

The remainder is as follows :—

17550	06500	84834	29272	80492	56652	30056	77179	51985	96380
06400	15769	36917	76044	90943	15598	00090	70477	96549	03362
30614	39569	71063	83855	24053	35869	04219	87709	24604	49236
79071	67965	18350	79865	61803	71534	89641	16619	31638	84825
79008	0								

Aug. 28th, 1871.

II. Second Paper “On the Numerical Value of Euler's Constant, and on the Summation of the Harmonic Series employed in obtaining such Value.” By WILLIAM SHANKS, Houghton-le-Spring, Durham. Communicated by Prof. G. G. STOKES, Sec. R.S. Received August 30, 1871.

Three cases and sources of inaccuracy in finding the value of  $E$  in the former paper (Proc. Roy. Soc. vol. xv. p. 429) having been pointed out by Mr. Glaisher, and some other minor errors not noticed by him having since been detected by the author, and these having vitiated the results, but only in a slight degree the inferences drawn from them (for in the former paper the *last and leading conclusion* as to the value of  $E$ , though *limited*, was certainly *correct*), the author has been led, from a deep sense of obligation to the Royal Society, to revise, correct, and extend what he had previously done. And it will be seen, from comparing Mr. Glaisher's remarks and results with what follows in this paper, that the supplementary matter herein given, including the extension of  $E$  &c. to 110 places of decimals, can scarcely be without interest to mathematicians, and especially as regards the summation of the harmonic series in the formula for finding the value of  $E$ .

Not having seen M. Oettinger's article in Crelle's ‘Journal,’ “On Computing the value of  $E$ ,” the author is unable to state what artifices he used in summing the harmonic series. Mr. Glaisher gives a very simple and obvious one from M. Oettinger, which the author could not but see and employ for calculating the values of the reciprocals of the even numbers.

In summing the harmonic series, the author found the reciprocals of all numbers up to 200, as far as 200 places of decimals; next the reciprocals from 200 to 500, to only 105 decimals; and afterwards the reciprocals of the odd composite numbers up to 5000, to the same extent. In passing from  $S_{2000}$  to  $S_{5000}$ , some extra calculation was necessary, which need not be stated here. It is, however, necessary to calculate, *in extenso*, the reciprocals of the odd composite numbers only to half the number of terms which it is proposed to sum. The reciprocals of all the prime numbers must of course be calculated separately.

The leading artifices the author employed to shorten calculation may be best stated and explained by supposing that the reciprocals of all the odd numbers below 5000 have been computed and retained separately, also

that the sum of the series to 5000 terms has been found, and that the series is required to be summed to 10,000 terms.

To obtain the sum of the reciprocals of the even numbers from 5000 to 10,000, we have:—

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 (\frac{1}{2501} + \frac{1}{2503} + \dots + \frac{1}{9999}) \div 2. & (\frac{1}{41} + \dots + \frac{1}{77}) \div 2^7. \\
 (\frac{1}{1251} + \frac{1}{1253} + \dots + \frac{1}{4999}) \div 2^2. & (\frac{1}{21} + \dots + \frac{1}{39}) \div 2^8. \\
 (\frac{1}{627} + \dots + \frac{1}{1249}) \div 2^3. & (\frac{1}{11} + \dots + \frac{1}{19}) \div 2^9. \\
 (\frac{1}{313} + \dots + \frac{1}{625}) \div 2^4. & (\frac{1}{5} + \dots + \frac{1}{9}) \div 2^{10}. \\
 (\frac{1}{157} + \dots + \frac{1}{311}) \div 2^5. & \frac{1}{3} \div 2^{11}. \\
 (\frac{1}{79} + \dots + \frac{1}{155}) \div 2^6. & 1 \div 2^{13}.
 \end{array}$$

These twelve quotients, when added together, give the value of the reciprocals of the even numbers between 5000 and 10,000, including the latter number.

To obtain the sum of the reciprocals of the odd composite numbers between 5000 and 10,000, we have, using *prime* divisors,

$$\begin{array}{l}
 (\frac{1}{1667} + \frac{1}{1669} + \dots + \frac{1}{3333}) \div 3. \\
 (\frac{1}{1001} + \frac{1}{1003} + \frac{1}{1007} + \dots + \frac{1}{9999}) \div 5.
 \end{array}$$

Here it must be observed that *all odd numbers which are multiples of previous prime divisors* must be excluded: *e. g.*  $\frac{1}{1005}$  must be excluded from division by 5, because 1005 is a multiple of 3.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 (\frac{1}{719} + \dots + \frac{1}{1427}) \div 7. & (\frac{1}{127} + \dots + \frac{1}{241}) \div 41. \\
 (\frac{1}{457} + \dots + \frac{1}{907}) \div 11. & (\frac{1}{127} + \dots + \frac{1}{229}) \div 43. \\
 (\frac{1}{359} + \dots + \frac{1}{719}) \div 13. & (\frac{1}{107} + \dots + \frac{1}{211}) \div 47. \\
 (\frac{1}{307} + \dots + \frac{1}{587}) \div 17. & (\frac{1}{97} + \dots + \frac{1}{181}) \div 53. \\
 (\frac{1}{269} + \dots + \frac{1}{523}) \div 19. & (\frac{1}{89} + \dots + \frac{1}{167}) \div 59. \\
 (\frac{1}{223} + \dots + \frac{1}{433}) \div 23. & (\frac{1}{83} + \dots + \frac{1}{163}) \div 61. \\
 (\frac{1}{173} + \dots + \frac{1}{337}) \div 29. & (\frac{1}{79} + \dots + \frac{1}{149}) \div 67. \\
 (\frac{1}{163} + \dots + \frac{1}{317}) \div 31. & (\frac{1}{71} + \dots + \frac{1}{139}) \div 71. \\
 (\frac{1}{137} + \dots + \frac{1}{269}) \div 37. &
 \end{array}$$

Here it must be noted that all numbers *below* prime divisors must always be excluded.

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 (\frac{1}{73} + \dots + \frac{1}{131}) \div 73. & (\frac{1}{59} + \dots + \frac{1}{109}) \div 89. \\
 (\frac{1}{79} + \dots + \frac{1}{113}) \div 79. & (\frac{1}{97} + \dots + \frac{1}{103}) \div 97. \\
 (\frac{1}{83} + \dots + \frac{1}{113}) \div 83. &
 \end{array}$$

These twenty-four quotients, when added together, give the sum of the reciprocals of the odd composite numbers between 5000 and 10,000. To this sum add the sum of the prime reciprocals between 5000 and 10,000; the result is the value of the reciprocals of all the odd numbers between 5000 and 10,000. It need scarcely be stated that the sum of these two

distinct sets of numbers, increased by the sum of the series to 5000 terms, will give the sum of the harmonic series to 10,000 terms.

Before proceeding further it should be stated that, having obtained the correct value of  $E$ , from  $S_{200}$  &c. to 110 decimals, verifying Mr. Glaisher's to 99 decimals, it was comparatively easy to extend  $S_{500}$  and  $S_{1000}$  to 110 decimals, and to correct and extend  $S_{2000}$ ,  $S_{5000}$ , and  $S_{10,000}$  to the same extent.

When we have  $S_{100}$ , the calculations from Bernoulli's 31 numbers will lead to obtaining  $E$  only to about 92 decimals. This value may no doubt be extended by finding the ratio between the last and each succeeding Bernoulli's number. Such ratio is, however, only approximative, and can yield correct results of only a limited number of decimals. The excess of the + Bernoulli terms over the — ones, to 110 decimals, when  $S_{100}$  is used, is readily obtained when  $E$  and  $\log_e 100$  are known to the same extent. Such excess will be found below; also the separate sums of the + and — terms in which Bernoulli's numbers enter, both when  $S=100$  and when  $S=200$ , to 205 decimals.

The values of  $S_{500}$ ,  $S_{1000}$ ,  $S_{2000}$ ,  $S_{5000}$ , and  $S_{10,000}$  to 110 decimals, also the corresponding + and — results of the Bernoulli terms to the same extent, are likewise given below, as they involve very considerable calculation, and may thus be tested and verified. The values of  $S_{100}$  and  $S_{200}$  may as well be also written anew, inasmuch as a few slight errors had crept into them before.

$$E = \begin{array}{r} \cdot 57721 \ 56649 \ 01532 \ 86060 \ 65120 \ 90082 \ 40243 \ 10421 \ 59335 \ 93992 \\ 35988 \ 05767 \ 23488 \ 48677 \ 26777 \ 66467 \ 09369 \ 47063 \ 29174 \ 67495 \\ 11141 \ 14421 \dots\dots \end{array}$$

$$S_{100} = \begin{array}{r} 5 \cdot 18737 \ 75176 \ 39620 \ 26080 \ 51176 \ 75658 \ 25315 \ 79089 \ 72126 \ 70845 \\ 16531 \ 76533 \ 95658 \ 72195 \ 57532 \ 55049 \ 66056 \ 87768 \ 92312 \ 04135 \\ 49921 \ 06986 \ 97779 \ 79182 \ 73403 \ 18717 \ 00828 \ 94825 \ 42444 \ 49096 \\ 57618 \ 56474 \ 16326 \ 13467 \ 07313 \ 21114 \ 47132 \ 49733 \ 09103 \ 51129 \\ \dots\dots \end{array}$$

$$S_{200} = \begin{array}{r} 5 \cdot 87803 \ 09481 \ 21444 \ 47605 \ 73863 \ 97130 \ 86163 \ 68374 \ 00246 \ 53024 \\ 30844 \ 64971 \ 94472 \ 28783 \ 30029 \ 84018 \ 15499 \ 64301 \ 86679 \ 89238 \\ 37326 \ 83211 \ 85439 \ 05911 \ 76542 \ 77755 \ 27568 \ 86559 \ 30203 \ 06046 \\ 25715 \ 75389 \ 22254 \ 75748 \ 47845 \ 75246 \ 64079 \ 54805 \ 61627 \ 08880 \\ \dots\dots \end{array}$$

$$S_{500} = \begin{array}{r} 6 \cdot 79282 \ 34299 \ 90524 \ 60298 \ 92871 \ 45367 \ 97369 \ 48198 \ 13814 \ 39677 \\ 91166 \ 43088 \ 89685 \ 43566 \ 23790 \ 55049 \ 24576 \ 49403 \ 73586 \ 56039 \\ 14705 \ 68279 \dots\dots \end{array}$$

$$S_{1000} = \begin{array}{r} 7 \cdot 48547 \ 08605 \ 50344 \ 91265 \ 65182 \ 04333 \ 90017 \ 65216 \ 79169 \ 70880 \\ 36657 \ 73626 \ 74995 \ 76993 \ 49165 \ 20244 \ 09599 \ 34437 \ 41184 \ 50813 \\ 93907 \ 71134 \dots\dots \end{array}$$

$$S_{2000} = \begin{array}{r} 8 \cdot 17836 \ 81036 \ 10282 \ 40957 \ 76565 \ 71641 \ 69368 \ 79354 \ 66740 \ 91248 \\ 77402 \ 20419 \ 74812 \ 15302 \ 80688 \ 34328 \ 60377 \ 35324 \ 29687 \ 02614 \\ 20643 \ 33506 \dots\dots \end{array}$$

$S_{5000} = 9\cdot09450 \ 88529 \ 84436 \ 96726 \ 12455 \ 33393 \ 43939 \ 17829 \ 87811 \ 30381$   
 $14506 \ 16283 \ 85209 \ 05328 \ 30500 \ 87619 \ 93914 \ 09299 \ 23691 \ 97409$   
 $31969 \ 93538\ldots$

$S_{10,000} = 9\cdot78760 \ 60360 \ 44382 \ 26417 \ 84779 \ 04851 \ 60533 \ 48592 \ 62945 \ 57769$   
 $16183 \ 89460 \ 95668 \ 16020 \ 24943 \ 15950 \ 68001 \ 25127 \ 29008 \ 08825$   
 $88669 \ 45713\ldots$

When we have  $S_{100}$  we have excess of + Bernoulli terms over — Bernoulli terms as follows :—

$+0\cdot00000 \ 83332 \ 50003 \ 96783 \ 73773 \ 23792 \ 87768 \ 83353 \ 90186 \ 48901$   
 $78976 \ 95889 \ 08023 \ 27933 \ 88599 \ 81913 \ 48032 \ 53704 \ 54782 \ 29326$   
 $45555 \ 64243\ldots$

For  $S_{100}$  the sum of the + Bernoulli terms is

$+0\cdot00000 \ 83333 \ 33337 \ 30158 \ 73773 \ 44885 \ 67821 \ 37321 \ 67823 \ 08773$   
 $00082 \ 30639 \ 33761 \ 49846 \ 36254 \ 14224 \ 82920 \ 15089 \ 51978 \ 53129$   
 $32622 \ 35457 \ 80834 \ 33466 \ 17877 \ 22649 \ 42919 \ 19943 \ 83311 \ 44605$   
 $09910 \ 37086 \ 58144 \ 47970 \ 79756 \ 13813 \ 15081 \ 18650 \ 05862 \ 58830$   
 $54265\ldots$

For  $S_{100}$  the sum of the — Bernoulli terms is

$-0\cdot00000 \ 00000 \ 83333 \ 33375 \ 00000 \ 21092 \ 80052 \ 53967 \ 77636 \ 59871$   
 $21105 \ 34750 \ 25738 \ 21912 \ 47654 \ 32311 \ 34887 \ 61384 \ 93958 \ 76677$   
 $70933 \ 50276 \ 12351 \ 60205 \ 99358 \ 40193 \ 39578 \ 24455 \ 06318 \ 69180$   
 $82191 \ 70839 \ 75485 \ 79804 \ 74621 \ 35198 \ 75347 \ 46810 \ 82718 \ 00710$   
 $69953\ldots$

For  $S_{200}$  the sum of the + Bernoulli terms is

$+0\cdot00000 \ 20833 \ 33333 \ 39533 \ 73016 \ 61283 \ 59538 \ 59711 \ 91078 \ 12258$   
 $22890 \ 92137 \ 92329 \ 17052 \ 51095 \ 23490 \ 89894 \ 78957 \ 35141 \ 06774$   
 $04433 \ 65950 \ 49748 \ 89147 \ 11592 \ 75754 \ 43919 \ 38271 \ 38143 \ 50271$   
 $65525 \ 60887 \ 11534 \ 99567 \ 61791 \ 58429 \ 85003 \ 06150 \ 05862 \ 58830$   
 $54265\ldots$

For  $S_{200}$  the sum of the — Bernoulli terms is

$-0\cdot00000 \ 00000 \ 05208 \ 33333 \ 49609 \ 37505 \ 14960 \ 84887 \ 28877 \ 09510$   
 $05685 \ 64006 \ 82170 \ 11770 \ 13023 \ 01074 \ 35246 \ 38458 \ 75084 \ 75675$   
 $04222 \ 29829 \ 71026 \ 50819 \ 24197 \ 13084 \ 02015 \ 36765 \ 99447 \ 44527$   
 $25466 \ 44760 \ 75767 \ 81146 \ 37524 \ 18401 \ 87847 \ 46810 \ 82718 \ 00710$   
 $69953\ldots$

For  $S_{500}$  the sum of the + Bernoulli terms is

$+0\cdot00000 \ 03333 \ 33333 \ 33358 \ 73015 \ 87309 \ 34487 \ 73462 \ 42678 \ 21147$   
 $87864 \ 83345 \ 53789 \ 61875 \ 16264 \ 59799 \ 20761 \ 22352 \ 44796 \ 75809$   
 $19590 \ 05554\ldots$

For  $S_{500}$  the sum of the — Bernoulli terms is

—'00000 00000 00133 33333 33344 00000 00008 63960 92825 14227  
 06303 41363 50645 63522 06215 12108 84946 96404 61971 02278  
 38712 72302.....

For  $S_{1000}$  the sum of the + Bernoulli terms is

+ '00000 00833 33333 33333 73015 87301 59487 73448 77428 21067  
 82137 32165 00876 22580 99464 52882 37182 41954 63931 48991  
 92230 67302.....

For  $S_{1000}$  the sum of the — Bernoulli terms is

—'00000 00000 00008 33333 33333 37500 00000 00210 92796 09323  
 93526 00040 82093 23718 92820 00915 30332 37713 49061 83360  
 48493 88803.....

For  $S_{2000}$  the sum of the + Bernoulli terms is

+ '00000 00208 33333 33333 33953 37301 58730 89855 02344 88243  
 11403 65711 84320 18015 80288 93393 93977 27188 21088 95868  
 23862 44594.....

For  $S_{2000}$  the sum of the — Bernoulli terms is

—'00000 00000 00000 52083 33333 33349 60937 50000 05149 60842  
 10995 59700 64404 23526 83197 86039 81846 60506 95079 95161  
 64799 80365.....

For  $S_{5000}$  the sum of the + Bernoulli terms is

+ '00000 00033 33333 33333 33335 87301 58730 15880 77344 87734  
 48909 98210 67821 14787 86482 16512 65337 39125 53345 19304  
 37661 22499.....

For  $S_{5000}$  the sum of the — Bernoulli terms is

—'00000 00000 00000 01333 33333 33333 34400 00000 00000 08639  
 60927 96095 70104 02470 73465 66314 96500 75868 11665 04160  
 31880 36102.....

For  $S_{10,000}$  the sum of the + Bernoulli terms is

+ '00000 00008 33333 33333 33333 37301 58730 15873 02344 87734  
 48773 45710 67821 06782 13732 16500 84808 26100 49665 77626  
 52262 19358.....

For  $S_{10,000}$  the sum of the — Bernoulli terms is

—'00000 00000 00000 00083 33333 33333 33337 50000 00000 00002  
 10927 96092 79613 71220 73188 24992 34000 15344 13659 87023  
 61119 37034.....

Suppose  $n$ , in the harmonic series,  $\approx 1$  followed by 1000 ciphers; then,

since  $n$  is very large, we may disregard  $-\frac{1}{2n} + \frac{B_1}{2n^2}$  &c. We thus have  $E = Sn - \log_e n$ , or  $Sn = \log_e n + E$ ; but  $\log_e n = \log_e 10 \times 1$  followed by 100 ciphers, therefore

$S_n = 2.30258 \quad 50929 \quad 94045 \quad 68401 \quad 79914 \quad 54684 \quad 36420 \quad 76011 \quad 01488 \quad 62877$   
 $29760 \quad 33327 \quad 90096 \quad 75726 \quad 09677 \quad 35248 \quad 02359 \quad 97205 \quad 08959 \quad 82983$   
 $99889 \quad 35053 \quad 24395 \quad 34694 \quad 06073 \quad 44733 \quad 23049 \quad 86088 \quad 22209 \quad 63091$   
 $14157 \quad 00596 \quad 30696 \quad 81232 \quad 73586 \quad 10266 \quad 98852 \quad 09395 \quad 27703 \quad 06845$   
 $63633, \dots$

August 28th, 1871.

### III. "An Experimental Determination of the Velocity of Sound."

By E. J. STONE, M.A., F.R.S., Astronomer Royal at the Cape of Good Hope. Received August 21, 1871.

(Abstract.)

A galvanic current passes from the batteries at the Royal Observatory, Cape Town, at 1 o'clock, and discharges a gun at the Castle, and through relays drops a time-ball at Port Elizabeth. It appeared to the author that a valuable determination of the velocity of sound might be obtained by measuring upon the chronograph of the Observatory the interval between the time of the sound reaching some point near the gun and that of its arrival at the Observatory. As there is only a single wire between the Observatory and Cape Town, some little difficulty was experienced in making the necessary arrangements, without any interference with the 1 o'clock current to Port Elizabeth; but this difficulty was overcome by a plan which the author describes, and which was brought into successful operation on Feb. 27, 1871. The experiments could not have been carried out, on account of the encroachment they would have made on the time of the Observatory staff, had it not been for the assistance of J. Den, Esq., the acting manager of the Cape Telegraph Company, to whom the author is indebted for the preparation of a good earth-connexion near the gun, for permission to Mr. Kirby, a gentleman attached to the telegraph office, to assist in the experiments, and for a general superintendence of the arrangements at Cape Town.

The observed times of hearing the sound were recorded on the chronograph by two observers, situated one (Mr. Kirby) at a distance of 641 feet from the gun, the other (Mr. Mann) at the Observatory, at a distance of 15,449 feet from the gun. The former distance was sufficient to allow the connexion of the main wire to be broken at the telegraph office after the gun had been fired, but before the sound reached the first observer.

As there were no reciprocal signals, a correction was made by calculation for the effect of the wind, its velocity being measured by a set of Robin-