

863.

NOTE ON THE THEORY OF LINEAR DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS.

[From *Crelle's Journal der Mathem.*, t. CI. (1887), pp. 209—213.]

THE theorem v. given by Fuchs in the memoir "Zur Theorie der linearen Differentialgleichungen mit veränderlichen Coefficienten," *Crelle's Journal*, t. LXVIII. (1868), pp. 354—385 (see p. 374) for the purpose of deciding whether the integrals belonging to a group of roots of the "determinirenden Fundamentalgleichung" (or as I call it, the Indicial equation) do or do not involve logarithms, may I think be exhibited in a clearer form.

Starting from the differential equation

$$P(y), = p_0 \frac{d^m y}{dx^m} + p_1 \frac{d^{m-1} y}{dx^{m-1}} + \dots + p_m y, = 0,$$

of the order m , then if X be any function of x not satisfying the differential equation, we can at once form a differential equation of the order $m+1$, satisfied by all the solutions of the differential equation, and having also the solution $y=X$; the required equation is in fact

$$\partial_x P(y) \cdot P(X) - P(y) \cdot \partial_x P(X) = 0.$$

This I call the augmented equation.

I recall that the equation $P(y)=0$, considered by Fuchs, is an equation having for each singular point $x=a$, m regular integrals, viz. the coefficients p_0, p_1, \dots, p_m have the forms $q_0(x-a)^m, q_1(x-a)^{m-1}, \dots, q_m$, where q_0, q_1, \dots, q_m are rational and integral functions of $x-a$, q_0 not vanishing for $x=a$, and the other functions q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m not in general vanishing for $x=a$. Writing $y=(x-a)^\theta$, we obtain

$$P(x-a)^\theta = I(\theta)(x-a)^\theta + \text{higher powers of } (x-a),$$

where $I(\theta)$, the coefficient of the lowest power of $(x-a)$, is a function of θ of the order m , which I call the indicial coefficient; and equating it to zero, we have $I(\theta)=0$, the determinirende Fundamentalgleichung, or Indicial equation, being an equation of

the order m . If the roots of this equation are such that no two of them are equal or differ only by an integer number, then we have m particular integrals each of them of the form

$$y = (x - a)^r + \text{higher powers of } (x - a),$$

where r is any root of the indicial equation: but if we have in the indicial equation a group of λ roots $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\lambda$, such that the difference of each two of them is either zero or an integer, then the integrals which correspond to these roots involve or may involve logarithms; in particular, if any two of the roots are equal, the integrals for the group will involve logarithms.

Consider now the differential equation $P(y) = 0$ in reference to the singular point $x = a$ as above, and writing $X = (x - a)^\epsilon f$ where ϵ is in the first instance arbitrary, and f is a rational and integral function of $x - a$ not vanishing for $x = a$, we form the augmented equation which, observing that we have in general $P(X) = (x - a)^\epsilon Q$, Q a rational and integral function of $x - a$ not vanishing for $x = a$, and dividing the whole equation by $(x - a)^{\epsilon - 1}$, may be written

$$\partial_x P(y) \cdot (x - a) Q - P(y) \{ \epsilon Q + (x - a) \partial_x Q \} = 0,$$

an equation of the same form as the original equation (but of the order $m + 1$ instead of m), and having an indicial equation

$$(\theta - \epsilon) I(\theta) = 0.$$

In fact, writing as before $y = (x - a)^\theta$, we have in $\partial_x P(y) \cdot (x - a) Q$ the term of lowest order $\theta I(\theta) Q_0 (x - a)^\theta$ and in $P(y) \cdot \epsilon Q$ the term of lowest order $\epsilon I(\theta) Q_0 (x - a)^\theta$, whereas in $P(y) (x - a) \partial_x Q$ the term of lowest order is $(x - a)^{\theta + 1}$; the indicial equation is thus as just found.

If however ϵ be equal to a root of the indicial equation $I(\theta) = 0$, then instead of $P(X) = (x - a)^\epsilon Q$, we have $P(X) = (x - a)^\mu Q$, where the index μ is $= \epsilon +$ a positive integer, and where the value of the difference $\mu - \epsilon$ may depend upon the determination of the function f in the expression $(x - a)^\epsilon f$. The indicial equation for the augmented equation is in this case $(\theta - \mu) I(\theta) = 0$.

If the indicial equation $I(\theta) = 0$ of the given differential equation has a group of roots $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\lambda$, the difference of any two of these roots being zero or an integer, then taking $\epsilon =$ any one of these roots, the augmented equation will have a group of roots $(\mu, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\lambda)$.

If any two of the roots $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\lambda$ are equal, the group of integrals $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_\lambda$ will involve logarithms: the question only arises when these roots are unequal, and taking them to be so, the theorem v. is in effect as follows: "If by taking $\epsilon =$ some one of the roots $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\lambda$, and by a proper determination of the function f we can make μ to be $=$ one of the same roots $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\lambda$, then the group of integrals $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_\lambda$ will involve logarithms; but if μ cannot be made $=$ one of the roots $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_\lambda$, then the group of integrals will be free from logarithms."

As an example, I consider the equation

$$P(y) = (x^2 - x^4) \frac{d^2 y}{dx^2} - 2x^3 \frac{dy}{dx} - (n^2 + n)y = 0.$$

This is Legendre's equation $(1-x^2)\frac{d^2y}{dx^2} - 2x\frac{dy}{dx} + (n^2+n)y = 0$, with $\frac{1}{x}$ substituted for x , so that, instead of a singular point $x = \infty$, there may be a singular point $x = 0$. Attending to the singular point $x = 0$, we have $P(x^\theta) = (\theta^2 - \theta - n^2 - n)x^\theta + \text{higher powers}$, so that the indicial equation $I(\theta) = 0$ is $\theta^2 - \theta - n^2 - n = 0$, that is, $(\theta + n)(\theta - n - 1) = 0$, or we have the roots $-n, n + 1$, which differ by an integer, and thus form a group, if n be = an integer, or be = an integer $-\frac{1}{2}$; to fix the ideas, say that the roots are $-p, p + 1$ or else $-p + \frac{1}{2}, p + \frac{1}{2}$ where p is a positive integer.

Writing for greater convenience $x^\epsilon f = x^\epsilon + F$, where F is a sum of powers of x higher than ϵ , we find without difficulty

$$P(x^\epsilon f) = x^\epsilon \{(\epsilon + n)(\epsilon - n - 1) - (\epsilon^2 + \epsilon)x^2 + (x^2 - x^4)x^{-\epsilon}F'' - (n^2 + n)x^{-\epsilon}F\}$$

which, so long as ϵ remains arbitrary, is of the form $x^\epsilon Q$, $Q = (\epsilon + n)(\epsilon - n - 1) + \text{powers of } x$; if however ϵ be a root of the indicial equation, for instance, if $\epsilon = -n$, then the expression in brackets $\{ \}$ contains at any rate the factor x , so that the form is $P(x^{-n}f) = x^\mu Q$, where μ is $= -n + 1$ at least; we can however, by a proper determination of the function f , make μ acquire a larger value.

For instance, suppose $-n, n + 1 = -2, 3$; $\epsilon = -n = -2$, and assume

$$x^\epsilon f = x^{-2} + Bx^{-1} + Cx^0 + Dx^1 + Ex^2 + Fx^3 + Gx^4 + \dots$$

To calculate $P(x^\epsilon f)$, we have

x^{-2}	x^{-1}	x^0	x^1	x^2	x^3	x^4	$x^5 \dots$
6	2B	0C	0D	2E	6F	12G	20H ...
		- 6	- 2B	- 0C	- 0D	- 2E	- 6F
		+ 4	+ 2B	- 0C	- 2D	- 4E	- 6F
- 6	- 6B	- 6C	- 6D	- 6E	- 6F	- 6G	- 6H.
P(x^\epsilon f) =	0	- 4B	- 6C	- 6D	- 4E	0F	6G
		- 2			- 2D	- 6E	- 12F ...

Hence if B not = 0, we have $\mu = -1$; if $B = 0, -6C - 2$ not = 0, we have $\mu = 0$; if $B = 0, -6C - 2 = 0, D$ not = 0, we have $\mu = 1$; if $B = 0, -6C - 2 = 0, D = 0$, but E not = 0, we have $\mu = 2$; if $B = 0, -6C - 2 = 0, D = 0, E = 0$, then the coefficient of $x^3, = 0F - 2D$, is = 0, and we have not $\mu = 3$, but $\mu = 4$ at least, viz. μ will be = 4, if $6G - 6E = 0$, that is, if $G = 0$; but leaving F arbitrary, we can by giving proper values to the subsequent coefficients $H, I, \&c.$, make μ to be = 5 or any larger integer value. The values of μ are thus = -1, 0, 1, 2, 4, 5, ..., and we see that the group $(\mu, -n, n + 1)$, that is, $(\mu, -2, 3)$, does not in any case contain two equal indices. Starting from the value $\epsilon = 3$, the value of μ is > 3 , and thus here also the group $(\mu, -2, 3)$ does not contain two equal indices.

The conclusion from the theorem thus is that the integrals u_1, u_2 , belonging to the roots $-2, 3$, do not involve logarithms: and in precisely the same manner, it appears that the integrals, belonging to the two roots $-p, p + 1$ (p any positive

integer), do not involve logarithms: this is right, for the integrals are, in fact, the Legendrian functions of the first and second kinds P_p and Q_p , with only $\frac{1}{x}$ written therein instead of x .

Similarly, if for instance $-n, n+1 = -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$, then, if $\epsilon = -n = -\frac{1}{2}$, assuming

$$x^\epsilon f = x^{-\frac{1}{2}} + Bx^{\frac{1}{2}} + Cx^{\frac{3}{2}} + Dx^{\frac{5}{2}} + Ex^{\frac{7}{2}} + \dots,$$

we have

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
 x^{-\frac{1}{2}} & x^{\frac{1}{2}} & x^{\frac{3}{2}} & x^{\frac{5}{2}} & x^{\frac{7}{2}} & \dots \\
 \hline
 \frac{3}{4} & -\frac{1}{4}B & \frac{3}{4}C & \frac{15}{4}D & \frac{35}{4}E & \\
 & & -\frac{3}{4} & +\frac{1}{4}B & -\frac{3}{4}C & \\
 & & +1 & -B & -3C & \\
 -\frac{3}{4} & -\frac{3}{4}B & -\frac{3}{4}C & -\frac{3}{4}D & -\frac{3}{4}E & \\
 \hline
 P(x^\epsilon f) = & 0 & -B & 0C & 3D & 8E \dots \\
 & & & +\frac{1}{4} & -\frac{3}{4}B & -\frac{15}{4}C \dots
 \end{array}$$

We have here if B not $= 0, \mu = \frac{1}{2}$; but if $B = 0$, then we cannot in any way make the coefficient of $x^{\frac{3}{2}}$ to vanish, and consequently $\mu = \frac{3}{2}$. With this last value of μ , the group $(\mu, -n, n+1)$, that is, $(\mu, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})$, becomes $(\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})$ which contains two equal roots, and the conclusion from the theorem thus is that the integrals u_1, u_2 , corresponding to the roots $-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$, involve logarithmic values. And similarly in general the integrals u_1, u_2 , corresponding to the roots $-p+\frac{1}{2}, p+\frac{1}{2}$ (p any positive integer), involve logarithmic values: this also is right.

The examples exhibit the true character of the theorem, and show I think that it is a less remarkable one than would at first sight appear: in fact, in working them out, we really ascertain by an actual substitution whether the differential equation can be satisfied by series of powers only, without logarithms. Thus for $n=2$ as above, it appears that the equation is satisfied by the series

$$y = x^{-2} + Bx^{-1} + Cx^0 + Dx^1 + Ex^2 + Fx^3 + Gx^4 + Hx^5 + \dots,$$

where

$$B = 0, C = -\frac{1}{3}, D = 0, E = 0, F = F, G = 0, H = -\frac{6}{7}F, \dots,$$

that is, by

$$y = x^{-2} + \frac{1}{3} + F(x^3 - \frac{6}{7}x^5 + \dots),$$

in other words, that we have the two particular integrals $y = x^{-2} + \frac{1}{3}$, and $y = x^3 - \frac{6}{7}x^5 + \dots$, belonging to the two roots $-2, 3$ respectively.

Similarly, when $n = \frac{1}{2}$, we cannot satisfy the equation by a series

$$y = x^{-\frac{1}{2}} + Bx^{\frac{1}{2}} + Cx^{\frac{3}{2}} + Dx^{\frac{5}{2}} + \dots;$$

for in order to satisfy the equation, we must have $B = 0, C = \infty$; there is thus no series of powers $y = x^{-\frac{1}{2}} + Cx^{\frac{3}{2}} + \dots$, corresponding to the root $-\frac{1}{2}$: but there is a series $y = x^{\frac{3}{2}} + kx^{\frac{7}{2}} + \dots$ corresponding to the root $\frac{3}{2}$; and thus the integrals u_1, u_2 , corresponding to these roots $-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}$, involve logarithms.

Cambridge, 23 March 1887.