= \lambda^4 - 4\lambda^3 - 73\lambda^2 + 260\lambda + 568 in the neighborhood of the stated roots and showed that the error in the eigenvalues was less than $1 \times 10^{-7}$.

The last component of $x^{(4)}$ in [1] should read $-0.38333123+$ in place of $-0.3833123+$.

J. L. Brenner
G. W. Reitwiesner

Computing Laboratory
Ballistic Research Laboratories
Ordnance Corps, U. S. Army
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland

Sponsored by the Office of Ordnance Research, U. S. Army.


A Note on the Summation of Chebyshev Series

In a recent note [1] I gave tables of the numerical coefficients in the Chebyshev expansions of some common functions, and suggested that these should be used to provide polynomial approximations by truncation and rearrangement in powers of the independent variable.

The purpose of the present note is to show that the truncated Chebyshev series may be evaluated directly without rearrangement, and without using tables of Chebyshev polynomials. The process used is one of recurrence, and is well suited for use with automatic computing machines.

Let the truncated series be denoted by

$$f(x) = A_0 + A_1 T_1^*(x) + A_2 T_2^*(x) + \cdots + A_N T_N^*(x),$$

where, following the notation of Lanczos [2] which is used throughout,

$$T_n^*(x) = \cos n\theta, \quad \cos \theta = 2x - 1, \quad 0 \leq x \leq 1.$$

In order to evaluate $f(x)$ for a given value of $x$ we construct the sequence $B_N, B_{N-1}, \cdots, B_0$, given by $B_{N+2} = B_{N+1} = 0$ and

$$B_n - (4x - 2)B_{n+1} + B_{n+2} = A_n, \quad n = N, N - 1, \cdots, 1, 0.$$

Then we have

$$f(x) = B_0 - (2x - 1)B_1.$$

This result may be verified by using the recurrence relation

$$T_n^*(x) - (4x - 2)T_{n+1}^*(x) + T_{n+2}^*(x) = 0.$$

It may be thought that the coefficient $(4x - 2)$ in (2) can give rise to considerable building-up error in $f(x)$. To investigate this point, we observe that the general solution of the equation

$$u_n - (4x - 2)u_{n+1} + u_{n+2} = 0$$
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is given by
\[ u_n = \alpha T_n^*(x) + \beta U_n^*(x), \]
where \( U_n^*(x) = \sin((n + 1)\theta) \csc \theta, \cos \theta = 2x - 1 \), and \( \alpha, \beta \) are arbitrary constants.

Hence a rounding error \( \epsilon(n) \) in \( A_n \) or \( B_n \) introduces an error \( \epsilon_s(n) \) in \( B_s(s \leq n) \), given by
\[ \epsilon_s(n) = \alpha T_s^*(x) + \beta U_s^*(x), \]
where
\[ \epsilon(n) = \alpha T_n^*(x) + \beta U_n^*(x) \quad 0 = \alpha T_{n+1}^*(x) + \beta U_{n+1}^*(x). \]

Solving the last pair of equations, we obtain
\[ \alpha = \epsilon(n) \cdot T_{n+1}^*(x)/T_1^*(x), \quad \beta = -\epsilon(n) \cdot T_{n+1}^*(x)/T_1^*(x) \]
and substituting in (4) we find that
\[ \epsilon_s(n) = \{T_s^*(x) \cdot U_{n+1}^*(x) - U_s^*(x) \cdot T_{n+1}^*(x)\} \epsilon(n)/T_1^*(x) \]
\[ = U_{n-s}^*(x) \cdot \epsilon(n). \]

The corresponding error in \( f(x) \) may be found from (3), and is given by
\[ \epsilon_0(n) - (2x - 1)\epsilon_1(n) = \{U_n^*(x) - T_1^*(x) \cdot U_{n-1}^*(x)\} \epsilon(n) \]
\[ = T_s^*(x) \cdot \epsilon(n), \]
which is the same as that produced by an error of \( \epsilon(n) \) in \( A_n \) when the series is summed in the usual way. Hence the rounding-off of \( B_n \) to the same number of decimals as \( A_n \) can only double the maximum rounding error in \( f(x) \). If one or two guarding figures are retained in \( A_n \) and \( B_n \), this error may be made negligible compared with the truncation error which has been introduced in replacing the infinite Chebyshev series by \( f(x) \).

Thus, although the errors in \( B_n \) may become quite large if \( N \) is large (see (5)), the error in \( f(x) \) is not serious.

We may note that a similar device may be used to evaluate other series in terms of functions which satisfy a linear recurrence relation; for example, Neumann series of Bessel functions.

Let
\[ f(x) = a_0 p_0(x) + a_1 p_1(x) + \cdots + a_N p_N(x), \]
where
\[ p_{n+1}(x) + \alpha_n p_n(x) + \beta_n p_{n-1}(x) = 0, \]
and \( \alpha_n, \beta_n \) may be functions of \( x \) as well as of \( n \).

We construct the sequence \( b_N, b_{N-1}, \cdots, b_0 \), where \( b_{N+1} = b_{N+2} = 0 \) and
\[ b_n + \alpha_n b_{n+1} + \beta_{n+1} b_{n+2} = a_n, \quad n = N, N - 1, \cdots, 0. \]
Then application of the recurrence relation (6) shows that
\[ f(x) = b_0 p_0(x) + b_1 \{ p_1(x) + a_0 p_0(x) \}. \]

C. W. Clenshaw

National Physical Laboratory
Teddington, Middlesex
England
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Conjectures Concerning the Mersenne Numbers

Conjectures concerning the Mersenne numbers are appropriate since they were inaugurated with one. A conjecture [1] that seems likely to be false, but unlikely to be proved false, is that all numbers \( p_n \) are prime \( (n = 1, 2, 3, \ldots) \), where, for example, \( p_4 \) is
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
2 & \quad -1 \\
2 & \quad -1 \\
2 & \quad -1 \\
2 & \quad -1 \\
\end{array}
\]
Recursively, \( p_1 = 3 \), \( p_{n+1} = 2^{p_n} - 1 \). The first four are 3, 7, 127 and \( 2^{127} - 1 \), all known to be prime. Any factor of \( p_8 \) is congruent to 1 modulo \( p_4 \), so \( p_8 \) certainly has no factor less than \( 2^{127} \). Similarly
\[
2^{2^{81} - 1} - 1
\]
is not divisible by any known prime, if \( 2^{2^{81} - 1} \) is still the largest known prime [2]. One can try to argue about the probability that a number of the form \( 2^p - 1 \) is prime, when \( p \) is known to be prime. The probability that a whole number \( x \) is prime is about \( 1/\log x \), and is close to
\[
\frac{1}{2} e^r(1 - \frac{1}{2})(1 - \frac{1}{3})(1 - \frac{1}{5}) \cdots \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right)
\]
where \( q \approx \sqrt{x} \), so the factors \( (1 - \frac{1}{2}), (1 - \frac{1}{3}), \) etc., can be regarded as probabilities that are not far from independent. But if \( x = 2^p - 1 \), only every \( p \)th factor of (1) should be taken, and the probability apparently ought to be about the \( p \)th root of \( 1/p \cdot \log 2 \), which is approximately 1 when \( p \) is large. But this argument is also invalid, as we may see from the statistics of Mersenne primes [2]. We may see from these statistics (assuming them to contain no gaps), that, if \( m_n \) denotes the \( n \)th Mersenne prime \( (m_1 = 3) \), then
\[
2.18 \log \log m_n < n < 2.72 \log \log m_n \quad (3 \leq n \leq 17)
\]
while
\[
2.31 \log \log m_{17} = 17.
\]