

PROPAGATION OF SINGULARITIES FOR WEAK KAM SOLUTIONS AND BARRIER FUNCTIONS

PIERMARCO CANNARSA, WEI CHENG, AND QI ZHANG

ABSTRACT. This paper studies the structure of the singular set (points of nondifferentiability) of viscosity solutions to Hamilton-Jacobi equations associated with general mechanical systems on the n -torus. First, using the level set method, we characterize the propagation of singularities along generalized characteristics. Then, we obtain a local propagation result for singularities of weak KAM solutions in the supercritical case. Finally, we apply such a result to study the propagation of singularities for barrier functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathbb{T}^n be the n -dimensional flat torus, and let $H(x, p)$ be a Tonelli Hamiltonian on $T^*\mathbb{T}^n \simeq \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$, that is, a continuous function in (x, p) , convex and superlinear with respect to p . For any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by $\alpha(c)$ the unique real number such that the associated Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$(1.1) \quad H(x, c + Du(x)) = \alpha(c), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^n,$$

admits a \mathbb{T}^n -periodic viscosity solution, u_c . The map $c \mapsto \alpha(c)$ is called Mather's α -function (or *effective Hamiltonian*) in the literature.

Viscosity solutions (or weak KAM solutions) of (1.1) have been widely studied for their relevance to many different research fields such as nonlinear partial differential equations, calculus of variations, optimal control, optimal transport, geodesic dynamics, and Hamiltonian dynamical systems (see, for instance, [16, 17], [12], [13, 14], [8]). As is well-known, the solutions of (1.1) turn out to be semiconcave with linear modulus and coincide with the value function of the action functional defined by the associated Tonelli Lagrangian. Semiconcavity is a very useful property for the analysis of this paper: we recall the basic notions about semiconcave functions in section 2.1, referring the reader to the monograph [8] for more details and applications. In particular, the superdifferential D^+v of a semiconcave function v is a key notion in this theory, as is the singular set of v , Σ_v , which is defined as the set of all points x such that $D^+v(x)$ is not a singleton.

In this paper, we will be concerned with some questions related to Mather's theory and weak KAM theory for Hamiltonian dynamical systems, especially in connection with the dynamics of singularities on a supercritical energy surface, i.e.,

Date: February 25, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 26B25, 35A21, 49L25, 37J50, 70H20.

Key words and phrases. Semiconcave functions, singularities, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, weak KAM theory.

This work was partially supported by the Natural Scientific Foundation of China (Grant No. 11271182) and National Basic Research Program of China (Grant No. 2013CB834100).

when $\alpha(c)$ in (1.1) is strictly greater than Mañé's critical value. We will focus our attention on the class of Hamiltonians which is relevant to mechanics, that is,

$$(1.2) \quad H(x, p) = \frac{1}{2} \langle A(x)p, p \rangle + V(x), \quad (x, p) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $A(x)$ is a symmetric positive definite $n \times n$ matrix, \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and V is a smooth \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic function on \mathbb{R}^n .

Given a weak KAM solution u_c of (1.1) (here we regard u_c as a \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic function on \mathbb{R}^n), one is interested in describing the structure of the singularities of u_c or, equivalently, of the function

$$v(x) := u_c(x) + \langle c, x \rangle, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

in a neighborhood of a singular point $x_0 \in \Sigma_v$. We recall that Σ_v has Lebesgue measure zero and is countably $(n-1)$ -rectifiable ([24]).

For applications to dynamical systems, the above measure theoretic results need to be completed by a suitable analysis of the way singularities propagate. An interesting approach to such a problem—developed by various authors in several papers ([11], [4, 2, 9, 3], [23])—is the one based on the differential inclusion

$$(1.3) \quad \dot{\mathbf{x}}(s) \in \text{co } H_p(\mathbf{x}(s), D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s))),$$

where “co” stands for the closed convex hull. The above inclusion generalizes the classical equation of characteristics and turns out to be very useful to describe singular dynamics. Indeed, given $x_0 \in \Sigma_v$, the solution of (1.3) with initial condition $\mathbf{x}(0) = x_0$ provides a singular arc for v under the nondegeneracy condition

$$(1.4) \quad 0 \notin D^+v(x_0)$$

(see [2, 9] and [23]). This condition has an interesting geometrical meaning, as it is equivalent to the fact that the level set

$$\Lambda_{x_0} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : v(x) = v(x_0)\}$$

is an $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz submanifold near x_0 .

On the other hand, when (1.4) is violated, the unique solution of (1.3) starting from x_0 is the constant arc $\mathbf{x}(s) \equiv x_0$. So, new ideas are needed to describe the structure of Σ_v near a singular point at which D^+v contains the zero vector. The main results of this paper propose possible solutions to such a problem in the supercritical case

$$\alpha(c) > \max_{\mathbb{T}^n} V$$

that was partially addressed in [9].

First, we show that condition (1.4) holds if and only if x_0 is not a local maximum point of v and the level set Λ_{x_0} is an $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz submanifold near x_0 (Theorem 3.2). In any case, that is, even when $0 \in D^+v(x_0)$, we prove that the singularities of v propagate along Lipschitz arcs (Theorem 3.10), solving an open problem raised in [9]. For this result, we use the propagation principle for general semiconcave functions due to Albano and the first author [2] (see also [9]).

Finally, we turn to study the singularities of the so-called barrier function B_c^* (see Mather [20]), concluding that propagation also occurs in this case (Theorem 4.2). Moreover, given a pair of weak KAM solutions (u_c^-, u_c^+) such that $B_c^* = u_c^- - u_c^+$, we show that any $x \in \Sigma_{B_c^*}$ produces a homoclinic orbit with respect to the Aubry set provided that u_c^- and u_c^+ possess a common reachable gradient (Theorem 4.3). In a forthcoming paper, building on this analysis, we will address further regularity

issues aiming at solving central problems in Hamiltonian dynamics such as the problem of Arnold diffusions.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review preliminary material on viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations and semiconcavity. In Section 3, we characterize the regularity condition $0 \notin D^+v(x)$, and discuss the (local and global) propagation of singularities along generalized characteristics. In section 4, the local propagation of singularities is derived for the barrier function and applied to the study of homoclinic orbits.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let \mathbb{T}^n be the n -dimensional flat torus. We denote by $T\mathbb{T}^n$ the tangent bundle of \mathbb{T}^n and by $T^*\mathbb{T}^n$ the cotangent bundle.

Definition 2.1. A function $L : T\mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be a *Tonelli Lagrangian* if the following assumptions are satisfied.

(L1) *Smoothness:* $L = L(x, q)$ is of class at least C^2 .

(L2) *Convexity:* The Hessian $\frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial q^2}(x, q)$ is positive definite on each fibre $T_x\mathbb{T}^n$.

(L3) *Superlinearity:*

$$\lim_{|q| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(x, q)}{|q|} = \infty \quad \text{uniformly for } x \in \mathbb{T}^n.$$

Given a Tonelli Lagrangian L , the *Tonelli Hamiltonian* $H = H(x, p)$ associated with L is defined as follows:

$$H(x, p) = \max \{ \langle p, q \rangle - L(x, q) : q \in T_x\mathbb{T}^n \}, \quad (x, p) \in T^*\mathbb{T}^n.$$

It is easy to see that for any Tonelli Lagrangian L , the associated Hamiltonian H satisfies similar smoothness (H is of class at least C^2), convexity, and superlinearity conditions, which will be referred to as (H1), (H2), and (H3).

2.1. Semiconcave functions. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex open set. We recall that a function $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *semiconcave* (with linear modulus) if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda u(x) + (1 - \lambda)u(y) - u(\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y) \leq \frac{C}{2}\lambda(1 - \lambda)|x - y|^2$$

for any $x, y \in \Omega$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Any constant C that satisfies the above inequality is called a *semiconcavity constant* for u in Ω . Property (2.1) has many equivalent versions, one of which is to require that

$$(2.2) \quad x \mapsto u(x) - \frac{C}{2}|x|^2 \text{ is concave in } \Omega.$$

Let $u : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. We recall that, for any $x \in \Omega$, the closed convex sets

$$D^-u(x) = \left\{ p \in \mathbb{R}^n : \liminf_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{u(y) - u(x) - \langle p, y - x \rangle}{|y - x|} \geq 0 \right\},$$

$$D^+u(x) = \left\{ p \in \mathbb{R}^n : \limsup_{y \rightarrow x} \frac{u(y) - u(x) - \langle p, y - x \rangle}{|y - x|} \leq 0 \right\}.$$

are called the (*Dini*) *subdifferential* and *superdifferential* of u at x , respectively. For semiconcave functions, the superdifferential plays a major role as is shown by the following property (see, e.g., [8] for the proof).

Proposition 2.2. *Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. If there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that, for any $x \in \Omega$, there exists $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that*

$$(2.3) \quad u(y) \leq u(x) + \langle p, y - x \rangle + \frac{C}{2}|y - x|^2, \quad \forall y \in \Omega,$$

then u is semiconcave with constant C and $p \in D^+u(x)$. Conversely, if u is semiconcave in Ω with constant C , then (2.3) holds for any $x \in \Omega$ and $p \in D^+u(x)$.

Let $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be locally Lipschitz. We recall that a vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called a *reachable* (or *limiting*) *gradient* of u at x if there exists a sequence $\{x_n\} \subset \Omega \setminus \{x\}$ such that u is differentiable at x_k for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Du(x_k) = p.$$

The set of all reachable gradients of u at x is denoted by $D^*u(x)$.

Now we list some well known properties of the superdifferential of a semiconcave function on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (see, e.g., [8] for the proof).

Proposition 2.3. *Let $u : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a semiconcave function and let $x \in \Omega$. Then the following properties hold.*

- (a) $D^+u(x)$ is a nonempty compact convex set in \mathbb{R}^n and $D^*u(x) \subset \partial D^+u(x)$, where $\partial D^+u(x)$ denotes the topological boundary of $D^+u(x)$.
- (b) The set-valued function $x \rightsquigarrow D^+u(x)$ is upper semicontinuous.
- (c) If $D^+u(x)$ is a singleton, then u is differentiable at x . Moreover, if $D^+u(x)$ is a singleton for every point in Ω , then $u \in C^1(\Omega)$.
- (d) $D^+u(x) = \text{co } D^*u(x)$.
- (e) $D^*u(x) = \{ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} p_i : p_i \in D^+u(x_i), x_i \rightarrow x, \text{diam}(D^+u(x_i)) \rightarrow 0 \}$.

A point $x \in \Omega$ is called a *singular point* of u if $D^+u(x)$ is not a singleton. The set of all singular points of u , also called the *singular set* of u , is denoted by Σ_u .

2.2. Hamilton-Jacobi equations and viscosity solutions. Throughout this paper we will be concerned with the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$(2.4) \quad H(x, c + Du(x)) = \alpha(c) \quad (x \in \mathbb{T}^n)$$

with

$$(2.5) \quad H(x, p) := \frac{1}{2} \langle A(x)p, p \rangle + V(x) \quad (x, p) \in \mathbb{T}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where

- $\langle A(\cdot)\cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is a smooth \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic Riemannian metric on \mathbb{R}^n (that is, $A(x)$ is a \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic symmetric positive definite $n \times n$ matrix with smooth entries),
- V is a smooth \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic function on \mathbb{R}^n ,
- $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and
- $\alpha : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Mather's α -function (that is, for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\alpha(c)$ is the unique constant such that (2.4) admits a \mathbb{Z}^n -periodic viscosity solution).

We recall that a continuous function u is called a *viscosity subsolution* of equation (2.4) if, for any $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$,

$$(2.6) \quad H(x, c + p) \leq \alpha(c), \quad \forall p \in D^+u(x).$$

Similarly, u is a *viscosity supersolution* of equation (2.4) if, for any $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$,

$$(2.7) \quad H(x, c + p) \geq \alpha(c), \quad \forall p \in D^-u(x).$$

Finally, u is called a *viscosity solution* of equation (2.4), if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a supersolution.

Remark 2.4. In the context of weak KAM theory, the configuration space M is a smooth closed manifold in general. In this case, we can use the standard definition of viscosity solutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (2.4) given in terms of test functions, i.e., u is called a viscosity subsolution (resp. supersolution) of (2.4) if

$$H(x, c + D\phi(x)) \leq \alpha(c), \quad (\text{resp. } H(x, c + D\phi(x)) \geq \alpha(c)),$$

for any $\phi \in C^1(\Omega)$ such that $u - \phi$ attains a local maximum (resp. minimum) at x , and a viscosity solution of (2.4) if it is a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution simultaneously. However, for the purposes of this paper, we only consider the case of $M = \mathbb{T}^n$. Thus, we also omit the general treatment of the notion of local semiconcavity on manifolds (see, for instance, [22]).

2.3. Facts from nonsmooth analysis. We now need to recall some basic fact from nonsmooth analysis. The interested reader can find more details on this topic in [10], as well as the proof of the results we are going to recall.

Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a nonempty closed set and let $x \in S$.

Definition 2.5. A vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ belongs to the *contingent cone* (or *Bouligand's tangent cone*) $T_S(x)$ iff there exist sequences $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ converging to θ and $t_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ decreasing to 0 such that

$$x + t_i \theta_i \in S, \quad \forall i \geq 1.$$

A vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ belongs to *Clarke's tangent cone* $C_S(x)$ iff, for all sequences $x_i \in S$ converging to x and $t_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ decreasing to 0, there is a sequence $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$x_i + t_i \theta_i \in S, \quad \forall i \geq 1.$$

The vector space generated by $T_S(x)$ is called the *tangent space* to S at x and is denoted by $\text{Tan}(x, S)$.

Note that $C_S(x)$ is always contained in $T_S(x)$.

Definition 2.6. S is said to be *epi-Lipschitzian* near x if there is an invertible linear transformation $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that, for some neighborhood U of x , one has

$$S \cap U = U \cap A^{-1}(\text{epi } f),$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz function and

$$\text{epi } f = \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R} : f(y) \leq z\}.$$

When the above holds, the part of the boundary of S in U is represented by the graph of a Lipschitz function and can be regarded as an $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz submanifold of \mathbb{R}^n . One can show that a closed set S is epi-Lipschitzian near x iff $C_S(x)$ has nonempty interior (see [21]).

Definition 2.7. Let $F : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ be a vector-valued function, written in terms of component functions as $F(x) = (f^1(x), \dots, f^m(x))$, where each $f^i : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, is locally Lipschitz near x . The *generalized Jacobian* of F at x , denoted by $\partial F(x)$, is the compact set

$$\partial F(x) = \text{co} \left\{ \lim_{x_i \rightarrow x} JF(x_i) : F \text{ is differentiable at } x_i \right\}.$$

$\partial F(x)$ is said to be of *maximal rank* if every matrix in $\partial F(x)$ is of maximal rank.

We conclude with the implicit function theorem for Lipschitz mappings. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^k$ be an open set, let $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ and let $(y_0, z_0) \in \Omega$. The notation $\pi_z \partial F(y_0, z_0)$ stands for the set of all $k \times k$ matrices M such that, for some $k \times m$ matrix N , the $k \times (k + m)$ matrix (N, M) belongs to $\partial F(y_0, z_0)$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let $F : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ be locally Lipschitz, let $(y_0, z_0) \in \Omega$, and suppose that $\pi_z \partial F(y_0, z_0)$ only contains matrices of maximal rank. Then there exists a neighborhood U of y_0 and a Lipschitz function $z : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $z(y_0) = z_0$ and*

$$F(y, z(y)) = 0, \quad \forall y \in U.$$

3. PROPAGATION OF SINGULARITIES FOR WEAK KAM SOLUTIONS

Let $u_c(x)$ be a weak KAM solution of equation (2.4), with Hamiltonian given by (2.5). One can lift the problem to the universal covering space \mathbb{R}^n defining

$$(3.1) \quad v(x) := u_c(x) + \langle c, x \rangle, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then, v is also a locally semiconcave function. Throughout this paper we will assume the energy condition

$$(3.2) \quad \alpha(c) > \max_{x \in \mathbb{T}^n} V(x),$$

where the latter is the so-called Mañé's critical value.

3.1. Local maxima of weak KAM solutions. Let v be defined by (3.1). Then, the singular sets of v and u_c coincide. For all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, define the level set

$$\Lambda_x := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : v(y) = v(x)\},$$

and superlevel set

$$\Lambda_x^+ := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : v(y) \geq v(x)\}.$$

Let $x \in \Sigma_v$. We want to characterize the *regularity condition*

$$0 \notin D^+v(x)$$

in terms of the smoothness of the level set Λ_x . As is well-known, the above condition is crucial for the propagation of singularities along generalized characteristics.

Example. Let us consider the mechanical system $L(x, q) = \frac{1}{2}|q|^2 - V(x)$, where $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $V \leq 0$ is such that $\max_{x \in \mathbb{T}^n} V(x) = 0$ and $\min_{x \in \mathbb{T}^n} V(x) < 0$. Let μ be a c -minimal invariant probability measure on $T\mathbb{T}^n$ (see, e.g. [19],[20]), that is,

$$-\alpha(c) = \int_{T\mathbb{T}^n} \left(\frac{1}{2}|q|^2 - \langle c, q \rangle - V(x) \right) d\mu.$$

If $\kappa = \int_{T\mathbb{T}^n} V(x) d\mu_0 > \min_{x \in \mathbb{T}^n} V(x)$, where μ_0 is an invariant probability measure generated by the linear flow $\dot{x}(t) = c$, then

$$\frac{1}{2}|c|^2 + \kappa \leq \alpha(c) \leq \frac{1}{2}|c|^2.$$

Therefore,

$$|c| \leq \sqrt{2(\alpha(c) - \kappa)}.$$

On the other hand, if v is defined as in (3.1), easy calculations show that, for any $x \in \arg \min V$,

$$|p| = \sqrt{2(\alpha(c) - V(x))}, \quad p \in D^*v(x).$$

This implies the Lipschitz constant of v near x is not less than $|c|$. It is clear that there could exist no local maximum point of v , if $|c|$ were larger than the Lipschitz constant of v .

Proposition 3.1. *Let v , defined in (3.1), satisfy the energy condition (3.2). Then v has no classical critical point. Consequently, if x is a local maximum point of v , then $x \in \Sigma_v$. Moreover, v has no local minima.*

Proof. For any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if v is differentiable at x with $Dv(x) = p$, then $D^+v(x)$ is a singleton and $D^+v(x) = D^*v(x) = \{p\}$ with $|p| = \sqrt{2(\alpha(c) - V(x))} > 0$ in view of the energy condition (3.2). Therefore, $p \neq 0$. Since $0 \in D^+v(x)$ whenever v has a local maximum at x , we deduce that any point at which v has a local maximum must be a singular. Finally, $D^\pm v(x) \neq \emptyset$ at any point x at which v attains a local minimum. So, any such point would be a classical critical point of v . \square

The above proposition implies that any $x \in \Sigma_v$ is either a ‘‘saddle point’’ or a local maximum point.

Theorem 3.2. *For $n \geq 2$, let v , defined as in (3.1), satisfy the energy condition (3.2) and let $x \in \Sigma_v$. Then $0 \notin D^+v(x)$ if and only if x is not a local maximum point of v and Λ_x is an $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz submanifold near x .*

Proof. Assume first $0 \notin D^+v(x)$. Then x cannot be a local maximum point of v and, by Proposition 2.8, Λ_x is an $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz manifold near x .

Conversely, suppose x is not a local maximum point of v and Λ_x is an $(n - 1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz manifold near x . Then Λ_x^+ is epi-Lipschitzian near x and, as recalled in section 2.3, Clarke’s tangent cone to Λ_x^+ at x has nonempty interior. Since $C_{\Lambda_x^+}(x) \subset T_{\Lambda_x^+}(x)$, for any $\theta \in C_{\Lambda_x^+}(x)$ with $|\theta| = 1$ there are sequences $\theta_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ converging to θ and $t_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ decreasing to 0 such that $x + t_i\theta_i \in \Lambda_x^+$ for all i . By the semiconcavity of v , for any $q \in D^+v(x)$ and all i , we have

$$(3.3) \quad v(x) \leq v(x + t_i\theta_i) \leq v(x) + \langle q, t_i\theta_i \rangle + \frac{C}{2}t_i^2|\theta_i|^2,$$

which leads to

$$\langle q, \theta_i \rangle + \frac{C}{2}t_i|\theta_i|^2 \geq 0$$

and, eventually, to $\langle q, \theta \rangle \geq 0$ for all $q \in D^+v(x)$. Therefore, for any set $\{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^n$ of linearly independent unit vectors generating $C_{\Lambda_x^+}(x)$ we have that

$$(3.4) \quad \langle q, \theta_k \rangle \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } q \in D^+v(x), \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

In other terms, $D^+v(x)$ is contained in the convex cone

$$C = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle q, \theta_k \rangle \geq 0, k = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Observe that 0 is an extreme point of such a cone since $\{\theta_k\}_{k=1}^n$ are linearly independent. Were 0 also in $D^+v(x)$, one would have that $0 \in \text{Ext } D^+v(x)$. This contradicts with Proposition A.9 which implies that

$$\text{Ext } D^+v(x) = D^*v(x) \subset \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle A(x)p, p \rangle = \rho\},$$

where $\rho = \sqrt{2(\alpha(c) - V(x))} > 0$ in view of condition (3.2). \square

Example. Theorem 3.2 does hold true if v is a general semiconcave function. For example, let $v : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$v(x, y) = \begin{cases} x^2 & x \leq 0, y \in \mathbb{R} \\ \frac{1}{x+1} - 1 & x > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to verify that $(0, 0)$ is not a local maximum of v and

$$\Lambda_{(0,0)} = \{(0, y) : y \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

is an $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz manifold, but $D^+v((0, 0)) = [-1, 0] \times \{0\} \ni (0, 0)$.

Remark 3.3. Let $x \in \Sigma_v$ be a local maximum point of v , and suppose there exist antipodal points $p_1, p_2 \in D^*v(x)$, $p_1 = -p_2$. Then, by Proposition A.11, there exist C^1 arcs γ_1 and γ_2 defined on $(-\infty, 0]$, which are $(u_c, L_c, \alpha(c))$ -calibrated, and $p_i = \frac{\partial L_c}{\partial q}(x, \dot{\gamma}_i(0))$, $i = 1, 2$. For the mechanical system

$$H(x, p) = \frac{1}{2} \langle A(x)p, p \rangle + V(x),$$

we have that $\dot{\gamma}_i(0) = A(x)p_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\dot{\gamma}_1(0) = -\dot{\gamma}_2(0)$. Define

$$\gamma(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma_1(t), & t \leq 0; \\ \gamma_2(-t), & t > 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see $\gamma : (-\infty, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ is a C^1 extremal curve. Moreover, it is well known that both the α -limit and the ω -limit of γ belong to (certain Aubry classes of) \mathcal{A}_c , see, e.g., [6]. In fact, $(\gamma, \dot{\gamma})$ is a homoclinic orbit with respect to $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_c$.

The above situation can indeed occur in weak KAM theory. For example, for the one-dimensional standard mathematical pendulum, there exists a closed interval $[c^-, c^+]$ near 0 and $\alpha(c) \equiv 0$ when c is contained in such a interval. If $c^- < c < c^+$, then it is well known there is one singular point of the corresponding weak KAM solution, say x_c , and such a point produces a homoclinic orbit to the hyperbolic fixed point in the aforementioned way. Note that of $x \in \Sigma_{u_c}$ for $c \in (c^-, c^+)$, then $x \notin \mathcal{I}(u_c)$ since u_c is differentiable at each point of $\mathcal{I}(u_c)$. However, $\mathcal{I}(u_c) = \mathbb{T}^1$ for $c = c^\pm$ and each $x \in \mathcal{I}(u_{c^\pm}) \setminus \mathcal{M}_{c^\pm}$ also gives a homoclinic orbit in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{c^\pm}$ respectively (for the definition of the set $\mathcal{I}(u)$ for a weak KAM solution u , see, e.g., [14]).

3.2. Generalized characteristics. The concept of generalized characteristic was initiated by Dafermos [11], and systematically developed later, see [2, 8, 9] and the reference therein.

Definition 3.4. A Lipschitz arc $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be a *generalized characteristic* of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$H(x, Du(x)) = E$$

with energy $E \in \mathbb{R}$, if \mathbf{x} satisfies the differential inclusion

$$(3.5) \quad \dot{\mathbf{x}}(s) \in \text{co } H_p(\mathbf{x}(s), D^+u(\mathbf{x}(s))), \quad \text{a.e. } s \in [0, \tau].$$

A basic criterion for the propagation of singularities along generalized characteristic was given in [2] (see [9, 23] for an improved version and simplified proof).

Proposition 3.5 ([2]). *Let u be a viscosity solution of Hamilton-Jacobi equation*

$$H(x, Du(x)) = E,$$

with E not less than Mañé's critical value, and let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then there exists a unique generalized characteristic $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with initial point $\mathbf{x}(0) = x_0$. Moreover, if $x_0 \in \Sigma_u$, then $\mathbf{x}(s) \in \Sigma_u$ for all $s \in [0, \tau]$. Furthermore, if

$$(3.6) \quad 0 \notin \text{co} H_p(x_0, D^+u(x_0)),$$

then $\mathbf{x}(\cdot)$ is injective for every $s \in [0, \tau]$.

Note that, for mechanical systems, condition (3.6) is just $0 \notin A(x)D^+v(x)$, which is equivalent to

$$(3.7) \quad 0 \notin D^+v(x),$$

since $A(x)$ is positive definite. The characteristic differential inclusion is

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}(s) \in A(\mathbf{x}(s))D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s)).$$

The following properties of generalized characteristics are fundamental (see [9]).

Proposition 3.6. *If $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a generalized characteristic, then the right derivative $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s)$ exists for all $s \in [0, \tau]$ and*

$$(3.8) \quad \dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s) = A(\mathbf{x}(s))p(s) \quad \forall s \in [0, \tau],$$

where $p(s)$ is the unique point of $D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s))$ such that

$$(3.9) \quad \frac{1}{2} \langle A(\mathbf{x}(s))p(s), p(s) \rangle = \min_{q \in D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s))} \frac{1}{2} \langle A(\mathbf{x}(s))q, q \rangle.$$

Moreover, $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+$ is right-continuous.

We now turn to study the behavior of a weak KAM solution v along a generalized characteristic.

Theorem 3.7. *Let v , defined as (3.1), satisfy the energy condition (3.2), and let $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a generalized characteristic such that $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s) \neq 0$, $\forall s \in [0, \tau]$. Then*

$$(3.10) \quad v(\mathbf{x}(s_1)) < v(\mathbf{x}(s_2)), \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq s_1 < s_2 \leq \tau.$$

Moreover, if $x \in \Sigma_v$ is not a local maximum point of v and the level set Λ_x is an $(n-1)$ -dimensional Lipschitz manifold near x , then there exists a singular generalized characteristic $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau'] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$ and $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s) \neq 0$ for all $s \in [0, \tau']$. In particular, \mathbf{x} is not constant.

Proof. The proof of (3.10) is similar to that of [3, Theorem 1]. Let

$$p(s) := A^{-1}(\mathbf{x}(s))\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s) \in D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s)), \quad s \in [0, \tau],$$

like in Proposition 3.6. It suffices to show that the right derivative of $v(\mathbf{x}(s))$ is positive, since then (3.10) follows by integration (recall that $v(\mathbf{x}(s))$ is locally Lipschitz). Let $s_0 \in [0, \tau]$, and set

$$x_0 = \mathbf{x}(s_0), \quad p_0 = A^{-1}(x_0)\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s_0) \in D^+v(x_0).$$

Recall that v is a viscosity solution of

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle A(x)Dv(x), Dv(x) \rangle + V(x) = E := \alpha(c),$$

and set $\bar{\rho} = \sqrt{2(E - V(x_0))}$, and denote by $E_\rho(x_0)$ the ellipsoid

$$(3.11) \quad E_\rho(x_0) = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle p, A(x_0)p \rangle \leq \rho\}$$

for all $0 < \rho \leq \bar{\rho}$. From Proposition 3.6, it follows that

$$\rho_0 := \langle p_0, A(x_0)p_0 \rangle \leq \langle p, A(x_0)p \rangle, \quad \forall p \in D^+v(x_0).$$

Being $\langle p, A(x_0)p \rangle$ strictly convex, we have that $E_{\rho_0}(x_0) \cap D^+v(x_0) = \{p_0\}$. Since both $E_{\rho_0}(x_0)$ and $D^+v(x_0)$ are compact convex subsets of \mathbb{R}^n , the support hyperplane to $E_{\rho_0}(x_0)$ at p_0 separates $E_{\rho_0}(x_0)$ and $D^+v(x_0)$, i.e.

$$\langle p_0, A(x_0)p_0 \rangle \leq \langle p, A(x_0)p_0 \rangle, \quad p \in D^+v(x_0).$$

Then, using the Lipschitz continuity of v and the representation of the directional derivative of a semiconcave function (see [8, Theorem 3.3.6]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds^+}v(\mathbf{x}(s))|_{s=s_0} &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{v(x_0 + h\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s_0)) - v(x_0)}{h} \\ &= \min_{p \in D^+v(x_0)} \langle p, \dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s_0) \rangle \\ &= \min_{p \in D^+v(x_0)} \langle p, A(x_0)p_0 \rangle \\ &= \langle p_0, A(x_0)p_0 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p(s) \neq 0$ for every $s \in [0, \tau]$ by assumption, (3.10) is proved.

In order to prove the last part of the conclusion, observe that the regularity condition $0 \notin D^+v(x)$ holds true by Theorem 3.2. Then, the existence of the singular generalized characteristic is obtained by Proposition 3.5. Using the upper semicontinuity of D^+v , for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s))$ is contained in the ε -neighborhood of $D^+v(x)$ for all $s \in [0, \delta]$. Therefore, $0 \notin D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s))$, or, by (3.9), $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(s) \neq 0$ for all $s \in [0, \delta]$. \square

Corollary 3.8. *For any $x \in \Sigma_v$, $0 \notin D^+v(x)$ if and only if there exists a singular generalized characteristic with initial point x such that $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(0) \neq 0$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.5, for any $x \in \Sigma_v$ with $0 \notin D^+v(x)$, there is a singular generalized characteristic $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ with initial point x . Moreover, $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(s) \neq 0$ for all $s \in [0, \tau]$ by Theorem 3.7.

Conversely, if $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a singular generalized characteristic with $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$ and $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(0) \neq 0$, then $0 \notin D^+v(x)$ by (3.8) and (3.9). \square

3.3. Local propagation of singularities. Let v be defined as in (3.1). Recall that v is a locally semiconcave function with linear modulus.

Let us denote by S^{n-1} the $(n-1)$ -dimensional sphere $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x| = 1\}$. The following proposition, that we state without proof, is the extension of a result due to [9], in the case of the flat metric on \mathbb{T}^n , to a general Riemannian metric.

Proposition 3.9. *Let u_c be a \mathbb{T}^n -periodic locally semiconcave solution of (2.4) satisfying the energy condition (3.2). Let $x_0 \in \Sigma_{u_c}$ and let Ω be an arbitrary bounded open set containing x_0 such that $\partial\Omega$ is homeomorphic to S^{n-1} . Then $\partial\Omega \cap \Sigma_{u_c} \neq \emptyset$.*

We will now show that singularities actually propagate along a Lipschitz continuous curve, answering the question raised in [9, Remark 6.2].

Theorem 3.10. *Let u_c be a \mathbb{T}^n -periodic semiconcave solution of (2.4) satisfying the energy condition (3.2). If $x_0 \in \Sigma_{u_c}$, then there exists a Lipschitz arc $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbf{x}(0) = x_0$, $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(0) \neq 0$, and $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \Sigma_{u_c}$ for all $t \in [0, \tau)$.*

Proof. Let u_c be a viscosity solution of (2.4) and v be defined as (3.1). Observe that v is also locally semiconcave and has the same singular set as u_c . In view of the propagation principle of [1]—which applies to any semiconcave function—the geometric condition

$$(3.12) \quad \partial D^+v(x_0) \setminus D^*v(x_0) \neq \emptyset$$

implies the conclusion of the theorem. Moreover, since

$$D^*v(x_0) \subset \partial E_\rho(x_0)$$

with $E_\rho(x_0)$ defined in (3.11) for $\rho = \sqrt{2(\alpha(c) - V(x_0))} > 0$, we have that (3.12) is equivalent to

$$(3.13) \quad D^*v(x_0) \neq \partial E_\rho(x_0)$$

by Proposition A.9. We shall therefore prove (3.13).

Suppose $D^*v(x_0) = \partial E_\rho(x_0)$ and, for each $\theta \in \partial E_\rho(x_0)$, denote by $(\mathbf{x}_\theta, p_\theta)$ the solution on $(-\infty, 0]$ of the Hamiltonian system

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}} = A(\mathbf{x})p \\ \dot{p} = \frac{1}{2}D\langle A(\mathbf{x})p, p \rangle - DV(\mathbf{x}) \end{cases} \quad \text{with initial conditions} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}(0) = x_0 \\ p(0) = \theta. \end{cases}$$

It is well-known that v is differentiable in a neighborhood of $\mathbf{x}_\theta(t)$ for all $t < 0$ and

$$(3.15) \quad Dv(\mathbf{x}_\theta(t)) = p_\theta(t) \quad \forall t \in (-\infty, 0).$$

Moreover, $\theta \mapsto (\mathbf{x}_\theta(t), p_\theta(t))$ is a continuous map for every $t \leq 0$, and so is the map

$$\gamma_t : \partial E_\rho(x_0) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \gamma_t(\theta) = \mathbf{x}_\theta(t).$$

We claim that γ_t is one-to-one for every $t < 0$. For let $\theta_0, \theta_1 \in \partial E_\rho$ be such that $\gamma_t(\theta_0) = \gamma_t(\theta_1)$. Then, by the forward uniqueness of solutions to the differential inclusion $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \in A(\mathbf{x})D^+v(\mathbf{x})$ (Proposition 3.6), we conclude that $\mathbf{x}_{\theta_0}(s) = \mathbf{x}_{\theta_1}(s)$ for all $s \in [t, 0]$. Thus, in view of (3.15), $p_{\theta_0}(s) = p_{\theta_1}(s)$ for all $s \in [t, 0]$. So, $\theta_0 = \theta_1$.

Since γ_t is continuous and one-to-one, we have that $\Gamma_t := \gamma_t(\partial E_\rho)$ is homeomorphic to S^{n-1} for all $t < 0$. So, the Jordan-Brouwer theorem (see, e.g., [15, Corollary 18.7]) ensures that, for any $t < 0$, $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Gamma_t$ has two connected components both with boundary Γ_t , one of which—labeled Ω_t —is bounded. Moreover, v is of class C^1 in a neighborhood of Γ_t . Since, by Proposition 3.9, $\Omega_t \cap \Sigma_v = \emptyset$, we conclude that v is of class C^1 on an open neighborhood, say U , of $\overline{\Omega}_t$. In fact, a well-know regularization argument based on semiconcavity and semiconvexity shows that $v \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(U)$.

Now, let $x_1 \in \Omega_t$ and let $\mathbf{x}_1 : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the solution of the problem

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\mathbf{x}}(s) \in A(\mathbf{x}(s))D^+u(\mathbf{x}(s)) & s \geq 0 \\ \mathbf{x}(0) = x_1. \end{cases}$$

Define

$$\tau := \inf\{s \geq 0 \mid \mathbf{x}_1(s) \in \Gamma_t\} > 0.$$

Since $\mathbf{x}_1(s) \in \Omega_t$ for all $s \in [0, \tau)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle c, \mathbf{x}_1(s) - x_1 \rangle + v(\mathbf{x}_1(s)) - v(x_1) &= \int_0^s \langle Du(\mathbf{x}_1(\sigma)), \dot{\mathbf{x}}(\sigma) \rangle d\sigma \\ &= 2 \int_0^s [\alpha(c) - V(\mathbf{x}_\theta(\sigma))] d\sigma \geq 2\mu s, \quad \forall s \in [0, \tau), \end{aligned}$$

with $\mu = E - \max_{\mathbb{T}^n} V > 0$. Therefore,

$$(3.17) \quad \langle c, \mathbf{x}_1(s) - x_1 \rangle \geq 2(\mu s - \|v\|_\infty), \quad \forall s \in [0, \tau].$$

The above inequality forces $\tau < +\infty$. So, $\mathbf{x}_1(\tau) \in \Gamma_t$. Equivalently, $\mathbf{x}_1(\tau) = \mathbf{x}_\theta(t)$ for some $\theta \in \partial E_\rho(x_0)$. Then, since (3.16) admits a unique solution, we have that

$$(3.18) \quad \mathbf{x}_1(s) = \mathbf{x}_\theta(t + s - \tau)$$

for any $s \geq \tau$. Moreover, since $u \in C_{\text{loc}}^{1,1}(U)$, we also have that (3.18) holds for all $s \geq 0$. In particular, $\mathbf{x}_\theta(t - \tau) = x_1$.

Finally, the same reasoning that led to (3.17) ensures that

$$\langle c, \mathbf{x}_\theta(t') \rangle \leq \langle c, x_1 \rangle + 2\|v\|_\infty - 2\mu(t - \tau - t'),$$

for every $t' < t - \tau$. Hence, for some $T < t - \tau$, $\mathbf{x}_\theta(T)$ must return to intersect Γ_t , that is,

$$(3.19) \quad \mathbf{x}_\theta(T) = \mathbf{x}_{\theta'}(t) \quad \text{for some } \theta' \in \partial E_\rho(x_0).$$

We claim this yields a contradiction. Indeed, (3.19) and again forward uniqueness imply that

$$\mathbf{x}_\theta(T + s - t) = \mathbf{x}_{\theta'}(s) \quad \text{for all } t \leq s \leq 0.$$

Hence, for $s = 0$, we obtain $\mathbf{x}_\theta(T - t) = x_0$. Now, this is a contradiction, because v is differentiable at $\mathbf{x}_\theta(T - t)$ whereas $x_0 \in \Sigma_v$. We have reached such a contradiction supposing that $D^*v(x_0) = \partial E_\rho(x_0)$, so (3.13) must hold true. \square

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\mathbf{x} : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Lipschitz arc, and let v be a locally semiconcave function. If $v(\mathbf{x}([a, b]))$ contains a nontrivial closed interval, then there exists $s_0 \in [a, b]$ such that $0 \notin D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s_0))$.*

Proof. Suppose $0 \in D^+v(\mathbf{x}(s))$ for all $s \in [a, b]$. Then, by the semiconcavity of v ,

$$v(\mathbf{x}(s)) - v(\mathbf{x}(s')) \leq \frac{C}{2} |\mathbf{x}(s') - \mathbf{x}(s)|^2 \leq K |s - s'|^2 \quad \forall s, s' \in [a, b],$$

where $K \geq 0$ depends on the Lipschitz norm of \mathbf{x} . It follows that the derivative of $v(\mathbf{x}(s))$ vanishes for all $s \in (a, b)$. This implies that $v(\mathbf{x}(s))$ is constant on $[a, b]$ since $v(\mathbf{x}(s))$ is Lipschitz continuous, which leads to a contradiction. \square

Corollary 3.12. *Let v , defined as in (3.1), satisfy the energy condition (3.2), and let $x \in \Sigma_v$ be an isolated local maximum point of v . Then, for any neighborhood U of x , there exists $y \in \Sigma_v \cap U$ such that $0 \notin D^+v(y)$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \Sigma_v$ be an isolated local maximum point of v . Then, by Theorem 3.10, there exists a Lipschitz singular arc $\mathbf{x} : [0, \tau) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbf{x}(0) = x$ and $\dot{\mathbf{x}}^+(0) \neq 0$. Therefore, in any neighborhood U of x one can find a point $\mathbf{x}(s) \in \Sigma_v$ with $0 < s < \tau$ so that $v(\mathbf{x}(s)) < v(x)$. The conclusion follows by Lemma 3.11. \square

Remark 3.13. By Corollary 3.12, if $x \in \Sigma_v$ is an isolated local maximum point of v , then in any neighborhood U of x there is a point $y \in \Sigma_v$ satisfying the regularity property $0 \notin D^+v(y)$. Whether the generalized characteristic $\mathbf{x}(s)$ with initial point $\mathbf{x}(0) = y$, given by Proposition 3.5, reaches x in finite or infinite time remains, however, an open problem.

4. APPLICATIONS TO WEAK KAM THEORY

In this section, we will use standard notions from weak KAM theory. The reader will find all the necessary preliminaries in Appendix A.

Let $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let h_c be Peierls' barrier (see Definition A.4 below). The *barrier function* $B_c^*(x)$ is defined as

$$(4.1) \quad B_c^*(x) = \inf_{y, z \in \mathcal{M}_c} \{h_c(y, x) + h_c(x, z) - h_c(y, z)\}, \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^n,$$

where \mathcal{M}_c is the projected Mather set, that is, the projection on \mathbb{T}^n of the Mather set $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_c$ by the graph property. Note that $\mathcal{M}_c \subset \mathcal{A}_c$ (see, e.g., [6][19][20]). By Proposition A.5, $h_c(x, \cdot)$ defines a global viscosity subsolution of (2.4). Also, $h_c(\cdot, x)$ defines a global critical supersolution. Fix $y, z \in \mathcal{M}_c$ and, for each $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$, let

$$u_{c,y}^-(x) = h_c(y, x), \quad u_{c,z}^+(x) = -h_c(x, z).$$

Then

$$(4.2) \quad B_c^*(x) = \inf_{y, z \in \mathcal{M}_c} \{u_{c,y}^-(x) - u_{c,z}^+(x) - h_c(y, z)\}.$$

For any $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^n$ define *Mather's pseudometric* (see [20]) on \mathcal{A}_c by

$$d_c(x, y) = h_c(x, y) + h_c(y, x).$$

Two points $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_c$ are said to be in the same *Aubry class* if $d_c(x, y) = 0$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_c$ be distinct points in the same Aubry class. Then $h_c(x, \cdot)$ equals $h_c(y, \cdot)$ up to a constant. If $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_c$, $x \neq y$, belong to different Aubry classes, then $h_c(x, \cdot) - h_c(y, \cdot)$ is not constant.*

Proof. First of all, let us recall that

$$(4.3) \quad h_c(x, z) = h_c(x, y) + h_c(y, z),$$

if either $d_c(x, y) = 0$ or $d_c(y, z) = 0$ (see [20, p. 1370]). Let us define $u_c^x(\cdot) = h_c(x, \cdot)$ for $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$. Then u_c^x equals u_c^y up to a constant.

On the other hand, fix $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^n$ belonging to distinct Aubry classes, and set $f(z) = h_c(x, z) - h_c(y, z)$, $z \in \mathbb{T}^n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) - f(y) &= h_c(x, x) - h_c(y, x) - h_c(x, y) + h_c(y, y) \\ &= -(h_c(y, x) + h_c(x, y)) = -d_c(x, y) \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $h_c(x, \cdot) - h_c(y, \cdot) \not\equiv C$ for any constant C . \square

From (4.3) it follows that, if there exists a unique Aubry class, then we can represent the barrier function B_c^* in the form

$$B_c^*(x) = u_{c,y}^-(x) - u_{c,y}^+(x) := u_c^-(x) - u_c^+(x),$$

where (u_c^-, u_c^+) is called a *conjugate pair* of weak KAM solutions.

A set \mathcal{S} of Tonelli Lagrangians is said to be *generic* in the sense of Mañé if there exists a residual set $\mathcal{O} \subset C^2(\mathbb{T}^n)$, and a Tonelli Lagrangian L_0 , such that each $L \in \mathcal{S}$ has the form

$$L = L_0 + V$$

for some $V \in \mathcal{O}$. A similar notion can be given for a set of Tonelli Hamiltonians. Moreover, a well-known result by Mañé [18] ensures that, for any fixed $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there is a unique viscosity solution of the equation associated with a generic Hamiltonian.

It is well known that u_c^- (resp. u_c^+) is a locally semiconcave (resp. semiconvex) function with linear modulus. Then the barrier function B_c^* is also a locally semiconcave function with linear modulus, see, e.g., [8, Proposition 2.1.5].

The following theorem describes the propagation of singularities of the barrier function.

Theorem 4.2. *For any generic mechanical system as (2.4) with*

$$L(x, v) = L_0(x, v) - V(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle A^{-1}(x)v, v \rangle - V(x),$$

the singularities of the barrier function B_c^ always propagate locally if the energy condition (3.2) is satisfied.*

Proof. Recall that, in generic case,

$$B_c^*(x) = u_c^-(x) - u_c^+(x).$$

Let x be a singular point of B_c^* . Then, we have that

$$(4.4) \quad x \in \Sigma_{u_c^-} \cup \Sigma_{u_c^+} \quad \text{and} \quad D^+ B_c^*(x) = D^+ u_c^-(x) - D^- u_c^+(x).$$

Indeed, if $x \notin \Sigma_{u_c^-} \cup \Sigma_{u_c^+}$, then both u_c^- and u_c^+ are differentiable at x , so x is not a singular point of B_c^* . Moreover, in view of (2.2), the representation of $D^+ B_c^*(x)$ in (4.4) follows by the sum rule for the superdifferential of concave functions.

If the energy condition (3.2) is satisfied, then we have

$$\partial D^+ u_c^-(x) \setminus D^* u_c^-(x) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{or} \quad \partial D^- u_c^+(x) \setminus D^* u_c^+(x) \neq \emptyset$$

by the same argument we used in the proof of Theorem 3.10. This implies that the singularity of u_c^- or u_c^+ must propagate locally. Our conclusion follows by (4.4). \square

The following result is motivated by Remark 3.3.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $x \in \Sigma_{B_c^*}$, and let $B_c^*(x) = u_c^-(x) - u_c^+(x)$ where (u_c^-, u_c^+) is a conjugate pair of weak KAM solutions in the generic case. Then x produces a homoclinic orbit with respect to the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_c$ if*

$$(4.5) \quad D^* u_c^-(x) \cap D^* u_c^+(x) \neq \emptyset.$$

If x is a local minimum point of B_c^ , then x also produces such a homoclinic orbit.*

Proof. Let $x \in \Sigma_{B_c^*}$, and let $p \in D^* u_c^-(x) \cap D^* u_c^+(x)$. Then, $|c + p| \neq 0$ since $c + p \in \partial E_\rho(x)$ with $\rho = \sqrt{2(\alpha(c) - V(x))} > 0$, where $E_\rho(x)$ is the ellipsoid defined in (3.11). Since such a vector p is a reachable gradient of $u_c^\pm(x)$, it follows that there exists a C^1 arc $\gamma_1 : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ (resp. $\gamma_2 : [0, +\infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$), with $\gamma_1(0) = x$ (resp. $\gamma_2(0) = x$), such that γ_1 is backward $(u_c^-, L_c, \alpha(c))$ -calibrated (resp. γ_2 is forward $(u_c^+, L_c, \alpha(c))$ -calibrated) by Proposition A.11. Moreover,

$$c + p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q}(x, \dot{\gamma}_i(0)) = A(x) \dot{\gamma}_i(0), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Now, define

$$\gamma(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma_1(t), & t \leq 0; \\ \gamma_2(t), & t > 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, $(\gamma, \dot{\gamma})$ is a C^1 extremal arc, and produces a homoclinic orbit with respect to the Aubry set $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_c$.

Finally, if x is a local minimum point of B_c^* , then B_c^* is differentiable at x with $D^+ B_c^*(x) = \{0\}$. Thus, the sum rule for the superdifferential of concave functions

yields that both u_c^- and u_c^+ are differentiable at x , and $Du_c^-(x) = Du_c^+(x)$. So, condition (4.5) is satisfied and, by the first part of the conclusion, x produces a homoclinic orbit with respect to the Aubry set. \square

Remark 4.4. The assumptions of Theorem 4.3 are satisfied by the mathematical pendulum system, as discussed in Remark 3.3 where condition (4.5) always holds for $c \in (c^-, c^+)$. It is interesting to compare this analysis with the technique that uses the set $\mathcal{I}(u^-, u^+)$ in classical weak KAM theory (see, e.g., [13]). On the other hand, how to guarantee that condition (4.5) holds remains an open problem.

It is well known that complex phenomena of Hamiltonian dynamics occur when the unstable and stable manifolds of hyperbolic periodic orbits intersect transversally. From the variational viewpoint, this is closely related to the regularity of the barrier function, as well as the structure of its singular set and conjugate loci.

APPENDIX A. SEMICONCAVITY AND WEAK KAM THEORY

We begin this appendix by briefly surveying some basic notions from weak KAM theory. We refer the reader to Fathi's unpublished book [13] for more details.

A.1. A brief review of weak KAM solutions. Let H be a Tonelli Hamiltonian on n -torus \mathbb{T}^n , and L be the corresponding Tonelli Lagrangian. For any fixed vector $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ let us consider the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$(A.1) \quad H(x, c + Du_c(x)) = E := \alpha(c), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^n,$$

where the energy E is assumed to satisfy the energy condition (3.2).

Definition A.1. Let L be a C^2 Tonelli Lagrangian on $T\mathbb{T}^n$, and set $L_c = L - c$ and $E = \alpha(c)$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$. A function $u_c : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be *dominated* by $L_c + E$ iff for each absolutely continuous arc $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ with $a < b$, one has

$$u_c(\gamma(b)) - u_c(\gamma(a)) \leq \int_a^b L_c(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds + E(b - a).$$

When this happens, one writes $u_c \prec L_c + E$.

Definition A.2. Let $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and u_c be a real-valued function on \mathbb{T}^n . A absolutely continuous curve $\gamma : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ is said to be (u_c, L_c, E) -*calibrated* if

$$u_c(\gamma(b)) - u_c(\gamma(a)) = \int_a^b L_c(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds + E(b - a).$$

The following facts clarifying the relation of the viscosity solutions and weak KAM solutions are well known (see, e.g. [13] [14]).

Proposition A.3. *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$. A function $u_c : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is dominated by $L_c + E$ if and only if u_c is a viscosity subsolution of (A.1).*

If u_c is a viscosity subsolution of (A.1), then there exists an absolutely continuous arc $\gamma_x : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ with $\gamma_x(0) = x$ such that γ_x is (u_c, L_c, E) -calibrated.

A viscosity subsolution (resp. solution) of (A.1) is also called a *critical* subsolution (resp. solution).

For $t > 0$, $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we introduce the following quantity

$$(A.2) \quad h_t^c(x, y) = \inf \int_0^t L_c(\gamma(s), \dot{\gamma}(s)) ds,$$

where γ belongs to the set $C_{x,y}(t)$ of all absolutely continuous arcs $\gamma : [0, t] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(t) = y$.

Definition A.4. Let $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $h_t^c(x, y)$ be defined as above. *Mañé's critical potential* and *Peierls' barrier* are defined, respectively, as

$$(A.3) \quad \phi_c(x, y) = \inf_{t>0} h_t^c(x, y) + \alpha(c)t,$$

$$(A.4) \quad h_c(x, y) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} h_t^c(x, y) + \alpha(c)t.$$

We call $\mathcal{A}_c = \{x \in \mathbb{T}^n : h_c(x, x) = 0\}$ the *projected Aubry set*.

It is well known that \mathcal{A}_c is nonempty for any $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Proposition A.5. ([14]) *If Peierls' barrier h_c is finite then, for each $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$, $u_c(y) := h_c(x, y)$ is a global critical solution of (A.1). Moreover, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{T}^n$, there is an arc $\xi : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$, with $\xi(0) = y$, such that*

$$u_c(\xi(0)) - u_c(\xi(-t)) = \int_{-t}^0 L_c(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) dt + \alpha(c)t, \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Proposition A.6. ([14]) *For each $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$, $u_c(y) := \phi_c(x, y)$ is a global critical subsolution of (A.1). Moreover, u_c defined as above is a global critical solution if and only if $x \in \mathcal{A}_c$. Furthermore, for any $y \in \mathbb{T}^n \setminus \{x\}$, there is an arc $\xi : (-\varepsilon, 0]$, with $\xi(0) = y$, such that*

$$u_c(\xi(0)) - u_c(\xi(-t)) = \int_{-t}^0 L_c(\xi(s), \dot{\xi}(s)) dt + \alpha(c)t, \quad \forall t \in [0, \varepsilon].$$

Proposition A.7. ([13]) *Let w be a critical subsolution of (A.1). Then there exists a critical solution u such that $u|_{\mathcal{A}_c} = w|_{\mathcal{A}_c}$.*

Since H is convex in the fibers, one has that the set of all critical subsolutions is convex, that is, for any pair of critical subsolution v_0, v_1 and every $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, $v_\lambda = \lambda v_0 + (1 - \lambda)v_1$ is also a critical subsolution. So, if (A.1) admits two distinct critical solutions, then each v_λ admits a critical solution u_λ , and (A.1) admits infinitely many critical solutions by Proposition A.7.

A.2. Viscosity solutions and their semiconcavity. Now, we recall some properties related to the semiconcavity of viscosity solutions. The following result is fundamental (see, e.g., [13] [22]).

Proposition A.8. *Any viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (A.1) is locally semiconcave with linear modulus.*

The following is the weak KAM analogue of [8, Theorem 6.4.12]

Proposition A.9. *Ext $D^+u(x) = D^*u(x)$ for any viscosity solution u of (A.1) and any $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$.*

Proof. The inclusion $\text{Ext } D^+u(x) \subset D^*u(x)$ is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.3 (d). For the opposite inclusion, fix $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and let p be a reachable gradient vector of u at x . Then there exists a sequence $\{x_k\}$ such that u is differentiable at each x_k , $H(x_k, c + Du(x_k)) = E$ and $p = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Du(x_k)$. Therefore,

$$H(x, c + p) = E, \quad \forall p \in D^*u(x).$$

Then the strict convexity of H in the fibers implies that p is no convex combination of other points of $D^+u(x)$. Thus, $D^*u(x) \subset \text{Ext } D^+u(x)$. \square

Remark A.10. Note that the equality $\text{Ext } D^+u(x) = D^*u(x)$ is false for a general semiconcave function u , see e.g. [8, Example 3.3.13].

We now turn to discuss some connections between the dynamics of Hamiltonian flows on an energy hypersurface with E not less than Mañé's critical value c_0 , and the structure of the superdifferential of the viscosity solutions of (A.1). The main part of the following result is due to Rifford [22], see Lemma 6 and Lemma 7 therein.

Proposition A.11. *Let $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $u : \mathbb{T}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a viscosity solution of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation*

$$H(x, c + Du(x)) = E = \alpha(c), \quad x \in \mathbb{T}^n,$$

where $E \geq c_0$. Then $p \in D^*u(x)$ if and only if there exists a unique C^1 curve $\gamma : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ which is (u, L, E) -calibrated, and $p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q}(x, \dot{\gamma}(0))$.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$ and $p \in D^*u(x)$. Then there exists a sequence $\{x_k\}$, with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x_k = x$, such u is differentiable at each x_k with $p_k = Du(x_k) \rightarrow p$. It is well known from weak KAM theory that, for each k , there exists a unique C^1 arc $\gamma_k : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ which is (u, L, E) -calibrated, and $p_k = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q}(x, \dot{\gamma}_k(0))$. The sequence γ_k is equi-Lipschitz, so, by the Ascoli-Arzelà theorem, we can extract a subsequence converging to a C^1 arc γ which is (u, L, E) -calibrated, and $p = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q}(x, \dot{\gamma}(0))$. Such an arc is necessarily a solution of the Euler-Lagrange equations. Uniqueness follows from classical results for ordinary differential equations.

Conversely, suppose there is a unique C^1 arc $\gamma : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^n$ with $\gamma(0) = x$ which is (u, L, E) -calibrated. Then, taking any sequence $x_k = \gamma(t_k)$ such that $t_k < 0$ and $x_k \rightarrow x$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, one has that u is differentiable at x_k and

$$Du(x_k) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial q}(x_k, \dot{\gamma}(t_k)) \rightarrow \frac{\partial L}{\partial q}(x, \dot{\gamma}(0)) = p.$$

Thus, $p \in D^*u(x)$. □

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Albano, P. Cannarsa, *Structural properties of singularities of semiconcave functions*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **28**(1999), no. 4, 719–740.
- [2] Albano, P., Cannarsa, P., *Propagation of singularities for solutions of nonlinear first order partial differential equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., **162**(2002), 1–23.
- [3] Albano, P., Cannarsa, P., Nguyen, K.T. and Sinestrari, C., *Singular gradient flow of the distance function and homotopy equivalence*, Math. Ann., **356**(2013), 23–43.
- [4] Ambrosio, L., Cannarsa, P. and Soner, H. M., *On the propagation of singularities of semiconvex functions*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **20**(1993), 597–616.
- [5] Aubin, J.-P., Cellina, A. *Differential inclusions: Set-valued maps and viability theory. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*, 264. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984.
- [6] Bernard, P., *Connecting orbits of time dependent Lagrangian systems*. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **52**(2002), no. 5, 1533–1568.
- [7] Bernard, P., Contreras, G., *A generic property of families of Lagrangian systems*. Ann. of Math. (2) **167** (2008), no. 3, 1099–1108.
- [8] Cannarsa, P., Sinestrari, C., *Semiconcave functions, Hamilton-Jacobi equations, and optimal control. Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*, 58, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2004.
- [9] Cannarsa, P., Yu, Y. *Singular dynamics for semiconcave functions*. J. Eur. Math. Soc. **11**(2009), no. 5, 999–1024.
- [10] Clarke, F. H., *Optimization and nonsmooth analysis*. Second edition. *Classics in Applied Mathematics*, 5, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1990.

- [11] Dafermos, C. M. *Generalized characteristics and the structure of solutions of hyperbolic conservation laws*. Indiana Univ. Math. J. 26 (1977), no. 6, 1097–1119.
- [12] Evans, L. C., *Periodic homogenization of certain fully nonlinear PDE*, Proc. Royal Society Edinburgh **120** (1992), 245–265.
- [13] Fathi, A., *Weak KAM theorem in Lagrangian dynamics*, to be published by Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Fathi, A., Siconolfi, A. *Existence of C^1 critical subsolutions of the Hamilton-Jacobi equation*, Invent. Math. **155**(2004), no. 2, 363–388.
- [15] Greenberg, M. J., *Lectures on algebraic topology*, W.A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1967.
- [16] Lions, P.-L., *Generalized solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, Research Notes in Mathematics 69, Pitman, Boston, 1982.
- [17] Lions, P.-L., Papanicolaou, G. and Varadhan, S.R.S., *Homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, unpublished, circa 1988.
- [18] Mañé, R., *Generic properties and problems of minimizing measures of Lagrangian systems*. Nonlinearity **9**(1996), no. 2, 273–310.
- [19] Mather, J. N., *Action minimizing invariant measures for positive definite Lagrangian systems*, Math. Z. **207**(1991), no. 2, 169–207.
- [20] Mather, J. N., *Variational construction of connecting orbits*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **43**(1993), no. 5, 1349–1386.
- [21] Rockafellar, R. T., *Clarke's tangent cones and the boundaries of closed sets in \mathbb{R}^n* , Non-linear Anal. Theor. Meth. Appl. **3** (1979), 145–154.
- [22] Rifford, L., *On viscosity solutions of certain Hamilton-Jacobi equations: regularity results and generalized Sard's theorems*. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 33 (2008), no. 1-3, 517–559.
- [23] Yu, Y., *A simple proof of the propagation of singularities for solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (5) **5**(2006), 439–444.
- [24] Zaiček, L., *On the differentiation of convex functions in finite and infinite dimensional spaces*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal **29** (1979), 340–348.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA TOR VERGATA, VIA DELLA RICERCA SCIENTIFICA 1, 00133 ROMA, ITALY

E-mail address: `cannarsa@mat.uniroma2.it`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY, NANJING 210093, CHINA

E-mail address: `chengwei@nju.edu.cn`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NANJING UNIVERSITY OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS, NANJING 210016, CHINA

E-mail address: `zhangqi@nuaa.edu.cn`