

Theta Functions

John D Mangual

$$\theta(x; p) = (x; p)_{\infty} (px^{-1}; p)_{\infty} = \exp \left(- \sum_{m \neq 0} \frac{x^m}{m(1 - p^m)} \right)$$

another one

$$\theta(z; q) := (z; q)_{\infty} (q/z; q)_{\infty} = \frac{1}{(q; q)_{\infty}} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} z^k q^{\binom{k}{2}}$$

the shifted factorials are defined by:

$$(z; q)_{\infty} = \prod_{i \geq 0} (1 - zq^i)$$

Let's see if

$$\binom{k}{2} = \frac{k(k-1)}{2} = \frac{k^2}{2} - \frac{k}{2}$$

Then it could be:

$$\theta(q^2; q) = \frac{1}{(q; q^2)} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} q^k q^{2\binom{k}{2}} = \frac{1}{(q; q^2)} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{n^2}$$

Wikipedia has

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}} b^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} = (-a; ab)_{\infty} (-b; ab)_{\infty} (ab; ab)_{\infty}$$

and we can set $a = b = q$:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{n^2} = (-q; q^2)_{\infty} (-q; q^2)_{\infty} (q^2; q^2)_{\infty}$$

This also seems odd we can try

$$\theta(q; q^2) = (q; q^2)_{\infty} (q; q)_{\infty} (q^2; q^2)_{\infty} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{n^2}$$

It might be parameterized in terms of two angles:

$$\theta(z; \tau) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{\pi i n^2 \tau + 2\pi i n z}$$

which has another triple product

$$\prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{2\pi i m \tau}) \left[1 + e^{(2m-1)\pi i \tau + 2\pi i z} \right] \left[1 + e^{(2m-1)\pi i \tau - 2\pi i z} \right]$$

Then $q = e^{2\pi i \tau}$ and $x = e^{2\pi i z}$:

$$\theta(0; q) = \prod (1 - q^2)(1 + q^{2m-1})(1 - q^{2m+1})$$

This is a beautiful triple product but we have to write in terms of rising and falling factorials.

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{n^2} = (-q; q^2)_{\infty} (-q; q^2)_{\infty} (q^2; q^2)_{\infty}$$

The exponent formula looks like

$$\log(1 - x) = \sum \frac{x^m}{m}$$

and the geometric series formula:

$$\sum p^{km} = \frac{1}{1 - p^m}$$

If we put two of them together it says:

$$\sum_m \sum_k \frac{1}{m} x^m p^{km} = \sum_m \frac{1}{m} \frac{x^m}{1 - p^m}$$

This is very much the logarithm in the beginning of this article.

Part II

So one big problem I will have with a lot of elliptic index paper with θ functions everywhere is the normalization. And their endless obsession with modular invariance¹

Uh... so before I get into that we rewind to 2003 before a lot of this paper and read through Appendix A of Nekrasov-Okounkov:

$$\gamma_{\hbar}(x; \Lambda) = \frac{d}{ds} \Big|_{s=0} \frac{\Lambda^s}{\Gamma(s)} \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} t^s \frac{e^{-tx}}{(e^{\hbar t} - 1)(e^{-\hbar t} - 1)}$$

This is a mouth-ful but notice right away this is a **Mellin transform** and also this is **zeta regularization**. The Nekrasov partition function is *badly* divergent (as most physics formulas are) and here is one way to fix it.

However, these gentlemen have used a very common idea in number theory. Here is a baby example:

$$\sqrt{1} - \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} - \sqrt{4} + \dots = (\sqrt{1} - 2\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3}) + (\sqrt{2} - 2\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{4}) + \dots$$

Uh... hopefully I remember later²

¹If the object is invariant under $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ or a congruence subgroup $[\Gamma_0(N) : \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})] = N$ or a *non-congruence* group. There are many possibilities that Nekrasov and Shatashvili do not account for ('cuz they're not interested).

²but **you** and read <http://math.stackexchange.com/q/1896464/4997>

Nekrasov and Okounkov state this really is zeta-function regularization so we have

$$\gamma_{\hbar}(0; \Lambda) = -\frac{1}{12}$$

and even some instance of the volumes of the unitary groups:

$$\log (\text{Vol } U(N)) = \gamma_1(N; 1)$$

and the other functions $\gamma_{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2}$ are embellishments³.

These γ_{\hbar} satisfy a second-difference equation:

$$\gamma_{\hbar}(x - \hbar, \Lambda) - 2\gamma_{\hbar}(x, \Lambda) + \gamma_{\hbar}(x + \hbar, \Lambda) = \log \left(\frac{x}{\Lambda} \right)$$

Theres so many logs floating around but I really want to talk about this Λ :

$$\sum [\Lambda(n) - 1] \frac{e^{-ny}}{1 - e^{-ny}} \sim -\frac{2\gamma}{y}$$

Then by the Hardy-Littlewood Tauberian theorem (for Lambert series)⁴:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n) - 1}{n} = -2\gamma$$

³and a nuisance to read – painful on the eyes

⁴which we will argue is the same kind of regularization as Nikita Nekrasov uses

If this thing converges at all the coefficients must have been small:

$$\sum_{n \leq x} [\Lambda(n) - 1] = o(x)$$

and this is very much equivalent to the Prime Number Theorem.

Here the Λ in question is the Van Mangold function:

$$\Lambda(n) = \begin{cases} \log p & \text{if } n = p^k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and we regularize the Lambert sum to a normal finite sum

$$y \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\Lambda(n) - 1)e^{-ny}}{1 - e^{-ny}} \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\Lambda(n) - 1)}{n} e^{-ny} \rightarrow -2\gamma$$

if we let $y \rightarrow 0$

References

- (1) Taro Kimura, Vasily Pestun **Quiver elliptic W-algebras** [arXiv:1608.04651](#)
- (2) Wikipedia “Jacobi Triple Product”, “Ramanujan Theta Function”
- (3) Eric M. Rains, S. Ole Warnaar **Bounded Littlewood identities** [arXiv:1506.02755](#)
- (4) GH Hardy **Divergent Series** [texttthttps://archive.org/details/DivergentSeries](#)
- (5) David Vernon Widder **The Laplace Transform** [https://archive.org/details/laplacetransform03181](#)