

The American Mathematical Monthly

Letter from the Editor
 1
 Cantor Set Arithmetic
 Jayadev S. Athreya, Bruce Reznick, and Jeremy T. Tyson
 4
 A Family of Self-Similar Sets of Geometric Dimension
 1
 Peter J. Heule, Victor Heule, Frank Heule, and Frank Heule
 10
 The Arithmetic Mean, Harmonic Mean, and Geometric Mean
 John J. Schaeffer
 15
 On the Approximability of Infinitely Matrix Multiplication
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 20
 Conjugate Lines in the Quaternionic Configuration
 Michael J. Heule
 25
 NOTES
 Periodic Square Numbers
 Robert J. M. Heule
 30
 On the Number of Elements of Maximal Order in a Group
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 35
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 40
 The Arithmetic Mean, Harmonic Mean, and Geometric Mean
 John J. Schaeffer
 45
 A Family of Self-Similar Sets of Geometric Dimension
 Peter J. Heule, Victor Heule, Frank Heule, and Frank Heule
 50
 On the Approximability of Infinitely Matrix Multiplication
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 55
 Conjugate Lines in the Quaternionic Configuration
 Michael J. Heule
 60
 REVIEWS
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 65
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 70
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 75
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 80
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 85
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 90
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 95
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 100
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 105
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 110
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 115
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 120
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 125
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 130
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 135
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 140
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 145
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 150
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 155
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 160
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 165
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 170
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 175
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 180
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 185
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 190
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 195
 On the Approximability of Geometric Dimension
 John J. Schaeffer and Frank Heule
 200

ISSN: 0002-9890 (Print) 1930-0972 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/uamm20>

Cantor Set Arithmetic

Jayadev S. Athreya, Bruce Reznick & Jeremy T. Tyson

To cite this article: Jayadev S. Athreya, Bruce Reznick & Jeremy T. Tyson (2019) Cantor Set Arithmetic, The American Mathematical Monthly, 126:1, 4-17, DOI: 10.1080/00029890.2019.1528121

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00029890.2019.1528121>



Published online: 30 Jan 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 72



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Cantor Set Arithmetic

Jayadev S. Athreya, Bruce Reznick, and Jeremy T. Tyson

Abstract. Every element u of $[0, 1]$ can be written in the form $u = x^2y$, where x, y are elements of the Cantor set C . In particular, every real number between zero and one is the product of three elements of the Cantor set. On the other hand, the set of real numbers v that can be written in the form $v = xy$ with x and y in C is a closed subset of $[0, 1]$ with Lebesgue measure strictly between $\frac{17}{21}$ and $\frac{8}{9}$. We also describe the structure of the quotient of C by itself, that is, the image of $C \times (C \setminus \{0\})$ under the function $f(x, y) = x/y$.

1. INTRODUCTION. One of the first exotic mathematical objects encountered by the post-calculus student is the Cantor set

$$C = \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \alpha_k 3^{-k}, \alpha_k \in \{0, 2\} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

(See Section 2 for several equivalent definitions of C .) One of its most beautiful properties is that

$$C + C := \{x + y : x, y \in C\} \quad (2)$$

is equal to $[0, 2]$. (The whole interval is produced by adding dust to itself!)

The first published proof of (2) was by Steinhaus [10] in 1917. The result was later rediscovered by John Randolph, whose paper appeared in this MONTHLY in 1940 [7]. The proof given here is due to Shallit [9] in 1991, and greatly simplifies Randolph's.

We remind the reader of the beautiful constructive proof of (2). It is enough to prove the containment $C + C \supset [0, 2]$. Given $u \in [0, 2]$, consider the ternary representation for $u/2$:

$$\frac{u}{2} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon_k}{3^k}, \quad \epsilon_k \in \{0, 1, 2\}. \quad (3)$$

Define pairs (α_k, β_k) to be $(0, 0)$, $(2, 0)$, $(2, 2)$ according to whether $\epsilon_k = 0, 1, 2$, respectively, and define elements $x, y \in C$ by

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_k}{3^k}, \quad y = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta_k}{3^k}. \quad (4)$$

Since $\alpha_k + \beta_k = 2\epsilon_k$, $x + y = 2 \cdot \frac{u}{2} = u$.

While presenting this proof in a class, one of the authors (BR) wondered what would happen if addition were replaced by other arithmetic operations. Another author (JT) immediately pointed out that subtraction is easy, because of a symmetry of C :

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon_k}{3^k} \in C \iff 1 - x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2 - \epsilon_k}{3^k} \in C.$$

doi.org/10.1080/00029890.2018.1528121

MSC: Primary 28A80, Secondary 11K55

Thus

$$C - C := \{x - y : x, y \in C\} = \{x - (1 - z) : x, z \in C\} = C + C - 1 = [-1, 1].$$

More generally, to understand the structure of linear combinations $aC + bC$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, it suffices to consider the case $a = 1$ and $0 \leq b \leq 1$. (If $a > b > 0$, then $aC + bC = a(C + (b/a)C)$; the remaining cases are left to the reader.) The precise structure of the linear combination set

$$aC + bC$$

was obtained by Pawłowicz [6], who extended an earlier result by Utz [13], published in this MONTHLY in 1951. Utz's result states that

$$C + bC = [0, 1 + b] \quad \text{for every } \frac{1}{3} \leq b \leq 3. \quad (5)$$

Multiplication is trickier. The inclusion $C \subset [0, \frac{1}{3}] \cup [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$ implies that any element of the interval $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{4}{9})$ cannot be written as a product of two elements from C . Thus the measure of the product of C with itself is at most $\frac{8}{9}$. This paper grew out of a study of multiplication on C . Arithmetic products of Cantor sets have been studied by Takahashi [11, 12]. Products of Cantor sets arise as spectra of certain two-dimensional quasicrystal models; see [11] for details.

In this paper we will prove the following results.

Theorem 1.

1. Every $u \in [0, 1]$ can be written as $u = x^2y$ for some $x, y \in C$.
2. The set of quotients from C can be described as follows:

$$\left\{ \frac{x}{y} : x, y \in C, y \neq 0 \right\} = \bigcup_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{2}{3} \cdot 3^m, \frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^m \right]. \quad (6)$$

3. The set $\{xy : x, y \in C\}$ is a closed set with Lebesgue measure strictly greater than $\frac{17}{21}$.

In particular, part (1) of Theorem 1 implies that every real number in the interval $[0, 1]$ is the product of three elements of C . Jeff Shallit independently conjectured part (2) in 2011.

In words, (6) says that each positive real number is a quotient of two elements of the Cantor set if and only if either the left-most nonzero digit in the ternary representation of u is “2,” or the left-most nonzero digit is “1,” but the first subsequent non-“1” digit is “0,” not “2.”

This paper is organized as follows. We begin in Section 2 with several different descriptions of the Cantor set, and then the key tools, all of which are accessible to students in a good undergraduate analysis class. As a warmup, we begin Section 3 by using these tools to give a short proof of Utz's result (5) in Section 3. The remainder of Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. Sprinkled throughout are relevant open questions. This article began as a standard research paper, but we realized that many of our main results might be of interest to a wider audience. In Section 4, we discuss some of our other results, which will be published elsewhere, with different combinations of coauthors.

2. TOOLS. We begin by recalling several equivalent and well-known definitions of the Cantor set. See Fléron [3] and the references within for an excellent overview of the history of the Cantor set and the context in which several of these definitions first arose.

The standard ternary representation of a real number x in $[0, 1]$ is

$$x = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_k(x)}{3^k}, \quad \alpha_k(x) \in \{0, 1, 2\}. \quad (7)$$

This representation is unique, except for the *ternary rationals*, $\{\frac{m}{3^n}, m, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, which have two ternary representations. Supposing $\alpha_n > 0$ and $m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, so that $\alpha_n \in \{1, 2\}$ below, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m}{3^n} &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{3^k} + \frac{\alpha_n}{3^n} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{0}{3^k} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\alpha_k}{3^k} + \frac{\alpha_n - 1}{3^n} + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{3^k}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The *Cantor set* C consists those $x \in [0, 1]$ admitting a ternary representation as in (7) with $\alpha_k(x) \in \{0, 2\}$ for all k . Note that C also contains those ternary rationals as in (8) whose final digit is “1.” These may be transformed as above into a representation in which $\alpha_n(x) = 0$ and $\alpha_k(x) = 2$ for $k > n$. As noted earlier, $x \in C$ if and only if $1 - x \in C$. Further, if $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$x \in C \implies 3^{-k}x \in C. \quad (9)$$

This definition arises in dynamical systems, as the Cantor set C can be viewed as an invariant set for the map $x \mapsto 3x \pmod{1}$, or equivalently, as the image of an invariant set C' for the one-sided shift map σ acting on $\Omega = \{0, 1, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. Given a sequence $\omega = (\omega_n)_{n=1}^{\infty} = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots)$ in Ω ,

$$\sigma\omega = (\omega_2, \omega_3, \dots).$$

Letting $C' = \{0, 2\}^{\mathbb{N}} \subset \Omega$, we realize the Cantor set C as the image of C' under the coding map $T : \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by

$$T(\omega) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \omega_n 3^{-n}.$$

We now present the usual “middle-third” definition of the Cantor set: Define $C_n = \{x : \alpha_k(x) \in \{0, 2\}, 1 \leq k \leq n\}$, which is a union of 2^n closed intervals of length 3^{-n} , written as

$$C_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^n} I_{n,i}. \quad (10)$$

The left-hand endpoints of the $I_{n,i}$'s comprise the set

$$\left\{ \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\epsilon_k}{3^k} : \epsilon_k \in \{0, 2\} \right\}. \quad (11)$$

The right-hand endpoints have “1” as their final nonzero ternary digit when written as a finite ternary expansion.

The more direct definition of C is as a nested intersection of closed sets:

$$C = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n; \quad C_1 \supset C_2 \supset C_3 \supset \dots \quad (12)$$

This definition is standard in fractal geometry, where the Cantor set C is seen as the invariant set for the pair of contractive linear mappings $f_1(x) = \frac{1}{3}x$ and $f_2(x) = \frac{1}{3}x + \frac{2}{3}$ acting on the real line. That is, C is the unique nonempty compact set that is fully invariant under f_1 and f_2 :

$$C = f_1(C) \cup f_2(C).$$

Observe that each “parent” interval $I_{n,i} = [a, a + \frac{1}{3^n}]$ in C_n has two “child” intervals

$$I_{n+1,2i-1} = [a, a + \frac{1}{3^{n+1}}], \quad I_{n+1,2i} = [a + \frac{2}{3^{n+1}}, a + \frac{3}{3^{n+1}}] \quad (13)$$

in C_{n+1} , and C_{n+1} is the union of all children intervals whose parents are in C_n .

It is useful to introduce the following notation to represent the omission of the middle third:

$$I = [a, a + 3t] \implies \ddot{I} = [a, a + t] \cup [a + 2t, a + 3t]. \quad (14)$$

Using this notation,

$$C_{n+1} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^{n+1}} I_{n+1,i} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{2^n} \ddot{I}_{n,i}. \quad (15)$$

It will also be useful, for studying products and quotients, to give a third definition. Let $\tilde{C} = C \cap [1/2, 1] = C \cap [2/3, 1] = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3} \cdot C$. Then by examining the smallest k for which $\epsilon_k = 2$, we see that

$$C = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} 3^{-k} \tilde{C}. \quad (16)$$

Similarly, let $\tilde{C}_n = C_n \cap [1/2, 1]$, consisting of 2^{n-1} closed intervals of length 3^{-n} :

$$\tilde{C}_n = \bigcup_{i=2^{n-1}+1}^{2^n} I_{n,i}. \quad (17)$$

Then

$$\tilde{C} = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{C}_n. \quad (18)$$

And, analogously,

$$\tilde{C}_{n+1} = \bigcup_{i=2^{n+1}}^{2^{n+1}+1} I_{n+1,i} = \bigcup_{i=2^{n-1}+1}^{2^n} \ddot{I}_{n,i}. \quad (19)$$

By looking at the left-hand endpoints, we see that each interval $I_{n,i} \neq [0, \frac{1}{3^n}]$ can be written as $\frac{1}{3^{n-k}}I_{k,j}$ for some $I_{k,j} \in \tilde{C}_k$; hence

$$C_n = \left[0, \frac{1}{3^n}\right] \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{3^{n-k}}\tilde{C}_k. \quad (20)$$

The keys to our method lie in two lemmas which might appear on a first serious analysis exam. (Please do not send such exams to the authors!)

Lemma 2. *Suppose $\{K_i\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ are nonempty compact sets, $K_1 \supseteq K_2 \supseteq K_3 \supseteq \dots$, and $K = \bigcap K_i$.*

(i) *If $(x_j) \rightarrow x$, $x_j \in K_j$, then $x \in K$.*

(ii) *If $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, then $F(K^m) = \bigcap F(K_i^m)$.*

Proof. (i). If $x \notin K$, then $x \notin K_r$ for some r . Since K_r^c is open, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ so that $(x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon) \subseteq K_r^c \subseteq K_{r+1}^c \dots$ and hence $|x_j - x| \geq \epsilon$ for $j \geq r$, a contradiction to $x_j \rightarrow x$.

(ii). Since $K \subseteq K_i$, we have $F(K^m) \subseteq \bigcap F(K_i^m)$. Conversely, suppose $u \in \bigcap F(K_i^m)$. We need to find $x \in K^m$ such that $F(x) = u$. For each i , choose $x_i = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,m}) \in K_i^m$ so that $F(x_i) = u$. Since K_1^m is compact, the Bolzano–Weierstrass theorem implies that the sequence (x_i) has a convergent subsequence $x_{r_j} = (x_{r_j,1}, \dots, x_{r_j,m}) \rightarrow y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$. Applying (i) to the subsequence $K_{r_1} \supseteq K_{r_2} \supseteq K_{r_3} \supseteq \dots$, we see that each $y_k \in K$ and since F is continuous, $F(y) = u$, as desired. ■

If we perform the middle-third construction with an initial interval of $[a, b]$, it is easy to see that the limiting object is a translate of the Cantor set, specifically $C_{a,b} := a + (b - a)C$.

Lemma 3. *Suppose $F : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous, and suppose that for every choice of disjoint or identical subintervals $I_k \subset [a, b]$ of common length,*

$$F(I_1, \dots, I_m) = F(\ddot{I}_1, \dots, \ddot{I}_m). \quad (21)$$

Then $F(C_{a,b}^m) = F([a, b]^m)$.

Proof. We prove the result for $[a, b] = [0, 1]$; the result follows generally by composing F with an appropriate linear function. Let

$$C_k = \bigcup_{j=1}^{2^k} I_{k,j}, \quad (22)$$

where each interval $I_{k,j}$ has length 3^{-k} . It follows that

$$F(C_k^m) = \bigcup_{1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_m \leq 2^k} F(I_{k,j_1}, \dots, I_{k,j_m}), \quad (23)$$

where for each pair (ℓ, ℓ') , I_{k,j_ℓ} and $I_{k,j_{\ell'}}$ are either identical or disjoint. Since

$$C_{k+1} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{2^k} \ddot{I}_{k,j}, \quad (24)$$

the hypothesis implies that $F(C_k^m) = F(C_{k+1}^m)$, and the result then follows from [Lemma 2\(ii\)](#). ■

We only apply [Lemma 3](#) in the cases that $m = 2$ and $[a, b] = [0, 1]$ and $[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$. (In the latter case, when $F(x, y) = xy$ or x/y , it is helpful to have control of the ratio x/y .)

3. ARITHMETIC ON THE CANTOR SET.

Addition and subtraction. Sums and differences of Cantor sets have been widely studied in connection with dynamical systems. In this section we give a brief proof of the following result of Utz [\[13\]](#). Further information about sums of Cantor sets can be found in [\[1, 2\]](#).

Theorem 4 (Utz). *If $\lambda \in [\frac{1}{3}, 3]$, then every element u in $[0, 1 + \lambda]$ can be written in the form $u = x + \lambda y$ for $x, y \in C$.*

We include this proof in order to introduce the main ideas in the proof of [Theorem 1](#) in a simpler context. The key tool is [Lemma 3](#).

Let $f_\lambda(x, y) = x + \lambda y$; we wish to show that $f_\lambda(C^2) = [0, 1 + \lambda]$. Observe that $C + \lambda C = \lambda(C + \lambda^{-1}C)$ for $\lambda \neq 0$, so it suffices to consider $\frac{1}{3} \leq \lambda \leq 1$.

Proof. We apply [Lemma 3](#) and show that for any two closed intervals I_1, I_2 of the same length in $[a, b]$, $f_\lambda(I_1, I_2) = f_\lambda(\ddot{I}_1, \ddot{I}_2)$. For clarity, we write $I_1 = [r, r + 3t]$, $I_2 = [s, s + 3t]$, and $w = r + \lambda s$, so that $f_\lambda(I_1, I_2) = [w, w + 3(1 + \lambda)t]$.

Observe that $\ddot{I}_1 = [r, r + t] \cup [r + 2t, r + 3t]$ and $\ddot{I}_2 = [s, s + t] \cup [s + 2t, s + 3t]$, so

$$f_\lambda(\ddot{I}_1, \ddot{I}_2) = ([w, w + (1 + \lambda)t] \cup [w + 2\lambda t, w + (1 + 3\lambda)t]) \cup ([w + 2t, w + (3 + \lambda)t] \cup [w + (2 + 2\lambda)t, w + (3 + 3\lambda)t]). \quad (25)$$

Since $\lambda \leq 1$, $1 + \lambda \geq 2\lambda$, and $3 + \lambda \geq 2 + 2\lambda$, the pairs of intervals coalesce into

$$f_\lambda(\ddot{I}_1, \ddot{I}_2) = [w, w + (1 + 3\lambda)t] \cup [w + 2t, w + (3 + 3\lambda)t]. \quad (26)$$

Since $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{3}$, we have $2 \leq 1 + 3\lambda$. Hence $f_\lambda(\ddot{I}_1, \ddot{I}_2) = f_\lambda(I_1, I_2)$, completing the proof. ■

Remark 1. Unlike the folklore proof for $\lambda = 1$, there seems to be no obvious algorithmic proof, save for $\lambda = \frac{1}{3}$. In this case, suppose $u \in [0, \frac{4}{3}]$. If $u = \frac{4}{3}$, then $u = 1 + \frac{1}{3} \cdot 1 \in C + \frac{1}{3}C$. If $u < \frac{4}{3}$, then we can write $u = x + y$, $x, y \in C$, and assume $x \geq y$. Since $y \leq \frac{u}{2} < \frac{2}{3}$ is in C , $y \leq \frac{1}{3}$; hence $y = \frac{1}{3}z$, $z \in C$. This produces the desired construction.

The case of subtraction, that is, the case of f_λ when $\lambda < 0$, is easily handled.

Theorem 5. *If $\beta = -\lambda < 0$, then*

$$f_\beta(C^2) = -\lambda + f_\lambda(C^2). \quad (27)$$

Proof. If $\beta < 0$, $x, y \in C$, we have

$$x + \beta y = x + \beta(1 - z) = -\lambda + x + \lambda z \quad (28)$$

for x and z in C . ■

Remark 2. Arithmetic sums of Cantor sets and more general compact sets have been studied intensively. For instance, Mendes and Oliveira [5] discuss the topological structure of sums of Cantor sets, while Schmeling and Shmerkin [8] characterize those nondecreasing sequences $0 \leq d_1 \leq d_2 \leq d_3 \leq \dots \leq 1$ that can arise as the sequence of Hausdorff dimensions of iterated sumsets $A, A + A, A + A + A, \dots$ for a compact subset A of \mathbb{R} . Recent work of Gorodetski and Northrup [4] involves the Lebesgue measure of sumsets of Cantor sets and other compact subsets of the real line. We refer the interested reader to these papers and the references therein for more information.

Multiplication. We let $f(x, y) = x^2y$ and shall show that $f(C^2) = [0, 1]$. We begin by showing that it suffices to consider $f(\tilde{C}^2)$.

Lemma 6. *If $f(\tilde{C}^2) = [\frac{8}{27}, 1]$, then $f(C^2) = [0, 1]$.*

Proof. Suppose $u \in [0, 1]$. If $u = 0$, then $u = 0^2 \cdot 0$. If $u > 0$, then there exists a unique integer $r \geq 0$ so that $u = 3^{-r}v$, where $v \in (\frac{1}{3}, 1]$. Since $\frac{8}{27} < \frac{1}{3}$, $v = x^2y$ for $x, y \in \tilde{C} \subset C$, and since $x, 3^{-r}y \in C$, $u = x^2(3^{-r}y)$ is the desired representation. ■

Accordingly, we confine our attention to \tilde{C} .

Lemma 7. *If $I = [a, a + 3t]$ and $J = [b, b + 3t]$ are in $[\frac{2}{3}, 1]$, then $f(I, J) = f(\tilde{I}, \tilde{J})$.*

Proof. We first define

$$\begin{aligned} [a^2b, (a+t)^2(b+t)] &=: [u_1, v_1]; \\ [a^2(b+2t), (a+t)^2(b+3t)] &=: [u_2, v_2]; \\ [(a+2t)^2b, (a+3t)^2(b+t)] &=: [u_3, v_3]; \\ [(a+2t)^2(b+2t), (a+3t)^2(b+3t)] &=: [u_4, v_4]. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Evidently, $f(I, J) = [u_1, v_4]$, and also $u_1 < u_2, v_1 < v_2$, and $u_3 < u_4, v_3 < v_4$. If we can first show that $v_1 > u_2$ and $v_3 > u_4$, then $[u_1, v_1] \cup [u_2, v_2] = [u_1, v_2]$ and $[u_3, v_3] \cup [u_4, v_4] = [u_3, v_4]$. Second, since $u_1 < u_3$ and $v_2 < v_4$, if we can show that $v_2 > u_3$, then $[u_1, v_2] \cup [u_3, v_4] = [u_1, v_4]$, and the proof will be complete.

We compute

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 - u_2 &= a(2b - a)t + (2a + b)t^2 + t^3; \\ v_2 - u_3 &= a(3a - 2b)t + (6a - 3b)t^2 + 3t^3; \\ v_3 - u_4 &= a(2b - a)t + (5b - 2a)t^2 + t^3. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Since $2b - a \geq 2 \cdot \frac{2}{3} - 1 > 0$, $3a - 2b \geq 3 \cdot \frac{2}{3} - 2 \geq 0$, $6a - 3b \geq 6 \cdot \frac{2}{3} - 3 > 0$, and $5b - 2a \geq 5 \cdot \frac{2}{3} - 2 > 0$, each of the quantities in (30) is positive and the proof is complete. ■

Theorem 8.

$$f(\tilde{C}^2) = [\frac{8}{27}, 1]. \tag{31}$$

Proof. Apply [Lemma 3](#), noting that $f([\frac{2}{3}, 1]^2) = [\frac{8}{27}, 1]$. ■

Remark 3. Observe that $u \in [0, 1]$, written as x^2y , where $x, y \in C$, is also $x \cdot x \cdot y$, so this implies that every element in $[0, 1]$ is a product of three elements from the Cantor set. (This can also be proved in a more ungainly way, by taking $m = 3$ in [Lemma 3](#) with $f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1x_2x_3$.)

Remark 4. We do not know an algorithm for expressing $u \in [0, 1]$ in the form of x^2y or $x_1x_2x_3$ as a product of elements of the Cantor set.

Remark 5. More generally, one can look at $f_{a,b}(C^2)$ where $f_{a,b}(x, y) := x^a y^b$. Since $u = x^a y^b$ if and only if $u^{1/a} = xy^{b/a}$, for $u \in (0, 1)$, it suffices to consider $a = 1$. By looking at $C_1 = [0, \frac{1}{3}] \cup [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$, it is not hard to see that if $f(x, y) = xy^t$, $t \geq 1$, and $(\frac{2}{3})^{1+t} > \frac{1}{3}$, then $f(C_1^2)$ is already missing an interval from $[0, 1]$. This condition occurs when $t < \frac{\log 2}{\log 3/2} \approx 1.7095$.

Remark 6. By taking logarithms, we can convert the question about products of elements of C into a question about sums. (We can omit the point 0 since its multiplicative behavior is trivial.) Of course, the underlying set is no longer the standard self-similar Cantor set but is a more general (“nonlinear”) closed subset of \mathbb{R} . Some conclusions about the number of factors needed to recover all of $[0, 1]$ can be obtained from the general results in the papers of Cabrelli–Hare–Molter [\[1, 2\]](#), but it does not appear that one obtains the precise conclusion of part 2 of [Theorem 1](#) in this fashion.

Division. In this section, we complete our arithmetic discussion by considering quotients.

Theorem 9.

$$\left\{ \frac{u}{v} : u, v \in C \right\} = \bigcup_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\frac{2}{3} \cdot 3^m, \frac{3}{2} \cdot 3^m \right]. \quad (32)$$

Proof. As with multiplication, it suffices to consider \tilde{C} .

Lemma 10. *Theorem 9 is implied by the identity*

$$\left\{ \frac{u}{v} : u, v \in \tilde{C} \right\} = \left[\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{2} \right]. \quad (33)$$

Proof. Write $u, v \in C$ as $u = 3^{-s}\tilde{u}$, $v = 3^{-t}\tilde{v}$ for integers $c, d \geq 0$ and $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in \tilde{C}$. Then $u/v = 3^{d-c}\tilde{u}/\tilde{v}$, where $m = d - c$ can attain any integer value. ■

We now prove (33). Consider $\tilde{C}_1 = [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$ and apply [Lemma 3](#). Clearly, $\{\frac{u}{v} : u, v \in \tilde{C}_1\} = [\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{2}]$. Consider two intervals in \tilde{C}_n , $I_1 = [a, a + 3t]$ and $I_2 = [b, b + 3t]$. These intervals are either identical or disjoint. Since $x = \frac{u}{v}$ implies $\frac{1}{x} = \frac{v}{u}$, there is no harm in assuming $a \leq b$, and either $I_1 = I_2$ and $a = b$, or the intervals are disjoint and $a + 3t \leq b$. The quotients from these intervals will lie in

$$J_0 := \left[\frac{a}{b + 3t}, \frac{a + 3t}{b} \right] := [r_0, s_0].$$

Since $\ddot{I}_1 = [a, a + t] \cup [a + 2t, a + 3t]$ and $\ddot{I}_2 = [b, b + t] \cup [b + 2t, b + 3t]$, we obtain four subintervals

$$J_1 = \left[\frac{a}{b + 3t}, \frac{a + t}{b + 2t} \right] = [r_1, s_1],$$

$$J_2 = \left[\frac{a}{b + t}, \frac{a + t}{b} \right] = [r_2, s_2],$$

$$J_3 = \left[\frac{a + 2t}{b + 3t}, \frac{a + 3t}{b + 2t} \right] = [r_3, s_3],$$

$$J_4 = \left[\frac{a + 2t}{b + t}, \frac{a + 3t}{b} \right] = [r_4, s_4].$$

We need to see how $J_0 = J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_3 \cup J_4$. There are two cases, depending on whether $a = b$ or $a < b$.

We first record some algebraic relations. We have $r_1 = r_0$ and $s_4 = s_0$, and, evidently, $r_1 < r_2, s_1 < s_2, r_3 < r_4, s_3 < s_4$. Further,

$$\begin{aligned} r_3 - r_2 &= \frac{a + 2t}{b + 3t} - \frac{a}{b + t} = \frac{2t(b - a + t)}{(b + t)(b + 3t)}, \\ s_3 - s_2 &= \frac{a + 3t}{b + 2t} - \frac{a + t}{b} = \frac{2t(b - a - t)}{b(b + 2t)}, \\ s_1 - r_2 &= \frac{a + t}{b + 2t} - \frac{a}{b + t} = \frac{t(b - a + t)}{(b + t)(b + 2t)}, \\ s_2 - r_3 &= \frac{a + t}{b} - \frac{a + 2t}{b + 3t} = \frac{t(3a + 3t - b)}{b(b + 3t)} \geq \frac{t(3 \cdot \frac{2}{3} + 0 - 1)}{b(b + 3t)} > 0, \\ s_3 - r_4 &= \frac{a + 3t}{b + 2t} - \frac{a + 2t}{b + t} = \frac{t(b - a - t)}{(b + t)(b + 2t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose first that $a < b$, so $a + 3t < b$. Then each of the differences above is positive, so $r_1 < r_2 < r_3 < r_4$ and $s_1 < s_2 < s_3 < s_4$; further, the intervals overlap: $s_1 > r_2, s_2 > r_3$, and $s_3 > r_4$. Thus $J_0 = J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_3 \cup J_4$.

If $a = b$, then $J_3 = \left[\frac{a+2t}{a+3t}, \frac{a+3t}{a+2t} \right] \subset \left[\frac{a}{a+t}, \frac{a+t}{a} \right] = J_2$, so we may drop J_3 from consideration. We have $r_1 < r_2 < r_4$ and $s_1 < s_2 < s_4$ and need only show that $s_1 > r_2$ and $s_2 > r_4$. The first is clear, and for the second,

$$s_2 - r_4 = \frac{a + t}{a} - \frac{a + 2t}{a + t} = \frac{t^2}{a(a + t)} > 0, \tag{34}$$

so $J_0 = J_1 \cup J_2 \cup J_4$, and we are done. ■

Remark 7. We do not know an algorithm for expressing a feasible u as a quotient of elements in C .

Multiplication, revisited. Let $g(x, y) = xy$. As noted earlier, $g(C^2)$ is not the full interval $[0, 1]$, though $g(C^2) = \bigcap g(C_i^2)$ is the intersection of a descending chain of closed sets and so is closed. In order to gain some information about $g(C^2)$, we look carefully at how [Lemma 3](#) fails.

Lemma 11. Let $I = [a, a + 3t]$ and $J = [b, b + 3t]$, with $\frac{2}{3} \leq a \leq b \leq 1$, be either identical or disjoint intervals. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a < b &\implies g(\ddot{I}, \ddot{J}) = g(I, J); \\ a = b &\implies g(\ddot{I}, \ddot{I}) = g(I, I) \setminus ((a + 2t)^2 - t^2, (a + 2t)^2). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We have

$$g([a, a + 3t], [b, b + 3t]) = [ab, ab + 3(a + b)t + 9t^2]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &g([a, a + t] \cup [a + 2t, a + 3t], [b, b + t] \cup [b + 2t, b + 3t]) \\ &= [ab, ab + (a + b)t + t^2] \cup [ab + 2at, ab + (3a + b)t + 3t^2] \\ &\quad \cup [ab + 2bt, ab + (a + 3b)t + 3t^2] \\ &\quad \cup [ab + (2a + 2b)t + 4t^2, ab + 3(a + b)t + 9t^2]. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Since $a \leq b$, it follows that $ab + 2at \leq ab + (a + b)t + t^2$, and the first two intervals coalesce into $[ab, ab + (3a + b)t + 3t^2]$.

Suppose that $a < b$, and recall that we have assumed $\frac{2}{3} \leq a < b \leq 1$. Since $a + t \leq b$, it follows that $ab + (2a + 2b)t + 4t^2 \leq ab + (a + 3b)t + 3t^2$ and the last two intervals coalesce into $[ab + 2bt, ab + 3(a + b)t + 9t^2]$. Thus the right-hand side of (35) reduces to

$$[ab, ab + (3a + b)t + 3t^2] \cup [ab + 2bt, ab + 3(a + b)t + 9t^2]. \tag{36}$$

Moreover,

$$ab + (3a + b)t + 3t^2 - (ab + 2bt) = t(3a + 3t - b) \geq t(3 \cdot \frac{2}{3} + 0 - 1) = t \geq 0,$$

which shows that the pair of intervals in (36) coalesces to a single interval. This proves the first statement.

If $a = b$, then the middle two intervals in (35) are the same, and

$$\begin{aligned} &g([a, a + t] \cup [a + 2t, a + 3t])^2 \\ &= [a^2, a^2 + 4at + 3t^2] \cup [a^2 + 4at + 4t^2, a^2 + 6at + 9t^2] \\ &= [a^2, (a + 3t)^2] \setminus ((a + 2t)^2 - t^2, (a + 2t)^2). \end{aligned}$$

■

This leads to the following estimate for the Lebesgue measure of $g(C^2)$.

Theorem 12.

$$\mu(g(C^2)) \geq \frac{17}{21}.$$

Proof. First note that $g(\tilde{C}^2) \subset g(\tilde{C}_1^2) = [\frac{4}{9}, 1]$. It follows as before

$$g(C^2) = \{0\} \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} 3^{-k} g(\tilde{C}^2), \tag{37}$$

and since $\frac{1}{3} < \frac{4}{9}$, the sets $3^{-k}g(\tilde{C}^2)$ are disjoint. Therefore,

$$\mu(g(C^2)) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 3^{-k} \mu(g(\tilde{C}^2)) = \frac{3}{2} \mu(g(\tilde{C}^2)). \quad (38)$$

Since \tilde{C}_n consists of 2^{n-1} intervals of length 3^{-n} , it follows from [Lemma 11](#) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(g(\tilde{C}_{n+1}^2)) &\geq \mu(g(\tilde{C}_n^2)) - \frac{2^{n-1}}{3^{2n+2}} \\ \implies \mu(g(\tilde{C}^2)) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{4}{9}\right) - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{n-1}}{3^{2n+2}} = \frac{34}{63} \\ \implies \mu(g(C^2)) &\geq \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{34}{63} = \frac{17}{21}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

■

Remark 8. This argument shows that for all m ,

$$\mu(g(\tilde{C}_m^2)) \geq \mu(g(\tilde{C}^2)) \geq \mu(g(\tilde{C}_m^2)) - \sum_{n=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{n-1}}{3^{2n+2}}. \quad (40)$$

The reason that [Theorem 12](#) is only an estimate is that there is no guarantee that intervals missing from $f(\tilde{I}^2)$ cannot be covered elsewhere. The first instance in which this occurs is for $n = 4$: one of the intervals in \tilde{C}_4 is $I_0 = [\frac{62}{81}, \frac{63}{81}] = [.2022_3, .21_3]$. By [Lemma 11](#),

$$\left(\frac{188^2-1}{243^2}, \frac{188^2}{243^2}\right) = \left(\frac{35343}{59049}, \frac{35344}{59049}\right) \approx (.5985368, .5985537) \notin f(\tilde{I}_0^2). \quad (41)$$

However, \tilde{C}_5 contains the intervals

$$J_1 = \left[\frac{162}{243}, \frac{163}{243}\right] = [.2_3, .20001_3], \quad J_2 = \left[\frac{216}{243}, \frac{217}{243}\right] = [.22_3, .22001_3], \quad (42)$$

and

$$J_1 J_2 = \left[\frac{34992}{59049}, \frac{35371}{59049}\right] \approx (.5925926, .59901099)$$

covers the otherwise-missing interval. A more detailed *Mathematica* computation, using $m = 11$, gives the first eight decimal digits for $\mu(g(C^2))$:

$$\mu(g(C^2)) = .80955358 \dots \approx \frac{17}{21} + 2.97 \times 10^{-5}. \quad (43)$$

4. FINAL REMARKS. As mentioned in the introduction, this paper is part of a larger project. We discuss a few results from this project whose proofs will appear elsewhere, written by various combinations of the authors and their students.

Self-similar Cantor sets. The Cantor set easily generalizes to sets defined with different “middle-fractions” removed. Consider the self-similar Cantor set $D^{(t)}$ obtained as the invariant set for the pair of contractive mappings

$$f_1(x) = tx, \quad f_2(x) = tx + (1 - t)$$

acting on the real line. Thus

$$D^{(t)} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} D_n^{(t)},$$

where, for each $n \geq 0$, $D_n^{(t)}$ is a union of 2^n intervals, each of length t^n , contained in $[0, 1]$. For instance,

$$D_1^{(t)} = [0, t] \cup [1 - t, 1],$$

$$D_2^{(t)} = [0, t^2] \cup [t(1 - t), t] \cup [1 - t, 1 - t + t^2] \cup [1 - t^2, 1].$$

For an integer $m \geq 2$, let t_m be the unique solution to $(1 - t)^m = t$ in $[0, 1]$. Then

$$\dots < t_4 < t_3 < t_2 < \frac{1}{2}$$

and $t_m \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Numerical values are

$$t_2 = \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 0.381966\dots$$

$$t_3 \approx 0.317672\dots$$

$$t_4 \approx 0.275508\dots$$

$$t_5 \approx 0.245122\dots$$

$$t_6 \approx 0.22191\dots$$

$$t_7 \approx 0.203456\dots$$

If we choose t such that $t_m \leq t < t_{m-1}$ (that is, $(1 - t)^m \leq t < (1 - t)^{m-1}$) and let $g_n(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$, then

$$g_m((D^{(t)})^m) = [0, 1],$$

but $g_{m-1}((D^{(t)})^{m-1})$ has Lebesgue measure strictly less than one. In particular, if a Cantor set D in which a middle fraction λ is taken with $\lambda \leq 1 - 2t_2 = \sqrt{5} - 2 \approx .23607$, then every element in $[0, 1]$ can be written as a product of two elements of D .

Number theory. There is much more to be said about the representation of specific numbers in C/C . For example, if $v = 2u$ for $u, v \in C$, then

$$u = \frac{1}{3^n}, v = \frac{2}{3^n}, \quad n \geq 1;$$

if $v = 11u$ for $u, v \in C$, then

$$u = \frac{1}{4 \cdot 3^n}, v = \frac{11}{4 \cdot 3^n}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

By contrast, if $v = 4u$ for $u, v \in C$, then there exists a finite or infinite sequence of integers (n_k) with $n_1 \geq 2$ and $n_{k+1} - n_k \geq 2$, so that

$$u = \sum_k \frac{2}{3^{n_k}}, \quad v = \sum_k \left(\frac{2}{3^{n_{k-1}}} + \frac{2}{3^{n_k}} \right).$$

The proof of the second result is trickier than the other two.

We also mention a conjecture for which there is strong numerical evidence.

Conjecture 13. *Every $u \in [0, 1]$ can be written as $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2$, $x_i \in C$.*

We need a minimum of four squares, since $(\frac{1}{3})^2 + (\frac{1}{3})^2 + (\frac{1}{3})^2 < (\frac{2}{3})^2$, so the open interval $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{4}{9})$ will be missing from the sum of three squares.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. The authors wish to thank the referees and editors for their rapid, sympathetic, and extremely useful suggestions for improving the manuscript. We also thank Jeff Shallit and Yuki Takahashi for providing additional references. B.R. wants to thank Professor W. A. J. Luxemburg (1929–2018) for his course Math 108 at Caltech in 1970–1971, which introduced him to the beauties of analysis. J.S.A. was supported by NSF CAREER grant DMS-1559860 and NSF grants DMS-1069153, DMS-1107452, DMS-1107263, and DMS-1107367. B.R. was supported by Simons Collaboration Grant 280987. J.T.T. was supported by NSF grants DMS-1201875 and DMS-1600650 and Simons Collaboration Grant 353627.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cabrelli, C. A., Hare, K. E., Molter, U. M. (1997). Sums of Cantor sets. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Syst.* 17(6): 1299–1313.
- [2] Cabrelli, C. A., Hare, K. E., Molter, U. M. (2002). Sums of Cantor sets yielding an interval. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* 73(3): 405–418.
- [3] Fleron, J. F. (1994). A note on the history of the Cantor set and Cantor function. *Math. Mag.* 67(2): 136–140.
- [4] Gorodetski, A., Northrup, S. (2015). On sums of nearly affine Cantor sets. Preprint, arxiv.org/pdf/1510.07008.pdf
- [5] Mendes, P., Oliveira, F. (1994). On the topological structure of the arithmetic sum of two Cantor sets. *Nonlinearity.* 7(2): 329–343.
- [6] Pawłowicz, M. (2013). Linear combinations of the classic Cantor set. *Tatra Mt. Math. Publ.* 56: 47–60.
- [7] Randolph, J. F. (1940). Distances between points of the Cantor set. *Amer. Math. Monthly.* 47(8): 549–551.
- [8] Schmeling, J., Shmerkin, P. (2010). On the dimension of iterated sumsets. In: Barral, J., Seuret, S., eds. *Recent Developments in Fractals and Related Fields*. Appl. Numer. Harmon. Anal. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., pp. 55–72.
- [9] Shallit, J. (1991) Quickies Q785, A785. *Math. Mag.* 64(5): 351, 357.
- [10] Steinhaus, H. (1917). Mowa Własność Mnogości Cantora. *Wector*, 1–3. (Steinhaus, H. D., trans.) (1985). *Selected Papers*. Warszawa: PWN.
- [11] Takahashi, Y. (2016) Quantum and spectral properties of the Labyrinth model. *J. Math. Phys.* 2016(6): 063506, 14pp.
- [12] Takahashi, Y. (2017) Products of two Cantor sets. *Nonlinearity.* 30(5): 2114–2137
- [13] Utz, W. R. (1951). The distance set for the Cantor discontinuum. *Amer. Math. Monthly.* 58(6): 407–408.

JAYADEV S. ATHREYA received his degrees at Iowa State University (2000) and the University of Chicago (2006). He is the founder of the Illinois Geometry Lab (IGL) and the Washington Experimental Mathematics Lab (WXML), and is currently an Associate Professor at the University of Washington, and the Director of the WXML.

Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195
jathreya@uw.edu

BRUCE REZNICK received his degrees at Caltech (1973) and Stanford (1976) and has been on the faculty of the University of Illinois since 1979. His first publication was Elementary Problem E 2467 in this MONTHLY.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801
reznick@math.uiuc.edu

JEREMY T. TYSON received his degrees from Washington University (1994) and the University of Michigan (1999). He has been a member of the faculty of the University of Illinois since 2002. He served as Director of the Illinois Geometry Lab from 2015 to 2017 and currently serves as Department Chair.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801
tyson@math.uiuc.edu