

ALGEBRO-GEOMETRIC ASPECTS OF HEINE-STIELTJES THEORY

BORIS SHAPIRO

Dedicated to Heinrich Eduard Heine and his 140 years old riddle

ABSTRACT. The goal of the paper is to develop a Heine-Stieltjes theory for univariate linear differential operators of higher order. Namely, for a given linear ordinary differential operator $\mathfrak{d}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_i(z) \frac{d^i}{dz^i}$ with polynomial coefficients set $r = \max_{i=1, \dots, k} (\deg Q_i(z) - i)$. If $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ satisfies the conditions: i) $r \geq 0$ and ii) $\deg Q_k(z) = k + r$ we call it a *non-degenerate higher Lamé operator*. Following the classical approach of E. Heine and T. Stieltjes, see [18], [41] we study the multiparameter spectral problem of finding all polynomials $V(z)$ of degree at most r such that the equation:

$$\mathfrak{d}(z)S(z) + V(z)S(z) = 0$$

has for a given positive integer n a polynomial solution $S(z)$ of degree n . We show that under some mild non-degeneracy assumptions there exist exactly $\binom{n+r}{n}$ such polynomials $V_{n,i}(z)$ whose corresponding eigenpolynomials $S_{n,i}(z)$ are of degree n . We generalize a number of well-known results in this area and discuss occurring degeneracies.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	1
1.1. Generalizations of Heine's theorem, degeneracies and nonresonance condition	4
1.2. Generalizations of Stieltjes's theorem	6
1.3. Generalizations of Polya's theorem	7
2. Proof of generalized Heine's theorems	9
2.1. On eigenvalues for rectangular matrices	11
3. Proof of generalized Pólya's theorems	15
3.1. Root localization for Van Vleck and Stieltjes polynomials	16
4. 'On the existence and number of Lamé functions of higher degree', by E. Heine	18
4.1. Comments on Heine's result and history around it.	18
4.2. Translation	19
5. Final Remarks	23
References	24

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

The algebraic form of the classical Lamé equation, [47], ch. 23, was introduced by Gabriel Lamé in 1830's in connection with the separation of variables in the

Date: July 10, 2018.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 34B07, 34L20, 30C15.

Key words and phrases. Generalized Lamé equation, multiparameter spectral problem, Van Vleck and Heine-Stieltjes polynomials.

Laplace equation in \mathbb{R}^l with respect to elliptic coordinates. It has the form:

$$Q(z)\frac{d^2S}{dz^2} + \frac{1}{2}Q'(z)\frac{dS}{dz} + V(z)S = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where $Q_l(z)$ is a real polynomial of degree l with all real and distinct roots, and $V(z)$ is a polynomial of degree at most $l-2$ whose choice depends on what type of solution to (1.1) we are looking for. In the second half of the 19-th century several celebrated mathematicians including M. Bôcher, E. Heine, F. Klein, T. Stieltjes studied the number and different properties of the so-called Lamé polynomials of a given degree and certain kind. (They are also called Lamé **solutions** of a certain kind.) Such solutions to (1.1) exist for certain choices of $V(z)$ and are characterized by the property that their logarithmic derivative is a rational function. For a given $Q(z)$ of degree $l \geq 2$ with simple roots there exist 2^l different kinds of Lamé polynomials depending on whether this solution is smooth at a given root of $Q(z)$ or has there a square root singularity, see details in [32] and [47]. (An excellent modern study of these questions can be found in [20].) In what follows we will concentrate on the usual polynomial solutions of (1.1) and its various modifications.

A *generalized Lamé equation*, see [47] is the second order differential equation given by

$$Q_2(z)\frac{d^2S}{dz^2} + Q_1(z)\frac{dS}{dz} + V(z)S = 0, \quad (1.2)$$

where $Q_2(z)$ is a complex polynomial of degree l and $Q_1(z)$ is a complex polynomial of degree at most $l-1$. The special case $l=3$ is widely known as the Heun equation.

The next fundamental proposition announced in [18] and provided there with not a quite satisfactory proof was undoubtedly the starting point of the classical Heine-Stieltjes theory.

Theorem 1 (Heine). *If the coefficients of $Q_2(z)$ and $Q_1(z)$ are algebraically independent, i.e. they do not satisfy an algebraic equation with integer coefficients then for any integer $n > 0$ there exists exactly $\binom{n+l-2}{n}$ polynomials $V(z)$ of degree exactly $(l-2)$ such that the equation (1.2) has and unique (up to a constant factor) polynomial solution S of degree exactly n .*

Remark 1. Notice that throughout this paper we count polynomials $V(z)$ individually and polynomials $S(z)$ projectively, i.e. up to a constant factor.

Later on a physically important and directly related to the original (1.1) special case of (1.2) when $Q_2(z)$ and $Q_1(z)$ have all real, simple and interlacing zeros and the same sign of the leading coefficients was considered separately by T. Stieltjes and his followers. The equation can be then written as follows:

$$\prod_{i=1}^l (z - \alpha_i) \frac{d^2S}{dz^2} + \sum_{j=1}^l \beta_j \prod_{j \neq i} (z - \alpha_i) \frac{dS}{dz} + V(z)S = 0, \quad (1.3)$$

with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_l$ real and β_1, \dots, β_l positive. In particular, the next proposition was proved.

Theorem 2 (Stieltjes-Van Vleck-Bôcher [41], [45], [8] and [42]). *Under the assumptions of (1.3) and for any integer $n > 0$*

- (1) *there exist exactly $\binom{n+l-2}{n}$ distinct polynomials V of degree $(l-2)$ such that the equation (1.3) has a polynomial solution S of degree exactly n .*
- (2) *each root of each V and S is real and simple, and belongs to the interval (α_1, α_l) .*
- (3) *none of the roots of S can coincide with some of α_i 's. Moreover, $\binom{n+l-2}{n}$ polynomials S are in 1-1-correspondence with $\binom{n+l-2}{n}$ possible ways to distribute n points into the $(l-1)$ open intervals $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, \alpha_3), \dots, (\alpha_{l-1}, \alpha_l)$.*

The polynomials V and the corresponding polynomial solutions S of the equation (1.2) (or, equivalently, of (1.3)) are called *Van Vleck* and *Stieltjes* (or *Heine-Stieltjes*) polynomials resp.

The case when α_i 's and/or β_j 's are complex is substantially less studied, see [26] and [27]. One nice result in this set-up is as follows, see [31].

Theorem 3 (Polya). *If in the notation of (1.3) all α_i 's are complex and all β_j 's are positive that all the roots of each V and S belong to the convex hull Conv_{Q_2} of the set of roots $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l)$ of $Q_2(z)$.*

Remark 2. The situation when all the residues β_j are negative (for example, $Q_1(z) = -Q_2'(z)$) or have different signs seems to differ drastically from the latter case, see e.g. [44] and [14]. Further interesting results on the distribution of the zeros of Van Vleck and Stieltjes polynomials under weaker assumptions on α_i 's and β_j 's were obtained in [21], [22], [1], [2], [48].

In the present article we extend the above three fundamental results on generalized Lamé equations of the second order to the case of higher orders and/or complex coefficients. Namely, consider an arbitrary linear ordinary differential operator

$$\mathfrak{d}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^k Q_i(z) \frac{d^i}{dz^i}, \quad (1.4)$$

with polynomial coefficients. The number $r = \max_{i=1, \dots, k} (\deg Q_i(z) - i)$ will be called the *Fuchs index* of $\mathfrak{d}(z)$. The operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ is called a *higher Lamé operator* if its Fuchs index r is non-negative. In the case of the vanishing Fuchs index $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ is usually called *exactly solvable* in the physics literature, see [43]. This case is also of the special interest in connection with the classical Bochner-Krall problem in the theory of orthogonal polynomials.

The operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ is called *non-degenerate* if $\deg Q_k(z) = k + r$. Notice, that non-degeneracy of $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ is a quite natural condition equivalent to the requirement that $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ has either a regular or a regular singular point at ∞ .

Given a higher Lamé operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ consider the multiparameter spectral problem as follows.

Problem. For each positive integer n find all polynomials $V(z)$ of degree at most r such that the equation

$$\mathfrak{d}(z)S(z) + V(z)S(z) = 0 \quad (1.5)$$

has a polynomial solution $S(z)$ of degree n .

Following the classical terminology we call (1.5) a *higher Heine-Stieltjes spectral problem*, $V(z)$ is called a *higher Van Vleck polynomial*, and the corresponding polynomial $S(z)$ is called a *higher Stieltjes polynomial*. Below we will often skip mentioning 'higher'.

Remark 3. Obviously, any differential operator (1.4) has either a non-negative or a negative Fuchs index. In the latter case it can be easily transformed into the operator with a non-negative Fuchs index by the change of variable $y = \frac{1}{z}$. Notice also that the condition of non-degeneracy is generically satisfied. In what follows we will always assume wlog that the leading coefficient of such an operator is a monic polynomial.

1.1. Generalizations of Heine's theorem, degeneracies and nonresonance condition. We start with a number of generalizations of Heine's theorem 1. Following Heine's original proof one can obtain the following straightforward generalization.

Theorem 4. *For any non-degenerate higher Lamé operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ with algebraically independent coefficients of its polynomial coefficients $Q_i(z)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$ and for any $n \geq 0$ there exist exactly $\binom{n+r}{r}$ distinct Van Vleck polynomials $V(z)$'s whose corresponding Stieltjes polynomials $S(z)$'s are unique (up to a constant factor) and of degree n .*

Our next result obtained by a linear-algebraic interpretation of (1.5) has no genericity assumptions and is crucial in the problem of existence of solutions of (1.5), comp. [27], Problem 1.

Theorem 5. *For any non-degenerate operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ with a Fuchs index $r \geq 0$ and any positive integer n the total number of Van Vleck polynomials $V(z)$ (counted with natural multiplicities) having a Stieltjes polynomial $S(z)$ of degree less than or equal to n equals $\binom{n+r+1}{r+1}$.*

Remark 4. Note that in Theorem 5 we do not require that there is a unique (up to constant factor) Stieltjes polynomial corresponding to a given Van Vleck polynomial. For the exact description of the notion of the *natural multiplicity* of a Van Vleck polynomial which is rather lengthy consult Definition 2 in § 2.

On degeneracies. Notice that Theorem 4 claims that a generic operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ has for any positive n exactly $\binom{n+r}{r}$ distinct Van Vleck polynomials each of which has a unique Stieltjes polynomial and this polynomial is of degree exactly n . The question about possible degeneracies occurring in Problems (1.2) and (1.5) if we drop the genericity assumptions on $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ is quite delicate. Not only Van Vleck polynomials can attain a nontrivial multiplicity as well as more than 1-dimensional linear space of Stieltjes polynomials but there are examples when there are no Stieltjes polynomials of some degree. In particular, for any polynomial $Q(z)$ of degree l no choice of a polynomial $V(z)$ of degree at most $l - 2$ will supply the equation

$$Q(z) \frac{d^2 S}{dz^2} - Q'(z) \frac{dS}{dz} + V(z)S = 0$$

with a polynomial solution S of degree $l + 1$. (This follows from the Proposition 5 and Lemma 4 of [14].) The fact that (1.2) can admit families (linear spaces of dimension at least 2) of polynomial solutions S corresponding to one and the same V was already mentioned by Heine in his original proof. More exact information is available nowadays. For example, a result of Varchenko-Scherbak gives necessary and sufficient condition for a Fuchsian second order equation to have 2 independent polynomial solutions, see [35] and [14]. Finally, high multiplicity of Van Vleck polynomials occur, for example, in the case $Q_2(z) = z^l$, $Q_1(z) = 0$. Then one can easily show that for all $n \geq 2$ there exists just one and only polynomial $V_n(z) = -n(n-1)z^{l-2}$ solving the above problem; its corresponding Stieltjes polynomial equals $S_n(z) = z^n$. The multiplicity of the latter Van Vleck polynomial $V_n(z)$ is $\binom{n+l-2}{n}$.

To formulate necessary and sufficient conditions under which the conclusion of Heine's theorem holds for all positive integers n is apparently an impossible task. Heine himself mentions that for the validity of his result for a given fixed positive integer n one has to avoid a certain discriminantal hypersurface (similar to the usual discriminant of univariate polynomials) which is given by an equation with integer coefficients but this equation is difficult to obtain explicitly.

Below we formulate a simple sufficient condition which allows us to avoid many of the above degeneracies and guarantees the existence of Stieltjes polynomials of a given degree. Namely, consider an arbitrary non-degenerate operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ of the form (1.4) with the Fuchs index r . Denote by A_k, A_{k-1}, \dots, A_1 the coefficients at the highest possible degrees $k+r, k+r-1, \dots, r+1$ in the polynomials $Q_k(z), Q_{k-1}(z), \dots, Q_1(z)$ resp. (Notice that any subset of A_j 's can vanish but $A_k \neq 0$ due to the non-degeneracy of $\mathfrak{d}(z)$.) In what follows we will often use the notation

$$(j)_i = j(j-1)(j-2)\dots(j-i+1),$$

where j is a non-negative and i is a positive integer. In case $j = i$ one has $(j)_i = j!$ and in case $j < i$ one gets $(j)_i = 0$. For any non-negative n we call by *the n -th diagonal coefficient* \mathbb{L}_n the expression:

$$\mathbb{L}_n = (n)_k A_k + (n)_{k-1} A_{k-1} + \dots + (n)_1 A_1. \quad (1.6)$$

Proposition 1. *If in the above notation and for a given positive integer n the n -th nonresonance condition*

$$\mathbb{L}_n \neq \mathbb{L}_j, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1 \quad (1.7)$$

holds then there exist Van Vleck polynomials which possess Stieltjes polynomials of degree exactly n and no other Stieltjes polynomials of degree smaller than n . In this case the total number of such Van Vleck polynomials (counted with natural multiplicities) equals $\binom{n+r}{r}$.

Remark 5. The above nonresonance condition is quite natural. It says that if the equation (1.5) has a polynomial solution of degree n then it has no polynomial solutions of smaller degrees. Another way to express this fact is that if the indicial equation of (1.5) at ∞ has $-n$ as its root then it has no roots among non-positive integers $0, -1, -2, \dots, 1-n$, see e.g. [32], ch. V.

Explicit formula (1.6) for \mathbb{L}_n immediately shows that Theorem 5 and Proposition 1 are valid for any non-degenerate $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ and all sufficiently large n .

Corollary 1. *For any non-degenerate higher Lamé operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ and all sufficiently large n the n -th nonresonance condition holds. In particular, for any problem (1.5) there exist and finitely many (up to a scalar multiple) Stieltjes polynomials of any sufficiently large degree.*

Remark 6. Notice that for an arbitrary non-degenerate operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ and a given integer n it is difficult to find explicitly all Van Vleck polynomials which possess a Stieltjes polynomial of degree at most n . By this we mean that in order to do this one has, in general, to solve an overdetermined system of algebraic equations in the coefficients of V since the set of Van Vleck polynomials under consideration is not a complete intersection. (This system of determinantal equations contains many more equations than variables.) However, one consequence of Heine's way to prove his Theorem 1 is as follows. For a given non-degenerate operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ with Fuchs index r and a positive integer n denote by $\mathfrak{V}_n \subset \text{Pol}_r$ the set of all its Van Vleck polynomials possessing a Stieltjes polynomial of degree exactly n .

Theorem 6. *If in the above notation the n -th nonresonance condition (1.7) holds then \mathfrak{V}_n is a complete intersection and the corresponding system of equations can be given explicitly in each specific case.*

Explicit example of the defining system of r algebraic equations in r variables can be found in § 2, see Example 1. In purely linear algebraic setting this result and further information about relevant discriminants can be found in [39].

1.2. Generalizations of Stieltjes's theorem. We continue with a conceptually new generalization of Theorem 2. It was conjectured by the present author after extensive computer experiments and was later proved by P. Brändén. In the present paper we only announce his result and its corollaries since it requires a large amount of additional information and techniques. The actual proof will be published by its author elsewhere.

Definition 1. A differential operator $\mathfrak{d}(z) = \sum_{i=m}^k Q_i(z) \frac{d^i}{dz^i}$, $1 \leq m \leq k$ where all $Q_i(z)$'s are polynomials with real coefficients is called a *strict hyperbolicity preserver* if for any real polynomial $P(z)$ with all real and simple roots the image $\mathfrak{d}(P(z))$ either vanishes identically or is a polynomial with only real and simple roots.

Theorem 7. *For any strict hyperbolicity preserving non-degenerate Lamé operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ with the Fuchs index r as above and any integer $n \geq m$*

- (1) *there exist exactly $\binom{n+r}{n}$ distinct polynomials $V(z)$ of degree exactly r such that the equation (1.5) has a polynomial solution $S(z)$ of degree exactly n .*
- (2) *all roots of each such $V(z)$ and $S(z)$ are real, simple, coprime.*
- (3) *$\binom{n+r}{n}$ polynomials $S(z)$ are in 1-1-correspondence with $\binom{n+r}{n}$ possible arrangements of r real roots of polynomials $V(z)$ and n real roots of the corresponding polynomials $S(z)$.*

Using Theorem 5 one immediately sees that the latter result describes the set of all possible pairs (V, S) with $m \leq n = \deg S$ for any hyperbolicity preserver $\mathfrak{d}(z)$.

Remark 7. The interested reader can check that the sum of the first two terms in (1.3) is indeed a strict hyperbolicity preserver. It looks very tempting and important to find an analog of the electrostatic interpretation of the roots of classical Heine-Stieltjes and classical Van Vleck polynomials (alias 'Bethe ansatz') in the case of higher Heine-Stieltjes and Van Vleck polynomials, comp. [28].

Remark 8. Notice that the converse to the above theorem is false. Namely, one can show that the exactly solvable operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)(f) = f' + z(z+1)f''$ has all hyperbolic eigenpolynomials but is not a hyperbolicity preserver.

A straight-forward application of Theorem 7 to differential operators of order 2 gives the following. Consider a differential equation

$$\prod_{i=1}^l (z - \alpha_i) \frac{d^k S}{dz^k} + \sum_{j=1}^l \beta_j \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^l (z - \alpha_i) \frac{d^{k-1} S}{dz^{k-1}} + V(z)S = 0, \quad (1.8)$$

where $2 \leq k \leq l$, $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_l$ and β_1, \dots, β_l are positive.

Corollary 2. *Under the assumptions of (1.8) and for any $n \geq k - 1$*

- (1) *there exist exactly $\binom{n+l-k}{n}$ polynomials $V(z)$ of degree $(l - k)$ such that the equation (1.8) has a polynomial solution $S(z)$ of degree exactly n .*
- (2) *all roots of each $V(z)$ and $S(z)$ are real, simple, coprime and belong to the interval (α_1, α_l) .*
- (3) *$\binom{n+l-k}{n}$ polynomials $S(z)$ are in 1-1-correspondence with $\binom{n+l-k}{n}$ possible arrangements of $(l - k)$ real roots of a polynomial $V(z)$ and n real roots of the corresponding polynomial $S(z)$ on the interval (α_1, α_l) .*

It seems that Theorem 7 and Corollary 2 give a new interpretation of Theorem 2 even in the classical case (1.3). However the following two statements proven by G. Shah explain this mystery, see Theorem 3 of [36] and Theorem 3 of [38].

Proposition 2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2 the roots of any Van Vleck polynomial $V(z)$ and its corresponding $S(z)$ are coprime.*

Moreover,

Proposition 3. *If $v_1 < v_2 < \dots < v_r$, $r = l-2$ denote the roots of some Van Vleck polynomial $V(z)$ in the classical situation (1.3) then for each $i = 2, \dots, l-1$ the interval (v_i, α_{i+1}) contains no roots of the corresponding $S(z)$. Therefore, for each polynomial $S(z)$ the distribution of its n roots into $(l-1)$ intervals $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), \dots, (\alpha_{l-1}, \alpha_l)$ coincides with the distribution of these roots defined by the roots of its Van Vleck polynomial $V(z)$.*

Remark 9. Note that we do not claim $v_i < \alpha_{i+1}$, i.e. the endpoints of the interval (v_i, α_{i+1}) can be placed in the wrong order or can coincide.

1.3. Generalizations of Polya's theorem.

We start with a simple-minded statement of Polya's theorem 3, [31].

Theorem 8. *If the zeros $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l$ in (1.8) are complex and the constants β_1, \dots, β_l are non-negative then all the roots of V 's and S 's lie in the (closed) convex hull Conv_{Q_k} of the roots $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l)$ of the polynomial $Q_k(z)$.*

The next Theorem 9 is far more general. It shows that Theorem 8 is **asymptotically** true for any non-degenerate Lamé operator. The question for which operators $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ the roots of all its Van Vleck and Stieltjes polynomials lie exactly (and not just asymptotically) in the convex hull of its leading coefficient seems to be very hard even in the classical case of the equation (1.2).

Theorem 9. *For any non-degenerate higher Lamé operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ and any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a positive integer N_ϵ such that the zeros of all Van Vleck polynomials $V(z)$ possessing a Heine-Stieltjes polynomial $S(z)$ of degree $n \geq N_\epsilon$ and well as all zeros of these Stieltjes polynomials belong to $\text{Conv}_{Q_k}^\epsilon$. Here Conv_{Q_k} is the convex hull of all zeros of the leading coefficient Q_k and $\text{Conv}_{Q_k}^\epsilon$ is its ϵ -neighborhood in the usual Euclidean distance on \mathbb{C} .*

The latter theorem is closely related to the next somewhat simpler localization result having independent interest.

Proposition 4. *For any non-degenerate higher Lamé operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ there exist a positive integer N_0 and a positive number R_0 such that all zeros of all Van Vleck polynomials $V(z)$ possessing a Stieltjes polynomial $S(z)$ of degree $n \geq N_0$ as well as all zeros of these Stieltjes polynomials lie in the disk $|z| \leq R_0$.*

Remark 10. Notice that the roots of absolutely all Van Vleck polynomials (and not just those whose Stieltjes polynomials are of sufficiently large degree) of any non-degenerate higher Lamé operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ lie in some disk. But this is no longer true for Stieltjes polynomials. If the set of all Stieltjes polynomials is discrete (up to a scalar multiple) then their roots are bounded. But as soon as some Van Vleck polynomial admits an at least 2-dimensional linear space of Stieltjes polynomials then these roots become unbounded for obvious reasons. However for sufficiently large n no Van Vleck polynomial admits such families, see Corollary 1 and the localization result holds.

Remark 11. Similar and stronger localization results with explicit constants and degree bounds were independently obtained by J. Borcea (private communication).

Let us now show a typical behavior of the zeros of Van Vleck polynomials and the corresponding Stieltjes polynomials obtained in numerical experiments. Below we

consider as an example the operator $\mathfrak{d}(z) = Q(z)\frac{d^3}{dz^3}$ with $Q(z) = (z^2 + 1)(z - 3I - 2)(z + 2I - 3)$. For $n = 24$ we calculate all 25 pairs (V, S) with $\deg S = 24$. (Notice that V in this case is linear.) The asymptotic behavior of the union of zeros of all Van Vleck polynomials whose Stieltjes polynomials have a given degree n when $n \rightarrow \infty$ as well as the asymptotics of the zeros of subsequences of Stieltjes polynomials of increasing degrees whose corresponding (monic) Van Vleck polynomials have a limit seems to be an extremely rich and interesting topic, see first steps in [40].




FIGURE 1. Zeros of 25 different linear Van Vleck polynomials whose Stieltjes polynomials are of degree 24. Four average size dots are the zeros of $Q(z) = (z^2 + 1)(z - 3I - 2)(z + 2I - 3)$ and large dots are the zeros of different $V(z)$.




FIGURE 2. Zeros of 25 different Stieltjes polynomials of degree 24 for the above $\mathfrak{d}(z)$. The small dots on each picture are the 24 zeros of $S(z)$; 4 average size dots are the zeros of $Q(z)$ and the single large dot is the (only) zero of the corresponding $V(z)$.

Some literature. Let us mention a few relatively recent references on (generalized) Lamé equation. Being an object of substantial physical and mathematical

importance it, in particular, gives an example of an equation whose monodromy group can be analyzed in details, see [7], [19]-[20]. It is also closely related to the so-called quasi-exact solvability and integrable models, see [15]. Theory of multiparameter spectral problems originating from Heine-Stieltjes pioneering studies was developed in sixties, see e.g. [46] and references therein. Recently the interest to Heine-Stieltjes polynomials has stimulated by an unexpected extension of the Bethe ansatz in representation theory, see [33], [29], [34], [35] and a further series of article by A. Varchenko and his coauthors, e.g. [30]. Starting with [25] a substantial progress has been made in the understanding of the asymptotics of the root distributions for these polynomials when either $l \rightarrow \infty$ (thermodynamic asymptotics) or $n \rightarrow \infty$ (semi-classical asymptotics), see [10], and [9]. Asymptotic root distribution for the eigenpolynomials of non-degenerate exactly solvable operators was studied in [24] and [6]. Interesting preliminary results of a similar flavor in the case of degenerate exactly solvable operators were very recently obtained by T. Bergkvist, [5].

Acknowledgements. I am very grateful to my former collaborator and colleague G. Másson for the pioneering numerical experiments in 1999. His wild guesses gave birth to a vast project on asymptotics for polynomial solutions to linear ordinary differential equations depending on parameter(s) which occupies me since then. I want to thank P. Bränden for sharing his proof of Theorem 7 with me in a private communication. Sincere thanks go to R. Bøgvad, J. Borcea, I. Scherbak, A. Varchenko and, especially, to A. Martínez-Finkelshtein for many useful discussions of the area and their interest in my work. Finally, I owe a great deal to the Wolfram corporation whose package Mathematica although quite expensive and not quite reliable was indispensable in doing the actual $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\alpha$.

2. PROOF OF GENERALIZED HEINE'S THEOREMS

We start with Theorem 4 (see Introduction). For this we need a detailed description of the action of a non-degenerate operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ on the linear space Pol_n of all univariate polynomials of degree at most n .

Proof. Substituting $V(z) = v_r z^r + v_{r-1} z^{r-1} + \dots + v_0$ and $S(z) = s_n z^n + s_{n-1} z^{n-1} + \dots + s_0$ in (1.5) we get the following system of $(n+r+1)$ equations of a band shape (i.e. only a fixed and independent of n number of diagonals is non-vanishing in this

system):

$$\begin{cases}
0 = s_n(v_r + L_{n,n+r}); \\
0 = s_n(v_{r-1} + L_{n,n+r-1}) + s_{n-1}(v_r + L_{n-1,n+r-1}); \\
0 = s_n(v_{r-2} + L_{n,n+r-2}) + s_{n-1}(v_{r-1} + L_{n-1,n+r-2}) + s_{n-2}(v_r + L_{n-2,n+r-2}); \\
\vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \\
0 = s_n(v_0 + L_{n,n}) + s_{n-1}(v_1 + L_{n-1,n}) + \dots + s_{n-r}(v_r + L_{n-r,n}); \\
0 = s_n L_{n,n-1} + s_{n-1}(v_0 + L_{n-1,n-1}) + \dots + s_{n-r-1}(v_r + L_{n-r-1,n-1}); \\
0 = s_n L_{n,n-2} + s_1 L_{1,r+1} + s_2(v_r + L_{2,r}) + \dots + s_{n-r-2}(v_r + L_{n-r-2,n-2}); \\
\vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \\
0 = s_n L_{n,r} + s_{n-1} L_{n-1,r} + s_{n-2} L_{n-2,r} + \dots + s_0(v_r + L_{0,r}); \\
0 = s_n L_{n,r-1} + s_{n-1} L_{n-1,r-1} + s_{n-2} L_{n-2,r-1} + \dots + s_0(v_{r-1} + L_{0,1}); \\
\vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \\
0 = s_n L_{n,1} + s_{n-1} L_{n-1,1} + \dots + s_1(v_0 + L_{1,1}) + s_0(v_1 + L_{0,1}); \\
0 = s_n L_{n,0} + s_{n-1} L_{n-1,0} + \dots + s_1 L_{0,1} + s_0(v_0 + L_{0,0}).
\end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Here $L_{p,q}$ is a polynomial which expresses the coefficient containing s_p at the power z^q in $\sum_{i=1}^k Q_i(z)S^{(i)}$. Obviously, it is linear in the coefficients of $Q_k(z), \dots, Q_1(z)$ and is explicitly given by the relation

$$L_{p,q} = \sum_{r=1}^k (p)_r A_{r,q-p+r},$$

where $A_{r,q-p+r}$ is the coefficient at z^{q-p+r} in $Q_r(z)$. In the notation used in the definition (1.6) we have $L_{m,m+r} = \mathbb{L}_m, m = 0, \dots, n$. We use the convention that $L_{p,q}$ vanishes outside the admissible range of indices and, therefore many of the above coefficients $L_{p,q}$ are in fact equal to 0. (In the system (2.1) we assumed that $n \geq r$ for simplicity.) Notice that all equations in (2.1) depend linearly on the variables v_r, \dots, v_0 and s_n, \dots, s_0 as well as on the coefficients of polynomials $Q_i(z), i = 1, \dots, k$. Note additionally, that (2.1) is lower-triangular w.r.t the coefficients s_n, \dots, s_0 which allows us to perform the following important elimination. Let us enumerate the equations of (2.1) from 0 to $n+r$ assigning the number j to the equation describing the vanishing of the coefficient at the power z^{n+r-j} . Then if $\mathbb{L}_n = L_{n,n+r} \neq 0$ one has that the 0-th equation has a solution $s_n = 1$ and $v_r = -L_{n,n+r} \neq 0$. The next n equations are triangular w.r.t the coefficients s_n, \dots, s_0 , i.e. j -th equation in this group contains only the variables $s_n, s_{n-1}, \dots, s_{n-j}$ (among all s_j 's) along with other types of variables. Thus under the assumption that all the diagonal terms $v_r + L_{n-i,n+r-i} = \mathbb{L}_{n-i} - \mathbb{L}_n, i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ are nonvanishing we can express all $s_{n-i}, i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ consecutively as rational functions of the remaining variables and get the reduced system of r rational equations containing only (v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0) as unknowns. Notice that in view of $v_r = -L_{n,n+r} \neq 0$ the nonvanishing of the diagonal entries $v_r + L_{n-i,n+r-i}, i = 0, 1, \dots, n$ coincides exactly with the nonresonance condition (1.7).

Cleaning the common denominators we get a reduced system of polynomial equations. We show now that this polynomial system is quasi-homogeneous in the variables v_j with the quasi-homogeneous weights $w(v_j)$ given by $w(v_j) = r - j$. Thus using the weighted-homogeneous version of the Bezout theorem, see e.g [13] we get that if the system under consideration defines a complete intersection, i.e. has only isolated solutions then their number (counted with multiplicities) equals $\binom{n+r}{r}$ in the corresponding weighted projective space. To check the quasi-homogeneity

note that the standard action of \mathbb{C}^* on the set of roots of the polynomial $V(z)$ by simultaneous multiplication assigns the weight $r - j$ to its coefficient v_j . These weights are still valid in the reduced system with the variables s_n, \dots, s_0 eliminated. Finally, we have to show that if the coefficients of $Q_k(z), \dots, Q_1(z)$ are algebraically independent then the eliminated system has exactly $\binom{n+r}{r}$ simple solutions. Indeed, consider the linear space EQ of all systems of r quasi-homogeneous equations in the variables (v_r, \dots, v_0) with the weights $w(v_j) = r - j$ and where the i -th equation is weighted-homogeneous of degree $n + i$. We equip this space with the standard monomial basis.

To accomplish the proof of Theorem 4 we need two additional standard facts.

Lemma 1. *The discriminant $Discr \subset EQ$ (i.e. the set of the coefficients of monomials in the equations for which the system has at least one solution of multiplicity greater than 1) is given by an algebraic equation with rational coefficients in the standard monomial basis of EQ .*

Proof. See [17], ch. 13. □

Consider some linear parameter space Λ with a chosen basis. Assume there is a rational map: $\Phi : \Lambda \rightarrow EQ$ where each coordinate in the standard monomial basis of EQ is given by a rational function with rational coefficients w.r.t to the chosen basis in Λ . The next statement is obvious.

Lemma 2. *In the above notation the pullback of $\Phi^{-1}(Discr)$ in Λ either a) coincides with the whole Λ or b) is given in the chosen basis by an algebraic equation with rational coefficients.*

It remains to show that there are some values of the coefficients of the polynomials $Q_k(z), \dots, Q_1(z)$ for which there are exactly $\binom{n+r}{r}$ distinct solutions of (1.5). Here we are not able to follow the nice inductive argument of [18], see also the last paragraph in § 4. Heine's proof does not generalize immediately to higher order equations. Instead we can, for example, invoke Theorem 7 whose proof is completely independent of the present arguments. It claims, in particular, that for any strict hyperbolicity preserver of the form $\mathfrak{d}(z) = \sum_{i=m}^k Q_i(z) \frac{d^i}{dz^i}$ and any $n \geq m$ there exist exactly $\binom{n+r}{r}$ pairs (V, S) . One can additionally choose such a hyperbolicity preserver with $m = 1$ and therefore get a necessary example of an operator with given k and r such that for any $n \geq 1$ it has exactly the maximal number of pairs (V, S) . □

To settle Theorem 5 (see Introduction) let us first reinterpret Problem (1.5) in linear algebraic terms.

2.1. On eigenvalues for rectangular matrices. We start with the following natural question.

Problem. Given a $(l+1)$ -tuple of $(m_1 \times m_2)$ -matrices A, B_1, \dots, B_l where $m_1 \leq m_2$ describe the set of all values of parameters $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l$ for which the rank of the linear combination $A + \lambda_1 B_1 + \dots + \lambda_l B_l$ is less than m_1 i.e. when the linear system $v * (A + \lambda_1 B_1 + \dots + \lambda_l B_l) = 0$ has a nontrivial (left) solution $v \neq 0$ which we call an *eigenvector of A wrt the linear span of B_1, \dots, B_l .*

Let \mathcal{M}_{m_1, m_2} denote the linear space of all $(m_1 \times m_2)$ -matrices with complex entries. Below we will consider l -tuples of $(m_1 \times m_2)$ -matrices B_1, \dots, B_l which are linearly independent in \mathcal{M}_{m_1, m_2} and denote their linear span by $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(B_1, \dots, B_l)$. Given a matrix pencil $\mathcal{P} = A + \mathcal{L}$ where $A \in \mathcal{M}_{m_1, m_2}$ denote by $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \subset \mathcal{P}$ its *eigenvalue locus*, i.e. the set of matrices in \mathcal{P} whose rank is less than the maximal

one. Denote by $\mathcal{M}^1 \subset \mathcal{M}_{m_1, m_2}$ the set of all $(m_1 \times m_2)$ matrices with positive corank, i.e whose rank is less than m_1 . Its co-dimension equals $m_2 - m_1 + 1$ and its degree as an algebraic variety equals $\binom{m_2}{m_1-1}$, see [12], Prop. 2.15. Consider the natural left-right action of the group $GL_{m_1} \times GL_{m_2}$ on \mathcal{M}_{m_1, m_2} , where GL_{m_1} (resp. GL_{m_2}) acts on $(m_1 \times m_2)$ -matrices by the left (resp. right) multiplication. This action on \mathcal{M}_{m_1, m_2} has finitely many orbits, each orbit being the set of all matrices of a given (co)rank, see e.g. [4], ch.1 §2. Notice that due to the well-known formula of the product of coranks the codimension of the set of matrices of rank $\leq r$ equals $(m_1 - r)(m_2 - r)$. Obviously, for any pencil \mathcal{P} one has that the eigenvalue locus coincides with $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{M}^1 \cap \mathcal{P}$. Thus for a generic pencil \mathcal{P} of dimension l the eigenvalue locus $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a subvariety of \mathcal{P} of codimension $m_2 - m_1 + 1$ if $l \geq m_2 - m_1 + 1$ and it is empty otherwise. The most interesting situation for applications occurs when $l = m_2 - m_1 + 1$ in which case $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is generically a finite set. From now on let us assume that $l = m_2 - m_1 + 1$. Denoting as above by \mathcal{L} the linear span of B_1, \dots, B_l we say that \mathcal{L} is *transversal* to \mathcal{M}^1 if the intersection $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{M}^1$ is finite and *non-transversal* to \mathcal{M}^1 otherwise. Notice that due to homogeneity of \mathcal{M}^1 any $(m_2 - m_1 + 1)$ -dimensional linear subspace \mathcal{L} transversal to it intersects \mathcal{M}^1 only at 0 and that the multiplicity of this intersection at 0 equals $\binom{m_2}{m_1-1}$.

We start with the following obvious statement which will later imply Theorem 5.

Lemma 3. *If $(m_2 - m_1 + 1)$ -dimensional linear space \mathcal{L} is transversal to \mathcal{M}^1 then for any matrix $A \in \mathcal{M}_{m_1, m_2}$ the eigenvalue locus $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$ of the pencil $\mathcal{P} = A + \mathcal{L}$ consists of exactly $\binom{m_2}{m_1-1}$ points counted with multiplicities.*

Remark 12. Notice that since $\mathcal{M}^1 \subset \mathcal{M}(m_1, m_2)$ is an incomplete intersection then in order to explicitly determine the eigenvalue locus of a given matrix A w.r.t. some $(m_2 - m_1 + 1)$ -dimensional linear subspace $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{M}(m_1, m_2)$ one has to solve an overdetermined system of $\binom{m_2}{m_1}$ equations describing the vanishing of all maximal minors of a $(m_1 \times m_2)$ -matrix depending on parameters. Fortunately, in our main application, i.e. for the multi-parameter spectral problem (1.5) we encounter only 'triangular' rectangular matrices (i.e. with the left-lower corner vanishing) for which the determination of the eigenvalue locus often reduces to a complete intersection, see proof of Theorem 4 and Theorem 6.

Let us explain how Lemma 3 implies Theorem 5. Namely, given a non-degenerate operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ in order to find all its Van Vleck polynomials having (at least one) Stieltjes polynomial of degree at most n we need to study the action of $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ on the linear space Pol_n of all univariate polynomials of degree at most n . If $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ has the Fuchs index r then $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ maps Pol_n to Pol_{n+r} . Using the standard monomial basis $1, z, z^2, \dots, z^l$ in Pol_l we get that if $n \geq k = \text{ord}(\mathfrak{d}(z))$ then the action of $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ in this basis is represented by a 'triangular' band $(n+1) \times (n+r+1)$ -matrix $A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n}$ with at most $r+k$ non-vanishing diagonals. Here 'triangular' means that all entries $a_{i,j}$ of $A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n}$ with $i < j$ vanish. Denote by I_s , $s = 0, \dots, r$ the $(n+1) \times (n+r+1)$ -matrix whose entries are given by $a_{i,j} = 0$ if $i - j \neq s$ and 1 otherwise. Denote by \mathfrak{L} the linear span of I_0, \dots, I_r and notice that \mathfrak{L} is transversal to $\mathcal{M}^1 \subset M_{n+1, n+r+1}$ since any matrix belonging to the pencil \mathfrak{L} and different from 0 has full rank.

Notice that adding an arbitrary polynomial $V(x) = v_r z^r + v_{r-1} z^{r-1} + \dots + v_0$ of degree at most r to $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ corresponds on the matrix level to adding of the linear combination $v_r I_0 + v_{r-1} I_1 + \dots + v_0 I_r$ to the initial matrix $A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n}$. The existence of a non-trivial Stieltjes polynomial of degree at most n corresponds to the fact that the matrix $A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n} + v_r I_0 + v_{r-1} I_1 + \dots + v_0 I_r$ has a non-trivial (left) kernel. Thus, for a given non-degenerate operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ the problem of finding all Van Vleck polynomials whose Stieltjes polynomials are of degree at most n is exactly equivalent to the determination of all the eigenvalues of its matrix $A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n}$ w.r.t.

the linear space \mathcal{L} in the above-mentioned sense. Lemma 3 has a simple analog for 'triangular' rectangular matrices which is equivalent to Theorem 5.

Namely, denote by $TM(m_1, m_2) \subset \mathcal{M}(m_1, m_2)$, $m_1 \leq m_2$ the set of all 'triangular' $m_1 \times m_2$ -matrices, i.e. with $a_{i,j} = 0$ for $i < j$. Let $\mathcal{L} \subset TM(m_1, m_2)$ be the linear subspace spanned by all $(m_2 - m_1 + 1)$ possible unit matrices $I_1, \dots, I_{m_2 - m_1 + 1} \in TM(m_1, m_2)$. Finally, denote by $TM^1 \subset TM(m_1, m_2)$ the set of all 'triangular' matrices with positive corank.

Lemma 4. *For any matrix $A \in TM(m_1, m_2)$ the eigenvalue locus $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}}$ of the pencil $\mathcal{P} = A + \mathcal{L}$ consists of exactly $\binom{m_2}{m_1 - 1}$ points counted with multiplicities.*

Proof. The same as above. \square

The latter Lemma settles Theorem 5. Let us now prove Proposition 1 (see Introduction).

Proof. In the above notation consider the pencil $\mathcal{A}_n(v_r, v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0) = A_{\mathfrak{D}(z), n} + v_r I_0 + v_{r-1} I_1 + \dots + v_0 I_r$ of $(n+1) \times (n+r+1)$ -matrices. One has

$$\mathcal{A}_n(v_r, v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{L}_n + v_r & * & * & * & * & \cdots \\ 0 & \mathbb{L}_{n-1} + v_r & * & * & * & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & \mathbb{L}_{n-2} + v_r & * & * & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathbb{L}_{n-3} + v_r & * & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{pmatrix},$$

where $*$ stands for possibly non-vanishing entries. The obvious necessary condition for such a matrix to have a positive corank is that one of the elements on the shown above main diagonal vanishes, i.e. there exists $i = 0, \dots, n$ such that $\mathbb{L}_i + v_r = 0$ or, equivalently, $v_r = -\mathbb{L}_i$. Set $v_r = -\mathbb{L}_n$ thus 'killing' the entry in the left-upper corner. Recall that the n -th nonresonance condition requires that $\mathbb{L}_n \neq \mathbb{L}_j, j = 0, \dots, n-1$. Therefore the subtraction of \mathbb{L}_n along the main diagonal will keep all other diagonal entries except for the left-upper corner non-vanishing. The r -dimensional pencil $\mathcal{A}_n(-\mathbb{L}_n, v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0) = A_{\mathfrak{D}(z), n} - \mathbb{L}_n I_0 + v_{r-1} I_1 + \dots + v_0 I_r$ has its 1-st column of the above matrix presentation vanishing and its main diagonal being the same for all possible values of v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0 . Therefore, by Lemma 3 there exist exactly $\binom{n+r}{r}$ eigenvalues $v_{r-1}, v_{r-2}, \dots, v_0$ counted with multiplicities such that $\mathcal{A}_n(-\mathbb{L}_n, v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0)$ has a positive corank. Finally, notice that since for any matrix from the pencil $\mathcal{A}_n(-\mathbb{L}_n, v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0)$ its entries along the main diagonal except for the left-upper corner are non-vanishing its corank can be at most 1. Moreover, when the corank of such a matrix is 1 then the occurring non-trivial linear combination of the rows which vanishes must necessarily include the first row since the second, the third etc rows are linearly independent for the above reason. The coefficients of this linear dependence of rows are exactly the coefficients of the corresponding Stieltjes polynomial. The fact that the first row must be in the linear dependence means in this language that the leading coefficient of this Stieltjes polynomial (which by definition is of degree at most n) must be non-vanishing, i.e. this Stieltjes polynomial is of degree exactly n . Proposition 1 is settled. \square

To prove Theorem 6 (see Introduction) we need to take a more careful look at the proof of Theorem 4. Namely, consider again the system (2.1) determining the set of all pairs (V, S) where V is a Van Vleck polynomial and S is the corresponding Stieltjes polynomial of degree at most n . As in the proof of Theorem 4 we solve the 0-th equation in (2.1) by taking $s_n = 1$ and $v_r = -L_{n, n+r} = -\mathbb{L}_n$. (By Proposition 1 finding a solution of (2.1) with $s_n = 1$ and $v_r = -L_{n, n+r} = -\mathbb{L}_n$ leads to a pair (V, S) such that V is of degree exactly equal to r and S is of degree exactly

equal to n .) Then we express consecutively the variables $s_{n-1}, s_{n-2}, \dots, s_0$ from the next n equations of (2.1). The crucial circumstance here is that while doing this we only divide by the differences of the form $\mathbb{L}_n - \mathbb{L}_j$, $j = n-1, n-2, \dots, 0$ which are non-vanishing due to the validity of our nonresonance condition. Substituting the obtained expressions for s_j , $j = 0, \dots, n$ in the remaining r equations in (2.1) we get the required eliminated system of algebraic equations on the variables v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0 which proves the required result. \square

To illustrate the above procedure let us consider a concrete example.

Example 1. Consider the action of some operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ with the Fuchs index $r = 2$ on the space Pol_1 . Its maps Pol_1 to Pol_3 and, say, is represented in the monomial bases of Pol_1 and Pol_3 by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{L}_1 & L_{1,2} & L_{1,1} & L_{1,0} \\ 0 & \mathbb{L}_0 & L_{0,1} & L_{0,0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

(Here we used the notation from the proof of Theorem 4.) Since $r = 2$ we need to add to $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ a quadratic Van Vleck polynomial $V(z) = v_2 z^2 + v_1 z + v_0$ with the undetermined coefficients v_2, v_1, v_0 which modifies the above matrix as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{L}_1 + v_2 & L_{1,2} + v_1 & L_{1,1} + v_0 & L_{1,0} \\ 0 & \mathbb{L}_0 + v_2 & L_{0,1} + v_1 & L_{0,0} + v_0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The operator $\mathfrak{d}(z) + V(z)$ has a linear Stieltjes polynomial $S(z) = s_1 z + s_0$ if and only if the vector (s_1, s_0) is the left kernel of the latter matrix which leads to the system:

$$\begin{cases} 0 = s_1(\mathbb{L}_1 + v_2); \\ 0 = s_1(L_{1,2} + v_1) + s_0(\mathbb{L}_0 + v_2); \\ 0 = s_1(L_{1,1} + v_0) + s_0(L_{0,1} + v_1); \\ 0 = s_1 L_{1,0} + s_0(L_{0,0} + v_0). \end{cases}$$

Setting $s_1 = 1$ and $v_2 = -\mathbb{L}_1$ as was explained earlier we get $s_0 = \frac{L_{1,2} + v_1}{\mathbb{L}_1 - \mathbb{L}_0}$ from the 2-nd equation. Substituting the obtained variables in the remaining two equations we get the system of two equations:

$$\begin{cases} (\mathbb{L}_1 - \mathbb{L}_0)(v_0 + L_{1,1}) + (v_1 + L_{1,1})(v_1 + L_{1,2}) = 0; \\ (v_0 + L_{0,0})(v_1 + L_{1,2}) + (\mathbb{L}_1 - \mathbb{L}_0)L_{1,0} = 0. \end{cases}$$

which determines three (not necessarily distinct) pairs (v_1, v_0) which together with $v_2 = -\mathbb{L}_1$ given us three required (not necessarily distinct) quadratic Van Vleck polynomials whose Stieltjes polynomials are of degree exactly 1.

Now we finally describe the notion of natural multiplicity of a given Van Vleck polynomial of an operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ used in the introduction. Let $\tilde{V}(z) = \tilde{v}_r z^r + \tilde{v}_{r-1} z^{r-1} + \dots + \tilde{v}_0$ be some fixed Van Vleck polynomial of the Heine-Stieltjes problem (1.5), i.e. there exists a (not necessarily unique) polynomial solution $\tilde{S}(z)$ of the equation of (1.5) with the chosen $V(z) = \tilde{V}(z)$. (Below we use notation from the proof of Proposition 1.)

Definition 2. Given a positive integer n let us define the n -th multiplicity $\#_n(\tilde{V})$ of $\tilde{V}(z)$ as the usual local algebraic multiplicity of the intersection of the $(r+1)$ -dimensional matrix pencil $\mathcal{A}_n(v_r, v_{r-1}, \dots, v_0) = A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n} + v_r I_0 + v_{r-1} I_1 + \dots + v_0 I_r$ consisting of 'triangular' $(n+1) \times (n+r+1)$ -matrices with the set $TM^1 \subset TM(n+1, n+r+1)$ of positive corank matrices at the matrix $A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n} + \tilde{v}_r I_0 + \tilde{v}_{r-1} I_1 + \dots + \tilde{v}_0 I_r$. Here (as above) $A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n}$ denotes the matrix of the action of $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ on the space Pol_n taken w.r.t monomial basis and $A_{\mathfrak{d}(z), n} + \tilde{v}_r I_0 + \tilde{v}_{r-1} I_1 + \dots + \tilde{v}_0 I_r$ is, therefore, the matrix of action of the operator $\mathfrak{d}(z) + \tilde{V}(z)$ on Pol_n . In case, when

$A_{\mathfrak{d}(z),n} + \tilde{v}_r I_0 + \tilde{v}_{r-1} I_1 + \dots + \tilde{v}_0 I_r$ does not belong to $TM^1 \subset TM(n+1, n+r+1)$, i.e. the operator $\mathfrak{d}(z) + \tilde{V}(z)$ does not annihilate any polynomial of degree at most n we set $\sharp_n(\tilde{V}) = 0$.

Remark 13. The natural multiplicity of Van Vleck polynomials in Theorems 4 and 5 while counting those with Stieltjes polynomials of degree at most n is exactly the n -th multiplicity from Definition 2.

Obviously, for any given Van Vleck polynomial $\tilde{V}(z)$ the sequence $\{\sharp_n(\tilde{V})\}$, $n = 0, 1, \dots$ is a non-decreasing sequence of non-negative integers. Moreover the following stabilization result holds.

Lemma 5. *For any non-degenerate operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ the sequence $\{\sharp_n(\tilde{V})\}$ of multiplicities of any its Van Vleck polynomial $\tilde{V}(z)$ stabilizes, i.e. there exists $n_{\tilde{V}}$ such that for all $n > n_{\tilde{V}}$ one has $\sharp_n(\tilde{V}) = \sharp_{n_{\tilde{V}}}(\tilde{V})$.*

Proof. Indeed, as was mentioned in e.g. the proof of Proposition 1 the leading coefficient \tilde{v}_r of $\tilde{V}(z)$ must necessarily coincide with $-\mathbb{L}_m$ for some non-negative m . The sequence $\{|\mathbb{L}_j|\}$ is strictly increasing starting from some j_0 , see (1.6). Moreover, by Proposition 1 if $\mathbb{L}_n \neq L_j, j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ then the total multiplicity of all Van Vleck polynomials whose leading term equals $-\mathbb{L}_n$ equals $\binom{n+r}{r}$. Therefore, if we take the index value j_0 such $|\mathbb{L}_j| > |\mathbb{L}_m|$ for all $j \geq j_0$ then the multiplicities $\sharp_j(\tilde{V})$ can not change for $j \geq j_0$ since the total multiplicity increase is obtained on Van Vleck polynomials with a different leading coefficient when j grows. \square

3. PROOF OF GENERALIZED PÓLYA'S THEOREMS

Let us now prove Theorem 8 following straightforwardly the recipe of [31] which in its turn is closely related to the proof of the classical Gauss-Lukas theorem.

Proof. Let (z_1, \dots, z_n) denote the set of all roots of a Stieltjes polynomial $S(z)$ of some degree n satisfying the equation (1.8) with α_i 's being complex and β_j 's being positive. Then for each z_i one has

$$\frac{S^{(k)}(z_i)}{S^{(k-1)}(z_i)} + \sum_{j=1}^l \frac{\beta_j}{z_i - \alpha_j} = 0.$$

This equation has the form

$$\sum_{s=1}^p \frac{m_s}{z_i - \xi_s} + \sum_{j=1}^l \frac{\beta_j}{z_i - \alpha_j} = 0, \quad (3.1)$$

where (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_p) is the set of all roots of $S^{(k-1)}(z)$ with $p = n - k + 1$ and (m_1, \dots, m_p) is the set of multiplicities of the roots (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_p) . Notice that by the standard Gauss-Lukas theorem all (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_p) lie in the convex hull of the set of roots (z_1, \dots, z_n) . Assume now that the convex hull of (z_1, \dots, z_n) is not contained in the convex hull of $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l)$. Then there exists some root z_i and an affine line $L \subset \mathbb{C}$ separating z_i from the rest of z_j 's together with all α_j 's and ξ_m 's. But then the equation (3.1) can not hold since all the vectors $z_i - \xi_s$ and $z_i - \alpha_j$ lie in the same half-plane. \square

Remark 14. The above argument works for the roots of Van Vleck polynomials $V(z)$ as well and extends to the case $\beta_j \geq 0$.

To settle a much more delicate Theorem 9 we will prove a number of localization results having an independent interest.

3.1. Root localization for Van Vleck and Stieltjes polynomials.

Definition 3. Given a finite (complex-valued) measure μ supported on \mathbb{C} we call by its *total mass* the integral $\int_{\mathbb{C}} d\mu(\zeta)$. The Cauchy transform $\mathcal{C}_\mu(z)$ of μ is standardly defined as

$$\mathcal{C}_\mu(z) = \int_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{d\mu(\zeta)}{z - \zeta}. \quad (3.2)$$

Obviously, $\mathcal{C}_\mu(z)$ is analytic outside the support of μ and has a number of important properties, e.g. that $\mu = \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\mathcal{C}_\mu(z)}{\partial \bar{z}}$ understood in the distributional sense. Detailed information about Cauchy transforms can be found in [16].

Definition 4. Given a (monic) polynomial $P(z)$ of some degree m we associate with $P(z)$ its *root-counting measure* $\mu_P(z) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_j \delta(z - z_j)$ where $\{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$ stands for the set of all roots of $P(z)$ with repetitions and $\delta(z - z_j)$ is the usual Dirac delta-function supported at z_j .

Directly from the definition of $\mu_P(z)$ one has that for any given polynomial $P(z)$ of degree m its Cauchy transform is given by $\mathcal{C}_{\mu_P}(z) = \frac{P'(z)}{mP(z)}$.

We start with a rather simple estimate of the absolute value of the Cauchy transform of a probability measure which will help us to prove Proposition 4, comp. Lemma 2 in [5].

Lemma 6. *Let μ be a probability measure supported in a disk D_0 of radius R_0 and centered at z_0 . Then for any z outside D_0 one has the following estimate of the absolute value of its Cauchy transform $\mathcal{C}_\mu(z)$:*

$$\frac{1}{|z - z_0 - R_0|} \geq |\mathcal{C}_\mu(z)| \geq \frac{1}{2|z - z_0|}. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. The l.h.s. of the above inequality is quite obvious. By (3.2) one has that $|\mathcal{C}_\mu(z)|$ will be maximal if one places the whole unit mass of μ at the point which has the least distance to z in the admissible support. In our case such a point p is the intersection of the boundary circle of D_0 with the segment (z, z_0) . Its distance to z equals $|z - z_0 - R_0|$ which gives the required inequality. To settle the r.h.s. let us assume for simplicity that $z_0 = 0$. Translation invariance of our considerations is obvious. Let us use (3.2) and change the integration variable as follows:

$$\frac{1}{z - \zeta} = \frac{1}{z} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \zeta/z} = \frac{1}{z} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \theta}$$

where $\theta = \frac{\zeta}{z}$. Since z lies outside D_0 and ζ lies inside D_0 one has $|\theta| < 1$ which implies for $w = \frac{1}{1 - \theta}$ that one has $\operatorname{Re}(w) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Indeed,

$$|w - 1| = \frac{|\theta|}{|1 - \theta|} = |\theta||w| \leq |w| \Leftrightarrow |w - 1| \leq |w| \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{Re}(w) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{C}_\mu(z)| = \left| \int_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{d\mu(\zeta)}{z - \zeta} \right| = \frac{1}{|z|} \left| \int_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{d\mu(\zeta)}{1 - \theta} \right| = \frac{1}{|z|} \left| \int_{\mathbb{C}} w d\mu(\zeta) \right| \geq \frac{1}{|z|} \left| \int_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Re}(w) d\mu(\zeta) \right| \geq \frac{1}{2|z|}. \quad \square$$

Using Lemma 6 we now settle Proposition 4 (see Introduction).

Proof. Take a pair $(V(z), S(z))$ where $V(z)$ is some Van Vleck polynomial and $S(z)$ is its corresponding Stieltjes polynomial of degree n . Let ξ be the root of either $V(z)$ or $S(z)$ which has the maximal modulus among all roots of the chosen $V(z)$ and $S(z)$. We want to show that there exists a radius $R > 0$ such that $|\xi| \leq R$ for

any ξ as above and as soon as n is large enough. Substituting $V(z), S(z), \xi$ in (1.5) and using (1.4) we get the relation:

$$Q_k(\xi)S^{(k)}(\xi) + Q_{k-1}(\xi)S^{(k-1)}(\xi) + \dots + Q_1(\xi)S'(\xi) = 0,$$

dividing which by its first term we obtain:

$$1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{Q_j(\xi)S^{(j)}(\xi)}{Q_k(\xi)S^{(k)}(\xi)} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Notice that the rational function $b_i(z) := \frac{S^{(i+1)}(z)}{(n-i)S^{(i)}(z)}$ is the Cauchy transform of the polynomial $S^{(i)}(z)$. Easy arithmetic shows that

$$S^{(i)}(z) = \frac{S^{(k)}(z)}{(n-k+1)\dots(n-i) \prod_{j=i}^{k-1} b_j(z)} \Leftrightarrow \frac{S^{(i)}(z)}{S^{(k)}(z)} = \frac{(n-k)!}{(n-i)! \prod_{j=i}^{k-1} b_j(z)}.$$

Notice additionally, that by the usual Gauss-Lucas theorem all roots of any $S^{(i)}(z)$ lie within the convex hull of the set of roots of $S(z)$. In particular, all these roots lie within the disk of radius $|\xi|$. Therefore, using Lemma 6 we get

$$\left| \frac{Q_i(\xi)S^{(i)}(\xi)}{Q_k(\xi)S^{(k)}(\xi)} \right| \leq \frac{|Q_i(\xi)| (n-k)!}{|Q_k(\xi)| (n-i)!} 2^{k-i} |\xi|^{k-i}. \quad (3.5)$$

Notice that since $Q_k(z)$ is a monic polynomial of degree $k+r$ (recall that r is the Fuchs index of the operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$) then one can choose a radius R such that for any z with $|z| > R$ one has $|Q_k(z)| \geq \frac{|z|^{k+r}}{2}$. Now since for any $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ one has $\deg Q_i(z) \leq i+r$ we can choose a positive constant K such that $|Q_i(z)| \leq K|z|^{i+r}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ and $|z| > R$. We want to show that ξ can not be too large for a sufficiently large n . Using our previous assumptions and assuming additionally that $|\xi| > R$ we get

$$\left| \frac{Q_i(\xi)S^{(i)}(\xi)}{Q_k(\xi)S^{(k)}(\xi)} \right| \leq \frac{|Q_i(\xi)| (n-k)!}{|Q_k(\xi)| (n-i)!} 2^{k-i} |\xi|^{k-i} \leq \frac{K \cdot 2^{k-i+1}}{(n-i)\dots(n-k+1)}.$$

Now we can finally choose N_0 large enough such that for all $n \geq N_0$, all $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ and any $|\xi| > R$ one has that

$$\left| \frac{Q_i(\xi)S^{(i)}(\xi)}{Q_k(\xi)S^{(k)}(\xi)} \right| \leq \frac{K \cdot 2^{k-i+1}}{(n-i)\dots(n-k+1)} < \frac{1}{k-1}.$$

But then obviously the relation (3.4) can not hold for all $n \geq N_0$ and any $|\xi| > R$ since

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{Q_j(\xi)S^{(j)}(\xi)}{Q_k(\xi)S^{(k)}(\xi)} \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \left| \frac{Q_j(\xi)S^{(j)}(\xi)}{Q_k(\xi)S^{(k)}(\xi)} \right| < \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{k-1} < 1.$$

□

Now we will strengthen the arguments in the proof of Proposition 4 in order to settle Theorem 9. Denote by \mathcal{R}_{Q_k} the maximal distance between the origin and Conv_{Q_k} . The following statement holds.

Lemma 7. *For any non-degenerate higher Lamé operator $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ and a given number $\delta > 0$ there exists a positive integer N_δ such that the roots of all Van Vleck polynomials $V(z)$ possessing a Stieltjes polynomial $S(z)$ of degree $\geq N_\delta$ as well as the roots of these Stieltjes polynomials lie in the disk $|z| \leq \mathcal{R}_{Q_k} + \delta$.*

Proof. Notice that once δ is fixed the quotient $\frac{|Q_i(z)|}{|Q_k(z)|}$ is bounded from above for each $i = 1, \dots, k-1$ if we assume that $|z| \geq \mathcal{R}_{Q_k} + \delta$. Indeed, all the roots of $Q_k(z)$ lie within the disk of radius \mathcal{R}_{Q_k} centered at the origin and each $Q_i(z)$ has a smaller degree than $Q_k(z)$. Consider now again the estimate (3.5). Since we now know that ξ lies in some bounded domain for all possible polynomials $V(z)$ and $S(z)$ of sufficiently high degree and that the quotient $\frac{|Q_i(z)|}{|Q_k(z)|}$ is bounded from above outside the disk of radius $\mathcal{R}_{Q_k} + \delta$ we get that the right-hand side of (3.5) goes to 0 when $n \rightarrow \infty$ under the assumption that ξ stays outside the latter disk. Looking again at (3.4) we see that by the latter argument it can not hold for $|\xi| \geq \mathcal{R}_{Q_k} + \delta$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$. This contradiction proves the lemma. \square

To finish the proof of Theorem 9 notice that the choice of the origin is in our hands, i.e we can make an arbitrary affine shift of the independent variable z and use the same arguments. Since the convex hull Conv_{Q_k} is the intersection of all disks centered at different points and containing Conv_{Q_k} we can for any chosen $\epsilon > 0$ find the intersection \mathcal{K} of finitely many disks in \mathbb{C} such that \mathcal{K} contains Conv_{Q_k} but is contained in $\text{Conv}_{Q_k}^\epsilon$. (One can choose one such disk for each edge of the boundary of Conv_{Q_k} putting its center sufficiently far away on the line perpendicular to the edge and passing through its middle point.) Then since \mathcal{K} is the intersection of finitely many disks we can applying Lemma 7 find such N_ϵ that all roots of all $V(z)$ and $S(z)$ for all $n \geq N_\epsilon$ lie in \mathcal{K} . \square

4. 'ON THE EXISTENCE AND NUMBER OF LAMÉ FUNCTIONS OF HIGHER DEGREE', BY E. HEINE

4.1. Comments on Heine's result and history around it. As Heine himself mentions in [18] the requirement of algebraic independence of the coefficients of $Q_2(z)$ and $Q_1(z)$ being sufficient is too strong and restrictive for his purposes but he fails to give any other explicit condition guaranteeing the same result, see Theorem 1. Heine's original motivation for the consideration (1.2) comes from the classical Lamé equation (1.1) in which case $Q_1(z)$ and $Q_2(z)$ are very much algebraically dependent, namely, $Q_1(z) = Q_2'(z)/2$. Also in order to prove that the upper bound $\binom{n+l-2}{n}$ is actually achieved for algebraically independent $Q_1(z)$ and $Q_2(z)$ Heine uses an inductive argument where he forces $Q_2(z)$ and $Q_1(z)$ to become algebraically dependent in a special way. Theorem 2 is another clear indication that the algebraic independence is apparently an inappropriate condition for the goal.

Interpretation of Heine's text written in a rather cumbersome 19-th century German and the exact statements it contains seems to create difficulties for mathematicians starting from 1870's and up to now, see e.g. [27]. The main classical sources, namely, [41] from 1885, [31] from 1912 and [42] from 1939 are not too clear about what it is that Heine actually proved and under what assumptions on $Q_2(z)$ and $Q_1(z)$ one can guarantee that for a given positive n the number of possible polynomial pairs (V, S) such that the corresponding S has degree exactly n is finite and bounded by $\binom{n+l-2}{n}$. Being aware of the existence of a gap in his proof Heine seems to covers by a reference to a letter of his friend Leopold Kronecker who has (under unknown conditions) shown that for a given degree n the eliminant of the system of algebraic equations defining the coefficients of the polynomial $V(z)$ does not vanish identically. This statement is equivalent to the finiteness of the number of these polynomials. Heine mentions also a short note of Kronecker's on this topic presented in the January issue of Monatsbericht der Berliner Akademie from 1864. Unfortunately the track ends here. All one can find in this issue is the phrase that at the meeting on the section of physics and mathematics of the Prussian Academy

of Science held on November 14, 1864 "Herr Kronecker las über die verschieden Faktoren des Discriminante von Eliminations-Gleichungen ", i.e. "Herr Kronecker gave a lecture on different factors of the discriminant of the elimination equation." In attempt to overbridge this gap we undertook the task of translating and (even more so) decoding Heine's arguments. In what follows we give a frase-by-frase translation of portions of §135 and §136 from Heine's book [18] which are relevant for our consideration. Some of the phrases were difficult to understand literally and we provided our interpretation and comments of the content placed within the slash signs. We allowed ourselves to correct several obvious misprints without a special mention, tried to keep (to certain extent) the language flavor and preserved the enumeration of the formulas of the original text.

4.2. Translation. §135 ...

Next we ask which conditions the polynomials $\chi(x)$ and $\theta(x)$ must satisfy in order for the differential equation

$$\psi(x)\frac{d^2W}{du^2} + \chi(x)\frac{dW}{du} + \theta(x)W = 0 \quad (88)$$

to have a solution which is a polynomial of degree n in x assuming that ψ is of degree $p + 1$ and χ and θ are of degrees at most p resp. $p - 1$. /In fact, $\chi(x)$ is fixed and $\theta(x)$ is a variable polynomial. It is not clear why Heine talks about both $\chi(x)$ and $\theta(x)$ here./

This is always the case when it is the question about, as in the case of Lamé functions, a differential equation whose general solution does not contain any higher transcendentals than a rational function of integrals of algebraic functions and which has a definite order at $x = \infty$. /This and the next two phrases explain why one should assume that $\deg(\chi) < \deg(\psi)$./

We say about a function W that it is of the order α for the finite value $x = a$, if $(x - a)^{\alpha - \epsilon}W$ and $(x - a)^{\alpha + \epsilon}W$ will be 0 respectively ∞ for $x = a$, however small ϵ is taken; we assign to it the order α at infinity, if $x^{-\alpha - \epsilon}W$ and $x^{-\alpha + \epsilon}W$ for $x = \infty$ becomes 0 resp. ∞ . Thus, for example, $\log x$ has a definite order, namely 0.

If y and z are two particular solutions of (88) then one has

$$\log(yz' - zy') = \int \frac{\chi}{\psi} dx.$$

If χ were not of smaller degree than ψ then $yz' - zy'$ would at $x = \infty$ go to 0 or ∞ as an exponential function and would therefore have no order.

For the solution to have an order for every x where $\psi(x)$ vanishes, $\frac{\chi(x)}{\psi(x)}$, after possible cancellations can in the denominator only have different factors. This follows from the same equality between two particular solutions which we used above.

The following theorem answers the question posed at the begining:

If the two polynomials $\psi(x)$ and $\chi(x)$ are given, the first of degree $p + 1$, the second of degree p , then for exactly $\frac{(n+1)(n+2)\dots(n+p-1)}{1.2\dots(p-1)}$ different functions $\theta(x)$, there exists a particular solution of (88) which is a polynomial of degree n in x .

For $p = 1$ we understand the number given above which in general might be denoted by (n, p) as 1. It is assumed above that the coefficients of ψ and χ are mutually independent. I call the numbers a, b , etc. mutually independent when there is no algebraic equation with integer coefficients which they satisfy. /As stated above Heine actually proves his theorem under the assumption of the algebraic independence of the coefficients./

It may be immediately added here that we will say about the numbers a, b, \dots which already satisfy one or more algebraic equations that "they are further specialized" when in addition to these equations they satisfy one or more additional equations - which of course are not allowed to contradict the earlier ones.

The just mentioned assumption for the validity of the theorem demands more than is necessary. One could say with the same right that a polynomial of degree n in x with mutually independent coefficients vanishes for n different values of x while for this it would suffice that the coefficients did not satisfy a particular equation with integer coefficients, namely, the well-known one which describes the coincidence of roots. Also for the validity of our theorem it suffices that the coefficients do not satisfy certain finite number of algebraic equations, which equations in every case can be found but not in a comprehensible way. /As we mentioned in the introduction Heine realizes that for a given fixed n the set of all pairs of polynomials $(\psi(x), \chi(x))$ of degrees at most $p + 1$ and p respectively for which there are less than (n, p) functions $\theta(x)$ solving the problem under consideration is an algebraic hypersurface with integer coefficients. It is by no means clear to us how Heine could possibly conclude that all the coefficients of the discriminantal equation are integers in the basis of the coefficients of $\psi(x)$ and $\chi(x)$. The development of the corresponding theory can be traced back to Cayley, see appendix in [17], but no general results were obtained until much later./

§136. To obtain the proof of the theorem one substitutes in (88) polynomials of degree n and $p - 1$ for W and θ , namely

$$W = x^n + g_1x^{n-1} + \dots +,$$

$$\theta = k_0x^{p-1} + k_1x^{p-2} + k_2x^{p-3} + \dots$$

It is clear that the necessary and sufficient condition that W satisfies the equation (88) is that certain $n + p$ equations are satisfied which are linear in both the g_i 's and k_j 's and in the coefficients of ψ and χ . To show the structure of these, without having to work with too clumsy formulas I present them for the case $p = 3$.

Let the given functions be

$$\psi(x) = x(c_0x^3 + c_1x^2 + c_2x + c_3),$$

$$\chi(x) = b_0x^3 + b_1x^2 + b_2x + b_3$$

and the sought functions

$$W(x) = g_0x^n + g_1x^{n-1} + g_2x^{n-2} + \dots + g_n,$$

$$\theta(x) = k_0x^2 + k_1x + k_2.$$

/Notice that Heine apparently realizes that, in general, it might be impossible to find $W(x)$ as a polynomial of degree exactly n and introduces even the leading coefficient as a new variable without special explanations./

For W to satisfy the differential equation (88) the coefficients g_i 's and k_j 's must satisfy the system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= g_0[k_0 + nb_0 + n(n-1)c_0]; \\
0 &= g_1[k_0 + (n-1)b_0 + (n-1)(n-2)c_0] + g_0[k_1 + nb_1 + n(n-1)c_1]; \\
0 &= g_2[k_0 + (n-2)b_0 + (n-2)(n-3)c_0] + g_1[k_1 + (n-1)b_1 + (n-1)(n-2)c_1] + \\
&\quad + g_0[k_2 + nb_2 + n(n-1)c_2]; \\
0 &= g_3[k_0 + (n-3)b_0 + (n-3)(n-4)c_0] + g_2[k_1 + (n-2)b_1 + (n-2)(n-3)c_1] + \\
&\quad + g_1[k_2 + (n-1)b_2 + (n-1)(n-2)c_2] + g_0[nb_3 + n(n-1)c_3]; \\
0 &= g_4[k_0 + (n-4)b_0 + (n-4)(n-5)c_0] + g_3[k_1 + (n-3)b_1 + (n-3)(n-4)c_1] + \\
&\quad + g_2[k_2 + (n-2)b_2 + (n-2)(n-3)c_2] + g_1[(n-1)b_3 + (n-1)(n-2)c_3]; \\
&\dots
\end{aligned}$$

In this way the equations will continue to be formed so that the next one will give the relation between the four g_i 's with the indices 5, 4, 3, 2. The final equations will be

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= g_{n-1}[k_0 + b_0] + g_{n-2}[k_1 + 2b_1 + 2 \cdot 1c_1] + g_{n-3}[k_2 + 3b_1 + 3 \cdot 2c_2] + g_{n-4}[4b_3 + 4 \cdot 3c_3]; \\
0 &= g_n[k_0] + g_{n-1}[k_1 + 1 \cdot b_1] + g_{n-2}[k_2 + 2b_2 + 2 \cdot 1c_2] + g_{n-3}[3b_3 + 3 \cdot 2c_3]; \\
0 &= g_n[k_0] + g_{n-1}[k_1 + 1 \cdot b_1] + g_{n-2}[2b_3 + 2 \cdot 1c_3]; \\
0 &= g_n[k_0] + g_{n-1}[b_3].
\end{aligned}$$

From the first equation the coefficient k_0 is completely determined in terms of the given coefficients b_0 and c_0 of ψ and χ ; the next n equations give all g_i 's expressed in terms of the same known coefficients b_i 's and c_j 's and the $(p-1)$ (in our example 2) unknowns k_1, k_2, \dots . The values of g_i 's that are obtained from the second to the $(n+1)$ st equations when substituted in the last $(p-1)$ equations, will then give $(p-1)$ equations of higher degrees between the unknowns k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{p-1} and the known coefficients of ψ and χ , which only appear rationally in these equations. /Heine apparently means that g_i 's will be given by rational functions of c_i 's and b_m 's and substituting these one gets a system of rational equations defining k_j 's./

Once the k_j 's have been determined from these $p-1$ equations, the substitution of the found values in the 2nd to the $(n+1)$ st equations will give the g_i 's. Two systems of related k_j 's are called *different*, i.e. the two systems k_1, \dots, k_{p-1} and k'_1, \dots, k'_{p-1} are called *different* when they are not equal. One realizes with the full confidence from the form of the 2nd to the $(n+1)$ -st equation that every system k_j 's corresponds to a system of g_i 's and different systems of k_j 's correspond to different system of g_i 's. /The latter statement of Heine is false as is. It requires that the diagonal entries in the uppertriangular system are non-vanishing (see our nonresonance condition in the introduction). But it is certainly true if the coefficients of $\psi(x)$ and $\chi(x)$ are algebraically independent./

One obtains thus that

There exist as many different equations (88) and therefore as many different polynomials W of degree n as there are different systems of k_j 's.

Next it is realized that

The degree of the elimination equation is at most (n, p) , that is there can only be at most (n, p) different systems of k_j 's.

If one throws a glance at the $(n+p)$ equations, which, with the exception of the first one for k_0 , one can find above for the special case that $p=3$, one will perhaps not realize the truth of this statement immediately, and instead believe that the degree of the elimination equation is larger. /One is supposed to disregard the 1st equation in the system above and study the remaining $(n+p)$ equations./

But if one instead of k_2, k_3, \dots , substitutes x_2^2, x_3^3, \dots where the lower numbers are indices and the upper numbers are exponents, and for symmetry we use $x_i \leftrightarrow k_i$, one realizes immediately that g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n are polynomials in the x_i 's of degree $1, 2, \dots, n$ resp. so that after the substitution the $(p-1)$ last equations will have degrees $n+1, n+2, \dots, n+p+1$ in x_i 's. That means that the degree of the elimination equation will at most grow to $(n+1)(n+2)\dots(n+p+1)$. If one takes into account that every value of k_1, k_2, \dots corresponds to one value of x_1 , two values of x_2 , three values of x_3 then the above assertion is proved. /This is an excellent passage! What Heine does is called in the modern language of algebraic geometry the weighted Bezout theorem, see e.g. [13]. The author was unable to find a reliable proof of this result in the literature prior to 1970./

Under the assumptions that the elimination equation is not identically zero it will indeed have the above mentioned degree and give (n, p) different systems of k 's.

/Crucial claim but not completely proved below./

There exist as I will show below indeed (n, p) distinct systems of the coefficients if the coefficients of ψ and χ are specialized in a certain way. /Heine will show by induction that for a special choice of ψ and χ one can obtain exactly (n, p) distinct solutions. But instead of algebraically independent coefficients of ψ and χ he needs to make them dependent to get an example of (n, p) distinct solutions. This is correct as soon as one knows that even for the specialized situation the total number of solutions is finite. This finiteness probably follows from his specific choice of specialization, see below./

That this elimination resultant does not vanish identically follows from the next observation which I take from a letter of my friend Kronecker. /One needs to check also that the system of equations has (under very unclear non-degeneracy assumptions on the coefficients of ψ and χ) only isolated solutions. This is equivalent to the non-vanishing of the eliminant./

If in the mentioned final equation which will determine the functions $\theta(x)$ and $W(x)$ all coefficients vanish then according to the general principle of elimination will at least one of the roots of $W(x) = 0$ be unrestricted. /This is an interesting although a rather obvious observation. Notice that the elimination theory hardly at all existed in 1870's./

If one assigns to this root all values for which $\psi(x)$ vanishes then one gets through this (procedure) certain restrictions on the function $\chi(x)$ but the latter function does not satisfy them even after the mentioned specialization.

Herr Kronecker added in the mentioned message that these restrictions are actually satisfied and one of the roots of $W(x) = 0$ remains undetermined if both $\psi(x)$ and $\chi(x)$ have the properties that for the known function $\theta(x)$ both solutions of (88) are polynomials in x .¹

Concerning the number of systems with specialized ψ and χ I set such relations between the coefficients which give that ψ has a factor $(x-a)$ twice and χ has it once. /Then the algebraic independence is lost here since ψ has a double root and therefore lies on a discriminantal surface./ Then all W satisfying (88) have the

¹ In Monatsbericht der Berliner Akademie from January 1864 added (accomplished) Herr Kronecker my message with the following

Introducing the roots of $W(x) = 0$ as variables in the equations

$$\psi(x_k)W''(x_k) + \chi(x_k)W'(x_k) = 0, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

which define them and substituting the coefficients of W' and W'' through the symmetric functions of x_1, \dots, x_n one sees directly that one of the unknowns x remains arbitrary if the elimination equation vanishes. Through a simple transformation of this system of equations one can determine the degree of the final equation and at the same time prove that certain coefficients are different from 0 as long as there are no special conditions on the functions ψ and χ . /A rather unclear proof of the nonvanishing of the eliminant./

form

$$U(n); (x-a)U(n-1); \dots; (x-a)^n U(0),$$

where U are as in §123 polynomials coprime with $(x-a)$ are their degrees are given in parenthesis to the left of the letter U . Under the substitution of this expression in (88) one gets for every U an equation like (88) in which instead of ψ and χ appear polynomials with unrestricted coefficients which are not of degree $p+1$ and p but instead of p and $p-1$. /Apparently the logics here is as follows. We can use our result to prove that the number (n, p) of simple solutions is obtained if we can show that for the above specialization the total number of solutions is finite./

If one assumes that the general statement which we are proving is settled if ψ is the product of p linear factors (and for the product of 2 linear factors this is easy to show) then one gets the situation when ψ consists of $p+1$ factors of which two are coinciding, altogether

$$(n, p-1) + (n-1, p-1) + (n-2, p-1) + \dots + (0, p-1)$$

which after summation gives (n, p) different W , i.e. (n, p) different θ just as many as different systems of k 's. /This accomplished the induction step. What one misses is mentioning that the total number of solutions for Heine's specialization is finite. But this follows from his representation of all solutions as $U(n); (x-a)U(n-1); \dots; (x-a)^n U(0)$. In each of these cases we already know that the number of solutions is finite and all of them are simple. To be completely rigorous one should use a double induction on p and n as we did in § 2. Additional simplification of the order 2 case compared to the general order k case considered above comes from the fact that during the above specialization one can assume that the polynomials $\tilde{\psi}$ and $\tilde{\chi}$ such that $\psi = (x-a)\tilde{\psi}$ and $\chi = (x-a)\tilde{\chi}$ have algebraically independent coefficients which does not work for higher order case./

5. FINAL REMARKS

Let us formulate a number of relevant questions and conjectures.

Problem 1. Is it possible to describe when a linear ordinary differential equation with polynomial coefficients admits at least 2 polynomial solutions?

The prototype result of Varchenko-Scherbak gives a satisfactory answer for equations of the second order. The answer to the latter question allows to detect the appearance of multi-dimensional families of Stieltjes polynomials.

Problem 2. Under the nonresonance assumption (1.7) is it possible to obtain explicitly the discriminantal surface which shows when a Van Vleck polynomial attains a non-trivial multiplicity.

This question addresses the problem of explicit determination of the discriminantal surface mentioned in Heine's proof. Some discussion of this problem can be found in [39].

Problem 3. Explain how the number of Van Vlecks polynomials having Stieltjes polynomials for a certain given degree n can drop below $\binom{n+r}{r}$?

The next question addresses the issue of location of the roots of Van Vleck and Stieltjes polynomials.

Problem 4. Under what assumptions on $\mathfrak{d}(z)$ the roots of any its Van Vleck and Stieltjes polynomials lie in the convex hull of its leading coefficient $Q_k(z)$?

The basic examples are provided by Stieltjes's and Polya's theorems.

Finally,

Problem 5. Is it possible to extend the results of this paper to the case of degenerate higher Lamé operators?

T. Bergkvist [5] has obtained a number of interesting results and conjectures in the case of degenerate exactly solvable operators. Motivated by her results we formulate the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1. *For any degenerate Lamé operator and any positive integer N_0 the union of all the roots to polynomials V and S taken over $\deg S \geq N_0$ is always unbounded. Therefore, this property is a key distinction between non-degenerate and degenerate Lamé operators.*

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Alam, Zeros of Stieltjes and Van Vleck polynomials. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 252 (1979), 197–204.
- [2] N. Zaheer, M. Alam, On the zeros of Stieltjes and Van Vleck polynomials. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 229 (1977), 279–288.
- [3] A. M. Al-Rashed, N. Zaheer, Zeros of Stieltjes and Van Vleck polynomials and applications. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 110 (1985), no. 2, 327–339.
- [4] V. Arnold, A. Varchenko, S. Gusein-Zade, *Singularities of differentiable maps. Vol. I. The classification of critical points, caustics and wave fronts.* Translated from the Russian by Ian Porteous and Mark Reynolds. *Monographs in Mathematics*, 82. Birkhuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1985. xi+382 pp.
- [5] T. Bergkvist, On asymptotics of polynomial eigenfunctions for exactly solvable differential operators. *J. Approx. Theory* 149 (2007), no. 2, 151–187.
- [6] T. Bergkvist, H. Rullgård, On polynomial eigenfunctions for a class of differential operators. *Math. Res. Lett.* 9 (2002), no. 2-3, 153–171.
- [7] F. Beukers, A. van der Waall, Lamé equations with algebraic solutions. *J. Differential Equations* 197 (2004), no. 1, 1–25.
- [8] M. Bôcher, The roots of polynomials that satisfy certain differential equations of the second order, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 4, (1897), 256–258.
- [9] A. Bourget, D. Jakobson, M. Min-Oo, J. A. Toth, A law of large numbers for the zeroes of Heine-Stieltjes polynomials. *Lett. Math. Phys.* 64 (2003), no. 2, 105–118.
- [10] A. Bourget, Nodal statistics for the Van Vleck polynomials. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 230(3) (2002), 503–516.
- [11] A. Bourget, J. A. Toth, Asymptotic statistics of zeroes for the Lamé ensemble. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 222(3) (2001), 475–493.
- [12] W. Bruns, U. Vetter, *Determinantal rings.* *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 1327. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. viii+236 pp.
- [13] I. Dolgachev, *Weighted projective varieties. Group actions and vector fields* (Vancouver, B.C., 1981), 34–71, *Lecture Notes in Math.*, 956, Springer, Berlin, 1982.
- [14] A. Eremenko, A. Gabrielov, Elementary proof of the B. and M. Shapiro conjecture for rational functions, [math.AG/0512370](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0512370).
- [15] P. I. Etingof, A. A. Kirillov, Representations of affine Lie algebras, parabolic differential equations, and Lam functions. *Duke Math. J.* 74 (1994), no. 3, 585–614.
- [16] J. Garnett, *Analytic capacity and measure.* *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, Vol. 297. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1972. iv+138 pp.
- [17] I. Gelfand, M. Kapranov, A. Zelevinsky, *Discriminants, resultants, and multidimensional determinants.* *Mathematics: Theory & Applications.* Birkhuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994. x+523 pp.
- [18] E. Heine, *Handbuch der Kugelfunctionen*, Berlin: G. Reimer Verlag, (1878), vol.1, 472–479.
- [19] R. S. Maier, Algebraic solutions of the Lamé equation, revisited, *J. Differential Equations* 198(1) (2004), 16–34.
- [20] R. S. Maier, Lamé polynomials, hyperelliptic reductions and Lamé band structure. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 366 (2008), no. 1867, 1115–1153.
- [21] M. Marden, *Geometry of polynomials.* Second edition. *Mathematical Surveys*, No. 3 American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I. 1966 xiii+243 pp
- [22] M. Marden, On Stieltjes polynomials. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 33 (1931), no. 4, 934–944.

- [23] M. Marden, On the polynomial solutions of the generalized Lamé differential equation. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 1, (1950). 492–497.
- [24] G. Másson, B. Shapiro, On polynomial eigenfunctions of a hypergeometric-type operator. Experiment. Math. 10 (2001), no. 4, 609–618.
- [25] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, E. B. Saff, Asymptotic properties of Heine-Stieltjes and Van Vleck polynomials. J. Approx. Theory 118 (2002), no. 1, 131–151.
- [26] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, P. Martínez-González, R. Orive, Asymptotics of polynomial solutions of a class of generalized Lamé differential equations. Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal. 19 (2005), 18–28 (electronic).
- [27] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein Open problems I: Heine-Stieltjes polynomials, in Baratchart, L.; Martínez-Finkelshtein, A.; Jimenez, D.; Lubinsky, D. S.; Mhaskar, H. N.; Pritsker, I.; Putinar, M.; Stylianopoulos, N.; Totik, V.; Varju, P.; Xu, Y. Open problems in constructive function theory. Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal. 25 (2006), 511–525.
- [28] F. Marcellán, A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, P. Martínez-González, Electrostatic models for zeros of polynomials: old, new, and some open problems. J. Comput. Appl. Math. 207 (2007), no. 2, 258–272.
- [29] E. Mukhin, A. Varchenko, Critical points of master functions and flag varieties. Commun. Contemp. Math. 6(1) (2004), 111–163.
- [30] E. Mukhin, V. Tarasov, A. Varchenko, Higher Lamé equations and critical points of master functions. Mosc. Math. J. 7 (2007), no. 3, 533–542, 575.
- [31] G. Pólya, Sur un théoreme de Stieltjes, C. R. Acad. Sci Paris 155 (1912), 767–769.
- [32] Poole, E. G. C. *Introduction to the theory of linear differential equations*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York 1960 viii+202 pp.
- [33] N. Reshetikhin, A. Varchenko, Quasiclassical asymptotics of solutions to the KZ equations. (English summary) Geometry, topology, & physics, 293–322, Conf. Proc. Lecture Notes Geom. Topology, IV, Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.
- [34] I. Scherbak, Rational functions with prescribed critical points, Geom. Funct. Anal. 12(6) (2002), 1365–1380.
- [35] I. Scherbak, A. Varchenko, Critical points of functions, sl_2 -representations, and Fuchsian differential equations with only univalued solutions, Dedicated to Vladimir I. Arnold on the occasion of his 65th birthday. Mosc. Math. J. 3 (2003), no. 2, 621–645, 745.
- [36] G. M. Shah, On the zeros of Van Vleck polynomials. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 19 1968 1421–1426.
- [37] G. M. Shah, Monotonic variation of the zeros of Stieltjes and Van Vleck polynomials. J. Indian Math. Soc. (N.S.) 33 1969 85–92 (1970).
- [38] G. M. Shah, On the zeros of Stieltjes and Van Vleck polynomials. Illinois J. Math. 14 1970 522–528.
- [39] B. Shapiro, M. Shapiro, On eigenvalues of rectangular matrices, submitted.
- [40] B. Shapiro, M. Tater, On spectral polynomials of the Heun equation. I. arXiv:0812.2321, submitted.
- [41] T. J. Stieltjes, Sur certains polynomes. (French) Qui vérifient une équation différentielle linéaire du second ordre et sur la theorie des fonctions de Lamé. Acta Math. 6 (1885), no. 1, 321–326.
- [42] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal polynomials*. Fourth edition. American Mathematical Society, Colloquium Publications, Vol. XXIII. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1975. xiii+432 pp.
- [43] A. Turbiner, On polynomial solutions of differential equations. J.Math.Phys., vol.33 (1992), 3989–3994.
- [44] D. Dimitrov, W. Van Assche, Lamé differential equations and electrostatics. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 128 (2000), no. 12, 3621–3628.
- [45] E. B. van Vleck, On the polynomials of Stieltjes. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 4 (1898), no. 9, 426–438.
- [46] H. Volkmer, *Multiparameter eigenvalue problems and expansion theorems*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1356. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. vi+157 pp.
- [47] E. Whittaker and G. Watson, *A course of modern analysis*, 4th edn., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, (1963).
- [48] N. Zaheer, On Stieltjes and Van Vleck polynomials. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 60 (1976), 169–174 (1977).