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#### Abstract

This paper presents a detailed symbolic approach to the study of self-similar tilings. It uses properties of addresses associated with graph-directed iterated function systems to establish conjugacy properties of tiling spaces. Tiles may be fractals and the tiled set maybe a complicated unbounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$.


## 1. Introduction

This paper presents a symbolic approach to the study of self-similar tilings. It uses graph-directed iterated function systems to produce and analyze both classical tilings of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ and also other generalized tilings of what may be unbounded fractal subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$. Our primary goal is to understand conjugacy properties of these tilings.

See [28] for formal background on iterated function systems (IFS) and [23] for a recent review. We are concerned with graph directed IFSs as defined here, but see also [2, 6, 16, 20, 21, 24, 32, 48]. Terms in this introduction are defined formally elsewhere in the text.
1.1. Two examples. Here we illustrate informally two simple examples of the construction and properties of what we call rigid fractal tilings. We use these examples to illustrate Theorem 17.

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{2}$ be either the filled hexagonal polygon illustrated in Figure 1(i) or the fractal illustrated in Figure 1(iii). $A$ in Figure 1(i) satisfies the equation

$$
A=E_{1}(s A) \cup E_{2}\left(s^{2} A\right)
$$

where $0<s$ solves $s^{2}+s-1=0$ and $E_{1}, E_{2}$ are the isometries implied by Figure 1(ii). Likewise, $A$ in Figure1(iii) satisfies the same equation, but here $0<s$ solves $s^{4}+s-1=0$ and $E_{1}, E_{2}$ are the isometries implied by Figure 1 (iv). In both cases we say that $A$ is tiled by copies of the two prototiles $s A$ and $s^{2} A$.
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Figure 1. See text.

The little tilings, in Figures 1(ii) and 1(iv), share three interesting properties. If we scale up either tiling in Figure 1 by $s^{-1}$, the tile $E_{1}(s A)$ becomes a copy of $A$ and the tile $E_{2}\left(s^{2} A\right)$ becomes a copy of $s A$. The former can be split into a copy of $s A$ and a copy of $s^{2} A$. We can repeat this scaling up and splitting to form, in each case, a sequence of successively strictly larger tilings as illustrated in Figure 2. We call the tilings in these sequences canonical tilings, $\left\{T_{n}\right\}$.

The second interesting property is this. Consider the sequence of canonical tilings $\left\{T_{n}\right\}$ in the first example. Let $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ be Euclidean transformations on $\mathbb{R}^{2}$. Suppose $E_{1} T_{k} \cap E_{2} T_{l}$ is nonempty and tiles $E_{1} s^{-k} A \cap E_{2} s^{-l} A$. Then either $E_{1} T_{k} \subset E_{2} T_{l}$ or $E_{2} T_{l} \subset E_{1} T_{k}$. This is a consequence of the observation that if $s^{k} T_{0} \cap E T_{0}$ is nonempty for some integer $k$ and some isometry $E$, then $E=I$ and $k=0$. We say that the little tiling in Figure 1(ii) is rigid (with respect to Euclidean transformations). Similarly, we say that the tiling in Figure 1(iv) is rigid (with respect to non-flip Euclidean transformations).

The third interesting property is this. There are non-denumerably many different infinite sequences of isometries $\left\{E_{k_{n}}\right\}$, where $\left\{k_{n}\right\}$ is a subsequence of the positive integers, such that $E_{k_{n}} T_{k_{n}} \subset E_{k_{n+1}} T_{k_{n+1}}$.


Figure 2. This illustrates the sequences of canonical tilings $\left\{T_{n}\right\}$ associated with two examples. See text.

This enables us to define an unbounded tiling $T\left(\left\{E_{k_{n}}\right\}\right):=\bigcup E_{k_{n}} T_{k_{n}}$ corresponding to the sequence $\left\{E_{k_{n}}\right\}$.

This illustrates informally a generalization of a standard construction [1] of self-similar tilings that applies both to classical tilings, as defined by Grunbaum and Sheppard [26], and to certain purely fractal tilings. It also illustrates the notion of rigid tilings.

As in self-similar tiling theory, a key question is: When does $T\left(\left\{E_{k_{n}}\right\}\right)$ $=E T\left(\left\{E_{k_{n}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right\}\right)$ for some isometry $E$ ? Theorem 17 (below) answers this question for the case of rigid tilings.

To informally explain Theorem 17 , we redefine the tilings $T\left(\left\{E_{k_{n}}\right\}\right)$ using the language of iterated function systems (IFS). Each of the above examples is associated with a pair of contractive similitudes that comprise an IFS $\left\{f_{1}: \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2}, f_{2}: \mathbb{R}^{2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2}\right\}$ such that there is a fixed $0<s<1$ so that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}=\{1,2, \ldots\}$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^{2}$,

$$
f_{\theta_{1}}^{-1} \circ f_{\theta_{2}}^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_{\theta_{k}}^{-1} x=s^{-\xi} U\left(\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}, \ldots, \theta_{k}\right) x+t\left(\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}, \ldots \theta_{k}\right)
$$

where $\xi=\theta_{1}+\theta_{2}+\ldots+\theta_{k}, U$ is a unitary transformation on $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ and $t$ is a translation, both dependent only on $\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right) \in\{1,2\}^{k}$.

We define a family of partial tilings in terms of canonical tilings by

$$
\Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right)=f_{\theta_{1}}^{-1} \circ f_{\theta_{2}}^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_{\theta_{k}}^{-1} s^{\xi} T_{\xi}
$$

It is a remarkable and beautiful fact that

$$
\Pi\left(\theta_{1}\right) \subset \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2}\right) \subset \ldots \subset \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right)
$$

so that for all $\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \theta_{3} \ldots$

$$
\Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \theta_{3} \ldots\right):=\cup \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right)
$$

is a well-defined unbounded tiling of (possibly a subset of) $\mathbb{R}^{2}$.

In Section 12 we establish an equivalence between representations of tilings in the form $T\left(\left\{E_{k_{n}}\right\}\right)$ with representations in the form $\Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \theta_{3} \ldots\right)$.

Our question "When does $T\left(\left\{E_{k_{n}}\right\}\right)=E T\left(\left\{E_{k_{n}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right\}\right)$ ?" becomes: "When does $\Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \theta_{3} \ldots\right)=E \Pi\left(\psi_{1} \psi_{2} \psi_{3} \ldots\right)$ ?".

Theorem 17; Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a tiling IFS.
(i) If $\theta, \psi \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}, S^{p} \theta=S^{q} \psi, E=f_{-\theta \mid p}\left(f_{-\psi \mid q}\right)^{-1},(\theta \mid p)^{+}=(\psi \mid q)^{+}$, and $\xi(\theta \mid p)=\xi(\psi \mid q)$, then $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ where $E$ is an isometry.
(ii) Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be rigid, and let $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ where $E \in \mathcal{U}$ is an isometry, for some pair of addresses $\theta, \psi \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$. Then there are $p, q \in N$ such that $S^{p} \theta=S^{q} \psi, E=f_{-(\theta \mid p)}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid q)}\right)^{-1},(\theta \mid p)^{+}=(\psi \mid q)^{+}$, and $\xi(\theta \mid p)=\xi(\psi \mid q)$.

The statement of Theorem 17 involves terms that are defined precisely in Sections 2 and 3. In the present context: $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is the IFS $\mathcal{F}=\left\{f_{1}, f_{2}\right\}$ with a directed graph $\mathcal{G}$ with two edges and one vertex, $\Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}=\{1,2\}^{\infty}, S^{p} \theta=\theta_{p+1} \theta_{p+2} \ldots, f_{-\theta \mid p}=f_{\theta_{1}}^{-1} \circ f_{\theta_{2}}^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_{\theta_{p}}^{-1},(\theta \mid p)^{+}=$ $(\psi \mid q)^{+}=A, \xi(\theta \mid p)=\theta_{1}+\theta_{2}+\ldots+\theta_{p}$, and $\xi(\theta \mid p)=\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}+\ldots+\psi_{q}$. For the first example, $\mathcal{U}$ is a set of Euclidean transformations. For the second example $\mathcal{U}$ is the set of non-flip Euclidean transformations together with the set of transformations described in part (i) of Theorem 16.

Part (i) of Theorem 17, in the present context, asserts that if there are positive integers $p$ and $q$ so that $\theta_{1}+\theta_{2}+\ldots+\theta_{p}=\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}+\ldots+\psi_{q}$ and $\theta_{p+i}=\psi_{q+i}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \theta_{3} \ldots\right)=E \Pi\left(\psi_{1} \psi_{2} \psi_{3} \ldots\right)$ with $E=f_{\theta_{1}}^{-1} \circ f_{\theta_{2}}^{-1} \circ \ldots \circ f_{\theta_{p}}^{-1} \circ f_{\psi_{q}} \circ f_{\psi_{q-1}} \ldots \circ f_{\psi_{1}}$. Part (ii) of Theorem 16 asserts how, for rigid systems, these conditions are also necessary.

This completes our informal introduction to the central result in this paper.
1.2. Main result and related work. In fact, the tilings just described are associated with inverse limits as in 41]. In the body of this paper a tiling $\Pi(\theta)$ is associated with a path $\theta$ of a directed graph and an IFS. The general question is: when does $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ for some pair of paths $\theta$ and $\psi$ and some isometry $E$ ? This question lies at the back of many ideas related to homology, spectral theory of operators defined on tiling spaces, and non-commutative geometry. See for example the brief overview in [25]. Our main result is Theorem 17 which explains exactly when $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ for rigid systems. Much of the work in this paper is to set up the framework, to define the tilings $\Pi(\theta)$ and describe some of their basic properties.

There are relationships between this work and Solomyak [44, 45], and Anderson and Putnam [1] , and many other works on tiling theory.

However our approach to the construction of tilings is more general because we include purely fractal tilings, where tiles may have empty interiors, as well as more standard self-similar tilings. Our methods are based on addresses associated with graph directed IFS and mappings from these addresses into tilings and tiling spaces.

We mention the work of Pearse [37] and Pearse and Winter [38] concerning tilings of the convex hull of attractors of IFSs. We do not discuss their construction here. But we note that it is relevant because their canonical tilings may be extended to tilings of $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ by taking inverse limits. It appears that such tilings may cover the complements of the supports of some of the tilings we discuss.

We mention the recent work of Smilansky and Solomon [43] concerning non commensurable tilings of $\mathbb{R}^{2}$. While we do not discuss non commensurable fractal tilings in this paper, we note that such tilings may be described symbolically via a natural extension of the present framework, along the lines of [14].

This paper extensively develops [13] which concerns tilings derived from attractors of IFSs with trivial graphs. Here we generalize to graphdirected IFSs and show that a certain property, rigidity, implies a specific equivalence class structure on the tiling space. In the context of standard self-similar tiling theory, as considered for example in [1, 44], rigidity is largely equivalent to the unique composition property and to recognizability. But it is a more general geometrical notion and it also applies to purely fractal structures. It is also related to, but distinct from, the notion of measure rigidity in IFS theory [27]. Our main results are Theorems 17 and 18 . They describe the possible conjugacy classes of isometries applied to rigid fractal tilings.

This paper is the completion of [12], which initiated our study of graph-directed fractal tiling theory. It has relationships with [14], which uses graph-theoretic language and what we call tiling hierarchies. Here the point of view is that of iterated function systems, addresses and certain supertiles called canonical tilings. This paper goes much further than [14]. For example it considers purely fractal tilings, continuity properties of the map from addresses to tilings, the formal description of canonical tilings in terms of addresses, and the relationship between rigidity and recognizability.
1.3. Outline. Section 2 introduces notation and concepts needed throughout. We define a graph $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ where $\mathcal{F}$ is an $\operatorname{IFS}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{M}, \mathcal{G}$ is a directed graph, and paths in $\mathcal{G}$ correspond to allowed compositions of functions in $\mathcal{F}$. We present our notation for paths $\Sigma$ in $\mathcal{G}$ and paths $\Sigma^{\dagger}$ in $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}$, the reversed graph. Definition 1 specifies the attractor $A$ of
$(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ and the address map $\pi$ which takes paths and vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ to subsets of $A$. Theorem 1 states the continuity properties of $\pi$. Definition 2 defines disjunctive paths. These are infinite paths that visit all vertices in every allowed order. Insight into the relationship between disjunctive points and $A$ is provided by Theorem 1 and underlies a simple chaos game algorithm, generalizing [9], for calculating both $A$ and the tilings discussed in this paper. Properties of the shift map $S$, Definition 3, acting on paths and vertices are stated in Theorem 2. Subsection 2.5 introduces a part of dynamical systems theory relevant later to describing intersections of fractal tiles. In Theorem 3 the pointwise ergodic theorem is applied to establish that the image under $\pi$ of the disjunctive points in $\Sigma$ have full measure, for many natural stationary measures on $A$.

Section 3 establishes tiling IFSs and their tilings. A generalized notion of a tiling, to accommodate fractal supports, is described in Subsection 3.3. A tiling IFS is a graph $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ with the special conditions in Definition 5. In particular, it is required that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ obeys the open set condition (OSC) in Definition 4. According to Theorem 4 a tiling map $\Pi$, tilings $\Pi(\theta)$ and sets of tiles associated with paths $\theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}$, are well-defined by Definition 6. Definitions 7, 8, 9, 10 describe the critical set, the dynamical boundary, and the inner boundaries of the attractor of a tiling IFS. These objects, and their relationship with disjunctive points (they don't contain any), play a key role in describing the nonempty intersections of the tiles in $\Pi(\theta)$. Some of their properties are the subject of Theorem 5, which also provides the Hausdorff dimensions of the attractor of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ and the tiles in $\Pi(\theta)$. Theorem 5 underpins Theorem 4.

Section 4 studies continuity properties of the tiling function $\Pi(\theta)$. A convenient metric $d_{\mathbb{T}}$ on the space of tilings $\mathbb{T}=\Pi\left(\Sigma^{\dagger}\right)$ is introduced. Theorem 6 says that $\left(\mathbb{T}, d_{\mathbb{T}}\right)$ is a compact metric space, and Theorem 7 says that $\Pi: \Sigma^{\dagger} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ is upper semi-continuous, but continuous when restricted to reversible points, a generalization of a notion in [10]. A proof of Theorem 7, using a natural generalization of central open sets as defined by Bandt 4], is presented.

Section 5 examines the combinatorics of the addresses of finite tilings in $\Pi(\theta)$. Theorem 8 relates the addresses of tiles in $\Pi(\theta)$, where $|\theta|$ is finite, to addresses of tiles in copies of tilings contained in $\Pi(\theta)$.

Section 6 introduces canonical tilings. Definition 11 defines the canonical tilings $T_{k}^{v}$ indexed by a vertex $v \in \mathcal{G}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. All tilings $\Pi(\theta)$ comprise what we call isometric combinations of canonical tilings. Theorem 9 gives identities between isometric combinations, and follows
from Theorem 8, Canonical tilings, their notation, and related identities, play a key role in establishing our main results.

Section 7 considers general properties of tilings $\Pi(\theta)$. The notion of a coprime graph and standard properties of tilings such as quasiperiodic, local isomorphism, and self-similarity, are defined. Theorem 10 states that if $\mathcal{G}$ is coprime then all tilings $\Pi(\theta)$ with $|\theta|=\infty$ are quasiperiodic, and that any pair are locally isomorphic; also if $\theta$ is eventually periodic, then $\Pi(\theta)$ is self-similar. The proof uses earlier identities involving canonical tilings.

Section 8 introduces relative and absolute addresses of canonical tilings and uses them to establish deflation $\alpha$ and inflation $\alpha^{-1}$, operators that act on the graph of $\Pi(\theta)$ to produce new objects. Relative addresses are associated with copies of canonical tilings $T_{k}^{v}$ and are defined in Definition 12, Lemma 4 notes that the relative addresses of $T_{k}^{v}$ are in bijection with the subset $\Omega_{k}^{v}$ of $\Sigma$. Theorem 11 explains how a relative address is associated with a hierarchy of canonical tilings. Absolute addresses are also defined and in Theorem 12 a relationship between absolute and relative addresses is exhibited. In Definition 13, inflation and deflation of canonical tilings are defined according to $\alpha T_{k}^{v}=T_{k-1}^{v}$. Finally, Definition 14 supported by Theorem 13 establishes how the domains of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ can be extended to include the graph of $\Pi(\theta)$, and how their actions relate to $\Pi(S \theta)$. This is a key result.

In Section 9 it is pointed out that $\alpha$ may not act consistently on isometric combinations of canonical tilings. We define rigid tilings and rigid tiling IFSs, and extend the definitions of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ so they act consistently on isometric combinations of rigid canonical tilings. Definition 15 specifies what it means for two tilings to meet and in Definition 16 we define what is a rigid tiling. The notion of a rigid tiling is with respect to a set of isometries $\mathcal{U}$ that act on tiles and tilings. In Lemma 5 it is explained that for rigid tilings, if certain scaled copies of canonical tilings meet, then one is contained in the other. Theorem 14 provides some properties of rigid tilings and gives an alternative test for rigidity.

Also in Section 9, the definitions of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ are extended to include local action on isometric combinations of canonical tilings and on $\Pi(\theta)$ (without regard for $\theta$ ) so if two isometric combinations represent the same tiling then $\alpha$ may act consistently term-by-term to produce the same result, and similarly for $\alpha^{-1}$. The local actions of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ on tilings are defined using the concepts of large tiles and partners. Theorem 15 lists properties of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ acting on isometric
combinations of canonical rigid tilings, and leads to Corollary 2 which asserts that if $\Pi(\theta) \subset E \Pi(\psi)$ for some $E \in \mathcal{U}$, then $\alpha^{K}$ can be applied to the two tilings $\Pi(\theta)$ and $E \Pi(\psi)$ to yield $\alpha^{K}(\Pi(\theta)) \subset \alpha^{K}(E \Pi(\psi))$, without knowing $\theta$ and $\psi$.

Section 10 arrives at a main result of this paper, concerning rigid tilings. Theorem 17 tells us exactly when, for rigid tilings, $\Pi(\theta)=$ $E \Pi(\psi)$ for some $E \in \mathcal{U}$. The proof uses properties of relative addresses given in Theorem 16. It is necessary that the two addresses have a common tail, and $E$ is defined in terms of the initial parts of the addresses of $\theta$ and $\psi$. Then Corollary 3 tells us that if $\mathcal{U}$ contains the group of Euclidean translations, then $\Pi(\theta)$ is not periodic for any infinite $\theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}$.

Section 11 explores consequences of $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$, where $E$ is some isometry, without requiring rigidity. It contains one definition and one theorem. The section begins by showing by example that it can occur that $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ implies $\alpha^{K}(\Pi(\theta))=\alpha^{K}(E \Pi(\psi))$ without requiring rigidity. Such examples are termed well-behaved in Definition 18. For well-behaved tilings, Theorem 18 details the structure of $E$ such that $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$. It is essentially equivalent to Theorem 17 in the case of rigid tilings.

Section 12 establishes a relationship between this work and Anderson and Putnam [1]. It is proved that the tiling space of [1] is conjugate to $\{E \Pi(\theta)$ : specified set of translations $E$ and addresses $\theta\}$.

## 2. Foundations

2.1. Graph iterated function systems. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a finite set of invertible contraction mappings $f: \mathbb{R}^{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{M}$ each with contraction factor $0<\lambda<1$, that is $\|f(x)-f(y)\| \leq \lambda\|x-y\|$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$. We suppose

$$
\mathcal{F}=\left\{f_{1}, f_{2}, \ldots, f_{N}\right\}, N>1
$$

Let $\mathcal{G}=(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V})$ be a strongly connected primitive directed graph with edges $\mathcal{E}$ and vertices $\mathcal{V}$ with

$$
\mathcal{E}=\left\{e_{1}, e_{2}, \ldots, e_{N}\right\}, \mathcal{V}=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{V}\right\}, 1 \leq V<N
$$

$\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected means there is a path, a sequence of consecutive directed edges, from any vertex to any vertex. $\mathcal{G}$ is primitive means that if $\mathcal{W}$ is the $V \times V$ matrix whose $i j^{\text {th }}$ entry is the number of edges directed from vertex $j$ to vertex $i$, then there is some power of $\mathcal{W}$ whose entries are all strictly positive.

We call $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ a graph IFS. The directed graph $\mathcal{G}$ provides some orders in which functions of $\mathcal{F}$ may be composed. The sequence of successive directed edges $e_{\sigma_{1}} e_{\sigma_{2}} \cdots e_{\sigma_{k}}$ may be associated with the composite function

$$
f_{\sigma_{1}} f_{\sigma_{2}} \cdots f_{\sigma_{k}}:=f_{\sigma_{1}} \circ f_{\sigma_{2}} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma_{k}}
$$

2.2. Notation for paths in $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{G}^{\dagger}$ and compositions of functions. Let $\mathbb{N}$ be the strictly positive integers and $\mathbb{N}_{0}=\mathbb{N} \cup\{0\}$. For $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $[N]:=\{1,2, \ldots, N\}$.
$\Sigma$ is the set of directed paths in $\mathcal{G}$, each with an initial vertex. A path $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is written $\sigma=\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \cdots$ corresponding to the sequence of successive directed edges $e_{\sigma_{1}} e_{\sigma_{2}} \cdots$ in $\mathcal{G}$. The length of $\sigma$ is $|\sigma| \in$ $\mathbb{N}_{0} \cup\{\infty\}$. A metric $d_{\Sigma}$ on $\Sigma$ is

$$
d_{\Sigma}(\sigma, \omega):=2^{-\min \left\{k \in \mathbb{N}: \tilde{\sigma}_{k} \neq \tilde{\omega}_{k}\right\}} \text { for } \sigma \neq \omega
$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_{k}=\sigma_{k}$ for all $k \leq|\sigma|, \tilde{\sigma}_{k}=0$ for all $k>|\sigma|$. Then $\left(\Sigma, d_{\Sigma}\right)$ is a compact metric space.

The set $\Sigma_{*} \subset \Sigma$ is the set of directed paths of finite lengths, and $\Sigma_{\infty} \subset \Sigma$ is the set of directed paths of infinite length. For $\sigma \in \Sigma$, let $\sigma^{-} \in \mathcal{V}$ be the initial vertex and, if $\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}$, let $\sigma^{+} \in \mathcal{V}$ be the terminal vertex; and for $v \in \mathcal{V}$ let

$$
\Sigma_{v}:=\left\{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}: \sigma^{-}=v\right\}
$$

For $\sigma \in \Sigma, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
\sigma \mid k:=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \ldots \sigma_{k} & \text { if }|\sigma|>k \\
\sigma_{1}^{+} & \text {if }|\sigma| \leq k
\end{array}\right.
$$

We try to reserve the symbol $\sigma$ to mean a directed path in $\Sigma$.
$\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}=\left(\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}, \mathcal{V}\right)$ is the graph $\mathcal{G}$ modified so that the directions associated with all edges are reversed. For any edge $e \in \mathcal{G}$, we use the same label $e$ for the corresponding reversed edge in $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}$. The superscript $\dagger$ means that the superscripted object relates to $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}$. For example, $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}=\mathcal{E}$ is the set of edges of $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}, \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ is the set of directed paths in $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}$ of finite length, $\Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ is the set of directed paths in $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}$, each of which starts at a vertex and is of infinite length, and $\Sigma^{\dagger}=\Sigma_{*}^{\dagger} \cup \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$. We try to reserve the symbol $\theta$ to mean a directed path in $\Sigma^{\dagger}$.

We refer to the edges in both $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$ by the same set of indices $\{1,2, \ldots, N\}$. The vertices in both $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}$ are referred to using the set of indices $\{1,2, \ldots, V\}$. Then both $f_{e}$ and the inverse of $f_{e}$

$$
f_{-e}:=f_{e}^{-1}
$$

are well-defined for all $e \in \mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{E}^{\dagger}$.

Typically in this paper, $\mathcal{G}$ and $\Sigma$ are associated with compositions of functions in $\mathcal{F}$, while $\mathcal{G}^{\dagger}$ and $\Sigma^{\dagger}$ are associated with compositions of their inverses. We use the following notation.

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{\sigma \mid k} & :=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
f_{\sigma_{1}} f_{\sigma_{2}} \cdots f_{\sigma_{k}} & \text { if }|\sigma|>k \\
f_{\sigma_{1}^{+}} & \text {if }|\sigma| \leq k
\end{array} \text { for all } \sigma \in \Sigma\right. \\
f_{\sigma} & =f_{\sigma_{1}} f_{\sigma_{2}} \cdots f_{\sigma_{|\sigma|}} \text { for all } \sigma \in \Sigma_{*} \\
f_{-(\theta \mid k)} & :=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
f_{\theta_{1}}^{-1} f_{\theta_{2}}^{-1} \cdots f_{\theta_{k}}^{-1} & \text { if }|\theta|>k \\
f_{-\theta_{1}^{+}} & \text {if }|\theta| \leq k
\end{array} \text { for all } \theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}\right. \\
f_{-\theta} & =f_{\theta_{1}}^{-1} f_{\theta_{2}}^{-1} \cdots f_{\theta_{|\sigma|}}^{-1} \text { for all } \theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}
\end{aligned}
$$

We define $f_{v}=f_{-v}=\chi_{A_{v}}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$ where $\chi_{A_{v}}$ is the characteristic function of $A_{v} \subset \mathbb{R}^{M}$, see Definition 1(iii).
2.3. Addresses and Attractors. Let $\mathbb{H}$ be the nonempty compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ and let $d_{\mathbb{H}}$ be the Hausdorff metric. Singletons in $\mathbb{H}$ are identified with points in $\mathbb{R}^{M}$.
Definition 1. The attractor $A$ of the graph $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$, its components $A_{v}$, and the address map $\pi: \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$, are defined as follows.
(i) $\pi(\sigma):=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} f_{\sigma \mid k}(x)$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}$, independently of $x \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$
(ii) $\quad A:=\pi\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)$
(iii) $\pi(v):=A_{v}:=\pi\left(\Sigma_{v}\right)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$
(iv) $\pi(\sigma):=f_{\sigma}\left(A_{\sigma^{+}}\right)$for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}$

Example 1. Let $\mathcal{F}=\left\{\mathbb{R}^{M} ; f_{1}, f_{2}, f_{3}, f_{4}\right\}$ where each $f_{i}: \mathbb{R}^{M} \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ is a contraction. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the directed graph with four edges $\left\{e_{1}, e_{2}, e_{3}, e_{4}\right\}$ and two vertices $\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}\right\}$, where $e_{1}$ is directed from $v_{1}$ to $v_{1}, e_{2}$ is directed from $v_{1}$ to $v_{2}, e_{3}$ is directed from $v_{2}$ to $v_{1}$, and $e_{4}$ is directed from $v_{2}$ to $v_{2}$. Then $A=A_{1} \cup A_{2}$ where $\left(A_{1}, A_{2}\right)$ is the unique pair of nonempty closed bounded subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{1}\left(A_{1}\right) \cup f_{2}\left(A_{2}\right)=A_{1} \\
& f_{3}\left(A_{1}\right) \cup f_{4}\left(A_{2}\right)=A_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\pi(243)=f_{2} f_{4} f_{3}\left(A_{1}\right)$. Also $\pi(111 \ldots)=\pi(\overline{1})$ is the singleton fixed point of $f_{1}$. For instance, if $M=1, f_{1}(x)=0.5 x, f_{2}(x)=0.5 x-0.5$, $f_{3}(x)=0.5 x+2$, and $f_{4}(x)=0.5 x+1.5$, then $A_{1}=[0,1], A_{2}=[2,3]$, $A=[0,1] \cup[2,3], \pi(243)=f_{2} f_{4} f_{3}([0,1])=[0.75,0.875]$ and $\pi(\overline{1})=\{0\}$.

Theorem 1. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a graph IFS.
(1) $\pi: \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ is well-defined and independent of $x \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$
(2) $\pi: \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ is continuous
(3) $\pi(\sigma)=\bigcap_{k=1}^{|\sigma|} \pi(\sigma \mid k)$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$
(4) $f_{\sigma}\left(A_{\sigma^{+}}\right) \subset A_{\sigma^{-}}$for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}$

Proof. (1) For all $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}, \pi(\sigma)$ is well-defined by (i), independently of $x$, because $\mathcal{F}$ is strictly contractive [28]. It follows that $A$ is welldefined by (ii). Also it follows that $A_{v}$ and $\pi(v)$ are well-defined by (iii), for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. In turn, $\pi(\sigma)$ is well-defined for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}$ by Definition 1(iv). (2) $\pi$ is continuous because for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}$

$$
d_{\mathbb{H}}(\pi(\sigma \mid k), \pi(\sigma \mid l)) \leq \lambda^{\min \{k, l\}} \max _{v, w} d_{\mathbb{H}}\left(A_{v}, A_{w}\right)
$$

(3) and (4) follow from Definition 1(iv).

Definition 2. Define $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}$ to be disjunctive if, given any $\omega \in \Sigma_{*}$, there is $p \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\omega=\sigma_{p} \sigma_{p+1} \ldots \sigma_{p+|\omega|}$.

Similarly, $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ is disjunctive if, given any $\varphi \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$, there is $p \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\varphi=\theta_{p} \theta_{p+1} \ldots \theta_{p+|\varphi|}$.

Theorem 1. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a graph IFS. Let $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}, x_{0} \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$, and $x_{n}=f_{\theta_{n}}\left(x_{n-1}\right)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$
\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\left(\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} x_{n}\right)} \subseteq A
$$

with equality when $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ is disjunctive.
Proof. $\Omega\left(\left\{x_{n}: n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}\right):=\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\left(\bigcup_{n=k}^{\infty} x_{n}\right)}$ is an $\Omega$-limit set. Specifically it is the set of accumulation points of $\left\{x_{n}: n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{M}$. Since $\pi$ is continuous

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Omega\left(\left\{x_{n}: n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}\right) & =\Omega\left(\left\{f_{\theta_{n} \theta_{n-1} \cdots \theta_{1}}\left(x_{0}\right): n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}\right) \\
& =\pi\left(\Omega\left(\left\{\theta_{n} \theta_{n-1} \cdots \theta_{1}: n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The $\Omega$-limit set of $\left\{\theta_{n} \theta_{n-1} \cdots \theta_{1}: n \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$ is contained in or equal to $\Sigma_{\infty}$, with equality when $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ is disjunctive.
2.4. Shift maps. The shift map as defined here acts continuously on $\Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}$ and commutes with $\pi$ according to Theorem 2 (4). It is used in Sections 8 and 11.

Definition 3. The shift map $S: \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}$ is defined by $S\left(\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \cdots\right)=\sigma_{2} \sigma_{3} \cdots$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma, S v=v$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, with the conventions

$$
S^{k} \sigma=\sigma \mid k=\sigma_{1}^{+} \text {when } k \geq|\sigma|
$$

Theorem 2. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a graph IFS.
(1) $S: \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}$ is well-defined
(2) $S(\Sigma \cup \mathcal{V})=\Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}$
(3) $S: \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}$ continuous
(4) $f_{\sigma \mid k} \circ \pi \circ S^{k}(\sigma)=\pi(\sigma)$ for all $\sigma \in \Sigma$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$

Proof. (1) and (2) can be checked. (3) $S$ is continuous at every point in $\Sigma_{*} \cup \mathcal{V}$ because this subset of $\Sigma \cup \mathcal{V}$ is discrete and it is mapped onto itself by $S$. A calculation using the metric $d_{\Sigma}$ proves that $S$ is continuous at every point in $\Sigma_{\infty}$. (4) If $\sigma=\sigma_{1}$ and $k=0$ then

$$
f_{\sigma \mid k} \circ \pi \circ S^{k}(\sigma)=\chi_{A_{\sigma_{1}^{+}}} \circ \pi\left(\sigma_{1}^{+}\right)=\chi_{A_{\sigma_{1}^{+}}}\left(A_{\sigma_{1}^{+}}\right)=\pi\left(\sigma_{1}^{+}\right)
$$

If $\sigma=\sigma_{1}$ and $k=1$, then

$$
f_{\sigma \mid k} \circ \pi \circ S^{k}(\sigma)=f_{\sigma_{1}} \circ \pi\left(\sigma_{1}^{+}\right)=f_{\sigma_{1}}\left(A_{\sigma_{1}^{+}}\right)=\pi\left(\sigma_{1}\right)
$$

If $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{\sigma \mid k} \circ \pi \circ S^{k}(\sigma) & =f_{\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \cdots \sigma_{k}}\left(\pi\left(\sigma_{k+1} \sigma_{k+2} \cdots\right)\right) \\
& =f_{\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \cdots \sigma_{k}}\left(\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \pi\left(\sigma_{k+1} \sigma_{k+2} \cdots \sigma_{m}\right)\right) \\
& =\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \pi\left(\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \cdots \sigma_{m}\right)=\pi(\sigma)
\end{aligned}
$$

The remaining cases follow similarly.
2.5. Disjunctive orbits, ergodicity, subshifts of finite type. In this Subsection we discuss some stationary measures associated with dynamics and Markov processes associated with the attractor of a graph $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$. These measures are useful because they assign all their mass to the set of images of the disjunctive points. Since points of intersection between tiles in tilings considered in Section 3.4 are images of non-disjunctive points, we are able to say how these intersections are small in a measure theoretic sense. We use this material in Subsection 3.5 in relation to the notions of the "interior" and the "boundary" of a tile.

Let $T=\left.S\right|_{\Sigma_{\infty}}$. The dynamical system $T: \Sigma_{\infty} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\infty}$ is chaotic in the purely topological sense of Devaney [22]: it has a dense set of periodic points, it is sensitively dependent on initial conditions, and
it is topologically transitive. Topologically transitive means that if $Q$ and $R$ are open subsets of $\Sigma_{\infty}$, then there is $K \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$
Q \cap T^{K} R \neq \varnothing
$$

This is true because the set of disjunctive points in $\Sigma_{\infty}$ is dense in $\Sigma_{\infty}$ and the orbit under $T$ of any disjunctive point passes arbitrarily close to any given point in $\Sigma_{\infty}$.

However, $T: \Sigma_{\infty} \rightarrow \Sigma_{\infty}$ also possesses many invariant normalized Borel measures, each having support $\Sigma_{\infty}$ and such that $T$ is ergodic with respect to each. An example of such a measure $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$ may be constructed by defining a Markov process on $\Sigma_{\infty}$ using $\mathcal{G}$ and probabilities $\mathcal{P}=\left\{p_{e}>0: e \in \mathcal{E}\right\}$ where $\sum_{\substack{d^{+}=e^{+} \\ d \in \mathcal{E}}} p_{d}=1$ for all $e \in \mathcal{E}$. Then $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$ is the unique normalized measure on the Borel subsets $\mathcal{B}$ of $\Sigma_{\infty}$ such that

$$
\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(b)=\sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} p_{e} \mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(e b \cap \Sigma_{\infty}\right) \text { for all } b \in \mathcal{B}
$$

where $e b:=\left\{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}: \sigma_{1}=e, S \sigma \in b\right\}$. In particular, $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$ is invariant under $T$, that is

$$
\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(b)=\mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(T^{-1} b\right) \text { for all } b \in \mathcal{B}
$$

The key point (1) in Theorem 3 is well known: $T$ is ergodic with respect to $\mu$. That is, if $T b=T^{-1} b$ for some $b \in \mathcal{B}$, then either $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(b)=0$ or $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(b)=1$. As a consequence, the set of disjunctive points has full measure, independent of $\mathcal{P}$.

Theorem 3. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a graph IFS. Let $\left(\Sigma_{\infty}, \mathcal{B}, T, \mu_{\mathcal{P}}\right)$ be the $d y$ namical system described above. Let $D$ be the disjunctive points in $\Sigma_{\infty}$. Then
(1) Parry 36: $\left(\Sigma_{\infty}, \mathcal{B}, T, \mu_{\mathcal{P}}\right)$ is ergodic
(2) $D=T D=T^{-1} D \in \mathcal{B}$
(3) $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(D)=1$, and $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D\right)=0$

Proof. (1) This is a standard result in ergodic theory, see for example [36]. (2) It is readily checked that $D \in \mathcal{B}$ and that $T^{-1} D=D=T D$. (3) Let $\mu=\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$. Since $\left(\Sigma_{\infty}, \mathcal{B}, T, \mu\right)$ is ergodic and $D=T^{-1} D$, it follows that $\mu(D) \in\{0,1\}$. Also we have

$$
1=\mu\left(\Sigma_{\infty}\right)=\mu(D)+\mu\left(\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D\right)
$$

So either $\mu(D)=1$ and $\mu\left(\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D\right)=0$ or vice-versa. Now notice that

$$
\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D \subset \bigcup_{x \in \Sigma_{*} \backslash \varnothing} D_{x}
$$

where $D_{x}=\left\{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}: S^{n} \sigma \notin c[x] \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}\right\}$ where $c[x]$ is the cylinder set

$$
c[x]:=\left\{z \in \Sigma_{\infty}: z=x y, y \in \Sigma_{\infty}\right\} .
$$

In particular

$$
\mu\left(\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D\right) \leq \sum_{x \in \Sigma_{*}} \mu\left(D_{x}\right)
$$

But $\mu\left(D_{x}\right)=0$ as proved next, so $\mu\left(\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D\right)=0$. Proof that $\mu\left(D_{x}\right)=0$ : Let $f: \Sigma_{\infty} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $f(\sigma)=0$ if $\sigma \in c[x]$ and $f(\sigma)=1$ if $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty} \backslash c[x]$. Since $f \in L_{1}(\mu)$, by the ergodic theorem we have

$$
\int_{\Sigma_{\infty}} f d \mu=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f\left(T^{k} \sigma\right) \text { for } \mu \text {-almost all } \sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}
$$

But $\int f d \mu=1-\mu(c[x])>0$ because the support of $\mu$ is $\Sigma_{\infty}$, and $\Sigma_{\infty}$ contains a cylinder set disjoint from $c[x]$ because $|\mathcal{E}| \geq 2$, and all cylinder sets have strictly positive measure. Also $f\left(T^{k} \sigma\right)=0$ for all $x \in D_{x}$ so

$$
\begin{gathered}
\qquad \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f\left(T^{k} \sigma\right)=0 \text { for all } x \in D_{x} \\
\text { so } \int_{\Sigma_{\infty}} f d \mu \neq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f\left(T^{k} \sigma\right) \text { for all } x \in D_{x} \text {, so } \mu\left(D_{x}\right)=0 .
\end{gathered}
$$

## 3. Tilings

3.1. Similitudes. A similitude is an affine transformation $f: \mathbb{R}^{M} \rightarrow$ $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ of the form $f(x)=\lambda O(x)+q$, where $O$ is an orthogonal transformation and $q \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$ is the translational part of $f(x)$. The real number $\lambda>0$, a measure of the expansion or contraction of the similitude, is called its scaling ratio. An isometry is a similitude of unit scaling ratio and we say that two sets are isometric if they are related by an isometry.

### 3.2. Tiling iterated function systems.

Definition 4. The graph $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is said to obey the open set condition (OSC) if there are non-empty bounded open sets $\left\{\mathcal{O}_{v}: v \in\right.$ $\mathcal{V}\}$ such that for all $d, e \in \mathcal{E}$ we have $f_{e}\left(\mathcal{O}_{e^{+}}\right) \subset \mathcal{O}_{e^{-}}$and $f_{e}\left(\mathcal{O}_{e^{+}}\right) \cap$ $f_{d}\left(\mathcal{O}_{d^{+}}\right)=\varnothing$ whenever $e^{-}=d^{-}$.

The OSC for graph IFS is discussed in [19] and [20]. The paper [35], which discusses separation conditions for graph IFS more generally, notes that many theorems for IFS carry over to graph IFS. We note that
some IFSs which obey the weaker restricted $O S C$ can be transformed into graph IFSs that obey the OSC [20].

Remark 1. Concerning the problem of finding graph IFS that obey either the OSC or the restricted OSC, we note the impressive digital computer application IFStile [29]. The system uses exact integer arithmetic over quadratic and higher order number fields and searches exhaustively over parameter spaces, using theorems and methodology of Bandt, especially [3], using neighbor maps to identify systems that obey the (restricted) OSC.
Definition 5. Let $\mathcal{F}=\left\{\mathbb{R}^{M} ; f_{1}, f_{2}, \cdots, f_{N}\right\}$, with $N \geq 2$, be an IFS of contractive similitudes where the scaling factor of $f_{n}$ is $\lambda_{n}=s^{a_{n}}$, where $0<s<1$ is fixed, $a_{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\operatorname{gcd}\left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, \cdots, a_{N}\right\}=1$. Let the graph IFS $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ obey the OSC. Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{v} \cap A_{w}=\varnothing \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $v \neq w$, and let the affine span of $A_{v}$ be $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Then $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is called a tiling iterated function system (tiling IFS). Let $a_{\text {max }}=\max \left\{a_{1}, a_{2}, \cdots, a_{N}\right\}$.

The requirement $A_{v} \cap A_{w}=\varnothing$ whenever $v \neq w$ is without loss of generality in the following sense. By means of changes of coordinates applied to some of the maps of the IFS, we can move $A_{v}$ to $T_{v} A_{v}$, where $T_{v}: \mathbb{R}^{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{M}$ is a translation, while holding $A_{w}$ fixed for all $w \neq v$. To do this, let

$$
\widetilde{f}_{e}=\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
T_{v} f_{e} T_{v}^{-1} & \text { if } e^{+}=v \text { and } e^{-}=v \\
T_{v} f_{e} & \text { if } e^{+} \neq v \text { and } e^{-}=v \\
f_{e} T_{v}^{-1} & \text { if } e^{+}=v \text { and } e^{-} \neq v \\
f_{e} & \text { if } e^{+} \neq v \text { and } e^{-} \neq v
\end{array}\right.
$$

and let $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}=\left\{f_{e}: e \in \mathcal{E}\right\}$. Then the components of the attractor of $\{\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, \mathcal{G}\}$ are $\widetilde{A}_{w}=A_{w}$ for $w \neq v$ and $\widetilde{A}_{v}=T_{v} A_{v}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. By repeating this process for each vertex, we can modify the IFS so that different components of the attractor have empty intersections. Only the relative positions of the components are changed, while their geometries are unaltered, and (3.1) holds. This being the case, the OSC is simply "there are non-empty open sets $\left\{\mathcal{O}_{v}: v \in \mathcal{V}\right\}$ such that $f_{e}\left(\mathcal{O}_{e^{+}}\right) \cap f_{d}\left(\mathcal{O}_{d^{+}}\right)=\varnothing$ for all $d, e \in \mathcal{V}$ with $d \neq e^{"}$.
3.3. Tilings in this paper. According to Grunbaum and Sheppard [26] a tiling is a countable family of closed sets $\left\{t_{1}, t_{2}, \ldots\right\}$ which cover $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ without gaps or overlaps. More explicitly, they say that $\mathbb{R}^{2}=\cup\left\{t_{i}\right.$ : $i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and the sets $t_{i}$ are called tiles. Here we consider tilings of
subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ such as fractal blow-ups [46] where tiles are components of attractors of IFSs, which may have empty interiors, as well as more standard self-similar tilings, such as tilings of $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ by congruent squares. More precisely we define in Subsection 3.4 the tiles and tilings we consider. We refer to our tilings loosely as 'fractal tilings'. In Theorem 4 (1) we show that the intersection of two tiles $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ in a fractal tiling is small both topologically and measure theoretically, relative to the tiles themselves. This matches the customary situation: in a tiling of $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ by congruent square tiles, tiles have positive twodimensional Lebesgue measure, intersections of distinct tiles have zero two-dimensional Lebesgue measure and are subsets of their topological boundaries.
3.4. The tiling map. Define subsets of $\Sigma_{*}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Omega_{k}=\left\{\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}: \xi^{-}(\sigma) \leq k<\xi(\sigma)\right\}, \Omega_{0}=[N] \\
& \Omega_{k}^{v}=\left\{\sigma \in \Omega_{k}: \sigma^{-}=v\right\}, \Omega_{0}^{v}=\left\{\sigma_{1} \in[N]: \sigma_{1}^{-}=v\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}, v \in \mathcal{V}$. Here $\xi: \Sigma_{*} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_{0}$ is defined for all $\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}$ by

$$
\xi(\sigma)=\sum_{k=1}^{|\sigma|} a_{\sigma_{k}}, \xi^{-}(\sigma)=\sum_{k=1}^{|\sigma|-1} a_{\sigma_{k}}, \xi(\varnothing)=\xi^{-}(\varnothing)=0
$$

Definition 6. The tiling map $\Pi$ from $\Sigma^{\dagger}$ to collections of subsets of $\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{R}^{M}\right)$ is defined as follows. For $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$,

$$
\Pi(\theta)=f_{-\theta} \pi\left(\Omega_{\xi(\theta)}^{\theta^{+}}\right), \Pi(\theta \mid 0)=\pi\left(\Omega_{0}^{\theta^{-}}\right)
$$

and for $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$,

$$
\Pi(\theta)=\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Pi(\theta \mid k)
$$

For $\sigma \in \Omega_{\xi(\theta)}^{\theta^{+}}$and $\theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}$, the set $f_{-\theta} \pi(\sigma)$ is called a tile and $\Pi(\theta)$ is called a tiling. The support of the tiling $\Pi(\theta)$ is the union of its tiles, and $\Pi(\theta)$ is said to tile its support.

Theorem 4. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a tiling IFS.
(1) For all $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}, \Pi(\theta \mid k)$ is a well-defined tiling. In particular, if $t_{1}, t_{2} \in \Pi(\theta \mid k)$ with $t_{1} \neq t_{2}$, then $t_{1} \cap t_{2}$ is small both topologically and measure theoretically, compared to $t_{1}$. That is, $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(t_{1} \cap t_{2}\right)=0$ and, if $x=f_{-(\theta \mid k)}(\pi(\sigma)) \in t_{1} \cap t_{2}$, for some $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}$, where $(\theta \mid k)^{+}=\sigma^{-}$, then $\sigma$ is not disjunctive (i.e. $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty} \backslash \mathcal{D}$ ).
(2) For all $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ the sequence of tilings $\{\Pi(\theta \mid k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ obeys

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi(\theta \mid 0) \subset \Pi(\theta \mid 1) \subset \Pi(\theta \mid 2) \subset \cdots \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, $\Pi(\theta)$ is a well-defined tiling for all $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$.
(3) $\Pi(\theta)$ is a tiling of a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ that is bounded when $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ and unbounded when $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$.
(4) For all $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi(\theta)=\lim _{k \rightarrow \infty} f_{-(\theta \mid k)}\left(\left\{\pi(\sigma): \sigma \in \Omega_{\xi(\theta \mid k)}, \sigma^{-}=\theta^{+}\right\}\right) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The limit here is equivalently the union of an increasing sequence (each set of sets in the sequence is contained in its successor), or the limit with respect to the metric defined in Section 4.1, using the Hausdorff-Hausdorff metric on a sphere.
(5) Any tile $t \in \Pi(\theta)$ can be written $t=s^{m} E A_{v}$ for some isometry of the form $E=f_{-\theta} f_{\sigma}$, for some $m \in\left\{0,1,2, \ldots, a_{\max }-1\right\}, \theta \in$ $\Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}, \sigma \in \Sigma_{*}, \theta^{+}=\sigma^{-}, \sigma^{+}=v \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proof. (1) $\Pi(\theta \mid 0)$ is a tiling in the sense described in Section 3.3. $\Pi(\theta \mid 0)=\pi\left(\Omega_{0}^{\theta^{-}}\right)=\pi\left(\left\{e \in[N]: e^{-}=\theta^{-}\right\}\right)=\left\{f_{e}\left(A_{e^{+}}\right): e^{-}=\theta^{-}\right\}$ has support $A_{e^{-}}$and its tiles are supposed to be $\left\{f_{e}\left(A_{e^{+}}\right): e^{-}=\theta^{-}\right\}$. We need to check (i) that they are components of attractors of tiling IFSs and (ii) that their intersections are relatively small. (i) is true because for each $e \in[N]$, the set $f_{e}\left(A_{e^{+}}\right)$is a component of the attractor of the tiling IFS $\left(f_{e} \mathcal{F} f_{e}^{-1}, \mathcal{G}\right)$. (ii) This is a consequence of the OSC. It follows from Theorem 5 parts (3) and (4). Similarly, $\Pi(\theta \mid k)$ and $\Pi(\theta)$ are tilings as in Section 3.3: the tiles are components of attractors of appropriately shifted versions of the original tiling IFS and their intersections are isometric to subsets of the critical set of the original tiling IFS. (2) The proof is algebraic, independent of topology, essentially the same as for the case where $V=1[13]$. Briefly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi(\theta \mid k+1) & =\left\{f_{\theta_{1} \ldots}^{-1} \ldots f_{\theta_{k+1}}^{-1} f_{\sigma_{1}} . . f_{\sigma_{|\sigma|}}\left(A_{\sigma_{|\sigma|}^{+}}\right): \xi\left(\sigma_{1} . . \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right) \leq \xi\left(\theta_{1} . . \theta_{|\sigma|}\right)<\xi\left(\sigma_{1} . . \sigma_{|\sigma|}\right)\right\} \\
& \supset\left\{f_{\theta_{1} \ldots}^{-1} \ldots f_{\theta_{k}}^{-1} f_{\sigma_{2}} . . f_{\sigma_{|\sigma|}}\left(A_{\sigma_{|\sigma|}^{+}}^{+}\right): \xi\left(\sigma_{2} . . \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right) \leq \xi\left(\theta_{2} . . \theta_{|\sigma|}\right)<\xi\left(\sigma_{2} . . \sigma_{|\sigma|}\right)\right\} \\
& =\left\{f_{\theta_{1} \ldots}^{-1} \ldots f_{\theta_{k}}^{-1} f_{\sigma_{1} . .} f_{\sigma_{|\sigma|-1}}\left(A_{\sigma_{|\sigma|-1}^{+}}^{+}\right): \xi\left(\sigma_{1} . . \sigma_{|\sigma|-2}\right) \leq \xi\left(\theta_{1} . . \theta_{|\sigma|-1}\right)<\xi\left(\sigma_{1} . . \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right)\right\} \\
& =\Pi(\theta \mid k)
\end{aligned}
$$

(3) For $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}, \Pi(\theta)=f_{-\theta} \pi\left(\Omega_{\xi(\theta)}^{\theta^{+}}\right)$so the support of $\Pi(\theta)$ is $f_{-\theta}(\bigcup\{\pi(\sigma)$ : $\left.\left.\sigma \in \Omega_{\xi(\theta)}^{\theta^{+}}\right)=f_{-\theta} A_{\theta^{+}}\right\}$. Here $f_{-\theta}$ is a similitude of expansion factor $|s|^{-\xi(\theta)}$ which diverges with $|\theta|$, and $A_{\theta^{+}}$spans $\mathbb{R}^{M}$. (4) This follows from (3). (5) For $t \in \Pi(\theta)$ we have $t=f_{-(\theta \mid k)} f_{\sigma}\left(A_{v}\right)$ for some $k, \theta, \sigma$
and $v$, with $\xi^{-}(\sigma) \leq \xi(\theta \mid k)<\xi(\sigma)$. Here $f_{-(\theta \mid k)} f_{\sigma}=s^{-m} E$ where $m=$ $\xi(\theta \mid k)-\xi(\sigma)$ is an integer that lies between 1 and $a_{\max }$ and $E$ is an isometry on $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ of the form $s^{m} f_{-(\theta \mid k)} f_{\sigma}$ for some $m \in\left\{1,2, \ldots, a_{\max }\right\}$.
3.5. How tiles in a tiling can intersect: the dynamical boundary, critical set and inner boundaries.

Definition 7. The critical set of the (attractor of the) tiling IFS $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is

$$
\mathcal{C}:=\bigcup_{\substack{d \neq e \\ d, e \in \mathcal{E}}} f_{d}\left(A_{d^{+}}\right) \cap f_{e}\left(A_{e^{+}}\right)
$$

Definition 8. The dynamical boundary of the (attractor of the) tiling $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$

$$
\partial A:=\overline{\bigcup_{\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}} f_{-\theta}\left(A_{\theta^{+}} \cap \mathcal{C}\right) \cap A_{\theta^{-}}}
$$

where $f_{-\theta}$ is as defined near the start of Subsection 3.4.
If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ obeys the OSC, then $A \backslash \partial A \neq \varnothing$. If $A \backslash \partial A \neq \varnothing$, we say that the tiling IFS is non-overlapping. See the discussions in [4, 8] which also apply to the present situation. We expect that if a tiling is nonoverlapping then it obeys the OSC, but this has not been proven even in the case $V=1$. We know of no counterexample.

Definition 9. The inner boundary of the (attractor of the) tiling $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is

$$
\widehat{\mathcal{C}}:=\bigcup_{\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}} f_{\sigma}\left(A_{\sigma^{+}} \cap \mathcal{C}\right) \cap A_{\sigma^{-}}
$$

Definition 10. The inner boundaries to depth $k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, of the (attractor of the) tiling $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$, are

$$
\widehat{\mathcal{C}_{k}}:=\bigcup_{\sigma \in \Omega_{k}} f_{\sigma}\left(A_{\sigma^{+}} \cap \mathcal{C}\right) \cap A_{\sigma^{-}} \text {and } \widehat{\mathcal{C}_{k}^{v}}:=\bigcup_{\sigma \in \Omega_{k}^{v}} f_{\sigma}\left(A_{\sigma^{+}} \cap \mathcal{C}\right) \cap A_{\sigma^{-}},
$$

where $\Omega_{k}$ and $\Omega_{k}^{v}$ are as defined at the start of Subsection 3.4.
The following theorem tells us that the critical set of a tiling IFS is small, not only topologically, but also measure theoretically, compared to the attractor.

Theorem 5. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a tiling IFS, let $\mathcal{C}$ be the critical set, $\partial A$ be the dynamical boundary, $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{k}$ be the inner boundary to depth $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $D$ be the disjunctive points in $\Sigma_{\infty}$.
(1) Bedford [15] and Mauldin and Williams [32]: The Hausdorff dimension $\mathcal{D}_{H}(A)$ of the attractor $A$ of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is the unique $t \in[0, M]$ such that the spectral radius of the matrix

$$
\mathcal{W}_{w, v}(t)=\sum_{\left\{e \in \mathcal{E}: e^{+}=v, e^{-}=w\right\}} s^{t a_{e}}
$$

equals one. Also $0<\mu_{\mathcal{H}}(A)<\infty$ where $\mu_{\mathcal{H}}$ is, up to a strictly positive constant factor, the Hausdorff measure on $A$.
(2) $\partial A \cup \widehat{\mathcal{C}_{k}} \subset \pi\left(\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D\right)$.
(3) $\left(\partial A \cup\left(\cup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{k}\right)\right) \cap \Pi(D)=\emptyset$, in the relative topology induced on $A$ by the natural topology of $\mathbb{R}^{M}, \partial A$ is closed and $A \backslash \partial A$ is open.
(4) $\partial A \cap A^{\circ}=\emptyset$ where $A^{\circ}$ is the interior of $A$ as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$.
(5) $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{C})\right)=0, \mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\pi^{-1}(\partial \mathcal{A})\right)=0, \mu_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\pi^{-1}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{k}\right)\right)=0$, for all $\mathcal{P}$.
(6) If $\sum_{v} \mathcal{W}_{w, v}(t)=1$ then $\mu_{\mathcal{H}}=\mu_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}} \circ \pi^{-1}$ where $\mu_{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}}$ is the stationary measure on $\Sigma_{\infty}$ obtained when $p_{e}=s^{\mathcal{D}_{H}(A) a_{e}}$ in the Markov process described before Theorem 3. In this case for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
\mu_{\mathcal{H}}(\partial \mathcal{A})=0, \mu_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{C})=0, \mu_{\mathcal{H}}\left(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{k}\right)=0
$$

Remark 2. The dynamical boundary is a subset of the topological boundary of $A$, viewed as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$. In the relative topology of $A$, that is the topology of $A$ as a metric space in its own right, the boundary is empty and the dynamical boundary acts as a kind of boundary of the attractor. In particular, the dynamical boundary, the critical set, and the inner boundary to any finite depth, are closed sets in the (relative) topology of $A$, and their complements, $A \backslash \partial A$, $A \backslash \mathcal{C}, A \backslash \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{k}^{(v)}$, are open. Around every disjunctive point (i.e. image of a disjunctive point in $\Sigma_{\infty}$ under $\pi$ ) in the attractor there is an open ball that does not meet any of the sets $\partial A, \mathcal{C}, \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{k}^{(v)}$. Also, Baire's theorem tells us that $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ does not contain an open set of $A$. The complements of $\partial A, \mathcal{C}, \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{k}^{(v)}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ provide types of 'interiors' of $A$. We say that the critical set, the dynamical boundary, and the inner boundaries are small in a topological sense.

Proof. (1) To apply [32] there must be at most one edge of $\mathcal{G}$ directed from vertex $v$ to vertex $w$, for all $v$ and $w$. This can always be contrived, without changing either the dimension or the geometries of the components of the attractor using the state-spitting technique of 31], described here. If $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$ are such that $d=\left|\begin{array}{c}\sum_{\substack{d^{-}=v \\ d^{+}=w}} 1\end{array}\right|>1$, then introduce new vertices $w^{(1)}, w^{(2)}, \ldots, w^{(d)}$ to replace $w$, and new components
of the attractor $A_{w^{(1)}}=A_{w^{(2)}}=\ldots=A_{w^{(d)}}$ all equal to $A_{w}$, and replace the $d$ outgoing edges from $v$ to $w$ by one outgoing edge to each of the new vertices. All other edges associated with the vertex $w$, both inward and outward pointing, are replaced by copies of them at each of the duplicated vertices. Likewise the maps associated with the new edges are duplicates of the originals. Now translate the coincident attractors so that they have empty intersections and modify the maps accordingly, as described following Definition 5, relating them to the original ones by isometric changes of coordinates. Repeating this process in connection with every ordered pair of vertices ensures that there is at most one outward pointing edge from vertex $v$ to vertex $w$, for all $v$ and $w$ in $\mathcal{G}$. This reduces the present situation to that in [32], who makes this assumption. Clearly the dimension of the attractor is unaltered. We also have $0<\mu_{H}(A)<\infty$ by [32, Theorem 3]. Note that [32, Theorem 3] requires a different separation condition than the OSC, but both [19, Theorem 2.1] and [20] refer to [32, Theorem 3] as though the two conditions are equivalent, and we have assumed that this is true. (2) This is the generalization to the graph-directed case of the definitions and argument in [8, Proposition 2.2]. We present the proof in parts (a) and (b) for the case $\mathcal{V}=1$. The proof is carries over to the tiling IFS case. We focus on showing that $\mathcal{C} \subset \pi\left(\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D\right)$. The other containments follow similarly. (a) The OSC implies, for similitudes, the open set $\mathcal{O}=\bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathcal{O}_{v}$ can be chosen so that $\mathcal{O} \cap A \neq \emptyset$ [42], which implies $A \backslash \partial A \neq \emptyset$ because in this case $\mathcal{O} \cap \partial A=\emptyset$ by [33, Theorem 2.3 via (iii) implies (i) implies (ii)]. (b) $A \backslash \partial A \neq \emptyset$ implies $\partial A \cap \pi(D)=\varnothing$ because if $x=\pi(\sigma) \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\sigma \in D$ then $\partial A=A$ as in [8, Proposition 2.2] Prop 2.2. It follows that $\mathcal{C} \subset \pi\left(\Sigma_{\infty} \backslash D\right)$. (3) This follows from (2) and $\partial A \cap \pi(D)=\varnothing$. (4) This is [8, Proposition 2.1] carried over to the tiling IFS case, using the non-overlappingness of $A$, namely $A \backslash \partial A \neq \emptyset$. (5) This follows from (2) and Theorem 3 part (3). (6) Using the thermodynamic formalism [15] and the assumption that $\sum_{v} \mathcal{W}_{w, v}(t)=1$, we find that $\mu_{H}=\mu_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \circ \pi^{-1}$ is, up to a positive multiplicative constant, the Hausdorff measure obtained when

$$
p_{e}=s^{\mathcal{D}_{H}(A) a_{e}} / \sum_{d^{+}=e^{+}} s^{\mathcal{D}_{H}(A) a_{d}}
$$

## 4. Continuity properties of $\Pi: \Sigma^{\dagger} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$.

### 4.1. A convenient compact tiling space. Let

$$
\mathbb{T}=\left\{\Pi(\theta): \theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}\right\}
$$

Let $\rho: \mathbb{R}^{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{M}$ be the usual $M$-dimensional stereographic projection to the $M$-sphere, obtained by positioning $\mathbb{S}^{M}$ tangent to $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ at the origin. Let $\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)$ be the non-empty closed (w.r.t. the usual topology on $\mathbb{S}^{M}$ ) subsets of $\mathbb{S}^{M}$. Let $d_{\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)}$ be the Hausdorff distance with respect to the round metric on $\mathbb{S}^{M}$, so that $\left(\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right), d_{\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)}\right)$ is a compact metric space. Let $\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)\right)$ be the nonempty compact subsets of $\left(\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right), d_{\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)}\right)$, and let $d_{\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)\right)}$ be the associated Hausdorff metric. Then $\left(\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)\right), d_{\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)\right)}\right)$ is a compact metric space. Finally, define a metric $d_{\mathbb{T}}$ on $\mathbb{T}$ by

$$
d_{\mathbb{T}}\left(T_{1}, T_{2}\right)=d_{\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{S}^{M}\right)\right)}\left(\rho\left(T_{1}\right), \rho\left(T_{2}\right)\right)
$$

for all $T_{1}, T_{2} \in \mathbb{T}$.
Theorem 6. $\left(\mathbb{T}, d_{\mathbb{T}}\right)$ is a compact metric space.
Proof. We make these comments. There is an absolute upper bound to the diameter of all tiles in all tilings. Every ball $B_{R}(O)$, the ball centered at the origin of radius $R$, meets at least one tile of any tiling $T$. The projection of the collection of sets obtained by intersecting each tiling in $\mathbb{T}$ with $B_{R}(O)$ and keeping the subset of each set that meets $B_{R}(O)$ is a compact metric space with respect to $d_{\mathbb{T}}$. Note that $d_{\mathbb{T}}\left(T_{1} \cup B_{R}^{C}(O), T_{2} \cup B_{R}^{C}(O)\right) \rightarrow 0$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$, where $B_{R}^{C}(O)=$ $\mathbb{R}^{M} \backslash B_{R}(O)$, for any pair of tilings $T_{1}, T_{2} \in \mathbb{T}$. A diagonal argument may be used to prove the theorem, as follows. Any $T \in \mathbb{T}$ can be expressed as an infinite sequence of tiles, with possible repetitions of tiles. Let $\left(T_{k}\right)$ be a sequence of tilings. Let $\left(T_{k_{1}}\right)$ be a subsequence of $\left(T_{k}\right)$ that converges inside (the projection of) $B_{1}(O)$. Recursively, let $\left(T_{k_{n+1}}\right)$ be a subsequence of $\left(T_{k_{n}}\right)$ that converges inside $B_{n+1}(O)$. Then the sequence of tilings $\left(T_{k_{n}, n}\right)$ converges to a tiling, with respect to the metric $d_{\mathbb{T}}$.

See also for example [1, 17, 41, 44, 47] where related metrics and topologies are defined. The Hausdorff-Gromov metric applied to collections of subsets of the $M$-sphere might also be used to measure distances between tilings. This does not suit the present setting, where non-trivial isometries of tilings are distinguished.
4.2. Continuity. The following definition generalizes a related concept for the case where $A$ is a topological disk and $|\mathcal{V}|=1$, see [10]. For $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ define $I(\theta) \subset \Sigma_{\infty}$ to be the set of limit points of $\left\{\theta_{l+m} \theta_{l+m-1} \ldots \theta_{m+1}: l, m \in \mathbb{N}\right\}$. Define for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$

$$
H_{v}:=\cup\left\{f_{-\theta} f_{\sigma}\left(A_{\sigma^{+}}\right): \theta^{+}=\sigma^{-}=v, \theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}, \sigma \in \Sigma_{*}, \theta_{|\theta|} \neq \sigma_{1}\right\}
$$

$H_{v}$ is the union of all images of $A_{w}$ under the stated neighbor maps, for all $w \in \mathcal{V}$, namely the maps $f_{-\theta} f_{\sigma}$ in the definition of $H_{v}$. It is a generalization of the same definition in the case $V=1, ~[3, ~ 4, ~ 5] . ~ D e f i n e ~$ the central open sets to be

$$
O_{v}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{M}: d\left(x, A_{v}\right)<d\left(x, H_{v}\right)\right\}
$$

It is the case that $\left\{O_{v}: v \in \mathcal{V}\right\}$ obeys the open set condition and " $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ obeys the OSC" if and only if " $A_{v}$ is not contained in $\bar{H}_{v}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$ ". This follows from the argument in [4] generalized in obvious ways, for example to ensure that chains of functions of the form $f_{-\theta} f_{\sigma}$ are consistent with $\mathcal{G}$.

Call $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ reversible if

$$
\Sigma_{r e v}^{\dagger}:=I(\theta) \cap\left\{\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}: \pi(\sigma) \subset \cup_{v} O_{v}\right\} \neq \varnothing
$$

Equivalently, $\theta \in \Sigma_{\text {rev }}^{\dagger}$ if the following holds: there exists $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\infty}$ with $\pi(\sigma) \in \cup_{v} O_{v}$ such that, for all $L, M \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $m \geq M$ so that

$$
\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \ldots \sigma_{L}=\theta_{m+L} \theta_{m+L-1} \ldots \theta_{m+1}
$$

Equivalently, in terms of the notion of "full" words, see [10], $\theta \in \Sigma_{r e v}^{\dagger}$ if there is a nonempty compact set $A^{\prime} \subset \cup_{v} O_{v}$ such that for any positive integer $M$ there exists $n>m \geq M$ so that

$$
f_{\theta_{n}} f_{\theta_{n-1} \ldots} f_{\theta_{m+1}}\left(A_{\theta_{m+1}^{+}}\right) \subset A^{\prime}
$$

Theorem 7. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a tiling IFS. Then

$$
\left.\Pi\right|_{\Sigma_{r e v}^{\dagger}}: \Sigma_{\text {rev }}^{\dagger} \subset \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}
$$

is continuous and

$$
\Pi: \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}
$$

is upper semi-continuous in this sense: if $\Pi\left(\theta^{(n)}\right)$ is a sequence of tilings that converges to a tiling $T \in \mathbb{T}$ as $\theta^{(n)}$ converges to $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$, then $\Pi(\theta) \subset T$.

Proof. Proof of upper semi-continuity: let $\left\{\theta^{(n)}\right\}$ be a sequence of points in $\Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ that converges to $\theta$ and such that $\lim \Pi\left(\theta^{(n)}\right)=T$ with respect to the tiling metric. Let $m$ be given. Then there is $l_{m}$ so that for all $n \geq l_{m}$ we have $\theta\left|m=\theta^{(n)}\right| m$ and hence $\Pi(\theta \mid m)=\Pi\left(\theta^{(n)} \mid m\right) \subset$ $\Pi\left(\theta^{(n)}\right)$. Hence we have $\Pi(\theta \mid m) \subset \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi\left(\theta^{(n)}\right)$ and hence, since this is
true for all $m, \Pi(\theta) \subset \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi\left(\theta^{(n)}\right)$. Proof that $\left.\Pi\right|_{\Sigma_{\text {rev }}^{\dagger}}: \Sigma_{\text {rev }}^{\dagger} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ is continuous involves blow-ups [46] of central opens sets. Analogously to the definition of $\Pi$, define a mapping $\Xi$ from $\Sigma^{\dagger}$ to subsets of $\mathbb{H}\left(\mathbb{R}^{M}\right)$ as follows. For $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}, \theta \neq \varnothing$,

$$
\Xi(\theta):=\left\{f_{-\theta} f_{\sigma}\left(\overline{O_{\sigma^{+}}}\right): \sigma \in \Omega_{\xi(\theta)}^{\theta^{+}}\right\}
$$

and for $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$

$$
\Xi(\theta):=\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \Xi(\theta \mid k)
$$

As is the case for $\Pi$, increasing families of sets are obtained: each collection $\Xi(\theta)$ comprises a covering by compact sets of a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$, the subset being bounded when $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ and unbounded when $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$. For all $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ the sequence of collections of sets $\{\Xi(\theta \mid k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is nested according to

$$
\Xi(\theta \mid 1) \subset \Xi(\theta \mid 2) \subset \Xi(\theta \mid 3) \subset \cdots
$$

and we have $\{\Xi(\theta \mid k)\}$ converges to $\Xi(\theta)$ in the metric introduced in Section 4.1. We refer to $\Xi(\theta)$ as a central open set tiling. (Examples of such tilings are illustrated in Figures 3 and 5.) In particular, when reversible, the new tiles, those in $\Xi(\theta \mid k+1) \backslash \Xi(\theta \mid k)$, are located further and further away from the origin as $k$ increases. The result follows.

Example 2. Let $\mathcal{F}=\left\{\mathbb{R} ; f_{1}(x)=x / 2, f_{2}(x)=(x+1) / 2\right\}$, and consider the sequence of tilings $\{\Pi(111 . .(k-$ times $) \ldots 12): k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. This sequence converges to a tiling of $[-1, \infty)$, whilst the sequence of tilings $\{\Pi(111 . .(k-$ times $) \ldots 11): k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ converges to a tiling of $[0, \infty]$.

Example 3. Example of a central open set tiling. See Figures 3 and 4. In this case the maps of the IFS are, in complex number representation

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{1}(z)=\frac{z}{2}, f_{2}(z)=\frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{2 \pi i}{3}}(z-i)-\frac{1}{4}(3-\sqrt{3} i) \\
& f_{3}(z)=\frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{2 \pi i}{3}}(z-i)+\frac{1}{4}(3+\sqrt{3} i), f_{4}(z)=\frac{1}{2} z+\frac{i}{2} \\
& f_{5}(z)=\frac{1}{2} e^{-\frac{2 \pi i}{3}} z+i\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right)-\frac{3}{4}, f_{6}(z)=\frac{1}{2} e^{\frac{2 \pi i}{3}} z+i\left(1+\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right)+\frac{3}{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

The tilings illustrated in Figure 3 are $\Pi(1111 \ldots)$ and $\Xi(1111 \ldots)$.


Figure 3. Example of a central open set tiling. The underlying fractal tiling is also shown. The three prototiles are shown on the right.




Figure 4. Illustration of the graph IFS in Figure 3 and Example 3 .

Example 4. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the tiling IFS on $\mathbb{R}^{2}$ defined by $|\mathcal{V}|=1$ and the two similitudes

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{1}\left[\begin{array}{l}
x \\
y
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
.6413 & -.3283 \\
.3283 & .6413
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x \\
y
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{c}
.3231 \\
-.133
\end{array}\right] \\
& f_{2}\left[\begin{array}{l}
x \\
y
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
-.2362 & .4620 \\
.4620 & .2362
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x \\
y
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{l}
.8052 \\
.5093
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Part of the associated central open set tiling $\Xi(111 \ldots)$ is illustrated in Figure 5, overlayed on the corresponding tiling $\Xi(111 \ldots)$. Computations are approximate. By inspection, assuming the attractor is connected and obeys the OSC, this IFS is rigid (see Section 16, Definition 9 ) with respect to euclidean transformations.

Example 5. Figure 6 shows a patch of a central open set tiling associated with a fractal example in the Introduction.


Figure 5. Part of a central open set tiling. See Example 4. The open set tiles and the underlying fractal tiles are illustrated, a constant colour for each tile.


Figure 6. A patch of a central open set tiling associated with the fractal example in Figure 1. All tiles that intersect the grey square are shown. Note the limited ways in which the tiles, of two sizes, can meet. Each tile has its own colour, but some tiles have the same colour.
5. SYMBOLIC STRUCTURE : CANONICAL SYMBOLIC TILINGS AND SYMBOLIC INFLATION AND DEFLATION
Write $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ to mean any of $\Omega_{k}^{v}$ or $\Omega_{k}$. The following lemma tells us that $\Omega_{k+1}^{(v)}$ can be obtained from $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ by adding symbols to the right-hand end of some strings in $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ and leaving the other strings unaltered.

Lemma 1. (Symbolic Splitting) For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$ the following relations hold:
$\Omega_{k+1}^{(v)}=\left\{\sigma \in \Omega_{k}^{(v)}: k+1<\xi(\sigma)\right\} \cup\left\{\sigma j \in \Sigma_{*}^{(v)}: \sigma \in \Omega_{k}^{(v)}, k+1=\xi(\sigma)\right\}$.
Proof. The assertion follows at once from definition of $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$.
Define $\alpha_{s}^{-1}: \Omega_{k}^{(v)} \rightarrow 2^{\Omega_{k+1}^{(v)}}$ by

$$
\alpha_{s}^{-1} \sigma=\left\{\begin{array}{c}
\sigma \text { if } k+1<\xi(\sigma) \\
\left\{\sigma e: \sigma_{|\sigma|}^{+}=e^{-}, e \in \mathcal{E}\right\} \text { if } k+1=\xi(\sigma)
\end{array}\right.
$$

Then

$$
\left\{\sigma \in \alpha_{s}^{-1}(\omega): \omega \in \Omega_{k}^{v}\right\}=\Omega_{k+1}^{v}
$$

This defines symbolic inflation or "splitting and expansion" of $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$, some words in $\Omega_{k+1}^{(v)}$ being the same as in $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ while all the other words in $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$, namely those $\sigma$ for which $k+1=\xi(\sigma)$, are split. The inverse operation is symbolic deflation or "amalgamation and shrinking", described by the function

$$
\alpha_{s}: \Omega_{k+1}^{(v)} \rightarrow \Omega_{k}^{(v)}, \alpha_{s}\left(\Omega_{k+1}^{(v)}\right)=\Omega_{k}^{(v)}
$$

where $\alpha_{s}(\sigma)$ is the unique $\omega \in \Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ such that $\sigma=\omega \beta$ for some $\beta \in \Sigma_{*}$. Note that $\beta$ may be the empty string.

We can use $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ to define a partition of $\Omega_{m}^{(v)}$ for $m \geq k$. The partition of $\Omega_{k+j}^{(v)}$ is $\Omega_{k+j}^{(v)} / \sim$ where $x \sim y$ if $\alpha_{s}^{j}(x)=\alpha_{s}^{j}(y)$.

Lemma 2. (Symbolic Partitions) For all $m \geq k \geq 0$, the set $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ defines a partition $P_{m, k}^{(v)}$ of $\Omega_{m}^{(v)}$ according to $p \in P_{m, k}^{(v)}$ if and only if there is $\omega \in \Sigma_{*}$ such that

$$
p=\left\{\omega \beta \in \Omega_{m}^{(v)}: \beta \in \Omega_{k}^{(v)}\right\} .
$$

Proof. This follows from Lemma 1 for any $\theta \in \Omega_{m}^{(v)}$ there is a unique $\omega \in \Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ such that $\theta=\omega \beta$ for some $\beta \in \Sigma_{*}$. Each word in $\Omega_{m}^{(v)}$ is associated with a unique word in $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$. Each word in $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ is associated with a set of words in $\Omega_{m}^{(v)}$.

According to Lemma 1, $\Omega_{k+1}^{(v)}$ may be calculated by tacking words (some of which may be empty) onto the right-hand end of the words in $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$. We can invert this description by expressing $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ as a union of predecessors $\left(\Omega_{j}^{(v)}\right.$ s with $\left.j<k\right)$ of $\Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ with words tacked onto their other ends, that is, their left-hand ends.

Theorem 8. (Symbolic Predecessors) For all $k \geq a_{\max }+l$, for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$,

$$
\Omega_{k}^{(v)}=\bigsqcup_{\omega \in \Omega_{l}^{(v)}} \omega \Omega_{k-\xi(\omega)}^{\omega^{+}}
$$

Proof. It is clear that the union is indeed a disjoint union. It is easy to check that the r.h.s. is contained in the l.h.s. Conversely, if $\sigma \in \Omega_{k}^{(v)}$ then there is unique $\omega \in \Omega_{l}^{(v)}$ such that $\sigma=\omega \beta$ for some $\beta \in \Sigma_{*}$ by Corollary 2. Because $\omega \beta \in \Sigma_{*}$ it follows that $\beta_{1}$ is an edge that starts where the last edge in $\omega$ is directed, namely the vertex $\omega^{+}$. Finally, since $\xi(\omega \beta)=\xi(\omega)+\xi(\beta)$ it follows that $\beta \in \Omega_{k-\xi(\omega)}^{\omega^{+}}$.

## 6. Canonical tilings and their relationship to $\Pi(\theta)$

Definition 11. We define the canonical tilings of the tiling IFS $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ to be

$$
T_{k}:=s^{-k} \pi\left(\Omega_{k}\right), T_{k}^{v}:=s^{-k} \pi\left(\Omega_{k}^{v}\right)
$$

$k \in \mathbb{N}, v \in \mathcal{V}$, also

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{0} & :=\Pi(0):=\cup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} T_{0}^{v}, T_{0}^{v}:=\Pi(e \mid 0):=\left\{f_{e}\left(A^{e^{+}}\right): e^{-}=v\right\} \\
T_{-1}^{v} & :=s A_{v}, T_{-1}:=\cup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} s A_{v}
\end{aligned}
$$

A canonical tiling may be written as a disjoint union of images under isometries applied to other canonical tilings as described in Lemma 3 . More generally we may say, concerning any tiling $T$ which is a union of images under isometries applied to canonical tilings, that " $T$ can be written as an isometric combination of canonical tilings".

Lemma 3. For all $k \geq a_{\max }+l$, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$

$$
T_{k}^{v}=\bigsqcup_{\omega \in \Omega_{l}^{v}} E_{k, \omega} T_{k-\xi(\omega)}^{\omega^{+}} \text {and } T_{k}=\bigsqcup_{\omega \in \Omega_{l}} E_{k, \omega} T_{k-\xi(\omega)}^{\omega^{+}}
$$

where $E_{k, \omega}=s^{-k} f_{\omega} s^{k-\xi(\omega)} \in \mathcal{U}$ is an isometry.
Proof. Direct calculation using Theorem 8 .

Theorem 9. For all $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$,

$$
\Pi(\theta)=E_{\theta} T_{\xi(\theta)}^{\theta^{+}}
$$

where $E_{\theta}=f_{-\theta} s^{\xi(\theta)} \in \mathcal{U}$. Also if $l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, and $\xi(\theta) \geq a_{\max }+l$, then

$$
\Pi(\theta)=\bigsqcup_{\omega \in \Omega_{l}^{\theta^{+}}} E_{\theta, \omega} T_{\xi(\theta)-\xi(\omega)}^{\omega+}
$$

where $E_{\theta, \omega}=f_{-\theta} f_{\omega} s^{\xi(\theta)-\xi(\omega)} \in \mathcal{U}$ is an isometry.
Proof. Writing $\theta=\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}$ so that $|\theta|=k$, we have from the definitions

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right) & =f_{-\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}}\left\{\pi(\sigma): \sigma \in \Omega_{\xi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right)}^{\theta_{i}^{+}}\right\} \\
& =f_{-\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}} \xi^{\xi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right)} s^{-\xi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right)}\left\{\pi(\sigma): \sigma \in \Omega_{\xi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{k}\right)}^{\theta^{+}}\right\} \\
& =E_{\theta} T_{\xi(\theta)}^{\theta_{\theta \mid}^{+}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $E_{\theta}=f_{-\theta} s^{\xi(\theta)}$. The last statement of the theorem follows similarly from Lemma 3 .

## 7. Tilings in $\mathbb{T}^{\infty}$ that are quasiperiodic

We recall from 13 the following definitions. A subset $P$ of a tiling $T$ is called a patch of $T$ if it is contained in a ball of finite radius. A tiling $T$ is quasiperiodic if, for any patch $P$, there is a number $R>0$ such that any ball centered at a point in the support of $T$, of radius $R$, contains an isometric copy of $P$. Two tilings are locally isomorphic if any patch in either tiling also appears in the other tiling. A tiling $T$ is self-similar if there is a similitude $\psi$ such that $\psi(t)$ is a union of tiles in $T$ for all $t \in T$. In this case $\psi$ is called a self-similarity for $T$. These definitions are consistent with [39, 45] when applied to "classical" self-similar tilings supported on $\mathbb{R}^{M}$.

We say that the tiling $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is coprime if there is a pair $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$ and there are $\sigma, \omega \in \Sigma_{*}$ with $\sigma^{+}=\omega^{+}=v$ and $\sigma^{-}=\omega^{-}=w$ such that the greatest common factor of $\xi(\sigma)$ and $\xi(\omega)$ is 1 .

Theorem 10. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a tiling IFS.
(1) If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is coprime, then each tiling in $\mathbb{T}_{\infty}:=\left\{\Pi(\theta): \theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}\right\}$ is quasiperiodic.
(2) If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is coprime, then each pair of tilings in $\mathbb{T}_{\infty}$ are locally isomorphic.
(3) If $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ is eventually periodic, then $\Pi(\theta)$ is self-similar: if $\theta=\alpha \bar{\beta}$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$, then $f_{-\alpha} f_{-\beta}\left(f_{-\alpha}\right)^{-1}$ is a selfsimilarity for $\Pi(\theta)$.

Proof. This uses Theorem 9, and follows similar lines to [13, proof of Theorem 2]. (1) Let $\theta \in[N]^{\infty}$ be given and let $P$ be a patch in $\Pi(\theta)$. There is a $K_{1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $P$ is contained in $\Pi\left(\theta \mid K_{1}\right)$. Hence an isometric copy of $P$ is contained in $T_{K_{2}}^{\left(\theta \mid K_{1}\right)^{+}}$where $K_{2}=\xi\left(\theta \mid K_{1}\right)$. Now choose $K_{3} \in \mathbb{N}$ so that an isometric copy of $T_{K_{2}}^{\left(\theta \mid K_{1}\right)^{+}}$is contained in each $T_{k}^{v}$ with $k \geq K_{3}$. That this is possible follows from the recursion in Lemma 3 and the assumption that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is coprime. In particular, $T_{K_{2}} \subset T_{K_{3}+i}$ for all $i \in\left\{1,2, \ldots, a_{\max }\right\}$. Now let $K_{4}=K_{3}+a_{\max }$. Then, for all $k \geq K_{4}$ and all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, the tiling $T_{k}^{v}$ is an isometric combination of $\left\{T_{K_{3}+i}^{w}: i=1,2, \ldots, a_{\max }, w \in \mathcal{V}\right\}$, and each of these tilings contains a copy of $T_{K_{2}}^{\left(\theta \mid K_{1}\right)^{+}}$and, in particular, a copy of $P$. Let $D=\max \{\|x-y\|: x, y \in A\}$ be the diameter of $A$. The support of $T_{k}$ is $s^{-k} A$ which has diameter $s^{-k} D$. Hence $\cup\left\{t \in T_{k}\right\} \subset B_{x}\left(2 s^{-k} D\right)$, the ball centered at $x$ of radius $2 s^{-k} D$, for all $x \in \cup\left\{t \in T_{k}\right\}$. It follows that if $x \in \cup\left\{t \in \Pi\left(\theta^{\prime}\right)\right\}$ for any $\theta^{\prime} \in[N]^{\infty}$, then $B\left(x, 2 s^{-K_{4}} D\right)$ contains a copy of $T_{K_{2}}$ and hence a copy of $P$. Therefore all unbounded tilings in $\mathbb{T}$ are quasiperiodic. (2) This is essentially the same as (1). (3) Let $\theta=\alpha \bar{\beta}=\alpha_{1} \alpha_{2} \cdots \alpha_{l} \beta_{1} \beta_{2} \cdots \beta_{m} \beta_{1} \beta_{2} \cdots \beta_{m} \cdots \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$, and

$$
E_{\theta \mid k}:=f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)}, T(\theta \mid k):=T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}}
$$

We have the increasing union

$$
\Pi(\theta)=\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} E_{\theta \mid(l+j m+m)} T(\theta \mid(l+j m+m))
$$

We can write

$$
\Pi(\theta)=\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} E_{\theta \mid(l+j m)} T(\theta \mid(l+j m))=f_{-\alpha} \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} f_{-\beta}^{j} s^{\xi(\theta \mid(l+j m))} T(\theta \mid(l+j m))
$$

and also

$$
\Pi(\theta)=\bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} E_{\theta \mid(l+j m+m)} T(\theta \mid(l+j m+m))=f_{-\alpha} f_{-\beta} \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} f_{-\beta}^{j} s^{\xi(\theta \mid(l+j m+m))} T(\theta \mid(l+j m+m)) .
$$

Here $f_{-\beta}^{j} s^{e(\theta \mid(l+j m+m))} T(\theta \mid(l+j m+m))$ is a refinement of $f_{-\beta}^{j} s^{e(\theta \mid(l+j m))} T(\theta \mid(l+$ $j m)$ ). It follows that $\left(f_{-\alpha} f_{-\beta}\right)^{-1} \Pi(\theta)$ is a refinement of $\left(f_{-\alpha}\right)^{-1} \Pi(\theta)$, from which it follows that $\left(f_{-\alpha}\right)\left(f_{-\alpha} f_{-\beta}\right)^{-1} \Pi(\theta)$ is a refinement of $\Pi(\theta)$. Therefore, every set in $\left(f_{-\alpha} f_{-\beta}\right)\left(f_{-\alpha}\right)^{-1} \Pi(\theta)$ is a union of tiles in $\Pi(\theta)$.

## 8. Addresses

Addresses, both relative and absolute, are described in [13] for the case $|\mathcal{V}|=1$. See also [7]. Here we add information and generalize. The relationship between these two types of addresses is subtle.

Write $T_{k}^{(v)}$ to mean any of $T_{k}^{v}$ or $T_{k}$.
Definition 12. The relative address of $t \in T_{k}^{(v)}$ is defined to be $\varnothing . \pi^{-1} s^{k}(t) \in \varnothing \cdot \Omega_{k}^{(v)}$. The relative address of a tile $t \in T_{k}$ depends on its context, its location relative to $T_{k}$, and depends in particular on $k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$. Relative addresses also apply to the tiles of $\Pi(\theta)$ for each $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ because $\Pi(\theta)=E_{\theta} T_{\xi(\theta)}^{\theta_{\theta \mid}^{+}}$where $E_{\theta}=f_{-\theta} s^{\xi(\theta)}$ (by Theorem 9 ) is a known isometry applied to $T_{\xi(\theta)}$. Thus, the relative address of $t \in \Pi(\theta)$ relative to $\Pi(\theta)$ is $\varnothing \cdot \pi^{-1} f_{-\theta}^{-1}(t)$, for $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$. When it is clear from context we may drop the symbols " $\varnothing$.".

Lemma 4. The tiles of $T_{k}$ are in bijective correspondence with the set of relative addresses $\varnothing . \Omega_{k}$. The tiles of $T_{k}^{v}$ are in bijective correspondence with the set of relative addresses $\varnothing . \Omega_{k}^{v}$.

Proof. The correspondences are provided by the bijective map

$$
H: \varnothing . \Omega_{k} \rightarrow T_{k}
$$

defined by $H(\varnothing . \sigma)=s^{-k} \pi(\sigma)$. We have $T_{k}=s^{-k} \pi\left(\Omega_{k}\right)$ so $H$ maps $\varnothing . \Omega_{k}$ onto $T_{k}$. Also $H$ is one-to-one: if $\beta \neq \gamma$, for $\beta, \gamma \in \Sigma_{*}$ then $f_{\beta}(A) \neq f_{\gamma}(A)$ because $H(\varnothing \cdot \beta)=H(\varnothing \cdot \gamma)$ implies $\pi(\beta)=\pi(\gamma)$ which implies $\beta=\gamma$ because the tiling IFS obeys the open set condition and $A_{v} \cap A_{w}=\emptyset$ for $v \neq w$. If the requirement $A_{v} \cap A_{w}=\emptyset$ does not hold, it may not be true that $H: \varnothing . \Omega_{k} \rightarrow T_{k}$ is one-to-one; but it remains true that $\left.H\right|_{\varnothing . \Omega_{k}^{v}}: \varnothing . \Omega_{k}^{v} \rightarrow T_{k}^{v}$ is bijective.

For precision we should write "the relative address of $t$ relative to $T_{k}$ ": however, when the context $t \in T_{k}$ is clear, we may simply refer to "the relative address of $t$ ". For example, if $t \in E T_{k}$ where $E$ is an isometry that is either known or can be inferred from the context, then we may say that $t$ has a unique relative address.

Example 6. (Standard 1D binary tiling) For the IFS $\mathcal{F}_{0}=\left\{\mathbb{R} ; f_{1}, f_{2}\right\}$ with $f_{1}(x)=0.5 x, f_{2}(x)=0.5 x+0.5$ we have $\Pi(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ is a tiling by copies of the tile $t=[0,0.5]$ whose union is an interval of length $2^{|\theta|}$ and is isometric to $T_{|\theta|}$ and represented by $t t t t \ldots . t$ with relative addresses in order from left to right

$$
\varnothing .111 \ldots 11, \varnothing .111 \ldots 12, \varnothing .111 \ldots 21, \ldots ., \varnothing .222 \ldots 22
$$

the length of each string (address) being $|\theta|+1$. Notice that here $T_{k}$ contains $2^{|\theta|}-1$ copies of $T_{0}$ (namely tt ) where a copy is $E T_{0}$ where $E \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{F}_{0}}$, the group of isometries generated by the functions of $\mathcal{F}_{0}$.

Example 7. (Fibonacci 1D tilings) $\mathcal{F}_{1}=\left\{a x, a^{2} x+1-a^{2}\right\}$ where $a+$ $a^{2}=1, a>0$. The tiles of $\Pi(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ are images under isometries (that belong to the group of isometries generated by the IFS) applied to the tiles $[0, a]$ and $[a, 1]$ of the attractor $A=[0,1]$. Writing the tiling $T_{0}$ as $l s$ where $l$ is a copy of $[0, a]$ and (here) $s$ is a copy of $\left[0, a^{2}\right]$ we have:
$T_{0}=l s$ has relative addresses $\varnothing .1, \varnothing .2$ (i.e. the address of $l$ is 1 and of $s$ is 2)
$T_{1}=l s l$ has relative addresses $\varnothing .11, \varnothing .12, \varnothing .2$
$T_{2}=$ lslls has relative addresses $\varnothing .111, \varnothing .112, \varnothing .12, \varnothing .21, \varnothing .22$
$T_{3}=l$ sllslsl has relative addresses $\varnothing .1111, \varnothing .1112, \varnothing .112, \varnothing .121, \ldots$
We remark that $T_{k}$ comprises $F_{k+1}$ distinct tiles and contains exactly $F_{k}$ copies of $T_{0}$, where $\left\{F_{k}: k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}\right\}$ is a sequence of Fibonacci numbers $\{1,2,3,5,8,13,21, \ldots\}$. Also $T_{4}=$ lsllslsllslls contains two overlapping copies of $T_{2}$.

The following theorem defines hierarchies of canonical tilings. It points out that each relative address is associated with a specific hierarchy.

Theorem 11. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a tiling IFS. The following hierarchy of canonical tilings is associated with any given relative address $\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}$ :
$F_{0} T_{0}^{\sigma_{|\sigma|} \mid 0} \subset F_{1} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|}\right)}^{\sigma_{|\sigma|}^{+}} \subset F_{2} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right)}^{\sigma_{\mid+1}^{+}} \subset \ldots F_{|\sigma|-1} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \ldots \sigma_{2}\right)}^{\sigma_{2}^{+}} \subset T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \ldots \sigma_{1}\right)}^{\sigma_{1}^{+}}$
where $F_{k}$ is the isometry $s^{-\xi(\sigma)}\left(f_{-\sigma_{|\sigma|-k} \sigma_{|\sigma|-k-1} \ldots \sigma_{1}} s^{\xi\left(\sigma_{1} \ldots \sigma_{|\sigma|-k}\right)}\right)^{-1} s^{\xi(\sigma)}$ for $k=0,1, \ldots, \xi(\sigma)$.

Proof. The chain of inclusions

$$
\Pi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \mid 0\right) \subset \Pi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|}\right) \subset \Pi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right) \subset \ldots \subset \Pi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \ldots \sigma_{1}\right)
$$

can be rewritten

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{0}^{\sigma_{|\sigma|} \mid 0} & \subset f_{-\sigma_{|\sigma|}} s^{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|}\right)} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|}\right)}^{\sigma_{|\sigma|}^{+}} \subset f_{-\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}} s^{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right)} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \mid \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right)}^{\sigma_{|\sigma|-1}^{+}} \subset \ldots \\
& \subset f_{-\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \ldots \sigma_{1}} s^{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \ldots \sigma_{1}\right)} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \ldots \sigma_{1}\right)}^{\sigma_{1}^{+}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Apply the isometry $E=s^{-\xi(\sigma)} f_{\sigma}$ on the left throughout to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
s^{-\xi(\sigma)} f_{\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \ldots \sigma_{|\sigma|}} T_{0}^{\sigma_{|\sigma|} \mid 0} & \subset s^{-\xi(\sigma)} f_{\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \ldots \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}} s^{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|}\right)} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|}\right)}^{\sigma_{|\sigma|}^{+}} \\
& \left.\subset s^{-\xi(\sigma)} f_{\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \ldots \sigma_{|\sigma|-2}} s^{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right)} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1}\right)}^{\sigma_{|\sigma|-1}^{+}}\right) \\
& \subset \ldots \\
& \subset s^{-\xi(\sigma)} f_{\sigma_{1}} s^{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \ldots \sigma_{2}\right)} T_{\xi\left(\sigma_{|\sigma|} \sigma_{|\sigma|-1} \ldots \sigma_{2}\right)}^{\sigma_{2}^{+}} \\
& \subset T_{\xi(\sigma)}^{\sigma_{1}^{+}}
\end{aligned}
$$

which is equivalent to equation 8.1.
8.1. Absolute addresses. The set of absolute addresses associated with $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is

$$
\mathbb{A}:=\left\{\theta \cdot \sigma: \theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}, \sigma^{-}=\theta^{+}, \theta_{|\theta|} \neq \sigma_{1}\right\} .
$$

Define $\widehat{\Pi}: \mathbb{A} \rightarrow\{t \in T: T \in \mathbb{T}\}$ by

$$
\widehat{\Pi}(\theta \cdot \omega)=f_{-\theta} \cdot f_{\sigma}\left(A_{\sigma^{+}}\right) .
$$

The condition $\theta_{|\theta|} \neq \sigma_{1}$ is imposed. We say that $\theta . \sigma$ is an absolute address of the tile $f_{-\theta} \cdot f_{\omega}(A)$. It follows from Definition 5 that the map $\widehat{\Pi}$ is surjective: every tile of $\{t \in T: T \in \mathbb{T}\}$ possesses at least one absolute address.

Although tiles have unique relative addresses, relative to the $T_{k}^{v}$ to which they are being treated as belonging, they may have many different absolute addresses. The tile [1, 1.5] of Example 6 has the two absolute addresses 1.21 and 21.211, and many others.

### 8.2. Relationship between relative and absolute addresses.

Theorem 12. If $t \in \Pi(\theta)$ with $\theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ has relative address $\omega$ relative to $\Pi(\theta)$, then an absolute address of $t$ is $\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{l} \cdot S^{|\theta|-l} \omega$ where $l \in \mathbb{N}$ is the unique index such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
t \in \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{l}\right) \text { and } t \notin \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{l-1}\right) \tag{8.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Recalling that

$$
\Pi(\theta \mid 0) \subset \Pi\left(\theta_{1}\right) \subset \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2}\right) \subset \ldots \subset \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{|\theta|-1}\right) \subset \Pi(\theta)
$$

we have the disjoint union
$\Pi(\theta)=\Pi(\theta \mid 0) \cup\left(\Pi\left(\theta_{1}\right) \backslash \Pi(\varnothing)\right) \cup\left(\Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2}\right) \backslash \Pi\left(\theta_{1}\right)\right) \cup \ldots \cup\left(\Pi(\theta) \backslash \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{|\theta|-1}\right)\right)$.

So there is a unique $l$ such that Equation (8.2) is true. Since $t \in \Pi(\theta)$ has relative address $\varnothing . \sigma$ relative to $\Pi(\theta)$ we have

$$
\varnothing \cdot \sigma=\varnothing \cdot \pi^{-1} f_{-\theta}^{-1}(t)
$$

and so an absolute address of $t$ is

$$
\left.\theta \cdot \sigma\right|_{\text {cancel }}=\left.\theta \cdot \pi^{-1} f_{-\theta}^{-1}(t)\right|_{\text {cancel }}
$$

where $\left.\right|_{\text {cancel }}$ means equal symbols on either side of "." are removed until there is a different symbol on either side. Since $t \in \Pi\left(\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{l}\right)$ the terms $\theta_{l+1} \theta_{l+2} \ldots \theta_{|\theta|}$ must cancel yielding the absolute address

$$
\left.\theta \cdot \sigma\right|_{\text {cancel }}=\theta_{1} \theta_{2} \ldots \theta_{l} \cdot \sigma_{|\theta|-l+1} \ldots \sigma_{|\sigma|}
$$

### 8.3. Inflation and deflation of $\Pi(\theta)$ when $\theta$ is known.

Definition 13. The deflation operator $\alpha$ and its inverse, the inflation operator $\alpha^{-1}$, both restricted to canonical tilings $T_{k}^{v}$ where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in \mathcal{V}$ are specified, is defined by

$$
\alpha T_{k}^{v}=T_{k-1}^{v}, \alpha^{-1} T_{k-1}^{v}=T_{k}^{v}
$$

for all specified $k \in \mathbb{N}, v \in \mathcal{V}$. The domains of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ are extended to include any specified isometry $E \in \mathcal{U}$ applied to $T_{k}^{v}$, by defining

$$
\begin{align*}
\alpha E T_{k}^{v} & =\left(s E s^{-1}\right) \alpha T_{k}^{v}=\left(s E s^{-1}\right) T_{k-1}^{v}  \tag{8.3}\\
\alpha^{-1} E T_{k-1}^{v} & =\left(s^{-1} E s\right) T_{k}^{v}
\end{align*}
$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}, v \in \mathcal{V}$.
Note that $\alpha^{m} \alpha^{n}\left(E T_{k}^{v}\right)$ is well-defined and equals $\alpha^{m+n}\left(E T_{k}^{v}\right)$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ with $n+m \geq-k$ and $n \geq-k$ where we define $\alpha^{0}$ to be an identity map.

Note that the tiling $\alpha^{-1} T_{k-1}^{v}$ may be calculated by replacing each tile $t \in T_{k-1}^{v}$ whose relative address (relative to $T_{k-1}^{v}$ ) $\varnothing . \sigma$ obeys $\xi(\sigma)=$ $k-1$ by the set of tiles in $T_{k}^{v}$ whose relative addresses (relative to $T_{k}^{v}$ ) are $\varnothing . \sigma i$ where $i^{-}=\sigma^{+}$; and (ii) replacing each tile $t \in T_{k-1}^{v}$ whose relative address $\varnothing$. $\sigma$ obeys $\xi(\sigma)>k-1$ by $s^{-1} t$. Conversely, $\alpha T_{k}^{v}$ can be calculated by replacing each tile in $T_{k}^{v}$ whose relative addresses (relative to $T_{k}^{v}$ ) take the form $\varnothing . \sigma i$ where $i^{-}=\sigma^{+}$for some fixed $\sigma$ with $\xi(\sigma)=k$, by the tile in $T_{k-1}^{v}$ whose relative address (relative to $\left.T_{k-1}^{v}\right)$ is $\varnothing . \sigma$.

Definition 14. The domains of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ are extended to include $E \Pi(\theta)$, for any specified isometry $E \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}$, by defining:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha(E \Pi(\theta \mid k)) & =s E f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)-1} T_{\xi(\theta|k|-1}^{(\theta \mid k)+} \text { for all } k \leq|\theta|, k \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \\
\alpha^{-1}(E \Pi(\theta \mid k)) & =s^{-1} E f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)+1} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)+1}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \text {for all } k \leq|\theta|, k \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \\
\alpha^{K}(E \Pi(\theta)) & =\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} s^{K} E f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \text {if }|\theta|=\infty, K \in \mathbb{N}_{0} \\
\alpha^{-K}(E \Pi(\theta)) & =\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} s^{-K} E f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)+K} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)+K}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \text {if }|\theta|=\infty, K \in \mathbb{N}_{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 13 tells us that the unions in this definition are increasing unions of nested sequences, and hence that the actions of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ are well-defined on their extended domains, provided that the indices $K \in \mathbb{N}_{0}, E \in \mathcal{U}, \theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}$ are specified.

Theorem 13. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a tiling IFS. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{K}(E \Pi(\theta \mid M)) \subset \alpha^{K}(E \Pi(\theta \mid M+1)) \subset \ldots \tag{8.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $M \in \mathbb{N}, K \in \mathbb{Z}, K<\xi(\theta \mid M), \theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$. Then tilings produced by the actions of $\alpha^{K}$ on $E \Pi(\theta)$ are well defined by Definition 14. Moreover, for all $\theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}, n \in[N], k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, with $E_{\theta \mid k}:=f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)}$, we have the following identities

$$
\begin{align*}
\alpha^{a_{\theta_{1}}} \Pi(\theta) & =s^{a_{\theta_{1}}} f_{\theta_{1}}^{-1} \Pi(S \theta)  \tag{8.5}\\
\alpha^{-a_{n}} \Pi(\theta) & =s^{-a_{n}} f_{n} \Pi(n \theta) \\
\Pi\left(S^{k} \theta\right) & =\alpha^{\xi(\theta \mid k)} E_{\theta \mid k}^{-1} \Pi(\theta)
\end{align*}
$$

In the last equality, we require $k<|\theta|$.
Proof. The crucial point is that the unions in Definition 14 are increasing unions (i.e. each successive collection of tiles contains its predecessor). The nestedness in Equation (8.4) follows from the equivalence of the following statements.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s^{K} E f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \subset s^{K} E f_{-(\theta \mid k+1)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k+1)-K} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k+1)-K}^{(\theta \mid k+1)^{+}} \\
& f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K}^{(\theta \mid k)} \subset f_{-(\theta \mid k+1)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k+1)-K} T_{\xi|\theta| k+1)-K}^{(\theta \mid k+1+} \\
& s^{+\xi(\theta \mid k)-K} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \subset f_{-\theta_{k+1}} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k+1)-K} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k+1)-K}^{(\theta \mid k+1)^{+}} \\
&\left\{f_{\sigma}\left(A^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}}\right): \sigma \in \Omega_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}}\right\} \subset f_{-\theta_{k+1}}\left\{f_{\sigma}\left(A^{(\theta \mid k+1)^{+}}\right): \sigma \in \Omega_{\xi(\theta \mid k+1)-K}^{(\theta \mid k+1)^{+}}\right\} \\
&\left.\quad \Omega_{\xi(\theta \mid k+1)-K}^{(\theta \mid(k+1))^{+}}\right)\left.\supset \theta_{k+1} \sigma: \sigma \in \Omega_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-K}^{(\theta \mid k+1)^{+}}, \theta_{k+1}^{+}=\sigma^{-}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Next we prove that $\alpha^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} \Pi(\theta)=s^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} f_{-\theta \mid m} \Pi\left(S^{m} \theta\right)$ and in particular that $\alpha^{a_{\theta_{1}}} \Pi(\theta)=s^{a_{\theta_{1}}} f_{\theta_{1}}^{-1} \Pi(S \theta)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} \Pi(\theta) & =\bigcup_{k=K}^{\infty} s^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)-\xi(\theta \mid m)} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-\xi(\theta \mid m)}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \\
& =\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} s^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)-\xi(\theta \mid m)} T_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-\xi(\theta \mid m)}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \\
& =\bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} s^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} f_{-(\theta \mid m)} f_{-\left(S^{m} \theta \mid k-m\right)} s^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} s^{\xi\left(S^{m} \theta \mid k-m\right)} T_{\left.\xi\left|S^{m} \theta\right| k-m\right)}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \\
& =s^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} f_{-(\theta \mid m)} \bigcup_{k=m}^{\infty} f_{-\left(S^{m} \theta \mid k-m\right)} s^{\xi\left(S^{m} \theta \mid k-m\right)} T_{\xi\left(S^{m} \theta \mid k-m\right)}^{(\theta \mid k+} \\
& =s^{\xi(\theta \mid m)} f_{-(\theta \mid m)} \Pi\left(S^{m} \theta\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Proofs of the remaining two equalities in Equation (8.5) follow similarly.

Remark 3. Notice that for $\alpha$ or $\alpha^{-1}$ to act on a tiling $\Pi(\theta)$, as in Theorem [13, it is necessary that $\theta$ is known: that is, $\alpha$ acts on the function $\Pi$ : $\Sigma^{\dagger} \rightarrow \Pi\left(\Sigma^{\dagger}\right)$ or equivalently on the graph $\{(\Pi(\theta), \theta)$ : $\left.\left.\theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}\right)\right\}$. For example the statement $\Pi(\theta)=\Pi(\psi)$ does not imply $\alpha \Pi(\theta)=\alpha \Pi(\psi)$ without more information.

## 9. Rigid tiling IFSs

Call a tiling $T$ an isometric combination of canonical tilings if it can be written in the form

$$
T=\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}
$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is a countable index set, $v_{i} \in \mathcal{V}, k_{i} \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$, and it is assumed that $E_{i}, v_{i}, k_{i}$ are known for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. For example the tiling $\Pi(\theta)$ where $\theta$ is given is an isometric combination of canonical tilings for all $\theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}$. Inflation and deflation of a tiling $T$ may not be well-defined when it is represented as an isometric combination of canonical tilings. For example it can occur that $T=T_{v}^{k}=\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}$ but $\alpha T \neq \cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha\left(E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}\right)$ as the following example shows.

Example 8. In $\mathbb{R}$ let $f_{1}(x)=\frac{1}{2} x, f_{2}(x)=\frac{1}{4} x+\frac{1}{2}, f_{3}(x)=\frac{1}{4} x+\frac{1}{4}$, $f_{4}(x)=\frac{1}{2} x+2, f_{5}(x)=\frac{1}{2} x+\frac{3}{2}$ and let $E x=x-1$. Then observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{1} & =f_{1}\left(A_{1}\right) \cup f_{2}\left(A_{1}\right) \cup f_{3}\left(A_{2}\right), A_{2}=f_{4}\left(A_{1}\right) \cup f_{5}\left(A_{2}\right) \\
T_{0}^{1} & =\left\{\left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right],\left[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}\right],\left[\frac{3}{4}, 1\right]\right\}, T_{0}^{2}=\left\{\left[2, \frac{5}{2}\right],\left[\frac{5}{2}, 3\right]\right\} \\
T_{1}^{1} & =T_{0}^{1} \cup E T_{0}^{2}, \\
\alpha T_{1}^{1} & =T_{0}^{1} \neq \alpha T_{0}^{1} \cup \alpha E T_{0}^{2}=T_{0}^{1} \cup s E[0,1]
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $E s T_{0}^{2} \subset T_{0}^{1}$ where $E s[2,3]=\left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$ and $s=\frac{1}{2}$.
In this Section 9 we define the notions of a rigid tiling $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ and a rigid tiling $T$. We extend the definitions of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ so that they act directly on tilings, in such a way that if $T$ is a rigid tiling and $T=\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}$ with $v_{i} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $k_{i} \in \mathbb{N}$ is an isometric combination, then

$$
\alpha T=\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha\left(E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}\right)=\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} S E_{i} s^{-1} T_{k_{i}-1}^{v_{i}}
$$

and similarly for $\alpha^{-1}$ independently of the specific representation of $T$ as an isometric combination.
9.1. Definitions. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be any set of isometries on $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ that contains the set of isometries $\left\{s^{m} f_{-\theta} f_{\sigma}: m \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, a_{\max }-1\right\}, \theta \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}, \sigma \in\right.$ $\left.\Sigma_{*}, \theta^{+}=\sigma^{-}, m+\xi(\sigma)-\xi(\theta)=0\right\}$. It may be a group such as the group of translations or the Euclidean group on $\mathbb{R}^{M}$.

Definition 15. If $P$ and $Q$ are sets of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ we say " $P$ meets $Q$ ", to mean that $P \cap Q \neq \varnothing$ and $(\cup P) \cap(\cup Q)=\cup(P \cap Q)$. We also say that " $P$ is a copy of $Q$ " to mean that there is $E \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $P=E Q$. For example, " $T_{k}^{v}$ meets a copy of $T_{l}^{w "}$ is shorthand for "there is $E \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $T_{k}^{v} \cap E T_{l}^{w} \neq \varnothing$ and the union of the set of tiles $T_{k}^{v} \cap E T_{l}^{w}$ is $s^{-k} A_{v} \cap E s^{-l} A_{w}$ ".
Definition 16. The tilings $\mathbb{T}:=\left\{\Pi(\theta): \theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}\right\}$ and the tiling IFS $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ are each said to be $\operatorname{rigid}$ (with respect to $\mathcal{U}$ ) when the following three statements are true for all $E \in \mathcal{U}$, and all $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$ :

A(i) if $T_{0}^{v}$ meets $E s^{k} T_{0}^{w}$ for some $k \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, a_{\max }-1\right\}$ then $E=I d$, $k=0$, and $v=w$;

A(ii) if $E T_{0}^{v}$ tiles $A_{w}$ then $E=I d$ and $v=w$;
A(iii) if $A_{w}=E s^{k} A_{v}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, then $E=I d, k=0$, and $v=w$.

Definition 16 is weaker than the definition of strongly rigid in the case $|\mathcal{V}|=1$ in [13]. For tiles with non-empty interiors, if $\mathcal{U}$ is the
group of translations on $\mathbb{R}^{M}$, and $a_{\max }=1$, rigidity is largely equivalent to recognizability [1] and to the unique composition property [45]. Rigidity extends these concepts to tilings involving more than one scaling factor, more general sets of transformations, and to the context of more general fractal tilings.

Lemma 5. Let the family of tilings $\mathbb{T}:=\left\{\Pi(\theta): \theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}\right\}$ and the tiling $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be rigid. If $s^{k} T_{0}^{v}$ meets $E T_{l}^{w}$ for some $k, l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}, v, w \in \mathcal{V}$, $E \in \mathcal{U}$, then $k=0$ and $T_{0}^{v} \subset E T_{l}^{w}$.

Proof. If $s^{k} T_{0}^{v}$ meets $E T_{0}^{w}$ then $k=0, E=I d, v=w$. In particular, if $s^{k} T_{0}^{v}$ meets $E T_{0}^{w}$ then $k=0$, and $T_{0}^{v} \subset E T_{0}^{w}$. Suppose that if $s^{k} T_{0}^{v}$ meets $E T_{l}^{w}$ then $k=0$, and $T_{0}^{v} \subset E T_{l}^{w}$, for all $l=0,1,2, . . L$. If $s^{k} T_{0}^{v}$ meets $E T_{L+1}^{w}$, but does not meet any copy of $T_{0}^{x}$ contained in $E T_{L+1}^{w}$ we can apply $\alpha$ to $E T_{l}^{w}$ and at the same time shrink $s^{k} T_{0}^{v}$ without modification, yielding that $s^{k+1} T_{0}^{v}$ meets $T_{l-1}^{w}$ where $E^{\prime}=s E s^{-1} \in \mathcal{U}$. This implies $k=-1$ which is false. We conclude that $s^{k} T_{0}^{v}$ meets a copy of $T_{0}^{x}$ contained in $E T_{L+1}^{w}$ which implies $k=0$ and $T_{0}^{v} \subset E T_{L+1}^{w}$.

Theorem 14. If the family of tilings $\mathbb{T}:=\left\{\Pi(\theta): \theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}\right\}$ and the tiling $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ are rigid then the following four statements are true. $B(i)$ if $E \in \mathcal{U}, v, w \in \mathcal{V}$, and $T_{0}^{v}$ meets $E T_{0}^{w}$, then $v=w$ and $E=I d$;
$B$ (ii) if $E \in \mathcal{U}, v, w \in \mathcal{V}$, and $k, l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ are such that $T_{k}^{v}$ meets $E T_{l}^{w}$, then

$$
\text { either } T_{k}^{v} \subset E T_{l}^{w} \text { or } E T_{l}^{w} \subset T_{k}^{v}
$$

$B$ (iii) if $E \in \mathcal{U}, v, w \in \mathcal{V}$, and $E T_{0}^{v}$ tiles $A_{w}$, then $E=I d$ and $v=w$;
$B\left(\right.$ iv ) if $A_{w}=E s^{k} A_{v}$ for some $E \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}, k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, then $E=$ $I d, k=0$, and $v=w$.

If $|\mathcal{V}|=1$ or if each $T_{0}^{v}$ possesses a tile isometric to $s^{a_{\max }} A_{w}$, for some $w$ that may depend on $v$, then the two sets of conditions, $\{A(i), A(i i), A(i i i)\}$ and $\{B(i), B(i i), B(i i i), B(i v)\}$ are equivalent.

Proof. Follows from Lemma 5.
Corollary 1. Let the family of tilings $\mathbb{T}:=\left\{\Pi(\theta): \theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}\right\}$ and the tiling $\operatorname{IFS}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be rigid. If $\theta, \varphi \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$, and $\Pi(\theta)$ meets $E \Pi(\varphi)$, then

$$
\text { either } \Pi(\theta) \subset E \Pi(\varphi) \text { or } E \Pi(\varphi) \subset \Pi(\theta)
$$

9.2. Inflation and deflation of rigid tilings. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the set of all tilings $T$ that can be written in the form $T=\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}$ where $i$ is a countable index set, $E_{i} \in \mathcal{U}, k_{i} \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, and $v_{i} \in \mathcal{V}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$. Let $\mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$ be the set of all tilings $T^{\prime}$ that can be written in the form $T^{\prime}=\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}-1}^{v_{i}}$
where $i$ is a countable index set, $E_{i} \in \mathcal{U}, k_{i} \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, and $v_{i} \in \mathcal{V}$ for all $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

The following definition extends the domains of $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ to $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$ respectively, in the case of rigid tilings. It generalizes the definition of strongly rigid in [13] to the graph directed case. It relies on the fact, assured by Lemma 5, that no "spurious copies" of any $T_{0}^{v}$ can occur in any tiling in $\mathbb{Q}$.

Definition 17. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a rigid tiling IFS. Deflation $\alpha: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$ is defined by $\alpha(T)=\{\alpha(t): t \in T\}$ for all $t \in T \in \mathbb{Q}$, where

$$
\alpha(t):=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
s E A_{v} & \text { if } t \in E T_{0}^{v} \subset T \text { for some } E \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}, \\
s t & \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

$E T_{0}^{v}$ is called the set of partners of $t \in E T_{0}^{v}$. If $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ are partners of $t$, then $\alpha\left(t_{1}\right)=\alpha\left(t_{2}\right)$. Inflation $\alpha^{-1}: \mathbb{Q}^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is defined by $\alpha^{-1} T=$ $\left\{\alpha^{-1}(t): t \in T\right\}$ for all $t \in T \in \mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$, where

$$
\alpha^{-1}(t):=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
s^{-1} t & \text { if } t \neq E s A_{v} \text { for any } E \in \mathcal{U}, v \in \mathcal{V}, \\
E T_{0}^{v} & \text { if } t=E s A_{v}
\end{array}\right.
$$

for all $T \in \mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$.
Conditions $A$ (ii) and $A($ iii $)$ ensure that inflation, represented by the operator $\alpha^{-1}$, is well-defined on $\mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$. Call a tile in any tiling in $\mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$ which is isometric to $s A_{v}$ for some $v \in \mathcal{V}$ a large tile. To inflate a tiling $T^{\prime}$ in $\mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$, first replace each large tile in $T^{\prime}$ by the corresponding unique (by $A(i i))$ copy of $s T_{0}^{v}$ (for all $v$ ), yielding a set of sets $T^{\prime}$, and then apply the similitude $s^{-1}$ to $T^{\prime}$ to yield $T \in \mathbb{Q}$. Similarly, deflation is well-defined, because by Lemma 5 no copies of $s^{k} T_{0}^{v}$ with $k>0$ can occur in any $T_{l}^{w}$.

Condition $A($ iii $)$ ensures that, given the canonical tiling $T_{k}^{v}$, we can infer the values of the indices $v$ and $k$. In the case $a_{\text {max }}=1$, a consequence of rigidity (with respect to the translation group) is that canonical tilings are recognizable, as discussed in Section 12 .

For rigid tilings $\alpha: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$ and $\alpha^{-1}: \mathbb{Q}^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ are well-defined. Every copy of $T_{0}^{w}$ in $T_{k}^{v}$ is related via $\alpha^{-1}$ to a large tile in $T_{k-1}^{v}$. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the large tiles in $T_{k-1}^{v}$ and copies of $T_{0}^{x}$ in $T_{k}^{v}$. In particular we find that $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ in Definition 17 are consistent with the definition in Section 8.3. The following theorem says that, for rigid tilings, inflation and deflation are well defined, in particular they interact in an unconfusing manner on isometric combinations.

Theorem 15. If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is rigid, then the following statements are true for all $E, E^{\prime} \in \mathcal{U}, k, l \in \mathbb{N}, v, w \in \mathcal{V}$, and index sets $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}^{\prime}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{J}^{\prime}$,
(i) $E T_{0}^{v} \subset T_{k}^{w}$ if and only if $s E A_{v} \in T_{k-1}^{w}$
(ii) $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ in Definition 17 are consistent with Definition 13 in Section 8.3, that is

$$
\alpha\left(E T_{k}^{v}\right)=\bigcup_{t \in E T_{k}^{v}} \alpha(t) \text { and } \alpha^{-1}\left(E T_{k}^{v}\right)=\bigcup_{t \in E T_{k}^{v}} \alpha^{-1}(t)
$$

(iii) if $E T_{k}^{v} \subset E^{\prime} T_{l}^{w}$, then

$$
\alpha\left(E T_{k}^{v}\right) \subset \alpha\left(E^{\prime} T_{l}^{w}\right) \text { and } \alpha^{-1}\left(E T_{k}^{v}\right) \subset \alpha^{-1}\left(E^{\prime} T_{l}^{w}\right)
$$

(iv) if $\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}} \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $\cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} E_{j} T_{k_{j}}^{v_{j}} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$, then
$\alpha\left(\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}\right)=\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha\left(E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}\right)$ and $\alpha^{-1}\left(\cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} E_{j} T_{k_{j}}^{v_{j}}\right)=\cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \alpha^{-1}\left(E_{j} T_{k_{j}}^{v_{j}}\right)$
(v) if $\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}} \subset \cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{\prime}} E_{i}^{\prime} T_{k_{i}^{\prime}}^{v_{i}^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} E_{j} T_{k_{j}}^{v_{j}} \subset \cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}^{\prime}} E_{j}^{\prime} T_{k_{j}^{\prime}}^{v_{j}^{\prime}} \in$ $\mathbb{Q}^{\prime}$, then
$\alpha\left(\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} E_{i} T_{k_{i}}^{v_{i}}\right) \subset \alpha\left(\cup_{i \in \mathcal{I}^{\prime}} E_{i}^{\prime} T_{k_{i}^{\prime}}^{v_{i}^{\prime}}\right)$ and $\alpha^{-1}\left(\cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}} E_{j} T_{k_{j}}^{v_{j}}\right) \subset \alpha^{-1}\left(\cup_{j \in \mathcal{J}^{\prime}} E_{j}^{\prime} T_{k_{j}^{\prime}}^{v_{j}^{\prime}}\right)$
Proof. These statements follow from Theorem 14.
Corollary 2. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be rigid and $\Pi(\theta) \subset E \Pi(\psi)$, for some $\theta, \psi \in$ $\Sigma^{\dagger}$. Then $\alpha^{k} \Pi(\theta) \subset s^{k} E s^{-k} \alpha^{k} \Pi(\psi)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, with $k \leq \min \{\xi(\theta), \xi(\psi)\}$ when both $\theta$ and $\psi$ lie in $\Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$. Also $\alpha^{-k} \Pi(\theta) \subset s^{-k} E s^{k} \alpha^{-k} \Pi(\psi)$.
Proof. This follows directly using the above identities.

## 10. Characterization of isometric Rigid tilings

Define for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v, w \in \mathcal{V}$

$$
\Lambda_{k}^{v, w}=\left\{\sigma \in \Sigma_{*}: \xi(\sigma)=k, \sigma^{-}=v, \sigma^{+}=w\right\} \subset \Omega_{k-1}^{v}
$$

Theorem 16. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a rigid tiling IFS. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ there is a bijection between $\Lambda_{k}^{v, w}$ and the set of isometric copies of $T_{0}^{w}$ contained in $T_{k}^{v}$. The bijection is provided by the map $H: \Lambda_{k}^{v, w} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(H) \subset T_{k}^{v}$ defined by

$$
H(\sigma)=s^{-k} f_{\sigma}\left(T_{0}^{w}\right)
$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H})$ is the range of $H$.
Proof. (i) It is readily checked that $H\left(\Lambda_{k}^{v, w}\right) \subset T_{k}^{v}$. (ii) Suppose $H(\sigma)=$ $H(\omega)$ for $\sigma, \omega \in \Lambda_{k}^{v, w}$. Then $\xi(\sigma)=\xi(\omega)=k, \sigma^{+}=\omega^{+}=w, \sigma^{-}=$ $\omega^{-}=v$ and

$$
s^{-k} f_{\sigma}\left(T_{0}^{w}\right)=s^{-k} f_{\omega}\left(T_{0}^{w}\right) \Rightarrow f_{\sigma}\left(A_{v}\right)=f_{\omega}\left(A_{v}\right) \Rightarrow \sigma=\omega
$$

(iii) Suppose that $E T_{0}^{w} \subset T_{k}^{v}$ is an isometric copy of $T_{0}^{w}$ that is contained in $T_{k}^{v}$. Then we need to show that $E T_{0}^{w}$ is in $\mathcal{R}(H)$. We have

$$
\alpha E T_{0}^{w} \subset \alpha T_{k}^{v} \Rightarrow s E s^{-1} s A_{w} \in T_{k-1}^{v} \Rightarrow s E s^{-1} s A_{w}=s^{-k+1} f_{\sigma}\left(A_{w}\right)
$$

for some $\sigma$ such that $\sigma^{+}=w, \sigma^{-}=v, \xi(\sigma)=k$, because the r.h.s. must be a tile in $T_{k-1}^{v}$ congruent to $s A_{w}$. It follows that $E=s^{-k} f_{\sigma}$ where $\sigma \in \Lambda_{k}^{v, w}$ and so $H(\sigma)=E T_{0}^{w} \in \mathcal{R}(H)$, because any copy of $T_{0}^{w}$ in $E T_{k}^{v}$ must equal the result of application of $\alpha^{-1}$ to a copy of $s A_{v}$ in $T_{k-1}^{v}$.

Theorem 17. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a tiling IFS.
(i) If $\theta, \psi \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}, S^{p} \theta=S^{q} \psi, E=f_{-\theta \mid p}\left(f_{-\psi \mid q}\right)^{-1},(\theta \mid p)^{+}=(\psi \mid q)^{+}$, and $\xi(\theta \mid p)=\xi(\psi \mid q)$, then $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ where $E$ is an isometry.
(ii) Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be rigid, and let $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ where $E \in \mathcal{U}$ is an isometry, for some pair of addresses $\theta, \psi \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$. Then there are $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S^{p} \theta=S^{q} \psi, E=f_{-(\theta \mid p)}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid q)}\right)^{-1},(\theta \mid p)^{+}=(\psi \mid q)^{+}$, and $\xi(\theta \mid p)=\xi(\psi \mid q)$.

Proof. Part (i) is readily checked. Proof of (ii). (A) Begin by choosing $L \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ such that $\Pi(\theta \mid 0) \cap E \Pi(\psi \mid L) \neq \emptyset$. Note that $\Pi(\theta \mid 0) \subset E \Pi(\psi \mid L)$. (B) Let $l \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ with $l \geq L$. Using Corollary 1 we can choose $k=k_{l}$ so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi(\theta \mid k) \subset E \Pi(\psi \mid l) \subset \Pi(\theta \mid k+1) \tag{10.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(C) Using Theorem 13 and Corollary 2, we can apply $\alpha^{\xi(\theta \mid k)}$ to both sides of $\Pi(\theta \mid k) \subset E \Pi(\psi \mid l)$ to obtain

$$
\alpha^{\xi(\theta \mid k)} \Pi(\theta \mid k) \subset \alpha^{\xi(\theta \mid k)} E \Pi(\psi \mid l)
$$

Writing $w=(\theta \mid k)^{+}, v=(\psi \mid l)^{+}$and using the first part of Theorem 9 , we now have

$$
\begin{aligned}
s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)} f_{-(\theta \mid k)} T_{0}^{w} & \subset s^{\xi(\theta \mid k)} E f_{-(\psi \mid l)} s^{\xi(\psi \mid l)-\xi(\theta \mid k)} T_{\xi(\psi \mid l)-\xi(\theta \mid k)}^{v} \\
& \Rightarrow s^{-\xi(\psi \mid l)+\xi(\theta \mid k)}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid l)}\right)^{-1} E^{-1} f_{-(\theta \mid k)} T_{0}^{w} \subset T_{\xi(\psi \mid l)-\xi(\theta \mid k)}^{v}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now apply the Theorem 16 to conclude that there is $\sigma \in \Lambda_{\xi(\psi \mid)-\xi(\theta \mid k)}^{v, w}$ with $\sigma^{+}=v$ and $\sigma^{-}=w$ so that

$$
s^{-\xi(\psi \mid l)+\xi(\theta \mid k-1)}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid l)}\right)^{-1} E^{-1} f_{-(\theta \mid k-1)} T_{0}^{w}=s^{-\xi(\psi \mid l)+\xi(\theta \mid k-1)} f_{\sigma} T_{0}^{w}
$$

This implies

$$
E=f_{-(\theta \mid k)} f_{\sigma}^{-1}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid l)}\right)^{-1}
$$

We also have $E \Pi(\psi \mid l) \subset \Pi(\theta \mid k+1)$ which, following the same steps, yields

$$
E=f_{-(\theta \mid k+1)} f_{\tilde{\sigma}}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid l)}\right)^{-1}
$$

for some $\tilde{\sigma} \in \Lambda_{\xi(\theta \mid k)-\xi(\psi \mid l)}^{x, y}$ where $x=\theta_{k+1}^{+}, y=\psi_{l}^{+}=v$. Comparing the two expression for $E$ we conclude

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{-(\theta \mid k+1)} f_{\tilde{\sigma}}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid l)}\right)^{-1} & =f_{-(\theta \mid k)} f_{\sigma}^{-1}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid l)}\right)^{-1} \\
& \Rightarrow f_{-\theta_{k}}=f_{\sigma}^{-1} f_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies either $\tilde{\sigma}=\emptyset, \sigma=\theta_{k}$, and $v=w$, or $\sigma=\emptyset$ and $\tilde{\sigma}=\theta_{k}$ and $w=x$. It follows that either $E=f_{-(\theta \mid k)}\left(f_{-\psi \mid l}\right)^{-1}$ or $f_{-(\theta \mid k+1)}\left(f_{-\psi \mid l}\right)^{-1}$. That is, one or other of the two inclusion symbols in (10.1) can be replaced by an equality sign. It follows that either $E=f_{-(\theta \mid k)}\left(f_{-\psi \mid l}\right)^{-1}$ where $\xi(\theta \mid k)=\xi(\psi \mid l)$ or $f_{-(\theta \mid k+1)}\left(f_{-\psi \mid l}\right)^{-1}$ where $\xi(\theta+1 \mid k)=\xi(\psi \mid l)$. (D) The rest of the proof follows from the arbitrarily large size of $l$.

Corollary 3. If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is rigid (with respect to $\mathcal{U}$ ) then $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\theta)$ for some $E \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$, if and only if $E=I d$. In particular, if $\mathcal{U}$ contains the group of Euclidean translations on $\mathbb{R}^{M}$, then $\Pi(\theta)$ is non-periodic for all $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$.

## 11. Inflation and deflation of tilings which may not be RIGID

In this section we explore consequences of $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ without requiring rigidity. An example of what we do require is: if $\Pi(\theta)=$ $E \Pi(\psi)$, where $\theta, \psi \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ and $E \in \mathcal{U}$ are known, then $\alpha^{n} \Pi(\theta)=$ $\alpha^{n}(E \Pi(\psi))$ for all $n$. In this example $\alpha$ acts on graphs of functions as described earlier, but the resulting tilings on both sides of the equation coincide. This is always true when the system is rigid. But it occurs more commonly as illustrated by the following examples.
Example 9. Let $V=1$ with $\mathcal{F}=\left\{\mathbb{R}^{1} ; f_{1}(x)=x / 2, f_{2}(x)=(x+1) / 2\right\}$. Tilings $\Pi(\theta)$ for $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ take one of three forms: either (i) $\Pi(\theta)=$ $\{[n / 2,(n+1) / 2]: n=\ldots-2,-1,0,1,2 \ldots\}$ or (ii) $\Pi(\theta)$ is a translation of the tiling $\left\{[n / 2,(n+1) / 2]: n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}\right\}$ or (iii) it is an integer translation of $\left\{[-(n+1) / 2,-n / 2]: n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}\right\}$. Also $\alpha \Pi(\theta)$ takes the form of $\Pi(\theta)$ and if $\Pi(\theta)=\Pi(\psi)$, then $\alpha \Pi(\theta)=\alpha \Pi(\psi)$.
Example 10. Let $V=1$ and $|\mathcal{E}|=2$ in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ with $f_{1}, f_{2}$ defined respectively by

$$
\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & -s & 0 \\
s & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x \\
y \\
z
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{l}
0 \\
s \\
0
\end{array}\right],\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
s^{2} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -s^{2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2}
\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{l}
x \\
y \\
z
\end{array}\right]+\left[\begin{array}{l}
0 \\
1 \\
\frac{1}{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where $s^{2}+s^{4}=1,0<s$. See Figure 7. It is easy to see that, if $\theta$ and $\psi \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ and $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ for some translation $E$, then $\alpha^{K} \Pi(\theta)=$ $\alpha^{K}(E \Pi(\psi))$ for all $K \in \mathbb{N}$.


Figure 7. Illustration related to a 3 D tiling that is golden b in two directions and 0.5 scalings in z direction. See [11] for discussion of golden b tilings. See Example 10 for the IFS.

In the rest of this section $\mathcal{U}$ is simply a set of isometries on $\mathbb{R}^{M}$.
Definition 18. If $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ implies $\alpha^{k} \Pi(\theta)=\alpha^{k} E \Pi(\psi)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $\theta, \psi \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}, E \in \mathcal{U}, i, j \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$, then we say that $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is well-behaved (with respect to the set of isometries $\mathcal{U}$ ).

Theorem 18. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a well-behaved tiling IFS. If $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ for some isometry $E \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\theta, \psi \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$, then there are $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, $h, e \in \mathcal{E}, l \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, a_{\max }-1\right\}$ so that

$$
E=f_{-\theta \mid p} s^{l} f_{h} V_{h^{+} e^{+}} f_{e}^{-1} f_{-\psi \mid q}^{-1}
$$

where $h^{-}=\theta_{p+1}^{+}, e^{-}=\psi_{q}^{+}$and $V_{h^{+} e^{+}}$is a similitude such that $V_{h^{+} e^{+}} A_{e^{+}}=$ $A_{h^{+}}$.

Proof. Since $\Pi(\theta)=E \Pi(\psi)$ and $\alpha$ is well-behaved we have $\alpha^{\xi(\psi \mid q)} \Pi(\theta)=$ $\alpha^{\xi(\psi \mid q)} E \Pi(\psi)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\xi(\psi \mid q)=\xi(\theta \mid p)+m \leq \xi(\theta \mid p+1)$. Note that $m=m(p, \theta, \psi)$ and $q=q(p, \theta, \psi)$. We calculate

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha^{\xi(\psi \mid q)} E \Pi(\psi) & =s^{\xi(\psi \mid q)} E s^{-\xi(\psi \mid q)} \alpha^{\xi(\psi \mid q)} \Pi(\psi)=s^{\xi(\psi \mid q)} E f_{-(\psi \mid q)} \Pi\left(S^{q} \psi\right) \\
\alpha^{\xi(\psi \mid q)} \Pi(\theta) & =\alpha^{m} \alpha^{\xi(\theta \mid p)} \Pi(\theta)=\alpha^{m} s^{\xi(\theta \mid p)} f_{-(\theta \mid p)} \Pi\left(S^{p} \theta\right) \\
& =s^{\xi(\theta \mid p)} s^{m} f_{-(\theta \mid p)} s^{-m} \alpha^{m} \Pi\left(S^{p} \theta\right) \\
& =s^{\xi(\psi \mid q)} f_{-(\theta \mid p)} s^{-m} \alpha^{m} \Pi\left(S^{p} \theta\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

In the following, the sequences of unions are increasing unions.

$$
\begin{aligned}
s^{m}\left(f_{-(\theta \mid p)}\right)^{-1} E f_{-(\psi \mid q)} \Pi\left(S^{q} \psi\right) & =\alpha^{m} \Pi\left(S^{p} \theta\right) \\
& =\alpha^{m} \Pi\left(S^{p} \theta \mid j\right) \cup \alpha^{m} \Pi\left(S^{p} \theta \mid j+1\right) \ldots \\
& =\alpha^{m} \Pi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right) \cup \alpha^{m} \Pi\left(\theta_{p+1} \theta_{p+2}\right) \cup \ldots \\
& =\alpha^{m} f_{-\theta_{p+1}} s^{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right)} T_{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right)}^{\theta_{p+1}^{+}} \cup \alpha^{m} f_{-\theta_{p+1} \theta_{p+2}} s^{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1} \theta_{p+2}\right)} T_{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1} \theta_{p+2}\right)}^{\theta_{p+2}^{+}} . \\
& =s^{m} f_{-\theta_{p+1}} s^{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right)-m} T_{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right)-m}^{\theta_{p+1}^{+}} \cup \ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

We also have

$$
s^{m}\left(f_{-(\theta \mid q)}\right)^{-1} E f_{-(\psi \mid q)} \Pi\left(S^{q} \psi\right)=s^{m}\left(f_{-(\theta \mid q)}\right)^{-1} E f_{-(\psi \mid q)} T_{0}^{\psi_{q}^{+}} \cup \ldots
$$

By choosing $P$ sufficiently large, the following equivalent statements hold for all $p \geq P$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& s^{m}\left(f_{-(\theta \mid p)}\right)^{-1} E f_{-(\psi \mid q)} T_{0}^{\psi_{q}^{+}} \text {meets } s^{m} f_{-\theta_{p+1}} s^{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right)-m} T_{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right)-m}^{\theta_{p+1}^{+}} \\
& s^{m-\xi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right)}\left(f_{-(\theta \mid p+1)}\right)^{-1} E f_{-(\psi \mid q)} T_{0}^{\psi_{q}^{+}} \text {meets } T_{\xi\left(\theta_{p+1}\right)-m}^{\theta_{p+1}^{+}}
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that, for some $e, h \in \mathcal{E}, l=\xi\left(\theta_{q+1}\right)-m$, we must have:

$$
\begin{aligned}
s^{-l}\left(f_{-(\theta \mid p+1)}\right)^{-1} E f_{-(\psi \mid q)} f_{e}\left(A_{e^{+}}\right) & =f_{h}\left(A_{h^{+}}\right) \text {where } h^{-}=\theta_{p+1}^{+}, e^{-}=\psi_{q}^{+} \\
f_{-h} s^{-l}\left(f_{-(\theta \mid p+1)}\right)^{-1} E f_{-(\psi \mid q)} f_{e} & =V_{h^{+}, e^{+}} \text {where } V_{h^{+}, e^{+}} A_{e^{+}}=A_{h^{+}} \text {is a similitude; } \\
E & =f_{-(\theta \mid p+1)} s^{l} f_{h} V_{h^{+}, e^{+}} f_{-e}\left(f_{-(\psi \mid q)}\right)^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

Replacing $p+1$ by $p$ yields the formula for $E$ in the statement of the theorem.

Notice how this result is consistent with Theorem 17 because if the system is rigid, then $s^{l} f_{h} V_{h^{+}, e^{+}} f_{-e}$ must be the identity. It has a nice interpretation in terms of the possibilities for Example 10; translations by $\frac{ \pm 1}{2}$ map any tiling of $\mathbb{R}$ into the same tiling, and correspond to the fact that in this case $T_{0}$ meets $T_{0} \pm \frac{1}{2}$.

## 12. Relationship with the self-Similar tiling spaces of Anderson and Putnam [1]

Here we construct the tiling spaces of Anderson and Putnam [1] (A\&P) and relate them to the tilings in this paper. We recall the terminology of A\&P with adjustments so that their setting intersects ours. In this Section a tile is homeomorphic to a closed ball in $\mathbb{R}^{M}$, a partial tiling is a set of tiles with disjoint interiors, a tiling is a partial tiling with support $\mathbb{R}^{M}$, and $\mathcal{U}$ is the set of euclidean translations on $\mathbb{R}^{M}$.

A\&P present the following general description of the kind of tilings they consider, in the introduction to [1]. 'A tiling of $\left(\mathbb{R}^{M}=\right) \mathbb{R}^{d}$ is a cover of $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ by sets, each of which is a translation of one of the prototiles ..., so that they overlap only on their boundaries. We also assume a substitution rule: we have a constant $\left(s^{-1}=\right) \lambda>1$ and, for each (A\&P) prototile, a rule for subdividing it into pieces, each of which is another prototile, scaled down by a factor $\lambda^{-1}$.

Next we report the construction of the A\&P tiling space $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$. We refer to the sets that $\mathrm{A} \& \mathrm{P}$ call prototiles as $\mathrm{A} \& \mathrm{P}-$ prototiles. For any partial tiling $T$, expansions $\lambda$ and translations $u$ are defined by A\&P according to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda T & =\{\lambda t: t \in T\} \text { for } \lambda \in(1, \infty) \\
u(T) & =\{u(t): t \in T\} \text { for all } u \in \mathcal{U}
\end{aligned}
$$

In A\&P $u \in \mathcal{U}$ is represented by $u \in \mathbb{R}^{M}$ and $u(t)=t+u$. The collection of tilings $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ is defined as follows. All tiles in a tiling in $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ are translations of a finite set of (AधP-)prototiles $\left\{\hat{p}_{i}: i=\right.$ $\left.1,2, \ldots, n_{\text {pro }}\right\}$. Let $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{A \& P}$ be the collection of all partial tilings that only contain translations of these prototiles. Assume there is a number $\lambda>1$ and a substitution rule that associates to each $\hat{p}_{i}$ a partial tiling $P_{i}$ with support $\hat{p}_{i}$ such that $\lambda P_{i}$ is in $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{A \& P}$. An inflation map $\hat{\omega}$ : $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{A \& P} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{A \& P}$ is defined by

$$
\hat{\omega}(T)=\lambda \bigcup_{u\left(\hat{p}_{i}\right) \in T} u\left(P_{i}\right)
$$

The tiling space $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ is the collection of tilings $T$ in $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_{\text {A\&P }}$ such that for any $P \subset T$ with bounded support, we have $P \subset \hat{\omega}^{n}\left(u\left(\hat{p}_{i}\right)\right)$ for some $n, i$,and $u$. Let $\omega=\left.\hat{\omega}\right|_{T_{A \& P}}$. A\&P point out that their definitions of the tiling space $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ and the operator $\omega$, are adapted from the standard ones for symbolic substitution dynamical systems, for example in [34], and are similar to the usage by [40]. It is also the same as the definition in [45]. But care must be taken with all such assertions of equivalence. For example, here we do not consider either labelled tiles or tiles with adornments.

The partial tilings $\left\{P_{i}\right\}$ of the prototiles $\left\{\hat{p}_{i}\right\}$ define a graph IFS $\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}\}$ in the following way. The vertices of $\mathcal{G}$ correspond to the A\&Pprototiles, one for each $\hat{p}_{v}, v=1,2, \ldots, n_{\text {pro }}$. There is one directed edge $e$ of $\mathcal{G}$ from vertex $v$ to $w$ for each distinct $u \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\lambda^{-1} \hat{p}_{w}+u \subset P_{v}$. The result is a directed graph $\mathcal{G}$ and a set of similitudes $\mathcal{F}$ so that

$$
P_{v}=\left\{f_{e}\left(\hat{p}_{e^{+}}\right): e^{-}=v\right\}, \hat{p}_{v}=\bigcup_{e^{-}=v} f_{e}\left(\hat{p}_{e^{+}}\right), f_{e}(x)=\lambda^{-1} x+u_{e}, u_{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{M}
$$

We have $A=\cup_{v} \hat{p}_{v}$ is the attractor of $\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}\}$ and $\left\{A_{v}=\hat{p}_{v}: v=1,2, \ldots, n_{\text {pro }}\right\}$ are its components. Using the construction following Definition 5 in Subsection 3.2, we can assume without loss of generality that the components $A_{v}=\hat{p}_{v}$ are disjoint. Also $\mathcal{F}$ obeys the OSC, as can be seen by choosing the open sets $\mathcal{O}_{v}$ to be the interiors of $\hat{p}_{v}$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Provided that the A\&P system is primitive as defined below, see (2) below, $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected and primitive as defined earlier. In this way the partial tilings $P_{i}$ of the prototiles $\hat{p}_{i}$ define a tiling $\operatorname{IFS}\{\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}\}$.

A\&P require that $\left(\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}, \omega, \mathcal{U}\right)$ have these three properties:
(1) $\omega: \mathbb{T}_{A \& P} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ is bijective;
(2) the substitution is primitive (there is a fixed positive integer $N_{0}$ such that for each pair of prototiles $\hat{p}_{i}$ and $\hat{p}_{j}$, there exists $u \in \mathcal{U}$ so that the partial tiling $\hat{\omega}^{N_{0}}\left(\left\{\hat{p}_{i}\right\}\right)$ contains $\left.u\left(\hat{p}_{j}\right)\right)$;
(3) $\mathbb{T}_{\text {A\&P }}$ satisfies a finite pattern condition: for each $r>0$, there are only finitely many partial tilings up to translation that are subsets of tilings in $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ and whose supports have diameters less than $r$.

Condition 1 is equivalent to recognizability as referred to by A\&P and as defined by [45]. See also [18] and references therein.

In other works, see [45], tilings are defined by starting from a selfsimilar tiling $T$ of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ and then taking the closure of the set of all translations of $T$. A\&P prove that the resulting collection of tilings is the same as $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P \text {. This leads us to the following question. How is }}$ $\mathbb{T}_{\text {A\&P }}$ related to the collection of tilings $\mathbb{T}$ defined in this paper?

To relate the two contexts note that our prototiles are related to A\&P-prototiles by $p_{v}=\lambda^{-1} \hat{p}_{v}$ for $v=1,2, \ldots,|\mathcal{V}|$ and $s=\lambda^{-1}$. In the present setting, where tiles have nonempty interiors, note that $\Sigma_{\text {rev }}^{\dagger}$ is the set of $\theta \in \Sigma_{\infty}^{\dagger}$ such that the support of $\Pi(\theta)$ is all of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$.

Theorem 19. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a rigid tiling IFS defined by the partial tilings $P_{i}$ of the sets $\hat{p}_{i} \in \mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$, let $\left|P_{i}\right|>1$ for all $i$, and let $A \xi \mathcal{P}$ 's conditions (1) and (2) hold. Then

$$
\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}=\left\{\lambda u(\Pi(\theta)): \theta \in \Sigma_{r e v}^{\dagger}, u \in \mathcal{U}\right\}
$$

We will need the following observation.
Proposition 1. Let $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ be a rigid tiling IFS with $a_{\max }=1$. Let $\Pi(\theta) \subset E \Pi(\psi)$ for some $\theta, \psi \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}, E \in \mathcal{U}$. Then $E \Pi(\psi)=\Pi(\theta \tilde{\psi})$ for some $\tilde{\psi} \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ such that $\tilde{\psi}^{-}=\theta^{+}, \psi^{+}=\tilde{\psi}^{+},|\psi|=|\theta|+|\tilde{\psi}|$.

Proof of Proposition 1.

$$
\begin{align*}
\Pi(\theta) & \subset E \Pi(\psi) \\
& \Longrightarrow \alpha^{|\theta|} \Pi(\theta) \subset \alpha^{|\theta|} E \Pi(\psi)  \tag{12.1}\\
& \Longrightarrow s^{|\theta|} f_{-\theta} T_{0}^{\theta^{+}} \subset s^{|\theta|} E f_{-\psi \mid(|\theta|)} \Pi\left(S^{|\theta|} \psi\right)=\tilde{E} \Pi(\tilde{\psi})
\end{align*}
$$

where $\tilde{E}:=s^{|\theta|} E f_{-\psi \mid(|\theta|)} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\tilde{\psi}:=S^{|\theta|} \psi$. But

$$
\tilde{E} \Pi(\tilde{\psi})=\tilde{E}\left\{f_{-\tilde{\psi}} f_{\omega}\left(T_{0}^{\omega^{+}}\right): \omega^{-}=\tilde{\psi}^{+},|\omega|=|\tilde{\psi}|\right\}
$$

so by rigidity there is some $\omega \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}$ with $\omega^{-}=\tilde{\psi}^{+}$and $|\omega|=|\tilde{\psi}|$, such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
s^{|\theta|} f_{-\theta} T_{0}^{\theta^{+}} & =\tilde{E} f_{-\tilde{\psi}} f_{\omega}\left(T_{0}^{\omega^{+}}\right) \\
& \Longrightarrow f_{-\theta} T_{0}^{\theta^{+}}=E f_{-\psi \mid(|\theta|)} f_{-\tilde{\psi}} f_{\omega}\left(T_{0}^{\omega^{+}}\right) \\
& \Longrightarrow f_{-\theta} T_{0}^{\theta^{+}}=E f_{-\psi \mid(|\theta|)} f_{-\tilde{\psi}} f_{\omega}\left(T_{0}^{\omega^{+}}\right) \\
& \Longrightarrow\left(f_{-\psi \mid(|\theta|)} f_{-\tilde{\psi}} f_{\omega}\right)^{-1} f_{-\theta}=E
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have again used rigidity to deduce the last implication. We now substitute back into Equation 12.1 to obtain

$$
\alpha^{|\theta|} E \Pi(\psi)=\alpha^{|\theta|}\left(f_{-\psi \mid(|\theta|)} f_{-\tilde{\psi}} f_{\omega}\right)^{-1} \Pi(\psi)
$$

and applying $\alpha^{-|\theta|}$ to both sides we get

$$
E \Pi(\psi)=\left(f_{-\psi \mid(|\theta|)} f_{-\tilde{\psi}} f_{\omega}\right)^{-1} \Pi(\psi)=\Pi(\theta \tilde{\psi})
$$

as stated in the Theorem.
Proof of Theorem 19. Let $T \in \mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$. Let $r>0$. Let $T_{r}$ be the partial tiling $T_{r}:=\left\{t \in T: t \cap B_{r}(O) \neq \varnothing\right\}$ where $B_{r}(O)$ is the open ball of radius $r$. Let $r_{1}=1$. Then $T_{1} \subset \hat{\omega}^{n_{1}}\left(u_{1}\left(\hat{p}_{i_{1}}\right)\right)$ for some $n_{1}, u_{1}, i_{1}$. Now choose $r_{2}>r_{1}$ so that $\hat{\omega}^{n_{1}}\left(u_{1}\left(\hat{p}_{i_{1}}\right)\right) \subset T_{r_{2}}$ and choose $n_{2}, i_{2}, u_{2}$ so that $T_{2} \subset \hat{\omega}^{n_{2}}\left(u_{2}\left(\hat{p}_{i_{2}}\right)\right)$. Proceeding in this manner we find

$$
T_{r_{1}=1} \subset \hat{\omega}^{n_{1}}\left(u_{1}\left(\hat{p}_{i_{1}}\right)\right) \subset T_{r_{2}} \subset \hat{\omega}^{n_{2}}\left(u_{2}\left(\hat{p}_{i_{2}}\right)\right) \subset T_{r_{3}} \subset \hat{\omega}^{n_{3}}\left(u_{2}\left(\hat{p}_{i_{3}}\right)\right) \subset \ldots
$$

Hence we can rewrite $T$ as a the union of a strictly increasing sequence of partial tilings,

$$
T=\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} T_{r_{k}}=\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \hat{\omega}^{n_{k}}\left(u_{k}\left(\hat{p}_{i_{k}}\right)\right)
$$

for some sequence $\left(n_{k}, u_{k}, i_{k}\right)$. Since the sequence $\left\{\hat{\omega}^{n_{k}}\left(u_{k}\left(\hat{p}_{i_{k}}\right)\right)\right\}$ is increasing (nested), we can replace the sequence $\{n=1,2,3, \ldots\}$ by any infinite subsequence of it. Also, let $\hat{p}_{v}$ be such that $\hat{p}_{v}=\hat{p}_{i_{k}}$
for infinitely many values of $k$. It follows that there is an infinite subsequence $\left(n_{k_{n}}, u_{k_{n}}\right)$ such that

$$
T=\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \hat{\omega}^{n_{k_{n}}}\left(u_{k_{n}}\left(\hat{p}_{v}\right)\right)=\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\left(s^{-1} u_{k_{n}} s \hat{\omega}^{n_{k_{n}}} \hat{p}_{v}\right)=s^{-1} \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\left(u_{k_{n}} T_{n_{k_{n}}-1}^{v}\right)
$$

It follows that there is a sequence $\left\{\theta^{\left(k_{n}\right)} \in \Sigma_{*}^{\dagger}:\left|\theta^{\left(k_{n}\right)}\right|=k_{n},\left(\theta^{\left(k_{n}\right)}\right)^{-}=v\right\}$ and a sequence of translations $\left\{E_{k_{n}} \in \mathcal{U}\right\}$ so that $s T$ can be written as the increasing union

$$
s T=\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_{k_{n}} \Pi\left(\theta^{\left(k_{n}\right)}\right)
$$

We now apply Proposition 1 repeatedly to deduce that there are unique $E \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\theta \in \Sigma^{\dagger}$ such that $E=E_{k_{n}}$ and $\theta \mid k_{n}=\theta^{\left(k_{n}\right)}$ for all $n$

$$
s T=\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E \Pi(\theta \mid n)=E \Pi(\theta)
$$

This completes the proof that $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P} \subset\left\{\lambda u(\Pi(\theta)): \theta \in \Sigma_{r e v}^{\dagger}, u \in \mathcal{U}\right\}$. To prove the inclusion the other way round, suppose that $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $\Pi(\theta)$ with $\theta \in \Sigma_{\text {rev }}^{\dagger}$ is given. Since $\theta \in \Sigma_{r e v}^{\dagger}, \Pi(\theta)$ is supported on $\mathbb{R}^{M}=\mathbb{R}^{d}$. Then we need to show that there is $T \in \mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ such that $T=u \lambda \Pi(\theta)$. We show instead that there is $T^{\prime} \in \mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ such that $T^{\prime}=\lambda \Pi(\theta)$ because then, by [1, Corollary 3.5], $\mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$ contains all translations of any tiling that it contains. Let $P$ be a patch in $\Pi(\theta)$. Then $P \subset \Pi(\theta \mid k)$ for some $k$. We show that $\Pi(\theta \mid k)=s \hat{\omega}^{k+1}\left(u\left(\hat{p}_{v}\right)\right)$ for some $u$ and $P_{v}$. But

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pi(\theta \mid k) & =f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{k} T_{k}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}}=f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{k} \alpha^{-k} T_{0}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \\
& =\alpha^{-k} f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{k} T_{0}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}}=\alpha^{-k} u T_{0}^{(\theta \mid k)^{+}} \\
& =s \hat{\omega}^{k+1}\left(u\left(\hat{p}_{v}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $u=f_{-(\theta \mid k)} s^{k} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $v=(\theta \mid k)^{+}$. Since the patch $P$ of $\Pi(\theta)$ is arbitrary, it follows that $\Pi(\theta) \in s \mathbb{T}_{A \& P}$.

If $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is rigid, then $\alpha$ and $\alpha^{-1}$ are well-defined on tilings. For the case where $a_{\max }=1$, tiles have non-empty interiors, and $\mathcal{U}$ is translations, this means if $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G})$ is rigid, then all tilings of $\mathbb{R}^{M}$ in $\mathbb{T}_{\infty}$ are recognizable in the sense of $A \& P$ and 45]. But we do not know whether or not, in the same setting, recognizability implies rigidity.
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