

FREE FERMIONIC SCHUR FUNCTIONS

SLAVA NAPRIENKO

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we introduce a new family of Schur functions that depend on two sets of variables and two doubly infinite sequences of parameters. These functions generalize and unify various existing Schur functions, including classical Schur functions, factorial Schur functions, supersymmetric Schur functions, Frobenius-Schur functions, factorial supersymmetric Schur functions, and dual Schur functions. We prove that the new family of functions satisfies several well-known properties, such as the combinatorial description, Jacobi-Trudi identity, Nägelsbach-Kostka formula, Giambelli formula, Ribbon formula, Weyl formula, Berele-Regev factorization, and Cauchy identity.

Our approach is based on the integrable six vertex model with free fermionic weights. We show that these weights satisfy the *refined Yang-Baxter equation*, which results in supersymmetry for the Schur functions. Furthermore, we derive refined operator relations for the row transfer operators and use them to find partition functions with various boundary conditions. Our results provide new proofs for known results as well as new identities for the Schur functions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Six Vertex Model	4
2.1. Combinatorial description	5
2.2. Non-intersecting lattice paths	6
2.3. Row transfer operators	9
2.4. The Yang-Baxter equation and operator relations	12
2.5. Partition functions	16
2.6. The six vertex model on infinite strip	18
3. Partitions, Maya diagrams, and ribbons	22
4. Free fermionic Schur functions	23
4.1. Further properties	28
References	29

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we introduce a new family of Schur functions $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x,y)$, which depend on two sets of variables $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$, as well as two doubly infinite sequences of parameters $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. We provide a hands-on definition in the style of Olshanski, Regev, and Vershik [ORV03].

First, we define the *complete symmetric free fermionic functions* $h_{k;a,b}$ by the generating series

$$1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{k;a,b}(x, y) \frac{1 - a_k b_k}{1 - a_0 b_0} \frac{(z - b_0)}{(1 - a_1 z)} \frac{(z - b_1)}{(1 - a_2 z)} \cdots \frac{(z - b_{k-1})}{(1 - a_k z)} = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1 + y_i z}{1 - x_i z} \frac{1 - b_0 x_i}{1 + b_0 y_i}.$$

As usual, we set $h_{0;a,b} = 1$ and $h_{k;a,b} = 0$ for $k < 0$.

For any two partitions λ and μ , the *free fermionic Schur functions* $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}$ are given by

$$s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b} = \det(h_{\lambda_i - \mu_j - i + j; \tau^{1-j} a, \tau^{1-j} b})_{1 \leq i, j \leq l(\lambda)},$$

where $\tau^s((a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}) = (a_{i+s})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the shift operator.

We show that this new family of Schur functions unifies and generalizes existing families of Schur functions from literature that we discuss now.

The *classical Schur functions* $s_{\lambda}(x)$ are a type of symmetric function that arise in various areas of mathematics, such as representation theory, algebraic combinatorics, and the theory of special functions. They can be used to provide characters for polynomial representations of the general linear group or the symmetric group, and also appear in algebraic geometry as representatives of cycles in flag varieties. There are numerous generalizations of Schur functions that have been studied in different contexts.

One such generalization is the *factorial Schur function* $s_{\lambda}(x|a)$, which depends on a sequence of parameters $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. When $a_i = -i + 1$, these functions are known as shifted Schur functions $s_{\lambda}^*(x)$ and were introduced by Olshanski and Okounkov in [OO97]. They form a natural basis for the center of the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Another variant, the *double Schur function* $s_{\lambda}(x||a)$, was introduced by Molev in [Mol09] and differs from the factorial Schur functions only by a reparametrization. Both the factorial and double Schur functions have the property of stability, which allows for their definition in infinitely many variables. The factorial Schur functions have also applications in the combinatorics of flag varieties, where they appear as the equivariant Schubert classes.

Another generalization is the *supersymmetric Schur function* $s_{\lambda}(x/y)$, which depends on two sets of variables x and y and satisfies the property of supersymmetry. This property relates the Schur functions to the representation theory of the superalgebra $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ [BR87].

Molev [Mol98] further generalized the factorial and supersymmetric Schur functions by introducing the *factorial supersymmetric Schur functions* $s_{\lambda}(x/y||a)$. However, Olshanski, Regev, and Vershik [ORV03] pointed out that Molev's generalization does not have the stability property. They introduced the *Frobenius-Schur functions* $s_{\lambda;a}(x, y)$ as a shifted version of Molev's functions, which do possess the stability property. When the number of variables x and y are equal, the Frobenius-Schur functions differ from Molev's functions only by a shift in the parameters.

One of the most fundamental results in the study of classical Schur functions $s_{\lambda}(x)$ is the Cauchy identity, which provides a closed product formula for the sum of Schur functions over all partitions:

$$\sum_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}(x) s_{\lambda}(y) = \prod_{i,j} \frac{1}{1 - x_i y_j}.$$

Berele and Regev [BR87] demonstrated that the supersymmetric Schur functions $s_\lambda(x/y)$ also satisfy a Cauchy identity of the form:

$$\sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda(x/y) s_\lambda(z/w) = \prod_{i,j} \frac{1 + y_i z_j}{1 - x_i z_j} \frac{1 + x_i w_j}{1 - y_i w_j}.$$

However, it remained unclear whether a similar result held for the factorial Schur functions $s_\lambda(x||a)$. In Theorem 3.1 of [Mol09], Molev introduced a new family of dual Schur functions $\widehat{s}_\lambda(x||a)$ and demonstrated that they satisfy a Cauchy identity with the factorial Schur functions:

$$\sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda(x||a) \widehat{s}_\lambda(z||a) = \prod_{i,j} \frac{1 - a_i z_j}{1 - x_i z_j}.$$

Furthermore, Molev proved in Corollary 3.2 of [Mol09] that the factorial supersymmetric Schur functions $s_\lambda(x/y||a)$ (also known as Frobenius-Schur functions $s_{\lambda;a}(x, y)$) and the dual Schur functions satisfy the following Cauchy identity:

$$\sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda(x/y||a) \widehat{s}_\lambda(y||a) = \prod_{i,j} \frac{1 + y_i z_j}{1 - x_i y_j}.$$

However, it was not known if a Cauchy identity in the style of Berele-Regev involving two factorial supersymmetric Schur functions existed.

In this article, we present a new family of free fermionic Schur functions that unifies and generalizes previously mentioned Schur functions. Specifically, we show that the new family of functions $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y)$ encompasses the following cases:

- (1) $s_{\lambda/\mu;0,0}(x, 0) = s_{\lambda/\mu}(x)$: classical Schur functions,
- (2) $s_{\lambda/\mu;0,0}(x, y) = s_{\lambda/\mu}(x/y)$: supersymmetric Schur functions,
- (3) $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,0}(x, a') = s_{\lambda/\mu}(x||a)$: factorial Schur functions,
- (4) $s_{\lambda/\mu;a',0}(x, y) = s_{\lambda/\mu}(x/y||a)$: factorial supersymmetric Schur functions,
- (5) $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,0}(x, y) = s_{\lambda/\mu;a}(x, y)$: Frobenius-Schur functions,
- (6) $s_{\lambda/\mu;0,b}(x, 0) = \widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu}(x||b)$: dual Schur functions.

Furthermore, we demonstrate that the free fermionic Schur functions satisfy a Berele-Regev Cauchy identity, which relates the free fermionic Schur functions to their dual counterparts:

Theorem (See Theorem 4.7 in text).

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{\lambda} s_{\lambda;a,b}(x, y) \widehat{s}_{\lambda;a,b}(z, w) = \prod_{i,j} \frac{1 + y_i z_j}{1 - x_i y_j} \frac{1 + x_i w_j}{1 - y_i w_j}.$$

It is noteworthy that the right-hand side of the identity does not depend on the doubly infinite sequences of parameters $a = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $b = (b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Naturally, our version of the Cauchy identity degenerates to all Cauchy identities mentioned above.

In addition to the Cauchy identity, we prove that the free fermionic Schur functions possess various properties commonly associated with Schur functions, such as the combinatorial description, Jacobi-Trudi identity, Nägelsbach-Kostka formula, Giambelli formula, Ribbon formula, Weyl determinant formula, Berele-Regev factorization, and others.

Our approach is based on the integrable six vertex model with free fermionic weights. Specifically, we define the free fermionic Schur functions as the partition function of the six

vertex model, where each vertex is assigned two spectral parameters x, y associated with the row and two spectral parameters a, b associated with the column. The weights assigned to each vertex are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(x, y; a, b) &= 1 - bx, & b_1(x, y; a, b) &= 1 + by, & c_1(x, y; a, b) &= 1 - ab, \\ a_2(x, y; a, b) &= y + a, & b_2(x, y; a, b) &= x - a, & c_2(x, y; a, b) &= x + y. \end{aligned}$$

The central tool in the theory of integrable lattice models is the Yang-Baxter equation. It relates the weights of two vertices by exchanging their row spectral parameters simultaneously. In particular, if $T(x, y; a, b)$ represents a vertex with labels x, y and a, b , then the classical Yang-Baxter equation is given by

$$R(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2)T(x_1, y_1; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) = T(x_2, y_2; a, b)T(x_1, y_1; a, b)R(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2).$$

One of the main novelties of our work is the introduction of new *refined Yang-Baxter equations*, which allow us to exchange the spectral parameters x or y separately:

Theorem (See Theorem 2.8 in text).

$$\begin{aligned} R^x(x_1, x_2; y_1)T(x_1, y_1; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) &= T(x_2, y_1; a, b)T(x_1, y_2; a, b)R^x(x_1, x_2; y_1), \\ R^y(y_1, y_2; x_2)T(x_1, y_2; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) &= T(x_1, y_2; a, b)T(x_2, y_1; a, b)R^y(y_1, y_2; x_2). \end{aligned}$$

The refined Yang-Baxter equations lead to the refined Yang-Baxter algebra of the row transfer operators which allows us to demonstrate that the free fermionic Schur functions defined in our model possess supersymmetry. Specifically, they are symmetric separately in x and y , and satisfy the cancellation property (Proposition 4.1).

The free fermionic six vertex model has been previously used to define generalizations of Schur functions. In [Mot17b], a family of Schur functions was defined using a specific parametrization of weights. In [ABPW21], Aggarwal, Borodin, Petrov, and Wheeler studied the partition functions of the free fermionic six vertex models with a different parametrization of the weights and showed that the partition functions specialize to the factorial Schur functions and supersymmetric Schur functions. It is possible to relate the weights from [ABPW21] to our weights through a sequence of reparametrizations, which means that many results obtained using different parametrizations are analogous to each other.

However, our choice of parametrization, normalization, and shift of parameters enables us to define a new family of Schur functions that are both supersymmetric and stable under specialization. These properties are important as they allow for the definition of symmetric Schur functions in infinitely many variables as elements of a graded ring. Furthermore, our choice of parametrization unifies the factorial supersymmetric Schur functions and the dual Schur functions from Molev's work [Mol09]. By unifying these various types of Schur functions and establishing their stability and supersymmetry, we provide a uniform approach to studying Schur functions and their generalizations using the free fermionic six vertex model.

Acknowledgements. I am sincerely grateful to Daniel Bump for his invaluable support and guidance and mentorship throughout the course of this project. Thank you!

2. SIX VERTEX MODEL

In this section, we review the six vertex model from statistical mechanics. We show that the six vertex model has a combinatorial description in terms of admissible states on a lattice




FIGURE 1. The six vertex model and a typical state.




FIGURE 2. The six admissible types of vertices. The types of vertices are traditionally called $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2$, following Baxter [Bax82]

as well as an operator description in terms of row transfer operators. A good overview of the six vertex model is given in Section 1 of [BBF11] and Section 1-4 of [ABPW21].

2.1. Combinatorial description. The *six vertex model* is a model on a rectangular lattice that is determined by the following data:

- (1) Row labels $I = (I_1, I_2, \dots, I_N)$, where N is the number of rows,
- (2) Column labels $J = (J_1, J_2, \dots, J_M)$, where M is the number of columns,
- (3) Boundaries $\beta = (\beta^l, \beta^t, \beta^r, \beta^b)$ with $\beta^l, \beta^t, \beta^r, \beta^b \in 2^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Given the data, the six vertex model is the configurations of paths on a rectangular lattice with N rows and M columns. The paths enter the lattice on the left at rows β^l and on the top at columns β^t , and leave the lattice on the right at rows β^r , and on the bottom at columns β^b . Paths travel from NW to SE, and they can intersect, but they can only move right and down. Due to these restrictions, there are only six possible configurations for each vertex, hence the name of the model.

An *admissible state* in a six vertex model is any configuration of paths that respects the boundaries. It is important to note that the six vertex model satisfies a preservation law: each vertex has the same number of incoming and outgoing paths. Therefore, for there to be any admissible states at all, the number of paths entering and leaving the model must be equal: $l(\beta^l) + l(\beta^t) = l(\beta^r) + l(\beta^b)$. We denote the set of all admissible states of the six vertex model with the given data as $\mathfrak{S}(I, J; \beta^l, \beta^t, \beta^r, \beta^b)$. If some of the boundaries are out of range of the model, they are ignored.

Let $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2: I \times J \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the weight functions. The *vertex weight* $\text{wt}(v)$ of a vertex v in a state $s \in \mathfrak{S}$ is the weight function of the vertex type. For example, the vertex

weight of a vertex of type b_2 on row with label i and column with label j is equal to $b_2(i, j)$. The *state weight* of a state $s \in \mathfrak{S}$ is the product of the weights of all vertices in s . Finally, the *partition function* $Z(\mathfrak{S})$ of a six vertex model \mathfrak{S} is the sum of the weights of all states in \mathfrak{S} :

$$Z(\mathfrak{S}) = \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} \text{wt}(s) = \sum_{s \in \mathfrak{S}} \prod_{v \in s} \text{wt}(v).$$

For brevity, we write $Z(I, J; \beta^l, \beta^t, \beta^r, \beta^b)$ for $Z(\mathfrak{S}(I, J; \beta^l, \beta^t, \beta^r, \beta^b))$.

One of the main objectives in the study of integrable lattice models is to identify appropriate weights that result in meaningful and useful partition functions. The six vertex model, for example, has been shown to produce a variety of special functions depending on the choice of weights used. With one set of weights, the model generates the number of alternating sign matrices [Kup96]. With another, it produces Schur functions, and more generally, spherical Whittaker functions for the general linear group over a non-archimedean local field by means of the Casselman-Shalika formula [BBF11]. Additionally, using yet another set of weights, the six vertex model generates supersymmetric Schur functions [Har21]. Recently, by using more general weights, it has been demonstrated that the six vertex model can produce various generalizations of Schur functions [Mot17b, Mot17a, ABPW21].

In this paper, the vertices will have the horizontal labels of the form (x_i, y_j) and the vertical labels of the form (a_i, b_j) . Then we use the following weights:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} a_1(x, y; a, b) &= 1 - bx, & b_1(x, y; a, b) &= 1 + by, & c_1(x, y; a, b) &= 1 - ab, \\ a_2(x, y; a, b) &= y + a, & b_2(x, y; a, b) &= x - a, & c_2(x, y; a, b) &= x + y. \end{aligned}$$

We note that similar weights were used in Section 3 of [BBF11] and Figure 4 of [ABPW21]. By change of variables and rescaling, it is possible to relate different choices of weights to each other. However, we have chosen our parametrization because it is most suitable for studying the resulting symmetric functions. In particular, our choice of weights leads to the refined Yang-Baxter equation, which gives an easy proof of the supersymmetry.

2.2. Non-intersecting lattice paths. We revisit the theory of non-intersecting lattice paths and recall the powerful Lindström–Gessel–Viennot lemma (LGV lemma). For a comprehensive treatment of the topic, we refer the reader to [Lin73, GV85].

Consider a directed acyclic graph G , in which each directed edge $e \in G$ is assigned a weight $\text{wt}(e)$. For a directed path P between two vertices, we define the weight of the path, $\text{wt}(P)$, as the product of the weights of the edges in the path. For any two vertices $a, b \in G$, we define the sum $e(a, b) = \sum_{P: a \rightarrow b} \text{wt}(P)$ over all directed paths from a to b .

Let $A = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $B = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be two n -tuples of vertices. We consider an n -tuple of non-intersecting paths $(P_1, \dots, P_n): A \rightarrow B$, where $P_i: a_i \rightarrow b_i$. The weight $\text{wt}(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ of the n -tuple is defined as the product $\text{wt}(P_1, \dots, P_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{wt}(P_i)$ of the weights of the involved paths. Additionally, we impose the restriction that if we fix the starting points (a_1, \dots, a_n) , then each path P_i in an n -tuple (P_1, \dots, P_n) of non-intersecting paths must end exactly at b_i . In other words, there is no n -tuple of non-intersecting paths P_1, \dots, P_n such that $P_i: a_i \rightarrow b_{\sigma(i)}$ for some permutation $\sigma \in S_n$.

With these conditions in place, we can state the Lindström–Gessel–Viennot lemma:

Lemma 2.1. *The weighted sum of all n -tuples $(P_1, \dots, P_n): A \rightarrow B$ is equal to the determinant of the weights of one path traveling from a_i to b_j , i.e.,*

$$\sum_{(P_1, \dots, P_n): A \rightarrow B} \text{wt}(P_1, \dots, P_n) = \det(e(a_i, b_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

Remark 2.2. The LGV lemma is applicable in a vastly more general context, including the possibility of permutations of the paths and more general graphs. However, in this paper, we focus on the most basic and special case.

The six vertex model resembles a model of non-intersecting lattice paths, with the exception that the paths *do* intersect. However, under certain conditions on the weights, it is possible to adjust these intersections to obtain a model of non-intersecting paths without altering the normalized partition function.

We say that the weights of a six vertex model are *free fermionic* if they satisfy the following condition:

$$(2.2) \quad a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 = c_1 c_2.$$

The weights given by (2.1) are free fermionic as

$$(1 - bx)(y + a) + (1 + by)(x - a) = (1 - ab)(x + y).$$

Let $\tilde{a}_1 = a_1/a_1 = 1$, $\tilde{a}_2 = a_2/a_1$, $\tilde{b}_1 = b_1/a_1$, $\tilde{b}_2 = b_2/a_1$, $\tilde{c}_1 = c_1/a_1$, and $\tilde{c}_2 = c_2/a_1$ be the normalized weight functions. We also define the normalized partition function

$$\tilde{Z}(I; J; \beta) = \frac{Z(I; J; \beta)}{\prod_{i=1}^N \prod_{j=1}^M a_1(I_i, J_j)}.$$

By dividing the weight of vertices at each site by the weight of a_1 , we obtain a new partition function which is equivalent to the original partition function with the normalized weights. This normalization eliminates the contribution of vertices of type a_1 to the partition function, thus making it possible to relate the six-vertex model to a system of non-intersecting lattice paths.

Given a six vertex model $\mathfrak{S}(I; J; \beta^l, \beta^t, \beta^r, \beta^b)$, we can associate a corresponding directed acyclic graph $G(I; J; \beta^l, \beta^t, \beta^r, \beta^b)$ in which each horizontal edge is directed from left to right, and each vertical edge is directed from top to bottom. Additionally, for each vertex, we add a new diagonal edge connecting the midpoint of the top edge to the midpoint of the right edge and directed from northwest to southeast. The weights of the edges in this graph are as specified in the table in Figure 3.

edge					
weight	$\tilde{c}_1(v)$	1	$\tilde{b}_1(v)$	$\tilde{b}_2(v)/\tilde{c}_1(v)$	$\tilde{a}_2(v)/\tilde{c}_1(v)$

FIGURE 3. The weights of edges around the vertex v in the associated graph.

With this construction, we have the following proposition:

Then the six vertex weight \tilde{c}_2 splits into the sum of $\tilde{b}_1\tilde{b}_2/\tilde{c}_1$ and \tilde{a}_2/\tilde{c}_1 . But by the free-fermionic condition for the normalized weights, we have

$$\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_2 = \tilde{b}_1\tilde{b}_2 + \tilde{a}_2.$$

Since the weight preserves at each vertex, it preserves globally, and we showed that the partition function equals to the weighted sum of non-intersecting lattice paths. Now we apply the LGV lemma to get the result. \square

2.3. Row transfer operators. In this subsection, we introduce an alternative definition of the six vertex model, in terms of row transfer operators, which will be useful for our analysis.

The six vertex model can be viewed as a composition of operators acting on parametrized vector spaces. Specifically, we consider two families of vector spaces:

- (1) $V(x, y) = \mathbb{C}e_0 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_1 \cong \mathbb{C}^2$, which correspond to the horizontal edges,
- (2) $W(a, b) = \mathbb{C}e_0 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_1 \cong \mathbb{C}^2$, which correspond to the vertical edges.

We define the vertex operator

$$T(x, y; a, b) : V(x, y) \otimes W(a, b) \rightarrow W(a, b) \otimes V(a, b),$$

which is given by its matrix in the standard basis $e_0 \otimes e_0, e_0 \otimes e_1, e_1 \otimes e_0, e_1 \otimes e_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} T(x, y; a, b) &= \begin{pmatrix} a_1(x, y; a, b) & & & & \\ & c_1(x, y; a, b) & b_1(x, y; a, b) & & \\ & b_2(x, y; a, b) & c_2(x, y; a, b) & & \\ & & & & a_2(x, y; a, b) \\ & & & & \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 - bx & & & & \\ & 1 - ab & 1 + by & & \\ & x - a & x + y & & \\ & & & & y + a \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$


Despite not all matrix elements depend on all variables x, y, a, b , we write the dependence for the uniform notation.

In our convention, the operators act on the left. For vectors v, w , we write $\langle v|T|w \rangle$ for the corresponding matrix coefficient. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(x, y; a, b) &= \langle e_0 \otimes e_0 | T(x, y; a, b) | e_0 \otimes e_0 \rangle = 1 - bx, \\ a_2(x, y; a, b) &= \langle e_1 \otimes e_1 | T(x, y; a, b) | e_1 \otimes e_1 \rangle = y + a, \\ b_1(x, y; a, b) &= \langle e_0 \otimes e_1 | T(x, y; a, b) | e_1 \otimes e_0 \rangle = 1 + by, \\ b_2(x, y; a, b) &= \langle e_1 \otimes e_0 | T(x, y; a, b) | e_0 \otimes e_1 \rangle = x - a, \\ c_1(x, y; a, b) &= \langle e_0 \otimes e_1 | T(x, y; a, b) | e_0 \otimes e_1 \rangle = 1 - ab, \\ c_2(x, y; a, b) &= \langle e_1 \otimes e_0 | T(x, y; a, b) | e_1 \otimes e_0 \rangle = x + y. \end{aligned}$$

Graphically, we represent the vertex operator as a vertex in a rectangular lattice. We label the horizontal edge by x, y to represent $V(x, y)$ and the vertical edge by a, b to represent $W(a, b)$. Then we draw empty edges for the basis elements e_0 of the corresponding spaces,

and shaded edges for the basis elements e_1 . For example, we have



Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$. Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$. We define the vector spaces

$$V(x, y) = V(x_n, y_n) \otimes V(x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}) \otimes \dots \otimes V(x_1, y_1),$$

$$W(a, b) = W(a_1, b_1) \otimes W(a_2, b_2) \otimes \dots \otimes W(a_m, b_m)$$


which represents the space of rows/columns in the six vertex model. Note that when x and y (or a and b) are single variables, the definition reduces to the single row/column space.

We define the row operator

$$T(x, y; a_1, \dots, a_m; b_1, \dots, b_m) = T(x, y; a_1, b_1)T(x, y; a_2, b_2) \dots T(x, y; a_m, b_m).$$

from $V(x, y) \otimes W(a_1, \dots, a_m; b_1, \dots, b_m)$ to $W(a_1, \dots, a_m; b_1, \dots, b_m) \otimes V(x, y)$. Here we mean that every operator $T(x, y; a_i, b_i)$ transposes $V(x, y)$ with $W(a_i, b_i)$ and acts by identity elsewhere.

Graphically, we can represent the row operator as a row in a rectangular lattice consisting of the vertex operators:




Naturally, several rows stacked together form an operator

$$T(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n; a_1, \dots, a_m; b_1, \dots, b_m)$$

from $V(x, y) \otimes W(a, b)$ to $W(a, b) \otimes V(x, y)$ which is the six vertex operator.

Graphically, we represent the six vertex operator as the rectangular lattice with rows labeled by $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$ and columns labeled by $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_m, b_m)$.



Now, if we apply the six vertex operator to the basis vectors of the vector space $V(x, y) \otimes W(a, b)$, we can represent the action of each state graphically as a system of paths traveling from the top left corner to the bottom right corner of the rectangular lattice. In this way, we have recovered the combinatorial definition of the six vertex model. In particular, the partition functions of the model are given by the matrix coefficients of the six vertex operator, where the boundary conditions correspond to the basis elements of the vector space.

One way to study the six vertex operator is to decompose it into a composition of so-called row transfer operators acting on the column space. There are four different types of row transfer operators, depending on the boundary conditions of a given row. Since the row operators depend on the parameters x and y , while a and b are constant, we usually omit the parameters a and b from the notation.

We define the row transfer operators

$$A(x, y), B(x, y), C(x, y), D(x, y): W(a; b) \rightarrow W(a; b).$$

We define these operators by their matrix coefficients:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v|A(x, y; a, b)|w \rangle &= \langle e_0 \otimes v|T(x, y; a, b)|w \otimes e_0 \rangle, \\ \langle v|B(x, y; a, b)|w \rangle &= \langle e_1 \otimes v|T(x, y; a, b)|w \otimes e_0 \rangle, \\ \langle v|C(x, y; a, b)|w \rangle &= \langle e_1 \otimes v|T(x, y; a, b)|w \otimes e_0 \rangle, \\ \langle v|D(x, y; a, b)|w \rangle &= \langle e_1 \otimes v|T(x, y; a, b)|w \otimes e_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Graphically, the four row transfer operators are shown in Figure 5.

Lemma 2.4. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v \otimes u|A(x, y; a, b) &= \langle v|A(x, y; a, b)| \otimes \langle u|A(x, y; a, b)| + \langle v|B(x, y; a, b)| \otimes \langle u|C(x, y; a, b)|, \\ \langle v \otimes u|B(x, y; a, b) &= \langle v|A(x, y; a, b)| \otimes \langle u|B(x, y; a, b)| + \langle v|B(x, y; a, b)| \otimes \langle u|D(x, y; a, b)|, \\ \langle v \otimes u|C(x, y; a, b) &= \langle v|C(x, y; a, b)| \otimes \langle u|A(x, y; a, b)| + \langle v|D(x, y; a, b)| \otimes \langle u|C(x, y; a, b)|, \\ \langle v \otimes u|D(x, y; a, b) &= \langle v|C(x, y; a, b)| \otimes \langle u|B(x, y; a, b)| + \langle v|D(x, y; a, b)| \otimes \langle u|D(x, y; a, b)|, \end{aligned}$$

where each operator acts on the corresponding column space of vectors v or u .

Proof. By definition. □

Let us connect the combinatorial definition and the row transfer operators definition on the following example.




FIGURE 5. Row transfer operators for $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$, $b = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, and $m = 8$.

Example 2.5. The operator

$$A(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) \dots A(x_n, y_n)$$

corresponds to the six vertex model

$$\mathfrak{S}((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n); (a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_m, b_m); \emptyset, \beta^t, \emptyset, \beta^b).$$

Indeed, the composition of row transfer operators of type A graphically represents the six vertex model with left and right boundary being empty. Then the matrix coefficient

$$\langle e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_m} | A(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) \dots A(x_n, y_n) | e_{j_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{j_m} \rangle$$

corresponds to the partition function

$$Z((x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n); (a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_m, b_m); \emptyset, (1_{i_k=1})_{k=1}^m, \emptyset, (1_{j_k=1})_{k=1}^m).$$

2.4. The Yang-Baxter equation and operator relations. The central tool in the theory of integrable lattice models is the Yang-Baxter equation which sets the relation for the weight functions. Thanks to these relations, the partition function satisfies various functional equations which makes it possible both to compute it and to recognize its connection to the special functions. We formulate the Yang-Baxter equation for the row transfer operators. For combinatorial description in terms of cross vertices, see Lemma 1 in [BBF11] or Figure 6 in [ABPW21].

Consider the following operators:

$$\begin{aligned} R^x(x_1, x_2; y) &: V(x_2, y_1) \otimes V(x_1, y_2) \rightarrow V(x_1, y_1) \otimes V(x_2, y_2), \\ R^y(y_1, y_2; x) &: V(x_1, y_2) \otimes V(x_2, y_1) \rightarrow V(x_1, y_1) \otimes V(x_2, y_2), \\ R^{x,y}(x_1, x_2; y) &: V(x_2, y_2) \otimes V(x_1, y_1) \rightarrow V(x_1, y_1) \otimes V(x_2, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

given in the standard bases by matrices

$$\begin{aligned} R^{x,y}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2) &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 + y_2 & & & \\ & x_2 + y_2 & y_2 - y_1 & \\ & x_1 - x_2 & x_1 + y_1 & \\ & & & x_2 + y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ R^x(x_1, x_2; y) &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 + y & & & \\ & x_2 + y & 0 & \\ & x_1 - x_2 & x_1 + y & \\ & & & x_2 + y \end{pmatrix}, \\ R^y(y_1, y_2; x) &= \begin{pmatrix} x + y_2 & & & \\ & x + y_2 & y_2 - y_1 & \\ & 0 & x + y_1 & \\ & & & x + y_1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that the six vertex $R^{x,y}$ factors into the product of two five vertex matrices:

$$R^{x,y}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2) = (x_2 + y_2)^{-1} R^x(x_1, x_2; y) R^y(y_1, y_2; x).$$

See Section 4.7 of [WZJ18] for another instance of similar factorization.

Remark 2.6. We note that by setting $y_i = -q^2 x_i$, the R -matrix $R^{x,y}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2)$ transforms into the well-known R -matrix for the standard representations of the affine quantum supergroup $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}(1|1)})$:

$$R_q(x_1, x_2) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 - q^2 x_2 & & & \\ & x_2 - q^2 x_2 & q^2(x_1 - x_2) & \\ & x_1 - x_2 & x_1 - q^2 x_1 & \\ & & & x_2 - qx_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

More generally, by setting $y_i = q_i x_i$, we obtain the R -matrix from [BBF11] up to a change of variables and a rescaling. Furthermore, it is possible to establish a connection between the R -matrix $R^{x,y}$ and the R -matrix given by weights (2.6) from [ABPW21] through a similar transformation.

Remark 2.7. The five vertex R -matrices can be written in a simple form:

$$R^x(x_1, x_2; y) = (x_2 + y)I_4 + (x_1 - x_2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 0 & 0 & \\ & 1 & 1 & \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$R^y(y_1, y_2; x) = (x + y_2)I_4 + (y_1 - y_2) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & 0 & -1 & \\ & 0 & 1 & \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The algebra generated by R_i^x and R_i^y acting on a tensor product $V(x_1, y_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes V(x_n, y_n)$ is spanned by the corresponding elements P_i and P'_i , where P_i^x and P_i^y act on the i -th and $(i + 1)$ -th sites by the matrices given in the above equations. This algebra could be seen as distant relative of the Temperley Lieb algebra for the free fermionic matrices.

Theorem 2.8 (The refined Yang-Baxter equations).

$$R^x(x_1, x_2; y_1)T(x_1, y_1; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) = T(x_2, y_1; a, b)T(x_1, y_2; a, b)R^x(x_1, x_2; y_1),$$

$$R^y(y_1, y_2; x_2)T(x_1, y_2; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) = T(x_1, y_2; a, b)T(x_2, y_1; a, b)R^y(y_1, y_2; x_2),$$

$$R^{x,y}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2)T(x_1, y_1; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) = T(x_2, y_2; a, b)T(x_1, y_1; a, b)R^{x,y}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2).$$

Proof. Direct calculation. □

We note that we provided the *refined* Yang-Baxter equation, which is a generalization of the standard Yang-Baxter equation. The standard Yang-Baxter equation, which is represented by the matrix $R^{x,y}$, simultaneously exchanges both spectral parameters x and y . In contrast, the matrices R^x and R^y exchange only one of the spectral parameters at a time. By composing these operators, we recover the standard Yang-Baxter equation.

The refined Yang-Baxter equation gives rise to refined relations for the row transfer operators, which involve only the exchange of x or y parameters. These refined relations allow us to demonstrate that the partition functions are symmetric separately in x variables and in y variables. This is a novel result that cannot be shown using the standard technique, as the standard Yang-Baxter equation simultaneously exchanges both parameters.

Furthermore, we note that the R -matrices do not depend on the parameters a and b . By repeatedly applying the Yang-Baxter equation, we can derive the Yang-Baxter equation for the entire row operators, a process known as the train argument. This technique involves moving the R -matrix through pairs of operators in a consecutive manner.

Corollary 2.9 (Train argument). *Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$. Then*

$$R^x(x_1, x_2; y_1)T(x_1, y_2; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) = T(x_2, y_1; a, b)T(x_1, y_2; a, b)R^x(x_1, x_2; y_1),$$

$$R^y(y_1, y_2; x_2)T(x_1, y_2; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) = T(x_1, y_2; a, b)T(x_2, y_1; a, b)R^y(y_1, y_2; x_2),$$

$$R^{x,y}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2)T(x_1, y_1; a, b)T(x_2, y_2; a, b) = T(x_2, y_2; a, b)T(x_1, y_1; a, b)R^{x,y}(x_1, y_1; x_2, y_2).$$

The refined Yang-Baxter equation, in conjunction with the train argument, provides relations for the row transfer operators that can be deduced by reading off the matrix coefficients of the Yang-Baxter equation for the row operators.

Proposition 2.10 (Operator relations). *The operators A, B, C, D satisfy relations.*

(1) *The cancellation property:*

$$A(t, -t) = 1, \quad D(t, -t) = 1.$$

(2) *The separate symmetry in x 's and y 's for operators A and D :*

$$\begin{aligned} A(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) &= A(x_2, y_1)A(x_1, y_2), \\ A(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) &= A(x_1; y_2)A(x_2, y_1), \\ D(x_1, y_1)D(x_2, y_2) &= D(x_2, y_1)D(x_1, y_2), \\ D(x_1, y_1)D(x_2, y_2) &= D(x_1; y_2)D(x_2, y_1), \end{aligned}$$

(3) *The partial symmetry in x 's and y 's for operators B and C :*

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1 + y_1)B(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_1)B(x_2; y_1)B(x_1, y_2), \\ (x_2 + y_2)B(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_1)B(x_1; y_2)B(x_2, y_1), \\ (x_2 + y_1)C(x_1, y_1)C(x_2, y_2) &= (x_1 + y_1)C(x_2; y_1)C(x_1, y_2), \\ (x_2 + y_1)C(x_1, y_1)C(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_2)C(x_1; y_2)C(x_2, y_1). \end{aligned}$$

(4) *The partial symmetry in x 's and y 's between operators B, C :*

$$\begin{aligned} (x_2 + y_1)B(x_1, y_1)C(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_2)B(x_1, y_2)C(x_2, y_1), \\ (x_2 + y_1)C(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2) &= (x_1 + y_1)C(x_2, y_1)B(x_1, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

(5) *The relations between $A, B, A, C, D, B,$ and D, C :*

$$\begin{aligned} (x_2 - x_1)A(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_1)B(x_2, y_1)A(x_1, y_2) - (x_1 + y_1)B(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2), \\ (y_1 - y_2)B(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_1)A(x_1, y_2)B(x_2, y_1) - (x_2 + y_2)A(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2), \\ (x_1 - x_2)C(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) &= (x_1 + y_1)(A(x_2, y_1)C(x_1, y_2) - A(x_1, y_1)C(x_2, y_2)), \\ (y_1 - y_2)A(x_1, y_1)C(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_2)(C(x_1, y_2)A(x_2, y_1) - C(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2)). \end{aligned}$$

(6) *The relations between $A, D, D, A, B, C,$ and C, B :*

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1 + y_1)A(x_1, y_1)D(x_2, y_2) + (x_1 - x_2)C(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2) &= (x_1 + y_1)A(x_2, y_1)D(x_1, y_2), \\ (x_2 + y_1)A(x_1, y_1)D(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_1)A(x_1, y_2)D(x_2, y_1) + (y_2 - y_1)B(x_1, y_2)C(x_2, y_1), \\ (x_2 + y_1)D(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_1)D(x_2, y_1)A(x_1, y_2) + (x_1 - x_2)C(x_2, y_1)B(x_1, y_2), \\ (x_2 + y_2)D(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) + (y_2 - y_1)B(x_1, y_1)C(x_2, y_2) &= (x_2 + y_2)D(x_1, y_2)A(x_2, y_1). \end{aligned}$$

(7) *Finally, the relations between A, B, C, D :*

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1 + y_1)B(x_1, y_1)C(x_2, y_2) + (x_1 - x_2)D(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) &= \\ &= (x_2 + y_1)B(x_2, y_1)C(x_1, y_2) + (x_1 - x_2)A(x_2, y_1)D(x_1, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (x_2 + y_2)C(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2) + (y_2 - y_1)A(x_1, y_1)D(x_2, y_2) &= \\ &= (x_2 + y_1)C(x_1, y_2)B(x_2, y_1) + (y_2 - y_1)D(x_1, y_2)A(x_2, y_1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Direct calculation using the Yang-Baxter equations and the train argument. \square

Remark 2.11. We note that these operator relations refine the relations given in Proposition 2.4 of [ABPW21] or Corollary 4.3 of [Kor21]. Specifically, since the R -matrix $R^{x,y}$ is the product of two five vertex matrices R^x and R^y , these relations imply all relations that arise from the classical Yang-Baxter equation.

The refined Yang-Baxter equation also gives rise to new operator relations that cannot be identified using the standard Yang-Baxter equation alone. For example, the fourth group of operator relations involving the partial symmetry for operators B and C is a new relation that cannot be derived from the standard R -matrix, as each side would yield two terms, resulting in a relation involving four terms in total.

The row transfer operators A, B, C, D and the relations between them form the *Yang-Baxter algebra* on $W(a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_m)$. This algebra has a rich structure that can be exploited to solve the six vertex model. In particular, the algebraic Bethe ansatz is a powerful technique for finding explicit expressions for the matrix coefficients of the row transfer operators in terms of solutions to the Bethe equations. These solutions can then be used to compute the partition function and correlation functions of the six vertex model.

2.5. Partition functions. In this section, we show how to apply the combinatorial definition, the LGV lemma, the refined Yang-Baxter equation, and the resulting operator relations to compute exactly the partition functions with various boundary conditions.

In the following result, we consider the row transfer operators, and say that they satisfy certain properties if all of their matrix coefficients also satisfy those properties. We proceed to establish further properties of these operators.

Lemma 2.12. *We have the following properties.*

- (1) *The operators B and C have a pre-factor:*
 - (a) $B(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2) \dots B(x_n, y_n)$ is divisible by $\prod_{i < j} (x_j + y_i)$
 - (b) $C(x_1, y_1)C(x_2, y_2) \dots C(x_n, y_n)$ is divisible by $\prod_{i < j} (x_i + y_j)$
- (2) *The operators have a separate symmetry in x 's and y 's:*
 - (a) $A(x_1, y_1)A(x_2, y_2) \dots A(x_n, y_n)$ is symmetric separately in x 's and in y 's,
 - (b) $D(x_1, y_1)D(x_2, y_2) \dots D(x_n, y_n)$ is symmetric separately in x 's and in y 's,
 - (c) $B(x_1, y_1) \dots B(x_n, y_n) / \prod_{i < j} (x_j + y_i)$ is symmetric separately in x 's and in y 's
 - (d) $C(x_1, y_1) \dots C(x_n, y_n) / \prod_{i < j} (x_i + y_j)$ is symmetric separately in x 's and in y 's

Proof. The partial symmetry follows directly from the operator relations. For the pre-factor, we note that all matrix coefficients are the elements of the ring

$$\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n; a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_m],$$

which is a unique factorization domain.

For statement 1, we use the operator relations established in Proposition 2.10 to show that the matrix coefficients of $B(x_1, y_1)B(x_2, y_2) \dots B(x_n, y_n)$ are divisible by $(x_j + y_i)$ for each $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. Since all of these polynomials are co-prime, it follows that the operator is divisible by the product $\prod_{i < j} (x_j + y_i)$. Statement for the operators C can be shown using similar reasoning. \square

In the following proposition, we present an explicit computation of the partition function of certain operators. We utilize the method described in [BBF11] to factorize the partition




FIGURE 6. The domain wall boundary conditions and a typical state in the model.

function and demonstrate that the resulting ratio is independent of a certain set of variables. We then evaluate the ratio under a particular specialization.

Let $e(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r)$ denote $e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_m}$ with $i_k = 1$ only when $k \in \{k_1, \dots, k_r\}$.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ be with $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots > \alpha_n > 0$. Then*

$$\langle e(\alpha) | B(x_1, y_1) B(x_2, y_2) \dots B(x_n, y_n) | e(\emptyset) \rangle = \prod_{i < j} \frac{x_j + y_i}{x_j - x_i} \det(c_{\alpha_i}(x_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n},$$

$$\langle e(\emptyset) | C(x_1, y_1) C(x_2, y_2) \dots C(x_n, y_n) | e(\alpha) \rangle = \prod_{i < j} \frac{x_j + y_i}{x_j - x_i} \det(c_{\alpha_i}(x_j))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n},$$

where $c_k(x) = (1 - a_k b_k) \prod_{j=k+1}^m (1 - b_j x) \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} (x - a_j)$.

Proof. By previous lemma, we know that the partition function is divisible by the product $\prod_{i < j} (x_j + y_i)$. Counting the degrees of y_i 's, we conclude that the ratio is independent on y 's. Then we set $y_i = -x_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Notice that the weight $(y - a)$ becomes $-(x - a)$. By inspection, we have

$$\langle e(\alpha) | B(x, -x) | = \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^k c_{i_k}(x) \langle e(\alpha_1, \dots, \widehat{\alpha_k}, \dots, \alpha_n) |.$$

Hence, we have

$$\langle e(\alpha) | B(x_1, -x_1) \dots B(x_n, -x_n) | e(\emptyset) \rangle = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \text{sgn}(\pi) c_{\pi(1)}(x_1) c_{\pi(2)}(x_2) \dots c_{\pi(n)}(x_n),$$

which is the expansion for $\det(c_{\alpha_i}(x_j))$.

The calculations for the operators C are analogous. □

As a corollary, we get the partition function for the domain wall boundary conditions.

Corollary 2.14. *We have*

$$\langle \rho_n | B(x_1, y_1) B(x_2, y_2) \dots B(x_n, y_n) | \emptyset \rangle = \prod_{i < j} (x_j + y_i) (1 - a_i b_j),$$

$$\langle \rho_n | C(x_1, y_1) C(x_2, y_2) \dots C(x_n, y_n) | \emptyset \rangle = \prod_{i < j} (x_i + y_j) (1 - a_i b_j).$$

Proof. By the previous proposition, we only need to compute the determinant $\det(c_i(x_j))$. The determinant can be computed either by induction or by condensation method. □

2.6. The six vertex model on infinite strip. In this section, we extend the definition of the six vertex model to the infinite strip with column labels parametrized by all integers. To motivate the discussion, we consider the limit situation of some of the relations arising from the operator relations in Proposition 2.10.

We begin by defining the following notation:

$$(x|a)^r = \prod_{i=1}^r (x - a_i), \quad (x; a)^r = \prod_{i=1}^r (1 - a_i x).$$

With this notation, we can state the following lemma:

Lemma 2.15. *The following identities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} (z - x) \langle e_0^{\otimes m} | C(x, y) B(z, w) | e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle &= (x + y) ((x|b)^m (z; a)^m - (z; b)^m (x|a)^m), \\ (y - w) \langle e_1^{\otimes m} | B(x, y) C(z, w) | e_1^{\otimes m} \rangle &= (z + w) ((y|a)^m (w; b)^m - (w|a)^m (y; b)^m). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first identity can be obtained by applying $\langle e_0^m | \cdot | e_0^m \rangle$ to the first relation in group (6) from the operator relations. The second identity can be obtained by applying $\langle e_1^m | \cdot | e_1^m \rangle$ to the fourth relation in group (6) in the operator relations. \square

As an application, we generalize the formula for the sum of a finite geometric progression.

Corollary 2.16. *The following identity holds:*

$$(2.3) \quad \sum_{k=1}^m (1 - a_k b_k) (x|a)^{k-1} (z; b)^{k-1} \frac{(x; b)^m (z|a)^m}{(x; b)^k (z|a)^k} = \frac{(x; b)^m (z|b)^m - (x|a)^m (z; b)^m}{z - x}.$$

Proof. We use the first identity in the previous lemma and the explicit calculation

$$\langle e_0^{\otimes m} | C(x, y) B(z, w) | e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle = (x + y) \sum_{k=1}^m (1 - a_k b_k) (x|a)^{k-1} (z; b)^{k-1} \frac{(x; b)^m (z|a)^m}{(x; b)^k (z|a)^k}.$$

Now divide both sides of the previous corollary by $x + y$. \square

If we set $a = b = 0$, we get the standard geometric progression:

$$\sum_{k=1}^m x^{k-1} z^{m-k} = \frac{z^m - x^m}{z - x}.$$

We will use the example of the geometric progression to demonstrate how we will handle limits in this paper. By dividing both sides of equation Equation (2.3) by $(x; b)^m (z|b)^m$, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^m (1 - a_k b_k) \frac{(x|a)^{k-1} (z; b)^{k-1}}{(x; b)^k (z|a)^k} = \frac{1 - \frac{(x|a)^m (z; b)^m}{(x; b)^m (z|a)^m}}{z - x}.$$

To ensure the convergence of the above equation, we make the following assumption.

Assumption 2.17. Let $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of complex numbers, and let $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$. We write $\Theta_{a,b}(x, y)$ to denote the assumption that

$$\left| \frac{(x|a)^m (z; b)^m}{(x; b)^m (z|a)^m} \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad m \rightarrow +\infty.$$

If all terms in the product are non-zero, the assumption holds if and only if for infinitely many $j = 1, 2, \dots$, we have

$$\left| \frac{x - a_j}{1 - b_j x} \frac{1 - b_j z}{z - a_j} \right| < 1 - \epsilon,$$

where ϵ is a positive constant strictly less than one.

Under assumption $\Theta_{a,b}(x, z)$, we can conclude that the generalization of the formula for the sum of an infinite geometric progression is given by

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - a_k b_k) \frac{(x|a)^{k-1}}{(x; b)^k} \frac{(z; b)^{k-1}}{(z|a)^k} = \frac{1}{z - x}.$$

We reformulate the results in terms of the matrix coefficients:

Lemma 2.18.

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\langle e_0^{\otimes m} | C(x, y) B(z, w) | e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle}{(x; b)^m (z|b)^m} &= \frac{x + y}{z - w}, \quad \text{under } \Theta_{a,b}(x, z), \\ \lim_{m \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\langle e_1^{\otimes m} | B(x, y) C(z, w) | e_1^{\otimes m} \rangle}{(y|a)^m (w; b)^m} &= \frac{z + w}{y - w}, \quad \text{under } \Theta_{a,b}(y, w). \end{aligned}$$

Now we are ready to give the definition of the six vertex model on the infinite two-sided strip. Let $a = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $b = (b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be two doubly infinite sequences.

Let $W(a, b) = \bigotimes_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} W(a_k, b_k)$. Let \mathcal{W} be a subspace of $W(a, b)$ spanned by basis vectors $\bigotimes_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e_{i_k}$ such that $i_k = 0$ for all large enough $k \gg 0$, and $i_k = 1$ for all large enough $k \ll 0$.

It will be convenient to define the following notation. For a sequence $a = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, we write the dual sequence $a' = (-a_{-i+1})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. We also sometimes write $i' = -i + 1$ for indices of a sequence. Hence, $a_{i'} = a_{-i+1}$.

More formally, let $a^m = (a_{-m+1}, \dots, a_m)$ and $b^m = (b_{-m+1}, \dots, b_m)$. Then consider the embedding maps $i_m: W(a^m, b^m) \rightarrow W(a^{m+1}, b^{m+1})$ given by $i_m(v) = e_1 \otimes v \otimes e_0$. Then $(W(a^m, b^m), i_m)$ form an inverse system, and then \mathcal{W} is the inverse limit $\mathcal{W} = \varprojlim_m (W_m, i_m)$. For a vector $v \in \mathcal{W}$, let v^m be the projection on $W(a^m, b^m)$.

We define the row transfer operators on \mathcal{W} :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(x, y) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{A^m(x, y)}{(x; b)^m (y; b')^m}, \\ \mathcal{B}(x, y) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B^m(x, y)}{(y; b')^m (x|a)^m}, \\ \mathcal{C}(x, y) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C^m(x, y)}{(y|a')^m (x; b)^m}, \\ \mathcal{D}(x, y) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D^m(x, y)}{(y|a')^m (x|a)^m}, \end{aligned}$$

where $T^m(x, y)$ stands for an operator on $W(a^m, b^m)$.

Graphically, we extend the definition of the six vertex model to the situation with infinitely many columns with labels extending in both sides. We normalize the weights such that the types of vertices that happen infinitely often have weight 1. Then the partition function is well-defined. See Figure 7 for the four different normalizations of weights used for operators $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$. For example, a row of operator \mathcal{A} looks like this:





FIGURE 7. Four types of vertices together with their weights. The thick line represents the presence of a path, and thin line represents the absence.



Thanks to normalization, for any $v, u \in \mathcal{W}$, the sequence

$$\frac{\langle v^m | A^m(x, y) | u^m \rangle}{(x; b)^m (y; b')^m}$$

stabilizes, hence, the limit is well-defined. The same holds for the other operators. Hence, the new operators inherit some of the properties from the finite case.

Lemma 2.19. *We have*

- (1) *The cancellation property: $\mathcal{A}(t, -t) = 1$ and $\mathcal{D}(t, -t) = 1$,*
- (2) *The separate symmetry in x 's and y 's:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(x_1, y_1) \mathcal{A}(x_2; y_2) &= \mathcal{A}(x_2, y_1) \mathcal{A}(x_1, y_2), \\ \mathcal{A}(x_1, y_1) \mathcal{A}(x_2; y_2) &= \mathcal{A}(x_1; y_2) \mathcal{A}(x_2, y_1), \\ \mathcal{D}(x_1, y_1) \mathcal{D}(x_2; y_2) &= \mathcal{D}(x_2, y_1) \mathcal{D}(x_1, y_2), \\ \mathcal{D}(x_1, y_1) \mathcal{D}(x_2; y_2) &= \mathcal{D}(x_1; y_2) \mathcal{D}(x_2, y_1), \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since the sequence stabilizes, it follows from the finite case in Proposition 2.10. \square

Under certain assumptions on weights of the form Assumption 2.17, the operator relations simplify in the limit. See the detailed discussion of the similar simplified relations in Section 7 of [ABPW21]. We do not write the full list of simplified relations here. However, we note that there could be new relations coming from the refined Yang-Baxter equation.

We will need only the following crucial relation between operators \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{D} .

Proposition 2.20. *Under assumptions $\Theta_{a,b}(x, z)$ and $\Theta_{a',b'}(y, w)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{A}(x, y)\mathcal{D}(z, w) = \frac{z+y}{x-z} \frac{x+w}{y-w} \mathcal{D}(z, w)\mathcal{A}(x, y).$$

Proof. Let $v, u \in W(a^k, b^k)$. For $m = 1, 2, \dots$, let $M = k + m$. Solving a system of equations from Proposition 2.10, we find the following relation:

$$(z+y)(x+w)Q_m = (x-z)(y-w)Q'_m + (x+y)(y-w)Q''_m + (z+w)(y-w)Q'''_m + (x+y)(z+w)Q''''_m,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_m &= \frac{\langle e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes v \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} | D(z, w)A(x, y) | e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes u \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle}{(y; b')^M (x; b)^M (w|a')^M (z|a)^M}, \\ Q'_m &= \frac{\langle e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes v \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} | A(x, y)D(z, w) | e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes u \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle}{(y; b')^M (x; b)^M (w|a')^M (z|a)^M}, \\ Q''_m &= \frac{\langle e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes v \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} | B(x, y)C(z, w) | e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes u \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle}{(y; b')^M (x; b)^M (w|a')^M (z|a)^M}, \\ Q'''_m &= \frac{\langle e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes v \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} | C(x, y)B(z, w) | e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes u \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle}{(y; b')^M (x; b)^M (w|a')^M (z|a)^M}, \\ Q''''_m &= \frac{\langle e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes v \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} | D(x, y)A(z, w) | e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes u \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle}{(y; b')^M (x; b)^M (w|a')^M (z|a)^M}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_m &\rightarrow \langle v | \mathcal{D}(z, w)\mathcal{A}(x, y) | u \rangle, \quad m \rightarrow +\infty, \\ Q'_m &\rightarrow \langle v | \mathcal{A}(x, y)\mathcal{D}(z, w) | u \rangle, \quad m \rightarrow +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

By inspection, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q''_m &= \frac{(x|\tau^k a)^m (z; \tau^k b)^m}{(x; \tau^k b)^m (z|\tau^k a)^m} \langle e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes v | B(x, y)C(z, w) | e_1^{\otimes m} \otimes u \rangle, \\ Q'''_m &= \frac{(y|(\tau^k a)')^m (w; (\tau^k b)')^m}{(y; (\tau^k b)')^m (w|(\tau^k a)')^m} \langle v \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} | C(x, y)B(z, w) | u \otimes e_0^{\otimes m} \rangle, \\ Q''''_m &= \frac{(y|(\tau^k a)')^m (w; (\tau^k b)')^m (x|\tau^k a)^m (z; \tau^k b)^m}{(y; (\tau^k b)')^m (w|(\tau^k a)')^m (x; \tau^k b)^m (z|\tau^k a)^m} \langle v | D(x, y)A(z, w) | u \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since by assumption, the prefactor in each case goes to zero, it is enough to show that the matrix coefficients is bounded. For Q''''_m is it clear. For Q''_m and Q'''_m , applying Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.18, we see that each term is the sum of a bounded term times a convergent geometric progression. Hence, Q''_m, Q'''_m, Q''''_m go to zero as m goes to infinity. \square




FIGURE 8. A typical ribbon in the row transfer operator.

3. PARTITIONS, MAYA DIAGRAMS, AND RIBBONS

In the previous section, we defined the space $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}(a, b)$ spanned by a natural basis parametrized by what are commonly referred to as *Maya diagrams*. A Maya diagram $\sigma = (i_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is an element of $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that there exist numbers n, n' such that $i_k = 1$ for all $k < n$ and $i_k = 0$ for all $k > n'$. In other words, $i_k = 1$ for all large enough negative integers, and $i_k = 0$ for all large enough positive integers. The corresponding basis element for a given Maya diagram is given by the expression $(e_{\sigma_k})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$ be a partition, that is, an n -tuple of non-negative integers such that $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$. For an integer $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a partition λ , we define the corresponding Maya diagram by $(i_k)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ with $i_k = 1$ if $k \in \{\lambda_i - i + 1 + c\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, and zero otherwise. We denote the corresponding basis element by $\sigma_c(\lambda)$ or $\langle \lambda; c \rangle$. We also denote $\sigma(\lambda) = \sigma_0(\lambda)$ and $\langle \lambda \rangle = \langle \lambda; c \rangle$. It is not hard to see that these elements parametrize all basis vectors, and thus we can decompose the space $\mathcal{W} = \bigoplus_{c \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{W}_c$, where each \mathcal{W}_c is spanned on vectors $\sigma_c(\lambda)$. The integer c is sometimes called the “charge” or “level”.

Let ν be a skew diagram containing no 2×2 block of squares. Such a diagram is called a “ribbon” or a “skew hook” if it is connected. A skew diagram with no 2×2 blocks of squares is a disjoint union of ribbons. We describe the ribbon in terms of the corresponding Maya diagrams, with charge zero.

Let λ/μ be the skew partition. Let $(i_0; i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k; i_{k+1})$ with $i_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $i_0 \in \sigma(\mu) \setminus \sigma(\lambda)$, $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \sigma(\lambda) \cap \sigma(\mu)$, and $i_{k+1} \in \sigma(\lambda) \setminus \sigma(\mu)$. It is not hard to see that such a tuple corresponds exactly to a ribbon in λ/μ . We denote by $\text{Rib}(\lambda/\mu)$ the set of all ribbons in λ/μ .

In the previous section, we defined operators on \mathcal{W} . They can be seen as $\mathcal{A}: \mathcal{W}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_c$, $\mathcal{B}: \mathcal{W}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{c+1}$, $\mathcal{C}: \mathcal{W}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_{c-1}$, and $\mathcal{D}: \mathcal{W}_c \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_c$. We will focus on the operators \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{D} , and for convenience, we will work in charge zero.

We now show that the row operators \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{D} have a natural description in terms of ribbons. More generally, the entire Yang-Baxter algebra generated by the row transfer operators could be described in terms of ribbons. See Section 4.3 of [Kor21] for reference.

We compute explicitly the following values which describe the action of the operators on the basis elements:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\lambda/\mu; a, b}(x, y) &:= \langle \mu | \mathcal{A}(x, y) | \lambda \rangle, \\ \widehat{f}_{\lambda/\mu; a, b}(x, y) &:= \langle \lambda | \mathcal{D}(x, y) | \mu \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1. *We have*

$$f_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) = \gamma_{\mu;b}(x, y) \prod_{r \in R(\lambda/\mu)} \text{wt}_{r;a,b}(x, y),$$

$$\widehat{f}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) = \gamma_{\mu;b}(x, y) \prod_{r \in R(\lambda/\mu)} \widehat{\text{wt}}_{r;a,b}(x, y),$$

where

$$\gamma_{\lambda;b}(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 + b_{\lambda-i+1}y}{1 + b_{-i+1}y} \frac{1 - b_{i-\lambda_i}x}{1 - b_i x},$$

$$\text{wt}_{r;a,b}(x, y) = \frac{1 - a_{i_0}b_{i_0}}{1 + b_{i_0}y} \frac{x + y}{1 - b_{i_{k+1}}x} \prod_{k=i_0+1}^{i_{k+1}-1} \begin{cases} (y + a_j)/(1 + b_j y), & \text{if } j \in \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}, \\ (x - a_j)/(1 - b_j x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$\widehat{\text{wt}}_{r;a,b}(x, y) = \frac{1 - a_{i_{k+1}}b_{i_{k+1}}}{1 + b_{i_0}y} \frac{x + y}{1 - b_{i_{k+1}}x} \prod_{k=i_0+1}^{i_{k+1}-1} \begin{cases} (1 + b_j y)/(y + a_j), & \text{if } j \in \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}, \\ (1 - b_j x)/(x - a_j), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By inspection, the row transfer operator of type \mathcal{A} consists of the ribbons as illustrated in Figure 8. Then function $\gamma_{\lambda;b}$ renormalizes the weights such that vertices of type b_1 do not contribute. Then the ribbon weight functions $\text{wt}_{r;a,b}$ and $\widehat{\text{wt}}_{r;a,b}$ give the explicit weight of a ribbon. Since the row transfer operator is the product over all such ribbons, the result follows. The operator \mathcal{D} is treated in a similar manner. \square

The formula become particularly simple in the case of the simplest ribbon. Recall that a *hook* is a partition of the form $(p+1, 1^q)$ for $p, q \geq 0$. In Frobenius notation, a hook has the form $(p|q)$.

Corollary 3.2. *We have $f_{\lambda;a,b} = \widehat{f}_{\lambda;a,b} = 0$ unless λ is a hook. Moreover,*

$$f_{(p|q);a,b}(x, y) = \frac{(1 - a_{(q+1)'}b_{(q+1)'}) (x + y) (x|a)^p (y|a')^q}{(1 + b_{(q+1)'}y)(1 - b_{(p+1)}x) (x;b)^p (y;b')^q},$$

$$\widehat{f}_{(p|q);a,b}(z, w) = \frac{(1 - a_{(p+1)}b_{(p+1)}) (z + w) (z;b)^p (w;b')^q}{(1 + a_{(q+1)'}w)(1 - a_{(p+1)}z) (z|a)^p (w|a')^q}.$$

4. FREE FERMIONIC SCHUR FUNCTIONS

In this section, we introduce a new family of Schur functions, defined as the partition functions of the six vertex model with weights as specified in equation (2.1). These functions are defined using the row transfer operator approach and will be shown to generalize and unify existing families of Schur functions.

Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$, $a = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, and $b = (b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. We define the free *fermionic Schur functions* $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y)$ and the *dual free fermionic Schur functions* $\widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y)$ as follows:

$$s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) = \langle \mu | \mathcal{A}(x_1, y_1) \dots \mathcal{A}(x_n, y_n) | \lambda \rangle,$$

$$\widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) = \langle \lambda | \mathcal{D}(x_1^{-1}, y_1^{-1}) \dots \mathcal{D}(x_n^{-1}, y_n^{-1}) | \mu \rangle.$$

We will now demonstrate various familiar properties for the new Schur functions $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}$ that generalize the well-known properties of Schur functions. We remark the the Schur functions are related to $G_{\lambda/\mu}$ functions from [ABPW21] by reparametrization of the weights.

A function $f(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is said to be supersymmetric if it is symmetric in variables x and y , and satisfies the cancellation property:

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, t; y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}, -t) = f(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}; y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}).$$

Proposition 4.1. *The functions $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y)$ and $\widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y)$ are supersymmetric.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2.19. □

Remark 4.2. It is important to note that the above proof relies on the refined Yang-Baxter equation. The standard Yang-Baxter equation would only allow for the demonstration that the partition functions are symmetric under simultaneous permutation of variables x and y , as seen in Lemma 4 of [BBF11] or Proposition 3.5 of [ABPW21].

Thanks to the cancellation property, we can define the free fermionic Schur functions in $\infty + \infty$ variables $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$ such that if $y_k = -x_k$ for all $k > n$, then

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n), \\ \widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in the following discussion, we will not specify the number of variables unless it is necessary for the argument at hand.

Proposition 4.3 (Branching rules). *The following relations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \sum_{\mu \subseteq \nu \subseteq \lambda} s_{\nu/\mu;a,b}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) f_{\lambda/\nu;a,b}(x_n, y_n), \\ \widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \sum_{\mu \subseteq \nu \subseteq \lambda} \widehat{s}_{\nu/\mu;a,b}(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \widehat{f}_{\lambda/\nu;a,b}(x_n, y_n), \end{aligned}$$

where the branching weights $f_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}$ and $\widehat{f}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}$ are defined in Lemma 3.1.

Proof. It follows from the definition and Lemma 3.1. □

We give a combinatorial formula in terms of ribbons, generalizing (4.5) in [ORV03].

Corollary 4.4 (Combinatorial ribbon formula). *The following relations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \sum_{\mu = \nu_0 \subset \nu_1 \subset \dots \subset \nu_n = \lambda} f_{\nu_1/\nu_0}(x_1, y_1) \dots f_{\nu_n/\nu_{n-1}}(x_n, y_n), \\ \widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \sum_{\mu = \nu_0 \subset \nu_1 \subset \dots \subset \nu_n = \lambda} \widehat{f}_{\nu_1/\nu_0}(x_1, y_1) \dots \widehat{f}_{\nu_n/\nu_{n-1}}(x_n, y_n). \end{aligned}$$

where ν_k/ν_{k-1} contains no 2×2 block of squares for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Proof. The above relations follow from the successive use of the branching rules, which separates one variable at a time. Additionally, by Lemma 3.1, we know that $f_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x_i, y_i)$ and $\widehat{f}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x_i, y_i)$ are zero unless λ/μ is a ribbon. □

In the following results, we will use the notation from Assumption 2.17 and assume that $\Theta_{a,b}(x_i, z_j)$ and $\Theta_{a',b'}(y_i, w_j)$ for all $i, j = 1, 2, \dots$. We give a generalization of the skew Cauchy identity. In terms of partition functions of the six vertex model, this result is the generalization of Proposition 3.7 in [ABPW21].

Proposition 4.5 (Skew Cauchy Identity). *We have the following identity:*

$$\sum_{\lambda} s_{\lambda/\mu; a, b}(x, y) \widehat{s}_{\lambda/\nu; a, b}(z, w) = \prod_{i, j} \frac{1 + y_i z_j}{1 - x_i z_j} \frac{1 + x_i w_j}{1 - y_i w_j} \sum_{\rho} \widehat{s}_{\mu/\rho; a, b}(z, w) s_{\nu/\rho; a, b}(x, y).$$

Proof. This identity can be derived by repeated application of Lemma 2.20. \square

The following special case generalizes Theorem 3.4 in [Mol09].

Corollary 4.6.

$$\prod_{i, j} \frac{1 + y_i z_j}{1 - x_i z_j} \frac{1 + x_i w_j}{1 - y_i w_j} s_{\nu; a, b}(x, y) = \sum_{\nu \subset \lambda} s_{\lambda; a, b}(x, y) \widehat{s}_{\lambda/\nu; a, b}(z, w),$$

$$\prod_{i, j} \frac{1 + y_i z_j}{1 - x_i z_j} \frac{1 + x_i w_j}{1 - y_i w_j} \widehat{s}_{\mu; a, b}(z, w) = \sum_{\mu \subset \lambda} \widehat{s}_{\lambda; a, b}(z, w) s_{\lambda/\mu; a, b}(x, y).$$

Proof. Set $\mu = \emptyset$ or $\nu = \emptyset$ in the skew Cauchy identity. \square

We now prove one of our main results, the Cauchy identity in the form of Berele-Regev [BR87]. We remark that the right-hand side of the identity is independent of the parameters $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $(b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. This identity degenerates to Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.2 from [Mol09].

Theorem 4.7 (Cauchy Identity). *We have the following identity:*

$$\sum_{\lambda} s_{\lambda; a, b}(x, y) \widehat{s}_{\lambda; a, b}(z, w) = \prod_{i, j} \frac{1 + y_i z_j}{1 - x_i z_j} \frac{1 + x_i w_j}{1 - y_i w_j}.$$

Proof. Setting $\mu = \nu = \emptyset$ in Proposition 4.5 yields the desired identity. \square

We use the Cauchy identity to give the generating series for the hook Schur functions $s_{(p|q); a, b}$. This result generalizes Proposition 7.1 from [ORV03].

Recall that we defined

$$(x|a)^r = (x - a_1)(x - a_2) \dots (x - a_r),$$

$$(x; a)^r = (1 - a_1 x)(1 - a_2 x) \dots (1 - a_r x).$$

For a sequence $a = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, let $a' = (-a_{-i+1})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be the dual sequence.

Corollary 4.8 (Generating series for hook functions).

$$1 + (z + w) \sum_{p, q=0}^{\infty} s_{(p|q); a, b}(x, y) (1 - a_{p+1} b_{p+1}) \frac{(z|b)^p}{(z; a)^{p+1}} \frac{(w|b')^q}{(w; a')^{q+1}} = \prod_i \frac{1 + y_i z}{1 - x_i z} \frac{1 + x_i w}{1 - y_i w},$$

$$1 + (x + y) \sum_{p, q=0}^{\infty} \widehat{s}_{(p|q); a, b}(z, w) (1 - a_{(q+1)'} b_{(q+1)'}) \frac{(x|a)^p}{(x; b)^{p+1}} \frac{(y|a')^q}{(y; b')^{q+1}} = \prod_i \frac{1 + z_j y}{1 - z_j x} \frac{1 + w_j x}{1 - w_j y}.$$

Proof. Let z, w or x, y be single variables in the Cauchy identity, then use the explicit formula for the hook Schur functions from Corollary 3.2. \square

Let $(x, z|a, b)^r$ be defined by

$$(x, z|a, b)^r = (1 - a_{r+1}b_{r+1}) \frac{(x|a)^r}{(x; b)^{r+1}} \frac{(z|b)^r}{(z; a)^{r+1}}.$$

As a special case, we get the following identity:

Corollary 4.9.

$$1 + (x + y)(z + w) \sum_{p, q=0}^{\infty} (x, z|a, b)^p (y, w|a', b')^q = \frac{1 + yz}{1 - xz} \frac{1 + xw}{1 - yw}.$$

Proof. Set x, y to be single variables in the generating series for hook functions. □

Let $h_{p+1; a, b} = s_{(p|0); a, b} = s_{(p+1); a, b}$ and $\widehat{h}_{p+1; a, b} = \widehat{s}_{(p|0); a, b} = \widehat{s}_{(p+1); a, b}$ be the complete symmetric functions, and $e_{q+1; a, b} = s_{(0|q); a, b} = s_{(1^q+1); a, b}$ and $\widehat{e}_{q+1; a, b} = \widehat{s}_{(0|q); a, b} = \widehat{s}_{(1^q+1); a, b}$ be the elementary symmetric functions. We define $h_{0; a, b} = \widehat{h}_{0; a, b} = e_{0; a, b} = \widehat{e}_{0; a, b} = 1$.

Let τ^r be an operator that acts on sequences $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$ by shifting the indices by $\tau^r(a_i) = (a_{i+r})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. We also write $\tau^r s_{\lambda/\mu; a, b}$ for $s_{\lambda/\mu; \tau^r a, \tau^r b}$.

Corollary 4.10 (Generating series for complete and elementary functions).

$$(4.1) \quad 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} h_{k; a, b}(x, y) \frac{1 - a_k b_k}{1 - a_0 b_0} \frac{(z|\tau^{-1}b)^k}{(z; a)^k} = \prod_i \frac{1 + y_i z}{1 - x_i z} \frac{1 - b_0 x_i}{1 + b_0 y_i},$$

$$(4.2) \quad 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e_{k; a, b}(x, y) \frac{1 - a_k b_k}{1 - a_1 b_1} \frac{(w|(\tau^{-1}b)')^k}{(w; a')^k} = \prod_i \frac{1 + x_i w}{1 - y_i w} \frac{1 + y_i b_1}{1 - x_i b_1},$$

$$(4.3) \quad 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \widehat{h}_{k; a, b}(z, w) \frac{1 - a_k b_k}{1 - a_0 b_0} \frac{(x|\tau^{-1}a)^k}{(x; b)^k} = \prod_i \frac{1 - z_j a_0}{1 - z_j x} \frac{1 + w_j x}{1 + a_0 w_j},$$

$$(4.4) \quad 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \widehat{e}_{k; a, b}(z, w) \frac{1 - a_k b_k}{1 - a_1 b_1} \frac{(y|(\tau^{-1}a)')^k}{(y; b')^k} = \prod_i \frac{1 + z_j y}{1 - w_j y} \frac{1 + a_1 w_j}{1 - a_1 z_j}.$$

Proof. We prove the first identity by setting $w = -b_0$ in the generating series for complete homogeneous symmetric functions, as given by the first identity in Corollary 4.8. Using the property $(b_0^{-1}; b')^q = 0$ for $q > 0$, we can simplify the sum to only include $p = 0, 1, 2, \dots$

Similarly, we can obtain the other identities by setting $z = b_1$, $y = -a_0$, and $x = a_1$ in the generating series for elementary homogeneous symmetric functions and complete homogeneous symmetric functions, respectively. Then, we simplify the expressions to obtain the desired identities. □

Proposition 4.11 (Jacobi-Trudi Formula).

$$s_{\lambda/\mu; a, b} = \det \left(\tau^{\mu_j - j + 1} h_{\lambda_i - \mu_j - i + j; a, b} \right).$$

Proof. By the LGV lemma for the six vertex model (see Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\langle \mu | A(x_1, y_1) \dots A(x_n, y_n) | \lambda \rangle = \det \left(\langle e(\mu_i - i + 1) | A(x_1, y_1) \dots A(x_n, y_n) | e(\lambda_j - j + 1) \rangle \right),$$

where $e(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r)$ denote $e_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes e_{i_m}$ with $i_k = 1$ only when $k \in \{k_1, \dots, k_r\}$. Using the fact that

$$\langle e(\mu_j - j + 1) | A(x_1, y_1) \dots A(x_n, y_n) | e(\lambda_i - i + 1) \rangle = \tau^{\mu_j - j + 1} h_{\lambda_i - \mu_j - i + j}(x, y),$$

we can deduce the proposition. We have absorbed the normalization factors into the definition of $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}$. \square

As a consequence of the Jacobi-Trudi formula, the functions $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}$ can be identified with a special case of the ninth variation introduced by Macdonald in [Mac92]. Therefore, we have the following corollary. We refer to [Mac92] for notation.

Corollary 4.12 (Determinant identities). *The functions $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}$ satisfy the following determinant identities:*

(1) (*Nägelsbach-Kostka formula*)

$$s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b} = \det(\tau^{\mu_j+j-1} e_{\lambda'_i - \mu'_j - i + j; a, b}).$$

(2) (*Giambelli formula*)

$$s_{\lambda;a,b} = \det(s_{(\alpha_i|\beta_j); a, b})_{1 \leq i, j \leq d(\lambda)}.$$

(3) (*Ribbon formula*)

$$s_{\lambda;a,b} = \det(s_{[\alpha_i|\beta_j]l; a, b})_{1 \leq i, j \leq r(\lambda)}.$$

Proof. These are formal consequences of the Macdonald. These are formulas (9.6), (9.6'), (9.7), and (9.9) in [Mac92]. \square

Finally, we show that the new Schur functions generalize and unify the existing Schur functions from literature.

Corollary 4.13 (Degenerations).

- (1) $s_{\lambda/\mu;0,0}(x, 0) = s_{\lambda/\mu}(x)$: *classical Schur functions,*
- (2) $s_{\lambda/\mu;0,0}(x, y) = s_{\lambda/\mu}(x/y)$: *supersymmetric Schur functions,*
- (3) $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,0}(x, a')$ = $s_{\lambda/\mu}(x \parallel a)$: *factorial Schur functions,*
- (4) $s_{\lambda/\mu;a',0}(x, y) = s_{\lambda/\mu}(x/y \parallel a)$: *factorial supersymmetric Schur functions,*
- (5) $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,0}(x, y) = s_{\lambda/\mu;a}(x, y)$: *Frobenius-Schur functions,*
- (6) $\widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu;0,b}(x/0) = \widehat{s}_{\lambda/\mu}(x \parallel b)$: *dual Schur functions.*

Proof. The Frobenius-Schur functions and dual Schur functions satisfy the Jacobi-Trudi identity by Theorem A.6 in [ORV03] and Proposition 3.9 in [Mol09], respectively. Hence, it is enough to show that the complete homogeneous functions $h_{k;a,b}$ degenerate to the Frobenius-Schur's $h_{k;a}$ and the dual Schur's $\widehat{h}_{k;a}$. We do so by showing that the generating series degenerates to the generating series in both cases. By Corollary 4.10, when $z \mapsto z^{-1}$ and $b = 0$, the generating series for complete homogeneous functions $h_{k;a,b}$ becomes

$$1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{h_{k;a,0}}{(z - a_1)(z - a_2) \dots (z - a_k)} = \frac{z + y_i}{z - x_i},$$

which is exactly the generating series from (3.1) of [ORV03].

Similarly, when we set $a = 0$ and $w = 0$ in the generating series for complete homogeneous functions, we get

$$1 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \widehat{h}_{k;a,0}(1 - a_0 z)(1 - a_1 z) \dots (1 - a_{k-1} z) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - a_0 z}{1 - x_i z},$$

which is the generating function for the dual complete symmetric functions $\widehat{h}_k(x||b')$ from Proposition 3.8 in [Mol09].

Since the Schur functions, supersymmetric Schur functions, factorial Schur functions, and factorial supersymmetric Schur functions are all special cases of the Frobenius-Schur functions and the dual Schur functions, the result follows.

Alternatively, one can show that the complete homogeneous functions $h_{k;a,b}$ degenerate to the Frobenius-Schur functions $h_{k;a}$ and the dual Schur functions $\widehat{h}_{k;a}$ by noting that they satisfy the correct branching rules and Cauchy identities, respectively. The branching weight from Lemma 3.3 with $b = 0$ degenerates to the correct branching rules from Proposition 4.3 in [ORV03], and our Cauchy identity in Theorem 4.7 degenerates to Corollary 3.2 in [Mol09] when $b = 0$ and $w = 0$. This implies that $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,0} = s_{\lambda/\mu;a}$ and $\widehat{s}_{\lambda;a,0}(z)$ are equal to the dual Schur functions $\widehat{s}_\lambda(z||a)$. \square

4.1. Further properties. In this section, we use the properties of the six vertex model to derive additional properties of the Schur functions.

Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$, $a = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, and $b = (b_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. We define the one variable Schur functions $G_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y)$ and the dual Schur functions $\widehat{G}_{\lambda/\mu}(x)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \langle \mu | \mathcal{B}(x_1, y_1) \dots \mathcal{B}(x_n, y_n) | \lambda; n \rangle, \\ \widehat{G}_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \langle \lambda; n | \mathcal{C}(x_1, y_1) \dots \mathcal{C}(x_n, y_n) | \mu \rangle, \\ G'_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \langle \mu^c; n | \mathcal{B}(x_1, y_1) \dots \mathcal{B}(x_n, y_n) | \lambda^c \rangle, \\ \widehat{G}'_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= \langle \lambda^c; n | \mathcal{C}(x_1, y_1) \dots \mathcal{C}(x_n, y_n) | \mu^c \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The non-skew shape case allows for an explicit formula for certain functions, as stated in Proposition 2.13. Specifically, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\lambda;a,b}(x, y) &= \prod_{i < j} (x_j + y_i) g_{\lambda;a,b}(x), \\ \widehat{G}_{\lambda;a,b}(x, y) &= \prod_{i \leq j} (x_i + y_j) \widehat{g}_{\lambda;a,b}(x), \\ G'_{\lambda;a,b}(x, y) &= \prod_{i \leq j} (x_j + y_i) g'_{\lambda;a,b}(y), \\ \widehat{G}'_{\lambda;a,b}(x, y) &= \prod_{i \leq j} (x_i + y_j) \widehat{g}'_{\lambda;a,b}(x). \end{aligned}$$

where functions $g_{\lambda;a,b}$, $\widehat{g}_{\lambda;a,b}$, $g'_{\lambda;a,b}$, and $\widehat{g}'_{\lambda;a,b}$ are given by the corresponding determinants. These functions are symmetric in the variables x as can be seen from the determinant expression. These functions $g_{\lambda;a,b}$ can be seen as an analogue of the classical Schur functions $s_\lambda(x)$ with respect to the supersymmetric Schur functions $s_\lambda(x, y)$. The determinant expression is then the analogue of the Weyl formula for the Schur functions.

To further elaborate, we present the Weyl formula for $g_{\lambda;a,b}(x)$:




FIGURE 9. The n paths must pass through the edges in the middle. The partition function factors into the left and the right sides.

Theorem 4.14 (Weyl formula).

$$g_{\lambda;a,b}(x) = \frac{\det \left(\frac{(x_i|a)^{\lambda_i+n-i}}{(x_i|b)^{\lambda_i+n-i+1}} \right)}{\det \left(\frac{(x_i|a)^{n-i}}{(x_i|b)^{n-i+1}} \right)}.$$

Proof. It is Proposition 2.13 after the normalization by $\prod_{i,j}(1-b_jx_i)$ and $\prod_{i=1}^n(1-a_ib_i)$. \square

In addition, we proceed to show how these functions are related to the Schur functions previously defined. Specifically, we prove the generalization of the Berele-Regev factorization [BR87].

Proposition 4.15 (Berele-Regev factorization). *Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$. Let $\lambda = (n^n + \mu) \cup \nu$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}(x, y) &= G'_{\nu;a',b'}(x, y)G_{\mu;a,b}(x, y) \\ &= \prod_{i,j=1}^n (x_i + y_j)g'_{\nu;a',b'}(y)g_{\mu;a,b}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof of this proposition is based on the six vertex model for $s_{\lambda/\mu;a,b}$. Due to the boundary conditions of the model, all admissible states have the n paths crossing through the edges in the middle. This means that the partition function of the model factors into the product of two partition functions for the left and the right sides. These partition functions are given by G' and G . The proof concludes by noting that the partition function of the left side has indices a', b' . See Figure 9 for illustration. \square

REFERENCES

- [ABPW21] Amol Aggarwal, Alexei Borodin, Leonid Petrov, and Michael Wheeler. Free Fermion Six Vertex Model: Symmetric Functions and Random Domino Tilings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06718*, 2021.
- [Bax82] Rodney J. Baxter. *Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London, 1982.
- [BBF11] Ben Brubaker, Daniel Bump, and Solomon Friedberg. Schur polynomials and the Yang-Baxter equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 308(2):281–301, 2011. doi:10.1007/s00220-011-1345-3.

- [BR87] A. Berele and A. Regev. Hook Young diagrams with applications to combinatorics and to representations of Lie superalgebras. *Adv. in Math.*, 64(2):118–175, 1987. URL: [https://doi-org.stanford.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/0001-8708\(87\)90007-7](https://doi-org.stanford.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/0001-8708(87)90007-7), doi:10.1016/0001-8708(87)90007-7.
- [GV85] Ira Gessel and Gérard Viennot. Binomial determinants, paths, and hook length formulae. *Adv. in Math.*, 58(3):300–321, 1985. doi:10.1016/0001-8708(85)90121-5.
- [Har21] Andrew Hardt. Lattice models, hamiltonian operators, and symmetric functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.14597*, 2021.
- [Kor21] Christian Korff. Cylindric Hecke characters and Gromov-Witten invariants via the asymmetric six-vertex model. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 381(2):591–640, 2021. doi:10.1007/s00220-020-03906-x.
- [Kup96] Greg Kuperberg. Another proof of the alternating-sign matrix conjecture. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (3):139–150, 1996. URL: <https://doi-org.stanford.idm.oclc.org/10.1155/S1073792896000128>, doi:10.1155/S1073792896000128.
- [Lin73] Bernt Lindström. On the vector representations of induced matroids. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 5:85–90, 1973. doi:10.1112/blms/5.1.85.
- [Mac92] I. G. Macdonald. Schur functions: theme and variations. In *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire (Saint-Nabor, 1992)*, volume 498 of *Publ. Inst. Rech. Math. Av.*, pages 5–39. Univ. Louis Pasteur, Strasbourg, 1992. doi:10.1108/EUM0000000002757.
- [Mol98] Alexander Molev. Factorial supersymmetric Schur functions and super Capelli identities. In *Kirillov’s seminar on representation theory*, volume 181 of *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2*, pages 109–137. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1998. URL: <https://doi-org.stanford.idm.oclc.org/10.1090/trans2/181/04>, doi:10.1090/trans2/181/04.
- [Mol09] A. I. Molev. Comultiplication rules for the double Schur functions and Cauchy identities. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 16(1):Research Paper 13, 44, 2009. URL: http://www.combinatorics.org/Volume_16/Abstracts/v16i1r13.html.
- [Mot17a] Kohei Motegi. Dual wavefunction of the Felderhof model. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 107(7):1235–1263, 2017. doi:10.1007/s11005-017-0942-2.
- [Mot17b] Kohei Motegi. Izergin-Korepin analysis on the projected wavefunctions of the generalized free-fermion model. *Adv. Math. Phys.*, pages Art. ID 7563781, 11, 2017. doi:10.1155/2017/7563781.
- [OO97] A. Okunkov and G. Olshanskiĭ. Shifted Schur functions. *Algebra i Analiz*, 9(2):73–146, 1997.
- [ORV03] Grigori Olshanski, Amitai Regev, and Anatoly Vershik. Frobenius-Schur functions. In *Studies in memory of Issai Schur (Chevaleret/Rehovot, 2000)*, volume 210 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 251–299. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2003. With an appendix by Vladimir Ivanov.
- [WZJ18] M. Wheeler and P. Zinn-Justin. Hall polynomials, inverse Kostka polynomials and puzzles. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 159:107–163, 2018. URL: <https://doi-org.stanford.idm.oclc.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2018.05.005>, doi:10.1016/j.jcta.2018.05.005.