

# SINGULAR POLYNOMIALS AND MODULES FOR THE SYMMETRIC GROUPS

CHARLES F. DUNKL

**ABSTRACT.** For certain negative rational numbers  $\kappa_0$ , called singular values, and associated with the symmetric group  $S_N$  on  $N$  objects, there exist homogeneous polynomials annihilated by each Dunkl operator when the parameter  $\kappa = \kappa_0$ . It was shown by de Jeu, Opdam and the author (Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 346 (1994), 237-256) that the singular values are exactly the values  $-\frac{m}{n}$  with  $2 \leq n \leq N$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$  and  $\frac{m}{n}$  is not an integer. For each pair  $(m, n)$  satisfying these conditions there is a unique irreducible  $S_N$ -module of singular polynomials for the singular value  $-\frac{m}{n}$ . The existence of these polynomials was previously established by the author (IMRN 2004, #67, 3607-3635). The uniqueness is proven in the present paper. By using Murphy's (J. Alg. 69(1981), 287-297) results on the eigenvalues of the Murphy elements, the problem of existence of singular polynomials is first restricted to the isotype  $\tau$  (where  $\tau$  is a partition of  $N$  corresponding to an irreducible representation of  $S_N$ ) satisfying the condition that  $n/\gcd(m, n)$  divides  $\tau_i + 1$  for  $1 \leq i < l$ ;  $l$  is the length of  $\tau$ , that is,  $\tau_l > \tau_{l+1} = 0$ . Then by arguments involving the analysis of nonsymmetric Jack polynomials it is shown that the assumption  $\tau_2 \geq n/\gcd(m, n)$  leads to a contradiction. This shows that the singular polynomials are exactly those already determined, and are of isotype  $\tau$ , where  $\tau_2 = \dots = \tau_{l-1} = (n/\gcd(m, n)) - 1 \geq \tau_l$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The symmetric group  $S_N$  on  $N$  letters acts on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  by permutation of coordinates. The alternating polynomial, also called the discriminant, is defined by  $a_N(x) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (x_i - x_j)$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and is a fundamental object associated to the group. The Macdonald-Mehta-Selberg integral for  $S_N$  is

$$(2\pi)^{-N/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |a_N(x)|^{2\kappa} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2\right) dx = \prod_{n=2}^N \frac{\Gamma(n\kappa + 1)}{\Gamma(\kappa + 1)},$$

for  $\kappa \geq 0$ . The right hand side is a meromorphic function of  $\kappa$  without zeroes and with poles at  $\kappa = -\frac{m}{n}$ , for  $2 \leq n \leq N$ ,  $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$  and  $\frac{m}{n}$  is not an integer. (For an algebraic proof of the integral, see [5, Sect. 8.7].) Do these values have another connection with the symmetric group? The purpose of this paper is to show that for each pair  $(m, n)$  of natural numbers with  $2 \leq n \leq N$  and  $\frac{m}{n}$  not an integer there is a unique irreducible  $S_N$ -module of homogeneous polynomials which have a

---

*Date:* January 26, 2005.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20C30, 05E10; Secondary 16S32.

*Key words and phrases.* singular polynomials, Murphy elements, nonsymmetric Jack polynomials.

During the preparation of this paper the author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS 0100539.

certain singularity property with respect to a commutative algebra of differential-difference operators. In a previous paper [2] the author established the existence of a space of such polynomials for each pair  $(m, n)$ . This paper proves the uniqueness of the polynomials and the associated modules. By use of the Murphy elements one can find a link between the singular polynomials, the partition of  $N$  which labels the module and the nonsymmetric Jack polynomials (NSJP's). This is the family of simultaneous eigenvectors of a commuting set  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  of operators (involving a parameter  $\kappa$ ). The singular polynomials come from the specializations of certain of NSJP's when  $\kappa$  takes the value  $-\frac{m}{n}$ . The algebra generated by the  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)$  is semisimple (that is, the set of NSJP's forms a basis for all polynomials) for generic  $\kappa$ , but this property may be lost for some negative rational values. A part of the development is to show how to find limits of certain expressions in the NSJP's as  $\kappa$  approaches  $-\frac{m}{n}$ .

Murphy [9] found the eigenvalues of the Murphy elements when restricted to any irreducible  $S_N$ -module. In Section 2 we use his results to find a necessary condition on a partition to allow corresponding singular polynomials and also to prove a uniqueness result. The condition is this: suppose  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  and there is an  $S_N$ -module of singular polynomials corresponding to  $\kappa = -\frac{m}{n}$ , and suppose the module is labeled by the partition  $\tau$  (that is,  $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots)$  with  $\sum_{i \geq 1} \tau_i = N$  and  $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$ ) then  $n \mid (\tau_i + 1)$  for  $1 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$ , where  $\ell(\tau) = \max\{j : \tau_j \geq 1\}$ . Section 3 develops the relevant results on NSJP's. In Section 4 it is shown that the two-part partitions of the form  $(N - n, n)$  with  $n \mid (N - n + 1)$  can not give rise to singular polynomials. Section 5 completes the proof of the main result: if  $\tau_2 \geq n$  then there can not be corresponding singular polynomials. This shows that the class of partitions, namely,  $\tau$  with  $n \mid (\tau_1 + 1)$  and  $\tau_2 = \tau_3 = \dots = \tau_{\ell(\tau)-1} = n - 1$ , appearing in [2] is exhaustive. In Section 6 there is a restatement of the main theorem and a discussion of the relation between singular polynomials and modules over the rational Cherednik algebra.

The group  $S_N$  is the finite reflection group of type  $A_{N-1}$  and it acts by permutation of coordinates. Let  $\mathbb{N}_0$  denote  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$  (also  $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}$  denote the sets of integers and rational numbers respectively). For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  (called a "composition") let  $|\alpha| = \sum_{i=1}^N \alpha_i$  and define the monomial  $x^\alpha$  to be  $\prod_{i=1}^N x_i^{\alpha_i}$ ; its degree is  $|\alpha|$ . The length of a composition  $\alpha$  is  $\ell(\alpha) = \max\{j : \alpha_j > 0\}$ . Consider elements of  $S_N$  as permutations on  $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Then, for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $w \in S_N$  let  $(xw)_i = x_{w(i)}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$  and extend this action to polynomials by  $(wf)(x) = f(xw)$ . This has the effect that monomials transform to monomials:  $w(x^\alpha) = x^{w\alpha}$  where  $(w\alpha)_i = \alpha_{w^{-1}(i)}$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ . (Consider  $x$  as a row vector,  $\alpha$  as a column vector, and  $w$  as a permutation matrix, with 1's at the  $(w(j), j)$  entries.) The reflections in  $S_N$  are the transpositions interchanging  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  and are denoted by  $(i, j)$  for  $i \neq j$ .

In [1] the author constructed for each finite reflection group a parametrized commutative algebra of differential-difference operators. Let  $\kappa$  be a formal parameter, that is,  $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$  is a transcendental extension of  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

**Definition 1.** *The space of polynomials is  $\mathcal{P} := \text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \{x^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N\}$  and for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  the subspace of homogeneous polynomials of degree  $n$  is  $\mathcal{P}_n := \text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \{x^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N, |\alpha| = n\}$ . For  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  let  $\text{coef}(p, \alpha)$  denote the coefficient of  $x^\alpha$  in  $p$  (thus  $p = \sum_\beta \text{coef}(p, \beta) x^\beta$ ).*

For the symmetric group  $S_N$  the operators are defined as follows:

**Definition 2.** For any polynomial  $f$  on  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N$  let

$$\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) f(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} f(x) + \kappa \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{f(x) - (ij) f(x)}{x_i - x_j}.$$

It was shown in [1] that  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) \mathcal{D}_j(\kappa) = \mathcal{D}_j(\kappa) \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq N$  and each  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$  maps  $\mathcal{P}_n$  to  $\mathcal{P}_{n-1}$  for  $n \geq 1$ . A specific numerical parameter value  $\kappa_0$  is said to be a *singular value* (associated with  $S_N$ ) if there exists a nonzero polynomial  $p$  such that  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) p = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ : such a  $p$  is called a *singular polynomial*. It was shown in [4] that the singular values are the numbers  $-\frac{m}{n}$  where  $n = 2, \dots, N$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\frac{m}{n} \notin \mathbb{Z}$ . Earlier, Opdam [10] showed that the  $S_N$ -Bessel function  $J(x, y)$  considered as a function of the parameter  $\kappa$  has poles precisely at these numbers (for  $\kappa > 0$  the Bessel function is the entire solution of the system of equations  $\sum_{j=1}^N \left( \mathcal{D}_j^{(x)}(\kappa) \right)^k J(x, y) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^N y_j^k \right) J(x, y)$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq N$ ,  $J(0, y) = 1$ ,  $J(xw, y) = J(x, yw) = J(x, y)$  for  $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^N$ ). Because the operators  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$  preserve homogeneity and have the  $S_N$ -transformation property  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)(i, j) = (i, j) \mathcal{D}_j(\kappa)$ , the set of singular polynomials for a specific singular value is a direct sum of irreducible  $S_N$ -modules of homogeneous polynomials. The set of partitions of length  $\leq N$  is denoted by  $\mathbb{N}_0^{N, P}$  and consists of all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  such that  $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N-1$ . When writing partitions it is customary to suppress trailing zeros and to use exponents to indicate multiplicity, for example  $(5, 2^3)$  is the same as  $(5, 2, 2, 2, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{5, P}$ . (The exponent notation is also used for compositions.)

The irreducible representations of  $S_N$  are labeled by partitions  $\tau$  of  $N$  (that is,  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N, P}$  and  $|\tau| = N$ ) and we say a polynomial  $f$  is of *isotype*  $\tau$  if  $f$  is an element of an irreducible  $S_N$ -submodule of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  corresponding to  $\tau$ . It was conjectured in [4] that the two-part representations  $(n-1, N-n+1)$  (with  $2(n-1) \geq N$ ) give rise to singular polynomials for the singular values  $-\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) < \frac{n}{N-n+1}$ , and the representations  $(dn-1, n-1, \dots, n-1, \tau_l)$  for  $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$  give rise to singular polynomials for the singular values  $-\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  (where  $l = \ell(\tau)$  and  $N = (dn-1) + (l-2)(n-1) + \tau_l$ ). This construction is presented in [2] in terms of nonsymmetric Jack polynomials. In this paper we show that there are no other singular polynomials. By using Murphy's techniques in his construction of the Young seminormal representations [9] we can show that the isotype  $\tau$  of any irreducible module of singular polynomials for  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  (with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$ ) must satisfy  $n | (\tau_i + 1)$  for  $1 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$ . After that most of the work is to show that the assumption  $\tau_2 \geq n$  leads to a contradiction. Note that the condition  $\tau_2 < n$  implies for three or more parts  $\tau_i = n-1$  for  $2 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$  (and  $\tau_{\ell(\tau)} \leq n-1$ ) and for two parts that  $\tau_2 < \frac{\tau_1 + 1}{\gcd(m_1, \tau_1 + 1)} = n$  for the singular value  $-\frac{m_1}{\tau_1 + 1}$ . These are the restrictions described above.

The notation is almost the same as that in [2] except that the parameter has been incorporated. Key parts of the proofs depend on the behavior of polynomials as  $\kappa$  approaches a singular value  $\kappa_0$ . The commutative algebra of the operators

defining the nonsymmetric Jack polynomials is generated by

$$\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) f(x) = \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) x_i f(x) - \kappa \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (j, i) f(x), 1 \leq i \leq N.$$

(this differs by the additive constant  $\kappa$  from the notation in [5, Ch.8]). The operators act in a triangular manner on monomials, as is explained below.

**Definition 3.** For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ , let  $\alpha^+$  denote the unique partition such that  $\alpha^+ = w\alpha$  for some  $w \in S_N$ . For  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  the partial order  $\alpha \succ \beta$  ( $\alpha$  dominates  $\beta$ ) means that  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^j \alpha_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^j \beta_i$  for  $1 \leq j \leq N$ ;  $\alpha \triangleright \beta$  means that  $|\alpha| = |\beta|$  and either  $\alpha^+ \succ \beta^+$  or  $\alpha^+ = \beta^+$  and  $\alpha \succ \beta$ . The notations  $\alpha \succeq \beta$  and  $\alpha \supseteq \beta$  include the case  $\alpha = \beta$ .

When acting on the monomial basis of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  the operators  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)$  have on-diagonal coefficients involving the following *rank* function on  $\mathbb{N}_0^N$ . We denote the cardinality of a set  $E$  by  $\#E$ .

**Definition 4.** For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N$  let

$$\begin{aligned} r(\alpha, i) &= \#\{j : \alpha_j > \alpha_i\} + \#\{j : 1 \leq j \leq i, \alpha_j = \alpha_i\}, \\ \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) &= (N - r(\alpha, i))\kappa + \alpha_i + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly for a fixed  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  the values  $\{r(\alpha, i) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  consist of all of  $\{1, \dots, N\}$ , are independent of trailing zeros (that is, if  $\alpha' \in \mathbb{N}_0^M$ ,  $\alpha'_i = \alpha_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$  and  $\alpha'_i = 0$  for  $N < i \leq M$  then  $r(\alpha, i) = r(\alpha', i)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ ), and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N,P}$  if and only if  $r(\alpha, i) = i$  for all  $i$  (the latter property motivated the use of “ $1 \leq j \leq i$ ” rather than “ $1 \leq j < i$ ” in the definition). Then (see [5, p.291])  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) x^\alpha = \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) x^\alpha + q_{\alpha, i}(x)$  where  $q_{\alpha, i}(x)$  is a sum of terms  $\pm \kappa x^\beta$  with  $\alpha \triangleright \beta$ . The nonsymmetric Jack polynomials are the simultaneous eigenvectors of  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  and they are well-defined for generic  $\kappa$ .

## 2. $S_N$ -MODULES

In this section we find necessary conditions on a partition  $\tau$  of  $N$  for the existence of singular polynomials of isotype  $\tau$ . Suppose  $f$  is a singular polynomial for some singular value  $\kappa_0$ . We may assume  $f$  is homogeneous because the operators  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$  are homogeneous and that  $f$  has rational coefficients ( $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0)$  is a rational operator). Any translate of  $f$  by  $S_N$  is singular so  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{wf : w \in S_N\}$  is an  $S_N$ -module of singular polynomials for  $\kappa_0$ . Suppose one of the irreducible components has isotype  $\tau$ , for some partition  $\tau$  with  $|\tau| = N$ . This decomposition is a computation over  $\mathbb{Q}$  (from the representation theory of  $S_N$ ). Henceforth we restrict our attention to this module, denoted by  $M$ .

We turn to the application of Murphy's results. For any given isotype he determined the eigenvalues and transformation properties of the eigenvectors of the commuting operators  $\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (i, j) : 2 \leq i \leq N \right\}$  (Jucys-Murphy elements). The results have to be read in reverse in a certain sense.

**Proposition 1.** Suppose  $f$  is a singular polynomial for  $\kappa = \kappa_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , then  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f = f + \kappa_0 \sum_{j=i+1}^N (i, j) f$ .

*Proof.* We have the commutation  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)(x_i f) = x_i \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) f + f + \kappa \sum_{j \neq i} (i, j) f$ . Now set  $\kappa = \kappa_0$  and note that  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f = \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0)(x_i f) - \kappa_0 \sum_{j < i} (i, j) f = -\kappa_0 \sum_{j < i} (i, j) f$ .  $\square$

Denote the Murphy elements  $\omega_i = \sum_{j=N-i+2}^N (N+1-i, j)$  for  $2 \leq i \leq N$  and let  $\omega_1 = 0$  (as a transformation); then  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f = f + \kappa_0 \omega_{N+1-i} f$  for  $f \in M$ . A *standard Young tableau* (SYT) of shape  $\tau$  is a one-to-one assignment of the numbers  $\{1, \dots, N\}$  to the nodes of the Ferrers diagram  $\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\tau), 1 \leq j \leq \tau_i\}$  so that the entries increase in each row and in each column. The notation  $T(i, j)$  refers to the entry at row  $i$ , column  $j$ . There is an order on SYT's of given shape (for details see [9, p.288]) and the maximum SYT in this order, denoted by  $T_0$ , is produced by entering the numbers  $1, 2, \dots, N$  row by row (the first row is  $1, \dots, \tau_1$ , the second is  $\tau_1 + 1, \dots, \tau_1 + \tau_2$  and so forth).

**Definition 5.** Let  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N,P}$  with  $|\tau| = N$ , and let  $Y(\tau)$  denote the set of SYT's of shape  $\tau$ . Suppose  $T \in Y(\tau)$  then let  $rw(i, T), cm(i, T), \eta_i(T) := cm(i, T) - rw(i, T)$  denote the row, column and content, respectively of the node of  $T$  containing  $i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ .

(With this notation  $T(rw(i, T), cm(i, T)) = i$ .) Murphy constructed a basis  $\{f_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$  for the irreducible representation of isotype  $\tau$  such that  $\omega_i f_T = \eta_i(T) f_T$  for each  $i$  and  $T$  (actually, this is an isomorphic image of the construction, which is in terms of specific polynomials, of minimal degree). The eigenvalues  $(\eta_1(T), \dots, \eta_N(T))$  determine the SYT  $T$  uniquely thus there is a unique (up to scalar multiplication) basis  $\{f_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$  for  $M$  with

$$\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f_T = (1 + \kappa_0 \eta_{N+1-i}(T)) f_T, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq N, T \in Y(\tau).$$

(The argument for uniqueness of  $T$  is in [9]: one can reconstruct  $T$  by adjoining boxes containing  $2, 3, \dots, N$  to 1 by using the values  $\eta_2(T), \dots, \eta_N(T)$ ; at any stage the locations at which one can adjoin a box to make a larger SYT have different contents.) We will show that  $f_{T_0}$  is (a multiple of)  $x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \triangleleft \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$  with coefficients  $A_\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N,P}$  with

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda_{N+1-i} = -\kappa_0 \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (\tau_j + 1), \text{ for } \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j < i \leq \sum_{j=1}^s \tau_j.$$

This implies that if  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  then  $n | (\tau_j + 1)$  for  $1 \leq j < \ell(\tau)$  (the maximum value for  $s$  in the above formula). The proof relies on the triangularity properties of the  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0)$  with respect to the order  $\triangleright$ .

**Definition 6.** For each  $T \in Y(\tau)$  let  $C_T = \{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N : \text{coef}(f_T, \beta) \neq 0\}$ . Let  $C$  be the set of  $\alpha \in \cup_{T \in Y(\tau)} C_T$  such that  $\alpha$  is  $\triangleright$ -maximal in some  $C_T$  (that is,  $\alpha, \beta \in C_T$  and  $\beta \triangleright \alpha$  implies  $\beta = \alpha$ ).

**Lemma 1.** If  $\alpha$  is a  $\triangleright$ -maximal element of  $C$  then  $\alpha$  is a partition.

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for any  $\beta \in \cup_T C_T$  there exists a partition  $\lambda \in C$  with  $\lambda \triangleright \beta$ . Since  $M = \text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{f_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$  is  $S_N$ -invariant we see that for any  $w \in S_N$  and  $\beta \in C_T$  for some  $T$  there exists  $T_1 \in Y(\tau)$  such that  $w\beta \in C_{T_1}$  (note that  $wf_T(x) = f_T(xw)$  and  $w(x^\beta) = x^{w\beta}$ ). So  $\cup_T C_T$  is  $S_N$ -invariant, in particular

if  $\beta \in \cup_T C_T$  then  $\beta^+ \in \cup_T C_T$ . Thus there exists  $\gamma \in C$  such that  $\gamma \supseteq \beta^+$ . Since  $C$  is finite the maximal elements  $\alpha$  satisfy  $\alpha \supseteq \alpha^+$ , that is,  $\alpha$  is a partition.  $\square$

The next step is to show that there is a unique maximal element in  $C$  determined by equation 2.1.

**Lemma 2.** *If  $T \in Y(\tau)$  satisfies  $\eta_{s+1}(T) \leq \eta_s(T) + 1$  for  $1 \leq s < N$  then  $T = T_0$ .*

*Proof.* We have to show that the condition implies  $rw(s, T) \leq rw(s+1, T)$  for each  $s$ . Fix  $s$  and let  $T(i_1, j_1) = s$  and  $T(i_2, j_2) = s+1$  so that  $\eta_s(T) - \eta_{s+1}(T) = (j_1 - j_2) + (i_2 - i_1)$ . We list the possibilities for these nodes in any SYT. If  $s$  and  $s+1$  are in the same row of  $T$  then  $i_2 = i_1, j_2 = j_1 + 1$  and  $\eta_{s+1}(T) = \eta_s(T) + 1$ . If  $s$  and  $s+1$  are in the same column of  $T$  then  $i_2 = i_1 + 1, j_2 = j_1$  and  $\eta_{s+1}(T) = \eta_s(T) - 1$ . The condition  $i_1 < i_2$  and  $j_1 < j_2$  is impossible or else  $s < T(i_2, j_1) < s+1$ . Also the condition  $i_1 > i_2$  and  $j_1 > j_2$  is impossible or else  $s+1 < T(i_1, j_2) < s$ . If  $i_1 < i_2$  and  $j_1 > j_2$  then  $\eta_s(T) - \eta_{s+1}(T) \geq 2$ . The case  $i_1 > i_2$  and  $j_1 < j_2$  is ruled out by hypothesis because it implies  $\eta_s(T) - \eta_{s+1}(T) \leq -2$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose  $\lambda$  is a  $\triangleright$ -maximal element of  $C$  then  $\lambda$  is  $\triangleright$ -maximal in  $C_{T_0}$  and is given by equation 2.1.*

*Proof.* By hypothesis  $\lambda$  is a partition and is  $\triangleright$ -maximal in  $C_T$  for some  $T \in Y(\tau)$ . By the triangularity property of  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0)$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{coef}((1 + \kappa_0 \eta_{N+1-i}(T)) f_T, \lambda) &= \text{coef}(\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f_T, \lambda) \\ &= \xi_i(\lambda; \kappa_0) \text{coef}(f_T, \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

and  $\xi_i(\lambda; \kappa_0) = (N - i) \kappa_0 + \lambda_i + 1$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . This gives the equations

$$\begin{aligned} (N - i) \kappa_0 + \lambda_i + 1 &= 1 + \kappa_0 \eta_{N+1-i}(T), \\ \lambda_{N+1-i} &= \kappa_0 (\eta_i(T) + 1 - i). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\lambda$  is a partition  $\lambda_{N+1-i} \leq \lambda_{N-i}$  for  $1 \leq i < N$  and thus  $\eta_i(T) + 1 - i \geq \eta_{i+1}(T) + 1 - (i+1)$  (note that  $\kappa_0 < 0$ ). By Lemma 2  $T = T_0$ . By definition of  $T_0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \tau_1$  we have  $\eta_i(T_0) = i - 1$  thus  $\lambda_{N+1-i} = 0$ . In the range  $\sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j + 1 \leq i \leq \sum_{j=1}^s \tau_j$  (row  $s$  of  $T_0$ )  $\eta_i(T_0) = \left(i - \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j\right) - s$  and  $\lambda_{N+1-i} = -\kappa_0 \left(\sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j + s - 1\right) = -\kappa_0 \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} (\tau_j + 1)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** *There is a unique  $\triangleright$ -maximal element  $\lambda$  of  $C$  given by equation 2.1, and  $n | (\tau_j + 1)$  for  $1 \leq j < \ell(\tau)$  (where  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  and  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$ ).*

*Proof.* The uniqueness is now obvious. The equation  $\lambda_{N+1-i} = m \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \frac{\tau_j + 1}{n}$  for  $\sum_{j=1}^{s-1} \tau_j < i \leq \sum_{j=1}^s \tau_j$  shows inductively that  $n | (\tau_j + 1)$  for  $1 \leq j < \ell(\tau)$ ; since the maximum value of  $s$  is  $\ell(\tau)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** *For any  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  and partition  $\tau$  of  $N$  there is at most one irreducible  $S_N$ -module, consisting of singular polynomials for the singular value  $\kappa_0$ , that has isotype  $\tau$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose there are two unequal modules  $M$  and  $M'$  satisfying the hypotheses. Let  $\{f_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$  and  $\{f'_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$  be the respective bases for  $M$  and  $M'$  produced by Murphy's construction. Normalize the two bases so that both  $f_{T_0}$  and  $f'_{T_0}$  are monic in  $x^\lambda$  (that is,  $f_{T_0} = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \triangleleft \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$  and  $f'_{T_0}$  has the same form with  $A_\beta$  replaced by  $A'_\beta$ ), with  $\lambda$  given by equation 2.1. Let  $g_T = f_T - f'_T$  for  $T \in Y(\tau)$ , then  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{g_T : T \in Y(\tau)\}$  consists of singular polynomials and its basis has the same transformation properties under the action of  $S_N$  as the basis of  $M$ . By the Theorem  $\text{coef}(g_{T_0}, \lambda) \neq 0$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

The following summarizes the results of this section. The polynomial  $f_{T_0}$  is renamed  $g_\lambda$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose there exist singular polynomials for  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  (and  $2 \leq n \leq N$ ) of isotype  $\tau$ , a partition of  $N$ , then  $n \mid (\tau_i + 1)$  for  $1 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$  and there is a unique singular polynomial  $g_\lambda = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \triangleleft \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$  (with  $A_\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ ) of isotype  $\tau$  such that  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) g_\lambda = \xi_i(\lambda; \kappa_0) g_\lambda$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , where  $\lambda$  is given by equation 2.1.*

### 3. NONSYMMETRIC JACK POLYNOMIALS

These polynomials are the simultaneous eigenvectors of the commuting set of operators  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ . The existence follows from the triangular property and the fact that the correspondence (from compositions to eigenvalues)  $\alpha \mapsto (\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa))_{i=1}^N$  is one-to-one for generic  $\kappa$ . We use the notation from [2] (for now just the  $x$ -monic version is used but there will be a reference to the  $p$ -monic version).

**Definition 7.** *For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ , let  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  denote the  $x$ -monic simultaneous eigenvectors, that is,  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) = \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$  and  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) = x^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \triangleleft \alpha} A_{\beta\alpha}^x(\kappa) x^\beta$ , with coefficients  $A_{\beta\alpha}^x(\kappa) \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$ .*

**Definition 8.** *For  $1 \leq i \leq N$  the operators  $\mathcal{B}_{ij}$  (with  $j \neq i$ ) and the operator  $\mathcal{B}_i$  (each maps  $\mathcal{P}_n$  into itself, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ) are given by*

$$\mathcal{B}_{ij}p(x) := \frac{x_i p(x) - x_j p(x(i, j))}{x_i - x_j} - \begin{cases} 0, & i < j \\ p(x(i, j)), & i > j, \end{cases}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_i p := \sum_{j \neq i} \mathcal{B}_{ij} p, \text{ for } p \in \mathcal{P}.$$

In this notation  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) p(x) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (x_i p(x)) + \kappa \mathcal{B}_i p(x)$ . There is an easily proved identity:  $\mathcal{B}_{ij} + \mathcal{B}_{ji} = 1$ , and this shows directly that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) = N + \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \kappa \frac{N(N-1)}{2}.$$

For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and  $i \neq j$  by direct computation we obtain:

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{B}_{ij}x^\alpha = \sum_{l=0}^{\alpha_i - \alpha_j} \left( \frac{x_j}{x_i} \right)^l x^\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha_i \geq \alpha_j, i < j,$$

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{B}_{ij}x^\alpha = \sum_{l=0}^{\alpha_i - \alpha_j - 1} \left( \frac{x_j}{x_i} \right)^l x^\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha_i \geq \alpha_j, i > j,$$

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{B}_{ij}x^\alpha = - \sum_{l=1}^{\alpha_j - \alpha_i - 1} \left( \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right)^l x^\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha_i < \alpha_j, i < j,$$

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{B}_{ij}x^\alpha = - \sum_{l=1}^{\alpha_j - \alpha_i} \left( \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right)^l x^\alpha, \text{ for } \alpha_i < \alpha_j, i > j.$$

There is another invariant subspace structure for  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)\}$  besides the  $\triangleright$ -triangular property. The purpose of the following arguments is to allow the computation of certain coefficients of  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  crucial in the arguments of Section 5.

**Definition 9.** For  $1 \leq s \leq N$  and  $n \geq 1$  let

$$I_{s,n}^{(N)} := \left\{ \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N : \alpha_i < n \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq s, \alpha_i \leq n \text{ for } s+1 \leq i \leq N \right\},$$

$$P_{s,n}^{(N)} := \text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \left\{ x^\alpha : \alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)} \right\}.$$

Note that each  $I_{s,n}^{(N)}$  is finite and  $P_{s,n}^{(N)}$  is the direct sum of its homogeneous subspaces  $P_{s,n}^{(N)} \cap \mathcal{P}_k, k \geq 0$ .

**Lemma 3.** Suppose  $1 \leq s \leq N$  and  $n \geq 1$ , then  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) P_{s,n}^{(N)} \subset P_{s,n}^{(N)}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , and  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \left\{ \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) : \alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)} \right\} = P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$ . It suffices to show  $\mathcal{B}_{ij}x^\alpha \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$  for all  $i, j$ . By formulae 3.1-3.4 this is obvious for  $1 \leq i, j \leq s$  or  $s+1 \leq i, j \leq N$ , or  $\max(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) < n$ . Only the two cases  $1 \leq i \leq s, \alpha_j = n$  (thus  $j > s$ ) and  $1 \leq j \leq s, \alpha_i = n$  (with  $i > s$ ) remain to be considered. Formulae 3.3 and 3.2 respectively show that  $\mathcal{B}_{ij}x^\alpha \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ . For any  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  the eigenvector  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  is contained in the orbit of  $x^\alpha$  under the algebra generated by  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)\}$  hence  $x^\alpha \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$  implies  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ . That the span of  $\{\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)\}$  is all of  $P_{s,n}^{(N)}$  follows easily (dimension argument, for example).  $\square$

**Definition 10.** For a partition  $\lambda$  and an integer  $s$  with  $1 \leq s \leq N$  define the insertion operator  $\iota(s; \lambda) : \mathbb{N}_0^N \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0^{N+\ell(\lambda)}$  as follows: for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$

$$(\iota(s; \lambda)\alpha)_i = \begin{cases} \alpha_i, & 1 \leq i \leq s \\ \lambda_{i-s}, & s < i \leq s + \ell(\lambda) \\ \alpha_{i-\ell(\lambda)}, & s + \ell(\lambda) < i \leq N + \ell(\lambda). \end{cases}$$

The definition is only interesting when  $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$  where  $n = \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}$ , in which case the following rank equations hold: let  $\beta = \iota(s; \lambda)\alpha$  and  $k = \ell(\lambda)$ , then  $r(\beta, i) = r(\alpha, i) + k$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ ,  $r(\beta, i) = r(\alpha, i - k) + k$  for  $s + k < i \leq N + k$ , and  $r(\beta, i) = i - s$  for  $s + 1 \leq i \leq s + k$ .

**Theorem 3.** Suppose  $\lambda$  is a partition,  $1 \leq s \leq N$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$  where  $n = \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}$ , and  $\alpha \triangleright \beta$ , then  $\text{coef} \left( \zeta_{\iota(s, \lambda)\alpha}^x(\kappa), \iota(s, \lambda)\beta \right) = \text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \beta)$ .



It suffices to prove this for  $\ell(\lambda) = 1$  because then one can insert one part of  $\lambda$  at a time in nondecreasing order: explicitly let  $\lambda^{(j)} = (\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)+1-j}, \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)+2-j}, \dots, \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)})$  for  $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)$ , then  $\iota(s, (\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)-j})) \iota(s, \lambda^{(j)}) = \iota(s, \lambda^{(j+1)})$ ; also if  $\alpha, \beta \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$  then  $\iota(s, \lambda^{(j)}) \alpha \in I_{s,k}^{(N+j)}$  where  $k = \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)+1-j}$  and  $\alpha \triangleright \beta$  implies  $\iota(s, \lambda^{(j)}) \alpha \triangleright \iota(s, \lambda^{(j)}) \beta$ .

For arbitrary  $M \geq 1$  let  $\mathcal{P}^{(M)} = \text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)} \{x^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^M\}$  and let  $\mathcal{U}_i^{(M)}(\kappa)$  denote the operator  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)$  for  $M$  variables. For  $M > N$  let  $\pi_{MN}$  be the projection from  $\mathcal{P}^{(M)}$  onto  $\mathcal{P}^{(N)}$  defined by setting  $x_{N+1} = x_{N+2} = \dots = x_M = 0$ . The coefficients of the  $\zeta_\alpha^x$  do not depend on the number of variables (that is  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x, \beta)$  is independent of  $N \geq \max(\ell(\alpha), \ell(\beta))$ ) because of the intertwining relation

$$(3.5) \quad \pi_{MN} \mathcal{U}_i^{(M)}(\kappa) = \left( \mathcal{U}_i^{(N)}(\kappa) + (M - N) \kappa \right) \pi_{MN},$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq N < M$ . Fix integers  $n, s$  with  $n \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq s \leq N$  and define the map  $\iota_{s,n} : \mathcal{P}^{(N)} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^{(N+1)}$  by  $\iota_{s,n} x^\alpha = x^\beta$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and  $\beta = \iota(s, (n)) \alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s, n, \alpha_{s+1}, \dots, \alpha_N)$  and extending by linearity to all polynomials. Direct computation yields the identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_i^{(N+1)}(\kappa) \iota_{s,n} - \iota_{s,n} \mathcal{U}_i^{(N)}(\kappa) &= \kappa \mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} \iota_{s,n}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq s, \\ \mathcal{U}_{i+1}^{(N+1)}(\kappa) \iota_{s,n} - \iota_{s,n} \mathcal{U}_{i+1}^{(N)}(\kappa) &= \kappa \mathcal{B}_{i+1,s+1} \iota_{s,n}, \text{ for } s+1 \leq i \leq N. \end{aligned}$$

We show that if  $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$  then  $\iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  is congruent to  $\zeta_{\iota(s,(n))\alpha}^x(\kappa)$  modulo the subspace  $P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$ . To illustrate the argument, suppose there is a linear operator  $\mathcal{V}$  with an invariant subspace  $E$  and there is a vector  $f$  and number  $c$  so that  $\mathcal{V}f - cf \in E$  then  $f - ((\mathcal{V} - c)|_E)^{-1}(\mathcal{V}f - cf)$  is an eigenvector of  $\mathcal{V}$  with eigenvalue  $c$ , provided that the restriction of  $\mathcal{V} - c$  to  $E$  is invertible. This can be adapted for simultaneous eigenvectors of pairwise commuting operators by extending the base field  $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$ , adjoining another formal variable (transcendental)  $v$  and considering just one operator  $\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \mathcal{U}_i^{(N)}(\kappa)$  (or  $\sum_{i=1}^{N+1} v^i \mathcal{U}_i^{(N+1)}(\kappa)$ , as appropriate). The eigenvalues  $\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa)$  are simple ( $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and generic  $\kappa$ ). Denote the field  $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa, v)$  by  $\mathbb{K}$ .

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose  $1 \leq s \leq N$  and  $n \geq 1$ . If  $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$  then  $\iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) = \zeta_{\iota(s,(n))\alpha}^x(\kappa) + f_\alpha$  for some  $f_\alpha \in P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$ .*

*Proof.* First we show  $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} \iota_{s,n} P_{s,n}^{(N)} \subset P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$  for  $i \neq s+1$ . Let  $\alpha \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$  and  $\beta = \iota(s, (n)) \alpha$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq s$  by Formula 3.3  $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta = -\sum_{l=1}^{n-\alpha_i-1} \left( \frac{x_i}{x_{s+1}} \right)^l x^\beta$  with the key (change from  $\beta$ ) terms being  $x_i^{\alpha_i+l} x_{s+1}^{n-l}$  where  $\alpha_i+1 \leq \alpha_i+l \leq n-1$  and  $\alpha_i+1 \leq n-l \leq n-1$ ; if  $\alpha_i = n-1$  then  $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta = 0$ . Suppose  $s+2 \leq i \leq N+1$ ; if  $\alpha_{i-1} = n = \beta_i$  then  $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta = 0$  by Formula 3.2, if  $\alpha_{i-1} = \beta_i < n$  then by Formula 3.4  $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta = -\sum_{l=1}^{n-\beta_i} \left( \frac{x_i}{x_{s+1}} \right)^l x^\beta$  with key terms  $x_i^{\beta_i+l} x_{s+1}^{n-l}$  where  $\beta_i+1 \leq \beta_i+l \leq n$  and  $\beta_i \leq n-l \leq n-1$ . Thus  $\mathcal{B}_{i,s+1} x^\beta \in P_{s+1,n}^{(N+1)}$ .

Temporarily we use a superscript on the eigenvalues  $\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa)$  to indicate the number of variables, then

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta; \kappa) &= (N+1 - r(\beta, i))\kappa + \beta_i + 1 \\ &= (N+1 - (r(\alpha, i) + 1))\kappa + \alpha_i + 1 = \xi_i^{(N)}(\alpha; \kappa)\end{aligned}$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq s$  and, similarly,  $\xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta; \kappa) = \xi_{i-1}^{(N)}(\alpha; \kappa)$  for  $s+2 \leq i \leq N+1$ . The eigenvalues  $\{\xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta; \kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N+1, i \neq s+1\}$  and the degree of homogeneity  $|\beta| = |\alpha| + n$  determine  $\zeta_\beta^x(\kappa)$  uniquely, subject to  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\beta^x(\kappa), \beta) = 1$ , because  $\sum_{i=1}^{N+1} \mathcal{U}_i^{(N+1)}(\kappa) = N+1 + \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \kappa \frac{N(N+1)}{2}$ . Let

$$\mathcal{V} := \left( \sum_{i=1}^s + \sum_{i=s+2}^{N+1} \right) v^i \mathcal{U}_i^{(N+1)}(\kappa).$$

The polynomials  $\{\zeta_\gamma^x(\kappa) : \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N+1}, |\gamma| = |\alpha| + n\}$  form a basis of eigenvectors of  $\mathcal{V}$  for  $E := \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}} \{x^\gamma : \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^{N+1}, |\gamma| = |\alpha| + n\}$  and each eigenvalue is simple. Let  $F := \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}} \{x^\gamma : \gamma \in I_{s+1, n}^{(N+1)}, |\gamma| = |\alpha| + n\}$  then  $\mathcal{V}F \subset F$  by Lemma 3. Finally consider

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_{\iota_{s,n}} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) &= \sum_{i=1}^s v^i \left( \iota_{s,n} \mathcal{U}_i^{(N)} + \kappa \mathcal{B}_{i, s+1} \iota_{s,n} \right) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=s+2}^{N+1} v^i \left( \iota_{s,n} \mathcal{U}_{i-1}^{(N)} + \kappa \mathcal{B}_{i, s+1} \iota_{s,n} \right) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) \\ &= \sum_{i=1, i \neq s+1}^{N+1} v^i \xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta; i) \iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + h_\alpha,\end{aligned}$$

where  $h_\alpha = \kappa \left( \sum_{i=1}^s + \sum_{i=s+2}^{N+1} \right) v^i \mathcal{B}_{i, s+1} \iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  and  $h_\alpha \in F$ , since  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) \in P_{s,n}^{(N)}$ . Let  $\mathcal{V}_\beta$  be the restriction of  $\mathcal{V} - \sum_{i=1, i \neq s+1}^{N+1} v^i \xi_i^{(N+1)}(\beta; i)$  to the invariant subspace  $F$  and let  $f_\alpha = \mathcal{V}_\beta^{-1} h_\alpha$ , then  $\iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) - f_\alpha = \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa)$  because  $\text{coef}(f_\alpha, \beta) = 0$  and  $\text{coef}(\iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \beta) = \text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \alpha) = 1$ . Since  $f_\alpha = \iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) - \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa)$  the coefficients of  $f_\alpha$  are in  $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.** Suppose  $\alpha, \gamma \in I_{s,n}^{(N)}$  then

$$\text{coef} \left( \zeta_{\iota(s,n)\alpha}^x(\kappa), \iota(s, (n)) \gamma \right) = \text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \gamma).$$

*Proof.* By definition  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \gamma) = \text{coef}(\iota_{s,n} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \iota(s, (n)) \gamma)$ . Also  $(\iota(s, (n)) \gamma)_{s+1} = n$  and thus  $\text{coef}(f, \iota(s, (n)) \gamma) = 0$  for any  $f \in P_{s+1, n}^{(N+1)}$ .  $\square$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

The poles of the coefficients of  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  play a key role in the analysis of singular polynomials. Knop and Sahi [8] found an algorithm for the evaluation of the coefficients. It uses the idea of extending the definition of Ferrers diagrams to compositions and associating a hook-length to each node in the diagram. The *Ferrers diagram* of a composition  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  is the set  $\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha), 0 \leq j \leq \alpha_i\}$ .

For each node  $(i, j)$  with  $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_i$  there are two special subsets of the Ferrers diagram, the *arm*  $\{(i, l) : j < l \leq \alpha_i\}$  and the *leg*  $\{(l, j) : l > i, j \leq \alpha_l \leq \alpha_i\} \cup \{(l, j-1) : l < i, j-1 \leq \alpha_l < \alpha_i\}$ . The node itself, the arm and the leg make up the *hook*. The definition of hooks for compositions is from [8, p.15]. The cardinality of the leg is called the leg-length, formalized by the following:

**Definition 11.** For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha)$  and  $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_i$  the leg-length is

$$L(\alpha; i, j) := \# \{l : l > i, j \leq \alpha_l \leq \alpha_i\} \\ + \# \{l : l < i, j \leq \alpha_l + 1 \leq \alpha_i\}.$$

For  $t \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$  the hook-length and the hook-length product for  $\alpha$  are given by

$$h(\alpha, t; i, j) = (\alpha_i - j + t + \kappa L(\alpha; i, j)) \\ h(\alpha, t) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\alpha)} \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_i} h(\alpha, t; i, j),$$

Note that the indices  $\{i : \alpha_i = 0\}$  are omitted in the product  $h(\alpha, t)$ . In [2] and [5] we used the notation

$$\mathcal{E}_\varepsilon(\alpha) = \prod \left\{ 1 + \frac{\varepsilon \kappa}{\kappa(r(\alpha, i) - r(\alpha, j)) + \alpha_j - \alpha_i} : i < j, \alpha_i < \alpha_j \right\}, \varepsilon = \pm.$$

The denominator also equals  $\xi_j(\alpha; \kappa) - \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa)$ . The relation to  $h(\alpha, t)$  (for the values  $t = 1, \kappa + 1$  which are of concern here) is the following:

**Lemma 5.** For  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ ,  $h(\alpha, \kappa + 1) = h(\alpha^+, \kappa + 1) \mathcal{E}_+(\alpha)$  and  $h(\alpha, 1) = \frac{h(\alpha^+, 1)}{\mathcal{E}_-(\alpha)}$ .

*Proof.* We use induction on adjacent transpositions. The statements are true for  $\alpha = \alpha^+$ . Fix  $\alpha^+$  and suppose  $\alpha_i > \alpha_{i+1}$  for some  $i$ . Let  $\sigma = (i, i+1)$ . Consider the ratio  $\frac{h(\sigma\alpha, t)}{h(\alpha, t)}$ . The only node whose hook-length changes (in the sense of interchanging rows  $i$  and  $i+1$  of the Ferrers diagram) is  $(i, \alpha_{i+1} + 1)$ . Explicitly  $h(\sigma\alpha, t; s, j) = h(\alpha, t; s, j)$  for  $s \neq i, i+1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_s$ ,  $h(\sigma\alpha, t; i, j) = h(\alpha, t; i+1, j)$  for  $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_{i+1}$  and  $h(\sigma\alpha, t; i+1, j) = h(\alpha, t; i, j)$  for  $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_i$  except for  $j = \alpha_{i+1} + 1$ . Thus  $\frac{h(\sigma\alpha, t)}{h(\alpha, t)} = \frac{h(\sigma\alpha, t; i+1, \alpha_{i+1} + 1)}{h(\alpha, t; i, \alpha_{i+1} + 1)}$ . Note that  $L(\sigma\alpha; i+1, \alpha_{i+1} + 1) = L(\alpha; i, \alpha_{i+1} + 1) + 1$  (the node  $(i, \alpha_{i+1})$  is adjoined to the leg). Let

$$E_1 = \{s : s \leq i, \alpha_s \geq \alpha_i\} \cup \{s : s > i, \alpha_s > \alpha_i\}, \\ E_2 = \{s : s \leq i+1, \alpha_s \geq \alpha_{i+1}\} \cup \{s : s > i+1, \alpha_s > \alpha_{i+1}\},$$

thus by definition  $r(\alpha, i) = \#E_1$  and  $r(\alpha, i+1) = \#E_2$ . Now  $E_1 \subset E_2$  thus  $r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i) = \#(E_2 \setminus E_1)$  and  $E_2 \setminus E_1 = \{s : s < i, \alpha_i > \alpha_s \geq \alpha_{i+1}\} \cup \{i\} \cup \{s : s > i+1, \alpha_i \geq \alpha_s > \alpha_{i+1}\}$ . This shows that  $\#(E_2 \setminus E_1) = 1 + L(\alpha; i, \alpha_{i+1} + 1)$ , and

$$h(\alpha, t; i, \alpha_{i+1} + 1) = \kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i) - 1) + t + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1} - 1, \\ h(\sigma\alpha, t; i+1, \alpha_{i+1} + 1) = \kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i)) + t + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1} - 1.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h(\sigma\alpha, \kappa+1; i+1, \alpha_{i+1}+1)}{h(\alpha, \kappa+1; i, \alpha_{i+1}+1)} &= \frac{\kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i) + 1) + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}}{\kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i)) + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}} \\ &= 1 + \frac{\kappa}{\kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i)) + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}} \\ &= \mathcal{E}_+(\sigma\alpha) / \mathcal{E}_+(\alpha); \end{aligned}$$

the latter equation is proven in Theorem 8.5.8, from [5, p.302], and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{h(\sigma\alpha, 1; i+1, \alpha_{i+1}+1)}{h(\alpha, 1; i, \alpha_{i+1}+1)} &= \frac{\kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i)) + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}}{\kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i) - 1) + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}} \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{\kappa}{\kappa(r(\alpha, i+1) - r(\alpha, i)) + \alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1}}\right)^{-1} \\ &= \mathcal{E}_-(\alpha) / \mathcal{E}_-(\sigma\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $h(\alpha, \kappa+1)$  and  $h(\alpha^+, \kappa+1) \mathcal{E}_+(\alpha)$  have the same transformation properties under adjacent transpositions and hence are equal. Similarly  $h(\alpha, 1) = \frac{h(\alpha^+, 1)}{\mathcal{E}_-(\alpha)}$ .  $\square$

Knop and Sahi [8, Theorem 5.1] showed that  $h(\alpha, \kappa+1) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  has all coefficients in  $\mathbb{N}_0[\kappa]$  for each  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ . When  $\kappa$  takes on a negative rational number  $\kappa_0$  it may happen that two different compositions have the same eigenvalues  $(\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa_0))_{i=1}^N$  so one can not claim the existence of a basis of simultaneous eigenvectors of  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ . We recall the following from [2].

**Definition 12.** Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and let  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  then say  $(\alpha, \beta)$  is a  $(-\frac{m}{n})$ -critical pair (for  $\alpha$ ) if  $\alpha \triangleright \beta$  and  $(n\kappa + m)$  divides  $(r(\beta, i) - r(\alpha, i))\kappa + \alpha_i - \beta_i$  (in  $\mathbb{Q}[\kappa]$ ) for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ .

The definition implies  $\xi_i(\alpha; -\frac{m}{n}) = \xi_i(\beta; -\frac{m}{n})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . We can deduce the existence of simple poles at  $\kappa = -\frac{m}{n}$  in a certain coefficient.

**Lemma 6.** Suppose  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ ,  $h(\alpha, \kappa+1)$  has a simple zero at  $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $(\alpha, \beta)$  is the unique  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair for  $\alpha$ , then  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \beta)$  has a simple pole at  $\kappa_0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \beta)$  is independent of the number of variables  $N$  provided  $N \geq \max(\ell(\alpha), \ell(\beta))$  we may assume  $N = \ell(\alpha) + |\alpha|$ . Let  $\gamma = (0^{\ell(\alpha)}, 1^{|\alpha|}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  then by [8]  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \gamma) = (|\alpha|)! \kappa^{|\alpha|} / h(\alpha, \kappa+1)$ . Let  $f = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} (\kappa - \kappa_0) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  which exists as a polynomial over  $\mathbb{Q}$  by hypothesis and is not zero because  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} (\kappa - \kappa_0) \text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \gamma) \neq 0$ . The polynomial  $f$  is a simultaneous eigenvector for  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  because  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) f = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} (\kappa - \kappa_0) \mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) = \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa_0) f$ . Let  $\gamma$  be a  $\triangleright$ -maximal element of  $\{\delta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N : \text{coef}(f, \delta) \neq 0\}$ . By  $\triangleright$ -triangularity  $\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa_0) = \xi_i(\delta; \kappa_0)$  for each  $i$ , thus  $\delta = \alpha$  or  $\delta = \beta$  by definition of critical pairs. It is impossible for  $\delta = \alpha$  since  $\text{coef}(f, \alpha) = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} (\kappa - \kappa_0) = 0$  hence  $\delta = \beta$ . So  $\text{coef}(f, \beta) = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} (\kappa - \kappa_0) \text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa), \beta) \neq 0$ .  $\square$

In the next sections the Lemma will be combined with Theorem 3.

**Example 1.** The conceptual proof of the Lemma may be the only reasonably effective method. For example in the next section we need the conclusion of Lemma 6 for  $\text{coef}(\zeta_{(5,6)}^x(\kappa), (2, 0, 3, 3, 3))$ , which arises for  $N = 5, \tau = (3, 2), \kappa_0 = -\frac{3}{2}$ .

There is a combinatorial formula for the coefficients of  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  due to Knop and Sahi [8], which requires a sum over  $3! \times 1721$  configurations for this example (the factorial comes from permuting the indices  $(3, 4, 5)$ ). By direct (computer algebra) calculations this coefficient equals

$$\frac{30\kappa^3(1+\kappa)^2(62\kappa^3+135\kappa^2+78\kappa+40)}{(2\kappa+3)(2\kappa+5)(\kappa+2)^2(\kappa+3)^2(\kappa+4)(\kappa+5)}.$$

The expression suggests that there is no practical closed form.

We address the problem of the relationship of a simultaneous eigenvector of  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  to the nonsymmetric Jack polynomials; namely, how can such a polynomial be expressed as a limit as  $\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0$ ? For a given  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  let  $C(\alpha, \kappa_0) = \{\beta : (\alpha, \beta) \text{ is a } \kappa_0\text{-critical pair}\}$ . In the proof we again use the field  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(\kappa, v)$  and the operator  $\sum_{i=1}^N v^i \mathcal{U}_i(\kappa)$ ; otherwise to each  $\gamma \in E$  one has to associate some  $i$  for which  $\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa_0) \neq \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa_0)$ . The expressions we consider are all rational in  $\kappa$  (now with values in  $\mathbb{Q}(v)$ ) so having no pole at  $\kappa_0$  is equivalent to being analytic in a neighborhood of  $\kappa_0$ .

**Theorem 4.** Suppose for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  that there exists a simultaneous eigenvector  $g_\alpha = x^\alpha + \sum_{\beta \triangleleft \alpha} A_\beta x^\beta$  of  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ , with the coefficients  $A_\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ , then there are coefficients  $B_\beta(\kappa) \in \mathbb{K}$  defined for  $\beta \in C(\alpha, \kappa_0)$  such that the polynomial  $q_\alpha(\kappa) = \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \sum \left\{ B_\beta(\kappa) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa) : \beta \in C(\alpha, \kappa_0) \right\}$  has no pole at  $\kappa_0$  and  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} q_\alpha(\kappa) = g_\alpha$ .

*Proof.* By the triangularity property  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) g_\alpha = \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa_0) g_\alpha$ . For generic  $\kappa$  there are coefficients  $B'_\gamma(\kappa)$  defined for all  $\gamma \triangleleft \alpha$  so that  $g_\alpha = \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \sum_{\gamma \triangleleft \alpha} B'_\gamma(\kappa) \zeta_\gamma^x(\kappa)$  (because the nonsymmetric Jack polynomials form a basis and the change-of-basis matrix is unimodular and triangular). Let  $E = \{\gamma : \gamma \triangleleft \alpha, \gamma \notin C(\alpha, \kappa_0)\}$ . Apply the operator

$$\mathcal{V}(\kappa) := \prod_{\gamma \in E} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i (\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa))}{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i (\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa))}$$

to both sides of the equation for  $g_\alpha$ , thus annihilating all  $\zeta_\gamma^x(\kappa)$  with  $\gamma \in E$ . The right hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(\kappa) g_\alpha &= \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \sum_{\beta \in C(\alpha, \kappa_0)} B'_\beta(\kappa) \left( \prod_{\gamma \in E} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i (\xi_i(\beta; \kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa))}{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i (\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa))} \right) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa) \\ &= \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) + \sum_{\beta \in C(\alpha, \kappa_0)} B_\beta(\kappa) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa), \end{aligned}$$

with the last equation implicitly defining the coefficients  $B_\beta(\kappa)$ . We use the operators  $\mathcal{B}_i$  from Definition 8. To evaluate  $\mathcal{V}(\kappa) g_\alpha$  directly we consider

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa)) g_\alpha - (\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa)) g_\alpha \\ &= (\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) + (\kappa - \kappa_0) \mathcal{B}_i - \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa)) g_\alpha \\ &= (\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa_0) - \xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) + (\kappa - \kappa_0) \mathcal{B}_i) g_\alpha \\ &= (\kappa - \kappa_0) (r(\alpha, i) - N + \mathcal{B}_i) g_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for each  $\gamma \in E$  we have

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i (\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa))}{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i (\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa))} g_\alpha = g_\alpha + (\kappa - \kappa_0) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i (r(\alpha, i) - N + \mathcal{B}_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^N v^i (\xi_i(\alpha; \kappa) - \xi_i(\gamma; \kappa))} g_\alpha.$$

The latter term has no pole at  $\kappa_0$ , since  $(\alpha, \gamma)$  is not a  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair. Apply this computation repeatedly to obtain  $\mathcal{V}(\kappa) g_\alpha = g_\alpha + (\kappa - \kappa_0) p(\kappa)$ , where  $p$  is polynomial in  $x$ , rational in  $\kappa$  and has no pole at  $\kappa_0$ . Hence set  $q_\alpha(\kappa) = \mathcal{V}(\kappa) g_\alpha$ , then  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} q_\alpha(\kappa) = g_\alpha$ , and this completes the proof.  $\square$

If we apply this result to the hypothetical singular polynomial described in Theorem 2, that is  $g_\lambda = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \triangleleft \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{V}(\kappa) g_\lambda = \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa) + \sum \{B_\beta(\kappa) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa) : \beta \in C(\lambda, \kappa_0)\},$$

which has no pole at  $\kappa_0$ . More importantly, since  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$  is polynomial in  $\kappa$ , the relation  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) \mathcal{V}(\kappa) g_\lambda = \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) g_\lambda = 0$  holds. This is a key ingredient in the proof that  $\tau_2 < n$ , because we can now apply the known formulae for  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa)$ .

The basic step is the formula for  $\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\alpha)}(\kappa) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ . The computation involves a cyclic shift. For  $1 \leq i \leq N$  let  $\varepsilon(i) \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  denote the standard basis element, that is,  $\varepsilon(i)_j = \delta_{ij}$ .

**Definition 13.** For  $1 < k \leq N$  let  $\theta_k = (1, 2)(2, 3) \dots (k-1, k) \in S_N$ , (thus,  $\theta_k \alpha = (\alpha_k, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{k+1}, \dots)$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ ). If  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  satisfies  $\ell(\alpha) = k$  for  $1 < k \leq N$  set  $\tilde{\alpha} = \theta_k(\alpha - \varepsilon(k)) = (\alpha_k - 1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}, 0, \dots)$ .

In [2] the formula for  $\mathcal{D}_k(\kappa)$  is stated for the  $p$ -basis  $\{\zeta_\alpha(\kappa)\}$ . To use the result here it suffices to invoke the transformation formula  $\zeta_\alpha(\kappa) = \frac{h(\alpha, \kappa+1)}{h(\alpha, 1)} \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ . The ratio does not have to be computed explicitly since only the values of  $\frac{h(\alpha, t)}{h(\tilde{\alpha}, t)}$  for  $t = 1, \kappa + 1$  are needed.

**Lemma 7.** Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and suppose  $\ell(\alpha) = k$  then  $\frac{h(\alpha, t)}{h(\tilde{\alpha}, t)} = (k - r(\alpha, k)) \kappa + t + \alpha_k - 1$ .

*Proof.* Heuristically the Ferrers diagram for  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is produced from that of  $\alpha$  by deleting the node at  $(k, 1)$  and moving the remainder of row  $k$  to the top (row zero); then every node still has the same hook-length and the required ratio is  $h(\alpha, t; k, 1)$ . Explicitly,  $h(\tilde{\alpha}, t; i, j) = h(\alpha, t; i-1, j)$  for  $2 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq \alpha_{i-1}$  and  $h(\tilde{\alpha}, t; 1, j-1) = h(\alpha, t; k, j)$  for  $2 \leq j \leq \alpha_k$  because

$$\begin{aligned} L(\alpha; k, j) &= \#l : l < k, j \leq \alpha_l + 1 \leq \alpha_k \\ &= \#\{l : 1 < l, j-1 \leq \alpha_{l-1} \leq \alpha_k - 1\} = L(\tilde{\alpha}; 1, j-1). \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} L(\alpha; k, 1) &= \#\{l : l < k, 1 \leq \alpha_l + 1 \leq \alpha_k\} = \#\{l : l < k, 0 \leq \alpha_l < \alpha_k\} \\ &= k - \#\{l : l \leq k, \alpha_l \geq \alpha_k\} = k - r(\alpha, k), \end{aligned}$$

thus  $h(\alpha, t; 1, k) = \kappa(k - r(\alpha, k)) + t + \alpha_k - 1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.** Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and suppose  $\ell(\alpha) = k$  then

$$\mathcal{D}_k(\kappa) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa) = \frac{(k - r(\alpha, k)) \kappa + \alpha_k}{(k + 1 - r(\alpha, k)) \kappa + \alpha_k} ((N + 1 - r(\alpha, k)) \kappa + \alpha_k) \theta_k^{-1} \zeta_{\tilde{\alpha}}^x(\kappa).$$

*Proof.* In [2, Theorem 3.5] it was shown that

$$\mathcal{D}_k(\kappa) \zeta_\alpha(\kappa) = ((N+1-r(\alpha, k))\kappa + \alpha_k) \theta_k^{-1} \zeta_{\tilde{\alpha}}(\kappa).$$

To modify this equation to hold for the  $x$ -monic polynomials multiply the right hand side by  $\frac{h(\alpha, 1) h(\tilde{\alpha}, \kappa+1)}{h(\tilde{\alpha}, 1) h(\alpha, \kappa+1)} = \frac{(k-r(\alpha, k))\kappa + \alpha_k}{(k+1-r(\alpha, k))\kappa + \alpha_k}$ .  $\square$

The last topic for the section is the action of  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa)$  with respect to the order  $\triangleright$ . In the lemma the operator is modified to be degree-preserving to simplify the statement.

**Lemma 8.** *Suppose  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , if  $\text{coef}(x_i \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) x^\beta, \alpha) \neq 0$  then  $\beta = \alpha$  or  $\beta^+ \succ \alpha^+$  or  $\beta = (i, j)\alpha$  with  $\alpha_i > \alpha_j, 1 \leq j \leq N$ .*

*Proof.* By direct computation for  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  we have

$$x_i \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) x^\beta = \beta_i x^\beta + \kappa \sum_{\beta_j < \beta_i} \sum_{l=0}^{\beta_i - \beta_j - 1} \left( \frac{x_j}{x_i} \right)^l x^\beta - \kappa \sum_{\beta_j > \beta_i} \sum_{l=1}^{\beta_j - \beta_i} \left( \frac{x_i}{x_j} \right)^l x^\beta.$$

The term  $x^\alpha$  appears in the sum if (i)  $\alpha = \beta$ , (ii) (with coefficient  $\kappa$ ) for some  $j$ ,  $\beta_i > \beta_j$  and  $\alpha_i = \beta_i - l, \alpha_j = \beta_j + l$  with  $0 \leq l \leq \beta_i - \beta_j - 1$ , (iii) (with coefficient  $-\kappa$ ) for some  $j$ ,  $\beta_i < \beta_j$  and  $\alpha_i = \beta_i + l, \alpha_j = \beta_j - l$  with  $1 \leq l \leq \beta_j - \beta_i$  (for (ii) and (iii)  $\alpha_k = \beta_k$  for  $k \neq i, j$ ). In case (ii)  $\alpha = \beta$  for  $l = 0$  and  $\beta^+ \succ \alpha^+$  for  $1 \leq l \leq \beta_i - \beta_j - 1$  by [5, Lemma 8.2.3]. In case (iii)  $\alpha = (i, j)\beta$  for  $l = \beta_j - \beta_i = \alpha_i - \alpha_j > 0$  and  $\beta^+ \succ \alpha^+$  for  $1 \leq l \leq \beta_i - \beta_j - 1$  as before.  $\square$

The Lemma will be used in analyzing the effect of  $\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\alpha)}(\kappa)$  on  $q_\alpha(\kappa)$ , the polynomial defined in Theorem 4. The aim will be to show it suffices to consider  $\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\alpha)}(\kappa) \zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa)$ . We point out that for any given partition  $\tau$  with  $\tau_2 \geq n$  there may be several reasons why there can be no singular polynomial of isotype  $\tau$ , notably there may be no eigenfunction of  $\{\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$  with the respective eigenvalues  $\{\xi_i(\lambda; \kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ , where  $\lambda$  is as specified in Theorem 2. Our proof singles out one aspect, a certain nonvanishing coefficient of  $\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa_0) g_\lambda$  which applies to all cases.

#### 4. THE TWO-PART CASE

In this section we consider the simplest case where  $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2)$ ,  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  and  $\tau_2 = n$ . By Corollary 1  $\tau_1 = dn - 1$  for some  $d \geq 2$  (since  $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2$ ). We will show that there is no singular polynomial for  $\kappa_0$  of isotype  $\tau$ . By Theorem 2, if there exist singular polynomials for  $\kappa_0$  of isotype  $\tau$  then there exists  $g_\lambda = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \triangleleft \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$  with  $\lambda = ((md)^n)$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) g_\lambda = 0$  and  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) g_\lambda = \xi_i(\lambda; \kappa_0) g_\lambda$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . In fact,  $g_\lambda = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$ . This follows from Theorem 4 because there is no  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair  $(\lambda, \beta)$  with  $\ell(\beta) \leq N$ . (The background for this is detailed in [2]; briefly  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\alpha^x, \beta)$  is independent of the number  $M$  of variables provided  $\max(\ell(\alpha), \ell(\beta)) \leq M$  (see equation 3.5); also if  $\ell(\alpha) \leq N < \ell(\alpha) + |\alpha|$  then not every factor of  $h(\alpha, \kappa+1)$  need appear as a pole of  $\zeta_\alpha^x$ .) We start by computing  $h(\lambda, \kappa+1)$  and showing there is a unique  $\beta$  so that  $(\lambda, \beta)$  is a  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair for  $\lambda$  and  $\ell(\beta) = N+1$ .

For the rectangular diagram  $\lambda = ((md)^n)$  it is clear that  $L(\lambda; i, j) = n - i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq md$  so that  $h(\lambda, \kappa+1) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{md} ((n-i+1)\kappa + md + 1 - j) =$

$\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^{md} (i\kappa + j)$ . Since  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  the multiplicity of  $(n\kappa + m)$  in  $h(\lambda, \kappa + 1)$  is one, occurring as  $h(\lambda, \kappa + 1; 1, md - m + 1)$ . The algorithm of [3] yields  $\beta = (0^n, m^{nd})$  for a  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair  $(\lambda, \beta)$ . Note  $\ell(\beta) = n + nd = \tau_2 + (\tau_1 + 1) = N + 1$ . Also recall the easily proved rule: for any critical pair  $(\alpha, \gamma)$  it always holds that if  $i > \ell(\alpha)$  and  $\gamma_i = 0$  then  $\gamma_j = 0$  for all  $j > i$ ; since  $r(\alpha, i) = i = r(\gamma, i)$ .

**Proposition 3.** *For  $\lambda = ((md)^n)$ ,  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  let  $\beta = (0^n, m^{nd})$  then  $(\lambda, \beta)$  is the unique  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair for  $\lambda$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^M$  for some  $M \geq N$ , and  $\gamma$  satisfies the conditions  $\lambda \geq \gamma$  and  $R_i : (r(\gamma, i) - i)m = (\lambda_i - \gamma_i)n$  for  $1 \leq i \leq M$  (as usual, define  $\lambda_i = 0$  for any  $i > \ell(\lambda)$ , the equation is a restatement of  $(r(\gamma, i) - i)\kappa_0 + (\lambda_i - \gamma_i) = 0$ ). We must show  $\gamma = \lambda$  or  $\gamma = \beta$ . Since  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  there exists  $\eta \in \mathbb{N}_0^M$  so that  $\gamma = m\eta$  (componentwise; note  $r(\gamma, i) = r(\eta, i)$  for each  $i$ ). By condition  $R_{n+1}$  we have  $(r(\eta, n+1) - n - 1) = -n\eta_{n+1}$  so that  $\eta_{n+1} = 1 - \frac{1}{n}(r(\eta, n+1) - 1) \leq 1$  and thus  $\eta_{n+1} = 1$  or  $\eta_{n+1} = 0$ .

If  $\eta_{n+1} = 1$  then  $r(\eta, n+1) = 1$ , which implies  $\eta_i = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $\eta_i \leq 1$  for  $i > n+1$ . Since  $|\eta| = \frac{1}{m}|\gamma| = \frac{1}{m}|\lambda| = nd$  we see that  $\eta^+ = (1^{nd})$  and in fact  $\eta_i = 1$  for  $n+1 \leq i \leq n(d+1)$ , since  $\eta_j = 0$  and  $\eta_{j+1} = 1$  is impossible for  $j > n$ . Thus  $r(1, \eta) = nd + 1$  and condition  $R_1$  becomes  $(nd + 1 - 1)m = (md - 0)n$ . So  $\gamma = \beta$ ; the other conditions  $R_i$  are verified similarly.

If  $\eta_{n+1} = 0$  then  $r(\eta, n+1) = n+1$  and  $\ell(\eta) = \ell(\gamma) = n$ . But the conditions  $\lambda_i = \lambda_1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n = \ell(\lambda)$ ,  $\lambda \geq \gamma$  and  $\ell(\gamma) = \ell(\lambda)$  together imply  $\gamma = \lambda$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.** *The polynomial  $\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$  in  $N = nd + n - 1$  variables has no pole at  $\kappa_0$ . The (hypothetical) singular polynomial  $g_\lambda = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$ .*

*Proof.* By Theorem 4  $g_\lambda = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$ , since there is no  $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  so that  $(\lambda, \gamma)$  is  $\kappa_0$ -critical. By [2, Theorem 4.8]  $\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$  in  $nd + n - 1$  variables has no pole at  $\kappa_0$  (since  $N = nd + n - 1 < \ell(\beta)$ ).  $\square$

This implies  $\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa_0)g_\lambda = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \mathcal{D}_n(\kappa)\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$ . In the notation of Section 3 (noting  $N + 1 - r(\lambda, n) = (nd + n - 1) + 1 - n = nd$ )

$$\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa)\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa) = \frac{md}{\kappa + md}d(n\kappa + m)\theta_n^{-1}\zeta_{\tilde{\lambda}}^x(\kappa),$$

where  $\tilde{\lambda} = (md - 1, (md)^{n-1})$ . We will show that the coefficient of  $x^\gamma$  in the equation does not converge to zero as  $\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0$ , where  $\gamma = \theta_n(m - 1, 0^{n-1}, m^{nd-1}) = (0^{n-1}, m - 1, m^{nd-1})$  and  $\ell(\gamma) = N$ . The following is similar to Proposition 3.

**Proposition 4.** *For  $\tilde{\lambda} = (md - 1, (md)^{n-1})$ ,  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  let  $\beta = (m - 1, 0^{n-1}, m^{nd-1})$  then  $(\tilde{\lambda}, \beta)$  is the unique  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair for  $\tilde{\lambda}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^M$  for some  $M \geq N$ , and  $\gamma$  satisfies the conditions  $\tilde{\lambda} \geq \gamma$  and  $R_i : (r(\gamma, i) - r(\tilde{\lambda}, i))m = (\tilde{\lambda}_i - \gamma_i)n$  for  $1 \leq i \leq M$ . The conditions  $R_i$



specialize to:

$$\begin{aligned} (r(\gamma, 1) - n)m &= (md - 1 - \gamma_1)n, \text{ for } i = 1, \\ (r(\gamma, i) - i + 1)m &= (md - \gamma_i)n, \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n, \\ (r(\gamma, i) - i + 1)m &= -\gamma_i n, \text{ for } i > n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\gamma_1 \equiv m - 1 \pmod{m}$  and  $\gamma_i \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$  for  $i \geq 2$ . Consider the condition  $R_{n+1} : (r(\gamma, n+1) - n - 1)m = -n\gamma_{n+1}$ , equivalent to  $\gamma_{n+1}/m = 1 - (r(\gamma, n+1) - 1)/n \leq 1$ . Thus  $\gamma_{n+1} = m$  or  $\gamma_{n+1} = 0$ . If  $\gamma_{n+1} = m$  then  $r(\gamma, n+1) = 1$ , implying that  $\gamma_i < m$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . The congruence conditions imply  $\gamma_1 = m - 1$  and  $\gamma_i = 0$  for  $2 \leq i \leq n$ . Arguing similarly to Proposition 3 we see that  $\gamma_i = m$  or  $\gamma_i = 0$  for  $i \geq n+1$ ; the condition  $|\gamma| = nmd - 1$  shows that  $\gamma = (m - 1, 0^{n-1}, m^{nd-1})$ . To verify  $R_1$  note  $r(\gamma, 1) = nd$  so  $(nd - n)m = ((md - 1) - (m - 1))n = mn(d - 1)$  is satisfied. For  $2 \leq i \leq n$  we have  $r(\gamma, i) = nd + i - 1$  and  $\gamma_i = 0$  so the condition  $R_i$ , namely,  $(nd + i - 1 - i + 1)m = mdn$  is satisfied.

If  $\gamma_{n+1} = 0$  then  $\ell(\gamma) = n$ ; for this particular  $\tilde{\lambda}$  the conditions  $(\tilde{\lambda})^+ \succeq \gamma^+$  and  $\ell(\gamma) = n$  together imply  $(\tilde{\lambda})^+ = \gamma^+$ ; then  $\tilde{\lambda} \succeq \gamma$  implies  $\tilde{\lambda} = \gamma$ .  $\square$

By Lemma 7  $h(\tilde{\lambda}, \kappa + 1) = h(\lambda, \kappa + 1) / (\kappa + md)$  so  $(n\kappa + m)$  has multiplicity one in  $h(\tilde{\lambda}, \kappa + 1)$ . Next we will show  $\text{coef}(\zeta_{\tilde{\lambda}}(\kappa), \beta)$  has a simple pole at  $\kappa_0$ , where  $\beta$  is defined in the Proposition.

For  $w \in S_N$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  since  $w(x^\alpha) = x^{w\alpha}$  the transformation property  $\text{coef}(p, \alpha) = \text{coef}(wp, w\alpha)$  holds for any polynomial  $p$ .

**Theorem 5.** Suppose  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  and  $\tau = (dn - 1, n)$  with  $d \geq 2, n \geq 2$  so that  $N = (d + 1)n - 1$ , then there are no singular polynomials for  $\kappa_0$  of isotype  $\tau$ .

*Proof.* By Corollary 4 if there is a singular polynomial of isotype  $\tau$  for the singular value  $\kappa_0$  then  $g_\lambda = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$  is singular, where  $\lambda = ((md)^n)$ . By Proposition 2  $\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa) = \frac{md}{\kappa + md} d(n\kappa + m) \theta_n^{-1} \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$ . Let  $\beta = (m - 1, 0^{n-1}, m^{nd-1})$  so that  $(\tilde{\lambda}, \beta)$  is the unique  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair for  $\tilde{\lambda}$ . It is crucial that  $\ell(\beta) = n + nd - 1 = N$ . By Lemma 6  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \beta) = \frac{f(\kappa)}{n\kappa + m}$  where  $f(\kappa) \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$ ,  $f(\kappa)$  has no pole at  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  and  $f(\kappa_0) \neq 0$ . Note  $\theta_n^{-1}\beta = (0^{n-1}, m - 1, m^{nd-1})$ . Thus

$$\text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \theta_n^{-1}\beta) = \frac{md^2(n\kappa + m)f(\kappa)}{(\kappa + md)(n\kappa + m)} = \frac{md^2 f(\kappa)}{\kappa + md}$$

and

$$\text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_n(\kappa_0) g_\lambda, \theta_n^{-1}\beta) = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \frac{md^2 f(\kappa)}{\kappa + md} \neq 0,$$

and so  $g_\lambda$  is not singular for  $\kappa_0$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

This argument will serve as the key ingredient for the general case  $\tau$ .

## 5. THE GENERAL CASE

In this section we consider the singular value  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  and  $2 \leq n \leq N$  for the isotype  $\tau$ , where  $\tau$  has two or more parts and  $\tau_2 > n$ . Let  $l = \ell(\tau) \geq 2$ . We assume there exists a singular polynomial for  $\kappa_0$  of isotype  $\tau$  and will eventually arrive at a contradiction. By Corollary 1 there are integers  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{l-1}$  so that  $\tau_i = d_i n - 1$  for  $1 \leq i < l$ . Because  $\tau$  is a partition it follows that  $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_{l-1}$ . By hypothesis  $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 > n$  so that  $d_1 \geq 2$ , and  $d_2 \geq 2$  if  $l \geq 3$ . By Theorem 2 there is a corresponding partition  $\lambda$  and a singular polynomial  $g_\lambda = x^\lambda + \sum_{\beta \triangleleft \lambda} A_\beta x^\beta$  with  $\mathcal{U}_i(\kappa_0) g_\lambda = \xi_i(\lambda; \kappa_0) g_\lambda$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . The computations are expressed in terms of (with  $1 \leq i \leq l-1$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} t_i &:= \sum_{j=1}^{l-i} d_j = \sum_{j=1}^{l-i} \frac{\tau_j + 1}{n}, \\ p_i &:= \sum_{j=l+1-i}^l \tau_j, \\ \lambda &:= ((mt_1)^{\tau_1}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \dots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2}, 0^{\tau_1}), \\ \gamma &:= ((mt_1)^{\tau_1}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \dots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2-n}, 0^{n-1}, m-1, m^{\tau_1}), \\ \alpha &:= ((mt_1)^{\tau_1}, (mt_2)^{\tau_{l-1}}, \dots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2-n}, 0^{n-1}, m, m^{\tau_1}). \end{aligned}$$

Also let  $p_0 = 0, p_l = N$ . Note that  $p_{l-1} = \ell(\lambda) = N - \tau_1$ ,  $t_{l-1} = d_1 \geq 2$  and  $|\gamma| + 1 = |\alpha| = |\lambda|$  because  $(\tau_1 + 1)m = nd_1 m = nmt_{l-1}$ . By Theorem 4 there exists a polynomial  $q_\lambda(\kappa) = \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa) + \sum \left\{ B_\beta(\kappa) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa) : \beta \in C(\lambda, \kappa_0) \right\}$  which has no pole at  $\kappa_0$  and  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} q_\lambda(\kappa) = g_\lambda$ ; the coefficients  $B_\beta(\kappa) \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa, v)$  and  $C(\lambda, \kappa_0)$  is the set of  $\beta$  such that  $(\lambda, \beta)$  is a  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair.

We will show  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa) \neq 0$  by showing  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma) \neq 0$ . The proof has two parts: firstly we show that  $\text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma) = \text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \gamma)$  and secondly we use the Insertion Theorem 3 and the result from the previous section.

**Lemma 9.** *Suppose  $\delta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$ ,  $\lambda \triangleright \delta$  and  $\text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) x^\delta, \gamma) \neq 0$  then  $\delta \triangleright \alpha$ .*

*Proof.* By construction  $\text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) x^\delta, \gamma) = \text{coef}(x_{\ell(\lambda)} \mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) x^\delta, \alpha)$ . By Lemma 8  $\delta = \alpha$  or  $\delta^+ \succ \alpha^+$  or  $\delta = (\ell(\lambda), j) \alpha$  with  $\alpha_{\ell(\lambda)} > \alpha_j$ ; but in the latter case  $j < \ell(\lambda)$  (in fact  $\ell(\lambda) - n \leq j < \ell(\lambda)$  and  $\alpha_j = 0$ ) so that  $\delta \succ \alpha$ . Thus  $\delta \triangleright \alpha$ .  $\square$

To complete the first part of the argument we need only show that there is no  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair  $(\lambda, \beta)$  with  $\beta \triangleright \alpha$ .

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose  $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^M$  (with some  $M \geq N$ ),  $\lambda \triangleright \beta \triangleright \alpha$  and  $\beta$  satisfies the rank equation  $(r(\beta, i) - i)m = (\lambda_i - \beta_i)n$  for  $i \geq 1$  then  $\beta = \lambda$ .*

*Proof.* The rank equation and definition of  $\alpha$  imply  $m|\beta_i$  and  $m|\alpha_i$  for each  $i$ ; since the definition of  $\triangleright$  implies that  $\mu \triangleright \nu$  if and only if  $m\mu \triangleright m\nu$  for arbitrary compositions  $\mu, \nu$  (where  $(m\mu)_i := m\mu_i$ ) we will assume that  $m = 1$  in the rest of the proof. Since  $\beta$  is trapped between  $\lambda = (t_1^{\tau_1}, t_2^{\tau_{l-1}}, \dots, t_{l-1}^{\tau_2}, 0^{\tau_1})$  and  $\alpha = (t_1^{\tau_1}, t_2^{\tau_{l-1}}, \dots, t_{l-1}^{\tau_2-n}, 0^{n-1}, 1^{\tau_1+1})$  we deduce that  $\beta^+$  agrees with  $\lambda$  in the first  $N -$

$\tau_1 - n$  entries, that is,  $(\beta^+)_i = \lambda_i = \alpha_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq N - \tau_1 - n = p_{l-1} - n$ . None of the entries of  $\beta$  equal to some  $t_j$  can “move to the left” (lower index). For  $j, k$  with  $1 \leq j \leq k \leq l-1$  suppose that the first appearance (least index) of  $t_k$  in  $\beta$  is at an index  $i$  with  $\lambda_i = t_j$ , that is,  $p_{j-1} + 1 \leq i \leq p_j$ , then  $r(\beta, i) = p_{k-1} + 1$  and the rank equation implies

$$\begin{aligned} i &= r(\beta, i) - n(\lambda_i - \beta_i) = p_{k-1} + 1 - n(t_j - t_k) \\ &= p_{k-1} + 1 - n \sum_{s=l-k+1}^{l-j} d_s = p_{k-1} + 1 - \sum_{s=l-k+1}^{l-j} (\tau_s + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq i - (p_{j-1} + 1) &= p_{k-1} - p_{j-1} - \sum_{s=l-k+1}^{l-j} (\tau_s + 1) \\ &= \sum_{s=l+2-k}^{l+1-j} \tau_s - \sum_{s=l-k+1}^{l-j} \tau_s - (k-j) = \tau_{l+1-j} - \tau_{l-k+1} - (k-j) \\ &\leq j - k \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality  $\tau_{l+1-j} - \tau_{l-k+1} \leq 0$  holds because  $\tau$  is a partition and  $l - k + 1 \leq l - j + 1$  by hypothesis. The chain of inequalities shows that  $j = k$  and  $i = p_{k-1} + 1$  (the possibility  $i > p_{k-1} + 1$  has not yet been ruled out).

The key to the argument is the value of  $\beta_{\ell(\lambda)+1}$  (recall  $\ell(\lambda) = p_{l-1}$ ). The case  $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = t_j$  is impossible for  $1 \leq j \leq l-1$ ; indeed suppose  $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = t_j$  then  $r(\beta, p_{l-1} + 1) \geq p_{j-1} + 1$  and the rank equation is  $p_{l-1} + 1 = r(\beta, p_{l-1} + 1) + nt_j$  (note  $\lambda_{p_{l-1}+1} = 0$ ) thus

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq (p_{l-1} + 1 - nt_j) - (p_{j-1} + 1) \\ &= \tau_{l+1-j} - \tau_1 - (l-j) \leq j - l < 0. \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction (the calculation is similar to the previous one, replacing  $k$  by  $l$  and  $t_k$  by  $t_l = 0$ ). The condition  $\beta^+ \preceq \lambda$  now implies that  $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} < t_{l-1}$  and  $\#\{j : \beta_j > \beta_{p_{l-1}+1}\} \geq \ell(\lambda) - n = p_{l-1} - n$ , hence  $r(\beta, p_{l-1} + 1) \geq p_{l-1} - n + 1$ . The rank equation is  $-n\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = r(\beta, p_{l-1} + 1) - (p_{l-1} + 1) \geq -n$  and so  $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} \leq 1$ .

Suppose  $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = 0$  then  $r(\beta, p_{l-1} + 1) = (p_{l-1} + 1)$  which implies  $\beta_i = 0$  for  $i > p_{l-1} + 1$  and  $\beta_i > 0$  for  $i \leq p_{l-1}$ . Since  $\beta^+$  differs from  $\lambda$  in at most the last  $n$  entries and  $\lambda_i = t_{l-1}$  for  $\ell(\lambda) - n < i \leq \ell(\lambda)$  it follows that  $\beta^+ = \lambda$  (note if  $(t_{l-1}^n) \succeq \mu$  where  $\mu$  is a partition and  $\ell(\mu) = n$  then  $\mu = (t_{l-1}^n)$ ). Since the entries of  $\beta$  can not move to the left,  $\beta = \lambda$ ; in detail, argue inductively that the only possible value for  $\beta_i$  when  $1 \leq i \leq p_1$  is  $t_1$ , then the only possible value when  $p_1 + 1 \leq i \leq p_2$  is  $t_2$ , and so on. (If  $l = 2$  then this argument is not needed.)

Suppose  $\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = 1$ . In this part replace the bound  $\beta \supseteq \alpha$  by  $\beta \supseteq \alpha' := (t_1^{\tau_1}, t_2^{\tau_2-1}, \dots, t_{l-1}^{\tau_{l-1}-n}, 0^n, 1^{\tau_1+1})$ , a weaker restriction since  $\alpha \supset \alpha'$  (note that  $(\lambda, \alpha')$  is a  $(-\frac{1}{n})$ -critical pair). We will show that  $\beta = \alpha'$ , which contradicts the assumption  $\ell(\beta) = N$ . Recall  $t_j > t_{l-1} \geq 2$  for  $1 \leq j < l-1$ , by the hypothesis  $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 > n$ . The rank equation yields  $r(\beta, p_{l-1} + 1) = (p_{l-1} + 1) - n\beta_{p_{l-1}+1} = p_{l-1} + 1 - n$ . For  $i < p_{l-1} + 1$  this implies  $\beta_i = t_j$  for some  $j$  or  $\beta_i < 1$ , that is,  $\beta_i = 0$ ; for  $i > p_{l-1} + 1$  the rank implies  $\beta_i = t_j$  for some  $j$  or  $\beta_i \leq 1$ . This forces the values of  $\beta$  other than  $(t_1^{\tau_1}, t_2^{\tau_2-1}, \dots, t_{l-1}^{\tau_{l-1}-n})$  to be 0 or 1, that is,  $(\beta^+)_i \leq 1$  for  $i > p_{l-1} - n$ . The condition  $|\lambda| = |\beta|$  shows that  $\#\{j : \beta_j = 1\} = nt_{l-1} = \tau_1 + 1$ . Since  $\beta_i = 1$  is ruled out for

$i \leq p_{l-1}$  it follows that  $\beta_i = 1$  for  $p_{l-1}+1 \leq i \leq p_{l-1}+\tau_1+1 = N+1$ ; indeed suppose the  $j^{\text{th}}$  occurrence of 1 in  $\beta$  is at index  $i$ , that is,  $r(\beta, i) = p_{l-1} + j - n$ ,  $\beta_i = 1$  and  $i > p_{l-1}$  then the rank equation implies  $r(\beta, i) - i = (p_{l-1} + j - n) - i = -n\beta_i = -n$  thus  $i = p_{l-1} + j$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq \tau_1 + 1$ . The  $n$  remaining values of  $\beta_i$  (for  $1 \leq i \leq N+1$ ) are zero, and so  $\beta^+ = (\alpha')^+$ . The condition  $\beta \supseteq \alpha'$  implies  $\beta \succeq \alpha'$  (by definition) which shows  $\beta_i = \alpha'_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq p_{l-1} - n$  (if  $p_{j-1} + 1 \leq i \leq p_j$  and  $j < l - 1$  then  $\beta_i = t_j$  and if  $p_{l-2} + 1 \leq i \leq p_{l-1} - n$  then  $\beta_i = t_{l-1}$ ). Thus  $\beta_i = 0$  for  $p_{l-1} - n < i \leq p_{l-1}$  and  $\beta = \alpha'$ . The proof is finished since  $\ell(\alpha') = N + 1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.**  $\text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma) = \text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \gamma)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\beta \in C(\lambda, \kappa_0)$ . If  $\text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa), \gamma) \neq 0$  then by Lemma 9 there exists  $\delta \in \mathbb{N}_0^N$  such that  $\beta \supseteq \delta \supseteq \alpha$ , which contradicts the Theorem. Hence  $\text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\beta^x(\kappa), \gamma) = 0$  for each  $\beta \in C(\lambda, \kappa_0)$ .  $\square$

**Example 2.** In the context of the Theorem there may well be compositions  $\beta$  other than  $\alpha'$  for which  $(\lambda, \beta)$  is a  $\kappa_0$ -critical pair. Suppose  $N = 10$ ,  $\tau = (3, 3, 3, 1)$  and  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{1}{2}$ , then  $\lambda = (6, 4^3, 2^3)$  and  $\alpha' = (6, 4^3, 2, 0, 0, 1^4)$ ; the multiplicity of  $(2\kappa + 1)$  in  $h(\lambda, \kappa + 1)$  is 3. Among other compositions  $\beta$  with  $(\lambda, \beta)$  being  $(-\frac{1}{2})$ -critical are  $(6, 1^3, 2^3, 3^3)$  and  $(6, 0^3, 2, 4^2, 1^4, 4)$ ; the latter is a permutation of  $\alpha'$ . For another example take  $N = 14$ ,  $\tau = (8, 6)$  and  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{1}{3}$ , then  $\lambda = (3^6)$  and  $\alpha' = (3^3, 0^3, 1^9)$ ; the multiplicity of  $(3\kappa + 1)$  in  $h(\lambda, \kappa + 1)$  is 2 and both  $(1^6, 2^6)$  and  $(1^3, 0^3, 2^6, 1^3)$  form  $(-\frac{1}{3})$ -critical pairs with  $\lambda$ . The algorithm of [3] was used to produce the  $\beta$ 's.

Let  $k = \ell(\lambda) = N - \tau_1$  and from Definition 13 let  $\theta_k = (1, 2) \dots (k - 1, k) \in S_N$ , a cyclic shift and let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\lambda} &= (mt_{l-1} - 1, (mt_1)^{\tau_1}, (mt_2)^{\tau_1-1}, \dots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2-1}, 0^{\tau_1}), \\ \tilde{\alpha} &= (m - 1, (mt_1)^{\tau_1}, (mt_2)^{\tau_1-1}, \dots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2-n}, 0^{n-1}, m^{\tau_1}), \end{aligned}$$

so that  $\tilde{\alpha} = \theta_k \gamma$ . By Proposition 2

$$\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa) = \frac{mt_{l-1}}{\kappa + mt_{l-1}} ((N + 1 - k)\kappa + mt_{l-1}) \theta_k^{-1} \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa)$$

and  $(N + 1 - k)\kappa + mt_{l-1} = (\tau_1 + 1)\kappa + md_1 = (n\kappa + m)d_1$  (recall  $\tau_1 + 1 = nd_1$ ). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \gamma) &= \frac{md_1^2}{\kappa + md_1} (n\kappa + m) \text{coef}(\theta_k^{-1} \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \gamma) \\ &= \frac{md_1^2}{\kappa + md_1} (n\kappa + m) \text{coef}(\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \theta_k \gamma). \end{aligned}$$

We finish the argument by using the Insertion Theorem 3. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= ((mt_1)^{\tau_1}, (mt_2)^{\tau_1-1}, \dots, (mt_{l-1})^{\tau_2-n}), \\ \nu &= (mt_{l-1} - 1, (mt_{l-1})^{n-1}, 0^{\tau_1}), \\ \sigma &= (m - 1, 0^{n-1}, m^{\tau_1}), \end{aligned}$$

then  $\tilde{\lambda} = \iota(1, \mu)\nu$  and  $\tilde{\alpha} = \iota(1, \mu)\sigma$ .

**Lemma 10.**  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \gamma) \neq 0$ .

*Proof.* Let  $p = mt_{l-1} = md_1$ , and  $M = n + \tau_1$  then  $\nu, \sigma \in I_{1,p}^{(M)}$ . By Theorem 3  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \tilde{\alpha}) = \text{coef}(\zeta_\nu^x(\kappa), \sigma)$  and by Proposition 4 and Lemma 6  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\nu^x(\kappa), \sigma)$  has a simple pole at  $\kappa = \kappa_0$  (this is the same argument used in the previous section). Thus there exists  $f(\kappa) \in \mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$  so that  $\text{coef}(\zeta_\nu^x(\kappa), \sigma) = \frac{f(\kappa)}{n\kappa + m}$  and  $f(\kappa_0) \neq 0$ . To conclude,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \gamma) &= \frac{md_1^2}{\kappa + md_1} (n\kappa + m) \text{coef}(\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \tilde{\alpha}) \\ &= \frac{md_1^2}{\kappa + md_1} f(\kappa) \end{aligned}$$

which has a nonzero limit at  $\kappa_0$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 7.** Suppose  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  and  $\tau$  is a partition of  $N$  such that  $n \mid (\tau_i + 1)$  for  $1 \leq i < \ell(\tau)$ . If  $\tau_2 \geq n$  then there are no singular polynomials for  $\kappa_0$  of isotype  $\tau$ .

*Proof.* For  $\tau_2 > n$  if there is a singular polynomial of isotype  $\tau$  for the singular value then  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa) = 0$  for the polynomial  $q_\lambda(\kappa)$  described above. But  $\lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) q_\lambda(\kappa), \gamma) = \lim_{\kappa \rightarrow \kappa_0} \text{coef}(\mathcal{D}_{\ell(\lambda)}(\kappa) \zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa), \gamma) \neq 0$ , and so these singular polynomials do not exist. The case  $\tau_2 = n, \ell(\tau) = 2$  was done in the previous section.  $\square$

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Together with the results of [2, Theorem 2.7] we have a complete description of singular polynomials for the group  $S_N$ . For each pair  $(m_0, n_0) \in \mathbb{N}^2$  with  $2 \leq n_0 \leq N$  and  $\frac{m_0}{n_0} \notin \mathbb{N}$ , let  $d = \gcd(m_0, n_0)$ ,  $m = \frac{m_0}{d}$ ,  $n = \frac{n_0}{d}$ , then there is a unique irreducible  $S_N$ -module of singular polynomials for the singular value  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$  of isotype  $\tau$ , where

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} l &= \left\lceil \frac{N - n_0 + 1}{n - 1} \right\rceil + 1 \\ \tau &= (n_0 - 1, (n - 1)^{l-2}, \tau_l). \end{aligned}$$

The number  $l = \ell(\tau)$  is the solution of the inequality  $1 \leq \tau_l = (N - n_0 + 1) - (l - 2)(n - 1) \leq n - 1$  ( $\lceil r \rceil$  denotes the smallest integer  $\geq r$ ). Then the index for the corresponding singular polynomial is given by:

$$(6.2) \quad \lambda = \begin{cases} (m_0^{\tau_2}, 0^{n_0-1}), & l = 2 \\ ((m_0 + (l - 2)m)^{\tau_l}, (m_0 + (l - 3)m)^{n-1}, \dots, m_0^{n-1}, 0^{n_0-1}), & l \geq 3 \end{cases}.$$

Note that  $l = 2$  is equivalent to  $N - n_0 + 1 < n$  or  $d < \frac{n_0}{N - n_0 + 1}$ , and  $\tau_2 = N - n_0 + 1$ . For  $l \geq 3$  the computation for  $\lambda$  uses the notation of the previous section with  $t_i = d + l - 1 - i$ ,  $mt_i = m_0 + (l - 1 - i)m$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l - 1$ . The  $S_N$ -module of singular polynomials is  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}}\{w\zeta_\lambda^x(\kappa_0) : w \in S_N\}$  and the basis corresponding to Murphy's construction is exactly the set of  $\zeta_\alpha^x(\kappa_0)$  such that  $\alpha$  is a reverse lattice permutation of  $\lambda$ . There are no other singular polynomials.

The relation of modules of singular polynomials to monodromy representations of the Hecke algebra was discussed in [4, Sect.6]. The parameter is  $q = e^{-2\pi i \kappa}$ ; the existence of singular polynomials of isotype  $\tau$  shows that the monodromy representation corresponding to  $\tau$  contains the trivial representation. There is a general result on the connection between monodromy (called the KZ-functor) and the dual Specht modules in [7, Sect. 6.2].

Recall the definition of the rational Cherednik algebra (see [7, Sect. 3] and [6]). We consider the image  $A(\kappa)$  under the faithful representation on  $\mathcal{P}$ ; indeed  $A(\kappa)$  is the  $\mathbb{Q}(\kappa)$ -algebra generated by  $\{\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) : 1 \leq i \leq N\} \cup \{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\} \cup S_N$  (where  $x_i$  denotes the multiplication map  $p(x) \mapsto x_i p(x)$  and  $w \in S_N$  acts by  $p(x) \mapsto p(xw)$  for  $p \in \mathcal{P}$ ). In the sequel, when  $\kappa$  is specialized to a rational  $\kappa_0$ , we use  $\mathcal{P}$  to denote the polynomials with rational coefficients (that is,  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{x^\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^N\}$ ). Here are some basic results about  $A(\kappa)$ -submodules of  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Proposition 5.** *Suppose  $M$  is a nontrivial proper  $A(\kappa_0)$ -submodule of  $\mathcal{P}$  for some  $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ , then  $M$  is the direct sum of its homogeneous components  $M_n := M \cap \mathcal{P}_n$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , the nonzero component  $M_{n_0}$  of least degree ( $M_j = \{0\}$  for  $j < n_0$ ) is an  $S_N$ -module of singular polynomials and  $\kappa_0$  is a singular value.*

*Proof.* The identity  $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa) = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + \kappa \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} (1 - (i, j))$  implies that the Euler operator  $\sum_{i=1}^N x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \in A(\kappa)$ . Hence  $M = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (M \cap \mathcal{P}_n)$ . There exists  $n_0 > 0$  such that  $M_{n_0} \neq \{0\}$  and  $M_j = \{0\}$  for  $0 \leq j < n_0$  (or else  $M_0 \neq \{0\}$ ,  $1 \in M$  and so  $M = \mathcal{P}$ ). Then  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0)p = 0$  for any  $p \in M_{n_0}$  and  $1 \leq i \leq N$ .  $\square$

Say that the *degree* of an  $A(\kappa_0)$ -submodule  $M$  is the least degree of nonzero homogeneous components of  $M$ , that is,  $\min \{j : M_j \neq \{0\}\}$ . There is a symmetric bilinear form on  $\mathcal{P}$  defined by

$$\langle p, q \rangle_\kappa = p(\mathcal{D}_1(\kappa), \dots, \mathcal{D}_N(\kappa)) q(x) |_{x=0}.$$

The radical was defined in [4, Sect. 4] to be

$$\text{Rad}(\kappa) := \{p \in \mathcal{P} : \langle p, q \rangle_\kappa = 0 \text{ for all } q \in \mathcal{P}\}$$

and was shown to be an  $A(\kappa)$ -submodule. For  $\kappa_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\text{Rad}(\kappa_0) \neq \{0\}$  exactly when  $\kappa_0$  is a singular value.

**Proposition 6.** *For any singular value  $\kappa_0$  the radical  $\text{Rad}(\kappa_0)$  is the largest proper  $A(\kappa_0)$ -submodule of  $\mathcal{P}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $M$  is a nontrivial proper  $A(\kappa_0)$ -submodule. Suppose  $p \in M_n = M \cap \mathcal{P}_n$  for some  $n > 0$  and  $p \neq 0$ . Then for any  $q \in \mathcal{P}_n$  we have  $\langle p, q \rangle_{\kappa_0} = \langle q, p \rangle_{\kappa_0} = q(\mathcal{D}_1(\kappa_0), \dots, \mathcal{D}_N(\kappa_0)) p(x) \in M_0 = \{0\}$ . Hence  $p \in \text{Rad}(\kappa_0)$  and  $M \subset \text{Rad}(\kappa_0)$ .  $\square$

Our complete description of irreducible  $S_N$ -modules of singular polynomials leads to some explicit results about  $A(\kappa_0)$ -submodules. We use the notation from equations 6.1 and 6.2.

**Definition 14.** *For any pair  $(m_0, n_0) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  with  $2 \leq n_0 \leq N$  and  $\frac{m_0}{n_0} \notin \mathbb{N}$  let  $M(m_0, n_0) = \{\sum_{i=1}^{n_\tau} p_i \zeta_{w_i \lambda}^x(\kappa_0) : p_i \in \mathcal{P}\}$ , where  $n_\tau$  is the degree of the representation  $\tau$  and  $\{w_i \lambda : 1 \leq i \leq n_\tau\}$  is the set of reverse lattice permutations of  $\lambda$  (that is,  $\{\zeta_{w_i \lambda}^x(\kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq n_\tau\}$  is a basis for the singular polynomials corresponding to the pair  $(m_0, n_0)$ ).*

The following is from [2, Sect. 6]:

**Proposition 7.**  $M(m_0, n_0)$  is a proper  $A(\kappa_0)$ -submodule, and its degree is  $m \left( \frac{1}{2} (l-2)(n-1)(2d+l-3) + \tau_l(d+l-2) \right)$  (where  $d = \gcd(m_0, n_0)$ ,  $n = n_0/d$  and  $m = m_0/d$ ).

*Proof.* Clearly  $M(m_0, n_0)$  is closed under multiplication by  $\mathcal{P}$  and the action of  $S_N$ . Suppose  $f = pg$  where  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  and  $g \in \text{span} \{ \zeta_{w_i \lambda}^x(\kappa_0) : 1 \leq i \leq n_\tau \}$  (that is,  $g$  is singular). By the product rule,

$$\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) f = p \mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) g + g \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} p \right) + \kappa_0 \sum_{j \neq i} ((i, j) g) \frac{p(x) - p(x(i, j))}{x_i - x_j}$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq N$ . But  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) g = 0$  and  $\frac{p(x) - p(x(i, j))}{x_i - x_j}$  is a polynomial, thus  $\mathcal{D}_i(\kappa_0) f \in M(m_0, n_0)$ . The degree is  $|\lambda|$  (as in equation 6.2).  $\square$

An equivalent formula for  $\frac{|\lambda|}{m}$  is  $(N - nd + 1)(d + l - 2) - \frac{1}{2}(n - 1)(l - 1)(l - 2)$ . For a given pair  $(m, n)$  with  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  (and  $2 \leq n \leq N$ ) there are the  $A(\kappa_0)$ -submodules  $\{M(dm, dn) : 1 \leq d \leq \lfloor \frac{N}{n} \rfloor\}$  ( $\lfloor r \rfloor$  denotes the largest integer  $\leq r$ ). The degree of  $M(dm, dn)$  decreases as  $d$  increases. This is obvious because the nonzero part of the index  $\lambda$  for  $M((d+1)m, (d+1)n)$  is a substring of the index  $\lambda'$  for  $M(dm, dn)$ ; for example take  $N = 10, \kappa_0 = -\frac{1}{3}$  then the values of  $\lambda$  (from equation 6.2) are  $(4^2, 3^2, 2^2, 1^2, 0^2)$ ,  $(4, 3^2, 2^2, 0^5)$ ,  $(3^2, 0^8)$  for  $d = 1, 2, 3$  respectively. For direct computation, let  $l, \tau, \lambda$  and  $l', \tau', \lambda'$  denote the expressions defined in equations 6.1 and 6.2 for  $(m_0, n_0)$  equal to  $(dm, dn)$  and  $((d+1)m, (d+1)n)$  respectively. If  $\tau_l = 1$  then  $l' = l - 2$  and  $\tau'_{l-2} = n - 1$ ; if  $2 \leq \tau_l \leq n - 1$  then  $l' = l - 1$  and  $\tau'_{l-1} = \tau_l - 1$ . For both cases  $|\lambda| - |\lambda'| = m(dn + l - 2)$ . Thus for any given degree of homogeneity there is at most one irreducible  $S_N$ -module of singular polynomials of that degree (for  $\kappa_0 = -\frac{m}{n}$ ). The singular polynomials of least degree correspond to  $(mq, nq)$  where  $q = \lfloor \frac{N}{n} \rfloor$ .

**Proposition 8.** Suppose  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  and  $N = nq + r$  with  $0 \leq r \leq n - 1$  (so  $q = \lfloor \frac{N}{n} \rfloor$ ) and  $k$  denotes the degree of  $\text{Rad}(-\frac{m}{n})$ . If  $r < n - 1$  then  $k = mq(r + 1)$ ,  $\text{Rad}(-\frac{m}{n}) \cap \mathcal{P}_k$  is of isotype  $(nq - 1, N - nq + 1)$ , and equals  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Q}} \{w \zeta_{\lambda}^x(-\frac{m}{n}) : w \in S_N\}$ , where  $\lambda = ((mq)^{r+1}, 0^{nq-1})$ . If  $r = n - 1$  then  $k = m(qn + 1)$  and  $\text{Rad}(-\frac{m}{n}) \cap \mathcal{P}_k$  is of isotype  $(nq - 1, n - 1, 1)$  with corresponding  $\lambda = (m(q + 1), (mq)^{n-1}, 0^{nq-1})$ .

As well as the maximum  $A(\kappa_0)$ -submodule there is a minimum one, namely,  $M(m, n)$ .

**Proposition 9.** Suppose  $\gcd(m, n) = 1$  and  $2 \leq n \leq N$  then  $M(m, n)$  is contained in each nontrivial  $A(-\frac{m}{n})$ -submodule.

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a proper nontrivial  $A(-\frac{m}{n})$ -submodule. Let  $s_0$  be the degree of  $M$ . By Proposition 5  $M_{s_0}$  is an  $S_N$ -module of singular polynomials, thus  $s_0 = |\lambda|$  for some  $\lambda$  given by Equation 6.2. Suppose  $\lambda$  corresponds to the pair  $(dm, dn)$  with  $1 \leq d \leq \lfloor \frac{N}{n} \rfloor$ , then  $M(dm, dn) \subset M$ . The intersection of any two nontrivial  $A(-\frac{m}{n})$ -submodules  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  is a nontrivial  $A(-\frac{m}{n})$ -submodule (if  $f \in M_1$  and  $g \in M_2$  then  $fg \in M_1 \cap M_2$ ). Thus  $M(dm, dn) \cap M(m, n)$  is a nontrivial submodule

of  $M(m, n)$  which must equal  $M(m, n)$  because the degree of  $M(m, n)$  is the maximum for the degrees of  $M(dm, dn)$ . Hence  $M(m, n) \subset M(dm, dn) \subset M$ .  $\square$

One could speculate that  $\{M(dm, dn) : 1 \leq d \leq \lfloor \frac{N}{n} \rfloor\}$  is the collection of all non-trivial proper  $A(-\frac{m}{n})$ -submodules and that they are nested, that is,  $M(dm, dn) \subset M((d+1)m, (d+1)n)$ . This would be a characterization of  $\text{Rad}(-\frac{m}{n})$ .

#### REFERENCES

- [1] C. Dunkl, Differential-difference operators associated to reflection groups: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **311** (1989), 167-183.
- [2] C. Dunkl, Singular polynomials for the symmetric groups, *Int. Math. Research Notices* **2004** (2004), #67, 3607-3635.
- [3] C. Dunkl, Hook-lengths and pairs of compositions, preprint arXiv:math.CO/0410466, Oct. 2004.
- [4] C. Dunkl, M. de Jeu, and E. Opdam, Singular polynomials for finite reflection groups, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **346** (1994), 237-256.
- [5] C. Dunkl and Y. Xu, *Orthogonal Polynomials of Several Variables*, Encycl. of Math. and its Applications **81**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [6] P. Etingof and V. Ginzburg, Symplectic reflection algebras, Calogero-Moser space and deformed Harish-Chandra isomorphism, *Invent. Math.* **147** (2002), 243-348.
- [7] V. Ginzburg, N. Guay, E. Opdam and R. Rouquier, On the category  $\mathcal{O}$  for rational Cherednik algebras, *Invent. Math.* **154** (2003), 617-651.
- [8] F. Knop and S. Sahi, A recursion and a combinatorial formula for Jack polynomials, *Invent. Math.* **128** (1997), 9-22.
- [9] G. Murphy, A new construction of Young's seminormal representation of the symmetric groups, *J. Algebra* **69** (1981), 287-297.
- [10] E. Opdam, Dunkl operators, Bessel functions and the discriminant of a finite Coxeter group, *Compos. Math.* **85** (1993), 333-373.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, P.O.Box 400137 CHARLOTTESVILLE  
VA 22904-4137

E-mail address: cfd5z@virginia.edu

URL: <http://www.people.virginia.edu/~cfd5z/>