

Spectral curve and Hamiltonian structure of isomonodromic $SU(2)$ Calogero-Gaudin system

Kanehisa Takasaki

Department of Fundamental Sciences

Faculty of Integrated Human Studies, Kyoto University

Yoshida, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan

E-mail: takasaki@math.h.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Abstract

This paper presents an approach to the Hamiltonian structure of isomonodromic systems of matrix ODE's on a torus from their spectral curve. An isomonodromic analogue of the so called $SU(2)$ Calogero-Gaudin system is used for a case study of this approach. A clue of this approach is a mapping from the Lax equation to a dynamical system of a finite number of points on the spectral curve. The coordinates of these moving points give a new set of canonical variables, which have been used in the literature for separation of variables of many integrable systems including the usual $SU(2)$ Calogero-Gaudin system itself. The same machinery turns out to work for the isomonodromic system on a torus, though the separability is lost and the non-autonomous nature of the system causes technical complications. Strong evidence is shown which suggests that this isomonodromic system is equivalent to a previously known isomonodromic system of second order scalar ODE's on a torus.

arXiv nlin.SI/0111019

I Introduction

The notion of isomonodromic deformations originates in the celebrated work of R. Fuchs [1]. Fuchs studied isomonodromic deformations of a second order linear ODE

$$\frac{d^2}{dz^2} + p_1(z)\frac{dy}{dz} + p_2(z)y = 0$$

with five regular singular points (four of them being generic and the fifth apparent) on the Riemann sphere, and discovered a nonlinear ODE that is nowadays called the sixth Painlevé equation. His work was soon generalized by Garnier [2] and Schlesinger [3] in different directions. Whereas Garnier extended the work of Fuchs to a second order linear ODE with more singularities (including irregular ones as well), Schlesinger studied a matrix system of the form

$$\frac{dY}{dz} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{A_j}{z - t_j} Y,$$

and obtained the so called Schlesinger system

$$\frac{\partial A_k}{\partial t_j} = (1 - \delta_{jk}) \frac{[A_k, A_j]}{t_k - t_j} - \delta_{jk} \sum_{l \neq k} \frac{[A_k, A_l]}{t_k - t_l}$$

that characterizes isomonodromic deformations. It turned out afterwards [4] that Garnier's isomonodromic deformations of a second order scalar ODE with an arbitrary number of regular singular points can be reproduced from the 2×2 Schlesinger system.

The next stage of generalization is, naturally, isomonodromic deformations on a torus. This issue was first tackled by Okamoto [5], who obtained a system of isomonodromic deformations of a second order scalar ODE on a torus. One of his remarkable results is that the isomonodromic system on a torus can be formulated as a Hamiltonian system in much the same way as Garnier's isomonodromic system on a sphere was converted to a Hamiltonian system [6]. Iwasaki [7] extended Okamoto's work to scalar ODE's of an arbitrary order on an arbitrary compact Riemann surface, and elucidated the geometric origin of the Hamiltonian structure that Okamoto derived. The study of isomonodromic systems on a torus was further refined by Okamoto himself [8] and Kawai [9].

As regards matrix systems, Korotkin and Samtleben [10] constructed an example of isomonodromic deformations of a 2×2 matrix system on a torus. Levin and Olshanetsky

[11] developed a general framework in which the Schlesinger system and Korotkin and Samtleben’s isomonodromic system are placed, along with generalizations to higher genus Riemann surfaces, in a unified way. A few more examples of matrix systems on a torus with different structures are also known [12, 13, 14]. Compared with Okamoto and Iwasaki’s formulation, these “elliptic analogues of the Schlesinger system” are obtained on entirely different grounds — conformal field theories, principal (or vector) bundles on a torus, KZ equations, and integrable systems arising therein. This can be seen from the structure of the matrix system

$$\frac{dY}{dz} = L(z)Y$$

to consider isomonodromic deformations. Namely, the matrix $L(z)$ in these isomonodromic systems is borrowed from the isospectral Lax equation of an integrable system. Accordingly, each of these isomonodromic systems has an isospectral partner. The isospectral partner of Korotkin and Samtleben’s isomonodromic system is the Calogero-Gaudin system [15, 16] for the $SU(2)$ group.

In this paper, we present a *spectral description* of the Hamiltonian structure of Korotkin and Samtleben’s isomonodromic system (though it seems likely that the same approach will be possible for other elliptic analogues of the Schlesinger system as well). This description is based on the “spectral curve”

$$C = \{(z, w) \mid \det(wI - L(z)) = 0\}$$

of the L -matrix. The basic idea stems from the work of the Montreal group (Harnad et al.) on the notion of “spectral Darboux coordinates” for isospectral systems with a rational L -matrix [17] and its variant for isomonodromic systems on a sphere [18, 19]. As they demonstrated for these systems, one can construct a mapping from the Lax equation of this type of systems to a dynamical system of a finite number of points P_1, \dots, P_N on the spectral curve C (though the spectral curve itself becomes dynamical in the case of isomonodromic systems). Spectral Darboux coordinates are the coordinates $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_N$ of the moving points $P_k = (\lambda_k, \mu_k)$. In the case of isospectral system, they lead to “separation of variables” of the system. The most classical case is the so called Moser system [20]. It has a 2×2 rational L -matrix, and the spectral curve is a hyperelliptic curve. The spectral description of this system, worked out by Moser

himself, is a modern version of the classical theory of separation of variables by ellipsoidal coordinates and hyperelliptic integrals. Remarkably, as Harnad and Wisse pointed out for the cases related to the Painlevé equations, almost the same story (apart from the loss of separability) repeats on the isomonodromic side! The 2×2 Schlesinger system and its extensions including irregular singular points may be thought of as an isomonodromic analogue of the Moser system, and the associated spectral Darboux coordinates turn out to be exactly the canonical variables that Okamoto [6] use in his reformulation of Garnier’s work [4] on the 2×2 Schlesinger system (though Okamoto himself was not aware of such a link with the spectral curve). The goal of this paper is to illustrate a similar approach to “elliptic analogues” of the Schlesinger system.

The spectral description (or separation of variables) of the usual $SU(2)$ Calogero-Gaudin system has been developed by Brzeziński [21] and Enriquez et al. [22] (including “quantum separation of variables” in the sense of Sklyanin [23]). We shall more or less follow their methods, in particular, that of Brzeziński. Actually, it is a rational model of the $SU(2)$ Calogero-Gaudin system (rather than the elliptic model) that he considered. Thus we are to extend his method in two-fold ways — firstly, to an elliptic model (which is the subject of the work of Enriquez et al.), and secondly, to an isomonodromic system.

This paper is organized as follows. Sections II and III are for preparation. In Section II, the Poisson structure of the L -matrix is described by a dynamical r -matrix. In Section III, the isomonodromic system is formulated in the Hamiltonian and Lax forms. Section IV and V are the main part of this paper. In Section IV, the spectral curve and the spectral Darboux coordinates are introduced. Unlike the case of isospectral systems, the Hamiltonians are non-autonomous, and the canonical transformation to these new variables are time-dependent. This enforces some extra effort on us to determine the final form of the Hamiltonian structure in the spectral Darboux coordinates. Section V is devoted to this issue. In Section VI, we slightly change the topic, and consider a possible link with isomonodromic deformations of a second order scalar ODE. Some more remarks are supplemented in Section VII along with our conclusion. A few technical details are collected in Appendices.

II L -matrix and Poisson structure

II.1 L -matrix

Following the idea of Korotkin and Samtleben [10], we start from the L -matrix

$$L(z) = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & -p \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{j=1}^N \begin{pmatrix} \zeta(z - t_j) A_j^3 & \phi(q, z - t_j) A_j^- \\ \phi(-q, z - t_j) A_j^+ & -\zeta(z - t_j) A_j^3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where q and p are Calogero variables, A_j^\pm and A_j^3 are spin variables, $\zeta(z)$ denotes the Weierstrass ζ function and $\phi(u, z)$ the auxiliary function that is widely used in the study of systems of the Calogero type:

$$\zeta(z) = \frac{\sigma'(z)}{\sigma(z)}, \quad \phi(u, z) = \frac{\sigma(u - z)}{\sigma(u)\sigma(z)}. \quad (2)$$

Here $\sigma(z)$ is Weierstrass sigma function, and the prime stands for a derivative, i.e., $\sigma'(z) = d\sigma(z)/dz$. Let $2\omega_1$ and $2\omega_3$ denote the primitive periods of the Weierstrass functions. Throughout this paper, we assume that $t_j \neq t_k$ if $j \neq k$.

This L -matrix is slightly different from that of Korotkin and Samtleben [10]. They use Jacobi's elliptic theta function ϑ_1 rather than Weierstrass' sigma function σ . Their L -matrix is thereby more suited for formulating isomonodromic deformations against the modulus τ . We dare to modify Korotkin and Samtleben's L -matrix because this simplifies the use of interpolation formulae of elliptic functions. It should be possible to start from the L -matrix of Korotkin and Samtleben and to derive substantially the same results, though we shall not pursue it in this paper.

The Poisson structure of the dynamical variables is a standard one. The Calogero variables q, p are, in fact, the relative coordinate $q_1 - q_2$ and momentum $(p_1 - p_2)/2$ of a two body system with canonical variables (q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2) , and become a canonically conjugate pair $\{q, p\} = 1$ in themselves. The spin variables A_j^\pm, A_j^3 obey the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ relations

$$\{A_j^3, A_k^\pm\} = \pm \delta_{jk} A_k^\pm, \quad \{A_j^+, A_k^-\} = 2\delta_{jk} A_k^3 \quad (3)$$

with respect to the Poisson bracket.

The Poisson bracket of the spin variables is nothing but the Kostant-Killilov bracket for the residue matrix

$$A_j = \begin{pmatrix} A_j^3 & A_j^- \\ A_j^+ & -A_j^3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

of $L(z)$ at $z = t_j$. The conjugacy class

$$\mathcal{O}_j = \{A_j \mid A_j \sim \text{diag}(\theta_j/2, -\theta_j/2)\} \quad (5)$$

of semi-simple matrices with fixed eigenvalues $\pm\theta_j/2$ is a maximal (two-dimensional) symplectic leaf of this Poisson structure. One can use a canonically conjugate pair (x_j, ξ_j) , $\{x_j, \xi_j\} = 1$, to parametrize this symplectic leaf as follows:

$$A_j^+ = -\frac{\xi_j^2}{2} + \frac{\theta_j^2}{2x_j^2}, \quad A_j^- = \frac{x_j^2}{2}, \quad A_j^3 = \frac{x_j \xi_j}{2}. \quad (6)$$

Note that this parametrization is consistent with the Poisson bracket of $A_j^{\pm,3}$.

II.2 Poisson bracket of L -matrix elements

Let us write the matrix elements of $L(z)$ as

$$L(z) = \begin{pmatrix} A(u) & B(u) \\ C(u) & -A(u) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

More explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned} A(u) &= p + \sum_{j=1}^N \zeta(z - t_j) A_j^3, \\ B(u) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(q, z - t_j) A_j^-, \\ C(u) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(-q, z - t_j) A_j^+. \end{aligned}$$

The non-zero Poisson brackets of these matrix elements take the form

$$\{A(z), B(w)\} = B(z)\phi(-q, z - w) - B(w)\zeta(z - w), \quad (8)$$

$$\{A(z), C(w)\} = -C(z)\phi(q, z - w) + C(w)\zeta(z - w), \quad (9)$$

$$\{B(z), C(w)\} = 2(A(z) - A(w))\phi(q, z - w) + 2\phi_u(q, z - w) \sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3. \quad (10)$$

where

$$\phi_u(u, z) = \frac{\partial \phi(u, z)}{\partial u}.$$

Thus the Poisson algebra of the matrix elements of $L(z)$ *almost closes* up to the extra term proportional to $\sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3$, which is later set to zero in order to derive the Lax equation.

These Poisson commutation relations can be easily verified by direct calculations using the functional identity

$$\phi(u, z)\phi(-u, w) + \phi(u, z - w)(\zeta(z) - \zeta(w)) + \phi_u(u, z - w) = 0 \quad (11)$$

of the auxiliary functions. This functional identity is a consequence of the more general one

$$\phi(u, z)\phi(v, w) + \phi(u + v, z)\phi(-v, z - w) - \phi(u + v, w)\phi(u, z - w) = 0, \quad (12)$$

from which the former identity can be derived by letting $v \rightarrow -u$.

The Poisson structure of the $L(z)$ -matrix elements can be cast into the compact form

$$\begin{aligned} \{L(z) \otimes L(w)\} &= \sum_{a,b,c,d} \{L_{ab}(z), L_{cd}(w)\} E_{ab} \otimes E_{cd} \\ &= [L(z) \otimes I + I \otimes L(w), r(z - w)] + 2 \frac{\partial r(z - w)}{\partial q} \sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where E_{ab} denotes the matrix with the (a, b) element equal to 1 and the other elements vanishing. The r -matrix takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} r(z - w) &= \zeta(z - w) E_{11} \otimes E_{11} + \phi(q, z - w) E_{12} \otimes E_{21} \\ &\quad + \phi(-q, z - w) E_{21} \otimes E_{12} + \zeta(z - w) E_{22} \otimes E_{22} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \zeta(z - w) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \phi(q, z - w) & 0 \\ 0 & \phi(-q, z - w) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \zeta(z - w) \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

which is a special case of the well known dynamical r -matrix of the elliptic Calogero-Moser system [24, 25, 26].

III Hamiltonians and Lax equations

III.1 Hamiltonians

We now introduce the Hamiltonians

$$\mathcal{H}_j = \text{Res}_{z=t_j} \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} L(z)^2, \quad (15)$$

which can be written, more explicitly, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_j = & pA_j^3 + 2 \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) A_j^3 A_k^3 \\ & + \sum_{k \neq j} \phi(-q, t_j - t_k) A_j^- A_k^+ + \sum_{k \neq j} \phi(q, t_j - t_k) A_j^+ A_k^-. \end{aligned}$$

Note that these Hamiltonians depend on the time variables explicitly; the associated Hamiltonian system is thus non-autonomous. As we show below, these Hamiltonians *almost commute* up to a term proportional to the factor $\sum_j A_j$.

To this end, we use the general formula

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{m} \text{Tr} L(z)^m, \frac{1}{k} \text{Tr} L(w)^k \right\} = \text{Tr} \left(\{L(z) \otimes L(w)\} L(z)^{m-1} \otimes L(w)^{k-1} \right). \quad (16)$$

Inserting the Poisson commutation relations (13) into the right hand side, we obtain the identity

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} L(z)^2, \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} L(w)^2 \right\} = 2 \text{Tr} \left(\frac{\partial r(z-w)}{\partial q} L(z) \otimes L(w) \right) \sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3, \quad (17)$$

which implies that the Poisson brackets of the Hamiltonians are proportional to $\sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3$:

$$\{\mathcal{H}_j, \mathcal{H}_k\} \propto \sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3. \quad (18)$$

Moreover, as direct calculations show, the factor $\sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3$ itself commutes with the Hamiltonians:

$$\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3, \mathcal{H}_k \right\} = 0. \quad (19)$$

These relations ensure that one can consistently impose the constraint

$$\sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3 = 0, \quad (20)$$

which is preserved by the Hamiltonian flows

$$\frac{\partial q}{\partial t_j} = \{q, \mathcal{H}_j\}, \quad \frac{\partial p}{\partial t_j} = \{p, \mathcal{H}_j\}, \quad \frac{\partial A_k}{\partial t_j} = \{A_k, \mathcal{H}_j\}. \quad (21)$$

This constrained non-autonomous Hamiltonian system is our elliptic analogue of the Schesinger system.

III.2 Calculating $\{L(z), \mathcal{H}_j\}$

Our next task is to calculate the Poisson bracket

$$\{L(z), \mathcal{H}_j\} = \sum_{a,b} \{L_{ab}(z), \mathcal{H}_j\} E_{ab}$$

of the L -matrix with the Hamiltonians. To this end, one can use another general formula

$$\left\{L(z), \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr } L(w)^n\right\} = \text{Tr}_2 \left(\{L(z) \otimes L(w)\} I \otimes L(w)^{n-1} \right), \quad (22)$$

where Tr_2 denotes the trace over the second component of the tensor product:

$$\text{Tr}_2 \left(\sum_{a,b,c,d} X_{abcd} E_{ab} \otimes E_{cd} \right) = \sum_{a,b} \left(\sum_c X_{abcc} \right) E_{ab}.$$

Plugging the Poisson commutation relation (13) into this formula, one obtains the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{L(z), \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr } L(w)^2\right\} &= \left[L(z), \text{Tr}_2(r(z-w)I \otimes L(w)) \right] \\ &\quad + 2 \text{Tr}_2 \left(\frac{\partial r(z-w)}{\partial q} I \otimes L(w) \right) \sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The residue at $w = t_j$ should give the Poisson bracket that we have sought. The residues of the quantities on the right hand can be easily evaluated:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{w=t_j} \text{Tr}_2(r(z-w)I \otimes L(w)) &= \begin{pmatrix} \zeta(z-t_j)A_j^3 & \phi(q, z-t_j)A_j^- \\ \phi(-q, z-t_j)A_j^+ & -\zeta(z-t_j)A_j^3 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \text{Res}_{w=t_j} \text{Tr}_2 \left(\frac{\partial r(z-w)}{\partial q} I \otimes L(w) \right) &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \phi_u(q, z-t_j)A_j^- \\ -\phi_u(-q, z-t_j)A_j^+ & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

One thus ends up with the identity

$$\{L(z), \mathcal{H}_j\} = [L(z), M_j(z)] + \text{term proportional to } \sum_{j=1}^N A_j^3, \quad (24)$$

where

$$M_j(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta(z-t_j)A_j^3 & \phi(q, z-t_j)A_j^- \\ \phi(-q, z-t_j)A_j^+ & -\zeta(z-t_j)A_j^3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

III.3 Isomonodromic Lax equation

We are now ready to rewrite the constrained Hamiltonian system (20)&(21) into an isomonodromic Lax equation.

Let us examine what occurs if the matrix elements of $L(z)$ are differentiated against t_j . For instance, the $(1, 2)$ element reads

$$L_{12}(z) = \sum_{k=1}^N \phi(q, z - t_k) A_k^-,$$

hence the Leibniz rule yields

$$\frac{\partial L_{12}(z)}{\partial t_j} = \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\phi_u(q, z - t_k) \frac{\partial q}{\partial t_j} A_k^- + \phi(q, z - t_k) \frac{\partial A_k^-}{\partial t_j} \right) - \phi'(q, z - t_j) A_j^-,$$

where

$$\phi'(u, z) = \frac{\partial \phi(q, z)}{\partial z}.$$

Note here that the last term on the right hand side is equal to $\partial M_{j,12}(z)/\partial z$. Since the t_j -derivatives of the dynamical variables can be expressed as the Poisson bracket with \mathcal{H}_j (see (21)), the foregoing equation can be rewritten

$$\frac{\partial L_{12}(z)}{\partial t_j} = \{L_{12}(z), \mathcal{H}_j\} - \frac{\partial M_{j,12}(z)}{\partial z}.$$

Repeating similar calculations for the other matrix elements, we can eventually confirm that

$$\frac{\partial L(z)}{\partial t_j} = \{L(z), \mathcal{H}_j\} - \frac{\partial M_j(z)}{\partial z}.$$

We now turn on the constraint (20) and apply the previous calculation converting the Poisson bracket $\{L(z), \mathcal{H}_j\}$ to the commutator $[L(z), M_j(z)]$. The outcome is the isomonodromic Lax equation

$$\frac{\partial L(z)}{\partial t_j} = [L(z), M_j(z)] - \frac{\partial M_j(z)}{\partial z} \tag{26}$$

with an extra term on the right hand side that breaks isospectrality of the L -matrix

IV Spectral curve and Darboux coordinates

IV.1 Spectral curve

The spectral curve is defined by the eigenvalue equation

$$\det(wI - L(z)) = 0. \quad (27)$$

Since $L(z)$ is trace-free, the left hand side can be rewritten as

$$\det(wI - L(z)) = w^2 + \det L(z) = w^2 - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr } L(z)^2. \quad (28)$$

Under the constraint (20), the matrix elements of $L(z)$ enjoy the following quasi-periodicity along the period lattice of the torus:

$$L(z + 2m\omega_1 + 2n\omega_3) = e^{-(2m\eta_1 + 2n\eta_3)Q} L(z) e^{-(2m\eta_1 + 2n\eta_3)Q}, \quad (29)$$

where Q is the diagonal matrix $Q = \text{diag}(q, -q)$, and η_1 and η_3 are the values of $\zeta(z)$ at $z = \omega_1, \omega_3$. The quasi-periodicity of $L(z)$ is a consequence of the quasi-periodicity of $\zeta(z)$ and $\phi(u, z)$,

$$\zeta(z + 2m\omega_1 + 2n\omega_3) = \zeta(z) + 2m\eta_1 + 2n\eta_3, \quad (30)$$

$$\phi(u, z + 2m\omega_1 + 2n\omega_3) = e^{-2m\eta_1 - 2n\eta_3} \phi(u, z), \quad (31)$$

which are easy to confirm from the property of the sigma function.

The quasi-periodicity of $L(z)$, in particular, implies the double periodicity of $\text{Tr } L(z)^2/2$, which thereby becomes an elliptic function with poles at $z = t_1, \dots, t_N$. Since

$$L(z) = \frac{A_j}{z - t_j} + O(1)$$

as $z \rightarrow t_j$, this elliptic function has a double pole at $z = t_j$ with the leading coefficient equal to the quadratic Casimir

$$C_j = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr } A_j^2 = \frac{\theta_j^2}{4} \quad (32)$$

of A_j . The residue is nothing but the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_j . Thus $\text{Tr } L(z)^2/2$ can be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr } L(z)^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N C_j \wp(z - t_j) + \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{H}_j \wp(z - t_j) + \mathcal{H}_0, \quad (33)$$

where \mathcal{H}_0 is a constant term (which however depends on ω_1 and ω_3). Also note that the Hamiltonians are not linearly independent, but obey the linear constraint

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{H}_j = 0. \quad (34)$$

This is a consequence of the the double periodicity of $\text{Tr } L(z)^2/2$.

The spectral curve thus turns out to be a double covering of the torus. The branch points are located above the (possibly multiple) $2N$ zeros of $\text{Tr } L(z)^2/2$. If these zeros are all simple, the genus of the spectral curve is equal to $N + 1$. The spectral curve is time-dependent because of the extra term $\partial M_j(z)/\partial z$ on the right hand side of the Lax equation.

IV.2 Spectral Darboux coordinates

The construction of spectral Darboux coordinates is parallel to the case of the rational (and isospectral) model [21]. The “coordinate part” $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$ are defined as the N zeros (modulo the period lattice) of $L_{12}(z)$,

$$L_{12}(\lambda_j) = 0, \quad (35)$$

and the “momentum part” μ_1, \dots, μ_N are defined to be the value of $L_{11}(z)$ at these points,

$$\mu_j = L_{11}(\lambda_j) = p + \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(\lambda_j - t_k) A_k^3. \quad (36)$$

In order to avoid a delicate problem, we assume throughout the following consideration that $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ if $j \neq k$. It is easy to see that (λ_j, μ_j) sits on the spectral curve; $L(\lambda_j)$ takes the triangular form

$$L(\lambda_j) = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_k & 0 \\ L_{21}(\lambda_j) & -\mu_k \end{pmatrix},$$

which implies that $\pm\mu_j$ are eigenvalues of $L(\lambda_j)$.

The λ_j ’s are constrained by a linear relation. To see this, let us note that $L_{12}(z)$ can be factorized as

$$L_{12}(z) = \kappa \frac{\prod_{j=1}^N \sigma(z - \lambda_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^N \sigma(z - t_j)}, \quad (37)$$

where κ is a constant that does not depend on z . The quasi-periodicity

$$L_{12}(z + 2m\omega_1 + 2n\omega_3) = e^{-(2m\eta_1 + 2n\eta_3)q} L_{12}(z)$$

of $L_{12}(z)$ implies that its zeros $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$ are constrained as

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^N t_j \equiv q \pmod{2\omega_1 \mathbf{Z} + 2\omega_3 \mathbf{Z}}. \quad (38)$$

Since each λ_j is defined only up to a difference by an element of the period lattice, let us redefine λ_j 's, if necessary, such that this holds without “mod $2\omega_1 \mathbf{Z} + 2\omega_3 \mathbf{Z}$ ”:

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^N t_j = q. \quad (39)$$

Of course this will be valid only for a *local* study of the system; this naive prescription has to be modified if one considers a global problem.

IV.3 Time-dependent canonical transformation

In order to prove the canonicity of these variables λ_j, μ_j , we now restrict the spin variables onto the direct product $\mathcal{O}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{O}_N$ of the symplectic leaves and use the parametrization (6) by (x_j, ξ_j) . Moreover, we tentatively relax the constraint (20), which now takes the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^N x_j \xi_j = 0, \quad (40)$$

and restore it in the final stage.

The factorization relation (37) of $L_{12}(z)$ now reads

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \phi(q, z - t_j) x_j^2 = \kappa \frac{Q(z)}{P(z)} \quad (41)$$

where we have introduced the two functions

$$Q(z) = \prod_{j=1}^N \sigma(z - \lambda_j), \quad P(z) = \prod_{j=1}^N \sigma(z - t_j). \quad (42)$$

This reduces to the relations

$$\frac{1}{2} x_j^2 = \kappa \frac{Q(t_j)}{P'(t_j)} = \kappa \frac{\prod_{k=1}^N \sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)}{\prod_{k \neq j} \sigma(t_j - t_k)} \quad (43)$$

of the residues of both hand sides at $z = t_j$. These relations show how the old variables x_j are connected with the new variables λ_j (and κ). By logarithmic differentiation, these relations can be further converted to the linear relations

$$\begin{aligned} 2d \log x_j &= d \log \kappa + \sum_{k=1}^N d \log \sigma(t_j - \lambda_k) - \sum_{k \neq j} d \log \sigma(t_j - t_k) \\ &= d \log \kappa + \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k)(dt_j - d\lambda_k) - \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k)(dt_j - dt_k). \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

of differential forms.

Our goal is to derive a relation between the canonical one-forms $\sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j dx_j + pdq$ and $\sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j d\lambda_j$. We first multiply the both hand sides of the last relation by $x_j \xi_j / 2$, sum over $j = 1, \dots, N$, and add pdq to both hand sides. We then obtain the linear relation

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j dx_j + pdq &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N x_j \xi_j d \log \kappa + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^N x_j \xi_j \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k)(dt_j - d\lambda_k) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq k} x_j \xi_j \zeta(t_j - t_k)(dt_j - dt_k) + pdq. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by differentiating (39), we have the relation

$$dq = \sum_{j=1}^N d\lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^N dt_j,$$

which we can use to eliminate the differential dq on the right hand side of the foregoing linear relation of one-forms. The right hand side thereby becomes a linear combination of $d \log \kappa$, $d\lambda_j$'s and dt_j 's, and the coefficient of $d\lambda_j$ turns out to be equal to μ_j by (36). We thus eventually find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j dx_j + pdq &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N x_j \xi_j d \log \kappa + \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j d\lambda_j \\ &\quad - p \sum_{j=1}^N dt_j + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^N x_j \xi_j \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k) dt_j \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq k} x_j \xi_j \zeta(t_j - t_k)(dt_j - dt_k). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The last equation shows that λ_j and μ_j are Darboux coordinates of the canonical one-form $\sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j dx_j + pdq$, and that $\log \kappa$ is a conjugate variable of the left hand side of constraint (40). This interpretation is fully parallel to the spectral description of rational isospectral systems [17, 18, 19].

An essential difference lies in the fact that the time variables explicitly enter the relation between the two canonical one-forms. This means that the spectral Darboux coordinates are connected with the old variables (x_j, ξ_j, q, p) by a *time-dependent* canonical transformation. Accordingly, the Hamiltonians (which is denoted by H_j in the following) in the spectral Darboux coordinates differ from the Hamiltonians \mathcal{H}_j in the old variables (x_j, ξ_j, q, p) . Their relation is to be determined by the fundamental formula

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j dx_j + pdq - \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{H}_j dt_j = \sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j d\lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^N H_j dt_j, \quad (46)$$

in which we have imposed the constraint (40). More explicitly, the new Hamiltonians are defined as

$$H_j = \mathcal{H}_j + p - \frac{1}{2} x_j \xi_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k) - \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) x_k \xi_k. \quad (47)$$

The goal of the next section is to rewrite the right hand side in terms of the spectral Darboux coordinates.

V Hamiltonians in spectral Darboux coordinates

V.1 Linear equations characterizing Hamiltonians

Let us recall that the pairs (λ_j, μ_j) of the spectral Darboux coordinates all sit on the spectral curve. Therefore the equations

$$\mu_k^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N C_j \wp(\lambda_k - t_j) + \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{H}_j \zeta(\lambda_k - t_j) + \mathcal{H}_0$$

are satisfied for $k = 1, \dots, N$. These equations, along with the linear constraint (34), may be thought of as a system of linear equations that determine \mathcal{H}_j 's. In fact, as we shall discuss afterwards, these linear equations can be solved for \mathcal{H}_j 's, which thereby becomes an explicit function of the spectral Darboux coordinates (and of the time variables).

If the system in consideration were an isospectral system (such as the Moser system or the usual Calogero-Gaudin system), the time variables would not appear here explicitly, and \mathcal{H}_j 's would be the Hamiltonians that we have sought. The only problem would have been to solve the foregoing linear equations for \mathcal{H}_j . This is, actually, what Brzeziński

[21] and Enriquez et al. [22] did in their work on separation of variables of the $SU(2)$ Calogero-Gaudin system.

In the present case, the true Hamiltonians are *not* \mathcal{H}_j 's but H_j 's. We have to rewrite the extra terms on the right hand side of (47), too, as a function of the spectral Darboux coordinates. This is another problem that we have to solve.

To this end, let us note that the defining equation (36) of μ_j , which can be rewritten as

$$\mu_k = \sum_{j=1}^N \zeta(\lambda_k - t_j) \frac{x_j \xi_j}{2} + p,$$

may be thought of as a system of linear equations for p and $x_j \xi_j/2$. If one can solve these equations for p and $x_j \xi_j/2$, the solution should be an expression of p and $x_j \xi_j/2$ as a function of the spectral Darboux coordinates. Remarkably, these linear equations have the same coefficients as the foregoing linear equations for \mathcal{H}_0 and \mathcal{H}_j . Moreover, $x_j \xi_j/2$ obey the linear constraint (40), in perfect analogy with the linear constraint (34) for \mathcal{H}_j !

Thus the two problems, one for \mathcal{H}_j and the other for the extra terms in (47), can be reduced to a single problem, namely, solving a system of linear equations of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N \zeta(\lambda_k - t_j) X_j + X_0 &= b_k \quad (k = 1, \dots, N), \\ \sum_{j=1}^N X_j &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

As we shall show below, this system of linear equations has a unique and explicit solution.

V.2 Solution of linear equations

We assume that $q \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2\omega_1 \mathbf{Z} + 2\omega_3 \mathbf{Z}}$ or, equivalently, $\sigma(q) \neq 0$. The following ensures the uniqueness of solution of (48).

Lemma 1 *If $b_j = \dots = b_N = 0$, then $X_0 = X_1 = \dots = X_N = 0$.*

Proof. Consider the function

$$f(z) = \sum_{j=1}^N \zeta(z - t_j) X_j + X_0.$$

The first N equations of (48) imply that $f(z)$ has zeros at $z = \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N$. The remaining one ensures that $f(z)$ is a doubly periodic meromorphic function on the z -plane. All possible poles are obviously simple and confined to $z = t_1, \dots, t_N$ and their translations by the period lattice. Therefore, if $f(z)$ is not identically zero, the zeros λ_j and the poles t_j are constrained as

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^N t_j \equiv 0 \pmod{2\omega_1 \mathbf{Z} + 2\omega_3 \mathbf{Z}},$$

but this contradicts the assumption that $q \neq 0$; recall the constraint (39). Thus $f(z)$ is identically zero, and all the coefficients X_0, X_1, \dots, X_N have to be zero. *Q.E.D.*

Having proven the uniqueness, the problem is to find a solution by any means. This can be done with the aid of an elliptic analogue of Cauchy's interpolation formula (see Appendix A).

Lemma 2 *A solution of (48) is given by*

$$X_j = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)b_k}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(q)}, \quad (49)$$

$$X_0 = - \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)\zeta(\lambda_k - t_j - q)b_k}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(q)}. \quad (50)$$

Proof. We have only to confirm that these X_j and X_0 do satisfy (48). The last equation of (48) is indeed satisfied as (A.1) shows. As regards the other equations of (48), the main task is to calculate

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \zeta(\lambda_l - t_j)X_j = \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} \zeta(\lambda_l - t_j) \right) \frac{P(\lambda_k)b_k}{Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(q)}.$$

We can use the two identities (A.3) and (A.4) to rewrite the sum over j on the right hand side, and find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N \zeta(\lambda_l - t_j)X_j &= \sum_{k,j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)\zeta(\lambda_k - t_j - q)b_k}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(q)} + b_l \\ &= -X_0 + b_l, \end{aligned}$$

which is nothing but the first N equations of (48). *Q.E.D.*

V.3 Writing H_j explicitly

Let us apply the foregoing formulae (49) and (50) of solution of (48) to the problem of deriving an explicit form of H_j as a function of the spectral Darboux coordinates.

If we use the formulae to the case where

$$X_j = \mathcal{H}_j, \quad X_0 = \mathcal{H}_0, \quad b_k = \mu_k^2 - \sum_{l=1}^N C_l \wp(\lambda_k - t_l),$$

we find the following expression of \mathcal{H}_j and \mathcal{H}_0 :

$$\mathcal{H}_j = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(q)} \left(\mu_k^2 - \sum_{l=1}^N C_l \wp(\lambda_k - t_l) \right), \quad (51)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = - \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)\zeta(\lambda_k - t_j - q)}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(q)} \left(\mu_k^2 - \sum_{l=1}^N C_l \wp(\lambda_k - t_l) \right). \quad (52)$$

Similarly, if we use the formulae in the case where

$$X_j = \frac{1}{2}x_j\xi_j, \quad X_0 = p, \quad b_k = \mu_k.$$

we find the following expression of $x_j\xi_j/2$ and p as a function of the spectral Darboux coordinates:

$$\frac{1}{2}x_j\xi_j = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)\mu_k}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(q)}, \quad (53)$$

$$p = - \sum_{j,k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)\zeta(\lambda_k - t_j - q)\mu_k}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(q)}. \quad (54)$$

Thus we have been able to rewrite each term on the right hand side of (47) to an explicit function of the spectral Darboux coordinates.

Although the extra terms on the right hand side of (47) still appear to be in disorder, one can see by but straightforward calculations (see Appendix B) that the sum of these terms boils down to a form similar to the foregoing expression of \mathcal{H}_j :

$$\begin{aligned} & p - \frac{1}{2}x_j\xi_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k) - \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) x_k \xi_k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} (\zeta(t_j - \lambda_k + q) - \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k)) \mu_k. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Combining these results, we obtain the following expression of H_j in terms of the spectral Darboux coordinates:

$$H_j = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(q)} \times \\ \times \left(\mu_k^2 + (\zeta(t_j - \lambda_k + q) - \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k))\mu_k - \sum_{l=1}^N C_l \wp(\lambda_k - t_l) \right). \quad (56)$$

The finishing stroke is to eliminate q by (39):

$$H_j = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_k)\sigma(\sum_{l \neq k} \lambda_l - \sum_{l \neq j} t_l)}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)\sigma(\sum_{l=1}^N \lambda_l - \sum_{l=1}^N t_l)} \times \\ \times \left(\mu_k^2 + (\zeta(t_j - \lambda_k + q) - \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k))\mu_k - \sum_{l=1}^N C_l \wp(\lambda_k - t_l) \right). \quad (57)$$

VI Relation to second order scalar ODE

One can derive from any 2×2 matrix system

$$\frac{dY}{dz} = L(z)Y, \quad Y = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

a second order scalar ODE of the form

$$\frac{d^2 y_1}{dz^2} + p_1(z) \frac{dy_1}{dz} + p_2(z) y_1 = 0. \quad (58)$$

The coefficients $p_1(z)$ and $p_2(z)$ are determined by the matrix elements of $L(z)$ as

$$p_1(z) = -\text{Tr } L(z) - (\log L_{12}(z))', \quad (59)$$

$$p_2(z) = \det L(z) - L'_{11}(z) + L_{11}(z)(\log L_{12}(z))', \quad (60)$$

where the prime stands for the derivative in z , i.e., $' = d/dz$. This is a fully algebraic (or differential-algebraic) manipulation that does not rely upon the detail of $L(z)$. Formally, one can further eliminate the first order term by the “gauge transformation”

$$y_1 = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \int^z p_1(z) dz\right) y, \quad (61)$$

and obtain the equation

$$\frac{d^2 y}{dz^2} + p(z)y = 0, \quad (62)$$

where

$$p(z) = -\frac{1}{2}p_1'(z) - \frac{1}{4}p_1(z)^2 + p_2(z). \quad (63)$$

This step is more delicate, because the indefinite integral of $p_1(z)$ may cause complications in a topologically nontrivial setting.

Let us apply this general procedure to the matrix system on the torus that we have started from. Since $L(z)$ is trace-free, the foregoing formulae of $p_1(z)$ and $p_2(z)$ become slightly simpler. In particular, $p_1(z)$ can now be written explicitly as

$$p_1(z) = -(\log L_{12}(z))' = -\sum_{j=1}^N \zeta(z - \lambda_j) + \sum_{j=1}^N \zeta(z - t_j), \quad (64)$$

which implies that $p_1(z)$ is doubly periodic. $p_2(z)$ is also doubly periodic (as the quasi-periodicity of the matrix elements of $L(z)$ implies), and now given by the formula

$$p_2(z) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr } L(z)^2 - L'_{11}(z) + L_{11}(z)(\log L_{12}(z))'. \quad (65)$$

One can see from this formula that $p_2(z)$ has simple poles at $z = \lambda_j$ and double poles at $z = t_j$. One can therefore express $p_2(z)$ as

$$p_2(z) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j \wp(z - t_j) + \sum_{j=1}^N \beta_j \zeta(z - t_j) + \sum_{j=1}^N \gamma_j \zeta(z - \lambda_j) + \delta$$

with the coefficients to be determined by Laurent expansion at the poles. The first coefficient can be readily determined:

$$\alpha_j = -C_j = -\text{Tr } A_j^2/2. \quad (66)$$

The second and third coefficients β_j, γ_j turn out to be, up to signature, H_j and μ_j as we now show below.

β_j and γ_j are the residues of $p_2(z)$ at $z = t_j$ and $z = \lambda_j$. Let us examine the residue of each term in the foregoing expression (65) of $p_2(z)$. Note that $L'_{11}(z)$ does not contribute to the residues. At $z = t_j$, the residues of the other terms can be expressed as

$$-\text{Res}_{z=t_j} \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr } L(z)^2 = -\mathcal{H}_j$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{z=t_j} L_{11}(z)(\log L_{12}(z))' &= -p - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) x_k \xi_k \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} x_j \xi_j \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k) - \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As (47) shows, their sum is equal to $-H_j$, so that

$$\beta_j = \operatorname{Res}_{z=t_j} p_2(z) = -H_j. \quad (67)$$

At $z = \lambda_j$, on the other hand,

$$-\operatorname{Res}_{z=\lambda_j} \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} L(z)^2 = 0$$

and

$$\operatorname{Res}_{z=\lambda_j} L_{11}(z)(\log L_{12}(z))' = L_{11}(\lambda_j) = \mu_j.$$

Therefore

$$\gamma_j = \operatorname{Res}_{z=\lambda_j} p_2(z) = \mu_j. \quad (68)$$

What we have seen above is almost the same setting as Okamoto [8] and Kawai [9] studied in their work on isomonodromic deformations of a second order scalar ODE on a torus. A difference is that they consider a scalar ODE without the first order term. This difference, however, can be removed by the aforementioned gauge transformation, which now takes the form

$$y_1 = \left(\frac{\prod_{j=1}^N \sigma(z - \lambda_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^N \sigma(z - t_j)} \right)^{1/2} y. \quad (69)$$

One can see from the definition (63) that the zero-th order term $p(z)$ of the transformed ODE is a doubly periodic meromorphic function with second order poles at $z = \lambda_j, t_j$. Moreover, having done the foregoing calculations, one can easily calculate the residues of $p(z)$ as follows:

$$\operatorname{Res}_{z=\lambda_j} p(z) = \mu_j - 2 \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(\lambda_j - t_k) + 2 \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(\lambda_j - \lambda_k), \quad (70)$$

$$\operatorname{Res}_{z=t_j} p(z) = -H_j - 2 \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k) + 2 \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k). \quad (71)$$

It is rather these quantities that Okamoto uses as Hamiltonians and conjugate “momenta” of λ_j ’s. We can indeed reformulate our Hamiltonian system in that way. Namely, if we define

$$\nu_j = \operatorname{Res}_{z=\lambda_j}, \quad K_j = \operatorname{Res}_{z=t_j} p(z), \quad (72)$$

these quantities turn out to satisfy the equation

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mu_j d\lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^N H_j dt_j = \sum_{j=1}^N \nu_j d\lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^N K_j dt_j + \text{exact form}, \quad (73)$$

which means that λ_j 's and ν_j 's are a new set of Darboux coordinates connected with the previous ones by a time-dependent canonical transformation, and that K_j 's are the associated Hamiltonians. This is an elliptic analogue of the two equivalent representations of the Hamiltonian structure in Garnier's isomonodromic system [6].

VII Conclusion

We have demonstrated that the spectral description of the Hamiltonian structure works for Korotkin and Samtleben's isomonodromic system on a torus as well. The final Hamiltonians H_j turn out to be a rather complicated function of the spectral Darboux coordinates and the time variables. The consideration on the reduction of the 2×2 system to a scalar ODE suggests strongly that our Hamiltonian system is equivalent to Okamoto's isomonodromic system of second order scalar ODE's on a torus [8], which he proposed as an elliptic analogue of Garnier's isomonodromic systems on a sphere [2, 6]. Thus, in a sense, we have done an elliptic version of Garnier's work [4] (refined by Okamoto [6]) on the reduction of the 2×2 Schlesinger system to one of his isomonodromic systems.

It deserves to be mentioned that our work indirectly shows the existence of a seemingly new isomonodromic system as well. This system emerges in the limit as the torus degenerates to a cylinder or a sphere. This amounts to replacing the basic functions $\sigma(z)$, $\zeta(z)$ and $\phi(u, z)$ by trigonometric or rational functions as follows:

1. Trigonometric model

$$\sigma(z) = \sin z, \quad \zeta(z) = \frac{\cos z}{\sin z}, \quad \phi(u, z) = \frac{\cos z}{\sin z} - \frac{\cos u}{\sin u}. \quad (74)$$

2. Rational model

$$\sigma(z) = z, \quad \zeta(z) = \frac{1}{z}, \quad \phi(u, z) = \frac{1}{z} - \frac{1}{u}. \quad (75)$$

A hyperbolic model will be obtained if one replaces the trigonometric functions by the corresponding hyperbolic functions. These are nothing but the well known pattern of

degeneration of the Calogero-Moser systems; the Calogero-Gaudin systems, too, obey this pattern. In fact, it is the rational model in this list that Brzeziński considered in his work [21]. One can formulate an isomonodromic analogue of these degenerate Calogero-Gaudin systems just as we have done for the elliptic model. Presumably, those isomonodromic systems will not be known in the literature.

Another interesting open problem is to give a spectral description of the isomonodromic $SU(2)$ pure Gaudin system [12, 14]. Separation of variables of the isospectral partner was studied by Sklyanin and Takebe [27] (see also the paper of Hurtubise and Kjiri [28] for geometric aspects). The work of Sklyanin and Takebe shows that separation of variables of this system is technically far more complicated than the Calogero-Gaudin system. This will be also the case for the isomonodromic analogue.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Shingo Kawai and Takashi Takebe for many useful comments. This work is partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No. 12640169) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Technology.

A Interpolation formula

Let us examine the auxiliary function

$$f_k(z) = \frac{Q(z)\sigma(z - \lambda_k + q)}{P(z)\sigma(z - \lambda_k)}.$$

This is a doubly periodic meromorphic function with simple zeros at λ_j ($j \neq k$) and $\lambda_k - q$ and simple poles at t_j ($j = 1, \dots, N$). By the residue theorem, the residues

$$\operatorname{Res}_{z=t_j} f_k(z) = \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)}$$

at the poles $z = t_j$ obey the sum-to-zero constraint

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} = 0. \tag{A.1}$$

Let us consider the linear combination

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} \zeta(z - t_j)$$

of $\zeta(z - t_j)$ weighted by these residues. Since this function is a doubly periodic meromorphic function with the same set of simple poles and residues as $f_k(z)$, it differs from $f_k(z)$ by at most a constant:

$$\frac{Q(z)\sigma(z - \lambda_k + q)}{P(z)\sigma(z - \lambda_k)} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} \zeta(z - t_j) + \text{constant}.$$

Moreover, since the left hand side vanishes at $z = \lambda_k - q$, the constant term on the right hand side can be easily determined as follows:

$$\text{constant} = - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} \zeta(\lambda_k - t_j - q).$$

We thus obtain the interpolation formula

$$\frac{Q(z)\sigma(z - \lambda_k + q)}{P(z)\sigma(z - \lambda_k)} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} (\zeta(z - t_j) - \zeta(\lambda_k - t_j - q)). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

One can derive the following three identities from this interpolation formula.

1. Since the left hand side of the interpolation formula vanishes at $z = \lambda_l$ ($l \neq k$),

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} (\zeta(\lambda_l - t_j) - \zeta(\lambda_k - t_j - q)) = 0 \quad (l \neq k). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

2. By letting $z \rightarrow \lambda_k$ in the interpolation formula,

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_k)} (\zeta(\lambda_k - t_j) - \zeta(\lambda_k - t_j - q)) = \frac{Q'(\lambda_k)\sigma(q)}{P'(\lambda_k)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

3. By replacing $k \rightarrow l$, $j \rightarrow k$ and separating a term from the sum, the interpolation formula takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{Q(t_k)\sigma(t_k - \lambda_l + q)}{P'(t_k)\sigma(t_k - \lambda_l)} \zeta(z - t_k) \\ &= \frac{Q(z)\sigma(z - \lambda_l + q)}{P(z)\sigma(z - \lambda_l)} - \frac{Q(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_l + q)}{P'(t_j)\sigma(t_j - \lambda_l)} \zeta(z - t_j) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_k)\sigma(t_k - \lambda_l + q)}{P'(t_k)\sigma(t_k - \lambda_l)} \zeta(\lambda_l - t_k - q). \end{aligned}$$

By letting $z \rightarrow t_j$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k \neq j} \frac{Q(t_k) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l + q)}{P'(t_k) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l)} \zeta(t_j - t_k) \\
&= \frac{Q(t_j) \sigma(t_j - \lambda_l + q)}{P'(t_j) \sigma(t_j - \lambda_l)} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{P''(t_j)}{P'(t_j)} + \frac{Q'(t_j)}{Q(t_j)} - \zeta(t_j - \lambda_l) + \zeta(t_j - \lambda_l + q) \right) \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{Q(t_k) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l + q)}{P'(t_k) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l)} \zeta(\lambda_l - t_k - q). \tag{A.5}
\end{aligned}$$

B Calculation of extra terms in (47)

Let us use (53) to rewrite the last piece on the right hand side of (47) as

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - t_k) x_k \xi_k = \sum_{l=1}^N \left(\sum_{k \neq j} \frac{Q(t_k) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l + q)}{P'(t_k) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l)} \zeta(t_j - t_k) \right) \frac{P(\lambda_l) \mu_l}{Q'(\lambda_l) \sigma(q)}.$$

The sum over $k \neq j$ arising here has been partially calculated in (A.5). Using the identities

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{P''(t_j)}{P'(t_j)} = \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k), \quad \frac{Q'(t_j)}{Q(t_j)} = \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k)$$

on the right hand side of (A.5), one can rewrite the foregoing quantity as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - t_k) x_k \xi_k \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j) P(\lambda_l) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l + q) \mu_l}{P'(t_j) Q'(\lambda_l) \sigma(t_j - \lambda_l) \sigma(q)} \left(- \sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) + \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k) \right) \\
&+ \sum_{l=1}^N \frac{Q(t_j) P(\lambda_l) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l + q)}{P'(t_j) Q'(\lambda_l) \sigma(t_j - \lambda_l) \sigma(q)} (\zeta(t_j - \lambda_l + q) - \zeta(t_j - \lambda_l)) \mu_l \\
&+ \sum_{k,l=1}^N \frac{Q(t_k) P(\lambda_l) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l + q) \zeta(\lambda_l - t_k - q) \mu_l}{P'(t_k) Q'(\lambda_l) \sigma(t_k - \lambda_l) \sigma(q)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (53) and (54), the first and third lines on the right hand side turn into the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{first line} &= -\frac{1}{2} x_j \xi_j \left(\sum_{k \neq j} \zeta(t_j - t_k) - \sum_{k=1}^N \zeta(t_j - \lambda_k) \right), \\
\text{third line} &= -p.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the sum of these two cancels the second and third pieces on the right hand side of (47), we eventually obtain the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
& p - \frac{1}{2}x_j\xi_j\left(\sum_{k=1}^N\zeta(t_j-\lambda_k)-\sum_{k\neq j}\zeta(t_j-t_k)\right)+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{k\neq j}\zeta(t_j-t_k)x_k\xi_k \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^N\frac{Q(t_j)P(\lambda_l)\sigma(t_j-\lambda_l+q)}{P'(t_j)Q'(\lambda_l)\sigma(t_j-\lambda_l)\sigma(q)}(\zeta(t_j-\lambda_l+q)-\zeta(t_j-\lambda_l))\mu_l,
\end{aligned}$$

which is nothing but (55).

References

- [1] R. Fuchs, “Über lineare homogene Differentialgleichungen zweiter Ordnung mit im endlich gelegene wesentlich singulären Stellen,” *Math. Ann.* **63**, 301–321 (1907).
- [2] R. Garnier, “Sur des équations différentielles du troisième ordre dont l’intégrale est uniform et sur une classe d’équations nouvelles d’ordre supérieur dont l’intégrale générale à ses point critiques fixés,” *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)* **29**, 1–126 (1912).
- [3] L. Schlesinger, “Über eine Klasse von Differentialsystemen beliebiger Ordnung mit festen kritischer Punkten,” *J. für Math.* **141**, 96–145 (1912).
- [4] R. Garnier, “Solution du problème de Riemann pour les systèmes différentiels linéaires du second ordre,” *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)* **43**, 177–307 (1926).
- [5] K. Okamoto, “On Fuchs’s problem on a torus, I,” *Funkcial. Ekvac.* **14**, 137–152 (1971); “Sur le problème de Fuchs sur un tore, II,” *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sec. IA* **24**, 357–372 (1977); “Déformation d’une équation différentielle linéaire avec une singularité irrégulière sur un tore,” *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sec. IA* **26**, 501–518 (1979); “The Hamiltonian structure derived from the holonomic deformation of the linear ordinary differential equations on an elliptic curve,” *Sci. Papers, Col. Art. Sci. Univ. Tokyo* **37**, 1–11 (1987).
- [6] K. Okamoto, “Isomonodromic deformation and Painlevé equation, and the Garnier system,” *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sec. IA*, **33**575–618 (1986).
- [7] K. Iwasaki, “Moduli and deformation for Fuchsian projective connections on a Riemann surface,” *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sect. IA* **38**, 431–531 (1991); “Fuchsian moduli on Riemann surface — its Poisson structure and the Poincaré-Lefschetz duality,” *Pacific J. Math.* **155**, 319–340 (1992).
- [8] K. Okamoto, “On the holonomic deformations of linear ordinary differential equations on an elliptic curve,” *Kyushu J. Math.* **49**, 281–308 (1995).
- [9] S. Kawai, “Isomonodromic deformation of Fuchsian-type projective connections on elliptic curves,” *RIMS Kokyuroku vol. 1022*, pp.53–57 (RIMS, Kyoto University, 1997).

- [10] D.A. Korotkin and J.A.H. Samtleben, “On the quantization of isomonodromic deformations on the torus,” *Intern. J. Mod. Phys.* **A12**, 2013–2030 (1997).
- [11] A.M. Levin and M.A. Olshanetsky, “Painlevé-Calogero correspondence,” in *Calogero-Moser-Sutherland models*, CRM Ser. Math. Phys., pp. 313–332 (Springer, New York, 2000); “Hierarchies of isomonodromic deformations and Hitchin systems,” in *Moscow Seminar in Mathematical Physics*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, vol. 191, pp. 223–262 (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999).
- [12] K. Takasaki, “Gaudin model, KZ equation, and isomonodromic problem on torus,” *Lett. Math. Phys.* **44**, 143–156 (1998).
- [13] K. Takasaki, “Elliptic Calogero-Moser systems and isomonodromic deformations,” *J. Math. Phys.* **40**, 5787–5821 (1999).
- [14] D. Korotkin, N. Manojlović and H. Samtleben, “Schlesinger transformations for elliptic isomonodromic deformations,” *J. Math. Phys.* **41**, 3125–3141 (2000).
- [15] N. Nekrasov, “Holomorphic bundles and many body problems,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **180**, 587–603 (1996).
- [16] B. Enriquez and V. Rubtsov, “Hitchin systems, higher Gaudin operators and r -matrices,” *Math. Res. Lett.* **3**, 343–357 (1996).
- [17] M.R. Adams, J. Harnad and J. Hurtubise, “Darboux coordinates and Liouville-Arnold integration in loop algebras,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **155**, 385–413 (1993).
- [18] J. Harnad, “Dual isomonodromic deformations and moment maps to loop algebras,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **166**, 337–365 (1994).
- [19] J. Harnad and M.A. Wisse, “Loop algebra moment maps and Hamiltonian models for the Painlevé transcendents,” *AMS-Fields Inst. Commun.* **7**, 155–169 (1996).
- [20] J. Moser, “Geometry of quadrics and spectral theory,” in: W.-Y. Hsiang et al. (eds.), *The Chern Symposium 1979*, pp. 147–188 (Springer-Verlag, 1980).
- [21] T. Brzeziński, “Dynamical r -matrices and separation of variables: the Generalized Calogero-Moser models,” *Phys. Lett.* **B325**, 401–408 (1994).

- [22] B. Enriquez, B. Feigin and V. Rubtsov, “Separation of variables for Gaudin-Calogero systems,” *Compositio Math.* **110**, 1–16 (1998).
- [23] E.K. Sklyanin, “Separation of variables — new trends,” *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **118**, 35–60 (1995).
- [24] J. Avan and M. Talon, “Classical R -matrix structure for the Calogero model,” *Phys. Lett.* **B303**, 33–37 (1993).
- [25] E. Sklyanin, “Dynamical r -matrices for the elliptic Calogero-Moser model,” *Alg. and Anal.* **6**, 227–237 (1994).
- [26] H.W. Braden and T. Suzuki, “ R -matrices for elliptic Calogero-Moser models,” *Lett. Math. Phys.* **30**, 147–158 (1994).
- [27] E. Sklyanin and T. Takebe, “Separation of variables in the elliptic Gaudin model,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **204**, 17–38 (1999).
- [28] J.C. Hurtubise and M. Kjiri, “Separating coordinates for the generalized Hitchin systems and the classical r -matrix,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **210** (2000), 521–540.