

THE SCALING LIMIT OF THE CORRELATION OF HOLES ON THE TRIANGULAR LATTICE WITH PERIODIC BOUNDARY CONDITIONS

MIHAI CIUCU

School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0160

ABSTRACT. We define the correlation of holes on the triangular lattice under periodic boundary conditions and study its asymptotics as the distances between the holes grow to infinity. We prove that the joint correlation of an arbitrary collection of lattice-triangular holes of even sides satisfies, for large separations between the holes, a Coulomb law and a superposition principle that perfectly parallel the laws of two dimensional electrostatics, with physical charges corresponding to holes, and their magnitude to the difference between the number of right-pointing and left-pointing unit triangles in each hole.

We detail this parallel by indicating that, as a consequence of our result, the relative probabilities of finding a fixed collection of holes at given mutual distances (when sampling uniformly at random over all unit rhombus tilings of the complement of the holes) approaches, for large separations between the holes, the relative probabilities of finding the corresponding two dimensional physical system of charges at given mutual distances. Physical temperature corresponds to a parameter refining the background triangular lattice.

We also give an equivalent phrasing of our result in terms of covering surfaces of given holonomy. From this perspective, two dimensional electrostatic potential energy arises by averaging over all possible discrete geometries of the covering surfaces.


Introduction

In [3] we considered the joint correlation ω of symmetrically distributed holes on the triangular lattice, a natural extension of the monomer-monomer correlation introduced by Fisher and Stephenson in [10]. Under the assumption that one of the holes is a unit lattice triangle u on the symmetry axis ℓ and all remaining holes are lattice triangles of side 2, oriented so that they point away from the lattice line perpendicular to ℓ that supports

Research supported in part by NSF grant DMS 0100950.

u , we proved in [3] that, asymptotically as the distances between holes are large, ω satisfies a multiplicative superposition principle that perfectly parallels the superposition principle of two dimensional electrostatics (with holes corresponding to electrical charges, and charge magnitude given by the difference between the number of up-pointing and down-pointing unit triangles in a hole). Our proof was based on explicit product formulas we obtained in [4] for the number of lozenge tilings of two families of lattice regions.

The correlation we used in [3] was defined by including the holes inside a lattice hexagon approaching infinite size so that the holes remain around its center. The presence of the boundary of the hexagon distorts the local dimer statistics. More precisely, there exists an explicit real valued function f defined on the hexagon (f is the unique maximum of a certain local entropy integral; see [8][7]) so that in the scaling limit the local statistics of dimers at each point inside the hexagon is governed by $\mu_{s,t}$, where (s,t) is the tilt of f at that point and $\mu_{s,t}$ is the unique invariant Gibbs measure of slope (s,t) (this was conjectured by Cohn, Kenyon and Propp in [7] and proved and generalized by Sheffield in [21] and Kenyon, Okounkov and Sheffield in [17]). It follows from the latter two papers that $\mu_{0,0}$ is the unique invariant Gibbs measure of maximal entropy. Since the function f has tilt $(0,0)$ only at the center of the hexagon, the local dimer statistics is distorted away from maximal entropy everywhere except at the center¹:



A typical lozenge tiling of a hexagon of side 40.

¹This figure is courtesy of David Wilson.

(for more details, see [8]; this does not happen in the case of a square on the square lattice considered in [10]). Therefore, an important goal is to define the correlation of holes in a different way, via regions that do not distort the dimer statistics, and determine whether it still reduces to the superposition principle of electrostatics in the limit as the holes grow far apart. Other highly desirable features are to allow general, not necessarily symmetric distributions of the holes, as well as holes of arbitrary size.

It is these goals that we accomplish in this paper. We give a new definition for the correlation of holes by including them in a sequence of lattice tori of size approaching infinity (see Section 1). We prove that this new correlation also reduces to the superposition principle of electrostatics as the distances between the holes grow to infinity.

We note that by [21] and [17] the torus measures on doubly periodic bipartite planar graphs converge to the maximal entropy invariant Gibbs measure. Thus defining hole correlations via limits of tori is consistent with our goal of having maximal entropy dimer statistics.

The main result of this paper, Theorem 1.1, addresses the case of an arbitrary collection of lattice-triangular holes of even sides. It is a counterpart of our result [3, Theorem 2.1], but more general than that in three important ways: (1) no symmetry of the distribution of the holes is assumed here; (2) the triangular holes are allowed to have arbitrary even sides, and (3) the multiplicative constant has an explicit conceptual interpretation—it is obtained by multiplying a simple explicit constant, depending only on the charges of the holes, by the product of the correlations of each hole regarded on its own.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, the parallel to electrostatics described in [3], which was restricted there by assumptions of symmetry and charge, becomes now established in general—including the presence of a “lattice refinement” parameter which corresponds to physical temperature. We detail this in Section 15, where we also give an equivalent phrasing of our result in terms of covering surfaces of given holonomy. From this perspective, two dimensional electrostatics arises by averaging over all possible discrete geometries of the covering surfaces.

Regarded from the point of view of surface models, our result raises naturally the question of describing the limit of the average height function — which can be suitably defined, even though as we see in Section 15 it is multivalued in general — as the lattice spacing approaches zero. It turns out that the right object to consider is, by contrast to other dimer surface limit shape results in the literature (see [6][8][7]), the un-normalized average height function (the normalized one approaches zero in the fine mesh limit), and, as we show in [5], the limit surface is a sum of helicoids. This in turn is equivalent to the statement that a certain naturally defined discrete field (the 90° rotation of the tilt of the average height function) converges in the scaling limit to the electric field; see Section 15 for more details. The general surface models arising from dimers on doubly periodic bipartite planar graphs are studied in [17], where they are classified according to the

behavior of the variance of the height function.

The defining difference between our results and the above quoted ones is the presence of holes. Indeed, the boundaries of the holes form the only boundary present in our case. If there are no holes, the effects we are studying in this paper and in [5] are not present. Consistent with this is that for instance [17] focuses on the variance of height function differences, since the behavior of the average height function is not so interesting in the absence of boundary. So we could say that when specialized to the hexagonal lattice with unit weights the results of [17] give the variance of the height function differences (the field mentioned in the previous paragraph being zero), while the sequel [5] of this paper gives the value of the field created by the presence of holes.

It appears that there are very few rigorously proved results on the asymptotics of the correlation of non-zero charge holes in the literature (it is this case that reveals electrostatics as the governing law; the particular instance of holes of charge zero equivalent to dimer-dimer correlations has been studied more; see e.g. [10]). In fact, the only such result the author is aware of is the monomer-monomer correlation on the square lattice along a lattice diagonal direction obtained by Hartwig [11] (this was conjectured in [10]). For a discussion of the differences between our set-up and other discrete models for Coulomb gas in the physics literature, and for some earlier pointers to electrostatics suggested by the study of the spin-spin correlation in the Ising model, see [3, pp. 2–3 and 91].

In order to relate the results of this paper to those of [2] and [3], we note that despite their very different definitions, the correlation $\hat{\omega}$ considered in this paper and the correlation ω of [3] turn out to satisfy, up to a multiplicative constant, the same asymptotic superposition principle. We also note that the special case of Theorem 1.1 when one has just two oppositely oriented lattice triangular holes of side 2 was treated in [2] using a third, quite different definition of correlation, and was shown there to obey exactly the same asymptotics as the one that follows by Theorem 1.1 for $\hat{\omega}$ in this special case.

We conclude by mentioning that, as pointed out by the anonymous referee, in a different surface model, the discrete Gaussian free field model (see e.g. [22]), there is a natural analog of holes. Moreover, the question of determining the scaling limit of the average height function in the presence of these “holes” is much simpler than what it turns out to be in our model, and also leads to two dimensional electrostatics. In view of previous connections between the discrete Gaussian free field model and the dimer model (see e.g. Boutillier [1] or Kenyon [16]), this may offer an intuitive reason why the results we obtain in this paper and in [5] should hold.

1. Definition of $\hat{\omega}$ and statement of main result

Draw the triangular lattice so that some of the lattice lines are vertical. For terminolog-

ical brevity, we will often refer to unit lattice triangles as *monomers*; a left-pointing (resp., right-pointing) unit lattice triangle is called a *left-monomer* (resp., *right-monomer*).

For any finite union Q of unit holes on the triangular lattice, define the *charge* $\text{ch}(Q)$ of Q to be the number of right-monomers in Q minus the number of left-monomers in Q .

Let $U_1, \dots, U_n$ be arbitrary unit holes on the triangular lattice. Following Kenyon [14], provided $\sum_{i=1}^n \text{ch}(U_i) = 0$, we define the joint correlation of $U_1, \dots, U_n$ by

$$\omega_1(U_1, \dots, U_n) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(H_{N,N} \setminus U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n)}{M(H_{N,N})}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $H_{N,N}$ is a large lattice rhombus of side N whose opposite sides are identified so as to create a torus, and $M(R)$ denotes the number of lozenge tilings of the lattice region R (a lozenge, or unit rhombus, is the union of any two unit lattice triangles that share an edge)².

An important advantage of this definition is that, provided $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n$ is a union of non-overlapping lattice triangles of side 2, [14] and [15] provide an expression for $\omega_1(Q_1, \dots, Q_n)$ as a determinant.

To state this explicitly, we introduce the following system of coordinates on the monomers of the triangular lattice. Choose the origin O to be at the center of a vertical unit lattice segment, and pick the x - and y -coordinate axes to be straight lines through O of polar arguments $-\pi/3$ and $\pi/3$, respectively. Coordinatize left-monomers by the (integer) coordinates of the midpoints of their vertical sides; coordinatize each right-monomer likewise, by the coordinates of the midpoint of its vertical side (thus any pair of integers specifies a unique left-monomer and a unique right-monomer, sharing a vertical side).

Let $(l_1, l'_1), \dots, (l_k, l'_k)$ be the coordinates of the left-monomers contained in the union $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n$ of our holes, and let the coordinates of the right-monomers contained in this union be $(r_1, r'_1), \dots, (r_k, r'_k)$ (the latter are the same in number as the former, since we are assuming the total charge of the unit holes to be zero). Then, provided $U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_n$ is a union of non-overlapping lattice triangles of side 2, it follows by [14] and [15] that

$$\omega_1(U_1, \dots, U_n) = |\det(P(r_i - l_j, r'_i - l'_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}|, \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$P(x, y) := \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{e^{ix\theta} e^{iy\phi} d\theta d\phi}{1 + e^{-i\theta} + e^{-i\phi}}. \quad (1.3)$$

²The total charge of the the holes needs to be zero in order for the region in the numerator of (1.1) to contain the same number of each type of unit triangles—a necessary condition for the existence of lozenge tilings. For any situation when the total charge is not zero, (1.1) would assign value 0 to the joint correlation of the holes, irrespective of their relative positions.

Thus, if $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$ are holes that are unions of non-overlapping triangles of side 2, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\sum_{i=1}^n \text{ch}(Q_i) = 0$, defining their correlation by ω_1 seems both natural and convenient, as the above determinant formula can be used as a starting point for determining its asymptotics.

What if $\sum_{i=1}^n \text{ch}(Q_i) \neq 0$? We need then an appropriate extension of the correlation ω_1 that applies also in this situation, and is manageable enough to work with so that its asymptotics can still be worked out. We found that the following inductively defined correlation $\hat{\omega}$ does the job. This was a crucial part of our proof.

DEFINITION. *Let $T_1, \dots, T_n$ be lattice triangular holes of side 2.*

If $q = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{ch}(T_i) \geq 0$, define their joint correlation $\hat{\omega}(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ inductively by:

(i) If $q = 0$, define $\hat{\omega}$ by (1.1).

(ii) If $q = 2s$, $s \geq 1$, define

$$\hat{\omega}(T_1, \dots, T_n) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (3r)^{2s} \hat{\omega}(T_1, \dots, T_n, W(3r, 0)),$$

where $W(3r, 0)$ is the left- (or west-) pointing lattice triangle of side two whose western-most left-monomer has coordinates $(3r, 0)$.

If $q < 0$, consider the mirror images $\bar{T}_1, \dots, \bar{T}_n$ of our holes across a vertical lattice line, and define $\hat{\omega}(T_1, \dots, T_n) := \hat{\omega}(\bar{T}_1, \dots, \bar{T}_n)$.

(The fact that $\hat{\omega}$ is well-defined by the above follows from Propositions 3.2 and 4.1.)

Note that $\hat{\omega}$ is defined via a sequence of toroidal regions of sizes growing to infinity. Since, in stark contrast with the case of the hexagonal regions used to define the correlation ω of [3], the periodic boundary conditions of such regions do not distort in the limit the local dimer statistics, the definition $\hat{\omega}$ for the correlation seems much more natural from a physical point of view than the ω defined in [3]. The question is: Does the asymptotics of $\hat{\omega}$ also lead to the superposition principle of electrostatics? The object of this paper is to prove that the answer to this question is affirmative.

To state our results explicitly, pick a reference monomer μ in each hole Q under consideration, and define $Q(a, b)$ to be the translated copy of Q in which the image of μ has coordinates (a, b) .

The main result of this paper is the following.

THEOREM 1.1. *Let $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$ be lattice-triangular holes of even side-lengths (see Figure 1.1(a) for an illustration). Then for any family of n distinct pairs of integer multiples*

of 3, (x_i, y_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\omega}(\Delta_1(Rx_1, Ry_1), \dots, \Delta_n(Rx_n, Ry_n)) &= \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2} \{ \sum_{i=1}^n |\text{ch}(\Delta_i)| - |\sum_{i=1}^n \text{ch}(\Delta_i)| \}} \prod_{i=1}^n \hat{\omega}(\Delta_i) \\ &\times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(\Delta_i(Rx_i, Ry_i), \Delta_j(Rx_j, Ry_j))^{\frac{1}{2} \text{ch}(\Delta_i) \text{ch}(\Delta_j)} \\ &+ O(R^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \text{ch}(\Delta_i) \text{ch}(\Delta_j) - 1}), \end{aligned}$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$, where d denotes the Euclidean distance.

To prove this, it turns out to be convenient to generalize first the above statement by introducing a number of new parameters. These will be essential for the evaluation of a certain determinant which represents a key step of our calculations.

To state this generalization, let Q_i be an arbitrary union of non-overlapping lattice triangles of side two, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since Q_i is not necessarily connected, we call it a *multihole*.

Consider the case of multiholes satisfying the following three conditions: (1) each Q_i is *pure*, i.e., is a union of like-oriented lattice triangular holes of side 2; (2) each Q_i is *linear*, i.e., its constituent lattice triangular holes of side 2 have their centers along a straight (not necessarily lattice) line; and (3) the directions of these pure and linear multiholes are all parallel among themselves (an instance of such multiholes is pictured in Figure 1.1(b)).

We will say that a rational number r is divisible by 3 if $r = a/b$, where a and b are relatively prime integers and $3|a$. The generalization of Theorem 1.1 we need is the following.

THEOREM 1.2. *If $L_1, \dots, L_n$ are pure, linear and parallel multiholes, and if the slope $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ of their common direction satisfies $3|1 - q$, then for any family of n distinct pairs of integer multiples of 3, (x_i, y_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\omega}(L_1(Rx_1, Ry_1), \dots, L_n(Rx_n, Ry_n)) &= \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2} \{ \sum_{i=1}^n |\text{ch}(L_i)| - |\sum_{i=1}^n \text{ch}(L_i)| \}} \prod_{i=1}^n \hat{\omega}(L_i) \\ &\times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} d(L_i(Rx_i, Ry_i), L_j(Rx_j, Ry_j))^{\frac{1}{2} \text{ch}(L_i) \text{ch}(L_j)} \\ &+ O(R^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \text{ch}(L_i) \text{ch}(L_j) - 1}), \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

as $R \rightarrow \infty$, where d denotes the Euclidean distance.




FIGURE 1.1. (a) Triangular holes of even side. (b) An example of pure, linear, parallel multiholes (ellipses indicate that multiholes keep fixed size and shape as they move away from one another).

We note that the assumption $3|1 - q$ on the slope q of the common direction of the linear multiholes is not really essential, but makes the calculations in Sections 5–7 simpler (outside this assumption, Newton’s divided differences need to be adjusted by introducing some multiplicative constants). In addition, the set of rationals q with $3|1 - q$ is easily seen to be dense in $\mathbb{Q}$. Similarly, the divisibility by 3 of the integers x_i and y_i is not really essential, but simplifies the application of the method of factor exhaustion to the evaluation of the determinant M'' given by (5.11)–(5.15) (see Sections 9, 11 and 12). It clearly does not impend on the generality of the directions of the rays through the origin that contain (x_i, y_i) .

Geometrically, the above result states that if the multiholes $L_1, \dots, L_n$ are translated away from each other at the same rate along fixed rays through the origin, with their shapes and sizes kept intact, then the asymptotics of their joint correlation $\hat{\omega}$ is given by an explicit multiplicative superposition principle. This corresponds to a refinement of the superposition principle of electrostatics: the R -dependent part on the right hand




FIGURE 1.2. An instance of pure, linear multiholes of arbitrary directions.

side of (1.4) parallels perfectly its physical counterpart (our statistic ch corresponding to electrical charge), but our multiplicative constant is given by the product of the correlations of the constituents of each multihole (this would correspond to the physical charges having some “structure”) times an absolute constant raised to a power that depends just on the $\text{ch}(L_i)$ ’s.

Equivalently, we could hold the location of the multiholes fixed, and refine the triangular lattice instead (more precisely, for each i , fix the geometrical position of some lattice point p_i in L_i and shrink L_i around p_i in step with the refinement of the lattice). From this perspective, Theorem 1.2 states that the scaling limit of the joint correlation of pure, linear and parallel multiholes is given by the described refined superposition principle. As the lattice spacing approaches zero, the multiholes, preserving their charge, become more and more point-like. Nevertheless, the specific way in which each multihole L_i approaches this point-likeness—the structure of L_i —makes itself felt as a multiplicative contribution of $\hat{\omega}(L_i)$.

Theorem 1.1 follows easily from Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Lemma 3.1(b), due to forced unit rhombic tiles, a triangular hole of side $2s$ is equivalent to a horizontal string of s contiguous triangular holes of side 2 (an instance of this is illustrated in Figure 1.1(b): the union of the leftmost three holes

in Q_1 forces a total of 12 unit rhombic tiles; their removal creates a triangular hole of side 6). Since in our system of coordinates horizontal lines have slope $q = 1$, the statement follows by Theorem 1.2. $\square$

Although the statement of Theorem 1.2 is general enough so that we can prove the determinant evaluation it boils down to by factor exhaustion (and thus deduce Theorem 1.1), it is worth mentioning that we can extend it further to the case when the pure, linear multiholes have arbitrary, not necessarily parallel directions.

THEOREM 1.3. *The statement of Theorem 1.2 holds more generally when the slopes q_i of L_i and q'_j of R_j are arbitrary rational numbers with $3|1 - q_i$, $3|1 - q'_j$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, n$.*

Such a more general instance is pictured in Figure 1.2.

REMARK 1.4. The approach employed in this paper does not allow the presence of holes shaped as lattice triangles of odd size. This is due to the fact that a certain advantageous employment (noticed by Kenyon [15]) of a construction of Percus [20] for obtaining a Pfaffian orientation of a subgraph from a Pfaffian orientation of the full graph, which allows expressing the ratio between the number of perfect matchings of a subgraph and the number of perfect matchings of the full graph as a determinant, is not applicable in this situation.

2. Deducing Theorem 1.2 from Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.2

Denote by $E(x, y)$ the right- (or east-) pointing lattice triangular hole of side 2 whose central monomer (a left-monomer) has coordinates (x, y) . For any $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and any list $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, \dots, a_n]$ of integers for which $qa_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the $E(a_i, qa_i)$'s are mutually disjoint, $i = 1, \dots, n$, define the multihole $E_{\mathbf{a}}^q$ by

$$E_{\mathbf{a}}^q := E(a_1, qa_1) \cup \dots \cup E(a_n, qa_n).$$

Similarly, let $W(x, y)$ be the left- (or west-) pointing lattice triangular hole of side 2 whose central monomer (a right-monomer) has coordinates (x, y) . Given $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and a list of integers $\mathbf{b} = [b_1, \dots, b_n]$ so that $qb_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the $W(b_i, qb_i)$'s are mutually disjoint, $i = 1, \dots, n$, define the multihole $W_{\mathbf{b}}^q$ by

$$W_{\mathbf{b}}^q := W(b_1, qb_1) \cup \dots \cup W(b_n, qb_n).$$

By definition, any pure and linear multihole is of the form $E_{\mathbf{a}}^q$ or $W_{\mathbf{b}}^q$. The parameter q gives the slope of the line containing the centers of the constituent triangular holes of side 2. Thus, the members of any family of pure, linear and parallel multiholes have one of the above two forms, and they all share the same q .

THEOREM 2.1. Let $m, n \geq 0$ be integers, and q a rational number for which $3|1-q$. For $i = 1, \dots, m$, let $\mathbf{a}_i = [a_{i1} < \dots < a_{is_i}]$ be a list of s_i integers so that $qa_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the $E(a_{ij}, qa_{ij})$'s are mutually disjoint, $j = 1, \dots, s_i$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $\mathbf{b}_i = [b_{i1} < \dots < b_{it_i}]$ be a list of t_i integers so that $qb_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the $W(b_{ij}, qb_{ij})$'s are mutually disjoint, $j = 1, \dots, t_i$.

Then for any family of $m+n$ distinct pairs of integer multiples of 3, (x_i, y_i) , $i = 1, \dots, m$, (z_j, w_j) , $j = 1, \dots, n$, we have, as $R \rightarrow \infty$, that

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\omega}(E_{\mathbf{a}_1}^q(Rx_1, Ry_1), \dots, E_{\mathbf{a}_m}^q(Rx_m, Ry_m), W_{\mathbf{b}_1}^q(Rz_1, Rw_1), \dots, W_{\mathbf{b}_n}^q(Rz_n, Rw_n)) = \\ & \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi} \right)^{\sum_{i=1}^m s_i + \sum_{i=1}^n t_i + |\sum_{i=1}^m s_i - \sum_{i=1}^n t_i|} (1+q+q^2)^{\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{s_i}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \binom{t_i}{2}} \\ & \times \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq s_i} (a_{ij} - a_{ik})^2 \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq t_i} (b_{ij} - b_{ik})^2 \\ & \times \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} [(x_i - x_j)^2 + (x_i - x_j)(y_i - y_j) + (y_i - y_j)^2]^{s_i s_j}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n [(x_i - z_j)^2 + (x_i - z_j)(y_i - w_j) + (y_i - w_j)^2]^{s_i t_j}} \\ & \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} [(z_i - z_j)^2 + (z_i - z_j)(w_i - w_j) + (w_i - w_j)^2]^{t_i t_j} \\ & \times R^{2\{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n s_i t_j\}} \\ & + O(R^{2\{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n s_i t_j\} - 1}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

PROPOSITION 2.2. Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $3|1-q$, and let $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, \dots, a_s]$ be integers so that $qa_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the $E(a_i, qa_i)$'s are mutually disjoint, $i = 1, \dots, s$. Then

$$\hat{\omega}(E_{\mathbf{a}}^q) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi} \right)^{2s} (1+q+q^2)^{\binom{s}{2}} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq s} (a_i - a_j)^2. \quad (2.2)$$

Theorem 1.2 follows easily from the above two results.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Re-denote the integer n in the statement of the theorem by N . Assume that m of the N given L_i 's point east; by assumption, they are of the form $E_{\mathbf{a}_1}^q, \dots, E_{\mathbf{a}_m}^q$, where $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $3|1-q$, and $\mathbf{a}_i = [a_{i1}, \dots, a_{is_i}]$ are lists of integers. The remaining $n := N - m$ multiholes are then of the form $W_{\mathbf{b}_1}^q, \dots, W_{\mathbf{b}_n}^q$, where $\mathbf{b}_i = [b_{i1}, \dots, b_{it_i}]$ are lists of integers.

Then the left hand side of (1.4) is clearly the same as the left hand side of (2.1). By Theorem 2.1, to complete the proof it suffices to show that the right hand side of (2.1) is equal to the right hand side of (1.4).

Clearly, by our definition of $\hat{\omega}$ in Section 1, Proposition 2.2 implies that for any $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, $3|1 - q$, and any list $\mathbf{b} = [b_1, \dots, b_t]$ of integers for which $W_{\mathbf{b}}^q$ is defined, one also has

$$\hat{\omega}(W_{\mathbf{b}}^q) = \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi}\right)^{2t} (1 + q + q^2)^{\binom{t}{2}} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} (b_i - b_j)^2. \quad (2.3)$$

By (2.2) and (2.3), the expression on the right hand side of (2.1) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\pi}\right)^{-\sum_{i=1}^m s_i - \sum_{i=1}^n t_i + |\sum_{i=1}^m s_i - \sum_{i=1}^n t_i|} \prod_{i=1}^m \hat{\omega}(E_{\mathbf{a}_i}^q) \prod_{i=1}^n \hat{\omega}(W_{\mathbf{b}_i}^q) \\ & \times \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} [(Rx_i - Rx_j)^2 + (Rx_i - Rx_j)(Ry_i - Ry_j) + (Ry_i - Ry_j)^2]^{s_i s_j}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n [(Rx_i - Rz_j)^2 + (Rx_i - Rz_j)(Ry_i - Rw_j) + (Ry_i - Rw_j)^2]^{s_i t_j}} \\ & \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} [(Rz_i - Rz_j)^2 + (Rz_i - Rz_j)(Rw_i - Rw_j) + (Rw_i - Rw_j)^2]^{t_i t_j}. \end{aligned}$$

However, since in our 60° -angle system of coordinates the Euclidean distance is given by the formula

$$d((a, b), (c, d)) = \sqrt{(a - c)^2 + (a - c)(b - d) + (b - d)^2},$$

the quantities in the square brackets are recognized to be the squares of Euclidean distances between the reference monomers in the pairs of multiholes

$$(E_{\mathbf{a}_i}^q(Rx_i, Ry_i), E_{\mathbf{a}_j}^q(Rx_j, Ry_j)),$$

$$(W_{\mathbf{b}_i}^q(Rz_i, Rw_i), W_{\mathbf{b}_j}^q(Rz_j, Rw_j)),$$

and

$$(E_{\mathbf{a}_i}^q(Rx_i, Ry_i), W_{\mathbf{b}_j}^q(Rz_j, Rw_j)),$$

respectively.

Furthermore, it is clear by definition that $\text{ch}(E_{\mathbf{a}_i}^q) = 2s_i$ and $\text{ch}(W_{\mathbf{b}_j}^q) = -2t_j$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Therefore the expression above is just the right hand side of (1.4) when the collection of multiholes $\{L_1, \dots, L_N\}$ is written out explicitly as $\{E_{\mathbf{a}_1}^q, \dots, E_{\mathbf{a}_m}^q, W_{\mathbf{b}_1}^q, \dots, W_{\mathbf{b}_n}^q\}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. $\square$

The above arguments reduce the proof of Theorem 1.2 to proving Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.2.

Outline of proof of Theorem 2.1. The arguments in the proof can be grouped in three parts.

The first part, covered by Sections 3 and 4, proceeds by providing an expression for $\hat{\omega}$ (see Proposition 3.2) as the determinant of a certain matrix M whose entries are of two types: on the one hand, values of the function P defined by (1.3), and on the other, values of certain two-variable polynomials $U_s(a, b)$, $s \geq 0$, that are the coefficients of the asymptotic series of $P(-R - 1 + a, -1 + b)$, as $R \rightarrow \infty$. Proposition 4.1 provides an explicit expression for the $U_s(a, b)$'s in terms of powers of the finite difference operator. We obtain this expression by Laplace's method for finding the asymptotic series of a contour integral. We use in our derivation Gauss' summation of a ${}_2F_1$ hypergeometric function and Newton's expression for a polynomial in terms of powers of the difference operator.

To prove the statement of Theorem 2.1 one needs then to determine the large R asymptotics of $\det(M)$. However, the matrix formed by the leading R -parts of the entries of M turns out to be singular. The second part of our proof, contained in Sections 5–7, addresses this complication by finding explicit elementary row and column operations on the matrix M so that the resulting matrix M' —clearly of the same determinant as M —has the property that the matrix formed by the asymptotics of its entries is non-singular. The row and column operations that achieve this turn out to be governed by Newton's divided difference operator. It is in this part that we crucially use the pure, linear and parallel structure of our multiholes.

Finally, in the third part (covered by Sections 8–12) we evaluate the determinant of the matrix M'' formed by the asymptotics of the entries of M' by the method of factor exhaustion. This well-known method of evaluating determinants with polynomial entries applies when the value of the determinant is guessed explicitly, and is a polynomial with all roots and multiplicities known. The method of factor exhaustion proceeds by showing that the determinant admits all these guessed roots with the guessed multiplicities, by finding a suitable number of independent row or column combinations that vanish when the variable equals the root in question. This, together with a comparison of the degrees, implies that the value of the determinant is equal to the guessed polynomial up to a multiplicative constant. An additional argument is then needed to establish this multiplicative constant, and thus the value of the determinant.

The guessed value of $\det(M'')$ follows from the expression on the right hand side of (2.1). The entries of M'' turn out to be rational functions in the variables q and x_i, y_i, z_j, w_j , $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. In Section 9 we prove that, regarded as a polynomial in q , $\det(M'')$ is divisible by the factors involving q in its guessed expression. Comparing degrees in q we deduce that it suffices to prove the determinant evaluation for the matrix M_0 obtained from M'' by specializing $q = 0$. To this end, we apply the method of factor exhaustion to dM_0 , where d is the least common multiple of the denominators of the

entries of M_0 .

We provide vanishing row and column combinations that prove the divisibility of $\det dM_0$ by the factors of its guessed expression in Sections 11 and 12. The fact that the specified row and column combinations are vanishing is deduced from known exact evaluations of ${}_2F_1$ and ${}_3F_2$ hypergeometric functions. This allows us to deduce in Section 10 the validity of the determinant evaluation up to a multiplicative constant. Finally, in the Appendix we show that the multiplicative constant is the one dictated by the right hand side of (2.1).

As described above, the obtained evaluation of $\det(M'')$ determines the asymptotics of $\det(M)$, and thus that of $\hat{\omega}$. This leads to the expression on the right hand side of (2.1), and completes the proof of Theorem 2.1. The details are given in Section 13. $\square$

Outline of proof of Proposition 2.2. We use the approach described in the first two parts of the above outline of the proof of Theorem 2.1, applying it to the single multihole $E_{\mathbf{a}}^q$. The corresponding matrix M'' turns out to be an upper-triangular block-matrix consisting of 2×2 blocks. The determinants of the diagonal blocks are readily calculated, and their product is checked to agree with the expression (1.6). The detailed proof is presented in Section 13. $\square$

The necessary changes in the proof of Theorem 1.2 that afford the more general Theorem 1.3 are presented in Section 14.

3. A determinant formula for $\hat{\omega}$

Recall the toroidal regions $H_{N,N}$ considered at the beginning of Section 1. We say that a collection $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ of holes on the triangular lattice *forces* a unit rhombic tile t on the lattice if t is present in all tilings of $H_{N,N} \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$, for all N large enough that $H_{N,N}$ contains $\mathcal{U}$. In proving our determinant formula for $\hat{\omega}$ we make use of the following simple observation. This is also needed to deduce Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.2.

LEMMA 3.1. (a). *Let $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ be a collection of unit holes having total charge zero, and let $t_1, \dots, t_k$ be unit rhombic tiles that are forced by $\mathcal{U}$. Then*

$$\omega_1(u_1, \dots, u_n, t_1, \dots, t_k) = \omega_1(u_1, \dots, u_n).$$

(b). *If the collection $\{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ of non-overlapping lattice triangular holes of side 2 forces the unit rhombic tiles $t_1, \dots, t_k$, then*

$$\hat{\omega}(T_1, \dots, T_n, t_1, \dots, t_k) = \hat{\omega}(T_1, \dots, T_n).$$

Proof. Both statements follow directly from the definitions of ω_1 and $\hat{\omega}$ in Section 1. $\square$

Consider the function P defined by (1.3). For $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $s \geq 0$, define $U_s(a, b)$ by writing the asymptotic series of $P(-3r - 1 + a, -1 + b)$, $r \rightarrow \infty$, as

$$P(-3r - 1 + a, -1 + b) \sim \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} (3r)^{-s-1} U_s(a, b).$$

By the definition of asymptotic series (see e.g., [19, p.16]), this means

$$P(-3r - 1 + a, -1 + b) - \sum_{s=0}^{n-1} (3r)^{-s-1} U_s(a, b) = O(r^{-n}), \quad (3.1)$$

for each fixed value of n . The fact that $P(-3r - 1 + a, -1 + b)$ admits an asymptotic series follows from Proposition 4.1, which also gives an explicit formula for the $U_s(a, b)$'s.

For notational brevity, it will be convenient to define the following families of 2×2 matrices:

$$A(x, y) := \begin{bmatrix} P(x-1, y-1) & P(x-2, y) \\ P(x, y-2) & P(x-1, y-1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.2)$$

and, for $s \geq 0$,

$$B_s(x, y) := \begin{bmatrix} U_s(x, y) & U_s(x-1, y+1) \\ U_s(x+1, y-1) & U_s(x, y) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.3)$$

The following result extends the determinant expression (1.2) for ω_1 to $\hat{\omega}$. In particular, it provides a determinant formula for the exact correlation of an arbitrary collection of non-overlapping triangular holes of side two ((1.2) addressed this only when there were the same number of holes of each orientation in the collection).

As in the previous section, let $E(x, y)$ and $W(x, y)$ denote the lattice triangular holes of side 2 that point east and west, respectively, and have their central monomer of coordinates (x, y) .

PROPOSITION 3.2. *For $m \geq n$ we have*

$$\hat{\omega}(E(a_1, b_1), \dots, E(a_m, b_m), W(c_1, d_1), \dots, W(c_n, d_n)) = |\det M|,$$

where M is the $m \times m$ matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix}
 A(a_1-c_1, b_1-d_1) & A(a_1-c_2, b_1-d_2) & \cdots & A(a_1-c_n, b_1-d_n) & B_0(a_1, b_1) & B_1(a_1, b_1) & \cdots & B_{m-n-1}(a_1, b_1) \\
 A(a_2-c_1, b_2-d_1) & A(a_2-c_2, b_2-d_2) & \cdots & A(a_2-c_n, b_2-d_n) & B_0(a_2, b_2) & B_1(a_2, b_2) & \cdots & B_{m-n-1}(a_2, b_2) \\
 \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot \\
 \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot \\
 \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot \\
 A(a_m-c_1, b_m-d_1) & A(a_m-c_2, b_m-d_2) & \cdots & A(a_m-c_n, b_m-d_n) & B_0(a_m, b_m) & B_1(a_m, b_m) & \cdots & B_{m-n-1}(a_m, b_m)
 \end{bmatrix}
 \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on $m - n$. Let $m - n = 0$. By definition, when the total charge of the holes is zero, $\hat{\omega}$ is the same as ω_1 . Therefore, by Lemma 3.1(a), the value of $\hat{\omega}$ on the left hand side above remains unchanged if we replace each $E(a_i, b_i)$ by the pair of right-monomers of coordinates $(a_i - 1, b_i)$ and $(a_i, b_i - 1)$, and each $W(c_j, d_j)$ by the pair of left-monomers of coordinates $(c_j, b_j + 1)$ and $(c_j + 1, b_j)$. Since in this collection the $4m$ monomers come in adjacent pairs, Theorem 2.3 of [15] is applicable, and, combined with (1.2), provides an expression for their joint correlation $\hat{\omega}$ as

$$\left| \det \left(P(r_i - l_j, r'_i - l'_j) \right)_{1 \leq i < j \leq 2m} \right|,$$

where (r_i, r'_i) and (l_i, l'_i) , $i = 1, \dots, 2m$, are the coordinates of the right-, respectively left-monomers in the collection. It is immediate to check that when listing the coordinates of the right-monomers in the order $[(a_i - 1, b_i), (a_i, b_i - 1) : i = 1, \dots, m]$, and those of the left-monomers in the order $[(c_i, b_i + 1), (c_i + 1, b_i) : i = 1, \dots, m]$, the above matrix becomes precisely the $m = n$ specialization of matrix (3.4).

Suppose now the statement holds for $m - n = k$. By the definition of $\hat{\omega}$ and by the

induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{\omega}(E(a_1, b_1), \dots, E(a_{n+k+1}, b_{n+k+1}), W(c_1, d_1), \dots, W(c_n, d_n)) \\
&= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (3r)^{2k+2} \hat{\omega}(E(a_1, b_1), \dots, E(a_{n+k+1}, b_{n+k+1}), W(c_1, d_1), \dots, W(c_n, d_n), W(3r, 0)) \\
&= \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} (3r)^{2k+2} \\
& \times \det \begin{bmatrix} A(a_1 - c_1, b_1 - d_1) & \cdots & A(a_1 - c_n, b_1 - d_n) & A(a_1 - 3r, b_1) & B_0(a_1, b_1) & \cdots & B_{k-1}(a_1, b_1) \\ A(a_2 - c_1, b_2 - d_1) & \cdots & A(a_2 - c_n, b_2 - d_n) & A(a_2 - 3r, b_2) & B_0(a_2, b_2) & \cdots & B_{k-1}(a_2, b_2) \\ \cdot & & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & & \cdot \\ \cdot & & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & & \cdot \\ A(a_N - c_1, b_N - d_1) & \cdots & A(a_N - c_n, b_N - d_n) & A(a_N - 3r, b_N) & B_0(a_N, b_N) & \cdots & B_{k-1}(a_N, b_N) \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where $N = n + k + 1$. By (3.1)–(3.3), one sees that adding suitable multiples of the last $2k$ columns to columns $2n + 1$ and $2n + 2$, the 2×2 block at the intersection of rows $2i - 1$, $2i$ and columns $2n + 1$, $2n + 2$ in the above matrix becomes:

$$\begin{bmatrix} (3r)^{-k-1}U_k(a_i, b_i) + O(r^{-k-2}) & (3r)^{-k-1}U_k(a_i - 1, b_i + 1) + O(r^{-k-2}) \\ (3r)^{-k-1}U_k(a_i + 1, b_i - 1) + O(r^{-k-2}) & (3r)^{-k-1}U_k(a_i, b_i) + O(r^{-k-2}) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3.6}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$. The contributions of the terms in the expansion of the determinant in which at least one of the $O(r^{-k-2})$ parts is chosen is clearly $O(r^{-2k-3})$. Therefore, omitting the $O(r^{-k-2})$ terms in these two columns does not change the limit (3.5). After omitting these terms, the factors $(3r)^{-k-1}$ can be factored out along these two columns, canceling the factor $(3r)^{2k+2}$ in the limit (3.5). By (3.3), the 2×2 block resulting this way from (3.6) is just $B_k(a_i, b_i)$. Interchange the pairs of columns $(2n + 1, 2n + 2k + 1)$ and $(2n + 2, 2n + 2k + 2)$ of the matrix resulting this way from the matrix in (3.5) to complete the induction step. $\square$

4. An exact formula for $U_s(a, b)$

The goal of this section is to prove the following result.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Let P be given by (1.3), and let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the coefficients of the asymptotic series*

$$P(-3r - 1 + a, -1 + b) \sim \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} (3r)^{-s-1} U_s(a, b), \quad r \rightarrow \infty$$

are given by

$$U_s(a, b) = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \left[\zeta^{a-b-1} (1 - D\zeta^{-1})^{-b} - \zeta^{-a+b+1} (1 - D\zeta)^{-b} \right] (x^s) \Big|_{x=a+b-1}, \quad (4.1)$$

where D is the difference operator (for a function f defined on $\mathbb{Z}$, Df is defined by $Df(x) = f(x+1) - f(x)$), and $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$.

Consider the functions

$$p(t) = -\ln(-1 - t) \quad (4.2)$$

$$Q(t) = t^{-b}(-1 - t)^{-a}. \quad (4.3)$$

In proving Proposition 4.1 we will use some properties of these functions, which are stated in the following three lemmas.

LEMMA 4.2. *The power series expansion of $Q(t)$ around $t = z$ is*

$$Q(t) = z^{-b}(-1 - z)^{-a} \sum_{k \geq 0} \left[\frac{(-1)^k}{k! z^k (1+z)^k} \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (a+b+l)_{k-l} (b)_l z^{k-l} \right] (t-z)^k. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. By Taylor's formula, it suffices to show that

$$\left. \frac{d^k}{dt^k} t^{-b}(-1 - t)^{-a} \right|_{t=z} = z^{-b}(-1 - z)^{-a} \left[\frac{(-1)^k}{z^k (1+z)^k} \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (a+b+l)_{k-l} (b)_l z^{k-l} \right]. \quad (4.5)$$

One readily sees that

$$\frac{d^l}{dt^l} t^{-b} = (-1)^l (b)_l t^{-b-l}$$

and

$$\frac{d^l}{dt^l}(-1-t)^{-a} = (a)_l(-1-t)^{-a-l},$$

for $l \geq 0$. Therefore, by Leibniz's formula for the derivative of a product, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{d^k}{dt^k} t^{-b}(-1-t)^{-a} \right|_{t=z} &= \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (-1)^l (b)_l (a)_{k-l} z^{-b-l} (-1-z)^{-a-(k-l)} \\ &= z^{-b}(-1-z)^{-a} (-1)^k \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (a)_{k-l} (b)_l (1+z)^{-(k-l)} z^{-l}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to prove (4.5) it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (a)_{k-l} (b)_l z^{-l} (1+z)^{-(k-l)} = (1+z)^{-k} \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (a+b+l)_{k-l} (b)_l z^{-l}. \quad (4.6)$$

Multiplying by $(1+z)^k$, both sides above become polynomials in z^{-1} of degree at most k . Therefore (4.6) will follow provided we check that the coefficient of z^{-n} is the same on both sides, for all $0 \leq n \leq k$. This is readily seen to amount to showing that

$$\sum_{l=n}^k \binom{k}{l} \binom{l}{l-n} (a)_{k-l} (b)_l = \binom{k}{n} (a+b+n)_{k-n} (b)_n, \quad (4.7)$$

for all $0 \leq n \leq k$.

The left hand side of (4.7) can be expressed in terms of a hypergeometric function³ by writing

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{k}{l} &= \frac{(-1)^l (-k)_l}{l!} = \frac{(-1)^l (-k)_n}{n!} \frac{(-k+n)_{l-n}}{(n+1)_{l-n}} \\ \binom{l}{l-n} &= \frac{l!}{n! (l-n)!} = \frac{n! (n+1)_{l-n}}{n! (l-n)!} = \frac{(n+1)_{l-n}}{(l-n)!} \end{aligned}$$

³The hypergeometric function of parameters $a_1, \dots, a_p$ and $b_1, \dots, b_q$ is defined by

$${}_pF_q \left[\begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix} ; z \right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a_1)_k \cdots (a_p)_k}{k! (b_1)_k \cdots (b_q)_k} z^k,$$

where $(a)_0 := 1$ and $(a)_k := a(a+1) \cdots (a+k-1)$ for $k \geq 1$.

$$(a)_{k-l} = (a)_{k-n} \frac{(a)_{k-l}}{(a)_{k-n}} = \frac{(-1)^{l-n} (a)_{k-n}}{(-a-k+n+1)_{l-n}}$$

$$(b)_l = (b)_n (b+n)_{l-n}.$$

Indeed, the left hand side of (4.7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=n}^k \binom{k}{l} \binom{l}{l-n} (a)_{k-l} (b)_l \\ = \frac{(-1)^n (-k)_n (b)_n (a)_{k-n}}{n!} \sum_{l=n}^k \frac{(-k+n)_{l-n} (n+1)_{l-n} (b+n)_{l-n}}{(n+1)_{l-n} (l-n)! (-a-k+n+1)_{l-n}} \\ = \frac{(-1)^n (-k)_n (a)_{k-n} (b)_n}{n!} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -k+n, b+n \\ -a-k+n+1 \end{matrix}; 1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

By Gauss' formula (see e.g. [23, (1.7.6), Appendix (III.3)]), for $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\operatorname{Re}(c-a-b) > 0$ and $c \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots$, one has

$${}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix}; 1 \right] = \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(c-a-b)}{\Gamma(c-a)\Gamma(c-b)}. \quad (4.9)$$

Let $b, k \geq n$ be fixed, and choose a to be a large enough negative integer so that $-a-b-n+1 > 0$ and $-a-k+n+1 > 0$. Then by (4.9) we get

$$\begin{aligned} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -k+n, b+n \\ -a-k+n+1 \end{matrix}; 1 \right] &= \frac{\Gamma(-a+1-(k-n))}{\Gamma(-a+1)} \frac{\Gamma(-a-b-k+1+(k-n))}{\Gamma(-a-b-k+1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{(-a+1-k+n)_{k-n}} (-a-b-k+1)_{k-n}, \end{aligned}$$

where at the last equality we used repeatedly that $\Gamma(x+1) = x\Gamma(x)$. Therefore, by (4.8) equality (4.7) amounts to

$$\frac{(-1)^n (-k)_n}{n!} (b)_n (a)_{k-n} \frac{(-a-b-k+1)_{k-n}}{(-a+1-k+n)_{k-n}} = \binom{k}{n} (a+b+n)_{k-n} (b)_n.$$

Dividing by $\binom{k}{n} = \frac{(-1)^n (-k)_n}{n!}$ and then multiplying by the denominator leads to having the same factors on both sides. This proves (4.7) for large enough negative integers a . Since both sides of (4.7) are polynomials in a , it follows that (4.7) holds for general a . This completes the proof of the Lemma. $\square$

LEMMA 4.3. For $z \neq -1$ the function $p(t)$ given by (4.2) is analytic in a neighborhood of z , and the reversion of its power series expansion

$$v := p(t) - p(z) = p_0(t - z) + p_1(t - z)^2 + \dots$$

is given by

$$t - z = (1 + z)(e^{-v} - 1). \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. The first part of the statement is clear. The expression for the reversion of the series also follows easily by exponentiating $-v = -p(t) + p(z) = \ln(-1 - t) - \ln(-1 - z)$:

$$\frac{-1 - t}{-1 - z} = e^{-v} \Leftrightarrow t - z + z + 1 = (1 + z)e^{-v} \Leftrightarrow t - z = (1 + z)(e^{-v} - 1).$$

□

Clearly, for the function $p(t)$ given by (4.2), $p'(t) = -1/(1 + t)$, so

$$\frac{1}{p'(t)} = -(1 + z) - (t - z). \quad (4.11)$$

LEMMA 4.4. Replacing $t - z$ in (4.4) and (4.11) by the expression given by (4.10) leads to

$$\frac{Q(t)}{p'(t)} = z^{-b}(-1 - z)^{-a} \sum_{k \geq 0} \left[-\frac{1 + z}{k!} \sum_{l=0}^k \frac{(b)_l}{l!} D^l(x^k) \Big|_{x=a+b-1} z^{-l} \right] v^k, \quad (4.12)$$

where D is the difference operator.

Proof. Denoting by $[v^k]f(v)$ the coefficient of v^k in the series $f(v)$, we need to show that for all $k \geq 0$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} [v^k] \frac{Q(t)}{p'(t)} &= [v^k] \left\{ z^{-b}(-1 - z)^{-a} \sum_{s \geq 0} \frac{1}{s!} \left[\sum_{l=0}^s \binom{s}{l} (a + b + l)_{s-l} (b)_l z^{-l} \right] (1 - e^{-v})^s \right\} \\ &\times \{ -(1 + z) - (1 + z)(e^{-v} - 1) \} = -z^{-b}(-1 - z)^{-a} \frac{1 + z}{k!} \sum_{l=0}^k \frac{(b)_l}{l!} D^l(x^k) \Big|_{x=a+b-1} z^{-l}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Since

$$[v^k] e^{-(j+1)v} = [v^k] \sum_{t \geq 0} \frac{(-j-1)^t v^t}{t!} = \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} (j+1)^k,$$

and thus

$$[v^k] (1 - e^{-v})^s e^{-v} = [v^k] \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j \binom{s}{j} e^{-(j+1)v} = \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j \binom{s}{j} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} (j+1)^k,$$

we obtain that the left hand side of (4.13) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & -z^{-b}(-1-z)^{-a}(1+z) \sum_{s \geq 0} \frac{1}{s!} \left[\sum_{j=0}^s \frac{(-1)^{j+k}}{k!} \binom{s}{j} (j+1)^k \right] \\ & \times \left[\sum_{l=0}^s \binom{s}{l} (a+b+l)_{s-l} (b)_l z^{-l} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Thus, equality (4.13) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^k \sum_{s \geq 0} \frac{1}{s!} \left[\sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j \binom{s}{j} (j+1)^k \right] \left[\sum_{l=0}^s \binom{s}{l} (a+b+l)_{s-l} (b)_l z^{-l} \right] \\ & = \sum_{l=0}^k \frac{(b)_l}{l!} D^l(x^k) \Big|_{x=a+b-1} z^{-l}, \end{aligned}$$

which in turn, by extracting the coefficients of z^{-n} and dividing by $(-1)^k(b)_n$, amounts to

$$\sum_{s \geq 0} \frac{1}{s!} \left[\sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^j \binom{s}{j} (j+1)^k \right] \binom{s}{n} (a+b+n)_{s-n} = \frac{(-1)^k}{n!} D^n(x^k) \Big|_{x=a+b-1}, \quad (4.15)$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Using the formula for the powers of the difference operator (see e.g. [24, p.36])

$$D^s f(u) = \sum_{j=0}^s (-1)^{s-j} \binom{s}{j} f(u+j), \quad (4.16)$$

the sum in the brackets in (4.15) is readily seen to be just $(-1)^s D^s x^k|_{x=1}$. Therefore (4.15) becomes

$$\sum_{s \geq n} \frac{(-1)^s}{s!} \binom{s}{n} (a+b+n)_{s-n} D^s x^k|_{x=1} = \frac{(-1)^k}{n!} D^n x^k|_{x=a+b-1}.$$

We show more generally that for any polynomial $f(x)$ one has

$$\sum_{s \geq n} \frac{(-1)^s}{s!} \binom{s}{n} (c+n)_{s-n} D^s f(x)|_{x=1} = \frac{1}{n!} D^n f(-x)|_{x=c-1}. \quad (4.17)$$

By the definition of D it follows that $D[f(-x)]|_{x=c} = -D[f(x)]|_{x=-c-1}$. Repeated application of this implies

$$D^n[f(-x)]|_{x=c} = (-1)^n D^n[f(x)]|_{x=-c-n}.$$

Using this, the right hand side of (4.17) becomes

$$\frac{(-1)^n}{n!} D^n f(x)|_{x=1-c-n}.$$

On the other hand, the left hand side of (4.17) equals

$$\sum_{s \geq n} (-1)^s \frac{(c+n)_{s-n}}{n! (s-n)!} D^s f(x)|_{x=1} = \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \sum_{s \geq n} \binom{-c-n}{s-n} D^s f(x)|_{x=1}.$$

Therefore, (4.17) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{j \geq 0} \binom{-c-n}{j} D^{n+j} f(x)|_{x=1} = D^n f(x)|_{x=1-c-n}. \quad (4.18)$$

However, this is readily deduced from Newton's formula for a polynomial $f(x)$ in terms of powers of the difference operator (see e.g. [13, (4), p.75]):

$$f(x) = f(d) + \binom{x-d}{1} Df(x)|_{x=d} + \binom{x-d}{2} D^2 f(x)|_{x=d} + \dots$$

Indeed, taking $x = 1 - c - n$, $d = 1$ in the above equality, and applying then D^n to both sides, we obtain equality (4.18). This completes the proof of (4.12). $\square$

We are now ready to present the proof of the main result of this section.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. By [14, (4.11)], for $x \leq -1$ the function P given by (1.3) can be written as

$$P(x, y) = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{e^{4\pi i/3}} t^{-y-1} (-1-t)^{-x-1} dt, \quad (4.19)$$

where the integral is a contour integral along the counterclockwise oriented arc of the unit circle connecting $e^{2\pi i/3}$ to $e^{4\pi i/3}$. Therefore, for all $R \geq a$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(-R-1+a, -1+b) &= -\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{e^{4\pi i/3}} t^{-b} (-1-t)^{R-a} dt \\
&= -\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{e^{4\pi i/3}} e^{-R[-\ln(-1-t)]} t^{-b} (-1-t)^{-a} dt \\
&= -\frac{i}{2\pi} \left\{ \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{e^{\pi i/3}} e^{-Rp(t)} Q(t) dt - \int_{e^{4\pi i/3}}^{e^{\pi i/3}} e^{-Rp(t)} Q(t) dt \right\}, \quad (4.20)
\end{aligned}$$

where $p(t)$ and $Q(t)$ are given by (4.2)–(4.3). We find the asymptotic series for large R of the two integrals in the curly braces using Laplace's method for contour integrals as presented in [19, Theorem 6.1, p.125].

Denote the two integrals by

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1(R) &= \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{-1} e^{-Rp(t)} Q(t) dt \\
I_2(R) &= \int_{e^{4\pi i/3}}^{-1} e^{-Rp(t)} Q(t) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

One readily verifies that $I_1(R)$ satisfies conditions (i)–(v) of [19, pp.121–122]. Indeed, $p(t)$ and $Q(t)$ are clearly independent of R and holomorphic in the open disk $D(e^{2\pi i/3}, 1)$, which contains the interior of the integration path $\mathcal{P}$; this checks conditions (i) and (ii). Condition (iii) requires $p(t)$ and $Q(t)$ to admit power series expansions around $t = e^{2\pi i/3}$; this is clear from their definitions. Condition (iv) requires $I_1(R)$ to converge at -1 absolutely and uniformly for R large enough; this is readily seen to be the case. Finally, to check condition (v) we need to show that $\operatorname{Re}\{p(t) - p(e^{2\pi i/3})\} > 0$ for $t \in (e^{2\pi i/3}, -1)$. Since $\operatorname{Re} p(t) = \operatorname{Re}\{-\ln(-1-t)\} = -\ln|-1-t|$, and $|-1-t| \leq 1$ throughout $\mathcal{P}$, with equality only for $t = e^{2\pi i/3}$, the latter requirement is verified as well.

Therefore, [19, Theorem 6.1, p.125] applies and the asymptotics series of $I_1(R)$ is given by

$$\frac{I_1(R)}{e^{-Rp(\zeta)}} \sim \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \Gamma\left(\frac{s+\lambda}{\mu}\right) \frac{a_s}{R^{(s+\lambda)/\mu}}, \quad (4.21)$$

where $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$, μ is the smallest power of $t - z$ with a non-zero coefficient in the series expansion of $p(t) - p(\zeta)$, $\lambda - 1$ is the smallest power of $t - \zeta$ with a non-zero coefficient in the expansion of $Q(t)$, and a_s is the coefficient of v^s in the power series expansion (4.12) of $Q(t)/p'(t)$. Since the value of p_0 in Lemma 4.3 is $p'(\zeta) = -1/(1 + \zeta) \neq 0$, we have $\mu = 1$. Lemma 4.4 shows that $\lambda = 1$, and also provides the explicit form of the a_s 's. Therefore (4.21) becomes

$$\frac{I_1(R)}{e^{-Rp(\zeta)}} \sim \zeta^{-b}(-1 - \zeta)^{-a+1} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \left[\sum_{l=0}^s \frac{(b)_l}{l!} D^l(x^k)|_{x=a+b-1} \zeta^{-l} \right] \frac{1}{R^{s+1}}. \quad (4.22)$$

The sum in the brackets is, by the binomial theorem, just $(1 - D\zeta^{-1})^{-b}(x^k)|_{x=a+b-1}$. Since $-1 - \zeta = \zeta^{-1}$ and $e^{-Rp(\zeta)} = (-1 - \zeta)^R = \zeta^{-R}$, we obtain from (4.22) the explicit asymptotic series of $I_1(R)$ to be

$$\frac{I_1(R)}{\zeta^{-R}} \sim \zeta^{a-b-1} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1 - D\zeta^{-1})^{-b}(x^k)|_{x=a+b-1}}{R^{s+1}}. \quad (4.23)$$

The value of the integral $I_2(R)$ is readily seen to be the complex conjugate of $I_1(R)$. It follows then from (4.23) that

$$\frac{I_2(R)}{\zeta^R} \sim \zeta^{-a+b+1} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1 - D\zeta)^{-b}(x^k)|_{x=a+b-1}}{R^{s+1}}. \quad (4.24)$$

Substituting (4.23)–(4.24) with R replaced by $3r$ in (4.20) and using $\zeta^3 = 1$ we obtain (4.1). $\square$

5. Asymptotic singularity and Newton's divided difference operator

Direct application of Proposition 3.2 to the collection of $\sum_{i=1}^m s_i + \sum_{j=1}^n t_j$ triangular holes of side 2 that the multiholes $E_{\mathbf{a}_1}^q, \dots, E_{\mathbf{a}_m}^q, W_{\mathbf{b}_1}^q, \dots, W_{\mathbf{b}_n}^q$ consist of leads to the following result.

Let $S = \sum_{i=1}^m s_i$ and $T = \sum_{j=1}^n t_j$.

LEMMA 5.1. For $S \geq T$, the correlation on the left hand side of (2.1) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\omega}(E_{\mathbf{a}_1}^q(Rx_1, Ry_1), \dots, E_{\mathbf{a}_m}^q(Rx_m, Ry_m), W_{\mathbf{b}_1}^q(Rz_1, Rw_1), \dots, W_{\mathbf{b}_n}^q(Rz_n, Rw_n)) \\ &= |\det(M)|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M = [C_1 \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad C_n \quad D] \quad (5.1)$$

is a $2S \times 2S$ matrix whose blocks are given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline P(-R(z_j - x_1) + a_{11} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_1) + q(a_{11} - b_{j1}) - 1) & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} & \dots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline P(-R(z_j - x_1) + a_{11} - b_{jt_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_1) + q(a_{11} - b_{jt_j}) - 1) & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline P(-R(z_j - x_1) + a_{1s_1} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_1) + q(a_{1s_1} - b_{j1}) - 1) & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} & \dots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline P(-R(z_j - x_1) + a_{1s_1} - b_{jt_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_1) + q(a_{1s_1} - b_{jt_j}) - 1) & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline P(-R(z_j - x_m) + a_{m1} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_m) + q(a_{m1} - b_{j1}) - 1) & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} & \dots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline P(-R(z_j - x_m) + a_{m1} - b_{jt_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_m) + q(a_{m1} - b_{jt_j}) - 1) & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline P(-R(z_j - x_m) + a_{ms_m} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_m) + q(a_{ms_m} - b_{j1}) - 1) & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} & \dots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline P(-R(z_j - x_m) + a_{ms_m} - b_{jt_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_m) + q(a_{ms_m} - b_{jt_j}) - 1) & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and

$U_0(Rx_1 + a_{11}, Ry_1 + qa_{11})$		$\dots$	$U_{S-T-1}(Rx_1 + a_{11}, Ry_1 + qa_{11})$	
$\vdots$			$\vdots$	
$U_0(Rx_1 + a_{1s_1}, Ry_1 + qa_{1s_1})$		$\dots$	$U_{S-T-1}(Rx_1 + a_{1s_1}, Ry_1 + qa_{1s_1})$	

$D =$

$\bullet$
 $\bullet$
 $\bullet$

$U_0(Rx_m + a_{m1}, Ry_m + qa_{m1})$		$\dots$	$U_{S-T-1}(Rx_m + a_{m1}, Ry_m + qa_{m1})$	
$\vdots$			$\vdots$	
$U_0(Rx_m + a_{ms_m}, Ry_m + qa_{ms_m})$		$\dots$	$U_{S-T-1}(Rx_m + a_{ms_m}, Ry_m + qa_{ms_m})$	

(5.3)

(C_j has $2S$ rows and $2t_j$ columns, D has $2S$ rows and $2S - 2T$ columns); here for a function f of two arguments the box

$f(x, y)$	

denotes the 2×2 matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(x, y) & f(x-1, y+1) \\ f(x+1, y-1) & f(x, y) \end{bmatrix},$$

and the large boxes with rounded corners outline $2s_i \times 2t_j$ blocks of (3.4) that correspond to a given pair $(E_{\mathbf{a}_j}, W_{\mathbf{b}_i})$ of multiholes.

Therefore, in order to determine the asymptotics of the correlation of the multiholes, it suffices to find the asymptotics of $\det(M)$ as $R \rightarrow \infty$.

In working out the asymptotics of the determinant of a matrix whose entries are functions of a parameter two situations can occur. Consider the matrix formed by the asymptotic approximations of the entries of the original matrix. If this matrix is non-singular, then its determinant gives the asymptotics of the determinant of the original matrix. On the other hand, the matrix of approximants may be singular. Then to find the asymptotics of the determinant of the original matrix, one needs in general to work with higher order terms of the asymptotic series of the entries, and both finding these higher terms explicitly and evaluating the resulting determinant gets usually very complicated.

It turns out that our matrix M falls into the second category: the matrix of the asymptotic approximants (as $R \rightarrow \infty$) of its entries is singular unless $s_1 = \dots = s_m = t_1 = \dots = t_n = 1$.

Fortunately, however, it also turns out that we can find suitable determinant-preserving row and column operations on M that transform it into a matrix M' which falls into the first category. The row and column operations that achieve this are patterned after the operator involved in the following result.

LEMMA 5.2. *Let X be an $n \times n$ matrix, and suppose rows $i_1, \dots, i_k$ in it are the vectors $f(c_1), \dots, f(c_k)$, respectively, where f is some vector function. Consider the operator μ that acts on rows $i_1, \dots, i_k$ of X by transforming them as*

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(c_1) \\ f(c_2) \\ \vdots \\ f(c_k) \end{bmatrix} \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}^0 f(c_1) \\ (c_2 - c_1) \mathcal{D}^1 f(c_1) \\ \vdots \\ (c_k - c_1)(c_k - c_2) \dots (c_k - c_{k-1}) \mathcal{D}^{k-1} f(c_1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is Newton's divided difference operator, whose powers are defined inductively by $\mathcal{D}^0 f = f$ and $\mathcal{D}^r f(c_i) = (\mathcal{D}^{r-1} f(c_{i+1}) - \mathcal{D}^{r-1} f(c_i)) / (c_{i+1} - c_i)$. Then $\det(\mu(X)) = \det(X)$.

Proof. By [13, (2), p.20], for any function f and any sequence $c_1, \dots, c_l$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(c_l) &= f(c_1) + (c_l - c_1) \mathcal{D} f(c_1) + (c_l - c_1)(c_l - c_2) \mathcal{D}^2 f(c_1) + \dots \\ &\quad + (c_l - c_1)(c_l - c_2) \dots (c_l - c_{l-1}) \mathcal{D}^{l-1} f(c_1). \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Define a sequence of matrices X_j as follows. Let $X_0 = \mu(X)$; let X_1 be the matrix obtained from X_0 by replacing row i_2 by the sum of rows i_2 and i_1 ; let X_2 be the matrix

obtained from X_1 by replacing row i_3 by the sum of rows i_3 and i_2 ; and so on. Clearly, rows $i_1, \dots, i_k$ of X_{k-1} are then $R_{i_1}, R_{i_1} + R_{i_2}, \dots, R_{i_1} + \dots + R_{i_k}$, respectively, where R_i stands for row i of $\mu(X)$. By (5.5), these are exactly rows $i_1, \dots, i_k$ of X . Thus, $X_{k-1} = X$. Since X_{k-1} was obtained by a sequence of elementary row operations from $\mu(X)$, it follows that $\det(\mu(X)) = \det(X_{k-1}) = \det(X)$. $\square$

We now define the matrix M' that resolves the asymptotic singularity of M described before the statement of Lemma 5.2.

By its definition in the statement of Lemma 5.1, it is apparent that for any $i = 1, \dots, m$, rows $2 \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} s_k + 1, 2 \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} s_k + 3, \dots, 2 \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} s_k + 2s_i - 1$ of M are of the form $f(a_{i1}), f(a_{i2}), \dots, f(a_{is_i})$, for a suitable vector function f . Apply the operator (5.4) on these s_i rows of M , for each $i = 1, \dots, m$.

By the same token, rows $2 \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} s_k + 2, 2 \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} s_k + 4, \dots, 2 \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} s_k + 2s_i$ of M are also of the form $f(a_{i1}), f(a_{i2}), \dots, f(a_{is_i})$, for a suitable vector function f . Apply the operator (5.4) on these s_i rows of M as well, for each $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let M_1 be the resulting matrix.

In the same fashion, for any fixed $j = 1, \dots, n$, it is clear from (5.1) that the columns of M with indices $2 \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} t_l + 1, 2 \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} t_l + 3, \dots, 2 \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} t_l + 2t_j - 1$, on the one hand, and those with indices $2 \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} t_l + 2, 2 \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} t_l + 4, \dots, 2 \sum_{l=1}^{j-1} t_l + 2t_j$, on the other, are each of the form $f(-b_{j1}), f(-b_{j2}), \dots, f(-b_{jt_j})$, for a suitable vector function f . Furthermore, the same is true for the corresponding two t_j -tuples of columns in matrix M_1 . We define M' to be the matrix obtained from M_1 by applying the operator (5.4)—which clearly works equally well for columns—along each of these t_j -tuples of columns, for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Thus M' is obtained from M by applying operator (5.4) for a total of $2m + 2n$ times.

To describe the entries of M' the following terminology will be convenient. We refer to the first $2T$ columns of M as the *P-part* of M ; the last $2S - 2T$ columns form the *U-part* of M (see (5.1)–(5.3)). The *P-part* consists of an $m \times n$ array of blocks, the block P_{ij} in position (i, j) being in turn a $s_i \times t_j$ array of 2×2 matrices⁴. The *U-part* of M is a column of m blocks, the block U_i in position i being an $s_i \times (S - T)$ array of 2×2 matrices. *Block-row* i consists of $P_{i1}, P_{i2}, \dots, P_{im}, U_i$; *block-column* j consists of $P_{1j}, P_{2j}, \dots, P_{nj}$ (it is precisely this block-column that is displayed in (5.2)). The 2×2 block-matrices naturally group the $2t_j$ columns of block-column j into t_j pairs of consecutive columns; we call them *bi-columns*; bi-column k of a block-column consists of columns $2k - 1$ and $2k$ of that block-column. *Bi-rows* are defined analogously.

Since the block structure of M_1 and M' is clearly the same as that of M , we use the above terminology for them as well.

⁴The block P_{ij} can be thought of as corresponding to the pair $(E_{\mathbf{a}_i}^q, W_{\mathbf{b}_j}^q)$ of multiholes; then its 2×2 block in position (k, l) corresponds to the pair $(E(a_{ik}, qa_{ik}), W(b_{jl}, qb_{jl}))$ of triangular holes of side 2.

With this terminology, a concise description of our constructions is that we first obtain M_1 from M by applying operator (5.4) along the top halves of the bi-rows in block-row i , and then along the bottom halves of the same bi-rows, for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. M' is obtained from M_1 by applying operator (5.4) along the left halves of its bi-columns in block-column j , and then along the right halves of the same bi-columns, for $j = 1, \dots, n$.

The 2×2 matrix in position (k, l) in the (i, j) -block of the P -part of M ($1 \leq k \leq s_i$, $1 \leq l \leq t_j$) is

$$\begin{bmatrix} P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{ik} - b_{jl} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{ik} - b_{jl}) - 1) & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{ik} - b_{jl} - 2, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{ik} - b_{jl})) \\ P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{ik} - b_{jl}, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{ik} - b_{jl}) - 2) & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{ik} - b_{jl} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{ik} - b_{jl}) - 1) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By our construction, the corresponding 2×2 matrix in M' is

$$\alpha_k^{(i)} \beta_l^{(j)} \mathcal{D}_b^{l-1} \mathcal{D}_a^{k-1} \begin{bmatrix} P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i1} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i1} - b_{j1}) - 1) & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i1} - b_{j1} - 2, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i1} - b_{j1})) \\ P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i1} - b_{j1}, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i1} - b_{j1}) - 2) & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i1} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i1} - b_{j1}) - 1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.6)$$

where the powers of $\mathcal{D}$ act entry-wise, $\mathcal{D}_a^{k-1}$ acting on the sequence $a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \dots, a_{is_i}$, $\mathcal{D}_b^{l-1}$ on the sequence $-b_{j1}, -b_{j2}, \dots, -b_{jt_j}$, and

$$\alpha_k^{(i)} = (a_{ik} - a_{i1})(a_{ik} - a_{i2}) \cdots (a_{ik} - a_{i,k-1}), \quad (5.7)$$

$$\beta_l^{(j)} = (-b_{jl} + b_{j1})(-b_{jl} + b_{j2}) \cdots (-b_{jl} + b_{j,l-1}). \quad (5.8)$$

On the other hand, the 2×2 submatrix of M at the intersection of rows $2k - 1$ and $2k$ of block-row i with columns $2T + 2l - 1$ and $2T + 2l$ ($1 \leq k \leq s_i$, $1 \leq l \leq S - T$) is by (5.1)–(5.3)

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_{l-1}(Rx_i + a_{ik}, Ry_i + qa_{ik}) & U_{l-1}(Rx_i + a_{ik} - 1, Ry_i + qa_{ik} + 1) \\ U_{l-1}(Rx_i + a_{ik} + 1, Ry_i + qa_{ik} - 1) & U_{l-1}(Rx_i + a_{ik}, Ry_i + qa_{ik}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

By our construction, the corresponding 2×2 submatrix of M_1 —and thus of M' , as our applications of the operator (5.4) to M_1 do not affect the U -part of M_1 —is

$$\alpha_k^{(i)} \mathcal{D}_a^{k-1} \begin{bmatrix} U_{l-1}(Rx_i + a_{i1}, Ry_i + qa_{i1}) & U_{l-1}(Rx_i + a_{i1} - 1, Ry_i + qa_{i1} + 1) \\ U_{l-1}(Rx_i + a_{i1} + 1, Ry_i + qa_{i1} - 1) & U_{l-1}(Rx_i + a_{i1}, Ry_i + qa_{i1}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.9)$$

with $\alpha_k^{(i)}$ given by (5.7).

Thus in short, the 2×2 blocks that form M' —the matrix of the same determinant as M , but whose entries' approximants will turn out to form a non-singular matrix—are given by (5.6)–(5.9).

The asymptotics of the entries of (5.6) and (5.9) is worked out in the next two sections. The formulas we obtain there lead us to the following result.

PROPOSITION 5.3. *The asymptotics of the determinant of the matrix M in the statement of Lemma 5.1 is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \det(M) = (-1)^S \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^{2S} & \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq s_i} (a_{ij} - a_{ik})^2 \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq t_i} (b_{ij} - b_{ik})^2 \\ & \times \det(M'') R^{2\{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n s_i t_j\}} \\ & + O(R^{2\{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n s_i t_j\} - 1}), \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

where

$$M'' = [C'' \quad D''] \quad (5.11)$$

is the $2S \times 2S$ matrix whose blocks are given by

$$C'' = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_1 - x_1, w_1 - y_1) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_1 - 1, 0, z_1 - x_1, w_1 - y_1) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \cdots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_1 - x_1, w_1 - y_1) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_1 - 1, 0, z_1 - x_1, w_1 - y_1) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_n - 1, 0, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \cdots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_n - 1, 0, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} \quad \bullet \cdots \bullet \quad \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_n - 1, 0, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \cdots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, t_n - 1, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_n - 1, t_n - 1, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_n - 1, 0, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \cdots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, t_n - 1, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_n - 1, t_n - 1, z_n - x_n, w_n - y_n) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} \quad \bullet \cdots \bullet \quad \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_1 - x_m, w_1 - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_m - 1, 0, z_1 - x_m, w_1 - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \cdots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, t_1 - 1, z_1 - x_m, w_1 - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_m - 1, t_1 - 1, z_1 - x_m, w_1 - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_n - x_m, w_n - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_m - 1, 0, z_n - x_m, w_n - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \cdots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, t_n - 1, z_n - x_m, w_n - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_m - 1, t_n - 1, z_n - x_m, w_n - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} \quad \bullet \cdots \bullet \quad \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, 0, z_n - x_m, w_n - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_m - 1, 0, z_n - x_m, w_n - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \cdots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline A^{11}(0, t_n - 1, z_n - x_m, w_n - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \vdots \\ \hline A^{11}(s_m - 1, t_n - 1, z_n - x_m, w_n - y_m) & A^{12} \\ \hline A^{21} & A^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

(5.12)

and

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline B_0^{11}(0, x_1, y_1) & B_0^{12} \\ \hline B_0^{21} & B_0^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \\ \hline B_0^{11}(s_1 - 1, x_1, y_1) & B_0^{12} \\ \hline B_0^{21} & B_0^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \dots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline B_{S-T-1}^{11}(0, x_1, y_1) & B_{S-T-1}^{12} \\ \hline B_{S-T-1}^{21} & B_{S-T-1}^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \\ \hline B_{S-T-1}^{11}(s_1 - 1, x_1, y_1) & B_{S-T-1}^{12} \\ \hline B_{S-T-1}^{21} & B_{S-T-1}^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} \\
\\
D'' = & \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \bullet \\ \bullet \end{array} & \\
\\
\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline B_0^{11}(0, x_m, y_m) & B_0^{12} \\ \hline B_0^{21} & B_0^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \\ \hline B_0^{11}(s_m - 1, x_m, y_m) & B_0^{12} \\ \hline B_0^{21} & B_0^{11} \\ \hline \end{array} & \dots & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline B_{S-T-1}^{11}(0, x_m, y_m) & B_{S-T-1}^{12} \\ \hline B_{S-T-1}^{21} & B_{S-T-1}^{11} \\ \hline \vdots & \\ \hline B_{S-T-1}^{11}(s_m - 1, x_m, y_m) & B_{S-T-1}^{12} \\ \hline B_{S-T-1}^{21} & B_{S-T-1}^{11} \\ \hline \end{array}
\end{array}
\tag{5.13}$$

with⁵

$$A \begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix} (k, l, u, v) = \binom{k+l}{k} \left[\begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{Bmatrix} \zeta^{-1} \frac{(1 - q\zeta)^{k+l}}{(u - v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} - \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{Bmatrix} \zeta \frac{(1 - q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}}{(u - v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} \right],
\tag{5.14}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
B_l \begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix} (k, u, v) &= \binom{l}{k} \left[\begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{Bmatrix} \zeta^{-1} (1 - q\zeta)^k (u - v\zeta)^{l-k} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{Bmatrix} \zeta (1 - q\zeta^{-1})^k (u - v\zeta^{-1})^{l-k} \right]
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.15}$$

⁵Equality (5.14) defines simultaneously three functions, A^{11} , A^{12} and A^{21} ; for instance, to obtain the expression for A^{12} , one chooses the middle quantities in the curly braces on the right hand side. Similarly in (5.15).

(here $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$; in (5.12) and (5.13) the arguments within each 2×2 box are the same; for brevity, they are indicated only for the top left entry).

Proof. By Proposition 7.1, as $R \rightarrow \infty$, the entries of the 2×2 matrix (5.6) have their asymptotics given by

$$-\frac{i}{2\pi} \frac{\alpha_k^{(i)} \beta_l^{(j)}}{R^{k+l-1}} \begin{bmatrix} A^{11}(k-1, l-1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) & A^{12}(k-1, l-1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) \\ A^{21}(k-1, l-1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) & A^{11}(k-1, l-1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) \end{bmatrix} + O(R^{-k-l}).$$

Therefore, the asymptotic approximations (as $R \rightarrow \infty$) of the entries in the (i, j) block of the P -part of M' form the matrix⁶

$$-\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \times \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{11}(0, 0, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i)}{R} & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{12}}{R} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{11}(0, t_j - 1, z_i - x_j, w_i - y_j)}{R^{t_j}} & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^{t_j}} \\ \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{11}}{R} & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{12}}{R} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{11}}{R^{t_j}} & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^{t_j}} \\ \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{11}(1, 0, z_i - x_j, w_i - y_j)}{R^2} & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{11}(1, t_j - 1, z_i - x_j, w_i - y_j)}{R^{t_j+1}} & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^{t_j+1}} \\ \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{11}}{R^2} & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{11}}{R^{t_j+1}} & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^{t_j+1}} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{11}(s_i - 1, 0, z_i - x_j, w_i - y_j)}{R^{s_i}} & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^{s_i}} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{11}(s_i - 1, t_j - 1, z_i - x_j, w_i - y_j)}{R^{s_i+t_j-1}} & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^{s_i+t_j-1}} \\ \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{11}}{R^{s_i}} & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} \beta_1^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^{s_i}} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{11}}{R^{s_i+t_j-1}} & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} \beta_{t_j}^{(j)} A^{12}}{R^{s_i+t_j-1}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.16)$$

and the difference between each entry of M' and its approximant shown in (5.16) is $O(R^{h-1})$, if the order of the approximant is R^h (as in (5.12), the arguments of A^{11} , A^{12}

⁶To distinguish it from a variable index, we denote in this section the complex number i by $\sqrt{-1}$.

and A^{21} are the same within each 2×2 block in (5.16); to economize space, they are indicated only for the top left entry in each such block).

On the other hand, by Proposition 6.1, matrix (5.9) can be written as

$$-\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \frac{\alpha_k^{(i)}}{R^{k-l}} \begin{bmatrix} B_{l-1}^{11}(k-1, x_i, y_i) & B_{l-1}^{12}(k-1, x_i, y_i) \\ B_{l-1}^{21}(k-1, x_i, y_i) & B_{l-1}^{11}(k-1, x_i, y_i) \end{bmatrix} + O(R^{k-l-1}).$$

Thus, the asymptotic approximations of the entries in the i -th block of the U -part of M' form the matrix

$$-\frac{\sqrt{-1}}{2\pi} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} B_0^{11}(0, x_i, y_i)}{R^0} & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} B_0^{12}}{R^0} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{11}(0, x_i, y_i)}{R^{1-(S-T)}} & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{12}}{R^{1-(S-T)}} \\ \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} B_0^{21}}{R^0} & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} B_0^{11}}{R^0} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{21}}{R^{1-(S-T)}} & \frac{\alpha_1^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{11}}{R^{1-(S-T)}} \\ \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} B_0^{11}(1, x_i, y_i)}{R^1} & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} B_0^{12}}{R^1} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{11}(1, x_i, y_i)}{R^{2-(S-T)}} & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{12}}{R^{2-(S-T)}} \\ \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} B_0^{21}}{R^1} & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} B_0^{11}}{R^1} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{21}}{R^{2-(S-T)}} & \frac{\alpha_2^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{11}}{R^{2-(S-T)}} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} B_0^{11}(s_i-1, x_i, y_i)}{R^{s_i-1}} & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} B_0^{12}}{R^{s_i-1}} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{11}(s_i-1, x_i, y_i)}{R^{s_i-(S-T)}} & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{12}}{R^{s_i-(S-T)}} \\ \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} B_0^{21}}{R^{s_i-1}} & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} B_0^{11}}{R^{s_i-1}} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{21}}{R^{s_i-(S-T)}} & \frac{\alpha_{s_i}^{(i)} B_{S-T-1}^{11}}{R^{s_i-(S-T)}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.17)$$

with the same conventions about arguments and the same statement about the difference between exact values of entries of M' and their above approximations as in (5.16).

The forms (5.16) and (5.17) of the blocks of M' clearly show that all the factors $-\sqrt{-1}/(2\pi)$ factor out along the rows, for a total contribution of $(1/2\pi)^{2S}$ to $\det(M')$. It is also apparent from (5.16) and (5.17) that all the α 's factor out along the rows of M' , giving, by (5.7), a combined contribution of

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{k=1}^{s_i} \left(\alpha_k^{(i)} \right)^2 = \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq s_i} (a_{ij} - a_{ik})^2.$$

In a similar fashion, all the β 's factor out along the columns of M' , and by (5.8) they combine to a multiplicative factor of

$$\prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{l=1}^{t_j} \left(\beta_l^{(j)} \right)^2 = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq t_i} (b_{ij} - b_{ik})^2.$$

Furthermore, the factors in R can also be factored out along the rows and columns of M' . Indeed, multiply the rows in block-row i by $R^1, R^1, R^2, R^2, \dots, R^{s_i}, R^{s_i}$, respectively (from top to bottom), for $i = 1, \dots, m$. By (5.16)–(5.17), this will make the degrees in R of the entries constant along the columns. More precisely, in block-column j , the degree in R becomes 0 along columns 1 and 2, -1 along columns 3 and 4, and so on, reaching degree $-(t_i - 1)$ along columns $2t_j - 1$ and $2t_j$ of block-column j ; and in the U -part the degrees in R become 1 for the first two columns, 2 for the next two, and so on, reaching degree $S - T$ for the last two columns of the U -part. Factoring out these powers of R along the columns, and taking into account the factors we multiplied the rows by, one obtains that the overall exponent of R that gets factored out of the determinant of M' is

$$-2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{k=1}^{s_i} k - 2 \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^{t_j} (l-1) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{S-T} j = - \sum_{i=1}^m s_i(s_i+1) - \sum_{j=1}^n t_j(t_j-1) + (S-T)(S-T-1),$$

which is readily seen to equal $2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j - 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n s_i t_j$. However, after factoring out this way the $-\sqrt{-1}/(2\pi)$'s, α 's, β 's and the powers of R from the blocks (5.16) and (5.17) of M' , the resulting matrix is precisely the matrix M'' given by (5.11)–(5.15). This completes the proof. $\square$

6. The asymptotics of the entries in the U -part of M'

In this section we determine the asymptotics of the entries of (5.9) as $R \rightarrow \infty$. These asymptotics follow from the following result. When Newton's divided difference operator $\mathcal{D}$ acts on a function f of more than one variable, we write $\mathcal{D}_x f$ to indicate that $\mathcal{D}$ acts on f regarded as a function of the variable x .

PROPOSITION 6.1. *Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying $3 \nmid 1 - q$. Then for any fixed $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $u, v \in 3\mathbb{Z}$, and $0 \leq k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_x^k U_l(Ru + x + c, Rv + qx + d)|_{x=a_1} = \\ - \frac{i}{2\pi} \binom{l}{k} [\zeta^{c-d-1} (1 - q\zeta)^k (u - v\zeta)^{l-k} - \zeta^{-c+d+1} (1 - q\zeta^{-1})^k (u - v\zeta^{-1})^{l-k}] R^{l-k} \\ + O(R^{l-k-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

where $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$ and $\mathcal{D}_x^k$ acts with respect to a fixed integer sequence $a_1, a_2, \dots$ with the property $qa_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \geq 1$.

In our proof of the above result we use the following three preliminary lemmas.

LEMMA 6.2. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$(1 - D\zeta^{-1})^{-b}(x^k)|_{x=a+b-1} = (a - b\zeta)^k + \text{monomials in } a \text{ and } b \text{ of joint degree } < k, \quad (6.2)$$

and

$$(1 - D\zeta)^{-b}(x^k)|_{x=a+b-1} = (a - b\zeta^{-1})^k + \text{monomials in } a \text{ and } b \text{ of joint degree } < k. \quad (6.3)$$

Proof. By repeated application of the fact that $(x+1)^{k-n} - x^{k-n} = (k-n)x^{k-n-1} + O(x^{k-n-2})$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, one obtains that

$$D^n x^k = k(k-1) \cdots (k-n+1)x^{k-n} + O(x^{k-n-1}), \quad x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.4)$$

Since

$$(1 - D\zeta^{-1})^{-b}(x^k) = x^k - \binom{-b}{1}\zeta^{-1}Dx^k + \binom{-b}{2}\zeta^{-2}D^2x^k - \cdots,$$

we get by (6.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - D\zeta)^{-b}(x^k)|_{x=a+b-1} &= (a+b)^k + b\zeta^{-1}k(a+b)^{k-1} + \frac{b^2}{2!}\zeta^{-2}k(k-1)(a+b)^{k-2} \\ &\quad + \frac{b^3}{3!}\zeta^{-3}k(k-1)(k-2)(a+b)^{k-3} + \cdots \\ &\quad + \text{monomials in } a \text{ and } b \text{ of joint degree } < k \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

(we used here that the portion of $\binom{-b}{l}$ of maximal degree is $\frac{b^l}{l!}$). However, the leading part on the right hand side in (6.5) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} &(a+b)^k + \binom{k}{1}(a+b)^{k-1}b\zeta^{-1} + \binom{k}{2}(a+b)^{k-2}(b\zeta^{-1})^2 + \cdots \\ &= [(a+b) + b\zeta^{-1}]^k \\ &= (a - b\zeta)^k, \end{aligned}$$

since $1 + \zeta^{-1} = -\zeta$. Thus, (6.2) follows from (6.5). Replacing ζ^{-1} by ζ in the above argument proves (6.3). $\square$

LEMMA 6.3. Let $h_n(x_1, \dots, x_s)$ be the complete homogeneous symmetric function of degree n in the variables $x_1, \dots, x_s$ ($h_n := 0$ for $n < 0$, $h_0 = 1$, $h_1 = \sum_k x_k$, $h_2 = \sum_k x_k^2 + \sum_{k < l} x_k x_l$, and so on; see e.g. [25, p.294]). Then for any $0 \leq n, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\mathcal{D}^k x^n|_{x=a_1} = h_{n-k}(a_1, \dots, a_{k+1}). \quad (6.6)$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on k . For $k = 0$, $\mathcal{D}^0 x^n|_{x=a_1} = a_1^n$, which is clearly the same as $h_n(a_1)$. The induction step follows by the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^k x^n|_{x=a_1} &= \frac{\mathcal{D}^{k-1} x^n|_{x=a_2} - \mathcal{D}^{k-1} x^n|_{x=a_1}}{a_{k+1} - a_1} \\ &= \frac{h_{n-k+1}(a_2, \dots, a_{k+1}) - h_{n-k+1}(a_1, \dots, a_k)}{a_{k+1} - a_1} \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{n-k+1} \frac{a_{k+1}^r h_{n-k+1-r}(a_2, \dots, a_k) - a_1^r h_{n-k+1-r}(a_2, \dots, a_k)}{a_{k+1} - a_1} \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{n-k} h_{n-k-r}(a_2, \dots, a_k) (a_1^r + a_1^{r-1} a_{k+1} + \dots + a_{k+1}^r) \\ &= h_{n-k}(a_1, \dots, a_{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where at the second equality we used the induction hypothesis. $\square$

LEMMA 6.4. For any $0 \leq k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $A, B, C \in \mathbb{C}$ we have

$$\mathcal{D}_x^k (Ax + RB + C)^l|_{x=a_1} = \binom{l}{k} A^k B^{l-k} R^{l-k} + O(R^{l-k-1}), \quad R \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.7)$$

Proof. Expand the power on the left hand side by the binomial theorem and use (6.6) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_x^k (Ax + RB + C)^l|_{x=a_1} &= \sum_{n=0}^l \binom{l}{n} A^n (RB + C)^{l-n} h_{n-k}(a_1, \dots, a_{k+1}) \\ &= \binom{l}{k} A^k B^{l-k} R^{l-k} h_0(a_1, \dots, a_{k+1}) + O(R^{l-k-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $h_0 = 1$, this completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 6.1. By (4.1) and Lemma 6.2 we obtain

$$U_l(a, b) = -\frac{i}{2\pi} [\zeta^{a-b-1}(a - b\zeta)^l - \zeta^{-a+b+1}(a - b\zeta^{-1})^l] \\ + \text{monomials in } a \text{ and } b \text{ of joint degree } < l. \quad (6.8)$$

In particular,

$$U_l(Ru + x + c, Rv + qx + d) \\ = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \{ \zeta^{R(u-v)+x(1-q)+c-d-1} [(1 - q\zeta)x + R(u - v\zeta) + c - d\zeta]^l \\ - \zeta^{-R(u-v)-x(1-q)-c+d+1} [(1 - q\zeta^{-1})x + R(u - v\zeta^{-1}) + c - d\zeta^{-1}]^l \} \\ + \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta \geq 0 \\ \alpha + \beta < l}} c_{\alpha, \beta} (Ru + x + c)^\alpha (Rv + qx + d)^\beta, \quad (6.9)$$

where the $c_{\alpha, \beta}$'s are independent of R and x .

By hypothesis, $R(u - v) + x(1 - q)$ is a multiple of 3. Thus, since $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$, the exponents of ζ in front of the square brackets in (6.9) simplify to $c - d - 1$ and $-c + d + 1$, respectively.

By Lemma 6.4, as $R \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\mathcal{D}_x^k [(1 - q\zeta)x + R(u - v\zeta) + c - d\zeta]^l|_{x=a_1} = \binom{l}{k} (1 - q\zeta)^k (u - v\zeta)^{l-k} R^{l-k} + O(R^{l-k-1})$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}_x^k [(1 - q\zeta^{-1})x + R(u - v\zeta^{-1}) + c - d\zeta^{-1}]^l|_{x=a_1} = \binom{l}{k} (1 - q\zeta^{-1})^k (u - v\zeta^{-1})^{l-k} R^{l-k} \\ + O(R^{l-k-1}).$$

On the other hand, the result of applying $\mathcal{D}_x^k$ to the sum in (6.9) is clearly $O(R^{l-k-1})$. Applying $\mathcal{D}_x^k$ to both sides of (6.9) and using the above observations we obtain (6.1). $\square$

7. The asymptotics of the entries in the P -part of M'

In this section we determine the asymptotics of the entries of (5.6) as $R \rightarrow \infty$. The resulting formulas are contained in the following result. As in the previous section, a variable at the index of Newton's divided difference operator $\mathcal{D}$ indicates that the function upon which it acts is regarded as a function of that variable.

PROPOSITION 7.1. *Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying $3|1-q$. Then for any fixed $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $u, v \in 3\mathbb{Z}$, $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, and $0 \leq k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{D}_y^l \left\{ \mathcal{D}_x^k P(-Ru + x + y + c, -Rv + q(x + y) + d)|_{x=a_1} \right\} \Big|_{y=b_1} = \\ & -\frac{i}{2\pi} \binom{k+l}{l} \left[\zeta^{c-d-1} \frac{(1-q\zeta)^{k+l}}{(u-v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} - \zeta^{-c+d+1} \frac{(1-q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}}{(u-v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} \right] \frac{1}{R^{k+l+1}} + O(R^{-k-l-2}), \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

where $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$, $\mathcal{D}_x^k$ acts with respect to a fixed integer sequence $a_1, a_2, \dots$, $\mathcal{D}_y^l$ acts with respect to another integer sequence $b_1, b_2, \dots$, and $qa_j, qb_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $j \geq 1$.

In our proof we will employ the following preliminary results.

LEMMA 7.2. *For $0 \leq n, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and indeterminates $q, z, c_0, c_1, \dots$, one has*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j (qc_0)_j}{j!} \frac{(c_0)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} z^{k-2j}}{(c_0 - c_1)(c_0 - c_2) \cdots (c_0 - c_n)} + \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j (qc_1)_j}{j!} \frac{(c_1)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} z^{k-2j}}{(c_1 - c_0)(c_1 - c_2) \cdots (c_1 - c_n)} + \cdots \\ & + \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j (qc_n)_j}{j!} \frac{(c_n)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} z^{k-2j}}{(c_n - c_0)(c_n - c_1) \cdots (c_n - c_{n-1})} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k < n, \\ \frac{1}{n!} (z - qz^{-1})^n, & \text{if } k = n. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Multiplying by $\prod_{0 \leq j < l \leq n} (c_l - c_j)$, the statement becomes equivalent to the polynomial identities

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^n \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < l \leq n \\ j, l \neq 0}} (c_l - c_j) \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j (qc_0)_j}{j!} \frac{(c_0)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} z^{k-2j} + \cdots \\ & + (-1)^0 \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < l \leq n \\ j, l \neq n}} (c_l - c_j) \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j (qc_n)_j}{j!} \frac{(c_n)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} z^{k-2j} \\ & = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } k < n, \\ \frac{\prod_{0 \leq j < l \leq n} (c_l - c_j)}{n!} \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} (-1)^j q^j z^{n-2j}, & \text{if } k = n. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

We prove (7.3) first, so let $k = n$. Agreement of the coefficients of z^{n-2s} on the two sides of (7.3) amounts to

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-1)^n \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < l \leq n \\ j, l \neq 0}} (c_l - c_j) \frac{(-1)^s (qc_0)_s}{s!} \frac{(c_0)_{n-s}}{(n-s)!} + \cdots \\
& \quad + (-1)^0 \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < l \leq n \\ j, l \neq n}} (c_l - c_j) \frac{(-1)^s (qc_n)_s}{s!} \frac{(c_n)_{n-s}}{(n-s)!} \\
& = \frac{1}{n!} \binom{n}{s} (-1)^s q^s \prod_{0 \leq j < l \leq n} (c_l - c_j).
\end{aligned}$$

Simplifying this identity we obtain that (7.3) is equivalent to the set of identities

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-1)^n (qc_0)_s (c_0)_{n-s} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < l \leq n \\ j, l \neq 0}} (c_l - c_j) + \cdots + (-1)^0 (qc_n)_s (c_n)_{n-s} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < l \leq n \\ j, l \neq n}} (c_l - c_j) \\
& = q^s \prod_{0 \leq j < l \leq n} (c_l - c_j),
\end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

for $0 \leq s \leq n$.

Let $0 \leq m < p \leq n$, and assume $c_m = c_p$. We claim that this causes the left hand side of (7.4) to be 0. Indeed, let $\Delta(x_0, \dots, x_t) = \prod_{0 \leq j < l \leq t} (x_l - x_j)$. Then for $c_m = c_p$ the left hand side of (7.4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& (-1)^m \Delta(c_0, \dots, c_{m-1}, c_{m+1}, \dots, c_p, \dots, c_n) (qc_m)_s (c_m)_{n-s} + \\
& \quad (-1)^p \Delta(c_0, \dots, c_m, \dots, c_{p-1}, c_{p+1}, \dots, c_n) (qc_p)_s (c_p)_{n-s}.
\end{aligned}$$

However, since $c_m = c_p$, the second list of indeterminates on which Δ acts above is obtained from the first such list by moving c_p across $p - m - 1$ neighbors to its left. This implies that the two Δ -expressions differ by a multiplicative constant of $(-1)^{p-m-1}$, and thus the above expression equals 0.

Regard the two sides of (7.4) as polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}[q][c_0, \dots, c_n]$. As a consequence of our observation in the previous paragraph, the polynomial on the left is divisible by the product $\prod_{0 \leq j < l \leq n} (c_l - c_j)$. Furthermore, the degree of the polynomial on the left is $\binom{n}{2} + n$, which is the same as the degree of this product. It follows that the two sides of (7.4) are equal up to a multiplicative factor in $\mathbb{Z}[q]$.

To finish proving (7.4) it suffices to show that it holds for a specialization of the c_j 's. For $c_j = j$, $j = 0, \dots, n$, this amounts to

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{n-j}}{(n-j)!j!} (qj)_s (j)_{n-s} = q^s, \quad 0 \leq s \leq n. \quad (7.5)$$

Take $f(x) = x^t$ and $u = 0$ in the expression (4.16) for the n -th power of the divided difference operator D . We obtain

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{n-j}}{(n-j)!j!} j^t = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 \leq t < n, \\ 1, & \text{if } t = n. \end{cases} \quad (7.6)$$

Thus, only the term in j^n in the expansion of

$$\begin{aligned} (qj)_s (j)_{n-s} &= qj(qj+1) \cdots (qj+s-1)j(j+1) \cdots (j+n-s-1) \\ &= q^s j^n + \text{terms in } j \text{ of degree } < n \end{aligned}$$

contributes to the left hand side of (7.5). This proves (7.5), and completes the proof of (7.3).

We now turn to proving (7.2), so assume $k < n$. By extracting the coefficients of z^{k-2s} , (7.2) becomes equivalent to

$$(-1)^n (qc_0)_s (c_0)_{k-s} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < l \leq n \\ j, l \neq 0}} (c_l - c_j) + \cdots + (-1)^0 (qc_n)_s (c_n)_{k-s} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < l \leq 0 \\ j, l \neq n}} (c_l - c_j) = 0, \quad (7.7)$$

for $0 \leq s \leq k$.

By the arguments we used in the case $k = n$, the left hand side of (7.7) is seen to be of the form $\alpha \prod_{0 \leq j < l \leq n} (c_l - c_j)$, with $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$. To establish (7.7) it suffices to show $\alpha = 0$. The specialization that led to (7.5) shows that in order to deduce the latter it is enough to check that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \frac{(-1)^{n-j}}{(n-j)!j!} (qj)_s (j)_{k-s} = 0, \quad 0 \leq s \leq k < n.$$

This follows from (7.6) by the same reasoning we used to prove (7.5). $\square$

LEMMA 7.3. *Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $3|1-q$ and consider a sequence $a_0, a_1, \dots$ of integers so that $qa_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \geq 0$. Then for any $n \geq 0$, in the power series expansion*

$$\mathcal{D}_x^n t^{-qx} (-1-t)^{-x} \big|_{x=a_0} = \sum_{k \geq 0} q_k (t - \zeta)^k \quad (7.8)$$

around $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$, the first non-zero coefficient is $q_n = \frac{1}{n!}(\zeta - q\zeta^{-1})^n$.

Proof. By [13, (1), p.19], for any function f we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^n f(a_0) &= \frac{f(a_0)}{(a_0 - a_1)(a_0 - a_2) \cdots (a_0 - a_n)} + \frac{f(a_1)}{(a_1 - a_0)(a_1 - a_2) \cdots (a_1 - a_n)} + \cdots \\ &\quad + \frac{f(a_n)}{(a_n - a_0)(a_n - a_1) \cdots (a_n - a_{n-1})}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.9)$$

Take $f(x, t) = t^{-qx}(-1 - t)^{-x}$ in the above equality. Then the resulting expression will supply the power series expansion (7.8), provided we work out the coefficients of the series expansion

$$f(a_j, t) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{\partial^k f(a_j, \zeta)}{\partial t^k} (t - \zeta)^k.$$

Let $g(t) = t^{-qx}$ and $h(t) = (-1 - t)^{-x}$. Their derivatives of order l are given by

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(l)}(t) &= (-1)^l (qx)_l t^{-qx-l}, \\ h^{(l)}(t) &= (x)_l (-1 - t)^{-x-l}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Leibniz's formula for the derivative of a product,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^k f(a_j, \zeta)}{\partial t^k} &= \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (-1)^l (qa_j)_l (a_j)_{k-l} \zeta^{-qa_j-l} (-1 - \zeta)^{-a_j-(k-l)} \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^k \binom{k}{l} (-1)^l (qa_j)_l (a_j)_{k-l} \zeta^{k-2l}, \end{aligned}$$

where at the last equality we used $-1 - \zeta = \zeta^{-1}$ and $\zeta^{a_j(1-q)} = 1$. Substituting this in (7.9) we obtain that the coefficient of $(t - \zeta)^k$ in the power series expansion of $\mathcal{D}_x^n t^{-qx}(-1 - t)^{-x}|_{x=a_0}$ around $t = \zeta$ is

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j (qa_0)_j}{j!} \frac{(a_0)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \zeta^{k-2j}}{(a_0 - a_1)(a_0 - a_2) \cdots (a_0 - a_n)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j (qa_1)_j}{j!} \frac{(a_1)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \zeta^{k-2j}}{(a_1 - a_0)(a_1 - a_2) \cdots (a_1 - a_n)} + \cdots + \frac{\sum_{j=0}^k \frac{(-1)^j (qa_n)_j}{j!} \frac{(a_n)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \zeta^{k-2j}}{(a_n - a_0)(a_n - a_1) \cdots (a_n - a_{n-1})}. \end{aligned}$$

Apply Lemma 7.2 to complete the proof. $\square$

LEMMA 7.4. Let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $3|1-q$, and let $a_1, a_2, \dots$ and $b_1, b_2, \dots$ be sequences of integers so that $qa_j, qb_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \geq 1$. Then for any $k, l \geq 0$, in the power series expansion

$$\mathcal{D}_y^l \left\{ \mathcal{D}_x^k t^{-q(x+y)} (-1-t)^{-(x+y)} \Big|_{x=a_1} \right\} \Big|_{y=b_1} = \sum_{s \geq 0} q_s (t - \zeta)^s$$

around $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$, the first non-zero coefficient is $q_{k+l} = \frac{1}{k!l!} (\zeta - q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_y^l \left\{ \mathcal{D}_x^k t^{-q(x+y)} (-1-t)^{-(x+y)} \Big|_{x=a_1} \right\} \Big|_{y=b_1} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_y^l \left\{ t^{-qy} (-1-t)^{-y} \mathcal{D}_x^k t^{-qx} (-1-t)^{-x} \Big|_{x=a_1} \right\} \Big|_{y=b_1} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_y^l t^{-qy} (-1-t)^{-y} \Big|_{y=b_1} \mathcal{D}_x^k t^{-qx} (-1-t)^{-x} \Big|_{x=a_1}. \end{aligned}$$

The statement follows therefore by Lemma 7.3. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 7.1. Assume first that $u > 0$. Then by (4.19) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} P(-Ru + x + y + c, -Rv + q(x+y) + d) \\ &= -\frac{i}{2\pi} \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{e^{4\pi i/3}} t^{Rv} (-1-t)^{Ru} t^{-q(x+y)-d-1} (-1-t)^{-(x+y)-c-1} dt \\ &= -\frac{i}{2\pi} \left\{ \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{-1} e^{-Rp(t)} Q(t) dt - \int_{e^{4\pi i/3}}^{-1} e^{-Rp(t)} Q(t) dt \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large R , where

$$\begin{aligned} p(t) &= -v \ln t - u \ln(-1-t), \\ Q(t) &= t^{-q(x+y)-d-1} (-1-t)^{-(x+y)-c-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

Applying $\mathcal{D}_y^l \mathcal{D}_x^k$ to both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_y^l \left\{ \mathcal{D}_x^k P(-Ru + x + y + c, -Rv + q(x+y) + d) \Big|_{x=a_1} \right\} \Big|_{y=b_1} \\ &= -\frac{i}{2\pi} \left\{ \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{-1} e^{-Rp(t)} \tilde{Q}(t) dt - \int_{e^{4\pi i/3}}^{-1} e^{-Rp(t)} \tilde{Q}(t) dt \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

where $p(t)$ is given by (7.10) and

$$\tilde{Q}(t) = t^{-d-1}(-1-t)^{-c-1} \mathcal{D}_y^l \left\{ \mathcal{D}_x^k t^{-q(x+y)}(-1-t)^{-(x+y)} \Big|_{x=a_1} \right\} \Big|_{y=b_1}. \quad (7.12)$$

As in (4.20), the values of the two integrals in (7.11) are complex conjugates. Let

$$I(R) = \int_{e^{2\pi i/3}}^{-1} e^{-Rp(t)} \tilde{Q}(t) dt.$$

We find the asymptotics of $I(R)$ by the approach we used in the proof of Proposition 4.1—Laplace’s method for contour integrals as presented in [19, Theorem 6.1, p.125]. The integral $I(R)$ is readily seen to satisfy conditions (i)–(v) of [19, pp.121–122] ((v) holds since we are in the case $u > 0$).

The first two coefficients of the power series expansion

$$p(t) = p(\zeta) + p_0(t - \zeta) + p_1(t - \zeta)^2 + \dots$$

of the function $p(t)$ of (7.10) are easily checked to satisfy $e^{-Rp(\zeta)} = \zeta^{-R(u-v)} = 1$ (the second equality since u and v are multiples of 3) and $p_0 = p'(\zeta) = u\zeta - v\zeta^{-1}$. Since $p_0 \neq 0$ it also follows that the value of μ when applying (4.21) for $I(R)$ is $\mu = 1$.

The function $\tilde{Q}(t)$ given by (7.12) is precisely the function whose power series expansion is considered in Lemma 7.4, multiplied by $t^{-d-1}(-1-t)^{-c-1}$. Since the first non-zero coefficient in the power series expansion of $t^{-d-1}(-1-t)^{-c-1}$ around $t = \zeta$ is the constant term, and it equals $\zeta^{-d-1}(-1-\zeta)^{-c-1} = \zeta^{c-d}$, we obtain by Lemma 7.4 that the power series expansion of $\tilde{Q}(t)$ has the form

$$\tilde{Q}(t) = \tilde{q}_0(t - \zeta)^{k+l} + \tilde{q}_1(t - \zeta)^{k+l+1} + \dots$$

with $\tilde{q}_0 = \frac{\zeta^{c-d}}{k!l!}(\zeta - q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}$. Therefore, since $\tilde{q}_0 \neq 0$, the value of λ when applying (4.21) for $I(R)$ is $\lambda = k + l + 1$. Furthermore, the a_0 of (4.21) is now, by [O, p.123], equal to

$$\frac{\tilde{q}_0}{\mu p_0^{\lambda/\mu}} = \frac{\zeta^{c-d}}{k!l!} \frac{(\zeta - q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}}{(u\zeta - v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}}.$$

Thus, by applying (4.21) to $I(R)$ and looking just at the first term of the asymptotic series, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I(R) &= \frac{I(R)}{e^{-Rp(\zeta)}} = \frac{\Gamma(k+l+1)}{R^{k+l+1}} \frac{\zeta^{c-d}}{k!l!} \frac{(\zeta - q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}}{(u\zeta - v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} + O(R^{-k-l-2}) \\ &= \binom{k+l}{l} \zeta^{c-d-1} \frac{(1-q\zeta)^{k+l}}{(u-v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} + O(R^{-k-l-2}), \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

where at the last equality we used $\zeta^{-2} = \zeta$.

The asymptotics of the second integral in (7.11) is obtained by taking complex conjugation in (7.13). Replacing these asymptotics into (7.11) we obtain (7.1).

We now extend the proof to the case when u is not necessarily positive. The same arguments we employed above imply for $u > 0$ the slightly more general asymptotics

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_y^l \left\{ \mathcal{D}_x^k P(-Ru + q'(x+y) + c, -Rv + q(x+y) + d) \Big|_{x=a_1} \right\} \Big|_{y=b_1} = \\ -\frac{i}{2\pi} \binom{k+l}{l} \left[\zeta^{c-d} \frac{(q'\zeta - q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}}{(u\zeta - v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} - \zeta^{-c+d} \frac{(q'\zeta^{-1} - q\zeta)^{k+l}}{(u\zeta^{-1} - v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} \right] \frac{1}{R^{k+l+1}} \\ + O(R^{-k-l-2}), \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

for any $q' \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $3|q' - q$, and any integer multiples u and v of 3 at least one of which is non-zero.

Suppose now $v > 0$. By its definition (1.3) it is clear that $P(\alpha, \beta) = P(\beta, \alpha)$, so we can write

$$P(-Ru + x + y + c, -Rv + q(x+y) + d) = P(-Rv + q(x+y) + d, -Ru + x + y + c).$$

Since $v > 0$, (7.14) applies to the right hand side above. Its asymptotics is thus

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{i}{2\pi} \binom{k+l}{l} \left[\zeta^{d-c} \frac{(q\zeta - \zeta^{-1})^{k+l}}{(v\zeta - u\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} - \zeta^{-d+c} \frac{(q\zeta^{-1} - \zeta)^{k+l}}{(v\zeta^{-1} - u\zeta)^{k+l+1}} \right] \frac{1}{R^{k+l+1}} \\ + O(R^{-k-l-2}) \\ = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \binom{k+l}{l} \left[-\zeta^{d-c} \frac{(\zeta^{-1} - q\zeta)^{k+l}}{(u\zeta^{-1} - v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} + \zeta^{-d+c} \frac{(\zeta - q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}}{(u\zeta - v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} \right] \frac{1}{R^{k+l+1}} \\ + O(R^{-k-l-2}), \end{aligned}$$

which agrees with (7.1).

If neither $u > 0$ nor $v > 0$ hold, then since by hypothesis $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, we must have $-u - v > 0$. By [14], P also satisfies the symmetry $P(\alpha, \beta) = P(-\alpha - \beta - 1, \alpha)$. Write therefore

$$\begin{aligned} P(-Ru + x + y + c, -Rv + q(x+y) + d) \\ = P(-R(-u - v) + (-1 - q)(x+y) - c - d - 1, -Ru + x + y + c). \end{aligned}$$

Relation (7.14) is applicable to the right hand side above: $-u - v$ and $-v$ are multiples of 3 (since u and v are assumed to be so), $(-1 - q) - 1 = -3 + 1 - q$ is divisible by 3 (since $3|1 - q$), and $-u - v > 0$. We obtain by (7.14) that its asymptotics is

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{i}{2\pi} \binom{k+l}{l} \left[\zeta^{-2c-d-1} \frac{[(-1-q)\zeta - \zeta^{-1}]^{k+l}}{[(-u-v)\zeta - u\zeta^{-1}]^{k+l+1}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \zeta^{2c+d+1} \frac{[(-1-q)\zeta^{-1} - \zeta]^{k+l}}{[(-u-v)\zeta^{-1} - u\zeta]^{k+l+1}} \right] \frac{1}{R^{k+l+1}} + O(R^{-k-l-2}) \\
& = -\frac{i}{2\pi} \binom{k+l}{l} \left[\zeta^{c-d-1} \frac{(1-q\zeta)^{k+l}}{(u-v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \zeta^{-c+d+1} \frac{(1-q\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}}{(u-v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} \right] \frac{1}{R^{k+l+1}} + O(R^{-k-l-2})
\end{aligned}$$

(we used $\zeta^{-2c} = \zeta^c$ and $-\zeta - \zeta^{-1} = 1$). This is precisely the right hand side of (7.1), and the proof is complete. $\square$

8. The evaluation of $\det(M'')$

We evaluate the determinant of the matrix M'' given by (5.11)–(5.15) by the method of factor exhaustion. It turns out that this evaluation holds for any ζ , not just for the specific $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$ from the statement of Proposition 5.3. Therefore we will treat ζ as an indeterminate in Sections 8–12 and in the Appendix.

The proof of the evaluation of $\det(M'')$ involves several technical steps, presented in Sections 9–12 and in the Appendix. In the current section we show how to put together those steps to deduce the evaluation.

THEOREM 8.1. *Let $S = \sum_{i=1}^m s_i$, $T = \sum_{j=1}^n t_j$, and assume $S \geq T$. Then the determinant of the matrix M'' defined in (5.11)–(5.15), with ζ , q , x_i , y_i , w_j , z_j , $i = 1, \dots, m$,*

$j = 1, \dots, n$ being indeterminates, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\det(M'') &= (\zeta^2 - \zeta^{-2})^{2S} [(q - \zeta)(q - \zeta^{-1})]^{\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{s_i}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{t_j}{2}} \\
&\times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} [((x_i - x_j) - \zeta(y_i - y_j))((x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - y_j))]^{s_i s_j} \\
&\times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} [((z_i - z_j) - \zeta(w_i - w_j))((z_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(w_i - w_j))]^{t_i t_j} \\
&\times \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n [((x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j))((x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j))]^{-s_i t_j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

Proof. Regard both sides of (8.1) as polynomials in q with coefficients in the field of rational functions $\mathbb{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n, \zeta)$.

It is not hard to show that the degree in q of the left hand side of (8.1) is at most $\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{s_i}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{t_j}{2}$. Indeed, multiplying the first $2T$ columns of M'' from left to right by

$$\begin{aligned}
&q^0, q^0, q^{-1}, q^{-1}, \dots, q^{t_1-1}, q^{t_1-1}, q^0, q^0, q^{-1}, q^{-1}, \dots, q^{t_2-1}, q^{t_2-1}, \dots, \\
&q^0, q^0, q^{-1}, q^{-1}, \dots, q^{t_n-1}, q^{t_n-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

respectively, the degrees in q of the entries become constant along the rows (except for some 0 entries generated by (5.15) when $l < k$). Namely, from top to bottom, these common degrees along the rows are

$$0, 0, 1, 1, \dots, s_1 - 1, s_1 - 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, \dots, s_2 - 1, s_2 - 1, \dots, 0, 0, 1, 1, \dots, s_m - 1, s_m - 1,$$

respectively. Thus, the degree in q of any element in the expansion of this scaled-column modification of M'' is either 0 or

$$2 \sum_{i=0}^{s_1-1} i + \dots + 2 \sum_{i=0}^{s_m-1} i = \sum_{i=1}^m \binom{s_i}{2}.$$

Taking into account the factors (8.2) we multiplied the columns of M'' by, it follows that the degree in q of the left hand side of (8.1) is at most $\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{s_i}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{t_j}{2}$.

On the other hand, by Corollary 9.2, the left hand side of (8.1) is divisible by

$$[(q - \zeta)(q - \zeta^{-1})]^{\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{s_i}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{t_j}{2}},$$

which is, up to a scalar multiple, the polynomial on the right hand side of (8.1). It follows that the two polynomials on the left and right in (8.1) must be the same up to multiplication by a factor independent of q . In particular, to prove (8.1) it suffices to establish it for $q = 0$, i.e., to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \det(M''|_{q=0}) &= (\zeta^2 - \zeta^{-2})^{2S} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} [((x_i - x_j) - \zeta(y_i - y_j))((x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - y_j))]^{s_i s_j} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} [((z_i - z_j) - \zeta(w_i - w_j))((z_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(w_i - w_j))]^{t_i t_j} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n [((x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j))((x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j))]^{-s_i t_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

Taking $h = 0$ in Proposition 10.1 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \det(M''|_{q=0}) &= c \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} [((x_i - x_j) - \zeta(y_i - y_j))((x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - y_j))]^{s_i s_j} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} [((z_i - z_j) - \zeta(w_i - w_j))((z_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(w_i - w_j))]^{t_i t_j} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n [((x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j))((x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j))]^{-s_i t_j}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.4)$$

with $c \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$.

To determine c , specialize in (8.4) $y_i = 0$, $w_j = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then, given that we also have $q = 0$, formulas (5.14)–(5.15) become equivalent to

$$A \begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix} (k, l, u, v) = \frac{\binom{k+l}{k}}{u^{k+l+1}} \begin{Bmatrix} \zeta^{-1} - \zeta \\ \zeta^{-3} - \zeta^3 \\ \zeta - \zeta^{-1} \end{Bmatrix} \quad (8.5)$$

and

$$B_l \begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix} (k, u, v) = \binom{l}{k} u^{l-k} \begin{Bmatrix} \zeta^{-1} - \zeta \\ \zeta^{-3} - \zeta^3 \\ \zeta - \zeta^{-1} \end{Bmatrix}. \quad (8.6)$$

Denote by M_0'' the matrix given by (5.11)–(5.13) with definitions (8.5)–(8.6). Equality (8.4) becomes under our specialization

$$\det(M_0'') = c \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (x_i - x_j)^{2s_i s_j} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_i - z_j)^{2t_i t_j}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - z_j)^{2s_i t_j}}. \quad (8.7)$$

Permute the rows of M_0'' by listing them in the order $1, 3, \dots, 2S-1, 2, 4, \dots, 2S$, and then apply this same permutation to the columns of the resulting matrix. Denote by M_1 the matrix obtained permuting this way the rows and columns of M_0'' .

Note that when using definitions (8.5) and (8.6) in (5.12) and (5.13), in all 2×2 blocks the entries in positions $(2, 1)$ and $(2, 2)$ are negatives of each other. The consequence of this for the matrix M_1 is that it has the form

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} C & D \\ -C & C \end{bmatrix},$$

where C and D are $S \times S$ matrices. We obtain

$$\det(M_0'') = \det(M_1) = \det \begin{bmatrix} C + D & D \\ 0 & C \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8.8)$$

Furthermore, (8.5) and (8.6) imply that we have

$$C = (\zeta^{-1} - \zeta)N' \quad (8.9)$$

$$C + D = (\zeta^{-1} - \zeta + \zeta^{-3} - \zeta^3)N' = (\zeta^{-1} - \zeta)(\zeta^{-1} + \zeta)^2 N', \quad (8.10)$$

where N' is the matrix obtained from the matrix N in Theorem A.1 by replacing z_j by $-z_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. By (8.8)–(8.10) we obtain

$$\det(M_0'') = (\zeta^{-1} - \zeta)^{2S} (\zeta^{-1} + \zeta)^{2S} (\det N')^2 = (\zeta^2 - \zeta^{-2})^{2S} (\det N')^2. \quad (8.11)$$

By Theorem A.1 the above equality implies

$$\det(M_0'') = (\zeta^2 - \zeta^{-2})^{2S} \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (x_i - x_j)^{2s_i s_j} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_i - z_j)^{2t_i t_j}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - z_j)^{2s_i t_j}}.$$

Comparing this to (8.7) we obtain that $c = (\zeta^2 - \zeta^{-2})^{2S}$. Replacing this in (8.4) implies (8.3). This completes the proof. $\square$

9. Divisibility of $\det(M'')$ by the powers of $q - \zeta$ and $q - \zeta^{-1}$

It turns out that rather than proving directly the divisibility of $\det(M'')$ by the factors involving q on the right hand side of (8.1), it is more convenient to deduce this as a special case of a more general result.

More precisely, deform definitions (5.14)–(5.15) by introducing a new parameter h as follows:

$$A \begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix} (k, l, u, v) = \binom{k+l}{k} \left[\left\{ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{matrix} \right\} \zeta^{-1} \frac{(-\zeta)^{k+l} (q - \zeta^{-1})_{k,h} (q - \zeta^{-1})_{l,h}}{(u - v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} \right. \\ \left. - \left\{ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{matrix} \right\} \zeta \frac{(-\zeta^{-1})^{k+l} (q - \zeta)_{k,h} (q - \zeta)_{l,h}}{(u - v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} \right], \quad (9.1)$$

and

$$B_l \begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix} (k, u, v) = \binom{l}{k} \left[\left\{ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{matrix} \right\} \zeta^{-1} (-\zeta)^k (q - \zeta^{-1})_{k,h} (u - v\zeta)^{l-k} \right. \\ \left. - \left\{ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{matrix} \right\} \zeta (-\zeta^{-1})^k (q - \zeta)_{k,h} (u - v\zeta^{-1})^{l-k} \right], \quad (9.2)$$

where

$$(a)_{n,h} := a(a+h)(a+2h) \cdots (a+(n-1)h).$$

Clearly, formulas (5.14)–(5.15) correspond to the special case $h = 0$ in the above expressions.

PROPOSITION 9.1. *Regarded as a polynomial in q with coefficients in*

$$\mathbb{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n, \zeta)[h],$$

the determinant of the matrix (5.11)–(5.13) with definitions (9.1)–(9.2) admits $q = \zeta^{\pm 1} - \lambda h$ as a root of multiplicity

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \max(s_i - (\lambda + 1), 0) + \sum_{j=1}^n \max(t_j - (\lambda + 1), 0),$$

for all $\lambda \geq 0$.

COROLLARY 9.2. *Regard the determinant of the matrix M'' given by (5.11)–(5.15) as a polynomial in q with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n, \zeta)$. Then $\det(M'')$ is divisible by*

$$[(q - \zeta)(q - \zeta^{-1})]^{\sum_{i=1}^m \binom{s_i}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{t_j}{2}}.$$

Proof. Take $h = 0$ in Proposition 9.1 and use that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \max(s_i - (\lambda + 1), 0) + \sum_{j=1}^n \max(t_j - (\lambda + 1), 0) \right\} \\ = \sum_{i=1}^m [(s_i - 1) + (s_i - 2) + \dots + 1] + \sum_{j=1}^n [(t_j - 1) + (t_j - 2) + \dots + 1] \\ = \sum_{i=1}^m \binom{s_i}{2} + \sum_{j=1}^n \binom{t_j}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 9.1. Recall the terminology we defined after the proof of Lemma 5.2 to describe the structure of the matrix (5.11)–(5.13): the blocks outlined by large rectangles form block-rows and block-columns, while the 2×2 blocks form bi-rows and bi-columns. Refer to portion (5.12) as the A -part and to portion (5.13) as the B -part of the matrix. In block-row i , bi-row $k + 1$ consists of the juxtaposition of the $n + 1$ matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^{11}(k, 0, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) & A^{12}(k, 0, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) & \dots & A^{11}(k, t_j - 1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) & A^{12}(k, t_j - 1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) \\ A^{21}(k, 0, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) & A^{11}(k, 0, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) & \dots & A^{21}(k, t_j - 1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) & A^{11}(k, t_j - 1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) \end{bmatrix},$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$\begin{bmatrix} B_0^{11}(k, x_i, y_i) & B_0^{12}(k, x_i, y_i) & \dots & B_{S-T-1}^{11}(k, x_i, y_i) & B_{S-T-1}^{12}(k, x_i, y_i) \\ B_0^{21}(k, x_i, y_i) & B_0^{11}(k, x_i, y_i) & \dots & B_{S-T-1}^{21}(k, x_i, y_i) & B_{S-T-1}^{11}(k, x_i, y_i) \end{bmatrix}.$$

We consider first the case of the roots of type $q = \zeta - \lambda h$. Perform the elementary row operation of adding the top half of this bi-row, multiplied by $-\zeta^2$, to its bottom half:

$$R_{2k+2}^{(i)} := R_{2k+2}^{(i)} - \zeta^2 R_{2k+1}^{(i)} \quad (9.3)$$

($R_p^{(i)}$ stands for row p of the block-row i in matrix (5.11)–(5.13)). By (9.1), the modified entries in bi-column $l + 1$ of block-column j are

$$A^{21}(k, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) - \zeta^2 A^{11}(k, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) = - \binom{k+l}{k} \left[\zeta(\zeta^{-2} - \zeta^2) \frac{(-\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}(q - \zeta)_{k,h}(q - \zeta)_{l,h}}{[(z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i)]^{k+l+1}} \right] \quad (9.4)$$

and

$$A^{11}(k, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) - \zeta^2 A^{12}(k, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) = - \binom{k+l}{k} \left[\zeta(1 - \zeta^4) \frac{(-\zeta^{-1})^{k+l}(q - \zeta)_{k,h}(q - \zeta)_{l,h}}{[(z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i)]^{k+l+1}} \right], \quad (9.5)$$

while by (9.2) the modified entries in bi-column $l + 1$ of the B -part are

$$B_l^{21}(k, x_i, y_i) - \zeta^2 B_l^{11}(k, x_i, y_i) = - \binom{l}{k} [\zeta(\zeta^{-2} - \zeta^2)(-\zeta^{-1})^k (q - \zeta)_{k,h}(u - v\zeta^{-1})^{l-k}]$$

and

$$B_l^{11}(k, x_i, y_i) - \zeta^2 B_l^{12}(k, x_i, y_i) = - \binom{l}{k} [\zeta(1 - \zeta^4)(-\zeta^{-1})^k (q - \zeta)_{k,h}(u - v\zeta^{-1})^{l-k}].$$

Note that

$$q - (\zeta - \lambda h) \mid (q - \zeta)_{k,h} = (q - \zeta)(q - (\zeta - h)) \cdots (q - (\zeta - (k - 1))h) \quad (9.6)$$

provided $\lambda \leq k - 1$. The above expressions show therefore that whenever $k \geq \lambda + 1$, operation (9.3) produces a row along which all entries are divisible by $q - (\zeta - \lambda h)$.

Let D be the matrix obtained from matrix (5.11)–(5.13), (9.1)–(9.2) by applying row operations (9.3) for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $k \geq \lambda + 1$. Let E be the matrix obtained from D by performing the column operations

$$C_{2l+1}^{(j)} := C_{2l+1}^{(j)} - \zeta^2 C_{2l+2}^{(j)}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, \quad l \geq \lambda + 1 \quad (9.7)$$

($C_p^{(j)}$ stands for column p of the block-column j in matrix D).

Then to finish the proof, it suffices to show that all entries of E along its columns produced by (9.7) are divisible by $q - (\zeta - \lambda h)$, and that those of them situated in bottom halves of bi-rows of index $\geq \lambda + 1$ are in fact divisible by $(q - (\zeta - \lambda h))^2$.

To verify this, consider an arbitrary entry α of a column of type (9.7) of E .

Case 1. The entry α is in the top half of bi-row $k + 1$ of block-row i .

Then the entries of D on which (9.7) acts are unmodified by the row operations (9.3). Formulas (9.1)–(9.2) imply that

$$\alpha = -\binom{k+l}{k} \zeta(1 - \zeta^4) \frac{(-\zeta^{-1})^{k+l} (q - \zeta)_{k,h} (q - \zeta)_{l,h}}{[(z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i)]^{k+l+1}}.$$

Since $l \geq \lambda + 1$, (9.6) implies that this is divisible by $q - (\zeta - \lambda h)$.

Case 2. The entry α is in the bottom half of bi-row $k + 1$ of block-row i .

Then the entries of D on which (9.7) acts are given by (9.4) and (9.5). It follows that

$$\alpha = -\binom{k+l}{k} \zeta [-(\zeta^{-2} - \zeta^2) + \zeta^2(1 - \zeta^4)] \frac{(-\zeta^{-1})^{k+l} (q - \zeta)_{k,h} (q - \zeta)_{l,h}}{[(z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i)]^{k+l+1}}.$$

By (9.6), this is divisible by $q - (\zeta - \lambda h)$, since $l \geq \lambda + 1$. If in addition $k \geq \lambda + 1$, (9.6) implies that α is divisible by $(q - (\zeta - \lambda h))^2$.

This verifies our statement about the entries of E along the columns produced by (9.7), and completes the proof of the statement of the Proposition for the roots of type $q = \zeta - \lambda h$.

To obtain the corresponding statement about the roots of type $q = \zeta^{-1} - \lambda h$, replace ζ by ζ^{-1} in the statement we just proved, and use the fact that this has the effect of replacing the quantities (9.1)–(9.2) by their negatives. $\square$

10. The case $q = 0$ of Theorem 8.1, up to a constant multiple

Proposition 9.1 reduces the proof of Theorem 8.1 to the case $q = 0$ (see Section 8). It turns out that in order to handle this case it is convenient to deform the $q = 0$ specialization of definitions (5.14)–(5.15) by introducing a new parameter h as follows:

$$A \begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix} (k, l, u, v) = \binom{k+l}{k} \left[\begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{Bmatrix} \zeta^{-1} \frac{1}{(u - v\zeta)_{k+l+1,h}} - \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{Bmatrix} \zeta \frac{1}{(u - v\zeta^{-1})_{k+l+1,h}} \right], \quad (10.1)$$

and

$$B_l \begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix} (k, u, v) = \binom{l}{k} \left[\begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{Bmatrix} \zeta^{-1} (u - v\zeta)_{l-k,h} - \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{Bmatrix} \zeta (u - v\zeta^{-1})_{l-k,h} \right], \quad (10.2)$$

where as in the previous section $(a)_{n,h} := a(a+h)(a+2h)\cdots(a+(n-1)h)$. Clearly, setting $h = 0$ above yields the specialization $q = 0$ of the definitions (5.14)–(5.15).

PROPOSITION 10.1. *Let M_0 be the $2S \times 2S$ matrix given by (5.11)–(5.13) and (10.1)–(10.2). Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \det(M_0) = & c \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \prod_{k=0}^{s_i-1} \prod_{l=0}^{s_j-1} [(x_i - x_j) - \zeta(y_i - y_j) - (k-l)h][(x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - y_j) - (k-l)h] \\ & \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \prod_{k=0}^{t_i-1} \prod_{l=0}^{t_j-1} [(z_i - z_j) - \zeta(w_i - w_j) - (k-l)h][(z_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(w_i - w_j) - (k-l)h] \\ & \times \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{k=0}^{s_i-1} \prod_{l=0}^{t_j-1} \{[(x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j) - (k+l)h]^{-1} \\ & \times [(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j) - (k+l)h]^{-1}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (10.3)$$

where $c \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$.

Proof. Let

$$d = \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{a=0}^{s_i+t_j-2} [(x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j) - ah][(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j) - ah]. \quad (10.4)$$

It follows from the definition of M_0 that when multiplying it by d , all its entries become polynomials in the variables $h, x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$.

For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and integers $s, t \geq 1$ define

$$N_1(a, s, t) = |\{(k, l) : k - l = a, 0 \leq k \leq s-1, 0 \leq l \leq t-1\}| \quad (10.5)$$

and

$$N_2(a, s, t) = |\{(k, l) : k + l = a, 0 \leq k \leq s-1, 0 \leq l \leq t-1\}|. \quad (10.6)$$

Then, multiplying all rows of M_0 by d , (10.3) becomes equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
\det(dM_0) = & c \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \prod_{a=-(s_j-1)}^{s_i-1} \left\{ [(x_i - x_j) - \zeta(y_i - y_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, s_i, s_j)} \right. \\
& \left. \times [(x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - y_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, s_i, s_j)} \right\} \\
& \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \prod_{a=-(t_j-1)}^{t_i-1} \left\{ [(z_i - z_j) - \zeta(w_i - w_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, t_i, t_j)} \right. \\
& \left. \times [(z_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(w_i - w_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, t_i, t_j)} \right\} \\
& \times \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{a=0}^{s_i+t_j-2} \{ [(x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j) - ah]^{2S-N_2(a, s_i, t_j)} \\
& \times [(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j) - ah]^{2S-N_2(a, s_i, t_j)} \}.
\end{aligned} \tag{10.7}$$

Regard both sides of (10.7) as polynomials in the variables

$$h, x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n,$$

with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$.

By Corollary 11.3 and Proposition 12.1, $\det(dM_0)$ is divisible by the full product expression on the right hand side of (10.7). It follows from definitions (10.5) and (10.6) that

$$\sum_{a=-(t-1)}^{s-1} N_1(a, s, t) = \sum_{a=0}^{s+t-2} N_2(a, s, t) = st.$$

By (10.4), the degree of d is

$$\deg(d) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n (s_i + t_j - 1).$$

Therefore, jointly in its variables, the polynomial on the right hand side of (10.7) has degree

$$2S \deg(d) + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j + 2 \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j - 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n s_i t_j. \tag{10.8}$$

To complete the proof, it suffices to show that the degree of $\det(dM_0)$ is less or equal than the value given by this expression. In turn, this is clearly equivalent to the degree⁷ of $\det(M_0)$ being at most the value given by the three sum-terms in (10.8). However, this follows by the argument we used in the proof of Proposition 5.3 to factor out the powers of R from the determinant of the matrix with blocks (5.16)–(5.17): Indeed, the degree in R of each entry of that matrix is equal to the joint degree in its variables of the corresponding entry of M_0 . $\square$

REMARK 10.2. Setting $h = 0$ in (10.3) and using (8.3) (which is a special case of Theorem 8.1) we obtain the explicit value $c = (\zeta^{-2} - \zeta^2)^{2S}$ for the multiplicative constant in Proposition 10.1. This provides a more general deformation of Cauchy's determinant than the one presented in Theorem A.1.

**11. Divisibility of $\det(dM_0)$ by the powers of $(x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - y_j) - ah$
and $(z_i - w_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(z_i - w_j) - ah$**

For any integers $s \geq 1$ and $0 \leq i \leq s-1$, define the $2s$ -vector $\mathbf{v}_i^s$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v}_i^s &= [v_{i0}, -\zeta^2 v_{i0}, v_{i1}, -\zeta^2 v_{i1}, \dots, v_{s-1}, -\zeta^2 v_{s-1}], \\ v_{ij} &= (-1)^j j! \binom{i}{j} h^j, \quad j = 0, 1, \dots, s-1. \end{aligned} \tag{11.1}$$

Denote by $\mathbf{0}_r$ the r -vector with all coordinates equal to 0.

LEMMA 11.1. *Let k and l be integers, $0 \leq k \leq s_i - 1$, $0 \leq l \leq s_j - 1$, $i < j$. Then, if $x_i = x_j + \zeta(y_i - y_j) + (k - l)h$, the linear combination of the rows of matrix M_0 specified by the $2S$ -vector*

$$[\mathbf{0}_{2s_1}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2s_{i-1}}, -\mathbf{v}_k^{s_i}, \mathbf{0}_{2s_{i+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2s_{j-1}}, \mathbf{v}_l^{s_j}, \mathbf{0}_{2s_{j+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2s_m}] \tag{11.2}$$

is a vanishing row combination. Furthermore, for any fixed $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, the vectors of the above type satisfying $k - l = a$ are linearly independent.

Proof. Note that in any subset of the set of vectors with $k - l = a$ fixed there is a unique vector with a rightmost non-zero coordinate. Indeed, if two such vectors have

⁷The degree of a rational function is the difference between the degrees of its numerator and denominator.

their rightmost non-zero coordinates in the same position, the values of l they correspond to are equal, but then $k - l = a$ implies that the k -values they correspond to are also equal, so the two vectors are identical. This implies the linear independence claimed in the statement of the Lemma.

Due to the form of M_0 , the statement that the specified row combination is vanishing amounts to four separate identities. Namely, we need to check that the indicated row combination produces 0 along the even and odd indexed columns of portion (5.12) of M_0 , and also along the even and odd indexed columns of portion (5.13) of M_0 . It is convenient to refer to these two portions as the A -part and B -part of M_0 .

Along column $2r + 1$ of block-column b (cf. our terminology related to the structure of (5.12)–(5.13)) of the A -part of M_0 , the vanishing of the indicated row combination amounts to

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s_i-1} v_{k\alpha} [A^{11}(\alpha, r, z_b - x_i, w_b - y_i) - \zeta^2 A^{21}(\alpha, r, z_b - x_i, w_b - y_i)] \\ & + \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s_j-1} v_{l\alpha} [A^{11}(\alpha, r, z_b - x_j, w_b - y_j) - \zeta^2 A^{21}(\alpha, r, z_b - x_j, w_b - y_j)] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (11.3)$$

provided $x_i = x_j + \zeta(y_i - y_j) + (k - l)h$.

By (11.1) and (10.1)–(10.2), the left hand side above equals

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\alpha=0}^k (-h)^\alpha \frac{k!}{(k - \alpha)!} \binom{\alpha + r}{\alpha} \frac{1 - \zeta^4}{\zeta} \frac{1}{((z_b - x_i) - \zeta(w_b - y_i))_{\alpha+r+1,h}} \\ & + \sum_{\alpha=0}^l (-h)^\alpha \frac{l!}{(l - \alpha)!} \binom{\alpha + r}{\alpha} \frac{1 - \zeta^4}{\zeta} \frac{1}{((z_b - x_j) - \zeta(w_b - y_j))_{\alpha+r+1,h}}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.4)$$

When $x_i = x_j + \zeta(y_i - y_j) + (k - l)h$, we have $(z_b - x_j) - \zeta(w_b - y_j) = (z_b - x_i) - \zeta(w_b - y_i) + (k - l)h$. Denoting $c = (z_b - x_i) - \zeta(w_b - y_i)$, we obtain that (11.3) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\alpha=0}^k (-h)^\alpha \frac{k!}{(k - \alpha)!} \binom{\alpha + r}{\alpha} \frac{1}{(c)_{\alpha+r+1,h}} \\ & = \sum_{\alpha=0}^l (-h)^\alpha \frac{l!}{(l - \alpha)!} \binom{\alpha + r}{\alpha} \frac{1}{(c + (k - l)h)_{\alpha+r+1,h}}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.5)$$

We claim that the left hand side of (11.5) evaluates as

$$\sum_{\alpha=0}^k (-h)^\alpha \frac{k!}{(k-\alpha)!} \binom{\alpha+r}{\alpha} \frac{1}{(c)_{\alpha+r+1,h}} = \frac{1}{h^{r+1}} \frac{1}{(\frac{c}{h} + k)_{r+1}}. \quad (11.6)$$

Indeed, let $c' = c/h$. The left hand side of (11.6) can then be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\alpha=0}^k (-h)^\alpha \frac{k!}{(k-\alpha)!} \binom{\alpha+r}{\alpha} \frac{1}{(c')_{\alpha+r+1} h^{\alpha+r+1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{h^{r+1}} \sum_{\alpha=0}^k (-k)_\alpha \frac{(r+1)_\alpha}{\alpha!} \frac{1}{(c')_{r+1} (c' + r + 1)_\alpha} \\ &= \frac{1}{(c')_{r+1} h^{r+1}} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -k, r+1 \\ c' + r + 1 \end{matrix}; 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Then (11.6) follows by Lemma 11.2.

By (11.6), the right hand side of (11.5) equals

$$\frac{1}{h^{r+1}} \frac{1}{(\frac{c+(k-l)h}{h} + l)_{r+1}}.$$

This proves (11.5), and therefore (11.3).

Next, we verify that the row combination (11.2) is vanishing along the column $2r+2$ of block-column b . This amounts to proving a close analog of (11.3); namely, that

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s_i-1} v_{k\alpha} [A^{12}(\alpha, r, z_b - x_i, w_b - y_i) - \zeta^2 A^{11}(\alpha, r, z_b - x_i, w_b - y_i)] \\ & + \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s_j-1} v_{l\alpha} [A^{12}(\alpha, r, z_b - x_j, w_b - y_j) - \zeta^2 A^{11}(\alpha, r, z_b - x_j, w_b - y_j)] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (11.7)$$

provided $x_i = x_j + \zeta(y_i - y_j) + (k-l)h$. By (11.1) and (10.1)–(10.2), the left hand side of (11.7) is nearly the same as the left hand side of (11.3)—the only difference is that the factor $1 - \zeta^4$ at the numerator gets now replaced by $\zeta^{-2} - \zeta^2$. Therefore (11.7) follows by (11.3).

To complete the proof we need to check that row combination (11.2) vanishes along the columns of the B -part of M_0 .

Along column $2r + 1$ of the B -part of M_0 , the vanishing of row combination (11.2) amounts to showing that for $x_i = x_j + \zeta(y_i - y_j) + (k - l)h$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s_i-1} v_{k\alpha} [B^{11}(\alpha, r, x_i, y_i) - \zeta^2 B^{12}(\alpha, r, x_i, y_i)] \\ & + \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s_j-1} v_{l\alpha} [B^{11}(\alpha, r, x_j, y_j) - \zeta^2 B^{12}(\alpha, r, x_j, y_j)] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (11.8)$$

By (11.1) and formulas (10.1)–(10.2), the left hand side of (11.8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 - \zeta^4}{\zeta} \left\{ - \sum_{\alpha=0}^k (-h)^\alpha \frac{k!}{(k - \alpha)!} \binom{r}{\alpha} (x_i - \zeta y_i)_{r-\alpha, h} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{\alpha=0}^l (-h)^\alpha \frac{l!}{(l - \alpha)!} \binom{r}{\alpha} (x_j - \zeta y_j)_{r-\alpha, h} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.9)$$

Letting $c = (x_i - \zeta y_i)/h$, the first sum above can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\alpha=0}^k (-h)^\alpha \frac{k!}{(k - \alpha)!} \binom{r}{\alpha} (c)_{r-\alpha} h^{r-\alpha} \\ & = h^r \sum_{\alpha=0}^k (-k)_\alpha \frac{(-r)_\alpha}{\alpha!} \frac{(c)_r}{(-c - r + 1)_\alpha} \\ & = (c)_r h^r {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -k, -r \\ -c - r + 1 \end{matrix}; 1 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Replacing r by $-r - 1$ and c by $-c + 1$, Lemma 11.2 implies, after simplifications, that

$${}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -k, -r \\ -c - r + 1 \end{matrix}; 1 \right] = \frac{(c - k)_r}{(c)_r}.$$

Therefore, the first sum in (11.9) equals $h^r (c - k)_r$. But the second sum in (11.9) has the same form, except $(x_j - \zeta y_j)/h = (x_i - \zeta y_i)/h - (k - l) = c - (k - l)$, since we are assuming $x_i = x_j + \zeta(y_i - y_j) + (k - l)h$. It follows that the second sum equals $h^r ((c - (k - l)) - l)_r$, and thus cancels the first sum. This proves (11.8).

The final identity to check is that row combination (11.2) is vanishing along column $2r + 2$ of the B -part of M_0 . This is equivalent to the following counterpart of (11.8):

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s_i-1} v_{k\alpha} [B^{12}(\alpha, r, x_i, y_i) - \zeta^2 B^{11}(\alpha, r, x_i, y_i)] \\
& + \sum_{\alpha=0}^{s_j-1} v_{l\alpha} [B^{12}(\alpha, r, x_j, y_j) - \zeta^2 B^{11}(\alpha, r, x_j, y_j)] = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{11.10}$$

Replacing (11.1) and (10.1)–(10.2) in this shows that, just as it was the case for (11.3) and (11.7), the expressions on the left hand sides of (11.10) and (11.8) differ only in that the factor $1 - \zeta^4$ in the former gets replaced by $\zeta^{-2} - \zeta^2$ in the latter. Therefore (11.10) follows from (11.8), and the proof is complete. $\square$

LEMMA 11.2. *Let $0 \leq k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then if c is an indeterminate one has*

$${}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -k, r+1 \\ c+r+1 \end{matrix}; 1 \right] = \begin{cases} \frac{(c)_{r+1}}{(c+k)_{r+1}}, & \text{if } r+1 \geq 0, \\ \frac{(c+k+r+1)_{-r-1}}{(c+r+1)_{-r-1}}, & \text{if } r+1 < 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since $k \geq 0$, the hypergeometric series is terminating and the equality in the statement is equivalent to a polynomial identity in c . By Gauss' formula (4.9), for any large enough integer c we have

$${}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -k, r+1 \\ c+r+1 \end{matrix}; 1 \right] = \frac{\Gamma(c+r+1)\Gamma(c+k)}{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(c+k+r+1)}.$$

The expression on the right hand side readily checks to simplify to the ones in the statement. This proves that the rational functions in c on the two sides of the equality in the statement agree on infinitely many values of c . They must therefore be identical. $\square$

COROLLARY 11.3. *Regarded as a polynomial with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$ in the variables*

$h, x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n$, $\det(dM_0)$ is divisible by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \prod_{a=-(s_j-1)}^{s_i-1} \left\{ [(x_i - x_j) - \zeta(y_i - y_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, s_i, s_j)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times [(x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - y_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, s_i, s_j)} \right\} \\
& \times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \prod_{a=-(t_j-1)}^{t_i-1} \left\{ [(z_i - z_j) - \zeta(w_i - w_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, t_i, t_j)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times [(z_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(w_i - w_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, t_i, t_j)} \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{11.11}$$

Proof. By Lemma 11.1, $x_i = x_j + \zeta(y_i - y_j) + ah$ is a root of multiplicity $N_1(a, s_i, s_j)$ of $\det(dM_0)$, when the latter is regarded as a polynomial in the single variable x_i , with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}, h, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n]$. By Bézout's theorem, it follows that

$$[(x_i - x_j) - \zeta(y_i - y_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, s_i, s_j)} \mid \det(dM_0). \tag{11.12}$$

By the form of the expressions (10.1)–(10.2) and (10.4), the effect of replacing ζ by ζ^{-1} in dM_0 is to replace each entry by its negative. Therefore (11.12) implies that we also have

$$[(x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - y_j) - ah]^{N_1(a, s_i, s_j)} \mid \det(dM_0).$$

To obtain the divisibility by the factors on the second line of (11.11), note that Lemma 11.1 admits a perfect analog for column combinations. The proof of this analog is identical to the part of the proof of Lemma 11.1 that pertains to verifying that combination (11.2) is vanishing along the columns of the A -part of M_0 . This is due to the symmetry of formula (10.1) under interchanging k and l . $\square$

12. Divisibility of $\det(dM_0)$ by the powers of $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j)$

PROPOSITION 12.1. *Regarded as a polynomial with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta, \zeta^{-1}]$ in the variables $h, x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_m, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n$, $\det(dM_0)$ is divisible by*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{a=0}^{s_i+t_j-2} [(x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j) - ah]^{2S-N_2(a, s_i, t_j)} \\
& \quad \times [(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j) - ah]^{2S-N_2(a, s_i, t_j)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Our proof is based on finding suitable sets of independent linear combinations of the rows and columns of dM_0 that vanish when $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$. These are presented in the following four preliminary results.

LEMMA 12.2. *Each column of dM_0 outside of block-column j becomes zero when $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$.*

Proof. This holds on account of the multiplicative factor d —outside block-column j the factors $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah$ of d do not get canceled by factors in the denominators of expressions (10.1)–(10.2). $\square$

LEMMA 12.3. *Let $a \in \{0, 1, \dots, s_i + t_j - 2\}$ be fixed, and assume $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$. Then the column combination*

$$[\mathbf{0}_{2t_1}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2t_{j-1}}, \mathbf{0}_{2l}, 1, -\zeta^{\pm 2}, \mathbf{0}_{2t_j-2l-2}, \mathbf{0}_{2t_{j+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2t_n}, \mathbf{0}_{2S-2T}]$$

in dM_0 is vanishing, for $l = 0, \dots, t_j - 1$.

Proof. The vanishing of the given column combination along row $2r + 1$ of block-row i of dM_0 amounts to

$$d^{ij} A^{11}(r, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) - \zeta^{\pm 2} d^{ij} A^{12}(r, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) = 0, \quad (12.1)$$

where

$$d^{ij} = \prod_{a=0}^{s_i+t_j-2} [(x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j) - ah][(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j) - ah] \quad (12.2)$$

is the part of d involving precisely indices i and j . By definition (10.1), (12.1) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{r+l}{r} \\ & \times \left[\zeta^{-1}(1 - \zeta^{\pm 2}\zeta^{-2}) \frac{((z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i))_{s_i+t_j-1,h} ((z_j - x_i) - \zeta^{-1}(w_j - y_i))_{s_i+t_j-1,h}}{((z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i))_{r+l+1,h}} \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \zeta(1 - \zeta^{\pm 2}\zeta^2) \frac{((z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i))_{s_i+t_j-1,h} ((z_j - x_i) - \zeta^{-1}(w_j - y_i))_{s_i+t_j-1,h}}{((z_j - x_i) - \zeta^{-1}(w_j - y_i))_{r+l+1,h}} \right] \\ & = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (12.3)$$

Suppose $+2$ is chosen at the exponent in (12.3). Then the first term in the square brackets is clearly 0. The second term is 0 due to the factor of $(z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i) + ah$ in the numerator, which clearly does not get canceled by any factor of the denominator. The case when -2 is chosen at the exponent in (12.3) follows similarly.

The vanishing of the indicated column combination along row $2r + 2$ of block-row i of dM_0 amounts to

$$d^{ij}A^{21}(r, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) - \zeta^{\pm 2}d^{ij}A^{11}(r, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) = 0.$$

This is obtained from (12.1) by dividing by $-\zeta^{\pm 2}$. $\square$

LEMMA 12.4. *Let $a = s_i + k$, $k \in \{0, \dots, t_j - 2\}$, be fixed. Then when $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$, columns $2, 4, 6, \dots, 2k + 2$ of block-column j of dM_0 become identically zero.*

Proof. For $0 \leq l \leq k$ and $0 \leq r \leq s_i - 1$, the entry in column $2l + 2$ of block-column j of dM_0 that is situated in row $2r + 1$ of block-row i is

$$d^{ij}A^{12}(r, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i),$$

where d^{ij} is given by (12.2). By (10.1) and (12.2) the explicit value of this is

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{r+l}{r} & \left[\zeta^{-3} \frac{((z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i))_{s_i+t_j-1,h} ((z_j - x_i) - \zeta^{-1}(w_j - y_i))_{s_i+t_j-1,h}}{((z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i))_{r+l+1,h}} \right. \\ & \left. - \zeta^3 \frac{((z_j - x_i) - \zeta(w_j - y_i))_{s_i+t_j-1,h} ((z_j - x_i) - \zeta^{-1}(w_j - y_i))_{s_i+t_j-1,h}}{((z_j - x_i) - \zeta^{-1}(w_j - y_i))_{r+l+1,h}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The factors $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah$ in the numerators are not canceled by any of the factors in the denominators, as the latter are of the form $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - bh$ with $0 \leq b \leq r+l < s_i+k = a$. Thus the expression above is 0 for $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$.

The entry in column $2l + 2$ of block-column j of dM_0 which is situated in row $2r + 2$ of block-row i is seen to be 0 by the same argument. $\square$

LEMMA 12.5. *Let $a \in \{0, \dots, t_j - 2\}$ be fixed. For $0 \leq k \leq t_j - 2 - a$, consider the vectors*

$$\mathbf{u}_k = \frac{(-1)^k(t_j - 1)!}{k!(t_j - 2 - a - k)!} \left[\left(0, \frac{(-h)^\alpha}{(a - \alpha)!(a - \alpha + 1 + k)} \right)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq a} \right]$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}_k = \left[\mathbf{0}_{2k}, 0, \frac{(t_j - 1)!}{(t_j - 2 - a - k)!} (-h)^{1+a+k}, \mathbf{0}_{2(t_j-2-a-k)} \right].$$

Then if $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$, the column combinations of dM_0 with coefficients

$$[\mathbf{0}_{2t_1}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2t_{j-1}}, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{0}_{2t_{j+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2t_n}] \quad (12.4)$$

are vanishing for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, t_j - 2 - a$.

Proof. The fact that the indicated column combination is vanishing along row $2r + 1$ in block-row i is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(-1)^k (t_j - 1)!}{k! (t_j - 2 - a - k)!} \sum_{\alpha=0}^a \frac{(-h)^\alpha}{(a - \alpha)! (k + 1 + a - \alpha)!} dA^{12}(r, \alpha, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) \\ &= - \frac{(t_j - 1)!}{(t_j - 2 - a - k)!} (-h)^{a+k+1} dA^{12}(r, a + k + 1, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i), \end{aligned} \quad (12.5)$$

provided $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$.

Assume $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$. Using (10.1), (10.4), the fact that $(a)_{n,h}/(a)_{k,h} = (a + kh)_{n-k,h}$ and dividing through by all the factors of d not present in (12.2), the above equality becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(-1)^k (t_j - 1)!}{k! (t_j - 2 - a - k)!} \sum_{\alpha=0}^a \frac{(-h)^\alpha}{(a - \alpha)! (k + 1 + a - \alpha)!} \binom{r + \alpha}{\alpha} \\ & \times [\zeta^{-3}(-ah + (r + \alpha + 1)h)_{s_i+t_j-r-\alpha,h} (u - v\zeta^{-1})_{s_i+t_j+1,h} \\ & \quad - \zeta^3(-ah)_{s_i+t_j+1,h} (u - v\zeta^{-1} + (r + \alpha + 1)h)_{s_i+t_j-r-\alpha,h}] \\ &= - \frac{(t_j - 1)!}{(t_j - 2 - a - k)!} (-h)^{a+k+1} \binom{r + a + k + 1}{r} \\ & \times [\zeta^{-3}(-ah + (r + a + k + 2)h)_{s_i+t_j-r-a-k-1,h} (u - v\zeta^{-1})_{s_i+t_j+1,h} \\ & \quad - \zeta^3(-ah)_{s_i+t_j+1,h} (u - v\zeta^{-1} + (r + a + k + 2)h)_{s_i+t_j-r-a-k-1,h}], \end{aligned}$$

where $u = z_j - x_i$ and $v = w_j - y_i$. Using that $(-ah)_{s_i+t_j+1,h} = 0$, the above simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\alpha=0}^a \frac{(-1)^\alpha}{(a - \alpha)! (k + 1 + a - \alpha)!} \binom{r + \alpha}{\alpha} (-a + r + \alpha + 1)_{s_i+t_j-r-\alpha} \\ &= (-1)^a k! \binom{r + a + k + 1}{r} (r + k + 2)_{s_i+t_j-r-a-k-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (12.6)$$

Write for notational simplicity $s = s_i + t_j$. Then after some manipulation, the left hand side of (12.6) becomes

$$-\frac{(s-a)!}{a!\Gamma(r+1)(-a-k-1)} \sum_{\alpha=0}^a \frac{(-a)_\alpha(-a-k-1)_\alpha(r+1)_\alpha}{\alpha!(-a-k)_\alpha} \frac{(r+1-a)_a}{(r+1-a)_\alpha},$$

an expression that is well-defined for any $0 \leq a, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a \leq s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \in \mathbb{C}$. Furthermore, when $r \notin \mathbb{Z}$, the above expression can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{(s-a)!(r+1-a)_a}{a!\Gamma(r+1)(-a-k-1)} \sum_{\alpha=0}^a \frac{(-a)_\alpha(-a-k-1)_\alpha(r+1)_\alpha}{\alpha!(-a-k)_\alpha(r+1-a)_\alpha} \\ & = -\frac{(s-a)!(r+1-a)_a}{a!\Gamma(r+1)(-a-k-1)} {}_3F_2 \left[\begin{matrix} -a, -a-k-1, r+1 \\ r+1-a, -a-k \end{matrix} ; 1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (12.7)$$

The ${}_3F_2$ above can be evaluated by choosing $n = a$, $x = -a-k-1$, $y = r+1$, $z = r+1-a$ in the Pfaff-Saalschütz summation formula (found e.g. in [23, (2.3.1.3), Appendix (III.2)])

$${}_3F_2 \left[\begin{matrix} -n, x, y \\ z, 1+x+y-z-n \end{matrix} ; 1 \right] = \frac{(z-x)_n(z-y)_n}{(z)_n(z-x-y)_n}.$$

Thus, by (12.7) we obtain that for $r \notin \mathbb{Z}$ the left hand side of (12.6) equals

$$-\frac{(s-a)!(r+1-a)_a}{a!\Gamma(r+1)(-a-k-1)} \frac{(r+k+2)_a(-a)_a}{(r+1-a)_a(k+1)_a}.$$

However, this is readily seen to agree with the right hand side of (12.6) (which, by writing $(r+n)_{m-r} = \Gamma(m+n)/\Gamma(r+n)$, is defined for any $r \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$). This proves equality (12.6) for $r \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$. Since the two sides of (12.6) are analytic functions of r that coincide on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, they must be identical. This proves (12.6) and therefore (12.5).

The vanishing of column combination (12.4) along row $2r+2$ in block-row i is equivalent to the equality obtained from (12.5) by replacing the A^{12} 's by A^{11} 's. This is readily seen to be equivalent to (12.6) as well (the only difference from the case of A^{12} 's is that the factors ζ^{-3} and ζ^3 in the formula displayed above (12.6) get replaced by ζ^{-1} and ζ , respectively). This completes the proof of the statement of the lemma for the case $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$.

The case when $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$ follows by replacing ζ by ζ^{-1} in the case we proved above, and using the fact that the right hand side of (10.1) simply changes sign under this substitution. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 12.1. We treat first the case $s_i \geq t_j$.

For each $a \in \{0, \dots, s_i + t_j - 2\}$, Lemmas 12.2 and 12.3 provide together a set of $2S - 2t_j + t_j = 2S - t_j$ independent column combinations that are vanishing when $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$. To complete the proof it suffices to enlarge this set by $t_j - N_2(a, s_i, t_j)$ more vanishing column combinations, so that the enlarged set of column combinations is linearly independent.

If $0 \leq a \leq t_j - 2$, Lemma 12.5 provides $t_j - 1 - a$ such additional column combinations. However, it follows by definition (10.6) that $N_2(a, s_i, t_j) = a + 1$ for $0 \leq a \leq t_j - 2$. Therefore these can be taken as the additional $t_j - N_2(a, s_i, t_j)$ column combinations that we need.

For $t_j - 1 \leq a \leq s_i - 1$, (10.6) implies that $N_2(a, s_i, t_j) = t_j$, so no vanishing column combinations are needed in addition to the ones supplied by Lemmas 12.2 and 12.3.

If on the other hand $s_i \leq a \leq s_i + t_j - 2$, then $N_2(a, s_i, t_j) = s_i + t_j - a - 1$, and the needed additional vanishing column combinations are provided by Lemma 12.4.

Similar arguments, based on the counterparts of Lemmas 12.2–12.5 presented below, imply the same conclusion if $s_i \leq t_j$. $\square$

LEMMA 12.2'. *Each row of dM_0 outside of block-row i becomes zero when $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$.*

Proof. This follows by the same argument as Lemma 12.2 $\square$

LEMMA 12.3'. *Let $a \in \{0, 1, \dots, s_i + t_j - 2\}$ be fixed, and assume $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$. Then the row combination*

$$[\mathbf{0}_{2s_1}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2s_{i-1}}, \mathbf{0}_{2r}, 1, -\zeta^{\pm 2}, \mathbf{0}_{2s_i-2r-2}, \mathbf{0}_{2s_{i+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2s_m}]$$

in dM_0 is vanishing, for $r = 0, \dots, s_i - 1$.

Proof. The vanishing of the given column combination along column $2l + 1$ of block-row i of dM_0 amounts to

$$d^{ij}A^{11}(r, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) - \zeta^{\pm 2}d^{ij}A^{21}(r, l, z_j - x_i, w_j - y_i) = 0.$$

with d^{ij} given by (12.2). This follows by the argument used in the proof of Lemma 12.3. The case of column $2l + 2$ follows by dividing the above equality by $\zeta^{\pm 2}$.

In addition, we need to verify the vanishing of the indicated row combination for the B -part of dM_0 . But this holds trivially since the entire B -part of dM_0 is zero when $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$. $\square$

LEMMA 12.4'. *Let $a = t_j + l$, $l \in \{0, \dots, s_i - 2\}$, be fixed. Then when $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$, rows $2, 4, 6, \dots, 2l + 2$ of block-row i of dM_0 become identically zero.*

Proof. This follows by an argument perfectly analogous to the one used in the proof of Lemma 12.4. $\square$

LEMMA 12.5'. Let $a \in \{0, \dots, s_i - 2\}$ be fixed. For $0 \leq k \leq s_i - 2 - a$, consider the vectors

$$\mathbf{u}_k = \frac{(-1)^k (s_i - 1)!}{k! (s_i - 2 - a - k)!} \left[\left(0, \frac{(-h)^\alpha}{(a - \alpha)! (a - \alpha + 1 + k)} \right)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq a} \right]$$

and

$$\mathbf{v}_k = \left[\mathbf{0}_{2k}, 0, \frac{(s_i - 1)!}{(s_i - 2 - a - k)!} (-h)^{1+a+k}, \mathbf{0}_{2(s_i - 2 - a - k)} \right].$$

Then if $(x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{\pm 1}(y_i - w_j) - ah = 0$, the row combinations of dM_0 with coefficients

$$[\mathbf{0}_{2s_1}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2s_{i-1}}, \mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{0}_{2s_{i+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{2s_m}]$$

are vanishing for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, s_i - 2 - a$.

Proof. The vanishing of the indicated row combination on the A -part of dM_0 follows by the calculations in the proof of Lemma 12.5. Along the B part of dM_0 this holds trivially, as explained in the proof of Lemma 12.3'. $\square$

13. The proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 2.2

We are now ready to present the proofs of the two results from which we deduced Theorem 1.2 in Section 2.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. By reflecting the lattice and the holes about a vertical lattice line if necessary, we may assume $S = \sum_{k=1}^m s_k \geq \sum_{l=1}^n t_l = T$.

The statement follows then directly by Proposition 5.1, Proposition 5.3 and Theorem 8.1, using that for $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$ one has

$$\zeta^{-2} - \zeta^2 = i\sqrt{3} \tag{13.1}$$

and

$$(u - \zeta v)(u - \zeta^{-1}v) = u^2 + uv + v^2. \tag{13.2}$$

$\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.2. By Proposition 5.1 we have

$$\hat{\omega}(E(a_1, qa_1), \dots, E(a_s, qa_s)) = |\det(M_1)|, \tag{13.3}$$

where M_1 is the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_0(a_1, qa_1) & U_0(a_1-1, qa_1+1) & \cdots & U_{s-1}(a_1, qa_1) & U_{s-1}(a_1-1, qa_1+1) \\ U_0(a_1+1, qa_1-1) & U_0(a_1, qa_1) & \cdots & U_{s-1}(a_1+1, qa_1-1) & U_{s-1}(a_1, qa_1) \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ U_0(a_s, qa_s) & U_0(a_s-1, qa_s+1) & \cdots & U_{s-1}(a_s, qa_s) & U_{s-1}(a_s-1, qa_s+1) \\ U_0(a_s+1, qa_s-1) & U_0(a_s, qa_s) & \cdots & U_{s-1}(a_s+1, qa_s-1) & U_{s-1}(a_s, qa_s) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Apply the determinant-preserving operator (5.4) to M_1 twice, first along the rows of odd index and then along the rows of even index. By the arguments in the proof of Proposition 5.3 we obtain that

$$\det(M_1) = \prod_{1 \leq k < l \leq s} (a_k - a_l)^2 \det(M_2), \quad (13.4)$$

where M_2 is the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}^0 U_0(a_1, qa_1) & \mathcal{D}^0 U_0(a_1-1, qa_1+1) & \cdots & \mathcal{D}^0 U_{s-1}(a_1, qa_1) & \mathcal{D}^0 U_{s-1}(a_1-1, qa_1+1) \\ \mathcal{D}^0 U_0(a_1+1, qa_1-1) & \mathcal{D}^0 U_0(a_1, qa_1) & \cdots & \mathcal{D}^0 U_{s-1}(a_1+1, qa_1-1) & \mathcal{D}^0 U_{s-1}(a_1, qa_1) \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ \mathcal{D}^{s-1} U_0(a_s, qa_s) & \mathcal{D}^{s-1} U_0(a_s-1, qa_s+1) & \cdots & \mathcal{D}^{s-1} U_{s-1}(a_s, qa_s) & \mathcal{D}^{s-1} U_{s-1}(a_s-1, qa_s+1) \\ \mathcal{D}^{s-1} U_0(a_s+1, qa_s-1) & \mathcal{D}^{s-1} U_0(a_s, qa_s) & \cdots & \mathcal{D}^{s-1} U_{s-1}(a_s+1, qa_s-1) & \mathcal{D}^{s-1} U_{s-1}(a_s, qa_s) \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have seen in the proof of Proposition 6.1 that

$$U_l(a, b) = -\frac{i}{2\pi} [\zeta^{a-b-1}(a - b\zeta)^l - \zeta^{-a+b+1}(a - b\zeta^{-1})^l] \\ + \text{monomials in } a \text{ and } b \text{ of joint degree } < l.$$

This implies that, viewed as a block-matrix consisting of 2×2 blocks, M_2 is block-upper-triangular. Furthermore, using Lemma 6.4 and the assumption $3|1-q$, the $(k+1)$ -st diagonal 2×2 block of M_2 is seen to be

$$-\frac{i}{2\pi} \begin{bmatrix} \zeta^{-1}(1-q\zeta)^k - \zeta(1-q\zeta^{-1})^k & \zeta^{-3}(1-q\zeta)^k - \zeta^3(1-q\zeta^{-1})^k \\ \zeta(1-q\zeta)^k - \zeta^{-1}(1-q\zeta^{-1})^k & \zeta^{-1}(1-q\zeta)^k - \zeta(1-q\zeta^{-1})^k \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since the determinant of this block equals

$$-\frac{1}{4\pi^2} (\zeta^{-2} - \zeta^2)^2 (q - \zeta)^k (q - \zeta^{-1})^k,$$

equality (2.2) follows by (13.3) and (13.4), using (13.1)–(13.2). $\square$

14. The case of arbitrary slopes

Let us now consider the pure linear multiholes of not necessarily equal slopes $E_{\mathbf{a}_1}^{q_1}, \dots, E_{\mathbf{a}_m}^{q_m}$ and $W_{\mathbf{b}_1}^{q'_1}, \dots, W_{\mathbf{b}_n}^{q'_n}$. Then their correlation is still given by Lemma 5.1, but with the following change in the definition of the block matrices C_j and D of matrix M : Modify the blocks of (5.2) so that the top left entries of the 2×2 matrices change from

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i1} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i1} - b_{j1}) - 1) & \cdots & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i1} - b_{j,t_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i1} - b_{j,t_j}) - 1) \\ P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i2} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i2} - b_{j1}) - 1) & \cdots & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i2} - b_{j,t_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i2} - b_{j,t_j}) - 1) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \end{array}$$

$$P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i,s_i} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i,s_i} - b_{j1}) - 1) \quad \cdots \quad P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i,s_i} - b_{j,t_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q(a_{i,s_i} - b_{j,t_j}) - 1)$$

to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i1} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q_i a_{i1} - q'_j b_{j1} - 1) & \cdots & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i1} - b_{j,t_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q_i a_{i1} - q'_j b_{j,t_j} - 1) \\ P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i2} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q_i a_{i2} - q'_j b_{j1} - 1) & \cdots & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i2} - b_{j,t_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q_i a_{i2} - q'_j b_{j,t_j} - 1) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i,s_i} - b_{j1} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q_i a_{i,s_i} - q'_j b_{j1} - 1) & \cdots & P(-R(z_j - x_i) + a_{i,s_i} - b_{j,t_j} - 1, -R(w_j - y_i) + q_i a_{i,s_i} - q'_j b_{j,t_j} - 1) \end{array}$$

and the blocks of (5.3) so that the top left entries of the 2×2 matrices change from

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_0(Rx_i + a_{i1}, Ry_j + qa_{i1}) & \cdots & U_{S-T-1}(Rx_i + a_{i1}, Ry_j + qa_{i1}) \\ U_0(Rx_i + a_{i2}, Ry_j + qa_{i2}) & \cdots & U_{S-T-1}(Rx_i + a_{i2}, Ry_j + qa_{i2}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \end{array}$$

$$U_0(Rx_i + a_{i,s_i}, Ry_j + qa_{i,s_i}) \quad \cdots \quad U_{S-T-1}(Rx_i + a_{i,s_i}, Ry_j + qa_{i,s_i})$$

to

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_0(Rx_i + a_{i1}, Ry_j + q_i a_{i1}) & \cdots & U_{S-T-1}(Rx_i + a_{i1}, Ry_j + q_i a_{i1}) \\ U_0(Rx_i + a_{i2}, Ry_j + q_i a_{i2}) & \cdots & U_{S-T-1}(Rx_i + a_{i2}, Ry_j + q_i a_{i2}) \\ \vdots & & \vdots \end{array}$$

$$U_0(Rx_i + a_{i,s_i}, Ry_j + q_i a_{i,s_i}) \quad \cdots \quad U_{S-T-1}(Rx_i + a_{i,s_i}, Ry_j + q_i a_{i,s_i})$$

It is apparent from the above that in this more general version of the matrix M we have the same $2m + 2n$ opportunities to apply operation (5.4) (or its analog for columns) as for the original matrix M of Section 5, obtained from the above when $q_1 = \dots = q'_n = q$. Indeed, the arguments of Section 5 apply in this more general case of arbitrary slopes, and give that the determinant of the above modification of the matrix M is equal to the determinant of the deformation of the matrix M' of (5.6)–(5.9) in which the quantities qa_{ik} are replaced by $q_i a_{ik}$'s and the quantities qb_{jl} by $q'_j b_{jl}$'s. The asymptotics of the thus modified entries in (5.9) is given by Proposition 6.1. For the modified entries of (5.6) we need the following slight extension of Proposition 7.1, whose proof follows by the arguments of Section 7.

PROPOSITION 7.1'. *Let q and q' be rational numbers so that $3|1 - q$ and $3|1 - q'$. Then for any fixed $c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $u, v \in 3\mathbb{Z}$, $(u, v) \neq (0, 0)$, and $0 \leq k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_y^l \{ \mathcal{D}_x^k P(-Ru + x + y + c, -Rv + qx + q'y + d)|_{x=a_1} \} \Big|_{y=b_1} = \\ -\frac{i}{2\pi} \binom{k+l}{l} \left[\zeta^{c-d-1} \frac{(1-q\zeta)^k (1-q'\zeta)^l}{(u-v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} \right. \\ \left. - \zeta^{-c+d+1} \frac{(1-q\zeta^{-1})^k (1-q'\zeta^{-1})^l}{(u-v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} \right] \frac{1}{R^{k+l+1}} + O(R^{-k-l-2}). \end{aligned}$$

The arguments that proved Proposition 5.3 yield then that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\omega}(E_{\mathbf{a}_1}^{q_1}(Rx_1, Ry_1), \dots, E_{\mathbf{a}_m}^{q_m}(Rx_m, Ry_m), W_{\mathbf{b}_1}^{q'_1}(Rz_1, Rw_1), \dots, W_{\mathbf{b}_n}^{q'_n}(Rz_n, Rw_n)) \\ = \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \right)^{2S} \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq s_i} (a_{ij} - a_{ik})^2 \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq t_i} (b_{ij} - b_{ik})^2 \\ \times |\det(\bar{M}'')| R^{2\{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n s_i t_j\}} \\ + O(R^{2\{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n s_i t_j\} - 1}), \end{aligned} \quad (14.1)$$

where

$$\bar{M}'' = [\bar{C}'' \quad \bar{D}''], \quad (14.2)$$

$$\bar{C}'' = \begin{bmatrix} & \vdots & \\ \cdots & C''_{ij} & \cdots \\ & \vdots & \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14.3)$$

$$C''_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{ij}^{11}(0,0,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & A_{ij}^{12}(0,0,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & \cdots & A_{ij}^{11}(0,t_j-1,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & A_{ij}^{12}(0,t_j-1,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) \\ A_{ij}^{21}(0,0,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & A_{ij}^{11}(0,0,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & \cdots & A_{ij}^{21}(0,t_j-1,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & A_{ij}^{11}(0,t_j-1,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ A_{ij}^{11}(s_i-1,0,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & A_{ij}^{12}(s_i-1,0,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & \cdots & A_{ij}^{11}(s_i-1,t_j-1,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & A_{ij}^{12}(s_i-1,t_j-1,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) \\ A_{ij}^{21}(s_i-1,0,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & A_{ij}^{11}(s_i-1,0,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & \cdots & A_{ij}^{21}(s_i-1,t_j-1,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) & A_{ij}^{11}(s_i-1,t_j-1,z_j-x_i,w_j-y_i) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14.4)$$

$$\bar{D}'' = \begin{bmatrix} \vdots \\ D''_i \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14.5)$$

$$D''_i = \begin{bmatrix} B_{0,i}^{11}(0,x_i,y_i) & B_{0,i}^{12}(0,x_i,y_i) & \cdots & B_{S-T-1,i}^{11}(0,x_i,y_i) & B_{S-T-1,i}^{12}(0,x_i,y_i) \\ B_{0,i}^{21}(0,x_i,y_i) & B_{0,i}^{22}(0,x_i,y_i) & \cdots & B_{S-T-1,i}^{21}(0,x_i,y_i) & B_{S-T-1,i}^{11}(0,x_i,y_i) \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ B_{0,i}^{11}(s_i-1,x_i,y_i) & B_{0,i}^{12}(s_i-1,x_i,y_i) & \cdots & B_{S-T-1,i}^{11}(s_i-1,x_i,y_i) & B_{S-T-1,i}^{12}(s_i-1,x_i,y_i) \\ B_{0,i}^{21}(s_i-1,x_i,y_i) & B_{0,i}^{22}(s_i-1,x_i,y_i) & \cdots & B_{S-T-1,i}^{21}(s_i-1,x_i,y_i) & B_{S-T-1,i}^{11}(s_i-1,x_i,y_i) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14.6)$$

and

$$A_{ij}^{\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{smallmatrix} \right\}}(k,l,u,v) = \binom{k+l}{k} \left[\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{smallmatrix} \right\} \zeta^{-1} \frac{(1-q_i\zeta)^k(1-q'_j\zeta)^l}{(u-v\zeta)^{k+l+1}} - \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{smallmatrix} \right\} \zeta \frac{(1-q_i\zeta^{-1})^k(1-q'_j\zeta^{-1})^l}{(u-v\zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} \right], \quad (14.7)$$

$$B_{l,i}^{\begin{pmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{pmatrix}}(k, u, v) = \binom{l}{k} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{pmatrix} \zeta^{-1} (1 - q_i \zeta)^k (u - v \zeta)^{l-k} - \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \zeta (1 - q_i \zeta^{-1})^k (u - v \zeta^{-1})^{l-k} \right]. \quad (14.8)$$

Theorem 3.1 — the asymptotics of the correlation in the case of arbitrary slopes — follows by (14.1) and the following extension of Theorem 8.1.

THEOREM 14.1. *Let $S = \sum_{i=1}^m s_i$, $T = \sum_{j=1}^n t_j$, and assume $S \geq T$. Then the determinant of the matrix $\bar{M}''$ defined in (14.2)–(14.8), with ζ , q , x_i , y_i , w_j , z_j , $i = 1, \dots, m$, $j = 1, \dots, n$ being indeterminates, is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\bar{M}'') &= (\zeta^2 - \zeta^{-2})^{2S} \prod_{i=1}^m [(q_i - \zeta)(q_i - \zeta^{-1})]^{\binom{s_i}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^n [(q'_j - \zeta)(q'_j - \zeta^{-1})]^{\binom{t_j}{2}} \\ &\times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} [((x_i - x_j) - \zeta(y_i - y_j))((x_i - x_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - y_j))]^{s_i s_j} \\ &\times \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} [((z_i - z_j) - \zeta(w_i - w_j))((z_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(w_i - w_j))]^{t_i t_j} \\ &\times \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n [((x_i - z_j) - \zeta(y_i - w_j))((x_i - z_j) - \zeta^{-1}(y_i - w_j))]^{-s_i t_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (14.9)$$

Proof. Theorem 8.1 was proved in Sections 8–12. The only part of the proof affected by the generalization from the matrix M'' to $\bar{M}''$ is Section 9, as we now need to show that $\det \bar{M}''$ is divisible by $(q_i - \zeta^{\pm 1})^{\binom{s_i}{2}}$ and $(q'_j - \zeta^{\pm 1})^{\binom{t_j}{2}}$. As in Section 9, deform the definitions (14.7) and (14.8), by introducing a new parameter h , to

$$A_{ij}^{\begin{pmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{pmatrix}}(k, l, u, v) = \binom{k+l}{k} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{pmatrix} \zeta^{-1} \frac{(-\zeta)^{k+l} (q_i - \zeta^{-1})_{k,h} (q'_j - \zeta^{-1})_{l,h}}{(u - v \zeta)^{k+l+1}} - \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{pmatrix} \zeta \frac{(-\zeta^{-1})^{k+l} (q_i - \zeta)_{k,h} (q'_j - \zeta)_{l,h}}{(u - v \zeta^{-1})^{k+l+1}} \right] \quad (14.10)$$

and

$$B_{l,i}^{\begin{Bmatrix} 11 \\ 12 \\ 21 \end{Bmatrix}}(k, u, v) = \binom{l}{k} \left[\begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^{-2} \\ \zeta^2 \end{Bmatrix} \zeta^{-1} (-\zeta)^k (q_i - \zeta^{-1})_{k,h} (u - v\zeta)^{l-k} \right. \\ \left. - \begin{Bmatrix} 1 \\ \zeta^2 \\ \zeta^{-2} \end{Bmatrix} \zeta (-\zeta^{-1})^k (q_i - \zeta)_{k,h} (u - v\zeta^{-1})^{l-k} \right], \quad (14.11)$$

where $(a)_{n,h} := a(a+h)(a+2h)\cdots(a+(n-1)h)$. Running the arguments of the proof of Proposition 9.1 with the sole change that the row operations (9.3) and (9.7) are now applied only for a fixed value of i and a fixed value of j (as opposed to all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and all $1 \leq j \leq n$), we obtain that for any integer λ the left hand side of (14.9), when regarded as a polynomial in q_i , admits $q_i = \zeta^{\pm 1} - \lambda h$ as a root of multiplicity $\max(s_i - (\lambda + 1), 0)$, and as a polynomial in q'_j admits $q'_j = \zeta^{\pm 1} - \lambda h$ as a root of multiplicity $\max(t_j - (\lambda + 1), 0)$. Setting $h = 0$ we obtain the desired divisibility of $\det \bar{M}''$ by the powers of $q_i - \zeta^{\pm 1}$ and $q'_j - \zeta^{\pm 1}$, and the proof is complete. $\square$

15. Random covering surfaces and physical interpretation

Let $q_1, \dots, q_n$ be fixed even integers, and assume $2q = \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \geq 0$. Let U be a fixed rhombus on the triangular lattice, centered at the origin and having side l , with l very large. Consider the lattice triangular holes of side two $W(3r_1, 0), \dots, W(3r_q, 0)$, where r_1 is vastly larger than the side of U and r_i is vastly larger than r_{i-1} , for $i = 2, \dots, q$. Let S be the lattice rhombus rU with opposite sides identified so as to make a torus, where r is vastly larger than r_q .

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the collection of all non-overlapping placements $C = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_n\}$ of lattice triangular holes inside S , where Q_i has side q_i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Given an integer $x \geq 1$, a collection of holes on the triangular lattice T may also be viewed as residing on the x -fold refinement T_x of the triangular lattice. Regarded so, their correlation is still well-defined; denote it by $\hat{\omega}_x$.

Let

$$\mathcal{S}_x = \bigcup_{\{Q_1, \dots, Q_n\} \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{T}_x(S \setminus Q_1 \cup \dots \cup Q_n \cup W(3r_1, 0) \cdots \cup W(3r_q, 0)),$$

where $\mathcal{T}_x(R)$ is the set of all lozenge tilings of the region R when regarded as residing on the x -fold refinement of the triangular lattice.

Then Theorem 1.1 implies that when sampling uniformly at random from $\mathcal{S}_x$, the ratio of the probabilities P that $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$ are at mutual distances d_{ij} and P' that $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$ are at mutual distances d'_{ij} is, in the limit $1 \ll l \ll r_1 \ll \dots \ll r_q \ll r$ and for large separations between the holes, given by

$$\frac{P}{P'} \sim \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} q_i q_j (-\ln d_{ij})}}{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} q_i q_j (-\ln d'_{ij})}}. \quad (15.1)$$

On the other hand, the Fundamental Theorem of Statistical Physics (see e.g. [9, §40-3]) implies that, given a physical system of two dimensional charges of magnitudes $q_1 q_e, \dots, q_n q_e$ (where q_e is the elementary charge), the relative probability that the charges are at mutual distances d_{ij} versus d'_{ij} is given by

$$\frac{e^{-\frac{q_e^2}{2\pi\epsilon_0 kT} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} q_i q_j (-\ln d_{ij})}}{e^{-\frac{q_e^2}{2\pi\epsilon_0 kT} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} q_i q_j (-\ln d'_{ij})}}, \quad (15.2)$$

where k is Boltzmann's constant (see e.g. [9, §39-4]), T is absolute temperature, and ϵ_0 is the permittivity of (two dimensional) empty space.

Thus physical electrostatic interaction in two dimensions is perfectly paralleled by our model, with charges corresponding to holes, charge magnitude to the difference between the number of right- and left-pointing unit triangles in the hole, and temperature to c/x^2 , where x is the lattice refinement parameter and c is a constant.

We note that while there is evidence that the superposition principle of Theorem 1.1 is independent of the type of the background lattice (see [3, §14]), the specific relationship obtained between T and x when doing the above analysis does depend on the lattice. We also note that there is an analogous three dimensional model one can consider (see [3, §15]), and recent numerical simulations suggests that the parallel to electrostatics also holds in three dimensions (see [12]). In the version presented in [3, §15] the relationship between physical temperature and the lattice refinement parameter is one of direct proportionality.

We conclude this section by providing an equivalent interpretation of our result in terms of covering surfaces.

View the plane with our triangular lattice T as being the (x, y) -coordinate plane in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Consider a copy of the lattice $L = \mathbb{Z}^3$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ placed in such a way that the image of the lattice points of L under the orthogonal projection p on the (x, y) -coordinate plane consists precisely of the lattice points of T .

Then the triangular lattice lifts under $p : L \mapsto T$ to the cubic lattice L . Furthermore, it is well known that the lozenge tilings of a simply connected region on T lift under p to




FIGURE 15.1. Lifting with cuts. FIGURE 15.2. The boundary of a hole becomes a spiral.

lattice surfaces of L (more precisely, to minimal lattice surfaces—unions S of unit squares of L so that the restriction of p to S is one-to-one).

This bijection breaks down if the lattice region has holes. However, it turns out that tilings of regions with holes can be lifted to covering surfaces under p . Indeed, consider for instance the region with two holes shown in Figure 15.1, and consider a tiling μ of it (also indicated in the figure). Cut the region along non-intersecting lattice paths leading from each hole to the boundary (these cuts are indicated by dotted lines in Figure 15.1). The resulting region is simply connected, hence μ can be lifted to a lattice surface S_0 in L (four different views of the surface corresponding to the tiling and cuts in Figure 15.1 are shown in Figure 15.3; the view from the top—with no perspective—looks just like the tiling; a further instance is shown in Figure 15.4.). For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let S_n be the translation of S_0 by the vector nv , where v is the up-pointing large diagonal of a unit cube of L . Then $S = \cup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} S_n$ is independent of the choice of the cuts, and is a covering surface under the projection p for the tiling μ .

The boundary of a hole Q lifts under $p : S_n \mapsto T$ to a lattice path on L that in general is not closed: the vector that separates its endpoints is precisely $\text{ch}(Q)v$. The full image under p^{-1} of the boundary of the hole—call it a *tubular hole* of S —becomes a collection of $|\text{ch}(Q)|$ identical interspersed spirals of step $\text{ch}(Q)$ (for $\text{ch}(Q) = -1$ this is illustrated in Figure 15.2). This step size is known as the local *holonomy* of the covering surface. The collection of step sizes associated to all the holes form what we call the *holonomy type* of the covering surface.

By this correspondence, the parallel discussed at the beginning of this section becomes a parallel between relative probabilities of two dimensional electrostatic charges being at specified mutual distances and relative probabilities of random covering surfaces of given




Figure 15.3. Four views of the surface lifting the tiling of Figure 15.1.

holonomy type (and appropriate periodic boundary conditions) to have their tubular holes at specified mutual distances. The parameter x that accounts for temperature controls then the “resolution” of the covering surfaces.

From this perspective, the laws of two dimensional electrostatics arise by averaging over all possible discrete geometries of the covering surfaces.

The joint correlation of the holes is a real number that arises by averaging over all the covering surfaces that lift tilings of the complement of the holes. In this paper we studied the asymptotic behavior of this number as the holes move away from one another (and found that this asymptotic behavior is governed by Coulomb’s law for the electrostatic potential energy). A complementary question, imperative from the point of view of the




Figure 15.4. Two views of the surface lifting a tiling of the complement of the holes in Figure 2.1.

literature on surface models (see e.g. [6], [8] and [7])), is the following. Keep the holes fixed, and move around a “probing point,” which at each position records the (suitably defined) average height of the covering surfaces compatible with the fixed position of the holes. What can we say about this average surface in the scaling limit?

More precisely, let us refine the triangular lattice more and more, keeping the holes of fixed side lengths *in the refined lattice* — this will cause the holes to shrink to points as the lattice spacing approaches zero. Then if we arrange for the holes to shrink to points chosen beforehand, does the limit of the normalized⁸ average multivalued height function exist? If so, what is this limit?

⁸To obtain the normalized height function, as we refine the triangular lattice say R -fold, we replace the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^3$ in the surface interpretation of tilings presented earlier in this section by the lattice $(\frac{1}{R}\mathbb{Z})^3$.




Figure 15.5. The limit of the average over all surfaces of the type shown in Figure 15.4.

It turns out that the above described limit surface exists, and is just the horizontal coordinate plane with the corresponding points removed. Thus, unlike in the explicit limit surface results of Cohn et al. [6][8] and the related results of [7][17][21], to capture the interesting behavior we need to consider the *un-normalized* average height function. This occurs also in Kenyon [16], where it is shown that the (un-normalized) average height function of Temperleyan domains on the square lattice converges in the scaling limit to a harmonic function.

We show in [5] that the scaling limit of the latter is a sum of “refined helicoids” based at the points to which the holes shrink, and with steps proportional to the charge of the corresponding holes (if for a helicoid H the points on the same vertical are a distance d apart, the s -refinement of H is obtained by taking $s - 1$ more copies of H , all vertical translates of it, and interspersing them so that the points on their union that are on the same vertical are a distance d/s apart). For instance, the scaling limit of the average over

all the surfaces of the kind shown in Figure 15.4 is of the type illustrated in Figure 15.5.

We conclude by mentioning that this limit surface result turns out to be equivalent to determining the scaling limit of the discrete vector field defined by the average orientation of a lozenge covering a fixed unit triangle in the complement of the holes (see [5] for details). In this phrasing, the above result states that the scaling limit of this discrete field is precisely the two dimensional electrostatic field obtained when regarding the holes as charges of magnitude given by the difference between the number of right and left monomers in them. Thus the two complementary viewpoints of studying the behavior of the correlation when the holes move around, and studying the average height function when the holes are fixed, lead to the emergence of two complementary aspects of electrostatics: the electrostatic potential energy and the electric field.

APPENDIX. A determinant evaluation

The object of this section is to prove the following result.

THEOREM A.1. *Let $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_m \geq 1$ and $t_1 \geq \dots \geq t_n \geq 1$ be integers. Denote $S = \sum_{i=1}^m s_i$, $T = \sum_{j=1}^n t_j$, and assume $S \geq T$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_m$ and $z_1, \dots, z_n$ be indeterminates. Define N to be the $S \times S$ matrix*

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \end{bmatrix} \tag{A.1}$$

whose blocks are given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\binom{0}{0}}{-x_1 - z_1} & \frac{\binom{1}{0}}{(-x_1 - z_1)^2} & \dots & \frac{\binom{t_1-1}{0}}{(-x_1 - z_1)^{t_1}} & \frac{\binom{0}{0}}{-x_1 - z_n} & \frac{\binom{1}{0}}{(-x_1 - z_n)^2} & \dots & \frac{\binom{t_n-1}{0}}{(-x_1 - z_n)^{t_n}} \\ \frac{\binom{1}{1}}{(-x_1 - z_1)^2} & \frac{\binom{2}{1}}{(-x_1 - z_1)^3} & \dots & \frac{\binom{t_1}{1}}{(-x_1 - z_1)^{t_1+1}} & \frac{\binom{1}{1}}{(-x_1 - z_n)^2} & \frac{\binom{2}{1}}{(-x_1 - z_n)^3} & \dots & \frac{\binom{t_n}{1}}{(-x_1 - z_n)^{t_n+1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\binom{s_1-1}{s_1-1}}{(-x_1 - z_1)^{s_1}} & \frac{\binom{s_1}{s_1-1}}{(-x_1 - z_1)^{s_1+1}} & \dots & \frac{\binom{s_1+t_1-2}{s_1-1}}{(-x_1 - z_1)^{s_1+t_1-1}} & \frac{\binom{s_1-1}{s_1-1}}{(-x_1 - z_n)^{s_1}} & \frac{\binom{s_1}{s_1-1}}{(-x_1 - z_n)^{s_1+1}} & \dots & \frac{\binom{s_1+t_n-2}{s_1-1}}{(-x_1 - z_n)^{s_1+t_n-1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\binom{0}{0}}{-x_m - z_1} & \frac{\binom{1}{0}}{(-x_m - z_1)^2} & \dots & \frac{\binom{t_1-1}{0}}{(-x_m - z_1)^{t_1}} & \frac{\binom{0}{0}}{-x_m - z_n} & \frac{\binom{1}{0}}{(-x_m - z_n)^2} & \dots & \frac{\binom{t_n-1}{0}}{(-x_m - z_n)^{t_n}} \\ \frac{\binom{1}{1}}{(-x_m - z_1)^2} & \frac{\binom{2}{1}}{(-x_m - z_1)^3} & \dots & \frac{\binom{t_1}{1}}{(-x_m - z_1)^{t_1+1}} & \frac{\binom{1}{1}}{(-x_m - z_n)^2} & \frac{\binom{2}{1}}{(-x_m - z_n)^3} & \dots & \frac{\binom{t_n}{1}}{(-x_m - z_n)^{t_n+1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{\binom{s_m-1}{s_m-1}}{(-x_m - z_1)^{s_m}} & \frac{\binom{s_m}{s_m-1}}{(-x_m - z_1)^{s_m+1}} & \dots & \frac{\binom{s_m+t_1-2}{s_m-1}}{(-x_m - z_1)^{s_m+t_1-1}} & \frac{\binom{s_m-1}{s_m-1}}{(-x_m - z_n)^{s_m}} & \frac{\binom{s_m}{s_m-1}}{(-x_m - z_n)^{s_m+1}} & \dots & \frac{\binom{s_m+t_n-2}{s_m-1}}{(-x_m - z_n)^{s_m+t_n-1}} \end{bmatrix} \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} \binom{0}{0}x_1^0 & \binom{1}{0}x_1 & \cdots & \binom{S-T-1}{0}x_1^{S-T-1} \\ \binom{0}{1}x_1^{-1} & \binom{1}{1}x_1^0 & \cdots & \binom{S-T-1}{1}x_1^{S-T-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \binom{0}{s_1-1}x_1^{1-s_1} & \binom{1}{s_1-1}x_1^{2-s_1} & \cdots & \binom{S-T-1}{s_1-1}x_1^{S-T-s_1} \\ & & \vdots & \\ & & \vdots & \\ & & \vdots & \\ \binom{0}{0}x_m^0 & \binom{1}{0}x_m & \cdots & \binom{S-T-1}{0}x_m^{S-T-1} \\ \binom{0}{1}x_m^{-1} & \binom{1}{1}x_m^0 & \cdots & \binom{S-T-1}{1}x_m^{S-T-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \binom{0}{s_m-1}x_m^{1-s_m} & \binom{1}{s_m-1}x_m^{2-s_m} & \cdots & \binom{S-T-1}{s_m-1}x_m^{S-T-s_m} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Then we have

$$\det N = \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (x_j - x_i)^{s_i s_j} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_j - z_i)^{t_i t_j}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (-x_i - z_j)^{s_i t_j}}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Our proof relies on Proposition A.2 below which presents some interest in its own right. Let F be an analytic function, and let $\mathbf{f}$ be the S -vector

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f} = & [F(x_1), \frac{1}{1!}F'(x_1), \dots, \frac{1}{(s_1-1)!}F^{(s_1-1)}(x_1), \\ & F(x_2), \frac{1}{1!}F'(x_2), \dots, \frac{1}{(s_2-1)!}F^{(s_2-1)}(x_2), \\ & \dots, \\ & F(x_m), \frac{1}{1!}F'(x_m), \dots, \frac{1}{(s_m-1)!}F^{(s_m-1)}(x_m)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_m$.

For each $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, consider the following two lists of vectors of type $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]$, where $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ are vectors of lengths s_i and s_j , respectively.

The first list, $L_{ij}^{(1)}$, consists of the following s_i groups, totaling $s_j(s_i - s_j + 1) + 1 + 2 + \dots + (s_j - 1) = s_i s_j - s_j(s_j - 1)/2$ vectors (as before, $\mathbf{0}_k$ denotes the k -vector with all coordinates 0):

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{u} \qquad \qquad \qquad \mathbf{v} \\ \\ \left. \begin{array}{cccccc|ccccc} \mathbf{0}_0 & \binom{0}{0} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_0 & 0 & \binom{1}{1} & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_0 & 0 & 0 & \binom{2}{2} & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right\} s_j \end{array}$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{cccccc|ccccc} \mathbf{0}_1 & \binom{1}{0} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_1 & 0 & \binom{2}{1} & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_1 & 0 & 0 & \binom{3}{2} & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right\} s_j$$

.

.

.

$$\left. \begin{array}{cccccc|ccccc} \mathbf{0}_{s_i-s_j} & \binom{s_i-s_j}{0} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_{s_i-s_j} & 0 & \binom{s_i-s_j+1}{1} & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \mathbf{0}_{s_i-s_j} & 0 & 0 & \binom{s_i-s_j+2}{2} & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right\} s_j$$

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\mathbf{0}_{s_i-s_j+1} & \binom{s_i-s_j+1}{0} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & | & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i-s_j+1} & 0 & \binom{s_i-s_j+2}{1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & | & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i-s_j+1} & 0 & 0 & \binom{s_i-s_j+3}{2} & \cdots & 0 & | & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot
\end{array} \Bigg\} s_j - 1$$

.

.

.

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\mathbf{0}_{s_i-2} & \binom{s_i-2}{0} & 0 & | & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i-2} & 0 & \binom{s_i-1}{1} & | & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i-1} & \binom{s_i-1}{0} & | & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{array} \Bigg\} 2$$

$$\mathbf{0}_{s_i-1} \quad \binom{s_i-1}{0} \quad | \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad \cdots \quad 0 \Big\} 1.$$

(A.6)

The second list, $L_{ij}^{(2)}$, consists of the following $s_j - 1$ groups

$$\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{u} & \mathbf{v}
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_0 & -\binom{s_i}{1} & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_0 & -\binom{s_i}{2} & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_0 & -\binom{s_i}{s_j-1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_1 & -\binom{s_i}{1} & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_1 & -\binom{s_i}{2} & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_1 & -\binom{s_i}{s_j-2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{array} \Bigg\} s_j - 1$$

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_1 & -\binom{s_i}{1} & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_1 & -\binom{s_i}{2} & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_1 & -\binom{s_i}{s_j-2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{array} \Bigg\} s_j - 2$$

.

.

.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_{s_j-3} & -\binom{s_i}{1} & 1 & 0 & \Big\} 2 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_{s_j-3} & -\binom{s_i}{2} & 0 & 1 & \Big\} 2 \\
\mathbf{0}_{s_i} & | & \mathbf{0}_{s_j-2} & -\binom{s_i}{1} & 0 & 1 & \Big\} 1,
\end{array}$$

(A.7)

and has a total of $1 + 2 + \dots + (s_j - 1) = s_j(s_j - 1)/2$ vectors.

Define the list L_{ij} to consist of the vectors

$$[\mathbf{0}_{s_1}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{s_{i-1}}, -\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{0}_{s_{i+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{s_{j-1}}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{0}_{s_{j+1}}, \dots, \mathbf{0}_{s_m}], \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $[\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]$ ranges first over the list (A.6) and then over the list (A.7). Then L_{ij} consists of $s_i s_j$ vectors of length S .

Let L be the list obtained by concatenating the lists (A.8) as follows:

$$L = [L_{12}, L_{13}, \dots, L_{1m}, L_{23}, L_{24}, \dots, L_{2m}, \dots, L_{m-1,m}]. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Then L consists of $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j$ S -vectors of type

$$[0, \dots, 0, -\alpha, 0, \dots, 0, \beta, 0, \dots, 0]. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

If the two non-zero coordinates of (A.10) are in positions k and l , $k < l$, associate with the vector (A.10) the operation

$$f_l := \frac{\beta f_l - \alpha f_k}{x_l - x_k} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

on the coordinates of the vector $\mathbf{f} = [f_1, \dots, f_S]$ given by (A.5).

PROPOSITION A.2. *After applying the coordinate operations (A.11) associated to the vectors of the list L to the vector $\mathbf{f}$ given by (A.5) and setting $x_m = \dots = x_1$, the resulting vector is*

$$[F(x_1), \frac{1}{1!}F'(x_1), \frac{1}{2!}F''(x_1), \dots, \frac{1}{(S-1)!}F^{(S-1)}(x_1)]. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Our proof of this proposition is based on the next three Lemmas. They concern the special case $m = 2$, $s_1 = a \geq b = s_2$ of Proposition A.2. In this case the vector $\mathbf{f}$ becomes

$$[F(x_1), \frac{1}{1!}F'(x_1), \dots, \frac{1}{(a-1)!}F^{(a-1)}(x_1), F(x_2), \frac{1}{1!}F'(x_2), \dots, \frac{1}{(b-1)!}F^{(b-1)}(x_2)]. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Denote by $R_a(f, x_0)(x)$ the remainder of the truncated Taylor expansion of f around x_0 :

$$f(x) = f(x_0) + \frac{f'(x_0)}{1!}(x-x_0) + \dots + \frac{f^{(a-1)}(x_0)}{(a-1)!}(x-x_0)^{a-1} + (x-x_0)^a R_a(f, x_0)(x). \quad (\text{A.14})$$

LEMMA A.3. Consider the ab coordinate operations (A.11) corresponding to the vectors $[-\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}]$, where the pairs $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$ are the ones obtained from (A.6) and (A.7) by replacing s_i by a and s_j by b .

After applying these operations to the vector (A.13), its $a+k+1$ -st coordinate becomes

$$\frac{1}{k!} \frac{1}{(x_2 - x_1)^k} \left\{ R_{a-k}(F^{(k)}, x_1)(x_2) - \binom{k}{1} (a)_1 R_{a-k+1}(F^{(k-1)}, x_1)(x_2) + \dots \right. \\ \left. + (-1)^k \binom{k}{k} (a)_k R_a(F, x_1)(x_2) \right\},$$

for $k = 0, 1, \dots, b-1$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on k . Identify the vectors in the lists (A.6) and (A.7) corresponding to $s_i = a$, $s_j = b$ with the coordinate operations (A.11) they encode.

For $k = 0$ the statement follows from the form of the coordinate operations (A.6)–(A.7) and the definition (A.14) of $R_a(F, x_1)(x_2)$.

As indicated in (A.7), group the $b(b-1)/2$ operations of (A.7) in groups of sizes $b-1, b-2, \dots, 1$. Note that after the first coordinate operation in the i -th group, coordinate $a+i+1$ already reaches its final form. On the other hand, the earliest time coordinate $a+i+1$ is multiplied by a constant and added to some coordinate that comes after it is in the $i+1$ -st group of (A.7). Since coordinate $a+1$ reaches its final form already after operations (A.6), it follows that by the time coordinate $a+i$ is multiplied by a constant and added to row $a+k+1$, $k \geq i$, row $a+i$ has already reached its final form, for all $i \geq 1$.

Therefore, for the induction step we need to prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{(x_2 - x_1)^k} \left\{ R_{a-k}(\frac{1}{k!} F^{(k)}) - \binom{a}{k} R_a(F) - \binom{a}{k-1} \frac{1}{1!} [R_{a-1}(F') - (a)_1 R_a(F)] \right. \\ & \quad - \binom{a}{k-2} \frac{1}{2!} [R_{a-2}(F'') - 2(a)_1 R_{a-1}(F') + (a)_2 R_a(F)] - \dots \\ & \quad - \binom{a}{1} \frac{1}{(k-1)!} [R_{a-k+1}(F^{(k-1)}) - \binom{k-1}{1} (a)_1 R_{a-k+2}(F^{(k-2)}) + \dots \\ & \quad \left. + (-1)^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{k-1} (a)_{k-1} R_a(F)] \right\} \\ & = \frac{1}{k!} \frac{1}{(x_2 - x_1)^k} [R_{a-k}(F^{(k)}) - \binom{k}{1} (a)_1 R_{a-k+1}(F^{(k-1)}) + \dots + (-1)^k \binom{k}{k} (a)_k R_a(F)]. \end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

Extracting the coefficients of $R_{a-i}(F^{(i)})$ on both sides, (A.15) is seen to be equivalent to

$$- \sum_{j=0}^{k-i-1} \binom{a}{k-i-j} \frac{1}{(i+j)!} (-1)^j \binom{i+j}{j} (a)_j = \frac{1}{k!} (-1)^{k-i} \binom{k}{k-i} (a)_{k-i}, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$. After some manipulation (A.16) turns out to be equivalent to

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n+1} (-1)^j \frac{(a+1-j)_n}{(n+1-j)!j!} = 0, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where $n = k - i$. However, the left hand side of (A.17) can be expressed in terms of hypergeometric series as

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n+1} (-1)^j \frac{(a+1-j)_n}{(n+1-j)!j!} = \frac{(a+1)_n}{(n+1)!} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -a, -n-1 \\ -a-n \end{matrix}; 1 \right].$$

The resulting ${}_2F_1$ is zero by Gauss' summation (4.9). □

LEMMA A.4. For $k = 0, 1, \dots, a-1$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^k}{dx_2^k} R_a(F, x_1)(x_2) &= \frac{1}{(x_2 - x_1)^k} \left\{ R_{a-k}(F^{(k)}, x_1)(x_2) \right. \\ &\quad - \binom{k}{1} (a)_1 R_{a-k+1}(F^{(k-1)}, x_1)(x_2) + \dots \\ &\quad \left. + (-1)^k \binom{k}{k} (a)_k R_a(F, x_1)(x_2) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Proof. By definition (A.14) we have

$$R_a(F, x_1)(x_2) = F(x_2)(x_2 - x_1)^{-a} - \sum_{j=0}^{a-1} \frac{F^{(j)}(x_1)}{j!} (x_2 - x_1)^{-a+j}.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{d^k}{dx_2^k} R_a(F, x_1)(x_2) = \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{k}{i} (-1)^i (a)_i \frac{F^{(k-i)}(x_2)}{(x_2 - x_1)^{a+i}} - (-1)^k \sum_{j=0}^{a-1} \frac{F^{(j)}(x_1)}{j!} \frac{(a-j)_k}{(x_2 - x_1)^{a+k-j}}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

Definition (A.14) also implies

$$R_{a-i}(F^{(i)}, x_1)(x_2) = \frac{1}{(x_2 - x_1)^{a-i}} \left\{ F^{(i)}(x_2) - F^{(i)}(x_1) - \frac{F^{(i+1)}(x_1)}{1!}(x_2 - x_1) - \dots - \frac{F^{(a-1)}(x_1)}{(a-i-1)!}(x_2 - x_1)^{a-i-1} \right\},$$

for $i = 0, \dots, k$. Therefore, writing for brevity $x = x_2 - x_1$, $F_i = F^{(i)}(x_1)$ and $G_i = F^{(i)}(x_2)$, the right hand side of (A.18) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{x^k} \left\{ \frac{1}{x^{a-k}} [G_k - \frac{F_k}{0!} - \frac{F_{k+1}}{1!}x - \dots - \frac{F_{a-1}}{(a-k-1)!}x^{a-k-1}] \right. \\ & \quad - \binom{k}{1} \frac{(a)_1}{x^{a-k+1}} [G_{k-1} - \frac{F_{k-1}}{0!} - \frac{F_k}{1!}x - \dots - \frac{F_{a-1}}{(a-k)!}x^{a-k}] \\ & \quad + \dots \\ & \quad \left. + (-1)^k \binom{k}{k} \frac{(a)_k}{x^a} [G_0 - \frac{F_0}{0!} - \frac{F_1}{1!}x - \dots - \frac{F_{a-1}}{(a-1)!}x^{a-1}] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

To prove (A.18) we need to show that the above expression equals (A.19). The coefficient of G_i in (A.20) is

$$(-1)^{k-i} \binom{k}{k-i} \frac{(a)_{k-i}}{x^{a-i}} \frac{1}{x^k},$$

which clearly agrees with the coefficient of G_i in (A.19). Agreement of the coefficients of F_i on the other hand turns out to amount to

$$k! \sum_{j=0}^i \frac{(-1)^j}{j!(i-j)!} \frac{(a)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} = \frac{(a-i)_k}{i!}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

for $i = 0, \dots, k$.

The left hand side of (A.21) becomes after some manipulation

$$k! \sum_{j=0}^i \frac{(-1)^j}{j!(i-j)!} \frac{(a)_{k-j}}{(k-j)!} = \frac{(a)_k}{i!} \sum_{j=0}^i \frac{(-k)_j (-i)_j}{j! (-a-k+1)_j} = \frac{(a)_k}{i!} {}_2F_1 \left[\begin{matrix} -k, -i \\ -k - (a-1) \end{matrix}; 1 \right].$$

Gauss' summation (4.9) implies that when a is a large enough negative integer the above expression agrees with the right hand side of (A.21). Then (A.21) follows since both its sides are polynomials in a . $\square$

LEMMA A.5. For all $k \geq 0$ we have

$$\left. \frac{d^k}{dx^k} R_a(F, x_0)(x) \right|_{x=x_0} = \frac{k!}{(a+k)!} F^{(a+k)}(x_0).$$

Proof. Since F is analytic we have by (A.14) that

$$R_a(F, x_0)(x) = \frac{F^{(a)}(x_0)}{a!} + \frac{F^{(a+1)}(x_0)}{(a+1)!}(x - x_0) + \cdots.$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d^k}{dx^k} R_a(F, x_0)(x) \\ &= \frac{k!}{0!}(x - x_0)^0 \frac{1}{(a+k)!} F^{(a+k)}(x_0) + \frac{(k+1)!}{1!}(x - x_0)^1 \frac{1}{(a+k+1)!} F^{(a+k+1)}(x_0) + \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

Take $x = x_0$ to obtain the statement of the Lemma. $\square$

Proof of Proposition A.2. We proceed by induction on m . For $m = 1$ the statement is clear. Perform on the vector $\mathbf{f}$ the coordinate operations (A.11) corresponding to the initial segment $[L_{12}, \dots, L_{1m}]$ of the list L —a total of $s_1 s_2 + \cdots + s_1 s_m$ coordinate operations. By Lemmas A.3 and A.4, the last $S - s_1$ coordinates become

$$\begin{aligned} & [G(x_2), \frac{1}{1!} G'(x_2), \dots, \frac{1}{(s_2 - 1)!} G^{(s_2 - 1)}(x_2), \\ & G(x_3), \frac{1}{1!} G'(x_3), \dots, \frac{1}{(s_3 - 1)!} G^{(s_3 - 1)}(x_3), \\ & \dots, \\ & G(x_m), \frac{1}{1!} G'(x_m), \dots, \frac{1}{(s_m - 1)!} G^{(s_m - 1)}(x_m)], \end{aligned}$$

where $G(x) = R_{s_1}(F, x_1)(x)$.

By the induction hypothesis, applying the remaining $\sum_{2 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j$ coordinate operations and letting $x_m = \cdots = x_2$, the above vector becomes

$$[G(x_2), \frac{1}{1!} G'(x_2), \dots, \frac{1}{(S - s_1)!} G^{(S - s_1)}(x_2)]. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

However, since $G(x) = R_{s_1}(F, x_1)(x)$, we obtain by Lemma A.5 that

$$G^{(k)}(x_1) = \frac{d^k}{dx^k} R_{s_1}(F, x_1)(x) \Big|_{x=x_1} = \frac{k!}{(s_1 + k)!} F^{(s_1+k)}(x_1).$$

This shows that when appending the $x_2 = x_1$ specialization of (A.22) to the first s_1 coordinates of $\mathbf{f}$, the resulting vector is precisely the one given by (A.12). $\square$

Let $F(x) = 1/(-x - z)$ and $G_l(x) = x^l$, $l \geq 0$. One readily checks that

$$\frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k}{dx^k} \left[\frac{1}{l!} F^{(l)}(x) \right] = \frac{\binom{k+l}{k}}{(-x-z)^{k+l+1}}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{k!} G_l^{(k)}(x) = \binom{l}{k} x^{l-k},$$

for all $k, l \geq 0$.

It follows from these equalities that if we let $F_j(x) = 1/(-x - z_j)$, $j = 0, \dots, n$, and define the S -vector $\mathbf{h}(x)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{h}(x) = & [F_1(x), \frac{1}{1!} F_1'(x), \dots, \frac{1}{(t_1-1)!} F_1^{(t_1-1)}(x), \\ & F_2(x), \frac{1}{1!} F_2'(x), \dots, \frac{1}{(t_2-1)!} F_2^{(t_2-1)}(x), \\ & \dots, \\ & F_n(x), \frac{1}{1!} F_n'(x), \dots, \frac{1}{(t_n-1)!} F_n^{(t_n-1)}(x), G_0(x), G_1(x), \dots, G_{S-T-1}(x)], \end{aligned} \tag{A.23}$$

then the matrix N in the statement of Theorem A.1 can be written as

$$N = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}(x_1) \\ \frac{1}{1!}\mathbf{h}'(x_1) \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{(s_1-1)!}\mathbf{h}^{(s_1-1)}(x_1) \\ \\ \mathbf{h}(x_2) \\ \frac{1}{1!}\mathbf{h}'(x_2) \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{(s_2-1)!}\mathbf{h}^{(s_2-1)}(x_2) \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \\ \mathbf{h}(x_m) \\ \frac{1}{1!}\mathbf{h}'(x_m) \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{(s_m-1)!}\mathbf{h}^{(s_m-1)}(x_m) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.24})$$

To present our next result, associate to each vector of type (A.10) in which the non-zero coordinates are in positions $k < l$ the row operation

$$R_l := \frac{\beta R_l - \alpha R_k}{x_l - x_k} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

in matrix N . Then the list L defined by (A.6)–(A.9) describes $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j$ row operations on N .

In addition, consider the list

$$L' = [L'_{12}, L'_{13}, \dots, L'_{1n}, L'_{23}, L'_{24}, \dots, L'_{2n}, \dots, L'_{n-1,n}],$$

where L'_{ij} is obtained from the list L_{ij} defined by (A.6)–(A.8) by replacing the m -tuple $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ by the n -tuple $(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.

Interpret each of the $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j$ vectors of L' as a *column* operation on matrix N using the analog of (A.25) in which the x_i 's are replaced by z_i 's.

PROPOSITION A.6. (a). After applying the $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} s_i s_j$ row operations (A.25) of the list L to matrix N and setting $x_m = \dots = x_1 = x$, the resulting matrix is

$$N_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}(x) \\ \frac{1}{1!} \mathbf{h}'(x) \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{(S-1)!} \mathbf{h}^{(S-1)}(x) \end{bmatrix}.$$

(b). After applying the $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} t_i t_j$ column operations encoded by L' to matrix N_1 and setting $z_n = \dots = z_1 = z$, the resulting matrix N_2 is of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} F(x, z) & \frac{1}{1!} \frac{\partial F(x, z)}{\partial z} & \dots & \frac{1}{(T-1)!} \frac{\partial^{T-1} F(x, z)}{\partial z^{T-1}} & 1 & * & \dots & * \\ \frac{1}{1!} \frac{\partial F(x, z)}{\partial x} & \frac{1}{1!1!} \frac{\partial^2 F(x, z)}{\partial x \partial z} & \dots & \frac{1}{1!(T-1)!} \frac{\partial^T F(x, z)}{\partial x \partial z^{T-1}} & 0 & 1 & \dots & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{(S-1)!} \frac{\partial^{S-1} F(x, z)}{\partial x^{S-1}} & \frac{1}{(S-1)!1!} \frac{\partial^S F(x, z)}{\partial x^{S-1} \partial z} & \dots & \frac{1}{(S-1)!(T-1)!} \frac{\partial^{S+T-2} F(x, z)}{\partial x^{S-1} \partial z^{T-1}} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.26})$$

where $F(x, z) = 1/(-x - z)$.

Proof. (a). This follows using the form (A.24) of matrix N and applying Proposition A.2 to each of its column vectors.

(b). By (A.23) the portion of $\mathbf{h}^{(k)}(x)$ consisting of its first $S - T$ coordinates has the form of the vector $\mathbf{f}$ in the statement of Proposition A.2, for all $k \geq 0$. Therefore, applying Proposition A.2 to each row of N_1 we obtain that N_2 has the stated form in the portion contained in its first T columns.

Along the last $S - T$ columns the matrix N_2 is the same as N_1 . Since $G_l(x) = x^l$ in (A.23), part (a) implies that the portion of N_1 contained in its last $S - T$ columns has the form indicated in (A.26). $\square$

LEMMA A.7. One has the matrix identity

$$\left[\left(\binom{l+i+j}{i} x^{i+j+1} \right)_{0 \leq i, j < n} \right] = \left[\left(\binom{l+i}{l+j} x^{i-j} \right)_{0 \leq i, j < n} \right] \left[\left(\binom{j}{i} x^{i+j+1} \right)_{0 \leq i, j < n} \right].$$

Proof. The stated equality is equivalent to

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{l+i}{l+k} \binom{j}{k} = \binom{l+i+j}{i},$$

for all $0 \leq i, j < n$. This follows by extracting the coefficient of x^i on both sides of the identity $(x+1)^{l+i}(x+1)^j = (x+1)^{l+i+j}$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem A.1. From (8.11) and (8.7) we deduce that

$$\det N = c \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (x_j - x_i)^{s_i s_j} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_j - z_i)^{t_i t_j}}{\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (-x_i - z_j)^{s_i t_j}},$$

where $c \in \mathbb{Q}$. Write this as

$$\frac{\det N}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (x_j - x_i)^{s_i s_j} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_j - z_i)^{t_i t_j}} = \frac{c}{\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (-x_i - z_j)^{s_i t_j}}. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

By Part (b) of Proposition A.6 we obtain, denoting $f(x) = -1/x$ and using $f^{(n)}(-1) = n!$, that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left. \frac{\det N}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} (x_j - x_i)^{s_i s_j} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (z_j - z_i)^{t_i t_j}} \right|_{\substack{x_1 = \dots = x_m = -1 \\ z_1 = \dots = z_n = 0}} \\ &= \det \left[\left(\frac{1}{k!l!} f^{(k+l)}(-1) \right)_{\substack{S-T \leq k \leq S-1 \\ 0 \leq l \leq T-1}} \right] \\ &= \det \left[\left(\binom{S-T+k+l}{l} \right)_{0 \leq k, l \leq T-1} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

However, by Lemma A.7, the last matrix is the product of a lower triangular and an upper triangular matrix, both having all diagonal entries equal to 1—so its determinant is 1. Then (A.28) implies that $c = 1$ in (A.27), thus completing the proof of the Theorem. $\square$

REMARK A.8. Theorem A.1 generalizes both the Cauchy determinant, which is obtained when $m = n$ and all s_i 's and t_j 's equal 1, and the Vandermonde determinant, obtained when $n = 0$, $s_1 = \dots = s_m = 1$.

The case $m = rn$, $s_1 = \dots = s_{rn} = 1$, $t_1 = \dots = t_n = r$ is stated as an exercise in [18, Ex.42, p.360].

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank the anonymous referee for pointing out Sheffield’s results [21] on the existence and uniqueness of invariant Gibbs measures and for helping to properly place our result in the context of previous results in the literature. The intuitive rationale for electrostatics to emerge in the dimer model based on the fact that the discrete Gaussian free field model, which is known to have other close connections with the dimer model, leads to electrostatics when considering questions analogous to the correlation of holes, is also due to the referee.

References

- [1] C. Boutillier, Pattern densities in fluid dimer models, arXiv:math.PR/0603324.
- [2] M. Ciucu, Rotational invariance of quadromer correlations on the hexagonal lattice, *Adv. in Math.* **191** (2005), 46–47.
- [3] M. Ciucu, A random tiling model for two dimensional electrostatics, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **178** (2005), no. 839, 1–104.
- [4] M. Ciucu, Plane partitions I: A generalization of MacMahon’s formula, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **178** (2005), no. 839, 106–144.
- [5] M. Ciucu, The emergence of the electrostatic field as a Feynman sum in random tilings with holes, preprint, www.math.gatech.edu/~ciucu/ef.pdf
- [6] H. Cohn, N. Elkies, and J. Propp, Local statistics for random domino tilings of the Aztec diamond, *Duke Math. J.* **85** (1996), 117–166.
- [7] H. Cohn, R. Kenyon, and J. Propp, A variational principle for domino tilings, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **14** (2001), 297–346
- [8] H. Cohn, M. Larsen, J. Propp, The shape of a typical boxed plane partition, *New York J. of Math.* **4** (1998), 137–165.
- [9] R. P. Feynman, “The Feynman Lectures on Physics,” vol. I, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1963.
- [10] M. E. Fisher and J. Stephenson, Statistical mechanics of dimers on a plane lattice. II. Dimer correlations and monomers, *Phys. Rev. (2)* **132** (1963), 1411–1431.
- [11] R. E. Hartwig, Monomer pair correlations, *J. Mathematical Phys.* **7** (1966), 286–299.
- [12] D. A. Huse, W. Krauth, R. Moessner and S. L. Sondhi, Coulomb and liquid dimer models in three dimensions, arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0305318, May 2003.

- [13] C. Jordan, “Calculus of finite differences,” Chelsea, New York, 1960.
- [14] R. Kenyon, Local statistics of lattice dimers, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* **33** (1997), 591–618.
- [15] R. Kenyon, Long-range properties of spanning trees. Probabilistic techniques in equilibrium and nonequilibrium statistical physics, *J. Math. Phys.* **41** (2000), 1338–1363.
- [16] R. Kenyon, Dominos and the Gaussian free field, *Ann. Probab.* **29** (2001), 1128–1137.
- [17] R. Kenyon, A. Okounkov and S. Sheffield, Dimers and amoebae, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **163**, no. 3 (2006), 1019–1056.
- [18] T. Muir, “A treatise on the theory of determinants,” revised and enlarged by W. H. Metzler, Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1933.
- [19] F. W. J. Olver, Asymptotics and special functions, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- [20] J. K. Percus, One more technique for the dimer problem, *J. Math. Phys.* **10** (1969), 1881–1888.
- [21] S. Sheffield, Random Surfaces, *Astérisque*, 2005, No. 304.
- [22] S. Sheffield, Gaussian free fields for mathematicians, arXiv:math.PR/0312099.
- [23] L. J. Slater, “Generalized hypergeometric series,” Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1966.
- [24] R. P. Stanley, “Enumerative Combinatorics,” vol. I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [25] R. P. Stanley, “Enumerative Combinatorics,” vol. II, Cambridge, University Press, Cambridge, 1999.