

## 1 Preliminaries

**Definition 1.** Let  $I_1 = [a_1, b_1]$ ,  $I_2 = [a_2, b_2]$  be intervals that are either both closed or both open in  $\mathbb{R}$ , with  $a_1 \neq b_1$ . Then we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(I_1, I_2) : I_1 &\rightarrow I_2 \\ \Lambda(I_1, I_2) : x &\mapsto (x - a_1) \frac{b_2 - a_2}{b_1 - a_1} + a_2\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 1.** Let  $I_1, I_2$  be intervals as above. Then  $\Lambda(I_1, I_2)$  is increasing. If  $b_2 \neq a_2$ , it is strictly increasing.

*Proof.* Let  $x_1, x_2 \in I_1$  such that  $x_2 > x_1$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(I_1, I_2)(x_2) - \Lambda(I_1, I_2)(x_1) &= (x_2 - a_1) \frac{b_2 - a_2}{b_1 - a_1} + a_2 - (x_1 - a_1) \frac{b_2 - a_2}{b_1 - a_1} + a_2 \\ &= (x_2 - a_1) \frac{b_2 - a_2}{b_1 - a_1} - (x_1 - a_1) \frac{b_2 - a_2}{b_1 - a_1} \\ &= (x_2 - x_1) \frac{b_2 - a_2}{b_1 - a_1} \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

If  $b_2 > a_2$ , this last inequality is strict. □

**Lemma 2.** Let  $I_1, I_2$  be intervals as above. Then if  $b_2 \neq a_2$ ,  $\Lambda(I_1, I_2)$  is invertible (in fact, a homeomorphism). Furthermore,  $\Lambda^{-1}(I_1, I_2) = \Lambda(I_2, I_1)$ .

*Proof.* We prove this directly: let  $x \in I_1$ ,  $y = \Lambda(I_1, I_2)(x)$ . Then

$$y = (x - a_1) \frac{b_2 - a_2}{b_1 - a_1} + a_2 \implies (y - a_2) \frac{b_1 - a_1}{b_2 - a_2} + a_1 = x$$

In other words,  $x = \Lambda^{-1}(I_1, I_2)(y) = \Lambda(I_2, I_1)(y)$ . □

**Definition 2.** Let  $D$  be a closed interval in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then  $\{D_i\}_1^N$  is a ordered partition of  $D$  if:

1. Each  $D_i$  is either open or closed.
2.  $\bigcup_{i=1}^N D_i = D$  and for  $i \neq j$ ,  $D_i \cap D_j$  has at most one point.
3. For  $i = 1, \dots, N - 1$ , the right endpoint of  $D_i$  is the left endpoint of  $D_{i+1}$ .

**Lemma 3.** Let  $D, R$  be closed intervals in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\{D_i\}_1^N, \{R_i\}_1^N$  be ordered partitions of  $D$  and  $R$ , with each  $|D_i| > 0$ . Let  $\Lambda : D \rightarrow R$  be defined as

$$\Lambda(x) = \Lambda(D_i, R_i)(x) \quad \text{for } x \in D_i$$

be a piecewise linear function. Then  $\Lambda$  is well-defined and increasing. If all  $|R_i| > 0$ , then  $\Lambda$  is strictly increasing.

*Proof.* Suppose  $x \in D_i \cap D_j$  for  $i > j$ . Then  $x$  must be the right endpoint of  $D_i$  and the left endpoint of  $D_j$ , so by Definition 1,  $\Lambda(D_i, R_i) = \Lambda(D_j, R_j)$ . So  $\Lambda$  is well-defined.

Then, by Lemma 1,  $\Lambda$  is increasing (or strictly increasing) on each interval.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** Let  $D, R$  be closed intervals in  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\{D_i\}_1^N, \{D'_i\}_1^M$  be ordered partitions of  $D$  such that  $|D_i| > 0$  and  $|D'_i| > 0$  for all  $i$ . Let  $\{R_i\}_1^N, \{R'_i\}_1^M$ , be ordered partitions of  $R$ . Let  $\Lambda' : D \rightarrow R, \Lambda : D \rightarrow R$  be defined as

$$\Lambda(x) = \Lambda(D_i, R_i)(x) \quad \Lambda'(x) = \Lambda(D'_i, R'_i)(x) \quad \text{for } x \in D_i$$

be piecewise linear functions. Then  $|\Lambda(x) - \Lambda'(x)| \leq |R|$  for all  $x \in D$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 3 we have that  $\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda'$  are strictly increasing. Let  $d_1, d_2$  be the endpoints of  $D$ ,  $r_1, r_2$  the endpoints of  $R$ . By construction  $\Lambda(d_1) = \Lambda'(d_1) = r_1$  and  $\Lambda(d_2) = \Lambda'(d_2) = r_2$ . Thus, for any  $x \in D$ ,

$$\Lambda(d_1) = r_1 \leq \Lambda(x) \leq r_2 = \Lambda(d_2) \text{ and } \Lambda'(d_1) = r_1 \leq \Lambda'(x) \leq r_2 = \Lambda'(d_2)$$

Assume WLOG that  $\Lambda'(x) \leq \Lambda(x)$ . Then

$$\Lambda(x) - \Lambda'(x) \leq r_2 - \Lambda'(x) \leq r_2 - r_1 = |R| \quad \square$$

**Definition 3.** We define a Cantor-like sequence to be a sequence  $\{P^i\}_0^\infty$  of ordered partitions of  $[0, 1]$  such that  $P^0$  contains the single interval  $[0, 1]$ , and for all  $i \geq 1$ ,  $P^i$  is defined from  $P^{i-1}$  by replacing each closed interval  $[a, b]$  by the three intervals

$$\left[ a, \frac{b+a-\ell_i}{2} \right] \quad \left( \frac{b+a-\ell_i}{2}, \frac{b+a+\ell_i}{2} \right) \quad \left[ \frac{b+a+\ell_i}{2}, b \right]$$

with  $\ell_i > 0$  chosen such that

$$\ell_1 + 2\ell_2 + 4\ell_3 + \dots + 2^{i-1}\ell_i + \dots \leq 1$$

**Definition 4.** Let  $\{P^i\}_0^\infty$  be a Cantor-like sequence. Define a new sequence  $\{C^i\}_1^\infty$  by

$$C^i = \bigcup_{j=0}^{\infty} P_{2^j}^i \quad i = 0, 1, \dots$$

so that each  $C^i$  is the union of the closed sets in  $P^i$ . Then

$$\mathcal{C} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} C_i$$

is a Cantor-like set.

**Remark.** Choosing  $\ell_i = 1/3^i$  gives us the traditional “remove one-third” Cantor set. Choosing  $\ell_i = 1/2^{2^i}$  gives us the Smith–Volterra–Cantor “fat Cantor” set.

## 2 Facts About Cantor-Like Sets

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an arbitrary Cantor-like set,  $\{C^i\}$  and  $\{P^i\}$  as in Definition 4. We notice:

- The size of the intervals in  $C^i$  tend to 0 as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . This is because there are  $2^i$  such intervals, all of the same length, whose total length can never exceed 1.
- The endpoints of every interval in every  $C^i$  are in  $\mathcal{C}$ . This is by construction.

Further,  $\mathcal{C}$  has the following properties:

- *Closed.* It is defined as the countable intersection of closed sets.
- *Perfect.* Let  $x \in \mathcal{C}$  and let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then for every  $C^i$ ,  $x \in C_j^i$  for some  $j$ . As  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , the size of these  $C_j^i$  tends to 0, so by choosing the right endpoint  $x_i$  of  $C_j^i$ , we have a sequence  $\{x_i\}$  such that  $x_i \rightarrow x$ . Thus  $x$  is a limit point of  $\mathcal{C}$ .
- *No interior points.* Choose the sequence  $\{x_i\}$  from the previous claim, and define  $\{y_i\}$  by  $y_i = x_i + \ell_i/2$ . Then  $y_i \notin \mathcal{C}$  (it is removed in the  $i$ th step) but since  $\ell_i \rightarrow 0$ , we still have  $y_i \rightarrow x$ . Thus  $x$  is not an interior point.
- *Uncountability.* We will derive a surjection from  $\mathcal{C}$  to  $[0, 1]$ .

**Theorem 1.** Let  $\{\ell_i\}$  be as in Definition 4. Then  $m(\mathcal{C}) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^{i-1}\ell_i$ .

*Proof.* As the intervals in each  $C^i$  are disjoint, we have that

$$1 = m([0, 1]) = \sum_{j=0}^{2^i} m(P_j^i) = \sum_{j=0}^{2^{i-1}} m(P_{2j}^i) + \sum_{j=0}^{2^{i-1}} m(P_{2j+1}^i) = m(C^i) + \sum_{j=1}^i 2^{j-1}\ell_j$$

using finite additivity and the definition of  $C^i$  and  $\ell_i$ . Therefore, for each  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$m(C^i) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^i 2^{j-1}\ell_j$$

Finally, because  $C^i \supset C^{i+1}$  for each  $i$ , by Corollary 3.3 in chapter 1 of Stein/Shakarchi,

$$m(\mathcal{C}) = m\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} C^i\right) = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} m(C^i) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{j-1}\ell_j$$

□

**Remark.** For the traditional Cantor set,  $\ell_i = (1/3)^i$  and this limit evaluates to 0, as expected. But for the fat Cantor set, we get  $1/2$ , though all the usual properties of the set hold!

### 3 The Cantor-Lebesgue Function

Define the following sequence  $\{Q^i\}_0^\infty$  of ordered partitions of  $[0, 1]$ : let  $Q^0$  contain only  $[0, 1]$ . Then for each  $i \geq 1$ , construct  $Q^i$  from  $Q^{i-1}$  by replacing each nontrivial interval  $[a, b]$  by the intervals

$$\left[ a, \frac{a+b}{2} \right] \quad \left[ \frac{a+b}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} \right] \quad \left[ \frac{a+b}{2}, b \right]$$

Notice that each  $Q^i$  covers  $[0, 1]$  and contains exactly as many intervals as the corresponding  $P^i$  from Definition 4.

Now, let  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\{P^i\}_0^\infty$  be as in Definition 4. Define a sequence of functions  $\{\phi_i\}_0^\infty$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_i &: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \\ \phi_i &: x \mapsto \Lambda \left( \overline{P_j^i}, Q_j^i \right) (x) \quad x \in P_j^i \end{aligned}$$

We define the *Cantor-Lebesgue function*:

$$\phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad \phi(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(x)$$

**Theorem 2.** *The Cantor-Lebesgue function is continuous.*

*Proof.* Let  $\phi$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$ ,  $\{C^i\}_0^\infty$ ,  $\{P^i\}_0^\infty$ ,  $\{Q^i\}_0^\infty$  and  $\{\phi^i\}_0^\infty$  be as above.

By construction,  $\phi_i$  is continuous for all  $i$ . We need to show that the limit is continuous.

Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $m > n$ . Let  $x \in [0, 1]$ , so that  $x \in P_i^n$  for some  $i$ . We have two cases:

- $P_i^n = (a, b)$ . As this is an open interval, it exists unchanged in  $P^m$ , as does its image in  $Q^m$ . It follows that  $|\phi_n(x) - \phi_m(x)| = 0$ .
- $P_i^n = [a, b]$ . Then after  $m-n$  steps in the Cantor-like set construction,  $P_i^n = \bigcup_{j=j_1}^{j_2} P_j^m$  for some  $j_1, j_2$ , and  $\phi_n(P_i^n) = \bigcup_{j=j_1}^{j_2} \phi_m(P_j^m)$ . By Lemma 1,  $|\phi_n(x) - \phi_m(x)| \leq |P_i^n|$ .

The size of closed  $|P_i^n|$  decreases to 0 (as there are  $2^n$  of them, each of which is the same size, and the total length is  $\leq 1$ ) as  $n$  tends to infinity. Therefore, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we can choose some  $n$  sufficiently large so that for all  $m > n$ ,

$$|\phi_n(x) - \phi_m(x)| \leq |P_i^n|$$

This is the Cauchy criterion, and we know from Math 320 that this gives us uniform convergence to  $\phi$ , and the limit of a uniformly converging sequence of continuous functions is itself continuous.  $\square$

Notice that if  $x \notin \mathcal{C}$ , some neighborhood of  $x$  will be mapped to a trivial interval. That is, the “holes” in the Cantor-like set will be mapped to constant functions. As a consequence, if  $\mathcal{C}$  is the traditional Cantor set of measure 0,  $\phi$  is a continuous increasing function with derivative 0 almost everywhere!

**Remark.** As  $\phi(0) = 0$ ,  $\phi(1) = 1$ , the IVT gives us that  $\phi$  is surjective.

**Remark.** The restriction of  $\phi$  to  $\mathcal{C}$  has  $[0, 1]$  as its image, since every number  $x$  *not* in  $\mathcal{C}$  has  $\phi(x)$  copied from its nearest endpoints.

## 4 A Most Suprising Homeomorphism

Now, let  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}'$  be two Cantor-like sets, and  $\{P^i\}_1^\infty$ ,  $\{P'^i\}_1^\infty$  the sequences of ordered partitions used in Definition 4 to build them. Proceeding as before, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_i &: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \\ \Phi_i &: x \mapsto \Lambda(P_j^i, P_j'^i)(x) \quad x \in P_j^i\end{aligned}$$

We define the following function:

$$\Phi : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] \quad \Phi(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(x)$$

By exactly the same proof as above,  $\Phi$  is continuous. Furthermore,

**Theorem 3.**  $\Phi$  is strictly increasing.

*Proof.* By Lemma 1,  $\phi_i$  is strictly increasing for all  $i$ . As the endpoints of every interval in every  $\mathcal{C}^i$  are fixed by  $\phi_n$ ,  $n > i$ , it follows that  $\phi$  is strictly increasing on the set of interval endpoints in  $\mathcal{C}$ .

Let  $x, y \in [0, 1]$ ,  $x < y$ . Then we have two cases:

1. If both  $x$  and  $y$  are in  $\mathcal{C}$ , after some number  $N$  of iterations, the intervals in  $\mathcal{C}^i$ ,  $i > N$ , will have length less than  $y - x$ . Then  $y$  and  $x$  will lie in different intervals. Let  $x_1$  be the right endpoint of  $x$ 's interval,  $y_1$  the left endpoint of  $y$ 's. We then have that for all  $i > N$ ,

$$\phi_i(x) \leq \phi_i(x_1) = \phi(x_1) < \phi(y_1) = \phi_i(y_1) \leq \phi_i(y)$$

and by taking  $i \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\phi(x) < \phi(y)$ .

2. Otherwise, at least one of  $x, y$  is not in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Assume WLOG that  $x \notin \mathcal{C}$ . Then after some number of iterations  $N$ ,  $\phi_i(x)$  will be fixed for all  $i > N$ . If  $y \notin \mathcal{C}$ ,  $\phi_i(y)$  will also be fixed, so we can use Lemma 1 to see that  $\phi(x) = \phi_i(x) < \phi_i(y) = \phi(y)$ .

Otherwise,  $y \in \mathcal{C}$ , so choose  $e$  to be an endpoint between  $x$  and  $y$ . Then after some number of iterations,  $\phi(e)$  is fixed, so  $\phi_i(x) = \phi(x) < \phi(e) = \phi_i(e) \leq \phi_i(y)$ . Take  $i \rightarrow \infty$  to see that  $\phi(x) < \phi(y)$ .

□

**Remark.** As a consequence of the above,  $\Phi$  is bijective.