

# 分形分析

(英文版)

CAMBRIDGE TRACTS IN MATHEMATICS

143

## ANALYSIS ON FRACTALS

JUN KIGAMI



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

(日) Jun Kigami 著  
京 都 大 学



机械工业出版社  
China Machine Press

经典原版书库

# 分形分析

(英文版)

Analysis on Fractals

(日) Jun Kigami 著  
京都大学



机械工业出版社  
China Machine Press

Jun Kigami: Analysis on Fractals (ISBN: 0-521-79321-1).

Originally published by Cambridge University Press in 2001.

This reprint edition is published with the permission of the Syndicate of the Press of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England.

Copyright © 2001 by Jun Kigami.

This edition is licensed for distribution and sale in the People's Republic of China only, excluding Hong Kong, Taiwan and Macao and may not be distributed and sold elsewhere.

本书原版由剑桥大学出版社出版。

本书英文影印版由英国剑桥大学出版社授权出版。

此版本仅限在中华人民共和国境内（不包括中国香港、台湾、澳门地区）销售发行，未经授权的书出口将被视为违反版权法的行为。

版权所有，侵权必究。

**本书版权登记号：图字：01-2004-1205**

**图书在版编目（CIP）数据**

分形分析（英文版）/（日）木上淳（Kigami, J.）著. - 北京：机械工业出版社，2004.9  
（经典原版书库）

书名原文：Analysis on Fractals

ISBN 7-111-14981-5

I. 分… II. 木… III. 分形理论－英文 IV. O189

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字（2004）第077157号

机械工业出版社（北京市西城区百万庄大街22号 邮政编码 100037）

责任编辑：迟振春

北京昌平奔腾印刷厂印刷·新华书店北京发行所发行

2004年9月第1版第1次印刷

787mm × 1092mm 1/16 · 14.5印张

印数：0 001-3 000册

定价：35.00元

凡购本书，如有倒页、脱页、缺页，由本社发行部调换

本社购书热线：（010）68326294

# Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Geometry of Self-Similar Sets</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Construction of self-similar sets	8
1.2 Shift space and self-similar sets	12
1.3 Self-similar structure	17
1.4 Self-similar measure	25
1.5 Dimension of self-similar sets	28
1.6 Connectivity of self-similar sets	33
Notes and references	38
Exercises	39
<b>2 Analysis on Limits of Networks</b>	<b>41</b>
2.1 Dirichlet forms and Laplacians on a finite set	41
2.2 Sequence of discrete Laplacians	51
2.3 Resistance form and resistance metric	55
2.4 Dirichlet forms and Laplacians on limits of networks	63
Notes and references	66
Exercises	66
<b>3 Construction of Laplacians on P. C. F. Self-Similar Structures</b>	<b>68</b>
3.1 Harmonic structures	69
3.2 Harmonic functions	73
3.3 Topology given by effective resistance	83
3.4 Dirichlet forms on p. c. f. self-similar sets	88
3.5 Green's function	94
3.6 Green's operator	102
3.7 Laplacians	107
3.8 Nested fractals	115
Notes and references	127

Exercises	128
<b>4 Eigenvalues and Eigenfunctions of Laplacians</b>	<b>131</b>
4.1 Eigenvalues and eigenfunctions	132
4.2 Relation between dimensions	137
4.3 Localized eigenfunctions	141
4.4 Existence of localized eigenfunctions	146
4.5 Estimate of eigenfunctions	152
Notes and references	155
<b>5 Heat Kernels</b>	<b>157</b>
5.1 Construction of heat kernels	158
5.2 Parabolic maximum principle	164
5.3 Asymptotic behavior of the heat kernels	171
Notes and references	178
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>180</b>
<b>A Additional Facts</b>	<b>180</b>
A.1 Second eigenvalue of $A_i$	180
A.2 General boundary conditions	185
A.3 Probabilistic approach	193
<b>B Mathematical Background</b>	<b>196</b>
B.1 Self-adjoint operators and quadratic forms	196
B.2 Semigroups	199
B.3 Dirichlet forms and the Nash inequality	202
B.4 The renewal theorem	207
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>212</b>
<b>Index of Notation</b>	<b>221</b>
<b>Index</b>	<b>222</b>

# Introduction

What is “Analysis on Fractals”? Why is it interesting?

To answer those questions, we need to go back to the history of fractals.

Many examples of fractals, like the Sierpinski gasket, the Koch curve and the Cantor set, were already known to mathematicians early in the twentieth century. Those sets were originally pathological (or exceptional) counterexamples. For instance, the Koch curve (see Figure 0.1) is an example of a compact curve with infinite length and the Cantor set is an example of an uncountable perfect set with zero Lebesgue measure. Consequently, they were thought of as purely mathematical objects. In fact, they attracted much interest in harmonic analysis in connection with Fourier transform, and in geometric measure theory. There were extensive works started in the early twentieth century by Wiener, Winter, Erdős, Hausdorff, Besicovich and so on. See [181], [32] and [124]. These sets, however, had never been associated with any objects in nature.

This situation had not changed until Mandelbrot proposed the notion of fractals in the 1970s. In [122, 123] he claimed that many objects in nature are not collections of smooth components. As evidence, using the experiments by Richardson, he showed that some coast lines were not smooth curves but curves which have infinite length like the Koch curve. Choosing




Fig. 0.1. Koch curve




Fig. 0.2. Sierpinski gasket

words more carefully and accurately, we need to say that some coast lines should be modeled by curves with infinite length rather than (compositions of) smooth curves.

Mandelbrot coined this revolutionary idea and introduced the notion of fractals as a new class of mathematical objects which represent nature. The importance of his proposal was soon recognized in many areas of science, for example, physics, chemistry and biology. In mathematics, a new area called fractal geometry developed quickly on the foundation of geometric measure theory, harmonic analysis, dynamical systems and ergodic theory. Fractal geometry treats the properties of (fractal) sets and measures on them, like the Hausdorff dimension and the Hausdorff measure. From the viewpoint of applications, it concerns the static aspects of the objects in nature.

How about the dynamical aspects? There occur (physical) phenomena on those objects modeled by fractals. How can we describe them? More precisely, how does heat diffuse on fractals and how does a material with a fractal structure vibrate? To give an answer to these questions, we need a theory of "analysis on fractals". For example, on a domain in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , diffusion of heat is described by the heat (or diffusion) equation,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta u,$$

where  $u = u(t, x)$ ,  $t$  is time,  $x$  is position and  $\Delta$  is the Laplacian defined by  $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i^2}$ . If our domain is a fractal, we need to know what the






Fig. 0.3. Approximation of the Sierpinski gasket by graphs  $G_m$

“Laplacian” on it is. This problem contains somewhat contradictory factors. Since fractals like the Sierpinski gasket and the Koch curve do not have any smooth structures, to define differential operators like the Laplacian is not possible from the classical viewpoint of analysis. To overcome such a difficulty is a new challenge in mathematics and this is what analysis on fractals is about.

During the 1970s and 1980s, physicists tried to describe phenomena on fractals. They succeeded in calculating some of the physical characteristics of fractals, for example, the spectral exponent, which should describe the distribution of the eigenstates. (See, for example, [118] and [75] for reviews of studies in physics.) However they did not know how to define “Laplacians” on fractals. See Note and References of Chapter 4 for details.

Motivated by studies in physics, Kusuoka [106] and Goldstein [51] independently took the first step in the mathematical development. They constructed “Brownian motion” on the Sierpinski gasket. Their method of construction is now called the probabilistic approach. First they considered a sequence of random walks on the graphs which approximate the Sierpinski gasket and showed that by taking a certain scaling factor, those random walks converged to a diffusion process on the Sierpinski gasket. To be more precise, let us define the Sierpinski gasket. Let  $\{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$  be a set of vertices of an equilateral triangle in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Define  $f_i(z) = (z - p_i)/2 + p_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Then The Sierpinski gasket  $K$  is the unique non-empty compact subset  $K$  of  $\mathbb{R}$  that satisfies

$$K = f_1(K) \cup f_2(K) \cup f_3(K).$$

See Figure 0.2. Let  $V_0 = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ . Define a sequence of finite sets  $\{V_m\}_{m \geq 0}$  inductively by  $V_{m+1} = f_1(V_m) \cup f_2(V_m) \cup f_3(V_m)$ . Then we have the natural graph  $G_m$  whose set of vertices is  $V_m$ . (See Figure 0.3.)



For  $p \in V_m$ , let  $V_{m,p}$  be the collection of the direct neighbors of  $p$  in  $V_m$ . Observe that  $\#(V_{m,p}) = 4$  if  $p \notin V_0$  and  $\#(V_{m,p}) = 2$  if  $p \in V_0$ , where  $\#(A)$  is the number of elements in a set  $A$ . Let  $X_t^{(m)}$  be the simple random walk on  $G_m$ . (This means that if a particle is at  $p$  at time  $t$ , it will move to one of the direct neighbors with the probability  $\#(V_{m,p})^{-1}$  at time  $t + 1$ .) What Kusuoka and Goldstein proved was that

$$X_{5^{-m}t}^{(m)} \rightarrow X_t$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $X_t$  was a diffusion process, called Brownian motion, on the Sierpinski gasket. In this probabilistic approach, a Laplacian is the infinitesimal generator of the semigroup which is associated with the diffusion process.

Barlow and Perkins [20] followed the probabilistic approach and obtained an Aronson-type estimate of the heat kernel associated with Brownian motion on the Sierpinski gasket. See Notes and References of Chapter 5. Then, in [116], Lindström extended this construction of Brownian motion to nested fractals, which is a class of finitely ramified self-similar sets with strong symmetry. See 3.8 for the definition of nested fractals. (Roughly speaking, finitely ramified self-similar sets are the self-similar sets which become disconnected if one removes a finite number of points. See 1.3 for details.)

On the other hand, in [82], a direct definition of the Laplacian on the Sierpinski gasket was proposed. Under this direct definition, one could describe the structures of harmonic functions, Green's function and solutions of Poisson's equations. This alternative approach is called the analytical approach. Instead of the sequence of random walks, one considered a sequence of discrete Laplacians on the graphs and then proved that by choosing a proper scaling, those discrete Laplacians would converge to a good operator, called the Laplacian on the Sierpinski gasket. More precisely, let  $\ell(V_m) = \{f : f \text{ maps } V_m \text{ to } \mathbb{R}\}$ . Then define a linear operator  $L_m : \ell(V_m) \rightarrow \ell(V_m)$  by

$$(L_m u)(p) = \sum_{q \in V_{m,p}} (u(q) - u(p))$$

for any  $u \in \ell(V_m)$  and any  $p \in V_m$ . This operator  $L_m$  is the natural discrete Laplacian on the graph  $G_m$ . Then the Laplacian on the Sierpinski gasket, denoted by  $\Delta$ , is defined by

$$5^m (L_m u)(p) \rightarrow (\Delta u)(p)$$

as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ . This  $\Delta$  is now called the standard Laplacian on the Sierpinski

gasket. (Of course, it needs to be shown that  $\Delta$  is a meaningful operator in some sense with a non-trivial domain, as we will show in the course of this book. Also we will explain why  $5^m$  is the proper scaling. See 3.7, in particular, Example 3.7.3.) This analytical approach was followed by Kusuoka [107] and Kigami [83], where they extended the construction of the Laplacians to more general class of finitely ramified fractals.

Since those early studies, many people have studied analysis on fractals and obtained numerous results using both approaches. Naturally the two approaches are complementary to each other and share the same goal. In this book, we will basically follow the analytical approach and study Dirichlet forms, Laplacians, eigenvalues of Laplacians and heat kernels on post critically finite self-similar sets. (Post critically finite self-similar sets are the mathematical formulation of finite ramified self-similar sets. See 1.3.) The advantage of the analytical approach is that one can get concrete and direct description of harmonic functions, Green's functions, Dirichlet forms and Laplacians. On the other hand, however, studying the detailed structure of the heat kernels, like the Aronson-type estimates, we need to employ the probabilistic approach. (Barlow's lecture note [6] is a self-contained and well-organized exposition in this direction. See also Kumagai [104] for a review of recent results.) Moreover, the probabilistic approach can be applied to infinitely ramified self-similar sets, for example, the Sierpinski carpet (Figure 0.4) as well. In the series of papers, [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12], Barlow and Bass constructed Brownian motions on the (higher dimensional) Sierpinski carpets and obtained the Aronson-type estimate of the associated heat kernels by using the probabilistic approach. Except for Kusuoka and Zhou [109], so far, the analytical approach has not succeeded in studying analysis on infinitely ramified fractals.

One may ask "why do you only study self-similar sets?". Indeed, self-similar sets are a special class of fractals and there are no objects in nature which have the exact structures of self-similar sets. The reason is that self-similar sets are perhaps the simplest and the most basic structures in the theory of fractals. They should give us much information on what would happen in the general case of fractals. Although there have been many studies on analysis on fractals, we are still near the beginning in the exploration of this field. We hope that this volume will contribute to fruitful developments in the future.

The organization of this book is as follows. In the first chapter, we will explain the basics of the geometry of self-similar sets. We will give the definition of self-similar sets, study topological structures of self-similar sets and introduce self-similar measures on them. The key notion is the self-




Fig. 0.4. Sierpinski carpet

similar structure which is a purely topological description of a self-similar set. See 1.3. Also, we will define post critically finite self-similar structure in 1.3, which will be our main stage of analysis on fractals.

In Chapter 2, we will study analysis on finite sets, namely, Dirichlet forms and Laplacians. The important fact is that those notions are closely related to electrical networks and that the effective resistance associated with them gives a distance on the finite set. Getting much help from this analogy with electrical networks, we will study the convergence of Dirichlet forms on a sequence of finite sets. This convergence theory will play an essential role in constructing Dirichlet forms and Laplacians on post critically finite self-similar sets in the next chapter.

Chapter 3 is the heart of this book, where we will explain how to construct Dirichlet forms, harmonic functions, Green's functions and Laplacians on post critically finite self-similar sets. The key notion here is the "harmonic structure" introduced in 3.1. In this chapter, we will spend many pages to argue how to deal with the case when a harmonic structure is not regular and also when  $K \setminus V_0$  is not connected, where  $K$  is the self-similar set and  $V_0$  corresponds to the boundary of  $K$ . These cases are of interest and sometimes really make a difference. However one would still get most of the essence of the theory by assuming that the harmonic structure is regular and that  $K \setminus V_0$  is connected. So the reader may do so to avoid too many proofs.

In Chapter 4, we will study eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of Laplacians

on post critically finite self-similar sets. We will obtain a Weyl-type estimate of the distribution of eigenvalues in 4.1 and show the existence of localized eigenfunctions in 4.4.

In the final chapter, we will study (Dirichlet or Neumann) heat kernels associated with Laplacians (or Dirichlet forms). In 5.2, it will be shown that the parabolic maximum principle holds for solutions of the heat equations. In 5.3, we will get on-diagonal estimates of heat kernels as time goes to zero.

This book is based on my graduate course at Cornell University in the fall semester, 1997. I would like to thank the Department of Mathematics, Cornell University for their hospitality. In particular, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor R. S. Strichartz, who suggested that I wrote these lecture notes, and gave me many fruitful comments on the manuscript. I also thank Dr. C. Blum and Dr. A. Teplyaev who attended my lecture and gave me many useful suggestions. I am also grateful to the Isaac Newton Institute of Mathematical Science, University of Cambridge, where a considerable part of the manuscript was written during my stay. I would express my special thanks to Professors M. T. Barlow and R. F. Bass who carefully read the whole manuscript and helped me to improve my written English. I would also like to thank all the people who gave me valuable comments on the material; among them are Professors M. L. Lapidus, B. M. Hambly, V. Metz, T. Kumagai, Mr. T. Shimonono and Mr. K. Kuwada. Finally I would like thank the late Professor Masaya Yamaguti, who was my thesis adviser and introduced me to the study of analysis on fractals.

# 1

## Geometry of Self-Similar Sets

In this chapter, we will review some basics on the geometry of self-similar sets which will be needed later. Specifically, we will explain what a self-similar set is (in 1.1), how to understand the structure of a self-similar set (in 1.2 and 1.3) and how to calculate the Hausdorff dimension of a self-similar set (in 1.5).

The key notion is that of a “self-similar structure” introduced in 1.3, which is a description of a self-similar set from a purely topological viewpoint. As we will explain in 1.3, the topological structure of a self-similar set is essential in constructing analytical structures like Laplacians and Dirichlet forms. More precisely, if two self-similar sets are topologically the same (i.e., homeomorphic), then analytical structure on one self-similar set can be transferred to another self-similar set through the homeomorphism.

In particular, we will introduce the notion of post critically finite self-similar structures, on which we will construct the analytical structures like Laplacians and Dirichlet forms in Chapter 3.

### 1.1 Construction of self-similar sets

In this section, we will define self-similar sets on a metric space and show an existence and uniqueness theorem for self-similar sets. First we will introduce the notion of contractions on a metric space.

**Notation.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. For  $x \in X$  and  $r > 0$ ,

$$B_r(x) = \{y : y \in X, d(x, y) \leq r\}$$

**Definition 1.1.1.** Let  $(X, d_X)$  and  $(Y, d_Y)$  be metric spaces. A map  $f :$

$X \rightarrow Y$  is said to be (uniformly) Lipschitz continuous on  $X$  with respect to  $d_X, d_Y$  if

$$L = \sup_{x, y \in X, x \neq y} \frac{d_Y(f(x), f(y))}{d_X(x, y)} < \infty.$$

The above constant  $L$  is called the Lipschitz constant of  $f$  and is denoted by  $L = \text{Lip}(f)$ .

Obviously, by the above definition, a Lipschitz continuous map is continuous.

**Definition 1.1.2 (Contraction).** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space. If  $f : X \rightarrow X$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $X$  with respect to  $d$  and  $\text{Lip}(f) < 1$ , then  $f$  is called a contraction with respect to the metric  $d$  with contraction ratio  $\text{Lip}(f)$ . In particular, a contraction  $f$  with contraction ratio  $r$  is called a similitude if  $d(f(x), f(y)) = rd(x, y)$  for all  $x, y \in X$ .

*Remark.* If  $f$  is a similitude on  $(\mathbb{R}^n, d_E)$ , where  $d_E$  is the Euclidean distance on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then there exist  $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $U \in O(n)$  and  $r > 0$  such that  $f(x) = rUx + a$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . (Exercise 1.1)

The following theorem is called the "contraction principle".

**Theorem 1.1.3 (Contraction principle).** Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and let  $f : X \rightarrow X$  be a contraction with respect to the metric  $d$ . Then there exists a unique fixed point of  $f$ , in other words, there exists a unique solution to the equation  $f(x) = x$ . Moreover if  $x_*$  is the fixed point of  $f$ , then  $\{f^n(a)\}_{n \geq 0}$  converges to  $x_*$  for all  $a \in X$  where  $f^n$  is the  $n$ -th iteration of  $f$ .

*Proof.* If  $r$  is the ratio of contraction of  $f$ , then for  $m > n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} d(f^n(a), f^m(a)) &\leq d(f^n(a), f^{n+1}(a)) + \cdots + d(f^{m-1}(a), f^m(a)) \\ &\leq (r^n + \cdots + r^{m-1})d(a, f(a)) \leq \frac{r^n}{(1-r)}d(a, f(a)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\{f^n(a)\}_{n \geq 0}$  is a Cauchy sequence. As  $(X, d)$  is complete, there exists  $x_* \in X$  such that  $f^n(a) \rightarrow x_*$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Using the fact that  $f^{(n+1)}(a) = f(f^n(a))$ , we can easily deduce that  $x_* = f(x_*)$ .

Now, if  $f(x) = x$  and  $f(y) = y$ , then  $d(x, y) = d(f(x), f(y)) \leq rd(x, y)$ . Therefore  $d(x, y) = 0$  and  $x = y$ . So we have uniqueness of fixed points.  $\square$

*Remark.* In general, for a mapping  $f$  from a set to itself, a solution of  $f(x) = x$  is called a fixed point or an equilibrium point of  $f$ .

We now state the main theorem of this section, which ensures uniqueness and existence of self-similar sets.

**Theorem 1.1.4.** *Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space. If  $f_i : X \rightarrow X$  is a contraction with respect to the metric  $d$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , then there exists a unique non-empty compact subset  $K$  of  $X$  that satisfies*

$$K = f_1(K) \cup \dots \cup f_N(K).$$

*$K$  is called the self-similar set with respect to  $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N\}$ .*

*Remark.* In other literature, the name "self-similar set" is used in a more restricted sense. For example, Hutchinson [76] uses the name "self-similar set" only if all the contractions are similitudes. Also, in the case that all the contractions are affine functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the associated set may be called a self-affine set.

The contraction principle is a special case of Theorem 1.1.4 where  $N = 1$ .

In the rest of this section, we will give a proof of Theorem 1.1.4. Define

$$F(A) = \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq N} f_j(A)$$

for  $A \subseteq X$ . The main idea is to show existence of a fixed point of  $F$ . In order to do so, first we choose a good domain for  $F$ , defined by

$$\mathcal{C}(X) = \{A : A \text{ is a non-empty compact subset of } X\}.$$

Obviously  $F$  is a mapping from  $\mathcal{C}(X)$  to itself. Next we define a metric  $\delta$  on  $\mathcal{C}(X)$ , which is called the Hausdorff metric on  $\mathcal{C}(X)$ .

**Proposition 1.1.5.** *For  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ , define*

$$\delta(A, B) = \inf\{r > 0 : U_r(A) \supseteq B \text{ and } U_r(B) \supseteq A\},$$

*where  $U_r(A) = \{x \in X : d(x, y) \leq r \text{ for some } y \in A\} = \bigcup_{y \in A} B_r(y)$ . Then  $\delta$  is a metric on  $\mathcal{C}(X)$ . Moreover if  $(X, d)$  is complete, then  $(\mathcal{C}(X), \delta)$  is also complete.*

Before giving a proof of the above proposition, we recall some standard definitions in general topology.

**Definition 1.1.6.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space and let  $K$  be a subset of  $X$ .

- (1) A finite set  $A \subset K$  is called an  $r$ -net of  $K$  for  $r > 0$  if and only if  $\bigcup_{x \in A} B_r(x) \supseteq K$ .
- (2)  $K$  is said to be totally bounded if and only if there exists an  $r$ -net of  $K$  for any  $r > 0$ .



It is well-known that a metric space is compact if and only if it is complete and totally bounded.

*Proof of Proposition 1.1.5.* Obviously, we see that  $\delta(A, B) = \delta(B, A) \geq 0$  and  $\delta(A, A) = 0$ .

$\delta(A, B) = 0 \Rightarrow A = B$ : For any  $n$ ,  $U_{1/n}(B) \supseteq A$ . Therefore for any  $x \in A$ , we can choose  $x_n \in B$  such that  $d(x, x_n) \leq 1/n$ . As  $B$  is closed,  $x \in B$ . Hence we have  $A \subseteq B$ . One can obtain  $B \subseteq A$  in exactly the same way.

Triangle inequality: If  $r > \delta(A, B)$  and  $s > \delta(B, C)$ , then  $U_{r+s}(A) \supseteq C$  and  $U_{r+s}(C) \supseteq A$ . Hence  $r+s \geq \delta(A, C)$ . This implies  $\delta(A, B) + \delta(B, C) \geq \delta(A, C)$ .

Next we prove that  $(\mathcal{C}(X), \delta)$  is complete if  $(X, d)$  is complete. For a Cauchy sequence  $\{A_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  in  $(\mathcal{C}(X), \delta)$ , define  $B_n = \overline{\cup_{k \geq n} A_k}$ . First we will show that  $B_n$  is compact. As  $B_n$  is a monotonically decreasing sequence of closed sets, it is enough to show that  $B_1$  is compact. For any  $r > 0$ , we can choose  $m$  so that  $U_{r/2}(A_m) \supseteq A_k$  for all  $k \geq m$ . As  $A_m$  is compact, there exists a  $r/2$ -net  $P$  of  $A_m$ . We can immediately verify that  $\cup_{x \in P} B_r(x) \supseteq U_{r/2}(A_m) \supseteq \cup_{k \geq m} A_k$ . As  $\cup_{x \in P} B_r(x)$  is closed, it is easy to see that  $P$  is an  $r$ -net of  $B_m$ . Adding  $r$ -nets of  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{m-1}$  to  $P$ , we can obtain an  $r$ -net of  $B_1$ . Hence  $B_1$  is totally bounded. Also,  $B_1$  is complete because it is a closed subset of the complete metric space  $X$ . Thus it follows that  $B_n$  is compact.

Now as  $\{B_n\}$  is a monotonically decreasing sequence of non-empty compact sets,  $A = \cap_{n \geq 1} B_n$  is compact and non-empty. For any  $r > 0$ , we can choose  $m$  so that  $U_r(A_m) \supseteq A_k$  for all  $k \geq m$ . Then  $U_r(A_m) \supseteq B_m \supseteq A$ . On the other hand,  $U_r(A) \supseteq B_m \supseteq A_m$  for sufficiently large  $m$ . Thus we have  $\delta(A, A_m) \leq r$  for sufficiently large  $m$ . Hence  $A_m \rightarrow A$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  in the Hausdorff metric. So  $(\mathcal{C}(X), \delta)$  is complete.  $\square$

Theorem 1.1.4 can be stated in the following way using the Hausdorff metric  $(\mathcal{C}(X), \delta)$ .

**Theorem 1.1.7.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a complete metric space and let  $f_i : X \rightarrow X$  be a contraction for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Define  $F : \mathcal{C}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(X)$  by  $F(A) = \cup_{1 \leq i \leq n} f_i(A)$ . Then  $F$  has a unique fixed point  $K$ . Moreover, for any  $A \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ ,  $F^n(A)$  converges to  $K$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  with respect to the Hausdorff metric.

**Lemma 1.1.8.** For  $A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ ,

$$\delta(A_1 \cup A_2, B_1 \cup B_2) \leq \max\{\delta(A_1, B_1), \delta(A_2, B_2)\}$$

*Proof.* If  $r > \max\{\delta(A_1, B_1), \delta(A_2, B_2)\}$ , then  $U_r(A_1) \supseteq B_1$  and  $U_r(A_2) \supseteq B_2$ . Hence  $U_r(A_1 \cup A_2) \supseteq B_1 \cup B_2$ . A similar argument implies  $U_r(B_1 \cup B_2) \supseteq A_1 \cup A_2$ . Hence  $r \geq \delta(A_1 \cup A_2, B_1 \cup B_2)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.1.9.** *If  $f$  is a contraction with contraction ratio  $r$ , then, for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ ,  $\delta(f(A), f(B)) \leq r\delta(A, B)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $U_s(A) \supseteq B$  and  $U_s(B) \supseteq A$ ,  $U_{sr}(f(A)) \supseteq f(U_s(A)) \supseteq f(B)$ . Also the same argument implies  $U_{sr}(f(B)) \supseteq f(A)$ . Therefore,  $\delta(f(A), f(B)) \leq rs$  and this completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.7.* Using Lemma 1.1.8 repeatedly, we obtain

$$\delta(F(A), F(B)) = \delta(\cup_{1 \leq j \leq N} f_j(A), \cup_{1 \leq j \leq N} f_j(B)) \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \delta(f_j(A), f_j(B)).$$

By Lemma 1.1.9,  $\delta(f_i(A), f_i(B)) \leq r_i \delta(A, B)$ , where  $r_i$  is the contraction ratio of  $f_i$ . If  $r = \max_{1 \leq i \leq N} r_i$ , then  $\delta(F(A), F(B)) \leq r \delta(A, B)$ . Therefore  $F$  turns out to be a contraction with respect to the Hausdorff metric. By Proposition 1.1.5, we see that  $(\mathcal{C}(X), \delta)$  is complete. Now the contraction principle (Theorem 1.1.3) implies Theorem 1.1.7 immediately.  $\square$

## 1.2 Shift space and self-similar sets

In this section, we will introduce the shift space, which is the key to understanding the topological structure of self-similar sets. In fact, Theorem 1.2.3 will show that every self-similar set is a quotient space of a shift space.

**Definition 1.2.1.** Let  $N$  be a natural number.

(1) For  $m \geq 1$ , we define

$$W_m^N = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}^m = \{w_1 w_2 \dots w_m : w_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}\}.$$

$w \in W_m^N$  is called a word of length  $m$  with symbols  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Also, for  $m = 0$ , we define  $W_0^N = \{\emptyset\}$  and call  $\emptyset$  the empty word. Moreover, set  $W_*^N = \cup_{m \geq 0} W_m^N$  and denote the length of  $w \in W_*^N$  by  $|w|$ .

(2) The collection of one-sided infinite sequences of symbols  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$  is denoted by  $\Sigma^N$ , which is called the shift space with  $N$ -symbols. More precisely,

$$\Sigma^N = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}^{\mathbb{N}} = \{\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \dots : \omega_i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \text{ for } i \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

For  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , define a map  $\sigma_k : \Sigma^N \rightarrow \Sigma^N$  by  $\sigma_k(\omega_1 \omega_2 \omega_3 \dots) =$