

Deep Dive into a New Proof of the Divergence of the Harmonic Series

Samy Lahlou

Abstract

I present in this paper a new proof of the divergence of the Harmonic Series in two ways, the first one with a calculus level of rigor, and the second one in a more rigorous way in today's standards. I also explain how to go from the first one to the second one for readers with any basic knowledge in calculus .

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	The Unrigorous Proof	2
3	From Calculus to Analysis	3
3.1	What do we want to prove ?	3
3.2	The Alternating Series Test	6
3.3	Properties of Sums and Series	10
3.4	The Rigorous Proof	12
4	Why bother with rigor ?	13
4.1	Ramanujan's Series of Integers	13
4.2	Fourier's Theorem	15
5	Conclusion	17

1 Introduction

The Harmonic Series is a well known mathematical object defined as follows:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \dots$$

It has been studied for centuries now. One of the key property of the Harmonic Series is its divergence which was first proved by Nicole Oresme in the 12th century. Since the 12th century, numerous proofs were found and published. To learn more about these different proofs, I highly recommend the article *The Harmonic Series Diverges Again and Again* which was written by Steven J. Kifowit and Terra A. Stamps [4]

I stepped upon this new proof by trying to replicate some series manipulations linked to Ramanujan's *proof* that

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + \dots = -\frac{1}{12}$$

and applying these methods to other series. The proof that I present here is short but I think that this document is a good excuse to explain how to go from a calculus level of rigor to a more advanced one as expected in a Real Analysis class. The sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 can be skipped if you already have a background of classical Real Analysis.

2 The Unrigorous Proof

In this section, I will present the proof in a way that most people with a basic knowledge of series in calculus can understand. The goal is to make the idea of the proof very clear without being compelled by the rules of rigor.

Theorem.

$$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \dots = \infty$$

Proof. First, let's denote by H the infinite sum we are interested in:

$$H = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \dots$$

and consider the slightly modified infinite sum

$$L = 1 - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4} + \dots$$

Using the Alternating Series Test, we know that L converges. Moreover, we know that L is approximately equal to 0.693. Consider now the following manipulation:

$$\begin{aligned} H - L &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{6} + \dots \\ &\quad - \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{6} + \dots \right) \\ &= 0 + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + 0 + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{4} + 0 + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{6} + \dots \\ &= 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{6} + \dots \\ &= H \end{aligned}$$

But this can only happen if either $H = \pm\infty$ or $L = 0$. Since $L \neq 0$, then we either have $H = \infty$ or $H = -\infty$. Since H is positive, then $H = \infty$ which is equivalent to

$$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \dots = \infty$$

□

3 From Calculus to Analysis

3.1 What do we want to prove ?

In the proof appearing in the previous section, many questions arise : does $H - L = H$ really implies that $H = \pm\infty$ or $L = 0$? Is it allowed to manipulate infinite series in the same way as finite sums ? What do we mean by ∞ ? Is it a number ? How do we know that L is approximately equal to 0.693 ?

The first step towards a rigorous proof would be to define clearly the terms we are using and state the theorems that will end up being important. But to do so, we also need to be really precise concerning what we are trying to prove. If the claim is ambiguous, then any proof will lack of rigor or precision

at some point. Hence, our goal now is to define the important concepts and mathematical objects that we are manipulating.

The main object in the theorem is the infinite sum of the reciprocals of the natural numbers. How do we make sense of adding infinitely many numbers together ? What do we mean by an expression of the form:

$$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} + \dots$$

We already know from calculus that a series is defined as a limit of a sequence. Let's write this more precisely.

Definition. Given a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of real numbers, then the sequence of partial sums of $(a_n)_n$ is the sequence $(s_n)_n$ defined by

$$s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From this sequence, we define

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n$$

the series associated with the sequence $(a_n)_n$. If the limit exists, we say that the series *converges*, otherwise, we say that the series *diverges*.

It turns out that this notion of convergence is actually the key to make our proof rigorous. I will not prove here all the properties of limits that we know from calculus but technically, they can all be proven using the ϵ -definition of limits of sequences. The properties that I will use without a proof in this document are the following:

- Given two convergent sequences $(a_n)_n$ and $(b_n)_n$ of real numbers, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_n \pm b_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n \pm \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_n$$

- Given a convergent sequence $(a_n)_n$ of real numbers, if $m \leq a_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$m \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n$$

- Given two convergent series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_n \pm b_n) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \pm \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n$$

However, notice that for our goal, we need to show that a series is *equal* to infinity, but we only know how to deal with convergence to a real number, what about infinity? We can actually define in a distinct definition what it means to *go* to infinity. We know that a sequence goes to infinity if gets arbitrarily large. However, we also know that a sequence which alternates between arbitrarily large numbers and zero don't goes to infinity (visually). In other words, a sequence that goes to infinity needs to *stay* arbitrarily large. Let's summarize what we just said in a precise definition.

Definition. Given a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of real numbers, we write

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = \infty$$

if for all $M \geq 0$, there is an index $N \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $a_n \geq M$ whenever $n \geq N$ and say that $(a_n)_n$ diverges to infinity.

Similarly, given a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of real numbers, we write

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = \infty$$

if sequence of partial sums of $(a_n)_n$ diverges to infinity.

With these definitions, we can now rephrase our claim as follows: the series associated with the sequence $(\frac{1}{n})_n$ diverges to infinity. With the last definition, we now have a clear instruction for how to prove it: we need to show that for all $M \geq 0$, there exists a $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k} \geq M$$

for all $n \geq N$. We will actually prove in the next section a useful preliminary result that will make our proof easier. Now that we know exactly what we want to prove, we can move on and start to prove the preliminary results.

3.2 The Alternating Series Test

The most obvious theorem we used in our unrigorous proof was the Alternating Series Test. This theorem is usually mentioned in any standard calculus class and I choose here to prove it to point out an important property of the real numbers that we will use to prove another preliminary result. But first, let's define some terminology concerning sequences.

Definition (Monotonicity of sequences). Given a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of real numbers, we say that the sequence is *increasing* if

$$a_1 \leq a_2 \leq a_3 \leq \dots$$

i.e., if $a_n \leq a_{n+1}$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly, if we say that the sequence is *decreasing* if $a_n \geq a_{n+1}$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In both cases, we say that the sequence is *monotone*.

Definition (Bounded sequences). Given a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of real numbers, we say that the sequence is *bounded above* if there exists a real number M such that $a_n \leq M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Similarly, we say that the sequence is *bounded below* if there exists a real number m such that $m \leq a_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We can now state the Alternating Series Test. This theorem is what we call a *convergence test*. It is a theorem that asserts the convergence of the series associated with a sequence $(a_n)_n$ given some informations about the sequence. There exist a lot of other convergence tests but we will only need this one for our goal.

Theorem (Alternating Series Test). Given a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of real numbers, if the sequence is positive (all of its terms is positive), decreasing and converges to zero, then the series

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n+1} a_n = a_1 - a_2 + a_3 - a_4 + \dots$$

converges to a real number.

As I said earlier, the proof of the AST (Alternating Series Test) will require an important property of the real numbers. We can formulate this property as follows.

Theorem (Completeness of \mathbb{R}). If a nonempty subset of \mathbb{R} is bounded above, then its supremum exists.

It turns out that this weird non obvious theorem is actually equivalent to a simpler and most useful one : the Monotone Convergence Theorem for sequences.


Theorem (Monotone Convergence Theorem). If a sequence of real numbers is increasing and bounded above, then it must be convergent. Similarly, if a sequence of real numbers is decreasing and bounded below, then it is convergent as well.

To get a more in-depth study of the Completeness of \mathbb{R} and the equivalence with the MCT (Monotone Convergence Theorem), I highly recommend the Chapter 2 of *Understanding Analysis* by Stephen Abbott [1]. We can now prove the AST.

Proof. First, define $(s_n)_n$ as the sequence of partial sums of $((-1)^{n+1}a_n)_n$:

$$s_n = \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{k+1} a_k$$

If we plot this new sequence, we get something that looks like



Graph of s_n as a function of n

The graph looks like this because to go from one term to another, we need to alternate between adding and subtracting positive terms that get

smaller and smaller. From this graph, it is easy to see that we can split s_n into two subsequences, the even and odd terms. In the graph, the odd terms are represented by the decreasing curve that seem to bound by above the graph. Similarly, the even terms are represented by the increasing curve that seem to bound by below the graph.

Let's first prove that these two subsequences, $(s_{2n-1})_n$ and $(s_{2n})_n$, both converge. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since $(a_n)_n$ is decreasing, then

$$s_{2(n+1)-1} = s_{2n+1} = s_{2n-1} - a_{2n} + a_{2n+1} \leq s_{2n-1}$$

and

$$s_{2(n+1)} = s_{2n+2} = s_{2n} + a_{2n+1} - a_{2n+2} \geq s_{2n}$$

Therefore, by definition and as we can see in the graph, the subsequence $(s_{2n-1})_n$ is decreasing and the subsequence $(s_{2n})_n$ is increasing. Moreover, notice that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, using the fact that $(s_{2n})_n$ is increasing, we have

$$s_{2n-1} = s_{2n-1} - a_{2n} + a_{2n} = s_{2n} + a_{2n} \geq s_{2n} \geq s_2$$

so by definition, $(s_{2n-1})_n$ is bounded below by s_2 . Similarly, we can prove that $(s_{2n})_n$ is bounded above by s_1 . Therefore, by MCT, both subsequences converge. In other words, there exist real numbers L_1 and L_2 such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{2n-1} = L_1$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{2n} = L_2$$

But notice that

$$\begin{aligned} L_2 - L_1 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{2n} - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{2n-1} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (s_{2n} - s_{2n-1}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (-a_{2n}) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

which implies $L_1 = L_2$. It follows that $(s_n)_n$ converges to L_1 (and hence to L_2). Therefore, by definition, the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{k+1} a_k$ converges. \square

Since we used the AST in our unrigorous proof to establish the convergence of the series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k}$, let's now prove rigorously that the series actually converges. But we also used another important property of this series in the proof, the fact that it was approximately equal to 0.693. However, the only important information here is that the series is nonzero, we don't really care about what specific value it converges to. Let's prove these properties in the following lemma (a lemma is simply the name we give to a result that is intended to be used later in a proof).

Lemma 1. The series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n}$ converges to a strictly positive number.

Proof. Since the sequence $(\frac{1}{n})_n$ is positive, decreasing and converges to zero, then it directly follows from the AST that the series converges. Now, if we denote by $(s_n)_n$ the sequence of partial sums of the sequence $(\frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n})_n$, recall that in the proof of the AST, we actually showed that $s_2 \geq s_{2n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore:

$$0 < s_2 \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{2n-1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n}$$

which proves our claim. \square

As I said previously, the MCT is actually really useful for proving another result that will turn out to be really important for our goal.

Lemma 2. Let $(a_n)_n$ be a sequence of positive real numbers. If the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ diverges, then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = \infty$.

Proof. Let's denote by $(s_n)_n$ the sequence of partial sums of $(a_n)_n$. Notice that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$s_{n+1} = s_n + a_{n+1} \geq s_n$$

so $(s_n)_n$ is an increasing sequence. Let $M \geq 0$, by contradiction, suppose that $s_n \leq M$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. But notice that it simply means that $(s_n)_n$ is bounded above. However, since $(s_n)_n$ is also increasing, then by the MCT, it converges. This contradicts the fact that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ diverges. Therefore, there must be at least one $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s_N \geq M$. Moreover, for all $n \geq N$, then

$$s_n \geq s_N \geq M$$

Therefore, by definition, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n = \infty$$

□

3.3 Properties of Sums and Series

One of the main problem in the unrigorous proof we didn't point out yet is the notations we used. Writing a series in the form

$$a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + a_4 + \dots$$

is actually not a really good idea because it makes us think that series can be manipulated in the same way as usual sums. However, it is really important to remember that series are not infinite sums. We sometimes call series *infinite sums* because they are a nice generalization of the summation operation applied to infinitely many objects, but many important properties of finite sums (such as commutativity for example) aren't shared by series. Therefore, it is always preferable and more precise to denote a series using the Σ -notation.

If we try to rewrite the unrigorous proof with the Σ -notation, we quickly run into a problem, it is not obvious at all that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$$

if we assume that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ converges. The reason is that to establish this equality, we actually had to regroup some terms together since between each term we had a 0:

$$\left(0 + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}\right) + \left(0 + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{4}\right) + \left(0 + 2 \cdot \frac{1}{6}\right) + \dots = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots$$

This fact may seem obvious with this notation, but with Σ -notation, it looks like

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_{2n-1} + a_{2n}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$$

which seems less obvious. Thus, let's prove it (first, one finite sums, then, on series).

Theorem. Let $(a_n)_n$ be a sequence of real numbers, then

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (a_{2k-1} + a_{2k}) = \sum_{k=1}^{2n} a_k$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Let's prove it by induction on $n \in \mathbb{N}$. First,

$$\sum_{k=1}^1 (a_{2k-1} + a_{2k}) = a_1 + a_2 = \sum_{k=1}^2 a_k$$

which proves it for $n = 1$. Now, for the inductive step, suppose that there is a $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (a_{2k-1} + a_{2k}) = \sum_{k=1}^{2n} a_k$$

then adding $a_{2n+1} + a_{2n+2}$ on both sides gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} (a_{2k-1} + a_{2k}) &= \sum_{k=1}^n (a_{2k-1} + a_{2k}) + a_{2n+1} + a_{2n+2} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{2n} a_k + a_{2n+1} + a_{2n+2} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{2n+2} a_k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{2(n+1)} a_k \end{aligned}$$

which proves that it holds for $n + 1$. Therefore, it holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by induction. \square

From this theorem, we can now prove it for series.

Lemma 3. Given a sequence $(a_n)_n$ of real numbers, if the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ converges, then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_{2n-1} + a_{2n}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$$

Proof. Let $(s_n)_n$ and $(t_n)_n$ be the sequences of partial sums of $(a_n)_n$ and $(a_{2n-1} + a_{2n})_n$ respectively. By our assumption, $(s_n)_n$ converges so any subsequence of $(s_n)_n$ also converges to the same limit which is $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$. In particular, we can apply this to the subsequence $(s_{2n})_n$ which gives us:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{2n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$$

By the previous theorem, we know that $s_{2n} = t_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so the two sequences are actually the same. Therefore, $(t_n)_n$ converges which gives us

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (a_{2n-1} + a_{2n}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} t_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_{2n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$$

which is the desired result. \square

3.4 The Rigorous Proof

We are now ready to prove the theorem rigorously.

Theorem.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} = \infty$$

Proof. Towards a proof by contradiction, suppose that the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ converges, then by Lemma 3:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2n-1} + \frac{1}{2n} \right)$$

Similarly, since we know from Lemma 1 that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n}$ converges as well, then again, by Lemma 3:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2n-1} - \frac{1}{2n} \right)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2n-1} + \frac{1}{2n} \right) - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2n-1} - \frac{1}{2n} \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2n-1} + \frac{1}{2n} - \frac{1}{2n-1} + \frac{1}{2n} \right) \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2n} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}
\end{aligned}$$

By subtracting $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ on both sides and multiplying by -1 , we get

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n} = 0$$

which contradicts Lemma 1. Therefore, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ diverges which implies

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} = \infty$$

by Lemma 2 since $(\frac{1}{n})_n$ is a positive sequence. □

4 Why bother with rigor ?

4.1 Ramanujan's Series of Integers

After all of this work and proofs to make the proof rigorous, we can ask ourself the following question : why bothering this much going into the details if, at the end, the unrigorous proof was easier and gave us the same result ? Why bothering with rigor if it makes everything way harder and less obvious ? This can be answered through a classical example concerning the manipulations of series as infinite sums. This example is due to Srinivasa Ramanujan and can be found in his notebook [2].

First, recall the formula for geometric series

$$1 + x + x^2 + x^3 + x^4 + \dots = \frac{1}{1-x}$$

which is valid for values of x between 0 and 1. Notice that by differentiating on both sides as a function of x , we get

$$1 + 2x + 3x^2 + 4x^3 + \dots = \frac{1}{(1-x)^2}$$

By plugging-in $x = -1$ in this formula, we get

$$1 - 2 + 3 - 4 + \dots = \frac{1}{(1+1)^2} = \frac{1}{4} \quad (1)$$

Now, define

$$c = 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + \dots$$

and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} -3c &= c - 4c \\ &= 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + \dots \\ &\quad - (\quad 4 \quad + 8 \quad + 12 + \dots) \\ &= 1 - 2 + 3 - 4 + 5 - 6 + \dots \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned}$$

where the last step is due to equation (1). Solving for c gives us

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + \dots = -\frac{1}{12}$$

This formula is quite surprising and obviously false. This precise example is now well-known in the mathematical culture because of its link with some more serious mathematics (the Riemann Zeta Function) and physics (the Casimir Effect).

Another example of the same nature shows a similar obvious contradiction with the same manipulations. Consider

$$c = 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + \dots$$

and notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= c - c \\
&= 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + \dots \\
&\quad - (0 + 1 + 2 + 3 + \dots) \\
&= (1 - 0) + (2 - 1) + (3 - 2) + (4 - 2) + \dots \\
&= 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots
\end{aligned}$$

which gives us

$$1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots = 0 \tag{2}$$

Again, applying this same manipulation to equation (2) gives us

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= 0 - 0 \\
&= 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots \\
&\quad - (0 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots) \\
&= (1 - 0) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + (1 - 1) + \dots \\
&= 1 + 0 + 0 + 0 + \dots
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction since $0 \neq 1$.

It turns out that every *invalid* step in the two previous examples comes either from some problems with convergence or from the manipulation of series in the same way as finite sums. These problems are precisely what we made sure to go over precisely towards a rigorous proof. It is clear now that using the wrong notations or not making sure of convergence can potentially and easily lead to some errors and contradictions. This shows why rigor is needed most of the time.

4.2 Fourier's Theorem

The Birth of Calculus (around the late 17th century) can be compared to an explosion in the field of Mathematics. In just a few decades, a whole new set of ideas, techniques, brand new results and mathematical geniuses appeared. However, looking back at some texts of this period clearly shows that the usual mathematical rigor that we know since Ancient Greece was left out of the party. A way of explaining why it was the case is the fact that in practice (in physics for example), everything seemed to work perfectly. Why spending a huge amount of time proving rigorously a formula if everyone knows that

it works and everyone is already using it ? It turns out that this lack of rigor became more of an obstacle as time went by. To illustrate this point, it will be better to focus on a specific example.

In the first half of the 19th century, Joseph Fourier published his work on the theory of heat propagation and the study of the Heat Equation using trigonometric series [3]. It is in this period that he published what we now call Fourier's Theorem which basically states that any function can be represented as a trigonometric series (the details are not important here, even knowing what a trigonometric series is isn't important). However, Fourier didn't prove his theorem so most of his contemporaries tried to, such as Augustin Louis Cauchy, Siméon Denis Poisson and Peter Lejeune Dirichlet. It is only the latter that actually succeeded in giving a rigorous enough and general enough proof of Fourier's Theorem (a version of it, not the full theorem). But to do so, he had to define the notion of function, even though everyone knew what a function was for centuries.

A few decades later, another mathematician pursued Dirichlet's work on Fourier's Theorem: Bernhard Riemann. In the middle of the 19th century, Riemann tried to improve Dirichlet's proof but noticed that the notion of integral, as the concept of function before Dirichlet, wasn't well defined and needed a clear definition. Without a clear and formal definition of the integral, it would be hard to prove some theorems that involve taking an integral (such as Fourier's Theorem). This is the main motivation behind what we now call Riemann's Integral; which became the first widely accepted rigorous definition of the integral. But again, everyone knew before Riemann what was an integral, Riemann didn't invent the integral.

Again, a few decades later, after a lot of progress on proving Fourier's Theorem, while working on a theorem related to Fourier's Theorem, the mathematician Georg Cantor found himself defining the notion of real numbers and even the premises of a modern theory of sets. This theory of sets became the foundations of modern mathematics and is still an active field of research today.

The question now is: why defining these intuitive notions after centuries of everyone knowing intuitively what they were? The answer is simple: it turned out that none of these notions were intuitive. What is a set ? A collection of objects ? But what is a collection then ? Similarly, what is an integral ? The area under the curve of a function ? But what is a function or even an area ? Today, we have whole branches of mathematics dedicated to answering these questions: Measure Theory, Set Theory, Integration Theory,

... It is for this matter that the first step towards a rigorous proof was to define precisely the concepts mentionned in the claim of the theorem. Again, as for the previous section, we get here another reason why rigor is important: some intuitive notions may in fact not be intuitive at all and it is worth trying to understand why. For more details about Fourier's Theorem and its consequences on Mathematical Analysis, I wrote with Nisrine Sqalli a whole article on the subject : *Fourier Analysis: The Catalyst of Modern Analysis* [5].

5 Conclusion

Intuition may be very important and very powerful but let's not forget that it is not perfect. Intuitively, the earth is flat and the sun revolves around the earth. With rigor, we end up asking seemingly simple questions that require creating completely new worlds that intuition would have never let us explore to answer the question. It is only by rigor that we were able to understand the true nature of Fourier's Theorem and many others. In conclusion, the goal here was to explain why the rigor in mathematics wasn't an obstacle but the exact opposit.

Concerning the proof of the Divergence of Harmonic Series, as I said at the beginning, I found it nowhere else on the internet or by asking some professors so please, if you have heard of this proof from somewhere else than this paper, let me know by emailing me at samy.lahloukamal@mail.mcgill.ca so I update this document. Thank you.

References

- [1] S. Abbott. *Understanding Analysis*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, 2010.
- [2] B. Berndt. *Ramanujan's Notebooks: Part I*. Number ptie. 1. Springer New York, 2012.
- [3] J. Fourier. *Théorie analytique de la chaleur*. Landmarks of Science. Didot, 1822.
- [4] S. J. Kifowit and T. A. Stamps. The harmonic series diverges again and again. *To appear in The AMATYC Review*, page 1, 2006.
- [5] N. Sqalli and S. Lahlou. Fourier analysis : The catalyst of modern analysis. 2025.