

A SIMPLE PROOF OF SOME ERGODIC THEOREMS

BY

YITZHAK KATZNELSON AND BENJAMIN WEISS

ABSTRACT

Some ideas of T. Kamae's proof using nonstandard analysis are employed to give a simple proof of Birkhoff's theorem in a classical setting as well as Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem.

Let (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) be a probability measure space and let $T: X \rightarrow X$ be a measurable, measure preserving transformation, possibly noninvertible. Birkhoff's ergodic theorem states that for any integrable function f , the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j x) = f^*(x)$$

exists for μ -a.e. x , and f^* is a T -invariant function with the same integral as f . We adapt an idea of T. Kamae [1] to give a simple proof of this result. It is sufficient to deal with nonnegative functions and defining

$$\bar{f}(x) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j x), \quad \underline{f}(x) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j x)$$

it suffices to show that

$$\int \bar{f}(x) d\mu(x) \leq \int f(x) d\mu(x) \leq \int \underline{f}(x) d\mu(x)$$

since that gives equality a.e. $\bar{f}(x) = \underline{f}(x)$ and $\int f^* d\mu = \int f d\mu$ while the T -invariance of both \bar{f} and \underline{f} is clear. Fix some $M > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$, denote

$$\bar{f}_M(x) = \min\{\bar{f}(x), M\}$$

and define $n(x)$ to be the least integer $n \geq 1$ for which

$$\bar{f}_M(x) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j x) + \varepsilon.$$

Since \bar{f} is T -invariant so is \bar{f}_M and thus averaging gives that for all x

$$(1) \quad \sum_0^{n(x)-1} \bar{f}_M(T^j x) \leq \sum_0^{n(x)-1} f(T^j x) + n(x) \cdot \varepsilon.$$

Now $n(x)$ is everywhere finite so that there is some N for which the set

$$A = \{x : n(x) > N\}$$

has measure less than ε/M . Define now

$$\bar{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & x \notin A, \\ \max\{f(x), M\}, & x \in A, \end{cases} \quad \bar{n}(x) = \begin{cases} n(x), & x \notin A, \\ 1, & x \in A, \end{cases}$$

and observe that

$$(\bar{1}) \quad \sum_0^{\bar{n}(x)-1} \bar{f}_M(T^j x) \leq \sum_0^{\bar{n}(x)-1} \bar{f}(T^j x) + \bar{n}(x) \cdot \varepsilon$$

is also valid. The crucial improvement is that now $\bar{n}(x)$ is everywhere bounded by N , while

$$(2) \quad \int \bar{f}(x) d\mu(x) \leq \int f(x) d\mu(x) + \int_A M \cdot d\mu(x) \leq \int f(x) d\mu(x) + \varepsilon.$$

Choosing now L so that $NM/L < \varepsilon$ and defining inductively $n_0(x) = 0$ and

$$n_k(x) = n_{k-1}(x) + \bar{n}(T^{n_{k-1}(x)} x), \dots$$

we have

$$\sum_0^{L-1} \bar{f}_M(T^j x) = \sum_{k=1}^{k(x)} \sum_{n_{k-1}(x)}^{n_k(x)-1} \bar{f}_M(T^j x) + \sum_{n_{k(x)}(x)}^{L-1} \bar{f}_M(T^j x)$$

where $k(x)$ is the maximal k for which $n_k(x) \leq L - 1$. Applying $(\bar{1})$ to each of the $k(x)$ terms, and estimating by M the last $L - n_{k(x)}(x) \leq N - 1$ terms we have for all x

$$\sum_0^{L-1} \bar{f}_M(T^j x) \leq \sum_0^{L-1} \bar{f}(T^j x) + L \cdot \varepsilon + (N - 1)M,$$

where the fact that $\bar{f} \geq 0$ allows us to write $L - 1$ as the upper limit of the summation. Integrating both sides and dividing by L gives

$$\int \bar{f}_M d\mu \leq \int \bar{f} d\mu + \varepsilon + \frac{(N - 1)M}{L} \leq \int f d\mu + 3\varepsilon$$

in light of (2) and the choice of L . It is here that we use the fact that T is measure preserving. Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and $M \rightarrow \infty$ gives half of what we wanted, namely

$$\int \bar{f} d\mu \leq \int f d\mu.$$

For the other half, fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and define now $n(x)$ as the least integer $n \geq 1$ for which

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_0^{n-1} f(T^i x) \leq \underline{f}(x) + \varepsilon.$$

As before $A = \{x : n(x) > N\}$ where now N is chosen so that $\int_A f(x) d\mu(x) < \varepsilon$. We define now

$$\tilde{n}(x) = \begin{cases} n(x), & x \notin A, \\ 1, & x \in A, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{f}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x), & x \notin A, \\ 0, & x \in A, \end{cases}$$

and conclude the proof in the same way as before.

Observe that we could have restricted the integration to any T -invariant set so that we really have shown that $f^*(x)$ is a version of the conditional expectation of f with respect to the σ -algebra of invariant sets. The same basic idea, of modifying the function so that $n(x)$ becomes bounded, can be used to simplify proofs of other ergodic theorems as well. To illustrate the possibilities we give such a proof of Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem [2]:

THEOREM. *If T is a measure preserving transformation of the probability measure space (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) and $\{f_n\}_1^\infty$ is a sequence of L^1 -functions satisfying*

$$(3) \quad f_{n+m}(x) \leq f_n(x) + f_m(T^n x), \quad \text{all } n, m \geq 1$$

then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1/n)f_n(x)$ exists a.e. and may be identified as $\phi(x) = \inf_n (1/n)f_n^(x)$ where f_n^* is the projection of f_n onto the space of T -invariant functions.*

For the proof, note first that (3) implies

$$(3') \quad f_{n+m}^*(x) \leq f_n^*(x) + f_m^*(x)$$

and hence $(1/n)f_n^*(x)$ converges to $\phi(x)$. Next, denote

$$\bar{f}(x) = \limsup \frac{1}{n} f_n(x), \quad \underline{f}(x) = \liminf \frac{1}{n} f_n(x),$$

and observe that both \bar{f} and \underline{f} are T -invariant. Now

$$(4) \quad \frac{1}{n} f_n(x) \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_1(T^j x)$$

and thus by Birkhoff's ergodic theorem $\bar{f}(x) \leq f^*(x)$.

We remark at this point that (4) implies that the sequence $\{(1/n)f_n^*\}$ is equi-integrable, and combining this with the obvious inequality

$$\int \phi d\mu \leq \int \frac{1}{n} f_n^* d\mu = \int \frac{1}{n} f_n d\mu, \quad \text{all } n,$$

we see that if $\int \phi d\mu > -\infty$, then the pointwise convergence a.e. of $(1/n)f_n$ to ϕ implies convergence in L^1 -norm. We have a similar, asymptotic, estimate with f_N instead of f_1 in (4). Fix $N > 1$ and let $n > N$. For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ write $n = i + mN + k$ with $k < N$. Then by (3)

$$f_n(x) \leq f_i(x) + \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} f_N(T^{i+Nj}x) + f_k(T^{mN+i}x)$$

and summing over i ,

$$Nf_n(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} f_i(x) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_N(T^j x) + \sum_{i=1}^N f_{n-i-mN}(T^{mN+i}x)$$

hence

$$\frac{1}{n} f_n(x) \leq \frac{1}{nN} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f_N(T^j x) + \frac{1}{nN} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N f_i(x) + \sum_{i=1}^N f_{n-i-mN}(T^{mN+i}x) \right).$$

As $n \rightarrow \infty$ the last two terms on the right converge to zero a.e. and, by the ergodic theorem,

$$\bar{f}(x) \leq \frac{1}{N} f_N^*(x) \quad \text{a.e.}$$

which implies

$$(5) \quad \bar{f}(x) \leq \phi(x) \quad \text{a.e.}$$

For points x where $\phi(x) = -\infty$, (5) shows that the desired limit exists and equals $\phi(x)$. We restrict our attention to $X_M = \{x : \phi(x) \geq -M\}$, which is T -invariant, and proceed to show that

$$(6) \quad \int_{X_M} \underline{f} d\mu \geq \int_{X_M} \phi d\mu.$$

This combined with (5) shows that the statement of the theorem is valid on X_M ,

and as $\bigcup_1^\infty X_M = \{x : \phi(x) > -\infty\}$ this will complete the proof. For ease of notation we will simply assume $\phi(x) \geq -M$ for all x .

As in the proof of the Birkhoff theorem fix an $\varepsilon > 0$, set $\underline{f}_M = \max\{f, -M - 1\}$, and put

$$n(x) = \min \left\{ n \geq 1 : \frac{1}{n} f_n(x) \leq \underline{f}_M(x) + \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Set $A = \{x : n(x) > N\}$ where N is chosen so that

$$(7) \quad \int_A (|f_1(x)| + M + 1) d\mu(x) < \varepsilon,$$

and define the modifications as before:

$$\tilde{f}_M(x) = \begin{cases} \underline{f}_M(x), & x \notin A, \\ f_1(x), & x \in A, \end{cases} \quad n(x) = \begin{cases} n(x), & x \notin A, \\ 1, & x \in A. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\tilde{f}_M(x) \leq \underline{f}_M(x)$ for all x , and by (7)

$$(8) \quad \int \tilde{f}_M d\mu \leq \int \underline{f}_M d\mu + \varepsilon.$$

Using the T -invariance of \underline{f}_M we have for all x

$$f_{\tilde{n}(x)}(x) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\tilde{n}(x)-1} \tilde{f}_M(T^j x) + \tilde{n}(x) \cdot \varepsilon$$

and can calculate for any $L > N$ as before:

$$f_L(x) \leq \sum_0^{L-1} \tilde{f}_M(T^j x) + L \cdot \varepsilon + N(M + 1) + \sum_{L-N}^{L-1} |f_1(T^j x)|.$$

Integrating and dividing by L we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int \phi(x) d\mu &\leq \int \frac{1}{L} f_L^* d\mu = \int \frac{1}{L} f_L d\mu \\ &\leq \int \tilde{f}_M d\mu + \varepsilon + \frac{N(M+1)}{L} + \frac{N}{L} \cdot \int |f_1| d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $L \rightarrow \infty$ and using (8), we see that

$$(9) \quad \int \phi(x) d\mu \leq \int \underline{f}_M(x) d\mu.$$

Recall now that $\underline{f}_M(x) \leq \phi(x)$ holds for all x and that, combined with (9), implies

$\underline{f}_M(x) = \phi(x)$ a.e. Since whenever $\underline{f}_M(x) \neq \underline{f}(x)$ we have $\underline{f}_M(x) = -M - 1 \neq \phi(x)$, this can happen only on a null set and $\underline{f}(x) = \phi(x)$ a.e.

REFERENCES

1. T. Kamae, *A simple proof of the ergodic theorem using nonstandard analysis*, Isr. J. Math. **42** (1982), 284–290.
2. J. F. C. Kingman, *Subadditive ergodic theory*, Ann. Probab. **1** (1973), 883–909.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM
JERUSALEM, ISRAEL