MATHEMATICS OF COMPUTATION, VOLUME 31, NUMBER 138
APRIL 1977, PAGES 581–598

Numbers Generated by the Reciprocal of $e^x - x - 1$

By F. T. Howard

Abstract. In this paper we examine the polynomials $A_n(z)$ and the rational numbers $A_n = A_n(0)$ defined by means of

$$e^{xz}x^2(e^x - x - 1)^{-1} = 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n(z)x^n/n!.$$

We prove that the numbers A_n are related to the Stirling numbers and associated Stirling numbers of the second kind, and we show that this relationship appears to be a logical extension of a similar relationship involving Bernoulli and Stirling numbers. Other similarities between A_n and the Bernoulli numbers are pointed out. We also reexamine and extend previous results concerning A_n and $A_n(z)$. In particular, it has been conjectured that A_n has the same sign as $-\cos n\theta$, where $re^{i\theta}$ is the zero of $e^x - x - 1$ with smallest absolute value. We verify this for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 14329$ and show that if the conjecture is not true for A_n, then $|\cos n\theta| < 10^{-(n-1)/5}$. We also show that $A_n(z)$ has no integer roots, and in the interval $[0, 1]$, $A_n(z)$ has either two or three real roots.

1. **Introduction.** Define the rational numbers $A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots$ by means of

$$(1.1)\qquad \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{2x^n}{(n+2)!}\right)^{-1} = \frac{x^2/2}{e^x - x - 1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n \frac{x^n}{n!}.$$

This definition is apparently due to L. Carlitz [4], who raised the question of whethei a theorem like the Staudt-Clausen theorem holds for the numbers A_n. Because of the obvious similarity of (1.1) to the definition of the Bernoulli numbers B_n, i.e.

$$(1.2)\qquad \frac{x}{e^x - 1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n \frac{x^n}{n!},$$

this seems to be a reasonable question. The writer [6] has shown, however, that evidently such a theorem does not hold: If p is any odd prime, then

$$(1.3)\qquad p^m A_{m(p-2)}/[m(p-2)]! \equiv 2^m \pmod{p},$$

which implies that arbitrarily large powers of p will divide the denominator of some A_n. However, for $n > 1$,

$$(1.4)\qquad 2A_n \equiv 1 \pmod 4,$$

so the denominator of A_n, for $n > 1$, is even and not divisible by 4. This last propert is also true of the Bernoulli numbers B_{2n}.

Received June 17, 1976.

AMS (MOS) subject classifications (1970). Primary 10A40.

Key words and phrases. Bernoulli number and polynomial, Stirling numbers of the second kind, associated Stirling numbers of the second kind, Eisenstein's irreducibility criterion, set partition, composition, Staudt-Clausen theorem.

In the present paper we reexamine questions raised in [6] and [8] about A_n, and we attempt to clarify and extend the results in those papers. We also prove that the numbers A_n are related to the Stirling numbers of the second kind, and we show that this relationship appears to be a logical extension of a similar relationship involving Bernoulli and Stirling numbers. The goal of the present paper is to show that (1.1) is a natural definition to make and that the A_n are of interest in their own right. A summary by sections follows.

In Section 2 we examine a conjecture made in [8] about the sign of A_n. We prove that if $re^{i\theta}$ is the zero of $e^x - x - 1$ with smallest absolute value, then A_n has the same sign as $-\cos n\theta$ if $|\cos n\theta| > 10^{-(n-1)/5}$. We show that A_n does indeed have the same sign as $-\cos n\theta$ for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 14329$.

In Section 3 we examine the polynomials $A_n(z)$, defined in [6] by means of

$$(1.5) \qquad \frac{(x^2/2)e^{xz}}{e^x - x - 1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n(z) \frac{x^n}{n!} .$$

We prove that if $n > 1$, $A_n(z)$ has either two or three real roots in the closed interval $[0, 1]$. We show that $A_n(z)$ has no integer roots and $A_{2n}(z)$ has no rational roots. For special values of n we show $A_n(z)$ is irreducible over the rational field.

In Section 4 we prove some general theorems for numbers generated by the reciprocal of any series. We show that, in a sense, there is always an explicit formula for these numbers, and there is also a way of expressing these numbers as a linear combination of numbers which have a combinatorial interpretation.

In Section 5 we apply the theorems of Section 4 to A_n. We show how A_n can be expressed in terms of the Stirling numbers of the second kind and the associated Stirling numbers of the second kind.

In Section 6 we prove some miscellaneous results for A_n and $A_n(z)$. We show that $2|A_n| < |B_n|$, if n is even; and we prove some theorems concerning possible rational roots of $A_n(z)$, if n is odd. We include in this section a table of values of $\cos n\theta$, $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 46$, where $re^{i\theta}$ is the zero of $e^x - x - 1$ with smallest absolute value. We also include a table indicating how the sign of A_n changes for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 14329$.

All calculations in this paper were performed on a Texas Instruments SR-50A calculator. This machine computes to thirteen significant digits and rounds off to ten significant digits.

We note that a listing of the first 15 numbers A_n can be found in [6].

2. **Sign of A_n.** It is pointed out in [8] that by using Hadamard's factorization theorem [17, p. 250], we can write $2A_n = -n! \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (x_s)^{-n}$, where $x_1, x_2, \ldots$ are the zeros of $e^x - x - 1$. Using

$$x_s = r_s e^{i\theta_s}, \quad \bar{x}_s = r_s e^{-i\theta_s},$$

we can write

$$A_n = -n! \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} r_s^{-n} \cos n\theta_s. \tag{2.1}$$

If we let x_1 be the zero with smallest absolute value, the following conjecture was made in [8].

Conjecture. For $n > 0$, A_n has the same sign as $-\cos n\theta_1$.

We shall refer to this as "the sign conjecture", and we shall show that it is true at least for $n \leqslant 14329$. In [8] the conjecture was verified for $n \leqslant 37$.

It is not too difficult to find approximations for x_s. If we set $e^x - x - 1 = 0$ and let $x = a + bi$, we see that

$$a = b \cot b - 1 = \ln b - \ln(\sin b), \quad (\sin b) \exp(b \cot b) = eb;$$

and by examining the graphs of e^x and $(\sin x)\exp(x \cot x)$, we see that

$$(2n + 1/4)\pi < b < (2n + \tfrac{1}{2})\pi, \qquad n = 1, 2, \ldots\ . \tag{2.2}$$

We can compute the following approximations: $x_1 = a + bi$, with

$$\begin{gathered} 2.08884300 < a < 2.08884302, \\ 7.461489270 < b < 7.461489300, \\ 74.360416^\circ < \theta_1 < 74.360417^\circ, \\ 7.748360 < r_1 < 7.748361. \end{gathered} \tag{2.3}$$

From (2.1) we see that A_n has the same sign as $-\cos n\theta_1$ if

$$|\cos n\theta_1| > \left| \sum_{s=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r_1}{r_s}\right)^n \cos n\theta_s \right| .$$

Since, by (2.2) and (2.3),

$$\sum_{s=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{r_1}{r_s}\right)^n < \sum_{s=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{7.75}{2\pi s}\right)^n < \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^n \sum_{s=2}^{\infty} s^{-n},$$

we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.1. *If* $|\cos n\theta_1| > (5/4)^n \Sigma_{s=2}^{\infty} s^{-n}$, *then* A_n *has the same sign as* $-\cos n\theta_1$.

The sum in Theorem 2.1 is very small for large n. In fact, it is not difficult to show it is less than $(5/8)^{n-1}$ and hence less than $10^{-(n-1)/5}$.

COROLLARY. *If* $|\cos n\theta_1| > 10^{-(n-1)/5}$, *then* A_n *has the same sign as* $-\cos n\theta_1$.

The values of $\cos n\theta_1$ have been computed for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 46$ and are included in Section 6. We see that the sign conjecture holds for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 46$, the smallest value of $\cos n\theta_1$, being .005 when $n = 23$. We have the following approximations modulo 360 degrees.

$$23\theta_1 = 270.289^\circ, \quad 46\theta_1 = 180.579^\circ,$$

$$69\theta_1 = 90.869^\circ, \quad 92\theta_1 = 1.158^\circ.$$

We see that if $n = 46 + k$, $0 < k < 46$, then A_n and A_k have different signs; the exact opposite of the original pattern of signs occurs for $46 < n < 92$. (A_0 is a special case for which the sign conjecture is not true.) In fact, we expect $A_{46+k}/(46 + k)!$ to be approximately $-(r_1)^{-46}A_k/k!$. Also, the pattern of signs for $0 < n \leqslant 92$ will be repeated for $92 < n \leqslant 184$; that is, A_{92+k} and A_k will have the same sign for $k = 1, 2, \ldots, 92$. The following theorem tells exactly what the signs are for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 327$.

THEOREM 2.2. *For positive n, let* $n = 46k + s$, $0 \leqslant k \leqslant 6$, $0 \leqslant s < 46$. *Let* $s = 12m + t$, $0 \leqslant t < 12$. *If* $t = 0, 1, 4, 5, 6, 9$ *or* 10, *then* $(-1)^{k+m+1}A_n > 0$. *If* $t = 2, 3, 7$ *or* 8, *then* $(-1)^{k+m}A_n > 0$. *If* $s = 11$ *or* 23, *then* $(-1)^{k+m}A_n > 0$. *If* $s = 35$, *then* $(-1)^{k+1}A_n > 0$.

As n gets larger, the discrepancy between $46\theta_1$ and 180 degrees begins to make a difference. Using Table 1 in Section 6, we see that the first change in the pattern of Theorem 2.2 occurs at $n = 328 = 46 \cdot 7 + 6$. That is, as k increases from 0 to 7, the angle $(46k + 6)\theta_1$ changes in the following way (approximately): 86°, 267°, 87°, 268°, 88°, 269°, 89.637°, 270.2166°. If $n = 46k + s$, $7 \leqslant k \leqslant 12$, the pattern of Theorem 2.2 holds with one exception: if $n = 46k + 6$, then $(-1)^k A_n > 0$. As n gets larger, the pattern will continue to change. Table 2 in Section 6 indicates when the pattern of Theorem 2.2 changes for various values of s. When $n = 633 = 46 \cdot 13 + 35$, for example, the pattern changes for numbers of the form $46k + 35$; i.e. $(-1)^k A_{46k+35} > 0$. By checking the value of $\cos n\theta_1$ at the numbers given in Table 2, and also at $n = 46(k - 1) + s$, we see, by the corollary to Theorem 2.1, that A_n has the same sign as $-\cos n\theta_1$ for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 14329$. The smallest value of $\cos n\theta_1$ for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 14329$ occurs when $n = 1243$ and is about .00004. We have used the approximation $74.360416 < \theta_1 < 74.360417$ in these calculations. We see by the corollary to Theorem 2.1 that if the sign conjecture is not true for A_n, then $|\cos n\theta_1| < 10^{-2865}$.

THEOREM 2.3. *For* $n > 0$, *we never have* $A_n > 0, A_{n+1} < 0, A_{n+2} > 0$ *or* $A_n < 0, A_{n+1} > 0, A_{n+2} < 0$.

Proof. Suppose $A_n > 0, A_{n+1} < 0, A_{n+2} > 0$. Since θ_1 is about 74 degrees, it is clear the sign conjecture does not hold for at least one of n, $n + 1$ or $n + 2$. Suppose A_n does not have the same sign as $-\cos n\theta_1$. Then by the corollary to Theorem 2.1, $n\theta_1$ is within one degree (modulo 360 degrees) of either 90 or 270 degrees. It is then clear that the sign conjecture does hold for A_{n+1} and A_{n+2}, and, in fact, they both must have the same sign, which is a contradiction. If the sign conjecture does not holds for A_{n+1}, we see that A_n and A_{n+2} must have opposite signs, and if the sign conjecture is not true for A_{n+2}, we see that A_n and A_{n+1} must have the same sign. The reasoning is similar if $A_n < 0, A_{n+1} > 0, A_{n+2} < 0$.

Using the same kind of reasoning, we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.4. *For* $n \geqslant 0$, *we never have four consecutive numbers* A_n, A_{n+1}, A_{n+2}, A_{n+3} *with the same sign.*

Because of (2.1) and the fact that

$$\sum_{s=2}^{\infty} (r_1/r_s)^n < (5/8)^{n-1},$$

we see that, for $n \geqslant 20$, if $|\cos(n + 1)\theta_1| - r_1|\cos n\theta_1| > .001$, then $|A_{n+1}| > (n + 1)|A_n|$. On the other hand, if $r_1|\cos n\theta_1| > 1.001$, then $(n + 1)|A_n| > |A_{n+1}|$. Thus we have the following theorem, which actually holds for all $n \geqslant 0$.

THEOREM 2.5. *If* $|\cos n\theta_1| \leqslant .118$, *then* $|A_{n+1}| > (n+1)|A_n|$. *If* $|\cos n\theta_1| \geqslant .1292$, *then* $(n+1)|A_n| > |A_{n+1}|$.

Usually $(n+1)|A_n| > |A_{n+1}|$, but this is not true for many values of n including

$$n = 46k + 6, \quad 0 \leqslant k \leqslant 6,$$
$$n = 46k + 35, \quad 2 \leqslant k \leqslant 12,$$
$$n = 46k + 18, \quad 9 \leqslant k \leqslant 19.$$

For these particular values of n, A_n and A_{n+1} have opposite signs, a fact that is important when we are examining the real roots of $A_{n+1}(z)$. Of course there are cases, like $n = 23$, when A_n and A_{n+1} have the same sign and $(n+1)|A_n| < |A_{n+1}|$.

3. **The Polynomials** $A_n(z)$. It was proved in [8] that the polynomial $A_n(z)$ defined by (1.5) has at least one real root in the closed interval [0, 1] for $n > 0$. In this section we show that $A_n(z)$ has either two or three real roots in [0, 1], and in addition we prove that $A_{2n}(z)$ has no rational roots for $n \geqslant 0$. For a few specific values of n, we show that $A_n(z)$ is irreducible over the rational field. These results can be comparec to similar properties of the Bernoulli and Euler polynomials [1], [2], [9], [10], [15].

In [6] the following formulas were proved.

$$A_n(z) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \binom{n}{r} A_r z^{n-r}, \tag{3.1}$$

$$A_n'(z) = nA_{n-1}(z), \tag{3.2}$$

$$A_n(z+1) - A_n(z) - A_n'(z) = \binom{n}{2} z^{n-2} \quad \text{for } n > 1. \tag{3.3}$$

It follows from (3.2) and (3.3) that

$$\int_0^1 A_n(z)\,dz = A_n, \tag{3.4}$$

and more generally

$$\int_y^{y+1} A_n(z)\,dz = A_n(y) + ny^{n-1}/2. \tag{3.5}$$

In the theorems that follow, we assume u/b is a rational number reduced to its lowest terms. Also, we note that

$$A_0(z) = 1, \quad A_1(z) = z - 1/3,$$

so $A_1(z)$ does have the rational root 1/3.

THEOREM 3.1. *If* $A_n(u/b) = 0$, *then* $b = 3$ *and* $u \equiv n \equiv 1 \pmod 3$.

Proof. By (3.1) we have

$$\frac{3^n}{n!} A_n(z) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \frac{3^r}{r!} A_r \frac{3^{n-r}}{(n-r)!} z^{n-r},$$

and since $3^{n-r}/(n-r)! \equiv 0 \pmod 3$, unless $r = n$, we have, by (1.3),

$$3^n A_n(z)/n! \equiv (-1)^n \pmod 3.$$

It follows that if u/b is a root then $b \equiv 0 \pmod 3$. Otherwise we have $(-1)^n \equiv 0$

(mod 3). (See also Lemma 2.3 in [7].) We have, from (3.1),

$$0 = \frac{u^n}{b} - \frac{nu^{n-1}}{3} + \binom{n}{2}\frac{u^{n-2}b}{18} + \sum_{r=3}^{n}\binom{n}{r}A_r u^{n-r}b^{r-1}. \tag{3.6}$$

In [6] it is shown that if $m = [n/(p-2)] + 1$, p an odd prime, then $p^m A_n/n! \equiv 0 \pmod p$. Thus $b^{r-1}A_r$ is integral (mod b) for $r > 2$, and we see that

$$\frac{u^n}{b} - \frac{nu^{n-1}}{3} + \binom{n}{2}\frac{u^{n-2}b}{18} \tag{3.7}$$

must be integral (mod 3); i.e., the above sum is a rational number with denomination not divisible by 3. For any prime $p \neq 3$, let p^s be the highest power of p dividing b. Then if $s > 0$,

$$0 \equiv p^s u^n/b \not\equiv 0 \pmod p,$$

by (3.6), which is impossible. Now suppose $b = 3^s$. If $s > 1$, we see from (3.6) that $0 \equiv u^n \pmod 3$, a contradiction since g.c.d. $(u, 3) = 1$. Hence $b = 3$, and since (3.7) must be integral (mod 3), we must have $u \equiv n \equiv 1 \pmod 3$.

Theorem 3.1 shows that no polynomial $A_n(z)$ has an integer root.

THEOREM 3.2. *For $n \geqslant 0$, $A_{2n}(z)$ has no rational roots.*

Proof. By (1.4) and (3.1), we have, for any $k \geqslant 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2A_k(z) &\equiv \sum_{r=2}^{k}\binom{k}{r}z^{k-r} + 2z^k + 2kz^{k-1} \\ &\equiv (1+z)^k + z^k + kz^{k-1} \pmod 4. \end{aligned}$$

If $k = 2n$, we see that $2A_{2n}(u/3) \equiv 1 \pmod 2$, so $u/3$ cannot be a root of $A_{2n}(z)$.

Unfortunately, it is not clear whether or not $A_{2n+1}(z)$ can have rational roots. If we let $k = 2n + 1$ in the proof of Theorem 3.2, the only conclusion we can draw is that u is odd and $u \equiv 2n + 1 \pmod 4$. We do know by Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 that if $A_n(u/3) = 0$, then $n \equiv 1 \pmod 6$. Furthermore, it can be proved that if $p - 2$ divides n, where p is any prime number larger than 3, then $A_n(z)$ does not have a rational root. Also, if $A_n(1/3) = 0$, $n > 1$, then $n \equiv 1 \pmod{36}$. These last two results are proved in Section 6.

Next we examine the real roots of $A_n(z)$ on the closed interval $[0, 1]$.

LEMMA 3.1. *If $n > 1$, then $A_n(z)$ has at least two real roots in $[0, 1]$.*

Proof. We shall consider four different cases, using (3.2), (3.3), (3.4).

Case 1. $A_n > 0, A_{n+1} > 0$. We see that $A_{n+1}(z)$ is an increasing function at $z = 0$ and that $A_{n+1}(1) > A_{n+1}(0)$. It follows from (3.4) that the area bounded by $A_{n+1}(z)$, the x-axis and the lines $x = 0$, $x = 1$ is exactly $A_{n+1} = A_{n+1}(0)$. Thus for some values of z we must have $A_{n+1}(z) < A_{n+1}$, and we see there must be at least two "critical points" on the graph, i.e., there are two real numbers a and b, $0 < a < b < 1$, such that $0 = A'_{n+1}(a) = A'_{n+1}(b)$. Thus $A_n(a) = 0 = A_n(b)$. The case $A_n < 0, A_{n+1} < 0$ is similar.

Case 2. $A_n < 0, A_{n+1} > 0$. In this case $A_{n+1}(1) < A_{n+1}(0)$ and $A_{n+1}(z)$ is a decreasing function at $z = 0$. As in Case 1, we see there must be at least two real numbers a and b such that $A'_{n+1}(a) = 0 = A'_{n+1}(b)$. The case $A_n > 0, A_{n+1} < 0$ is similar.

LEMMA 3.2. *If $n \geq 0$, then $A_n(z)$ has no more than three real roots in* $[0, 1]$.

Proof. Suppose n is the smallest positive integer such that $A_n(z)$ has more than three real roots in $[0, 1]$. Then $n > 3$.

Case 1. $A_n > 0, A_{n-1} > 0$. Since $A_n(z)$ is increasing at $z = 0$, we see that there must be at least four critical points on the graph of $A_n(z)$. This implies that $A_{n-1}(z)$ has at least four real roots in $[0, 1]$, a contradiction. The case $A_n < 0, A_{n-1} < 0$ is similar. It is clear that if the lemma is true for $A_n(z)$, and A_n and A_{n-1} have the same sign, then $A_n(z)$ has exactly two real roots in $[0, 1]$.

Case 2. $A_n > 0, A_{n-1} < 0, A_n(1) < 0$. If $A_n(z)$ has at least four real roots in $[0, 1]$, it is clear there are at least four critical points on the graph of $A_n(z)$. This implies $A_{n-1}(z)$ has at least four real roots in $[0, 1]$, a contradiction. The case $A_n < 0, A_{n-1} > 0, A_n(1) > 0$ is similar.

Case 3. $A_n > 0, A_{n-1} < 0, A_n(1) > 0$. By Theorem 2.3 we know $A_{n-2} < 0$, and from Case 1 we know $A_{n-1}(z)$ has exactly two real roots in $[0, 1]$. If $A_n(z)$ has at least four real roots in $[0, 1]$, there are at least three critical points on the graph of $A_n(z)$, which is impossible. The case $A_n < 0, A_{n-1} > 0, A_n(1) < 0$ is similar.

LEMMA 3.3. *If $n \geq 0$, $A_n(z)$ has no multiple real roots in* $[0, 1]$.

Proof. Suppose n is the smallest positive integer such that $A_n(z)$ has a multiple root. By (3.2) it must be a double root.

Case 1. $A_n > 0, A_{n-1} > 0$. We know $A_n(z)$ is increasing at $z = 0$; $A_n(1) > A_n(0)$, and $A_n(z)$ has exactly two distinct real roots in $[0, 1]$. We see, then, that a double root implies four critical points on the graph of $A_n(z)$, a contradiction. The case $A_n < 0, A_{n-1} < 0$ is similar.

Case 2. $A_n > 0, A_{n-1} < 0, A_n(1) < 0$. The only possibility is that $A_n(z)$ has exactly two real roots in $[0, 1]$, one of them a double root. By Theorem 2.3, we know $A_{n+1} > 0$, so $A_{n+1}(z)$ has exactly two real roots in $[0, 1]$. Also, $A_{n+1}(z)$ is decreasing at $z = 1$, since $A_n(1) < 0$, and is increasing at $z = 0$. This implies there are at least three critical points on the graph of $A_{n+1}(z)$, a contradiction. The case $A_n < 0, A_{n-1} > 0, A_n(1) > 0$ is similar.

Case 3. $A_n > 0, A_{n-1} < 0, A_n(1) > 0$. Since $A_n(z)$ has at least two distinct real roots in $[0, 1]$, a double root implies at least three critical points on the graph of $A_n(z)$. We know, however, that A_{n-1} has exactly two real roots in $[0, 1]$ since $A_{n-2} < 0$. The case $A_n < 0, A_{n-1} > 0, A_n(1) < 0$ is similar.

By Lemmas 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, we have the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.3. *Suppose $n > 1$. Then $A_n(z)$ has no multiple real roots in* $[0, 1]$, *and*

(a) *if A_n and A_{n-1} have the same sign, then $A_n(z)$ has exactly two real roots in* $[0, 1]$.

(b) *if A_n and A_{n-1} have opposite signs, and if $n|A_{n-1}| > |A_n|$, then $A_n(z)$ has exactly three real roots in* $[0, 1]$.

(c) *if* A_n *and* A_{n-1} *have opposite signs, and if* $n|A_{n-1}| < |A_n|$, *then* $A_n(z)$ *has exactly two real roots in* $[0, 1]$.

By (3.3), the condition $n|A_{n-1}| > |A_n|$ is equivalent to $A_n(1)$ having the same sign as A_{n-1}, if A_n and A_{n-1} have different signs. Similarly, the condition $n|A_{n-1}| < |A_n|$ is equivalent to $A_n(1)$ having the same sign as A_n. By Theorem 2.5 and the remarks following it, we see that usually $A_n(1)$ has the same sign as A_{n-1}. However, this is not the case for many values of n, such as $n = 46k + 6, 0 \leqslant k \leqslant 6$.

It is not clear how the roots of $A_n(z)$ are distributed outside the interval $[0, 1]$. If $y > 0$ and $A_n(y) < 0$, it follows from (3.5) that $A_n(y)$ has at least one real root between y and $y + 1$. This is because $A_{n+1}(z)$ is decreasing at $z = y$ and

$$\int_y^{y+1} A_n(z)\, dz > A_{n+1}(y),$$

so there must be at least one real number a, $y < a < y + 1$, such that $A'_{n+1}(a) = 0 = A_n(a)$. By the same type of reasoning, if $y < 0$ and $A_{2n}(z) < 0$, then $A_{2n}(z)$ has at least one real root between $y - 1$ and y. If $y < 0$ and $A_{2n+1}(y) > 0$, then $A_{2n+1}(z)$ has at least one real root between $y - 1$ and y. The distributions of the real roots of the Bernoulli and Euler polynomials can be found in [10] and [9] respectively.

Eisenstein's irreducibility criterion has been used to show that certain Bernoulli, Euler and van der Pol polynomials are irreducible over the rational field. The same method can be used on $A_n(z)$.

THEOREM 3.4. *If* $n = 2^k$, $k \geqslant 0$, *or* $n = m(p - 2)$ *where* p *is an odd prime,* $2m < p$, *then* $A_n(z)$ *is irreducible over the rational field.*

Proof. If $n = 2^k$, we have

$$2A_n(z) = 2 \sum_{r=0}^{n} \binom{n}{r} A_r z^{n-r} \equiv 2A_n \equiv 1 \pmod 2,$$

and furthermore $2A_0 \not\equiv 0 \pmod 4$. Thus $2A_n(z)$ is an Eisenstein polynomial and is irreducible over the rational field. Suppose $2m < p$. From a theorem in [6], we know that if r is in any of the intervals $[0, p - 2)$, $[p, 2(p - 2))$, . . . , $[(m - 1)p, m(p - 2))$, then A_r is integral (mod p), and also $p^2 A_r \equiv 0 \pmod p$ for $0 \leqslant r \leqslant m(p - 2)$. We see, by (1.3), that if $n = m(p - 2)$ then pA_n is an Eisenstein polynomial.

4. The Reciprocal of a Series. In this section we prove some theorems that are true for the reciprocal of any power series. Some of our results can be proved by using generalized chain rule differentiation formulas; instead we shall generalize methods used by Jordan [12] and Riordan [16]. We do not claim these results are new, though references are somewhat hard to find. Perhaps [14] is a good general reference. The goal of this and the subsequent section is to show how the numbers A_n are related to the Stirling numbers, and associated Stirling numbers, of the second kind.

Suppose $a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + \cdots$ is a given power series, $a_0 \neq 0$. We shall assume that the series has a positive radius of convergence, though this condition is not really necessary for the theorems of this section. Define the numbers c_n by means of

$$\left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} a_r x^r\right)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n. \tag{4.1}$$

Then $c_0 = 1/a_0$ and $\Sigma_{i=0}^n a_i c_{n-i} = 0$. By Cramer's rule, we have the following theorem [13, p. 116]:

THEOREM 4.1. *If c_n is defined by* (4.1), *then*

$$c_n = \frac{(-1)^n}{(a_0)^{n+1}} \begin{vmatrix} a_1 & a_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ a_2 & a_1 & a_0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & & \cdots & & \\ a_n & a_{n-1} & a_{n-2} & \cdots & a_1 \end{vmatrix}.$$

An alternate approach is the following:

$$a_0 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{a_0} x^n \right)^{-1}$$
$$= \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{a_0} x^n \right)^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-1)^j \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{a_0} x^n \right)^j.$$

By comparing coefficients of x, we have the next theorem.

THEOREM 4.2. *If c_n is defined by* (4.1), *then for $n > 0$*,

$$c_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j a_{k_1} \cdots a_{k_j} / (a_0)^{j+1}$$

where for each j the sum is over all compositions (ordered partitions) $k_1 + \cdots + k_j = n$, each $k_i \geqslant 1$.

In Theorem 4.2 the order of the numbers $k_1, \ldots, k_j$ is important. For example $1 + 3$ is not considered the same composition of 4 as $3 + 1$.

Define $F(n, j)$ by means of

$$\left(\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} a_r x^r \right)^j = \sum_{n=j}^{\infty} j! F(n, j) \frac{x^n}{n!}. \tag{4.2}$$

Then

$$j! F(n, j) = n! \sum a_{k_1} \cdots a_{k_j}, \tag{4.3}$$

where the sum is over all compositions $k_1 + \cdots + k_j = n$, each $k_i \geqslant 1$. Comparing (4.3) with Theorem 4.2, we have the next theorem.

THEOREM 4.3. *If c_n is defined by* (4.1) *and $F(n, j)$ is defined by* (4.2), *then*

$$n! c_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j j! (a_0)^{-j-1} F(n, j).$$

The number $F(n, j)$ has the following interpretation [5], [16, pp. 74–78]: Consider all the partitions of the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ into j nonempty subsets (called *blocks* of the set partition). Assign a "weight" of $k! a_k$ to each block which has exactly k elements. For each set partition there is a weight, found by multiplying the weights of the j blocks making up the partition. Then $F(n, j)$ is the sum of the weights of all the set partitions of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ consisting of j blocks.

For example, to compute $F(4, 2)$, we see there are three set partitions with weight $4a_2^2$ and four set partitions with weight $6a_1a_3$. Thus $F(4, 2) = 12a_2^2 + 24a_1a_3$.

If we define $F_n(s)$ by means of

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} F_n(s)\frac{x^n}{n!} = \exp\left(s\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} a_r x^r\right), \tag{4.4}$$

we see that

$$F_n(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} F(n, j)s^j. \tag{4.5}$$

If a generating function is written in the form

$$a_m x^m\left(\sum_{r=m}^{\infty} a_r x^r\right)^{-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} d_n x^n, \tag{4.6}$$

where m is a fixed nonnegative integer, $a_m \neq 0$, it is perhaps more convenient to proceed as follows. We have $d_0 = 1$, and for $n > 0$ we have, by Theorem 4.2,

$$d_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j a_{k_1+m} \cdots a_{k_j+m}/(a_m)^j, \tag{4.7}$$

where the sum is over all compositions $k_1 + \cdots + k_j = n$, each $k_i \geqslant 1$. For $t \geqslant 0$ define $G_{t,n}(s)$ and $G(t; n, j)$ by means of

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} G_{t,n}(s)\frac{x^n}{n!} = \exp\left(s\sum_{r=t+1}^{\infty} a_r x^r\right), \tag{4.8}$$

$$G_{t,n}(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{[n/t+1]} G(t; n, j)s^j. \tag{4.9}$$

Then

$$j!G(t; n, j) = \sum n!a_{k_1} \cdots a_{k_j}, \tag{4.10}$$

where the sum is over all compositions $k_1 + \cdots + k_j = n$, each $k_i \geqslant t + 1$. The number $G(t; n, j)$ has the same interpretation as $F(n, j)$, except each block used in a set partition of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ must contain at least $t + 1$ elements. For example, $G(1; 4, 2) = 12a_2^2$ and $G(2; 4, 2) = 0$. By (4.7) and (4.10) we have

$$d_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j j!(a_m)^{-j} G(m; n + mj, j)/(n + mj)!. \tag{4.11}$$

By using the principle of inclusion-exclusion and the identity

$$\sum_{j=r}^{n} \binom{j}{r} = \binom{n+1}{r+1}$$

(see also the derivation of formula 18 in [12, p. 598]), we can derive the formula

$$d_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j j!(a_m)^{-j}\binom{n+1}{j+1} G(m-1; n + mj, j)/(n + mj)!. \tag{4.12}$$

So if c_n is defined by (4.1) and d_n by (4.6), it is always possible to write "explicit" formulas for c_n and d_n, as shown by Theorem 4.2 and (4.7). It is also possible to write c_n and d_n as linear combinations of numbers which have a combinatorial interpretation, as shown by Theorem 4.3, (4.11) and (4.12). The next theorem shows it is always possible to find an application for the numbers c_n and d_n (see [12, pp. 587–599]).

THEOREM 4.4. *If c_n is defined by* (4.1) *and $f(x)$, $h(x)$ are functions defined for positive integers x, then*

$$h(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i f(n-i) \tag{4.13}$$

if and only if

$$f(n) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} c_m h(n-m). \tag{4.14}$$

Proof. Suppose (4.13) holds. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h(n)x^{n-1} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i f(n-i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i x^i \sum_{n=i+1}^{\infty} f(n-i)x^{n-i-1} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i x^i\right)^{-1} \sum_{n=i+1}^{\infty} f(n-i)x^{n-i-1}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_i x^i\right)\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} h(n)x^{n-1}\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n)x^{n-1}$$

and (4.14) follows. If we assume (4.14), we use a similar method to prove (4.13).

We note that several formulas in [12, pp. 219, 247, 599] involving the Bernoulli numbers are special cases of the theorems of this section.

5. Relationship of A_n to the Stirling Numbers. We now apply the results of Section 4 to the numbers A_n. From (1.1) and (4.7) we have, for $n > 0$,

$$A_n = n! \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(-2)^j}{(k_1+2)! \cdots (k_j+2)!}, \tag{5.1}$$

the sum being over all compositions $k_1 + \cdots + k_j = n$, each $k_i \geqslant 1$. This can be compared to a similar formula for the Bernoulli numbers [12, p. 247]:

$$B_n = n! \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(-1)^j}{(k_1+1)! \cdots (k_j+1)!}.$$

To find formulas corresponding to (4.11) and (4.12), we define $b_{t,n}(s)$ and $b(t; n, j)$ by means of

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_{t,n}(s)\frac{x^n}{n!} = \exp(s(e^x - 1 - \cdots - x^t/t!)) \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$b_{t,n}(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{[n/t+1]} b(t; n, j)s^j. \tag{5.3}$$

Then (5.2) and (5.3) imply

$$(e^x - 1 - x - \cdots - x^t/t!)^j = \sum_{n=tj}^{\infty} j!b(t; n, j)\frac{x^n}{n!}\,. \tag{5.4}$$

Using a different notation, these definitions were made by Riordan [16, p. 102, problem 7]. The numbers $b(0; n, j)$ are the Stirling numbers of the second kind, which are very important in combinatorial analysis and finite differences. See [12] and [16] for applications. We shall use the notation

$$b(0; n, j) = S(n, j). \tag{5.5}$$

The numbers $b(1; n, j)$, called the associated Stirling numbers of the second kind, have also been studied [16, p. 77], [12, pp. 171–173], [3]. Following Riordan, we shall use the notation

$$b(1; n, j) = b(n, j). \tag{5.6}$$

We shall also write

$$b(2; n, j) = g(n, j). \tag{5.7}$$

The numbers $b(t; n, j)$ have the following interpretations (see the remarks following Theorem 4.3): $b(t; n, j)$ is the number of set partitions of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ consisting of exactly j blocks, where each block contains at least $t + 1$ elements. Another interpretation is that $b(t; n, j)$ is the number of ways of placing n distinct objects into j nondistinct cells, where each cell must contain at least $t + 1$ objects.

By (4.11) and (4.12), we have the following formulas:

$$A_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j \binom{n+2j}{n}^{-1} [1 \cdot 3 \cdots (2j-1)]^{-1} g(n+2j, j), \tag{5.8}$$

$$A_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j \binom{n+1}{j+1}\binom{n+2j}{n}^{-1} [1 \cdot 3 \cdots (2j-1)]^{-1} b(n+2j, j). \tag{5.9}$$

We can compare (5.8) and (5.9) to similar formulas for the Bernoulli numbers [12, pp. 219, 599]. Since [16, p. 77]

$$b(n, j) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} S(n-k, j-k),$$

we have, from (5.9),

$$A_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{j} (-1)^k \binom{n+1}{j+1}\binom{n+2j}{j-k}\binom{n+2j}{n}^{-1} \cdot [1 \cdot 3 \cdots (2j-1)]^{-1} S(n+j+k, k). \tag{5.10}$$

The integers $g(n, j)$ defined by (5.4) and (5.7) have properties similar to those of the Stirling numbers and associated Stirling numbers of the second kind. In particular, with $g(0, 0) = 1$, we have

(5.11) $$g(n+1, j) = jg(n, j) + \binom{n}{2} g(n-2, j-1),$$

and we can easily compute a few values of $g(n, j)$:

$j \backslash n$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	91	210	456
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	280	2100

We also have

(5.12) $$g(n, j) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} (-1)^k \binom{n}{2k} [1 \cdot 3 \cdots 2k-1] b(n-2k, j-k),$$

(5.13) $$b(n, j) = \sum_{k=0}^{j} \binom{n}{2k} [1 \cdot 3 \cdots 2k-1] g(n-2k, j-k).$$

Formulas (5.11), (5.12) and (5.13) can be proved in a more general setting. Following Riordan [16, pp. 76–78], we see that

(5.14) $$b_{t,n+1}(s) = s \sum_{r=0}^{n-t} \binom{n}{r} b_{t,n}(s),$$

(5.15) $$b_{t,n}(s) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \frac{n!(t!)^{-r}(-s)^r}{r!(n-tr)!} b_{t-1,n-tr}(s),$$

(5.16) $$b_{t,n-1}(s) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \frac{n!(t!)^{-r}(s)^r}{r!(n-tr)!} b_{t,n-tr}(s).$$

By differentiating (5.2) with respect to u and subtracting s times the derivative of (5.2) with respect to s, we derive

(5.17) $$b(t; n+1, j) = jb(t; n, j) + \binom{n}{t} b(t; n-t, j-1),$$

with $b(t; 0, 0) = 1$. Also, from (5.2) and (5.3),

(5.18) $$b(t; n, j) = \sum \frac{n!}{j! k_1! \cdots k_j!},$$

the sum being over all compositions $k_1 + \cdots + k_j = n$, each $k_i \geqslant t+1$.

A natural generalization of (1.1) is

(5.19) $$\frac{x^m/m!}{e^x - 1 - x - \cdots - x^{m-1}/(m-1)!} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_{m,n} \frac{x^n}{n!}.$$

Definition (5.19) was made in [8], and arithmetic properties of the rational numbers $A_{m,n}$ were discussed in that paper. It follows that

(5.20) $$A_{m,n} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-m!)^j j! n! b(m; n+mj, j)/(n+mj)!$$

and

$$A_{m,n} = n! \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(-m!)^j}{(m+k_1)! \cdots (m+k_j)!}, \tag{5.21}$$

the sum being over all compositions $k_1 + \cdots + k_j = n$, each $k_i \geq 1$. Applying Theorem 4.4, we see that if

$$h(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{i} \frac{m!}{(i+1)\cdots(i+m)} f(n-i),$$

then

$$f(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{i} A_{m,i} h(n-i).$$

From (5.19) we have $A_{1,n} = B_n$ and $A_{2,n} = A_n$.

6. Miscellaneous Results. From (1.1) and (2.3) we see that

$$(e-2)^{-1} = 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n/n!; \tag{6.1}$$

and the convergence appears to be very rapid since

$$(e-2)^{-1} = 1.392211191 \cdots \quad \text{and} \quad 2 \sum_{n=0}^{5} A_n/n! = 1.392210464 \cdots.$$

By letting $x = -1$ in (1.1), we have

$$e = 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n A_n/n!, \tag{6.2}$$

and again the convergence is rapid. More generally, from (1.5) we have for all z

$$e^{1-z} = 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n A_n(z)/n!. \tag{6.3}$$

We can compare the sizes of A_n and the Bernoulli numbers. From (2.1) and (2.2) we see that

$$|A_n| < n! \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (2\pi s)^{-n}, \tag{6.4}$$

and since [12, p. 244]

$$2(n!) \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (2\pi s)^{-n} = |B_n|,$$

for n even, we see that for $n = 2m$, $m > 0$,

$$2|A_{2m}| < |B_{2m}|, \tag{6.5}$$

and it follows [12, p. 245] that for $m > 0$

(6.6) $$24|A_{2m}| < (2m)!(2\pi)^{2-2m}.$$

Generally, using the approximation

$$|A_n| = n!(\cos n\theta_1)r_1^{-n},$$

we conjecture that for all $n > 0$

(6.7) $$|A_n| < n!7^{-n}.$$

It was proved in [8] that the numbers A_n are not bounded.

As we saw in Section 3, there is still a question of whether or not $A_n(z)$ can have rational roots when n is odd. The following theorems shed a little light on this situation.

THEOREM 6.1. *If p is a prime number, $p > 3$, and if $p - 2$ divides n, then $A_n(z)$ has no rational roots.*

Proof. By the proof of Theorem 6.2 in [6], we have

$$\frac{p^m A_{m(p-2)}(u/3)}{[m(p-2)]!} \equiv \frac{p^m}{[m(p-2)]!} A_{m(p-2)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

It follows that $u/3$ cannot be a root of $A_{m(p-2)}(z)$.

THEOREM 6.2. *Suppose $u/3$ is a rational root of $A_n(z)$ and $n = 1 + 3^t k$, $k \not\equiv 0$ (mod 3). If $t = 1$, then $u \equiv 1$ (mod 9). If $t > 1$, then $u \equiv 1$ (mod 3^{t+2}).*

Proof. We know from Theorem 3.1 that $u \equiv n \equiv 1$ (mod 3). Note that

$$\binom{n}{r} 3^r A_r = n(n-1) \cdots (n-r+1) 3^r A_r / r!,$$

so

$$\sum_{r=3m+2}^{n} \binom{n}{r} 3^{r-1} A_r u^{n-r} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^{t+m-1}}.$$

From (3.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\equiv \sum_{r=0}^{4} \binom{n}{r} 3^{r-1} A_r u^{n-r} \\ &\equiv u^{n-1}(u-1)/3 + 3^{t-1} k u^{n-4}(-1 - 2u + 10u^2 - 40u^3)/40 \\ &\equiv u^{n-1}(u-1)/3 \pmod{3^t}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $u \equiv 1$ (mod 3^{t+1}). In fact, if $t > 1$,

$$0 \equiv u^{n-1}(u-1)/3 - 3^t k \cdot 11/40 - 3^t k \cdot 47/1400 \pmod{3^{t+1}},$$

which implies $u \equiv 1$ (mod 3^{t+2}).

We can use the method of Theorem 6.2 to get more information about u, if u/b is a rational root of $A_n(z)$. Suppose $n = 1 + 3^t k$, $t > 2$, $k \equiv 0$ (mod 3) and suppose $u = 1 + 3^{t+2} m$. Then we have

$$0 \equiv \sum_{r=0}^{10} \binom{n}{r} 3^{r-1} u^{n-r} \equiv 3^{t+1}m + 3^t k(-11/40 - 47/1400) + 3^{t+1}k(5120)$$

$$\equiv 3^{t+1}m - 3^{t+1}k \pmod{3^{t+2}}.$$

For $r = 8, 9, 10$ we have used (1.3). Thus we see that in this case we must have $m \equiv k \pmod 3$.

If $n = 4 + 9k$ or $7 + 9k$, $k \not\equiv 0 \pmod 3$, we can use this method to show that $u \equiv 19 \pmod{27}$. If $n = 1 + 9k$, $k \not\equiv 0 \pmod 3$, we can use this method to show that $u \equiv 1 \pmod{243}$.

By these results and the remarks following Theorem 3.2, we see that if $A_n(1/3) = 0$, then $n \equiv 1 \pmod{36}$.

Returning to definitions (5.2) and (5.3), we can find a relationship between $b_{2,n}(s)$ and the Hermite polynomials. Let

$$g_n(s) = b_{2,n}(s), \quad a_n(s) = b_{0,n}(s).$$

From (5.2) we have

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g_n(s)\frac{u^n}{n!} = \exp[s(e^u - 1)]\exp[-s(u + u^2/2)]. \tag{6.8}$$

In [11, p. 181] the Hermite polynomial $H_n(x)$ is defined by means of

$$\exp(xu - u^2/2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} H_n(x)\frac{u^n}{n!}. \tag{6.9}$$

Thus by (6.8) and (6.9) we have

$$g_n(1) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \binom{n}{r} a_r(1) H_{n-r}(-1),$$

where $H_0(-1) = 1$, $H_1(-1) = -1$ and

$$H_{n+1}(-1) = -H_n(-1) - nH_{n-1}(-1).$$

It follows that

$$g_n(1) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{r} \binom{n}{r} S(n - r, j) H_r(-1).$$

The number $g_n(1)$ is the number of ways of putting n different objects into n like cells, where each nonempty cell must contain at least three objects.

We conclude with two tables. Table 1 gives the value of $n\theta_1$ (modulo 360°), rounded off to the nearest degree, and also the values of $\cos n\theta_1$ rounded off at the third place. This is done for $1 \leqslant n \leqslant 46$. Table 2 indicates when the pattern of Theorem 2.2 changes for A_n when $n = 46k + s$.

TABLE 1

(1) 74°, .270	(17) 184°, −.997	(32) 220°, −.771
(2) 149°, −.855	(18) 258°, −.288	(33) 294°, .405
(3) 223°, −.730	(19) 333°, .890	(34) 8°, .990
(4) 297°, .461	(20) 47°, .679	(35) 83°, .129
(5) 12°, .979	(21) 122°, −.524	(36) 157°, −.920
(6) 86°, .067	(22) 196°, −.962	(37) 231°, −.625
(7) 161°, −.943	(23) 270.3°, .005	(38) 306°, .583
(8) 235°, −.575	(24) 345°, .964	(39) 20°, .939
(9) 309°, .633	(25) 59°, .515	(40) 94°, −.077
(10) 24°, .916	(26) 133°, −.689	(41) 169°, −.981
(11) 98°, −.139	(27) 208°, −.885	(42) 243°, −.452
(12) 172°, −.991	(28) 282°, .209	(43) 317°, .737
(13) 247°, −.396	(29) 356°, .998	(44) 32°, .849
(14) 321°, .778	(30) 71°, .329	(45) 106°, −.279
(15) 35°, .815	(31) 145°, −.821	(46) 180.6°, −.9999
(16) 110°, −.338		

TABLE 2

s	6	35	18	1	30	13	42	25	8	27	20
k	7	13	20	28	34	41	47	54	61	67	74

s	3	32	15	44	27	10	39	22	5	34
k	82	88	95	101	108	115	121	128	136	142

s	17	46	29	12	41	24	7	36	19
k	149	155	162	169	175	182	190	196	203

s	2	31	14	43	26	9	38	21	4
k	210	216	223	229	236	244	250	257	264

s	33	16	45	28	11	40	23
k	270	277	283	290	298	304	311

7. **Acknowledgement.** I would like to thank Professor L. Carlitz for his advice and encouragement. I would also like to thank Professor J. W. Sawyer of the Wake Forest computer center and H. R. P. Ferguson of Brigham Young University, for confirming approximations (2.3) with the following computations:

$$a = 2.0888430156130,$$
$$b = 7.46148928565425,$$
$$\theta_1 = 74.36041657449774°,$$
$$r_1 = 7.74836031065984.$$

Department of Mathematics
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27109

1. J. BRILLHART, "On the Euler and Bernoulli polynomials," *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, v. 234, 1969, pp. 45–64. MR 39 #4117.

2. L. CARLITZ, "Note on irreducibility of the Bernoulli and Euler polynomials," *Duke Math. J.*, v. 19, 1952, pp. 475–481. MR **14**, 163.

3. L. CARLITZ, "Note on the numbers of Jordan and Ward," *Duke Math. J.*, v. 38, 1971, pp. 783–790. MR **45** #1776.

4. L. CARLITZ, "The Staudt-Clausen theorem," *Math. Mag.*, v. 34, 1960/61, pp. 131–146. MR **24** #A258.

5. L. CARLITZ, "Set partitions," *Fibonacci Quart.* (To appear.)

6. F. T. HOWARD, "A sequence of numbers related to the exponential function," *Duke Math. J.*, v. 34, 1967, pp. 599–616. MR **36** #130.

7. F. T. HOWARD, "Factors and roots of the van der Pol polynomials," *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, v. 53, 1975, pp. 1–8. MR **52** #252.

8. F. T. HOWARD, "Some sequences of rational numbers related to the exponential function," *Duke Math. J.*, v. 34, 1967, pp. 701–716. MR **36** #131.

9. F. T. HOWARD, "Roots of the Euler polynomials," *Pacific J. Math.*, v. 64, 1976, pp. 181–191.

10. K. INKERI, "The real roots of Bernoulli polynomials," *Ann. Univ. Turku. Ser. A* I, v. 37, 1959, pp. 3–20. MR 22 #1703.

11. D. JACKSON, *Fourier Series and Orthogonal Polynomials*, Carus Monograph Ser., no. 6, Math. Assoc. of America, Oberlin, Ohio, 1941. MR **3**, 230.

12. C. JORDAN, *Calculus of Finite Differences*, Hungarian Agent Eggenberger Book-Shop, Budapest, 1939; Chelsea, New York, 1950. MR **1**, 74.

13. K. KNOPP, *Infinite Sequences and Series*, Dover, New York, 1956. MR **18**, 30.

14. P. A. MacMAHON, *Combinatory Analysis*, Chelsea, New York, 1960. MR **25** #5003.

15. N. E. NÖRLUND, *Vorlesungen über Differenzrechnung*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1924.

16. J. RIORDAN, *An Introduction to Combinatorial Analysis*, Chapman & Hall, London; Wiley, New York, 1958. MR **20** #3077.

17. E. C. TITCHMARSH, *The Theory of Functions*, 2nd ed., Oxford, London, 1939.