## STRONGLY RECURRENT TRANSFORMATIONS

## ARSHAG HAJIAN

Let  $(X, \mathscr{B}, m)$  be a finite or  $\sigma$ -finite and non-atomic measure space. A set B is said to be measurable if it is a member of  $\mathscr{B}$ . Two measures on  $\mathscr{B}$ , finite or  $\sigma$ -finite (one may be finite and the other  $\sigma$ -finite), are said to be equivalent if they have the same null sets. In this paper we consider a one-to-one, nonsingular, measurable transformation  $\phi$  of X onto itself. By a nonsingular transformation  $\phi$  we mean  $m(\phi B) = m(\phi^{-1}B) = 0$  for every measurable set B with m(B) = 0, and by a measurable transformation  $\phi$  we mean  $\phi B \in \mathscr{B}$ and  $\phi^{-1}B \in \mathscr{B}$  for every  $B \in \mathscr{B}$ . We shall say that the transformation  $\phi$  is measure preserving (with respect to a measure  $\mu$ ) or equivalently,  $\mu$  is an invariant measure (with respect to the transformation  $\phi$ ) if  $\mu(\phi B) = \mu(\phi^{-1}B) = \mu(B)$  for every measurable set B.

A recurrent transformation is a common notion in ergodic theory. This is a measurable transformation  $\phi$  defined on a finite or  $\sigma$ -finite measure space  $(X, \mathcal{B}, m)$  with the following property: if A is a measurable set of positive measure, then for almost all  $x \in A$   $\phi^n x$ belongs to A for infinitely many integers n. It is not difficult to see that every measurable transformation which preserves a finite invariant measure  $\mu$  equivalent to *m* is recurrent. The converse statement is not in general true; for example an ergodic transformation which preserves an infinite and  $\sigma$ -finite measure is always recurrent yet it does not preserve a finite invariant equivalent measure. In this paper we restrict the notion of a recurrent transformation. We introduce the notion of a strongly recurrent set and define a strongly recurrent transformation. We show that a transformation  $\phi$  is strongly recurrent if and only if there exists a finite invariant measure  $\mu$  equivalent to m (Theorem 2). This is accomplished by showing the connection between strongly recurrent sets and weakly wandering sets (Theorem 1). Weakly wandering sets were introduced in [1], and the condition that a transformation  $\phi$  does not have any weakly wandering set of positive measure was further strengthened (see condition  $(W)^*$  below). It was shown in [1] that this stronger condition was again a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a finite invariant measure  $\mu$  equivalent to m. We show that a similar strengthening for a strongly recurrent transformation is false for a wide class of measure preserving transformations defined on a finite measure space (Theorem 3).

DEFINITION. A measurable set S is said to be strongly recurrent Received July 22, 1963.