

Orthogonal Polynomials and Special Functions

UC|UP Joint PhD Program in Mathematics

José Carlos Soares Petronilho



Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Sciences and Technology
University of Coimbra
2016–2017

These notes contain part of the lectures of an introductory course on orthogonal polynomials and special functions that I gave in the joint PhD Program in Mathematics UC|UP in the academic years 2015-2016 (at University of Porto) and 2016-2017 (at University of Coimbra).

The notes were written for students who have never contacted with the above topics. Most results presented here can be found in the available bibliography at the end of each text/chapter, although in general more detailed proofs have been included (a few of them different from the ones presented in the source references), hoping this helps the beginner student. Besides the topics contained in the notes, several other subjects were covered in the course, including an introduction to discrete orthogonal polynomials, orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle, spectral theory of Jacobi operators, and the study of the arithmetic nature of the values of the Riemann zeta function at the integer numbers, including Apéry's theorem and Ball and Rivoal's results about the existence of infinitely many irrational numbers among the values of the Riemann zeta function at the odd integer numbers.

I would like to thank all the students who chose the course, Ali Moghanni, Dieudonné Mbouna, Lili Song, Nikolaus Tsopanidis, Peter Lombaers, Rúben Sousa, and Willian Ribeiro. Their questions and comments helped me to improve earlier versions of these notes.

J. Petronilho (July 2017).¹

¹This version: revised on April 2018.

Contents

1.	Orthogonal polynomials: foundations	1
1.	The spaces \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}'	1
2.	Dual basis in \mathcal{P}^*	3
3.	Basic operations in \mathcal{P} and in \mathcal{P}'	4
4.	The formal Stieltjes series	7
	Exercises	8
	Final remarks	9
	Bibliography	10
2.	Basic theory of orthogonal polynomials	11
1.	Orthogonal polynomial sequences	11
2.	Existence of OPS	13
3.	OPS in the positive-definite sense	16
4.	Favard's Theorem	20
5.	The Christoffel-Darboux identities	23
	Exercises	24
	Final remarks	25
	Bibliography	26
3.	Zeros of orthogonal polynomials and quadrature formulas	27
1.	Zeros of OPS	27
2.	Gauss-Jacobi-Christoffel quadrature formula	32
	Exercises	34
	Final remarks	35
	Bibliography	35
4.	The spectral theorem for orthogonal polynomials	37
1.	Helly's theorems	37
2.	The representation theorem	41
3.	The spectral theorem	45
4.	On the unicity of the spectral measure	47
	Exercises	51
	Final remarks	52

Bibliography	53
5. Markov's Theorem	55
1. The Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula	55
2. Associated polynomials	57
3. Markov's Theorem	59
Exercises	65
Final remarks	68
Bibliography	69
6. Orthogonal polynomials and dual basis	71
1. Orthogonal polynomials and dual basis	71
2. The translation and homothetic operators	72
Exercises	76
Final remarks	76
Bibliography	76
7. Pearson's distributional differential equation	77
1. Pearson's distributional differential equation	77
2. The regular solutions of Pearson's equation	80
Exercises	84
Final remarks	85
Bibliography	85
8. Classical orthogonal polynomials	87
1. Definition and characterizations	87
2. Classification and canonical representatives	95
3. The positive-definite case	100
4. Orthogonality of the Bessel polynomials on \mathbb{S}^1	104
5. Explicit expressions for the classical OP	107
Exercises	112
Final remarks	113
Bibliography	114
9. Introduction to hypergeometric series	115
1. The gamma and beta functions	115
2. Hypergeometric series	120
3. The hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$	125
4. The Pfaff-Saalschütz, Dixon's, and Dougall's identities	132
5. Binomial sums	134
Exercises	138
Final remarks	140

Bibliography	141
Appendix A. Topics on locally convex spaces	143
1. Definitions and basic properties	143
2. Fréchet spaces	144
3. The inductive limit topology	145
4. The weak dual topology	146
Bibliography	147

1

Orthogonal polynomials: foundations

1. The spaces \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}'

Orthogonal polynomials (OP) can be studied from several different points of view. Following the French mathematician Pascal Maroni, from an algebraic viewpoint (meaning that orthogonality will be considered with respect to a moment linear functional, not necessarily represented by a weight function or a positive Borel measure), it is very useful to consider OP as test functions living in an appropriate locally convex space (LCS), which we will denote by \mathcal{P} . This LCS is the set of all polynomials (with real or complex coefficients) endowed with a strict inductive limit topology, so that

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_n = \text{ind} \lim_n \mathcal{P}_n ,$$

where \mathcal{P}_n is the space of all polynomials of degree at most n .¹ \mathcal{P}_n being a finite dimensional vector space, all its norms are equivalent, so there is no need to specify any one in particular. For the development of the theory to be presented here it is not important to know much about the above topology (the definition and basic properties of LCS, including inductive limit topologies, can be found, e.g., in the book by M. Reed and B. Simon, Chapter V—see also Appendix A), but the reader should keep in mind that the reason why such topology is introduced is because it implies the following fundamental property: the topological and the algebraic dual spaces of \mathcal{P} coincide.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $\mathcal{P} := \text{ind} \lim_n \mathcal{P}_n$, as in (1.1), and let \mathcal{P}^* and \mathcal{P}' be the algebraic and the topological duals of \mathcal{P} , respectively. Then*

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{P}^* .$$

Proof. Obviously, $\mathcal{P}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}^*$. To prove that $\mathcal{P}^* \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$, take $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}^*$. Taking into account Theorem A.5, to prove that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ it suffices to show that the restriction $\mathbf{u}|_{\mathcal{P}_n}$ is continuous for every n . But this is a trivial assertion, since $\mathbf{u}|_{\mathcal{P}_n}$ is a linear functional defined on a finite dimensional normed space. \square

Equality (1.2) means that every linear functional defined in \mathcal{P} is continuous (for the strict inductive limit topology in \mathcal{P}). This is a curious property, since we know that,

¹For the sake of simplicity, we do not distinguish between *polynomial* and *polynomial function*.

X being a normed vector space, it is true that $X' = X^*$ if $\dim X < \infty$, but, for the contrary, $X' \neq X^*$ whenever $\dim X = \infty$. This last fact can be easily stated by using Zorn's lemma. (Exercise 1.) Of course there is no contradiction between (1.2) and the fact that \mathcal{P} is an infinite dimensional vector space, because \mathcal{P} (carried with the inductive limit topology) is not a normed space. Indeed, being a strict inductive limit of the spaces \mathcal{P}_n , and taking into account that each \mathcal{P}_n is a proper closed subspace of \mathcal{P}_{n+1} (so that \mathcal{P} is indeed an hyper strict inductive limit of the spaces \mathcal{P}_n), the general theory of LCS (cf. Theorem A.6) ensures that \mathcal{P} cannot be a metrizable space, and so *a fortiori* it is not a normed space—or, to be more precise, it is not possible to provide \mathcal{P} with a norm that generates in it the above inductive limit topology.

In \mathcal{P}' we consider the weak dual topology, which, by definition, is generated by the family of semi-norms $s_p : \mathcal{P}' \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$, $p \in \mathcal{P}$, defined by

$$(1.3) \quad s_p(\mathbf{u}) := |\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle|, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

It turns out that this family of semi-norms s_p is equivalent to the family of semi-norms $|\cdot|_n : \mathcal{P}' \rightarrow [0, +\infty[$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, defined by

$$(1.4) \quad |\mathbf{u}|_n := \max_{0 \leq k \leq n} |\langle \mathbf{u}, x^k \rangle|, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

Indeed, the following proposition holds.

THEOREM 1.2. $\mathcal{S} := \{s_p : p \in \mathcal{P}\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_\# := \{|\cdot|_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$, with s_p and $|\cdot|_n$ given by (1.3)–(1.4), are equivalent families of seminorms in \mathcal{P}' , provided $\mathcal{P} := \text{ind} \lim_n \mathcal{P}_n$.

Proof. Given $p \in \mathcal{P}$, putting $p(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j x^j$ and $C(p) := \sum_{j=0}^n |a_j|$, we have

$$s_p(\mathbf{u}) = |\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle| = \left| \sum_{j=0}^n a_j \langle \mathbf{u}, x^j \rangle \right| \leq C(p) |\mathbf{u}|_n, \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

On the other hand, given $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, setting $p_j(x) := x^j$ ($j = 0, 1, \dots, n$), we have

$$|\mathbf{u}|_n = \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} |\langle \mathbf{u}, x^j \rangle| \leq \sum_{j=0}^n |\langle \mathbf{u}, x^j \rangle| = \sum_{j=0}^n s_{p_j}(\mathbf{u}), \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

Therefore, by Proposition A.2, \mathcal{S} and $\mathcal{S}_\#$ are equivalent families of semi-norms. \square

Since $\mathcal{S}_\#$ is a countable family of seminorms, then by Theorem 1.2, together with Theorem A.3 and Remark A.1, \mathcal{P}' is a metrizable space, a metric being given by

$$(1.5) \quad \varrho(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \frac{|\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}|_n}{1 + |\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v}|_n}, \quad \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

Moreover, \mathcal{P}' is a Fréchet space. (Exercise 3.)

2. Dual basis in \mathcal{P}^*

Since we will work in the dual space \mathcal{P}^* , it would be useful to explicitly building bases in \mathcal{P}^* . This makes sense, since (1.2) allow us writing expansions (finite or infinite sums) of the elements of \mathcal{P}^* in terms of the elements of a given basis, in the sense of the weak dual topology in \mathcal{P}' . Such basis in \mathcal{P}^* may be achieved in a natural way, using simple sets of polynomials. A *simple set* in \mathcal{P} is a sequence of polynomials, $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, such that $\deg R_n = n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (where $R_0 \equiv \text{const.} \neq 0$). To any simple set in \mathcal{P} , $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, we may associate a *dual basis*, which, by definition, is a sequence of linear functionals $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, being $\mathbf{a}_n : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, such that

$$\langle \mathbf{a}_n, R_k \rangle := \delta_{n,k} \quad (n, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots),$$

where $\delta_{n,k}$ represents the Kronecker symbol ($\delta_{n,k} = 1$ if $n = k$; $\delta_{n,k} = 0$ if $n \neq k$). The following is a fundamental result. Together with equality (1.2) it is on the foundations of the (algebraic) theory of OP.

THEOREM 1.3. *Let $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a simple set in \mathcal{P} and $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the associated dual basis. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}^*$. Then*

$$(1.6) \quad \mathbf{u} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \langle \mathbf{u}, R_n \rangle \mathbf{a}_n,$$

in the sense of the weak dual topology in \mathcal{P}' .

Proof. Notice first that the assertion makes sense, according with (1.2). To prove it, fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and let

$$\mathbf{s}_N := \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \lambda_n \mathbf{a}_n \quad (\lambda_n := \langle \mathbf{u}, R_n \rangle)$$

be the partial sum of order N of the series appearing in (1.6). We need to show that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mathbf{s}_N - \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = 0, \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Clearly, it suffices to prove that this equality holds for $p \in \{R_0, R_1, R_2, \dots\}$. Indeed, fix $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, for $N > k$,

$$\langle \mathbf{s}_N - \mathbf{u}, R_k \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \langle \mathbf{u}, R_n \rangle \langle \mathbf{a}_n, R_k \rangle - \langle \mathbf{u}, R_k \rangle = 0,$$

hence $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle \mathbf{s}_N - \mathbf{u}, R_k \rangle = 0$. □

3. Basic operations in \mathcal{P} and in \mathcal{P}'

In this section we introduce some fundamental operations in the framework of the algebraic theory of OP. Given a functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, we will denote by

$$u_n := \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

the *moment* of order n of \mathbf{u} . Clearly, if \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} are two functionals in \mathcal{P}' such that the corresponding sequences of moments satisfy $u_n = v_n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, then $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$. Therefore, *each functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is uniquely determined by its sequence of moments.*

Define operators M_ϕ , T , and θ_c , from \mathcal{P} into \mathcal{P} , by

$$(1.7) \quad M_\phi p(x) := \phi(x)p(x), \quad Tp(x) := -p'(x), \quad \theta_c p(x) := \frac{p(x) - p(c)}{x - c} \quad (p \in \mathcal{P}),$$

where $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$ (fixed), $'$ denotes derivative with respect to x , and $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Note that $\theta_c p(x)$ is defined as above if $x \neq c$, with the obvious definition $\theta_c p(c) := p'(c)$ if $x = c$ (so that, indeed, $\theta_c p \in \mathcal{P}$). By Theorem A.7, the dual operators (cf. Appendix A) M'_ϕ , T' , and θ'_c belong to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{P}')$. For each $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, the images $M'_\phi \mathbf{u}$, $T' \mathbf{u}$, and $\theta'_c \mathbf{u}$, are elements (functionals) in \mathcal{P}' , hereafter denoted by $\phi \mathbf{u}$, $D\mathbf{u}$, and $(x - c)^{-1} \mathbf{u}$.

DEFINITION 1.1. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$, and $c \in \mathbb{C}$.*

(i) *the left multiplication of \mathbf{u} by ϕ , denoted by $\phi \mathbf{u}$, is the functional defined by*

$$\langle \phi \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \langle \mathbf{u}, \phi p \rangle, \quad p \in \mathcal{P};$$

(ii) *the derivative of \mathbf{u} , denoted by $D\mathbf{u}$, is the functional in \mathcal{P}' defined by*

$$\langle D\mathbf{u}, p \rangle := -\langle \mathbf{u}, p' \rangle, \quad p \in \mathcal{P};$$

(iii) *the division of \mathbf{u} by $x - c$, denoted by $(x - c)^{-1} \mathbf{u}$, is the functional defined by*

$$\langle (x - c)^{-1} \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \langle \mathbf{u}, \theta_c p \rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{u}, \frac{p(x) - p(c)}{x - c} \right\rangle, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Note that these definitions, introduced here by duality with respect to the operators defined in (1.7), are in accordance with those usually given in Theory of Distributions (this explains the minus sign appearing in the second definition).

THEOREM 1.4. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$. Then*

$$D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \phi' \mathbf{u} + \phi D\mathbf{u}.$$

Proof. Indeed, for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D(\phi \mathbf{u}), p \rangle &= -\langle \phi \mathbf{u}, p' \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi p' \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{u}, -\phi' p + (\phi p)' \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{u}, \phi' p \rangle - \langle \mathbf{u}, (\phi p)' \rangle = \langle \phi' \mathbf{u}, p \rangle + \langle D\mathbf{u}, \phi p \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi' \mathbf{u} + \phi D\mathbf{u}, p \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

hence the desired equality holds. □

By definition, the left multiplication of a functional in \mathcal{P}' by a polynomial is another functional in \mathcal{P}' . We may also define a right multiplication of a linear functional by a polynomial. The result is a polynomial.

DEFINITION 1.2. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}$. The right multiplication of \mathbf{u} by ψ , denoted by $\mathbf{u}\psi$, is the polynomial defined by*

$$\mathbf{u}\psi(x) := \langle \mathbf{u}_\xi, \theta_\xi(x\psi) \rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{u}_\xi, \frac{x\psi(x) - \xi\psi(\xi)}{x - \xi} \right\rangle ,$$

where the subscript ξ in \mathbf{u}_ξ means that \mathbf{u} acts in polynomials of the variable ξ .

Setting $\psi(x) := \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$, the polynomial $\mathbf{u}\psi$ is explicitly given by

$$(1.8) \quad \mathbf{u}\psi(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n \left(\sum_{j=i}^n a_j u_{j-i} \right) x^i ,$$

and it also admits the following useful matrix representation:

$$(1.9) \quad \mathbf{u}\psi(x) = [a_0 \ a_1 \ \cdots \ a_n] \begin{bmatrix} u_0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ u_1 & u_0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ u_2 & u_1 & u_0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_n & u_{n-1} & u_{n-2} & \cdots & u_0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ x \\ x^2 \\ \vdots \\ x^n \end{bmatrix} .$$

The right multiplication of a functional by a polynomial enable us to introduce a product in \mathcal{P}' , by duality. Indeed, fix $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and let $T_{\mathbf{u}} : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ be defined by

$$T_{\mathbf{u}}p := \mathbf{u}p , \quad p \in \mathcal{P} .$$

The dual operator, $T'_{\mathbf{u}} : \mathcal{P}' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$ ($\mathbf{v} \mapsto T'_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{v}$), is given by

$$\langle T'_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{v}, p \rangle := \langle \mathbf{v}, T_{\mathbf{u}}p \rangle = \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}p \rangle , \quad p \in \mathcal{P} .$$

Thus, we may introduce a product in \mathcal{P}' , by duality with respect to the right multiplication of a functional by a polynomial.

DEFINITION 1.3. *Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}'$. The product $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}$ is the functional in \mathcal{P}' given by*

$$\langle \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}, p \rangle := \langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{u}p \rangle , \quad p \in \mathcal{P} .$$

This product is commutative. This fact may be seen easily by noticing that the moments of the functionals $\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{v}\mathbf{u}$ coincide:

$$(1.10) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}, x^n \rangle = \sum_{i+j=n} u_i v_j = \langle \mathbf{v}\mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Further, there exists unit element in \mathcal{P}' , namely the Dirac functional at the origin, $\delta \equiv \delta_0$. Indeed, using (1.10), it is easy to prove that

$$\mathbf{u}\delta = \mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

Recall that the *Dirac functional* at a point $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $\delta_c : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, is defined by

$$\langle \delta_c, p \rangle := p(c), \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

The next proposition lists some basic properties concerning the above operations. The proof is left to the reader. (Exercise 6.)

PROPOSITION 1.5. *Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{P}'$, $p \in \mathcal{P}$, and $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Then:*

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. $\delta p = p$ | 6. $p(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}) = (p\mathbf{u})\mathbf{v} + x(\mathbf{u}\theta_0 p)\mathbf{v}$ |
| 2. $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{u}p) = (\mathbf{v}\mathbf{u})p$ | 7. $D(\mathbf{u}p) = (D\mathbf{u})p + \mathbf{u}p' + \mathbf{u}\theta_0 p$ |
| 3. $(\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v})\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{v}\mathbf{w}$ | 8. $D(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}) = (D\mathbf{u})\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{u}D\mathbf{v} + x^{-1}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v})$ |
| 4. $(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v})\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{w})$ | 9. $(x - c)((x - c)^{-1}\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$ |
| 5. \mathbf{u} has an inverse iff $u_0 \neq 0$ | 10. $(x - c)^{-1}((x - c)\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u} - u_0\delta_c.$ |

Notice that from property 10 one also obtains

$$(x - c)\mathbf{u} = (x - c)\mathbf{v} \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} + (u_0 - v_0)\delta_c.$$

We conclude this section by stating the following

PROPOSITION 1.6. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and $p, q \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}$, and denote by Z_p and Z_q the zeros of p and q , respectively. Then the following property holds:*

$$(1.11) \quad Z_p \cap Z_q = \emptyset \quad \wedge \quad p\mathbf{u} = q\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Proof. Denote the degrees of p and q by m and n , respectively. Without loss of generality, we may assume that q is monic (i.e., the coefficient of x^n is equal to 1). Moreover, if $m = 0$ or $n = 0$ (i.e., if p or q is a nonzero constant) then trivially $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, so we may assume as well that $m, n \geq 1$. We will prove that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ by induction on the degree n of q (and keeping p fixed).

Suppose that $n = 1$, so that $q(x) = x - b$, with $b \in \mathbb{C}$ and $p(b) \neq 0$. Then, from $q\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ we have $x\mathbf{u} = b\mathbf{u}$, hence $x^j\mathbf{u} = b^j\mathbf{u}$ for each $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Therefore, $p\mathbf{u} = p(b)\mathbf{u}$, and so equation $p\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ is equivalent to $p(b)\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$.

Suppose now (induction hypothesis) that property (1.11) holds for each polynomial q of degree n (which does not share zeros with p and fulfills $q\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$). Let \tilde{q} be a polynomial of degree $n + 1$ which does not share zeros with p and fulfills $\tilde{q}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. Then we may write $\tilde{q} = (x - b)q$ where q is a polynomial of degree n which does not share zeros with p and $p(b) \neq 0$. Let $\mathbf{v} := q\mathbf{u}$. Then $(x - b)\mathbf{v} = \tilde{q}\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$ and $p\mathbf{v} = q(p\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}$, and so, by the case $n = 1$ already proved, we conclude that $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $q\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, one has $p\mathbf{u} = q\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, and since q is a polynomial of degree n which does not share zeros with p , it follows by the induction hypothesis that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$. \square

4. The formal Stieltjes series

Let Δ' the vector space of the formal series in the variable z with coefficients in \mathbb{C} :

$$\Delta' := \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^n \mid c_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\}.$$

In Δ' the operations of addition, multiplication and scalar multiplication are defined in the usual way (see e.g. Trèves's book [6]). Endowing Δ' with the family of seminorms $\rho_n : \Delta' \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where

$$\rho_n \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^n \right) := \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} |c_j|,$$

Δ' becomes a metrizable LCS. This space can be identified with \mathcal{P}' .

THEOREM 1.7. *The operator $F : \mathcal{P}' \rightarrow \Delta'$ given by*

$$\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}' \quad \mapsto \quad F(\mathbf{u}) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n z^n$$

is a topological isomorphism (\mathcal{P}' being endowed with the weak dual topology).

Proof. Clearly, F is linear and bijective. Moreover, for each $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\rho_n(F(\mathbf{u})) = \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} |u_j| = |\mathbf{u}|_n.$$

Therefore, since the family of seminorms $\{|\cdot|_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$ generates the topology in \mathcal{P}' (cf. Theorem 1.2), we deduce, for each sequence $\{\mathbf{u}_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ in \mathcal{P}' ,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{u}_j) \rightarrow 0 \text{ (in } \Delta') & \text{ iff } \rho_n(F(\mathbf{u}_j)) \rightarrow 0 \text{ for each } n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ & \text{ iff } |\mathbf{u}_j|_n \rightarrow 0 \text{ for each } n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ & \text{ iff } \mathbf{u}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{0} \text{ (in } \mathcal{P}'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, F is bicontinuous, which proves the theorem. \square

Note that the isomorphism F allow us to transfer the algebraic structure from Δ' into \mathcal{P}' . This fact is accomplished through the formal Stieltjes series.

DEFINITION 1.4. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. The formal Stieltjes series associated with \mathbf{u} is*

$$S_{\mathbf{u}}(z) := - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{u_n}{z^{n+1}} \equiv -\frac{1}{z} F\left(\frac{1}{z}\right).$$

Note that $S_{\mathbf{u}}(z)$ gives a representation for the sequence of moments, $\{u_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, of \mathbf{u} . The formal Stieltjes series is an important tool in the theory of OP, allowing us to state characterizations theorems concerning certain important classes of OP, e.g., classical OP, semiclassical OP, and Laguerre-Hahn OP. $S_{\mathbf{u}}(z)$ and its formal derivative,

$$S'_{\mathbf{u}}(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(n+1)u_n}{z^{n+2}},$$

become tools of major importance in the study of these classes of OP.

Exercises

1. Show that in any infinite dimensional normed space there are linear functionals which are not continuous—hence, an equality like (1.2) cannot hold on an infinite dimensional normed space. As a consequence, being X a normed space, there holds:

$$\begin{cases} X' = X^* & \text{if } \dim X < \infty; \\ X' \subsetneq X^* & \text{if } \dim X = \infty. \end{cases}$$

(*Hint:* If $\dim X = \infty$, there exists a denumerable subset $E = \{e_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subset X$ whose elements are linearly independent unit vectors in X . Set $Y := \langle E \rangle$. Then, Zorn's Lemma ensures that Y has a complementary subspace in X , say, Z , so that $X = Y + Z$, with $Y \cap Z = \{0\}$, and each $x \in X$ admits a unique representation as $x = y + z$, with $y \in Y$ and $z \in Z$ [see e.g. Lax's book, p. 14, Lemma 9]. Denoting by \mathbb{K} ($= \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C}) the field of scalars associated with the vector space X , define $\ell : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ by $\ell(x) := \ell_0(y)$, being $\ell_0 : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ the linear functional given by

$$\ell_0\left(\sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k e_k\right) = \sum_{k=1}^N \alpha_k \quad (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N \in \mathbb{K}; \ N \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Show that $\ell \in X^* \setminus X'$.)

2. Let $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{K}[x]$ be the set of all polynomials (regarded as polynomial functions) with coefficients in \mathbb{K} ($= \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C}). Prove that the mapping $\|\cdot\| : \mathbb{P} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ defined by

$$\|f\| := \max_{0 \leq k \leq N} |a_k|, \quad f(x) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^N a_k x^k \in \mathbb{K}[x] \quad (N := \deg f),$$

is a norm in \mathbb{P} , but with this norm \mathbb{P} is not a complete (Banach) space.

(*Hint:* To prove noncompleteness use the Banach-Steinhaus theorem.)

3. Prove that \mathcal{P}' is a Fréchet space.

(*Hint.* The weak dual topology in \mathcal{P}' is generated by the countable family of seminorms $\mathcal{S}_{\sharp} := \{|\cdot|_n : n \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$, hence a given sequence $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in \mathcal{P}' is Cauchy if and only if

$$\forall \epsilon > 0 \ \forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \ \exists n_0 = n_0(\epsilon, k) \in \mathbb{N} : \forall n, m \in \mathbb{N}, \ n, m \geq n_0 \Rightarrow |\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}_m|_k < \epsilon.$$

To prove that \mathcal{P}' is Fréchet we have to show that each Cauchy sequence $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in \mathcal{P}' converges, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ such that $|\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}|_k \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.)

4. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, $\phi \in \mathcal{P}$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Prove Leibniz formula

$$D^n(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \phi^{(k)} D^{n-k} \mathbf{u} .$$

5. Show that the dual basis $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ corresponding to the simple set $\{x^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{a}_n := \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(n)} ,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(n)}$ is the (distributional) derivative of order n of the Dirac functional $\boldsymbol{\delta} \equiv \boldsymbol{\delta}_0$. Conclude that each functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ admits the representation

$$\mathbf{u} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n \frac{u_n}{n!} \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(n)} ,$$

in the sense of the weak dual topology in \mathcal{P}' .

6. Prove the properties listed in Proposition 1.5.²

Final remarks

The theoretical foundations on the (so called) algebraic theory of OP are contained in the articles [2], [3], and [4] by Pascal Maroni, which were our source references for writing this text/chapter. The basic facts about LCS needed to understanding this text are contained e.g. in the book [5] by Michael Reed and Barry Simon, that we have used also for writing Appendix A on LCS. An alternative/complementar reference is the book by François Trèves [6]. Exercises **1** and **2** can be found in several books on Functional Analysis. Exercises **3** up to **6** were elaborated using as source, essentially,

²On the course of the proof of several properties listed in Proposition 1.5, it may be useful to use the following identities, valid for any array $\{\alpha_{i,j}\}_{0 \leq j \leq i \leq n}$ of $\frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}$ complex numbers:

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=0}^i \alpha_{i,j} = \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{j=i}^n \alpha_{j,j-i} = \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{i=j}^n \alpha_{i,j} .$$

Indeed, dispose the array elements to form a right triangle:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \alpha_{0,0} \\ & & & & & & \alpha_{1,0} & \alpha_{1,1} \\ & & & & & & \alpha_{2,0} & \alpha_{2,1} & \alpha_{2,2} \\ & & & & & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \\ & & & & & & \alpha_{n,0} & \alpha_{n,1} & \alpha_{n,2} & \dots & \alpha_{n,n} \end{array}$$

Then we only need to notice that the first double sum corresponds to adding the elements by horizontal lines, from top to bottom, the second sum corresponds to adding the elements by diagonal lines, starting from the “hypotenuse”, and the third one corresponds to adding the elements by vertical lines, from left to right.

the articles by Maroni mentioned above (where some proofs of the results presented therein were not included).

Bibliography

- [1] Peter D. Lax, *Functional Analysis*, John Wiley & Sons (2002).
- [2] P. Maroni, *Sur quelques espaces de distributions qui sont des formes linéaires sur l'espace vectoriel des polynômes*, In C. Brezinski et al. Eds., *Symposium Laguerre, Bar-le-Duc*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1171**, Springer-Verlag (1985) 184–194.
- [3] P. Maroni, *Le calcul des formes linéaires et les polynômes orthogonaux semiclassiques*, In M. Alfaro et al. Eds., *Orthogonal Polynomials and Their Applications*, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1329**, Springer-Verlag (1988) 279–290.
- [4] P. Maroni, *Une théorie algébrique des polynômes orthogonaux. Applications aux polynômes orthogonaux semiclassiques*, In C. Brezinski et al. Eds., *Orthogonal Polynomials and Their Applications*, *Proc. Erice 1990, IMACS, Ann. Comp. App. Math.* **9** (1991) 95–130.
- [5] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis*, Academic Press (1972).
- [6] F. Trèves, *Topological Vector Spaces, Distributions and Kernels*, Academic Press (1967).

2

Basic theory of orthogonal polynomials

1. Orthogonal polynomial sequences

DEFINITION 2.1. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ a sequence in \mathcal{P} .

- (i) $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is called an orthogonal polynomial sequence (OPS) with respect to \mathbf{u} if $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a simple set (so that $\deg P_n = n$ for all n) and there exists a sequence $\{h_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, with $h_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, such that

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, P_m P_n \rangle = h_n \delta_{m,n}, \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

- (ii) \mathbf{u} is called regular (or quasi-definite) if there exists an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} .

REMARK 2.1. Whenever \mathbf{u} is regular and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , we will use such phrases as “ $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS for \mathbf{u} ”, or “ $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS associated with \mathbf{u} ”, or “ \mathbf{u} is regular and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ an associated OPS”, etc.

Next we notice that if \mathbf{u} is regular and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ an associated OPS, then every polynomial admits a Fourier-type expansion in terms of a finite subset of $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$.

THEOREM 2.1. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, regular, and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . Let π_k be a polynomial of degree k . Then,

$$\pi_k(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k c_{k,j} P_j(x), \quad c_{k,j} := \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, \pi_k P_j \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_j^2 \rangle}.$$

Proof. Since $\{P_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ is a simple set in \mathcal{P} , then $\{P_j\}_{j=0}^k$ is an algebraic basis in \mathcal{P}_k . Therefore, since $\pi_k \in \mathcal{P}_k$, there exist complex numbers $c_{k,j}$ such that

$$\pi_k(x) = \sum_{j=0}^k c_{k,j} P_j(x).$$

Multiplying both sides of this equality by P_ℓ , being ℓ fixed, $0 \leq \ell \leq k$, and then taking the action of the functional \mathbf{u} in both sides of the resulting equality, we deduce

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \pi_k P_\ell \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^k c_{k,j} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_j P_\ell \rangle = c_{k,\ell} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_\ell^2 \rangle,$$

hence the desired result follows. □

THEOREM 2.2. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a simple set in \mathcal{P} . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} ;
- (ii) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n \setminus \{0\}$, there is $h_n = h_n(\pi) \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, such that

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \pi P_n \rangle = h_n \delta_{m,n}, \quad m := \deg \pi.$$

- (iii) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there exists $h_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, x^m P_n \rangle = h_n \delta_{m,n}, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Assume that (i) holds. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and let $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Setting $m := \deg \pi$, from Theorem 2.1 we know that there exists complex numbers $c_{m,j}$ such that

$$\pi(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m c_{m,j} P_j(x).$$

Clearly, $c_{m,m} \neq 0$ (since $\pi \neq 0$, $\deg \pi = m$, and $\{P_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ is a simple set in \mathcal{P}). Thus,

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \pi P_n \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^m c_{m,j} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_j P_n \rangle = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m < n, \\ c_{n,n} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle \neq 0 & \text{if } m = n, \end{cases}$$

hence (i) \Rightarrow (ii), being $h_n := c_{n,n} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle$. Taking $\pi(x) := x^m$ in (ii), it is clear that (ii) \Rightarrow (iii). Finally, assume that (iii) holds. Fix $j, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and, without loss of generality, assume that $j \leq n$. Since $\{P_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a simple set, there exists complex numbers $c_{j,m}$, with $c_{j,j} \neq 0$, such that $P_j(x) = \sum_{m=0}^j c_{j,m} x^m$. Therefore, we deduce

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, P_j P_n \rangle = \sum_{m=0}^j c_{j,m} \langle \mathbf{u}, x^m P_n \rangle = \sum_{m=0}^j c_{j,m} h_n \delta_{m,n} = \tilde{h}_n \delta_{j,n},$$

where $\tilde{h}_n := c_{n,n} h_n \neq 0$. Thus (iii) \Rightarrow (i), which completes the proof. \square

The next proposition states that, up to normalization, there exists only one OPS associated with a given regular functional.

THEOREM 2.3. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be regular, and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be two OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . Then, there exists a sequence $\{c_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, with $c_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, such that*

$$Q_n(x) = c_n P_n(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Proof. Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , then

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, Q_k P_j \rangle = 0 \quad \text{if } j < k.$$

Thus, by Theorem 2.1, taking $\pi_k(x) = Q_k(x)$, we obtain $Q_k(x) = c_{k,k} P_k(x)$, being $c_{k,k} = \langle \mathbf{u}, P_k Q_k \rangle / \langle \mathbf{u}, P_k^2 \rangle \neq 0$, which concludes the proof, by taking $c_k := c_{k,k}$. \square

Theorem 2.3 implies that an OPS is uniquely determined if it satisfies a condition that fixes the leading coefficient of each P_n (i.e., the coefficient of x^n). In particular,

if $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS and the leading coefficient of each P_n is 1, we say that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the *monic* OPS (with respect to \mathbf{u}). In general, being $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} (not necessarily monic), and being k_n the leading coefficient of P_n , so that

$$P_n(x) = k_n x^n + \text{lower degree terms} ,$$

the corresponding monic OPS is $\{\hat{P}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, where

$$\hat{P}_n(x) := k_n^{-1} P_n(x) .$$

On the other hand, if $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} and

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle = 1 \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots) ,$$

we say that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an *orthonormal* polynomial sequence (with respect to \mathbf{u}). In general, being $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} (not necessarily orthonormal), the sequence $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, where

$$p_n(x) := \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle^{-1/2} P_n(x) ,$$

is orthonormal with respect to \mathbf{u} . Here the square root needs not be real, but, as noticed above, $p_n(x)$ may be uniquely determined by requiring an additional condition on its leading coefficient (e.g., that its leading coefficient be positive).

Finally, we notice the following obvious fact: *if $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to the functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, then $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is also an OPS with respect to the functional $\mathbf{v} := c\mathbf{u}$, for every constant $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.*

2. Existence of OPS

In this section we analyze the question of whether a given functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is regular, i.e., we ask for necessary and sufficient conditions that guarantee the existence of an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . To answer this question, we introduce the so called Hankel determinants. Denoting, as usual, by $u_j := \langle \mathbf{u}, x^j \rangle$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the moments of \mathbf{u} , we define the associated *Hankel determinant* $H_n \equiv H_n(\mathbf{u})$ as

$$(2.1) \quad H_n := \det \{ [u_{i+j}]_{i,j=0}^n \} = \begin{vmatrix} u_0 & u_1 & \cdots & u_{n-1} & u_n \\ u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_n & u_{n+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{n-1} & u_n & \cdots & u_{2n-2} & u_{2n-1} \\ u_n & u_{n+1} & \cdots & u_{2n-1} & u_{2n} \end{vmatrix} , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Notice that H_n is a determinant of order $n+1$. It is also useful to set

$$(2.2) \quad H_{-1} := 1 .$$

THEOREM 2.4. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Then, \mathbf{u} is regular if and only if

$$(2.3) \quad H_n \neq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Under such conditions, the monic OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to \mathbf{u} is given by $P_0(x) = 1$ and

$$(2.4) \quad P_n(x) = \frac{1}{H_{n-1}} \begin{vmatrix} u_0 & u_1 & \cdots & u_{n-1} & u_n \\ u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_n & u_{n+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{n-1} & u_n & \cdots & u_{2n-2} & u_{2n-1} \\ 1 & x & \cdots & x^{n-1} & x^n \end{vmatrix}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. Suppose that \mathbf{u} is regular. Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, there exists $c_{n,0}, c_{n,1}, \dots, c_{n,n} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$(2.5) \quad P_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n c_{n,k} x^k.$$

By Theorem 2.2, there exists $h_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad h_n \delta_{m,n} = \langle \mathbf{u}, x^m P_n \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^n c_{n,k} u_{k+m}, \quad m = 0, 1, \dots, n.$$

This may be written in matrix form as

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{bmatrix} u_0 & u_1 & \cdots & u_{n-1} & u_n \\ u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_n & u_{n+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{n-1} & u_n & \cdots & u_{2n-2} & u_{2n-1} \\ u_n & u_{n+1} & \cdots & u_{2n-1} & u_{2n} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{n,0} \\ c_{n,1} \\ \vdots \\ c_{n,n-1} \\ c_{n,n} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ h_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the sequence $\{h_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in (2.6) uniquely determines the OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ ¹, then this system (2.7), where the coefficients $c_{n,0}, c_{n,1}, \dots, c_{n,n}$ of P_n are the unknowns, has a unique solution. Hence $H_n \neq 0$, because H_n is the determinant of such system.

Conversely, suppose that $H_n \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, for any fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, to each constant $h_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ corresponds a unique vector $(c_{n,0}, c_{n,1}, \dots, c_{n,n})$, solution of the system (2.7). Using the components of this vector, we may define a polynomial $P_n(x)$ by expression (2.5). This polynomial fulfils (2.6), since (2.6) and (2.7) are equivalent. To conclude that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , it remains to prove that it is a simple set, i.e., $\deg P_n = n$ for all n . Indeed, solving (2.7) for $c_{n,n}$ by Crammer's rule, and taking into account the hypothesis $H_n \neq 0$, we obtain

¹ Indeed, if $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is also an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} such that (2.6) holds with Q_n instead of P_n , with the same h_n , then, since, by Theorem 2.3, $Q_n(x) = c_n P_n(x)$ for some complex number $c_n \neq 0$, one would have $h_n = \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n Q_n \rangle = c_n \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n P_n \rangle = c_n h_n$, hence $c_n = 1$, so that $Q_n = P_n$.

$$(2.8) \quad c_{n,n} = \frac{h_n H_{n-1}}{H_n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

hence $c_{n,n} \neq 0$, which proves that, indeed, $\deg P_n = n$ for all n .

It remains to prove (2.4). We will present two proofs. The first one is a constructive proof. The second one is much more concise.

First proof of (2.4). Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . For each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $P_n(x)$ may be written as in (2.5), being $c_{n,0}, c_{n,1}, \dots, c_{n,n-1} \in \mathbb{C}$, and $c_{n,n} = 1$. As above, for each $m \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, we deduce $0 = \langle \mathbf{u}, x^m P_n \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^n c_{n,k} u_{k+m}$. From this, and taking into account that $c_{n,n} = 1$, we obtain the following system of n equations in the n unknowns $c_{n,0}, c_{n,1}, \dots, c_{n,n-1}$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} u_0 & u_1 & \cdots & u_{n-1} \\ u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_{n-1} & u_n & \cdots & u_{2n-2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{n,0} \\ c_{n,1} \\ \vdots \\ c_{n,n-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -u_n \\ -u_{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ -u_{2n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The determinant of this system is $H_{n-1} \neq 0$. Solving by Crammer's rule, we obtain

$$c_{n,k} = \frac{1}{H_{n-1}} \begin{vmatrix} u_0 & \cdots & u_{k-1} & -u_n & u_{k+1} & \cdots & u_{n-1} \\ u_1 & \cdots & u_k & -u_{n+1} & u_{k+2} & \cdots & u_n \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_{n-1} & \cdots & u_{n+k-2} & -u_{2n-1} & u_{n+k} & \cdots & u_{2n-2} \end{vmatrix}$$

for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. Performing elementary operations on the columns of this determinant, by moving successively the $(k+1)$ th column to its right (so that $n-k-1$ permutations on columns must be done), we deduce

$$(2.9) \quad c_{n,k} = \frac{(-1)^{n-k}}{H_{n-1}} \begin{vmatrix} u_0 & \cdots & u_{k-1} & u_{k+1} & \cdots & u_{n-1} & u_n \\ u_1 & \cdots & u_k & u_{k+2} & \cdots & u_n & u_{n+1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{n-1} & \cdots & u_{n+k-2} & u_{n+k} & \cdots & u_{2n-2} & u_{2n-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. Clearly, (2.9) is also true for $k = n$, since in that case the right-hand side of (2.9) reduces to 1. Therefore, substituting (2.9) into (2.5), we obtain

$$P_n(x) = \frac{1}{H_{n-1}} \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^{n-k} \begin{vmatrix} u_0 & \cdots & u_{k-1} & u_{k+1} & \cdots & u_{n-1} & u_n \\ u_1 & \cdots & u_k & u_{k+2} & \cdots & u_n & u_{n+1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ u_{n-1} & \cdots & u_{n+k-2} & u_{n+k} & \cdots & u_{2n-2} & u_{2n-1} \end{vmatrix} x^k,$$

hence formula (2.4) follows by Laplace's Theorem, developing the determinant in the right-hand side of (2.4) along its last row.

Second proof of (2.4). Let $Q_n(x)$ be the (monic) polynomial of degree n defined by the right-hand side of (2.4). If $m < n$ then, clearly, $\langle \mathbf{u}, x^m Q_n \rangle = 0$ (since $\langle \mathbf{u}, x^m Q_n \rangle$ becomes a determinant whose $m+1$ row and $n+1$ row are equal). If $m = n$, then we simply notice that $\langle \mathbf{u}, x^n Q_n \rangle = H_n/H_{n-1} \neq 0$. Thus, by Theorem 2.2, $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , and since each Q_n is a monic polynomial, one should conclude that (2.4) holds. \square

COROLLARY 2.5. *Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be an OPS with respect to $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and let π_n be a polynomial of degree n . Denote by k_n and a_n the leading coefficients of P_n and π_n , respectively, so that*

$$\begin{aligned} P_n(x) &= k_n x^n + \text{lower degree terms}, \\ \pi_n(x) &= a_n x^n + \text{lower degree terms} \end{aligned}$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then

$$(2.10) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, \pi_n P_n \rangle = a_n \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n P_n \rangle = \frac{a_n k_n H_n}{H_{n-1}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Proof. Writing $\pi_n(x) = a_n x^n + \pi_{n-1}(x)$, with $\pi_{n-1} \in \mathcal{P}_{n-1}$, and taking into account Theorem 2.2, we deduce, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \pi_n P_n \rangle = a_n \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n P_n \rangle + \langle \mathbf{u}, \pi_{n-1} P_n \rangle = a_n \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n P_n \rangle = a_n h_n = \frac{a_n k_n H_n}{H_{n-1}},$$

where the last equality follows from (2.8), noticing that $c_{n,n} = k_n$. \square

3. OPS in the positive-definite sense

In many important occurrences of OP, the functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}^*$ with respect to which the polynomials are orthogonal admits an integral representation involving a weight function, or, in the most general situation, a positive Borel measure, μ , whose support is an infinite subset of \mathbb{R} , and with finite moments of all orders, so that

$$(2.11) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x) d\mu(x), \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

One easily verifies that, under such conditions, the property

$$(2.12) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle > 0$$

holds for each polynomial $p \in \mathcal{P}$ which is nonzero (i.e., it doesn't vanish identically) and nonnegative for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. It turns out that this property characterizes functionals $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ such that an integral representation as (2.11) holds, under the conditions described above. This "equivalence" between (2.11) and (2.12) is a nontrivial fact, and it will be proved later. We start the study of such functionals by introducing the following definition.

DEFINITION 2.2. A functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is called positive-definite if the condition

$$(2.13) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle > 0$$

holds for each polynomial p which is nonzero and nonnegative for all real x .

Next we state some basic properties of positive-definite linear functionals in \mathcal{P} .

THEOREM 2.6. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite. Then, the moments $u_n := \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle$ are real numbers. More precisely, the following holds:

$$(2.14) \quad u_{2n} > 0, \quad u_{2n+1} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Proof. On the first hand, since \mathbf{u} is positive-definite and $x^{2n} \geq 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$u_{2n} = \langle \mathbf{u}, x^{2n} \rangle > 0.$$

On the other hand, using again the positive-definiteness of \mathbf{u} and Newton's binomial formula, we may write

$$0 < \langle \mathbf{u}, (1+x)^{2n} \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k} u_k,$$

hence it follows by induction that u_{2n+1} is a real number. \square

Given a positive-definite functional defined in \mathcal{P} , a step-by-step method of constructing a corresponding orthonormal polynomial sequence can be described, known as *Gram-Schmidt process*. This method produces real orthonormal polynomials.

THEOREM 2.7 (Gram-Schmidt process). Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite. Define a sequence of polynomials $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, constructed step-by-step, as follows:

$$(2.15) \quad p_n(x) := \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle^{-1/2} P_n(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a simple set of monic polynomials, constructed step-by-step as

$$(2.16) \quad P_n(x) := x^n - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n p_k \rangle p_k(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Then, $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is orthonormal with respect to \mathbf{u} , being each $p_n(x)$ a real polynomial (i.e., with real coefficients). Moreover, $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the corresponding monic OPS, being also each $P_n(x)$ a real polynomial.

Proof. To state the theorem we prove that each $P_n(x)$ is a real polynomial (this implies $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle > 0$, since \mathbf{u} is positive-definite, so $p_n(x)$ is also a real polynomial), and

$$(2.17) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p_n^2 \rangle = 1, \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p_j p_{n+1} \rangle = 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n.$$

This will be proved by induction over n . For $n = 0$, we have

$$P_0(x) = 1, \quad p_0(x) = u_0^{-1/2},$$

hence $p_0(x)$ is real—notice that, by Theorem 2.6, conditions (2.14) hold—and

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p_0^2 \rangle = u_0^{-1} \langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle = u_0^{-1} u_0 = 1 .$$

Now, we compute

$$P_1(x) = x - \langle \mathbf{u}, xp_0 \rangle p_0(x) = x - u_1/u_0 ,$$

hence $P_1(x)$ is a real polynomial, and since \mathbf{u} is positive-definite, we have $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_1^2 \rangle > 0$. Thus, $p_1(x) := \langle \mathbf{u}, P_1^2 \rangle^{-1/2} P_1(x)$ is well defined, it is a real polynomial, and

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p_0 p_1 \rangle = u_0^{-1/2} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_1^2 \rangle^{-1/2} \langle \mathbf{u}, x - u_1/u_0 \rangle = 0 ,$$

and we conclude that (2.17) holds for $n = 0$. Assume now (induction hypothesis) that, for some $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the polynomials $P_1(x), \dots, P_{m+1}(x)$ are real, and (2.17) holds for all positive integers $n \leq m$. We need to prove that $P_{m+2}(x)$ is also a real polynomial and (2.17) remains true if n is replaced by $m + 1$. Indeed, since $P_{m+1}(x)$ is real and \mathbf{u} is positive-definite, then $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{m+1}^2 \rangle > 0$, and so

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p_{m+1}^2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{m+1}^2 \rangle^{-1} P_{m+1}^2 \rangle = 1 .$$

Moreover, since, by the induction hypothesis, $P_1(x), \dots, P_{m+1}(x)$ are real, then so are $p_0(x), p_1(x), \dots, p_{m+1}(x)$, hence so is $P_{m+2}(x)$. Then, $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{m+2}^2 \rangle > 0$, and so $p_{m+2}(x) := \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{m+2}^2 \rangle^{-1/2} P_{m+2}(x)$ is well defined. Thus, for each $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, m+1\}$,

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p_j p_{m+2} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{m+2}^2 \rangle^{-1/2} \left(\langle \mathbf{u}, p_j x^{m+2} \rangle - \sum_{k=0}^{m+1} \langle \mathbf{u}, x^{m+2} p_k \rangle \langle \mathbf{u}, p_j p_k \rangle \right) .$$

Since, by the induction hypothesis, $\langle \mathbf{u}, p_j p_k \rangle = \delta_{j,k}$ if $j, k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m+1\}$, we deduce

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p_j p_{m+2} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{m+2}^2 \rangle^{-1/2} \left(\langle \mathbf{u}, p_j x^{m+2} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{u}, x^{m+2} p_j \rangle \right) = 0 , \quad 0 \leq j \leq m+1 .$$

This completes the proof. \square

COROLLARY 2.8. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite. Then, \mathbf{u} is regular.*

Next we state the connection between positive-definite functionals defined in \mathcal{P} and the Hankel determinants introduced in (2.1). We will need the following classical result characterizing non-negative polynomials.

LEMMA 2.9. *Let $\pi(x)$ be a polynomial that is non-negative for all real x . Then, there are real polynomials $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$ such that*

$$(2.18) \quad \pi(x) = P^2(x) + Q^2(x) .$$

Proof. Since $\pi(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then π is a real polynomial (i.e., its coefficients are all real numbers) such that its real zeros have even multiplicity and its non-real zeros occur in conjugate pairs. Thus, we can write

$$\pi(x) = R^2(x) \prod_{k=1}^m (x - a_k + ib_k)(x - a_k - ib_k) ,$$

where R is a real polynomial and a_k, b_k real numbers. Therefore, since we may write

$$\prod_{k=1}^m (x - a_k + ib_k) = A(x) + iB(x) ,$$

where A and B are real polynomials, we deduce

$$\pi(x) = R^2(x)[A(x) + iB(x)][\overline{A(x) + iB(x)}] = R^2(x)[A^2(x) + B^2(x)] ,$$

hence the desired result follows by taking $P := RA$ and $Q := RB$. \square

THEOREM 2.10. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Then, \mathbf{u} is positive-definite if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

- (i) *the moments $u_n := \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle$ are real for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$;*
- (ii) *the Hankel determinants (2.1) are all positive:*

$$(2.19) \quad H_n > 0 , \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Proof. Suppose that \mathbf{u} is positive-definite. Then by Theorem 2.6 all the moments u_n are real. Moreover, by Theorem 2.7, a monic OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to \mathbf{u} exists, with each $P_n(x)$ a real polynomial, and so $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle > 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (since \mathbf{u} is positive-definite). Then, and taking into account Corollary 2.5, we have

$$0 < \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle = \frac{H_n}{H_{n-1}} , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Therefore, since $H_{-1} = 1$, it follows by induction that $H_n > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Conversely, suppose that conditions (i) and (ii) hold. (ii) and Theorem 2.4 ensure that \mathbf{u} is regular, hence there exists a monic OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to \mathbf{u} . Since $P_n(x)$ admits the representation (2.4), it follows from (i) and (ii) that each $P_n(x)$ is a real polynomial. Also, again by Corollary 2.5 and by (ii), we have

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle = \frac{H_n}{H_{n-1}} > 0 , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Let $Q(x)$ be a nonzero real polynomial of degree m . Since each $P_n(x)$ is real, we may write $Q(x) = \sum_{j=0}^m a_j P_j(x)$, where $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$ for all j , with $a_m \neq 0$. Therefore,

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, Q^2 \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^m a_j^2 \langle \mathbf{u}, P_j^2 \rangle > 0 .$$

Thus, it follows from Lemma 2.9 that \mathbf{u} is positive-definite. \square

COROLLARY 2.11. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Suppose that \mathbf{u} is regular and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the associated monic OPS. Assume further that $P_n(x)$ is real for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and*

$$(2.20) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle > 0 , \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Then, \mathbf{u} is positive-definite.

Proof. The hypothesis allow us to proceed as in the last part of the proof of Theorem 2.10, in order to obtain $\langle \mathbf{u}, Q^2 \rangle > 0$ for every nonzero real polynomial Q , so that, by Lemma 2.9, \mathbf{u} is positive-definite. \square

4. Favard's Theorem

One of the most important characterizations of OPS is the fact that any three consecutive polynomials are connected by a very simple relation. This is the content of Favard's Theorem. We begin by stating the following proposition.

THEOREM 2.12. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, regular, and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the corresponding monic OPS. Then, $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfies the three-term recurrence relation*

$$(2.21) \quad P_{n+1}(x) = (x - \beta_n)P_n(x) - \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

with initial conditions

$$(2.22) \quad P_{-1}(x) = 0, \quad P_0(x) = 1,$$

where $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are sequences of complex numbers such that

$$(2.23) \quad \gamma_n \neq 0, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

Moreover, if \mathbf{u} is positive-definite, then

$$(2.24) \quad \beta_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \gamma_n > 0, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

Proof. Since $xP_n(x)$ is a polynomial of degree $n+1$ then, by Theorem 2.1,

$$xP_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} c_{n,j} P_j(x), \quad c_{n,j} := \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, xP_n P_j \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_j^2 \rangle} \quad (0 \leq j \leq n+1).$$

Clearly, $\langle \mathbf{u}, xP_n P_j \rangle = 0$ if $0 \leq j \leq n-2$ (since $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u}), and $c_{n,n+1} = 1$ (since each P_j is a monic polynomial). Hence,

$$xP_n(x) = P_{n+1}(x) + c_{n,n} P_n(x) + c_{n,n-1} P_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Therefore, we obtain (2.21), with

$$\beta_n := c_{n,n} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, xP_n^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$$

and

$$\gamma_n := c_{n,n-1} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, xP_n P_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

If \mathbf{u} is positive-definite, then, by Theorem 2.7, each $P_n(x)$ is a real polynomial. Hence it follows from the previous expressions for β_n and γ_n that conditions (2.24) hold. \square

REMARK 2.2. Since $P_{-1}(x) = 0$, then it doesn't matter how to define γ_0 . Often we will make the useful choice $\gamma_0 := u_0$.

COROLLARY 2.13. *Under the conditions of Theorem 2.12, the following holds:*

(i) *the β -parameters are given by*

$$(2.25) \quad \beta_n = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, xP_n^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots;$$

(ii) *the γ -parameters are given by*

$$(2.26) \quad \gamma_n = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle} = \frac{H_{n-2}H_n}{H_{n-1}^2}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots;$$

(iii) *setting*

$$(2.27) \quad P_n(x) = x^n + f_n x^{n-1} + g_n x^{n-2} + \text{lower degree terms},$$

the coefficients f_n and g_n are given in terms of the β and γ -parameters by

$$(2.28) \quad f_n = - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \beta_j, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots$$

and

$$(2.29) \quad g_n = \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq n-1} \beta_i \beta_j - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \gamma_k, \quad n = 2, 3, \dots$$

Proof. (i) and (ii) follow from the proof of Theorem 2.12 and taking into account (2.10) in Corollary 2.5, so that $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle = H_n/H_{n-1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. To prove (iii), substitute $P_n(x) = x^n + f_n x^{n-1} + g_n x^{n-2} + \dots$ and the corresponding expressions for $P_{n+1}(x)$ and $P_{n-1}(x)$ in the recurrence relation (2.21), so that

$$\begin{aligned} x^{n+1} + f_{n+1}x^n + g_{n+1}x^{n-1} + \dots \\ &= (x - \beta_n)(x^n + f_n x^{n-1} + g_n x^{n-2} + \dots) - \gamma_n(x^{n-1} + f_{n-1}x^{n-2} + \dots) \\ &= x^{n+1} + (f_n - \beta_n)x^n + (g_n - \beta_n f_n - \gamma_n)x^{n-1} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by comparing coefficients, and defining $f_0 = g_1 = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n+1} &= f_n - \beta_n, \quad n \geq 0; \\ g_{n+1} &= g_n - \beta_n f_n - \gamma_n, \quad n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, (2.28) and (2.29) follow easily by induction (or by applying the telescoping property for sums). \square

REMARK 2.3. Regarding to Corollary 2.13, notice also the relations (with the convention that empty product equals one)

$$(2.30) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle = \frac{H_n}{H_{n-1}} = u_0 \prod_{j=1}^n \gamma_j, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

THEOREM 2.14 (Favard). *Let $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be two arbitrary sequences of complex numbers, and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence of (monic) polynomials defined by the three-term recurrence relation*

$$(2.31) \quad P_{n+1}(x) = (x - \beta_n)P_n(x) - \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

with initial conditions

$$(2.32) \quad P_{-1}(x) = 0, \quad P_0(x) = 1.$$

Then there exists a unique functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ such that

$$(2.33) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle = u_0 := \gamma_0, \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n P_m \rangle = 0 \quad \text{if } n \neq m \quad (n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0).$$

Moreover, \mathbf{u} is regular and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the corresponding monic OPS if and only if $\gamma_n \neq 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, while \mathbf{u} is positive-definite and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the corresponding monic OPS if and only if $\beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma_n > 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. Since $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ defined by (2.31) is clearly a simple set in \mathcal{P} (so that it is an algebraic basis in \mathcal{P}), we may define a functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ by

$$(2.34) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, P_0 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle := \gamma_0, \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n \rangle = 0, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Rewrite (2.31) as

$$(2.35) \quad xP_n(x) = P_{n+1}(x) + \beta_n P_n(x) + \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n \geq 0.$$

Then, $\langle \mathbf{u}, xP_n \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+1} \rangle + \beta_n \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n \rangle + \gamma_n \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1} \rangle$ for each $n \geq 0$, hence, by (2.34),

$$(2.36) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, xP_n \rangle = 0, \quad n \geq 2.$$

Multiplying both sides of (2.35) by x and using (2.36), we find

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, x^2 P_n \rangle = 0, \quad n \geq 3.$$

Continuing in this manner, we deduce

$$(2.37) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, x^k P_n \rangle = 0, \quad 0 \leq k < n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, if $m \neq n$, say $m < n$, then writing $P_m(x) = \sum_{k=0}^m a_{m,k} x^k$, we obtain

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, P_m P_n \rangle = \sum_{k=0}^m a_{m,k} \langle \mathbf{u}, x^k P_n \rangle = 0.$$

This proves (2.33). Next, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, multiplying both sides of (2.35) by x^{n-1} , we find $\langle \mathbf{u}, x^n P_n \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, x^{n-1} P_{n+1} \rangle + \beta_n \langle \mathbf{u}, x^{n-1} P_n \rangle + \gamma_n \langle \mathbf{u}, x^{n-1} P_{n-1} \rangle$, hence, using (2.37),

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, x^n P_n \rangle = \gamma_n \langle \mathbf{u}, x^{n-1} P_{n-1} \rangle, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Applying successively this equality, we find

$$(2.38) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n P_n \rangle = \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

This holds for $n = 0$ since $\langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle := \gamma_0$. Notice also that the first equality in (2.38) holds taking into account (2.37), after writing $P_n(x) = x^n + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} a_{n,k} x^k$. It follows from

(2.33) and (2.38) that \mathbf{u} is regular and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the corresponding monic OPS if and only if $\gamma_n \neq 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

In addition, if \mathbf{u} is positive-definite and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the corresponding monic OPS, then $\gamma_0 = \langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle > 0$ and so, by Theorem 2.12, we may conclude that $\beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma_n > 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Conversely, assume that $\beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma_n > 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then, by (2.31) we see that $P_n(x)$ is real (i.e., it has real coefficients) for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, from (2.38), we have $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle > 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This, together with (2.33), proves that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . By Corollary 2.11, \mathbf{u} is positive-definite. \square

REMARK 2.4. Since $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in Theorem 2.14 is independent of γ_0 , and $u_0 := \gamma_0$, then the functional \mathbf{u} is unique up to the (given) choice of γ_0 , i.e., up to the choice of its first moment $u_0 := \langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle$.

REMARK 2.5. The original theorem of Favard concerned only the positive-definite case and the functional \mathbf{u} was represented by a Stieltjes integral. The corresponding result for regular functionals was subsequently observed by Shohat.

5. The Christoffel-Darboux identities

In this section we state other important consequences of the three-term recurrence relation characterizing a given OPS.

THEOREM 2.15 (Christoffel-Darboux identities). *Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a monic OPS fulfilling the three-term recurrence relation (2.21)–(2.22). Then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,*

$$(2.39) \quad \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{P_j(x)P_j(y)}{\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_j} = \frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n} \frac{P_{n+1}(x)P_n(y) - P_n(x)P_{n+1}(y)}{x - y} \quad \text{if } x \neq y$$

(with the convention that empty product equals one), and

$$(2.40) \quad \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{P_j^2(x)}{\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_j} = \frac{P'_{n+1}(x)P_n(x) - P'_n(x)P_{n+1}(x)}{\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n}.$$

Proof. Since (2.40) follows from (2.39) by taking the limit $y \rightarrow x$, we only need to prove (2.39). From (2.21)–(2.22) we have, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} xP_n(x)P_n(y) &= P_{n+1}(x)P_n(y) + \beta_n P_n(x)P_n(y) + \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x)P_n(y), \\ yP_n(y)P_n(x) &= P_{n+1}(y)P_n(x) + \beta_n P_n(y)P_n(x) + \gamma_n P_{n-1}(y)P_n(x). \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the second equation from the first one yields

$$(2.41) \quad (x - y)P_n(x)P_n(y) = G_{n+1}(x, y) - \gamma_n G_n(x, y), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where

$$G_n(x, y) := P_n(x)P_{n-1}(y) - P_n(y)P_{n-1}(x).$$

Dividing both sides of (2.41) by $\gamma_1\gamma_2\cdots\gamma_n(x-y)$, and then in the resulting equality changing n into j , we obtain

$$\frac{P_j(x)P_j(y)}{\gamma_1\gamma_2\cdots\gamma_j} = \frac{G_{j+1}(x,y)}{\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_j(x-y)} - \frac{G_j(x,y)}{\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_{j-1}(x-y)}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Summing from $j = 0$ to $j = n$, the right-hand side becomes a telescoping sum, hence, taking into account that $G_0(x,y) = 0$, we deduce (2.39). \square

Exercises

1. Is the simple set $\{x^n\}_{n \geq 0}$ an OPS with respect to some $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$?
2. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, regular, and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the corresponding monic OPS. Show that

$$P_n(x) = \frac{1}{\Delta_{n-1}} \begin{vmatrix} \langle \mathbf{u}, R_0 R_0 \rangle & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_0 R_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_0 R_{n-1} \rangle & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_0 R_n \rangle \\ \langle \mathbf{u}, R_1 R_0 \rangle & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_1 R_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_1 R_{n-1} \rangle & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_1 R_n \rangle \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \langle \mathbf{u}, R_{n-1} R_0 \rangle & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_{n-1} R_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_{n-1} R_{n-1} \rangle & \langle \mathbf{u}, R_{n-1} R_n \rangle \\ R_0(x) & R_1(x) & \cdots & R_{n-1}(x) & R_n(x) \end{vmatrix}$$

where $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is any simple set of monic polynomials, and

$$\Delta_{-1} := 1, \quad \Delta_n := \det \left\{ [\langle \mathbf{u}, R_i R_j \rangle]_{i,j=0}^n \right\}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

3. Let $\{T_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the sequence of the Chebyshev polynomials of the first kind, defined by

$$T_n(x) = \cos(n\theta), \quad x = \cos \theta \quad (0 \leq \theta \leq \pi; -1 \leq x \leq 1).$$

- (a) Prove that $\{T_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ fulfills the three-term recurrence relation

$$2xT_n(x) = T_{n+1}(x) + T_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

with initial conditions $T_0(x) = 1$ and $T_1(x) = x$. (Note that this shows that T_n is a polynomial of degree n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.)

- (b) Set $p_0(x) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} T_0(x)$ and $p_n(x) := \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} T_n(x)$ if $n \geq 1$. Show that $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is orthonormal with respect to $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ given by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \int_{-1}^1 \frac{p(x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx.$$

- (c) Prove that $T_n(x)$ admits the explicit expression

$$T_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} (-1)^k \binom{n}{2k} x^{n-2k} (1-x^2)^k,$$

where $\lfloor s \rfloor$ denotes the greatest integer less than or equal to the real number s .

4. Let $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the sequence of the Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind, defined by

$$U_n(x) = \frac{\sin(n+1)\theta}{\sin \theta}, \quad x = \cos \theta \quad (0 \leq \theta \leq \pi; -1 \leq x \leq 1).$$

(It is assumed that $U_n(x)$ is defined by continuity whenever $\sin \theta = 0$.)

- (a) Prove that $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ fulfills the three-term recurrence relation

$$2xU_n(x) = U_{n+1}(x) + U_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

with initial conditions $U_0(x) = 1$ and $U_1(x) = 2x$. (Hence U_n is a polynomial of degree n for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.)

- (b) Set $p_n(x) := \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} U_n(x)$. Show that $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is orthonormal with respect to $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ given by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \int_{-1}^1 p(x) \sqrt{1-x^2} \, dx.$$

- (c) Prove that $U_n(x)$ admits the explicit representation

$$U_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor} (-1)^k \binom{n+1}{2k+1} x^{n-2k} (1-x^2)^k.$$

5. Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the sequence of the Legendre polynomials, defined by

$$P_n(x) := \frac{1}{2^n n!} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} \{(x^2 - 1)^n\}.$$

Notice that the leading coefficient of P_n is $2^{-n} \binom{2n}{n}$, hence it is not a monic polynomial. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, set

$$p_n(x) := \sqrt{\frac{2n+1}{2}} P_n(x).$$

Show that $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is orthonormal with respect to $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ given by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \int_{-1}^1 p(x) \, dx.$$

Final remarks

The main sources on the basis of this text are the books by Theodore S. Chihara [1] (1978) and Mourad E. H. Ismail [4] (2005), where the student may find most of the results presented here. The notion of OPS introduced in Definition 2.1 reflects our option to adopt the concept of *formal orthogonality*, also called *regular orthogonality*. Many researchers/authors prefer to adopt a definition of orthogonality that corresponds to the positive-definite case. The book by Gabor Szegő [5] (whose 1st edition goes back to 1939) is considered the first important book entirely dedicated to the theory of OP. Other recommended references containing the general theory presented here are the books by Geza Freud [2] (1976) and Walter Gautschi [3] (2004). Exercise 2 may be found e.g. in Szegő's book. Exercises 3 up to 5 involve three families of OP that

the students probably already meet on previous courses (Numerical Analysis, Linear Algebra, or Functional Analysis, among others) and they can be found in the books included on the bibliography (appearing therein as exercises or not).

Bibliography

- [1] T. S. Chihara, *An introduction to orthogonal polynomials*, Gordon and Breach (1978).
- [2] G. Freud, *Orthogonal polynomials*, Pergamon Press, Oxford (1971).
- [3] W. Gautschi, *Orthogonal polynomials. Computation and Approximation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2004).
- [4] M. E. H. Ismail, *Classical and Quantum Orthogonal Polynomials in One Variable*, Cambridge University Press (2005) [paperback edition: 2009].
- [5] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, AMS Colloq. Publ. **230** (1975), 4th ed.

3

Zeros of orthogonal polynomials and quadrature formulas

1. Zeros of OPS

When $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is positive-definite, then the zeros of the corresponding OPS exhibit a certain regularity in their behavior. In order to discuss this behavior we need to make an extension of the concept of positive-definiteness as introduced in Definition 2.2. To make it clear we emphasize that a polynomial p is said to be nonzero on a set E (written $p \not\equiv 0$ on E) if it does not vanish identically on E .

DEFINITION 3.1. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.

(i) \mathbf{u} is said positive-definite on E if the condition

$$(3.1) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle > 0$$

holds for each real polynomial p which is nonzero and nonnegative on E ;

(ii) if \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on E , then E is called a supporting set for \mathbf{u} .

REMARK 3.1. Notice that if $E = \mathbb{R}$ then positive-definiteness on \mathbb{R} is the same as positive-definiteness as introduced in Definition 2.2.

THEOREM 3.1. Let $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, with $\#E = \infty$. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and suppose that \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on E . Then, the following holds:

(i) if $E \subseteq S$, then \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on S ;

(ii) if $E \supseteq S$ and $\overline{S} = E$, then \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on S .

Proof. (i) Let p be a real polynomial and suppose that $p(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in S$, and that $p \not\equiv 0$ on S . Since (by hypothesis) $E \subseteq S$, then also $p(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in E$ and, moreover, $p \not\equiv 0$ on E (since $p \not\equiv 0$ on S —hence p does not vanishes identically on \mathbb{R} —and $\#E = \infty$). Therefore, since (by hypothesis) \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on E , we deduce $\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle > 0$. Thus, \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on S .

(ii) Take a real polynomial p such that $p(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in S$ and $p \not\equiv 0$ on S . Then

$$(3.2) \quad p(x) \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in E.$$

Indeed, suppose that there is $x_0 \in E$ with $p(x_0) < 0$. Since p is continuous on \mathbb{R} , then

$$(3.3) \quad \exists \delta > 0 : \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, |x - x_0| < \delta \Rightarrow p(x) < 0.$$

Now, since $x_0 \in E$ and $\delta > 0$, taking into account that $\overline{S} = E$, we may ensure that

$$(3.4) \quad \exists s \in S : |s - x_0| < \delta .$$

From (3.3) and (3.4) we conclude that $p(s) < 0$, in contradiction with the choice of p . Henceforth, (3.2) holds. Moreover, $p \not\equiv 0$ on E (since $p \not\equiv 0$ on S and $S \subseteq E$). Thus, since (by hypothesis) \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on E , we conclude that $\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle > 0$, hence \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on S . \square

REMARK 3.2. Statement (ii) in Theorem 3.1 holds trivially if $\#E < \infty$, since in that case $S = E$. On the contrary, statement (i) does not holds if $\#E < \infty$. For instance, if x_1, \dots, x_N are any N distinct real numbers, and $h_1, \dots, h_N > 0$, then, being $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ the functional defined by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle := \sum_{j=1}^N h_j x_j^n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0),$$

\mathbf{u} is positive-definite on $E := \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$, but it is not positive-definite on any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that E is a proper subset of S .¹

THEOREM 3.2. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite, and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . Let I be an interval which is a supporting set for \mathbf{u} . Then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the zeros of P_n are all real, simple, and they are located in the interior of I .*

Proof. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since \mathbf{u} is positive-definite then P_n is a real polynomial, i.e., its coefficients are real numbers (by Theorem 2.7). Moreover, since $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n \rangle = 0$ then $P_n(x)$ must change sign at least once in the interior of the interval I . [Indeed, if $P_n(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in I$ then, since I is a supporting set for \mathbf{u} , we would have $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n \rangle > 0$, a contradiction with $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n \rangle = 0$, hence, there is at least one point $r_1 \in I$ such that $P_n(r_1) < 0$. Similarly, if $P_n(x) \leq 0$ for all $x \in I$ then $-P_n(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in I$, so we would have $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{u}, -P_n \rangle < 0$, again a contradiction with $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n \rangle = 0$, hence, there is at least one point $r_2 \in I$ such that $P_n(r_2) > 0$. Therefore, $P_n(r_1)P_n(r_2) < 0$, so $P_n(x)$ change sign at least once in the interval $(r_1, r_2) \subset I$.] Therefore, $P_n(x)$ has at least one zero of odd multiplicity located in the interior of I . Let x_1, \dots, x_k denote the distinct zeros of odd multiplicity of $P_n(x)$ which are located in the interior of I . Set

$$\pi_k(x) := (x - x_1)(x - x_2) \cdots (x - x_k) .$$

Then the polynomial $\pi_k P_n$ has no zeros of odd multiplicity in the interior of I , hence $\pi_k(x)P_n(x) \geq 0$ for each $x \in I$. Therefore, since \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on I ,

$$(3.5) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, \pi_k P_n \rangle > 0 .$$

¹This can be seen immediately by noticing that \mathbf{u} may be represented as a Riemann-Stieltjes integral with respect to the right continuous step function supported on E with jump h_j at the point x_j , for each $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$.

On the other hand, since $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , we must have

$$(3.6) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, \pi_k P_n \rangle \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } k < n, \\ \neq 0 & \text{if } k = n. \end{cases}$$

From (3.5) and (3.6) we deduce that $k = n$. This means that $P_n(x)$ has n distinct zeros of odd multiplicity in the interior of I , and since $\deg P_n = n$, we may conclude that $P_n(x)$ has n real and simple zeros, all in the interior of I . \square

Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a monic OPS with respect to a positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. According to Theorem 3.2, the zeros $x_{n,1}, \dots, x_{n,n}$ of each $P_n(x)$ may be ordered by increasing size, so that

$$(3.7) \quad x_{n,1} < x_{n,2} < \dots < x_{n,n}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

Since $P_n(x)$ has positive leading coefficient ($= 1$), it follows that for each $n \geq 1$,

$$(3.8) \quad P_n(x) > 0 \quad \text{if } x > x_{n,n};$$

$$(3.9) \quad \operatorname{sgn} P_n(x) = (-1)^n \quad \text{if } x < x_{n,1},$$

where sgn is the *signum* function, defined by

$$\operatorname{sgn}(x) := \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } x < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } x > 0. \end{cases}$$

THEOREM 3.3. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite, and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the corresponding monic OPS. Suppose (without loss of generality) that the zeros of P_n fulfill (3.7) for each $n \geq 2$. Then, the following holds:*

- (i) P'_n has exactly one zero in each open interval $(x_{n,j}, x_{n,j+1})$, $1 \leq j \leq n-1$.
Moreover:

$$(3.10) \quad \operatorname{sgn} P'_n(x_{n,j}) = (-1)^{n-j}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n;$$

- (ii) the zeros of P_n and P_{n+1} fulfill the separating (or interlacing) property:

$$(3.11) \quad x_{n+1,j} < x_{n,j} < x_{n+1,j+1}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n;$$

- (iii) for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{x_{n,j}\}_{n \geq j}$ is a decreasing sequence, while $\{x_{n,n-j+1}\}_{n \geq j}$ is an increasing sequence;

- (iv) for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the limits

$$(3.12) \quad \xi_j := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n,j}, \quad \eta_j := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n,n-j+1}$$

all exist (at least in the extended real number system).

Proof. (i) Since $P_n(x)$ has n real and distinct zeros $x_{n,1}, \dots, x_{n,n}$, then by the Cauchy-Bolzano theorem the derivative $P'_n(x)$ has $n - 1$ real and distinct zeros, one zero in between each pair of consecutive zeros of $P_n(x)$. Henceforth, in each interval $(x_{n,j}, x_{n,j+1})$, $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$, there is exactly one zero of $P'_n(x)$. Moreover, we see that for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$, $P'_n(x_{n,j})$ alternates in sign as j varies from 0 to n , and since $P'_n(x)$ has positive leading coefficient ($= n$), we conclude that (3.10) holds.

(ii) By the confluent Cristoffel-Darboux formula (2.40), with $x = x_{n+1,j}$, we have

$$(3.13) \quad P'_{n+1}(x_{n+1,j})P_n(x_{n+1,j}) > 0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n + 1.$$

On the other hand, by (3.10) with n replaced by $n + 1$, we also have

$$(3.14) \quad \text{sgn } P'_{n+1}(x_{n+1,j}) = (-1)^{n+1-j}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1.$$

It follows from (3.13) and (3.14) that

$$\text{sgn } P_n(x_{n+1,j}) = (-1)^{n+1-j}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n + 1.$$

Therefore, $P_n(x)$ has at least one zero, and hence exactly one zero, on each of the intervals $(x_{n+1,j}, x_{n+1,j+1})$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, which proves (3.11).

(iii) It is an immediate consequence of (ii).

(iv) It is an immediate consequence of (iii). □

Property (iv) in Theorem 3.3 motivates a very important definition:

DEFINITION 3.2. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite, and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the corresponding monic OPS. The closed interval $[\xi, \eta]$, where

$$(3.15) \quad \xi := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n,1}, \quad \eta := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_{n,n}$$

is called the true interval of orthogonality of $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$.

REMARK 3.3. The true interval of orthogonality is the smallest closed interval that contains all the zeros of all the polynomials in the sequence $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. Moreover, it can be shown that *the true interval of orthogonality is the smallest closed interval that is a supporting set for \mathbf{u} .*

REMARK 3.4. The three-term recurrence relation for a given monic OPS (not necessarily with respect to a positive-definite moment linear functional)

$$xP_{n-1}(x) = P_n(x) + \beta_{n-1}P_{n-1}(x) + \gamma_{n-1}P_{n-2}(x), \quad n \geq 1,$$

with initial conditions $P_{-1}(x) := 0$ and $P_0(x) = 1$, may be written in matrix form as

$$(3.16) \quad x \begin{pmatrix} P_0(x) \\ P_1(x) \\ \vdots \\ P_{n-2}(x) \\ P_{n-1}(x) \end{pmatrix} = J_n \begin{pmatrix} P_0(x) \\ P_1(x) \\ \vdots \\ P_{n-2}(x) \\ P_{n-1}(x) \end{pmatrix} + P_n(x) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where J_n is a tridiagonal matrix of order n given by

$$(3.17) \quad J_n := \begin{pmatrix} \beta_0 & 1 & & & & \\ \gamma_1 & \beta_1 & 1 & & & \\ & \gamma_2 & \beta_2 & 1 & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & \beta_{n-2} & 1 & \\ & & & \gamma_{n-1} & \beta_{n-1} & \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the following holds:

- (i) the eigenvalues of J_n are the zeros of P_n , hence the spectrum of J_n is

$$\sigma(J_n) = \{x_{n,j} : j = 1, \dots, n\};$$

- (ii) an eigenvector $v_{n,j}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $x_{n,j}$ is

$$v_{n,j} := \begin{pmatrix} P_0(x_{n,j}) \\ P_1(x_{n,j}) \\ \vdots \\ P_{n-2}(x_{n,j}) \\ P_{n-1}(x_{n,j}) \end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

This establishes a connection between Orthogonal Polynomials and Linear Algebra.

REMARK 3.5. Often we will refer to J_n as the *Jacobi matrix* associated with P_n , although in the framework of Linear Algebra the name “Jacobi” is usually attached to symmetric tridiagonal matrices.

REMARK 3.6. As a consequence of the connection just mentioned, P_n is the (monic) characteristic polynomial associated with the matrix J_n , so that

$$P_n(x) = \det(xI_n - J_n),$$

where I_n is the identity matrix of order n . Henceforth, $P_n(x)$ may be represented as a determinant involving only the sequences of the β and γ -parameters:

$$(3.18) \quad P_n(x) = \begin{vmatrix} x - \beta_0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \gamma_1 & x - \beta_1 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_2 & x - \beta_2 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & x - \beta_{n-2} & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \gamma_{n-1} & x - \beta_{n-1} \end{vmatrix}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

2. Gauss-Jacobi-Christoffel quadrature formula

Fix n points $(t_j, y_j) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $1 \leq j \leq n$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). Assume that $t_i \neq t_j$ if $i \neq j$. It is well known that the only solution for the problem —known as *Lagrange problem*— of constructing a polynomial of degree at most $n - 1$ whose graph passes through all the points (t_j, y_j) is the so-called *Lagrange interpolation polynomial*, L_n , defined by

$$(3.19) \quad L_n(x) := \sum_{j=1}^n y_j \ell_j(x) ,$$

where

$$(3.20) \quad \ell_j(x) := \frac{F(x)}{(x - t_j)F'(t_j)} , \quad F(x) := \prod_{i=1}^n (x - t_i) .$$

Clearly, ℓ_j is a polynomial of degree $n - 1$ for each $j = 1, \dots, n$, which fulfils

$$(3.21) \quad \ell_j(t_k) = \delta_{j,k} , \quad j, k = 1, 2, \dots, n .$$

Moreover, the interpolation property implies that L_n satisfies the property

$$(3.22) \quad L_n(t_j) = y_j , \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n .$$

We will use the Lagrange interpolation polynomial to obtain the Gauss-Jacobi-Christoffel quadrature formula.

THEOREM 3.4 (Gauss-Jacobi-Christoffel quadrature formula). *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite, and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the corresponding monic OPS. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $x_{n,1}, \dots, x_{n,n}$ the zeros of P_n . Then*

$$(3.23) \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} , \exists A_{n,1}, \dots, A_{n,n} > 0 : \forall p \in \mathcal{P}_{2n-1} , \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{n,j} p(x_{n,j}) .$$

Moreover,

$$(3.24) \quad \sum_{j=1}^n A_{n,j} = u_0 := \langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle .$$

Proof. Let $p \in \mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$. Consider the Lagrange interpolation polynomial L_n that passes through the points $(t_j, y_j) \equiv (x_{n,j}, p(x_{n,j}))$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, i.e.,

$$L_n(x) := \sum_{j=1}^n p(x_{n,j}) \ell_{j,n}(x) , \quad \ell_{j,n}(x) := \frac{P_n(x)}{(x - x_{n,j})P'_n(x_{n,j})} .$$

Let $Q(x) := p(x) - L_n(x)$. Then, $Q \in \mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$ and $Q(x_{n,j}) = p(x_{n,j}) - L_n(x_{n,j}) = y_j - y_j = 0$ for each $j = 1, \dots, n$, hence $Q(x)$ vanishes at the zeros of $P_n(x)$. Therefore,

$$\exists R \in \mathcal{P}_{n-1} : Q(x) = R(x)P_n(x) .$$

Since $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , we deduce

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, Q + L_n \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, RP_n \rangle + \langle \mathbf{u}, L_n \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, L_n \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n p(x_{n,j}) \langle \mathbf{u}, \ell_{j,n} \rangle .$$

Thus, setting

$$(3.25) \quad A_{n,j} := \langle \mathbf{u}, \ell_{j,n} \rangle , \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n ,$$

we obtain

$$(3.26) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{n,j} p(x_{n,j}) .$$

Therefore, (3.23) will become proved provided we can show that the $A_{n,j}$'s defined by (3.25) are all positive numbers. Indeed, taking $p(x) \equiv \ell_{j,n}^2(x)$ in (3.26)—notice that each $\ell_{j,n}$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, is a polynomial of degree $n-1$, hence $\ell_{j,n}^2 \in \mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$ —, and taking into account that \mathbf{u} is positive-definite, we have

$$0 < \langle \mathbf{u}, \ell_{j,n}^2 \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{n,k} \ell_{j,n}^2(x_{n,k}) = \sum_{k=1}^n A_{n,k} \delta_{j,k} = A_{n,j}$$

for each $j = 1, \dots, n$. Notice also that the $A_{n,j}$'s defined by (3.25) do not depend on p . Hence, (3.23) is proved. Finally, choosing $p(x) \equiv 1$ in (3.23), we obtain (3.24). \square

REMARK 3.7. Quadrature formulas are very useful tools in Numerical Analysis, e.g. for computing integrals by approximation. Indeed, numerical quadrature consists of approximating the integral of a given integrable function f ,

$$I[f] := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d\mu(x) ,$$

with respect some positive Borel measure μ , by a finite sum which uses only the values of f at n points t_j (called nodes),

$$I_n[f] := \sum_{j=1}^n f(t_j) A_j ,$$

where the coefficients A_j (which may depend on n , as well as the nodes t_j) have to be chosen properly so that the quadrature formula is correct,—i.e., the equality $I[f] = I_n[f]$ holds—, for as many functions f as possible.

Exercises

1. Let x_1, \dots, x_N be any N distinct real numbers, and let $h_1, \dots, h_N > 0$. Define $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle := \sum_{j=1}^N h_j x_j^n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Prove that:

- (a) \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on $E := \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$;
 - (b) \mathbf{u} is not positive-definite on any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that E is a proper subset of S .
2. Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$, with $bc > 0$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, set

$$P_n(x) := (bc)^{n/2} U_n\left(\frac{x-a}{2\sqrt{bc}}\right),$$

where $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the sequence of the Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind.

- (a) Show that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS w.r.t. a positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$.
- (b) Consider the tridiagonal Toeplitz matrix of order n

$$A_n = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & & & \\ c & a & b & & \\ & c & a & b & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ & & & c & a & b \\ & & & & c & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

Prove that the eigenvalues of A_n are

$$\lambda_j := a + 2\sqrt{bc} \cos \frac{j\pi}{n+1} \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, n),$$

with corresponding eigenvectors

$$v_j := \frac{1}{\sin \frac{j\pi}{n+1}} \begin{pmatrix} \sin \frac{j\pi}{n+1} \\ (c/b)^{1/2} \sin \frac{2j\pi}{n+1} \\ \vdots \\ (c/b)^{(n-1)/2} \sin \frac{nj\pi}{n+1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

(Hint. Define $Q_n(x) := b^{-n} P_n(x)$, and write the TTRR for $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in matrix form.)

3. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite. Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the corresponding monic OPS and $\{p_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ an associated orthonormal sequence. Denote by x_{n1}, \dots, x_{nn} the zeros of $P_n(x)$ and let $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be the sequence of γ -parameters appearing in the TTRR fulfilled by $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. Show that the “weights” A_{nk} in the associated Gauss quadrature formula admit the following representations:

$$A_{nk} = -\frac{u_0 \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n}{P_{n+1}(x_{nk}) P'_n(x_{nk})} = \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^n p_j^2(x_{nk}) \right\}^{-1} \quad (1 \leq k \leq n; n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

(Hint. Use the Christoffel-Darboux identities.)

4. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be defined as

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x) d\mu(x), \quad p \in \mathcal{P},$$

where μ is a positive Borel measure with infinite support² and finite moments of all orders.

(a) Prove that \mathbf{u} is positive-definite.

(b) Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . Prove that the maximum of the ratio

$$\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}} x Q_n^2(x) d\mu(x)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}} Q_n^2(x) d\mu(x)}$$

taken over all real polynomials Q_n of degree at most n is equal to the largest zero $x_{n+1,n+1}$ of the polynomial P_{n+1} , and the minimum is equal to the smallest zero $x_{n+1,1}$ of P_{n+1} .

(c) Determine polynomials Q_n where these maximum and minimum ratios are attained.

Final remarks

The presentation of the topics considered in this text follows Chihara's book [1]. These topics may be found also in most books containing chapters on the general theory of OP. In particular, they are treated (with more or less detail) in the books included in the bibliography. Exercises **1** up to **3** appear in Chihara's book, being the results contained therein proved in several textbooks appearing in the bibliography. The result expressed by exercise **2** appears in useful applications of OP. Concerning exercise **4**, see e.g. the article [6] by W. Van Assche.

Bibliography

- [1] T. S. Chihara, *An introduction to orthogonal polynomials*, Gordon and Breach (1978).
- [2] G. Freud, *Orthogonal polynomials*, Pergamon Press, Oxford (1971).
- [3] W. Gautschi, *Orthogonal polynomials. Computation and approximation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2004).
- [4] M. E. H. Ismail, *Classical and quantum orthogonal polynomials in one variable*, Cambridge University Press (2005) [paperback edition: 2009].
- [5] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal polynomials*, AMS Colloq. Publ. **230** (1975), 4th ed.
- [6] W. Van Assche, *Orthogonal polynomials in the complex plane and on the real line, Special functions, q-series and related topics (Toronto, ON, 1995)*, Fields Inst. Commun. **14**, AMS (1997) 211-245.

²The support of μ is the set $\text{supp}(\mu) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mu((x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)) > 0, \forall \epsilon > 0\}$.

4

The spectral theorem for orthogonal polynomials

Here we still concentrates in the study of OPS with respect to positive-definite moment linear functionals $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Our aim is to prove that any such functional admits an integral representation involving a positive Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R} (which needs not to be unique) with infinite support and such that all its moments exist.

1. Helly's theorems

In this section we state some preliminary results needed for the proof of the representation theorem to be stated in the next section.

LEMMA 4.1. *Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be an interval and let $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a monotone function. Then, f has at most countably many discontinuity points.*

Proof. This is a well known result in Real Analysis. A nice proof can be found e.g. in the book [7] by G. Leoni. \square

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of real functions defined on a countable set E . Suppose that $\{f_n(x)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a bounded sequence for each $x \in E$. Then $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ contains a subsequence $\{f_{n_j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ that converges everywhere on E , i.e., the (sub)sequence $\{f_{n_j}(x)\}_{j \geq 1}$ converges for each $x \in E$.*

Proof. Set $E := \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots\}$ and write $f_n^{(0)} \equiv f_n$. Since $\{f_n^{(0)}(x_1)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a bounded sequence of real numbers, it contains a convergent subsequence, i.e., there exists a subsequence $\{f_n^{(1)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ of $\{f_n^{(0)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that $\{f_n^{(1)}(x)\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges for $x = x_1$. Now, since $\{f_n^{(1)}(x_2)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a bounded sequence, it contains a convergent subsequence, hence, there exists a subsequence $\{f_n^{(2)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ of $\{f_n^{(1)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that $\{f_n^{(2)}(x)\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges for $x = x_2$. Proceeding in this way, we obtain sequences

$$\{f_n^{(0)}\}_{n \geq 1}, \quad \{f_n^{(1)}\}_{n \geq 1}, \quad \{f_n^{(2)}\}_{n \geq 1}, \quad \dots, \quad \{f_n^{(k)}\}_{n \geq 1}, \quad \dots$$

such that:

- (i) $\{f_n^{(k)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a subsequence of $\{f_n^{(k-1)}\}_{n \geq 1}$, for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$;
- (ii) $\{f_n^{(k)}(x)\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges for each $x \in E_k := \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$.

It follows from (i)—with a little care (passing to a subsequence if necessary) to ensure that the relative order of terms is preserved—that the diagonal sequence, $\{f_n^{(n)}\}_{n \geq 1}$, is

also a subsequence of $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$. Since, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, except for the first $k - 1$ terms, $\{f_n^{(n)}\}_{n \geq 1}$ is also a subsequence of $\{f_n^{(k)}\}_{n \geq 1}$, it follows from (ii) that

$$\{f_n^{(n)}(x)\}_{n \geq 1} \text{ converges for each } x \in \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} E_k = E.$$

Therefore, since, for each $x \in E$, $\{f_n^{(n)}(x)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a subsequence of $\{f_n(x)\}_{n \geq 1}$, the proof is concluded. \square

THEOREM 4.3 (Helly's selection principle). *Let $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a uniformly bounded sequence of nondecreasing functions defined on \mathbb{R} . Then, $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ has a subsequence which converges on \mathbb{R} to a bounded and nondecreasing function.*

Proof. Consider the set of rational numbers, \mathbb{Q} . According to Lemma 4.2, there is a subsequence $\{\phi_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ which converges everywhere on \mathbb{Q} . Henceforth, we may define a function $\Phi_1 : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$(4.1) \quad \Phi_1(r) := \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(r), \quad r \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

It follows from the hypothesis on $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ that Φ_1 is bounded and nondecreasing on \mathbb{Q} . We now extend the domain of Φ_1 to \mathbb{R} by defining $\Phi_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$(4.2) \quad \Phi_2(x) := \begin{cases} \Phi_1(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Q}, \\ \sup_{\substack{r \in \mathbb{Q} \\ r < x}} \Phi_1(r) & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}. \end{cases}$$

This function Φ_2 is clearly bounded and nondecreasing on \mathbb{R} (since the same properties are fulfilled by Φ_1). According to (4.1), $\{\phi_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ converges to $\Phi_2(x)$ at each point $x \in \mathbb{Q}$. Next we show that $\{\phi_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ also converges to $\Phi_2(x)$ at each point x where Φ_2 is continuous. To this end, suppose that Φ_2 is continuous at the point $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. Since \mathbb{Q} is a dense subset of \mathbb{R} and Φ_2 is continuous at x , then

$$(4.3) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists x_2 \in \mathbb{Q} : x < x_2 \wedge \Phi_2(x_2) < \Phi_2(x) + \epsilon.$$

Fix arbitrarily $x_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$, with $x_1 < x$. Then, since (by hypothesis) ϕ_{n_k} is a nondecreasing function on \mathbb{R} , we have

$$\phi_{n_k}(x_1) \leq \phi_{n_k}(x) \leq \phi_{n_k}(x_2).$$

Therefore, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2(x_1) &= \Phi_1(x_1) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x_1) = \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x_1) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x_2) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x_2) = \Phi_1(x_2) = \Phi_2(x_2) \\ &< \Phi_2(x) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Summarizing, we proved that, if Φ_2 is continuous at a point $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, then

$$\forall x_1 \in \mathbb{Q}, \quad x_1 < x \Rightarrow \Phi_2(x_1) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) < \Phi_2(x) + \epsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$\Phi_2(x) = \lim_{\substack{x_1 \rightarrow x^- \\ x_1 \in \mathbb{Q}}} \Phi_2(x_1) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) < \Phi_2(x) + \epsilon ,$$

hence, since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we deduce (letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$),

$$\Phi_2(x) \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) \leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) \leq \Phi_2(x) .$$

Since the left-hand side and the right-hand side coincide, these inequalities are indeed equalities, hence

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_k}(x) = \Phi_2(x) .$$

Thus indeed $\{\phi_{n_k}(x)\}_{k \geq 1}$ converges to $\Phi_2(x)$ at each point $x \in \mathbb{R}$ of continuity of Φ_2 .

Now, observe that Φ_2 is a nondecreasing function, so (by Lemma 4.1) the set of its points of discontinuity form an at most countable set. Denote by D the set of points of discontinuity of Φ_2 which does not belong to \mathbb{Q} . Applying Lemma 4.2 to $\{\phi_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ and D , we deduce that there is a subsequence $\{\phi_{n_{k_j}}\}_{j \geq 1}$ of $\{\phi_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ which converges everywhere on D to a limit function $\Phi_3 : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Finally, define $\phi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\phi(x) := \begin{cases} \Phi_2(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus D , \\ \Phi_3(x) & \text{if } x \in D . \end{cases}$$

It is clear that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_{n_{k_j}}(x) = \phi(x) , \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R} .$$

Moreover, the hypothesis on $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ ensure that ϕ is bounded and nondecreasing. In conclusion: $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ has a convergent subsequence $\{\phi_{n_{k_j}}\}_{j \geq 1}$ which converges to a bounded and nondecreasing function ϕ on \mathbb{R} . The proof is complete. \square

The next theorem involves the Riemann-Stieltjes integral. The needed facts concerning this integral can be found e.g. in the book [6] by Kolmogorov and Fomini.

THEOREM 4.4 (Helly's convergence theorem). *Let $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a uniformly bounded sequence of nondecreasing functions defined on a compact interval $[a, b]$, and suppose that this sequence converges on $[a, b]$ to a limit function ϕ , so that*

$$(4.4) \quad \phi(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \phi_n(x) , \quad x \in [a, b] .$$

Then, for each continuous function $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the following holds:

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_a^b f(x) d\phi_n(x) = \int_a^b f(x) d\phi(x) .$$

Proof. Since $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly bounded and each ϕ_n is nondecreasing on $[a, b]$,

$$\exists M > 0 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N} , \quad 0 \leq \phi_n(b) - \phi_n(a) \leq M ,$$

hence, by hypothesis (4.4), also

$$(4.6) \quad 0 \leq \phi(b) - \phi(a) \leq M.$$

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Since, by hypothesis, f is a continuous function on the compact set $[a, b]$, then f is uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$, hence there is a partition P_ϵ of $[a, b]$,

$$P_\epsilon \quad : \quad a = x_0 < x_1 < \cdots < x_{i-1} < x_i < \cdots < x_{m-1} < x_m = b,$$

such that

$$(4.7) \quad x, z \in [x_{i-1}, x_i] \Rightarrow |f(x) - f(z)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2M}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}.$$

[Indeed, being f uniformly continuous on $[a, b]$, this means that

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \delta = \delta(\epsilon) > 0 : \forall x, z \in [a, b], \quad |x - z| < \delta \Rightarrow |f(x) - f(z)| < \epsilon/(2M);$$

hence we choose the partition P_ϵ so that $|x_i - x_{i-1}| < \delta$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$.] Now, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, choose an “intermediate point” $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, and set

$$\Delta_i \phi := \phi(x_i) - \phi(x_{i-1}), \quad \Delta_i \phi_n := \phi_n(x_i) - \phi_n(x_{i-1}).$$

By the Mean Value theorem for the Riemann-Stieltjes integral, for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, there exists $\xi'_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ such that

$$\int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} f(x) d\phi(x) = f(\xi'_i)(\phi(x_i) - \phi(x_{i-1})) = (f(\xi'_i) - f(\xi_i) + f(\xi_i))\Delta_i \phi,$$

hence

$$\int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} f(x) d\phi(x) - f(\xi_i)\Delta_i \phi = (f(\xi'_i) - f(\xi_i))\Delta_i \phi, \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}.$$

Summing over i and taking into account that $\sum_{i=1}^m \int_{x_{i-1}}^{x_i} f(x) d\phi(x) = \int_a^b f(x) d\phi(x)$, and then applying the triangular inequality, we obtain

$$\left| \int_a^b f(x) d\phi(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i)\Delta_i \phi \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |f(\xi'_i) - f(\xi_i)|\Delta_i \phi,$$

hence, since $\xi_i, \xi'_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, so that we may apply (4.7), we deduce

$$(4.8) \quad \left| \int_a^b f(x) d\phi(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i)\Delta_i \phi \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2M} \sum_{i=1}^m \Delta_i \phi = \frac{\epsilon}{2M} (\phi(b) - \phi(a)) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2},$$

where the last inequality holds by (4.6). In the same way, replacing ϕ by ϕ_n in the previous reasoning, we deduce

$$(4.9) \quad \left| \int_a^b f(x) d\phi_n(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i)\Delta_i \phi_n \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Next, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_a^b f(x) d\phi(x) - \int_a^b f(x) d\phi_n(x) \right| &\leq \left| \int_a^b f(x) d\phi(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i) \Delta_i \phi \right| \\ &+ \left| \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i) \Delta_i \phi - \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i) \Delta_i \phi_n \right| + \left| \int_a^b f(x) d\phi_n(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i) \Delta_i \phi_n \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, taking into account (4.8) and (4.9), and noticing that

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i) \Delta_i \phi - \sum_{i=1}^m f(\xi_i) \Delta_i \phi_n \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |f(\xi_i)| |\Delta_i \phi - \Delta_i \phi_n|,$$

we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad \left| \int_a^b f(x) d\phi(x) - \int_a^b f(x) d\phi_n(x) \right| < \epsilon + \sum_{i=1}^m |f(\xi_i)| |\Delta_i \phi - \Delta_i \phi_n|.$$

Keeping P_ϵ fixed, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} (\Delta_i \phi - \Delta_i \phi_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \{(\phi(x_i) - \phi_n(x_i)) - (\phi(x_{i-1}) - \phi_n(x_{i-1}))\} = 0,$$

where the last equality follows from (4.4), hence we conclude from (4.10) that

$$(4.11) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \int_a^b f(x) d\phi(x) - \int_a^b f(x) d\phi_n(x) \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is positive and arbitrary, the \limsup in (4.11) must be equal to zero. It turns out that in (4.11) we may replace the \limsup by the limit, and since this limit is equal to zero, we conclude that (4.5) holds. \square

2. The representation theorem

We are ready to state the important representation theorem for a positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, showing that such a functional admits an integral representation as a Riemann-Stieltjes integral with respect to a real bounded nondecreasing function on \mathbb{R} fulfilling some natural conditions (namely, finite moments of all orders, and infinite spectrum). We begin by introducing some useful concepts.

DEFINITION 4.1. *A function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a distribution function if it is bounded, nondecreasing and all its moments*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^n d\psi(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

are finite. The spectrum of a distribution function ψ is the set

$$\sigma(\psi) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \psi(x + \delta) - \psi(x - \delta) > 0, \forall \delta > 0\}.$$

REMARK 4.1. Often, being ψ a distribution function, a point in $\sigma(\psi)$ is called a *spectral point*, or an *increasing point* of ψ .

THEOREM 4.5. *The spectrum $\sigma(\psi)$ of a distribution function ψ is closed in \mathbb{R} .*

Proof. We will prove that $\mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(\psi)$ is an open set. Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(\psi)$. Then

$$\exists \delta > 0 : \psi(x_0 + \delta) - \psi(x_0 - \delta) \leq 0 .$$

Since ψ is nondecreasing, ψ must be constant ($= C$) on the interval $(x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$. Therefore, we see that if $x \in (x_0 - \delta/2, x_0 + \delta/2)$, then there is $\delta' > 0$ (choose δ' such that $0 < \delta' < \delta/2$) such that $\psi(x + \delta') - \psi(x - \delta') = C - C = 0$, hence $x \notin \sigma(\psi)$. Thus,

$$\left(x_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}, x_0 + \frac{\delta}{2}\right) \subseteq \mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(\psi) ,$$

so that x_0 is an interior point of $\mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(\psi)$. Since x_0 was arbitrarily fixed on the set $\mathbb{R} \setminus \sigma(\psi)$, we conclude that this set is open in \mathbb{R} . \square

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . By Theorems 2.7 and 3.2, each $P_n(x)$ is a real polynomial having n real simple zeros:

$$x_{n,1} < x_{n,2} < \cdots < x_{n,n} .$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, introduce a distribution function $\psi_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, characterized as being a bounded and right continuous step function with spectrum $\sigma(\psi_n) = \{x_{n,1}, \dots, x_{n,n}\}$, and having jump $A_{n,j} > 0$ at the j th zero $x_{n,j}$ of $P_n(x)$, where the $A_{n,j}$'s ($1 \leq j \leq n$) are the weights appearing in Gauss quadrature formula, so that

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_n(-\infty) &:= 0 , \quad \psi_n(+\infty) := u_0 , \\ \psi_n(x_{n,j}) - \psi_n(x_{n,j} - 0) &= A_{n,j} , \quad 1 \leq j \leq n . \end{aligned}$$

Explicitly, we may write

$$(4.13) \quad \psi_n(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x < x_{n,1} ; \\ A_{n,1} + \cdots + A_{n,j} & \text{if } x_{n,j} \leq x < x_{n,j+1} , \quad 1 \leq j \leq n-1 ; \\ u_0 & \text{if } x \geq x_{n,n} . \end{cases}$$

Then, for each fixed $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2n-1\}$, by using the Gauss-Jacobi-Christoffel quadrature formula (Theorem 3.4) applied to the polynomial $p(x) := x^k$, one sees that the moment $u_k := \langle \mathbf{u}, x^k \rangle$ may be represented as a Riemann-Stieltjes integral with respect to ψ_n as:

$$(4.14) \quad u_k = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{n,j} x_{n,j}^k = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^k d\psi_n(x) , \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, 2n-1 .$$

Now, by Helly's selection principle, there is a subsequence $\{\psi_{n_j}\}_{j \geq 0}$ of $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ which converges on \mathbb{R} to a bounded and nondecreasing function ψ :

$$(4.15) \quad \psi(x) := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{n_j}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

DEFINITION 4.2. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite. A function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined as in (4.15) —limit of a subsequence of the step functions (4.12)— is called a natural representative for \mathbf{u} .*

REMARK 4.2. A natural representative ψ for \mathbf{u} is a distribution function. Indeed, as noted above, ψ is bounded and nondecreasing. Moreover, all the moments

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^n d\psi(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

are finite, as follows by the representation Theorem 4.6, to be proved next.

THEOREM 4.6 (representation theorem for positive-definite functionals on \mathcal{P}). *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite. Then, there is a natural representative of \mathbf{u} , $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, whose spectrum is an infinite set, such that*

$$(4.16) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(x) d\psi(x), \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Proof. We consider two cases.

Case 1. Assume that the true interval of orthogonality $[\xi, \eta]$ is bounded (compact). Then (cf. Remark 3.3) from (4.12) and (4.15) we see that $\psi(x) = 0$ if $x < \xi$, and $\psi(x) = u_0 > 0$ if $x > \eta$. Therefore, for each (fixed) $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we may write

$$(4.17) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^k d\psi(x) = \int_{\xi}^{\eta} x^k d\psi(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\xi}^{\eta} x^k d\psi_{n_j}(x),$$

where the last equality holds by Helly's convergence theorem. Keeping k fixed, and since $k \leq 2n_j - 1$ for j sufficiently large, we deduce from (4.14) that the limit in (4.17) equals u_k , and so

$$(4.18) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^k d\psi(x) = u_k = \langle \mathbf{u}, x^k \rangle, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Thus, (4.16) follows whenever $[\xi, \eta]$ is bounded.

Case 2. Assume now that $[\xi, \eta]$ is unbounded.¹ By Helly's selection theorem, there exists a subsequence $\{\psi_{n_i}\}_{i \geq 0}$ of $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ which converges on \mathbb{R} to a bounded and

¹In this case Helly's convergence theorem cannot be applied (Exercise 1.).

nondecreasing function ψ . Setting $\phi_i := \psi_{n_i}$, according with (4.14) we deduce

$$(4.19) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^k d\phi_i(x) = u_k \quad \text{if} \quad n_i \geq \frac{k+1}{2}, \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. For any compact interval $[\alpha, \beta]$, by Helly's convergence theorem we have

$$(4.20) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\phi_j(x) = \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\psi(x).$$

Therefore, choosing $-\infty < \alpha < 0 < \beta < +\infty$ and j such that $n_j > k+1$, we deduce

$$(4.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \left| u_k - \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\psi(x) \right| &= \left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^k d\phi_j(x) - \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\psi(x) \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha} x^k d\phi_j(x) + \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\phi_j(x) + \int_{\beta}^{+\infty} x^k d\phi_j(x) - \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\psi(x) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha} x^k d\phi_j(x) \right| + \left| \int_{\beta}^{+\infty} x^k d\phi_j(x) \right| + \left| \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\phi_j(x) - \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\psi(x) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

But,

$$\left| \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha} x^k d\phi_j(x) \right| = \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha} \frac{x^{2k+2}}{x^{k+2}} d\phi_j(x) \right| \leq \frac{1}{|\alpha|^{k+2}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^{2k+2} d\phi_j(x) = \frac{u_{2k+2}}{|\alpha|^{k+2}},$$

where the last equality follows from (4.19), since $n_j > k+1$. Similarly,

$$\left| \int_{\beta}^{+\infty} x^k d\phi_j(x) \right| \leq \frac{u_{2k+2}}{\beta^{k+2}}.$$

Therefore, sending $j \rightarrow +\infty$ in (4.21) and taking into account (4.20), we find

$$\left| u_k - \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} x^k d\psi(x) \right| \leq u_{2k+2} \left(\frac{1}{|\alpha|^{k+2}} + \frac{1}{\beta^{k+2}} \right), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Thus, taking the limits $\alpha \rightarrow -\infty$ and $\beta \rightarrow +\infty$, we conclude that (4.18) holds also whenever the true interval of orthogonality is unbounded.

It remains to prove that the spectrum of any natural representative ψ (of \mathbf{u}) fulfilling (4.16) is an infinite set. Indeed, if $\sigma(\psi) = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$ (a finite subset of \mathbb{R}), define

$$p(x) := (x - x_1)(x - x_2) \cdots (x - x_N),$$

and let $h_j := \psi(x_j + 0) - \psi(x_j - 0)$ be the jump of ψ at the point x_j . Then, from (4.16) we would have

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p^2 \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p^2(x) d\psi(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N p^2(x_j) h_j = 0,$$

in contradiction with the positive definiteness of \mathbf{u} . □

REMARK 4.3. We have remarked before that a natural representative ψ for a positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is a distribution function. Moreover, being a nondecreasing function, the set of points of discontinuity of ψ is finite or denumerable. Thus, since changing the values of ψ at its points of discontinuity does not change the value of the Riemann-Stieltjes integral with respect to ψ for continuous integrand functions (and so in particular for polynomials), it follows that *there is a representative of \mathbf{u} , in the sense of (4.16), which is a bounded nondecreasing right-continuous function with infinite spectrum and finite moments of all orders.*

REMARK 4.4. If ψ is a distribution function which represents a positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ in the sense of (4.16), then so is any function obtained by adding a constant to ψ . Such distribution functions are called *essentially equal*. The discussion about the existence of different distribution functions (not essentially equal) which represent a given functional will be made later.

3. The spectral theorem

In this section we present an alternative statement of the representation theorem (Theorem 4.6), called the *spectral theorem for orthogonal polynomials*. It is worth mentioning that both the representation theorem and the spectral theorem are equivalent versions of Favard's Theorem in the positive-definite case.

The spectral theorem asserts that any positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ admits an integral representation involving a positive Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R} (which needs not to be unique) with infinite support and such that all its moments exist (i.e., they are finite). Recall that the *support* of μ is the set

$$(4.22) \quad \text{supp}(\mu) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \mu((x - \epsilon, x + \epsilon)) > 0, \forall \epsilon > 0\},$$

while saying that all the moments of μ exist (are finite) means that

$$(4.23) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x|^n d\mu < \infty, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Given a finite positive Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R} , the function $F_\mu : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$(4.24) \quad F_\mu(x) := \mu((-\infty, x])$$

is called the *distribution function* of μ . This function F_μ is bounded, nondecreasing, right-continuous, nonnegative, and it fulfills

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} F_\mu(x) = 0.$$

Conversely, any function $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying these five properties is a distribution function for a finite positive Borel measure μ , so that $F \equiv F_\mu$, and

$$(4.25) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) dF_{\mu}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(x) d\mu(x)$$

for each continuous and μ -integrable function f , where the integral on the left-hand side of (4.25) is the Riemann-Stieltjes integral generated by F . Because of this fact often we will use μ to denote both a measure and its corresponding distribution function. The integral on the left-hand side of (4.25) is indeed the Lebesgue-Stieltjes integral generated by F , and this is simply the Lebesgue integral with respect to the Lebesgue-Stieltjes measure μ_F generated by F .

REMARK 4.5. Notice that the support of a measure μ and the spectrum of the corresponding distribution function, F_{μ} , coincide, i.e.,

$$(4.26) \quad \text{supp}(\mu) = \sigma(F_{\mu}) := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : F_{\mu}(x + \delta) - F_{\mu}(x - \delta) > 0, \forall \delta > 0\}.$$

THEOREM 4.7 (spectral theorem for orthogonal polynomials). *Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a monic OPS characterized by the three-term recurrence relation*

$$(4.27) \quad P_{n+1}(x) = (x - \beta_n)P_n(x) - \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

with initial conditions $P_{-1}(x) = 0$ and $P_0(x) = 1$. Suppose that

$$(4.28) \quad \beta_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \gamma_n > 0, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

Then, there exists a positive Borel measure μ on \mathbb{R} , whose support is an infinite set, and with finite moments of all orders, such that

$$(4.29) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} P_n(x) P_m(x) d\mu(x) = \zeta_n \delta_{n,m}, \quad n, m = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

where $\zeta_n := \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (being $\zeta_0 := 1$).

Proof. By Favard's Theorem, under the given hypothesis $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to a positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Therefore, by the representation Theorem 4.6, there exists a distribution function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (a natural representative of \mathbf{u}), whose spectrum $\sigma(\psi)$ is an infinite subset of \mathbb{R} , fulfilling

$$(4.30) \quad u_k := \langle \mathbf{u}, x^k \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} x^k d\psi(x), \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

We may assume that ψ is right-continuous without changing its spectrum. Let μ be the corresponding Stieltjes-Lebesgue measure (hence it is a positive Borel measure), so that ψ is the distribution function F_{μ} of the measure μ . Then

$$\psi(x) = F_{\mu}(x) = \mu((-\infty, x]), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}$$

and we deduce $\text{supp}(\mu) = \sigma(\psi)$, hence the support of μ is an infinite set. Moreover, from the connection between the Riemann-Lebesgue and the Stieltjes-Lebesgue integrals, we

have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(x) d\psi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x) dF_{\mu}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} p(x) d\mu(x) , \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{P} ,$$

and so, in particular, by (4.30), the moments of μ all exist and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} P_n(x) P_m(x) d\mu(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} P_n(x) P_m(x) d\psi(x) = \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n P_m \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle \delta_{n,m}$$

for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Now, taking into account (2.30), we have

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle = u_0 \prod_{j=1}^n \gamma_j = u_0 \zeta_n , \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Thus, if $u_0 = 1$, we obtain (4.29); otherwise, we normalize μ passing to the measure $\hat{\mu} = u_0^{-1} \mu$, and so (4.29) holds with $\hat{\mu}$ instead of μ . \square

REMARK 4.6. Often, we will refer to a measure μ under the conditions of the spectral theorem as a “spectral measure”, or an “orthogonality measure” for the given OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. This measure needs not to be unique whenever the true interval of orthogonality is an unbounded set, as it was observed by Stieltjes. In section 4 we will analyze this question.

4. On the unicity of the spectral measure

As remarked before, the orthogonality measure for an OPS needs not to be unique. We present an example due to Stieltjes. Consider the weight function

$$(4.31) \quad w_c(x; \alpha) := (1 + \alpha \sin(2\pi c \ln x)) e^{-c \ln^2 x} , \quad x \in I := (0, +\infty) ,$$

where we fix α and c so that $-1 < \alpha < 1$ and $c > 0$. Clearly, these choices of c and α ensure that $w_c(\cdot; \alpha)$ becomes nonnegative and integrable on I . This weight function defines a positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ given by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \int_0^{+\infty} p(x) w_c(x; \alpha) dx , \quad p \in \mathcal{P} .$$

An associated distribution function representing \mathbf{u} is

$$\psi_c(x; \alpha) := \int_{-\infty}^x w_c(t; \alpha) \chi_{(0, +\infty)}(t) dt , \quad x \in \mathbb{R} .$$

Computing the moments of \mathbf{u} , we deduce (Exercise 2.)

$$(4.32) \quad u_n := \int_0^{+\infty} x^n w_c(x; \alpha) dx = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{c}} e^{(n+1)^2/4c} , \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Thus, we see that the moments are independent of the choice of α , hence (for fixed $c > 0$) by varying $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$ we obtain different orthogonality measures with the same

moments. Therefore there are infinitely many orthogonality measures for an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} .

Next we prove that the orthogonality measure given by the spectral theorem is unique if both sequences of the β -parameters and γ -parameters are bounded. We begin by stating two preliminary results.

LEMMA 4.8. *Let $A = [a_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^N$ be a matrix of order N , and let M be a positive constant chosen so that*

$$|a_{i,j}| \leq M, \quad \forall i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

Suppose that each row and each column of A have at most ℓ nonzero entries. Then each eigenvalue λ of A satisfies

$$|\lambda| \leq \ell M.$$

Proof. Take $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ to be an eigenvector of A corresponding to the eigenvalue λ , so that

$$Ax = \lambda x, \quad \|x\| = 1,$$

where $\|x\| := \sqrt{\langle x, x \rangle}$, being $\langle x, y \rangle := \sum_{j=1}^N x_j \overline{y_j}$ the usual inner product on \mathbb{C}^N . Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\lambda|^2 &= |\lambda \|x\|^2|^2 = |\lambda \langle x, x \rangle|^2 = |\langle \lambda x, x \rangle|^2 = |\langle Ax, x \rangle|^2 \\ &\leq \|Ax\|^2 \|x\|^2 = \|Ax\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N |(Ax)_j|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N \left| \sum_{k=1}^N a_{jk} x_k \right|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\sum_{k=1}^N |a_{jk}|^2 \sum_{k=1}^N |x_k|^2 \right) = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N |a_{jk}|^2 \leq \ell^2 M^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the first two inequalities we have applied the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, and the last one holds since, by hypothesis, each row and each column of A have at most ℓ nonzero entries and all the entries of A are bounded by M . \square

THEOREM 4.9. *Under the hypothesis of the spectral Theorem 4.7, assume further that both $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are bounded sequences. Then the support of the orthogonality measure μ is a bounded set.*

Proof. By hypothesis,

$$(4.33) \quad \exists C > 0 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad |\beta_n| \leq C, \quad |\gamma_n| \leq C.$$

On the other hand, we know that the zeros $x_{n,j}$ of P_n ($1 \leq j \leq n$) are the eigenvalues of the tridiagonal matrix J_n given by (3.17). Since, by (4.33), the entries of J_n are bounded by $M := \max\{1, C\}$, and in each row and each column of J_n there are at most $\ell = 3$ nonzero entries, then Lemma 4.8 ensures that

$$(4.34) \quad |x_{n,j}| \leq 3M, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

Thus, the spectrum of each distribution function $\psi_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ introduced in (4.12) is contained in the interval $[-3M, 3M]$, hence the spectrum $\sigma(\psi)$ of any distribution function ψ obtained as a limit of a subsequence of $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is also contained in $[-3M, 3M]$. Therefore, the orthogonality measure μ given by the spectral Theorem 4.7 satisfies

$$\text{supp}(\mu) = \sigma(\psi) \subseteq [-3M, 3M] ,$$

so that $\text{supp}(\mu)$ is a bounded set. \square

REMARK 4.7. Under the conditions of the spectral Theorem 4.7, it follows from the proof of Theorem 4.9 that *if $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are bounded sequences then the true interval of orthogonality of the corresponding monic OPS is bounded.*

THEOREM 4.10. *Under the hypothesis of the spectral Theorem 4.7, assume further that both $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are bounded sequences. Then the orthogonality measure μ is unique.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.9, there exists at least one orthogonality measure μ with compact support. Let ν be any other orthogonality measure (hence it has the same moments as μ). Fix $a > 0$. Then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have

$$(4.35) \quad \int_{|x| \geq a} d\nu(x) \leq \int_{|x| \geq a} \left| \frac{x}{a} \right|^{2n} d\nu(x) \leq a^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^{2n} d\nu(x) = a^{-2n} \int_{\mathbb{R}} x^{2n} d\mu(x) .$$

We have seen in the proof of Theorem 4.9 that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the zeros $x_{n,j}$ of P_n are uniformly bounded, hence

$$(4.36) \quad \exists r > 0 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n+1\}, \quad |x_{n+1,j}| \leq r .$$

By the Gauss-Jacobi-Christoffel quadrature formula (Theorem 3.4), with n replaced by $n+1$ and $p(x) = x^{2n}$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} x^{2n} d\mu(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} A_{n+1,j} x_{n+1,j}^{2n} .$$

Substituting this in the right-hand side of (4.35) and taking into account (4.36), as well as (3.23), we deduce

$$\int_{|x| \geq a} d\nu(x) \leq \left(\frac{r}{a} \right)^{2n} \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} A_{n+1,j} = u_0 \left(\frac{r}{a} \right)^{2n} .$$

Choosing $a > r$ and taking the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain $\int_{|x| \geq a} d\nu(x) = 0$. Thus $\nu(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| \geq a\}) = 0$, hence $\text{supp}(\nu) \subseteq [-a, a]$ for each $a > r$, and so

$$\text{supp}(\nu) \subseteq [-r, r] .$$

This proves that any orthogonality measure has a compact support contained in the interval $[-r, r]$. To prove the uniqueness of the orthogonality measure, take arbitrarily $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|z| \geq 2r$ and $|t| \leq r$. Then $|\frac{t}{z}| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, hence

$$s_n(t) := \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{t^k}{z^{k+1}} = \frac{1}{z} \sum_{k=0}^n \left(\frac{t}{z}\right)^k = \frac{1 - \left(\frac{t}{z}\right)^{n+1}}{z - t} \rightarrow \frac{1}{z - t}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Therefore, for any orthogonality measure μ ,

$$(4.37) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu(t)}{z - t} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} s_n(t) d\mu(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} s_n(t) d\mu(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{u_k}{z^{k+1}},$$

where the interchange between the limit and the integral follows by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, taking into account that

$$|s_n(t)| = \left| \frac{1 - \left(\frac{t}{z}\right)^{n+1}}{z - t} \right| \leq \frac{2}{|z - t|} =: g(t) \in L^1_{\mu}([-r, r]).$$

Notice that the limit in the right-hand side of (4.37) depends only of the moments u_k , $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, hence it has the same value considering any measure μ with the same moments and with compact support contained in $[-r, r]$ (i.e., considering any orthogonality measure). Therefore, the function

$$F(z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{z - x}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [-r, r]$$

is uniquely determined by μ for z outside the circle $|z| = 2r$ (meaning that, for z outside this circle, $F(z)$ has the same value for any orthogonality measure μ). Since F is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus [-r, r]$, then by the identity theorem for analytic functions,² we may conclude that $F(z)$ is uniquely determined by μ for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [-r, r]$. Thus the uniqueness of the measure follows from the Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula:

$$\psi_{\mu}(t) - \psi_{\mu}(s) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_s^t \frac{F(x - i\varepsilon) - F(x + i\varepsilon)}{2i} dx,$$

where ψ_{μ} is an appropriate normalization of the distribution function F_{μ} , given by

$$\psi_{\mu}(-\infty) := 0, \quad \psi_{\mu}(t) := \frac{F_{\mu}(t + 0) + F_{\mu}(t - 0)}{2}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Notice that ψ_{μ} and F_{μ} may be different only at (countably many) points of discontinuity, hence the integrals of continuous functions with respect to ψ_{μ} and F_{μ} take the same value. The Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula will be proved later. \square

²The identity theorem for analytic functions asserts that *given functions f and g analytic on a connected open set $D \subseteq \mathbb{C}$, if $f = g$ on some open and non-empty subset of D then $f = g$ on D .*

We conclude this section stating without proof two results that ensure uniqueness of the orthogonality measure—see Theorems II-5.1 and II-5.2 in Freud's book [3].

THEOREM 4.11 (Riesz uniqueness criterium). *The orthogonality measure μ is unique whenever its sequence of moments $u_n := \int_{\mathbb{R}} t^n d\mu(t)$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) satisfies*

$$(4.38) \quad \liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\sqrt[2n]{u_{2n}}}{2n} < \infty .$$

COROLLARY 4.12. *The orthogonality measure μ is unique if the condition*

$$(4.39) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\theta|x|} d\mu(x) < \infty$$

holds for some $\theta > 0$.

Exercises

1. Show that the conclusion of Helly's convergence Theorem 4.4 may not hold whenever $[\xi, \eta]$ is not a bounded interval.

(Hint. Consider $\{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ defined by $\phi_n(x) := 0$ if $x < n$, and $\phi_n(x) := 1$ if $x \geq n$.)

2. Prove (4.32).

3. (Charlier polynomials.) Define the monic Charlier OPS $\{C_n^{(a)}(x)\}_{n \geq 0}$ by the generating function

$$e^{-aw}(1+w)^x = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n^{(a)}(x) \frac{w^n}{n!} ,$$

being $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. Prove the following assertions:

- (a) For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $C_n^{(a)}(x)$ has the explicit representation

$$C_n^{(a)}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{x}{k} \binom{n}{k} k! (-a)^{n-k} ,$$

being $\binom{z}{0} := 1$ and $\binom{z}{k} := z(z-1) \cdots (z-k+1)/k!$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ($z \in \mathbb{C}$).

- (b) $\{C_n^{(a)}(x)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to the functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ given by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} p(x) d\psi^{(a)}(x) , \quad p \in \mathcal{P} ,$$

where $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a step function whose jumps are given by $e^{-a}a^x/x!$ at the points $x = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The positive-definite case occurs for $a > 0$, and in this case $\psi^{(a)}(x)$ is the Poisson distribution function of probability theory.

- (c) The TTRR for $\{C_n^{(a)}(x)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is

$$C_{n+1}^{(a)}(x) = (x - n - a)C_n^{(a)}(x) - anC_{n-1}^{(a)}(x) , \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots ,$$

being $C_{-1}^{(a)}(x) := 0$ and $C_0^{(a)}(x) = 0$.

4. (Meixner polynomials.) Let $\{m_n(x; \beta, c)\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the Meixner OPS of the first kind, defined via the generating function

$$(1 - c^{-1}w)^x (1 - w)^{-x-\beta} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} m_n(x; \beta, c) \frac{w^n}{n!} ,$$

being $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$. Prove the following assertions:

- (a) For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $m_n(x; \beta, c)$ has the explicit representation

$$m_n(x; \beta, c) = (-1)^n n! \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{x}{k} \binom{-x-\beta}{n-k} c^{-k} .$$

- (b) If $0 < c < 1$ and $\beta > 0$, $\{m_n(x; \beta, c)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to the positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ given by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(x) d\psi(x) , \quad p \in \mathcal{P} ,$$

where the distribution function $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a step function supported on \mathbb{N}_0 (i.e., $\sigma(\psi) = \mathbb{N}_0$) whose jump at the point $x = k$ is given by $c^k(\beta)_k/k!$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

(Hint. Proceed as for the Charlier polynomials, using the relation

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\beta)_n z^n}{n!} = (1 - z)^{-\beta} , \quad |z| < 1 .)$$

5. Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a monic OPS with respect to a positive Borel measure μ . Prove that each $P_n(x)$ admits the representation

$$P_n(x) = \frac{1}{n! H_{n-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \cdots \int_{\mathbb{R}} \prod_{i=1}^n (x - x_i) \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} (x_j - x_k)^2 d\mu(x_1) \cdots d\mu(x_n) ,$$

where H_{n-1} is the Hankel determinant of order n .

Remark. This formula goes back at least as far as Heine (from Heine-Borel), 1878. Nowadays it has important applications in *Random Matrix Theory*.

Final remarks

A concise proof of Lemma 4.1 appears in the book [7] by Giovanni Leoni. Lemma 4.2 and Helly's Theorems (under the formulation presented here) may be found in Chihara's book. For the main facts concerning the Riemann-Stieltjes integral needed to understand this text we refer the student to the classical book [6] by Kolmogorov and Fomini. The sections about the representation theorem (Theorem 4.6) and the spectral theorem (Theorem 4.7) follow closely the presentations appearing in the books by Chihara and Ismail (respectively). The section where we consider the problem of the uniqueness of the orthogonality measure is also based on Ismail's book. Theorem 4.11 and Corollary 4.12 appear in Freud's book [3] (cf. Theorems II-5.1 and II-5.2 therein). Exercises 1, 3 and 4 were taken from Chihara's book. Stieltjes example in

exercise **2** may be found in Ismail's book. Exercise **5** appear, e.g., in Szegő's book [8], being the formulation presented here based on Percy Deift's book [2]. As a final remark we mention that Deift's book presents another formulation of the spectral theorem, exploring the connections between the theory of OP and the theory of Jacobi operators.

Bibliography

- [1] T. S. Chihara, *An introduction to orthogonal polynomials*, Gordon and Breach (1978).
- [2] P. Deift, *Orthogonal polynomials and random matrices: A Riemann-Hilbert Approach*, AMS Courant Lecture Notes **3** (2000).
- [3] G. Freud, *Orthogonal polynomials*, Pergamon Press, Oxford (1971).
- [4] W. Gautschi, *Orthogonal polynomials. Computation and approximation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2004).
- [5] M. E. H. Ismail, *Classical and quantum orthogonal polynomials in one variable*, Cambridge University Press (2005) [paperback edition: 2009].
- [6] A. Kolmogorov and S. Fomini, *Introductory Real Analysis*, Dover Publications, Inc. (1975).
- [7] G. Leoni, *A first course in Sobolev spaces*, Graduate Studies in Math., AMS, **105** (2009).
- [8] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal polynomials*, AMS Colloq. Publ. **230** (1975), 4th ed.

5

Markov's Theorem

According to the spectral Theorem 4.7, given a sequence of monic polynomials $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ fulfilling the three-term recurrence relation

$$(5.1) \quad xP_n(x) = P_{n+1}(x) + \beta_n P_n(x) + \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

with initial conditions $P_{-1}(x) = 0$ and $P_0(x) = 1$, and subject to the conditions

$$(5.2) \quad \beta_{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \gamma_n > 0, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots,$$

then there exists a positive Borel measure μ which is an orthogonality measure with respect to which $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS. Moreover, when the true interval of orthogonality is a compact set (or when both $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are bounded sequences) this measure is unique. Thus, it is natural to ask:

PROBLEM. *How to find the orthogonality measure from the three-term recurrence relation fulfilled by the polynomials?*

This question fits into the study of the so-called *inverse problems* in the Theory of Orthogonal Polynomials. In this text we will describe a program that leads to the orthogonality measure starting from the three-term recurrence relation. The main tools for the success of this program are Markov's Theorem and the Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula. The latter allow us to find the measure from the knowledge of its Stieltjes transform, which in turn is determined by the former.

1. The Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula

DEFINITION 5.1. *Let μ be a finite positive Borel measure, with $\text{supp}(\mu) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. The Stieltjes transform associated with μ is the complex function $F \equiv F(\cdot; \mu)$ given by*

$$(5.3) \quad F(z) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu(x)}{z - x}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu).$$

Recall that $\text{supp}(\mu)$ is a closed set. Using this fact we may prove that F is an analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu)$. The Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula allow us to recover the measure from the knowledge of its corresponding Stieltjes transform.

THEOREM 5.1 (Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula). *Let μ be a finite positive Borel measure. Then for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, with $a < b$, the equality*

$$(5.4) \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_a^b \Im(F(x - i\varepsilon)) dx = \mu((a, b)) + \frac{1}{2} \mu(\{a\}) + \frac{1}{2} \mu(\{b\})$$

holds, where F is the Stieltjes transform associated with μ .

Proof. Observe that $\overline{F(z)} = F(\bar{z})$, hence

$$\Im(F(z)) = \frac{F(z) - F(\bar{z})}{2i} = -\frac{1}{2i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{z - \bar{z}}{|x - z|^2} d\mu(x) = - \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\Im(z)}{|x - z|^2} d\mu(x),$$

so that, setting $z = x - i\varepsilon$, with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we may write

$$\Im(F(x - i\varepsilon)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\varepsilon}{|s - x + i\varepsilon|^2} d\mu(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\varepsilon}{(s - x)^2 + \varepsilon^2} d\mu(s).$$

Integrating on (a, b) with respect to x , and then interchanging the order of integration in the last integral (this is allowed taking into account that the integrand function is positive), we obtain

$$(5.5) \quad \int_a^b \Im(F(x - i\varepsilon)) dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{\varepsilon}(s) d\mu(s),$$

where

$$\theta_{\varepsilon}(s) := \int_a^b \frac{\varepsilon}{(s - x)^2 + \varepsilon^2} dx = \arctan\left(\frac{b - s}{\varepsilon}\right) - \arctan\left(\frac{a - s}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Notice that, for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \theta_{\varepsilon}(s) = \begin{cases} \pi & \text{if } a < s < b \\ \frac{\pi}{2} & \text{if } s = a \text{ or } s = b \\ 0 & \text{if } s < a \text{ or } s > b \end{cases} = \pi \chi_{(a,b)}(s) + \frac{\pi}{2} \chi_{\{a\}}(s) + \frac{\pi}{2} \chi_{\{b\}}(s).$$

Moreover, $|\theta_{\varepsilon}(s)| \leq \pi$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and the (constant) function $s \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto \pi$ is integrable with respect to μ (since μ is a finite measure, so that $\mu(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$). Thus, by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \theta_{\varepsilon}(s) d\mu(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \theta_{\varepsilon}(s) d\mu(s) = \pi \mu((a, b)) + \frac{\pi}{2} \mu(\{a\}) + \frac{\pi}{2} \mu(\{b\}),$$

and (5.4) follows from (5.5) taking the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$. \square

REMARK 5.1. The Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula (5.4) may be stated in terms of the distribution function F_{μ} associated to the measure μ , after an appropriate normalization of F_{μ} . Indeed, being $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\psi(x) := \frac{F_\mu(x+0) + F_\mu(x-0)}{2},$$

and recalling that $F_\mu(x) := \mu((-\infty, x])$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, (5.4) may be rewritten as

$$\psi(b) - \psi(a) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_a^b \Im(F(x - i\varepsilon)) \, dx.$$

In fact, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(b) - \psi(a) &= \frac{1}{2} [F_\mu(b+0) + F_\mu(b-0) - F_\mu(a+0) - F_\mu(a-0)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [(F_\mu(b) - F_\mu(a)) + (F_\mu(b-0) - F_\mu(a-0))] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [\mu((a, b]) + \mu([a, b)))] = \mu((a, b)) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(\{a\}) + \frac{1}{2}\mu(\{b\}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we took into account that F_μ is right-continuous.

2. Associated polynomials

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, regular (not necessarily positive-definite), and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the corresponding monic OPS. According with Favard's Theorem, $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is characterized by the three-term recurrence relation (5.1), with $\beta_{n-1} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Making a shift on this recurrence relation, we may define a new monic OPS, $\{P_n^{(k)}\}_{n \geq 0}$, being $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (fixed), called the (monic) *associated polynomials of order k* corresponding to $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, by

$$(5.6) \quad P_{n+1}^{(k)}(x) = (x - \beta_{n+k})P_n^{(k)}(x) - \gamma_{n+k}P_{n-1}^{(k)}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

with initial conditions $P_{-1}^{(k)}(x) = 0$ and $P_0^{(k)}(x) = 1$. Favard's Theorem ensures that, indeed, $\{P_n^{(k)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS.

REMARK 5.2. If $k = 0$, then $P_n^{(0)} \equiv P_n$. When $k = 1$, often $\{P_n^{(1)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is called the sequence of (monic) *associated polynomials of the first kind*, or *numerator polynomials*.

According with (3.18), for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $P_n^{(k)}$ has the following representation as a determinant of order n of a tridiagonal matrix:

$$(5.7) \quad P_n^{(k)}(x) = \begin{vmatrix} x - \beta_k & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \gamma_{k+1} & x - \beta_{k+1} & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_{k+2} & x - \beta_{k+2} & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & x - \beta_{n+k-2} & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \gamma_{n+k-1} & x - \beta_{n+k-1} \end{vmatrix}.$$

When $k \geq 1$, another representation for $P_n^{(k)}$ is

$$(5.8) \quad P_n^{(k)}(x) = \frac{1}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{k-1}^2 \rangle} \left\langle P_{k-1}(\xi) \mathbf{u}(\xi), \frac{P_{n+k}(x) - P_{n+k}(\xi)}{x - \xi} \right\rangle \quad (k \in \mathbb{N}; n \in \mathbb{N}_0),$$

where $\mathbf{u}(\xi)$ means that \mathbf{u} acts on polynomials regarded as functions of the variable ξ . The representation (5.8) may be easily proved by checking that the right-hand side defines a polynomial on the variable x which fulfills the three-term recurrence relation (5.6), and for $n = -1$ and $n = 0$ the right-hand side of (5.8) equals 0 and 1, respectively. (Exercise 4.) A more concise form of writing (5.8) is

$$(5.9) \quad P_n^{(k)}(x) = \langle (\xi - x)^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{k-1}(\xi), P_{n+k}(\xi) \rangle \quad (k \in \mathbb{N}; n \in \mathbb{N}_0),$$

where $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the dual basis associated with $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and the division of a functional by a polynomial is given by Definition 1.1. Finally, considering the operator θ_0 introduced in (1.7), defined for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$ by $\theta_0 p(x) := (p(x) - p(0))/x$ if $x \neq 0$, and $\theta_0 p(0) := p'(0)$, and taking into account the definition of right multiplication of a functional by a polynomial (Definition 1.2), then from (5.9) we arrive at a rather elegant representation for the n th degree monic associated polynomial of order k :

$$(5.10) \quad P_n^{(k)} = \mathbf{a}_{k-1} \theta_0 P_{n+k} \quad (k \in \mathbb{N}; n \in \mathbb{N}_0).$$

A very useful relation linking the associated polynomials of orders k and $k + 1$ is

$$(5.11) \quad P_n^{(k+1)}(x) P_n^{(k)}(x) - P_{n+1}^{(k)}(x) P_{n-1}^{(k+1)}(x) = \prod_{j=1}^n \gamma_{j+k}, \quad k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Indeed, by (5.6), we have, for all $k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_n^{(k+1)}(x) &= (x - \beta_{n+k}) P_{n-1}^{(k+1)}(x) - \gamma_{n+k} P_{n-2}^{(k+1)}(x), \\ P_{n+1}^{(k)}(x) &= (x - \beta_{n+k}) P_n^{(k)}(x) - \gamma_{n+k} P_{n-1}^{(k)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying the first equality by $P_n^{(k)}(x)$ and the second one by $-P_{n-1}^{(k+1)}(x)$, and then adding the resulting equalities, we deduce

$$P_n^{(k+1)}(x) P_n^{(k)}(x) - P_{n+1}^{(k)}(x) P_{n-1}^{(k+1)}(x) = \gamma_{n+k} (P_{n-1}^{(k+1)}(x) P_{n-1}^{(k)}(x) - P_n^{(k)}(x) P_{n-2}^{(k+1)}(x)),$$

hence (5.11) follows after repeatedly application of this relation.

We also state the following formulas, close to the Christoffel–Darboux identities:

$$(5.12) \quad \frac{P_n(x) - P_n(y)}{x - y} = \sum_{k=1}^n P_{k-1}(x) P_{n-k}^{(k)}(y), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

$$(5.13) \quad P'_n(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n P_{k-1}(x) P_{n-k}^{(k)}(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Clearly, (5.13) follows from (5.12) by taking the limit $y \rightarrow x$. To prove (5.12), notice that $(P_n(x) - P_n(y))/(x - y)$ is a polynomial of degree $n - 1$ in the variable x (whose coefficients depend on y), so we can write

$$(5.14) \quad \frac{P_n(x) - P_n(y)}{x - y} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} c_{n,k}(y) P_k(x)$$

for each $n \geq 1$. Then for $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$, we compute the Fourier coefficients $c_{n,k}(y)$:

$$c_{n,k}(y) = \frac{\left\langle \mathbf{u}(x), \frac{P_n(x) - P_n(y)}{x - y} P_k(x) \right\rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_k^2 \rangle} = P_{n-1-k}^{(k+1)}(y),$$

where the last equality holds due to (5.8). Substituting the last expression for $c_{n,k}(y)$ into (5.14) we obtain (5.12).

3. Markov's Theorem

We now return to the positive-definite case, with the purpose to state the celebrated Markov's theorem. We begin by proving some preliminary results.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be positive-definite and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . Then*

$$(5.15) \quad \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(x)}{P_n(x)} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{A_{n,j}}{x - x_{n,j}} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\psi_n(t)}{x - t}, \quad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \Lambda_n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}),$$

where $A_{n,1}, \dots, A_{n,n}$ are the coefficients appearing in the quadrature formula (3.23), $\Lambda_n := \{x_{n,1}, \dots, x_{n,n}\}$, being $x_{n,1} < \dots < x_{n,n}$ the zeros of P_n , and ψ_n is the distribution function introduced in (4.12).

Proof. Notice first that, by (5.11) with $k = 0$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the equality

$$P_n^{(1)}(x) P_n(x) - P_{n+1}(x) P_{n-1}^{(1)}(x) = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n$$

holds. Hence, since $\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n \neq 0$, we see that P_n and $P_{n-1}^{(1)}$ have no common zeros. Moreover, we know that the zeros of P_n are real and simple. Thus, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the decomposition of the rational function $P_{n-1}^{(1)}(x)/P_n(x)$ into partial fractions yields

$$(5.16) \quad \frac{P_{n-1}^{(1)}(x)}{P_n(x)} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\lambda_{n,j}}{x - x_{n,j}}, \quad \lambda_{n,j} := \frac{P_{n-1}^{(1)}(x_{n,j})}{P'_n(x_{n,j})}.$$

On the other hand, from (3.25) in the proof of Theorem 3.4, we know that

$$A_{n,j} = \langle \mathbf{u}, \ell_{j,n} \rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{u}, \frac{P_n(x)}{(x - x_{n,j})P'_n(x_{n,j})} \right\rangle = \frac{u_0}{P'_n(x_{n,j})} \frac{1}{u_0} \left\langle \mathbf{u}, \frac{P_n(x_{n,j}) - P_n(x)}{x_{n,j} - x} \right\rangle.$$

Moreover, by (5.8) with $k = 1$, and changing n into $n - 1$, we see that the relation

$$P_{n-1}^{(1)}(x) = \frac{1}{u_0} \left\langle \mathbf{u}_\xi, \frac{P_n(x) - P_n(\xi)}{x - \xi} \right\rangle$$

holds for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, we conclude that $A_{n,j} = u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(x_{n,j}) / P'_n(x_{n,j})$, hence $\lambda_{n,j} = A_{n,j} / u_0$. Thus the first equality in (5.15) is proved. The second one is an immediate consequence of the properties of the Riemann-Stieltjes integral, taking into account that ψ_n is a step function with spectrum $\sigma(\psi_n) = \Lambda_n$, and with jump equal to $A_{n,j}$ at the point $x_{n,j}$. \square

LEMMA 5.3. *Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a monic OPS with respect to a positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and let ψ be a natural representative for \mathbf{u} , in the sense of the representation Theorem 4.6. Let s be a spectral point of ψ . Then, every neighborhood of s contains at least one zero of $P_n(x)$ for infinitely many values of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In symbols:*

$$(5.17) \quad \forall V \in \mathcal{V}(s), \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \exists n \in \mathbb{N} : \quad n > N \wedge V \cap \Lambda_n \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof. By hypothesis, $s \in \sigma(\psi)$. If (5.17) is not true, there exist a neighborhood V of s and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that V does not contain zeros of P_n for every $n \geq N$. Then, by definition of ψ_n , we have $\psi_n(x) = \psi_n(z)$ for all $x, z \in V$ and $n \geq N$. Since ψ is a natural representative of \mathbf{u} , there is a subsequence $\{\psi_{n_j}\}_{j \geq 1}$ of $\{\psi_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that

$$\psi(x) := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{n_j}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore, $\psi(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{n_j}(x) = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \psi_{n_j}(z) = \psi(z)$ for every $x, z \in V$. Thus ψ is constant on the neighborhood V of s , hence $s \notin \sigma(\psi)$, contrary to the hypothesis. \square

It follows from Lemma 5.3 that if s is a spectral point of a natural representative ψ of \mathbf{u} , then either s is a zero of $P_n(x)$ for infinitely many n , or else s is a limit of a sequence of numbers belonging to the set

$$Z_1 := \{x_{n,j} : 1 \leq j \leq n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Therefore, setting

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &:= Z_1' \equiv \{\text{accumulation points of } Z_1\}, \\ X_2 &:= \{x \in Z_1 : P_n(x) = 0 \text{ for infinitely many } n\}, \end{aligned}$$

then $\sigma(\psi) \subseteq X_1 \cup X_2$. Moreover, the following holds:

$$(5.18) \quad \sigma(\psi) \subseteq X_1 \cup X_2 \subseteq [\xi, \eta] = \text{co}(\sigma(\psi)),$$

where $\text{co}(\sigma(\psi))$ is the convex hull of the set $\sigma(\psi)$, i.e., it is the smallest closed interval which contains $\sigma(\psi)$, and, as usual, $[\xi, \eta]$ is the true interval of orthogonality of $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. Indeed, the second inclusion in (5.18) is an immediate consequence of the definitions of the involved sets, and the last equality holds since *the interval $\text{co}(\sigma(\psi))$ is a supporting set for \mathbf{u}* . To prove this, set $\text{co}(\sigma(\psi)) = [a, b]$, and let $p(x)$ be a real polynomial which does not vanish identically on $[a, b]$ and it is non-negative there. Then, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(x) d\psi(x) = \int_a^b p(x) d\psi(x).$$

Since $\sigma(\psi)$ is an infinite set, there is $x_0 \in \sigma(\psi)$ such that $p(x_0) \neq 0$, and so, since $p(x) \geq 0$ for each $x \in [a, b]$, by continuity we have $p(x) > 0$ for each x on a neighborhood $(x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$ of the point x_0 —choosing $\delta > 0$ so that $(x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \subseteq [a, b]$ —, hence, using the Mean Value Theorem for the Riemann-Stieltjes integral, we may write

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \int_a^b p(x) d\psi(x) \geq \int_{x_0 - \delta}^{x_0 + \delta} p(x) d\psi(x) = p(\xi_0)(\psi(x_0 + \delta) - \psi(x_0 - \delta)),$$

for some $\xi_0 \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$. Henceforth, since $p(\xi_0) > 0$ and $\psi(x_0 + \delta) - \psi(x_0 - \delta) > 0$ (since $x_0 \in \sigma(\psi)$), we conclude that $\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle > 0$, so that $[a, b] = \text{co}(\sigma(\psi))$ is indeed an interval which is a supporting set for \mathbf{u} . Therefore, by Theorem 3.2, the (closed) interval $\text{co}(\sigma(\psi))$ contains the zeros of each P_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, hence $[\xi, \eta] \subseteq \text{co}(\sigma(\psi))$. Now, since $\sigma(\psi) \subseteq [\xi, \eta] \subseteq \text{co}(\sigma(\psi))$, then $[\xi, \eta] = \text{co}(\sigma(\psi))$. Thus (5.18) is proved.

We next show that $X_1 \cup X_2$ is a closed set in \mathbb{C} . To prove this fact, we will show that the limit of any convergent sequence of elements in $X_1 \cup X_2$ belongs to this set. Indeed, take arbitrarily a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that $x_n \in X_1 \cup X_2$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_n \rightarrow x$ in \mathbb{C} . We need to prove that $x \in X_1 \cup X_2$. Since $x_n \in X_1 \cup X_2$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then two situations may occur: $x_n \in X_1$ for infinitely many n , or $x_n \in X_2$ for infinitely many n (or both). In the first situation (passing, if necessary, to a subsequence), since $x_n \rightarrow x$ and $X_1 := Z'_1$ is a closed set, we have $x \in X_1$; in the second situation, we have (passing again, if necessary, to a subsequence, and taking into account that $X_2 \subset Z_1$) $x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n \in X'_2 \subseteq Z'_1 = X_1$. Therefore, in any situation, $x \in X_1 \subseteq X_1 \cup X_2$, which proves that $X_1 \cup X_2$ is closed.

We also need the following result from Complex Analysis, stated here without proof (see e.g. Reinhold Remmert's book [11], pp. 150–151).

LEMMA 5.4 (Vitali's convergence theorem). *Let G be a domain in \mathbb{C} (i.e., G is a nonempty open connected subset of \mathbb{C}), and let $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of analytic functions in G that is locally bounded in G (equivalently, it is bounded on every compact set in G). Suppose that the set*

$$(5.19) \quad A := \{z \in G : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(z) \text{ exists in } \mathbb{C}\}$$

has at least one accumulation point in G . Then the sequence $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of G .

Finally we are ready to state Markov's theorem.

THEOREM 5.5 (Markov). *Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a monic OPS with respect to a positive-definite $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and let ψ be a natural representative of \mathbf{u} , in the sense of the representation Theorem 4.6. Assume further that $\sigma(\psi)$ is a bounded set. Then*

$$(5.20) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\psi(x)}{z-x}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2),$$

the convergence being uniform on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2)$.

Proof. Since $\sigma(\psi)$ is bounded, then it follows immediately from (5.18) that the true interval of orthogonality $[\xi, \eta]$ of the sequence $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is bounded. According with Lemma 5.2, we may write

$$(5.21) \quad \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \int_{\xi}^{\eta} \frac{d\psi_n(x)}{z-x}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\xi, \eta]$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, the representation Theorem 4.6 ensures the existence of a subsequence $\{\psi_{n_j}\}_{j \geq 0}$ which converges on $[\xi, \eta]$ to the given natural representative ψ . It follows from Helly's convergence Theorem 4.4 that

$$(5.22) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{u_0 P_{n_j-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_{n_j}(z)} = \int_{\xi}^{\eta} \frac{d\psi(x)}{z-x}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [\xi, \eta].$$

Set $M := \max\{|\xi|, |\eta|\}$. We will prove that

$$(5.23) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\psi(x)}{z-x}, \quad |z| > M,$$

the convergence being uniform on each set $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq M'\}$ such that $M' > M$. We start by noticing that, by (5.11), with $k = 0$,

$$(5.24) \quad \frac{u_0 P_n^{(1)}(z)}{P_{n+1}(z)} - \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \frac{C_n}{P_{n+1}(z)P_n(z)}, \quad |z| > M$$

for each $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, where $C_n := u_0 \prod_{j=1}^n \gamma_j$. Since $P_{n+1}(z)P_n(z)$ is a polynomial of degree $2n+1$ with real and simple zeros, then by developing the right-hand side of (5.24) in a Laurent series on the (open) annulus $|z| > M$ (taking into account that $1/(z-x) = \sum_{j \geq 0} x^j/z^{j+1}$ for $|z| > |x|$), we see that the Laurent series development of the left-hand side of (5.24) takes the form

$$(5.25) \quad \frac{u_0 P_n^{(1)}(z)}{P_{n+1}(z)} - \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \frac{c_{2n+1}}{z^{2n+1}} + \frac{c_{2n+2}}{z^{2n+2}} + \dots, \quad |z| > M$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. By repeatedly application of (5.25) we deduce

$$(5.26) \quad \frac{u_0 P_{m-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_m(z)} - \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \sum_{j=2n}^{\infty} \frac{c_j^{(m,n)}}{z^{j+1}}, \quad |z| > M, \quad m \geq n \quad (m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0),$$

where the $c_j^{(m,n)}$'s are complex numbers (indeed, we will see that they are real numbers). Next, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ consider the Laurent series development

$$(5.27) \quad \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_j^{(n)}}{z^{j+1}}, \quad |z| > M.$$

Then, on the first hand, comparing (5.26) and (5.27), we deduce

$$(5.28) \quad c_j^{(m,n)} = c_j^{(m)} - c_j^{(n)}, \quad j \geq 2n, \quad m \geq n \quad (m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0).$$

On the other hand, since $1/(z-x) = \sum_{j \geq 0} x^j / z^{j+1}$ for $|z| > |x|$, then (5.21) yields

$$\frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{z^{j+1}} \int_{\xi}^{\eta} x^j d\psi_n(x), \quad |z| > M \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0),$$

hence, comparing with (5.27), and taking into account the uniqueness of the coefficients of a Laurent development, we obtain

$$c_j^{(n)} = \int_{\xi}^{\eta} x^j d\psi_n(x) \quad (j, n \in \mathbb{N}_0).$$

Therefore, for $m \geq n$ and $j \geq 2n$, we deduce

$$|c_j^{(m,n)}| = |c_j^{(m)} - c_j^{(n)}| = \left| \int_{\xi}^{\eta} x^j d\psi_m(x) - \int_{\xi}^{\eta} x^j d\psi_n(x) \right| \leq 2u_0 M^j,$$

where the last inequality holds since $[\xi, \eta] \subseteq [-M, M]$ and $\int_{\xi}^{\eta} d\psi_n(x) = u_0$. Thus, from (5.26) we obtain

$$(5.29) \quad \left| \frac{u_0 P_{m-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_m(z)} - \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} \right| \leq 2u_0 \sum_{j=2n}^{\infty} \left(\frac{M}{|z|} \right)^{j+1}, \quad |z| > M, \quad m \geq n.$$

Since the series $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{M}{|z|} \right)^{j+1}$ is convergent whenever $|z| > M$, it follows from (5.29) that $\{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)/P_n(z)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a Cauchy sequence for each z fulfilling $|z| > M$. Thus, since by (5.22) this sequence has a convergent subsequence, it follows that the sequence converges (to the same limit as its subsequence). Hence (5.23) is proved. Note that the convergence in (5.23) is uniform on each set $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq M'\}$ with $M' > M$. In fact, from (5.29) we obtain

$$(5.30) \quad \left| \frac{u_0 P_{m-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_m(z)} - \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} \right| \leq 2u_0 \sum_{j=2n}^{\infty} \left(\frac{M}{M'} \right)^{j+1}, \quad |z| \geq M' > M, \quad m \geq n.$$

Therefore, since, clearly,

$$(5.31) \quad \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N} : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq n_0 \Rightarrow 2u_0 \sum_{j=2n}^{\infty} \left(\frac{M}{M'} \right)^{j+1} < \epsilon,$$

then $\{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}/P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a (uniformly) Cauchy sequence on the set $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq M'\}$, hence it converges uniformly therein, and so we conclude that, indeed, the convergence in (5.23) holds uniformly on this set. [This fact can be proved directly as follows: Fix $\epsilon > 0$. By (5.31) and (5.30), there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\forall m, n \in \mathbb{N}, \forall z \in A_{M'}, m \geq n \geq n_0 \Rightarrow \left| \frac{u_0 P_{m-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_m(z)} - \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} \right| < \epsilon,$$

where $A_{M'} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \geq M'\}$. Keeping $z \in A_{M'}$ and n fixed, and letting $m \rightarrow \infty$, and taking into account that we already proved (5.23) pointwise, it follows that

$$\forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall z \in A_{M'}, m \geq n_0 \Rightarrow \left| \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\psi(x)}{x-z} - \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} \right| \leq \epsilon,$$

hence the convergence in (5.23) holds uniformly on the set $A_{M'}$, for each $M' > M$.]

To complete the proof, we need to show that the convergence in (5.23) is indeed uniform on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2)$. For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$Z_N := \{x_{n,j} : 1 \leq j \leq n, n \geq N\}.$$

Let K be a compact subset of $\mathbb{C} \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2)$. Then K contains at most finitely many zeros of the polynomials in the sequence $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ (otherwise, K could contain an infinite subset of points in Z_1 , hence—since it is compact—it would contain a point in $Z'_1 = X_1$, and so $K \cap X_1 \neq \emptyset$, which contradicts the definition of K), and none of these zeros belong to X_2 . Therefore, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $K \cap (X_1 \cup Z_N) = \emptyset$. Next, set

$$(5.32) \quad \delta := \text{dist}(K, X_1 \cup Z_N) = \inf \{|z - x| : z \in K, x \in X_1 \cup Z_N\}.$$

Since K is compact and $X_1 \cup Z_N$ is closed (this fact can be proved in the same way as we did above to prove that $X_1 \cup X_2$ is closed), and $K \cap (X_1 \cup Z_N) = \emptyset$, then $\delta > 0$. Therefore, using (5.15), we deduce, for each $n \geq N$,

$$\left| \frac{u_0 P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)}{P_n(z)} \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{A_{n,j}}{|z - x_{n,j}|} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{j=1}^n A_{n,j} = \frac{u_0}{\delta}, \quad z \in K.$$

(The last inequality follows from (5.32), taking into account that $x_{n,j} \in Z_N$ if $n \geq N$.) Therefore, setting $f_n(z) := P_{n+N-1}^{(1)}(z)/P_{n+N}(z)$, we see that the sequence of functions $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is bounded in K . Thus, the claimed result follows from (5.23) and Vitali's convergence theorem (Lemma 5.4), taking therein $G := \mathbb{C} \setminus (X_1 \cup X_2)$ and noting that the set A defined by (5.19) contains $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| > M\}$. \square

REMARK 5.3. The statement and proof given here for Markov's theorem is based on references [2], [3], [4], and [13]. Markov proved Theorem 5.5 for absolutely continuous measures μ supported on a bounded interval: $\text{supp}(\mu) = [a, b]$. Under such conditions, by (5.18), $X_1 \cup X_2 = [a, b]$. The result remains true for unbounded intervals, provided the underlying moment problem is determined (see [1]). Different proofs of Markov's theorem, based on the notion of weak convergence of measures, appear in [12] and [1].

REMARK 5.4. The set $X_1 \cup X_2$ in Theorem 5.5 cannot be replaced by $\sigma(\psi)$. For instance, consider the sequence of monic polynomials $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ defined by

$$P_{2n+1}(x) := 2^n x U_n\left(\frac{x^2-5}{4}\right), \quad P_{2n}(x) := 2^n \left\{ U_n\left(\frac{x^2-5}{4}\right) + 2U_{n-1}\left(\frac{x^2-5}{4}\right) \right\}.$$

It can be shown (Exercise 6.) that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to the measure

$$d\mu(x) := \frac{\chi_E(x)}{|x|} \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{x^2-5}{4}\right)^2} dx,$$

where $E := [-3, -1] \cup [1, 3]$. Clearly, $0 \in X_2 \subseteq X_1 \cup X_2$ and $0 \notin E = \sigma(\psi)$. Nevertheless, the ratio $P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)/P_n(z)$ is not well defined at $z = 0$ if n is odd, hence the sequence $\{P_{n-1}^{(1)}(z)/P_n(z)\}_{n \geq 0}$ has no limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ at $z = 0$.

Exercises

1. Prove that the Stieltjes transform F introduced in Definition 5.1 is an analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \text{supp}(\mu)$.
2. Let $d\mu(x) := \frac{\chi_{(-1,1)}(x)}{\pi\sqrt{1-x^2}} dx$ (so that μ is the orthogonality measure for the Chebyshev polynomials of the first kind, $\{T_n\}_{n \geq 0}$). Show that the Stieltjes transform of μ is

$$F(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{z^2 - 1}}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [-1, 1],$$

where the branch of the complex square root is chosen so that $\sqrt{z^2 - 1}$ is an analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus [-1, 1]$ and $\sqrt{z^2 - 1} > 0$ if $z > 1$.

3. Show that the Stieltjes transform of the orthogonality measure $d\mu(x) := \frac{\chi_{(-1,1)}(x)}{\pi} \sqrt{1-x^2} dx$ (for the Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind, $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$) is

$$F(z) = 2(z - \sqrt{z^2 - 1}), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [-1, 1],$$

where the branch of the complex square root is chosen as in Exercise 2.

4. Prove relations (5.8) and (5.10).
5. Let $d\lambda(x) := \chi_{(-1,1)} dx$ be the orthogonality measure for the Legendre polynomials (so that it is the Lebesgue measure on $[-1, 1]$). Show that the associated Legendre polynomials of the first kind are orthogonal with respect to the measure

$$d\lambda^{(1)}(x) := \frac{2\chi_{(-1,1)}(x)}{\pi^2 + \ln^2 \frac{1+x}{1-x}} dx.$$

(Hint. Denote by F and $F^{(1)}$ the Stieltjes transforms of the orthogonality measures for the Legendre polynomials and their associated polynomials of the first kind, respectively. We may start by showing that

$$F(z) = \text{Log} \left(\frac{z+1}{z-1} \right), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [-1, 1].$$

Here we took the principal branch of the logarithm, so that F is an analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus [-1, 1]$. Hence, setting $z = x - i\epsilon$, with $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we deduce

$$F(x - i\epsilon) = \ln \sqrt{\frac{(1+x)^2 + \epsilon^2}{(1-x)^2 + \epsilon^2}} + 2i \arctan \left(\sqrt{\left(\frac{x^2 - 1 + \epsilon^2}{2\epsilon} \right)^2 + 1} - \frac{x^2 - 1 + \epsilon^2}{2\epsilon} \right).$$

Next, using the relation $F^{(1)}(z) = z - \beta_0 - u_0/F(z)$, $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [-1, 1]$ (as usual, u_0 is the moment of order zero for the measure $d\lambda$, and β_0 is the first β -parameter appearing in the TTRR for the monic Legendre polynomials—so that, indeed, we compute $u_0 = 2$ and $\beta_0 = 0$), the orthogonality measure $d\lambda^{(1)}$ can be easily computed using the Perron-Stieltjes inversion formula, noticing that, writing $d\lambda^{(1)}(x) = w^{(1)}(x)dx$, then

$$w^{(1)}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \Im(F^{(1)}(x - i\epsilon)), \quad -1 < x < 1.$$

6. Let $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the Chebyshev OPS of the second kind, which is orthogonal with respect to the positive-definite functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ defined by

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 p(x) \sqrt{1-x^2} dx, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a sequence of polynomials defined by

$$P_{2n+1}(x) := 2^n x U_n\left(\frac{x^2-5}{4}\right), \quad P_{2n}(x) := 2^n U_n\left(\frac{x^2-5}{4}\right) + 2^{n-1} U_{n-1}\left(\frac{x^2-5}{4}\right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

- (a) Prove that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to a positive-definite functional, by showing that it fulfills the TTRR

$$P_{-1}(x) = 0, \quad P_0(x) = 1, \quad P_{n+1}(x) = xP_n(x) - \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where $\gamma_{2n} = 1$ and $\gamma_{2n+1} = 4$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

- (b) Prove that the spectral measure for $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ (appearing in the spectral theorem for orthogonal polynomials) has distribution function ψ given by

$$\psi(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x w(t) dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$\omega(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|t|} \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{t^2-5}{4}\right)^2} & \text{if } t \in E, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \notin E, \end{cases}$$

being $E := [-3, -1] \cup [1, 3]$. Is the spectral measure unique? Why?

- (c) Use the monic OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ to show that the set $X_1 \cup X_2$ in the statement of Markov's theorem cannot be replaced by $\sigma(\psi)$.

7. Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a monic OPS with respect to a positive Borel measure μ . Denote the zeros of P_n by $x_{n,1}, x_{n,2}, \dots, x_{n,n}$, in increasing order, and let $\{P_n^{(1)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the sequence of numerator polynomials, which is a monic OPS with respect to a positive Borel measure $\mu^{(1)}$, and so $P_n^{(1)}$ has n real and simple zeros for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Denoting these zeros by $x_{n,1}^{(1)}, x_{n,2}^{(1)}, \dots, x_{n,n}^{(1)}$, in increasing order, prove the following interlacing property:

$$x_{n+1,j} < x_{n,j}^{(1)} < x_{n+1,j+1}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Conclude that $\text{co}(\text{supp}(\mu^{(1)})) \subseteq \text{co}(\text{supp}(\mu))$.

8. Suppose that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is regular, normalized so that $u_0 := \langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle = 1$, and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$, and set

$$\mathbf{u}^{\lambda,c} := \delta_c + \lambda(x - c)^{-1} \mathbf{u}.$$

- (a) Prove that $\mathbf{u}^{\lambda,c}$ is regular if and only if $P_n(c) + \lambda P_{n-1}^{(1)}(c) \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, under these conditions, setting

$$a_0 := 0, \quad a_n \equiv a_n^{\lambda,c} := -\frac{P_n(c) + \lambda P_{n-1}^{(1)}(c)}{P_{n-1}(c) + \lambda P_{n-2}^{(1)}(c)} \quad \text{if } n \geq 1,$$

the monic OPS $\{P_n^{\lambda,c}\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to $\mathbf{u}^{\lambda,c}$ is given by

$$P_n^{\lambda,c}(x) = P_n(x) + a_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

and $\{P_n^{\lambda,c}\}_{n \geq 0}$ fulfills the TTRR

$$P_{n+1}^{\lambda,c}(x) = (x - \beta_n^{\lambda,c}) P_n^{\lambda,c}(x) - \gamma_n^{\lambda,c} P_{n-1}^{\lambda,c}(x), \quad n \geq 0,$$

where $\beta_n^{\lambda,c} := \beta_n + a_n - a_{n+1}$ ($n \geq 0$), $\gamma_1^{\lambda,c} := \lambda a_1$, and $\gamma_n^{\lambda,c} := \gamma_{n-1} a_n / a_{n-1}$ ($n \geq 2$), being $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ the sequences of parameters appearing in the TTRR for $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, so that $P_{n+1}(x) = (x - \beta_n) P_n(x) - \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x)$, $n \geq 0$, with $\beta_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ for each n .

- (b) Suppose that the β -parameters vanish in the TTRR for $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ (i.e., $\beta_n = 0$ for each $n \geq 0$). Show that $\mathbf{u}^{\lambda,0} := \delta + \lambda x^{-1} \mathbf{u}$ is regular and the corresponding parameters $a_n \equiv a_n^{\lambda,0}$ defined in (a) are given by

$$a_{2n} = -\frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{P_{2n}(0)}{P_{2n-2}^{(1)}(0)} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} \frac{\gamma_{2j+1}}{\gamma_{2j}}, \quad a_{2n-1} = -\lambda \frac{P_{2n-2}^{(1)}(0)}{P_{2n-2}(0)} = -\lambda \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{\gamma_{2j}}{\gamma_{2j-1}}$$

for each $n \geq 1$ (with the conventions $\gamma_0 := 1$ and empty product equals 1).

9. (Orthogonal polynomials on the semi-circle) Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be defined by

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, p \rangle := \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi p(e^{i\theta}) d\theta, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

- (a) Show that

$$\mathbf{v} = \delta - \frac{2}{\pi i} x^{-1} \mathbf{u},$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is the (positive-definite) Legendre functional normalized so that

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \frac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^1 p(x) dx, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

(*Hint.* Note that $\int_{\Gamma} \frac{p(z)}{z} dz = 0$ for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, where Γ is the closed path on \mathbb{C} defined by $\Gamma := \Gamma_1 + \ell_{\epsilon}^{-} + \Gamma_{\epsilon} + \ell_{\epsilon}^{+}$, Γ_1 and Γ_{ϵ} being semicircles on the upper semi-plane of radius 1 and ϵ , respectively, with $0 < \epsilon < 1$, Γ_1 starting at the point $z = 1$ and ending at $z = -1$, and Γ_{ϵ} starting at $z = -\epsilon$ and ending at $z = \epsilon$, and ℓ_{ϵ}^{-} and ℓ_{ϵ}^{+} are segments on the real line, joining the points $z = -1$ to $z = -\epsilon$, and $z = \epsilon$ to $z = 1$, respectively. Consider the integrals along each of the paths Γ_1 , ℓ_{ϵ}^{-} , Γ_{ϵ} , and ℓ_{ϵ}^{+} , and then take the limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^{+}$.)

(b) Prove that \mathbf{v} is regular and the monic OPS $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to \mathbf{v} is given by

$$Q_n(x) = P_n(x) - \frac{2i}{2n-1} \left(\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)} \right)^2 P_{n-1}(x), \quad n \geq 1,$$

where $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the (Legendre) monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} .
(*Hint.* Use exercise 8.)

Final remarks

The proof of the Perron–Stieltjes inversion formula (Theorem 5.1) is taken from the article [9] by Erik Koelink. The proofs of Markov’s Theorem and the lemmas before it are based on references [2], [3], [4], and [13]. Alternative proofs of Markov’s Theorem appear in Berg’s article [1] (based on the concept of weak convergence of measures), and in the book [12] by Nikishin and Sorokin.

Exercise 1 is a statement that appears in the book of Nikishin and Sorokin (p. 60), from where we have also taken exercises 2 and 3. The result of exercise 4 appears e.g. in the article [10] by Maroni. The result of exercise 5 may be found in Gautschi’s book [6]. Exercise 6 deals with a very special case of an OPS obtained from another one via a polynomial mapping. This kind of polynomial transformation between two families of OP has received considerable attention in the last decades (see e.g. [8] and [5]). Exercise 7 appears e.g. in Chihara’s book [4]. The OP on the semi-circle studied in exercise 9 were introduced by Gautschi and Milovanović in [7], where they have studied the main properties of such polynomials by a technique totally different from the one presented in this exercise. The approach considered in exercise 9 to the OP on the semi-circle, based on exercise 8, is due to Maroni (cf. e.g. [10] and references therein).

Bibliography

- [1] C. Berg, *Markov's theorem revisited*, J. Approx. Theory **78** (1994), 260–275.
- [2] J. Charris, G. Salas, and V. Silva, *Polinomios ortogonales relacionados com problemas espectrales*, Revista Colombiana de Matematicas **27** (1991), 35–80.
- [3] J. Charris, B. Aldana, and G. Preciado-López, *Recurrence relations, continued fractions, and determining the spectral properties of orthogonal systems of polynomials* (In Spanish), Rev. Acad. Colombiana Cienc. Exact. Fis. Natur **27** (2003), n°104, 381–421.
- [4] T. S. Chihara, *An introduction to orthogonal polynomials*, Gordon and Breach (1978).
- [5] M. N. de Jesus and J. Petronilho, *On orthogonal polynomials obtained via polynomial mappings*, J. Approx. Theory **162** (2010) 2243–2277.
- [6] W. Gautschi, *Orthogonal polynomials. Computation and Approximation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2004).
- [7] W. Gautschi and G. V. Milovanović, *Polynomials orthogonal on the semicircle*, J. Approx. Theory **46** (1986), 230–250.
- [8] J. Geronimo and W. Van Assche, *Orthogonal polynomials on several intervals via a polynomial mapping*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **308** (1988) 559–581.
- [9] E. Koelink, *Spectral theory and special functions*, Laredo Lectures on Orthogonal Polynomials and Special Functions (R. Álvarez-Nodarse, F. Marcellán, and W. Van Assche Eds.), Nova Science Publishers, 45–84 (2004).
- [10] P. Maroni, *Une théorie algébrique des polynômes orthogonaux. Applications aux polynômes orthogonaux semiclassicals*, In C. Brezinski et al. Eds., Orthogonal Polynomials and Their Applications, Proc. Erice 1990, IMACS, Ann. Comp. App. Math. **9** (1991) 95–130.
- [11] R. Remmert, *Classical Topics in Complex Function Theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **172**, Springer (1997).
- [12] E. M. Nikishin and V. N. Sorokin, *Rational approximations and orthogonality*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs **92** (1975) AMS.
- [13] W. Van Assche, *Orthogonal polynomials, associated polynomials, and functions of the second kind*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **37** (1991), 237–249.

6

Orthogonal polynomials and dual basis

Every OPS is a simple set of polynomials, hence it has an associated dual basis in \mathcal{P}' . In this text we present several properties of the dual basis associated with an OPS. We also introduce some additional operations on the spaces \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' (the translation and homothetic operators on these spaces) which appear as useful tools on the study of several classes of OP, including the so called classical and semiclassical families.

1. Orthogonal polynomials and dual basis

We begin by establishing some connections between a regular functional and the dual basis associated with the corresponding monic OPS.

THEOREM 6.1. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be regular, $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the corresponding monic OPS, and $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the associated dual basis. Then:*

(i) *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, \mathbf{a}_n is explicitly given by*

$$\mathbf{a}_n = \frac{P_n}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \mathbf{u} .$$

As a consequence, $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{a}_0 , being

$$\mathbf{u} = u_0 \mathbf{a}_0 .$$

(ii) *Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that*

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, P_n \rangle = 0 \text{ if } n \geq N + 1 .$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{v} = \sum_{j=0}^N \langle \mathbf{v}, P_j \rangle \mathbf{a}_j = \phi \mathbf{u} , \quad \phi(x) := \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, P_j \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_j^2 \rangle} P_j(x) .$$

Further, $\deg \phi \leq N$, and $\deg \phi = N$ if and only if $\langle \mathbf{v}, P_N \rangle \neq 0$.

(iii) *Let the TTRR fulfilled by $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be*

$$xP_n(x) = P_{n+1}(x) + \beta_n P_n(x) + \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x) , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 ,$$

with $P_{-1}(x) = 0$, $P_0(x) = 1$, $\beta_n \in \mathbb{C}$, and $\gamma_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ fulfills

$$x \mathbf{a}_n = \mathbf{a}_{n-1} + \beta_n \mathbf{a}_n + \gamma_{n+1} \mathbf{a}_{n+1} , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 ,$$

with initial conditions $\mathbf{a}_{-1} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{a}_0 = u_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}$.

Proof. By Theorem 1.3, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we may write

$$P_n \mathbf{u} = \sum_{j \geq 0} \langle P_n \mathbf{u}, P_j \rangle \mathbf{a}_j = \sum_{j \geq 0} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n P_j \rangle \mathbf{a}_j = \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle \mathbf{a}_n ,$$

hence (i) is proved. Statement (ii) follows immediately from (i) using again Theorem 1.3. Finally, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x \mathbf{a}_n &= \frac{x P_n}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \mathbf{u} = \frac{P_{n+1} + \beta_n P_n + \gamma_n P_{n-1}}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \mathbf{u} \\ &= \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+1}^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \frac{P_{n+1}}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+1}^2 \rangle} \mathbf{u} + \beta_n \frac{P_n}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \mathbf{u} + \gamma_n \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \frac{P_{n-1}}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle} \mathbf{u} \\ &= \gamma_{n+1} \mathbf{a}_{n+1} + \beta_n \mathbf{a}_n + \mathbf{a}_{n-1} , \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the relation $\gamma_i = \langle \mathbf{u}, P_i^2 \rangle / \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{i-1}^2 \rangle$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ (cf. Corollary 2.13). \square

COROLLARY 6.2. *Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a monic OPS (with respect to some functional in \mathcal{P}') and let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Then $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{v} if and only if*

$$(6.1) \quad \langle \mathbf{v}, 1 \rangle \neq 0 , \quad \langle \mathbf{v}, P_n \rangle = 0 , \quad n \geq 1 .$$

Proof. Clearly, if $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{v} then (6.1) holds. Conversely, if (6.1) holds, then by (ii) in Theorem 6.1,

$$\mathbf{v} = \langle \mathbf{v}, 1 \rangle \mathbf{a}_0 = \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}, 1 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle} \mathbf{u} ,$$

where \mathbf{a}_0 is the first element of the dual basis associated with $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, and \mathbf{u} is the regular functional with respect to which $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS. Since, by hypothesis, $\langle \mathbf{v}, 1 \rangle \neq 0$, it follows that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{v} . \square

2. The translation and homothetic operators

DEFINITION 6.1 (translation operators). *Let $b \in \mathbb{C}$.*

(i) *The translator operator on \mathcal{P} is $\tau_b : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ ($p \mapsto \tau_b p$) defined by*

$$(6.2) \quad \tau_b p(x) := p(x - b) , \quad p \in \mathcal{P} ;$$

(ii) *The translator operator on \mathcal{P}' is $\tau_b := \tau'_{-b}$, i.e., $\tau_b : \mathcal{P}' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$ is the dual operator of τ_{-b} , so that*

$$(6.3) \quad \langle \tau_b \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \langle \mathbf{u}, \tau_{-b} p \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, p(x + b) \rangle , \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}' , \quad p \in \mathcal{P} .$$

Notice that the moments of the functional $\tau_b \mathbf{u}$ are

$$(6.4) \quad (\tau_b \mathbf{u})_n = \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} b^{n-j} u_j = \sum_{i+j=n} \binom{n}{i} b^i u_j , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Indeed, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$(\tau_b \mathbf{u})_n := \langle \tau_b \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, \tau_{-b} x^n \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, (x+b)^n \rangle = \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} b^{n-j} \langle \mathbf{u}, x^j \rangle.$$

DEFINITION 6.2 (homothetic operators). *Let $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$.*

(i) *The homothetic operator on \mathcal{P} is $h_a : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ ($p \mapsto h_a p$) defined by*

$$(6.5) \quad h_a p(x) := p(ax), \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

(ii) *The homothetic operator on \mathcal{P}' is $\mathbf{h}_a := h'_a$, i.e., $\mathbf{h}_a : \mathcal{P}' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$ is the dual operator of h_a , so that*

$$(6.6) \quad \langle \mathbf{h}_a \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \langle \mathbf{u}, h_a p \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, p(ax) \rangle, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}', \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

The moments of the functional $\mathbf{h}_a \mathbf{u}$ are

$$(6.7) \quad (\mathbf{h}_a \mathbf{u})_n = a^n u_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

In the next proposition we list some useful properties involving the translation and homothetic operators.

PROPOSITION 6.3. *Let $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Then:*

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. $\tau_0 p = h_1 p = p$ | 6. $\tau_0 \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{h}_1 \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}$ |
| 2. $(\tau_b \circ \tau_{-b})p = (\tau_{-b} \circ \tau_b)p = p$ | 7. $(\tau_b \circ \tau_{-b})\mathbf{u} = (\tau_{-b} \circ \tau_b)\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}$ |
| 3. $(h_a \circ h_{a^{-1}})p = (h_{a^{-1}} \circ h_a)p = p$ | 8. $(\mathbf{h}_a \circ \mathbf{h}_{a^{-1}})\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{h}_{a^{-1}} \circ \mathbf{h}_a)\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}$ |
| 4. $(h_a \circ \tau_b)p = (\tau_{b/a} \circ h_a)p$ | 9. $(\mathbf{h}_a \circ \tau_b)\mathbf{u} = (\tau_{ab} \circ \mathbf{h}_a)\mathbf{u}$ |
| 5. $(\tau_b \circ h_a)p = (h_a \circ \tau_{ab})p$ | 10. $(\tau_b \circ \mathbf{h}_a)\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{h}_a \circ \tau_{b/a})\mathbf{u}$ |

Proof. Properties 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 8 follow easily by straightforward computations. The proof of property 4 can be done as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (h_a \circ \tau_b)p(x) &= h_a[(\tau_b p)(x)] = (\tau_b p)(ax) = p(ax - b) = p\left(a\left(x - \frac{b}{a}\right)\right) \\ &= \tau_{b/a}[p(ax)] = \tau_{b/a}[h_a p(x)] = (\tau_{b/a} \circ h_a)p(x). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing b by ab in property 4 we obtain property 5. To prove property 9, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\mathbf{h}_a \circ \tau_b)\mathbf{u}, p \rangle &= \langle \tau_b \mathbf{u}, h_a p \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, (\tau_{-b} \circ h_a)p \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, (h_a \circ \tau_{-ab})p \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{h}_a \mathbf{u}, \tau_{-ab} p \rangle = \langle (\tau_{ab} \circ \mathbf{h}_a)\mathbf{u}, p \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality we have used property 5. Finally, replacing b by b/a in property 9 we obtain property 10. \square

Properties 2 and 3 show that the operators τ_b and h_a are invertible in \mathcal{P} , being

$$(6.8) \quad \tau_b^{-1}p = \tau_{-b}p, \quad h_a^{-1}p = h_{a^{-1}}p, \quad a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \quad b \in \mathbb{C}, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Similarly, properties 6 and 7 show that τ_b and h_a are invertible in \mathcal{P}' , being

$$(6.9) \quad \tau_b^{-1}\mathbf{u} = \tau_{-b}\mathbf{u}, \quad h_a^{-1}\mathbf{u} = h_{a^{-1}}\mathbf{u}, \quad a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \quad b \in \mathbb{C}, \quad \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'.$$

As a consequence, we also deduce

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} (h_a \circ \tau_b)^{-1} &= \tau_{-b} \circ h_{a^{-1}}, & (\tau_b \circ h_a)^{-1} &= h_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-b} \quad \text{on } \mathcal{P}; \\ (h_a \circ \tau_b)^{-1} &= \tau_{-b} \circ h_{a^{-1}}, & (\tau_b \circ h_a)^{-1} &= h_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-b} \quad \text{on } \mathcal{P}'. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we point out the following property that one should keep in mind (it follows immediately from the proof of property 4 above replacing b by $-b$):

$$(6.11) \quad (h_a \circ \tau_{-b})p(x) = p(ax + b), \quad a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \quad b \in \mathbb{C}, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

The next proposition is of fundamental importance for a rigorous treatment of the classification problem of semiclassical OP.

THEOREM 6.4. *Define a binary relation on \mathcal{P}' as follows: for every $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}'$,*

$$(6.12) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{v} \quad \text{iff} \quad \exists a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \quad \exists b \in \mathbb{C} : \quad \mathbf{v} = (h_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-b})\mathbf{u}.$$

Then, \sim is an equivalent relation on \mathcal{P}' .

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Since

$$\mathbf{u} = (h_1 \circ \tau_0)\mathbf{u},$$

then $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{u}$, so that the binary relation \sim is reflexive. To prove that it is symmetric, assume that $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{v}$. Then (6.12) holds. Therefore, we may write

$$\mathbf{u} = (h_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-b})^{-1}\mathbf{v} = (\tau_b \circ h_a)\mathbf{v} = (h_a \circ \tau_{b/a})\mathbf{v} = (h_{c^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-d})\mathbf{v},$$

where $c := a^{-1} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $d := -b/a \in \mathbb{C}$. (Notice also that the third equality follows from property 10 in Proposition 6.3.) Thus, $\mathbf{v} \sim \mathbf{u}$. Finally, to prove that \sim is transitive, suppose that $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{v} \sim \mathbf{w}$. Then, there exists $a, c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $b, d \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\mathbf{v} = (h_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-b})\mathbf{u}, \quad \mathbf{w} = (h_{c^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-d})\mathbf{v}.$$

As a consequence, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w} &= (h_{c^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-d})(h_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-b})\mathbf{u} = (h_{c^{-1}} \circ (\tau_{-d} \circ h_{a^{-1}}) \circ \tau_{-b})\mathbf{u} \\ &= (h_{c^{-1}} \circ (h_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-ad}) \circ \tau_{-b})\mathbf{u} = ((h_{c^{-1}} \circ h_{a^{-1}}) \circ (\tau_{-ad} \circ \tau_{-b}))\mathbf{u} \\ &= (h_{a^{-1}c^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-ad-b})\mathbf{u} = (h_{\alpha^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-\beta})\mathbf{u}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha := ac \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\beta := b + ad \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{w}$. □

REMARK 6.1. The relation between \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} in (6.12) may be expressed as

$$(6.13) \quad \langle \mathbf{v}, x^n \rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{u}, \left(\frac{x-b}{a} \right)^n \right\rangle, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

THEOREM 6.5. Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a simple set in \mathcal{P} and $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ its associated dual basis. Let $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $b \in \mathbb{C}$. Define

$$(6.14) \quad Q_n := a^{-n} (h_a \circ \tau_{-b}) P_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Then $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a simple set in \mathcal{P} , and its dual basis, $\{\mathbf{b}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, is given by

$$(6.15) \quad \mathbf{b}_n = a^n (\mathbf{h}_{a^{-1}} \circ \boldsymbol{\tau}_{-b}) \mathbf{a}_n, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$$

Proof. It is clear that $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a simple set in \mathcal{P} . Moreover, for every $n, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{b}_n, Q_k \rangle &= a^{n-k} \langle (\mathbf{h}_{a^{-1}} \circ \boldsymbol{\tau}_{-b}) \mathbf{a}_n, (h_a \circ \tau_{-b}) P_k \rangle = a^{n-k} \langle \mathbf{a}_n, (\tau_b \circ h_{a^{-1}}) (h_a \circ \tau_{-b}) P_k \rangle \\ &= a^{n-k} \langle \mathbf{a}_n, P_k \rangle = a^{n-k} \delta_{n,k} = \delta_{n,k}, \end{aligned}$$

hence $\{\mathbf{b}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the dual basis associated with $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. \square

REMARK 6.2. By (6.11) we see that the polynomial Q_n in (6.14) is indeed

$$(6.16) \quad Q_n(x) := a^{-n} P_n(ax + b), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

so that Q_n is obtained from P_n by an affine change of the variable, being Q_n normalized so that it becomes a monic polynomial whenever P_n is monic.

THEOREM 6.6. Under the hypothesis of Theorem 6.5, assume further that $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to the functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and let

$$(6.17) \quad xP_n(x) = P_{n+1}(x) + \beta_n P_n(x) + \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

be the TTRR fulfilled by $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, with initial conditions $P_{-1}(x) = 0$ and $P_0(x) = 1$, being $\beta_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Then, $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to

$$(6.18) \quad \mathbf{v} := (\mathbf{h}_{a^{-1}} \circ \boldsymbol{\tau}_{-b}) \mathbf{u},$$

and the TTRR fulfilled by $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is

$$(6.19) \quad xQ_n(x) = Q_{n+1}(x) + \hat{\beta}_n Q_n(x) + \hat{\gamma}_n Q_{n-1}(x), \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots,$$

with initial conditions $Q_{-1}(x) = 0$ and $Q_0(x) = 1$, where

$$(6.20) \quad \hat{\beta}_n := \frac{\beta_n - b}{a}, \quad \hat{\gamma}_n := \frac{\gamma_n}{a^2}.$$

Proof. Changing x into $ax + b$ in (6.17) and then multiplying both sides of the resulting equality by a^{-n-1} , we obtain (6.19). Since $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfies (6.19) and $\hat{\gamma}_n \neq 0$ for each $n \geq 1$, then it is a monic OPS (by Favard's Theorem). By Theorem 6.5, the

dual basis associated with $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is given by (6.15). Moreover, by Theorem 6.1–(i), $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{b}_0 . Therefore, since

$$\mathbf{b}_0 = (\mathbf{h}_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-b}) \mathbf{a}_0 = (\mathbf{h}_{a^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-b}) u_0^{-1} \mathbf{u} = u_0^{-1} \mathbf{v} ,$$

so that $\mathbf{v} = u_0 \mathbf{b}_0$ (being $u_0 \neq 0$), we conclude that $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{v} . \square

Exercises

1. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathscr{P}'$ be regular, $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ the corresponding monic OPS, and $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ its dual basis in \mathscr{P}' . Consider the monic OPS $\{P_n^{(k)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ (of the associated polynomials of order k , $k \in \mathbb{N}$) and let $\{\mathbf{a}_n^{(k)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ be its dual basis. Show that

$$x^{-1}(\mathbf{a}_n^{(k)} \mathbf{a}_{k-1}) = \mathbf{a}_{n+k} , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

In particular, $\mathbf{a}_n^{(1)} = (x \mathbf{a}_{n+1}) \mathbf{a}_0^{-1}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and so $\{P_n^{(1)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to the functional $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}$ given by

$$\mathbf{u}^{(1)} = c(x P_1 \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{u}^{-1} = -c u_0 x^2 \mathbf{u}^{-1} , \quad c := u_0^{(1)} / \gamma_1 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} .$$

(This relation suggests taking the normalization $u_0^{(1)} := \gamma_1$, which is henceforth considered the standard normalization of the functional $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}$.)

Final remarks

This short text is based on the works [3] and [4] by Pascal Maroni, although some of the results therein may be found also in Chihara's book. The equivalence relation (6.12) appears in Maroni's work [4] (see p. 19 therein). Some detailed computations concerning the results presented in this text may be found in the master thesis [2] (under the co-supervision of Pascal Maroni and Zélia da Rocha).

Finally we mention that the results contained in this text are of an elementary nature and they could be left as exercises included in other texts. Our option to include them as an autonomous text is due to the advantage that results from its systematized presentation for reading some subsequent texts.

Bibliography

- [1] T. S. Chihara, *An introduction to orthogonal polynomials*, Gordon and Breach (1978).
- [2] A. Loureiro, *Uma nova caracterização dos polinómios ortogonais clássicos*, MSc thesis, Univ. Porto (2003).
- [3] P. Maroni, *Une théorie algébrique des polynômes orthogonaux. Applications aux polynômes orthogonaux semiclassicals*, In C. Brezinski et al. Eds., *Orthogonal Polynomials and Their Applications*, Proc. Erice 1990, IMACS, Ann. Comp. App. Math. **9** (1991) 95–130.
- [4] P. Maroni, *Fonctions eulériennes. Polynômes orthogonaux classiques*, *Téchniques de l'Ingénieur, traité Généralités (Sciences Fondamentales)*, A **154** (1994) 1–30.

7

Pearson's distributional differential equation

In this text we start our study of the so called *classical orthogonal polynomials*, which includes four families of OP: Hermite, Laguerre, Jacobi (including as special cases the Legendre and Chebyshev polynomials), and Bessel polynomials. Those constitute perhaps the most important class of OP. The regular functional with respect to which each one of these families is an OPS satisfies an homogeneous linear distributional differential equation of the first order, called *Pearson's equation*—see equation (7.1) in bellow. Our purpose, here, is the analysis of the solutions $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ of this equation.

1. Pearson's distributional differential equation

The Pearson's distributional differential equation has the form

$$(7.1) \quad D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u} ,$$

where $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_1$, and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is the unknown. Notice that we do not require *a priori* \mathbf{u} to be a regular functional. We may write

$$(7.2) \quad \phi(x) = ax^2 + bx + c , \quad \psi(x) = px + q ,$$

being $a, b, c, p, q \in \mathbb{C}$. We also define, for each integer or rational number n ,

$$(7.3) \quad \psi_n := \psi + n\phi' , \quad d_n := \psi'_{n/2} = na + p , \quad e_n := \psi_n(0) = nb + q .$$

Notice that $\psi_n(x) = d_{2n}x + e_n \in \mathcal{P}_1$. Finally, for each $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we set

$$(7.4) \quad \mathbf{u}^{[n]} := \phi^n \mathbf{u} .$$

We begin with the following elementary result.

LEMMA 7.1. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Then \mathbf{u} satisfies the Pearson distributional differential equation (7.1) if and only if the corresponding sequence of moments, $u_n := \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle$, satisfies the second order linear difference equation*

$$(7.5) \quad d_n u_{n+1} + e_n u_n + n\phi(0)u_{n-1} = 0 , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Moreover, if \mathbf{u} satisfies (7.1), then $\mathbf{u}^{[n]}$ satisfies

$$(7.6) \quad D(\phi \mathbf{u}^{[n]}) = \psi_n \mathbf{u}^{[n]} , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u} &\Leftrightarrow \langle D(\phi \mathbf{u}), x^n \rangle = \langle \psi \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \\ &\Leftrightarrow -n \langle \mathbf{u}, \phi x^{n-1} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, \psi x^n \rangle, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \\ &\Leftrightarrow (na + p)u_{n+1} + (nb + q)u_n + ncu_{n-1} = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \end{aligned}$$

hence the first assertion of the theorem is proved. To prove (7.6) we use mathematical induction. Since $\mathbf{u}^{[0]} := \mathbf{u}$ and $\psi_0 = \psi$, then (7.6) holds for $n = 0$. Assume that (7.6) holds for a certain $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $D(\mathbf{u}^{[n+1]}) = D(\phi \mathbf{u}^{[n]}) = \psi_n \mathbf{u}^{[n]}$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} D(\phi \mathbf{u}^{[n+1]}) &= \phi' \mathbf{u}^{[n+1]} + \phi D(\mathbf{u}^{[n+1]}) = \phi' \mathbf{u}^{[n+1]} + \phi \psi_n \mathbf{u}^{[n]} = (\phi' + \psi_n) \mathbf{u}^{[n+1]} \\ &= \psi_{n+1} \mathbf{u}^{[n+1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (7.6) is proved. \square

THEOREM 7.2. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and suppose that \mathbf{u} satisfies the Pearson distributional differential equation (7.1). Suppose further that*

$$(7.7) \quad d_n \neq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Then, there exists a simple set of polynomials $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ such that

$$(7.8) \quad R_n \mathbf{u} = D^n(\phi^n \mathbf{u}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Moreover, $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ may be chosen so that it satisfies the three-term recurrence relation

$$(7.9) \quad R_{n+1}(x) = (\tilde{\alpha}_n x - \tilde{\beta}_n) R_n(x) - \tilde{\gamma}_n R_{n-1}(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

with initial conditions $R_{-1}(x) = 0$ and $R_0(x) = 1$, being

$$(7.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\alpha}_n &:= \frac{d_{2n-1} d_{2n}}{d_{n-1}}, \quad \tilde{\beta}_n := -\tilde{\alpha}_n \frac{d_{-2} q + 2b n d_{n-1}}{d_{2n-2} d_{2n}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0, \\ \tilde{\gamma}_n &:= -\tilde{\alpha}_n \frac{n d_{2n-2}}{d_{2n-1}} \phi \left(-\frac{e_{n-1}}{d_{2n-2}} \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof will be made by mathematical induction on n . Defining

$$R_0 := 1, \quad R_1 := \psi,$$

it is clear that (7.8) holds for $n = 0$ and $n = 1$. Suppose now that (7.8) holds for the indices n and $n - 1$, that is, there exist polynomials R_n and R_{n-1} , with degrees n and $n - 1$, respectively, such that

$$(7.11) \quad R_n \mathbf{u} = D^n(\phi^n \mathbf{u}), \quad R_{n-1} \mathbf{u} = D^{n-1}(\phi^{n-1} \mathbf{u}).$$

We must show that there is a polynomial R_{n+1} of degree $n + 1$ such that

$$(7.12) \quad R_{n+1} \mathbf{u} = D^{n+1}(\phi^{n+1} \mathbf{u}).$$

Using Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^{n+1}(\phi^{n+1}\mathbf{u}) &= D^n[D(\phi\mathbf{u}^{[n]})] = D^n(\psi_n\mathbf{u}^{[n]}) = D^n(\psi_n\phi^n\mathbf{u}) \\ &= \binom{n}{0}\psi_n D^n(\phi^n\mathbf{u}) + \binom{n}{1}\psi'_n D^{n-1}(\phi^n\mathbf{u}) = \psi_n R_n\mathbf{u} + n\psi'_n D^{n-1}(\phi^n\mathbf{u}), \end{aligned}$$

where in the fourth equality we applied the distributional Leibniz rule and in the last one we used the first relation in the induction hypothesis (7.11). Therefore,

$$(7.13) \quad D^{n-1}(\phi^n\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{nd_{2n}}(D^{n+1}(\phi^{n+1}\mathbf{u}) - \psi_n R_n\mathbf{u}).$$

Notice that, according to the hypothesis (7.7), $\psi'_{m/2} = d_m \neq 0$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We point out that we have deduced (7.13) using the first relation in (7.11). Therefore, making the change of indices $n \rightarrow n-1$ in the above reasoning and using the second relation in (7.11), we obtain

$$(7.14) \quad D^{n-2}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{(n-1)d_{2n-2}}(R_n - \psi_{n-1}R_{n-1})\mathbf{u}.$$

On the other hand, using again Lemma 7.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^{n+1}(\phi^{n+1}\mathbf{u}) &= D^{n-1}[D(\psi_n\phi^n\mathbf{u})] = D^{n-1}[(\psi'_n\phi + \psi_n\psi_{n-1})\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}] \\ &= (\psi'_n\phi + \psi_n\psi_{n-1})D^{n-1}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}) + \binom{n-1}{1}(\psi'_n\phi + \psi_n\psi_{n-1})'D^{n-2}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}) \\ &\quad + \binom{n-1}{2}(\psi'_n\phi + \psi_n\psi_{n-1})''D^{n-3}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}) \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have applied again Leibniz rule. Consequently, using (7.14) and the second relation in (7.11), and taking into account the identities

$$(\psi'_n\phi + \psi_n\psi_{n-1})' = 2d_{2n-1}\psi_n, \quad (\psi'_n\phi + \psi_n\psi_{n-1})'' = 2d_{2n}d_{2n-1},$$

we deduce

$$(7.15) \quad \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}D^{n-3}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2d_{2n}d_{2n-1}}\left\{D^{n+1}(\phi^{n+1}\mathbf{u}) - (\psi'_n\phi + \psi_n\psi_{n-1})R_{n-1}\mathbf{u} - \frac{2d_{2n-1}}{d_{2n-2}}\psi_n(R_n - \psi_{n-1}R_{n-1})\mathbf{u}\right\}.$$

Now, consider the left-hand side of (7.13). Using Leibniz rule, we have

$$D^{n-1}(\phi^n\mathbf{u}) = \phi D^{n-1}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}) + (n-1)\phi' D^{n-2}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}) + (n-1)(n-2)aD^{n-3}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}).$$

Substituting into (7.13), and using (7.14) and the second relation in (7.11), we deduce

$$(7.16) \quad \begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{nd_{2n}}(D^{n+1}(\phi^{n+1}\mathbf{u}) - \psi_n R_n\mathbf{u}) \\ &= \phi R_{n-1}\mathbf{u} + \frac{\phi'}{d_{2n-2}}(R_n - \psi_{n-1}R_{n-1})\mathbf{u} + a(n-1)(n-2)D^{n-3}(\phi^{n-1}\mathbf{u}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, substituting (7.15) in the right-hand side of (7.16), after some computations (we may use MATHEMATICA!) we obtain (7.12), provided we define

$$R_{n+1}(x) := \frac{d_{2n-1}d_{2n}}{d_{n-1}} \left[\left(x + \frac{d_{-2}q + 2bnd_{n-1}}{d_{2n-2}d_{2n}} \right) R_n(x) + \frac{nd_{2n-2}}{d_{2n-1}} \phi \left(-\frac{e_{n-1}}{d_{2n-2}} \right) R_{n-1}(x) \right].$$

Since (by the induction hypothesis) R_n and R_{n-1} have degrees n and $n-1$ (respectively), it follows that R_{n+1} is a polynomial of degree $n+1$. Thus the theorem is proved. \square

2. The regular solutions of Pearson's equation

In the previous section we analyzed Pearson's distributional differential equation (7.1) without requiring the regularity condition on the functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. In this section we determine necessary and sufficient conditions, involving only the (coefficients of the) polynomials ϕ and ψ , which ensure the regularity of such a functional.

Notice that if both ϕ and ψ vanish identically then Pearson's equation (7.1) reduces to a trivial equation, so we will exclude this situation from our study.

LEMMA 7.3. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. Suppose that \mathbf{u} is regular and satisfies Pearson's equation (7.1), being $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_1$, and assume that at least one of the polynomials ϕ and ψ is nonzero. Then neither ϕ nor ψ is the zero polynomial, and*

$$(7.17) \quad \deg \psi = 1.$$

Proof. Since \mathbf{u} is regular, there is a monic OPS, $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, with respect to \mathbf{u} . Since \mathbf{u} fulfills (7.1), if $\psi \equiv 0$ then $D(\phi\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0}$; hence, if $\phi \not\equiv 0$, setting $r := \deg \phi$ and denoting by $k(\neq 0)$ the leading coefficient of ϕ , we would have

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, P_r^2 \rangle = k^{-1} \langle \phi\mathbf{u}, P_r \rangle = -k^{-1} \langle D(\phi\mathbf{u}), \int P_r \rangle = -k^{-1} \langle \mathbf{0}, \int P_r \rangle = 0,$$

violating the regularity of \mathbf{u} . We conclude that $\psi \equiv 0$ implies $\phi \equiv 0$. Suppose now that $\phi \equiv 0$. Then, $\psi\mathbf{u} = 0$. If $\psi \not\equiv 0$, setting $t := \deg \psi$ and being $m(\neq 0)$ the leading coefficient of ψ , we would have $\langle \mathbf{u}, P_t^2 \rangle = m^{-1} \langle \psi\mathbf{u}, P_t \rangle = 0$, violating again the regularity of \mathbf{u} . We conclude that $\phi \equiv 0$ implies $\psi \equiv 0$. Finally, suppose that $\psi \equiv \text{constant} = q \neq 0$. Then $\langle \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle = q^{-1} \langle \psi\mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle = q^{-1} \langle D(\phi\mathbf{u}), 1 \rangle = 0$, violating once again the regularity of \mathbf{u} . Thus $\deg \psi = 1$. \square

Given a monic polynomial P_n of degree n (which needs not to belong to an OPS), we denote by $P_n^{[k]}$ the monic polynomial of degree n defined by

$$(7.18) \quad P_n^{[k]}(x) := \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \frac{P_{n+k}(x)}{(n+1)_k} \quad (k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0),$$

where, for a given $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, $(\alpha)_n$ is the *Pochhammer symbol*, defined as

$$(7.19) \quad (\alpha)_0 := 1, \quad (\alpha)_n := \alpha(\alpha+1) \cdots (\alpha+n-1), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Clearly, if $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a simple set in \mathcal{P} , then so is $\{P_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$. Under such conditions, there is a beautiful relation between the associated dual basis.

LEMMA 7.4. *Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be a simple set in \mathcal{P} , and let $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the dual basis in \mathcal{P}' associated with $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{P_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$, respectively. Then,*

$$(7.20) \quad D^k(\mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}) = (-1)^k (n+1)_k \mathbf{a}_{n+k}, \quad k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Proof. Fix $j, k, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D^k(\mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}), P_j \rangle &= (-1)^k \langle \mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}, \frac{d^k}{dx^k} P_j \rangle = (-1)^k (j-k+1)_k \langle \mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}, P_{j-k}^{[k]} \rangle \\ &= (-1)^k (n+1)_k \delta_{n, j-k} = \langle (-1)^k (n+1)_k \mathbf{a}_{n+k}, P_j \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (7.20) is proved. \square

LEMMA 7.5. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and suppose that \mathbf{u} satisfies the Pearson distributional differential equation (7.1), with ϕ and ψ given by (7.2), being at least one of these polynomials nonzero. Suppose further that \mathbf{u} is regular. Then*

$$(7.21) \quad d_n := na + p \neq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Moreover, let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , and $P_n^{[k]}$ defined by (7.18). Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbf{u}^{[k]} := \phi^k \mathbf{u}$ is regular and $\{P_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is its monic OPS.

Proof. By Lemma 7.3, both ϕ and ψ are nonzero, and $\deg \psi = 1$, hence $p \neq 0$. Consider first the case $k = 1$. Write $Q_n = P_n^{[1]} := P'_{n+1}/(n+1)$. We will show that

$$(7.22) \quad \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, Q_n Q_m \rangle = -\frac{d_n}{n+1} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+1}^2 \rangle \delta_{nm}, \quad n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Indeed, since $D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u}$, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} (n+1) \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, Q_m Q_n \rangle &= \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, Q_m P'_{n+1} \rangle = \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, (Q_m P_{n+1})' - Q'_m P_{n+1} \rangle \\ &= -\langle D(\phi \mathbf{u}), Q_m P_{n+1} \rangle - \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, Q'_m P_{n+1} \rangle \\ &= -\langle \mathbf{u}, (\psi Q_m + \phi Q'_m) P_{n+1} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, assuming (without loss of generality) $m \leq n$, since $\deg(\psi Q_m + \phi Q'_m) < n+1$ if $m < n$, and $\psi Q_m + \phi Q'_m = (na+p)x^{n+1} + \pi_n(x)$ if $m = n$, where $\pi_n \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we obtain (7.22). Let $s := \deg \phi \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, write $P_{n+s}(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{n+s} a_{nm} Q_m(x)$, being a_{nm} complex parameters. Multiplying both sides of this equality by ϕQ_n and then applying \mathbf{u} , and taking into account (7.22), we deduce

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi Q_n P_{n+s} \rangle = -\frac{a_{nn} d_n}{n+1} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+1}^2 \rangle, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The left-hand side of this equality never vanishes, since $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} and $\deg \phi = s$ (and ϕ is not the zero polynomial). Thus the right-hand side of the equality cannot vanish, hence $d_n \neq 0$ (and also $a_{nn} \neq 0$), which proves (7.21).

It remains to prove that $\{P_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to $\mathbf{u}^{[k]} := \phi^k \mathbf{u}$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k = 1$, since, by (7.22),

$$(7.23) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}^{[1]}, P_n^{[1]} P_m^{[1]} \rangle = -\frac{na+p}{n+1} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+1}^2 \rangle \delta_{nm}, \quad n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

then (7.21) ensures that $\{P_n^{[1]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to $\mathbf{u}^{[1]} := \phi \mathbf{u}$. Now, by Lemma 7.1, $\mathbf{u}^{[1]}$ fulfills the Pearson's equation $D(\phi \mathbf{u}^{[1]}) = \psi_1 \mathbf{u}^{[1]}$, hence, since $P_n^{[2]} = (P_{n+1}^{[1]})'/(n+1)$ and $\psi_1(x) = (2a+p)x + b+q$, from (7.23) with \mathbf{u} , ψ , and $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ replaced by $\mathbf{u}^{[1]}$, ψ_1 , and $\{P_n^{[1]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ (resp.), we deduce, for every $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\langle \mathbf{u}^{[2]}, P_n^{[2]} P_m^{[2]} \rangle = -\frac{(n+2)a+p}{n+1} \langle \mathbf{u}^{[1]}, (P_{n+1}^{[1]})^2 \rangle \delta_{nm} = \frac{d_{n+1}d_{n+2}}{(n+1)(n+2)} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+2}^2 \rangle \delta_{nm},$$

and so $\{P_n^{[2]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to $\mathbf{u}^{[2]}$. Arguing by induction, we prove

$$(7.24) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}^{[k]}, P_n^{[k]} P_m^{[k]} \rangle = (-1)^k \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} d_{n+k+j-1}}{(n+1)_k} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+k}^2 \rangle \delta_{nm} \quad (k, n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0),$$

hence $\{P_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to $\mathbf{u}^{[k]}$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. \square

We may now establish necessary and sufficient conditions ensuring the regularity of a given functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ satisfying (7.2).

THEOREM 7.6. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}' \setminus \{0\}$, and suppose that \mathbf{u} satisfies the Pearson equation*

$$(7.25) \quad D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u},$$

where ϕ and ψ are nonzero polynomials such that $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_1$. Set

$$\phi(x) := ax^2 + bx + c, \quad \psi(x) := px + q, \quad d_n := na + p, \quad e_n := nb + q \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0).$$

Then, \mathbf{u} is regular if and only if

$$(7.26) \quad d_n \neq 0, \quad \phi\left(-\frac{e_n}{d_{2n}}\right) \neq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Moreover, under these conditions, the monic OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to \mathbf{u} is given by the three-term recurrence relation

$$(7.27) \quad P_{n+1}(x) = (x - \beta_n)P_n(x) - \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0$$

with initial conditions $P_{-1}(x) = 0$ and $P_0(x) = 1$, being

$$(7.28) \quad \beta_n = \frac{ne_n}{d_{2n}} - \frac{(n+1)e_{n+1}}{d_{2n+2}}, \quad \gamma_{n+1} = -\frac{(n+1)d_{n-1}}{d_{2n-1}d_{2n+1}} \phi\left(-\frac{e_n}{d_{2n}}\right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

In addition, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, P_n satisfies the distributional Rodrigues formula

$$(7.29) \quad P_n \mathbf{u} = k_n D^n(\phi^n \mathbf{u}), \quad k_n := \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} d_{n+i-1}^{-1}.$$

Proof. Suppose that \mathbf{u} is regular. Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . By Lemma 7.5, $d_n \neq 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, $\mathbf{u}^{[k]} := \phi^k \mathbf{u}$ is regular and $\{P_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is its monic OPS, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This monic OPS satisfies a TTRR

$$(7.30) \quad P_{n+1}^{[k]}(x) = (x - \beta_n^{[k]})P_n^{[k]}(x) - \gamma_n^{[k]}P_{n-1}^{[k]}(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0$$

with initial conditions $P_{-1}^{[k]}(x) = 0$ and $P_0^{[k]}(x) = 1$, being $\beta_n^{[k]} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_n^{[k]} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ for each n . Let us compute $\gamma_1^{[n]}$ for each fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We first show that the coefficient $\gamma_1 \equiv \gamma_1^{[0]}$, appearing in the TTRR for $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, is given by

$$(7.31) \quad \gamma_1 = -\frac{1}{p+a}\phi\left(-\frac{q}{p}\right).$$

To prove this relation, take $n = 0$ and $n = 1$ in the recurrence relation (7.5) for the sequence of moments associated to \mathbf{u} . This gives

$$(7.32) \quad u_1 = -\frac{q}{p}u_0, \quad u_2 = -\frac{1}{p+a}\left[-(b+q)\frac{q}{p} + c\right]u_0.$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 2.13,

$$(7.33) \quad \gamma_1 = \frac{H_{-1}H_1}{H_0^2} = \frac{u_2u_0 - u_1^2}{u_0^2}.$$

Substituting u_1 and u_2 given by (7.32) into (7.33) yields (7.31). Now, since equation (7.6) is of the same type as equation (7.25), with the same polynomial ϕ and being ψ replaced by ψ_n , we see that the expression of $\gamma_1^{[n]}$ may be obtained replacing the coefficients p and q of ψ in (7.31) by the corresponding coefficients of ψ_n . Hence,

$$(7.34) \quad \gamma_1^{[n]} = -\frac{1}{d_{2n}+a}\phi\left(-\frac{e_n}{d_{2n}}\right) = -\frac{1}{d_{2n+1}}\phi\left(-\frac{e_n}{d_{2n}}\right).$$

Since $\mathbf{u}^{[n]}$ is regular, then $\gamma_1^{[n]} \neq 0$. Thus, the second condition in (7.26) holds.

Conversely, suppose that conditions (7.26) hold. According with Theorem 7.2, there is a simple set of polynomials $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ such that (7.8) holds and satisfying the TTRR (7.9)–(7.10). The hypothesis (7.26) ensure that $\tilde{\alpha}_n \neq 0$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_n \neq 0$ for each n . Thus, by Favard's theorem, $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS. We claim that $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is an OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . By Corollary 6.2, we only need to show that

$$(7.35) \quad u_0 \neq 0, \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, R_n \rangle = 0, \quad n \geq 1.$$

In fact, if $u_0 = 0$, since (by Lemma 7.1) Pearson's equation (7.25) is equivalent to the recurrence relation (7.5) fulfilled by the moments u_n , and since for $n = 0$ (7.5) yields $pu_1 + qu_0 = 0$, we would get $pu_1 = 0$ and so $u_1 = 0$ (because $p = d_0 \neq 0$); therefore, $u_0 = u_1 = 0$, and it follows recurrently from (7.5) that $u_n = 0$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, hence $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, in contradiction with the hypothesis. Thus, $u_0 \neq 0$. On the other hand, by (7.8), for each $n \geq 1$ we have $\langle \mathbf{u}, R_n \rangle = \langle R_n \mathbf{u}, 1 \rangle = (-1)^n \langle \phi^n \mathbf{u}, 0 \rangle = 0$. Thus (7.35) is proved. Therefore $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , hence \mathbf{u} is regular.

It remains to prove (7.28)–(7.29). Since $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{R_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are both OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} , then there exist a sequence $\{k_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, with $k_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, such that

$$(7.36) \quad P_n(x) = k_n R_n(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Multiplying both sides of (7.9) by k_n we obtain

$$xP_n(x) = \frac{k_n}{\tilde{\alpha}_n k_{n+1}} P_{n+1}(x) + \frac{\tilde{\beta}_n}{\tilde{\alpha}_n} P_n(x) + \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n k_n}{\tilde{\alpha}_n k_{n-1}} P_{n-1}(x), \quad n \geq 1,$$

and $P_1 = x - \tilde{\beta}_0$ where $\tilde{\beta}_0 = -q/p$. Since each P_n is a monic polynomial, we must have $k_n/(\tilde{\alpha}_n k_{n+1}) = 1$. Therefore, since $k_0 = 1$, it follows that

$$k_n = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \tilde{\alpha}_i^{-1} = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} d_{n+i-1}^{-1}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Thus (7.29) follows from (7.36) and (7.8). Finally, by (7.10), the coefficients of the TTRR for $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_n &= \frac{\tilde{\beta}_n}{\tilde{\alpha}_n} = -\frac{d_{-2}q + 2bnd_{n-1}}{d_{2n}d_{2n-2}}, \quad n \geq 0; \\ \gamma_n &= \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_n k_n}{\tilde{\alpha}_n k_{n-1}} = -\frac{nd_{n-2}}{d_{2n-3}d_{2n-1}} \phi\left(-\frac{e_{n-1}}{d_{2n-2}}\right), \quad n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

REMARK 7.1. The regularity conditions (7.26) may be expressed as

$$(7.37) \quad d_n \cdot (ae_n^2 - be_n d_{2n} + cd_{2n}^2) \neq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Exercises

1. Let $\mathbf{u} \equiv \mathbf{u}(r_1, r_2) \in \mathcal{P}'$ (with $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{C}$) be a solution of the Pearson's equation

$$D((x - r_1)(x - r_2)\mathbf{u}) = \left(x - \frac{r_1 + r_2}{2}\right)\mathbf{u}.$$

- (a) Prove that \mathbf{u} is regular if and only if $r_1 \neq r_2$.
- (b) Assuming the condition $r_1 \neq r_2$, show that the monic OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to \mathbf{u} is given by

$$P_n(x) := \left(\frac{r_1 - r_2}{4}\right)^n U_n\left(\frac{2x - r_1 - r_2}{r_1 - r_2}\right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is the OPS of the Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind.

Final remarks

This text is based on reference [2] and the works [3], [4], and [5] by Maroni. As far as we know, the regularity condition (7.21) was firstly stated (in a different way) by the Russian mathematician Ya. L. Geronimus in [1] (cf. Theorem II therein).

Bibliography

- [1] Ya. L. Geronimus, *On polynomials orthogonal with respect to numerical sequences and on Hahn's theorem*, Izv. Akad. Nauk. **4** (1940) 215–228. (In Russian.)
- [2] F. Marcellán and J. Petronilho, *On the solution of some distributional differential equations: existence and characterizations of the classical moment functionals*, Integral Transforms and Special Functions **2** (1994) 185–218.
- [3] P. Maroni, *Une théorie algébrique des polynômes orthogonaux. Applications aux polynômes orthogonaux semiclassicals*, In C. Brezinski et al. Eds., Orthogonal Polynomials and Their Applications, Proc. Erice 1990, IMACS, Ann. Comp. App. Math. **9** (1991) 95–130.
- [4] P. Maroni, *Variations Around Classical Orthogonal Polynomials. Connected Problems*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **48** (1993) 133–155.
- [5] P. Maroni, *Fonctions eulériennes. Polynômes orthogonaux classiques*, Techniques de l'Ingénieur, traité Généralités (Sciences Fondamentales), A **154** (1994) 1–30.

8

Classical orthogonal polynomials

The *classical functionals* are the regular solutions (in \mathcal{P}') of Pearson's equation. The corresponding OPS are called *classical orthogonal polynomials*. In this text we present the most significant results concerning this important class of OP.

1. Definition and characterizations

DEFINITION 8.1. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$. \mathbf{u} is called a *classical functional* if the following two conditions hold:

- (i) \mathbf{u} is regular;
- (ii) \mathbf{u} satisfies a Pearson distributional differential equation

$$(8.1) \quad D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u} ,$$

where ϕ and ψ are polynomials fulfilling

$$(8.2) \quad \deg \phi \leq 2 , \quad \deg \psi = 1 .$$

An OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to a classical functional is called a *classical OPS*.

REMARK 8.1. According with Lemma 7.3, in the above definition conditions (8.2) may be replaced by the weaker conditions

$$(8.3) \quad \phi \in \mathcal{P}_2 , \quad \psi \in \mathcal{P}_1 , \quad \{\phi, \psi\} \neq \mathcal{P}_{-1} := \{0\} .$$

Theorem 7.6 gives necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of solutions of Pearson's equation, characterizing also such functionals (and, in particular, solving the question of the existence of classical functionals). Thus, we may state: *a functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}' \setminus \{0\}$ is classical if and only if there exist $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_1$ such that the following conditions hold:*

$$(8.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{(i)} \quad D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u} ; \\ & \text{(ii)} \quad na + p \neq 0 , \quad \phi \left(-\frac{nb + q}{2na + p} \right) \neq 0 , \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 , \end{aligned}$$

where we have set $\phi(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ and $\psi(x) = px + q$.

In the next proposition we state several characterizations of the classical OPS. For convenience, we introduce the concept of admissible pair of polynomials.

DEFINITION 8.2. (ϕ, ψ) is called an admissible pair if

$$\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2, \quad \psi \in \mathcal{P}_1, \quad d_n := \psi' + \frac{n}{2} \phi'' \neq 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Introducing this concept makes sense, since according with conditions (ii) in (8.4), only admissible pairs may appear in the framework of the theory of classical OP.

THEOREM 8.1 (characterizations of the classical OPS). *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, regular, and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be its monic OPS. Then the following properties are equivalent:*

C1. \mathbf{u} is classical, i.e., there are nonzero polynomials $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_1$ such that \mathbf{u} satisfies the distributional Pearson's differential equation

$$D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u};$$

C1'. there is an admissible pair (ϕ, ψ) such that \mathbf{u} satisfies Pearson's equation

$$D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u};$$

C2. (Al-Salam & Chihara) there exist a polynomial $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, complex parameters a_n, b_n and c_n , with $c_n \neq 0$ if $n \geq 1$, such that

$$\phi(x)P'_n(x) = a_n P_{n+1}(x) + b_n P_n(x) + c_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n \geq 0;$$

C3. (Hahn) $\left\{P_n^{[k]} := \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \frac{P_{n+k}}{(n+1)_k}\right\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$;

C3'. $\{P_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$;

C4. there exist $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and complex parameters $r_n^{[k]}$ and $s_n^{[k]}$ such that

$$P_n^{[k-1]}(x) = P_n^{[k]}(x) + r_n^{[k]} P_{n-1}^{[k]}(x) + s_n^{[k]} P_{n-2}^{[k]}(x), \quad n \geq 2; \quad (\star)$$

C4'. for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist parameters $r_n^{[k]}$ and $s_n^{[k]}$ such that (\star) holds;

C5. (Bochner) there exist polynomials ϕ and ψ and, for each $n \geq 0$, a complex parameter λ_n , with $\lambda_n \neq 0$ if $n \geq 1$, such that $y = P_n(x)$ is a solution of the second order ordinary differential equation

$$\phi(x)y'' + \psi(x)y' + \lambda_n y = 0, \quad n \geq 0;$$

C6. (Maroni) there is an admissible pair (ϕ, ψ) so that the formal Stieltjes series associated with \mathbf{u} , $S_{\mathbf{u}}(z) := -\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} u_n/z^{n+1}$, satisfies (formally)

$$\phi(z)S'_{\mathbf{u}}(z) = [\psi(z) - \phi'(z)]S_{\mathbf{u}}(z) + (\psi' - \frac{1}{2}\phi'')u_0;$$

C7. (McCarthy) there exists an admissible pair (ϕ, ψ) and, for each $n \geq 1$, complex parameters h_n and t_n such that

$$\phi(P_n P_{n-1})'(x) = h_n P_n^2(x) - (\psi - \phi')P_n P_{n-1}(x) + t_n P_{n-1}^2(x);$$

C8. (distributional Rodrigues formula) there exist a polynomial $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and nonzero complex parameters k_n such that

$$P_n(x)\mathbf{u} = k_n D^n(\phi^n(x)\mathbf{u}), \quad n \geq 0.$$

Moreover, the polynomials ϕ and ψ may be taken the same in all properties above where they appear. In addition, let the TTRR fulfilled by the monic OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be

$$P_{n+1}(x) = (x - \beta_n)P_n(x) - \gamma_n P_{n-1}(x), \quad n \geq 0$$

($P_{-1}(x) = 0$; $P_0(x) = 1$). Write $\phi(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$, $\psi(x) = px + q$, $d_n := na + p$, and $e_n := nb + q$. Then

$$\beta_n = -\frac{d_{-2}q + 2bnd_{n-1}}{d_{2n}d_{2n-2}}, \quad \gamma_n = -\frac{nd_{n-2}}{d_{2n-3}d_{2n-1}}\phi\left(-\frac{e_{n-1}}{d_{2n-2}}\right),$$

and the parameters appearing in the above characterizations may be computed explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= na, \quad b_n = -\frac{1}{2}\psi(\beta_n), \quad c_n = -d_{n-1}\gamma_n, \quad r_n^{[1]} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\psi(\beta_n)}{d_{n-1}}, \quad s_n^{[1]} = -\frac{(n-1)a}{d_{n-2}}\gamma_n, \\ \lambda_n &= -nd_{n-1}, \quad h_n = d_{2n-3}, \quad t_n = -d_{2n-1}\gamma_n, \quad k_n = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} d_{n+i-1}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 7.5 and Theorem 7.6, $C1 \Leftrightarrow C1'$, $C1 \Rightarrow C3'$, and $C1' \Leftrightarrow C8$. Clearly, $C3' \Rightarrow C3$ and $C4' \Rightarrow C4$. We show that $C3' \Rightarrow C4'$ using the same arguments of the proof of $C3 \Rightarrow C4$ given in bellow. The proof of $C1' \Leftrightarrow C6$ is left to the reader (Exercise 1.). Thus, we only need to show that:

$$C1' \Rightarrow C2 \Rightarrow C3 \Rightarrow C4 \Rightarrow C1, \quad C1 \Leftrightarrow C5, \quad C2 \Leftrightarrow C7.$$

($C1' \Rightarrow C2$). Assume that $C1'$ holds. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since $\deg(\phi P'_n) \leq n+1$, then

$$(8.5) \quad \phi P'_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} a_{n,j} P_j, \quad a_{n,j} := \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_j \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_j^2 \rangle}.$$

For each integer number j , with $0 \leq j \leq n+1$, we deduce

$$(8.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_j \rangle &= \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, (P_n P_j)' - P_n P'_j \rangle = -\langle D(\phi \mathbf{u}), P_n P_j \rangle - \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, P_n P'_j \rangle \\ &= -\langle \mathbf{u}, \psi P_j P_n \rangle - \langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_j P_n \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

If $0 \leq j \leq n-2$ we obtain $\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_j \rangle = 0$, and so $a_{n,j} = 0$. Thus, (8.5) reduces to

$$\phi P'_n = a_n P_{n+1} + b_n P_n + c_n P_{n-1}, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where, writing $\phi(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ and $\psi(x) = px + q$, $a_n = na$ (by comparison of coefficients), $b_n = a_{n,n}$, and $c_n := a_{n,n-1}$. Setting $j = n-1$ in (8.6), we deduce

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_{n-1} \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{u}, (\psi P_{n-1} + \phi P'_{n-1}) P_n \rangle = -d_{n-1} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle,$$

hence

$$c_n := a_{n,n-1} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_{n-1} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle} = -d_{n-1} \gamma_n, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Since, by hypothesis, (ϕ, ψ) is an admissible pair, then we may conclude that $c_n \neq 0$ for each $n \geq 1$. Thus $C1' \Rightarrow C2$. Notice that taking $j = n$ in (8.6) yields

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_n \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{u}, \psi P_n^2 \rangle = -\frac{1}{2} (p \langle \mathbf{u}, x P_n^2 \rangle + q \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle),$$

hence we deduce the expression for b_n given in the statement of the theorem:

$$b_n := a_{n,n} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_n \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} = -\frac{1}{2} \left(p \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, x P_n^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} + q \right) = -\frac{1}{2} \psi(\beta_n) .$$

(C2 \Rightarrow C3). Suppose that C2 holds. We will show that $\{P_n^{[1]} := P'_{n+1}/(n+1)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to $\mathbf{v} := \phi \mathbf{u}$. Indeed, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $0 \leq m \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (n+1) \langle \mathbf{v}, x^m P_n^{[1]} \rangle &= \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, x^m P'_{n+1} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, (\phi P'_{n+1}) x^m \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{u}, (a_{n+1} P_{n+2} + b_{n+1} P_{n+1} + c_{n+1} P_n) x^m \rangle = c_{n+1} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle \delta_{m,n} . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since (by hypothesis) $c_{n+1} \neq 0$ for each $n \geq 0$, we conclude that $\{P_n^{[1]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS (with respect to $\mathbf{v} := \phi \mathbf{u}$).

(C3 \Rightarrow C4). By hypothesis, $\{P_n^{[k]} := \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \left(\frac{P_{n+k}}{(n+1)_k} \right)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS for some (fixed) $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists $\beta_n^{[k]} \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_n^{[k]} \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$(8.7) \quad x P_n^{[k]} = P_{n+1}^{[k]} + \beta_n^{[k]} P_n^{[k]} + \gamma_n^{[k]} P_{n-1}^{[k]}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Similarly, there exists $\beta_n \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\gamma_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$(8.8) \quad x P_n = P_{n+1} + \beta_n P_n + \gamma_n P_{n-1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Changing n into $n+k$ in (8.8), then taking the derivative of order k in both sides of the resulting equation and using Leibnitz rule on the left-hand side, we find

$$x P_n^{[k]} + \frac{k}{n+1} P_{n+1}^{[k-1]} = \frac{n+k+1}{n+1} P_{n+1}^{[k]} + \beta_{n+k} P_n^{[k]} + \frac{n\gamma_{n+k}}{n+k} P_{n-1}^{[k]}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

In this equation, replacing $x P_n^{[k]}$ by the right-hand side of (8.7), and then changing n into $n-1$, we obtain (\star) , with

$$r_n^{[k]} = \frac{n(\beta_{n+k-1} - \beta_{n-1}^{[k]})}{k}, \quad s_n^{[k]} = \frac{n((n-1)\gamma_{n+k-1} - (n+k-1)\gamma_{n-1}^{[k]})}{k(n+k-1)} .$$

(C4 \Rightarrow C1). By hypothesis (\star) holds. Let $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the dual basis for $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{P_n^{[k]}\}_{n \geq 0}$, respectively. By Theorem 1.3, $\mathbf{a}_n^{[k]} = \sum_{j \geq 0} \langle \mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}, P_j^{[k-1]} \rangle \mathbf{a}_j^{[k-1]}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Using (\star) , we compute

$$\langle \mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}, P_j^{[k-1]} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}, P_j^{[k]} \rangle + r_j^{[k]} \langle \mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}, P_{j-1}^{[k]} \rangle + s_j^{[k]} \langle \mathbf{a}_n^{[k]}, P_{j-2}^{[k]} \rangle = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = n \\ r_{n+1}^{[k]}, & \text{if } j = n+1 \\ s_{n+2}^{[k]}, & \text{if } j = n+2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

hence

$$\mathbf{a}_n^{[k]} = \mathbf{a}_n^{[k-1]} + r_{n+1}^{[k]} \mathbf{a}_{n+1}^{[k-1]} + s_{n+2}^{[k]} \mathbf{a}_{n+2}^{[k-1]}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Taking the (distributional) derivative of order k in both sides of this equation, and using the relations $D^j(\mathbf{a}_n^{[j]}) = (-1)^j(n+1)_j \mathbf{a}_{n+j}$ (see Lemma 7.4), we obtain

$$D \left(\frac{1}{n+k} \mathbf{a}_{n+k-1} + \frac{r_{n+1}^{[k]}}{n+1} \mathbf{a}_{n+k} + \frac{(n+k+1)s_{n+2}^{[k]}}{(n+1)(n+2)} \mathbf{a}_{n+k+1} \right) = -\mathbf{a}_{n+k}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Therefore, since, by Theorem 6.1, $\mathbf{a}_j = \frac{P_j}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_j^2 \rangle} \mathbf{u}$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and, by Corollary 2.13, $\gamma_j = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_j^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{j-1}^2 \rangle}$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, being γ_j the γ -parameter appearing in (8.8), we deduce

$$(8.9) \quad D(\Phi_{n+k+1} \mathbf{u}) = -P_{n+k} \mathbf{u}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

where Φ_{n+k+1} is a polynomial of degree at most $n+k+1$, given by

$$\Phi_{n+k+1}(x) := \frac{\gamma_{n+k}}{n+k} P_{n+k-1}(x) + \frac{r_{n+1}^{[k]}}{n+1} P_{n+k}(x) + \frac{(n+k+1)s_{n+2}^{[k]}}{(n+1)(n+2)\gamma_{n+k+1}} P_{n+k+1}(x).$$

Since Φ_{n+k+1} is a (finite) linear combination of polynomials of the simple set $\{P_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ and $\gamma_{n+k} \neq 0$, then Φ_{n+k+1} does not vanishes identically, so $\Phi_{n+k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{n+k+1} \setminus \{0\}$. Setting $n=0$ and $n=1$ in (8.9) we obtain the two equations

$$(8.10) \quad D(\Phi_{k+1} \mathbf{u}) = -P_k \mathbf{u}, \quad D(\Phi_{k+2} \mathbf{u}) = -P_{k+1} \mathbf{u}.$$

If $k=1$ it follows immediately from the first of these equations that C1 holds. Henceforth, assume that $k \geq 2$. Setting $n=0$ and $n=1$ in the definition of Φ_{n+k+1} and using the TTRR (8.8), we easily deduce

$$(8.11) \quad \begin{cases} \Phi_{k+1}(x) &= E_0(x; k)P_{k+1}(x) + F_1(x; k)P_k(x), \\ \Phi_{k+2}(x) &= G_1(x; k)P_{k+1}(x) + H_0(x; k)P_k(x), \end{cases}$$

where $E_0(\cdot; k), H_0(\cdot; k) \in \mathcal{P}_0$ and $F_1(\cdot; k), G_1(\cdot; k) \in \mathcal{P}_1$, explicitly given by

$$(8.12) \quad \begin{aligned} E_0(x; k) &:= \frac{(k+1)s_2^{[k]}}{2\gamma_{k+1}} - \frac{1}{k}, & F_1(x; k) &:= \frac{x - \beta_k}{k} + r_1^{[k]}, \\ G_1(x; k) &:= \frac{(k+2)s_3^{[k]}(x - \beta_{k+1})}{6\gamma_{k+2}} + \frac{r_2^{[k]}}{2}, & H_0(x; k) &:= \frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{k+1} - \frac{(k+2)s_3^{[k]}\gamma_{k+1}}{6\gamma_{k+2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Delta_2(x) \equiv \Delta_2(x; k) := E_0(x; k)H_0(x; k) - F_1(x; k)G_1(x; k)$, the determinant of the system (8.11). Using (8.10)–(8.12), and taking into account that \mathbf{u} is regular, we prove that $\Delta_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2 \setminus \{0\}$ (Exercise 1.). Solving (8.11) for P_k and P_{k+1} we obtain

$$(8.13) \quad \Delta_2(x)P_{k+1}(x) = H_0(x; k)\Phi_{k+1}(x) - F_1(x; k)\Phi_{k+2}(x),$$

$$(8.14) \quad \Delta_2(x)P_k(x) = E_0(x; k)\Phi_{k+2}(x) - G_1(x; k)\Phi_{k+1}(x).$$

Since P_k and P_{k+1} cannot share zeros, it follows from (8.13)–(8.14) that any common zero of Φ_{k+1} and Φ_{k+2} (if there is some) must be a zero of Δ_2 . Let Φ be the greatest

common divisor of Φ_{k+1} and Φ_{k+2} , i.e.,

$$\Phi(x) := \text{g.c.d.} \{ \Phi_{k+1}(x), \Phi_{k+2}(x) \} .$$

Any zero of Φ is also a zero of both Φ_{k+1} and Φ_{k+2} , and so it is a zero of Δ_2 . Therefore, $\Phi \in \mathcal{P}_2 \setminus \{0\}$. (Notice that indeed $\Phi \neq 0$, since $\Phi_{k+1} \neq 0$ and $\Phi_{k+2} \neq 0$.) Moreover, there exist polynomials $\Phi_{1,k}$ and $\Phi_{2,k}$, with no common zeros, such that

$$(8.15) \quad \Phi_{k+1} = \Phi \Phi_{1,k} , \quad \Phi_{k+2} = \Phi \Phi_{2,k} ,$$

$$(8.16) \quad \Phi_{1,k} \in \mathcal{P}_{k+1-\ell} \setminus \{0\} , \quad \Phi_{2,k} \in \mathcal{P}_{k+2-\ell} \setminus \{0\} , \quad \ell := \deg \Phi \leq 2 .$$

From (8.10) and (8.15) we deduce

$$(8.17) \quad \Phi_{1,k} D(\Phi \mathbf{u}) = -(P_k + \Phi'_{1,k} \Phi) \mathbf{u} , \quad \Phi_{2,k} D(\Phi \mathbf{u}) = -(P_{k+1} + \Phi'_{2,k} \Phi) \mathbf{u} .$$

Combining these two equations yields $(\Phi_{1,k}(P_{k+1} + \Phi'_{2,k} \Phi) - \Phi_{2,k}(P_k + \Phi'_{1,k} \Phi)) \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, and so, since \mathbf{u} is regular, $\Phi_{1,k}(P_{k+1} + \Phi'_{2,k} \Phi) = \Phi_{2,k}(P_k + \Phi'_{1,k} \Phi)$. Therefore, taking into account that $\Phi_{1,k}$ and $\Phi_{2,k}$ have no common zeros and (8.16) holds, we may ensure that there exists a polynomial $\Psi \in \mathcal{P}_1$ such that

$$(8.18) \quad P_k + \Phi'_{1,k} \Phi = -\Psi \Phi_{1,k} , \quad P_{k+1} + \Phi'_{2,k} \Phi = -\Psi \Phi_{2,k} .$$

Combining equations (8.17) and (8.18) we deduce

$$\Phi_{1,k} (D(\Phi \mathbf{u}) - \Psi \mathbf{u}) = \Phi_{2,k} (D(\Phi \mathbf{u}) - \Psi \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{0} .$$

From these equations, and using once again the fact that $\Phi_{1,k}$ and $\Phi_{2,k}$ have no common zeros, we conclude, by Proposition 1.6, that $D(\Phi \mathbf{u}) = \Psi \mathbf{u}$. Thus $C4 \Rightarrow C1$. The formulas for $r_n^{[1]}$ and $s_n^{[1]}$ given in the statement of the theorem may be derived as follows. We have already proved that $C4 \Rightarrow C1 \Rightarrow C1' \Rightarrow C2 \Rightarrow C3 \Rightarrow C4$, and we see that the polynomials ϕ and ψ appearing in all these characterizations may be taken the same. As we have seen, the formulas for b_n and c_n given in the statement of the theorem hold. We now use these formulas to obtain the expressions for $r_n^{[1]}$ and $s_n^{[1]}$. Set $Q_n := P_n^{[1]} := P'_{n+1}/(n+1)$. By $C4$, $P_n = Q_n + r_n^{[1]} Q_{n-1} + s_n^{[1]} Q_{n-2}$ if $n \geq 2$. Hence, since $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to $\mathbf{v} := \phi \mathbf{u}$, we deduce, for each $n \geq 2$,

$$r_n^{[1]} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P_n P'_n \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_{n-1} \rangle} = \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_{n-1} \rangle} \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_n P_n \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle} \frac{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-1}^2 \rangle} = \frac{1}{c_n} b_n \gamma_n = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\psi(\beta_n)}{d_{n-1}} ,$$

where the third equality holds taking into account $C2$. Similarly, for each $n \geq 2$,

$$s_n^{[1]} = \frac{a \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle}{\frac{1}{n-1} \langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P'_{n-1} P_{n-2} \rangle} = \frac{(n-1)a \langle \mathbf{u}, P_n^2 \rangle}{c_{n-1} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n-2}^2 \rangle} = \frac{(n-1)a}{c_{n-1}} \gamma_{n-1} \gamma_n = -\frac{(n-1)a}{d_{n-2}} \gamma_n .$$

($C1 \Rightarrow C5$). By hypothesis, $D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u}$, where $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$, $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_1$, and $\deg \psi = 1$ (cf. Lemma 7.3). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and write

$$(8.19) \quad \phi P_n'' + \psi P_n' = \sum_{j=0}^n \lambda_{n,j} P_j .$$

Then, for each j such that $0 \leq j \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_j^2 \rangle \lambda_{n,j} &= \langle \mathbf{u}, (\phi P_n'' + \psi P_n') P_j \rangle = \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, P_n'' P_j \rangle + \langle \psi \mathbf{u}, P_n' P_j \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, (P_n' P_j)' \rangle - \langle \phi \mathbf{u}, P_n' P_j' \rangle + \langle \psi \mathbf{u}, P_n' P_j \rangle = -\langle \phi \mathbf{u}, P_n' P_j' \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since by hypothesis C1 holds, and we have already proved that $C1 \Rightarrow C1' \Rightarrow C2 \Rightarrow C3$, and in the proof of $C2 \Rightarrow C3$ we have shown that $\{Q_n := P_{n+1}'/(n+1)\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to $\mathbf{v} := \phi \mathbf{u}$, then $\langle \phi \mathbf{u}, P_n' P_j' \rangle = 0$ if $j \neq n$, hence (8.19) reduces to

$$(8.20) \quad \phi P_n'' + \psi P_n' + \lambda_n P_n = 0, \quad n \geq 0,$$

where $\lambda_n := -\lambda_{n,n}$. Comparing leading coefficients in (8.20), and setting $\phi(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ and $\psi(x) = px + q$, we obtain $\lambda_n = -n((n-1)a + p) = -nd_{n-1}$, hence $\lambda_n \neq 0$ if $n \geq 1$ (since $C1 \Rightarrow C1'$, so (ϕ, ψ) is an admissible pair). Thus $C1 \Rightarrow C5$.

(C5 \Rightarrow C1). By hypothesis, there exist $\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\lambda_n \in \mathbb{C}$, with $\lambda_n \neq 0$ if $n \geq 1$, such that $-\phi P_{n+1}'' = \psi P_{n+1}' + \lambda_{n+1} P_{n+1}$. Taking in this equation $n = 0$ and $n = 1$ we deduce $\psi = -\lambda_1 P_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1 \setminus \mathcal{P}_0$ and $\phi = -(\psi P_2' + \lambda_2 P_2)/2 \in \mathcal{P}_2$. We will prove that $D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u}$ by showing that the actions of the functionals $D(\phi \mathbf{u})$ and $\psi \mathbf{u}$ coincide on the simple set $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D(\phi \mathbf{u}), Q_n \rangle &= \frac{1}{n+1} \langle D(\phi \mathbf{u}), P_{n+1}' \rangle = -\frac{1}{n+1} \langle \mathbf{u}, \phi P_{n+1}'' \rangle = \frac{1}{n+1} \langle \mathbf{u}, \psi P_{n+1}' + \lambda_{n+1} P_{n+1} \rangle \\ &= \langle \mathbf{u}, \psi Q_n \rangle + \frac{\lambda_{n+1}}{n+1} \langle \mathbf{u}, P_{n+1} \rangle = \langle \psi \mathbf{u}, Q_n \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since at least one of the polynomials ϕ and ψ is nonzero (because $\lambda_n \neq 0$), C1 holds.

(C2 \Rightarrow C7). Since by hypothesis (C2) holds, we may write

$$(8.21) \quad \phi P_n' = a_n P_{n+1} + b_n P_n + c_n P_{n-1},$$

$$(8.22) \quad \phi P_{n-1}' = a_{n-1} P_n + b_{n-1} P_{n-1} + c_{n-1} P_{n-2}.$$

Multiplying (8.21) by P_{n-1} and (8.22) by P_n and adding the resulting equalities, we find that $\phi(P_n P_{n-1})'$ is a linear combination of the polynomials P_n^2 , $P_n P_{n-1}$, P_{n-1}^2 , $P_{n+1} P_{n-1}$ and $P_n P_{n-2}$. Substituting P_{n+1} and P_{n-2} by the corresponding expressions given by the TTRR, we deduce

$$(8.23) \quad \phi(P_n P_{n-1})' = A_n P_n^2 + (B_n x + C_n) P_n P_{n-1} + D_n P_{n-1}^2, \quad n \geq 1,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &:= a_{n-1} - \frac{c_{n-1}}{\gamma_{n-1}}, \quad B_n := a_n + \frac{c_{n-1}}{\gamma_{n-1}}, \\ C_n &:= -a_n \beta_n + b_n + b_{n-1} - \frac{c_{n-1}}{\gamma_{n-1}} \beta_{n-1}, \quad D_n := c_n - a_n \gamma_n. \end{aligned}$$

Write $\phi(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ and $\psi(x) = px + q$. We have already seen that $C2 \Leftrightarrow C1'$, and while proving $C1' \Rightarrow C2$ we have shown that the coefficients a_n , b_n , and c_n appearing in (8.21) are given by $a_n = na$, $b_n = -\frac{1}{2}\psi(\beta_n)$, and $c_n = -d_{n-1}\gamma_n$. It follows that

$$(8.24) \quad \begin{aligned} A_n &= d_{2n-3}, \quad B_n = 2a - p, \quad D_n = -d_{2n-1}\gamma_n, \\ C_n &= -\frac{1}{2}(d_{2n}\beta_n - d_{2n-4}\beta_{n-1}) - q = b - q, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is easily derived using the expressions for the β -parameters given in the statement of the theorem. Therefore, $B_n x + C_n = \phi' - \psi$ (independent of n). Finally, substituting (8.24) into (8.23) yields the equation appearing in C7, being $h_n = A_n = d_{2n-3}$ and $t_n = D_n = -d_{2n-1}\gamma_n$ for each $n \geq 1$. Thus $C2 \Rightarrow C7$.

(C7 \Rightarrow C2). Fix an integer $n \geq 1$. For this n , rewrite the equation in (C7) as

$$(\phi P'_n + \psi P_n - t_n P_{n-1}) P_{n-1} = (-\phi P'_{n-1} + \phi' P_{n-1} + h_n P_n) P_n .$$

Therefore, since P_n and P_{n-1} have no common zeros, there is $\pi_{1,n} \in \mathcal{P}_1$ such that

$$(8.25) \quad \phi P'_n + \psi P_n - t_n P_{n-1} = \pi_{1,n} P_n ,$$

$$(8.26) \quad -\phi P'_{n-1} + \phi' P_{n-1} + h_n P_n = \pi_{1,n} P_{n-1} .$$

By comparing the leading coefficients on both sides of equation (8.25) we deduce $\pi_{1,n}(x) = d_n x + z_n$ for some $z_n \in \mathbb{C}$ (and $d_n := na + p$). By hypothesis, (ϕ, ψ) is an admissible pair, hence $d_n \neq 0$ and so $\deg \pi_{1,n} = 1$. Moreover, by the TTRR for $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, $xP_n = P_{n+1} + \beta_n P_n + \gamma_n P_{n-1}$. Therefore, (8.25) may be rewritten as

$$\phi P'_n = a_n P_{n+1} + b_n P_n + c_n P_{n-1} ,$$

where $a_n := na$, $b_n := na\beta_n + z_n - q$, and $c_n := na\gamma_n + t_n$. To conclude the proof we need to show that $c_n \neq 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. Indeed, changing n into $n+1$ in (8.26) and adding the resulting equation with (8.25), we obtain

$$(\psi + \phi') P_n - t_n P_{n-1} + h_{n+1} P_{n+1} = ((d_n + d_{n+1})x + (z_n + z_{n+1})) P_n .$$

Since $\psi + \phi' = (2a + p)x + q + b$ and taking into account once again the TTRR for $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, the last equation may be rewritten as a trivial linear combination of the three polynomials P_{n+1} , P_n , and P_{n-1} . Thus, we deduce

$$h_{n+1} = d_{2n-1} , \quad z_{n+1} = -z_n - d_{2n-1}\beta_n + q + b , \quad t_n = -d_{2n-1}\gamma_n .$$

Therefore, $c_n = na\gamma_n + t_n = -d_{n-1}\gamma_n \neq 0$ (since $n \geq 1$). This completes the proof. \square

REMARK 8.2. The β and γ -parameters in Theorem 8.1 may be written explicitly in terms (only) of the coefficients of ϕ and ψ as follows (for each $n \geq 0$):

$$\beta_n = -\frac{(-2a + p)q + 2bn[(n-1)a + p]}{(2na + p)[(2n-2)a + p]} ,$$

$$\gamma_{n+1} = \frac{-(n+1)[(n-1)a + p][a(nb + q)^2 - b(nb + q)(2na + p) + c(2na + p)^2]}{[(2n-1)a + p](2na + p)^2[2(n+1)a + p]} .$$

REMARK 8.3. It is worth mentioning that the distributional approach considered here —developed mainly by Pascal Maroni— simplifies dramatically the original proofs of the characterizations of the classical OPS in Theorem 8.1. The student is invited to look at some of the original proofs — see references [1],[2],[6],[7],[9],[19].

Class	\mathbf{u}	Φ	Ψ	regularity conditions
Hermite	\mathbf{u}_H	1	$-2x$	—
Laguerre	$\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$	x	$-x + \alpha + 1$	$-\alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$
Jacobi	$\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$	$1 - x^2$	$-(\alpha + \beta + 2)x + \beta - \alpha$	$-\alpha, -\beta, -(\alpha + \beta + 1) \notin \mathbb{N}$
Bessel	$\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$	x^2	$(\alpha + 2)x + 2$	$-(\alpha + 1) \notin \mathbb{N}$

TABLE 1. Classification and canonical forms of the classical functionals

2. Classification and canonical representatives

In this section we prove a remarkable property: *up to constant factors and affine changes of variables, there are only four (parametric) families of classical OP, namely, the Hermite, Laguerre, Jacobi, and Bessel polynomials.* The corresponding regular functionals will be denoted by \mathbf{u}_H , $\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$, $\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$, and $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$ (resp.) and these will be called the *canonical representatives* (or *canonical forms*) of the classical functionals. Their description is given in Table 1. Each one of these functionals fulfils Pearson's equation (8.1), being the corresponding pair $(\phi, \psi) \equiv (\Phi, \Psi)$ given in the table. The regularity conditions in the table are determined by conditions (ii) appearing in (8.4).

Ultimately, denoting by $[\mathbf{u}]$ the equivalent class determined by a functional $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$, and setting $\mathcal{P}'_C := \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}' \mid \mathbf{u} \text{ is classical}\}$, we will show that

$$\mathcal{P}'_C / \sim := \{ [\mathbf{u}] \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'_C \} = \{ [\mathbf{u}_H], [\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}], [\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}], [\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}] \} ,$$

where the parameters α and β vary on \mathbb{C} subject to the regularity conditions in Table 1, and \sim is the equivalence relation in \mathcal{P}' introduced in Theorem 6.4, defined by

$$(8.27) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{v} \quad \text{iff} \quad \exists A \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, \exists B \in \mathbb{C} : \mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{h}_{A^{-1}} \circ \tau_{-B})\mathbf{u} .$$

We start by proving a proposition that allow us to ensure that this equivalence relation preserves the classical character of a given classical functional.

LEMMA 8.2. *Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}'$ and suppose that $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{v}$, i.e., (8.27) holds. Suppose that there exist two polynomials ϕ and ψ such that*

$$D(\phi\mathbf{u}) = \psi\mathbf{u} .$$

Let $\Phi(x) := K\phi(Ax + B)$ and $\Psi(x) := KA\psi(Ax + B)$, being $K \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Then

$$D(\Phi\mathbf{v}) = \Psi\mathbf{v} .$$

Moreover, if \mathbf{u} is a classical functional, then so is \mathbf{v} .

Proof. Since \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} fulfill (8.27), then

$$\langle \mathbf{v}, x^n \rangle = \left\langle \mathbf{u}, \left(\frac{x-B}{A} \right)^n \right\rangle , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Therefore, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle D(\Phi \mathbf{v}), x^n \rangle &= -n \langle \mathbf{v}, \Phi(x) x^{n-1} \rangle = -n \langle \mathbf{u}, (\tau_B \circ h_{A^{-1}})(\Phi(x) x^{n-1}) \rangle \\
&= -n \left\langle \mathbf{u}, \Phi\left(\frac{x-B}{A}\right) \left(\frac{x-B}{A}\right)^{n-1} \right\rangle = - \left\langle \mathbf{u}, K\phi(x) \cdot A \frac{d}{dx} \left\{ \left(\frac{x-B}{A}\right)^n \right\} \right\rangle \\
&= KA \left\langle D(\phi(x)\mathbf{u}), \left(\frac{x-B}{A}\right)^n \right\rangle = KA \left\langle \psi(x)\mathbf{u}, \left(\frac{x-B}{A}\right)^n \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \mathbf{u}, \Psi\left(\frac{x-B}{A}\right) \left(\frac{x-B}{A}\right)^n \right\rangle = \langle \mathbf{u}, (\tau_B \circ h_{A^{-1}})(\Psi(x)x^n) \rangle \\
&= \langle \mathbf{v}, \Psi(x)x^n \rangle = \langle \Psi \mathbf{v}, x^n \rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the last sentence stated in the lemma follows by using Theorem 6.6. \square

THEOREM 8.3 (canonical representatives of the classical functionals). *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be a classical functional, so that \mathbf{u} fulfils the distributional Pearson's equation*

$$(8.28) \quad D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u} ,$$

where $\phi(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$ and $\psi(x) = px + q$, subject to the regularity conditions

$$(8.29) \quad na + p \neq 0 , \quad \phi\left(-\frac{nb+q}{2na+p}\right) \neq 0 , \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Then, there exists a regular functional $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{P}'$ such that

$$(8.30) \quad \mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{v} , \quad D(\Phi \mathbf{v}) = \Psi \mathbf{v} ,$$

where, for each classical functional determined by the pair (ϕ, ψ) , the corresponding pair (Φ, Ψ) is given by Table 1. More precisely, setting

$$\Delta := b^2 - 4ac ; \quad d := \psi\left(-\frac{b}{2a}\right) \text{ if } a \neq 0 ,$$

the following holds:

1. (Hermite) if $a = b = 0$, then:

$$\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{h}_{\sqrt{-p/(2c)}} \circ \tau_{q/p}) \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_H ;$$

2. (Laguerre) if $a = 0$ and $b \neq 0$, then:

$$\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{h}_{-p/b} \circ \tau_{c/b}) \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)} , \quad \alpha := -1 + (qb - pc)/b^2 ;$$

3. (Bessel) if $a \neq 0$ and $\Delta = 0$, then:

$$\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{h}_{2a/d} \circ \tau_{b/(2a)}) \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)} , \quad \alpha := -2 + p/a ;$$

4. (Jacobi) if $a \neq 0$ and $\Delta \neq 0$, then:

$$\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{h}_{-2a/\sqrt{\Delta}} \circ \tau_{b/(2a)}) \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)} ,$$

$$\alpha := -1 + p/(2a) - d/\sqrt{\Delta} , \quad \beta := -1 + p/(2a) + d/\sqrt{\Delta} .$$

Proof. Taking into account Lemma 8.2, the theorem will be proved if we are able to show that, for each given pair (ϕ, ψ) , and for each corresponding pair (Φ, Ψ) given

by Table 1—where the “corresponding pair” (Φ, Ψ) is the one in the table such that ϕ and Φ have the same degree and their zeros the same multiplicity—, there exist $A, K \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $B \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the relations

$$(8.31) \quad \Phi(x) = K\phi(Ax + B), \quad \Psi(x) = KA\psi(Ax + B) = KA^2px + KA(Bp + q)$$

hold, for appropriate choices of the parameters α and β appearing in Table 1 for the Laguerre, Bessel, and Jacobi cases. Indeed, considering the four possible cases determined by the polynomial ϕ , we have:

1. Assume $a = b = 0$, i.e., $\phi(x) = c$. The regularity conditions (8.29) ensure that $p \neq 0$ and $c \neq 0$. Therefore, since in this case we require $(\Phi, \Psi) = (1, -2x)$, from (8.31) we obtain the equations

$$1 = Kc, \quad -2 = KA^2p, \quad 0 = Bp + q.$$

A solution of this system of equations is

$$K = 1/c, \quad A = \sqrt{-2c/p}, \quad B = -q/p,$$

which gives the desired result for the Hermite case, by Lemma 8.2.

2. Assume $a = 0$ and $b \neq 0$, so that $\phi(x) = bx + c$. Since in this case we require $(\Phi, \Psi) = (x, -x + \alpha + 1)$, from (8.31) we obtain

$$1 = KAb, \quad 0 = bB + c, \quad -1 = KA^2p, \quad \alpha + 1 = KA(Bp + q).$$

Solving this system we find

$$K = -p/b^2, \quad B = -c/b, \quad A = -b/p, \quad \alpha = -1 + (qb - pc)/b^2.$$

Notice that, in this case,

$$d_n = p, \quad \phi\left(-\frac{nb + q}{2na + p}\right) = -\frac{b^2}{p}(n + \alpha + 1),$$

hence the regularity conditions (8.29) ensure that $p \neq 0$ (and so K and A are well defined, being both nonzero complex numbers) and $-\alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$.

3. Assume $a \neq 0$ and $\Delta = 0$. Then $\phi(x) = a\left(x + \frac{b}{2a}\right)^2$. In this case we require $(\Phi, \Psi) = (x^2, (\alpha + 2)x + 2)$, hence from (8.31) we obtain

$$1 = KA^2a, \quad 0 = B + b/(2a), \quad \alpha + 2 = KA^2p, \quad 2 = KA(Bp + q).$$

Therefore, taking into account that $d := \psi\left(-\frac{b}{2a}\right) = (2aq - pb)/(2a)$, we deduce

$$K = 4a/d^2, \quad B = -b/(2a), \quad A = d/(2a), \quad \alpha = -2 + p/a.$$

In this case we have

$$d_n = a(n + \alpha + 2), \quad \phi\left(-\frac{nb + q}{2na + p}\right) = \frac{d^2}{a(2n + \alpha + 2)^2},$$

hence conditions (8.29) ensure that $-(\alpha + 1) \notin \mathbb{N}$ and $d \neq 0$, and so, in particular, K is well defined, being both K and A nonzero complex numbers.

4. Finally, assume $a \neq 0$ and $\Delta \neq 0$. Writing $\phi(x) = a \left[\left(x + \frac{b}{2a} \right)^2 - \frac{\Delta}{4a^2} \right]$, since in this case we require $(\Phi, \Psi) = (1 - x^2, -(\alpha + \beta + 2)x + \beta - \alpha)$, from (8.31) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -1 &= KA^2a, \quad 0 = B + b/(2a), \quad 1 = Ka \left[\left(B + \frac{b}{2a} \right)^2 - \frac{\Delta}{4a^2} \right], \\ -(\alpha + \beta + 2) &= KA^2p, \quad \beta - \alpha = KA(Bp + q). \end{aligned}$$

A solution of this system of five equations is¹

$$\begin{aligned} K &= -4a/\Delta, \quad B = -b/(2a), \quad A = -\sqrt{\Delta}/(2a), \\ \alpha &= -1 + p/(2a) - d/\sqrt{\Delta}, \quad \beta = -1 + p/(2a) + d/\sqrt{\Delta}. \end{aligned}$$

Adding and subtracting the last equations for α and β , we find $\alpha + \beta + 2 = p/a$ and $\alpha - \beta = -2d/\sqrt{\Delta}$, hence we deduce

$$d_n = a(n + \alpha + \beta + 2), \quad \phi \left(-\frac{nb + q}{2na + p} \right) = -\frac{\Delta (n + \alpha + 1)(n + \beta + 1)}{a (2n + \alpha + \beta + 2)^2},$$

Therefore, conditions (8.29) ensure that $-(\alpha + \beta + 1) \notin \mathbb{N}$, $-\alpha \notin \mathbb{N}$, and $-\beta \notin \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof. \square

REMARK 8.4. It follows from the proof of Theorem 8.3 that the parameters α and β defined in the statement of this theorem (in cases 2, 3, and 4) fulfil the regularity conditions appearing in Table 1.

The preceding theorem allows us to classify each classical functional according with the degree of the polynomial ϕ appearing in Pearson's equation (8.1).

COROLLARY 8.4. *Let \mathbf{u} be a classical functional, fulfilling (8.1)–(8.2).*

- (i) *if $\deg \phi = 0$ (hence ϕ is a nonzero constant), then $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{u}_H$;*
- (ii) *if $\deg \phi = 1$, then $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$ for some α ;*
- (iii) *if $\deg \phi = 2$ and ϕ has simple zeros, then $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ for some pair (α, β) ;*
- (iv) *if $\deg \phi = 2$ and ϕ has a double zero, then $\mathbf{u} \sim \mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$ for some α .*

REMARK 8.5. The monic OPS with respect to the canonical representatives \mathbf{u}_H , $\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$, $\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$, and $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$ will be denoted by $\{\widehat{H}_n\}$, $\{\widehat{L}_n^{(\alpha)}\}$, $\{\widehat{P}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}\}$, and $\{\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}\}$ (resp.), and they will be called the (monic) *Hermite*, *Laguerre*, *Jacobi*, and *Bessel* polynomials. Table 2 summarizes the corresponding parameters appearing in all characterizations presented in Theorem 8.1.

REMARK 8.6. Note that, in view of Theorem 8.3 and Theorem 6.6, we may now justify a sentence made at the beginning of the section: *up to constant factors and affine changes of variables, the Hermite, Laguerre, Jacobi, and Bessel polynomials are the only families of classical OP.*

¹We choose A with the minus sign since whenever $(\phi, \psi) = (\Phi, \Psi)$ that choice implies $A = 1$ and $B = 0$, hence $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$, and so it is a more natural choice.

	\widehat{H}_n	$\widehat{L}_n^{(\alpha)}$	$\widehat{P}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}$	$\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}$
λ_n	$2n$	n	$n(n+\alpha+\beta+1)$	$-n(n+\alpha+1)$
β_n	0	$2n+\alpha+1$	$\frac{\beta^2 - \alpha^2}{(2n+\alpha+\beta)(2n+2+\alpha+\beta)}$	$\frac{-2\alpha}{(2n+\alpha)(2n+2+\alpha)}$
γ_n	$\frac{n}{2}$	$n(n+\alpha)$	$\frac{4n(n+\alpha)(n+\beta)(n+\alpha+\beta)}{(2n+\alpha+\beta-1)(2n+\alpha+\beta)^2(2n+\alpha+\beta+1)}$	$\frac{-4n(n+\alpha)}{(2n+\alpha-1)(2n+\alpha)^2(2n+\alpha+1)}$
a_n	0	0	$-n$	n
b_n	0	n	$\frac{2(\alpha-\beta)n(n+\alpha+\beta+1)}{(2n+\alpha+\beta)(2n+2+\alpha+\beta)}$	$\frac{-4n(n+\alpha+1)}{(2n+\alpha)(2n+2+\alpha)}$
c_n	n	$n(n+\alpha)$	$\frac{4n(n+\alpha)(n+\beta)(n+\alpha+\beta)(n+\alpha+\beta+1)}{(2n+\alpha+\beta-1)(2n+\alpha+\beta)^2(2n+\alpha+\beta+1)}$	$\frac{4n(n+\alpha)(n+\alpha+1)}{(2n+\alpha-1)(2n+\alpha)^2(2n+\alpha+1)}$
$r_n^{[1]}$	0	n	$\frac{2(\alpha-\beta)n}{(2n+\alpha+\beta)(2n+2+\alpha+\beta)}$	$\frac{4n}{(2n+\alpha)(2n+2+\alpha)}$
$s_n^{[1]}$	0	0	$\frac{-4(n-1)n(n+\alpha)(n+\beta)}{(2n+\alpha+\beta-1)(2n+\alpha+\beta)^2(2n+\alpha+\beta+1)}$	$\frac{4(n-1)n}{(2n+\alpha-1)(2n+\alpha)^2(2n+\alpha+1)}$
h_n	-2	-1	$-(2n+\alpha+\beta-1)$	$2n+\alpha-1$
t_n	n	$n(n+\alpha)$	$\frac{4n(n+\alpha)(n+\beta)(n+\alpha+\beta)}{(2n+\alpha+\beta-1)(2n+\alpha+\beta)^2}$	$\frac{4n(n+\alpha)}{(2n+\alpha-1)(2n+\alpha)^2}$
k_n	$\frac{(-1)^n}{2^n}$	$(-1)^n$	$\frac{(-1)^n}{(n+\alpha+\beta+1)_n}$	$\frac{1}{(n+\alpha+1)_n}$

TABLE 2. Parameters for the classical monic OPS appearing in Theorem 8.1 with respect to the canonical forms given in Table 1.

REMARK 8.7. Notice also the following special cases of Jacobi polynomials (up to normalization), that we have introduced in some previous texts:

$\alpha = \beta = 0$, Legendre polynomials;
 $\alpha = \beta = -\frac{1}{2}$, Chebyshev polynomials of the first kind: $\{T_n\}_{n \geq 0}$;
 $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{2}$, Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind: $\{U_n\}_{n \geq 0}$;
 $\alpha = \beta =: \lambda - \frac{1}{2}$, Gegenbauer (or ultraspherical) polynomials: $\{C_n^\lambda\}_{n \geq 0}$ ($-2\lambda \notin \mathbb{N}$).

REMARK 8.8. The Legendre polynomials were the first discovered OPS, and they have been introduced by the French mathematician Adrien Marie Legendre (1752-1833) in a work published in 1785 entitled “Sur l’attraction des sphéroïdes”. Chebyshev polynomials were introduced by the Russian mathematician Pafnuti Lvovich Chebychev (1821-1894), and Jacobi polynomials by the German mathematician Carl Gustav Jacob Jacobi (1804-1851) in a work published in 1859 about the so-called *hypergeometric functions*, which are solutions of the ordinary differential equation

$$x(1-x)y'' + (\gamma - (\alpha + \beta + 1)x)y' - \alpha\beta y = 0,$$

proposed by the German mathematician Carl Friedrich Gauss (1777-1855).

3. The positive-definite case

In this section we analyze the classical functionals in the positive-definite case. To be more precise, we will find the conditions ensuring that the classical functionals are positive-definite, and then, under such conditions, we will show that these functionals may be represented uniquely by simple weight functions (via proper or improper Riemann integrals). Of course, up to affine changes of the variables, we only need to analyze the positive-definiteness of the canonical forms described in Table 1. We begin by stating the following elementary proposition.

LEMMA 8.5. *Let (ξ, η) be a bounded or unbounded interval of real numbers. Let $\omega : (\xi, \eta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function fulfilling the following four properties:*

- (i) $\omega \in \mathcal{C}^1(\xi, \eta)$ and $\omega(x) > 0$ for each $x \in (\xi, \eta)$;
- (ii) $\int_{\xi}^{\eta} |x|^k \omega(x) dx < \infty$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$;
- (iii) *there exist real polynomials ϕ and ψ such that ω fulfils the first order ODE*

$$(8.32) \quad (\phi\omega)' = \psi\omega \quad \text{on } (\xi, \eta) ;$$

- (iv) $\lim_{x \rightarrow \xi^+} x^k \phi(x) \omega(x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \eta^-} x^k \phi(x) \omega(x) = 0$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Define a functional \mathbf{u} on \mathcal{P} by

$$(8.33) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle := \int_{\xi}^{\eta} p(x) \omega(x) dx, \quad p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Then \mathbf{u} is a positive-definite functional on $[\xi, \eta]$, and it fulfils the generalized Pearson's distributional differential equation

$$(8.34) \quad D(\phi\mathbf{u}) = \psi\mathbf{u}.$$

Proof. Hypothesis (i)–(ii) ensure that \mathbf{u} is well defined. Take arbitrarily $p \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $p(x) \geq 0$ on $[\xi, \eta]$ and $p(x) \not\equiv 0$. Since p is continuous on $[\xi, \eta]$ and not vanishes identically there, then there exist $x_0 \in (\xi, \eta)$ and $\delta > 0$ so that $(x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta) \subset (\xi, \eta)$ and $p(x) > \epsilon := p(x_0)/2 > 0$ for each $x \in (x_0 - \delta, x_0 + \delta)$. Hence

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, p \rangle = \int_{\xi}^{\eta} p(x) \omega(x) dx \geq \epsilon \int_{x_0 - \delta}^{x_0 + \delta} \omega(x) dx > 0,$$

where the last equality follows from hypothesis (i). Thus \mathbf{u} is positive-definite on $[\xi, \eta]$. To prove that \mathbf{u} satisfies (8.34), take $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle D(\phi\mathbf{u}), p \rangle &= -\langle \mathbf{u}, \phi p' \rangle = -\int_{\xi}^{\eta} \phi p' \omega dx = -\int_{\xi}^{\eta} [(\phi\omega p)' - (\phi\omega)' p] dx \\ &= \phi(x) \omega(x) p(x) \Big|_{\xi}^{\eta} + \int_{\xi}^{\eta} \psi \omega p dx = \langle \psi\mathbf{u}, p \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (iii) in the fourth equality, and (ii) and (iv) in the last one. \square

REMARK 8.9. Under the conditions of Lemma 8.5, we say that ω is a *weight function* for \mathbf{u} , and that \mathbf{u} is represented by the weight function ω ; and we also say that the OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} is orthogonal with respect to the weight function ω .

3.1. Hermite functional. By Table 2, the coefficients appearing in the TTRR for the monic OPS with respect to the (canonical) Hermite functional, \mathbf{u}_H , satisfy

$$\beta_n = 0 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0; \quad \gamma_n = \frac{n}{2} > 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, by Favard's Theorem, \mathbf{u}_H is positive-definite. Next we show that \mathbf{u}_H is represented by a weight function, in the sense of (8.33). First, we guess the polynomials ϕ and ψ from Table 1, so that $\phi(x) \equiv 1$ and $\psi(x) = -2x$. This gives the ODE

$$\omega' = -2x\omega.$$

The general solution of this equation is Ce^{-x^2} , where C is an arbitrary real constant. Thus we choose the weight function

$$(8.35) \quad \omega(x) := e^{-x^2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Notice that it is quite natural to take $(\xi, \eta) := \mathbb{R}$, since this is the largest interval where ω becomes positive, as required on hypothesis (i) appearing in Lemma 8.5. Of course, by construction, (iii) is also fulfilled. Moreover, one immediately sees that ω satisfies the remaining hypothesis (ii) and (iv). Thus, by Lemma 8.5 and Theorem 8.3,

$$(8.36) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}_H, p \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} p(x) e^{-x^2} dx, \quad p \in \mathcal{P},$$

meaning that \mathbf{u}_H is represented by the weight function (8.35). The corresponding positive Borel measure is supported on \mathbb{R} , and the associated distribution function $\psi_H : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$(8.37) \quad \psi_H(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-t^2} dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Notice that \mathbf{u}_H is uniquely determined by ψ_H . Indeed, this follows Corollary 4.12, by choosing there $\theta = 2$ and hence noticing that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{\theta|x|} d\psi_H(x) = 2 \int_0^{+\infty} e^{2x-x^2} dx < \infty.$$

Thus, in accordance with the spectral Theorem 4.7, we conclude that the Hermite polynomials are orthogonal in the positive-definite sense with respect to a unique positive Borel measure supported on \mathbb{R} , and characterized by the distribution function (8.37). The reader would recognize here, up to normalization, the Gaussian (or normal) probability distribution function.

3.2. Laguerre functional. By Table 2, the coefficients appearing in the TTRR for the monic OPS with respect to the Laguerre functional, $\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$, satisfy

$$\beta_n \in \mathbb{R}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \Leftrightarrow \alpha \in \mathbb{R}; \quad \gamma_n > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \Leftrightarrow \alpha > -1.$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$ is positive-definite if and only if $\alpha > -1$. To show that $\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$ is represented by a weight function (if $\alpha > -1$), consider the corresponding polynomials $\phi(x) = x$ and $\psi(x) = -x + \alpha + 1$, given by Table 1. This gives the ODE

$$(x\omega)' = (-x + \alpha + 1)\omega.$$

The general solution of this equation is $Cx^\alpha e^{-x}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus we choose

$$(8.38) \quad \omega(x) := x^\alpha e^{-x}, \quad x \in (0, +\infty).$$

As before, we chose $(\xi, \eta) := (0, +\infty)$ since this is the largest interval where ω becomes positive. Thus, hypothesis (i) and (iii) in Lemma 8.5 are fulfilled. Moreover, since $\alpha > -1$, we have, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\int_0^{+\infty} |x|^k \omega(x) dx = \int_0^1 x^{\alpha+k} e^{-x} dx + \int_1^{+\infty} x^{\alpha+k} e^{-x} dx < \infty.$$

The last two integrals converge. Indeed, on one hand, $\int_0^1 x^{\alpha+k} e^{-x} dx \leq \int_0^1 x^{\alpha+k} dx < \infty$ (because $\alpha + k > -1$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$); on the other hand, $\int_1^{+\infty} x^{\alpha+k} e^{-x} dx < \infty$, since $\int_1^{+\infty} \frac{1}{x^s} dx < \infty$ for an arbitrarily fixed $s > 1$, and

$$\frac{x^{\alpha+k} e^{-x}}{\frac{1}{x^s}} = x^{\alpha+k+s} e^{-x} \rightarrow 0 \quad (x \rightarrow +\infty).$$

Thus, ω satisfies hypothesis (ii). Of course, ω also satisfies (iv). Thus, by Lemma 8.5 and Theorem 8.3,

$$(8.39) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}, p \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} p(x) x^\alpha e^{-x} dx, \quad p \in \mathcal{P},$$

so $\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$ is represented by the weight function (8.38). The corresponding positive Borel measure is supported on the closed interval $[0, +\infty)$, and the associated distribution function $\psi_L^{(\alpha)} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$(8.40) \quad \psi_L^{(\alpha)}(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x t^\alpha e^{-t} \chi_{(0, +\infty)}(t) dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Notice that $\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$ is uniquely determined by $\psi_L^{(\alpha)}$. This follows e.g. from Corollary 4.12, by choosing there $0 < \theta < 1$ and hence noticing that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{\theta|x|} d\psi_L^{(\alpha)}(x) = \int_0^1 x^\alpha e^{(\theta-1)x} dx + \int_1^{+\infty} x^\alpha e^{(\theta-1)x} dx < \infty.$$

Thus, in accordance with the spectral Theorem 4.7, we conclude that if $\alpha > -1$ the Laguerre polynomials are orthogonal in the positive-definite sense with respect to a unique positive Borel measure supported on $[0, +\infty)$, and characterized by the distribution function (8.40). The reader would recognizes here, up to normalization, the gamma probability distribution function.

3.3. Jacobi functional. By Table 2, the coefficients appearing in the TTRR for the monic OPS with respect to the Jacobi functional, $\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$, satisfy

$$\beta_n \in \mathbb{R}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \Leftrightarrow \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}; \quad \gamma_n > 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \Leftrightarrow \alpha, \beta > -1.$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is positive-definite if and only if $\alpha > -1$ and $\beta > -1$. To show that $\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is represented by a weight function (if $\alpha > -1$ and $\beta > -1$), consider the corresponding polynomials $\phi(x) = 1 - x^2$ and $\psi(x) = -(\alpha + \beta + 2)x + \beta - \alpha$, given by Table 1. This gives the ODE

$$((1 - x^2)\omega)' = (-(\alpha + \beta + 2)x + \beta - \alpha)\omega.$$

The general solution of this equation is $C(1 - x)^\alpha(1 + x)^\beta$, $C \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus we choose

$$(8.41) \quad \omega(x) := (1 - x)^\alpha(1 + x)^\beta, \quad x \in (-1, 1).$$

Clearly, hypothesis (i), (iii) and (iv) appearing in Lemma 8.5 are fulfilled, where $(\xi, \eta) := (-1, 1)$. Moreover, since $\alpha > -1$ and $\beta > -1$, we have, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\int_{-1}^1 |x|^k \omega(x) dx \leq 2^\alpha \int_{-1}^0 (1 + x)^\beta dx + 2^\beta \int_0^1 (1 - x)^\alpha dx < \infty,$$

and so ω satisfies hypothesis (ii). Thus, by Lemma 8.5 and Theorem 8.3,

$$(8.42) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}, p \rangle = \int_{-1}^1 p(x)(1 - x)^\alpha(1 + x)^\beta dx, \quad p \in \mathcal{P},$$

hence $\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is represented by the weight function (8.41). The corresponding positive Borel measure is supported on the closed interval $[-1, 1]$, and the associated distribution function $\psi_J^{(\alpha, \beta)} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$(8.43) \quad \psi_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) := \int_{-\infty}^x (1 - t)^\alpha(1 + t)^\beta \chi_{(-1, 1)}(t) dt, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Notice that, since the sequences $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{\gamma_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ are bounded, then, by Theorem 4.10, $\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is uniquely determined by $\psi_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$. Therefore, we conclude that if $\alpha > -1$ and $\beta > -1$ then the Jacobi polynomials are orthogonal in the positive-definite sense with respect to a unique positive Borel measure supported on $[-1, 1]$, and characterized by the distribution function (8.43). The reader would recognizes here, up to normalization, the beta probability distribution function.

\mathbf{u}	Interval of orthogonality	$w(x)$	Restrictions
$\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$	$[-1, 1]$	$(1-x)^\alpha(1+x)^\beta$	$\alpha > -1, \beta > -1$
$\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$	$[0, +\infty[$	$x^\alpha e^{-x}$	$\alpha > -1$
\mathbf{u}_H	$] -\infty, +\infty[$	e^{-x^2}	—

TABLE 3. Weight functions (w) representing the canonical forms (presented in Table 1) in the positive-definite case.

3.4. Bessel functional. Consider the coefficients given by Table 2 for the TTRR of the monic OPS with respect to the Bessel functional, $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$. We see that the condition $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-2, -3, -4, \dots\}$ is necessary for $\beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Under this condition, we see that $\gamma_n > 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if and only if α fulfils the property

$$\alpha < -(2n+1) \vee -(2n-1) < \alpha < -n, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Clearly, there is no α fulfilling this property. Therefore, $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$ is not positive-definite whatever the choice of the parameter α .

REMARK 8.10. Table 3 summarizes the weight functions representing the classical functionals on the positive-definite case.

4. Orthogonality of the Bessel polynomials on \mathbb{S}^1

We have seen that the Bessel OPS $\{\hat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is not an OPS with respect to a positive-definite functional. Despite this fact, Krall and Frink [11] proved that $\{\hat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ fulfils the orthogonality relations (8.46) in bellow, where the integration is over the unit circle $\mathbb{S}^1 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ (or any closed contour around the origin) and the “weight” function is given by

$$(8.44) \quad \rho^{(\alpha)}(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left[1 + \alpha + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\alpha+2)_{k-1}} \left(-\frac{2}{z} \right)^k \right], \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

The ratio test ensures that the series in (8.44) converges absolutely on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and uniformly on each compact subset of this set. This function $\rho \equiv \rho^{(\alpha)}(z)$ fulfils

$$(8.45) \quad (z^2 \rho)' = ((\alpha+2)z+2)\rho - \frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\pi i} z, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Indeed, since

$$\rho'(z) = \frac{1}{4\pi i} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{(\alpha+2)_k} \left(-\frac{2}{z} \right)^{k+2},$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
(z^2\rho)'(z) - [(\alpha+2)z+2]\rho(z) &= z^2\rho'(z) - (\alpha z+2)\rho(z) \\
&= \frac{1}{\pi i} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{(\alpha+2)_k} \left(-\frac{2}{z}\right)^k - \frac{\alpha z+2}{2\pi i} \left[\alpha+1 - \frac{2}{z} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\alpha+2)_k} \left(-\frac{2}{z}\right)^k \right] \\
&= -\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\pi i} z + \frac{1}{\pi i} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{k+1+\alpha}{(\alpha+2)_k} \left(-\frac{2}{z}\right)^k - \frac{1}{\pi i} \left[\alpha+1 - \frac{2}{z} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(\alpha+2)_k} \left(-\frac{2}{z}\right)^k \right] \\
&= -\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\pi i} z .
\end{aligned}$$

THEOREM 8.6 (Krall & Frink). *Let $\{\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the Bessel monic OPS (being $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{-2, -3, -4, \dots\}$), and let $\rho^{(\alpha)}$ be defined as in (8.44). Then*

$$(8.46) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \widehat{B}_m^{(\alpha)}(z) \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(z) \rho^{(\alpha)}(z) dz = \frac{2^{2n+1}(-1)^{n+1} n!}{(\alpha+2)_{2n}(n+\alpha+1)_n} \delta_{m,n} \quad (m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0) .$$

Proof. From C5 in Theorem 8.1 and Tables 1 and 2, $y_n := \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(z)$ fulfills

$$(8.47) \quad z^2 y_n'' + ((\alpha+2)z+2)y_n' = n(n+\alpha+1)y_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} .$$

Multiplying both sides of (8.47) by ρ and taking into account (8.45), we deduce

$$(z^2 \rho y_n')' + \frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\pi i} z y_n' = n(n+\alpha+1) \rho y_n, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} .$$

Multiplying both sides of this equality by y_m and then integrating around \mathbb{S}^1 ,

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} (z^2 \rho y_n')' y_m dz + \frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} z y_n' y_m dz = n(n+\alpha+1) \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} y_n y_m \rho dz \quad (n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0) .$$

Clearly, by Cauchy's theorem, $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} z y_n' y_m dz = 0$. Also, integrating by parts², we deduce $\int_{\mathbb{S}^1} (z^2 \rho y_n')' y_m dz = - \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} z^2 \rho y_n' y_m' dz$. Hence the above equality reduces to

$$(8.48) \quad n(n+\alpha+1) \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} y_n y_m \rho dz = - \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} z^2 y_n' y_m' \rho dz \quad (n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0) .$$

²Recall that if f and g are complex functions holomorphic on a neighborhood of the image of a differentiable and closed path γ , then $\int_{\gamma} f'(z)g(z) dz = - \int_{\gamma} f(z)g'(z) dz$ (integration by parts formula). Indeed, considering a path parametrization $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\gamma} f'(z)g(z) dz &= \int_0^1 f'(\gamma(t))g(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t) dt = \int_0^1 (f \circ \gamma)'(t) \cdot (g \circ \gamma)(t) dt \\
&= - \int_0^1 (f \circ \gamma)(t) \cdot (g \circ \gamma)'(t) dt = - \int_0^1 f(\gamma(t)) \cdot g'(\gamma(t))\gamma'(t) dt = - \int_{\gamma} f(z)g'(z) dz ,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality we used the integration by parts formula for the Riemann integral and took into account that the relation $\gamma(0) = \gamma(1)$ holds (since γ is closed).

Interchanging n and m and subtracting the resulting equality to (8.48), yields

$$(8.49) \quad (n-m)(n+m+\alpha+1) \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} y_n y_m \rho \, dz = 0 \quad (n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0) .$$

Since $-(\alpha+1) \notin \mathbb{N}_0$ then $n+m+\alpha+1 \neq 0$ if $n \neq m$. Thus (8.49) gives us

$$(8.50) \quad \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} y_n y_m \rho \, dz = 0 \quad \text{if } n \neq m \quad (n, m \in \mathbb{N}_0) .$$

This proves (8.46) whenever $n \neq m$. If $n = m$, from (8.48) we find

$$(8.51) \quad I_n := \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} y_n^2 \rho \, dz = -\frac{1}{n(n+\alpha+1)} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} z^2 y'_n \cdot y'_n \rho \, dz, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} .$$

By C2 in Theorem 8.1, we have $z^2 y'_n = a_n y_{n+1} + b_n y_n + c_n y_{n-1}$. Moreover, clearly, $y'_n = n y_{n-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} a_{nj} y_j$ for some complex numbers a_{nj} . Substituting these expressions into the integrand on the right-hand side of (8.51) and using (8.50), we obtain

$$(8.52) \quad I_n := \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} y_n^2 \rho \, dz = -\frac{c_n}{n+\alpha+1} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} y_{n-1}^2 \rho \, dz = \gamma_n I_{n-1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where the last equality holds since $c_n = -d_{n-1} \gamma_n = -(n+\alpha+1) \gamma_n$ (see Theorem 8.1 and Table 1). Iterating (8.52) we deduce $I_n = \gamma_n \gamma_{n-1} \cdots \gamma_1 I_0$, hence using the expression for γ_n given in Table 2, we deduce

$$(8.53) \quad I_n = \frac{(-4)^n n!}{(\alpha+2)_{2n} (n+\alpha+1)_n} I_0, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

It remains to compute I_0 . Since ρ is given by the Laurent series (8.44), one see by the definition of residue that $\text{Res}(\rho; z=0) = -\frac{1}{\pi i}$, hence, by the residue theorem,

$$(8.54) \quad I_0 := \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \rho \, dz = 2\pi i \text{Res}(\rho; z=0) = -2 .$$

Inserting (8.54) into (8.53) yields (8.46) for $n = m$. This completes the proof. \square

REMARK 8.11. The function $\omega_\alpha(z) := z^\alpha e^{-2/z}$ fulfills the Pearson's type equation

$$(8.55) \quad (z^2 \omega_\alpha(z))' = ((\alpha+2)z+2) \omega_\alpha(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} .$$

This suggests using ω_α instead of $\rho^{(\alpha)}$ as “weight” function in the orthogonality relations (8.46). However, ω_α is a multivalued function if α is not an integer number and this may be inconvenient for integration around the origin 0. In general, $\rho^{(\alpha)}$ and ω_α yield different orthogonality relations for the Bessel polynomials, unless $\alpha = 0$ or $\alpha = -1$ (compare equations (8.45) and (8.55), and see Exercise 7.).

5. Explicit expressions for the classical OP

5.1. The Rodrigues-type formula. Theorem 7.6 states that the monic OPS $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ with respect to a classical functional \mathbf{u} (which needs not to be positive-definite) satisfies a distributional Rodrigues formula, involving P_n and \mathbf{u} . In the next we prove that if, in addition, \mathbf{u} is (classical and) represented by the weight function ω , then also a Rodrigues-type formula involving P_n and ω holds.

THEOREM 8.7 (Rodrigues-type formula). *Assume the hypothesis of Lemma 8.5, so that \mathbf{u} is positive-definite and represented by the weight function ω , as in (8.33). Assume further that $\omega \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\xi, \eta)$, and ϕ and ψ are nonzero real polynomials, $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_1$. Let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{u} . Then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,*

$$(8.56) \quad P_n(x) = \frac{k_n}{w(x)} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} (\phi^n(x) \omega(x)) \quad , \quad \xi < x < \eta \quad ,$$

where $k_n := \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} d_{n+i-1}^{-1}$, being $d_k := \frac{k}{2} \phi'' + \psi'$.

Proof. By Lemma 8.5, \mathbf{u} fulfills the distributional Pearson's equation

$$(8.57) \quad D(\phi \mathbf{u}) = \psi \mathbf{u} \quad .$$

Therefore, since \mathbf{u} is regular (because it is positive-definite), Theorem 7.6 ensures that $d_k \neq 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and the distributional Rodrigues formula holds:

$$(8.58) \quad P_n \mathbf{u} = k_n D^n(\phi^n \mathbf{u}) \quad , \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0 \quad .$$

While proving Theorem 7.2, and up to normalization (being $P_n = k_n R_n$), we have deduced (8.58) from (8.57) by purely algebraic arguments, the essential tool in the proof being the distributional Leibnitz rule for the derivative of order n of the functional $\phi \mathbf{u}$ (the left product of the functional \mathbf{u} by the polynomial ϕ). Therefore, since the weight function ω fulfills the ODE (which can be regarded as an analogue version for ordinary functions of the distributional differential equation (8.57))

$$(8.59) \quad (\phi \omega)' = \psi \omega \quad \text{on } (\xi, \eta) \quad ,$$

we see without effort, *mutatis mutandis*, that the steps of the proof of Theorem 7.2 may be followed (replacing therein \mathbf{u} by ω , and $\mathbf{u}^{[n]}$ by $\omega^{[n]} := \phi^n \omega$, and considering the ordinary derivative instead of the distributional derivative) allowing us to deduce (8.56) from (8.59) and the Leibnitz rule for the product of ordinary functions. \square

The Rodrigues formula (8.56) gives an explicit representation for P_n as a derivative of order n of a simple real function, divided by the weight function. This representation is very useful in many areas, e.g., in Number Theory, or in Physics. In the next we use (8.56) to derive explicit expressions for P_n as a linear combination of powers of x . Up to an affine change of variables, we can restrict our study to the canonical forms described in the previous sections.

5.2. Explicit formula for Jacobi polynomials. Consider $\alpha > -1$ and $\beta > -1$. Substituting in (8.56) the explicit expression of ϕ , ψ , k_n , and ω appearing in Tables 1, 2, and 3, we may write, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $-1 < x < 1$,

$$\widehat{P}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) = \frac{(-1)^n}{(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)_n} \frac{1}{(1-x)^\alpha (1+x)^\beta} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} \{(1-x)^{n+\alpha} (1+x)^{n+\beta}\}.$$

By Leibniz's rule for the n th derivative of a product, and making use of the generalized binomial coefficient, defined by

$$\binom{z}{0} := 1, \quad \binom{z}{k} := \frac{z(z-1) \cdots (z-k+1)}{k!}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N},$$

we deduce

$$(8.60) \quad \widehat{P}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) = \frac{1}{\binom{2n+\alpha+\beta}{n}} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n+\alpha}{n-k} \binom{n+\beta}{k} (x-1)^k (x+1)^{n-k}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

In the literature on OP it is usual to consider (non monic) Jacobi polynomials $\{P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ normalized so that

$$(8.61) \quad P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(1) = \binom{n+\alpha}{n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

called the *standard normalization* for Jacobi polynomials. Therefore, since, by (8.60),

$$(8.62) \quad \widehat{P}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(1) = \frac{2^n}{\binom{2n+\alpha+\beta}{n}} \binom{n+\alpha}{n} = \frac{2^n (\alpha+1)_n}{(n+\alpha+\beta+1)_n},$$

we conclude that the relation between the Jacobi polynomials with standard normalization and the monic Jacobi polynomials is

$$(8.63) \quad P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) = 2^{-n} \binom{2n+\alpha+\beta}{n} \widehat{P}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

This together with (8.60) leads to the explicit expression for the Jacobi polynomials with the standard normalization (8.63):

$$P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) = 2^{-n} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n+\alpha}{n-k} \binom{n+\beta}{k} (x-1)^k (x+1)^{n-k}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

We also point out the following useful relation:

$$(8.64) \quad P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(-x) = (-1)^n P_n^{(\beta, \alpha)}(x), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

(Clearly this relation holds also for the monic polynomials.) Also, from (8.61), (8.62), and (8.64),

$$P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(-1) = (-1)^n \binom{n + \beta}{n}, \quad \widehat{P}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(-1) = \frac{(-2)^n (\beta + 1)_n}{(n + \alpha + \beta + 1)_n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Finally, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the following formula holds (Exercise 4.):

$$(8.65) \quad \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \{ \widehat{P}_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) \} = (n - k + 1)_k \widehat{P}_{n-k}^{(\alpha+k, \beta+k)}(x), \quad n \geq k.$$

5.3. Explicit formula for Laguerre polynomials. Let $\alpha > -1$. Substituting in (8.56) the explicit expression of ϕ , ψ , k_n , and ω appearing in Tables 1, 2, and 3, we may write, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x > 0$,

$$\widehat{L}_n^{(\alpha)}(x) = (-1)^n x^{-\alpha} e^x \frac{d^n}{dx^n} \{ x^{n+\alpha} e^{-x} \}.$$

By Leibniz's rule for the n th derivative of a product, we deduce

$$(8.66) \quad \widehat{L}_n^{(\alpha)}(x) = (-1)^n n! \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n + \alpha}{n - k} \frac{(-x)^k}{k!}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Considering Laguerre polynomials $\{L_n^{(\alpha)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ with *standard normalization*, i.e.,

$$L_n^{(\alpha)}(0) = \binom{n + \alpha}{n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

then, since, by (8.66),

$$\widehat{L}_n^{(\alpha)}(0) = (-1)^n n! \binom{n + \alpha}{n} = (-1)^n (\alpha + 1)_n,$$

we see that the relation between the Laguerre polynomials with standard normalization and the monic Laguerre polynomials is

$$L_n^{(\alpha)}(x) = \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \widehat{L}_n^{(\alpha)}(x) \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

This together with (8.66) leads to the explicit expression for the Laguerre polynomials with the standard normalization:

$$L_n^{(\alpha)}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n+\alpha}{n-k} \frac{(-x)^k}{k!}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

We also point out that, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, the following formula holds (Exercise 4.):

$$(8.67) \quad \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \{ \widehat{L}_n^{(\alpha)}(x) \} = (n-k+1)_k \widehat{L}_{n-k}^{(\alpha+k)}(x), \quad n \geq k.$$

5.4. Explicit formula for Hermite polynomials. Substituting in (8.56) the explicit expression of ϕ , ψ , k_n , and ω appearing in Tables 1, 2, and 3, we may write, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\widehat{H}_n(x) = \frac{(-1)^n}{2^n} e^{x^2} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} \{ e^{-x^2} \}.$$

Using this formula we can derive the explicit expression for the Hermite polynomials. Nevertheless we will obtain such a formula by a different way. By Lemma 7.5, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\{ \widehat{H}_n^{[k]} := \frac{1}{(n+1)_k} \frac{d^k \widehat{H}_{n+k}}{dx^k} \}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to the functional $\mathbf{u}^{[k]} := \phi^k \mathbf{u}_H = \mathbf{u}_H$ (since $\phi \equiv 1$, by Table 1), hence $\widehat{H}_n^{[k]} \equiv H_n$, and so

$$(8.68) \quad \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \{ \widehat{H}_n(x) \} = (n-k+1)_k \widehat{H}_{n-k}(x), \quad n \geq k.$$

Therefore, using McLaurin formula, and since $(n-k+1)_k = k! \binom{n}{k}$, we may write

$$(8.69) \quad \widehat{H}_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{\frac{d^k \widehat{H}_n}{dx^k}(0)}{k!} x^k = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \widehat{H}_{n-k}(0) x^k = \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} \widehat{H}_j(0) x^{n-j}.$$

To compute $\widehat{H}_j(0)$, we start with the TTRR for $\{\widehat{H}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ (see Table 2):

$$\widehat{H}_{n+1}(x) = x \widehat{H}_n(x) - \frac{n}{2} \widehat{H}_{n-1}(x), \quad n \geq 0$$

($\widehat{H}_{-1}(x) = 0$, $\widehat{H}_0(x) = 1$). Thus $\widehat{H}_{n+1}(0) = -\frac{n}{2} \widehat{H}_{n-1}(0)$ for each $n \geq 0$, hence

$$(8.70) \quad \widehat{H}_{2n-1}(0) = 0, \quad \widehat{H}_{2n}(0) = (-1)^n \frac{(2n-1)!!}{2^n}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

Inserting (8.70) into (8.69) we easily deduce the desired explicit expression:

$$(8.71) \quad \widehat{H}_n(x) = \frac{n!}{2^n} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \frac{(-1)^k (2x)^{n-2k}}{(n-2k)! k!}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The standard normalization for the Hermite polynomials is $\{H_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ given by

$$(8.72) \quad H_n(x) = 2^n \widehat{H}_n(x) = n! \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \frac{(-1)^k (2x)^{n-2k}}{(n-2k)!k!}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

5.5. Explicit formula for Bessel polynomials. The Bessel functional $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$ fulfils Pearson's equation $D(\phi \mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}) = \psi \mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$, where $\phi(x) = x^2$ and $\psi(x) = (\alpha + 2)x + 2$ (see Table 1). Hence, by Lemma 7.5, the sequence $\{[\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}]^{[k]} := \frac{1}{(n+1)_k} \frac{d^k \widehat{B}_{n+k}^{(\alpha)}}{dx^k}\}_{n \geq 0}$ is a monic OPS with respect to the functional $\mathbf{u}^{[k]} := x^{2k} \mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, by Lemma 7.1, $\mathbf{u}^{[k]}$ fulfils Pearson's equation $D(x^2 \mathbf{u}^{[k]}) = \psi_k \mathbf{u}^{[k]}$, where $\psi_k := \psi + k\phi' = (\alpha + 2k + 2)x + 2$. Thus, $\mathbf{u}^{[k]} = \mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha+2k)}$, $[\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}]^{[k]} \equiv \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha+2k)}$, and so

$$(8.73) \quad \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \{\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(x)\} = (n - k + 1)_k \widehat{B}_{n-k}^{(\alpha+2k)}(x), \quad n \geq k.$$

Therefore, using McLaurin formula, we may write

$$(8.74) \quad \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{\frac{d^k \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}}{dx^k}(0)}{k!} x^k = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} \widehat{B}_{n-k}^{(\alpha+2k)}(0) x^k.$$

Thus we need to compute $\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(0)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Taking $z = x = 0$ in the ODE (8.47) for $y_n := \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(x)$, and since, by (8.73) with $k = 1$, $y'_n(x) = n \widehat{B}_{n-1}^{(\alpha+2)}(x)$, we obtain (for each $n \geq 1$) $\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(0) = \frac{2}{n+\alpha+1} \widehat{B}_{n-1}^{(\alpha+2)}(0)$, hence, by iteration of this identity, we deduce $\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(0) = \frac{2^n}{(n+\alpha+1)_n} \widehat{B}_0^{(\alpha+2n)}(0)$, i.e.,

$$(8.75) \quad \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(0) = \frac{2^n}{(n+\alpha+1)_n}, \quad n \geq 0.$$

Finally, inserting (8.75) into (8.74) we obtain

$$(8.76) \quad \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(x) = \frac{2^n}{(n+\alpha+1)_n} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (n+\alpha+1)_k \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^k, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

A standard normalization for the Bessel polynomials (cf. Chihara [3], p.182–183) is $\{Y_n^{(\alpha)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ chosen so that $Y_n^{(\alpha)}(0) = 1$, and so

$$(8.77) \quad Y_n^{(\alpha)}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (n+\alpha+1)_k \left(\frac{x}{2}\right)^k, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

REMARK 8.12. Although $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$ is not a positive-definite functional, the Bessel polynomials $\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}$ fulfill the (ordinary) Rodrigues-type formula (for $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$)

$$(8.78) \quad \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(x) = \frac{1}{(n + \alpha + 1)_n} \frac{1}{\omega_\alpha(x)} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} (x^{2n} \omega_\alpha(x)) , \quad \omega_\alpha(x) := x^\alpha e^{-2/x}$$

(Exercise 7.). This formula can be used to derive the explicit expression (8.76).

REMARK 8.13. The explicit expressions (8.60) and (8.66) for Jacobi and Laguerre polynomials can be deduced using the technique we have applied to derive (8.76). Thus we may remove the restrictions $\alpha > -1$ and $\beta > -1$ considered on the proof of (8.60) and (8.66), and hence these explicit formulas remain true requiring only that the corresponding functionals are regular (not necessarily positive-definite).

Exercises

1. Complete the proof of Theorem 8.1 by proving that:
 - (a) the polynomial Δ_2 introduced in the proof of $C4 \Rightarrow C1$ fulfills $\Delta_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2 \setminus \{0\}$.
 - (b) $C1' \Leftrightarrow C6$.
2. For arbitrary $k \in \mathbb{N}$, find expressions for the parameters $r_n^{[k]}$ and $s_n^{[k]}$ appearing in characterization C4 of Theorem 8.1, only in terms of the coefficients of the polynomials ϕ and ψ appearing in the Pearson's equation for \mathbf{u} . Compute these expressions for the classical canonical forms of Hermite, Laguerre, Jacobi, and Bessel.
3. Let \mathbf{u} be a classical functional, so that it is a regular functional on \mathcal{P} which fulfills Pearson's equation $D(\phi\mathbf{u}) = \psi\mathbf{u}$, being $\phi \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{P}_1 \setminus \mathcal{P}_0$.
 - (a) Find a closed formula for the Hankel determinant $H_n := \det \{[u_{i+j}]_{i,j=0}^n\}$ (of order $n+1$), involving only the (coefficients of the) polynomials ϕ and ψ .
 - (b) Compute H_n for the classical canonical forms of Hermite, Laguerre, Jacobi, and Bessel. Give also expressions for the moments in each case.
4. Prove relations (8.65) and (8.67). (*Hint.* Proceed as we did for proving (8.73).)
5. Prove that the (standard) Jacobi polynomials admit the explicit representation

$$P_n^{(\alpha,\beta)}(x) = \binom{2n + \alpha + \beta}{n} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{\binom{n}{k} \binom{n+\alpha}{n-k}}{\binom{2n+\alpha+\beta}{n-k}} \left(\frac{x-1}{2}\right)^k, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

6. (a) Suppose that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ is regular, and let $\{P_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ be its monic OPS. Let $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and set $\mathbf{v} := (x - c)\mathbf{u}$. Prove that \mathbf{v} is regular if and only if $P_n(c) \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Under such conditions, $\{Q_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ being the monic OPS with respect to \mathbf{v} , show that

$$Q_n(x) = \frac{1}{x - c} \left[P_{n+1}(x) - \frac{P_{n+1}(c)}{P_n(c)} P_n(x) \right], \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

- (b) Using the results in (a), prove that the following relation among (standard) Jacobi polynomials holds for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$:

$$(2n + \alpha + \beta + 2)(x + 1)P_n^{(\alpha,\beta+1)}(x) = 2(n + \beta + 1)P_n^{(\alpha,\beta)}(x) + 2(n + 1)P_{n+1}^{(\alpha,\beta)}(x).$$

7. Let $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$, with $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{-2, -3, -4, \dots\}$, be the (canonical) Bessel functional, and $\{\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ the monic OPS with respect to $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$. Show that, although $\mathbf{u}_B^{(\alpha)}$ is not a positive-definite functional, the following holds:
- (a) For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}$ fulfills the Rodrigues-type formula (8.78).
 - (b) If $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cup \{-1\}$, then $\{\widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfies the orthogonality relations

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} \widehat{B}_m^{(\alpha)}(z) \widehat{B}_n^{(\alpha)}(z) \omega_\alpha(z) dz = \frac{(-1)^{n+\alpha+1} 2^{2n+\alpha+1} n!}{(2n+\alpha+1)! (n+\alpha+1)_n} \delta_{m,n}$$

for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, where $\mathbb{S}^1 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ (the unit circle).

8. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}'$ be a regular functional fulfilling the generalized Pearson's distributional differential equation

$$2D((x^2 + 2x + 1)\mathbf{u}) = (-2x^2 - x + 1)\mathbf{u}$$

and such that $u_1 = -u_0/2$ (where, as usual, $u_n := \langle \mathbf{u}, x^n \rangle$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$). Show that \mathbf{u} is a classical functional, identifying \mathbf{u} as well as the corresponding monic OPS. Conclude that \mathbf{u} is a positive-definite functional uniquely represented by a positive Borel measure μ with finite moments of all orders and $\text{supp}(\mu) = [-1, +\infty)$. Determine μ explicitly.

9. (a) Prove that the integral representation (8.42) for the Jacobi functional $\mathbf{u}_J^{(\alpha, \beta)}$ is still valid provided that $\Re \alpha > -1$ and $\Re \beta > -1$.
- (b) Prove that the integral representation (8.39) for the Laguerre functional $\mathbf{u}_L^{(\alpha)}$ is still valid provided that $\Re \alpha > -1$.
- (Hint. Use the identity principle for complex analytic functions regarding α and β as complex variables.)

Final remarks

As we already mentioned, the (distributional) approach considered here to the classical OP is due to Pascal Maroni. This approach simplifies considerably most of the original proofs of the characterization properties presented in Theorem 8.1. The statement and proof of this theorem is based, essentially, on the articles [16], [13], and [14]. We did not find characterizations C4 and C4' (see Theorem 8.1) in the available literature, for arbitrary k . For $k = 1$, C4 was proved in [13]. For $k \geq 2$, the proof of $C4 \Rightarrow C1$ uses arguments originally presented in the article [18] by Maroni and da Rocha (see also [12]). It is a well known fact that any classical functional is equivalent to one of the canonical forms presented in Table 1 (see [17], p. 19). This fact is expressed by Theorem 8.3, whose explicit statement we also have not found in the literature. Many authors consider that classical OPS only include Hermite, Laguerre, and Jacobi OP, with appropriate constraints on the involved parameters ensuring that their orthogonality occurs in the positive-definite sense. The content of Section 4, about Bessel polynomials, is taken from the original article by Krall and Frink [11] (although here we made a minor simplification in the proof of Theorem 8.46).

The relations presented in exercises 4 and 5 are very well known and they appear in many texts about OP. Exercise 6 may be found in Chihara's book [3]. Exercise 7 is

a result presented in the article [11] by Krall and Frink, considering the normalization adopted in Chihara's book [3]. The result expressed by exercise 9 appears in the text [17] by Maroni (but notice that the hint given here leads to an alternative proof).

Bibliography

- [1] W. Al-Salam, T. S. Chihara, *Another characterization of the classical orthogonal polynomials*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **3**(1) (1972) 65–70.
- [2] S. Bochner, *Über Sturm-Liouvillesche Polynomsysteme*, Math. Zeit. **29** (1929) 730–736.
- [3] T. S. Chihara, *An introduction to orthogonal polynomials*, Gordon and Breach (1978).
- [4] G. Freud, *Orthogonal polynomials*, Pergamon Press, Oxford (1971).
- [5] Ya. L. Geronimus, *On polynomials orthogonal with respect to numerical sequences and on Hahn's theorem*, Izv. Akad. Nauk. **4** (1940) 215–228. (In Russian.)
- [6] W. Hahn, *Über die Jacobischen polynome und zwei verwandte polynomklassen*, Math. Zeit. **39** (1935) 634–638.
- [7] W. Hahn, *Über höhere ableitungen von orthogonal polynomen*, Math. Zeit. **43** (1937) 101.
- [8] M. E. H. Ismail, *Classical and Quantum Orthogonal Polynomials in One Variable*, Cambridge University Press (2005) [paperback edition: 2009].
- [9] H. L. Krall, *On derivatives of orthogonal polynomials*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **42** (1936) 867–870.
- [10] H. L. Krall, *On higher derivatives of orthogonal polynomials II*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **47** (1941) 261–264.
- [11] H. L. Krall and O. Frink, *A new class of orthogonal polynomials: the Bessel polynomials*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **65** (1949) 100–115.
- [12] A. Loureiro, P. Maroni, and Z. da Rocha, *The generalized Bochner condition about classical orthogonal polynomials revisited*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **322** (2006) 645–667.
- [13] F. Marcellán, A. Branquinho, and J. Petronilho, *Classical orthogonal polynomials: a functional approach*, Acta Applicandæ Mathematicæ **34** (1994) 283–303.
- [14] F. Marcellán and J. Petronilho, *On the solution of some distributional differential equations: existence and characterizations of the classical moment functionals*, Integral Transforms and Special Functions **2** (1994) 185–218.
- [15] P. Maroni, *Une théorie algébrique des polynômes orthogonaux. Applications aux polynômes orthogonaux semiclassicals*, In C. Brezinski et al. Eds., *Orthogonal Polynomials and Their Applications*, Proc. Erice 1990, IMACS, Ann. Comp. App. Math. **9** (1991) 95–130.
- [16] P. Maroni, *Variations around classical orthogonal polynomials. Connected problems*, J. Comput. Appl. Math. **48** (1993) 133–155.
- [17] P. Maroni, *Fonctions eulériennes. Polynômes orthogonaux classiques*, Techniques de l'Ingénieur, traité Généralités (Sciences Fondamentales), A **154** (1994) 1–30.
- [18] P. Maroni and Z. da Rocha, *A new characterization of classical forms*, Comm. Appl. Anal. **5** (2001) 351–362.
- [19] P. J. McCarthy, *Characterizations of classical polynomials*, Port. Math. **20** (1961) 47–52.
- [20] A. F. Nikiforov and V. B. Uvarov, *Special Functions of Mathematical Physics*, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel (1988).
- [21] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, AMS Colloq. Publ. **230** (1975), 4th ed.

9

Introduction to hypergeometric series

In this text we give a short introduction to *hypergeometric series and functions*. Our presentation is mainly based in chapters 1 and 2 in the book [1] by G. Andrews, R. Askey and R. Roy (which contains much more information concerning this topic), although in some points of the presentation we also had supported in the books [8] by Rainville, [2] by Bailey, [10] by Whittaker and Watson, [4] by Lebedev, as well as in the Batman Manuscript Project [3] (directed by A. Erdélyi), and Maroni's monograph [6]. The hypergeometric series (and functions) are fundamental tools in all the area of Special Functions, being also extremely useful in many branches of Mathematics and its applications. Before introducing such series, we need to review two other basic functions, namely the gamma and the beta functions.

1. The gamma and beta functions

DEFINITION 9.1 (Gauss). *The gamma function is defined as*

$$(9.1) \quad \Gamma(z) := \lim_{\substack{n \rightarrow +\infty \\ (n \in \mathbb{N})}} \frac{n! n^{z-1}}{(z)_n}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}.$$

The gamma function is a generalization of the factorial. Indeed, assuming momentarily that the above limit exists, we may write

$$\Gamma(z+1) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n! n^z}{(z+1)_n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n! n^{z-1}}{(z)_n} \frac{zn}{z+n} = z\Gamma(z),$$

hence the following property holds (difference equation for the gamma function):

$$(9.2) \quad \Gamma(z+1) = z\Gamma(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}.$$

In particular, and since $\Gamma(1) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n! n^0 / (1)_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n! / n! = 1$, we deduce

$$(9.3) \quad \Gamma(n+1) = n!, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Notice also that (9.2) allow us write the following useful identity

$$(9.4) \quad (a)_n = \frac{\Gamma(n+a)}{\Gamma(a)}, \quad a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

The next theorem shows that indeed the limit defining the gamma function exists. We need to recall the definition of the *Euler-Mascheroni* constant¹:

$$(9.5) \quad \gamma := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n} - \ln n \right) = 0.5772156 \dots$$

Notice that this limit exists. In fact, setting $u_n := \int_0^1 \frac{t}{n(n+t)} dt = \frac{1}{n} - \ln \frac{n+1}{n}$, we have $0 < u_n \leq \int_0^1 \frac{1}{n(n+t)} dt = \frac{1}{n^2}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, hence $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u_n$ converges, and so

$$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n} - \ln n = \sum_{k=1}^n u_k + \ln \frac{n+1}{n} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k = \gamma.$$

THEOREM 9.1. *The limit (9.1) exists and is never zero. Moreover, Γ is an analytic function in all its domain $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$, with simple poles at the points $0, -1, -2, -3, \dots$. In addition, the identities*

$$(9.6) \quad \Gamma(z) = \frac{1}{z} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{n} \right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{n} \right)^z \right] \quad (\text{Euler})$$

$$(9.7) \quad \frac{1}{\Gamma(z)} = ze^{\gamma z} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{n} \right) e^{-z/n} \right] \quad (\text{Schl\"omilch})$$

hold for each $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$, where γ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant.

*Proof.*² Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z| \leq \frac{1}{2}N$. Recall that, taking the principal value of $\log(1+w)$, we have $\log(1+w) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k-1}}{k} w^k$ if $|w| < 1$, hence

$$\left| \log \left(1 + \frac{z}{n} \right) - \frac{z}{n} \right| \leq \frac{|z|^2}{n^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left| \frac{z}{n} \right|^k \leq \frac{N^2}{4n^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^k = \frac{N^2}{2n^2} \quad \text{if } n > N.$$

Since the series $\sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{N^2}{2n^2}$ is convergent, then Weierstrass M -test ensures that $\Sigma_N(z) := \sum_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \left[\log \left(1 + \frac{z}{n} \right) - \frac{z}{n} \right]$ is an absolutely and uniformly convergent series in the region $|z| \leq \frac{1}{2}N$, and so, since its terms are analytic functions in this region,

¹This constant is often referred as *Euler's constant*. Its arithmetic nature — to know whether γ is a rational or transcendental number — is unknown. It is conjectured that “ $\gamma \notin \mathbb{Q}$ ” (indeed, it is expected that “ γ is a transcendental number”, but a proof (or disproof) has been resisting along the times. This is an old and important conjecture in Number Theory, that fits into the class of problems related with Hilbert's seventh problem appearing in the famous list of open problems presented by David Hilbert on the occasion of the International Congress of Mathematics held in Paris in 1900.

²We present a proof that does not assume knowledge of the theory of infinite products, following the exposition at the begin of chapter XII in Whittaker and Watson's book [10]. (Indeed, assuming some basic facts concerning this theory, a more concise proof could be done.)

then Σ_N is an analytic function in the same region. Consequently, its exponential

$$\Lambda_N(z) := e^{\Sigma_N(z)} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{n=N+1}^m \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) e^{-\frac{z}{n}} \right] =: \prod_{n=N+1}^{\infty} \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) e^{-\frac{z}{n}} \right]$$

is an analytic function in the region $|z| \leq \frac{1}{2}N$ which is never zero there (since it is the exponential of a finite complex value, for each N and z), and so

$$\Lambda_N(z) \prod_{n=1}^N \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) e^{-\frac{z}{n}} \right] = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{n=1}^m \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) e^{-\frac{z}{n}} \right] =: \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) e^{-\frac{z}{n}} \right] =: \Lambda(z)$$

is an analytic function in the region $|z| \leq \frac{1}{2}N$ which fulfills $\Lambda(z) \neq 0$ for each z in this region that does not coincide with a nonnegative integer number. Therefore, since we can take N arbitrarily large, we conclude that Λ is analytic in \mathbb{C} (an entire function) and fulfills $\Lambda(z) \neq 0$ for each $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{-1, -2, -3, \dots\}$. Clearly, the zeros of $\Lambda(z)$ are precisely the numbers $-1, -2, -3, \dots$, which are simple zeros. Now, we may write

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\gamma z} \Lambda(z) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{(1+\frac{1}{2}+\dots+\frac{1}{n}-\ln n)z} \cdot \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{j=1}^n \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{j}\right) e^{-\frac{z}{j}} \right] \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ e^{(1+\frac{1}{2}+\dots+\frac{1}{n}-\ln n)z} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{j}\right) e^{-\frac{z}{j}} \right] \right\} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-z} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{z}{j}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and since, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{-1, -2, -3, \dots, -(n-1)\}$,

$$(9.8) \quad \frac{n! n^{z-1}}{(z)_n} = \frac{1}{z} \frac{n^z}{\frac{1+z}{1} \frac{2+z}{2} \dots \frac{n-1+z}{n-1}} = \frac{1}{z} \left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) \left[n^{-z} \prod_{j=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{z}{j}\right) \right]^{-1},$$

we conclude that there exists, and it is nonzero, the limit

$$(9.9) \quad \Gamma(z) := \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{n! n^{z-1}}{(z)_n} = \frac{1}{ze^{\gamma z} \Lambda(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}.$$

Moreover, taking into account the facts proved above about the function Λ , it follows immediately that Γ is an analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$ and it has simple poles at the points $0, -1, -2, -3, \dots$. Notice that (9.9) also proves (9.7). Finally, for each $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{-1, -2, -3, \dots, -(n-1)\}$, (9.8) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{n! n^{z-1}}{(z)_n} = \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right)^z \left(1 + \frac{z}{n}\right) \frac{1}{z} \prod_{j=1}^n \left[\left(1 + \frac{z}{j}\right)^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{j}\right)^z \right],$$

hence taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain (9.6). \square

REMARK 9.1. Historically, the gamma function was first defined by Euler, as in (9.6) above, being the notation “ $\Gamma(z)$ ” introduced by Legendre in 1814.

DEFINITION 9.2. *The beta integral is*

$$(9.10) \quad B(x, y) := \int_0^1 t^{x-1}(1-t)^{y-1} dt, \quad \Re x > 0, \quad \Re y > 0.$$

The beta function is obtained from the beta integral by analytic continuation, and we still denote it by $B(x, y)$.

Notice that the integral in (9.10) is symmetric in x and y , i.e.,

$$(9.11) \quad B(x, y) = B(y, x), \quad \Re x > 0, \quad \Re y > 0.$$

This identity follows immediately from (9.10) making the change of variables $t = 1 - s$.

THEOREM 9.2. *The beta function fulfills*

$$(9.12) \quad B(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)} \quad (x, y, x+y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}).$$

Proof. If $\Re x > 0$ and $\Re y > 0$, the beta function $B(x, y)$ is given by (9.10). On the other hand, by Theorem 9.1, $\Gamma(x)$, $\Gamma(y)$, and $\Gamma(x+y)$ are well defined and non-zero for all x and y such that $x, y, x+y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$. Thus the right-hand side of (9.12) is well defined, and we only need to prove (9.12) for x and y such that $\Re x > 0$ and $\Re y > 0$, since — taking into account Theorem 9.1 again — the right-hand side of (9.12) provides the analytic continuation of the beta integral. Assuming $\Re x > 0$ and $\Re y > 0$, we start by proving that B fulfills the functional equation

$$(9.13) \quad B(x, y) = \frac{x+y}{y} B(x, y+1).$$

By (9.10), we may write $B(x, y+1) = \int_0^1 t^{x-1}(1-t)^{y-1} dt - \int_0^1 t^x(1-t)^{y-1} dt$, i.e.,

$$(9.14) \quad B(x, y+1) = B(x, y) - B(x+1, y).$$

On the other hand, integration by parts yields $B(x, y+1) = \int_0^1 t^{x-1}(1-t)^y dt = \frac{t^x}{x}(1-t)^y \Big|_{t=0}^1 + \frac{y}{x} \int_0^1 t^x(1-t)^{y-1} dt = \frac{y}{x} B(x+1, y)$, hence

$$(9.15) \quad B(x+1, y) = \frac{x}{y} B(x, y+1).$$

Inserting (9.15) in the right-hand side of (9.14) proves (9.13). Iterating (9.13),

$$(9.16) \quad B(x, y) = \frac{(x+y)_n}{(y)_n} B(x, y+n), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

One sees (making the change of variables $t = s/n$) that

$$B(x, y+n) = \int_0^1 t^{x-1} (1-t)^{y+n-1} dt = \frac{1}{n^x} \int_0^n s^{x-1} \left(1 - \frac{s}{n}\right)^{y+n-1} ds ,$$

and so (9.16) may be rewritten as

$$(9.17) \quad B(x, y) = \frac{(x+y)_n}{n! n^{x+y-1}} \frac{n! n^{y-1}}{(y)_n} \int_0^n s^{x-1} \left(1 - \frac{s}{n}\right)^{y+n-1} ds , \quad n \in \mathbb{N} .$$

Now, by definition of the gamma function, we have

$$(9.18) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(x+y)_n}{n! n^{x+y-1}} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(x+y)} , \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n! n^{y-1}}{(y)_n} = \Gamma(y) .$$

Moreover, using (for instance) Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem and the connections between the Lebesgue and the Riemann integrals, we deduce (Exercise 1.)

$$(9.19) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^n s^{x-1} \left(1 - \frac{s}{n}\right)^{y+n-1} ds = \int_0^{+\infty} s^{x-1} e^{-s} ds .$$

Therefore, taking the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ in (9.17), from (9.18) and (9.19) we obtain

$$(9.20) \quad B(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)} \int_0^{+\infty} t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt .$$

Taking $y = 1$, and since $\Gamma(1) = 1$, we deduce

$$(9.21) \quad \int_0^{+\infty} t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt = \Gamma(x+1)B(x, 1) = x\Gamma(x) \int_0^1 t^{x-1} dt = \Gamma(x) .$$

Therefore, inserting (9.21) into (9.20) gives (9.12) for $\Re x > 0$ and $\Re y > 0$. Thus by the considerations at the begin of the proof, (9.12) follows for all x and y such that $x, y, x+y \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$. \square

COROLLARY 9.3. *The gamma function fulfills*

$$(9.22) \quad \Gamma(x) = \int_0^{+\infty} t^{x-1} e^{-t} dt , \quad \Re x > 0 .$$

Proof. Indeed, (9.22) is relation (9.21) stated in the proof of Theorem 9.2. \square

COROLLARY 9.4 (Euler's reflection formula). *The gamma function fulfills*

$$(9.23) \quad \Gamma(z)\Gamma(1-z) = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi z)} , \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z} .$$

Proof. The proof is left to the reader (Exercise 2.). \square

2. Hypergeometric series

An *hypergeometric series* is a series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n$ where

$$\frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} \text{ is a rational function of } n.$$

On factorizing the polynomials in n , we may write

$$(9.24) \quad \frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} = \frac{(n+a_1)(n+a_2)\cdots(n+a_p)}{(n+b_1)(n+b_2)\cdots(n+b_q)} \frac{x}{n+1},$$

where x is a complex number (which appears because the polynomials may be non monic) and a_j and b_j are complex parameters such that $b_j \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}$. Therefore, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$c_n = c_{n-1} \frac{(a_1+n-1)(a_2+n-1)\cdots(a_p+n-1)}{(b_1+n-1)(b_2+n-1)\cdots(b_q+n-1)} \frac{x}{n},$$

and by iterating this relation we obtain

$$(9.25) \quad c_n = c_0 \frac{(a_1)_n(a_2)_n\cdots(a_p)_n}{(b_1)_n(b_2)_n\cdots(b_q)_n} \frac{x^n}{n!}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Thus (up to a constant factor) an *hypergeometric series* is a series of the form

$$(9.26) \quad {}_pF_q \left(\begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix}; x \right) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a_1)_n(a_2)_n\cdots(a_p)_n}{(b_1)_n(b_2)_n\cdots(b_q)_n} \frac{x^n}{n!},$$

being $x \in \mathbb{C}$ and, for all possible j ,

$$(9.27) \quad a_j \in \mathbb{C}, \quad b_j \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, -3, \dots\}.$$

REMARK 9.2. Often, instead of the left-hand side of (9.26), the notations

$$(9.28) \quad {}_pF_q(a_1, \dots, a_p; b_1, \dots, b_q; x), \quad {}_pF_q(x), \quad {}_pF_q$$

are used, provided concerning the last two ones there is no danger of misunderstanding. Moreover, it may happens that in the numerator or in the denominator (or in both) of the fraction defining the general term of an hypergeometric series, no parameters a_j or b_j appear (this situation takes place when the number of corresponding parameters is $p=0$ or $q=0$, respectively). In this situation we write “—” instead of the a_j or b_j parameters, to indicate their absence. For instance,

$${}_0F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} - \\ b_1 \end{matrix}; x \right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{(b_1)_n n!}, \quad {}_3F_0 \left(\begin{matrix} a_1, a_2, a_3 \\ - \end{matrix}; x \right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a_1)_n(a_2)_n(a_3)_n}{n!} x^n.$$

REMARK 9.3. Notice that if a_j is zero or a negative integer number for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, then the series on the right-hand side of (9.26) terminates, i.e., it reduces to a finite sum (and thus it becomes a polynomial in the variable x). In such a case, (9.26) is called a *terminating hypergeometric series*.

Next we analyze the convergence of the hypergeometric series.

THEOREM 9.5. *Let ${}_pF_q$ be the hypergeometric series defined by (9.26). Then:*

- (i) *if $p \leq q$, then ${}_pF_q(x)$ converges absolutely for each $x \in \mathbb{C}$;*
- (ii) *if $p = q + 1$, then ${}_pF_q(x)$ converges absolutely if $|x| < 1$, and it diverges if $|x| > 1$ and the series does not terminates.*
- (iii) *if $p > q + 1$, then ${}_pF_q(x)$ diverges for each $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, provided that the series does not terminates.*

Proof. We will apply the ratio test. We may assume that the series does not terminates (otherwise it converges trivially). By (9.24), we may write

$$(9.29) \quad \left| \frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} \right| = \frac{\left| 1 + \frac{a_1}{n} \right| \cdots \left| 1 + \frac{a_p}{n} \right| n^{p-(q+1)}}{\left| 1 + \frac{b_1}{n} \right| \cdots \left| 1 + \frac{b_q}{n} \right| \left| 1 + \frac{1}{n} \right|} |x|, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Therefore, the following holds:

- (i) Suppose $p \leq q$. Then, by (9.29), $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} \right| = 0 < 1$, hence, by the ratio test, the series defining ${}_pF_q(x)$ converges absolutely for each $x \in \mathbb{C}$.
- (ii) Suppose $p = q + 1$. Then, by (9.29), $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} \right| = |x|$, hence the series ${}_pF_q(x)$ converges absolutely if $|x| < 1$, and it diverges if $|x| > 1$.
- (iii) Suppose $p > q + 1$. By (9.29), $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left| \frac{c_{n+1}}{c_n} \right| = +\infty$, hence the series ${}_pF_q(x)$ diverges for each $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. \square

The case whether $|x| = 1$ when $p = q + 1$ is of great interest. The next theorem gives the conditions for convergence in this case. Its proof requires the following

LEMMA 9.6 (Gauss's test). *Let $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of positive numbers. Suppose that there exist $r > 1$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and a bounded sequence $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ such that*

$$(9.30) \quad \frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} = 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{n} + \frac{C_n}{n^r}, \quad n \geq N.$$

Then the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$ is convergent if $\epsilon > 1$, and it is divergent if $\epsilon \leq 1$.

*Proof.*³ Assume first $\epsilon < 1$. Since $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded and $r > 1$, there exists an integer $N_1 \geq N$ such that $|C_n|/n^{r-1} \leq (1 - \epsilon)/2$ if $n \geq N_1$. Therefore, from (9.30),

³Gauss's test is a consequence of Raabes's test if $\epsilon \neq 1$, and of Bertrand's test if $\epsilon = 1$. Here we adapt the proofs of these tests to give a "direct" proof of Gauss's test, in order to maintain the proof of Theorem 9.7 more self contained.

$\frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} \leq 1 + \frac{1+\epsilon}{2} \frac{1}{n} < \frac{n+1}{n}$ for $n \geq N_1$, hence, $(n+1)a_{n+1} > na_n$ for each $n \geq N_1$. By repeatedly application of this inequality we deduce

$$a_n \geq \frac{c_1}{n} \quad \text{if } n \geq N_1,$$

where $c_1 := N_1 a_{N_1} > 0$. Thus, since the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n}$ is divergent, then so is $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$. Assume now $\epsilon = 1$. Since $r > 1$ then $\frac{\ln x}{x^{r-1}} \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow +\infty$, hence, since $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded, also $C_n \ln n / n^{r-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Consequently, there exists an integer $N_2 > N$ such that $C_n \ln n / n^{r-1} \leq 1$ if $n \geq N_2$, and so, from (9.30),

$$(9.31) \quad \frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n \ln n} \leq \frac{(n+1) \ln(n+1)}{n \ln n} \quad \text{if } n \geq N_2.$$

The second inequality in (9.31) holds since it is equivalent to the inequality $1 \leq f(n)$, being $f(x) := (x+1) \ln \frac{x+1}{x}$; and this last inequality holds since f is (strictly) decreasing on $(0, +\infty)$, and so $f(n) \geq \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f(x) = 1$ for each $n > 1$. From (9.31),

$$a_n \geq \frac{c_2}{n \ln n} \quad \text{if } n \geq N_2,$$

where $c_2 := a_{N_2} N_2 \ln N_2 > 0$, and since the series $\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \ln n}$ is divergent (use the integral test: $\int_2^{+\infty} \frac{dx}{x \ln x} = \ln \ln x|_2^{+\infty} = +\infty$), then so is $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$. Finally, assume $\epsilon > 1$. Arguing as before, there exists $N'_1 \geq N$ such that $|C_n|/n^{r-1} \leq (\epsilon - 1)/2$ if $n \geq N'_1$. Hence, setting $q := (\epsilon + 1)/2$ and taking s such that $1 < s < q$, we deduce

$$(9.32) \quad \frac{a_n}{a_{n+1}} \geq 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{n} - \frac{\epsilon - 1}{2} \frac{1}{n} = 1 + \frac{q}{n} \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^s \quad \text{if } n \geq N_3,$$

being N_3 an integer chosen so that $N_3 \geq \max \{N'_1, \frac{2^{s+2}}{q-s}\}$. The last inequality in (9.32) holds by the binomial theorem⁴, which allow us writing, for each $n \geq 2$,

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^s = 1 + \frac{s}{n} + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \binom{s}{k} \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^k \leq 1 + \frac{s}{n} + \frac{4}{n^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(s)_k}{k!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k = 1 + \frac{s}{n} + \frac{2^{s+2}}{n^2}$$

(where we have used the inequality $|\binom{\alpha}{k}| \leq (|\alpha|)_k / k!$, valid for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$), and so the last inequality in (9.32) follows taking into account that $1 + \frac{q}{n} = 1 + \frac{s}{n} + \frac{(q-s)n}{n^2}$. From (9.32) we obtain $(n+1)^s a_{n+1} \leq n^s a_n$ if $n \geq N_3$, hence

$$a_n \leq \frac{c_3}{n^s} \quad \text{if } n \geq N_3,$$

where $c_3 := a_{N_3} N_3^s > 0$, and since $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$ is convergent, then so is $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n$. \square

Before proving the theorem we also point out the following fact⁵: *the coefficient of x^n in the series $_{q+1}F_q(x)$ is*

⁴The binomial theorem states: $(1+z)^\alpha = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{\alpha}{k} z^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-\alpha)_k}{k!} (-z)^k$ if $\alpha, z \in \mathbb{C}$, $|z| < 1$.

⁵Recall that, given two sequences of real or complex numbers $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{b_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, the notation “ $a_n \sim b_n$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ ” means that $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

$$(9.33) \quad \frac{(a_1)_n (a_2)_n \cdots (a_{q+1})_n}{(b_1)_n (b_2)_n \cdots (b_q)_n n!} \sim \frac{\Gamma(b_1) \cdots \Gamma(b_q)}{\Gamma(a_1) \cdots \Gamma(a_{q+1})} n^{\sum a_j - \sum b_j - 1}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

(Here we use the abbreviations $\sum a_j := \sum_{j=1}^{q+1} a_j$ and $\sum b_j := \sum_{j=1}^q b_j$.) Relation (9.33) follows at once from the definition (9.1) of the gamma function, which gives

$$(z)_n \sim \frac{n! n^{z-1}}{\Gamma(z)}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

THEOREM 9.7. *Let $|x| = 1$ and $p = q + 1$ in the hypergeometric series defined by (9.26), and suppose that it is a nonterminating series.*

- (i) *if $\Re(\sum a_j - \sum b_j) < 0$, then ${}_{q+1}F_q(x)$ converges absolutely;*
- (ii) *if $0 \leq \Re(\sum a_j - \sum b_j) < 1$ and $x \neq 1$, then ${}_{q+1}F_q(x)$ converges conditionally;*
- (iii) *if $\Re(\sum a_j - \sum b_j) \geq 1$, then ${}_{q+1}F_q(x)$ diverges.*

Proof. Since $|x| = 1$, then $x = e^{i\theta}$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Define

$$\alpha_n \equiv \alpha_n(\theta) := x^n = e^{in\theta}, \quad \beta_n := \frac{(a_1)_n \cdots (a_{q+1})_n}{(b_1)_n \cdots (b_q)_n n!} \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}_0).$$

Thus, we may write ${}_{q+1}F_q(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n(x)$, where $f_n(x) := \alpha_n \beta_n$. Define also

$$\gamma := \frac{\Gamma(b_1) \cdots \Gamma(b_q)}{\Gamma(a_1) \cdots \Gamma(a_{q+1})}, \quad \epsilon := 1 - \Re(\sum a_j - \sum b_j).$$

Notice that, taking into account (9.33), we have

$$(9.34) \quad |f_n(x)| = |\beta_n| \sim \frac{|\gamma|}{n^\epsilon} \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow +\infty.$$

The three cases (i), (ii), and (iii) in the statement of the theorem correspond, respectively, to $\epsilon > 1$, $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, and $\epsilon \leq 0$. So we will analyze the convergence of the series ${}_{q+1}F_q(x)$ considering separately these three cases.⁶

If $\epsilon \leq 0$, then, by (9.34), if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(x)$ exists, it cannot be zero, hence the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n(x) \equiv {}_{q+1}F_q(x)$ is divergent. This proves (iii).

If $\epsilon > 1$, the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^\epsilon}$ is convergent, and then, by (9.34), so is $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |f_n(x)|$, hence $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n(x) \equiv {}_{q+1}F_q(x)$ is absolutely convergent. This proves (i).

At last, suppose that $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ and $x \neq 1$. Since $x = e^{i\theta}$, we may take $0 < \theta < 2\pi$. Thus, setting $S_n \equiv S_n(\theta) := \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \alpha_k \beta_k$, we may ensure the convergence of the series

⁶ Note that (9.34) gives us $\left| \frac{f_{n+1}(x)}{f_n(x)} \right| \sim \left(\frac{n}{n+1} \right)^\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, and so one sees that the ratio test is inconclusive.

$_{q+1}F_q(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n$ provided that we are able to show that this last limit exists. Indeed, by the summation by parts formula,

$$S_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \alpha_k \beta_k = A_n \beta_{n-1} - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} A_k (\beta_k - \beta_{k-1}), \quad A_n := \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \alpha_j.$$

The sequence $\{A_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ is bounded, since for each $n \geq 1$,

$$|A_n| = \left| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e^{ik\theta} \right| = \left| \frac{1 - e^{in\theta}}{1 - e^{i\theta}} \right| = \left| \frac{\sin(n\theta/2)}{\sin(\theta/2)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\sin(\theta/2)}.$$

Moreover, taking into account (9.34), the sequence $\{\beta_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ converges to zero. It follows that $A_n \beta_{n-1} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, to conclude that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n$ exists, we need to show that $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} A_{n+1}(\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n)$ is a convergent series. Indeed, we have

$$(9.35) \quad \beta_{n+1} - \beta_n = \beta_{n+1} \left(1 - \frac{(n+b_1) \cdots (n+b_q)(n+1)}{(n+a_1) \cdots (n+a_q)(n+a_{q+1})} \right) = \beta_{n+1} \frac{c n^q + \pi_{q-1}(n)}{n^{q+1} + \pi_q(n)},$$

where $c := \sum_{j=1}^{q+1} a_j - \sum_{j=1}^q b_j - 1$, $\pi_{q-1} \in \mathcal{P}_{q-1}$, and $\pi_q \in \mathcal{P}_q$. Notice that $c \neq 0$, since $|c| \geq |\Re c| = \epsilon > 0$. Therefore, we deduce

$$|A_{n+1}(\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n)| \leq \frac{|\beta_{n+1}|}{\sin(\theta/2)} \left| \frac{c n^q + \pi_{q-1}(n)}{n^{q+1} + \pi_q(n)} \right| \sim \frac{M}{n^{1+\epsilon}}, \quad M := \frac{|\gamma c|}{\sin(\theta/2)} > 0,$$

hence the (absolute) convergence of the series $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} A_{n+1}(\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n)$ follows from the convergence of the series $\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{n^{1+\epsilon}}$.

To prove that the convergence of the series $_{q+1}F_q(x)$ is not absolute, we need to show that the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\beta_n|$ is divergent. This can be done using Gauss's test (Lemma 9.6), according to which (since $\epsilon \leq 1$) we may conclude that this series diverges if we can show that there exist $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and a bounded sequence $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 1}$, such that $|\beta_n/\beta_{n+1}| = 1 + \epsilon/n + C_n/n^2$ for each $n \geq N$. Indeed, taking into account (9.35) and the equality $|1 - z|^2 = 1 - 2\Re z + |z|^2$, valid for any complex number z , we deduce

$$\left| \frac{\beta_n}{\beta_{n+1}} \right|^2 = \left| 1 - \frac{c n^q + \pi_{q-1}(n)}{n^{q+1} + \pi_q(n)} \right|^2 = 1 + \frac{2\epsilon}{n} + \frac{B_n}{n^2},$$

where

$$B_n := \left| c - \frac{c_n}{n} \right|^2 + 2\Re c_n, \quad c_n := \frac{n[c \pi_q(n) - n \pi_{q-1}(n)]}{n^{q+1} + \pi_q(n)}.$$

Note that $\{B_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a bounded sequence (in fact, it is convergent), so there exists $B > 0$ such that $|B_n| \leq B$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, using the binomial theorem, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{\beta_n}{\beta_{n+1}} \right| = \sqrt{1 + \frac{2\epsilon}{n} + \frac{B_n}{n^2}} = 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{n} + \frac{C_n}{n^2} \quad \text{if } n \geq N,$$

where N is an integer number choosen large enough such that $|2\epsilon/n + B_n/n^2| \leq 1/2$ for each $n \geq N$, and

$$C_n := \frac{B_n}{2} + \left(2\epsilon + \frac{B_n}{n}\right)^2 \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \binom{1/2}{k} \left(\frac{2\epsilon}{n} + \frac{B_n}{n^2}\right)^{k-2}, \quad n \geq N.$$

(It doesn't matter how to define C_1, \dots, C_{N-1} .) Clearly, $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is bounded, since

$$|C_n| \leq \frac{B}{2} + 4(2+B)^2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\frac{1}{2})_k}{k!} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^k = \frac{B}{2} + 4\sqrt{2}(2+B)^2 \quad \text{if } n \geq N.$$

Thus the proof of (ii) is complete. \square

REMARK 9.4. Many elementary functions have representations as hypergeometric series. We present some simple examples (Exercise 4.):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad e^x &= {}_0F_0\left(\overline{}; -x\right) & \text{(ii)} \quad \log(1-x) &= -x {}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1, 1 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}; x\right) \\ \text{(iii)} \quad \sin x &= x {}_0F_1\left(\overline{}; -x^2/4\right) & \text{(iv)} \quad \cos x &= {}_0F_1\left(\overline{}; -x^2/4\right) \\ \text{(v)} \quad \arcsin x &= x {}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1/2, 1/2 \\ 3/2 \end{smallmatrix}; x^2\right) & \text{(vi)} \quad \arctan x &= x {}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1/2, 1 \\ 3/2 \end{smallmatrix}; -x^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we note that the *binomial theorem* can be written in hypergeometric form:

$$(9.36) \quad (1-x)^{-a} = {}_1F_0\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a \\ \overline{} \end{smallmatrix}; x\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n}{n!} x^n, \quad |x| < 1, \quad a \in \mathbb{C}.$$

3. The hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$

3.1. Definition. The preceding example (ii) involving $\log(1-x)$ shows that although the series converges for $|x| < 1$, it has an analytic continuation as a single-valued function in the complex plane from which a line joining 1 to ∞ is deleted. We will see that this behavior describes the general situation, i.e., a ${}_2F_1$ series has a continuation to the complex plane with branch points at 1 and ∞ .

DEFINITION 9.3. *The hypergeometric function is defined by the series*

$$(9.37) \quad {}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a, b \\ c \end{smallmatrix}; x\right) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n (b)_n}{(c)_n} \frac{x^n}{n!}$$

for $|x| < 1$, and by analytic continuation elsewhere.

REMARK 9.5. Of course, in definition (9.37) it is implicitly assumed that $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ and $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, \dots\}$.

REMARK 9.6. Usually we reserve the use of the words *hypergeometric function* for ${}_2F_1$, and *hypergeometric series* will be the series ${}_pF_q$ defined by (9.26) — which includes ${}_2F_1$, but will not necessarily mean just ${}_2F_1$.

Notice that Theorems 9.5 and 9.7 applied to the specific ${}_2F_1$ series yield:

THEOREM 9.8. *Consider the hypergeometric series (9.37), and suppose that it is a nonterminating series. Then:*

1. *If $|x| < 1$, then the series is absolutely convergent.*
2. *If $|x| > 1$, then the series is divergent.*
3. *If $|x| = 1$, then the following holds:*
 - (i) *if $\Re(a + b - c) < 0$, then the series converges absolutely;*
 - (ii) *if $0 \leq \Re(a + b - c) < 1$ and $x \neq 1$, then the series converges conditionally;*
 - (iii) *if $\Re(a + b - c) \geq 1$, then the series diverges.*

Consider, for instance, $a = b = c = 1$. Then, since $(1)_n = n!$, one has

$${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} 1, 1 \\ 1 \end{matrix}; x \right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} x^n = \frac{1}{1-x} \quad \text{if } |x| < 1.$$

In this case, the series is convergent if $|x| < 1$, and it is divergent otherwise. Clearly the function $1/(x-1)$ provides the analytic continuation to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$, and thus the hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} 1, 1 \\ 1 \end{matrix}; x \right)$ becomes defined for each $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$.

Next we state some important results concerning the hypergeometric function ${}_2F_1$, including Euler's integral representation and Gauss theorem, as well as two other results involving terminating series ${}_2F_1(x)$ and ${}_3F_2(x)$ at the point $x = 1$, namely the Chu-Vandermonde and Pfaff-Saalschütz identities.

3.2. Euler's integral representation. Euler's integral representation may be viewed as the analytic continuation of (9.37), provided that the condition $\Re c > \Re b > 0$ is satisfied. This condition involves only the parameters b and c , and not the parameter a , which is involved in the function $(1 - xt)^{-a}$ that appears in the integrand of the integral representation — see (9.39) in bellow. Regarded as a function of the complex variable x (and being $0 \leq t \leq 1$, fixed), this function is in general multivalued (it is single-valued if a is an integer number — see (9.38) in bellow). Taking its principal value, we obtain a single-valued function which is analytic in the x -plane cut along the real axis from 1 to ∞ , i.e., it is an analytic function of the variable x in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$. To see why this holds, we recall that, if α is a (fixed) complex number, the function defined for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ by $z^\alpha := e^{\alpha \log_r z}$, where $\log_r z := \ln |z| + i \arg_r z$, $\arg_r z \in]r, r + 2\pi]$, and $r \in \mathbb{R}$ (fixing the branch of the logarithm), is an analytic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \ell_r$, where ℓ_r is the ray $\ell_r := \{\rho e^{ir} \mid \rho \geq 0\}$. Using this fact one sees that for its principal value (which is obtained for $r = -\pi$), the function $(1 - xt)^{-a}$, for fixed $t \in [0, 1]$, is analytic outside the range of values $x \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the condition $1 - xt \in \ell_{-\pi} := (-\infty, 0]$ holds. This condition is impossible if $t = 0$, hence $(1 - xt)^{-a}$ is analytic in \mathbb{C} if $t = 0$.

If $t \in (0, 1]$, then $1 - xt \in (-\infty, 0]$ if and only if $x \geq 1/t$, and so $(1 - xt)^{-a}$ is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus [1/t, +\infty)$. The choice of the (principal) branch implies the following explicit expression of $(1 - xt)^{-a}$ as single-valued function (of the variable x):⁷

$$(9.38) \quad \begin{aligned} (1 - xt)^{-a} &:= |1 - xt|^{-\Re a} e^{\Im a \cdot \arg(1 - xt) - i(\Re a \cdot \arg(1 - xt) + \Im a \cdot \ln |1 - xt|)} , \\ x &\in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty) , \quad t \in [0, 1] , \quad \arg(1 - xt) \in] - \pi, \pi] . \end{aligned}$$

(Note that from this we obtain $(1 - xt)^{-a} \equiv 1$ if $t = 0$ and $(1 - xt)^{-a} \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow 0^+$.) In conclusion: $(1 - xt)^{-a}$ with its principal value defines a single-valued function analytic in the x -plane cut along the real axis from 1 to $+\infty$, whatever the value of $t \in [0, 1]$.

THEOREM 9.9 (Euler's integral representation). *If $\Re c > \Re b > 0$, then*

$$(9.39) \quad {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix} ; x \right) = \frac{\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(b)\Gamma(c-b)} \int_0^1 t^{b-1} (1-t)^{c-b-1} (1-xt)^{-a} dt ,$$

in the x -plane cut along the real axis from 1 to $+\infty$. Here it should be understood that $\arg t = \arg(1-t) = 0$ and $(1-xt)^{-a}$ as its principal value.

Proof. Fix $x \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|x| < 1$. According with the binomial theorem (9.36),

$$(9.40) \quad t^{b-1} (1-t)^{c-b-1} (1-xt)^{-a} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} f_n(t) ,$$

where $f_n \equiv f_n(\cdot; x) : (0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (regarded as a function of t) is defined by

$$f_n(t) := \frac{(a)_n x^n}{n!} t^{n+b-1} (1-t)^{c-b-1} .$$

Notice that $f_n \in L^1(0, 1)$. Indeed, for each $t \in (0, 1)$, we may write

$$|f_n(t)| = \frac{|(a)_n| |x|^n}{n!} |t^n| t^{\Re b-1} (1-t)^{\Re(c-b)-1} \leq \frac{(|a|)_n |x|^n}{n!} t^{\Re b-1} (1-t)^{\Re(c-b)-1} ,$$

the last inequality being justified by the obvious inequality $|(\alpha)_n| \leq (|\alpha|)_n$, which holds for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since, by assumption, $\Re b > 0$ and $\Re(c-b) > 0$, then the function $t \in (0, 1) \mapsto t^{\Re b-1} (1-t)^{\Re(c-b)-1}$ is in $L^1(0, 1)$. To see why this holds, notice simply that the integral of such a function is the beta integral (cf. Definition 9.2)

$$\int_0^1 t^{\Re b-1} (1-t)^{\Re(c-b)-1} dt = B(\Re b, \Re(c-b)) .$$

Moreover, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we may write

$$\int_0^1 |f_n(t)| dt \leq \frac{(|a|)_n |x|^n}{n!} B(\Re b, \Re(c-b)) ,$$

⁷Notice also that $1 - xt = 1$ if $t = 0$ and $1 - xt \neq 0$ for each $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$ if $0 < t \leq 1$, hence $1 - xt \neq 0$ for each $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$ if $t \in [0, 1]$, and so $(1 - xt)^{-a}$ is well defined for every $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, whatever the choice of $a \in \mathbb{C}$.

and so, summing up for $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, and noticing that, taking into account (ii) in Theorem 9.5, the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(|a|)_n}{n!} |x|^n = {}_1F_0 \left(\frac{|a|}{-}; |x| \right)$ is convergent, we obtain

$$(9.41) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_0^1 |f_n(t)| dt \leq B(\Re b, \Re(c-b)) {}_1F_0 \left(\frac{|a|}{-}; |x| \right) < \infty.$$

Now, integrating both sides of (9.40) with respect to the variable t , (9.41) allow us to perform the change in the order of integration and summation.⁸ This yields

$$(9.42) \quad \int_0^1 t^{b-1} (1-t)^{c-b-1} (1-xt)^{-a} dt = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n}{n!} x^n \int_0^1 t^{n+b-1} (1-t)^{c-b-1} dt.$$

By (9.10) and (9.12), and taking into account (9.4), we may write

$$\int_0^1 t^{n+b-1} (1-t)^{c-b-1} dt = B(n+b, c-b) = \frac{\Gamma(n+b)\Gamma(c-b)}{\Gamma(n+c)} = \frac{(b)_n \Gamma(b) \Gamma(c-b)}{(c)_n \Gamma(c)}.$$

Inserting this into the right-hand side of (9.42) yields (9.39) for $|x| < 1$. To prove that (9.39) holds in the cut plane $\mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, we will show that the integral on the right-hand side of (9.39) is an analytic function of x in the cut plane. Indeed, set⁹

$$f(x, t) := t^{b-1} (1-t)^{c-b-1} (1-xt)^{-a}, \quad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty), \quad t \in (0, 1).$$

(It doesn't matter how we define f for $t = 0$ or $t = 1$, provided it remains analytic in the variable x .) We have already seen that for each fixed $t \in [0, 1]$ the function $x \mapsto (1-xt)^{-a}$ is analytic in the cut plane $\mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, and so the same holds for f , regarded as a function of the variable x . On the other hand, it is not difficult to see that for each fixed $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, the function $t \mapsto (1-xt)^{-a}$ is continuous on $[0, 1]$, hence it is measurable there, and then so is f , regarded as a function of the variable

⁸ Recall the following well known (consequence of the Monotone Convergence Theorem)

THEOREM: Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a measure space and $\{f_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ a sequence of (complex) functions in $L^1(\Omega, \mu)$ fulfilling $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} |f_n| d\mu < \infty$. Then $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |f_n| < \infty$ μ -a.e. in Ω , $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n \in L^1(\Omega, \mu)$, and

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n \right) d\mu = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\Omega} f_n d\mu.$$

⁹ We will apply the following general theorem, taking therein $\Omega = [0, 1]$, $G = \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, and μ the Lebesgue measure in \mathbb{R} restricted to the interval $[0, 1]$.

THEOREM [5]: Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a measure space, let $G \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ be open, and let $f : G \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function fulfilling the following three properties: (i) $f(z, \cdot)$ is \mathcal{A} -measurable for each $z \in G$; (ii) $f(\cdot, t)$ is analytic in G for each $t \in \Omega$; and (iii) $\int_{\Omega} |f(\cdot, t)| d\mu(t)$ is locally bounded, that is,

$$\forall z_0 \in G, \quad \exists \delta \equiv \delta(z_0) > 0 \quad : \quad \sup_{\substack{|z-z_0| \leq \delta \\ (z \in G)}} \int_{\Omega} |f(z, t)| d\mu(t) < \infty.$$

Then $\int_{\Omega} f(\cdot, t) d\mu(t)$ is analytic in G and it may be differentiated under the integral.

t . Moreover, from (9.38), it is straightforward to show (Exercise 5.) that for each $z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, there exists $\delta \equiv \delta(z_0) > 0$ such that

$$(9.43) \quad |(1 - xt)^{-a}| \leq C(a, z_0, \delta) e^{\pi|\Im a|}, \quad \forall x \in \overline{B}(z_0, \delta), \quad \forall t \in [0, 1],$$

being $\overline{B}(z_0, \delta) := \{x \in \mathbb{C} : |x - z_0| \leq \delta\} \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$ and $C(a, z_0, \delta)$ is a constant that depends only of a , z_0 , and δ , and so, we obtain

$$\sup_{|x - z_0| \leq \delta} \int_0^1 |f(x, t)| dt \leq C(a, z_0, \delta) e^{\pi|\Im a|} B(\Re b, \Re(c - b)) < \infty.$$

Thus, we conclude that the right-hand side of (9.39) is an analytic function of the variable x in the cut plane, hence, since we have already proved that (9.39) holds if $|x| < 1$, then it follows by analytic continuation that it holds in the cut x -plane $\mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$ as well. \square

As a first application of Euler's integral representation we derive two transformation formulas of hypergeometric functions.

COROLLARY 9.10. *If $|x| < 1$ and $|x/(x-1)| < 1$, then the following transformation formula holds:*

$$(9.44) \quad {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix}; x \right) = (1-x)^{-a} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & c-b \\ & c \end{matrix}; \frac{x}{x-1} \right); \quad (\text{Pfaff, 1797})$$

and if $|x| < 1$, then

$$(9.45) \quad {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix}; x \right) = (1-x)^{c-a-b} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} c-a, & c-b \\ & c \end{matrix}; x \right). \quad (\text{Euler, 1794})$$

Here, it should be understood that $(1-x)^{-a}$ and $(1-x)^{c-a-b}$ have their principal values. Moreover, these formulas are valid for all complex parameters a , b , and c , provided that c is not zero neither a negative integer number.

Proof. Assume first $\Re c > \Re b > 0$. To prove Pfaff's transformation, make the substitution $t = 1 - s$ in Euler's integral (9.39). Then

$$\begin{aligned} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix}; x \right) &= \frac{\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(b)\Gamma(c-b)} \int_0^1 (1-s)^{b-1} s^{c-b-1} (1-x+xs)^{-a} ds \\ &= \frac{(1-x)^{-a}\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(b)\Gamma(c-b)} \int_0^1 (1-s)^{b-1} s^{c-b-1} \left(1 - \frac{xs}{x-1}\right)^{-a} ds \\ &= (1-x)^{-a} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & c-b \\ & c \end{matrix}; \frac{x}{x-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

To prove Euler's transformation, we consider Pfaff's transformation and note that the hypergeometric series is symmetric in the parameters appearing in the numerator.

Therefore, we may write

$${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix} ; x \right) = (1-x)^{-a} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} c-b, & a \\ & c \end{matrix} ; \frac{x}{x-1} \right).$$

Applying again Pfaff's transformation (to the last ${}_2F_1$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix} ; x \right) &= (1-x)^{-a} \left(1 - \frac{x}{x-1}\right)^{-c+b} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} c-b, & c-a \\ & c \end{matrix} ; \frac{\frac{x}{x-1}}{\frac{x}{x-1}-1} \right) \\ &= (1-x)^{-a} (1-x)^{c-b} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} c-a, & c-b \\ & c \end{matrix} ; x \right). \end{aligned}$$

So (9.44) and (9.45) hold under the assumption $\Re c > \Re b > 0$. Analytic continuation in the parameters b and c (Exercise 6.) gives (9.44) and (9.45) for all complex values of a , b and c , with $c \neq 0, -1, -2, -3, \dots$. \square

REMARK 9.7. The hypergeometric ${}_2F_1$ series defined on the right-hand side of (9.44) converges for $|x/(x-1)| < 1$. Thus, since this condition is equivalent to $\Re x < \frac{1}{2}$, the right-hand side of Pfaff's transformation gives the analytic continuation to the region $\Re x < \frac{1}{2}$ (via Euler's integral representation) of the series defined by ${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix} ; x \right)$.

3.3. Gauss's summation formula. Our next result is a celebrated theorem by Gauss. It is convenient to state firstly the following

LEMMA 9.11. *If $\Re(c-a-b) > 0$, then*

$$(9.46) \quad {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix} ; 1 \right) = \frac{(c-a)(c-b)}{c(c-a-b)} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c+1 \end{matrix} ; 1 \right).$$

Proof. Set

$$A_n := \frac{(a)_n(b)_n}{n!(c)_n}, \quad B_n := \frac{(a)_n(b)_n}{n!(c+1)_n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

After straightforward computations we deduce

$$c(c-a-b)A_n = (c-a)(c-b)B_n + cnA_n - c(n+1)A_{n+1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Therefore, summing up from $n = 0$ to $n = N$, we obtain

$$(9.47) \quad c(c-a-b) \sum_{n=0}^N A_n = (c-a)(c-b) \sum_{n=0}^N B_n - c(N+1)A_{N+1}, \quad N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Now, as $N \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\sum_{n=0}^N A_n \rightarrow {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix} ; 1 \right), \quad \sum_{n=0}^N B_n \rightarrow {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c+1 \end{matrix} ; 1 \right).$$

Moreover, by (9.33), as $N \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\frac{(a)_{N+1}(b)_{N+1}}{(c)_{N+1}(N+1)!} \sim \frac{\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)} (N+1)^{a+b-c-1},$$

and so, since $\Re(a+b-c) < 0$, we obtain

$$(N+1)A_{N+1} = (N+1) \frac{(a)_{N+1}(b)_{N+1}}{(c)_{N+1}(N+1)!} \sim \frac{\Gamma(c)}{\Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)} (N+1)^{a+b-c} \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, taking $N \rightarrow +\infty$ in (9.47) yields (9.46). \square

THEOREM 9.12 (Gauss's summation formula, 1812). *If $\Re(c-a-b) > 0$, then*

$$(9.48) \quad {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(c-a-b)}{\Gamma(c-a)\Gamma(c-b)}.$$

Proof. Iterating (9.46) n times yields

$$(9.49) \quad {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = \frac{(c-a)_n(c-b)_n}{(c)_n(c-a-b)_n} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c+n \end{matrix}; 1 \right), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By (9.33), as $n \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\frac{(c-a)_n(c-b)_n}{(c)_n(c-a-b)_n} = \frac{(c-a)_n(c-b)_n(1)_n}{(c)_n(c-a-b)_n n!} \sim \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(c-a-b)}{\Gamma(c-a)\Gamma(c-b)\Gamma(1)},$$

i.e., recalling that $\Gamma(1) = 1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{(c-a)_n(c-b)_n}{(c)_n(c-a-b)_n} = \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(c-a-b)}{\Gamma(c-a)\Gamma(c-b)}.$$

Therefore, (9.48) will be proved taking the limit in (9.49) as $n \rightarrow \infty$, provided we are able to show that

$$(9.50) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c+n \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = 1.$$

Let $u_k(a, b, c)$ denote the coefficient of x^k in ${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix}; x \right)$, i.e., write

$${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c \end{matrix}; x \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_k(a, b, c) x^k, \quad u_k(a, b, c) := \frac{(a)_k(b)_k}{(c)_k k!}.$$

For each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > |c|$, we have $|(a)_k| \leq (|a|)_k$, $|(b)_k| \leq (|b|)_k$, and $|(c+n)_k| \geq (n-|c|)_k$, hence

$$|u_k(a, b, c+n)| = \left| \frac{(a)_k(b)_k}{(c+n)_k k!} \right| \leq \frac{(|a|)_k(|b|)_k}{(n-|c|)_k k!} = u_k(|a|, |b|, n-|c|),$$

and so we may write

$$\left| {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, & b \\ & c+n \end{matrix}; 1 \right) - 1 \right| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k(a, b, c+n) \right| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} u_k(|a|, |b|, n-|c|).$$

Thus

$$(9.51) \quad \left| {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c+n \end{matrix}; 1 \right) - 1 \right| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} u_{k+1}(|a|, |b|, n - |c|), \quad n > |c|.$$

Next, notice that, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $n > |c|$,

$$\begin{aligned} u_{k+1}(|a|, |b|, n - |c|) &= \frac{(|a|)_{k+1}(|b|)_{k+1}}{(n - |c|)_{k+1}(k+1)!} = \frac{1}{k+1} \frac{|ab|}{n - |c|} \frac{(|a|+1)_k(|b|+1)_k}{(n+1-|c|)_k k!} \\ &\leq \frac{|ab|}{n - |c|} u_k(|a|+1, |b|+1, n+1-|c|). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from (9.51) we obtain

$$\left| {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c+n \end{matrix}; 1 \right) - 1 \right| \leq \frac{|ab|}{n - |c|} {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} |a|+1, |b|+1 \\ n+1-|c| \end{matrix}; 1 \right), \quad n > |c|.$$

According to (i) in Theorem 9.7, the series ${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} |a|+1, |b|+1 \\ n+1-|c| \end{matrix}; 1 \right)$ converges (absolutely) if $n > |a| + |b| + |c| + 1$. This series is, clearly, a decreasing function of n , hence it is bounded by a positive number independent of n , say, $M \equiv M(a, b, c) > 0$, and so

$$\left| {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c+n \end{matrix}; 1 \right) - 1 \right| \leq \frac{|ab|M}{n - |c|} \quad \text{if } n > |a| + |b| + |c| + 1.$$

Therefore, taking the limit as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ we obtain (9.50). \square

COROLLARY 9.13 (Chu-Vandermonde). *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$,*

$$(9.52) \quad {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, a \\ c \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = \frac{(c-a)_n}{(c)_n}.$$

Proof. The result follows immediately taking $b = -n$ in (9.48) and using (9.4). \square

4. The Pfaff-Saalschütz, Dixon's, and Dougall's identities

The Chu-Vandermonde identity (9.52) gives a closed formula for a terminating ${}_2F_1$ hypergeometric series. Similarly, the Pfaff-Saalschütz identity gives a closed formula for a terminating ${}_3F_2$ hypergeometric series. These kind of formulas are very useful on the computation of binomial sums in closed form, as we will see in the next section.

THEOREM 9.14 (Pfaff-Saalschütz). *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(9.53) \quad {}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, a, b \\ c, 1+a+b-c-n \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = \frac{(c-a)_n(c-b)_n}{(c)_n(c-a-b)_n}.$$

Proof. By Euler's transformation formula (9.45) and the binomial theorem (9.36),

$${}_1F_0 \left(\begin{matrix} c-a-b \\ - \end{matrix}; x \right) \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix}; x \right) = {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} c-a, c-b \\ c \end{matrix}; x \right), \quad |x| < 1.$$

Rewrite this equation as

$$\left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(c-a-b)_n}{n!} x^n \right) \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n (b)_n}{(c)_n n!} x^n \right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(c-a)_n (c-b)_n}{(c)_n n!} x^n, \quad |x| < 1.$$

Form the Cauchy product of the series on the left-hand side and then equate the coefficients of x^n in both sides of the resulting equality. This yields

$$(9.54) \quad \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(a)_j (b)_j (c-a-b)_{n-j}}{j! (c)_j (n-j)_j} = \frac{(c-a)_n (c-b)_n}{(c)_n n!}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Now, taking into account the equalities

$$(\alpha)_{n-j} = \frac{(-1)^j (\alpha)_n}{(1-\alpha-n)_j}, \quad \frac{(-1)^j n!}{(n-j)!} = (-n)_j, \quad 0 \leq j \leq n,$$

the sum on the left-hand side of (9.54) becomes

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(a)_j (b)_j (-n)_j (c-a-b)_n}{j! (c)_j (1+a+b-c-n)_j n!} = \frac{(c-a-b)_n}{n!} {}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, a, b \\ c, 1+a+b-c-n \end{matrix}; 1 \right).$$

Thus the theorem is proved. \square

In the next section we will present examples illustrating how Chu-Vandermonde and Pfaff-Saalschütz identities can be useful to obtain closed formulas for sums involving binomial coefficients. In the applications to such *binomial identities*, often the case $p = q + 1$ occur, the success of the procedure depending upon certain relations fulfilled by the parameters a_1, \dots, a_{q+1} and b_1, \dots, b_q appearing in the definition of

$$(9.55) \quad {}_{q+1}F_q \left(\begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_{q+1} \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix}; x \right).$$

The series (9.55) is called *k-balanced* at $x = 1$ if one of the a_j 's is a negative integer number, and the following condition holds:

$$(9.56) \quad k + \sum_{j=1}^{q+1} a_j = \sum_{j=1}^q b_j.$$

The condition that one of the a_j 's is a negative integer number means that the series terminates. This condition seem artificial, but without it many results do not hold. An *1-balanced* series is also called *Saalschützian*. (9.55) is called *well-poised* if

$$(9.57) \quad 1 + a_1 = b_1 + a_2 = \dots = b_q + a_{q+1}.$$

We conclude by stating without proof (the proofs can be founded in several of the textbooks presented in the Bibliography) two theorems involving two identities of these

types. Dixon's identity applies to a well-poised ${}_3F_2$ series, while Dougall's identity applies to a well-poised 2-balanced ${}_7F_6$ series.

THEOREM 9.15 (Dixon). *The identity*
(9.58)

$${}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} a, -b, -c \\ 1+a+b, 1+a+c \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = \frac{\Gamma(1+\frac{a}{2})\Gamma(1+a+b)\Gamma(1+a+c)\Gamma(1+\frac{a}{2}+b+c)}{\Gamma(1+a)\Gamma(1+\frac{a}{2}+b)\Gamma(1+\frac{a}{2}+c)\Gamma(1+a+b+c)}$$

holds, where the condition $\Re(a+2b+2c+2) > 0$ is assumed whenever the left-hand side is an infinite series.

THEOREM 9.16 (Dougall). *For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$(9.59) \quad {}_7F_6 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, a, 1+a/2, -b, -c, -d, -e \\ a/2, 1+a+b, 1+a+c, 1+a+d, 1+d+e, 1+a+n \end{matrix}; 1 \right) \\ = \frac{(1+a)_n(1+a+b+c)_n(1+a+b+d)_n(1+a+c+d)_n}{(1+a+b)_n(1+a+c)_n(1+a+d)_n(1+a+b+c+d)_n},$$

provided that $1+2a+b+c+d+e+n=0$.

It is worth mentioning that many other interesting identities are given in the books presented in the Bibliography.

5. Binomial sums

One area where hypergeometric identities are very useful is in the evaluation of sums of products of binomial coefficients. The main idea behind this procedure is writing such a sum as an hypergeometric series. In this section we present three examples illustrating the power of this technique. While working on examples of this type, we need to compute quotients involving binomial coefficients, so often it is useful to make use of the following identities (easy to check), which hold for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$:

$$(9.60) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad & \frac{\binom{\alpha+1}{k+1}}{\binom{\alpha}{k}} = \frac{\alpha+1}{k+1}, & \text{(iii)} \quad & \frac{\binom{\alpha+2}{k+1}}{\binom{\alpha}{k}} = \frac{(\alpha+2)(\alpha+1)}{(k+1)(\alpha-k+1)}, \\ \text{(ii)} \quad & \frac{\binom{\alpha}{k+1}}{\binom{\alpha}{k}} = \frac{\alpha-k}{k+1}, & \text{(iv)} \quad & \frac{\binom{\alpha+1}{k+2}}{\binom{\alpha}{k}} = \frac{(\alpha+1)(\alpha-k)}{(k+2)(k+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

It is also useful to keep in mind the relations

$$\binom{\alpha}{n} := \frac{\alpha(\alpha-1)\cdots(\alpha-n+1)}{n!} = \frac{(-1)^n(-\alpha)_n}{n!} = \frac{(\alpha-n+1)_n}{n!},$$

which hold for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

EXAMPLE 1. As a first example, we show that

$$(9.61) \quad \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^j \frac{\binom{\alpha}{j} \binom{\alpha-1-j}{n-j}}{j+1} = \frac{\binom{\alpha}{n+1} + (-1)^n}{\alpha+1}, \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{-1\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Proof. Denote the sum of the left-hand side by S , so that

$$S := \sum_{j=0}^n c_j, \quad c_j := (-1)^j \frac{\binom{\alpha}{j} \binom{\alpha-1-j}{n-j}}{j+1}.$$

To write this sum as an hypergeometric series, we first compute the ratio c_{j+1}/c_j and then we put it in the form (9.24):

$$\frac{c_{j+1}}{c_j} = -\frac{(j+1)\binom{\alpha}{j+1}\binom{\alpha-2-j}{n-1-j}}{(j+2)\binom{\alpha}{j}\binom{\alpha-1-j}{n-j}} = \frac{(j-n)(j-\alpha)(j+1)}{(j-\alpha+1)(j+2)} \frac{1}{j+1},$$

the last equality following immediately by (ii) and (i) in (9.60). Thus — cf. (9.25) —,

$$(9.62) \quad S := \sum_{j=0}^n c_j = c_0 \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-n)_j (-\alpha)_j (1)_j}{(-\alpha+1)_j (2)_j j!}, \quad c_0 := \binom{\alpha-1}{n},$$

and so the given binomial sum can be written in hypergeometric form as

$$(9.63) \quad S = \binom{\alpha-1}{n} {}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, -\alpha, 1 \\ -\alpha+1, 2 \end{matrix}; 1 \right).$$

At this point, one could try to apply the Pfaff-Saalschütz identity (9.53). However, the ${}_3F_2$ series in (9.63) is not of the form of the ${}_3F_2$ appearing in (9.53). (Indeed, if $a = -\alpha$, $b = 1$, and $c = -\alpha + 1$, then $1 + a + b - c - n = 1 - n \neq 2$.) Thus, the Pfaff-Saalschütz identity does not apply. Nevertheless, returning to (9.62), and noting that $(1)_j = j!$, $(2)_j = (1)_{j+1} = (j+1)!$, and $(z)_j = (z-1)_{j+1}/(z-1)$, we may write

$$(9.64) \quad \begin{aligned} S &= -\binom{\alpha-1}{n} \frac{\alpha}{(n+1)(\alpha+1)} \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-n-1)_{j+1} (-\alpha-1)_{j+1}}{(-\alpha)_{j+1} (j+1)!} \\ &= -\binom{\alpha-1}{n} \frac{\alpha}{(n+1)(\alpha+1)} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n+1} \frac{(-n-1)_j (-\alpha-1)_j}{(-\alpha)_j j!} - 1 \right) \\ &= -\binom{\alpha-1}{n} \frac{\alpha}{(n+1)(\alpha+1)} \left[{}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -(n+1), -\alpha-1 \\ -\alpha \end{matrix}; 1 \right) - 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The last ${}_2F_1$ may be computed by the Chu-Vandermonde identity (9.52), and so

$${}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} -(n+1), -\alpha-1 \\ -\alpha \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = \frac{(1)_{n+1}}{(-\alpha)_{n+1}} = \frac{(n+1)!}{(-\alpha)_{n+1}}.$$

Inserting this expression into (9.64) and simplifying the result, we obtain (9.61). \square

EXAMPLE 2. As a second example, let us show that

$$(9.65) \quad \sum_{j=0}^{n-m} \frac{(-1)^j}{j+1} \binom{n+j}{m+2j} \binom{2j}{j} = \binom{n-1}{m-1}, \quad m, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. It is clear that (9.65) holds if $n < m$, since in such case both sides of (9.65) are equal to zero (this holds because $\binom{k}{\ell} = 0$ if $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k < \ell$). Henceforth we assume $1 \leq m \leq n$. Let

$$S := \sum_{j \geq 0} c_j, \quad c_j := \frac{(-1)^j}{j+1} \binom{n+j}{m+2j} \binom{2j}{j}.$$

Since $\binom{n+j}{m+2j} = 0$ if $n+j < m+2j$, i.e., if $j > n-m$, then $c_j = 0$ if $j > n-m$, and so S is indeed a finite sum. Using (iii) and (iv) in (9.60), we compute

$$\frac{c_{j+1}}{c_j} = -\frac{(j+1)\binom{n+j+1}{m+2j+2}\binom{2j+2}{j+1}}{(j+2)\binom{n+j}{m+2j}\binom{2j}{j}} = \frac{(j+n+1)(j-n+m)(j+\frac{1}{2})}{(j+\frac{m}{2}+1)(j+\frac{m+1}{2})(j+2)}.$$

Thus, since $c_0 = \binom{n}{m}$, we obtain — cf. (9.25) —,

$$(9.66) \quad S = \binom{n}{m} \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{(n+1)_j (m-n)_j (\frac{1}{2})_j}{(\frac{m}{2}+1)_j (\frac{m+1}{2})_j (j+1)!} = \binom{n}{m} \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{(n+1)_{j-1} (m-n)_{j-1} (\frac{1}{2})_{j-1}}{(\frac{m}{2}+1)_{j-1} (\frac{m+1}{2})_{j-1} j!}.$$

If $m > 1$, using $(z+1)_{j-1} = (z)_j/z$, the last sum can be written as

$$(9.67) \quad S = -\frac{1}{2} \binom{n}{m} \frac{m(m-1)}{n(m-n-1)} \left[{}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} n, m-n-1, -\frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m-1}{2} \end{matrix}; 1 \right) - 1 \right].$$

Since $m < n+1$, by the Pfaff-Saalschütz identity (9.53) the last ${}_3F_2$ series becomes

$${}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} -(n+1-m), n, -\frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{m-1}{2}, \frac{m}{2} \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = \frac{(\frac{m-1}{2}-n)_{n+1-m} (\frac{m}{2})_{n+1-m}}{(\frac{m-1}{2})_{n+1-m} (\frac{m}{2}-n)_{n+1-m}}.$$

Inserting this expression into the right-hand side of (9.67) and simplifying the resulting equality — in this simplification process the relation

$$(\alpha - n)_k = (-1)^k (-\alpha + n - k + 1)_k$$

may be useful —, we obtain (9.65) whenever $m > 1$. If $m = 1$, noting that $(1)_j = j!$ and $(j+1)! = (2)_j$, the first equality in (9.66) gives

$$S = \binom{n}{1} {}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} -(n-1), n+1, \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{3}{2}, 2 \end{matrix}; 1 \right) = n \frac{(\frac{1}{2}-n)_{n-1} (1)_{n-1}}{(\frac{3}{2})_{n-1} (-n)_{n-1}} = 1,$$

where in the second equality we have used again the Pfaff-Saalschütz identity (9.53). This proves (9.65) for $m = 1$. Notice that since $c_j = 0$ if $j > n - m$ then in (9.65) one may replace $\sum_{j=0}^{n-m}$ by $\sum_{j \geq 0}$. \square

EXAMPLE 3. As a last example, we show that if $n, p \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(9.68) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} 2k \binom{2p}{k+p} \binom{2n}{k+n} = \frac{4np}{n+p} \binom{2p-1}{p} \binom{2n-1}{n}, \quad \ell := \min\{n, p\}.$$

Proof. Denote the sum of the left-hand side of (9.68) by S . Then

$$S = \sum_{k \geq 0} c_k, \quad c_k := 2(k+1) \binom{2p}{k+1+p} \binom{2n}{k+1+n}.$$

The last equality holds, indeed, since $c_k = 0$ if $k \geq \min\{n, p\} =: \ell$. To write this sum as a (terminating) hypergeometric series, we compute the ratio c_{k+1}/c_k :

$$\frac{c_{k+1}}{c_k} = \frac{(k+2)(k+1-p)(k+1-n)}{(k+2+p)(k+2+n)} \frac{1}{k+1}, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, \ell-1.$$

Thus — cf. (9.25) —, the given sum can be written in hypergeometric form as

$$S = c_0 \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(2)_k (1-p)_k (1-n)_k}{(2+p)_k (2+n)_k} = 2 \binom{2p}{1+p} \binom{2n}{1+n} {}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} 2, 1-p, 1-n \\ 2+p, 2+n \end{matrix}; 1 \right).$$

This ${}_3F_2$ series can be computed using Dixon's identity (9.58), taking therein $a = 2$, $b = p - 1$, and $c = n - 1$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} S &= 2 \binom{2p}{1+p} \binom{2n}{1+n} \frac{\Gamma(2)\Gamma(2+p)\Gamma(2+n)\Gamma(p+n)}{\Gamma(3)\Gamma(1+p)\Gamma(1+n)\Gamma(p+n+1)} \\ &= \binom{2p}{1+p} \binom{2n}{1+n} \frac{(1+p)(1+n)}{p+n}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (9.2). Therefore, taking into account (i) in (9.60), we obtain (9.68). \square

REMARK 9.8. The reader is invited to read the very interesting article [9], where Ranjan Roy presented (the above and) several other examples, pointing out the power of this technique to compute intricate binomial sums.

REMARK 9.9. A powerful technique to prove identities between hypergeometric functions was developed by Zeilberger and Wilf, called the *creative telescoping* method. This method is also referred to as the *W-Z method*, and it is described e.g. in the books [1] and [7]. It is worth mentioning that in [1] (p. 175), Andrews, Askey, and Roy wrote: “The discoveries of Wilf and Zeilberger truly revolutionized the study of summations of terminating hypergeometric series.” As a matter of fact, many further developments of

these techniques have appeared since then, including extensions to the so-called (basic) q -hypergeometric series as well as fully algorithm implementation on the computer.

Exercises

1. Prove the limit relation (9.19).

(Hint: Use Lebesgue's convergence dominated theorem and the connections between the Lebesgue integral and the proper and improper Riemann integrals. It may be useful to notice that for real t and $a > 0$,

$$\left(1 - \frac{t}{n}\right)^{a+n-1} \chi_{[0,n]}(t) \leq e^{1-t}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

2. Prove Euler's reflection formula (9.23).

(Hint. Set $t = s/(1+s)$ in the definition of the beta integral to obtain

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{s^{x-1}}{(1+s)^{x+y}} ds = \frac{\Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)}, \quad \Re x > 0, \quad \Re y > 0;$$

this gives

$$\Gamma(x)\Gamma(1-x) = \int_0^\infty \frac{t^{x-1}}{1+t} dt, \quad 0 < x < 1.$$

The last integral can be computed by the residue theorem using the contour integral

$$\int_{\Gamma_{\epsilon,R}} \frac{z^{x-1}}{1-z} dz,$$

where $\Gamma_{\epsilon,R} := C_{\epsilon,R} \cup \ell_{\epsilon,R}^+ \cup C_\epsilon \cup \ell_{\epsilon,R}^-$ is a closed path, $C_{\epsilon,R}$ is an incomplete circle around the origin of radius R with starting and ending points at $z = -R \cos \theta \pm i\epsilon$, not containing the point $z = -R$, being $0 < \epsilon < 1 < R$ and $\theta := \arcsin(\epsilon/R)$, C_ϵ is the semicircle around the origin of radius ϵ joining the points $z = \pm i\epsilon$ and containing $z = \epsilon$, and $\ell_{\epsilon,R}^\pm$ are two segments parallel to the negative real axis, one of them starting at $z = -R \cos \theta + i\epsilon$ and ending at $z = i\epsilon$, and the other one starting at $z = -i\epsilon$ and ending at $z = -R \cos \theta - i\epsilon$.

3. Prove Legendre's duplication formula:

$$\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(2x) = 2^{2x-1} \Gamma(x) \Gamma\left(x + \frac{1}{2}\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \left\{-\frac{k}{2} : k \in \mathbb{N}_0\right\}.$$

(Hint. Use $(2x)_{2n} = 2^{2n} (x)_n (x + \frac{1}{2})_n$ together with (9.4) and the definition of Γ .)

4. Prove the hypergeometric series representations (i)–(vi) given in Remark 9.4.

5. Show that the estimative (9.43) holds.

(Hint. For each $z_0 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus [1, +\infty)$, (9.43) holds if we define δ and $C(a, z_0, \delta)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &:= \frac{1}{2} |\Im z_0| \chi_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}}(\Im z_0) \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{1}{2} (1 - z_0) \chi_{(-\infty, 0]}(\Re a) + \frac{1}{6} (2 - z_0 - |z_0|) \chi_{(0, +\infty)}(\Re a) \right] \chi_{\{0\}}(\Im z_0), \\ C(a, z_0, \delta) &:= (1 + |z_0| + \delta)^{-\Re a} \chi_{(-\infty, 0]}(\Re a) \\ &\quad + \left[1/\delta^{\Re a} \chi_{\{0\}}(\Im z_0) + (1 + |z_0|/\delta)^{\Re a} \chi_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}}(\Im z_0) \right] \chi_{(0, +\infty)}(\Re a). \end{aligned}$$

In case $\Re a > 0$, it may be useful to notice that

$$|1 - xt|^2 = \begin{cases} (1 - z_0 t)[(1 - z_0 t) + 2t(z_0 - \Re x)] + |x - z_0|^2 t^2 & \text{if } \Im z_0 = 0 \\ |x|^2 \left(t - \frac{\Re x}{|x|^2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Im x}{|x|}\right)^2 & \text{if } \Im z_0 \neq 0 \end{cases}$$

holds for each $x \in \overline{B}(z_0, \delta)$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, and so

$$|1 - xt| \geq \begin{cases} \{(1 - z_0 t)[(1 - z_0 t) + 2t(z_0 - \Re x)]\}^{1/2} \geq \delta & \text{if } \Im z_0 = 0 \\ |\Im x|/|x| \geq \delta/(\delta + |z_0|) & \text{if } \Im z_0 \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

Then use (9.38) to obtain the desired estimative.)

6. Prove the following statements:

- (a) If x is fixed in \mathbb{C} and $|x| < 1$, then ${}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a, b \\ c \end{smallmatrix}; x\right)$ is an analytic function of the variables a , b , and c for all finite (complex) values of a , b , and c , except for simple poles at $c \in \{0, -1, -2, \dots\}$.
- (b) ${}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a, b \\ c \end{smallmatrix}; 1\right)$ is an analytic function of a , b , and c for all finite values of a , b , and c such that $\Re(c - a - b) > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, -1, -2, \dots\}$.

7. Give an alternative proof to Gauss's summation formula (Theorem 9.12), by using Euler's integral representation (or the technique of its proof) to firstly state Gauss's formula for $\Re c > \Re b > 0$, and then removing this constraint by analytic continuation on the parameters, using statement (b) in exercise 6.

8. Use Gauss's summation formula and Legendre's duplication formula to show that

$${}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -\frac{n}{2}, -\frac{n-1}{2} \\ \frac{2b+1}{2} \end{smallmatrix}; 1\right) = \frac{2^n (b)_n}{(2b)_n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \Re b > 0.$$

9. Let m and n be nonnegative integer numbers. Prove that

$$\sum_{k=0}^n \binom{m}{k} \binom{m+n-k}{m} \frac{(-1)^k}{m+n+1-k} = \frac{n!}{(m+1)_{n+1}}.$$

(Hint. This sum can be written as $\binom{m+n}{m} {}_3F_2\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -n, -m, -m-n-1 \\ -m-n, -m-n \end{smallmatrix}; 1\right) / (m+n+1)$.)

10. Use Dixon's identity and Euler's reflection formula to show that

$$\sum_{j=-\ell}^{\ell} (-1)^j \binom{2\ell}{\ell+j} \binom{2m}{m+j} \binom{2n}{n+j} = \frac{\binom{2\ell}{\ell} \binom{2m}{m} \binom{2n}{n} \binom{\ell+m+n}{m+n}}{\binom{\ell+m}{\ell} \binom{\ell+n}{\ell}},$$

where $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\ell := \min\{m, n\}$.

(Hint. Write the sum as $(-1)^\ell \binom{2m}{m-\ell} \binom{2n}{n-\ell} {}_3F_2\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -2\ell, -m-\ell, -n-\ell \\ m-\ell+1, n-\ell+1 \end{smallmatrix}; 1\right)$. To compute this ${}_3F_2$ apply Dixon's identity to ${}_3F_2\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -2\ell-2\epsilon, -m-\ell-\epsilon, -n-\ell-\epsilon \\ m-\ell+1-\epsilon, n-\ell+1-\epsilon \end{smallmatrix}; 1\right)$ for small $\epsilon > 0$, to the result apply Euler's reflection formula, and then take the limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$.)

11. Show that $y := {}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a, b \\ c \end{smallmatrix}; x\right)$ fulfills the *hypergeometric differential equation*

$$x(1-x)y'' + [c - (a+b+1)x]y' - aby = 0, \quad |x| < 1.$$

12. Prove the following hypergeometric representations of the classical orthogonal polynomials of Hermite, Laguerre, Jacobi, and Bessel (with standard normalization):

$$\begin{aligned} H_n(x) &= (2x)^n {}_2F_0\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -\frac{n}{2}, \frac{1-n}{2} \\ - \end{smallmatrix}; -\frac{1}{x^2}\right), \\ L_n^{(\alpha)}(x) &= \binom{n+\alpha}{n} {}_1F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -n \\ \alpha+1 \end{smallmatrix}; x\right), \\ P_n^{(\alpha, \beta)}(x) &= \binom{n+\alpha}{n} {}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -n, n+\alpha+\beta+1 \\ \alpha+1 \end{smallmatrix}; \frac{1-x}{2}\right) \\ &= \binom{n+\alpha}{n} \left(\frac{x+1}{2}\right)^n {}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -n, -n-\beta \\ \alpha+1 \end{smallmatrix}; \frac{x-1}{x+1}\right), \\ Y_n^{(\alpha)}(x) &= {}_2F_0\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -n, n+\alpha+1 \\ - \end{smallmatrix}; -\frac{x}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

These formulas hold for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{C}$ (with the natural definitions by continuity at the point $x = 0$ in the Hermite representation and at the point $x = -1$ in the second representation for the Jacobi polynomials).

13. Prove the following hypergeometric representations of the classical discrete orthogonal polynomials of Charlier and Meixner introduced in exercises **3** and **4** of text 4:

$$\begin{aligned} C_n^{(a)}(x) &= (-a)^n {}_2F_0\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -n, -x \\ - \end{smallmatrix}; -\frac{1}{a}\right), \\ m_n(x; \beta, c) &= (x+\beta)_n {}_2F_1\left(\begin{smallmatrix} -n, -x \\ -x-\beta-n+1 \end{smallmatrix}; \frac{1}{c}\right). \end{aligned}$$

These formulas hold for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{C}$.

Final remarks

As we mentioned at the begin of this text, we followed closely chapters 1, 2, and 3 from the book [1] by Andrews, Askey, and Roy, with some incursions on the books by Rainville [8], Bailey [2], Whittaker and Watson [10], and Lebedev [4], as well as on the so-called *Batman Manuscript Project* [3] (coordinated by Arthur Erdélyi), and on the work [6] by Maroni. The proof of Theorem 9.1 presented here does not assume any knowledge about infinite products, and it is based on the content appearing at the begin of Chapter XII in the book [10]. Indeed, assuming the knowledge of some basic facts

about infinite products, a more concise proof may be done. In [1] only statements (i) and (iii) in Theorem 9.7 were proved. Here we presented a detailed proof of (ii), giving the full details of the proof, as well as of the Euler integral representation (Theorem 9.9). Examples 1, 2, and 3 in Section 5 appear in the article [9] by Ranjan Roy, as well as in the book [1].

Exercises **2**, **3**, **4**, **9**, and **10** may be found in [1] (some of them presented here with some minor adjustments, reflecting our style of presentation of full details). Exercise **5** is suggested by the need to justify a differentiation under the integral symbol in the proof of Euler's integral representation (usually omitted in the literature). Exercises **6**, **7**, and **8** may be found in Rainville's book [8]. Exercise **11** appears in several introductory texts on hypergeometric series. The ODE which appears in it is in the historical origins of these series. The results expressed by exercises **12** and **13** are very important and they may be found in several texts mentioned in the bibliography. We point out that the suggestion given for proving the hypergeometric representations in exercise **12**, based on the explicit formulas for the classical OP deduced in the previous text/chapter, allow us to give very concise proofs for all these formulas (for instance, regarding the hypergeometric representation for the Jacobi OP, compare with Theorem 6.3.3 in [1], p. 295).

Bibliography

- [1] G. Andrews, R. Askey, and R. Roy, *Special Functions*, Cambridge University Press (1999) [paperback edition: 2000].
- [2] W. N. Bailey, *Generalized Hypergeometric Series*, Cambridge University Press (1935).
- [3] A. Erdélyi, Ed., *Higher Transcendental Functions*, vols. 1–3, McGraw-Hill (1955).
- [4] N. N. Lebedev, *Special Functions and their applications*, Prentice-Hall (1965). [Translated and edited by R. A. Silverman].
- [5] L. Mattner, *Complex differentiation under the integral*, Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde IV Ser. **5/2** (1) (2001) 32–35.
- [6] P. Maroni, *Fonctions eulériennes. Polynômes orthogonaux classiques*, Techniques de l'Ingénieur, traité Généralités (Sciences Fondamentales), A **154** (1994) 1–30.
- [7] M. Petkovšek, H. S. Wilf, and D. Zeilberger, *A = B*, A K Peters, Wellesley (2006), 3th ed.
- [8] E. D. Rainville, *Special Functions*, The Macmillan Company, New York (1960).
- [9] R. Roy, *Binomial identities and hypergeometric identities*, The American Mathematical Monthly **94** (1987) 36–46.
- [10] E. T. Whittaker and G. N. Watson, *A course of modern analysis*, Cambridge University Press (1963), 4th ed. reprinted.

APPENDIX A

Topics on locally convex spaces

In this text we review the most important facts concerning the theory of locally convex spaces (LCS) needed along the course. Most of the material presented here is from the book [3] by M. Reed and B. Simon (specially from Chapter V therein). The subject is also studied in deep detail in the book [6] by F. Trèves. Other recommended sources of information (containing concise presentations) are the books by M. Al-Gwaiz [1], B. Simon [4], P. Lax [2], and W. Rudin [5].

1. Definitions and basic properties

We denote by \mathbb{K} the scalar field of a given vector space, being either $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} .

DEFINITION A.1. *A seminorm on a vector space X is a mapping $p : X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ obeying the following two conditions:*

- (i) $p(x + y) \leq p(x) + p(y)$, $\forall x, y \in X$;
- (ii) $p(\lambda x) = |\lambda|p(x)$, $\forall x \in X$, $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{K}$.

A family of seminorms $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ is said to separate points if

- (iii) $p_\alpha(x) = 0$, $\forall \alpha \in A \Rightarrow x = 0$.

DEFINITION A.2. *A locally convex space (LCS) is a vector space X with a family $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ of seminorms separating points. The natural topology on a LCS is the weakest topology in which all the seminorms p_α are continuous and in which the operation of addition is continuous. (Often we will refer to it as the “ $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ –natural topology”.)*

PROPOSITION A.1. *The natural topology of a LCS is Hausdorff.*

A neighborhood base at 0 for the $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ –natural topology in a LCS X is given by the totality of the sets of the form

$$V(0; \epsilon, \{p_{\alpha_1}, \dots, p_{\alpha_N}\}) := \{x \in X : p_{\alpha_i}(x) < \epsilon, i = 1, \dots, N\} ,$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ and $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N\}$ is a (finite) subset of A . As a consequence, given a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ in X , and being $x \in X$, we deduce

$$(A.1) \quad x_n \rightarrow x \text{ in } X \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p_\alpha(x_n - x) \rightarrow 0, \forall \alpha \in A .$$

DEFINITION A.3. Two families of seminorms $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ and $\{q_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$ in a LCS X are called equivalent if they generate the same natural topology in X .

PROPOSITION A.2. Let $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ and $\{q_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$ be two families of seminorms in a LCS X . The following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ and $\{q_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$ are equivalent families of seminorms;
- (ii) each p_α is continuous in the $\{q_\beta\}_{\beta \in B}$ -natural topology, and each q_β is continuous in the $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ -natural topology;
- (iii) for each $\alpha \in A$, there are $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in B$ and $C > 0$ so that

$$p_\alpha(x) \leq C \sum_{i=1}^n q_{\beta_i}(x), \quad \forall x \in X;$$

and for each $\beta \in B$, there are $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in A$ and $K > 0$ so that

$$q_\beta(x) \leq K \sum_{i=1}^n p_{\alpha_i}(x), \quad \forall x \in X.$$

2. Fréchet spaces

THEOREM A.3. Let X be a LCS. The following are equivalent:

- (i) X is metrizable (i.e., the topology in X may be defined by a metric);
- (ii) 0 has a countable neighborhood base;
- (iii) the topology in X is generated by some countable family of seminorms.

REMARK A.1. If $\{p_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a countable family of seminorms generating the topology in a LCS X , then the application $d : X \times X \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ defined by

$$d(x, y) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} \frac{p_k(x - y)}{1 + p_k(x - y)}, \quad x, y \in X,$$

is a metric in X and it generates the same topology in X as the family $\{p_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$.

DEFINITION A.4. A complete metrizable LCS is called a Fréchet space.

REMARK A.2. Recall that a complete metric space is a metric space in which every Cauchy sequence is convergent (for some element in that space). In a metrizable LCS, whose topology is generated by the countable family of seminorms $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}}$, a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Cauchy if and only if

$$\forall \epsilon > 0, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{N}, \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N} : \forall n, m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad n, m \geq n_0 \Rightarrow p_\alpha(x_n - x_m) < \epsilon.$$

3. The inductive limit topology

Here we introduce the inductive limit topology in a particularly simple case, which, however, will be sufficient for our purposes. Up to some minor modifications (mostly concerning notation), essentially, we pursue following Reed and Simon.

DEFINITION A.5. *Let X be a vector space and $\{X_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ a family of subspaces of X such that*

$$X_n \subseteq X_{n+1}, \quad X = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n.$$

Suppose that each X_n is a LCS and let $i_n : X_n \rightarrow X$ ($x \mapsto x$) be the natural injection from X_n into X .

- (i) *The inductive limit topology (in X) of the spaces X_n is the strongest topology in X such that X is a LCS and all the maps i_n are continuous; we write*

$$X = \text{ind} \lim_n X_n;$$

- (ii) *if each X_{n+1} induces in X_n the given topology in X_n (i.e., X_n is a topological subspace of X_{n+1} with the relative topology), the above topology is called the strict inductive limit topology of the spaces X_n ;*
- (iii) *if—in addition to the conditions in (ii)—each X_n is a proper closed subspace of X_{n+1} , the above topology is called the hyper strict inductive limit topology of the spaces X_n .*

THEOREM A.4. *Let X be a LCS endowed with the strict inductive limit topology of the LCS X_n . Then the following holds:*

- (i) *the restriction of the (strict inductive limit) topology on X to each X_n is the given topology on X_n ;*
- (ii) *the collection of all convex sets $U \subseteq X$ such that $U \cap X_n$ is open in X_n for each n is a neighborhood base at 0 in X ;*

THEOREM A.5. *Let X be a LCS with the strict inductive limit topology of the LCS X_n , and let Y be any LCS. Then, a linear mapping $T : X \rightarrow Y$ is continuous if and only if each of the restrictions $T_n := T|X_n : X_n \rightarrow Y$ is continuous.*

THEOREM A.6. *Let X be a LCS with the hyper strict inductive limit topology of the LCS X_n . Then the following holds:*

- (i) *if $\{x_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a sequence in X and $x \in X$, then*

$$x_n \rightarrow x \text{ in } X \iff \exists k \in \mathbb{N} : x_n \in X_k \text{ for all } n \wedge x_n \rightarrow x \text{ in } X_k;$$
- (ii) *if all the spaces X_n are sequentially complete, then so is X ;*
- (iii) *X is not a metrizable space.*

REMARK A.3. Those who learned already about LCS (priori to this course) may be a little surprised because here we didn't made any reference to concepts such as “absorbing” set, “balanced” set, or “gauge” (among others). These are indeed very useful tools in the study of LCS—specially for a presentation of the theory of LCS including proofs of all the results stated—, but none for our presentation.

4. The weak dual topology

Let X be a vector space (over the field $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C}). The *algebraic dual* of X , denoted by X^* , is the set of all linear functionals $\mathbf{f} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. Usually the action of a functional $\mathbf{f} \in X^*$ over a vector $x \in X$ (i.e., the scalar $\mathbf{f}(x)$) will be denoted by

$$\langle \mathbf{f}, x \rangle .$$

If, besides being a vector space, X is endowed with a compatible topology (i.e., addition and scalar multiplication are continuous mappings), X is called a *topological vector space* (TVS). We denote by $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ the set of all linear and continuous operators between two TVS X and Y . In particular, the *topological dual* of a TVS X is the set

$$X' := \mathcal{L}(X, \mathbb{K}) = \{ \mathbf{f} \in X^* : \mathbf{f} \text{ is continuous} \} .$$

Clearly, $X' \subseteq X^*$. It is worth mentioning that this inclusion is actually an equality if X is a finite dimensional normed space, while it is a strict inclusion whenever X is an infinite dimensional normed space (a fact that can be proved using Zorn's Lemma). We emphasize, however, that there are infinite dimensional TVS, X , such that the set equality $X' = X^*$ holds.

DEFINITION A.6. *Let X be a TVS. The weak dual topology in X' is the topology in X' generated by the family of seminorms $\mathcal{S} := \{s_x | x \in X\}$, where each seminorm $s_x : X' \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ is defined for each $\mathbf{f} \in X'$ by*

$$s_x(\mathbf{f}) := |\langle \mathbf{f}, x \rangle| .$$

Endowed with the weak dual topology, X' becomes a LCS (and so it is an Hausdorff space). Henceforth, according with (A.1), given a sequence $\{\mathbf{f}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ in X' , we have

$$\mathbf{f}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{0} \text{ in } X' \quad \text{iff} \quad \langle \mathbf{f}_n, x \rangle \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall x \in X .$$

Because of this property, often the name *point convergence topology* is given to the weak dual topology in X' . Another one which we may find in the literature is *topology of convergence on the finite subsets of X* . This name is due to the fact that the collection of the sets of the form

$$V_{X'}(\mathbf{0}; \epsilon, F) := \{ \mathbf{f} \in X' : s_x(\mathbf{f}) < \epsilon, \quad \forall x \in F \} ,$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ and F is a finite subset of X , is a neighborhood base at $\mathbf{0} \in X'$.

DEFINITION A.7. Let X and Y be TVS, and $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. The dual operator (or dual mapping) of T is the (linear) mapping

$$T' : Y' \rightarrow X' \quad (\mathbf{g} \in Y' \mapsto T'\mathbf{g} \in X') ,$$

where $T'\mathbf{g} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is defined by

$$\langle T'\mathbf{g}, x \rangle := \langle \mathbf{g}, Tx \rangle , \quad x \in X .$$

THEOREM A.7. Let X and Y be TVS, and $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$. Let X' and Y' be endowed with the weak dual topologies. Then $T' \in \mathcal{L}(Y', X')$.

Bibliography

- [1] M. A. Al-Gwaiz, *Theory of Distributions*, Marcel Dekker, Inc. (1992).
- [2] Peter D. Lax, *Functional Analysis*, John Wiley & Sons (2002).
- [3] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics I: Functional Analysis*, Academic Press (1972).
- [4] B. Simon, *Real Analysis: A Comprehensive Course in Analysis*, Part 1, AMS (2015).
- [5] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, McGraw-Hill (1986) [paperback edition: 2004].
- [6] F. Trèves, *Topological Vector Spaces, Distributions and Kernels*, Academic Press (1967).