

ON THE DEFINITION OF NORMAL NUMBERS

IVAN NIVEN AND H. S. ZUCKERMAN

1. Introduction. Let R be a real number with fractional part $.x_1x_2x_3 \cdots$ when written to scale r . Let $N(b, n)$ denote the number of occurrences of the digit b in the first n places. The number R is said to be *simply normal* to scale r if

$$(1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(b, n)}{n} = \frac{1}{r}$$

for each of the r possible values of b ; R is said to be *normal* to scale r if all the numbers R, rR, r^2R, \cdots are simply normal to all the scales r, r^2, r^3, \cdots . These definitions, for $r = 10$, were introduced by Émile Borel [1], who stated (p.261) that "la propriété caractéristique" of a normal number is the following: that for any sequence B whatsoever of v specified digits, we have

$$(2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N(B, n)}{n} = \frac{1}{r^v},$$

where $N(B, n)$ stands for the number of occurrences of the sequence B in the first n decimal places.

Several writers, for example Champernowne [2], Koksma [3, p.116], and Copeland and Erdős [4], have taken this property (2) as the definition of a normal number. Hardy and Wright [5, p.124] state that property (2) is equivalent to the definition, but give no proof. It is easy to show that a normal number has property (2), but the implication in the other direction does not appear to be so obvious. If the number R has property (2) then any sequence of digits

$$B = b_1b_2 \cdots b_v$$

appears with the appropriate frequency, but will the frequencies all be the same for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, v$ if we count only those occurrences of B such that b_1 is an $i, i + v, i + 2v, \cdots$ -th digit? It is the purpose of this note to show that this is

Received August 14, 1950, and, in revised form, November 22, 1950.

Pacific J. Math. 1 (1951), 103-109.