

## A SPECIAL CONGRUENCE

L. CARLITZ

1. It is familiar that if  $p$  is a prime such that  $p-1 \nmid m$ ,  $p^r \mid m$  then

$$(1.1) \quad B_m \equiv 0 \pmod{p^r},$$

where  $B_m$  denotes a Bernoulli number in the even suffix notation. The writer has recently proved the companion formula ([2, Theorem 3]; see also [1])

$$(1.2) \quad B_{m(p-1)} + 1/p - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p^r} \quad (p \geq 3),$$

for  $p^r \mid m$ ,  $m > 0$ ; moreover if  $m = p^r h$ , then

$$(1.3) \quad p^{-r} (B_{m(p-1)} + 1/p - 1) \equiv h w_p \pmod{p} \quad (p > 3),$$

where  $w_p$  denotes Wilson's quotient  $((p-1)! + 1)/p$ .

In this note we show that the above formulas imply

$$(1.4) \quad p + (p-1) \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{r+1}},$$

where  $p^r \mid m$  and  $p \geq 3$ . More precisely if  $m = p^r m_0$ , we have, for  $p > 3$ ,

$$(1.5) \quad p^{-r-1} \left\{ p + (p-1) \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \right\} \\ \equiv m_0 \left\{ \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{0 < 2s < m, p-1 \nmid 2s} \binom{m-1}{2s-1} \frac{B_{2s}}{2s} + \delta_m \frac{w_p}{p-1} \right\} \pmod{p},$$

where  $\delta_m = 1$  for  $p-1 \mid m-1$ ,  $\delta_m = 0$  otherwise.

For  $r=0$ , (1.4) is due to Hermite. The proof below of (1.4) was suggested by Nielsen's proof [3, p. 254] of Hermite's formula.

2. **Proof of (1.4).** Using the basic recurrence for the Bernoulli numbers we may write

$$(2.1) \quad 1 - \frac{1}{2} m + \sum_{0 < 2s < m} \binom{m}{2s} B_{2s} = 0.$$

Now let  $p^r \mid m$ . Consider first a term such that  $p-1 \nmid 2s$ . Let  $p^k \mid s$ , so that by (1.1),  $B_{2s} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k}$ . If  $k \leq r$ , it follows that

$$(2.2) \quad \binom{m}{2s} = \frac{m}{2s} \binom{m-1}{2s-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{r-k}}$$

---

Received by the editors February 2, 1953.

and consequently

$$(2.3) \quad \binom{m}{2s} B_{2s} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^r}.$$

Clearly (2.3) holds also for  $k > r$ . Thus (2.1) and (2.2) imply

$$1 + \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} B_{s(p-1)} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^r},$$

which may be rewritten as

$$(2.4) \quad 1 + \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \left( B_{s(p-1)} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \\ \equiv \left( \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \pmod{p^r}.$$

Now exactly as in proving (2.3), we may show, using (1.2), that

$$\binom{m}{s(p-1)} \left( B_{s(p-1)} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^r}.$$

Thus (2.4) reduces to

$$(2.5) \quad 1 \equiv \left( \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \pmod{p^r}.$$

It is evident that (2.5) and (1.4) are equivalent.

**3. Proof of (1.5).** We again begin with (2.1) which we now write as

$$1 - \frac{1}{2}m + \sum_{0 < 2s < m, p-1 \nmid 2s} \binom{m}{2s} B_{2s} \\ + \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} B_{s(p-1)} = 0.$$

This evidently implies

$$(3.1) \quad 1 - \frac{1}{2}m + \sum_{0 < 2s < m, p-1 \nmid 2s} \binom{m}{2s} B_{2s} \\ + \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \left( B_{s(p-1)} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \\ = \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \left( \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right).$$

Consider first the sum

$$(3.2) \quad S = \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \left( B_{s(p-1)} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right).$$

Let  $p^k | s$  and put

$$s = p^k h;$$

then by (1.3) we have

$$(3.3) \quad B_{s(p-1)} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \equiv p^k h w_p \pmod{p^{k+1}}.$$

If  $k \leq r$  it is evident from (2.2) that (3.3) yields

$$(3.4) \quad \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \left( B_{s(p-1)} + \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \equiv \binom{m}{s(p-1)} p^k h w_p \pmod{p^{r+1}};$$

clearly (3.4) holds also for  $k > r$ . Since the right member of (3.4) is equal to

$$m \binom{m-1}{s(p-1)-1} w_p / (p-1),$$

we see that (3.2) becomes

$$(3.5) \quad S \equiv \frac{m w_p}{p-1} \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m-1}{s(p-1)-1} \pmod{p^{r+1}}.$$

In the next place for the first sum in the left member of (3.1) we have

$$(3.6) \quad \sum_{0 < 2s < m, p-1 \nmid 2s} \binom{m}{2s} B_{2s} = m \sum_{0 < 2s < m, p-1 \nmid 2s} \binom{m-1}{2s-1} \frac{B_{2s}}{2s}.$$

Substituting from (3.5) and (3.6) in (3.1) we get

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & 1 - \left( \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \\ & \equiv \frac{1}{2} m - m \sum_{0 < 2s < m, p-1 \nmid 2s} \binom{m-1}{2s-1} \frac{B_{2s}}{2s} \\ & \quad - \frac{m w_p}{p-1} \sum_{0 < s(p-1) < m} \binom{m-1}{s(p-1)-1} \pmod{p^{r+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let  $p^r \mid m$ ,  $p^{r+1} \nmid m$ ; then (3.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.8) \quad & \frac{1}{m} \left\{ 1 - \left( \frac{1}{p} - 1 \right) \sum_{0 \leq s(p-1) < m} \binom{m}{s(p-1)} \right\} \\
 & \equiv \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{0 \leq 2s < m, p-1 \nmid 2s} \binom{m-1}{2s-1} \frac{B_{2s}}{2s} \\
 & \quad - \frac{w_p}{p-1} \sum_{0 \leq s(p-1) < m} \binom{m-1}{s(p-1)-1} \pmod{p}.
 \end{aligned}$$

But [3, p. 255]

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{0 \leq s(p-1) < m} \binom{m-1}{s(p-1)-1} \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & (p-1 \nmid m-1), \\ -1 & (p-1 \mid m-1); \end{cases}$$

indeed (3.9) is an easy consequence of the case  $r=0$  of (1.4). Finally (3.7), (3.8), and (3.9) evidently imply (1.5).

#### REFERENCES

1. L. Carlitz, *A divisibility property of the Bernoulli number*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. vol. 3 (1952) pp. 604-607.
2. ———, *Some congruences for the Bernoulli numbers*, Amer. J. Math. vol. 75 (1953) pp. 163-172.
3. N. Nielsen, *Sur le théorème de v. Staudt et de Th. Clausen relatif aux nombres de Bernoulli*, Annali di Matematica (3) vol. 22 (1914).

DUKE UNIVERSITY