphi^s(x) = S_n \varphi^u(I \circ T^n x) + O(1)
\]

and

\[
\bar{R}_n(x) = -\bar{R}_n(I \circ T^n x) + O(1/n)
\]

for any \( x \in M \). The terms \( O(1) \) can be dropped if the Riemannian metric is chosen invariant under \( I \).

**Lemma 5.6** Let \( \mathcal{R}_0 \) be a Markov partition of \( M \). Then \( \mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R}_0 \lor I \mathcal{R}_0 \) is a Markov partition invariant under \( I \), i.e. for any \( R \in \mathcal{R} \) we have \( IR \in \mathcal{R} \).

The proofs of the lemmas are left as (easy) exercises.

Now, let \( \mathcal{R} \) be a Markov partition from the last lemma. Let \( \Lambda = [0, n] \) and \( C(\omega^\Lambda) \subset \Sigma_A \) any admissible cylinder of length \( n+1 \) in the symbolic space \( \Sigma_A \). The set \( \pi(C(\omega^\Lambda)) \) is a rectangle in \( M \). The invariance of \( \mathcal{R} \) under \( I \) implies that \( I \circ T^n \circ \pi(C(\omega^\Lambda)) = \pi(C(\omega^\Lambda')) \) for some other cylinder \( C(\omega^\Lambda') \subset \Sigma_A \) of length \( n \). Recall that \( |\bar{R}_n(x) - \bar{R}_n(y)| = O(1/n) \) for all \( x, y \in \pi(C(\omega^\Lambda)) \), and \( |\bar{R}_n(x') - \bar{R}_n(y')| = O(1/n) \) for all \( x', y' \in \pi(C(\omega^\Lambda')) \), see Remark 2.7. Then \( \bar{R}_n(x) = -\bar{R}_n(x') + O(1/n) \) for all \( x, x' \) as above. Now, recall that

\[
\mu^+(\pi(C(\omega^\Lambda))) \asymp \exp[S_n \varphi^u(x)]
\]

and

\[
\mu^+(\pi(C(\omega^\Lambda'))) \asymp \exp[S_n \varphi^u(x')] \asymp \exp[S_n \varphi^s(x)]
\]
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Hence,

\[
\frac{\mu^+ (\pi(C(\omega_\Lambda)))}{\mu^+ (\pi(C(\omega'_\Lambda)))} \leq \exp [S_n \varphi^u(x) - S_n \varphi^s(x)] \leq \exp [n \bar{R}_n(x)] \tag{5.5}
\]

Now consider \( C(\omega_\Lambda) \subset \Sigma_A \) such that \( \bar{R}_n(x')/\bar{R} \in (-p - \delta, p + \delta + O(1/n)) \) for any \( x' \in \pi(C(\omega'_\Lambda)) \). Summing up (5.5) over all such \( C(\omega_\Lambda) \) completes our proof of the theorem. \( \square \)

In terms of the large deviation theorem 2.32, the above result means that

\[ \eta(p) + \eta(-p) = \bar{R}p \]

e.g. the odd part of the free energy function \( \eta(p) \) is linear in \( p \), with slope \( \bar{R} \).

Theorem 5.4 is a specification of the large deviation theorem rather than the central limit theorem. One may mistakenly relate 5.4 to the CLT in the following way. By the CLT, \( \sqrt{n}(\bar{R}_n - \bar{R}) \) converges in distribution to a normal law \( N(0, \sigma_0^2) \) with some \( \sigma_0^2 \geq 0 \). Hence, \( \bar{R}_n/\bar{R} \) is approximately normal \( N(1, \sigma_0^2/\bar{R}^2n) \). Assuming the closeness of the corresponding densities, one can write

\[ f_n(p) \approx \frac{\bar{R} \sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{2\sigma_0}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(p - 1)^2}{2\sigma_0^2} \bar{R}^2n \right] \tag{5.6} \]

Assuming now that (5.6) is exact, one obtains

\[ f_n(p)/f_n(-p) = \exp[2\sigma_0^{-2}\bar{R}^2np] \]

and Theorem 5.4 seems to follow provided we have \( 2\sigma_0^{-2}\bar{R} = 1 \).

The above argument is, in fact, faulty. The CLT only applies to the values \( \bar{R}_n = \bar{R} + O(1/\sqrt{n}) \), i.e. \( p = 1 + O(1/\sqrt{n}) \). Theorem 5.4, on the contrary, is a large deviation result, it applies to all \( |p| \leq p^* \), i.e. to all \( |\bar{R}_n| \leq p^* \bar{R} \). It is logically unrelated to the CLT, in particular, it does not require that \( 2\sigma_0^{-2}\bar{R} = 1 \).

6 SRB measures for general diffeomorphisms

Remarkably, the theory of SRB measures for Axiom A attractors, at least in its essential parts, extends to much more general diffeomorphisms. Here
we describe these extensions, leaving out proofs, most of which are highly nontrivial. Our discussion is based on recent excellent survey articles by Ruelle [72] and Young [80].

Let $T : M \rightarrow M$ be a $C^2$ diffeomorphism of a smooth compact manifold $M$, and $\rho$ a $T$-invariant ergodic measure on $M$. No assumptions on the hyperbolicity of $T$ are necessary at this point.

The theorem of Oseledec [54] permits the definition of Lyapunov exponents $\lambda_i(x)$, $1 \leq i \leq \dim M$, at $\rho$-almost every point $x \in M$. The set of Lyapunov exponents $\{\lambda_i(x)\}$ (called sometimes the Lyapunov spectrum) is the same $\rho$-almost everywhere, due to the ergodicity of $\rho$. The tangent vectors with positive Lyapunov exponents span the unstable subspace $E^u_x$, those with negative Lyapunov exponents span the stable subspace $E^s_x$, and those with zero Lyapunov exponents span the neutral subspace $E^0_x$. The decomposition $T_x M = E^u_x \oplus E^s_x \oplus E^0_x$ is defined $\rho$-almost everywhere and stays invariant under $DT$.

Pesin’s theory [56, 57] allows the definition of stable and unstable manifolds $\rho$-almost everywhere. These are smooth submanifolds of $M$, the stable manifold $W^s(x)$ through $x$ is tangent to $E^s_x$ and the unstable manifold $W^u(x)$ through $x$ is tangent to $E^u_x$.

We now make the first hyperbolicity assumption on $T$: let at least one Lyapunov exponent of $T$ be positive $\rho$-almost everywhere. Then unstable manifolds $W^u(x)$ are not trivial.

**Definition.** An invariant ergodic measure $\rho$ is called a **Sinai-Ruelle-Bowen (SRB) measure** if its conditional distributions on unstable manifolds are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on those manifolds.

SRB measures have a remarkable property that generalizes Theorem 3.17. The following theorem was proved by Ledrappier, Strelcyn and Young:

**Theorem 6.1 ([48, 50])** An ergodic measure $\rho$ is SRB if and only if

$$h_\rho(T) = \Sigma^+ \lambda_i \quad \rho\text{-a.e.} \quad (6.1)$$

where the right hand side is the sum of all positive Lyapunov exponents (note that it is $\rho$-almost everywhere constant).

The following inequality nicely complementing Theorem 6.1 was proved by Ruelle.
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Theorem 6.2 ([69]) For an arbitrary ergodic measure $\rho$, we only have
\[ h_\rho(T) \leq \Sigma^+ \lambda_i \quad \rho\text{-a.e.} \quad (6.2) \]

The identity (6.1) for SRB measures is known as Pesin’s formula, while (6.2) for general ergodic measures is known as Ruelle’s inequality.

Next, we make a stronger hyperbolicity assumption on $T$: let all its Lyapunov exponents be nonzero $\rho$-almost everywhere.

**Definition.** A diffeomorphism $T$ is said to be fully hyperbolic with respect to an invariant measure $\rho$ if all the Lyapunov exponents of $T$ are nonzero almost everywhere.

The full hyperbolicity does not require uniform expansion of unstable vectors or uniform contraction of stable vectors (in the way it is required for Anosov and Axiom A systems). For this reason, full hyperbolicity is often referred to as nonuniform hyperbolicity.

**Theorem 6.3 ([61])** Let $T$ be fully hyperbolic. If $\rho$ is an SRB measure, then there is a subset $B \subset M$ of positive Lebesgue measure such that for each $x \in B$ the measure
\[ \delta_{x,n} := \frac{1}{n}(\delta_x + \delta_{Tx} + \cdots + \delta_{T^{n-1}x}) \]
weakly converges to $\rho$ (here $\delta_x$ is the $\delta$-measure concentrated at $x$). In this case, $x$ is called a $\rho$-generic point. Equivalently, for any continuous function $f : M \to \mathbb{R}$ and every $x \in B$ we have
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \left( f(x) + f(Tx) + \cdots + f(T^{n-1}x) \right) = \int f \, d\rho \]

One often calls the set $B$ the basin of attraction for the measure $\rho$.

**Remark 6.1.** If an ergodic measure $\rho$ is absolutely continuous on $M$ with density $g(x)$, then it is an SRB measure [57], and its basin of attraction contains the open set $\{g(x) > 0\}$ (possibly, minus a subset of Lebesgue measure 0).

According to our criteria in Section 3, absolutely continuous ergodic measures play the role of equilibrium states in statistical physics. If an SRB
measure $\rho$ is singular (i.e. there is a subset $A \subset M$ of zero Lebesgue measure such that $\rho(A) = 1$), then $\rho$ plays the role of a nonequilibrium steady state.

The previous theorem easily implies that there are at most countably many distinct SRB measures. This is further specified by the following analogue of Smale’s spectral decomposition:

**Theorem 6.4 ([49, 57])** Let $T : M \to M$ be a nonuniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphism. There are at most countably many distinct SRB measures. Let $\rho$ be any SRB measure. Then either $\rho$ is mixing and Bernoulli, or there is a decomposition of its support into finitely many disjoint measurable subsets $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ cyclically permuted by $T$, such that $T^n|X_i$ is mixing and Bernoulli for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

**Existence of SRB measures.** The importance of SRB measures, especially in physical applications, is clear from our previous discussion. Theorem 6.4 establishes an upper bound on the number of SRB measures. However, nothing guarantees the shear existence of such measures. In fact, we only know that SRB measures exist for Anosov and Axiom A diffeomorphisms. For more general types of diffeomorphisms, very little is known. Just a few years ago, Benedicks and Young proved [9] the existence of SRB measures for Hénon attractors (and those are, probably, the only genuinely nonuniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphisms for which rigorous results exist). On the other hand, attractors without SRB measures have been observed by Hu and Young also recently, see [42]. Aside from these specific examples, there are no general mathematical theorems on the existence or nonexistence of SRB measures for nonuniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphisms.

There are hyperbolic maps other than diffeomorphisms for which SRB measures are rigorously constructed [58, 79], however. We only mention them briefly. Let $T$ be defined on an open subset $U \subset M$ and $T : U \to T(U)$ a $C^2$ diffeomorphism. The set $\partial U$ may be regarded as the singularity set for $T$. Now, assume a uniform hyperbolicity in the sense

$$
||DT^nv|| \leq c\lambda^n||v|| \quad \text{for } v \in E^s_x, \ n \geq 0
$$

$$
||DT^nv|| \geq c^{-1}\lambda^{-n}||v|| \quad \text{for } v \in E^u_x, \ n \geq 0
$$

uniformly in $x$ whenever $T^n$ exists. Here $c > 0$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ are constants. Many physically interesting models, e.g. billiards and Lorenz attractors, fit
in this category, see [79, 80] for detail. For such models, SRB measures were constructed by Pesin [58] and under some extra assumptions statistical properties were studied by Young [79].

Numerical evidence is also overwhelmingly in favor of the existence of SRB measures in many hyperbolic models, whether smooth or containing singularities. For randomly chosen initial points in the basin of attraction, trajectory plots tend to produce pictures that are very much alike – the data points concentrate nicely along unstable manifolds and their distribution in the stable direction is very irregular (singular). Based on these observations and recent theoretical studies, it is currently assumed in statistical mechanics that nonequilibrium steady states in hyperbolic models typically are SRB measures. At the very least, they can be treated as SRB measures in Anosov and Axiom A attractors, for the purpose of computing time and space averages [31, 72].

Dimension of invariant measures. To better understand the difference between SRB measures and other ergodic measures, let us look at Pesin’s formula (6.1) and Ruelle’s inequality (6.2) as follows. It is our fundamental understanding that randomness (chaos) is created by the separation of nearby orbits. The asymptotic separation of nearby orbits is quantified by the sum of positive Lyapunov exponents. On the other hand, the randomness (in the sense of information) of a measure preserving transformation \((M, T, \rho)\) is quantified by its entropy \(h_\rho(T)\). Pesin’s identity (6.1) clearly establishes the balance between the ‘input’ (‘amount’ of separation) and the ‘output’ (‘amount’ of randomness). Ruelle’s inequality suggests that for non-SRB measures the separation is “wasted” on something other than randomness, i.e. there is a “leakage” of separated trajectories from the support of the invariant measure, so that the measure does not account for all trajectories. The separation occurs along unstable manifolds, so the leakage of separated trajectories can only happen if the invariant measure has “holes” on those manifolds, through which some trajectories leak out unaccounted.

This is exactly what happens to non-SRB measures, their conditional distributions on unstable manifolds are singular, so they only capture a fraction of those manifolds and leave out holes of some kind. To quantify the fraction of an unstable manifold captured by a measure we use the notion of dimension.

Definition. Let \(B^u_\varepsilon(x)\) be a ball of radius \(\varepsilon\) on the unstable manifold \(W^u(x)\),
centered at $x$. If $\rho^u_x$ is the conditional measure induced by $\rho$ on $W^u(x)$, then we call the limit

$$d^u_x(\rho) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\log \rho^u_x(B^u_\varepsilon(x))}{\log \varepsilon}$$

(if one exists) the *dimension* of the measure $\rho$ on the unstable manifold $W^u(x)$ (at the point $x$). This limit exists $\rho^u$-almost everywhere on $W^u(x)$. If $\rho$ is ergodic, the limit is constant $\rho$-almost everywhere on $M$, and we denote it by $d^u(\rho)$.

We note that the above limit is the infimum of Hausdorff dimensions of subsets of full $\rho^u_x$-measure on $W^u(x)$. If the conditional measure is absolutely continuous on $W^u(x)$, then $d^u(\rho) = \dim W^u(x)$, otherwise $d^u(\rho) < \dim W^u(x)$. The deficiency of $d^u(\rho)$ signifies the presence of “holes” on $W^u(x)$, not filled properly by the measure $\rho^u_x$.

An exact relation between the dimension and the entropy was established by Ledrappier and Young:

**Theorem 6.5 ([50])** Let $\rho$ be an ergodic measure for a nonuniformly hyperbolic diffeomorphism. Then, corresponding to each Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_i > 0$, there is a number $\sigma_i \in [0, 1]$ such that

(a) $d^u(\rho) = \sum^+ \sigma_i$;
(b) $h_\rho(T) = \sum^+ \lambda_i \sigma_i$.

The number $\sigma_i$ is essentially the dimension of $\rho$ in the direction of the unstable tangent vector corresponding to the Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_i > 0$.

**Remark 6.2.** It is interesting that one can also define $d^s(\rho)$, the dimension of the conditional measures induced by $\rho$ on stable manifolds. Then one would expect that

$$d^u(\rho) + d^s(\rho) = d(\rho)$$

(6.3)

where $d(\rho)$ is the dimension of $\rho$ on $M$ defined in a similar way:

$$d_x(\rho) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\log \rho(B_\varepsilon(x))}{\log \varepsilon}$$

The identity (6.3) has been known as the Eckmann-Ruelle conjecture for many years. It was proved very recently by Barreira, Pesin and Schmeling [8].
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The leakage from the system can also be described in a different way. Let \(\Omega\) be a compact \(T\)-invariant subset of \(M\) of zero Lebesgue measure, and we will study invariant measures on \(\Omega\). Let \(U\) be a small open neighborhood of \(\Omega\). For \(m \geq 0\) define

\[ U_n = \cap_{i=0}^n T^i U \quad \text{and} \quad U_{-n} = \cap_{i=-n}^0 T^{-i} U \]

If \(\Omega\) is not an attractor, typical points \(x \in U\) will sooner or later escape from \(U\), i.e. generally, mass will leak out of \(U\). In that case \(U_{-n}\) shrinks as \(n \to \infty\) and its volume approaches zero. The limit

\[ \gamma = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \ln \left( \frac{\text{Vol} U_{-n}}{\text{Vol} U_{-n-1}} \right) \geq 0 \tag{6.4} \]

(if one exists) is called the escape rate. The larger \(\gamma\), the faster the mass leaks out of \(U\).

**Theorem 6.6 ([71])** Let \(\Omega\) be an Axiom A basic set. Then

(a) The limit (6.4) exists and

\[ \gamma = -P_{\varphi_u} \geq 0 \]

where \(P_{\varphi_u}\) is the topological pressure of the function \(\varphi_u = -\ln J^u_x\) defined in Section 3.

(b) Let \(m_{-n}\) be the normalized Lebesgue measure on \(U_{-n}\). Then the measure

\[ \frac{1}{n+1} \left( m_{-n} + T_* m_{-n} + \cdots + T^n_* m_{-n} \right) \]

weakly converges to the generalized SRB measure \(\mu^+ = \mu_{\varphi_u}\) on the basic set \(\Omega\).

This is proved by Ruelle [71] and can be also derived from our results in Section 3, we omit details.

Recall that for any ergodic measure \(\rho\) on \(\Omega\) we have

\[ \rho(\varphi_u) = -\Sigma^+ \lambda_i \quad \rho\text{-a.e.} \]

see Lemma 3.16. Now the variational principle (2.51) implies
Corollary 6.7  For any ergodic measure \( \rho \) on \( \Omega \) we have

\[
h_{\rho}(T) \leq \Sigma^+ \lambda_i - \gamma \quad \rho\text{-a.e.}
\]

and the equality occurs if and only if \( \rho = \mu^+ \), the generalized SRB measure on \( \Omega \). Hence,

\[
h_{\mu^+}(T) = \Sigma^+ \lambda_i - \gamma \quad \mu^+\text{-a.e.} \tag{6.5}
\]

Note that once again an SRB measure (this time a generalized SRB measure) is characterized by the equality in an entropy formula.

The identity (6.5) is known as the escape rate formula. It extends Pesin’s formula from Axiom A attractors to arbitrary Axiom A basic sets. Note that it establishes an exact balance of randomness: it is the total amount of separation minus the amount spent on repelling trajectories away from \( \Omega \).

Theorem 6.6 also shows that the measure \( \mu^+ \) describes the distribution of orbits of typical points \( x \in U \) that stay in \( U \) for a long enough time (i.e., \( x \in U_{-n} \) with a large \( n \)). This is a natural extension of the notion of nonequilibrium steady state to the present situation, where the mass is leaking out of the system. So, we will refer to \( \mu^+ \) as a (generalized) nonequilibrium steady state on the set \( \Omega \).

If \( \Omega \) is not an attractor, then almost every point \( x \in U \) (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) eventually escapes from \( U \). The basic set \( \Omega \) only attracts the stable manifolds of its points and repels the rest of \( U \). For this reason \( \Omega \) is called a semi-attractor or a repeller, the latter term is now getting standard.

After the work of Gaspard and Nicolis [34], many physicists started extensive studies of chaotic systems with various openings or holes in phase space, and the corresponding repellers on which interesting invariant measures exist. This new branch of nonequilibrium statistical mechanics is now called chaotic scattering theory. We refer the reader to a survey by Gaspard and Dorfman [35] and references therein. The existence of (generalized) steady states on repellers and the escape rate formula (6.5) have been observed numerically and studied heuristically in a variety of models with nonuniform hyperbolicity. Very little has been proven mathematically, though.

We only mention one rigorous result obtained very recently [18, 19, 20, 21]. There, instead of taking a small open neighborhood of a repeller, the authors started with a completely hyperbolic (Anosov) diffeomorphism and cut some
open holes in the manifold. The orbits that enter the holes are taken away from the system, thus simulating ‘escape’.

**Anosov diffeomorphisms with holes.** Let \( T : M \rightarrow M \) be a transitive Anosov diffeomorphism. Fix an open set \( H \subset M \) and consider the dynamics on \( U = M \setminus H \). For \( n \geq 0 \) put

\[
U_n = \bigcap_{i=0}^{n} T^i U \quad \text{and} \quad U_{-n} = \bigcap_{i=0}^{n} T^{-i} U,
\]

and also

\[
U_+ = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} U_n, \quad U_- = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} U_{-n}, \quad \Omega = U_+ \cap U_-
\]

Observe that all these sets are closed, \( T^{-1} U_+ \subset U_+ \), \( T U_- \subset U_- \) and \( T \Omega = T^{-1} \Omega = \Omega \). The set \( U_+ \) is a union of unstable manifolds, \( U_- \) is a union of stable manifolds, and \( \Omega \) is a Cantor-like set of points. The trajectories of points \( x \in \Omega \) (in the future and the past) always avoid \( H \) (the union of holes). \( \Omega \) is also called a repeller.

Let \( m_{-n} \) be the normalized Lebesgue measure on \( U_{-n} \) and \( m_n = T^n m_n \).

Note that \( m_n \) can be obtained by iterating the Lebesgue measure on \( U \), cutting out its fractions escaping through \( H \) and renormalizing the remainder.

**Theorem 6.8 ([20, 21])** Assume that \( \dim M = 2 \) and \( H \) satisfies some technical assumptions (see below). Then

(a) The measure

\[
\frac{1}{n+1} \left( m_{-n} + T m_{-n} + \cdots + T^n m_{-n} \right)
\]

weakly converges to a \( T \)-invariant measure \( m^+ \) on \( \Omega \).

(b) The measure \( m^+ \) is ergodic, \( K \)-mixing, and an equilibrium state for the function \( \varphi^u = -\ln J^u_x \) on \( \Omega \).

(c) The escape rate (6.4) exists and the escape rate formula holds:

\[
h_{m^+}(T) = \Sigma^+ \lambda_i - \gamma \quad m^+\text{-a.e.}
\]

(d) The measure \( m_n = T^n m_{-n} \) weakly converges to a measure \( \hat{m}^+ \) on \( U_+ \) which has two properties: (i) its conditional distributions on unstable manifolds \( W^u \subset U_+ \) are smooth (actually, they coincide with \( u \)-SRB measures defined in Section 3), and (ii) the measure \( \hat{m}^+ \) is not \( T \)-invariant but satisfies

\[
(T \hat{m}^+)(A) = e^{-\gamma} \cdot \hat{m}^+(A) \quad \text{for all} \ A \subset U
\]
i.e. the image of $\tilde{m}^+$ restricted to $U$ is proportional to $\tilde{m}^+$. Furthermore, a measure $\tilde{m}^+$ defined by the properties (i) and (ii) is unique.

(d) The measure $T_n^*\tilde{m}^+$ weakly converges to $m^+$ as $n \to \infty$.

The assumptions on $H$ in this theorem are as follows. $H$ is an open set consisting of a finite number, $N$, of connected components. The minimal distance between those components is some $d_0 > 0$. For any local unstable and stable manifold $W$ of length $< d_0$ the intersection $W \cap H$ must consist of $\leq B$ intervals, where $B < \infty$ is some constant. The main assumption is that the connected components of $H$ have diameter less than certain $d = d(T, N, d_0, B) > 0$.

The smallness of the components of $H$ is necessary to prevent the decomposition of $U$ into ‘noninteracting’ parts and hence the nonergodicity of the measure $m^+$ on $\Omega$ (such situations are described in [19]).

**Remark 6.3.** The measures $m^+$ and $\tilde{m}^+$ and the escape rate $\gamma$ depend continuously on the open set $H$. In particular, if $H$ shrinks to $N$ isolated points, then $\gamma \to 0$ and both measures $m^+$, $\tilde{m}^+$ weakly converge to the SRB measure $\mu^+$ of the Anosov diffeomorphism $T : M \to M$.

**Remark 6.4.** Since $T^{-1}$ is also an Anosov diffeomorphism, one can construct a measure $m^-$ on $\Omega$ and define the escape rate $\gamma^-$ by using the map $T^{-1}$ instead of $T$. Generally, $m^+ \neq m^-$ and $\gamma \neq \gamma^-$, see examples in [16]. It is proved in [21] that $m^+ = m^-$ and $\gamma = \gamma^-$ provided the Anosov diffeomorphism preserves an absolutely continuous measure. Again, physically, this corresponds to an equilibrium situation.
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