RENDICONTI
del
SEMINARIO MATEMATICO
della
UNIVERSITÀ DI PADOVA

P. I. PASTRO

The q-analogue of Hölder's theorem for the gamma function

Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova, tome 70 (1983), p. 47-53

<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=RSMUP_1983__70__47_0>

© Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova, 1983, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova » (http://rendiconti.math.unipd.it/) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM
Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

REND SEM. MAT. UNIV. PADOVA, Vol. 70 (1983)

The q-Analogue of Hölder's Theorem for the Gamma Function.

P. I. PASTRO (*)

Introduction.

F. H. Jackson (see [1]) defined a q-analogue of the classical Euler gamma function:

$$\Gamma_q(x) = (1-q)^{1-x}(q;q)_\infty/(q^x;q)_\infty$$

where $0 < q < 1$, and the product $(a;q)_\infty$ is defined by

$$(a;q)_\infty = \prod_{n=0}^{\infty}(1-aq^n)\,.$$

In (2.3) R. Askey has proved that the functions $\Gamma_q(x)$ are uniquely determined by the conditions:

i) $\Gamma_q(x+1)(1-q) = \Gamma_q(x)(1-q^x)$;

ii) $\log \Gamma_q(x)$ is convex for positive x;

iii) $\Gamma_q(1) = 1$.

This is analogous to the celebrated theorem of Bohr-Mollerup for the gamma function. Condition i) can be considered a differential equation of infinite order if one writes $e^D f(x) = f(x+1)$. In analogy

(*) Indirizzo dell'A.: Via Silvello, 39 - 31020 Villorba (TV).

with the classical theorem of Hölder (see [4]) which asserts that $\Gamma(x)$ satisfies no algebraic differential equation over $C(x)$, one is naturally led to conjecture the same result for the functions $\Gamma_q(x)$, which for fixed x tend to $\Gamma(x)$ as $q \to 1^-$. The principal result of this note is to establish that conjecture.

1. – In what follows $C[x, q^x]$ and $C(x, q^x)$ denote the ring and the field generated by x and q^x over the field C of the complex numbers respectively.

PROPOSITION 1. If $y(x)$ is a meromorphic function not identically 0 satisfying an algebraic equation of $C(x, q^x)$, then $y(x)$ has at most a finite number of zeroes and poles on the real axis.

The proposition follows from the next

LEMMA. Let $g(x, q^x) \in C[x, q^x]$ not identically 0. Then g has a finite number of real zeroes.

PROOF. Since:

$$g(x, q^x) = (q^x)^r Q(x, q^x) = (q^x)^r\left(p_0(x) + \ldots + q^{nx} p_n(x)\right)$$

where $p_0(x), p_n(x) \in C[x] \setminus (0)$; $p_i(x) \in C[x]$, $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$; it follows that $Z(g(x, q^x)) = Z(Q(x, q^x))$ where, as usual and in what follows, $Z(f)$ denotes the zero-set of the function f. If $n = 0$ the lemma follows easily, since $Z(Q) = Z(p_0)$. If $n \neq 0$ one supposes that $0 < q < 1$ and considers x a real variable. One then has

$$\lim_{x \to -\infty} |Q(x, q^x)| = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \to +\infty} |Q(x, q^x)| = c\,,$$

where c denotes a positive real number (possibly ∞). Consequently, there is a real neighborhood of infinity in which $|Q(x, q^x)|$ is strictly positive. Hence the real zeroes of Q are bounded, and thus finite in number. This proves the lemma.

It follows immediately that each non-zero element of $C(x, q^x)$ has at most a finite number of real zeroes and poles.

Proof of proposition 1.

By hypothesis, there exists a polynomial $f(t)$ in one indeterminate t over $C(x, q^x)$ such that for every complex number x, one has $f(y(x)) = 0$,

that is,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{k} a_n(y(x))^n = 0\,, \qquad a_n \in C(x, q^x) \qquad \text{and} \qquad a_0 \neq 0\,.$$

If y had infinitely many real zeroes, then a_0 would necessarily vanish at all these zeroes, except possibly at the poles of the other a_n, $n \neq 0$, which are finite in number.

This would then contradict the lemma. Q.E.D.

COROLLARY 1. The functions $\Gamma_q(x)$ and $g(x) = (d/dx)(\log \Gamma_q(x))$ are trascendental over $C(x, q^x)$.

COROLLARY 2. If $R(x) \in C(x, q^x)$ has a non-zero real period, then $R(x)$ is a constant.

2. – In the proof of the q-analogue of the Hölder's theorem the functional equation $g(x+1) = g(x) - (q^x \log q)/(1-q^x)$, which follows immediately from condition i) of the introduction, and the following two propositions will be used extensively.

PROPOSITION 2. For every positive integer n

$$\frac{d^n}{dx^n}\left(g(x+1)\right) = \frac{d^n}{dx^n}\left(g(x)\right) + P_n(q^x)/(1-q^x)^{n+1}\,,$$

where $P_n(q^x) \in C[q^x] \setminus (0)$ is not divisible by $(1-q^x)$.

PROOF. The result is an easy induction on n.

PROPOSITION 3. Let $P(q^x) \in C[q^x]$, $P(1) \neq 0$. Then there exists no $R(x) \in C(x, q^x)$ such that for some positive integer k

$$(1-q^x)^k\left(R(x) - R(x+1)\right) = P(q^x)\,.$$

PROOF. The result follows easily from proposition 1 when one observes that such an $R(x)$ would necessarily have poles at all the negative integers, or at all the positive integers.

In what follows $T = (t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, t_i indeterminates; and $T = G(x)$ denotes the substitution $t_{i+1} = (d^i/dx^i)(g(x))$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$.

THEOREM. The function $g(x)$ satisfies no algebraic differential equation over $C(x, q^x)$, that is there does not exist any non-zero polynomial $F(T)$ in the indeterminates T over $C(x, q^x)$ such that $F(G(x)) \equiv 0$.

PROOF. Define the weight of $(t_1)^{m_1} \dots (t_n)^{m_n}$ to be the integer $\sum_{k=1}^{n} km_k$, define the weight of a polynomial in the indeterminates T over $C(x, q^x)$ as the maximum of the weights of the monomials which appear in it.

We reason by contradiction. Suppose that there exists a polinomial $E_x(T)$ such that $E_x(G(x)) \equiv 0$. One can write

$$E_x(T) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_s} R_{s,i}(x) Q_{s,i}(T) + \Delta_0$$

where $s > 1$ is the weight of E; $R_{s,i}(x) \in C(x, q^x)$ and $R_{s,0}(x) = 1$; $Q_{s,i}(T)$ is a term of the type $(t_1)^{m_1} \dots (t_n)^{m_n}$ of weight s, and $Q_{s,i} \neq Q_{s,j}$ for $i \neq j$, and Δ_a represents « a generic sum of terms of weight strictly less than $s - a$ ». (The case $s = 1$ is excluded by Corollary 1). One notes that $E_{x+1}(T)$ has weight s, and that $E_{x+1}(G(x+1)) \equiv 0$. Consider

$$E_x^{[1]}(G(x)) = E_x(G(x)) - E_{x+1}(G(x+1)) .$$

Then

$$E_x^{[1]}(G(x)) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_s} (R_{s,i}(x) - R_{s,i}(x+1)) Q_{s,i}(G(x)) + \Delta_0$$

since

$$Q_{s,i}(G(x+1)) = Q_{s,i}(G(x)) + \Delta_0 .$$

Clearly $E_x^{[1]}(G(x)) \equiv 0$. Furthermore $E_x^{[1]}$ has at most k_s terms of weight s, ($R_{s,0}(x) \equiv 1$, by assumption). In the case that $E_x^{[1]}(T) \neq 0$ this would lead to a contradiction if one started from an E_x with s and k_s minimal. There remains only to treat the case $E_x^{[1]}(T) \equiv 0$.

Since $Q_{l,i} = Q_{v,j}$ if and only if $l = v$ and $i = j$, it follows that $R_{s,i}(x) \equiv R_{s,i}(x+1)$ and hence by corollary 2 $R_{s,i}(x) \equiv a_{s,i} \in C$.

Therefore

$$E_x^{[1]}(G(x)) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_s} a_{s,i} \left(Q_{s,i}(G(x)) - Q_{s,i}(G(x+1)) \right) + \Delta_0 .$$

By the definition of the weight function, one finds that

$$Q_{s,i}(G(x)) - Q_{s,i}(G(x+1)) = \delta_{s,i} v_{s,i}(1-q^x)^{-1} P_0(q^x) Q_{s,i}(G(x))/g(x) + \Delta_1 ,$$

where $\delta_{s,i}$ is 0 or 1 according as the difference lacks or includes a term of weight $s-1$, and $v_{s,i}$ is a complex number. Furthermore, it follows that every class of weight $s-1$ can be represented in a unique way as a difference of the form $Q_{s,i}(G(x)) - Q_{s,i}(G(x+1))$.

Hence

$$E_x^{[1]}(G(x)) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_{s-1}} \big(\delta_{s,i}^{[1]} v_{s,i}(1-q^x)^{-1} P_0(q^x) + R_{s-1,i}(x) - \\ - R_{s-1,i}(x+1)\big) Q_{s-1,i}(G(x)) + \Delta_1$$

where $Q_{s-1,i}$ varies over all possible terms of weight $s-1$, and $\delta_{s,j}^{[i]}$ is 1 or 0 according as $Q_{s,j}(G(x)) - Q_{s,j}(G(x+1)) = Q_{s-1,i}(G(x)) + \Delta_1$ or not.

The assumption that $E_x^{[1]}(G(x)) \equiv 0$ implies that

$$R_{s-1,i}(x) - R_{s-1,i}(x+1) \equiv -\delta_{s,j}^{[i]} v_{s,j}(1-q^x)^{-1} P_0(q^x)$$

(j is uniquely determinated).

By Corollary 2 and proposition 3 one deduces that

i) $R_{s-1,i}(x) = a_{s-1,i} \in C$, $i = 0, \ldots, k_{s-1}$;

ii) $\delta_{s,i}^{[i]} = 0$, $j = 0, \ldots, k_s$, $i = 0, \ldots, k_{s-1}$, or equivalently, if $Q_{r,v}(T) = t_1^{m(1,r,v)} \ldots t_n^{m(n,r,v)}$ where $m(l, r, v)$ is an integer that depends upon l, r, v, then $m(1, s, i) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, k_s$.

Therefore

$$E_x^{[1]}(G(x)) = \sum_{i=0}^{k_s} a_{s,i}\big(Q_{s,i}(G(x) - Q_{s,i}(G(x+1))\big) + \\ + \sum_{i=0}^{k_{s-1}} a_{s-1,i}\big(Q_{s-1,i}(G(x)) - Q_{s-1,i}(G(x+1))\big) + \Delta_1 .$$

Repeating that same argument just made, one obtains

i) $R_{s-2,i}(x) = a_{s-2,i} \in C$, $i = 0, \ldots, k_{s-2}$;

ii) $m(2, s, i) = 0$, $m(1, s-1, j) = 0$, $i = 0, \ldots, k_s$, $j = 0, \ldots, k_{s-1}$.

Continuing recursively, one finds that $m(l, j, i) = 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, s$; $i = 0, \ldots, k_j$; and $l = 1, \ldots, n$.

Thus one concludes that E_x is really a polynomial of weight 1, which contradicts our initial hypothesis, $s > 1$, this completes the proof that $\varphi(x)$ satisfies no algebraic differential equation over $C(x, q^x)$.

One has the same result for q-gamma function, since if a function $y(x)$ satisfies an algebraic differential equation then its logarithmic derivative $z(x)$ also satisfies such an equation.

One sees this assertion in the following way.

If $F(T) = 0$ is the equation for $Y(x)$, then substituting $d/dx(y(x)) = z(x)y(x)$, one obtains the identity

$$F\left(y(x), z(x), \ldots, \frac{d^{n-1}}{dx^{n-1}} z(x)\right) \equiv 0 .$$

Taking the derivative with respect to x, and substituting once again one finds

$$E\left(y(x), z(x), \ldots, \frac{d^n}{dx^n} z(x)\right) \equiv 0 .$$

$F(t_1, z(x), \ldots)$ and $E(t_1, z(x), \ldots)$ have a common zero $y(x)$ as polynomials in the first variable only. Hence their resultant with respect to t_1, the first variable, which depends only on $z(x)$ is identically 0. Thus $z(x)$ satisfies an algebraic differential equation. Q.E.D.

Addendum.

D. Moak [5] has recently characterized the q-gamma functions for $q > 1$. They are defined by:

$$\Gamma_q(x) = \frac{q^{\binom{x}{2}}(q^{-1}; q^{-1})_\infty (q-1)^{1-x}}{(q^{-x}; q^{-1})_\infty}$$

and satisfy the same functional equations as the $\Gamma_q(x)$ with $q < 1$:

$$\Gamma_q(x+1) = \frac{q^x - 1}{q-1} \Gamma_q(x) .$$

Clearly these new $\Gamma_q(x)$ have poles at all the negative integers. Hence, the results of the preceding article apply also to these functions. In fact, the only

place in which the condition $q < 1$ is used in section 1. is in the proof of the lemma, and there the same proof works for $q > 1$. In section 2 all results follow from the functional equation of $g(x) = d/dx(\log \Gamma_q(x))$, and this equation also holds for $\Gamma_q(x)$ when $q > 1$.

REFERENCES

[1] F. H. JACKSON, *Basic Double Hypergeometric functions*, Quart. J. Math., Oxford, serie **13** (1942); **15** (1944).

[2] R. ASKEY, *The q-gamma and q-beta functions*, Applicable Analysis, vol. 8, 1978.

[3] R. ASKEY, *Ramanujan's Extensions of the gamma and beta functions*, American Journal of Mathematics, maggio 1980.

[4] CAMPBELL, *Les Integrales Euleriannes*, Dunod.

[5] D. S. MOAK, *The q-gamma function for* $q > 1$; Aequations Math., **20** (1980) pp. 278-285.

Manoscritto pervenuto alla redazione il 3 febbraio 1982.