Pacific Journal of Mathematics

DIFFERENCE EQUATIONS FOR SOME ORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS

H. L. Krall and I. M. Sheffer

Vol. 28, No. 2 April 1969

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 28, No. 2, 1969

DIFFERENCE EQUATIONS FOR SOME ORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS

H. L. KRALL AND I. M. SHEFFER

It is well-known that every orthogonal polynomial set $\{P_n(x)\}$ satisfies a 3-term *recurrence* relation of the form

$$(1.1)\quad P_{n+1}(x) = (a_n x + b_n)P_n(x) + c_n P_{n-1}(x) \qquad (n = 1, 2, \cdots) .$$

Some orthogonal sets (polynomials of Jacobi, Hermite and so on) are solutions of differential equations. It will be shown that there exist orthogonal polynomial sets that satisfy 3-term *difference* equations of the form

$$(1.2)\qquad A(x)y(x+\alpha) + B(x)y(x-\alpha) + C(x)y(x) = \lambda y(x)$$

where A, B, C are polynomials of degree $\leqq 2$ and λ is a parameter.

Consider the difference equation

$$(1.3)\qquad A(x)y(x+\alpha) + B(x)y(x+\beta) + C(x)y(x) = \lambda y(x)$$

where A, B, C are real polynomials, λ is a parameter, and $\alpha, \beta, 0$ are distinct and real. We examine two cases, according as A, B, C are of degree $\leqq 1$:

(a) $A(x) = a_1x + a_0,\ B(x) = b_1x + b_0,\ C(x) = c_1x,$
or are of degree $\leqq 2$:

(b) $A(x) = a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0,\ B(x) = b_2x^2 + b_1x + b_0,\ C(x) = c_2x^2 + c_1x$ (a_2, b_2, c_2 not all zero). We shall use the notation (1.3a), (1.3b) to denote equation (1.3) for the respective conditions (a), (b).

Equation (1.3) will be termed *admissible* if there exists a real sequence $\{\lambda_n\}$ $(n = 0, 1, \cdots)$ such that for $\lambda = \lambda_n$ there is a polynomial solution $y_n(x)$, unique to within a multiplicative constant, and $y_n(x)$ is of degree (exactly) n. It follows that admissibility implies that

$$(1.4)\qquad \lambda_m \neq \lambda_n (m \neq n) .$$

LEMMA 1.1. *Equation* (1.3a) *is admissible if and only if*

$$(1.5)\qquad a_1 + b_1 + c_1 = 0 , \qquad \delta \equiv a_1\alpha + b_1\beta \neq 0 .$$

And in this case we have

$$(1.6)\qquad \lambda_n = (a_0 + b_0) + n(a_1\alpha + b_1\beta) \qquad (n = 0, 1, \cdots) .$$

Proof. Let n be arbitrary. If we substitute the nth degree polynomial

$$y(x) = x^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} p_j x^j \tag{1.7}$$

into (1.3a), a necessary and sufficient condition that $y(x)$ be a solution is that coefficients of $x^{n+1}, x^n, \cdots$ agree on both sides. The coefficient of x^{n+1} yields the first of (1.5), that of x^n gives $\lambda = \lambda_n$ as in (1.6); and those of $x^{n-1}, \cdots, x^0$ give successive equations for $p_{n-1}, \cdots, p_0$. In these equations the coefficients of $p_{n-1}, \cdots, p_0$ are respectively $\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1}, \lambda_n - \lambda_{n-2}, \cdots, \lambda_n - \lambda_0$, so there is one and only one choice of the p_j's if and only if $\lambda_n \neq \lambda_j$ $(j \leqq n-1)$. This condition is equivalent to the second part of (1.5); and the lemma is established.

LEMMA 1.2. *Equation* (1.3b) *is admissible if and only if*

$$a_2 + b_2 + c_2 = 0\ , \quad a_1 + b_1 + c_1 = 0\ , \quad a_2\alpha + b_2\beta = 0\ ; \tag{1.8}$$

$$2(a_1\alpha + b_1\beta) + n(a_2\alpha^2 + b_2\beta^2) \neq 0 \qquad (n = 0, 1, \cdots)\ . \tag{1.9}$$

And in this case λ_n *is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_n &= (a_0 + b_0) + n(a_1\alpha + b_1\beta) + n(n-1)(a_2\alpha^2 + b_2\beta^2)/2 \\ &(n = 0, 1, \cdots)\ .\end{aligned} \tag{1.10}$$

Proof. Substituting (1.7) into (1.3b) and equating like terms (as a necessary and sufficient condition for a solution) we find that the terms in x^{n+2}, x^{n+1} give (1.8), the x^n term gives $\lambda = \lambda_n$ as in (1.10), and $p_{n-1}, \cdots, p_0$ again are uniquely determined if and only if $\lambda_n \neq \lambda_j$ $(j \leqq n-1)$. Now the condition $\lambda_m \neq \lambda_n$ $(m \neq n)$ is seen to reduce to (1.9); so the lemma is proved.

In the proofs of Lemmas 1.1, 1.2 it was seen that if a polynomial $y(x)$ of degree n satisfies (1.3a or b) then the corresponding value of λ is λ_n as given by (1.6) or (1.10); so we have the

COROLLARY. *If* (1.3a) *or* (1.3b) *is admissible then for each* $\lambda \neq \lambda_n$ $(n = 0, 1, \cdots)$ *the only polynomial solution is* $y(x) \equiv 0$.

Let (1.3a) or (1.3b) be admissible. In both cases the solution for $n = 1$ is

$$y_1(x) = x + (a_0\alpha + b_0\beta)\delta^{-1} \tag{1.11}$$

where δ is given in (1.5). If we set

$$x + d = x^*, \ z(x^*) = y(x^* - d)$$

with

$$d = (a_0\alpha + b_0\beta)\delta^{-1}\ ,$$

the equation in $z(x^*)$ will also be admissible and will have the form (1.3a) or (1.3b) after the constant term in $C(x^*)$ has been absorbed into the λ. Moreover, for $n = 1$ we have

$$z_1(x^*) = x^* .$$

An admissible equation (1.3a) or (1.3b) in which for $n = 1$ the solution contains no constant term will be called *canonical*. It is no restriction to limit ourselves to canonical equations.

From (1.11) we obtain

LEMMA 1.3. *The admissible equation* (1.3a) *or* (1.3b) *is canonical if and only if*

$$a_0\alpha + b_0\beta = 0 . \tag{1.12}$$

2. Orthogonality for case (1.3a). We consider the problem of determining those canonical equations (1.3a) [(1.3b) in § 3] whose polynomial solutions form an orthogonal set. For all polynomials $y(x)$ we have

$$y(x + u) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} y^{(k)}(x)u^k/k ! \tag{2.1}$$

so (1.3a) is equivalent, with respect to polynomial solutions, to the differential equation of infinite order

$$xy'(x) + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} H_k(x)y^{(k)}(x)/k! = \sigma y(x) \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$H_k(x) = r_k + s_kx = (a_0\alpha^k + b_0\beta^k)\delta^{-1} + (a_1\alpha^k + b_1\beta^k)\delta^{-1}x \tag{2.3}$$

$(k = 1, 2, \cdots)$ with $\sigma = \{\lambda - (a_0 + b_0)\}\delta^{-1}$. Using (1.6) we find that the sequence $\{\sigma_n\}$ for which there are polynomial solutions is given by $\sigma_n = n$.

Equation (2.2) is identical with equation (3.1) of [1]. In Remark (i) ([1], p. 151) it is shown that if $r_2 = 0$ the polynomial solutions do not form an orthogonal set. We therefore assume $r_2 \neq 0$. In this case, Theorem 3.1 ([1], p. 151) states that the solutions of (our present) equation (2.2), hence of cononical equation (1.3a), form a weak orthogonal set if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} r_{2p+1} &= 0 , & s_{2p+1} &= s_3^p , \\ r_{2p+2} &= r_2s_3^p , & s_{2p+2} &= s_2s_3^p \qquad (p = 0, 1, \cdots) . \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Moreover the weak orthogonal set is an orthogonal set when and only when one of the following two relations holds:

(2.5$_1$) $$s_2^2 - s_3 = 0\ ;$$

(2.5$_2$) $$s_2^2 - s_3 \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 2r_2(s_2^2 - s_3)^{-1} \neq 0, 1, 2, \cdots .$$

The condition $r_{2p+1} = 0$ is

(2.6) $$a_0\alpha^{2p+1} + b_0\beta^{2p+1} = 0 \qquad (p = 0, 1, \cdots) .$$

If $a_0 = 0$ or $b_0 = 0$ then both are zero since $\alpha\beta \neq 0$. But then $r_2 = 0$, contrary to assumption. So $a_0b_0 \neq 0$. Taking $p = 0, 1$ in (2.6) we then get $\beta^2 = \alpha^2$. Since α, β are distinct, then $\beta = -\alpha$; and again from (2.6) with $p = 0$: $a_0 = b_0$. Thus, if $r_2 \neq 0$ then $r_{2p+1} = 0$ $(p = 0, 1, \cdots)$ if and only if

(2.7) $$\beta = -\alpha, a_0 = b_0 \neq 0 .$$

With (2.7) holding then

$$\delta = \alpha(a_1 - b_1) \neq 0 ,$$

so

(2.8) $$\begin{aligned} &r_{2p+1} = 0,\ s_{2p+1} = \alpha^{2p},\ r_{2p+2} = 2a_0(a_1 - b_1)^{-1}\alpha^{2p+1}, \\ &s_{2p+2} = (a_1 + b_1)(a_1 - b_1)^{-1}\alpha^{2p+1} . \end{aligned}$$

Conditions (2.4) are seen to be satisfied. And (2.5$_1$), (2.5$_2$) become respectively:

(2.9$_1$) $$a_1b_1 = 0\ ;$$

(2.9$_2$) $$a_1b_1 \neq 0,\ a_0(a_1 - b_1)(\alpha a_1b_1)^{-1} \neq 0, 1, \cdots .$$

To sum up:

THEOREM 2.1. *Let equation* (1.3a) *be canonical. Then its polynomial solutions from an orthogonal set if and only if* (2.7) *holds and one of* (2.9$_1$), (2.9$_2$) *holds.*

REMARKS. (i) If (1.3a) is canonical its polynomial solutions form an orthogonal set if and only if it is of the form

(2.10) $$\begin{aligned} (a_1x + a_0)y(x + \alpha) + (b_1x + a_0)y(x - \alpha) \\ - (a_1 + b_1)xy(x) = \lambda y(x) , \end{aligned}$$

with $a_0 \neq 0$, $a_1 \neq b_1$, $\alpha \neq 0$, and either (2.9$_1$) or (2.9$_2$) holding.

(ii) In (2.10) make the variable changes $x = \alpha x^*$, $z(x^*) = y(\alpha x^*)$. There results a similar difference equation in $z(x^*)$, in which α is replaced by 1. This equation has an orthogonal set of solutions when (2.10) does. It may be termed a *standard* canonical equation. After dividing by a_0 this equation has the form (dropping asterisks)

$$(c_1x + 1)z(x+1) + (d_1x + 1)z(x-1) - (c_1 + d_1)xz(x) = \mu z(x) \,, \tag{2.11}$$

with $c_1 - d_1 \neq 0$ and either $c_1d_1 = 0$ or

$$c_1d_1 \neq 0, (c_1 - d_1)(c_1d_1)^{-1} \neq 0, 1, 2, \cdots .$$

3. **Orthogonality for case (1.3b).** Let equation (1.3b) be canonical, so that (1.12) holds. Putting (2.1) into (1.3b) we get an infinite order differential equation with polynomial coefficients of degree $\leqq 2$, which is equivalent to (1.3b) at least for polynomial solutions:

$$xy'(x) + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} T_k(x)y^{(k)}(x)/k! = \sigma y(x) \,, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$T_k(x) = r_k + s_kx + t_kx^2 = (a_0\alpha^k + b_0\beta^k)\delta^{-1} + (a_1\alpha^k + b_1\beta^k)\delta^{-1}x + (a_2\alpha^k + b_2\beta^k)\delta^{-1}x^2 \qquad (k = 2, 3, \cdots) \tag{3.2}$$

and $\sigma = \{\lambda - (a_0 + b_0)\}\delta^{-1}$ and δ is given by (1.5). From (1.10) we see that $\{\sigma_n\}$ is given by

$$\sigma_n = n + n(n-1)t_2/2 \,.$$

Equations of the form (3.1), that is, with $\max_k$ {degree $T_k(x)$} $= 2$ were considered in [1], but the results obtained were not as complete as for the case where the coefficients are of degree $\leqq 1$. We must therefore proceed differently. We first show that if canonical equation (1.3b), hence also (3.1), has an orthogonal set of solutions then $\beta = -\alpha$.

For suppose not. Then $|\alpha| \neq |\beta|$, since α, β are distinct. We may assume that $|\alpha| > |\beta|$. By Theorem 2.2 ([1], p. 148) there is a sequence of constants $\{\alpha_n\}$ (the moments of the weight function corresponding to the orthogonal set), with $\alpha_0 \neq 0$, that satisfies the system of equations

$$d^p_{p+k} = 0, D^p_{p+k} = 0 \qquad (p, k = 0, 1, \cdots) \tag{3.3}$$

where (in our present case, as seen in [1], p. 153)

$$d^p_{p+k} = \sum_{i=k}^{2k+2} \alpha_i \left[\binom{k}{i-k} r_{2p+2k+1-i} + \binom{k}{i-k-1} s_{2p+2k+2-i} + \binom{k}{i-k-2} t_{2p+2k+3-i} \right] , \tag{3.4}$$

$$D^p_{p+k} = \sum_{i=k}^{2k+3} \alpha_i \left[\frac{i+1}{k+1} \binom{k+1}{i-k} r_{2p+2k+2-i} + \frac{i}{k+1} \binom{k+1}{i-k-1} s_{2p+2k+3-i} + \frac{i-1}{k+1} \binom{k+1}{i-k-2} t_{2p+2k+4-i} \right]. \tag{3.5}$$

Here the convention is made that $\binom{m}{q} = 0$ for $q < 0$, and $r_j = s_j = t_j = 0$ for $j \leqq 0$ and $r_1 = t_1 = 0$, $s_1 = 1$.

Putting the values of r_k, s_k, t_k from (3.2) into (3.3) we get

$$\begin{cases} \alpha^{2p+2k+1} U_k + \beta^{2p+2k+1} V_k = 0 \\ \alpha^{2p+2k+2} W_k + \beta^{2p+2k+2} X_k = 0 \end{cases} \qquad (p, k = 0, 1, \cdots) \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_k &= \sum_{i=k}^{2k+2} \alpha_i \left[\binom{k}{i-k} a_0 \alpha^{-i} + \binom{k}{i-k-1} a_1 \alpha^{-i+1} + \binom{k}{i-k-2} a_2 \alpha^{-i+2} \right], \\ W_k &= \sum_{i=k}^{2k+3} \alpha_i \left[\frac{i+1}{k+1} \binom{k+1}{i-k} a_0 \alpha^{-i} + \frac{i}{k+1} \binom{k+1}{i-k-1} a_1 \alpha^{-i+1} + \frac{i-1}{k+1} \binom{k+1}{i-k-2} a_2 \alpha^{-i+2} \right], \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

and V_k, X_k are obtained from U_k, W_k be replacing

$$a_0, a_1, a_2, \alpha \quad \text{by} \quad b_0, b_1, b_2, \beta .$$

Let k be arbitrary but fixed. If we divide (3.6) by $\alpha^{2p+2k+1}$, $\alpha^{2p+2k+2}$ respectively and let $p \to \infty$, then since $|\beta/\alpha| < 1$ we get

$$U_k = 0,\ W_k = 0 \qquad (k = 0, 1, \cdots) . \tag{3.8}$$

And from (3.6) we then have

$$V_k = 0,\ X_k = 0 \qquad (k = 0, 1, \cdots) . \tag{3.9}$$

For $k = 0$, (3.8), (3.9) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 a_0 + \alpha_1 a_1 + \alpha_2 a_2 = 0,\ \alpha_1 a_0 + \alpha_2 a_1 + \alpha_3 a_2 = 0 , \\ \alpha_0 b_0 + \alpha_1 b_1 + \alpha_2 b_2 = 0,\ \alpha_1 b_0 + \alpha_2 b_1 + \alpha_3 b_2 = 0 . \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Now from (3.3) with $p = k = 0$ we have

$$\alpha_0 r_1 + \alpha_1 s_1 + \alpha_2 t_1 = 0 .$$

But $r_1 = t_1 = 0$, $s_1 = 1$; hence

$$\alpha_1 = 0 .$$

So (3.10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha_0 a_0 + \alpha_2 a_2 = 0, \alpha_2 a_1 + \alpha_3 a_2 = 0 , \\ &\alpha_0 b_0 + \alpha_2 b_2 = 0, \alpha_2 b_1 + \alpha_3 b_2 = 0 . \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Now $a_2 b_2 \neq 0$. For if a_2 or b_2 is zero then from $a_2\alpha + b_2\beta = 0$ (in (1.8)) and $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ we get $a_2 = b_2 = 0$. Hence (again from (1.8)) $c_2 = 0$; so all coefficients in (1.3b) are of degree < 2, contrary to assumption. Again, $a_0 b_0 \neq 0$. For if a_0 or b_0 is zero then (3.11) implies that $\alpha_2 = 0$. Since we already have $\alpha_1 = 0$, then $\Delta_1 = \begin{vmatrix} \alpha_0 \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \end{vmatrix} = 0$. But for the moments $\{\alpha_n\}$ corresponding to an orthogonal set it is known [2] that

$$\Delta_n \equiv \begin{vmatrix} \alpha_0 \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n \\ \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_{n+1} \\ \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \\ \alpha_n \alpha_{n+1} \cdots \alpha_{2n} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0 \qquad (n = 0, 1, \cdots) ;$$

so we have a contradiction. Thus,

$$a_2 b_2 \neq 0, a_0 b_0 \neq 0, \alpha_2 \neq 0 . \tag{3.12}$$

The right hand equations in (3.11) give us

$$-b_1 a_2 + a_1 b_2 = 0 .$$

This with

$$\alpha a_2 + \beta b_2 = 0$$

from (1.8) implies

$$\alpha a_1 + \beta b_1 = 0 ,$$

contrary to (1.9) for $n = 0$. So the assumption $\beta \neq -\alpha$ leads to a contradiction, and we have

$$\beta = -\alpha . \tag{3.13}$$

Then from (1.12):

$$a_0 = b_0 . \tag{3.14}$$

In (3.2) we now have

$$\begin{cases} r_{2p} = 2a_0\delta^{-1}\alpha^{2p}, \, s_{2p} = (a_1 + b_1)\delta^{-1}\alpha^{2p}, \, t_{2p} = (a_2 + b_2)\delta^{-1}\alpha^{2p} \\ r_{2p+1} = 0, \, s_{2p+1} = (a_1 - b_1)\delta^{-1}\alpha^{2p+1}, \, t_{2p+1} = (a_2 - b_2)\delta^{-1}\alpha^{2p+1} \end{cases} \tag{3.15}$$

$(p = 1, 2, \cdots)$, with $r_1 = t_1 = 0$, $s_1 = 1$. (3.12) and (3.15) show that

$$r_2 \neq 0 .$$

Let

$$u_p = s_{2p+1},\ v_p = t_{2p+1},\ w_p = t_{2p+2} . \tag{3.16}$$

From $a_2\alpha + b_2\beta = 0$, $\beta = -\alpha \neq 0$ we get

$$a_2 = b_2 . \tag{3.17}$$

It is then readily seen that

$$v_p = 0,\ w_p - t_2 u_p = 0 \qquad (p = 0, 1, 2, \cdots) \tag{3.18}$$

Choose r_2, s_2, t_2, s_3 to satisfy the conditions

$$r_2 \neq 0,\ 2 + kt_2 \neq 0 (k = 0, 1, \cdots),\ \Delta_2 \neq 0 , \tag{3.19}$$

where $\alpha_1 = 0$, α_2, α_3, α_4 are obtained from the equations

$$D_0^0 = 0,\ d_1^0 = 0,\ D_1^0 = 0 . \tag{3.20}$$

(3.18)-(3.20) make Theorem 4.2 ([1], p. 158) applicable, so that the solutions of (1.3b) form a weak orthogonal set if and only if

$$\begin{cases} s_{2p+1} = s_3^p,\ t_{2p+1} = 0,\ r_{2p+1} = 0 \\ s_{2p+2} = s_2 s_3^p,\ t_{2p+2} = t_2 s_3^p,\ r_{2p+2} = r_2 s_3^p \end{cases} \qquad (p = 0, 1, \cdots) . \tag{3.21}$$

Now these conditions do hold in view of (3.14).

The first two conditions of (3.19) become

$$a_0 \neq 0;\ (a_1 - b_1) + k\alpha a_2 \neq 0 \qquad (k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots) . \tag{3.22}$$

Finally, for weak orthogonality to imply orthogonality it is necessary and sufficient ([1], pp. 161-162) that $t_2 \notin S(r_2, s_2, s_3)$ where $S(r_2, s_2, s_3)$ is the set of all real values of t_2 for which $\pi_n(r_2, s_2, s_3, t_2) = 0$ for some $n > 1$. The expression for π_n is lengthy, and we do not reproduce it here. We merely observe that for given r_2, s_2, s_3 the set $S(r_2, s_2, s_3)$ is at most denumerable.

To sum up:

THEOREM 3.1. *Let the admissible equation* (1.3b) *be canonical. Its solutions form an orthogonal polynomial set if and only if*:

(i) (3.12), (3.13), (3.14), (3.17), (3.19) *hold.*

(ii) $t_2 \notin S(r_2, s_2, s_3)$.

REMARKS. (a) If the canonical equation (1.3b) has an orthogonal polynomial set of solutions then it has the form

$$(3.23)\quad \begin{aligned}(a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0)y(x + \alpha) + (a_2x^2 + b_1x + a_0)y(x - \alpha)\\ - [2a_2x^2 + (a_1 + b_1)x]y(x) = \lambda y(x)\ ,\end{aligned}$$

with

$$(3.24)\quad a_0a_2(a_1 - b_1)\alpha \neq 0;\ (a_1 - b_1) + k\alpha a_2 \neq 0 \qquad (k = 0, 1, \cdots)\ .$$

(b) As in § 2 the transformation $x = \alpha x^*$, $z(x^*) = y(\alpha x^*)$ carries (3.24) into a similar equation with α replaced by 1.

4. Two examples. If an orthogonal polynomial set $\{P_n(x)\}$ satisfies (2.10) with $\lambda = \lambda_n$ for $y = P_n(x)$ then from (1.6) we have

$$(4.1)\qquad \lambda_n = 2a_0 + n\alpha(a_1 - b_1) \qquad (n = 0, 1, \cdots)\ .$$

Let $\{P_n(x)\}$, $\{Q_n(x)\}$ be polynomial sets defined by the respective generating functions

$$(4.2)\qquad e^{ct}(1 - t)^{x+c} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n(x)t^n \qquad (c \neq 0)\ ,$$

$$(4.3)\qquad (1 - t)^{x-bd}\cdot(1 - bt)^{-x+d} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_n(x)t^n \qquad (b \neq 0, 1)\ .$$

We shall show that these sets are orthogonal and satisfy an equation of the form (2.10).

Denote the left side of (2.10) by $L[y]$. If $G(x, t)$ is the generating function in (4.2) then

$$(4.4)\quad L[G] = G\{(a_1x + a_0)(1 - t)^{\alpha} + (b_1x + a_0)(1 - t)^{-\alpha} - (a_1 + b_1)x\}\ .$$

Also,

$$(4.5)\quad \begin{aligned}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda_nP_n(x)t^n &= 2a_0G + \alpha(a_1 - b_1)t\ \partial G/\partial t\\ &= G\{2a_0 + \alpha(a_1 - b_1)t[c - (x + c)(1 - t)^{-1}]\}\ .\end{aligned}$$

$\{P_n(x)\}$ will satisfy (2.10) if (4.4) and (4.5) are identical. It is a straightforward computation to show that they are identical if

$$(4.6)\qquad \alpha = 1;\ a_1 = 0;\ b_1 = a_0/c\ .$$

Hence $\{P_n(x)\}$ is an orthogonal set which satisfies the equation

$$(4.7)\quad P_n(x + 1) + (x + c)P_n(x - 1) - xP_n(x) = (2c - n)P_n(x)\ .$$

In the same way it is found that $\{Q_n(x)\}$ is an orthogonal set that is a solution of (2.10) for

$$(4.8)\qquad \alpha = 1;\ a_1 = bb_1;\ a_0 = -bdb_1\ .$$

The equation reduces to

$$b(x-d)Q_n(x+1)+(x-bd)Q_n(x-1)-(b+1)xQ_n(x) = \{-2bd+n(b-1)\}Q_n(x)\,. \tag{4.9}$$

In the case of (4.9) the condition (2.9_2) is to hold. It reduces to

$$-d(b-1)\neq 0,1,2,\cdots\,. \tag{4.10}$$

REFERENCES

1. H. L. Krall and I. M. Sheffer, *Differential equations of infinite order for orthogonal polynomials*, Annali di Matematica (4) **74** (1966), 135–172.
2. G. Szegö, *Orthogonal polynomials*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 23, 1959.

Received March 12, 1968.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. It should not contain references to the bibliography. Manuscripts, in duplicate if possible, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Rev. **36**, 1539-1546. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints are provided free for each article; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published monthly. Effective with Volume 16 the price per volume (3 numbers) is $8.00; single issues, $3.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: $4.00 per volume; single issues $1.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 7-17, Fujimi 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 28, No. 2 April, 1969