To complete the treatment of Brother Alfred's question, it must be noted that, if $n = 1$ or 2, $F_n = 1$ and so divides F_m, yielding a residue of $F_0 = 0$. And if m or n is negative, the well-known relation

$$F_{-t} = (-1)^{t-1} F_t ,$$

which was used in the derivation of (4), shows that the residue is still $\pm F_s$.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

NOTICE TO ALL SUBSCRIBERS!!!

Please notify the Managing Editor AT ONCE of any address change. The Post Office Department, rather than forwarding magazines mailed third class, sends them directly to the dead-letter office. Unless the addressee specifically requests the Fibonacci Quarterly be forwarded at first class rates to the new address, he will not receive it. (This will usually cost about 30 cents for first-class postage.) If possible, please notify us AT LEAST THREE WEEKS PRIOR to publication dates: February 15, April 15, October 15, and December 15.

CORRECTED FACTORIZATIONS OF FIBONACCI NUMBERS

DAVID M. BLOOM
University of Massachusetts

Kraitchik's table of factors of the Fibonacci numbers (Recherches sur la Theorie des Nombres," p. 77-79) contains at least two errors, as follows:

(u_n denotes n^{th} Fibonacci number, as in Kraitchik)

n	u_n	Kraitchik's Factorization	Correct Factorization
57	365, 435, 296, 162	$2 \cdot 37 \cdot 113 \cdot 4371901$	$2 \cdot 37 \cdot 113 \cdot 797 \cdot 54833$
67	44, 945, 570, 212, 853	prime	$269 \cdot 116849 \cdot 1429913$

Note: in the factorization of u_{57}, $797 \cdot 54833 = 43701901$, not 4371901)
Have these errors been pointed out elsewhere?