arXiv:1612.06285v1 [math.AP] 16 Dec 2016

Chaotic motions for a version of the Vlasov equation

Ugo Bessi*

Abstract

We consider a version of the Vlasov equation on the circle under a periodic potential $V(x,t)$ and a repulsing smooth interaction W. We suppose that the Lagrangian for the single particle has chaotic orbits; using Aubry-Mather theory and ideas of W. Gangbo, A. Tudorascu and P. Bernard, we prove that, for any initial distribution of particles, it is possible to choose their initial speed in such a way to get a chaotic orbit on $[0,+\infty)$.

Introduction

The Vlasov equation on the circle governs the motion of many particles on $S^1 := \frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{Z}}$ under the action of an external potential $V(t,x)$ and a mutual interaction W; we shall suppose throughout that

• $V \in C^2(S^1 \times S^1)$ and $W \in C^2(S^1)$.

• Seen as a function on $\mathbf{R}$, W is even: $W(x) = W(-x)$. Moreover, $W(x) \leq 0$ and $W(x) = 0$ if and only if $x \in \mathbf{Z}$; $W''(x) < 0$ when $x \in \mathbf{Z}$.

Following [5], we lift the particles to $\mathbf{R}$; we let $I = [0,1)$ and we parametrize the position of the particles at time t by the map $\sigma_t \in L^2(I, \mathbf{R})$; the "Lagrangian" version of Vlasov is the ODE in $L^2(I)$

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{\sigma}_t z = -V'(t, \sigma_t z) - \displaystyle\int_I W'(\sigma_t z - \sigma_t z')\mathrm{d}z' \\ \sigma_0 = M \\ \dot{\sigma}_0 = N \end{cases} \qquad (ODE)_{Lag}$$

with $M, N \in L^2(I)$. Note that we stick to the notation of [5] and write $\sigma_t z$ instead of $\sigma_t(z)$.

We note that $(ODE)_{Lag}$ is the Euler-Lagrange equation of the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}\colon S^1 \times L^2(I) \times L^2(I) \to \mathbf{R}, \qquad \mathcal{L}(t, M, N) = \frac{1}{2}\|N\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(t, M) - \mathcal{W}(M)$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}(t, M) = \int_I V(t, Mz)\mathrm{d}z, \qquad \mathcal{W}(M) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{I\times I} W(Mz - Mz')\mathrm{d}z\mathrm{d}z'.$$

* Dipartimento di Matematica, Università Roma Tre, Largo S. Leonardo Murialdo, 00146 Roma, Italy.
email: bessi@matrm3.mat.uniroma3.it

Now $V(t,x)$ and $W(x)$, seen as functions on $\mathbf{R}$, are $\mathbf{Z}$-periodic. This implies that $(ODE)_{Lag}$ has a natural invariance with respect to $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}} := L^2(I,\mathbf{Z})$: if σ_t solves $(ODE)_{Lag}$ and $g \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$, then also $\sigma_t + g$ solves $(ODE)_{Lag}$. Moreover, $(ODE)_{Lag}$ is also rearrangement-invariant: if σ_t solves $(ODE)_{Lag}$ and G is a measure-preserving transformation of I, then also $\sigma_t \circ G$ solves $(ODE)_{Lag}$. This gives us two ways to consider the Vlasov equation: either we look at it as an ODE invariant with respect to a large group of symmetries, or we concentrate on the time evolution of the *density* of our particles, forgetting about the labeling. Let us be a little more precise on this second approach.

Let $\pi\colon \mathbf{R} \to S^1$ be the natural projection; the push-forward of the Lebesgue measure on I by the map $(\pi \circ \sigma_t, \dot\sigma_t)$ is a measure f_t on $S^1 \times \mathbf{R}$. If we denote by (x,v) the coordinates on $S^1 \times \mathbf{R}$, and by ρ_t the x-marginal of f_t, then f_t satisfies the continuity equation

$$\partial_t f_t + v\partial_x f_t = \partial_v(f_t \partial_x P_t) \qquad (ODE)_{Meas}$$

where

$$P_t(x) = V(t,x) + \int_I W(x-x')\mathrm{d}\rho_t(x').$$

To be more precise, f_t satisfies $(ODE)_{meas}$ in the weak sense, i. e.

$$-\int_{S^1\times\mathbf{R}} \phi \mathrm{d}f_0 + \int_{[0,+\infty)} \mathrm{d}t \int_{S^1\times\mathbf{R}} [-\partial_t\phi - v\partial_x\phi + \partial_v\phi\partial_x P_t]\mathrm{d}f_t = 0 \qquad \forall \phi \in C^\infty_0([0,+\infty)\times S^1\times\mathbf{R}).$$

In this paper, we shall follow [5] and adopt another, equivalent approach: indeed, we shall concentrate on $(ODE)_{Lag}$, but we shall quotient by the actions of $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ and Group.

We are interested in the relation between the Vlasov equation and the motion of a single particle, which is governed by the Lagrangian on $S^1 \times S^1 \times \mathbf{R}$

$$L(t,q,\dot q) = \frac{1}{2}|\dot q|^2 - V(t,q).$$

Let us look at the term $-\mathcal{W}$ in the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$; by our hypotheses on W, $-\mathcal{W}(\sigma)$ is minimal if $\sigma z = a + bz$ with $a \in \mathbf{R}$ and $b \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$; in other words, it is minimal if all the particles are grouped together on S^1. Thus, if $\sigma\colon [0,+\infty) \to L^2(I)$ minimizes, in some sense,

$$\int_{[0,+\infty)} \mathcal{L}(t,\sigma_t,\dot\sigma_t)\mathrm{d}t,$$

we expect that the particles parametrized by σ_t converge, as $t \to +\infty$, to an orbit q minimal for L. To say this precisely, we need some notation.

Definition. Let $K \subset \mathbf{R}$ be an interval; we denote by $AC(K,S^1)$ the class of absolutely continuous functions from K to S^1. Let $c \in \mathbf{R}$; we say that $q \in AC(K,S^1)$ is c-minimal for L if, for every $t_1 < t_2 \in K$ and $\tilde q \in AC((t_1,t_2),S^1)$ with $\tilde q(t_1) = q(t_1)$ and $\tilde q(t_2) = q(t_2)$, we have that

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} [L(t,q,\dot q) - c\dot q]\mathrm{d}t \le \int_{t_1}^{t_2} [L(t,\tilde q,\dot{\tilde q}) - c\dot{\tilde q}]\mathrm{d}t.$$

For the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ there is a similar definition of c-minimality, which we postpone to the next section.

Definition. Following the notation of [2], we call $\mathcal{G}(c)$ the set of the functions $q \in AC(\mathbf{R}, S^1)$, c-minimal for L.

We state one of the theorems of [5]; we shall define the distance $dist_{weak}(M_1, M_2)$ (which is just the 2-Wasserstein distance between the measures induced by M_1 and M_2) in the next section. In the statement, with a slight abuse of notation, we identify the number $q(t) \in \mathbf{R}$ with the function of $L^2(I)$ constantly equal to $q(t)$.

Theorem 1. *Let the potentials V and W be as above. Let $c \in \mathbf{R}$ and let $M\colon I \to \mathbf{R}$ be monotone nondecreasing with $M(1-) \leq M(0) + 1$. Then, there is an initial speed $N \in L^2(I)$ such that the solution σ_t of $(ODE)_{Lag}$ satisfies*

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \inf_{q \in \mathcal{G}(c)} [dist_{weak}(\sigma_t, q(t)) + ||\dot{\sigma}_t - \dot{q}(t)||_{L^2(I)}] = 0.$$

Since $W'(0) = 0$, if $q\colon \mathbf{R} \to S^1$ is an orbit of L, then q is an orbit of $\mathcal{L}$ too; in particular, if L has chaotic orbits, so has $\mathcal{L}$. One could ask, however, if, for any initial distribution of particles, there are orbits, chaotic in the future with that initial distribution. In view of the precise statement, we give a few definitions.

Definitions. We say that the Lagrangian L admits no invariant circle of cohomology c if, for some $t \in [0, 1)$, the set

$$\{q(t) : q \in \mathcal{G}(c)\}$$

is properly contained in S^1. We say that the interval $J \subset \mathbf{R}$ is a Birkhoff region of instability if L does not admit invariant circles of cohomology c for all $c \in J$.

It is easy to see that the orbits which are in the α-limit, or in the ω-limit of orbits in $\mathcal{G}(c)$ are still in $\mathcal{G}(c)$; we shall call this smaller set $\mathrm{Lim}(c)$.

Our aim is to prove the following.

Theorem 2. *Let the interval $J \subset \mathbf{R}$ be a Birkhoff region of instability for L. Let $M\colon I \to \mathbf{R}$ be monotone increasing, with $M(1-) \leq M(0) + 1$. Let $\{c_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \subset J$, and let $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \subset (0, 1)$. Then there are functions $T_{\epsilon_i}\colon J \to \mathbf{N}$ and $T\colon J \times J \to \mathbf{N}$ such that the following happens.*

If $\{t'_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{N}}, \{t''_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \subset (0, +\infty)$ are such that

$$t''_i - t'_i \geq T_{\epsilon_i}(c_i) \quad \text{and} \quad t'_{i+1} - t''_i \geq T(c_i, c_{i+1})$$

then there is a trajectory σ_t of $(ODE)_{Lag}$ and a sequence $t_i \in (t'_i, t''_i)$ such that $\sigma_0 = M$ and

$$\inf_{q \in \mathcal{M}(c_i)} [dist_{weak}(\sigma_{t_i}, q(t_i)) + ||\dot{\sigma}_{t_i} - \dot{q}(t_i)||_{L^2(I)}] \leq \epsilon_i. \tag{1}$$

The sets $\mathcal{M}(c_i) \subset \mathcal{G}(c_i)$ will be defined in the next section.

If, in addition, there is a class c_∞ such that $c_i = c_\infty$ for large i, then the trajectory σ has $\mathrm{Lim}(c_\infty)$ *in the ω-limit.*

The proof of this theorem, in section 3 below, is similar to that of theorem 2.10 (A) of [2]. In section 1, we shall recall some definitions and results from [5] and [8]; in section 2, we shall prove theorem 1. We shall do this for completeness' sake, since the proof of this theorem is distributed between [5] and [6] (see also [7]).

§1
Notation and preliminaries

We noticed in the introduction that $(ODE)_{Lag}$ is invariant by the actions of $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ and of the group of measure-preserving maps of I into itself. This prompts us to quotient $L^2(I)$ by these two groups; we recall from [5] some facts about this quotient.

First of all, we set

$$\mathbf{T} := \frac{L^2(I)}{L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}(I)}.$$

The space $\mathbf{T}$ is metric, with distance between the equivalence classes $[M]$ and $[\bar{M}]$ given by

$$dist_{\mathbf{Z}}([M],[\bar{M}]) := \inf_{Z \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}(I)} ||M - \bar{M} - Z||_{L^2(I)} = |||M - \bar{M}|_{S^1}||_{L^2(I)}$$

where $|x-y|_{S^1} = \min_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} |a-b-k|$. For any $x \in I$, we can choose measurably $Z(x) \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $|M(x) - \bar{M}(x)|_{S^1} = |M(x) - \bar{M}(x) - Z(x)|$; this proves the second inequality above, while the first one is the definition. It also proves that the inf in the definition of $dist_{\mathbf{Z}}$ is a minimum.

Let Group denote the group of the measurable maps of I into itself which preserve Lebesgue measure and have measurable inverse; for $M, \bar{M} \in L^2(I)$ we set

$$dist_{weak}(M,\bar{M}) = \inf_{G\in \mathrm{Group}} dist_{\mathbf{Z}}(M\circ G, \bar{M}).$$

This yields that M and $M \circ G$, which we would like to consider equivalent, have zero distance; however, if we say that $M \simeq \bar{M}$ when $\bar{M} = M \circ G$ for some $G \in$ Group, then the equivalence classes are not closed in $\mathbf{T}$, essentially because the inf in the definition of $dist_{weak}$ is not a minimum: it is possible (see [5]) that $dist_{weak}(M,\bar{M}) = 0$ even if M and $\bar{M}$ are not equivalent. But we can consider their closure if we look at the equivalence relation from the right point of view, i. e. that of the measure induced by M.

We denote by Meas the space of Borel measures on S^1, and we let $\pi\colon \mathbf{R} \to S^1$ be the natural projection. We introduce the map

$$\Phi\colon L^2(I) \to \mathrm{Meas}, \qquad \Phi\colon M \to (\pi\circ M)_\sharp \nu_0$$

where $(\cdot)_\sharp$ denotes push-forward and ν_0 is the Lebesgue measure on I. We note that Φ is invariant under the action of $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ and Group; in other words, if $Z \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ and $G \in$ Group, then $\Phi(u) = \Phi((u+Z)\circ G)$. We

say that $M \simeq \bar{M}$ if $\Phi(M) = \Phi(\bar{M})$. We set $\mathbf{S} := \frac{\mathbf{T}}{\simeq}$; on this space, we consider the metric

$$dist_{\mathbf{S}}([M],[\bar{M}]) = \inf\{||M^* - \bar{M}^*||_{L^2(I)} : M^* \in [M], \quad \bar{M}^* \in [\bar{M}]\}.$$

The infimum above is a minimum: one can always find a minimal couple $(M^*, \bar{M}^*)$ with M monotone and taking values in $[0,1]$, and $\bar{M}$ monotone and taking values in $[-\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$. By lemma 2.14 of [5], $\mathbf{S}$ is isometric to the space of Borel probability measures on S^1 with the 2-Wasserstein distance; in particular, it is a compact space. It is a consequence of proposition 2.8 of [5] that $dist_{weak}(M, \bar{M}) = dist_{\mathbf{S}}([M],[\bar{M}])$.

By proposition 2.9 of [5], which we copy below, the $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$-equivariant (or $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$-equivariant and Group-equivariant) closed forms on $L^2(I)$ have a particularly simple structure.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $S: L^2(I) \to \mathbf{R}$ be C^1.*
1) If $\mathrm{d}S$ is $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$-periodic in the sense that $\mathrm{d}_{M+Z}S = \mathrm{d}_M S$ for all $Z \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}(I)$, then there is a unique $C \in L^2(I)$ and a function $U: L^2(I) \to \mathbf{R}$, of class C^1 and $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$-periodic, such that

$$S(M) = U(M) + \langle C, M \rangle_{L^2(I)}.$$

2) If, in addition, $: M \to \mathrm{d}_M S$ is rearrangement-invariant (i. e. $\mathrm{d}_M S = \mathrm{d}_{M\circ G} S$ for all $G \in$ Group), then C is constant and U is rearrangement-invariant.

In view of the proposition above, for $c \in \mathbf{R}$ we define

$$\mathcal{L}_c(t, M, N) = \mathcal{L}(t, M, N) - \langle c, N \rangle_{L^2(I)}.$$

We also define

$$L_c(t, q, \dot{q}) = L(t, q, \dot{q}) - c\dot{q}.$$

We have already defined the c-minimal orbits of L in the introduction. In order to define the c-minimal orbits of $\mathcal{L}$, we let $K \subset \mathbf{R}$ be an open interval, bounded or not; following [1], we say that $u \in L^1_{loc}(K, L^2(I))$ is absolutely continuous (or AC) if there is $\dot{u} \in L^1_{loc}(K, L^2(I))$ such that, for any $\phi \in C^1_0(K, \mathbf{R})$, we have that

$$\int_K u_t(x)\dot{\phi}(t)\mathrm{d}t = -\int_K \dot{u}_t(x)\phi(t)\mathrm{d}t. \tag{1.1}$$

The equality above is in $L^2(I)$, i. e. it holds for a. e. $x \in I$; however, the exceptional set could depend on ϕ. But it is easy to see that this is not the case, and that $: t \to u_t(x)$ is AC for a. e. $x \in I$.

Let $c \in \mathbf{R}$; we say that $\sigma \in AC(K, L^2(I))$ is c-minimal for $\mathcal{L}$ if, for any interval $[t_0, t_1] \subset K$ and any $\tilde{\sigma} \in AC((t_0, t_1), L^2(I))$ satisfying

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{t_1} - \sigma_{t_1} \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}(I) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\sigma}_{t_2} - \sigma_{t_2} \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}(I),$$

we have that

$$\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t)\mathrm{d}t \leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathcal{L}_c(t, \tilde{\sigma}_t, \dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t)\mathrm{d}t.$$

Reverting to the one-particle case, we define, following [8], $-\alpha^L(c)$ as the infimum, over all the probability measures on $S^1 \times S^1 \times \mathbf{R}$ invariant by the Euler-Lagrange flow of L, of

$$\int_{S^1\times S^1\times \mathbf{R}} L_c(t,q,\dot{q})\mathrm{d}\mu(t,q,\dot{q}).$$

We say that an invariant probability measure $\bar{\mu}$ on $S^1 \times S^1 \times \mathbf{R}$ is c-minimal if

$$-\alpha^L(c) = \int_{S^1\times S^1\times \mathbf{R}} L_c(t,q,\dot{q})\mathrm{d}\bar{\mu}(t,q,\dot{q}).$$

For any $c \in \mathbf{R}$, there is always at least one c-minimal measure; we group the c-minimal measures in a set $\mathcal{M}_{meas}(c)$. The closure of the union of all the supports of the measures in $\mathcal{M}_{meas}(c)$ is an invariant set; we take all the orbits which have initial condition in this set and we gather them in the set $\mathcal{M}(c)$; we have that $\mathcal{M}(c) \subset \mathcal{G}(c)$.

Let now $n \in \mathbf{N}$, and let $\mathcal{A}_n$ be the σ-algebra on I generated by the intervals $[\frac{i}{n}, \frac{i+1}{n})$ with $i \in (0, \dots, n-1)$; we call $\mathcal{C}_n$ the closed subspace of the $\mathcal{A}_n$-measurable functions of $L^2(I)$, and we denote by $P_n\colon L^2(I) \to \mathcal{C}_n$ the orthogonal projection. We have a bijection

$$D_n\colon \mathbf{R}^n \to \mathcal{C}_n, \qquad D_n\colon (q_1,\dots,q_n) \to \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q_i 1_{[\frac{i}{n},\frac{i+1}{n})}(x).$$

§2
Proof of theorem 1

We shall denote by $C_{\mathrm{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$ the class of continuous, $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ and Group-equivariant functions on $L^2(I)$; we shall also denote by Mon the class of monotone increasing functions M on $I = [0,1)$, such that $M(1-) \leq M(0)+1$. We shall denote by Mon_0 the set of the $M \in Mon$ such that $M(0) \in [0,1]$.

Definition of the Lax-Oleinik semigroup for $\mathcal{L}$. Let $U \in C_{\mathrm{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$. For $c \in \mathbf{R}$ and $M \in L^2(I)$, we define

$$\hat{U}(M) = \inf\{\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t,\sigma_t,\dot{\sigma}_t)\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1) : \sigma \in AC([0,1],L^2(I)), \quad \sigma_0 = M\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $\alpha, c \in \mathbf{R}$; we call $\Lambda_{c,\alpha}$ the map

$$\Lambda_{c,\alpha}\colon U \to \hat{U} + \alpha.$$

Lemma 2.1. *The function $\hat{U}$ defined by (2.1) is $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ and* Group-*equivariant.*

Proof. We prove that $\hat{U}$ is Group-equivariant. Let $G \in$ Group; we want to show that

$$\hat{U}(M \circ G) = \hat{U}(M).$$

We note that, if $:t \to \sigma_t$ is an admissible curve for the inf defining $\hat{U}(M)$, then $\sigma_t^G := \sigma_t \circ G$ is admissible for the inf defining $\hat{U}(M \circ G)$; in other words, $\sigma_0^G = M \circ G$ and $:t \to \sigma_t^G$ is AC. Moreover, since $\mathcal{L}$ and U are Group-equivariant, we have that

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}(t, \sigma_t^G, \dot{\sigma}_t^G)\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1^G) = \int_0^1 \mathcal{L}(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t)\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1).$$

This implies that $\hat{U}(M \circ G) \leq \hat{U}(M)$; this same formula, substituting $M \circ G$ for M and G^{-1} for G, yields the opposite inequality.

\\\

Proposition 2.2. *Let $U \in C_{\mathrm{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$, let $M \in Mon$, and let $\hat{U}(M)$ be defined as in (2.1). Then, the following hold.*
1) $\hat{U}(M)$ is finite and there is $\sigma \in AC([0,1], L^2(I))$ on which $\hat{U}(M)$ is attained.
2) The function σ of point 1) is c-minimal for $\mathcal{L}$ on $[0,1]$ and $\sigma_t \in Mon$ for all $t \in [0,1]$.

Remark. We are going to show below that, if $M \in Mon$ and σ_t is minimal, then $:x \to \sigma_t x$ is monotone for all $t \geq 0$; however, we only prove that $\sigma_t 1 \leq \sigma_t 0 + 1$ holds for a particular minimal.

Proof. We need a few lemmas.

Lemma 2.3. *If $U \in C_{\mathrm{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$, then U is bounded.*

Proof. Let $M \in L^2(I)$ and let $\tilde{M} = M + Z$, where we have added $Z \in L^2_Z$ is such a way that $\tilde{M}$ has range in $[0,1]$; thus $\bar{M}$, the monotone rearrangement of $\tilde{M}$, belongs to Mon_0. Since M and $\bar{M}$ are equivalent in the sense of section 1 (they induce the same measure on S^1), lemma 2.6 of [5] says that M can be approximated in L^2 by a sequence $\bar{M} \circ G_n + Z_n$, with $G_n \in$ Group and $Z_n \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$. Since U is continuous, Group and $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$-invariant, we get that $U(M) = U(\bar{M})$; thus it suffices to show that U is bounded on Mon_0. But this follows, since, in the norm topology of $L^2(I)$, Mon_0 is compact and U is continuous. Said differently, U quotients to a continuous function on $\mathbf{S}$; since we saw in section 1 that $\mathbf{S}$ is compact, we have that U is bounded.

\\\

Lemma 2.4. *1) For any $M \in L^2(I)$, $\hat{U}(M)$ is finite.*
2) If σ satisfies $\sigma_0 = M$ and

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t)\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1) \leq \hat{U}(M) + 1 \tag{2.2}$$

then

$$\int_0^1 ||\dot{\sigma}_t||^2_{L^2(I)}\mathrm{d}t < C$$

for some $C > 0$ independent on U and M.

Proof. We begin to prove that $\hat{U}(M)$ is finite. We note that $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ are bounded, because they are the integral of the bounded functions V and W; U is bounded by lemma 2.3. Since

$$\int_0^1 [\frac{1}{2}\|\dot{\sigma}_t\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t\rangle_{L^2(I)}]\mathrm{d}t$$

is bounded from below, (2.1) immediately implies that $\hat{U}(M) > -\infty$.

We prove that $\hat{U}(M) < +\infty$. We saw in lemma 2.3 that U quotients to a continuous function on the compact space $\mathbf{S}$. In paticular, U reaches its minimum on an equivalence class $[\bar{M}]$.

Since $|a-b|_{S^1} \leq 1$, the definition of $dist_{\mathbf{Z}}$ implies that the diameter of $\mathbf{T}$ is smaller than 1; in particular, we can find $Z \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ such that, setting $\tilde{M} = \bar{M} + Z$, we have $||\tilde{M} - M||_{L^2(I)} \leq 1$. We define

$$\tilde{\sigma}_t = (1-t)M + t\tilde{M}$$

and we see that (2.1) implies the first inequality below; the second one follows from the fact that $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ are bounded; the last one follows from the fact that $\|\tilde{M} - M\|_{L^2(I)} \leq 1$.

$$\hat{U}(M) \leq \int_0^1 [\frac{1}{2}\|\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t\rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(\tilde{\sigma}_t) - \mathcal{W}(\tilde{\sigma}_t)]\mathrm{d}t + U(\tilde{\sigma}_1) \leq$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{M} - M\|^2_{L^2(I)} + |c| \cdot \|\tilde{M} - M\|_{L^2(I)} + C_4 + U(\tilde{M}) \leq C_5 + \min U.$$

This ends the proof of point 1). Let now σ be as in point 2); the first inequality below is (2.2), the second one follows by the last formula.

$$\int_0^1 [\frac{1}{2}\|\dot{\sigma}_t\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t\rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(\sigma_t) - \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t)]\mathrm{d}t \leq$$

$$\hat{U}(M) + 1 - U(\sigma_1) \leq C_5 + 1 + \min U - U(\sigma_1) \leq C_5 + 1.$$

Since $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ are bounded, we get the thesis.

\\\

Following [GT], we show that we can approximate with a finite number of particles.

Lemma 2.5. *Let σ satisfy (2.2), let P_n be the projection defined in section 1 and let $\sigma^n_t = P_n\sigma_t$. Then,*

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma^n_t, \dot{\sigma}^n_t)\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma^n_1) \to \int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t)\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. Let σ and σ^n be as in the statement of the lemma. We assert that, as $n \to +\infty$,

$$\int_0^1 ||\sigma^n_t - \sigma_t||_{L^2(I)}\mathrm{d}t \to 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^1 ||\dot{\sigma}^n_t - \dot{\sigma}_t||^2_{L^2(I)}\mathrm{d}t \to 0. \tag{2.4}$$

The first limit in (2.2) follows by the dominated convergence theorem: indeed, P_n converges pointwise to the identity and

$$||\sigma^n_t||_{L^2(I)} \leq ||\sigma_t||_{L^2(I)} \leq C_1 \qquad \forall t \in [0,1].$$

The last inequality above follows from the fact that, since σ is continuous, $\sigma_{[0,1]}$ is compact in $L^2(I)$. The second limit in (2.3) follows analogously, since $\dot{\sigma}_t^n = P_n\dot{\sigma}_t \to \dot{\sigma}_t$ and $\|\dot{\sigma}_t^n\|^2_{L^2(I)} \leq \|\dot{\sigma}_t\|^2_{L^2(I)}$ for a. e. t; this latter function is integrable on $[0,1]$ by point 2) of lemma 2.4.

The second inequality below follows from the fact that V and W are Lipschitz; the last one follows from Hölder; the first formula of (2.4) implies the convergence.

$$\left|\int_0^1 [\mathcal{V}(\sigma_t^n) + \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t^n) - \mathcal{V}(\sigma_t) - \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t^n)]\mathrm{d}t\right| \leq$$

$$\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}t \int_I |V(t,\sigma_t^n x) - V(\sigma_t x)|\mathrm{d}x + \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}t \int_{I\times I} |W(\sigma_t^n x - \sigma_t^n y) - W(\sigma_t x - \sigma_t y)|\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y \leq$$

$$\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}t \int_I C_4|\sigma_t^n x - \sigma_t x|\mathrm{d}x \leq C_4 \int_0^1 ||\sigma_t^n - \sigma_t||_{L^2(I)}\mathrm{d}t \to 0. \tag{2.5}$$

Applying the formula above, the second one of (2.4) and the fact that U is continuous on $\mathbf{T}$, we get that

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t,\sigma^n,\dot{\sigma}^n)\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1^n) = \int_0^1 [\frac{1}{2}\|\dot{\sigma}_t^n\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t^n\rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(\sigma_t^n) - \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t^n)]\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1^n) \to$$

$$\int_0^1 [\frac{1}{2}\|\dot{\sigma}_t\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t\rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(\sigma_t) - \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t)]\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1) = \int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t,\sigma,\dot{\sigma})\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1)$$

which is the thesis.

\\\

We now introduce the finite-dimensional Lagrangian on n particles, each of mass $\frac{1}{n}$:

$$L_{n,c}(t,q,\dot{q}) = \frac{1}{2n}\sum_{i=1}^n |\dot{q}_i|^2 - \frac{c}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \dot{q}_i - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n V(t,q_i) - \frac{1}{2n^2}\sum_{i,j=1}^n W(q_i - q_j).$$

With this definition we have that, if the operator D_n is defined as at the end of section 1,

$$L_{n,c}(t,q,\dot{q}) = \mathcal{L}_c(t, D_n q, D_n \dot{q}).$$

This implies the following relation between the Lax-Oleinik operators of L_n and $\mathcal{L}$:

$$\delta_n := \min\{\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t,\gamma_t,\dot{\gamma}_t)\mathrm{d}t + U(\gamma_1) : \gamma\colon [0,1] \to \mathcal{C}_n, \quad \gamma_0 = P_n M\} =$$

$$\min\{\int_0^1 L_{n,c}(t,q,\dot{q})\mathrm{d}t + U(D_n q(1)) : q\colon [0,1] \to \mathbf{R}^n, \quad D_n q(0) = P_n M\}. \tag{2.6}$$

The minimum in the second formula above is attained by Tonelli's theorem; clearly, if the second minimum is attained on q, the first one is attained on $D_n q$, and vice-versa. Now, lemma 2.5 implies that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \delta_n \leq \hat{U}(M). \tag{2.7}$$

In the following, we shall show that there is γ^n, minimal in (2.6), is such that $\gamma_t^n \in Mon$ for $t \in [0,1]$. We shall also show that γ^n has a subsequence γ^{n_k} converging uniformly to some $\gamma \in AC([0,1], L^2(I))$, i. e.

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} ||\gamma_t^{n_k} - \gamma_t||_{L^2(I)} = 0. \tag{2.8}$$

We assert that this implies proposition 2.2. First of all, since $\gamma_t^{n_k} \in Mon$ and (2.8) holds, we have that $\gamma_t \in Mon$ for $t \in [0,1]$. Moreover, if (2.8) holds, then we see as in (2.5) that

$$\int_0^1 [\mathcal{V}(t,\gamma_t^{n_k}) + \mathcal{W}(\gamma_t^{n_k})]\mathrm{d}t \to \int_0^1 [\mathcal{V}(t,\gamma_t) + \mathcal{W}(\gamma_t)]\mathrm{d}t.$$

On the other hand, the L^2 norm of the derivative is lower semicontinuous with respect to uniform convergence (this is true for maps valued in $\mathbf{R}^n$; it can be shown for maps valued in $L^2(I)$ by projecting on larger and larger subspaces), and thus

$$\int_0^1 \frac{1}{2}\|\dot\gamma_t\|^2_{L^2(I)}\mathrm{d}t \le \liminf_{n\to+\infty} \int_0^1 \frac{1}{2}\|\dot\gamma_t^{n_k}\|^2_{L^2(I)}\mathrm{d}t.$$

Moreover,

$$\int_0^1 \langle c, \dot\sigma_t^n\rangle_{L^2(I)}\mathrm{d}t = \langle c, \sigma_1^n - \sigma_0^n\rangle \to \langle c, \sigma_1 - \sigma_0\rangle = \int_0^1 \langle c, \dot\sigma_t\rangle_{L^2(I)}\mathrm{d}t.$$

By the last three formulas and the continuity of U, we have that

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t,\gamma_t,\dot\gamma_t)\mathrm{d}t + U(\gamma_1) \le \liminf_{k\to+\infty} \left[\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t,\gamma_t^{n_k},\dot\gamma_t^{n_k})\mathrm{d}t + U(\gamma_1^{n_k})\right].$$

This, (2.7) and the fact that δ_{n_k} is attained on γ_{n_k} yield

$$\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}(t,\gamma_t,\dot\gamma_t)\mathrm{d}t + U(\gamma_1) \le \hat U(M).$$

Since $\gamma_0^n = P_n M$, we get that $\gamma_0 = M$; thus, by (2.1), equality holds in the formula above; this proves part of point 1) of the thesis, namely the existence of a minimizer. The fact that $\hat U(M)$ is finite, is point 1) of lemma 2.4. Moreover, we get that the lim sup of (2.7) is actually a limit and is equal to $\hat U(M)$.

As for point 2), we have just seen that $\gamma_t \in Mon$ for $t \in [0,1]$. The fact that σ_t is c-minimal follows immediately from the fact that σ_t minimizes in (2.1).

We need the next three lemmas to prove that, when $M \in Mon$, (2.8) holds. Naturally, there are similar lemmas in [5] and [6]: "self contained" is often synonymous with "reinventing the wheel".

Lemma 2.6. *Let P_nM be monotone increasing, and let the first* min *of (2.6) be attained on γ^n. Then $: x \to \gamma_t^n x$ is monotone increasing for all $t \in [0,1]$.*

Proof. We have seen after (2.6) that there is a function $(q_1(t),\dots,q_n(t))$, minimal in the second formula of (2.6), such that $\gamma_t^n = D_n(q_1(t),\dots,q_n(t))$; since P_nM is monotone increasing, we have that $q_1(0) \le q_2(0) \le \dots \le q_n(0)$. We must prove that, up to rearranging the indices for which $q_i(0) = q_{i+1}(0) = \dots = q_{i+l}(0)$, we have $q_1(t) \le q_2(t) \le \dots \le q_n(t)$ for $t \in [0,1]$. Since this follows from the fact that the orbits q_i are an ordered set, it suffices to prove that there are no two times $t_1 < t_2 \in [0,1]$ and two indices $i < j$ such that

$$q_i(t_1) < q_j(t_1) \quad \text{and} \quad q_i(t_2) > q_j(t_2). \tag{2.9}$$

We shall argue by contradiction, supposing that the formula above holds. Let us define a new orbit $\tilde q$ as

$$\tilde q_i(t) = \min(q_i(t), q_j(t)), \quad \tilde q_j(t) = \max(q_i(t), q_j(t)), \quad \tilde q_l(t) = q_l(t) \quad \text{for} \quad l \ne i,j.$$

Since P_nM is monotone, we have that $\tilde{q}(0) = q(0)$; using the fact that U is Group-invariant, we get that

$$\int_0^1 L_{n,c}(t, q, \dot{q})\mathrm{d}t + U(D_n q(1)) = \int_0^1 L_{n,c}(t, \tilde{q}, \dot{\tilde{q}})\mathrm{d}t + U(D_n \tilde{q}(1)). \tag{2.10}$$

On the other hand, $\tilde{q}$ is not minimal. To show this, let us suppose by contradiction that $\tilde{q}$ is minimal; in particular, it is a solution of the Euler-Lagrange equation and it is C^1. Since q is continuous, by (2.9) there is $\bar{t} \in (t_1, t_2)$ such that $q_i(\bar{t}) = q_j(\bar{t}) = \tilde{q}_i(\bar{t}) = \tilde{q}_j(\bar{t})$. We have seen that $\tilde{q}_i$ and $\tilde{q}_j$ are C^1; this and their definition imply that

$$\dot{q}_i(\bar{t}) = \dot{q}_j(\bar{t}) = \dot{\tilde{q}}_i(\bar{t}) = \dot{\tilde{q}}_j(\bar{t}).$$

Now the solutions q and $\tilde{q}$ have the same initial conditions at $\bar{t}$ but they do not coincide, a contradiction.

Since $\tilde{q}$ is not minimal, we can find $\hat{q}$ with the same boundary conditions of $\tilde{q}$ such that

$$\int_0^1 L_{n,c}(t, \hat{q}, \dot{\hat{q}})\mathrm{d}t + U(D_n \hat{q}(1)) < \int_0^1 L_{n,c}(t, \tilde{q}, \dot{\tilde{q}})\mathrm{d}t + U(D_n \tilde{q}(1)).$$

We recall that $\hat{q}(0) = \tilde{q}(0) = q(0)$, while $\hat{q}(1) = \tilde{q}(1)$ coincides with $q(1)$ up to rearranging indices, and thus $U(D_n q(1)) = U(D_n \hat{q}(1))$; this, together with the last formula and (2.10), contradict the minimality of q.

\\\

Lemma 2.7. *Let $P_nM \in Mon$. Then there is γ, minimal in the first formula of (2.6), such that $\gamma_t \in Mon$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.*

Proof. We have seen in the last lemma that, if γ_0 is monotone, then γ_t is monotone for $t \in [0, 1]$; thus, we have only to prove that, if $\gamma_0(1) - \gamma_0(0) \leq 1$, then there is a minimal γ such that $\gamma_t(1) - \gamma_t(0) \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$.

We have also seen that there is $q\colon [0, 1] \to \mathbf{R}^n$, minimal in the second formula of (2.6), such that $\gamma_t = D_n q(t)$.

There are two cases; the first one is $\gamma_0(1) - \gamma_0(0) < 1$ or, equivalently, $q_n(0) - q_1(0) < 1$. Let us suppose by contradiction that the thesis is false; then there is $t_1 \in (0, 1]$ such that $\gamma_{t_1}(1) - \gamma_{t_1}(0) > 1$; since $\gamma_t = D_n q(t)$, this means that

$$q_n(t_1) - q_1(t_1) > 1. \tag{2.11}$$

Let us consider the orbit

$$\tilde{q}_1(t) = q_1(t) + 1, \quad \tilde{q}_i(t) = q_i(t) \quad \text{for} \quad i \neq 1.$$

Since $L_{n,c}$ is invariant by integer translations and permutation of indices, $\tilde{q}$ is a minimizer in the second formula of (2.6) with initial condition $\tilde{q}(0)$. Since $q_n(0) - q_1(0) < 1$, we get that $\tilde{q}_1(0) > \tilde{q}_n(0)$, while by (2.11) we have that $\tilde{q}_1(t_1) < \tilde{q}_n(t_1)$. In other words, $\tilde{q}_1$ and $\tilde{q}_n$ cross; but this is forbidden by the last lemma.

In the second case, $q_n(0) = q_1(0) + 1$; we set $\tilde{q}_n(0) = q_n(0) - \epsilon$ and $\tilde{q}_i(0) = q_i(0)$ for $i < n$. We assert that $\hat{U}(D_n \tilde{q}(0)) \to \hat{U}(D_n q(0))$ for $\epsilon \to 0$; indeed, here we are dealing with the Lax-Oleinik semigroup in finite dimension, and it is a standard theorem that, in this case, $\hat{U}$ it is Lipschitz.

Let $\tilde{q}$ minimize in (2.6) with initial condition $\tilde{q}(0)$; since $\tilde{q}_n(0) < \tilde{q}_1(0) + 1$ by definition, the last paragraph implies that $D_n\tilde{q}(t) \in Mon$ for all t. We call $\bar{q}$ the limit of the orbits $\tilde{q}$ as $\epsilon \to 0$; again because we are dealing with a Lagrangian in $\mathbf{R}^n$, it is standard to see that this limit exists along a subsequence. It is a standard fact (which we reproved after (2.6)) that the limit $D_n\bar{q}$ minimizes; moreover, it belongs to Mon, being the limit of functions in Mon.

\\\

We now end the proof of (2.8); we have seen that proposition 2 follows from this formula. Let γ^n be minimal in (2.6); by point 2) of lemma 2.4 and the fact that U is continuous,

$$\int_0^1 ||\dot{\gamma}_t^n||^2_{L^2(I)} \mathrm{d}t \leq C$$

for some $C > 0$ independent on n. As a consequence, the $\frac{1}{2}$-Hölder norm of $\gamma^n \colon [0,1] \to L^2(I)$ is bounded uniformly in n; since the L^2-norm of $\gamma_0^n = P_n M$ is bounded too, we get that

$$||\gamma_t^n||_{L^2(I)} \leq C_3 \quad \forall t \in [0,1]$$

for some $C_3 > 0$ independent on n. By lemma 2.7, we can suppose that $\gamma_t^n \in Mon$ for all $t \in [0,1]$; in particular, $\gamma_t^n(x) - \gamma_t^n(0) \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0,1]$ and $x \in I$. Together with the last formula, this implies that

$$||\gamma_t^n||_{L^\infty(I)} \leq C_4 \quad \forall t \in [0,1].$$

Since $\gamma_t \in Mon$, by the last formula we have that, for all $t \in [0,1]$,

$$\gamma_t^n \in A := Mon \cap \{u \in L^2(I) : \, ||u||_{L^\infty(I)} \leq C_4\}.$$

Thus $\gamma^n \colon [0,1] \to L^2(I)$ is a uniformly $\frac{1}{2}$-Hölder sequence with values in the set A, which is compact in $L^2(I)$ by one of Helly's theorems; now (2.8) follows by Ascoli-Arzelà.

\\\

We now begin to analyze the Lax-Oleinik operator $\Lambda_{c,\alpha}$, with a view to prove that, for a suitable choice of α, it has a fixed point in $C_{\mathrm{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$.

Lemma 2.8. *There is $L > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $U \in C_{\mathrm{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$, and let $\hat{U}$ be defined as in (2.1). Then $\hat{U}$ is L-Lipschitz for $dist_{\mathbf{Z}}$.*

Proof. Let $\hat{U}$ be defined as in (2.1), and let $M_1, M_2 \in L^2(I)$; we have to prove that

$$|\hat{U}(M_1) - \hat{U}(M_2)| \leq L dist_{\mathbf{Z}}(M_1, M_2). \tag{2.12}$$

By section 1 and lemma 2.1, up to adding elements of $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ to M_1 and M_2, we can suppose that M_1 takes values in $[0,1]$, M_2 takes values in $[-1,2]$ and

$$dist_{\mathbf{Z}}(M_1, M_2) = ||M_1 - M_2||_{L^2(I)}. \tag{2.13}$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be fixed; by (2.1), we can find σ_t^1 with $\sigma_0^1 = M_1$ such that

$$\hat{U}(M_1) \geq \int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t^1, \dot{\sigma}_t^1)\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_1^1) - \epsilon. \tag{2.14}$$

We recall that we cannot use proposition 2.2, because M_1 belongs to $L^2(I)$, not to Mon. We set

$$\sigma_t^2 = \sigma_t^1 + (1-t)(M_2 - M_1).$$

By (2.14), the definition of $\hat{U}(M_2)$ and the fact that $\sigma_1^1 = \sigma_1^2$, we get the first inequality below.

$$\hat{U}(M_2) - \hat{U}(M_1) \leq \int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t^2, \dot{\sigma}_t^2)\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t^1, \dot{\sigma}_t^1)\mathrm{d}t + \epsilon \leq$$

$$-\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}t \int_I \dot{\sigma}_t(x)[M_2(x) - M_1(x)]\mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}t \int_I |M_2(x) - M_1(x)|^2 \mathrm{d}x +$$

$$c\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}t \int_I (M_2(x) - M_1(x))\mathrm{d}x + 2A\int_0^1 (1-t)\mathrm{d}t \int_I |M_2(x) - M_1(x)|\mathrm{d}x + \epsilon.$$

The second inequality above comes from the fact that the potentials V and W are A-Lipschitz for some $A > 0$. Now we apply Cauchy-Schwarz to the formula above; we recall that, by (2.14) and lemma 2.4, we have $||\dot{\sigma}||_{L^2([0,1]\times I)} \leq C$ with C independent on U and M. We get

$$\hat{U}(M_2) - \hat{U}(M_1) \leq \tilde{L}(\|M_1 - M_2\|_{L^2(I)}^2 + \|M_1 - M_2\|_{L^2(I)}) + \epsilon.$$

Since M_1, M_2 take values in $[-1, 2]$, the last formula implies that

$$\hat{U}(M_2) - \hat{U}(M_1) \leq L||M_1 - M_2||_{L^2(I)} + \epsilon.$$

Using (2.13) and the fact that $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we get

$$\hat{U}(M_2) - \hat{U}(M_1) \leq L dist_{\mathbf{Z}}(M_1, M_2).$$

Interchanging the rôles of M_1 and M_2, we get (2.12).

\\\

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\hat{U}$ and $L > 0$ be as in the last lemma. Then $\hat{U}$ quotients to a function on $\mathbf{S}$, which is L-Lipschitz for $dist_{\mathbf{S}}$.*

Proof. Let $M_1, M_2 \in L^2(I)$; we know by section 1 that there are $\tilde{M}_1 \in [M_1]$ and $\tilde{M}_2 \in [M_2]$ such that $\tilde{M}_1$ is monotone and has range in $[0, 1]$, $\tilde{M}_2$ is monotone and has range in $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$ and

$$dist_{\mathbf{S}}([M_1], [M_2]) = ||\tilde{M}_1 - \tilde{M}_2||_{L^2(I)} = dist_{\mathbf{Z}}(\tilde{M}_1, \tilde{M}_2).$$

By lemma 2.6 of [5], M_1 can be approximated in $L^2(I)$ by a sequence $(\tilde{M}_1 + Z_i) \circ G_i$ with $Z_i \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ and $G_i \in$ Group, and the same holds for M_2. Since $dist_{\mathbf{Z}}(M, N) \leq ||M - N||_{L^2(I)}$, lemma 2.8 implies that $\hat{U}$ is continuous on $L^2(I)$; since $\hat{U}$ is equivariant too (lemma 2.1), we get the first equality below.

$$|\hat{U}(M_1) - \hat{U}(M_2)| = |\hat{U}(\tilde{M}_1) - \hat{U}(\tilde{M}_2)| \leq$$

$$Ldist_{\mathbf{Z}}(\tilde{M}_1, \tilde{M}_2) = Ldist_{\mathbf{S}}([M_1], [M_2]).$$

The inequality above comes from lemma 2.8; the last formula implies the thesis.

\\\

At the beginning of this section, we defined the operator $\Lambda_{c,\alpha}$; by the last lemma, it brings $C_{\text{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$ into itself. As usual for Lax-Oleinik operators, it is non-expansive.

Lemma 2.10. *The operator $\Lambda_{c,\alpha}$ from $C_{\text{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$ into itself is 1-Lipschitz for the* sup *norm on $C_{\text{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$.*

Proof. From (2.1) we get that, if $U_1 \leq U_2$, then $\hat{U}_1 \leq \hat{U}_2$; moreover, if $\beta \in \mathbf{R}$, then $(U + \beta)\hat{} = \hat{U} + \beta$. Thus, if $U_3, U_4 \in C_{\text{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$, we have

$$\hat{U}_4 \leq (U_3 + ||U_4 - U_3||_{\sup})\hat{} = \hat{U}_3 + ||U_4 - U_3||_{\sup}.$$

Interchanging the rôles of U_3 and U_4, we get the thesis.

\\\

Proposition 2.11. *There is a unique constant $\alpha(c)$ such that the operator $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}$ has a fixed point in $C_{\text{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$. If L is as in lemma 2.9, the fixed points are L-Lipschitz on $\mathbf{S}$ for $dist_{\mathbf{S}}$.*

Proof. Let us denote by $Lip_L(\mathbf{S})$ the functions U defined on $\mathbf{S}$ which are L-Lipschitz for $dist_{\mathbf{S}}$. We see as in lemma 2.9 that, if $U \in C_{\text{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$ is L-Lipschitz for $\|\cdot\|_{L^2(I)}$, then U quotients to a function on $\mathbf{S}$ which is L-Lipschitz for $dist_{\mathbf{S}}$; vice-versa, any function in $Lip_L(\mathbf{S})$ lifts to an L-Lipschitz function in $C_{\text{Group}}(\mathbf{T})$: just compose with the projection on $\mathbf{S}$. As a consequence, it suffices to find a fixed point of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha}$ on $Lip_L(\mathbf{S})$.

We have seen in lemma 2.10 that, if $a \in \mathbf{R}$,

$$\Lambda_{c,\alpha}(U + a) = \Lambda_{c,\alpha}U + a.$$

This prompts us to follow [4] and to define the space

$$Lip^0_L(\mathbf{S}) = \{U \in Lip_L(\mathbf{S}) : U([f]) = 0\}$$

where $f\colon I \to S^1$ is the function $f(x) \equiv 0$ and $[\cdot]$ denotes the equivalence class. This is a set of equicontinuous functions on $\mathbf{S}$; since $\mathbf{S}$ is bounded, $Lip^0_L(\mathbf{S})$ is equibounded too.

We set

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_c(U) = \hat{U} - \hat{U}([f]).$$

By section 1, $\mathbf{S}$ is compact set for $dist_{\mathbf{S}}$; thus, $Lip_L^0(\mathbf{S})$ is, by Ascoli-Arzelà, a compact set of $C(\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{R})$; moreover, it is convex. The function $\tilde{\Lambda}_c$ brings this set into itself by lemma 2.9 and is continuous (actually, 2-Lipschitz) by lemma 2.10; thus, $\tilde{\Lambda}_c$ has a fixed point U_{fix} by the Schauder fixed point theorem. If we set

$$\alpha(c) = -\hat{U}_{fix}([f])$$

we see by the definition of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}$ that

$$\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}(U_{fix}) = \hat{U}_{fix} + \alpha(c) = \hat{U}_{fix} - \hat{U}_{fix}([f]) = \tilde{\Lambda}_c(U_{fix}) = U_{fix}$$

i. e. that U_{fix} is a fixed point of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}$ on $Lip_L(\mathbf{S})$.

It remains to prove that $\alpha(c)$ is unique. Let us suppose by contradiction that there is $\alpha \neq \alpha(c)$ such that $\Lambda_{c,\alpha}$ has a fixed point U_1; to fix ideas, let $\alpha > \alpha(c)$. Clearly, U_1 is a fixed point of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha}^n$, while U_{fix} is a fixed point of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}^n$; this implies the first equality below.

$$\|U_1 - U_{fix}\|_{\sup} = ||\Lambda_{c,\alpha}^n U_1 - \Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}^n U_{fix}||_{\sup} =$$

$$||\Lambda_{c,\alpha}^n U_1 - \Lambda_{c,\alpha}^n U_{fix} + n(\alpha - \alpha(c))||_{\sup} \geq -||U_1 - U_{fix}||_{\sup} + n(\alpha - \alpha(c))$$

where the last inequality comes from lemma 2.10. But U_1 and U_{fix} are bounded by lemma 2.3; we let $n \to +\infty$ in the formula above and, recalling that $\alpha > \alpha(c)$, we get a contradiction. The case $\alpha < \alpha(c)$ is analogous.

\\\

We now want to prove that the function $\alpha(c)$ of the last lemma coincides with the function $\alpha^L(c)$ we defined in section 1. The connection is provided by the following fact (see [4] for a proof): $\alpha^L(c)$ is the unique $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}$ for which the Lax-Oleinik operator

$$\hat{\Lambda}\colon C(S^1) \to C(S^1)$$

$$(\hat{\Lambda}u)(x) = \alpha + \min\{\int_0^1 L_c(t, q, \dot{q})\mathrm{d}t + u(q(1)) : \, q(0) = x\}$$

has a fixed point. The minimum above is attained by Tonelli's theorem.

Lemma 2.12. $\alpha^L(c) = \alpha(c)$.

Proof. By the last proposition, there is a fixed point U of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}$. Since U is a fixed point of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}^k$ too, we can apply proposition 2.2 to $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}^k$: for a constant function $M \equiv x_0$, we can find $\bar{\sigma} \in AC([0,k], L^2(I))$, c-minimal for $\mathcal{L}$ and such that $\bar{\sigma}_0 = M$ and

$$U(M) = \int_0^k [\mathcal{L}_c(t, \bar{\sigma}_t, \dot{\bar{\sigma}}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t + U(\bar{\sigma}_k).$$

It can be proven as in [4] that $\bar{\sigma}$ does not depend on k, but we shall not need this in the proof. Since $||U||_{Sup} \leq C$ by lemma 2.3, we get that

$$\left| \int_0^k [\mathcal{L}_c(t, \bar{\sigma}_t, \dot{\bar{\sigma}}_t) + \alpha(c)] \mathrm{d}t \right| \leq 2C \quad \forall k \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{2.15}$$

On the other hand, let u be a fixed point of $\hat{\Lambda}$ and let $\bar{q}$ realize the min in the definition of $(\hat{\Lambda}^k u)(x_0)$; we get as above that

$$u(x_0) = \int_0^k [L(t, \bar{q}, \dot{\bar{q}}) + \alpha^L(c)] \mathrm{d}t + u(\bar{q}(k)).$$

Since u is bounded (it is a continuous function on S^1) we get again that, possibly increasing C,

$$\left| \int_0^k [L_c(t, \bar{q}, \dot{\bar{q}}) + \alpha^L(c)] \mathrm{d}t \right| \leq 2C \quad \forall k \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{2.16}$$

Since $\bar{q}(0) = M \equiv x_0$, (2.1) implies the first inequality below; as we did above, we identify the number $\bar{q}(t)$ with the function in $L^2(I)$ constantly equal to $\bar{q}(t)$; we could have underlined this identification using the operator D_1.

$$U(M) = (\Lambda^k_{c,\alpha(c)} U)(M) \leq \int_0^k [\mathcal{L}_c(t, \bar{q}, \dot{\bar{q}}) + \alpha(c)] \mathrm{d}t + U(\bar{q}(k)) =$$

$$\int_0^k [L_c(t, \bar{q}, \dot{\bar{q}}) + \alpha(c)] \mathrm{d}t + U(\bar{q}(k)) = \int_0^k [L_c(t, \bar{q}, \dot{\bar{q}}) + \alpha^L(c)] \mathrm{d}t + k[\alpha(c) - \alpha^L(c)] + U(\bar{q}(k)) \leq$$

$$k[\alpha(c) - \alpha^L(c)] + U(\bar{q}(k)) + 2C.$$

The second equality above comes from the fact that $W(0) = 0$, the second inequality from (2.16). Since U is bounded, taking k large in the formula above, we get that

$$\alpha(c) \geq \alpha^L(c). \tag{2.17}$$

We prove the opposite inequality. Let $\bar{\sigma}$ be as in (2.15); by lemma 2.5, we can find $n = n(k, \bar{\sigma})$ so large that, defining $q = (q_1, \ldots, q_n)$ by $D_n q(t) = P_n \bar{\sigma}_t$, we have

$$\int_0^k \mathcal{L}_c(t, \bar{\sigma}_t, \dot{\bar{\sigma}}_t) \mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma_k) \geq \int_0^k L_{n,c}(t, q, \dot{q}) \mathrm{d}t + U(D_n q(k)) - 1.$$

We recall that $||U||_{\sup} \leq C$; we set $C_1 = 2C + 1$ and we get from the formula above that

$$\int_0^k \mathcal{L}_c(t, \bar{\sigma}_t, \dot{\bar{\sigma}}_t) \mathrm{d}t + C_1 \geq \int_0^k L_{n,c}(t, q, \dot{q}) \mathrm{d}t.$$

Note that C_1 does not depend on k and n. Since

$$L_{n,c}(t, q, \dot{q}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L_c(t, q_i, \dot{q}_i) - \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n W(q_i - q_j)$$

and $W \leq 0$, we get that there is $i \in (1, \ldots, n)$ such that

$$\int_0^k \mathcal{L}_c(t, \bar{\sigma}_t, \dot{\bar{\sigma}}_t) \mathrm{d}t + C_1 \geq \int_0^k L_c(t, q_i, \dot{q}_i) \mathrm{d}t.$$

Taking $\tilde{q}$ minimal in the definition of $(\hat{\Lambda}^k u)(q_i(0))$, we get the inequality below.

$$u(q_i(0)) = \int_0^k [L_c(t, \tilde{q}, \dot{\tilde{q}}) + \alpha^L(c)]\mathrm{d}t + u(\tilde{q}(k)) \leq \int_0^k [L_c(t, q_i, \dot{q}_i) + \alpha^L(c)]\mathrm{d}t + u(q_i(k)).$$

Since u is bounded, by the last two formulas we get

$$\int_0^k L_c(t, \tilde{q}, \dot{\tilde{q}})\mathrm{d}t \leq \int_0^k \mathcal{L}_c(t, \bar{\sigma}_t, \dot{\bar{\sigma}}_t)\mathrm{d}t + C_2$$

for some $C_2 > 0$ independent on n and k. We have put into C_2 the bounded contribution of u. We note that (2.16) holds for $\tilde{q}$ too; indeed, in the proof we only used that $\tilde{q}$ is minimal and that u is bounded. Now, (2.16) for $\tilde{q}$ and (2.15) yield the first inequality below; the last formula yields the second one.

$$k[\alpha(c) - \alpha^L(c)] \leq \int_0^k L_c(t, \tilde{q}, \dot{\tilde{q}})\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^k \mathcal{L}_c(t, \bar{\sigma}_t, \dot{\bar{\sigma}}_t)\mathrm{d}t + 4C \leq C_3.$$

Letting $k \to +\infty$, we get the inequality opposite to (2.17), and we are done.

\\\

The next lemma tells us the the sets $\mathcal{G}(c)$ for L or for $\mathcal{L}$ coincide.

Lemma 2.13. *Let $\sigma\colon \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{T}$ be c-minimal for $\mathcal{L}$; moreover, let $\sigma_t \in Mon$ for all $t \in \mathbf{R}$ and let*

$$\liminf_{k \to +\infty} \int_{-k}^k [\mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t < +\infty. \tag{2.18}$$

Let ν_0 denote the Lebesgue measure on I. Then there is q, c-minimal for L, such that $(\pi \circ \sigma_t)_\sharp \nu_0 = \delta_{q(t)}$.

Proof. We assert that it suffices to prove that

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t)\mathrm{d}t = 0. \tag{2.19}$$

First of all, the integral above is well defined for any σ_t, though possibly equal to $-\infty$; this is because $\mathcal{W} \leq 0$. Now, let σ_t satisfy (2.19); since $\mathcal{W} \leq 0$ and $: t \to \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t)$ is continuous (we recall that σ_t is AC) we get that $\mathcal{W}(\sigma_t) = 0$ for $t \in \mathbf{R}$. By our hypotheses on W, this implies that

$$\sigma_t x - \sigma_t y \in \mathbf{Z} \quad \text{for a. e.} \quad (x, y) \in I \times I.$$

By Fubini and the fact that $: t \to \sigma_t x$ is AC for a. e. x, we can choose x such that, setting, $q(t) = \sigma_t x$, we have

a) $\sigma_t y - q(t) \in \mathbf{Z}$ for a. e. $y \in I$.

b) q is AC.

Now a) implies that $(\pi \circ \sigma_t)\nu_0 = \delta_{q(t)}$, which is part of the thesis; it remains to prove that q is c-minimal. To do this, we set $\tilde{\sigma}_t = q(t)$ and we see that, by point a) above, $\sigma_t x - \tilde{\sigma}_t x \in \mathbf{Z}$. We recall that, for a. e. $x \in I$, the function $: t \to \tilde{\sigma}_t x - \sigma_t x$ is AC; since it must take integer values, it is constant as a function of

time. Thus, $\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t x = \dot{\sigma}_t x$ for a. e. $x \in I$; this implies the first equality below, while the second one comes from (2.19).

$$\int_{-k}^{k} [\mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t = \int_{-k}^{k} [\mathcal{L}_c(t, \tilde{\sigma}_t, \dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t = \int_{-k}^{k} [L_c(t, q, \dot{q}) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t.$$

Now σ is c-minimal by hypothesis; since by a) $\tilde{\sigma}_{\pm k} - \sigma_{\pm k} \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$, the first equality above implies that $\tilde{\sigma}$ is c-minimal too; this in turn implies, by the second equality above, that q is c-minimal for the one-dimensional Lagrangian L.

We divide the proof of (2.19) into three steps.

Step 1. We begin with a much weaker fact than (2.19), i. e. that

$$-\int_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t)\mathrm{d}t < +\infty. \tag{2.20}$$

Let σ be as above; for starters, we prove that there is $C_1 \geq 0$ such that

$$\int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}||\dot{\sigma}_t||^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t \rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(\sigma_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t \geq -C_1 \quad \forall k \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{2.21}$$

To prove (2.21), we recall a fact from [9]: there is $C_1 \geq 0$ such that, for any absolutely continuous q and $k \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$\int_{0}^{k} [L_c(t, q, \dot{q}) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t \geq -C_1. \tag{2.22}$$

To prove this, we recall that there is a $u \in C(S^1)$ which is a fixed point of $\hat{\Lambda}^k$ for all $k \in \mathbf{N}$; we defined the operator $\hat{\Lambda}$ before lemma 2.12. Let us suppose by contradiction that there is q_k such that

$$\int_{0}^{k} [L_c(t, q_k, \dot{q}_k) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t \to -\infty \quad \text{as} \quad k \to +\infty.$$

Using q_k as a test function in the definition of $\hat{\Lambda}^k(u)$, we see that $\hat{\Lambda}^k(u)$ is unbounded from below as $k \to +\infty$; but this is impossible, since $\hat{\Lambda}^k(u) = u$ and u is bounded.

Using Fubini, and the fact that the weak time derivative of σ_t in L^2 coincides with $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\sigma_t x$ for a. e. x, we see that

$$\int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}||\dot{\sigma}_t||^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t \rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(\sigma_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t =$$

$$\int_I \mathrm{d}x \int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}|\dot{\sigma}_t x|^2 - c \cdot \dot{\sigma}_t x - V(t, \sigma_t x) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t \geq -C_1$$

where the last inequality comes from (2.22). This proves (2.21).

Now, if (2.20) were false, (2.21) would imply

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} \int_{-k}^{k} [\mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t = +\infty$$

contradicting (2.18).

Step 2. We assert that (2.19) is true asymptotically, i. e. that

$$\lim_{|t| \to +\infty} \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t) = 0. \tag{2.23}$$

To prove this, we recall that σ_t is minimal; in particular, it satisfies $(ODE)_{Lag}$; thus,

$$||\ddot{\sigma}_t||_{L^2(I)} \leq ||V'(t,\sigma_t)||_{L^2(I)} + || \int_I W'(\sigma_t z - \sigma_t z')\mathrm{d}z'||_{L^2(I)}.$$

Since V' and W' are bounded, we get that

$$||\ddot{\sigma}_t||_{L^2(I)} \leq C_2 \qquad \forall t \in \mathbf{R}. \tag{2.24}$$

We assert that this implies that

$$||\dot{\sigma}_t||_{L^2(I)} \leq C_3 \qquad \forall t \in \mathbf{R} \tag{2.25}$$

for a constant $C_3 > 0$. Let us suppose by contradiction that $||\dot{\sigma}_{t_j}||_{L^2(I)} \to +\infty$ for a sequence $t_j \to +\infty$; we assume that $t_j \in [n_j, n_j + 1]$. By (2.24), we have that

$$\inf_{t\in[n_j,n_j+1]} ||\dot{\sigma}_t||_{L^2(I)} \to +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad j \to +\infty.$$

Since $-W \geq 0$, we get the first inequality below; (2.21) implies the second one; the limit at the end follows by the formula above.

$$\int_{-k}^{k} [\mathcal{L}_c(t,\sigma_t,\dot{\sigma}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t \geq \int_{-k}^{n_j} [\mathcal{L}_c(t,\sigma_t,\dot{\sigma}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t +$$

$$\int_{n_j}^{n_j+1} \mathrm{d}t \int_I [L_c(t,\sigma_t z, \dot{\sigma}_t z) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}z + \int_{n_j+1}^{k} [\mathcal{L}_c(t,\sigma_t,\dot{\sigma}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t \geq$$

$$-2C_1 + \int_{n_j}^{n_j+1} [\frac{1}{2}||\dot{\sigma}_t||^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t\rangle_{L^2(I)} - \langle 1, V(t,\sigma_t)\rangle_{L^2(I)} + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t \to +\infty.$$

But this contradicts (2.18).

Since W' is bounded, we get that $\mathcal{W}'$, the L^2-differential of $\mathcal{W}$, is bounded too; by (2.23) this implies that

$$\left|\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{W}(\sigma_t)\right| = |\langle \mathcal{W}'(\sigma_t), \dot{\sigma}_t\rangle_{L^2(I)}| \leq C_4 \qquad \forall t \in \mathbf{R}.$$

Together with (2.20), this implies (2.23).

Now the idea is the following: if (2.19) did not hold, we could find a function $\tilde{\sigma}$ which coincides with σ for $|t| \geq n$ and with the orbit of a single particle for $|t| \leq n-1$; using step 2, we could prove that $\tilde{\sigma}$ has smaller action than σ, which is a contradiction since σ is minimal. The next step tells us where to look for $\tilde{\sigma}$.

Step 3. Let us suppose by contradiction that (2.19) does not hold; up to an integer translation in time, this means that

$$-\int_0^1 \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t)\mathrm{d}t \geq \epsilon \tag{2.26}$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$. Once ϵ is fixed in this way, we assert that there is $C > 0$ for which the following holds: for each $\delta > 0$ we can find $k \in \mathbf{N}$, a set $A_k \subset I$, two functions $Z_{\pm k} \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}(I)$ and $z \in A_k$ such that

a) $$|(\sigma_{\pm k}x - Z_{\pm k}x) - (\sigma_{\pm k}z - Z_{\pm k}z)| \leq 2C\sqrt{\delta} \quad \text{if } k \text{ is large and } x \in A_k.$$

b) $$|(\sigma_{\pm k}x - Z_{\pm k}x) - (\sigma_{\pm k}z - Z_{\pm k}z)| \leq 4 \quad \text{if} \quad x \notin A_k$$

and

$$\int_{-k}^{k} L_c(t, \sigma_t z, \dot{\sigma}_t z)\mathrm{d}t \leq \int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}||\dot{\sigma}_t||^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t \rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(t, \sigma_t)]\mathrm{d}t + \frac{\epsilon}{4}. \tag{2.27}$$

We prove this fact. Chebishev's inequality and (2.23) imply this: let $\delta, \chi > 0$; then, if $|t|$ is large enough, we have $-W(\sigma_t x - \sigma_t x') \leq \delta$ for $(x, x') \in (I \times I) \setminus B_{\delta,\chi,|t|}$, with $\nu_0(B_{\delta,\chi,|t|}) < \chi$. By our hypotheses on W, this implies that

$$|\sigma_t x - \sigma_t x'|_{S^1} \leq C\sqrt{\delta} \quad \text{for} \quad (x, x') \in (I \times I) \setminus B_{\delta,\chi,|t|}. \tag{2.28}$$

We assert that this implies the following. Let $\delta, \chi > 0$; then for all $k \in \mathbf{N}$ large enough, we can find $q(\pm k) \in [\sigma_{\pm k}0, \sigma_{\pm k}1]$ and $Z_{\pm k} \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$ such that, setting

$$A_k = \{x \in I : |\sigma_{\pm k}x - (Z_{\pm k}x + q(\pm k))| < C\sqrt{\delta}\}$$

we have

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_{\pm k}x - (Z_{\pm k}x + q(\pm k)) \in [-1, 1] \quad \forall (t, x) \\ \qquad\qquad \nu_0(A_k) \geq 1 - \chi \quad \text{for} \quad k \to +\infty. \end{cases} \tag{2.29}$$

Indeed, by Fubini, we can choose x' such that

$$\nu_0(\{x : (x, x') \in B_{\delta,\chi,k}\}) < \chi$$

and set $q(\pm k) = \sigma_{\pm k}x'$; we choose $Z_{\pm k}x \in \mathbf{Z}$ in such a way that

$$|\sigma_{\pm k}x - (Z_{\pm k}x + q(\pm k))| = |\sigma_{\pm k}x - q(\pm k)|_{S^1}.$$

This implies by (2.28) that $\nu_0(A_k) \geq 1 - \chi$; the first estimate of (2.29) follows from the fact that $\sigma_{\pm k} \in Mon$. Moreover, since $q(\pm k) = \sigma_{\pm k}x' \in [\sigma_{\pm k}0, \sigma_{\pm k}1]$, we can take $Z_{\pm k} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$.

We let C_1 be as in (2.22); we take $\chi \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ in the second one of (2.29); taking $|k|$ large enough, we get that

$$C_1\nu_0(I \setminus A_k) < \frac{\epsilon}{8}.$$

We shall feel free to reduce χ (and thus to increase k) in the course of the proof. Fubini implies the equality below; (2.22) implies the first inequality; the second one follows by the formula above.

$$\int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}\|\dot{\sigma}_t\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t \rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(t, \sigma_t)]\mathrm{d}t =$$

$$\int_{A_k} \mathrm{d}x \int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}|\dot{\sigma}_t x|^2 - c \cdot \dot{\sigma}_t x - V(t, \sigma_t x)]\mathrm{d}t + \int_{I \setminus A_k} \mathrm{d}x \int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}|\dot{\sigma}_t x|^2 - c \cdot \dot{\sigma}_t x - V(t, \sigma_t x)]\mathrm{d}t \geq$$

$$\int_{A_k} \mathrm{d}x \int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}|\dot{\sigma}_t x|^2 - c \cdot \dot{\sigma}_t x - V(t, \sigma_t x)]\mathrm{d}t - C_1\nu_0(I \setminus A_k) \geq$$

$$\int_{A_k} \mathrm{d}x \int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}|\dot{\sigma}_t x|^2 - c \cdot \dot{\sigma}_t x - V(t, \sigma_t x)]\mathrm{d}t - \frac{\epsilon}{8}.$$

Thus (possibly reducing χ and thus increasing k), there is at least one $z \in A_k$, which depends on k, such that (2.27) holds.

Now point a) follows because $z \in A_k$, and thus $|\sigma_{\pm k} z - (Z_{\pm k} z - q(\pm k)| < C\sqrt{\delta}$; moreover, for all $x \in A_k$, $|\sigma_{\pm k} x - (Z_{\pm k} x - q(\pm k)| < C\sqrt{\delta}$. Point b) follows in the same way, using the first formula of (2.29).

End of the proof of (2.19). Let $z \in A_k$ be fixed as above; we set

$$\tilde{\sigma}_t x = \begin{cases} \sigma_t z - (t+k-1)(\sigma_{-k} x - Z_{-k} x + Z_{-k} z - \sigma_{-k} z) & -k \le t \le -k+1 \\ \sigma_t z & |t| \le k-1 \\ \sigma_t z + (t-k+1)(\sigma_k x - Z_k x + Z_k z - \sigma_k z) & k-1 \le t \le k. \end{cases}$$

In other words, on $[-k, k]$ we squeeze together all the particles on $\sigma_t z$; this sends to zero the $\mathcal{W}$ term in the Lagrangian. We want to prove that, if (2.26) holds, then the action of $\tilde{\sigma}_t$ is smaller that the action of σ_t, contradicting the minimality of the latter.

We see that $\tilde{\sigma}_{\pm k} - \sigma_{\pm k} \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$.

Now points a), b) and the definition of $\tilde{\sigma}$ imply that

a') $$\begin{cases} |\tilde{\sigma}_t x - \sigma_t z| \le 2C\sqrt{\delta} \quad \text{if} \quad t \in [-k, -k+1], \quad x \in A_k \quad \text{and} \quad k \quad \text{is large enough,} \\ |\tilde{\sigma}_t x - \sigma_t z| \le 2C\sqrt{\delta} \quad \text{if} \quad t \in [k-1, k], \quad x \in A_k \quad \text{and} \quad k \quad \text{is large enough .} \end{cases}$$

and

b') $$\begin{cases} |\tilde{\sigma}_t x - \sigma_t z| \le 4 \quad \text{if } t \in [-k, -k+1] \text{ and } k \text{ is large enough} \\ |\tilde{\sigma}_t x - \sigma_t z| \le 4 \quad \text{if } t \in [k-1, k] \text{ and } k \text{ is large enough.} \end{cases}$$

By a') and b') we easily deduce that, possibly reducing again δ and χ, and then choosing a k for which (2.29) holds, we have

$$\int_{[-k,-k+1]\cup[k-1,k]} |\mathcal{W}(\tilde{\sigma}_t) - \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t z)| \mathrm{d}t \le \frac{\epsilon}{8}, \qquad \int_{[-k,-k+1]\cup[k-1,k]} |\mathcal{V}(t, \tilde{\sigma}_t) - \mathcal{V}(t, \sigma_t z)| \mathrm{d}t \le \frac{\epsilon}{8}$$

and

$$\int_{[-k,-k+1]\cup[k-1,k]} [\frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t \rangle_{L^2(I)} - (\frac{1}{2} \|\dot{\sigma}_t z\|^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\sigma}_t z \rangle_{L^2(I)})] \mathrm{d}t \le \frac{\epsilon}{8}.$$

Note that, as usual, we have identified $\sigma_t z \in \mathbf{R}$ with the function in $L^2(I)$ constantly equal to $\sigma_t z$; this, and the fact that $\tilde{\sigma}_t x \equiv \sigma_t z$ for $t \in [-k+1, k-1]$, imply the equality below. The first inequality below follows from the formula above and from the fact that

$$\int_{-k}^{k} \mathcal{W}(\sigma_t z) \mathrm{d}t = 0$$

since $: t \to \sigma_t z$ is the motion of a single particle. The second inequality follows from (2.27); the last one follows from (2.26).

$$\int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2} ||\dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t||^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c, \dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t \rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(\tilde{\sigma}_t) - \mathcal{W}(\tilde{\sigma}_t)] \mathrm{d}t =$$

$$\int_{-k}^{k} \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t z, \dot{\sigma}_t z) \mathrm{d}t + \int_{[-k,-k+1]\cup[k-1,k]} \mathcal{L}_c(t, \tilde{\sigma}_t, \dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t) \mathrm{d}t - \int_{[-k,-k+1]\cup[k-1,k]} \mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t z, \dot{\sigma}_t z) \mathrm{d}t \le$$

$$\int_{-k}^{k} L_c(t,\sigma_t z,\dot\sigma_t z)\mathrm{d}t + \frac{3}{8}\epsilon \le \int_{-k}^{k} [\frac{1}{2}||\dot\sigma_t||^2_{L^2(I)} - \langle c,\dot\sigma_t\rangle_{L^2(I)} - \mathcal{V}(t,\sigma_t)]\mathrm{d}t + \frac{5}{8}\epsilon \le$$
$$\int_{-k}^{k} \mathcal{L}_c(t,\sigma_t,\dot\sigma_t)\mathrm{d}t - \frac{3}{8}\epsilon.$$

Since $\tilde\sigma_{\pm k} - \sigma_{\pm k} \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$, we have contradicted the minimality of σ.

\\\

We now give the proof of theorem 1, together with a more precise statement.

Theorem 1. *For any initial condition $M \in Mon$ and $c \in A$, there is σ^c_t, c-minimal for $\mathcal{L}$, such that $\sigma^c_0 = M$, $\sigma^c_t \in Mon$ for $t \in [0,+\infty)$ and*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \inf\{dist_{weak}(\sigma^c_t, q(t)) + ||\dot\sigma^c_t - \dot q(t)||_{L^2(I)} : q \in \mathcal{G}(c)\} = 0. \tag{2.30}$$

The limit above is uniform in the following sense: let $A \subset \mathbf{R}$ be compact and let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there is $T > 0$ such that, for all $c \in A$ and all initial conditions $M \in Mon$,

$$\inf\{dist_{weak}(\sigma^c_t, q(t)) + ||\dot\sigma^c_t - \dot q(t)||_{L^2(I)} : q \in \mathcal{G}(c)\} < \epsilon \quad \text{if} \quad t \ge T. \tag{2.31}$$

Proof. Let U be a fixed point of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}$; we know that the inf in the definition of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}(U)$ is attained on some σ^c_t; we forgo the proof (which is identical to [4]) that σ^c_t is defined for $t \in [0,+\infty)$ and that, for all $l \in \mathbf{N}$,

$$\Lambda^l_{c,\alpha(c)}(U)(M) = \int_0^l [\mathcal{L}_c(t,\sigma^c_t,\dot\sigma^c_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t + U(\sigma^c_l). \tag{2.32}$$

The last formula easily implies that σ^c_t is c-minimal on $[0,+\infty)$. By proposition 2.2, we can suppose that $\sigma^c_t \in Mon$ for $t \in [0,+\infty)$. It suffices to prove that σ^c_t satisfies (2.30), or the stronger (2.31).

Let us suppose by contradiction that (2.31) is false; then there is $\epsilon > 0$ and three sequences $n_k \nearrow +\infty$, $c_k \in A$ and $M_k \in Mon$ such that

$$\inf_{q\in\mathcal{G}(c_k)} \{dist_{weak}(\sigma^{c_k}_{n_k} - q(n_k)) + ||\dot\sigma^{c_k}_{n_k} - \dot q(n_k)||_{L^2(I)}\} \ge \epsilon. \tag{2.33}$$

Up to subsequences, we can suppose that $c_k \to c \in A$. Since $\sigma^{c_k}_{n_k} \in Mon$, after an integer translation we can suppose that $\sigma^{c_k}_{n_k}$ is bounded. Moreover, $\sigma^{c_k}_{t+n_k}$ is uniformly Hölder from $[-n_k,+\infty)$ to $L^2(I)$; we saw this while proving proposition 2.2. Since $\sigma^{c_k}_{t+n_k}$ belongs to the locally compact space Mon, we can apply Ascoli-Arzelà as in the proof of proposition 2.2; we get that, up to subsequences, there is $\sigma\colon \mathbf{R} \to L^2(I)$ such that $\sigma^{c_k}_{t+n_k} \to \sigma_t$ uniformly on the compact sets of $\mathbf{R}$.

The orbit σ is defined on $\mathbf{R}$ because each $\sigma^{c_k}_{t+n_k}$ is defined on $[-n_k,+\infty)$ and we are supposing that $n_k \nearrow +\infty$. Since σ is the limit of a sequence of c_k-minimal orbits, it is easy to see that it is c-minimal. In particular, σ satisfies $(ODE)_{Lag}$; thus, from the locally uniform convergence of $\sigma^{c_k}_{t+n_k}$ we deduce the locally uniform convergence of $\ddot\sigma^{c_k}_{t+n_k}$; from this, it follows through integration that $\dot\sigma^{c_k}_{t+n_k}$ converges, uniformly on compact sets, to $\dot\sigma_t$.

In lemma 2.8, it is easy to see that the Lipschitz constant $L(c)$ of $\Lambda_{c,\alpha(c)}U$ depends only on c and is bounded on bounded sets. Since $\{c_k\}$ converges, we can suppose that the fixed points of $\Lambda_{c_k,\alpha(c_k)}$ are L-Lipschitz for the same L; by (2.32), this implies that

$$\int_0^l [\mathcal{L}_{c_k}(t, \sigma_t^{c_k}, \dot{\sigma}_t^{c_k}) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t$$

is bounded independently on l and k. Translating in time, it means that for any $a < b \in \mathbf{Z}$, for k large we have that

$$\int_a^b [\mathcal{L}_{c_k}(t, \sigma_{t+n_k}^{c_k}, \dot{\sigma}_{t+n_k}^{c_k}) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t$$

is defined and bounded independently on k and $b-a$. Taking limits under the integral sign, this implies that

$$\int_a^b [\mathcal{L}_c(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t) + \alpha(c)]\mathrm{d}t$$

is bounded too, i. e. that σ satisfies (2.18). As a consequence, lemma 2.13 holds and $\sigma_t = q(t)$ with q c-minimal. However, by (2.33) and uniform convergence of $(\sigma_{t+n_k}^{c_k}, \dot{\sigma}_{t+n_k}^{c_k})$, we have that

$$\inf_{q \in \mathcal{G}(c)} [dist_{weak}(\sigma_0, q(0)) + ||\dot{\sigma}_0 - \dot{q}(0)||_{L^2(I)}] \geq \epsilon$$

a contradiction.

\\\

Remark 2.15. We note a last connection with Aubry-Mather theory: if $W = 0$ (i. e. if we are in the situation of [8]), and if σ_t minimizes $\int_0^1 \mathcal{L}_c$ among all curves such that $dist_{weak}(\sigma_1, \sigma_0) = 1$, then $\mathrm{d}t \otimes (\sigma_t)_\sharp(\nu_0)$, a measure on $S^1 \times S^1$, is a Mather c-minimal measure as defined in section 1. We leave the easy proof to the reader; other results along these lines are in [3].

§3
Birkhoff regions of instability

We prove theorem 2; we shall adapt the method of [2].

Definitions. Let U be an open set of $S^1 \times S^1$; we shall denote by U also the open set of the points $(t, x) \in \mathbf{R} \times S^1$ such that $(t \mathrm{mod} 1, x) \in U$. Let $k \in \mathbf{Z}$. A one-form ω on $\mathbf{R} \times S^1$ is called a (U, k)-step form if there is a closed form $\bar{\omega}$ on $S^1 \times S^1$ such that the restriction of ω to $\{t \leq k-1\}$ is zero, the restriction of ω to $\{t \geq k\}$ is $\bar{\omega}$ and the restriction of ω to the set $U \cup \{t \leq k-1\} \cup \{t \geq k\}$ is closed.

We shall also set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(c) = \{(t, q(t)) : q \in \mathcal{G}(c), \quad t \in \mathbf{R}\}, \qquad \tilde{\mathrm{Lim}}(c) = \{(t, q(t)) : q \in \mathrm{Lim}(c), \quad t \in \mathbf{R}\}$$

where the sets $\mathcal{G}(c)$ and $\mathrm{Lim}(c)$ have been defined in the introduction.

We omit the proof of the next lemma, which is a merger of point 2.6 and of theorem 6.3 of [2]; as usual, we denote by $[\omega]$ the cohomology class of a closed form on $S^1 \times S^1$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let us suppose that the interval $J \subset \mathbf{R}$ is a Birkhoff region of instability, and let $c \in J$. Then there is a neighbourhood U of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(c)$ such that, for any $k \in \mathbf{Z}$, there is a (U,k)-step form ω with $[\bar{\omega}] = [\mathrm{d}x]$.*

Definition. We shall call adapted a neighbourhood U of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(c)$ as that of lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{8}]$, let the map $\sigma\colon [a,b] \to \mathbf{T}$ be continuous and let $\mu_t = (\pi \circ \sigma_t)_\sharp \nu_0$. Let us suppose that, for each $t \in [a,b]$, there is $x_t \in S^1$ such that $\mu_t(x_t - \epsilon, x_t + \epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Then there is a function $q\colon [a,b] \to \mathbf{R}$ of class C^1 such that*
1) $dist_{weak}(q(t), \sigma_t) < 4\epsilon$ and
2) $|\pi q(t) - x_t|_{S^1} < 4\epsilon$.

Moreover, if $\sigma_b = a$ on $\mathbf{T}$, then we can choose q in such a way that $q(b) = a$ on S^1.

Proof. Since $\sigma\colon [a,b] \to \mathbf{T}$ is continuous, we get, as an easy consequence of dominated convergence, that the map $: t \to \mu_t$ is continuous for the weak-$*$ topology of measures. Let now $I \subset S^1$ be a fixed open arc; we recall that

$$\mu_t(I) = \sup \int_{S^1} \phi \mathrm{d}\mu_t$$

where the sup is taken among the continuous functions $\phi\colon S^1 \to [0,1]$ which are zero outside I; this means that the map $: t \to \mu_t(I)$ is l. s. c., being the sup of a family of continuous functions. Thus, if $\mu_{t_0}(x_{t_0} - \epsilon, x_{t_0} + \epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon$, for t_1 close to t_0 we have that $\mu_{t_1}(x_{t_0} - \epsilon, x_{t_0} + \epsilon) \geq 1 - 2\epsilon$.

By compactness, we can cover $[a,b]$ with a finite number of open intervals $I_i = (t_i - a_i, t_i + a_i)$, and we can find points $x_i \in S^1$ such that, if $t \in I_i$, then $\mu_t(x_i - \epsilon, x_i + \epsilon) \geq 1 - 2\epsilon$. By the usual lemmas on coverings, we can suppose that
a) $t_i < t_{i+1}$.
b) $I_i \cap I_{i+1} \neq \emptyset$ and $I_i^c \setminus I_{i+1} \neq \emptyset \neq I_{i+1} \setminus I_i^c$.
c) $I_i \cap I_{i+2} = \emptyset$.

Let $t \in I_i \cap I_{i+1}$; such a point exists by *b)*. We have that $\mu_t(x_i - \epsilon, x_i + \epsilon) \geq 1 - 2\epsilon$ and $\mu_t(x_{i+1} - \epsilon, x_{i+1} + \epsilon) \geq 1 - 2\epsilon$; since $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{8})$ and the total measure is 1, the two intervals must intersect, and we get $|x_{i+1} - x_i|_{S^1} < 2\epsilon$. Thus, if $x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]$, we have that

$$(x - 3\epsilon, x + 3\epsilon) \supset (x_i - \epsilon, x_i + \epsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad (x - 3\epsilon, x + 3\epsilon) \supset (x_{i+1} - \epsilon, x_{i+1} + \epsilon).$$

If $t \in I_i$ (or if $t \in I_{i+1}$), we already have an estimate on the measure of the two intervals on the right; thus, $\mu_t(x - 3\epsilon, x + 3\epsilon) \geq 1 - 2\epsilon$ if $t \in I_i \cup I_{i+1}$ and $x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}]$.

Now we take $\tilde{q}(t) \in C^1([a,b], S^1)$ such that $\tilde{q}(t_i) = x_i$ for all i and $\tilde{q}(t) \in (x_i, x_{i+1})$ for $t \in (t_i, t_{i+1})$. By the last paragraph, for $t \in [a,b]$, $\mu_t(\tilde{q}(t) - 3\epsilon, \tilde{q}(t) + 3\epsilon) \geq 1 - 2\epsilon$. We take a lift $q(t)$ of $\tilde{q}(t)$ to $\mathbf{R}$: we want to show that this function satisfies the thesis.

The equality below is proven in lemma 2.14 of [5]:

$$dist_{weak}(\sigma_t, q(t)) = \min\left\{\int_{S^1\times S^1} |x-y|^2_{S^1} \mathrm{d}\lambda(x,y)\right\}$$

where the minimum is taken on all the measures λ on $S^1 \times S^1$ which have μ_t as the first marginal and $\delta_{\tilde{q}(t)}$ as the second one. If we take $\lambda = \mu_t \otimes \delta_{\tilde{q}(t)}$, we get that

$$dist_{weak}(\sigma_t, q(t)) \leq \int_{(\tilde{q}(t)-3\epsilon, \tilde{q}(t)+3\epsilon)\times S^1} |x-y|^2_{S^1} \mathrm{d}\lambda(x,y) + \int_{(\tilde{q}(t)-3\epsilon, \tilde{q}(t)+3\epsilon)^c\times S^1} |x-y|^2_{S^1} \mathrm{d}\lambda(x,y) \leq$$
$$9\epsilon^2 \mu_t(\tilde{q}(t) - 3\epsilon, \tilde{q}(t) + 3\epsilon) + \mu_t((\tilde{q}(t) - 3\epsilon, \tilde{q}(t) + 3\epsilon)^c) \leq 9\epsilon^2 + 2\epsilon.$$

Since $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{8}$, we have that $9\epsilon^2 + 2\epsilon < 4\epsilon$ and point 1) follows.

We now recall that $\mu_t(\tilde{q}(t) - 3\epsilon, \tilde{q}(t) + 3\epsilon) \geq 1 - 2\epsilon$ and $\mu_t(x_t - \epsilon, x_t + \epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon$; this implies as above that the two intervals must intersect, and thus point 2) follows.

As for the last assertion, we note that, if $\sigma_b = a$ on $\mathbf{T}$, then $\mu_b = \delta_a$; we add to our covering of $[a,b]$ the interval $[b-\gamma, b+\gamma]$ on which $\mu_t(a-\epsilon, a+\epsilon) \geq 1-2\epsilon$ and take the function $\tilde{q}$ in such a way that $\tilde{q}(b) = a$; then we are done.

\\\

Definitions.

• **The extension.** We shall say that $\sigma\colon [a,b] \to \mathbf{T}$ is ϵ-concentrated if it satisfies the hypotheses of lemma 3.2. If σ_t is ϵ-concentrated and $q(t)$ is as in lemma 3.2, we shall say that the couple $(\sigma_t, q(t))$ is an extension of σ_t.

• **The gap-filler.** Let $\{c_i\}_{i\geq 0}$ be as in theorem 2. We fix $k_i \geq 0$ and we find $\{d^i_j\}_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \subset [c_i, c_{i+1}]$ (or $\{d^i_j\}_{j=0}^{k_i-1} \subset [c_{i+1}, c_i]$ if $c_{i+1} \leq c_i$) in such a way that

1) $d^i_0 = c_i$; moreover, $\{d^i_j\}_j$ is increasing if $c_i < c_{i+1}$, and decreasing if $c_i > c_{i+1}$.

2) $$|d^i_{j+1} - d^i_j| \leq \frac{|c_{i+1} - c_i|}{k_i} \quad \text{and} \quad |d^i_{k_i-1} - c_{i+1}| \leq \frac{|c_{i+1} - c_i|}{k_i}.$$

We group the $\{d^i_j\}_{i,j}$ into a unique sequence $\{f_s\}_{s=0}^{+\infty}$ with the natural order; in other words,

$$f_0 = c_0 = d^0_0, \quad f_1 = d^0_1, \quad f_2 = d^0_2, \ldots, \quad f_{k_0-1} = d^0_{k_0-1}, \quad f_{k_0} = c_1 = d^1_0, \quad f_{k_0+1} = d^1_1, \ldots$$

We call such a sequence $\{f_s\}_{s=0}^{+\infty}$ a $\{k_i\}$-gap-filler of $\{c_i\}$.

• **The form.** Let now $\{f_s\}_{s\geq 0} \subset J$ be a $\{k_i\}$-gap-filler of $\{c_i\}$ and let $\{T_s\}_{s\geq 0}$ be a sequence of positive integers; we set $T_{-1} = 0$ and, for $s \geq -1$,

$$\tilde{T}_s = \sum_{l=-1}^{s} T_l.$$

Using lemma 3.1, for $s \geq 0$ we can find adapted neighbourhoods U_s of $\tilde{\Gamma}(c_s)$ and $(U_s, \tilde{T}_s)$-step forms ω_s such that

$$\omega_s = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad t \leq \tilde{T}_s - 1 \\ \bar{\omega}_s & \text{if} \quad t \geq \tilde{T}_s \quad \text{with} \quad [\bar{\omega}_s] = (f_{s+1} - f_s)[\mathrm{d}x]. \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

We set $\omega_{-1} = 0$.

We define

$$\omega = \sum_{l=0}^{k} \omega_l$$

and we note that the form $c_0 + \omega$ satisfies $[c_0 + \omega] = f_s[\mathrm{d}x]$ for $s \geq 0$ and

$$t \in \left(\tilde{T}_{s-1}, \tilde{T}_s - 1\right).$$

We refer the reader to the diagram below: on the middle line there are the times, on the upper ones the values of forms ω_s, and on the lower one the values of the form $c_0 + \omega$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} & & \omega_{-1} = 0 & & \omega_0 = f_1 - f_0 & & \omega_1 = f_2 - f_1 & & \omega_2 = f_3 - f_2 & \\ \tilde{T}_{-1} = 0 & & & \tilde{T}_0 & & \tilde{T}_1 & & \tilde{T}_2 & & \tilde{T}_3 \\ & & c_0 + \omega = f_0 = c_0 & & c_0 + \omega = f_1 & & c_0 + \omega = f_2 & & c_0 + \omega = f_3 & \end{array}$$

• **The set $\mathcal{D}$ of extensions.** Let V_s be an open set such that $\mathcal{G}(c_s) \subset V_s \subset\subset U_s$. Let

$$\delta_s = \frac{1}{64} \min\{|x - y|_{S^1} : (t, x) \in \bar{V}_s, \quad (t, y) \notin U_s\}.$$

We note that $\delta_s \leq \frac{1}{64}$, since the diameter of S^1 is smaller than 1. We shall consider the paths $\sigma \colon [0, +\infty) \to \mathbf{T}$ such that, setting as before $\mu_t = (\pi \circ \sigma_t)_\sharp \nu_0$,

A) For all $s \geq 0$ and all $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_{s+1} - 1]$, there is $x_t \in S^1$ such that $\mu_t([x_t - \delta_s, x_t + \delta_s]) \geq 1 - \delta_s$.

B) $\mu_t(\{x : (t, x) \in \bar{V}_s\}) \geq 1 - \delta_s$ if $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_s]$ and $s \geq 0$.

Before ending the definition, we comment on conditions *A)* and *B)*.

First of all, by point *A)*, for $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_s]$ there is $x_t \in S^1$ such that $\mu_t([x_t - \delta_s, x_t + \delta_s]) \geq 1 - \delta_s$; this and point *B)* imply that $[x_t - \delta_s, x_t + \delta_s]$ and $\{x : (t, x) \in \bar{V}_s\}$ must intersect; in other words, x_t is in a δ_s-neighbourhood of $\{x : (t, x) \in \bar{V}_s\}$.

Since $[x_t - \delta_s, x_t + \delta_s] \subset (x_t - 2\delta_s, x_t + 2\delta_s)$, we have by *A)* that σ is $2\delta_s$ concentrated; since $2\delta_s \leq \frac{1}{8}$, we can apply point 2) of lemma 3.2 with $\epsilon = 2\delta_s$. We get that, for $t \geq \tilde{T}_0 - 1$, there is an extension (σ, q) of σ with $|q(t) - x_t| \leq 8\delta_s$; by the last paragraph, we get that $q(t)$ is in a $9\delta_s$-neighbourhood of $\{x : (t, x) \in \bar{V}_s\}$; by the definition of δ_s, $(t, q(t)) \in U_s$ for $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_s]$.

We say that the couple (σ, q), with σ defined for $t \geq 0$ and q defined for $t \geq \tilde{T}_0 - 1$, belongs to the set $\mathcal{D}$ if σ satisfies *A)* and *B)*, and if q is an extension of σ satisfying $|q(t) - x_t|_{S^1} \leq 9\delta_s$ for $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_{s+1} - 1]$.

Lemma 3.3. *Conditions A) and B) are closed for the pointwise convergence of σ_t. In other words, if σ_t^n satisfies A) and B) for $t \in [\tilde{T}_{s-1} - 1, \tilde{T}_s - 1]$, and if $\sigma_t^n \to \sigma_t$ in L^2 for $t \in [\tilde{T}_{s-1} - 1, \tilde{T}_s - 1]$, then σ_t satisfies A) and B) for $t \in [\tilde{T}_{s-1} - 1, \tilde{T}_s - 1]$.*

Proof. We recall that the map $:\mu \to \mu(a,b)$ is lower semi continuous for the weak$*$ topology of measures, and that the map $:\sigma_t \to (\pi \circ \sigma_t)_\sharp \nu_0$ is continuous from L^2 to the weak$*$ topology of measures. Let σ_t^n and σ_t be as in the statement of the lemma; let μ_t^n be the measure on S^1 induced by σ_t^n, and let $x_t^n \in S^1$ satisfy A). By what we just said, $\mu_t^n \to \mu_t$ in the weak$*$ topology; up to taking a subsequence, we can suppose that x_t^n tends to a point $x_t \in S^1$. We prove that μ_t and x_t satisfy A). Let $\delta' > \delta_s$; we have that

$$\mu_t([x_t - \delta', x_t + \delta']^c) \leq \liminf \mu_t^n([x_t - \delta', x_t + \delta']^c) \leq \liminf \mu_{t_n}([x_{t_n} - \delta_s, x_{t_n} + \delta_s]^c) \leq \delta_s.$$

The first inequality above comes from the fact that $[x_t - \delta', x_t + \delta']^c$ is an open arc of S^1 and the map $:\mu \to \mu([x_t - \delta', x_t + \delta']^c)$ is lower semicontinuous, as in lemma 3.2. The second inequality comes from the fact that $[x_{t_n}^n - \delta_s, x_{t_n}^n + \delta_s] \subset [x_t - \delta', x_t + \delta']$ for n large enough, since $\delta' > \delta_s$ and $x_t^n \to x_t$; the third one, from the fact that σ_t^n satisfies A) . Since $\delta' > \delta_s$ is arbitrary, we get that A) holds for σ_t.

The proof of B) is analogous.

\\\

Let now $\sigma\colon [0, +\infty) \to \mathbf{T}$ be an orbit which satisfies B); let it satisfy A) for $x_t \in S^1$, and also for $\tilde{x}_t \in S^1$. Let (σ, q) be an extension with $|\pi \circ q(t) - x_t|_{S^1} < 9\delta_s$, and let $(\sigma, \tilde{q})$ be another extension with $|\pi \circ \tilde{q}(t) - \tilde{x}_t|_{S^1} < 9\delta_s$. Since A) holds for x_t and $\tilde{x}_t$, we get that $|x_t - \tilde{x}_t|_{S^1} \leq 2\delta_s$; in particular, $|\pi \circ \tilde{q}(t) - x_t|_{S^1} < 11\delta_s$. Since we also have that $|\pi \circ q(t) - x_t|_{S^1} < 9\delta_s$, we get that $|\pi \circ \tilde{q}(t) - \pi \circ q(t)|_{S^1} \leq 20\delta_s$ for $t \geq \tilde{T}_0 - 1$. Since $\delta_s \leq \frac{1}{64}$, we have that $20\delta_s < \frac{1}{2}$; i. e., if $\pi\colon \mathbf{R} \to S^1$, $q(t)$ and $\tilde{q}(t)$ are in a ball on which a determination of π^{-1} is defined.

This has a standard consequence for the lifts to the universal cover: up to adding an integer to $\tilde{q}$, there is a unique lift of x_t to $\mathbf{R}$ such that $|q(t) - x_t| < 11\delta_s$ and $|\tilde{q}(t) - x_t| < 11\delta_s$ for all $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_{s+1} - 1]$ and all $s \in \mathbf{N}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let σ satisfy points A) and B) above, and let (σ, q), $(\sigma, \tilde{q}) \in \mathcal{D}$ be two extensions of σ; up to adding an integer to $\tilde{q}$, we suppose that q and $\tilde{q}$ satisfy the property above. Then, the curves $:t \to (t, q(t))$ and $:t \to (t, \tilde{q})$ are homotopic in*

$$\mathcal{U}\colon = \{\tilde{T}_{-1} \leq t \leq \tilde{T}_0 - 1\} \cup U_0 \cup \{\tilde{T}_0 \leq t \leq \tilde{T}_1 - 1\} \cup U_1 \cup \ldots \subset \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^n.$$

Proof. Before stating the lemma, we saw that x_t can be lifted in a unique way to $\mathbf{R}$ in such a way that, for $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_s]$, we have $|q(t) - x_t| \leq 11\delta_s$ and $|\tilde{q}(t) - x_t| \leq 11\delta_s$. Since x_t is in a δ_s-neighbourhood of $\{x : (t, x) \in \bar{V}_s\}$ (we noticed this before while defining D), we get that, for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, $(1-\lambda)q(t) + \lambda\tilde{q}(t)$ is in a $12\delta_s$-neighbourhood of $\{x : (t, x) \in \bar{V}_s\}$; by the definition of δ_s, this implies that $(t, (1-\lambda)q(t) + \lambda\tilde{q}(t)) \in U_s$ for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, and this ends the proof.

\\\

Definition. We shall say that $(\sigma, q) \in \mathcal{D}$ is a minimizer of $\mathcal{L}_{c_0} - \omega$ if, for all $t_1 > T_0$, the following happens. Let $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{q}) \in \mathcal{D}$ satisfy $\tilde{\sigma}_0 - \sigma_0 \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$, $\tilde{\sigma}_{t_1} - \sigma_{t_1} \in L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$, and $\tilde{q}(t_1) = q(t_1)$. Then,

$$\int_0^{t_1} \mathcal{L}_{c_0}(t, \sigma_t, \dot{\sigma}_t)\mathrm{d}t - \int_{\tilde{T}_0 - 1}^{t_1} \omega(t, q(t)) \cdot (1, \dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t \leq \int_0^{t_1} \mathcal{L}_{c_0}(t, \tilde{\sigma}_t, \dot{\tilde{\sigma}}_t)\mathrm{d}t - \int_{\tilde{T}_0 - 1}^{t_1} \omega(t, \tilde{q}(t)) \cdot (1, \dot{\tilde{q}}(t))\mathrm{d}t.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $M \in Mon$. Then there is $(\sigma, q) \in \mathcal{D}$ such that*

1) $\sigma_0 = M$.

2) $\sigma_t \in Mon$ for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$.

3) (σ, q) minimizes $\mathcal{L}_{c_0} - \omega$ in $\mathcal{D}$.

Proof. We begin to prove this: for $\tilde{T}_s$ defined as above, there is $(\sigma^s, q^s) \in \mathcal{D}$ which minimizes $\mathcal{L}_c - \omega$ on $[0, \tilde{T}_s]$ with boundary conditions $\sigma^s_0 = M$, $\sigma^s_{\tilde{T}_s} = 0$ and $q^s(\tilde{T}_s) = 0$. Naturally, when we say that $\sigma^s_0 = M$ or $\sigma^s_{\tilde{T}_s} = 0$, we mean equality on $\mathbf{T}$, i. e. up to adding an element of $L^2_{\mathbf{Z}}$; also $q^s(\tilde{T}_s) = 0$ is an equality on S^1.

The proof of this is similar to the one of proposition 2.2. We begin to tackle the finite-dimensional problem.

Let P_n be the projection of section 1; we want to connect $P_n M$ and 0 with a minimal path $(\tilde{\sigma}, \tilde{q}) \in \mathcal{D}$, with $\tilde{\sigma}_t \in \mathcal{C}_n$. Let us set, as in section 1, $P_n \sigma_t = D_n(z_1(t), \ldots, z_n(t))$; we are thus minimizing the functional

$$I(z) = \int_0^{\tilde{T}_s} [\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\dot{z}_i|^2 - \frac{c_0}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \dot{z}_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n V(t, z_i) - \frac{1}{2n^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n W(z_i - z_j)]\mathrm{d}t - \int_{\tilde{T}_0 - 1}^{\tilde{T}_s} \omega(t, q(t)) \cdot (1, \dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t$$

over all couples (z, q) belonging to $\mathcal{D}$. As for the boundary conditions, we ask that $z(0) = P_n M$ and $z(\tilde{T}_s) = 0$ in $\mathbf{T}$; equivalently, we ask that, if $P_n M = (\bar{z}_1, \ldots, \bar{z}_n)$, then $\pi \circ z_i(0) = \pi(\bar{z}_i)$ and $\pi \circ z_i(\tilde{T}_s) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Moreover, we ask that $\pi \circ q(\tilde{T}_s) = 0$. Such an extension exists because of the last assertion of lemma 3.2.

Note that we have called the functional $I(z)$ even though, nominally, it depends on (z, q). However, by lemma 3.4, if (z, q) and (z, q_1) are two extensions of z, then q and q_1 are homotopic in $\mathcal{U}$; since $\omega(\tilde{T}_0 - 1, \cdot) = 0$ and $q(\tilde{T}_s) = q_1(\tilde{T}_s)$, this implies that

$$\int_{\tilde{T}_0 - 1}^{\tilde{T}_s} \omega(t, q(t)) \cdot (1, \dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t = \int_{\tilde{T}_0 - 1}^{\tilde{T}_s} \omega(t, q_1(t)) \cdot (1, \dot{q}_1(t))\mathrm{d}t.$$

In other words, $I(z)$ does not depend on the particular extension (z, q) of z we choose: it is a function only of z.

By lemma 3.3, the fact that z satisfies A) and B) is equivalent to the fact that $(t, z(t)) \in K_1$, where K_1 is a closed set in $\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}^n$. In other words, we are dealing with a "minimization with obstacle" problem: we are minimizing I among all $z \in AC([0, \tilde{T}_s], \mathbf{R}^n)$ such that $(t, z(t))$ belongs to a closed set K_1. It is standard (see below for a proof) that such problems admit a minimum, provided they are coercive, and this is what we prove next.

By the definition of ω, we have that

$$\int_{\tilde{T}_0-1}^{\tilde{T}_s} \omega(t,q(t))\cdot(1,\dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t = \int_{\tilde{T}_0-1}^{\tilde{T}_1-1} \omega_0(t,q(t))\cdot(1,\dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t + \int_{\tilde{T}_1-1}^{\tilde{T}_2-1} \omega_1(t,q(t))\cdot(1,\dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t + \ldots +$$

$$\int_{\tilde{T}_{s-1}-1}^{\tilde{T}_s-1} \omega_{s-1}(t,q(t))\cdot(1,\dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t + \int_{\tilde{T}_s-1}^{\tilde{T}_s} \omega_s(t,q(t))\cdot(1,\dot{q}(t))\mathrm{d}t.$$

Since the forms $\omega_1,\ldots,\omega_s$ are finite in number, and each of them is bounded, we get that I is coercive; actually, we get that, if z^k is a minimizing sequence for I, then

$$\frac{1}{n}\int_0^{\tilde{T}_s}\sum_{i=1}^{n}|\dot{z}_i^k|^2\mathrm{d}t \le C_4 \tag{3.2}$$

for some C_4 independent on n and k. In particular, z^k is uniformly Hölder; since $z^k(T_0)=P_nM$, we have that $z_k(0)$ is bounded and thus, that z_k is bounded on $[0,\tilde{T}_s]$. By Ascoli-Arzelà, z^k converges, up to subsequences, to a limit $\tilde{z}$; since K_1 is closed, we get that $(t,\tilde{z}(t))\in K_1$ for all $t\in[0,T]$. It is standard (see section 2 for the proof of a similar fact) that I is lower semicontinuous under uniform convergence; by this and lemma 3.4, if we take any extension $(\tilde{z},\tilde{q})\in\mathcal{D}$ with $\pi\circ\tilde{q}(\tilde{T}_s)=0$, $(\tilde{z},\tilde{q})$ will minimize $I(z)$ among all couples $(z,q)\in\mathcal{D}$ such that $z\in AC([0,\tilde{T}_s],\mathbf{R}^n)$ and (z,q) satisfies the boundary conditions above.

Now we want to prove the assertion we made at the beginning, i. e. the existence of a minimum when σ takes values in $L^2(I)$, not in $\mathcal{C}_n$. Let us call $(\tilde{\sigma}^n,\tilde{q}^n)$ the minimal couple we found above, and let us set $\tilde{\sigma}^n = D_n(\tilde{z}_1,\ldots,\tilde{z}_n)$. We note that the argument of lemma 2.7 continues to hold: indeed, this argument consisted in rearranging the indices of $(\tilde{z}_1,\ldots,\tilde{z}_n)$; but this has no effect on properties A) and B). Thus we can suppose that $\tilde{\sigma}^n_t\in Mon$ for $t\in[0,\tilde{T}_s]$; it follows by (3.2) that the $\frac{1}{2}$-Hölder norm of $\tilde{\sigma}^n$ is bounded uniformly in n. This implies as in the proof of proposition 2.2 that, up to subsequences, $\tilde{\sigma}^n\to\sigma^{\tilde{T}_s}$. By lemma 3.3, A) and B) are closed conditions, and thus $\sigma^{\tilde{T}_s}$ continues to satisfy them. Again, we take any extension $(\sigma^{\tilde{T}_s},q^{\tilde{T}_s})\in\mathcal{D}$ with $\pi(q^{\tilde{T}_s}(\tilde{T}_s))=0$, and that will be minimal by the lower semicontinuity of I and lemma 3.4.

We now note that, by an argument similar to the one above, σ_t is bounded in the $C^{0,\frac{1}{2}}_{loc}$ topology; in other words, on any fixed set $[0,T]$, the $\frac{1}{2}$-Hölder norm of σ^{T_s} is bounded in s; since $\sigma_t^{\tilde{T}_s}\in Mon$ for $t\in[0,\tilde{T}_s]$, we can use Ascoli-Arzelà as in the proof of proposition 2.2 and get that, up to subsequences, $\sigma^{\tilde{T}_s}\to\sigma$ uniformly on compact sets. Now we see as before that σ is minimal on $[0,+\infty)$, and we are done.

\\\

We omit the proof of the next lemma, since it is identical to that of theorem 1.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\{f_s\}_{s\ge0}$ be as above and let $\{\gamma_s\}_{s\ge0}$ be a sequence in $(0,1)$. Then, if we choose the times $\{T_s\}_{s\ge0}$ large enough, the following happens. Let $\sigma\colon[0,+\infty)\to\mathbf{T}$ minimize $\mathcal{L}_{c_0}-\omega$ in $\mathcal{D}$; in view of lemma 3.5, we shall suppose that $\sigma_t\in Mon$ for $t\in[0,+\infty)$. Then, for any $t\in[\tilde{T}_{s-1},\tilde{T}_s]$, $s\ge1$, we can find $\bar{q}$, minimal for $L_{c_0}-\omega$, satisfying*

$$dist_{weak}(\sigma_t,\bar{q}(t)) + \|\dot{\sigma}_t - \dot{\bar{q}}(t)\|_{L^2(I)} < \frac{\gamma_s}{4}.$$

Lemma 3.7. *There are $\Gamma_i > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $\{d^i_j\}$ be a $\{k_i\}$-gap-filler of $\{c_i\}$, let $k_i \geq \Gamma_i$ and let $T_0, \dots, T_{k_1} \geq \Gamma_1$, $T_{k_1+1}, \dots, T_{k_2} \geq \Gamma_2$, etc... Let (σ, q) minimize $\mathcal{L}_c - \omega$ in $\mathcal{D}$. Then σ_t is a solution of $(ODE)_{Lag}$.*

Proof. We know from lemma 3.6 that, if we choose Γ_i large enough, for any $t \in [\tilde{T}_{s-1}, \tilde{T}_s]$, $s \geq 1$ there is $\bar{q}\colon [0, +\infty) \to S^1$, minimal for $L_c - \omega$, such that

$$dist_{weak}(\sigma_t, \bar{q}(t)) < \frac{\gamma_s}{4}.$$

Now, $\bar{q}$ is a minimal orbit of the one-dimensional Lagrangian $L_c - \omega$; for this Lagrangian it has been proven in [2] that, if T_{s-1}, T_s, T_{s+1} are large enough and $a \in [\tilde{T}_{s-1}, \tilde{T}_s]$, $s \geq 1$, there is $\tilde{q} \in \mathcal{G}(f_s)$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [a, a+1]} |\bar{q}(t) - \tilde{q}(t)|_{S^1} < \frac{\gamma_s}{4}.$$

Together with the last formula, this implies that, if we choose Γ_i large enough, we have that, for $s \geq 1$ and $a \in [\tilde{T}_{s-1}, \tilde{T}_s]$, there is $\tilde{q} \in \mathcal{G}(f_s)$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in [a, a+1]} dist_{weak}(\sigma_t, \tilde{q}(t)) < \frac{\gamma_s}{2}. \tag{3.3}$$

Thus, if we choose $\gamma_s \leq \delta_s$, we have A') below; possibly reducing γ_s, we get B').

A') σ_t is $\frac{1}{2}\delta_s$-concentrated for $t \in [\tilde{T}_s, \tilde{T}_{s+1}]$ and $s \geq 0$.

B') $\mu_t(\bar{V}_s \cap (\{t\} \times S^1)) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_s$ for $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_s]$ and $s \geq 0$.

In particular, σ satisfies points A) and B) above; thus, we can find an extension (σ, q) such that $(t, q(t)) \in U_s$ for $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_s]$.

Now we can show that the Euler-Lagrange equation holds. Let $T > \tilde{T}_0$, let $\psi \in C^1([0, T], L^2(I))$ and let us suppose that $\psi_0 = \psi_T = 0$. Let us set $\sigma^\lambda = \sigma + \lambda\psi$; the boundary conditions on ψ imply that

$$\sigma^\lambda_0 = \sigma_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^\lambda_T = \sigma_T.$$

Moreover,

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} ||\sigma^\lambda_t - \sigma_t||_{L^2(I)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad \lambda \to 0.$$

The formula above and A'), B') imply that, if λ is small enough, then σ^λ satisfies points A) and B). We have seen that this implies that σ^λ_t has an extension $(\sigma^\lambda_t, q^\lambda(t))$ with $(t, q^\lambda(t)) \in U_s$ for $t \in [\tilde{T}_s - 1, \tilde{T}_s]$. Moreover, arguing as in lemma 3.2, we can require that $q^\lambda(T) = q(T)$. By lemma 3.4, q and q^λ are homotopic in $\mathcal{U}$; moreover, $\omega(T_0 - 1, \cdot) = 0$. Thus,

$$\int_{\tilde{T}_0 - 1}^{T} \omega(t, q(t)) \cdot (1, \dot{q}(t)) \mathrm{d}t = \int_{\tilde{T}_0 - 1}^{T} \omega(t, q^\lambda(t)) \cdot (1, \dot{q}^\lambda(t)) \mathrm{d}t.$$

This and the fact that σ_t is minimal for $\mathcal{L}-\omega$ imply that

$$\int_0^T \mathcal{L}_{c_0}(t,\sigma_t^\lambda,\dot\sigma_t^\lambda)\mathrm{d}t - \int_0^T \mathcal{L}_{c_0}(t,\sigma_t,\dot\sigma_t)\mathrm{d}t \geq 0.$$

Differentiating in λ, we get that σ solves $(ODE)_{Lag}$.

\\\

Lemma 3.8. *For any $c \in \mathbf{R}$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, there is $T_\epsilon(c) \in \mathbf{N}$ with the following properties: if $\sigma\colon [0,T_\epsilon(c)] \to Mon$ is c-minimal for $\mathcal{L}$, then there is a time $t \in [0,T_\epsilon(c)]$ such that*

$$\inf_{q\in\mathcal{M}(c)} [dist_{weak}(\sigma_t,q(t)) + \|\dot\sigma_t - \dot q(t)\|_{L^2(I)}] \leq \epsilon.$$

Moreover, if $\sigma\colon [0,+\infty] \to Mon$ is c-minimal for $\mathcal{L}$, then

$$\inf_{q\in\mathrm{Lim}(c)} [dist_{weak}(\sigma_t,q(t)) + \|\dot\sigma_t - \dot q(t)\|_{L^2(I)}] \leq \epsilon \quad \textit{for} \quad t \geq \frac{1}{2}T_\epsilon(c).$$

Proof. We begin with the first statement. By lemma 2.9 of [2], there is $\tilde T_\epsilon(c) \in \mathbf{N}$ with the following property: if $T \in \mathbf{N}$, if $q\colon [T,T+\tilde T_\epsilon(c)] \to S^1$ is c-minimal for L, then there is $t \in [T,T+\tilde T_\epsilon(c)]$ and $\tilde q \in \mathcal{M}(c)$ such that

$$|q(t)-\tilde q(t)| + |\dot q(t) - \dot{\tilde q}(t)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

By theorem 1, for $\gamma > 0$, there is $T \in \mathbf{N}$ and q c-minimal such that

$$dist_{weak}(\sigma_T,q(T)) + ||\dot\sigma_T - \dot q(T)||_{L^2(I)} \leq \gamma.$$

If we take γ small enough and $T_\epsilon(c) = T+\tilde T_\epsilon(c)$, the thesis follows from the last two formulas and continuous dependence on the initial conditions.

The proof of the second statement is similar to the first one: σ_t accumulates, for t large, on a c-minimal orbit of L; this orbit accumulates on $\mathrm{Lim}(c)$ by definition of the latter.

\\\

Proof of theorem 2. Let $\{f_s\}$ be a $\{k_i\}$-gap-filler of $\{c_i\}$; let Γ_i satisfy the hypotheses of lemma 3.7, and let $k_i = \Gamma_i$. We define the form ω as above, choosing the times T_s in the following way. When $f_s = d_j^i$ and $j \neq 0$, we take $T_s = k_i$. When $f_s = d_0^i$, we take

$$T_s = t_i^{''} - t_i' - (k_i-1)k_i + (t_{i+1}' - t_i^{''}).$$

Here, t_i' and $t_i^{''}$ are as in the hypotheses of theorem 2; since we want that $T_s \geq k_i$, we ask that

$$t_{i+1}' - t_i^{''} \geq T(c_i,c_{i+1}) := k_i^2.$$

Moreover, we ask that

$$t_i^{''} - t_i' \geq T_{\epsilon_i}(c_i)$$

where $T_{\epsilon_i}(c_i)$ is defined as in lemma 3.8.

Now lemma 3.5 holds for any choice of the T_i, and thus there is (σ, q) minimal in $\mathcal{D}$ for $\mathcal{L} - \omega$. We have chosen k_i and T_i in such a way that they satisfy the hypotheses of lemma 3.7. As a consequence, σ solves $(ODE)_{Lag}$. Formula (1) of theorem 2 holds by our choice of $T_\epsilon(c_i)$ and lemma 3.8. As for the last statement of theorem 2, it follows from the last statement of lemma 3.8.

\\\

Acknowledgements. We thank the referees for helpful comments and remarks.

Bibliography

[1] R. A. Adams, Sobolev spaces, Academic Press, 1975, New York.

[2] P. Bernard, Connecting orbits of time-dependent Lagrangian systems, Annales de l'Institut Fourier, Grenoble, **52**, 1533-1568, 2002.

[3] P. Bernard, B. Buffoni, Optimal mass transportation and Aubry-Mather theory, J. Eur. Math. Soc., **9**, 85-121, 2007.

[4] A. Fathi, Weak KAM theorem in Lagrangian dynamics, Fourth preliminary version, mimeographed notes, Lyon, 2003.

[5] W. Gangbo, A. Tudorascu, Lagrangian dynamics on an infinite-dimensional torus; a weak KAM theorem, Adv. Math., **224**, 260-292, 2010.

[6] W. Gangbo, T. Nguyen, A. Tudorascu, Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the Wasserstein space, Methods Appl. Anal., **15**, 155-183, 2008.

[7] W. Gangbo, A. Tudorascu, A weak KAM theorem: from finite to infinite dimension, in Optimal transportation, Geometric and functional inequalities, L. Ambrosio editor, Pisa, 2010.

[8] J. N. Mather, Action minimizing invariant measures for positive-definite Lagrangian Systems, Math. Zeit., **207**, 169-207, 1991.

[9] J. N. Mather, Variational construction of connecting orbits, Ann. Inst. Fourier, **43**, 1349-1386, 1993.