Compositio Math. 144 (2008) 271–303
doi:10.1112/S0010437X07003211

Bisymmetric functions, Macdonald polynomials and $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series

S. Ole Warnaar

Abstract

A new type of $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series based on Macdonald polynomials is introduced. Besides a pair of Macdonald polynomials attached to two different sets of variables, a key ingredient in the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series is a bisymmetric function related to Macdonald's commuting family of q-difference operators, to the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integrals of Tarasov and Varchenko, and to alternating sign matrices. Our main result for $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series is a multivariable generalization of the celebrated q-binomial theorem. In the limit this q-binomial sum yields a new $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integral for Jack polynomials.

1. Introduction

The q-binomial theorem, which was independently discovered by Cauchy, Heine and Gauss (with special cases due to Euler and Rothe) is one of the most important results in the theory of q-series; see e.g. [AAR99, GR04] and references therein. Using the standard notation $(a;q)_n = (1-a)(1-aq)\cdots(1-aq^{n-1})$ for the q-shifted factorial, the theorem may be stated as

$$ {}_1\phi_0\left[\begin{matrix} a \\ - \end{matrix}; q, z\right] := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a;q)_k}{(q;q)_k}\, z^k = \frac{(az;q)_\infty}{(z;q)_\infty} \tag{1.1}$$

for $|q| < 1$ and $|z| < 1$. A well-known alternative representation of the q-binomial theorem is as the q-beta integral (for the definition of q-integrals, see [GR04])

$$\int_0^1 t^{\alpha-1}(tq;q)_{\beta-1}\,\mathrm{d}_q t = \frac{\Gamma_q(\alpha)\Gamma_q(\beta)}{\Gamma_q(\alpha+\beta)},$$

where $0 < q < 1$, Γ_q is the q-gamma function [GR04],

$$(a;q)_z = \frac{(a;q)_\infty}{(aq^z;q)_\infty} \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{C},$$

and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathrm{Re}(\alpha) > 0$, $-\beta \notin \{0,1,2,\dots\}$. Assuming $\mathrm{Re}(\beta) > 0$ and taking the limit $q \to 1^-$ it follows that the q-binomial theorem implies Euler's beta integral [AAR99]

$$\int_0^1 t^{\alpha-1}(1-t)^{\beta-1}\,\mathrm{d}t = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta)}.$$

Building on the pioneering work of Milne and Gustafson on multivariable basic hypergeometric series, many generalizations of the q-binomial theorem have been found in recent times. Most of these are labelled by one of the classical root systems; see e.g. [GK96, Mil85, Mil97, ML95, BS98].

Received 30 October 2006, accepted in final form 16 July 2007, published online 7 February 2008.
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification 05E05, 33D67.
Keywords: basic hypergeometric series, Macdonald polynomials, $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integrals.
Work supported by the Australian Research Council.
This journal is © Foundation Compositio Mathematica 2008.

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A particularly interesting generalization of the q-binomial series is obtained when z^k in (1.1) is replaced by an appropriate symmetric function such as the Schur function or Macdonald polynomial; see [BF99, Kan96, Mac, Mil92]. The latter case was independently considered by Kaneko and Macdonald, who proved [Kan96, Mac] that

$$ {}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix}a\\ -\end{matrix};q,t;x\right] := \sum_{\lambda} t^{n(\lambda)}\frac{(a;q,t)_\lambda}{c'_\lambda(q,t)}\,P_\lambda(x;q,t) = \prod_{i\geqslant 1}\frac{(ax_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i;q)_\infty}. \tag{1.2}$$

Here $P_\lambda(x;q,t)$ is the Macdonald polynomial labelled by the partition λ, $n(\lambda)=\sum_{i\geqslant 1}(i-1)\lambda_i$, and $c'_\lambda(q,t)$ and $(a;q,t)_\lambda$ (defined in § 2.1) are generalizations of the q-shifted factorials $(q;q)_k$ and $(a;q)_k$, respectively. If x contains a single variable then the partition λ is restricted to only one part, and (1.2) reduces to the ordinary q-binomial theorem (1.1).

Analogous to the single-variable case, (1.2) may be transformed into a multiple q-integral. In the $q\to 1^-$ limit this implies the famous Selberg integral [Sel44]

$$\int_{[0,1]^n}\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha-1}(1-x_i)^{\beta-1}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}|x_i-x_j|^{2\gamma}\,\mathrm{d}x = \prod_{i=1}^n\frac{\Gamma(\alpha+(i-1)\gamma)\Gamma(\beta+(i-1)\gamma)\Gamma(i\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta+(n+i-2)\gamma)\Gamma(\gamma+1)} \tag{1.3}$$

for $\mathrm{Re}(\alpha)>0,\ \mathrm{Re}(\beta)>0,\ \mathrm{Re}(\gamma)>-\min\{1/n,\mathrm{Re}(\alpha)/(n-1),\mathrm{Re}(\beta)/(n-1)\}$.

In this paper we take the natural next step in the development of basic hypergeometric series and prove an $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ version of the Kaneko–Macdonald q-binomial theorem:

$$ {}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix}a\\ -\end{matrix};q,t;x,y\right] = \prod_{i=1}^m\frac{(azt^{m-1}x_i;q)_\infty}{(zt^{m-1}x_i;q)_\infty}\prod_{i=1}^{n-m}\frac{(azt^{n-i};q)_\infty}{(zt^{n-i};q)_\infty} \tag{1.4}$$

for $y=z(1,t,\dots,t^{n-1})$ and $0\leqslant m\leqslant n$. The series on the left (defined in § 5) depends on two Macdonald polynomials, $P_\lambda(x_1,\dots,x_m;q,t)$ and $P_\mu(y_1,\dots,y_n;q,t)$, and – as a new ingredient – involves a bisymmetric function related to Macdonald's commuting family of q-difference operators [Mac95].

As in the previous two cases one may transform the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series into a multiple q-integral. The $q\to 1^-$ limit then yields the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integral of Tarasov and Varchenko [TV03]

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{C_\gamma^{m,n}[0,1]} & h(x,y)\prod_{i=1}^m x_i^{\beta_1-1}\prod_{i=1}^n(1-y_i)^{\alpha-1}y_i^{\beta_2-1}\\ &\times\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m}|x_i-x_j|^{2\gamma}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}|y_i-y_j|^{2\gamma}\prod_{i=1}^m\prod_{j=1}^n|x_i-y_j|^{-\gamma}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y\\ &=\prod_{i=1}^m\frac{\Gamma(\beta_1+(i-1)\gamma)\Gamma(\beta_1+\beta_2+(i-2)\gamma)\Gamma((i-n-1)\gamma)\Gamma(i\gamma)}{\Gamma(\beta_1+(i+m-n-2)\gamma)\Gamma(\alpha+\beta_1+\beta_2+(i+n-3)\gamma)\Gamma(\gamma)}\\ &\times\prod_{i=1}^n\frac{\Gamma(\alpha+(i-1)\gamma)\Gamma(i\gamma)}{\Gamma(\gamma)}\prod_{i=1}^{n-m}\frac{\Gamma(\beta_2+(i-1)\gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta_2+(i+n-2)\gamma)},\end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

where $C_\gamma^{m,n}[0,1]$ is an integration domain described in § 5, $h(x,y)$ is the bisymmetric function

$$h(x,y)=\frac{(n-m)!}{n!}\sum_{\substack{l_1,\dots,l_m=1\\ l_i\neq l_j}}^n\prod_{i=1}^m\frac{y_{l_i}}{y_{l_i}-x_i}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and (for generic n and m)

$$\operatorname{Re}(\alpha) > 0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\beta_1) > 0, \quad \operatorname{Re}(\beta_2) > 0,$$
$$-\min\left\{\frac{1}{n}, \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\alpha)}{n-1}, \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\beta_1)}{m-1}, \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\beta_2)}{n-m-1}, \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\beta_1+\beta_2)}{m-2}\right\} < \operatorname{Re}(\gamma) < 0.$$

1.1 Outline

In the next section we provide a brief introduction to Macdonald polynomials and the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ Kaneko–Macdonald multivariable basic hypergeometric series. Then, in § 3, we define the bisymmetric function $F(x, y; t)$, which plays a key part in the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series studied in this paper. We prove several elementary results for F, and establish a connection with the bisymmetric function of Tarasov and Varchenko, and with alternating sign matrices. In § 4 we obtain an identity involving the q, t-Littlewood–Richardson coefficients and a specialization of the function F. This identity is at the heart of our proof of the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ q-binomial theorem (1.4). Finally, in § 5 we define the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series and prove several q-binomial theorems as well as a (more general) q-Euler transformation. Taking the $(q, t) \to (1^-, 1^-)$ limit of the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ q-binomial theorem (such that $(1-t)/(1-q) \to \gamma$) yields a generalization of the Tarasov–Varchenko integral (1.5) involving the Jack polynomial.

2. Macdonald polynomials

2.1 Preliminaries

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ be a partition, i.e. $\lambda_1 \geqslant \lambda_2 \geqslant \cdots$ with finitely many λ_i unequal to zero. The length and weight of λ, denoted by $l(\lambda)$ and $|\lambda|$, are the number and sum of the non-zero λ_i respectively. As usual we identify two partitions that differ only in their string of zeros, so that $(6, 3, 3, 1, 0, 0)$ and $(6, 3, 1, 1)$ represent the same partition. When $|\lambda| = N$ we say that λ is a partition of N, and the unique partition of zero is denoted by 0. The multiplicity of the part i in the partition λ is denoted by $m_i = m_i(\lambda)$, and occasionally we will write $\lambda = (1^{m_1} 2^{m_2} \cdots)$.

We identify a partition with its Ferrers graph, defined by the set of points in $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $1 \leqslant j \leqslant \lambda_i$, and further make the usual identification between Ferrers graphs and (Young) diagrams by replacing points by squares.

The conjugate λ' of λ is the partition obtained by reflecting the diagram of λ in the main diagonal, so that, in particular, $m_i(\lambda) = \lambda'_i - \lambda'_{i+1}$. The statistic $n(\lambda)$ is given by

$$n(\lambda) = \sum_{i \geqslant 1} (i-1)\lambda_i = \sum_{i \geqslant 1} \binom{\lambda'_i}{2}.$$

The dominance partial order on the set of partitions of N is defined by $\lambda \geqslant \mu$ if $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_i \geqslant \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_i$ for all $i \geqslant 1$. If $\lambda \geqslant \mu$ and $\lambda \neq \mu$ then $\lambda > \mu$.

If λ and μ are partitions then $\mu \subseteq \lambda$ if (the diagram of) μ is contained in (the diagram of) λ, i.e. $\mu_i \leqslant \lambda_i$ for all $i \geqslant 1$. If $\mu \subseteq \lambda$ then the skew diagram $\lambda - \mu$ denotes the set-theoretic difference between λ and μ, i.e. those squares of λ not contained in μ.

Let $s = (i, j)$ be a square in the diagram of λ. Then $a(s)$, $a'(s)$, $l(s)$ and $l'(s)$ are the arm-length, arm-colength, leg-length and leg-colength of s, defined by

$$a(s) = \lambda_i - j, \quad a'(s) = j - 1,$$
$$l(s) = \lambda'_j - i, \quad l'(s) = i - 1.$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This may be used to define the generalized hook-length polynomials [Mac95, Equation (VI.8.1)]

$$c_\lambda(q,t)=\prod_{s\in\lambda}(1-q^{a(s)}t^{l(s)+1}), \tag{2.1a}$$

$$c'_\lambda(q,t)=\prod_{s\in\lambda}(1-q^{a(s)+1}t^{l(s)}), \tag{2.1b}$$

where the products are over all squares of λ. We further set

$$b_\lambda(q,t)=\frac{c_\lambda(q,t)}{c'_\lambda(q,t)}. \tag{2.2}$$

Observe that if λ contains a single part, say k, then

$$c'_{(k)}(q,t)=(q;q)_k.$$

For N a non-negative integer the q-shifted factorial $(b;q)_N$ is defined as $(b;q)_0=1$ and

$$(b;q)_N=(1-b)(1-bq)\cdots(1-bq^{N-1}). \tag{2.3}$$

We also need the q-shifted factorial for negative (integer) values of N. This may be obtained from the above by

$$(b;q)_{-N}=\frac{1}{(bq^{-N};q)_N}.$$

This implies in particular that $1/(q;q)_{-N}=0$ for positive N.

The definition (2.3) may be extended to partitions λ by

$$(b;q,t)_\lambda=\prod_{s\in\lambda}(1-b\,q^{a'(s)}t^{-l'(s)})=\prod_{i=1}^{l(\lambda)}(bt^{1-i};q)_{\lambda_i}.$$

With this notation the polynomials (2.1) may be recast as [Kan96, Proposition 3.2]

$$c_\lambda(q,t)=(t^n;q,t)_\lambda\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\frac{(t^{j-i};q)_{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}}{(t^{j-i+1};q)_{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}}, \tag{2.4a}$$

$$c'_\lambda(q,t)=(qt^{n-1};q,t)_\lambda\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\frac{(qt^{j-i-1};q)_{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}}{(qt^{j-i};q)_{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}}, \tag{2.4b}$$

where n is any integer such that $n\geqslant l(\lambda)$.

Finally we introduce the usual condensed notation for q-shifted factorials as

$$(a_1,\dots,a_k;q)_N=(a_1;q)_N\cdots(a_k;q)_N$$

and

$$(a_1,\dots,a_k;q,t)_\lambda=(a_1;q,t)_\lambda\cdots(a_k;q,t)_\lambda.$$

2.2 Macdonald polynomials

Let $\mathfrak{S}_n$ denote the symmetric group, acting on $x=(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ by permuting the x_i, and let $\Lambda_n=\mathbb{Z}[x_1,\dots,x_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ and Λ denote the ring of symmetric polynomials in n independent variables and the ring of symmetric functions in countably many variables, respectively.

For $\lambda=(\lambda_1,\dots,\lambda_n)$ a partition of at most n parts the monomial symmetric function m_λ is defined as

$$m_\lambda(x)=\sum x^\alpha,$$

where the sum is over all distinct permutations α of λ, and $x^\alpha=x_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$. For $l(\lambda)>n$ we set $m_\lambda(x)=0$. The monomial symmetric functions m_λ for $l(\lambda)\leqslant n$ form a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of Λ_n.

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For r a non-negative integer the power sums p_r are given by $p_0 = 1$ and $p_r = m_{(r)}$ for $r > 1$. Hence

$$p_r(x) = \sum_{i \geqslant 1} x_i^r. \tag{2.5}$$

More generally the power-sum products are defined as $p_\lambda(x) = p_{\lambda_1}(x) \cdots p_{\lambda_n}(x)$.

Following Macdonald we define the scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{q,t}$ by

$$\langle p_\lambda, p_\mu \rangle_{q,t} = \delta_{\lambda\mu} z_\lambda \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1 - q^{\lambda_i}}{1 - t^{\lambda_i}},$$

with $z_\lambda = \prod_{i \geqslant 1} m_i! i^{m_i}$ and $m_i = m_i(\lambda)$. If we denote the ring of symmetric functions in n variables over the field $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}(q,t)$ of rational functions in q and t by $\Lambda_{n,\mathbb{F}}$, then the Macdonald polynomial $P_\lambda(x; q, t)$ is the unique symmetric polynomial in $\Lambda_{n,\mathbb{F}}$ such that [Mac95, Equation (VI.4.7)]

$$P_\lambda(x; q, t) = m_\lambda(x) + \sum_{\mu < \lambda} u_{\lambda\mu}(q,t) m_\mu(x) \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\langle P_\lambda, P_\mu \rangle_{q,t} = 0 \quad \text{if } \lambda \neq \mu.$$

The Macdonald polynomials $P_\lambda(x; q, t)$ with $l(\lambda) \leqslant n$ form an $\mathbb{F}$-basis of $\Lambda_{n,\mathbb{F}}$. If $l(\lambda) > n$ then $P_\lambda(x; q, t) = 0$. From (2.6) it follows that $P_\lambda(x; q, t)$ for $l(\lambda) \leqslant n$ is homogeneous of degree $|\lambda|$:

$$P_\lambda(zx; q, t) = z^{|\lambda|} P_\lambda(x; q, t), \tag{2.7}$$

with z a scalar.

When $q = t$ the Macdonald polynomials simplify to the well-known Schur functions:

$$P_\lambda(x; t, t) = s_\lambda(x). \tag{2.8}$$

The latter are defined much more simply as

$$s_\lambda(x) = \frac{\det_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant n}(x_i^{\lambda_j + n - j})}{\det_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant n}(x_i^{n-j})} = \frac{\det_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant n}(x_i^{\lambda_j + n - j})}{\Delta(x)}, \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\Delta(x) = \prod_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} (x_i - x_j)$$

is the Vandermonde product.

For $f \in \Lambda_{n,\mathbb{F}}$ and λ a partition such that $l(\lambda) \leqslant n$ the evaluation homomorphism $u_\lambda^{(n)} : \Lambda_{n,\mathbb{F}} \to \mathbb{F}$ is defined as

$$u_\lambda^{(n)}(f) = f(q^{\lambda_1} t^{n-1}, q^{\lambda_2} t^{n-2}, \ldots, q^{\lambda_n} t^0). \tag{2.10}$$

We extend this to $f \in \mathbb{F}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ for those f for which the right-hand side of (2.10) is well defined. According to the principal specialization formula for Macdonald polynomials [Mac95, Example VI.6.5],

$$u_0^{(n)}(P_\lambda) = t^{n(\lambda)} \prod_{s \in \lambda} \frac{1 - q^{a'(s)} t^{n - l'(s)}}{1 - q^{a(s)} t^{l(s)+1}} = t^{n(\lambda)} \frac{(t^n; q, t)_\lambda}{c_\lambda(q,t)}. \tag{2.11}$$

For more general evaluations we have the symmetry [Mac95, Equation (VI.6.6)]

$$u_\lambda^{(n)}(P_\mu) u_0^{(n)}(P_\lambda) = u_\mu^{(n)}(P_\lambda) u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu), \tag{2.12}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

provided $l(\lambda), l(\mu) \leqslant n$. It will also be convenient to define the homomorphism $u^{(n)}_{\lambda;z}$ as

$$u^{(n)}_{\lambda;z}(f) = f(zq^{\lambda_1}t^{n-1}, zq^{\lambda_2}t^{n-2}, \dots, zq^{\lambda_n}t^0). \tag{2.13}$$

For homogeneous functions of degree d we of course have

$$u^{(n)}_{\lambda;z}(f) = z^d u^{(n)}_{\lambda}(f). \tag{2.14}$$

Thanks to the stability $P_\lambda(x_1,\dots,x_n;q,t) = P_\lambda(x_1,\dots,x_n,0;q,t)$ for $l(\lambda) \leqslant n$, we may extend the P_λ to an infinite alphabet, and in the remainder of this section we assume that x (and y) contain countably many variables so that we will be working in the ring $\Lambda_{\mathbb{F}} = \Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}$ instead of $\Lambda_{n,\mathbb{F}}$. By abuse of terminology we still refer to $P_\lambda(x;q,t)$ as a Macdonald polynomial, instead of a Macdonald function.

For b an indeterminate, the homomorphism $\epsilon_{a,t} : \Lambda_{\mathbb{F}} \to \mathbb{F}$ is defined by its action on the power sums p_r as [Mac95, Equation (VI.6.16)]

$$\epsilon_{b,t}(p_r) = \frac{1-b^r}{1-t^r}. \tag{2.15}$$

According to [Mac95, Equation (VI.6.17)]

$$\epsilon_{b,t}(P_\lambda) = t^{n(\lambda)} \prod_{s\in\lambda} \frac{1-b\,q^{a'(s)}t^{-l'(s)}}{1-q^{a(s)}t^{l(s)+1}} = t^{n(\lambda)} \frac{(b;q,t)_\lambda}{c_\lambda(q,t)}. \tag{2.16}$$

We also note that, for any symmetric function f,

$$\epsilon_{t^n,t}(f) = u^{(n)}_0(f) = f(1,t,\dots,t^{n-1}); \tag{2.17}$$

compare for example (2.11) and (2.16).

The q,t-Littlewood–Richardson coefficients are defined by

$$P_\mu(x;q,t)P_\nu(x;q,t) = \sum_\lambda f^\lambda_{\mu\nu}(q,t)P_\lambda(x;q,t), \tag{2.18}$$

and trivially satisfy

$$f^\lambda_{\mu\nu}(q,t) = f^\lambda_{\nu\mu}(q,t)$$

and

$$f^\lambda_{\mu\nu}(q,t) = 0 \quad \text{unless } |\lambda| = |\mu| + |\nu|. \tag{2.19}$$

It can also be shown that [Mac95, Equation (VI.7.7)]

$$f^\lambda_{\mu\nu}(q,t) = 0 \quad \text{unless } \mu,\nu \subseteq \lambda. \tag{2.20}$$

The q,t-Littlewood–Richardson coefficients may be used to define the skew Macdonald polynomials

$$P_{\lambda/\mu}(x;q,t) = \sum_\nu f^\lambda_{\mu\nu}(q,t)P_\nu(x;q,t). \tag{2.21}$$

By (2.20), $P_{\lambda/\mu}(x;q,t) = 0$ unless $\mu \subseteq \lambda$ (in which case it is homogeneous of degree $|\lambda| - |\mu|$). Equivalent to (2.21) is

$$P_\lambda(x,y;q,t) = \sum_\mu P_{\lambda/\mu}(x;q,t)P_\mu(y;q,t). \tag{2.22}$$

Finally we need the Kaneko–Macdonald definition of $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ basic hypergeometric series with Macdonald polynomial argument [Kan96, Mac]

$${}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix} a_1,\dots,a_{r+1} \\ b_1,\dots,b_r \end{matrix};q,t;x\right] = \sum_\lambda t^{n(\lambda)} \frac{P_\lambda(x;q,t)}{c'_\lambda(q,t)} \frac{(a_1,\dots,a_{r+1};q,t)_\lambda}{(b_1,\dots,b_r;q,t)_\lambda}. \tag{2.23}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the single-variable case, $x = (z)$, this reduces to the classical ${}_{r+1}\phi_r$ basic hypergeometric series [GR04]:

$${}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix} a_1,\dots,a_{r+1} \\ b_1,\dots,b_r \end{matrix}; q,t;(z)\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a_1,\dots,a_{r+1};q)_k}{(q,b_1,\dots,b_r;q)_k} z^k =: {}_{r+1}\phi_r\left[\begin{matrix} a_1,\dots,a_{r+1} \\ b_1,\dots,b_r \end{matrix}; q,z\right].$$

The main result for Kaneko–Macdonald series needed in this paper is the q-binomial theorem (see [Kan96, Theorem 3.5] and [Mac, Equation (2.2)]; see also [Mac95, p. 374])

$${}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix} a \\ - \end{matrix}; q,t;x\right] = \prod_{i\geqslant 1} \frac{(ax_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i;q)_\infty}, \tag{2.24}$$

which is (1.2) of the Introduction. Those familiar with Macdonald polynomials will recognize the intimate connection with the Cauchy identity [Mac95, Equation (VI.4.13)]

$$\sum_\lambda b_\lambda(q,t) P_\lambda(x;q,t) P_\lambda(y;q,t) = \prod_{i,j\geqslant 1} \frac{(tx_iy_j;q)_\infty}{(x_iy_j;q)_\infty}, \tag{2.25}$$

with $b_\lambda(q,t)$ defined in (2.2). Acting with the homomorphism $\epsilon_{a,t}$ on the left (with $\epsilon_{a,t}$ acting on y) and using (2.2) and (2.16) immediately gives the above ${}_1\Phi_0$ series, so that (2.24) is equivalent to

$$\epsilon_{a,t}\left(\prod_{i,j\geqslant 1} \frac{(tx_iy_j;q)_\infty}{(x_iy_j;q)_\infty}\right) = \prod_{i\geqslant 1} \frac{(ax_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i;q)_\infty}. \tag{2.26}$$

3. The bisymmetric function F

Unless stated otherwise m and n are integers such that $0 \leqslant m \leqslant n$, and $x = (x_1,\dots,x_m)$ and $y = (y_1,\dots,y_n)$. Given such x we set

$$x^{(i_1,i_2,\dots,i_N)} = (x_1,\dots,x_{i_1-1},x_{i_1+1},\dots,x_{i_2-1},x_{i_2+1},\dots,x_{i_N-1},x_{i_N+1},\dots,x_m)$$

for integers $1 \leqslant i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_N \leqslant m$. We further use the shorthand notation

$$(x^{(p+1,\dots,m)}, 0^{m-p}) = (x_1,\dots,x_p, \underbrace{0,\dots,0}_{m-p \text{ times}}),$$

and apply the same notation to $y = (y_1,\dots,y_n)$.

The symmetric group will feature prominently in this section, especially in the proofs. In total we employ the symmetric group acting on four different sets of variables, sometimes of the same cardinality. To avoid ambiguity we write

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_x} w(f(x))$$

instead of the more common

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_m} w(f(x)) := \sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_m} f(x_{w_1},\dots,x_{w_m}),$$

with similar notation for other sets of variables.

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.1 Definitions and results

Let r be a non-negative integer not exceeding m. Macdonald introduced the commuting family of q-difference operators D_r as [Mac95, Equation (VI.3.4)$_r$]

$$D_r = t^{\binom{r}{2}} \sum_{\substack{I\subseteq[m]\\|I|=r}} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}} \frac{tx_i - x_j}{x_i - x_j} \prod_{i\in I} T_{q,x_i},$$

where $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and

$$T_{q,x_i}(f(x)) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, qx_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_m)$$

is the q-shift operator acting on x_i.

Defining the generating series

$$D(u; q, t) = \sum_{r=0}^{m} D_r(-u)^r,$$

Macdonald [Mac95, Equation (VI.4.15)] showed that for $l(\lambda) \leqslant m$ the P_λ are the eigenfunctions of $D(u; q, t)$:

$$D(u; q, t)P_\lambda(x; q, t) = g_\lambda(u; q, t)P_\lambda(x; q, t), \tag{3.1}$$

with eigenvalue

$$g_\lambda(u; q, t) = \prod_{i=1}^{m}(1 - ut^{m-i}q^{\lambda_i}).$$

In [KN99, Equations (1.12) and (1.13)] Kirillov and Noumi combined the Cauchy identity (2.25) with (3.1) to obtain

$$\sum_\lambda b_\lambda(q, t)g_\lambda(u; q, t)P_\lambda(x; q, t)P_\lambda(y; q, t) = F(u; x, y; t) \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(tx_iy_j; q)_\infty}{(x_iy_j; q)_\infty}, \tag{3.2}$$

where the bisymmetric function $F(u; x, y; t)$ is given by

$$F(u; x, y; t) = \sum_{I\subseteq[m]} (-u)^{|I|}t^{\binom{|I|}{2}} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}} \frac{tx_i - x_j}{x_i - x_j} \prod_{i\in I}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1 - x_iy_j}{1 - tx_iy_j}. \tag{3.3}$$

In § 5 we define two types of $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series featuring particular specializations of F. In our study of these series several elementary results for F are needed. Proofs of all claims may be found in § 3.3.

Lemma 3.1 (Stability). *We have*

$$F(u; x, y; t)|_{x_my_n=1} = F(u; x^{(m)}, y^{(n)}; t) \tag{3.4a}$$

and

$$F(u; x, y; t)|_{x_m=y_n=0} = (1 - u)F(ut; x^{(m)}, y^{(n)}; t). \tag{3.4b}$$

The formulae (3.2) and (3.3) also make sense when y contains countably many variables (provided, of course, that we replace $\prod_{j=1}^{n}$ by $\prod_{j\geqslant 1}$). In the following we assume such y.

Lemma 3.2. *With $\epsilon_{a,t}$ acting on $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$ we have*

$$\epsilon_{ut^{m-1},t}(F(u; x, y; t)) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1 - ut^{m-i}}{1 - ut^{m-1}x_i} \tag{3.5a}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and

$$\epsilon_{a,t}(F(1;x,y;t)) = t^{\binom{m}{2}} x_1 \cdots x_m \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1-at^{1-i}}{1-ax_i}. \tag{3.5b}$$

It easily follows (see § 3.3) that

$$\epsilon_{a,t}(F(u;x,y;t)) = \sum_{I\subseteq[m]} (-u)^{|I|} t^{\binom{|I|}{2}} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}} \frac{tx_i - x_j}{x_i - x_j} \prod_{i\in I} \frac{1-x_i}{1-ax_i}, \tag{3.6}$$

so that Lemma 3.2 is equivalent to the pair of identities

$$\sum_{I\subseteq[m]} (-u)^{|I|} t^{\binom{|I|}{2}} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}} \frac{tx_i - x_j}{x_i - x_j} \prod_{i\in I} \frac{1-x_i}{1-ut^{m-1}x_i} = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1-ut^{m-i}}{1-ut^{m-1}x_i} \tag{3.7a}$$

and

$$\sum_{I\subseteq[m]} (-1)^{|I|} t^{\binom{|I|}{2}} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}} \frac{tx_i - x_j}{x_i - x_j} \prod_{i\in I} \frac{1-x_i}{1-ax_i} = t^{\binom{m}{2}} x_1 \cdots x_m \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1-at^{1-i}}{1-ax_i}. \tag{3.7b}$$

This shows that (3.5a) and (3.5b) are in fact equivalent: taking (3.7a) and making the substitutions $u \to at^{m-1}$, $x_i \to 1/(ax_i)$ and $I \to [m] - I$ yields (3.7b).

The results that we will actually need in § 5 correspond to the principal specialization formula, obtained by choosing $u = t^{n-m+1}$ or $a = t^n$ in Lemma 3.2 and using (2.17).

Corollary 3.1 (Principal specialization). *With $u_0^{(n)}$ acting on $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ we have*

$$u_0^{(n)}(F(t^{n-m+1};x,y;t)) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1-t^{i+n-m}}{1-t^n x_i}$$

and

$$u_0^{(n)}(F(1;x,y;t)) = t^{\binom{m}{2}} x_1 \cdots x_m \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1-t^{i+n-m}}{1-t^n x_i}.$$

These last two results are suggestive of

$$F(1;x,y;t) = t^{\binom{m}{2}-\binom{n}{2}} F(t^{n-m+1};x,y;t) \prod_{i=1}^{m} x_i \prod_{j=1}^{n} y_j,$$

but this is in fact only true for $m = n$ as will be shown in (3.12) below.

The function F may be connected to the bisymmetric function introduced by Tarasov and Varchenko [TV03] in their work on $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integrals. To this end we define

$$\omega(x,y;t) = F(1;x^{-1},y;t), \tag{3.8}$$

where $x^{-1} = (x_1^{-1}, \ldots, x_m^{-1})$. From (3.3) it follows that

$$\omega(x,y;t) = \sum_{I\subseteq[m]} (-1)^{|I|} t^{\binom{|I|}{2}} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}} \frac{x_i - tx_j}{x_i - x_j} \prod_{i\in I} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{x_i - y_j}{x_i - ty_j}. \tag{3.9}$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let k be an integer such that $1 \leqslant k \leqslant m$. Then we have*

$$\omega(x,y;t) = t^{m-n}(1-t) \sum_{l=1}^{n} \omega(x^{(k)}, y^{(l)};t) \frac{y_l}{x_k - ty_l} \prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq k}}^{m} \frac{x_i - y_l}{x_i - ty_l} \prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq l}}^{n} \frac{y_i - ty_l}{y_i - y_l}. \tag{3.10}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since $\omega(-,y;t)=1$ we may use (3.10) and induction to find the following alternative multisum expression for ω.

Corollary 3.2. *We have*

$$\omega(x,y;t)=t^{m(m-n)}(1-t)^m\sum_{\substack{l_1,\dots,l_m=1\\ l_i\neq l_j}}^{n}\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{y_{l_i}}{x_i-ty_{l_i}}\prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq l_1,\dots,l_m}}^{n}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{y_i-ty_{l_j}}{y_i-y_{l_j}}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m}\frac{x_i-y_{l_j}}{x_i-ty_{l_j}}\cdot\frac{y_{l_i}-ty_{l_j}}{y_{l_i}-y_{l_j}}. \tag{3.11}$$

Note that for $m=n$ this is equivalent to

$$\omega(x,y;t)=(1-t)^n\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_y}w\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{y_i}{x_i-ty_i}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\frac{x_i-y_j}{x_i-ty_j}\cdot\frac{y_i-ty_j}{y_i-y_j}\biggr),$$

from which it readily follows that

$$\omega(x,y;t)=\omega(x^{-1},y^{-1};t^{-1})\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{y_i}{x_i}$$

or, equivalently,

$$F(1;x,y;t)=F(1;x^{-1},y^{-1};t^{-1})\prod_{i=1}^{n}x_iy_i.$$

Since it follows from (3.3) that, for general $0\leqslant m\leqslant n$,

$$F(u;x,y;t)=F(ut^{m-n-1};x^{-1},y^{-1};t^{-1}),$$

we also have

$$F(1;x,y;t)=F(t;x,y;t)\prod_{i=1}^{n}x_iy_i \tag{3.12}$$

when $m=n$.

Using Corollary 3.2 we may achieve the further rewriting of ω as follows.

Proposition 3.2. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(x,y;t)=\frac{t^{m(m-n)}(1-t)^{n+m}}{(t;t)_{n-m}(t;t)_m}\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_x\times\mathfrak{S}_y}w\biggl(&\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{y_{i+n-m}}{x_i-ty_{i+n-m}}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\frac{y_i-ty_j}{y_i-y_j}\\ &\times\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m}\frac{x_i-y_{j+n-m}}{x_i-ty_{j+n-m}}\cdot\frac{x_i-tx_j}{x_i-x_j}\biggr).\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

The representation of $\omega(x,y;t)$ provided by (3.13) immediately implies that

$$\lim_{q\to1}F(1;q^{-v},q^u;q^\gamma)=\lim_{q\to1}\omega(q^v,q^u;q^\gamma)=\frac{(-\gamma)^m n!}{(n-m)!}\,w(u,v;\gamma), \tag{3.14}$$

where $w(u,v;\gamma)$ is the bisymmetric function of Tarasov and Varchenko [TV03, Equation (2.2)], and $q^v=(q^{v_1},\dots,q^{v_m})$, $q^u=(q^{u_1},\dots,q^{u_n})$.

Depending on the respective values of m and n either (3.9) or (3.11) provides the most efficient way of computing $\omega(x,y;t)$. In the former we need to sum over all 2^m subsets of $[m]$, whereas in the latter we are summing over all $\binom{n}{m}$ m-subsets of $[n]$. A distinct advantage of the representation (3.11) (and of (3.13)) over (3.9) is that it permits the computation of the $t\to1$ limit, required in the derivation of the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integral (1.5). In particular, the bisymmetric function featured in that

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

integral follows as

$$\begin{aligned} h(x,y) &= (-1)^m \frac{(n-m)!}{n!} \lim_{t\to 1} \frac{\omega(x,y;t)}{(1-t)^m} \\ &= \frac{(n-m)!}{n!} \sum_{\substack{l_1,\dots,l_m=1 \\ l_i\neq l_j}}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{y_{l_i}}{y_{l_i}-x_i} \\ &= \frac{1}{m!n!} \sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_x\times\mathfrak{S}_y} w\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{y_{i+n-m}}{y_{i+n-m}-x_i}\biggr). \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Finally we mention that $F(t;x,y;t)$ for $m=n$ is nothing but the well-known Izergin–Korepin determinant [Ize87, Kor82] in disguise.

LEMMA 3.3. *For $x=(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ and $y=(y_1,\dots,y_n)$ we have*

$$F(t;x,y;t) = \det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}\biggl(\frac{1}{(1-x_iy_j)(1-tx_iy_j)}\biggr) \frac{(1-t)^n \prod_{i,j=1}^{n}(1-x_iy_j)}{\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}(x_i-x_j)(y_i-y_j)}.$$

Since $F(0;x,y;0)=1$ this reduces to Cauchy's double alternant when $t=0$; see e.g. [Kra99, Equation (2.7)].

Several combinatorial interpretations of the Izergin–Korepin determinant are known, for example as the partition function of square ice [Bre99, Las99]. Perhaps best known is its evaluation in terms of alternating sign matrices [Bre99, Kup96]. This (together with (3.8) and (3.12)) implies that, for $m=n$,

$$\omega(x,y;t) = \frac{(1-t)^n y_1\cdots y_n}{\prod_{i,j=1}^{n}(x_i-ty_j)} \sum_{A} (1-t)^{2N(A)} t^{\binom{n}{2}-\mathcal{I}(A)} \prod_{i=1}^{n} y_i^{N_i(A)} x_i^{N^i(A)} \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ a_{ij}=0}}^{n} (\alpha_{ij}y_i - x_j).$$

Here the sum is over all n by n alternating sign matrices A (matrices with entries $a_{ij}\in\{-1,0,1\}$ such that the ones and minus ones alternate along each row and along each column and such that the entries in each row and column add up to 1), $N_i(A)$ is the number of minus ones in row i, $N^i(A)$ is the number of minus ones in column i, $N(A)$ is the total number of minus ones, $\mathcal{I}(A)$ is the inversion number,

$$\mathcal{I}(A) = \sum_{1\leqslant i'<i\leqslant n} \sum_{1\leqslant j<j'\leqslant n} a_{ij}a_{i'j'},$$

and

$$\alpha_{ij} = t \quad \text{if} \ \sum_{k=1}^{j} a_{ik} = \sum_{k=1}^{i} a_{kj}$$

and $\alpha_{ij}=1$ otherwise.

3.2 The rational functions $W_{\lambda\mu}$ and $V_{\lambda\mu}$

Related to the bisymmetric function F we introduce two rational functions $W_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t)$ and $V_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t)$ as follows. Let λ and μ be partitions such that $l(\lambda)\leqslant m$ and $l(\mu)\leqslant n$. Then

$$W_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t) = u^{(m)}_{\lambda;z} u^{(n)}_{\mu}(F(u;x,y;t)) \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$V_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t) = u^{(m)}_{\lambda;z} u^{(n)}_{\mu}(F(u;x^{-1},y;t)). \tag{3.17}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There is no need to consider the more general specialization $u^{(m)}_{\lambda;z}u^{(n)}_{\mu;w}$ since

$$u^{(m)}_{\lambda;z}u^{(n)}_{\mu;w}(F(u;x,y;t)) = u^{(m)}_{\lambda;zw}u^{(n)}_{\mu}(F(u;x,y;t)).$$

From (3.3) it immediately follows that

$$W_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t) = \sum_{I\subseteq[m]}(-u)^{|I|}t^{\binom{|I|}{2}}\prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}}\frac{1-q^{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}t^{j-i+1}}{1-q^{\lambda_i-\lambda_j}t^{j-i}}\prod_{i\in I}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1-zq^{\lambda_i+\mu_j}t^{m+n-i-j}}{1-zq^{\lambda_i+\mu_j}t^{m+n-i-j+1}}$$

and

$$V_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t) = \sum_{I\subseteq[m]}(-u)^{|I|}t^{\binom{|I|}{2}-n|I|}\prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}}\frac{1-q^{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}t^{i-j+1}}{1-q^{\lambda_j-\lambda_i}t^{i-j}}\prod_{i\in I}\prod_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1-zq^{\lambda_i-\mu_j}t^{j-i+m-n}}{1-zq^{\lambda_i-\mu_j}t^{j-i+m-n-1}}.$$

Furthermore, from (3.17) and Corollary 3.1 we infer that

$$V_{\lambda,0}(t^{n-m+1},z;q,t) = q^{|\lambda|}z^m\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{1-t^{m-n-i}}{1-zq^{\lambda_i}t^{m-n-i}} \tag{3.18a}$$

and

$$V_{\lambda,0}(1,z;q,t) = \prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{1-t^{m-n-i}}{1-zq^{\lambda_i}t^{m-n-i}}. \tag{3.18b}$$

3.3 Proofs of the claims of § 3.1

Proof of Lemma 3.1. By taking $x_my_n=1$ in (3.3) it follows that the summand vanishes if $m\in I$. Hence we need only to sum over $I\subseteq[m-1]$, resulting in

$$\begin{aligned}F(u;x,y;t)|_{x_my_n=1} &= \sum_{I\subseteq[m-1]}(-u)^{|I|}t^{\binom{|I|}{2}}\prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\in[m]-I}}\frac{tx_i-x_j}{x_i-x_j}\prod_{i\in I}\biggl(\frac{1-x_i/x_m}{1-tx_i/x_m}\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\frac{1-x_iy_j}{1-tx_iy_j}\biggr)\\ &= \sum_{I\subseteq[m-1]}(-u)^{|I|}t^{\binom{|I|}{2}}\prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}}\frac{tx_i-x_j}{x_i-x_j}\prod_{i\in I}\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\frac{1-x_iy_j}{1-tx_iy_j}.\end{aligned}$$

This last expression is $F(u;x^{(m)},y^{(n)};t)$, establishing (3.4a).

In proving (3.4b) we make the m-dependence of $g_\lambda(u;q,t)$ explicit by writing $g^{(m)}_\lambda(u;q,t)$.

Taking $x_m=y_n=0$ in (3.2) and using the stability of the Macdonald polynomials yields

$$\sum_\lambda b_\lambda(q,t)g^{(m)}_\lambda(u;q,t)P_\lambda(x^{(m)};q,t)P_\lambda(y^{(n)};q,t) = F(u;x,y;t)|_{x_m=y_n=0}\prod_{i=1}^{m-1}\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\frac{(tx_iy_j;q)_\infty}{(x_iy_j;q)_\infty}.$$

Since $P_\lambda(x^{(m)};q,t)=0$ if $l(\lambda)\geqslant m$ we may assume that $l(\lambda)\leqslant m-1$. But then

$$\begin{aligned}g^{(m)}_\lambda(u;q,t) &= (1-u)\prod_{i=1}^{m-1}(1-ut^{m-i}q^{\lambda_i})\\ &= (1-u)\,g^{(m-1)}_\lambda(ut;q,t),\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

so that

$$(1-u)\sum_{\lambda} b_\lambda(q,t) g_\lambda^{(m-1)}(ut;q,t) P_\lambda(x^{(m)};q,t) P_\lambda(y^{(n)};q,t)$$
$$= F(u;x,y;t)|_{x_m=y_n=0} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1}\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{(tx_iy_j;q)_\infty}{(x_iy_j;q)_\infty}.$$

Summing the left-hand side (LHS) using (3.2) (with $(n,m,x,y)\to(n-1,m-1,x^{(m)},y^{(n)})$) completes the proof of (3.4b). □

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Recall our earlier comment following (2.24) that the ${}_1\Phi_0$ series naturally arises from the sum side of the Cauchy identity (2.25) by application of the homomorphism $\epsilon_{a,t}$ (acting on y). It is therefore an obvious idea to apply $\epsilon_{a,t}$ to the more general identity

$$\sum_\lambda b_\lambda(q,t) g_\lambda(u;q,t) P_\lambda(x;q,t) P_\lambda(y;q,t) = F(u;x,y;t) \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{(tx_iy_j;q)_\infty}{(x_iy_j;q)_\infty}.$$

Doing so and using (2.2), (2.16), (2.23), (2.26) and

$$g_\lambda(u;q,t) = g_0(u;q,t)\frac{(uqt^{m-1};q,t)_\lambda}{(ut^{m-1};q,t)_\lambda}$$

yields

$$g_0(u;q,t)\, {}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} a, uqt^{m-1} \\ ut^{m-1}\end{matrix};q,t;x\right] = \epsilon_{a,t}(F(u;x,y;t)) \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(ax_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i;q)_\infty} \tag{3.19}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\epsilon_{a,t}(F(u;x,y;t)) = g_0(u;q,t)\, {}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} a, uqt^{m-1} \\ ut^{m-1}\end{matrix};q,t;x\right] \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(ax_i;q)_\infty}. \tag{3.20}$$

Taking $a=ut^{m-1}$ the ${}_2\Phi_1$ reduces to a ${}_1\Phi_0$ which may be summed by (2.24), so that

$$\epsilon_{ut^{m-1},t}(F(u;x,y;t)) = g_0(u;q,t)\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{(uqt^{m-1}x_i;q)_\infty}{(ut^{m-1}x_i;q)_\infty}$$
$$= \prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{1-ut^{m-i}}{1-ut^{m-1}x_i},$$

in accordance with (3.5a).

To prove (3.5b) we have to prove identity (3.6) (see the comments immediately following Lemma 3.2). Hence we need to show that

$$\epsilon_{a,t}\biggl(\prod_{j\geqslant 1}\frac{1-zy_j}{1-tzy_j}\biggr) = \frac{1-z}{1-az}.$$

By taking the logarithm on both sides this is equivalent to

$$\epsilon_{a,t}\biggl(\sum_{j\geqslant 1}(\log(1-zy_j)-\log(1-tzy_j))\biggr) = \log\biggl(\frac{1-z}{1-az}\biggr).$$

Using the series expansion for $\log(1-x)$, then interchanging sums and finally using definition (2.5) of the power sums, this yields

$$\epsilon_{a,t}\biggl(-\sum_{m\geqslant 1}\frac{(1-t^m)z^m}{m}\,p_m(y)\biggr) = \log\biggl(\frac{1-z}{1-az}\biggr).$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By (2.15) this simplifies to

$$-\sum_{m\geqslant 1}\frac{(1-a^m)z^m}{m}=\log\biggl(\frac{1-z}{1-az}\biggr)$$

which is obviously true. □

As an aside we note that (3.6) and (3.19) may be combined to yield the following generalization of the Kaneko–Macdonald q-binomial theorem (2.24):

$$\begin{aligned}
&{}_2\Phi_1\biggl[\begin{matrix}a, uqt^{m-1}\\ ut^{m-1}\end{matrix};q,t;x\biggr]\prod_{i=1}^m(1-ut^{m-i})\\
&\quad=\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^m\frac{(ax_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i;q)_\infty}\biggr)\sum_{I\subseteq[m]}(-u)^{|I|}t^{\binom{|I|}{2}}\prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\in\bar{I}}}\frac{tx_i-x_j}{x_i-x_j}\prod_{i\in I}\frac{1-x_i}{1-ax_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Since $\omega(x,y;t)$ is symmetric in x it suffices to prove the proposition for $k=m$.

It follows from (3.9) that $\omega(x,y;t)$, viewed as a function of x_m, has simple poles at $x_m=x_i$ for $1\leqslant i\leqslant m-1$ and $x_m=ty_j$ for $1\leqslant j\leqslant n$. However, since $\omega(x,y;t)$ is symmetric in x, the first set of poles must have zero residue.

It also follows from (3.9) that

$$\lim_{x_m\to\infty}\omega(x,y;t)=0.$$

Indeed, if $\omega_I(x,y;t)$ is the summand of (3.9) and if $I\subseteq[m-1]$, then

$$\lim_{x_m\to\infty}\omega_I(x,y;t)=-\lim_{x_m\to\infty}\omega_{I\cup\{m\}}(x,y;t).$$

The above observations imply the existence of the partial fraction expansion

$$\omega(x,y;t)=\sum_{l=1}^n\frac{A_l}{x_m-ty_l},$$

with $A_l=A_l(x^{(m)},y;t)$ determined by

$$\begin{aligned}
A_l&=\lim_{x_m\to ty_l}(x_m-ty_l)\,\omega(x,y;t)\\
&=\lim_{x_m\to ty_l}(x_m-ty_l)\sum_{I\subseteq[m]}(-1)^{|I|}t^{\binom{|I|}{2}}\prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}}\frac{x_i-tx_j}{x_i-x_j}\prod_{i\in I}\prod_{j=1}^n\frac{x_i-y_j}{x_i-ty_j}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the limit, only sets I containing m give a non-vanishing contribution. A straightforward calculation thus gives

$$\begin{aligned}
A_l=(t-1)y_l&\sum_{\substack{I\subseteq[m]\\ m\in I}}(-1)^{|I|}t^{\binom{|I|}{2}-|I|+m-n+1}\prod_{j\notin I}\frac{x_j-y_l}{x_j-ty_l}\prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq l}}^n\frac{y_j-ty_l}{y_j-y_l}\\
&\times\prod_{\substack{i\in I-\{m\}\\ j\notin I}}\frac{x_i-tx_j}{x_i-x_j}\prod_{i\in I-\{m\}}\prod_{j=1}^n\frac{x_i-y_j}{x_i-ty_j}.
\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rewriting the sum as a sum over $[m-1]$ this becomes

$$A_l = (t-1)y_l \sum_{I\subseteq[m-1]} (-1)^{|I|+1} t^{\binom{|I|}{2}+m-n} \prod_{j\notin I} \frac{x_j - y_l}{x_j - ty_l} \prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq l}}^{n} \frac{y_j - ty_l}{y_j - y_l} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\notin I}} \frac{x_i - tx_j}{x_i - x_j} \prod_{i\in I}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{x_i - y_j}{x_i - ty_j}.$$

By

$$\prod_{j\notin I} \frac{x_j - y_l}{x_j - ty_l} \prod_{i\in I}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{x_i - y_j}{x_i - ty_j} = \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{x_i - y_l}{x_i - ty_l} \prod_{i\in I}\prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq l}}^{n} \frac{x_i - y_j}{x_i - ty_j},$$

this finally yields

$$\begin{aligned} A_l &= (1-t)t^{m-n} y_l \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{x_i - y_l}{x_i - ty_l} \prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq l}}^{n} \frac{y_j - ty_l}{y_j - y_l} \sum_{I\subseteq[m-1]} (-1)^{|I|} t^{\binom{|I|}{2}} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\in \bar{I}}} \frac{x_i - tx_j}{x_i - x_j} \prod_{i\in I}\prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq l}}^{n} \frac{x_i - y_j}{x_i - ty_j} \\ &= (1-t)t^{m-n} y_l\, \omega(x^{(m)}, y^{(l)}; t) \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{x_i - y_l}{x_i - ty_l} \prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq l}}^{n} \frac{y_j - ty_l}{y_j - y_l}, \end{aligned}$$

as required. □

Proof of Proposition 3.2. We first symmetrize the right-hand side (RHS) of (3.13) with respect to y and compute

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_y} w\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{y_{i+n-m}}{x_i - ty_{i+n-m}} \prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \frac{y_i - ty_j}{y_i - y_j} \prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m} \frac{x_i - y_{j+n-m}}{x_i - ty_{j+n-m}} \biggr).$$

To this end we write each permutation w as $w = (\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-m}, l_1, \dots, l_m)$. In summing over w we first sum over the σ_i for fixed $l_1, \dots, l_m$. This yields

$$\sum_{\substack{l_1,\dots,l_m=1\\ l_i\neq l_j}}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{y_{l_i}}{x_i - ty_{l_i}} \prod_{i=1}^{n-m}\prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{Y_i - ty_{l_j}}{Y_i - y_{l_j}} \prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m} \frac{x_i - y_{l_j}}{x_i - ty_{l_j}} \cdot \frac{y_{l_i} - ty_{l_i}}{y_{l_i} - y_{l_j}} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}_Y} \sigma\biggl(\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n-m} \frac{Y_i - tY_j}{Y_i - Y_j} \biggr),$$

where $Y = (Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-m}) = y^{(l_1,l_2,\dots,l_m)}$ and where we have used the symmetry of the double product involving Y_i and y_{l_j} to pull it out of the sum over $\mathfrak{S}_Y$. Carrying out this sum using [Mac95, Ch. III, (1.4)]

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_u} w\biggl(\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \frac{u_i - tu_j}{u_i - u_j} \biggr) = \frac{(t;t)_n}{(1-t)^n}, \tag{3.21}$$

we obtain

$$\frac{(t;t)_{n-m}}{(1-t)^{n-m}} \sum_{\substack{l_1,\dots,l_m=1\\ l_i\neq l_j}}^{n} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{y_{l_i}}{x_i - ty_{l_i}} \prod_{i=1}^{n-m}\prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{Y_i - ty_{l_j}}{Y_i - y_{l_j}} \prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m} \frac{x_i - y_{l_j}}{x_i - ty_{l_j}} \cdot \frac{y_{l_i} - ty_{l_i}}{y_{l_i} - y_{l_j}}.$$

If we denote the expression on the RHS of (3.13) by $\bar{\omega}(x, y; t)$, and use that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n-m}\prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{Y_i - ty_{l_j}}{Y_i - y_{l_j}} = \prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq l_1,\dots,l_m}}^{n} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{y_i - ty_{l_j}}{y_i - y_{l_j}},$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the above calculations imply that

$$\bar{\omega}(x,y;t)=\kappa(t)\sum_{\substack{l_1,\dots,l_m=1\\ l_i\neq l_j}}^{n}\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_x} w\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{y_{l_i}}{x_i-ty_{l_i}}\prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq l_1,\dots,l_m}}^{n}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{y_i-ty_{l_j}}{y_i-y_{l_j}}\\ \times\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m}\frac{x_i-tx_j}{x_i-x_j}\cdot\frac{x_i-y_{l_j}}{x_i-ty_{l_j}}\cdot\frac{y_{l_i}-ty_{l_i}}{y_{l_i}-y_{l_j}}\biggr),$$

where

$$\kappa(t)=\frac{t^{m(m-n)}(1-t)^{2m}}{(t;t)_m}.$$

The expression for $\omega(x,y;t)$ given by (3.11) is also a sum over the l_i but unfortunately the two summands do not equate and some further manipulations of the sums are required.

To proceed we apply

$$\sum_{\substack{l_1,\dots,l_m=1\\ l_i\neq l_j}}^{n} f(y_l)=\sum_{1\leqslant l_1<\cdots<l_m\leqslant n}\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_{y_l}} w(f(y_l)), \tag{3.22}$$

with $y_l=(y_{l_1},\dots,y_{l_m})$. Therefore

$$\bar{\omega}(x,y;t)=\kappa(t)\sum_{1\leqslant l_1<\cdots<l_m\leqslant n}\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_x\times\mathfrak{S}_{y_l}} w\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{y_{l_i}}{x_i-ty_{l_i}}\prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq l_1,\dots,l_m}}^{n}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{y_i-ty_{l_j}}{y_i-y_{l_j}}\\ \times\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m}\frac{x_i-tx_j}{x_i-x_j}\cdot\frac{x_i-y_{l_j}}{x_i-ty_{l_j}}\cdot\frac{y_{l_i}-ty_{l_i}}{y_{l_i}-y_{l_j}}\biggr).$$

We now invoke the following lemma, which reduces to (3.21) for $v=u$.

Lemma 3.4. *For $u=(u_1,\dots,u_n)$ and $v=(v_1,\dots,v_n)$ there holds*

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_u\times\mathfrak{S}_v} w\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{u_i-tv_i}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\frac{u_i-tu_j}{u_i-u_j}\cdot\frac{u_i-v_j}{u_i-tv_j}\cdot\frac{v_i-tv_j}{v_i-v_j}\biggr)\\ =\frac{(t;t)_n}{(1-t)^n}\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v} w\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{u_i-tv_i}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\frac{u_i-v_j}{u_i-tv_j}\cdot\frac{v_i-tv_j}{v_i-v_j}\biggr).$$

Since

$$\prod_{i=1}^{m}y_{l_i}\prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq l_1,\dots,l_m}}^{n}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{y_i-ty_{l_j}}{y_i-y_{l_j}}$$

is symmetric in y_l, Lemma 3.4 (with $(n,u,v)\to(m,x,y_l)$) may be applied to yield

$$\bar{\omega}(x,y;t)=\kappa(t)\frac{(t;t)_m}{(1-t)^m}\sum_{1\leqslant l_1<\cdots<l_m\leqslant n}\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_{y_l}} w\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{y_{l_i}}{x_i-ty_{l_i}}\\ \times\prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq l_1,\dots,l_m}}^{n}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{y_i-ty_{l_j}}{y_i-y_{l_j}}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m}\frac{x_i-y_{l_j}}{x_i-ty_{l_j}}\cdot\frac{y_{l_i}-ty_{l_j}}{y_{l_i}-y_{l_j}}\biggr).$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Reversing (3.22) we finally get

$$\bar{\omega}(x,y;t)=\kappa(t)\frac{(t;t)_m}{(1-t)^m}\sum_{\substack{l_1,\dots,l_m=1\\ l_i\neq l_j}}^{n}\prod_{i=1}^{m}\frac{y_{l_i}}{x_i-ty_{l_i}}\prod_{\substack{i=1\\ i\neq l_1,\dots,l_m}}^{n}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\frac{y_i-ty_{l_j}}{y_i-y_{l_j}}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m}\frac{x_i-y_{l_j}}{x_i-ty_{l_j}}\cdot\frac{y_{l_i}-ty_{l_j}}{y_{l_i}-y_{l_j}}.$$

Comparing this with (3.11) we see that $\bar{\omega}=\omega$ and the proof of Proposition 3.2 is complete except for the proof of Lemma 3.4. □

Proof of Lemma 3.4. Defining

$$g(u,v;t)=\prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{1}{u_i-tv_i}\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\frac{u_i-v_j}{u_i-tv_j}\cdot\frac{v_i-tv_j}{v_i-v_j},$$

Proposition 3.2 states that

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_u\times\mathfrak{S}_v}w\biggl(g(u,v;t)\prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\frac{u_i-tu_j}{u_i-u_j}\biggr)=\frac{(t;t)_n}{(1-t)^n}\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v}w(g(u,v;t)). \tag{3.23}$$

The difficulty is that it is unclear that the RHS is symmetric in u. For example, when $n=2$ it reads (without the (u,v)-independent prefactor)

$$\frac{1}{u_1-tv_1}\cdot\frac{1}{u_2-tv_2}\cdot\frac{u_1-v_2}{u_1-tv_2}\cdot\frac{v_1-tv_2}{v_1-tv_2}+\frac{1}{u_1-tv_2}\cdot\frac{1}{u_2-tv_1}\cdot\frac{u_1-v_1}{u_1-tv_1}\cdot\frac{v_2-tv_1}{v_2-tv_1},$$

which appears symmetric in v only, but is in fact equal to

$$\frac{(1+t)(tv_1v_2+u_1u_2)-t(v_1+v_2)(u_1+u_2)}{(u_1-tv_1)(u_1-tv_2)(u_2-tv_1)(u_2-tv_2)}.$$

Let $T_{k,u}\in\mathfrak{S}_u$ by the kth adjacent transposition acting on u:

$$T_{k,u}(f(u))=f(u_1,\dots,u_{k-1},u_{k+1},u_k,u_{k+2},\dots,u_n).$$

The $T_{k,u}$ for $1\leqslant k\leqslant n-1$ generate $\mathfrak{S}_u$, and to prove that the RHS of (3.23) is symmetric in u it suffices to show that it is invariant under the action of the $T_{k,u}$. That is, we must show that

$$T_{k,u}\biggl(\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v}w(g(u,v;t))\biggr)=\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v}w(g(u,v;t))$$

or, equivalently,

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v}w(T_{k,u}(g(u,v;t)))=\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v}w(g(u,v;t)), \tag{3.24}$$

since $T_{k,u}$ commutes with the v-symmetrization.

A direct computation shows that

$$T_{k,u}(g(u,v;t))=g(u,v;t)-\frac{(u_k-u_{k+1})(v_{k+1}-tv_k)}{(u_k-v_{k+1})(u_{k+1}-tv_k)}g(u,v;t).$$

Acting with $\mathfrak{S}_v$ it thus follows that (3.24) holds if

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v}w(h(u,v;t))=0 \tag{3.25}$$

for

$$h(u,v;t)=\frac{(v_{k+1}-tv_k)}{(u_k-v_{k+1})(u_{k+1}-tv_k)}g(u,v;t).$$

Given an arbitrary permutation $w=(w_1,\dots,w_n)\in\mathfrak{S}_v$ let $w'\in\mathfrak{S}_v$ be given by

$$w'=(w_1,\dots,w_{k-1},w_{k+1},w_k,w_{k+2},\dots,w_n).$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Another direct computation shows that

$$w(h(u,v;t)) = -w'(h(u,v;t)).$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v} w(h(u,v;t)) = -\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v} w(h(u,v;t)),$$

from which (3.25) follows.

Now that the u-symmetry of the RHS of (3.23) has been established the rest is easy. By (3.21) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{RHS (3.23)} &= \sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_u} w\biggl(\frac{u_i-tu_j}{u_i-u_j}\biggr)\sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_v} w(g(u,v;t))\\ &= \sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_u\times\mathfrak{S}_v} w\biggl(\frac{u_i-tu_j}{u_i-u_j}g(u,v;t)\biggr) = \text{LHS (3.23)},\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of Lemma 3.4. □

Proof of Lemma 3.3. The entries of the determinant may be expanded by

$$\frac{1}{(1-xy)(1-txy)} = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\infty} \begin{bmatrix}\alpha+1\\ \alpha\end{bmatrix}_t (xy)^{\alpha},$$

where

$$\begin{bmatrix}N\\ k\end{bmatrix}_q = \frac{(q^{N-k+1};q)_k}{(q;q)_k}$$

is a q-binomial coefficient. By multilinearity this gives

$$\det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}\Bigl(\cdots\Bigr) = \sum_{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n=0}^{\infty} \det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}(y_j^{\alpha_i})\, x^{\alpha} \begin{bmatrix}\alpha+1\\ \alpha\end{bmatrix}_t,$$

where

$$\begin{bmatrix}\alpha+1\\ \alpha\end{bmatrix}_t = \prod_{i=1}^{n}\begin{bmatrix}\alpha_i+1\\ \alpha_i\end{bmatrix}_t.$$

Since the summand vanishes when two (or more) of the summation indices coincide and since the product of t-binomials is symmetric in α, this may be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}\Bigl(\cdots\Bigr) &= \sum_{\alpha_1>\cdots>\alpha_n\geqslant 0}^{\infty}\ \sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_\alpha} \det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}(y_j^{\alpha_{w_i}})x^{w(\alpha)}\begin{bmatrix}\alpha+1\\ \alpha\end{bmatrix}_t\\ &= \sum_{\alpha_1>\cdots>\alpha_n\geqslant 0}^{\infty} \det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}(y_j^{\alpha_i})\begin{bmatrix}\alpha+1\\ \alpha\end{bmatrix}_t \sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_\alpha}\epsilon(w)x^{w(\alpha)}\\ &= \sum_{\alpha_1>\cdots>\alpha_n\geqslant 0}^{\infty} \det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}(y_j^{\alpha_i}) \det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}(x_j^{\alpha_i})\begin{bmatrix}\alpha+1\\ \alpha\end{bmatrix}_t,\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon(w)$ in the second line denotes the signature of the permutation w.

Setting $\alpha_i = \lambda_i + n - i + 1$ and using (2.9) this becomes

$$\det_{1\leqslant i,j\leqslant n}\Bigl(\cdots\Bigr) = \Delta(x)\Delta(y)\sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda(x)s_\lambda(y)\prod_{i=1}^{n}\begin{bmatrix}\lambda_i+n-i+1\\ \lambda_i+n-i\end{bmatrix}_t.$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Recalling that $m = n$ we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i + n - i + 1 \\ \lambda_i + n - i \end{bmatrix}_t = \frac{g_\lambda(t;t,t)}{(1-t)^n},$$

so that

$$\sum_\lambda g_\lambda(t;t,t) s_\lambda(x) s_\lambda(y) = (1-t)^n \det_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant n} \left(\cdots \right) \frac{1}{\Delta(x)\Delta(y)}.$$

By (2.8) the LHS may be recognized as the LHS of (3.2) for $m = n$, $q = t$ and $u = t$. Hence it may be replaced by the corresponding RHS, leading to

$$F(t;x,y;t) = (1-t)^n \det_{1 \leqslant i,j \leqslant n} \left(\cdots \right) \frac{\prod_{i,j=1}^{n}(1 - x_i y_j)}{\Delta(x)\Delta(y)},$$

as claimed by the lemma. □

4. An identity for q,t-Littlewood–Richardson coefficients

In our proof of the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ q-binomial theorem in (1.4) we require the following identity for the q,t-Littlewood–Richardson coefficients.

THEOREM 4.1. *Given integers $0 \leqslant m \leqslant n$, let λ and μ be partitions such that $l(\lambda) \leqslant m$ and $l(\mu) \leqslant n$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\omega,\nu} t^{n(\nu)-|\omega|} f^\lambda_{\omega\nu}(q,t) V_{\nu,0}(u,1;q,t) u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) \frac{(qt^{m-n-1};q,t)_\nu}{c'_\nu(q,t)} \\ &\quad = t^{n(\lambda)-m|\mu|} V_{\lambda\mu}(u,1;q,t) u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu) \frac{(qt^{m-1};q,t)_\lambda}{c'_\lambda(q,t)} \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(qt^{j-i+m-n-1};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}{(qt^{j-i+m-n};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f^\lambda_{\omega\nu}(q,t) = 0$ if $\omega \not\subseteq \lambda$ and $P_{\mu/\omega} = 0$ if $\omega \not\subseteq \mu$ we may add the restrictions $\omega \subseteq \lambda$ and $\omega \subseteq \mu$ to the sum over ω. It may in fact also be shown that the summand on the LHS vanishes unless

$$\lambda_i \geqslant \mu_{i+n-m} \quad \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m. \tag{4.1}$$

In other words, if μ^* is the partition formed by the last m parts of μ (i.e. $\mu^* = (\mu_{n-m+1}, \ldots, \mu_n)$), then the summand vanishes unless $\mu^* \subseteq \lambda$.

To see this we recall from [Mac95, Equation (VI.7.13′)] that

$$P_{\mu/\omega}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-m}; q,t) = \sum_T \psi_T(q,t) x^T,$$

where the sum is over all semistandard Young tableaux T of skew shape $\mu - \omega$ over the alphabet $\{1, \ldots, n-m\}$; x^T is the monomial defined by T and $\psi_T \in \mathbb{F}$. For the shape $\mu - \omega$ to have an admissible filling it must have at most $n - m$ boxes in each of its columns. Hence $\omega_i \geqslant \mu_{i+n-m}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$. Since we have already established that the summand vanishes unless $\omega \subseteq \lambda$, a necessary condition for non-vanishing of the summand is thus given by (4.1). Since $1/(q;q)_{-N} = 0$ for N a positive integer, it is easily seen that also the double product on the RHS of the theorem vanishes unless (4.1) holds.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We start with (3.2) with λ replaced by η and apply the homomorphisms $u^{(m)}_{\lambda;z}$ (acting on x) and $u^{(n)}_\mu$ (acting on y). Using the homogeneity (2.7) of the Macdonald polynomials

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and recalling (3.16), this leads to

$$\sum_{\eta} z^{|\eta|} b_\eta(q,t) g_\eta(u;q,t) u_\lambda^{(m)}(P_\eta) u_\mu^{(n)}(P_\eta)$$
$$= W_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t) \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(zt^{n+m-i};q)_\infty}{(zt^{m-i};q)_\infty} \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(zt^{n+m-i-j};q)_{\lambda_i+\mu_j}}{(zt^{n+m-i-j+1};q)_{\lambda_i+\mu_j}}. \tag{4.2}$$

The summand on the LHS vanishes unless $l(\eta) \leqslant m$. Assuming such η we may twice use the symmetry (2.12) to rewrite the LHS as

$$\mathrm{LHS}(4.2) = \sum_{\eta} z^{|\eta|} b_\eta(q,t) g_\eta(u;q,t) \frac{u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\lambda) u_\eta^{(n)}(P_\mu) u_0^{(m)}(P_\eta) u_0^{(n)}(P_\eta)}{u_0^{(m)}(P_\lambda) u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)}.$$

Next we apply (2.22) as well as (2.7) to get

$$\begin{aligned} u_\eta^{(n)}(P_\mu) &= P_\mu(q^{\eta_1}t^{n-1},\dots,q^{\eta_m}t^{n-m},t^{n-m-1},\dots,t,1;q,t) \\ &= \sum_{\omega} P_\omega(q^{\eta_1}t^{n-1},\dots,q^{\eta_m}t^{n-m};q,t) u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) \\ &= \sum_{\omega} t^{(n-m)|\omega|} u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\omega) u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\mathrm{LHS}(4.2) = \sum_{\eta,\omega} z^{|\eta|} t^{(n-m)|\omega|} b_\eta(q,t) g_\eta(u;q,t) \frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\lambda) u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\omega) u_0^{(m)}(P_\eta) u_0^{(n)}(P_\eta)}{u_0^{(m)}(P_\lambda) u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)}.$$

Next we use that

$$\begin{aligned} u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\lambda) u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\omega) &= u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\lambda P_\omega) \\ &= u_\eta^{(m)}\Bigl(\sum_{\nu} f_{\omega\lambda}^{\nu}(q,t) P_\nu\Bigr) \qquad \text{(by (2.18))} \\ &= \sum_{\nu} f_{\omega\lambda}^{\nu}(q,t) u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\nu) \end{aligned}$$

to rewrite this as

$$\mathrm{LHS}(4.2) = \sum_{\eta,\omega,\nu} z^{|\eta|} t^{(n-m)|\omega|} f_{\omega\lambda}^{\nu}(q,t) b_\eta(q,t) g_\eta(u;q,t) \frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) u_\eta^{(m)}(P_\nu) u_0^{(m)}(P_\eta) u_0^{(n)}(P_\eta)}{u_0^{(m)}(P_\lambda) u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)}.$$

By one more application of (2.12) this becomes

$$\mathrm{LHS}(4.2) = \sum_{\eta,\omega,\nu} z^{|\eta|} t^{(n-m)|\omega|} f_{\omega\lambda}^{\nu}(q,t) b_\eta(q,t) g_\eta(u;q,t) \frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) u_\nu^{(m)}(P_\eta) u_0^{(m)}(P_\nu) u_0^{(n)}(P_\eta)}{u_0^{(m)}(P_\lambda) u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)}.$$

As a result of the previous manipulations, the sum over η corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\eta} z^{|\eta|} b_\eta(q,t) g_\eta(u;q,t) u_\nu^{(m)}(P_\eta) u_0^{(n)}(P_\eta) \\ &\quad = u_{\nu;z}^{(m)} u_0^{(n)}\Bigl(\sum_{\eta} b_\eta(q,t) g_\eta(u;q,t) P_\eta(x;q,t) P_\eta(y;q,t)\Bigr) \\ &\quad = u_{\nu;z}^{(m)} u_0^{(n)}\Bigl(F(u;x,y;t) \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(tx_iy_j;q)_\infty}{(x_iy_j;q)_\infty}\Bigr) \qquad \text{(by (3.2))} \end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$= u_{\nu;z}^{(m)} u_0^{(n)}(F(u;x,y;t)) \frac{(zt^{m-1};q,t)_\nu}{(zt^{n+m-1};q,t)_\nu} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(zt^{n+m-i};q)_\infty}{(zt^{m-i};q)_\infty}$$

$$= W_{\nu,0}(u,z;q,t) \frac{(zt^{m-1};q,t)_\nu}{(zt^{n+m-1};q,t)_\nu} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(zt^{n+m-i};q)_\infty}{(zt^{m-i};q)_\infty} \qquad \text{(by (3.16)).}$$

We thus arrive at

$$\text{LHS(4.2)} = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(zt^{n+m-i};q)_\infty}{(zt^{m-i};q)_\infty} \sum_{\omega,\nu} t^{(n-m)|\omega|} f_{\omega\lambda}^{\nu}(q,t) W_{\nu,0}(u,z;q,t) \times \frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) u_0^{(m)}(P_\nu)}{u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu) u_0^{(m)}(P_\lambda)} \frac{(zt^{m-1};q,t)_\nu}{(zt^{n+m-1};q,t)_\nu}.$$

Finally equating this with the RHS of (4.2) yields

$$\sum_{\omega,\nu} t^{(n-m)|\omega|} f_{\omega\lambda}^{\nu}(q,t) W_{\nu,0}(u,z;q,t) \frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) u_0^{(m)}(P_\nu)}{u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu) u_0^{(m)}(P_\lambda)} \frac{(zt^{m-1};q,t)_\nu}{(zt^{n+m-1};q,t)_\nu} = W_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t) \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(zt^{n+m-i-j};q)_{\lambda_i+\mu_j}}{(zt^{n+m-i-j+1};q)_{\lambda_i+\mu_j}}. \tag{4.3}$$

Both sides of this identity trivially vanish if $l(\lambda) > m$. Furthermore, the summand on the LHS vanishes if $l(\nu) > m$. Hence we may without loss of generality assume in the following that $l(\lambda) \leqslant m$ and $l(\nu) \leqslant m$. (The latter of course refers to a restriction on the summation index.) We may also assume that the largest part of ν is bounded since $f_{\omega\lambda}^{\nu} = 0$ if $|\omega| + |\lambda| \neq |\nu|$ and $P_{\mu/\omega} = 0$ if $\omega \not\subseteq \mu$. In particular $\nu_1 \leqslant |\lambda| + |\mu|$.

The above considerations imply that $\lambda, \nu \subseteq (N^m)$ for sufficiently large N. Given such N we can define the partitions $\hat{\lambda}$ and $\hat{\mu}$ as the complements of λ and ν with respect to (N^m), i.e. $\hat{\lambda}_i = N - \lambda_{m+1-i}$ and $\hat{\nu}_i = N - \nu_{m+1-i}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$.

We now replace $z \to q^{1-m-N}/z$, $\lambda \to \hat{\lambda}$ and $\nu \to \hat{\nu}$ in (4.3), and then eliminate the hats. For this we need the easily established

$$W_{\hat{\lambda}\mu}(u, q^{1-m-N}/z; q,t), = V_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t),$$

as well as [War05, p. 263]

$$f_{\omega\hat{\lambda}}^{\hat{\nu}}(q,t) = t^{n(\nu)-n(\lambda)} f_{\omega\nu}^{\lambda}(q,t) \frac{(qt^{m-1};q,t)_\nu}{(qt^{m-1};q,t)_\lambda} \frac{c'_\lambda(q,t)}{c'_\nu(q,t)} \frac{u_0^{(m)}(P_\lambda)}{u_0^{(m)}(P_\nu)},$$

with [BF99, Equation (4.1)]

$$\frac{(a;q,t)_{\hat{\lambda}}}{(b;q,t)_{\hat{\lambda}}} = \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^{|\lambda|} \frac{(a;q,t)_{(N^m)}}{(b;q,t)_{(N^m)}} \frac{(q^{1-N}t^{m-1}/b;q,t)_\lambda}{(q^{1-N}t^{m-1}/a;q,t)_\lambda}$$

and

$$u_0^{(m)}(P_{\hat{\lambda}}) = t^{\binom{m}{2}N + (1-m)|\lambda|} u_0^{(m)}(P_\lambda).$$

This last result follows from [BF99, Equation (4.3)]

$$P_{\hat{\lambda}}(x;q,t) = (x_1 \cdots x_m)^N \, P_\lambda(x^{-1};q,t)$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and the homogeneity (2.7). As a result we arrive at

$$\sum_{\omega,\nu} t^{n(\nu)-|\omega|} f^{\lambda}_{\omega\nu}(q,t) V_{\nu,0}(u,z;q,t) u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) \frac{(qt^{m-1},zqt^{m-n-1};q,t)_\nu}{c'_\nu(q,t)\,(zqt^{m-1};q,t)_\nu}$$
$$= t^{n(\lambda)-m|\mu|} V_{\lambda\mu}(u,z;q,t) u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu) \frac{(qt^{m-1};q,t)_\lambda}{c'_\lambda(q,t)} \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(zqt^{j-i+m-n-1};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}{(zqt^{j-i+m-n};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}},$$

where we have also that $f^{\lambda}_{\omega\nu}=0$ if $|\omega|+|\nu|\neq|\lambda|$, and

$$\frac{(a;q)_{N-k}}{(b;q)_{N-k}} = \frac{(a;q)_N}{(b;q)_N} \frac{(q^{1-N}/b;q)_k}{(q^{1-N}/a;q)_k} \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^k.$$

Finally specializing $z=1$ completes the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

5. $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series

Below we will give two different definitions of $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series, denoted Type I and Type II respectively. To cover both types at once we introduce the function $V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)$ which is given either by

$$V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t) = V_{\lambda\mu}(1,1;q,t) \qquad \text{Type I},$$

or by

$$V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t) = q^{-|\lambda|} V_{\lambda\mu}(t^{n-m+1},1;q,t) \quad \text{Type II}.$$

Note that it follows from (3.17) and (3.8) that, for Type I series,

$$V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t) = u_\lambda^{(m)} u_\mu^{(n)}(\omega(x,y;t)).$$

From (3.18a) and (3.18b) we see that, regardless of our choice of $V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)$,

$$V_{\lambda,0}(q,t) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1-t^{m-n-i}}{1-q^{\lambda_i}t^{m-n-i}} = \frac{(t^{m-n-1};q,t)_\lambda}{(qt^{m-n-1};q,t)_\lambda}. \tag{5.1}$$

It is important to observe that $V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)$ depends not merely on the partitions λ and μ but also on the integers m and n. (We tacitly assume that $l(\lambda)\leqslant m$ and $l(\mu)\leqslant n$.) These integers are mostly assumed to be fixed, but occasionally we will relate series labelled by (m,n) to those labelled by $(m-1,n-1)$. If we write $V^{(m,n)}_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)$ instead of $V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)$ it follows from Lemma 3.1 that $V^{(m,n)}_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)$ only depends on the difference $n-m$. Specifically, we have

$$V^{(m,n)}_{\lambda\mu}(q,t) = V^{(m-1,n-1)}_{\lambda\mu}(q,t), \tag{5.2}$$

provided of course that $l(\lambda)\leqslant m-1$ and $l(\mu)\leqslant n-1$.

To reduce the length of many of the subsequent formulae we introduce another rational function $\Omega_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)$ as

$$\Omega_{\lambda\mu}(q,t) = V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)(qt^{m-1};q,t)_\lambda \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{(qt^{j-i+m-n-1};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}{(qt^{j-i+m-n};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}, \tag{5.3}$$

where λ and μ are partitions such that $l(\lambda)\leqslant m$ and $l(\mu)\leqslant n$.

Two easily established results for $\Omega_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)$ are

$$\Omega_{\lambda,0}(q,t) = (t^{m-n-1};q)_\lambda \tag{5.4}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and, displaying the (m,n) dependence,

$$\Omega^{(m,n)}_{\lambda\mu}(q,t) = \Omega^{(m-1,n-1)}_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)\, t^{|\mu|} \frac{(t^{n-1};q,t)_\mu}{(t^n;q,t)_\mu} \tag{5.5}$$

for $l(\lambda) \leqslant m-1$ and $l(\mu) \leqslant n-1$. Equation (5.4) follows from (5.1) and

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{(qt^{j-i+m-n-1};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}{(qt^{j-i+m-n};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}\bigg|_{\mu=0} = \frac{(qt^{m-n-1};q,t)_\lambda}{(qt^{m-1};q,t)_\lambda},$$

and (5.5) follows from (5.2) and

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{(qt^{j-i+m-n-1};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}{(qt^{j-i+m-n};q)_{\lambda_i-\mu_j}}\bigg|_{\lambda_m=\mu_n=0} = t^{|\mu|} \frac{(qt^{m-2};q,t)_\lambda}{(qt^{m-1};q,t)_\lambda} \frac{(t^{n-1};q,t)_\mu}{(t^n;q,t)_\mu}.$$

We can now state the main definition of this section.

Definition 5.1 ($\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series). Let $x=(x_1,\dots,x_m)$ and $y=(y_1,\dots,y_n)$ such that $0 \leqslant m \leqslant n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &{}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix} a_1,\dots,a_{r+1} \\ b_1,\dots,b_r \end{matrix}; q,t;x,y\right] \\ &\quad = \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i t^{m-n-1};q)_\infty} \sum_{\lambda,\mu} t^{n(\lambda)+n(\mu)} \frac{P_\lambda(x;q,t)}{c'_\lambda(q,t)} \frac{P_\mu(y;q,t)}{c'_\mu(q,t)} \frac{(a_1,\dots,a_{r+1};q,t)_\mu}{(b_1,\dots,b_r;q,t)_\mu} \Omega_{\lambda\mu}(q,t), \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where the sum is over partitions λ and μ such that $l(\lambda) \leqslant m$, $l(\mu) \leqslant n$ and

$$\lambda_i \geqslant \mu_{i-m+n} \quad \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m. \tag{5.7}$$

Remarks. (i) The restrictions on the sum may alternatively be expressed by the inequalities [TV03, Equation (2.4)]

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccc} & & & & \lambda_1 & \geqslant & \lambda_2 & \geqslant & \cdots & \geqslant & \lambda_m & & \\ & & & & \vee\!\!\!| & & \vee\!\!\!| & & & & \vee\!\!\!| & & \\ \mu_1 & \geqslant & \cdots & \geqslant & \mu_{n-m+1} & \geqslant & \mu_{n-m+2} & \geqslant & \cdots & \geqslant & \mu_n & \geqslant & 0. \end{array}$$

(ii) The prefactor

$$\prod_{i=1}^m \frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i t^{m-n-1};q)_\infty}$$

in the definition has been included to simplify subsequent formulae, and implies that for $a_1=1$ the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series simplifies to 1; see Lemma 5.2 below.

(iii) The main reason for attaching the label $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ to the series of Definition 5.1 is the connection with the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ discrete exponential and continuous Selberg integrals of Tarasov and Varchenko; for details, see below the proof of Proposition 5.2. We are currently developing a theory of $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ basic hypergeometric series [War07]. In such series, a Macdonald polynomial is attached to each vertex of the $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ Dynkin diagram, and the corresponding $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ q-binomial theorem may be expressed concisely in terms of the data of the underlying Lie algebra.

(iv) Finally we remark that nearly all our results involve non-terminating $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series. To ensure convergence we implicitly assume that

$$\max\{|q|,|t|,|x_1|,\dots,|x_m|,|y_1|,\dots,|y_n|\} < 1$$

whenever necessary.

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Our most important results for $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series are two generalizations of the q-binomial theorem. First, however, we state several elementary properties of the series. In all of the results below the parameters $a_1, \dots, a_{r+1}$ and $b_1, \dots, b_r$ act as dummies, and to shorten some of the equations we abbreviate these sequences by A and B respectively.

Lemma 5.1. *We have*

$$ {}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;x,(0^n)\right]=1. $$

Proof. Since $P_\mu((0^n);q,t)=\delta_{\mu,0}$ we get

$$ {}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;x,(0^n)\right]=\prod_{i=1}^m\frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(x_it^{m-n-1};q)_\infty}\sum_\lambda t^{n(\lambda)}\frac{P_\lambda(x;q,t)}{c'_\lambda(q,t)}\,\Omega_{\lambda,0}(q,t). $$

Thanks to (5.4) this is

$$ {}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;x,(0^n)\right]={}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix}t^{m-n-1}\\-\end{matrix};q,t;x\right]\prod_{i=1}^m\frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(x_it^{m-n-1};q)_\infty}, $$

where on the RHS we have used the definition in (2.23) of the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ Kaneko–Macdonald series. Summing the ${}_1\Phi_0$ series by the q-binomial theorem (2.24) results in the claim of the lemma. □

Lemma 5.2. *We have*

$$ {}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}1,a_2,\dots,a_{r+1}\\b_1,\dots,b_r\end{matrix};q,t;x,y\right]=1. $$

Proof. When $a_1=1$ the summand vanishes unless $\mu=0$. The proof is thus a repeat of the proof of Lemma 5.1. □

The next two lemmas relate $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series with labels (n,m) and $(n-1,m-1)$. Recall the notation introduced in § 3.

Lemma 5.3 (Stability 1). *With $u_{0;z}^{(n)}$ acting on y and $u_{0;tz}^{(n-1)}$ acting on $y^{(n)}$, we have*

$$ u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;(x^{(m)},0),y\right]\right)=u_{0;tz}^{(n-1)}\left({}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;x^{(m)},y^{(n)}\right]\right). $$

Lemma 5.4 (Stability 2). *We have*

$$ {}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t,(x^{(m)},0),(y^{(n)},0)\right]={}_{r+2}\Phi_{r+1}\left[\begin{matrix}t^{n-1},A\\t^n,B\end{matrix};q,t;x^{(m)},ty^{(n)}\right]. $$

Iterating the two types of stability leads to

$$ u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;(0^m),y\right]\right)=u_{0;t^mz}^{(n-m)}\left({}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;y^{(n-m+1,\dots,n)}\right]\right) $$

and

$$ {}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;(0^m),(y^{(n-m+1,\dots,n)},0^m)\right]={}_{r+2}\Phi_{r+1}\left[\begin{matrix}t^{n-m},A\\t^n,B\end{matrix};q,t;t^my^{(n-m+1,\dots,n)}\right]. $$

Note that both RHSs involve the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ Kaneko–Macdonald series.

Proof of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. Because we are comparing series for different (m,n) values, we write $\Omega_{\lambda\mu}^{(m,n)}$ instead of $\Omega_{\lambda\mu}$.

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If $x_m = 0$ only partitions of length strictly less than m contribute to the sum over λ. But if $\lambda_m = 0$ then the inequality $0 \leqslant \mu_n \leqslant \lambda_m$ implies that also $\mu_n = 0$. Hence we may use (5.5) and the homogeneity of the Macdonald polynomials to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&{}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix}; q, t; (x^{(m)}, 0), y\right]\\&\quad= \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i t^{m-n-1};q)_\infty} \sum_{\lambda,\mu} t^{n(\lambda)+n(\mu)} \frac{P_\lambda(x^{(m)};q,t)}{c'_\lambda(q,t)} \frac{P_\mu(ty;q,t)}{c'_\mu(q,t)} \frac{(t^{n-1},A;q,t)_\mu}{(t^n,B;q,t)_\mu} \Omega_{\lambda\mu}^{(m-1,n-1)}(q,t),\end{aligned}$$

where the sum is over partitions λ and μ such that $l(\lambda) \leqslant m-1$, $l(\mu) \leqslant n-1$ and

$$\lambda_i \geqslant \mu_{i-m+n} \quad \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m-1.$$

All terms on the RHS depend on $n-1$ and $m-1$ except for $P_\mu(ty;q,t)$, since $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$. Either we can make the obvious choice $y_n = 0$ and use the stability of the Macdonald polynomial, $P_\mu(t(y^{(n)},0);q,t) = P_\mu(ty^{(n)};q,t)$, to obtain Lemma 5.4, or we can specialize y. In the latter case we may use that, for $l(\mu) \leqslant n-1$,

$$u_{0;z}^{(n)}(P_\mu(y;q,t)) = u_{0;z}^{(n-1)}(P_\mu(y^{(n)};q,t)) \frac{(t^n;q,t)_\mu}{(t^{n-1};q,t)_\mu}, \tag{5.8}$$

as follows from (2.11). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix}; q, t; (x^{(m)}, 0), y\right]\right)\\&\quad= \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} \frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(x_i t^{m-n-1};q)_\infty} \sum_{\lambda,\mu} t^{n(\lambda)+n(\mu)} \frac{P_\lambda(x^{(m)};q,t)}{c'_\lambda(q,t)} \frac{u_{0;tz}(P_\mu(y^{(n-1)};q,t))}{c'_\mu(q,t)} \frac{(A;q,t)_\mu}{(B;q,t)_\mu} \Omega_{\lambda\mu}^{(m-1,n-1)}(q,t),\end{aligned}$$

in accordance with the RHS of Lemma 5.3. □

Our next result implies all four previous lemmas, but unlike the latter it is not elementary, requiring Theorem 4.1 for its proof.

PROPOSITION 5.1. *Fix σ as*

$$\sigma = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for Type I,} \\ 1 & \text{for Type II,} \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

and let $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ be given by

$$X_i = \begin{cases} q^{-\sigma} t^{-1} x_i & \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m, \\ t^{n-i} & \text{for } m+1 \leqslant i \leqslant n. \end{cases}$$

Then

$${}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right] = \sum_\mu t^{n(\mu)+m|\mu|} \frac{P_\mu(y;q,t) P_\mu(X;q,t)}{c'_\mu(q,t)\, u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)} \frac{(A;q,t)_\mu}{(B;q,t)_\mu}. \tag{5.10}$$

Note that by taking $y = (0^n)$ or $a_1 = 1$ the summand vanishes unless $\mu = 0$ leading to Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2. Also Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 immediately follow from the proposition be it that the latter also requires (5.8). For example, applying $u_{0;z}^{(n)}$ acting on y to (5.10) yields

$$u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right]\right) = \sum_\mu z^{|\mu|} t^{n(\mu)+m|\mu|} \frac{P_\mu(X;q,t)}{c'_\mu(q,t)} \frac{(A;q,t)_\mu}{(B;q,t)_\mu}.$$

Not only does this make Lemma 5.3 obvious but it in fact implies the following more general (and more important) result.

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

COROLLARY 5.1. *With the same notation as in Proposition 5.1 we have*

$$u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;x,y\right]\right)={}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;zt^mX\right]. \tag{5.11}$$

Note that on the RHS we have the $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ Kaneko–Macdonald series.

There is another important corollary of Proposition 5.1. If we take $m=n$ then

$$P_\mu(X;q,t)=q^{-\sigma|\mu|}t^{-|\mu|}P_\mu(x;q,t).$$

Hence for $m=n$ the series (5.10) is invariant under the interchange of x and y.

COROLLARY 5.2. *For $m=n$, i.e. $x=(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ and $y=(y_1,\dots,y_n)$, there holds*

$${}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;x,y\right]={}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;y,x\right].$$

Using the above two corollaries it is straightforward to prove several q-binomial theorems for $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series. First, however, we shall prove Proposition 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Recalling the definition in (5.3) and using (5.1), Theorem 4.1 may be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)&=\sum_{\omega,\nu}t^{n(\nu)-n(\lambda)+m|\mu|-|\omega|}f^\lambda_{\omega\nu}(q,t)c'_\lambda(q,t)\\&\quad\times\frac{V_{\nu,0}(u,1;q,t)}{V_{\nu,0}(q,t)}\frac{V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)}{V_{\lambda\mu}(u,1;q,t)}\frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega})}{u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)}\frac{(t^{m-n-1};q,t)_\nu}{c'_\nu(q,t)}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking $u=1$ or $u=t^{n-m+1}$, so that

$$\frac{V_{\nu,0}(u,1;q,t)}{V_{\nu,0}(q,t)}\frac{V_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)}{V_{\lambda\mu}(u,1;q,t)}\to q^{-\sigma(|\lambda|-|\nu|)},$$

and using that $f^\lambda_{\omega\nu}=0$ if $|\omega|+|\nu|\neq|\lambda|$, we obtain

$$\Omega_{\lambda\mu}(q,t)=\sum_{\omega,\nu}t^{n(\nu)-n(\lambda)+m|\mu|-|\omega|}q^{-\sigma|\omega|}f^\lambda_{\omega\nu}(q,t)\,c'_\lambda(q,t)\frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega})}{u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)}\frac{(t^{m-n-1};q,t)_\nu}{c'_\nu(q,t)}.$$

Substituting this in the definition (5.6) of the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ basic hypergeometric series leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&{}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;x,y\right]\\&\quad=\prod_{i=1}^m\frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(x_it^{m-n-1};q)_\infty}\sum_{\lambda,\mu,\nu,\omega}t^{n(\mu)+n(\nu)+m|\mu|-|\omega|}q^{-\sigma|\omega|}\\&\qquad\times\frac{P_\mu(y;q,t)}{c'_\mu(q,t)}\frac{(A;q,t)_\mu}{(B;q,t)_\mu}\frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega})}{u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)}\frac{(t^{m-n-1};q,t)_\nu}{c'_\nu(q,t)}f^\lambda_{\omega\nu}(q,t)P_\lambda(x;q,t).\end{aligned}$$

Now performing the sum over λ by (2.18) yields

$$\begin{aligned}&{}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix}A\\B\end{matrix};q,t;x,y\right]\\&=\prod_{i=1}^m\frac{(x_i;q)_\infty}{(x_it^{m-n-1};q)_\infty}\sum_{\mu,\nu,\omega}t^{n(\mu)+n(\nu)+m|\mu|-|\omega|}q^{-\sigma|\omega|}\frac{P_\mu(y;q,t)}{c'_\mu(q,t)}\frac{(A;q,t)_\mu}{(B;q,t)_\mu}\frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega})}{u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)}\\&\quad\times\frac{(t^{m-n-1};q,t)_\nu}{c'_\nu(q,t)}P_\nu(x;q,t)P_\omega(x;q,t).\end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The next simplification arises by noting that the sum over ν corresponds to a summable $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ Kaneko–Macdonald series:

$$ {}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix} qt^{m-n-1} \\ - \end{matrix}; q, t; x\right] = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(x_i t^{m-n-1}; q)_\infty}{(x_i; q)_\infty} $$

by (2.23) and (2.24). Hence

$$ {}_{r+1}\Phi_r\left[\begin{matrix} A \\ B \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right] = \sum_{\mu,\omega} t^{n(\mu)+m|\mu|-|\omega|} q^{-\sigma|\omega|} \frac{P_\mu(y;q,t)}{c'_\mu(q,t)} \frac{(A;q,t)_\mu}{(B;q,t)_\mu} \frac{u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega})}{u_0^{(n)}(P_\mu)} P_\omega(x;q,t). $$

Next we use the homogeneity (2.7) of P_ω, the definition (2.10) of the principal specialization $u_0^{(n-m)}$ and the definition (2.22) of the skew Macdonald polynomials to perform the sum over ω:

$$ \begin{aligned} \sum_\omega (q^\sigma t)^{-|\omega|} u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) P_\omega(x;q,t) &= \sum_\omega u_0^{(n-m)}(P_{\mu/\omega}) P_\omega(q^{-\sigma}t^{-1}x;q,t) \\ &= P_\mu(X;q,t), \end{aligned} $$

where $X = (q^{-\sigma}t^{-1}x, t^{n-m-1}, \ldots, t, 1)$. The resulting identity is (5.10). □

From Corollary 5.1 it is clear that whenever an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ series is summable this implies a corresponding sum for $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series. The most obvious choice is to set $r=0$ in Corollary 5.1 so that the RHS of (5.11) may be summed by the Kaneko–Macdonald q-binomial theorem (2.24). Hence we get

$$ \begin{aligned} u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix} a \\ - \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right]\right) &= \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(azt^m X_i; q)_\infty}{(zt^m X_i; q)_\infty} \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(azq^{-\sigma}t^{m-1}x_i; q)_\infty}{(zq^{-\sigma}t^{m-1}x_i; q)_\infty} \prod_{i=m+1}^{n} \frac{(azt^{m+n-i}; q)_\infty}{(zt^{m+n-i}; q)_\infty}. \end{aligned} $$

THEOREM 5.1 (First $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ q-binomial theorem). *For $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $y = z(1, t, \ldots, t^{n-1})$ we have*

$$ {}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix} a \\ - \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right] = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(azt^{m-1}x_i; q)_\infty}{(zt^{m-1}x_i; q)_\infty} \prod_{i=1}^{n-m} \frac{(azt^{n-i}; q)_\infty}{(zt^{n-i}; q)_\infty} $$

for the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series of Type I, and

$$ {}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix} a \\ - \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right] = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(azq^{-1}t^{m-1}x_i; q)_\infty}{(zq^{-1}t^{m-1}x_i; q)_\infty} \prod_{i=1}^{n-m} \frac{(azt^{n-i}; q)_\infty}{(zt^{n-i}; q)_\infty} $$

for the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series of Type II.

If we assume that $m=n$, then we may first invoke the symmetry of Corollary 5.2 to find a second pair of q-binomial theorems.

THEOREM 5.2 (Second $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ q-binomial theorem). *For $x = z(1, t, \ldots, t^{n-1})$ and $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)$ we have*

$$ {}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix} a \\ - \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right] = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(azt^{n-1}y_i; q)_\infty}{(zt^{n-1}y_i; q)_\infty} $$

for the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series of Type I, and

$$ {}_1\Phi_0\left[\begin{matrix} a \\ - \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right] = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(azq^{-1}t^{n-1}y_i; q)_\infty}{(zq^{-1}t^{n-1}y_i; q)_\infty} $$

for the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series of Type II.

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Using further results for $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ Kaneko–Macdonald series, many more identities for $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ series may be proved, such as q-Gauss sums, q-Saalschütz sums, etc. Below we restrict ourselves to just one further application in the form of an $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ analogue of Heine's q-Euler transformation.

Proposition 5.2. *Let σ be fixed as in (5.9), and let $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $y = z(1, t, \ldots, t^{n-1})$. Then we have*

$$ {}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right] = {}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} c/a, c/b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; x, aby/c\right] \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(abzq^{-\sigma}t^{m-1}x_i/c;q)_\infty}{(zq^{-\sigma}t^{m-1}x_i;q)_\infty} \prod_{i=1}^{n-m} \frac{(abzt^{n-i}/c;q)_\infty}{(zt^{n-i};q)_\infty}. $$

For $b = c$ the ${}_2\Phi_1$ on the RHS is 1 by Lemma 5.2 and we recover the q-binomial theorem of Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. According to (5.1) we get

$$ u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right]\right) = {}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; zt^m X\right]. $$

In [BF99, Proposition 3.1] Baker and Forrester proved that

$$ {}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; x\right] = {}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} c/a, c/b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; \frac{abx}{c}\right] \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(abx_i/c;q)_\infty}{(x_i;q)_\infty}, $$

so that we get

$$ u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right]\right) = {}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} c/a, c/b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; \frac{abzt^m X}{c}\right] \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(abzt^m X_i/c;q)_\infty}{(zt^m X_i;q)_\infty}. $$

Again using (5.11) gives

$$ u_{0;z}^{(n)}\left({}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} a, b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right]\right) = u_{0;abz/c}^{(n)}\left({}_2\Phi_1\left[\begin{matrix} c/a, c/b \\ c \end{matrix}; q, t; x, y\right]\right) \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(abzt^m X_i/c;q)_\infty}{(zt^m X_i;q)_\infty}. $$

Eliminating X_i completes the proof of Proposition 5.2. □

Theorem 5.1 may be viewed as a q, t, x-analogue of a result of Tarasov and Varchenko, stated in [TV03, Theorem 2.3] as an $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ discrete exponential Selberg integral. To obtain the Tarasov–Varchenko result we take $t = q^\gamma$ and $a = q^{\beta+\gamma(n-1)}$ in the theorem, and let q tend to 1^-. A standard computation using (2.4) and (2.11) then leads to

$$ \begin{aligned} &\sum_{\lambda,\mu} z^{|\mu|} v_{\lambda\mu}(\gamma) \frac{P_\lambda^{(1/\gamma)}(x)}{P_\lambda^{(1/\gamma)}(1^m)} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma(\beta+\tilde{\mu}_i)}{\Gamma(1+\tilde{\mu}_i)} \prod_{i=1}^{m}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma(1-\gamma+\tilde{\lambda}_i-\tilde{\mu}_j)}{\Gamma(1+\tilde{\lambda}_i-\tilde{\mu}_j)} \\ &\quad\times \prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} \frac{(\tilde{\mu}_i-\tilde{\mu}_j)\Gamma(\gamma+\tilde{\mu}_i-\tilde{\mu}_j)}{\Gamma(1-\gamma+\tilde{\mu}_i-\tilde{\mu}_j)} \prod_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant m} \frac{(\tilde{\lambda}_i-\tilde{\lambda}_j)\Gamma(\gamma+\tilde{\lambda}_i-\tilde{\lambda}_j)}{\Gamma(1-\gamma+\tilde{\lambda}_i-\tilde{\lambda}_j)} \\ &= (1-z)^{-(\beta+(n-1)\gamma)(n-m)} \prod_{i=1}^{m} (1-zx_i)^{-\beta-\gamma(n-1)}(1-x_i)^{-\gamma(m-n-1)} \\ &\quad\times \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma(i\gamma)\Gamma(\beta+\gamma(i-1))}{\Gamma(\gamma)} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\Gamma(i\gamma)\Gamma(1+\gamma(i-n-1))}{\Gamma(\gamma)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12} $$

Here

$$ \tilde{\lambda}_i = \lambda_i + \gamma(m-i) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}_i = \mu_i + \gamma(n-i), $$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$P^{(\alpha)}_\lambda(x)$ is the Jack polynomial

$$P^{(\alpha)}_\lambda(x) = \lim_{t\to 1} P_\lambda(x; t^\alpha, t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\lambda\mu}(\gamma) &= \lim_{q\to 1} V_{\lambda\mu}(q, q^\gamma) \\ &= \sum_{I\subseteq[m]} (-1)^{|I|} \prod_{\substack{i\in I\\ j\in \bar{I}}} \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_j - \tilde{\lambda}_i + \gamma}{\tilde{\lambda}_j - \tilde{\lambda}_i} \prod_{i\in I}\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\tilde{\lambda}_i - \tilde{\mu}_j}{\tilde{\lambda}_i - \tilde{\mu}_j - \gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $x = (w^m)$ and using the homogeneity of the Jack polynomials (so that $P^{(1/\gamma)}_\mu(w^m) = w^{|\mu|}P^{(1/\gamma)}_\mu(1^m)$) results in the Tarasov–Varchenko identity. To make the correspondence exact we need to recall the difference in normalization exhibited in (3.14), and the fact that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{m} \Gamma(1 + \gamma(i - n - 1)) = \frac{(-\gamma)^m n!}{(n-m)!} \prod_{i=1}^{m} \Gamma(\gamma(i - n - 1)).$$

It is interesting to note that Tarasov and Varchenko obtained the $x = (w^m)$ instance of the series (5.12) as the coordinate function of the hypergeometric solution of the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ dynamical differential equation of [TV02] with values in the weight subspace $L_\lambda[\lambda - n\alpha_1 - m\alpha_2]$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\Lambda_1$. Here L_λ is an irreducible $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ highest weight module of weight λ, and α_i and Λ_i ($i = 1, 2$) are the roots and fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{sl}_3$. The existence of identities such as (5.12) (with $x = (w^m)$) and their associated integral evaluations was anticipated by Mukhin and Varchenko, who formulated a very general conjecture regarding $\mathfrak{g}$ type Selberg integrals being expressible in terms of products of gamma functions [MV00, Conjecture 1].

By a standard limiting procedure the sum (5.12) (with $x = (w^m)$) may be transformed into an integral, leading to the $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ exponential Selberg integral of [TV03, Theorem 3.1]. More generally, if we first transform Theorem 5.1 into a q-integral and then take the $q \to 1^-$ limit we get a more general $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integral, not contained in [TV03]. More precisely, we take Theorem 5.1 (for Type I series) and apply the homomorphism $u^{(m)}_{\nu;w}$ acting on x. Thanks to (2.12) and (2.14) this yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\lambda,\mu} w^{|\lambda|} z^{|\mu|} t^{n(\lambda)+n(\mu)} u^{(n)}_\lambda(P_\nu)\,(a; q, t)_\mu \Omega_{\lambda\mu}(q, t) \frac{u^{(n)}_0(P_\lambda)}{c'_\lambda(q, t)} \frac{u_0(P_\mu)}{c'_\mu(q, t)} \\ &\quad = u^{(n)}_0(P_\nu) \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{(awzt^{2m-i-1}q^{\nu_i}; q)_\infty}{(zt^{2m-i-1}wq^{\nu_i}; q)_\infty} \frac{(wt^{2m-n-i-1}q^{\nu_i}; q)_\infty}{(wt^{m-i}q^{\nu_i}; q)_\infty} \prod_{i=1}^{n-m} \frac{(azt^{n-i}; q)_\infty}{(zt^{n-i}; q)_\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we replace $(a, w, z, t) \to (q^{(n-1)\gamma+\alpha}, q^{\beta_1}, q^{\beta_2 - m\gamma}, q^\gamma)$ and use the definition of the q-gamma function to interpret this as an $(m+n)$-dimensional q-integral. Taking the limit $q \to 1$ then yields an $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integral involving the Jack polynomial. The precise details of this essentially elementary calculation will be given in a future paper in which more general Selberg-type integrals will be considered.

To give the exact form of the integral we need to borrow some notation from [TV03]. Let M be a map

$$M : \{1, \ldots, m\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$$

such that

$$M(i) \leqslant M(i + 1)$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and

$$1 \leqslant M(i) \leqslant n-m+i.$$

It is easily seen that there are exactly

$$\frac{n-m+1}{n+1}\binom{m+n}{m}$$

admissible maps M.

Let $D^{m,n}[0,1] \subseteq [0,1]^{m+n}$ be defined as the set of points

$$P=(x_1,\dots,x_m,y_1,\dots,y_n)$$

such that

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccc} & & & & 0 & \leqslant & x_1 & \leqslant & x_2 & \leqslant & \cdots & \leqslant & x_m \\ & & & & & & \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\geqslant$}} & & \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\geqslant$}} & & & & \text{\rotatebox{90}{$\geqslant$}} \\ 0 & \leqslant & y_1 & \leqslant & \cdots & \leqslant & y_{n-m+1} & \leqslant & y_{n-m+2} & \leqslant & \cdots & \leqslant & y_n. \end{array} \tag{5.13}$$

The x as well as the y coordinates $P \in D^{m,n}[0,1]$ are totally ordered, but only a partial order exists between the x_i and the y_j. We now write $D^{m,n}[0,1]$ as a chain,

$$D^{m,n}[0,1]=\sum_M D_M^{m,n}[0,1],$$

where $D_M^{m,n}[0,1] \subseteq D^{m,n}[0,1]$ is defined by points P endowed with a total ordering among its coordinates, by supplementing (5.13) with

$$y_{M(i)-1} \leqslant x_i \leqslant y_{M_s(i)} \quad \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m,$$

where $y_0 := 0$. We further define the chain

$$C_\gamma^{m,n}[0,1]=\sum_M F_M^{m,n}(\gamma) D_M^{m,n}[0,1], \tag{5.14}$$

where

$$F_M^{m,n}(\gamma)=\prod_{i=1}^m \frac{\sin(\pi(i+n-m-M(i)+1)\gamma)}{\sin(\pi(i+n-m)\gamma)}.$$

Up to a trivial transformation (corresponding to the variable change (5.15)), the above chains coincide with those of [TV03].

Finally introducing the Pochhammer symbol

$$(a)_N=a(a+1)\cdots(a+N-1)$$

and recalling the definition in (3.15), we are in a position to state the integral analogue of Theorem 5.1.

COROLLARY 5.3 ($\mathfrak{sl}_3$ Selberg integral). *Let ν be a partition of at most m parts. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int\limits_{C_\gamma^{m,n}[0,1]} P_\nu^{(1/\gamma)}(x) h(x,y) \prod_{i=1}^m x_i^{\beta_1-1} \prod_{i=1}^n (1-y_i)^{\alpha-1} y_i^{\beta_2-1} |\Delta(x)|^{2\gamma} |\Delta(y)|^{2\gamma} \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n |x_i-y_j|^{-\gamma} \, \mathrm{d}x \, \mathrm{d}y \\ &= \prod_{1 \leqslant i<j \leqslant m} \frac{((j-i+1)\gamma)_{\nu_i-\nu_j}}{((j-i)\gamma)_{\nu_i-\nu_j}} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+(i-1)\gamma)\Gamma(i\gamma)}{\Gamma(\gamma)} \prod_{i=1}^{n-m} \frac{\Gamma(\beta_2+(i-1)\gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta_2+(i+n-2)\gamma)} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{\Gamma(\beta_1+(m-i)\gamma+\nu_i)\Gamma(\beta_1+\beta_2+(m-i-1)\gamma+\nu_i)\Gamma((i-n-1)\gamma)\Gamma(i\gamma)}{\Gamma(\beta_1+(2m-n-i-1)\gamma+\nu_i)\Gamma(\alpha+\beta_1+\beta_2+(m+n-i-2)\gamma+\nu_i)\Gamma(\gamma)}, \end{aligned}$$

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where

$$\begin{gathered}\mathrm{Re}(\alpha)>0, \quad \mathrm{Re}(\beta_1)>0, \quad \mathrm{Re}(\beta_2)>0, \\ -\min\biggl\{\frac{1}{n}, \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\alpha)}{n-1}, \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\beta_1)}{m-1}, \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\beta_2)}{n-m-1}, \frac{\mathrm{Re}(\beta_1+\beta_2)}{m-2}\biggr\} < \mathrm{Re}(\gamma) < 0.\end{gathered}$$

The conditions on α, β_1, β_2 and γ (which are only sharp when $\nu = 0$) are valid for generic n and m and need small modifications when $m = 0, 1$ or $m = n$. The conditions are correct for $n = 1$, $m = 2$ or $n = m + 1$ provided $1/0$ is interpreted as $+\infty$. Conditions that are sharp follow by demanding that the arguments of gamma functions appearing in the numerator on the RHS have positive real part. We also note that without loss of generality one may assume that ν has at most $m - 1$ parts, since

$$P_{(\nu_1,\dots,\nu_m)}(x) = (x_1 \cdots x_m)^{\nu_n} P_{(\nu_1-\nu_m,\dots,\nu_{m-1}-\nu_m,0)}(x),$$

so that ν_n may be eliminated by a rescaling of β_1.

For $m = 0$ Corollary 5.3 is the Selberg integral (1.3) up to some trivial changes. Indeed for $m = 0$ we get, after replacing β_2 by β,

$$\int\limits_{0\leqslant y_1\leqslant\ldots\leqslant y_n\leqslant 1} |\Delta(y)|^{2\gamma} \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1-y_i)^{\alpha-1} y_i^{\beta-1}\,\mathrm{d}y = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+(i-1)\gamma)\Gamma(\beta+(i-1)\gamma)\Gamma(i\gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta+(i+n-2)\gamma)\Gamma(\gamma)}.$$

Since the integrand is symmetric in y and

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma(i\gamma)}{\Gamma(\gamma)} = \frac{1}{n!} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma(i\gamma+1)}{\Gamma(\gamma+1)},$$

this yields (1.3) with α and β interchanged. (Alternatively, one may replace $y_i \to 1 - y_i$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$ instead of replacing $\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta$.)

When $\nu = 0$ all reference to the Jack polynomial $P_\nu^{1/\gamma}(x)$ disappears from Corollary 5.3 and we obtain the Tarasov–Varchenko integral (1.5). To make the connection with the integral of [TV03] precise one needs to replace

$$\begin{aligned} x_i &\to 1 - s_i, & y_i &\to 1 - t_i, \\ n &\to k_1, & m &\to k_2, \\ \alpha &\to \alpha + 1, & \beta_1 &\leftrightarrow \beta_2, \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

and observe that

$$h(1-s, 1-t) = (-1)^{k_2}\, \tilde{h}_{k_1,k_2,k_2}(t; s) \prod_{i=1}^{k_1} t_i^{-1},$$

where $\tilde{h}_{l_1,l_2,m}(t; s)$ is the function defined in [TV03, § 5]. Then correcting a factor $(-1)^{k_2}$ missing in [TV03] one obtains the integral

$$\tilde{J}_{k_1,k_2,k_2}(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma)$$

given by the final two equations of that paper.

For $\nu = (1^r)$ the Jack polynomial simplifies to the elementary symmetric function

$$P_{(1^r)}(x) = e_r(x) = \sum_{1\leqslant i_1<i_2<\cdots<i_r\leqslant m} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}$$

and Corollary 5.3 yields an $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ version of Aomoto's integral [Aom95].

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Corollary 5.4. *For $0 \leqslant r \leqslant m$, we have*

$$\int_{C_\gamma^{m,n}[0,1]} e_r(x)h(x,y)\prod_{i=1}^m x_i^{\beta_1-1}\prod_{i=1}^n (1-y_i)^{\alpha-1}y_i^{\beta_2-1}|\Delta(x)|^{2\gamma}|\Delta(y)|^{2\gamma}\prod_{i=1}^m\prod_{j=1}^n |x_i-y_j|^{-\gamma}\,\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y$$

$$= \binom{m}{r}\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\Gamma(\alpha+(i-1)\gamma)\Gamma(i\gamma)}{\Gamma(\gamma)}\prod_{i=1}^{n-m}\frac{\Gamma(\beta_2+(i-1)\gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta_2+(i+n-2)\gamma)}$$

$$\times\prod_{i=1}^m\biggl(\frac{\Gamma(\beta_1+(m-i)\gamma+\chi(i\leqslant r))}{\Gamma(\beta_1+(2m-n-i-1)\gamma+\chi(i\leqslant r))}$$

$$\times\frac{\Gamma(\beta_1+\beta_2+(m-i-1)\gamma+\chi(i\leqslant r))\Gamma((i-n-1)\gamma)\Gamma(i\gamma)}{\Gamma(\alpha+\beta_1+\beta_2+(m+n-i-2)\gamma+\chi(i\leqslant r))\Gamma(\gamma)}\biggr),$$

where

$$\mathrm{Re}(\alpha)>0,\quad \mathrm{Re}(\beta_1)>0,\quad \mathrm{Re}(\beta_2)>0,$$
$$-\min\biggl\{\frac{1}{n},\frac{\mathrm{Re}(\alpha)}{n-1},\frac{\mathrm{Re}(\beta_1)}{m-1},\frac{\mathrm{Re}(\beta_2)}{n-m-1},\frac{\mathrm{Re}(\beta_1+\beta_2)}{m-2}\biggr\}<\mathrm{Re}(\gamma)<0,$$

and $\chi(\text{true})=1$, $\chi(\text{false})=0$.

The comments made immediately after Corollary 5.3 still apply.

Acknowledgements

I am much indebted to Michael Schlosser for very helpful discussions and for pointing out the significance of [KN99] for our work.

References

AAR99 G. E. Andrews, R. Askey and R. Roy, *Special functions*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, vol. 71 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).

Aom95 K. Aomoto, *Connection formulas of the q-analog de Rham cohomology*, in *Functional Analysis on the Eve of the 21st Century*, vol. 1, eds S. Gindikin *et al.*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 131 (Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 1995), 1–12.

BF99 T. H. Baker and P. J. Forrester, *Transformation formulas for multivariable basic hypergeometric series*, Methods Appl. Anal. **6** (1999), 147–164.

BS98 G. Bhatnagar and M. Schlosser, *C_n and D_n very-well-poised ${}_{10}\phi_9$ transformations*, Constr. Approx. **14** (1998), 531–567.

Bre99 D. M. Bressoud, *Proofs and confirmations – The story of the alternating sign matrix conjecture* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).

GR04 G. Gasper and M. Rahman, *Basic hypergeometric series*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, vol. 35, second edition (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).

GK96 R. A. Gustafson and C. Krattenthaler, *Heine transformations for a new kind of basic hypergeometric series in $U(n)$*, J. Comput. Math. Appl. **68** (1996), 151–158.

Ize87 A. G. Izergin, *Partition function of a six-vertex model in a finite volume*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **297** (1987), 331–333.

Kan96 J. Kaneko, *q-Selberg integrals and Macdonald polynomials*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **29** (1996), 583–637.

KN99 A. N. Kirillov and M. Noumi, *q-Difference raising operators for Macdonald polynomials and the integrality of transition coefficients*, in *Algebraic methods and q-special functions*, CRM Proceedings and Lecture Notes, vol. 22 (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999), 227–243.

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kor82 V. E. Korepin, *Calculation of norms of Bethe wave functions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **86** (1982), 391–418.

Kra99 C. Krattenthaler, *Advanced determinant calculus*, Sém. Lothar. Combin. **42** (1999), Art. B42q, 41 pp.

Kup96 G. Kuperberg, *Another proof of the alternating-sign matrix conjecture*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (1996), 139–150.

Las99 A. Lascoux, *Square-ice enumeration*, Sém. Lothar. Combin. **42** (1999), Art. B42p, 15 pp.

Mac95 I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, second edition (Oxford University Press, New York, 1995).

Mac I. G. Macdonald, *Hypergeometric series II*, unpublished manuscript.

Mil85 S. C. Milne, *An elementary proof of the Macdonald identities for* $A_l^{(1)}$, Adv. Math. **57** (1985), 34–70.

Mil92 S. C. Milne, *Summation theorems for basic hypergeometric series of Schur function argument*, in *Progress in approximation theory*, eds A. A. Gonchar and E. B. Saff, Springer Series in Computational Mathematics, vol. 19 (Springer, New York, 1992), 51–77.

Mil97 S. C. Milne, *Balanced* ${}_3\phi_2$ *summation theorems for* $U(n)$ *basic hypergeometric series*, Adv. Math. **131** (1997), 93–187.

ML95 S. C. Milne and G. M. Lilly, *Consequences of the* A_ℓ *and* C_ℓ *Bailey transform and Bailey lemma*, Discrete Math. **139** (1995), 319–346.

MV00 E. Mukhin and A. Varchenko, *Remarks on critical points of phase functions and norms of Bethe vectors*, Adv. Stud. Pure Math. **27** (2000), 239–246.

Sel44 A. Selberg, *Bemerkninger om et multipelt integral*, Norske Mat. Tidsskr. **26** (1944), 71–78.

TV02 V. Tarasov and A. Varchenko, *Duality for Knizhnik–Zamolodchikov and dynamical equations*, Acta Appl. Math. **73** (2002), 141–154.

TV03 V. Tarasov and A. Varchenko, *Selberg-type integrals associated with* $\mathfrak{sl}_3$, Lett. Math. Phys. **65** (2003), 173–185.

War05 S. O. Warnaar, *q-Selberg integrals and Macdonald polynomials*, Ramanujan J. **10** (2005), 237–268.

War07 S. O. Warnaar, *A Selberg integral for the Lie algebra* A_n, Preprint (2007), arXiv:0708.1193.

S. Ole Warnaar warnaar@ms.unimelb.edu.au
Department of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia

https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X07003211 Published online by Cambridge University Press