

# RECIPROCITY ALGEBRAS AND BRANCHING FOR CLASSICAL SYMMETRIC PAIRS

ROGER E. HOWE, ENG-CHYE TAN, AND JEB F. WILLENBRING

**ABSTRACT.** We study branching laws for a classical group  $G$  and a symmetric subgroup  $H$ . Our approach is through the *branching algebra*, the algebra of covariants for  $H$  in the regular functions on the natural torus bundle over the flag manifold for  $G$ . We give concrete descriptions of certain subalgebras of the branching algebra using classical invariant theory. In this context, it turns out that the ten classes of classical symmetric pairs  $(G, H)$  are associated in pairs,  $(G, H)$  and  $(H', G')$ , and that the (partial) branching algebra for  $(G, H)$  also describes a branching law from  $H'$  to  $G'$ . (However, the second branching law may involve certain infinite-dimensional highest weight modules for  $H'$ .) To highlight the fact that these algebras describe two branching laws simultaneously, we call them *reciprocity algebras*. Our description of the reciprocity algebras reveals that they all are related to the tensor product algebra for  $GL_n$ . This relation is especially strong in the *stable range*. We provide explicit descriptions of reciprocity algebras in the stable range in terms of the tensor product algebra for  $GL_n$ . This is the structure lying behind formulas for branching multiplicities in terms of Littlewood-Richardson coefficients.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One of the basic problems in the study of transformation groups and finite dimensional representation theory is the *branching problem*: describing how irreducible representations of a compact group (mutatis mutandis, a reductive complex algebraic group) decompose when restricted to a subgroup. More specifically, given a group  $G$  and a subgroup  $H$ , we may consider the branching problem for the pair  $(G, H)$ . This paper introduces and establishes some basic features of an approach to the branching problem for a class of particularly interesting cases: the classical symmetric pairs, in which the group  $G$  is a classical group and the subgroup  $H$  is a symmetric subgroup - the fixed points of an involution of  $G$ . One can organize these pairs in 10 families, listed in table I (see page 19).

There is already a substantial literature on branching rules for classical symmetric pairs [1], [2], [3], [4], [8], [9], [10], [11], [14], [16], [17], [19], [24], [25], [26], [27], [28], [29], [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36], [37], [39], [41], [44], [45], [46], [47], [48], [50], [49], [54], [55], [56], [61], [65], [66], [69].

A substantial portion of this work is combinatorial in nature, and is formulated in terms of tableaux and Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. This approach began with the work of Littlewood and Richardson [48] [9] on tensor products of representations of  $GL_n$  and Littlewood's Restriction Formula [50] [49] for restriction of certain representations of  $GL_n$  to the orthogonal group or the symplectic group. More recent work in this tradition includes [61],

several papers by Koike and Terada [34], [35], [36], [37] and by R.W. King and collaborators [24], [25], [26], [27], [4], [28], [30], [31], [29].

A group  $G$  embedded diagonally in the product  $G \times G$  is a symmetric subgroup, corresponding to the involution which exchanges the two copies of  $G$ . An irreducible representation of  $G \times G$  is just a tensor product  $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$  of irreducible representations of  $G$ . Thus, the branching problem for symmetric pairs includes the *tensor product problem* - to describe how a tensor product of representations of a group  $G$  decomposes into irreducible pieces. In the 1990s, striking progress on the tensor product problem came from an unexpected source - the theory of quantum groups (see [7, 20–22]).

Quantum groups are one-parameter deformations of the universal enveloping algebra of a semisimple Lie algebra. The extra parameter was used by Lusztig ([51]) and Kashiwara ([23]) to define bases (“canonical bases” or “crystal bases”) for these algebras. The properties of these bases permitted combinatorial descriptions of tensor product multiplicities, providing an extension of the Littlewood-Richardson Rule for  $GL_n$  to all simple groups. This approach has been elucidated and simplified by the path model of Littelmann (see [44–47]), which also provides branching rules for restriction from a group  $G$  to the Levi component of a parabolic subgroup.

This paper takes another approach to the branching problem for classical symmetric pairs. Its main tool is invariant theory, represented primarily by the geometric version of highest weight theory (see [10], [14] and [6]) and by classical invariant theory [10, 14, 66]. (At the moment, parts of our development also depend on the combinatorial theory of the Littlewood-Richardson Rule. However, our approach also suggests alternative approaches to these results, and we hope eventually to obtain independent proofs.) To describe the branching rule for a classical symmetric pair  $(G, H)$ , we study a naturally defined algebra  $B(G, H)$ , which we call the *branching algebra* for the pair  $(G, H)$ . The algebra  $B(G, H)$  carries a multigrading by  $\hat{A}_G^+ \times \hat{A}_H^+$ , the semigroups of dominant weights of  $G$  and  $H$ . The dimension of the homogeneous component  $B(G, H)^{(\phi, \psi)}$  labeled by  $(\phi, \psi) \in \hat{A}_G^+ \times \hat{A}_H^+$  equals the multiplicity of  $\rho^\psi$  in  $\rho^\phi$ , where  $\rho^\phi$  (respectively,  $\rho^\psi$ ) is the irreducible representation of  $G$  with highest weight  $\phi$  (respectively, irreducible representation of  $H$ , with highest weight  $\psi$ ). Branching algebras were studied in [69], but have been mostly neglected since.

In addition to the full branching algebras, our theory distinguishes certain families of graded subalgebras, depending on integer parameters. For a certain range of the parameters, the subalgebras have a particularly simple structure. We call this the *stable range*, and the resulting algebras, *stable branching algebras*.

This approach must of course give the same numbers as are produced by the combinatorial, quantum group and path model methods. We have already shown in [16] how to use branching algebras systematically to express stable branching multiplicities for all families of classical symmetric pairs in terms of Littlewood-Richardson coefficients.

We feel that branching algebras have several virtues in addition to providing an efficient route to formulas for branching multiplicities. One is, they provide finer information than multiplicities: they provide highest weight vectors. Indeed, the homogeneous component  $B(G, H)^{(\phi, \psi)}$  of  $B(G, H)$  consists of the  $\psi$ -highest weight vectors for  $H$  in a specific realization of the representation  $\rho^\phi$  of  $G$ . Thus, if one understands  $B(G, H)$  well enough, one gets information about how  $H$ -modules sit inside  $G$ -modules. For the classical symmetric pairs, this possibility can in fact be realized: in [17], the authors have shown how to construct an

explicit basis for the  $GL_n$  tensor product algebra. In further work, Howe and Lee [15] have extended this construction to apply to most of the families of branching algebras.

A second positive feature of branching algebras is, they collect all multiplicity information into one coherent structure. This has several potential implications. For example, it has been observed in many cases that branching multiplicities can be interpreted as the number of integral points in certain convex polytopes. The theory of SAGBI bases ([58]) provides a strategy for attaching lattices cones to affine algebras. The explicit bases mentioned above permit one to realize the SAGBI strategy effectively. The insight gained into the structure of branching algebras allows one in turn to predict the existence of convex polytopes whose integral points define the desired multiplicities [2], [3], [42], [43].

The algebra structure also provides natural connections between the different branching algebras. The stable branching algebras for all 10 families of classical symmetric pairs are closely related to each other, and in particular, they all can be described in terms of the  $GL_n$  branching algebra. These relationships lie behind the various formulas expressing stable multiplicities for all families in terms of Littlewood-Richardson coefficients [16].

These connections in fact go beyond branching algebras. By some remarkable coincidences, there are also very close relationships between branching algebras for classical symmetric pairs and classical Kostant-Rallis actions (see [40], [67], [68]). By a Kostant-Rallis action, we mean the complexified action of  $H$  on  $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h}$ , where  $H$  is a maximal compact subgroup of a semisimple Lie group  $G$ , and  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  are the Lie algebras of  $G$  and  $H$  respectively. Some key results about these actions were given in [40], but some aspects of their structure are still not completely settled. The tight connection of classical Kostant-Rallis actions with branching algebras can be used to improve understanding of these important examples. Beyond these immediate applications, branching algebras should provide a useful general tool for analyzing group actions.

We also feel that the branching algebra approach sheds light on some of the basic constructions of the combinatorial theory. For example, the combinatorial description tensor product multiplicities for  $GL_n$  by means of Littlewood-Richardson tableaux still has an air of mystery about it. A number of experts have remarked on the curious circumstance that, although tensor product multiplicities are obviously symmetric in the two tensor factors, the Littlewood-Richardson description of multiplicities is not symmetric. The SAGBI basis description of the  $GL_n$  tensor product algebra [17] provides a natural interpretation of the information encoded by a Littlewood-Richardson tableau, including providing a straightforward context for the asymmetrical treatment of the two factors.

The efficient packaging of all multiplicity formulas for a given pair in one algebraic structure also seems to provide an efficient way of computing explicit results in low rank examples. The authors hope to treat a collection of explicit cases in a future publication.

Finally, although the branching algebra construction is not limited to symmetric pairs, it has a remarkable additional feature in the case of classical symmetric pairs. As explained in [11] [12], classical invariant theory gives rise to natural correspondences between representations of pairs (“dual pairs”) of classical groups. It turns out that these correspondences can be refined to correspondences between branching laws for symmetric pairs. The 10 families of classical symmetric pairs pair up into 5 families of pairs of pairs (see Table II on page 19), in such a way that a branching algebra for one pair can also be interpreted as a branching algebra for the corresponding pair. Thus, one branching algebra simultaneously describes

branching between representations of two classical symmetric pairs. This can be thought of as a reciprocity law, analogous to Frobenius Reciprocity in the theory of group representations. Hence we call these branching algebras *reciprocity algebras*. (Multiplicity versions of these reciprocity laws are implicitly included in the general result of [11]). We should also remark that in most cases, the relevant representations for some of the groups involved in the pairs will be infinite dimensional. However, the infinite dimensional representations which occur are of a very special sort, and share many of the characteristics of finite-dimensional representations.)

For all the above reasons, we hope that branching algebras will serve as a useful complement to the already developed approaches to describing branching laws.

**1.1. Overview.** We will give the construction of a branching algebra in the following section. We shall illustrate how the algebra structure emphasizes the coherence of the branching problem across representations of  $G$ , rather than simply providing a representation-by-representation answer. Further, the algebra structure goes beyond the numerical nature of multiplicities, and is the basis of some of the well-known multiplicity results.

There are three main parts to this paper:

- (a) **Background:** preliminary knowledge on multiplicity-free spaces, the theory of dual pairs and the classification of classical symmetric pairs, leading to the concept of reciprocity algebra. One can group the classical symmetric pairs into 10 families, and it turns out that these families are associated in pairs,  $(G, H)$  and  $(H', G')$  (see Tables I and II), and that the branching algebra for  $(G, H)$  also describes a branching law from  $H'$  to  $G'$ . Hence, we call the algebra that describes the two related branching laws a *reciprocity algebra*.
- (b) **Reciprocity:** explaining the underpinnings of the reciprocity of multiplicities for the 5 pairs of reciprocity algebras, with detailed discussions for certain representative pairs.
- (c) **Stability:** describing the branching algebra for a symmetric pair  $(G, H)$  in terms of a  $GL_n$  tensor product algebra. This emphasizes the underlying importance of the  $GL_n$  branching algebras, since their structure relate to all others. This phenomenon is also the basis for the expression of multiplicity formulas for representations of classical groups in terms of Littlewood-Richardson coefficients - a recurring theme in the literature. The present paper brings more structure to these multiplicity results.

The first four sections provide the necessary background:

- §3: We provide the notations for the parametrization of representations in §3.1. Next, we discuss some preliminary concepts on multiplicity-free spaces and prove a main theorem (see Theorem 3.3) on embedding the associated graded algebra of a graded  $G$ -multiplicity-free space into the algebra  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)$ . The final subsection discusses the rudiments of classical invariant theory, formulated in terms of the theory of dual pairs.
- §4: Section 4 begins with the simplest example of a pair of branching algebras for  $GL_n$ , leading us to the concept of reciprocity algebras. This is where we bring forth the classification of classical symmetric pairs and the theory of dual pairs to introduce the 5 pairs (also called *see-saw pairs*) of reciprocity algebras.

For the second part of the paper, we organize discussions of the see-saw pairs as follows:

- §5: discusses the branching from  $GL_n$  to  $O_n$  (note that branching from  $GL_{2n}$  to  $Sp_{2n}$  can be treated similarly);
- §6: discusses the tensor product algebra for  $O_n$  (note that the tensor product algebra of  $Sp_{2n}$  can be treated similarly);
- §7: provides a more general treatment of the reciprocity for  $(GL_n, GL_m)$ .

For the sake of brevity, we will not discuss the branching from  $Sp_{2(m+n)}$  to  $Sp_{2m} \times Sp_{2n}$ ,  $O_{2n}$  to  $GL_n$  and  $Sp_{2n}$  to  $GL_n$ . They can be treated similarly.

In the final part of this paper we begin with some important comments on stability results for branching in §8. We demonstrate the theoretical underpinnings for stability results, highlighting certain specific see-saw pairs:

- §9: we interpret the associated graded of the branching algebra from  $GL_n$  to  $O_n$  as a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra (see Definition 3.1) of the tensor product algebra of  $GL_m$  in the stable range  $n > 2m$ .
- §10: we interpret the associated graded of the  $O_n$  tensor product algebra as a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of a triple product of tensor product algebras of  $GL_n$ ,  $GL_m$  and  $GL_\ell$  in the stable range  $n > 2(m + \ell)$ .
- §11: we interpret the branching algebra of  $O_{n+m}$  to  $O_n \times O_m$  as a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of a triple tensor product algebra of  $GL_\ell$  in the stable range  $\min(n, m) > 2\ell$ .

In all these cases, we show that the branching algebras associated to symmetric pairs can all be identified with suitable branching algebras associated to the general linear groups. Thus, if we can have control of the solution in the general linear group case, we will have some control of the other classical groups. And indeed, we do (see [17]). The other non-trivial examples will be important extensions of this work, and we hope to see them in further papers, for example, [15].

**Acknowledgements:** We thank Kenji Ueno and Chen-Bo Zhu for discussions on the proof in the Appendix. The second named author also acknowledges the support of NUS grant R-146-000-050-112. The third named author was supported by NSA Grant # H98230-05-1-0078.

## 2. BRANCHING ALGEBRAS

For a reductive complex linear algebraic  $G$ , let  $U_G$  be a maximal unipotent subgroup of  $G$ . The group  $U_G$  is determined up to conjugacy in  $G$  [5]. Let  $A_G$  denote a maximal torus which normalizes  $U_G$ , so that  $B_G = A_G \cdot U_G$  is a Borel subgroup of  $G$ . Also let  $\hat{A}_G^+$  be the set of dominant characters of  $A_G$  – the semigroup of highest weights of representations of  $G$ . It is well-known [5] [14] and may be thought of as a geometric version of the theory of the highest weight, that the space of regular functions on the coset space  $G/U_G$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)$ , decomposes (under the action of  $G$  by left translations) as a direct sum of one copy of each irreducible representation  $V_\psi$  (with highest weight  $\psi$ ) of  $G$  (see [64]):

$$\mathcal{R}(G/U_G) \simeq \bigoplus_{\psi \in \hat{A}_G^+} V_\psi. \quad (2.1)$$

We note that  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)$  has the structure of an  $\hat{A}_G^+$ -graded algebra, for which the  $V_\psi$  are the graded components. To be specific, we note that since  $A_G$  normalizes  $U_G$ , it acts on  $G/U_G$  by right translations, and this action commutes with the action of  $G$  by left translations.

The following result is well-known, probably folklore. We provide the proof anyway, since we are not able to find a suitable reference.

**Proposition 2.1.** *The algebra of regular functions  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)$  is an  $\widehat{A}_G^+$ -graded algebra, under the right action of  $A_G$ . More precisely, the decomposition (2.1) is the graded algebra decomposition under  $A_G$ , where  $V_\psi$  is the  $A_G$ -eigenspace corresponding to  $\phi \in \widehat{A}_G^+$  with  $\phi = w^*(\psi^{-1})$ . Here  $w$  is the longest element of the Weyl group with respect to the root system determined by the Borel subgroup  $B_G$ .*

**Proof.** Since  $A_G$  is commutative and reductive, we can decompose  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)$  into eigenspaces for the right action of  $A_G$ . These eigenspaces must be invariant under the action of  $G$  by left translations. Since  $V_\psi$  is irreducible for the action of  $G$ , it must belong to a single  $A_G$  eigenspace. Let  $f$  be the highest weight vector for  $B_G$  in  $V_\psi$ . Then by definition  $L_a(f) = \psi(a)(f)$ , where  $a \in A_G$  and  $L_g$  indicates left translation by  $g$ :  $L_g(f)(h) = f(g^{-1}h)$  for any  $h$  in  $G$ , representing a point in  $G/U_G$ . If  $w$  is the longest element of the Weyl group, then the  $B_G$  orbit  $B_G w U_G$  is dense in  $G/U_G$ , so that  $f$  is determined by its restriction to  $B_G w U_G$ . We compute that

$$\psi(a)f(w) = L_a(f)(w) = f(a^{-1}w) = f(w w^{-1} a^{-1} w) = R_{w^{-1} a^{-1} w} f(w),$$

where  $R_g f(h) = f(hg)$  refers to the right translation of  $f$  by  $g$ . If  $V_\psi$  belongs to the  $\phi$  eigenspace for the right action of  $A_G$ , then this equation implies that

$$\psi(a) = \phi(w^{-1} a^{-1} w), \quad \text{or} \quad \psi = w^*(\phi^{-1}), \quad (2.2)$$

where  $w^*$  indicates the action of  $w$  on  $\widehat{A}_G$  resulting from conjugation of  $A_G$  by  $w$ . Thus, the  $V_\psi$  are exactly the eigenspaces for the right action of  $A_G$ , with the  $A_G$ -eigencharacter related to the highest weight by the equation (2.2). Since the right action by  $A_G$  (as well as the left action by  $G$ ) is an action by algebra automorphisms of  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)$ , it is easy to check that if  $f_1$  is a  $\phi$ -eigenfunction for  $A_G$ , and  $f_2$  is a  $\theta$ -eigenfunction, then the product  $f_1 f_2$  is a  $\phi\theta$ -eigenfunction for  $A_G$ . It follows that

$$V_\psi V_\chi = V_{\psi\chi},$$

so that, indeed, the decomposition (2.1) defines a structure of an  $\widehat{A}_G^+$ -graded algebra on  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)$ .  $\square$

Now let  $H \subset G$  be a reductive subgroup, and let  $U_H$  be a maximal unipotent subgroup of  $H$ . We consider the algebra  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$ , of functions on  $G/U_G$  which are invariant under left translations by  $U_H$ . Let  $A_H$  be a maximal torus of  $H$  normalizing  $U_H$ , so that  $B_H := A_H \cdot U_H$  is a Borel subgroup of  $H$ . Then  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$  will be invariant under the (left) action of  $A_H$ , and we may decompose  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$  into eigenspaces for  $A_H$ . Since the functions in  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$  are by definition (left) invariant under  $U_H$ , the (left)  $A_H$ -eigenfunctions will in fact be (left)  $B_H$  eigenfunctions. In other words, they are highest weight vectors for  $H$ . Hence, the characters of  $A_H$  acting on (the left of)  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$  will all be dominant with respect to  $B_H$ , and we may write  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$  as a sum of (left)  $A_H$  eigenspaces  $(\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H})^\chi$  for dominant characters  $\chi$  of  $H$ :

$$\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H} = \bigoplus_{\chi \in \widehat{A}_H^+} (\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H})^\chi. \quad (2.3)$$

Since the spaces  $V_\psi$  of decomposition (2.1) are (left)  $G$ -invariant, they are a fortiori left  $H$ -invariant, so we have a decomposition of  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$  into *right*  $A_G$ -eigenspaces  $(\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H})_\psi$ :

$$\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H} = \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{A}_G^+} \mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H} \cap V_\psi := \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{A}_G^+} \mathcal{R}(G/U_G)_\psi^{U_H}.$$

Combining this decomposition with the decomposition (2.3), we may write

$$\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H} = \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{A}_G^+, \chi \in \widehat{A}_H^+} (\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)_\psi^{U_H})^\chi. \quad (2.4)$$

To emphasize the key features of this algebra, we note the resulting consequences of decomposition (2.4) in the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.2.** (a) *The decomposition (2.4) is an  $(\widehat{A}_G^+ \times \widehat{A}_H^+)$ -graded algebra decomposition of  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$ .*

(b) *The subspaces  $(\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)_\psi^{U_H})^\chi$  tell us the  $\chi$  highest weight vectors for  $B_H$  in the irreducible representation  $V_\psi$  of  $G$ . Therefore, the decomposition*

$$\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)_\psi^{U_H} = \bigoplus_{\chi \in \widehat{A}_H^+} (\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)_\psi^{U_H})^\chi$$

*tells us how  $V_\psi$  decomposes as a  $H$ -module.*

Thus, knowledge of  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$  as a  $(\widehat{A}_G^+ \times \widehat{A}_H^+)$ -graded algebra tell us how representations of  $G$  decompose when restricted to  $H$ , in other words, it describes the branching rule from  $G$  to  $H$ . We will call  $\mathcal{R}(G/U_G)^{U_H}$  the  $(G, H)$  *branching algebra*. When  $G \simeq H \times H$ , and  $H$  is embedded diagonally in  $G$ , the branching algebra describes the decomposition of tensor products of representations of  $H$ , and we then call it the *tensor product algebra* for  $H$ . More generally, we would like to understand the  $(G, H)$  branching algebras for symmetric pairs  $(G, H)$ .

### 3. PRELIMINARIES AND NOTATIONS

**3.1. Parametrization of Representations.** Let  $G$  be a classical reductive algebraic group over  $\mathbb{C}$ :  $G = GL_n(\mathbb{C}) = GL_n$ , the general linear group; or  $G = O_n(\mathbb{C}) = O_n$ , the orthogonal group; or  $G = Sp_{2n}(\mathbb{C}) = Sp_{2n}$ , the symplectic group. We shall explain our notations on irreducible representations of  $G$  using integer partitions. In each of these cases, we select a Borel subalgebra of the classical Lie algebra and coordinatize it, as is done in [10]. Consequently, all highest weights are parameterized in the standard way (see [10]).

A non-negative integer *partition*  $\lambda$ , with  $k$  parts, is an integer sequence  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k > 0$ . We may sometimes refer to  $\lambda$  as a *Young* or *Ferrers diagram*. We use the same notation for partitions as is done in [52]. For example, we write  $\ell(\lambda)$  to denote the *length* (or *depth*) of a partition, i.e.,  $\ell(\lambda) = k$  for the above partition. Also let  $|\lambda| = \sum_i \lambda_i$  be the size of a partition and  $\lambda'$  denote the *transpose* (or *conjugate*) of  $\lambda$  (i.e.,  $(\lambda')_i = |\{\lambda_j : \lambda_j \geq i\}|$ ).

**GL<sub>n</sub> Representations:** Given non-negative integers  $p, q$  and  $n$  such that  $n \geq p + q$  and non-negative integer partitions  $\lambda^+$  and  $\lambda^-$  with  $p$  and  $q$  parts respectively, let  $F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)}$  denote

the irreducible rational representation of  $GL_n$  with highest weight given by the  $n$ -tuple:

$$(\lambda^+, \lambda^-) = \underbrace{(\lambda_1^+, \lambda_2^+, \dots, \lambda_p^+, 0, \dots, 0, -\lambda_q^-, \dots, -\lambda_1^-)}_n$$

If  $\lambda^- = (0)$  then we will write  $F_{(n)}^{\lambda^+}$  for  $F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)}$ . Note that if  $\lambda^+ = (0)$  then  $(F_{(n)}^{\lambda^-})^*$  is equivalent to  $F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)}$ . More generally,  $(F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)})^*$  is equivalent to  $F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^-, \lambda^+)}$ .

**$O_n$  Representations:** The complex orthogonal group has two connected components. Because the group is disconnected we cannot index irreducible representations by highest weights. There is however an analog of Schur-Weyl duality for the case of  $O_n$  in which each irreducible rational representation is indexed uniquely by a non-negative integer partition  $\nu$  such that  $(\nu')_1 + (\nu')_2 \leq n$ . That is, the sum of the first two columns of the Young diagram of  $\nu$  is at most  $n$ . We will call such a diagram  $O_n$ -admissible (see [10] Chapter 10 for details). Let  $E_{(n)}^\nu$  denote the irreducible representation of  $O_n$  indexed  $\nu$  in this way.

An irreducible rational representation of  $SO_n$  may be indexed by its highest weight. In [10] Section 5.2.2, the irreducible representations of  $O_n$  are determined in terms of their restrictions to  $SO_n$  (which is a normal subgroup having index 2). We note that if  $\ell(\nu) \neq \frac{n}{2}$ , then the restriction of  $E_{(n)}^\nu$  to  $SO_n$  is irreducible. If  $\ell(\nu) = \frac{n}{2}$  ( $n$  even), then  $E_{(n)}^\nu$  decomposes into exactly two irreducible representations of  $SO_n$ . See [10] Section 10.2.4 and 10.2.5 for the correspondence between this parametrization and the above parametrization by partitions.

The determinant defines an (irreducible) one-dimensional representation of  $O_n$ . This representation is indexed by the length  $n$  partition  $\zeta = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ . An irreducible representation of  $O_n$  will remain irreducible when tensored by  $E_{(n)}^\zeta$ , but the resulting representation *may* be inequivalent to the initial representation. We say that a pair of  $O_n$ -admissible partitions  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are *associate* if  $E_{(n)}^\alpha \otimes E_{(n)}^\zeta \cong E_{(n)}^\beta$ . It turns out that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are associate exactly when  $(\alpha')_1 + (\beta')_1 = n$  and  $(\alpha')_i = (\beta')_i$  for all  $i > 1$ . This relation is clearly symmetric, and is related to the structure of the underlying  $SO_n$ -representations. Indeed, when restricted to  $SO_n$ ,  $E_{(n)}^\alpha \cong E_{(n)}^\beta$  if and only if  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are either associate or equal.

**$Sp_{2n}$  Representations:** For a non-negative integer partition  $\nu$  with  $p$  parts where  $p \leq n$ , let  $V_{(2n)}^\nu$  denote the irreducible rational representation of  $Sp_{2n}$  where the highest weight indexed by the partition  $\nu$  is given by the  $n$  tuple:

$$\underbrace{(\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_p, 0, \dots, 0)}_n.$$

**3.2. Multiplicity-Free Actions.** Let  $G$  be a complex reductive algebraic group acting on a complex vector space  $V$ . We say  $V$  is a *multiplicity-free action* if the algebra  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  of polynomial functions on  $V$  is multiplicity free as a  $G$  module. The criterion of Servedio-Vinberg [60] [65] says that  $V$  is multiplicity free if and only if a Borel subgroup  $B$  of  $G$  has a Zariski open orbit in  $V$ . In other words,  $B$  (and hence  $G$ ) acts prehomogeneously on  $V$  (see [59]). A direct consequence is that  $B$  eigenfunctions in  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  have a very simple structure. Let  $Q_\psi \in \mathcal{P}(V)$  be a  $B$  eigenfunction with eigencharacter  $\psi$ , normalized so that  $Q_\psi(v_0) = 1$  for some fixed  $v_0$  in a Zariski open  $B$  orbit in  $V$ . Then  $Q_\psi$  is completely determined by  $\psi$ :



For  $v = b^{-1}v_0$  in the Zariski open  $B$  orbit,

$$Q_\psi(v) = Q_\psi(b^{-1}v_0) = \psi(b)Q_\psi(v_0) = \psi(b), \quad b \in B.$$

$Q_\psi$  is then determined on all of  $V$  by continuity. Since  $B = AU$ , and  $U = (B, B)$  is the commutator subgroup of  $B$ , we can identify a character of  $B$  with a character of  $A$ . Thus the  $B$  eigenfunctions are precisely the  $G$  highest weight vectors (with respect to  $B$ ) in  $\mathcal{P}(V)$ . Further

$$Q_{\psi_1}Q_{\psi_2} = Q_{\psi_1\psi_2}$$

and so the set of  $\widehat{A}^+(V) = \{\psi \in \widehat{A}^+ \mid Q_\psi \neq 0\}$  forms a sub-semigroup of the cone  $\widehat{A}^+$  of dominant weights of  $A$ .

An element  $\psi (\neq 1)$  of a semigroup is *primitive* if it is not expressible as a non-trivial product of two elements of the semigroup. The algebra  $\mathcal{P}(V)^U$  has unique factorization (see [18]). The eigenfunctions associated to the primitive elements of  $\widehat{A}^+(V)$  are prime polynomials, and  $\mathcal{P}(V)^U$  is the polynomial ring on these eigenfunctions. If  $\psi = \psi_1\psi_2$ , then  $Q_\psi = Q_{\psi_1}Q_{\psi_2}$ . Thus, if  $\psi$  is not primitive, then the polynomial  $Q_\psi$  cannot be prime. An element

$$\psi = \prod_{j=1}^k \psi_j^{c_j}$$

has  $c_j$ 's uniquely determined, and hence the prime factorization

$$Q_\psi = \prod_{j=1}^k Q_{\psi_j}^{c_j}.$$

Consider a multiplicity-free action of  $G$  on an algebra  $\mathcal{W}$ . In the general situation, we would like to associate this algebra  $\mathcal{W}$  with a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{R}(G/U)$ . With this goal in mind, we introduce the following notion:

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\mathcal{P} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \widehat{A}^+} \mathcal{P}_\lambda$  denote an algebra graded by an abelian semigroup  $\widehat{A}^+$ . If  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}$ , then we say that  $\mathcal{W}$  is a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}$  if

$$\mathcal{W} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in Z} \mathcal{P}_\lambda$$

where  $Z$  is a sub-semigroup of  $\widehat{A}^+$ , which we will denote by  $\widehat{A}^+(\mathcal{W}) = Z$ . Note that  $\mathcal{W}$  is graded by  $\widehat{A}^+(\mathcal{W})$ .

In what is to follow, we will usually have  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(V)$  (polynomial functions on a vector space  $V$ ) and  $\widehat{A}^+$  will denote the dominant chamber of the character group of a maximal torus  $A$  of a reductive group  $G$  acting on  $V$ . In this situation, we introduce an  $A^+$ -filtration on  $\mathcal{W}$  as follows:

$$\mathcal{W}^{(\psi)} = \bigoplus_{\phi \leq \psi} \mathcal{W}_\phi$$

where the ordering  $\leq$  is the ordering on  $\widehat{A}^+$  given by (see [55])

$$\psi_1 \leq \psi_2 \quad \text{if } \psi_1^{-1}\psi_2 \text{ is expressible as a product of} \\ \text{rational powers of positive roots.}$$

Note that positive roots are weights of the adjoint representation of  $G$  on its Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . We refer to the abelian group structure on the integral weights multiplicatively. Also, it will turn out that we only need positive *integer* powers of the positive roots.

Next consider the more specific situation where  $\mathcal{W}$  which is a  $G$ -invariant and  $G$ -multiplicity-free subalgebra of a polynomial algebra  $\mathcal{P}(V)$ . Suppose that  $\mathcal{W}^U$  has unique factorization. Then  $\mathcal{W}^U$  is a polynomial ring and  $\widehat{A}^+(\mathcal{W})$  is a free sub-semigroup in  $\widehat{A}^+$  generated by the highest weights corresponding to the non-zero graded components of  $\mathcal{W}$ . Write the  $G$  decomposition as follows:

$$\mathcal{W} = \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{A}^+(\mathcal{W})} \mathcal{W}_\psi$$

noting that  $\mathcal{W}_\psi$  is an irreducible  $G$  module with highest weight  $\psi$ .

If  $\delta$  occurs with positive multiplicity in the tensor product decomposition

$$\mathcal{W}_\phi \otimes \mathcal{W}_\psi = \bigoplus_{\delta} \dim \operatorname{Hom}_G(\mathcal{W}_\delta, \mathcal{W}_\phi \otimes \mathcal{W}_\psi) \mathcal{W}_\delta,$$

then  $\delta \leq \phi\psi$ . If

$$\mathcal{W}_\eta \subset \mathcal{W}^{(\phi)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W}_\gamma \subset \mathcal{W}^{(\psi)}, \quad \text{i.e., } \eta \leq \phi \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma \leq \psi,$$

then it follows that

$$\mathcal{W}_\eta \cdot \mathcal{W}_\gamma \hookrightarrow \mathcal{W}_\eta \otimes \mathcal{W}_\gamma \subset \mathcal{W}^{(\eta\gamma)} \subset \mathcal{W}^{(\phi\psi)}.$$

Thus

$$\mathcal{W}^{(\phi)} \cdot \mathcal{W}^{(\psi)} \subset \mathcal{W}^{(\phi\psi)}.$$

We have now an  $A^+$ -filtered algebra

$$\mathcal{W} = \bigcup_{\psi \in \widehat{A}^+(\mathcal{W})} \mathcal{W}^{(\psi)},$$

and this filtration is known as the *dominance filtration* [55].

With a filtered algebra, we can form its associated algebra which is  $\widehat{A}^+$  graded:

$$\operatorname{Gr}_{\widehat{A}^+} \mathcal{W} = \bigoplus_{\psi \in \widehat{A}^+(\mathcal{W})} (\operatorname{Gr}_{\widehat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^\psi$$

where

$$(\operatorname{Gr}_{\widehat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^\psi = \mathcal{W}^{(\psi)} / \left( \bigoplus_{\phi < \psi} \mathcal{W}^{(\phi)} \right).$$

**Theorem 3.2.** *Consider a multiplicity-free  $G$ -module  $\mathcal{W}$  with a  $\widehat{A}^+$ -filtered algebra structure such that  $\mathcal{W}$  is a unique factorization domain. Assume that the zero degree subspace of  $\mathcal{W}$  is  $\mathbb{C}$ . Then there is a canonical  $\widehat{A}^+$ -graded algebra injection:*

$$\operatorname{Gr}_{\widehat{A}^+} \pi : \operatorname{Gr}_{\widehat{A}^+} \mathcal{W} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}(G/U).$$

**Proof.** In [14] it is shown that under the above hypothesis,  $\mathcal{W}^U$  is a polynomial ring on a canonical set of generators. Now,  $\mathcal{W}^U$  is a  $\widehat{A}^+$ -graded algebra and therefore, there exists an injective  $\widehat{A}^+$ -graded algebra homomorphism obtained by sending each generator of the domain to a (indeed any) highest weight vector of the same weight in the codomain:

$$\alpha : \mathcal{W}^U \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}(G/U)^U.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{W}^U = \operatorname{Gr}_{\widehat{A}^+}(\mathcal{W}^U) = (\operatorname{Gr}_{\widehat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^U$ .

There exists a unique  $G$ -module homomorphism  $\bar{\alpha} : \text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}(G/U)$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \alpha : & \mathcal{W}^U & \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}(G/U)^U \\ & \cap & \cap \\ \bar{\alpha} : & \text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W} & \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}(G/U) \end{array}$$

We wish to show that  $\bar{\alpha}$  is an algebra homomorphism, i.e.,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (\text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^\lambda & \times & (\text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^\mu & \xrightarrow{m_{\mathcal{W}}} & (\text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^{\lambda+\mu} \\ \bar{\alpha} \downarrow & & \bar{\alpha} \downarrow & & \bar{\alpha} \downarrow \\ \mathcal{R}(G/U)^\lambda & \times & \mathcal{R}(G/U)^\mu & \xrightarrow{m_{\mathcal{R}(G/U)}} & \mathcal{R}(G/U)^{\lambda+\mu} \end{array}$$

commutes.

We have two maps:

$$f_i : (\text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^\lambda \otimes (\text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(G/U)^{\lambda+\mu}, \quad i = 1, 2,$$

defined by:  $f_1(v \otimes w) = m_{\mathcal{R}(G/U)}(\bar{\alpha}(v) \otimes \bar{\alpha}(w))$  and  $f_2(v \otimes w) = \bar{\alpha}(m_{\mathcal{W}}(v \otimes w))$ .

Each of  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  is  $G$ -equivariant and,

$$\dim \{ \beta \mid \beta : (\text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^\lambda \otimes (\text{Gr}_{\hat{A}^+} \mathcal{W})^\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(G/U)^{\lambda+\mu} \} = 1$$

because the Cartan product has multiplicity one in the tensor product of two irreducible  $G$ -modules  $V_\lambda$  and  $V_\mu$  [55].

Therefore, there exists a constant  $C$  such that  $f_1 = Cf_2$ . We know that  $\bar{\alpha}|_{\mathcal{W}^U} = \alpha$  is an algebra homomorphism. So for highest weight vectors  $v^\lambda \in \mathcal{W}_\lambda^U$  and  $w^\mu \in \mathcal{W}_\mu^U$ :

$$f_1(v^\lambda \otimes w^\mu) = \bar{\alpha}(v^\lambda) \bar{\alpha}(w^\mu) = \alpha(v^\lambda) \alpha(w^\mu) = \alpha(v^\lambda w^\mu) = \bar{\alpha}(v^\lambda w^\mu) = f_2(v^\lambda \otimes w^\mu).$$

(Note that  $v^\lambda w^\mu$  is a highest weight vector.) Note that  $C = 1$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Dual Pairs and Duality Correspondence.** We recall here some material and notation that will be required for later sections. Much of this material can be found in several other sources on classical invariant theory (such as [14] and [10]).

In our context, the theory of dual pairs may be cast in a purely algebraic language. In this section, we will describe three dual pairs  $(K, \mathfrak{g})$ , where  $K$  is a classical linear algebraic group defined over  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a complex classical Lie algebra. In each case, we have a linear action of  $K$  on a finite dimensional complex vector space  $V$ , which is a finite sum of copies of the standard module for  $K$  or copies of the dual of the standard module for  $K$ . This action induces an action on the complex valued polynomial functions on  $V$ , upon which  $\mathfrak{g}$  acts by polynomial coefficient differential operators. The actions of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $K$  commute with each other. Furthermore, the algebra of polynomial coefficient differential operators which commute with the  $K$ -action (resp.  $\mathfrak{g}$ -action) on  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  is generated as an algebra by the image of the  $\mathfrak{g}$ -action (resp.  $K$ -action). In light of this situation, we may regard  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  as a representation of  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $K$  simultaneously. Theorem 3.4 describes, in part, the (multiplicity-free) decomposition of  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  into irreducible modules for the joint action.

Of particular importance are the  $K$ -invariants in  $\mathcal{P}(V)$ . In each case, we may describe this invariant ring through the action of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Indeed,  $\mathfrak{g}$  may be decomposed into three subspaces

denoted  $\mathfrak{g}^{(2,0)}$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}^{(1,1)}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}^{(0,2)}$ . These subspaces are in fact Lie subalgebras with  $\mathfrak{g}^{(0,2)}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}^{(2,0)}$  abelian, while  $\mathfrak{g}^{(1,1)}$  normalizes each of them. Furthermore,  $\mathfrak{g}^{(1,1)} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^{(2,0)}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}^{(1,1)} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^{(0,2)}$  are the Levi decompositions of certain parabolic subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

Theorem 3.3 asserts that  $\mathcal{P}(V)^K$  is generated as an algebra by  $\mathfrak{g}^{(2,0)}$ . Moreover, within a certain stable range (described in Theorem 3.3),  $\mathcal{P}(V)^K$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g}^{(2,0)})$ , the full symmetric algebra on  $\mathfrak{g}^{(2,0)}$ . This is the *first fundamental theorems of classical invariant theory* (see [10], [14], [66]).

Note that at the same time, we obtain an action of  $K$  (by conjugation) on the constant coefficient differential operators on  $\mathcal{P}(V)$ , denoted  $\mathcal{D}(V)$ . In turn, the  $K$ -invariant subalgebra,  $\mathcal{D}(V)^K$  is generated by  $\mathfrak{g}^{(0,2)}$ . This brings us to our next ingredient. Define the  $K$ -harmonic polynomials to be:

$$\mathcal{H} := \{f \in \mathcal{P}(V) \mid \Delta f = 0 \text{ for all } \Delta \in \mathcal{D}(V)^K\}.$$

For each dual pair, we have a surjection,  $\mathcal{P}(V)^K \otimes \mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{m} \mathcal{P}(V)$  defined by multiplication. Note that we may regard  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  as a module over the algebra  $\mathcal{P}(V)^K$ . By definition, this module is free iff  $m$  is injective. Within a certain *stable range*,  $m$  is indeed injective, and this range is indicated as part of Theorem 3.3. We have provided a proof of the injectivity part of this theorem (also known as the Separation of Variables Theorem) as an appendix of this paper.

For each  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$ , the subspace  $\mathfrak{g}^{(1,1)}$  is *isomorphic* to the Lie algebra of a subgroup  $G^{(1,1)} \subseteq GL(V)$  which commutes with the action of  $K$ . In Theorem 3.5 we describe the action of this group. Note that, in general, the differential of the action of  $G^{(1,1)}$  on  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  is not quite the same as the action of  $\mathfrak{g}^{(1,1)}$ ; however, it differs only by a central shift.

Under the joint action of  $K \times G^{(1,1)}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}$  is a multiplicity-free invariant subspace of  $\mathcal{P}(V)$ . The precise decomposition of  $\mathcal{H}$  is provided in Theorem 3.5.

Finally, in each of the three dual pair settings we have  $\mathcal{P}(V) = I(\mathcal{J}^+) \oplus \mathcal{H}$ , where  $I(\mathcal{J}^+)$  is the ideal in  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  generated by  $\mathfrak{g}^{(2,0)}$  (which is the same as the ideal generated by the homogeneous invariants of positive degree). We note that the natural map:

$$\mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(V)/I(\mathcal{J}^+) \tag{3.1}$$

is a linear isomorphism of representations.

Details in this section including all theorems stated can be found in [10], [12] or [14].

**3.3.1. Definitions of the Three Dual Pair Actions.** We now describe the three dual pairs in detail as well as state Theorems 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 on a case-by-case basis. For the following, we let  $M_{n,m}$  be the complex vector space of  $n$  by  $m$  matrices. We shall select a coordinate system  $\{x_{ij} \mid i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, m\}$ .

**CASE A:  $(O_n, \mathfrak{sp}_{2m})$  where  $V := M_{n,m}$ .**

By  $O_n$  we mean the group of invertible  $n \times n$  matrices,  $g$  such that  $gJg^t = J$  where  $J$  is the  $n \times n$  matrix:

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

12

This group acts on the complex  $n \times m$  matrices,  $V = M_{n,m}$  by left multiplication.

Using the standard matrices entries as coordinates, we define the following differential operators:

$$\Delta_{ij} := \sum_{s=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{si} \partial x_{n-s+1j}}, \quad r_{ij}^2 := \sum_{s=1}^n x_{si} x_{n-s+1j}, \quad \text{and} \quad E_{ij} := \sum_{s=1}^n x_{si} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{n-s+1j}}.$$

We define three spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(1,1)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ E_{ij} + \frac{n}{2} \delta_{i,j} \mid i, j = 1, \dots, m \right\}, \\ \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ r_{ij}^2 \mid 1 \leq i \leq j \leq m \right\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(0,2)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ \Delta_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i \leq j \leq m \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The direct sum,  $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(1,1)} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(0,2)}$ , is preserved under the usual operator bracket and is isomorphic, as a Lie algebra, to the rank  $m$  complex symplectic Lie algebra,  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$ . This presentation defines an action of  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$  on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$ . The  $O_n$  action is defined by multiplication on the left: for  $g \in O_n$  and  $f \in \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  we set  $g \cdot f(x) = f(g^t x)$  for all  $x \in M_{n,m}$ .

#### CASE B: $(\mathbf{Sp}_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2m})$ where $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{M}_{2n,m}$ .

By  $Sp_{2n}$  we mean the group of complex  $2n \times 2n$  invertible matrices,  $g$ , such that  $gJg^t = J$  where  $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_k \\ -I_k & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  with  $I_k$  the  $k \times k$  identity matrix. This group acts on the complex  $2n \times m$  matrices,  $V = M_{2n,m}$  by left multiplication.

Using the standard matrix entries as coordinates, we define the following differential operators:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{ij} &:= \sum_{s=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{si} \partial x_{s+n,j}} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{s+n,i} \partial x_{sj}} \right), \quad S_{ij}^2 := \sum_{s=1}^n (x_{si} x_{s+n,j} - x_{s+n,i} x_{sj}), \quad \text{and} \\ E_{ij} &:= \sum_{s=1}^{2n} x_{si} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{sj}}. \end{aligned}$$

We define three spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{so}_{2m}^{(1,1)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ E_{ij} + n \delta_{i,j} \mid i, j = 1, \dots, m \right\}, \\ \mathfrak{so}_{2m}^{(2,0)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ S_{ij}^2 \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq m \right\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathfrak{so}_{2m}^{(0,2)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ D_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq m \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The direct sum,  $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{so}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \oplus \mathfrak{so}_{2m}^{(1,1)} \oplus \mathfrak{so}_{2m}^{(0,2)}$ , is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{so}_{2m}$ , the rank  $m$  orthogonal Lie algebra of type  $D$ , and this presentation defines an action of  $\mathfrak{so}_{2m}$  on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m})$ . For  $g \in Sp_{2n}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m})$ , we set  $g \cdot f(x) = f(g^t x)$  for all  $x \in M_{2n,m}$ .

#### CASE C: $(\mathbf{GL}_n, \mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell})$ where $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{M}_{n,m} \oplus \mathbf{M}_{\ell,n}$ .

Let  $\{x_{ab}\}$  and  $\{y_{cd}\}$  be the coordinates on  $M_{n,m}$  and  $M_{\ell,n}$  respectively. Define the following differential operators:

$$\bar{\Delta}_{ij} := \sum_{s=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{si} \partial y_{js}}, \quad \bar{r}_{ij}^2 := \sum_{s=1}^n x_{si} y_{js}, \quad E_{ij}^X := \sum_{s=1}^n x_{si} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{sj}}, \quad \text{and} \quad E_{ij}^Y := \sum_{s=1}^n y_{is} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{js}}.$$

(In the above,  $i$  and  $j$  range over the appropriate interval defined by the sizes of the matrices.) We define three spaces:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}^{(1,1)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ E_{ij}^X + \frac{n}{2} \delta_{i,j} \mid i, j = 1, \dots, m \right\} \oplus \text{Span} \left\{ E_{ij}^Y + \frac{n}{2} \delta_{i,j} \mid i, j = 1, \dots, \ell \right\}, \\ \mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}^{(2,0)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ \bar{r}_{ij}^2 \mid i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, \ell \right\}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}^{(0,2)} &:= \text{Span} \left\{ \bar{\Delta}_{ij} \mid i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, \ell \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The direct sum,  $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}^{(2,0)} \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}^{(1,1)} \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}^{(0,2)}$ , is isomorphic to the rank  $m + \ell$  general linear Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell}$ , and this presentation defines an action of  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell}$  on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})$ . For  $g \in GL_n$  and  $f \in \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})$ , we set  $g \cdot f(x, y) = f(g^t x, y(g^t)^{-1})$  for all  $x \in M_{n,m}$ ,  $y \in M_{\ell,n}$ .

**3.3.2. Theorems on the Invariants, Decompositions and Harmonics.** Let  $SM_m$  and  $AM_m$  be the space of symmetric and anti-symmetric  $m$  by  $m$  matrices respectively. If  $V$  is a vector space, we denote the symmetric algebra on  $V$  by  $\mathcal{S}(V)$ . Note that in each of the dual pairs, we have defined the action of  $K$  on  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  so that  $\mathcal{P}(V) \cong \mathcal{S}(V)$  as  $K$  modules. (This is in contrast with the usual identification  $\mathcal{P}(V) \cong \mathcal{S}(V^*)$ .) Also, for a set  $S$ , we shall denote by  $\mathbb{C}[S]$  by the algebra generated by elements in the set  $S$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** (*First Fundamental Theorem of Invariant Theory and Separation of Variables*)

(a) **CASE A: ( $O_n, \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$ )** *The invariants*

$$\mathcal{J}_{n,m} := \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{O_n} = \mathbb{C}[r_{ij}^2] \quad \left( \cong \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}) \cong \mathcal{P}(SM_m) \text{ if } n \geq m \right).$$

Let  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  denote the  $O_n$ -harmonics. Further, if  $n \geq 2m$ , we have separation of variables

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) \simeq \mathcal{H}_{n,m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{n,m}.$$

(b) **CASE B: ( $Sp_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2m}$ )** *The invariants*

$$\bar{\mathcal{J}}_{2n,m} := \mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m})^{Sp_{2n}} = \mathbb{C}[S_{ij}^2] \quad \left( \cong \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{so}_{2m}^{(2,0)}) \cong \mathcal{P}(AM_m) \text{ if } n \geq m \right).$$

Let  $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{2n,m} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m})$  denote the  $Sp_{2n}$ -harmonics. Further, if  $n \geq m$ , we have separation of variables

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m}) \simeq \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{2n,m} \otimes \bar{\mathcal{J}}_{2n,m}.$$

(c) **CASE C: ( $GL_n, \mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell}$ )** *The invariants*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell} := \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})^{GL_n} = \mathbb{C}[\bar{r}_{ij}^2] \quad \left( \cong \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}^{(2,0)}) \cong \mathcal{P}(M_{m,\ell}) \text{ if } n \geq \min(m, \ell) \right).$$

Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{n,m,\ell} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})$  denote the  $GL_n$ -harmonics. Further, if  $n \geq m + \ell$ , we have separation of variables

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n}) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{n,m,\ell} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}.$$

We refer our readers to the Appendix for a new proof of the Separation of Variables Theorem.

The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  acts on  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  via differential operators. Under this action  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  decomposes into irreducible (infinite-dimensional, highest weight) representations of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The group

$K$  is reductive, so  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  also decomposes into irreducible (finite-dimensional, highest weight) representations of  $K$ .

In the space of polynomial coefficient differential operators, the algebra generated by the image of the  $K$ -action is a the full centralizer of the algebra generated by the  $\mathfrak{g}$ -action. A consequence of this is that  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  has a multiplicity free decomposition under the joint action of the group  $K$  and the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The irreducible constituents are of the form  $U \otimes \tilde{U}$  where  $U$  is an irreducible  $K$ -representation while  $\tilde{U}$  is an irreducible  $\mathfrak{g}$ -representation.

In each of the three cases,  $O_n$ ,  $Sp_{2n}$  and  $GL_n$ , denote the representations paired with  $E^\lambda$ ,  $V^\lambda$  and  $F^\lambda$  by  $\tilde{E}^\lambda$ ,  $\tilde{V}^\lambda$  and  $\tilde{F}^\lambda$  respectively. The parametrization involving highest weights being made precise by the pairing defined in the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.4.** (*Multiplicity-Free Decomposition under  $\mathbf{K} \times \mathfrak{g}$* )

For each case, we state the decomposition of  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  into irreducible representations:

(a) **CASE A: ( $O_n, \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$ )**

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) = \bigoplus E_{(n)}^\lambda \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\lambda \quad (3.2)$$

where the sum is over all partitions  $\lambda$  with length at most  $\min(n, m)$ , and such that  $(\lambda')_1 + (\lambda')_2 \leq n$ .

As a representation of  $GL_m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\lambda &= \mathcal{J}_{n,m} \cdot F_{(m)}^\lambda && \text{for any } n, m \geq 0, \\ &\cong \mathcal{S}(SM_m) \otimes F_{(m)}^\lambda && \text{provided } n \geq 2m. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

(b) **CASE B: ( $Sp_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2m}$ )**

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m}) = \bigoplus V_{(2n)}^\lambda \otimes \tilde{V}_{(2m)}^\lambda \quad (3.4)$$

where the sum is over all partitions  $\lambda$  with length at most  $\min(n, m)$ .

As a representation of  $GL_m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_{(2m)}^\lambda &= \overline{\mathcal{J}}_{2n,m} \cdot F_{(m)}^\lambda && \text{for any } n, m \geq 0, \\ &\cong \mathcal{S}(AM_m) \otimes F_{(m)}^\lambda && \text{provided } n \geq m. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

(c) **CASE C: ( $GL_n, \mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell}$ )**

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n}) = \bigoplus F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)} \otimes \tilde{F}_{(m,\ell)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)} \quad (3.6)$$

where the sum is over all ordered pairs of partitions  $(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)$  such that  $\ell(\lambda^+) + \ell(\lambda^-) \leq n$ ,  $\ell(\lambda^+) \leq \min(n, m)$ , and  $\ell(\lambda^-) \leq \min(n, \ell)$ .

As a representation of  $GL_m \times GL_\ell$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_{(m,\ell)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)} &= \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell} \cdot \left( F_{(m)}^{\lambda^+} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\lambda^-} \right) && \text{for any } n, m, \ell \geq 0, \\ &\cong \mathcal{S}(M_{m,\ell}) \otimes \left( F_{(m)}^{\lambda^+} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\lambda^-} \right) && \text{provided } n \geq m + \ell. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

**Remarks:** In Case C, the representation  $\tilde{F}_{(m,\ell)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)}$  are (in general) complexifications of infinite-dimensional highest weight representations of  $(\mathfrak{u}_{(m,\ell)})_{\mathbb{C}} \simeq \mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell}$ . Sometimes want to emphasize the interplay of the two pieces  $M_{n,m}$  and  $M_{\ell,n}$ , by writing  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}$  instead of

$\mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell}$ . The degenerate case when  $\ell = 0$  is particularly interesting. This is the  $\mathbf{GL}_n \times \mathbf{GL}_m$  duality:

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) = \bigoplus_{\lambda} F_{(n)}^{\lambda} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\lambda} \quad (3.8)$$

where the sum is over all integer partitions  $\lambda$  such that  $\ell(\lambda) \leq \min(n, m)$ .

**Theorem 3.5.** (*Multiplicity-Free Decomposition of Harmonics under  $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{G}^{(1,1)}$* )  
We proceed in cases:

(a) **CASE A:  $(\mathbf{O}_n, \mathfrak{sp}_{2m})$**  Let  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  denote the  $O_n$ -harmonics. The group  $O_n \times GL_m$  acts on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  by  $(g, h) \cdot f(x) = f(g^t x h)$ , where  $g \in O_n$ ,  $h \in GL_m$  and  $x \in M_{n,m}$ . Then  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}$  is invariant under this action. As an  $O_n \times GL_m$  representation,

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \cong \mathcal{H}_{n,m} = \bigoplus E_{(n)}^{\lambda} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\lambda}, \quad (3.9)$$

where the sum is over all partitions  $\lambda$  with length at most  $\min(n, m)$  and such that  $(\lambda')_1 + (\lambda')_2 \leq n$ .

(b) **CASE B:  $(\mathbf{Sp}_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2m})$**  Let  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{2n,m} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m})$  denote the  $Sp_{2n}$ -harmonics. The group  $Sp_{2n} \times GL_m$  acts on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m})$  by  $(g, h) \cdot f(x) = f(g^t x h)$ , where  $g \in Sp_{2n}$ ,  $h \in GL_m$  and  $x \in M_{2n,m}$ . Then  $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_{2n,m}$  is invariant under this action. As a  $Sp_{2n} \times GL_m$  representation,

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m})/I(\overline{\mathcal{J}}_{2n,m}^+) \cong \overline{\mathcal{H}}_{2n,m} = \bigoplus V_{(2n)}^{\lambda} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\lambda} \quad (3.10)$$

where the sum is over all partitions  $\lambda$  with length at most  $\min(n, m)$ .

(c) **CASE C:  $(\mathbf{GL}_n, \mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell})$**  Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{n,m,\ell} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})$  denote the  $GL_n$ -harmonics. The group  $GL_n \times GL_m \times GL_{\ell}$  acts on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})$  by

$$(g, h_1, h_2) \cdot f(x, y) = f(g^t x h_1, h_2^t y (g^t)^{-1}),$$

for  $g \in GL_n$ ,  $h_1 \in GL_m$ ,  $h_2 \in GL_{\ell}$ ,  $x \in M_{n,m}$  and  $y \in M_{\ell,n}$ . Then  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{n,m,\ell}$  is invariant under this action. As a  $GL_n \times GL_m \times GL_{\ell}$  representation,

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+) \cong \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{n,m,\ell} = \bigoplus F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)} \otimes \left( F_{(m)}^{\lambda^+} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\lambda^-} \right) \quad (3.11)$$

where the sum is over all ordered pairs of partitions  $(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)$  such that  $\ell(\lambda^+) + \ell(\lambda^-) \leq n$ ,  $\ell(\lambda^+) \leq \min(n, m)$ , and  $\ell(\lambda^-) \leq \min(n, \ell)$ .

**Remarks.** The three cases are summarized in the following table:

$K$	$O_n$	$Sp_{2n}$	$GL_n$
$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$	$\mathfrak{so}_{2m}$	$\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}$
$V$	$M_{n,m}$	$M_{2n,m}$	$M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n}$
$G^{(1,1)}$	$GL_m$	$GL_m$	$GL_m \times GL_{\ell}$



#### 4. RECIPROCITY ALGEBRAS

In this paper, we study branching algebras using classical invariant theory. The formulation of classical invariant theory in terms of dual pairs [12] allows one to realize branching algebras for classical symmetric pairs as concrete algebras of polynomials on vector spaces. Furthermore, when realized in this way, the branching algebras have a double interpretation in which they solve two related branching problems simultaneously. Classical invariant theory also provides a flexible means which allows an inductive approach to the computation of branching algebras, and makes evident natural connections between different branching algebras.

The easiest illustration of the above assertions is the realization of the tensor product algebra for  $GL_n$  presented as follows.

**4.1. Illustration: Tensor Product Algebra for  $GL_n$ .** This first example is in [14], which we recall here as it is a model for the other (more involved) constructions of branching algebras as total subalgebras of  $GL_n$  tensor product algebras.

Consider the joint action of  $GL_n \times GL_m$  on the  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  by the rule

$$(g, h) \cdot f(x) = f(g^t x h), \quad \text{for } g \in GL_n, h \in GL_m, x \in M_{n,m}.$$

For the corresponding action on polynomials, one has the decomposition (see Theorem 3.4(c) and (3.8))

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda} F_{(n)}^{\lambda} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\lambda}, \quad (4.1)$$

of the polynomials into irreducible  $GL_n \times GL_m$  representations. Note that the sum is over non-negative partitions  $\lambda$  with length at most  $\min(n, m)$ .

Let  $U_m = U_{GL_m}$  denote the upper triangular unipotent subgroup of  $GL_m$ . From decomposition (4.1), we can easily see that

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_m} \simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\lambda} F_{(n)}^{\lambda} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\lambda} \right)^{U_m} \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda} F_{(n)}^{\lambda} \otimes (F_{(m)}^{\lambda})^{U_m}. \quad (4.2)$$

Since the spaces  $(F_{(m)}^{\lambda})^{U_m}$  are one-dimensional, the sum in equation (4.2) consists of one copy of each  $F_{(n)}^{\lambda}$ . Just as in the discussion of §3.2, the algebra is graded by  $\widehat{A}_m^+$ , where  $A_m$  is the diagonal torus of  $GL_m$ , and one sees from (4.2) that the graded components are the  $F_{(n)}^{\lambda}$ .

By the arguments in §3.2,  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_m}$  can thus be associated to a graded subalgebra in  $\mathcal{R}(GL_n/U_n)$ , in particular, this is a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra as in Definition 3.1. To study tensor products of representations of  $GL_n$ , we can take the direct sum of  $M_{n,m}$  and  $M_{n,\ell}$ . We then have an action of  $GL_n \times GL_m \times GL_{\ell}$  on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell})$ . Since  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell}) \simeq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})$ , we may deduce from (4.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell})^{U_m \times U_{\ell}} &\simeq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_m} \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})^{U_{\ell}} \\ &\simeq \bigoplus_{\mu, \nu} (F_{(n)}^{\mu} \otimes F_{(n)}^{\nu}) \otimes \left( (F_{(m)}^{\mu})^{U_m} \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^{\nu})^{U_{\ell}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Thus, this algebra is the sum of one copy of each tensor products  $F_{(n)}^\mu \otimes F_{(n)}^\nu$ . Hence, if we take the  $U_n$ -invariants, we will get a subalgebra of the tensor product algebra for  $GL_n$ . This results in the algebra

$$(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell})^{U_m \times U_\ell})^{U_n} \simeq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell})^{U_m \times U_\ell \times U_n}.$$

This shows that we can realize the tensor product algebra for  $GL_n$ , or more precisely, various  $(0,1)$ -subalgebras of it, as algebras of polynomial functions on matrices, specifically as the algebras  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell})^{U_m \times U_\ell \times U_n}$ .

However, the algebra  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell})^{U_m \times U_\ell \times U_n}$  has a second interpretation, as a different branching algebra. We note that  $M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell} \simeq M_{n,m+\ell}$ . On this space we have the action of  $GL_n \times GL_{m+\ell}$ , which is described by the obvious adaptation of equation (4.1). The action of  $GL_n \times GL_m \times GL_\ell$  arises by restriction of the action of  $GL_{m+\ell}$  to the subgroup  $GL_m \times GL_\ell$  embedded block diagonally in  $GL_{m+\ell}$ . By (the obvious analog of) decomposition (4.2), we see that

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})^{U_n} \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda} (F_{(n)}^\lambda)^{U_n} \otimes F_{(m+\ell)}^\lambda.$$

This algebra embeds as a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{R}(GL_{m+\ell}/U_{m+\ell})$ , in particular, this is a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra as in Definition 3.1. If we then take the  $U_m \times U_\ell$  invariants, we find that

$$(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})^{U_n})^{U_m \times U_\ell} \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda} (F_{(n)}^\lambda)^{U_n} \otimes (F_{(m+\ell)}^\lambda)^{U_m \times U_\ell}$$

is a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of the  $(GL_{m+\ell}, GL_m \times GL_\ell)$  branching algebra. Thus, we have established the following result.

**Theorem 4.1.** (a) *The algebra  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})^{U_n \times U_m \times U_\ell}$  is isomorphic to a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of the  $(GL_n \times GL_n, GL_n)$  branching algebra (a.k.a. the  $GL_n$  tensor product algebra), and to a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of the  $(GL_{m+\ell}, GL_m \times GL_\ell)$  branching algebra.*  
(b) *In particular, the dimension of the  $\psi^\lambda \times \psi^\mu \times \psi^\nu$  homogeneous component for  $A_n \times A_m \times A_\ell$  of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})^{U_n \times U_m \times U_\ell}$  records simultaneously*  
(i) *the multiplicity of  $F_{(n)}^\lambda$  in the tensor product  $F_{(n)}^\mu \otimes F_{(n)}^\nu$ , and*  
(ii) *the multiplicity of  $F_{(m)}^\mu \otimes F_{(\ell)}^\nu$  in  $F_{(m+\ell)}^\lambda$ ,*  
*for partitions  $\mu, \nu, \lambda$  such that  $\ell(\mu) \leq \min(n, m)$ ,  $\ell(\nu) \leq \min(n, \ell)$  and  $\ell(\lambda) \leq \min(n, m + \ell)$ .*

Thus, we can not only realize the  $GL_n$  tensor product algebra concretely as an algebra of polynomials, we find that it appears simultaneously in two guises, the second being as the branching algebra for the pair  $(GL_{m+\ell}, GL_m \times GL_\ell)$ . We emphasize two features of this situation.

First, the pair  $(GL_{m+\ell}, GL_m \times GL_\ell)$ , as well as the pair  $(GL_n \times GL_n, GL_n)$ , is a symmetric pair. Hence, both the interpretations of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})^{U_n \times U_m \times U_\ell}$  are as branching algebras for symmetric pairs.

Second, the relationship between the two situations is captured by the notion of “see-saw pair” of dual pairs [41]. Precisely, a context for understanding the decomposition law (4.1) is provided by observing that  $GL_n$  and  $GL_m$  (or more correctly, slight modifications of their Lie algebras) are mutual centralizers inside the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sp}(M_{n,m})$  (of the metaplectic group) of polynomial coefficient differential operators of total degree two on  $M_{n,m}$  [12] [14]. We say that they define a *dual pair* inside  $\mathfrak{sp}(M_{n,m})$ . The decomposition (4.1) then appears

as the correspondence of representations associated to this dual pair [12]. Further, the pairs of groups  $(GL_n, GL_{m+\ell}) = (G_1, G'_1)$  and  $(GL_n \times GL_m, GL_m \times GL_\ell) = (G_2, G'_2)$  both define dual pairs inside the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sp}(M_{n,m+\ell})$ . We evidently have the relations

$$G_1 = GL_n \subset GL_n \times GL_m = G_2, \quad (4.4)$$

and (hence)

$$G'_1 = GL_{m+\ell} \supset GL_m \times GL_\ell = G'_2. \quad (4.5)$$

We refer to a pair of dual pairs related as in inclusions (4.4) and (4.5), a *see-saw pair* of dual pairs.

In these terms, we may think of the symmetric pairs  $(G_2, G_1)$  and  $(G'_1, G'_2)$  as a “*reciprocal pair*” of symmetric pairs. If we do so, we see that the algebra  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})^{U_n \times U_m \times U_\ell}$  is describable as  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})^{U_{G_1} \times U_{G'_2}}$  – it has a description in terms of the see-saw pair, and in this description the two pairs of the see-saw, or alternatively, the two reciprocal symmetric pairs, enter equivalently into the description of the algebra that describes the branching law for both symmetric pairs. For this reason, we also call this algebra, which describes the branching law for both symmetric pairs, the *reciprocity algebra* of the pair of pairs.

It turns out that any branching algebra associated to a classical symmetric pair, that is, a pair  $(G, H)$  in which  $G$  is a product of classical groups, has an interpretation as a reciprocity algebra – an algebra that describes a branching law for two reciprocal symmetric pairs simultaneously. Sometimes, however, one of the branching laws involves infinite-dimensional representations.

**4.2. Symmetric Pairs and Reciprocity Pairs.** In the context of dual pairs, we would like to understand the  $(G, H)$  branching of irreducible representations of  $G$  to  $H$ , for symmetric pairs  $(G, H)$ . Table I lists the symmetric pairs which we will cover in this paper.

If  $G$  is a classical group over  $\mathbb{C}$ , then  $G$  can be embedded as one member of a dual pair in the symplectic group as described in [12]. The resulting pairs of groups are  $(GL_n, GL_m)$  or  $(O_n, Sp_{2m})$ , each inside  $Sp_{2nm}$ , and are called *irreducible* dual pairs. In general, a dual pair of reductive groups in  $Sp_{2r}$  is a product of such pairs.

Table I: Classical Symmetric Pairs

Description	G	H
Diagonal	$GL_n \times GL_n$	$GL_n$
Diagonal	$O_n \times O_n$	$O_n$
Diagonal	$Sp_{2n} \times Sp_{2n}$	$Sp_{2n}$
Direct Sum	$GL_{n+m}$	$GL_n \times GL_m$
Direct Sum	$O_{n+m}$	$O_n \times O_m$
Direct Sum	$Sp_{2(n+m)}$	$Sp_{2n} \times Sp_{2m}$
Polarization	$O_{2n}$	$GL_n$
Polarization	$Sp_{2n}$	$GL_n$
Bilinear Form	$GL_n$	$O_n$
Bilinear Form	$GL_{2n}$	$Sp_{2n}$

**Proposition 4.2** *Let  $G$  be a classical group, or a product of two copies of a classical group. Let  $G$  belong to a dual pair  $(G, G')$  in a symplectic group  $Sp_{2m}$ . Let  $H \subset G$  be a symmetric subgroup, and let  $H'$  be the centralizer of  $H$  in  $Sp_{2m}$ . Then  $(H, H')$  is also a dual pair in  $Sp_{2m}$ , and  $G'$  is a symmetric subgroup inside  $H'$ .*

**Proof:** This can be shown by fairly easy case-by-case checking. The basic reason that  $(H, H')$  form a dual pair is that, for any classical symmetric pair  $(G, H)$ , the restriction of the standard module of  $G$ , or its dual, to  $H$  is a sum of standard modules of  $H$ , or their duals [12]. This is very easy to check on a case-by-case basis. The see-saw relationship of symmetric pairs organizes the 10 series of symmetric pairs as given in Table I into five pairs of pairs. These are shown in Table II.  $\square$

Table II: Reciprocity Pairs

Symmetric Pair (G, H)	(H, $\mathfrak{h}'$ )	(G, $\mathfrak{g}'$ )
$(GL_n \times GL_n, GL_n)$	$(GL_n, \mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell})$	$(GL_n \times GL_n, \mathfrak{gl}_m \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_\ell)$
$(O_n \times O_n, O_n)$	$(O_n, \mathfrak{sp}_{2(m+\ell)})$	$(O_n \times O_n, \mathfrak{sp}_{2m} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell})$
$(Sp_{2n} \times Sp_{2n}, Sp_{2n})$	$(Sp_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2(m+\ell)})$	$(Sp_{2n} \times Sp_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2m} \oplus \mathfrak{so}_{2\ell})$
$(GL_{n+m}, GL_n \times GL_m)$	$(GL_n \times GL_m, \mathfrak{gl}_\ell \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_\ell)$	$(GL_{n+m}, \mathfrak{gl}_\ell)$
$(O_{n+m}, O_n \times O_m)$	$(O_n \times O_m, \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell})$	$(O_{n+m}, \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell})$
$(Sp_{2(n+m)}, Sp_{2n} \times Sp_{2m})$	$(Sp_{2n} \times Sp_{2m}, \mathfrak{so}_{2\ell} \oplus \mathfrak{so}_{2\ell})$	$(Sp_{2(n+m)}, \mathfrak{so}_{2\ell})$
$(O_{2n}, GL_n)$	$(GL_n, \mathfrak{gl}_{m,m})$	$(O_{2n}, \mathfrak{sp}_{2m})$
$(Sp_{2n}, GL_n)$	$(GL_n, \mathfrak{gl}_{m,m})$	$(Sp_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2m})$
$(GL_n, O_n)$	$(O_n, \mathfrak{sp}_{2m})$	$(GL_n, \mathfrak{gl}_m)$
$(GL_{2n}, Sp_{2n})$	$(Sp_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2m})$	$(GL_{2n}, \mathfrak{gl}_m)$

**Remark:** Note that when the second component of any pair in Table II is of Lie type A, then the action actually integrates to the group. Table II also amounts to another point of view on the structure on which [13] is based.

We begin with discussions of reciprocity algebras in the next three sections. The discussions provided are ordered more in terms of complexity and do not follow the sequence given in Table I.

## 5. BRANCHING FROM $GL_n$ TO $O_n$

Consider the problem of restricting irreducible representations of  $GL_n$  to the orthogonal group  $O_n$ . We consider the symmetric see-saw pair  $(GL_n, O_n)$  and  $(Sp_{2m}, GL_m)$ . As in the discussion of §4.1, we can realize (a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of) the coordinate ring of the flag manifold  $GL_n/U_n$  as the algebra of  $U_m$ -invariants on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$ . If we then look at the  $U_{O_n}$ -invariants in this algebra, then we will have (a certain  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of) the  $(GL_n, O_n)$  branching algebra. Thus, we are interested in the algebra

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n} \times U_m}.$$

We note that, in analogy with the situation of §4.1, this is the algebra of invariants for the unipotent subgroups of the smaller member of each symmetric pair.

Let us investigate what this algebra appears to be if we first take invariants with respect to  $U_{O_n}$ . We have a decomposition of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  as a joint  $O_n \times \mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$ -module (see Theorem 3.4 (a)):

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu} E_{(n)}^{\mu} \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu}. \quad (5.1)$$

Recall that the sum runs through the set of all non-negative integer partitions  $\mu$  such that  $\ell(\mu) \leq \min(n, m)$  and  $(\mu')_1 + (\mu')_2 \leq n$ . Here  $E_{(n)}^{\mu}$  denotes the irreducible  $O_n$  representation parameterized by  $\mu$ . Recall from §3.3, the decomposition  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu} F_{(n)}^{\mu} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\mu}$ . The module  $E_{(n)}^{\mu}$  is generated by the  $GL_n$  highest weight vector in  $F_{(n)}^{\mu}$ . Further,  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu}$  is an irreducible infinite-dimensional representation of  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$  with lowest  $\mathfrak{gl}_m$ -type  $F_{(m)}^{\mu}$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** *Assume  $n > 2m$ .*

- (a) *The algebra  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n} \times U_m}$  is isomorphic to a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of the  $(GL_n, O_n)$  branching algebra, and to a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of the  $(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}, GL_m)$  branching algebra.*
- (b) *In particular, the dimension of the  $\phi^{\mu} \times \psi^{\lambda}$  homogeneous component for  $A_{O_n} \times A_m$  of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n} \times U_m}$  records simultaneously*
  - (i) *the multiplicity of  $E_{(n)}^{\mu}$  in the representation  $F_{(n)}^{\lambda}$ , and*
  - (ii) *the multiplicity of  $F_{(m)}^{\lambda}$  in  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu}$ .**for partitions  $\mu, \lambda$  such that  $\ell(\mu) \leq m, \ell(\lambda) \leq m$ .*

**Proof.** Taking the  $U_{O_n}$ -invariants for the decomposition (5.1), we find that

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}} \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu} (E_{(n)}^{\mu})^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu}, \quad (5.2)$$

where the sum is over partitions  $\mu$  such that  $\ell(\mu) \leq \min(n, m)$  and  $(\mu')_1 + (\mu')_2 \leq n$ . Note that the stability condition  $n > 2m$  guarantees the latter inequality. The space  $(E_{(n)}^{\mu})^{U_{O_n}}$  is the space of highest weight vectors for  $(E_{(n)}^{\mu})^{U_{O_n}}$ . We would like to say that it is one-dimensional, so that  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}$  would consist of one copy of each of the irreducible representations  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu}$ . But, owing to the disconnectedness of  $O_n$ , this is not quite true, and when it is true, the highest weight may not completely determine  $E_{(n)}^{\mu}$ .

However, if  $n > 2m$ , then  $(E_{(n)}^{\mu})^{U_{O_n}}$  is one-dimensional, and does single out  $E_{(n)}^{\mu}$  among the representations which appear in the sum (5.1). Hence, let us make this restriction for

the present discussion. Taking the  $U_m$  invariants in the sum (5.2), we find that

$$(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}})^{U_m} \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu} (E_{(n)}^{\mu})^{U_{O_n}} \otimes (\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu})^{U_m}. \quad (5.3)$$

Note that the sum is over all partitions  $\mu$  such that  $\ell(\mu) \leq m$  (since  $n > 2m$ ). The space  $(\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu})^{U_m}$  describes how the representation  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu}$  of  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$  decomposes as a  $\mathfrak{gl}_m$  module, or equivalently, as a  $GL_m$ -module. In other words,  $(\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu})^{U_m}$  describes the branching rule from  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$  to  $\mathfrak{gl}_m$  for the module  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu}$ .

We know (thanks to our restriction to  $n > 2m$ ) that the space  $(E_{(n)}^{\mu})^{U_{O_n}}$  is one-dimensional. Let  $\phi^{\mu}$  be the  $A_{O_n}$  weight of  $(E_{(n)}^{\mu})^{U_{O_n}}$ . Thus,  $\phi^{\mu}$  is the restriction to the diagonal maximal torus  $A_{O_n}$  of the character  $\psi^{\mu}$  of the group  $A_n$  of diagonal  $n \times n$  matrices. Our assumption further implies that  $\phi^{\mu}$  determines  $E_{(n)}^{\mu}$ . Therefore, for a given dominant  $A_m$  weight  $\psi^{\lambda}$ , corresponding to the partition  $\lambda$ , where  $\ell(\lambda) \leq m$ , the  $\psi^{\lambda}$ -eigenspace in  $(\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu})^{U_m}$  tells us the multiplicity of  $F_{(m)}^{\lambda}$  in the restriction of  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu}$  to  $\mathfrak{gl}_m$ . This is the same as the dimension of the joint  $(\phi^{\mu} \times \psi^{\lambda})$ -eigenspace in

$$(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}})^{U_m} \simeq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n} \times U_m} \simeq (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_m})^{U_{O_n}}.$$

But we have already seen that this eigenspace describes the multiplicity of  $E_{(n)}^{\mu}$  in  $F_{(n)}^{\lambda}$ . Thus, again the  $A_{O_n} \times A_m$  homogeneous components of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n} \times U_m}$  have a simultaneous interpretation, one for a branching law associated to each of the two symmetric pairs composing the symmetric see-saw pair.  $\square$

In this case, one of the branching laws involves infinite-dimensional representations. However, they are highest weight representations, which are the most tractable of infinite-dimensional representations, from an algebraic point of view.

## 6. TENSOR PRODUCT ALGEBRA FOR $O_n$

Using the symmetric see-saw pair  $((O_n, O_n \times O_n), (Sp_{2m} \times Sp_{2\ell}, Sp_{2(m+\ell)}))$ , we can construct  $((0,1)$ -subalgebras of) the tensor product algebra for  $O_n$ . To prepare for this, we should explicate the decomposition (5.1) further.

Let us recall the basic setup as in §3.3.1 Case A. Recall that  $\mathcal{J}_{n,m} = \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{O_n}$  is the algebra of  $O_n$ -invariant polynomials. Theorem 3.3(a) implies that  $\mathcal{J}_{n,m}$  is a quotient of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)})$ , the symmetric algebra on  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}$ .

The natural mapping

$$\mathcal{H}_{n,m} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \quad (6.1)$$

is a linear  $O_n \times GL_m$ -module isomorphism. Further, the  $O_n \times GL_m$  structure of  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}$  is as follows (see Theorem 3.5(a)):

$$\mathcal{H}_{n,m} \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu} E_{(n)}^{\mu} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\mu}. \quad (6.2)$$

Here  $\mu$  ranges over the same diagrams as in (5.1).

From Theorem 3.4(a),

$$\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^{\mu} \simeq F_{(m)}^{\mu} \cdot \mathcal{J}_{n,m} \simeq \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}) \cdot F_{(m)}^{\mu}, \quad (6.3)$$

and it follows that

$$\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\mu / (\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \cdot \tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\mu) \simeq F_{(m)}^\mu.$$

In other words, we can detect the  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$  isomorphism class of the module  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\mu$  by the  $GL_m$  isomorphism class of the quotient  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\mu / (\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \cdot \tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\mu)$ . Also, if  $W \subset \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  is any  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$ -invariant subspace, then

$$W / (\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \cdot W) \simeq W \cap \mathcal{H}_{n,m},$$

and this subspace also reveals the  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$  isomorphism type of  $W$ .

We can use the above to find a model for (a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of) the tensor product algebra of  $O_n$ . One consequence of the above discussion is that

$$(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+))^{U_m} \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu} E_{(n)}^\mu \otimes (F_{(m)}^\mu)^{U_m} \quad (6.4)$$

consists of one copy of each irreducible representation  $E_{(n)}^\mu$ .

If we repeat the above discussion for  $M_{n,\ell}$ , and combine the results, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+))^{U_m} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_\ell} \\ & \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu, \nu} (E_{(n)}^\mu \otimes E_{(n)}^\nu) \otimes ((F_{(m)}^\mu)^{U_m} \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^\nu)^{U_\ell}) \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

is a direct sum of one copy of each possible tensor product of an  $E_{(n)}^\mu$  with an  $E_{(n)}^\nu$ . At this point, we make the assumption that  $n > 2(m + \ell)$ , as in this range the  $O_n$  constituents of decomposition are irreducible when restricted to the connected component of the identity in  $O_n$ . If we now take the  $U_{O_n}$ -invariants in equation (6.5), we will have (a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of) the tensor product algebra of  $O_n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+))^{U_m} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_\ell})^{U_{O_n}} \\ & \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu, \nu} (E_{(n)}^\mu \otimes E_{(n)}^\nu)^{U_{O_n}} \otimes ((F_{(m)}^\mu)^{U_m} \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^\nu)^{U_\ell}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

We can describe this algebra in another way. Begin with the observation that  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell}) \simeq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})$ , and

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+) \simeq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+).$$

Thus

$$(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+))^{U_m} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_\ell} \simeq (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_m \times U_\ell},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+))^{U_m} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_\ell})^{U_{O_n}} \\ & \simeq ((\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_m \times U_\ell})^{U_{O_n}} \\ & \simeq ((\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell}) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}})^{U_m \times U_\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

**Theorem 6.1.** *Given positive integers  $n, m$  and  $\ell$  with  $n > 2(m + \ell)$  we have:*

(a) *The algebra*

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+))^{U_m} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_\ell})^{U_{O_n}} \\ & \simeq ((\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}})^{U_m \times U_\ell} \end{aligned}$$

*is isomorphic to a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of the  $(O_n \times O_n, O_n)$  branching algebra (a.k.a. the  $O_n$  tensor product algebra), and to a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of the  $(\mathfrak{sp}_{2(m+\ell)}, \mathfrak{sp}_{2m} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell})$  branching algebra.*

(b) *Specifically, the dimension of the  $(\phi^\lambda \times \psi^\mu \times \psi^\nu)$ -eigenspace for  $A_{O_n} \times A_m \times A_\ell$  of  $((\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}})^{U_m \times U_\ell}$  records simultaneously*

(i) *the multiplicity of  $E_{(n)}^\lambda$  in  $E_{(n)}^\mu \otimes E_{(n)}^\nu$ , as well as*

(ii) *the multiplicity of  $\tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\mu \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2\ell)}^\nu$  in the restriction of  $\tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda$ .*

*Here the partitions  $\mu, \nu, \lambda$  satisfy the following conditions:*

*$\ell(\mu) \leq \min(n, m)$ ,  $\ell(\nu) \leq \min(n, \ell)$ , and  $\ell(\lambda) \leq \min(n, m + \ell)$ .*

**Proof.** Let us now compute the ring expressed in this way. From Theorem 3.4(a), we know that

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}} \simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\mu} E_{(n)}^\mu \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\mu \right)^{U_{O_n}} \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu} (E_{(n)}^\mu)^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2m)}^\mu.$$

Note that within the range  $n > 2(m + \ell)$  we have  $\dim(E_{(n)}^\mu)^{U_{O_n}} = 1$  since the  $O_n$ -representations  $E_{(n)}^\mu$  remain irreducible when restricted to  $SO_n$ .

Now repeat this with  $m$  replaced by  $m + \ell$ :

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})^{U_{O_n}} \simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\mu} E_{(n)}^\mu \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\mu \right)^{U_{O_n}} \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu} (E_{(n)}^\mu)^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\mu.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}} \simeq \left( \left( \bigoplus_{\lambda} E_{(n)}^\lambda \otimes \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda \right) / I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+) \right)^{U_{O_n}} \\ & \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda} (E_{(n)}^\lambda)^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \left( \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda / (\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell}^{(2,0)}) \cdot \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda \right). \end{aligned}$$

From this we finally get

$$\begin{aligned} & ((\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}})^{U_m \times U_\ell} \\ & \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda} (E_{(n)}^\lambda)^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \left( \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda / (\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell}^{(2,0)}) \cdot \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda \right)^{U_m \times U_\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

From the discussion following equation (6.1), we see that the factor

$$\left( \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda / (\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell}^{(2,0)}) \cdot \tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda \right)^{U_m \times U_\ell}$$

tells us the  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell}$  decomposition of  $\tilde{E}_{(2(m+\ell))}^\lambda$ .  $\square$



Hence, again the algebra has a double interpretation, one in terms of decomposing tensor products of  $O_n$  representations, and one in terms of branching from  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2(m+\ell)}$  to  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell}$  (although the second branching law involves infinite-dimensional representations).

## 7. MORE RECIPROCITY ALGEBRAS FOR $(GL_n, GL_m)$

Whereas our first example of a reciprocity algebra in §4.1 involved only finite-dimensional representations, the others all involve infinite-dimensional representations in some respect. It turns out that the apparently exceptional nature of the reciprocity algebra for the pair  $(GL_n, GL_m)$  is somewhat deceptive. In fact, we can associate several reciprocity algebras to  $(GL_n, GL_m)$ , and nearly all of them will involve infinite-dimensional representations.

We shall refer to §3.3.1 and consider the action of  $GL_n$  on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})$  by the rule

$$g \cdot f(x, y) = f(g^t x, y(g^t)^{-1}) \quad (7.1)$$

for  $x \in M_{n,m}$ ,  $y \in M_{\ell,n}$  and  $g \in GL_n$ . Recall from Theorem 3.3(c) that the algebra  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}$  generated by  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}^{(2,0)}$ . It is the space of all polynomials on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})$  invariant under  $GL_n$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{n,m,\ell}$  be the space of  $GL_n$ -harmonics and recall the  $GL_n \times GL_m \times GL_\ell$  isomorphism (see Theorem 3.5(c)):

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+) \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{n,m,\ell}.$$

**Theorem 7.1.** (a) *The algebra*

$$\left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+))^{U_m \times U_\ell} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m'} \oplus M_{\ell',n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m',\ell'}^+))^{U_{m'} \times U_{\ell'}} \right)^{U_n}$$

*is isomorphic to a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of the  $(GL_n \times GL_n, GL_n)$  branching algebra as well as to a  $(\mathfrak{gl}_{m+m',\ell+\ell'}, \mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell} \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_{m',\ell'})$  branching algebra.*

(b) *In particular, the dimension of the  $(A_n \times A_m \times A_{m'} \times A_\ell \times A_{\ell'})$ -eigenspace of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+m'} \oplus M_{\ell+\ell',n})$  describes simultaneously*

(i) *the multiplicity of  $F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)}$  in  $F_{(n)}^{(\mu^+, \mu^-)} \otimes F_{(n)}^{(\nu^+, \nu^-)}$ , and*

(ii) *the multiplicity of the representation  $\tilde{F}_{(m,\ell)}^{(\mu^+, \mu^-)} \otimes \tilde{F}_{(m',\ell')}^{(\nu^+, \nu^-)}$  of  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell} \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_{m',\ell'}$  in the restriction of the representation  $\tilde{F}_{(m+m',\ell+\ell')}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)}$  of  $\mathfrak{gl}_{(m+m'),(\ell+\ell')}$ .*

*Here the partitions  $\mu^+, \mu^-, \nu^+, \nu^-, \lambda^+, \lambda^-$  are such that  $\ell(\mu^+) \leq m$ ,  $\ell(\mu^-) \leq \ell$ ,  $\ell(\mu^+) + \ell(\mu^-) \leq n$ ,  $\ell(\nu^+) \leq m'$ ,  $\ell(\nu^-) \leq \ell'$ ,  $\ell(\nu^+) + \ell(\nu^-) \leq n$ ,  $\ell(\lambda^+) \leq m + m'$ ,  $\ell(\lambda^-) \leq \ell + \ell'$  and  $\ell(\lambda^+) + \ell(\lambda^-) \leq n$ .*

**Remarks:** Recall from the remarks after Theorem 3.4 that we have written  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell}$  instead of  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m+\ell}$  to emphasize the interplay of the two components  $M_{n,m}$  and  $M_{\ell,n}$ .

**Proof.** From the above description of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})$ , we can see using (3.11) that

$$(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+))^{U_m \times U_\ell} \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu^+, \mu^-} F_{(n)}^{(\mu^+, \mu^-)} \otimes (F_{(m)}^{\mu^+})^{U_m} \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^{\mu^-})^{U_\ell}$$

is a multiplicity-free sum of representations  $F_{(n)}^{(\mu^+, \mu^-)}$  of  $GL_n$ . Again, this can be embedded as a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of the coordinate ring of  $GL_n/U_n$ .

Now repeat this with  $m'$  in place of  $m$  and  $\ell'$  in place of  $\ell$ . We again get a multiplicity-free sum of a family of representations of  $GL_n$ . If we take the tensor product of the two sums,

and look at highest weight vectors for  $GL_n$ , we will get a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of the tensor algebra for  $GL_n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+))^{U_m \times U_\ell} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m'} \oplus M_{\ell',n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m',\ell'}^+))^{U_{m'} \times U_{\ell'}} \right)^{U_n} \\ & \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu^+, \mu^-, \nu^+, \nu^-} (F_{(n)}^{(\mu^+, \mu^-)} \otimes F_{(n)}^{(\nu^+, \nu^-)})^{U_n} \otimes \left( (F_{(m)}^{\mu^+})^{U_m} \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^{\mu^-})^{U_\ell} \otimes (F_{(m')}^{\nu^+})^{U_{m'}} \otimes (F_{(\ell')}^{\nu^-})^{U_{\ell'}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the sum is over partitions  $\mu^+$ ,  $\mu^-$ ,  $\nu^+$  and  $\nu^-$  such that  $\ell(\mu^+) \leq m$ ,  $\ell(\mu^-) \leq \ell$ ,  $\ell(\mu^+) + \ell(\mu^-) \leq n$ ,  $\ell(\nu^+) \leq m'$ ,  $\ell(\nu^-) \leq \ell'$ ,  $\ell(\nu^+) + \ell(\nu^-) \leq n$ .

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+))^{U_m \times U_\ell} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m'} \oplus M_{\ell',n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m',\ell'}^+))^{U_{m'} \times U_{\ell'}} \right)^{U_n} \\ & \simeq \left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+)) \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m'} \oplus M_{\ell',n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m',\ell'}^+)) \right)^{U_n \times U_m \times U_\ell \times U_{m'} \times U_{\ell'}} \\ & \simeq \left( \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{\ell,n} \oplus M_{n,m'} \oplus M_{\ell',n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+ \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m',\ell'}^+) \right)^{U_n \times U_m \times U_\ell \times U_{m'} \times U_{\ell'}} \\ & \simeq \left( \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+m'} \oplus M_{\ell+\ell',n})/I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+ \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m',\ell'}^+) \right)^{U_n \times U_m \times U_\ell \times U_{m'} \times U_{\ell'}} \\ & \simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\lambda^+, \lambda^-} (F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)})^{U_n} \otimes \tilde{F}_{(m+m', \ell+\ell')}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)} / I(\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+ \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m',\ell'}^+) \right)^{U_m \times U_\ell \times U_{m'} \times U_{\ell'}} \\ & \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda^+, \lambda^-} (F_{(n)}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)})^{U_n} \otimes \left( \tilde{F}_{(m+m', \ell+\ell')}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)} / (\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m,\ell}^+ \oplus \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{n,m',\ell'}^+) \cdot \tilde{F}_{(m+m', \ell+\ell')}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)} \right)^{U_m \times U_\ell \times U_{m'} \times U_{\ell'}} \end{aligned}$$

which tells us about the  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell} \oplus \mathfrak{gl}_{m',\ell'}$  decomposition in the representation  $\tilde{F}_{(m+m', \ell+\ell')}^{(\lambda^+, \lambda^-)}$  of  $\mathfrak{gl}_{(m+m'), (\ell+\ell')}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

The construction of §4.1 of course is just the case  $\ell = 0 = \ell'$  of the current discussion. That case is notable for staying completely in the context of finite-dimensional representation theory. Another case of interest is when  $\ell = 0 = m'$ . Then, although the representations of  $\mathfrak{gl}_{m,\ell'}$  are infinite dimensional, the representations of the subalgebras  $\mathfrak{gl}_m$  and  $\mathfrak{gl}_{\ell'}$  are finite dimensional. This case is analogous to branching from  $GL_n$  to  $O_n$  (or from  $GL_{2n}$  to  $Sp_{2n}$ ).

## 8. THE STABLE RANGE AND RELATIONS BETWEEN RECIPROCITY ALGEBRAS

Let us summarize our discussions this far. Given any classical symmetric pair, we can embed it in a (family of) see-saw symmetric pair(s). Doing this, we find that (a  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra of) the branching algebra for the pair can equally well be interpreted as the branching algebra for a dual family of representations of the dual symmetric pair. The representations of the dual symmetric pair will frequently be infinite dimensional, but they are always highest weight modules.

An immediate consequence of this isomorphism of algebras is the isomorphisms of intertwining spaces and hence equality of multiplicities, which we have collectively described as

*reciprocity laws.* These reciprocity laws are of the same nature as Frobenius Reciprocity for induced representations of groups.

From §4.2, we see that the see-saw symmetric pairs actually come in two parameter families. If one of the pairs involves many more variables than the other, then certain features of the discussions above become simpler.

Take the results of Theorem 4.1 as an illustration: The Littlewood-Richardson coefficients for  $GL_n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda &= \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{GL_n}(F_{(n)}^\lambda, F_{(n)}^\mu \otimes F_{(n)}^\nu) \\ &= \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{GL_m \times GL_\ell}(F_{(m)}^\mu \otimes F_{(\ell)}^\nu, F_{(m+\ell)}^\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

are independent of  $n$ , if  $n \geq m + \ell$ , and depend only on the shape of the partitions  $\mu$ ,  $\nu$  and  $\lambda$ .

Consider another example: branching from  $GL_{2n}$  to  $Sp_{2n}$ . If we let these groups act on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{2n,m})$ , we get the see-saw pairs  $(Sp_{2n}, \mathfrak{so}_{2m})$  and  $(GL_{2n}, \mathfrak{gl}_m)$ . The branching coefficients  $d_\lambda^\mu$  from  $GL_{2n}$  to  $Sp_{2n}$  can be described as follows:

$$F_{(2n)}^\lambda|_{Sp_{2n}} = \sum_{\mu} d_\lambda^\mu V_{(2n)}^\mu$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d_\lambda^\mu &= \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{Sp_{2n}}(V_{2n}^\mu, F_{2n}^\lambda) \\ &= \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{GL_m}(F_{(m)}^\lambda, F_{(m)}^\mu \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{so}_{2m}^{(2,0)})) \\ &= \dim \operatorname{Hom}_{GL_m}(F_{(m)}^\lambda, F_{(m)}^\mu \otimes \mathcal{S}(\wedge^2 \mathbb{C}^m)) \end{aligned}$$

is independent of  $n$ , if  $n \geq m$ , and only depends on the diagrams  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ . This allows one to create a theory of “stable characters” for  $Sp_{2n}$ . Similar considerations apply to  $GL_n$  and  $O_n$  and this idea has been actively pursued by [37], amongst others.

These are all instances of stability laws. The well-known one-step branching from  $GL_n$  to  $GL_{n-1}$  is another instance. This branching can be described entirely by diagrams, with no mention of the size  $n$ , if  $n$  is large. Iteration of this branching also shows that when  $n$  is large, the weight multiplicities of dominant weights of an irreducible  $GL_n$  representation are independent of  $n$ . See [1] for the other classical groups, which don’t share this stability property.

In the sections that follow, we will illustrate the simplifications that occur in the stable range, highlighting certain specific see-saw pairs. In all these cases, we show that the branching algebras associated to symmetric pairs can all be described by use of suitable branching algebras associated to the general linear groups. Thus, if we can have control of the solution in the general linear group case, we will have some control of the other classical groups. The other non-trivial examples will be important extensions of this work, and we hope to see them in further papers, for example, [16], [17] and [15].

## 9. STABILITY FOR BRANCHING FROM $GL_n$ TO $O_n$

We begin with a detailed discussion of the case of  $(GL_n, O_n)$  and  $(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}, GL_m)$ . Here we have already encountered the stable range, without the name. It is when  $n > 2m$ . Several things happen in the stable range:

- (a) The representations  $E_{(n)}^\mu$  of the orthogonal group remain irreducible when restricted to the special orthogonal group  $SO_n$ , and furthermore, no two of them are equivalent.
- (b) Recall the algebra  $\mathcal{J}_{n,m}$  of  $O_n$ -invariant polynomials on  $M_{n,m}$  generated by the quadratic invariants, which is the abelian subalgebra  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}$  of  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}$ . In the stable range (in fact it holds true whenever  $n \geq m$ ), the natural surjective homomorphism

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_{n,m}$$

is an isomorphism. See Theorem 3.3(a).

- (c) In the stable range, the multiplication map

$$\mathcal{H}_{n,m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{n,m} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{n,m} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$$

is also an isomorphism of  $O_n \times GL_m$ -modules. See Theorem 3.3(a).

Of course, the subspace  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}$  of harmonic polynomials is not an algebra – it is not closed under multiplication. This is quite clear, since  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}$  contains all the linear functions, which generate the whole polynomial ring. However, to form the reciprocity algebra associated to the symmetric see-saw pairs  $(GL_n, O_n)$  and  $(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}, GL_m)$ , we need to take the  $U_{O_n}$ -invariants. Thus, our reciprocity algebra is a subalgebra of

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{H}_{n,m} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}))^{U_{O_n}} &= \mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}) \\ &\simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\mu} (E_{(n)}^\mu)^{U_{O_n}} \otimes F_{(m)}^\mu \right) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}). \end{aligned} \quad (9.1)$$

**Theorem 9.1.** *When  $n > 2m$ , the space  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}}$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$ . Hence, the algebra  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}$  is isomorphic to a tensor product*

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)})$$

*of the algebras  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}}$  and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)})$ . Furthermore, the algebra  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}}$  is isomorphic (as a representation) to the subalgebra  $\mathcal{R}^+(GL_m/U_m)$  of  $\mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m)$  defined by the polynomial representations.*

**Proof.** Note that  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}}$  can be identified with a subalgebra  $\mathcal{R}^+(GL_m/U_m)$  of  $\mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m)$  defined by the polynomial representations, from our discussion in §3.2. Consider the space of polynomials belonging to the sum in the last expression of equation (9.1). Let  $\{x_{jk} \mid j = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, m\}$  be the standard matrix entries on  $M_{n,m}$ . In order to make the unipotent group  $U_{O_n}$  of  $O_n$  maximally compatible with (in fact, contained in) the unipotent subgroup  $U_n$  of  $GL_n$ , we choose the inner product on  $\mathbb{C}^n$  as in Section 3.3.1. By this choice, joint  $O_n \times GL_m$  harmonic highest weight vectors are monomials in the determinants

$$\delta_j = \det \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & \dots & x_{1j} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & \dots & x_{2j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{j1} & x_{j2} & \dots & x_{jj} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, m. \quad (9.2)$$

From this, we can see that the space  $\sum_{\mu}(E_{(n)}^{\mu})^{U_{O_n}} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\mu}$  is spanned by the monomials in the determinants

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} x_{1,b_1} & x_{1,b_2} & \dots & x_{1,b_j} \\ x_{2,b_1} & x_{2,b_2} & \dots & x_{2,b_j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{j,b_1} & x_{j,b_2} & \dots & x_{j,b_j} \end{bmatrix} \quad (9.3)$$

as  $\{b_1, b_2, b_3, \dots, b_j\}$  ranges over all  $j$ -tuples of integers from 1 to  $m$ . Indeed, the span of such monomials is clearly invariant under  $\mathfrak{gl}_m$ , and consists of highest weight vectors for  $O_n$ . Finally, we see that these monomials will all be harmonic, because the partial Laplacians spanning  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(0,2)}$  have the form

$$\Delta_{ab} = \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_{j,a} \partial x_{n+1-j,b}}. \quad (9.4)$$

Since every term of  $\Delta_{ab}$  involves differentiating with respect to a variable  $x_{jk}$  with  $j > n/2$ , and the determinants (9.3) do not depend on these variables, we see that they will be annihilated by the  $\Delta_{ab}$ , which means that they are harmonic. This shows that  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}}$  is a subalgebra of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$ .

We have thus completed the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

We can use the description in Theorem 9.1 of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}$  to relate the branching algebra  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n} \times U_m}$  to the tensor product algebra for  $GL_m$ . As a  $GL_m$ -module, the space  $\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m)$ , the space of symmetric  $m \times m$  matrices. It is well known that the symmetric algebra  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m))$  is multiplicity-free as a representation of  $GL_m$ , and decomposes into a sum of one copy of each polynomial representation corresponding to a diagram with rows of even length (or a partition of even parts):

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m)) \simeq \bigoplus_{\nu} F_{(m)}^{2\nu}. \quad (9.5)$$

(Note that this result is in several places in the literature. See [10] and [14] for example.)

As a  $GL_m$ -module,  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m))$  could be embedded in  $\mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m)$ , but the algebra structures on these two algebras are quite different.

Using the dominance filtration (see §3.2), we have a canonical  $\widehat{A}^+$ -algebra filtration on  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m))$ . If we form the associated graded algebra, then Theorem 3.2 says that it will be isomorphic to the subalgebra of  $\mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m)$  spanned by the representations attached to diagrams with even length rows.

Let us denote the associated graded algebra of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m))$  by  $\text{Gr}_{\widehat{A}_m^+} \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m))$ . Let us denote the subalgebra of  $\mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m)$  spanned by the representations attached to diagrams with even length rows by  $\mathcal{R}^{+2}(GL_m/U_m)$ .

We can filter the tensor product  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)})$  by means of the filtration on  $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)})$ . The associated graded algebra will then be  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \text{Gr}_{\widehat{A}_m^+} \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)})$ . This discussion has indicated that the following result holds.

**Theorem 9.2.** *When  $n > 2m$ , the associated graded algebra of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}$  with respect to the dominance filtration on the factor  $\mathcal{J}_{n,m}$  is isomorphic to the tensor product of the graded*

subalgebras  $\mathcal{R}^+(GL_m/U_m)$  and  $\mathcal{R}^{+2}(GL_m/U_m)$  of  $\mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m)$ :

$$Gr_{\hat{A}_m^+}(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}) \simeq \mathcal{R}^+(GL_m/U_m) \otimes \mathcal{R}^{+2}(GL_m/U_m).$$

Of course,  $Gr_{\hat{A}_m^+}(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}})$  is isomorphic as a  $GL_m$ -module to  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}$  in an obvious way, by construction. Also  $Gr_{\hat{A}_m^+}(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}})$  inherits the  $\hat{A}_{O_n}^+$  grading from  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}$  – it becomes identified with the  $\hat{A}_m^+$  grading on the first factor  $\mathcal{R}^+(GL_m/U_m)$  in the tensor product of Theorem 9.2. On the other hand, the second factor is also  $\hat{A}_m^+$ -graded in the obvious way, since it is the factor which defines the associated graded. When we take the  $U_m$  invariants, we get another grading by  $\hat{A}_m^+$ , associated to the  $A_m$  action on the  $U_m$  invariants. This triply  $\hat{A}_m^+$ -graded algebra is evidently a  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of the tensor product algebra of  $GL_m$ .

On the other hand, we could take the  $U_m$  invariants inside  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}$ , and then pass to the associated graded. It is not hard to convince oneself that these two processes commute with each other. Hence, we finally have:

**Corollary 9.3** *When  $n > 2m$ , the associated graded algebra of  $U_m$  invariants in  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} Gr_{\hat{A}_m^+} \left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}})^{U_m} \right) &\simeq (Gr_{\hat{A}_m^+}(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}}))^{U_m} \\ &\simeq (\mathcal{R}^+(GL_m/U_m) \otimes \mathcal{R}^{+2}(GL_m/U_m))^{U_m} \end{aligned}$$

*is a triply-graded  $(0,1)$ -subalgebra of the tensor product algebra of  $GL_m$ . The restrictions on the gradings which define  $Gr_{\hat{A}_m^+} \left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{U_{O_n}})^{U_m} \right)$  are:*

- (a) *the weight on the first factor of  $(\mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m) \otimes \mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m))^{U_m}$  should correspond to a partition (i.e., it should be a polynomial weight), and*
- (b) *the weight on the second factor should correspond to a partition with even parts.*

**Remark:** The content of Corollary 9.3 in terms of multiplicities is the Littlewood Restriction Formula [8], [16]; see formula (2.4.1), [24]; see (5.7) with (4.19), [37]; see Theorem 1.5.3 and 2.3.1, [49] and [50]. With this result it is possible to compute a basis of the reciprocity algebra for  $(GL_n, O_n)$  using [16]; see second preprint of [15].

## 10. TENSOR PRODUCTS FOR $O_n$

According to Theorem 6.1, we can compute tensor products for the orthogonal group via the algebra

$$\left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+))^{U_m} \otimes (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_\ell} \right)^{U_{O_n}}.$$

Here the stable range is  $n > 2(m + \ell)$ . Then we have

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m+\ell}) \simeq \mathcal{H}_{n,m+\ell} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2(m+\ell)}^{(2,0)}).$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2(m+\ell)}^{(2,0)}) &= \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)} \oplus \mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell}^{(2,0)} \oplus (\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell)) \\ &\simeq \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)}) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell}^{(2,0)}) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathcal{J}_{n,m} \simeq \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2m}^{(2,0)})$  and  $\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell} \simeq \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{sp}_{2\ell}^{(2,0)})$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+) &\simeq \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m} \oplus M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+ \oplus \mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+) \\ &\simeq \mathcal{H}_{n,m+\ell} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell). \end{aligned} \quad (10.1)$$

Thus, using equation (10.1), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}} \\ &\simeq (\mathcal{H}_{n,m+\ell} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell))^{U_{O_n}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{n,m+\ell}^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell) \\ &\simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\lambda} E_{(n)}^{\lambda} \otimes F_{(m+\ell)}^{\lambda} \right)^{U_{O_n}} \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell) \\ &\simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\lambda} (E_{(n)}^{\lambda})^{U_{O_n}} \otimes F_{(m+\ell)}^{\lambda} \right) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell) \\ &\simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\lambda} (F_{(n)}^{\lambda})^{U_n} \otimes F_{(m+\ell)}^{\lambda} \right) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $F_{(n)}^{\lambda}$  is the  $GL_n$  representation generated by the highest weight of the  $O_n$  representation  $E_{(n)}^{\lambda}$  and both  $(F_{(n)}^{\lambda})^{U_n}$  and  $(E_{(n)}^{\lambda})^{O_n}$  are one dimensional.

Hence, finally we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}} \right)^{U_m \times U_\ell} \\ &\simeq \left( \left( \bigoplus_{\lambda} (F_{(n)}^{\lambda})^{U_n} \otimes F_{(m+\ell)}^{\lambda} \right) \otimes \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell) \right)^{U_m \times U_\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (10.2)$$

We can interpret this algebra in term of tensor product algebras for general linear groups. According to Theorem 3.4(c) and (3.8), as a  $GL_m \times GL_\ell$  module, we have

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell) \simeq \bigoplus_{\delta} F_{(m)}^{\delta} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\delta}. \quad (10.3)$$

We also know that

$$\mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m \times GL_\ell/U_\ell) \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu, \nu} F_{(m)}^{\mu} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\nu}. \quad (10.4)$$

Since this algebra is bigraded by  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ , we can consider the “diagonal”  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebra

$$\Delta \mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m \times GL_\ell/U_\ell) \simeq \bigoplus_{\delta} F_{(m)}^{\delta} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\delta} \quad (10.5)$$

resulting from requiring the two partitions to be the same. Evidently, the algebra  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell)$  is isomorphic to  $\Delta \mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m \times GL_\ell/U_\ell)$  as  $GL_m \times GL_\ell$ -module. They are not isomorphic as algebras, since  $\Delta \mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m \times GL_\ell/U_\ell)$  is graded by  $\hat{A}_m^+ \times \hat{A}_\ell^+$ , while  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell)$  is not. However, we may filter  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell)$  by the representations of  $GL_m \times GL_\ell$  (or of either factor) using the dominance filtration (see §3.2), and then the associated graded algebra will be isomorphic to  $\Delta \mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m \times GL_\ell/U_\ell)$  by Theorem 3.2:

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{\hat{A}_m^+ \times \hat{A}_\ell^+}(\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell)) \simeq \Delta \mathcal{R}(GL_m/U_m \times GL_\ell/U_\ell).$$

Now turn to the first factor  $\bigoplus_{\lambda} \left( (F_{(n)}^{\lambda})^{U_n} \otimes F_{(m+\ell)}^{\lambda} \right)$  on the right hand side of equation (10.2). According to Theorem 4.1, we can write this as

$$\bigoplus_{\lambda} (F_{(n)}^{\lambda})^{U_n} \otimes F_{(m+\ell)}^{\lambda} \simeq \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta} \left( F_{(n)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(n)}^{\beta} \right)^{U_n} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\beta}. \quad (10.6)$$

Combining equations (10.2), (10.3) and (10.6), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}} \right)^{U_m \times U_{\ell}} \\ & \simeq \left( \left( \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta} \left( F_{(n)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(n)}^{\beta} \right)^{U_n} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\beta} \right) \otimes \left( \bigoplus_{\delta} F_{(m)}^{\delta} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\delta} \right) \right)^{U_m \times U_{\ell}} \\ & \simeq \left( \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta, \delta} \left( F_{(n)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(n)}^{\beta} \right)^{U_n} \otimes (F_{(m)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\delta}) \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^{\beta} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\delta}) \right)^{U_m \times U_{\ell}} \\ & \simeq \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta, \delta} \left( F_{(n)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(n)}^{\beta} \right)^{U_n} \otimes (F_{(m)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\delta})^{U_m} \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^{\beta} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\delta})^{U_{\ell}} \end{aligned} \quad (10.7)$$

At this point, this is an isomorphism of graded vector spaces, not an algebra isomorphism.

We may interpret the last expression in (10.7) analogously to (10.4) and (10.5). We have the (polynomial) tensor product algebras

$$(\mathcal{R}^+(GL_k/U_k) \otimes \mathcal{R}^+(GL_k/U_k))^{U_k} \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda, \mu} \left( F_{(k)}^{\lambda} \otimes F_{(k)}^{\mu} \right)^{U_k}$$

for  $k = n, m$  and  $\ell$ . If we form the tensor product of these, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{R}^+(GL_n/U_n) \otimes \mathcal{R}^+(GL_n/U_n))^{U_n} \otimes (\mathcal{R}^+(GL_m/U_m) \otimes \mathcal{R}^+(GL_m/U_m))^{U_m} \\ & \otimes (\mathcal{R}^+(GL_{\ell}/U_{\ell}) \otimes \mathcal{R}^+(GL_{\ell}/U_{\ell}))^{U_{\ell}} \\ & \simeq \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta, \delta, \lambda, \mu, \nu} \left( F_{(n)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(n)}^{\beta} \right)^{U_n} \otimes (F_{(m)}^{\delta} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\lambda})^{U_m} \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^{\mu} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\nu})^{U_{\ell}} \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote this algebra by  $\mathbb{T}_{n,m,\ell}$ . The algebra  $\mathbb{T}_{n,m,\ell}$  is  $(\widehat{A}_n^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_m^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_{\ell}^+)^3$ -graded. If we require that  $\lambda = \alpha$ , or that  $\mu = \beta$ , or that  $\nu = \delta$ , then we obtain  $(0, 1)$ -subalgebras of  $\mathbb{T}_{n,m,\ell}$ . If  $\delta = \alpha$ , we will denote it by  $\Delta_{1,3}\mathbb{T}_{n,m,\ell}$ , and so forth. The subalgebra obtained by requiring that all three diagonal conditions occur at once will be denoted by using all three  $\Delta$ 's. Thus we will write

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_{1,3}\Delta_{2,5}\Delta_{4,6}\mathbb{T}_{n,m,\ell} \\ & = \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \delta} \left( F_{(n)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(n)}^{\beta} \right)^{U_n} \otimes (F_{(m)}^{\alpha} \otimes F_{(m)}^{\delta})^{U_m} \otimes (F_{(\ell)}^{\beta} \otimes F_{(\ell)}^{\delta})^{U_{\ell}} \end{aligned} \quad (10.8)$$

We see from equations (10.7) and (10.8), that  $\Delta_{1,3}\Delta_{2,5}\Delta_{4,6}\mathbb{T}_{n,m,\ell}$  and

$$\left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}} \right)^{U_m \times U_{\ell}}$$



are isomorphic as multigraded vector spaces. They may not be isomorphic as algebras, because

$$\left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}} \right)^{U_m \times U_\ell}$$

is not graded, while we see from equations (10.7) and (10.8), that  $\Delta_{1,3}\Delta_{2,5}\Delta_{4,6}\mathbb{T}_{n,m,\ell}$  is. However, if we pass to the associated graded of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes \mathbb{C}^\ell)$ , then the two algebras do become isomorphic. We record this fact.

**Theorem 10.1.** *Assume the stable range  $n > 2(m+\ell)$ . We have the following isomorphisms of  $(\widehat{A}_n^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_m^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_\ell^+)^3$ -graded algebras:*

$$\begin{aligned} Gr_{(\widehat{A}_n^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_m^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_\ell^+)^3} \left( \left( (\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+) \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,\ell}^+))^{U_{O_n}} \right)^{U_m \times U_\ell} \right) \\ \simeq \Delta_{1,3}\Delta_{2,5}\Delta_{4,6}\mathbb{T}_{n,m,\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark:** The content of Theorem 10.1 in terms of multiplicities can be found in [16]; see formula (2.1.2), [28]; see Theorem 4.1 and [54].

## 11. RESTRICTION FROM $O_{n+m}$ TO $O_n \times O_m$

Consider now branching from  $O_{n+m}$  to the product  $O_n \times O_m$ . We look at the action of  $O_{n+m}$  on  $M_{n+m,\ell}$  by multiplication on the left. Here we simply state the relationship of the reciprocity algebra for  $(O_{n+m}, O_n \times O_m)$  in the stable range, in relation to the  $GL_n$  tensor product algebras. We shall omit the proof.

The content of Theorem 11.1 in terms of multiplicities can be found in [16]; see formula (2.2.2), [28]; see (2.16) and [37]; see Theorem 2.5 and corollary 2.6. With this result it is possible to compute a basis of the reciprocity algebra for  $(O_{n+m}, O_n \times O_m)$  using [17]; see second preprint of [15].

**Theorem 11.1.** *Assume the stable range  $\min(m, n) > 2\ell$ . We have the following isomorphisms of  $(\widehat{A}_\ell^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_\ell^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_\ell^+)^3$ -graded algebras:*

$$\begin{aligned} Gr_{(\widehat{A}_\ell^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_\ell^+)^3 \times (\widehat{A}_\ell^+)^3} \left( \mathcal{P}(M_{n+m,\ell})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n+m,\ell}^+) \right)^{U_{O_n} \times U_{O_m} \times U_\ell} \\ \simeq (\mathcal{R}^+(GL_\ell/U_\ell) \otimes \mathcal{R}^+(GL_\ell/U_\ell) \otimes \mathcal{R}^{+2}(GL_\ell/U_\ell))^{U_\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

## Appendix: A Proof of the Separation of Variables Theorem

We provide a simple proof here for  $G = O_n$ . It could be adapted easily for  $Sp_{2n}$  acting on copies of  $\mathbb{C}^{2n}$  or  $GL_n$  acting on copies of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\mathbb{C}^{n*}$ .

Let  $O_n$  act by the usual left multiplication on  $M_{n,m}$ , the  $n \times m$  matrices. We assume that  $n \geq 2m$ , which includes the stable range  $n > 2m$ . Let  $r_{ij}$  be the invariant pairing between the  $i$ -th column and the  $j$ -th column. Recall that  $\mathcal{J}_{n,m} = \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{O_n}$  is generated freely by the homogeneous quadratic polynomials  $\{r_{ij}\}$  in this range (see [10] Theorem 5.2.7). Also, the space of harmonics, i.e., polynomials annihilated by all the differential operators dual to the  $r_{ij}$ 's, is denoted by  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}$  as in Theorem 3.3(a).

**Theorem (Separation of Variables)** *If  $n \geq 2m$ , then*

$$\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) \simeq \mathcal{H}_{n,m} \otimes \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})^{O_n}$$

**Remarks.** Proofs of this result for orthogonal groups (see Theorem 2.5 of [62]) and for symplectic groups (see Theorem 1.10 of [63]) are given by Ton-That using results of [38].

**Proof of Separation of Variables Theorem:** Let  $I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+)$  be the ideal in  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  generated by  $r_{ij}$ 's with zero constant terms, and consider  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  as an  $I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+)$  module by multiplication.

We shall need the notion of a regular sequence. First, denote the ideal in  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  generated by  $\{f_1, \dots, f_s\}$  by the symbol  $\langle f_1, \dots, f_s \rangle \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$ . A sequence  $\{f_1, \dots, f_k\} \subset I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+)$  forms a *regular sequence* for  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  if

- (a)  $f_i$  is not a zero-divisor on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / \langle f_1, \dots, f_{i-1} \rangle \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , and
- (b)  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / \langle f_1, \dots, f_k \rangle \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  is non-zero.

Geometrically, saying that a given function  $f$  is not a zero-divisor on  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) / \langle f_1, \dots, f_{i-1} \rangle$  is the same as saying that  $f$  does not vanish identically on any irreducible component of the zero set of  $\{f_1, \dots, f_{i-1}\}$ . This in turn is the same as saying that each irreducible component of  $\{f_1, \dots, f_{i-1}, f\}$  has dimension one less than the component of the zero set of  $\{f_1, \dots, f_{i-1}\}$ .

Separation of variables would follow from knowing that the  $r_{ij}$ 's (in some order) form a regular sequence for  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$ . In fact, you can take any order you want. For an ideal  $I$  in a commutative ring  $S$ , we have the chain:

$$S \supseteq I \supseteq I^2 \supseteq I^3 \supseteq \dots$$

and we can thus form the associated graded algebra

$$\mathrm{Gr}_I S = S/I \oplus I/I^2 \oplus I^2/I^3 \oplus \dots$$

with multiplication (setting  $S = I^0$ )

$$I^i/I^{i+1} \otimes I^j/I^{j+1} \longrightarrow I^{i+j}/I^{i+j+1}$$

induced by multiplication on  $S$ . In our context,  $S = \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$  and  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})/I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+)$  is the coordinate ring of the null-cone and as a linear space (in particular, as a  $O_n \times GL_m$  module), it is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{H}_{n,m}$ . If  $\{r_{ij}\} \subset I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+)$  is a regular sequence of  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$ , then we have a nice presentation of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+)} \mathcal{P}(M_{n,m})$ :

**Ree's Theorem** (see Theorem 2.1 of [56]) *If  $I$  is generated by a regular sequence  $f_1, \dots, f_n$ , then the map  $\phi : (S/I)[x_1, \dots, x_n] \leftarrow Gr_I S$ , sending  $x_i$  to the class  $f_i$  in  $I/I^2$  is an isomorphism.*

Ree's Theorem thus implies that as vector spaces, we have  $S = S/I \otimes \mathbb{C}[f_1, \dots, f_n]$ , and in our context,  $\mathcal{P}(M_{n,m}) \cong \mathcal{H}_{n,m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_{n,m}$ .

Thus we want to show that indeed  $\{r_{ij}\}$  form a regular sequence in  $I(\mathcal{J}_{n,m}^+)$ . To show this, consider the map from  $M_{n,m}$  to the  $m \times m$  symmetric matrices  $\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m)$  by putting the  $r_{ij}$  in a matrix:

$$Q : M_{n,m} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m) \quad \text{where} \quad Q(T) = T^t T, \quad T \in M_{n,m}.$$

First observe that this map is  $O_n \times GL_m$  equivariant:

$$Q(gTh) = h^t Q(T) h, \quad g \in O_n, h \in GL_m.$$

Further, the  $O_n$  and  $GL_m$  actions commute.

Let us study the fibers of the map  $Q$ . Define the following rank  $m$  matrices in  $M_{n,m}$ : For  $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$ , let

$$T_k = [c_1 c_2 \dots c_k c_{k+1} \dots c_m] \in M_{n,m}$$

where  $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k\}$  is an *orthonormal* set of *non-isotropic* vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and  $\{c_{k+1}, \dots, c_m\}$  is an *orthogonal* set of *isotropic* vectors in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , such that each of the  $c_j$  with  $j > k$  are orthogonal to the  $c_j$  with  $j \leq k$ . It is easy to see that

$$Q(T_k) = \begin{bmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $I_k$  is the  $k \times k$  identity matrix. Next, for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$ , define the sets  $\Theta_k \subset M_{n,m}$  as follows:

$$\Theta_k = \{X \in M_{n,m} \mid Q(X) = Q(T_k) \text{ and } \text{rank } X = \text{rank } T_k = m\}.$$

Let us remind our readers on the following version of Witt's Theorem (see Theorem 3.7.1 of [14]):

**Witt's Theorem** *Given two  $n \times m$  matrices  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , there is an orthogonal  $n \times n$  matrix  $g$  such that  $gT_1 = T_2$  if and only if  $Q(T_1) = Q(T_2)$  and  $\ker T_1 = \ker T_2$ .*

Since  $X$  and  $T_k$  are of full rank, i.e.,  $\text{rank } X = \text{rank } T_k = m$ , thus  $\ker X = \ker T_k = \{0\}$ . By Witt's Theorem,  $\Theta_k$  is an  $O_n$  orbit in the fiber  $Q^{-1}(Q(T_k)) \subset M_{n,m}$ . The full rank condition gives the openness and denseness of this orbit. The *null cone* (or null fiber)  $NCQ = \Theta_0$  corresponds to  $k = 0$ .

We claim that the fibers of the map  $Q$  are all varieties of the same dimension, i.e.,  $Q$  is an *equi-dimensional* map:

**Proposition** *Consider the  $O_n \times GL_m$ -equivariant map  $Q$ . Then for each  $Y \in \mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m)$ ,*

- (a) *the fiber  $Q^{-1}(Y)$  is an irreducible variety, invariant under  $O_n$ , and contains an open dense orbit of the form  $\Theta_k \cdot h$ , for some  $h \in GL_m$  and some  $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$ .*
- (b) *the dimension of each fiber  $Q^{-1}(Y)$  is  $f = nm - \frac{m(m+1)}{2}$ , which is independent of the fiber.*

**Remark:** The inverse image of any symmetric matrix contains exactly one  $O_n$  orbit consisting of invertible matrices. This is dense in the whole inverse image. It is the condition

that  $n \geq 2m$  which permits injective maps into isotropic subspaces (i.e., such that the pulled-back form vanishes).

**Proof of Proposition:** For  $Y \in \mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m)$ , we can find  $h \in GL_m$  such that  $h^t Y h = \begin{bmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ , for some  $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$ .

If  $X \in M_{n,m}$  is such that  $Q(X) = Y$ , then  $Q(Xh) = h^t Q(X) h = h^t Y h = \begin{bmatrix} I_k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . Further,  $\text{rank } Xh = \text{rank } X$ . In other words, the fiber  $Q^{-1}(Y)$  associated to  $Y \in \mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m)$  is the closure of an open dense orbit given by  $\Theta_k \cdot h$ , and hence an irreducible variety.

The fact that the orbits  $\Theta_k$  (and their translates) have the same dimension follows from the computation of the dimension of the pointwise stabilizer in  $O_n$  of  $T_k \in M_{n,m}$ . The pointwise stabilizer can be easily computed for each  $k = 0, 1, \dots, m$ . The dimension of each fiber is  $f = nm - \frac{m(m+1)}{2}$ . (You can see this dimension from the null cone pretty easily because the ring of  $O_n$  invariants is freely generated by  $\frac{m(m+1)}{2}$  polynomials  $r_{ij}$ 's.)  $\square$

Since the mapping  $Q$  has equi-dimensional fibres, if  $V \subset \mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m)$  is any irreducible variety of dimension  $e$ , then  $Q^{-1}(V)$  will be an irreducible variety of dimension  $e + f$ . The  $Q(r_{ij})$ 's are coordinates on  $\mathcal{S}^2(\mathbb{C}^m)$ , so the variety defined by  $d$  of them is a subspace of codimension  $d$ . It follows that the pullback of this subspace by  $Q$  is also irreducible and of codimension  $d$ . Therefore, the dimension of the zero set of  $r_{ij}$ 's decrease by 1 at each stage, making  $\{r_{ij}\}$  a regular sequence (see Lemma 4 on page 105 of [53]).  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. M. Benkart, D. J. Britten, and F. W. Lemire, *Stability in modules for classical Lie algebras—a constructive approach*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (1990), vi+165. MR1010997 (90m:17012)
- [2] A. D. Berenstein and A. V. Zelevinsky, *Triple multiplicities for  $\mathfrak{sl}(r+1)$  and the spectrum of the exterior algebra of the adjoint representation*, J. Algebraic Combin. **1** (1992), 7–22. MR1162639 (93h:17012)
- [3] Arkady Berenstein and Andrei Zelevinsky, *Tensor product multiplicities, canonical bases and totally positive varieties*, Invent. Math. **143** (2001), 77–128. MR1802793 (2002c:17005)
- [4] G. R. E. Black, R. C. King, and B. G. Wybourne, *Kronecker products for compact semisimple Lie groups*, J. Phys. A **16** (1983), 1555–1589. MR708193 (85e:22020)
- [5] Armand Borel, *Linear algebraic groups*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 126, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991, ISBN 0-387-97370-2. MR1102012 (92d:20001)
- [6] Raoul Bott, *Homogeneous vector bundles*, Ann. of Math. (2) **66** (1957), 203–248. MR0089473 (19,681d)
- [7] V. G. Drinfel'd, *Quantum groups*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Berkeley, Calif., 1986), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 798–820. MR934283 (89f:17017)
- [8] Thomas J. Enright and Jeb F. Willenbring, *Hilbert series, Howe duality and branching for classical groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **159** (2004), 337–375. MR2052357 (2005d:22013)
- [9] William Fulton, *Young tableaux*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 35, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, ISBN 0-521-56144-2, 0-521-56724-6, With applications to representation theory and geometry. MR1464693 (99f:05119)
- [10] Roe Goodman and Nolan R. Wallach, *Representations and invariants of the classical groups*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 68, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, ISBN 0-521-58273-3, 0-521-66348-2. MR1606831 (99b:20073)
- [11] Roger Howe, *Reciprocity laws in the theory of dual pairs*, Representation Theory of Reductive Groups (Park City, Utah, 1982), Progr. Math., vol. 40, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983, pp. 159–175. MR733812 (85k:22033)
- [12] ———, *Remarks on classical invariant theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **313** (1989), 539–570. MR986027 (90h:22015a)

- [13] ———, *Transcending classical invariant theory*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **2** (1989), 535–552. MR985172 (90k:22016)
- [14] ———, *Perspectives on invariant theory: Schur duality, multiplicity-free actions and beyond*, The Schur Lectures (1992) (Tel Aviv), Israel Math. Conf. Proc., vol. 8, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1995, pp. 1–182. MR1321638 (96e:13006)
- [15] Roger Howe and Soo Teck Lee, *Bases for Reciprocity Algebras I, II, III (preprints)*.
- [16] Roger Howe, Eng-Chye Tan, and Jeb F. Willenbring, *Stable branching rules for classical symmetric pairs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357** (2005), 1601–1626 (electronic). MR2115378
- [17] Roger Howe, Eng-Chye Tan, and Jeb Willenbring, *A Basis for the  $\mathbf{GL}_n$  Tensor Product Algebra*, To appear in Advances in Mathematics.
- [18] Roger Howe and Tōru Umeda, *The Capelli identity, the double commutant theorem, and multiplicity-free actions*, Math. Ann. **290** (1991), 565–619. MR1116239 (92j:17004)
- [19] Gordon James and Adalbert Kerber, *The representation theory of the symmetric group*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 16, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1981, ISBN 0-201-13515-9, With a foreword by P. M. Cohn; With an introduction by Gilbert de B. Robinson. MR644144 (83k:20003)
- [20] Jens Carsten Jantzen, *Introduction to quantum groups*, Representations of Reductive Groups, Publ. Newton Inst., Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998, pp. 105–127. MR1714152 (2000j:17021)
- [21] Michio Jimbo, *Solvable lattice models and quantum groups*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. I, II (Kyoto, 1990), Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 1991, pp. 1343–1352. MR1159318 (93g:82036)
- [22] Anthony Joseph, *Quantum groups and their primitive ideals*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 29, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995, ISBN 3-540-57057-8. MR1315966 (96d:17015)
- [23] Masaki Kashiwara, *Crystalizing the  $q$ -analogue of universal enveloping algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **133** (1990), 249–260. MR1090425 (92b:17018)
- [24] R. C. King, *Modification rules and products of irreducible representations of the unitary, orthogonal, and symplectic groups*, J. Mathematical Phys. **12** (1971), 1588–1598. MR0287816 (44 #5019)
- [25] ———, *Branching rules using tensor methods*, Group Theoretical Methods in Physics (Proc. Third Internat. Colloq., Centre Phys. Théor., Marseille, 1974), Vol. 2, Centre Nat. Recherche Sci., Centre Phys. Théor., Marseille, 1974, pp. 400–408. MR0480644 (58 #800)
- [26] ———, *Branching rules for  $GL(N) \supset_m$  and the evaluation of inner plethysms*, J. Mathematical Phys. **15** (1974), 258–267. MR0331999 (48 #10331)
- [27] ———, *Branching rules for classical Lie groups using tensor and spinor methods*, J. Phys. A **8** (1975), 429–449. MR0411400 (53 #15136)
- [28] ———, *S-functions and characters of Lie algebras and superalgebras*, Invariant Theory and Tableaux (Minneapolis, MN, 1988), IMA Vol. Math. Appl., vol. 19, Springer, New York, 1990, pp. 226–261. MR1035497 (90k:17014)
- [29] R King C., *Branching rules and weight multiplicities for simple and affine Lie algebras*, Algebraic Methods in Physics (Montréal, QC, 1997), CRM Ser. Math. Phys., Springer, New York, 2001, pp. 121–133. MR1847252 (2002g:17013)
- [30] R. C. King and B. G. Wybourne, *Analogies between finite-dimensional irreducible representations of  $SO(2n)$  and infinite-dimensional irreducible representations of  $Sp(2n, \mathbf{R})$ . I. Characters and products*, J. Math. Phys. **41** (2000), 5002–5019. MR1765836 (2001f:20090a)
- [31] ———, *Analogies between finite-dimensional irreducible representations of  $SO(2n)$  and infinite-dimensional irreducible representations of  $Sp(2n, \mathbf{R})$ . II. Plethysms*, J. Math. Phys. **41** (2000), 5656–5690. MR1770978 (2001f:20090b)
- [32] A. W. Knap, *Branching theorems for compact symmetric spaces*, Represent. Theory **5** (2001), 404–436 (electronic). MR1870596 (2002i:20065)
- [33] Anthony W. Knap, *Lie groups beyond an introduction*, 2nd ed., Progress in Mathematics, vol. 140, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2002, ISBN 0-8176-4259-5. MR1920389 (2003c:22001)

- [34] Kazuhiko Koike and Itaru Terada, *Littlewood's formulas and their application to representations of classical Weyl groups*, Commutative Algebra and Combinatorics (Kyoto, 1985), Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 11, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987, pp. 147–160. MR951200 (89i:20028)
- [35] ———, *Young-diagrammatic methods for the representation theory of the groups  $\mathrm{Sp}$  and  $\mathrm{SO}$* , The Arcata Conference on Representations of Finite Groups (Arcata, Calif., 1986), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 47, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 437–447. MR933432 (89b:20086)
- [36] ———, *Young-diagrammatic methods for the representation theory of the classical groups of type  $B_n$ ,  $C_n$ ,  $D_n$* , J. Algebra **107** (1987), 466–511. MR885807 (88i:22035)
- [37] ———, *Young diagrammatic methods for the restriction of representations of complex classical Lie groups to reductive subgroups of maximal rank*, Adv. Math. **79** (1990), 104–135. MR1031827 (91a:22013)
- [38] Bertram Kostant, *Lie group representations on polynomial rings*, Amer. J. Math. **85** (1963), 327–404. MR0158024 (28 #1252)
- [39] ———, *A branching law for subgroups fixed by an involution and a noncompact analogue of the Borel-Weil theorem*, Noncommutative Harmonic Analysis, Progr. Math., vol. 220, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2004, pp. 291–353. MR2036575 (2004m:17015)
- [40] B. Kostant and S. Rallis, *Orbits and representations associated with symmetric spaces*, Amer. J. Math. **93** (1971), 753–809. MR0311837 (47 #399)
- [41] Stephen S. Kudla, *Seesaw dual reductive pairs*, Automorphic Forms of Several Variables (Katata, 1983), Progr. Math., vol. 46, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1984, pp. 244–268. MR763017 (86b:22032)
- [42] Venkatramani Lakshmibai, Peter Littelmann, and Peter Magyar, *Standard monomial theory and applications*, Representation Theories and Algebraic Geometry (Montreal, PQ, 1997), NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., vol. 514, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1998, pp. 319–364, Notes by Rupert W. T. Yu. MR1653037 (99j:20050)
- [43] V. Lakshmibai and C. S. Seshadri, *Standard monomial theory*, Proceedings of the Hyderabad Conference on Algebraic Groups (Hyderabad, 1989), Manoj Prakashan, Madras, 1991, pp. 279–322. MR1131317 (92k:14053)
- [44] Peter Littelmann, *A Littlewood-Richardson rule for symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras*, Invent. Math. **116** (1994), 329–346. MR1253196 (95f:17023)
- [45] ———, *The path model for representations of symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Zürich, 1994), Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995, pp. 298–308. MR1403930 (97h:17024)
- [46] ———, *The path model for representations of symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Zürich, 1994), Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995, pp. 298–308. MR1403930 (97h:17024)
- [47] ———, *Paths and root operators in representation theory*, Ann. of Math. (2) **142** (1995), 499–525. MR1356780 (96m:17011)
- [48] D. E. Littlewood and A. R. Richardson, *Group characters and algebra*, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London. Ser. A. **233** (1934), 99–142.
- [49] D. E. Littlewood, *On invariant theory under restricted groups*, Philos. Trans. Roy. Soc. London. Ser. A. **239** (1944), 387–417. MR0012299 (7,6e)
- [50] ———, *The Theory of Group Characters and Matrix Representations of Groups*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1940. MR0002127 (2,3a)
- [51] G. Lusztig, *Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), 447–498. MR1035415 (90m:17023)
- [52] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, 2nd ed., Oxford Mathematical Monographs, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, New York, 1995, ISBN 0-19-853489-2, With contributions by A. Zelevinsky; Oxford Science Publications. MR1354144 (96h:05207)
- [53] Hideyuki Matsumura, *Commutative algebra*, 2nd ed., Mathematics Lecture Note Series, vol. 56, Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass., 1980, ISBN 0-8053-7026-9. MR575344 (82i:13003)
- [54] M. J. Newell, *Modification rules for the orthogonal and symplectic groups*, Proc. Roy. Irish Acad. Sect. A. **54** (1951), 153–163. MR0043093 (13,204e)

- [55] V. L. Popov, *Contractions of actions of reductive algebraic groups*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **130(172)** (1986), 310–334, 431. MR865764 (88c:14065) (Russian)
- [56] D. Rees, *The grade of an ideal or module*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **53** (1957), 28–42. MR0082967 (18,637c)
- [57] Joe Repka, *Tensor products of holomorphic discrete series representations*, Canad. J. Math. **31** (1979), 836–844. MR540911 (82c:22017)
- [58] Lorenzo Robbiano and Moss Sweedler, *Subalgebra bases*, Commutative Algebra (Salvador, 1988), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1430, Springer, Berlin, 1990, pp. 61–87. MR1068324 (91f:13027)
- [59] M. Sato and T. Kimura, *A classification of irreducible prehomogeneous vector spaces and their relative invariants*, Nagoya Math. J. **65** (1977), 1–155. MR0430336 (55 #3341)
- [60] Frank J. Servedio, *Prehomogeneous vector spaces and varieties*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **176** (1973), 421–444. MR0320173 (47 #8712)
- [61] Sheila Sundaram, *Tableaux in the representation theory of the classical Lie groups*, Invariant Theory and Tableaux (Minneapolis, MN, 1988), IMA Vol. Math. Appl., vol. 19, Springer, New York, 1990, pp. 191–225. MR1035496 (91e:22022)
- [62] Tuong Ton That, *Lie group representations and harmonic polynomials of a matrix variable*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **216** (1976), 1–46. MR0399366 (53 #3210)
- [63] ———, *Symplectic Stiefel harmonics and holomorphic representations of symplectic groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **232** (1977), 265–277. MR0476926 (57 #16477)
- [64] Jacob Towber, *Two new functors from modules to algebras*, J. Algebra **47** (1977), 80–104. MR0469955 (57 #9735)
- [65] È. B. Vinberg, *Complexity of actions of reductive groups*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **20** (1986), 1–13, 96. MR831043 (87j:14077) (Russian)
- [66] Hermann Weyl, *The classical groups*, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997, ISBN 0-691-05756-7, Their invariants and representations; Fifteenth printing Princeton Paperbacks. MR1488158 (98k:01049)
- [67] N. R. Wallach and J. Willenbring, *On some  $q$ -analogs of a theorem of Kostant-Rallis*, Canad. J. Math. **52** (2000), 438–448. MR1755786 (2001j:22020)
- [68] Jeb F. Willenbring, *An application of the Littlewood restriction formula to the Kostant-Rallis theorem*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **354** (2002), 4393–4419 (electronic). MR1926881 (2003e:20049)
- [69] D. P. Želobenko, *Compact Lie groups and their representations*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1973, Translated from the Russian by Israel Program for Scientific Translations; Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Vol. 40. MR0473098 (57 #12776b)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, YALE UNIVERSITY, BOX 208283 YALE STATION, NEW HAVEN, CT 06520, USA

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE, 2 SCIENCE DRIVE 2, SINGAPORE 117543, SINGAPORE

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MILWAUKEE, MILWAUKEE, WI 53201, USA