

NON-ARCHIMEDEAN INFINITE HECKE ALGEBRA

MILO BECHTLOFF WEISING

ABSTRACT. We study the representation theory of the infinite type A Hecke algebra over a non-archimedean field in the case where the parameter is a pseudo-uniformizer. Specifically, we consider a family of representations, called almost-symmetric, which satisfy additional topological and algebraic constraints. We give a full classification of the irreducible almost-symmetric representations. These turn out to be indexed by integer partitions arising as topological completions of specific direct limits of Hecke-Specht modules. We give detailed analysis of these representations and construct functionals analogous to finite Hecke algebra traces.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Background	3
2.1. Combinatorics	3
2.2. Finite Hecke Algebras	4
2.3. Non-archimedean Analysis	6
2.4. Non-archimedean Infinite Hecke Algebra	8
3. Irreducible Almost-symmetric Representations	9
3.1. Construction of Irreducible Representations	9
3.2. Classification of Irreducible Representations	13
4. Regularized Traces of Irreducible Almost-symmetric Representations	15
4.1. Inner Products on Irreducible Representations	15
4.2. Regularized Traces of Irreducible Representations	18
4.3. Rationality Conjecture	21
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of symmetric groups is a meeting point for representation theory and combinatorics. This, too, is true for the infinite symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_∞ but most approaches to understanding this group involve analytic techniques [BO16]. As the Edrei-Thoma Theorem shows, this is to some extent unavoidable since the harmonic analysis of \mathfrak{S}_∞ is intimately tied to deep subjects in analysis. Even though combinatorial methods are crucial for the character theory of the infinite symmetric group, the well-behaved explicit representations of \mathfrak{S}_∞ are often not combinatorial in nature [Oko97] [Ols03]. In fact, some of the most natural combinatorial representations of \mathfrak{S}_∞ are somewhat counter-intuitively poorly behaved.

The structure of type A finite Hecke algebras over \mathbb{C} depends heavily on the value of their parameter $t \in \mathbb{C}$. Generically, they admit a nearly identical representation theory as the symmetric groups. Namely, for generic $t \in \mathbb{C}$, they are semisimple and their irreducible representations are indexed by integer partitions with dimensions given by counting standard Young tableaux. As a result, the harmonic analysis of the infinite type A Hecke algebras over \mathbb{C} are in some ways analogous to their symmetric group counterpart for $t \in \mathbb{C}$ generic [VK98] [GKV14].

Recently, coming from the study of double affine Hecke algebras and the combinatorics of LLT and Macdonald polynomials, it has become useful to consider Hecke algebras over non-archimedean fields [IW22][BW25][BW24a]. Typically, the field in question is $\mathbb{Q}((t))$ where t is considered both as the topological generator of the Laurent series field $\mathbb{Q}((t))$ and as the parameter of the Hecke algebras. For finite Hecke algebras the presence of the non-archimedean topology does not make any significant difference to the underlying representation theory. However, there seem to be more important differences in the case of the infinite Hecke algebra. Specifically, the non-archimedean topology allows for the construction of new projection operators using partially-trivial idempotent elements. These results suggest that the structure of the infinite Hecke algebra might be significantly different over archimedean and non-archimedean fields at least when the parameter t is a pseudo-uniformizer.

The goal of this paper is to initiate the study of the infinite Hecke algebra \mathcal{H}_∞ over non-archimedean fields \mathbb{F} . Because the entire representation theory of \mathcal{H}_∞ seems to be intricate, we opt to instead study a class of representations which we call almost-symmetric. These are continuous actions of \mathcal{H}_∞ on non-archimedean Banach spaces which admit an extended nontrivial continuous action by idempotent elements ϵ_k . Note that over non-archimedean fields infinite dimensional Banach spaces are not reflexive and so we are forced to consider actions on Banach spaces as opposed to the usual situation over \mathbb{C} where one considers actions on Hilbert spaces. For every partition λ , we build an almost-symmetric representation \hat{S}_λ as a norm completion of the direct limit of Hecke-Specht modules $S_{(n-|\lambda|, \lambda)}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using a combination of combinatorial and analytic methods, in Proposition 3.12 we show that the representations \hat{S}_λ are irreducible. In fact, in Theorem 3.18, we are able to show that these are in fact all of the irreducible almost-symmetric representations of \mathcal{H}_∞ . The combinatorics involved in these computations are mostly standard but they are highly related to the notions of representation stability of Church–Ellenberg–Farb [CEF15] and results of Murnaghan [Mur38]. Analytically, however, due to a lack of some of the standard tools of functional analysis in the non-archimedean setting we need to use some arguments which may be non-standard to a combinatorialist and more combinatorial than an analyst might expect. Notably, we rely on the concept of almost-symmetric representations to avoid having to invoke a hypothetical version of the von Neumann double commutant theorem.

In the last section of the paper, we consider the problem of assigning trace functionals to the irreducible representations in the way one would do for finite Hecke algebra representations. Hecke algebra traces are related to chromatic quasi-symmetric functions, immanants, LLT polynomials, and Kazhdan–Lusztig theory [Hai93] [SW16] [MSW24]. Theorem 4.6 shows that there is an essentially unique inner product (that is to say a non-degenerate continuous symmetric bilinear form) $(-, -)_\lambda$ on each of the spaces \hat{S}_λ such that the generators T_i of \mathcal{H}_∞ are self-adjoint. We then use the bilinear form $(-, -)_\lambda$ to define a linear functional Γ_λ on \mathcal{H}_∞ which we call the regularized trace of \hat{S}_λ . There are many such possible definitions

for this functional so we make our definition to carefully align with the author's previous work [BW24b] where nearly identical infinite series appeared in the context of stable-limits of the vector-valued DAHA representations of Dunkl–Luque [DL11]. We prove in Theorem 4.15 that the values of Γ_λ at integral elements of \mathcal{H}_∞ are still integral. Lastly, we pose Conjecture 4.16 stating that the values $\Gamma_\lambda(1)$ have a specific form.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Combinatorics. Here we define the main combinatorial notions we will require for this paper.

Definition 2.1. For $n \geq 1$ let \mathfrak{S}_n denote the **symmetric group** of permutations of the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Let s_1, \dots, s_{n-1} denote the simple transpositions $s_i := (i \ i+1)$. Given $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ define the length of σ , $\ell(\sigma)$, as the minimal number of s_i 's required to express σ as a product of the form $\sigma = s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_\ell}$. Equivalently, $\ell(\sigma)$ is the number of inversions of σ , i.e., pairs of numbers $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ such that $\sigma(i) > \sigma(j)$. We say that $\sigma = s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_\ell}$ is a reduced expression if $\ell = \ell(\sigma)$. For all $n \geq 1$ we embed $\mathfrak{S}_n \subset \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}$ as the subgroup of all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}$ such that $\sigma(n+1) = n+1$. Define the **infinite symmetric group** \mathfrak{S}_∞ as the direct limit $\lim_{\rightarrow} \mathfrak{S}_n$. Equivalently, \mathfrak{S}_∞ is the group of all bijections $\sigma : \{1, 2, \dots\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots\}$ such that $\sigma(i) = i$ for all but finitely many $i \geq 1$. In this paper, a composition is a tuple $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$ where $\mu_i \geq 1$. The size of the composition is $|\mu| := \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_r$ and the length of the composition is $\ell(\mu) := r$. An infinite composition will refer to a tuple of the form $\gamma = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r, \infty)$ where μ is a (finite) composition and ∞ is a formal symbol. Given a (finite) composition $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$ with size $|\mu| = n$ define the **Young subgroup** \mathfrak{S}_μ as the copy of $\mathfrak{S}_{\mu_1} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{S}_{\mu_r}$ embedded into \mathfrak{S}_n such that each \mathfrak{S}_{μ_i} permutes the labels $\{\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_{i-1} + 1, \dots, \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_{i-1} + \mu_i\}$. Given an infinite composition $\gamma = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r, \infty)$ we consider the Young subgroup \mathfrak{S}_γ as the copy of $\mathfrak{S}_\mu \times \mathfrak{S}_\infty$ where \mathfrak{S}_μ permutes the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and \mathfrak{S}_∞ permutes the set $\{n+1, n+2, \dots\}$.

Definition 2.2. A **partition** is a weakly decreasing sequence of positive integers $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$. Define \mathbb{Y} as the set of all partitions. We refer to $\ell(\lambda) := \ell$ as the length of λ and $|\lambda| := \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell$ as the size of λ . We identify every partition λ with its corresponding **Young diagram** in French notation, i.e., the left-adjusted lattice diagram whose row lengths from top to bottom are $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$. The **dominance ordering** on \mathbb{Y} is given by $\mu \leq \lambda$ if for all $\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i \leq \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_i$ where we consider $\mu_i = 0$ if $i > \ell(\mu)$ and $\lambda_i = 0$ if $i > \ell(\lambda)$.

Definition 2.3. A **standard Young tableau** of shape $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ is a labeling $\tau : \lambda \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots\}$ of the boxes of λ which is strictly increasing from left to right and strictly increasing from top to bottom and takes the values $\{1, \dots, |\lambda|\}$. We write $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ for the set of all standard Young tableaux of shape λ . Let τ_λ denote the **column-standard** Young tableau of shape λ which is the unique element of $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ such that if \square_1 is directly below \square_2 , then $\tau_\lambda(\square_1) = \tau_\lambda(\square_2) - 1$. If $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ such that swapping the labels $i, i+1$ results in a standard Young tableau, we write $s_i(\tau) \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ for this resulting tableau. We give $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ the structure of a partially ordered set uniquely via the following rules:

- If we have some $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ such that the entry $i+1$ appears strictly to the right and above the entry i in τ , then we say $s_i(\tau) > \tau$ is a cover for the ordering $>$.
- The order $>$ on $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ is the transitive closure of the above cover relations.

Example 1. The following is a maximal length chain in $\text{SYT}(2, 2, 1)$:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline \end{array} < \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} < \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} < \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 5 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Note the column-standard tableau is the unique minimal element and the row-standard tableau is the unique maximal element of $\text{SYT}(2, 2, 1)$.

Definition 2.4. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ with size $|\lambda| = n$ and $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$. For all $\square \in \lambda$ define the **content** $c(\square) := j - i$ where $\square = (i, j)$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ define $c_\tau(i) := c(\square)$ where $\square \in \lambda$ is the unique square such that $\tau(\square) = i$.

Example 2. For $\tau = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} \in \text{SYT}(2, 2, 1)$, the content values are

$$(c_\tau(1), c_\tau(2), c_\tau(3), c_\tau(4), c_\tau(5)) = (0, -1, 1, -2, 0).$$

2.2. Finite Hecke Algebras. For the remainder of the paper, fix a **non-archimedean field** \mathbb{F} which is complete with respect to the non-trivial norm $|\cdot|$ and fix $t \in \mathbb{F}$ to be a **pseudo-uniformizer**, i.e., $0 < |t| < 1$.

Definition 2.5. Define \mathcal{H}_n to be the **finite Hecke algebra** over \mathbb{F} with generators T_1, \dots, T_{n-1} satisfying

- $(T_i - 1)(T_i + t) = 0$
- $T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1}$
- $T_i T_j = T_j T_i$ for $|i - j| > 1$.

Given a composition $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_r)$ of size $|\mu| = n$ define the **Young subalgebra** \mathcal{H}_μ as the copy of $\mathcal{H}_{\mu_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mu_r}$ embedded in \mathcal{H}_n where each \mathcal{H}_{μ_i} is generated by the elements $\{T_{\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_{i-1} + 1}, \dots, T_{\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_{i-1} + \mu_i - 1}\}$. Define the trivial representation $\text{triv}(\mu)$ as the 1-dimensional representation of \mathcal{H}_μ determined by the algebra character $T_i \mapsto 1$.

Over the complex numbers \mathbb{C} the algebra \mathcal{H}_n as defined above is **semisimple** so far as $t \neq 0$ is not a root of unity of sufficiently small order. In the non-archimedean setting, we refer to a more general semi-simplicity result of Andersen–Stroppel–Tubbenhauer. We are only using a special case of their result: particularly, no matter the characteristic of \mathbb{F} , the element t is a unit but cannot be a root of unity.

Theorem 2.6 (Andersen–Stroppel–Tubbenhauer). [AST17] The algebra \mathcal{H}_n is semisimple over \mathbb{F} .

Here we give an explicit construction of the **irreducible** representations of \mathcal{H}_n .

Definition 2.7. We define the **Jucys-Murphy** elements $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n \in \mathcal{H}_n$ by $\theta_1 := 1$ and $\theta_{i+1} := tT_i^{-1}\theta_i T_i^{-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Further, define the **intertwiner** elements $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_{n-1}$ by $\varphi_i := (tT_i^{-1})\theta_i - \theta_i(tT_i^{-1})$. For a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and a reduced expression $\sigma = s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_r}$ we write $T_\sigma := T_{i_1} \dots T_{i_r}$.

Remark 1. There are natural algebra inclusions $\mathcal{H}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{n+1}$ given by $T_i \rightarrow T_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Under this embedding $\theta_i \rightarrow \theta_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ so we can naturally identify the copies of θ_i in both \mathcal{H}_n and \mathcal{H}_{n+1} .

The following list of relations is straightforward to verify.

Proposition 2.8. The following relations hold:

- $\theta_i = t^{i-1}T_{i-1}^{-1} \cdots T_1^{-1}T_1^{-1} \cdots T_{i-1}^{-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$
- $\theta_i\theta_j = \theta_j\theta_i$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$
- $T_i\theta_j = \theta_jT_i$ for $j \notin \{i, i+1\}$
- $\varphi_i = tT_i^{-1}(\theta_i - \theta_{i+1}) + (t-1)\theta_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$
- $\varphi_i\varphi_{i+1}\varphi_i = \varphi_{i+1}\varphi_i\varphi_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$
- $\varphi_i\varphi_j = \varphi_j\varphi_i$ for $|i-j| > 1$
- $\varphi_i\theta_j = \theta_{s_i(j)}\varphi_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$
- $\varphi_i^2 = (t\theta_i - \theta_{i+1})(t\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)$.

The following definition gives a description of the irreducible representations of \mathcal{H}_n . There are many equivalent methods for defining these representations but we choose to specify eigenvectors for the Jucys-Murphy elements θ_i directly as we will require these eigenvectors throughout this paper.

Definition 2.9. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ with $|\lambda| = n$. Define **Hecke-Specht module** S_λ as the \mathcal{H}_n -module spanned by e_τ for $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ defined by the following relations:

- $\theta_i(e_\tau) = t^{c_\tau(i)}e_\tau$
- If $s_i(\tau) > \tau$, then $\varphi_i(e_\tau) = (t^{c_\tau(i)} - t^{c_\tau(i+1)})e_{s_i(\tau)}$.
- If the labels $i, i+1$ are in the same row in τ , then $T_i(e_\tau) = e_\tau$.
- If the labels $i, i+1$ are in the same column in τ , then $T_i(e_\tau) = -te_\tau$.

Remark 2. Using the relations from Proposition 2.8, we find the following more explicit form for the action of the T_i on the $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ basis:

- If $s_i(\tau) > \tau$, then

$$T_i(e_\tau) = e_{s_i(\tau)} + \frac{1-t}{1-t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)}}e_\tau.$$

- If $s_i(\tau) < \tau$, then

$$T_i(e_\tau) = t \frac{(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)-1})(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)+1})}{(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)})^2} e_{s_i(\tau)} - t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)} \frac{1-t}{1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)}} e_\tau.$$

- If the labels $i, i+1$ are in the same row in τ , then $T_i(e_\tau) = e_\tau$.
- If the labels $i, i+1$ are in the same column in τ , then $T_i(e_\tau) = -te_\tau$.

Example 3. For the following examples, for the sake of notation, we conflate τ with e_τ :

•

$$T_2 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & \\ \hline \end{array} + \left(\frac{1-t}{1-t^2} \right) \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

•

$$T_4 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} + \left(\frac{1-t}{1-t^4} \right) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

•

$$T_1 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

•

$$T_3 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} = -t \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Proposition 2.10. Definition 2.9 is well-posed, i.e., the action of the operators T_i on S_λ define an irreducible \mathcal{H}_n -module.

Proof. This is a standard result which we leave to the reader. \square

Remark 3. The set $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y} : |\lambda| = n\}$ gives a full set of irreducible \mathcal{H}_n -modules up to isomorphism. Note that for $\tau, \tau' \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$, the θ -weights of e_τ and $e_{\tau'}$ are equal if and only if $\tau = \tau'$. The algebras $\mathcal{H}_{n-1} \subset \mathcal{H}_n$ satisfy the typical branching rules for symmetric group Specht-modules, namely:

$$\text{Res}_{\mathcal{H}_{n-1}}^{\mathcal{H}_n} S_\lambda = \bigoplus_{\mu \subset \lambda} S_\mu$$

where $|\lambda| = n$ and $\mu \subset \lambda$ range over all of those partitions with size $|\mu| = n - 1$ contained in λ .

We will require the following special elements of the finite Hecke algebras.

Definition 2.11. For $1 \leq k \leq n$ define the **partially-trivial idempotent** $\epsilon_k^{(n)} \in \mathcal{H}_n$ as

$$\epsilon_k^{(n)} := \frac{1}{[n-k]_t!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{1^k, n-k}} t^{\binom{n-k}{2} - \ell(\sigma)} T_\sigma.$$

Lemma 2.12. For all $0 \leq k, \ell \leq n$, $\epsilon_k^{(n)} \epsilon_\ell^{(n)} = \epsilon_{\min\{k, \ell\}}^{(n)}$. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, and $k+1 \leq j \leq n-1$, $T_i \epsilon_k^{(n)} = \epsilon_k^{(n)} T_i$ and $T_j \epsilon_k^{(n)} = \epsilon_k^{(n)} T_j = \epsilon_k^{(n)}$.

Proof. These relations are straightforward to check directly. \square

2.3. Non-archimedean Analysis. For an overview of the basics of non-archimedean functional analysis we refer the reader to [Sch02].

Definition 2.13. A **Banach space** over \mathbb{F} is a pair of a vector space V over \mathbb{F} and a norm $\|\cdot\|$ such that V is complete with respect to the metric induced by $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|$ satisfies the **ultra-metric** condition, i.e., for all $v, w \in V$, $\|v + w\| \leq \max\{\|v\|, \|w\|\}$.

We will often label Banach spaces $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ simply by their vector space V when the norm $\|\cdot\|$ is implicit. Note that the field \mathbb{F} itself is a Banach space whose norm is $|\cdot|$.

Definition 2.14. Let S be a countable set. Define $\ell_\infty(S)$ as the space of all functions $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that $\|f\| := \sup_{j \in S} |f(j)| < \infty$. Define $c_0(S)$ as the subspace of $f \in \ell_\infty(S)$ such that for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exist only finitely many $j \in S$ such that $|f(j)| \geq \epsilon$.

Often, we instead write elements $f \in \ell_\infty(S)$ as $f \equiv \sum_{j \in S} f(j) e_j$ where $\{e_j\}_{j \in S}$ are indicator functions for their specified elements. For $\ell_\infty(S)$ when S is infinite this is a formal sum but for $c_0(S)$ this is a genuine sum in the sense that for $f \in c_0(S)$, if $S = \{j_1, j_2, \dots\}$ is an enumeration of S , then $f = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} f(j_i) e_{j_i}$. In other words, the indicator functions $\{e_j | j \in S\}$ have dense span in $c_0(S)$. This fact will be important throughout the paper.

Definition 2.15. Let $(V_1, \|\cdot\|_1), (V_2, \|\cdot\|_2)$ be Banach spaces over \mathbb{F} . A linear map $A : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ is bounded if there exists some $C \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that for all $v \in V_1$, $\|A(v)\|_2 \leq C\|v\|_1$. The norm of a bounded operator A is defined by $\|A\|_{V_1, V_2} := \sup_{v \in V_1 \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|A(v)\|_2}{\|v\|_1}$. We will write $\mathcal{B}(V_1, V_2)$ for the Banach space of all such bounded linear maps with norm $\|\cdot\|_{V_1, V_2}$. For any Banach space $(V, \|\cdot\|)$ we will write $\mathcal{B}(V) := \mathcal{B}(V, V)$.

Note that all bounded linear maps between Banach spaces are topologically continuous.

Definition 2.16. Let \mathcal{A} be an algebra over \mathbb{F} . A representation of \mathcal{A} is an algebraic representation of \mathcal{A} on a Banach space V such that for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$ the action map $v \mapsto x(v)$ is bounded. We say that the representation V is irreducible if the only closed \mathcal{A} -invariant subspaces of V are 0 and V . A homomorphism $f : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ of \mathcal{A} -representations is a bounded linear map which is \mathcal{A} -equivariant. We consider two representations isomorphic $V_1 \cong V_2$ if there exists a bounded linear map $f : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ which is \mathcal{A} -equivariant and a topological homeomorphism.

The following is an important technical result related to the standard **open mapping theorem** in functional analysis.

Lemma 2.17. Any continuous linear bijection between two Banach spaces over \mathbb{F} is a topological isomorphism.

Proof. This is a consequence of the more general result Corollary 8.7 [Sch02] since \mathbb{F} -Banach spaces are \mathbb{F} -Fréchet spaces. \square

Later in the paper, we will need to discuss inner products on Banach spaces over \mathbb{F} . Since we are working over a non-archimedean field the concept of inner products must be approached carefully.

Definition 2.18. Let V be a Banach space over \mathbb{F} . An **inner product** on V is a non-degenerate continuous symmetric bilinear form $\langle -, - \rangle : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$. If $A \in \mathcal{B}(V)$, then we say A is **adjoint-able** if there exists $A^* \in \mathcal{B}(V)$ such that for all $v, w \in V$, $\langle A(v), w \rangle = \langle v, A^*(w) \rangle$.

Lemma 2.19. If $A \in \mathcal{B}(V)$ is adjoint-able with respect to an inner product $\langle -, - \rangle$, then it has a unique adjoint $A^* \in \mathcal{B}(V)$.

Proof. Suppose $(A^*)_1, (A^*)_2 \in \mathcal{B}(V)$ both satisfy for all $v, w \in V$ that $\langle A(v), w \rangle = \langle v, (A^*)_i(w) \rangle$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then for all $v, w \in V$,

$$\langle v, ((A^*)_1 - (A^*)_2)(w) \rangle = \langle v, (A^*)_1(w) \rangle - \langle v, (A^*)_2(w) \rangle = \langle A(v), w \rangle - \langle A(v), w \rangle = 0.$$

Since $\langle -, - \rangle$ is non-degenerate $(A^*)_1(w) = (A^*)_2(w)$ for all $w \in V$ and so $(A^*)_1 = (A^*)_2$. \square

Definition 2.20. If $A \in \mathcal{B}(V)$ is adjoint-able with respect to an inner product $\langle -, - \rangle$, then we say A is **self-adjoint** if $A^* = A$ and **skew-adjoint** if $A^* = -A$.

Lemma 2.21. Let $\langle -, - \rangle$ be an inner product on the Banach space V over \mathbb{F} , let $A, B \in \mathcal{B}(V)$ be adjoint-able operators, and let $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$. The following hold:

- $(A + \alpha B)^* = A^* + \alpha B^*$
- $(AB)^* = B^* A^*$
- If A, B are self-adjoint, then $AB - BA$ is skew adjoint.

Proof. This is immediate from the uniqueness of adjoint operators in Lemma 2.19 and a little algebra. \square

2.4. Non-archimedean Infinite Hecke Algebra. Our primary objects of study will be the infinite Hecke algebra in type A and a certain idempotent-completion of this algebra.

Definition 2.22. Define the **infinite Hecke algebra** \mathcal{H}_∞ as the \mathbb{F} -algebra generated by T_1, T_2, \dots subject to the relations:

- for all $i \geq 1$, $(T_i - 1)(T_i + 1) = 0$,
- for all $i, j \geq 1$ with $j \notin \{i, i+1\}$, $T_i T_j = T_j T_i$,
- for all $i \geq 1$, $T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1}$.

For an infinite composition (μ, ∞) define $\mathcal{H}_{\mu, \infty}$ as the copy of $\mathcal{H}_\mu \otimes \mathcal{H}_\infty \subseteq \mathcal{H}_\infty$ where $\mathcal{H}_\mu \subset \mathcal{H}_{|\mu|}$ and \mathcal{H}_∞ is generated by $T_{|\mu|+1}, T_{|\mu|+2}, \dots$. We will write $\text{triv}(\mu, \infty)$ for the 1-dimensional representation of $\mathcal{H}_{\mu, \infty}$ determined by the algebra character $T_i \mapsto 1$ for all relevant $i \geq 1$.

Define the **extended infinite Hecke algebra** $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ by adjoining elements $\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots$ to $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ subject to the relations:

- for all $k \geq 0$, $\epsilon_k^2 = \epsilon_k$,
- for all $k, \ell \geq 0$, $\epsilon_k \epsilon_\ell = \epsilon_{\min\{k, \ell\}}$,
- for all $k \geq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, and $k+1 \leq j$, $\epsilon_k T_i = T_i \epsilon_k$ and $\epsilon_k T_j = T_j \epsilon_k = \epsilon_k$.

Remark 4. The addition of the idempotent elements ϵ_k to \mathcal{H}_∞ is somewhat analogous to a **von Neumann algebra** completion of \mathcal{H}_∞ . If one had access to the usual tools in the analysis of C^* -algebras over \mathbb{C} , one would instead find a faithful representation of \mathcal{H}_∞ on a Hilbert space V and study the weak closure of \mathcal{H}_∞ in the algebra of bounded operators on V . This would contain orthogonal projections like the ϵ_k 's. In fact, one may try to do this in our non-archimedean situation. However, there are some technical issues which get in the way. The primary issue is that, as far as this author is aware, there is no suitable analogue of the von Neumann **double commutant theorem** for non-archimedean operator algebras nor is there a standard notion of weak operator topology for non-archimedean Banach algebras. That is not to say that no such theory could exist but rather that it seems to be a gap in the literature. Instead of this purely analytic approach, we have opted in this paper to use a mix of combinatorial and analytic arguments to get over these technical constraints.

In this paper, we will be focusing on a special well-behaved class of representations for the extended infinite Hecke algebra $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$.

Definition 2.23. An **almost-symmetric representation** of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ is a Banach space V over \mathbb{F} along with an algebra homomorphism $\rho : \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(V)$ such that

- For all $i \geq 1, k \geq 0$, $\|\rho(T_i)\| \leq 1$ and $\|\rho(\epsilon_k)\| \leq 1$.
- There exists some $k \geq 0$ such that $\rho(\epsilon_k) \neq 0$.

We will often drop the homomorphism ρ notation when context is clear.

Example 4. The simplest example of an almost-symmetric representation of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ is the trivial representation \hat{S}_\emptyset . This is the 1-dimensional space $\mathbb{F}.v$ with action given by $T_i(v) := v$ and $\epsilon_k(v) := v$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$. Clearly, $\|T_i\| = \|\epsilon_k\| = 1$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$. The simplest non-example is the **sign** representation which is the 1-dimensional space $\mathbb{F}.w$ with action given by $T_i(w) := -tw$ and $\epsilon_k(w) := 0$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$. Clearly, $\|T_i\| = |t| < 1$ and $\epsilon_k = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $k \geq 0$. Therefore, the sign representation is not almost-symmetric.

3. IRREDUCIBLE ALMOST-SYMMETRIC REPRESENTATIONS

3.1. Construction of Irreducible Representations. Here we will construct special representations \hat{S}_λ of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ indexed by partitions $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$. We will then show that representations are in fact irreducible. First, we construct certain representations $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$ of \mathcal{H}_∞ whose closures with respect to certain norms will yield the representations \hat{S}_λ .

Definition 3.1. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ define $n_\lambda := |\lambda| + \lambda_1$. For $n \geq n_\lambda$ define $\lambda^{(n)} := (n - |\lambda|, \lambda)$. Define $\lambda^{(\infty)}$ as the infinite Young diagram $\lambda^{(\infty)} := \cup_{n \geq n_\lambda} \lambda^{(n)}$. We will write $\text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ for the set of bijective fillings $\tau : \lambda^{(\infty)} \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ which are strictly increasing down columns and left to right across rows. We give $\text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ the poset structure determined by the poset structures on each $\text{SYT}(\lambda^{(n)})$. Define the \mathcal{H}_∞ -module $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} := \bigcup_{n \geq n_\lambda} S_{\lambda^{(n)}}$ where for all $n \geq n_\lambda, m \geq 0$, and $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda^{(n)})$ we identify $e_\tau \in S_{\lambda^{(n)}}$ with the vector $e_{\tau'} \in S_{\lambda^{(n+m)}}$ for $\tau' \in \text{SYT}(\lambda^{(n+m)})$ the unique filling such that $\tau'|_{\lambda^{(n)}} = \tau$.

Example 5. Consider $\tau = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \in \text{SYT}(3, 2, 1)$. We can think of $(3, 2, 1)$ instead as $\lambda^{(6)}$

where $\lambda = (2, 1)$. To obtain an element of $\text{SYT}_\infty(2, 1)$ we identify τ with the following elements of $\text{SYT}(\lambda^{(7)}), \text{SYT}(\lambda^{(8)}), \dots$:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \equiv \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 & 7 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & & \\ \hline 5 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \equiv \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 & 7 & 8 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & & & \\ \hline 5 & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \equiv \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \equiv \dots$$

The dimensions of the partially-trivial subspaces of the representations $S_{\lambda^{(n)}}$ satisfy useful stability properties as n increases.

Lemma 3.2. Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{Y}$, $r \geq n_\lambda$, and $m \geq \max\{n_\mu, |\mu| + \lambda_1\}$. Then

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, m}} (\text{triv}(1^r) \otimes S_{\mu^{(m)}}, S_{\lambda^{(r+m)}}) = \begin{cases} \binom{r}{|\lambda/\mu|} |\text{SYT}(\lambda/\mu)| & \mu \subseteq \lambda \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, for $\mu = \emptyset$ and $m \geq \lambda_1$, $\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, m}} (\text{triv}(1^r, m), S_{\lambda^{(r+m)}}) = \binom{r}{|\lambda|} |\text{SYT}(\lambda)|$.

Proof. By Frobenius reciprocity,

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, m}} (\text{triv}(1^r) \otimes S_{\mu^{(m)}}, S_{\lambda^{(r+m)}}) = \dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{r+m}} (\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, m}}^{\mathcal{H}_{r+m}} \text{triv}(1^r) \otimes S_{\mu^{(m)}}, S_{\lambda^{(r+m)}})$$

and by the branching rules in Remark 3,

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{r+m}} (\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, m}}^{\mathcal{H}_{r+m}} \text{triv}(1^r) \otimes S_{\mu^{(m)}}, S_{\lambda^{(r+m)}}) = |\text{SYT}(\lambda^{(r+m)}/\mu^{(m)})|$$

where we consider the skew diagram $\lambda^{(r+m)}/\mu^{(m)}$ empty unless $\mu^{(m)} \subseteq \lambda^{(r+m)}$. Note that $\mu^{(m)} \subseteq \lambda^{(r+m)}$ is equivalent to $\mu \subseteq \lambda$. If $\mu \not\subseteq \lambda$, then the count is 0. Assume $\mu \subseteq \lambda$. Since $m \geq |\mu| + \lambda_1$, the skew diagram $\lambda^{(r+m)}/\mu^{(m)}$ is a disjoint union of a horizontal row of size $r - |\lambda/\mu|$ and the skew diagram λ/μ . Thus

$$|\text{SYT}(\lambda^{(r+m)}/\mu^{(m)})| = \binom{r}{r - |\lambda/\mu|} |\text{SYT}(\lambda/\mu)| = \binom{r}{|\lambda/\mu|} |\text{SYT}(\lambda/\mu)|.$$

□

It will be important to concretely describe a basis for the partially-trivial subspaces of the modules $S_{\lambda^{(n)}}$.


Definition 3.3. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $r \geq n_\lambda$. Define $C_{\lambda,r}$ denote the set of all pairs (μ, β) of horizontal strip tableaux μ with size λ_1 on the boundary of $\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}$ and β a standard filling of the complement diagram $\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)} \setminus \mu$. We may inject $C_{\lambda,r}$ into $\text{SYT}(\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)})$ by assigning a given $(\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda,r}$ to the unique $\gamma_{\mu,\beta} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)})$ determined by

- $\gamma_{\mu,\beta}|_\mu$ is column standard with entries $\{r+1, \dots, r+\lambda_1\}$
- $\gamma_{\mu,\beta}|_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}/\mu} = \beta$.

For $(\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda,r}$ define

$$v_{\mu,\beta} := \epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)}(e_{\gamma_{\mu,\beta}}) \in S_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}}.$$

Example 6. Consider $\lambda = (2, 1)$ and $r = 8 \geq n_{2,1} = 5$. Then the partitions ν such that $\lambda^{(10)}/\nu = (7, 2, 1)/\nu$ is a horizontal strip with size 2 are exactly $(5, 2, 1)$, $(6, 2)$, $(6, 1, 1)$, and $(7, 1)$:



Here the \star 's show the complementary diagram $\mu = \lambda^{(10)}/\nu$. Choosing any standard fillings β for the shapes ν give elements of $C_{(2,1),8}$.

The vectors $v_{\mu,\beta}$ described above give a basis for the partially-trivial vectors in the modules $S_{\lambda^{(n)}}$.

Proposition 3.4. The set $\{v_{\mu,\beta} | (\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda,r}\}$ is a basis for $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \lambda_1}}(\text{triv}(1^r, \lambda_1), S_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}})$.

Proof. From Remark 2 it is easy to see that for all $(\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda,r}$ the vector $e_{\gamma_{\mu,\beta}}$ generates a $\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \lambda_1}$ -submodule of $S_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}}$ isomorphic to $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \kappa_\mu}}^{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \lambda_1}} \text{triv}(1^r, \kappa_\mu) \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{\kappa_\mu}}^{\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1}} \text{triv}(\kappa_\mu)$ where κ_μ is the composition of size λ_1 formed from the sizes of the rows of μ reading bottom to top. By Frobenius reciprocity,

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1}} \left(\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{\kappa_\mu}}^{\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1}} \text{triv}(\kappa_\mu), \text{triv}(\lambda_1) \right) = \dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{\kappa_\mu}} (\text{triv}(\kappa_\mu), \text{triv}(\kappa_\mu)) = 1$$

and furthermore, the vector $e_{\gamma_{\mu,\beta}}$, which represents the copy of $\text{triv}(\kappa_\mu)$ in $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{\kappa_\mu}}^{\mathcal{H}_{\lambda_1}} \text{triv}(\kappa_\mu)$, must map onto the 1-dimensional generator of $\text{triv}(\lambda_1)$ upon application of the trivial-symmetrizer $\epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)}$. Therefore, for all $(\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda,r}$, $v_{\mu,\beta} = \epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)}(e_{\gamma_{\mu,\beta}}) \neq 0$. Furthermore, since $\theta_j \epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)} = \epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)} \theta_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$, we know that each $v_{\mu,\beta}$ is still a simultaneous eigenvector for $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$. Since the joint $(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$ -eigenvalues determine the shape of $\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}/\mu$ and the standard filling β , it follows that the $v_{\mu,\beta}$ are linearly independent. Finally, to see that $\{v_{\mu,\beta} | \mu \in C_{\lambda,r}\}$ is a basis for $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \lambda_1}}(\text{triv}(1^r, \lambda_1), S_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}})$ note that for any $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)})$ we may use the placement of the entries $\{r+1, \dots, r+\lambda_1\}$ to determine a boundary shape μ of $\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}$ and using the filling of the complementary diagram $\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)} \setminus \mu$ to determine β . If μ contains any two vertically connected boxes, then we know

$\epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)}(e_\tau) = 0$. Otherwise, we know $(\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda, r}$ and so by induction using the relations from Remark 2 we are able to write $\epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)}(e_\tau) = \alpha v_{\mu, \beta}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$. Thus $\{v_{\mu, \beta} | (\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda, r}\}$ spans $\epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)}(S_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}}) \equiv \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \lambda_1}}(\text{triv}(1^r, \lambda_1), S_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}})$ and is therefore a basis. \square

Remark 5. It is an interesting combinatorial consequence of Proposition 3.4 that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $r \geq n_\lambda$, $|C_{\lambda, r}| = \binom{r}{|\lambda|} |\text{SYT}(\lambda)|$. That is to say,

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}/\nu \text{ hor. strip} \\ |\nu|=r}} |\text{SYT}(\nu)| = \binom{r}{|\lambda|} |\text{SYT}(\lambda)|.$$

For a nontrivial example, take $\lambda = (2, 1)$ and $r = 8 \geq n_{2,1} = 5$ as in Example 6. Then the partitions ν such that $\lambda^{(10)}/\nu = (7, 2, 1)/\nu$ is a horizontal strip with size 2 are exactly $(5, 2, 1)$, $(6, 2)$, $(6, 1, 1)$, and $(7, 1)$. The standard tableaux counts for these partitions are 64, 20, 21, and 7 respectively. Now, $\binom{8}{3} |\text{SYT}(2, 1)| = 56 \cdot 2 = 112$ and indeed we have $64 + 20 + 21 + 7 = 112$. It would be interesting to find a bijective proof of this fact.

Importantly, the vectors $v_{\mu, \beta}$ actually give a basis for the partially-trivial vectors in the full module $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$.

Corollary 3.5. The set $\{v_{\mu, \beta} | (\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda, r}\}$ is a basis for $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \infty}}(\text{triv}(1^r, \infty), S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}})$.

Proof. We know that the embeddings $S_{\lambda^{(n)}} \subseteq S_{\lambda^{(n+1)}}$ are injective for all $n \geq n_\lambda$ so certainly $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, m}}(\text{triv}(1^r, m), S_{\lambda^{(r+m)}}) \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, m+1}}(\text{triv}(1^r, m+1), S_{\lambda^{(r+m+1)}})$ are also embeddings. By Lemma 3.7, it follows that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \infty}}(\text{triv}(1^r, \infty), S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^r, \lambda_1}}(\text{triv}(1^r, \lambda_1), S_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}}) \subseteq S_{\lambda^{(r+\lambda_1)}}$. Thus from Proposition 3.4, we know that $\{v_{\mu, \beta} | (\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda, r}\}$ is a basis for the $\text{triv}(1^r, \infty)$ vectors in $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$. \square

Using the basis vectors $v_{\mu, \beta}$, we are able to fully to describe the action of the partial-trivial idempotents $\epsilon_r^{(n)}$ on the modules $S_{\lambda^{(n)}}$.

Lemma 3.6. If $m \geq \lambda_1$, $r \geq n_\lambda$, and $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda^{(r+m)})$, then there exists a unique $(\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda, r}$ and scalar $\alpha_r(\tau) \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\epsilon_r^{(r+m)}(e_\tau) = \alpha_r(\tau) v_{\mu, \beta}$. Furthermore, $|\alpha_r(\tau)| \leq 1$.

Proof. By considering the placement of the entries $\{r+1, \dots, r+\lambda_1\}$, any $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda^{(r+m)})$ may be obtained from a unique $\gamma_{\mu, \beta}$ with $C_{\lambda, r}$ via a sequence of steps $\tau \mapsto s_j(\tau)$ with $s_j(\tau) > \tau$ for $r+1 \leq j \leq r+m-1$. From Lemma 2.12, we see then that for all $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda^{(r+m)})$, $\epsilon_r^{(r+m)}(e_\tau) = \alpha_r(\tau) v_{\mu, \beta}$ for some unique $(\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda, r}$ and scalar $\alpha_r(\tau)$. In particular, if $s_j(\tau) > \tau$ for $r+1 \leq j \leq r+m-1$, then using the relation $\epsilon_r^{(r+m)} T_j = \epsilon_r^{(r+m)}$, we find that

$$a_r(s_j(\tau)) = t \frac{1 - t^{c_\tau(j+1) - c_\tau(j) - 1}}{1 - t^{c_\tau(j+1) - c_\tau(j)}} a_r(\tau).$$

Lastly, since $a_r(\gamma_{\mu, \beta}) = 1$ for all $\mu \in C_{\lambda, r}$, by induction we see that $|a_r(\tau)| \leq 1$. \square

The action of the partially-trivial idempotents $\epsilon_r^{(n)}$ is stable in the following sense.

Lemma 3.7. If $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ and $r \geq n_\lambda$, then for all $m' \geq m \geq \max\{\lambda_1, \text{rk}(\tau)\}$, $\epsilon_r^{(r+m)}(e_\tau) = \epsilon_r^{(r+m')}(e_\tau)$.

Proof. This is a consequence of the fact that from Lemma 3.6, the right-hand side of the equations $\epsilon_r^{(r+m)}(e_\tau) = \alpha_r(\tau) v_{\mu, \beta}$ do not depend on m so long as $m \geq \max\{\lambda_1, \text{rk}(\tau)\}$. \square

We are now ready to give the definition of the modules \hat{S}_λ .

Definition 3.8. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$, define \hat{S}_λ as the space of formal sums $\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} c_\tau e_\tau$ such that for all $c > 0$ there exist only finitely many $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ such that $|c_\tau| \geq c$. We give \hat{S}_λ the norm $\|\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} c_\tau e_\tau\| := \sup_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} |c_\tau|$. In other words, $\hat{S}_\lambda := c_0(\text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda))$. For $r \geq 1$, define the operator $\epsilon_r : \hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow \hat{S}_\lambda$ as

$$\epsilon_r \left(\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} c_\tau e_\tau \right) := \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} c_\tau \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \epsilon_r^{(r+m)}(e_\tau).$$

For $i \geq 1$, define the operator $T_i : \hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow \hat{S}_\lambda$ by

$$\begin{aligned} T_i \left(\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} c_\tau e_\tau \right) := & \sum_{\substack{\{i, i+1\} \text{ same row of } \tau}} c_\tau e_\tau + \sum_{\substack{\{i, i+1\} \text{ same column of } \tau}} (-t) c_\tau e_\tau + \sum_{\tau < s_i(\tau)} \left(e_{s_i(\tau)} + \frac{1-t}{1-t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)}} e_\tau \right) \\ & + \sum_{\tau > s_i(\lambda)} \left(t \frac{(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)-1})(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)+1})}{(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)})^2} e_{s_i(\tau)} - t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)} \frac{1-t}{1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)}} e_\tau \right). \end{aligned}$$

Crucially, note that $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$ is a dense subspace of \hat{S}_λ . We will use this fact repeatedly.

Lemma 3.9. The operators $T_i, \epsilon_r : \hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow \hat{S}_\lambda$ are bounded with $\|T_i\|, \|\epsilon_r\| \leq 1$. In particular, $\|T_i\| = 1$, and $\|\epsilon_r\| = 1$ for $r \geq n_\lambda$.

Proof. Remark 2 shows directly that $\|T_i\| \leq 1$. To see that $\|T_i\| = 1$, note that for all $i \geq 1$ we may find $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ such that $i, i+1$ appear in the same row of τ . Namely, define τ by labeling the first row of $\lambda^{(\infty)}$ first with the labels $1, \dots, i, i+1$ and place the entries $\{i+2, \dots, i+|\lambda|+2\}$ in the row-standard orientation in $\lambda \subset \lambda^{(\infty)}$, and filling the remaining entries of $\lambda^{(\infty)}/\lambda^{(i+|\lambda|+2)}$ consecutively. Then $T_i(e_\tau) = e_\tau$ so indeed $\|T_i\| = 1$. The bound $\|\epsilon_r\| \leq 1$ for all $r \geq 0$ follows from Lemma 3.6 and the simple fact that for all $r \geq n_\lambda$ and $(\mu, \beta) \in C_{\lambda, r}$, $\|v_{\mu, \beta}\| = \|\epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)}(e_{\gamma_{\mu, \beta}})\| \leq \|\epsilon_r^{(r+\lambda_1)}\| \cdot \|e_{\gamma_{\mu, \beta}}\| \leq 1$. To see that $\|\epsilon_r\| = 1$ for $r \geq n_\lambda$ simply note that $\epsilon_r(e_{\tau_\lambda}) = e_{\tau_\lambda}$. \square

Proposition 3.10. The operators $T_i, \epsilon_r : \hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow \hat{S}_\lambda$ define an almost-symmetric representation of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$.

Proof. It suffices to check that the operators T_i, ϵ_r define a representation of \mathcal{H}_∞ on \hat{S}_λ . However, it is clear from Definition 3.8 by restricting to $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$, that the operators T_i, ϵ_r satisfy the relations of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ on $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$. Thus, from the norm bounds in Lemma 3.9 we see that they indeed define an action of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ which is almost-symmetric since $\epsilon_{n_\lambda} \neq 0$. \square

We will now show that the \hat{S}_λ are irreducible representations of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$. First, we need the following technical result which guarantees that no non-zero vector in \hat{S}_λ can be annihilated by every ϵ_r operator for $r \geq n_\lambda$. We use an analytic approach to greatly simplify the argument.

Lemma 3.11. For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$, as operators on \hat{S}_λ ,

$$\bigcap_{r \geq n_\lambda} \text{Ker}(\epsilon_r) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $v \in \bigcap_{r \geq n_\lambda} \text{Ker}(\epsilon_r)$ and $c > 0$. Since $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$ is dense in \hat{S}_λ , we may find some $v_0 \in S_{\lambda(\infty)}$ such that $\|v - v_0\| < c$. Let $r \geq n_\lambda$ be such that $v_0 \in S_{\lambda(r)}$. Then $\epsilon_r(v_0) = v_0$. Now we see that

$$\|v_0\| = \|v_0 - 0\| = \|\epsilon_r(v_0) - \epsilon_r(v)\| \leq \|\epsilon_r\| \cdot \|v_0 - v\| = \|v_0 - v\| < c.$$

Thus

$$\|v\| = \|v - v_0 + v_0\| \leq \max\{\|v - v_0\|, \|v_0\|\} < c.$$

Since $\|v\| < c$ for all $c > 0$, $\|v\| = 0$ and so $v = 0$. \square

Using a combination of combinatorial and analytic arguments, it is not hard to show that the $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ modules \hat{S}_λ are irreducible.

Proposition 3.12. For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$, \hat{S}_λ is an irreducible $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module.

Proof. Set $n_\lambda := |\lambda| + \lambda_1$. Let $v \in \hat{S}_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$. Then by Lemma 3.11 there exists $r \geq n_\lambda$ such that $\epsilon_r(v) \neq 0$. By Lemma 3.6, $\epsilon_r(v) \in S_{\lambda(r+\lambda_1)}$. Since $S_{\lambda(r+\lambda_1)}$ is an irreducible $\mathcal{H}_{r+\lambda_1}$ -module we can find some $X \in \mathcal{H}_{r+\lambda_1}$ such that $X\epsilon_r(v) = e_{\tau_\lambda}$ where τ_λ is the column standard element of $\text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$. We know that $\mathcal{H}_\infty \cdot e_{\tau_\lambda} = S_{\lambda(\infty)}$ is norm dense in \hat{S}_λ . Therefore, $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty \cdot v = \hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty \cdot e_{\tau_\lambda}$ is also norm dense in \hat{S}_λ . Thus if $V \subseteq \hat{S}_\lambda$ is a nonzero closed $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -submodule of \hat{S}_λ , then necessarily $V = \hat{S}_\lambda$, i.e., \hat{S}_λ is irreducible. \square

3.2. Classification of Irreducible Representations. In this section, we will prove that the **only** almost-symmetric representations of $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ which are irreducible are the modules \hat{S}_λ given by Definition 3.8. We will roughly use the following argument. First, show that the presence of non-zero partially-invariant vectors in \mathcal{H}_∞ -modules guarantees an entire copy of some module $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$. Then, using an analytic argument, we argue that if an almost-symmetric $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module contains a full copy of some $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$, then it in fact admits a non-zero bounded module map $\hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow V$ with closed image. Lastly, using Proposition 3.12 and Lemma 2.17 we conclude that such a map is a topological homeomorphism onto its image. Thus if V is irreducible, it is equivalent to some $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$.

We start this section with a two combinatorial lemmas.

Lemma 3.13. Let $k, j \geq 0$. Suppose V is a \mathcal{H}_{k+j} -module and $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$ is T_i -invariant for $k+1 \leq i \leq k+j-1$. Then any S_λ which admits a \mathcal{H}_{k+j} -module injection into $\mathcal{H}_{k+j} \cdot v$ satisfies $(j, 1^k) \leq \lambda$.

Proof. Let $U := \mathcal{H}_{k+j} \cdot v$. Since v is T_i -invariant for $k+1 \leq i \leq k+j-1$, by Frobenius reciprocity there exists a \mathcal{H}_{k+j} -module surjection $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^k, j}}^{\mathcal{H}_{k+j}} \text{triv}(1^k, j) \rightarrow U$. Using the branching rules from Remark 3, we see that

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{1^k, j}}^{\mathcal{H}_{k+j}} \text{triv}(1^k, j) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash k+j} K_{\lambda, (j, 1^k)} S_\lambda$$

where $K_{\lambda, \mu}$ are the **Kostka numbers**. Thus if $K_{\lambda, (j, 1^k)} \neq 0$, then $\lambda \supseteq (j, 1^k)$. \square

Lemma 3.14. Let $k \geq 0$. Suppose $\mu_k \subset \mu_{k+1} \subset \dots$ is an increasing sequence of partitions such that for all $j \geq 0$, $|\mu_{k+j}| = k + j$ and $\mu_{k+j} \supseteq (j, 1^k)$. Then there exists a partition λ with $|\lambda| \leq k$ such that for all sufficiently large j , $\lambda^{(k+j)} = \mu_{k+j}$.

Proof. Since $(\mu_{2k})_1 \geq k$ we may choose λ to be the unique partition λ with $|\lambda| \leq k$ such that $\mu_{2k} = \lambda^{(2k)}$. The condition $\mu_{k+j} \supseteq (j, 1^k)$ tells us that $(\mu_{k+j})_1 \geq j$. This means that there are at most k boxes of every μ_{k+j} not in the first row of the diagram. By the pigeonhole principle, as the chain of partitions $\mu_{2k} \subset \mu_{2k+1} \subset \dots$ grows, there must be only finitely many boxes which are added to rows which are not the first row. Therefore, there exists some partition λ' with $|\lambda'| \leq k$ such that for all sufficiently large j , $\mu_{k+j} = (\lambda')^{(k+j)}$. \square

The above combinatorial lemmas have the following representation-theoretic consequence.

Proposition 3.15. If V is a \mathcal{H}_∞ -module and $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$ is T_i -invariant for all $i > k$, then the cyclic submodule $\mathcal{H}_\infty \cdot v \subseteq V$ contains a submodule isomorphic to $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$ for some partition λ with $|\lambda| \leq k$.

Proof. For $j \geq 0$ define $U_{k+j} := \mathcal{H}_{k+j} \cdot v$ which form a filtration

$$U_k \subseteq U_{k+1} \subseteq \dots$$

By decomposing each U_{k+j} into irreducible \mathcal{H}_{k+j} -submodules, we can find a sequence of partitions $(\mu_{k+j})_{j \geq 0}$ such that

- for all $j \geq 0$, $|\mu_{k+j}| = k + j$
- $\mu_k \subset \mu_{k+1} \subset \dots$
- $S_{\mu_k} \subseteq S_{\mu_{k+1}} \subseteq \dots$ forms a sub-filtration of $U_k \subseteq U_{k+1} \subseteq \dots$.

By Lemma 3.13, we know that for all $j \geq 0$, $\mu_{k+j} \supseteq (j, 1^k)$. Thus by Lemma 3.14, it follows that there exists some λ with $|\lambda| \leq k$ such that for all $j \gg 0$, $\mu_{k+j} = \lambda^{(k+j)}$. Thus we have constructed a \mathcal{H}_∞ -submodule of $\mathcal{H}_\infty \cdot v$ of the form $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} = \bigcup_{j \gg 0} S_{\lambda^{(k+j)}}$. \square

We require the next technical analytic lemma.

Lemma 3.16. Let V be an almost-symmetric $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module and suppose $f : S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} \rightarrow V$ is an injective \mathcal{H}_∞ -module map. Then f extends uniquely to a non-zero bounded $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module map $\hat{f} : \hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow V$ with closed image.

Proof. Since V is a $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module, we know that $\|T_i\|_V \leq 1$ for all $i \geq 1$. Since $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$ is cyclic as a \mathcal{H}_∞ -module we know that necessarily $f : S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} \rightarrow V$ is bounded with respect to the norm topology on $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$ considered as a subspace of \hat{S}_λ . Therefore, f extends uniquely to a non-zero bounded $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module map $\hat{f} : \hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow V$. This map has closed image since if some sequence in $f(S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}) \subseteq V$ converges in V , then the corresponding sequence will also converge in \hat{S}_λ as the norm on \hat{S}_λ is **stronger** than the one on $f(S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}) \subseteq V$. \square

Combining our result so far shows that every almost-symmetric representation admits a map from one of the modules \hat{S}_λ .

Corollary 3.17. If V is an almost-symmetric $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module, then there exists a partition λ with a nonzero $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module map $\hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow V$ with closed image.

Proof. Since V is an almost-symmetric $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module, there exists some $k \geq 0$ such that $\epsilon_k \neq 0$ as an operator on V . Then there exists some $v \in V \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\epsilon_k(v) \neq 0$. Note that for all $i > k$, $T_i \epsilon_k(v) = (T_i \epsilon_k)(v) = \epsilon_k(v)$. By Proposition 3.15, we may find a partition λ

with $|\lambda| \leq k$ such that $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$ embeds as a \mathcal{H}_∞ -submodule into $\mathcal{H}_\infty.v \subseteq V$. By Lemma 3.16, there exists a unique extension of the embedding $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} \rightarrow V$ to a bounded $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module map $\hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow V$ with closed image. \square

Finally, we are able to complete our classification of the irreducible almost-symmetric representations of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$.

Theorem 3.18. If V is an irreducible almost-symmetric $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module, then there exists a bounded $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module isomorphism $\hat{S}_\lambda \cong V$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$.

Proof. Suppose V is an irreducible almost-symmetric $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module. By Corollary 3.17, there exists a partition λ along with a nonzero bounded $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module map $\hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow V$ with closed image. By Proposition 3.12, we know that \hat{S}_λ is irreducible so the map $\hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow V$ is a bounded $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -module linear isomorphism. In particular, the map $\hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow V$ must be injective as otherwise, by continuity, the kernel would be a closed $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_\infty$ -invariant subspace of \hat{S}_λ . Lastly, Lemma 2.17 guarantees that this linear isomorphism is actually a topological homeomorphism. \square

4. REGULARIZED TRACES OF IRREDUCIBLE ALMOST-SYMMETRIC REPRESENTATIONS

The traces values of irreducible representations of Hecke algebras have an interesting place in algebraic combinatorics relating to chromatic quasi-symmetric functions, immanants, LLT polynomials, and Kazhdan–Lusztig theory [Hai93] [SW16] [MSW24]. Since we have found a natural analogue for at least some of the irreducible representations of \mathcal{H}_∞ , it seems natural to try and extend this theory to the infinite setting.

In the finite dimensional setting, there is a canonically well-defined trace functional for irreducible Hecke algebra representations. Even in the infinite dimensional setting, for the infinite symmetric group and infinite Hecke algebras over \mathbb{C} there are methods for canonically defining traces. However, in the infinite dimensional setting over the non-archimedean field \mathbb{F} we run into some difficulties. First, any attempt at defining limits of normalized trace functionals for the representations $S_{\lambda^{(n)}}$ will fail over \mathbb{F} . That leaves the only available option to instead consider traces in the functional analysis sense of trace-class operators on Hilbert spaces. Here again, we run into difficulties since the Banach spaces \hat{S}_λ are not reflexive (at least for $\lambda \neq \emptyset$). Our solution is to consider inner products in the sense of Definition 2.18. Typically to compute the trace of an operator x with respect to an inner product, one considers sums of the form $\langle x(v_i), v_i \rangle$ ranging over an orthonormal basis. In our case, most elements of \mathcal{H}_∞ will have non-convergent trace values under this definition. To arrive at well-defined trace values for all elements of \mathcal{H}_∞ on \hat{S}_λ , we instead re-normalize our basis and use the same type of series but for the rescaled basis.

4.1. Inner Products on Irreducible Representations. In this section, we will show that the representations \hat{S}_λ admit (essentially) unique inner products $(-, -)_\lambda$ subject to the constraint the operators T_i must be self-adjoint. In order to build these inner products on the full spaces \hat{S}_λ , we first look at the finite dimensional representations S_λ .

Proposition 4.1. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ with $|\lambda| = n$. There exists a unique inner product $\langle -, - \rangle_\lambda : S_\lambda \times S_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, $T_i^* = T_i$ and $\langle e_{\tau_\lambda}, e_{\tau_\lambda} \rangle_\lambda = 1$.

Proof. Suppose $\langle -, - \rangle : S_\lambda \times S_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is some symmetric bilinear form such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $v, w \in S_\lambda$, $\langle T_i(v), w \rangle = \langle v, T_i(w) \rangle$. It is easy to see that for all $1 \leq j \leq n$

and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and for all $v, w \in S_\lambda$, $\langle \theta_j(v), w \rangle = \langle v, \theta_j(w) \rangle$ and $\langle \varphi_j(v), w \rangle = -\langle v, \varphi_j(w) \rangle$. Recall that if $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ with $\tau_1 \neq \tau_2$ then there exists some $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $c_{\tau_1}(j) \neq c_{\tau_2}(j)$. Thus for any $\tau_1 \neq \tau_2$ we can find $1 \leq j \leq n$ such that $t^{c_{\tau_1}(j)} \neq t^{c_{\tau_2}(j)}$ so that

$$(t^{c_{\tau_1}(j)} - t^{c_{\tau_2}(j)})\langle e_{\tau_1}, e_{\tau_2} \rangle = \langle t^{c_{\tau_1}(j)} e_{\tau_1}, e_{\tau_2} \rangle - \langle e_{\tau_1}, t^{c_{\tau_2}(j)} e_{\tau_2} \rangle = \langle \theta_j(e_{\tau_1}), e_{\tau_2} \rangle - \langle e_{\tau_1}, \theta_j(e_{\tau_2}) \rangle = 0$$

which implies that $\langle e_{\tau_1}, e_{\tau_2} \rangle = 0$. Therefore, the set $\{e_\tau | \tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)\}$ is an orthogonal basis for S_λ with respect to $\langle -, - \rangle$. Thus any such inner product $\langle -, - \rangle$ on S_λ is uniquely determined by the values $\langle e_\tau, e_\tau \rangle \in \mathbb{F}$ for $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$. Furthermore, if $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ with $s_i(\tau) > \tau$, then on one hand,

$$\langle \varphi_i(e_\tau), \varphi_i(e_\tau) \rangle = (t^{c_\tau(i)} - t^{c_\tau(i+1)})^2 \langle e_{s_i(\tau)}, e_{s_i(\tau)} \rangle.$$

Using Lemma 2.21 we know that for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, since T_i and θ_i are self-adjoint with respect to $\langle -, - \rangle$, $\varphi_i = tT_i^{-1}\theta_i - \theta_i tT_i^{-1}$ is skew-adjoint with respect to each $\langle -, - \rangle$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varphi_i(e_\tau), \varphi_i(e_\tau) \rangle &= \langle e_\tau, -\varphi_i^2(e_\tau) \rangle \\ &= \langle e_\tau, -(t\theta_i - \theta_{i+1})(t\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i)(e_\tau) \rangle \\ &= -(t^{c_\tau(i)+1} - t^{c_\tau(i+1)})(t^{c_\tau(i+1)+1} - t^{c_\tau(i)})\langle e_\tau, e_\tau \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $c_\tau(i+1) \notin \{c_\tau(i) - 1, c_\tau(i), c_\tau(i) + 1\}$ so because t is a pseudo-uniformizer in \mathbb{F} , $t^{c_\tau(i+1)} \notin \{t^{c_\tau(i)-1}, t^{c_\tau(i)}, t^{c_\tau(i)+1}\}$. Therefore,

$$\langle e_{s_i(\tau)}, e_{s_i(\tau)} \rangle = \frac{(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)} - t)(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)+1} - 1)}{(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)} - 1)^2} \langle e_\tau, e_\tau \rangle.$$

Thus if $\langle e_\tau, e_\tau \rangle \neq 0$, then $\langle e_{s_i(\tau)}, e_{s_i(\tau)} \rangle \neq 0$. Since τ_λ is the unique minimal element of $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ if $\langle e_{\tau_\lambda}, e_{\tau_\lambda} \rangle \neq 0$, then the values $\langle e_\tau, e_\tau \rangle$ for $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ are uniquely determined and nonzero. In particular, we may choose $\langle e_{\tau_\lambda}, e_{\tau_\lambda} \rangle = 1$ and define the other values $\langle e_\tau, e_\tau \rangle$ accordingly. It follows that there exists a unique inner product $\langle -, - \rangle_\lambda$ satisfying the criteria in the statement of the proposition. \square

To better keep track of the outputs of the inner products $\langle -, - \rangle_\lambda$, we use the following recursive definition.

Definition 4.2. Define the function $a : \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ recursively by

- $a(\tau_\lambda) := 1$
- if $s_i(\tau) > \tau$, then $a(s_i(\tau)) := \frac{(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)} - t)(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)+1} - 1)}{(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)} - 1)^2} a(\tau)$.

Define the **inversion number** $\text{inv}(\tau)$ of $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ to be the minimal number r such that there exist $i_1, \dots, i_r \geq 1$ with $\tau = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_1}(\tau_\lambda)$.

The values $a(\tau)$ are complicated, but luckily they have predictable norms $|a(\tau)|$.

Lemma 4.3. For all $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$, $|a(\tau)| = |t|^{\text{inv}(\tau)}$. In particular, $|a(\tau)| \leq 1$ for all $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$.

Proof. If $\tau \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ and $i \geq 1$, then $c_\tau(i+1) - c_\tau(i) \geq 2$. Therefore, by definition

$$\begin{aligned} |a(s_i(\tau))| &= \left| \frac{(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)} - t)(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)+1} - 1)}{(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)} - 1)^2} a(\tau) \right| \\ &= |t| \cdot \left| \frac{(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)-1} - 1)(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)+1} - 1)}{(t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)} - 1)^2} \right| \cdot |a(\tau)| \\ &= |t| \cdot |a(\tau)| \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since $a(\tau_\lambda) = 1$, by induction, we see that $|a(\tau)| = |t|^r$ where r is the minimal number such that there exist $i_1, \dots, i_r \geq 1$ with $\tau = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_1}(\tau_\lambda)$. In other words, $|a(\tau)| = |t|^{\text{inv}(\tau)}$. \square

Remark 6. Equivalently, $\text{inv}(\tau)$ is the number of inversion pairs of τ , i.e., boxes (\square_1, \square_2) of the diagram $\lambda^{(\infty)}$ such that $\tau_\lambda(\square_1) < \tau_\lambda(\square_2)$ and $\tau(\square_1) > \tau(\square_2)$. This may be easily verified by induction along the poset $\text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$. Similarly, in the same way one may verify the following explicit formula:

$$a(\tau) = t^{\text{inv}(\tau)} \prod_{(\square_1, \square_2) \in \text{Inv}(\tau)} \frac{(1 - t^{c(\square_2)-c(\square_1)-1})(1 - t^{c(\square_2)-c(\square_1)+1})}{(1 - t^{c(\square_2)-c(\square_1)})^2}$$

where $\text{Inv}(\tau)$ is the set of inverse pairs of τ .

Example 7. Consider $\tau \in \text{SYT}(3, 2, 1)$ given by $\tau = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 6 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$. If we label the boxes of τ by

their labels, then the inversion pairs of τ are $(4, 2), (4, 3), (5, 2), (5, 3)$, and $(6, 3)$ which have content gaps $c_\tau(\square_2) - c_\tau(\square_1)$ given by 2, 3, 3, 4, and 2 respectively. Therefore,

$$a(\tau) = t^5 \left(\frac{(1-t)(1-t^3)}{(1-t^2)^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{(1-t^2)(1-t^4)}{(1-t^3)^2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{(1-t^3)(1-t^5)}{(1-t^4)^2} \right) = t^5 \frac{(1-t)^2(1-t^3)(1-t^5)}{(1-t^2)^2}.$$

Using the values $a(\tau)$, we are able to give an explicit description of the symmetric bilinear forms $\langle -, - \rangle_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$ extending those forms $\langle -, - \rangle_{\lambda^{(n)}}$ on the finite dimensional representations $S_{\lambda^{(n)}}$.

Definition 4.4. Define the symmetric bilinear form $\langle -, - \rangle_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} : S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} \times S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ by

$$\left\langle \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \alpha_\tau e_\tau, \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \beta_\tau e_\tau \right\rangle_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} := \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \alpha_\tau \beta_\tau a(\tau).$$

The forms $\langle -, - \rangle_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$ are continuous with respect to the norm topology on $S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} \subseteq \hat{S}_\lambda$.

Lemma 4.5. For all $v, w \in S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$, $|\langle v, w \rangle_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}| \leq \|v\| \cdot \|w\|$.

Proof. Let $v = \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \alpha_\tau e_\tau, w = \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \beta_\tau e_\tau \in S_{\lambda^{(\infty)}}$. Then

$$\left| \left\langle \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \alpha_\tau e_\tau, \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \beta_\tau e_\tau \right\rangle_{\lambda^{(\infty)}} \right| = \left| \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \alpha_\tau \beta_\tau a(\tau) \right| \leq \sup_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} |\alpha_\tau \beta_\tau a(\tau)|$$

so from Lemma 4.3 we find that

$$|\langle v, w \rangle_{\lambda(\infty)}| \leq \sup_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} |\alpha_\tau \beta_\tau| \leq \sup_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} |\alpha_\tau| \cdot \sup_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} |\beta_\tau| = \|v\| \cdot \|w\|.$$

□

By continuity, we are able to define the desired inner products on the spaces \hat{S}_λ .

Theorem 4.6. There exists a unique inner product $(-, -)_\lambda : \hat{S}_\lambda \times \hat{S}_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that $(e_{\tau_\lambda}, e_{\tau_\lambda})_\lambda = 1$ and for all $i \geq 1$, $T_i^* = T_i$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, we find that $\langle -, - \rangle_{\lambda(\infty)} : S_{\lambda(\infty)} \times S_{\lambda(\infty)} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ is continuous. Therefore, as $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$ is norm dense in \hat{S}_λ , there exists a unique extension of $\langle -, - \rangle_{\lambda(\infty)}$ to $\hat{S}_\lambda \times \hat{S}_\lambda$. Call this map $(-, -)_\lambda$. It is easy to see that $(-, -)_\lambda$ satisfies the requirements of the theorem statement. In particular, $(-, -)_\lambda$ has the explicit description

$$\left(\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \alpha_\tau e_\tau, \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \beta_\tau e_\tau \right)_\lambda = \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \alpha_\tau \beta_\tau a(\tau).$$

Furthermore, $(-, -)_\lambda$ is unique since any other $(-, -)'_\lambda$ satisfying the requirements of the theorem statement would necessarily agree with $(-, -)_\lambda$ on the dense subspace $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$ so by continuity $(-, -)_\lambda = (-, -)'_\lambda$. □

4.2. Regularized Traces of Irreducible Representations. In the absence of the usual tools of analysis over \mathbb{C} , that would allow one to consider traces of operators acting on the spaces \hat{S}_λ , we will instead take a combinatorial approach to defining analogous regularized trace functionals. In order to match conventions with the author's previous work [BW24b] (see Remark 7 and Conjecture 4.16 for more details), we will need to re-normalize the bases $\{e_\tau | \tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)\}$ for each \hat{S}_λ .

Definition 4.7. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$, define

$$\tilde{e}_\tau := \prod_{(\square_1, \square_2) \in \text{Inv}(\tau)} \left(\frac{1 - t^{c(\square_2) - c(\square_1)}}{1 - t^{c(\square_2) - c(\square_1) + 1}} \right) e_\tau.$$

Note that $\|\tilde{e}_\tau\| = \|e_\tau\| = 1$ for all $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$.

Lemma 4.8. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$. For all $k \geq 0$ there exist only finitely many $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ such that $\text{inv}(\tau) \leq k$.

Proof. This follows from a nearly identical argument to the proof of Corollary 6.6 in [BW24b]. □

Recall that since \mathbb{F} is non-archimedean, a series over a countable set J of the form $\sum_{j \in J} c_j$ converges if and only if for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists only finitely many $j \in J$ such that $|c_j| > \epsilon$. This is equivalent to requiring that $\lim_{j \in J} |c_j| = 0$ for any ordering of J .

Proposition 4.9. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$. If $A \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{S}_\lambda)$, then the series $\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (A(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda$ converges in \mathbb{F} . Furthermore, $|\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (A(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda| \leq \|A\|$.

Proof. Let $(a_{\tau,\gamma})_{\tau,\gamma \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)}$ be the unique scalars such that for all $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$, $A(\tilde{e}_\tau) = \sum_{\gamma \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} a_{\tau,\gamma} \tilde{e}_\gamma$. Then for $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(A(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda| &= |\alpha_{\tau,\tau} a(\tau)| \\ &\leq |a(\tau)| \sup_{\gamma \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} |\alpha_{\tau,\gamma}| \\ &= |a(\tau)| \cdot \|A(\tilde{e}_\tau)\| \\ &\leq |a(\tau)| \cdot \|A\| \\ &= t^{\text{inv}(\tau)} \cdot \|A\|. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4.8, for all $k \geq 0$ there exist only finitely many $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ such that $\text{inv}(\tau) \leq k$. Therefore, for all $c > 0$ there exists only finitely many $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ such that $t^{\text{inv}(\tau)} \cdot \|A\| \geq c$. But since $|(A(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda| \leq t^{\text{inv}(\tau)} \cdot \|A\|$ for all $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$, there exist only finitely many $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$ such that $|(A(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda| > c$. Therefore, the series $\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (A(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda$ converges in \mathbb{F} . Lastly,

$$\left| \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (A(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda \right| \leq \sup_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} |(A(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda| \leq \sup_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} \|A\| \cdot |a(\tau)| \leq \|A\|.$$

□

Definition 4.10. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$. Define the **regularized trace** $\Gamma_\lambda : \mathcal{H}_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ as the map

$$\Gamma_\lambda(X) := \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (X(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda.$$

Remark 7. Although the inner product $(-, -)_\lambda$ is (essentially) unique, we have made a very specific choice in defining the function $\Gamma_\lambda : \mathcal{H}_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$. If we rescale the basis \tilde{e}_τ , we would obtain another possible definition for the regularized trace of the representation \hat{S}_λ . This ambiguity would not be present if we were working over \mathbb{C} since in that case traces of trace-class operators on Hilbert spaces are basis-independent. However, Definition 4.10 was chosen carefully to align with Theorem 6.12 of the author's prior paper [BW24b]. In that context, certain sum-product identities were obtained using the combinatorics of vector-valued double affine Hecke algebra representations. The sums that appear in that context are nearly identical to the values $\Gamma_\lambda(1)$. See Section 4.3 for more details.

We require the following symmetry of \mathcal{H}_∞ .

Lemma 4.11. There exists a unique linear anti-automorphism $\iota : \mathcal{H}_\infty \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_\infty$ such that $\iota(T_i) = T_i$ for all $i \geq 1$.

Proof. The set $\{T_\sigma | \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty\}$ forms a basis for \mathcal{H}_∞ . Define $\iota(T_\sigma) := T_{\sigma^{-1}}$ and extend linearly. It is straightforward to verify that ι is an anti-automorphism of \mathcal{H}_∞ by checking that ι preserves the relations defining \mathcal{H}_∞ . □

The regularized trace maps are self-adjoint in the following sense.

Proposition 4.12. For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$, $\Gamma_\lambda \circ \iota = \Gamma_\lambda$.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$. From Theorem 4.6 and Lemma 2.21, we know that $T_\sigma^* = T_{\sigma^{-1}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma) &= \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (T_\sigma(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (\tilde{e}_\tau, T_\sigma^*(\tilde{e}_\tau))_\lambda \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (\tilde{e}_\tau, T_{\sigma^{-1}}(\tilde{e}_\tau))_\lambda \\
&= \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} (T_{\sigma^{-1}}(\tilde{e}_\tau), \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda \\
&= \Gamma_\lambda(T_{\sigma^{-1}}) \\
&= \Gamma_\lambda(\iota(T_\sigma)).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the linearity of Γ_λ , $\Gamma_\lambda \circ \iota = \Gamma_\lambda$. \square

We may find formulas for the values of Γ_λ at certain nice elements of \mathcal{H}_∞ .

Proposition 4.13. Let $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r \geq 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$. Then $\Gamma_\lambda(\theta_1^{a_1} \dots \theta_r^{a_r})$ is explicitly given by the following:

$$\sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty} t^{a_1 c_\tau(1) + \dots + a_r c_\tau(r) + \text{inv}(\tau)} \prod_{(\square_1, \square_2) \in \text{Inv}(\tau)} \left(\frac{1 - t^{c(\square_2) - c(\square_1) - 1}}{1 - t^{c(\square_2) - c(\square_1) + 1}} \right).$$

Proof. This follows from the simple fact that $\theta_1^{a_1} \dots \theta_r^{a_r}(\tilde{e}_\tau) = t^{a_1 c_1(\tau) + \dots + a_r c_r(\tau)} \tilde{e}_\tau$ and

$$(\tilde{e}_\lambda, \tilde{e}_\lambda)_\lambda = t^{\text{inv}(\tau)} \prod_{(\square_1, \square_2) \in \text{Inv}(\tau)} \left(\frac{1 - t^{c(\square_2) - c(\square_1) - 1}}{1 - t^{c(\square_2) - c(\square_1) + 1}} \right)$$

for all $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty$. \square

Proposition 4.14. Let $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty$ be an involution with odd length and $\text{char } \mathbb{F} \neq 2$. Then for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$, $\Gamma_\lambda(\varphi_\sigma) = 0$.

Proof. Using Lemma 2.21, we know that for all $i \geq 1$, since T_i and θ_i are self-adjoint with respect to every $(-, -)_\lambda$, $\varphi_i = tT_i^{-1}\theta_i - \theta_i tT_i^{-1}$ is skew-adjoint with respect to each $(-, -)_\lambda$. Since σ is an involution, $\varphi_\sigma^* = (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)} \varphi_{\sigma^{-1}} = (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)} \varphi_\sigma = -\varphi_\sigma$ since $\ell(\sigma)$ is odd. Then since $\Gamma_\lambda \circ \iota = \Gamma_\lambda$, $\Gamma_\lambda(\varphi_\sigma) = -\Gamma_\lambda(\varphi_\sigma)$ so as $\text{char } \mathbb{F} \neq 2$, $\Gamma_\lambda(\varphi_\sigma) = 0$. \square

Here we will investigate integrality properties of the Γ_λ maps. Let $\mathcal{O} := \{x \in \mathbb{F} \mid |x| \leq 1\}$. Define $\mathcal{H}_\infty^+ := \mathcal{O} \cdot \{T_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty\}$.

Theorem 4.15. If $X \in \mathcal{H}_\infty^+$, then for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$, $\Gamma_\lambda(X) \in \mathcal{O}$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma) \in \mathcal{O}$ for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$. Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_\infty$. It is evident from Proposition 4.13 that $\Gamma_\lambda(1) \in \mathcal{O}$ so it suffices to show that $\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma - 1) \in \mathcal{O}$. To this end note that $(T_\sigma - 1)(\tilde{e}_\tau) = 0$ for all but finitely many $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$. Furthermore, from Remark 2, we see that the structure constants of the action of \mathcal{H}_∞ on $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$ are all in \mathcal{O} . More specifically,

- if $s_i(\tau) > \tau$, then $c_\tau(i+1) - c_\tau(i) > 1$ so

$$T_i(e_\tau) = e_{s_i(\tau)} + \frac{1-t}{1-t^{c_\tau(i+1)-c_\tau(i)}} e_\tau \in \mathcal{O}.\{e_\tau, e_{s_i(\tau)}\},$$

- if $s_i(\tau) < \tau$, then $c_\tau(i) - c_\tau(i+1) > 1$ so

$$T_i(e_\tau) = t \frac{(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)-1})(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)+1})}{(1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)})^2} e_{s_i(\tau)} - t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)} \frac{1-t}{1-t^{c_\tau(i)-c_\tau(i+1)}} e_\tau \in \mathcal{O}.\{e_\tau, e_{s_i(\tau)}\},$$

- if the labels $i, i+1$ are in the same row in τ , then $T_i(e_\tau) = e_\tau \in \mathcal{O}.\{e_\tau\}$,
- and if the labels $i, i+1$ are in the same column in τ , then $T_i(e_\tau) = -te_\tau \in \mathcal{O}\{e_\tau\}$.

Therefore, for all $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$, $(T_\sigma - 1)(e_\tau) \in \mathcal{O}.\{e_\gamma | \gamma \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)\}$ and similarly, since for all $\gamma \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$, \tilde{e}_γ and e_γ differs by a scalar of norm 1, $(T_\sigma - 1)(\tilde{e}_\tau) \in \mathcal{O}.\{\tilde{e}_\gamma | \gamma \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)\}$. Thus, $\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma - 1)$ is a finite sum of the form $\sum_\tau b_\tau (\tilde{e}_\tau, \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda$ for $b_\tau \in \mathcal{O}$. Since $(\tilde{e}_\tau, \tilde{e}_\tau)_\lambda \in \mathcal{O}$, it follows that $\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma - 1) \in \mathcal{O}$. \square

4.3. Rationality Conjecture. We finish this paper by giving a simple conjecture regarding the regularized dimensions of the representations \hat{S}_λ . The values $\Gamma_\lambda(X)$ are already interesting in the case $X = 1$. These values represent a kind of regularized dimension of the representations \hat{S}_λ . They are given by

$$\Gamma_\lambda(1) = \sum_{\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)} t^{\text{inv}(\tau)} \prod_{(\square_1, \square_2) \in \text{Inv}(\tau)} \left(\frac{1-t^{c(\square_2)-c(\square_1)-1}}{1-t^{c(\square_2)-c(\square_1)+1}} \right).$$

Note that trivially $\Gamma_\emptyset(1) = 1$. The simplest nontrivial example $\lambda = (1)$ gives

$$\Gamma_{(1)}(1) = 1 + t \left(\frac{1-t}{1-t^3} \right) + t^2 \left(\frac{1-t}{1-t^3} \right) \left(\frac{1-t^2}{1-t^4} \right) + t^3 \left(\frac{1-t}{1-t^3} \right) \left(\frac{1-t^2}{1-t^4} \right) \left(\frac{1-t^3}{1-t^5} \right) + \dots$$

which remarkably telescopes to give $\Gamma_{(1)}(1) = 1 + t = \frac{1-t^2}{1-t}$. This is very similar to Theorem 6.12 of [BW24b] but that result, unfortunately, strictly does not apply in this situation. In some sense, the values $\Gamma_\lambda(1)$ represent a degenerate case of that result. Nevertheless, the author's previous result suggests the following conjecture:

Conjecture 4.16. For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$, $\Gamma_\lambda(1)$ may be expressed in the form $\Gamma_\lambda(1) = \frac{\prod_j (1-t^{a_j})}{\prod_i (1-t^{b_i})}$ for some $a_j, b_i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$.

This conjecture, if true, would have the following consequence.

Proposition 4.17. Suppose $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}((t))$. If Conjecture 4.16 holds, then for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{H}_\infty$, $\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma) \in \mathbb{Q}(t)$.

Proof. Note that $(T_\sigma - 1)\tilde{e}_\tau = 0$ for all but finitely many $\tau \in \text{SYT}_\infty(\lambda)$. Recall that the structure coefficients for the action of \mathcal{H}_∞ on $S_{\lambda(\infty)}$ in the e_τ -basis are rational functions of t . Therefore, $\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma - 1)$ is a finite sum of terms which are guaranteed to be rational functions of t . Hence, $\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma - 1) \in \mathbb{Q}(t)$. Assuming Conjecture 4.16 holds, $\Gamma_\lambda(1) \in \mathbb{Q}(t)$ so $\Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma) = \Gamma_\lambda(T_\sigma - 1) + \Gamma_\lambda(1) \in \mathbb{Q}(t)$. \square

Remark 8. After finding a better understanding for the series $\Gamma_\lambda(1)$, the natural next step in future work is to investigate the values of Γ_λ at elements of the **canonical Kazhdan-Lusztig basis** C_w of \mathcal{H}_∞ .

REFERENCES

- [AST17] Henning Haahr Andersen, Catharina Stroppel, and Daniel Tubbenhauer. “Semisimplicity of Hecke and (walled) Brauer algebras”. English. In: *J. Aust. Math. Soc.* 103.1 (2017), pp. 1–44. ISSN: 1446-7887. DOI: 10.1017/S1446788716000392.
- [BO16] Alexei Borodin and Grigori Olshanski. *Representations of the infinite symmetric group*. English. Vol. 160. Camb. Stud. Adv. Math. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. ISBN: 978-1-107-17555-6; 978-1-316-79857-7. DOI: 10.1017/CB09781316798577.
- [BW24a] Milo Bechtloff Weising. “Delta Operators on Almost Symmetric Functions”. In: (2024). arXiv: 2405.09846 [math.RT]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.09846>.
- [BW24b] Milo Bechtloff Weising. *Murnaghan-Type Representations for the Positive Elliptic Hall Algebra*. 2024. arXiv: 2405.00756 [math.CO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.00756>.
- [BW25] Milo J. Bechtloff Weising. “Stable-limit non-symmetric Macdonald functions”. English. In: *Algebr. Comb.* 7.6 (2025), pp. 1845–1878. ISSN: 2589-5486. DOI: 10.5802/alco.395.
- [CEF15] Thomas Church, Jordan S. Ellenberg, and Benson Farb. “FI-modules and stability for representations of symmetric groups”. English. In: *Duke Math. J.* 164.9 (2015), pp. 1833–1910. ISSN: 0012-7094. DOI: 10.1215/00127094-3120274.
- [DL11] C. F. Dunkl and J.-G. Luque. “Vector valued Macdonald polynomials”. In: *Sém. Lothar. Combin.* 66 (2011/12), Art. B66b, 68. ISSN: 1286-4889.
- [GKV14] Vadim Gorin, Sergei Kerov, and Anatoly Vershik. “Finite traces and representations of the group of infinite matrices over a finite field”. English. In: *Adv. Math.* 254 (2014), pp. 331–395. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2013.12.028.
- [Hai93] Mark Haiman. “Hecke algebra characters and immanant conjectures”. English. In: *J. Am. Math. Soc.* 6.3 (1993), pp. 569–595. ISSN: 0894-0347. DOI: 10.2307/2152777.
- [IW22] Bogdan Ion and Dongyu Wu. “THE STABLE LIMIT DAHA AND THE DOUBLE DYCK PATH ALGEBRA”. In: *Journal of the Institute of Mathematics of Jussieu* (2022), 1–46. DOI: 10.1017/S1474748022000445.
- [MSW24] Alejandro H. Morales, Mark A. Skandera, and Jiayuan Wang. “LLT polynomials and Hecke algebra traces”. English. In: *Proceedings of the 13th edition of the conference on random generation of combinatorial structures. Polyominoes and tilings, GASCom 2024, Bordeaux, France, June 24–28, 2024*. Waterloo: Open Publishing Association (OPA), 2024, pp. 150–155. DOI: 10.4204/EPTCS.403.31.
- [Mur38] F. D. Murnaghan. “The Analysis of the Kronecker Product of Irreducible Representations of the Symmetric Group”. In: *Amer. J. Math.* 60.3 (1938), pp. 761–784. ISSN: 0002-9327, 1080-6377. DOI: 10.2307/2371610. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2371610>.
- [Oko97] Andrei Okounkov. “On representations of the infinite symmetric group”. English. In: *J. Math. Sci., New York* 96.5 (1997), p. 1. ISSN: 1072-3374. DOI: 10.1007/BF02175834.
- [Ols03] Grigori Olshanski. “An introduction to harmonic analysis on the infinite symmetric group.” English. In: *Asymptotic combinatorics with applications to mathematical physics. A European mathematical summer school held at the Euler Institute,*

- St. Petersburg, Russia, July 9–20, 2001*. Berlin: Springer, 2003, pp. 127–160. ISBN: 3-540-40312-4.
- [Sch02] Peter Schneider. *Nonarchimedean functional analysis*. English. Springer Monogr. Math. Berlin: Springer, 2002. ISBN: 3-540-42533-0.
- [SW16] John Shareshian and Michelle L. Wachs. “Chromatic quasisymmetric functions”. English. In: *Adv. Math.* 295 (2016), pp. 497–551. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2015.12.018.
- [VK98] A. M. Vershik and S. V. Kerov. “On an infinite-dimensional group over a finite field”. English. In: *Funct. Anal. Appl.* 32.3 (1998), pp. 147–152. ISSN: 0016-2663. DOI: 10.1007/BF02463335.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS (0123), 460 MCBRYDE HALL, VIRGINIA TECH, 225 STANGER STREET,
 BLACKSBURG, VA 24061-1026
Email address: milojbw@vt.edu