ON ASYMMETRY OF THE FUTURE AND THE PAST FOR LIMIT SELF-JOININGS

OLEG N. AGEEV

Abstract. Let $\triangle_T$ be an off-diagonal joining of a transformation T. We construct a non-typical transformation having asymmetry between limit sets of $\triangle_{T^n}$ for positive and negative powers of T. It follows from a correspondence between subpolymorphisms and positive operators, and from structure of limit polynomial operators. We apply this technique to find all polynomial operators of degree 1 from a weak closure (in the space of positive operators on L_2) of powers for Chacon's automorphism and for its generalizations.

Introduction

In [1], D. Rudolph introduced the notion of joinings. This notion turned out to be very fruitful (see [2]-[6]). It is known that every automorphism or endomorphism can be characterized both as a measure on a graph of this map, i. e. a joining or, more general, a polymorphism [7], and as an operator on L_2. This gives a way to study structure of joinings by operator methods, and automorphisms by joinings.

It is not difficult to show that limit sets for positive and negative powers of a transformation T are equal in the space of all automorphisms if T is rigid. If T is not rigid, then these sets are empty. Moreover, for rigid or mixing transformations (see Section 1) these limit sets also are equal in the space of all linear operators on L_2.

Nevertheless we prove (Theorem 2.4) that there exist rank-one transformations T with different limit sets of off-diagonal joinings for positive and negative powers of T or, in terms of operators, the sets of limit operators are different.

We apply a new approach, via limit polynomials. This approach gave recently a possibility to solve([8],[9]) old Rokhlin's problem (see [10]-[13]) and to answer some well-known questions, for example, the paper [8] contains an answer to Katok's question.

In Section 1 we introduce subpolymorphisms and a natural homeomorphism between the space of such measures and a subspace of positive operators on L_2. Note that, for any transformation T, the space of its self-joinings lies in the space of subpolymorphisms.

Theorem 2.1 describes all possible limit linear polynomials in $T_{(k)}$ for powers of transformations $T_{(k)}$, where $T_{(k)}$ are constructed in Section 1. In particular, this

---

Date: April 10. 01.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37A, 28D05, 28D15, 20M14, 47B65; Secondary 47A05, 47A15, 47D, 60G.

Key words and phrases. Joinings, Chacon's automorphism, weak operator convergence.

The author was supported in part by Max Planck Institute of Mathematics, Bonn and RFBR Grants #100-15-96107, #99-01-01104.

implies that only one linear polynomial $1/2E+1/2T$ is a limit of powers for classical Chacon's transformation T (see [3],[14],[15]).

In Section 3 we show that the future and the past for limit self-joinings can not be completely different for any automorphism. Moreover, their intersection contains an abelian semigroup that is trivial (i.e. $\{\mu \times \mu\}$) only for mixing transformations.

1. Basic definitions and notations

Let T be a transformation defined on a non-atomic standard Borel probability space $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$. A transformation and a unitary operator on $L_2(\mu)$: $Tf(x) = f(Tx)$ are often called automorphisms and denoted by the same symbol T. It is clear that T is contained in the space of positive operators on $L_2(\mu)$ $\mathcal{L}^+ = \{U : (Uf \in L_2$ if $f \in L_2)\&(Ug \geq 0$ if $g \geq 0)\}$ equipped with the weak operator convergence. Everywhere below the identity automorphism will be denoted by E. The group of all automorphisms $\mathbf{Aut}(\mu)$ of $(X, \mathcal{F}, \mu)$ becomes a completely metrizable topological group when endowed with the weak convergence of transformations ($T_n \to T$ iff for any measurable A $\mu(T_n(A)\triangle T(A)) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$). Note that this topology is a restriction of the weak operator topology in $\mathcal{L}^+$ to the non-closed $\mathbf{Aut}(\mu)$. Denote by $C(T)$ the commutant of T, i.e. the set $\{S \in \mathbf{Aut}(\mu) : ST = TS\}$.

Let ν be a finite Borel measure on $X \times X$ with marginal measures, say $\pi_1\nu$ and $\pi_2\nu$, such that

$$\pi_i\nu(A) \leq \mu(A) \text{ for any} \mu\text{-measurable set } A. \tag{1.1}$$

Obviously, marginal measures are μ-absolutely continuous and $\|\nu\| = \nu(X \times X) \leq 1$. The set of all such measures, say $M(\mu)$, is a convex compact metrizable space with respect to the topology determined by

$$\mu_n \to \mu_0 \Leftrightarrow \mu_n(A \times B) \to \mu_0(A \times B)$$

for any μ-measurable sets A and B. Now we shall give the following definition.

Definition 1.1. Each measure from $M(\mu)$ is called a subpolymorphism.

Fix $T \in \mathbf{Aut}(\mu)$. The set $J_c(T,T)$ of c-self-joinings, i.e. $T \times T$-invariant elements ν of $M(\mu)$, with $\|\nu\| = c$, is a closed subspace of $M(\mu)$ for any $c \in [0,1]$. If T is ergodic, then each ν from $J_c(T,T)$ has $c\mu$ as marginal measures. This gives that $J(T,T) = J_1(T,T)$ is exactly the set of well-known self-joinings. Let $S \in C(T)$. As usual, by an off-diagonal joining $\triangle_S$ we mean a measure from $J(T,T)$ completely defined by $\triangle_S(A \times B) = \mu(S^{-1}A \cap B)$, where A, B are any μ-measurable sets. Denote by $LJ_+(T)$ and $LJ_-(T)$ limit sets of $\triangle_{T^n}$ in $M(\mu)$ for all positive n and negative n respectively. It is clear that $LJ_\pm(T) \subseteq J(T,T)$. If T is mixing, then $LJ_\pm(T)$ consist of only one point $\mu \times \mu$. It is well known that T is weakly mixing iff $LJ_\pm(T)$ contain at least $\mu \times \mu$. We say T is rigid if $T^{n_k} \to E$ for some sequence $n_k \to \infty$.

Proposition 1.2. *$LJ_-(T) = LJ_+(T)$ for rigid T.*

Proposition 1.3. *$LJ_+(T^*) = LJ_-(T) = \sigma LJ_+(T)$,*

where σ is a flip map (i.e. $\sigma(x,y) = (y,x)$), and S^* denotes the operator adjoint to S.

Corollary 1.4. *$LJ_-(T) = LJ_+(T)$ iff $LJ_+(T)$ is invariant with respect to σ.*

We leave simple proofs of statements above to the reader. It seems to be well known that the set of rigid transformations is a dense G_δ-set in $\mathbf{Aut}(\mu)$ (see [16] about close results in different subclasses of the set of non-singular transformations). It turns out that $LJ_-(T) = LJ_+(T)$ for a typical transformation T.

1.1. **Construction of $T_{(k)}$.** We consider the following "generalized" Chacon's automorphisms. For each $k \geq 3$, let $T_{(k)}$ be a rank-one transformation, where each column C_{n+1} is obtained by cutting C_n into k subcolumns, say $C_n(i)$, of equal width, placing a spacer only on the subcolumn $C_n(k-1)$, and then stacking the subcolumn $C_n(i+1)$ on top of $C_n(i)$ for $1 \leq i < k$. It is clear that $T_{(3)}$ is exactly Chacon's automorphism. For the column C_n, let h_n be its height and let d_n be a measure of its one level, where $n \geq 1$.

1.2. **Correspondence between positive operators and $M(\mu)$.** Consider

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu^+ = \{U \in \mathcal{L}^+ : \int_A U(\mathbf{1})d\mu \leq \mu(A)$$

$$\& \quad \int_A U^*(\mathbf{1})d\mu \leq \mu(A) \text{ for any} \mu\text{-measurable set } A\}$$

with a restriction of the weak operator topology to this set. Obviously,

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu^+ = \{U \in \mathcal{L}^+ : U(\mathbf{1}) \leq \mathbf{1}$$

$$\& U^*(\mathbf{1}) \leq \mathbf{1} \text{ for a.e. } x \text{ with respect to } \mu\}.$$

Proposition 1.5. *Natural correspondence given by*

$$\langle U_\nu f, g\rangle = \int f \otimes \bar{g} d\nu, \tag{1.2}$$

for any $f, g \in L_2(\mu)$, defines a linear homeomorphism, say ϕ, between topological spaces $M(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{L}_\mu^+$.

Note that in (1.2) f and $U_\nu f$ are from different spaces $L_2(\mu)$, but we naturally identify these spaces.

Proof. Indeed, the right part of (1.2) is a linear bounded functional for every $f \in L_2(\mu)$ because

$$|\int f \otimes \bar{g} d\nu| \leq \|f\|_\nu \|g\|_\nu = \|f\|_{\pi_1\nu}\|g\|_{\pi_2\nu} \leq \|f\|_\mu \|g\|_\mu, \tag{1.3}$$

where $\|h\|_l$ means a norm of $h \in L_2(l)$. Thus $U_\nu f \in L_2(\mu)$ for each $f \in L_2(\mu)$. Remain properties of the map ϕ are obvious. □

Some properties of operators U_ν were considered in [17] due to Vershik for polymorphisms ν, i. e. for elements of $M(\mu)$ with exact equality in (1.1) for each A.

Remark 1.6. Clearly, $\phi(\triangle_T) = T$, where $T \in \mathbf{Aut}(\mu)$. Also, U_ν commutes with T if and only if $\nu \in J_{\|\nu\|}(T, T)$.

Note that

$$\int f \otimes \bar{g} d\nu = \int_X \bar{g}(y) d\pi_2\nu \int_X f(x) d\nu_y(x) = \int_X \bar{g}(y)\rho_2(y) d\mu(y) \int_X f(x) d\nu_y(x),$$

where $\rho_2(y)$ is a density of $\pi_2\nu$ with respect to μ, and $\nu_y(x)$ is a canonical system of conditional measures corresponding to ν. Hence, changing g to $U_\nu f$ in (1.2) and (1.3), we get

Corollary 1.7. *$\mathcal{L}_\mu^+$ is a compact convex metrizable space. For any subpolymorphism $\nu \in M(\mu)$, $\|U_\nu\| \le 1$, and*

$$U_\nu(f) = \rho_2(y) \int_X f(x) d\nu_y(x).$$

Remark 1.8. The space $\mathcal{L}_\mu^+$ is a semigroup, and closed with respect to taking parts of operators, i.e. if $0 \le V \le U$ and $U \in \mathcal{L}_\mu^+$, then $V \in \mathcal{L}_\mu^+$.

Remark 1.9. It is readily seen that $\phi(LJ_+(T))$ and $\phi(LJ_-(T))$ are T-invariant closed semigroups.

2. Limit polynomials

The following theorem completely determines the simplest limit polynomial.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{P}_1[x]$ be the set of polynomials of degree at most 1. Then*

$$\phi(LJ_+(T_{(k)})) \cap \mathcal{P}_1[T_{(k)}] = \{\frac{1}{k-1}E + \frac{k-2}{k-1}T_{(k)}\}.$$

Proof. In order to prove Theorem 2.1 we need for some definitions and a technical lemma. For some clarity we restrict our attention on the case $k = 4$. The proof for $k \neq 4$ is analogous.

Let $m_i \to +\infty$ as $i \to +\infty$. Fix i and choose n such that $h_n \le m_i < h_{n+1}$. Consider the $(n+1)^{\text{st}}$ column. Number its levels by $1, 2, ..., 4h_n + 1$ from the base consequently. There exists i_0 such that $(3h_n - m_i)^{\text{th}}(\text{mod} h_{n+1})$ level belongs to $C_n(i_0)$. Let p_i be a number of higher levels in $C_n(i_0)$. Denote by $B_i(j)$ the set of the top p_i levels of $C_n(j)$ and $A_i(j) = C_n(j) \backslash B_i(j)$ ($A_i(j)$ or $B_i(j)$ can be empty). Define $O_i = \{x \in C_{n+1} : T^r x \in C_{n+1} \text{for } r = 1, 2, ..., h_{n+1}\}$. It is clear that on each level a measure of x from O_i is $2/3d_{n+1}$.

Define operators

$$Q_i = \chi_{A_i(i_0)} T_{(4)}^{m_i}, \; R_i = \chi_{B_i(i_0)} T_{(4)}^{m_i},$$

$$Q_i' = \chi_{O_i} Q_i, \quad R_i' = \chi_{O_i} R_i.$$

Note that $Q_i, Q_i' R_i, R_i'$ are in $\mathcal{L}_\mu^+$ because they less than $T_{(4)}^{m_i}$.

Lemma 2.2.

$$T_{(4)}^{m_i} - P_i \to 0 \; as \; i \to +\infty, \tag{2.1}$$

where

1. $P_i = (4/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 8/3E)Q_i + (1/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 2E + 5/3T_{(4)})R_i$ *if* $h_n \le m_i < 2h_n$.
2. $P_i = (1/3T_{(4)}^{-2} + 2T_{(4)}^{-1} + 5/3E)Q_i + (2/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 8/3E + 2/3T_{(4)})R_i$ *if* $2h_n \le m_i < 3h_n$.
3. $P_i = (2/3T_{(4)}^{-2} + 8/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 2/3E)3/2Q_i' + (4/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 8/3E)3/2R_i'$ *if* $3h_n \le m_i < h_{n+1}$.

Proof. It is enough to show (2.1) on pairs of functions from some dense set in $L_2(\mu)$. Therefore we can assume that f and g are constant, say $f_n(j)$ and $g_n(j)$, on each j^{th} level of C_n for sufficiently large n.

Obviously, if $\mu(D_i) \to 0$, then $\chi_{D_i} T^{m_i} \to 0$. Thus

$$T_{(4)}^{m_i} - \sum_j \chi_{A_i(j)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} - \sum_j \chi_{B_i(j)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} \to 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Next we will calculate the connection between components of each sum in (2.2), using that $T_{(4)}^{m_i} f$ has a "regular" structure on sets $A_i(j)$ and $B_i(j)$ and g is independent of j. Consider the $(n+1)^{\text{st}}$ column.

1. If $m_i < 2h_n$, then $i_0 = 2$. Clearly,

$$\langle \chi_{A_i(1)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} f, g \rangle = d_{n+1} \sum_{l=1}^{h_n - p_i} f_n(l + p_i) \bar{g}_n(l) = \langle Q_i f, g \rangle, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\langle \chi_{B_i(1)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} f, g \rangle = d_{n+1} \sum_{l=h_n-p_i+1}^{h_n} f_n(l + p_i - h_n) \bar{g}_n(l) = \langle T_{(4)} R_i f, g \rangle.$$

Here and next values of f and g can be written wrong on bases and tops of $A_i(j)$ and $B_i(j)$, but this fact does not essential for convergence of such operators. It is clear that

$$\chi_{A_i(1)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} - Q_i \to 0,$$

$$\chi_{B_i(1)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} - T_{(4)} R_i \to 0.$$

Analogously,

$$\chi_{A_i(3)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} - T_{(4)}^{-1} Q_i \to 0.$$

By construction of $T_{(4)}$, the function $f(T_{(4)}^{m_i} x)$ has two values on each level from $B_i(3), A_i(4), B_i(4)$. The first one is exactly at x from O_i, and the second one is elsewhere when one point from $\{x, T_{(4)} x, ..., T_{(4)}^{m_i} x\}$ is outside of C_{n+1}. Thus

$$\langle \chi_{B_i(3)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} f, g \rangle = \langle \chi_{B_i(3) \cap O_i} T_{(4)}^{m_i} f, g \rangle + \langle \chi_{B_i(3) \setminus O_i} T_{(4)}^{m_i} f, g \rangle =$$

$$\frac{2}{3} d_{n+1} \sum_{l=h_n-p_i+2}^{h_n} f_n(l + p_i - h_n - 1) \bar{g}_n(l) +$$

$$\frac{1}{3} d_{n+1} \sum_{l=h_n-p_i+3}^{h_n} f_n(l + p_i - h_n - 2) \bar{g}_n(l) = \frac{2}{3} \langle R_i f, g \rangle + \frac{1}{3} \langle T_{(4)}^{-1} R_i f, g \rangle.$$

Hence

$$\chi_{B_i(3)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} - (\frac{2}{3} E + \frac{1}{3} T_{(4)}^{-1}) R_i \to 0.$$

In the same way, we get

$$\chi_{A_i(4)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} - (\frac{2}{3} E + \frac{1}{3} T_{(4)}^{-1}) Q_i \to 0,$$

$$\chi_{B_i(4)} T_{(4)}^{m_i} - (\frac{2}{3} T_{(4)} + \frac{1}{3} E) R_i \to 0.$$

This completes the calculation in the case 1.

2. Here $i_0 = 1$. As above, we have

$$\chi_{A_i(2)}T_{(4)}^{m_i} - T_{(4)}^{-1}Q_i \to 0, \quad \chi_{B_i(2)}T_{(4)}^{m_i} - (\frac{2}{3}E + \frac{1}{3}T_{(4)}^{-1})R_i \to 0,$$

$$\chi_{A_i(3)}T_{(4)}^{m_i} - (\frac{2}{3}T_{(4)}^{-1} + \frac{1}{3}T_{(4)}^{-2})Q_i \to 0, \ \chi_{B_i(3)}T_{(4)}^{m_i} - (\frac{2}{3}E + \frac{1}{3}T_{(4)}^{-1})R_i \to 0,$$

$$\chi_{A_i(4)}T_{(4)}^{m_i} - (\frac{2}{3}E + \frac{1}{3}T_{(4)}^{-1})Q_i \to 0, \ \chi_{B_i(4)}T_{(4)}^{m_i} - (\frac{2}{3}T_{(4)} + \frac{1}{3}E)R_i \to 0.$$

3. In this case, $i_0 = 4$, and $f(T_{(4)}^{m_i}x)$ has two values on each level, except for from $A_i(1)$. Using

$$\langle Q_i' f, g\rangle = \frac{2}{3}d_{n+1}\sum_{l=1}^{h_n-p_i} f_n(l+p_i)\bar{g}_n(l),$$

calculate

$$\langle \chi_{A_i(1)}T_{(4)}^{m_i}f, g\rangle = d_{n+1}\sum_{l=1}^{h_n-p_i} f_n(l+p_i-1)\bar{g}_n(l) = \frac{3}{2}\langle T_{(4)}^{-1}Q_i' f, g\rangle,$$

$$\langle \chi_{A_i(4)}T_{(4)}^{m_i}f, g\rangle = \langle \chi_{A_i(4)\cap O_i}T_{(4)}^{m_i}f, g\rangle + \langle \chi_{A_i(4)\setminus O_i}T_{(4)}^{m_i}f, g\rangle =$$

$$\langle Q_i' f, g\rangle + \frac{1}{3}d_{n+1}\sum_{l=1}^{h_n-p_i} f_n(l+p_i-1)\bar{g}_n(l) =$$

$$\langle Q_i' f, g\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle T_{(4)}^{-1}Q_i' f, g\rangle.$$

For $j = 2, 3$, we get

$$\langle \chi_{A_i(j)}T_{(4)}^{m_i}f, g\rangle = \frac{2}{3}d_{n+1}\sum_{l=1}^{h_n-p_i} f_n(l+p_i-1)\bar{g}_n(l) +$$

$$\frac{1}{3}d_{n+1}\sum_{l=1}^{h_n-p_i} f_n(l+p_i-2)\bar{g}_n(l) = \langle T_{(4)}^{-1}Q_i' f, g\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle T_{(4)}^{-2}Q_i' f, g\rangle.$$

As before, for any j

$$\langle \chi_{B_i(j)}T_{(4)}^{m_i}f, g\rangle = \frac{2}{3}d_{n+1}\sum_{l=h_n-p_i+2}^{h_n} f_n(l+p_i-h_n-1)\bar{g}_n(l) +$$

$$\frac{1}{3}d_{n+1}\sum_{l=h_n-p_i+3}^{h_n} f_n(l+p_i-h_n-2)\bar{g}_n(l) = \langle R_i' f, g\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\langle T_{(4)}^{-1}R_i' f, g\rangle.$$

$\square$

1. Fix $P = aE + bT_{(4)}$. Let $T_{(4)}^{m_i} \to P$ for some $m_i \to +\infty$. It is clear that $a, b \geq 0$, because $P \in \mathcal{L}_\mu^+$. Choose a subsequence of m_i (if necessary) such that

$$Q_i^{(x_i)} \to Q, \tag{2.4}$$

$$R_i^{(x_i)} \to R,$$

where (x_i) means nothing or prime for each i, and (x_i) is completely defined by m_i as in Lemma 2.2. Obviously, $Q, R \in \mathcal{L}_\mu^+$. By construction of $T_{(4)}$,

$$\|T_{(4)}\chi_{D_i} - \chi_{D_i}\|_\mu^2 \leq 2d_{n+1} \to 0,$$

where D_i is $A_i(i_0)$ or $A_i(i_0) \cap O_i$. Thus

$$\|(T_{(4)}Q_i^{(x_i)} - Q_i^{(x_i)}T_{(4)})f\|_\mu^2 \leq \|T_{(4)}\chi_{D_i} - \chi_{D_i}\|_\mu \|T_{(4)}^2 f\|_\mu \to 0,$$

for any $f \in L_2(\mu)$. Therefore Q commutes with $T_{(4)}$. Analogously, we have that R commutes with $T_{(4)}$. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_1^+[x]$ the subset of $\mathcal{P}_1[x]$ with non-negative coefficients.

Next we will show that if $P = \sum_{i=1}^l S_i$, where $S_i \in \mathcal{L}_\mu^+$, and S_i commute with $T_{(4)}$, then $S_i \in \mathcal{P}_1^+[T_{(4)}]$. Indeed, measures $\phi^{-1}S_i$ are $T_{(4)} \times T_{(4)}$- invariant and absolutely continuous with respect to the subpolymorphism $\phi^{-1}P = a\triangle_E + b\triangle_{T_{(4)}}$. The transformation $T_{(4)} \times T_{(4)}$ is ergodic for measures $\triangle_E$ and $\triangle_{T_{(4)}}$. Hence every $T_{(4)} \times T_{(4)}$-invariant part of the measure $\triangle_E$ $(\triangle_{T_{(4)}})$ is $c\triangle_E$ $(c\triangle_{T_{(4)}})$ for some $c > 0$. This gives $\phi^{-1}S_i = a_i\triangle_E + b_i\triangle_{T_{(4)}}$ for some $a_i, b_i \geq 0$.

¿From Lemma 2.2 and (2.4) we have that

$$P = UQ + VR, \tag{2.5}$$

where (U, V) is at least one of the following pairs $(4/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 8/3E, 1/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 2E + 5/3T_{(4)})$, $(1/3T_{(4)}^{-2} + 2T_{(4)}^{-1} + 5/3E, 2/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 8/3E + 2/3T_{(4)})$, $(T_{(4)}^{-2} + 4T_{(4)}^{-1} + E, 2T_{(4)}^{-1} + 4E)$. In any case P contains c_1Q and c_2R as parts. Thus $Q, R \in \mathcal{P}_1^+[T_{(4)}]$. Obviously,

$$1 = \langle T_{(4)}^{m_i}\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}\rangle \to \langle P\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}\rangle. \tag{2.6}$$

This implies that $P \neq 0$. Therefore (2.5) is possible only when $P = (4/3T_{(4)}^{-1} + 8/3E)cT_{(4)}$. It remains to mention, using (2.6), that $c = 1/4$.

2. The proof that $1/3E + 2/3T_{(4)} \in \phi(LJ_+(T_{(4)}))$ is almost obvious. Namely, consider $m_i = h_n$. We obtain $i_0 = 2, p_i = 0, R_i = 0$. Thus (2.3) gives

$$\langle Q_i f, g\rangle = d_{n+1}\sum_{l=1}^{h_n} f_n(l)\bar{g}_n(l) = \frac{d_n}{4}\sum_{l=1}^{h_n} f_n(l)\bar{g}_n(l) = \frac{1}{4}\langle f, g\rangle.$$

This implies that

$$\langle P_i f, g\rangle = \langle(\frac{1}{3}T_{(4)}^{-1} + \frac{2}{3}E)f, g\rangle.$$

Thus Theorem 2.1 follows from Lemma 2.2 and Remark 1.9. □

Remark 2.3. By the same argument as in [3], it is not difficult to show that $T_{(k)}$ have minimal self-joinings. Then Q, R can be written in the following form

$$\alpha \int + \sum_j a_j T_{(k)}^j,$$

where $\int$ is an orthogonal projection onto the space of constants, and $0 \le \alpha,\ 0 \le a_i$. This gives that the first part of Theorem 2.1 also follows directly from (2.5).

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 2.4. *$LJ_+(T_{(k)}) \neq LJ_-(T_{(k)})$ for $k > 3$.*

Proof. Indeed, it is clear that

$$\phi(LJ_+(T^*)) = \{U_\nu^* : \nu \in LJ_+(T)\}.$$

Therefore, using Proposition 1.3, Remark 1.9, and Theorem 2.1, we have

$$\phi(LJ_-(T_{(k)})) \cap \mathcal{P}_1[T_{(k)}] = \{\frac{k-2}{k-1}E + \frac{1}{k-1}T_{(k)}\},$$

and Theorem 2.4 is proved. □

3. Closing remarks

Proposition 3.1. *For any $T \in \mathbf{Aut}(\mu)$*

$$LJ_+(T) \cap LJ_-(T) \neq \emptyset.$$

This is an immediate consequence of the next proposition.

Proposition 3.2.

$$\phi(LJ_+(T)) \cap \phi(LJ_-(T)) \supseteq \{T_+T_- : T_\pm \in \phi(LJ_\pm(T))\}, \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\{T_+T_- : T_\pm \in \phi(LJ_\pm(T))\} = \{\int\} \Leftrightarrow T \textit{ is mixing},$$

where $\int$ is defined as in Remark 2.3.

Proof. Fix $T_\pm \in \phi(LJ_\pm(T))$, and $n_i, k_i \to +\infty$ such that $T^{k_i} \to T_+,\ T^{-n_i} \to T_-$. Consider also a dense set of functions from $L_2(\mu)$, say f_l. For each $\epsilon > 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, choose i such that

$$|\langle T^{-n_i} f_{l_1}, T_+^* f_{l_2}\rangle - \langle T_- f_{l_1}, T_+^* f_{l_2}\rangle| < \epsilon,$$

for all $l_1, l_2 \le m$. Finally choose $j = j(i)$ such that $k_{j(i)} - n_i > m$ and

$$|\langle T^{k_{j(i)}} T^{-n_i} f_{l_1}, f_{l_2}\rangle - \langle T_+ T^{-n_i} f_{l_1}, f_{l_2}\rangle| < \epsilon,$$

for all $l_1, l_2 \le m$. Thus

$$|\langle T^{k_{j(i)}-n_i} f_{l_1}, f_{l_2}\rangle - \langle T_- f_{l_1}, T_+^* f_{l_2}\rangle| < 2\epsilon.$$

Therefore $T^{k_{j(i)}-n_i} \to T_+T_-$, where $k_{j(i)} - n_i \to +\infty$.

Operators T_+ and T_- belong to the von Neumann algebra generated by T. Thus $T_+T_- = T_-T_+$. This implies that arguing as above, we see that $T^{-n_{j'(i)}+k_i} \to T_+T_-$, where $-n_{j'(i)} + k_i \to -\infty$.

The second part of the proof is more or less standard. Indeed, if T is not mixing, then there exists T_+ from $\phi(LJ_+(T))\backslash\{\int\}$. Thus $T_- = T_+^* \in \phi(LJ_-(T))\backslash\{\int\}$. Next for $S^*S = \int$, where $S \in \phi(J(T,T))$, we have

$$\int f d\mu = 0 \Rightarrow \langle Sf, Sf\rangle = \langle S^*Sf, f\rangle = \langle \int f, f\rangle = 0.$$

This means that $Sf = 0$, and finally $S = \int$. Therefore the operator $T_+T_- = T_-T_+ = T_+^*T_+$ is not $\int$. □

Remark 3.3. Obviously, in (3.1) we have exact equality if T is rigid or mixing. However, taking into account Remark 2.3 , the operator $1/2E + 1/2T$ can not be represented as T_+T_- for Chacon's transformation T. This yields that, in general, the left part of (3.1) is different from the right part.

References

1. D. Rudolph, *An example of a measure preserving map with minimal self-joinings, and applications*, J. Analyse Math. **35** (1979), 97–122.
2. M. Ratner, *Horocycle flows, joinings and rigidity of products*, Ann. of Math.(2) **118** (1983), 277–313.
3. A del Junco, M. Rahe, and L. Swanson, *Chacon's automorphism has minimal self-joinings*, J. Analyse Math. **37** (1980), 276–284.
4. J. King, *The commutant is the weak closure of the powers, for rank-1 transformations*, Erg. Theory and Dyn. Sys. **6** (1986), 363–384.
5. B. Host, *Mixing of all orders and pairwise independent joinings of systems with singular spectrum*, Isr. J. Math. **76** (1991), 289–298.
6. A del Junco and D. Rudolph, *On ergodic actions whose self-joinings are graphs*, Erg. Theory and Dyn. Sys. **7** (1987), 531–557.
7. A. Vershik, *Dynamic theory of growth in groups: entropy, boundaries, examples*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **55** (2000), 59–128; English transl., Russian Math. Surv. **55** (2000), 667–733.
8. O. Ageev, *On ergodic transformations with homogeneous spectrum*, J. Dynam. Control Systems **5** (1999), 149–152.
9. V. Ryzhikov, *Transformations having homogeneous spectra*, J. Dynam. Control Systems **5** (1999), 145–148.
10. A. Katok, Ja. Sinai, and A. Stepin, *The theory of dynamical systems and general transformation groups with invariant measure*, Mathematical analysis, Vol. 13 (Russian), pp. 129–262. (errata insert) Akad. Nauk SSSR VINITI, Moscow, 1975.
11. G. Goodson *A survey of recent results in the spectral theory of ergodic dynamical systems*, J. Dynam. Control Systems **5** (1999), 173–226.
12. E. Robinson, Jr. *Ergodic measure preserving transformations with arbitrary finite spectral multiplicities*, Invent. Math. **72** (1983), 299–314.
13. O. Ageev, *The spectral multiplicity function and geometric representations of interval exchange transformations*, Math. Sb. **190** (1999), 3–28; English transl., Sb. Math. **190** (1999), 1–28.
14. D. Rudolph, *Fundamentals of measurable dynamics. Ergodic theory on Lebesgue spaces*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1990.
15. O. Ageev, *The spectrum of Cartesian powers for the classical automorphisms*, Mat. Zametky **68** (2000), 643–647, in Russian.
16. O. Ageev, C. Silva, *Genericity of rigidity and multiple recurrence for infinite measure preserving and nonsingular transformations*, preprint.
17. M. Lemańczyk, B. Host, J.-P. Thouvenot, *Gaussian automorphisms whose ergodic self-joinings are Gaussian*, Fund. Math. **164** (2000), 253–293.

Department of Mathematics, Moscow State Technical University, 2nd Baumanscaya St. 5, 107005 Moscow, Russia

E-mail address: ageev@mx.bmstu.ru

Current address: Max Planck Institute of Mathematics, P.O.Box 7280, D-53072 Bonn, Germany

E-mail address: ageev@mpim-bonn.mpg.de