

HEREDITARILY NON-SENSITIVE DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS AND LINEAR REPRESENTATIONS

E. GLASNER AND M. MEGRELISHVILI

ABSTRACT. For an arbitrary topological group G any compact G -dynamical system (G, X) can be linearly G -represented as a weak*-compact subset of a dual Banach space V^* . As was shown in [44] the Banach space V can be chosen to be reflexive iff the metric system (G, X) is weakly almost periodic (WAP). In this paper we study the wider class of compact G -systems which can be linearly represented as a weak*-compact subset of a dual Banach space with the Radon-Nikodým property. We call such a system a Radon-Nikodým system (RN). One of our main results is to show that for metrizable compact G -systems the three classes: RN, HNS (hereditarily not sensitive) and HAE (hereditarily almost equicontinuous) coincide. We investigate these classes and their relation to previously studied classes of G -systems such as WAP and LE (locally equicontinuous). We show that the Glasner-Weiss examples of recurrent-transitive locally equicontinuous but not weakly almost periodic cascades are actually RN. Using fragmentability and Namioka's theorem we give an enveloping semigroup characterization of HNS systems and show that the enveloping semigroup $E(X)$ of a compact metrizable HNS G -system is a separable Rosenthal compact, hence of cardinality $\leq 2^{\aleph_0}$. We investigate a dynamical version of the Bourgain-Fremlin-Talagrand dichotomy and a dynamical version of Todorčević dichotomy concerning Rosenthal compacts.

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
1. Topological dynamics background	4
2. The enveloping semigroup	6
3. A dynamical version of the Bourgain-Fremlin-Talagrand theorem	10
4. Metric approximation of dynamical systems	11
5. Almost equicontinuity, local equicontinuity and variations	13
6. Fragmented maps and families	17
7. Asplund functions and RN systems	20
8. Veech functions	24
9. Hereditary AE and NS systems	25
10. Some Examples	30
11. The G-W examples are HAE	33
12. The mincenter of an RN system	35
13. A recurrent transitive LE but not HAE system	37
14. An enveloping semigroup characterization of HNS	39
References	44

Date: October 25, 2004.

Key words and phrases. almost equicontinuous, Asplund function, fragmentability, Ellis semigroup, local equicontinuous, Namioka's theorem, Radon-Nikodým system, Rosenthal compact, sensitive dependence, weakly almost periodic.

The second author thanks the Israel Science Foundation (grant number 4699).

2000 *Mathematical Subject Classification* 54H20, 54H15, 37B05, 43A60, 46B22.

INTRODUCTION

The main goal of this paper is to exhibit new and perhaps unexpected connections between the (lack of) chaotic behavior of a dynamical system and the existence of linear representations of the system on certain Banach spaces. The property *sensitive dependence on initial conditions* appears as a basic constituent in several definitions of “chaos” (see, for example, [9, 14, 24, 10] and references thereof). In the present paper we introduce the classes of *hereditarily not sensitive* (HNS for short; intuitively these are the non-chaotic systems) and *hereditarily almost equicontinuous systems* (HAE). It turns out that these classes of dynamical systems are well behaved with respect to the standard operations on dynamical systems and they admit elegant characterizations in terms of Banach space representations.

For an arbitrary topological group G any compact G -system X can be linearly G -represented as a weak*-compact subset of a dual Banach space V^* . As was shown in [44] the Banach space V can be chosen to be reflexive iff the metric G -system X is weakly almost periodic (WAP). We say that a dynamical system (G, X) is a Radon-Nikodým system (RN) if V^* can be chosen as a Banach space with the Radon-Nikodým property. One of our main results is to show that for metrizable compact G -systems the three classes of RN, HNS and HAE dynamical systems coincide. For general compact G -systems X we prove that X is in the class HNS iff X is RN-approximable. In other words: a compact system is non-chaotic if and only if it admits sufficiently many G -representations in RN dual Banach spaces. The link between the various topological dynamics aspects of almost equicontinuity on the one hand and the Banach space RN properties on the other hand is the versatile notion of *fragmentability*. It played a central role in the works on RN compacta (see e.g. Namioka [47]) and their dynamical analogues (see Megrelishvili [41, 42, 44]). It also serves as an important tool in the present work.

The following brief historical review will hopefully help the reader to get a clearer perspective on the context of our results. The theory of weakly almost periodic (WAP) functions on topological groups was developed by W. F. Eberlein, [16], A. Grothendieck, [27] and I. Glicksberg and K. de Leeuw, [15]. About thirty years ago, W. A. Veech in an attempt to unify and generalize the classical theory of weakly almost periodic functions on a discrete group G , introduced a class of functions in $\ell^\infty(G)$ which he denoted by $K(G)$, [56]. He showed that $K(G)$ is a uniformly closed left and right G -invariant subalgebra of $\ell^\infty(G)$ containing the algebra of weakly almost periodic functions $WAP(G)$ and shares with $WAP(G)$ the property that every minimal function in $K(G)$ is actually almost periodic.

In [50] Shtern has shown that for any compact Hausdorff semitopological semigroup S there exists a reflexive Banach space E such that S is topologically isomorphic to a closed subsemigroup of $\mathbf{B} = \{s \in \mathcal{L}(E) : \|s\| \leq 1\}$. Here $\mathcal{L}(E)$ is the Banach space of bounded linear operators from E to itself and \mathbf{B} is equipped with the weak operator topology. Megrelishvili provided an alternative proof for this theorem in [42] and has shown in [44] that WAP dynamical systems are characterized as those systems that have sufficiently many linear G -representations on weakly compact subsets of reflexive Banach spaces.

A seemingly independent development is the new theory of Almost Equicontinuous dynamical systems (AE). This was developed in a series of papers, Glasner & Weiss [24], Akin, Auslander & Berg [1, 2] and Glasner & Weiss [25]. In the latter the class of Locally Equicontinuous dynamical systems (LE) was introduced and studied. It was shown there that the collection $LE(G)$ of locally equicontinuous functions forms a uniformly closed G -invariant subalgebra of $\ell^\infty(G)$ containing $WAP(G)$ and having the property that each minimal function in $LE(G)$ is almost periodic.

Of course the classical theory of WAP functions is valid for a general topological group G and it is not hard to see that the AE theory, as well as the theory of $K(G)$ -functions — which we call Veech functions — extend to such groups as well.

Let V be a Banach space, V^* its dual. A compact dynamical G -system X is V^* -representable if there exist a weakly continuous co-homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{Iso}(V)$, where $\text{Iso}(V)$ is the group of linear isometries of a Banach space V onto itself, and a G -embedding $\phi : X \rightarrow V_1^*$, where V_1^* is the (weak*-compact) unit ball of the dual Banach space V^* and the G -action is the dual action induced on V_1^* from the G -action on V . An old observation (due to Teleman [52]) is that every compact dynamical G -system X is $C(X)^*$ -representable.

The notion of an Eberlein compact (Eb) space in the sense of Amir and Lindenstrauss [4] is well studied and it is well known that such spaces are characterized by being homeomorphic to a weakly compact subset of a (reflexive) Banach space. Later the notion of Radon-Nikodým (RN) compact spaces was introduced. These can be characterized as weak* compact sets in the duals V^* with the RN property. It is equivalent to saying that V is an *Asplund space* (see, for example, [21, 47] and Remark 6.2.3). We refer to the excellent 1987 paper of I. Namioka [47] where the theory of RN compacts is expounded.

One of the main objects of [44] was the investigation of RN systems (a dynamical analog of RN compacta) and the related class of functions called “Asplund functions”. More precisely, call a dynamical system which is linearly representable as a weak*-compact subset of a dual Banach space with the Radon-Nikodým property a *Radon-Nikodým system* (RN for short). The class of RN-*approximable* systems, that is the subsystems of a product of RN systems, will be denoted by RN_{app} . It was shown in [44] that $\text{WAP} \subset \text{RN}_{\text{app}} \subset \text{LE}$.

Given a compact dynamical G -system X , a subgroup $H < G$ and a function $f \in C(X)$, define a pseudometric $\rho_{H,f}$ of X as follows:

$$\rho_{H,f}(x, x') = \sup_{h \in H} |f(hx) - f(hx')|.$$

We say that f is an *Asplund function* (notation: $f \in \text{Asp}(X)$) if the pseudometric space $(X, \rho_{H,f})$ is separable for every countable subgroup $H < G$. These are exactly the functions which come from linear G -representations of X in V^* with Asplund V . By [44], a compact G -system X is RN_{app} iff $C(X) = \text{Asp}(X)$ and always $\text{WAP}(X) \subset \text{Asp}(X)$.

The first section of the paper is a brief review of some known aspects of abstract topological dynamics which provide a convenient framework for our results. In the Second we discuss enveloping semigroups and semigroup compactifications. Our treatment differs slightly from the traditional approach and terminology and contains some new observations. For more details refer to the books [18, 22, 23, 57, 59, 11] and [6]. See also [8, 37, 58].

In [36] Köhler shows that the well known Bourgain-Fremlin-Talagrand dichotomy, when applied to the family $\{f^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of iterates of a continuous interval map $f : I \rightarrow I$, yields a corresponding dichotomy for the enveloping semigroups. In the third section we generalize this and obtain a Bourgain-Fremlin-Talagrand dichotomy for enveloping semigroups of metric dynamical systems.

Section 4 treats the property of *m-approximability*, i.e. the property of being approximable by metric systems. For many groups every dynamical system is *m-approximable* and we characterize such groups as being exactly the *uniformly Lindelöf* groups.

In Section 5 we recall some important notions like almost equicontinuity, WAP and LE and relate them to universal systems. We also study the related notion of *lightness* of a function $f \in \text{RUC}(G)$ – the coincidence of the pointwise and the norm topologies on its G -orbit.

Section 6 is devoted to some results concerning fragmentability. These will be crucial at many points in the rest of the paper. In Section 7 we investigate Asplund functions and their

relations to fragmentability. In Section 8 we deal with the related class of Veech functions. As already mentioned the latter class $K(G)$ is a generalization of Veech's definition [56]. We show that every Asplund function is a Veech function and that for separable groups these two classes coincide.

In Section 9 we introduce the dynamical properties of HAE and HNS and show that they are intimately related to the linear representation condition of being an RN system. In particular for metrizable compact systems we establish the following equalities and inclusions:

$$Eb = WAP \subset RN = HAE = HNS = RN_{app} \subset LE.$$

Here Eb stands for Eberlein systems – a dynamical version of Eberlein compacts (see Definition 7.5). Section 10 is devoted to various examples and applications. We show that for symbolic systems the RN property is equivalent to having a countable phase space; and that any \mathbb{Z} -dynamical system (f, X) , where X is either the unit interval or the unit circle and $f : X \rightarrow X$ is a homeomorphism, is an RN system.

In Section 11 we show that the Glasner-Weiss examples of recurrent-transitive LE but not WAP metric cascades are actually HAE. In Section 12 we investigate the mincenter of an HAE system, and in Section 13 we use a modified construction to produce an example of a recurrent-transitive, LE but not HAE system. This example exhibits the sharp distinction between the possible mincenters of LE and HAE systems.

In the final section, using *fragmented families* of functions and *Namioka's joint continuity theorem*, we establish an enveloping semigroup characterization of Asplund functions and HNS systems. Our results imply that the Ellis semigroup $E(X)$ of a compact metrizable HNS system (G, X) is a Rosenthal compact. In particular, by a result of Bourgain-Fremmlin-Talagrand [12], we obtain that $E(X)$ is *angelic* (hence, it cannot contain a subspace homeomorphic to $\beta\mathbb{N}$). Moreover a theorem of Todorćević implies that, for discrete countable acting groups G , $E(X)$ either contains an uncountable discrete subspace or it admits an at most two-to-one metric G -factor.

We are indebted to Stevo Todorćević for enlightening comments. Thanks are due to Hanfeng Li for a critical reading of the manuscript and his consequent fruitful suggestions, including improvements in the statement and proof of Propositions 5.13 and 9.4. Finally we thank Benjy Weiss for many helpful conversations.

1. TOPOLOGICAL DYNAMICS BACKGROUND

A *dynamical system* (G, X) is a continuous action $G \times X \rightarrow X$ of the topological group G on the compact ¹ space X . Sometimes we refer to it also as a G -space, but this expression can also be used for noncompact spaces. For instance, we can treat $X := G$ as a G -space under the (left) regular action. The notations (X, τ) and (X, μ) are used for a topological and a uniform space respectively. When the acting group is the group \mathbb{Z} of integers, we sometimes write (T, X) instead of (\mathbb{Z}, X) , where $T : X \rightarrow X$ is the homeomorphism which corresponds to the element $1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ (such systems are sometimes called *cascades*). We write gx for the image of $x \in X$ under the homeomorphism $\check{g} : X \rightarrow X$ which corresponds to $g \in G$. As usual, $Gx = \mathcal{O}_G(x) = \{gx : g \in G\}$ is the *orbit* of x and $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x) = \text{cls}(Gx)$ is the closure in X of $\mathcal{O}_G(x)$. If (G, Y) is another G -system then a surjective continuous G -map $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ (that is, $g\pi(x) = \pi(gx), \forall (g, x) \in G \times X$) is called a *homomorphism*. We also say that Y is a G -factor of X . When (G, X) is a dynamical system and $Y \subset X$ is a nonempty closed G -invariant subset, we say that the dynamical system (G, Y) , obtained by restriction to Y , is a *subsystem* of (G, X) .

¹compact will mean *compact and Hausdorff*

Denote by $C(X)$ the Banach algebra of all real valued bounded functions on a topological space X . We write $RUC(G)$ for the Banach algebra of *right uniformly continuous*² real valued bounded functions on G . These are the functions which are uniformly continuous with respect to the *right uniformity* on G . Thus $f \in RUC(G)$ iff for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neighborhood V of the identity element $e \in G$ such that $\sup_{g \in G} |f(vg) - f(g)| < \varepsilon$ for every $v \in V$. It is equivalent to say that the orbit map $G \rightarrow C(G)$, $g \mapsto {}_g f$ is norm continuous where ${}_g f$ is the *left translation* of f defined by ${}_g f(x) = L_g(f)(x) := f(gx)$. Analogously can be defined the algebra $LUC(G)$ of *left uniformly continuous* functions and the *right translations* $f_g(x) = R_g(f)(x) := f(xg)$. It is easy to see that $UC(G) := RUC(G) \cap LUC(G)$ is a left and right G -invariant closed subalgebra of $RUC(G)$. More generally: for a given (not necessarily compact) G -space X a function $f \in C(X)$ will be called *right uniformly continuous* if the orbit map $G \rightarrow C(X)$, $g \mapsto {}_g f := L_g(f)$ is norm continuous, where $L_g(f)(x) := f(gx)$. The set $RUC(X)$ of all right uniformly continuous functions on X is a uniformly closed G -invariant subalgebra of $C(X)$.

A G -compactification of a G -space X is a dense continuous G -map $\nu : X \rightarrow Y$ into a compact G -system Y . We say that a G -compactification $\nu : G \rightarrow S$ of $X := G$ (the left regular action) is a *right topological semigroup compactification* of G if S is a *right topological semigroup* (that is, for every $p \in S$ the map $\rho_s : S \rightarrow S, \rho_s(x) = xs$ is continuous) and ν is a homomorphism of semigroups. A compactification $\nu : X \rightarrow Y$ is *proper* when ν is a topological embedding. There exists a canonical 1-1 correspondence (see for example [58]) between the G -compactifications of X and uniformly closed G -subalgebras ("subalgebra", will always mean a subalgebra of $RUC(X)$ containing the constants). The compactification $\nu : X \rightarrow Y$ induces an isometric G -embedding of G -algebras

$$j_\nu : C(Y) \rightarrow RUC(X), \quad \phi \mapsto \phi \circ \nu$$

and the algebra \mathcal{A}_ν (corresponding to ν) is defined as the image $j_\nu(C(Y))$. Conversely, if \mathcal{A} is a uniformly closed G -subalgebra of $RUC(X)$, then its Gelfand space $|\mathcal{A}| \subset (\mathcal{A}^*, \text{weak}^*)$ has a structure of a dynamical system $(G, |\mathcal{A}|)$ and the map $\nu_\mathcal{A} : X \rightarrow Y := |\mathcal{A}|$, $x \mapsto \text{eva}_x$, where $\text{eva}_x(\varphi) := \varphi(x)$ is the evaluation at x multiplicative functional, defines a G -compactification. In particular, $\nu_{\mathcal{A}_\nu} = \nu$. If $\nu_1 : X \rightarrow Y_1$ and $\nu_2 : X \rightarrow Y_2$ are two G -compactifications then $\mathcal{A}_{\nu_1} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\nu_2}$ iff $\nu_1 = \alpha \circ \nu_2$ for some G -homomorphism $\alpha : Y_2 \rightarrow Y_1$. The algebra \mathcal{A}_ν determines the compactification ν uniquely, up to the equivalence of G -compactifications.

The G -algebra $RUC(X)$ defines the corresponding Gelfand space $|RUC(X)|$ (which we denote by $\beta_G X$) and the *maximal G -compactification* $i_\beta : X \rightarrow \beta_G X$. Note that this map may not be an embedding even for Polish X and G (see [39]); it follows that there is no proper G -compactification for such X . If X is a compact G -system then $\beta_G X$ can be identified with X and $C(X) = RUC(X)$.

For every $f \in RUC(X)$ denote by \mathcal{A}_f the smallest closed G -invariant subalgebra of $RUC(X)$ which contains f . There is then a naturally defined G -action on $|\mathcal{A}_f|$ and a G -compactification (homomorphism of dynamical systems if X is compact) $\pi_f : X \rightarrow |\mathcal{A}_f|$.

A point $x_0 \in X$ is a *transitive point* if $\overline{\mathcal{O}_G(x_0)} = X$ and the system (G, X) is called *point transitive* (or just *transitive*) if there is some transitive point in X . It is *topologically transitive* if for every two nonempty open subsets $U, V \subset X$ there exists $g \in G$ with $gU \cap V \neq \emptyset$. If, in addition, X has no isolated points we say that the system (G, X) is *recurrent-transitive*. When X is metrizable, topological transitivity is equivalent to point transitivity and, in fact, to the existence of a dense G_δ set of transitive points. A system (G, X) is called *weakly mixing* if the product system $(G, X \times X)$ (where $g(x, x') = (gx, gx')$) is topologically transitive. A system (G, X) is called *minimal* if every point of X is transitive.

²Some authors call these functions *left uniformly continuous*

A triple (G, X, x_0) with x_0 a distinguished transitive point is called a *pointed dynamical system* (or sometimes an *ambit*). For homomorphisms $\pi : (X, x_0) \rightarrow (Y, y_0)$ of pointed systems we require that $\pi(x_0) = y_0$. When such a homomorphism exists it is unique.

A pointed dynamical system (G, X, x_0) can be treated as a G -compactification $\nu_{x_0} : G \rightarrow X$, $\nu_{x_0}(g) = gx_0$. We associate, with every $F \in C(X)$, the function $j_{x_0}(F) = f \in RUC(G)$ defined by $f(g) = F(gx_0)$. Then the map $j_{x_0} : C(X) \rightarrow RUC(G)$ is actually the above mentioned isometric embedding $j_{\nu_{x_0}} : C(X) \rightarrow RUC(G)$. Let us denote its image by $j_{x_0}(C(X)) = \mathcal{A}(X, x_0)$. We have ${}_gf = {}_g(j_{x_0}(F)) = j_{x_0}(F \circ g)$. The Gelfand space $|\mathcal{A}(X, x_0)|$ of the algebra $\mathcal{A}(X, x_0)$ is naturally identified with X and in particular the multiplicative functional $\text{eva}_e : f \mapsto f(e)$, is identified with the point x_0 . Moreover the action of G on $\mathcal{A}(X, x_0)$ by left translations induces an action of G on $|\mathcal{A}(X, x_0)|$ and under this identification the pointed systems (X, x_0) and $(|\mathcal{A}(X, x_0)|, \text{eva}_e)$ are isomorphic.

Conversely, if \mathcal{A} is a G -invariant uniformly closed subalgebra of $RUC(G)$ (here and in the sequel when we say that a subalgebra of $RUC(G)$ is G -invariant we mean left G -invariant), then its Gelfand space $|\mathcal{A}|$ has a structure of a pointed dynamical system $(G, |\mathcal{A}|, \text{eva}_e)$. In particular, we have, corresponding to the algebra $RUC(G)$, the *universal ambit* (G, G^R, eva_e) where we denote the Gelfand space $|RUC(G)| = \beta_G G$ by G^R (See for example [18] or [59] for more details).

It is easy to check that for any collection $\{(G, X_\theta, x_\theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ of pointed systems we have

$$\mathcal{A}\left(\bigvee\{(X_\theta, x_\theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}\right) = \bigvee\{\mathcal{A}(X_\theta, x_\theta) : \theta \in \Theta\},$$

where $\bigvee\{(X_\theta, x_\theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ is the orbit closure of the point x in the product space $\prod_{\theta \in \Theta} X_\theta$ whose θ coordinate is x_θ , and the algebra on the right hand side is the closed subalgebra of $RUC(G)$ generated by the union of the subalgebras $\mathcal{A}(X_\theta, x_\theta)$.

- Definition 1.1.**
1. We say that a function $f \in RUC(X)$ on a G -space X is *coming from a G -system Y* if there exist a G -compactification $\nu : X \rightarrow Y$ (so, ν is onto if X is compact) and a function $F \in C(Y)$ such that $f = \nu \circ F$ (equivalently, $f \in \mathcal{A}_\nu$). For instance, only the maximal G -compactification $i_\beta : X \rightarrow \beta_G X$ has the property that every $f \in RUC(X)$ is coming from i_β .
 2. A function $f \in RUC(G)$ is *coming from a pointed system (Y, y_0)* if for some continuous function $F \in C(Y)$ we have $f(g) = F(gy_0)$, $\forall g \in G$; i.e. $f = j_{y_0}(F)$. Defining $i : X = G \rightarrow Y$ by $i(g) = gy_0$ observe that this is indeed a particular case of 1.1.1.
 3. A function $f \in RUC(X)$ is called *minimal* if it comes from a minimal system.

2. THE ENVELOPING SEMIGROUP

The *enveloping (or Ellis) semigroup* $E = E(G, X) = E(X)$ of a dynamical system (G, X) is defined as the closure in X^X (with its compact, usually non-metrizable, pointwise convergence topology) of the set $\check{G} = \{\check{g} : X \rightarrow X\}_{g \in G}$ considered as a subset of X^X . With the operation of composition of maps this is a right topological semigroup. Moreover, the map $i : G \rightarrow E(X)$, $g \mapsto \check{g}$ is a right topological semigroup compactification of G .

Proposition 2.1. *The enveloping semigroup of a dynamical system (G, X) is isomorphic (as a dynamical system) to the pointed product*

$$(E', \omega_0) = \bigvee\{(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x) : x \in X\} \subset X^X.$$

Proof. It is easy to see that the map $p \mapsto p\omega_0$, $(G, E, i(e)) \rightarrow (G, E', \omega_0)$ is an isomorphism of pointed systems. \square

Let X be a (not necessarily compact) G -space. Given $f \in RUC(X)$ let $I = [-\|f\|, \|f\|] \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\Omega = I^G$, the product space equipped with the compact product topology. We let G act on Ω by $g\omega(h) = \omega(hg)$, $g, h \in G$.

Define the map

$$f_{\#} : X \rightarrow \Omega, \quad f_{\#}(x)(g) = f(gx)$$

and the closure $X_f := \text{cls}(f_{\#}(X))$ in Ω . Note that $X_f = f_{\#}(X)$ whenever X is compact.

Denoting the unique continuous extension of f to $\beta_G X$ by \tilde{f} we now define a map

$$\psi : \beta_G X \rightarrow X_f \quad \text{by} \quad \psi(y)(g) = \tilde{f}(gy), \quad y \in \beta_G X, g \in G.$$

Let $\pi_e : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the projection of $\Omega = I^G$ onto the e -coordinate and let $F_e := \pi_e \upharpoonright_{X_f} : X_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be its restriction to X_f . Thus, $F_e(\omega) := \omega(e)$ for every $\omega \in X_f$.

- Proposition 2.2.** 1. Each $\omega \in X_f$ is an element of $RUC(G)$.
 2. The map $\psi : \beta_G X \rightarrow X_f$ is a continuous homomorphism of G -systems. The dynamical system $(G, |\mathcal{A}_f|)$ is isomorphic to (G, X_f) and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\beta_G} & \beta_G X & & \\ \pi_f \downarrow & \searrow \pi & \downarrow \psi & \searrow \tilde{f} & \\ |\mathcal{A}_f| & \xleftrightarrow{\quad} & X_f & \xrightarrow{F_e} & \mathbb{R} \end{array}$$

commutes.

3. $f = F_e \circ f_{\#}$. Thus every $f \in RUC(X)$ is coming from the system X_f . Moreover, if f is coming from a system Y and a G -compactification $\nu : X \rightarrow Y$ then there exists a homomorphism $\alpha : Y \rightarrow X_f$ such that $f_{\#} = \alpha \circ \nu$.

Proof. 1. $f \in RUC(X)$ implies that $f_{\#}(X)$ is a uniformly equicontinuous subset of I^G (endowing G with its right uniformity). Thus, the pointwise closure $\text{cls}(f_{\#}(X)) = X_f$ is also uniformly equicontinuous. In particular, for every $\omega \in X_f$ the function $\omega : G \rightarrow I$ is right uniformly continuous.

2. Suppose $i_{\beta}(x_{\nu}) \in i_{\beta}(X)$ is a net converging to $y \in \beta_G X$. Then $\psi(y)(g) = \tilde{f}(gy) = \lim_{\nu} f(gx_{\nu}) = \lim_{\nu} f_{\#}(x_{\nu})(g)$. Thus $\psi(y) = \lim_{\nu} f_{\#}(x_{\nu})$ is indeed an element of X_f and it is easy to see that ψ is a continuous G -homomorphism. In particular, we see that X_f , being a G -factor of $\beta_G X$, is indeed a G -system (i.e. the G -action on X_f is jointly continuous).

Next consider the map $\pi : \beta_G X \rightarrow |\mathcal{A}_f|$. By definition, the elements of $\beta_G X$ are continuous multiplicative linear functionals on the algebra $RUC(X)$, and for $y \in \beta_G X$ its value $\pi(y) \in |\mathcal{A}_f|$ is the restriction $y \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{A}_f}$ to the subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_f \subset RUC(X)$. For $g \in G$, as above, let ${}_g f \in \mathcal{A}_f \subset RUC(X)$ be defined by ${}_g f(x) = f(gx)$. Then $\pi(y_1) = \pi(y_2)$ implies $y_1({}_g f) = \tilde{f}(gy_1) = \tilde{f}(gy_2) = y_2({}_g f)$ for every $g \in G$.

Conversely, assuming, $\tilde{f}(gy_1) = \tilde{f}(gy_2)$ for every $g \in G$, we observe that, as y_1 and y_2 are multiplicative functionals, we also have $y_1(h) = y_2(h)$ for every h in the subalgebra \mathcal{A}_0 generated by the family $\{{}_g f : g \in G\}$. Since \mathcal{A}_0 is dense in \mathcal{A}_f and as y_1 and y_2 are continuous we deduce that $\pi(y_1) = y_1 \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{A}_f} = y_2 \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{A}_f} = \pi(y_2)$.

We clearly have $\psi(y_1) = \psi(y_2) \iff \tilde{f}(gy_1) = \tilde{f}(gy_2)$ for every $g \in G$. Thus for $y_1, y_2 \in \beta_G X$ we have $\pi(y_1) = \pi(y_2) \iff \psi(y_1) = \psi(y_2) \iff \tilde{f}(gy_1) = \tilde{f}(gy_2)$ for every $g \in G$, and we find that indeed $|\mathcal{A}_f|$ and X_f are isomorphic G -systems.

The commutativity of the diagram is straightforward.

3. Clearly, $F_e(f_{\#}(x)) = f_{\#}(x)(e) = f(ex) = f(x)$ for every $x \in X$. For the rest use the G -isomorphism $|\mathcal{A}_f| \leftrightarrow X_f$ (assertion 2). If $f = F \circ \nu$ for some $F \in C(Y)$ then $f \in \mathcal{A}_{\nu}$. This implies the inclusion of G -subalgebras $\mathcal{A}_f \subset \mathcal{A}_{\nu}$ which leads to the desired G -homomorphism $\alpha : Y \rightarrow X_f$. \square

- Remark 2.3.** 1. Below we use the map $f_\sharp : X \rightarrow X_f$ and Proposition 2.2 in two particular cases. First, for a compact G -space X when clearly $\beta_G X$ can be replaced by X . We frequently consider also the case of left regular action of G on itself $X := G$ (see Proposition 2.4). Here the canonical maximal G -compactification $i_\beta : X \rightarrow \beta_G X$ is actually the compactification $G \rightarrow G^R$ and the orbit $Gf = f_\sharp(G)$ of f is dense in $X_f = \text{cls}(f_\sharp(G))$.
2. $\beta_G X$ is a subdirect product of the G -systems X_f where $f \in RUC(X)$. This follows easily from Proposition 2.2 and the fact that elements of $C(\beta_G X) = \{\tilde{f} : f \in RUC(X)\}$ separate points and closed subsets of $\beta_G X$.
3. Proposition 2.2.4 actually says that the compactification $f_\sharp : X \rightarrow X_f$ is *minimal* (in fact, *the smallest*) among all the G -compactifications $\nu : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $f \in RUC(X)$ is coming from ν . The *maximal* compactification in the same setting is clearly $i_\beta : X \rightarrow \beta_G X$.

- Proposition 2.4.** 1. Consider the left regular action of G on itself $X := G$. For every $f \in RUC(G)$ we have $Gf \subset X_f = \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(f) \subset \Omega$, $f_\sharp(e) = f$ and $F_e(gf) = f(g)$ for every $g \in G$.
2. The pointed G -system $(|\mathcal{A}_f|, \text{eva}_e)$ is isomorphic to (X_f, f) .
3. $f = F_e \circ f_\sharp$. Thus every $f \in RUC(G)$ is coming from the pointed system (X_f, f) . Moreover, if f is coming from a pointed system (Y, y_0) and $\nu : (G, e) \rightarrow (Y, y_0)$ is the corresponding G -compactification then there exists a homomorphism $\alpha : (Y, y_0) \rightarrow (X_f, f)$ such that $f_\sharp = \alpha \circ \nu$. In particular, $f \in \mathcal{A}_f \subset \mathcal{A}(Y, y_0)$.
4. Denote by $X_f^H \subset I^H$ the dynamical system constructed for the subgroup $H < G$ and the restriction $f \upharpoonright_H$ (e.g., $X_f^G = X_f$). If $H < G$ is a dense subgroup then, for every $f \in RUC(G)$, the dynamical systems (H, X_f) and (H, X_f^H) are canonically isomorphic.

Proof. For the assertions 1, 2 and 3 use Proposition 2.2 and Remark 2.3.1.

4. Let $j : X_f \rightarrow X_f^H$ be the restriction of the natural projection $I^G \rightarrow I^H$. Clearly, $j : (H, X_f) \rightarrow (H, X_f^H)$ is a surjective homomorphism. If $j(\omega) = j(\omega')$ then $\omega(h) = \omega'(h)$ for every $h \in H$. Since, by Proposition 2.2.1 every $\omega \in X_f$ is a continuous function on G and since we assume that H is dense in G we conclude that $\omega = \omega'$ so that j is an isomorphism. \square

Definition 2.5. We say that a pointed dynamical system (G, X, x_0) is *point-universal* if it has the property that for every $x \in X$ there is a homomorphism $\pi_x : (X, x_0) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$. A closed G -invariant subalgebra $\mathcal{A} \subset RUC(G)$ is called *point-universal* if the corresponding Gelfand system $(G, |\mathcal{A}|, \text{eva}_e)$ is point-universal.

Proposition 2.6. The following conditions on the pointed dynamical system (G, X, x_0) are equivalent:

1. (X, x_0) is point-universal.
2. $\mathcal{A}(X, x_0) = \bigcup_{x \in X} \mathcal{A}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$.
3. (X, x_0) is isomorphic to its enveloping semigroup $(E(X), i(e))$.

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$: Clearly, $\mathcal{A}(X, x_0) = \mathcal{A}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_0), x_0) \subset \bigcup_{x \in X} \mathcal{A}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$. Suppose $f(g) = F(gx) \forall g \in G$ for some $F \in C(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x))$ and $x \in X$. Since (X, x_0) is point-universal there exists a homomorphism $\pi_x : (X, x_0) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$. Hence $f(g) = F(gx) = F(g\pi_x(x_0)) = F(\pi_x(gx_0)) = (F \circ \pi_x)(gx_0) = j_{x_0}(F \circ \pi_x)(g)$ and we conclude that $f = j_{x_0}(F \circ \pi_x) \in \mathcal{A}(X, x_0)$.

$2 \Rightarrow 3$: Proposition 2.1 guarantees the existence of a pointed isomorphism between the systems $(E(X), i(e))$ and $\bigvee_{x \in X} (\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$. Now, using our assumption we have:

$$\mathcal{A}(E(X), i(e)) = \mathcal{A}\left(\bigvee_{x \in X} (\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)\right) = \bigvee_{x \in X} \mathcal{A}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x) = \mathcal{A}(X, x_0),$$

whence the isomorphism of (X, x_0) and $(E(X), i(e))$.

$3 \Rightarrow 1$: For any fixed $x \in X$ the map $\pi_x : E(X) \rightarrow X$, defined by $\pi_x(p) = px$, is a G -homomorphism with $\pi_x(i(e)) = x$. Our assumption that (X, x_0) and $(E(X), i(e))$ are isomorphic now implies the point-universality of (X, x_0) . \square

We now formulate three important corollaries.

Corollary 2.7. *A transitive system (G, X, x_0) is point-universal iff the map $G \rightarrow X, g \mapsto gx_0$ is a right topological semigroup compactification of G .*

Proof. The necessity of the condition follows directly from Proposition 2.6. Suppose now that the map $G \rightarrow X, g \mapsto gx_0$ is a right topological semigroup compactification of G . Given $x \in X$ we observe that the map $\rho_x : (X, x_0) \rightarrow (X, x)$, $\rho_x(z) = zx$ is a homomorphism of pointed systems, so that (G, X, x_0) is point-universal. \square

In particular, for every G -system X the enveloping semigroup $(E(X), i(e))$, as a pointed G -system, is point-universal. Here $i : G \rightarrow E(X)$, $g \mapsto \check{g}$ is the canonical enveloping semigroup compactification.

Corollary 2.8. *Let (G, X, x_0) be a point-universal dynamical system and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(X, x_0) = j_{x_0}(C(X))$ the corresponding algebra.*

1. *For every $h \in RUC(G)$ coming from the pointed system $(G, \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$ (for some $x \in X$) we have $\text{cls}(Gh) = X_h \subset \mathcal{A}$ (i.e. every point $\varphi \in X_h$ considered as a function on G is in \mathcal{A}).*
2. *\mathcal{A} is right and left G -invariant.*

Proof. 1. Assume that $h \in RUC(G)$ comes from the pointed G -system $(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(y_0), y_0)$ for some $y_0 \in X$. We have to show that $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}$ whenever $\varphi \in X_h = \text{cls}(Gh)$. Consider the orbit closure $X_\varphi = \text{cls}(G\varphi)$ in X_h . Since $X_\varphi \subset X_h$ and X_h is a G -factor of $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(y_0)$ (Proposition 2.4.3) we can choose a point $z_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(y_0) \subset X$ such that (X_φ, φ) is a G -factor of $(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(z_0), z_0)$. Denote by $q : (\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(z_0), z_0) \rightarrow (X_\varphi, \varphi)$ the corresponding homomorphism. Let $F_e : X_\varphi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the map defined as in Proposition 2.4.3 (for X_φ). It is easy to see that $F_e(q(gz_0)) = f(g)$. Therefore, φ comes from the pointed system $(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(z_0), z_0)$. By Proposition 2.4.3, $\mathcal{A}_\varphi \subset \mathcal{A}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(z_0), z_0)$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{A}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(z_0), z_0) \subset \mathcal{A}(X, x_0)$ by Proposition 2.6.2. This completes the proof because we obtain $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}_\varphi \subset \mathcal{A}(X, x_0) = \mathcal{A}$.

To see 2, first note that $\mathcal{A} = j_{x_0}(C(X))$ is left G -invariant. Now we check that \mathcal{A} is also right G -invariant. Observe that for $f \in \mathcal{A}$ we have a representation $f(g) = F(gx_0)$, $\forall g \in G$ for some $F \in C(X)$. Given $g' \in G$ we then have

$$f_{g'}(g) = f(gg') = F(gg'x_0) = F(g(g'x_0)),$$

so that $f_{g'}$ comes from the function F restricted to the orbit of the point $x = g'x_0$. Now apply once again claim 2 of Proposition 2.6. \square

Corollary 2.9. *Let P be a property of G -dynamical systems which is preserved by products and subsystems.*

1. *Let (G, X) be a dynamical system and let $\mathcal{P} \subset C(X)$ be the collection of functions coming from systems having property P . Then \mathcal{P} is a uniformly closed, G -invariant subalgebra of $C(X)$. Thus \mathcal{P} defines a factor $(G, X^\mathcal{P})$ of (G, X) which is the maximum factor with property P .*

2. Let $\mathcal{P} \subset RUC(G)$ be the collection of functions coming from systems with property P . Then \mathcal{P} is a point-universal (uniformly closed, right and left G -invariant) subalgebra of $RUC(G)$. Thus \mathcal{P} defines a factor $G^{\mathcal{P}}$ of $G^{\mathbb{R}}$ which is the maximum factor of $G^{\mathbb{R}}$ with property P . Moreover $(G^{\mathcal{P}}, \text{eva}_e)$ is the universal point transitive dynamical system having property P ; i.e. if (G, Z) is any dynamical system with property P and $z_0 \in Z$ is a transitive point then there exists a homomorphism $\phi : G^{\mathcal{P}} \rightarrow Z$ mapping the distinguished point $\text{eva}_e \in G^{\mathcal{P}}$ onto z_0 .
3. If in addition P is preserved by factors then $f \in \mathcal{P}$ iff X_f has property P .

Proof. 1. We only give an outline of the rather standard procedure. If $F_i \in C(X)$, $i = 1, 2$ are given which arise from factors $\pi_i : X \rightarrow Y_i$ with property P (i.e. $F_i(x) = F'_i(\pi_i(x))$, for $F'_i \in C(Y_i)$), we consider the map $\pi = \pi_1 \times \pi_2 : X \rightarrow Y_1 \times Y_2$. By assumption then the subsystem $Y = \pi(X) \subset Y_1 \times Y_2$ has property P and denoting by F' the restriction of $F'_1(y_1)F'_2(y_2)$ to Y we see that $F(x) = F_1(x)F_2(x) = F' \circ \pi(x)$ has the right form. Finite sums are handled similarly and we conclude that \mathcal{P} is an algebra. If $F = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} F_i$, $F_i \in C(X)$ is a uniformly convergent series with $F_i \in \mathcal{P}$ then an analogous construction involving a countable product will show that $F \in \mathcal{P}$. Therefore \mathcal{P} is uniformly closed.

2. This is proved similarly. E.g. if f_i , $i = 1, 2$ come from (G, X_i, x_i) with property P , so that $f_i(g) = F_i(gx_i)$ with $F_i \in C(X_i)$, then $f(g) = (f_1 + f_2)(g) = F_1(gx_1) + F_2(gx_2)$ comes from the subsystem $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_1, x_2) \subset X_1 \times X_2$.

For every point $x \in G^{\mathcal{P}}$ the pointed G -system $(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$ has the property P . The P -universality of $(G, G^{\mathcal{P}})$ implies that there exists a G -homomorphism $(G^{\mathcal{P}}, \text{eva}_e) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$. This means that $(G^{\mathcal{P}}, \text{eva}_e)$ is point-universal.

3. Use Proposition 2.2.3. □

3. A DYNAMICAL VERSION OF THE BOURGAIN-FREMLIN-TALAGRAND THEOREM

Let $E = E(X)$ be the enveloping semigroup of a G -system X . For every $f \in C(X)$ define a set

$$E^f := \{p_f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{p \in E} = \{f \circ p : p \in E\}, \quad p_f(x) = f(px).$$

Then E^f is a pointwise compact subset of \mathbb{R}^X , being a continuous image of E under the map $E \rightarrow E^f$, $p \mapsto p_f$. We have a natural separately continuous *right* action

$$E^f \times G \rightarrow E^f, \quad (p_f, g) \mapsto (pg)_f.$$

When G is a commutative group then E^f can be treated also as a left G -system. In this case the action $G \times E^f \rightarrow E^f$ is jointly continuous; so that moreover, the map $E \rightarrow E^f$, $p \mapsto p_f$ is a homomorphism of G -systems.

Recall that a topological space K is *Rosenthal compact* [26] if it is homeomorphic to a pointwise compact subset of the space $B_1(X)$ of functions of the first Baire class on a Polish space X . All metric compact spaces are Rosenthal. An example of a separable non-metrizable Rosenthal compact is the *Helly compact* of all (not only strictly) increasing selfmaps of $[0, 1]$ in the pointwise topology). Another is the “two arrows” space of Alexandroff and Urysohn (see Example 14.10). A topological space K is *angelic* if the closure of every subset $A \subset K$ is the set of limits of sequences from A and every relatively countably compact set in K is relatively compact. Clearly, $\beta\mathbb{N}$, the Stone-Ćech compactification of the natural numbers \mathbb{N} , cannot be embedded into a Rosenthal compact space.

The following theorem is due to Bourgain-Fremlin-Talagrand [12, Theorem 3F], generalizing a result of Rosenthal. The second assertion (BFT dichotomy) is presented as in the book of Todorćević [53] (see Proposition 1 of Section 13).

Theorem 3.1. 1. *Every Rosenthal compact space K is angelic.*
 2. *(BFT dichotomy) Let X be a Polish space and let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subset C(X)$ be a sequence of real valued functions which is pointwise bounded (i.e. for each $x \in X$ the sequence $\{f_n(x)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is bounded in \mathbb{R}). Let K be the pointwise closure of $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in \mathbb{R}^X . Then either $K \subset B_1(X)$ (i.e. K is Rosenthal compact) or K contains a homeomorphic copy of $\beta\mathbb{N}$.*

Next we will show how the BFT dichotomy leads to a corresponding dynamical dichotomy (see also [36]). In the proof we will use the following observation. Let G be an arbitrary topological group. For every compact G -space X , denote by $j : G \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(X)$ the associated (always *continuous*) homomorphism into the group of all selfhomeomorphisms of X . Then the topological group $\check{G} = j(G)$ (we will call it the *natural restriction*) naturally acts on X . If X is a compact metric space then $\text{Homeo}(X)$, equipped with the topology of uniform convergence, is a Polish group. Hence, the subgroup $\check{G} = j(G)$ is second countable. In particular one can always find a countable dense subgroup G_0 of \check{G} .

Theorem 3.2 (A dynamical BFT dichotomy). *Let (G, X) be a metric dynamical system and let $E = E(X)$ be its enveloping semigroup. We have the following alternative. Either*

1. *E is a separable Rosenthal compact (hence $\text{card } E \leq 2^{\aleph_0}$); or*
2. *the compact space E contains a homeomorphic copy of $\beta\mathbb{N}$, hence $\text{card } E = 2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$.*

The first possibility holds iff E^f is a Rosenthal compact for every $f \in C(X)$.

Proof. Since X is compact and metrizable one can choose a sequence $\{f_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $C(X)$ which separates the points of X . For every pair p, q of distinct elements of E there exist a point $x_0 \in X$ and a function f_{n_0} from our sequence such that $f_{n_0}(px_0) \neq f_{n_0}(qx_0)$. It follows that the continuous diagonal map

$$\Phi : E \rightarrow \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E^{f_n}, \quad p \mapsto (f_1 \circ p, f_2 \circ p, \dots)$$

separates the points of E and hence is a topological embedding. (For G commutative, clearly Φ is an isomorphism of dynamical systems.)

Now if for each n the space E^{f_n} is a Rosenthal compact then so is $E \cong \Phi(E) \subset \prod_{n=1}^\infty E^{f_n}$, because the class of Rosenthal compacts is closed under countable products and closed subspaces. On the other hand — since for each $f \in C(X)$, $E^f = \text{cls}\{f \circ g : g \in G_0\}$, where G_0 is a countable dense subgroup of \check{G} — by the BFT theorem, Theorem 3.1, if at least one E^{f_n} is not Rosenthal then it contains a homeomorphic copy of $\beta\mathbb{N}$ and it is easy to see that so does its preimage E . (In fact if $\beta\mathbb{N} \cong Z \subset E^{f_n}$ then any closed subset Y of E which projects onto Z and is minimal with respect to these properties is also homeomorphic to $\beta\mathbb{N}$.)

Again an application of the BFT theorem yields the fact that in the first case E is angelic. Clearly, the cardinality of every separable angelic space is at most 2^{\aleph_0} . Now in order to complete the proof observe that for every compact metric G -system X the space E , being the pointwise closure of \check{G} in X^X , is separable, hence $\text{card } E \leq 2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$.

The last assertion clearly follows from the above proof. \square

4. METRIC APPROXIMATION OF DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS

Let (X, μ) be a uniform space and let $\varepsilon \in \mu$. We say that X is ε -Lindelöf if the uniform cover $\{\varepsilon(x) \mid x \in X\}$, where $\varepsilon(x) = \{y \in X \mid (x, y) \in \varepsilon\}$, has a countable subcover. If X is ε -Lindelöf for each $\varepsilon \in \mu$, then it is called *uniformly Lindelöf* [41]. We note that

(X, μ) is uniformly Lindelöf iff it is \aleph_0 -precompact in the sense of Isbell [29]. If X , as a topological space, is either separable, Lindelöf or *ccc* (see [29, p. 24]), then (X, μ) is uniformly Lindelöf. For a metrizable uniform structure μ , (X, μ) is uniformly Lindelöf iff X is separable. Uniformly continuous maps send uniformly Lindelöf subspaces onto uniformly Lindelöf subspaces.

We say that a compact G -system X is *m-approximable* if it is a subdirect product of metric compact G -systems (see also the notion of *quasi-separability* in the sense of [35, 59]). A topological group G is \aleph_0 -bounded (in the sense of Guran [28]) if for every neighborhood U of e there exists a countable subset $C \subset G$ such that $G = CU$. Clearly, G is \aleph_0 -bounded means exactly that G is uniformly Lindelöf with respect to its right (or, left) uniformity. By [28] a group G is \aleph_0 -bounded iff G is a topological subgroup of a product of second countable topological groups. If G is either separable or Lindelöf (σ -compact, for instance) then G is uniformly Lindelöf. By Keynes [35], every transitive system X with σ -compact acting group G is m-approximable. The following generalization provides a simple criterion for m-approximability.

Recall our notation for the “natural restriction” $\check{G} = j(G)$, where for a compact G -system (G, X) , the map $j : G \rightarrow \text{Homeo}(X)$ is the associated continuous homomorphism of G into the group of all selfhomeomorphisms of X (see Section 3).

Proposition 4.1. *Let X be a compact G -system. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *X is an inverse limit of metrizable compact G -systems (of dimension $\leq \dim X$);*
2. *(G, X) is m-approximable;*
3. *\check{G} is uniformly Lindelöf.*

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$ is trivial.

For $2 \Rightarrow 3$ observe that for every metric compact G -factor X_i of X the corresponding natural restriction $G_i \subset \text{Homeo}(X_i)$ of G is second countable with respect to the compact open topology. By our assumption it follows that the group $\check{G} \subset \text{Homeo}(X)$ can be topologically embedded into the product $\prod_i G_i$ of second countable groups. Hence \check{G} is uniformly Lindelöf by the theorem of Guran mentioned above.

The implication $3 \Rightarrow 1$ has been proved (one can assume that $G = \check{G}$) in [38, p. 82], and [40, Theorem 2.19] (see also [55, Lemma 10]). \square

Proposition 4.2. *Let G be a topological group. The following conditions are equivalent.*

1. *G is uniformly Lindelöf.*
2. *The greatest ambit G^R is m-approximable.*
3. *Every compact G -system is m-approximable.*
4. *For every G -space X and each $f \in RUC(X)$ the G -system X_f is metrizable.*

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 4$: Suppose that G is uniformly Lindelöf. Given $f \in RUC(X)$ the orbit map

$$G \rightarrow RUC(X), \quad g \mapsto_g f$$

is uniformly continuous, where G is endowed with its right uniformity. Therefore, the orbit Gf is also uniformly Lindelöf, hence separable in the Banach space $RUC(X)$ (inspired by [55, Lemma 10]). It follows that the Banach G -algebra \mathcal{A}_f generated by Gf is also separable. By Proposition 2.2.2, X_f is metrizable.

$4 \Rightarrow 2$: Consider the G -space $X := G$. Assuming that each X_f is metrizable, we see, by Remark 2.3.2, that $G^R = \beta_G X$ is an m-approximable G -system.

$2 \Rightarrow 1$: Since G naturally embeds as an orbit into G^R , we get that the map $j : G \rightarrow \check{G} \subset \text{Homeo}(G^R)$ is a homeomorphism. If G^R is m-approximable then by Proposition 4.1, \check{G} (and hence G) is uniformly Lindelöf.

$1 \Rightarrow 3$: Immediately follows by Proposition 4.1.

3 \Rightarrow 2: Trivial. \square

5. ALMOST EQUICONTINUITY, LOCAL EQUICONTINUITY AND VARIATIONS

By a *uniform* G -space (X, μ) we mean a G -space (X, τ) where τ is a (completely regular not necessarily Hausdorff) topology, and a *compatible* (not necessarily separated) uniform structure μ , so that the topology defined by μ is τ .

Definition 5.1. Let (X, μ) be a uniform G -space.

1. A point $x_0 \in X$ is a *point of equicontinuity* (notation: $x_0 \in Eq(X)$) if for every entourage $\varepsilon \in \mu$, there is a neighborhood U of x_0 such that $(gx_0, gx) \in \varepsilon$ for every $x \in U$ and $g \in G$. The G -space X is *equicontinuous* if $Eq(X) = X$. As usual, X is *uniformly equicontinuous* if for every $\varepsilon \in \mu$ there is $\delta \in \mu$ such that $(gx, gy) \in \varepsilon$ for every $g \in G$ and $(x, y) \in \delta$. For compact X , equicontinuity and uniform equicontinuity coincide.
2. The G -space X is *almost equicontinuous* (AE for short) if $Eq(X)$ is dense in X . For a compact transitive (and metrizable) AE system X the set $Eq(X)$ coincides with the (resp.: dense G_δ) subset of transitive points of X (see [24] and [1]).
3. We say that the G -space X is *hereditarily almost equicontinuous* (HAE for short) if every closed uniform G -subspace of X is AE.

Let $\pi : G \times X \rightarrow X$ be a separately continuous (at least) action on a uniform space (X, μ) . Following [3, ch. 4] define the injective *orbit map*

$$\pi_\# : X \rightarrow C(G, X), \quad \pi_\#(x)(g) = gx,$$

where $C(G, X)$ is the collection of continuous maps from G into X . Given a subgroup $H < G$ endow $C(H, X)$ with the uniform structure whose basis consists of sets of the form

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} = \{(f, f') \in C(H, X) : (f(h), f'(h)) \in \varepsilon \text{ for all } h \in H\}.$$

We use the map $\pi_\# : X \rightarrow C(H, X)$ to define a uniform structure μ_H on X , (the *uniform structure of uniform convergence*), as follows. For $\varepsilon \in \mu$ set

$$[\varepsilon]_H := \{(x, y) \in X \times X : (hx, hy) \in \varepsilon \text{ for all } h \in H\}.$$

The collection $\{[\varepsilon]_H : \varepsilon \in \mu\}$ is a basis for μ_H .

Always $\mu \subset \mu_H$ and equality occurs iff the action of H on (X, μ) is uniformly equicontinuous. If (X, μ) is metrizable and d denotes some compatible metric on X , then the corresponding μ_H is uniformly equivalent to the following metric

$$d_H(x, x') = \sup_{g \in H} d(gx, gx').$$

- Remark 5.2.*
1. It is easy to characterize μ_G for G -subsets of $RUC(G)$ (e.g., for $X_f = \text{cls}(f_\#(X)) \subset RUC(G)$), where μ is the pointwise uniformity on $RUC(G)$. The corresponding μ_G is the metric uniformity inherited from the norm of $RUC(G)$.
 2. The arguments of [1, Theorem 2.6] show that the uniform space (X, μ_G) is complete for every compact G -system (X, μ) .

Lemma 5.3. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. x_0 is a point of equicontinuity of the G -space (X, μ) .
2. x_0 is a point of continuity of the map $\pi_\# : X \rightarrow C(G, X)$.
3. x_0 is a point of continuity of the map $\text{id}_X : (X, \mu) \rightarrow (X, \mu_G)$.

Proof. Straightforward. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Given a compact system $(G, (X, \mu))$ (with the unique compatible uniformity μ) the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $(G, (X, \mu))$ is (uniformly) equicontinuous.
2. $\mu_G = \mu$.
3. $\pi_{\sharp} : X \rightarrow C(G, X)$ is continuous.
4. μ_G is precompact.

Proof. By Remark 5.2.2 the uniform space (X, μ_G) is complete. Thus precompact implies compact. This establishes $4 \Rightarrow 1$.

The implications $1 \Rightarrow 2 \Rightarrow 3 \Rightarrow 4$ are trivial taking into account Lemma 5.3. \square

Lemma 5.5. *The uniformity μ_G defined above is compatible with subdirect products. More precisely:*

1. Let G act on the uniform space (X, μ) and let Y be a G -invariant subset. Then $(\mu_G) \upharpoonright_Y = (\mu \upharpoonright_Y)_G$.
2. Let $\{(X_i, \mu_i) : i \in I\}$ be a family of uniform G -spaces. Then $(\prod_i \mu_i)_G = \prod_i (\mu_i)_G$.

Proof. Straightforward. \square

Definition 5.6. 1. Let us say that a subset K of a uniform G -space (X, μ) is *light* if the topologies induced by the uniformities μ and μ_G coincide on K . We say that X is *orbitwise light* if all orbits are light in X .

2. (X, μ) is said to be *locally equicontinuous* (LE for short) if every point x_0 is a point of equicontinuity of the uniform G -subspace $\text{cls}(Gx_0)$. That is, for every $x_0 \in X$ and every element ε of the uniform structure μ there exists a neighborhood O of x_0 in X such that $(gx, gx_0) \in \varepsilon$ for every $g \in G$ and every $x \in O \cap \text{cls}(Gx_0)$ (see [25]). It is easy to see that the latter condition, equivalently, can be replaced by the weaker condition: $x \in O \cap Gx_0$ (this explains Lemma 5.7.1 below).

Lemma 5.7. 1. $x_0 \in X$ is a point of equicontinuity of $\text{cls}(Gx_0)$ iff Gx_0 is light in X .

2. X is LE iff X is orbitwise light.

3. A pointed system (X, x_0) is AE iff the orbit Gx_0 is light in X .

4. Let $f \in RUC(X)$. A subset $K \subset X_f = \text{cls}(f_{\sharp}(X))$ is light iff the pointwise and norm topologies coincide on $K \subset RUC(G)$.

Proof. 1. Straightforward.

2. Follows directly from Claim 1.

3. If X is AE and transitive, then $Eq(X)$ coincides with the set of transitive points. In particular, $x_0 \in Eq(X)$. Thus, Gx_0 is light in X by Claim 1.

Conversely, let Gx_0 be a light subset and x_0 be a transitive point. Then again by the first assertion $x_0 \in Eq(X)$. Hence $Eq(X)$ (containing Gx_0) is dense in X .

4. For the last assertion see Remark 5.2.1. \square

Given a G -space X the collection $AP(X)$ of functions in $RUC(X)$ coming from equicontinuous systems is the G -invariant uniformly closed algebra of almost periodic functions, where a function $f \in C(X)$ is *almost periodic* if the set of translates $\{L_g(f) : g \in G\}$, where $L_g(f)(x) = f(gx)$, forms a precompact subset of the Banach space $C(X)$. A function $f \in C(X)$ is called *weakly almost periodic* (WAP for short, notation: $f \in WAP(X)$) if the set of translates $\{L_g(f) : g \in G\}$ forms a weakly precompact subset of $C(X)$. We say that a dynamical system (G, X) is *weakly almost periodic* if $C(X) = WAP(X)$. The classical theory shows that $WAP(G)$ is a left and right G -invariant, uniformly closed, point-universal algebra containing $AP(G)$ and that every minimal function in $WAP(G)$ is in $AP(G)$.

The following characterization of WAP dynamical systems is due to Ellis [17] (see also Ellis and Nerurkar [19]) and is based on a result of Grothendieck [27] (namely: pointwise compact bounded subsets in $C(X)$ are weakly compact for every compact X).

Theorem 5.8. *Let (G, X) be a dynamical system. The following conditions are equivalent.*

1. (G, X) is WAP.
2. The enveloping semigroup $E(X)$ consists of continuous maps.

Remark 5.9. When (G, X) is WAP the enveloping semigroup $E(X)$ is a semitopological semigroup; i.e. for each $p \in E$ both $\rho_p : q \mapsto qp$ and $\lambda_p : q \mapsto pq$ are continuous maps. The converse holds if in addition we assume that (G, X) is point transitive. As one can verify the enveloping semigroup of the dynamical system described in Example 10.9 below is isomorphic to the Bohr compactification of the integers (use Proposition 2.1). In particular it is a topological group; however the original system is not even AE and therefore not WAP as we will shortly see.

The next characterization, of AE metric systems, is due to Akin, Auslander and Berg [2].

Theorem 5.10. *Let (G, X) be a compact metrizable system. The following conditions are equivalent.*

1. (G, X) is almost equicontinuous.
2. There exists a dense G_δ subset $X_0 \subset X$ such that every member of the enveloping semigroup E is continuous on X_0 .

Combining these results Akin, Auslander and Berg deduce that every compact metric WAP system is AE, [2]. Since every subsystem of a WAP system is WAP it follows from Theorems 5.8 and 5.10 that every metrizable WAP system is both AE and LE. This result is retrieved, and generalized, in [44] for all compact RN_{app} G -systems using linear representation methods.

Note that a transitive LE system is of course AE but there are nontransitive LE systems which are not AE (e.g., see Remark 10.12 below). It was shown in [25] that the LE property is preserved under products under passage to a subsystem and under factors $X \rightarrow Y$ provided that X is metrizable (for arbitrary systems X see Proposition 5.13 below).

Let $LE(X)$ be the collection of functions on a G -space X coming from LE dynamical systems. It then follows from Corollary 2.9 that $LE(G)$ is a uniformly closed point-universal left and right G -invariant subalgebra of $RUC(G)$ and that $LE(X)$, for compact X , is the G -subalgebra of $C(X)$ that corresponds to the unique maximal LE factor of (G, X) . The results and methods of [25] show that $WAP(X) \subset LE(X)$ and that a minimal function in $LE(X)$ is almost periodic (see also Corollary 5.14.2 below).

Remark 5.11. In contrast to the well behaved classes of WAP and LE systems, it is well known that the class of AE systems is closed neither under passage to subsystems nor under taking factors, see [24, 1] and Remark 10.12 below.

By Corollary 2.9 we see that for every G -space X the classes $AP(X)$, $WAP(X)$, $LE(X)$ form G -invariant Banach subalgebras of $C(X)$. Recall that for a topological group G we denote the greatest ambit of G by $G^{RUC(G)} = G^R = |RUC(G)|$. It is well known that the maximal compactification $u_R : G \rightarrow G^R$ is a right topological semigroup compactification of G . We adopt the following notation. For a G -invariant closed subalgebra \mathcal{A} of $RUC(G)$ let $G^{\mathcal{A}}$ denote the corresponding factor $G^R \rightarrow G^{\mathcal{A}}$ and for a dynamical system (G, X) and an algebra $\mathcal{A} \subset C(X)$, let $X^{\mathcal{A}} = |\mathcal{A}|$ denote the corresponding factor $\beta_G X \rightarrow X^{\mathcal{A}}$.

In the next proposition we sum up some old and new observations concerning some subalgebras of $RUC(X)$ and $RUC(G)$.

Proposition 5.12. *Let G be a topological group.*

1. *For every G -space X we have the following inclusions*

$$RUC(X) \supset LE(X) \supset Asp(X) \supset WAP(X) \supset AP(X),$$

and the corresponding G -factors

$$\beta_G X \rightarrow X^{LE} \rightarrow X^{Asp} \rightarrow X^{WAP} \rightarrow X^{AP}.$$

2. *For every topological group G we have the following inclusions*

$$RUC(G) \supset UC(G) \supset LE(G) \supset Asp(G) \supset WAP(G) \supset AP(G),$$

and the corresponding G -factors

$$G^R \rightarrow G^{UC} \rightarrow G^{LE} \rightarrow G^{Asp} \rightarrow G^{WAP} \rightarrow G^{AP}.$$

3. *The compactifications G^{AP} and G^{WAP} of G are respectively: a topological group and a semitopological semigroup; G^R and G^{Asp} are right topological semigroup compactifications of G .*

Proof. For the properties of $Asp(X)$ we refer to section 7, Theorem 7.6.6 and Lemma 9.7.2.

In order to show that $UC(G) \supset LE(G)$ we have only to check that $LUC(G) \supset LE(G)$. Let $f \in LE(G)$. By the definition f is coming from a point transitive LE system (X, x_0) . Therefore for some continuous function $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have $f(g) = F(gx_0)$. Let μ be the natural uniformity on X . For a given $\varepsilon > 0$ choose an entourage $\delta \in \mu$ such that $|F(x) - F(y)| < \varepsilon$ for every $(x, y) \in \delta$. Since x_0 is a point of equicontinuity we can choose a neighborhood O of x_0 such that $(gx, gx_0) \in \delta$ for every $(g, x) \in G \times O$. Now pick a neighborhood U of $e \in G$ such that $Ux_0 \subset O$. Then clearly $|F(gux_0) - F(gx_0)| < \varepsilon$ for every $(g, u) \in G \times U$; or, equivalently $|f(gu) - f(g)| < \varepsilon$. This means that $f \in LUC(G)$. \square

Now we show the inheritance of LE under factors.

Proposition 5.13. *Let X be a compact LE G -system. If $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ is a G -homomorphism then (G, Y) is LE.*

Proof. We have to show that each point y_0 in the space Y is an equicontinuity point of the subsystem $\overline{O}_G(y_0)$. Fix $y_0 \in Y$ and assume, with no loss in generality, that $\overline{O}_G(y_0) = Y$. Furthermore, since by Zorn's lemma there is a subsystem of X which is minimal with the property that it projects onto Y , we may and will assume that X itself is minimal with respect to this property. Denoting by Y_0 the subset of transitive points in Y it then follows that the set $X_0 = \pi^{-1}(Y_0)$ coincides with the set of transitive points in X . Let ε be an element of the uniform structure of Y (i.e. a neighborhood of the identity in $Y \times Y$). Then the preimage $\delta := \pi^{-1}(\varepsilon)$ is an element of the uniform structure of X . Let q be a preimage of y_0 . Then $q \in Eq(X)$ since q is transitive and X is LE (see Definition 5.1.2). Thus there exists an open neighborhood U_q of q such that $(gx, gq) \in \delta$ for all $g \in G$ and $x \in U_q$. Let V be the union of all such U_q 's for q running over the preimages of y_0 . Then V is an open neighborhood of $\pi^{-1}(y_0)$. Set W to be $Y \setminus \pi(X \setminus V)$. Then W is an open neighborhood of y_0 . For any $y \in W$ we can find some preimage q of y_0 and some point $x \in U_q$ such that $\pi(x) = y$. Then $(gx, gq) \in \delta$ for all $g \in G$, which means that $(gy, gy_0) \in \varepsilon$ for all $g \in G$. Therefore $y_0 \in Eq(Y)$. \square

Corollary 5.14. *Let G be a topological group, X a G -space and $f \in RUC(X)$. Then*

1. $f \in LE(X) \Leftrightarrow X_f$ is LE.
2. If $f \in LE(X)$ is a minimal function then $f \in AP(X)$.

Proof. 1. Use Propositions 5.13 and 2.9.3.

2. Observe that every minimal LE system is AP. \square

Our next result is an intrinsic characterization of the LE property of a function.

First recall that for the left regular action of G on $X := G$, the space X_f can be defined as the pointwise closure of the orbit Gf (Remark 2.3.1) in $RUC(G)$.

Definition 5.15. We say that a function $f \in RUC(G)$ is

1. *light* (notation: $f \in \text{light}(G)$), if the pointwise and norm topologies coincide on the orbit $Gf := \{R_g(f) : g \in G\} \subset X_f$ (with $X := G$) as a subset of $RUC(G)$.
2. *hereditarily light*, if the pointwise and norm topologies coincide on the orbit Gh for every $h \in X_f$. Notation: $f \in \text{hlight}(G)$.

By Lemma 5.7.4 and Definition 5.6.1, $f \in \text{light}(G)$ ($f \in \text{hlight}(G)$) iff Gf is a *light subset* of the G -system X_f (resp.: iff X_f is *orbitwise light*).

Proposition 5.16. *For every topological group G and $f \in RUC(G)$ we have:*

1. $UC(G) \supset \text{light}(G)$.
2. $f \in \text{light}(G) \Leftrightarrow X_f$ is AE.
3. $f \in \text{hlight}(G) \Leftrightarrow X_f$ is LE.

Proof. 1. The pointwise and norm topologies coincide on Gf . It follows that the orbit map $G \rightarrow C(G)$, $g \mapsto f_g$ is norm continuous. This means that f is left uniformly continuous.

2. Since f is a transitive point of $X_f = \text{cls}(Gf)$ we can use Lemma 5.7.3.
3. Use Lemma 5.7.2. □

Theorem 5.17. $LE(G) = \text{hlight}(G)$ for every topological group G .

Proof. Follows from Proposition 5.16.3 and Corollary 5.14.1. □

Remarks 5.18. 1. Using the involution

$$UC(G) \rightarrow UC(G), \quad f \mapsto f^* \quad (f^*(g) := f(g^{-1}))$$

(Observe that $(Gf)^* = f^*G$) we can conclude that the “right” and “left” versions (regarding $fG := \{L_g(f) : g \in G\}$) of lightness are equivalent.

2. By [44, Theorem 8.5], $WAP(G) \subset \text{light}(G)$ for every topological group G . Theorem 5.17 provides a stronger inclusion $LE(G) \subset \text{light}(G)$ (since $f \in WAP(G)$ implies $f \in LE(G)$ by Proposition 5.12).
3. In view of Proposition 5.16.2 a minimal function is light iff it is AP. Thus, for example, the function $f(n) = \cos(n^2)$ on the integers, which comes from a minimal distal but not equicontinuous \mathbb{Z} -system on the two torus, is not light.
4. We note without proof that $UC(G)$ is not in general point-universal. This holds for the group $G := H_+[0, 1]$ of all orientation preserving selfhomeomorphisms of the closed interval endowed with the compact open topology.

6. FRAGMENTED MAPS AND FAMILIES

The following definition is a generalized version of *fragmentability* (implicitly it appears in a paper of Namioka and Phelps [48]) in the sense of Jayne and Rogers [32].

Definition 6.1. [41] Let (X, τ) be a topological space and (Y, μ) a uniform space.

1. We say that X is (τ, μ) -*fragmented* by a (not necessarily continuous) function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ if for every nonempty subset A of X and every $\varepsilon \in \mu$ there exists an open subset O of X such that $O \cap A$ is nonempty and the set $f(O \cap A)$ is ε -small in Y . We also say in that case that the function f is *fragmented*. Note that it is enough to check the condition above only for closed subsets $A \subset X$ and for $\varepsilon \in \mu$ from a

subbase γ of μ (that is, the finite intersections of the elements of γ form a base of the uniformity μ).

2. If the condition holds only for every nonempty *open subset* A of X then we say that f is *locally fragmented*.
3. If $X \subset Y$ and f is the inclusion map then we say that X is (locally) (τ, μ) -fragmented, or even simpler, (locally) μ -fragmented.
4. A topological space (X, τ) is *scattered* (i.e., every nonempty subspace has an isolated point) iff X is (τ, ρ) -fragmented, where $\rho(x, y) = 1$ iff $x \neq y$.

Remark 6.2. 1. Note that in Definition 6.1.1 when $Y = X$, $f = \text{id}_X$ and μ is a metric uniform structure, we get the usual definition of fragmentability [32] (For the case of functions see also [31]).

2. Namioka's *joint continuity theorem* [46] (see also Theorem 14.1 below) implies that every weakly compact subset K of a Banach space is (weak, norm)-fragmented (that is, $\text{id}_K : (K, \text{weak}) \rightarrow (K, \text{norm})$ is fragmented).
3. Recall that a Banach space V is an *Asplund* space if the dual of every separable linear subspace is separable, iff every bounded subset A of the dual V^* is (weak*, norm)-fragmented, iff V^* has the Radon-Nikodým property. Reflexive spaces and spaces of the type $c_0(\Gamma)$ are Asplund. For more details cf. [21, 47].

Following [45] we say that $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is *barely continuous* if for every nonempty closed subset $A \subset X$, the restricted map $f \upharpoonright_A$ has at least one point of continuity.

Lemma 6.3. 1. If f is (τ, μ) -continuous then X is (τ, μ) -fragmented by f .

2. Suppose that there exists a dense subset of (τ, μ) -continuity points of f . Then X is locally (τ, μ) -fragmented by f .
3. X is (τ, μ) -fragmented by f iff X is hereditarily locally fragmented by f (that is, for every closed subset $A \subset X$ the restricted function $f \upharpoonright_A$ is (relatively) locally (τ, μ) -fragmented).
4. Every barely continuous f is fragmented.
5. Fragmentability is preserved under products. More precisely, if $f_i : (X_i, \tau) \rightarrow (Y_i, \mu_i)$ is fragmented for every $i \in I$ then the product map

$$f := \prod_{i \in I} f_i : \prod_{i \in I} X_i \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} Y_i$$

is (τ, μ) -fragmented with respect to the product topology τ and the product uniformity μ . The same is true also for diagonal products.

6. Let $\alpha : X \rightarrow Y$ be a continuous map. If $f : Y \rightarrow (Z, \mu)$ is a fragmented map then the composition $f \circ \alpha : X \rightarrow (Z, \mu)$ is also fragmented.

Proof. The assertions 1, 2 and 6 are straightforward.

For 3 and 4 use the fact that it is enough to check the fragmentability condition only for closed subsets $A \subset X$.

The verification of 5 is straightforward taking into account that it is enough to check the fragmentability (see Definition 6.1.1) for $\varepsilon \in \gamma$, where γ is a subbase of μ . \square

Fragmentability has good stability properties being closed under passage to subspaces (trivial), products (Lemma 6.3.5) and quotients. Here we include the details for quotients. The following lemma is a generalized version of [41, Lemma 4.8] which in turn was inspired by Lemma 2.1 of Namioka's paper [47].

Lemma 6.4. Let (X_1, τ_1) and (X_2, τ_2) be compact (Hausdorff) spaces, and let (Y_1, μ_1) and (Y_2, μ_2) be uniform spaces. Suppose that: $F : X_1 \rightarrow X_2$ is a continuous surjection,

$f : (Y_1, \mu_1) \rightarrow (Y_2, \mu_2)$ is uniformly continuous, $\phi_1 : X_1 \rightarrow Y_1$ and $\phi_2 : X_2 \rightarrow Y_2$ are maps such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X_1, \tau_1) & \xrightarrow{\phi_1} & (Y_1, \mu_1) \\ F \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ (X_2, \tau_2) & \xrightarrow{\phi_2} & (Y_2, \mu_2) \end{array}$$

commutes. If X_1 is fragmented by ϕ_1 then X_2 is fragmented by ϕ_2 .

Proof. We modify the proof of [41, Lemma 4.8]. In the definition of fragmentability it suffices to check the condition for *closed subsets*. So, let $\varepsilon \in \mu_2$ and let A be a non-empty closed and hence, compact subset of X_2 . Choose $\delta \in \mu_1$ such that $(f \times f)(\delta) \subset \varepsilon$. By Zorn's Lemma, there exists a minimal compact subset M of X_1 such that $F(M) = A$. Since X_1 is fragmented by ϕ_1 , there exists $V \in \tau_1$ such that $V \cap M \neq \emptyset$ and $\phi_1(V \cap M)$ is δ -small. Then the set $f\phi_1(V \cap M)$ is ε -small. Consider the set $W := A \setminus F(M \setminus V)$. Then

- (a) $\phi_2(W)$ is ε -small, being a subset of $f\phi_1(V \cap M) = \phi_2 F(V \cap M)$.
 - (b) W is relatively open in A ;
 - (c) W is non-empty
- (otherwise, $M \setminus V$ is a *proper* compact subset of X_1 such that $F(M \setminus V) = A$).

□

The next lemma provides a key to understanding the connection between fragmentability and separability properties.

Lemma 6.5. *Let (X, τ) be a separable metrizable space and (Y, ρ) a pseudometric space. Suppose that X is (τ, ρ) -fragmented by a surjective map $f : X \rightarrow Y$. Then Y is separable.*

Proof. Assume (to the contrary) that the pseudometric space (Y, ρ) is not separable. Then there exist an $\varepsilon > 0$ and an uncountable subset H of Y such that $\rho(h_1, h_2) > \varepsilon$ for all distinct $h_1, h_2 \in H$. Choose a subset A of X such that $f(A) = H$ and f is bijective on A . Since X is second countable the uncountable subspace A of X (in its relative topology) is a disjoint union of a countable set of isolated points and a nonempty closed perfect set M comprising the condensation points of A (this follows from the proof of the Cantor-Bendixon theorem; see e.g. [20]). By fragmentability there exists an open subset O of X such that $O \cap M$ is nonempty and $f(O \cap M)$ is ε -small. By the property of H the intersection $O \cap M$ must be a singleton, contradicting the fact that no point of M is isolated. □

Proposition 6.6. *If X is locally fragmented by $f : X \rightarrow Y$, where (X, τ) is a Baire space and (Y, ρ) is a pseudometric space then f is continuous at the points of a dense G_δ subset of X .*

Proof. For a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ consider

$$O_\varepsilon := \{\text{union of all } \tau\text{-open subsets } O \text{ of } X \text{ with } \text{diam}_\rho f(O) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

The local fragmentability implies that O_ε is dense in X . Clearly, $\bigcap_n \{O_{\frac{1}{n}} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the required dense G_δ subset of X . □

A topological space X is *hereditarily Baire* if every closed subspace of X is a Baire space. Recall that for metrizable spaces X and Y a function $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is of *Baire class 1* if $f^{-1}(U) \subset X$ is an F_σ subset for every open $U \subset Y$ (see e.g. [34, Section 24.B]).

Proposition 6.7. *Let (X, τ) be a hereditarily Baire (e.g., Polish, or compact) space, (Y, ρ) a pseudometric space. Consider the following assertions:*

- (a) X is (τ, ρ) -fragmented by $f : X \rightarrow Y$;
- (b) f is barely continuous;
- (c) f is of Baire class 1.

Then always (a) \Leftrightarrow (b). If X is Polish then (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c). If, X is Polish and $f(X)$ is separable then (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) \Leftrightarrow (c).

Proof. For (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) combine Lemma 6.3 and Proposition 6.6.

The equivalence (b) \Leftrightarrow (c) for Polish X and separable Y is well known (see [34, Theorem 24.15]) and actually goes back to Baire. Observe that if f is barely continuous then f is fragmented (Lemma 6.3.4). Hence by Lemma 6.5 we can assume in the proof of the implication (b) \Rightarrow (c) that $f(X)$ is separable. \square

The following new definition will play a crucial role in Section 14.

Definition 6.8. 1. We say that a family of functions $\mathcal{F} = \{f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \mu)\}$ is *fragmented* if the condition of Definition 6.1.1 holds simultaneously for all $f \in \mathcal{F}$. That is, $f(O \cap A)$ is ε -small for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$. It is equivalent to say that the mapping

$$\pi_{\sharp} : X \rightarrow Y^{\mathcal{F}}, \quad \pi_{\sharp}(x)(f) = f(x)$$

is (τ, μ_U) -fragmented, where μ_U is the uniformity of uniform convergence on the set $Y^{\mathcal{F}}$ of all mappings from \mathcal{F} into (Y, μ) .

- 2. Analogously one can define the notions of a *locally fragmented family* and a *barely continuous family*. The latter means that every closed subset $A \subset X$ contains a point $a \in A$ such that the collection $\mathcal{F}_A = \{f \upharpoonright_A : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is equicontinuous at a . If μ is pseudometrizable then so is μ_U . Therefore if in addition (X, τ) is hereditarily Baire then it follows by Proposition 6.7 that \mathcal{F} is *fragmented* iff \mathcal{F} is *barely continuous*.

Fragmented families, like equicontinuous families, are stable under pointwise closures as the following lemma shows.

Lemma 6.9. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \mu)\}$ be a fragmented family of functions. Then the pointwise closure $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$ of \mathcal{F} in Y^X is also a (τ, μ) -fragmented family.*

Proof. Use straightforward “ 3ε -trick” argument. \square

7. ASPLUND FUNCTIONS AND RN SYSTEMS

Let H be a subgroup of G . Recall that we denote by μ_H the uniform structure on the uniform G -space (X, μ) inherited by the inclusion $\pi_{\sharp} : X \rightarrow C(H, X)$. Precisely, μ_H is generated by the basis $\{[\varepsilon]_H : \varepsilon \in \mu\}$, where

$$[\varepsilon]_H := \{(x, y) \in X \times X : (hx, hy) \in \varepsilon \text{ for all } h \in H\}.$$

For every $f \in C(X)$ and $H < G$ denote by $\rho_{H,f}$ the pseudometric on X defined by

$$\rho_{H,f}(x, y) = \sup_{h \in H} \{|f(hx) - f(hy)|\}$$

Then $\mu_{\text{cls}(H)} = \mu_H$ and $\rho_{\text{cls}(H),f} = \rho_{H,f}$.

Definition 7.1. 1. A continuous function $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the compact G -space X is an *Asplund function* [44] if for every countable subgroup $H \subset G$ the pseudometric space $(X, \rho_{H,f})$ is separable. It is an *s-Asplund function* (notation: $f \in \text{Asp}_s(X)$) when $(X, \rho_{G,f})$ is separable. A pseudometric d on a set X is called *Asplund* (respectively,

s-Asplund) if for every countable subgroup $H < G$ (respectively, for $H = G$) the pseudometric space (X, d_H) is separable, where

$$d_H(x, y) = \sup_{g \in H} d(gx, gy).$$

2. More generally, we say that a function $f \in RUC(X)$ on a (not necessarily compact) G -space X is an *Asplund function* (notation: $f \in Asp(X)$) if f is coming (in the sense of Definition 1.1) from an Asplund function F on a G -system Y and a G -compactification $\nu : X \rightarrow Y$. By Remark 7.2.2 below, equivalently, one can take each of the following G -compactifications (see Remark 2.3.3) $f_{\sharp} : X \rightarrow X_f$ (minimally possible) or $i_{\beta} : X \rightarrow \beta_G X$ (maximal). Analogously we define the class $Asp_s(X)$ of *s-Asplund functions* on a G -space X .
3. In particular, a function $f \in RUC(G)$ is an *Asplund function* (*s-Asplund function*) if it is Asplund (*s-Asplund*) for the (regular) G -space $X := G$. Notation: $f \in Asp(G)$ (resp.: $f \in Asp_s(G)$).

Remarks 7.2. 1. Note that in the definition of Asplund functions $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, equivalently, we can run over all uniformly Lindelöf subgroups $H < G$. Indeed, as in the proof of Proposition 4.2, the orbit HF is norm separable. Let $K < G$ be a countable subgroup of H such that KF is dense in HF . Then $\rho_{H,F} = \rho_{K,F}$.

2. Let $q : Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$ be a G -homomorphism of compact G -spaces. It is straightforward to show that a continuous bounded function $F : Y_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Asplund (*s-Asplund*) iff the function $f = F \circ q : Y_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Asplund (resp.: *s-Asplund*).

3. Of course every *s-Asplund* function is Asplund. If G , or, the natural restriction \check{G} , is uniformly Lindelöf (e.g. \check{G} is second countable if X is compact and metrizable) then clearly the converse is also true. Thus in this case $Asp(X) = Asp_s(X)$.

4. Let (G, X) be a dynamical system and d a pseudometric on X . Suppose $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is d -uniformly continuous. If d is Asplund or *s-Asplund* then so is F .

Let X be a G -space. By Proposition 2.2.1, X_f is a subset of $RUC(G)$ for every $f \in RUC(X)$. Let $r_G : X_f \hookrightarrow RUC(G)$ be the inclusion map. For every subgroup $H < G$ we can define the natural restriction operator $q_H : RUC(G) \rightarrow RUC(H)$. Denote by $f_{\sharp}^H := r_H \circ f_{\sharp} : X \rightarrow RUC(H)$ the composition. The corresponding pseudometric induced by f_{\sharp}^H on X is just $\rho_{H,f}$. Finally define the composition $r_H := q_H \circ r_G : X_f \rightarrow RUC(H)$ and let $\xi_{H,f}$ be the corresponding pseudometric induced on X_f by the norm of $RUC(H)$. Precisely,

$$\xi_{H,f}(\omega, \omega') = \sup_{h \in H} |\omega(h) - \omega'(h)|.$$

Lemma 7.3. *Let X be a G -space and $f \in RUC(X)$. Let $F_e : X_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the map $F_e(\omega) = \omega(e)$, $\omega \in X_f$ (defined before Proposition 2.2). The following are equivalent:*

1. $f \in Asp(X)$.
2. $F_e \in Asp(X_f)$.
3. $(X_f, \xi_{H,f})$ is separable for every countable (uniformly Lindelöf) subgroup $H < G$.
4. $r_H(X_f)$ is norm separable in $RUC(H)$ for every countable (uniformly Lindelöf) subgroup $H < G$.

Proof. 1 \Leftrightarrow 2 is trivial by Definition 7.1.2, Remark 7.2.2 and Proposition 2.2.3.

3 \Leftrightarrow 4 is clear by the definitions of $\xi_{H,f}$ and r_H .

2 \Leftrightarrow 3: $F_e \in Asp(X_f)$ means, by Definition 7.1.1, that for every countable (uniformly Lindelöf) subgroup $H < G$ the pseudometric space (X_f, ρ_{H,F_e}) is separable, where

$$\rho_{H,F_e}(\omega, \omega') = \sup_{h \in H} |F_e(h\omega) - F_e(h\omega')|.$$

Recall that by the definition of $F_e : X_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have $F_e(h\omega) = (h\omega)(e) = \omega(h)$. Hence

$$\xi_{H,f}(\omega, \omega') = \sup_{h \in H} |\omega(h) - \omega'(h)| = \sup_{h \in H} |F_e(h\omega) - F_e(h\omega')| = \rho_{H,F_e}(\omega, \omega')$$

Therefore we obtain that the pseudometrics $\xi_{H,f}$ and ρ_{H,F_e} coincide on X_f . This clearly completes the proof. \square

Corollary 7.4. *Let X be a G -space and $f \in RUC(X)$. The following are equivalent:*

1. $f \in \text{Asp}_s(X)$.
2. $F_e \in \text{Asp}_s(X_f)$.
3. X_f is norm separable in $RUC(G)$.

Proof. The proof of Lemma 7.3 shows that in fact $\xi_{H,f}$ and ρ_{H,F_e} coincide on X_f for every $H < G$. Consider the particular case of $H := G$ taking into account that $r_G(X_f) = X_f$. \square

The following definition of RN dynamical systems (a natural generalization of RN compacta in the sense of Namioka [47]) and *Eberlein systems* (a natural generalization of Eberlein compacta in the sense of Amir-Lindenstrauss [4]) were introduced in [44]. About the definition and properties of Asplund spaces see Remark 6.2.3 and [47, 21].

Definition 7.5. Let (G, X) be a compact dynamical system.

1. (G, X) is a *Radon-Nikodým system* (RN for short) if there exists a representation $(h, \alpha) : G \times X \rightarrow \text{Iso}(V) \times V^*$, where V is an Asplund Banach space, $h : G \rightarrow \text{Iso}(V)$ is a strongly continuous co-homomorphism and $\alpha : X \rightarrow (V^*, w^*)$ is a bounded weak* G -embedding (with respect to the *dual action* $G \times V^* \rightarrow V^*$, $(g\varphi)(v) := \varphi(h(g)(v))$). If we can choose V to be reflexive, then (G, X) is called an *Eberlein system*. Notation: RN and Eb respectively.
2. (G, X) is called an *RN-approximable system* (RN_{app}) if it can be represented as a subdirect product of RN systems (that is, (G, X) is isomorphic to a subsystem of a product of RN systems).

Note that compact spaces which are not RN necessarily are non-metrizable, while there are many natural *metric* compact G -systems which are not RN.

The next theorem collects some useful properties which were obtained recently in [44].

Theorem 7.6. *Let (G, X) be a compact G -system.*

1. X is WAP iff X is a subdirect product of Eberlein G -systems. A metric system X is WAP iff X is Eberlein.
2. The system (G, X) is RN iff there exists a representation (h, α) of (G, X) into a Banach space V such that: $h : G \rightarrow \text{Iso}(V)$ is a co-homomorphism (no continuity assumptions on h), $\alpha : X \rightarrow V^*$ is a bounded weak* G -embedding and $\alpha(X)$ is (weak*, norm)-fragmented.
3. $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an Asplund function iff f arises from an Asplund representation (that is, there exists an Asplund representation $(h, \alpha) : G \times X \rightarrow \text{Iso}(V) \times V^*$, where V is an Asplund space, such that $f(x) = \alpha(x)(v)$ for some $v \in V$). Equivalently, iff f is coming from an RN (or, RN_{app}) G -factor Y of X .
4. The system (G, X) is RN_{app} iff $\text{Asp}(X) = C(X)$.
5. RN is closed under countable products and RN_{app} is closed under quotients. For metric compact systems $\text{RN}_{\text{app}} = \text{RN}$ holds.
6. $\text{Asp}(X)$ is a closed G -invariant subalgebra of $C(X)$ containing $\text{WAP}(X)$. The canonical compactification $u_A : G \rightarrow G^{\text{Asp}}$ is the universal RN_{app} compactification of G . Moreover, u_A is a right topological semigroup compactification of G .

7. (G, X) is RN iff $(G, (C(X)_1^*, w^*))$ is RN iff $(G, P(X))$ is RN, where $P(X)$ denotes the space of all probability measures on X (with the induced action of G).

The proofs of the assertions 1, 2 and 3 use several ideas from Banach space theory; mainly the notion of *Asplund sets* and Stegal's generalization of a factorization construction by Davis, Figiel, Johnson and Pełczyński [13, 47, 51, 21].

Proposition 7.7. *Let G be an arbitrary topological group.*

1. $(G^{Asp}, u_A(e))$ is point-universal.
2. $Asp(G)$ is left and right G -invariant and $X_f \subset Asp(G)$ for every $f \in Asp(G)$.

Proof. 1. By Theorem 7.6.6, $u_A : G \rightarrow G^{Asp}$ is the universal RN_{app} right topological semi-group compactification. Clearly RN_{app} is closed under passage to subsystems. Hence, by the universality, for every $x \in G^{Asp}$ there exists a G -homomorphism $(G^{Asp}, u_A(e)) \rightarrow (\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x), x)$. This proves the point-universality.

2. By the first assertion, Corollary 2.8 (for $(X, x_0) := (G^{Asp}, u_A(e))$ and $\mathcal{A}(X, x_0) = Asp(G)$) implies that $Asp(G)$ is left and right G -invariant and $X_f \subset Asp(G)$. \square

Let (X, τ) be a topological space. As usual, a metric ρ on the set X is said to be *lower semi-continuous* if the set $\{(x, y) : \rho(x, y) \leq t\}$ is closed in $X \times X$ for each $t > 0$. A typical example is any subset $X \subset V^*$ of a dual Banach space equipped with the weak* topology and the norm metric. It turns out that every lower semi-continuous metric on a compact Hausdorff space X arises in this way (Lemma 7.8.1). This important result has been established in [30] using ideas of Ghoussoub and Maurey.

Lemma 7.8. 1. [30] *Let (X, τ) be a compact space and let $\rho \leq 1$ be a lower semi-continuous metric on (X, τ) . Then there is a dual Banach space V^* and a homeomorphic embedding $\alpha : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (V_1^*, w^*)$ such that*

$$\|\alpha(x) - \alpha(y)\| = \rho(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in X$.

2. *If in addition X is a G -space and ρ is G -invariant, then the Claim 1 admits a G -generalization. More precisely, there is a linear isometric (not necessarily jointly continuous) right action $V \times G \rightarrow V$ such that $\alpha : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (V_1^*, w^*)$ is a G -map.*

Proof. 2: As in the proof of [30, Theorem 2.1] the required Banach space V is defined as the space of all continuous real-valued functions f on (X, τ) which satisfy a uniform Lipschitz condition of order 1 with respect to ρ , endowed with the norm

$$p(f) = \max\{\|f\|_{Lip}, \|f\|\},$$

where $\|f\| = \sup\{|f(x)| : x \in X\}$ and the seminorm $\|f\|_{Lip}$ is defined to be the least constant K such that

$$|f(x_1) - f(x_2)| \leq K\rho(x_1, x_2)$$

for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$. Then the map $\alpha : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (V_1^*, w^*)$ is defined by $\alpha(x)(f) = f(x)$. It is easy to verify that the construction admits an easy G -modification. This proves Claim 2. \square

Theorem 7.9. *Let (G, X) be a compact dynamical system. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. (G, X) is RN.
2. X is fragmented with respect to some bounded lower semi-continuous G -invariant metric ρ .

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$: Our G -system X , being RN, is a G -subspace of the ball $V_1^* = (V_1^*, w^*)$ for some Asplund space V . By a well known characterization of Asplund spaces, V_1^* is (w^*, norm) -fragmented. Hence, X is also fragmented by the lower semi-continuous G -invariant metric on X , $\rho(x_1, x_2) = \|x_1 - x_2\|$ inherited by the norm of V^* .

$2 \Rightarrow 1$: Using Lemma 7.8.1 we can find a Banach space V and a weak* embedding $\alpha : (X, \tau) \rightarrow V_1^*$ such that α is (ρ, norm) -isometric. Since X is (τ, ρ) -fragmented we get that $\alpha(X) \subset V_1^*$ is (w^*, norm) -fragmented. Moreover, by Claim 2 of the same lemma, there exists a co-homomorphism (without continuity assumptions) $h : G \rightarrow \text{Iso}(V)$ (the right action $V \times G \rightarrow V$ leads to the co-homomorphism) such that the map $\alpha : X \rightarrow V_1^*$ is G -equivariant with respect to the dual action of G on V^* defined by $(g\varphi)(v) := \varphi(h(g)(v))$. Therefore we get a G -equivariant pair $(h, \alpha) : G \times X \rightarrow \text{Iso}(V) \times V_1^*$. By Theorem 7.6.2 we deduce that the G -system (X, τ) is RN. \square

8. VEECH FUNCTIONS

The algebra $K(G)$ was defined by Veech in [56] — for a discrete group G — as the algebra of functions $f \in \ell^\infty(G)$ such that for every countable subgroup $H < G$ the collection $X_{f|_H} = \bar{O}_H(\eta_0) \subset \Omega_H = [-\|f\|, \|f\|]^H$, with $\eta_0 = f|_H$, considered as a subspace of the Banach space $\ell^\infty(H)$, is norm separable. Replacing $\ell^\infty(G)$ and $\ell^\infty(H)$ by $RUC(G)$ and $RUC(H)$, respectively, we define — for any topological group G — the algebra $K(G) \subset RUC(G)$ as follows.

Definition 8.1. Let G be a topological group. We say that a function $f \in RUC(G)$ is a *Veech function* if for every countable (equivalently: separable) subgroup $H < G$ the corresponding H -dynamical system $(H, X_{f|_H}, \eta_0)$, when considered as a subspace of the Banach space $RUC(H)$ (see Proposition 2.4.4), is norm separable (that is, $r_H(X_{f|_H}) \subset RUC(H)$ is separable; see the definitions before Lemma 7.3). We denote by $K(G)$ the collection of Veech functions in $RUC(G)$.

Theorem 8.2. For any topological group G we have:

1. $K(G)$ is a closed left G -invariant subalgebra of $RUC(G)$.
2. The algebra $K(G)$ is point-universal. In particular it is also right G -invariant.
3. $\text{Asp}(G) \subset K(G)$.
4. $K(G) = \text{Asp}(G) = \text{Asp}_s(G)$ for every separable G .

Proof. 1. For every $f \in K(G)$ let (G, X_f, f) be the corresponding pointed dynamical system as constructed in Proposition 2.4. If f_i , $i = 1, 2$ are in $K(G)$ and $H < G$ is a countable subgroup then the subsets $X_{f_i|_H}$, $i = 1, 2$ are norm separable in $RUC(H)$ and therefore so is $X = \{\omega + \eta : \omega \in X_{f_1|_H}, \eta \in X_{f_2|_H}\}$. Since $X_{(f_1+f_2)|_H} \subset X$ it follows that $f_1 + f_2 \in K(G)$. Likewise $f_1 \cdot f_2 \in K(G)$, and we conclude that $K(G)$ is a subalgebra. Uniformly convergent countable sums are treated similarly and it follows that $K(G)$ is uniformly closed. The left G -invariance is clear.

2. Given $f \in K(G)$ one shows, as in [56, Lemma 3.4], that every element $\omega \in X_f$ is also in $K(G)$. Define the G -ambit

$$(Y, y_0) := \bigvee \{(X_f, f) : f \in K(G)\}.$$

By construction, $K(G) \subset \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(Y, y_0)$. On the other hand the algebra \mathcal{A} is generated (as a closed invariant algebra) by the functions of $K(G)$ and by part 1 it follows that $K(G) = \mathcal{A}$. Suppose $py_0 = qy_0$ for $p, q \in E(Y)$ (the enveloping semigroup of (G, Y)). Now every $y \in Y$, considered as an element of the product space $\prod_{f \in K(G)} X_f$, has the property

that its f -coordinate, say y_f is again an element of $K(G)$ and it follows that y_f appears as a coordinate of y_0 as well. Therefore also $py_f = qy_f$ and it follows that $py = qy$. Thus the map $p \mapsto py_0$ from $E(Y)$ to Y is an isomorphism. By Proposition 2.6, $(Y, y_0) = |K(G)|$ is point-universal.

3. By Lemma 7.3, a function $f \in RUC(G)$ is Asplund iff $r_H(X_f)$ is norm separable in $RUC(H)$ for every countable subgroup $H < G$. Consider $\text{cls}(Hf)$ the H -orbit closure in X_f (for $f \in X_f = \text{cls}(Gf)$). Then $r_H(\text{cls}(Hf))$ is also separable in $RUC(H)$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that the set $r_H(X_{f|_H})$ coincides with $r_H(\text{cls}(Hf))$. Hence, $r_H(X_{f|_H})$ is also separable in $RUC(H)$. This exactly means that $f \in K(G)$.

4. Let $f \in K(G)$. Then the collection $X_{f|_H}$ is norm separable for every separable subgroup $H < G$. In particular, X_f (for $H := G$) is norm separable. Now by Corollary 7.4 we can conclude that $f \in \text{Asp}_s(G)$. \square

9. HEREDITARY AE AND NS SYSTEMS

We begin with a generalized version of sensitivity. The *functional version* (Definition 9.1.3) will be convenient in the proof of Theorem 14.2.

Definition 9.1. 1. The uniform G -space (X, μ) has *sensitive dependence on initial conditions* (or, simply is *sensitive*) if there exists an $\varepsilon \in \mu$ such that for every $x \in X$ and any neighborhood U of x there exists $y \in U$ and $g \in G$ such that $(gx, gy) \notin \varepsilon$ (for metric cascades see for example [9, 14, 24]).

Thus a (metric) G -space (X, μ) is *not sensitive*, NS for short, if for every $(\varepsilon > 0) \varepsilon \in \mu$ there exists an open nonempty subset O of X such that gO is ε -small in (X, μ) for all $g \in G$, or, equivalently, O is $[\varepsilon]_G$ -small in (X, μ_G) (respectively: whose d_G -diameter is less than ε , where d is the metric on X and as usual $d_G(x, x') = \sup_{g \in G} \{d(gx, gx')\}$).

2. We say that (G, X) is *hereditarily not sensitive* (HNS for short) if every nonempty closed G -subspace A of X is not sensitive.
3. More generally, we say that a map $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ is *sensitive* if there exists an $\varepsilon \in \mu$ such that for every $x \in X$ and any neighborhood U of x there exist $y \in U$ and $g \in G$ such that $(f(gx), f(gy)) \notin \varepsilon$. Accordingly, *hereditarily not sensitive* will mean that the restricted function $f|_A : A \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ is not sensitive for every closed G -subspace A of X . Using these notions we can define the classes of NS and HNS functions. Observe that (X, μ) is NS iff the map $\text{id}_X : (X, \mu) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$ is NS.

Remark 9.2. Trivially, a G -map $f : X \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ is NS in each of the following cases:

1. (X, η) is a uniform G -space such that $\text{Eq}(X) \neq \emptyset$ (e.g. if X is AE) and f is (η, μ) -uniformly continuous.
2. $f : X \rightarrow (Y, \mu_G)$ is locally fragmented.

Note also that if a G -space X has an isolated point then trivially every map $f : X \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ is NS.

Next we provide some useful results which link our dynamical and topological definitions (and involve fragmentability and sensitivity).

Lemma 9.3. 1. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a G -map. Then the following are equivalent:

- (a) $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ is HNS.
- (b) $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \mu_G)$ is fragmented.
- (c) $f : (A, \tau|_A) \rightarrow (Y, \mu_G)$ is locally fragmented for every closed nonempty G -subset A of X .

2. (X, μ) is HNS iff $\text{id}_X : (X, \mu) \rightarrow (X, \mu_G)$ is fragmented.
3. $\text{HAE} \subset \text{HNS}$.

Proof. 1. (a) \Rightarrow (b): Suppose that $f : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ is HNS. We have to show that f is (τ, μ_G) -fragmented. Let A be a nonempty subset of X and $[\varepsilon]_G \in \mu_G$. Consider the closed G -subspace $Z := \text{cls}(GA)$ of X . Then by our assumption $f \upharpoonright_Z : Z \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ is NS. Hence there exists a relatively open nonempty subset $W \subset Z$ such that

$$(f(gx), f(gy)) = (gf(x), gf(y)) \in \varepsilon$$

for every $(g, x, y) \in G \times W \times W$. Therefore, $f(W)$ is $[\varepsilon]_G$ -small. Since GA is dense in Z , the intersection $W \cap GA$ is nonempty. There exists $g_0 \in G$ such that $g_0^{-1}W \cap A \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, clearly, $f(g_0^{-1}W)$ is also $[\varepsilon]_G$ -small. Thus the same is true for $f(g_0^{-1}W \cap A)$.

(a) \Rightarrow (b): Is trivial.

(c) \Rightarrow (a): Remark 9.2.2 implies that $f \upharpoonright_A : A \rightarrow (Y, \mu)$ is NS for every closed G -subspace A . Hence, f is HNS.

2: This is a particular case of the first assertion for $f = \text{id}_X : (X, \mu) \rightarrow (X, \mu)$.

3: Let (G, X) be HAE. For every closed nonempty G -subsystem A there exists a point of equicontinuity a_0 of (G, A) . By Remark 9.2.1, (G, A) is NS. Therefore, (G, X) is HNS. \square

Proposition 9.4. *Let X be a compact G -system with its unique uniformity μ . Consider the following conditions:*

- (a) X is AE.
- (b) X is locally μ_G -fragmented.
- (c) X is NS.

Then we have:

1. Always, (a) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c).
2. If μ_G is metrizable (e.g., if μ is metrizable) then (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c).
3. If X is transitive then (a) \Leftrightarrow (b) \Leftrightarrow (c).

Proof. 1. (a) \Rightarrow (b): Let U be a nonempty open subset of X and $\varepsilon \in \mu$. Since X is AE we can choose a point $x_0 \in \text{Eq}(X) \cap U$. Now we can pick an open neighborhood $O \subset U$ of x_0 such that $(gx, gx') \in \varepsilon$ for every $g \in G$ and $x, x' \in O$. Therefore, $(x, x') \in [\varepsilon]_G$. This proves that X is locally μ_G -fragmented.

(b) \Rightarrow (c): Trivial.

2. (a) \Leftrightarrow (b): If μ_G is metrizable then Proposition 6.6 guarantees that $\text{id}_X : (X, \mu) \rightarrow (X, \mu_G)$ is continuous at the points of a dense G_δ subset (say, Y) of X . By Lemma 5.3, $Y \subset \text{Eq}(X)$. Hence, $\text{Eq}(X)$ is also dense in X . Therefore, X is AE.

3. (c) \Rightarrow (a): It suffices to show that every transitive point $a \in X$ belongs to $\text{Eq}(X)$. Let $\varepsilon \in \mu$. Since X is NS one can choose a nonempty open subset U of X being $[\varepsilon]_G$ -small. Since a is transitive, we can find $g \in G$ such that $ga \in U$. Then $g^{-1}U$ is an open neighborhood of a being $[\varepsilon]_G$ -small. Thus, $a \in \text{Eq}(X)$. \square

The equivalence of AE and NS for transitive metric systems is shown in [24, 1].

Corollary 9.5. *For every topological group G and $f \in \text{RUC}(G)$ the following are equivalent:*

1. $f \in \text{light}(G)$.
2. X_f is AE.
3. X_f is locally norm-fragmented (with respect to the norm of $\text{RUC}(G)$).
4. X_f is NS.

Proof. Use Propositions 9.4.3 and 5.16.2. It should be noted here that if μ is the natural pointwise uniformity on $X_f = \text{cls}(Gf) \subset RUC(G)$ then the norm of $RUC(G)$ induces on X_f the uniformity μ_G (Remark 5.2.1). \square

Lemma 9.6. *HNS is closed under quotients of compact G -systems.*

Proof. Let $f : X \rightarrow Y$ be a G -quotient. Denote by μ_X and μ_Y the original uniform structures on X and Y respectively. Assume that X is HNS. Or, equivalently (see Lemma 9.3.2), that X is $(\mu_X)_G$ -fragmented. Since $f : (X, \mu_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mu_Y)$ is uniformly continuous, it is easy to see that the map $f : (X, (\mu_X)_G) \rightarrow (Y, (\mu_Y)_G)$ is also uniformly continuous. We can now apply Lemma 6.4. It follows that Y is $(\mu_Y)_G$ -fragmented. Hence, Y is HNS (use again Lemma 9.3.2). \square

Note that the class NS is not closed under quotients (see [24]).

Lemma 9.7. 1. *Every RN compact G -system X is HAE. In particular, such a system is always LE and HNS.*
2. *$\text{Asp}(X) \subset \text{LE}(X)$ for every G -space X .*

Proof. 1. By Definition 7.5 there exists a representation (h, α) of (G, X) into an Asplund space V such that $h : G \rightarrow \text{Iso}(V)$ is a co-homomorphism and $\alpha : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (V^*, w^*)$ is a bounded weak* G -embedding. Since V is Asplund, it follows that $\alpha(X)$ is (weak*, norm)-fragmented. The map $\text{id}_X : (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \text{norm})$ has a dense subset of points of continuity by Proposition 6.6. The norm induces on X the metric uniform structure which majorizes the original uniform structure μ on X . On the other hand the norm is G -invariant. It follows that every point of continuity of $\text{id}_X : (X, \mu) \rightarrow (X, \text{norm})$ is a point of equicontinuity for the system (G, X) . Clearly, the same is true for every restriction on a closed G -invariant nonempty subset Y of X . Hence X is HAE. Then clearly X is LE (see Definition 5.1.2). Lemma 9.3.3 implies that X is also HNS.

2. Use the first assertion and Theorem 7.6.3 (taking into account Definition 7.1.2). \square

In the following theorem we show that the classes HNS and RN_{app} coincide. Loosely speaking we can rephrase this by saying that a compact G -system X admits sufficiently many good (namely: Asplund) representations if and only if X is “non-chaotic”.

Theorem 9.8. *For a compact G -space X (with its unique compatible uniformity μ) the following are equivalent:*

1. X is RN_{app} .
2. X is HNS.
3. $\pi_{\sharp} : X \rightarrow C(G, X)$ is fragmented.
4. $\check{G} = \{\check{g} : X \rightarrow X\}_{g \in G}$ is a fragmented family.
5. (X, μ_H) is uniformly Lindelöf for every countable (equivalently, uniformly Lindelöf) subgroup $H < G$.

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$: The first assertion means that (X, μ) is a subdirect product of a collection X_i of RN G -systems (with the uniformity μ_i). By Lemma 9.7.1 every X_i is HNS. Lemma 9.3.2 guarantees that each X_i is $(\mu_i)_G$ -fragmented. Then X is μ_G -fragmented. Indeed, fragmentability is closed under passage to products (Lemma 6.3.5) and subspaces. Now, by Lemma 9.3.2, X is HNS.

$2 \Leftrightarrow 3$: $\pi_{\sharp} : X \rightarrow C(G, X)$ is fragmented iff X is μ_G -fragmented. Hence, we can use Lemma 9.3.2.

$3 \Leftrightarrow 4$: See Definition 6.8.1.

$2 \Rightarrow 5$: Let $X \in HNS$ and $H < G$ be a uniformly Lindelöf subgroup. We have to show that (X, μ_H) is uniformly Lindelöf. The system (H, X) (being m -approximable by virtue of Proposition 4.1) is a subdirect product of a family of compact metric H -systems $\{X_i : i \in I\}$. Uniform product of uniformly Lindelöf spaces is uniformly Lindelöf. Therefore by Lemma 5.5 it suffices to establish that every $(X_i, (\mu_i)_H)$ is uniformly Lindelöf. Since μ_i and $(\mu_i)_H$ are metrizable, this is equivalent to showing that $(\mu_i)_H$ is separable. Since (H, X) is HNS then, by Lemma 9.6, the H -quotient (H, X_i) is also HNS. Hence, $id_{X_i} : (X_i, \mu_i) \rightarrow (X_i, (\mu_i)_H)$ is fragmented by virtue of Lemma 9.3.2. Now, Lemma 6.5 guarantees that $(X_i, (\mu_i)_H)$ is separable.

$5 \Rightarrow 1$: We have to show that X is RN_{app} . Equivalently, by Theorem 7.6.4 we need to check that $C(X) = Asp(X)$. Let $F \in C(X)$ and $H < G$ be a countable subgroup. By our assumption, (X, μ_H) is uniformly Lindelöf. Since $F : (X, \mu) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous then $id_X : (X, \mu_H) \rightarrow (X, \rho_{H,F})$ is also uniformly continuous. Therefore, $(X, \rho_{H,F})$ is uniformly Lindelöf, too. Since $\rho_{H,F}$ is a pseudometric, we conclude that $(X, \rho_{H,F})$ is separable. This proves that $F \in Asp(X)$. \square

- Remarks 9.9.*
1. Every precompact uniform space is uniformly Lindelöf. Note here that (X, μ_G) is precompact iff (G, X) is equicontinuous (cf. Corollary 5.4). Therefore, RN_{app} , and its equivalent concept HNS, can be viewed as a natural generalization of equicontinuity.
 2. Theorem 9.8 implies that RN_{app} (or, HNS) is “countably-determined”. That is, (G, X) is RN_{app} iff (H, X) is RN_{app} for every *countable* subgroup $H < G$.
 3. Let $H < G$ be a *syndetic* subgroup (that is, there exists a compact subset $K \subset G$ such that $G = KH$) of a uniformly Lindelöf group G . Then a system (G, X) is RN_{app} iff the system (H, X) is RN_{app} . Indeed, K acts μ -uniformly equicontinuously on X . Thus if (X, μ_H) is uniformly Lindelöf then (X, μ_{KH}) is uniformly Lindelöf, too.
 4. We get also that always, $HAE \subset RN_{app}$ (because $HAE \subset HNS = RN_{app}$).
 5. $RN_{app} \subset LE$ by Lemma 9.7.1 (or, by [44, Theorem 6.10]).

We now have the following diagram for compact G -systems:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 Eb & \longrightarrow & RN & \longrightarrow & HAE & \longrightarrow & HNS = RN_{app} \longrightarrow LE \\
 & & & & & \nearrow & \\
 & & & & WAP & &
 \end{array}$$

- Remark 9.10.*
1. We do not know (even for cascades) if $HAE \neq HNS$ for nonmetrizable systems. All other implications, in general, are proper:
 2. $RN \neq HAE$, $Eb \neq WAP$. Indeed, take a system (G, X) with trivial G and a compact X which is not RN in the sense of Namioka, and hence not Eberlein, as a compact space (e.g. $X := \beta\mathbb{N}$). Such a G -system however trivially is WAP and also HAE .
 3. $Eb \neq RN$. Take a trivial action on a compact space $X \in RN \setminus Eb$.
 4. $RN_{app} \neq LE$ even for transitive metric systems (Remark 10.12 and Theorem 11.1).
 5. $WAP \neq HNS$. See Theorem 11.1.

Theorem 9.11. *For a compact G -system X the following are equivalent:*

1. $f \in Asp(X)$.
2. $f_{\#}^G : X \rightarrow RUC(G)$ is fragmented.
3. $\check{G}^f := \{\check{g}_f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{g \in G}$ (where $\check{g}_f(x) = f(gx)$) is a fragmented family.
4. X_f is norm fragmented.
5. The G -system X_f is RN .

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$: By Theorem 7.6.3 there exist a G -quotient $\alpha : (X, \mu_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mu_Y)$ with $Y \in \text{RN}$ and $F \in C(Y)$ such that $f = F \circ \alpha$. Then $f_{\sharp} = F_{\sharp} \circ \alpha$. Therefore, by Lemma 6.3.6, it is enough to show that $F_{\sharp} : Y \rightarrow RUC(G)$ is fragmented, or equivalently, that Y is $\rho_{G,F}$ -fragmented (see remark before Lemma 7.3). By our assumption (Y, μ_Y) is RN. Therefore, Theorem 9.8 guarantees that Y is $(\mu_Y)_G$ -fragmented. Since $\text{id}_Y : (Y, (\mu_Y)_G) \rightarrow (Y, \rho_{G,F})$ is uniformly continuous, it follows that Y is $\rho_{G,F}$ -fragmented, as required.

$2 \Leftrightarrow 3$: See Definition 6.8.1.

$2 \Rightarrow 4$: Let $f_{\sharp} : X \rightarrow X_f$ be the canonical G -quotient. Then by Lemma 6.4 (with $Y_1 = Y_2 = RUC(G)$) the fragmentability of $f_{\sharp}^G : X \rightarrow RUC(G)$ guarantees the fragmentability of $r_G : X_f \rightarrow RUC(G)$.

$4 \Rightarrow 5$: The norm on $RUC(G)$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to the pointwise topology. Hence, Theorem 7.9 ensures that the G -system X_f is RN.

$5 \Rightarrow 1$: Since X_f is RN, by Theorem 7.6.3 and Proposition 2.2.3 we get that $f \in \text{Asp}(X)$. \square

Note that X_f is an Eberlein system if and only if $f \in \text{WAP}(X)$. Indeed we can apply [44, Theorem 4.11] making use of the *right strict G -duality* (in the sense of [44]) $Y \times X_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $Y := \text{cls}_w(fG)$ is the weak closure of fG in $\text{WAP}(X)$.

Remark 9.12. Note in the following list how, for a G -space X , topological properties of X_f correspond to dynamical properties of $f \in RUC(X)$ and provide an interesting dynamical hierarchy.

$$\begin{aligned} X_f \text{ is norm compact} &\leftrightarrow f \text{ is AP} \\ X_f \text{ is weakly compact} &\leftrightarrow f \text{ is WAP} \\ X_f \text{ is norm fragmented} &\leftrightarrow f \text{ is Asplund} \\ X_f \text{ is orbitwise light} &\leftrightarrow f \text{ is LE} \end{aligned}$$

In the domain of compact metric systems NS and AE are distinct properties. In contrast to this fact, if these conditions hold hereditarily then they are equivalent.

Theorem 9.13. *Let (X, d) be a compact metric G -space. The following properties are equivalent.*

1. X is RN.
2. X is HAE.
3. Every closed G -subsystem Y of X has a point of equicontinuity.
4. X is HNS.
5. X is d_G -fragmented (recall that $d_G(x, x') = \sup_{g \in G} d(gx, gx')$).
6. (X, d_G) is separable (that is, d is an s -Asplund metric).
7. Every continuous function $F : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is s -Asplund.

Proof. Since X is metric, $\check{G} \subset \text{Homeo}(X)$ is second countable. So we can and do assume, for simplicity, that G is second countable.

By Theorem 7.6.5, $\text{RN} = \text{RN}_{\text{app}}$ in the domain of compact metric systems. Hence, it follows by our diagram above that $1 \Leftrightarrow 2 \Leftrightarrow 4$.

$2 \Rightarrow 3$: Is trivial.

$3 \Rightarrow 4$: By the assumption $\text{Eq}(Y) \neq \emptyset$ for every subsystem (G, Y) . Thus, Y is NS by Remark 9.2.1. It follows that X is HNS.

$4 \Leftrightarrow 5$: By Lemma 9.3.2.

$5 \Rightarrow 6$: By Lemma 6.5.

6 \Rightarrow 7: By our assumption (X, d_G) is separable. Since $\text{id}_X : (X, d_G) \rightarrow (X, \rho_{G,F})$ is uniformly continuous, we obtain that $(X, \rho_{G,F})$ is also separable, as required.

7 \Rightarrow 1: Every s-Asplund function is Asplund. Hence, $C(X) = \text{Asp}(X)$. By assertions 4 and 5 of Theorem 7.6 we can conclude that X is RN. \square

Summing up we have the following simple diagram (with two proper inclusions) for *metric* compact systems :

$$Eb = WAP \rightarrow RN = HAE = HNS = RN_{app} \rightarrow LE$$

Remark 9.14. (Semigroup case) For a semigroup S acting jointly continuously on a compact space X the main results of this section (Theorems 9.8, 9.11, 9.13 (with the exception of 9.13.3)) are still valid after minor natural modifications of the definitions of HAE and HNS. More precisely, we require that the corresponding conditions hold for every closed nonempty, not necessarily S -invariant, subset A of X .

10. SOME EXAMPLES

Corollary 10.1. *The class of compact metrizable HNS (hence also RN, HAE) systems is closed under factors and countable products.*

Proof. $RN=HAE=HNS$ by Theorem 9.13. Now use Lemma 9.6 and Theorem 7.6.5. \square

Corollary 10.2. *Every scattered compact G -space X (e.g., countable X) is RN (see also [44]).*

Proof. We can derive this fact directly from Theorem 7.9 using Remark 6.2.4. \square

A metric G -space (X, d) is called *expansive* if there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $d_G(x, y) := \sup_{g \in G} d(gx, gy) > c$ for every distinct $x, y \in X$.

Corollary 10.3. *An expansive compact metric G -space (X, d) is RN iff X is countable.*

Proof. If X is RN then by Theorem 9.13, (X, d_G) is separable. On the other hand, (X, d_G) is discrete for every expansive system (X, d) . Thus, X is countable. \square

For a countable discrete group G and a finite alphabet S the compact space S^G is a G -space under left translations $(g\omega)(h) = \omega(g^{-1}h)$, $\omega \in S^G$, $g, h \in G$. A closed invariant subset $X \subset S^G$ defines a subsystem (G, X) . Such systems are called *subshifts* or *symbolic dynamical systems*.

Corollary 10.4. *For a countable discrete group G and a finite alphabet S let $X \subset S^G$ be a subshift. The following properties are equivalent:*

1. X is RN.
2. X is countable.

Moreover if $X \subset S^G$ is an RN subshift and $x \in X$ is a recurrent point then it is periodic (i.e. Gx is a finite set).

Proof. It is easy to see (and well known) that every subshift is expansive.

For the last assertion recall that if x is a recurrent point with an infinite orbit then its orbit closure contains a homeomorphic copy of the Cantor set. \square

Remarks 10.5. 1. Note that a subshift $X \subset S^G$ is equicontinuous iff X is finite. Once again (Remark 9.9.1) we see the analogy between “equicontinuous — finite” and “RN — countable”.

2. By Theorem 1.3 of [24] and the variational principle an LE (e.g., RN) cascade has topological entropy zero. This probably holds for a much broader class of acting groups but we have not investigated this direction.
3. It is interesting to compare some of the current definitions of chaos and the corresponding classes of dynamical systems (see, for example, [14, 24, 10]) with the class of G -systems X such that $\text{Asp}(X) = \{\text{constants}\}$. The latter are the systems which admit only trivial representations on Asplund Banach spaces.

For some (one-dimensional) compact spaces every selfhomeomorphism will produce an RN system.

Proposition 10.6. 1. *For each element $f \in \text{Homeo}(I)$, the homeomorphism group of the unit interval $I = [0, 1]$, the corresponding dynamical system (f, I) is HNS.*

2. *For each element $f \in \text{Homeo}(S^1)$, the homeomorphism group of the circle $S^1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$, the corresponding dynamical system (f, S^1) is HNS.*

Proof. 1. Fix an element $f \in \text{Homeo}(I)$, which with no loss of generality we assume is orientation preserving. Consider the dynamical system (f, I) and for a set $A \subset I$ denote $O_f(A) = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f^n(A)$. Let us note first that for every $x \in [0, 1]$ the sequence $\dots f^{-2}(x), f^{-1}(x), x, f(x), f^2(x), \dots$ is monotone increasing hence the orbit closure of x is just the orbit together with the points $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^{-n}(x)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f^n(x)$. In particular the dynamical system (f, I) is LE.

Next we will show that (f, I) is NS. If this is not the case then there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every non empty open set $U \subset I$ there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\text{diam}(f^n U) \geq \epsilon$. Let $(a, b) \subset I$ be an open interval and let $\{U_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a countable basis for open sets in (a, b) . If for every k the set $(a, b) \cap O_f(U_k)$ is dense in (a, b) then the orbit of any point $x \in (a, b) \cap \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} O_f(U_k)$ will be dense in (a, b) which is impossible.

We conclude that for every interval (a, b) and every proper subinterval J_1 there is another subinterval $J_2 \subset (a, b)$ which is disjoint from $O_f(J_1)$. By induction we can find an infinite sequence of disjoint intervals J_j in (a, b) such that for every j the set J_{j+1} , and hence also $O_f(J_{j+1})$, is disjoint from $\cup_{i \leq j} O_f(J_i)$. Since for each j the set $O_f(J_j)$ contains an interval of length at least ϵ we arrive at a contradiction. This concludes the proof that (f, I) is NS.

Next consider any nonempty closed invariant subset $Y \subset I$. If Y contains an isolated point then clearly the system (f, Y) is NS. Thus we now assume that Y is a perfect set. We can then repeat the argument that showed that (f, I) is NS for the system (f, Y) and arrive at the same kind of contradiction since again an orbit of a single point in Y can not be everywhere dense in a nonempty set of the form $(a, b) \cap Y$.

2. We will use Poincaré's classification of the systems (S^1, f) whose nature is well understood (see for example [33], Section 11.2). Again we can assume with no loss of generality that our homeomorphism f preserves the orientation on S^1 . Let $r(f) \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the rotation number of f . If $r(f)$ is rational then some power of f has a fixed point and we are reduced to the case of a homeomorphism of $I = [0, 1]$. Thus we can assume that $r(f)$ is irrational. There are two cases to consider. The first is when the system (S^1, f) is minimal, in which case f is conjugate to an irrational rotation and is therefore equicontinuous.

In the second case, when (S^1, f) is not minimal, there exists a unique minimal subset $K \subset S^1$ with K a Cantor set and there are wandering intervals $J \subset S^1$. For such an interval, given an $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an N such that for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $|n| \geq N$, $\text{diam}(f^n(J)) < \epsilon$; whence the NS property of (S^1, f) .

For the HNS property consider an arbitrary subsystem (Y, f) with $Y \subset S^1$. Again distinguish between the cases when Y has an isolated point and when it is a perfect set. The presence of an isolated point ensures NS. Finally when Y is perfect it is either equal to K , hence equicontinuous, or we can still use the existence of the wandering intervals in

(S^1, f) to obtain a nonempty set $J \cap Y$ with the property that the diameter of its images under the iterates of f tends to zero. \square

Proposition 10.7. *A weakly mixing metrizable AE (e.g., RN) system is necessarily trivial.*

Proof. Fix a metric d on X and let $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}\text{diam}(X)$. Let $x_0 \in X$ be an equicontinuity point of X . Let $\delta > 0$ satisfy: $x \in B_\delta(x_0) \Rightarrow d(gx_0, gx) < \varepsilon$ for all $g \in G$. By weak mixing there is a transitive point $(z, w) \in B_\delta(x_0) \times B_\delta(x_0)$ in $X \times X$. Since for every $g \in G$

$$d(gz, gw) \leq d(gz, gx_0) + d(gx_0, gw) < 2\varepsilon,$$

we conclude that $\text{diam}(X) \leq 2\varepsilon$, contradicting our choice of ε . \square

Examples 10.8. Of course it is easy to find non-RN metric systems. Here are some “random” examples.

1. The cascades on the torus \mathbb{T}^2 defined by a hyperbolic automorphism, or the horocycle flows (being weakly mixing) are not RN. Likewise Anosov diffeomorphisms on a compact manifold (being expansive (see [5]), are not RN.
2. Systems which contain non-equicontinuous minimal subsystems fail to be RN.
3. Let X be compact Hausdorff and uncountable and set $G = \text{Homeo}(X)$. Then in many cases (like $X = [0, 1]$) the action is expansive, hence not RN (Corollary 10.3).
4. As we have seen, any uncountable subshift is not RN. Thus, for example the well known “generator of the Morse cascade”

$$w = \dots 01101001100101100110100110010110\dots$$

considered as a function $w : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is not an Asplund function on the group \mathbb{Z} .

5. In Proposition 10.6.2 it is essential that $f : S^1 \rightarrow S^1$ is a homeomorphism. Indeed, defining $f(z) = z^2$, we get a sensitive action of the semigroup \mathbb{N} on S^1 . Thus, the corresponding semigroup action (\mathbb{N}, S^1) is not RN.

A transitive LE system is, by definition, AE but there are nontransitive LE systems which are not AE.

Example 10.9. As can be easily seen the \mathbb{Z} system (T, D) , where $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1\}$ is the unit disk in the complex plane and $T : D \rightarrow D$ is the homeomorphism given by the formula $Tz = z \exp(2\pi i|z|)$, is an LE system which is not AE.

There exist many compact metrizable transitive AE systems which fail to be HAE. This follows, for example, from the following lemma.

Lemma 10.10. *Every compact metric chain recurrent \mathbb{Z} -space X is a subsystem of a compact metric transitive AE cascade Y .*

Proof. By induction choose for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a finite ε -pseudo orbit, with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{n}$, $\{x_k^n : 1 \leq k \leq m_n\}$ such that (i) $\{x_k^n : 1 \leq k \leq m_n\}$ is $\frac{1}{n}$ -dense in X , and (ii) $d(Tx_{m_n}^n, x_1^{n+1}) < \frac{1}{n+1}$. Similar sequences $\{z_k^n : 1 \leq k \leq m_n\}$ are constructed for negative integers n and now let Y be the subset of $X \times [0, 1]$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Y = & \{(x_k^n, 1/n) : 1 \leq k \leq m_n, n > 0\} \\ & \cup \{(z_k^n, 1/n) : 1 \leq k \leq m_n, n < 0\} \\ & \cup (X \times \{0\}). \end{aligned}$$

It is now clear how to define $T : Y \rightarrow Y$ so that (T, Y) will satisfy the claim of the lemma. \square

When the initial system is transitive we can get a bit more.

Lemma 10.11. *Every compact metrizable transitive \mathbb{Z} -space X is a subsystem (in fact a \mathbb{Z} -retract) of some compact metrizable transitive AE cascade Y .*

Proof. Choose a dense countable \mathbb{Z} -invariant subset $D := \mathbb{Z}x_0$ of X . Consider the *Alexandroff duplicate*: $K = X' \cup X$ where X' is a disjoint discrete copy of X and the basic neighborhoods at $x \in X$ have the form $U' \setminus \{x\} \cup U$, where U is a neighborhood of x in the original space X . Then K is a compact (Hausdorff) G -system. Define $Y := D' \cup X \subset K$, then Y is a \mathbb{Z} -invariant closed subspace of K and the orbit D' of x'_0 is dense in Y . The map $r : Y \rightarrow X$, $r(d') = d$, $r(x) = x$ is the required equivariant continuous retraction. \square

Remark 10.12. If we apply the construction of Lemma 10.10 to the (clearly chain recurrent) system $(T, X) = (T, D)$ of Example 10.9 we obtain a transitive (but not recurrent-transitive) metric LE system (T, Y) which is not HAE (or, RN_{app}). Applying Lemma 10.11 to a transitive non AE system (T, X) (e.g. a minimal weakly mixing system), we obtain an example of an AE system with both a subsystem and a factor which are not AE (see [24]). As noted above, HAE is preserved under both passage to subsystems and the operation of taking factors. In the next section we will show that the Glasner-Weiss family of recurrent-transitive LE but not WAP systems consists, in fact, of HAE systems. On the other hand, in Section 13 we will modify these examples so that the resulting dynamical system will still be recurrent-transitive, LE, but no longer HAE. Thus even among metric recurrent transitive \mathbb{Z} -systems we have the proper inclusions

$$\text{WAP} \subset \text{HAE} \subset \text{LE}.$$

Then we can conclude that the following inclusions are also proper

$$\text{WAP}(\mathbb{Z}) \subset \text{Asp}(\mathbb{Z}) \subset \text{LE}(\mathbb{Z}).$$

11. THE G-W EXAMPLES ARE HAE

In this section we assume that the reader is familiar with the details of the paper [25]. In particular we use the notations of that paper with no further comments.

Theorem 11.1. *The G-W examples of recurrent-transitive LE but not WAP systems are actually HAE.*

Proof. Recall, Ω is the space of continuous maps $x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow 2^I$, where $I = [0, 1]$ and 2^I is the compact metric space of closed subsets of I equipped with the Hausdorff metric d . (In fact, the values x assumes are either intervals or points.) The topology on Ω is that of uniform convergence on compact sets: $x_n \rightarrow x$ if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $M > 0$ there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $n > N$, $\sup_{|t| \leq M} d(x_n(t), x(t)) < \varepsilon$. This topology makes Ω a compact metrizable space. On Ω there is a natural \mathbb{R} -action defined by translations: $(T^t x)(s) = x(s + t)$. The dynamical system (T, X) is obtained as the orbit closure $X = \text{cls}\{T^n \omega : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for a carefully constructed (kite-like) element $\omega \in \Omega$ (see also the figure in Section 13). We next sum up some of the salient facts we have about (T, X) .

(a) For every $x \in X$ there is a unique interval $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$ such that:

- (i) $x(t) \subset [a, b]$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{R}$,
- (ii) there exists a sequence $t_l \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lim x(t_l) = [a, b]$.

We denote

$$\mathbf{N}(x) = [a, b].$$

(b) The function $x \mapsto \mathbf{N}(x)$ is lower semicontinuous; i.e. $\lim_{\nu} x_{\nu} = x \Rightarrow \liminf_{\nu} \mathbf{N}(x_{\nu}) \supset \mathbf{N}(x)$.

- (c) Let us call intervals $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$ of the form $\mathbf{N}(x)$, $x \in X$, *admissible* intervals. Then for every admissible $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$ there exists a unique element $\omega_{ab} \in X$ with $\mathbf{N}(\omega_{ab}) = \omega_{ab}(0) = [a, b]$. (In particular $\omega_{01} = \omega$.)
- (d) Let $J = \{\omega_{ab} \in X : 0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1\}$. Then J is a closed subset of X and $\mathbf{N} : J \rightarrow \{(a, b) : 0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1\} \subset [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ is a homeomorphism onto the set of admissible intervals. (Not every subinterval of $[0, 1]$ is admissible. For example neither $[0, 9/10]$ nor any degenerate interval with $9/10 < a = b \leq 1$ is attained.)
- (e) Denoting $X_{ab} = \bar{\mathcal{O}}_T(\omega_{ab})$ we have $x \in X_{ab}$ iff $\mathbf{N}(x) \subset [a, b]$.
- (f) For each admissible interval $[a, b] \subset [0, 1]$ the subsystem (T, X_{ab}) is AE, with $Eq(X_{ab}) = \{x \in X : \mathbf{N}(x) = [a, b]\}$.

These facts, perhaps with the exception of item (b), are either stated explicitly and proved in [25] or can be easily deduced from it. For completeness we provide a proof for (b).

Proof of (b). With no loss in generality we assume that $\liminf_\nu \mathbf{N}(x_\nu) = \lim_\nu \mathbf{N}(x_\nu) = [a, b]$ and we then have to show that $[a, b] \supset \mathbf{N}(x)$. There exists a sequence m_i such that $\lim_i T^{m_i}x(0) = \mathbf{N}(x)$. Therefore, given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an i with

$$(11.1) \quad d(T^{m_i}x(0), \mathbf{N}(x)) < \varepsilon.$$

Next choose ν such that

$$(11.2) \quad d(T^{m_i}x_\nu(0), T^{m_i}x(0)) < \varepsilon$$

and

$$(11.3) \quad d(\mathbf{N}(x_\nu), [a, b]) < \varepsilon.$$

Now, by (11.3) we have

$$[a - \varepsilon, b + \varepsilon] \supset \mathbf{N}(x_\nu) \supset T^{m_i}x_\nu(0),$$

hence by (11.1) and (11.2)

$$[a - 3\varepsilon, b + 3\varepsilon] \supset \mathbf{N}(x).$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary we conclude that indeed $[a, b] \supset \mathbf{N}(x)$. \square

Of course this list implies the LE property of (T, X) . However, we are after the stronger property HAE. For this end consider now an arbitrary closed invariant nonempty subset Y of X . Let J_Y be the subset of Y which consists of those elements $y \in J \cap Y$ for which $\mathbf{N}(y) = y(0)$ is maximal; that is, if $z \in Y$ and $\mathbf{N}(z) \supset \mathbf{N}(y)$ then $\mathbf{N}(z) = \mathbf{N}(y)$.

Claim 1: The restriction of $\mathbf{N} \upharpoonright_{J_Y} : J_Y \rightarrow [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ is continuous at points of J_Y .

Proof. Suppose $Y \ni y_n \rightarrow y \in J_Y$. By the lower semicontinuity of \mathbf{N} ,

$$[a, b] = \liminf_n \mathbf{N}(y_n) \supset \mathbf{N}(y).$$

Choose a subsequence n_i such that $\mathbf{N}(y_{n_i}) \rightarrow [a, b]$. Then for some sequence m_i we have $T^{m_i}y_{n_i}(0) \rightarrow [a, b]$. By compactness we can assume with no loss in generality that $T^{m_i}y_{n_i} \rightarrow z$ for some $z \in Y$. Now, $T^{m_i}y_{n_i}(0) \rightarrow z(0) = [a, b] \supset \mathbf{N}(y)$, whence $\mathbf{N}(y) = [a, b]$. It follows easily that $\lim_n \mathbf{N}(y_n) = \mathbf{N}(y)$. \square

In item (d) of the above list we noted that J is a closed subset of X and $\mathbf{N} : J \rightarrow [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ is a homeomorphism into. Set $K = \mathbf{N}(J \cap Y)$ and let $K_0 \subset K$ be the subset of maximal elements in K ; i.e. $[a, b] \in K_0$ iff $[a, b] \in K$ and $K \ni [c, d] \supset [a, b]$ implies $[c, d] = [a, b]$. Clearly K_0 is a closed subset of the closed set K and for every $[c, d] \in K$ there exists some $[a, b] \in K_0$ with $[c, d] \subset [a, b]$.

Claim 2: $K_0 = \mathbf{N}(J_Y)$.

Proof. Let $[a, b]$ be an element of K_0 , then $[a, b] = \mathbf{N}(y)$ for some $y \in J \cap Y$. If $[c, d] = \mathbf{N}(z) \supset [a, b]$ for some $z \in Y$, then for some $z' \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_T(z) \subset Y$ we have $z'(0) = [c, d] = \mathbf{N}(z')$. In particular $z' \in J \cap Y$ and $\mathbf{N}(z') = [c, d] \in K$. Hence $[c, d] = [a, b]$ and it follows that $y \in J_Y$.

Conversely, if $y \in J_Y$ with $y(0) = [a, b] = \mathbf{N}(y)$ and $\mathbf{N}(z) = z(0) = [c, d] \supset [a, b]$ for $z \in Y$, then $[c, d] = [a, b]$ and $[a, b] \in K_0$. \square

Claim 3: J_Y is closed and nonempty; in fact $Y = \text{cls}\{T^n J_Y : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Proof. The fact that J_Y is closed and nonempty is a direct consequence of Claim 2. Clearly $\mathbf{N}(Y) = \mathbf{N}(J \cap Y) = K$ and it follows that every $[a, b] = \mathbf{N}(y) \in \mathbf{N}(Y)$ is a subset of some $[c, d] = \mathbf{N}(\omega_{ab}) \in K_0$. By item (e) we have $y \in X_{ab} = \bar{\mathcal{O}}_T(\omega_{ab})$ and our claim follows. \square

Claim 4: Every $\omega_{ab} \in J_Y$ with $a < b$ is in $Eq(Y)$.

Proof. The key fact in proving the inclusion $J_Y \setminus \{\text{constant functions}\} \subset Eq(Y)$ is a certain uniformity of the function $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon'(\varepsilon, b - a)$ provided by Lemma 3.5 of [25]. In essence, as can be seen by combining Lemmas 3.5, 3.6 and 1.1 of [25], this function is the equicontinuity modulus function for $D(z, w) = \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} d(T^n z, T^n w)$ on orbit closures in (T, X) ; i.e. given a point $x \in X$ with $\mathbf{N}(x) = [a, b]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, the ε' -neighborhood of x , $B_{\varepsilon'}(x) \cap \bar{\mathcal{O}}_T(x)$, in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_T(x)$ is (ε, D) -small. The point is, that the $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon'(\varepsilon, b - a)$ provided by Lemma 3.5 of [25] is uniform in x as long as $b - a$ is bounded away from zero.

Therefore, given a point $\omega_{ab} \in J_Y$, with $a < b$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ we can choose a point $\omega_{a'b'} \in J$ with $a' < a < b < b'$ so that $a - a', b' - b$ are sufficiently small to ensure that $\omega_{ab} \in B_{\varepsilon'}(\omega_{a'b'})$. Of course by (e) we have $\omega_{ab} \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_T(\omega_{a'b'})$.

By Claim 1, ω_{ab} is a continuity point for the restriction of the map \mathbf{N} to Y and it follows that there exists a neighborhood V of ω_{ab} such that $\mathbf{N}(y) \subset [a', b']$ for every $y \in V$, hence $y \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_T(\omega_{a'b'})$. We now conclude that $B_{\varepsilon'}(\omega_{a'b'}) \cap V$ is an (ε, D) -small neighborhood of ω_{ab} in the subsystem Y and the proof that ω_{ab} is an equicontinuity point of the system (T, Y) is complete. \square

We next observe that T acts as the identity on the open subset

$$U = Y \setminus \text{cls}\{T^n \omega_{ab} : \omega_{ab} \in J_Y, a < b, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

(when non-empty) and thus every point in U is an equicontinuity point. This observation together with Claims 3 and 4 show that the set $Eq(Y)$ of equicontinuity points is dense in Y . That is, (T, Y) is an AE system and our proof of the HAE property of (T, X) is complete. \square

12. THE MINCENTER OF AN RN SYSTEM

Unlike the case of topologically transitive WAP systems, where the *mincenter* (i.e. the closure of the union of the minimal subsets of X) consists of a single minimal equicontinuous subsystem, the mincenter of a topologically transitive RN system need not be minimal. In the G-W examples the mincenter consists of a continuum of fixed points; moreover, as was shown in [25] a slight modification of the construction there will yield examples of HAE systems whose mincenter consists of uncountably many nontrivial minimal equicontinuous subsystems all isomorphic to a single circle rotation. However, in Section 13 we will present a more sophisticated modification which produces an example of an LE system with a

mincenter containing uncountably many non-isomorphic rotations. In the present section we obtain some information about the mincenter of metrizable RN (equivalently, HAE) systems. This will be used in the next section to draw a sharp distinction between LE and HAE systems.

The *prolongation* relation $\text{Prol}(X) \subset X \times X$ of a compact dynamical system (G, X) is defined as follows:

$$\text{Prol}(X) = \{(x, x') : \exists \text{ nets } g_\nu \in G \text{ and } x_\nu \in X \text{ such that } \lim_\nu x_\nu = x \text{ and } \lim_\nu g_\nu x_\nu = x'\}.$$

It is easy to verify that $\text{Prol}(X)$ is a closed symmetric and G -invariant relation. For $x_0 \in X$ we let

$$\text{Prol}[x_0] = \{x \in X : (x_0, x) \in \text{Prol}(X)\}.$$

Note that always $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x) \subset \text{Prol}[x]$, and if $x_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x)$ then $x \in \text{Prol}[x_0]$. For closed invariant sets $A \subset B \subset X$ we say that A is *capturing in* B if $x \in B$ and $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x) \cap A \neq \emptyset$ imply $x \in A$ (see [7]).

Lemma 12.1. 1. *Let (X, d) be a metric G -system, $x_0 \in \text{Eq}(X)$ and $x \in \text{Prol}[x_0]$, then $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_0)$. Hence,*

$$\text{Prol}[x_0] = \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_0).$$

2. *If $x_0 \in \text{Eq}(X)$ and $x_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x)$, then $x \in \text{Eq}(X)$ and $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_0)$; that is, $\text{Eq}(X)$ is a capturing subset of X .*

Proof. 1. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $z \in B_\delta(x_0)$ implies $d_G(x_0, z) < \varepsilon$. There are nets $g_\nu \in G$ and $x_\nu \in X$ such that $\lim_\nu x_\nu = x_0$ and $\lim_\nu g_\nu x_\nu = x$. For sufficiently large ν we have $x_\nu \in B_\delta(x_0)$ and $d(g_\nu x_\nu, x) < \varepsilon$, hence

$$d(g_\nu x_0, x) \leq d(g_\nu x_0, g_\nu x_\nu) + d(g_\nu x_\nu, x) < 2\varepsilon,$$

hence $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_0)$. Thus $\text{Prol}[x_0] \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_0)$. The inclusion $\text{Prol}[x_0] \supset \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_0)$ is always true.

2. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $d_G(x_0, z) < \varepsilon$ for every $z \in B_\delta(x_0)$. There exists $g \in G$ with $gx \in B_\delta(x_0)$ and therefore an $\eta > 0$ with $gB_\eta(x) \subset B_\delta(x_0)$. Now for every $h \in G$ and $w \in B_\eta(x)$ we have

$$d(hgx, hgw) < d(hgx, hx_0) + d(hgw, hx_0) < 2\varepsilon.$$

Thus also $x \in \text{Eq}(X)$. By assumption $x_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x)$ hence $x \in \text{Prol}[x_0]$ and by part 1, $x \in \overline{\mathcal{O}}_G(x_0)$. \square

Proposition 12.2. *Let (X, d) be a metrizable RNg-system, M its mincenter. Then $\text{Eq}(M)$ is a disjoint union of minimal equicontinuous systems, each a capturing subset of M .*

Proof. Our system X is HAE by Theorem 9.13. Therefore the subsystem (G, M) is AE. Let $x_0 \in M$ be an equicontinuity point of M . Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ such that $x \in B_\delta(x_0) \cap M$ implies $d(gx_0, gx) < \varepsilon$ for every $g \in G$. Let $x' \in B_\delta(x_0)$ be a minimal point. It then follows that $S = \{g \in G : gx' \in B_\delta(x_0)\}$ is a syndetic subset of G (i.e. $FS = G$ for some finite subset F of G). Collecting these estimations we get, for every $g \in S$,

$$d(gx_0, x_0) \leq d(gx_0, gx') + d(gx', x_0) \leq 2\varepsilon.$$

Thus for each $\varepsilon > 0$ the set $N(x_0, B_\varepsilon(x_0)) = \{g \in G : d(gx_0, x_0) \leq \varepsilon\}$ is syndetic, whence x_0 is minimal.

Thus every equicontinuity point x_0 of M is minimal and we apply Lemma 12.1 to conclude that $\text{Eq}(M)$ is a capturing subset of M . \square

Corollary 12.3. *The mincenter Z of a metrizable RN system (G, X) is transitive iff Z is minimal and equicontinuous.*

Remark 12.4. The Birkhoff center Y of a compact metrizable \mathbb{Z} -dynamical system (T, X) can be defined as the closure of its recurrent points. A nonempty open set $U \subset X$ such that $T^j U \cap U = \emptyset$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ is called a *wandering set*. The complement of the union of all wandering sets is a closed invariant subsystem $Z_1 \subset X$ which contains Y . Repeating this process (countably many times) we get by transfinite induction a countable ordinal η such that $Z_\eta = Y$. Since an isolated transitive point of any compact metric system is always an equicontinuity point it follows easily that the system (T, X) is LE iff its Birkhoff center (T, Y) is LE. Does the same statement hold for RN ?

13. A RECURRENT TRANSITIVE LE BUT NOT HAE SYSTEM


As promised in Section 10 we will sketch in the present section a modification of the G-W construction that will yield a recurrent-transitive system which is LE but not HAE. The possibility of introducing such a modification (in order to achieve another goal) occurred to the authors of [25] already at the time when this paper was written. The first author (E.G.) would like to thank B. Weiss for his help in checking the details of the modified construction.

Theorem 13.1. *There exists a recurrent-transitive LE but not HAE system.*

Proof. In the original construction the basic “frames” α_n were defined by the formula

$$\alpha_n(t) = \alpha_0\left(\frac{t}{p_n}\right), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

where α_0 is the original periodic kite-like function,



The kite-like function α_0

and the sequence p_k is defined by $p_0 = 1$ and $p_{n+1} = 10k_n p_n$ for a sequence of integers $k_n \nearrow \infty$ such that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_n}{p_{n+1}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{10k_n} < \infty.$$

In the modified construction the kite-like parts of α_n will not be changed but the lines between consecutive kites will contain larger and larger segments in which the original straight line will be replaced by graphs of functions of the form

$$(13.1) \quad f_\theta : t \mapsto \sin(2\pi\theta t),$$

properly scaled so that they fit into our strip $\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1]$. At the outset the sequence k_n will be chosen to grow sufficiently fast in order to leave room for the insertion of the sine functions. The parameters θ will be constructed inductively as a binary tree of irrational

numbers $\{\theta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, where at the $n + 1$ stage $\theta_{\varepsilon 0} = \theta_\varepsilon$ and $\theta_{\varepsilon 1}$ is a new point in $[0, 1]$. The numbers θ_ε will satisfy inequalities of the form

$$(13.2) \quad \|p_n \theta_\varepsilon\| < \frac{1}{n^n}, \quad \forall \varepsilon \in \cup_{k=1}^\infty \{0, 1\}^k,$$

where $\|\lambda\|$ denotes the distance of the real number λ from the closest integer. The points on the circle which satisfy the inequality (13.2) at the stage $n + 1$, form a union of finitely many disjoint open intervals and the “neighbor” $\theta_{\varepsilon 1}$ of $\theta_{\varepsilon 0} = \theta_\varepsilon$ will be chosen in that same interval which already contains $\theta_{\varepsilon 0}$. When the construction is finished we end up with a Cantor set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{T}$ consisting of the closure of the set $\{\theta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in \cup_{k=1}^\infty \{0, 1\}^k\}$. At stage n there will be finitely many functions f_θ with parameters θ_ε , $\varepsilon \in \cup_{k=1}^n \{0, 1\}^k$ and they will replace segments of the straight lines connecting the kites of α_n . Each of these functions will grow in amplitude very gradually from zero to say $1/100$ and then after running for a long time with maximal amplitude $1/100$ will symmetrically diminish in amplitude till it becomes again a straight line. Each function will appear once and their occurrences will be separated by very long stretches of the straight line. Of course this picture will be repeated periodically between any two consecutive kites of α_n . Apart from these changes the construction of the functions β_n will be repeated unmodified as in [25].

We claim that the construction sketched above, when carefully carried out, will yield an element $\omega \in \Omega$ whose orbit closure $X = \text{cls}\{T^n \omega : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ will be, like the original system, a recurrent-transitive LE system. However, unlike the old system whose minimal sets were all fixed points, our new system will have, for each $\theta \in \Lambda$, a minimal subset isomorphic to the irrational rotation (R_θ, \mathbb{T}) . We will not verify here these claims, whose proofs parallel the proofs of the original construction in [25]. We will though demonstrate the fact that (T, X) is not HAE. Indeed, this is a direct consequence of the following proposition. (A second proof will be given in Remark 14.13.1.)

Proposition 13.2. *Let (T, X) be a compact metric cascade and suppose that there exists an uncountable subset $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{T}$ with the property that for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there exists a subsystem $Y_\lambda \subset X$ such that the system (T, Y_λ) is isomorphic to the rotation (R_λ, \mathbb{T}) on the torus $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Then (T, X) is not HAE.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that (T, X) is HAE and let $Y = \text{cls}(\cup\{Y_\lambda : \lambda \in \Lambda\})$. By assumption the system (T, Y) is also HAE and clearly Y coincides with its mincenter $Y = M(Y)$. Let A_0 be a subset of Y such that for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there is exactly one point in the intersection $A_0 \cap Y_\lambda$, and let $A = \cup\{T^n A_0 : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. If $\{U_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is a countable basis for open sets in Y then the set $O = \cup\{U_m : \text{card}(U_m \cap A) \leq \aleph_0\}$ is open and it meets at most countably many Y_λ 's. Omitting, at the outset, this countable set from Λ we can and shall assume that $U_m \cap A$ is uncountable for every m . By the AE property the set $Y_0 = Eq(Y)$ of equicontinuity points is a dense G_δ subset of Y , and by Proposition 10.2 each point of Y_0 belongs to a minimal set. Since the set Y_f of fixed points in Y is closed, it has an empty interior and it follows that the set $Y_1 = Y_0 \setminus Y_f$ is also a dense G_δ subset of Y .

Choose a point $z_0 \in Y_1$, then $z_0 \in Z$ for some nontrivial minimal set Z . Now the system Z can admit at most a countable set of eigenvalues and therefore can be *not disjoint* from at most countably many of the systems Y_λ . We can therefore choose an infinite sequence $\{\lambda_n\} \subset \Lambda$ and a sequence of points $y_n \in Y_{\lambda_n}$ such that (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = z_0$, (ii) the set $\{\lambda_n : n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ is independent over the rational numbers \mathbb{Q} , and (iii) Z is disjoint from the minimal system $\prod_{n=1}^\infty (R_{\lambda_n}, \mathbb{T})$. Thus the dynamical system

$$(T, \Omega) = (T, Z) \times \prod_{n=1}^\infty (R_{\lambda_n}, \mathbb{T})$$

is minimal and in particular for some sequence m_i we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T^{m_i} y_n &= y_n, \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \dots, \\ \text{while } \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T^{m_i} z_0 &= z_1 \neq z_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} y_n = z_0$, this contradicts the fact that z_0 is an equicontinuity point and the proof of the lemma is complete. \square

This also concludes the proof of Theorem 13.1. \square

14. AN ENVELOPING SEMIGROUP CHARACTERIZATION OF HNS

In this section we give an enveloping semigroup characterizations of Asplund functions and HNS systems in terms of fragmented families (Definition 6.8). In addition to fragmentability, our approach essentially uses Namioka's theorem. First we recall this fundamental result and an auxiliary definition. A topological space X is said to be *Čech-complete* if X is a G_δ subset in some its proper compactification. Hence if X is either locally compact (Hausdorff) or a complete metric space then X is Čech-complete. We need the following version of Namioka's theorem.

Theorem 14.1. [46] (*Namioka's Joint Continuity Theorem*) *Let $w : K \times X \rightarrow M$ be a separately continuous function where M is a metric space, K is compact and X is Čech-complete. Then there exists a dense G_δ set X_0 in X such that w is jointly continuous at every point of $K \times X_0$.*

Let $E = E(X)$ be the enveloping semigroup of a compact G -system X . Recall that

$$E^f := \{p_f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{p \in E}, \quad p_f(x) = f(px).$$

is a pointwise compact subset of \mathbb{R}^X , being a continuous image of E under the map $E \rightarrow E^f$, $p \mapsto p_f$ (see Section 3).

For every $f \in C(X)$ define the mapping

$$w_f : E \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad w_f(p, x) := f(px).$$

It induces two natural mappings: $E^f \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(p_f, x) \mapsto f(px)$ and $E^f \times X_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(p_f, f_\#(x)) \mapsto f(px)$. For the latter case observe that by the proof of Proposition 2.2.2 (with $f_\# = \psi : \beta_G(X) = X \rightarrow X_f$) we have

$$\psi(x_1) = \psi(x_2) \quad \text{iff} \quad f(gx_1) = f(gx_2) \quad \forall g \in G.$$

It follows that

$$\psi(x_1) = \psi(x_2) \quad \text{iff} \quad f(px_1) = f(px_2) \quad \forall p \in E.$$

Hence, $E^f \times X_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is well defined.

We are now ready to prove the following result.

Theorem 14.2. *Let X be a compact G -system. The following are equivalent:*

1. $f \in \text{Asp}(X)$.
2. E^f is a fragmented family.
3. E^f is a barely continuous family.
4. For every closed (G -invariant) subset $Y \subset X$ there exists a dense G_δ subset Y_0 of Y such that the induced map $p_f : Y_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $p_f(y) = f(py)$ is continuous for every member p of the enveloping semigroup E .

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$: By Theorem 9.11 the family $\check{G}^f := \{\check{g}_f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{g \in G}$ is fragmented. Then the family E^f (being a pointwise closure of \check{G}^f) is also fragmented (Lemma 6.9).

$2 \Leftrightarrow 3$: See Definition 6.8.2.

$2 \Rightarrow 4$: Since E^f is a fragmented family then for every closed nonempty subset $Y \subset X$ the family of restrictions $E_Y^f := \{p_f \upharpoonright_Y : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ is (locally) fragmented. Now by Proposition 6.6 (see also Definition 6.8.1) there exists a dense G_δ subset $Y_0 \subset Y$ such that every $y_0 \in Y_0$ is a point of equicontinuity of the family E_Y^f . Clearly this implies that $p_f : Y_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous for every $p \in E$.

$4 \Rightarrow 1$: We have to show by Theorem 9.11 that the G -map $f_\# : X \rightarrow RUC(G)$ is norm-fragmented. The action of G on $RUC(G)$ preserves the norm. Therefore, in this case $\mu_G = \mu$ holds, where μ is the uniformity generated by the norm. By Lemma 9.3.1 it suffices to check that $f_\# \upharpoonright_Y : Y \rightarrow (RUC(G), \mu)$ is locally fragmented for every closed nonempty G -subset Y in X .

By our assumption we can pick a dense G_δ subset Y_0 of Y such that the induced map $p_f : Y_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $p_f(y) = f(py)$ is continuous for every $p \in E(X)$. It follows that

$$w_f \upharpoonright_{E \times Y_0} : E \times Y_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad w_f(p, y) = f(py)$$

is separately continuous. Since Y_0 is Čech-complete, by Namioka's theorem there exists a dense subset Y_1 of Y_0 such that $w_f \upharpoonright_{E \times Y_1}$ is jointly continuous at every $(p, y_1) \in E \times Y_1$. Our aim is to show that $f_\# \upharpoonright_Y : Y \rightarrow RUC(G)$ is continuous at every $y_1 \in Y_1$. By the compactness of E (and the inclusion $\check{G} \subset E$) it is sufficient to check that the map

$$w_f \upharpoonright_{E \times Y} : E \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

is continuous at each $(p, y_1) \in E \times Y_1$. In order to check the latter condition fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By the joint continuity of $w_f \upharpoonright_{E \times Y_1} : E \times Y_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, one can choose an open neighborhood U of p in E and an open neighborhood O of y_1 in the space Y such that

$$|f(py_1) - f(qy)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$$

holds for every $q \in U$ and $y \in O \cap Y_1$. We claim that

$$|f(py_1) - f(qz)| < \varepsilon$$

for every $(q, z) \in U \times O$. Fix such a pair (q, z) and choose $g := g_{q,z} \in G$ such that the corresponding g -translation $\check{g} : X \rightarrow X$ belongs to U and satisfies

$$|f(gz) - f(qz)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Since Y_1 is dense in Y and $\check{g} : X \rightarrow X$ is continuous, one can pick an element $a \in Y_1 \cap O$ such that

$$|f(ga) - f(gz)| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Putting these estimations together we obtain the desired inequality $|f(py_1) - f(qz)| < \varepsilon$. Thus, we have shown that $f_\# \upharpoonright_Y : Y \rightarrow RUC(G)$ is continuous at every $y_1 \in Y_1$. Since Y_1 is dense in Y , we can conclude by Lemma 6.3.2 that $f_\# \upharpoonright_Y$ is locally fragmented. \square

As a corollary we obtain the following enveloping semigroup characterization of metric RN systems. It certainly can be derived also from Theorem 9.13 and the result of Akin-Auslander-Berg mentioned above (see Theorem 5.10).

Corollary 14.3. *Let X be a compact metric G -system. The following are equivalent:*

1. X is RN (equivalently, HAE) G -system.
2. For every closed (G -invariant) subspace $Y \subset X$ there exists a dense G_δ subset Y_0 of Y such that for every $p \in E$ the induced map $p : Y_0 \rightarrow X$, $p(y) := py$ is continuous.

Proof. Since X is a metric compact space we can choose a countable dense subset $\{f_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $C(X) = \text{Asp}(X)$. For a given closed (G -invariant) subset $Y \subset X$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a dense G_δ subset Y_n of Y such that for $p \in E$ the induced map $p_{f_n} : Y_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. Then it is easy to see that $Y_0 := \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Y_n$ is the desired subset of Y . \square

Definition 14.4. We say that a compact right topological semigroup S is an \mathcal{F} -semigroup if the family of maps $\{\lambda_p : S \rightarrow S\}_{p \in S}$, where $\lambda_p(s) = ps$, is a fragmented family. It is equivalent to say that for every nonempty closed subset $A \subset S$, every $f \in C(S)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an open subset $O \subset S$ such that $A \cap O$ is nonempty and the subset $f(p(A \cap O))$ is ε -small in \mathbb{R} for every $p \in S$.

Yet another way to formulate the definition is to require that

$$S^f := \{p_f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{p \in S} \quad (\text{where } p_f(x) = f(px))$$

be a fragmented family for every $f \in C(S)$.

Every compact semitopological semigroup is an \mathcal{F} -semigroup. The verification is easy applying Namioka's theorem to the map

$$S \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (s, a) \mapsto f(sa).$$

Theorem 14.5. *Let X be a compact G -system. The following are equivalent:*

1. X is HNS (equivalently, RN_{app}).
2. $E(X)$ is an \mathcal{F} -semigroup.
3. $\check{G} := \{\check{g} : X \rightarrow X\}_{g \in G}$ is a fragmented family.

Proof. $1 \Leftrightarrow 2$: X is RN_{app} iff $C(X) = \text{Asp}(X)$ (Theorem 7.6.4). On the other hand, $C(X) = \text{Asp}(X)$ iff E^f is fragmented for every $f \in C(X)$ (Theorem 14.2). Using Lemma 6.3.5 it is easy to see that E^f is fragmented for every $f \in C(X)$ iff $E = \{p : X \rightarrow X\}$ is a fragmented family.

$2 \Leftrightarrow 3$: Use Lemma 6.9. \square

An alternative proof of Theorem 14.5 follows from Theorem 9.11 and Lemma 6.9.

Corollary 14.6. G^{Asp} is an \mathcal{F} -semigroup for every topological group G .

Proof. The compact G -system $X := G^{\text{Asp}}$ is RN_{app} by Theorem 7.6.6. Therefore, Theorem 14.5 implies that the enveloping semigroup $E(G^{\text{Asp}})$ is an \mathcal{F} -semigroup. Since $(G^{\text{Asp}}, u_A(e))$ is point-universal (Proposition 7.7.1), by Proposition 2.6 there exists a G -isomorphism $\psi : (E(G^{\text{Asp}}), i(e)) \rightarrow (G^{\text{Asp}}, u_A(e))$ of pointed G -systems. In fact this map is an isomorphism of (right topological) semigroups because $u_A(G)$ is dense in G^{Asp} and $i(G)$ is dense in $E(G^{\text{Asp}})$. \square

Corollary 14.7. *Let (G, X) be a HNS system. Then $p : X \rightarrow X$ is fragmented (equivalently, Baire class 1, when X is metric) for every $p \in E(X)$.*

Proof. Use Proposition 6.7. \square

For the definitions of Rosenthal compact and angelic spaces see Section 3.

Theorem 14.8. 1. *Let X be a compact metrizable G -space. For every $f \in \text{Asp}(X)$ the compact space $E^f \subset \mathbb{R}^X$ is a Rosenthal compact.*
 2. *Let X be a metrizable compact Radon-Nikodým G -space. Then the enveloping semigroup E is a (separable) Rosenthal compact with cardinality $\leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ (in particular, no subspace of such E can be homeomorphic to $\beta\mathbb{N}$).*

Proof. 1. Since $f \in \text{Asp}(X)$, by Theorem 14.2, the family $E^f = \{p_f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}_{p \in E}$ is fragmented. In particular, each map $p_f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is fragmented. Since X is compact and metrizable we can apply Proposition 6.7. Hence, each function $p_f \in E^f$ is of Baire class 1 (on the Polish space X). Therefore, E^f is a Rosenthal compact.

2. $C(X) = \text{Asp}(X)$ by Theorem 7.6.4. It follows by the first assertion that E^f is a Rosenthal compact for every $f \in C(X)$. An application of the dynamical version of the BFT theorem, Theorem 3.2, concludes the proof. \square

Remark 14.9. In fact the following stronger version of Theorem 14.8.1 is true. If \check{G} is uniformly Lindelöf (in particular if G is separable) then for every compact (not necessarily metric) system X and every $f \in \text{Asp}(X)$ the space E^f is a Rosenthal compact. Indeed, using Proposition 2.2 it is easy to see that E^f is naturally homeomorphic to E^{F_e} , where for the maps $\psi = f_\# : X \rightarrow X_f$, $F_e : X_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have $F_e \circ f_\# = f$. Now observe that X_f is metric by Proposition 4.2.

Our next example is of a metric minimal cascade (T, X) which is not RN yet its enveloping semigroup $E = E(T, X)$ (a) is a separable Rosenthal compact of cardinality 2^{\aleph_0} and (b) has the property that each $p \in E$ is of Baire class 1. Thus this example shows that the converse of Theorem 14.8.2 does not hold and neither does that of Corollary 14.7.

Example 14.10. Let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ be the one-dimensional torus, and let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ be a fixed irrational number and $T_\alpha : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ is the rotation by α , $T_\alpha\beta = \beta + \alpha \pmod{1}$. We define a topological space X and a continuous map $\pi : X \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ as follows. For $\beta \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{n\alpha : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ the preimage $\pi^{-1}(\beta)$ will be a singleton x_β . On the other hand for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\pi^{-1}(n\alpha)$ will consist of exactly two points $x_{n\alpha}^-$ and $x_{n\alpha}^+$. For convenience we will use the notation β^\pm , ($\beta \in \mathbb{T}$) for points of X , where $(n\alpha)^- = x_{n\alpha}^-$, $(n\alpha)^+ = x_{n\alpha}^+$ and $\beta^- = \beta^+ = x_\beta$ for $\beta \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{n\alpha : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. A basis for the topology at a point of the form x_β , $\beta \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{n\alpha : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, is the collection of sets $\pi^{-1}(\beta - \varepsilon, \beta + \varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon > 0$. For $(n\alpha)^-$ a basis will be the collection of sets of the form $\{(n\alpha)^-\} \cup \pi^{-1}(n\alpha - \varepsilon, n\alpha)$, where $\varepsilon > 0$. Finally for $(n\alpha)^+$ a basis will be the collection of sets of the form $\{(n\alpha)^+\} \cup \pi^{-1}(n\alpha, n\alpha + \varepsilon)$. It is not hard to check that this defines a compact metrizable zero dimensional topology on X (in fact X is homeomorphic to the Cantor set) with respect to which π is continuous. Next define $T : X \rightarrow X$ by the formula $T\beta^\pm = (\beta + \alpha)^\pm$. Again it is not hard to see that $\pi : (T, X) \rightarrow (R_\alpha, \mathbb{T})$ is a homomorphism of dynamical systems and that (T, X) is minimal and not equicontinuous (in fact it is almost-automorphic). In particular (T, X) is not RN.

We now define for each $\gamma \in \mathbb{T}$ two distinct maps $p_\gamma^\pm : X \rightarrow X$ by the formulas

$$p_\gamma^\pm(\beta^\pm) = (\beta + \gamma)^\pm.$$

We leave the verification of the following claims as an exercise.

1. For every $\gamma \in \mathbb{T}$ and every sequence, $n_i \nearrow \infty$ with $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} n_i\alpha = \gamma$, and $\forall i, n_i\alpha < \gamma$, we have $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} T^{n_i} = p_\gamma^-$ in $E(T, X)$. An analogous statement holds for p_γ^+ .
2. $E(T, X) = \{T^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{p_\gamma^\pm : \gamma \in \mathbb{T}\}$
3. The subspace $\{T^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ inherits from E the discrete topology.
4. The subspace $E(T, X) \setminus \{T^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\} = \{p_\gamma^\pm : \gamma \in \mathbb{T}\}$ is homeomorphic to the “two arrows” space of Alexandroff and Urysohn (see [20, page 212], and also Ellis’ example [18, Example 5.29]). It thus follows that E is a separable Rosenthal compact of cardinality 2^{\aleph_0} .
5. For each $\gamma \in \mathbb{T}$ the complement of the set $C(p_\gamma^\pm)$ of continuity points of p_γ^\pm is the countable set $\{\beta^\pm : \beta + \gamma = n\alpha, \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. In particular each element of E is of Baire class 1.

A surprising result of Todorćević asserts that a Rosenthal compact X which is not metrizable obeys the following alternative: either X contains an uncountable discrete subspace or it is an at most two-to-one continuous preimage of a compact metric space ([54, Theorem 3]). An application of a standard trick then yields the following result.

Proposition 14.11. *(a dynamical Todorćević dichotomy) Let Γ be a countable discrete group. Let (Γ, X) be a compact point transitive system with the property that X is a Rosenthal compact. Then either X contains an uncountable discrete subspace or there exists a metric dynamical system (Γ, Y) and a homomorphism $\pi : (\Gamma, X) \rightarrow (\Gamma, Y)$ such that $|\pi^{-1}(y)| \leq 2$ for every $y \in Y$.*

Proof. If we rule out the first alternative in Todorćević's theorem then it follows by that theorem that there exists a compact metric space Z and a continuous map $\phi : X \rightarrow Z$ with the property that $|\phi^{-1}(z)| \leq 2$ for every $z \in Z$. Define a map $\pi : X \rightarrow Z^\Gamma$ by $\pi(x)_\gamma = \phi(\gamma x)$, $x \in X$, $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and set $Y = \pi(X)$. It is easy to check that $\pi : (\Gamma, X) \rightarrow (\Gamma, Y)$ is a homomorphism of dynamical systems, where Γ acts on Z^Γ by permuting the coordinates $(\gamma(y))_\delta = y_{\delta\gamma}$, $y \in Z^\Gamma$, $\gamma, \delta \in \Gamma$. Clearly Y is a metrizable compact space and finally $\pi(x) = \pi(x')$ implies in particular that $\phi(x) = \pi(x)_e = \pi(x')_e = \phi(x')$, hence also $|\pi^{-1}(y)| \leq 2$ for every $y \in Y$. \square

We do not know whether Theorem 14.8.2 can be strengthened to the statement that the enveloping semigroup of any compact metric RN system is in fact metric. However, Proposition 14.11 yields the following.

Corollary 14.12. *Let (Γ, X) be a metric RN system, where Γ is a countable discrete group, then either the enveloping semigroup $E(\Gamma, X)$ contains an uncountable discrete subspace or it admits a metric factor $\pi : (\Gamma, X) \rightarrow (\Gamma, Y)$ such that $|\pi^{-1}(y)| \leq 2$ for every $y \in Y$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Theorem 14.8.2 and Proposition 14.11. \square

- Remarks 14.13.*
1. Theorem 14.8.2 can be used to obtain an alternative proof of Proposition 13.2. In fact, as can be seen from Proposition 2.1, the enveloping semigroup of the system (T, X) in Proposition 13.2 has cardinality $2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$.
 2. Weakly almost periodic functions also admit an enveloping semigroup characterization. Namely, using Grothendieck's theorem (see the note before Theorem 5.8), one can show that $f \in WAP(X)$ iff the mapping $E^f \times X_f \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(p_f, f_\#(x)) \mapsto f(px)$ is separately continuous (iff the function induced on X_f by $f \circ p$ is continuous for every $p \in E$). In particular, this "local characterization" covers Ellis' result (see Theorem 5.8). This characterization provides also a new (independent) proof of the inclusion $WAP(X) \subset Asp(X)$ (use assertion 4 of Theorem 14.2).
 3. The main results of the present section remain true also for semigroup actions after some minor modifications (see Remark 9.14).

Problem 14.14. By Theorem 14.8.2 the enveloping semigroup of the G-W example is a separable Rosenthal compact (of cardinality 2^{\aleph_0}). We do not have a concrete description of this enveloping semigroup and do not even know whether it is metrizable or if it contains an uncountable discrete subspace.

REFERENCES

1. E. Akin, J. Auslander, and K. Berg, *When is a transitive map chaotic*, Convergence in Ergodic Theory and Probability, Walter de Gruyter & Co. 1996, pp. 25-40.
2. ———, *Almost equicontinuity and the enveloping semigroup*, Topological dynamics and applications, Contemporary Mathematics **215**, a volume in honor of R. Ellis, 1998, pp. 75-81.
3. E. Akin and E. Glasner, *Residual properties and almost equicontinuity*, J. d'Anal. Math. **84**, (2001), 243-286.
4. D. Amir and J. Lindenstrauss, *The structure of weakly compact subsets in Banach spaces*, Ann. of Math., **88** (1968), 35-46.
5. N. Aoki and K. Hiraide, *Topological Theory of Dynamical Systems*, North-Holland Math. Library **52**, 1994.
6. J. Auslander, *Minimal Flows and their Extensions*, Mathematics Studies 153, Notas de Matemática, 1988.
7. J. Auslander and E. Glasner, *The distal order of a minimal flow*, Israel J. of Math. **127**, (2002), 61-80.
8. J. Auslander and F. Hahn, *Point transitive flows, algebras of functions and the Bebutov system*, Fund. Math. **60**, (1967), 117-137.
9. J. Auslander and J. Yorke, *Interval maps, factors of maps and chaos*, Tohoku Math. J. **17** (1980), 177-188.
10. F. Blanchard, E. Glasner, S. Kolyada and A. Maass, *On Li-Yorke pairs*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **547** (2002), 51-68.
11. J.F. Berglund, H.D. Junghenn and P. Milnes, *Analysis on Semigroups*, Wiley, New York, 1989.
12. J. Bourgain, D.H. Fremlin and M. Talagrand, *Pointwise compact sets of Baire-measurable functions*, Amer. J. Math. **100** (1978), 845-886.
13. W.J. Davis, T. Figiel, W.B. Johnson and A. Pełczyński, *Factoring weakly compact operators*, J. Func. Anal. **17**, (1974), 311-327.
14. R. Devaney, *Chaotic Dynamical Systems*, 1989, New York, Addison-Wesley.
15. K. de Leeuw and I. Glicksberg, *Applications of almost periodic compactifications*, Acta Math. **105**, (1961), 63-97.
16. W.F. Eberlein, *Abstract ergodic theorems and weak almost periodic functions*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **67**, (1949), 217-240.
17. R. Ellis, *Equicontinuity and almost periodic functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **10**, (1959), 637-643.
18. ———, *Lectures on Topological Dynamics*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1969.
19. R. Ellis and M. Nerurkar, *Weakly almost periodic flows*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **313**, (1989), 103-119.
20. R. Engelking, *General topology*, revised and completed edition, Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
21. M. Fabian, *Gateaux differentiability of convex functions and topology. Weak Asplund spaces*, Canadian Math. Soc. Series of Monographs and Advanced Texts, A Wiley-Interscience Publication, New York, 1997.
22. E. Glasner, *Proximal flows*, Lecture Notes in Math. **517**, Springer-Verlag, 1976.
23. ———, *Ergodic Theory via joinings*, Math. Surveys and Monographs, AMS, **101**, 2003.
24. E. Glasner and B. Weiss, *Sensitive dependence on initial conditions*, Nonlinearity **6**, (1993), 1067-1075.
25. ———, *Locally equicontinuous dynamical systems*, Colloq. Math. **84/85**, Part 2, (2000), 345-361.
26. G. Godefroy, *Compacts de Rosenthal*, Pacific J. Math. **91** (1980), 293-306.
27. A. Grothendieck, *Critères de compacité dans les espaces fonctionnels généraux*, Amer. J. of Math. **74**, (1952), 168-186.
28. I.I. Guran, *Topological groups similar to Lindelöf groups*, Soviet Math. Dokl., **23** (1981), 173-175.
29. J. Isbell, *Uniform spaces*, AMS, Providence, 1961.
30. J.E. Jayne, I. Namioka and C.A. Rogers, *Norm fragmented weak* compact sets*, Collect. Math. **41:1** (1990), 133-163.
31. J.E. Jayne, J. Orihuela, A.J. Pallares and G. Vera, *σ -fragmentability of multivalued maps and selection theorems*, J. Funct. Anal. **117** (1993), no. 2, 243-273.
32. J.E. Jayne and C.A. Rogers, *Borel selectors for upper semicontinuous set-valued maps*, Acta Math., **155**, (1985), 41-79.
33. A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Modern theory of dynamical systems*, Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications, Vol. **54**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
34. A.S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Springer-Verlag, Graduate texts in mathematics **156**, 1991.
35. H.B. Keynes, *The structure of weakly mixing minimal transformation groups*, Illinois J. Math., **15** (1971), 475-489.

36. A. Köhler, *Enveloping semigroups for flows*, Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, **95A**, (1995), 179-191.
37. J.D. Lawson, *Flows and compactifications*, J. London Math. Soc. (2), **46:2** (1992), 349-363.
38. M. Megrelishvili, *Uniformity and topological transformation groups*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Tbilisi State University, 1985.
39. ———, *A Tychonoff G -space not admitting a compact G -extension or a G -linearization*, Russ. Math. Surv., **43:2** (1988), 177-178.
40. ———, *Compactification and factorization in the category of G -spaces*, in: Categorical Topology, ed: J. Adamek and S. MacLane, World Scientific, Singapore, 1989, 220-237.
41. ———, *Fragmentability and continuity of semigroup actions*, Semigroup Forum, **57** (1998), 101-126.
42. ———, *Operator topologies and reflexive representability*, in Research & Exposition in Mathematics, **24**, (2000) 189-201, Heldermann Verlag Berlin.
43. ———, *Every semitopological semigroup compactification of the group $H_+[0, 1]$ is trivial*, Semigroup forum **63**, (2001), 357-370.
44. ———, *Fragmentability and representations of flows*, Topology Proceedings, **27:2** (2003), 497-544.
Electronic version: <http://at.yorku.ca/b/a/a/1/95.htm> (or: www.math.biu.ac.il/~megreli).
45. E. Michael and I. Namioka, *Barely continuous functions*, Bull. acad. Polon. Sci. Ser. Sci. Math. Astron. Phys., **24** (1976), 889-892.
46. I. Namioka, *Separate continuity and joint continuity*, Pacific. J. Math., **51** (1974), 515-531.
47. ———, *Radon-Nikodým compact spaces and fragmentability*, Mathematika **34**, (1987), 258-281.
48. I. Namioka and R.R. Phelps, *Banach spaces which are Asplund spaces*, Duke Math. J., **42** (1975), 735-750.
49. W. Roelcke and S. Dierolf, *Uniform structures on topological groups and their quotients*, McGraw-Hill, 1981.
50. A. Shtern, *Compact semitopological semigroups and reflexive representability*, Russian J. of Math. Physics **2**, (1994), 131-132.
51. Ch. Stegall, *The Radon-Nikodym property and conjugate Banach spaces II*, Trans. AMS, **264** (1981), 507-519.
52. S. Teleman, *Sur la représentation linéaire des groupes topologiques*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. **74**, (1957), 319-339.
53. S. Todorčević, *Topics in topology*, Springer-Verlag, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **1652**, 1997.
54. ———, *Compact subsets of the first Baire class*, J. of the AMS, **12**, (1999), 1179-1212.
55. V.V. Uspenskij, *Topological groups and Dugundji compacta*, Math. USSR Sbornik, vol. **67**, (1990), 555-580.
56. W.A. Veech, *A fixed point theorem-free approach to weak almost periodicity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **177**, (1973), 353-362.
57. J. de Vries, *Topological transformation Groups 1*, Mathematical centre Tracts 65, Math. Centrum, Amsterdam, 1975.
58. ———, *Equivariant embeddings of G -spaces*, in: J. Novak (ed.), *General Topology and its Relations to Modern Analysis and Algebra IV*, Part B, Prague, 1977, 485-493.
59. ———, *Elements of Topological Dynamics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEL-AVIV UNIVERSITY, RAMAT AVIV, ISRAEL
 E-mail address: glasner@math.tau.ac.il
 URL: <http://www.math.tau.ac.il/~glasner>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, 52900 RAMAT-GAN, ISRAEL
 E-mail address: megereli@math.biu.ac.il
 URL: <http://www.math.biu.ac.il/~megereli>