

# Proposal: The Factorial Function

John D Mangual

It would not be a stretch to categorize my work under the topics in my 3 previous blog posts and this one. I talk about the Stirling formula:

$$n! \approx \sqrt{2\pi e} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n$$

Think about it. If you don't know much math, there are only so many starting points. So no matter how complicated our analysis gets, there should only be a few principles at play.

Here we can get away with just the trapezoid rule:

$$\log n! = \log 1 + \log 2 + \cdots + \log n$$

$$\approx \int_1^n \log x \, dx = n \log n - n$$

The goal of this project is to state and make towards specific conjectures, built from these.

This concludes my proposals for the Spring.

**A** My frustration with physics literature or math literature, I am unlikely to come up with observation of interest to others.

For one things, since my interest is about  $n!$  I am maybe interested in counting things. Within combinatorics there is:

- counting things
- finding rare and exotic objects
- studying how things are connected
- words

and many other things. I am mainly focusing on the first one here. It is called **enumerative combinatorics**. There are two kinds of applications:

- counting things predicted by mathematics
- counting things related to the outside world

The permutation group can be used to prove quadratic reciprocity.

There's a nice example of card shuffling, where measures on the permutation group converges to the uniform distribution.

The domino shuffling of the Aztec diamond can be expressed in terms of measures on the permutation group.

Binomial coefficients can be completed to geometric objects in the field of math called "integral geometry"

Galois theory, literally permutes the zeros of a polynomial and I always liked those inequalities from contests (which I could never solve)

The Taylor series uses factorials. That's by far the strangest one. What is being permuted there?

I would say combinatorics is a very healthy field and not much I could contribute there. Nothing profound or exciting.

## B

The modern theory of factorials I can't even read the formulas.

$$D_{-n} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} f(x_i) = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{(2\pi i)^n} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} f(x_i) \operatorname{Res} \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{z_n t^{n-i}}{z_i q^{n-i}}}{\left(1 - \frac{tz_2}{qz_1}\right) \cdots \left(1 - \frac{tz_n}{qz_{n-1}}\right)} \prod_{i < j} \frac{\left(1 - \frac{z_i}{z_j}\right) \left(1 - \frac{qz_i}{tz_j}\right)}{\left(1 - \frac{z_i}{tz_j}\right) \left(1 - \frac{qz_i}{z_j}\right)} \right. \\ \left. \times \prod_{i=1}^n \left( \prod_{i'=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - t^{-1} q \frac{x_{i'}}{z_i}}{1 - q \frac{x_{i'}}{z_i}} \cdot \frac{f(z_i)}{f(q^{-1} z_i)} z_i^{-1} \right) \right].$$

Here is a very important random process

$$\frac{\Gamma(N\theta)}{\Gamma(\theta)^M \Gamma(N\theta - M\theta)} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} (x_i^{N-1} - x_j^{N-1})(x_i^N - x_j^N)^{1-2\theta} \\ \times \prod_{j=1}^M (x_i^N)^{(N-1)\theta} (1 - x_i^N)^{\theta(M-N-1)+1} \prod_{i,j=1}^M |x_j^N - x_i^{N-1}|^{\theta-1} \prod_{i=1}^M \frac{(1 - x_i^{N-1})^{\theta(N-M)-1}}{(x_i^{N-1})^{N\theta}}.$$

Here is another discussion of that random process

$$(29) \quad \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_J: |a|=j} \frac{q^{\sum_{m=1}^J (m-1)a_m}}{Z_j(J)} w_{\{u, qu, \dots, q^{J-1}u\}} \left( i_0, \{a_1, \dots, a_J\}; k_0, \{c_1, \dots, c_J\} \right) \\ = q^{\sum_{m=1}^J (m-1)c_m} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_J: |a|=j} \frac{q^{\sum_{m=1}^J (m-1)a_m}}{Z_j(J)} w_{\{u, qu, \dots, q^{J-1}u\}} \left( i_0, \{a_1, \dots, a_J\}; k_0, \underbrace{\{1, \dots, 1\}}_n, \underbrace{\{0, \dots, 0\}}_{J-n} \right) \\ = \frac{q^{\sum_{m=1}^J (m-1)c_m}}{Z_n(J)} \sum_{\substack{a_1, \dots, a_J: |a|=j \\ d_1, \dots, d_J: |d|=n}} \frac{q^{\sum_{m=1}^J (m-1)a_m}}{Z_j(J)} w_{\{u, qu, \dots, q^{J-1}u\}} \left( i_0, \{a_1, \dots, a_J\}; k_0, \{d_1, \dots, d_J\} \right),$$

here is a physics partition function

$$Z_T(t) = \sum_{\mathcal{X} \in \mathfrak{M}^T} \exp \left( - \sum_{(x_L > x_R)} \left( \left( c_{i(x_L), i(x_R)}^+ \right)^{[0]} \beta \log \frac{x_R}{x_L} + \sum_{m \neq 0} \frac{1 - q_1^m}{m(1 - p^m)(1 - q_2^{-m})} \left( c_{i(x_L), i(x_R)} \right)^{[m]} \frac{x_R^m}{x_L^m} \right) \right) \\ \times \exp \left( \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \left( \log q_{i(x)} \log_{q_2} \frac{x}{\tilde{x}} + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1 - q_1^m}{1 - p^m} t_{i(x), m}^{(+)} x^m + \frac{1 - q_1^{-m}}{1 - p^{-m}} t_{i(x), m}^{(-)} x^{-m} \right) \right) \right) \quad (2.15)$$

Reality is complex, physical systems ultimately describe a very complicated reality.<sup>1</sup> I am betting these formulas are very important and useful. If I could read them!

Here is one more just in as of yesterday:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\{z_1=\frac{\beta}{\gamma}, z_2=\frac{pq}{t}\}, v, a, b} = (p; p)^2 (q; q)^2 \oint \frac{dw_1}{4\pi i w_1} \oint \frac{dw_2}{4\pi i w_2} \frac{\Gamma_e(\frac{pq}{t}(\beta\gamma)^{\pm 1} w_1^{\pm 1} w_2^{\pm 1})}{\Gamma_e(w_1^{\pm 2}) \Gamma_e(w_2^{\pm 2})} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$\Gamma_e(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\beta^2}{\gamma} b^{-1} w_1^{\pm 1}) \Gamma_e(\frac{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}{pq} \gamma^{-1} b w_1^{\pm 1}) \Gamma_e(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\gamma^2}{\beta} b w_2^{\pm 1}) \Gamma_e(\frac{t^{\frac{3}{2}}}{pq} \beta^{-1} b^{-1} w_2^{\pm 1})$$

$$\Gamma_e(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma a w_1^{\pm 1} v_1^{\pm 1}) \Gamma_e(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta^{-1} a^{-1} w_1^{\pm 1} v_2^{\pm 1}) \Gamma_e(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \beta a^{-1} w_2^{\pm 1} v_1^{\pm 1}) \Gamma_e(t^{\frac{1}{2}} \gamma^{-1} a w_2^{\pm 1} v_2^{\pm 1}).$$

It's really great there is all these wonderful formulas. arXiv really is a LIFO queue. Every day there is something new and you forget about what happened just before.

Now to find some common ground:

- why are they doing all of this?
- there are lots of generalized factorials (and we have found some) these formulas are very specific and what had motivated the authors to build them
- what's in it for the rest of us? what are they counting?

Just like an elementary school reading comprehension exercise. What is the main idea?

---

<sup>1</sup>An iPhone is a very complicated thing and we don't know how to use it, except for basic features.

**C** These people are interested in the **superconformal index** or **partition function** of certain supersymmetric gauge theories.

Here's a claim:

- superconformal indices generalize the factorial function

There's immediate defects about this idea. Uh...

- (supersymmetric) gauge theories are geometric objects
- and the answer we are getting is a "cardinality" of (unknown object).
- So **we have discarded most of the information available to us** I believe we are counting fixed points of torus orbits, or various combinations of  $SU(2)$ .

We have no idea what they are talking about anyway... so why not start with that?

One mantra floating around is that **combinatorics objects are shadows of geometric objects** and its corollary **geometric objects are shadows of integrable systems, K-theory, etc**

And there are new-age one's like "**entropy is cardinality**" or even "**entropy is area**". And we can cross our legs and meditate on that.

**C-1** To summarize part C, some physicists are generating sequences of numbers, which behave like the factorial, to arbitrary accuracy but with unclear meaning or patterns.

One thing I notice is the factorial and the Vandermonde matrix can go under the same style

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & a & a^2 \\ 1 & b & b^2 \\ 1 & c & c^2 \end{vmatrix} = (a - b)(b - c)(c - a)$$

and the Wikipedia page on Schur polynomials has other formulas of this type:

$$\frac{1}{(a - b)(b - c)(c - a)} \begin{vmatrix} a & a^2 & a^4 \\ b & b^2 & b^4 \\ c & c^2 & c^4 \end{vmatrix} = abc(a + b + c)$$

To me this is the oldest style of problem. Take a sequence of numbers and say something about them.

**Existential Crisis** Research level mathematics is written in a very modern language<sup>2</sup> where it's hard for the non-specialist (me) to discern what the original problem was.

And having spent (on the order of years) asking for a direct statement. Take algebraic geometry for example. They got rid of all the equations. If need a **specific** modular form, or variety, I want the sequence of coefficients,

Physics and engineering are written in the old-fashioned language. If you look past the first pages of the math papers – they are also still mostly written with classical invariant theory. In business / Econ / CS we are lucky if we are using the old-fashioned language.

Many people even feel that numbers and other mathematical reasoning are too brittle for use. Therefore if we look into “the outside world” there will be objects that will defy current mathematical classification, or theories that the outside world hasn't seen.

And hopefully these are helpful exchanges.

I will argue (maybe not here) is that Cohomology organizes computations into “trivial” and “non-trivial” parts. Yet, everyone finds *something* trivial. And trivial, basically just means **zero**, so really we're just exploring the meaning of **0**.

---

<sup>2</sup>because math was not abstract enough already!



**D** On to business. Let's name a few things to work on.

- shuffling cards (and carries in arithmetic) define measures on  $S_n$
- Domino tiling of special shapes (e.g. Aztec Diamond)
- The greatest common divisor of a polynomial  $f(a)$  always divides  $k!$  as  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ . And there's a theory of factorials due to Bhargava that solves this nicely.
- Taylor series involves a factorial:  $f(x) = \sum \frac{f^n(x_0)}{n!} (x - x_0)^n$  and Taylor's theorem fails in various circumstances
- The volumes of spheres always involve factorial

$$\text{Vol}(S^N \times S^N) = \frac{4\pi^N}{\frac{N}{2}! \times \frac{N}{2}!}$$

- By fundamental theorem of algebra

$$p(x) = (x - a_1) \dots (x - a_n)$$

then I can permute the  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ .

Cayley's Representation Theorem is the observation that all finite groups embed in a permutation group  $G \subseteq S_n$ . These are like coordinates. And Schur-Weyl duality says  $S_N \leftrightarrow U(N)$ .

If I look at empirical data, "real-world" we will never have a group structure. Things will always be off. So there's something called an **almost-group** or we'll find some other way to reason about life.

## References

- (1) **Wikipedia** "Factorial Function" <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Factorial>
- (2) Manjul Bhargava **The Factorial Function and Generalizations** The American Mathematical Monthly, Vol. 107, No. 9 (Nov., 2000), pp. 783-799
- (3) Kurt Johansson **Discrete orthogonal polynomial ensembles and the Plancherel measure**  
arXiv:math/9906120