Scratchwork: Divergences

John D Mangual

It's time to get serious. I can nearly put it together myself.

How do I review this proof without it degenerating into some kind of recitation fo facts? One of my critiques of analytic number theory is that...it doesn't look like number theory. If I spend all this effort to prove the Prime Number Theory...I already believed it was true!

I started to look for arguments where the connection to prime factorization or to Geometry or Probablity or any other branch of Math.[1] Talking to professors, I'm pretty much out of luck. They are satisfied with the current arguments. They are professionals, I'm not.

Try to imagine if Hollywood or a Hip-Hop label adopted the garbled narrative style of a Math Textbook. To me, Mathematics has been a giant bait-and-switch. They sold me one result, I got completely another.

I'm trying not to do that to you.

[1] If I express someone of my aggravation, and provide a partial demonstration / answer, that could be new.

References

(1) Terence Tao
The Euler-Maclaurin formula, Bernoulli numbers, the zeta function, and real-variable analytic continuation http://bit.ly/2cyNB3H

(2) GH Hardy **Divergent Series** Oxford University Press, 1949/1973.

(3) EC Titchmarsh **Theory of Functions** https://archive.org/details/TheTheoryOfFunctions

(4) Simon Rubinstein-Salzedo **Could Euler have conjectured the prime number theorem?** arXiv:1701.04718

(5) Andrew Granville, Adam J Harper, K. Soundararajan **A more intuitive proof of a sharp version of Halász's theorem** arXiv:1706.03755

(6) Serge Lang **Algebraic Number Theory** (Graduate Texts in Mathematics # 110) Springer, .

(7) Jürgen Neukirch. **Algebraic Number Theory** (Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften #322) Springer, 1999.

(8) David Sauzin **Introduction to 1-summability and resurgence** arXiv:1405.0356

(9) Don Zagier **On Newman's Short Proof of the Prime Number Theorem** http://people.mpim-bonn.mpg.de/zagier/files/doi/10.2307/2975232/fulltext.pdf