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#### Abstract

The potential of the $B C_{1}$ quantum elliptic model is a superposition of two Weierstrass functions with doubling of both periods (two coupling constants). The $B C_{1}$ elliptic model degenerates to $A_{1}$ elliptic model characterized by the Lamé Hamiltonian. It is shown that in the space of $B C_{1}$ elliptic invariant, the potential becomes a rational function, while the flat space metric becomes a polynomial. The model possesses the hidden $s l(2)$ algebra for arbitrary coupling constants: it is equivalent to $s l(2)$-quantum top in three different magnetic fields. It is shown that there exist three one-parametric families of coupling constants for which a finite number of polynomial eigenfunctions (up to a factor) occur.


[^0]The Calogero-Moser-Sutherland models represent a remarkable family of Weyl-invariant integrable systems (with rational, trigonometric/hyperbolic, elliptic potentials), both classical and quantum (see for review and discussions [1]). These models appear in different physical sciences, in particular, in theory of random matrices (see e.g. [2]) and in quantum field theory (see e.g. [3]). In the quantum case, at least some of these models have the outstanding property of (quasi)-exact-solvability when a number of eigenstates can be found explicitly (algebraically). Their gauge-rotated Hamiltonians, written in certain Weyl-invariant variables, are algebraic operators - specifically, differential operators with polynomial coefficients. It is worth noting that the $B C_{n}$ Calogero-Moser-Sutherland model is a particular case of the Inozemtsev model [4] which is seen as the most general $B C_{n}$ Weyl-invariant integrable system in $\mathbf{R}^{n}$. Both $B C_{n}$ (elliptic) Calogero-Moser-Sutherland and $B C_{n}$ (elliptic) Inozemtsev quantum models were extensively studied in [5], [6] and [7] (see references therein), respectively.

Following the formal definition, any one-dimensional dynamics is integrable. Amongst Calogero-Moser-Sutherland models, there exist only two models, $A_{1}$ and $B C_{1}$, which describe one-dimensional dynamics (in the case of $A_{1}$, it is the dynamics of the relative motion). A natural question to ask is what distinguishes these two models from all other integrable one-dimensional models. The goal of this paper is to show that both $A_{1}$ and $B C_{1}$ elliptic quantum systems are equivalent to $s l(2)$ quantum top in a constant magnetic field. They are quasi-exactly-solvable. The spectra of $B C_{1}$ elliptic model is also studied.

The $B C_{1}$ quantum elliptic model, as it was introduced in Olshanetsky-Perelomov [8], is described by the Hamiltonian

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}_{B C_{1}}^{(e)}=-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial x^{2}}+\kappa_{2} \wp(2 x)+\kappa_{3} \wp(x) \equiv-\frac{1}{2} \Delta^{(1)}+V, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta^{(1)}$ is one-dimensional Laplace operator, $\kappa_{2,3}$ are coupling constants. The Weierstrass function $\wp(x) \equiv \wp\left(x \mid g_{2}, g_{3}\right)$ (see e.g. [9]) is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\wp^{\prime}(x)\right)^{2}=4 \wp^{3}(x)-g_{2} \wp(x)-g_{3}=4\left(\wp(x)-e_{1}\right)\left(\wp(x)-e_{2}\right)\left(\wp(x)-e_{3}\right), \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $g_{2,3}$ are its invariants and $e_{1,2,3}$ are roots, $e_{1}+e_{2}+e_{3}=0$. If one of the coupling constants vanishes, $\kappa_{2}\left(\kappa_{3}\right)=0$, the Hamiltonian becomes $\left(A_{1}\right)$-Lamé Hamiltonian (see e.g. [10] and references therein). If in the elliptic potential of Eq. (1) the trigonometric limit is taken (one of periods tends to infinity which implies the condition $\Delta \equiv g_{2}^{3}+27 g_{3}^{3}=0$
holds) the Hamiltonian of $B C_{1}$ trigonometric/hyperbolic or generalized Pöschl-Teller model emerges.

Since we will be interested in the general properties of the operator $\mathcal{H}_{B C_{1}}^{(e)}$, without a loss of generality, we assume that the operator (1) is defined on real line, $x \in \mathbf{R}$ and for the sake of convenience the fundamental domain of the Weierstrass function is rectangular with real period 1 and imaginary period $i \tau$. The discrete symmetry of the Hamiltonian (1) is $\mathbb{Z}_{2} \oplus T_{r} \oplus T_{c}$. It consists of reflection $\mathbb{Z}_{2}(x \rightarrow-x)$ which is $B C_{1}$ Weyl group and two translations $T_{r}: x \rightarrow x+1$ and $T_{c}: x \rightarrow x+i \tau$ (periodicity). Perhaps, $\mathbb{Z}_{2} \oplus T_{r} \oplus T_{c}$ can make sense as double-affine $B C_{1}$ Weyl group.

We will consider a formal eigenvalue problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{H}_{B C_{1}}^{(e)} \Psi=E \Psi \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

without posing concrete boundary conditions. It can be immediately checked that (3) has the exact solution

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{0}=\left[\wp^{\prime}(x)\right]^{\mu}, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for coupling constants

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa_{2}=2 \mu(\mu-1), \kappa_{3}=2 \mu(1+2 \mu) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\mu$ is an arbitrary parameter, for which the eigenvalue

$$
E_{0}=0 .
$$

It implies that for parameters (5) the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{B C_{1}}^{(e)}$ has one-dimensional invariant subspace, $\Psi_{0}$ has the meaning of zero mode, and if $x \in[0,1]$, the function $\Psi_{0}$ (4) is the ground state function (no nodes).

Now let us introduce a new variable,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau=\wp(x) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

cf. [10] and references therein. It is evident that $\tau$ is invariant with respect to the action of the group $\mathbb{Z}_{2} \oplus T_{r} \oplus T_{c}$ - double affine $B C_{1}$ Weyl group. The first observation is that the potential (1) being written in $\tau$-variable is a rational function,

$$
V(\tau)=\frac{\kappa_{2}+4 \kappa_{3}}{4} \tau+\frac{\kappa_{2}}{16} \frac{12 g_{2} \tau^{2}+36 g_{3} \tau+g_{2}^{2}}{4 \tau^{3}-g_{2} \tau-g_{3}}
$$

and the ground state function (4) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{0}(\tau)=\left(4 \tau^{3}-g_{2} \tau-g_{3}\right)^{\frac{\mu}{2}} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

(cf. (1)), which is the determinant of the metric with upper indices (see below) to the power $\frac{\mu}{2}$. Making the gauge rotation

$$
h^{(e)}=-2\left(\Psi_{0}\right)^{-1} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{BC}_{1}}^{(e)} \Psi_{0}
$$

and changing variable to $\tau$, we arrive at the algebraic operator

$$
\begin{equation*}
h^{(e)}(\tau)=\Delta_{g}(\tau)+\mu\left(12 \tau^{2}-g_{2}\right) \partial_{\tau}-\tilde{\kappa}_{3} \tau \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta_{g}$ is one-dimensional Laplace-Beltrami operator

$$
\Delta_{g}(\tau)=g^{-1 / 2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} g^{1 / 2} g^{11} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}=g^{11} \frac{\partial^{2}}{\partial \tau^{2}}+\frac{g_{1}^{11}}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}
$$

with flat metric

$$
g^{11}=\left(4 \tau^{3}-g_{2} \tau-g_{3}\right)=\frac{1}{g},
$$

here $g$ is its determinant with upper indices, and

$$
\tilde{\kappa}_{3}=2 \kappa_{3}-4 \mu(1+2 \mu) \equiv 2 n(2 n+1+6 \mu) .
$$

In the explicit form the gauge-rotated operator (8) looks like

$$
\begin{equation*}
h^{(e)}(\tau)=\left(4 \tau^{3}-g_{2} \tau-g_{3}\right) \partial_{\tau}^{2}+(1+2 \mu)\left(6 \tau^{2}-\frac{g_{2}}{2}\right) \partial_{\tau}-2 n(2 n+1+6 \mu) \tau \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It can be easily checked that if parameter $n$ is a non-negative integer, the operator $h^{(e)}(\tau)$ (9) has the invariant subspace

$$
\mathcal{P}_{n}=\left\langle\tau^{p} \mid 0 \leq p \leq n\right\rangle,
$$

of dimension

$$
\operatorname{dim} \mathcal{P}_{n}=(n+1)
$$

namely,

$$
h^{(e)}: \mathcal{P}_{n} \mapsto \mathcal{P}_{n} .
$$

The space $\mathcal{P}_{n}$ is invariant w.r.t. $1 D$ projective (Möbius) transformation

$$
\tau \mapsto \frac{a \tau+b}{c \tau+d} .
$$

Furthermore, the space $\mathcal{P}_{n}$ is the finite-dimensional representation space of the algebra $\operatorname{sl}(2)$ of the first order differential operators realized as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{J}^{+}(n)=\tau^{2} \partial_{\tau}-n \tau, \mathcal{J}^{0}(n)=\tau \partial_{\tau}-n, \mathcal{J}^{-}(n)=\partial_{\tau} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, the operator (8) can be rewritten in terms of $s l(2)$-generators

$$
\begin{align*}
& h^{(e)}=4 \mathcal{J}^{+}(n) \mathcal{J}^{0}(n)-g_{2} \mathcal{J}^{0}(n) \mathcal{J}^{-}-g_{3} \mathcal{J}^{-} \mathcal{J}^{-} \\
& \quad+2(4 n+1+6 \mu) \mathcal{J}^{+}(n)-g_{2}\left(n+\frac{1}{2}+\mu\right) \mathcal{J}^{-} . \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus, it is $s l(2)$ quantum top in a constant magnetic field. This representation holds for any value of $n$. Thus, the algebra $s l(2)$ is the hidden algebra of $B C_{1}$ elliptic model with arbitrary coupling constants $\kappa_{2,3}$ parametrized as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa_{2}=2 \mu(\mu-1), \kappa_{3}=(n+2 \mu)(n+2 \mu+1) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $n$ takes an integer value, the hidden algebra $s l(2)$ appears in finite-dimensional representation, and the operator (9) has finite-dimensional invariant subspace and possesses a number of polynomial eigenfunctions $P_{n, i}(\tau ; \mu), i=1, \ldots(n+1)$. These polynomials can be called $B C_{1}$ Lamé polynomials (of the first kind). If $\mu=0,1$ these polynomials degenerate to Lamé polynomials of the first (fourth) kind, respectively. For example, for $n=0$ at coupling constants (5) (or (12) at $n=0$ ),

$$
E_{0,1}=0, P_{0,1}=1
$$

For $n=1$ at coupling constants

$$
\kappa_{2}=2 \mu(\mu-1), \kappa_{3}=2(1+2 \mu)(1+\mu),
$$

the eigenstates are

$$
E_{\mp}= \pm(1+2 \mu) \sqrt{3 g_{2}}, P_{1, \mp}=\tau \mp \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{g_{2}}{3}}
$$

As a function of $g_{2}$ both eigenvalues (eigenfunctions) are branches of double-sheeted Riemann surface. Note that if $\mu=-\frac{1}{2}$ degeneracy occurs: both eigenvalues coincide, they are equal to zero, any linear function is an eigenfunction. If $g_{2}=0$ but $\mu \neq-\frac{1}{2}$, the Jordan cell occurs: both eigenvalues are equal to zero but there exists a single eigenfunction, $P=\tau$. In general, for $n>1$, polynomial eigenfunctions have a form of a polynomial in $\tau$ of degree
$n$, they (as well as the eigenvalues) are branches of $(n+1)$-sheeted Riemann surfaces in the parameter $g_{2}$. To summarize, it can be stated that for coupling constants (12) at integer $n$, the Hamiltonian (1) has $(n+1)$ eigenfunctions of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{n, i}=P_{n, i}(\tau ; \mu) \Psi_{0}, \quad i=1, \ldots(n+1), \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Psi_{0}$ is given by (4).
It can be checked that the eigenvalue problem (3) has an exact solution other than (4),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{0, k}=\left[\wp^{\prime}(x)\right]^{\mu}\left(\wp(x)-e_{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}-\mu} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

for coupling constants

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa_{2}=2 \mu(\mu-1), \kappa_{3}=(1+2 \mu)(1-\mu), \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ is an arbitrary parameter, for which the eigenvalue is

$$
E_{0, k}=\frac{\left(4 \mu^{2}-1\right)}{2} e_{k}
$$

here $e_{k}$ is the $k$ th root of the Weierstrass function (2). It implies that for parameters (15) the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{B C_{1}}^{(e)}$ has one-dimensional invariant subspace.

Making a gauge rotation of the Hamiltonian (11) with subtracted $E_{0, k}$,

$$
h_{k}^{(e)}=-2\left(\Psi_{0, k}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{BC}_{1}}^{(e)}-E_{0, k}\right) \Psi_{0, k}
$$

and changing variable to $\tau$, we arrive at the algebraic operator

$$
\begin{gather*}
h_{k}^{(e)}(\tau)=\left(\tau-e_{k}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\mu}\left(h^{(e)}(\tau)-2 E_{0, k}\right)\left(\tau-e_{k}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}-\mu}=  \tag{16}\\
\left(4 \tau^{3}-g_{2} \tau-g_{3}\right) \partial_{\tau}^{2}+2\left((5+2 \mu) \tau^{2}+2(1-2 \mu) e_{k}\left(\tau+e_{k}\right)-(3-2 \mu) \frac{g_{2}}{4}\right) \partial_{\tau} \\
-2 \tilde{\kappa}_{3} \tau,
\end{gather*}
$$

(cf. (91)), where $e_{k}$ is $k$ th root of the Weierstrass function (see (22)), and

$$
\tilde{\kappa}_{3}=\kappa_{3}-(1-\mu)(1+2 \mu) .
$$

It can be checked that if $\tilde{\kappa}_{3}=2 n(n-1)+n(2 \mu+5)$ and the parameter $n$ takes nonnegative integer values, the operator $h_{k}^{(e)}(\tau)$ has the invariant subspace $\mathcal{P}_{n}$. Furthermore,
the operator (16) can be rewritten in terms of $s l(2)$-generators (10) for any value of $n$, cf. (11),

$$
\begin{gather*}
h_{k}^{(e)}=4 \mathcal{J}^{+}(n) \mathcal{J}^{0}(n)-g_{2} \mathcal{J}^{0}(n) \mathcal{J}^{-}-g_{3} \mathcal{J}^{-} \mathcal{J}^{-} \\
+2(4 n+3+2 \mu) \mathcal{J}^{+}(n)+4(1-2 \mu) e_{k}\left(\mathcal{J}^{0}(n)+n\right)+2\left(2(1-2 \mu) e_{k}^{2}-(2 n+3-2 \mu) \frac{g_{2}}{4}\right) \mathcal{J}^{-} \tag{17}
\end{gather*}
$$

Thus, it is $s l(2)$ quantum top in constant magnetic field.
Hence, the algebra $s l(2)$ is the hidden algebra of $B C_{1}$ elliptic model with arbitrary coupling constants $\kappa_{2,3}$ parametrized as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa_{2}=\mu(\mu-1), \kappa_{3}=2 n^{2}+n(3+2 \mu)+(1+2 \mu)(1-\mu), \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

(cf. (12)). If $n$ takes an integer value, the hidden algebra $s l(2)$ appears in a finite-dimensional representation, the operator (16) has a finite-dimensional invariant subspace and possesses a number of polynomial eigenfunctions $P_{n, i}\left(\tau ; \mu, e_{k}\right), i=1, \ldots(n+1)$ and $k=1,2,3$. These polynomials can be called $B C_{1}$ Lamé polynomials (of the second kind). If $\mu=0,1$ these polynomials degenerate to Lamé polynomials of the second (third) kind, respectively. For example, for $n=0$ at couplings (18),

$$
E_{0,1}=\frac{\left(4 \mu^{2}-1\right)}{2} e_{k}, P_{0,1}=1
$$

In general, for $n>1$, polynomial eigenfunctions have a form of a polynomial in $\tau$ of degree $n$, they (as well as the eigenvalues) are branches of $(n+1)$-sheeted Riemann surfaces in $g_{2}$. To summarize, it can be stated that for coupling constants (18), and at integer $n$, the Hamiltonian (1) has $(n+1)$ eigenfunctions of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{n, i ; k}=P_{n, i}\left(\tau ; \mu, e_{k}\right) \Psi_{0, k}, \quad i=1, \ldots(n+1), k=1,2,3, \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Psi_{0, k}$ is given by (14).
It can be checked that the eigenvalue problem (3) has one more exact solution other than (4) or (14),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi_{0, \tilde{k}}=\left[\wp^{\prime}(x)\right]^{\nu}\left[\left(\wp(x)-e_{i}\right)\left(\wp(x)-e_{j}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}-\nu} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tilde{k}$ is complement to $(i, j)$, for coupling constants

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa_{2}=2 \nu(\nu-1), \kappa_{3}=\nu(1-\nu) \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\nu$ is an arbitrary parameter, for which the eigenvalue is

$$
E_{0, \tilde{k}}=\frac{(1-2 \nu)(3-2 \nu)}{2} e_{k}
$$

here $e_{k}$ is the $\tilde{k}$ th root of the Weierstrass function (2). It implies that for parameters (21) the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{B C_{1}}^{(e)}$ has one-dimensional invariant subspace. If in (20) $\nu=1-\mu$ the solution (14) occurs.

Making a gauge rotation of the Hamiltonian (1) with subtracted $E_{0, \tilde{k}}$,

$$
h_{\tilde{k}}^{(e)}=-2\left(\Psi_{0, \tilde{k}}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{BC}_{1}}^{(e)}-E_{0, \tilde{k}}\right) \Psi_{0, \tilde{k}}
$$

and changing variable to $\tau$, we arrive at the algebraic operator

$$
\begin{gather*}
h_{\tilde{k}}^{(e)}(\tau)=\left[\left(\tau-e_{i}\right)\left(\tau-e_{j}\right)\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}+\mu}\left(h^{(e)}(\tau)-2 E_{0, \tilde{k}}\right)\left[\left(\tau-e_{i}\right)\left(\tau-e_{j}\right)\right]^{\frac{1}{2}-\mu}=  \tag{22}\\
\left(4 \tau^{3}-g_{2} \tau-g_{3}\right) \partial_{\tau}^{2}+2\left((7-2 \nu) \tau^{2}+2(2 \nu-1) e_{k}\left(\tau+e_{k}\right)-(5+2 \nu) \frac{g_{2}}{4}\right) \partial_{\tau} \\
-2 \tilde{\kappa}_{3} \tau
\end{gather*}
$$

(cf. (9)), where $e_{k}$ is $k$ th root of the Weierstrass function, see (22) and

$$
\tilde{\kappa}_{3}=\kappa_{3}-\nu(3-2 \nu)
$$

It can be checked that if $\tilde{\kappa}_{3}=2 n(n-1)+n(7-2 \nu)$, and the parameter $n$ takes a nonnegative integer value, the operator $h_{\tilde{k}}^{(e)}(\tau)$ has the invariant subspace $\mathcal{P}_{n}$. Furthermore, the operator (22) can be rewritten in terms of $s l(2)$-generators (10) for any value of $n$, cf. (11),

$$
\begin{gather*}
h_{\hat{k}}^{(e)}=4 \mathcal{J}^{+}(n) \mathcal{J}^{0}(n)-g_{2} \mathcal{J}^{0}(n) \mathcal{J}^{-}-g_{3} \mathcal{J}^{-} \mathcal{J}^{-} \\
+2(4 n+5-2 \nu) \mathcal{J}^{+}(n)+4(2 \nu-1) e_{k}\left(\mathcal{J}^{0}(n)+n\right)+2\left(2(2 \nu-1) e_{k}^{2}-(2 n+1+2 \nu) \frac{g_{2}}{4}\right) \mathcal{J}^{-} \tag{23}
\end{gather*}
$$

Thus, it is $s l(2)$ quantum top in constant magnetic field.
Hence, the algebra $s l(2)$ is the hidden algebra of $B C_{1}$ elliptic model with arbitrary coupling constants $\kappa_{2,3}$ parametrized as follows

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa_{2}=\nu(\nu-1), \kappa_{3}=2 n^{2}+n(5-2 \nu)+\nu(1-2 \nu) \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

(cf. (12), (18)). If $n$ takes an integer value, the hidden algebra $s l(2)$ appears in finitedimensional representation, and the operator (22) has finite-dimensional invariant subspace $\mathcal{P}_{n}$ and possesses a number of polynomial eigenfunctions $\tilde{P}_{n, i}\left(\tau ; \nu, e_{k}\right), i=1, \ldots(n+1)$ and $k=1,2,3$. These polynomials can be called $B C_{1}$ Lamé polynomials (of the third kind). If $\nu=0,1$ these polynomials degenerate to Lamé polynomials of the third (second) kind, respectively. For example, for $n=0$ at couplings (24),

$$
E_{0,1}=\frac{(1-2 \nu)(3-2 \nu)}{2} e_{k}, \quad P_{0,1}=1
$$

In general, for $n>1$, the polynomial eigenfunctions have a form of a polynomial in $\tau$ of degree $n$, and they (as well as the eigenvalues) are branches of $(n+1)$-sheeted Riemann surface in $g_{2}$. To summarize, it can be stated that for coupling constants (24) at integer $n$ the Hamiltonian (1) has $(n+1)$ eigenfunctions of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{\Psi}_{n, i ; k}=\tilde{P}_{n, i}\left(\tau ; \nu, e_{k}\right) \Psi_{0, k}, \quad i=1, \ldots(n+1), k=1,2,3 \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Psi_{0, \tilde{k}}$ is given by (20).
Observation: Let us construct the operator

$$
i_{\text {par }}^{(n)}(\tau)=\prod_{j=0}^{n}\left(\mathcal{J}^{0}(n)+j\right)
$$

where $\mathcal{J}^{0}(n)$ is the Euler-Cartan generator of the algebra $\operatorname{sl}(2)$ (10). It can be shown that any algebraic operator $h^{(e)}(11)$, (17), (23) at integer $n$ commutes with $i_{\text {par }}^{(n)}(\tau)$,

$$
\left[h^{(e)}(\tau), i_{\text {par }}^{(n)}(\tau)\right]: \mathcal{P}_{n} \mapsto 0
$$

Hence, $i_{\text {par }}^{(n)}(\tau)$ is the particular integral [11] of the $B C_{1}$ elliptic model (11).
In this paper we demonstrate that $B C_{1}$ elliptic model belongs to one-dimensional quasi-exactly-solvable (QES) problems [12]. However, it is not in the list of known QES problems (see e.g. [13]). We show the existence of three different algebraic forms of the $B C_{1}$ Hamiltonian - all of them are the second order polynomial elements of the universal enveloping algebra $U_{s l(2)}$. If this algebra appears in a finite-dimensional representation those elements possess a finite-dimensional invariant subspace. This phenomenon occurs for any of three one-parametric subfamilies of coupling constants for which polynomial eigenfunctions may occur. It is worth noting that a certain algebraic forms for a general $B C_{n}$ elliptic model were found some time ago in [5, 6].
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