Apéry Miracle

Thotsaporn Thanatipanonda

Mahidol University International College, Nakornpathom, Thailand

25 May 2016

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

Background



 $\begin{array}{r} 1887 \\ 1887 \\ - 1978 \\ \hline \\ Rocer \\ APERY \\ 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1916 \\ - 1994 \\ - 1916 \\$

Figure: Roger Apéry

Figure: His famous work in 1979

Roger Apéry was born in Rouen in 1916 to a French mother and Greek father. After studies at the cole Normale Suprieure (interrupted by a year as prisoner of war during World War II) he was appointed Lecturer at Rennes. In 1949 he was appointed Professor at the University of Caen where he remained until his retirement. In 1979 he published an unexpected proof of the irrationality of $\zeta(3)$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

• First time with irrational number, π .

- First time with irrational number, π .
- What should I have learned about an approximation of π. Archimedes used a regular n-gon to approximate the value of π.

$$\frac{n\sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right)}{2\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{n}\right)} < \pi < \frac{n\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}$$

- First time with irrational number, π .
- What should I have learned about an approximation of π. Archimedes used a regular n-gon to approximate the value of π.

$$\frac{n\sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right)}{2\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{n}\right)} < \pi < \frac{n\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}$$

• Other famous numbers that were proved to be irrational are $\sqrt{2}$, e, $\ln(2)$ and $\zeta(2k)$ for every positive integer k.

- First time with irrational number, π .
- What should I have learned about an approximation of π. Archimedes used a regular n-gon to approximate the value of π.

$$\frac{n\sin\left(\frac{2\pi}{n}\right)}{2\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{n}\right)} < \pi < \frac{n\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}-\frac{\pi}{n}\right)}$$

- Other famous numbers that were proved to be irrational are $\sqrt{2}$, e, $\ln(2)$ and $\zeta(2k)$ for every positive integer k.
- Proof of irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$ by contradiction.

How it should have been proved for $\sqrt{2}$ to be irrational

To rigorously proof that $\sqrt{2}$ is irrational. First consider

$$y := 2 + 1/(2 + 1/(2 + 1/(2 + ...$$

By using self-similarly, deduce the equation.

$$y = 2 + 1/y$$

Solving the quadratic equation to get $y = 1 + \sqrt{2}$. Hence, the infinite fraction indeed equals $1 + \sqrt{2}$. Therefore $1 + \sqrt{2}$ and $\sqrt{2}$ are indeed irrational.

This proof is much better because ...

 $\frac{p_n}{q_n} := [2,2,2,\ldots,2] \qquad \text{, repeated n times.}$

 p_n and q_n can be written in the form of recurrence relation.

This proof is much better because ...

$$\frac{p_n}{q_n} := [2, 2, 2, \dots, 2] \qquad \text{, repeated } n \text{ times.}$$

 p_n and q_n can be written in the form of recurrence relation.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

• Proposition Let $\xi := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p_n}{q_n}$. Then ξ exists and is an irrational number.

This proof is much better because ...

$$\frac{p_n}{q_n} := [2, 2, 2, \dots, 2] \qquad \text{, repeated } n \text{ times.}$$

 p_n and q_n can be written in the form of recurrence relation.

- Proposition Let $\xi := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p_n}{q_n}$. Then ξ exists and is an irrational number.
 - Furthermore, the error, $\xi \frac{p_n}{q_n}$ can be easily estimated:

$$\left|\xi - \frac{p_n}{q_n}\right| = \left|\sum_{i=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^i}{q_i q_{i-1}}\right| \le \frac{C}{q_n^2}$$

for some easily computable constant, C.

• This is a fundamental result in Diophantine approximation , showing that any real number has a sequence of good rational approximations (Dirichlet):

$$\left|\xi - \frac{p_n}{q_n}\right| < \frac{1}{q_n^2} \tag{1}$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 This is a fundamental result in Diophantine approximation, showing that any real number has a sequence of good rational approximations (Dirichlet):

$$\left|\xi - \frac{p_n}{q_n}\right| < \frac{1}{q_n^2} \tag{1}$$

• However if ξ is a rational a/b. If $\xi \neq r$, then

$$|\xi - r| = \left|\frac{a}{b} - \frac{p}{q}\right| = \frac{|bp - aq|}{bq} \ge \frac{1}{bq},$$

So equation (1) involves q < b. There are therefore only a finite number of solutions of equation (1).

• This leads to

Theorem (irrationality criterion)

If there is a $\delta > 1$ and an infinite sequence of distinct $\{p_n/q_n\}$ of rational numbers such that $\xi \neq p_n/q_n$ and

$$\left|\xi - \frac{p_n}{q_n}\right| < \frac{1}{q_n^{\delta}}, \qquad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

then ξ is irrational.

• This leads to

Theorem (irrationality criterion)

If there is a $\delta > 1$ and an infinite sequence of distinct $\{p_n/q_n\}$ of rational numbers such that $\xi \neq p_n/q_n$ and

$$\left|\xi - \frac{p_n}{q_n}\right| < \frac{1}{q_n^{\delta}}, \qquad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

then ξ is irrational.

 Apéry's original proof was based on this well known irrationality criterion.

• Apery defined a sequence $c_{n,k}$ by

$$c_{n,k} = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \frac{1}{m^3} + \sum_{m=1}^{k} \frac{(-1)^{m-1}}{2m^3 \binom{n}{m} \binom{n+m}{m}}.$$

He then defined two more sequences a_n and b_n that, roughly, have the quotient $c_{n,k}$. These sequences were

$$a_n = \sum_{k=0}^n c_{n,k} \binom{n}{k}^2 \binom{n+k}{k}^2$$

and

$$b_n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k}^2 \binom{n+k}{k}^2$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

• From here, we will follow some simple steps to arrive to the that $\zeta(3)$ is irrational.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

- From here, we will follow some simple steps to arrive to the that $\zeta(3)$ is irrational.
- Fact 1:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} = \zeta(3).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

- From here, we will follow some simple steps to arrive to the that ζ(3) is irrational.
- Fact 1:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} = \zeta(3).$$

• Fact 2: Both a_n and b_n satisfy the same recurrence relation:

$$n^{3}u_{n} - (34n^{3} - 51n^{2} + 27n - 5)u_{n-1} + (n-1)^{3}u_{n-2} = 0, \qquad n \ge 2$$

with the initial conditions $u_0 = 0$ and $u_1 = 6$ for a_n and $u_0 = 1$ and $u_1 = 5$ for b_n .

• Fact 3:

$$\left|\zeta(3) - \frac{a_n}{b_n}\right| = O(b_n^{-2}).$$

• Fact 3:

$$\left|\zeta(3) - \frac{a_n}{b_n}\right| = O(b_n^{-2}).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

• Fact 4: $b_n \approx c \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{4n}$.

• Fact 3:

$$\left|\zeta(3) - \frac{a_n}{b_n}\right| = O(b_n^{-2}).$$

• Fact 4: $b_n \approx c \cdot (1 + \sqrt{2})^{4n}$.

• Fact 5: Let $p_n = 2 lcm(1, 2, 3, ..., n)^3 a_n$ and $q_n = 2 lcm(1, 2, 3, ..., n)^3 b_n$ then

$$\left|\zeta(3) - \frac{p_n}{q_n}\right| = C/q_n^{\delta} \quad \text{where } \delta = \frac{2\log\alpha}{\log\alpha + 3} \approx 1.080529... > 1.$$

Then by the irrationality criterion, we conclude that $\zeta(3)$ is irrational.

Searching for Miracle

The Three kinds of Apéry Miracles

• A minor Apéry miracle is when

$$\alpha := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p(n)}{q(n)}$$

equals a well known constant, expressible in terms of $\pi, e, \gamma,$ etc.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Searching for Miracle

The Three kinds of Apéry Miracles

• A minor Apéry miracle is when

$$\alpha := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p(n)}{q(n)}$$

equals a well known constant, expressible in terms of $\pi, e, \gamma,$ etc.

• A major Apéry miracle is when

$$\alpha := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p(n)}{q(n)}$$

equals a well known constant, expressible in terms of π, e, γ , etc and it appears that $\delta > 1$, thereby proving irrationality.

Searching for Miracle

The Three kinds of Apéry Miracles

A minor Apéry miracle is when

$$\alpha := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p(n)}{q(n)}$$

equals a well known constant, expressible in terms of π, e, γ , etc.

A major Apéry miracle is when

$$\alpha := \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{p(n)}{q(n)}$$

equals a well known constant, expressible in terms of π, e, γ , etc and it appears that $\delta > 1$, thereby proving irrationality.

• A super Apéry miracle is when, in addition, the constant α has not yet been proven to be irrational, making you famous. ◆□▶ ◆圖▶ ★ 圖▶ ★ 圖▶ / 圖 / のへで

It's All Come Down to Experimental Mathematics

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで

Mathematics is an experimental science. There is a room to search for another miracle (?)



• About a year after Apéry announced his result, Beukers found a simpler proof ,not rely on recurrence relation, using only integration and Legendre polynomials.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <



- About a year after Apéry announced his result, Beukers found a simpler proof ,not rely on recurrence relation, using only integration and Legendre polynomials.
- Based on this idea, T. Rivoal, in 2000, showed that there are infinitely many irrational numbers among ζ(3), ζ(5), ζ(7),....

Epilogue

- About a year after Apéry announced his result, Beukers found a simpler proof ,not rely on recurrence relation, using only integration and Legendre polynomials.
- Based on this idea, T. Rivoal, in 2000, showed that there are infinitely many irrational numbers among ζ(3), ζ(5), ζ(7),....
- Then Zudilin, in 2001, showed that at least one of the four numbers $\zeta(5), \zeta(7), \zeta(9), \zeta(11)$ is irrational.