


Number Theory

Section 1.2. Summing over the Primes—Proofs of Theorems



()

Number Theory

April 17, 2022 1 / 17

Theorem 1.3

Theorem 1.3 (continued 1)

Proof (continued). Now if the expression of $1 + nQ$ as a product of primes is $1 + nQ = q_1^{e_1} q_2^{e_2} \cdots q_r^{e_r}$, then the expression $\left(\sum_{p>N} \frac{1}{p}\right)^t$ contains each $1/q_i^{e_i}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$ (when $p = q_i > N$ and $t = e_i$). Next, the expression $\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{p>N} \frac{1}{p}\right)^t$ contains a term of the form $\frac{s}{q_1^{e_1} q_2^{e_2} \cdots q_r^{e_r}} = \frac{s}{1 + nQ}$ where $s \geq 1$ (by adding the previous terms and getting a common denominator). So the left hand side of

$$P = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{p>N} \frac{1}{p}\right)^t < \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^t} = 1$$

contains a term greater than or equal to $1/(1 + nQ)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

()

Number Theory

April 17, 2022 4 / 17

Theorem 1.3

Theorem 1.3

Theorem 1.3. The series $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}$ diverges.

Proof. ASSUME that the series converges. Then there is some N such that $\sum p < N \frac{1}{p} < \frac{1}{2}$ (by the definition of convergence of a series). Let $Q = \prod_{p \leq N} p$ be the product of all the primes less than or equal to N . For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the number $1 + nQ$ is not divisible by a prime less than or equal to N , since such a prime *does* divide Q (and hence divides nQ). Now $1 + nQ$ can be expressed as a product of prime numbers by the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic and, since no prime less than or equal to N divides $1 + nQ$, then the primes in the expression must be greater than N . Consider

$$P = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{p>N} \frac{1}{p}\right)^t < \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^t} = 1.$$

()

Number Theory

April 17, 2022 3 / 17

Theorem 1.3

Theorem 1.3 (continued 2)

Proof (continued). Therefore

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + nQ} \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{p>N} \frac{1}{p}\right)^t < 1.$$

Since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + nQ}$ is a bounded positive term series, then it converges. But

since $1 + nQ \leq 2nQ$ then $\sum_{n=1}^K \frac{1}{1 + nQ} \geq \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{1}{2nQ} = \frac{1}{2Q} \sum_{n=1}^K \frac{1}{n}$ for any K ,

and since $\sum_{n=1}^K \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow \infty$ as $K \rightarrow \infty$ (since the limit yields the harmonic series), then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + nQ}$ diverges by the Direct Comparison Test.

()

Number Theory

April 17, 2022 5 / 17

Theorem 1.3 (continued 3)

Theorem 1.3. The series $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}$ diverges.

Proof (continued). But this is a CONTRADICTION to the fact that the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+nQ}$ converges. So the original assumption that $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}$ converges is false and hence this series diverges, as claimed. \square

Theorem 1.3

Theorem 1.3. The series $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}$ diverges.

Proof. Fix N and let

$$\mathfrak{N}(N) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{all prime factors of } n \text{ are less than or equal to } N\}.$$

Then, as in the second proof of Euclid's Infinite Primes Theorem (Theorem 1.2) we have

$$\sum_{n \in \mathfrak{N}(N)} \frac{1}{p} = \prod_{p \leq N} (1 + p^{-1} + p^{-2} + p^{-3} + \cdots) = \prod_{p \leq N} (1 - p^{-1})^{-1}.$$

Now for $n \leq N$, then $n \in \mathfrak{N}(N)$, so $\sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n} \leq \sum_{n \in \mathfrak{N}(N)} \frac{1}{n}$. By the inequality

in Note 1.1.A, we have

$$\log N \leq \log(N+1) \leq \sum_{n \in \mathfrak{N}(N)} \frac{1}{n} = \prod_{p \leq N} (1 - p^{-1})^{-1}. \quad (1.5)$$

Theorem 1.3 (continued 1)

Proof (continued). ... By the inequality in Note 1.1.A, we have

$$\log N \leq \sum_{n \in \mathfrak{N}(N)} \frac{1}{n} = \prod_{p \leq N} (1 - p^{-1})^{-1}. \quad (1.5)$$

With $f(v) = (1-v)\exp(v+v^2)$, we have $f'(v) = v(1-2v)\exp(v+v^2)$ and $f'(v) \geq 0$ for $v \in [0, 1/2]$ then f is increasing on this interval. Since $f(0) = 1$ then $f(v) = (1-v)\exp(v+v^2) \geq 1$ for all $v \in [0, 1/2]$; that is, $\frac{1}{1-v} \leq e^{v+v^2}$ for $v \in [0, 1/2]$. For p prime, we have $v = 1/p \leq 1/2$, so this inequality gives us that

$$\prod_{p \leq N} (1 - p^{-1})^{-1} \leq \prod_{p \leq N} \exp(p^{-1} + p^{-2}).$$

Combining this with Equation (1.5) and taking logarithms gives

$$\log \log N \leq \sum_{p \leq N} (p^{-1} + p^{-2}).$$

Theorem 1.3 (continued 2)

Theorem 1.3. The series $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}$ diverges.

Proof (continued). Since this is a positive term series then we have

$$\log \log N \leq \sum_{p \leq N} (p^{-1} + p^{-2}) = \sum_{p \leq N} \frac{1}{p} + \sum_{p \leq N} \frac{1}{p^2}.$$

As shown by Euler in his solution to the "Basel problem" in 1734,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6} \quad (\text{or we know simply that the series converges since it is a } p\text{-series with } p = 2 > 1).$$

That is, $\sum_{p \leq N} \frac{1}{p^2}$ is bounded. Since

$\log \log N \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, then $\sum_{p \leq N} \frac{1}{p} \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, as claimed. \square

Theorem 1.5

Theorem 1.5. Euler Product Representation.

For any real σ with $\sigma > 1$, $\zeta(\sigma) = \prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma})^{-1}$.

Proof. For any $\sigma > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - 2^{-\sigma})\zeta(\sigma) &= (1 - 2^{-\sigma}) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2n)^{\sigma}} \\ &= \sum_{n \text{ odd}} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} = 1 + \sum_{n \text{ odd}, n>2} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}}, \end{aligned}$$

where summing over all n odd where $n > 2$ is equivalent to summing over all n such that the prime factors of n are greater than 2. That is, in the final term we are summing over all n such that if prime p divides n , then $p > 2$. We denote this as

$$(1 - 2^{-\sigma})\zeta(\sigma) = 1 + \sum_{n \text{ odd}, n>2} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} = 1 + \sum_{p | n \Rightarrow p>2} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}}.$$

()

Number Theory

April 17, 2022

10 / 17

Theorem 1.5 (continued 1)

Theorem 1.5. Euler Product Representation.

For any real σ with $\sigma > 1$, $\zeta(\sigma) = \prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma})^{-1}$.

Proof (continued). Next consider,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - 2^{-\sigma})(1 - 3^{-\sigma})\zeta(\sigma) &= (1 - 3^{-\sigma}) \left(1 + \sum_{p | n \Rightarrow p>2} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} \right) \\ &= 1 + \sum_{p | n \Rightarrow p>2} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} - 3^{-\sigma} - \sum_{p | n \Rightarrow p>2} \frac{1}{(3n)^{\sigma}} \\ &= 1 + \sum_{p | n, n \neq 3, \Rightarrow p>2} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} - \sum_{p | n \Rightarrow p>2} \frac{1}{(3n)^{\sigma}} = 1 + \sum_{p | n \Rightarrow p>3} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the final term we are summing over all n such that if prime p divides n , then $p > 3$.

()

Number Theory

April 17, 2022

11 / 17

Theorem 1.5 (continued 2)

Proof (continued). Inductively, we then have for primes $2, 3, 5, \dots, P$ that

$$(1 - 2^{-\sigma})(1 - 3^{-\sigma})(1 - 5^{-\sigma}) \cdots (1 - P^{-\sigma})\zeta(\sigma) = 1 + \sum_{p | n \Rightarrow p>P} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}},$$

where in the final term we are summing over all n such that if prime p divides n , then $p > P$. Notice that if for n with only prime divisors p

where $p > P$, we must have $n > P$. Hence, $\sum_{n=P}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} \geq \sum_{p | n \Rightarrow p>P} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}}$. Since

$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}}$ converges (it is a p -series with $p = \sigma > 1$), then for any given

$\varepsilon > 0$, we can make P sufficiently large so that $\sum_{n=P}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} < \varepsilon$ (from the definition of convergent series).

()

Number Theory

April 17, 2022

12 / 17

Theorem 1.5 (continued 3)

Theorem 1.5. Euler Product Representation.

For any real σ with $\sigma > 1$, $\zeta(\sigma) = \prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma})^{-1}$.

Proof (continued). We now have

$$\lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} (1 - 2^{-\sigma})(1 - 3^{-\sigma}) \cdots (1 - P^{-\sigma})\zeta(\sigma) = \lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n=P}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} \right),$$

or $\prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma})\zeta(\sigma) = 1$, or

$$\zeta(\sigma) = \frac{1}{\prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma})} = \prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma})^{-1},$$

as claimed. □

()

Number Theory

April 17, 2022

13 / 17

Theorem 1.3

Theorem 1.3. The series $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}$ diverges.

Proof. We take the logarithm of the Euler product representation of the zeta function and use the fact that the logarithm is continuous so that we can pass limits in and out of the logarithm function (including infinite products). So

$$\log(\zeta(\sigma)) = \log\left(\prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma})^{-1}\right) = -\sum_p (1 - p^{-\sigma}),$$

Now the Maclaurin series for $\log(1+x) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{m-1} \frac{x^m}{m}$ (valid for $-1 < x \leq 1$), so

$$\log(1 - p^{-\sigma}) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{m-1} \frac{(-p^{-\sigma})^m}{m} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{-p^{-m\sigma}}{m} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{-1}{mp^{m\sigma}}.$$

()

Theorem 1.3 (continued 1)

Proof (continued). So

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\zeta(\sigma)) &= -\sum_p \log(1 - p^{-\sigma}) = -\sum_p \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{-1}{mp^{m\sigma}} \\ &= \sum_p \frac{1}{p^{\sigma}} + \sum_p \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{mp^{m\sigma}}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

since the series converges absolutely and can be rearranged. For any prime p , $1 - 1/p^{\sigma} \geq 1/2$ or $2 \geq 1/(1 - p^{-\sigma})$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_p \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{mp^{m\sigma}} &< \sum_p \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^{m\sigma}} \text{ replacing the } \frac{1}{m} \text{ terms with } 1 \\ &= \sum_p \frac{1/p^{2\sigma}}{1 - p^{-\sigma}} \text{ summing the geometric series} \\ &\quad \text{with first term } 1/p^{2\sigma} \text{ with ratio } p^{-\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

()

Theorem 1.3 (continued 2)

Proof (continued). ...

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_p \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{mp^{m\sigma}} &< \sum_p \frac{1/p^{2\sigma}}{1 - p^{-\sigma}} \\ &\leq 2 \sum_p \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma}} \text{ since } 1/(1 - p^{-\sigma}) \leq 2 \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}} = 2\zeta(2\sigma) < 2\zeta(2), \end{aligned}$$

since $\zeta(s)$ is a strictly decreasing function of s for $s > 1$. The double sum $\sum_p \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{mp^{m\sigma}}$ is therefore bounded by $2\zeta(2)$ for $\sigma \geq 1$, and is bounded by 2 times the p -series $\sum_p \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma}}$ when $\sigma > 1/2$.

()

Theorem 1.3 (continued 3)

Theorem 1.3. The series $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{p}$ diverges.

Proof (continued). That is, $\sum_p \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{mp^{m\sigma}} = O(1)$ (see the [Introduction](#) for the information on rates of growth). Therefore, by equation (1.10)

$$\log \zeta(\sigma) = \sum_p \frac{1}{p^{\sigma}} + O(1).$$

Now as $\sigma \rightarrow 1^+$ we have $\zeta(\sigma) \rightarrow \infty$ (see Figure 1.2, for example), so we must have $\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 1^+} \sum_p \frac{1}{p^{\sigma}} = \infty$. That is, $\sum_p \frac{1}{p}$ diverges to infinity, as claimed. □

()