IV. An Introduction to Symmetric Functions.

THE RING OF SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

There is a fair amount of algebraic machinery to be developed, but eventually we will see some quite amazing generating function identities proved by combinatorial methods. After that we’ll see an application of these ideas to prove a theorem which, on the face of it, has nothing to do with symmetric functions. (Although there are very strong and important links between symmetric functions and the representation theory of the symmetric and general linear groups, I will say very little about this.)

To begin with, consider the ring $R_n := \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ of polynomials in $n$ variables with integer coefficients. The symmetric group $S_n$ acts on $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ by permutation: for $\sigma \in S_n$ let $\sigma(x_i) := x_{\sigma(i)}$. This action is extended linearly and multiplicatively to all of $R_n$: for a polynomial $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in R_n$ we let $(\sigma(f))(x_1, \ldots, x_n) := f(x_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, x_{\sigma(n)})$.

A polynomial $f \in R_n$ is said to be symmetric if $\sigma(f) = f$ for all $\sigma \in S_n$. The set of all symmetric polynomials in $R_n$ is denoted by $\Lambda_n := \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]^{S_n}$.

Exercise: Check that $\Lambda_n$ is closed under addition and multiplication, and hence forms a subring of $R_n$, the ring of symmetric functions in $n$ variables.

Exercise: Check that the “Rayleigh operator” defined by

$$R(f) := \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \sigma(f)$$

for $f \in R_n$ is a linear transformation $R : R_n \rightarrow \Lambda_n \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. (The tensor product with $\mathbb{Q}$ just means that we allow rational coefficients.) Is this a ring homomorphism?

It is profitable to consider all the rings $\{\Lambda_n : n \geq 1\}$ simultaneously as specializations of one “limiting object” $\Lambda$, for it is in this limiting case that the proofs become most uniform and special cases are avoided. I shall gloss some details in my treatment – although they are not difficult – as I do not wish to dwell on foundations. For a complete and precise (and concise) treatment, see pp.10-12 of Macdonald. For any $m \geq n$ there is a ring homomorphism $R_m : R_n \rightarrow R_n$ defined by setting $x_i = 0$ for all $n < i \leq m$; restriction of this to the subring $\Lambda_m$ defines a ring homomorphism $\rho_{m,n} : \Lambda_m \rightarrow \Lambda_n$.

Exercise: Check that if $f \in \Lambda_m$ then $\rho_{m,n}(f) \in \Lambda_n$.

It is clear that if $m \geq n \geq p$ then $\rho_{p,n} \circ \rho_{m,n} = \rho_{m,p}$. Macdonald takes some additional care to show that $\rho_{m,n}$ is always surjective, and moreover if $m \geq n \geq k$ and $\rho_{m,n}$ is restricted to $\Lambda_k^m$, the space of symmetric functions in $m$ variables which are homogeneous polynomials of degree $k$, then $\rho_{m,n}^k : \Lambda_k^m \rightarrow \Lambda_k^n$ is bijective. (Here, the notation $\rho_{m,n}^k$ just means the restriction of $\rho_{m,n}$ to $\Lambda_k^m$.) The symmetric functions which are homogeneous of degree $k$ are formed by taking the the “inverse limit” of $\{\Lambda_n^k : n \geq 1\}$ with respect to
the homomorphisms \( \rho_{m,n}^k : m \geq n \geq 1 \). The notation is
\[
\Lambda^k := \lim_{\leftarrow} \Lambda_n^k.
\]
What it means is this: an element of \( \Lambda^k \) is an infinite sequence \( f = (f_n : n \geq 1) \) with \( f_n \in \Lambda_n^k \) and such that for all \( m \geq n \), \( \rho_{m,n}^k (f_m) = f_n \). The ring of symmetric functions is the direct sum of these homogeneous pieces:
\[
\Lambda := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \Lambda^k.
\]
Notice that since this is a direct sum, any \( f \in \Lambda \) can be written (uniquely) as a finite sum of symmetric functions of homogeneous degree: \( f = f_0 + f_1 + \cdots + f_t \) with \( f_k \in \Lambda^k \) for each \( 0 \leq k \leq t \).

**Exercise:** Check that \( \Lambda \) is a ring.

This is perhaps a rather forbidding definition. In fact, it is best to think of a symmetric function as an infinite sum of monomials in infinitely many indeterminates \( \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\} \) which is invariant under all permutations of the variables, and which has an upper bound on the degrees of the monomials which appear in it. As I hope to make clear, in practice the animals which live in \( \Lambda \) form a rich mathematical ecosystem and are not at all the intimidating beasts they might seem to be at first sight.

**MONOMIAL SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS**

Our goal in this section is to find a basis for \( \Lambda \) over the integers; that is, a subset \( \mathcal{B} \subseteq \Lambda \) such that every symmetric function can be expressed uniquely as a finite \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combination of elements of \( \mathcal{B} \).

Let \( \mathbb{P} := \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\} \) and \( \mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \). An exponent vector is a function \( \alpha : \mathbb{P} \to \mathbb{N} \) such that \( |\alpha| := \alpha(1) + \alpha(2) + \cdots \) is finite. The monomial associated to an exponent vector \( \alpha \) is
\[
x^{\alpha} := x_1^{\alpha(1)} x_2^{\alpha(2)} \cdots,
\]
which is a finite product. A partition is an exponent vector \( \lambda \) which is weakly decreasing: \( \lambda(1) \geq \lambda(2) \geq \cdots \). Traditionally, the notation for a partition is
\[
\lambda : \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_k > 0,
\]
the \( \lambda_i \) are the parts of \( \lambda \), and \( k \) is called the length of \( \lambda \), denoted by \( \ell(\lambda) \). The multiplicity vector of \( \lambda \) is \( \mathbf{m}(\lambda) := \langle m_1, m_2, \ldots \rangle \) in which, for each \( j \in \mathbb{P} \), \( m_j(\lambda) := \# \{ i : \lambda_i = j \} \) denotes the number of parts of \( \lambda \) which are equal to \( j \); that is, \( m_j(\lambda) \) is the multiplicity of \( j \) as a part of \( \lambda \).

**Exercise:** For any given \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), there are only finitely many partitions \( \lambda \) with \( |\lambda| = n \).
In fact, if \( p(n) \) denotes the number of partitions with \(|\lambda| = n\) then
\[
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p(n)x^n = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1-x^j}.
\]
(This is from C&O 330.)

Let \( S_\infty := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} S_n \) be the (little) infinite symmetric group. It is “little” in the sense that the elements of \( S_\infty \) are all those bijections from \( \mathbb{P} \) to \( \mathbb{P} \) which leave fixed all but finitely many elements of \( \mathbb{P} \). The “big” infinite symmetric group \( S_\infty \) consists of all bijections from \( \mathbb{P} \) to \( \mathbb{P} \). Certainly \( S_\infty \) is a subgroup of \( S_\infty \).

**Exercise:** The cardinality of \( S_\infty \) is \( \aleph_0 \), while the cardinality of \( S_\infty \) is \( 2^{\aleph_0} \), so “little” and “big” are appropriate adjectives.

The big infinite symmetric group acts on the set of indeterminates \( \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\} \) by permutation: for \( \sigma \in S_\infty \) we have \( \sigma(x_i) := x_{\sigma(i)} \) for all \( i \in \mathbb{P} \). This extends to an action on the set of monomials:
\[
\sigma(x^\alpha) = \sigma(x_1^{\alpha(1)} x_2^{\alpha(2)} \cdots) := x_{\sigma(1)}^{\alpha(1)} x_{\sigma(2)}^{\alpha(2)} \cdots.
\]

**Exercise:** Notice that the corresponding action of \( S_\infty \) on exponent vectors, such that \( \sigma(x^\alpha) = x^{\sigma(\alpha)} \), is given by \( (\sigma(\alpha))(i) := \alpha(\sigma^{-1}(i)) \).

The action of \( S_\infty \) on monomials is extended \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linearly to all formal \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combinations \( f = \sum_{\alpha} c_\alpha x^\alpha \) of monomials. Such an expression \( f \) is said to be invariant under a permutation \( \sigma \in S_\infty \) provided that \( \sigma(f) = f \), and is said to be symmetric if it is invariant under all permutations in \( S_\infty \).

**Exercise:** Let \( f = \sum_{\alpha} c_\alpha x^\alpha \) be an infinite \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear sum of monomials. Show that if \( f \) is invariant under all permutations in \( S_\infty \) then \( f \) is invariant under all permutations in \( S_\infty \).

(The converse to this exercise is trivial.) This shows that for symmetric functions we can forget about invariance under most of \( S_\infty \) and just use \( S_\infty \) instead.

For each exponent vector \( \alpha \) there is exactly one partition \( \lambda \) such that \( \alpha \) may be converted to \( \lambda \) by applying some permutation in \( S_\infty \). (It is obtained by listing the values of \( \alpha \) in weakly decreasing order, each with the appropriate multiplicity.) In other words, the set of all orbits of \( S_\infty \) acting on the set of exponent vectors (or on the set of monomials) corresponds bijectively with the set of all partitions. The unique partition in the \( S_\infty \)-orbit of \( \alpha \) is called the shape of \( \alpha \), and is denoted by \( \text{sh}(\alpha) \).

Now suppose that \( f = \sum_{\alpha} c_\alpha x^\alpha \) is a symmetric function in \( \Lambda \). Since \( f \) is a finite sum of its homogeneous pieces \( f = f_0 + \cdots + f_t \), we can deal with each homogeneous piece separately; so suppose that \( f \) is homogeneous of degree \( n \), say. Let \( x^\alpha \) be a monomial which occurs in \( f \) with coefficient \( c_\alpha \neq 0 \), so \( |\alpha| = n \). Since \( f \) is invariant under all the permutations in \( S_\infty \), every monomial \( x^\beta \) in the \( S_\infty \)-orbit of \( \alpha \) occurs in \( f \) with the same coefficient \( c_\beta = c_\alpha \). In particular, if \( \lambda = \text{sh}(\alpha) \) then \( x^\lambda \) occurs in \( f \) with coefficient \( c_\lambda = c_\alpha \).

For any partition \( \lambda \) we define the monomial symmetric function \( m_\lambda \) to be
\[
m_\lambda := \sum_{\alpha: \text{sh}(\alpha) = \lambda} x^\alpha.
\]
That is, $m_\lambda$ is the sum over all monomials in the same orbit of $S_P$ as $x^\lambda$. Certainly, $m_\lambda \in \Lambda$. From the above observations, we see that if $f$ is a symmetric function which is homogeneous of degree $n$, then $f$ may be expressed in the form

$$f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} c_\lambda m_\lambda$$

with coefficients $c_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$, in which the notation $\lambda \vdash n$ denotes that the summation is over all (finitely many) partitions with $|\lambda| = n$. Moreover, since distinct partitions correspond to distinct orbits of $S_P$ acting on monomials, this expression is unique. Now, since any symmetric function is (uniquely) a finite sum of its homogeneous pieces, we have proved the following.

**Proposition 4.1.** The set $\{m_\lambda\}$ (where $\lambda$ ranges over all partitions) is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis for $\Lambda$. That is, every symmetric function can be written uniquely as a finite $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of monomial symmetric functions.

**ELEMENTARY SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS**

Next, we find a set of generators for $\Lambda$ as a ring, and determine the ring structure of $\Lambda$.

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, the $j$-th elementary symmetric function $e_j$ is $m_{1^j}$, where $1^j$ denotes the partition with $j$ parts all equal to 1. More explicitly,

$$e_j := \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_j} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}.$$  

In particular, $e_0 = 1$ and $e_1 = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + \cdots$ and $e_2 = x_1 x_2 + x_1 x_3 + x_1 x_4 + \cdots + x_2 x_3 + \cdots$.

Another way to view this definition is in terms of the generating function

$$E(t) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} e_j t^j = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 + x_it).$$

The case $e_0 = 1$ is special; the other $e_j$ are referred to as one-part elementary symmetric functions, for reasons which will become clear in a moment. The result we prove in this section is the following.

**Proposition 4.2.** The one-part elementary symmetric functions $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots\}$ generate $\Lambda$ as a ring and are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{Z}$. Therefore,

$$\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[e_1, e_2, \ldots]$$

is a polynomial ring over $\mathbb{Z}$ in infinitely many indeterminates $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots\}$.

To say that $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots\}$ generates $\Lambda$ as a ring over $\mathbb{Z}$ means that every $f \in \Lambda$ can be expressed as a finite $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of finite products of the $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots\}$. To say that the one-part elementary symmetric functions are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{Z}$ means that all such expressions are unique. Now, if $e_{j_1} e_{j_2} \cdots e_{j_k}$ is a finite product of the $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots\}$, then, since multiplication is commutative, we might as well require that the
indices are weakly decreasing. So, for any partition \( \lambda \) we define the \textit{elementary symmetric function} indexed by \( \lambda \):

\[
e_\lambda := e_{\lambda_1} e_{\lambda_2} \cdots e_{\lambda_k}.
\]

(Hence the “one-part” terminology above.) Thus, we may restate Proposition 2 as follows:

**Proposition 4.3.** The set \( \{e_\lambda\} \) (where \( \lambda \) ranges over all partitions) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-basis for \( \Lambda \). That is, every symmetric function can be written uniquely as a finite \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combination of elementary symmetric functions.

To prove Proposition 3 we can restrict our attention to \( \Lambda^n \), the symmetric functions which are homogeneous of degree \( n \), for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) separately. Since \( \{m_\lambda : \lambda \vdash n\} \) is a (finite) basis for \( \Lambda^n \) over \( \mathbb{Z} \), we can express each elementary symmetric function of degree \( n \) uniquely in terms of this basis. This produces a coefficient matrix which is square of order \( p(n) \) (the number of partitions of \( n \)). We will show that this matrix is invertible over the integers, and hence is a change-of-basis matrix. Thus, \( \{e_\lambda : \lambda \vdash n\} \) will be seen to be a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-basis for \( \Lambda^n \), and Proposition 3 follows.

There are a few combinatorial preliminaries to the argument. For any partition \( \lambda : \lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_k > 0 \), the \textit{Ferrers diagram} of \( \lambda \) is the set of pairs \( F_\lambda := \{(a,b) : 1 \leq a \leq \ell(\lambda) \text{ and } 1 \leq b \leq \lambda_a\} \), visualized graphically as a set of boxes indexed using matrix coordinates (see below). Taking the transpose of \( F_\lambda \) (as if it were a matrix) produces the Ferrers diagram of another partition \( \lambda' \), called the \textit{conjugate} of \( \lambda \). Certainly, \( \lambda'' = \lambda \). Here is an example:

\[
\lambda : 7 5 4 4 1 \quad \lambda' : 5 4 4 2 1 1
\]

**Exercise:** Notice that \( m_j(\lambda') = \lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} \) for all \( j \in \mathbb{P} \).

The \textit{reverse lexicographic (revlex) order} on the set of exponent vectors (or on the set of monomials) is defined as follows: \( \alpha < \beta \) if either \( |\alpha| < |\beta| \), or \( |\alpha| = |\beta| \) and at the first index \( i \in \mathbb{P} \) for which \( \alpha(i) \neq \beta(i) \) we have \( \alpha(i) > \beta(i) \). We may restrict revlex order to the set of all partitions, since a partition is a special case of an exponent vector. For
example, for partitions of five we have 5 < 41 < 32 < 311 < 221 < 2111 < 11111.

**Exercise:** Notice that among all monomials in the $S_P$-orbit of $x^{\alpha}$, the revlex earliest one is $x^{sh(\alpha)}$. Hence, $x^{\lambda}$ is the revlex earliest monomial in $m_{\lambda}$.

The following proposition will complete the proof of Proposition 2.

**Proposition 4.4.** For any partition $\lambda$,

$$e_{\lambda'} = m_{\lambda} + \sum_{\lambda < \mu} a_{\lambda\mu} m_{\mu},$$

in which the sum is over partitions $\mu$ strictly later than $\lambda$ in revlex order, and the coefficients $a_{\lambda\mu}$ are nonnegative integers.

Before proving this, let’s consider as an example the case $n = 3$; the partitions of three are 3 < 21 < 111 in revlex order. By definition, $e_3 = m_{111}$. To compute $e_{21} = e_2 e_1$, notice that we can form any monomial of shape 111 in exactly three ways by taking a term from $e_2$ times a term from $e_1$; also, we can form any monomial of shape 21 in exactly one way like this, while partitions of shape 3 can not be formed at all. Hence, $e_{21} = m_{21} + 3m_{111}$. Finally, since $e_{111} = e_1 e_1 e_1$ we can form any monomial of shape 3 in one way, any monomial of shape 21 in $\binom{3}{2} = 3$ ways, and any monomial of shape 111 in $3! = 6$ ways. Hence, $e_{111} = m_3 + 3m_{21} + 6m_{111}$. Since $(3)' = 111$ and $(21)' = 21$ and $(111)' = 3$, this gives the following equations.

$$\begin{cases}
  e_{(3)'} &= m_3 + 3m_{21} + 6m_{111} \\
  e_{(21)'} &= m_{21} + 3m_{111} \\
  e_{(111)'} &= m_{111}
\end{cases}$$

In general, with respect to revlex order on the partitions of $n$, the coefficient matrix $(a_{\lambda\mu})$ in Proposition 4 is upper triangular with ones $(a_{\lambda\lambda} = 1)$ on the diagonal. Hence, this matrix is invertible over the integers, and this suffices to prove Proposition 3, and thus Proposition 2.

**Proof of Proposition 4.** By definition, $e_{\lambda'} = e_{\lambda_1'} e_{\lambda_2'} \cdots e_{\lambda_t'}$ where $t = \lambda_1$ is the length of $\lambda'$. This product is clearly a nonnegative integer linear combination of monomials, and so a nonnegative integer linear combination of monomial symmetric funtions. Collecting factors with the same index, we see that $e_{\lambda'} = e_1^{m_1} e_2^{m_2} \cdots e_k^{m_k}$ where $m_j := m_j(\lambda')$ is the multiplicity of $j$ as a part of $\lambda'$. By an exercise above, $m_j(\lambda') = \lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1}$, and so

$$e_{\lambda'} = e_1^{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} e_2^{\lambda_2 - \lambda_3} \cdots e_k^{\lambda_k - \lambda_{k+1}}$$

(where $\lambda_{k+1} = 0$). What is the revlex earliest monomial $x^\alpha$ which appears in this product? By an exercise above, its exponent vector must be a partition. Thinking about how the revlex order is defined, one sees that the best thing to do is to take the revlex earliest monomial from each factor. That is,

$$x_1^{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} (x_1 x_2)^{\lambda_2 - \lambda_3} \cdots (x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k)^{\lambda_k} = x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_k^{\lambda_k} = x^{\lambda}.$$
Since the monomial \(x^\lambda\) can be formed in only one way, \(m_\lambda\) occurs in \(e_\lambda\) with coefficient one. Since \(x^\lambda\) is the revlex earliest monomial in \(e_\lambda\) and \(m_\mu\) contains the monomial \(x^\mu\), if \(m_\mu\) occurs in \(e_\lambda\) with nonzero coefficient, then \(\lambda < \mu\) in revlex order.

\[\square\]

COMPLETE SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS AND DUALITY

In this section we give another set of generators for the ring \(\Lambda\), and begin to see some its deeper structure.

For each \(j \in \mathbb{N}\), the \(j\)-th complete symmetric function \(h_j\) is defined by

\[h_j := \sum_{\lambda \vdash j} m_\lambda = \sum_{|\alpha| = j} x^\alpha = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_j} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_j}.\]

That is, \(h_j\) is the sum over all monomials of degree \(j\). In particular, \(h_0 = 1\) and \(h_1 = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + \cdots\) and \(h_2 = x_1^2 + x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + \cdots + x_2^2 + x_2x_3 + \cdots\). Another way to view this definition is in terms of the generating function

\[H(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} h_n t^n = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{1 - x_i t}\right).\]

The case \(h_0 = 1\) is special; the other \(h_j\) are referred to as one-part complete symmetric functions, for reasons which will become clear below.

Since the one-part elementary symmetric functions are algebraically independent over \(\mathbb{Z}\), if \(A\) is any ring we may define a ring homomorphism \(\Lambda \to A\) by choosing the image of \(e_j\) in \(A\) for each \(j \in \mathbb{P}\). (Algebraic independence ensures that any such choices are compatible, and since the \(\{e_1, e_2, \ldots\}\) generate \(\Lambda\), the rest of the homomorphism is determined by \(\mathbb{Z}\)-linear and multiplicative extension.) Thus, we define a ring homomorphism \(\omega : \Lambda \to \Lambda\) by putting \(\omega(e_j) := h_j\) for all \(j \in \mathbb{P}\).

By the formulae for the generating functions of the one-part elementary or complete symmetric functions, we have \(H(t) = E(-t)^{-1}\); this gives \(E(-t)H(t) = 1\), or, upon expansion,

\[\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^j e_j h_{n-j}\right) t^n = 1.\]

**Proposition 4.5.** The ring homomorphism \(\omega : \Lambda \to \Lambda\) defined above is an involution; that is, \(\omega^2 = 1\) is the identity function. In particular, \(\omega\) is a ring automorphism of \(\Lambda\).

**Proof.** To show that \(\omega^2 = 1\) it suffices to show that \(\omega(h_j) = e_j\) for all \(j \in \mathbb{N}\), since the \(\{e_1, e_2, \ldots\}\) generate \(\Lambda\). Since \(h_0 = e_0 = 1\), this is trivial for \(j = 0\). Now we proceed by induction on \(j \in \mathbb{N}\). From \(E(-t)H(t) = 1\) we deduce that

\[h_n + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j e_j h_{n-j} = 0.\]
for all \( n \in \mathbb{P} \). Applying \( \omega \) and using the induction hypothesis, we see that

\[
\omega(h_n) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^{j} h_{j} e_{n-j} = 0.
\]

Comparing this with

\[
(-1)^{n} e_{n} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^{n-j} h_{j} e_{n-j} = 0,
\]

we see that \( \omega(h_n) = e_n \), completing the proof. \( \square \)

There is a slick way to do this argument with the generating functions. Since \( \omega \) is a ring homomorphism and \( E(-t)H(t) = 1 \), we deduce that \( \omega(E(-t))\omega(H(t)) = 1 \), by applying \( \omega \) to the coefficient of each power of \( t \) separately. Since \( \omega(E(t)) = H(t) \) by definition, this gives \( \omega(H(t)) = H(-t)^{-1} = E(t) \) and proves Proposition 5.

**Corollary 4.6.** The one-part complete symmetric functions \( \{h_1, h_2, \ldots\} \) generate \( \Lambda \) as a ring and are algebraically independent over \( \mathbb{Z} \). Therefore,

\[
\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}[h_1, h_2, \ldots]
\]

is a polynomial ring over \( \mathbb{Z} \) in infinitely many indeterminates \( \{h_1, h_2, \ldots\} \).

Now, for any partition \( \lambda \) we define the complete symmetric function indexed by \( \lambda \):

\[
h_{\lambda} := h_{\lambda_1}h_{\lambda_2}\cdots h_{\lambda_k}.
\]

(Hence the “one-part” terminology above.) Similarly to the case for elementary symmetric functions, Corollary 6 may be restated as follows.

**Corollary 4.7.** The set \( \{h_{\lambda}\} \) (where \( \lambda \) ranges over all partitions) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-basis for \( \Lambda \). That is, every symmetric function can be written uniquely as a finite \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combination of complete symmetric functions.

**POWER SUM SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS**

We give yet another set of generators; however, at one stage we must introduce denominators in the calculation. Thus, they merely generate the ring \( \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Q} \) of symmetric functions with rational coefficients. The real significance of the power sum symmetric functions is in relation to the character theory of symmetric groups – I will explain this briefly a bit later on.

For each \( j \in \mathbb{P} \), define the \( j \)-th one-part power sum symmetric function to be \( p_j := m_j = x_1^j + x_2^j + \cdots \). (Notice that \( p_j \) is not defined for \( j = 0 \).) By now, it is not surprising that for any partition \( \lambda \) we define the power sum symmetric function indexed by \( \lambda \) to be

\[
p_{\lambda} := p_{\lambda_1}p_{\lambda_2}\cdots p_{\lambda_k}.
\]
The generating function for one-part power sum symmetric functions is

\[ P(t) := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} p_j t^{j-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} x_i t^{j-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i}{1 - x_i t} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d}{dt} \log \frac{1}{1 - x_i t}, \]

from which it follows that

\[ P(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \log H(t) = H'(t)/H(t). \]

**Exercise:** Show that \( P(-t) = E'(t)/E(t) \).

From the equation \( H'(t) = P(t)H(t) \) we extract the coefficient of \( t^n \), finding that

\[ h_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} p_{n-j}h_j \]

for all \( n \in \mathbb{P} \). Since \( h_0 = 1 \), this may also be written as

\[ p_n = nh_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} h_{n-j}p_j \]

for all \( n \in \mathbb{P} \). By induction on \( n \), these equations imply that for all \( n \in \mathbb{P} \),

\[ h_n \in \mathbb{Q}[p_1, \ldots, p_n] \quad \text{and} \quad p_n \in \mathbb{Z}[h_1, \ldots, h_n]. \]

From this, Proposition 8 and Corollary 9 follow.

**Proposition 4.8.** The one-part power sum symmetric functions \( \{p_1, p_2, \ldots\} \) generate \( \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Q} \) as a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-algebra and are algebraically independent over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Therefore,

\[ \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}[p_1, p_2, \ldots] \]

is a polynomial ring over \( \mathbb{Q} \) in infinitely many indeterminates \( \{p_1, p_2, \ldots\} \).

**Corollary 4.9.** The set \( \{p_\lambda\} \) (where \( \lambda \) ranges over all partitions) is a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-basis for \( \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Q} \). That is, every symmetric function with rational coefficients can be written uniquely as a finite \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear combination of power sum symmetric functions.

As an example, consider \( h_2 = m_2 + m_{11} \). Since \( p_2 = m_2 \) and \( p_{11} = p_1p_1 = m_2 + 2m_{11} \), we see that \( h_2 = (p_2 + p_1^2)/2 \). So although the one-part power sums do generate \( \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Q} \), in which we allow rational coefficients, they do not generate all of \( \Lambda \) if only integer coefficients are allowed.

**Exercise:** From the identity \( \omega(H(t)) = E(t) \) (in which \( \omega \) is applied to the coefficient of each power of \( t \) separately), deduce that for any partition \( \lambda \) of size \( |\lambda| \) and length \( \ell(\lambda) \),

\[ \omega(p_\lambda) = (-1)^{|\lambda|-\ell(\lambda)} p_\lambda. \]
Thus the duality map $\omega$ has a particularly nice representation with respect to the power sum basis of $\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

**SCHUR SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS**

At last, our safari through the jungle of symmetric functions has arrived at the territory of its most prized denizens – the top rung of the evolutionary ladder in this world – the Schur symmetric functions. These correspond to the irreducible representations of the symmetric groups, about which I shall say a few things a bit later on. There are at least three ways to define the Schur functions (and then at least two theorems to prove – that the definitions are equivalent). At this point, we part company from Macdonald’s algebraic camp, equip ourselves with our combinatorial gear, and boldly set off in search of our quarry...

Let $\lambda$ be a partition, and recall that the Ferrers diagram of $\lambda$ is the set of pairs

$$F_\lambda := \{(a, b) : 1 \leq a \leq \ell(\lambda) \text{ and } 1 \leq b \leq \lambda_a\}.$$

A (Young) tableau of shape $\lambda$ is a function $T : F_\lambda \to \mathbb{P}$ satisfying the following two conditions for all $(a, b) \in F_\lambda$:

- if $(a, b + 1) \in F_\lambda$ then $T(a, b) \leq T(a, b + 1)$;
- if $(a + 1, b) \in F_\lambda$ then $T(a, b) < T(a + 1, b)$.

We picture the tableau $T$ graphically by writing the value of $T(a, b)$ in the $(a, b)$-th box of the Ferrers diagram $F_\lambda$. Then the first condition says that the entries of the tableau are weakly increasing as we read from left to right in each row, and the second condition says that the entries of the tableau are strictly increasing as we read from top to bottom in each column. Here is an example of a tableau of shape $7 5 4 2 2$.

For a tableau $T$ of shape $\lambda$, the monomial associated to $T$ is

$$x^T := \prod_{(a, b) \in F_\lambda} x_{T(a, b)}.$$
(For example, the monomial associated to the tableau above is \(x_1^5 x_2^3 x_3^5 x_4 x_5^2 x_7^2 x_8^2\).) The Schur symmetric function of shape \(\lambda\) is defined to be

\[
s_\lambda := \sum_T x^T,
\]

in which the summation is over all tableau of shape \(\lambda\). This must strike you as a rather objectionable definition, since it is not at all clear that \(s_\lambda\) is a symmetric function.

**Proposition 4.10.** For any partition \(\lambda\), \(s_\lambda\) is a symmetric function.

**Proof.** Certainly, \(s_\lambda\) is a formal sum of monomials which is homogeneous of degree \(|\lambda|\), hence is of bounded degree. It remains to show that \(s_\lambda\) is invariant under every permutation in \(S_P\).

**Exercise:** Every permutation in \(S_P\) can be expressed as a composition of a finite sequence of simple transpositions of the form \((i i + 1)\), for various \(i \in P\). (This is certainly not true of all permutations in \(S_\infty\).)

As a consequence of this exercise, to prove the proposition it suffices to show that \(s_\lambda\) is invariant under the simple transposition \((i i + 1)\), for each \(i \in P\).

So, fix any \(i \in P\) and let \(\sigma = (i i + 1)\). Let \(\mathcal{T}(\lambda)\) be the set of all tableau of shape \(\lambda\). We are going to define an involution \(\psi : \mathcal{T}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\lambda)\) such that for any tableau \(T\) of shape \(\lambda\), \(x^{\psi(T)} = \sigma(x^T)\). That is, the monomial associated to \(\psi(T)\) is obtained from the monomial associated to \(T\) by exchanging the indeterminates \(x_i\) and \(x_{i+1}\). Before we define \(\psi\), let’s see how this finishes the proof. Since \(\psi : \mathcal{T}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\lambda)\) is a bijection we may argue that

\[
s_\lambda = \sum_T x^T = \sum_T x^{\psi(T)} = \sum_T \sigma(x^T) = \sigma(s_\lambda),
\]

as required. (Here, the sums are over all tableau \(T\) of shape \(\lambda\).) It remains only to define the involution \(\psi\).

Let \(T\) be any tableau of shape \(\lambda\). Let \(B\) be the set of those boxes of \(F_\lambda\) on which \(T\) takes the value \(i\) or \(i + 1\). There are at most two boxes of \(B\) per column, because the values of \(T\) are strictly increasing down each column of \(F_\lambda\), and if there are two boxes of \(B\) in a column then they must be adjacent. Moreover, if both \((a, b)\) and \((a + 1, b)\) are in \(B\) then \(T(a, b) = i\) and \(T(a + 1, b) = i + 1\). Let \(A\) be the set of those boxes in \(B\) which are not in the same column as any other box of \(B\); this is the set of “adjustable” boxes. Here is an example of such a set \(B\) with \(i = 6\); the adjustable boxes are left empty.

In each row of \(T\), reading left to right, the entries of the adjustable boxes form a sequence of \(i\)-s followed by a sequence of \((i + 1)\)-s, since the entries of \(T\) increase weakly from left to right. For a given row, let’s say the adjustable boxes contain \(p\) \(i\)-s followed by \(q\) \((i + 1)\)-s. Then in \(\psi(T)\), the adjustable boxes in this row will contain \(q\) \(i\)-s followed by \(p\) \((i + 1)\)-s. This transformation is applied simultaneously for every row of \(T\) to produce \(\psi(T)\).

Now \(\psi(T)\) is a tableau of shape \(\lambda\): certainly the row condition is still fulfilled; also, if \((a, b)\) is an adjustable box then \(T(a - 1, b) < i\) and \(i + 1 < T(a + 1, b)\) (whenever these boxes
are still in $F_\lambda$), so $\psi(T)$ satisfies the column condition as well. From the construction it is clear that $\psi$ is an involution. If $x_j \notin \{x_i, x_{i+1}\}$ then the exponent of $x_j$ in $x^{\psi(T)}$ is the same as the exponent of $x_j$ in $x^T$, since no values of $T$ other than $i$ and $i + 1$ have been changed. After a little thought, one sees that the exponent of $x_i$ in $x^{\psi(T)}$ equals the exponent of $x_{i+1}$ in $x^T$, and the exponent of $x_{i+1}$ in $x^{\psi(T)}$ equals the exponent of $x_i$ in $x^T$. This shows that $x^{\psi(T)} = \sigma(x^T)$, and completes the proof. □

At this stage we are posed with the following challenges. First, since we have determined that the Schur function $s_\lambda$ really is a symmetric function, it has a unique expression in each of the following ways:

- as an integer linear combination of $\{m_\lambda\}$;
- as a polynomial in $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots\}$ with integer coefficients;
- as a polynomial in $\{h_1, h_2, \ldots\}$ with integer coefficients;
- as a polynomial in $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots\}$ with rational coefficients.

What, exactly, are the formulae in each of these cases? Second, it is natural to wonder whether the set $\{s_\lambda\}$ forms a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis for $\Lambda$. Third, we would like to know how the duality map $\omega$ acts on $s_\lambda$. We'll close this section by knocking off a couple of these problems, saving the others for later sections.

For a tableau $T$ of shape $\lambda$, the content of $T$ is the exponent vector $\alpha$ of the monomial $x^T$ associated with $T$; that is, for each $i \in \mathbb{P}$, $\alpha(i)$ is the number of boxes of $F_\lambda$ to which $T$ assigns the value $i$. 

**Figure 3**
Proposition 4.11. For any partition $\lambda$,

$$s_\lambda = \sum_{\mu} K_{\lambda\mu} m_\mu,$$

in which $K_{\lambda\mu}$ is the number of tableau of shape $\lambda$ and content $\mu$. In particular, the coefficients $K_{\lambda\mu}$ are nonnegative integers.

Proof. For each partition $\mu$, the coefficient of $x^\mu$ in $s_\lambda$ is, by definition, the number of tableau of shape $\lambda$ and content $\mu$. Since $s_\lambda$ is a symmetric function, the result follows. $\square$

That was easy! These coefficients $K_{\lambda\mu}$ are known as the Kostka numbers; their combinatorial interpretation gives us more information, as follows.

First we define the dominance (partial) order on the set of all exponent vectors as follows: $\alpha \succeq \beta$ provided that $\alpha(1) + \alpha(2) + \cdots + \alpha(i) \geq \beta(1) + \beta(2) + \cdots + \beta(i)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{P}$. We may restrict this definition to partitions, as they are a special case of exponent vectors. This is not a total order on exponent vectors of a given weight, not even on partitions of a given weight: e.g. the partitions 3 1 1 1 and 2 2 2 of six are mutually incomparable by dominance order.

Exercise: Show that for exponent vectors $\alpha, \beta$, if $\alpha \succeq \beta$ in dominance order, then $\alpha \preceq \beta$ in revlex order.

Proposition 4.12. Let $\lambda$ and $\mu$ be partitions. Then $K_{\lambda\lambda} = 1$, and if $K_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$ then $\lambda \succeq \mu$ in dominance order.

Proof. Assume that $T$ is a tableau of shape $\lambda$ and content $\mu$. Fix any $i \in \mathbb{P}$. There are $\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_i$ boxes of $F_\lambda$ to which $T$ assigns a value in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, i\}$, by definition of the content of $T$. These boxes must all occur in the topmost $i$ rows of $F_\lambda$, because $T$ is strictly increasing down the columns of $F_\lambda$. There are $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \cdots + \lambda_i$ boxes of $F_\lambda$ in the topmost $i$ rows. Thus, if $K_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$ then

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \cdots + \lambda_i \geq \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_i$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{P}$; that is, $\lambda \succeq \mu$. Considering the case in which $\mu = \lambda$, there is a unique tableau of shape $\lambda$ and content $\lambda$ – it assigns the value $i$ to every box in the $i$-th row of $F_\lambda$ – so $K_{\lambda\lambda} = 1$. $\square$

As an example, consider the case $n = 3$. Using the combinatorial interpretation of the Kostka numbers, it is not difficult to check that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
  s_3 = m_3 + m_{21} + m_{111} \\
  s_{21} = m_{21} + 2m_{111} \\
  s_{111} = m_{111}
\end{array} \right.$$  

Corollary 4.13. The set $\{s_\lambda\}$ (where $\lambda$ ranges over all partitions) is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis for $\Lambda$. That is, every symmetric function can be written uniquely as a finite $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of Schur symmetric functions.
**Proof.** Fix any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Let \((K_\lambda)\) be the square matrix, indexed by partitions of \( n \), giving the coefficients when the Schur functions \( \{s_\lambda : \lambda \vdash n\} \) are written as linear combinations of the monomial symmetric functions \( \{m_\mu : \mu \vdash n\} \). With the rows and columns listed in revlex order, \((K_\lambda)\) is upper triangular with ones on the diagonal, hence is invertible over the integers. Thus, for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( \{s_\lambda : \lambda \vdash n\} \) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-basis for \( \Lambda^n \), proving the result. \( \square \)

In fact, \( \{s_\lambda\} \) is the nicest basis for \( \Lambda \) that there is, and it is essentially unique. We'll have to wait a little while longer before this can be fully explained.

**JACOBI-TRUDY AND GESSEL-VIENNOT**

In this section we express the Schur functions as polynomials in the one-part elementary, and as polynomials in the one-part completes. This allows us to determine how the duality map acts on Schur functions. The derivations rely on interpreting the one-part elementary and completes as generating functions for lattice paths in the integer plane.

Consider \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) as a directed graph in which the vertices are the ordered pairs \((a,b)\) \( (a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \) and there are directed horizontal edges \((a,b) \rightarrow (a+1,b)\) and vertical edges \((a,b) \rightarrow (a,b+1)\) for all \((a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \). For us, a lattice path is an infinite path in \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) which has only finitely many horizontal edges. If the lattice path \( P \) begins at \((a,b)\) and has \( j \) horizontal edges, we say it is a path from \((a,b)\) to \((a+j,\infty)\).

We define two subgraphs of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) with labels on the horizontal edges, as follows. The subgraph \( E \) of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) has as vertices those pairs \((a,b)\) with \( a+b \geq 0 \), and the horizontal edge \((a,b) \rightarrow (a+1,b)\) is given the label \( a+b+1 \). We call \( E \) the elementary grid. Notice that the translation \((a,b) \mapsto (a+1,b-1)\) generates an infinite cyclic group of automorphisms of \( E \). The subgraph \( H \) of \( \mathbb{Z}^2 \) has as vertices those pairs \((a,b)\) with \( b \geq 0 \), and the horizontal edge \((a,b) \rightarrow (a+1,b)\) is given the label \( b+1 \). We call \( H \) the complete grid. Notice that the translation \((a,b) \mapsto (a+1,b)\) generates an infinite cyclic group of automorphisms of \( H \). Patches of these two grids are shown below.

For either grid \( E \) or \( H \), think of each horizontal edge labelled \( i \in \mathbb{P} \) as having a copy of the indeterminate \( x_i \) on it. For a lattice path \( P \) in either grid, the monomial associated to \( P \) is the product of the indeterminates on its horizontal edges; this will be denoted either \( x^E(P) \) or \( x^H(P) \), depending on the grid. Proposition 14 is immediate from the definitions.

**Proposition 4.14.** Let \( j \in \mathbb{N} \).

(a) We have \( e_j = \sum_P x^E(P) \), summing over all lattice paths from \((0,0)\) to \((j,\infty)\).

(b) We have \( h_j = \sum_P x^H(P) \), summing over all lattice paths from \((0,0)\) to \((j,\infty)\).

**Proof.** In the grid \( E \) there is an obvious bijection between \( j \)-element subsets of \( \mathbb{P} \) and lattice paths from \((0,0)\) to \((j,\infty)\). In the grid \( H \) there is an obvious bijection between \( j \)-element multisubsets of \( \mathbb{P} \) and lattice paths from \((0,0)\) to \((j,\infty)\). \( \square \)

Now consider the Schur function \( s_\lambda = \sum_T x^T \) indexed by the partition \( \lambda \). Let \( T \) be any tableau of shape \( \lambda \). For each \( 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\lambda) \), since the \( i \)-th row of \( T \) is weakly increasing
it determines a lattice path $P_i$ in $\mathcal{H}$ from $(a_i, 0)$ to $(a_i + \lambda_i, \infty)$; here we can choose any $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ because of the automorphisms of $\mathcal{H}$. We’ll choose the $a_i$ sensibly, so that the column condition on $T$ is translated into a combinatorial condition on the sequence of lattice paths $(P_1, \ldots, P_{\ell(\lambda)})$.

Without loss of generality we can start $P_1$ at $(-1, 0)$. Now, because of the column condition on $T$, the $i$-th horizontal step of $P_2$ must have a label strictly larger than the label of the $i$-th horizontal step of $P_1$. This can be ensured if we begin $P_2$ at the point $(-2, 0)$ and require that $P_1$ and $P_2$ must be vertex-disjoint. Similarly, if we begin $P_3$ at $(-3, 0)$ and require that $P_2$ and $P_3$ are vertex-disjoint, then the column condition for $T$ will be satisfied between rows two and three.

**Proposition 4.15.** Let $\lambda$ be a partition of length $k$. There is a bijection between the set of tableau $T$ of shape $\lambda$ and the set of $k$-tuples of lattice paths $(P_1, \ldots, P_k)$ in which

1. each $P_i$ goes from $(-i, 0)$ to $(\lambda_i - i, \infty)$,
2. these lattice paths are pairwise vertex-disjoint.

Moreover, if $T$ corresponds to $(P_1, \ldots, P_k)$ in this bijection, then

$$x^T = x^{\lambda(P_1)} x^{\lambda(P_2)} \cdots x^{\lambda(P_k)}.$$

**Proof.** This is left as an exercise. □

As an example, here is a picture of the 5-tuple of lattice paths in $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to the tableau on page 10.
Thus we interpret $s_\lambda$ as the sum over $\ell(\lambda)$-tuples of pairwise nonintersecting lattice paths in $H$, as in the statement of Proposition 15. This is getting us closer to expressing $s_\lambda$ as a polynomial in $\{h_1, h_2, \ldots\}$, but what next?

The last step in the argument is the following beautiful theorem of Gessel and Viennot. (They did not state it this generally, but the proof below is essentially theirs.) Begin with a finite, acyclic, directed graph $\mathcal{G}$. Assume that each edge $e$ of $\mathcal{G}$ has associated with it a weight $x_e$ in some commutative ring $R$. For any path $P$ in $\mathcal{G}$, let $x^P$ be the product of the weights of the edges in $P$. For any two vertices $(v, w)$ of $\mathcal{G}$, let $M(v, w)$ be the sum of $x^P$ over all paths $P$ in $\mathcal{G}$ from $v$ to $w$. (Notice that the hypotheses on $\mathcal{G}$ ensure that $M(v, w)$ is a polynomial in the edge-weights.)

**Proposition 4.16 (Gessel-Viennot).** Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a finite, acyclic, directed graph which is properly embedded in the plane, with edge-weights $\{x_e\}$ in a commutative ring $R$. Let $A_1, \ldots, A_k, Z_1, \ldots, Z_1$ be pairwise distinct vertices on the outer face of $\mathcal{G}$ which appear in that cyclic order around the outer face. Let

$$G(A_1, \ldots, A_k; Z_1, \ldots, Z_k) := \sum_{(P_1, \ldots, P_k)} x^{P_1} x^{P_2} \cdots x^{P_k},$$
in which the sum is over all \( k \)-tuples of paths in \( \mathcal{G} \) such that
- \( P_i \) goes from \( A_i \) to \( Z_i \) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq k \), and
- these paths are pairwise vertex-disjoint.

Then

\[
G(A_1, \ldots, A_k; Z_1, \ldots, Z_k) = \det(M(A_i, Z_j)).
\]

(On the right side, \( M(A_i, Z_j) \) is a \( k \)-by-\( k \) matrix.)

**Proof.** Expanding the determinant on the right side, we have

\[
\det(M(A_i, Z_j)) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^{k} M(A_i, Z_{\sigma(i)})
\]

in which the last sum is over all \( k \)-tuples of paths in \( \mathcal{G} \) such that for some permutation \( \sigma \in S_k \), \( P_i \) goes from \( A_i \) to \( Z_{\sigma(i)} \) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq k \); in this expression we put \( \text{sgn}(P_1, \ldots, P_k) := \text{sgn}(\sigma) \) for the unique such permutation. We will show that the contribution of the \( k \)-tuples of paths which are not vertex-disjoint sums to zero.

Let \( \mathcal{P} \) be the set of all \( k \)-tuples as in the previous paragraph. We will define an involution \( \psi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P} \) such that if \( \psi(P_1, \ldots, P_k) = (Q_1, \ldots, Q_k) \) then either
- \((Q_1, \ldots, Q_k) = (P_1, \ldots, P_k)\), or
- \(\text{sgn}(Q_1, \ldots, Q_k) = -\text{sgn}(P_1, \ldots, P_k)\) and \(x^{Q_1}x^{Q_2} \cdots x^{Q_k} = x^{P_1}x^{P_2} \cdots x^{P_k}\).

From this it will follow that in the expansion of the determinant \( \det(M(A_i, Z_j)) \) above, we need only sum over those \( k \)-tuples in \( \mathcal{P} \) which are left fixed by \( \psi \).

Here is the definition of \( \psi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P} \). Consider any \( k \)-tuple \((P_1, \ldots, P_k) \in \mathcal{P} \) with \( \sigma \in S_k \) such that \( P_i \) goes from \( A_i \) to \( Z_{\sigma(i)} \) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq k \). If this \( k \)-tuple of paths is pairwise vertex-disjoint then it is left fixed by \( \psi \). Otherwise, let \( 1 \leq t \leq k \) be the first index for which \( P_t \) shares a vertex with some other path in the \( k \)-tuple. Traversing \( P_t \) from \( A_t \) towards \( Z_{\sigma(t)} \), let \( V \) be the first vertex of \( P_t \) which is on some other path in the \( k \)-tuple. Let \( t < u \leq k \) be the first index such that \( V \) is on the path \( P_u \). Now we define \( \psi(P_1, \ldots, P_k) = (Q_1, \ldots, Q_k) \) as follows. If \( i \not\in \{t, u\} \) then \( Q_i := P_i \). We let \( Q_t \) consist of the segment of \( P_t \) from \( A_t \) to \( V \), followed by the segment of \( P_u \) from \( V \) to \( Z_{\sigma(u)} \); similarly, we let \( Q_u \) consist of the segment of \( P_u \) from \( A_u \) to \( V \), followed by the segment of \( P_t \) from \( V \) to \( Z_{\sigma(t)} \).

**Exercise:** Check that \( \psi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{P} \) is an involution.

**Exercise:** Check the properties claimed for \( \psi \) in the previous paragraph.

Here is a schematic picture for the construction of \( \psi \).

After the cancellation of terms according to \( \psi \), a \( k \)-tuple in \( \mathcal{P} \) contributes to the expansion of \( \det(M(A_i, Z_j)) \) if and only if it is pairwise vertex-disjoint. Since \( \mathcal{G} \) is properly embedded in the plane and \( A_1, \ldots, A_k, Z_k, \ldots, Z_1 \) are arranged cyclically on the outer face of \( \mathcal{G} \), this implies that \( P_t \) goes from \( A_t \) to \( Z_t \) for all \( 1 \leq t \leq k \). Hence the sign of each of these terms is positive, and the result follows. \( \square \)
It remains only to apply the Gessel-Viennot Theorem on the complete grid $\mathcal{H}$. The result is known as the Jacobi-Trudy Formula.

**Proposition 4.17.** Let $\lambda$ be a partition of length $k$. Then $s_{\lambda} = \det(h_{\lambda_i-i+j})$ in which the right side is a $k$-by-$k$ determinant and, by convention, $h_r = 0$ if $r < 0$.

**Proof.** From Proposition 15, $s_{\lambda}$ is the generating function for $k$-tuples $(P_1, \ldots, P_k)$ of pairwise vertex-disjoint lattice paths $P_i$ from $(-i,0)$ to $(\lambda_i-i,\infty)$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Now fix any (large) $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and specialize $x_i = 0$ for all $i > N$. Thus $s_{\lambda}(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ is a symmetric function in finitely many variables. In the lattice path picture, if any of the $P_i$ uses an edge with label $i > N$ then the contribution of $(P_1, \ldots, P_k)$ to $s_{\lambda}$ is zero. So after this specialization, $s_{\lambda}$ is the generating function for $k$-tuples $(P_1, \ldots, P_k)$ of pairwise vertex-disjoint lattice paths $P_i$ from $(-i,0)$ to $(\lambda_i-i,N)$ in the finite subgraph $\mathcal{H}(\lambda,N)$ of $\mathcal{H}$ induced by those vertices $(a,b)$ such that $-k \leq a \leq \lambda_1-1$ and $0 \leq b \leq N$. One checks that the hypotheses of the Gessel-Viennot Theorem are satisfied with $G = \mathcal{H}(\lambda,N)$, $A_i = (-i,0)$, and $Z_j = \lambda_j - j$, and that $M(A_i, Z_j) = h_{\lambda_j-j+i}(x_1, \ldots, x_N)$ in this case. Therefore

$$s_{\lambda}(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = \det(h_{\lambda_j-j+i}(x_1, \ldots, x_N)).$$
To complete the proof, just transpose the matrix on the right side and take the limit as \( N \) tends to infinity. \( \square \)

For example, for the partition 5 3 2 2,

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
  h_5 & h_6 & h_7 & h_8 \\
  h_2 & h_3 & h_4 & h_5 \\
  1 & h_1 & h_2 & h_3 \\
  0 & 1 & h_1 & h_2 \\
\end{vmatrix}
\]

Analogously, there is a dual form of the Jacobi-Trudi identity expressing \( s_\lambda \) as a polynomial in the one-part complete symmetric functions.

**Proposition 4.18.** Let \( \lambda \) be a partition. Then \( s_\lambda = \det(e_{\lambda_i - i+j}) \) in which the right side is a \( \lambda_1 \)-by-\( \lambda_1 \) determinant and, by convention, \( e_r = 0 \) if \( r < 0 \).

**Proof.** This is an exercise on homework assignment 3. \( \square \)

For example, for the partition 5 3 2 2, since the conjugate partition is 4 4 2 1 1,

\[
\begin{vmatrix}
  e_4 & e_5 & e_6 & e_7 & e_8 \\
  e_3 & e_4 & e_5 & e_6 & e_7 \\
  1 & e_1 & e_2 & e_3 & e_4 \\
  0 & 0 & 1 & e_1 & e_2 \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & e_1 \\
\end{vmatrix}
\]

**Corollary 4.19.** For any partition, \( \omega(s_\lambda) = s_{\lambda'} \).

**Proof.** By Jacobi-Trudy and its dual form,

\[
\omega(s_\lambda) = \omega(\det(e_{\lambda'_i-i+j})) = \det(h_{\lambda'_i-i+j}) = s_{\lambda'}.
\]
THE CAUCHY PRODUCT AND ORTHOGONALITY

In this section we define a symmetric, positive definite, integer-valued, bilinear form on
the ring \( \Lambda \) of symmetric functions.

We will be working with symmetric functions in two sets of indeterminates,
\( x = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots \} \) and \( y = \{y_1, y_2, \ldots \} \), so we will use notation such as \( h_\lambda(x) \), \( m_\lambda(y) \), \( p_\lambda(x) \),
etc. to indicate which indeterminates are being considered. Similarly, we will specify
the set of indeterminates with the notations \( H(x; t) \), \( P(y; t) \), etc. for the generating functions
for one-part symmetric functions.

To begin, we give two expansions in symmetric functions of the Cauchy product
\[
\Pi(x, y) := \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1-x_i y_j}.
\]

**Proposition 4.20.** The Cauchy product can be expanded as follows.
(a) \( \Pi(x, y) = \sum_\lambda h_\lambda(x)m_\lambda(y) = \sum_\lambda m_\lambda(x)h_\lambda(y) \).
(b) \( \Pi(x, y) = \sum_\lambda p_\lambda(x)p_\lambda(y)/z_\lambda \).

In these expressions, the sums are over all partitions, and for a partition \( \lambda \) with multiplicity
vector \( m(\lambda) = \langle m_1, m_2, \ldots \rangle \),
\[
z_\lambda := \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} m_j! j^{m_j}.
\]

**Proof.** For part (a) we calculate as follows.
\[
\Pi(x, y) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} H(x; y_j) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} h_r(x) y_j^r \right) = \sum_\alpha h_\alpha(x)y^\alpha = \sum_\lambda h_\lambda(x)m_\lambda(y).
\]

In the next-to-last summation, \( \alpha \) ranges over all multiplicity vectors and \( h_\alpha := \prod_i h_\alpha(i) \).
The other expression follows by symmetry.

For part (b), recall that \( P(t) = (d/dt) \log H(t) \). (The set of indeterminates does not
matter yet.) Integrating with respect to \( t \) we get
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_j t^j}{j} = \log H(t).
\]
(Notice that both sides have zero constant term, so the constant of integration has been chosen correctly.) Exponentiating, we find that
\[
H(t) = \exp \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_j t^j}{j} \right) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \exp \left( \frac{p_j t^j}{j} \right) = \prod_{j=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(p_j t^j)^m}{m! j^m} \right) = \sum_{\lambda} \frac{p_\lambda t^{\lambda}}{z_\lambda}.
\]

Now, letting \( xy \) denote the set \( \{x_i, y_j\} \) we see that \( \Pi(x, y) = H(xy; 1) \). Also, for any \( r \in \mathbb{P} \),
\[
p_r(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (x_i y_j)^r = p_r(x)p_r(y),
\]
from which it follows that \( p_\lambda(x, y) = p_\lambda(x)p_\lambda(y) \) for any partition \( \lambda \). From this, part (b) follows.

Now we define a bilinear form \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) on \( \Lambda \) by requiring that \( \{h_\lambda\} \) and \( \{m_\lambda\} \) be dual bases; that is, for any partitions \( \lambda, \mu \):
\[
\langle h_\lambda, m_\mu \rangle := \delta_{\lambda\mu},
\]
in which \( \delta_{\lambda\mu} \) is the Kronecker delta function. From this definition it is clear that \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) is bilinear, integer-valued, and that in the direct sum \( \Lambda = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \Lambda^n \) of \( \Lambda \) as a sum of its homogeneous pieces, the homogeneous pieces \( \Lambda^n \) are pairwise orthogonal. Symmetry and positive definiteness of \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) are a consequence of the following rather surprising fact.

**Proposition 4.21.** Let \( \{v_\lambda\} \) and \( \{w_\lambda\} \) be \( \mathbb{Q} \)-bases of \( \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Q} \), such that each \( v_\lambda \) and \( w_\lambda \) is homogeneous of degree \( |\lambda| \). The following conditions are equivalent:
(a) The bases \( \{v_\lambda\} \) and \( \{w_\lambda\} \) are dual with respect to \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \); that is, \( \langle v_\lambda, w_\mu \rangle = \delta_{\lambda\mu} \) for all partitions \( \lambda, \mu \);
(b) \( \Pi(x, y) = \sum_\lambda v_\lambda(x)w_\lambda(y) \)

**Proof.** Certainly \( \langle v_\lambda, w_\mu \rangle = 0 \) if \( |\lambda| \neq |\mu| \). Fix any \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and let \( \lambda, \mu \vdash n \). Express \( v_\lambda \) in terms of the basis \( \{h_\nu\} \) and \( w_\mu \) in terms of the basis \( \{m_\theta\} \); we get square matrices \( A = (a_{\lambda\nu}) \) and \( B = (b_{\mu\theta}) \) such that
\[
v_\lambda = \sum_\nu a_{\lambda\nu} h_\nu \quad \text{and} \quad w_\mu = \sum_\theta b_{\mu\theta} m_\theta.
\]
By definition of \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \),
\[
\langle v_\lambda, w_\mu \rangle = \sum_{\nu, \theta} a_{\lambda\nu} b_{\mu\theta} \langle h_\nu, m_\theta \rangle = \sum_\nu a_{\lambda\nu} b_{\mu\nu} = (AB^\dagger)_{\lambda\mu}.
\]
(Here $B^\dagger$ denotes the transpose of $B$.) So condition (a) is equivalent to the statement that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $AB^\dagger = I$, the identity matrix. Also,

$$\sum_{\lambda} v_\lambda(x)w_\lambda(y) = \sum_{\lambda} \left( \sum_{\nu} a_{\lambda\nu} h_\nu(x) \right) \left( \sum_{\theta} b_{\lambda\theta} m_\theta(y) \right) = \sum_{\nu,\theta} \left( \sum_{\lambda} a_{\lambda\nu} b_{\lambda\theta} \right) h_\nu(x)m_\theta(y).$$

Thus, condition (b) is equivalent to the statement that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $A^\dagger B = I$. Therefore conditions (a) and (b) are equivalent.

**Corollary 4.22.** The bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is symmetric and positive definite, and $\omega$ is an isometry.

**Proof.** From Proposition 20(b) and Proposition 21, the basis $\{p_\lambda\}$ of $\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is orthogonal:

$$\langle p_\lambda, p_\mu \rangle = z_\lambda \delta_{\lambda\mu}.$$ Since $z_\lambda > 0$ for all $\lambda$, it follows that the bilinear form is symmetric and positive definite. Since $\omega(p_\lambda) = (-1)^{|\lambda| - \ell(\lambda)}$ it is easy to check that for any partitions $\lambda, \mu$:

$$\langle \omega(p_\lambda), \omega(p_\mu) \rangle = \langle p_\lambda, p_\mu \rangle.$$ Hence, $\omega$ is an isometry. □

**THE ROBINSON-SCHENSTED CORRESPONDENCE**

In this section we prove combinatorially that the Schur functions form an orthonormal basis of the ring of symmetric functions. By the results of the previous section, the two conditions in Proposition 23 are equivalent.

**Proposition 4.23.** (a) $\Pi(x,y) = \sum_\lambda s_\lambda(x)s_\lambda(y)$.

(b) The Schur functions $\{s_\lambda\}$ form an orthonormal $\mathbb{Z}$-basis for $\Lambda$.

Before proving this, notice that any other orthonormal $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\Lambda$ is related to $\{s_\lambda\}$ by (for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$) an orthogonal matrix with integer coefficients.

**Exercise:** Prove that if $M$ is a matrix of integers and $MM^\dagger = I$ then $M$ is a signed permutation matrix.

So every orthonormal basis of $\Lambda$ is obtained from the Schur function basis by possibly reindexing and changing the signs of some of the $\{s_\lambda\}$. This is the sense in which I meant that the Schur function basis is essentially unique. Since each $s_\lambda$ is constructed naturally from the indexing partition $\lambda$, the choice of signs and indices of $\{s_\lambda\}$ is a sensible one.

We will prove Proposition 23(a) combinatorially by establishing a bijection between the objects counted by the generating functions on each side of the equation. On the right side, $\sum_\lambda s_\lambda(x)s_\lambda(y)$ is the generating function for all pairs $(T,U)$ of tableaux in which $T$ and $U$ have the same shape; the pair $(T,U)$ contributes $x^T y^U$ to the right
side. On the left side, \( \Pi(x,y) = \prod_{i,j} (1 - x_i y_j)^{-1} \) is the generating function for all finite sequences of pairs \( \beta = ((i_1, j_1), \ldots, (i_n, j_n)) \) such that \( j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \cdots \leq j_n \) and if \( j_t = j_{t+1} \) then \( i_t \leq i_{t+1} \); for convenience we call such a sequence \( \beta \) a biword. The biword \( \beta \) contributes \( (xy)^\beta := \prod_{n=1}^{n} x_{i_n} y_{j_n} \) to the left side. To prove Proposition 23(a) we establish a bijection between biwords \( \beta \) and pairs of tableaux \( (T, U) \) of the same shape, such that if \( \beta \) corresponds to \( (T, U) \) then \( (xy)^\beta = x^T y^U \). This is the Robinson-Schensted correspondence.

The construction is admittedly a bit baroque, but at heart it is simply founded on extensive iteration of one basic operation, called row insertion. Let \( R : r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \cdots \leq r_k \) and \( t \) be positive integers. (Think of \( R \) as being one row in a tableau). The insertion of \( t \) into row \( R \) is defined as follows. If \( r_k \leq t \) then we just append \( t \) to row \( R \) to get \( R' : r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \cdots \leq r_k \leq t \); also, we will define \( t' := 0 \) in this case. Otherwise, \( t < r_k \), so let \( 1 \leq u \leq k \) be the greatest index for which \( r_{u-1} \leq t \) (with the convention that \( r_0 = 1 \)). In this case we put \( R' : r_1 \leq \cdots \leq r_{u-1} \leq t < r_{u+1} \leq \cdots \leq r_k \) and let \( t' := r_u \). We use the notation \( (t' | R') \iff (R | t) \) for the operation of row insertion. For example,

\[
(7|2,3,5,6,8,9) \iff (2,3,5,7,8,9|6)
\]

A nice way to visualize this is to let \( t \) sweep across \( R \) from right to left, looking for the first place it will fit, and displacing the element of \( R \) which was previously in that position.

**Exercise:** Show that if \( (t' | R') \iff (R | t) \) then either \( t' = 0 \) or \( t' > t \).

We are going to iterate row insertion by applying it successively to each row in a tableau \( T \). For ease of expression, the convention \( (0 | R) \iff (R | 0) \) for any row \( R \) is useful. So, let \( T \) be a tableau of shape \( \lambda \), and let the rows of \( T \) be \( R_1, \ldots, R_k \), in which \( k = \ell(\lambda) \).

Let \( t = t_1 \) be a positive integer. Perform the row insertions

\[
(t_2 | R'_1) \iff (R_1 | t_1)
\]
\[
(t_3 | R'_2) \iff (R_2 | t_2)
\]
\[
\vdots
\]
\[
(t_{k+1} | R'_{k+1}) \iff (R_k | t_k)
\]
\[
(0 | R'_{k+1}) \iff (| t_{k+1})
\]

We obtain a sequence of rows \( (R'_1, \ldots, R'_{k+1}) \), including \( R'_{k+1} \) only if it is not empty. We will show that these are the rows of a tableau \( T' \); this defines the insertion of \( t \) into the tableau \( T \), which we denote by \( (T \leftarrow t) \). For example, consider the tableau of shape 5 3 2 2
with rows $(1, 1, 2, 4, 5), (2, 4, 5), (3, 5), (6, 7)$, and insert the positive integer 3:

$$(4|1, 1, 2, 3, 5) \iff (1, 1, 2, 4, 5|3)$$

$$(5|2, 4, 4) \iff (2, 4, 5|4)$$

$$(0|3, 5, 5) \iff (3, 5|5)$$

$$(0|6, 7) \iff (6, 7|0)$$

The result is the tableau $T'$ of shape 5 3 3 2 with rows $(1, 1, 2, 3, 5), (2, 4, 4), (3, 5, 5), (6, 7)$. Perhaps a better way to visualize this process is with the following notation:

$$\begin{array}{llll}
1 & 1 & 2 & 4 \ 5 & \leftarrow & 3 \\
2 & 4 & 5 & \leftarrow \\
3 & 5 & \square & \leftarrow \\
6 & 7 & & \\
\end{array}$$

Here, the underlined entries of the tableau $T$ are those elements which are displaced under the successive row insertions, and the box indicates the position at which row insertion stops because the new element is appended to a row of $T$. The positions of the underlined elements and the box form the bumping path of $t$ into $T$.

The key lemma upon which the correctness of the Robinson-Schensted correspondence rests is the following.

**Proposition 4.24.** (a) Let $R$ be a row, and let $t_1 \leq t_2$ be positive integers. Perform the row insertions $(t_1' | R') \iff (R | t_1)$ followed by $(t_2' | R'') \iff (R' | t_2)$. Then $t_2$ is inserted into a position in $R'$ strictly to the right of the position in $R$ into which $t_1$ is inserted. Furthermore, either $t_2' = 0$ or $t_1' \leq t_2'$.

(b) Let $T$ be a tableau with two rows $R_1$ and $R_2$. For $t_1 \in \mathbb{P}$, perform the row insertions $(t_2 | R_1') \iff (R_1 | t_1)$ followed by $(t_3 | R_2') \iff (R_2 | t_2)$. Either $t_2 = 0$ or $t_2$ is inserted into a position in $R_2$ weakly to the left of the position in $R_1$ into which $t_1$ is inserted.

**Proof.** For part (a), since $t_1 \leq t_2$, it follows easily from the definition of row insertion that $t_2$ is inserted into $R'$ strictly to the right of $t_1$. For the remaining claim we may assume that $t_1' \neq 0$ and $t_2' \neq 0$. Now $t_1'$ and $t_2'$ are the entries of $R$ which formerly occupied the positions in $R''$ of $t_1$ and $t_2$, respectively. Since $t_2$ is strictly to the right of $t_1$, it follows that $t_1' \leq t_2'$.

For part (b), we may assume that $t_2 \neq 0$. Assume that $t_1$ is inserted into position $b$ of $R_1$, displacing $t_2$. Then either position $b$ of $R_2$ is empty, or $t_2$ is strictly less than the element in position $b$ of $R_2$ (since the columns of $T$ are strictly increasing). By definition of row insertion, it follows that $t_2$ is inserted into one of positions 1, 2, ... , $b$ of $R_2$. □

Applying Proposition 24 inductively, the proof of the following corollary is immediate.

**Corollary 4.25.** Let $T$ be a tableau, and let $t_1 \leq t_2$ be positive integers. Perform the tableau insertions $T' := (T \leftarrow t_1)$ followed by $T'' := (T' \leftarrow t_2)$. 
(a) The bumping path of \( t_1 \) into \( T \) moves weakly to the left as one reads the successive rows of \( T \). (Similarly for the bumping path of \( t_2 \) into \( T' \), of course.)

(b) The bumping path of \( t_2 \) into \( T' \) stays strictly to the right of the bumping path of \( t_1 \) into \( T \).

To illustrate Corollary 25, consider the following example:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 & 6 & \leftarrow & 4 \\
2 & 3 & 6 & 7 & \leftarrow & \\
4 & 4 & 7 & 8 & \leftarrow & \\
5 & 6 & 8 & \leftarrow & \square & \leftarrow \\
\end{array}
\]

followed by

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 6 & \leftarrow & 5 \\
2 & 3 & 5 & 7 & \leftarrow & \\
4 & 4 & 6 & 8 & \leftarrow & \\
5 & 6 & 7 & \square & \leftarrow & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

The resulting tableau is

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
2 & 3 & 5 & 6 \\
4 & 4 & 6 & 7 \\
5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\
8 \\
\end{array}
\]

**Proposition 4.26.** Let \( t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n \) be any sequence of positive integers, let \( T_0 := () \), and for \( 1 \leq u \leq n \) let \( T_u := (T_{u-1} \leftarrow t_u) \). Then \( T_n \) is a tableau.

**Proof.** By induction on \( n \), it suffices to show that if \( T \) is a tableau and \( t \in \mathbb{P} \), then \( T' := (T \leftarrow t) \) is a tableau. By the definition of the row insertion algorithm, each row of \( T' \) is weakly increasing. Since the bumping path of \( t \) into \( T \) moves weakly to the left, the shape of \( T' \) is the Ferrers diagram of a partition obtained by adjoining one new box to the shape of \( T \). Now, let’s check the column condition for \( T' \); so consider two consecutive entries \( T'(a, b) \) and \( T'(a+1, b) \) in column \( b \) of \( T' \). Since \( T \) is a tableau, we have \( T'(a,b) < T'(a+1,b) \) unless at least one of \((a,b)\) or \((a+1,b)\) is on the bumping path of \( t \) into \( T \). Notice that \((a,b)\) is not the new box of the shape of \( T' \); if it were then \((a+1,b)\) would be a box of \( T \) and the shape of \( T \) would not be the Ferrers diagram of a partition. If \((a,b)\) is on the bumping path, then \( T'(a,b) \) is strictly less than the element \( t' \) which is bumped out of row \( a \) of \( T' \), and \( t' \) is less than or equal to \( T'(a+1,b) \) since the bumping path is moving weakly to the left; in this case \( T'(a,b) < T'(a+1,b) \), as required. If \((a+1,b)\) is on the bumping path, then \( T'(a+1,b) \) is the value bumped out of row \( a \) of \( T' \). Since the bumping path is moving weakly to the left, \( T'(a,b) \) is less than or equal to the value \( t'' \) inserted into row \( a \) of \( T \). Since \( t'' \) displaces \( T'(a+1,b) \) from row \( a \) of \( T \), we have \( t'' < T'(a+1,b) \), completing the proof. \( \square \)
Iterating part (b) of Corollary 25, we obtain the following statement.

**Proposition 4.27.** Let $T_1$ be a tableau, and let $t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \cdots \leq t_k$ be positive integers. Perform the tableau insertions $T_{i+1} := (T_i \leftarrow t_i)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\lambda$ be the shape of $T_1$ and let $\mu$ be the shape of $T_{k+1}$. Then $F_\mu \setminus F_\lambda$ is a set of $k$ boxes, with no more than one box per column.

Because of this proposition, we can define a function from biwords $\beta$ to pairs of tableau $(T, U)$ of the same shape, as follows. Let $\beta = ((i_1, j_1), \ldots, (i_n, j_n))$ be a biword, and initially define $T_0 := ()$ and $U_0 := ()$ and $\lambda(0) := ()$. For each $1 \leq u \leq n$, let $T_u := (T_{u-1} \leftarrow i_u)$ and let $\lambda^{(u)}$ be the shape of $T_u$. Construct $U_u$ by adjoining to $U_{u-1}$ a new box in the position $F_{\lambda^{(u)}} \setminus F_{\lambda^{(u-1)}}$ which contains the value $j_u$.

The Robinson-Schensted correspondence is the function $\beta \mapsto (T, U) := (T_n, U_n)$ defined by this procedure.

For example, consider the biword $\beta$ pictured below, in which the first row is $i_1, \ldots, i_n$ and the second is $j_1, \ldots, j_n$.

$$
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
& & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\text{x} & 3 & 3 & 6 & 2 & 4 & 5 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 3 \\
\text{y} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 4 \\
\end{array}
$$

Then $(T_3, U_3)$, $(T_6, U_6)$, $(T_{10}, U_{10})$, and $(T, U) = (T_{12}, U_{12})$ are as shown below.

$$
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
& & & & & & & & & & & & \\
3 & 3 & 6 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\
3 & 6 & 2 & 2 \\
1 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
2 & 4 & 5 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\
3 & 6 & 3 & 3 \\
1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
2 & 3 & 4 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\
3 & 4 & 5 & 3 & 3 & 4 \\
6 & 4 & \\
\end{array}
$$

By Proposition 26, we know that $T$ is a tableau; also, from Proposition 27 it follows that $U$ is a tableau. It is clear from the construction that $T$ and $U$ have the same shape and that $(xy)^\beta = x^T y^U$ if $\beta \mapsto (T, U)$. All that remains is to prove that the Robinson-Schensted correspondence is a bijection from biwords to pairs of tableau of the same shape.
To see how we can reverse the above procedure $\beta \mapsto (T,U)$, consider the output pair $(T,U)$ of tableau of the same shape $F_\lambda$. We must reconstruct the biword $\beta = ((i_1,j_1),\ldots,(i_n,j_n))$ corresponding to $(T,U)$. First of all, the sequence $j_1,\ldots,j_n$ is just the sequence of entries of $U$ sorted into weakly increasing order. Also from $U$, we can determine the sequence in which the boxes of $F_\lambda$ were adjoined to the Ferrers diagram: they must appear in weakly increasing order of the entries of $U$, and among the boxes with equal entries of $U$ they are adjoined from left to right, because of Corollary 25(b).

For example, from the last tableau $U$ pictured above, we see that the boxes of $F_{5331}$ were adjoined in the order

\[ 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 6 \quad 10 \\
4 \quad 5 \quad 9 \\
7 \quad 8 \quad 12 \\
11 \]

while the pair $(T,U)$ was being constructed. This allows us to reconstruct the sequence $i_1,\ldots,i_n$ of the biword $\beta$ by “extracting” the entries of $T$ according to the reverse order in which the boxes of $F_\lambda$ were adjoined.

The tableau extraction algorithm is the functional inverse of the tableau insertion algorithm $(T \leftarrow t)$. It takes as input a tableau $T$ and a box $(a,b)$ of the shape of $T$ which is a “lower-right corner” of the shape of $T$: that is, $(a,b)$ is maximal in the product partial order $((a',b') \leq (a,b)$ if and only if both $a' \leq a$ and $b' \leq b$) on the shape of $T$. The output is another tableau $T'$ and a positive integer $t$; we denote this by $(T \xrightarrow{(a,b)} t)$. To define tableau extraction, let the rows of $T$ be $R_1,\ldots,R_k$, so that $(a,b)$ is the last box of row $a$ of the shape of $T$. Remove $t_a := T(a,b)$ from $R_a$ along with the box $(a,b)$ from the shape of $T$, and let $R'_a$ denote the resulting row. In the next paragraph, we define a “row extraction” subroutine, denoted by $(t|R) \Rightarrow (R'|t')$; this will be the functional inverse of row insertion. Then tableau extraction is defined by iterating row extraction as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(t_1 \mid R_{a-1}) & \Rightarrow (R'_{a-1} \mid t_{a-1}) \\
(t_{a-1} \mid R_{a-2}) & \Rightarrow (R'_{a-2} \mid t_{a-2}) \\
& \quad \vdots \\
(t_3 \mid R_2) & \Rightarrow (R'_2 \mid t_2) \\
(t_2 \mid R_1) & \Rightarrow (R'_1 \mid t_1).
\end{align*}
\]

The output is the tableau $T'$ with rows $(R'_1,\ldots,R'_a, R_{a+1},\ldots,R_k)$ and the positive integer $t := t_1$. (We must check that $T'$ really is a tableau!)

The row extraction algorithm is defined as follows. Let $R : r_1 \leq \cdots \leq r_b$ be a row of positive integers, and let $t \geq 2$ be an integer. Let $1 \leq u \leq b$ be the greatest index such that $r_u < t$. Then $t' := t_u$ and $R' : r_1 \leq \cdots \leq r_{u-1} < t \leq r_{u+1} \leq \cdots \leq r_b$. This defines row extraction $(t|R) \Rightarrow (R'|t')$. By iteration, this defines tableau extraction $T \xrightarrow{(a,b)} t'$. 


Proposition 4.28. Let $R$ be a weakly increasing sequence of positive integers.
(a) If $t \in \mathbb{P}$ and $(t' \mid R') \iff (R' \mid t')$ and $(t'' \mid R'') \implies (R'' \mid t'')$, then $R'' = R$ and $t'' = t$.
(b) If $t \geq 2$ is an integer and $(t \mid R) \implies (R' \mid t')$ and $(t'' \mid R'') \iff (R' \mid t')$, then $R'' = R$ and $t'' = t$.

Proof. Exercise. □

Proposition 4.29. Let $T$ be a tableau and let $(a,b)$ be a lower-right corner of the shape of $T$. Perform the tableau extraction $T' := (T \overset{(a,b)}{\longrightarrow} t)$. Then $T'$ is a tableau.

Proof. Exercise. □

From the above results it follows that the function $\beta \mapsto (T,U)$ defined above provides a weight-preserving bijection between the set of all biwords $\beta$ and the set of all pairs of tableau $(T,U)$ of the same shape. This completes the verification of the correctness of the Robinson-Schensted correspondence, and proves Proposition 23.

One consequence of Proposition 23(a) is particularly noteworthy. For a partition $\lambda \vdash n$, a standard Young tableau of shape $\lambda$ (abbreviated “SYT”) is a tableau $T$ of shape $\lambda$ and content $1^n$; that is, the entries of $T$ are $\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$. Let $f_\lambda$ denote the number of SYTs of shape $\lambda$.

Exercise: By extracting the coefficient of $x_1x_2\cdots x_ny_1y_2\cdots y_n$ from both sides of Proposition 23(a), we see that
$$n! = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} f_\lambda^2.$$  

THE HOOK-LENGTH FORMULA

Let $\lambda$ be a partition, and let $F_\lambda$ be the corresponding Ferrers diagram. For any $(a,b) \in F_\lambda$, let the hook of $(a,b)$ be the set of boxes $(a',b') \in F_\lambda$ such that either $(a' = a$ and $b' \geq b)$ or $a' \geq a$ and $b' = b$); define $h(a,b)$ to be the cardinality of the hook of $(a,b)$.

Proposition 4.30 (Frame, Robinson, and Thrall). Let $\lambda$ be a partition. Then
$$f_\lambda = \frac{n!}{\prod_{(a,b) \in F_\lambda} h(a,b)}.$$  

Proof. See Section 5, Example 2 of Macdonald. □

SKEW SCHUR FUNCTIONS AND THE LITTLEWOOD-RICHARDSON RULE

Let $\lambda$ and $\mu$ be partitions such that $F_\mu \subseteq F_\lambda$. A skew tableau of shape $\lambda/\mu$ is a function $T : F_\lambda \setminus F_\mu \to \mathbb{P}$ which is weakly increasing from left to right along rows, and strictly increasing from top to bottom along columns. The skew Schur function of shape $\lambda/\mu$ is $s_{\lambda/\mu} := \sum_T x^T$, with the sum over all skew tableau of shape $\lambda/\mu$.

Exercise: Sketch a proof that $s_{\lambda/\mu}$ is a symmetric function.

Exercise: Derive a formula for $s_{\lambda/\mu}$ as a polynomial in the complete symmetric functions.
Proposition 4.31. Let $\lambda$ and $\mu$ be partitions such that $F_\mu \subseteq F_\lambda$. The skew Schur function $s_{\lambda/\mu}$ is a nonnegative integer linear combination of ordinary Schur functions. That is,

$$s_{\lambda/\mu} = \sum_\nu c^\lambda_{\mu\nu}s_\nu,$$

in which each $c^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$ is a nonnegative integer.

Proof. See Section 9 of Macdonald. □

In fact, to be more precise, the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients $c^\lambda_{\mu\nu}$ can be given a direct combinatorial interpretation, but we’ve done enough of symmetric functions and will move on to other things instead.