



# Newton's method for quadratics and nested intervals

Mordecai Golin, Kenneth J. Supowit

► **To cite this version:**

| Mordecai Golin, Kenneth J. Supowit. Newton's method for quadratics and nested intervals. [Research Report] RR-1564, INRIA. 1991. <inria-00074997>

**HAL Id: inria-00074997**

**<https://hal.inria.fr/inria-00074997>**

Submitted on 24 May 2006

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



UNITÉ DE RECHERCHE  
INRIA-ROCQUENCOURT

Institut National  
de Recherche  
en Informatique  
et en Automatique

Domaine de Voluceau  
Rocquencourt  
B.P.105  
78153 Le Chesnay Cedex  
France  
Tél.: (1) 39 63 55 11

Rapports de Recherche

N° 1564

*Programme 2*  
*Calcul Symbolique, Programmation*  
*et Génie logiciel*

**NEWTON'S METHOD  
FOR QUADRATICS AND NESTED  
INTERVALS**

**Mordecai J. GOLIN  
Kenneth J. SUPOWIT**

**Décembre 1991**



# Newton's Method for Quadratics and Nested Intervals

Mordecai J. Golin\*  
INRIA Rocquencourt

Kenneth J. Supowit  
Ohio State University

**Abstract:** In this paper we show how to use the technique of nested intervals to analyse Newton's method of finding the roots of quadratic polynomials.

## Méthode de Newton pour les polynômes de degré 2 et intervalles emboîtés

**Résumé :** Dans cet article nous indiquons comment utiliser la technique de intervalles emboîtés pour analyser le méthode de Newton de calcul des racines de polynômes de degré 2.

---

\*This work was supported in part by NSF Grant DCR-8605962 and Office of Naval Research Grant N00014-87-K-0460. It was later supported by a Chateaubriand fellowship from the French Ministère des Affaires Étrangères and by the European Community, Esprit II Basic Research Action Number 3075 (ALCOM)

# Newton's Method for Quadratics and Nested Intervals

Mordecai J. Golin\*  
Dept. of Computer Science  
Princeton University  
Princeton N.J 08544

Kenneth J. Supowit†  
Dept. of Computer and Info. Science  
Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

November 18, 1991

The function  $f(z) = \frac{1}{2}(z - 1/z)$  is the Newton map associated with the quadratic polynomial  $z^2 + 1$ . The iterated dynamics of  $f$  on  $\mathfrak{R}$  is usually studied by exploiting the conjugacy between  $f$  and the function  $z^2$ . In this paper we show how to use the technique of *nested intervals* to yield a direct analysis of the dynamics. We also show how to use the same technique to analyze the dynamics of the function  $z - 1/z$ . The results covered by this paper fall under Mathematical Reviews Mathematical Subject Classification number 40A05 (Convergence and divergence of series and integrals).

## 1 Introduction

In this note we will show how to utilize the technique of *nested intervals* to examine the iterated dynamics of two related functions that map  $\mathfrak{R}$ , the set of real numbers, to itself. The two functions are

$$f_1(z) = \frac{1}{2}(z - 1/z) \quad (1)$$

and

$$f_2(z) = z - 1/z. \quad (2)$$

By studying the iterated dynamics of a function  $f$  we mean studying the infinite sequences generated by iterating the function  $f$  on initial seeds  $x_0$ , i.e.

$$x_0, x_1 = f(x_0), x_2 = f(x_1), \dots, x_i = f(x_{i-1}), \dots \quad (3)$$

This sequence is sometimes known as the forward orbit of  $x_0$ . For  $f = f_1$  this sequence has already been extensively studied because  $f_1$  is the Newton map used to find the roots of the quadratic function  $g(z) = z^2 + 1$ . That is, given an initial seed,  $x_0$ , the sequence (3) will usually converge to either  $i$  or  $-i$ , the two roots of  $g$ . The set containing all  $x_0$  for which the sequence (3) does not converge is the *Julia set* associated with  $f$ . The Julia set associated with both  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  is the real line  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

The usual method of analyzing the iterated dynamics of (1) uses the fact that  $f_1$ , considered as a mapping on the Riemann sphere, is conjugate under a linear fractional transformation to the function  $z^2$ . The purpose of this note is to illustrate how to analyze the dynamics directly without using the conjugacy relationship. The only tools we use are simple ones from elementary calculus and point-set topology. We exhibit a one-one

---

\*This research was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant DCR-8605962 and Office of Naval Research grant N00014-87-K-0460. It was later supported by a Chateaubriand fellowship from the French Ministère des Affaires Étrangères and by the European Community, Esprit II Basic Research Action Number 3075 (ALCOM). Author's current address: Projet Algo, INRIA Rocquencourt, 78153 Le Chesnay, France.

†This research was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant DMC-8451214.

correspondence between points in  $\mathfrak{R}$  and integer sequences of alternating sign, e.g. 5, -7, 4, -6, ... This correspondence has nice properties such as: if the sequence associated with  $x_0$  is periodic/bounded then (3) is also periodic/bounded. Furthermore if the associated sequences of a series of points converges to the sequence associated with  $x$  then the points themselves converge to  $x$ . We will use these properties to analyze the dynamics of  $f = f_1$ . We will also show how this analysis, slightly modified, can be used to analyze the dynamics of  $f_2$ .

In section 2 we quickly review Newton's method for finding the roots of polynomials. We also briefly sketch the conjugacy mapping which forms the basis for the usual analysis of  $f_1$ . In section 3 we explain what we mean by *nested intervals*. We then show how to use nested intervals to define the *behavior* of a point under  $f_1$  in such a way that there is a one-to-one correspondence between points in  $\mathfrak{R}$  and possible behaviors. This correspondence will yield immediate proofs of the standard facts about the iterated behavior of  $f$ . As an example, it will show that the preimages of any point in  $\mathfrak{R}$  are dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ . It will also show that the set of points which have bounded forward orbits is 'Cantorlike.' Finally, in section 4, we will show how to modify the analysis of section 3 so that it can be applied to the iterated behavior of  $f_2$ .

## 2 Newton's Method

In this section we provide a quick review of Newton's (Cayley's) method for finding the roots of a polynomial. For a more complete explanation see [5]. Let  $g(z) = \sum_{i \leq n} a_i z^i$  be an  $n$ -th degree polynomial. The Newton's map associated with  $g$  is

$$f(z) = z - \frac{g(z)}{g'(z)}. \quad (4)$$

Newton's method for finding a root of  $g$  is to choose an initial seed  $x_0$  and iterate  $f$  on  $x_0$  constructing the infinite sequence

$$x_0, x_1 = f(x_0), x_2 = f(x_1), \dots, x_i = f(x_{i-1}), \dots \quad (5)$$

Later we will occasionally, need a more flexible notation: we set  $f^{(0)}(x) = x$  and inductively define  $f^{(i)}(x) = f(f^{(i-1)}(x))$  for  $i \geq 1$ . In this new notation (5) is written as

$$x_0, f(x_0), f^{(2)}(x_0), \dots, f^{(i)}(x_0), \dots \quad (6)$$

It is known that if  $x_0$  is close enough to a root  $\alpha$  of  $g$  then the sequence  $x_i$  will converge to the  $\alpha$ . The set containing all points  $x_0 \in \mathfrak{R}$  for which this sequence doesn't converge to some root of  $g$  is the Julia set associated with  $f$  [4].

As an example, suppose that  $g(z) = (z - \alpha)^2$  where  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}$  is an arbitrary complex number. Then

$$f(z) = \frac{z + \alpha}{2}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, for all  $z \in \mathcal{C}$ ,

$$|\alpha - f(z)| = \frac{|\alpha - z|}{2}, \quad (8)$$

the sequence  $x_i \rightarrow \alpha$  irrespective of the original seed  $x_0$ , and the Julia set associated with  $f$  is empty.

If  $g$  is a quadratic with two distinct roots the situation is much more interesting. Suppose, for example, that  $g(z) = z^2 + 1 = (z - i)(z + i)$ . Then

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2}(z - 1/z). \quad (9)$$

The classical method for analyzing this  $f$  uses the fact that it is *conjugate* to the function  $h(z) = z^2$ . By conjugate we mean that there is some function  $T$  with a two sided inverse  $T^{-1}$  such that

$$f(z) = T^{-1} \circ h \circ T(z) \quad (10)$$

where  $\circ$  is the functional composition operator. By a two sided inverse we mean that  $T(T^{-1}(z)) = z$  and  $T^{-1}(T(z)) = z$ . It is straightforward to check that equation (10) is true when  $T(z) = \frac{z+i}{z-i}$ . This  $T$  has a two sided inverse which is  $T^{-1}(z) = i\frac{z+1}{z-1}$ .

Iterating (10) yields

$$x_i = T^{-1} \circ h^{(i)} \circ T(z). \quad (11)$$

Therefore, the behavior of the sequence (5) can be examined by studying the behavior of the sequence  $z, z^2, z^4, z^8, \dots, z^{2^i}, \dots$ .

First let  $S_1 = \{z : |z| = 1\}$  be the unit disc,  $H^+ = \{x + iy : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, y > 0\}$  be the half plane with positive imaginary part and  $H^- = \{x - iy : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, y > 0\}$  be the half plane with negative imaginary part. The behavior of  $T$  is summarized in the following table:

$z$	$i$	$-i$	$\infty$	$\mathbb{R}$	$H^+$	$H^-$
$T(z)$	$\infty$	$0$	$1$	$S_1$	$\{z :  z  > 1\}$	$\{z :  z  < 1\}$

If  $|z| < 1$  then  $z^{2^i}$  converges to 0. If  $|z| > 1$  then  $z^{2^i}$  goes to infinity. If  $z \in S_1$ , the unit circle, then every point in  $z^{2^i}$  is also on  $S_1$ . If  $x_0 \in H^+$  then  $z = |T(x_0)| > 1$ ,  $z^{2^i}$  tends to infinity and  $f^{(i)}(x_0) \rightarrow i$ . Similarly, if  $x_0 \in H^-$  then  $z = |T(x_0)| < 1$ ,  $z^{2^i}$  tends to 0 and  $f^{(i)}(x_0) \rightarrow -i$ . Finally, if  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  then  $z = T(x_0) \in S_1$  and  $z^{2^i}$  is contained in  $S_1$ . Therefore the behavior of the sequence  $f^{(i)}(x_0)$  can be studied by examining the behavior of the sequence  $z^{(2^i)}$  for  $z \in S_1$ .

In general, if  $g(z) = (z - \alpha)(z - \beta)$  is a quadratic with two roots, then the analysis given above can be adapted to examine its associated Newton's function  $f = z - g(z)/g'(z)$  [5]. For more information on conjugacy methods and their applications to the study of iterated dynamics see [3].

In the next section we will show how to examine the dynamics of (5) without using the conjugacy relationship.

### 3 Nested Intervals

A sequence of closed bounded intervals,  $D_i = [a_i, b_i] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  is said to be *nested* if  $D_i \subseteq D_{i-1}$ . An important fact about such sequences of intervals, one which often occurs in the analysis of dynamic systems [6], is that the intersection  $\bigcap_i D_i$  is a nonempty closed interval, possibly a single point.

In this section we show how to utilize the technique of nested intervals to analyze the dynamics of

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \left( x - \frac{1}{x} \right).$$

That is, for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  we will study the behavior of the sequence

$$x, f^{(1)}(x), f^{(2)}(x), \dots, f^{(i)}(x), \dots \quad (12)$$

Examination of  $f$  shows that it is a monotonically decreasing surjective function from  $[1, \infty)$  onto  $[0, \infty)$  and a monotonically increasing one from  $(0, 1]$  to  $(-\infty, 0]$ . Similarly it is a monotonically increasing surjective function from  $(-\infty, -1]$  onto  $(-\infty, 0]$  and a monotonically decreasing one from  $[-1, 0)$  onto  $[0, \infty)$ . Therefore, the infinite sequence  $f^{(i)}(x)$ , will alternate between positive decreasing and negative increasing sequences (Figure 1) forever unless, for some  $i$ ,  $f^{(i)}(x) = 0$ . In this case we say that the sequence terminates since  $f(0)$  is undefined. (Alternatively we can say that  $f(0) = f(\infty) = \infty$  and  $f^{(j)}(x) = \infty$  for  $j > i$ .)

The rest of this section will be given over to showing that there is a one-to-one correspondence between points in  $\mathbb{R}$  and integer sequences of alternating sign

$$i_0, i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots \quad \text{such that } i_j i_{j+1} \leq 0,$$




Figure 1: This figure illustrates the first 9 iterates,  $x_i = f^{(i)}(x_0)$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq 8$  of  $f$ . Notice how the sequence flip-flops between increasing/decreasing subsequences of positive/negative values.

e.g.  $1, -3, 5, -7, \dots$  or  $-4, 6, -7, 5, \dots$ . This correspondence possesses properties useful in the analysis of the iterated sequence (12). For example, (12) is bounded if and only if the alternating integer sequence associated with  $x$  is bounded.

We associate with each point  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$ , two sets:  $F_x$  and  $B_x$ .  $F_x$ , the forward orbit of  $x$ , is the set containing all of the iterates  $f^{(i)}(x)$ , while  $B_x$ , the backward orbit of  $x$ , is the set of all preimages of  $x$ . Formally

$$\begin{aligned} F_x &= \{f^{(i)}(x) : i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\} \\ B_x &= \{z : \exists i, f^{(i)}(z) = x\}. \end{aligned}$$

A technical note: If  $x$  is a preimage of 0, ( $z \in B_0$ ), then there is some  $i$  such that  $f^{(i)}(z) = 0$ . In this case  $f^{(i+1)}(z)$  is undefined and we define  $F_z$  to be the finite set  $\{f^{(j)}(z) : 0 \leq j \leq i\}$ .

**Definition 1** A point  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$  is bounded if the forward orbit of  $x$  is bounded, i.e. there is some constant  $k$  such that  $F_x \subset [-k, k]$ .

**Definition 2** A point  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$  is periodic if there is some integer  $i \geq 0$  such that  $f^{(i)}(x) = x$ .

In this section we will prove the following facts:

**Fact 1.**  $\forall x \in \mathfrak{R}$ , the set  $B_x$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

**Fact 2.** The set  $\{x : x \text{ is periodic}\}$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

**Fact 3.** The set  $\{x : F_x \text{ is dense in } \mathfrak{R}\}$  is itself dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$  and has cardinality  $\aleph_1$ .

**Fact 4.** The set  $\{x : x \text{ is bounded}\}$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ , has cardinality  $\aleph_1$  and measure 0. In fact, it is the union of a countable number of ‘‘Cantorlike’’ sets.

Notice that Fact 1 implies that the system that we are studying is chaotic. That is, it tells us that specifying a point  $x$  to a very high degree of precision isn’t enough to tell us how  $x$  behaves under iteration.

We define a set of intervals that partition the real line. First, for any given  $x$  the equation  $f(z) = x$  has exactly two solutions:  $z_{\pm} = x \pm \sqrt{x^2 + 1}$ . Furthermore  $f(-1/z) = f(z)$  so  $z_- = -1/z_+$ . Thus one of  $z_{\pm}$  has absolute value greater than or equal to 1 while the other has the opposite sign and absolute value less than or equal to 1. We will denote these two solutions by  $g(x)$  and  $h(x)$ . These functions are defined in such a way that (for  $x \neq 0$ )  $g(-x) = -g(x)$  and  $h(-x) = -h(x)$ .

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} x + \sqrt{x^2 + 1} & x \geq 0 \\ x - \sqrt{x^2 + 1} & x < 0 \end{cases} \quad h(x) = \begin{cases} x - \sqrt{x^2 + 1} & x \geq 0 \\ x + \sqrt{x^2 + 1} & x < 0 \end{cases}.$$

Notice that  $g$  is monotonically increasing when  $x > 0$  and monotonically decreasing when  $x < 0$ . Analogously,  $h$  is monotonically decreasing when  $x > 0$  and monotonically increasing when  $x < 0$ . Thus, if  $D$  is a bounded interval not containing 0 then both  $g(D)$  and  $h(D)$  will be bounded intervals that do not contain 0. These facts will be important later.




Figure 2: The top figure illustrates the location of the  $a_i$ :  $a_0 = 0$ ,  $a_{i+1} = g(a_i)$ ,  $i > 0$  and  $a_{-i} = -a_i$ . The intervals,  $I_i$ ,  $i > 0$  are defined as  $I_i = (a_{i-1}, a_i]$ . with  $I_{-i} = -I_i$ . The bottom figure illustrates the first eight applications of  $f$  on the point  $x = x_0$ . We have set  $x_i = f^{(i)}(x)$ . The behavior of the sequence associated with  $x$  is  $2, -3, 3, -1, \dots$

Next, we define a doubly infinite sequence  $a_i$

$$a_0 = 0, \quad a_i = g(a_{i-1}), \quad i > 0, \quad a_i = -a_{-i}, \quad i < 0.$$

This permits us to define a set of intervals that partition  $\mathfrak{R}$ : We set  $I_0 = [0, 0]$  and

$$I_i = \begin{cases} (a_{i-1}, a_i] & i > 0 \\ [a_i, a_{i+1}) & i < 0 \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Note that  $I_i = -I_{-i}$ . See Figure 2. The functions  $f$ ,  $g$ , and  $h$ , operate rather remarkably on the intervals  $I_i$ . Recall that  $f$  is a monotonically decreasing function from  $[1, \infty)$  onto  $[0, \infty)$  and  $f(a_i) = a_{i-1}$  for  $i \geq 1$ . It follows that  $f(I_i) = I_{i-1}$  for  $i > 1$ . (We use the notation  $f(S) = \{f(x) : x \in S\}$  where  $S$  is an arbitrary set.) Symmetrically,  $f(I_i) = I_{i+1}$  for  $i < 1$ . As examples note that  $f(I_5) = I_4$  and  $f(I_{-5}) = I_{-4}$ . There are similar results for  $g$  and  $h$ . We summarize them in the following table:

$i$	$= 1$	$= -1$	$> 1$	$< -1$
$f(I_i) =$	$(-\infty, 0)$	$(0, \infty)$	$I_{i-1}$	$I_{i+1}$
$g(I_i) =$	$I_2$	$I_{-2}$	$I_{i+1}$	$I_{i-i}$
$h(I_i) \subseteq$	$I_1$	$I_{-1}$	$I_1$	$I_{-1}$

(14)

Since the  $I_i$  partition  $\mathfrak{R}$  we can associate with every  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$  a unique interval  $I_i$  that contains it and thus with the iterated sequence

$$x, f(x), f^{(2)}(x), \dots, f^{(j)}(x), \dots$$

we can associate a unique sequence of integers

$$i_0, i_1, i_2 \dots i_j \dots$$



such that  $f^{(j)}(x) \in I_j$ . As an example the point  $x = x_0$  pictured in Figure 2 has the associated sequence

$$2, 1, -3, -2, -1, 3, 2, 1, -1 \dots \quad (15)$$

because  $x \in I_2$ ,  $f(x) \in I_1$ ,  $f(f(x)) \in I_{-3}$ , etc.. If  $x \in B_0$  then its associated integer sequence is finite and ends at 0 since  $I_0 = \{0\}$  and  $f(0)$  is undefined. For example, if  $x = g(g(h(a_5)))$  then its associated sequence is

$$-3, -2, -1, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0. \quad (16)$$

If  $x \notin B_0$  then the sequence associated with  $x$  is infinite.

Notice that both (15) and (16) share a peculiar property: they are composed of concatenations of positive subsequences that step down by one to 1 and negative subsequences that step up by one to  $-1$ . Furthermore these subsequences have opposite signs. This property is a direct result of the first row of (14). More specifically: if  $x \in I_i$ ,  $i > 1$  then  $f(x) \in I_{i-1}, \dots, f^{(i-1)}(x) \in I_1$  and  $f^{(i)}(x) \in I_j$  where  $j \leq 0$ . Symmetrically if  $x \in I_i$ ,  $i < 1$  then  $f(x) \in I_{i+1}, \dots, f^{(|i|-1)}(x) \in I_1$  and  $f^{(|i|)}(x) \in I_j$  where  $j \geq 0$ . The process terminates if and only if  $i = 0$  since then  $x = 0$  and  $f(0)$  is undefined.

What we have just described is just a more detailed description of the “flip-flopping” behavior illustrated in Figure 1. In the next few pages (culminating in Theorem 1) we shall show that there is a one to one correspondence between sequences of flip-flops and points in  $\mathfrak{R}$ . We will then use this correspondence to prove Facts 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Thus, given  $x \in I_i$ , the first iterate of  $f$  on  $x$  whose location is unknown is  $f^{(|i|)}(x)$ . The sequence associated with  $x$  can therefore be reconstructed from a sequence containing only the first elements of the increasing (decreasing) sequences e.g.  $2, -3, 3, -1 \dots$  in place of (15) and  $-3, 5, 0$  in place of (16). We will call this abbreviated sequence the *behavior* of the sequence associated with  $x$  or simply, the behavior of  $x$ . We denote the behavior by  $S_x$ . The formal definition of  $S_x$  is

**Definition 3** For a point  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$  its behavior,  $S_x$ , is the sequence defined recursively as follows. Let  $i_0$  be the index of the interval containing  $x$ ,  $x \in I_{i_0}$ .

1. If  $i_0 = 0$  then  $S_x$  is the one item sequence  $0$ .
2. If  $i_0 \neq 0$  then  $S_x = i_0, S_{f^{(|i_0|)}(x)}$ .

For a given point  $x$  we will denote  $S_x$

$$S_x = i_0^x, i_1^x, i_2^x, \dots$$

From the definition we see that

$$f^{(|i_0^x|+|i_1^x|+\dots+|i_{n-1}^x|)}(x) \in I_{i_n^x}.$$

**Definition 4** A sequence of non-zero integers,  $i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots$  (finite or infinite) alternates if  $\text{sign}(i_j) = -\text{sign}(i_{j+1})$ ,  $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

For example:  $1, -1, 1, -1$  and  $-1, 2, -3, 4, -5, 6, \dots$  alternate but  $1, 1, 1, 1$  doesn't.

**Definition 5** An integer sequence  $S$  that satisfies one of the following two conditions will be called a legal behavior.

1.  $S$  is an infinite alternating sequence
2. or  $S = S', 0$  where  $S'$  is a finite alternating sequence.

For example  $S = 1, -1, 1, 0$  and  $1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, \dots$  are legal behaviors but  $1, -1$  and  $1, 1, 1, 1, \dots$  are not. We will use the notation  $S = i_0, i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots$  to represent the component integers of  $S$  Thus the behavior  $S = 1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, \dots$  can be expressed by writing  $i_k = (-1)^k(k+1)$ ,  $k \geq 0$ .

**Definition 6** Let  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$  be a finite alternating sequence. We set

$$D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = \{x : i_k^x = i_k \quad 0 \leq k \leq n\}.$$

$D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$  is the set of all  $x$  such that the first  $n+1$  components of  $S_x$  are identical with  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$ .

For example,  $D(2, -3, 3)$  contains all points  $x \in I_2$  such that  $f^{(2)}(x) \in I_{-3}$  and  $f^{(2+3)} \in I_3$ . This is illustrated in Figure 3. The  $D()$  can be constructed explicitly as follows: first note that  $D(i_0) = \{x : x \in I_{i_0}\} = I_{i_0}$ . We also have the following lemma:

**Lemma 1** Suppose  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$  is an alternating sequence Then

$$g(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)) = \begin{cases} D(i_0 + 1, i_2, \dots, i_n), & i_0 > 0 \\ D(i_0 - 1, i_2, \dots, i_n), & i_0 < 0 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

and

$$h(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)) = \begin{cases} D(-1, i_0, i_2, \dots, i_n), & i_0 > 0 \\ D(1, i_0, i_2, \dots, i_n), & i_0 < 0. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

*Proof:* This lemma is a direct consequence of (14). We only prove

$$g(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)) = D(i_0 + 1, i_2, \dots, i_n), \quad i_0 > 0.$$

The proofs of the other three relationships are similar.

$$\begin{aligned} x \in D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) &\Rightarrow i_k^x = i_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n \\ &\Rightarrow i_0^{g(x)} = i_0^x + 1 = i_0 + 1, \quad i_1^{g(x)} = i_1^x = i_k \quad 1 \leq k \leq n \\ &\Rightarrow g(x) \in D(i_0 + 1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$g(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)) \subseteq D(i_0 + 1, i_2, \dots, i_n), \quad i_0 > 0. \quad (19)$$

In the other direction

$$\begin{aligned} x \in D(i_0 + 1, i_2, \dots, i_n) &\Rightarrow i_0^x = i_0 + 1, \quad i_k^x = i_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n \\ &\Rightarrow i_k^{f(x)} = i_k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n \\ &\Rightarrow f(x) \in D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) \\ &\Rightarrow x \in g(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)) \end{aligned}$$

where the last line is a consequence of  $f(g(x)) = x$ . Therefore

$$g(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)) \supseteq D(i_0 + 1, i_2, \dots, i_n), \quad i_0 > 0$$

and we have finished the proof. ■

An immediate application of Lemma (1) is that, for  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$  an alternating sequence,

$$D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = g^{(|i_0|-1)}(h(D(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n))) \quad (20)$$

As an example we show how to apply the lemma to construct the intervals illustrated in Figure 3.

- $D(2) = I_2$ .
- $D(-3) = I_{-3}$  so  $D(2, -3) = g(h(I_{-3}))$ .




Figure 3: This figure exhibits how the nested intervals converge to a point. In the example we show the first three steps in the process of finding a point,  $x$ , with  $S_x = 2, -3, 3, \dots$ . The top row shows  $D(2)$ , the middle row  $D(2, -3)$  and the bottom row  $D(2, -3, 2)$ .

- $D(3) = I_3$  so  $D(-3, 3) = g^{(2)}(h(I_3))$  and  $D(2, -3, 3) = g(h(D(-3, 3))) = g(h(g^{(2)}(h(I_3))))$ .

In general, to explicitly construct  $D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$  we set

$$t_0(x) = x, \quad t_n(x) = t_{n-1} \circ g^{(|i_{n-1}|-1)} \circ h(x). \quad (21)$$

and repeated application of (20) yields

$$D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = t_n(D(i_n)) = t_n(I_{i_n}).$$

As mentioned before, if  $D$  is an interval not containing 0 then so are  $h(D)$  and  $g(D)$ ; thus  $t_n(D)$  is as well. This proves that  $D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$  is an interval that doesn't contain 0. Furthermore,  $h$  and  $g$  are one-one functions so  $t_n$  is a one-one function that maps  $I_n$  onto  $D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$ . This will be important in the proof of Theorem 1.

Another consequence of Lemma 1 is an upper bound on the size of  $D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$  that decreases geometrically with  $n$ . We use  $\mu(D)$  to denote the standard Lebesgue measure of set  $D$ .

**Lemma 2** Set  $r = 1 - (a_1^2 + 1)^{-1/2} \approx .6173$ . For  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$  an alternating sequence

$$\mu(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)) \leq 2^{|i_0|} \cdot r^n.$$

*Proof:* Our main tool will be the following variant of the the mean value theorem: if  $D$  is an interval and  $s$  a continuously differentiable function that maps intervals to intervals then

$$\mu(s(D)) = |s'(\xi)| \cdot \mu(D) \text{ for some } \xi \in D. \quad (22)$$

As a first application notice that  $h \circ g \circ f(x) = h(-1/x)$  for  $0 < x < 1$ . Since, for  $x \neq 0$ , we have  $h'(x) = 1 - \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{1+x^2}}$ , we immediately find that for all  $0 < x < 1$

$$(h \circ g \circ f)'(x) = \frac{\sqrt{1+x^2}-1}{x^2\sqrt{1+x^2}} < \frac{\sqrt{1+x^2}-1}{x^2} \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Applying the mean value theorem gives that for any interval  $D \subseteq (0, 1)$ :

$$\mu(h \circ g \circ f(D)) < \frac{1}{2}\mu(D). \quad (23)$$

To begin let  $i > 0$ . Then from Lemma 1 and the equality  $f(h(x)) = x$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} D(-1, i) &= h(I_i) \\ &= h(g^{(i-1)}(I_1)) \\ &= (h \circ g \circ f)^{(i-1)}(h(I_1)). \end{aligned}$$

An immediate consequence is that  $\mu(D(-1, i)) \leq 2^{1-i}$ . Since  $D(-1, i) = -D(1, -i)$  we have just proven that for  $i_0, i_1$  alternating,  $i_0 = \pm 1$ ,

$$\mu(D(i_0, i_1)) \leq 2^{1-|i_1|} \quad (24)$$

Next, let  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$  be an alternating sequence with  $i_0 = -1$ . Again using Lemma 1 we can write

$$\begin{aligned} D(-1, i_1, \dots, i_n) &= h \circ g^{(i_1-1)}(D(1, i_2, \dots, i_n)) \\ &= (h \circ g \circ f)^{(i_1-1)}(h(D(1, i_2, \dots, i_n))). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\mu(D(-1, i_1, \dots, i_n)) \leq 2^{1-i_1}\mu(h(D(1, i_2, \dots, i_n))). \quad (25)$$

But  $h'(x) = 1 - \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{1+x^2}}$  and  $D(1, i_2, \dots, i_n) \subseteq \left[\frac{1}{a_{j+1}}, \frac{1}{a_j}\right]$  so another application of the mean value theorem gives

$$\mu(h(D(1, i_2, \dots, i_n))) \leq \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_{i_2+1}^2 + 1}}\right] \mu(D(1, i_2, \dots, i_n)). \quad (26)$$

Plugging this back into (25) and taking symmetry into account we have just proven that, for  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$  an alternating sequence with  $i_0 = \pm 1$ ,

$$\mu(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)) \leq \frac{(1 - (a_{|i_2|+1}^2 + 1)^{-1/2})}{2^{|i_1|-1}} \mu(D(\frac{i_1}{|i_1|}, i_2, i_3, \dots, i_n)). \quad (27)$$

We unravel this inequality by recursively applying it to its own right hand side  $n - 1$  times and then apply (24) once: this yields

$$\mu(D(\pm 1, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)) \leq \prod_{2 \leq j \leq n-2} 2^{1-|i_j|} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{a_{|i_j|+1}^2 + 1}}\right)$$

We now examine this product on a term by term basis: if  $|i_j| = 1$  then  $1 - (a_{|i_j|+1}^2 + 1)^{-1/2} = r$  while if  $|i_j| > 1$  then  $2^{1-|i_j|} \leq 1/2 < r$ . Therefore

$$\mu(D(\pm 1, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)) \leq r^{n-1}.$$

Until now we assumed that  $i_0 = \pm 1$ . We conclude the proof of the lemma by noting that, for arbitrary  $i_0$ ,

$$D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = g^{(i_0-1)}(D(1, i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n)).$$

For all  $x \neq 0$  we have  $g'(x) = 1 + |x|/\sqrt{1+x^2} \leq 2$ . The lemma therefore follows from another application of the mean value theorem.  $\blacksquare$

**Definition 7** Let  $S = i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots$  be an infinite legal behavior. Let  $S^k = S^k = i_0^k, i_1^k, i_2^k, \dots$  be a sequence of (finite or infinite) behaviors. We say that  $S^k$  converges to  $S$ , ( $S^k \rightarrow S$ ), if the  $S_k$  converge to  $S$  component-wise, i.e.

$$\forall j \exists N_j \text{ such that } \forall k > N_j, \forall j' \leq j \quad i_{j'}^k = i_{j'}.$$

Example: let  $S$  be the sequence  $S_j = (-1)^j(j+1)$  and  $S_k$  the sequences  $S_j^k = (-1)^j((j \pmod k) + 1)$  e.g.

$$\begin{aligned} S &= 1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, \dots \\ S^1 &= 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots \\ S^2 &= 1, -2, 1, -2, 1, -2, 1, -2, \dots \\ S^3 &= 1, -2, 3, -1, 2, -3, 1, -2, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Then  $S_k \rightarrow S$ .

We now formulate and prove our main theorem

**Theorem 1** *The correspondence*

$$x \leftrightarrow S_x$$

is a one-one onto mapping between  $\mathfrak{R}$  and legal behaviors. Furthermore if  $x$  is a point and  $x_i$  is a sequence of points such that  $S_{x_i} \rightarrow S_x$ , then  $x_i \rightarrow x$ .

*Proof:* To prove the first part we must show that for every legal behavior  $S$  there is a unique point  $x$  such that  $S_x = S$ . We will treat the two cases  $S$  finite and  $S$  infinite separately.

First assume that  $S$  is a finite alternating sequence

$$S = i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n, 0.$$

Recall the function  $t_n$  defined in (21): it is a one-one function with the property

$$D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = t_n(I_{i_n}).$$

We now claim that  $x = t_n(a_{i_n})$  is the unique point such that  $S_x = S$ . This  $x$  satisfies  $S_x = S$  because  $x \in D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$  and  $f^{(|i_n|)}(a_{i_n}) = 0$ . Suppose now that  $x \neq t_n(a_{i_n})$  is another point such that  $S_x = S$ . Then  $x \in D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$  so there is a unique  $x' \in I_{i_n}$  such that  $x = t(x')$ . Furthermore we must have  $f^{(|i_n|)}(x') = 0$ . The unique  $x'$  that satisfies this last condition is  $x' = a_{i_n}$ . Therefore  $x = t_n(a_{i_n})$  is the unique point which satisfies  $S_x = S$ .

Now assume that  $S = i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n, \dots$  is infinite. By definition

$$S_x = S \iff x \in \bigcap_n D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n).$$

To simplify our notation we will set  $D_n = D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$ . We have already seen that the  $D_n$  are nested intervals with  $\mu(D_n) \downarrow 0$ . If the intervals were also closed then, as mentioned in the first paragraph in this section, there would be a unique  $x$  such that  $\bigcap_n D_n = \{x\}$  and we would be finished.

The  $D_n$  are not closed; they are half-open, half-closed intervals, e.g.,  $D(5) = I_5 = (a_4, a_5]$ . Thus the  $\overline{D_n}$ , the closures of the  $D_n$ , are nested closed intervals e.g.,  $\overline{D(5)} = [a_4, a_5]$ . Furthermore  $\mu(\overline{D_n}) = \mu(D_n) \downarrow 0$  so there is a unique  $x$  such that  $\bigcap_n \overline{D_n} = \{x\}$ . To prove that there is a unique  $x$ ,  $S_x = S$ , it will therefore suffice to prove that  $\bigcap_n D_n = \bigcap_n \overline{D_n}$ .

Recall that  $D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = t_n(I_{i_n})$ . where

$$t_0(x) = x, \quad t_n(x) = t_{n-1} \circ g^{(|i_{n-1}|-1)} \circ h(x).$$

The function  $t_n$  is the repeated composition of the functions  $h$  and  $g$ . Both of these functions are continuous and map  $\mathfrak{R}$  to  $\mathfrak{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)} &= \overline{t_n(I_{i_n})} \\
&= \overline{t_{n-1} \circ g^{(|i_{n-1}|-1)} \circ h(I_{i_n})} \\
&= t_{n-1} \circ g^{(|i_{n-1}|-1)}(\overline{h(I_{i_n})}).
\end{aligned}$$

Our next step is to calculate  $\overline{h(I_i)}$  for all  $i \neq 0$ . If  $i > 0$  then  $I_i = (a_{i-1}, a_i]$  so  $h(I_i) = \left(-\frac{1}{a_i}, -\frac{1}{a_{i+1}}\right]$ . Thus  $\overline{h(I_i)} = h(I_i) \cup \{-\frac{1}{a_i}\}$ . A similar calculation shows that this remains true even when  $i < 0$ . Therefore we have found that

$$\overline{D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)} = D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) \cup \{t_{n-1} \circ g^{(|i_{n-1}|-1)} \circ h(u_n)\}$$

where  $u_n = -\frac{1}{a_{i_n}}$ .

We can rewrite this as  $\overline{D_n} = D_n \cup \{x_n\}$  where  $x_n = t_{n-1} \circ g^{(|i_{n-1}|-1)} \circ h(u_n)$ . By definition we have that

$$f^{(|i_0|+|i_1|+\dots+|i_{n-2}|+|i_{n-1}|-1)}(x_n) = u_n \quad (28)$$

and thus  $x_n \in B_0$ , the set of preimages of 0.

Suppose now that  $\bigcap_n \overline{D_n} \neq \bigcap_n D_n$ . Because the  $D_n$  are nested there must be some integer  $N$  and some point  $y$  such that, for all  $n \geq N$ , we have  $x_n = y$  and  $y \in \overline{D_n}$  but  $y \notin D_n$ . From what we have seen above we know that  $y = x_N \in B_0$  so  $S_y$  is finite. Thus there is some  $m$  such that  $f^{(m)}(y) = 0$ ; any further iterate of  $y$  will be undefined. In particular  $f^{(|i_0|+|i_1|+\dots+|i_{n-2}|+|i_{n-1}|)}(y)$  will be undefined. But this contradicts (28) so we must have  $\bigcap_n \overline{D_n} = \bigcap_n D_n$  and thus, for every  $S$ , there is a unique point  $x$  with  $S_x = S$ .

We now prove that if  $S_{x_n} \rightarrow S_x$  then  $x_n \rightarrow x$ . We must show that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an  $N$  such that for all  $n > N$ ,  $|x_n - x| \leq \epsilon$ . This is straightforward. Given  $s$  let  $j$  be the first integer such that  $\mu(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_j)) \leq \epsilon$ . Lemma 2 tells us that such a  $j$  must exist. Since  $S_{x_n} \rightarrow S_x$  there must be an  $N$  such that for all  $n > N$ ,  $\forall k \leq j$ ,  $i_k^{x_n} = i_k^x$ . Therefore  $x_n, x \in D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_j)$  so  $|x_n - x| \leq \epsilon$ . ■

The theorem lets us derive properties describing the iterated dynamics of  $f$ . We use the fact that if  $S_y$  is a suffix of  $S_x$  then  $y \in F_x$  and  $x \in B_y$ . By suffix we mean that there is some  $n > 0$  such that  $i_j^y = i_{n+j}^x$  for all  $j \geq 0$ . Theorem 1 tells us that for a given  $x$  and fixed  $n$  there is a unique  $y$  that fulfills this condition. The definition of  $S_x$  tells us that  $y = f^{(|i_0|+|i_1|+\dots+|i_{n-1}|)}(x)$ . Thus  $y \in F_x$  and  $x \in B_y$ .

As an example suppose that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_y &= 1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, 7, -8, 9, -10, 11, -12, \dots \\
S_x &= 13, -13, 13, -13, 1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, 7, -8, \dots
\end{aligned}$$

Then  $S_y$  is a suffix of  $S_x$ .

Recall that a point is periodic if there is some  $j$  such that  $f^{(j)}(x) = x$ . The discussion in the previous paragraph implies that if  $S_x$  is periodic in the sense that there is some  $n > 0$  such that  $i_j^x = i_{j+n}^x$  for all  $j \geq 0$ , i.e.  $x$  is periodic (the converse is almost but not quite true). Thus we can prove Fact 1:

**Lemma 3** *Let  $P = \{x : \exists j \ f^{(j)}(x) = x\}$  be the set of periodic points. Then  $P$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ .*

*Proof:* We will actually show that  $P$  is dense in the set of all points with infinite behaviors,  $\mathfrak{R} \setminus B_0$ . Since  $B_0$  is countable the proof will follow. The general idea is to construct a sequence of periodic behaviors  $S_{x_n}$  that converge to  $S_x$ . For example if

$$S_x = 1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, 7, -8, 9, -10, \dots$$

then we might choose  $x_n$  so that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{x_1} &= 1, -2, 1, -2, 1, -2, 1, -2, \dots \\
S_{x_2} &= 1, -2, 3, -4, 1, -2, 3, -4, 1, -2, \dots \\
S_{x_3} &= 1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, 1, -2, 3, -4, \dots
\end{aligned}$$

etc..

Formally let  $x \in \mathfrak{R} \setminus B_0$  with  $S_x = i_0^x, i_1^x, \dots$ . By choice  $S_x$  is infinite. For  $n > 0$  let  $x_n$  be the unique point that satisfies  $i_j^{x_n} = i_{j \bmod(2n)}^x$ :

$$S_{x_n} = i_0^x, i_1^x, \dots, i_{2n-1}^x, i_0^x, i_1^x, \dots, i_{2n-1}^x, \dots$$

(The modulus is taken  $2n$  and not  $n$  to ensure that  $S_{x_n}$  alternates.) By definition  $x_n \in P$ . It is not hard to see that  $S_{x_n} \rightarrow S_x$  so  $x_n \rightarrow x$  and we have finished the proof. ■

We use the same technique to prove Fact 2, that the set of preimages of any point is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

**Lemma 4** For all  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$  the set  $B_x$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

*Proof:* Fix  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$ . The behavior  $S_x = i_0^x, i_1^x, \dots$  can be finite or infinite. As in the previous lemma it will be enough to show that  $B_x$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R} \setminus B_0$ .

Let  $y$  be an arbitrary point in  $\mathfrak{R} \setminus B_0$ :  $S_y = i_0^y, i_1^y, \dots$  is infinite. We construct a sequence of points  $x_n$  such that  $S_{x_n} \rightarrow S_y$ . Furthermore  $S_x$  will be a suffix of each of the  $S_{x_n}$  so  $x_n \in B_x$ . The proof of the lemma will follow from Theorem 1. As an example suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} S_x &= 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots \\ S_y &= 1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, 7, -8, 9, -10, \dots \end{aligned}$$

We can choose the  $x_n$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{x_1} &= 1, -2, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots \\ S_{x_2} &= 1, -2, 3, -4, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots \\ S_{x_3} &= 1, -2, 3, -4, 5, -6, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots \\ S_{x_4} &= 1, -2, 1, -1, 5, -6, 7, -8, 1, -1, \dots \end{aligned}$$

Formally, we construct the  $x_n$  so that  $S_{x_n}$  starts out as  $S_y$  but ends as  $S_x$ . To do this we define a parameter  $\delta$  that ensures that the copies of  $S_x$  commence at locations in the  $S_{x_n}$  that have the proper parity.

$$\delta = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{sign}(i_0^x) = \text{sign}(i_0^y) \\ 1 & \text{if } \text{sign}(i_0^x) \neq \text{sign}(i_0^y) \end{cases}$$

where  $\text{sign}(i) = i/|i|$ .

We now set  $x_n$  to be the unique point such that

$$i_k^{x_n} = \begin{cases} i_k^y & 0 \leq k \leq 2n + \delta \\ i_{k-2n-\delta}^x & k > 2n + \delta \end{cases}$$

The points  $x_n$  are all in  $B_x$  and  $S_{x_n} \rightarrow S_y$ , therefore  $x_n \rightarrow y$  and we have finished the proof. ■

Utilizing the same technique yet again we prove Fact 3:

**Lemma 5** The set

$$D = \{x : F_x \text{ is dense in } \mathfrak{R}\}$$

is itself dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$  and has cardinality  $\aleph_1$ .

*Proof:* We start by showing how to construct a point  $x \in D$ . Let  $A$  be the set of all finite alternating sequences with odd length whose first element is positive. It includes sequences such as  $\alpha = 1, -3, 5$ . If  $\alpha$  is a sequence we use  $-\alpha$  to denote the sequence whose elements are the negatives of those in  $\alpha$ . For the given example  $-\alpha = -1, 3, -5$ . Now,  $A$  is a countable set so we can enumerate all the sequences in  $A$  as  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$ . Let  $S$  be the concatenation of all of the pairs  $\alpha_i, -\alpha_i$ . That is

$$S = \alpha_1, -\alpha_1, \alpha_2, -\alpha_2, \alpha_3, -\alpha_3, \dots$$

Let  $x$  be the unique point with  $S_x = S$ . We claim that  $F_x$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

Let  $y \in \mathfrak{R} \setminus B_0$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ . We must show that there is some  $i$  such that  $|f^{(i)}(x) - y| < \epsilon$ . From Lemma 2 we know that there is some  $n$  such that if  $y' \in D(i_0^y, i_1^y, \dots, i_n^y)$  then  $|y' - y| < \epsilon$ . Now, by definition, if the sequence  $i_0^y, i_1^y, \dots, i_n^y$  appears anywhere in  $S_x$  then there is some  $i$  such that  $f^{(i)}(x) \in D(i_0^y, i_1^y, \dots, i_n^y)$ . By construction we know that every finite alternating sequence appears somewhere in  $S_x$ . Thus there is some  $i$  such that  $|f^{(i)}(x) - y| < \epsilon$ . Since  $y$  and  $\epsilon$  were chosen arbitrarily we have just shown that  $F_x$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ .

It is easy to modify the construction to show that  $D$  has cardinality  $\aleph_1$ . For each  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  choose  $\beta_i$  to be one of the two sequences  $1, -1$  or  $2, -2$ . Let  $S$  be the concatenation of all of the triplets  $\alpha_i, -\alpha_i, \beta_i$ . That is

$$S = \alpha_1, -\alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, -\alpha_2, \beta_2, \alpha_3, -\alpha_3, \beta_3, \dots$$

Let  $x$  be the unique point with  $S_x = S$ . The analysis of the previous paragraph shows that  $F_x$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ . Since there are  $\aleph_1$  possible choices of the sequences  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \dots$  there are at least  $\aleph_1$  points  $x$  with  $F_x \in D$ .

It remains to show that  $D$  itself is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$ . This is trivial. If  $x \in D$  then  $f(x) \in D$  so  $F_x \subseteq D$ . Since  $F_x$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{R}$  so is  $D$ . ■

We conclude this section by analyzing the structure of the set of all bounded points. This set will be shown to be the union of a countable number of sets, each possessing a structure similar to that of the Cantor set (Fact 4).

**Theorem 2** *The set of bounded points*

$$S = \{x : \exists c > 0, F_x \subseteq [-c, c]\}$$

has cardinality  $\aleph_1$  and measure 0.

*Proof:* We define  $S_m$ , the set of points whose forward orbit is in  $[-a_m, a_m]$ :

$$S_m = \{x : F_x \subseteq [-a_m, a_m]\}. \quad (29)$$

Since  $a_m \uparrow \infty$  we have that  $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq S_3 \dots$  and  $S = \cup S_n$ . We will prove that the cardinality of  $S_2$  is  $\aleph_1$  and therefore so is the cardinality of  $S$ . We will also prove that, for every  $m$ ,  $\mu(S_m) = 0$  and thus  $\mu(S) = \mu(\cup_m S_m) = 0$  because the countable union of sets of measure 0 has measure 0.

Our main tool will again be the correspondence  $x \leftrightarrow S_x$ . As before, for  $x \in \mathfrak{R}$  we denote

$$S_x = i_0^x, i_1^x, i_2^x, \dots$$

With this notation it is easy to see that (29) can be rewritten as

$$S_m = \{x : \forall j, |i_j^x| \leq m\}. \quad (30)$$

For example  $S_1 = \{x, -x\}$  where  $x$  is the unique point such that

$$S_x = 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots$$

$x = 1/\sqrt{3}$ . (This point  $x$  can be found by solving  $f(x) = -x$ .)

That  $S_2$  (and therefore  $S$ ) has cardinality  $\aleph_1$  follows from Theorem 1 together with the fact that the set of infinite alternating sequences that can be constructed utilizing the integers  $1, -1, 2, -2$  has cardinality  $\aleph_1$ . The second part, that  $\mu(S_m) = 0$ , will be more difficult to prove.

For the rest of the proof we assume that  $m > 1$  is fixed. We set

$$D_n = \bigcup_{\substack{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n \\ \forall j \leq n, |i_j| \leq m}} D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$$

where the union is taken over all alternating sequences of length  $n + 1$ . With this definition  $S_m = \bigcap_n D_n$  so it will be enough to show that  $\mu(D_n) \rightarrow 0$ .






Figure 4: This figure illustrates the first three steps in the construction of  $S_3$ , the set of all points whose forward iterations are in the bounded interval  $[-a_3, a_3]$ . The unshaded area in the top diagram is  $D_0$ , in the middle  $D_1$ , and in the bottom  $D_2$ . At each step  $D_{n+1} = D_n \setminus C_n$ .

In Figure 4 we illustrate  $D_0$ ,  $D_1$ , and  $D_2$  for the case  $m = 3$ . Notice how  $D_{n+1}$  is constructed by erasing  $m$  subintervals from each interval in  $D_n$ . This can be thought of as a generalization of the construction of the standard Cantor set.

To proceed we define

$$C(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = \{x : i_j^x = i_j, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n, \quad |i_{n+1}^x| > m\}$$

and

$$C_n = \bigcup_{\substack{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n \\ \forall j \leq n, |i_j| \leq m}} C(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n).$$

That is,  $C_n$  is the set of points in  $D_n$  that are not in  $D_{n+1}$ .

With this definition we have  $C_n \subseteq D_n$  and  $D_{n+1} = D_n \setminus C_n$ . We will show that there is a constant  $u > 0$  such that

$$\frac{\mu(C_n)}{\mu(D_n)} \geq u. \quad (31)$$

This will prove our assertion since it implies that

$$\mu(D_n) = \mu(D_{n-1}) - \mu(C_{n-1}) \leq (1 - u)\mu(D_{n-1}) \leq \dots \leq (1 - u)^n \mu(D_0),$$

and  $\mu(D_n) \downarrow 0$ .

We will actually prove something stronger: that for *any* alternating sequence  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$

$$\frac{\mu(C(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n))}{\mu(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n))} \geq u$$

and (31) will follow because the  $D()$  partition  $D_n$  and the  $C()$  partition  $C_n$ .

We again use our old trick of constructing

$$D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = g^{(|i_0|-1)}(h(D(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n))). \quad (32)$$

Similarly

$$C(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) = g^{(|i_0|-1)}(h(C(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n))). \quad (33)$$

We already saw that  $D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$  is an interval. Similarly  $C(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n)$  is an interval, i.e. this follows from (33) and the fact that  $C(i_n)$  is an interval. We can therefore apply (22) twice to get

$$\frac{\mu(C(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n))}{\mu(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n))} = \frac{\mu(C(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n))}{\mu(D(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n))} \cdot \frac{v'(\zeta_1)}{v'(\zeta_2)} \quad \zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) \quad (34)$$

where  $v(x) = g^{(|i_1|-1)}(h(x))$ .

Both  $g(x)$  and  $h(x)$  are doubly continuously differentiable bounded functions with bounded first and second derivatives when  $x \neq 0$  so  $v(x)$  has the same properties. Therefore, Taylor's theorem with remainder gives

$$v'(\zeta_1) = v'(\zeta_2)[1 - O(|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|)].$$

Lemma 2 tells us that  $|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| = O(r^n)$ . If we set

$$u_n = \min_{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n} \frac{\mu(C(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n))}{\mu(D(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n))}$$

then this bound together with equation (34) tells us that

$$u_n > u_{n-1}(1 - O(r^n)) = u_0 \prod_{t \leq n} (1 - O(r^t))$$

where the constant implicit in the  $O()$  notation is only dependent upon  $m$  and not on the sequence  $i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n$ . (At first glance this constant might look dependent on  $|i_0|$  but  $|i_0|$  has only  $2m - 1$  possible values. Hence we can take the maximum constant associated with any of the possibilities.)

The sum  $\sum_t O(r^t)$  converges; therefore the product  $\prod_t (1 - O(r^t))$  converges to some constant greater than 0. Furthermore, we know that for all  $n$ ,  $u_n > 0$ . Therefore  $u = \inf u_n$  exists and is greater than 0. ■

To quickly review: in this section we showed that there is a one-to-one correspondence between sequences of alternating integers and points on the real axis. This correspondence, given by Theorem 1, was used to derive many properties of the iterated dynamics of  $f$ . Basically, the theorem showed that a point is uniquely defined by its dynamic behavior and that there is a point which corresponds to every behavior.

#### 4 $f(z) = z - \frac{1}{z}$

In this section we sketch how to modify the analysis of the previous section to analyze the iterates of

$$f(x) = x - \frac{1}{x} \quad (35)$$

The analysis is almost the same as that of  $\frac{1}{2}(x - \frac{1}{x})$ . The only difference is in the definition of the functions  $g(x)$  and  $h(x)$ . The inverses of (35) are

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x + \sqrt{x^2 + 4}}{2} & x \geq 0 \\ \frac{x - \sqrt{x^2 + 4}}{2} & x < 0 \end{cases} \quad h(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x - \sqrt{x^2 + 4}}{2} & x \geq 0 \\ \frac{x + \sqrt{x^2 + 4}}{2} & x < 0 \end{cases}$$

Otherwise the analysis is exactly the same (although some of the constants are different). Figure 5 shows the partition  $\mathfrak{R}$  by the  $I_i$  under the new definitions. Notice that whereas in the previous section  $\mu(I_i) \sim 2^{|i|}$  here  $\mu(I_i) \sim \ln|i|$ . This does not cause any changes in the analysis.

**Acknowledgments:** The authors thank Ronald Graham [1] for bringing the question of the dynamics of  $f(z) = z - 1/z$  to their attention.




Figure 5: This figure illustrates how the intervals  $I_i$  partition  $\mathfrak{R}$  when  $f(x) = x - 1/x$ .

## References

- [1] R. Graham, *Computers and Combinatorics*, Distinguished Lecture Series, Department of Computer Science, Princeton University, October 15, 1986.
- [2] M. Hurley and C. Martin *Newton's Algorithm and Chaotic Dynamical Systems*, SIAM J. of Mathematical Analysis, 15, (1984), 238-252.
- [3] Z.A. Melzak *Companion to Concrete Mathematics*, John Wiley and Sons, New York. 1973.
- [4] H.O. Peitgen and P.H. Richter, *The Beauty of Fractals: Images of Complex Dynamic Systems*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin 1986.
- [5] H.O. Peitgen, D. Saupe, and F.V.. Haeseler, *Cayley's Problem and Julia Sets*, The Mathematical Intelligencer, 6, 2, (1984), 11-20.
- [6] D. Saari and J. Urenko, *Newton's Method, Circle Maps, and Chaotic Motion*, American Mathematical Monthly, 91, (1984), 1-17.

**ISSN 0249-6399**