arXiv:1708.00901v1 [math.DS] 2 Aug 2017

# A CHARACTERIZATION OF ROTATION NUMBER ON ONE-DIMENSIONAL TILING SPACES

BETSEYGAIL RAND AND LORENZO SADUN

Abstract. Identity-homotopic self-homeomorphisms of a space of non-periodic 1-dimensional tiling are generalizations of orientation-preserving self-homeomorphisms of circles. We define the analogue of rotation numbers for such maps. In constrast to the classical situation, additional assumptions are required to make rotation numbers globally well-defined and independent of initial conditions. We prove that these conditions are sufficient, and provide counterexamples when these conditions are not met.

## 1. Introduction

Since 1885, rotations numbers have been used to understand orientation-preserving homemorphisms of the circle $S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Each such homeomorphism $f$ lifts to a map $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $F(x+1) = F(x)+1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The rotation number of $f$ (see e.g. [3]) is defined to be $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{F^n(x)-x}{n}$. Different lifts give rotation numbers that differ by integers, so we should view the rotation number as an element of $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. Viewed in this way, the rotation number is always well-defined and does not depend on the initial point $x$.

If $L$ is any length, the circle $\mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z}$ can be viewed as the orbit, under translations, of a tiling that is periodic with period $L$ [5]. We can then view an orientation-preserving homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}/L\mathbb{Z}$ as a map on a space of periodic tilings. The goal of this paper is to define and study an analogue of rotation numbers for self-homeomorphisms, homotopic to the identity ("identity-homotopic") of a space of *non*-periodic tilings of $\mathbb{R}$.

We restrict our attention to non-periodic tilings that have two simplifying properties:

- Finite local complexity (FLC): For each radius $R$, there are only finitely many patterns of size $R$ or smaller, up to translation. Under the topology described below, this is equivalent to the tiling space being compact.
- Repetitivity: For each pattern $P$ that appears in our given tiling $T$, there exists a radius $R$ such that *every* ball of radius $R$ in $T$ contains at least one occurrence of $P$. This is equivalent to the orbit closure of $T$ being a minimal dynamical system. That is, if $\Omega$ is the orbit

closure of $T$ under translation, then the orbit of every tiling $T' \in \Omega$ is dense in $\Omega$.

So why study rotation numbers? In [2], the authors show that all homeomorphisms $f : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_2$ of minimal and uniquely ergodic tiling spaces of finite local complexity can be reduced to the composition of three types of maps.

(1) Local equivalences, sometimes called MLD maps. These are maps in which we relabel and perhaps relocate tiles according to a reversible local rule. For instance, we might take every tile of type $A$ and break it into five tiles of type $A'$. Such maps have no effect on the translational dynamics of the tiling spaces, and are generally viewed as trivial. These are not the maps we wish to study; rather, they are the maps that we usually mod out by.
(2) Shape changes, in which the combinatorics of the tiling $f(T)$ are the same as the combinatorics of the tiling $T$, but in which the shapes and sizes of the tiles in $f(T)$ differ from those of the corresponding tiles in $T$. Shape changes modulo MLD maps are parametrized by the vector-valued Čech cohomology group $\check{H}^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$, where $d$ is the dimension of the Euclidean space being tiled.
(3) Self-homeomorphisms $f : \Omega_1 \to \Omega_1$ that are homotopic to the identity. Since all such maps are homotopically the same, they cannot be studied with the usual tools of algebraic topology. Instead, we propose rotation numbers as a tool for studying such maps when $d = 1$.

In Section 2, we review essential notions from the theory of non-periodic tilings, and define the rotation number $rot_{f,T}(x)$ associated to a space $\Omega$ of non-periodic 1-dimensional tilings, a identity-homotopic self-homeomorphism $f : \Omega \to \Omega$, a tiling $T \in \Omega$, and a point $x \in \mathbb{R}$. A priori, $rot_{f,T}(x)$ depends both on the starting tiling $T$ and on the starting location $x$, as well as on the map $f$. In Section 3 we examine the dependence of $rot_{f,T}(x)$ on $x$. We show that, for fixed $T$ and $f$, $rot_{f,T}(x)$ can take at most one nonzero value, and we give an example where $rot_{f,T}(x)$ does in fact take on two values (one of which is zero). In Section 4 we investigate the dependence of $rot_{f,T}(x)$ on $T$. We develop conditions under which $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is well-defined and constant for all $(T, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. These involve unique ergodicity and either (a) an absence of fixed points, or (b) the translation associated with $f$ being "strongly pattern equivariant". Finally, in Section 5 we examine the importance of unique ergodicity and show that rotation numbers can be very ill-behaved without it.

We thank Antoine Julien and Johannes Kellendonk for helpful discussions.

## 2. Definitions

We work with one-dimensional tilings, where "tiles" are just intervals. We assume that there is a fixed, finite *alphabet* of possible tile types, which in one dimension implies that our tilings have finite local complexity. We also assume that our tilings are repetitive, hence that our tiling spaces are minimal.

We apply the following metric to such tilings. We say that tilings $T$ and $T'$ are within distance $\epsilon$ in the tiling metric if they agree, up to an overall translation of up to $\epsilon$, on the interval $[-1/\epsilon, 1/\epsilon]$. That is, two tilings are close if they agree on a big ball around the origin, up to a small translation. A *tiling space* is a translation-invariant set of tilings that is closed in the topology induced by this metric. For a subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}$, let $T|_S$ denote the tiling $T$ restricted to the set $S$. If the tiling space has a unique translation-invariant probability measure, then the space is *uniquely ergodic*.

Let $B_r$ be the closed ball of radius $r$ around the origin (i.e. the interval $[-r, r]$.). If $\Omega$ is a tiling space, then for each radius $r$, the *vertical* associated with a tiling $T \in \Omega$ is the set

$$V_r(T) = \{T' \in \Omega | T'|_{B_r} = T|_{B_r}\}. \tag{1}$$

A vertical is a totally disconnected set; if $\Omega$ is minimal, then the vertical is a Cantor set ([6]).

Let $f : \Omega \to \Omega$. We say $f$ is *strongly pattern-equivariant*, or SPE, if for every $r$ there is an $R$ such that $T_1|_{B_R} = T_2|_{B_R}$ implies $f(T_1)|_{B_r} = f(T_2)|_{B_r}$. We say $f$ is *weakly pattern-equivariant*, or WPE, if $f$ is continuous. (See [4].) An SPE function maps verticals to verticals. A WPE function typically does not preserve verticals, and is merely continuous.

We also speak of real-valued functions $v : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ being SPE or WPE. Such a function $v$ is SPE if there exists an $R$ such that $T_1|_{B_R} = T_2|_{B_R}$ implies $v(T_1) = v(T_2)$. A WPE function is the uniform limit of SPE functions. That is, $v$ is WPE if, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $R_\epsilon$ such that $T|_{B_R}$ determines $v(T)$ to within $\epsilon$. Real-valued SPE functions are locally constant on verticals, while WPE functions are merely continuous.

Finally, for fixed $T \in \Omega$ we can speak of SPE and WPE functions $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. If $v_T : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function, we define $\hat{v}(T - x) = v_T(x)$. We say $v_T$ is WPE if $\hat{v}$ extends by continuity to a WPE function $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, and say that $v_T$ is SPE if $\hat{v}$ extends to a SPE function $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$. Equivalently, a continuous function $v_T : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is SPE if and only if there exists an $R$ such that $(T - x)|_{B_R} = (T - y)|_{B_R}$ implies $v_T(x) = v_T(y)$.

Let $\Omega$ be a one-dimensional tiling space, and let $f : \Omega \to \Omega$ be a homeomorphism that is homotopic to the identity. Such an $f$ maps each path component of $\Omega$ to itself, and hence maps each tiling to a translate of itself.

Each tiling $T \in \Omega$ then induces a map $f_T : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ by $f(T-x) = T - f_T(x)$. Note that $f_T$ is itself an orientation-preserving homeomorphism. It is also convenient to define a velocity function $v_T(x) = f_T(x) - x$, such that $f(T-x) = f(T) - x - v_T(x)$.

**Definition.** For $T \in \Omega$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the *rotation number* of the identity-homotopic self-homeomorphism $f : \Omega \to \Omega$ is $rot_{f,T}(x) := \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f_T^n(x)-x}{n}$.

Basic questions include

(1) Is $rot_{f,T}(x)$ defined for all $T \in \Omega$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}$?
(2) For fixed $f$ and $T$, how does $rot_{f,T}(x)$ depend on $x$?
(3) For fixed $f$, how does $rot_{f,T}(x)$ depend on $T \in \Omega$?

For circle maps, rotation numbers are always well-defined and are independent of the starting point [3]. For tilings, we will derive criteria under which $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is well-defined and independent of $x$ and of $T$. We will also develop examples where these assumptions are not met, and where $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is *not* defined on all of $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, or depends on $x$, or depends on $T$.

## 3. Local questions

We begin with the dependence on $x$.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that $\Omega$ is a space of tilings on which $\mathbb{R}$ acts minimally. For fixed $f$ and $T \in \Omega$, $rot_{f,T}(x)$ takes on at most two values. Furthermore, if $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is defined and nonzero for some $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then $rot_{f,T}(y)$ is defined for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$.*

*If $rot_{f,T}(y)$ takes on exactly two values, then there is a threshold $d \in \mathbb{R}$ such that either*

$$rot_{f,T}(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y \le d, \\ b & \text{if } y > d, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

*where $b > 0$ or*

$$rot_{f,T}(y) = \begin{cases} c & \text{if } y < d, \\ 0 & \text{if } y \ge d, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

*where $c < 0$.*

*Proof.* The proof proceeds by cases. First we show that $rot_{f,T}$ cannot take on two different positive values, and likewise cannot take on two different negative values. Then we show that $rot_{f,T}$ cannot take on both a positive and a negative value. Then, assuming that $rot_{f,T}(x) > 0$ for some $x$, we show that $rot_{f,T}$ is either constant or takes the form (2). Similarly, if there exists an $x$ with $rot_{f,T}(x) < 0$, then $rot_{f,T}$ is either constant or takes the form (3).

Suppose that $rot_{f,T}(x) > 0$ and $rot_{f,T}(y) > 0$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $x < y$. Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f_{f,T}^n(x)-x}{n} = rot_{f,T}(x) > 0$, $f_T^n(x)$ is

greater than $y$ for all sufficiently large values of $n$. Suppose that $f_T^m(x) > y$. Since $f_T$ is an orientation-preserving homeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}$, for all $n$ we have

$$f_T^n(x) < f_T^n(y) < f_T^{n+m}(x). \tag{4}$$

But then $rot_{f,T}(y) = \lim \frac{f_T^n(y)-y}{n} = \lim \frac{f_T^n(y)}{n}$ is sandwiched between $\lim \frac{f_T^n(x)}{n}$ and $\lim \frac{f_T^{n+m}(x)}{n}$, both of which equal $rot_{f,T}(x)$. Thus $rot_{f,T}(y) = rot_{f,T}(x)$.

The proof that $rot_{f,T}$ cannot take on two different negative values is similar. Next we show that we cannot have $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ with $rot_T(x) < 0 < rot_T(y)$.

Suppose that $rot_T(x) < 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$. If $v_T(x)$ were $\geq 0$, then $f_T^n(x)$ would be a non-decreasing sequence, contradicting the assumption that $\lim \frac{f_T^n(x)-x}{n}$ is negative. Thus $v_T(x) < 0$. Since $v_T(x)$ is a continuous function of $T$ and $x$, and since $T$ is repetitive, this means that there exists a length $L$ such that every interval of length $L$ contains a point $x'$ with $v_T(x') < 0$. In particular, we can find such an $x'$ with $y < x'$. But then $f_T^n(y) < f_T^n(x') < x'$, so $rot_{f,T}(y) = \lim \frac{f_T^n(y)-y}{n}$ cannot be positive.

We have shown that $rot_T$ cannot take on two distinct positive values, two distinct negative values, or a positive and a negative value. Next we explore the consequences of having one point $x$ with $rot_{f,T}(x) > 0$.

Suppose that there is a point $x$ such that $rot_{f,T}(x) > 0$. This implies that $v_T(y) \geq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$, by the same reasoning that showed that $rot_{f,T}$ cannot take on both positive and negative values. Thus for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, $f_T^n(y)$ is a non-decreasing sequence. If $f_T^n(y)$ is eventually greater than $x$, then $rot_{f,T}(y) = rot_{f,T}(x)$, by (4). If $f_T^n(y)$ is bounded, then $rot_{f,T}(y) = 0$. Either way, $rot_{f,T}(y)$ is well-defined.

In other words, either $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is the same for all $x$, or $rot_{f,T}$ is a step function, going from zero to some positive value $c$. In the latter case, let $d$ be the supremum of all $x$'s for which $rot_{f,T}(x) = 0$, so that $rot_{f,T}(x) = 0$ if $x < d$ and $rot_{f,T}(x) = c$ for $x > d$. We claim that $v_T(d)$ must equal zero, since if $v_T(d) > 0$, then $f_T(d) > d$, and we can find a point $d' < d$ such that $f_T(d') > d$. But then $rot_{f,T}(d') = c$, contradicting the definition of $d$. Thus $rot_{f,T}(d) = 0$, and we are left with (2).

The reasoning of the previous two paragraphs is easily adapted to negative rotation numbers. If there is a point $x$ with $rot_T(x) < 0$, then $rot_{f,T}(y)$ is defined for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$, and (3) applies.

□

Note that we do *not* claim that $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is defined either everywhere or nowhere, only that having a *nonzero* value of $rot_{f,T}(x)$ makes $rot_{f,T}(y)$ defined for all $y$. If $\Omega$ fails to be uniquely ergodic, it can happen that

$rot_{f,T}(y)$ equals zero for some values of $y$ and is undefined for others. See example 4, below.


**Example 1** (Thue-Morse roadblocks)**.** The *Thue-Morse* tilings are tilings on the alphabet $\{a, b\}$ constructed from the substitution $\sigma(a) = ab$, $\sigma(b) = ba$. For simplicity, we assume that both the $a$ and $b$ tiles have length 1. Applying the substitution $n$ times to the $a$ and $b$ tiles gives *level* $n$ *supertiles* of length $2^n$, which we denote $A_n = \sigma^n(a)$ and $B_n = \sigma^n(b)$. Each Thue-Morse tiling can be uniquely decomposed into level $n$ supertiles $A_n$ and $B_n$, so we can meaningfully speak of the locations of level-$n$ supertiles within each tiling [5].

Let $\Omega$ be the space of Thue-Morse tilings. For each such tiling $T$, let $d_{n,T}(x)$ be the distance from $x$ to the nearest boundary of level-$n$ supertiles. Let

$$v_T(x) = \inf_{n>0} \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{d_{n,T}(x)}{2} \right), \tag{5}$$

and define $f(T - x) = T - x - v_T(x)$. We then extend $f$ to all of $\Omega$ by continuity.

By reducing $v_T$ to something close to zero at the boundaries of high-level supertiles, we are setting up "roadblocks" at these boundaries, so that $f_T^n(x)$ remains close to each such boundary for a long time. If $b$ is the boundary of two level-$n$ supertiles, then the graph of $v_T(x)$ is V-shaped near $x = b$, with $v_T(x) = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{2}|x - b|$.




Note that for $x$ a little to the left of $b$, $v_T(x)$ is half the distance from $x$ to $b'$, where $b' = b + 2/n$. We will compute the time needed to go from such a point past $b$. At each step, the distance from $x$ to $b'$ is cut in half, so the time needed to get to $b$ (whose distance from $b'$ is $2/n$) is $N = -log_2(\frac{2}{n|b-x|+2})$. Thus $f^n(x)$ spends $O(\log(n))$ steps approaching the boundary $b$ of each $n$th-order supertiles, and a similar length of time emerging from the roadblock.

Since such boundaries are spaced $2^n$ apart, the amount of time per unit length spent near roadblocks of arbitrary order is a convergent series, going

as $\sum_n \frac{\log(n)}{2^n}$, and so $f_T^n(x)$ increases with a positive average rate. Moreover, this rate $rot_{f,T}(x)$ takes the same value $c$ for all $x$ and almost every $T \in \Omega$, insofar as the distribution of level-$n$ supertiles is exactly the same for all $T \in \Omega$.

The story is different, however, if $T$ is a Thue-Morse tiling with an *infinite*-level supertile boundary at the origin. There are four such tilings, each a fixed point of the square of the substitution. We construct one of them as follows. Take the origin to be the left endpoint of an $A_n$ for all $n$, the right endpoint of an $A_n$ for $n$ even, and the right endpoint of a $B_n$ for $n$ odd. Explicitly,

$$T = \ldots abbabaabbaababba.abbabaabbaababba \ldots, \tag{6}$$

where the center dot indicates the placement of the origin. (The other Thue-Morse tilings with an infinite-level boundary at the origin are obtained by applying the substitution once to this one, by interchanging the $a$'s and $b$'s, or both.) For such a tiling, $v_T(0) = 0$, so $rot_{f,T}(x) = 0$ for all $x \leq 0$. Meanwhile, all points to the right of the origin encounter the same pattern of finite-level roadblocks as for a generic tiling, so $rot_{f,T}(x) = c$ for $x > 0$.

The upshot is that for this map $f : \Omega \to \Omega$, $rot_{f,T}(x)$ equals a fixed positive number $c$ unless $T$ is a translate of one of the four special tilings with infinite-level supertile boundaries, in which case $rot_{f,T}(x) = c$ if $x$ is to the right of the infinite-level supertile boundary and $rot_{f,T}(x) = 0$ if $x$ is to the left of, or at, the infinite-level supertile boundary.

## 4. Global invariance

The essence of Example 1 is that the presence of fixed points $T_i$ where $f(T_i) = T_i$ causes $rot_{f,T_i}(x)$ to equal zero for $x \leq 0$. By minimality, each $T_i$ can be approximated arbitrarily well by a translate of any other tiling $T'$, so every tiling contains roadblocks that require arbitrarily many steps to pass. However, the sensitivity of $v_T(x)$ to small changes in $T$, combined with the low frequency of such roadblocks, allows $rot_{f,T'}(x)$ to be nonzero (and independent of $T'$ and $x$) for almost every $T' \in \Omega$.

This suggests two ways to make $rot_{f,T}(x)$ well-defined and independent of $T$ and $x$ on *all* of a tiling space.

(1) Restrict attention to *strongly pattern equivariant* maps $f$, or equivalently to SPE functions $v_T(x)$. If such a map $f$ has a fixed point, then we will show that it contain infinitely many fixed points, and that $rot_{f,T}(x) = 0$ for all $T$ and all $x$.
(2) Avoid fixed points altogether. If $\Omega$ is minimal and uniquely ergodic, and if $v_T(x)$ is always positive, then we will show that $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is positive and independent of $(T, x)$.

**Theorem 2.** *If $\Omega$ is uniquely ergodic and $v_T(x)$ is strongly pattern-equivariant, then $rot_T(x)$ is well-defined and constant for all $(T, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$.*

*Proof.* There are two possibilities, depending on whether $f$ has any fixed points, i.e. on whether $v_T(x)$ is ever zero.

Suppose there exists $(T_0, x_0) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $v_{T_0}(x_0) = 0$, and that $v_T$ is SPE with radius $R$. By repetitivity, the patch of size $R$ around $x_0$ in $T_0$ appears, with bounded gaps, in every tiling $T \in \Omega$. In particular, for any $(T, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, we can find $x_1$ and $x_2$ such that $x_1 < x < x_2$ and such that $v_T(x_1) = v_T(x_2) = 0$. Since $x_1 < x < x_2$, $f_T^n(x)$ is trapped between $f_T^n(x_1) = x_1$ and $f_T^n(x_2) = x_2$, so $rot_{f,T}(x) = \lim \frac{f_T^n(x)-x}{n} = 0$ for all $(T, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$.

Next we consider the other case, where there are no such fixed points. Note that the range of $v_T$ is the same for all $T$, since by minimality the set of patches of radius $R$ (that determine $v_T$) is the same for all tilings. By continuity, we cannot have $v_T(x_1) < 0 < v_T(x_2)$, since then there would be a fixed point between $x_1$ and $x_2$. So $v_T$ is either everywhere positive or everywhere negative. We suppose that $v_T$ is everywhere positive, the other case being almost identical.

We will show that $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is well-defined. For a patch on $[a, b]$, define the *transit time of $x$* to be the number of iterations of $f$ needed for $f^n(x)$ to cross $[a, b]$. For $x, y < a$, the transit time of $x$ and $y$ can vary by at most 1, since their trajectories cannot leapfrog. Momentarily fix a length scale $L$ that we will eventually take to $\infty$. For each patch $P$ of length $L + 2R$, the values of $v_T$ on the central region of length $L$ is the same for every occurrence of $P$, insofar as $f$ is SPE with radius $R$. We call such a central region an *$R$-collared patch of length $L$*. There are only finitely many possible $R$-collared regions of length $L$, and the transit time needed for each one is determined up to a possible error of $\pm 1$.

To compute the transit time for a patch $P'$ of length $L' \gg L$, we simply add the times it takes to cross each interval of length $L$ within $L'$. By unique ergodicity, the frequencies of different $R$-collared patches of length $L$ are (approximately) the same for all patches of sufficiently large length $L'$, so the transit times per unit length for all $P'$ are nearly the same, with the errors coming from

(1) The difference of 1 between the maximum and minimum transit times for each $R$-collared patch $P$, and
(2) The observed frequencies of different sub-patches $P$ within $P'$ being slightly different from the ergodic averages.

The second error disappears as $L' \to \infty$, by unique ergodicity, while the first error disappears as $L \to \infty$. Since all large patches have (asymptotically) the same transit time per unit length, the reciprocal of this transit time per

unit length is the average velocity for all tilings and all initial conditions, i.e. is $rot_{f,T}(x)$ for all $(T, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. □

**Theorem 3.** *Suppose that $\Omega$ is minimal and uniquely ergodic, and that $f$ has no fixed point. Then $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is well-defined and constant for all $(T, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$.*

*Proof.* This is essentially the second case of the previous proof, with the added complication that the velocities are only continuous in $(T, x)$, hence weakly pattern equivariant, rather than strongly pattern equivariant.

However, the compactness of $\Omega$ and the absence of fixed points implies that there is a universal lower bound $\epsilon > 0$ such that $v_T(x) > \epsilon$ for all $(T, x)$. Pick a positive constant $\epsilon' < \epsilon$. (We will eventually take a limit as $\epsilon' \to 0$.) The continuity of $v$ implies that we can approximate $f$, to within $\epsilon'$, by a strongly pattern-equivariant function $f'$ with radius $R_{\epsilon'}$. Note that changing a velocity $v_T(x)$ of at least $\epsilon$ by an amount at most $\epsilon'$ yields a velocity of at least $(1 - \frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon})v_T(x)$ and at most $(1 + \frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon})v_T(x)$. In particular, replacing $f$ by $f'$ changes the transit times by at most a multiplicative factor of $(1 - \frac{\epsilon'}{\epsilon})^{-1}$. Applying the previous construction for fixed $f'$ shows that $rot_{f',T}(x)$ is well-defined and independent of $T$ and $x$. Taking a limit as $\epsilon' \to 0$ then yields a universal computation for $rot_{f,T}(x)$. □

**Example 2** (Bigger Thue-Morse roadblocks)**.** As in the previous example, we consider Thue-Morse tilings, only with a somewhat different velocity function. Let $g(n) = 2^{-(2^{n/2})}$. Define

$$v_T(x) = \inf_{n>0} \left( g(n) + \frac{d_{n,T}(x)}{2} \right), \tag{7}$$

where $d_{n,T}(x)$ is as before, and define $f(T) = T - v_T(0)$. The velocity function resembles that of the previous Thue-Morse example, except that the vertex of the local absolute value graph is $(b, 2^{-(2^{n/2})})$, where $b$ is the boundary of two $n^{th}$ order tiles, and so trajectories slow up much more drastically around boundaries of supertiles than before. Specifically, the time spent near each level-$n$ supertile boundary is $O(-\log_2(g(n))) = O(2^{n/2})$ instead of $O(\log(n))$. As in example 1, the average time $\sum_n -\log(g(n))/2^n$ per unit length spent crossing roadblocks is finite, so $rot_T(x)$ is defined and is constant for almost every $T$ and every $x$. Exactly as before, $rot_{f,T}(x)$ exhibits step-function behavior on the orbits of the four fixed points of $f$.

The point of this example is that $v_T(x)$ is a weakly pattern-equivariant function that is *extremely* well-approximated by a strongly pattern-equivariant function. Specifically, for each positive integer $N > 1$, let

$$v_{N,T}(x) = \min_{n \le N} \left( g(n) + \frac{d_{n,T}(x)}{2} \right), \tag{8}$$

and let $f_N(T) = T - v_{N,T}(0)$. For all boundaries of supertiles of level $m \leq N$, the velocity function $v_{N,T}$ behaves exactly the same as $v_T$, while at supertile boundaries of level $m > N$ it behaves as though we were merely approaching a level-$N$ supertile boundary.

The function $v_{N,T}(x)$ is determined exactly by the structure of $T$ in a neighborhood of size $O(2^N)$ around $x$, making $f_N$ SPE and guaranteeing that $rot_{f_N,T}(x)$ is well-defined and constant for all $(T, x)$. At the same time, $v_{N,T}$ approximates $v_T(x)$ to within $g(N) = 2^{-2^{N/2}}$. The moral of example 2 is that strongly PE functions $v_T(x)$ always give constant rotation numbers, but extremely small (albeit not arbitrarily small) deviations from strong pattern equivariance can spoil the picture.

We note in passing that for any specific repetitive and uniquely ergodic tiling space $\Omega$, one can formulate estimates on the dependence of weakly pattern equivariant functions on data near infinity, such that if $v_T(x)$'s satisfies these estimates then $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is defined everywhere and is constant. For instance, for Thue-Morse, if $v_T(x)$ can be approximated to within $2^{-L}$ by data in an interval of size $L$ centered at $x$, then $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is constant. However, this is an incredibly strong estimate, namely that if $T_1$ and $T_2$ agree on some neighborhood of the origin and $d(T_1, T_2) < \delta$, then $|v_{T_1}(0) - v_{T_2}(0)| < 2^{-1/\delta}$. Functions that satisfy such estimates are highly artificial, and will not be studied further in this paper.

## 5. Ergodicity

Finally, we consider the role of unique ergodicity.

**Example 3.** Consider the following hierarchical tiling, slightly modified from Example 3.7 of [1]. There are two kinds of tiles, $a$ and $b$, each of length 1. We define the 0-level supertiles to be the tiles themselves: $A_0 = a$ and $B_0 = b$. For $n > 0$, we construct the level-$n$ supertiles $A_n$ and $B_n$ from the level $n-1$ supertiles as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &= B_{n-1}A_{n-1}^{10^n-1} \\ B_n &= A_{n-1}B_{n-1}^{10^n-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

That is, an $A_n$ consists of a $B_{n-1}$ followed by $10^n - 1$ $A_{n-1}$'s, while a $B_n$ consists of an $A_{n-1}$ followed by $10^n - 1$ $B_{n-1}$'s. Since every $n$-supertile contains at least one $(n-1)$-supertile of each type, the resulting tilings are repetitive, and the space of these hierarchical (*fusion*) tilings is minimal.

However, it is not hard to check that the fraction of $a$ tiles in an $A_n$ supertile converges to a number $\alpha \approx 0.89$ as $n \to \infty$, and the fraction of $b$ tiles converges to $1 - \alpha$. Likewise, for large $n$, $B_n$ supertiles consist of a fraction $\alpha$ of $b$'s and $1 - \alpha$ of $a$'s. This implies that $\Omega$ is not uniquely ergodic.

In fact, there are exactly two ergodic measures, one obtained by averaging over $A_n$ supertiles as $n \to \infty$, and the other obtained by averaging over $B_n$ supertiles as $n \to \infty$.

Now define a velocity function $v_T(x)$ such that it takes approximately 10 steps to cross an $a$ tile and 20 steps to cross a $b$ tile.[1] Then the time per unit length that it takes to cross an $A_n$ supertile is approximately $10\alpha + 20(1-\alpha) = 20 - 10\alpha \approx 11.1$, while the time per unit lenght that it takes to cross a $B_n$ supertile is approximately $10(1-\alpha) + 20(\alpha) = 10 + 10\alpha \approx 18.9$.

Suppose $T$ is a tiling in which the origin lies in an $n$-supertile of type $A_n$ for all sufficiently large $n$, and that the union of these supertiles is all of $\mathbb{R}$. (In one ergodic measure, this is a probability-1 event, while in the other it has probability zero.) In such a case, every point $x$ is in an $A_n$ for all sufficiently large $n$ (with the minimal value of $n$ depending on the point $x$), insofar as for large enough $n$ it is in the same $n$-supertile as the origin. This implies that, starting at $x$ and moving rightwards, we see $a$ tiles a fraction $\alpha$ of the time and $b$ tiles a fraction $1-\alpha$ of the time, and so $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is well-defined and is approximately $1/(20-10\alpha)$.

Likewise, if the origin lies in a $B_n$ for all sufficiently large $n$, and if these $B_n$ supertiles exhaust $\mathbb{R}$, then $rot_{f,T}(x)$ will be approximately $1/(10+10\alpha)$. This happens with probability 0 with respect to one measure and probability 1 with respect to the other.

In addition, there are tilings (of measure zero with respect to both ergodic measures) where $rot_{f,T}$ is not defined. For instance, suppose that the origin is the left endpoint of an $A_n$ for all even $n$ and the left endpoint of a $B_n$ for all odd $n$. Starting at the origin in such a tiling, we would proceed at the average speed associated with $A$ supertiles for a while, then that associated with $B$ supertiles for a much longer while, then that associated with $A$ supertiles for an even longer while, and so on, with the times associated with each type growing super-exponentially. The quantity $\frac{f_T^n(0)-0}{n}$ has a lim-sup of approximately $1/(20-10\alpha)$ and a lim-inf of approximately $1/(10+10\alpha)$, and has no overall limit as $n \to \infty$. In other words, $rot_{f,T}(0)$ is not defined. Likewise, $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is not defined for *any* $x$ for this tiling.

In the absence of unique ergodicity, one should generally not expect the average velocity to be the same in all large regions of a tiling, and so we should not expect $(f_T^n(x) - x)/n$ to always converge to the same rotation number. By picking tilings that are generic for one ergodic measure or another, we can achieve the rotation number obtained by integrating over

[1] Approximately but not exactly, since the time it takes to cross an $a$ or $b$ tile must depend slightly on whether that tile is preceded and/or followed by an $a$ or $b$ tile. Such adjustments can be chosen to be arbitrarily small, but are needed to make $v_T(x)$ continuous.

that measure, and by picking tilings that are not generic for *any* ergodic measure, we can get situations where $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is not defined.

In fact, we can even arrange things so that, for a fixed tiling $T$, $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is defined for some values of $x$ but not for others.

**Example 4.** We begin with the previous example, only we modify the construction by introducing roadblocks around supertile boundaries. Suppose that we adjust $v$ such that for all $n \geq 1$ it takes an extra $n$ steps to cross each level-$n$ supertile boundary. Since $\sum_n n/|A_n|$ converges (where $|A_n|$ is the length of a level $n$ supertile of either type), we continue to have well-defined yet different rotation numbers for tilings in which the origin either lies in an $A_n$ for all sufficiently large $n$, or in a $B_n$ for all sufficiently large $n$, and in which the union of these supertiles is all of $\mathbb{R}$.

However, if $T$ is the tiling where the origin is at the boundary of two infinite-order supertiles, then $T$ is a fixed point of our homeomorphism, and so $rot_{f,T}(x) = 0$ for all $x \leq 0$. When $x > 0$, the ratio $(f_T^n(x) - x)/n$ oscillates between two distinct values and does not approach a limit, so $rot_{f,T}(x)$ is not defined.

## References


[1] N. Frank and L. Sadun, *Fusion: a general framework for hierarchical tilings of* $\mathbb{R}^d$, Geometriae Dedicata **171** (2014) 149-186.

[2] A. Julien and L. Sadun, *Tiling deformations, cohomology, and orbit equivalence of tiling spaces*, Preprint 2016, arXiv:1506.02694

[3] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 54, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. With a supplementary chapter by Katok and Leonardo Mendoza. (MR1326374)

[4] J. Kellondonk, *Pattern-equivariant functions and cohomology*, J. Phys. A **36** (2003) 1–8. (MR1985494)

[5] L. Sadun, "Topology of Tiling Spaces", University Lecture Series of the American Mathematical Society **46** (2008). (MR2446623)

[6] L. Sadun, R. Williams, "Tiling Spaces are Cantor Set Fiber Bundles", Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems **23** (2003) 307–316.



Department of Mathematics, Texas Lutheran University, Seguin, TX 78155

*E-mail address*: brand@tlu.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712

*E-mail address*: sadun@math.utexas.edu