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## Numdam

# THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATION THEOREM FOR MULTI- <br> DIMENSIONAL GROUP ACTIONS 

A. B. Katok

## I. Introduction

A new approach to the study of measure-preserving transformations and flows based on the notion of Kakutani equivalence or monotone equivalence has been developed during the last three years independently by Feldmann, Ornstein, Weiss and Rudolph and by Satayev and myself (cf. [I] - [6]). A survey of these works was given in the talk of Don Ornstein. The main purpose of my talk is to establish several basic notions and results as the first step in the direction of the multi-dimensional generalization of this approach i.e. the extension of "the monotone ergodic theory" from actions of $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{R}$ up to measure-preserving actions of the groups $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ where $m$ is an arbitrary positive integer. This extension is far from trivial and I am going to discuss some of the difficulties below. I have no recipes as to how all of these difficulties can be overcome. Even the formulation of the main criterion of equivalence in the positive-entropy case is vague because in the one-dimensional case it includes the notion of the LB-process which is based on the existence of the "past" in the group $\mathbb{Z}$ and this notion of the past has no canonical multi-dimensional generalization.

Indeed, there exists one special case of the LB-property, namely the property
of standardness (LB + zero-entropy, cf [2], [3], [4] ) which allows several natural generalizations. One of them is based on the consideration of the natural partial order in the group $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$. The corresponding notion of equivalence for $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$-actions was defined in ([2], definition 2.3 〕. Here we are going to prepare some basic definitions and results for the study of a slightly more general notion of equivalence which is based only on the integrability of an appropriated cocycle instead of non-negativeness which would arise in considerations based on the partial ordering. I hope that this approach admits a further generalization to actions of more general groups.

Studies in "the monotone ergodic theory" depend on constructions of an induced and special (integral) automorphism and a special flow over an automorphism (several different terms are used for naming the last mentioned notion: an integral flow, a flow under a function etc.). Indeed, up to the present time appropriate multidimensional generalizations of these notions have not been known. We begin to do away with this lack i.e. we define "special actions" of the groups $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{m}$. Then we prove the multidimensional generalization of the well known theorem of Ambrose and Kakutani and indicate another application of our machinery. In the next work we are going to define the generalization of Kakutani equivalence and the property of standardness and discuss the prospects and difficulties of the theory.

## II. Definition of special actions

The construction of a special flow over an automorphism provides a method of definition of a flow i.e. a measure-preserving action of the group $\mathbb{R}$ by the given automorphism i.e. an action of the group $\mathbb{Z}$ and some additional data namely a positive integrable function. Let us recall this construction.

Let $(X, \mu)$ be a Lebesgue space, $T: X \rightarrow X$ an automorphism of $X$ i.e. a measurable one-to-one measure-preserving transformation and $f$ an integrable positive function on $X$. Then we can construct a new Lebesgue space $X_{f} \in X \times \mathbb{R}$

$$
X_{f}=\{(x, s), x \in x, 0 \leq s \leq f(x)\}
$$

with a normalized measure induced from the space $X \times \mathbb{R}$ and define a flow $T^{f}=\left\{T_{t}{ }^{f}\right\}$ on $X_{f}$ in the following way: the point of $X_{f}$ moves with the unit speed along the "vertical" segment and then "jumps" immediately from the point (x,f(x)) into the point (Tx,0) . Certainly, this construction is specifically one-dimensional but we can interpret it in such a way that allows natural generalization.

Let us consider the cylinder $X \times \mathbb{R}$ with the natural product measure $\mu \times \lambda$, where $\lambda$ is a Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$, and define the automorphism $\hat{\uparrow}$ of this space with infinite measure in the following way

$$
\hat{T}(x, s)=(T x, s+f(x))
$$

This automorphism is a principal $\mathbb{R}$-extension of the given automorphism $T$, i.e. a transformation of $X \times \mathbb{R}$ which covers $T$ and maps each fiber into another fiber by a group translation. The "vertical" flow $\left\{T_{t}\right\}$ acts according to the formula

$$
T_{t}(x, s)=(x, t+s)
$$

and commutes with $\hat{T}$. Thus we can formally project this flow into the factor space of $\hat{\mathrm{T}}$-orbits. Since we assume that $f$ is positive there exists a natural fundamental domain for the cyclic group generated by $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}$; namely the set $X_{f}$ described above. Action of $\left\{T_{t}\right\}$ on this fundamental domain coincides with the special flow constructed over $T^{-1}$. The inversion of time is of no importance because we could start with $T^{-1}$ instead of $T$.

Two $\mathbb{R}$-extensions of the given automorphism $T$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T^{(1)}(x, s)=(T x, s+f(x)) \\
& T^{(2)}(x, s)=(T x, s+g(x))
\end{aligned}
$$

are metrically isomorphic if there exists a measurable function $h$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=g(x)+h(T x)-h(x) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The isomorphism is given by the following map $S$ :

$$
S(x, s)=(x, s+h(x))
$$

which commutes with the vertical flow so that the factor-flows generated by $f$ and $g$ are also isomorphic. If for given $f$ and $g$ equality (1) holds for some $h$ we will call the functions $f$ and $g \mathbb{R}$-cohomologous.

We can consider an $\mathbb{R}$-extension of $T$ generated by an arbitrary integrable (not necessary positive) function $f$. Ornstein, Kočergin and Weiss (see [5], [7] J proved that every integrable function with non-zero integral is $\mathbb{R}$-cohomologous with a function of constant sign, so that the factor-flow generated by such a function is metrically isomorphic to the special flow over $T$ or $T^{-1}$.

If $\int_{X} f d \mu=0$ then the partition of the space $X \times \mathbb{R}$ into trajectories of $\hat{\uparrow}$ is nonmeasurable so that we have to consider the measurable hull of this partition and the corresponding factor-space. In this case there are two possibilities : either $f$ is $\mathbb{R}$-cohomologous with 0 and consequently the factor-space is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}$ or the factor-space does not admit a good structure of a measure space compatible with the vertical flow. In both cases a good finite measure in the factor-space invariant under the factor-flow does not exist.

Now we are prepared to generalize the notion of a special flow. In the most general situation we should deal with a locally compact topological group G , a discrete subgroup HCG such that the homogenous space G/H has finite volume and a given left action $S=\left\{S_{h}\right\}_{h \in H}$ of $H$ by automorphisms of a Lebesgue space $(X, \mu)$. Then we should consider some principal G -extension $\hat{S}$ of $S$ and project the "vertical" right action of $G$ on $X \times G$ inta the space of $\hat{S}$-orbits. Some conditions on a $G$-extension are necessary to provide good properties of the factor-space and a sufficiently close connection between the given action $S$ and the produced factor-action of the vertical action.

But we are not going to discuss the general situation in detail and we
restrict ourselves to the following two cases : $G=H=\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ and $G=\mathbb{R}^{m}, H=\mathbb{Z}^{m}$. The former case corresponds to the multidimensional generalization of the notions of an induced automorphism, special automorphism and their combination (cf.[2], § 2 , the latter corresponds to the generalization of the notion of a special flow. Most of the arguments concerning the latter (continuous) case hold true automatically for the first one so that we shall deal with the continuous situation and note all the points where some special explanations for the discrete case will be necessary.

Let $T=\left\{T_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}}$ be an action of $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ on a Lebesgue space by measurepreserving transformations. Consider a principal $\mathbb{R}^{m}$-extension $\hat{T}$ of the action $T$ acting on the direct product $X \times \mathbb{R}^{m}$. Such an extension has the following form :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{T}_{n}(x, s)=\left(T x, s+h_{n}(x)\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $x \in X, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}, s \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$. The group property of $\hat{T}$ implies the following equation

$$
h_{n_{1}}+n_{2}(x)=h_{n_{1}}(x)+h_{n_{2}}\left(T_{n_{1}} x\right)
$$

for every $n_{1}, n_{2} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$.
We shall call the function $h_{n}(x)$ the cocycle generating the given $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ extension $\hat{T}$ of the action $T$.

As in the one-dimensional case we can consider the "vertical" action of $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ :

$$
T_{t}(x, s)=(x, s+t), \quad t \in R^{m}
$$

and since this action commutes with $\hat{T}$ we can formally project it into the space of $\hat{T}$-orbits.

In general partition of $X \times \mathbb{R}^{m}$ into $\hat{T}$-orbits may be nonmeasurable and so we should consider the measurable hull of this partition and the corresponding factor-space and factor-action. We are going to establish that the following condition ( $J$ ) which generalizes the condition of existence and non-vanishing of integral $\int_{x} f d \mu$ in the one-dimensional case provides simultaneously good
properties of the space of $\hat{T}$-orbits and a sufficiently close connection between the given action on $X$ and the produced factor-action. Let us fix the standard basis in $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{m}:\left\{e_{i}\right\} i=1, \ldots, m$, where $e_{i}=(0 \ldots 1 . .0)$ i-th place. Further, let $\xi=\left(\xi_{1}, \ldots, \xi_{m}\right)$ be an arbitrary basis in $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$. Form an $m \times m$ matrix

$$
H_{\xi}(x)=\left(\begin{array}{l}
h_{\xi_{1}}(x) \\
\vdots \\
\dot{h}_{m}(x)
\end{array}\right)
$$

(I) . Vector-functions $h_{e_{i}}(x), i=1 \ldots m$ and scalar functions det $H_{\xi}(x)$ where $\xi$ is an arbitrary basis in $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ are absolutely integrable and vectors $h_{i}=\int_{X} h_{i}(x) d \mu$ are linearly independent over $R$.

## Theorem 1.

Let $T$ be a measurable, measure-preserving, ergodic, free mod 0 action of the group $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ on a Lebesgue space $(X, \mu)$. Suppose that $\hat{T}$ is a principal $\mathbb{R}$ extension of $T$ generated by the cocycle $h$ which satisfies the condition (I). Then the following construction gives the finite Lebesgue measure $\hat{\mu}$ in the space of $\hat{T}$-orbits invariant under the vertical action. Let $A \subset X \times \mathbb{R}^{m}$ be a measurable set invariant under $\hat{T}$. Denote the standard unit cell in $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ :

$$
\left\{\left(t_{1}, \ldots, t_{m}\right\} \in R^{m}, 0 \leq t_{i} \leq 1, i=1, \ldots, m\right\}
$$

by $\Delta$ and choose measurably for every orbit $\gamma \in A$, a point $\left(x_{\gamma}, t_{\gamma}\right) \in \gamma$. Decompose $t_{\gamma}=s_{\gamma}+\tau_{\gamma}$ where $s_{\gamma} \in \Delta, \tau_{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$ and define the function $f_{A}$ on $x \times \Delta: f_{A}(x, t)=\operatorname{card}\left\{\gamma \in A: x_{\gamma}=x, s_{\gamma}=t\right\}$. Then

$$
\hat{\mu}(A)=\int_{X \times \Delta} f_{A}(x, t) d(\mu \times \lambda)
$$

where $\lambda$ is the standard Lebesgue measure on $\Delta$. Measure $\hat{\mu}$ does not depend on the choice of points $\left(x_{\gamma}, t_{\gamma}\right)$.

The main part of the proof of this theorem is the following proposition.

## Proposition 1.

If the conditions of theorem 1 hold then there exists a measurable set $B<X \times \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties.

1. For a.e. $x \in X$ the set $B \cap\left(\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)$ is bounded.
2. $\int_{X} \lambda\left(B \cap\left(\{x\} \times \mathbb{R}^{m}\right)\right) d \mu<\infty$
3. Almost every trajectory of $T$ intersects B.

## Proof of the proposition.

Fix the point $x \in X$, denote the convex hull of vectors $\left(-h_{n}(x)\right)$, where $n$ belongs to the set of all vertices of the cube $\Delta$, i.e. all 0 -1-vectors by $K_{X}$ and let $B=\bigcup_{x \in X}\left\{\{x\} \times K_{x}\right\}$. Obviously, $B$ is a measurable subset of $X \times \mathbb{R}^{m}$, so the proposition follows from the next two lemmas.

Lemma 1. Almost every trajectory of $\hat{T}$ intersects the set $B$.
Lemma 2. $\int_{X} \lambda\left(K_{X}\right) d \mu<\infty$.
Proof of lemma 1.
Choose a triangulation $\Theta$ of the space $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ with the following properties.

1. The vertexes of $\Theta$ are precisely the points of the integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}^{m} \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$.
2. $\Theta$ is invariant under integer translations.
3. $\Theta$ is a subdivision of the standard integer decomposition: $\{\Delta+n, n \in \mathbf{Z}\}$

Using this triangulation we can extend an arbitrary given map $\phi: \mathbb{Z}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}$ in a unique way up to the map $\hat{\phi}: \mathbb{R}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}$ defining $\hat{\phi}$ as a linear map on each simplex of $\Theta$.

Let $L: \mathbb{Z}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}$ denote the linear operator which is defined by its action on the basic vectors $e_{i}: L e_{i}=h_{i}$. Condition (I) implies that det $L \neq 0$. The individual ergodic theorem is true for the cocycle $h$ so that by the ergodicity of $T$ for a.e. $x \in X$ the following is true

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\|n\| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left\|h_{n}(x)-\operatorname{Ln}\right\|}{\|n\|}=0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the norm is Euclidean.
Now fix $x \in X$ for which (3) holds and prove that for every $s \in \mathbb{R}^{m}$ T-orbit of the point $(x, s)$ intersects the set $B$. Since

$$
\hat{T}_{n}\left(\{x\} \times\left\{K_{T_{n}} x-h_{n}(x)\right)=\left\{T_{n} x\right\} \times K_{T_{n}} x\right.
$$

it is enough to prove that sets

$$
K_{T_{n}} x-h_{n}(x), \quad n \in Z^{m}
$$

cover the whole space $\mathbb{R}^{m}$.
For this purpose consider the map $\phi_{x}: \mathbb{Z}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}$ defined by $\phi_{x}(n)=-h_{n}(x)$ and extend it using the triangulation $\Theta$ up to the map $\hat{\phi}_{x}: \mathbb{R}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}$. Obviously, for every $n \in Z^{m}$ the image $\hat{\phi}_{x}(\Delta+n)$ coincides with the set $K_{T_{n}}-h_{n}(x)$ so the proof would be over if we show that $\hat{\phi}_{x}$ is a surjective map. But this follows from the individual ergodic theorem and standard homotopy arguments. For denote $D_{z}=\left\{t \in \mathbb{R}^{m}:||t|| \leq r\right\}$ for $r>0$. Fix an arbitrary $R>0$ and choose $R_{1}$ such that $\left\|\hat{\phi}_{x}(t)\right\|>R$ for every $t$ with $\|t\|=R_{1}$ and the map $\psi: \partial D_{R_{1}} \rightarrow s^{m-1}$ defined by $\psi(t)=\frac{\hat{\phi}_{x}(t)}{\prod_{\phi_{x}}(t)| |}$ has non-zero degree. This is possible by (3) and det $L \neq 0$. Then $\hat{\phi}_{x}\left(D_{R_{1}}\right) \supset D_{R}$ so that $\hat{\phi}$ is a surjective map. Lemma 1 is proved.

Proof of lemma 2.
Denote a restriction of the triangulation $\Theta$ to the unit cube $\Delta$ by $\Theta_{0}$ and list the simplexes of this triangulation: $\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{k}$. Further, fix a vertex $p_{i}$ for every simplex $\sigma_{i} i=l \ldots k$, denote $\sigma_{i}-p_{i}$ by $\sigma_{i}$ and let $\xi_{1}^{i}, \ldots, \xi_{m}^{i}$ be the vertexes of the simplex $\sigma_{i}$ different from the origin. Obviously

$$
K_{x}=\bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \hat{\phi}_{x}\left(\sigma_{i}\right)
$$

and

$$
\lambda\left(\hat{\phi}_{x}\left(\sigma_{i}\right)\right)=\lambda\left(\hat{\phi}_{T_{p_{i}}}(x){ }^{\left.\left(\bar{\sigma}_{i}\right)\right)}\right.
$$

But

$$
\lambda\left(\hat{\phi}_{T_{p_{i}}}(x)\left(\bar{\sigma}_{i}\right)\right)=\frac{1}{m!} \operatorname{det} H_{\xi} i\left(T_{p_{i}}(x)\right)
$$

where $\xi^{i}=\left\{\xi_{1}^{i}, \ldots, \xi_{m}^{i}\right\}$, so that the lemma follows from condition (I). Now we can conclude the proof of theorem 1. It is easy to see from the individual ergodic theorem that the partition of $X \times \mathbb{R}^{m}$ into $\hat{J}$-orbits is measurable.

Proposition 1 implies that we can choose for every trajectory $\gamma \in A$ a point $\left\{x_{\gamma}, t_{\gamma}\right\}$ in the set $B$ described above. In this case for every measurable set $A$, invariant under $T$, the function $f_{A}(x, s)$ is a.e. finite and $\hat{\mu}(A)$ is also finite.

Moreover, the definition of $\hat{\mu}$ does not depend on the choice of $\left(x_{\gamma}, t_{\gamma}\right)$. For we can realize the transition from one such choice to another one by a finite or countable sequence of steps of the following kind: for each trajectory $\gamma$ belonging to a subset $A^{\prime} \subset A$ we change points $\left(x_{\gamma}{ }_{\gamma}\right)$ to

$$
\hat{J}_{n}\left(x_{\gamma}, t_{\gamma}\right)=\left(T_{n} x_{\gamma}, t_{\gamma}+h_{n}\left(x_{\gamma}\right)\right\}
$$

Furthermore we can decompose the set $A^{\prime}$ into subsets $A_{x}$ for which $x_{\gamma}=x$ and this decomposition is evidently measurable. If we consider the unit cell
$\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$ as a m-dimensional torus then for every $x \in X$ the transformation from an old $s_{\gamma}$ to a new $s_{\gamma}$ will be a shift on this torus so that the conditional measures on these elements will be preserved. The factor-measure is also preserved because this measure is just $\mu$ and a transformation in base is just $T_{n}$ which preserves the measure $\mu$.

If we fix the choice of points $\left(x_{\gamma}, t_{\gamma}\right)$ for ever orbit $\gamma \in X \times \mathbb{R}^{m}$ then the produced measure $\hat{\mu}$ is obviously non-negative and $\sigma$-additive. Since we
have proved the independence of this measure of the particular choice of $\left[x_{\gamma}, t_{\gamma}\right]$ the proof of theorem 1 is over.

## Definition.

Suppose $J$ is a measure preserving ergodic free action of the group $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ on a Lebesgue space $(X, \mu), \hat{T}$ is a principal $\mathbb{R}^{m}$-extension of $T$ generated by a cocycle $h$, which satisfies condition ( $I$ ). Then we shall call the factoraction of the vertical action of the groap $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ on the Lebesgue space of $\hat{T}$ orbits with the invariant measure $\hat{\mu}$ described in theorem 1 the special action over $T$ generated by the cocycle $h$.

Remark.
All considerations of this section can be transfered with appropriate modifications and simplifications to the case of the special action of $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$, i.e. a factor-action of the vertical $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$-action generated by some principal $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$-extension of the given measure-preserving ergodic free action of the group $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$.

## III. The special representation theorem.

Now we have established the notion of the special action and we could formulate the generalization of the Ambrose-Kakutani theorem by saying that every free ergodic action of the group $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ is metrically isomorphic to some special action over some ergodic action $J$ of the group $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$, . But we want to refine this statement by bringing some additional properties of a cocycle.

[^0]Definition.
Cocycle $h$ is called r-Lipschitz where $r>1$ is a real number if for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}, x \in X$

$$
r^{-1} \leq \frac{\|\left.\right|_{n}(x)| |}{\|n\|} \leq r
$$

Of course, if the cocycle $h$ is $r$-Lipschitz for some $r$ then $h_{n}(x)$ is a bounded function for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$ and $h$ satisfies condition ( $I$ ) .

Now we are completely ready to formulate the multidimensional version of the theorem about special representation.

Theorem 2.
Let $S=\left\{S_{t}\right\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}^{m}}$ be a measurable measure-preserving ergodic free action of the group $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ on a Lebesgue space $(X, \mu)$ and $\varepsilon>0$ an arbitrary small number. Then there exists an ergodic action of the group $\mathbb{Z}^{m} T=\left\{T_{n}\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}}$ and $(1+\varepsilon)$-Lipschitz cocycle $h$ such that $S$ is metrically isomorphic to the special action over $T$ generated by the cocycle $h$.

The first part of the proof is the following proposition of some independent interest. It is close to some results of Feldman and Moore mentioned in Feldman's talk and also to Rudolph's impressive result about the existence of a measurable partition whose elements are rectangles on orbits of a given action of the group $\mathbb{R}^{m}$.

## Proposition 2.

Suppose $S$ is an ergodic free action of the group $\mathbb{R}^{m}, r_{n} \rightarrow \infty$ is an increasing sequence of positive numbers. Then there exists a decreasing sequence of measurable sections $A_{1} \supset A_{2} \supset \ldots$ for the action $S$ and a sequence of measurable partitions $\xi_{n}$ such that for every $n=1,2$, ... almost every element of $\xi_{n}$ contains exactly one point $x \in A_{n}$ and has the following form:

$$
c_{x}^{n}=\left\{S_{t} x, t \in \Gamma_{n}(x)\right\},
$$

where $\Gamma_{n}(x)$ is a convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ which contains Euclidean ball of radius $r_{n}$ with the center at the origin.

Proof of the proposition.
We begin with the simplified version of the proposition where only one number $r>0$ is fixed and consequently only one section $A$ and partition $\xi$ have to be produced.

Represent the action $S$ as a continuous group of homeomorphisms of a compact metric space $F$ with Borel invariant measure $v$. Without loss of generality we can suppose that $\nu(A)>0$ for every open nonempty subset $A \subset F$. Denote the r-ball with the center at the point $x$ in the given metric of $F$ by
$B(x, r)$ and the Euclidean r-ball on the S-orbit of the point $x$ by $B_{S}(x, r)$. Fix an arbitrary point $x \in F$ and $\varepsilon>0$ and choose $\delta>0$ so small that

$$
\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{S}}(10 r, x) \cap \mathrm{B}(\delta, x)=\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{S}}(\varepsilon, x) \cap \mathrm{B}(\delta, x)
$$

Further there exists $x>0$ so that for every $y \in B(\mathscr{X}, x)$

$$
B_{S}(5 r, y) \cap B(\delta, x)=B_{S}(\varepsilon, y) \cap B(\delta, x)
$$

Then $y_{1}, y_{2} \in B(x, x)$,

$$
B_{S}\left(2 r, y_{1}\right) \cap B_{S}\left(2 r, y_{2}\right) \neq \varnothing
$$

imply that

$$
y_{2} \in B_{S}\left(2 \varepsilon, y_{1}\right)
$$

Thus an equivalence relation on the set $B(x, x)$ occurs : namely $y_{1} \sim y_{2}$ if $B_{S}\left(2 r, y_{1}\right) \cap B_{S}\left(2 r, y_{2}\right) \neq \varnothing$. This equivalence relation generates in a natural way the measurable partition of $B(x, x)$ and we can choose a measurable section $A$ of this partition, i.e. a set $A \subset B(X, x)$ which contains exactly one point from each element of the partition.

Sets $B_{S}(r, x), x \in A$ form a measurable partition of some part of the space $X$. This fact follows from the defintion of the equivalence relation and from the measurability of the section $A$. Now we want to "blow up" every set $B_{S}(r, x)$ within its orbit and get a partition of the whole space $X$.

Let us fix an orbit $\gamma$ of the action $S$ and examine the intersection $\gamma \cap A$. This intersection is a discrete set in the inner topology of the orbit. Break the orbit $\gamma$ into the Dirichlet regions of points of the set $\gamma \cap A$. In other words construct for each point $x \in \gamma \cap A$ the set

$$
D_{x}=\{y \in \gamma,||y-x|| \leq||y-z|| \text { for all } z \in \gamma \cap A\}
$$

where $\|$. \|| is the Euclidean norm in the orbit $\gamma$. The regions $D_{x}$ are convex subsets of $\gamma$.

It follows from the ergodicity of the action $S$ that for almost every orbit $\gamma$ all sets $D_{x}$ are bounded. Partition of $X$ into the sets $D_{X}(x \in A)$ is the required partition.

We can define on every measurable section $A$ for the given ergodic action $S$ of the group $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ the natural class of equivalent measures induced from the space $X$. Namely, fix a sufficiently small number $\varepsilon>0$, call subset CCA measurable if the set $\bigcup_{x \in C} B_{S}(\varepsilon, x)$ is $\mu$-measurable and suppose

$$
\nu_{\varepsilon}(C)=\mu\left(\bigcup_{x \in C} B_{S}(\varepsilon, x)\right)
$$

Evidently, the property of $C$ to be measurable or have measure zero does not depend on the choice of $\varepsilon$. We can and should construct our partition by a slightly more general way, namely replace the whole section $A$ by its subset $A$ ' of positive measure and then do with this smaller section i.e. blow up the balls $B_{S}(r, x), x \in A$, to the Dirichlet regions described ahove. We are going to use this generalization in the proof of the general version of proposition 2 .

Recall that we deal with the topological situation so we can introduce the following definition. The point $x \in A$, where $A$ is a measurable section of the given $\mathbb{R}^{m}$-action $S$ with the Borel invariant measure $\mu$ is called essential for the section $A$ if for every $\delta>0$ an intersection $A \cap B(\delta, x)$ has positive measure on $A$ in the sense described above.

Now we proceed to the proof of the general case of the proposition by induction. Suppose that the sets $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}$ are already constructed with the
help of the generalized version of our procedure and denote the corresponding points " $x$ " and numbers "æ" by $x_{i}$ and $x_{i} i=1 \ldots n$. Then choose an essential point $x_{n+1} \in A_{n}$ and fulfill all our considerations where the number $\partial_{n+1}$ is chosen so small that $B\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}\right) \subset B\left(x_{n}, x_{n}\right)$.

Such a choice of $x_{n+1}$ provides that classes of equivalent points in $B\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}\right)$ are just the intersections of such classes constructed at the previous step (i.e. in $\left.B\left(x_{n}, x_{n}\right)\right)$ with the ball $B\left(x_{n+1}, x_{n+1}\right)$. Hence we can choose the set $A_{n} \cap B\left(\mathscr{P}_{n+1}, x_{n+1}\right)$ as a new section $A_{n+1}$. Non-triviality of the intersection is provided by the choice of the point $x_{n+1}$ (recall that $x_{n+1}$ is an essential point for the section $A_{n}$ ] . Proposition 2 is proved.

Remarks.

1. In the one-dimensional case, the assertion of theorem 2 immediately follows from proposition 2. For, choose $r>\frac{100}{\varepsilon}+2$ and consider the corresponding section $A$ and measurable partition $\xi$. Each element $c$ of this partition is a sufficiently long segment of some trajectory of the given flow, i.e. there exists such a point $x_{c} \in A$ and number $t(c) \geq r$ that

$$
c=\left\{S_{t} x_{c}\right\} \quad 0 \leq t<t(c)
$$

Denote $\frac{t(c)}{[t(c)]}$ by $s(c)$ and consider the new measurable section

$$
B=\bigcup_{c \in \xi}\left[\bigcup_{k>0}^{t(c)]-1} S_{k s(c)^{x} c}\right.
$$

with the corresponding first return map which we shall denote by $T$.
Obviously for every $x \in B$ there exists $c \in \xi$ such that $T_{x}=S_{s(c)} x$.
Since $1 \leq s(c) \leq 1+\frac{1}{[t(c)]}<1+\varepsilon$ we have constructed the special representation for the flow $\left\{S_{t}\right\}$ with the function whose value lies between

1 and $1+\varepsilon$.
2. The discrete version of proposition 2 also holds with the corresponding changes in the formulation: a convex subset of $\boldsymbol{Z}^{m}$ is an intersection of a convex set $F \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$ and $\mathbf{Z}^{m}$ which is embedded into $\mathbb{R}^{m}$ as a standard integer
lattice. An easy consequence of this discrete version of the proposition is a new proof of the multi-dimensional generalization of the so-called Rochlin lemma about uniform approximation. We shall give this new proof in section IV below and now we get down to the proof of theorem 2.

The second essential step of the proof of this theorem is an extension of very "thin" sections $A_{n}$ up to more regular sections $B_{n}$.

Intersection of such a section with a typical orbit consists of very large "good" pieces. Each of such pieces is a slightly distorted piece of the lattice. The following proposition provides the existence and convergence of such sections.

Proposition 3.
There exists such a sequence $r_{n} \rightarrow \infty$ that for every $x \in A_{n}$, where $A_{n}$ is a set from the assertion of proposition 2 there exists a map

$$
\phi_{n, x}: \Gamma_{n}(x) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m}
$$

with the following properties.

1. $\phi_{n, x}$ depend on $x$ by a measurable way.
2. The Lipschitz constant of the map $\phi_{n, x}$ - id does not exceed $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{2^{n}}\right)$.
3. For every $t \in \Gamma_{n}(x)\left\|\phi_{n, x}(t)-t\right\|<m .2^{n}$
 measure $v=v \frac{1}{100}$ on every of the set $B_{n}$. Then

$$
v\left(B_{n+1} \Delta B_{n}\right)<\frac{1}{2^{n}}
$$

The next simple geometrical lemma is used at the proof of this proposition as well as in the concluding part of the proof of theorem 2 and in the considerations of section IV.
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## Lemma 3.

Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^{m}$ be a bounded convex set which contains an Euclidean ball of radius $R ; \Gamma_{r} \subset \Gamma$ is an r-neighbourhood of the boundary $\partial \Gamma$ of $\Gamma$. Then the following inequality between m-dimensional volumes $v_{m}(\Gamma)$ and $v_{m}\left(\Gamma_{r}\right)$ holds

$$
v_{m}\left(\Gamma_{r}\right) \leq \frac{m!\Gamma}{R} \cdot v_{m}(\Gamma)
$$

Proof of the lemma.
It is enough to prove the lemma for convex polyhedra because the case of a general convex set is treated by the polyhedral approximation and limiting process. So suppose that $\Gamma$ is a convex polyhedron which contains an Euclidean R-ball with the center in the point $x$. Denote the (m-1)-dimensional faces of $\Gamma$ by $F_{1, \ldots, F_{k}}$ and the cone with the vertex $x$ and base $F_{i}$ by $K_{i}$. Cones $K_{1} \ldots K_{k}$ form a subdivision of the polyhedron $\Gamma$. The height of each cone $K_{i}$ is greater than $R$ so that

$$
v_{m}\left(K_{i}\right) \geq \frac{R}{m!} v_{m-1}\left(F_{i}\right)
$$

The summing of these inequalities for $i=1, \ldots, k$ gives

$$
v_{m}(\Gamma)=\sum_{i=1}^{k} v_{m}\left(K_{i}\right) \geq \frac{R}{m!} \sum_{i=1}^{k} v_{m-1}\left(F_{i}\right)=\frac{R}{m!} \quad v_{m-1}(\partial \Gamma)
$$

On the other hand it follows from convexity of the set that

$$
v_{m}\left(\Gamma_{r}\right) \leq r v_{m-1}(\partial \Gamma)
$$

so that

$$
v_{m}\left(\Gamma_{r}\right) \leq \frac{m!r}{R} v_{m}(\Gamma)
$$

Lemma is proved.

Proof of proposition 3.
We choose the sequence $r_{n}$ such that $r_{n}>\frac{400 \cdot 4^{n} \cdot(m+1)!}{\varepsilon}$. We proceed the proof by induction. The base of the induction process is trivial because we can choose a sufficiently large number $r_{1}$ and define $\phi_{1, x}$ as an identical embedding of the set $\Gamma_{1}(x)$ into $\mathbb{R}^{m}$. Now let us suppose that the maps
$\phi_{i, x}$ for $i=1 \ldots n, x \in A_{i}$ are already constructed and denote for $x \in A_{n}$ and $r>0$ through $\Gamma_{n, r}^{\prime}(x)$ the difference between $\Gamma_{n}(x)$ and the $r$-neighbourhood of its boundary. Condition 3 implies that for every $r>0$

$$
\phi_{n, x}\left(\Gamma_{n, r}^{\prime}(x)\right) \subset \Gamma_{n, r-m}^{\prime} 2^{n}(x)
$$

Now fix a point $x \in A_{n+1}$ and consider the element $C_{x}^{n+1}$ of the partition $\xi_{n+1}$ which contains this point. List all points $y \in A_{n}$ such that $C_{y}^{n} \cap C_{x}^{n+1} \neq \emptyset$ Each of these points has the form

$$
y=S_{t(y)} x
$$

Let us divide the set $\Gamma_{n+1}(x)$ into the sets

$$
K_{y}=\Gamma_{n+1}(x) \cap\left(\Gamma_{n}(y)+t(y)\right)
$$

and let

$$
K_{y}^{\prime}=\Gamma_{n+1}(x) \cap\left(\Gamma^{\prime}{ }_{n, \frac{100 \cdot 2^{n} \cdot m}{\varepsilon}}(y)+t(y)\right)
$$

We begin with the definition of the map $\phi_{n+1, x}$ on the sets $K_{y}^{\prime}$, namely let for $t \in K_{y}^{\prime}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{n+1, x}(t)=[t(y)]+\phi_{n, y}(t-t(y)) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $[t]$ denote the entire part of the vector $t \in R^{m}$.
Obviously, on each set $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{y}}^{\prime}$ condition 2 holds. Condition 3 also holds because

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\left|\phi_{n+1, x}(t)-t\right|\right|=\| \phi_{n, y}(t-t(y))-(t-t(y))+[t(y)]- \\
& \left.-t(y)| | \leq \sup _{s \in \Gamma_{n}(y)}| | \phi_{n, y}(s)-s| |+\| \mid t(y)\right]-t(y) \| \leq \\
& \leq m \cdot 2^{n}+\sqrt{m}<m \cdot 2^{n+1} \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Let

$$
\Gamma^{\prime}=\bigcup_{y: C_{y}^{n} \cap c_{x}^{n+1} \neq \emptyset^{K^{\prime}} y}
$$

If $t_{1}, t_{2} \in \Gamma^{\prime}$, but $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ lie in different sets $K_{y}^{\prime}$, then the distance between $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ exceed $\frac{100 \cdot 2^{n} \cdot m}{\varepsilon}$ and

$$
\left|\left|\phi_{n+1, x}\left(t_{1}\right)-t_{1}-\left(\phi_{n+1, x}\left(t_{2}\right)-t_{2}\right)\right|\right| \leq 2^{n+2} \cdot m
$$

so that the Lipschitz constant of the map $\phi_{n+1, x}$ - id on the set $\Gamma^{\prime}$ does not exceed $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{2^{n}}\right)$.

Now we should define the map $\phi_{n+1, x}$ on the remaining part of the set $\Gamma_{n(x)}$ with a very small increase of the Lipschitz constant of the difference $\phi_{n+1, x^{-i d}}$ and without any increase of the $C^{0}$ norm of this difference. In the case of a scalar function such a prolongation (even without any increase of the Lipschitz constant) is provided by a fairly general and simple construction of Banach (see, for example, [10] , chapter 5, $\$ 5$, Lemma 3 ). However, I do not know any such general construction in the case of a vector function. So it is necessary to use some more special machinery.

Let $d(t)$ denote a Euclidean distance from the point $t \in K_{y}$ to the subset $K_{y}^{\prime}$ and let $s(t)$ denote the unique point of $K_{y}^{\prime}$, such that the distance between $t$ and $s(t)$ is equal to $d(t)$. Now we can define the map $\phi_{n+1, x}$ on each set $K_{y}$, namely

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{n+1, x}(t)=t+\left(\max \left(0,1-\frac{\varepsilon}{10 \cdot 2 n \cdot m} d(t)\right)\right) \cdot\left([t(y)]+\phi_{n, y}(s(t)-t(y))\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\lambda=\frac{\varepsilon}{10.2^{n} \cdot m}$. Obviously $\phi_{n, x}(t)=t$ if $d(t) \geq \lambda^{-1}$, i.e. if the point $t$ lies outside the $\lambda^{-1}$-neighbourhood of the set $K_{y}^{\prime}$. But $d(t)>2 . \lambda^{-1}$ for every point

$$
t \in \partial\left(\Gamma_{n}(y)+t(y)\right)
$$

so that the map $\phi_{n+1, x}$ coincides with the identity in some neighbourhood of the common boundary of every two sets $K_{y}$. Thus formula (6) gives the continuous map defined on the whole set $\Gamma_{n}(x)$ and it is enough to ensure conditions 2 and 3 within each set independently.

Condition 3 is obviously true because by virtue of (5) and (6)

$$
\max _{t \in K_{y}}| | \phi_{n+1, x}(t)-t| |=\max _{t \in K_{y}^{\prime}}| | \phi_{n+1, x}(t)-t \|
$$

Let us verify condition 2. Fix a number $r: 0 \leq r \leq \lambda^{-1}$ and consider the surface

$$
S_{r, y}=\left\{t \in K_{y,} d(t)=r\right\}
$$

It follows from the convexity of the set $K_{y}^{\prime}$ and from formula (6) that the Lipschitz constant of the map $\phi_{n+1}, x^{-i d}$ restricted on this surface does not exceed the corresponding constant for $\phi_{n+1, x}$ - id restricted on the surface $\partial K_{y}^{\prime}$. The last-mentioned constant does not exceed $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{2^{n}}\right)$ by virtue of (4). Further, the Lipschitz constant in the orthogonal direction to the surface
$S_{r, y}$ does not exceed $\lambda<\frac{\varepsilon}{2^{n+2}}$ so that the Lipschitz constant of $\phi_{n+1, x}$ id on the set $K_{y}$ is less than or equal to $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left(1-\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}\right)$.

We omit details concerning the measurability of our construction because
the construction is given by explicit formulae.
It remains to verify condition 4. Let us use the following notation

$$
B_{n}^{\prime}=\bigcup_{x \in A_{n+1}} \quad y: C_{y}^{n} \cap C_{x}^{n+1} \neq \emptyset \quad \bigcup_{k \in K_{y}^{\prime} \cap z^{m} \quad\left\{S_{\phi_{n, y}}(k)^{y}\right\}}
$$

From the definition of $\phi_{n+1, x}$ (see formula (4)) it follows that $B_{n}^{\prime}<B_{n} \cap B_{n+1}$. Let us estimate the measure of sets $B_{n} \backslash B_{n}^{\prime}$ and $B_{n+1} \backslash B_{n}^{\prime}$. Lemma 3 and the choice of $r_{n}$ imply that

$$
v_{m}\left(\Gamma_{n}(y) \backslash \Gamma_{n, \frac{100 \cdot 2^{n} \cdot m}{\varepsilon}}(y)\right) \leq \frac{100 \cdot 2^{n} \cdot m \cdot m!}{\varepsilon \cdot \Gamma_{n}} \cdot v_{m}\left(\Gamma_{n}(y)\right) \leq \frac{1}{2^{n+2}} \cdot v_{m}\left(\Gamma_{n}(y)\right)
$$

The conditional measure on each element $C_{y}^{n}$ is proportional to the image of the Euclidean volume in $\Gamma_{n}(y)$. Consequently conditional measure of the set

$$
\phi_{n, y}\left(\Gamma_{n}(y) \backslash \Gamma_{n}^{\prime}, \frac{100 \cdot 2^{n} \cdot m}{\varepsilon}\right)
$$

is less than $\frac{1}{2^{n+2}}$. Further the number of integer points in this difference is almost proportional to its volume and consequently

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Card }\left\{\left(B_{n} \backslash B_{n}^{\prime}\right) \cap \phi_{n, y}\left\{\Gamma_{n}(y)\right)\right\} \leq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \operatorname{Card}\left\{B_{n} \cap \phi_{n, y}\left(\Gamma_{n}(y)\right\}\right\} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly
Card $\left\{\left(B_{n+1} \backslash B_{n}^{\prime}\right) \cap \phi_{n+1, x}\left(t(y)+\Gamma_{n}(y)\right)\right\} \leq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \operatorname{Card}\left\{B_{n+1} \cap \phi_{n, y}\left(\Gamma_{n}(y)\right)\right\}$
Now suppose that $\varepsilon<\frac{1}{2}$ and consider the measure $v$ on the sets $B_{n}$ and $B_{n+1}$ and conditional measures induced by this measure on a fixed element $C$ of the partition $\xi_{n+1}$. These measures are uniform i.e. proportional to the number of elements in the intersections $C \cap B_{n}$ and $C \cap B_{n+1}$ so that inequalities (7) and (8) provide that condition 4 holds.

## Conclusion of the proof of theorem 2 .

So we have constructed the sequence of sections $B_{n}$. Now we are going to show that this sequence converges to the section $B$ which admits a natural action of group $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathfrak{m}}$. This fact allows us to represent the given $\mathbb{R}^{m}$-action $S$ as a special action over this action of $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ on the Lebesgue space ( $B, V$ ).

Denote the set $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{i=n}^{\infty} B_{i}$ by $B$. From condition 4 of proposition 3 it follows that

$$
\nu\left(B \Delta B_{n}\right) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \nu\left(B_{n+i+1} \Delta B_{n+i}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}
$$

For every point $y \in B$ and every sufficiently large $n$ there exists $x_{n} \in A_{n}$ and $k_{n} \in \Gamma_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)$ such that

$$
y=s_{\phi_{n, x_{n}}}\left(k_{n}\right)_{n}
$$

Now fix an element $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$. From the definition of the maps $\phi_{n, x}$ it follows
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that for a.e. $y \in B \quad k_{n}+k \in \Gamma_{n}\left(x_{n}\right)$ for all sufficiently large $n$, and the difference

$$
\phi_{n, x_{n}}\left(k_{n}+k\right)-\phi_{n, x_{n}}\left(k_{n}\right)
$$

does not depend on $n$. Denote this difference by $h_{k}(y)$. Obviously $S_{h_{k}(y)} y \in B$. Moreover $h_{k}$ is a cocycle i.e. for every $k_{1}, k_{2} \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$

$$
h_{k_{1}}+k_{2}(y)=h_{k_{1}}(y)+h_{k_{2}}\left(S_{h_{k_{1}}}(y) y\right)
$$

So we can define an action $T=\left\{T_{n}\right\}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ on the set $B$ which preserves the measure $v$, namely for $y \in B, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$ suppose

$$
T_{n} y=S_{h_{k}(y)^{y}}
$$

From condition 2 of proposition 3 we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1+\varepsilon)^{-1} \leq \frac{\| h_{k}(y)| |}{\|k\|} \leq 1+\varepsilon \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now it is easy to prove that the given $\mathbb{R}^{m}$-action $S$ is metrically isomorphic to the special action over $T$ generated by the cocycle -h which is $(1+\varepsilon)$-Lipschitz by (9) . For consider the space $B \times \mathbb{R}^{m}$ with the $\mathbb{R}^{m}$-extension $\hat{T}$ of the action $T$ generated by this cocycle :

$$
\hat{T}_{n}(y, t)=\left(T y, t-h_{n}(y)\right)
$$

and define the map $R: B \times \mathbb{R}^{m} \rightarrow X$ by

$$
R(y, t)=S_{t} y \in x
$$

Suppose that $R\left(y_{1}, t_{1}\right)=R\left(y_{2}, t_{2}\right)$, i.e. $S_{t_{1}} y_{1}=S_{t_{2}} y_{2}$ or $S_{t_{1}-t_{2}} y_{1}=y_{2}$.
But it means that for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$

$$
y_{2}=T_{k} y_{1} \text {, i.e. } t_{1}-t_{2}=h_{k}\left(y_{1}\right)
$$

Conversely if

$$
(y, t) \in B \times \mathbb{R}^{m}, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}
$$

then

$$
R\left(T_{k} y, t-h_{k}(y)\right)=S_{t-h_{k}}(y)\left(T_{k} y\right)=S_{t} y=R(y, t)
$$
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So the preimage $R^{-1}(x)$ of an arbitrary point $x \in X$ is precisely one orbit of $\hat{T}$ and consequently the map $R$ establishes the one-to-one correspondence between the space of $\hat{T}$-orbits with the factor-action generated by the vertical action and the space $X$ with the action $S$. The correspondence between the invariant measure is almost obvious so that we omit details. Theorem 2 is proved.

## IV. Rochlin lemma

We mentioned in the previous section about the new and simple proof of Rochlin (or Halmos-Rochlin or Kakutani-Rochlin) uniform approximation lemma for $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$-actions. The result itself is not new; it is known even for more general groups and under more general assumptions (see [11] for example) but our proof is quite simple and demonstrates use of our methods. Now let us pass on precise formulations.

Rochlin lemma.
Let $T=\left\{T_{n}\right\}$ be a measurable, measure-preserving free action of the group $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ on a Lebesgue space $(X, \mu), k=\left(k_{1} \ldots k_{m}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$ an arbitrary vector, $\Pi_{k}=\left\{\ell=\left(\ell_{1} \ldots \ell_{m}\right): \ell_{i} \in Z, 0 \leq \ell_{i}<k_{i}, i=1 \ldots m\right\}$ a rectangle in $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$, $\varepsilon>0$ an arbitrary small number. Then there exists a measurable set $E \subset X$ such that sets $T_{\ell} E, \ell \in \Pi_{k}$ are pair wise disjoint and

$$
\mu\left(\bigcup_{\ell \in \Pi_{k}} T_{\ell} E\right)>1-\varepsilon
$$

Proof
We deduce this lemma from the simplified version of proposition 2 for $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ actions. Notice that ergodicity is of no importance at the proof of this proposition. For we use only the fact that every trajectory of the action $T$ intersects the set $A$ i.e. that $A$ is a global measurable section for $T$. But it is easy to provide this property in the following way: begin with the local section as in the proof of proposition 2, then consider the minimal invariant
set $F_{1}$ containing the set $A$, construct the local section for the invariant set $X \backslash F_{1}$, define the set $F_{2}$ by a similar way and so on.

Introduce several notations. For a fixed vector $k=\left(k_{1}, \ldots, k_{m}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}$ denote by $\mathbb{Z}_{k}^{m}$ the sublattice $\mathbb{Z}_{k}^{m}=\left\{l=\left(\ell_{1}, \ldots, m \in \mathbb{Z}^{m}, \ell_{i}=t_{i} k_{i}, t_{i} \in \mathbb{Z}, i=1 \ldots m\right\}\right.$, and $K_{k}$ the partition of $\mathbb{Z}^{m}$ into the sets $\Pi_{k}+\ell, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{k}^{m}$.

Fix the number $r>\frac{100 \mathrm{~m} \cdot \mathrm{~m}!| | \mathrm{k} \| ل}{\varepsilon}$ and apply the simplified version of proposition 2. For every $x \in A$ consider all elements of partition $K_{k}$ which are contained in the set $\Gamma(x)$. Obviously the union of all such elements covers the difference between the set $\Gamma(x)$ and $(m .||k||)$-neighbourhood of its boundary so that by lemma 3 the conditional measure of the set $\left\{T_{k}\right\}$, (where $k$ belongs to this difference) on the element $C_{x}$ of the partition $\xi$ exceeds

$$
\begin{aligned}
1-\frac{m!m \cdot| | k| |}{r} & >1-\frac{\varepsilon}{100} \\
\text { Suppose } E= & \bigcup_{x \in A} \bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{k}^{m}}, \Pi_{k}+\ell \subset \Gamma(x)
\end{aligned}
$$

The measurability of this set follows from proposition 2. Estimation of conditional measures which we have done above provides that

$$
\mu\left(\bigcup_{\ell \in \Pi_{k}} T_{\ell} E\right)>1-\varepsilon
$$

At last by definition

$$
k_{1}, k_{2} \in \pi_{k} \quad k_{1} \neq k_{2}
$$

implies that

$$
T_{k_{1}} E \cap T_{k_{2}} E=\emptyset
$$

Lemma is proved.
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[^0]:    *) The general version of the Ambrose-Kakutani theorem deals with an arbitrary flow without fixed points. Similarly we could include more general cases in our considerations, for example arbitrary free actions, but this generalization demands some additional space and is not very essential.

