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WEAK LIMITS OF POWERS OF CHACON’S AUTOMORPHISM

É. JANVRESSE, A. A. PRIKHOD’KO, T. DE LA RUE, AND V. V. RYZHIKO

Abstract. We completely describe the weak closure of the powers of the Koopman operator associated to Chacon’s classical automorphism. We show that weak limits of these powers are the ortho-projector to constants and an explicit family of polynomials. As a consequence, we answer negatively the question of $\alpha$-weak mixing for Chacon’s automorphism.

1. Introduction

The classical version of Chacon’s automorphism, which is the main subject of the present work, was described by Friedman in [7]. It is a famous example of a rank-one automorphism, for which we recall briefly the construction by cutting and stacking: We start with a Rokhlin tower of height $h_0 := 1$, called Tower 0. At step $n$, Tower $n−1$ (of height $h_{n−1}$) is cut into 3 sub-columns, a spacer is inserted above the middle column before stacking all parts to get Tower $n$, of height $h_n = 3h_{n−1} + 1$. This transformation, denoted hereafter by $T$ and acting on a standard Borel probability space $(X, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$, is known to present an interesting combination of ergodic and spectral properties. It is weakly mixing but not strongly mixing (see [2], where the historical version of Chacon’s automorphism is constructed with only 2 sub-columns, but whose arguments also apply in the classical case). Del Junco proved in [4] that $T$ has trivial centralizer, then improved this result by showing with Rahe and Swanson that it has minimal self-joinings [3]. The second and fourth author proved in [9] that the convolution powers of its maximal spectral type are pairwise mutually singular. Their method involves the identification, in the weak closure of the powers of the associated Koopman operator $\hat{T}$, of an infinite family of polynomials in $\hat{T}$.

An automorphism $S$ is said to be $\alpha$-weakly mixing (for some $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$) if there exists a sequence $(k_j)$ of integers such that $S^{k_j}$ converges weakly to $\alpha \Theta + (1 - \alpha) \text{Id}$, where $\Theta$ is the ortho-projector to constants. The disjointness of the convolution powers is automatically satisfied in the case of $\alpha$-weakly mixing transformations with $0 < \alpha < 1$ (see Katok [8] and Stepin [13]). This property has been applied for numerous counterexamples in ergodic theory [5]. The question of $\alpha$-weak mixing for Chacon’s automorphism is a special case of a general problem to tell which operators can be obtained as weak limits of powers of $\hat{T}$. For a recent application of weak limits of powers of the Koopman operator, see [6]. Examples of transformations with non-trivial explicit weak closure of powers are given in [12].

The purpose of the present paper is to completely describe the weak closure

$$\mathcal{L} := \text{WCl}(\{\hat{T}^{-k}, k \in \mathbb{Z}\}) = \left\{ \lim_{j \to \infty} \hat{T}^{-k_j}, \text{ for a sequence of integers } (k_j) \right\}.$$
of the powers of \( \hat{T} \). Our main result, Theorem 5.1, states that \( \mathcal{L} \) is reduced to \( \Theta \) and an explicit family of polynomials in \( \hat{T} \). Our result implies in particular that \( T \) is not \( \alpha \)-weakly mixing for any \( 0 < \alpha < 1 \). Note that partial results in the description of \( \mathcal{L} \) have also been given by Ageev [1] who gave all polynomials in \( \hat{T} \) of degree at most 1 in \( \mathcal{L} \).

An essential ingredient in our description of \( \mathcal{L} \) is the identification of particular weak limits, along the sequences \( (mh_n)_{n \geq 1} \), where \( h_n \) is the height of the \( n \)-th tower in the cutting-and-stacking construction. As observed in [10], these weak limits are given by a family of polynomials \( (P_m(\hat{T})) \). In Section 2, we give a definition of these polynomials \( P_m \) based on the representation of \( T \) as an integral automorphism over the 3-adic odometer (this representation was already used in [9]). We provide inductive formulas for these polynomials in Section 3. These formulas enable us to derive useful results about the asymptotic behavior of their coefficients (Section 4).

Then, by expanding the integers \( (k_j) \) along the heights \( (h_n) \), we prove that if the weak limit of \( \hat{T}^{-k_i} \) is not \( \Theta \), then it can be factorized by some polynomial \( P_m(\hat{T}) \) (Proposition 5.6).

2. Representation of Chacon’s automorphism as integral automorphisms over the 3-adic odometer

2.1. Definition of the polynomials \( P_m \) in the 3-adic group. Consider the compact group of 3-adic numbers

\[
\Gamma := \mathbb{Z}_3 = \left\{ x = (x_0, x_1, x_2, \ldots), x_k \in \{0, 1, 2\} \right\}.
\]

We denote by \( \lambda \) the Haar measure on \( \Gamma \): Under \( \lambda \), the coordinates \( (x_k) \) are i.i.d., uniformly distributed in \( \{0, 1, 2\} \).

We introduce two \( \lambda \)-preserving transformations on \( \Gamma \):

- The shift-map \( \sigma : x = (x_0, x_1, \ldots) \in \Gamma \mapsto \sigma x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots) \in \Gamma \).
- The adding-machine transformation \( S : x \in \Gamma \mapsto x + 1 \in \Gamma \), where 1 is identified with the sequence \( (1, 0, 0, \ldots) \). (In general, each integer \( j \) is identified with an element of \( \Gamma \), so that \( S^j x = x + j \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \) and all \( x \in \Gamma \).)

We define the cocycle \( \phi : \Gamma \setminus \{(2, 2, \ldots)\} \to \mathbb{Z} \), where \( \phi(x) \) is the first coordinate of \( x \) which is different from 2:

\[
\phi(x) := \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } x = 2 \ldots 20^* \\
1 & \text{if } x = 2 \ldots 21^* .
\end{cases}
\]

We set \( \phi^{(0)}(x) := 0 \) and for \( m \geq 1 \),

\[
\phi^{(m)}(x) := \phi(x) + \phi(Sx) + \cdots + \phi(S^{m-1}x).
\]

Let us define \( \pi_m \) as the probability distribution of \( \phi^{(m)} \) on \( \mathbb{Z} \): \( \pi_m(j) := \lambda(\phi^{(m)} = j) \), and the polynomial \( P_m \) by

\[
P_m(X) := \mathbb{E}_\lambda \left[ X^{\phi^{(m)}} \right] = \sum_{j=0}^{m} \pi_m(j) X^j.
\]

Note that the degree of \( P_m \) is strictly less than \( m \) as soon as \( m > 2 \).
2.2. Integral automorphisms over the 3-adic odometer. We will make use of the following representations of Chacon’s automorphism. For each $n \geq 0$, we define

$$X_n := \{(x, i) : x \in \Gamma, 0 \leq i \leq h_n - 1 + \phi(x)\}$$

(see Figure 1).

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{0} & \text{1} & \text{20} & \text{21} & \cdots \\
\hline
\text{0*} & \text{1*} & \text{20*} & \text{21*} & \cdots \\
\hline
\end{array}$$

Figure 1. The space $X_n$

We consider the transformation $T_n$ of $X_n$, defined by

$$T_n(x, i) := \begin{cases} 
(x, i + 1) & \text{if } i + 1 \leq h_n - 1 + \phi(x) \\
(Sx, 0) & \text{if } i = h_n - 1 + \phi(x).
\end{cases}$$

Let us introduce the map $\psi_n : X_n \to X_{n+1}$ defined by

$$\psi_n(x, i) := (\sigma x, x_0 h_n + i + 1_{x_0=2}).$$

Observe that $\psi_n$ is bijective. Moreover, it conjugates the transformations $T_n$ and $T_{n+1}$. We consider the probability measure $\mu_n$ on $X_n$: For a fixed $i$ and a set $A \subset \{(x, i), x \in \Gamma\}$,

$$\mu_n(A) := \frac{1}{h_n + 1/2} \lambda(\{(x, i) \in \Gamma, (x, i) \in A\}).$$

The transformation $T_n$ preserves $\mu_n$ and the map $\psi_n$ sends $\mu_n$ to $\mu_{n+1}$. It follows that all the measure-preserving dynamical systems $(X_n, T_n, \mu_n)$ are isomorphic.

For $0 \leq i \leq h_n - 1$, we set $E_{n,i} := \{(x, i) : x \in \Gamma\} \subset X_n$. We have $E_{n,i} = T_n E_{n,0}$, hence

$$\{E_{n,0}, \ldots, E_{n,h_n-1}\}$$

is a Rokhlin tower of height $h_n$ for $T_n$. Moreover, for any $n \geq 0$, and any $0 \leq i \leq h_n - 1$,

$$\psi_n(E_{n,i}) = E_{n+1,i} \sqcup E_{n+1,h_n+i} \sqcup E_{n+1,2h_n+i+1}.$$

Fix $n_0$. By composition of the isomorphisms $(\psi_n)$, we can view all these Rokhlin towers inside $X_{n_0}$. The above formula shows that the towers are embedded in the same way as the towers of Chacon’s automorphism. Therefore, $(X_{n_0}, \mu_{n_0}, T_{n_0})$ is isomorphic to $(X, \mu, T)$. 
2.3. Weak limits along subsequences \((mh_n)_{n \geq 1}\).

**Lemma 2.1.** Let \(m \geq 1\) and \(u \geq 0\) be fixed integers. Then

\[
\sup_{A,B} \left| \mu \left( T^{mh_n+u}B \cap A \right) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_m(i+u) \mu \left( T^{-i}B \cap A \right) \right| \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0.
\]

where the supremum is taken over any sets \(A\) and \(B\) which are union of levels of Tower \(n\).

**Proof.** We may identify \((X,\mu,T)\) with \((X_n,\mu_n,T_n)\) and the level \(j\) of Tower \(n\) with \(E_{n,j} = \{(x,j) : x \in \Gamma\} \subset X_n\).

Assume that \(A = E_{n,k}\) for \(0 \leq k \leq h_n - 1\) and \(B = E_{n,j}\) for \(m < j \leq h_n - 1\).

We have

\[
T^{mh_n}B = T^{mh_n}E_{n,j} = \left\{ (S^m x, j - \phi(m)(x)) : x \in \Gamma \right\}.
\]

Then, viewed in \(X_n\),

\[
T^{mh_n}B \cap A = S^m \left\{ x \in \Gamma : \phi(m)(x) = j - k \right\} \times \{k\},
\]

and

\[
\mu \left( T^{mh_n}B \cap A \right) = \lambda \left( \phi(m) = j - k \right) \mu(E_{n,k}) = \pi_m(j-k)\mu(E_{n,k}).
\]

Moreover, \(\mu \left( T^{-i}B \cap A \right) = \mu(E_{n,k})\) if \(k = j - i\), and zero otherwise. We obtain that

\[
\mu \left( T^{mh_n}B \cap A \right) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_m(i) \mu \left( T^{-i}B \cap A \right).
\]

By additivity of the measure \(\mu\), the above equality remains true if \(A\) is a union of levels of Tower \(n\), and if \(B\) is a union of levels \(j \geq m\) of Tower \(n\). Finally, removing the restriction on the levels in \(B\), we have

\[
\left| \mu \left( T^{mh_n}B \cap A \right) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_m(i) \mu \left( T^{-i}B \cap A \right) \right| \leq 2m \mu(E_{n,0}) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0.
\]

This proves the lemma for \(u = 0\). For an arbitrary \(u\), we apply this result to the part of \(T^uB\) which remains in the \(n\)-th tower. We get an extra error term of order \(|u|\mu(E_{n,0})\).

As a direct consequence of Lemma 2.1, we recover the result from [10]:

**Theorem 2.2.** For any \(m \geq 1\), we have the weak convergence

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \tilde{T}^{-mh_n} = P_m(\tilde{T}).
\]

3. Recurrence formulas for \(P_m\)

3.1. Description of the sequence \((\phi(S^jx))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}\). Let \(x \in \Gamma \setminus \{(2,2,\ldots)\}\). We say that \(\text{order}(x) = k \geq 0\) if \(x_0 = \cdots = x_{k-1} = 2\) and \(x_k \neq 2\).

Since the first digit in the sequence \((\ldots, x-1, x, x+1, \ldots)\) follows a periodic pattern \(01201201\ldots\), the contribution of points of order 0 in the sequence \((\phi(S^jx))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}\) provides a periodic sequence of blocks 01 separated by one symbol given by a point of higher order (see Figure 2). To fill in the missing symbols corresponding to positions \(j\) such that \(\text{order}(x+j) \geq 1\), we observe that, if \(x\) starts with a 2, then for all \(j \in \mathbb{Z}\),

\[
\phi(x + 3j) = \phi(\sigma x + j).
\]
Hence the missing symbols are given by the sequence \( (\phi(S^j x))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \).

\[
\begin{align*}
0 & \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 0 & \quad \text{contribution of order 0} \\
0 & \quad 1 & \quad 0 & \quad 1 & \quad 0 & \quad \text{contribution of order 1} \\
0 & \quad & \quad & \quad & \quad & \quad \text{higher orders} \\
0 & \quad 1 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 1 & \quad 0 & \quad 0 & \quad 1 & \quad 0 & \quad \text{the whole sequence}
\end{align*}
\]

\textbf{Figure 2.} Structure of the sequence \( (\phi(S^j x))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \).

\textbf{Lemma 3.1.} The probability distributions of the random sequences \( (\phi(S^j x))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \) and \( (1 - \phi(S^{-j} x))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \) are the same.

\textit{Proof.} This is an easy consequence of the above construction of the sequence \( (\phi(S^j x))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \) and the fact that \( \sigma \) preserves the measure \( \lambda \). \( \square \)

\textbf{Lemma 3.2.} The coefficients of the polynomial \( P_m \) are symmetrical: For all \( 0 \leq j \leq m \), \( \pi_m(j) = \pi_m(m - j) \).

\textit{Proof.} The coefficient \( \pi_m(m - j) \) is equal to the probability to see \( (m - j) \) digits equal to 1 when looking at \( m \) consecutive terms of the sequence \( (\phi(S^j x))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \). Thus, \( \pi_m(m - j) \) is also equal to the probability to see \( j \) digits equal to 0 when looking at \( m \) consecutive terms. Using Lemma 3.1, we conclude that \( \pi_m(m - j) = \pi_m(j) \). \( \square \)

\textbf{3.2. Recurrence formulas for} \( P_m \).

\textbf{Theorem 3.3.} For all \( m \geq 0 \),

\[
P_m(X) = X^m P_m(X);
\]

\[
P_{m+1}(X) = \frac{1}{3} X^m \left( (1 + X)P_m(X) + P_{m+1}(X) \right);
\]

\[
P_{m+2}(X) = \frac{1}{3} X^m \left( XP_m(X) + (1 + X)P_{m+1}(X) \right).
\]

\textit{Proof.} Let \( x \in \Gamma \setminus \{2, 2, \ldots\} \). In the computation of \( \phi^{(3m)}(x) \), the contribution of the 2m points \( x + j \) (\( 0 \leq j \leq 3m - 1 \)) of order 0 is always \( m \). Because of the structure of the sequence \( (\phi(S^j x))_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \) described in section 3.1, the contribution of the other \( m \) points is \( \phi^{(m)}(\sigma x) \). Hence,

\[
\phi^{(3m)}(x) = m + \phi^{(m)}(\sigma x),
\]

which proves that \( P_{3m} = X^m P_m \).

Let us compute \( \phi^{(3m+1)}(x) \): If \( x_0 = 0 \), then \( \phi^{(3m+1)}(x) = \phi^{(3m)}(x + 1) \), which is equal to \( m + \phi^{(m)}(\sigma(x + 1)) \) by (2). Hence, \( \phi^{(3m+1)}(x) = m + \phi^{(m)}(\sigma x) \). If \( x_0 = 1 \), then \( \phi^{(3m+1)}(x) = 1 + \phi^{(3m)}(x + 1) \). Hence,

\[
\phi^{(3m+1)}(x) = 1 + m + \phi^{(m)}(\sigma(x + 1)) = 1 + m + \phi^{(m)}(\sigma x).
\]

If \( x_0 = 2 \), then \( \phi^{(3m+1)}(x) = \phi(x) + \phi^{(3m)}(x + 1) \). Since \( \phi(x) = \phi(\sigma x) \), we get

\[
\phi^{(3m+1)}(x) = \phi(\sigma x) + m + \phi^{(m)}(\sigma x + 1) = m + \phi^{(m+1)}(\sigma x).
\]

(3)

\[
\phi^{(3m+1)}(x) = \begin{cases} 
m + \phi^{(m)}(x) & \text{if } x_0 = 0, \\
1 + m + \phi^{(m)}(\sigma x) & \text{if } x_0 = 1, \\
m + \phi^{(m+1)}(\sigma x) & \text{if } x_0 = 2.
\end{cases}
\]
Since each digit appears with probability $1/3$ in first position, and since the distribution of $\sigma x$ conditioned on the first digit is $\lambda$, we get

$$P_{3m+1}(X) = \frac{1}{3} \left( E_{\Lambda} \left[ X^{m+\phi(m)} \right] + E_{\Lambda} \left[ X^{m+\phi(m)+1} \right] + E_{\Lambda} \left[ X^{m+\phi(m+1)} \right] \right).$$

This yields the desired formula for $P_{3m+1}$.

In the same way, we compute $\phi(3^m)(x)$:

$$\phi(3^m)(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + m + \phi(m)(\sigma x) & \text{if } x_0 = 0, \\ 1 + m + \phi(m+1)(\sigma x) & \text{if } x_0 = 1, \\ m + \phi(m+1)(\sigma x) & \text{if } x_0 = 2, \end{cases}$$

and we obtain the recurrence formula for $P_{3m+2}$.

3.3. Recurrence formulas for reduced polynomials. For $m \geq 0$, let $\ell(m)$ be the highest power of $X$ dividing $P_m$, so that

$$P_m(X) = X^{\ell(m)} \tilde{P}_m(X),$$

where $\tilde{P}_m$ is the reduced polynomial of order $m$, $\tilde{P}_m(0) \neq 0$.

Observe that $\ell(m)$ is the minimum value taken by the cocycle $\phi(m)$. Hence it is easy to see that $m \mapsto \ell(m)$ is non-decreasing, and that

$$s_m := \ell(m+1) - \ell(m) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.2,

$$\ell(m) + \deg(P_m) = m. \hspace{1cm} (5)$$

Thanks to the recurrence formulas for $P_m$ (see Theorem 3.3), we deduce recurrence formulas for $\ell(m)$:

$$\ell(3m) = m + \ell(m),$$

$$\ell(3m+1) = m + \ell(m),$$

$$\ell(3m+2) = m + \ell(m+1). \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

We also get recurrence formulas for the reduced polynomials:

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $m \geq 0$. then

$$\tilde{P}_{3m}(X) = \tilde{P}_m(X);$$

$$3\tilde{P}_{3m+1}(X) = (1+X)\tilde{P}_m(X) + X^{s_m} \tilde{P}_{m+1}(X);$$

$$3\tilde{P}_{3m+2}(X) = X^{1-s_m} \tilde{P}_m(X) + (1+X)\tilde{P}_{m+1}(X),$$

**Lemma 3.5.** Consider the 3-expansion of $m$: $m = \sum_{j \geq 0} m_j 3^j$, where $m_j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Let $i := \inf\{j : m_j \neq 1\}$. Then $s_m = 1$ if $m_i = 2$ and $s_m = 0$ if $m_i = 0$.

**Proof.** By (6), we see that $s_{3m} = 0$ and $s_{3m+2} = 1$. Moreover, $s_{3m+1} = s_m$. \qed
3.4. Degree of $\tilde{P}_m$. Let $d_m$ be the degree of $\tilde{P}_m$. Using (5), we get $d_m = \deg(P_m) - \ell(m) = m - 2\ell(m)$. Hence, we easily check that

$$d_{m+1} - d_m = 1 - 2s_m \in \{-1, 1\},$$

and $s_m = 1_{\{d_m > d_{m+1}\}}$. By Proposition 3.4, we have

$$d_{3m} = d_m, \quad d_{3m+1} = d_m + 1, \quad d_{3m+2} = d_{m+1} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d_{3m+3} = d_{m+1}. \tag{7}$$

We thus get an algorithm to compute the degree $d_m$ of $\tilde{P}_m$. Consider the 3-expansion of $m$: $m = \sum_{j>0} m_j 3^j$. In this expansion, remove all 1’s and count the number of blocks of 2’s. Then $d_m$ is equal to the number of removed 1’s plus twice the number of 2-blocks.

Example: Consider $m$ whose expansion in base 3 is 212202. Remove one 1, you get 22202 (two 2-blocks). Hence $d_m = 1 + 2 \times 2 = 5$.

**Corollary 3.6.** The first appearance of a reduced polynomial of degree $d$ is observed at

$$m = 2 + \sum_{j=1}^{d-2} 3^j = \frac{3^{d-1} + 1}{2}.$$ 

4. Properties of the probability distribution $\pi_m$

4.1. Unimodality of the distribution $\pi_m$. We set $b^{(m)}_j := \pi_m(j + \ell(m)) = \lambda(\phi^{(m)} = j + \ell(m))$, so that

$$\tilde{P}_m(X) = \sum_{j=0}^{d_m} b^{(m)}_j X^j.$$ 

Observe that by Lemma 3.2, the coefficients of $\tilde{P}_m$ are symmetric: $b^{(m)}_j = b^{(m)}_{d_m-j}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq d_m$.

**Lemma 4.1.** For any $m \geq 0$, the coefficients $\left(b^{(m)}_j\right)_{0 \leq j \leq \lceil d_m/2 \rceil}$ of $\tilde{P}_m$ are increasing.

**Proof.** The lemma holds for $\tilde{P}_0 = 1$ and $\tilde{P}_1(X) = (1 + X)/2$. Using Proposition 3.4, we prove the lemma by induction on $m$. Assume the property we want to prove is satisfied for some $m$ and $m+1$ and let us prove it is also true for $3m, 3m+1, 3m+2$ and $3m+3$. It obviously holds for $3m$ and $3m+3$ since $\tilde{P}_{3m} = \tilde{P}_m$ and $\tilde{P}_{3m+3} = \tilde{P}_{m+1}$. We can assume without loss of generality that $d_m < d_{m+1}$ (that is $s_m = 0$). Indeed, the recurrence formulas have the form

$$\left(\tilde{P}_{3m}, \tilde{P}_{3m+1}, \tilde{P}_{3m+2}, \tilde{P}_{3m+3}\right) = F \left(\tilde{P}_m, \tilde{P}_{m+1}\right),$$

where $F$ is such that

$$\left(\tilde{P}_{3m+3}, \tilde{P}_{3m+2}, \tilde{P}_{3m+1}, \tilde{P}_{3m}\right) = F \left(\tilde{P}_{m+1}, \tilde{P}_m\right).$$

By Proposition 3.4, we have $3b^{(3m+1)}_j = b^{(m+1)}_j + b^{(m+1)}_j$ and for $j \geq 1$

$$3b^{(3m+1)}_j = b^{(m)}_j + b^{(m)}_j + b^{(m)}_j.$$ 

Recall that $d_{3m+1} = d_m + 1$ (see Section 3.4) and we assumed that $d_{m+1} = d_m + 1$. Hence, if $d_m$ is even, we have $[d_{3m+1}/2] = [d_m/2] = [d_{m+1}/2]$ and the three terms on the RHS of the above equation are increasing functions of $j \in \{0, \ldots, [d_{3m+1}/2]\}$. If $d_m$ is odd, only the first term on the RHS may not be increasing for the largest value
of \( j \). But in this case, because of the symmetry of the coefficients (see Lemma 3.2), we have \( b^{(m)}_{(d_{m}/2)+1} = b^{(m)}_{(d_{m}/2)} \). This proves that the property holds for \( \tilde{P}_{d_{m}+1} \). A similar argument proves the property for \( \tilde{P}_{d_{m}+2} \). □

As a consequence of Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 4.1, we obtain:

**Proposition 4.2.** For all \( m \geq 1 \), the probability distribution \( \pi_{m} \) is symmetric and unimodal.

4.2. **Asymptotic behavior of \( \pi_{m} \) when \( d_{m} \to \infty \).** Recall that, for all \( m \), the coefficients of the polynomial \( P_{m} \) are given by the probability distribution \( \pi_{m} \) on \( \mathbb{Z} \) which is symmetric and unimodal (see Proposition 4.2). Recall that \( d_{m} \) is the degree of the reduced polynomial \( \tilde{P}_{m} \), that is \( (d_{m} + 1) \) is the number of nonzero coefficients of \( P_{m} \).

For any \( m \geq 1 \), consider the Fourier transform \( \hat{\pi}_{m} \) defined by

\[
\hat{\pi}_{m}(z) := \sum_{j} \pi_{m}(j) z^{-j} \quad \forall z \in S^{1}.
\]

Observe that \( \hat{\pi}_{m}(z) = P_{m}(1/z) = P_{m}(z)z^{-m} \). Moreover, we recover \( \pi_{m}(j) \) by the inverse Fourier transform

\[
\pi_{m}(j) = \int_{S^{1}} z^{j}\hat{\pi}_{m}(z) \, dz.
\]

**Lemma 4.3.**

\[
\sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_{m}(j) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{as} \quad d_{m} \to \infty.
\]

**Proof.** Observe that for any \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \),

\[
\pi_{m}(j) \leq \int_{S^{1}} |\hat{\pi}_{m}(z)| \, dz = \int_{S^{1}} |P_{m}(z)| \, dz.
\]

By Theorem 3.3, we have for any \( m \geq 3 \): If \( m \) is a multiple of 3, then \( |P_{m}(z)| = |P_{m/3}(z)| \). Otherwise, there exist \( m' < m \) and \( m'' < m \) such that

\[
|P_{m}(z)| \leq \frac{1+|1+z|}{3} \sup(|P_{m'}(z)|, |P_{m''}(z)|),
\]

Moreover, by (8),

\[
d_{m'} \geq d_{m} - 2, \quad \text{and} \quad d_{m''} \geq d_{m} - 2.
\]

Since \( |P_{1}(z)| \leq 1 \) and \( |P_{2}(z)| \leq 1 \), we easily prove by induction on \( m \) that

(9) \[
\forall m \geq 1, \quad |P_{m}(z)| \leq |\alpha(z)|^{(d_{m} - 2)/2},
\]

where \( \alpha(z) := \frac{1+|1+z|}{3} \). Since \( |\alpha(z)| < 1 \) for \( z \neq 1 \), we conclude the proof of the lemma. □

5. **Weak limits of powers of \( \hat{T} \)**

Recall that \( \mathcal{L} \) is the set of all weak limits of powers of \( \hat{T} \), and that \( \Theta \) is the ortho-projector to constants. The purpose of this section is to prove the following Theorem:
Theorem 5.1.
\[ \mathcal{L} = \{ \Theta \} \cup \{ P_{m_1}(\hat{T}) \ldots P_{m_r}(\hat{T}) \hat{T}^n, \ r \geq 0, \ 1 \leq m_1 \leq \ldots \leq m_r, \ n \in \mathbb{Z} \}. \]
Moreover, limits of the form \( \hat{T}^n \) for some \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \) can only be obtained as limits of \( \hat{T}^{-k_j} \) for bounded sequences \( (k_j) \).

5.1. Correspondence between elements of \( \mathcal{L} \) and measures on \( \mathbb{Z} \). Any \( L \in \mathcal{L} \) is associated with a self-joining \( \rho \) by
\[ \rho(A \times B) := (L 1_A, 1_B), \ \forall A, B. \]
Since \( T \) has minimal self-joinings, \( \rho \) is of the form
\[ \rho_\nu := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \nu(j) \Delta_{-j} + (1 - \nu(\mathbb{Z})) \mu \otimes \mu, \]
where \( \Delta_{-j}(A \times B) := \mu(A \cap T^{-j} B) \) and \( \nu \) is a positive measure on \( \mathbb{Z} \) with \( \nu(\mathbb{Z}) \leq 1 \).
Therefore, \( L \) has the form
\[ L = L_\nu := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \nu(j) \hat{T}^j + (1 - \nu(\mathbb{Z})) \Theta. \]
We set, for any positive measure \( \nu \) on \( \mathbb{Z} \) with \( \nu(\mathbb{Z}) \leq 1 \),
\[ \delta(\nu) := \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\nu(j + 1) - \nu(j)|. \]

Lemma 5.2. For any positive measures \( \nu \) and \( \nu' \) on \( \mathbb{Z} \) of total mass \( \leq 1 \), we have
\[ \delta(\nu * \nu') \leq \delta(\nu). \]
Proof.
\[ \delta(\nu * \nu') = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\nu * \nu'(j + 1) - \nu * \nu'(j)| \]
\[ = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \left| \sum_k \nu(j + 1 - k) - \nu(j - k) \right| \nu'(k) \]
\[ \leq \sum_k \nu'(k) \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |\nu(j + 1 - k) - \nu(j - k)| \leq \delta(\nu). \]

Lemma 5.3. Let \( (\nu_\ell) \) be a sequence of positive measures with \( \nu_\ell(\mathbb{Z}) \leq 1 \), such that \( \delta(\nu_\ell) \to 0 \) as \( \ell \to \infty \). Then \( L_{\nu_\ell} \to \Theta \).
Proof. For any \( A, B \), we have
\[ \rho_{\nu_\ell}(A \times B) = \sum_j \nu_\ell(j) \mu(A \cap T^{-j} B) + (1 - \nu_\ell(\mathbb{Z})) \mu(A) \mu(B) \]
and
\[ \rho_{\nu_\ell}(A \times TB) = \sum_j \nu_\ell(j + 1) \mu(A \cap T^{-j} B) + (1 - \nu_\ell(\mathbb{Z})) \mu(A) \mu(B). \]
Hence,
\[ |\rho_{\nu_\ell}(A \times B) - \rho_{\nu_\ell}(A \times TB)| \leq \sum_j |\nu_\ell(j + 1) - \nu_\ell(j)| \mu(A \cap T^{-j} B) \leq \delta(\nu_\ell). \]
It follows that any self-joining \( \rho \) which is a limit of a subsequence of \( (\rho_n) \) satisfies:

\[
\forall A, B \quad \rho(A \times B) = \rho(A \times TB).
\]

By ergodicity of \( T \), we get that \( \rho = \mu \otimes \mu \) and this proves the convergence of \( L_{\nu_T} \) to \( \Theta \).

**Lemma 5.4.**

\[
\sup_{1 \leq m_1 \leq \ldots \leq m_r} \delta (\pi_{m_1} \ast \cdots \ast \pi_{m_r}) \xrightarrow{r \to \infty} 0.
\]

**Proof.** Let us fix \((m_1)_{1 \leq i \leq r} \) larger than 1. Using the fact that the convolution of symmetric unimodal distributions remains symmetric and unimodal (see [11]), we obtain by Proposition 4.2 that \( \pi_{m_1} \ast \cdots \ast \pi_{m_r} \) is symmetric and unimodal. Thus

\[
\delta (\pi_{m_1} \ast \cdots \ast \pi_{m_r}) \leq 2 \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_{m_1} \ast \cdots \ast \pi_{m_r}(j).
\]

Moreover, by (9), we have for all \( j \)

\[
|\pi_{m_1} \ast \cdots \ast \pi_{m_r}(j)| = \left| \int_{S^1} z^j \prod_{i=1}^r \pi_{m_i}(z) \, dz \right| \leq \int_{S^1} \beta(z)^r \, dz,
\]

where \( \beta(z) := \sup \{|P_1(z)|, |P_2(z)|, \alpha(z)\} \). Since \( \beta(z) < 1 \) if \( z \neq 1 \), this ends the proof of the lemma.

5.2. **Factorization in \( \mathcal{L} \).**

**Lemma 5.5.** Let \((k_j)\) be a sequence of integers such that \( k_j = mh_{n_j} + k_j' \), where \( k_j'/h_{n_j} \to 0 \) and \( \lim_{j \to \infty} \hat{T}^{-k_j'} = L' \). Then

\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} \hat{T}^{-k_j} = P_m(\hat{T})L'.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( A \) and \( B \) be unions of levels of a fixed tower. For \( j \) large enough, \( A \) and \( B \) are still unions of levels in Tower \( n_j \), and there exists \( A_j \), union of levels in Tower \( n_j \), such that

\[
\mu(T^{-k_j'}A \Delta A_j) \leq |k_j'|/h_{n_j}.
\]

Then we have

\[
\langle 1_A, \hat{T}^{-k_j}1_B \rangle = \mu(T^{-k_j'}A \cap T^{mh_{n_j}}B)
\]

\[
= \mu(A_j \cap T^{mh_{n_j}}B) + O(k_j'/h_{n_j})
\]

Fix \( \varepsilon > 0 \). By Lemma 2.1, for \( j \) large enough, \( \mu(A_j \cap T^{mh_{n_j}}B) \) is within \( \varepsilon \) of \( \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_m(i)\mu(T^{-i}B \cap A_j) \). The latter expression is equal, up to a correction of order \( k_j'/h_{n_j} \), to

\[
\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_m(i)\mu(T^{-i}B \cap T^{-i}A) = \langle 1_A, \hat{T}^{-k_j'}P_m(\hat{T})1_B \rangle,
\]

which converges to \( \langle 1_A, L'P_m(\hat{T})1_B \rangle \) as \( j \to \infty \).

Let \( L \in \mathcal{L} \): There exists a sequence \((k_j)\) of integers such that

\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} \hat{T}^{-k_j} = L.
\]

If the sequence \((k_j)\) is bounded, then \( L \) is of the form \( \hat{T}^n \) for some \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). Otherwise, without loss of generality, we can assume that \( k_j \) is positive and \( k_j \to +\infty \).
Recall that the heights \((h_n)\) of the Rokhlin towers satisfy: \(h_{n+1} = 3h_n + 1\). We decompose \(k_j\) by the greedy algorithm along the integers \((h_n)\):

\[
k_j = \alpha_0^j h_{n_j} + \alpha_1^j h_{n_j-1} + \cdots + \alpha_s^j h_0,
\]

where \(\alpha_0^j \neq 0\), \(0 \leq \alpha_j^i \leq 3\) for all \(0 \leq \ell \leq n_j\). Observe that if \(\alpha^j_\ell = 3\), then \(\alpha^j_s = 0\) for all \(s > \ell\).

Using a diagonal procedure to extract a subsequence if necessary, we can suppose that for all \(\ell\), \(\alpha^j_\ell \rightarrow \alpha_\ell\) as \(j\) goes to \(\infty\). We have \(0 \leq \alpha_\ell \leq 3\), \(\alpha_0 \neq 0\) and if \(\alpha_\ell = 3\), then \(\alpha_s = 0\) for all \(s > \ell\).

**Proposition 5.6.** Let \(L \in \mathcal{L}\), and let \((k_j)\) and \((\alpha_\ell)\) be as above. If there exists \(r\) such that \(\alpha_\ell = 2\) for all \(\ell > r\), or \(\alpha_\ell = 0\) for all \(\ell > r\), then there exist \(m \geq 1\) and a sequence \((k_j')\) such that

\[
\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \hat{T}^{-k_j} = P_m(\hat{T}) L',
\]

where \(L' = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \hat{T}^{-k_j'}\).

If there exist infinitely many \(\ell\)'s such that \(\alpha_\ell \neq 2\) and infinitely many \(\ell\)'s such that \(\alpha_\ell \neq 0\), then \(L = \emptyset\).

**Proof.** Since \(h_{n+s} = 3^s(h_n + 1/2) - 1/2\), for all \(n, s \geq 0\), note that for all \(r \geq 0\) and all \(j\) large enough,

\[
\sum_{\ell=0}^{r} \alpha_\ell h_{n_j-\ell} = m_r h_{(n_j-r)} + u_r,
\]

where

\[
m_r := \alpha_0 3^r + \alpha_1 3^{r-1} + \cdots + \alpha_r \quad \text{and} \quad u_r := \sum_{\ell=0}^{r-1} \alpha_\ell h_{r-\ell-1}.
\]

First assume that \(\alpha_\ell = 0\) for all \(\ell > r\). Then for \(j\) large enough

\[
k_j = \alpha_0 h_{n_j} + \alpha_1 h_{n_j-1} + \cdots + \alpha_r h_{(n_j-r)} + k_j'
\]

where \(k_j' \ll h_{(n_j-r)}\). By (10), we can rewrite \(k_j\) as

\[
k_j = m_r h_{(n_j-r)} + k_j' + u_r,
\]

where \(k_j' + u_r \ll h_{(n_j-r)}\). Extracting a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that \(\hat{T}^{-\langle k_j' + u_r \rangle}\) converges to some \(L'\). We conclude using Lemma 5.5.

Assume now that there exist an infinity of \(r\) such that \(\alpha_r \neq 2\) and an infinity of \(r\) such that \(\alpha_r \neq 0\). By (10), for all \(r \geq 0\), and for all \(j\) large enough (depending on \(r\)),

\[
k_j = m_r h_{(n_j-r)} + u_r + k_j'
\]

where \(k_j' \ll h_{(n_j-r)'}\). Since \(2 \sum_{\ell=1}^{r'} h_{n_j-r-\ell} = h_{(n_j-r)} - h_{n_j-r-r'} - r'\), we get

\[
k_j = \alpha_0 h_{n_j} + \alpha_1 h_{n_j-1} + \cdots + (\alpha_r + 1) h_{(n_j-r)} + k_j'' \]

where \(|k_j''| = |k_j' - h_{n_j-r-r'} - r'| \ll h_{(n_j-r)}\). We get the conclusion using the same argument as above. This proves the first part of the proposition.

Assume now that there exist an infinity of \(r\) such that \(\alpha_r \neq 2\) and an infinity of \(r\) such that \(\alpha_r \neq 0\). By (10), for all \(r \geq 0\), and for all \(j\) large enough (depending on \(r\)),

\[
k_j = m_r h_{(n_j-r)} + u_r + k_j',
\]
where $0 \leq k'_j < h_{(n_j - r)}$. We know that $d_{m_r}$ goes to infinity as $r \to \infty$ (see Section 3.4) by hypotheses on the sequence $(\alpha_k)$. By Lemma 4.3, since $\pi_{m_r}$ is unimodal, we get $\delta(\pi_{m_r} * \delta_k) \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$ uniformly with respect to $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Let us fix $A_0$ and $B_0$ some sets which are union of levels of a fixed tower, say Tower $\pi$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By Lemma 5.3, $P_{m_r}(T^k \xrightarrow{r \to \infty} \Theta)$ uniformly with respect to $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, we can find $r$ large enough so that for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

\[ \left| \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_{m_r}(i + k) \mu(A_0 \cap T^{-i}B_0) - \mu(A_0)\mu(B_0) \right| < \varepsilon. \]  

(11)

Then, we can choose $j$ large enough to satisfy $\alpha_\ell^j = \alpha_\ell$ for all $\ell \leq r$, and

\[ \sup_{A,B} \left| \mu \left( A \cap T^{m_r-h_{(n_j - r)}+u_r}B \right) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_{m_r}(i + u_r) \mu \left( A \cap T^{-i}B \right) \right| < \varepsilon, \]  

(12)

where the supremum is taken over any sets $A$ and $B$ which are union of levels of Tower $(n_j - r)$ (see Lemma 2.1). We also assume that $(n_j - r) \geq \pi$, so that $A_0$ and $B_0$ are unions of levels in Tower $(n_j - r)$.

We want to use (12) in order to estimate

\[ \mu(A_0 \cap T^{k_j}B_0) = \mu \left( A_0 \cap T^{m_r-h_{(n_j - r)}+u_r}(T^{k_j}B_0) \right). \]

The problem is that, although $B_0$ is a union of levels in Tower $(n_j - r)$, this is not always the case for $T^{k_j}B_0$. Therefore we cut $B_0$ into 4 disjoint parts: $B_0 = B_1 \sqcup B_2 \sqcup B_3 \sqcup B_4$, where

- $B_1$ is the part of $B_0$ contained in the first $(h_{(n_j - r)} - k'_j)$ levels of Tower $(n_j - r)$, so that $T^{k_j}B_1$ is a union of levels in Tower $(n_j - r)$ which is included in $T^{k_j}B_0$.
- $B_2$ is the part of $B_0$ contained in the last $(k'_j - 1)$ levels of Tower $(n_j - r)$ which is not under a spacer, so that $T^{k_j}B_2$ is included in a union of levels in Tower $(n_j - r)$ which is itself included in $T^{k_j-h_{(n_j - r)}}B_0$.
- $B_3$ is the part of $B_0$ contained in the last $(k'_j - 1)$ levels of Tower $(n_j - r)$ which is under a spacer, so that $T^{k_j}B_3$ is included in a union of levels in Tower $(n_j - r)$ which is itself included in $T^{k_j-h_{(n_j - r)}-1}B_0$.
- $B_4$ is the part of $B_0$ contained in level $h_{(n_j - r)} - k'_j$ of Tower $(n_j - r)$:

\[ \mu(T^{k_j}B_4) \leq 1/h_{(n_j - r)}. \]

Using three times (12) and (11), we get

\[ \mu(A_0 \cap T^{k_j}B_0) \leq \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_{m_r}(i + u_r) \mu \left( A_0 \cap T^{-i}T^{k_j}B_0 \right) \]

\[ + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_{m_r}(i + u_r) \mu \left( A_0 \cap T^{-i}T^{k_j-h_{(n_j - r)}}B_0 \right) \]

\[ + \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_{m_r}(i + u_r) \mu \left( A_0 \cap T^{-i}T^{k_j-h_{(n_j - r)}-1}B_0 \right) \]

\[ + 3\varepsilon + 1/h_{(n_j - r)} \]

\[ \leq 3\mu(A_0) \mu(B_0) + 6\varepsilon + 1/h_{(n_j - r)}. \]
Hence, the self joining \( \rho \) defined by
\[
\rho(A \times B) := \lim_{j \to \infty} \mu(A \cap T^j B) = \langle 1_A, L1_B \rangle, \quad \forall A, B,
\]
satisfies \( \rho \leq 3\mu \otimes \mu \). By ergodicity of \( \mu \otimes \mu \), we conclude that \( \rho = \mu \otimes \mu \) and \( L = \Theta \).

\[\Box\]

**Proof of Theorem 5.1.** First, fix integers \( n \in \mathbb{Z}, r \geq 1 \) and \( 1 \leq m_1 \leq \cdots \leq m_r \). Using \( r \) times Lemma 5.5, we easily construct a sequence \((k_j)\) such that
\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} \hat{T}^{-k_j} = \prod_{i=1}^r P_{m_i}(\hat{T})\hat{T}^n.
\]

Conversely, we now want to prove that any \( L \in \mathcal{L} \) has this form. For \( L \in \mathcal{L} \), set
\[
r_L := \sup\{ \} \cup \left\{ r \geq 1 : \exists (m_i)_{i \leq r}, \exists L' \in \mathcal{L} \text{ s.t. } L = \prod_{i=1}^r P_{m_i}(\hat{T})L' \right\}.
\]

Observe that if \( L = \Theta \), then \( r_L = \infty \) (because for all \( m, P_m(\hat{T})\Theta = \Theta \)). Conversely, we prove that if \( r_L = \infty \), then \( L = \Theta \): Suppose that \( r_L = \infty \). Then for any \( r \), we can write \( L = \prod_{i=1}^r P_{m_i}(\hat{T})L' \) with \( L' \in \mathcal{L} \). We know that \( L \) and \( L' \) are of the form \( L_u \) and \( L_{uv} \) respectively. Moreover, we have
\[
\nu = \pi_{m_1} \cdots \pi_{m_r} * \nu'.
\]

By Lemma 5.2, \( \delta(\nu) \leq \delta(\pi_{m_1} \cdots \pi_{m_r}) \). But the right-hand side goes to 0 as \( r \to \infty \) by Lemma 5.4, so that \( \delta(\nu) = 0 \). We conclude that \( \nu(\mathbb{Z}) = 0 \) and \( L = \Theta \).

Assume now that \( r_L < \infty \). Let \((k_j)\) be such that \( L = \lim_j \hat{T}^{-k_j} \). If the sequence \((k_j)\) is bounded, then \( L = \hat{T}^n \) for some \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \), otherwise Proposition 5.6 applies, and since \( L \neq \Theta \) there exists \( L' \in \mathcal{L} \) and \( m \geq 1 \) such that \( L = P_m(\hat{T})L' \). We then have \( r_L \geq r_L + 1 \), and we can prove by induction on \( r_L \) that \( L \) is of the form
\[
L = \prod_{i=1}^r P_{m_i}(\hat{T})\hat{T}^n.
\]

\[\Box\]
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