

# Weakly mixing and rigid rank-one transformations preserving an infinite measure

Rachel L. Bayless and Kelly B. Yancey

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study the compatibility of rigidity with various notions of weak mixing in infinite ergodic theory. We prove that there exists an infinite measure-preserving transformation that is spectrally weakly mixing and rigid, but not doubly ergodic. We also construct an example to show that rigidity is compatible with rational ergodicity. At the end of the paper we explore the structure of rigidity sequences for infinite measure-preserving transformations that have ergodic Cartesian square, as well as the structure of rigidity sequences for infinite measure-preserving transformations that are rationally ergodic. All of our constructions are via the method of cutting and stacking.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	615
2. Preliminaries	617
2.1. Basics of cutting and stacking	619
2.2. Hajian–Kakutani +1 construction is not rigid	620
3. Weakly mixing constructions	622
3.1. Spectral weak mixing and rigidity	622
3.2. Ergodicity of the Cartesian square and rigidity	627
4. Rationally ergodic construction	631
5. Rigidity sequences	632
References	635

## 1. Introduction

The generic transformation in the set of all invertible transformations that preserve a finite measure is both rigid and weakly mixing [20]. There have been many recent developments toward characterizing the possible rigidity sequences for weakly mixing maps (see [4], [10], [16], [17]). In this paper, we

---

Received July 21, 2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37A40, 37A25.

*Key words and phrases.* Rigid, spectral weak mixing, double ergodicity, ergodic Cartesian square, infinite measure-preserving, rational ergodicity.

are interested in what happens when you move from finite ergodic theory to infinite ergodic theory (for more information see [2]). It is well-known that there are many equivalent definitions of weak mixing for transformations that preserve a finite measure. In infinite ergodic theory, however, these notions are no longer equivalent. Thus, the question becomes, which notions of weak mixing are compatible with rigidity in infinite ergodic theory? If they are compatible, what do the constructions look like and can we analyze their rigidity times?

For the remainder of this paper, we will be working with invertible transformations that preserve an infinite measure. We will be concerned with three types of weak mixing: spectral weak mixing, double ergodicity, and ergodicity of the Cartesian square. In [11] it was shown that ergodicity of the Cartesian square implies double ergodicity, which in turn implies spectral weak mixing. However, the reverse implications do not hold (see [6] and [11]).

Even though there are many nonequivalent notions of weak mixing, many generic results still remain valid. Consider the set of all automorphisms preserving an infinite measure equipped with the weak topology. In 2000 Choksi and Nadkarni proved that the generic transformation in this space has infinite ergodic index [13]. Since transformations with infinite ergodic index also have ergodic Cartesian square, all of the types of weak mixing mentioned above are also generic. In 2001 Ageev and Silva proved that rigidity is a generic property within the same set of automorphisms [9]. Finally, in the recent work of Bozgan et al. they show that rank-one transformations are generic [12]. Thus, the typical infinite measure-preserving automorphism is rank-one, rigid, and has ergodic Cartesian square. We will construct explicit examples of transformations with these properties and use the constructions to take the first step toward characterizing rigidity times for weakly mixing transformations that preserve an infinite measure. Our constructions are via the method of cutting and stacking.

The first main theorem of the paper cannot be obtained with categorical methods.

**Theorem A.** *There exists an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that is spectrally weakly mixing and rigid, but not doubly ergodic.*

The second main theorem of this paper can be obtained via the categorical arguments outlined above, but we give a constructive proof.

**Theorem B.** *There exists an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that has ergodic Cartesian square and is rigid.*

In this paper, we also explore the compatibility of rigidity with rational ergodicity. Rational ergodicity and weak rational ergodicity were introduced in 1977 by Aaronson [1]. When  $T : X \rightarrow X$  is an invertible transformation that preserves a probability measure,  $\mu$ , the Birkhoff ergodic theorem states

that ergodicity of  $T$  is equivalent to

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \mu(T^k A \cap B) = \mu(A)\mu(B) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

for every pair of measurable sets  $A, B \subset X$ . On the other hand, if  $X$  has infinite measure, then the Cesaro averages above converge to 0 for all sets  $A, B$  of finite measure. In [1] Aaronson showed that there exists no sequence of normalizing constants so that (1.1) converges to  $\mu(A)\mu(B)$  and introduced the definitions of rational ergodicity and weak rational ergodicity. Recently, in [12] and [14] these notions were explored in the setting of rank-one transformations. In [3] Aaronson proved that the set of weakly rationally ergodic transformations is a meager subset of the set of infinite measure-preserving transformations. In the same paper, it was shown that rational ergodicity implies weak rational ergodicity, and the validity of the reverse implication remains open. Thus, determining whether rational ergodicity is compatible with rigidity must come from a construction. With that in mind, we have the following theorem:

**Theorem C.** *There exists an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that is rationally ergodic and rigid.*

Finally, we use the ideas from the constructions in Theorems B and C to prove the following theorems which give a set of conditions under which a given sequence can be realized as a rigidity sequence for a transformation with ergodic Cartesian square or a rationally ergodic transformation.

**Theorem D.** *Let  $(n_m)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers such that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \rightarrow \infty$ . There exists an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that has ergodic Cartesian square and is rigid along  $(n_m)$ .*

**Theorem E.** *Let  $(n_m)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers such that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore, assume that  $n_{m+1} = 2^{k_m} n_m + r_m$  where  $0 \leq r_m < n_m$ . There exists an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that is rationally ergodic and rigid along  $(n_m)$ .*

In the next section, we provide definitions and briefly review the method of cutting and stacking. In Section 3, we discuss rank-one constructions that are rigid and weak mixing. In Section 4, we construct an example to show the compatibility of rigidity with rational ergodicity. Finally, in Section 5, we analyze rigidity sequences for weakly mixing transformations and rationally ergodic transformations.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$  be a  $\sigma$ -finite measure space. We assume throughout this paper that  $\mu(X) = \infty$  and  $T : X \rightarrow X$  is invertible and measure-preserving.

We begin with the definition of rigidity in this setting.

**Definition 1.** The transformation  $T$  is *rigid* if there exists an increasing sequence of natural numbers  $(n_m)$  such that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu(T^{n_m} A \Delta A) = 0$$

for all sets  $A$  of finite positive measure.

We now give three nonequivalent definitions of weak mixing for transformations that preserve an infinite measure.

**Definition 2.** The transformation  $T$  is *spectrally weakly mixing* if  $f \in L^\infty$  and  $f \circ T = \lambda f$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  implies that  $f$  is constant almost everywhere.

**Definition 3.** The transformation  $T$  is *doubly ergodic* if for every pair of positive measure sets  $A, B$ , there exists a time  $n$  such that

$$\mu(T^n A \cap A) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(T^n A \cap B) > 0.$$

**Definition 4.** The transformation  $T$  has *ergodic Cartesian square* if  $T \times T$  is ergodic with respect to  $\mu \times \mu$ .

As was mentioned in the introduction, the following string of strict implications was shown in [11]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ergodic Cartesian square} &\implies \text{double ergodicity} \\ &\implies \text{spectral weak mixing.} \end{aligned}$$

The following notation will be used in the definition of weak rational ergodicity. Let  $F \in \mathcal{B}$  be a set of finite positive measure. The *intrinsic weight sequence* of  $F$  is given by

$$u_k(F) = \frac{\mu(F \cap T^k F)}{\mu(F)^2}.$$

Furthermore, let

$$a_n(F) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} u_k(F).$$

The following definition introduces a property in the spirit of (1.1) that may also be satisfied by transformations that preserve an infinite measure.

**Definition 5.** A conservative ergodic transformation  $T$  is *weakly rationally ergodic* if there exists an  $F \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $0 < \mu(F) < \infty$  such that

$$\frac{1}{a_n(F)} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mu(A \cap T^k B) \rightarrow \mu(A)\mu(B) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

for all measurable  $A, B \subseteq F$ .

Finally, rational ergodicity (defined below) is stronger than weak rational ergodicity and requires the transformation to satisfy a Renyi inequality on a finite measure set.

**Definition 6.** A conservative ergodic transformation  $T$  is *rationally ergodic* if there exists an  $M < \infty$  and  $F \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $0 < \mu(F) < \infty$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad \int_F \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_F \circ T^k \right)^2 d\mu \leq M \left( \int_F \left( \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_F \circ T^k \right) d\mu \right)^2,$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**2.1. Basics of cutting and stacking.** In this paper, we construct transformations that are rigid and exhibit each of the above types of weak mixing, as well as transformations that are rigid and rationally ergodic. All of our examples are obtained via cutting and stacking. That is, we inductively define a sequence of towers,  $C_n$ , each of height  $h_n$ . Each  $C_n$  is a column of  $h_n$  disjoint intervals with equal measure denoted by  $\{I_{n,0}, \dots, I_{n,h_n-1}\}$ . The elements of  $C_n$  are called *levels*. We often refer to  $I_{n,0}$  as the *bottom level* and  $I_{n,h_n-1}$  as the *top level* of  $C_n$ . A transformation,  $T_n$ , is defined on  $\{I_{n,0}, \dots, I_{n,h_n-2}\}$  by moving up one level. That is,  $T_n(I_{n,i}) = I_{n,(i+1)}$  for all  $0 \leq i < h_n - 1$ . Note that  $T_n$  is not defined on the top level of  $C_n$ . Thus, we must define  $C_{n+1}$  by first cutting  $C_n$  into  $q_n$  subcolumns of equal width. That is, for each  $0 \leq i \leq h_n - 1$  we cut the  $i^{\text{th}}$  level into  $q_n$  pieces, and we denote these pieces by  $I_{n,i}^{[0]}, I_{n,i}^{[1]}, \dots, I_{n,i}^{[q_n-1]}$ . We may then add any number of new levels (called *spacers*) above each subcolumn. Now, we stack every subcolumn of  $C_n$  above the subcolumn to its left to form  $C_{n+1}$ . Thus,  $C_{n+1}$  consists of  $q_n$  copies of  $C_n$  which may be separated by spacers. Finally, we define  $T = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n$ . The transformation  $T$  is called a *rank-one* map.

We now define a notion of rigidity related specifically to rank-one transformations.

**Definition 7.** The sequence  $(n_m)$  is *rigid for  $C_N$*  if

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mu(T^{n_m} E \Delta E) = 0$$

for every level  $E$  of  $C_N$ .

**Remark 1.** If  $(n_m)$  is rigid for every  $C_N$ , then the transformation  $T$  is rigid along  $(n_m)$ . A proof of this fact can be found in [10] Lemma 3.14.

The following two approximation lemmas will be used in the proofs of the main theorems, so we state them here for completeness. Lemma 2.1 is a consequence of the double approximation lemma, and a proof can be found in [11].

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $A, B \subset [0, \infty)$  be sets of positive measure and let the levels  $I, J \subset C_n$  be such that*

$$\mu(I \cap A) + \mu(J \cap B) > \delta \mu(I)$$

*with the level  $J$  distance  $d$  above the level  $I$  (that is,  $T^d I = J$ ). If the levels  $I, J$  are cut into  $n + 2$  equal pieces,  $I^{[0]}, \dots, I^{[n+1]}$  and  $J^{[0]}, \dots, J^{[n+1]}$ , then*

there exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\mu\left(I^{[k]} \cap A\right) + \mu\left(J^{[k]} \cap B\right) > \delta\mu(I^{[k]})$$

and  $J^{[k]}$  is distance  $d$  above  $I^{[k]}$  in  $C_{n+1}$ .

A higher dimensional version of the double approximation lemma can be found in [15]. Using the same methods as [11] proves the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $A, B \subset [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$  be sets of positive measure and let the levels  $I_1, I_2, J_1, J_2 \subset C_n$  be such that*

$$\mu \times \mu((I_1 \times J_1) \cap A) + \mu \times \mu(I_2 \times J_2) \cap B > \delta\mu(I_1)\mu(J_1)$$

where  $T^{d_1}I_1 = I_2$  and  $T^{d_2}J_1 = J_2$ . If the levels  $I_1, I_2, J_1, J_2$  are cut into  $n+2$  equal pieces,  $I_i^{[0]}, \dots, I_i^{[n+1]}$  and  $J_i^{[0]}, \dots, J_i^{[n+1]}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , then there exists  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\mu \times \mu\left(\left(I_1^{[k]} \times J_1^{[l]}\right) \cap A\right) + \mu \times \mu\left(\left(I_2^{[k]} \times J_2^{[l]}\right) \cap B\right) > \delta\mu\left(I_1^{[k]}\right)\mu\left(J_1^{[l]}\right),$$

with  $I_2^{[k]}$  distance  $d_1$  above  $I_1^{[k]}$  and  $J_2^{[l]}$  distance  $d_2$  above  $J_1^{[l]}$  in  $C_{n+1}$ .

**2.2. Hajian–Kakutani +1 construction is not rigid.** The Hajian–Kakutani transformation was originally constructed in [19], and it is a classical example of a rank-one map that preserves an infinite measure. A modified version called the Hajian–Kakutani +1 (denoted HK(+1) for short) arises from adding one additional spacer to the original construction. It was shown in [7] that the HK(+1) construction is spectrally weakly mixing. Thus, it is natural to ask if this transformation is also rigid. It was shown in [18] that the HK(+1) transformation is not multiply recurrent and hence not rigid. We give a different proof (via explicit calculation) that the HK(+1) transformation is not rigid along any sequence.

We begin by describing the steps in the construction of HK(+1). The first stage,  $C_0$ , consists of the interval  $[0, 1)$ . Thus, the initial height  $h_0 = 1$ . In general, suppose we have already constructed the  $C_n$  tower, which is a union of  $h_n$  levels. To construct  $C_{n+1}$  from  $C_n$  do the following:

- (1) Cut  $C_n$  into 2 equal pieces.
- (2) Stack the right subcolumn of  $C_n$  on top of the left subcolumn.
- (3) Add  $2h_n + 1$  spacers to the end to form  $C_{n+1}$ .

At each stage of the construction, notice that the total height of the tower is  $h_{n+1} = 4h_n + 1$ .

**Proposition 2.3.** *The HK(+1) construction is not rigid.*

**Proof.** To show that this construction is not rigid, it suffices to find a set  $E$  of positive finite measure such that  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(T^n E \Delta E) > 0$ .

Let  $E = [0, 1)$ . Suppose for a contradiction, that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(T^n E \Delta E) = 0.$$




FIGURE 1. Construction of  $C_{n+1}$  for the HK(+1) transformation.

Let  $\epsilon > 0$ , and let  $N$  be such that  $N \in [h_n, h_{n+1} - 1]$  and  $\mu(T^N E \Delta E) < \epsilon$ . Before we proceed, we need some notation for how levels in  $C_n$  appear in  $C_{n+3}$ . Let  $I_{n,0}$  be the bottom level of the  $C_n$ -th tower.

Define

$$e_j = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } j = 0, 2, 4, 6 \\ 2h_n + 1, & \text{if } j = 1, 5 \\ 10h_n + 4, & \text{if } j = 3. \end{cases}$$

Let  $k_j$  for  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 7$  be defined by

$$k_0 = 0, \quad k_{j+1} = k_j + h_n + e_j.$$

Let

$$Y_j = \bigcup_{i=0}^{h_n-1} T^{i+k_j} I_{n+3,0}$$

for  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 7$ . Then,  $Y_{j+1} = T^{h_n+e_j} Y_j$  for  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 6$ .

Notice that  $h_{n+1} = 4h_n + 1$ . Thus  $N = ah_n + b$  where  $a = 1, 2, 3$  and  $0 \leq b \leq h_n$ . Let

$$e_{j,a} = \begin{cases} e_j, & \text{if } a = 1 \\ e_j + e_{j+1}, & \text{if } a = 2 \\ e_j + e_{j+1} + e_{j+2}, & \text{if } a = 3. \end{cases}$$

Then  $T^N Y_j = T^{ah_n+b} Y_j = T^{b-e_{j,a}} Y_{j+a}$ .

Suppose  $S_1, S_2$  are two sets of positive measure. By  $S_1 \stackrel{\epsilon}{\approx} S_2$  we will mean  $\mu(S_1 \Delta S_2) < \epsilon$ . Thus,

$$T^N(E \cap Y_j) = T^N E \cap T^N Y_j \stackrel{\epsilon}{\approx} E \cap T^{b-e_{j,a}} Y_{j+a}$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq 7 - a$ . Also notice that

$$T^N(E \cap Y_j) = T^{b-e_{j,a}}(E \cap Y_{j+a})$$

for  $0 \leq j \leq 7 - a$ . Putting these together we see that

$$E \cap Y_{j+a} \stackrel{\epsilon}{\approx} T^{-b+e_{j,a}} E \cap Y_{j+a}.$$

Thus  $E \stackrel{8\epsilon}{\approx} T^{-b+e_{j,a}} E$ . Since we can find  $j, j'$  such that  $|e_{j,a} - e_{j',a}| = 8h_n + 3$ , we have that  $E \stackrel{16\epsilon}{\approx} T^{8h_n+3} E$ .

Recall that  $E = [0, 1)$  and thus the set  $E$  is a proper subset of  $Y_j$ 's. Hence  $E \cap T^{8h_n+3} E = \emptyset$ , which contradicts  $E \stackrel{16\epsilon}{\approx} T^{8h_n+3} E$ .  $\square$

### 3. Weakly mixing constructions

**3.1. Spectral weak mixing and rigidity.** In this section, we explore transformations that are barely weakly mixing and rigid. We do this by constructing a transformation that is spectrally weakly mixing and rigid, but not doubly ergodic. The existence of such a transformation does not follow from categorical methods since the set of spectrally weakly mixing transformations that are not doubly ergodic is of first category.

**Theorem A.** *There exists an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that is spectrally weakly mixing and rigid, but not doubly ergodic.*

We will begin by describing the construction. The first stage,  $C_0$ , consists of the interval  $[0, 1)$ . Thus, the initial height  $h_0 = 1$ . In general, suppose we have already constructed the  $C_n$ -th tower, which is a union of  $h_n$  levels. To construct  $C_{n+1}$  from  $C_n$  do the following:

- (1) Cut  $C_n$  into  $n + 2$  equal pieces.
- (2) Compute the quantity  $a_n = \lceil \frac{n+2}{3} \rceil$ .
- (3) Stack the subcolumns of  $C_n$  to form  $C_{n+1}$  in the following order:  
 $a_n h_n$  stacks, two spacers,  $(n + 2 - a_n) h_n$  stacks,  $2h_n - 1$  spacers.

At each stage of the construction, notice that the total height of the tower is  $h_{n+1} = (n + 4)h_n + 1$ . The total number of spacers added to form  $C_{n+1}$  is  $2h_n + 1$ , and this ensures that our transformation preserves an infinite measure. That is,  $T : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ . To see this, let  $S_n$  be the union of spacers that are added to form the  $n$ -th tower  $C_n$ . Let  $\epsilon_n = \frac{2h_n+1}{(n+4)h_n+1}$ . Then

$$\frac{\mu(S_{n+1})}{\mu(C_{n+1})} = \frac{2h_n + 1}{h_{n+1}} = \frac{2h_n + 1}{(n + 4)h_n + 1} = \epsilon_n.$$

Since  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_{n+1} = \infty$ ,  $T$  preserves an infinite measure.






FIGURE 2. Construction of  $C_{n+1}$  for a transformation that is spectrally weakly mixing and rigid, but not doubly ergodic.

Intuitively, the “special spacers” (i.e., the two spacers placed over the  $a_n$ -th subcolumn of  $C_n$ ) are what allow us to prove spectral weak mixing, while at the same time not destroying rigidity. Also, the fact that the number of special spacers is two is what precludes double ergodicity. Before proving Theorem A, we need the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose  $I$  is an interval and  $A$  is a set of positive measure such that  $\mu(A \cap I) > \frac{11}{12}\mu(I)$ . Furthermore suppose that the interval  $I$  is divided into three equal pieces  $I_1, I_2, I_3$ . Then there exists a positive measure set  $A'$  such that  $A', A' + \frac{1}{3}\mu(I) \subset A$  where  $A' \subset I_1$ . Moreover,  $\mu(A') > \frac{1}{10}\mu(I)$ .*

**Proof.** To begin, suppose that  $\mu(I) = 1$ . Let  $A_i = A \cap I_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Since the  $\mu(A \cap I) > \frac{11}{12}$  we have that

$$\mu(A_i) \geq \mu(A \cap I) - \mu(I_1) - \mu(I_2) > \frac{11}{12} - \frac{2}{3} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Let  $A' = A_1 \cap (A_2 - \frac{1}{3})$ . It remains to show that  $\mu(A') > \frac{1}{10}$ . Suppose for a contradiction that  $\mu(A') \leq \frac{1}{10}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{3} = \mu(I_1) &\geq \mu(A_1) + \mu\left(A_2 - \frac{1}{3}\right) - \mu\left(A_1 \cap \left(A_2 - \frac{1}{3}\right)\right) \\ &> \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{10} = \frac{2}{5} \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore  $A'$  is our desired set.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *The map  $T^2$  is ergodic.*

**Proof.** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be subsets of  $[0, \infty)$  of positive measure. To prove ergodicity of  $T^2$  we must find a time  $m$  such that  $\mu(T^{2m}A \cap B) > 0$ . Let  $n$  be large enough so that  $\mu(A \cap I) > \frac{23}{24}\mu(I)$  and  $\mu(B \cap J) > \frac{23}{24}\mu(J)$  where  $I, J$  are levels of  $C_n$ . Suppose  $J$  is above  $I$  in  $C_n$  and specifically  $T^d I = J$ .

We now have two cases that depend on the parity of  $d$ .

*Case 1.*  $d$  is even. Let  $d = 2m$ . Then  $\mu(T^{2m}(A \cap I) \cap (B \cap J)) > 0$  since  $I$  and  $J$  are both  $\frac{11}{12}$  full of  $A$  and  $B$  respectively.

*Case 2.*  $d$  is odd. Let  $d = 2\ell + 1$ . Let  $C_{n+M}$  be the next stage in the construction such that  $n + M + 2$  is an odd multiple of 3. Apply the double approximation lemma (Lemma 2.1) to the levels  $I$  and  $J$  of  $C_n$ ,  $M$  consecutive times to obtain levels  $\bar{I}, \bar{J}$  of  $C_{n+M}$  such that  $T^d \bar{I} = \bar{J}$  and

$$\mu(A \cap \bar{I}) + \mu(B \cap \bar{J}) > \left(2 - \frac{1}{12}\right) \mu(\bar{I}).$$

Note that  $\mu(\bar{I}) = \mu(\bar{J})$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A \cap \bar{I}) &> \frac{11}{12} \mu(\bar{I}) \\ \mu(B \cap \bar{J}) &> \frac{11}{12} \mu(\bar{J}). \end{aligned}$$

Tower  $C_{n+M}$  is cut into  $n + M + 2 = 3a_{n+M}$  pieces and the subcolumn  $a_{n+M}$  has 2 special spacers added above it to form the tower  $C_{n+M+1}$ . Let  $n + M + 2 = 3k$  where  $k$  is odd. Since the levels  $\bar{I}$  and  $\bar{J}$  are  $\frac{11}{12}$ -full of the sets  $A$  and  $B$  respectively, by Lemma 3.1 there exists sets  $A_1 \subset A$  and  $B_1 \subset B$  of positive measure such that  $A_1$  belongs to the left third of the level  $\bar{I}$  and  $T^d(A_1 + \frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{I})) = B_1$ .

Consider the quantity  $kh_{n+M} + 2 + d$ . Since  $k, h_{n+M}$ , and  $d$  are odd integers, the sum  $kh_{n+M} + 2 + d$  is even. Let  $kh_{n+M} + 2 + d = 2m$ . Then,

$$\mu(T^{2m}A_1 \cap B_1) = \mu(T^{kh_{n+M}+2+d}A_1 \cap B_1) = \mu(B_1) > 0. \quad \square$$

The proof of Theorem A is given in the form of the following three lemmas, where each lemma highlights the individual properties that the transformation,  $T$ , exhibits.

**Lemma 3.3.** *The map  $T$  is spectrally weakly mixing.*

**Proof.** Suppose for a contradiction that  $f \in L^\infty([0, \infty))$  is a nonconstant eigenfunction with eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . Thus  $f \circ T = \lambda f$ . Our plan is to restrict the eigenfunction to a set of finite measure and apply standard arguments.

Let  $\bar{f} = f \upharpoonright_{[0,1]}$ , and let  $x \in [0, 1)$ . If  $k$  is such that  $T^k x \in [0, 1)$ , then

$$\bar{f}(T^k x) = f(T^k x) = \lambda^k f(x) = \lambda^k \bar{f}(x).$$

Note that  $\bar{f} \in L^2([0, 1))$ . Thus, we may approximate  $\bar{f}$  by a linear combination of characteristic functions. Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Let  $g \in L^2([0, 1))$  be such that  $\|g - \bar{f}\|_2 < \epsilon$  where  $g$  is a linear combination of characteristic functions of the levels of some  $C_n$ . Note that  $g$  is only defined on the levels of  $C_n$  that belong to  $[0, 1)$ . Also, assume that  $\|g\|_2 = 1$ .

Now, let  $E_1 \subset C_n$  be the  $r_n := a_n h_n$  bottom stacks of tower  $C_{n+1}$  intersected with  $[0, 1)$ . That is,  $E_1 = \left(\bigcup_{i=0}^{a_n h_n - 1} I_{n+1,i}\right) \cap [0, 1)$ . Then  $\mu(E_1) = \frac{a_n}{n+2} > \frac{1}{4}$ . Notice that  $g \upharpoonright_{E_1} = g \circ T^{r_n+2} \upharpoonright_{E_1}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \|g \circ T^{r_n+2} \upharpoonright_{E_1} - \lambda^{r_n+2} g \upharpoonright_{E_1}\|_2 &\leq \|g \circ T^{r_n+2} \upharpoonright_{E_1} - \bar{f} \circ T^{r_n+2} \upharpoonright_{E_1}\|_2 \\ &\quad + \|\bar{f} \circ T^{r_n+2} \upharpoonright_{E_1} - \lambda^{r_n+2} \bar{f} \upharpoonright_{E_1}\|_2 \\ &\quad + \|\lambda^{r_n+2} \bar{f} \upharpoonright_{E_1} - \lambda^{r_n+2} g \upharpoonright_{E_1}\|_2 \\ &\leq 2 \|g - \bar{f}\|_2 \\ &< 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Putting these together, we see that

$$\|g \upharpoonright_{E_1} - \lambda^{r_n+2} g \upharpoonright_{E_1}\|_2 < 2\epsilon$$

which implies

$$|\lambda^{r_n+2} - 1| \|g \upharpoonright_{E_1}\|_2 < 2\epsilon.$$

Thus,

$$|\lambda^{r_n+2} - 1| < \frac{2\epsilon}{\|g \upharpoonright_{E_1}\|_2} = \frac{2\epsilon}{\sqrt{\mu(E_1)}} < 4\epsilon.$$

Let  $E_2 \subset C_n$  be the  $r_n$  stacks of  $C_{n+1}$  that follow the special spacer, intersected with  $[0, 1)$ . In a similar manner, you can show that  $|\lambda^{r_n} - 1| < 4\epsilon$ . Therefore,

$$|\lambda^2 - 1| = |\lambda^{r_n+2} - \lambda^{r_n}| < 8\epsilon$$

and  $\lambda^2 = 1$ . Consider,

$$f(T^2 x) = \lambda^2 f(x) = f(x).$$

This is a contradiction since  $T^2$  is ergodic by Lemma 3.2. □

**Lemma 3.4.** *The map  $T$  is rigid along the height sequence.*

**Proof.** To see that  $T$  is rigid consider the sequence of heights  $(h_n)$ . Let  $L$  be a level of  $C_N$ . Recall that  $L$  is cut into  $N + 2$  equal pieces before being stacked to form  $C_{N+1}$ . Observe,  $\mu(T^{h_n} L \Delta L) \leq \frac{2\mu(L)}{n+2}$  for all  $n \geq N$ . Hence  $T$  is rigid along  $(h_n)$ . □

**Lemma 3.5.** *The map  $T$  is not doubly ergodic.*

**Proof.** To show that  $T$  is not doubly ergodic we need to find two sets of positive measure,  $A$  and  $B$ , such that there does not exist a time  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  where  $\mu(T^n A \cap A) > 0$  and  $\mu(T^n A \cap B) > 0$  simultaneously.

Let  $A = I_{1,0}$  and  $B = I_{1,1}$ , that is  $A$  and  $B$  are the bottom two levels of  $C_1$ . Define  $N_{A,A}$  and  $N_{A,B}$  by

$$N_{A,A} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \mu(T^n A \cap A) > 0\}$$

$$N_{A,B} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : \mu(T^n A \cap B) > 0\}.$$

Thus, we need to show that  $N_{A,A} \cap N_{A,B} = \emptyset$ . Since  $A$  and  $B$  are one level apart, that is  $TA = B$ , it suffices to prove that the set of differences of  $N_{A,A}$  does not contain the element one. Hence, we need to show  $1 \notin (N_{A,A} - N_{A,A})$ .

Let  $N_{A,A}^n = N_{A,A} \cap \{1, 2, \dots, h_n - 1\}$ . Then  $N_{A,A} = \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} N_{A,A}^n$ . We will show that 2 is the smallest positive number in  $N_{A,A} - N_{A,A}$  by inductively analyzing  $N_{A,A}^n - N_{A,A}^n$ .

First consider the tower  $C_2$ . Let  $d_1 = h_1 + 2$  and  $d_2 = h_1$ . Note that  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  are consecutive differences between the levels of  $A$  in  $C_2$ . Then,

$$N_{A,A}^2 = \left\{ \sum_{i=k}^{k'} d_i : 1 \leq k \leq k' \leq 2 \right\}.$$

Clearly the smallest possible positive difference between elements of  $N_{A,A}^2$  is 2.

Now consider the tower  $C_n$  for some  $n \geq 2$ . Let  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{m_n}$  be consecutive differences between the levels of  $A$  in  $C_n$ , where  $m_n = \frac{(n+1)!}{2} - 1$ . Then

$$N_{A,A}^n = \left\{ \sum_{i=k}^{k'} d_i : 1 \leq k \leq k' \leq m_n \right\}.$$

By our inductive hypothesis, we can assume that the smallest positive difference between elements of  $N_{A,A}^n$  is 2.

Consider the tower  $C_{n+1}$ . There are  $m_{n+1} + 1$  levels of  $A$  in  $C_{n+1}$ . Let  $\bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_{m_{n+1}}$  represent consecutive differences between the levels of  $A$  in  $C_{n+1}$ . Notice that

$$\bar{d}_{1+j} = d_1, \quad \bar{d}_{2+j} = d_2, \quad \dots \quad \bar{d}_{m_n+j} = d_{m_n},$$

where  $j$  has the form  $j = k(m_n + 1)$  ( $k$  a nonnegative integer) and  $m_n + j \leq m_{n+1}$ . Also,

$$\bar{d}_{k(m_n+1)} = \begin{cases} h_n - (d_1 + \dots + d_{m_n}) + 2, & \text{if } k = a_n = \lceil \frac{n+2}{3} \rceil \\ h_n - (d_1 + \dots + d_{m_n}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, the smallest positive difference between elements of  $N_{A,A}^{n+1}$  is also 2. This completes our inductive argument.  $\square$

**Remark 2.** In the above construction, if we instead added only one special spacer after the first  $a_n h_n$  stacks and  $2h_n$  spacers at the end, then an argument almost identical to the one in Lemma 3.3 shows that the resulting transformation is spectrally weakly mixing. It can also be shown that this construction is doubly ergodic on the levels. That is, if  $I, J$  are levels of some  $C_N$ , then there exists a time  $n$  such that  $\mu(T^n I \cap I) > 0$  and  $\mu(T^n I \cap J) > 0$ . It was, however, shown in [11] that there exist transformations that are doubly ergodic on intervals but not doubly ergodic, and the question of whether this transformation is doubly ergodic remains open.

**3.2. Ergodicity of the Cartesian square and rigidity.** In this section, we give a constructive proof of the following theorem.

**Theorem B.** *There exists an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that has ergodic Cartesian square and is rigid.*

Let us begin by describing the construction. The first stage,  $C_0$ , consists of the interval  $[0, 1)$ . Thus, the initial height is  $h_0 = 1$ . Define the sequence  $(s_n)$  by  $s_0 = 1, s_1 = 2, s_2 = 1, s_3 = 2, s_4 = 3, s_5 = 1, \dots$ . It is clear that  $(s_n)$  cycles through every natural number infinitely often. In general, suppose we have already constructed the  $C_n$  tower, which is a union of  $h_n$  levels. To construct  $C_{n+1}$  from  $C_n$  do the following:

- (1) Cut  $C_n$  into  $n + 2$  equal pieces.
- (2) Compute the quantity  $a_n = \lceil \frac{n+2}{3} \rceil$ .
- (3) Stack the subcolumns of  $C_n$  to form  $C_{n+1}$  in the following order:  
 $a_n h_n$  stacks,  $s_n$  spacers,  $(n + 2 - a_n) h_n$  stacks,  $2h_n + 1 - s_n$  spacers.

This construction is very similar to the previous construction in Section 3.1. In particular, the number of total number of spacers added to form  $C_{n+1}$  is still  $2h_n + 1$ . Thus, as before,  $h_{n+1} = (n + 4)h_n + 1$ , and  $T$  preserves an infinite measure. The two constructions differ in the amount of special spacers that we place over the  $a_n$ -th subcolumn. Intuitively, allowing the number of spacers added above the  $a_n$ -th subcolumn to cycle through every number infinitely often is what allows us to prove ergodicity of the Cartesian square, while at the same time not destroying rigidity.

Before we prove Theorem B, we prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.6.** *The transformation  $T$  is doubly ergodic and rigid.*

Proposition 3.6 is indeed implied by our main result (Theorem B), as ergodicity of the Cartesian square implies double ergodicity. We have, however, chosen to include a separate statement and proof because the proof technique is similar to that in Theorem B but much cleaner. Upon conclusion of the proof of Proposition 3.6, we will prove Theorem B.

The following counting lemma will be used in the proof of Proposition 3.6.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Suppose  $I$  is an interval and  $A$  is a set of positive measure such that  $\mu(A \cap I) > \frac{11}{12}\mu(I)$ . Furthermore suppose that the interval  $I$  is*

divided into three equal pieces  $I_1, I_2, I_3$ . Then there exists a positive measure set  $A'$  such that  $A', A' + \frac{1}{3}\mu(I), A' + \frac{2}{3}\mu(I) \subset A$ .

**Proof.** To begin, suppose that  $\mu(I) = 1$ . Let  $A_i = A \cap I_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Since the  $\mu(A \cap I) > \frac{11}{12}$  we have that

$$\mu(A_i) \geq \mu(A \cap I) - \mu(I_1) - \mu(I_2) > \frac{11}{12} - \frac{2}{3} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Let  $A' = (A_1) \cap (A_2 - \frac{1}{3}) \cap (A_3 - \frac{2}{3})$ . It remains to show that  $A'$  has positive measure. Suppose for a contradiction that  $\mu(A') = 0$ . First observe that

$$\mu\left(\left(A_2 - \frac{1}{3}\right) \cap \left(A_3 - \frac{1}{3}\right)\right) \leq \mu(I_1) - \mu(A_1) < \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{12}.$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{6}{12} &< \mu\left(A_2 - \frac{1}{3}\right) + \mu\left(A_3 - \frac{2}{3}\right) \\ &\leq \mu\left(\left(A_2 - \frac{1}{3}\right) \cup \left(A_3 - \frac{2}{3}\right)\right) + \mu\left(\left(A_2 - \frac{1}{3}\right) \cap \left(A_3 - \frac{2}{3}\right)\right) \\ &< \mu(I_1) + \frac{1}{12} = \frac{5}{12} \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore  $A'$  is our desired set.  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 3.6.** Similar to the construction in Section 3.1,  $T$  is rigid by Lemma 3.4. Thus, we need only show double ergodicity. To that end, let  $A, B \subset [0, \infty)$  be sets of positive measure. Our goal is show that there exists a time  $m$  such that  $\mu(T^m A \cap A) > 0$  and  $\mu(T^m A \cap B) > 0$ . Let  $n$  be large enough so that  $\mu(A \cap I) \geq \frac{23}{24}\mu(I)$  and  $\mu(B \cap J) \geq \frac{23}{24}\mu(J)$  where  $I, J$  are levels of  $C_n$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that the level  $J$  is  $d$  levels above  $I$  in  $C_n$ . That is,  $T^d I = J$ .

Let  $C_{n+M}$  be the next stage in the construction such that the tower  $C_{n+M}$  has  $d$  special spacers added above the  $a_{n+M}$ -th subcolumn to form  $C_{n+M+1}$ . Apply the double approximation lemma (Lemma 2.1) to the levels  $I$  and  $J$  of  $C_n$ ,  $M$  consecutive times to obtain levels  $\bar{I}, \bar{J}$  of  $C_{n+M}$  such that  $T^d \bar{I} = \bar{J}$  and

$$\mu(A \cap \bar{I}) + \mu(B \cap \bar{J}) > \left(2 - \frac{1}{12}\right)\mu(\bar{I}).$$

Note that  $\mu(\bar{I}) = \mu(\bar{J})$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(A \cap \bar{I}) &> \frac{11}{12}\mu(\bar{I}) \\ \mu(B \cap \bar{J}) &> \frac{11}{12}\mu(\bar{J}). \end{aligned}$$

To make the picture more clear, assume that  $n + M + 2$  is divisible by 3. That is, the tower  $C_{n+M}$  is cut into  $3a_{n+M}$  pieces, and the  $a_{n+M}$ -th subcolumn has  $d$  special spacers added above it to form the tower  $C_{n+M+1}$ .

Since the levels  $\bar{I}$  and  $\bar{J}$  are  $\frac{11}{12}$ -full of the sets  $A$  and  $B$  respectively, by Lemma 3.7 there exists sets  $\bar{A}_1 \subset A$ ,  $\bar{A}_2 \subset A$ , and  $\bar{B} \subset B$  of positive measure such that  $\bar{A}_1$  belongs to the left third of the level  $\bar{I}$ ,  $\bar{A}_1 + \frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{I}) = \bar{A}_2$ , and  $T^d(\bar{A}_2 + \frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{I})) = \bar{B}$ .




FIGURE 3. Illustration of  $\bar{I}$  and  $\bar{J}$  in  $C_{n+M}$  along with the placement of sets  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ , and  $B$ .

Now observe the following:

$$T^{a_{n+M}h_{n+M}+d}\bar{A}_1 = \bar{A}_2$$

$$T^{a_{n+M}h_{n+M}+d}\bar{A}_2 = T^d(\bar{A}_2 + \frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{I})) = \bar{B}.$$

If we let  $m = a_{n+M}h_{n+M} + d$ , then we have the result. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem B. Similar to the proof of double ergodicity, finding levels in an advantageous location to approximate arbitrary sets is a critical element of the proof.

**Proof of Theorem B.** Again, the argument in Lemma 3.4 shows that  $T$  is rigid. Thus, our goal is to show that the map  $T \times T$  is ergodic. That is, given sets of positive measure,  $E_1, E_2 \subset [0, \infty) \times [0, \infty)$ , there exists a time  $m$  such that  $\mu \times \mu((T \times T)^m E_1 \cap E_2) > 0$ .

Let  $n$  be large enough so that  $\mu \times \mu(E_1 \cap (I_1 \times J_1)) > \frac{199}{200}\mu(I_1)\mu(J_1)$  and  $\mu \times \mu(E_2 \cap (I_2 \times J_2)) > \frac{199}{200}\mu(I_2)\mu(J_2)$  where  $I_1, I_2, J_1, J_2$  are levels of  $C_n$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $I_2$  is above  $I_1$  and  $J_2$  is above  $J_1$  in  $C_n$ . Let  $d_1, d_2$  be such that  $T^{d_1}I_1 = I_2$  and  $T^{d_2}J_1 = J_2$ . Suppose that  $d_1 > d_2$ , and let  $k$  be such that  $d_1 = d_2 + k$ .

Let  $C_{n+M}$  be the next stage in the construction such that the tower  $C_{n+M}$  has  $k$  special spacers added above the  $a_{n+M}$ -th subcolumn to form  $C_{n+M+1}$ . Apply Lemma 2.2 to the squares  $I_1 \times J_1$  and  $I_2 \times J_2$ ,  $M$  consecutive times to obtain squares  $\overline{I}_1 \times \overline{J}_1$  and  $\overline{I}_2 \times \overline{J}_2$  where  $\overline{I}_1, \overline{I}_2, \overline{J}_1, \overline{J}_2$  are levels in  $C_{n+M}$ ,  $T^{d_1}\overline{I}_1 = \overline{I}_2$  and  $T^{d_2}\overline{J}_1 = \overline{J}_2$ , and

$$\mu \times \mu(E_1 \cap (\overline{I}_1 \times \overline{J}_1)) + \mu \times \mu(E_2 \cap (\overline{I}_2 \times \overline{J}_2)) > \left(2 - \frac{1}{100}\right) \mu(\overline{I}_1) \mu(\overline{J}_1).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \times \mu(E_1 \cap (\overline{I}_1 \times \overline{J}_1)) &> \frac{99}{100} \mu(\overline{I}_1) \mu(\overline{J}_1) \\ \mu \times \mu(E_2 \cap (\overline{I}_2 \times \overline{J}_2)) &> \frac{99}{100} \mu(\overline{I}_1) \mu(\overline{J}_1). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\pi_i$  be the projection map onto the  $i$ -th coordinate. Notice that since  $\mu \times \mu(E_i \cap (\overline{I}_i \times \overline{J}_i)) > \frac{99}{100} \mu(\overline{I}_i) \mu(\overline{J}_i)$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\pi_1(E_i) \cap \overline{I}_i) &> \frac{99}{100} \mu(\overline{I}_i) > \frac{11}{12} \mu(\overline{I}_i), \\ \mu(\pi_2(E_i) \cap \overline{J}_i) &> \frac{99}{100} \mu(\overline{J}_i) > \frac{11}{12} \mu(\overline{J}_i) \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ .

To make the picture more clear, assume that  $n + M + 2$  is divisible by 3. That is, the tower  $C_{n+M}$  is cut into  $3a_{n+M}$  pieces, and the subcolumn  $a_{n+M}$  has  $k$  special spacers added above it to form the tower  $C_{n+M+1}$ . Since the levels  $\overline{J}_1$  and  $\overline{J}_2$  are  $\frac{11}{12}$ -full of the sets  $\pi_2(E_1)$  and  $\pi_2(E_2)$  respectively, by Lemma 3.1 there exists sets  $A_2 \subset \pi_2(E_1)$  and  $B_2 \subset \pi_2(E_2)$  of measure at least  $\frac{1}{10} \mu(\overline{J}_1)$  such that  $A_2$  belongs to the left third of the level  $\overline{J}_1$  and  $T^{d_2}(A_2 + \frac{1}{3} \mu(\overline{J}_1)) = B_2$ .

A similar calculation can be carried out with levels  $\overline{I}_1$  and  $\overline{I}_2$  to obtain sets  $A_1 \subset \pi_1(E_1)$  and  $B_1 \subset \pi_1(E_2)$  of measure at least  $\frac{1}{10} \mu(\overline{I}_1)$  such that  $A_1$  belongs to the middle third of the level  $\overline{I}_1$  and  $T^{d_1}(A_1 + \frac{1}{3} \mu(\overline{I}_1)) = B_1$ .

Now observe the following

$$\begin{aligned} T^{a_{n+M}h_{n+M}+d_1}A_1 &= T^{d_1}\left(A_1 + \frac{1}{3}\mu(\overline{I}_1)\right) = B_1 \\ T^{a_{n+M}h_{n+M}+d_1}A_2 &= T^{d_2}\left(A_2 + \frac{1}{3}\mu(\overline{J}_1)\right) = B_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $m = a_{n+M}h_{n+M} + d_1$ . Note that  $\mu \times \mu(A_1 \times A_2) > \frac{1}{100} \mu(\overline{I}_1) \mu(\overline{J}_1)$  and  $(T \times T)^m(A_1 \times A_2) = B_1 \times B_2$ . Since  $E_i$  is at least  $\frac{199}{200}$ -full of  $\overline{I}_i \times \overline{J}_i$  we have that  $\mu \times \mu((A_1 \times A_2) \cap E_1) > 0$  and  $\mu \times \mu((B_1 \times B_2) \cap E_2) > 0$ . Hence,  $\mu \times \mu((T \times T)^m E_1 \cap E_2) > 0$ .  $\square$

Recently, we learned of the work of Adams and Silva who produced an example of an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that has ergodic Cartesian square and is rigid [8].






FIGURE 4. Illustration of  $\bar{I}_1, \bar{I}_2, \bar{J}_1,$  and  $\bar{J}_2$  in  $C_{n+M}$  along with an example placement of sets  $A_1, A_2, B_1,$  and  $B_2$ .

### 4. Rationally ergodic construction

In this section, we will show that rigidity is compatible with rational ergodicity. Recall that rational ergodicity implies weak rational ergodicity, which is a meager subset of the set of infinite measure-preserving transformations [3]. Thus, we cannot establish compatibility through categorical arguments, and instead prove the following theorem.

**Theorem C.** *There exists an infinite measure-preserving transformation that is rationally ergodic and rigid.*

A recent theorem proved independently by Aaronson et al. [5] and Bozgan et al. [12] shows that all rank-one transformations with a bounded number of cuts are boundedly rationally ergodic. Bounded rational ergodicity is stronger than rational ergodicity, and we will appeal to this theorem to prove rational ergodicity of our construction. Note that the rigidity of our previous constructions hinged on the number of cuts going to infinity. Thus, in an effort to reconcile two seemingly contradictory properties, we will realize a rank-one construction with an unbounded number of cuts as a rank-one construction with a bounded number of cuts by rarely adding spacers.

Now, let us describe our construction. Begin with the interval  $[0, 1)$  as the first stage,  $C_0$ . The initial height is then  $h_0 = 1$ . Define the sequence

$(s_n)$  by

$$s_n = \begin{cases} 2h_n & \text{if } n = 2^k \text{ for some } k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In general, suppose we have already constructed the  $C_n$ -th tower. To construct  $C_{n+1}$  do the following:

- (1) Cut  $C_n$  into 2 equal pieces.
- (2) Stack the subcolumns of  $C_n$  to form  $C_{n+1}$  in the following order:  
 $2h_n$  stacks,  $s_n$  spacers.

The construction resembles the Hajian–Kakutani transformation from 1970 [19], but spacers are only added when the stage of the construction is a power of 2.

**Proof of Theorem C.** It is clear from the description that  $T$  is a rank-one transformation with 1 cut. Appealing to the above mentioned theorem in [5] or [12], we immediately obtain that  $T$  is rationally ergodic.

We now show that  $T$  is rigid along the sequence  $(n_m)$  where  $n_m = h_{2^{m-1}+1}$ . This sequence was obtained from the heights of the towers that directly follow the addition of spacers. Let  $E$  be a level of  $C_N$ . Let  $M$  be the smallest positive integer such that  $h_N \leq n_M$ . Notice that to obtain  $C_{2^{M-1}+1}$  from  $C_{2^{M-1}}$  we cut the  $h_{2^{M-1}}$  levels of  $C_{2^{M-1}}$  into 2 equal pieces, stack the two subcolumns right on left, and then add  $s_{2^{M-1}} = 2h_{2^{M-1}}$  spacers at the top. We wish to observe what happens to the set  $E$  under  $n_M$  iterations of  $T$ . Recall that  $n_M$  is the height of tower  $C_{2^{M-1}+1}$ . Since there are no spacers added again until the  $2^M$  stage of the construction, to analyze  $T^{n_M} E \setminus E$  it is best to consider  $E$  in the  $C_{2^M+1}$  tower. Here we observe,

$$\mu(T^{n_M} E \setminus E) \leq \frac{1}{2^{2^M-2^{M-1}}} \mu(E) = \frac{1}{2^{2^M-1}} \mu(E).$$

Similarly, for all  $m$  such that  $h_N \leq n_m$  we have

$$\mu(T^{n_m} E \triangle E) \leq \frac{2}{2^{2^m-2^{m-1}}} \mu(E) = \frac{2}{2^{2^m-1}} \mu(E) = \frac{1}{2^{2^m-1-1}} \mu(E).$$

Since  $\frac{1}{2^{2^m-1-1}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  we have rigidity.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** Intuitively, the above construction can be thought of as a rank-one construction where the  $C_m$ -th tower is of height  $n_m$ . To obtain  $C_{m+1}$  from  $C_m$ , you cut  $C_m$  into  $2^{2^m-1}$  equal pieces and then stack as follows:  $2^{2^m-1} n_m$  stacks and  $2h_{2^m}$  spacers.

## 5. Rigidity sequences

In this section we will explore which sequences can be realized as rigidity sequences for two different types of transformations preserving an infinite measure. First, we prove a theorem on rigidity sequences for weakly mixing transformations (inspired by a proposition in [10]). Second, we prove a theorem on rigidity sequences for rationally ergodic transformations.

**Theorem D.** *Let  $(n_m)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers such that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \rightarrow \infty$ . There exists a rank-one, infinite measure-preserving transformation that has ergodic Cartesian square and is rigid along  $(n_m)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $(n_m)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers such that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \rightarrow \infty$ . Without loss of generality, define  $n_0 = 1$  and suppose that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \geq 4$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . Our construction will be a variant of the construction in Section 3.2.

Write  $n_{m+1}$  as  $n_{m+1} = q_m n_m + r_m$  where  $0 \leq r_m < n_m$ . Let  $p_m$  be the least positive integer such that  $\frac{p_m n_m + r_m}{n_{m+1}} \geq \frac{1}{m+1}$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . If we let  $\epsilon_m = \frac{p_m n_m + r_m}{n_{m+1}}$ , then  $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_m = \infty$  and  $\epsilon_m \rightarrow 0$ . Also notice that  $n_{m+1}$  can be written as  $n_{m+1} = (q_m - p_m)n_m + p_m n_m + r_m$  where  $q_m - p_m \geq 2$  for all  $m \geq 0$  and  $q_m - p_m \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now we will describe the construction. The sequence  $n_m$  will be the height of the  $C_m$  tower, that is  $h_m = n_m$ . The first stage,  $C_0$ , consists of the interval  $[0, 1)$ . Thus the initial height  $h_0 = 1 = n_0$ . Define the sequence  $(s_m)$  by  $s_0 = 1, s_1 = 2, s_2 = 1, s_3 = 2, s_4 = 3, s_5 = 1, \dots$ . It is clear that  $(s_m)$  cycles through every natural number infinitely often. In general, suppose we have already constructed the  $C_m$  tower, which is a union of  $h_m = n_m$  levels. To construct  $C_{m+1}$  from  $C_m$  do the following:

- (1) Cut  $C_m$  into  $q_m - p_m$  equal pieces.
- (2) Compute the quantity  $a_m = \lceil \frac{q_m - p_m}{3} \rceil$ .
- (3) Stack the subcolumns of  $C_m$  to form  $C_{m+1}$  in the following order:  
 $a_m h_m$  stacks,  $s_m$  spacers,  $(q_m - p_m - a_m) h_m$  stacks,  $p_m h_m + r_m - s_m$  spacers.

Notice that since  $p_m h_m = p_m n_m > m + 1$  for all  $m \geq 0$  and  $s_m \leq m + 1$ , there are a positive number of spacers placed at the end of the  $C_{m+1}$  tower. A proof similar to that of Theorem B shows that this construction has ergodic Cartesian square and is rigid along the sequence of heights, which is  $(n_m)$ . Also similar to before, the fact that  $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_m = \infty$  guarantees that  $T$  preserves an infinite measure. □

**Remark 4.** Is there an example of an infinite measure-preserving rank-one transformation that is weakly mixing and rigid along a sequence  $(n_m)$  where the ratios do not tend to infinity? More specifically, does there exist a rank-one transformation preserving an infinite measure that is weakly mixing and rigid along  $n_m = 2^m$ ?

Motivated by the construction in Theorem C, we now generalize possible rigidity sequences for rationally ergodic transformations.

**Theorem E.** *Let  $(n_m)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers such that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore, assume that  $n_{m+1} = 2^{k_m} n_m + r_m$  where  $0 \leq r_m < n_m$ . Then there exists an infinite measure-preserving transformation that is rationally ergodic and rigid along  $(n_m)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $(n_m)$  be an increasing sequence of natural numbers such that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \rightarrow \infty$ . Without loss of generality, define  $n_0 = 1$  and suppose that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \geq 5$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . Suppose that  $n_{m+1}$  can be written as  $n_{m+1} = 2^{k_m}n_m + r_m$  where  $0 \leq r_m < n_m$ .

Let  $p_m = 2^{k_m-1}$  and  $\epsilon_m = \frac{p_m n_m + r_m}{n_{m+1}}$ . Then  $\epsilon_m > \frac{1}{4}$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_m = \infty$ . Before we explicitly describe the construction, we will try to give the intuition. If we were to proceed in a manner similar to the previous theorem, then we would cut the  $n_m$  levels of  $C_m$  into  $2^{k_m} - p_m = 2^{k_m-1}$  equal pieces, stack them left to right and add  $p_m n_m + r_m = 2^{k_m-1}n_m + r_m$  spacers to the end. However, this would not produce a rank-one transformation with a bounded number of cuts, which is what we need in order to guarantee rational ergodicity. With that in mind, we will cut the tower into 2 equal pieces and stack left to right. This process will continue  $k_m - 1$  times, at which point we will add the appropriate number of spacers to double the measure. Now we will describe the construction explicitly.

Begin with the interval  $[0, 1)$  as the first stage,  $C_0$ . The initial height is then  $h_0 = 1$ . Define the sequence  $(s_n)$  by

$$s_n = \begin{cases} 2^{k_m-1}n_m + r_m & \text{if } n = k_m + k_{m-1} + \cdots + k_0 - (m + 2) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In general, suppose we have already constructed the  $C_n$  tower. To construct  $C_{n+1}$  do the following:

- (1) Cut  $C_n$  into 2 equal pieces.
- (2) Stack the subcolumns of  $C_n$  to form  $C_{n+1}$  in the following order:  
 $2h_n$  stacks,  $s_n$  spacers.

The first thing to notice about the construction is that most of the time you are simply cutting the existing tower into two pieces and stacking them, much like an odometer. However at certain times, namely along the sequence of times when  $s_n$  is nonzero, spacers are being added. The fact that  $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \epsilon_m = \infty$  guarantees that  $T$  preserves an infinite measure. Also, it is clear that the number of cuts is bounded and thus by a theorem in [5] or [12],  $T$  is rationally ergodic.

We now show that  $T$  is rigid along the sequence  $(n_m)$ . Note that  $n_0 = 1 = h_0$  and in general  $n_m = h_{k_{m-1} + \cdots + k_0 - m}$  for  $m \geq 1$ . Let  $E$  be a level of  $C_N$ . Let  $M$  be the smallest positive integer such that  $h_N \leq n_M$ . We wish to observe what happens to the set  $E$  under  $n_M$  iterations of  $T$ . Similar to the proof of rigidity in Section 4, since there are no spacers added after the stage that has height  $n_M$  until the  $k_M + \cdots + k_0 - (M + 2)$  stage of the construction, it is best to view  $E$  as a union of levels in  $C_{k_M + \cdots + k_0 - (M+1)}$ . Observe,

$$\mu(T^{n_M} E \setminus E) \leq \frac{1}{2^{k_M-1}} \mu(E).$$

Similarly, for all  $m$  such that  $h_N \leq n_m$  we have

$$\mu(T^{n_m} E \triangle E) \leq \frac{2}{2^{k_m-1}} \mu(E).$$

Since  $\frac{1}{2^{k_m-1}} \rightarrow 0$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  we have rigidity.  $\square$

**Remark 5.** In the above proof the key ingredients are that the ratios of the sequence go to infinity and that we can realize the corresponding rank-one construction with the number of cuts tending to infinity as a rank-one construction with a bounded number of cuts. This observation leads to a generalization of the above theorem.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Suppose  $(n_m)$  is an increasing sequence of natural numbers such that  $\frac{n_{m+1}}{n_m} \rightarrow \infty$  and write  $n_{m+1} = q_m n_m + r_m$ . If there exists  $K > 0$  such that for all  $m \geq 0$  we can find numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_{\ell_m}$  with  $a_i \leq K$  where  $\lceil \frac{q_m}{2} \rceil = a_1 \cdots a_{\ell_m}$  then there exists an infinite measure-preserving transformation that is rationally ergodic and rigid along  $(n_m)$ .*

**Acknowledgements.** The authors thank Cesar Silva for thought-provoking conversations. The second author would like to thank the Summer Math Program for Women at Carleton College for providing an academically stimulating environment while working on this paper.

## References

- [1] AARONSON, JON. Rational ergodicity and a metric invariant for Markov shifts. *Israel J. Math.* **27** (1977), no. 2, 93–123. [MR0584018](#) (58#28424), [Zbl 0376.28011](#), doi: [10.1007/BF02761661](#).
- [2] AARONSON, JON. An introduction to infinite ergodic theory. *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, 50. *American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 1997. xii+284 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-0494-4. [MR1450400](#) (99d:28025), [Zbl 0882.28013](#).
- [3] AARONSON, JON. Rational weak mixing in infinite measure spaces. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **33** (2013), no. 6, 1611–1643. [MR3122146](#), [Zbl 1287.37006](#), [arXiv:1105.3541](#), doi: [10.1017/etds.2012.102](#).
- [4] AARONSON, JON; HOSSEINI, MARYAM; LEMAŃCZYK, MARIUSZ. IP-rigidity and eigenvalue groups. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **34** (2014), no. 4, 1057–1076. [MR3227147](#), [Zbl 1309.37013](#), [arXiv:1203.2257](#), doi: [10.1017/etds.2012.186](#).
- [5] AARONSON, JON; KOSLOFF, ZEMER; WEISS, BENJAMIN. Symmetric Birkhoff sums in infinite ergodic theory. Preprint, 2014. [arXiv:1307.7490v2](#).
- [6] AARONSON, JONATHAN; LIN, MICHAEL; WEISS, BENJAMIN. Mixing properties of Markov operators and ergodic transformations, and ergodicity of Cartesian products. A collection of invited papers on ergodic theory. *Israel J. Math.* **33** (1979), no. 3–4, 198–224, (1980). [MR571530](#) (81i:47010a), [Zbl 0438.28018](#), doi: [10.1007/BF02762161](#).
- [7] ADAMS, TERRENCE; FRIEDMAN, NATHANIEL; SILVA, CESAR E. Rank-one weak mixing for nonsingular transformations. *Israel J. Math.* **102** (1997), 269–281. [MR1489108](#) (98j:28013), [Zbl 0896.58039](#), doi: [10.1007/BF02773802](#).
- [8] ADAMS, TERRENCE M.; SILVA, CESAR E. On infinite transformations with maximal control of ergodic two-fold product powers. Preprint, 2014. [arXiv:1402.1818](#).
- [9] AGEEV, O. N.; SILVA, C. E. Genericity of rigid and multiply recurrent infinite measure-preserving and nonsingular transformations. Proceedings of the 16th Summer Conference on General Topology and its Applications (New York). *Topology Proc.* **26** (2001/02), no. 2, 357–365. [MR2032829](#) (2004k:37012), [Zbl 1082.37502](#).

- [10] BERGELSON, V.; DEL JUNCO, A.; LEMAŃCZYK, M.; ROSENBLATT, J. Rigidity and non-recurrence along sequences. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **34** (2014), no. 5, 1464–1502. [MR3255429](#), [Zbl 06366527](#), [arXiv:1103.0905](#), doi: [10.1017/etds.2013.5](#).
- [11] BOWLES, AMIE; FIDKOWSKI, LUKASZ; MARINELLO, AMY E.; SILVA, CESAR E. Double ergodicity of nonsingular transformations and infinite measure-preserving staircase transformations. *Illinois J. Math.* **45** (2001), no. 3, 999–1019. [MR1879249](#) (2002j:37014), [Zbl 1055.37013](#).
- [12] BOZGAN, FRANCISC; SANCHEZ, ANTHONY; SILVA, CESAR E.; STEVENS, DAVID; WANG, JANE. Subsequence bounded rational ergodicity of rank-one transformations. *Dyn. Syst.* **30** (2015), no. 1, 70–84. [MR3304976](#), [Zbl 06406829](#), doi: [10.1080/14689367.2014.970518](#).
- [13] CHOKSI, J. R.; NADKARNI, M. G. Genericity of nonsingular transformations with infinite ergodic index. Dedicated to the memory of Anzelm Iwanik. *Colloq. Math.* **84/85** (2000), part 1, 195–201. [MR1778850](#) (2001g:28028), [Zbl 1007.28011](#).
- [14] DAI, IRVING; GARCIA, XAVIER; PĂDURARIU, TUDOR; SILVA, CESAR E. On rationally ergodic and rationally weakly mixing rank-one transformations. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **35** (2015), no. 4, 1141–1164. [MR3345166](#), [Zbl 06458480](#), [arXiv:1208.3161](#), doi: [10.1017/etds.2013.96](#).
- [15] DAY, SARAH L.; GRIVNA, BRIAN R.; MCCARTNEY, EARLE P.; SILVA, CESAR E. Power weakly mixing infinite transformations. *New York J. Math.* **5** (1999), 17–24 (electronic). [MR1679635](#) (2000m:28016), [Zbl 0923.28006](#), [arXiv:math/9803105](#).
- [16] EISNER, TANJA; GRIVAUX, SOPHIE. Hilbertian Jamison sequences and rigid dynamical systems. *J. Funct. Anal.* **261** (2011), no. 7, 2013–2052. [MR2822322](#), [Zbl 1242.47008](#), [arXiv:1101.4553](#), doi: [10.1016/j.jfa.2011.06.001](#).
- [17] GRIVAUX, SOPHIE. IP-Dirichlet measures and IP-rigid dynamical systems: an approach via generalized Riesz products. *Studia Math.* **215** (2013), no. 3, 237–259. [MR3080781](#), [Zbl 1296.37007](#), [arXiv:1209.2884](#), doi: [10.4064/sm215-3-3](#).
- [18] GRUHER, KATE; HINES, FRED; PATEL, DEEPAM; SILVA, CESAR E.; WAELDER, ROBERT. Power weak mixing does not imply multiple recurrence in infinite measure and other counterexamples. *New York J. Math.* **9** (2003), 1–22. [MR2016177](#) (2004k:37013), [Zbl 1013.37005](#).
- [19] HAJIAN, ARSHAG B.; KAKUTANI, SHIZUO. Example of an ergodic measure preserving transformation on an infinite measure space. *Contributions to Ergodic Theory and Probability* (Proc. Conf., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio, 1970), 44–52, *Springer, Berlin*, 1970. [MR0269807](#) (42 #4702), [Zbl 0213.07601](#), doi: [10.1007/BFb0060645](#).
- [20] HALMOS, PAUL R. Lectures on ergodic theory. *Chelsea Publishing Co., New York*, 1960. vii+101 pp. [MR0111817](#) (22 #2677), [Zbl 0096.09004](#).

(Rachel L. Bayless) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE, 141 E. COLLEGE AVE, DECATUR, GA 30030  
[rbayless@agnesscott.edu](mailto:rbayless@agnesscott.edu)

(Kelly B. Yancey) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-4015  
[kyancey@umd.edu](mailto:kyancey@umd.edu)

This paper is available via <http://nyjm.albany.edu/j/2015/21-27.html>.