A NON-PI MINIMAL SYSTEM IS LI-YORKE SENSITIVE
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Abstract. It is shown that any non-PI minimal system is Li-Yorke sensitive. Consequently, any minimal system with nontrivial weakly mixing factor (such a system is non-PI) is Li-Yorke sensitive, which answers affirmatively an open question by Akin and Kolyada in [AK03].

1. Introduction

1.1. Topological dynamics.

First we recall some basic notions in topological dynamics. A topological dynamical system $(X, T)$ is a compact metric space $(X, \rho)$ endowed with a continuous surjective map $T : X \to X$. For simplicity, we only consider homeomorphisms in this paper.

Recall that $(X, T)$ is transitive if for each pair of open (i.e. non-empty and open) subsets $U$ and $V$, $N(U,V) = \{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : U \cap T^{-n}V \neq \emptyset \}$ is non-empty. $(X, T)$ is is (topologically) weakly mixing if $(X \times X, T \times T)$ is transitive. A point $x \in X$ is a transitive point if its orbit $\text{Orb}(x, T) = \{ T^n x : n \in \mathbb{Z} \}$ is dense in $X$. If every point of $X$ is transitive, we say $(X, T)$ is minimal. A point is minimal if its orbit closure is a minimal subsystem.

A pair $(x, y) \in X \times X$ is said to be proximal if $\liminf_{n \to \infty} \rho(T^n x, T^n y) = 0$, and it is called asymptotic when $\lim_{n \to \infty} \rho(T^n x, T^n y) = 0$. The set of proximal pairs is denoted by $\text{P}(X, T)$ or $P$ when the system is clear. $P$ is a reflexive, symmetric, $T$-invariant relation but in general is not transitive or closed. For $x \in X$, the set $P[x] = \{ y \in X : (x, y) \in P \}$ is called the proximal cell of $x$. An important result concerning the proximal cell is that for any $x \in X$, $P[x]$ contains a minimal point; more precisely, every minimal subset of $\text{Orb}(x, T)$ meets $P[x]$ [Au88, Theorem 5.3]. It follows immediately that if $P[x]$ is a singleton, then $x$ is a minimal point and in that case $x$ is called a distal point. A system is called a distal system when every point is distal. A system $(X, T)$ with some distal point $x$ whose orbit $\text{Orb}(x)$ is dense in $X$ is called a point-distal system. For a weakly mixing system, the proximal cell $P[x]$ is “big”, in the sense that it is a residual subset of $X$ for all $x \in X$ [AK03]. In fact, for mixing systems, proximal cells can be very complicated [HSY].

For a topological dynamical system $(X, T)$, a pair is said to be a Li-Yorke pair if it is proximal but not asymptotic. $x \in X$ is recurrent if there is a subsequently $\{ n_i \}$ of $\mathbb{Z}$ with $n_i \to \infty$ such that $T^{n_i} x \to x$. A pair $(x, y) \in X^2 \setminus \Delta_X$ is said to be a strong Li-Yorke pair if it is proximal and is also a recurrent point of $X^2$, where $\Delta_X = \{(x,x) : x \in X\}$. A subset $A \subset X$ is called scrambled (resp. strongly scrambled) if every pair of distinct points in
A is Li-Yorke (resp. strong Li-Yorke). The system \((X, T)\) is said to be \textit{Li-Yorke chaotic} (resp. strong Li-Yorke chaotic) if it contains an uncountable scrambled (resp. strongly scrambled) subset.

Let \((X, T)\) be a dynamical system. A subset \(K\) of \(X\) is uniformly recurrent if for every \(\varepsilon > 0\) there is an \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) with \(d(T^n x, x) < \varepsilon\) for all \(x\) in \(K\). \(K\) is recurrent if every finite subset of \(K\) is uniformly recurrent. The subset \(K\) is called uniformly proximal if for every \(\varepsilon > 0\) there is \(n \in \mathbb{N}\) with \(\text{diam}(T^n K) < \varepsilon\). A subset \(K\) of \(X\) is called proximal if every finite subset of \(K\) is uniformly proximal.

A homomorphism \(\pi : (X, T) \rightarrow (Y, S)\) is a continuous surjective map from \(X\) to \(Y\) such that \(S \circ \pi = \pi \circ T\). In this case we say that \((X, T)\) an \textit{extension} of \((Y, S)\) and that \((Y, S)\) is a factor of \((X, T)\). An extension \(\pi\) is determined by the corresponding closed invariant equivalence relation \(R_\pi = \{(x_1, x_2) : \pi x_1 = \pi x_2\} = (\pi \times \pi)^{-1} \Delta_Y \subset X \times X\).

1.2. Li-Yorke sensitivity.

\((X, T)\) is \textit{Li-Yorke sensitive}, briefly LYS or LYS\(_\varepsilon\), if there is an \(\varepsilon > 0\) with the property that every \(x \in X\) is a limit of points \(y \in X\) such that the pair \((x, y)\) is proximal but not \(\varepsilon\)-asymptotic, i.e., if
\[
\liminf_{n \to \infty} \rho(T^n x, T^n y) = 0, \text{ and } \limsup_{n \to \infty} \rho(T^n x, T^n y) > \varepsilon.
\]
Each pair satisfying above condition is called an \(\varepsilon\)-\textit{Li-Yorke pair}. A set \(S \subseteq X\) is called an \(\varepsilon\)-\textit{scrambled set} if each pair with distinct elements is an \(\varepsilon\)-Li-Yorke pair. \((X, T)\) is \(\varepsilon\)-\textit{Li-Yorke chaotic}, briefly LYC\(_\varepsilon\) if it has an uncountable \(\varepsilon\)-scrambled subset, for some \(\varepsilon > 0\).

Li-Yorke Chaos [LY75] and sensitivity [Gu79, GW93] are two basic notions to describe the complexity of a topological dynamics. The notion of Li-Yorke sensitivity, combining the above two notions together, was introduced and studied by Akin and Kolyada [AK03]. In [AK03] the authors showed that every nontrivial weak mixing system is LYS, and they stated five conjectures concerning LYS. Three of them were disproved in [CM06] and [CM09]. In particular, it was proved that a minimal LYS system needs not to have a nontrivial weak mixing factor [CM06], and that a minimal system with a nontrivial LYS factor needs not to be LYS [CM09]. The remaining two open problems are the following:

**Question 1.1.** [AK03, Question 4.] \textit{Is every minimal system with a nontrivial weak mixing factor LYS?}

**Question 1.2.** [AK03, Question 2.] \textit{Does Li-Yorke sensitivity imply Li-Yorke chaos?}

In this paper we give an affirmative answer to Question 1.1. In fact, we show the following stronger result (for the definition of PI, see the next subsection):

**Main Theorem.** Let \((X, T)\) be a minimal system. If \((X, T)\) is not PI, then there is some \(\varepsilon > 0\) such that for any \(x \in X\) and any neighbourhood \(U\) of \(x\), there is a subset \(S \subseteq U\) such that
\begin{enumerate}
  \item \(S\) is uncountable and \(x \in S \subseteq P[x] \cap U\);
  \item \(S\) is \(\varepsilon\)-scrambled;
  \item \(S\) is proximal;
\end{enumerate}
(4) \( S \) is recurrent.

In particular, \((X, T)\) is \(\varepsilon\)-Li-Yorke chaotic, strongly Li-Yorke chaotic and Li-Yorke sensitive.

It is known that a factor of a minimal PI system is PI (see Lemma 2.4). Using this fact it is easy to show that every minimal system with a nontrivial weak mixing factor is not a PI system. So a minimal system with a non-trivial weakly mixing factor is LYS, answering Question 1.1 affirmatively. Moreover, by the Main Theorem, we have that any non-PI system is (strongly) Li-Yorke chaotic, which was proved first in [AGHSY]. Note that here we offer a different approach.

For more details related to Li-Yorke sensitivity, see [AK03, CM06, CM09, CM16].

1.3. On the structure of minimal systems.

Our main tool to show the Main Theorem is the structure theorem of minimal systems. In this subsection we state the structure theorem for minimal systems and give the definition of a PI system. For other undefined notions, see [Au88, G76, V77].

We first recall definitions of extensions. An extension \( \pi : (X, T) \to (Y, S) \) is called proximal if \( R_{\pi} \subset P(X, T) \). \( \pi \) is an equicontinuous or almost periodic extension if for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) there is \( \delta > 0 \) such that \((x, y) \in R_{\pi} \) and \( \rho(x, y) < \delta \) imply \( \rho(T^n x, T^n y) < \varepsilon \), for every \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). In the metric case an equicontinuous extension is also called an isometric extension. The extension \( \pi \) is a weakly mixing extension when \((R_{\pi}, T \times T)\) as a subsystem of the product system \((X \times X, T \times T)\) is transitive. \( \pi \) is called a relatively incontractible (RIC) extension if it is open and for every \( n \geq 1 \) the minimal points are dense in the relation

\[
R^n_{\pi} = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in X^n : \pi(x_i) = \pi(x_j), \forall 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}.
\]

Note that \( R^1_{\pi} = X \) and \( R^2_{\pi} = R_{\pi} \). We say that a minimal system \((X, T)\) is a strictly PI system (PI means proximal-isometric) if there is an ordinal \( \eta \) (which is countable when \( X \) is metrizable) and a family of systems \( \{(W_t, w_t)\}_{t \leq \eta} \) such that

1. \( W_0 \) is the trivial system,
2. for every \( t < \eta \) there exists a homomorphism \( \phi_t : W_{t+1} \to W_t \) which is either proximal or equicontinuous (isometric when \( X \) is metrizable),
3. for a limit ordinal \( \nu \leq \eta \) the system \( W_{\nu} \) is the inverse limit of the systems \( \{W_t\}_{t < \nu} \),
4. \( W_\eta = X \).

We say that \((X, T)\) is a PI-system if there exists a strictly PI system \( \tilde{X} \) and a proximal homomorphism \( \theta : \tilde{X} \to X \).

Finally we have the structure theorem for minimal systems (see Ellis-Glasner-Shapiro [EGS75], McMahon [Mc76], Veech [V77], and Glasner [G76]).

**Theorem 1.3** (Structure theorem for minimal systems). Let \((X, T)\) be a minimal system. Then we have the following diagram:
where $X_{\infty}$ is a proximal extension of $X$ and a RIC weakly mixing extension of the strictly PI-system $Y_{\infty}$.

The homomorphism $\pi_{\infty}$ is an isomorphism (so that $X_{\infty} = Y_{\infty}$) if and only if $X$ is a PI-system.

Remark 1.4. If $(X, T)$ is a weakly mixing minimal system, then in the structure theorem, $X = X_{\infty}$ and $Y_{\infty}$ is trivial. Hence if a minimal system is both PI and weakly mixing, then it is trivial.

2. Proof of Main Theorem

In this section we will give the proofs of the main results of the paper. To this aim, we need some basic results from the theory of minimal flows.

First recall some basic notions related to the Ellis semigroup. Given a system $(X, T)$ its enveloping semigroup or Ellis semigroup $E(X, T)$ is defined as the closure of the set $\{T^n : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ in $X^X$ (with its compact, usually non-metrizable, pointwise convergence topology). Let $(X, T), (Y, S)$ be systems and $\pi : X \to Y$ be an extension. Then there is a unique continuous semigroup homomorphism $\pi^* : E(X, T) \to E(Y, S)$ such that $\pi(px) = \pi^*(p)x$ for all $x \in X, p \in E(X, T)$. When there is no confusion, we usually regard that the enveloping semigroup of $X$ acts on $Y$: $p\pi(x) = \pi(px)$ for $x \in X$ and $p \in E(X, T)$.

For a semigroup the element $u$ with $u^2 = u$ is called an idempotent. The well known Ellis-Numakura theorem states that for any enveloping semigroup $E$ the set $J(E)$ of idempotents of $E$ is not empty. An idempotent $u \in J(E)$ is minimal if $v \in J(E)$ and $vu = v$ implies $uv = u$. A point $x \in X$ is minimal if and only if $ux = x$ for some minimal idempotent $u \in E(X, T)$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $T^{(n)} = T \times T \times \ldots \times T$ ($n$ times). For a subset $A \subseteq X^n$, let

$$\text{Orb}(A, T^{(n)}) = \left\{ (T^{(n)})^k A : k \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$ 

The following theorem is crucial to the proof of the Main Theorem. Note that we assume that $X$ and $Y$ are metrizable.

**Theorem 2.1.** [SY, Lemma B.2 and Theorem B.3] Let $(X, T)$ and $(Y, T)$ be minimal systems and let $\pi : X \to Y$ be a RIC weakly mixing extension. Let $y \in Y$ with $uy = y$, where $u$ is a minimal idempotent. Then for all $n \geq 2$, any nonempty open subset $U$ of $\overline{u\pi^{-1}(y)}$ and any transitive point $x' = (x'_1, \ldots, x'_{n-1}) \in R_{\pi}^{n-1}$ with $\pi(x'_j) = y, j = 1, \ldots, n-1$, one has that

$$\overline{\text{Orb}(\{x'\} \times U, T^{(n)})} = R_{\pi}^n.$$
Moreover, for each transitive point \( x' = (x'_1, \cdots, x'_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\pi}^{n-1} \) with \( \pi(x'_j) = y, j = 1, \cdots, n-1 \), there is some residual subset \( D \) of \( u\pi^{-1}(y) \) such that if \( x'' \in D \), then \( \text{Orb}((x', x''), T^{(n)}) = \mathbb{R}_{\pi}^{n} \).

**Remark 2.2.** We have the following

1. To prove Theorem 2.1 one needs the so-called Ellis trick by Glasner in [G76]. We refer to [G05] for more discussions about weakly mixing extensions.
2. In Theorem 2.1, when \( n = 2 \), \( R_{\pi}^{n-1} = R_{\pi}^{1} = X \), i.e. for each \( x \in X \) with \( \pi(x) = y \) there is some residual subset \( D \) of \( u\pi^{-1}(y) \) such that if \( x' \in D \), \( \text{Orb}((x, x'), T \times T) = R_{\pi} \). This result is Theorems 14.27 and 14.28 in [Au88].

**Corollary 2.3.** Let \((X, T)\) and \((Y, T)\) be minimal systems and let \( \pi : X \to Y \) be a RIC weakly mixing extension. Let \( y \in Y \) with \( uy = y \), where \( u \) is a minimal idempotent. If \( \pi \) is non-trivial, then \( u\pi^{-1}(y) \) is perfect, and hence it has the cardinality of the continuum.

**Proof.** If \( u\pi^{-1}(y) \) is not perfect, then there is some \( x \in u\pi^{-1}(y) \) such that \( \{x\} \) is relatively open in \( u\pi^{-1}(y) \). Take \( n = 2 \) and \( U = \{x\} \) in Theorem 2.1, then we have

\[
\Delta_X = \text{Orb}((\{x\} \times \{x\}, T \times T)) = R_{\pi}.
\]

Thus \( \pi \) is trivial, a contradiction! The proof is completed. \( \square \)

The following proposition will be used in the proof of the Main Theorem.

**Proposition 2.4.** [EGS75, Corollary 7.4] A factor of a PI flow is PI.

Now we are ready to give the proof of the Main Theorem.

**Proof of the Main Theorem.** By the structure theorem for minimal systems we have the following diagram:

\[
\begin{align*}
X & \xleftarrow{\theta} X_{\infty} \\
oiseless{\pi_{\infty}} \\
& \downarrow \\
Y_{\infty}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \theta \) is a proximal extension, \( \pi_{\infty} \) is a non-trivial weakly mixing RIC extension and \( Y_{\infty} \) is a strictly PI-system. Let

\[
d = \max\{\rho(\theta(x_1), \theta(x_2)) : (x_1, x_2) \in R_{\pi_{\infty}}\}.
\]

Then \( d > 0 \), since if \( d = 0 \) then \( R_{\pi_{\infty}} \subseteq R_{\theta} \), which implies that \( X \) is a factor of \( Y_{\infty} \), a contradiction by Proposition 2.4. Put \( \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}d > 0 \).

Fix \( x \in X \), an open neighbourhood \( U \) of \( x \) and choose \( x'_1 \in \theta^{-1}(x) \). Let \( ux'_1 = x'_1 \) for some minimal idempotent \( u \), and let \( y = \pi_{\infty}(x'_1) \). Let \( U' = \theta^{-1}(U) \), then \( U' \) is a neighborhood of \( x'_1 \). We are going to construct increasing subsets \( X_\alpha \subset u\pi_{\infty}^{-1}(y) \cap U' \), \( \alpha < \Omega \) such that each non-empty finite subset \( F \) of \( X_\alpha \) is a transitive point of \( R_{\pi_{\infty}} \), where \( \Omega \) is the first uncountable ordinal number and \( |F| \) means the cardinality of \( F \).
Put $X_1 = \{x'_1\}$. By Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.3, there is some $x'_2 \in u\pi_{\alpha}^{-1}(y) \cap U'$ such that $(x'_1, x'_2)$ is a transitive point of $R_{\pi_{\alpha}}$. Let $X_2 = \{x'_1, x'_2\}$.

Now assume that $\alpha < \Omega$ is an ordinal number and $X_\beta$ has been constructed for any $\beta < \alpha$ such that each non-empty finite subset $F$ of $X_\beta$ is a transitive point of $R_{\alpha}^F$. If $\alpha$ is a limit ordinal number then we put $X_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} X_\beta$. It is clear that each finite non-empty subset $F$ of $X_\alpha$ is a transitive point of $R_{\alpha}^F$. Assume now $\alpha$ is not a limit ordinal number. For each finite non-empty subset $F$ of $X_{\alpha - 1}$, by Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.3, the set $Z_F$ of points $z \in u\pi_{\alpha}^{-1}(y)$ such that $(F, z)$ is transitive in $R_{\alpha}^{|F| + 1}$ is residual in $u\pi_{\alpha}^{-1}(y)$. Hence $Z = \bigcap_F Z_F$ is also residual in $u\pi_{\alpha}^{-1}(y)$, where $F$ runs over all finite non-empty subsets of $X_{\alpha - 1}$. Choose $x'_\alpha \in (Z \setminus X_{\alpha - 1}) \cap U'$ and put $X_\alpha = X_{\alpha - 1} \cup \{x'_\alpha\}$. It is clear that $X_\alpha \subset u\pi_{\alpha}^{-1}(y) \cap U'$ and each finite non-empty subset $F$ of $X_\alpha$ is a transitive point of $R_{\alpha}^F$.

Let $S = \bigcup_{\alpha < \Omega} \theta(X_\alpha)$. Then $S \subset U$ and $x = \theta(x'_1) \in S$. First we show that all points in $S$ are distinct, and hence $S$ is uncountable. Assume the contrary that not all points in $S$ are distinct. This means that there are some $\alpha < \beta < \Omega$ such that $x_\alpha = \theta(x'_\alpha) = \theta(x'_\beta) = x_\beta$. In particular,
\[(x'_\alpha, x'_\beta) \in R_\theta.\]

As $(x'_\alpha, x'_\beta)$ is a transitive point of $(R_{\pi_{\alpha}}, T \times T)$, and it follows that
\[R_{\pi_{\alpha}} = \text{Orb}(x'_\alpha, x'_\beta), T \times T) \subset R_\theta.\]

Hence $X$ is a factor of $Y_\infty$, and $X$ is a PI flow by Proposition 2.4, a contradiction.

Now we show that $S$ is proximal and recurrent. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \ldots < \alpha_n < \Omega$. Let $x' = (x'_1, x'_2, \ldots, x'_n)$ and $x = (x_{\alpha_1}, x_{\alpha_2}, \ldots, x_{\alpha_n})$, where $x_{\alpha_i} = \theta(x'_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$. Since the diagonal of $X_\infty^n$ is contained in $R_{\pi_{\alpha}}^n$ and $x'$ is the transitive point of $R_{\pi_{\alpha}}^n$, there are a sequence $\{n_i\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ and some point $z' \in X_\infty$ such that $(T^{n_i} x_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, T^{n_i} x_{\alpha_n}) \to (z', \ldots, z')$ as $n_i \to \infty$. Since $\theta$ is continuous,
\[(T^{n_i} x_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, T^{n_i} x_{\alpha_n}) = (\theta(T^{n_i} x'_1), \ldots, \theta(T^{n_i} x'_n)) \to (\theta(z'), \ldots, \theta(z')), \quad n_i \to \infty.\]

Thus $\{x_{\alpha_1}, x_{\alpha_2}, \ldots, x_{\alpha_n}\}$ is uniformly proximal.

Since $x'$ is the transitive point of $R_{\pi_{\alpha}}^n$, $x'$ is recurrent in the product system $(X_\infty^n, T^{(n)})$ and hence its $\theta \times \ldots, \times \theta$-image $x$ is also recurrent. So $S$ is recurrent.

It is left to show that for all $\alpha < \beta < \Omega$, $(x_\alpha, x_\beta) = (\theta(x'_\alpha), \theta(x'_\beta))$ is LYS.$\varepsilon$. By the definition of $d$, there is some pair $(p, q) \in R_{\pi_{\alpha}}$ such that $\rho(\theta(p), \theta(q)) > \frac{1}{2}d = \varepsilon$.

Since $(x'_\alpha, x'_\beta)$ is the transitive point of $R_{\pi_{\alpha}}$, there is a sequence $\{m_i\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(T^{m_i} x'_\alpha, T^{m_i} x'_\beta) \to (p, q)$ as $m_i \to \infty$. As $\theta$ is continuous,
\[
\lim_i \rho(T^{m_i} x_\alpha, T^{m_i} x_\beta) = \lim_i \rho(\theta(T^{m_i} x'_\alpha), \theta(T^{m_i} x'_\beta)) = \rho(\theta(p), \theta(q)) > \varepsilon.
\]

Hence $(x_\alpha, x_\beta)$ is LYS.$\varepsilon$. The proof is completed. $\Box$

**Corollary 2.5.** Any minimal system with nontrivial weakly mixing factor is Li-Yorke sensitive.
Proof. Let \((X, T)\) be a minimal system with nontrivial weakly mixing factor \((Y, T)\). By the Main Theorem, it remains to show that \((X, T)\) is not PI. If not, then as factor of \((X, T)\), \((Y, T)\) is PI by Proposition 2.4. Hence \((Y, T)\) is both weakly mixing and PI, which means that \((Y, T)\) is trivial (Remark 1.4). A contradiction! \(\square\)

Remark 2.6. In this paper, we consider \(T : X \to X\) as a homeomorphism for simplicity. When \(T\) is a continuous surjective map, one can use the natural extension to get the corresponding results. Recall that for a system \((X, T)\), let \(\tilde{X}, \tilde{T}\) be the natural extension of \((X, T)\), i.e. \(\tilde{X} = \{(x_1, x_2, \ldots) \in \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} X : T(x_{i+1}) = x_i, \ i \in \mathbb{N}\}\) (as the subspace of the product space) and \(\tilde{T}(x_1, x_2, \ldots) = (T(x_1), x_1, x_2, \ldots)\). It is clear that \(\tilde{T} : \tilde{X} \to \tilde{X}\) is a homeomorphism and \(p_1 : \tilde{X} \to X\) is an asymptotic extension, where \(p_1\) is the projection to the first coordinate. When \((X, T)\) is minimal, \((\tilde{X}, \tilde{T})\) is minimal and \(p_1\) is almost one-to-one [AGHSY, Corollary 5.18].

3. A QUESTION

Finally we state a question related to Question 1.2.

Question 3.1. Is a non point-distal minimal system Li-Yorke chaotic?

Since each LYS minimal system is not point-distal, an affirmative answer to Question 3.1 will also give an affirmative answer to Question 1.2 for the minimal case.
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