

Canonical number systems for complex integers

By I. KÁTAI and J. SZABÓ in Budapest

1. It is a well-known fact that every non-negative integer N has a unique representation of the form

$$(1.1) \quad N = a_0 + a_1 A + \dots + a_k A^k,$$

where the integers a_j are selected from the set $\{0, 1, \dots, A-1\}$, and A is an integer, $A \geq 2$. Furthermore, choosing a negative integer $-A$ ($A \geq 2$), we can represent every integer N as a sum:

$$(1.2) \quad N = a_0 + a_1(-A) + \dots + a_k(-A)^k, \quad 0 \leq a_j \leq A-1, \quad (j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1),$$

where a_j are integers. The representation (1.2) is also unique.

The number systems of negative base have some applications in the theory of computations.

The following question seems to be interesting: Given a Gaussian integer ϑ , can we represent every Gaussian integer α in the form

$$(1.3) \quad \alpha = r_0 + r_1 \vartheta + \dots + r_k \vartheta^k$$

or not? Here $r_j \in \mathfrak{A}$, \mathfrak{A} being a fixed complete residue system mod ϑ .

If the answer is affirmative, we say that $(\vartheta, \mathfrak{A})$ is a number system.

We shall investigate only the case $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{A}_0$ where

$$(1.4) \quad \mathfrak{A}_0 = \{0, 1, \dots, N(\vartheta)-1\},$$

and $N(\vartheta)$ denotes the "norm"

$$N(\vartheta) = \vartheta \cdot \bar{\vartheta} = (\operatorname{Re} \vartheta)^2 + (\operatorname{Im} \vartheta)^2.$$

It is known that for $\vartheta = -1+i$, $(\vartheta, \mathfrak{A}_0)$ is a number system; see [1]

We prove:

Theorem 1. $(\vartheta, \mathfrak{A}_0)$ is a number system if and only if

- a) $\operatorname{Re} \vartheta < 0$ and b) $\operatorname{Im} \vartheta = \pm 1$.

For $\vartheta = -A \pm i$ the representation of α in the form (1.3) is unique.

Theorem 2. Let $\vartheta = -A \pm i$, z an arbitrary complex number. Then

$$(1.5) \quad z = a_l \vartheta^l + \dots + a_0 + \frac{a_{-1}}{\vartheta} + \frac{a_{-2}}{\vartheta^2} + \dots,$$

where $a_j \in \mathfrak{U}_0$ ($j = l, l-1, \dots, 0, -1, -2, \dots$).

We do not assert the uniqueness of the representation of z in the form (1.5).

2. Proof of Theorem 1. Necessity. Let $\vartheta = A + Bi$. Then

$$\mathfrak{U}_0 = \{0, 1, \dots, A^2 + B^2 - 1\}.$$

It is obvious that \mathfrak{U}_0 must be a complete residue system mod ϑ if $(\vartheta, \mathfrak{U}_0)$ is a number system. In the opposite case there is an α which is incongruent to k for every k in \mathfrak{U}_0 , but from (1.3) $\alpha \equiv r_0 \pmod{\vartheta}$, $r_0 \in \mathfrak{U}_0$ follows, and this is a contradiction.

Suppose that $A > 0$. We prove that $\alpha = (1-A) + iB = 1 - \bar{\vartheta}$ has no representation of type (1.3). Suppose in the contrary that

$$(2.1) \quad \alpha = r_0 + r_1 \vartheta + \dots + r_k \vartheta^k.$$

Let

$$\varrho = \alpha(1 - \vartheta) = (1 - A)^2 + B^2 = A^2 + B^2 - 2A + 1.$$

Since $A \equiv 1$, we have $\varrho \in \mathfrak{U}_0$. From (2.1) we get

$$\varrho = r_0 + (r_1 - r_0) \vartheta + \dots + (r_k - r_{k-1}) \vartheta^k - r_k \vartheta^{k+1}.$$

Hence $\varrho \equiv r_0 \pmod{\vartheta}$, and by $\varrho \in \mathfrak{U}_0$, $r_0 \in \mathfrak{U}_0$ we get: $\varrho = r_0$. So

$$(r_1 - r_0) \vartheta + \dots + (r_k - r_{k-1}) \vartheta^k - r_k \vartheta^{k+1} = 0.$$

Hence it follows immediately that

$$r_1 - r_0 = 0, \dots, r_k - r_{k-1} = 0, \dots, r_k = 0,$$

whence $r_k = r_{k-1} = \dots = r_1 = r_0 = 0$. Therefore $\varrho = 0$, and so $A = 1$, $B = 0$. But it is obvious that $\vartheta = 1$ is not a base of a number system. Similarly, $\vartheta = \pm i$ ($A = 0$, $B = \pm 1$) is not a base of a number system, either.

Let now $\text{Im } \vartheta = B \neq \pm 1$. Let us take into account that B is a divisor of $\text{Im } \vartheta^v$ ($v = 1, 2, \dots$). Hence, for an α of (1.3) we get:

$$\text{Im } \alpha = r_1 \text{Im } \vartheta + \dots + r_k \text{Im } \vartheta^k,$$

and so $B | \text{Im } \alpha$. Consequently, (1.3) will not hold for $\alpha = i$ ($B \neq \pm 1$).

Sufficiency. Let now $\vartheta = -A + i$ ($A \equiv 1$). Then \mathfrak{U}_0 is a complete residue system mod ϑ as it is well known. Let us take into account, that

$$(2.2) \quad \vartheta^2 + 2A\vartheta + A^2 + 1 = 0.$$

Let $\alpha = E + Fi$ be an arbitrary Gaussian integer. Taking $D = F$, $C = E + AF$, we get

$$(2.3) \quad \alpha = C + D\vartheta.$$

First we prove that every α has the form

$$(2.4) \quad \alpha = U + V\vartheta + X\vartheta^2 + Y\vartheta^3,$$

where U, V, X, Y are non-negative integers. From (2.2) we have

$$-1 = \vartheta^2 + 2A\vartheta + A^2.$$

Assuming that $C < 0$ we can substitute C in (2.3) by

$$|C| \cdot \vartheta^2 + 2A|C| \cdot \vartheta + A^2|C|.$$

In the case $D < 0$ we take a similar substitution, and get (2.4).

We shall use the following relation:

$$(2.5) \quad A^2 + 1 = \vartheta^3 + (2A - 1)\vartheta^2 + (A - 1)^2\vartheta.$$

Let

$$(2.6) \quad \alpha = d_0 + d_1\vartheta + \dots + d_k\vartheta^k \quad (k \geq 3), \quad d_j \geq 0 \quad (j = 0, \dots, k).$$

Let

$$(2.7) \quad t(\alpha, d) = d_0 + d_1 + \dots + d_k;$$

$t(\alpha, d)$ is a non-negative integer, $t(\alpha, d) = 0$ only if $\alpha = 0$.

We take

$$d_0 = r_0 + tN(\vartheta) = r_0 + t(A^2 + 1),$$

$t \geq 0$, integer, $0 \leq r_0 \leq A^2$. From (2.5) we have

$$(2.8) \quad d_0 = r_0 + t(A^2 + 1) = r_0 + t(A - 1)^2\vartheta + t(2A - 1)\vartheta^2 + t\vartheta^3.$$

We take the right hand side of (2.8) into (2.6). Then

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha &= r_0 + (d_1 + t(A - 1)^2)\vartheta + (d_2 + t(2A - 1))\vartheta^2 + (d_3 + t)\vartheta^3 + d_4\vartheta^4 + \dots + d_k\vartheta^k = \\ &= d_0^* + d_1^*\vartheta + \dots + d_k^*\vartheta^k. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$-t(A + 1)^2 + t(A - 1)^2 + t(2A - 1) + t = 0,$$

therefore

$$t(\alpha, d^*) = d_0^* + \dots + d_k^* = t(\alpha, d), \quad d_j^* \geq 0 \quad (j = 0, \dots, k).$$

Let

$$(2.10) \quad \alpha_1 = d_1^* + d_2^*\vartheta + \dots + d_k^*\vartheta^{k-1}.$$

We have

$$(2.11) \quad \alpha = \alpha_1 \vartheta + r_0 \quad (r_0 \in \mathfrak{A}_0),$$

$$t(\alpha_1, d^*) = d_1^* + d_2^* + \dots + d_k^*.$$

It is obvious that $t(\alpha_1, d^*) < t(\alpha, d)$, when $r_0 \neq 0$. For $r_0 = 0$, $t(\alpha_1, d^*) = t(\alpha, d)$.

Now we write $t(\alpha, d) = t(\alpha)$, $t(\alpha_1, d^*) = t(\alpha_1)$, We repeat the algorithm (2.9), (2.11):

$$\alpha = \alpha_1 \vartheta + r_0, \quad \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \vartheta + r_1, \quad \dots, \quad \alpha_{j-1} = \alpha_j \vartheta + r_{j-1} \quad (r_i \in \mathfrak{A}_0).$$

Then $t(\alpha) \cong t(\alpha_1) \cong \dots$ and $t(\alpha_i) > t(\alpha_{i+1})$ when $r_i \neq 0$. This process is terminated at the j th step if $\alpha_j = 0$. In this case we get

$$\alpha = r_0 + r_1 \vartheta + \dots + r_{j-1} \vartheta^{j-1} \quad (r_i \in \mathfrak{A}_0).$$

Suppose that the process is not terminated. Then for a suitably large i

$$t(\alpha_i) = t(\alpha_{i+1}) = \dots (\neq 0).$$

Hence

$$\alpha_i = \alpha_{i+1} \vartheta, \dots, \alpha_{i+k-1} = \alpha_{i+k} \vartheta$$

and, therefore, $\vartheta^k | \alpha_i$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots$). This holds only if $\alpha_i = 0$.

We proved the existence of the representation of α in the form (1.3).

Let us suppose now that there is an α which has two different representations:

$$\alpha = r_0 + r_1 \vartheta + \dots + r_k \vartheta^k = s_0 + s_1 \vartheta + \dots + s_k \vartheta^k, \quad r_i, s_i \in \mathfrak{A}_0.$$

Then $0 = (r_0 - s_0) + (r_1 - s_1) \vartheta + \dots + (r_k - s_k) \vartheta^k$ and therefore $r_0 \equiv s_0 \pmod{\vartheta}$; as $r_0, s_0 \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ we get $r_0 = s_0$. Dividing by ϑ , we get

$$0 = (r_1 - s_1) + \dots + (r_k - s_k) \vartheta^{k-1}.$$

We repeat the argument. Finally we get:

$$r_0 = s_0, r_1 = s_1, \dots, r_k = s_k.$$

We have proved the theorem for $\vartheta = -A + i$.

Let now $\vartheta = -A - i$. Using the theorem for $\bar{\vartheta} = -A + i$, we get

$$\bar{\alpha} = r_0 + r_1 \bar{\vartheta} + \dots + r_k \bar{\vartheta}^k \quad (r_i \in \mathfrak{A}_0)$$

for every Gaussian integer $\bar{\alpha}$. Hence

$$\alpha = r_0 + r_1 \vartheta + \dots + r_k \vartheta^k,$$

and so the theorem holds for $\vartheta = -A - i$, too.

3. Proof of Theorem 2. Let z be an arbitrary complex number, $z = x + iy$. Let

$$(3.1) \quad \vartheta^k = U_k + iV_k.$$

We have

$$(3.2) \quad z = \frac{z\vartheta^k}{\vartheta^k} = \frac{(x + iy)(U_k + iV_k)}{\vartheta^k} = \frac{C_k + D_k i}{\vartheta^k} + \frac{u_k + v_k i}{\vartheta^k},$$

where C_k, D_k are rational integers, $|u_k| < 1, |v_k| < 1$. Let

$$(3.3) \quad z_k = \frac{C_k + iD_k}{\vartheta^k}, \quad \delta_k = \frac{u_k + iv_k}{\vartheta^k}.$$

It is obvious that $\delta_k \rightarrow 0$ ($k \rightarrow \infty$), and so $z_k \rightarrow z$. Since $C_k + iD_k$ is a Gaussian integer, by Theorem 1 we have

$$(3.4) \quad C_k + iD_k = a_t^* \vartheta^t + \dots + a_0^*, \quad t = t(k).$$

First we prove that the sequence $t(k) - k$ ($k = 1, 2, \dots$) has an upper bound. Indeed, from (3.4)

$$z_k = a_t^* \vartheta^{t-k} + \dots + a_0^* \vartheta^{-k}.$$

Hence

$$(3.5) \quad a_t^* \vartheta^{t-k} + \dots + a_k^* = z_k - \frac{a_{k-1}^*}{\vartheta} - \dots - \frac{a_0^*}{\vartheta^k},$$

and so

$$(3.6) \quad |a_t^* \vartheta^{t-k} + \dots + a_k^*| \leq |z_k| + \frac{a_{k-1}^*}{|\vartheta|} + \dots + \frac{a_0^*}{|\vartheta|^k} \leq |z| + |\delta_k| + A^2 \left(\frac{1}{|\vartheta|} + \frac{1}{|\vartheta|^2} + \dots \right) \leq |z| + |\delta_k| + \frac{A^2}{|\vartheta| - 1}.$$

Hence it follows that

$$(3.7) \quad |a_t^* \vartheta^{t-k} + \dots + a_k^*| \leq c,$$

$c = c(z)$ being a suitable positive constant.

Since the representation of Gaussian integers in the form (1.3) is unique, and the circle $|w| \leq c$ contains only a finite set of Gaussian integers, therefore $t(k) - k$ has an upper bound. Let K be an integer, $t - k \leq K$. Then we can write z_k as

$$(3.8) \quad z_k = a_K^{(k)} \vartheta^K + \dots + a_0^{(k)} + \frac{a_{-1}^{(k)}}{\vartheta} + \frac{a_{-2}^{(k)}}{\vartheta^2} + \dots,$$

where $a_j^{(k)} \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ ($j = K, K-1, \dots, 0, -1, \dots$). Let $b_K \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ be an integer so that $a_K^{(k)} = b_K$ for infinitely many k . Let S_K be the subset of those integers k satisfying $a_K^{(k)} =$

$=b_k$. Suppose that S_K, \dots, S_{l+1} is constructed ($S_k \supseteq \dots \supseteq S_{l+1}$). Then there is a $b_l \in \mathfrak{A}_0$, such that for infinitely many k in S_{l+1} $a_l^{(k)} = b_l$. Let S_l be the set of these k 's. S_l has infinitely many elements. We repeat this argument for $K, K-1, \dots, 0, -1, \dots$. Let

$$w = b_K \vartheta^K + \dots + b_0 + \frac{b_{-1}}{\vartheta} + \dots$$

Let $k_1 < k_2 < \dots$ be an infinite sequence, so that

$$k_v \in S_{K-v+1} \quad (v=1, 2, \dots).$$

Since

$$z_k = b_K \vartheta^K + \dots + b_{K-v+1} \vartheta^{K-v+1} + a_{K-v}^{(k)} \vartheta^{K-v} + \dots,$$

therefore

$$\lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} z_{k_v} = w.$$

Taking into account that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} z_k = z$, we have $w = z$. Hence it follows that (3.9) is a suitable representation of z .

We have proved Theorem 2.

Reference

- [1] D. E. KNUTH, *The art of computer programming*. Vol. 2, Addison—Wesley Publishing Company (London, 1971).

(Received December 28, 1974)