

A problem communicated by Laurens de Vries

In a recent letter, Netty van Gasteren wrote to me a theorem that Laurens de Vries had shown in Eindhoven, and for which he had seen a very complicated proof. I give the problem as stated:

To be proved

$$\langle \sum_{j: 1 \leq j \leq n} b_j \rangle =$$

$$\langle \sum_{j: 1 \leq j \leq n} b_j \cdot \langle \prod_{i: 1 \leq i \leq n \wedge i \neq j} (1 - \frac{b_i}{b_j})^{-1} \rangle \rangle ,$$

when it has been given that

$$\langle \forall i, j: 1 \leq i < j \leq n: b_i \neq b_j \rangle$$

* * *

To simplify my calculations, I rephrased the theorem:

Let W be a set of n (by definition mutually different) numbers, and let R satisfy

$$R = \langle \sum_{x: x \in W} \frac{x^n}{\langle \prod_{y: y \in W - \{x\}} (x - y) \rangle} \rangle ;$$

then $R = \langle \sum_{x: x \in W} x \rangle$

Leaving the verification of the cases $n \leq 1$ to the reader, we focus our attention on $n \geq 2$.

R is defined as the sum of n fractions, each with a numerator of degree n and a denominator of degree $n-1$. Were we to reduce all of them to a common denominator, we would get the denominator

$$\langle \prod x, y: x, y \in W \wedge x \succ y: x-y \rangle$$

of degree $n \cdot (n-1)/2$ and a numerator of a degree 1 higher, but we first focus our attention to the sum of two of the fractions. For $p, q \in W \wedge p \neq q$, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{p^n}{\langle \prod y: y \in W - \{p\}: p-y \rangle} + \frac{q^n}{\langle \prod y: y \in W - \{q\}: q-y \rangle} \\ = & \left\{ \text{with } \bullet P.x = \langle \prod y: y \in W - \{p, q\}: x-y \rangle \right. \\ & \frac{p^n}{(p-q) \bullet P.p} + \frac{q^n}{(q-p) \bullet P.q} \\ = & \left. \left\{ \text{reduce to common denominator} \right\} \right. \\ & \frac{p^n \bullet P.q - q^n \bullet P.p}{(p-q) \bullet P.p \bullet P.q} \end{aligned}$$

Because $P.x$ is a polynomial in x ,

the numerator of our last fraction has a factor $p-q$, and hence we can eliminate the factor $p-q$ from both numerator and denominator. Since the other $n-2$ fractions have denominators that don't contain a factor $p-q$ we conclude that R remains bounded when p approaches q , hence R can be written as a fraction from whose denominator the factor $p-q$ has disappeared. Since p, q was an arbitrary pair of elements of W , we conclude that R can be written as a fraction with a denominator of degree 0 and hence a denominator of (at most) 1. For reasons of symmetry, we can conclude

$$(0) \quad R = c * \langle \sum x: x \in W: x \rangle$$

for some value of c , which is "constant" in the sense that it does not depend on the values in W . In order to determine the value of c , we consider

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} (R/p),$$

where the other values in W are kept constant. R/p is the sum of n fractions, $n-1$ have limit 0, and one has the

limit 1, hence \mathbb{R}/p has limit 1. (0) gives limit c , hence $c=1$, and the theorem has been proved.

Remark I have used asymptotic techniques: values approaching 0 or ∞ . With the same techniques I derived

$$\langle \sum x: x \in W: \frac{x^{n-1}}{\langle \prod y: y \in W - \{x\}: x-y \rangle} \rangle = 1$$

$$\langle \sum x: x \in W: \frac{x^{n+1}}{\langle \prod y: y \in W - \{x\}: x-y \rangle} \rangle =$$

$$\langle \sum x: x \in W: \langle \sum y: y \in W \wedge x \leq y: x \cdot y \rangle \rangle$$

For the last result I needed complex numbers, and I did not try higher exponents of x . (End of Remark.)

The above argument was constructed in the very early morning of 29 February 1996, during a mostly sleepless night at Seton Hospital.

Austin, 2 March 1996

prof. dr. Edsger W. Dijkstra
 Department of Computer Sciences
 The University of Texas at Austin
 Austin, TX 78712-1188
 USA