

TWO HOMOMORPHIC BUT NONISOMORPHIC MINIMAL SETS

Ta-Sun Wu

Let (X, T, π) be a transformation group with compact Hausdorff phase space [5]. We say that (X, T, π) is a minimal set if and only if for every point x in X the orbit closure $\overline{O(x, T)} = \overline{\{xt: t \in T\}}$ is the space X . The classification of minimal sets is one of the important problems in topological dynamics. Although significant progress has recently been made [4], the problem is far from solved. In a forthcoming paper [2], J. Auslander classifies the minimal sets by means of homomorphisms. A homomorphism $\theta: (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$ is a continuous map from X into Y such that $x\theta t = xt\theta$ for all $t \in T, x \in X$. In regard to such classifications, the following question naturally arises: *If (X, T) and (Y, T) are compact minimal sets having homomorphisms $\theta: (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, T)$ and $\phi: (Y, T) \rightarrow (X, T)$, does there exist an isomorphism from (X, T) onto (Y, T) ?*

In this note, we shall show by an example that the answer to this question is negative. Our minimal sets are based on minimal sets given by R. Ellis (see [4, Example 4] or [1, p. 613]); we shall describe these first.

1. Let Y denote the additive group of real numbers modulo 1, let Y_1 and Y_2 be two disjoint copies of Y , and let $X = Y_1 \cup Y_2$. For each $y \in Y$, corresponding points in Y_1 and Y_2 will be written as $(y, 1)$ and $(y, 2)$, respectively. Topologize X by specifying an open-closed neighborhood system for each point. If $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$N_\varepsilon(y, 1) = \{(y+t, 1): 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon\} \cup \{(y+t, 2): 0 < t < \varepsilon\}$$

be an open-closed neighborhood of $(y, 1) \in Y_1$, and let

$$N_\varepsilon(y, 2) = \{(y+t, 2): 0 \geq t \geq -\varepsilon\} \cup \{(y+t, 1): 0 > t > -\varepsilon\}$$

be an open-closed neighborhood of $(y, 2) \in Y_2$. For $i = 1, 2$, let $\tau: X \rightarrow X$ be defined by the formula $(y, i)\tau = (y + \alpha, i)$, where α is a real number. Then τ is a self-homomorphism of X .

1.1 LEMMA. *Let T denote the group generated by τ and topologized by the discrete topology. Then*

(X, T) is a transformation group, and

X is a compact, separable Hausdorff space satisfying the first countability axiom.

1.2 Definition. Let us call the real number α associated with τ the *rotation constant* of τ (or of T). Then (X, T) is a minimal set when the rotation constant is an irrational number. In this case, two points u and v in Y are proximal [4] if and only if $u = (y, i)$ and $v = (y, j)$ for some $y \in Y$.

Now we shall proceed to construct our minimal sets.

2. Let α, β , and γ be three real numbers such that α, β, γ , and 1 are rationally independent. Let (X, T) be the Ellis minimal set with rotation constant α , and let

Received October 11, 1966.

(A, T) be the Ellis minimal set with rotation constant β . In order to distinguish the elements of X and A , we write (a, i) and (b, j) ($i, j = 1, 2$) for the elements of A , where a and b belong to the circle group B (equivalently, to an isomorphic disjoint copy of Y).

2.1 Let T denote an infinite discrete cyclic group generated by t . For points in $X \times A$, we use the symbol $[x, a]$ instead of (x, a) , and we define

$$[(y, i), (a, j)]t = [(y + \alpha, i), (a + \beta, j)].$$

Then $(X \times A, T)$ is a compact minimal set. The proof of minimality is easy if we use the fact α and β are rationally independent.

2.2 For any $y \in Y$ and $a \in B$, the points

$$[(y, 1), (a, 1)], [(y, 1), (a, 2)], [(y, 2), (a, 1)], [(y, 2), (a, 2)]$$

are proximal. This can be proved either directly or by the use of results in [6] and [3].

2.3 Define $[(y, i), (a, j)]\rho = [(y + \gamma, i), (a + \gamma, j)]$ for $[(y, i), (a, j)] \in X \times A$. Then ρ is a self-isomorphism of $(X \times A, T)$.

2.4 Choose fixed elements $y \in Y$, $a \in B$. Let R_1 denote the relation on $X \times A$ induced by identifying each of the four points

$$\begin{aligned} & [(y, 1), (a, 1)]\rho^m t^n, [(y, 2), (a, 1)]\rho^m t^n, [(y, 1), (a, 2)]\rho^m t^n, \\ & [(y, 2), (a, 2)]\rho^m t^n \quad (m \geq 1, n \in I). \end{aligned}$$

Let R_2 denote the relation induced by identifying the points of each pair $[(y, 1), (a, 1)]\rho^m t^n$ and $[(y, 2), (a, 1)]\rho^m t^n$ ($m \geq 0, n \in I$).

2.5 LEMMA. $[(y, i), (a, j)]\rho^m = [(y, k), (a, \ell)]t^n$ if and only if $m = 0, n = 0, i = k, j = \ell$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Proof. } [(y, i), (a, j)]\rho^m &= [(y + m\gamma, i), (a + m\gamma, j)] = [(y, k), (a, \ell)]t^n \\ &= [(y + n\alpha, k), (a + n\beta, \ell)]. \end{aligned}$$

Since α, β , and γ are rationally independent, the assertion follows.

2.6 LEMMA. R_1 is a closed T -invariant equivalence relation.

Proof. It is easy to show that R_1 is a T -invariant equivalence relation. Corresponding to any convergent sequence $\{X_n\}$ with

$$X_n \in R_1 \subseteq (X \times A) \times (X \times A),$$

we consider the following two cases.

Case 1. There exists a subsequence of $\{X_n\}$ whose terms do not belong to the set

$$W = \{[(y, i), (a, j)]\rho^m t^n: m \geq 1, n \in I\}.$$

It is clear that the limit of this sequence is in the diagonal of $(X \times A) \times (X \times A)$.

Case 2. $X_n \in W$, except for finitely many indices. Here we may assume that $X_n \in W$ for all n . There exists a subsequence that (after reindexing) can be written

as $([(z_n, i), (b_n, j)], [(z_n, k), (b_n, \ell)])$. If there exists a subsequence of $\{z_n\}$ whose terms are equal to a constant, then by 2.5 the corresponding b_n is also constant, and *a fortiori* the limit is in R_1 . If all z_n are distinct, except for possibly finitely many indices, then so are the b_n . If z_n converges to z and b_n converges to b , then the limit of $\{x_n\}$ is $([(z, p), (b, q)], [(z, p), (b, q)])$, where p and q are equal to 1 or 2, depending on how the z_n converge to z (see [1, p. 613]). Thus we know that R_1 is closed.

2.7 LEMMA. R_2 is a closed T -invariant equivalence relation.

Proof. Use the same technique as for 2.6.

2.8 LEMMA. If $R_0 = R_1 \cup R_2$, then R_0 is a closed T -invariant equivalence relation.

Proof. Use Lemma 2.5 and straightforward computation. One can show that R_0 is an equivalence relation. The other assertions follow from Lemma 2.6 and Lemma 2.7.

2.9 LEMMA. $R_0\rho \subseteq R_1$, where it is understood that

$$([(x, i), (b, j)], [(x', i'), (b', j')])\rho = ([(x, i), (b, j)]\rho, [(x', i'), (b', j')]\rho).$$

The proof is obvious.

2.10 THEOREM. $(\frac{X \times A}{R_0}, T)$, $(\frac{X \times A}{R_1}, T)$ are minimal sets. There exist homomorphisms

$$\theta: (\frac{X \times A}{R_0}, T) \rightarrow (\frac{X \times A}{R_1}, T) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi: (\frac{X \times A}{R_1}, T) \rightarrow (\frac{X \times A}{R_0}, T),$$

but the two minimal sets are not isomorphic.

Proof. The first assertion is clear. The inclusion relation $R_1 \subseteq R_0$ induces a homomorphism

$$\theta: (\frac{X \times A}{R_0}, T) \rightarrow (\frac{X \times A}{R_1}, T).$$

Because $R_0\rho \subseteq R_1$, ρ induces a homomorphism

$$\phi: (\frac{X \times A}{R_1}, T) \rightarrow (\frac{X \times A}{R_0}, T).$$

$(\frac{X \times A}{R_0}, T)$ and $(\frac{X \times A}{R_1}, T)$ are not isomorphic, since $(\frac{X \times A}{R_0}, T)$ contains a point z such that the cardinality of $P(z)$ is 3, whereas the cardinality of $P(z)$ is 1 or 4 if $z \in \frac{X \times A}{R_1}$.

REFERENCES

1. J. Auslander, *Endomorphisms of minimal sets*, Duke Math. J. 30 (1963), 605-614.
2. ———, *Regular minimal sets, I*, (to appear).
3. J. P. Clay, *Proximity relations in transformation groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 108 (1963), 88-96.
4. R. Ellis and W. H. Gottschalk, *Homomorphisms of transformation groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 94 (1960), 258-271.
5. W. H. Gottschalk and G. A. Hedlund, *Topological dynamics*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium Publications 36, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R. I. (1955).
6. T. S. Wu, *Proximal relations in topological dynamics*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 16 (1965), 513-514.

Case Institute of Technology