

# MARTIN COMPACTIFICATIONS OF AFFINE BUILDINGS

BERTRAND RÉMY AND BARTOSZ TROJAN

**ABSTRACT.** We carry out an in-depth study of Martin compactifications of affine buildings, that is, from the viewpoint of potential theory and random walks. This work does not use any group action on buildings, although in the end all the results can be stated within the framework of the Bruhat–Tits theory of semisimple groups over non-Archimedean local fields. This choice should allow the use of these building compactifications in intriguing geometric group theory situations, where only lattice actions are available. The choice avoiding the use of a group action requires going back to certain more classical compactification procedures. The compactified spaces we obtain use and, at the same time, make it possible to understand geometrically the descriptions of asymptotic behavior of kernels resulting from the non-Archimedean harmonic analysis on affine buildings.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper deals with the Martin compactifications of affine buildings. In other words, it makes a connection between two very different mathematical topics. On the one hand, affine buildings are relevant to algebra and geometry and, on the other hand, Martin compactifications refer to analysis, more precisely potential and probability theory. Therefore, our first task in this introduction, before mentioning the new results, is to introduce these two fields independently but in a way making them compatible with one another. At this stage let us simply say that dealing with compactifications associated to potential theory allows us to construct, from a concrete viewpoint, compactifications that before this approach could only be obtained artificially. Conversely, these compactifications provide a geometric way of understanding the various factors in the asymptotic formula for the Green function obtained previously by Gelfand–Fourier analytic methods.

In what follows, the geometry on which the various analytic concepts are defined (such as random walks, or heat and Martin kernels) are affine buildings. In many situations, the latter spaces are non-Archimedean analogues of Riemannian symmetric spaces; they were indeed designed for this purpose by F. Bruhat and J. Tits (see [13] and [14] for the full theory, and [51] for an overview). Affine buildings thus provide the well-adapted geometry that enables one to understand semisimple algebraic groups over non-Archimedean local fields, such as classical matrix groups over finite extensions of the field of  $p$ -adic numbers  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  (e.g. the group  $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  itself). However, some affine buildings of low rank do not come from algebraic groups, and thus have interesting features in geometric group theory. For this reason we avoid using group actions in the paper, even though we are led by this analogy. This approach is completely parallel to the way a semisimple real Lie group  $G$  without compact factor is understood, that is via its action on the associated symmetric space  $X = G/K$  where  $K$  is a maximal compact subgroup (see [25] and [37]). As a result, geometric proofs of crucial tools in Lie theory and in representation theory, such as the well-known Cartan and Iwasawa decompositions for non-Archimedean semisimple Lie groups, are obtained. The main difference with Lie theory over the reals is that maximal compact subgroups are now also open, which is consistent with the fact that affine buildings are discrete structures, namely products of simplicial complexes. For instance, affine buildings in rank 1, i.e. corresponding to hyperbolic spaces, are semi-homogeneous trees.

Apart from the above well-known algebraic consequences, this led to the possibility of studying questions which are also relevant to spherical harmonic analysis inspired by works of Harish-Chandra. Indeed, I. Satake showed that the non-Archimedean semisimple Lie groups can be considered in the general framework

---

*Date:* December 3, 2021.

The research was partial supported by Centre de Mathématiques Laurent Schwartz and the National Science Centre, Poland, Grant 2016/23/B/ST1/01665.

of Gelfand pairs since some suitable Hecke algebras of bi-invariant functions were shown to be commutative under convolution [49]. The corresponding spherical functions were computed by I.G. Macdonald in [31]. This opened the way to beautiful combinatorial problems [32]. It also provided a Gelfand–Fourier transform allowing to attack more advanced questions and get deeper understanding of analytic objects, such as heat kernels.

Among these more advanced analytic problems we naturally find the ones related to random walks and integral representations of the corresponding harmonic functions. The pioneering work in the field is due to H. Furstenberg who developed the crucial notion of boundaries from a probabilistic viewpoint in this Lie-theoretic context [20]. The latter notion had a strong impact on many questions in group theory, in particular in rigidity theory [35], and it is likely to be still useful in many situations in geometric group theory where rich structures from Lie theory are missing and need to be replaced by more flexible measure-theoretic ones [5]. The Martin compactification procedure is relevant to this context. It deals with positive harmonic functions on symmetric spaces with respect to the Laplace–Beltrami operator, which is the only bi-invariant second order differential operator on the automorphism group. Later, it was extended to more general situations, at least at the bottom of the spectrum; for instance to integral equations with respect to well-behaved probability measures in the terminology introduced by Guivarc’h–Ji–Taylor [23]. Our aim is to construct Martin compactifications for affine buildings. Note that in this case, the absence of differential structure so to speak leads us to unify the approach via the use of averaging operators (i.e. difference operators). Averaging operators naturally correspond to Markov chains. We also wish to cover situations where no sufficiently transitive group action is available which is a way to include some intriguing lower-dimensional exotic affine buildings (for existence see e.g. [47]).

To be more precise, let us recall that an affine building  $\mathcal{X}$  is a simplicial complex covered by subcomplexes all modeled on a given affine tiling, called apartments, see [10, Chapter V]. The latter subcomplexes are required to satisfy natural incidence axioms: any two simplices must be contained in an apartment, and given any two apartments there must exist a simplicial isomorphism fixing their intersection (see Section 2.1 for definitions). These axioms are particularly well-adapted to the construction of a complete non-positively curved distance on  $\mathcal{X}$  which makes buildings a beautiful source of examples of CAT(0)-spaces for geometric group theory [12]. In this paper we try to stick as much as possible to the discrete point of view which enables us to use more easily many notions from probability theory. The approach to Martin compactification in the discrete setup was described by J.L. Doob [19]. We want to compactify the set of all the so-called special vertices [13, Section 1.3.7] of a given affine building  $\mathcal{X}$ . However, in the case when the root system of  $\mathcal{X}$  is non-reduced, Fourier analytic tools lead us to split the set of special vertices into two subsets  $V_g$  and  $V_g^\varepsilon$  where  $V_g$  consists of the special vertices having the same type as the origin  $o$  (we call them good vertices, see Section 2.3 and [43]). In the reduced cases, all special vertices are good, so to treat all the buildings in a uniform way, we prefer to use the terminology good vertices. In any case, each maximal simplex (called an alcove) contains at least one good vertex, hence  $V_g$  is sufficiently large to provide a satisfactory compactification of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

We study an averaging operator  $A$  acting on functions on good vertices that is related to the transition function  $p(x, y)$  of a finite range random walk defined on  $V_g$  (see Section 9.1) as follows

$$Af(x) = \sum_{y \in V_g} p(x, y)f(y), \quad x \in V_g.$$

Finite range of the random walk guarantees that the embedding  $\iota_\zeta$  defined in (1.1) has discrete image. We also assume that the random walk is isotropic and irreducible, which are the natural conditions corresponding to the well-behaved probability measures on symmetric spaces. Let  $\varrho$  be the spectral radius of the operator  $A$  acting on  $\ell^2(V_g)$ ; it can be computed in purely Lie-theoretic terms. Classically, for each  $\zeta \geq \varrho$  we can define the  $\zeta$ -Green function

$$G_\zeta(x, y) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \zeta^{-n} p(n; x, y), \quad \text{for } x, y \in V_g$$

which leads to the Martin kernels

$$K_\zeta(x, y) = \frac{G_\zeta(x, y)}{G_\zeta(o, y)}.$$

We are now in position to define the Martin embedding associated to  $p$  and to the parameter  $\zeta$ . Let us denote by  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g)$  the set of positive  $\zeta$ -superharmonic functions on  $V_g$  (i.e. functions  $f$  on  $V_g$  such that  $Af \leq \zeta f$ ), normalized to take value 1 at the origin  $o$ . The set  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g)$  endowed with the topology of pointwise convergence is a compact second countable Hausdorff space, thus it is metrizable. The corresponding Martin embedding is the map

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \iota_\zeta : V_g &\longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g) \\ y &\longmapsto K_\zeta(\cdot, y) \end{aligned}$$

which can be shown to be injective with discrete image, and  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -equivariant for a suitably defined projective action on  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g)$  (see formula (9.6)). Such an embedding with these properties is a typical map we will use in this paper in order to define compactifications in the sense of Section 2.4. The closure of the image of  $\iota_\zeta$ , which we denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \zeta}$ , is called the Martin compactification of  $\mathcal{X}$  (associated to  $p$  and to the parameter  $\zeta \geq \varrho$ ). The following theorem collects the main results of our paper (see Theorems 9.5 and 9.6 for the convergence part at and above the bottom of the spectrum respectively, and see Theorems 9.2 and 9.4 for uniqueness).

**Theorem A.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a thick regular locally finite affine building.*

(i) *For any isotropic irreducible finite range random walk on  $\mathcal{X}$ , the following dichotomy holds:*

- [At the bottom of the spectrum case] *If  $\zeta = \varrho$ , then  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \varrho}$  is  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -equivariantly isomorphic to any of the Furstenberg (measure-theoretic) or the Guivarc'h (group-theoretic) or Caprace–Lécureux (combinatorial) compactifications of the set  $V_g$  of good vertices.*
- [Above the bottom of the spectrum case] *If  $\zeta > \varrho$ , then  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \zeta}$  is  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -equivariantly isomorphic to the join of any of the previous compactifications with the Gromov visual compactification.*

(ii) *If the root system is non-reduced, there exists an isotropic irreducible finite range random walk on  $\mathcal{X}$  providing Martin compactifications of special vertices satisfying the same dichotomy.*

On Figure 1 we present an example of the closure of an apartment in a Martin compactification when the parameter  $\zeta$  is above the bottom of the spectrum  $\varrho$ . As the picture suggests, and as stated in the theorem, the Martin compactification dominates both: the Gromov and the (maximal) Furstenberg compactifications. It is illustrated on Figure 2 at the level of closures of apartments.

Let us now discuss on some pre-existing compactifications. Many of them were initially defined when the affine building comes from a semisimple algebraic group  $\mathbf{G}$  over a locally compact non-Archimedean valued field  $k$ , the first ones being due to E. Landvogt thanks to a gluing procedure [29]. In this context, by Bruhat–Tits theory [13], the group  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  acts on an affine building  $\mathcal{X}$  and the action is strongly transitive in the sense that  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  acts transitively on the inclusions of an alcove (i.e. a maximal simplex) in an apartment. To our knowledge, the richest situation from the perspective of algebraic structures where full Bruhat–Tits buildings are compactified (not only their vertices) and where integral models of  $\mathbf{G}$  (as defined in [14]) are taken into account, is treated in [44]. This requires to use Berkovich analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields but at the end leads to connections with representation theory [45] and algebraic geometry [46]. The outcome is a finite family of compactifications, indexed (as in the case of symmetric spaces) by the conjugacy classes of parabolic subgroups. In the biggest one, corresponding to the choice of a minimal parabolic subgroup, the closure of the vertices is equivariantly isomorphic to the group-theoretic compactification, hence to the Martin compactification at the bottom of the spectrum, that is  $\zeta = \rho$ . Therefore, the case of a parameter above the bottom of the spectrum,  $\zeta > \rho$ , provides new compactifications of vertices which take into account additional radial parameters for the convergence of unbounded sequences (in addition to distances with respect to some faces of the Weyl sectors in the building). The following theorem collects Theorems B.1 and B.3 in Appendix B.




FIGURE 1. Closure of an apartment in the Martin compactification above the bottom of the spectrum ( $\tilde{A}_2$  case)




FIGURE 2. The left picture is the closure of an apartment in the Gromov compactification whereas the right picture is the closure of an apartment in the (maximal) Furstenberg compactification ( $\tilde{A}_2$  case)

**Theorem B.** *Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a semisimple algebraic group defined over a locally compact non-Archimedean valued field  $k$ , and let  $\mathcal{X}$  be its Bruhat–Tits building. We choose a good vertex in  $\mathcal{X}$  and denote by  $K$  its stabilizer. Let  $p$  be a compactly supported bi- $K$ -invariant well-behaved probability measure on  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ . Then the Martin compactification  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{M,\varrho}$  can be equivariantly identified with the maximal Satake–Berkovich compactification of  $\mathcal{X}$  (from analytic geometry); hence for  $\zeta > \varrho$ , the Martin compactification  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{M,\zeta}$  is the join of  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{M,\varrho}$  with the Gromov visual compactification.*

In other words, in Theorems [A](#) and [B](#) we provide a concrete potential-theoretic way to construct compactifications that could only be obtained artificially by means of joining two previously known compactifications (i.e. embedding diagonally the building in their product and taking the closure of the image).

The Guivarc’h (group-theoretic) compactification was first defined in the Bruhat–Tits case, namely in [\[24\]](#) where Furstenberg’s measure-theoretic approach was mainly used as a tool. Then P.-E. Caprace and J. Lécureux, using a generalized notion of sectors, defined a combinatorial compactification for arbitrary buildings [\[15\]](#). Then, in presence of a strongly transitive automorphism group, they identified it with the group-theoretic one (which consists in attaching a maximal compact subgroup to each vertex and in using compactness of the Chabauty space of all closed subgroups of  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ , see [Section 8](#) for more details).

In this paper, we also make the choice of working in a situation which is as much discrete as possible. This is consistent with standard references on random walks on graphs [55] and with some recent works dealing with spherical harmonic analysis on buildings, in particular those due to A.M. Mantero and A. Zappa (e.g. [33] and [34]) and to J. Parkinson (e.g. [42] and [43]). Moreover, the statements of Theorem A are valid even with small, possibly trivial, automorphism groups for  $\mathcal{X}$ : according to J. Tits' classification [52], there exist affine buildings that are not relevant to any algebraic group situation only when the dimension is 1 (trees) or 2. Nevertheless, the excluded cases are very interesting because in dimension 2 they lead to situations in which natural questions such as the linearity of some automorphism groups, (super)rigidity, arithmeticity or, on the contrary, simplicity properties of lattices, and also property (T) and strengthenings of it, make sense and are strong motivations to develop more tools of geometric and analytic nature (see for instance [4] and [30] for striking recent results in this field).

Another purely geometric approach was developed by C. Charignon [17] and by G. Rousseau [48]. For our purposes this is an interesting viewpoint since, without any group action, it sticks as much as possible to Bruhat–Tits' original approach governed by Lie combinatorics. By this we mean that the obtained compactifications, isomorphic to the previous ones, are those which make most easily appear the modular structure of the compact space: the boundary can be seen as a disjoint union of affine buildings at infinity of smaller rank, called *façades*<sup>1</sup> in [loc. cit.]. In the Bruhat–Tits case, these *façades* are proven to be the affine buildings attached to the parabolic subgroups of the initial non-Archimedean semisimple group [44]. We rely on this already known structure in order to study the convergence of sequences of harmonic measures on affine buildings in the spirit of Furstenberg compactifications. Each of these harmonic measures is defined on the maximal boundary  $\Omega$  of the affine building  $\mathcal{X}$ , which is the set of parallelism classes of sectors endowed with a natural totally disconnected topology ( $\Omega$  as a set consists of the chambers of the spherical building at infinity  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ , see [1, Section 11.8]).

Each harmonic measure is attached to a well-defined special vertex in the building and, roughly speaking, is characterized by the fact that it is the most symmetric probability measure on  $\Omega$  with respect to the vertex (see [41, Chapter 7] and Section 6.1). Noting that each stratum at infinity, being an affine building, can carry its own harmonic measures on its own maximal boundary, the following result, which we prove in Theorem 7.1, makes sense.

**Theorem C.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a thick regular locally finite affine building. The closure of the collection of harmonic measures on  $\mathcal{X}$  in the space of probability measures  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  on the maximal boundary  $\Omega$  endowed with the weak-\* topology is  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -equivariantly isomorphic to the façade or to the combinatorial compactification of  $\mathcal{X}$ . More precisely, the maximal boundary of each affine building at infinity, or stratum, can be seen as a residue in  $\Omega$  and any cluster value of any unbounded sequence of harmonic measures in  $\mathcal{X}$  is a harmonic measure on a well-defined stratum.*

Let us roughly sum up this part of the paper: affine buildings provide a suitable framework to generalize to higher dimensions the classical study of harmonic measures on infinite graphs (since the set of initial harmonic measures has a strong geometric structure related with Lie theory). The resulting measures at infinity are again harmonic measures for smaller affine buildings in the boundary, and therefore an analogous geometric structure at infinity is preserved.

The reader who knows about compactifications of non-compact Riemannian symmetric spaces has already understood that our results perfectly parallel the latter situation. In particular, we owe a lot to the book [23] by Y. Guivarc'h, L. Ji and J.-C. Taylor (see also [21] and [22]) where, among many other things, the precise descriptions of the Martin compactifications of symmetric spaces, both at the bottom and above the bottom of the spectrum, are given.

We used many ideas from there, in particular the idea of exhibiting well-chosen classes of unbounded sequences that become convergent after applying a suitable embedding with compact metrizable target space (e.g. a space of probability measures on a flag manifold, the Chabauty space of closed subgroups of the

---

1. The terminology *façade* refers to a French word meaning the front face of a building; here a *façade* is an affine building at infinity.



isometry group etc.). Of course, the book and Y. Guivarc’h’s quoted articles are the first places where most Bruhat–Tits analogues were formulated and conjectured.

We decided to push the logic of using sequences to its fullest application. This means that we have chosen to study the compactifications, possibly by adapting the class of sequences according to the finally expected boundary, through the parametrization of the points at infinity provided by the initial data characterizing the unbounded sequence used. Both for symmetric spaces and for Bruhat–Tits buildings, we know that the closure of a Weyl sector completely describes the compactification (it is a consequence of the Cartan decomposition). For a given compactification, the question is then to know which geometric parameters related to these simplicial cones are to be taken into account. In the case of the Gromov visual compactification, whose boundary is in all cases (Archimedean or not) a single spherical building, we know that the parameters are radial and provide a direction of escape in the cone. In the case of all other compactifications considered, with the exception of the Martin compactification above the bottom of the spectrum, the correct parameters are a partition of codimension 1 faces of Weyl sectors into two subsets: one for which the distances to the corresponding walls explode and the other for which the distances to the walls converge. In our approach, we obtain an identification between compactification by showing that the redundancies of parametrization of the limit points according to the sequence parameters are exactly the same on both sides. The beauty of the Martin compactification above the bottom of the spectrum is that we have to use a similar partition as before, but to use an additional (partially) radial parameter for the subset of walls with exploding distances (see Theorem 9.6): this explains why it is obtained by joining the visual and any of the other previous compactifications.

Apart from the already mentioned fact that we avoid using group actions in order to make our results available to the study of exotic situations, another significant difference with the book [23] is the fact that one key ingredient there was provided by estimates of the heat kernel and of Green functions due to J.-Ph. Anker and L. Ji [3], while we use here asymptotics for the Green kernels, previously obtained by the second author in [53]. The latter formulas are exact asymptotics of the requested kernels, so they can be directly used for our purposes. This can be seen as a further manifestation of the fact that some formulas in spherical harmonic analysis can be simplified more efficiently in the non-Archimedean case: Harish-Chandra’s integral formula for spherical functions remains what it is on real numbers, while it was algebraized by I.G. Macdonald as early as in the 1970s [31].

**Choices and conventions.** Let us repeat quickly some choices: we are generically dealing with affine buildings without assuming the existence of any sufficiently transitive group action. When dealing with affine buildings arising from semisimple groups over local fields, we will explicitly call the corresponding spaces *Bruhat–Tits buildings*: in other words, no Bruhat–Tits building if no group of rational points  $G(k)$ . Note that Appendix B is specifically dedicated to describing our results in this context.

In order to optimally use the requested analytic formulas (e.g. Green kernel asymptotics), we mainly see buildings as sets of (special or good) vertices; the only exception to this rule is Section 4 introducing affine buildings at infinity according to G. Rousseau’s approach (façades in his terminology). At last, for a given affine building, the only apartment system we use on it is the complete one (i.e., in the metric context, any subset isometric to a Euclidean space and maximal for this property is an apartment). At last, we use the notation  $\text{Stab}_G(x)$  to denote the stabilizer of a point  $x$  in a group  $G$  acting on a set  $X$  containing  $x$ .

**Structure of the paper.** Section 2 recalls as quickly as possible the useful notions from building theory; it introduces the relevant classes of unbounded sequences and the definition of a compactification in our context. Section 3 deals with combinatorial compactifications of buildings which can be introduced in a remarkably elementary way in the affine case and which will mainly be used as a tool in the paper. Section 4 is the place where we use different, more metric, definitions of buildings, in order to recall the purely geometric construction of affine buildings at infinity. Section 5 contains a discrete variation on the theme of visual compactifications; this adaptation is useful to describe Martin compactifications above the bottom of the spectrum when seeing a building as a set of vertices. Section 6 deals with maximal boundaries of affine buildings, by analogy with the group-theoretic situations; it contains results preparing the study of the Furstenberg compactification which may be useful in their own. The goal of Section 7 is precisely to describe

compactifications of affine buildings obtained by suitably embedding them into the spaces of probability measures on maximal boundaries; the point is to show that cluster values of unbounded sequences of harmonic measures are still harmonic measures for affine buildings at infinity. In Section 8 we assume the existence of a sufficiently transitive (but not necessarily Bruhat–Tits) group action in order to define the Guivarc’h compactification and identify it with the Furstenberg and the combinatorial ones. Section 9 is the main part of the paper: it studies the Martin compactifications of affine buildings and proves the main Theorem A; this requires to recall some notion from potential and probability theory. In Appendix A, we construct a distinguished random walk when the root system of the affine building is non-reduced; this random walk provides the desired Martin compactifications on the set of all special vertices (not only the good ones).

## 2. AFFINE BUILDINGS AND COMPACTIFICATIONS

**2.1. Buildings.** A family  $\mathcal{X}$  of non-empty finite subsets of some set  $V$  is an *abstract simplicial complex* if for all  $\sigma \in \mathcal{X}$ , each subset  $\gamma \subseteq \sigma$  also belongs to  $\mathcal{X}$ . The elements of  $\mathcal{X}$  are called *simplices*. The dimension of a simplex  $\sigma$  is  $\#\sigma - 1$ . Zero dimensional simplices are called *vertices*. The set  $V(\mathcal{X}) = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{X}} \sigma$  is the *vertex set* of  $\mathcal{X}$ . The dimension of the complex  $\mathcal{X}$  is the maximal dimension of its simplices. A *face* of a simplex  $\sigma$  is a non-empty subset  $\gamma \subseteq \sigma$ . For a simplex  $\sigma$  we denote by  $\text{St}(\sigma)$  the collection of simplices containing  $\sigma$ ; in particular,  $\text{St}(\sigma)$  is a simplicial complex. Two abstract simplicial complexes  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{X}'$  are *isomorphic* if there is a bijection  $\psi : V(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{X}')$  such that for all  $\sigma = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \in \mathcal{X}$  we have  $\psi(\sigma) = \{\psi(x_1), \dots, \psi(x_k)\} \in \mathcal{X}'$ . With every abstract simplicial complex  $\mathcal{X}$  one can associate its *geometric realization*  $|\mathcal{X}|$  in the vector space of functions  $V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with finite support, see e.g. [40, §2].

A set  $\mathcal{C}$  equipped with a collection of equivalence relations  $\{\sim_i : i \in I\}$  where  $I = \{0, \dots, r\}$ , is called a *chamber system* and the elements of  $\mathcal{C}$  are called *chambers*. A *gallery* of type  $f = i_1 \dots i_k$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a sequence of chambers  $(c_1, \dots, c_k)$  such that for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , we have  $c_{j-1} \sim_{i_j} c_j$ , and  $c_{j-1} \neq c_j$ . If  $J \subseteq I$ , a *residue* of type  $J$  is a subset of  $\mathcal{C}$  such that any two chambers can be joined by a gallery of type  $f = i_1 \dots i_k$  with  $i_1, \dots, i_k \in J$ . From a chamber system  $\mathcal{C}$  we can construct an abstract simplicial complex where each residue of type  $J$  corresponds to a simplex of dimension  $r - \#J$ . Then, for a given vertex  $x$ , we denote by  $C(x)$  the set of chambers containing  $x$ .

A *Coxeter group* is a group  $W$  given by a presentation

$$\langle r_i : (r_i r_j)^{m_{i,j}} = 1, \text{ for all } i, j \in I \rangle$$

where  $M = (m_{i,j})_{I \times I}$  is a symmetric matrix with entries in  $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$  such that for all  $i, j \in I$ ,

$$m_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \geq 2 & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

For a word  $f = i_1 \dots i_k$  in the free monoid  $I$  we denote by  $r_f$  an element of  $W$  of the form  $r_f = r_{i_1} \dots r_{i_k}$ . The length of  $w \in W$ , denoted  $\ell(w)$ , is the smallest integer  $k$  such that there is a word  $f = i_1 \dots i_k$  and  $w = r_f$ . We say that  $f$  is *reduced* if  $\ell(r_f) = k$ . A Coxeter group  $W$  may be turned into a chamber system by introducing in  $W$  the following collection of equivalence relations:  $w \sim_i w'$  if and only if  $w = w'$  or  $w = w' r_i$ . The corresponding simplicial complex  $\Sigma$  is called *Coxeter complex*.

A simplicial complex  $\mathcal{X}$  is called a *building of type  $\Sigma$*  if it contains a family of subcomplexes called *apartments* such that

- (B0) each apartment is isomorphic to  $\Sigma$ ,
- (B1) any two simplices of  $\mathcal{X}$  lie in a common apartment,
- (B2) for any two apartments  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  having a chamber in common there is an isomorphism  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}'$  fixing  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}'$  pointwise.

The rank of the building is the cardinality of the set  $I$ . We always assume that  $\mathcal{X}$  is irreducible. A simplex  $c$  is a chamber in  $\mathcal{X}$  if it is a chamber in any of its apartments. By  $C(\mathcal{X})$  we denote the set of chambers in  $\mathcal{X}$ . Using the building axioms we see that  $C(\mathcal{X})$  has a chamber system structure. However, it is not unique. A geometric realization of the building  $\mathcal{X}$  is its geometric realization as an abstract simplicial complex. In

this article we assume that the system of apartments in  $\mathcal{X}$  is *complete*, meaning that any subcomplex of  $\mathcal{X}$  isomorphic to  $\Sigma$  is an apartment. We denote by  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  the group of automorphisms of the building  $\mathcal{X}$ .

**2.2. Affine Coxeter complexes.** In this section we recall basic facts about root systems and Coxeter groups. A general reference is [10], which deals with Coxeter systems attached to reduced root systems. Since we use from the beginning possibly non-reduced root systems, we will also refer to [33, 41].

Let  $\Phi$  be an irreducible, but not necessary reduced, finite root system in a Euclidean space  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Select  $\{\alpha_i : i \in I_0\}$ , where  $I_0 = \{1, \dots, r\}$ , a fixed base of  $\Phi$ , and let  $\Phi^+$  be the corresponding set of all positive roots. Since  $\Phi$  is irreducible, there is a unique highest root  $\alpha_0 = \sum_{i \in I_0} m_i \alpha_i$ ,  $m_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . We set

$$I_g = \{0\} \cup \{i \in I_0 : m_i = 1\}.$$

For each  $\alpha \in \Phi$ , we define a dual root

$$\alpha^\vee = \frac{2}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} \alpha.$$

Let  $\Phi^\vee = \{\alpha^\vee : \alpha \in \Phi\}$  be the dual root system. Then the *co-root lattice*  $Q$  is the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -span of  $\Phi^\vee$ . Let  $Q^+ = \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} \mathbb{N}_0 \alpha^\vee$ . The dual basis to  $\{\alpha_i : i \in I_0\}$  are fundamental co-weights  $\{\lambda_i : i \in I_0\}$ . The co-weight lattice  $P$  is the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -span of  $\{\lambda_i : i \in I_0\}$ . A co-weight  $\lambda \in P$  is called dominant if  $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_0} x_i \lambda_i$  where  $x_i \geq 0$  for all  $i \in I_0$ . Finally, the cone of all dominant co-weights is denoted by  $P^+$ . If  $x_i > 0$  for all  $i \in I_0$ , then  $\lambda$  is strongly dominant.

Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the family of affine hyperplanes, called *walls*, being of the form

$$H_{\alpha; k} = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha \rangle = k\}$$

where  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Each wall determines two half-apartments

$$H_{\alpha; k}^- = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha \rangle \leq k\} \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\alpha; k}^+ = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha \rangle \geq k\}.$$

Note that for a given  $\alpha$ , the family  $H_{\alpha; k}^-$  is increasing in  $k$  while the family  $H_{\alpha; k}^+$  is decreasing. To each wall we associate  $r_{\alpha; k}$  the orthogonal reflection in  $\mathfrak{a}$  defined by

$$r_{\alpha; k}(x) = x - (\langle x, \alpha \rangle - k) \alpha^\vee.$$

Set  $r_0 = r_{\alpha_0; 1}$ , and  $r_i = r_{\alpha_i; 0}$  for each  $i \in I_0$ .

The *finite Weyl group*  $W$  is the subgroup of  $\text{GL}(\mathfrak{a})$  generated by  $\{r_i : i \in I_0\}$ . Let us denote by  $w_0$  the longest element in  $W$ . The *fundamental sector* in  $\mathfrak{a}$  defined as

$$S_0 = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in I_0\} = \bigoplus_{i \in I_0} \mathbb{R}_+ \lambda_i = \bigcap_{i \in I_0} H_{\alpha_i; 0}^+$$

is the fundamental domain for the action of  $W$  on  $\mathfrak{a}$ .

The *affine Weyl group*  $W^a$  is the subgroup of  $\text{Aff}(\mathfrak{a})$  generated by  $\{r_i : i \in I\}$ . Observe that  $W^a$  is a Coxeter group. The hyperplanes  $\mathcal{H}$  give the geometric realization of its Coxeter complex  $\Sigma_\Phi$ . To see this, let  $C(\Sigma_\Phi)$  be the family of closures of the connected components of  $\mathfrak{a} \setminus \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} H$ . By  $C_0$  we denote the *fundamental chamber* (or *fundamental alcove*), i.e.

$$C_0 = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha_0 \rangle \leq 1 \text{ and } \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in I_0\} = \bigcap_{i \in I_0} H_{\alpha_i; 0}^+ \cap H_{\alpha_0; 1}^-$$

which is the fundamental domain for the action of  $W^a$  on  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Moreover, the group  $W^a$  acts simply transitively on  $C(\Sigma_\Phi)$ . This allows us to introduce a chamber system in  $C(\Sigma_\Phi)$ : For two chambers  $C$  and  $C'$  and  $i \in I$ , we set  $C \sim_i C'$  if and only if  $C = C'$  or there is  $w \in W^a$  such that  $C = w.C_0$  and  $C' = wr_i.C_0$ .

The vertices of  $C_0$  are  $\{0, \lambda_1/m_1, \dots, \lambda_r/m_r\}$ . Let us denote the set of vertices of all  $C \in C(\Sigma_\Phi)$  by  $V(\Sigma_\Phi)$ . Under the action of  $W^a$ , the set  $V(\Sigma_\Phi)$  is made up of  $r+1$  orbits  $W^a.0$  and  $W^a.(\lambda_i/m_i)$  for all  $i \in I_0$ . Thus setting  $\tau_{\Sigma_\Phi}(0) = 0$ , and  $\tau_{\Sigma_\Phi}(\lambda_i/m_i) = i$  for  $i \in I_0$ , we obtain the unique labeling  $\tau_{\Sigma_\Phi} : V(\Sigma_\Phi) \rightarrow I$  such that any chamber  $C \in C(\Sigma_\Phi)$  has one vertex with each label.



For each simplicial automorphism  $\varphi : \Sigma_\Phi \rightarrow \Sigma_\Phi$  there is a permutation  $\pi$  of the set  $I$  such that for all chambers  $C$  and  $C'$ , we have  $C \sim_i C'$  if and only if  $\varphi(C) \sim_{\pi(i)} \varphi(C')$ , and

$$\tau_{\Sigma_\Phi}(\varphi(v)) = \pi(\tau_{\Sigma_\Phi}(v)), \quad \text{for all } v \in V(\Sigma_\Phi).$$

A vertex  $v$  is called *special* if for each  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$  there is  $k$  such that  $v$  belongs to  $H_{\alpha,k}$ . The set of all special vertices is denoted by  $V_s(\Sigma_\Phi)$ . A codimension 1 simplex whose vertices have their labels in  $I \setminus \{i\}$  is called an *i-panel*.

Given  $\lambda \in P$  and  $w \in W^a$ , the set  $S = \lambda + w.S_0$  is called a *sector* in  $\Sigma_\Phi$  with a *base vertex*  $\lambda$ . Its sector *i-panel* is  $\lambda + w.(S_0 \cap H_{\alpha_i;0})$ .

Moreover, by [1, Corollary 3.20], an affine Coxeter complex  $\Sigma_\Phi$  uniquely determines the affine Weyl group  $W^a$  but not a finite root system  $\Phi$ . In fact, the root systems  $C_r$  and  $BC_r$  have the same affine Weyl group.

**2.3. Affine buildings.** A building  $\mathcal{X}$  of type  $\Sigma$  is called an *affine building* if  $\Sigma$  is a Coxeter complex corresponding to an affine Weyl group. Select a chamber  $c_0$  in  $C(\mathcal{X})$  and an apartment  $\mathcal{A}_0$  containing  $c_0$ . Using an isomorphism  $\psi_0 : \mathcal{A}_0 \rightarrow \Sigma$  such that  $\psi_0(c_0) = C_0$ , we define the labeling in  $\mathcal{A}_0$  by

$$\tau_{\mathcal{A}_0}(v) = \tau_\Sigma(\psi_0(v)), \quad v \in V(\mathcal{A}_0).$$

Now, thanks to the building axioms the labeling can be uniquely extended to  $\tau : V(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow I$ . We turn  $C(\mathcal{X})$  into a chamber system over  $I$  by declaring that two chambers  $c$  and  $c'$  are *i-adjacent* if they share all vertices except the one of type  $i$  (equivalently, they intersect along an *i-panel*). For each  $c \in C(\mathcal{X})$  and  $i \in I$ , we define

$$q_i(c) = \#\{c' \in C(\mathcal{X}) : c' \sim_i c\} - 1.$$

In all the paper, we *assume* that  $q_i(c)$  only depends on  $i$ , i.e. that  $q_i(c)$  is independent of  $c$ , and therefore the building  $\mathcal{X}$  is *regular*; we henceforth write  $q_i$  instead of  $q_i(c)$ . We also assume that  $1 < q_i(c) < \infty$  and therefore the building  $\mathcal{X}$  is *thick* and *locally finite*. A vertex of  $\mathcal{X}$  is *special* if it is special in any of its apartments. The set of special vertices is denoted by  $V_s$ . We choose the finite root system  $\Phi$  in such a way that  $\Sigma$  is its Coxeter complex. In all cases except when the affine group has type  $C_r$  or  $BC_r$ , the choice is unique. In the remaining cases we select  $C_r$  if  $q_0 = q_r$ , otherwise we take  $BC_r$ . This guarantees that  $q_{\tau(\lambda)} = q_{\tau(\lambda+\lambda')}$  for all  $\lambda, \lambda' \in P$ , see the discussion in [33, Section 2.13].

Let us define the set of *good* vertices  $V_g$  consisting of those  $x \in V(\mathcal{X})$  having the type  $\tau(x) \in I_g$ . If  $\Phi$  is reduced, then all special vertices are good. However, we do not have this property in the case of  $BC_r$ . Indeed, there are two types of special vertices, 0 and  $r$ , but only those of type 0 are mapped to  $P$ . To deal with the vertices of type  $r$  we modify the isomorphisms  $\psi_0$  that we have used to define  $\tau$ . For this purpose we use the non-trivial automorphism  $\varphi_\varepsilon$  of the Coxeter complex which permutes the vertices of the base chamber  $C_0$ . Let  $\varepsilon$  be the corresponding permutation of the set  $I$ . We compose the isomorphism  $\psi_0$  with the automorphism  $\varphi_\varepsilon$  getting a new isomorphism  $\psi_\varepsilon$  which we use to get the new labeling  $\tau_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \circ \tau$  on  $V(\mathcal{X})$ , which we call  $\varepsilon$ -type. In particular, the vertices of type  $r$  have  $\varepsilon$ -type 0 now and vice-versa. We set  $V_g^\varepsilon = \{x \in V(\mathcal{X}) : \tau_\varepsilon(x) = r\}$ . Hence,  $V_s = V_g \sqcup V_g^\varepsilon$ . Now, all the statements for good vertices hold true for  $V_g^\varepsilon$  after application of the permutation  $\varepsilon$ . In general, all notations with an index  $\varepsilon$  will correspond to the standard notions after applying this twist of types.

A half-apartment in  $\mathcal{X}$  is a half-apartment in any of its apartments. For a subset  $X$  of  $V(\mathcal{X})$ , the convex hull of  $X$  is the set of all vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$  that belong to every half-apartment containing  $X$ . The convex hull of two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  is denoted by  $[x, y]$ . A subcomplex  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a *sector* of  $\mathcal{X}$  if it is a sector in any apartment. We say that  $\pi$  is the sector *i-panel* of  $\mathcal{S}$  if there are an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $\mathcal{S}$  and a type-preserving isomorphism  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Sigma$ , such that  $\psi(\pi)$  is the sector *i-panel* of the sector  $\psi(\mathcal{S})$ . Two sectors are *equivalent* if they contain a common subsector. The set of equivalence classes of sectors is denoted by  $\Omega$ . For any special vertex  $x \in V_s$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , there is a unique sector denoted by  $[x, \omega]$  which has base vertex  $x$  and represents  $\omega$ . For any two elements  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  from  $\Omega$  there is an apartment of  $\mathcal{X}$  containing sectors  $[x, \omega_1]$  and  $[x, \omega_2]$  for a certain special vertex  $x$ . If the apartment is unique we say that  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  are *opposite* while the apartment is denoted as  $[\omega_1, \omega_2]$ . For  $x \in V_s$  and  $y \in V(\mathcal{X})$ , we set

$$\Omega(x, y) = \{\omega \in \Omega : y \in [x, \omega]\}.$$

Then for each  $x \in V_s$ , the collection  $\{\Omega(x, y) : y \in V_s\}$  generates a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff topology in  $\Omega$ . The action of the automorphism group  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  can be extended to a continuous action on  $\Omega$ . We fix once and for all the origin  $o$  which is a good vertex of  $c_0$ .

Given two special vertices  $x, y \in V_s$ , let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing  $x$  and  $y$  and let  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Sigma$  be a type-rotating isomorphism such that  $\psi(x) = 0$  and  $\psi(y) \in S_0$ , see [41, Definition 4.1.1]. We set  $\sigma(x, y) = \psi(y) \in \frac{1}{2}P^+$ . If  $x$  and  $y$  are good vertices then  $\sigma(x, y) \in P^+$ . For  $\lambda \in P^+$  and  $x \in V_g$ , we denote by  $V_\lambda(x)$  the set of all good vertices  $y \in V_g$  such that  $\sigma(x, y) = \lambda$ . The building axioms entail that the cardinality of  $V_\lambda(x)$  depends only on  $\lambda$ , see [43, Proposition 1.5]. Let  $N_\lambda$  be the common value.

Let  $\Phi^{++}$  be the set of roots  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$  such that  $\frac{1}{2}\alpha \notin \Phi^+$ . If  $\alpha \in \Phi^{++}$  then  $q_\alpha = q_i$  provided that  $\alpha \in W.\alpha_i$  for  $i \in I$ . We define

$$\tau_\alpha = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha \notin \Phi, \\ q_\alpha & \text{if } \alpha \in \Phi, \text{ but } \frac{1}{2}\alpha, 2\alpha \notin \Phi, \\ q_{\alpha_0} & \text{if } \alpha, \frac{1}{2}\alpha \in \Phi, \text{ and therefore } 2\alpha \notin \Phi, \\ q_\alpha q_{\alpha_0}^{-1} & \text{if } \alpha, 2\alpha \in \Phi, \text{ and therefore } \frac{1}{2}\alpha \notin \Phi. \end{cases}$$

Let us define a multiplicative function on  $\mathfrak{a}$  by the following formula

$$\chi(\lambda) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} \tau_\alpha^{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle}, \quad \lambda \in \mathfrak{a}.$$

For  $w \in W^a$  having the reduced expression  $w = r_{i_1} \cdots r_{i_k}$ , we set  $q_w = q_{i_1} \cdots q_{i_k}$ . Then

$$(2.1) \quad N_\lambda = \frac{W(q^{-1})}{W_\lambda(q^{-1})} \chi(\lambda)$$

where  $W_\lambda = \{w \in W : w.\lambda = \lambda\}$ , and where for any subset  $U \subseteq W$  we set

$$U(q^{-1}) = \sum_{w \in U} q_w^{-1}.$$

We also have

$$(2.2) \quad N_{\varepsilon; \lambda} = \frac{W(q_\varepsilon^{-1})}{W_\lambda(q_\varepsilon^{-1})} \chi(\lambda).$$

Lastly, let us define the horocycle (or Busemann) function  $h : V_s \times V_s \times \Omega \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}P$ : For two special vertices  $x$  and  $y$ , and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we set

$$(2.3) \quad h(x, y; \omega) = \sigma(x, z) - \sigma(y, z)$$

where  $z$  is any special vertex belonging to  $[x, \omega] \cap [y, \omega]$ . In fact, the value  $h(x, y; \omega)$  is independent of  $z$ , see e.g. [33, Proposition 3.3]. Figure 3 presents the geometric interpretation of  $h(x, y; \omega)$ .




FIGURE 3. Geometric interpretation of the quantity  $h(x, y; \omega) = \lambda - \mu$

Moreover,  $h$  satisfies a cocycle relation, that is for every  $x, y, z \in V_s$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$(2.4) \quad h(x, y; \omega) = h(x, z; \omega) + h(z, y; \omega).$$

Fix  $x \in V_s$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing the sector  $[x, \omega]$ . The *retraction* on  $\mathcal{A}$  with respect to  $\omega$  and centered at  $x$  is the mapping  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{x, \omega} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  defined as follows: If  $\gamma$  is any simplex in  $\mathcal{X}$ , there is a subsector  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $[x, \omega]$  such that  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\gamma$  are in one apartment  $\mathcal{A}'$ . By the building axiom (B2), there is an isomorphism  $\phi : \mathcal{A}' \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  fixing  $\mathcal{S}$  pointwise. Then  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{x, \omega}(\gamma) = \phi(\gamma)$ . The definition of  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{x, \omega}(\gamma)$  is independent of the apartment  $\mathcal{A}'$ . If  $x$  is a special vertex and  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Sigma$  is a type-rotating isomorphism such that  $\psi([x, \omega]) = S_0$ , then

$$h(x, y; \omega) = \psi(\rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{x, \omega}(y))$$

for all  $y \in V_s$ .

**2.4. Compactifications.** A *compactification* of the building  $\mathcal{X}$  is a pair  $(\iota, H)$  where  $H$  is a compact second countable Hausdorff space and  $\iota$  is an embedding of all special vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$  into  $H$  such that  $\iota(V_s)$  is a discrete set. Then the closure of the image  $\iota(V_s)$  equipped with the induced topology is a compact Hausdorff space. Since  $H$  is metrizable, to describe  $\text{cl}(\iota(V_s))$  it is sufficient to consider sequences of special vertices  $(x_n)$  such that  $(\iota(x_n))$  converges in  $H$ . If  $G$  is a subgroup of the automorphism group of  $\mathcal{X}$  that acts on  $H$ , the compactification is called a *G-compactification* if  $\iota$  is  $G$ -equivariant, that is  $\iota(g.x) = g.\iota(x)$  for all  $x \in V_s$  and  $g \in G$ .

We say that  $(\iota_1, H_1)$  *dominates*  $(\iota_2, H_2)$  if there is a continuous mapping  $\eta : H_1 \rightarrow H_2$  such that  $\iota_2 = \eta \circ \iota_1$ . If  $\eta$  happens to be a homeomorphism,  $(\iota_1, H_1)$  is said to be *isomorphic* to  $(\iota_2, H_2)$ . Lastly, if both are  $G$ -compactifications then  $(\iota_1, H_1)$  is  $G$ -isomorphic to  $(\iota_2, H_2)$  provided  $\eta$  is  $G$ -equivariant.

Given two compactifications  $(\iota_1, H_1)$  and  $(\iota_2, H_2)$  of the building  $\mathcal{X}$ , we can produce another compactification  $(\iota, H_1 \times H_2)$ , by setting  $\iota(x) = (\iota_1(x), \iota_2(x))$  for  $x \in V_s$ . It is denoted as  $(\iota_1, H_1) \vee (\iota_2, H_2)$ . Notice that  $(\iota_1, H_1) \vee (\iota_2, H_2)$  is the smallest compactification that dominates both  $(\iota_1, H_1)$  and  $(\iota_2, H_2)$ .

To describe the compactifications, we study sequences of special vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$  approaching infinity. To be precise, a sequence  $(x_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  of special vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$  *approaches infinity* if for any finite subset  $F \subset V_s$  there is  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for all  $n \geq N$ ,  $x_n \notin F$ . In fact, the way how the sequence approaches infinity can be refined. A sequence  $(x_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  of special vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$  is a *core* sequence, if all have the same type and there are  $\omega \in \Omega$ , a subset  $J \subseteq I_0$ , possibly empty, and numbers  $(c_j : j \in J) \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{N}_0^J$ , such that

$$(1) \quad (x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}) \subset [o, \omega],$$

$$(2) \quad \text{for all } j \in J \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$\langle \sigma(o, x_n), \alpha_j \rangle = c_j,$$

$$(3) \quad \text{for all } i \in I_0 \setminus J,$$

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \sigma(o, x_n), \alpha_i \rangle = \infty.$$

In this case  $(x_n)$  is often called  $(\omega, J, c)$ -core sequence. Let us observe that if  $(x_n) \subset V_g$  then  $(c_j : j \in J) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^J$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Every sequence approaching infinity contains a core subsequence.*

*Proof.* Let  $(x_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be sequence approaching infinity. For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set

$$A_n = \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} \Omega(o, x_k).$$

Then  $(A_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  is a decreasing sequence of nonempty clopen subsets of  $\Omega$ , that is at the same time closed and open sets. Since  $\Omega$  is compact we have

$$(2.5) \quad \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} \Omega(o, x_k) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \neq \emptyset.$$

Let  $\omega$  be any element of the left-hand side of (2.5). Then there is an increasing function  $f_0 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\omega \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \Omega(o, x_{f_0(n)}),$$

i.e.  $x_{f_0(n)} \in [o, \omega]$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Next, for each  $j = 1, \dots, r$ , we can find a monotonically increasing function  $f_j : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that the subsequence  $(\langle \sigma(o, x_{f_j(n)}), \alpha_j \rangle : n \in \mathbb{N})$  realizes the limit superior of  $(\langle \sigma(o, x_{f_{j-1}(n)}), \alpha_j \rangle : n \in \mathbb{N})$ . Observe that, if the limit superior is finite we can select  $f_j$  such that  $\langle \sigma(o, x_{f_j(n)}), \alpha_j \rangle$  is constant.  $\square$

To describe the visual compactification (see Section 5) and Martin compactification (see Section 9.5) we need further refinement of the sequences approaching infinity. Let

$$\mathbb{S}_+^{r-1} = \{u \in \mathbb{S}^{r-1} : \langle u, \alpha \rangle \geq 0, \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Phi^+\}$$

where  $\mathbb{S}^{r-1}$  denotes the unite sphere in  $\mathfrak{a}$ . A sequence  $(x_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  of special vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$  is an *angular* sequence if there is  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $u \in \mathbb{S}_+^{r-1}$  such that  $(x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}) \subset [o, \omega]$  and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma(o, x_n)}{|\sigma(o, x_n)|} = u.$$

We often say that  $(x_n)$  is  $(\omega, u)$ -sequence. The sequences that are at the same time core and angular are called angular core sequences. By compactness of  $\mathbb{S}^{r-1}$  and Lemma 2.1 we have:

**Lemma 2.2.** *Every sequence approaching infinity contains an angular subsequence.*

### 3. COMBINATORIAL COMPACTIFICATIONS

To study Guivarc'h compactification in Section 8 we use yet another construction described in [15] for a wide class of buildings not necessarily of affine type. Since we are interested in compactifying special vertices only, we can make the approach more explicit. In particular, we show convergence of core sequences and identify when the limits are the same. Thanks to this we immediately conclude in Section 7 that the combinatorial and Furstenberg compactifications are  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -equivariantly isomorphic.

For this purpose, let

$$(3.1) \quad \Gamma(\mathcal{X}) = \left\{ \gamma : V(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{x \in V(\mathcal{X})} \text{St}(x) : \gamma(x) \in \text{St}(x) \text{ for all } x \in V(\mathcal{X}) \right\}.$$

Since  $V(\mathcal{X})$  is countable and  $\text{St}(x)$  is finite for each  $x \in V(\mathcal{X})$ , by Tychonoff's theorem  $\Gamma(\mathcal{X})$  is a compact metrizable space. For an automorphism  $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{X})$ , we set

$$(g \cdot \gamma)(x) = g \cdot \gamma(g^{-1} \cdot x), \quad \text{for } x \in V(\mathcal{X}).$$

Let us consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : V_s &\longrightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{X}) \\ x &\longmapsto \gamma_x \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.2) \quad \gamma_x(y) = \bigcap_{c \in C(x)} \text{proj}_y(c), \quad y \in V(\mathcal{X}),$$

whereas  $C(x)$  is the set of chambers in  $\text{St}(x)$  and  $\text{proj}_y(c)$  is the unique chamber in  $\text{St}(y)$  that is the closest to  $c$ . The map  $\iota$  is equivariant, injective and has discrete image. The latter two properties are consequences of

$$(3.3) \quad \gamma_x(y) = \text{maximal simplex in } \text{St}(y) \text{ with vertices in } [x, y]$$

which leads to  $\gamma_x(y) = x$  if and only if  $y = x$ . In particular, the codimension of  $\gamma_x(y)$  is the number of independent walls containing  $x$  and  $y$ . For the proof of (3.3) see [15, Lemma 1.1]. The closure of  $\iota(V_s)$  in  $\Gamma(\mathcal{X})$  is called combinatorial compactification and it is denoted by  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_C$ . The map  $\gamma_x$  can be interpreted as a discrete vector field. This analogy was already mentioned in [15, Introduction] and we make it more concrete below. In the following theorem we study the corresponding boundary in terms of core sequences.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that  $(x_n)$  is an  $(\omega, J, c)$ -core sequence. Then for every  $y \in V(\mathcal{X})$ , the sequence  $(\gamma_{x_n}(y) : n \in \mathbb{N}_0)$  is eventually constant, and thus*

$$\gamma(y) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{x_n}(y) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} \gamma_{x_n}(y).$$

*If  $(x'_n)$  is an  $(\omega', J', c')$ -core sequence such that  $(\gamma_{x'_n})$  converges to the same limit then  $J' = J$ ,  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ , and  $c' = c$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $[o, x_n] \subset [o, x_{n+1}]$ , the set

$$Q = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [o, x_n]$$

is convex. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any apartment containing  $Q$ . First, we show that for each  $y \in V(\mathcal{A})$ , the sequence  $(\gamma_{x_n}(y) : n \in \mathbb{N}_0)$  is eventually constant. Indeed, there is  $n_0$  such that every half-apartment in  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $y$  with boundary parallel to  $\alpha$ -wall for  $\alpha \in \Phi \setminus \Phi_J$ , contains  $x_n$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . On the other hand if  $\alpha \in \Phi_J$ , then the half-apartment containing  $y$  with the boundary parallel to  $\alpha$ -wall which is passing through  $x_n$ , is independent of  $n$ . Hence, by (3.3), we easily conclude that  $\gamma_{x_n}(y)$  is eventually constant.

Next, let us consider  $y \in V(\mathcal{X})$  such that there is no apartment containing  $y$  and  $Q$ . Let  $(c_1, \dots, c_k)$  be the shortest gallery between  $Q$  and  $y$ . Let  $c_j$  be the last chamber in this gallery that can be put in one apartment with  $Q$ . Take  $\mathcal{A}$  to be an apartment containing both  $c_j$  and  $Q$ , and let  $L^\alpha$  be the half-apartment in  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $c_j$  whose boundary contains the panel shared between  $c_j$  and  $c_{j+1}$ . Since  $c_{j+1}$  cannot be put into the common apartment with  $Q$ , the boundary  $\partial L^\alpha$  intersects  $Q$ . Let  $L$  be the half-apartment in  $\mathcal{A}$  with the boundary  $\partial L^\alpha$  which contains  $\omega$ . Since  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{o, \omega}(y) \in V(\mathcal{A})$ , the sequence

$$(\gamma_{x_n}(\rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{o, \omega}(y)) : n \in \mathbb{N}_0)$$

is eventually constant. Moreover,  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{o, \omega}$  restricted to  $\text{conv}\{L, y\}$  is an isomorphism onto its image, thus the sequence  $(\gamma_{x_n}(y))$  is eventually constant too. This completes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

Next, let us define  $Q_x$  for  $x \in V(\mathcal{X})$  by the formula

$$(3.4) \quad Q_x = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} [x, x_n].$$

We have the following fact, which can be understood as the construction of a discrete geodesic flow.

**Claim 3.2.** *For each  $x \in V(\mathcal{X})$ ,  $Q_x$  is the minimal set  $Q' \subset V(\mathcal{X})$  with the properties:*

- (i)  $x \in Q'$ ,
- (ii) if a vertex  $y \in Q'$  then  $\gamma(y) \subset Q'$ .

*Moreover,  $Q_x$  consists of all vertices  $y \in V(\mathcal{X})$  such that there is a sequence of vertices  $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , such that  $x_0 = x$ ,  $x_n = y$  and  $x_{j+1} \in \gamma(x_j)$  for all  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ .*

For the proof, let us denote by  $\tilde{Q}_x$  the intersection over all subsets of  $V(\mathcal{X})$  satisfying (i) and (ii). Observe that  $\tilde{Q}_x \subseteq Q_x$ . To see this it is enough to show that  $Q_x$  satisfies (ii). If  $y \in Q_x$  then there is  $m \geq 1$  such that  $y \in [x, x_n]$  for all  $n \geq m$ , thus by (3.3) we have  $\gamma(y) \subset [x, x_n]$  for all  $n \geq m$ . To show the reverse inclusion, we prove that for each  $y \in Q_x$  there is a sequence of vertices  $(u_0, \dots, u_m)$  such that  $u_0 = x$ ,  $u_m = y$  and  $u_{j+1} \in \gamma(u_j)$  for all  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$ . We proceed by induction on the length of a minimal gallery between  $x$  and  $y$ . It is trivial if the length equals 1. Suppose that a minimal gallery between  $x$  and  $y$  has length  $k \geq 2$ . Let  $x'$  be any vertex in  $[x, y]$  other than  $x$  and  $y$ . Since  $y \in Q_x$ , there is  $n_0$  such that  $y \in [x, x_n]$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . Hence,  $x' \in [x, x_n]$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ , and so  $x' \in Q_x$ . Since the length of a minimal gallery between  $x$  and  $x'$  is smaller than  $k$ , by the inductive hypothesis, there is a sequence of vertices  $(u'_0, \dots, u'_{m'})$  such that  $u'_0 = x$ ,  $u'_{m'} = x'$ , and  $u'_{j+1} \in \gamma(u'_j)$  for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, m'-1\}$ . Moreover,  $y \in [x', x_n]$  for all  $n \geq n_0$  thus  $y \in Q_{x'}$ . Since the length of a minimal gallery between  $x'$  and  $y$  is smaller than  $k$ , by the inductive



hypothesis, there is a sequence of vertices  $(u''_0, \dots, u''_{m''})$  such that  $u''_0 = x'$ ,  $u''_{m''} = y$ , and  $u''_{j+1} \in \gamma(u''_j)$  for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, m'' - 1\}$ . Therefore, the desired sequence is  $(u'_0, \dots, u'_{m'}, u''_1, \dots, u''_{m''})$  which completes the proof of the claim.

To finish the proof of the theorem, let us assume that there are two core sequence  $(x_n)$  and  $(x'_n)$  such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{x_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{x'_n} = \gamma.$$

Thanks to Claim 3.2,

$$\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [o, x_n] = Q_o(\gamma) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [o, x'_n],$$

which easily leads to  $c = c'$ ,  $J = J'$  and  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ . □

#### 4. AFFINE BUILDINGS AT INFINITY

In this section, we adopt the geometric viewpoint on affine buildings (e.g., we recall the existence of complete, non-positively curved metrics) and we introduce various related structures, mainly at infinity. For instance we go back to the classical definition of the spherical building at infinity of a given affine building (Section 4.1) and, less classically, we introduce some auxiliary affine buildings of smaller rank, called *façades* (after G. Rousseau [48]). There are façades of two kinds. The outer façades are defined thanks to a wide generalization of the parallelism equivalence relation on sectors: the generalization applies to the family of subsets taken into account (we use chimneys and not only sectors, see Section 4.2), and also on the equivalence relations (roughly speaking, we take into account the value of Hausdorff distance between these subsets). The inner façades are inessential sub-buildings that are very useful for technical purposes. The former façades were recently introduced in order to construct, in a purely combinatorial way and without any group consideration, the polyhedral compactification of an affine building [17], while the latter ones had already been introduced by Bruhat–Tits [13, 7.6] in a group-theoretic context, which we can eventually get rid of. We conclude this section by understanding maximal boundaries of façades in terms of residues in the spherical building at infinity; this is useful when studying limits of harmonic measures in Section 7.

**4.1. Geometric and metric realizations.** In this paper, even though our starting point is a combinatorial definition of buildings (which is well adapted to our analytic arguments), we are sometimes led to using geometric realizations of affine buildings, as well as the associated non-positively curved distances. The initial buildings are discrete subsets of their geometric realizations.

For geometric realizations, we proceed as in J. Tits' paper on the classification of affine buildings [52]. This allows us to use G. Rousseau's upcoming book [48] in which apartments are by definition Euclidean affine spaces (in order to directly treat non-discrete buildings). We will also use [17] which sticks to the case we consider, namely locally finite affine buildings. Let us fix the following notational convention: if  $\mathcal{A}$  is a (discrete) apartment, then  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes its geometric realization;  $\mathcal{A}$  is thus a Euclidean affine space on which the affine Weyl group  $W^a$  acts by isometries. Accordingly, we denote by  $\mathcal{X}$  the geometric realization of  $\mathcal{X}$  and we adopt the same convention for sectors: if  $\mathcal{S}$  is a sector, we denote by  $\mathcal{S}$  its geometric realization. This additional structure on the geometric realization of each apartment is the suitable context to define cones in apartments (in the usual real affine sense, i.e. stability under  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -action by scalars) and we can also use the notions of vectorial and conical directions in apartments. Each sector  $\mathcal{S}$  is a simplicial cone, and so is each of its faces, which we will call a *sector face* of  $\mathcal{X}$  without refereeing to any specific sector containing it.

For any type of building, whenever the model for the apartments has a geometric realization admitting a distance which is invariant under the Weyl group, the geometric realization of the ambient building can be endowed with a distance which restricts to the initial one on each apartment [12, Theorem 10A.4]. If we start with a Weyl-invariant CAT(0)-distance on the apartments, we obtain a CAT(0)-distance on the building and each type-preserving automorphism extends to an isometry. This is obviously the case for affine buildings, and actually the CAT(0)-distance we will use was considered from the very beginning of affine building

theory [13, Section 2.5]. The distance on  $\mathcal{X}$ , as for any metric space, leads to the notion of *Hausdorff distance*  $d_H$  between subsets. Namely, for  $A, B \subset \mathcal{X}$ , we set

$$d_H(A, B) = \inf \{ \varepsilon > 0 : A \subset V_\varepsilon(B) \text{ and } B \subset V_\varepsilon(A) \}$$

where  $V_\varepsilon(C)$  denotes the  $\varepsilon$ -neighborhood  $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : d(x, C) < \varepsilon\}$  of  $C \subset \mathcal{X}$ . We say that two subsets in  $\mathcal{X}$  are *asymptotic* if they are at finite Hausdorff distance from one another; this is an equivalence relation.

The non-positively curved distance  $d$  on an affine building  $\mathcal{X}$  provides an intrinsic definition of geodesic segments between two points, namely:

$$[x, y] = \{z \in \mathcal{X} \mid d(x, z) + d(z, y) = d(x, y)\}$$

for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ . Geodesic segments themselves are the starting point of convexity arguments. The convex hull of a subset  $Y$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  is the smallest subset containing it and stable by taking geodesic segments between points in  $Y$ ; when  $Y$  is contained in an apartment, it is also the intersection of the affine half-spaces contained in the apartment and containing  $Y$ . The discrete version of the convex hull in this context was defined in [13, 2.4]: the *enclosure* of a subset  $Y$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  intersecting an alcove is the smallest subset of  $\mathcal{X}$  containing  $Y$  and stable by taking (closures of) minimal galleries between alcoves intersecting  $Y$ . When  $Y$  is contained in an apartment, it is also the intersection of the (closed) affine half-spaces contained in the apartment, bounded by a wall and containing  $Y$ . The advantage of the latter definition is that it applies to arbitrary subsets of apartments [13, Proposition 2.4.5].

The set of equivalence classes of geodesic rays is a spherical building with Weyl group  $W$ , [48, Theorem 3.2.14], we call it the *spherical building at infinity* of  $\mathcal{X}$  (or of its discrete subset  $\mathcal{X}$ ), and we denote it by  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{X}$  in the metric context of this section (or  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$  in the discrete context adopted anywhere else). For any cone  $C$  in some apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  (e.g. for any sector face in  $\mathcal{A}$ ), we denote by  $\partial_\infty C$  the set of asymptotic classes of rays drawn in  $C$ . The set of asymptotic classes of sector faces is the set of facets in the spherical building at infinity  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{X}$  (see [52] where the asymptotic equivalence relation is called *parallelism*, or also [1, Section 11.8]). There is a unique apartment system in  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{X}$  which consists of the boundaries  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{A}$  of the apartments  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  (recall that we systematically deal with full apartment systems for all the affine buildings in this paper).

As a set, the maximal boundary  $\Omega$  defined in Section 2.3 consisting of the parallelism classes of sectors, is the set of chambers of the spherical building  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ . It is a chamber system in which two chambers  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  are *i*-adjacent if there are sectors  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{S}'$  representing  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  respectively, and such that  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}'$  contains a codimension sector face (called *sector panel*) representing an *i*-panel in the spherical building  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ .

**4.2. Sector faces, chimneys and equivalence relations.** Let us recall the construction of an affine building associated to each facet in the spherical building at infinity  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{X}$ . The resulting collection of such buildings gives a stratification of the boundary of almost all the compactifications we consider in this paper (the exceptions are the visual and the Martin compactifications above the bottom of the spectrum: we explain this in Section 9.5). The affine buildings at infinity, indexed by the facets in  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{X}$ , are called *façades* in [48, Section 3.3]; they provide an important geometric viewpoint on the study of convergence of core sequences.

Recall first that a *sector face* in the building  $\mathcal{X}$  is a cone  $\mathcal{F}$ , in some apartment  $\mathcal{A}$ , of the form  $\mathcal{F} = x + \vec{F}$  where  $x \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $\vec{F}$  is some vector face in the vectorial model of  $\mathcal{A}$ ; we say then that  $\vec{F}$  is the *direction* of the sector face. This notion can be generalized in the following way: for any facet  $\sigma$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , the convex hull  $\text{encl}(\sigma + \vec{F})$  is called the *chimney*  $\mathcal{R}(\sigma, \vec{F})$  based at  $\sigma$  and *directed* by  $\vec{F}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , see [17, Definition 4.2.2].

Loosely speaking, taking into account the numerical values of the Hausdorff distance between sector faces (or, more generally, between cones) in the same asymptotic class leads to a more subtle equivalence relation on cones of given direction (i.e. of given asymptotic class). Here, chimneys are technical tools which are used to define a simplicial structure (and, eventually, a building structure) on the corresponding set of equivalence classes.

More precisely, the asymptotic equivalence relation can also be formulated into more combinatorial terms, see [17, Definition 4.7.1]. Let  $\mathcal{F} = x + \vec{F}$  be a sector face. A subsector face  $\mathcal{F}'$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  (i.e., a sector face  $\mathcal{F}'$  contained in  $\mathcal{F}$ ) is said to be *full* in  $\mathcal{F}$  if the sector faces  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{F}'$  have the same direction. Similarly, but

taking into account the fact that the base of a chimney is now a facet and not a mere point, we say that a subchimney  $\mathcal{R}'$  of  $\mathcal{R}$  (i.e., a chimney  $\mathcal{R}'$  contained in  $\mathcal{R}$ ) is *full* in  $\mathcal{R}$ , if  $\mathcal{R}'$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  have the same direction and generate the same affine subspace in any apartment containing  $\mathcal{R}$ . We define the *germ (at infinity)*  $\text{germ}_\infty(\mathcal{R})$  of a chimney  $\mathcal{R} = \text{cl}(\sigma + \vec{F})$ : a chimney  $\mathcal{R}'$  belongs to  $\text{germ}_\infty(\mathcal{R})$  if and only if  $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{R}'$  contains a chimney which is full in both  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{R}'$ . Figure 4 shows a chimney, two equivalent chimneys and two adjacent chimneys.




FIGURE 4. The first figure shows a chimney, the second one shows two equivalent chimneys and the third one illustrates adjacency of chimneys and of their classes in the façade.

**4.3. Affine buildings at infinity, or (outer) façades.** Let us choose  $F_\infty$  a facet in  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{X}$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$  the set all germs of sector faces whose direction belongs to the asymptotic class  $F_\infty$ , that is

$$\mathcal{X}(F_\infty) = \{\text{germ}_\infty(\mathcal{F}) : \mathcal{F} \text{ sector face such that } \partial_\infty \mathcal{F} \subseteq F_\infty\}.$$

The set  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$  admits an affine building structure [48, Section 3.3.15] where the apartments are given by apartments  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{A} \supset F_\infty$ : for such an  $\mathcal{A}$ , the corresponding apartment in  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$  is

$$\mathcal{A}(F_\infty) = \{\text{germ}_\infty(\mathcal{F}) : \mathcal{F} \text{ sector face contained in } \mathcal{A} \text{ and such that } \partial_\infty \mathcal{F} \subseteq F_\infty\}.$$

The facets are the germs of chimneys whose direction is given by  $F_\infty$ , [18, Section 2.6]. Note that the building  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$  is not contained in  $\mathcal{X}$  since it is abstractly constructed out of germs at infinity of vector faces. Nevertheless there is a natural map

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{F_\infty} : \mathcal{X} &\rightarrow \mathcal{X}(F_\infty) \\ x &\mapsto \text{germ}_\infty(x + F_\infty) \end{aligned}$$

which is a homomorphism of buildings in the sense of [48, Section 2.1.13].

We have a good compatibility between this construction and buildings at infinity. Let  $R(F_\infty)$  denote the residue of  $F_\infty$  in the spherical building at infinity  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{X}$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a sector one of whose sector faces represents  $F_\infty$ : this means that  $F_\infty$  is a facet of  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{S}$ , or also that the parallelism class of  $\mathcal{S}$ , denoted by  $[\mathcal{S}]_\parallel$ , belongs to  $R(F_\infty)$ . The sectors in  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$  are the images under the above map  $\pi_{F_\infty}$  of such sectors [18, Section 2.6]. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{S}'$  be two such sectors. If we assume in addition that they are parallel, there is a subsector  $\mathcal{S}''$  in  $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{S}'$ . Then  $\pi_{F_\infty}(\mathcal{S}'')$  is a common subsector of the sectors  $\pi_{F_\infty}(\mathcal{S})$  and  $\pi_{F_\infty}(\mathcal{S}')$  in  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$ , so that  $\pi_{F_\infty}(\mathcal{S})$  and  $\pi_{F_\infty}(\mathcal{S}')$  are parallel. This allows us to define the surjective map

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{F_\infty} : R(F_\infty) &\rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)} \\ [\mathcal{S}]_\parallel &\mapsto [\pi_{F_\infty}(\mathcal{S})]_\parallel \end{aligned}$$

where the notation  $[\cdot]_\parallel$  corresponds to taking the relevant parallelism class on each side of the map. If  $J$  is the type of  $F_\infty$ , the maximal boundary  $\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)}$  is the residue  $\text{res}_J(c_\infty)$  where  $c_\infty$  is any chamber at infinity whose closure contains  $F_\infty$ .

We can also put a building structure on a well-chosen subset of  $\mathcal{X}$ , making it a sub-building in the sense of [48, Section 2.1.15]. This requires to choose another facet  $F'_\infty$  which is opposite  $F_\infty$ , i.e. such that there is some apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  in which  $F'_\infty = -F_\infty$  (which we may write  $F'_\infty = \text{opp}_{\mathcal{A}}(F_\infty)$  sometimes). Given such a facet  $F'_\infty$  we consider the subset of apartments

$$\mathcal{A}(F_\infty, F'_\infty) = \{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A} : \partial_\infty \mathcal{A} \supset F_\infty \cup F'_\infty\}$$

and we set

$$\mathcal{X}(F_\infty, F'_\infty) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{A}(F_\infty, F'_\infty)} \mathcal{A}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty, F'_\infty)$  is a non-essential affine building for which  $\mathcal{A}(F_\infty, F'_\infty)$  is a system of apartments; it is called the *inner façade* associated to  $F_\infty$  and  $F'_\infty$ , [48, Section 3.3.14]. The restricted map  $\pi_{F_\infty}|_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty, F'_\infty)}$  is the essentialization map of  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty, F'_\infty)$ : this is part of the content of [18, Theorem 2.8] in which more precise statements can be found.

**Remark 1.** In the Bruhat–Tits case described more precisely in Appendix B, we will see that each outer façade  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$  is the Bruhat–Tits building associated to the semisimple quotient of the parabolic subgroup stabilizing  $F_\infty$ . Picking an opposite facet  $F'_\infty$  corresponds to picking a parabolic subgroup  $\text{Stab}(F'_\infty)$  which is opposite  $\text{Stab}(F_\infty)$ , i.e.  $\text{Stab}(F_\infty) \cap \text{Stab}(F'_\infty)$  is a Levi factor in both parabolic subgroups (see Section B.4 for more details).

Let us see what the concrete counterpart of these constructions is, at the level of apartments; this will be useful when studying the convergence of core sequences for some compactifications. We work in the Euclidean space  $\mathfrak{a}$  that is the vectorial model of the apartments in  $\mathcal{X}$ , hence in  $\mathcal{X}$ , see Section 2.2. Given  $J \subsetneq I_0$ , let  $\Phi_J$  to be the set of roots  $\alpha \in \Phi$  such that  $\langle \alpha, \lambda_k \rangle = 0$  if  $k \notin J$ . Let  $\tilde{\alpha}_0$  be the highest root in  $\Phi_J$ . In  $\mathfrak{a}$ , we consider the subcollection of walls  $\mathcal{H}_J$  consisting of all hyperplanes  $H_{j;k}$  for  $j \in J$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , together with

$$H_{\tilde{\alpha}_0;k} = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \tilde{\alpha}_0 \rangle = k\} \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let  $\tilde{r}_0$  be the orthogonal reflection with respect to  $H_{\tilde{\alpha}_0;1}$ . We denote by  $W_J$  and  $W_J^a$  the subgroups of  $W$  and  $W^a$  generated by  $\{r_j : j \in J\}$  and  $\{\tilde{r}_0\} \cup \{r_j : j \in J\}$ , respectively. Let  $C_J(\Sigma)$  be the family of all open connected components of  $\mathfrak{a} \setminus \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}_J} H$ . Since the group  $W_J^a$  acts transitively on  $C_J(\Sigma)$ , we can turn it into a chamber system. Let  $\Sigma_J$  denote the resulting abstract simplicial complex. The space  $\mathfrak{a}$  is an inessential realization of  $\Sigma_J$  in the sense of [10, Chapter V]. Since  $\mathcal{H}_J \subset \mathcal{H}$ , we can see  $\Sigma_J$  as a subcomplex of  $\Sigma$ . In particular, each half apartment in  $\Sigma_J$  is a half apartment in  $\Sigma$ . For each  $(k_j : j \in J) \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the set

$$\{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha_j \rangle = k_j \text{ for all } j \in J\}$$

is called a  $J$ -vertex. The fundamental  $J$ -sector is

$$S^J = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \langle x, \alpha_j \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } j \in J\}.$$

All  $J$ -sectors in  $\Sigma_J$  are of the form  $w.S^J$  for some  $w \in W_J^a$ .

In order to obtain from  $\mathfrak{a}$  an essential realization of  $\Sigma_J$  we need to introduce the orthonormal projection  $\pi_J$  onto  $\mathfrak{a}_J = \bigoplus_{j \in J} \mathbb{R}\alpha_j$  which is a direct factor in the orthogonal decomposition  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_J \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I_0 \setminus J} \mathbb{R}\lambda_i$ . For  $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ , we have

$$\pi_J(x) = P_J(x) = \sum_{j \in J} \langle x, \alpha_j \rangle P_J(\lambda_j)$$

where

$$(4.1) \quad P_J(x) = \frac{1}{|W_J|} \sum_{w \in W_J} (x - w.x).$$

We also set  $Q_J = \text{id} - P_J$ . To see that  $P_J$  indeed performs the orthogonal projection onto  $\mathfrak{a}_J$ , note first that for each  $j \in J$  and each  $i \in I_0 \setminus J$  we have  $s_j.\lambda_i = \lambda_i$ , hence  $w.x = x$  for each  $w \in W_J$  and each  $x \in \bigoplus_{i \in I_0 \setminus J} \mathbb{R}\lambda_i$ ; moreover, the fact that  $P_J$  acts as the identity on  $\mathfrak{a}_J$  comes from the irreducibility of the standard linear representation of an irreducible Coxeter system.

To sum up, when  $J$  varies over the proper subsets of  $I_0$ , the Euclidean spaces  $\mathfrak{a}$  endowed with the subcollections of walls  $\mathcal{H}_J$  are models for the apartments in the inner façades  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty, F'_\infty)$  associated to opposite facets at infinity; after projection onto  $\mathfrak{a}_J$ , we obtain the models for the apartments of the façades at infinity  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$ .

We finish with two lemmas that will be useful while studying convergence of core sequences.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $(x_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be an  $(\omega, J, c)$ -core sequence and let  $F = F_J$  be the associated spherical facet at infinity. Let  $z \in V_g$ . Then there are an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $F \subset \partial_\infty \mathcal{A}$ , a vertex  $\bar{z} \in V_g \cap \mathcal{A}$  with  $\pi_F(z) = \pi_F(\bar{z})$ , and an integer  $N \geq 0$  such that for all  $n \geq N$  we have  $x_n \in \mathcal{A}$  and*

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(\pi_F(z), \pi_F(x_n)) = P_J(\sigma(\bar{z}, x_n)).$$

*Proof.* By definition of an  $(\omega, J, c)$ -core sequence, each vertex  $x_n$  defines the same vertex at infinity  $\pi_F(x_n)$  in the façade at infinity  $\mathcal{X}(F)$ . There is an apartment in the building  $\mathcal{X}(F)$  containing  $\pi_F(z)$  and  $\pi_F(x_n)$ , and this apartment corresponds to an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  containing the germs at infinity of  $z + F$  and of  $x_0 + F$ , hence full subcones  $\bar{z} + F$  and  $x_N + F$  for some index  $N$ . Let  $F'$  be the facet opposite  $F$  in  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{A}$ . Since  $\bar{z}, x_n$  (for  $n \geq N$ ) and the direction  $\vec{F}$  are contained in  $\mathcal{A}$ , the retraction onto the inner façade  $\mathcal{X}(F, F')$  is distance-preserving for these vertices [48, Section 3.3.17], so we have  $\sigma(\bar{z}, x_n) = \sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F, F')}(\bar{z}, x_n)$ . The result follows in view of the above description of the essentialization of apartments and since  $\pi_F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(F)$  is the composition of the retraction  $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(F, F')$  with the essentialization map  $\mathcal{X}(F, F') \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(F)$  dividing each apartment by  $\alpha_F^\perp$ , see [48, Section 3.3.17].  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *For any spherical facet at infinity  $F_\infty$ , the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{F_\infty} : R(F_\infty) &\rightarrow \Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)} \\ [S]_\parallel &\mapsto [\pi_{F_\infty}(S)]_\parallel \end{aligned}$$

*is a homeomorphism.*

*Proof.* We already know that the map  $\varphi_{F_\infty}$  is surjective since it is obtained from factorizing by parallelism equivalence relations, at the levels of the source and the target, the map obtained from  $\pi_{F_\infty}$  sending surjectively the set of sectors in  $\mathcal{X}$  to the set of sectors in  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$ . Now, if we take sectors  $S$  and  $S'$  both containing a sector face directed by  $F_\infty$ , then we can find subsectors  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  of  $S$  and  $S'$  respectively, contained in the same apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  and still both containing a sector face directed by  $F_\infty$ . If  $S$  and  $S'$  are not parallel to one another to start with, then neither are  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  so that there exists  $w$  in the spherical Weyl group, non-trivial but stabilizing  $F_\infty$ , sending  $\mathcal{T}$  to  $\mathcal{T}'$ , say. After projecting by  $\pi_{F_\infty}$  this provides two sectors in the apartment  $\pi_{F_\infty}(\mathcal{A})$  which are deduced from one another by a non-trivial element of the Weyl group of  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$ , hence non parallel to one another. This proves the injectivity of  $\varphi_{F_\infty}$ .

To finish the proof, we use compactness of the source  $R(F_\infty)$  of  $\varphi_{F_\infty}$ . This fact is the content of Corollary 6.4 whose proof is completely independent from what follows. Therefore, in order to conclude that  $\varphi_{F_\infty}$  is a homeomorphism, it is enough to show its continuity. Let  $x_\infty, y_\infty \in \mathcal{X}(F_\infty) \cap \pi_{F_\infty}(V_s)$  and let  $\omega \in \varphi_{F_\infty}^{-1}(\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)}(x_\infty, y_\infty))$ , where  $\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)}(x_\infty, y_\infty)$  is a shadow defined in the maximal boundary  $\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)}$  of  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$ . By definition of a shadow, we have  $y_\infty \in [x_\infty, \varphi_{F_\infty}(\omega)]$ . The sector  $[x_\infty, \varphi_{F_\infty}(\omega)]$  is contained in an apartment of the façade  $\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)$ , which we can write  $\pi_{F_\infty}(\mathcal{A})$  for an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $\partial_\infty \mathcal{A}$  represents  $F_\infty$ . Let  $x \in \mathcal{A} \cap V_s$  be such that  $\pi_{F_\infty}(x) = x_\infty$ . In  $\mathcal{A}$ , there exists a sector tipped at  $x$  whose image by  $\pi_{F_\infty}$  is in the parallelism class  $\varphi_{F_\infty}(\omega)$ . By injectivity of  $\varphi_{F_\infty}$  this sector represents  $\omega$  so we can write  $[x_\infty, \varphi_{F_\infty}(\omega)] = \pi_{F_\infty}([x, \omega])$ . Now, we choose  $y \in [x, \omega] \cap V_s$  such that  $\pi_{F_\infty}(y) = y_\infty$  and we consider the shadow  $\Omega(x, y)$ . Let  $\omega' \in R(F) \cap \Omega(x, y)$ . We have  $y \in [x, \omega']$ , so applying  $\pi_{F_\infty}$  we obtain  $y_\infty \in [x_\infty, \varphi_{F_\infty}(\omega')]$ . This shows that the neighborhood  $\Omega(x, y)$  of  $\omega$  is contained in  $\varphi_{F_\infty}^{-1}(\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)}(x_\infty, y_\infty))$ . This proves the continuity of  $\varphi_{F_\infty}$  since  $\omega$  was picked arbitrarily in the preimage  $\varphi_{F_\infty}^{-1}(\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F_\infty)}(x_\infty, y_\infty))$ .  $\square$

We close this section by investigating the connection between façades and core sequences. Let  $(x_n)$  be an  $(\omega, J, c)$ -core sequence with respect to an origin  $o \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then  $\omega$  and  $J$  define a residue  $\text{res}_J(\omega) \subset \Omega$  and an associated facet at infinity  $F_J$ . To simplify notation, we denote  $\pi_{F_J}$  and  $\varphi_{F_J}$  by  $\pi_J$  and  $\varphi_J$ , respectively. Then  $\pi_J([o, \omega])$  is a sector in the façade  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$  and the image by  $\pi_J$  of  $(x_n)$  is a constant sequence whose image is a special vertex of  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$ , which we denote by  $x_{(\omega, J, c)}$ , or  $x_c$  when  $\omega$  and  $J$  are clear in the context. Note that if  $J' \subsetneq J$  and if  $(z_n)$  is an  $(\omega, J', c')$ -core sequence, then its projection by  $\pi_J$  is a core sequence in the façade  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$ ; more precisely, it is a  $(\varphi_J(\omega), J', c)$ -core sequence in  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$ , whose associated residue is the  $J'$ -residue of  $\varphi_J(\omega)$ ; by the previous lemma, the latter residue identifies with  $\text{res}_{J'}(\omega)$  in  $\Omega$ .



## 5. VISUAL COMPACTIFICATION

In this section we describe the visual compactification that can be constructed for any CAT(0) space  $X$ . For this purpose we embed  $X$  into the space of continuous functions on  $X$ . The visual boundary corresponds to the Busemann functions. The method was originally introduced in [6, §3] for complete Riemannian manifolds of non-positive curvature, and it has been extended to CAT(0) spaces in [12, Chapter II.8]. It is often called horofunction procedure. In particular, it depends on the choice of the metric. In our construction we use intrinsic and natural metric well-defined for special vertices avoiding the use of geometric realization of the building.

First, let us observe that

$$d(x, y) = |\sigma(x, y)|, \quad \text{for } x, y \in V_s,$$

defines a metric on special vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$ . To see this, recall that for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ , and  $x, y \in V_s$ ,

$$(5.1) \quad \langle \sigma(x, y), \alpha \rangle \geq \langle h(x, y; \omega), \alpha \rangle, \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \Phi^+.$$

Hence, for  $y \in [x, \omega]$  and  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ , by the cocycle relation we get

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \sigma(x, y), \alpha \rangle &= \langle h(x, y; \omega), \alpha \rangle = \langle h(x, z; \omega), \alpha \rangle + \langle h(z, y; \omega), \alpha \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \sigma(x, z), \alpha \rangle + \langle \sigma(z, y), \alpha \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that the triangle inequality holds.

Now, let us denote by  $C_*(V_s)$  the quotient space of real-valued functions on  $V_s$  equipped with the topology of pointwise convergence by the 1-dimensional subspace of constant functions. We introduce the action of the automorphisms group  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  on  $C^*(V_s)$  by setting for  $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ ,

$$g \cdot [f] = [g \cdot f]$$

where  $[f]$  is the equivalence class represented by  $f$ , and

$$(g \cdot f)(y) = f(g^{-1} \cdot y), \quad y \in V_s.$$

Now, we define the embedding

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : V_s &\longrightarrow C_*(V_s) \\ x &\longmapsto [f_x] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f_x(y) = -d(y, x), \quad y \in V_s.$$

It is easy to check that the map  $\iota$  is equivariant and injective, and  $\iota(V_s)$  is discrete. Let us denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_V$  the closure of  $\iota(V_s)$  in  $C_*(V_s)$ . The space  $C_*(V_s)$  is metrizable, thus by Lemma 2.2 while studying the visual boundary we can restrict attention to angular sequences.

We start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Fix  $\omega \in \Omega$  and  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ . If  $(y_n) \subset [o, \omega]$  is a sequence of special vertices such that*

$$(5.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \sigma(o, y_n), \alpha \rangle = \infty,$$

*then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \sigma(o, y_n) - \sigma(x, y_n), \alpha \rangle = \langle h(o, x; \omega), \alpha \rangle.$$

*Proof.* It is enough to consider  $\alpha = \alpha_j$  for  $j \in I_0$ . If the system is non-reduced and  $j = r$ , we take  $\alpha = 2\alpha_r$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing  $[o, \omega]$ . Select any  $z \in [o, \omega] \cap [x, \omega]$ . We claim that there is  $n_0$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,

$$\langle \sigma(o, y_n) - \sigma(x, y_n), \alpha \rangle = \langle \sigma(o, z) - \sigma(x, z), \alpha \rangle.$$

For the proof, we set  $x' = \rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{o, \omega}(x)$ . In view of (5.3), there is  $n_0$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ , the number of  $\alpha$ -walls separating  $x$  and  $y_n$  is the same as the number of  $\alpha$ -walls between  $x'$  and  $y_n$ . Since  $z$  belongs to

$[o, \omega] \cap [x, \omega]$ , also the number of  $\alpha$ -walls between  $x$  and  $z$  equals the number of  $\alpha$ -walls between  $x'$  and  $z$ . Therefore,

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \sigma(x, y_n), \alpha \rangle &= \langle \sigma(x', y_n), \alpha \rangle, \\ \langle \sigma(x, z), \alpha \rangle &= \langle \sigma(x', z), \alpha \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Next, let us denote by  $L_o, L_{x'}, L_z$  and  $L_{y_n}$  the half-apartments containing  $\omega$  with the boundary parallel to  $\alpha$  and passing through  $o, x', z$  and  $y_n$ , respectively. By possibly increasing  $n_0$ , we can guarantee that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,  $L_{y_n} \subsetneq L_{x'}$  and  $L_{y_n} \subsetneq L_z$ . Since  $z$  belongs to  $[o, \omega] \cap [x', \omega]$ , we must have  $L_z \subsetneq L_o$  and  $L_z \subsetneq L_{x'}$ . Therefore there are only two possibilities

$$L_{y_n} \subsetneq L_z \subsetneq L_o \subsetneq L_{x'}$$

or

$$L_{y_n} \subsetneq L_z \subsetneq L_{x'} \subsetneq L_o.$$

In both cases it is easy to check that the number of  $\alpha$ -walls between  $o$  and  $y_n$  minus the number of  $\alpha$ -walls between  $x'$  and  $y_n$  equals the number of  $\alpha$ -walls between  $o$  and  $z$  minus the number of  $\alpha$ -walls between  $x'$  and  $z$ . Namely,

$$\langle \sigma(o, y_n) - \sigma(x', y_n), \alpha \rangle = \langle \sigma(o, z) - \sigma(x', z), \alpha \rangle,$$

which together with (5.4) finishes the proof.  $\square$

The following theorem can be used to define the spherical building at infinity which was introduced in Section 4.1.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $(x_n)$  be an angular  $(\omega, u)$ -sequence. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [f_{x_n}(y)] = [u, h(o, y; \omega)], \quad y \in V_s.$$

*If  $(x'_n)$  is  $(\omega', u')$ -sequence such that  $(f_{x'_n})$  converges to the same limit then  $u = u'$  and  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$  where  $J = \{i \in I_0 : \langle u, \alpha_i \rangle = 0\}$ .*

*Proof.* We write

$$(5.5) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{x_n}(y) - f_{x_n}(o) &= \frac{|\sigma(o, x_n)|^2 - |\sigma(y, x_n)|^2}{|\sigma(y, x_n)| + |\sigma(o, x_n)|} \\ &= \frac{2\langle \sigma(o, x_n), \sigma(o, x_n) - \sigma(y, x_n) \rangle - |\sigma(o, x_n) - \sigma(y, x_n)|^2}{|\sigma(y, x_n)| + |\sigma(o, x_n)|}. \end{aligned}$$

By (5.2), for all  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$  we get

$$\langle \sigma(y, x_n), \alpha \rangle \leq \langle \sigma(y, o), \alpha \rangle + \langle \sigma(o, x_n), \alpha \rangle$$

and

$$\langle \sigma(o, x_n), \alpha \rangle \leq \langle \sigma(o, y), \alpha \rangle + \langle \sigma(y, x_n), \alpha \rangle.$$

Since  $|\sigma(o, y)| = |\sigma(y, o)|$ , we obtain

$$(5.6) \quad |\sigma(y, x_n) - \sigma(o, x_n)| \leq |\sigma(o, y)|.$$

Therefore, by (5.5),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_{x_n}(y) - f_{x_n}(o) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle \sigma(o, x_n), \sigma(o, x_n) - \sigma(y, x_n) \rangle}{|\sigma(o, x_n)|}.$$

In view of (5.6),

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\langle \sigma(o, x_n), \sigma(o, x_n) - \sigma(y, x_n) \rangle}{|\sigma(o, x_n)|} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle u, \sigma(o, x_n) - \sigma(y, x_n) \rangle.$$

Since  $(x_n)$  approaches infinity, the inequality  $\langle u, \alpha \rangle > 0$  implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \sigma(o, x_n), \alpha \rangle = +\infty,$$

thus by Lemma 5.1,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle u, \sigma(o, x_n) - \sigma(y, x_n) \rangle = \langle u, h(o, y; \omega) \rangle$$

as claimed.

Let us now turn to the proof of the second part of the theorem. Suppose that

$$(5.7) \quad \langle u, h(o, y; \omega) \rangle = \langle u', h(o, y; \omega') \rangle, \quad \text{for all } y \in V_s.$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$ , and let  $o'$  be any good vertex in  $\mathcal{A}$ . By the cocycle relation and (5.7), we get

$$\langle u, h(o', y; \omega) \rangle = \langle u', h(o', y; \omega') \rangle, \quad \text{for all } y \in V_s.$$

Hence, there is  $w \in W$  such that

$$(5.8) \quad \langle u, \lambda \rangle = \langle u', w^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in P.$$

Let  $k = \ell(w)$ . We write  $w = w_k = w_{k-1} r_{\beta_k}$  with  $\ell(w_k) > \ell(w_{k-1})$  and  $\beta_k \in \Phi^+$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u', w_k^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle &= \langle r_{\beta_k} \cdot u', w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle \\ &= \langle u', w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle - \langle u', \beta_k^\vee \rangle \langle \beta_k, w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, arguing by induction we arrive at

$$(5.9) \quad \langle u', w^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle = \langle u', \lambda \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^k \langle u', \beta_j^\vee \rangle \langle \lambda, w_{j-1} \cdot \beta_j \rangle$$

where for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , we have  $w_j = w_{j-1} r_{\beta_j}$  with  $\ell(w_j) > \ell(w_{j-1})$  and  $\beta_j \in \Phi^+$ . By [27, Proposition in Section 5.7], we have

$$(5.10) \quad w_{j-1} \cdot \beta_j \in \Phi^+.$$

Hence, by (5.8) and (5.9) we get

$$\langle u, \lambda \rangle \leq \langle u', \lambda \rangle.$$

Since we can swap  $\omega$  and  $u$  with  $\omega'$  and  $u'$ , respectively, we conclude that  $u = u'$ . Thus, by (5.8) and (5.9),

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \langle u, \beta_j^\vee \rangle \langle \lambda, w_{j-1} \cdot \beta_j \rangle = 0.$$

Because  $u \in \mathbb{S}_+^{r-1}$ , by (5.10),  $\langle u, \beta_j^\vee \rangle = 0$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , and the theorem follows.  $\square$

Since both  $\mathbb{S}^{r-1}$  and  $\Omega$  are compact, in view of Theorem 5.2 the set  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_V$  is a compact subset of  $C_*(V_s)$ . It is called visual compactification of  $\mathcal{X}$ . The action of the automorphism group  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  is continuous on  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_V$ .

## 6. MAXIMAL BOUNDARY

In this section we introduce harmonic measures which we use for Furstenberg compactifications: there is one such probability measure on the maximal boundary for each special point in the building. Then we study big cells in the maximal boundary from topological and measure-theoretic view points. In the last section we study level sets of horofunctions and their relation to harmonic measures.

Before we start, let us describe the topology on  $\Omega$ . Fix a special vertex  $x \in V_s$ , and consider the topology generated by the collection

$$\{\Omega(x, y) : y \in V_s\}$$

which turns  $\Omega$  into a totally disconnected compact Hausdorff space. A basis of neighborhoods for  $\omega \in \Omega$  is

$$\{\Omega(x, y) : y \in [x, \omega]\}.$$

Each  $\Omega(x, y)$  is clopen in  $\Omega$ , that is open and at the same time closed. The topology is independent of the choice of the reference vertex  $x$ , see e.g. [33, Proposition 3.15].

**6.1. Construction of harmonic measures.** The following proposition is well-known (see e.g. [33, 43]). It introduces the family of harmonic measures that are used to defined the Furstenberg compactification. The subtlety is that we cannot stand by group actions and integration on homogeneous spaces to define these measures.

**Proposition 6.1.** *For every special vertex  $x \in V_s$ , there is a unique Borel probability measure  $\nu_x$  on  $\Omega$  such that for all  $y, y' \in V_s$ , if  $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(x, y')$  then*

$$(6.1) \quad \nu_x(\Omega(x, y)) = \nu_x(\Omega(x, y')).$$

*Moreover, for  $x, y \in V_s$  the measures  $\nu_x$  and  $\nu_y$  are mutually absolutely continuous. When  $x, y \in V_g$  then the Radon–Nikodym derivative equals*

$$(6.2) \quad \frac{d\nu_y}{d\nu_x}(\omega) = \chi(h(x, y; \omega)), \quad \omega \in \Omega.$$

The proof below gives in fact all Radon–Nikodym derivatives, but the formulation uses notions from Section 2.3 such as the permutation  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* Let us consider the linear operator  $\Lambda$  acting on locally constant functions on  $\Omega$  that is initially defined as

$$(6.3) \quad \Lambda(\mathbb{1}_{\Omega(x, y)}) = \frac{1}{\#\{y' \in V_s : \sigma(x, y') = \sigma(x, y)\}}.$$

Since locally constant functions on  $\Omega$  are dense in the space of continuous functions on  $\Omega$ , the operator  $\Lambda$  has a unique extension to a positive linear operator  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  defined on all continuous complex-valued functions on  $\Omega$ . Hence, by the Riesz–Markov–Kakutani theorem, there is a unique regular Borel measure  $\nu_x$  on  $\Omega$  such that

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(f) = \int_{\Omega} f(\omega) \nu_x(d\omega)$$

for any continuous function  $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ .

To prove (6.2), we fix  $x, y \in V_g$ . Let  $\omega \in \Omega$ . By [43, Lemma 3.13], there is a good vertex  $z \in [x, \omega] \cap [y, \omega]$ , such that  $\Omega(x, z) = \Omega(y, z)$ . We may assume that  $h(x, z; \omega)$  and  $h(y, z; \omega)$  are strongly dominant co-weights. Then, by (2.1) and (2.3),

$$\nu_x(\Omega(x, z)) = \frac{1}{W(q^{-1})} \chi(-h(x, z; \omega)) = \frac{1}{W(q^{-1})} \chi(-\sigma(x, z))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_y(\Omega(x, z)) &= \nu_y(\Omega(y, z)) \\ &= \frac{1}{W(q^{-1})} \chi(-h(y, z; \omega)) = \frac{1}{W(q^{-1})} \chi(-\sigma(y, z)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\nu_y(\Omega(x, z))}{\nu_x(\Omega(x, z))} &= \chi(-h(y, z; \omega)) \chi(h(x, z; \omega)) \\ &= \chi(h(x, y; \omega)) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the cocycle relation (2.4).

If  $x \in V_g$  and  $z \in V_g^\varepsilon$ , we set

$$Z' = \{z' \in V_g : \exists \omega \in \Omega(x, z) \text{ such that } h(z, z'; \omega) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_r\}.$$

Let  $c$  be the unique chamber in  $\text{St}(z)$  which is the closest to  $x$ . Let  $w_0$  and  $w_{0r}$  be the longest element in  $W$  and  $W_{\lambda_r}$ , respectively. Each vertex  $z' \in Z'$  belongs to a certain chamber from  $\text{St}(z)$  which is opposite to  $c$ .

There are  $q_{\varepsilon; w_0}$  chambers with this property. However, for a fixed  $z' \in Z'$ , there are  $q_{\varepsilon; w_{0r}}$  distinct chambers sharing vertices  $z'$  and  $z$  that are opposite to  $c$ . Hence,

$$\#Z' = \frac{q_{\varepsilon; w_0}}{q_{\varepsilon; w_{0r}}}.$$

Since

$$\Omega(x, z) = \bigsqcup_{z' \in Z'} \Omega(x, z'),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_x(\Omega(x, z)) &= \sum_{z' \in Z'} \nu_x(\Omega(x, z')) \\ &= \frac{q_{\varepsilon; w_0}}{q_{\varepsilon; w_{0r}}} \frac{1}{W(q^{-1})} \chi(-\tfrac{1}{2}\lambda_r) \chi(-h(x, z; \omega)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for  $y \in V_g^\varepsilon$  and  $x \in V_g$  we obtain

$$\frac{\nu_y(\Omega(x, z))}{\nu_x(\Omega(x, z))} = \frac{W(q^{-1})}{W(q_\varepsilon^{-1})} \frac{q_{\varepsilon; w_{0r}}}{q_{\varepsilon; w_0}} \chi(\tfrac{1}{2}\lambda_r) \chi(h(x, y; \omega)).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.** We can weaken the hypothesis in Proposition 6.1, by imposing (6.1) for all  $y \in V_g$  having fixed type, say  $\tau(y) = j \in I$ . To see this, let  $z \in V_g$  with  $\tau(z) \neq j$ . There is  $y_0 \in V_g$  with  $\tau(y_0) = j$ , such that

$$\Omega(x, y_0) \subset \Omega(x, z).$$

Fix  $\omega_0 \in \Omega(x, y_0)$ . Then

$$Y = \{y \in V_g : \exists \omega \in \Omega(x, z) \text{ such that } h(x, y; \omega) = h(x, y_0; \omega_0)\}.$$

Observe that each vertex  $y \in Y$  has type  $j$ , and

$$\Omega(x, z) = \bigsqcup_{y \in Y} \Omega(x, y).$$

Now, the linear operator  $\Lambda$  defined in (6.3) for  $y \in V_g$ ,  $\tau(y) = j$ , can be uniquely extended to  $\mathbb{1}_{\Omega(x, z)}$ , for any  $z \in V_g$ . The rest of the poof is unchanged.

The measures  $(\nu_x : x \in V_g)$  naturally appear while studying the harmonic functions with respect to the vertex averaging operators, see Section 9.1. To be more precise, for  $\lambda \in P^+$ , and a function  $F : V_g \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , we set

$$(6.4) \quad A_\lambda F(x) = \frac{1}{N_\lambda} \sum_{y \in V_\lambda(x)} F(y), \quad x \in V_g.$$

Then for any  $f \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ , the function  $F : V_g \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  defined by

$$F(x) = \int_\Omega f(\omega) \nu_x(d\omega), \quad x \in V_g,$$

satisfies

$$A_\lambda F(x) = F(x),$$

for all  $x \in V_g$  and  $\lambda \in P^+$ . We have a similar characterization for vertices in  $V_g^\varepsilon$ .



**6.2. Big cells.** In the study of convergence of unbounded sequences of harmonic measures, we will make use of analogues of contraction arguments in the case of symmetric spaces and Bruhat–Tits buildings. The subspaces of  $\Omega$  on which the arguments are valid are analogues of the so-called big cells in flag varieties. Point (i) in the result below is also [26, Proposition 2.13]; our proof differs from the one given in [loc. cit.] in the sense that it stays inside the building, without using points at infinity.

**Theorem 6.2.** *For each  $\omega_0 \in \Omega$ , we denote by  $\Omega'(\omega_0)$  the set of all  $\omega \in \Omega$  that are opposite to  $\omega_0$ .*

(i) *The set  $\Omega'(\omega_0)$  is open in  $\Omega$ .*

(ii) *For each  $x \in V_s$ , we have  $\nu_x(\Omega'(\omega_0)) = 1$ .*

The subset  $\Omega'(\omega_0)$  is called the *big cell* associated to  $\omega_0$ . The above theorem says that big cells are open and co-null in maximal boundaries.

*Proof.* We start by proving (i). Let  $\omega \in \Omega'(\omega_0)$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} = [\omega, \omega_0]$ . Select any special vertex  $x \in \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $y \in [x, \omega]$ ,  $x \neq y$ . Then the retraction  $\rho_{\mathcal{A}}^{y, \omega_0}$  restricted to  $[y, \omega_0] \cup [y, \omega']$  for any  $\omega' \in \Omega(x, y)$  is an isomorphism onto  $[y, \omega_0] \cup [y, \omega]$ . Hence, there is a unique apartment containing  $[x, \omega_0]$  and  $[x, \omega']$ , thus  $\Omega(x, y) \subset \Omega'(\omega_0)$ .

We now turn to the (longer) proof of (ii). Without loss of generality we assume that  $x \in V_g$ . Given  $y \in V_g$ , we denote by  $\Omega_y(\omega_0)$  the set of all  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that there is an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  containing both sectors  $[y, \omega_0]$  and  $[y, \omega]$ . Then

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{y \in V_g} \Omega_y(\omega_0),$$

and so

$$(6.5) \quad \Omega \setminus \Omega'(\omega_0) = \bigcup_{y \in V_g} \Omega_y(\omega_0) \setminus \Omega'_y(\omega_0)$$

where we have set  $\Omega'_y(\omega_0) = \Omega'(\omega_0) \cap \Omega_y(\omega_0)$ . Since the set of vertices is countable, it is therefore enough to show that for all  $y \in V_g$ ,

$$(6.6) \quad \nu_x(\Omega_y(\omega_0) \setminus \Omega'_y(\omega_0)) = 0.$$

Since the measures  $\nu_x$  are mutually absolutely continuous, it is sufficient to consider  $x = y = o$ .

Next, let us observe that

$$(6.7) \quad \Omega_o(\omega_0) \setminus \Omega'_o(\omega_0) = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{\substack{w \in W \\ w \neq w_0}} \bigcup_{y \in B_w^{n\rho}} \Omega(o, y).$$

where for  $w \in W$  and  $\lambda \in P^+$ , by  $B_w^\lambda$  we denote the set of all  $x \in V_g$  such that  $h(o, x; \omega_0) = w \cdot \lambda$  and there is an apartment containing  $[o, \omega_0]$  and  $x$ . It is easy to verify the inclusion  $\subseteq$ . To show the reverse one, let us consider  $\omega$  belonging to the right-hand side of (6.7). Then there are sequences  $(y_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  and  $(w_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  such that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $w_n \in W \setminus \{w_0\}$ ,  $y_n \in B_{w_n}^{n\rho}$  and  $\omega \in \Omega(o, y_n)$ . In particular,

$$\omega \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \Omega(o, y_n).$$

Let  $\Lambda_n$  be the set of all sectors  $[o, \omega']$ , with  $\omega' \in \Omega'_o(\omega_0)$ , such that the apartment  $[\omega_0, \omega']$  contains  $y_n$ . Since  $y_n \in B_{w_n}^{n\rho}$ , each set  $\Lambda_n$  is non-empty. Moreover,  $\Lambda_{n+1} \subset \Lambda_n$  because the convex hull of  $o$  and  $y_{n+1}$  contains  $y_n$ . Hence, by compactness of  $\Omega$ , there is  $\omega'_0$  such that the apartment  $[\omega_0, \omega'_0]$  contains the convex hull of  $o$  and  $y_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , thus it contains  $[o, \omega]$ . This proves (6.7).

Now we notice that for a fixed  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the sets  $\Omega(o, y)$  are disjoint provided that  $\sigma(o, y) = n\rho$ , thus by (6.7)

$$\nu_o(\Omega_o(\omega_0) \setminus \Omega'_o(\omega_0)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_o \left( \bigcup_{\substack{w \in W \\ w \neq w_0}} \bigcup_{y \in B_w^{n\rho}} \Omega(o, y) \right)$$

$$= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\substack{w \in W \\ w \neq w_0}} \sum_{y \in B_w^{n\rho}} \nu_o(\Omega(o, y)).$$

Therefore to finish the proof of the theorem we show the following claim.

**Claim 6.3.** *For each  $w \in W$ ,  $w \neq w_0$ , we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#B_w^{n\rho}}{N_{n\rho}} = 0.$$

For the proof, let us notice that for a given  $y \in B_w^{(n+1)\rho}$  there is exactly one  $x \in B_w^{n\rho}$  such there is an apartment containing  $[o, \omega_0]$ ,  $x$  and  $y$ . Therefore, the problem is reduced to estimating the number of  $y$ 's that corresponds to a given  $x$ . To do so, we observe that there is a wall passing through  $x$  so that  $o$  and  $\omega_0$  are on its opposite sides. Let  $\beta \in \Phi^+$  be the corresponding root. Since a convex hull of  $[o, \omega_0]$  and  $x$  is contained in the intersection over all half-apartments having  $x$  on the boundary and containing the sector  $[o, \omega_0]$ , the intersection of the link of  $x$  with the convex hull contains at least two chambers that are  $\beta$  adjacent. Let  $c_0$  and  $c_1$  be the chambers with a vertex  $x$  that are the closest to  $o$  and  $\omega_0$ , respectively. Each minimal gallery between  $x$  and  $y$  starts with a certain chamber  $c'$  having a vertex  $x$  and which is opposite to  $c_0$ . All minimal galleries have the same type  $f$ . For a given  $y$  the chamber  $c'$  is unique. Moreover, for each  $c'$  there is the minimal gallery between  $c_0$  and  $c'$  which contains  $c_1$ . Therefore, there are at most  $q_\beta^{-1} q_{w_0}$  possible choices for  $c'$ , and hence there are at most  $q_\beta^{-1} q_{w_0} q_{w_f}$  vertices  $y \in B_w^{(n+1)\rho}$  such that the apartment containing  $y$  and  $[o, \omega_0]$  also contains  $x$ . Consequently,

$$\#B_w^{(n+1)\rho} \leq \#B_w^{n\rho} \cdot q_\beta^{-1} \chi(\rho).$$

In view of (2.1), we get

$$\frac{\#B_w^{(n+1)\rho}}{N_{(n+1)\rho}} \leq q_\beta^{-1} \frac{\#B_w^{n\rho}}{N_{n\rho}},$$

which complete the proof of the claim.

Now, using Claim 6.3 and Proposition 6.1, we get

$$\nu_o(\Omega_o(\omega_0) \setminus \Omega'_o(\omega_0)) = \sum_{\substack{w \in W \\ w \neq w_0}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#B_w^{n\rho}}{N_{n\rho}} = 0$$

which proves (6.6), from which (ii) and the theorem follow.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.4.** *Let  $F$  be a facet in the spherical building at infinity  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ . Then the corresponding residue is closed in the maximal boundary  $\Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $R$  be the residue attached to  $F$ ; it is a proper subset of  $\Omega$ . Let us show that  $\Omega \setminus R$  is open. We pick  $\omega \notin R$ . There exists an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  whose visual boundary  $\mathcal{A}^\infty$  contains  $F$  and  $\omega$ . Let  $-\omega$  be the chamber in  $\mathcal{A}^\infty$  which is opposite  $\omega$ . By (i) in Theorem 6.2, the big cell  $\Omega'(-\omega)$  is an open subset containing  $\omega$ , so it is enough to show that  $\Omega'(-\omega) \cap R = \emptyset$ . Let  $\rho$  denote the retraction of  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$  onto  $\mathcal{A}^\infty$  centered at  $-\omega$ . The map  $\rho$  preserves the Weyl-distance from  $-\omega$  and preserves each adjacency relation in  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ . The first point implies that  $\rho(\Omega'(-\omega)) = \{\omega\}$  and the second one implies that  $\rho(R)$  is the residue of  $F$  in  $\mathcal{A}^\infty$ . As a consequence, since  $\omega \notin R$  we obtain  $\Omega'(-\omega) \cap R = \emptyset$ , as requested.  $\square$

See Appendix B.3 for the group-theoretic case.

**6.3. Level-sets of horofunctions.** The aim of this section is to provide a better understanding of the maximal boundary  $\Omega$  from a topological and a measure-theoretic viewpoint. As shown by classical computation in non-Archimedean harmonic analysis [31], in order to compute integrals it is extremely useful to have subsets on which the functions under consideration are constant. We are interested here in subsets suitable for Busemann functions, in connection with Radon–Nikodym derivatives of harmonic measures.

Let  $x \in V_s$  and  $\omega_0 \in \Omega$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing the sector  $[x, \omega_0]$ , and  $\psi$  a type-rotating isomorphism  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Sigma$ , such that  $\psi([x, \omega_0]) = S_0$ . For a non-zero vector of non-negative integers  $\mathbf{n} = (n_\alpha : \alpha \in \Phi^{++})$ , we denote by  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$  the set of all  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that

$$[x, \omega_0] \cap \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++}} \psi^{-1}(H_{\alpha; n_\alpha}^-) \subseteq [x, \omega_0] \cap [x, \omega].$$

We say that  $\beta$  is *active* in  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$ , if

$$\bigcap_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \\ \alpha \neq \beta}} \psi^{-1}(H_{\alpha; n_\alpha}^-) \supsetneq \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++}} \psi^{-1}(H_{\alpha; n_\alpha}^-).$$

Lastly,  $\beta \in \Phi^{++}$  is called *supporting* in  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$ , if  $\beta$  is active in  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$  or  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} - e_\beta)$ . Let

$$\Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n}) = \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n}) \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \\ \alpha \text{ is active}}} \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} + e_\alpha) \right).$$

In fact, the set  $\Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$  consists of  $\omega \in \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$  such that

$$[x, \omega_0] \cap \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++}} \psi^{-1}(H_{\alpha; n_\alpha}^-) = [x, \omega_0] \cap [x, \omega].$$

**Proposition 6.5.** *Let  $x \in V_g$ ,  $\omega_0 \in \Omega$  and  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^{\Phi^{++}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing  $[x, \omega_0]$ . Then for each  $y \in V(\mathcal{A})$ , the function  $h(x, y; \cdot)$  is constant on  $\Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$  and its value depends only on  $h(x, y; \omega_0)$  and  $\mathbf{n}$ .*

*Proof.* Let us denote by  $\omega'_0$  the element opposite to  $\omega_0$  such that  $[x, \omega'_0] \subset \mathcal{A}$ . Let  $\omega \in \Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$ . There is an apartment  $\mathcal{A}_1$  containing  $[x, \omega]$  and  $[x, \omega'_0]$ . If  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Sigma$  is type-rotating isomorphism such that  $\psi([x, \omega_0]) = S_0$ , then

$$(6.8) \quad \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_1 = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++}} \psi^{-1}(H_{\alpha; n_\alpha}^-).$$

If  $y \in \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_1$ , then  $h(x, y; \omega) = h(x, y; \omega_0)$ . Assume that  $y \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}_1$ . Fix a minimal gallery between  $y$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1$ . Recall that the value of  $h(x, y; \omega)$  depends only on the type of the minimal gallery between  $y$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , and the chamber in  $\mathcal{A}_1$  that is the closest to  $y$ . In view of (6.8), the minimal gallery between  $y$  and  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A}_1$  is also a minimal gallery between  $y$  and  $\mathcal{A}_1$ , and the proposition follows.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.6.** *For all  $x, y, z \in V_g$ , if  $\Omega(x, z) \cap \Omega(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\nu_y(\Omega(x, z))$  depends only on  $\sigma(x, y)$  and  $\sigma(x, z)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda = \sigma(x, y)$ ,  $\mu = \sigma(x, z)$  and  $\omega_0 \in \Omega(x, y) \cap \Omega(x, z)$ . In particular, the points  $x, y$  and  $z$  are all contained in the sector  $[x, \omega_0]$ . By Proposition 6.1, we have

$$\nu_y(\Omega(x, z)) = \int_{\Omega(x, z)} \chi(h(x, y; \omega)) \nu_x(d\omega).$$

We can write

$$\Omega(x, z) = \left( \bigsqcup_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}} \Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n}) \right) \sqcup \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{m})$$

where

$$\mathbf{m} = (\max\{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle, \langle \mu, \alpha \rangle\} : \alpha \in \Phi^{++})$$

and

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{|\Phi^{++}|} : \begin{array}{l} \langle \mu, \alpha \rangle \leq n_\alpha \leq m_\alpha \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Phi^{++} \\ n_\alpha < m_\alpha \text{ for some } \alpha \in \Phi^{++} \\ \text{all walls are supporting} \end{array} \right\}.$$

To see this, it is enough to observe that  $\mathcal{N}$  parametrizes all convex subsets between  $\text{conv}\{x, z\}$  and  $\text{conv}\{x, y, z\}$  (recall that the latter convex hulls are subsets of  $[x, \omega_0]$ ).

By Proposition 6.5, we have

$$\int_{\Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})} \chi(h(x, y; \omega)) \nu_x(d\omega) = \chi(\eta_{\mathbf{n}}) \nu_x(\Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n}))$$

for some  $\eta_{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathfrak{a}$ . Moreover, for all  $\omega \in \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{m})$ ,

$$h(x, y; \omega) = h(x, y; \omega_0) = \lambda,$$

thus

$$\int_{\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{m})} \chi(h(x, y; \omega)) \nu_x(d\omega) = \chi(\lambda) \nu_x(\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{m})).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\nu_y(\Omega(x, z)) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}} \chi(\eta_{\mathbf{n}}) \nu_x(\Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})) + \chi(\lambda) \nu_x(\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{m})).$$

Notice that  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{e}_\alpha) \subseteq \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$ , thus

$$\nu_x(\Theta(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})) = \nu_x(\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})) - \nu_x\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{e}_\alpha)\right).$$

where  $A$  is the set of roots such that  $H_{\alpha; n_\alpha}$  is active in  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$ . Now, using the inclusion-exclusion principle, we can write

$$\nu_x\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in A} \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{e}_\alpha)\right) = \sum_{\emptyset \neq B \subseteq A} (-1)^{|B|+1} \nu_x\left(\bigcap_{\beta \in B} \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{e}_\beta)\right).$$

Since

$$\bigcap_{\beta \in B} \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{e}_\beta) = \Omega\left(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} + \sum_{\beta \in B} \mathbf{e}_\beta\right),$$

to conclude the proof of the theorem it is enough to show the following claim.

**Claim 6.7.** *The measure  $\nu_x(\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n}))$  depends only on the vector  $\mathbf{n}$ .*

Observe that if  $\mathbf{n}$  satisfies

$$n_\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^r n_{\alpha_j} \langle \alpha, \lambda_j \rangle$$

for all  $\alpha \in \Phi^{++}$ , then the claim holds true, since  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n}) = \Omega(x, y)$  where

$$(6.9) \quad y = \psi^{-1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^r n_{\alpha_j} \lambda_j\right).$$

Moreover, given  $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{|\Phi^{++}|}$ , we have  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n}) \supseteq \Omega(x, y)$  where  $y$  is defined by (6.9), thus the claim can be proved by backwards induction on  $\mathbf{n}$ . Suppose that the claim holds true for a certain  $\mathbf{n}$  and all  $\omega_0 \in \Omega$ ,  $x \in V_g$ . Let  $\beta \in \Phi^{++}$  be such that  $n_\beta \geq 1$ . We can assume that  $\beta$  is active in  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$ , since otherwise  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{e}_\beta) = \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})$ , and there is nothing to be proven. We set

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcap_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \\ \alpha \neq \beta}} \psi^{-1}(H_{\alpha; n_\alpha}^-) \cap \psi^{-1}(H_{\beta; n_\beta-1}^-).$$

Since  $\beta$  is active in  $\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{e}_\beta)$ , there is a chamber  $c_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$  such that the wall  $\psi^{-1}(H_{\beta; n_\beta-1}^-)$  contains the  $i$ -panel of  $c_0$  for a certain  $i \in I$ . Let  $\{c_0, c_1, \dots, c_{q_i}\}$  be the  $i$ -residue of  $c_0$ . For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, q_i\}$  there is an apartment  $\mathcal{A}_j$  containing  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $c_j$ . We select  $\omega_j \in \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{e}_\beta)$  such that the sector  $[x, \omega_j] \subset \mathcal{A}_j$  contains  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $c_j$ . Let  $\psi_j : \mathcal{A}_j \rightarrow \Sigma$  be a type-rotating isomorphism such that  $\psi_j([x, \omega_j]) = S_0$ . Since for each  $\omega \in \Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{e}_\beta)$  there is  $j \in \{1, \dots, q_i\}$  such that  $c_j \subset [x, \omega_j]$ , we have

$$\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{e}_\beta) = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{q_i} \Omega(x, \omega_j; \mathbf{n}).$$

Hence, by the induction hypothesis,

$$\nu_x(\Omega(x, \omega_0, \mathbf{n} - e_\beta)) = \sum_{j=1}^{q_i} \nu_x(\Omega(x, \omega_j; \mathbf{n})) = q_i \nu_x(\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n})),$$

which proves that  $\nu_x(\Omega(x, \omega_0; \mathbf{n} - e_\beta))$  depends only on the vector  $\mathbf{n}$ . This completes the proof of Claim 6.7 and the theorem follows.  $\square$

## 7. FURSTENBERG COMPACTIFICATION

In this section we describe Furstenberg compactifications. It originates in the study of harmonic functions on semisimple Lie groups see [20]. For Bruhat–Tits buildings associated with semisimple groups over a local field, it has been constructed in [24]. Our approach is purely geometric and provides the maximal Furstenberg compactification for a large class of affine buildings including exotic ones.

Let  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  be the space of Borel probability measures on  $\Omega$  endowed with the weak-\* topology. An automorphism  $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  acts on a measure  $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  by pushing forward, that is

$$\begin{aligned} (g.\nu)(A) &= (g_*\nu)(A) \\ &= \nu(g^{-1}.A) \end{aligned}$$

for any Borel set  $A$ .

We define

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : V_s &\longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega) \\ x &\longmapsto \nu_x \end{aligned}$$

where  $\nu_x$  is the harmonic measure defined in Proposition 6.1. The map  $\iota$  gives an equivariant embedding of  $V_s$  into the space of Borel probability measures on  $\Omega$ . Moreover,  $\iota(V_s)$  is discrete in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  since the open set

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^r \bigcap_{y_j \in V_{\lambda_j}(x)} \{ \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\Omega) : \nu(\Omega(x, y_j)) > \chi(-\lambda_j) \nu_{y_j}(\Omega(x, y_j)) \}$$

intersected with  $\iota(V_s)$  gives singleton  $\nu_x$ . Let  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_F$  be the closure of  $\iota(V_s)$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Then  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_F$  equipped with the induced topology is a compact Hausdorff space called the Furstenberg compactification of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let us describe the structure of  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_F$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  is metrizable, it is sufficient to consider sequences approaching infinity  $(x_n)$  such that  $(\iota(x_n))$  converges in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ . Furthermore, in view of Lemma 2.1, we restrict our attention to core sequences.

In order to state our main theorem on convergence of sequences of harmonic measures (which is Theorem C in the Introduction), it is convenient to use the notions and terminology introduced in Section 4, including façades indexed by spherical facets at infinity. We use freely the notation of Section 4.3, in particular the homeomorphism  $\varphi_J$ .

**Theorem 7.1.** *Suppose that  $(x_n)$  is an  $(\omega, J, c)$ -core sequence. Let  $R_J$  be the  $J$ -residue in  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$  containing  $\omega$  and let  $F_J$  be the corresponding spherical facet. We denote by  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$  the façade associated to  $F_J$ , and by  $x_{(\omega, J, c)}$  the vertex in  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$  defined by  $(x_n)$ . Then the sequence of harmonic measures  $(\nu_{x_n})$  weakly converges in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  to the measure  $\mu$  characterized by the following two conditions:*

(i) *the support  $\text{supp}(\mu)$  is equal to the residue  $\text{res}_J(\omega)$ ;*

(ii) *the measure  $(\varphi_J)_*\mu$  is the harmonic measure on the façade  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$  attached to the vertex  $x_{(\omega, J, c)}$ .*

*Moreover, if  $(x'_n)$  is an  $(\omega', J', c')$ -core sequence such that  $(\nu_{x'_n})$  weakly converges to the same limit  $\mu$  as above, then we have  $J' = J$ ,  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ , and  $c = c'$ .*

*Proof.* The proof uses the weak-\* compactness of the set  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  of probability measures on the compact metrizable maximal boundary  $\Omega$ . Convergence is obtained by proving uniqueness of the cluster value in two steps. The first one shows that any cluster value  $\mu$  of a sequence of harmonic measures as above has its

support contained in the residue  $R_J$ , which allows us then to push  $\mu$  by the homeomorphism  $\varphi_J$  in order to prove, in the second step, that  $(\varphi_J)_*\mu$  must be the announced harmonic measure on the façade  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$ .

Without loss of generality we assume that  $(x_n) \subset V_g$  (see Section 2.3). Let  $\mu$  be any cluster point of the sequence  $(\nu_{x_n})$ , that is, there is a subsequence  $(\nu_{x_{n_j}})$  weakly converging to  $\mu$ .

**Step 1.** We show that  $\text{supp } \mu \subseteq R_J$ .

To simplify notation in the proof of this step, we write  $R$  for  $R_J$  and accordingly  $F$  for  $F_J$ . Let  $\omega_1 \in \Omega \setminus R$ , and denote by  $\omega_0$  the projection of  $\omega_1$  onto  $R$  in  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ .

**Claim 7.2.** *There is an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  which contains both sectors  $[x_m, \omega_0]$  and  $[x_m, \omega_1]$  for a certain  $m \geq 1$ .*

Indeed, in the spherical building  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ , there is an apartment containing the facet  $F$  of type  $J$  corresponding to  $R$  and  $\omega_1$ . Since we are working with the complete apartment system, this apartment is the visual boundary of an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ . There is a full subsector face of  $[x_1, F]$  which is contained in  $\mathcal{A}$  so for a large enough  $m$  we have  $x_n \in \mathcal{A}$  for  $n \geq m$ , and therefore  $[x_m, F] \subset \mathcal{A}$  as well. By convexity we also have  $[x_m, \omega_0] \subset \mathcal{A}$ .




FIGURE 5. In this picture, we allow ourselves to mix notations from the model of an apartment and from apartments themselves.

Let  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Sigma$  be the type-rotating isomorphism such that  $\psi([x_m, \omega_0]) = S_0$ . We set

$$A(\omega_1) = \left\{ \beta \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J : [x_m, \omega_1] \subset \psi^{-1}(H_{\beta; 0}^+) \right\}.$$

Let  $c \in C(x_m)$  be such that  $\omega_1 \in \Omega(x_m, c)$ , where we have set

$$\Omega(x_m, c) = \{ \omega_2 \in \Omega : c \subset [x_m, \omega_2] \}.$$

We claim that

$$(7.1) \quad \mu(\Omega(x_m, c)) = 0.$$

The proof is by induction on the cardinality of the set  $A$ . Suppose that  $\#A(\omega_1) = 0$  (this means that  $\omega_1$  is in the residue which is opposite  $R$  with respect to  $\mathcal{A}$ ). By co-nullity of big cells (Theorem 6.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Omega(x_m, c)) &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{x_{n_j}}(\Omega(x_m, c)) \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{x_{n_j}}(\Omega'(x_m, c)) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Omega'(x_m, c) = \Omega(x_m, c) \cap \Omega'(\omega_0)$ . Recall that we know explicitly Radon–Nykodim derivatives between harmonic measures (Proposition 6.1), that is for  $n \geq m$  we have

$$\nu_{x_n}(\Omega'(x_m, c)) = \int_{\Omega'(x_m, c)} \chi(h(x_m, x_n; \omega_2)) \nu_{x_m}(d\omega_2).$$



Since for all  $\omega_2 \in \Omega'(x_m, c)$ ,

$$\sup_{n \geq m} \chi(h(x_m, x_n; \omega_2)) \leq 1,$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \chi(h(x_m, x_n; \omega_2)) = 0,$$

by the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem we easily conclude (7.1).

Next, let us assume that  $\#A(\omega_1) = k \geq 1$ . For  $\beta \in A$  and  $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , we set

$$\Xi(\beta, j) = \left\{ \omega_2 \in \Omega(x_m, c) : [x_m, \omega_2] \cap [x_m, \omega_1] \cap \psi^{-1}(H_{\beta; j}^+) \neq \emptyset \right\}.$$

Observe that since  $\#A(\omega_2) \leq \#A(\omega_1) - 1$ , we can apply to every  $\omega_2 \in \Xi(\beta, j) \setminus \Xi(\beta, j+1)$  the induction hypothesis. This leads to

$$\mu(\Xi(\beta, j) \setminus \Xi(\beta, j+1)) = 0,$$

and thus

$$(7.2) \quad \mu\left(\bigcup_{\beta \in A(\omega_1)} \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} \Xi(\beta, j) \setminus \Xi(\beta, j+1)\right) = 0.$$

Therefore it is enough to show that there is  $\beta \in A(\omega_1)$ , such that

$$(7.3) \quad \mu\left(\bigcap_{j=0}^{\infty} \Xi(\beta, j)\right) = 0.$$

Since  $\Xi(\beta, j+1) \subset \Xi(\beta, j)$ , by the Borel–Cantelli lemma it is sufficient to prove that for a certain  $\beta \in A(\omega_1)$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu(\Xi(\beta, j)) < \infty,$$

which we deduce from the fact that there is  $c > 1$  such that for all  $j \geq 0$ ,

$$(7.4) \quad c \cdot \mu(\Xi(\beta, j+1)) \leq \mu(\Xi(\beta, j)).$$

To see this, we notice that there is an  $\alpha$ -wall for a certain  $\alpha \in \Phi_J^+$  which intersects both  $\psi^{-1}(H_{\beta; j+1})$  and  $\psi^{-1}(H_{\beta; j})$ . Hence, for each  $n \geq m$ , we have

$$q_\alpha \cdot \nu_{x_n}(\Xi(\beta, j+1)) \leq \nu_{x_n}(\Xi(\beta, j)).$$

Since the sets  $\Xi(\beta, j)$  are clopen, by taking the limit we obtain (7.4). This completes the proof of (7.3) which together with (7.2) leads to (7.1).

The above reasoning implies that  $\mu$  is a Borel probability measure with support contained in  $R$ .

**Step 2.** Any cluster value  $\mu$  as in Step 1, which we write  $\mu = \lim \nu_{x_n}$  for simplicity, is such that the measure  $(\varphi_J)_* \mu$  is the harmonic measure of  $\mathcal{X}(F_J)$  attached to the vertex  $x_{(\omega, J, c)}$ .

For brevity again, we write  $F$  for  $F_J$ , also  $R$  for the residue of  $F$  in  $\Omega$  and  $x_c$  for  $x_{(\omega, J, c)}$ . In view of Proposition 6.1 and Remark 2, it is enough to show that for each  $y_\infty \in \mathcal{X}(F)$ , the measure

$$((\varphi_J)_* \mu)\left(\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_c, y_\infty)\right)$$

of the shadow at infinity  $\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_c, y_\infty)$ , depends only on the vectorial distance  $\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_c, y_\infty)$  from  $x_c$  to  $y_\infty$  in the façade  $\mathcal{X}(F)$ . Using Lemma 4.2, we have an apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  and an integer  $N$  such that  $\pi_F(\mathcal{A})$  is an apartment of  $\mathcal{X}(F)$  containing  $x_c$  and  $y_\infty$ , and the vertices  $x_n$  all belong to  $\mathcal{A}$  for  $n \geq N$ .

We denote by  $x$  the vertex  $x_N$ . The boundary  $\Omega$  identifies with the set of sectors tipped at  $x$  via the map  $t_x : \omega' \mapsto [x, \omega']$ . For the topology of shadows based at  $x$ , the map  $t_x$  is a homeomorphism which identifies  $R$  and the subset of sectors  $[x, \omega']$  containing the sector face  $[x, F]$ . Note that the inverse of the map  $t_x$  is nothing else than  $[x, \omega'] \mapsto \omega'$ . We choose a sector  $[x, \omega']$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  containing the sector face  $[x, F]$  and such that the corresponding sector  $\pi_F([x, \omega']) = [x_c, \varphi_J(\omega')]$  contains  $y_\infty$ . This settled, we can use the concrete descriptions of the apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  and of the projection  $\pi_F$  given in Section 4.3 where the restriction  $\pi_F|_{\mathcal{A}}$

is denoted by  $\pi_J$ . In what follows, we use  $x$  as an origin to identify  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $\mathfrak{a}$  and in general we use the notation of Section 4.3. The vectorial distance  $\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_c, y_\infty)$  is thus the element of  $\mathfrak{a}_J$  determined by the numbers  $y_j = \langle \sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_c, y_\infty), \alpha_j \rangle \in \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{N}_0$  for  $j \in J$ . Now, we introduce the point  $y$  in the apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  given by  $y = \sum_{j \in J} y_j \lambda_j$ . By construction, we have  $P_J(\sigma(x, y)) = \sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_c, y_\infty)$  and  $\pi_F(y) = y_\infty$  because  $\langle \pi_F(y), \alpha_j \rangle = \langle y, \alpha_j \rangle = y_j$ .

By convexity, the map  $\varphi_J \circ t_x^{-1}$  provides an identification between  $\Omega(x, y) \cap R$  and  $\Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_c, y_\infty)$ , so we can compute

$$(7.5) \quad ((\varphi_J)_* \mu) \left( \Omega_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_c, y_\infty) \right) = \mu(\Omega(x, y) \cap R) = \mu(\Omega(x, y)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{x_n}(\Omega(x, y)).$$

It remains to note that by Theorem 6.6, the left-hand side of (7.5) depends only on  $\sigma(x, y)$ , i.e. on the collection of numbers  $\langle \sigma(x, y), \alpha_j \rangle$  which are  $y_j$  if  $j \in J$  and 0 otherwise. Hence, combining with Step 1 and Step 2, we obtain (i) and (ii).

To show the uniqueness statement, let us suppose that there are two core sequences  $(x_n)$  and  $(x'_n)$  of type  $(\omega, J, c)$  and  $(\omega', J', c')$ , respectively, converging to the same limit, say  $\mu$ . By (i), we have  $\text{res}_J(\omega) = \text{supp}(\mu) = \text{res}_{J'}(\omega')$ , and since types of residues are well-defined we deduce that  $J' = J$  and  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ . Moreover, in view of the description of  $(\varphi_J)_* \mu$  as a harmonic measure, and since Proposition 6.1 implies that the vertex defining such a measure is well-defined, we have  $x_{(\omega, J, c)} = x_{(\omega', J', c')}$  and therefore the parameters  $c$  and  $c'$  must be the same. This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 8. GUIVARC'H COMPACTIFICATION

In this section we describe the Guivarc'h compactification which was introduced in [21, 22] in the context of symmetric spaces of non-compact type. For Bruhat–Tits buildings associated with semisimple groups over local fields the construction was developed in [24]. There is also an approach for general buildings in [15] which inspired our construction in this section.

Assume that there is a locally compact group  $G$  acting strongly transitively on the affine building  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e.  $G$  acts transitively on pairs  $(c, \mathcal{A})$  where  $\mathcal{A}$  is an apartment of  $\mathcal{X}$  containing a chamber  $c$ . We additionally assume that  $G$  is type-preserving and closed in  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ . The set  $\mathcal{S}(G)$  of closed subgroups of  $G$  equipped with the Chabauty topology becomes compact metrizable space, see [11, Theorem 1, §5.3, Chapter VIII]. For  $g \in G$  and  $F \in \mathcal{S}(G)$ , we set

$$g.F = gFg^{-1}.$$

Let us recall that a topological group is said to be *topologically locally finite*, if all its finitely generated subgroups are relatively compact. We denote by  $\text{Rad}_{\text{LF}}(G)$  the unique subgroup of  $G$  which is normal and topologically locally finite and maximal for this property. At last we say that a group element is *periodic* if the subgroup it generates is relatively compact.

We consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : V_s &\longrightarrow \mathcal{S}(G) \\ x &\longmapsto K_x \end{aligned}$$

where  $K_x = \text{Stab}_G(x)$ , i.e. the stabilizer of  $x$  in  $G$ . By [15, Lemma 4.8], the map  $\iota$  is injective, equivariant and has discrete image. The closure of  $\iota(V_s)$  in  $\mathcal{S}(G)$ , which we denote by  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_G$ , is called the *Guivarc'h* or *group-theoretic compactification* of  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{S}(G)$  is metrizable to describe the boundary it is sufficient to study core sequences. Let us recall the definition of  $\gamma_x$ , see (3.2)

$$\gamma_x(y) = \bigcap_{c \in C(x)} \text{proj}_y(c), \quad y \in V(\mathcal{X}).$$

The next theorem is based on [15, Section 4].

**Theorem 8.1.** *Suppose that  $(x_n)$  is an  $(\omega, J, c)$ -core sequence. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_{x_n} = \text{Rad}_{\text{LF}}(K_\gamma)$$

where  $K_\gamma$  is the stabilizer in  $G$  of

$$\gamma = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{x_n}.$$

If  $(x'_n)$  is an  $(\omega', J', c')$ -core sequence such that  $(K_{x'_n})$  converges to the same limit then  $J' = J$ ,  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ , and  $c' = c$ .

*Proof.* Let  $D \in \mathcal{S}(G)$  be a cluster point of the sequence  $(K_{x_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}_0)$ . Let  $g \in D$ . By [24, Lemma 2], there is a subsequence  $(g_{n_j} : j \in \mathbb{N})$  converging to  $g$  such that  $g_{n_j} \in K_{x_{n_j}}$ . In view of Theorem 3.1,  $\gamma$  is well-defined. Since the action of  $G$  on  $\Gamma(\mathcal{X})$  is continuous, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g \cdot \gamma &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} g_{n_j} \cdot \gamma_{x_{n_j}} \\ &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{x_{n_j}} = \gamma, \end{aligned}$$

that is,  $g \in K_\gamma$ . Moreover,  $g$  is the limit of periodic elements, thus  $g$  is a periodic element of  $K_\gamma$ , hence by [15, Lemma 4.5(i)] the element  $g$  belongs to  $\text{Rad}_{\text{LF}}(K_\gamma)$ .

To prove the reverse inclusion, let  $g \in \text{Rad}_{\text{LF}}(K_\gamma)$ . In particular,  $g$  is periodic, thus by the Bruhat–Tits fixed point lemma [12, Corollary II.2.8], there is a simplex fixed pointwise by  $g$ . Since  $g$  is type-preserving it fixes a certain vertex  $x \in V(\mathcal{X})$ . Therefore, by Claim 3.2,  $g$  pointwise preserves

$$Q_x(\gamma) = Q_x = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{n=m}^{\infty} [x, x_n].$$

Hence, to show that  $g \in D$ , it is enough to prove that the pointwise stabilizer of  $Q_x(\gamma)$  is a subgroup of  $D$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing  $Q_x(\gamma)$ . Since  $Q_x(\gamma)$  is convex, by [15, Lemma 4.7] it is sufficient to show that the pointwise stabilizer of each half-apartment in  $\mathcal{A}$  containing  $Q_x(\gamma)$ , is a subgroup of  $D$ . To see this, let  $L$  be any of such half-apartments and let  $K_L$  be its pointwise stabilizer in  $G$ . For each  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  there is  $k_n \in K_x$  such that  $k_n \cdot x_n$  is a special vertex in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since  $K_x$  is compact, there is a subsequence  $(k_{n_j} : j \in \mathbb{N}_0)$  converging to  $k \in K_x$ . By equivariance and continuity of the action, we get

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \gamma_{k_{n_j} \cdot x_{n_j}} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} k_{n_j} \cdot \gamma_{x_{n_j}} = k \cdot \gamma,$$

and

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} K_{k_{n_j} \cdot x_{n_j}} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} k_{n_j} \cdot K_{x_{n_j}} = k \cdot D.$$

Let  $y \in Q_x(k \cdot \gamma)$  where

$$Q_x(k \cdot \gamma) = \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{j=m}^{\infty} [x, k_{n_j} \cdot x_{n_j}].$$

In view of Claim 3.2, there is a sequence of vertices  $(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$  such that  $x_0 = x$ ,  $x_n = y$  and  $x_{j+1} \in k \cdot \gamma(x_j)$  for all  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Then  $(k^{-1} \cdot x_0, k^{-1} \cdot x_1, \dots, k^{-1} \cdot x_n)$  is a sequence of vertices such that  $k^{-1} \cdot x_0 = x$ ,  $k^{-1} \cdot x_n = k^{-1} \cdot y$ , and  $k^{-1} \cdot x_{j+1} \in \gamma(k^{-1} \cdot x_j)$  for all  $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Thus by Claim 3.2,  $k^{-1} \cdot y \in Q_x(\gamma) \subset L$ , and so  $y \in k \cdot L$ . Consequently,  $K_{k \cdot L}$  the pointwise stabilizer of  $k \cdot L$ , is a subgroup of every  $K_{k_{n_j} \cdot x_{n_j}}$  for  $j \geq j_0$ . Therefore,  $K_{k \cdot L}$  is a subgroup of  $k \cdot D$ , and so  $K_L$  is a subgroup of  $D$ . Now, by [15, Lemma 4.7], we conclude that the pointwise stabilizer of  $Q_x(\gamma)$  is a subgroup of  $D$ . In particular,  $g \in D$ , which completes the proof of the first part of the theorem.

For the second part, we need the following statement.

**Claim 8.2.** *For each  $x \in V_s$ , the set of vertices in  $\mathcal{X}$  that are fixed by  $K_x \cap K_\gamma$  is equal to  $Q_x(\gamma)$ .*

By Claim 3.2, the group  $K_x \cap K_\gamma$  fixes pointwise  $Q_x(\gamma)$ . Suppose, contrarily to our claim, that there is  $y \in V(\mathcal{X}) \setminus Q_x(\gamma)$  which is fixed by  $K_x \cap K_\gamma$ . Let

$$v = \bigcap_{c \in C(y)} \text{proj}_{Q_x(\gamma)}(c)$$

where  $\text{proj}_{Q_x(\gamma)}(c)$  is the unique chamber in  $\{C(z) : z \in Q_x(\gamma)\}$  which is closest to  $c$ . Since  $y \notin Q_x(\gamma)$ , the simplex  $v$  has positive dimension. From the fact that  $K_x \cap K_\gamma$  preserves both  $Q_x(\gamma)$  and  $y$ , it stems that it also preserves  $v$ . In view of [15, Lemma 4.7],  $K_x \cap K_\gamma$  acts transitively on the set of apartments containing  $Q_x(\gamma)$ , thus it cannot preserve  $v$ , a contradiction.

Now, to finish the proof, let us assume that  $\text{Rad}_{\text{LR}}(K_\gamma) = \text{Rad}_{\text{LR}}(K_{\gamma'})$ . In view of [15, Lemma 4.5(i)], the stabilizer of the vertex  $o$  in  $\text{Rad}_{\text{LR}}(K_\gamma)$  is  $K_o \cap K_\gamma$ . Hence,  $K_o \cap K_{\gamma'} = K_o \cap K_\gamma$ . Thus, by Claim 8.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [o, x_n] &= Q_x(\gamma) \\ &= Q_x(\gamma') = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [o, x'_n] \end{aligned}$$

which easily leads to  $c' = c$ ,  $J' = J$  and  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$  and the theorem follows.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** By Theorems 8.1 and 7.1, it stems that the Guivarc'h compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_G$  is  $G$ -isomorphic to the Furstenberg compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_F$  (see also Theorem B.1).

## 9. MARTIN COMPACTIFICATION

In this section we construct and study Martin compactifications for a large class of random walks on special vertices of affine buildings with reduced root systems. In fact, our framework is broader since we do not make any assumption on the spherical root system, but we rather deal with good vertices. The restriction on vertices is mild since if the root system is reduced, then all special vertices are good; moreover, in the non-reduced case the compactification for all special vertices is constructed thanks to a certain *distinguished* random walk described in Appendix A. We start by recalling the basics of random walks on discrete structures, and then we immediately specialize the situation to affine buildings by describing the asymptotics of ground spherical functions. This enables us to provide the uniqueness statements for limits of Martin kernels, which lead to the identifications announced in Theorem A of the introduction. The last two parts contain the convergence theorems which define and describe the Martin compactifications of affine buildings, at and above the bottom of the spectrum.

**9.1. Martin embeddings.** We say that a random walk is *isotropic* if the transition probabilities  $p(x, y)$  only depend on  $\sigma(x, y)$ , i.e. are constant on

$$\{(x', y') \in V_g \times V_g : \sigma(x', y') = \sigma(x, y)\}.$$

We set

$$\begin{aligned} p(0; x, y) &= \delta_x(y), \\ p(n; x, y) &= \sum_{z \in V_p} p(n-1; x, z)p(z, y), \quad n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

A random walk is *irreducible* if for each  $x, y \in V_g$  there is  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $p(n; x, y) > 0$ . It is *aperiodic* if for every  $x \in V_g$ ,

$$\gcd \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p(n; x, x) > 0\} = 1.$$

And lastly, a walk has *finite range* if for every  $x \in V_g$ , we have

$$\#\{y \in V_g : p(x, y) > 0\} < \infty.$$

For each isotropic finite range random walk on good vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$  with transition density  $p$ , we define the corresponding operator acting on  $f : V_g \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  as

$$(9.1) \quad Af(x) = \sum_{y \in V_g} p(x, y) f(y).$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathbb{C}\text{-span}\{A_\lambda : \lambda \in P^+\}$  be the commutative  $\star$ -subalgebra of the algebra of bounded linear operators on  $\ell^2(V_g)$  where  $A_\lambda$  are defined in (6.4). The multiplicative functionals on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  are given in terms of Macdonald polynomials. The latter are defined for  $\lambda \in P^+$ , as

$$(9.2) \quad P_\lambda(z) = \frac{\chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\lambda)}{W(q^{-1})} \sum_{w \in W} e^{\langle w \cdot z, \lambda \rangle} \mathbf{c}(w \cdot z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^r,$$

where

$$(9.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}(z) &= \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} \frac{1 - \tau_\alpha^{-1} \tau_{\alpha/2}^{-1/2} e^{-\langle z, \alpha^\vee \rangle}}{1 - \tau_{\alpha/2}^{-1/2} e^{-\langle z, \alpha^\vee \rangle}} \\ &= \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++}} \frac{\left(1 - \tau_{2\alpha}^{-1} \tau_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle z, \alpha^\vee \rangle}\right) \left(1 + \tau_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle z, \alpha^\vee \rangle}\right)}{1 - e^{-\langle z, \alpha^\vee \rangle}}. \end{aligned}$$

The values of  $P_\lambda$  when the denominator of the  $\mathbf{c}$ -function equals zero can be obtained by taking appropriate limits. The mapping

$$h_z(A_\lambda) = P_\lambda(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^r, \lambda \in P^+$$

extends to a multiplicative functional, still denoted by  $h_z$ , on  $\mathcal{A}_0$ . Moreover, all multiplicative functions on  $\mathcal{A}_0$  are of this form. For more details about spherical harmonic analysis on  $\mathcal{X}$  we refer the interested reader to [31] and [43].

In fact the formula (9.2) defines Macdonald polynomials for a given root system  $\Phi$  and parameters  $(\tau_\alpha : \alpha \in \Phi)$  invariant under the action of the Weyl group  $W$ . In particular, the definition is valid without any underlying building, see e.g. [36].

We henceforth fix an isotropic finite range random walk on good vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$ , with transition function  $p$ . Since the walk has finite range, there are a finite set  $\mathcal{V} \subset P$  and positive real numbers  $\{c_v : v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ , such that

$$(9.4) \quad \kappa(z) := \varrho^{-1} h_z(A) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} c_v e^{\langle z, v \rangle}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^r$$

where

$$(9.5) \quad \varrho = h_0(A)$$

with  $A$  given by (9.1). For each  $\zeta \geq \varrho$ , the *Green function*  $G_\zeta$  is defined as

$$G_\zeta(x, y) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \zeta^{-n} p(n; x, y), \quad x, y \in V_g.$$

Without loss of generality we assume that the random walk is aperiodic. Indeed, otherwise we consider

$$\tilde{p}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_x(y) + \frac{1}{2} p(x, y).$$

Then

$$G_\zeta(x, y) = \frac{\zeta}{\zeta + 1} \tilde{G}_{\frac{\zeta+1}{2}}(x, y).$$

Next, let us observe that for each  $y \in V_g$ , the function

$$V_g \ni x \mapsto G_\zeta(x, y)$$

is  $\zeta$ -harmonic, that is

$$\sum_{v \in V_g} p(x, v) G_\zeta(v, y) = \zeta G_\zeta(x, y).$$

Recall that a function  $f : V_g \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is called  $\zeta$ -superharmonic if  $Af \leq \zeta f$ . Let us denote by  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g)$  the set of positive  $\zeta$ -superharmonic functions on good vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$ , normalized to take value 1 at the origin  $o$ . The set  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g)$  endowed with the topology of pointwise convergence is a compact second countable Hausdorff space, thus it is metrizable. For an automorphism  $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  and a function  $f \in \mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g)$  we set

$$(9.6) \quad (g.f)(x) = \frac{f(g^{-1}.x)}{f(g^{-1}.o)}$$

provided that  $f(g^{-1}.o) \neq 0$ . Let us define the map

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : V_g &\longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g) \\ y &\longmapsto K_\zeta(\cdot, y) \end{aligned}$$

where for  $x, y \in V_g$  we have set

$$K_\zeta(x, y) = \frac{G_\zeta(x, y)}{G_\zeta(o, y)}.$$

Since the random walk is transient, the map  $\iota$  is injective. Moreover, for  $g \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ , we have

$$g.\iota(y) = g.K_\zeta(\cdot, y) = \frac{K_\zeta(g^{-1}., y)}{K_\zeta(g^{-1}.o, y)} = \frac{K_\zeta(\cdot, g.y)}{K_\zeta(o, g.y)} = K_\zeta(\cdot, g.y) = \iota(gy)$$

thus  $\iota$  is equivariant. Notice that  $\iota(V_g)$  is also discrete, because for  $y, y' \in V_g$  with  $y \neq y'$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_\zeta(y, y) - K_\zeta(y, y') &= \frac{G_\zeta(y, y)G_\zeta(o, y') - G_\zeta(o, y)G_\zeta(y, y')}{G_\zeta(o, y)G_\zeta(o, y')} \\ &= \frac{(G_\zeta(o, o) - 1)G_\zeta(o, y') + G_\zeta(o, y') - G_\zeta(o, y)G_\zeta(y, y')}{G_\zeta(o, y)G_\zeta(o, y')} \\ &\geq \frac{G_\zeta(o, o) - 1}{G_\zeta(o, y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \zeta}$  be the closure of  $\iota(V_g)$  in  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g)$ . The space  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_g)$  is metrizable, thus by Lemma 2.1, while studying  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \zeta}$  we restrict attention to core sequences. By [23, Proposition 6.4], the group  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  acts continuously on  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \zeta}$ .

**9.2. Asymptotic behavior of ground state spherical functions.** Before embarking on the computing the Martin kernels, we need the following auxiliary result. Given a subset  $J \subseteq I_0$ , let us define

$$\mathcal{P}_J(\mu) = \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{|W_J|} \sum_{w \in W_J} e^{\langle w, \theta, \mu \rangle} \mathbf{c}_J(w, \theta), \quad \mu \in P.$$

Let  $\mathbf{b}_J(z) = e^{\langle z, \rho_J \rangle} \mathbf{c}_J(z) \Delta_J(z)$  where  $\rho_J = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++}} \alpha^\vee$ , and

$$\Delta_J(z) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++}} \left( e^{\frac{1}{2} \langle z, \alpha^\vee \rangle} - e^{-\frac{1}{2} \langle z, \alpha^\vee \rangle} \right).$$

If  $J = I_0$  we drop the index  $J$  from the notation. By (9.2) it stems

$$(9.7) \quad P_\mu(0) = \frac{|W|}{W(q^{-1})} \chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mu) \mathcal{P}(\mu).$$

Here we describe the asymptotics of the auxiliary functions  $\mathcal{P}_J$  which will be used in the next section to describe the asymptotics of ground spherical functions.



**Proposition 9.1.** *Let  $J \subsetneq I_0$ . Suppose that  $(\gamma_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  is a sequence of dominant co-weights such that*

$$(9.8) \quad \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \langle \gamma_n, \alpha \rangle < \infty, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Phi_J^+,$$

and

$$(9.9) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \gamma_n, \alpha \rangle = +\infty, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J^+.$$

Then there is a positive constant  $a_J$ , such that

$$(9.10) \quad \mathcal{P}(\gamma_n) = \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \setminus \Phi_J} \langle \gamma_n, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right) \mathcal{P}_J(\gamma_n) (a_J + o(1)).$$

*Proof.* The proof is in two steps.

**Step 1.** Let us first prove (9.10) assuming that the sequence  $(\gamma_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  satisfies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\gamma_n| = +\infty$ , and

$$(9.11) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \frac{\gamma_n}{|\gamma_n|}, \alpha_j \right\rangle = 0, \quad \text{for all } j \in J,$$

instead of (9.8) and (9.9). We write

$$\sum_{w \in W} e^{\langle w \cdot \theta, \gamma \rangle} \mathbf{c}(w \cdot \theta) = \sum_{w \in W} e^{\langle w \cdot \theta, \gamma + \rho \rangle} \mathbf{b}(w \cdot \theta) \frac{1}{\Delta(w \cdot \theta)}.$$

Since  $\Delta(\theta)$  is a  $W$ -anti-invariant exponential polynomial, we have

$$\sum_{w \in W} e^{\langle w \cdot \theta, \gamma \rangle} \mathbf{c}(w \cdot \theta) = \frac{1}{\Delta(\theta)} \sum_{w \in W} (-1)^{\ell(w)} e^{\langle w \cdot \theta, \gamma + \rho \rangle} \mathbf{b}(w \cdot \theta).$$

Hence, using the definitions of  $P_J$  and  $Q_J$ , see (4.1), we have (see e.g. [2])

$$\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{c_{I_0}}{|W|} \sum_{w \in W} e^{\langle w \cdot \theta, \gamma \rangle} \mathbf{c}(w \cdot \theta) = \left\{ \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++}} \langle \nabla, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right\} \left\{ e^{\langle \theta, Q_J(\gamma + \rho) \rangle} e^{\langle \theta, P_J(\gamma + \rho) \rangle} \mathbf{b}(\theta) \right\}_{\theta=0}$$

which is equal to the sum over  $A \subseteq \Phi^{++}$  of terms

$$(9.12) \quad \prod_{\alpha \in A} \langle Q_J(\gamma + \rho), \alpha^\vee \rangle \left\{ \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \setminus A} \langle \nabla, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right\} \left\{ e^{\langle \theta, P_J(\gamma + \rho) \rangle} \mathbf{b}(\theta) \right\}_{\theta=0}.$$

The constant  $c_J$  is defined as

$$c_J = \left\{ \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \nabla, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right\} \left\{ \Delta_J(\theta) \right\}_{\theta=0}.$$

Observe that (9.12) equals zero if  $A \cap \Phi_J^{++} \neq \emptyset$ . Moreover, if  $A \subseteq \Phi^{++} \setminus \Phi_J^{++}$ , the term (9.12) is  $O(|\gamma|^{|A|})$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{c_{I_0}}{|W|} \sum_{w \in W} e^{\langle w \cdot \theta, \gamma_n \rangle} \mathbf{c}(w \cdot \theta) \\ = \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \setminus \Phi_J} \langle \gamma_n, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right) \left\{ \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \nabla, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right\} \left\{ e^{\langle \theta, P_J(\gamma_n + \rho) \rangle} \mathbf{b}(\theta) \right\}_{\theta=0} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we can reverse the steps to get

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \nabla, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right\} \left\{ e^{\langle \theta, P_J(\gamma + \rho) \rangle} \mathbf{b}(\theta) \right\}_{\theta=0} &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{c_J}{|W_J|} \sum_{w \in W_J} e^{\langle w \cdot \theta, P_J(\gamma + \rho) \rangle} \mathbf{b}(w \cdot \theta) \Delta_J(w \cdot \theta) \\ &= \lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0} \frac{c_J}{|W_J|} \sum_{w \in W_J} e^{\langle w \cdot \theta, P_J(\gamma) \rangle} \mathbf{c}_J(w \cdot \theta) \frac{\mathbf{b}(w \cdot \theta)}{\mathbf{b}_J(w \cdot \theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{b}/\mathbf{b}_J$  is  $W_J$ -invariant, the proof of the first step is completed.

**Step 2.** Let  $(\gamma_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  be a sequence satisfying (9.8) and (9.9). The proof is by induction over the rank. If  $r = 2$ , the conclusion easily follows by Step 1. Suppose that Proposition 9.1 holds true for all root systems of rank smaller than  $r$ . We define

$$J_1 = \left\{ j \in I_0 : \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \frac{\gamma_n}{|\gamma_n|}, \alpha_j \right\rangle = 0 \right\}.$$

Notice that  $J \subseteq J_1$ . In view of Step 1, we have

$$(9.13) \quad \mathcal{P}(\gamma_n) = \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \setminus \Phi_{J_1}} \langle \gamma_n, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right) \mathcal{P}_{J_1}(\gamma_n) \frac{c_{J_1} \mathbf{b}(0)}{c_{I_0} \mathbf{b}_{J_1}(0)} (1 + o(1)).$$

This concludes the proof in the case  $J = J_1$ . If  $J \subsetneq J_1$ , we consider  $J_1$  in place of  $I_0$ . By the inductive hypothesis we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{J_1}(\gamma_n) = \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_{J_1}^{++} \setminus \Phi_J} \langle \gamma_n, \alpha^\vee \rangle \right) \mathcal{P}_J(\gamma_n) \frac{c_J \mathbf{b}_{J_1}(0)}{c_{J_1} \mathbf{b}_J(0)} (1 + o(1)),$$

which together with (9.13) finishes the proof.  $\square$

**9.3. Uniqueness of limit functions.** We introduce here partial ground state spherical functions attached to subsets of simple roots. These functions will appear naturally when constructing the Martin boundary. This fits well with the fact that façades at infinity (as defined in Section 4.3) can be used to describe Martin compactifications. The partial ground spherical functions are combined with partial horospherical functions: the presence of the latter factors is explained by the fact that the corresponding affine buildings of smaller rank lie at infinity. The difference between the analytic behaviors of the factors enables us to provide a precise parametrization of the functions in the Martin boundaries.

Let us define the  $J$ -ground state spherical function as

$$\Phi_J(\lambda) = \frac{|W_J|}{W_J(q^{-1})} \chi_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\lambda) \mathcal{P}_J(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in P^+.$$

Recall that  $P_J$  is the orthogonal projection  $\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_J$  defined in (4.1).

**Theorem 9.2.** *Let  $J, J' \subsetneq I_0$ ,  $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$ ,  $y \in [o, \omega]$ ,  $y' \in [o, \omega']$ . If for all  $x \in V_g$ , we have*

$$(9.14) \quad \frac{\Phi_J(\sigma(x, y))}{\Phi_J(\sigma(o, y))} \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau^{\frac{1}{2} \langle h(o, x; \omega), \alpha \rangle} = \frac{\Phi_{J'}(\sigma(x, y'))}{\Phi_{J'}(\sigma(o, y'))} \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{J'}} \tau^{\frac{1}{2} \langle h(o, x; \omega'), \alpha \rangle}$$

*then  $J' = J$ ,  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ , and  $P_J(\sigma(o, y)) = P_J(\sigma(o, y'))$ .*

Note that the ratio of values of partial spherical ground functions above corresponds to the fact that, in the group case, the function space used to define Martin compactifications is acted upon by a projective action (see [23, p. 101, paragraph before Proposition 6.4]). The corresponding uniqueness statement in the case of symmetric spaces is [23, Theorem 7.22]: this result is more analytic and group-theoretic in nature since it establishes the uniqueness of eigenfunctions of Laplace operators satisfying some invariance under the action of a well-chosen unipotent subgroup.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing  $\omega$  and  $\omega'$  in its boundary. Let  $\tilde{\omega}$  be opposite to  $\omega$  such that  $[\omega, \tilde{\omega}] = \mathcal{A}$ . We select  $x \in V_s(\mathcal{A}) \cap [y', \tilde{\omega}] \cap [y, \tilde{\omega}]$ . Let  $\psi$  be the type-rotating isomorphism  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \Sigma$  such that  $\psi([x, \omega]) = S_0$ . For  $\lambda \in P^+$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set

$$x_{\lambda; n} = \psi^{-1}(-n\lambda).$$

Then

$$\sigma(x_{\lambda; n}, y) = \sigma(x_{\lambda; n}, x) + \sigma(x, y)$$

$$= n\lambda + \sigma(x, y),$$

and

$$\sigma(x_{\lambda;n}, y') = n\lambda + \sigma(x, y').$$

Next, by the cocycle relation

$$\begin{aligned} h(o, x_{\lambda;n}; \omega) &= h(o, x; \omega) + h(x, x_{\lambda;n}; \omega) \\ &= h(o, x; \omega) - n\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there is  $w \in W$  such that  $w.h(x, x_{\lambda;n}; \omega) = h(x, x_{\lambda;n}; \omega')$ , thus

$$\begin{aligned} h(o, x_{\lambda;n}; \omega') &= h(o, x; \omega') + h(x, x_{\lambda;n}; \omega') \\ &= h(o, x; \omega') - nw.\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$(9.15) \quad \frac{\Phi_J(\sigma(x, y) + n\lambda)}{\Phi_J(\sigma(x, y))} \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{-\frac{n}{2} \langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle} = \frac{\Phi_{J'}(\sigma(x, y') + n\lambda)}{\Phi_{J'}(\sigma(x, y'))} \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{J'}} \tau_\alpha^{-\frac{n}{2} \langle w.\lambda, \alpha \rangle}.$$

Suppose, contrarily to our claim, that there is  $j \in J \setminus J'$ . Select  $\lambda = \lambda_j$ . Then the left hand-side of (9.15) takes the form

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y) + n\lambda_j)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y))} \chi_J(-\frac{n}{2}\lambda_j) \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{-\frac{n}{2} \langle \lambda_j, \alpha \rangle}$$

which has a factor that is a non-trivial polynomial in  $n$ , while the right hand-side equals

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{J'}} \tau_\alpha^{-\frac{n}{2} \langle w.\lambda_j, \alpha \rangle}.$$

Therefore, (9.15) cannot be satisfied for  $n$  sufficiently large. Hence  $J = J'$  and (9.15) takes the form

$$(9.16) \quad \frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y) + n\lambda)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y))} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y'))}{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y') + n\lambda)} = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\frac{n}{2} \langle \lambda - w^{-1}.\lambda, \alpha \rangle}.$$

However, (9.16) cannot be satisfied unless both sides are constant sequences for  $n$  sufficiently large. Checking the right hand-side of (9.16) we conclude that it has to be constant equal to 1 for  $n \geq 1$ . Therefore, for all  $\lambda \in P^+$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$(9.17) \quad \frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y) + n\lambda)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y))} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y') + n\lambda)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y'))}$$

and

$$(9.18) \quad \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle} = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w^{-1}.\lambda, \alpha \rangle}.$$

We start with (9.17). The argument used in the proof of Proposition 9.1, shows that

$$\begin{aligned} c_J \mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y) + n\lambda) &= \mathbf{b}_J(0) \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \sigma(x, y) + \rho_J + n\lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{\beta \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \nabla, \beta^\vee \rangle \mathbf{b}_J(0) \cdot \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++} \\ \alpha \neq \beta}} \langle \sigma(x, y) + \rho_J + n\lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle + \text{lower powers of } n. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} c_J \mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y) + n\lambda) &= n^{|\Phi_J^{++}|} \mathbf{b}_J(0) \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \\ &\quad + n^{|\Phi_J^{++}|-1} \mathbf{b}_J(0) \sum_{\beta \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \sigma(x, y) + \rho_J, \beta^\vee \rangle \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++} \\ \alpha \neq \beta}} \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$+ n^{|\Phi_J^{++}|-1} \sum_{\beta \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \nabla, \beta^\vee \rangle \mathbf{b}_J(0) \cdot \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++} \\ \alpha \neq \beta}} \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle + \text{lower powers of } n.$$

For  $\lambda = \rho$ , by comparing the leading terms in (9.17), we immediately get

$$\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y)) = \mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y')).$$

Now, the equality of the following terms implies that for all  $\lambda \in P^+$ , we have

$$(9.19) \quad \sum_{\beta \in \Phi_J^{++}} \langle \sigma(x, y) - \sigma(x, y'), \beta^\vee \rangle \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++} \\ \alpha \neq \beta}} \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0.$$

We notice that for each  $j \in J$ , if  $\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++}$  satisfies  $\langle \alpha, \rho - \lambda_j \rangle = 0$ , then  $\alpha = \alpha_j$ . Thus, taking  $\lambda = \rho - \lambda_j$  in (9.19), we obtain

$$\langle \sigma(x, y) - \sigma(x, y'), \alpha_j^\vee \rangle \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi_J^{++} \\ \alpha \neq \alpha_j}} \langle \rho - \lambda_j, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0.$$

Summarizing, we showed that for all  $\alpha \in \Phi_J^+$  and  $x \in V_s(\mathcal{A}) \cap [y', \tilde{\omega}] \cap [y, \tilde{\omega}]$ , we have

$$(9.20) \quad \langle \sigma(x, y), \alpha \rangle = \langle \sigma(x, y'), \alpha \rangle.$$

Now, we claim that this leads to

$$(9.21) \quad \langle \sigma(o, y), \alpha \rangle \leq \langle \sigma(o, y'), \alpha \rangle, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Phi_J^+.$$

To see this, we fix  $\alpha \in \Phi_J^+$ . Let  $L_x, L_o, L_y$  and  $L_{y'}$  be the half-apartments containing  $\tilde{\omega}$ , whose bounding walls are all directed by  $\text{Ker}(\alpha)$  and pass through  $x, o, y$  and  $y'$ , respectively. Let us denote by  $L_u$  the smallest half-apartment in  $\mathcal{A}$  that contains  $\mathcal{A} \cap L_{y'}$ , whose bounding wall is directed by  $\text{Ker}(\alpha)$  and contains special vertices, with  $u$  being any of them. Then there are two possibilities,

$$L_y \subseteq L_u \subseteq L_o \subseteq L_x \quad \text{and} \quad L_{y'} \subseteq L_u \subseteq L_o \subseteq L_x,$$

or

$$L_y \subseteq L_o \subsetneq L_u \subseteq L_x \quad \text{and} \quad L_{y'} \subseteq L_u \subseteq L_x.$$

In the first case, by considering the number of  $\alpha$ -walls, we see that

$$\langle \sigma(x, y), \alpha \rangle = \langle \sigma(x, o), \alpha \rangle + \langle \sigma(o, u), \alpha \rangle + \langle \sigma(u, y), \alpha \rangle$$

and

$$\langle \sigma(x, y'), \alpha \rangle = \langle \sigma(x, o), \alpha \rangle + \langle \sigma(o, u), \alpha \rangle + \langle \sigma(u, y'), \alpha \rangle.$$

Therefore, by (9.20), we get

$$\langle \sigma(o, y'), \alpha \rangle = \langle \sigma(o, y), \alpha \rangle.$$

In the second case, we have

$$\langle \sigma(o, y'), \alpha \rangle \geq \langle \sigma(u, y'), \alpha \rangle$$

and

$$\langle \sigma(o, y), \alpha \rangle \leq \langle \sigma(u, y), \alpha \rangle.$$

Since by (9.20)

$$\langle \sigma(u, y), \alpha \rangle = \langle \sigma(x, y), \alpha \rangle - \langle \sigma(x, u), \alpha \rangle = \langle \sigma(u, y'), \alpha \rangle,$$

we conclude (9.21).

Consequently, we proved that (9.14) implies (9.21). Since we can swap  $J, \omega$  and  $y$  with  $J', \omega'$  and  $y'$ , respectively, by (9.21) we also get

$$\langle \sigma(o, y'), \alpha \rangle \leq \langle \sigma(o, y), \alpha \rangle, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Phi_J^+.$$

Hence, we have  $P_J(\sigma(o, y)) = P_J(\sigma(o, y'))$ .

Next, we show that (9.18) entails that  $w \in W_J$ . Let  $k = \ell(w)$  and suppose that  $w = w_k = w_{k-1}r_{\beta_k}$  is such that  $\ell(w_k) > \ell(w_{k-1})$ . Since the set

$$(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J) \cap r_{\beta_k}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)$$

is stable under the reflection  $r_{\beta_k}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \alpha \rangle} &= \left( \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \in r_{\beta_k}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, r_{\beta_k} \cdot \alpha \rangle} \right) \left( \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \notin r_{\beta_k}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, r_{\beta_k} \cdot \alpha \rangle} \right) \\ &= \left( \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \in r_{\beta_k}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \alpha \rangle} \right) \left( \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \notin r_{\beta_k}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \alpha \rangle} \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_k^\vee \rangle} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \beta_k \rangle} \right) \\ &= \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \alpha \rangle} \left( \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \notin r_{\beta_k}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_k^\vee \rangle} \right)^{\langle w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \beta_k \rangle}. \end{aligned}$$

Using induction on  $k$ , we get

$$(9.22) \quad \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\langle w^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \alpha \rangle} = \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle} \right) \prod_{j=1}^k \left( \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \notin r_{\beta_j}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} \right)^{\langle \lambda, w_{j-1} \cdot \beta_j \rangle}.$$

Let

$$\tilde{\rho} = \sum_{j \in I_0 \setminus J} \lambda_j.$$

We claim the following holds true.

**Claim 9.3.** *If  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$  and  $\langle \tilde{\rho}, r_\beta \cdot \alpha \rangle \leq 0$ , then  $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle > 0$ .*

To see this, we write

$$0 \geq \langle \tilde{\rho}, r_\beta \cdot \alpha \rangle = \langle \tilde{\rho}, \alpha \rangle - \langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle \langle \tilde{\rho}, \beta \rangle.$$

Since  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$ , we have  $\langle \tilde{\rho}, \beta \rangle > 0$  and  $\langle \tilde{\rho}, \alpha \rangle > 0$ , and thus

$$\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle \geq \frac{\langle \tilde{\rho}, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \tilde{\rho}, \beta \rangle} > 0,$$

proving the claim.

Now, from (9.18) and (9.22) we deduce that

$$(9.23) \quad \prod_{j=1}^k \left( \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \notin r_{\beta_j}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} \right)^{\langle \lambda, w_{j-1} \cdot \beta_j \rangle} = 1.$$

Observe that if  $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$  but  $\alpha \notin r_{\beta_j}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)$ , then

$$r_{\beta_j} \cdot \alpha \in (\Phi^- \setminus \Phi_J) \cup \Phi_J.$$

Therefore,  $\langle \tilde{\rho}, r_{\beta_j} \cdot \alpha \rangle \leq 0$  which together with Claim 9.3 implies that

$$\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle > 0.$$

If  $\Phi$  is reduced, then  $\tau_\alpha > 1$ , thus

$$(9.24) \quad \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} < 1.$$

In the non-reduced case, if  $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$ ,  $\alpha \notin r_{\beta_j}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)$  and  $2\alpha \in \Phi$ , then  $2\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$  and  $2\alpha \notin r_{\beta_j}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)$ . Thus

$$(9.25) \quad \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} \tau_{2\alpha}^{-\langle 2\alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} = (q_\alpha q_{\alpha_0})^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} < 1.$$

Lastly, for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ ,  $w_j = w_{j-1}r_{\beta_j}$  and  $\ell(w_j) > \ell(w_{j-1})$ , hence by [27, Section 5.7, Proposition] we have

$$(9.26) \quad w_{j-1} \cdot \beta_j \in \Phi^+.$$

Consequently, for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ ,

$$\prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \notin r_{\beta_j}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} = 1,$$

which in view of (9.24) and (9.25) is impossible unless the product is empty. The latter is possible only when  $\beta_j \in \Phi_J^+$ . Therefore,  $w \in W_J$  and so  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ . This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

Here is a variant of the previous uniqueness result which takes into account an additional radial parameter; it will be used to describe the Martin boundary above the bottom of the spectrum. Recall that the sector face  $[o, F_J]$  is the subset of  $\mathcal{F}$  consisting of the vectors such that  $\langle x, \alpha \rangle \geq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$  and  $\langle x, \alpha \rangle = 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Phi_J$ .

**Theorem 9.4.** *Let  $J, J' \subseteq I_0$ ,  $\omega, \omega' \in \Omega$ ,  $s \in [o, F_J]$ ,  $s' \in [o, F_{J'}]$  and  $y \in [o, \omega]$ ,  $y' \in [o, \omega']$ . If for all  $x \in V_g$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Phi_J(\sigma(x, y))}{\Phi_J(\sigma(o, y))} & \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}\langle h(o, x; \omega), \alpha \rangle} \right) e^{\langle s, h(o, x; \omega) \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\Phi_{J'}(\sigma(x, y'))}{\Phi_{J'}(\sigma(o, y'))} \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{J'}} \tau_\alpha^{\frac{1}{2}\langle h(o, x; \omega'), \alpha \rangle} \right) e^{\langle s', h(o, x; \omega') \rangle} \end{aligned}$$

then  $J' = J$ ,  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ ,  $s = s'$  and  $P_J(\sigma(o, y)) = P_J(\sigma(o, y'))$ .

*Proof.* By the same line of reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 9.2, we can show that  $J = J'$  and  $P_J(\sigma(o, y)) = P_J(\sigma(o, y'))$ . Moreover, there is  $w \in W$  such that for all  $\lambda \in P^+$ ,

$$(9.27) \quad \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle} \right) e^{\langle s, \lambda \rangle} = \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle w^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \alpha \rangle} \right) e^{\langle s', w^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle}.$$

It remains to conclude that  $s = s'$  and  $w \in W_J$ . Using the notation from the proof of Theorem 9.2, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s', w^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle &= \langle r_{\beta_k} \cdot s', w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle \\ &= \langle s', w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle - \langle s', \beta_k^\vee \rangle \langle w_{k-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \beta_k \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by induction on  $k$ , we get

$$e^{\langle s', w^{-1} \cdot \lambda \rangle} = e^{\langle s', \lambda \rangle} \prod_{j=1}^k \left( e^{-\langle s', \beta_j^\vee \rangle} \right)^{\langle w_{j-1}^{-1} \cdot \lambda, \beta_j \rangle},$$

which together with (9.22) and (9.27) gives

$$(9.28) \quad e^{\langle s, \lambda \rangle} = e^{\langle s', \lambda \rangle} \prod_{j=1}^k \left( e^{-\langle s', \beta_j^\vee \rangle} \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \notin r_{\beta_j}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} \right)^{\langle \lambda, w_{j-1} \cdot \beta_j \rangle}$$

Since  $s' \in [o, F_J]$ , we have  $\langle s', \beta^\vee \rangle \geq 0$ , for all  $\beta \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$ . Therefore, by (9.28)

$$e^{\langle s, \lambda \rangle} \leq e^{\langle s', \lambda \rangle}, \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in P^+.$$



Since we can swap  $J$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $s$  and  $y$  with  $J'$ ,  $\omega'$ ,  $s'$  and  $y'$ , respectively, we also get the reverse inequality thus  $s = s'$ . Now, in view of (9.26), (9.24) and (9.25), from (9.28) we deduce that for each  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ ,

$$e^{-\langle s, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} \prod_{\substack{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J \\ \alpha \notin r_{\beta_j}(\Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J)}} \tau_\alpha^{-\langle \alpha, \beta_j^\vee \rangle} = 1$$

which is impossible unless  $\langle s, \beta_j \rangle = 0$  and the product is empty. The latter is possible only when  $\beta_j \in \Phi_J^+$ . Therefore,  $w \in W_J$  and so  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$  and the theorem follows.  $\square$

**9.4. Martin compactification for  $\zeta = \varrho$ .** In this section we describe the Martin compactification at the bottom of the spectrum corresponding to the isotropic finite range random walk on good vertices of the building  $\mathcal{X}$  chosen in Section 9.1. We set  $\zeta = \varrho$  where  $\varrho$  is defined in (9.5).

As for Furstenberg compactifications, it is convenient to use the notions and terminology introduced in Section 4, including façades indexed by spherical facets at infinity. We again use the notation of Section 4.3.

**Theorem 9.5.** *Suppose that  $(y_n)$  is an  $(\omega, J, c)$ -core sequence. We denote by  $F$  the spherical facet at infinity corresponding to the residue  $\text{res}_J(\omega)$  and by  $\pi_F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(F)$  the projection to the façade at infinity  $\mathcal{X}(F)$ . Then for all  $x \in V_g$ , we have*

$$(9.29) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_\varrho(x, y_n) = \frac{\Phi_J(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_F, y_F))}{\Phi_J(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(o_F, y_F))} \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\frac{1}{2} \langle h(o, x; \omega), \alpha \rangle}$$

where  $x_F = \pi_F(x)$ ,  $y_F = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_F(y_n)$  (limit of a constant sequence). If  $(y'_n)$  is an  $(\omega', J', c')$ -core sequence such that  $(K_\varrho(\cdot, y'_n))$  converges to the same limit, then  $J' = J$ ,  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ , and  $c' = c$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\gamma_n = \sigma(o, y_n)$  and  $\eta_n = \sigma(x, y_n)$ . By [53, Theorem 6], we have

$$G_\varrho(o, y_n) = P_{\gamma_n}(0) |\gamma_n|^{-r-2|\Phi^{++}|+2} (D_0 + o(1))$$

and

$$G_\varrho(x, y_n) = P_{\eta_n}(0) |\eta_n|^{-r-2|\Phi^{++}|+2} (D_0 + o(1))$$

where  $D_0$  is a certain positive constant. Hence, by (9.7),

$$K_\varrho(x, y_n) = \frac{\mathcal{P}(\eta_n)}{\mathcal{P}(\gamma_n)} \left( \frac{|\gamma_n|}{|\eta_n|} \right)^{r+2|\Phi^{++}|-2} \chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\eta_n - \gamma_n) (1 + o(1)).$$

By (5.2), for all  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$ , we have

$$(9.30) \quad \langle \gamma_n, \alpha \rangle \leq \langle \sigma(o, x), \alpha \rangle + \langle \eta_n, \alpha \rangle,$$

and

$$(9.31) \quad \langle \eta_n, \alpha \rangle \leq \langle \sigma(x, o), \alpha \rangle + \langle \gamma_n, \alpha \rangle.$$

Hence,  $|\gamma_n| = |\eta_n|(1 + o(1))$ , and for all  $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J$ ,

$$\frac{\langle \gamma_n, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \eta_n, \alpha \rangle} = 1 + o(1).$$

Observe that by Lemma 4.1, for all  $\alpha \in \Phi_J^+$ ,

$$\langle \sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_F, y_F), \alpha \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \gamma_n, \alpha \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(o_F, y_F), \alpha \rangle = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \eta_n, \alpha \rangle.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 9.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{P}(\eta_n)}{\mathcal{P}(\gamma_n)} &= \frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\eta_n)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\gamma_n)} \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \setminus \Phi_J} \frac{\langle \eta_n, \alpha^\vee \rangle}{\langle \gamma_n, \alpha^\vee \rangle} \right) (1 + o(1)) \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_F, y_F))}{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(o_F, y_F))} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we invoke Lemma 5.1 to get

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\eta_n - \gamma_n) &= \frac{\chi_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\eta_n)}{\chi_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\gamma_n)} \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\frac{1}{2} \langle \gamma_n - \eta_n, \alpha \rangle} \right) \\ &= \frac{\chi_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_F, y_F))}{\chi_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(o_F, y_F))} \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\frac{1}{2} \langle h(o, x; \omega), \alpha \rangle} \right) (1 + o(1)) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (9.29). The uniqueness part of the theorem follows from Theorem 9.2.  $\square$

**Remark 4.** Assume that the finite root system associated to the building  $\mathcal{X}$  is reduced. As a direct consequence of Theorems 7.1 and 9.5 we conclude that the Martin compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \varrho}$  for any finite range isotropic random walk on special vertices is  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -isomorphic to the Furstenberg compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_F$ . Hence, if there is  $G$  a locally compact closed subgroup of  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$  acting strongly transitively on the building  $\mathcal{X}$  by preserving type then by Theorem 8.1, the Guivarc'h compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_G$  is  $G$ -isomorphic to the Martin compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \varrho}$ . Let us remark that the automorphism group of an irreducible affine building always acts strongly transitively on  $\mathcal{X}$  if the rank of the affine building is at least 4, see [50, page 274].

**9.5. Martin compactification for  $\zeta > \varrho$ .** In this section we describe the Martin compactification above the bottom of the spectrum corresponding to the isotropic finite range random walk on good vertices of the building  $\mathcal{X}$  chosen in Section 9.1. Recall the definition of  $\varrho$  given in (9.5) and  $\kappa$  in (9.4). This is the place where we have to use angular core sequences of good vertices defined at the end of Section 2.4. In order to describe the Martin kernel, let us define

$$\mathcal{C} = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} : \kappa(x) = \zeta \varrho^{-1}\}.$$

Notice that  $\mathcal{C}$  is the boundary of a convex body such that for each  $x \in \mathcal{C}$ , the gradient  $\nabla \kappa(x)$  is well defined. Hence, for each  $u \in \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$ , a unit sphere in  $\mathfrak{a}$  centered at the origin, there is a unique point  $s_u \in \mathcal{C}$ , such that

$$(9.32) \quad \nabla \kappa(s_u) = |\nabla \kappa(s_u)| u.$$

Moreover, if  $u \in \mathbb{S}_+^{r-1}$  then  $s_u \in \mathfrak{a}^+$ . In the next theorem we describe the Martin kernel for  $\zeta > \varrho$ .

**Theorem 9.6.** *Let  $(y_n)$  be an angular core  $(\omega, J, c, u)$ -sequence. We denote by  $F$  the spherical facet at infinity corresponding to the residue  $\text{res}_J(\omega)$  and by  $\pi_F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(F)$  the projection to the façade at infinity  $\mathcal{X}(F)$ . Then for all  $x \in V_g$ , we have*

$$(9.33) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_\zeta(x, y_n) = \frac{\Phi_J(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_F, y_F))}{\Phi_J(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(o_F, y_F))} \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_\alpha^{\frac{1}{2} \langle h(o, x; \omega), \alpha \rangle} \right) e^{\langle s_u, h(o, x; \omega) \rangle}$$

where  $x_F = \pi_F(x)$ ,  $y_F = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_F(y_n)$  (limit of a constant sequence). If  $(y'_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  is an angular core  $(\omega', J', c', u')$ -sequence such that  $(K_\zeta(\cdot, y'_n))$  converges to the same limit then  $J' = J$ ,  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ ,  $c' = c$  and  $u' = u$ .

*Proof.* First, let us introduce some notation. For  $s \in \mathfrak{a}$ , we define a quadratic form on  $\mathfrak{a}$ ,

$$B_s(y, y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v, v' \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{c_v e^{\langle s, v \rangle}}{\kappa(s)} \cdot \frac{c_{v'} e^{\langle s, v' \rangle}}{\kappa(s)} \langle y, v - v' \rangle^2, \quad y \in \mathfrak{a},$$

where  $\kappa$  is given by (9.4). Let

$$J_1 = \{j \in I_0 : \langle u, \alpha_j \rangle = 0\}.$$

In particular,  $J \subseteq J_1 \subsetneq I_0$ . For  $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$ , we set

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \sqrt{2\pi} |\nabla \log \kappa(s_\theta)|^{\frac{r-3}{2} + |\Phi_{J_1}^{++}|} (B_{s_\theta}(\theta, \theta))^{-\frac{1}{2}} Q(s_\theta)$$

where for  $s \in \mathfrak{a}$ ,

$$Q(s) = \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^r \int_{\mathfrak{a}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} B_s(z, z)} |\pi_{J_1}(z)|^2 dz \cdot \frac{1}{|\mathbf{b}_{J_1}(0)|^2} \cdot \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{J_1}} \frac{1 - \tau_{\alpha/2}^{-1/2} e^{-\langle s, \alpha^\vee \rangle}}{1 - \tau_{\alpha}^{-1} \tau_{\alpha/2}^{-1/2} e^{-\langle s, \alpha^\vee \rangle}}$$

and

$$\pi_{J_1}(s) = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_{J_1}^{++}} \langle s, \alpha^\vee \rangle.$$

Observe that  $\mathcal{R}(u) \neq 0$ . Indeed, since

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_{J_1}} \frac{1 - \tau_{\alpha/2}^{-1/2} e^{-\langle s, \alpha^\vee \rangle}}{1 - \tau_{\alpha}^{-1} \tau_{\alpha/2}^{-1/2} e^{-\langle s, \alpha^\vee \rangle}} = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \setminus \Phi_{J_1}} \frac{1 - e^{-\langle s, \alpha^\vee \rangle}}{(1 - \tau_{2\alpha}^{-1} \tau_{\alpha}^{-1/2} e^{-\langle s, \alpha^\vee \rangle/2})(1 + \tau_{\alpha}^{-1/2} e^{-\langle s, \alpha^\vee \rangle/2})},$$

the equality  $\mathcal{R}(u) = 0$  implies that there is  $\alpha \in \Phi^{++} \setminus \Phi_{J_1}$  such that  $\langle s_u, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$ . Hence, by (9.32), we would have  $\langle u, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$ , which is impossible.

Let  $\gamma_n = \sigma(o, y_n)$  and  $\eta_n = \sigma(x, y_n)$ . We set

$$u_n = \frac{\gamma_n}{|\gamma_n|}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_n = \frac{\eta_n}{|\eta_n|}.$$

By (9.30) and (9.31), we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} v_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n = u.$$

Since  $\mathcal{R}$  is a continuous function on  $\mathbb{S}^{r-1}$  and  $\mathcal{R}(u) \neq 0$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}(u_n) = \mathcal{R}(u)(1 + o(1)), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}(v_n) = \mathcal{R}(u)(1 + o(1)).$$

Now, by [53, Theorem 5], we get

$$G_\zeta(o, y_n) = |\gamma_n|^{-\frac{r-1}{2} - |\Phi_{J_1}^{++}|} \chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\gamma_n) \mathcal{P}_{J_1}(\gamma_n) \mathcal{R}(u_n) e^{-\langle s_{u_n}, \gamma_n \rangle} (1 + o(1))$$

and

$$G_\zeta(x, y_n) = |\eta_n|^{-\frac{r-1}{2} - |\Phi_{J_1}^{++}|} \chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\eta_n) \mathcal{P}_{J_1}(\eta_n) \mathcal{R}(v_n) e^{-\langle s_{v_n}, \eta_n \rangle} (1 + o(1)).$$

Hence,

$$K_\zeta(x, y_n) = \left( \frac{|\gamma_n|}{|\eta_n|} \right)^{\frac{r-1}{2} + |\Phi_{J_1}^{++}|} \frac{\mathcal{P}_{J_1}(\eta_n)}{\mathcal{P}_{J_1}(\gamma_n)} \chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\eta_n - \gamma_n) e^{-\langle s_{v_n}, \eta_n \rangle + \langle s_{u_n}, \gamma_n \rangle} (1 + o(1)).$$

By Proposition 9.1, we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}_{J_1}(\eta_n)}{\mathcal{P}_{J_1}(\gamma_n)} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\eta_n)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\gamma_n)} \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_{J_1}^{++} \setminus \Phi_J} \frac{\langle \eta_n, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \gamma_n, \alpha \rangle} \right) (1 + o(1)) = \frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\eta_n)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\gamma_n)} (1 + o(1)).$$

Moreover, in view of Lemmas 4.1 and 5.1,

$$\chi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\eta_n - \gamma_n) = \frac{\chi_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_F, y_F))}{\chi_J^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(o_F, y_F))} \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_{\alpha}^{\frac{1}{2} \langle h(o, x; \omega), \alpha \rangle} \right) (1 + o(1)).$$

Therefore,

$$K_\zeta(x, y_n) = \frac{\Phi_J(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(x_F, y_F))}{\Phi_J(\sigma_{\mathcal{X}(F)}(o_F, y_F))} \left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \setminus \Phi_J} \tau_{\alpha}^{\frac{1}{2} \langle h(o, x; \omega), \alpha \rangle} \right) e^{-\langle s_{v_n}, \eta_n \rangle + \langle s_{u_n}, \gamma_n \rangle} (1 + o(1)).$$

Next, we show the following claim, which uses the projection  $Q_J = \text{id} - P_J$  defined in (4.1).

**Claim 9.7.**

$$(9.34) \quad \langle s_{u_n}, \gamma_n \rangle - \langle s_{v_n}, \eta_n \rangle = \langle s_u, Q_J(\gamma_n - \eta_n) \rangle + o(1).$$

To see this, we write

$$(9.35) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle s_{u_n}, \gamma_n \rangle - \langle s_{v_n}, \eta_n \rangle &= |\gamma_n| \langle s_{u_n}, u_n \rangle - |\eta_n| \langle s_{v_n}, v_n \rangle \\ &= (|\gamma_n| - |\eta_n|) \langle s_{u_n}, u_n \rangle + |\eta_n| (\langle s_{u_n}, u_n \rangle - \langle s_{v_n}, v_n \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

We start by considering the second term in (9.35). Let us denote by  $\mathcal{M}$  the interior of the convex hull of  $\mathcal{V}$ . For  $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^{r-1}$ , we set  $t_0 = \min\{t > 0 : t^{-1}\theta \in \mathcal{M}\}$  and define a function on  $(t_0, \infty)$ ,

$$(9.36) \quad \psi_\theta(t) = t(\log(\zeta^{-1}\rho) - \phi(t^{-1}\theta))$$

where

$$\phi(\delta) = \min \{ \langle x, \delta \rangle - \log \kappa(x) : x \in \mathfrak{a} \}, \quad \delta \in \mathcal{M}.$$

For the properties of  $\phi$ , see [53, Section 2.1]. The function  $\psi_\theta$  attains its unique maximum at  $t_\theta > t_0$ . In particular,  $\psi'_\theta(t_\theta) = 0$  and  $\psi_\theta(t_\theta) = -\langle s_\theta, \theta \rangle$ . Thus the gradient of the function  $\mathbb{S}^{r-1} \ni \theta \mapsto \psi_\theta(t_\theta)$  equals  $-\nabla\phi(t_\theta^{-1}\theta) = -s_\theta$ . Hence, by the Taylor's formula we obtain

$$(9.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle s_{u_n}, u_n \rangle - \langle s_{v_n}, v_n \rangle &= \psi_{v_n}(t_{v_n}) - \psi_{u_n}(t_{u_n}) \\ &= -\langle s_{u_n}, v_n - u_n \rangle + O(|v_n - u_n|^2). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we compute

$$|\eta_n| (u_n - v_n) = \gamma_n - \eta_n + u_n (|\eta_n| - |\gamma_n|).$$

Since  $|\eta_n - \gamma_n|$  is bounded and  $(u_n)$  approaches  $u$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_n| - |\gamma_n| &= \frac{|\eta_n|^2 - |\gamma_n|^2}{|\eta_n| + |\gamma_n|} \\ &= \frac{2\langle \eta_n - \gamma_n, \gamma_n \rangle + |\eta_n - \gamma_n|^2}{|\eta_n| + |\gamma_n|} = \langle \eta_n - \gamma_n, u \rangle + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $|\eta_n| |u_n - v_n|$  is bounded. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta_n| \langle s_{u_n}, u_n - v_n \rangle &= \langle s_{u_n}, \gamma_n - \eta_n \rangle + \langle s_{u_n}, u_n \rangle (|\eta_n| - |\gamma_n|) \\ &= \langle s_u, \gamma_n - \eta_n \rangle + \langle s_{u_n}, u_n \rangle (|\eta_n| - |\gamma_n|) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which together with (9.37) implies that

$$|\eta_n| (\langle s_{u_n}, u_n \rangle - \langle s_{v_n}, v_n \rangle) = \langle s_u, \gamma_n - \eta_n \rangle + \langle s_{u_n}, u_n \rangle (|\eta_n| - |\gamma_n|) + o(1).$$

Therefore, by (9.35), we obtain

$$\langle s_{u_n}, \gamma_n \rangle - \langle s_{v_n}, \eta_n \rangle = \langle s_u, \gamma_n - \eta_n \rangle + o(1)$$

proving (9.34).

Now, Claim 9.7 together with Lemma 5.1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle s_{u_n}, \gamma_n \rangle - \langle s_{v_n}, \eta_n \rangle &= \langle s_u, \gamma_n - \eta_n \rangle + o(1) \\ &= \langle s_u, h(o, x; \omega) \rangle + o(1) \end{aligned}$$

where we have also used  $Q_J(s_u) = s_u$ . This establishes the limit (9.33). The uniqueness part of the theorem follows from Theorem 9.4.  $\square$

**Remark 5.** Assume that the finite root system associated to the building  $\mathcal{X}$  is reduced. In view of Theorems 5.2, 7.1 and 9.6 we see that the Martin compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \zeta}$ ,  $\zeta > \varrho$ , for any isotropic finite range random walk on special vertices is  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -isomorphic to  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_F \vee \overline{\mathcal{X}}_V$ . Similarly, by Theorem 5.2, 9.5 and 9.6 we conclude that  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \zeta}$ ,  $\zeta > \varrho$ , is  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -isomorphic to  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \varrho} \vee \overline{\mathcal{X}}_V$ .

APPENDIX A. DISTINGUISHED RANDOM WALK FOR  $\widetilde{\text{BC}}_r$ 

In Section 9 we study Martin compactifications of affine buildings for isotropic finite range random walks of good vertices. Unfortunately, in the non-reduced case we obtain two different boundaries corresponding to  $V_g$  and  $V_g^\varepsilon$ . In particular, there are no harmonic analytic tools which allow to study functions on  $V_s$ . This limitation is a consequence of a lack of Green's function asymptotics for more general random walks. In this appendix we define a certain random walk on *all* special vertices in the non-reduced case, for which we compute the limits of Martin kernels.

Let us recall that for each  $r \geq 1$  there is only one non-reduced finite root system,  $\text{BC}_r$ , that is

$$\Phi = \{ \pm e_i, \pm 2e_i, \pm e_j \pm e_k : 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j < k \leq r \}$$

where  $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$  is the standard basis of  $\mathfrak{a}$ . The standard base of  $\Phi$  consists of the roots

$$\alpha_j = \begin{cases} e_j - e_{j+1} & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq r-1, \\ e_r & \text{if } j = r. \end{cases}$$

Thus the fundamental co-weights are

$$\lambda_j = e_1 + e_2 + \dots + e_j.$$

Special vertices have type 0 or  $r$ , but only type 0 is good.

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an affine building of non-reduced type. Given a chamber  $c \in C(\mathcal{X})$ , let us denote by  $v_j(c)$  the vertex of  $c$  having type  $j$ . For a vertex  $v \in V(\mathcal{X})$ , let  $C(v)$  be the set of all chambers sharing the vertex  $v$ . For  $x \in V_s$ , we set

$$\mathcal{V}_r(x) = \{v_r(c) : c \in C(x)\}, \quad \text{if } \tau(x) = 0,$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_0(x) = \{v_0(c) : c \in C(x)\}, \quad \text{if } \tau(x) = r.$$

Observe that

$$N_r = \#\mathcal{V}_r(x) = \frac{W(q)}{W_{\lambda_r}(q)}, \quad \text{and} \quad N_0 = \#\mathcal{V}_0(x) = \frac{W_{\lambda_r}^a(q)}{W_{\lambda_r}(q)}$$

where  $W_\lambda^a = \{w \in W^a : w.\lambda = \lambda\}$ . Now, for each  $c \in C(\mathcal{X})$  we set

$$p(v_0(c), v_r(c)) = \frac{1}{N_r}, \quad \text{and} \quad p(v_r(c), v_0(c)) = \frac{1}{N_0}.$$

Then  $P = ((p(x, y) : x, y \in V_s)$  generates a reversible Markov chain on special vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Since the random walk has period 2, it is natural to consider

$$\tilde{p}(x, y) = \sum_{z \in V_g^\varepsilon} p(x, z)p(z, y), \quad x, y \in V_g.$$

For each  $y$  belonging to

$$\bigcup_{c \in C(x)} \{v_0(d) : d \in C(v_r(c))\}$$

there is  $z \in V_g^\varepsilon$  such that

$$\sigma(x, z) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_r, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(z, y) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_r.$$

Moreover, there is  $\omega \in \Omega$  such that  $h(x, y; \omega) \in P^+$ . Since

$$\sigma(x, y) = h(x, z; \omega) + h(z, y; \omega) \in P^+,$$

we conclude that  $\sigma(x, y) = 0$  or  $\lambda_k$  for a certain  $k \in I_0$ . Hence,

$$\bigcup_{c \in C(x)} \{v_0(d) : d \in C(v_r(c))\} = \{x\} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{j \in I'} V_{\lambda_j}(x)$$

for certain subset  $I'$  of  $I_0$ .

Now, let us fix  $y \in V_{\lambda_j}(x)$ . There are  $W_{\lambda_j}(q)$  distinct chambers  $c \in C(x)$  such that there is  $d \in C(v_r(c))$  with  $v_0(d) = y$ , but among them  $W_{\lambda_j \lambda_r}(q)$  share the vertex  $v_r(c)$  where  $W_{\lambda_j \lambda_r} = W_{\lambda_j} \cap W_{\lambda_r}$ . Therefore

$$\sum_{y \in V_g} \tilde{p}(x, y) f(y) = \frac{1}{N_0 N_r} \left( N_r f(x) + \sum_{j \in I'} \frac{W_{\lambda_j}(q)}{W_{\lambda_j \lambda_r}(q)} \sum_{y \in V_{\lambda_j}(x)} f(y) \right).$$

Hence,  $\tilde{P} = (\tilde{p}(x, y) : x, y \in V_g)$  generates a reversible Markov chain on good vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$ . The corresponding averaging operator belongs to the algebra  $\mathcal{A}_0$ . Moreover, if  $x, y \in V_g$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} G_\zeta(x, y) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta^n p(n; x, y) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \zeta^{2n} \tilde{p}(n; x, y) = \tilde{G}_\zeta(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if  $\tau(y) = 0$ , then

$$K_\zeta(x, y) = \begin{cases} \tilde{K}_\zeta(x, y) & \text{if } \tau(x) = 0, \\ \frac{1}{N_0} \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_0(x)} \tilde{K}_\zeta(x', y) & \text{if } \tau(x) = r, \end{cases}$$

where we have set

$$\tilde{K}_\zeta(x, y) = \frac{\tilde{G}_\zeta(x, y)}{\tilde{G}_\zeta(o, y)}, \quad x, y \in V_g.$$

Analogously, we can introduce a random walk whose transition function is given by the formula

$$\tilde{p}^\varepsilon(x, y) = \sum_{z \in V_g} p(x, z) p(z, y), \quad x, y \in V_g^\varepsilon.$$

For a chosen  $o^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{V}_r(o)$ , we set

$$\tilde{K}_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y) = \frac{\tilde{G}_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y)}{\tilde{G}_\zeta^\varepsilon(o^\varepsilon, y)}, \quad x, y \in V_g^\varepsilon,$$

and

$$K_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y) = \frac{G_\zeta(x, y)}{G_\zeta(o^\varepsilon, y)}, \quad x, y \in V_s.$$

Hence, for  $x, y \in V_s$ ,

$$(A.1) \quad K_\zeta(x, y) = \frac{G_\zeta(x, y)}{G_\zeta(o, y)} = \frac{K_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y)}{K_\zeta^\varepsilon(o, y)}.$$

Since for  $x, y \in V_g^\varepsilon$ ,

$$G_\zeta(x, y) = \tilde{G}_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y),$$

if  $\tau(y) = r$  we have

$$(A.2) \quad K_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y) = \begin{cases} \tilde{K}_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y) & \text{if } \tau(x) = r, \\ \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \tilde{K}_\zeta^\varepsilon(x', y) & \text{if } \tau(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Let us denote by  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_s)$  the set of positive  $\zeta$ -superharmonic functions on special vertices of  $\mathcal{X}$ , normalized to take value 1 at the vertex  $o$ . The set  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_s)$  endowed with the topology of pointwise convergence is a compact second countable Hausdorff space. Let us define the map

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : V_s &\longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_s) \\ y &\longmapsto K_\zeta(\cdot, y). \end{aligned}$$



Since the random walk generated by  $P$  is transient, the map  $\iota$  gives an equivariant embedding of  $V_s$  into  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_s)$  which has discrete image. Let  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{M,\zeta}$  be the closure of  $\iota(V_s)$  in  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_s)$ . The space  $\mathcal{B}_\zeta(V_s)$  is metrizable, thus by Lemma 2.1, while studying  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{M,\zeta}$  we can restrict attention to core and angular core sequences.

Now, to  $\tilde{K}_\zeta$  and  $\tilde{K}_\zeta^\varepsilon$  we can apply Theorems 9.5 and 9.6 proving the existence of the limits  $(K_\zeta(\cdot, y_n))$  for core and angular core sequences. It remains to describe sequences having the same limit (this is the analogue of the uniqueness statements in Theorem 9.5 and Theorem 9.6).

Suppose that there are two core sequence  $(y_n)$  and  $(y'_n)$  with parameters  $(\omega, J, c)$  and  $(\omega', J', c')$ , respectively, that have the same limit. We claim that  $J' = J$ ,  $\omega' \sim_J \omega$ , and  $c' = c$ . If  $\tau(y_n) = \tau(y'_n) = 0$  for all  $n$ , it is a direct consequence of Theorem 9.2. Suppose that  $\tau(y_n) = \tau(y'_n) = r$  for all  $n$ . Then by (A.1) for all  $x \in V_g^\varepsilon$ ,

$$\left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_\zeta^\varepsilon(o, y'_n) \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y_n) = \left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_\zeta^\varepsilon(o, y_n) \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_\zeta^\varepsilon(x, y'_n),$$

and we can repeat the same reasoning as in Theorem 9.2 to obtain the desired conclusion.

Finally, let us consider  $\tau(y_n) = 0$  and  $\tau(y'_n) = r$ . Then for all  $x \in V_g$ , by (A.2), we get

$$\left( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_\zeta^\varepsilon(o, y'_n) \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{K}_\zeta(x, y_n) = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{K}_\zeta^\varepsilon(x', y'_n).$$

Let  $y = y_m$  and  $y' = y'_m$  for  $m$  sufficiently large. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an apartment containing  $[o, \omega]$ , and  $\tilde{\omega}$  be opposite to  $\omega$  such that  $[\tilde{\omega}, \omega] = \mathcal{A}$ . Let us consider  $x \in V_g \cap [y', \tilde{\omega}] \cap [o, \tilde{\omega}]$ . By repeating the line of reasoning used in the proof of Theorem 9.2, we show that  $J' = J$ , and

$$\frac{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y) + n\lambda)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y))} = \frac{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \mathcal{P}_J^\varepsilon(\sigma(x', y') + n\lambda) \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega'))}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \mathcal{P}_J^\varepsilon(\sigma(x', y')) \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega'))}$$

for all  $\lambda \in P^+$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ . By comparing the coefficient with  $n^{|\Phi_J^{++}|}$  we get

$$\frac{\mathbf{b}_J(0)}{\mathcal{P}_J(\sigma(x, y))} = \frac{\mathbf{b}_J^\varepsilon(0) \sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega'))}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \mathcal{P}_J^\varepsilon(\sigma(x', y')) \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega'))}.$$

Since  $r \in J$ , by comparing the coefficients with  $n^{|\Phi_J^{++}|-1}$  we arrive at

$$(A.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \sigma(x, y), \alpha_r \rangle + \langle \nabla, \alpha_r \rangle \log \mathbf{b}_J(0) &= \langle \sigma(x, y'), \alpha_r \rangle + \langle \nabla, \alpha_r \rangle \log \mathbf{b}_J^\varepsilon(0) \\ &\quad - \frac{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \langle h(x, x'; \omega'), \alpha_r \rangle \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega'))}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega'))}. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that the following holds true.

**Claim A.1.** For all  $x \in V_g$  and  $\omega \in \Omega$ ,

$$(A.4) \quad \frac{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \langle h(x, x'; \omega), \alpha_r \rangle \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega))}{\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega))} = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{q_{\alpha_0}} - \sqrt{q_{\alpha_r}}}{\sqrt{q_{\alpha_0}} + \sqrt{q_{\alpha_r}}}.$$

For the proof, we recall that  $\alpha_r = e_r$ , thus

$$\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \langle h(x, x'; \omega), \alpha_r \rangle \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\eta \in \{-1, 1\}^r} \eta_r \chi^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^r \eta_j e_j \right) N_\eta$$

where for  $\eta \in \{-1, 1\}^r$ , we have set

$$N_\eta = \# \left\{ x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x) : h(x, x'; \omega) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^r \eta_j e_j \right\}.$$

Let us observe that for  $\eta' \in \{-1, 1\}^{r-1}$ ,

$$N_{(\eta', -1)} = q_{\alpha_r} N_{(\eta', 1)},$$

and by [33, Proposition 5.3]

$$\chi(e_r) = q_{\alpha_0} q_{\alpha_r}.$$

Hence,

$$\chi^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \eta_j e_j + e_r \right) N_{(\eta', 1)} - \chi^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \eta_j e_j - e_r \right) N_{(\eta', -1)} = \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{q_{\alpha_r}}{q_{\alpha_0}}} \right) \chi^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \eta_j e_j + e_r \right) N_{(\eta', 1)},$$

which leads to

$$\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \langle h(x, x'; \omega), \alpha_r \rangle \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega)) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{q_{\alpha_r}}{q_{\alpha_0}}} \right) \sum_{\eta' \in \{-1, 1\}^{r-1}} \chi^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \eta'_j e_j + e_r \right) N_{(\eta', 1)}$$

and

$$\sum_{x' \in \mathcal{V}_r(x)} \chi^{\frac{1}{2}}(h(x, x'; \omega)) = \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{q_{\alpha_r}}{q_{\alpha_0}}} \right) \sum_{\eta' \in \{-1, 1\}^{r-1}} \chi^{\frac{1}{4}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \eta'_j e_j + e_r \right) N_{(\eta', 1)},$$

and the claim follows.

Next, by [43, Section 5.2], for  $\theta = \sum_{j=1}^r \theta_j e_j$ , we have

$$\log \mathbf{b}_J^\varepsilon(\theta) - \log \mathbf{b}_J(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^r \log \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{q_{\alpha_r}}{q_{\alpha_0}}} e^{-\theta_j} \right) - \log \left( 1 + \sqrt{\frac{q_{\alpha_0}}{q_{\alpha_r}}} e^{-\theta_j} \right).$$

Hence,

$$\langle \nabla, \alpha_r \rangle \log \mathbf{b}_J^\varepsilon(0) - \langle \nabla, \alpha_r \rangle \log \mathbf{b}_J(0) = \frac{\sqrt{q_{\alpha_0}} - \sqrt{q_{\alpha_r}}}{\sqrt{q_{\alpha_0}} + \sqrt{q_{\alpha_r}}}.$$

Therefore, by (A.4), the formula (A.3) takes the form

$$\langle \sigma(x, y), \alpha_r \rangle - \langle \sigma(x, y'), \alpha_r \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{q_{\alpha_0}} - \sqrt{q_{\alpha_r}}}{\sqrt{q_{\alpha_0}} + \sqrt{q_{\alpha_r}}}.$$

Since the left-hand side belongs to  $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ , we must have  $q_{\alpha_0} = q_{\alpha_r}$  which leads to contradiction. Analogously, we treat angular core sequences.

**Remark 6.** Assume that the finite root system associated with the building  $\mathcal{X}$  has type  $\text{BC}_r$ . In view of Theorem 7.1 the Martin compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \varrho}$  for the random walk generated by  $P$  is  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -isomorphic to the Furstenberg compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_F$ . Moreover, if there is a locally compact group acting strongly transitively on the building  $\mathcal{X}$  then  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \varrho}$  is  $G$ -isomorphic to the Guivarc'h compactification. Lastly, by Theorems 5.2 and 7.1 we conclude that  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \zeta}$ ,  $\zeta > \varrho$  is  $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{X})$ -isomorphic to  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_F \vee \overline{\mathcal{X}}_V$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M, \varrho} \vee \overline{\mathcal{X}}_V$ .

## APPENDIX B. THE BRUHAT–TITS CASE

In this appendix, we reformulate the main new results of our paper in the situation when the building  $\mathcal{X}$  is Bruhat–Tits, i.e. when it is associated to a semisimple algebraic group over a (locally compact) non-Archimedean valued field. We illustrate our analytic results in the most widely known context dealing with affine buildings (in fact, in view of J. Tits' classification [52, Corollaire p.175], all affine buildings are Bruhat–Tits in dimension  $\geq 3$ ). In particular, we provide statements that can be (hopefully) directly used by those who are interested in Martin compactifications for algebraic groups. Our references for Bruhat–Tits theory are [51] for a global description, which itself summarizes results proved in detail (and in a generalized form) in [13] and [14].

Specifically in this appendix, we deviate from our general convention of using as much as possible the combinatorial viewpoint of abstract simplicial complexes: as in Section 4 we use the geometric viewpoint

where apartments are affine spaces associated to real Euclidean spaces. This is consistent with [51], [13] and [14]; passing from the combinatorial viewpoint to the geometric one is also described in [52, Section 5].

**B.1. The algebraic group setting.** In what follows, we let  $k$  be a (locally compact) non-Archimedean local field and let  $k^\circ$  be its ring of integers; we denote by  $\varpi$  a uniformizer of  $k$ , by  $\kappa = k^\circ/\varpi k^\circ$  its residue field of  $k$  and by  $\text{ord}_k : k^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  the associated valuation. We let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a connected semisimple algebraic group over  $k$ . Then it follows from Bruhat–Tits theory that the group  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  acts on an affine building  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{G}, k)$ , see [51, Section 2]. The action is well-balanced in the sense that it is strongly transitive (i.e. transitive on the inclusions of an alcove in an apartment) and proper (i.e. facet stabilizers are compact); the action is type-preserving as soon as we assume that  $\mathbf{G}$  is simply connected. In this context, apartments in the building are in bijective correspondence with maximal  $k$ -split tori. Let us fix  $\mathbf{S}$  such a maximal  $k$ -split torus and let us denote by  $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{Z}_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$  (resp. by  $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbf{S})$ ) its centralizer (resp. its normalizer). The spherical Weyl group, classically defined as the quotient  $W^{\text{sph}} = \mathbf{N}(k)/\mathbf{Z}(k)$ , is also the Weyl group associated to spherical root system  $\Phi^{\text{sph}} = \Phi(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{S})$ , defined as generated by reflections, see [9, Théorème 5.3].

Let us now recall how the apartment  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S}, k)$  associated to  $\mathbf{S}$  is constructed [51, Sect. 1]. For any algebraic  $k$ -group  $\mathbf{H}$ , we denote by  $X^*(\mathbf{H})$  (resp. by  $X_*(\mathbf{H})$ ) the group of characters  $\mathbf{H} \rightarrow \text{GL}_1$  (resp. the group of co-characters  $\text{GL}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{H}$ ) defined over  $k$ . The geometric realization  $\mathcal{A}$  of the apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  is a Euclidean affine space under the real vector space  $V = X_*(\mathbf{H}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$  admitting a suitable  $\mathbf{N}(k)$ -action  $\xi : \mathbf{N}(k) \rightarrow \text{Aff}(\mathcal{A})$ . Roughly speaking, it is constructed as follows. We first define a map  $\xi : \mathbf{N}(k) \rightarrow \text{Aff}(\mathcal{A})$  by duality; namely, for any  $z \in \mathbf{Z}(k)$  the image  $\xi(z)$  is characterized by

$$\chi(\xi(z)) = -\text{ord}_k(\chi(z))$$

for all  $\chi \in X^*(\mathbf{Z})$  where  $\chi$  on the left-hand side is seen as a linear form on  $V$ . The kernel of the map  $\xi$  is denoted by  $Z_c$ : it is the unique maximal compact subgroup of  $\mathbf{N}(k)$  [29, Proposition 1.2] (it does not come from an algebraic subgroup). The quotient group  $\Lambda = \mathbf{Z}(k)/Z_c$  is a free Abelian group of rank equal to  $\dim \mathbf{S} = \dim V$ , see [29, Lemma 1.3]. Setting  $\tilde{W} = \mathbf{N}(k)/Z_c$ , we obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Lambda \longrightarrow \tilde{W} \longrightarrow W^{\text{sph}} \longrightarrow 1.$$

The desired  $\mathbf{N}(k)$ -action will be via  $\tilde{W}$ . The provisional map  $\xi$  obtained so far corresponds to the action of the translation part  $\Lambda$  of  $\tilde{W}$ . More precisely, by a standard pushforward argument [29, Proposition 1.6], we finally obtain

- an affine space  $\mathcal{A}$  with underlying Euclidean vector space  $V$ ,
- an affine action  $\xi : \mathbf{N}(k) \rightarrow \text{Aff}(\mathcal{A})$ ,
- a collection of affine linear forms  $\Phi^{\text{aff}}$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ ,
- a map  $\alpha \mapsto X_\alpha$  attaching to each  $\alpha \in \Phi^{\text{aff}}$  a subgroup  $X_\alpha$  of  $\mathbf{G}(k)$

such that

- (i) for any  $n \in \mathbf{N}(k)$  we have  $nX_\alpha n^{-1} = X_{\alpha \circ \xi(n)}$ ,
- (ii) the set of vectorial parts of the affine linear forms in  $\Phi^{\text{aff}}$  is equal to  $\Phi^{\text{sph}}$ ,
- (iii) for any  $a \in \Phi^{\text{sph}}$  the subgroups  $X_\alpha$ , for  $\alpha$  of vectorial part equal to  $a$ , form a filtration of  $\mathbf{U}_a(k)$ .

Any affine linear form  $\alpha \in \Phi^{\text{aff}}$  is called an affine root of  $\mathbf{G}$  over  $k$ . The zero set  $\partial\alpha$  of an affine root  $\alpha$  is called a wall and we denote by  $r_\alpha$  the Euclidean reflection with respect  $\partial\alpha$ . The reflections  $r_\alpha$  generate a Euclidean reflection group  $W^a$  called the affine Weyl group of  $\mathcal{A}$ ; it is a finite index normal subgroup in  $\tilde{W}$ . The root system  $\Phi$  we introduce in Section 2.2 (and its Weyl group  $W$ ) is related to  $\Phi^{\text{sph}}$  by the fact that they both provide, up to proportionality, the vectorial parts of the affine roots in  $\Phi^{\text{aff}}$ , in particular  $W^{\text{sph}} \simeq W$  (but these two finite root systems are not globally proportional in general [51, Section 1.7]).

It follows from Borel–Tits theory, see [8, Theorem 21.15], that if we choose a minimal parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $\mathbf{P}$  containing  $\mathbf{S}$ , the couple  $(\mathbf{P}(k), \mathbf{N}(k))$  is a BN-pair (or Tits system in Bourbaki’s terminology [10, IV.2]) for the group  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ ; we will use this when going back to the maximal boundary  $\Omega$  and its big cells. The

spherical building at infinity  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ , which is defined geometrically [52, Proposition 1], is the building that is naturally associated to this combinatorial structure. To each chamber at infinity  $\omega$  of  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$  is attached a minimal parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $\mathbf{P}_\omega$  such that  $\mathbf{P}_\omega(k) = \text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(\omega)$ . More generally, if  $F$  is a facet in  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$  there exists a parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $\mathbf{P}_F$  such that  $\mathbf{P}_F(k) = \text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(F)$ , and all parabolic  $k$ -subgroups of  $\mathbf{G}$  are obtained this way.

**B.2. Cartan and Iwasawa decompositions, Busemann functions.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the apartment associated to a maximal  $k$ -split torus  $\mathbf{S}$  as before, and let  $c$  be an alcove in it whose closure contains a special vertex  $x$ . The cone with tip  $x$  and generated by  $c$  is an open Weyl sector in  $\mathcal{A}$ , which we denote  $\mathcal{S}$ ; its closure  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$  is a fundamental domain for the action of  $\text{Stab}_{W^a}(x) \simeq W^{\text{sph}}$  on  $\mathcal{A}$ . We denote by  $\omega$  the chamber at infinity represented by  $[x, \omega]$ . In order to formulate suitably the Cartan and Iwasawa decompositions with respect to these geometric choices, we use the map  $\xi : \mathbf{N}(k) \rightarrow \text{Aff}(\mathcal{A})$  giving the affine action of the group  $\mathbf{N}(k)$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  and whose image is isomorphic to  $\overline{W}$ . We denote by  $Y$  the group of all translations contained in  $\overline{W}$  and by  $Y^+$  the translations of  $Y$  sending  $x$  to a vertex in  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ .

The Cartan decomposition of  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  with respect to the choices of  $x \in \mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  is the following partition

$$\mathbf{G}(k) = \bigsqcup_{t \in Y^+} K_x \xi^{-1}(t) K_x$$

where we use the short notation  $K_x = \text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(x)$  for the maximal compact subgroup  $\text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(x)$  in  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ . The geometric interpretation of the Cartan decomposition is the fact that a fundamental domain for the  $K_x$ -action on the building  $X$  is given by the closed Weyl sector  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ .

This can be seen by going back to the problem of describing (at least partially) root group actions on  $X$ . More precisely, we denote by  $(\mathbf{U}_a : a \in \Phi^{\text{sph}})$  the collection of root groups in  $\mathbf{G}$  with respect to the maximal  $k$ -split torus  $\mathbf{S}$  defining  $\mathcal{A}$  (these metabelian groups are denoted by  $\mathbf{U}_{(a)}$  in [8, Proposition 21.9] and [9, Section 5.2] but we stick to the notation in [51]). By construction of the action  $\xi$  (see Section B.1), the group  $\mathbf{S}(k)$  acts by translations; the question here is to describe the action of a group  $\mathbf{U}_a(k)$  and for this we use its filtration by the subgroups  $X_\alpha$  where the  $\alpha$ 's have linear part  $a$ . If we fix such an affine root  $\alpha$ , then the compact subgroup  $X_\alpha$  of  $\mathbf{U}_a(k)$  fixes the positive half-space  $A_\alpha = \alpha^{-1}(\{0\})$  and folds the other half-apartment of  $\mathcal{A}$  into another apartment in  $X$ . This description is very useful for the interpretation of retractions in terms of actions of well-chosen unipotent subgroups; retractions centered inside the building are related to affine Bruhat–Tits decompositions and Cartan decomposition, while retractions centered at a chamber (or, more generally, at a spherical facet) at infinity are related to Iwasawa decompositions (or, more generally, to horospherical decompositions).

For the Cartan decomposition with respect to  $x \in \mathcal{A}$  in  $X$ , we choose the family of groups  $X_\alpha$  geometrically characterized by the condition:  $x \in A_\alpha$ ; in view of the previous description, all such  $X_\alpha$ 's are included in  $K_x$ . In a first step we can even impose the slightly stronger condition that  $c \subset A_\alpha$ . Then strong transitivity of the action is illustrated by the fact that any alcove or vertex  $y$  in  $X$  can be sent into  $\mathcal{A}$  by making act finitely many elements of well chosen subgroups  $X_\alpha$  with  $c \subset A_\alpha$ : this can be proceeded by an induction whose last step is illustrated in Figure 6.

At this stage, we found  $b$  fixing  $c$  and sending an arbitrary vertex,  $y$  say, into  $\mathcal{A}$ . We can now work in the apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  and make  $W_x = \text{Stab}_{W^a}(x)$  act: since  $x$  was chosen to be special, a fundamental domain for the  $W_x$ -action  $\mathcal{A}$  is given by  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$  and it remains to note that if  $n \in \mathbf{N}(k)$  lifts an element of  $W_x$  which sends  $b.y$  into  $\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ , then  $n \in K_x$ .

Figure 7 illustrates in one stroke the two steps when the  $k$ -rank of  $\mathbf{G}$  is equal to 1 (i.e. when  $X$  is a tree): the effects of retracting with respect to an edge  $c$  in a given geodesic, and then of using (if needed) the symmetry with respect to the chosen vertex  $x$ .

The Iwasawa decomposition of  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  with respect to the choices of  $[x, \omega] \subset \mathcal{A}$  in  $\mathcal{X}$  is the partition

$$\mathbf{G}(k) = \bigsqcup_{t \in Y} K_x \xi^{-1}(t) \mathbf{U}^\omega(k)$$

where  $\mathbf{U}^\omega$  denotes the unipotent radical of the minimal parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $\mathbf{P}_\omega$ .




FIGURE 6. Cartan decomposition: first, fold onto the chosen apartment by root group action (top picture) then use spherical Weyl group action to go to the chosen Weyl sector (bottom picture).




FIGURE 7. Cartan decomposition in the rank 1 case

For this decomposition we also have a geometric interpretation but now we have to use a retraction onto the apartment  $\mathcal{A}$  and based at  $\omega$ . The difference is that the collection of groups used to perform the foldings now consists of all the full root groups  $U_a(k)$  where  $a$  runs over the set of positive roots defined by the choice of the chamber  $\omega$  in the spherical building at infinity  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ . Concretely, for a positive root  $a \in \Phi$  there is no restriction on the affine root  $\alpha$  (with vectorial part  $a$ ) used since the fixed half-apartment can be, so to speak, arbitrarily close to  $\omega$  to fold by induction galleries from an arbitrary alcove into  $\mathcal{A}$ . Figure 8 illustrates an inductive step of such a folding applied to a gallery given by the projection of an arbitrary alcove into  $\mathcal{A}$ .




FIGURE 8. Iwasawa decomposition in general

Figure 9 illustrates the geometric interpretation of the Iwasawa decomposition in the tree case.

In order to be complete, we shall explain the connection between these decompositions and the various distances and similar quantities we use to study the convergence of unbounded sequences of vertices. We keep the geometric choices made before. If  $y$  is a special vertex, then the Cartan decomposition with respect to  $x \in \mathcal{A}$  says that there exists  $k \in K_x$  such that  $k.y \in \overline{S}$  and this vertex is represented by a positive coweight in the identification between  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{A}$  and  $S_0 \subset \mathfrak{a}$ : this coweight is  $\sigma(x, y)$ ; it is the non-Archimedean version




FIGURE 9. Iwasawa decomposition in the rank 1 case

of the radial component in bi-invariant harmonic analysis. If  $y$  lies in the same  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -orbit as  $x$ , then there exists  $n \in \mathbf{Z}(k)$  such that  $\xi(n)$  is a translation of  $Y^+$  and  $k.y = \xi(n).x$ ; if the  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -action on  $\mathcal{X}$  is type preserving, then a vertex  $y$  is in the same  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -orbit as  $x$  if and only if the vertices have the same type. Keeping the special vertex  $y$ , the Iwasawa decomposition of  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  with respect to  $[x, \omega] \subset \mathcal{A}$  implies that there exists  $u \in \mathbf{U}^\omega(k)$  such that  $u.y \in \mathcal{A}$ . The vertex  $u.y$  is represented by an arbitrary coweight in the identification between  $[x, \omega] \subset \mathcal{A}$  and  $S_0 \subset \mathfrak{a}$ : this coweight is  $h(x, y; \omega)$ . If  $y$  lies in the same  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -orbit as  $x$ , then there exists  $n \in \mathbf{Z}(k)$  such that  $\xi(n)$  is a translation of  $Y$  and  $u.y = \xi(n).x$ .

**B.3. The maximal boundary from the algebraic viewpoint.** In this paper, we make intensive use of the maximal boundary  $\Omega$  to do analysis on affine buildings, and in particular to define and study harmonic measures and Furstenberg compactifications of affine buildings.

First, recall that  $\Omega$  was defined in a purely geometric way: it is the set of parallelism classes of sectors, and therefore it can be seen also as the set of chambers in the spherical building at infinity  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ , i.e.  $\Omega = C(\mathcal{X}^\infty)$ . From this viewpoint, the topology on  $\Omega$  is defined as the one generated by the shadows  $\Omega(x, y)$  emanating from a given special vertex  $x$  (with varying  $y$ ). Nevertheless, since the obtained topology does not depend on the choice of  $x$ , see [33, Proposition 3.15], we can see it as generated by all shadows  $\Omega(x, y)$  where the special vertices  $x$  and  $y$  both vary in  $V_s$ .

Going back to group actions, for  $g \in \mathbf{G}(k)$  we have

$$y \in [x, \omega] \iff g.y \in g.[x, \omega] \iff g.y \in [g.x, g.\omega],$$

implying that  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  permutes the shadows and therefore acts continuously on  $\Omega$ . Since  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  acts strongly transitively on  $\mathcal{X}$ , so does it on  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ ; in particular, the  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -action on  $\Omega$  is transitive. As a consequence, if we pick  $\omega \in \Omega$  the orbit map of  $\omega$  provides a homeomorphism

$$\mathbf{G}(k)/\mathbf{P}_\omega(k) \simeq \Omega$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_\omega$  is the minimal parabolic  $k$ -subgroup associated to  $\omega$  (note that compactness of  $\mathbf{G}(k)/\mathbf{P}_\omega(k)$  follows from instance from a suitable Iwasawa decomposition – for more details, please go to the group-theoretic, alternative, definition of harmonic measures below in Section B.5).

As it is well-known from Borel–Tits theory [8, §21], the group  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  admits a Bruhat decomposition

$$\mathbf{G}(k) = \bigsqcup_{w \in W^{\text{sph}}} \mathbf{P}(k)w\mathbf{P}(k)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}$  is any minimal parabolic  $k$ -subgroup of  $\mathbf{G}$ . In fact, for each  $w \in W^{\text{sph}}$  the double class  $\mathbf{P}(k)w\mathbf{P}(k)$  can be written in a better way, avoiding in particular redundancies. If we pick a maximal  $k$ -split torus  $\mathbf{S}$  in  $\mathbf{P}$ , we have (positive) root subgroups with respect to  $\mathbf{S}$  included in the unipotent radical  $\mathbf{U}^+ = \text{rad}_u(\mathbf{P})$ , and similarly we have (negative) root groups included in the unipotent radical  $\mathbf{U}^-$  of the minimal parabolic subgroup that is opposite  $\mathbf{P}$  with respect to  $\mathbf{S}$ . Using this, we have  $\mathbf{P}(k)w\mathbf{P}(k) = \mathbf{U}_w^+(k)w\mathbf{P}(k)$  with  $\mathbf{U}_w^+ = \mathbf{U}^+ \cap w\mathbf{U}^-w^{-1}$ . Multiplying by the longest element  $\bar{w}$  in  $W^{\text{sph}}$ , we obtain the refined Birkhoff decomposition

$$\mathbf{G}(k) = \bigsqcup_{w \in W^{\text{sph}}} \mathbf{U}^{-,w}(k)w\mathbf{P}(k)$$



with  $U^{-,w} = U^- \cap wU^-w^{-1}$  for each  $w \in W^{\text{sph}}$ . Using root groups, it is also known that group multiplication provides an isomorphism of  $k$ -varieties, see [8, Proposition 21.9 and Theorem 21.20],

$$\prod_{b \in \Phi^{\text{sph},-} \cap w\Phi^{\text{sph},-}} U_b \simeq U^{-,w}.$$

Note that the biggest subgroup  $U^{-,w}$  is  $U^-$  and corresponds to  $w = 1$ .

Going back to the maximal boundary, and denoting by  $-\omega$  (or  $\text{opp}_S(\omega)$  when necessary) the chamber which is opposite  $\omega$  with respect to the apartment  $\mathcal{A}(S)$  corresponding to  $S$ , the isomorphism  $G(k)/P_\omega(k) \simeq \Omega$  and the Birkhoff decomposition of  $G(k)$  provide a decomposition of the maximal boundary

$$\Omega = \{-\omega\} \sqcup \left( \bigsqcup_{\substack{w \in W^{\text{sph}} \\ w \neq 1, \bar{w}}} U^{-,w}(k)w.\omega \right) \sqcup U^-(k).\omega$$

which is valid for each  $\omega \in \Omega$  and each  $k$ -split torus  $S$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(S)^\infty$  contains  $\omega$ . The last subset of the partition is nothing else than the big cell  $\Omega'(-\omega)$  of chambers which are opposite  $-\omega$ ; more generally, the above partition is indexed by the Weyl-distance of chambers from  $-\omega$  in the spherical building  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ . The big cell  $\Omega'(-\omega)$  is an open and co-null neighborhood of  $\omega$ : we checked this fact in general in (i) of Theorem 6.2 without relying on any group action. Note that the fact that any residue can be seen as a compact subset of  $\Omega$  (Corollary 6.4 in the group-free case) admits a more natural proof in the algebraic group context since a residue can be seen as an orbit under a well-chosen parabolic subgroup acting on  $\Omega$ . In fact, this orbit is also the orbit of a Levi factor of the parabolic subgroup, and even the orbit of a maximal compact subgroup in the latter Levi factor: this is a useful remark when dealing with Furstenberg compactifications – see Section B.5 below.

Some smaller neighborhoods than big cells can be produced thanks to the filtrations on coordinates of the root groups  $U_b(k)$ . More precisely, we can start from the previous big cell

$$\Omega'(-\omega) = U^-(k).\omega = \left( \prod_{b \in \Phi^{\text{sph},-}} U_b(k) \right).\omega \simeq \prod_{b \in \Phi^{\text{sph},-}} U_b(k)$$

to see that the root groups provide a system of coordinates (note that any root group is isomorphic, as a variety, to an affine space [8, Theorem 21.20 (i)]). Imposing some valuation conditions on the additive parameters of each root group still provides some (now compact) open subsets: in other words, we are replacing here each factor  $k$  of the coordinate system by a compact open factor  $\varpi^m k^\circ$  for some integer  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The choices of the parameters can be made consistent thanks to geometric considerations. For instance, we can pick a special vertex  $x \in \mathcal{A}(S)$ . This gives a sector  $[x, \omega]$  and any special vertex  $y \in [x, \omega]$  leads to a shadow  $\Omega(x, y)$  which, in the above parametrization of  $\Omega'(-\omega)$ , corresponds to choosing for each  $b \in \Phi^{\text{sph},-}$  the largest compact open subgroup of the Bruhat–Tits filtration of  $U_b(k)$  fixing  $y$ , see [13, Section 6.2].




FIGURE 10. The left picture shows shadows as constructed with root group parametrizations. In the paper, we use other open neighborhoods which correspond to more general convex subsets of sectors than combinatorial convex hull of two special vertices (see Section 6.3). The right picture illustrates these generalizations.

**B.4. Parabolic subgroups, Levi factors and their façades.** The descriptions of the Furstenberg, of the combinatorial and of the Martin compactifications at the bottom of the spectrum make appear affine buildings at infinity. As expected, the algebraic group case, and its rich Lie-theoretic combinatorics, is also the main source of inspiration for the constructions of the involved auxiliary affine buildings.

Keeping the notation of the previous section, let again  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$  be the apartment attached to the maximal  $k$ -split torus  $\mathbf{S}$ . Let  $F$  be a facet of the spherical building at infinity  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$ , which we assume to be contained in the boundary  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})^\infty$  of  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ . The stabilizer  $\mathbf{P}_F(k) = \text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(F)$  consists of the  $k$ -rational points of a parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $\mathbf{P}_F$  containing  $\mathbf{S}$ . The maximal  $k$ -split torus  $\mathbf{S}$  provides a Levi decomposition  $\mathbf{P}_F \simeq \mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}} \ltimes \text{rad}_u(\mathbf{P}_F)$  where  $\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}$  can be defined algebraically as the centralizer of a suitable singular subtorus of  $\mathbf{S}$ , see [8, Proposition 20.5], or geometrically as the (Zariski closure of) the stabilizer in  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  of  $F$  and its opposite  $-F = \text{opp}_{\mathbf{S}}(F)$  with respect to the boundary  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})^\infty$ . Note that  $\text{rad}_u(\mathbf{P}_F)(k)$  acts simply transitively on the facets of  $\mathcal{X}^\infty$  which are opposite  $F$  or, equivalently, on Levi factors of  $\mathbf{P}_F$ .

So far, we are dealing with the (unique) spherical building at infinity: this building comes from the combinatorics of the spherical Tits system constructed in Borel–Tits theory. It can be geometrically constructed as the boundary at infinity [12, Section II.8] of the Gromov compactification of  $\mathcal{X}$ , which is the compactification obtained by the horospherical process when using the family of usual distances to points for the Bruhat–Tits CAT(0)-metric [1, Section 11.2].

As for any compactification, thanks to the Cartan decomposition and its geometric interpretation (Section B.2), it is enough to describe the closure of a Weyl sector in order to describe the full space. In the case of the visual boundary, the parameters of convergence are radial. The points in the boundary of the chosen Weyl sector are in bijective correspondence with the unit vectors in the sector.

The other family of parameters, which is useful to describe the three compactifications mentioned at the beginning of this section, consists of the distances to the walls bounding the chosen Weyl sector. The choice of a spherical facet at infinity  $F$  as before can be seen as a way to select a subfamily of distances: this is explained in Section 4.3 when introducing the façade corresponding to  $F$  and the inner façade corresponding to  $F$  and  $-F$  as before. We want to give an algebraic group interpretation of these objects.

More precisely, let us go back to the Levi decomposition  $\mathbf{P}_F \simeq \mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}} \ltimes \text{rad}_u(\mathbf{P}_F)$  associated to the inclusion  $F \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})^\infty$ . The group  $\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}$  is a reductive  $k$ -group, therefore as such it admits a Bruhat–Tits building, which we denote by  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}, k)$ . The connected center  $\mathbf{Z}_{F,\mathbf{S}}$  of  $\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}$  is a torus, the derived subgroup  $\mathbf{G}_{F,\mathbf{S}} = [\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}, \mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}]$  is a semisimple  $k$ -group and the multiplication map  $\mathbf{Z}_{F,\mathbf{S}} \times \mathbf{G}_{F,\mathbf{S}} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}$  is an isogeny: the geometric counterpart of the latter fact is that the building  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}, k)$  admits a direct factor isometric to the Euclidean space  $X_*(\mathbf{Z}_{F,\mathbf{S}}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ . In this case, the inner façade  $\mathcal{X}(F, -F)$  associated to the inclusion  $-F \cup F \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})^\infty$  in Section 4.3 is nothing else than a natural  $\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}(k)$ -equivariant copy of (the geometric realization of)  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}, k)$  inside  $\mathcal{X}$ ; in the abstract group-theoretic (and more general) context of valuations of root group data, it had already been constructed in [13, Section 7.6]. As a set, the inner façade  $\mathcal{X}(F, -F)$  is the union of the apartments  $g \cdot \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$  when  $g$  runs over  $\mathbf{G}_{F,\mathbf{S}}(k)$ , or equivalently over  $\mathbf{M}_{F,\mathbf{S}}(k)$  since the elements of the singular torus  $\mathbf{Z}_{F,\mathbf{S}}(k)$  act trivially on the Bruhat–Tits building of  $\mathbf{G}_{F,\mathbf{S}}$ . In fact, in the apartment  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$  the elements of  $\mathbf{Z}_{F,\mathbf{S}}(k)$  act as translations along directions which are parallel to the vector subspace  $V_F$  of  $V$  given by  $F$ : in particular, they preserve the distances to any wall in the apartment  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$  whose direction contains  $V_F$ , moreover unbounded sequences of such semisimple matrices can be used to push to infinity a given vertex in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ .

This is a suitable place to mention a group-theoretic interpretation of distances to walls. Let  $x$  be a special vertex in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$  and let  $\omega$  be a chamber at infinity lying in  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})^\infty$  and belonging to the residue of  $F$ ; the chamber  $\omega$  defines a basis  $(a_i : i \in I_0)$  of the root system of  $\mathbf{G}$ . The Weyl cone  $[x, \omega]$  is simplicial and there is a bijective correspondence between the simple roots  $(a_i : i \in I_0)$  and the sector panels (codimension 1 faces) of  $[x, \omega]$ : the affine subspace spanned by a sector panel is directed by the kernel of a simple root and each simple root appears in this way. If we denote by  $J$  the type of  $F$ , the subroot system  $\Phi_J$  with a basis  $(a_i : i \in J)$  corresponds to the directions of the walls containing  $V_F$ . Concretely, the sector  $[x, \omega]$  is bounded by two kinds of sector panels: those whose direction is the kernel of a simple root in  $\Phi_J$  and the remaining ones. By construction each element in  $\mathbf{S}(k)$  stabilizes  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$  and acts as a translation Section B.1. Among

those translations, the semisimple matrices in  $\mathbf{Z}_{F,S}(k)$  act with a direction parallel to the sector face  $F$ . More precisely, let  $a_i$  be a simple root and let  $\Pi_i$  be the corresponding sector panel. Recall from Section B.2 that we have a decreasing filtration of  $\mathbf{U}_{a_i}(k)$  by a countable family of compact open subgroups indexed by affine linear forms of given vectorial part  $a_i$ . Then for a special vertex  $y \in [x, \omega]$ , the (non-negative) difference between the affine root whose zero-set contains  $\Pi_i$  (hence  $x$ ) and the affine root whose zero-set contains  $y$  is a discrete version of the Bruhat–Tits distance for special vertices in  $[x, \omega]$ . Recalling that for any  $n \in \mathbf{N}(k)$  we have  $nX_\alpha n^{-1} = X_{\alpha \circ \xi(n)}$ , we see that the elements  $s \in \mathbf{Z}_{F,S}(k)$  act as translations along directions which are parallel to the vector subspace  $V_F$ , since any such  $s$  centralizes each root group  $\mathbf{U}_{a_j}(k)$  with  $j \in J$ . Figure 11 illustrates the dynamics of semi-simple matrices along a sector face.




FIGURE 11. Dynamics of semisimple matrices along a sector face.

Going back to façades, we consider now the affine building  $\mathcal{X}(F)$  associated to the facet  $F$  only. Strictly speaking, this (essential) building is not contained in  $X$  but it is a stratum of the boundary of any of the compactifications mentioned above. In the natural  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -action on these compactifications, the subgroup  $\mathbf{P}_F(k)$  stabilizes the stratum  $\mathcal{X}(F)$ , which can thus be identified with the Bruhat–Tits building of the semisimple quotient of  $\mathbf{P}_F$ . This is made precise in the theorem below, which also summarizes many available compactifications and contains the first half of Theorem B in the introduction.

**Theorem B.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a connected semisimple linear algebraic group defined over a non-Archimedean local field  $k$  and let  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{G}, k)$  be its Bruhat–Tits building.*

- (i) *The maximal Berkovich compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{G}, k)$  is  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -equivariantly homeomorphic to the wonderful compactification, the maximal Satake, as well as the maximal polyhedral compactification of  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{G}, k)$ . The closure of the set of vertices in  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{G}, k)$  is  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -equivariantly homeomorphic to the group-theoretic compactification of  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{G}, k)$ . The closure of special vertices is  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -equivariantly homeomorphic to the Martin compactification of  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{G}, k)$  at the bottom of the spectrum.*
- (ii) *For any proper parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $\mathbf{P}$ , there exists a natural, injective, continuous map*

$$\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{P}/\text{rad}(\mathbf{P}), k) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{G}, k)$$

*whose image lies in the boundary. These maps altogether provide the following stratification*

$$\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{G}, k) = \bigsqcup_{\mathbf{P} \text{ parabolic } k\text{-subgroup}} \mathcal{X}(\mathbf{P}/\text{rad}(\mathbf{P}), k)$$

*where the union is indexed by the collection of all parabolic  $k$ -subgroups in  $\mathbf{G}$ .*

- (iii) *Any two points  $x, y$  in  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathbf{G}, k)$  lie in a common compactified apartment  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{S})$  and we have*

$$\mathbf{G}(k) = \text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(x) \mathbf{N}(k) \text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(y)$$

*where  $\mathbf{N}$  is the normalizer of the maximal split torus  $\mathbf{S}$  defining the apartment  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ .*

*Proof.* Berkovich compactifications of Bruhat–Tits buildings were defined in [7] in the split case, and in [44] in full generality. The idea is to embed  $X(\mathbf{G}, k)$  into the analytic space  $\mathbf{G}^{\text{an}}$  attached to  $\mathbf{G}$  and then into the analytic space  $(\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{P})^{\text{an}}$  attached to a flag variety of  $\mathbf{G}$ ; when the parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $\mathbf{P}$  is minimal the closure of the image of the composed map is maximal among the Berkovich compactifications. The wonderful compactification is obtained when replacing a flag variety  $\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{P}$  by a de Concini–Procesi wonderful compactification  $\overline{\mathbf{G}}$  and then by using an equivariant embedding from  $X(\mathbf{G}, k)$  to  $\overline{\mathbf{G}}^{\text{an}}$ . It was defined in [46] in the split case, and in [16] in full generality. The maximal polyhedral compactification in the Bruhat–Tits case was constructed in [29], the Satake compactifications were defined in [54] and then revisited in the context of non-Archimedean analytic geometry in [45]. The identifications between Berkovich and Satake compactifications are given by [45, Theorem 2.1], while the identification between the wonderful (resp. maximal polyhedral) and the maximal Berkovich compactification is [16, Corollary 15] (resp. is in [54] or [45, Proposition 5.4]). Therefore the description of the closure of vertices (in any of the previous compactifications) by means of the group-theoretic compactification is the content of [24, Theorem 20]. The new comparison involves the Martin compactification at the bottom of the spectrum: the considered set of vertices in this case is contained in the previous one, therefore the identification follows from Remark 4 in Section 9.4. This provides (i) and once this is obtained, (ii) and (iii) follow from [44, Theorem 2 of Introduction].  $\square$

**B.5. Furstenberg compactification.** The measure-theoretic compactification procedures are among the oldest ones for Riemannian symmetric spaces [20]. The idea, due to H. Furstenberg, is beautiful: it consists in using probability measures on the (maximal) boundary  $\Omega$  by seeing it as a homogeneous space for as many compact subgroups as possible in the ambient Lie group. In order to be more precise, we need to combine Iwasawa decompositions of  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  and Levi decompositions of parabolic  $k$ -subgroups. For any chamber at infinity  $\omega \in \Omega$ , we saw that have  $\Omega \simeq \mathbf{G}(k)/\mathbf{P}_\omega(k)$ . We can furthermore choose a maximal  $k$ -split torus  $\mathbf{S}$  such that the spherical apartment  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})^\infty$  contains  $\omega$  and we can pick a special vertex  $x$  in the affine apartment  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ . While we have an Iwasawa decomposition (Section B.2)

$$\mathbf{G}(k) = K_x \mathbf{S}(k) \mathbf{U}^\omega(k),$$

we also have a Levi decomposition (Section B.4)

$$\mathbf{P}_\omega(k) = ([\mathbf{Z}_\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{S}), \mathbf{Z}_\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{S})](k) \cdot \mathbf{S}(k)) \ltimes \mathbf{U}^\omega(k).$$

We used here the decomposition of the centralizer  $\mathbf{Z}_\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{S})$  into its part (derived subgroup)  $[\mathbf{Z}_\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{S}), \mathbf{Z}_\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{S})]$  whose  $k$ -rational points fix pointwise the apartment  $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$  and the part  $\mathbf{S}$  whose  $k$ -rational points provide the translations of the affine Weyl group.

Putting together these decompositions and then varying  $\mathbf{S}$  and  $x \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{S})$ , we see that  $\Omega$  is acted upon continuously and transitively by the stabilizer  $K_x$  of any special vertex  $x$ . It follows then from general integration theory on homogeneous spaces [11, VII §2 6, Théorème 3] that there is a unique  $K_x$ -invariant probability measure on  $\Omega$ , which we denote by  $\mu_x$ ; we call  $\mu_x$  the *homogeneous measure* associated to the special vertex  $x$ . As a result, if we also use the construction from Proposition 6.1 we can associate to each special vertex  $x$  the harmonic measure  $\nu_x$  and the homogeneous measure  $\mu_x$ . Here is the Bruhat–Tits version of Theorem C in the Introduction.

**Theorem B.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a simply connected semisimple algebraic group defined over a non-Archimedean local field  $k$  and let  $X(\mathbf{G}, k)$  be the associated Bruhat–Tits building. We denote by  $\Omega$  the maximal boundary of  $X(\mathbf{G}, k)$  and by  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  the set of probability measures on it, endowed with the weak-\* topology. For any special vertex  $x \in X(\mathbf{G}, k)$ , the harmonic measure  $\nu_x$  and the homogeneous measure  $\mu_x$  coincide, therefore the Furstenberg compactification is also the closure of the set of homogeneous measures in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$  and it is  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ -equivariantly homeomorphic to the Martin compactification at the bottom of the spectrum.*

**Remark 7.** The proof below is valid in the more general case when  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  is replaced by a type-preserving and strongly transitive automorphism group  $G$  acting on a locally finite affine building  $\mathcal{X}$ .

*Proof.* It is enough to prove the first statement since it clearly implies the second one by our definition of a Furstenberg compactification as the closure of the set of harmonic measures in  $\mathcal{P}(\Omega)$ , as well as the last one by Remark 4 in Section 9.4. We thus concentrate on the first statement. By the uniqueness of homogeneous measures checked above, it is enough to show that for any  $x \in V_s$  the probability measure  $\nu_x$  is  $K_x$ -invariant. Let us pick  $x \in V_s$  and  $k \in K_x$ ; we thus need to show that  $k_*\nu_x = \nu_x$ , which we do by checking harmonicity of  $k_*\nu_x$  (using the uniqueness given by Proposition 6.1). Let  $y, z \in V_s$  be such that  $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(x, z)$ . By the geometric interpretation of the Cartan decomposition (Section B.2), the group  $K_x$  acts transitively on the sectors tipped at  $x$ , and since it preserves types (because  $\mathbf{G}$  is assumed to be simply connected) we have  $\sigma(x, k.y) = \sigma(x, k.z)$ . By harmonicity of  $\nu_x$ , this implies that  $\nu_x(\Omega(x, k.y)) = \nu_x(\Omega(x, k.z))$ . But  $\Omega(x, k.y) = \Omega(k.x, k.y) = k.\Omega(x, y)$ , and similarly  $\Omega(x, k.z) = \Omega(k.x, k.z) = k.\Omega(x, z)$ , so the previous equality says that for any  $y, z \in V_s$  such that  $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(x, z)$ , we have  $(k^{-1}*\nu_x)(\Omega(x, y)) = (k^{-1}*\nu_x)(\Omega(x, z))$ ; this is the requested harmonicity, hence the first statement.  $\square$

One complementary question is to try to attach a natural measure on  $\Omega$  to an arbitrary point of the building. The problem is the lack of transitivity of the action on  $\Omega$  for an arbitrary facet stabilizer. More precisely, when we described geometrically the Cartan decomposition in Section B.2, we saw that the first step (the one using foldings given by root group actions, see Figure 6) could show that if  $c$  is an alcove in a given apartment  $\mathcal{A}$ , then the Iwahori subgroup  $\text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(c)$  acts on  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{G}, k)$  with  $\mathcal{A}$  as a fundamental domain; this is the geometric counterpart to the Bruhat–Tits decomposition  $\mathbf{G}(k) = \bigsqcup_{w \in W^a} \text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(c)w\text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(c)$ , see [13, Proposition 4.2.1]. By approximating geodesic rays by geodesic segments and passing to the limit, the outcome is that  $\text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(c)$  acts on  $\Omega$  with a fundamental set of representatives given by the chambers at infinity lying in  $\mathcal{A}^\infty$ . Keeping the group  $\text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(c)$ , which does not contain any lift of elements of the vectorial part of  $W^a$ , we cannot do better than this because the second step is not available. This shows that the set of  $\text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(c)$ -orbits on  $\Omega$  is indexed by the spherical Weyl group of  $\mathbf{G}$  over  $k$  (the combinatorial counterpart here is [13, Théorème 5.1.3 (vi)]). In particular, we cannot see  $\Omega$  as a homogeneous space for the Iwahori subgroup  $\text{Stab}_{\mathbf{G}(k)}(c)$  and deduce that it carries a unique invariant probability measure: there is a simplex of possible choices according to the mass given to each orbit. Note that the problem still holds for non special vertices, whose stabilizers in  $W^a$  do not act transitively on  $\mathcal{A}^\infty$ . This explains, at least in the Bruhat–Tits case, why we only considered the set of special vertices when defining Furstenberg compactifications. We intend to go back to this problem in a subsequent work.

**B.6. Martin compactifications.** We finally consider the potential-theoretic and probabilistic aspects of our paper, in the Bruhat–Tits context chosen for this appendix. In other words, we present the non-Archimedean counterpart to the study done on Riemannian symmetric spaces by Y. Guivarc’h and collaborators, see [23] and [22]. In these references, the Archimedean case of potential-theoretic compactifications is fully treated in the following sense:

- (i) Martin compactifications of symmetric spaces are defined, both by means of differential operators (i.e. eigenfunctions of Laplace operators) and via random walks [23, Chapters VI–VIII and XIV];
- (ii) for a given symmetric space, the Martin compactification at the bottom of the spectrum is shown to be equivariantly homeomorphic to the maximal Satake (representation-theoretic), the maximal Furstenberg (measure-theoretic) or the Guivarc’h compactifications (group-theoretic) [22, Theorems 2.13 and 3.20], see also [38];
- (iii) Martin compactifications above the bottom of the spectrum are shown to be equivariantly homeomorphic to the join of the Gromov compactification with any compactification discussed before in (ii), [23, Theorems 8.2 and 8.21];
- (iv) Martin compactifications at the bottom of the spectrum are used to parametrize geometrically two classes of remarkable subgroups, namely maximal distal and maximal amenable subgroups [22, Theorem 2.14], see also [39];



- (v) an integral formula for eigenfunctions of the Laplace operator is given by means of suitable Poisson kernels [23, Theorems 13.1 and 13.28] and an analogous result is given from the viewpoint of random walks [23, Theorem 13.33].

We consider now the Bruhat–Tits analogues of these results. These problems were mentioned, together with some hints, in [23, Chapter XV] and [22, §4]. We wish to explain here where the intuitions there could be implemented and where we took another path.

Of course, the use of techniques from partial differential equations is not directly efficient when dealing with buildings instead of Riemannian symmetric spaces. The viewpoint of random walks together with non-Archimedean harmonic analysis as developed in [31] becomes the main tool. In the probabilistic part of their work, Guivarc’h–Ji–Taylor use the notion of a *well-behaved* measure on a symmetric space  $X = G/K$ , or more precisely on the connected semisimple Lie group  $G$ : a positive measure on  $G$  is called well-behaved if it has a continuous density (with respect to the Haar measure) and if its support  $S$ , assumed to be compact, satisfies  $G = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} S^n$ . If we are given a bi- $K$ -invariant well-behaved probability measure  $p$ , then the convolution operator associated to  $p$  provides a generalization of the Laplace operator [21, Proposition 1]. The associated random walk has finite range whenever  $p$  has compact support and is irreducible whenever the probability measure  $p$  is well-behaved; moreover the trick in 9.1 modifies, if necessary, the random walk attached to  $p$  in such a way that it becomes aperiodic but still provides the same Martin boundary. To sum up, a compactly supported bi- $K$ -invariant well-behaved probability measure on  $\mathbf{G}(k)$  defines a random walk for which Theorems 9.5 and 9.6 provide explicit descriptions of Martin boundaries by means of core sequences (at the bottom and above the bottom of the spectrum, respectively). This settles (i) above and allows us to identify the Martin compactification at the bottom of the spectrum according to Theorem B.2 above, which settles (ii). While (iv) was established in [24], we intend to go back to (v), namely integral representation of harmonic functions, in a subsequent work. Finally, for (iii), we have the following statement which contains the second half of Theorem B in the introduction.

**Theorem B.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{G}$  be a semisimple simply connected algebraic group over  $k$ , a locally compact non-Archimedean valued field, and let  $\mathcal{X}$  be its Bruhat–Tits building. We choose a good vertex in  $\mathcal{X}$  and denote by  $K$  its stabilizer. Let us pick a compactly supported bi- $K$ -invariant well-behaved probability measure on  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ . Then, for every  $\zeta$  above the spectral radius  $\rho$  of the measure, the corresponding Martin compactification  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M,\zeta}$  is the join of  $\overline{\mathcal{X}}_{M,o}$  with the Gromov visual compactification.*

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi(g)dg$  be a compactly supported bi- $K$ -invariant well-behaved probability measure on  $\mathbf{G}(k)$ . Then  $\varphi$  is a compactly supported bi- $K$ -invariant continuous function on  $G$ . Let  $o$  be the good vertex in  $\mathcal{X}$  whose stabilizer is the subgroup  $K$  and let  $V_o$  be the set of the (good) vertices of the same type as  $o$ . Each  $v \in V_o$  can be written as  $g.o$  for some  $g \in \mathbf{G}(k)$  which well-defined up to right multiplication by elements in  $K$ . We wish to introduce the operator  $A$  acting on suitable functions  $f : V_o \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by the formula (see [23, Remark 2 p.171])

$$Af(v) = Af(g.o) = \int_G f(gh.o) \varphi(h) dh.$$

By left-invariance of the Haar measure, we can also write

$$Af(g.o) = \int_G f(h.o) \varphi(g^{-1}h) dh,$$

which, since  $\varphi$  is left  $K$ -invariant, shows that the definition does not depend on the element  $g \in \mathbf{G}(k)$  such that  $v = g.o$ .

We need to show that the operator  $A$  is as in Section 9.1. The function  $\varphi$ , being compactly supported and bi- $K$ -invariant, is a (finite) linear combination of characteristic functions of double classes modulo  $K$ . We are thus reduced to the situation where  $\varphi = \frac{1}{\text{vol}(K\xi^{-1}(t)K)} \mathbb{1}_{K\xi^{-1}(t)K}$  for some  $t \in Y^+$  in the notation of Section B.2, and where  $\text{vol}$  denotes the volume of with respect to the Haar measure. We have thus

$$Af(g.o) = \frac{1}{\text{vol}(K\xi^{-1}(t)K)} \int_{K\xi^{-1}(t)K} f(gh.o) dh.$$



The group  $K$  acts transitively on the vertices at vectorial distance  $t$  from  $o$  (B.2), so when  $h$  runs over  $K\xi^{-1}(t)K$ , the vertices  $(gh).o$  describe the combinatorial sphere  $V_t(v)$  centered at  $v = g.o$  and of vectorial radius  $t$ . Moreover, we have an identification of (finite)  $K$ -homogeneous spaces  $K\xi^{-1}(t)K/K \simeq K/\text{Stab}_K(t.o)$  on which the invariant measure is the counting measure. Altogether, this provides the integration formula

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{K\xi^{-1}(t)K} f(gh.o) \, dh &= \int_{\text{Stab}_K(t.o)} \left( \int_{K/\text{Stab}_K(t.o)} f(g\bar{k}.(t.o)) \, d\bar{k} \right) dk \\ &= \int_{\text{Stab}_K(t.o)} \left( \sum_{v' \in V_t(v)} f(v') \right) dk. \end{aligned}$$

Taking  $f$  to be constant equal to 1 gives:  $\text{vol}(K\xi^{-1}(t)K) = \text{vol}(\text{Stab}_K(t.o)) \times |V_t(v)|$ , thus going back to the previous expression for  $Af(g.o)$ , we obtain

$$Af(g.o) = \frac{1}{|V_t(v)|} \sum_{v' \in V_t(v)} f(v'),$$

which shows that  $A$  is indeed an averaging operator, as desired. In general,  $\varphi$  is a finite linear combination of characteristic functions of double classes modulo  $K$ , and therefore  $A$  is a finite linear combination of averaging operators as in Section 9.1.  $\square$

In the proofs of this appendix, we have used more general results from Sections 9.4 and 9.5. Recall that we do not require group action in order to define and understand Martin compactifications of affine buildings. We would like to conclude by discussing in slightly more details the differences with the hints and intuitions provided in [23] and [22]. More precisely, not only the use of group actions is crucial in the latter references, but even in the Bruhat–Tits framework chosen for this appendix, some differences with the case of symmetric spaces should be mentioned.

The main difference is the fact that for affine buildings, thanks to [53] which provides us exact asymptotics of the Green’s functions on affine buildings, we could perform exact computations of limits of Martin kernels. One consequence is that, uniformly with respect to any chosen procedure of compactification, we can use the same parametrizing system for limits, whatever the target space of the embedding map, so that finally we can identify or describe compactifications by arguments using these parameters only (which are basically: radial directions and distances to sector panels of a given Weyl sector). This is what we do at the end of each section dealing with a given type of compactification, see Remark 3 at the end of Section 8 (group-theoretic compactification), Remark 4 at the end of Section 9.4 (Martin compactification at the bottom of the spectrum), Remark 5 at the end of Section 9.5 (Martin compactification above the bottom of the spectrum) and Remark 6 at the end of Appendix A (the case of non-reduced root systems). In the case of symmetric spaces, the available asymptotics due to Anker–Ji [3] (Green kernels) and Anker [2] (ground state spherical function) are good enough to describe the Martin compactifications in [23] and [22], but the computation of limits is not direct. This is related to the well-known fact that Harish-Chandra’s integral formula for spherical functions remains an integral formula in Archimedean case, while it can be made algebraic in the non-Archimedean case [31, Chapter IV]: this is, so to speak, the analytic approach to the theory of Macdonald’s polynomials [32]. Note also that the idea to develop an abstract harmonic analysis dealing with (Iwahori–)Hecke algebras, and avoiding automorphism groups as much as possible, goes back to H. Matsumoto [36].

In order to make the comparison with Archimedean case in more details, let us separate two steps in the study of Martin compactifications: the computation of limits of Martin kernels first, and then the description of the boundaries. Already at the bottom of the spectrum, the computation of limits is not purely analytic [23, Proposition 7.26] since it is based on an argument of uniqueness of cluster value (by compactness), which itself uses a characterization of limit functions by means of conditions mixing harmonicity properties and knowledge of stabilizers [23, Theorem 7.22] (the convergence of measures for the Furstenberg compactifications uses a similar uniqueness argument based on the knowledge of the support and of part of the stabilizer of the limit measure). Still at the bottom of the spectrum, the description of the Martin

compactification [23, Theorem 7.33] uses in a crucial way the group action since the identification with other compactifications is based on an explicit comparison of stabilizers and of complete sets of representatives. Above the bottom of the spectrum, the computation of limits of Martin kernels [23, Theorem 8.2] is not direct since it uses the Anker–Ji and Anker asymptotics, which are given up to multiplicative constants. One then knows that a cluster value of Martin kernels attached to a core sequence is a multiple of the expected limit, but one still has to use representing measures and again knowledge of stabilizers in order to conclude, see [23, p. 124]. The description of the Martin compactifications above the bottom of the spectrum is also based on a precise understanding of stabilizers and complete sets of representatives (note that for the latter point an argument due to Karpelevich is systematically used, see [23, Proposition 7.20] and [28]).

In the non-Archimedean case, thanks to stronger asymptotics obtained in [53] we make in Section 9 the computation of limits of Martin kernels in a purely analytic way. The various factors in the resulting formulas (see Theorem 9.5 for the bottom spectrum and Theorem 9.6 otherwise) can be understood geometrically in terms of façades at infinity.

These factors do not have the same asymptotic behaviors: in both cases, the factor with polynomial growth mimics the initial situation in the sense that it corresponds to the ground state spherical function on the involved stratum at infinity (an affine building of smaller rank). The remaining factors have exponential growth and precisely this analytic difference is exploited to obtain the needed uniqueness results (see Section 9.3, in particular the way equation (9.16) is exploited). This allows us to directly use the geometric parameters of core sequences to describe the Martin compactifications and compare them with the previous ones.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P. Abramenko and K.S. Brown, *Buildings*, Graduate Text in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag New York, 2008.
- [2] J.-Ph. Anker, *La forme exacte de l'estimation fondamentale de Harish-Chandra*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Série I Math. **305** (1987), 371–374.
- [3] J.-Ph. Anker and L. Ji, *Heat kernel and Green function estimates on noncompact symmetric spaces*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **9** (1999), 1035–1091.
- [4] U. Bader, P.-E. Caprace, and J. Lécureux, *On the linearity of lattices in affine buildings and ergodicity of the singular Cartan flow*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **32** (2019), no. 2, 491–562.
- [5] U. Bader and Y. Shalom, *Factor and normal subgroup theorems for lattices in products of groups*, Invent. Math. **163** (2006), 415–454.
- [6] W. Ballmann, M. Gromov, and V. Schroeder, *Manifolds of nonpositive curvature*, Birkhäuser Borston Inc., 1985.
- [7] V.G. Berkovich, *Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 33, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.
- [8] A. Borel, *Linear algebraic groups*, second ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 126, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.
- [9] A. Borel and J. Tits, *Groupes réductifs*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1965), no. 27, 55–150.
- [10] N. Bourbaki, *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 4–6*, Elements of Mathematics, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2002.
- [11] ———, *Integration II. Chapters 7–9*, Elements of Mathematics, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.
- [12] M.R. Bridson and A. Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1999.
- [13] F. Bruhat and J. Tits, *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local, I*, Publ. Math. IHÉS **41** (1972), 5–251.
- [14] ———, *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local, II*, Publ. Math. IHÉS **60** (1984), 197–376.
- [15] P.-E. Caprace and J. Lécureux, *Combinatorial and group-theoretic compactification of buildings*, Ann. I. Fourier **61** (2011), no. 2, 619–672.
- [16] D. Chanfi, *Wonderful compactifications of Bruhat-Tits buildings in the non-split case*, arXiv:2011.00349, 2020.
- [17] C. Charignon, *Compactifications polygonales d'un immeuble affine*, arXiv: 0903.0502, 2009.
- [18] C. Ciobotaru, B. Mühlherr, and G. Rousseau, *The cone topology on mesures*, Advances in Geometry **20** (2020), 1–28.
- [19] J.L. Doob, *Discrete potential theory and boundaries*, J. Math. Mech. **8** (1959), 433–458; erratum 993.
- [20] H. Furstenberg, *A Poisson formula for semi-simple Lie groups*, Ann. Math. **77** (1963), 335–386.
- [21] Y. Guivarc'h, *Compactifications of symmetric spaces and positive eigenfunctions of the Laplacian*, Sémin. Math. Univ. Rennes, 1995.

- [22] ———, *Compactifications of symmetric spaces and positive eigenfunctions of the Laplacian*, Topics in probability and Lie groups: boundary theory, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, vol. 28, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001, In collaboration with J. C. Taylor and Lizhen Ji, pp. 69–116.
- [23] Y. Guivarc’h, L. Ji, and J.C. Taylor, *Compactifications of symmetric spaces*, Progress Math., vol. 156, Birkhäuser, 1998.
- [24] Y. Guivarc’h and B. Rémy, *Group-theoretic compactification of Bruhat–Tits buildings*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **39** (2006), no. 6, 871–920.
- [25] S. Helgason, *Differential geometry, Lie groups, and symmetric spaces*, Academic Press, 1978.
- [26] C. Horbez, J. Huang, and J. Lécureux, *Proper proximality in non-positive curvature*, arXiv:2005.08756, 2020.
- [27] J.E. Humphreys, *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [28] F.I. Karpelevich, *The geometry of geodesics and the eigenfunctions of the Beltrami–Laplace operator on symmetric spaces*, Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **1965** (1967), 51–199. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1967.
- [29] E. Landvogt, *A compactification of the Bruhat–Tits building*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1619, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [30] J. Lécureux, M. de la Salle, and S. Witzel, *Strong property (T), weak amenability and  $\ell^p$ -cohomology in  $\tilde{A}_2$ -buildings*, preprint arXiv:2010.07043, 2020.
- [31] I.G. Macdonald, *Spherical functions on a group of  $p$ -adic type*, Publications of the Ramanujan Institute, vol. 2, Ramanujan Institute, Centre for Advanced Study in Mathematics, University of Madras, Madras, 1971.
- [32] ———, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, second ed., Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [33] A.M. Mantero and A. Zappa, *Eigenvalues of the vertex set Hecke algebra of an affine building*, Trends in Harmonic Analysis (M.A. Picardello, ed.), INdAM, vol. 3, Springer, Milano, 2011, pp. 291–370.
- [34] ———, *Macdonald formula for spherical functions on affine buildings*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **20** (2011), no. 4, 669–758.
- [35] G.A. Margulis, *Discrete subgroups of semisimple Lie groups*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3), vol. 17, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [36] H. Matsumoto, *Analyse harmonique dans les systèmes de Tits bornologiques de type affine*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 590, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1977.
- [37] J. Maubon, *Symmetric spaces of the non-compact type: differential geometry*, Géométries à courbure négative ou nulle, groupes discrets et rigidités, Sémin. Congr., vol. 18, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2009, pp. 1–38.
- [38] C.C. Moore, *Compactifications of symmetric spaces*, Amer. J. Math. **86** (1964), 201–218.
- [39] ———, *Amenable subgroups of semisimple groups and proximal flows*, Israel J. Math. **34** (1979), no. 1-2, 121–138.
- [40] J.R. Munkres, *Elements of algebraic topology*, Westview Press, 1996.
- [41] J. Parkinson, *Buildings and Hecke algebras*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Sydney, 2005.
- [42] ———, *Buildings and Hecke algebras*, J. Algebra **297** (2006), no. 1, 1–49.
- [43] ———, *Spherical harmonic analysis on affine buildings*, Math. Z **253** (2006), 571–606.
- [44] B. Rémy, A. Thuillier, and A. Werner, *Bruhat–Tits theory from Berkovich’s point of view. I. realizations and compactifications of buildings*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér **43** (2010), no. 3, 461–554.
- [45] ———, *Bruhat–Tits theory from Berkovich’s point of view. II Satake compactifications of buildings*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **11** (2012), no. 2, 421–465.
- [46] ———, *Wonderful compactifications of Bruhat–Tits buildings*, Épijournal Géom. Algébrique **1** (2017), Art. 10, 18.
- [47] M.A. Ronan, *A construction of buildings with no rank 3 residues of spherical type*, Buildings and the geometry of diagrams (Como, 1984), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1181, Springer, Berlin, 1986, pp. 242–248.
- [48] G. Rousseau, *Buildings for reductive groups*, book in preparation, 2020.
- [49] I. Satake, *Theory of spherical functions on reductive algebraic groups over  $p$ -adic fields*, Publ. Math. IHÉS **18** (1963), 1–69.
- [50] J. Tits, *Buildings of spherical type and finite BN-pairs*, Lectures Notes in Mathematics, vol. 386, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1974.
- [51] ———, *Reductive groups over local fields*, Automorphic Forms, Representations and  $L$ -Functions, Part 1, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, vol. 33, AMS, 1979.
- [52] ———, *Immeubles de type affine*, Buildings and the geometry of diagrams (Como, 1984), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1181, Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [53] B. Trojan, *Asymptotic behaviour of heat kernels and Green functions on affine buildings*, preprint, 2020.

- [54] A. Werner, *Compactifications of Bruhat-Tits buildings associated to linear representations*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **95** (2007), no. 2, 497–518.
- [55] W. Woess, *Random walks on infinite graphs and groups*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 138, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

BERTRAND RÉMY, CENTRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES LAURENT SCHWARTZ, ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, 91128 PALAISEAU, FRANCE  
*Email address:* `bertrand.remy@polytechnique.edu`

BARTOSZ TROJAN, INSTYTUT MATEMATYCZNY POLSKIEJ AKADEMII NAUK, UL. ŚNIADECKICH 8, 00-696 WARSZAWA, POLAND  
*Email address:* `btrojan@impan.pl`