

On powers of the Diophantine function $\star : x \mapsto x(x + 1)$

Maxwell Lippmann*

Donald Silberger†

January 3, 2025

Dedicated to Harold Roosevelt Schriver, 1906-2001, who inspired a deduction that $5^0 = 1$

Abstract

We treat the functions $\star^k : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ where $\star : x \mapsto \star x := x(x + 1)$. The set $\{\star^k x + 1 : \{x, k\} \subset \mathbf{N}\}$ offers a short and direct proof that the set of primes is infinite. We introduce the “mother sequence,” M , obtained by factoring into prime powers the terms of $2, 3, 4, \dots$. For each $x \geq 1$ we introduce the infinite sequence x^* obtained by factoring the terms of the “gross x -sequence,” $\gamma_\star(x) := \langle x + 1; \star x + 1; \star^2 x + 1; \star^3 x + 1; \dots \rangle$, into prime powers. It turns out that $\gamma_\star(1)$ is Sylvester’s sequence, A00058 in the *On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*, OEIS, and that $\gamma_\star(2)$ is the sequence A082732 in the OEIS.

Theorem 2. For some integers $x \geq 1$ there are primes that divide no member of $\{\star^k x + 1 : k \geq 0\}$.

Theorem 3. For each $x \geq 2$ there are infinitely many infinite subsequences c_j of M such that $x^* = c_j$ and such that the infinite family of term sets in M of those c_j is pairwise disjoint.

Theorem 4. $1/x = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 1/(\star^k x + 1) + 1/(\star^n x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 1/(\star^k x + 1)$ for positive integers x and n .

Theorem 5. When $x^* := \langle x_j \rangle_{j=0}^{\infty}$ then $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 1/x_j < \infty$.

1 Introduction

Our initial interest in the elementary function $\star : \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ defined by $\star : x \mapsto \star x := x(x + 1)$, where $\mathbf{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, derives from its appearance in what we have called [3, 6] the Vital Identity

$$\frac{1}{z} = \frac{1}{z+1} + \frac{1}{z(z+1)} \quad \text{This identity holds for every complex number } z \notin \{-1, 0\}$$

In [3, 6] the Vital Identity has facilitated proofs about segments of the harmonic series and more generally about sums of the reciprocals of positive integers. We define \star^0 to be the identity function and $\star^{k+1} := \star^k \circ \star$.

We recall Theorem 1 in [6] where the fact that two consecutive positive integers are necessarily coprime entails that for every pair $k \geq 0$ and $x \geq 1$ of integers the integer $\star^k x + 1$ has at least k distinct prime factors. This fact immediately yields Euclid’s theorem that there exist infinitely many prime integers.

We are interested for each $x \in \mathbf{N}$ in two infinite sequences of integers. One is the *star sequence* x^* ; its terms are powers of primes. Each such x^* is uniquely determined and is created thus: First we produce the other sequence of interest to us; this is the *gross x -sequence*

$$\gamma_\star(x) := \langle x + 1; \star x + 1; \star^2 x + 1; \star^3 x + 1; \dots; \star^k x + 1; \dots \rangle = \langle \star^k x + 1 \rangle_{k=0}^{\infty}$$

The terms of $\gamma_\star(x)$ are separated by semicolons. It is easy to see, but it also follows from Theorem 3 of [6], that $\gamma_\star(x)$ is injective, that it very rapidly increases and that the set of its terms is pairwise coprime.

We manufacture x^* from $\gamma_\star(x)$ by factoring each term of $\gamma_\star(x)$ into a product of the powers of its primes and listing them separated by commas between successive semicolons in ascending order of increasing primes’ sizes. Change the semicolons into commas. The integers between commas are the terms of $x^* := \langle x_i \rangle_{i=1}^{\infty}$.

Example One. The gross 1-sequence $\gamma_\star(1)$ begins with $\langle 2; 3; 7; 43; 1807; 3263443; \dots \rangle$. So we compute that $1^* = \langle 2, 3, 7, 43, 13, 139, 3263443, \dots \rangle$; i.e., $1_0 = 2, 1_1 = 3, 1_2 = 7, 1_3 = 43, 1_4 = 13, 1_5 = 139, 1_6 = 3263443$.

*max.lippmann@yahoo.com Roslyn High School Roslyn, NY 11576

†SilbergD@newpaltz.edu or DonaldSilberger@gmail.com State University of New York New Paltz, NY 12561

The sequence $\gamma_*(1)$ turns out to be Sylvester's sequence, listed as A00058 in the *On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences - OEIS*. It is an open question whether every term in $\gamma_*(1)$ is square-free.

Example Two. We start the gross 2-sequence $\gamma_*(2) = \langle 3; 7; 43; 1807; 3263443; \dots \rangle$ and then we compute $2^* = \langle 3, 7, 43, 1807, 13, 139, 3263443 \dots \rangle$. Our $\gamma_*(2)$ occurs as A082732 in the *OEIS*.

Example Three. The gross 3-sequence begins with $\gamma_*(3) = \langle 4; 13; 157; 24493; 599882557; \dots \rangle$. We compute $3^* = \langle 2^2, 13, 157, 24493, 67, 277, 32323 \rangle$

Notice that $\gamma_*(2)$ is a proper suffix of $\gamma_*(1)$, and this implies that 2^* is a proper suffix of 1^* . These observations together with Theorem 3 in [6] establish

Lemma 1. *If $y \neq x$ and $y+1$ is a term in the sequence $\gamma_*(x)$, then y^* is a proper suffix of x^* , and no prime that is a factor of a term of the prefix of x^* that is complementary to y^* is a factor of any term of y^* .*

Theorem 2. *For some integers $x \geq 1$ there are primes that are factors of no member of $\{\star^k x + 1 : k \geq 0\}$.*

2 Embeddings

We introduce a mother sequence $M := \langle m_0, m_1, m_2, \dots \rangle = \langle m_i \rangle_{i=0}^\infty$ of powers of primes in whose womb every x^* resides along with infinitely many identical siblings. The sequence M is created by writing the natural numbers greater than 1 in their normal ascending order but then replacing each of those integers with its normal-order factorization into powers of primes separated by commas. The following finite prefix of the infinite sequence M ought to obviate any misunderstandings:

$$M = \langle 2, 3, 2^2, 5, 2, 3, 7, 2^3, 3^2, 2, 5, 11, 2^2, 3, 13, 2, 7, 3, 5, 2^4, 17, 2, 3^2, 19, 2^2, 5, 3, 7, 2, 11, 23, 2^3, 3, 5^2, 2, 13, 3^3, \dots \rangle$$

Notice that $2 = m_0 = m_4 = m_9 = m_{15} = m_{21} = \dots$ and that $5 = m_3 = m_{10} = m_{18} = \dots$. That is, far from the mother sequence's being injective, every prime power occurs infinitely often as a term in M . We will call m_0 "formally distinct" from m_4 although both m_0 and m_4 are numerically identical. We call the symbols m_i and m_j *formally distinct* as terms of M whenever $i \neq j$. We emphasize that m_i and m_j can be formally distinct even in the event that a numerical equality $m_i = m_j$ obtains.

Theorem 3. *For each integer $x \geq 1$ there is an infinite set $\mathbf{S}(x)$ of infinite subsequences c of M such that c is term-by-term numerically identical to x^* but for which the family $\mathcal{T}(x)$ of sets of formally distinct M -terms of the subsequences $c \in \mathbf{S}(x)$ is pairwise disjoint.*

Proof. Pick an integer $x \geq 1$ and recall the sequence $x^* := \langle x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots \rangle$ of powers of prime integers described in Section 1. We will recursively develop the promised set $\mathbf{S}(x) := \{c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots\}$ of subsequences of M with $c_j = x^*$ for all $j \geq 0$. In order that all of the $c_j \in \mathbf{S}(x)$ be built and not only a favored one of those infinite sequences, we shall resort to the trick used to prove Theorem 2 in [6] and reminiscent of the corner-slicing trick employed by Georg Cantor [1] in his proof that the set \mathbf{Q}^+ is countable.

We intend each c_i to be a sequence $c_i := \langle m_{i_0}, m_{i_1}, m_{i_2}, \dots, m_{i_j}, \dots \rangle$ of powers of primes for which $m_{i_j} = x_j$ is a numerical fact for every j . Let 0_0 be the least index t for which $m_t = x_0$. The term m_{0_0} was just now "captured from M ." For our purposes in building the set $\mathbf{S}(x)$ of subsequences of M , our designation of m_{0_0} as captured essentially removes m_{0_0} as a term from the mother sequence M .

Next, let 0_1 be the smallest integer t such that m_t is not yet captured and also such that $m_t = x_1$. We have thus far chosen the first two terms, m_{0_0} and m_{0_1} , of the subsequence c_0 . Our third choice will be the first term m_{1_0} of the subsequence c_1 ; here 1_0 is the smallest integer t for which both m_t is uncaptured and $m_t = x_0$. Three subsequential terms have been designated and thus captured. The order in which we select (and capture) terms of M for subsequences destined to comprise $\mathbf{S}(x)$ is easily recognized from this start:

$$m_{0_0} \rightarrow m_{0_1} \rightarrow m_{1_0} \rightarrow m_{0_2} \rightarrow m_{1_1} \rightarrow m_{2_0} \rightarrow m_{0_3} \rightarrow m_{1_2} \rightarrow m_{2_1} \rightarrow m_{3_0} \rightarrow m_{0_4} \rightarrow m_{1_3} \rightarrow m_{2_2} \rightarrow \dots$$

As a paradigm step in our subsequence term-choosing procedure, we now choose the second term of the subsequence c_3 . Let 3_1 be the smallest integer t for which $m_t = x_1$ but also for which m_t is not yet captured. We capture m_{3_1} from M to serve as the the second term in the subsequence c_3 .

It is clear for every $\langle u, v \rangle \in \omega \times \omega$ that¹, after a finite number of procedural steps of the sort described in the preceding three paragraphs, the v^{th} term m_{u_v} of the subsequence c_u will be captured and put into

¹following the lead of set theoreticians we define $\omega := \{0\} \cup \mathbf{N}$.

its place in c_u and that $m_{u_v} = x_v$. Moreover, for every pair $p \neq q$ of nonnegative integers, our procedure's failure to re-use any captured term of \mathbf{M} , that term's having already been assigned to be a term of some c_t , guarantees that the set of terms of the subsequence c_p is disjoint from the set of terms of c_q . \square

3 Sequence sums

In [3, 6] the function $\sigma : \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{N}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}^+ \cup \{\infty\}$ is defined by $\sigma : X \mapsto \sigma X := \sum_{y \in X} 1/y$, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{N})$ is the family of sets of positive integers. Expand this definition of σ thus: $\sigma x := \sigma\{x\} = 1/x$ and $\sigma x^{(y)} := \sigma\{x^{(y)}\} := y/x$ where " $x^{(y)}$ " indicates that the element x occurs with multiplicity y in the multiset $\{x^{(y)}\}$.

Define $\mathbf{T}(x)$ to be the set of terms x_i of x^* . Remember that each such x_i is the power of a prime.

Theorem 4. *Let $x \geq 1$. Then $1/x = \sigma \bigcup_{k=0}^n \{\star^k x + 1\} + 1/\star^n x$ for all $n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $1/x = \sigma \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \{\star^k x + 1\}$.*

Proof. Since $\star^k x \notin \{-1, 0\}$ for each $k \geq 0$, by the Vital Identity we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{x} &= \frac{1}{x+1} + \frac{1}{\star x} =: \frac{1}{\star^0 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^1 x} = \frac{1}{\star^0 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^1 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^2 x} = \frac{1}{\star^0 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^1 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^2 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^3 x} = \\ &= \frac{1}{\star^0 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^1 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^2 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^3 x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^4 x} = \cdots = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\star^k x + 1} + \frac{1}{\star^n x}. \end{aligned}$$

The first claim is proved. The second follows from it together with the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\star^n x} = 0$. \square

In the light of Theorem 4 and the paucity of factors that occur in each of the first few terms of the sequences $\gamma_\star(x)$ at which we have looked, and also of the swiftly burgeoning sizes of the primes encountered there, one might wager that $\sigma \mathbf{T}(x) < \infty$. On the other hand, there are reasons to hedge this bet.

One such reason is that $1/xy < (x+y)/xy = 1/x + 1/y$ with $x > 1$ and $y > 1$. So, if $\star^k x + 1 = p_{i_1}^{e_1} p_{i_2}^{e_2} \cdots p_{i_v}^{e_v}$ where $1/(\star^k x + 1)$ threatens to be a frequently encountered sort of summand in the sum treated in Theorem 4, and when we replace it with the significantly larger number, $1/p_{i_1}^{e_1} + \cdots + 1/p_{i_v}^{e_v}$, which would be the resulting partial sum in $\sigma \mathbf{T}(x)$, then the convergence of $\sigma \mathbf{T}(x)$ begins to seem questionable. For, if the terms of $\gamma_\star(x)$ tend toward having an ever larger number of factors as k increases, then $\sigma \bigcup \{\star^k x + 1 : k \geq 0\} \ll \sigma \mathbf{T}(x)$. Indeed, $\sigma \mathbf{T}(x) = \infty$ appears possible.

On the other hand, noticing that huge primes do occur early as terms in each sequence x^* , we may wonder whether big prime-power terms remain commonplace in the sequence x^* . These possibilities would entail rapidly diminishing summands in $\sigma \mathbf{T}(x)$ and thus support a guess that perhaps $\sigma \mathbf{T}(x) < \infty$ after all.

So, what actually happens?

Theorem 5. *$\sigma \mathbf{T}(x) = \infty$ for every integer $x \geq 1$.*

Proof. Our argument relies principally upon the Second Theorem of Franz Mertens [4] and Theorem 2 of R. W. K. Odoni [5] and finish with a passing reference to the famous 1734 solution by Leonhard Euler of the Basel Problem wherein he proved that

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbf{P}} \frac{1}{p^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6}.$$

The Mertens theorem offers an estimate of the size of the sum of the reciprocals of all primes less or equal to n , by asserting that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{p \leq n} \frac{1}{p} - \log \log n - M \right) = 0 \quad \text{where } M := 0.26149721 \dots \text{ is the Meissel-Mertens constant.}$$

The Odoni theorem estimates the number of distinct factors less than or equal to n of some term $\star^k 1 + 1$ of the Sylvester sequence $\gamma_\star(1)$ by asserting, for \mathbf{P} the set of those prime factors, that

$$\mathbf{P}(n) := \mathbf{P} \cap [1, n] = O\left(\frac{n}{(\log n)(\log \log \log n)}\right) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In the light of the Prime Number Theorem, which says that the total number $\pi(n)$ of primes less than or equal to n approximates $n/\log n$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the Odoni theorem says that the proportion of $\pi(n)$ comprising those such primes that occur as factors of terms of $\gamma_*(1)$ is asymptotic to $1/(\log \log \log n)$. Taken together with the Merten theorem, this implies that

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbf{P}(n)} \frac{1}{p} \approx \frac{\log \log n + M}{\log \log \log n} \quad \text{whence} \quad \sum_{x \in \mathbf{P}} \frac{1}{p} = \infty \quad \text{since obviously} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \log n + M}{\log \log \log n} = \infty.$$

In order to conclude our proof, however, we need slightly stronger assertions. We must show that

$$\sigma T(1) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1_j} = \infty \quad \text{and indeed that} \quad \sigma T(x) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x_j} = \infty \quad \text{for all integers} \quad x \geq 1.$$

On page 10 of his paper Odoni observes that the provisions of his Theorem 2 that are met by $\gamma_*(1)$ hold also for the sequences $\gamma_*(x)$ with $x > 1$. Hence, it remains only to show that $\sigma T(1) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 1/1_j = \infty$. This task require us to dismiss worries about a conceivable eventual predominance as terms of 1^* by proper powers of primes; i.e., by the likes of $1_j = p^u$ with $u > 1$.

How could an emerging and persisting flood of proper prime-power terms in 1^* threaten our theorem?

Euler's resolution, $\sum_{p \in \mathbf{P}} 1/p^2 = \pi/6$, of the Basel problem implies: *If all elements in $\mathbf{P} = \{p_j : j \in \mathbf{N}\}$ are awarded exponents $e_j \in \mathbf{N}$, and if $e_j = 1$ for at most finitely many j , then $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 1/p^{e_j} < \infty$.* So, we must argue that the sequence 1^* does not terminate in a tsunami of mainly proper prime-power terms.

Our first premise is that, for each prime p and each randomly selected set S_p of positive multiples n of p the probability that $p^2|n$ is within $\epsilon > 0$ of $1/p$ can be made arbitrarily close to 1 if S_p is large enough.

Our second premise is that nothing in the algorithm determined by the function \star militates toward increasing the probability that, for the majority of primes p that divide at least one term of the sequence 1^* , the probability is significantly higher than $1/p$ that p^2 divides that term.

Our third premise is a fact; namely, that no prime divides more than one term of the sequence 1^* . We infer that, for the ascending sequence $p_{a_1} < p_{a_2} < \dots < p_{a_j} < \dots$ of prime divisors of terms of 1^* , the probability that $p_{a_j}^2$ divides a term of 1^* gets vanishingly small as j increases.

From these three premises we infer that the proper prime-powers that occur as terms of the sequence 1^* are insufficient to produce the violation, $\sigma T(1) < \infty$, of our theorem. \square

The following two questions pertain to each $x \in \mathbf{N}$. However, answers for the case $x = 1$ alone would be germane.

Question One. If $\mathbf{b}_{x,k} :=$ the biggest prime with $\mathbf{b}_{x,k}^{e_{x,k}} \parallel \star^k x + 1$ for $e_{x,k} > 0$, does $\sigma\{\mathbf{b}_{x,k}^{e_{x,k}} : k \geq 0\} < \infty$?

Question Two. If $\mathbf{d}_{x,k} :=$ the littlest prime with $\mathbf{d}_{x,k}^{f_{x,k}} \parallel \star^k x + 1$ for $f_{x,k} > 0$, does $\sigma\{\mathbf{d}_{x,k}^{f_{x,k}} : k \geq 0\} < \infty$?

Googling Sylvester's sequence led us to wikipedia, which offers hundreds of related references. Wikipedia also apprised us of the valuable *On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences* where we found that our $\gamma_*(1)$ had been discovered in another form by James Joseph Sylvester in 1880. Indeed, Euclid may have known about $\gamma_*(1)$ two and one-third millennia ago.

Both $\gamma_*(1)$ and $\gamma_*(2)$ (respectively A00058 and A082732 in the *OEIS*) have number-theoretic significance. Each term of $\gamma_*(1)$ is 1 plus the product of the terms that precede it. Each term of $\gamma_*(2)$ is 1 plus the least common multiple of the terms preceding it.

Although $\gamma_*(2)$ would seem to lack luster since it is a suffix of $\gamma_*(1)$, it exhibits additional oddities of interest in their own right. E.g., starting with the fifth term of the sequence $\gamma_*(2)$ the ultimate two-digit suffixes of its terms alternate perpetually between 57 and 93.

It seems promising to seek number-theoretic interpretations of $\gamma_*(x)$ for selected other values of x besides $x = 1$ and $x = 2$.

For p a prime, what patterns emerge for the $\gamma_*(x)$ and the x^* where x is a p^n or when x is square-free?

The set $\{\star^k x + 1 : k \geq 0\}$ should be a gold mine for undiscovered primes when $x := \prod \mathbf{P}_{\text{known}}$.

References

- [1] Georg Cantor, *Über eine Eigenschaft des Inbegriffes aller reellen algebraischen Zahlen*, Crelle's Journal, (1874)
- [2] Leonhard Euler, *Variae observationes circa series infinitas*, Commentarii Academiae Scientiarum Petropolitanae, **9** (1737), 160-188.
- [3] David Hobby, Donald Silberger, Sylvia Silberger, *Sums of finitely many distinct rationals*, arXiv:1702.01316v2[math.NT] 19 Feb 2019, 1-12.
- [4] Franz Mertens, *Ein Beitrag zur analitischen Zahlentheorie*, J. reine angew. Math. **78** (1874) 46-62.
- [5] R. W. K. Odoni, *On the prime divisors of the sequence $w(n+1) = 1 + w_1 + \dots + w_n$* , J. London Math. Soc. (**2**) 32 (1985) 1-11.
- [6] Donald Silberger, *On sums of Egyptian fractions*, arXiv:2412.02049[math.NT] 2 Dec 2024, 1-7.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful for helpful suggestions from Kira Adaricheva, Evan O'Dorney and Allan J. Silberger.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 01A55, 01A60, 11A25, 11N05, 11N25