J. DIFFERENTIAL GEOMETRY
9 (1974) 639-644

ON TWO NOTIONS OF STRUCTURAL STABILITY

IVAN KUPKA

Introduction

In the literature one can find two notions of structural stability. First the original one given by Andronov and Pontriagin (see [1], [2], [5]) stated for vector fields, that is, for the actions of the additive group of real number $\boldsymbol{R}$ on a manifold M. This definition says roughly that an $\boldsymbol{R}$-action on M is structurally stable if, for any other $\boldsymbol{R}$-action close-to, in the sense that the vector fields generating these actions are close, there exists a homeomorphism of M onto itself mapping the orbits of the first action onto the orbits of the second. This definition can readily be extended (see below § 1), to actions on M of a given real Lie group G in particular $G = Z =$ additive group of all integers.

Another definition was proposed more recently by Smale (see [8] and [9]) for Z-actions on M. Such an action is generated by an diffeomorphism $\phi: M \to M$. Smale's definition is roughly that ϕ is structurally stable if any diffeomorphism ψ sufficiently close to ϕ in the C^1-topology is topologically conjugate to ϕ. Smale's definition, which can also be extended to action on M of any given real Lie group G, seems more restrictive than the one of Andronov and Pontrjagin.

The purpose of this note is to show that in the case $G = Z$, the two definitions are equivalent if the dimension of $M > 1$ and M is connected.

In § 1 we give precise statements of the two definitions, first in the case $G = Z$ (which is the one of interest to us) and then in the general case, for comparison sake.

The author wants to thank Professors S. Smale and J. Palis for reading a first draft of this paper and for making some interesting comments which he included.

1. Definitions of structural stability

A C^1-Z-action on a compact C^∞ manifold M is generated by a C^1-diffeomorphism $\phi: M \to M$.

Definition 1 (*Andronov-Pontrjagin*). A C^1-diffeomorphism $\phi: M \to M$ is structurally stable if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neighborhood U of ϕ in

Communicated by S. Smale, October 9, 1973.

$\text{Diff}^1(M)$ for the C^1-topology ($\text{Diff}^1(M)$ = group of all C^1-diffeomorphisms of M onto itself) such that for any $\psi \in U$ there exists a homeomorphism $h: M \to M$ with the following two properties: (a) h maps the orbits of ϕ onto the orbits of ψ. (b) $d(x, h(x)) \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in M$ where d is some chosen metric on M compatible with its topology. A homeomorphism with property (b) is called an ε-homeomorphism.

Definition 2 (*Smale*). A C^1-diffeomorphism $\phi: M \to M$ is said to be structurally stable if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neighborhood U of ϕ in $\text{Diff}^1(M)$ for the C^1-topology such that for any $\psi \in U$ there exist an ε-homeomorphism $h: M \to M$ and t equal to $+1$ or -1 such that $\psi = h \circ \phi^t \circ h^{-1}$.

In fact in Smale's definition $t = 1$ always. We introduce this little complication in Smale's definition in order to square it off with the general definition. It will follow from what will be proved later that $t = 1$ always (provided one chooses U small enough).

Now we give the same definitions in the general case of any Lie group G. A C^1-action of G on a manifold M is a homomorphism $\phi: G \to \text{Diff}^1(M)$ (also called representation) such that the mapping $G \times M \to M: (g, x) \to \phi(g)[x]$ is of class C^1. Call $A^1(G, M)$ the set of all these C^1-actions. It is a subset of $C^0(G, \text{Diff}^1(M))$, the set of all continuous mappings $G \to \text{Diff}^1(M)$. This set carries the compact open topology ($\text{Diff}^1(M)$ being endowed with the C^1-topology). Hence $A^1(G, M)$ as a subset of $C^0(G, \text{Diff}^1(M))$ is endowed, by restriction, of the compact open topology. The orbit of $x \in M$ under the G-action ϕ is the set $\{\phi(g)(x) \mid g \in G\}$.

Definition 1. A C^1-action $\phi_0: G \to \text{Diff}^1(M)$ of G on M is said to be structurally stable if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neighborhood U of ϕ_0 in $A^1(G, M)$ with the compact open topology such that for any $\phi \in U$ there exists an ε-homeomorphism $h: M \to M$ mapping the orbits of ϕ_0 onto the orbits of ϕ.

Definition 2. A C^1-action $\phi_0: G \to \text{Diff}^1(M)$ of G on M is said to be structurally stable if for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neighborhood U of ϕ_0 in $A^1(G, M)$ with the compact open topology such that for any $\phi \in U$ there exist an ε-homeomorphism $h: M \to M$ and an algebraic automorphism $t: G \to G$ such that $h \circ \phi(g) = \phi_0(t(g)) \circ h$ for all $g \in G$.

It is obvious that Definitions 1 and 2 stated previously in the case $G = Z$ are particular cases of the general Definitions 1 and 2 stated above.

Remark (*due to J. Palis*). For $G \neq Z$ it is obvious that in general Definition 1 does not imply Definition 2. In fact in the case $G = \boldsymbol{R}$ consider a Morse-Smale vector field with 2 or more closed orbits with different periods. It seems that it would be more appropriate to have the reparametrization t to depend on the points on the manifold too so that in Definition 2 one should replace $t: G \to G$ by $t: G \times M \to M$ and the following equation by:

$$h(\phi(g)x) = \phi_0(t(g, x))h(x) .$$

Now we state our main result.

Theorem. *In the case $G = Z$ the two definitions are equivalent at least if* $\dim M \geq 1$ *and M is connected.*

It is obvious that Definition 2 implies Definition 1. So we only have to show the converse. This will follow from some lemmas.

Comment on the case $\dim M = 1$. In that case $M = S^1$. Our proof below does not cover that case but the theorem is true in that case. The proof (due to J. Palis) is as follows: by Peixotos theorem [5] the structurally stable, in the sense of Definition 1, Z-actions are the Morse-Smale actions, and then it is an easy particular case of a theorem of J. Palis [3] that the Morse-Smale actions are stable in the sense of Definition 2.

2. Some auxiliary lemmas

Lemma 1. (a) *If $\phi: M \to M$ and $\psi: M \to M$ are two C^1-diffeomorphisms such that there exists a homeomorphism $h: M \to M$ mapping the orbits of ϕ onto the orbits of ψ, then h maps the set* Per (ϕ) *of all periodic points of ϕ onto the set* Per (ϕ) *of all periodic points of ψ.*

(b) *If a C^1-diffeomorphism $\phi: M \to M$ is structurally stable, then* Per (ϕ) *is countable.*

Proof. All this is well known. We only give the proofs for the sake of completeness. (a) follows immediately from the fact that a point $X \in M$ is periodic for ϕ if and only if its orbit is compact, and compactness is preserved by a homeomorphism. To prove (b) we use a general approximation theorem (see [4] or [7] or [8]) which implies that the set E of all C^1-diffeomorphisms ϕ, such that Per (ψ) is countable, is a Baire subset of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. Hence choose a $\psi \in E$ so close to ϕ that there exists a homeomorphism $h: M \to M$ mapping the orbits of ϕ onto the orbits of ψ. Then by (a) h maps Per (ϕ) onto Per (ψ), and hence Per (ϕ) is countable.

Lemma 2. *Assume that* $\dim M > 1$ *and M is connected, and that D is a countable subset of M. Then $M - D$ is arcwise connected.*

Proof. Let $U_1 \cup U_2 \cup \cdots \cup U_n$ be a finite covering of M, U_j, $j = 1, \cdots, n$, being domains of charts (U_i, α_i), and α_i mapping U_i onto the unit open ball $B^d(0, 1)$ in the euclidean spare $\boldsymbol{R}^d$ ($d =$ dimension of M). Let $D_j = D \cap U_j$ and $C_j = \alpha_j(D_j)$. It is obviously sufficient to prove that for x and y in $U_j - D_j$ there exists a continuous curve in $U_j - D_j$ joining x to y or what is the same that there exists a continuous curve in $B^d(0, 1) - C_j$ joining $\alpha_j(x)$ to $\alpha_j(y)$. Let E be the 2-plane in $\boldsymbol{R}^d$ spanned by $0, \alpha_j(x), \alpha_j(y)$ (if $\alpha_j(x) = 0$ or $\alpha_j(y) = 0$, take any 2-plane containing 0 and $\alpha_i(y)$ or $\alpha_j(x)$). Let $\Delta(x)$ be the set of all lines in E joining $\alpha_j(x)$ to the points of $C_j \cap E$, and $\Delta(y)$ the corresponding set for $\alpha_j(y)$. $\Delta(x)$ and $\Delta(y)$ are countable. Hence they exist, as close as we want to the line $(\alpha_j(x), \alpha_j(y))$, a line $\delta x \notin \Delta(x)$ passing through $\alpha_j(x)$ and a line $\delta_y \notin \Delta(y)$ passing through $\alpha_j(y)$. These lines meet at a point ζ close to the segment $\overline{\alpha_j(x)\alpha_j(y)}$. As this segment is contained in $B^d(0, 1)$ so will be ζ; as $B^d(0, 1)$ is convex, the 2 segments $\overline{\alpha_j(x)\zeta}$ and $\overline{\zeta\alpha_j(y)}$ will be in $B^d(0, 1)$ and, in fact, in $B^d(0, 1) - C_j$ by construction since $\overline{\alpha_j(x)\zeta}$ lies on δ_x and $\overline{\zeta\alpha_j(y)}$ on δ_y. Hence the polygonal curve $\overline{\alpha_j(x)\zeta} \cup \overline{\zeta\alpha_j(y)}$ joins $\alpha_j(x)$ to $\alpha_j(y)$ in $B^d(0, 1) - C_j$, and Lemma 2 is proved.

3. Proof of the theorem

Assume ϕ and ψ are two C^1-diffeomorphisms $M \to M$ such that there exists a homeomorphism $h\colon M \to M$ mapping the orbits of ϕ onto the orbits of ψ and that $\operatorname{Per}(\phi)$ is countable (hence by Lemma 1 (a) $\operatorname{Per}(\psi)$ is). We are going to show that there exists an integer $q \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $\psi^q \circ h = h \circ \phi$.

Choose a point x_0 in $M - \operatorname{Per}(\phi)$. Then there exists an unique integer $q \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $\psi^q(h(x_0)) = h(\phi(x_0))$. So we are going to show that if y is any other point in $M - \operatorname{Per}(\phi)$, then $\psi^q(h(y)) = h(\phi(y))$. By Lemma 2 there exists a continuous arc $\gamma \subset M - \operatorname{Per}(\phi)$, joining x_0 to y parametrized by the continuous map $t \in I = [0, 1] \to x(t) \in M - \operatorname{Per}(\phi)$, $x(0) = x_0$, $x(1) = y$. Let $T_m = \{t \mid t \in I, \psi^m(h(x(t))) = h(\phi(x(t)))\}$.

Lemma 3. (a) *The T_m are closed.* (b) *$T_m \cap T_k = \emptyset$ if $m \neq k$.* (c) $\bigcup_{m \in Z} T_m = I$.

Proof. (a) follows from the fact that the 2 functions $t \to \psi^m(h(x(t)))$ and $t \to h(\phi(x(t)))$ are continuous.

(b) If $t_0 \in T_m \cap T_k$, then $\psi^m(h(x(t_0))) = h(\phi(x(t_0))) = \psi^k(h(x(t_0)))$. Hence $\psi^{m-k}(h(x(t_0))) = h(x(t_0))$. So $h(x(t_0)) \in \operatorname{Per}(\psi)$. By Lemma 1 (a) $x(t_0) \in \operatorname{Per}(\phi)$. But $x(t_0) \in \gamma \subset M - \operatorname{Per}(\phi)$, a contradiction.

(c) is obvious for given any $x \in M$, $h(\phi(x)) \in \psi$-orbit of $h(x)$ and hence there exists an n such that $\psi^n(h(x)) = h(\phi(x))$. If $x \in M - \operatorname{Per}(\phi)$, this n is unique; otherwise *not*.

Let J_m be the interior of T_m, and let $\omega = \bigcup_{m \in Z} J_m$.

Lemma 4. (a) *ω is open and dense in I.*

(b) *Every connected component of ω is contained in one and only one T_m.*

Proof. (a) Since I is the union of the countable class of closed sets T_m, (a) follows from the Baire property of I.

(b) Since ω is the union of the open *disjoint* sets J_m, the components of ω are those of the J_m. Hence (b) follows from this and Lemma 3 (b).

Let $K = I - \omega$. If K is empty, $\omega =$ I. I is the sole connected component of ω and hence contained in a unique T_m by Lemma 4 (b). As $0 \in T_q$ ($x(0) = x_0$ and $\psi^q(h(x_0)) = \phi(h(x_0))$ by assumption), $m = q$ so $1 \in T_q$ and $\psi^q(h(y)) = \psi^q(h(x(1))) = h(\phi(y))$. We will show that $K \neq \emptyset$ leads to a contradiction. Let $K_m = K \cap T_m$. Then the K_m are closed and $K = \bigcup_{m \in Z} K_m$. As a closed subset of I, K has the Baire property, so one of the set K_m, say K_p, has a non-empty interior in the space K. This means that there exists an open interval $\delta \subset I$ such that $\delta \cap K \neq \emptyset$ and $\delta \cap K \subset K_p$. By Lemma 4 (a), $\delta \cap \omega \neq \emptyset$. Let

$]a, b[= \{t \mid a < t < b\}$ be a connected component of ω meeting δ. Then one of the extremities a, b is contained in δ, for otherwise $]a, b[\supset \delta$ and then $\delta \cap K = \emptyset$. Assume for example that $a \in \delta$. As $a \in K$, $a \in \delta \cap K \subset K_p$. So $a \in T_p$. But by Lemma 4 (b), $]a, b[$ is contained in a unique T_k. As $a \in$ closure of $]a, b[$ and this closure is also contained in T_k (T_k being closed), $a \in T_k$. As $T_k \cap T_p = \emptyset$ if $k \neq p$, by Lemma 3 (b) it follows that $k = p$. *So we have proved that if a connected component of ω meets δ, then it is contained in T_p.* Thus $\delta \cap \omega \subset T_p$. As $\delta \cap K \subset K_p \subset T_p$, it follows that $\delta \subset T_p$; hence $\delta \subset J_p$ as δ is open. But then $\delta \subset \omega$ which contradicts the fact that $\delta \cap K \neq \emptyset$. So $K = \emptyset$, and we have proved the following:

Lemma 5. $\psi^q \circ h = h \circ \phi$.

Lemma 6. $q = \pm 1$.

Proof. If $q \neq \pm 1$, then $h_0\phi^k = \psi^{qk} \circ h$ for all $k \in Z$, (easy to see by induction), and hence $h(\phi\text{-orbit of } x) = \{\psi^{qk}(h(x)) \mid k \in Z\}$. This last set is not the whole orbit of x, unless $q = \pm 1$ if $x \notin \mathrm{Per}(\phi)$.

Finally we have proved the following:

Proposition. *If ϕ, ψ: $M \to M$ are two C^1-diffeomorphisms such that there exists a homeomorphism h: $M \to M$ mapping the orbits of ϕ onto the orbits of ψ, then $\psi^q \circ h = h \circ \phi$ where $q = 1$ or -1.*

Now assume ϕ: $M \to M$ is structurally stable in the sense of Definition 1. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a neighborhood U of ϕ in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ such that for any $\psi \in U$ there exists an ε-homeomorphism h: $M \to M$ mapping the orbits of ϕ onto the orbits of ψ. By the proposition it follows that $\psi^q \circ h = h \circ \phi$ where $q = +1$ or -1. But there exists a possibly smaller neighborhood $U' \subset U$ of ϕ in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ such that if $\psi \in U'$ then $q = 1$. For, if such a neighborhood did not exist, then we could find a sequence $\{\psi_j \mid j = 1, 2, \cdots\}$, $\psi_j \in U$ and $\psi_j \to \phi$ in $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ as $j \to +\infty$, and a sequence $\{h_j \mid j = 1, 2, \cdots\}$ of homeomorphisms such that h_j maps the orbits of ϕ onto the orbits of ψ and $\sup_{x \in M}(x, h_j(x)) \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$, and $\psi_j^q \circ h_j = h_j \circ \phi$ with $q = -1$. Thus taking the limits as $j \to +\infty$ we get $\phi^{-1} = \phi$, and all points in M would be periodic of period 2 contradicting Lemma 1 (a). Hence the theorem is proved.

References

[1] R. Abraham & J. Robbin, *Transversal mappings and flows,* Benjamin, New York, 1967.

[2] A. Andronov & L. Pontrjagin, *Structurally stable systems,* Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSR **14** (1937) 247–250.

[3] J. Palis, *On Morse-Smale systems,* Topology **8** (1969) 385–404.

[4] M. M. Peixoto, *On an approximation theorem of Kupka and Smale,* J. Differential Equations **3** (1967) 214–227.

[5] ——, *Structural stability on two-dimensional manifolds,* Topology **1** (1962) 101–120.

[6] C. C. Pugh, *An improved closing lemma and a general density theorem,* Amer. Math. J. **89** (1967) 1011–1021.

[7] J. W. Robbin, *Topological conjugacy and structural stability for discrete dynamical systems,* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **78** (1972) 923–952.

[8] S. Smale, *Dynamical systems and the topological conjugacy problem for diffeomorphisms,* Proc. internat. congress Math. (Stockholm 1962), Inst. Mittag-Leffler, Djursholm, 1963, 490–496.

[9] ——, *Stable manifolds for differential equations and diffeomorphisms,* Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **18** (1963) 97–116.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO