

The function (C) is a simple function (2) behaving in an example of a un-
closed form at the singularities.

* The coeff: $\frac{1}{5}$ in the index of e happens to be $\frac{\pi^2}{5}$ in this particular case. It may be some other transcendental numbers in other cases.

† The coeffs of t, t^2, \dots happen to be $\frac{1}{5}, \dots$ in this case. In other cases they may turn out to be some other algebraic numbers.

Now a very interesting question arises: Is the converse of the statements concerning the forms (A) and (B) true? That is to say Suppose there is a function in the Eulerian form and suppose that all or an infinity of points $\eta = e^{\frac{2i\pi m}{n}}$ are exponential singularities and also suppose that all these points the asymptotic form of the function closes as neatly as in the cases of (A) and (B). The question is: — is the function taken ~~as~~ the sum of two functions one of which is an ordinary \mathcal{D} function and the other is a (trivial) function which is $O(1)$ at all the points $e^{\frac{2i\pi m}{n}}$. The answer is it is not necessarily so. When it is not so I call the function Mock \mathcal{D} -function. I have not proved rigorously that it is not necessarily so. But I have constructed a number of examples in which it is not inconceivable to construct a \mathcal{D} function to cut out the singularities.

Add 141 = 94 (14.12) L. 1 (3)

of the original function. Also I have shown if it is necessarily so then it leads to the following assertion; - viz. it is possible to construct two power series in x namely $\sum_0^{\infty} a_n x^n$ and $\sum_0^{\infty} b_n x^n$ both of which have essential singularities on the unit circle, while $\sum_0^{\infty} a_n x^n$ exists ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~circle~~ and is regular there and $\sum_0^{\infty} b_n x^n$ ~~is~~ ~~regular~~ ~~there~~ and $\sum_0^{\infty} a_n x^n$ and $\sum_0^{\infty} b_n x^n$ are convergent when $|x| < 1$, and tend to finite limits at every point $x = e^{2i\pi r/s}$ and that pro. at the same time the limit of $\sum_0^{\infty} a_n x^n$ at the point $x = e^{2i\pi r/s}$ is equal to the limit of $\sum_0^{\infty} b_n x^n$ at the point $x = e^{-2i\pi r/s}$.

This assertion seems to be untrue. Any how we shall go to the examples and see how far our assertions are true.

I have proved that if

$$f(v) = 1 + \frac{v}{(1+v)^2} + \frac{v^4}{(1+v)^2(1+v^2)^2} + \dots$$

$$\text{then } f(v) + (1-v)(1-v^3)(1-v^5)\dots \left(\frac{1-2v+2v^4}{-2v^3+} \right)$$

$$\text{at all the } = O(1)$$

$$\text{at all the points } v = -1, v^3 = -1, v^5 = -1, \dots$$

and at the same time

$$f(v) \left(\frac{1-2v+2v^4}{-2v^3+} \right) \dots (1-v)(1-v^3)(1-v^5)\dots (1-2v+2v^4)$$

$$= O(1)$$

$$\text{at all the points } v^2 = -1, v^4 = -1, v^6 = -1, \dots$$

$$\text{Also obviously } f(v) = O(1)$$

$$\text{at all the points } v = 1, v^2 = 1, v^3 = 1, \dots$$

$$F(v) = 1 + \frac{v^2}{1-v} + \frac{v^8}{(1-v)(1-v^3)} + \dots \quad (5)$$

$$\phi(-v) + \chi(v) = 2F(v).$$

$$f(v) + 2F(v^2) - 2 = \phi(-v^2) + \psi(v) \\ = 2\phi(-v^2) - f(v) = \frac{1-2v+2v^4-2v^9}{(1-v)(1-v^4)(1-v^4)(1-v^9)}$$

$$\psi(v) - F(v^2) + 1 = v \cdot \frac{1+v^2+v^6+v^{12}+\dots}{(1-v^3)(1-v^{12})(1-v^{27})}$$

Mock θ -functions (of 5th order)

$$f(v) = 1 + \frac{v^2}{1+v} + \frac{v^6}{(1+v)(1+v^5)} + \frac{v^{12}}{(1+v)(1+v^5)(1+v^{25})} + \dots$$

$$\phi(v) = v + v^4(1+v) + v^9(1+v)(1+v^5) + \dots$$

$$\psi(v) = 1 + v(1+v) + v^5(1+v)(1+v^5) + v^9(1+v)(1+v^5)(1+v^{25}) + \dots$$

$$\chi(v) = \frac{1}{1-v} + \frac{v}{(1-v^2)(1-v^3)} + \frac{v^2}{(1-v^3)(1-v^6)} + \frac{v^3}{(1-v^4)(1-v^5)(1-v^6)} + \dots$$

$$F(v) = \frac{1}{1-v} + \frac{v^4}{(1-v)(1-v^3)} + \frac{v^{12}}{(1-v)(1-v^3)(1-v^9)}$$

have got similar relations as above.

Mock θ -functions (of 7th order)

$$(i) \quad 1 + \frac{v}{1-v^2} + \frac{v^4}{(1-v^3)(1-v^5)} + \frac{v^7}{(1-v^5)(1-v^7)(1-v^{11})} + \dots$$

$$(ii) \quad \frac{v}{1-v} + \frac{v^4}{(1-v^2)(1-v^3)} + \frac{v^7}{(1-v^3)(1-v^5)(1-v^7)} + \dots$$

$$(iii) \quad \frac{1}{1-v} + \frac{v^2}{(1-v^2)(1-v^3)} + \frac{v^6}{(1-v^3)(1-v^5)(1-v^7)} + \dots$$

These are not related to each other.

Ever yours sincerely
S. Ramanujan