

# THE HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF CERTAIN SETS OF NONNORMAL NUMBERS

C. M. Colebrook

## 1. THE GENERATION OF MEASURES

Let  $C[0, 1)$  denote the collection of continuous, periodic functions (with period 1) on the reals, and let  $s$  be a fixed integer ( $s \geq 2$ ). We say that a real number  $x$  is  $\nu$ -normal (to the base  $s$ ) if the sequence  $\{s^n x\}$  has the distribution  $\nu$  in the sense that

$$(1.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(s^k x) = \int_0^1 f d\nu = \nu(f) \quad \text{for each } f \in C[0, 1).$$

Here,  $\nu$  denotes a probability measure on  $[0, 1)$  that is invariant under the transformation  $T: y \rightarrow Ty = sy - [sy]$ . In other words,  $\nu$  is the weak\* limit of the measures  $\mu_n$  defined by the relations

$$(1.2) \quad \mu_n(f) \equiv \mu_{n,x}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(T^k x).$$

We say that  $x$  generates  $\nu$  (to the base  $s$ ). The space of all these  $T$ -invariant probability measures, together with the weak\* topology, is denoted by  $I(s)$ . Observe that for each positive integer  $n$  we have the inclusion  $I(s) \subset I(s^n)$ . One measure in  $I(s)$  is the ordinary Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$ , and  $x$  is normal to the base  $s$  in the classical sense precisely when  $x$  is  $\lambda$ -normal to the base  $s$ .

Consider a measure  $\nu$  in  $I(s)$ , and let  $x$  generate  $\nu$  (to the base  $s$ ). As is well known (see for instance [5]), relation (1.1) also holds when  $f$  is bounded and the set of discontinuities of  $f$  has  $\nu$ -measure 0. In particular, the relation (1.1) holds when  $f$  is the characteristic function of an interval  $[\alpha, \beta)$ . That is,

$$(1.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} (\text{number of } k \text{ (} 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \text{), for which } T^k x \in [\alpha, \beta)) \\ \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n([\alpha, \beta)) = \nu([\alpha, \beta)),$$

provided  $\nu(\{\alpha\}) = 0 = \nu(\{\beta\})$ . Also, it is known that if the relation (1.3) holds for some point  $x$  and for all choices of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  such that  $\nu(\{\alpha\}) = 0 = \nu(\{\beta\})$ , then  $x$  is  $\nu$ -normal (to the base  $s$ ) (see [5]). In fact, for  $x$  to be  $\nu$ -normal, it suffices to require that condition (1.3) hold only for intervals of the form  $[as^{-n}, (a+1)s^{-n})$ ,

Received February 15, 1969.

This work was supported in part by a Faculty Research Fellowship from the State University of New York.

Michigan Math. J. 17 (1970).

where  $a$  and  $n$  are positive integers ( $1 \leq a \leq s^n - 2$ ). In this connection, we mention that for each  $T$ -invariant measure  $\nu$  and each positive integer  $n$ , the relations

$$\nu(\{as^{-n}\}) = 0 \quad (a = 1, 2, \dots, s^n - 1)$$

hold. To see this, we observe that the sets  $T^{-i}\{as^{-n}\}$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots$ ) are disjoint; therefore

$$\nu(\{as^{-n}\}) = \frac{1}{m} \nu\left(\bigcup_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i}\{as^{-n}\}\right) \leq \frac{1}{m}$$

for  $m = 1, 2, \dots$ . (However,  $\nu(\{0\})$  may be positive or 0.) We conclude that  $\nu$ -normality of  $x$  to the base  $s$  is equivalent to the validity of condition (1.3) with  $[\alpha, \beta) = [as^{-n}, (a + 1)s^{-n})$ , where  $a = 1, 2, \dots, s^n - 2$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). If  $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$ , then we may also include 0 and  $s^n - 1$  among the values of  $a$ .

Let  $c$  be a positive integer, and let  $f_a$  denote the characteristic function of the interval  $[as^{-c}, (a + 1)s^{-c})$  ( $a = 0, 1, \dots, s^c - 1$ ). We shall write  $W(c)$  for the collection of the  $s^c$  characteristic functions  $f_a$  ( $a = 0, 1, \dots, s^c - 1$ ), and we shall denote  $\bigcup_{c=1}^{\infty} W(c)$  by  $W$ . From the discussion above we see that we can obtain the distribution properties of the number  $x$  by considering the behavior of the sequence  $\{\mu_{n,x}(f)\}$  for  $f \in W$  instead of  $f \in C[0, 1)$ .

## 2. SOME TYPES OF NONNORMALITY: REGULARITY AND SIMPLE REGULARITY

Let  $\nu$  be a measure in  $I(s)$ . The number  $x$  is said to be *simply  $\nu$ -regular* (to the base  $s$ ) if condition (1.3) holds for the intervals

$$[\alpha, \beta) = [as^{-1}, (a + 1)s^{-1}) \quad (a = 0, 1, \dots, s - 1),$$

or equivalently, if condition (1.1) holds for  $f \in W(1)$ . We denote the set of all such  $x$  by  $F(\nu, s)$ . The number  $x$  is said to be  *$\nu$ -regular* (to the base  $s$ ) if

$$x \in \bigcap_{c=1}^{\infty} F(\nu, s^c) = G(\nu, s).$$

Obviously, one can also define simple  $\nu$ -regularity and  $\nu$ -regularity in terms of the digits in the expansion of  $x$  to the base  $s$  (see [1] for example). We observe that a number that is  $\nu$ -regular to the base  $s$  is also  $\nu$ -normal to the base  $s^n$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ). The converse holds if  $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$ .

## 3. HAUSDORFF DIMENSION

Throughout this paper,  $\dim A$  denotes the usual Hausdorff dimension of  $A \subset [0, 1)$ . Let  $\nu$  be a measure in  $I(s)$ . H. G. Eggleston [2] proved the relation

$$\dim F(\nu, s) = - \sum_{f \in W(1)} \nu(f) \log_s \nu(f).$$

(We shall always set  $p \log_s p = 0$  if  $p = 0$ .) Let  $h(\nu, c)$  be defined by

$$(3.1) \quad h(\nu, c) = - \sum_{f \in W(c)} \nu(f) \log_s^c \nu(f).$$

Then

$$\dim G(\nu, s) \leq \inf_c \dim F(\nu, s^c) = \inf_c h(\nu, c).$$

From well-known work on entropy (see for instance [4, page 48]), we conclude that

$$\inf_c h(\nu, c!) = \lim_{c \rightarrow \infty} h(\nu, c).$$

We denote this limit by  $h(\nu)$ . Thus

$$\dim G(\nu, s) \leq h(\nu).$$

In Section 7, we show that in fact equality holds.

Let us now choose a number  $x$ . In general, the weak\* limit of  $\{\mu_{n,x}\}$  does not exist, so that  $x$  fails to have a distribution to the base  $s$ . Let  $V'(x, s)$  denote the set of probability measures that are weak\* accumulation points of the sequence  $\{\mu_{n,x}\}$ . We shall say  $x$  generates  $V'(x, s)$  (to the base  $s$ ). Clearly  $V'(x, s) \subset I(s)$ . It is easy to show that  $V'(x, s)$  is always nonempty, closed, and connected in  $I(s)$ .

Let  $V$  be any nonempty, closed, connected subset of  $I(s)$ . We shall be interested in the set  $G(V, s)$ , defined as the set of all points  $x$  that generate  $V$  to each base  $s, s^2, \dots$ . In other words,  $x \in G(V, s)$  if and only if

$$V'(x, s^c) = V \quad (c = 1, 2, \dots).$$

In the case where  $V = \{\nu\}$  and  $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$ , one easily sees that this definition of  $G(V, s)$  agrees with the definition of  $G(\nu, s)$  given previously. (If  $\nu(\{0\}) \neq 0$  then  $G(\{\nu\}, s) \supset G(\nu, s)$ .) In particular, consider the Lebesgue measure  $\lambda$ . It is known (see for instance [1]) that every number that is normal to the base  $s$  in the classical sense is also normal to the base  $s^c$  ( $c = 2, 3, \dots$ ). Hence  $G(\lambda, s)$  is the set of all numbers normal to the base  $s$ . This set is known to have Lebesgue measure 1 (see [1]). Thus the Lebesgue measure of  $G(V, s)$  is 0 unless  $V = \{\lambda\}$ .

The following questions now arise. If  $V$  is some nonempty, closed, connected subset of  $I(s)$ , is  $G(V, s)$  nonempty? Further, can we obtain an estimate of the size of  $G(V, s)$ ?

In Section 6, we construct a nonempty subset of  $G(V, s)$ . Further, in Section 7, we show that the Hausdorff dimension of  $G(V, s)$  is given by  $\inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu)$ .

#### 4. AN UPPER BOUND ON THE HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF $G(V, s)$

Let  $c$  be a positive integer, and suppose  $x \in [0, 1)$ . We define  $\mu_n^{(c)}$  by the condition

$$\mu_n^{(c)}(f) \equiv \mu_{n,x}^{(c)}(f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^{ic} x) \quad (f \in W).$$

For each set  $V \subset I(s^c)$ , we define  $F(V, s^c)$  as the set of all points  $x \in [0, 1)$  for which the set

$$\{(\nu(f), f \in W(c)), \nu \in V\},$$

regarded as a subset of  $[0, 1]^{s^c}$ , is the set of accumulation points of

$$\{(\mu_{n,x}^{(c)}(f), f \in W(c))\}.$$

We note that the relations

$$\mu_{cn,x} \equiv \mu_{cn} = \frac{1}{c} (\mu_n^{(c)} + T\mu_n^{(c)} + \dots + T^{c-1}\mu_n^{(c)})$$

hold, where  $T\mu$  is defined by  $T\mu(f) = \mu(Tf)$  and  $Tf$  is given by  $Tf(y) = f(Ty)$  ( $y \in [0, 1)$ ). Also, we see that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} T^i \mu_{n_j}^{(c)} = T^i \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_j}^{(c)}$$

whether either limit exists. From these equations, we obtain the relation

$$(4.1) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{cn_j} = \frac{1}{c} \sum_{i=0}^{c-1} T^i \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_j}^{(c)}.$$

Equation (4.1) implies the inclusion  $V'(x, s) \supset V'(x, s^c) \cap I(s)$ . Further, an application of (4.1) to the case where  $x \in F(V, s^c)$  and  $V \subset I(s)$  shows that  $x \in F(V, s)$ . In other words,  $F(V, s) \supset F(V, s^c)$  if  $V \subset I(s)$ . We can now prove the following lemma.

(4.2) LEMMA. *For each  $V \subset I(s)$ , we have the inclusion*

$$G(V, s) \supset \bigcap_{c=1}^{\infty} F(V, s^c).$$

*Proof.* Let  $x$  be a fixed point of  $\bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} F(V, s^j)$ . Let  $c$  be a positive integer. Since  $x \in F(V, s^c)$ , it follows that  $V \supset V'(x, s^c)$ . Let  $\nu$  be a measure in  $V$ . For each  $m$  ( $m = 1, 2, \dots$ ), there is a sequence  $\{n_{j,m}\}$  such that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_{j,m}}^{(mc)}(f) = \nu(f) \quad (f \in W(mc)).$$

Such a sequence exists, because  $x \in F(V, s^{mc})$ . Since  $\nu \in I(s)$ , we can use relation (4.1) to obtain the relation

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{mn_{j,m}}^{(c)}(f) = \nu(f) \quad (f \in W(mc)).$$

We note also that each function in  $W(p)$  is the sum of functions in  $W(q)$ , whenever  $q > p$ . Thus we can use a diagonal procedure on  $\{\{mn_{j,m}\}, m = 1, 2, \dots\}$  to find a sequence  $\{n_j\}$  with the property that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_j}^{(c)}(f) = \nu(f) \quad (f \in \bigcup_{m=1}^{\infty} W(mc)).$$

Hence  $\nu \in V'(x, s^c)$ , and we have the inclusion  $V'(x, s^c) \supset V$ .

We have proved that  $V'(x, s^c) = V$  for  $c = 1, 2, \dots$ . But this is precisely the requirement for  $x$  to belong to  $G(V, s)$ .

On the other hand, suppose that  $x \in G(V, s)$ . Let  $c$  be a fixed positive integer. Then  $x$  also belongs to  $F(V', s^c)$ , where  $V'$  is some closed connected set such that  $V \subset V' \subset I(s^c)$ . Thus

$$G(V, s) \subset \bigcup F(V', s^c),$$

where the union is taken over all closed connected sets  $V'$  with the property that  $V \subset V' \subset I(s^c)$ . Now, Theorem 4 of Volkmann [6] gives the Hausdorff dimension of this union of sets as

$$\dim \bigcup F(V', s^c) = \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu, c).$$

It follows that  $\dim G(V, s) \leq \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu, c)$  ( $c = 1, 2, \dots$ ); therefore

$$(4.3) \quad \dim G(V, s) \leq \inf_c \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu, c) = \inf_{\nu \in V} \inf_c h(\nu, c) \leq \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu).$$

In the proof of Theorem (7.2) we shall show that

$$(4.4) \quad \dim \bigcap_{c=1}^{\infty} F(V, s^c) \geq \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu).$$

By (4.2) and (4.4), we have the inequality

$$(4.5) \quad \dim G(V, s) \geq \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu),$$

and from (4.3) and (4.5) we conclude that

$$\dim G(V, s) = \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu).$$

In particular, let us examine the case where  $V = \{\nu\}$ . If  $\nu(\{0\}) = 0$ , then  $\nu$ -regularity to the base  $s$ , and  $\nu$ -normality to all the bases  $s^n$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ) are equivalent. For instance, this condition is satisfied if  $\nu$  is ergodic with respect to  $T$  (except for the trivial case, where  $\nu$  is the point measure  $\varepsilon_0$  defined by  $\varepsilon_0(f) = f(0)$ ). Let  $\nu$  be ergodic ( $\nu \neq \varepsilon_0$ ). Then  $G(\{\nu\}, s)$  is the set of all numbers that are  $\nu$ -normal to each base  $s, s^2, \dots$ . Therefore  $h(\nu)$  is the Hausdorff dimension of the set of all numbers that are  $\nu$ -normal to each base  $s, s^2, \dots$ .

Let  $s \geq 2$  be a fixed integer. Let  $V$  be a fixed, closed, connected, nonempty subset of  $I(s)$ . In the next section, we shall construct a subset  $R$  of  $G(V, s)$ . Then, in Section 7, we show that  $\dim R \geq \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu)$ .

5. THE DEFINITION OF  $R(n, N, \nu)$

For each measure  $\nu \in I(s)$ , for each positive integer  $N$ , and for  $f \in W(n)$  ( $n$  a positive integer), let

$$\Phi(f, N, \nu) = [\nu(f)N] + \xi(f).$$

Here  $\xi(f) = 1$  for each  $f \in W(n)$  with the exception of one function  $\bar{f}$  chosen to satisfy the condition  $\nu(\bar{f}) = \max_{f \in W(n)} \nu(f)$ . Note that  $\nu(\bar{f}) \geq s^{-n}$  and  $\nu(\bar{f}) \geq N^{-1} s^n$  if

$N \geq s^{2n}$ . We choose  $\xi(\bar{f})$  so that  $N = \sum_{f \in W(n)} \Phi(f, N, \nu)$ . It is clear that  $\Phi(f, N, \nu)$  is positive provided  $N \geq s^{2n}$ . Also  $\Phi(\bar{f}, N, \nu) \geq [\nu(\bar{f})N] - (s^n - 1)$ , thus if  $N \geq s^{2n}$  then  $\Phi(\bar{f}, N, \nu) \geq 1$ . From now on we shall assume that  $N \geq s^{2n}$ .

We consider the set  $\{0, 1, \dots, s^n - 1\} = \{a: f_a \in W(n)\}$ , and the permutations with repetitions of the elements of this set that we obtain by repeating each  $a$  exactly  $\Phi(f_a, N, \nu)$  times. That is, each permutation is an ordering of  $N$  integers  $y$  ( $0 \leq y \leq s^n - 1$ ). Clearly, there are

$$S(n, N, \nu) = \frac{N!}{\prod \Phi(f, N, \nu)!}$$

such permutations. (Here the product is taken over all  $f \in W(n)$ .) For each permutation  $(y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N)$  ( $0 \leq y_i \leq s^n - 1$ ), we consider the associated interval  $[y, y + s^{-nN})$ , where

$$s^{nN}y = s^{n(N-1)}y_1 + s^{n(N-2)}y_2 + \dots + y_N.$$

Obviously, different permutations are associated with disjoint intervals. We denote the union of these disjoint, half-open intervals by  $R(n, N, \nu)$ . Each point in  $R(n, N, \nu)$  "approximately" generates  $\nu$  in the sense indicated in the following lemma.

**MAIN LEMMA.** *Let  $\nu \in I(s)$  be a fixed measure, and let  $c, n$ , and  $N$  be positive integers ( $c$  divides  $n$ ;  $N \geq s^{2n}$ ). For each  $x \in R(n, N, \nu)$  and each  $f \in W(c)$ , we have the inequality*

$$\left| \sum_{i=0}^{c^{-1}nN-1} f(T^{ic}x) - c^{-1}nN\nu(f) \right| < 2c^{-1}ns^n.$$

*Notation.* Let  $f \in W(c)$  be fixed. For all nonnegative integers  $i$  and  $n$  ( $c$  divides  $n$ ), we define  $w(f, i, n)$  to be the set of all functions  $g \in W(n)$  for which  $g(x) = 1$  implies  $f(T^{ic}x) = 1$ . We have the relation

$$\sum_{g \in w(f, i, n)} g(x) = f(T^{ic}x) = T^{ic}f(x).$$

We note that the set  $\{w(f, i, n): f \in W(c)\}$  is a partition of  $W(n)$  with the property that

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{g \in w(f, i, n)} \nu(g) = \nu(T^{ic}f) = \nu(f),$$

because  $\nu$  is invariant under  $T$ . Note that  $w(f, i, n)$  is empty if  $ic \geq n$ ; otherwise  $w(f, i, n)$  has  $s^{n-c}$  elements.

*Proof of the lemma.* Let  $x \in R(n, N, \nu)$  and  $f \in W(c)$  be fixed. From the definition of  $R(n, N, \nu)$ , it follows that the number of values of  $j$  ( $0 \leq jc < nN$ ), for which  $f(T^{jc} x) = 1$ , is given by the sum

$$\sum_{i=0}^{c^{-1}n-1} \sum_{g \in w(f,i,n)} \Phi(g, N, \nu).$$

Now relation (5.1) implies that

$$\sum_{g \in w(f,i,n)} \Phi(g, N, \nu) = \sum_{g \in w(f,i,n)} \nu(g)N + \theta(f, i, n) = N\nu(f) + \theta(f, i, n),$$

where

$$\theta(f, i, n) = \sum_{g \in w(f,i,n)} (\Phi(g, N, \nu) - \nu(g)N).$$

The definition of  $\Phi(g, N, \nu)$  implies the inequalities

$$|\theta(f, i, n)| \leq \sum_{g \in w(f,i,n)} |[\nu(g)N] - \nu(g)N + \xi(g)| < 2s^n.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=0}^{c^{-1}nN-1} f(T^{jc} x) - c^{-1}nN\nu(f) \right| &= \left| \sum_{i=0}^{c^{-1}n-1} \left( \sum_{g \in w(f,i,n)} (\Phi(g, N, \nu) - N\nu(g)) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{i=0}^{c^{-1}n-1} \theta(f, i, n) \right| < 2c^{-1}ns^n, \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma is proved.

Let  $\{n_p\}$ ,  $\{N_p\}$ , and  $\{t_p\}$  be sequences of integers ( $N_p \geq s^{2n_p}$ ), and put  $R_p = T^{-t_p} R(n_p, N_p, \nu_p)$ , where  $\{\nu_p\}$  is a sequence of measures in  $I(s)$ . For convenience, we write  $S_p$  for  $S(n_p, N_p, \nu_p)$ . We define  $R$  to be the intersection of all  $R_p$ :

$$R = \bigcap_{p=1}^{\infty} R_p.$$

The set  $R$  is always nonempty, provided  $t_p = n_p N_p + t_{p-1}$  and  $t_0 = 0$ . If  $x \in R$ , then  $T^{t_p} x \in R(n_p, N_p, \nu_p)$  ( $p = 1, 2, \dots$ ). By the Main Lemma,  $T^{t_p} x$  "approximately" generates  $\nu_p$ . In Section 6, we shall choose a sequence  $\{\nu_p\}$  that is dense in  $V$ . Then we shall choose sequences  $\{n_p\}$  and  $\{N_p\}$  such that each point in  $R$

generates just  $V$  to each base  $s, s^2, \dots$ . Clearly, the set  $R$  is of the form considered by Eggleston [3, Theorem 4].

Let  $h \geq 0$  be prescribed. Suppose we show that the series

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \frac{n_p N_p s^{\alpha t_p}}{p \prod_{q=1}^p S_q}$$

converges for all  $\alpha < h$ . By Eggleston's theorem, it follows that the Hausdorff dimension of  $R$  is at least  $h$ . In Section 7, we shall show that the series (5.2) converges for all  $\alpha < \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu)$ . Henceforth we denote  $\inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu)$  by  $h$ .

Let  $\{n_p\}$  and  $\{N_p\}$  be two unbounded, nondecreasing sequences of positive integers ( $N_p \geq s^{2n_p}$ ) that satisfy the additional conditions (here  $t_0 = 0$ ,  $t_p = n_p N_p + t_{p-1}$ )

- (i)  $n_p N_p = o(t_{p-1})$ ,
- (ii)  $n_p = m_p!$  ( $m_p$  an integer),
- (iii)  $n_{p+1}$  divides  $t_p$ .

(Such a pair of sequences can be constructed by induction on  $p$ , starting with arbitrary values  $m_1! = n_1$  and  $N_1 \geq s^{2n_1}$ .)

The following readily established lemma will be used to show convergence properties of certain functions of  $\{n_p\}$  and  $\{N_p\}$ .

**LEMMA.** *If  $\{u_p\}$  and  $\{v_p\}$  are sequences of positive terms such that  $\{v_p\}$  diverges and  $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} v_p/u_p = 0$ , then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{v_1 + v_2 + \dots + v_n}{u_1 + u_2 + \dots + u_n} = 0.$$

### 6. A DENSE SEQUENCE OF MEASURES IN $V$

Let  $\{a(n)\}$  and  $\{b(n)\}$  ( $a(n) > b(n)$ ) be fixed sequences decreasing to zero, and let  $\{c(n)\}$  be an increasing sequence of integers. For each  $\nu \in I(s)$  and each positive integer  $n$ , we define a neighborhood  $U_n(\nu)$  with center  $\nu$  by the formula

$$U_n(\nu) = \left\{ \mu \in I(s): \sum_{f \in W(c(n))} |\mu(f) - \nu(f)| < b(n) \right\}.$$

For each positive integer  $n$ , the compact set  $V$  admits a finite cover by sets of the form  $U_n(\nu)$  ( $\nu \in V$ ). Allowing repetitions, we may assume that each such cover can be written as  $\{U_n(\nu(j, n)), 1 \leq j \leq j_n\}$ , where  $j_n$  is finite. Further, we may assume that

$$U_n(\nu(j, n)) \cap U_n(\nu(j-1, n)) \neq \emptyset \quad (j = 2, 3, \dots, j_n) \quad \text{and}$$

$$U_n(\nu(j_n, n)) \cap U_{n+1}(\nu(1, n+1)) \neq \emptyset.$$



(Here we have used the connectivity of  $V$ .) For each  $n$ , we henceforth assume a fixed cover.

Let  $T_0 = 0$ ,  $T_M = T_{M-1} + j_M$ . For each positive integer  $r$ , let  $M \equiv M_r$  be determined by the inequalities  $T_{M-1} < r \leq T_M$ . We choose the integer  $p_r \equiv p(r)$  so that  $p(0) = 0$  and

$$(6.1) \quad t_{p(r-1)}(1 - b(M)) < t_{p(r)}(a(M) - b(M)) - 2 \sum_{q=p(r-1)+1}^{p(r)} n_q s^{n_q}.$$

Such a choice of  $p(r)$  is possible, because  $a(M) > b(M)$ ,  $t_p \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $s^{n_q} = o(N_q)$ . By the lemma, the last condition implies that  $\sum_{q=1}^p n_q s^{n_q} = o(t_p)$ .

For each  $r = T_{M-1} + j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq j_M$ ), set  $U_r = U_M(\nu(j, M))$ . First we order the centers of the neighborhoods  $U_r$ , allowing repetitions. For each  $p$  ( $p = 1, 2, \dots$ ), choose  $r$  so that  $P_{r-1} < p \leq p_r$ . We define  $\nu_p$  to be the center of  $U_r$ . One can easily verify that the sequence  $\{\nu_p\}$  is dense in  $V$ .

We now show that with our choice of the sequences  $\{\nu_p\}$ ,  $\{n_p\}$ , and  $\{N_p\}$ , every point of  $R$  generates the prescribed set  $V$  to each base  $s, s^2, \dots$ .

**THEOREM.**

$$R \subset \bigcap_{c=1}^{\infty} F(V, s^c).$$

*Proof.* We shall show that the following two propositions hold for each  $x \in R$  and each positive integer  $c$ .

(A) For each  $\nu \in V$ , there exists a sequence  $\{k_j\}$  such that

$$(6.2) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k_j} \sum_{i=0}^{k_j-1} f(T^{ic} x) = \nu(f) \quad (f \in W(c)).$$

(B) If  $\{k_j\}$  is a sequence for which (6.2) holds for some  $\nu' \in I(s^c)$ , then there exists  $\nu \in V$  such that  $\nu(f) = \nu'(f)$ , for all  $f \in W(c)$ .

In other words, in (A) we show that  $x \in F(V', s^c)$  for some  $V' \supset V$ , and in (B) we show that in fact  $x \in F(V, s^c)$ .

*Proof of (A).* Let  $x, \nu$ , and  $c$  be fixed ( $x \in R$ ;  $\nu \in V$ ;  $c$  a positive integer). By construction,  $\{U_r: T_{M-1} < r \leq T_M\}$  is a cover of  $V$  for each  $M$  ( $M = 1, 2, \dots$ ). Thus, for each  $M$ , there exists at least one integer  $r$  in the range  $T_{M-1} < r \leq T_M$  such that  $\nu \in U_r$ . Let  $r \equiv r(\nu, M)$  be an integer. Let  $M$  be so large ( $M \geq M_0$ , say) that  $c(M) \geq c$  and that  $n_{p(r)}$  is a multiple of  $c$  when  $r \geq r(\nu, M_0)$  (here we use the relation  $n_p = m_p!$ ). We show that the sequence

$$\{n = c^{-1} t_{p(r)}: r = r(\nu, M), M \geq M_0\}$$

satisfies condition (6.2). Note that  $c$  divides  $t_{p(r-1)}$ , because  $c$  divides  $n_{p(r)}$ . For  $n = c^{-1} t_{p(r)}$  and  $f \in W(c)$ , we have the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}
 & c \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^{ic} x) - n \nu(f) \right| \\
 & \leq \left| c \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^{ic} x) - t_{p(r-1)} \nu(f) \right| + (t_{p(r)} - t_{p(r-1)}) |\nu_{p(r)}(f) - \nu(f)| \\
 & \quad + \left| c \sum_{i=0}^{c^{-1} n_{p(r)} N_{p(r)} - 1} f(T^{t_{p(r-1)} + ic} x) - n_{p(r)} N_{p(r)} \nu_{p(r)}(f) \right| \\
 & \leq t_{p(r-1)} + (t_{p(r)} - t_{p(r-1)}) b(M) + 2 \sum_{p=p(r-1)+1}^{p(r)} n_p s^{n_p}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the Main Lemma and the fact that  $c \leq c(M)$ . From (6.1), we obtain the relation

$$c \left| \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^{ic} x) - n \nu(f) \right| < t_{p(r)} a(M).$$

But  $nc = t_{p(r)}$  and  $a(M) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n$  (and thus  $M$ ) increases. Hence (A) is proved.

*Proof of (B).* Let  $x$  ( $x \in R$ ) and the integer  $c$  be fixed. Suppose that  $\{k_j\}$  is a sequence for which the limit on the left-hand side of the equation (6.2) exists (and equals  $d_f$ , say) for all  $f \in W(c)$ . For each positive integer  $j$ , there exist unique integers  $r = r(j)$  and  $q = q(j)$  such that

$$t_{p(r)} < t_{q-1} \leq ck_j < t_q \leq t_{p(r+1)}.$$

Define  $M = M(j)$  by the condition  $T_{M-1} < r(j) \leq T_M$ . From now on, let  $j$  be large enough so that  $c(M(j)) \geq c$  and so that  $c$  divides  $n_{p(r)}$  if  $r \geq r(j)$  (then  $c$  divides  $t_{p(r)}$ ). For  $r = r(j)$ , we have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
 k_j c |\nu_{p(r)}(f) - d_f| & \leq c \left| \sum_{i=0}^{k_j-1} f(T^{ic} x) - k_j d_f \right| + \left| c \sum_{i=0}^{c^{-1} t_{p(r)} - 1} f(T^{ic} x) - t_{p(r)} \nu_{p(r)}(f) \right| \\
 & \quad + \sum_{q=p(r)+1}^{q(j)-1} \left( n_q s^{n_q} + n_q N_q |\nu_{p(r)}(f) - \nu_{p(r+1)}(f)| \right) + n_{q(j)} N_{q(j)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the Main Lemma with  $\nu = \nu_{p(r+1)} = \nu_q$  for

$$p(r) + 1 \leq q \leq p(r + 1).$$

The definition of  $R$  and the hypothesis on  $\{k_j\}$  imply that the right-hand side of the expression above is  $o(k_j)$ . Thus

$$\lim_{r=r(j), j \rightarrow \infty} \nu_{p(r)}(f) = d_f \quad (f \in W(c)).$$

But  $\{\nu_p\}$  is dense in  $V$ . It follows that the sequence  $\{\nu_{p(r(j))}(f), f \in W(c)\}$ , which, as we have just shown, converges in  $[0, 1]^{S^c}$ , has as limit the point  $(\nu(f), f \in W(c))$ , where  $\nu$  is some measure in  $V$ .

From Lemma (4.2) and the theorem, we conclude that  $R \subset G(V, s)$ .

7. A LOWER BOUND ON THE HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF  $G(V, s)$

We find a lower bound for the dimension of  $R$  by the method outlined in Section 5.

(7.1) LEMMA. *Let  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m$  and  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m$  be nonnegative numbers such that  $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_m = b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_m = k$ , where  $k \geq 1$ . If  $0 < a_i - b_i \leq 1$  ( $i = 2, 3, \dots, m$ ) and  $a_1 \geq 1$ , then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m (a_i \log_e a_i - b_i \log_e b_i) \leq m \log_e k.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\theta(x) = \sum_{i=1}^m (xa_i + (1-x)b_i) \log_e (xa_i + (1-x)b_i)$ . By the Mean-Value Theorem,  $\theta(1) - \theta(0) = \theta'(\xi)$  for some  $\xi \in (0, 1)$ . But

$$\theta'(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^m (a_i - b_i) \log_e (\xi a_i + (1 - \xi) b_i) \leq \sum \log_e (\xi a_i + (1 - \xi) b_i),$$

where the summation extends over only those  $i$  for which  $\xi a_i + (1 - \xi) b_i \geq 1$ . Certainly, the inequality  $\xi a_i + (1 - \xi) b_i \leq k$  holds for all  $i$  (recall that

$$1 \leq a_1 \leq \xi a_1 + (1 - \xi) b_1 \leq b_1);$$

thus

$$\theta'(\xi) \leq m \log_e k.$$

(7.2) THEOREM.

$$\dim R \geq \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu).$$

If  $\inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu) = 0$ , the result is trivial. Suppose  $h = \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu) > 0$ . As described in Section 5, we shall show that the series  $\sum u_p$  converges for  $0 < \alpha < h$ , where

$$\log_s u_p = n_p N_p + \alpha t_p - \sum_{q=1}^n \log_s S_q.$$

First we need a bound for  $S_q$ .

(7.3) LEMMA. Let  $n$  and  $N$  be integers ( $N \geq s^{2n}$ ), and let  $\nu \in I(s)$ . Let  $S = S(n, N, \nu)$  be as in Section 5. Then

$$\log_s S - nNh(\nu, n) > -\frac{3}{2} N^{1/2} \log_s 2\pi N - \frac{1}{12} \frac{s^{2n}}{N} \log_s e.$$

*Proof of lemma.* Let  $\Psi(x)$  be defined by the condition

$$\Gamma(x + 1) = x! = x^x e^{-x + \Psi(x)} \quad (x > 0).$$

By virtue of the well-known relation

$$\Psi''(x) = -\frac{1}{x} + \log_e (\Gamma(x + 1))'' = -\frac{1}{x} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(x+k)^2} \leq -\frac{1}{x} + \int_x^{\infty} \frac{1}{u^2} = 0$$

(see [7, p. 241]),  $\Psi(x)$  is a convex function. Thus

$$(7.4) \quad \sum_{f \in W(n)} \Psi(\Phi(f, N, \nu)) \leq s^n \Psi \left( s^{-n} \sum_{f \in W(n)} \Phi(f, N, \nu) \right) = s^n \Psi(s^{-n} N).$$

Clearly, the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \log_s S &= \log_s N! - \sum_{f \in W(n)} \log_s (\Phi(f, N, \nu)!) = N \log_s N - (\log_s e)(N - \Psi(N)) \\ &- \sum_{f \in W(n)} (\Phi(f, N, \nu) \log_s \Phi(f, N, \nu) - (\log_s e)\Phi(f, N, \nu) + (\log_s e)\Psi(\Phi(f, N, \nu))) \end{aligned}$$

hold.

Now we use Lemma (7.1) with  $m = s^n$ ,  $k = N$ . We set  $a_f = \Phi(f, N, \nu)$  ( $\Phi(\bar{f}, N, \nu) \geq 1$ ) and  $b_f = \nu(f)N$  ( $f \in W(n)$ ), and we observe that

$$\theta(0) = (N \log_s N - nNh(\nu, n)) \log_e s.$$

Thus

$$\theta(1) \log_s e = \sum_{f \in W(n)} \Phi(f, N, \nu) \log_s \Phi(f, N, \nu) < -nNh(\nu, n) + N \log_s N + s^n \log_s N.$$

From this inequality and inequality (7.4), we obtain the condition

$$\log_s S > nNh(\nu, n) - s^n \log_s N + (\Psi(N) - s^n \Psi(s^{-n} N)) \log_s e.$$

The Stirling bounds on  $\Psi(x)$  are

$$\frac{1}{2} \log_e 2\pi x < \Psi(x) < \frac{1}{12x} + \frac{1}{2} \log_e 2\pi x$$

(see [7, page 253]). Thus (use the fact that  $N \geq s^{2n}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \log_s S &> nN h(\nu, n) - s^n \log_s N + \frac{1}{2} \log_s 2\pi N - \frac{s^n}{2} \log_s 2\pi s^{-n} N - \frac{s^{2n} \log_s e}{12N} \\ &> nN h(\nu, n) - \frac{3}{2} N^{1/2} \log_s 2\pi N - \frac{1}{12} \frac{s^{2n}}{N} \log_s e. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Theorem (7.2).* It follows from the lemma and Lemma (7.3) and the choice of the sequences  $\{n_q\}$  and  $\{N_q\}$  that

$$n_p N_p - \sum_{q=1}^p (\log_s S_q - n_q N_q h(\nu_q, n_q)) = o(t_p).$$

Thus the inequality

$$\log_s u_p < (\alpha + \varepsilon) t_p - \sum_{q=1}^p n_q N_q h(\nu_q, n_q)$$

holds for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  and for all sufficiently large  $p$ . But  $n_q = m_q!$ ; hence  $h(\nu_q, n_q) \geq h(\nu_q)$  for all  $q$ . (This is a well-known result from the theory of entropy, see for instance [4, page 49].) Thus

$$\log_s u_p \leq (\alpha - h + \varepsilon) t_p,$$

for all large  $p$ . We have shown that for all numbers  $\alpha, \varepsilon$  ( $0 < \alpha < h, \varepsilon > 0$ ) with  $(\alpha - h + \varepsilon) < -\varepsilon$ , the inequality  $\log_s u_p < -\varepsilon t_p$  holds for all sufficiently large  $p$ .

This implies that  $\sum u_p$  converges. It now follows from the theorem of Eggleston [3, Theorem 4] that

$$\dim R \geq h \equiv \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu).$$

From (4.4), the theorem, and Theorem (7.2), we conclude that

$$\dim G(V, s) = \inf_{\nu \in V} h(\nu).$$

I am indebted to J. H. B. Kemperman for much guidance.

#### REFERENCES

1. J. Cigler and G. Helmborg, *Neuere Entwicklungen der Theorie der Gleichverteilung*. Jber. Deutsch. Math. Verein. 64, Abt. 1, (1961), 1-50.
2. H. G. Eggleston, *The fractional dimension of a set defined by decimal properties*. Quart. J. Math., Oxford Ser. 20 (1949), 31-36.
3. ———, *Sets of fractional dimensions which occur in some problems of number theory*. Proc. London Math. Soc. (2) 54 (1952), 42-93.
4. A. I. Khinchin, *Mathematical foundations of information theory*. Dover Publications, New York, 1957.

5. J. C. Oxtoby, *Ergodic sets*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 58 (1952), 116-136.
6. Bodo Volkmann, *Über Hausdorffsche Dimensionen von Mengen, die durch Zifferneigenschaften charakterisiert sind*. VI. Math. Z. 68 (1958), 439-449.
7. E. T. Whittaker and G. N. Watson, *A course of modern analysis*. 4th Edition. Cambridge University Press, 1946.

State University College  
Geneseo, New York 14454