

# ON AN IDENTITY OF BLOCK AND MARSCHAK<sup>1</sup>

BY J. G. VAN DER CORPUT

Communicated by Edwin Moise, July 29, 1959

In the Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society<sup>2</sup> H. D. Block and Jacob Marschak proved for each choice of the positive integers  $m$  and  $n$  with  $m \leq n$  the identity

$$(1) \quad \sum_1 \{ (u_{s_1} + u_{s_2} + \cdots + u_{s_n})(u_{s_2} + u_{s_3} + \cdots + u_{s_n}) \cdots (u_{s_{n-1}} + u_{s_n})u_{s_n} \}^{-1} \\ = \{ (u_1 + u_2 + \cdots + u_m)u_2u_3 \cdots u_n \}^{-1},$$

where  $u_1, \dots, u_n$  denote indefinite numbers and where  $\sum_1$  is extended over all the permutations  $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$  of  $(1, 2, \dots, n)$  which rank 1 before each of the numbers  $2, 3, \dots, m$ .

In this paper I shall prove: *If  $p, q$  and  $n$  denote integers with  $0 \leq p \leq q \leq n$  and  $n \geq 1$ , then*

$$(2) \quad \sum_2 \{ (u_{s_1} + u_{s_2} + \cdots + u_{s_n})(u_{s_2} + u_{s_3} + \cdots + u_{s_n}) \cdots (u_{s_{n-1}} + u_{s_n})u_{s_n} \}^{-1} \\ = \{ (u_1 + u_2 + \cdots + u_q)(u_2 + \cdots + u_q) \cdots (u_p + \cdots + u_q)u_{p+1} \cdots u_n \}^{-1},$$

where  $\sum_2$  is extended over the permutations  $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$  of  $(1, 2, \dots, n)$  which rank 1 before 2; 2 before 3;  $\dots$ ;  $p-1$  before  $p$  and finally  $p$  before each of the numbers  $p+1, p+2, \dots, q$ .

The particular case  $p=1, q=m$  yields (1).

In the proof of (2) I treat first the case  $q=n$ . Then  $\sum_2$  is extended over the permutations  $(s_1, \dots, s_n)$  with  $s_h = h$  ( $1 \leq h \leq p$ ), where  $(s_{p+1}, \dots, s_n)$  is an arbitrary permutation of  $(p+1, \dots, n)$ . In this case we must show that

$$(3) \quad \sum_2 = \{ (u_1 + \cdots + u_n)(u_2 + \cdots + u_n) \cdots (u_p + \cdots + u_n)u_{p+1} \cdots u_n \}^{-1}.$$

In the case  $p=n$  the sum  $\sum_2$  consists of only one term namely

<sup>1</sup> This paper is sponsored by the United States Army under Contract No. DA-11-022-ORD-2059.

<sup>2</sup> H. D. Block and Jacob Marschak, *An identity in arithmetic*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. vol. 65 (1959) pp. 123-124. Without loss of generality we may choose  $i=1$  in their identity and then this identity assumes the simpler form indicated in (1).

$(u_1 + \dots + u_n)^{-1}$ . I may therefore assume that  $p$  is  $\leq n-1$  and that (3) has already been proved with  $p$  replaced by  $p+1$ . For each integer  $h \geq p+1$  and  $\leq n$  the contribution to  $\sum_2$  of the permutations  $(s_{p+1}, \dots, s_n)$  with  $s_{p+1} = h$  is according to the induction hypothesis equal to

$$u_h \{ (u_1 + \dots + u_n)(u_2 + \dots + u_n) \dots (u_{p+1} + \dots + u_n) u_{p+1} \dots u_n \}^{-1},$$

so that

$$\sum_2 = \{ (u_1 + \dots + u_n)(u_2 + \dots + u_n) \dots (u_{p+1} + \dots + u_n) u_{p+1} \dots u_n \}^{-1} \sum_{h=p+1}^n u_h,$$

which gives the required result (3).

Finally we treat the case  $p \leq q \leq n-1$  and we may assume that (2) has already been proved with  $p$  replaced by  $p+1$ . We must prove that

$$(4) \quad u_{p+1} u_{p+2} \dots u_n \sum_2 = [p+1, p+2, \dots, q] / [1, 2, \dots, q],$$

where

$$[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_t] = (u_{a_1} + u_{a_2} + \dots + u_{a_t})(u_{a_2} + u_{a_3} + \dots + u_{a_t}) \dots (u_{a_{t-1}} + u_{a_t}) u_{a_t};$$

the right hand side means 1 if  $t=0$ .

By the induction hypothesis the contribution to  $u_{p+1} \dots u_n \sum_2$  of the permutations  $(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$  which rank  $p$  before  $q+1$  is equal to  $[p+1, \dots, q+1] / [1, \dots, q+1]$ ; the contribution to  $u_{p+1} \dots u_n \sum_2$  of the permutations which rank  $q+1$  between  $h-1$  and  $h$  is for each integer  $h$  with  $2 \leq h \leq p$  equal to

$$u_{q+1} [p+1, \dots, q] / [1, \dots, h-1, q+1, h, \dots, q]$$

and finally the contribution to  $u_{p+1} \dots u_n \sum_2$  of the permutations which rank  $q+1$  before 1 is equal to

$$u_{q+1} [p+1, \dots, q] / [q+1, 1, \dots, q].$$

In this way we find

$$u_{p+1} u_{p+2} \dots u_n \sum_2 = \frac{[p+1, \dots, q+1]}{[1, \dots, q+1]} + u_{q+1} \sum_{h=1}^p \frac{[p+1, \dots, q]}{[1, \dots, h-1, q+1, h, \dots, q]}.$$

It is therefore sufficient to prove that

$$(5) \quad \frac{[p+1, \dots, q+1]}{[1, \dots, q+1]} + u_{q+1} \sum_{h=1}^p \frac{[p+1, \dots, q]}{[1, \dots, h-1, q+1, h, \dots, q]} = \frac{[p+1, \dots, q]}{[1, \dots, q]}.$$

This identity is obvious for  $p=0$ , so that I may assume that  $p$  is  $\geq 1$  and that (5) has already been proved with  $p$  replaced by  $p-1$ .

The term with  $h=1$  occurring on the left hand side of (5) is equal to  $(u_1 + \dots + u_{q+1})^{-1}$  times

$$u_{q+1} \frac{[p+1, \dots, q]}{(u_1 + \dots + u_q)[2, \dots, q]},$$

so that this term is a rational function of  $u_1$  which possesses at  $u_1 = -(u_2 + \dots + u_{q+1})$  a simple pole with residue

$$-[p+1, \dots, q]/[2, \dots, q]$$

and at  $u_1 = -(u_2 + \dots + u_q)$  a simple pole with residue

$$[p+1, \dots, q]/[2, \dots, q].$$

The left hand side of (5) is therefore a rational function of  $u_1$  which possesses at  $u_1 = -(u_2 + \dots + u_{q+1})$  a simple pole with residue

$$\frac{[p+1, \dots, q+1]}{[2, \dots, q+1]} + u_{q+1} \sum_{h=2}^p \frac{[p+1, \dots, q]}{[2, \dots, h-1, q+1, h, \dots, q]} - \frac{[p+1, \dots, q]}{[2, \dots, q]}.$$

This expression assumes, if we replace  $u_2, u_3, \dots, u_{q+1}$  by  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_q$ , the form

$$\frac{[p, \dots, q]}{[1, \dots, q]} + u_q \sum_{h=1}^{p-1} \frac{[p, \dots, q-1]}{[1, \dots, h-1, q, h, \dots, q-1]} - \frac{[p, \dots, q-1]}{[1, \dots, q-1]}$$

which is equal to zero according to formula (5) applied with  $p$  and  $q$  replaced by  $p-1$  and  $q-1$ . Consequently the left hand side of (5) is a rational function of  $u_1$  which has at  $u_1 = -(u_2 + \dots + u_{q+1})$  a simple pole with residue 0, so that this function is analytic at that

point. This function has at  $u_1 = -(u_2 + \dots + u_q)$  a simple pole with residue  $[p+1, \dots, q]/[2, \dots, q]$  and this is also the case with the function occurring on the right hand side of (5). All the terms occurring in (5) are analytic functions of  $u_1$ , apart of the points  $u_1 = -(u_2 + \dots + u_{q+1})$  and  $u_1 = -(u_2 + \dots + u_q)$ , so that the difference between the two sides of (5) is a rational function of  $u_1$  without poles which tends for  $u_1 \rightarrow \infty$  to zero; this difference is therefore identically equal to zero. This completes the proof.

MATHEMATICS RESEARCH CENTER, UNITED STATES ARMY, MADISON, WIS.