TABLE ERRATA


On pp. 610–611, in Table 17.2, the 15D values of the complete elliptic integrals \( K(\alpha) \) and \( E(\alpha) \) have been reproduced from the tables of G. W. & R. M. Spenceley [1], as acknowledged in a footnote, and accordingly contain the 23 final-digit errors discovered therein by DiDonato [2]. The corresponding corrections have been confirmed by a new, carefully checked calculation, extending to 20D. Only two of the errors exceed the tolerance specified on p. ix of the Handbook; namely, the terminal tabular digits of \( K(\alpha) \) should read 86 and 30 in place of 89 and 25, respectively, when \( \alpha = 79^\circ \) and \( 87^\circ \).
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In Volume I the following corrections are required.

On p. 225, the right sides of formulas (20) and (21) should read, respectively,

\[
\sum \frac{(\alpha)_m + n (\beta)_m}{(\gamma)_m + n m! n!} x^m y^n, \quad |x| < 1.
\]

and

\[
\sum \frac{(\beta)_m (\beta')_n}{(\gamma)_m + n m! n!} x^m y^n.
\]

On p. 241, the right side of formula (10) should read

\[
\sum \frac{\Gamma(\gamma)\Gamma(\rho - \lambda)\Gamma(\sigma - \mu)}{\Gamma(\rho)\Gamma(\sigma)\Gamma(\gamma - \lambda - \mu)} (-x)^{-\lambda} (-y)^{-\mu}
\times F_2(\lambda + \mu + 1 - \gamma, \lambda, \mu, \lambda + 1 - \rho, \mu + 1 - \sigma; 1/x, 1/y).
\]
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In Volume II, on p. 186 the left side of formula (30) should read

\[
2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-1} T_n(x) x^n.
\]

Neville I. Robinson

The function tabulated to 3D is

\[ F(\omega) = 1 + 2j\sqrt{\omega}e^{-\omega}\int_{-j\sqrt{\omega}}^{\infty} e^{-x^2} dx, \]

where \( j \) denotes the imaginary unit, when \( 0 \leq \text{Re} \ \omega \leq 10, \ -10 \leq \text{Im} \ \omega \leq 0 \). The function can be written as

\[ F(\omega) = 1 + j\sqrt{\pi}\omega e^{-\omega} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-2\omega)^{n+1}}{(2n+1)!} \]

where \((2n + 1)! = 1 \cdot 3 \cdot \ldots \cdot (2n + 1)\). The table shows that \( \text{Im} \ F(\omega) \leq 0 \) when \( \text{Im} \ \omega = 0 \), from which it can be inferred that the table uses the branch of \( \sqrt{\omega} \) for which \( \text{Re} \ \sqrt{\omega} < 0, \ \text{Im} \ \sqrt{\omega} > 0 \) for the values of \( \omega \) under consideration.

An ALGOL procedure [1] computes the function

\[ G(p) = 1 + i\sqrt{\pi}pe^{-p}\text{erfc}(-ip), \quad \text{erfc}(q) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{q}^{\infty} e^{-x^2} dx, \]

where \( \text{Re} \ p > 0, \ \text{Im} \ p > 0 \), and the branch of \( \sqrt{p} \) used is such that \( \text{Re} \ \sqrt{p} > 0, \ \text{Im} \ \sqrt{p} > 0 \). Thereby, the relation between the two functions is

\[ F(\omega) = \overline{G(p)}, \quad p = \overline{\omega}. \]

By means of the procedure [1], which has an accuracy better than 3D, the values for \( \text{Re} \ \omega = 0(0.5)10 \) and \( \text{Im} \ \omega = -10(0.5)0 \) have been computed and compared with Table 1. This disclosed 87 errors of a unit in the last decimal and two errors of two units:

For \( \text{Re} \ F(8 - j) = -0.076 \), read -0.078,

for \( \text{Im} \ F(10 - 5j) = -0.025 \), read -0.027.

The function \( G(p) \) is closely related to the function \( w(z) = e^{-z^2} \text{erfc}(-iz) \), which has been tabulated [2] to 6D, in that

\[ G(p) = 1 + i\sqrt{\pi}pw(\sqrt{p}). \]

 Computations based upon the table of \( w(z) \) confirm the two corrections given above:

\[ G(8 + i) \approx -0.0779 + 0.0146i, \quad G(10 + 5i) \approx -0.0435 + 0.0266i. \]

The table under consideration has been differenced with respect to one of the independent real variables in the vicinity of the two above-mentioned entries: for \( \text{Im} \ \omega = -1 \) near \( \text{Re} \ \omega = 8 \), and for \( \text{Re} \ \omega = 10 \) near \( \text{Im} \ \omega = -5 \). This revealed a maximum absolute sixth-order difference equal to 34 and 39, respec-
tively, which shows that the accuracy of the table leaves something to be desired ([3, §11 - N], [4, §1.8]), but after the correction of the errors of both one unit and two units the differences decreased to 19 and 16.
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2. V. N. FADDEYEVA & N. M. TERENT’EV, Tables of Values of the Function \( w(x) = e^{-\pi^2} \left( 1 + \left( \frac{2i\sqrt{n}}{\pi} \right) \int_0^\infty e^{-t^2} dt \right) \) for Complex Argument, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1961.

526.—E. MEISSEL, Ueber die Besselschen Funktionen \( J_0(x) \) und \( J_1(x) \), Jahresbericht ueber die Oberrealschule in Kiel (Programm No. 284), 1890.

On p. 4 are tabulated to 16D the zeros, \( j_{1,s} \), of \( J_1(x) \) and the corresponding values \( J_0(j_{1,s}) \) for \( s = 1(1)50 \).

The only error in the tabulated zeros occurs in the final digit of \( j_{1,4} \): for 2231, read 2230.

In addition to six errors reported by Russon and Blair [1], there are two additional errors in the 16D turning values of \( J_0(x) \); namely, in \( J_0(j_{1,1}) \), for 5547, read 5530, and in \( J_0(j_{1,3}) \), for 8259, read 8432.

Meissel’s table of \( j_{1,s} \) and \( J_0(j_{1,s}) \) was reprinted in its entirety in Gray and Mathews [2] and subsequently in Gray, Mathews and MacRobert [3], and it was abridged to 10D in Davis and Kirkham [4]. It is well known [5] that Meissel’s correct value for \( j_{1,9} \) was copied incorrectly in these references, the tenth decimal figure having been printed erroneously as 0 instead of 9.
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2. A. GRAY & G. B. MATHEWS, A Treatise on Bessel Functions and Their Applications to Physics, Macmillan, London, 1895 (Table III, p. 280).
4. H. T. DAVIS & W. J. KIRKHAM, “A new table of the zeros of the Bessel functions \( J_0(x) \) and \( J_1(x) \) with corresponding values of \( J_1(x) \) and \( J_0(x) \),” Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., v. 33, 1927, pp. 760–772 (Table II, p. 769).


Equations 3.7.4 to 3.7.6 and 3.7.14 to 3.7.16 of Slater are incorrect; as are the first, second and fourth equations on p. 280 and the first equation to p. 322 of Magnus et al. The conditions given do not guarantee convergence of the integrals in question. Further, even when the integrals do converge, they are generally not equal to the functions listed, as can be seen by noting that both sides of each equation are
meromorphic functions of their parameters but that the integrals are analytic at points where the right-hand sides have poles.

The conditions under which the integrals converge can be found by inspection of the asymptotic forms of the integrands. In the case

\[ \text{Re} \, \alpha > 0, \quad \text{Re} \, k < 0, \quad \text{Re} \, z > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Re}(a + c' - a' - \alpha) > 0 \]

the fourth integral on p. 280 of Magnus et al. should read

\[
\int_0^\infty t^{a-1} {}_1F_1(a; c; kt)_1F_1(a'; c'; zt) e^{-zt} \, dt
\]

(1)

\[ = \Gamma(\alpha)z^{-\alpha} F_2(\alpha; a, a'; c, c'; k/z, 1) \]

which can be obtained by continuation from Eq. 14 on p. 216 of [1]. The integral in Eq. 3.7.4 of Slater is this same integral (in a slightly different notation). All other integrals mentioned above are either restrictions of this result to special values of the parameters, or a restatement in terms of Whittaker functions.

Other conditions for which the integral (1) has been evaluated are given in reference [2].
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