

ON A CLASS OF CONDITIONALLY CONVERGENT INFINITE PRODUCTS

By J. E. LITTLEWOOD.

[Received May 10th, 1909.—Read May 13th, 1909.—Revised October 24th, 1909.\*]

1. In a paper recently published in these *Proceedings*,† Mr. Hardy raises the problem: to find a product  $\prod(1+a_n)$ , such that  $\sum a_n^k$  is always convergent [*i.e.*, for positive integral values of  $k$ ], but never absolutely, and whose convergence, divergence, or oscillation is capable of proof.

Mr. Hardy shows that the product  $\prod(1+a_n e^{n\theta i})$  is divergent when  $\theta/\pi$  is rational, where  $a_n$  is a positive function of  $n$ , which tends steadily to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and which is such that  $\sum a_n^k$  is divergent for all positive integral values of  $k$ .‡ The question naturally arises: Is such a product ever convergent when  $\theta/\pi$  is irrational? This question will be seen to admit of a comparatively simple answer, *i.e.*, an answer not cumbered with elaborate restrictions as to the nature of  $a_n$ . It will be shown that, if  $a_n$  be any positive decreasing function of  $n$  which tends to zero as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the product  $\prod(1+a_n e^{n\theta i})$  is convergent for a certain class of irrational values of  $\theta/\pi$ , which class is independent of the  $a$ 's, and includes all algebraic numbers.

2. It is well known that, if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |u_n| = 0$ , the product

$$\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[ (1+u_n) \exp \left( -u_n + \frac{u_n^2}{2} - \frac{u_n^3}{3} + \dots \pm \frac{u_n^n}{n} \right) \right]$$

is convergent, so that the same product, when taken from  $n = 1$  to  $\nu$ ,

\* Shortly after the paper was communicated, and at the suggestion of the Council, I altered the original title, and gave a more explicit account of Abel's lemma, which is used in § 2. Some time later I discovered that the original discussion corresponding to §§ 2 and 3 was incomplete. The part of the paper then rewritten (October 24th) consists of § 3 and the part of § 2 which follows the result (3) of that article.

† Ser. 2, Vol. 7, p. 40, "On the Continuity or Discontinuity of a Function defined by an Infinite Product." See, in particular, pp. 47, 48.

‡ The simplest example of such a function is  $\prod(1 + e^{n\theta i}/\log n)$ .

tends to a definite limit as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ . Taking  $u_n = a_n e^{n\theta_i}$ , we see then that

$$\prod_{n=1}^{\nu} (1 + a_n e^{n\theta_i})$$

is convergent, provided

$$\prod_{n=1}^{\nu} \exp \left[ \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{(-)^m}{m} a_n^m e^{nm\theta_i} \right]$$

tends to a definite non-zero limit, or (on taking the logarithm) provided

$$f(\nu) = \sum_{n=1}^{\nu} \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{(-)^m}{m} a_n^m e^{nm\theta_i} \tag{1}$$

tends to a definite limit as  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let 
$$\theta_m = 2\pi \left[ \frac{m\theta}{2\pi} \right],$$

where  $[x]$  denotes the difference between  $x$  and the nearest integer. Then, if  $\theta/\pi$  is irrational, we evidently have

$$0 < |\theta_n| < \pi. \tag{2}$$

Since  $m\theta$  differs from  $\theta_m$  by a multiple of  $2\pi$ , we obtain from (1)

$$f(\nu) = \sum_{n=1}^{\nu} \sum_{m=1}^n \frac{(-)^m}{m} a_n^m e^{n\theta_m i}.$$

If in this expression we change the order of summation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(\nu) &= \sum_{m=1}^{\nu} \sum_{n=m}^{\nu} \frac{(-)^m}{m} a_n^m e^{n\theta_m i} \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\nu} \frac{(-)^m}{m} \sigma_m(\nu) \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where 
$$\sigma_m(\nu) = \sum_{n=m}^{\nu} a_n^m e^{n\theta_m i}$$

A necessary and sufficient condition that a function  $f(\nu)$  of  $\nu$  should tend to a definite limit is that, for an arbitrarily small positive  $\epsilon$ , and for all values of  $\nu' > \nu$ , we have

$$|f(\nu') - f(\nu)| < \epsilon, \quad \text{when } \nu > N,$$

where  $N$  depends on  $\epsilon$ , but not on  $\nu'$ .

In the present case we have

$$f(\nu') - f(\nu) = \sum_{m=1}^{\nu} \frac{(-)^m}{m} \{ \sigma_m(\nu') - \sigma_m(\nu) \} + \sum_{m=\nu+1}^{\nu'} \frac{(-)^m}{m} \sigma_m(\nu'). \tag{4}$$

Now the expressions

$$\sigma_m(\nu') - \sigma_m(\nu) = \sum_{n=\nu+1}^{\nu'} a_n^m e^{n\theta_m},$$

and

$$\sigma_m(\nu') = \sum_{n=m}^{\nu'} a_n^m e^{n\theta_m},$$

are sums of the type considered in the theorem known as Abel's lemma. The theorem is as follows.\*

If the sequence  $(\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots)$  of positive terms never increases, then

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^{\nu} a_n \nu_n \right| \leq H \nu_1,$$

where  $H$  is the upper limit of the expressions

$$|\alpha_1|, |\alpha_1 + \alpha_2|, |\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3|, \dots, |\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \dots + \alpha_\nu|.$$

In  $\sigma_m(\nu') - \sigma_m(\nu)$ , we may take

$$(a_{\nu+1}^m, a_{\nu+2}^m, \dots, a_{\nu'}^m), (e^{(\nu+1)\theta_m}, e^{(\nu+2)\theta_m}, \dots, e^{\nu'\theta_m}),$$

respectively for the sequences of  $\nu$ 's and  $a$ 's, and for  $\sigma_m(\nu')$ , we have the sequences

$$(a_m^m, a_{m+1}^m, \dots, a_{\nu'}^m), (e^{m\theta_m}, e^{(m+1)\theta_m}, \dots, e^{\nu'\theta_m}).$$

Now the sum  $\sum_{n=p}^q e^{n\theta_m}$  of any number of consecutive terms of the sequence  $e^{\theta_m}, e^{2\theta_m}, e^{3\theta_m}, \dots$ , has a modulus less than  $2\pi |\theta_m|^{-1}$ .† Hence the number  $H$  corresponding to each of the expressions  $\sigma_m(\nu') - \sigma_m(\nu)$ ,  $\sigma_m(\nu')$ , is less than  $2\pi |\theta_m|^{-1}$ . By the theorem, then, we have

$$|\sigma_m(\nu') - \sigma_m(\nu)| < 2\pi a_{\nu+1}^m |\theta_m|^{-1},$$

$$|\sigma_m(\nu')| < 2\pi a_m^m |\theta_m|^{-1}.$$

\* The theorem in Abel's original form is given in Bromwich's "Infinite Series," pp. 54, 55. The theorem for complex  $a$ 's given above follows by a trifling modification of the argument: it is also a particular case of the result to be found at the bottom of p. 205.

† We have  $\left| \sum_{n=p}^q e^{n\theta_m} \right| = \left| \frac{e^{(q+1)\theta_m} - e^{p\theta_m}}{1 - e^{\theta_m}} \right| < \frac{2}{|1 - e^{\theta_m}|}$ .

Now, if  $|\theta_m| < \frac{1}{2}\pi$ , then

$$|1 - e^{i\theta_m}|^{-1} < |\sin \theta_m|^{-1} < [|\theta_m| / (\frac{1}{2}\pi)]^{-1} < \frac{1}{2}\pi |\theta_m|^{-1};$$

and, if  $\frac{1}{2}\pi \leq |\theta_m| < \pi$ , then

$$|1 - e^{i\theta_m}|^{-1} \leq |1 - \cos \theta_m|^{-1} \leq 1 < \pi |\theta_m|^{-1}.$$

It follows that in any case  $\left| \sum_{n=p}^q e^{n\theta_m} \right| < 2\pi |\theta_m|^{-1}$ .

Hence, from (4),

$$\begin{aligned}
 |f(\nu') - f(\nu)| &< 2\pi \sum_{m=1}^{\nu} \frac{1}{m} a_{\nu+1}^m |\theta_m|^{-1} + 2\pi \sum_{m=\nu+1}^{\nu'} \frac{1}{m} a_m^m |\theta_m|^{-1} \\
 &< 2\pi \sum_{m=1}^{\nu} a_{\nu}^m |\theta_m|^{-1} + 2\pi \sum_{m=\nu+1}^{\nu'} a_{\nu}^m |\theta_m|^{-1} \\
 &\left( \text{since } \frac{1}{m} \leq 1, a_{\nu+1} \leq a_{\nu}, \text{ and } a_m \leq a_{\nu}, \text{ when } m > \nu \right) \\
 &< 2\pi \sum_{m=1}^{\nu'} a_{\nu}^m |\theta_m|^{-1}. \tag{5}
 \end{aligned}$$

3. Let us now suppose that for *all* values of  $m$  we have

$$|\theta_m| > K^{-m},$$

where  $K$  is some positive constant. Then, from (5) above,

$$|f(\nu') - f(\nu)| < 2\pi \sum_{m=1}^{\nu'} (Ka_{\nu})^m. \tag{1}$$

Let  $\nu$  be chosen so large that

$$Ka_{\nu} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Then we shall have, taking the geometric series in (1) to infinity,

$$|f(\nu') - f(\nu)| < 4\pi a_{\nu}.$$

This last expression is independent of  $\nu'$ , and may be made less than  $\epsilon$  by choosing  $\nu$  sufficiently large. The function  $f(\nu)$  will consequently tend to a definite limit.

4. We conclude, then, that  $\Pi(1 + a_n e^{n\theta})$  is convergent, provided we can find a constant  $K$ , such that

$$|\theta_m| > K^{-m}, \quad \text{when } m \geq 1.$$

This condition will certainly be fulfilled if  $\theta/\pi$  is an algebraic number. For it is well known that, if  $x$  is an algebraic number, and  $r/m$  an arithmetical fraction differing from  $x$  by less than (say) unity, then

$$|x - r/m| > hm^{-q},$$

where  $q$  is the degree of the equation with rational coefficients of which  $x$  is a root, and where  $h$  depends only on  $x$ .\* Hence, in the case we are considering, if

$$m\theta/(2\pi) = \theta_m/(2\pi) + r,$$

---

\* Sec, for example, Borel, *Leçons sur la Théorie des Fonctions*, p. 27.

so that  $r/m$  differs from  $\theta/(2\pi)$  by less than unity, we have

$$|\theta/(2\pi) - r/m| > hm^{-q},$$

or  $|\theta_m| > hm^{1-q}$ .

We shall then have, for all values of  $m \geq 1$ ,

$$|\theta_m| > K_1^{-1} e^{-(m-1)},$$

where  $K_1$  is a constant, for the expression

$$e^{-(m-1)}/(hm^{1-q})$$

has, for positive values of  $m$ , a finite maximum value when  $m = q - 1$ .

If now we choose  $K$  to be the greater of  $e$  and  $K_1$ , we have

$$|\theta_m| > K^{-m}.$$