

INFINITE-LEVEL FOCK SPACES, CRYSTAL BASES, AND TENSOR PRODUCT OF EXTREMAL WEIGHT MODULES OF TYPE $A_{+\infty}$

JAE-HOON KWON AND SOO-HONG LEE

ABSTRACT. We study the category \mathcal{C} generated by extremal weight modules over $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$. We show that \mathcal{C} is a tensor category, and give an explicit description of the socle filtration of tensor product of any two extremal weight modules. This follows from the study of Fock space $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ of infinite level, which has commuting actions of a parabolic q -boson algebra and $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ with $p = -q^{-1}$. It contains a (semisimple) limit of the fermionic Fock space \mathcal{F}^n of level n , which has a q -analogue of Howe duality often called level-rank duality. To describe the socle filtration of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$, we introduce the notion of a saturated crystal valuation, whose existence was observed for example in the embedding of an extremal weight module into a tensor product of fundamental weight modules of affine type due to Kashiwara and Beck-Nakajima.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Preliminary	5
3.	Parabolic q -boson algebras	11
4.	A category generated by extremal weight modules	21
5.	Fock space \mathcal{F}^n	26
6.	Fock space $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ of infinite level	34
7.	Crystal valuations	43
8.	Saturated crystal valuations and socle filtration	48
	References	71

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Extremal weight modules. Let $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be the quantized enveloping algebra associated with a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g} . An extremal weight module $V(\lambda)$ for an integral weight λ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, which can be viewed as a generalization of highest or lowest weight module. It also has a crystal base and a global crystal basis [17]. Especially when \mathfrak{g}

This work is supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIT) (No.2020R1A5A1016126 and RS-2024-00342349).

is of affine type and λ is of level zero, $V(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to a Weyl module introduced in [6], and they also play an important role in understanding the cell structure of the modified quantum group of level zero [2, 19].

1.2. A tensor category generated by extremal weight $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -modules. Suppose that $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_{>0}$ is a general linear Lie algebra of infinite rank, which is of type $A_{+\infty}$. Let \mathcal{P} be the set of partitions. Let $V_{\mu,\nu}$ denote the extremal weight module $V(\lambda)$, where $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ corresponds to the Weyl group orbit of an integral weight λ for $\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}$. In case of $\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}$, the crystal $\mathcal{B}_{\mu,\nu}$ of $V_{\mu,\nu}$ is connected [22], and hence $V_{\mu,\nu}$ is irreducible. Let \mathcal{C} be the category of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -modules of finite length with irreducible factors $V_{\mu,\nu}$. It is not semisimple, while the subcategories \mathcal{C}^\pm generated by highest weight modules $V_{\mu,0}$ and lowest weight modules $V_{0,\nu}$, respectively are semisimple whose Grothendieck rings $K(\mathcal{C}^\pm)$ are isomorphic to the ring of symmetric functions.

The main result of this paper is an explicit description of a socle filtration of tensor product of extremal weight modules in \mathcal{C} . We show that \mathcal{C} is a tensor category and show that the multiplicities of simples in each semisimple subquotient of the socle filtration of $V_{\mu,\nu} \otimes V_{\sigma,\tau}$ for $(\mu, \nu), (\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ are given in terms of Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. In particular, $V_{\mu,0} \otimes V_{0,\nu}$ is indecomposable with simple socle $V_{\mu,\nu}$, and hence the Grothendieck ring $K(\mathcal{C})$ is isomorphic to $K(\mathcal{C}^+) \otimes K(\mathcal{C}^-)$ with two natural \mathbb{Z} -bases $\{[V_{\mu,\nu}] \mid \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}\}$ and $\{[V_{\sigma,0} \otimes V_{0,\tau}] \mid \sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{P}\}$. We give a character formula of $[V_{\mu,\nu}] \in K(\mathcal{C})$ in terms of $[V_{\sigma,0} \otimes V_{0,\tau}]$ with Littlewood-Richardson coefficients.

We should remark that the decomposition of $\mathcal{B}_{\mu,\nu} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\sigma,\tau}$ is given in [22], but it does not explain in general the tensor structure on \mathcal{C} . Indeed, the filtration of $V_{\mu,\nu} \otimes V_{\sigma,\tau}$ does not always coincide with the decomposition of $\mathcal{B}_{\mu,\nu} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\sigma,\tau}$. For example, we have non-split exact sequences

$$(1.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow V_{(1),(1)} \longrightarrow V_{0,(1)} \otimes V_{(1),0} \longrightarrow V_{0,0} \longrightarrow 0,$$

while we have $\mathcal{B}_{(1),(1)} \cong \mathcal{B}_{0,(1)} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{(1),0}$. In general, we have $\mathcal{B}_{\mu,\nu} \cong \mathcal{B}_{0,\nu} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\mu,0} \subsetneq \mathcal{B}_{\mu,0} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{0,\nu}$, where the order of tensor product depends on the choice of comultiplication. This phenomenon, where a (proper) embedding of modules or crystal lattices induces an isomorphism of crystals, reminds us of the embedding of an extremal weight module into certain tensor product of extremal weight modules associated to multiples of fundamental weights, when \mathfrak{g} is of affine type (conjectured in [19] and proved in [2]). It is one of our motivations to understand this non-trivial difference between tensor structures in modules and crystals.

There is a non-semisimple tensor category of representations of \mathfrak{sl}_∞ with respect to a non-standard Borel subalgebra introduced in [28]. This category is defined in a complete different way, but it has very similar properties as \mathcal{C} . For example, the irreducible representations are parametrized by $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, say $\mathbb{V}_{\mu,\nu}$, and $\mathbb{V}_{\mu,0} \otimes \mathbb{V}_{0,\nu}$ has the same socle filtration as

in \mathcal{C} , where the tensor structure is studied through a non-semisimple mixed tensor power of the natural representation and its dual. More recently, it is shown to have a nice homological property [7] and have an interesting application to categorifying the boson-fermion correspondence [9]. It would be interesting to explore more direct connection between these two categories.

1.3. A Fock space of infinite level and a limit of level-rank duality. Let us explain our results in more details. Our approach to studying the tensor structure on \mathcal{C} is to embed the tensor products $V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}$ into a limit of the Fock space \mathcal{F}^n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Here \mathcal{F}^n is a q -deformed fermionic Fock space of level n , which has a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\infty}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module structure with $p = -q^{-1}$ (cf.[30]) admitting a q -analogue of $(\mathfrak{gl}_{\infty}, \mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -Howe duality [8] (also known as a level-rank duality).

To have a well-defined limit of \mathcal{F}^n with a $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module structure, we introduce a parabolic analogue of q -boson algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ for \mathfrak{gl}_{∞} with respect to its maximal Levi subalgebra (naturally generalizing the q -boson algebra introduced in [15]). It has a family of irreducible representations $V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu})$ parametrized by $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathscr{P}^2$, which can be identified with maximally parabolic Verma modules of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\infty})$ as a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -space. They form a semisimple category of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -modules with crystal bases as in the case of the usual q -boson algebra. Our presentation is given with respect to a general pair of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ for a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g} and its parabolic subalgebra \mathfrak{p} .

Let $\mathcal{M} = V_0(\Lambda_{\emptyset,\emptyset})$ be the irreducible $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -modules corresponding to the trivial highest weight. By using a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\infty})$ -comodule structure of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$, we define a directed system $\{\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}\}_{n \geq 0}$ with a morphism $\phi_{n,n+1} : \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ which is $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -linear, and let

$$\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M} = \varinjlim_n \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}.$$

First, we prove the following decomposition:

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{(\mu,\nu) \in \mathscr{P}^2} V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}) \otimes (V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}),$$

which is a non-semisimple $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\infty}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module (Theorem 6.7). Using the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -crystal structure of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$, we then construct a filtration $\{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}\}_{d \geq 0}$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -submodules, and show that it has the following semisimple subquotient:

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}}{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}} \cong \bigoplus_{(\mu,\nu) \in \mathscr{P}^2} \bigoplus_{\substack{(\zeta,\eta) \in \mathscr{P}^2 \\ |\mu| - |\zeta| = |\nu| - |\eta| = d}} (V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}) \otimes V_{\zeta,\eta})^{\oplus n_{\zeta,\eta}^{\mu,\nu}},$$

with $n_{\zeta,\eta}^{\mu,\nu} = \sum_{\sigma} c_{\sigma\zeta}^{\mu} c_{\sigma\eta}^{\nu}$, where $c_{\beta\gamma}^{\alpha}$ is the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient (Theorem 8.7). In particular, when $d = 0$, we obtain the following decomposition

$$(1.4) \quad (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -0} \cong \bigoplus_{(\mu,\nu) \in \mathscr{P}^2} V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}) \otimes V_{\mu,\nu},$$

which can be viewed as a limit of the level-rank duality on the Fock space \mathcal{F}^n . A combinatorial crystal model for (1.4) (without existence of the associated representation) is given in [22]. Note that both $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ and its proper semisimple submodule $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -0}$ have crystal bases whose crystals are isomorphic.

1.4. Saturated crystal valuation and socle filtration. Next we prove that $\{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}\}_{d \geq 0}$ is the socle filtration of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ (Theorem 8.23), that is,

$$(1.5) \quad \mathcal{V}_d^\circ = \text{soc}(\mathcal{V}_d),$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}_d^\circ = \frac{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}}{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}} \subset \mathcal{V}_d = \frac{\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}}{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}}.$$

For this, we introduce and systematically use the notion of *saturated crystal valuation*. It is motivated by an observation that an A_0 -submodule of a non-semisimple object may induce only a \mathbb{Q} -basis of its proper submodule at $q = 0$ as in the case of (1.1) or $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -0} \subset \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$, where A_0 is the subring of $f(q) \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ regular at $q = 0$. Let \mathfrak{v} be a valuation on a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -space V , which is equivalent to an A_0 -submodule \mathcal{L} of V (not necessarily free) with no element divisible by q infinitely many times. We call \mathcal{L} a crystal valuation if it is stable under crystal operators and compatible with weight space decomposition when they are available, and say that the crystal valuation \mathcal{L} is saturated with respect to a submodule V° when \mathcal{L} is a maximal A_0 -submodule of V that restricts to $\mathcal{L}^\circ := \mathcal{L} \cap V^\circ$. Indeed, this is equivalent to the condition that the natural inclusion $\mathcal{L}^\circ \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ induces an isomorphism of \mathbb{Q} -spaces at $q = 0$.

We show that there exists a crystal valuation \mathfrak{v}_{-d}° on \mathcal{V}_d saturated with respect to \mathcal{V}_d° (Theorem 8.9 and Theorem 8.18). The existence of \mathfrak{v}_{-d}° is obtained by analyzing the behavior of the canonical crystal valuations on the semisimple $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ under the morphisms in the directed system and then taking a limit of appropriately shifted valuations on $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$. This proof is the technical heart of the paper.

Then we prove (1.5) by using the sequence of subquotients associated to a filtration of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ whose limit is \mathcal{V}_d° (1.3), and the saturatedness of the crystal valuation on \mathcal{V}_d .

Now, it follows from the multiplicity space of $V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu})$ in (1.2) and (1.3) that

$$(1.6) \quad \frac{\text{soc}^{d+1}(V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu})}{\text{soc}^d(V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu})} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{(\zeta,\eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2 \\ |\mu| - |\zeta| = |\nu| - |\eta| = d}} V_{\zeta,\eta}^{\oplus n_{\zeta,\eta}^{\mu,\nu}},$$

where $n_{\zeta,\eta}^{\mu,\nu}$ is the one given in (1.3) (Theorem 8.25). In particular, this implies that $V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}$ is indecomposable. By taking restriction of the saturated crystal valuation on \mathcal{V}_d , we obtain a saturated crystal valuation on $V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu} / \text{soc}^d(V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu})$ for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, whose existence is a result of its own interest. We also have the same result for $V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes V_{\mu,\emptyset}$. As applications of (1.6), we obtain the character formula of $[V_{\mu,\nu}] \in K(\mathcal{C})$, and an explicit description of the socle filtration of $V_{\mu,\nu} \otimes V_{\sigma,\tau}$ for any $\mu, \nu, \sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{P}$ (Theorem 8.31).

1.5. The organization. The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly review necessary background. In Section 3, we introduce the notion of a parabolic q -boson algebra and its integrable representations in a general setting. Then we prove the semisimplicity and existence of a crystal base of an integrable representation. In Section 4, we recall the crystals of extremal weight modules of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$, and give a filtration of $V_{\mu,0} \otimes V_{0,\nu}$, which is weaker than the socle filtration, by standard arguments using canonical basis. In Section 5, we define the Fock space \mathcal{F}^n as a semi-infinite limit of a q -deformed exterior algebra. In Section 6, we define a Fock space $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$, and prove the decomposition (1.2). We also define a filtration on $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. In Section 7, we introduce the notion of a (saturated) crystal valuation, and prove the decomposition of a crystal valuation with respect to an isotypic decomposition of an integrable representation. In Section 8, we prove the decomposition of the subquotients (1.3). Finally, we prove the existence of a saturated crystal valuation on \mathcal{V}_d by which we prove that the filtration on $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ is the socle filtration (1.5).

2. PRELIMINARY

2.1. Quantized enveloping algebras. Let $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ be a symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix indexed by a set I , possibly infinite. Let P^\vee be the dual weight lattice, and $\Pi^\vee = \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \subset P^\vee$ the set of simple coroots. We assume that $P^\vee/\mathbb{Z}\Pi^\vee$ has a finite rank. Let $P = \{f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(P^\vee, \mathbb{Z}) \mid f(h_i) = 0 \text{ for all but finitely many } i \in I\}$, the restricted dual of P^\vee with respect to Π^\vee , be the weight lattice, and $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\} \subset P$ the set of simple roots, which are linearly independent, such that $\langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle = a_{ij}$ for $i, j \in I$.

Let $(,)$ be a symmetric bilinear form on P such that $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) \in 2\mathbb{Z}_+$ for $i \in I$, $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \leq 0$ for $i \neq j$, and $\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle = 2(\alpha_i, \lambda)/(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)$ for $i \in I$ and $\lambda \in P$. Let \mathfrak{g} be the Kac-Moody algebra associated with the Cartan datum $(A, P, P^\vee, \Pi, \Pi^\vee, (,))$. Let W be the Weyl group of \mathfrak{g} generated by the simple reflection s_i , where $s_i(\lambda) = \lambda - \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \alpha_i$ for $\lambda \in P$. Let $Q = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$, and $Q_\pm = \pm \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_i$, and let \geq denote the usual partial order on P . Let $P^+ = \{\lambda \in P \mid \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \text{ (} i \in I \text{)}\}$ be the set of dominant integral weights.

Let q be an indeterminate. For $i \in I$, put $q_i = q^{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2}$. For $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $i \in I$, let $[a]_i = \frac{q_i^a - q_i^{-a}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$ and $[a]_i! = [a]_i [a-1]_i \dots [1]_i$ ($a \geq 1$) with $[0]_i = 1$. If A is symmetric and $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = 2$ for all $i \in I$, then we simply write $[a]_i = [a]$.

Let $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be the associated quantized enveloping algebra, which is an associative $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebra generated by e_i, f_i, q^h for $i \in I$ and $h \in P^\vee$ subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} q^0 &= 1, & q^{h+h'} &= q^h q^{h'}, \\ q^h e_i q^{-h} &= q^{\langle h, \alpha_i \rangle} e_i, & q^h f_i q^{-h} &= q^{-\langle h, \alpha_i \rangle} f_i, \\ e_i f_j - f_j e_i &= \delta_{ij} \frac{t_i - t_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{c_{ij}} (-1)^k e_i^{(k)} e_j e_i^{(c_{ij}-k)} = \sum_{k=0}^{c_{ij}} (-1)^k f_i^{(k)} f_j f_i^{(c_{ij}-k)} = 0,$$

where $t_i = q^{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)h_i/2}$, $e_i^{(k)} = e_i^k/[k]_i!$, $f_i^{(k)} = f_i^k/[k]_i!$, and $c_{ij} = 1 - a_{ij}$ for $i, j \in I$. Unless otherwise specified, we regard $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ as a Hopf algebra with respect to the comultiplication Δ and the antipode S given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(q^h) &= q^h \otimes q^h, \\ \Delta(e_i) &= 1 \otimes e_i + e_i \otimes t_i^{-1}, \\ \Delta(f_i) &= f_i \otimes 1 + t_i \otimes f_i, \\ S(q^h) &= q^{-h}, \quad S(e_i) = -e_i t_i, \quad S(f_i) = -t_i^{-1} f_i, \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in I$ and $h \in P^\vee$, where $\Delta = \Delta_-$ is often called the lower comultiplication. Let Δ_+ be a comultiplication of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_+(q^h) &= q^h \otimes q^h, \\ \Delta_+(e_i) &= e_i \otimes 1 + t_i \otimes e_i, \\ \Delta_+(f_i) &= 1 \otimes f_i + f_i \otimes t_i^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is called upper comultiplication. Let $\Delta_\pm^{\text{op}} := \sigma \circ \Delta_\pm$ be the comultiplications where σ is a map $\sigma(x \otimes y) = y \otimes x$.

We denote by $U_q^\pm(\mathfrak{g})$ the subalgebra generated by e_i and f_i ($i \in I$), respectively, which is graded by Q_\pm , and denote by $U_q^0(\mathfrak{g})$ the subalgebra generated by q^h ($h \in P^\vee$). We put $U_q^{\leq 0}(\mathfrak{g}) = U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})U_q^0(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_q^{\geq 0}(\mathfrak{g}) = U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})U_q^0(\mathfrak{g})$.

Let $A = \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$, and let $U_q(\mathfrak{g})_A$ be the A -subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by $e_i^{(k)}$ and $f_i^{(k)}$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Let $\tau_\pm : U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear anti-automorphisms defined by

$$(2.1) \quad \tau_\pm(e_i) = q_i^{\pm 1} t_i^{\pm 1} f_i, \quad \tau_\pm(f_i) = q_i^{\pm 1} t_i^{\mp 1} e_i, \quad \tau_\pm(q^h) = q^h, \quad \text{for } i \in I \text{ and } h \in P^\vee.$$

Then we have $(\tau_\pm \otimes \tau_\pm) \circ \Delta_\pm = \Delta_\pm \circ \tau_\pm$.

2.2. Crystal bases. Let us briefly recall the notion of crystal base and its properties [15, 17, 18]. Let V be an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. In other words, V has a weight space decomposition $V = \bigoplus_{\mu \in P} V_\mu$, where $V_\mu = \{v \mid q^h v = q^{(h, \mu)} v \text{ } (h \in P^\vee)\}$, and e_i, f_i ($i \in I$) act locally nilpotently on V . We write $\text{wt}(v) = \mu$ for $v \in V_\mu$.

Let $i \in I$ be given. For a weight vector $v \in V$, we may write $v = \sum_{k \geq 0} f_i^{(k)} v_k$, where each v_k satisfies $e_i v_k = 0$. The (lower) crystal operators $\tilde{e}_i^{\text{low}}, \tilde{f}_i^{\text{low}}$ or simply \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i , are defined by

$$(2.2) \quad \tilde{e}_i v = \sum_{k \geq 1} f_i^{(k-1)} v_k, \quad \tilde{f}_i v = \sum_{k \geq 0} f_i^{(k+1)} v_k.$$

and the upper crystal operators $\tilde{e}_i^{\text{up}}, \tilde{f}_i^{\text{up}}$ are given by

$$(2.3) \quad \tilde{e}_i^{\text{up}}v = \sum_{k \geq 1} q_i^{-l_k + 2k - 1} f_i^{(k-1)} v_k, \quad \tilde{f}_i^{\text{up}}v = \sum_{k \geq 0} q_i^{l_k - 2k - 1} f_i^{(k+1)} v_k,$$

where $l_k = \langle h_i, \text{wt}(v_k) \rangle$.

Let A_0 be the subring of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ consisting of $f(q)$ regular at $q = 0$. A lower crystal base of V is a pair (L, B) , where L is an A_0 -lattice of V , and B is a \mathbb{Q} -basis of L/qL satisfying

- (1) $L = \bigoplus_{\mu \in P} L_\mu$ and $B = \bigsqcup_{\mu \in P} B_\mu$, where $L_\mu = L \cap V_\mu$ and $B_\mu = B \cap (L/qL)_\mu$,
- (2) $\tilde{e}_i L \subset L$, $\tilde{f}_i L \subset L$ and $\tilde{e}_i B \subset B \cup \{0\}$, $\tilde{f}_i B \subset B \cup \{0\}$ for $i \in I$,
- (3) $\tilde{f}_i b = b'$ if and only if $\tilde{e}_i b' = b$ for $i \in I$ and $b, b' \in B$,

while an upper crystal base of V is defined with respect to (2.3). We call B a crystal of V .

We call an A_0 -lattice L of V satisfying (1) and (2) a crystal lattice of V .

For $i \in I$, let $e'_i, e''_i : U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ be the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear maps given by

$$(2.4) \quad [e_i, u] = \frac{t_i e''_i(u) - t_i^{-1} e'_i(u)}{q_i - q_i^{-1}},$$

for homogeneous $u \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$. Note that ${}_i r(u) = e''_i(u)$ and $r_i(u) = q_i^{\langle h_i, \text{wt } P \rangle + 2} e'_i(u)$, where ${}_i r, r_i$ are given in [26]. We may also write $u = \sum_{k \geq 0} f_i^{(k)} v_k$, where each v_k satisfies $e'_i v_k = 0$. Then the crystal operators on $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ are defined as in (2.2) and a crystal base of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ is defined in the same way. Then $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ has a unique crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(\infty), \mathcal{B}(\infty))$.

Let V_i be integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules with lower or upper crystal bases (L_i, B_i) ($i = 1, 2$). Then the tensor product rule states that $(L_1 \otimes L_2, B_1 \otimes B_2)$ is a crystal base of $V_1 \otimes V_2$ such that

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{e}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= \begin{cases} \tilde{e}_i b_1 \otimes b_2, & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) \geq \varepsilon_i(b_2), \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{e}_i b_2, & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) < \varepsilon_i(b_2), \end{cases} \\ \tilde{f}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= \begin{cases} \tilde{f}_i b_1 \otimes b_2, & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) > \varepsilon_i(b_2), \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{f}_i b_2, & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) \leq \varepsilon_i(b_2), \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in I$ and $b_1 \otimes b_2 \in B_1 \otimes B_2$, where $\varepsilon_i(b) = \max\{k \geq 0 \mid \tilde{e}_i^k b \neq 0\}$ and $\varphi_i(b) = \max\{k \geq 0 \mid \tilde{f}_i^k b \neq 0\}$ for $b \in B_1, B_2$.

A weight vector $v \in V_\lambda$ is called i -extremal ($i \in I$) if $e_i v = 0$ or $f_i v = 0$. If v is i -extremal, we define

$$(2.6) \quad S_i v = \begin{cases} f_i^{\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle} v & \text{if } e_i v = 0 \\ e_i^{-\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle} v & \text{if } f_i v = 0 \end{cases}$$

A weight vector $v \in V$ is called an extremal vector if there exists $\{v_w\}_{w \in W}$ such that v_w s are i -extremal for all $i \in I$, and

$$v_e = v, \quad S_i v_w = v_{s_i w},$$

for $i \in I, w \in W$. An element of a crystal is also called extremal if it satisfies the same condition, where $e_i^{(n)}$ and $f_i^{(n)}$ are replaced by \tilde{e}_i^n and \tilde{f}_i^n , respectively.

For $\lambda \in P$, let $V(\lambda)$ be the $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module generated by u_λ subject to the relations that u_λ is an extremal vector of weight λ [17]. Note that $V(\lambda)$ is a highest weight module if $\lambda \in P^+$. It is shown in [17] that $V(\lambda)$ has a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(\lambda), \mathcal{B}(\lambda))$ and a global crystal basis or canonical basis $G(\lambda) = \{G_\lambda(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)\}$. We often assume that $u_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)_\lambda \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(\lambda)}$.

Suppose that $\lambda \in P^+$. Then the canonical projection $\pi_\lambda : U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow V(\lambda)$ restricts to $\pi_\lambda|_{\mathcal{L}(\infty)} : \mathcal{L}(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$, and induces $\bar{\pi}_\lambda : \mathcal{B}(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \sqcup \{0\}$. There is a unique bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $V(\lambda)$, called the q -Shapovalov form, which is characterized by

$$(2.7) \quad \langle u_\lambda, u_\lambda \rangle = 1, \quad \langle uv, w \rangle = \langle v, \tau_-(u)w \rangle,$$

for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}), v, w \in V(\lambda)$. We have $\langle \mathcal{L}(\lambda), \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \rangle \in A_0$, and $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) = \{v \in V(\lambda) \mid \langle v, \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \rangle \in A_0\}$ (cf. [15]). Also recall that, for $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$, and $m \geq 0$, we have

$$(2.8) \quad f_i^{(m)} G_\lambda(b) \in \bigoplus_{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)_{\text{wt } b - m\alpha_i}} q_i^{-m(\varepsilon_i(b') + m)} A_0 G_\lambda(b').$$

Let V be an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module with a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(V), \mathcal{B}(V))$. Let $\mathcal{B}(V)^{\text{h.w.}} = \{b \in \mathcal{B}(V) \mid \tilde{e}_i b = 0 \text{ for all } i \in I\}$, and for $\nu \in P$, let $\mathcal{B}(V)_{\geq \nu}^{\text{h.w.}} = \{b \in \mathcal{B}(V)^{\text{h.w.}} \mid \text{wt}(b) \geq \nu\}$. The following lemma can be easily proved, and its analogues with respect to crystal operators for other algebras will be frequently used later.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that V has finite dimensional weight spaces and $\text{wt}(V)$, the set of weights of V , is finitely dominated. For each $b \in \mathcal{B}(V)^{\text{h.w.}}$, choose $x_b \in \mathcal{L}(V)$ such that $x_b \equiv b \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(V)}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} U_q(\mathfrak{g})\text{-span of } \{x_b \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(V)_{\geq \nu}^{\text{h.w.}}\} &= U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})\text{-span of } \{x_b \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(V)_{\geq \nu}^{\text{h.w.}}\} \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{b \in \mathcal{B}(V)_{\geq \nu}^{\text{h.w.}}} V(\text{wt}(b)), \end{aligned}$$

and $\{x_b \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(V)_{\geq \nu}^{\text{h.w.}}\}$ generates a crystal lattice of $\bigoplus_{b \in \mathcal{B}(V)_{\geq \nu}^{\text{h.w.}}} V(\text{wt}(b))$ under \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i for $i \in I$.

2.3. Quasi- R -matrix, R -matrix, and canonical basis. Let us briefly review necessary materials on R -matrix and canonical bases of based modules [26].

Let $-$ be the involution of \mathbb{Q} -algebras on $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ given by $\bar{e}_i = e_i, \bar{f}_i = f_i, \bar{q}^h = q^{-h}$, and $\bar{q} = q^{-1}$ for $i \in I$ and $h \in P^\vee$. Let M and N be $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules with weight space decomposition.

Let Θ be the quasi- R -matrix [26, Theorem 4.1.2], which is given by

$$(2.9) \quad \Theta = \Theta_+ = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+} \Theta_\beta$$

such that Θ_β is a unique element in $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})_{-\beta} \otimes U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})_\beta$ such that $\Theta_0 = 1 \otimes 1$ and $\Delta_+(u) \Theta = \Theta \overline{\Delta}_+(u)$ for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, where $\overline{\Delta}_+(u) = \overline{\Delta}_+(\overline{u})$ for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Here, Θ is regarded as an element in a suitable completion $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \widehat{\otimes} U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})$. We remark that the completion used in [26] is not suitable for \mathfrak{g} with I infinite. We instead consider a finer completion given by subspaces $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})U_q^0(\mathfrak{g}) \sum_{\nu' \leq \nu} U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})_{-\nu'} \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{g}) + U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})U_q^0(\mathfrak{g}) \sum_{\nu' \leq \nu} U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})_{\nu'}$ parametrized by $\nu \in Q_+$, where Q_+ is regarded as a directed set by its poset structure. Then the statements for Θ in [26] holds for infinite I with respect to this completion.

The quasi- R -matrix Θ yields a universal R -matrix $R^{\text{univ}} = R = \sigma \Pi \overline{\Theta}$, where Π is a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear operator acting on $M \otimes N$ by $\Pi(m \otimes n) = q^{(\mu, \nu)} m \otimes n$, and σ is given by $\sigma(m \otimes n) = n \otimes m$ for $m \in M_\mu$ and $n \in N_\nu$. Note that we need to extend the base field to $\mathbb{Q}(q^{\frac{1}{d}})$ for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ in general, but we can take $d = 1$ in type A .

We also need an opposite version of the quasi- R -matrix, given by

$$(2.10) \quad \Theta' = R \Pi \sigma = \Pi \overline{\Theta^{\text{op}}} \Pi,$$

where Θ^{op} is obtained by applying σ to Θ . Since $R^{-1} = \sigma \Pi \overline{\Theta'}$, this can be viewed as a quasi- R -matrix constructed out of R^{-1} instead of R . The following identity follows from $R\Theta = R^{-1}\Theta' = \sigma \Pi$.

Lemma 2.2. *We have $R\overline{R\Theta} = R\overline{\Theta'R} = 1$.*

Remark 2.3. We may also construct Θ, Θ' , and R for other comultiplications. We let $\overline{\Delta}_\pm = \Delta_\pm^{\text{op}}$ the coproducts twisted by bar-involutions $\overline{\Delta}_\pm = - \circ \Delta_\pm \circ -$. Note that we have $\overline{\Delta}_\pm = \Delta_\pm^{\text{op}}$. Let $M \otimes_\pm N$ and $M \overline{\otimes}_\pm N$ be the $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module whose module structure is given by Δ_\pm and $\overline{\Delta}_\pm$, respectively. These coproducts are related by natural isomorphisms below

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M \otimes_+ N & \xrightarrow{\Pi^{-1}} & M \otimes_- N \\ \sigma \downarrow & & \downarrow \sigma \\ N \overline{\otimes}_- M & \xrightarrow{\Pi^{-1}} & N \overline{\otimes}_+ M \end{array}$$

(cf. [20, (2.2.9)]). By pulling back R, Θ , and Θ' along the natural isomorphisms above, we obtain $R_{\otimes_*}, \Theta_{\otimes_*}, \Theta'_{\otimes_*}$ corresponding to each tensor products $\otimes_* = \otimes_\pm, \overline{\otimes}_\pm$. For instance, we have

$$(2.11) \quad R_- := R_{\otimes_-} = \sigma \overline{\Theta} \Pi, \quad \Theta_- := \Theta_{\otimes_-} = \Pi^{-1} \Theta \Pi^{-1}, \quad \Theta'_- := \Theta'_{\otimes_-} = \overline{\Theta^{\text{op}}}.$$

Lemma 2.2 also holds in these cases.

Remark 2.4. For a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module M , consider a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module \overline{M} whose underlying set is M (we denote its elements by \overline{m} for $m \in M$), and the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is given by $u\overline{m} = \overline{um}$ for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $m \in M$. By Remark 2.3,

$$\overline{M \otimes_+ N} \cong M \overline{\otimes}_+ N \cong N \otimes_- M.$$

We recall the definition of a based module, introduced in [26], where the condition (4) below is modified so that it is compatible with crystal lattices at $q = 0$. A lower (resp. upper) based module is a pair (V, B) , where V is an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module with a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis B satisfying

- (1) $B \cap V_\lambda$ is a basis of V_λ for $\lambda \in P$,
- (2) The A -submodule V_A generated by B is stable under the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})_A$,
- (3) The \mathbb{Q} -linear involution $\overline{}$ on V given by $\overline{c(q)b} = c(q^{-1})b$ for all $c(q) \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ and $b \in B$ is compatible with $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -action, that is, $\overline{uv} = \overline{u}\overline{v}$ for all $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $v \in V$,
- (4) The A_0 -submodule generated by B is stable under lower (resp. upper) crystal operators.

Suppose that there exist \mathbb{Q} -linear involutions $\overline{}$ on $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules V_1 and V_2 compatible with the $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -action. For $v_1 \otimes v_2 \in V_1 \otimes_+ V_2$, we define

$$(2.12) \quad \overline{v_1 \otimes v_2} = \Theta(\overline{v_1} \otimes \overline{v_2}).$$

In general, (2.12) is well-defined only in a certain completion of $V_1 \otimes V_2$. If (2.12) gives a well-defined element in $V_1 \otimes V_2$ for all $v_1 \otimes v_2$ (for example, when V_1 is a lowest weight module or V_2 is a highest weight module), then it also gives a \mathbb{Q} -linear involution on $V_1 \otimes_+ V_2$, such that $\overline{u \cdot (v_1 \otimes v_2)} = \overline{u} \cdot \overline{v_1 \otimes v_2}$ for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

One can define a bar-involution on a tensor product of more than two modules by applying (2.12) inductively, which does not depend on the order of application of (2.12) due to $((1 \otimes \Delta_+) \Theta) \Theta^{23} = ((\Delta_+ \otimes 1) \Theta) \Theta^{12}$ (see [25, Proposition 4.2.4]): Define $\Theta^{(n)}$ as a formal sum in $U_q(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes n}$ inductively by $\Theta^{(2)} = \Theta$ and $\Theta^{(n)} = (\Delta_+ \otimes 1^{\otimes(n-2)}) \Theta^{(n-1)} (\Theta \otimes 1^{\otimes(n-2)})$ for $n \geq 3$. Then the map

$$(2.13) \quad \overline{v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n} = \Theta^{(n)}(\overline{v_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \overline{v_n}).$$

for $v_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes v_n \in V_1 \otimes_+ \cdots \otimes_+ V_n$ gives a \mathbb{Q} -linear involution compatible with the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

The opposite quasi- R -matrix Θ' of (2.10) also satisfies the following so that it can be used to define an involution on a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module $V_1 \otimes_+ V_2$ as well.

Lemma 2.5. *For $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, we have the following identities:*

$$\Delta_+(\overline{u})\Theta' = \Theta'\overline{\Delta_+}(u), \quad ((1 \otimes \Delta_+)\Theta')\Theta'^{23} = ((\Delta_+ \otimes 1)\Theta')\Theta'^{12}.$$

Proof. By the natural isomorphism Π in Remark 2.3, one has $\Delta_+(u)\Pi = \Pi\overline{\Delta_+}^{\text{op}}(u)$. Then,

$$(2.14) \quad \Delta_+(\overline{u})\Pi\overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}}\Pi = \Pi\overline{\Delta_+^{\text{op}}(u)\overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}}}\Pi = \Pi\overline{\Theta^{\text{op}}\overline{\Delta_+^{\text{op}}(u)}}\Pi = \Pi\overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}}\Delta_+^{\text{op}}(\overline{u})\Pi = \Pi\overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}}\Pi\overline{\Delta_+}(u),$$

which proves the first identity. Next, using (2.14) and the fact that $\Pi^{(3)} := (1 \otimes \Delta)(\Pi)(1 \otimes \Pi)$ is symmetric on each tensor component, we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((1 \otimes \Delta_+) \Theta') \Theta'^{23} &= ((1 \otimes \Delta_+) \Pi) \left((1 \otimes \Delta_+) \overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}} \right) \Pi^{(3)} \left(1 \otimes \overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}} \right) (1 \otimes \Pi) \\ &= \Pi^{(3)} \left((1 \otimes \overline{\Delta}_+^{\text{op}}) \overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}} \right) \left(1 \otimes \overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}} \right) \Pi^{(3)}, \end{aligned}$$

and then $\left((1 \otimes \overline{\Delta}_+^{\text{op}}) \overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}} \right) \left(1 \otimes \overline{\Theta}^{\text{op}} \right) = \overline{((\Delta_+ \otimes 1) \Theta) (\Theta \otimes 1)}^{321}$ yields the second identity, where $(v_1 \otimes v_2 \otimes v_3)^{321} = v_3 \otimes v_2 \otimes v_1$. \square

Remark 2.6. By the natural isomorphisms in Remark 2.3, we can also define a bar-involution on $V_1 \otimes_- V_2$ using Θ_- or Θ'_- in (2.11).

The following is proved in [26] for \mathfrak{g} finite type, and for arbitrary \mathfrak{g} in [4], in case of \otimes_+ .

Theorem 2.7 (cf. [4, Theorem 2.7]). *Suppose that (V_i, B_i) ($i = 1, 2$) are upper (resp. lower) based modules such that either V_1 is a lowest (resp. highest) weight module or V_2 is a highest (resp. lowest) weight module. Let L_i be the A_0 -span of B_i . Then there exists a unique basis $B_1 \diamond B_2 = \{b_1 \diamond b_2 \mid b_i \in B_i\}$ of $V_1 \otimes_+ V_2$ (resp. $V_1 \otimes_- V_2$), such that*

- (1) $b_1 \diamond b_2 \equiv b_1 \otimes b_2 \pmod{q(L_1 \otimes L_2)}$,
- (2) $\overline{b_1 \diamond b_2} = b_1 \diamond b_2$,

where the bar-involution on $V_1 \otimes_+ V_2$ (resp. $V_1 \otimes_- V_2$) is given by using Θ_+ (resp. Θ'_-). Furthermore, $V_1 \otimes_+ V_2$ (resp. $V_1 \otimes_- V_2$) is an upper (resp. lower) based module with respect to $B_1 \diamond B_2$.

Proof. In the case of \otimes_+ , the existence of $B_1 \diamond B_2$ is proved in [4], and the stability of a crystal lattice in this case is a result of a tensor product rule (2.5). The case of \otimes_- can be proved following arguments in [4] by changing the role of highest and lowest weight modules, since Θ'_- now lies in a completion of $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$, and for a weight vector $u \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$,

$$\Delta_-(u) = u \otimes 1 + \sum_{\text{wt } u_1 > \text{wt } u} c_{u_1, u_1} u_1 \otimes u_2 \quad (u_1, u_2 \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})).$$

\square

3. PARABOLIC q -BOSON ALGEBRAS

3.1. Definition and basic properties. We keep the notations in Section 2. Let J be a subset of I such that $J^c := I \setminus J$ is finite. Let $(A_J = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in J}, P_J^\vee, P_J, \Pi_J^\vee, \Pi_J, (\cdot, \cdot))$ be a Cartan datum of a submatrix A_J of A such that $\Pi_J^\vee = \{h_j \mid j \in J\} \subset \Pi^\vee$. Then there exists a canonical projection $P \rightarrow P_J$. Let $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{g}_J$ be the Kac-Moody algebra associated with the submatrix $A_J = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in J}$. We may regard \mathfrak{l} as a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , and let $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{l} + \mathfrak{b}$ denote the parabolic subalgebra, where \mathfrak{b} is the (positive) Borel subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} .

Let $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ be an associative $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebra generated by e'_i, e_j, f_l, q^h for $i \in J^c, j \in J, l \in I$, and $h \in P_J^\vee$ subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} q^0 &= 1, & q^{h+h'} &= q^h q^{h'} \quad (h, h' \in P_J^\vee), \\ q^h e'_i q^{-h} &= q^{\langle h, \alpha_i \rangle} e'_i, & q^h e_j q^{-h} &= q^{\langle h, \alpha_j \rangle} e_j, & q^h f_l q^{-h} &= q^{-\langle h, \alpha_l \rangle} f_l, \\ e_j f_l - f_l e_j &= \delta_{jl} \frac{t_j - t_j^{-1}}{q_j - q_j^{-1}}, & e'_i f_l &= q^{-\langle h_i, \alpha_l \rangle} f_l e'_i + \delta_{il}, \\ \mathbf{S}_{i_1, i_2}(e'_{i_1}, e'_{i_2}) &= \mathbf{S}_{l_1, l_2}(f_{l_1}, f_{l_2}) = \mathbf{S}_{j_1, j_2}(e_{j_1}, e_{j_2}) = 0 & (i_1, i_2 \in J^c, j_1, j_2 \in J, l_1, l_2 \in I), \\ \mathbf{S}_{i, j}^-(e'_i, e_j) &= \mathbf{S}_{j, i}^+(e_j, e'_i) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $t_j = q^{(\alpha_j, \alpha_j)h_j/2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{S}_{s, t}(x, y) &= \sum_{a+b=c_{st}} (-1)^a x^{(a)} y x^{(b)}, \\ \mathbf{S}_{s, t}^\pm(x, y) &= \sum_{a+b=c_{st}} (-1)^a q^{\pm a(\alpha_s, \alpha_t)} x^{(a)} y x^{(b)}, \end{aligned}$$

with $x_i^{(a)} = x_i^a / [a]_i!$ for $x = e, e', f$. We call $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ the parabolic q -boson algebra associated to $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$. If $J = \emptyset$, then $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ is equal to the algebra of q -bosons denoted by $B_q(\mathfrak{g})$ in [15].

Let $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ be the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ generated by f_l ($l \in I$), and let $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ be the subalgebra generated by e'_i, e_j ($i \in J^c, j \in J$), where $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^\pm$ is naturally graded by Q_\pm . Let $U_q^0(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ be the subalgebra generated by q^h ($h \in P_J^\vee$).

Lemma 3.1. *There is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -spaces $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \otimes U_q^0(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \otimes U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$, which is given by multiplication.*

Proof. We may assume that $P_J^\vee = \mathbb{Z}\Pi_J^\vee$, since the general case follows from this case. It is done by slightly modifying the arguments in [26, Chapter 15]. Let $U_q = U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+$ be an associative $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebra generated by $\mathbf{e}'_i, \mathbf{e}_j$ ($i \in J^c, j \in J$) subject to the same relations for e'_i, e_j in $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$. Then it is straightforward to check that there exists an embedding of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebras

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+ &\longrightarrow U_q^{\geq 0} := U_q^0 U_q^+ \\ \mathbf{e}'_i &\longmapsto \mathbf{e}'_i := -(q_i - q_i^{-1}) t_i e_i \\ \mathbf{e}_j &\longmapsto e_j \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in J^c$ and $j \in J$. So we may identify $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+$ with its image in $U_q^{\geq 0}$, which is generated by $\mathbf{e}'_i, \mathbf{e}_j$ ($i \in J^c, j \in J$). Let

$$(3.1) \quad \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q = U_q^- \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^0 \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+ = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+ \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^0 U_q^- \subset U_q,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^0$ denote the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -subalgebra of U_q^0 generated by t_i, q^h ($i \in J^c, h \in P_J^\vee$). From the triangular decomposition of U_q , the multiplication in U_q yields an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -spaces $U_q^- \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^0 \otimes \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+ \rightarrow U_q^- \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^0 \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+$. We define \mathbf{B}_q to be the quotient of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q$ by the two-sided

ideal \mathbf{I} generated by t_i ($i \in J^c$), and denote by \mathbf{B}_q^+ , \mathbf{B}_q^- and \mathbf{B}_q^0 the images of $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+$, U_q^- , and $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^0$, respectively. Indeed, we have $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^+ \cong \mathbf{B}_q^+$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^- \cong U_q^-$. Then there exists a well-defined homomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebras

$$(3.2) \quad U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{B}_q$$

from $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ to \mathbf{B}_q sending e'_i, e_j, t_j to e'_i, e_j, k_j (in $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ with the same notations) for $i \in J^c$ and $j \in J$. Since we have $\mathbf{B}_q^- \otimes \mathbf{B}_q^0 \otimes \mathbf{B}_q^+ \cong \mathbf{B}_q$ as a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -space, the map in (3.2) is an isomorphism. Hence we obtain the required isomorphism. \square

Proposition 3.2. *There is a homomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebras $\Delta = \Delta_- : U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(q^h) &= q^h \otimes q^h, \\ \Delta(e'_i) &= -(q_i - q_i^{-1})t_i e_i \otimes 1 + t_i \otimes e'_i, \\ \Delta(e_j) &= e_j \otimes t_j^{-1} + 1 \otimes e_j, \\ \Delta(f_l) &= f_l \otimes 1 + t_l \otimes f_l, \end{aligned}$$

for $i \in J^c$, $j \in J$, and $l \in I$, and $h \in P_J^\vee$. Hence $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ becomes a left $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -comodule algebra.

Proof. We may assume that $P_J^\vee = \mathbb{Z}\Pi_J^\vee$, since the general case follows from this case. We see from the definition of $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q$ in the proof of the previous lemma that $\Delta(\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q) \subset U_q \otimes \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{I}) \subset \mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I}$. This induces a well-defined map $\Delta : \mathbf{B}_q \longrightarrow U_q \otimes \mathbf{B}_q$ given by the above formula. \square

There exists an anti-involution $\tau = \tau_-$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ defined by

$$(3.3) \quad \tau(q^h) = q^h, \quad \tau(e'_i) = (1 - q_i^2)f_i, \quad \tau(e_j) = q_j f_j t_j^{-1}, \quad \tau(f_i) = \frac{1}{1 - q_i^2} e'_i, \quad \tau(f_j) = q_j e_j t_j,$$

for $i \in J^c$ and $j \in J$, and $h \in P_J^\vee$. Then we can check the following.

Proposition 3.3. *We have $(\tau \otimes \tau) \circ \Delta_- = \Delta_- \circ \tau$ as homomorphisms of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$, where τ on $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ on the left hand side is equal to τ_- in (2.1).*

Remark 3.4. We may also define a parabolic q -boson algebra associated with Δ_+ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Let $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebra generated by e''_i, e_j, f_l, q^h for $i \in J^c, j \in J, l \in I$, and $h \in P_J^\vee$, subject to the same relations for e_j, f_l, q^h in $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} e''_i f_l &= q^{(h_i, \alpha_l)} f_l e''_i + \delta_{il}, \\ \mathbf{S}_{i_1, i_2}(e''_{i_1}, e''_{i_2}) &= \mathbf{S}_{i, j}^+(e''_i, e_j) = \mathbf{S}_{i, j}^-(e_i, e''_j) = 0 \quad (i_1, i_2, i \in J^c, j \in J). \end{aligned}$$

There exists an isomorphism of \mathbb{Q} -algebras $- : U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}}$ given by $e'_i \mapsto e''_i, e_j \mapsto e_j, f_l \mapsto f_l, q^h \mapsto q^{-h}$, and $q \mapsto q^{-1}$. Lemma 3.1 holds for $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}}$, and Δ_+ induces a

homomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebras $\Delta_+ : U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}} \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}} \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_+(q^h) &= q^h \otimes q^h, \\ \Delta_+(e_i'') &= e_i'' \otimes t_i^{-1} + 1 \otimes (q_i - q_i^{-1})t_i^{-1}e_i, \\ \Delta_+(e_j) &= e_j \otimes 1 + t_j \otimes e_j, \\ \Delta_+(f_l) &= f_l \otimes t_l^{-1} + 1 \otimes f_l,\end{aligned}$$

for $i \in J^c, j \in J$, and $l \in I$, and $h \in P_J^\vee$. Similarly, there exists an anti-involution τ_+ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_+(q^h) &= q^h, \quad \tau_+(e_i'') = (1 - q_i^{-2})f_i, \quad \tau_+(e_j) = q_j t_j f_j, \\ \tau_+(f_i) &= \frac{1}{1 - q_i^{-2}}e_i'', \quad \tau_+(f_j) = q_j t_j^{-1}e_j,\end{aligned}$$

for $i \in J^c$ and $j \in J$, and $h \in P_J^\vee$. Then we have $(\tau_+ \otimes \tau_+) \circ \Delta_+ = \Delta_+ \circ \tau_+$ as homomorphisms of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}} \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}} \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

3.2. Integrable representations. Let $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ be the quantized enveloping algebra associated to $(A_J, P_J^\vee, P_J, \Pi_J^\vee, \Pi_J, (\cdot, \cdot))$. We regard it as a subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by e_i, f_i, q^h for $i \in J$ and $h \in P_J^\vee$. By the isomorphism (3.2), we may also regard it as a subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$.

Let $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}$ be the category of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -modules V such that

- (1) V has a weight space decomposition $V = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in P_J} V_\lambda$ with respect to $U_q^0(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$,
- (2) given $v \in V$, $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})_\beta v = 0$ for all but finitely many $\beta \in Q_+$,

and let $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$ be the subcategory of $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}$ consisting of V such that

- (3) V is integrable as a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -module, that is, e_i, f_i ($i \in J^c$) act locally nilpotently.

We call $V \in \mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$ an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -module. We call a non-zero weight vector $v \in V$ singular if $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})v = 0$.

For $\lambda \in P_J^+$, let $V_\mathfrak{l}(\lambda)$ be the irreducible highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -module with highest weight λ . We regard $V_\mathfrak{l}(\lambda)$ as a module over the subalgebra $U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ by letting $e_i' u_\lambda = 0$ for $i \in J^c$, where u_λ is a highest weight vector of $V_\mathfrak{l}(\lambda)$. Let

$$(3.4) \quad V_J(\lambda) = U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \otimes_{U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q^{\geq 0}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})} V_\mathfrak{l}(\lambda),$$

where $U_q^{\geq 0}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) = U_q^0(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$. Since $U_q(\mathfrak{l})U_q^{\geq 0}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \cong U_q^-(\mathfrak{l}) \otimes U_q^{\geq 0}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \cong U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_q^{\geq 0}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ as $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -spaces, we have as $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -spaces

$$(3.5) \quad V_J(\lambda) \cong U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U_q^-(\mathfrak{l})} V_\mathfrak{l}(\lambda) \cong U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \left/ \sum_{j \in J} U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) f_j^{(h_j, \lambda) + 1} \right.$$

Lemma 3.5. *For $\lambda \in P_J^+$, $V_J(\lambda)$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -module in $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$.*

Proof. It is clear from (3.4) that $V_J(\lambda)$ belongs to $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}$, so it suffices to show the condition (3). This follows from the fact that $V_J(\lambda)$ is generated by a singular vector $1 \otimes u_\lambda$ as a $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, and the identity (3.4.1) of [14]. \square

The following lemma justifies our notation e'_i for the generator of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $u \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ be given. Under the identification of (3.5), the action of e'_i on the image of u in $V_J(\lambda)$ equals the image of $e'_i(u)$ for $i \in J^c$, where e'_i is understood as a linear endomorphism of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ defined in (2.4).*

Proof. For $u \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$, we can prove $e'_i u - q_i^{\langle h_i, \text{wt } u \rangle} u e'_i = e'_i(u)$ by induction on the height of $\text{wt}(u)$, where both sides are understood as an element of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$. Then $e'_i(u \otimes u_\lambda) = e'_i u \otimes u_\lambda = (e'_i u - q_i^{\langle h_i, \text{wt } u \rangle} u e'_i) \otimes u_\lambda = e'_i(u) \otimes u_\lambda$, and the statement follows. \square

Remark 3.7. We may define the category $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}, \text{up}}$ of integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}}$ -modules and $V_J(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in P_J^+$ in the same way. We have an analogue of Lemma 3.6 with e'_i replaced by e''_i in (2.4).

3.3. Complete reducibility. Let us introduce an analogue of the quantum Casimir operator on $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -modules, which is defined in a similar way as in [26].

For $\alpha \in Q_+$, let $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})_{\geq \alpha} = \bigoplus_{\beta \geq \alpha} U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})_\beta$ and $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})_{\geq \alpha} = \bigoplus_{\beta \geq \alpha} U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})_\beta$. Let $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be the inverse limit of an inverse system $(U_q(\mathfrak{g})/U_q^{\leq 0}(\mathfrak{g})U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})_{\geq \alpha})_{\alpha \in Q_+}$ with respect to the maps $f_{\alpha\beta} : U_q(\mathfrak{g})/U_q^{\leq 0}(\mathfrak{g})U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})_{\geq \beta} \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g})/U_q^{\leq 0}(\mathfrak{g})U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})_{\geq \alpha}$ indexed by a directed set Q_+ . Let $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ be defined in a similar way with respect to $\{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})/U_q^{\leq 0}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})_{\geq \beta} \mid \beta \in Q_+\}$. Let

$$(3.6) \quad \Omega = m((S_+ \otimes 1)\Theta_+),$$

where m denotes the multiplication in $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, Θ_+ is given in (2.9), and S_+ is the antipode for Δ_+ given by $S_+ = (\overline{S})^{-1}$ with $\overline{S}(u) = \overline{S(\overline{u})}$ for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. It is a well-defined element in $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

Lemma 3.8. *Ω induces a well-defined element in $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ satisfying*

- (1) $e_j \Omega = t_j^2 \Omega e_j$, $f_j \Omega = t_j^{-2} \Omega f_j$, $q^h \Omega = \Omega q^h$ for $j \in J$ and $h \in Q_J$,
- (2) $e'_i \Omega = \Omega f_i = 0$ for $i \in J^c$.

Proof. Let $\widetilde{\mathfrak{B}}_q$ be the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ given in (3.1). We define the completion $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_q$ in a similar way. We may regard $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_q$ as a subalgebra $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, and $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ is a quotient of $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_q$ by the two-sided ideal $\widehat{\Gamma}$ generated by t_i ($i \in J^c$).

Recall from [26, 4.1] that we have

$$(\Theta_+)_\beta = \sum_{b \in \mathbf{B}_\beta} c_b b^* \otimes b \quad (\beta \in Q_+),$$

for some $c_b \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$, where \mathbf{B}_β is a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})_\beta$ and $\mathbf{B}_\beta^* := \{b^* \mid b \in \mathbf{B}_\beta\}$ is a dual basis of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})_{-\beta}$, and hence

$$\Omega = \sum_{b \in \mathbf{B}_\beta} c_b S_+(b^*)b.$$

Since $S_+(f_i) = -f_i t_i$ for $i \in I$, we see that $S_+(b^*)b \in \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q$, and Ω induces a well-defined element in $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^\wedge$, which we still denote by Ω .

Now, the equations in (1) follow from [26, 6.1.2]. This also implies $e'_i \Omega = \Omega f_i = 0$ in $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ since $e'_i \Omega = t_i^2 \Omega e'_i$ and $t_i^2 f_i \Omega = \Omega f_i$ in $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q$ ($i \in J^c$), which belong to \mathbf{I}^\wedge . This proves (2). \square

Remark 3.9. Although $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ is compatible with Δ_- (for example, Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3), we have to use Ω associated to Δ_+ in order to have $\Omega \in \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^\wedge$. Indeed, the quantum Casimir element associated with Δ_- does not induce a well-defined element in $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_q^\wedge$.

Let $V \in \mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}$ be given. Let Ξ be a linear operator on V given by $\Xi v = q^{(\lambda+2\rho, \lambda)} v$ for $v \in V_\lambda$, where $\rho \in P$ is given by $(\rho, \alpha_i) = (\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2$ for $i \in I$.

Proposition 3.10. *We have the following.*

- (1) *If $v \in V_\lambda$ is singular, then $\Omega \Xi v = q^{(\lambda+2\rho, \lambda)} v$.*
- (2) *$\Omega \Xi$ commutes with the $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -action on V .*

Proof. (1) is clear from the definition of Ω . (2) follows from Lemma 3.8 (1). \square

Proposition 3.11. *If V is generated by a singular vector, then V is irreducible. In particular, $V_J(\lambda)$ is irreducible for $\lambda \in P_J^+$.*

Proof. Let v be a singular vector of weight λ , which generates V . Suppose that there is a proper submodule W . Then W has a singular vector $w \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})v$ of weight μ .

Let $u \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ be such that $uv = w$. By Proposition 3.10(1), we have $(\lambda + 2\rho, \lambda) = (\mu + 2\rho, \mu)$. Since $\lambda \geq \mu$ and $\mu \in P_J^+$, we have $\lambda = \mu$ by standard arguments (cf. [14]), and hence u is a linear combination of monomials in f_i 's ($i \in J^c$). Since W is a proper submodule, u is not a constant and $\Omega u = 0$ by Lemma 3.8(2). So $\Omega \Xi w = 0$, which is again a contradiction. \square

Lemma 3.12. *The following identities hold on V :*

$$\Omega \Xi \Omega = \Omega_{\mathfrak{l}} \Xi \Omega = \Omega \Xi \Omega_{\mathfrak{l}},$$

where $\Omega_{\mathfrak{l}}$ denotes the Casimir element (3.6) for $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$.

Proof. It suffices to show that the identities hold for $v \in V_\lambda$. Since Ξ is a scalar multiplication, the statement follows from Lemma 3.8(2). \square

Theorem 3.13. *The category $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$ is semisimple with irreducibles $V_J(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in P_J^+$.*

Proof. Let $V \in \mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$, and let V' be the submodule generated by the singular vectors. Then V' is semisimple by Proposition 3.11. We claim that $V = V'$.

Suppose that $V \neq V'$. There exists a nonzero $v \in V$ of weight μ , which gives a singular vector of V/V' . Consider a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -submodule W generated by Ωv . Since W is a semisimple $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -module, we may write $\Omega v = v_1 + \cdots + v_n$, where v_1, \dots, v_n belong to mutually non-isomorphic isotypic components. Hence $\Omega_i \Xi v_i = q^{a_i} v_i$ for $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), where a_1, \dots, a_n are pairwise distinct. By Proposition 3.10 (1) and Lemma 3.12, the following identities hold for all $N \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^n q^{N a_k} e_j v_k &= e_j (\Omega_i \Xi)^N \Omega v = (\Omega_i \Xi)^N \Omega t_j^2 e_j v \in V' \quad (j \in J), \\ \sum_{k=1}^n q^{N a_k} e'_i v_k &= e'_i (\Omega_i \Xi)^N \Omega v = e'_i (\Omega \Xi)^N \Omega v = 0 \quad (i \in J^c). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $e_j v_k \in V'$ and $e'_i v_k = 0$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Since $v \notin V'$ and $\Omega \Xi v - q^{(\lambda+2\rho, \lambda)} v \in V'$, at least one among v_k is not in V' . So by replacing v with v_k , we may assume that $e'_i v = 0$ for all $i \in J^c$, and that $\Omega_i \Xi v = q^a v$ for some a . By applying $\Omega_i \Xi$ on V/V' , we have $(\mu + 2\rho, \mu) = a$.

By the condition (2) in the definition of $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}$, there exists a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -highest weight vector $w \in U_q(\mathfrak{l})v$ of weight λ . Then $\Omega_i \Xi w = q^{(\lambda+2\rho, \lambda)} w$, and $(\mu + 2\rho, \mu) = (\lambda + 2\rho, \lambda)$, and $\lambda \geq \mu$, which implies $\lambda = \mu$. So v is a singular vector with respect to $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -action, and hence a singular vector with respect to $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -action, but this contradicts the assumption that $v \notin V'$.

Finally, let V be an irreducible $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -module in $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$, which is generated by a singular vector v of weight λ . Since $U_q(\mathfrak{l})v$ is isomorphic to $V_J(\lambda)$ with $\lambda \in P_J^+$, there exists a surjective homomorphism $V_J(\lambda)$ onto V , and hence it is an isomorphism. \square

Remark 3.14. The complete reducibility also holds for $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}}}^{\text{int}}$, since twisting the action by $- : U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}}$ in Remark 3.4 induces an equivalence from $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})^{\text{up}}}^{\text{int}}$ to $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$.

3.4. A parabolic analogue of q -derivations. We introduce a parabolic analogue of q -derivations ${}_i r, r_i$ for $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$.

Let $\mathcal{M}_J = V_J(0)$, and denote its singular vector by $1 \in \mathcal{M}_J$. For $i \in J^c$, $f_i \in \mathcal{M}_J$ is a highest weight vector of weight $-\alpha_i$ with respect to the $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -action, which is unique up to scalar multiplication. Hence, there exists a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -linear projection $\pi_i : \mathcal{M}_J \rightarrow V_1(-\alpha_i)$. Regarding \mathcal{M}_J as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, that is, as a parabolic Verma module induced from $V_1(0)$, we have an injective $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -linear map $\mathcal{M}_J \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_J \otimes_{\pm} \mathcal{M}_J$, sending 1 to $1 \otimes 1$. Then we

define $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -linear maps

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} r_i^\pm : \mathcal{M}_J &\longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_J \otimes_\pm \mathcal{M}_J \xrightarrow{1 \otimes \pi_i} \mathcal{M}_J \otimes_\pm V_1(-\alpha_i), \\ {}_i r^\pm : \mathcal{M}_J &\longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_J \otimes_\pm \mathcal{M}_J \xrightarrow{\pi_i \otimes 1} V_1(-\alpha_i) \otimes_\pm \mathcal{M}_J. \end{aligned}$$

If $J = \emptyset$, then $V(-\alpha_i)$ is one-dimensional $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -subspace of weight $-\alpha_i$, r_i^\pm and ${}_i r^\pm$ coincides with the maps in [26]. Note that

$$(3.8) \quad \sigma \circ (- \otimes -) \circ r_i^\pm = {}_i r^\mp,$$

where σ is the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear map given by $\sigma(x \otimes y) = y \otimes x$. From the definition, we clearly have $({}_{i_1} r^\pm \otimes 1) \circ r_{i_2}^\pm = (1 \otimes r_{i_2}^\pm) \circ {}_{i_1} r^\pm$ ($i_1, i_2 \in J^c$), which can be viewed as an analogue of $e'_i e''_j = q_i^{\langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle} e''_j e'_i$ in [15, Proposition 3.4.5].

The following is an analogue of [15, Lemma 3.4.7], which plays an important role in Section 8.

Lemma 3.15. *If $u \in \mathcal{M}_J$ satisfies $r_i^+(u) = 0$ for all $i \in J^c$, then u is a scalar multiple of 1. The same holds for r_i^- , ${}_i r^+$, and ${}_i r^-$.*

Proof. Note that \mathcal{M}_J has a canonical Q_- grading induced from that of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ by (3.5). Suppose that $u \in (\mathcal{M}_J)_{-\xi}$ with respect to this grading. Suppose that $\xi \neq 0$. Since r_i^+ 's are $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -linear, any element of $U_q(\mathfrak{l})u$ satisfies the same condition as u . By the condition (2) in the definition of $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}$, there exists $\alpha \in Q_J^+$ such that $(U_q^+(\mathfrak{l})u)_{-\alpha} \neq 0$ and $(U_q^+(\mathfrak{l})u)_{-\beta} = 0$ for $0 \leq \beta < \alpha$. Note that $\alpha \neq 0$ since $(\mathcal{M}_J)_{-\alpha_j} = 0$ for $j \in J$. Therefore, $U_q^+(\mathfrak{l})u$ contains a $U_q(\mathfrak{l})$ -highest weight vector u' with $u' \in (\mathcal{M}_J)_{-\xi'}$ with $\xi' \neq 0$ such that $r_i(u') = 0$ for all $i \in J^c$. Hence, by replacing u with u' , we may assume that u satisfies $e_j u = 0$ for all $j \in J$.

Recall that

$$\Delta_+(u) \in u \otimes 1 + c e'_i(u) \otimes f_i + \sum_{\xi \in Q_+, \xi \neq 0, \alpha_i} U_q^{\leq 0}(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})_{-\xi}$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ (cf. [26, 1.2.13]). Therefore, $r_i^+(u) = 0$ implies $e'_i(u) = 0$. By Lemma 3.6, u is a singular vector of \mathcal{M}_J with respect to the $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -action. Then by Proposition 3.11, u is a scalar multiple of 1, which is a contradiction.

A similar argument using e''_i instead of e'_i and an application of Remark 3.7 proves the case for ${}_i r^+$. The cases for r_i^- and ${}_i r^-$ follows from (3.8). \square

3.5. Crystal base of $V_J(\lambda)$ and tensor product rule. Let $\mathcal{O}_{B_q(\mathfrak{g})}^{\text{int}} = \mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$ when $J = \emptyset$. Recall that $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ is a unique irreducible $B_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module in $\mathcal{O}_{B_q(\mathfrak{g})}^{\text{int}}$ with a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(\infty), \mathcal{B}(\infty))$ [15], where the crystal operators \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i for $i \in I$ are given by

$$(3.9) \quad \tilde{e}_i u = \sum_{k \geq 1} f_i^{(k-1)} u_k, \quad \tilde{f}_i u = \sum_{k \geq 0} f_i^{(k+1)} u_k,$$

for $u \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})_\beta$ ($\beta \in Q_-$) with $e'_i u_k = 0$. Let $G(\infty) = \{G(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)\}$ be the global crystal basis or canonical basis of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$.

Let $V \in \mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})}^{\text{int}}$ be given. We define a crystal base of V in the same way as in the case of integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules in Section 2.2 with respect to \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i in (3.9) for $i \in J^c$ and (2.2) for $i \in J$, where P is replaced by P_J .

Let $\lambda \in P_J^+$ be given. By (3.5), $V_J(\lambda)$ can be identified with

$$U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) / \sum_{j \in J} U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) f_j^{\langle h_j, \lambda \rangle + 1}$$

as a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -space, where the action of e'_i, f_i for $i \in J^c$ on $V_J(\lambda)$ coincide with those induced from $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ (cf. Lemma 3.6). Let u_λ denote the highest weight vector of $V_J(\lambda)$.

Let

$$\pi_\lambda^J : U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow V_J(\lambda)$$

be the canonical projection, which is a homomorphism of $B_q(\mathfrak{g}_{J^c})$ -modules. Let $\mathcal{B}_J(\lambda) = \{b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty) \mid \varepsilon_j^*(b) \leq \langle h_j, \lambda \rangle \ (j \in J)\}$, where $\varepsilon_j^*(b) = \max\{k \mid \tilde{e}_j^k b^* \neq 0\}$ and $*$ denotes the involution on $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ induced from the $*$ -involution on $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ [16]. Then $\pi_\lambda^J(G(b)) \neq 0$ if and only if $b \in \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda)$, and $\{G_{J,\lambda}(b) := \pi_\lambda^J(G(b)) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda)\}$ forms a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of $V_J(\lambda)$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}_J(\lambda) = \bigoplus_{b \in \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda)} A_0 G_{J,\lambda}(b),$$

$$\mathcal{B}_J(\lambda) = \{G_{J,\lambda}(b) \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)} \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda)\} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Theorem 3.16. *For $\lambda \in P_J^+$, $(\mathcal{L}_J(\lambda), \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda))$ is a crystal base of $V_J(\lambda)$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$(3.10) \quad \tilde{x}_i \mathcal{L}_J(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{L}_J(\lambda), \quad \tilde{x}_i \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda) \cup \{0\} \quad (i \in I, x = e, f).$$

since the other conditions for crystal base follow immediately.

Since π_λ^J commutes with e'_i, f_i for $i \in J^c$, it also commutes with \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i for $i \in J^c$. This implies (3.10) for $i \in J^c$.

Let $\Lambda \in P$ such that $\langle h_j, \Lambda \rangle = \langle h_j, \lambda \rangle$ for $j \in J$. Let

$$(3.11) \quad \pi_{J,\Lambda} : V_J(\lambda) \longrightarrow V(\Lambda)$$

be the canonical projection so that $\pi_\lambda^J \circ \pi_{J,\Lambda}$ is the canonical projection $\pi_\Lambda : U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \longrightarrow V(\Lambda)$. Recall that $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda) = \{b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty) \mid \varepsilon_i^*(b) \leq \langle h_i, \Lambda \rangle \ (i \in I)\}$ and $G(\Lambda) = \{\pi_\Lambda(G(b)) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\Lambda)\}$.

Let $\beta \in Q_+$ be given. Choose Λ such that $\langle h_j, \Lambda \rangle \gg 0$ for $j \in J$ so that $\mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)_{\lambda - \beta + k\alpha_j}$ ($k = 0, \pm 1$) is isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda)_{\Lambda - \beta + k\alpha_j}$ under $\pi_{J,\Lambda}$. Since $\pi_{J,\Lambda}$ is $U_q(\mathfrak{t})$ -linear by (3.5), $\pi_{J,\Lambda}$ commutes with \tilde{e}_j, \tilde{f}_j for $j \in J$. This implies that $\tilde{x}_j \mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)_{\lambda - \beta} \subset \mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)_{\lambda - \beta \pm \alpha_j}$ and $\tilde{x}_j G_{J,\lambda}(b) \in \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda) \cup \{0\} \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)}$ for $x = e, f$ and $j \in J$. Hence (3.10) holds for $j \in J$. \square

Corollary 3.17. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_J(\lambda) &= \sum_{r \geq 0, i_1, \dots, i_r \in I} A_0 \tilde{f}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r} u_\lambda, \\ \mathcal{B}_J(\lambda) &= \{ \tilde{f}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_r} u_\lambda \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)} \mid r \geq 0, i_1, \dots, i_r \in I \} \setminus \{0\}.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, $V_J(\lambda)$ has a unique crystal base up to scalar multiplication.

We also have an analogue of q -Shapovalov form on $V_J(\lambda)$.

Proposition 3.18. *There exists a unique nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $V_J(\lambda)$ such that*

$$\langle u_\lambda, u_\lambda \rangle = 1, \quad \langle uv, w \rangle = \langle v, \tau(u)w \rangle \quad (u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}), v, w \in V_J(\lambda)),$$

where τ is given in (3.3)

Proof. It can be proved by similar arguments as in the case of $J = I$ using Proposition 3.11. \square

Proposition 3.19. *We have the following.*

- (1) $\langle \tilde{f}_i u, v \rangle \equiv \langle u, \tilde{e}_i v \rangle \pmod{qA_0}$ for $u, v \in \mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)$ and $i \in I$.
- (2) $\mathcal{L}_J(\lambda) = \{ x \in V_J(\lambda) \mid \langle x, \mathcal{L}_J(\lambda) \rangle \subset A_0 \}$.

Proof. (1) As in the proof of [15, Proposition 5.1.1, 5.1.2], we may show by induction on the height of $\xi \in -Q_+$ that

$$(3.12) \quad \langle \tilde{f}_i u, v \rangle \equiv \langle u, \tilde{e}_i v \rangle \pmod{qA_0}$$

for $u \in \mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)_{\lambda+\xi+\alpha_i}, v \in \mathcal{L}_J(\lambda)_{\lambda+\xi}$. For $i \in J$, the proof is identical to the one in [15]. For $i \in J^c$, we have

$$\langle f_i^{(n+1)} u_0, f_i^{(m)} v_0 \rangle = \delta_{n+1, m} (1 - q_i^2)^{-m} \left(q_i^{\frac{m(m-1)}{2}} [m]_i! \right)^{-1} \langle u_0, v_0 \rangle,$$

where $u = f_i^{(n)} u_0, v = f_i^{(m+1)} v_0$ with $e'_i u_0 = e'_i v_0 = 0$. This provides an analogue of [15, (5.1.2)], which is needed for the proof of (3.12). (2) can be proved by the same arguments as in [15, Proposition 5.1.1]. \square

Let V_1 be an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, and let V_2 be an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -module. By Proposition 3.2, $V_1 \otimes V_2$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ -module. Then we have the following.

Theorem 3.20. *Let (L_i, B_i) be a crystal base of V_i ($i = 1, 2$). Then $(L_1 \otimes L_2, B_1 \otimes B_2)$ is a crystal base of $V_1 \otimes V_2$ such that \tilde{e}_i and \tilde{f}_i ($i \in I$) act on $B_1 \otimes B_2$ by the same formula as in (2.5).*

Proof. Let $(L, B) = (L_1 \otimes L_2, B_1 \otimes B_2)$. If $j \in J$, then (L, B) is a crystal base of $V_1 \otimes V_2$ as a module over the subalgebra $\langle e_j, f_j, t_j^{\pm 1} \rangle$. If $i \in J^c$, then (L, B) is also a crystal base of $V_1 \otimes V_2$ as a module over the subalgebra $\langle e'_i, f_i \rangle$ satisfying (2.5) [15, Section 3.5]. \square

4. A CATEGORY GENERATED BY EXTREMAL WEIGHT MODULES

4.1. Notations. Let \mathfrak{gl}_∞ be a Lie algebra of $(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z})$ -matrices spanned by the elementary matrices E_{ij} ($i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$). Let $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$ be the quantized enveloping algebra associated with

$$(1) P = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\epsilon_i \oplus \mathbb{Z}\Lambda_0 \oplus \mathbb{Z}\delta, P^\vee = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}E_{ii} \text{ with}$$

$$\langle E_{ii}, \epsilon_j \rangle = \delta_{ij} \quad (i, j \in \mathbb{Z}), \quad \langle E_{kk}, \Lambda_0 \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & k \leq 0 \\ 0 & k > 0 \end{cases}, \quad \langle E_{kk}, \delta \rangle = 1 \quad (k \in \mathbb{Z}),$$

$$(\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j) = \delta_{ij} \quad (i, j \in \mathbb{Z}), \quad (\epsilon_k, \Lambda_0) = \begin{cases} 1 & k \leq 0 \\ 0 & k > 0 \end{cases}, \quad (\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0) = (\Lambda_0, \delta) = (\delta, \delta) = 0,$$

$$(2) \Pi = \{ \alpha_i = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1} \mid i \in \mathbb{Z} \}, \Pi^\vee = \{ h_i = E_{ii} - E_{i+1i+1} \mid i \in \mathbb{Z} \}.$$

Then $(A, P^\vee, P, \Pi^\vee, \Pi, (,))$ satisfies conditions in Section 2.1. For $i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, let $\Lambda_i \in P^+$ be the i -th fundamental weight given by

$$\Lambda_i = \begin{cases} \Lambda_0 + \sum_{k=1}^i \epsilon_k & \text{if } i > 0, \\ \Lambda_0 - \sum_{k=i+1}^0 \epsilon_k & \text{if } i < 0. \end{cases}$$

For $n \geq 1$, let $\mathbb{Z}_+^n = \{ (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \mid \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \}$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, we put

$$\Lambda_\lambda = \Lambda_{\lambda_1} + \dots + \Lambda_{\lambda_n} \in P^+.$$

For an interval $S \subset \mathbb{R}$, denote $\mathbb{S} = S \cap \mathbb{Z}$. Let $A_S = (a_{ij})_{i, j \in \mathbb{S} \cap (S-1)}$, where $\mathbb{S} - 1$ denotes the translate of \mathbb{S} by -1 . Let $P_S^\vee = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{S}} \mathbb{Z}E_{ii} \subset P^\vee$, and P_S the dual of P_S^\vee inside P . Note that P_S is a quotient of P , where $\epsilon_i = 0$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{S}$ together with some relations expressing $\Lambda_0, \delta - \Lambda_0$, or δ as linear combination of ϵ_i 's (depending on S). Therefore, we may identify P_S with a subgroup of P containing $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{S}}$, and by restricting $(,)$ to P_S , we obtain a bilinear form $(,)_S$ on P_S . We define $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ to be the quantized enveloping algebra associated with this realization, which is canonically identified as a subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$. We denote $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ by $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}), U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$, and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ when $S = \mathbb{R}_{>0}, \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$, and $[1, n]$, respectively.

Let \mathcal{P} denote the set of partitions $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \geq 1}$. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\ell(\lambda)$ be the length of λ and $|\lambda| = \sum_{i \geq 1} \lambda_i$.

For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$, let $\epsilon_\lambda = \sum_{i \geq 1} \lambda_i \epsilon_i$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^\ell$, we also write $\epsilon_\lambda = \lambda_1 \epsilon_1 + \lambda_2 \epsilon_2 + \dots + \lambda_\ell \epsilon_\ell$. For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$, let $\epsilon_{\mu, \nu}^n = \mu_1 \epsilon_1 + \dots + \mu_s \epsilon_s - \nu_t \epsilon_{n-t+1} - \dots - \nu_\ell \epsilon_n$.

4.2. Extremal weight modules $V_{\mu, \nu}$ over $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$. Let $P_{>0} = P_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}$ be the weight lattice of $\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}$. Let $P_{>0}/W_{>0}$ be the set of $W_{>0}$ -orbits in $P_{>0}$, where $W_{>0}$ is the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}$. Given $\lambda = \sum_{i \geq 1} \lambda_i \epsilon_i \in P_{>0}$, we have partitions μ and ν , which are uniquely determined by the coefficients λ_i with $\lambda_i > 0$ and $\lambda_i < 0$, respectively. Then we have a well-defined

bijection

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} P_{>0}/W_{>0} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{P}^2 = \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{P} \\ W_{>0}\lambda & \longrightarrow & (\mu, \nu) \end{array}$$

For $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, let $V_{\mu, \nu}$ denote the extremal weight module $V(\lambda)$, where $W_{>0}\lambda$ corresponds to (μ, ν) . It has a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(V_{\mu, \nu}), \mathcal{B}(V_{\mu, \nu}))$.

Proposition 4.1. *For $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, $V_{\mu, \nu}$ is irreducible.*

Proof. Let V be a non-zero submodule of $V_{\mu, \nu}$ and let $v \in V$ be a non-zero weight vector. Let $s = \ell(\mu)$ and $t = \ell(\nu)$. For $n \geq s + t$, let $u_{\mu, \nu}^n$ be an extremal weight vector of weight $\epsilon_{\mu, \nu}^n$, which is a highest weight vector with respect to $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Since $V_{\mu, \nu}$ is generated by $u_{\mu, \nu}^n$, we may assume that v belongs to

$$(4.2) \quad V_{\mu, \nu}^n := U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)u_{\mu, \nu}^n$$

for a sufficiently large n . This implies that V contains $u_{\mu, \nu}^n$ and hence $V = V_{\mu, \nu}$. \square

Let us briefly recall a combinatorial realization of $\mathcal{B}(V_{\mu, \nu}) = \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in P_{>0}$ in [22]. Let us regard $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ as the crystal of the natural representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$: $1 \xrightarrow{1} 2 \xrightarrow{2} 3 \xrightarrow{3} \dots$ where $\text{wt}(k) = \epsilon_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\vee = \{k^\vee \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$, and regard it as the dual crystal of $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, that is, $\dots \xrightarrow{3} 3^\vee \xrightarrow{2} 2^\vee \xrightarrow{1} 1^\vee$ where $\text{wt}(k^\vee) = -\epsilon_k$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Let $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ correspond to $W_{>0}\lambda$ under (4.1). Note that $V_{\mu, \emptyset}$ is a highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module with highest weight ϵ_μ and $V_{\emptyset, \nu}$ is a lowest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module with lowest weight $-\epsilon_\nu$.

For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$, we identify μ with its Young diagram and let $SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}(\mu)$ be the set of all semistandard tableaux of shape μ with entries in $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ [10]. Then the crystal $\mathcal{B}(V_{\mu, \emptyset})$ can be identified with $SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}(\mu)$. Indeed, we identify $S \in SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}(\mu)$ with $w_1 \otimes w_2 \otimes \dots \otimes w_{|\mu|}$, where $w_1 w_2 \dots w_{|\mu|}$ is the column word of S , that is, a word given by reading the entries column by column from right to left and from top to bottom in each column. Then $SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}(\mu)$ is the connected component of H_μ in $SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}((1)^{\otimes |\mu|})$, where $\text{wt}(H_\mu) = \epsilon_\mu$.

Similarly, for $\nu \in \mathcal{P}$, let $SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\vee}(\nu^\pi)$ be the set of semistandard tableaux of shape ν with entries in $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, where ν^π is the skew diagram obtained by 180°-rotation of ν and $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ has a linear order $a^\vee < b^\vee$ for $a > b$. Then the crystal $\mathcal{B}(V_{\emptyset, \nu})$ can be identified with $SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\vee}(\nu^\pi)$, which is the connected component of H_ν^\vee in $SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\vee}((1)^{\otimes |\nu|})$ (as its column word), where $\text{wt}(H_\nu^\vee) = -\epsilon_\nu$.

Let $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu}$ to be the set of bitableaux (S, T) such that

- (1) $S \in SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}(\mu)$ and $T \in SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\vee}(\nu^\pi)$,
- (2) $|\{i \mid S^{(i,1)} \leq k\}| + |\{i \mid T_{(i,1)} \geq k^\vee\}| \leq k$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Here $S^{(i,j)}$ is the entry of S in the i -th row from the top and the j -th column from the left, and $T_{(i,j)}$ is the entry of T in the i -th row from the bottom and the j -th column from the right. We regard $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu} \subset SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}}(\mu) \otimes SST_{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^\vee}(\nu^\pi)$ and apply \tilde{e}_i and \tilde{f}_i for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Theorem 4.2 ([22]). *For $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, we have*

- (1) $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu} \cup \{0\}$ is stable under \tilde{e}_i and \tilde{f}_i for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and it is connected,
- (2) $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(V_{\mu, \nu})$,
- (3) $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_{\emptyset, \nu} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\mu, \emptyset}$.

Remark 4.3. It is shown in [22] that $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\sigma, \tau}$ is isomorphic to a disjoint union of $\mathcal{B}_{\zeta, \eta}$, where the multiplicity for each $\mathcal{B}_{\zeta, \eta}$ is given in terms of Littlewood-Richardson coefficients $c_{\alpha\beta}^{\gamma}$ for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{P}$ with $|\alpha| + |\beta| = |\gamma|$ (cf. [10]). For example, multiplicity for $\mathcal{B}_{\zeta, \eta}$ in $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, 0} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{0, \nu}$ is given by

$$(4.3) \quad m_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu} := \sum_{\sigma} c_{\sigma\zeta}^{\mu} c_{\sigma\eta}^{\nu}.$$

But we should remark that $V_{\mu, \nu} \otimes V_{\sigma, \tau}$ is not semisimple in general.

4.3. A monoidal category generated by $V_{\mu, \nu}$. In this subsection, we show that there exists a filtration on $V_{\mu, 0} \otimes V_{0, \nu}$, which is compatible with the decomposition of $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, 0} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{0, \nu}$ (Remark 4.3).

Lemma 4.4. *Let V be an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module with a crystal base (L, B) . Let v be a weight vector such that*

- (1) v is an extremal weight vector of weight λ ,
- (2) $v \in B \pmod{qL}$ and its connected component in B is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(V(\lambda))$.

Then there exists an injective $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -linear map $\phi : V(\lambda) \rightarrow V$ with $\phi(u_{\lambda}) = v$.

Proof. Let V' be the $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -submodule of V generated by v . Then there exists a surjective $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -linear map $\phi : V(\lambda) \rightarrow V'$ such that $\phi(u_{\lambda}) = v$. Let

$$L' = \sum_{r \geq 0, i_1, \dots, i_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} A_0 \tilde{x}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{x}_{i_r} v,$$

$$B' = \{ \tilde{x}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{x}_{i_r} v \pmod{qL} \mid r \geq 0, i_1, \dots, i_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \} \setminus \{0\}.$$

We have $\phi(\mathcal{L}(V(\lambda))) = L'$ and $\bar{\phi}(\mathcal{B}(V(\lambda))) = B'$ since ϕ is $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -linear, where $\bar{\phi} : \mathcal{L}(\lambda)/q\mathcal{L}(\lambda) \rightarrow L/qL$ is the map induced from ϕ . Also $\bar{\phi}$ is a bijection since B' is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(V(\lambda))$ and $\bar{\phi}$ commutes with \tilde{e}_i and \tilde{f}_i for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Let $u \in V(\lambda)$ be given such that $\phi(u) = 0$. Let $c \in \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\times}$ such that $cu \in \mathcal{L}(V(\lambda))$ and $cu = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}(V(\lambda))} c_b b \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(V(\lambda))}$ for some $c_b \in \mathbb{Q}$, which are not all 0. Then $\bar{\phi}(cu) = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}(V(\lambda))} c_b \bar{\phi}(b) = 0$, but this contradicts the fact that $\bar{\phi}$ is a bijection and $\bar{\phi}(\mathcal{B}(V(\lambda)))$ is linearly independent. Hence, ϕ is injective. \square

Let $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be given. Let $(\mathcal{L}_{\mu, \nu}, \mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu})$ and $G_{\mu, \nu}$ denote the crystal base and global crystal base of $V_{\mu, \nu}$, respectively. Let

$$V = V_{\mu, 0} \otimes V_{0, \nu}, \quad (\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B}) = (\mathcal{L}_{\mu, 0} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{0, \nu}, \mathcal{B}_{\mu, 0} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{0, \nu}).$$

Then $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a crystal base of V . Let G be the canonical basis of V so that (V, G) is a based module with respect to $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ (cf. Theorem 2.7).

Lemma 4.5. *There exists a unique injective $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -linear map $\phi : V_{\mu, \nu} \longrightarrow V$ such that $\phi(G_{\mu, \nu}) \subset G$.*

Proof. Let $u_{\mu, \nu}$ be an extremal weight vector of $V_{\mu, \nu}$ with weight $\epsilon_{\mu, \nu}^n$, say λ , where $n = \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$. Let $\lambda^+ = \mu_1 \epsilon_1 + \cdots + \mu_s \epsilon_s$ and $\lambda^- = -\nu_t \epsilon_{n-t+1} - \cdots - \nu_1 \epsilon_n$. Let $u_1 \in V_{\mu, \emptyset}$ and $u_2 \in V_{\emptyset, \nu}$ be unique weight vectors (up to scalar multiplication) such that $\text{wt}(u_1) = \lambda^+$ and $\text{wt}(u_2) = \lambda^-$, respectively. We may assume that $u_1 \otimes u_2 \in \mathcal{B} \pmod{q\mathcal{L}}$.

Then $u_1 \otimes u_2$ is an extremal weight vector of weight λ in V , and the connected component of $u_1 \otimes u_2$ in \mathcal{B} is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu}$ by Theorem 4.2. Hence there exists a unique injective $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -linear map $\phi : V_{\mu, \nu} \longrightarrow V$ such that $\phi(u_{\mu, \nu}) = u_1 \otimes u_2$ by Lemma 4.4.

Let $G_{\mu, \nu} = G(\lambda) = \{G_{\mu, \nu}(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu}\} \subset V_{\mu, \nu}$. Since $u_{\mu, \nu} \in G_{\mu, \nu}$ and $u_1 \otimes u_2 \in G$, we have

- (1) $\phi(G_{\mu, \nu}(b)) \in \mathcal{L} \cap U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})_A(u_1 \otimes u_2)$,
- (2) $\overline{\phi(G_{\mu, \nu}(b))} = \phi(G_{\mu, \nu}(b))$,
- (3) $\phi(G_{\mu, \nu}(b)) \equiv \overline{\phi}(b) \in \mathcal{B} \pmod{q\mathcal{L}}$,

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_{\mu, \nu}$. This implies that $\phi(G_{\mu, \nu}(b)) \subset G$ (cf. [26, 27.1.5]). \square

Let us introduce some partial orders on \mathcal{P}^2 . For $(\mu, \nu), (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, we first define a partial order \succeq by

$$(\mu, \nu) \succeq (\zeta, \eta) \iff \epsilon_{\mu, \nu}^n - \epsilon_{\zeta, \eta}^n \in Q_+ \text{ for } n \geq \max(\ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu), \ell(\zeta) + \ell(\eta)).$$

Note that this condition is independent of n . Next, we define a partial order \geq by

$$(4.4) \quad (\mu, \nu) \geq (\zeta, \eta) \iff |\mu| - |\nu| = |\zeta| - |\eta| \text{ and } \mu \supset \zeta, \nu \supset \eta,$$

where $\mu \supset \zeta$ means $\mu_i \geq \zeta_i$ for all i . Note that $(\mu, \nu) \geq (\zeta, \eta)$ implies $(\mu, \nu) \succeq (\zeta, \eta)$.

Let $\mathcal{P}(\mu, \nu) = \{(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2 \mid (\zeta, \eta) \leq (\mu, \nu)\}$. Define $\mathcal{P}_k(\mu, \nu)$ for $k \geq 0$ inductively by letting $\mathcal{P}_0(\mu, \nu) = \{(\mu, \nu)\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_k(\mu, \nu)$ the set of maximal elements in $\mathcal{P}(\mu, \nu) \setminus \bigsqcup_{l < k} \mathcal{P}_l(\mu, \nu)$ with respect to \succeq .

Proposition 4.6. *There exists a sequence of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -submodules $0 = F_{-1} \subset F_0 \subset F_1 \subset \cdots \subset F_k \subset \cdots \subset V$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{k \geq 1} F_k = V, \quad F_k/F_{k-1} \cong \bigoplus_{(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mu, \nu)} V_{\zeta, \eta}^{\oplus m_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu}},$$

where $m_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu}$ is given in (4.3).

Proof. For $n \geq \max\{\ell(\mu), \ell(\nu)\}$, consider

$$V^n \subset V^{n+1} \subset \cdots \subset V,$$

where $V^n = V_{\mu,0}^n \otimes V_{0,\nu}^n$ with $V_{\mu,0}^n = U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)u_{\mu,0}^n$ and $V_{0,\nu}^n = U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)u_{0,\nu}^n$ (cf. (4.2)). Let \mathcal{B}^n be the crystal of V^n . We may regard $\mathcal{B}^n \subset \mathcal{B}$.

By (4.3), we have

$$\mathcal{B} \cong \bigsqcup_{(\zeta,\eta) \in \mathcal{P}(\mu,\nu)} \mathcal{B}_{\zeta,\eta}^{\oplus m_{\zeta,\eta}^{\mu,\nu}}.$$

For $k \geq 0$, let

$$\mathcal{B}_k = \bigsqcup_{l \leq k} \bigsqcup_{(\zeta,\eta) \in \mathcal{P}_l(\mu,\nu)} \mathcal{B}_{\zeta,\eta}^{\oplus m_{\zeta,\eta}^{\mu,\nu}} \subset \mathcal{B}.$$

We inductively construct F_k so that F_k contains $G(b)$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}_k$.

For $k = 0$, there exists a submodule isomorphic to $V_{\mu,\nu}$ by Lemma 4.5, which we denote by F_0 . Suppose that we have constructed F_{k-1} for $k \geq 1$. Let $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mu, \nu)$ be given and let $\mathcal{B}' \subset \mathcal{B}$ be a connected component of \mathcal{B} isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_{\zeta,\eta}$. Choose a sufficiently large n so that $\mathcal{B}' \cap \mathcal{B}^n \neq \emptyset$. Let $b \in \mathcal{B}' \cap \mathcal{B}^n$ be a highest weight element. Then $\text{wt}(b) = \epsilon_{\zeta,\eta}^n$, which is maximal among the weights of $\mathcal{B}^n \setminus \mathcal{B}_{k-1}$. Hence, $G(b)$ is a highest weight vector in $V^n/(V^n \cap F_{k-1})$.

Suppose that $n' > n$ and $b' \in \mathcal{B}' \cap \mathcal{B}^{n'}$ is a highest weight element of weight $\epsilon_{\zeta,\eta}^{n'}$. By the same argument as above, $G(b')$ is a highest weight vector in $V^{n'}/(V^{n'} \cap F_{k-1})$, which is an extremal weight vector with respect to the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{n'})$. Since

$$\frac{V^n}{V^n \cap F_{k-1}} \subset \frac{V^{n'}}{V^{n'} \cap F_{k-1}},$$

$G(b)$ is an extremal weight vector in $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{n'})G(b')$. This implies that $G(b)$ is an extremal weight vector in $V/(V \cap F_{k-1})$ with respect to the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$, and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})G(b)$ is isomorphic to $V_{\zeta,\eta}$ by Theorem 4.2 (2) and Lemma 4.4.

Let F'_k be the sum of submodules of $V/V \cap F_{k-1}$ corresponding to each connected component $\mathcal{B}' \cong \mathcal{B}_{\zeta,\eta}$ for all $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mu, \nu)$. Then $F'_k \simeq \bigoplus_{(\zeta,\eta) \in \mathcal{P}_k(\mu,\nu)} V_{\zeta,\eta}^{\oplus m_{\zeta,\eta}^{\mu,\nu}}$. Now we take $F_k = \pi^{-1}(F'_k)$ where $\pi : V \rightarrow V/(V \cap F_{k-1})$ is the canonical projection. This completes the induction. \square

Corollary 4.7. *There exists a filtration on $V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes V_{\mu,\emptyset}$ with the same property as in Proposition 4.6.*

Proof. The functor $\overline{}$ in Remark 2.4 preserves weight spaces, and is exact. Also, we have $\overline{V_{\zeta,\eta}} \cong V_{\zeta,\eta}$ for $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, since $\overline{u_{\zeta,\eta}} \in \overline{V_{\zeta,\eta}}$ is also extremal for an extremal weight vector $u_{\zeta,\eta} \in V_{\zeta,\eta}$. Hence the filtration $\{F_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ on $V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}$ in Proposition 4.6 is mapped to a filtration $\{\overline{F}_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ on $\overline{V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}}$ such that $\overline{F}_k/\overline{F}_{k-1} \cong F_k/F_{k-1}$.

Now, we apply the following natural isomorphisms

$$\overline{V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes -} \otimes \overline{V_{\emptyset,\nu}} \cong \overline{V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes +} \otimes \overline{V_{\emptyset,\nu}} \cong \overline{V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes +} \otimes \overline{V_{\mu,\emptyset}} \cong \overline{V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes -} \otimes \overline{V_{\mu,\emptyset}}$$

(see Remark 2.4) to have a filtration on $V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes V_{\mu,\emptyset}$. \square

Remark 4.8. The R-matrix $R = R_-$ induces a well-defined $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -linear isomorphism $V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes V_{\mu,\emptyset} \cong V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}$, whose inverse R^{-1} is also well-defined. We may also deduce Corollary 4.7 from this isomorphism.

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ be a category of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -modules with weight space decomposition, and let \mathcal{C} be the full subcategory of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -modules of finite length whose simple subquotients are $V_{\lambda,\mu}$ for $(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, that is, the Serre subcategory generated by $V_{\lambda,\mu}$'s.

Proposition 4.9. *The category \mathcal{C} is a monoidal subcategory of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, whose Grothendieck ring $K(\mathcal{C})$ is commutative.*

Proof. It is enough to show that \mathcal{C} is closed under tensor product. By Proposition 4.6 and Corollary 4.7, we have $V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}, V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes V_{\mu,\emptyset} \in \mathcal{C}$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}$. Then we have $V_{\mu,\nu} \otimes V_{\zeta,\emptyset} \in \mathcal{C}$ for $\zeta \in \mathcal{P}$, since $V_{\mu,\nu} \subset V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes V_{\mu,\emptyset}$ and $V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\zeta,\emptyset}$ is a direct sum of $V_{\nu,\emptyset}$'s. Similarly, $V_{\mu,\nu} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\zeta} \subset (V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}) \otimes V_{\emptyset,\eta} \in \mathcal{C}$ for $\eta \in \mathcal{P}$.

Now for $V \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $V \otimes V_{\mu,\emptyset}, V \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu} \in \mathcal{C}$, which implies that $V \otimes V_{\mu,\nu} \subset V \otimes V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu} \in \mathcal{C}$. Similarly, we have $V_{\mu,\nu} \otimes V \in \mathcal{C}$. Therefore \mathcal{C} is closed under tensor product. The commutativity of $K(\mathcal{C})$ follows from the same argument as in the proof of Corollary 4.7. \square

5. FOCK SPACE \mathcal{F}^n

5.1. R-matrix and q -deformed exterior and symmetric algebras. We introduce a uniform construction of q -deformed exterior or symmetric algebras using R -matrices, which carries a commuting action of two quantum groups.

Let $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be the quantized enveloping algebra as in Section 2.1. Let p be another formal variable. Let $\dot{A} = (\dot{a}_{ij})_{i,j \in \dot{I}}$ be another symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix indexed by \dot{I} , and let $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ be the quantized enveloping algebra associated with a Cartan datum $(\dot{A}, \dot{P}, \dot{P}^\vee, \dot{\Pi}, \dot{\Pi}^\vee, (\cdot, \cdot))$ over $\mathbb{Q}(p)$.

Let V and W be $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules such that the universal R matrices $R := R^{\text{univ}}$ and $\dot{R} := \dot{R}^{\text{univ}}$ for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ yield well-defined maps on $V \otimes V$ and $W \otimes W$, respectively. Here the comultiplications for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ are assumed to be any \otimes_* in Remark 2.3.

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we define

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{A}^k(V \otimes W) = (V \otimes W)^{\otimes k} \left/ \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \text{Im} \left(R_{i,i+1} - \dot{R}_{i,i+1} \right) \right.,$$

where $R_{i,i+1}$ denotes R acting on the i th and $(i+1)$ st component $V \otimes V$, and $\dot{R}_{i,i+1}$ is defined in the same way. It is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module. Let

$$\mathcal{A}(V \otimes W) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{A}^k(V \otimes W), \quad \mathcal{A}^0(V \otimes W) = \mathbb{Q}(q) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(p),$$

which is a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded $\mathbb{Q}(q) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(p)$ -algebra.

When $p = q$ (resp. $p = -q^{-1}$), as we shall see, $\mathcal{A}(V \otimes W)$ behaves like a q -deformed symmetric (resp. exterior) algebra generated by $V \otimes W$, so we denote it by $S(V \otimes W) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} S^k(V \otimes W)$ and $\Lambda(V \otimes W) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \Lambda^k(V \otimes W)$, respectively. In these cases, the algebras $\mathcal{A}(V \otimes W)$ will be understood as algebras over $\mathbb{Q}(q)$, by tensoring with $\mathbb{Q}(q) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(p)/(p - q)$ (resp. $\mathbb{Q}(q) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(p)/(p + q^{-1})$).

Remark 5.1. When $\mathfrak{g} = \dot{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{gl}_n$ and V and W are standard representations, we recover the quantized coordinate ring of GL_n , see [1] and references therein. See [5] for an analogous construction using only $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and V without $U_q(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ and W . Although it is not needed in this paper, we expect that it can be extended to the case of quantum affine algebras analogously using normalized R -matrices. When $W = \mathbb{Q}(q)$ with $\dot{R} = -1$, this will give an exterior algebra introduced in [20]. We also refer the reader to [30] for a q -deformed exterior algebra with a $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{gl}}_m) \otimes U_{-q^{-1}}(\widehat{\mathfrak{gl}}_n)$ -action constructed by using affine Hecke algebras.

Lemma 5.2. *For $x \in \mathcal{A}^k(V \otimes W)$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}^l(V \otimes W)$, we have $R(x \otimes y) = \dot{R}(x \otimes y)$ in $\mathcal{A}^{k+l}(V \otimes W)$.*

Proof. By the hexagon property of R (cf. [26, Proposition 32.2.4]), $R(x \otimes y)$ is given by a series of application of $R_{i,i+1}$'s on $x \otimes y$. The same holds for $\dot{R}(x \otimes y)$, and the action of $R_{i,i+1}$ agrees with that of $\dot{R}_{i,i+1}$, so the equality follows. \square

Suppose that V and W have \mathbb{Q} -linear involutions – compatible with the actions of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$, respectively. We define an involution – on $(V \otimes W)^{\otimes k}$ using $\Theta \dot{\Theta}'$ following (2.12) and (2.13), where Θ is the quasi- R -matrix and $\dot{\Theta}'$ is the one associated with \dot{R}^{-1} (see (2.10)), with respect to given comultiplications for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$.

Lemma 5.3. *For $k \geq 0$, the involution – on $(V \otimes W)^{\otimes k}$ induces a well-defined involution on $\mathcal{A}^k(V \otimes W)$, which we still denote by –.*

Proof. We assume that the coproduct of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ are Δ_+ , since the proofs for the other cases are similar. Since $\Theta^{(k)} = (1^{\otimes(i-1)} \otimes \Delta \otimes 1^{\otimes(k-i-1)}) (\Theta^{(k-1)}) \Theta^{(i,i+1)}$, where $\Theta^{(i,i+1)}$ denotes Θ acting on the $(i, i+1)$ components, it suffices to show that $\Theta \dot{\Theta}'(\text{Im}(R - \dot{R})) \subset \text{Im}(R - \dot{R})$. It follows from the identity $\Theta \dot{\Theta}'(\overline{R} - \overline{\dot{R}}) = -(R - \dot{R})R^{-1}\dot{R}^{-1}\Theta \dot{\Theta}'$ due to Lemma 2.2. \square

We denote by wt and $\dot{\text{wt}}$ the weights for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$, respectively. We call $x \in \mathcal{A}^k(V \otimes W)$ a weight vector if $q^h x = q^{(h, \text{wt}(x))} x$ and $p^{\dot{h}} x = p^{(\dot{h}, \dot{\text{wt}}(x))} x$ for all $h \in P$ and $\dot{h} \in \dot{P}$. We have the following formula for the involution.

Lemma 5.4. *For weight vectors $x \in \mathcal{A}^k(V \otimes W)$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}^l(V \otimes W)$,*

$$(5.2) \quad \overline{x \cdot y} = q^{\varepsilon(\text{wt}(x), \text{wt}(y))} p^{\dot{\varepsilon}(\dot{\text{wt}}(x), \dot{\text{wt}}(y))} \overline{y} \cdot \overline{x},$$

where $x \cdot y$ denotes the product in $\mathcal{A}(V \otimes W)$, and the sign ε is \pm if the coproduct on $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is \otimes_{\pm} or $\overline{\otimes}_{\mp}$. The sign $\dot{\varepsilon}$ is determined by the coproduct on $U_p(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})$ in the same way.

Proof. We assume that the coproduct of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $U_p(\mathfrak{g})$ are Δ_+ , since the proofs for the other cases are similar.

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.3) \quad \Theta \dot{\Theta}'(\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}) &= R^{-1} \Pi \sigma \dot{R} \dot{\Pi} \dot{\sigma}(\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}) \\
&= q^{(\text{wt}(x), \text{wt}(y))} p^{(\dot{\text{wt}}(x), \dot{\text{wt}}(y))} R^{-1} \dot{R}(\bar{y} \cdot \bar{x}) \\
&= q^{(\text{wt}(x), \text{wt}(y))} p^{(\dot{\text{wt}}(x), \dot{\text{wt}}(y))} \bar{y} \cdot \bar{x},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 5.2. \square

Lemma 5.5. *The involution $-$ on $\mathcal{A}(V \otimes W)$ coincides with that induced from $\Theta' \dot{\Theta}$.*

Proof. By similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 5.3, we see that $\Theta' \dot{\Theta}$ induces a well-defined bar-involution on $\mathcal{A}(V \otimes W)$. We have an analogue of (5.3), where Θ , $\dot{\Theta}$, R^{-1} , and \dot{R} are replaced by Θ' , $\dot{\Theta}$, R , and \dot{R}^{-1} . This shows that Lemma 5.4 also holds for the bar-involution induced from $\Theta' \dot{\Theta}$. \square

5.2. q -deformed exterior algebras of type A . Suppose that S and T are intervals of \mathbb{R} , not necessarily bounded. Let $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ and $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ be as in Section 4.1 with $p = -q^{-1}$. Denote $\mathbf{S} = S \cap \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{T} = T \cap \mathbb{Z}$.

(5.4) From now on, we assume that the comultiplications for $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ and $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ are Δ_- and $\overline{\Delta}_+$, respectively.

Let V_S be the natural representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ with basis $\{v_a \mid a \in \mathbf{S}\}$, where $e_i v_a = \delta_{i+1} v_a$, $f_i v_a = \delta_{ia} v_{i+1}$ and $q^{E_{ii}} v_a = q^{\langle E_{ii}, \epsilon_a \rangle} v_a$ for $i \in \mathbf{S} \cap (\mathbf{S} - 1)$. Let \dot{V}_T be the natural representation of $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ with basis $\{\dot{v}_b \mid b \in \mathbf{T}\}$. Let

$$\Lambda_{S,T} = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \Lambda_{S,T}^k, \quad \text{where} \quad \Lambda_{S,T}^k = \Lambda^k(V_S \otimes \dot{V}_T).$$

It is well-known [13] that R acts on $V_S \otimes V_S$ by

$$(5.5) \quad R(v_a \otimes v_b) = \begin{cases} qv_a \otimes v_b & \text{if } a = b, \\ v_b \otimes v_a + (q - q^{-1})v_a \otimes v_b & \text{if } a < b, \\ v_b \otimes v_a & \text{if } a > b, \end{cases}$$

for $a, b \in \mathbf{S}$, and the formula for \dot{R} on $\dot{V}_T \otimes \dot{V}_T$ is given by applying the flipping σ to (5.5).

Let $w_{(a,b)}$ denote the image of $v_a \otimes \dot{v}_b$ in $\Lambda_{S,T}^1$ for $(a, b) \in \mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{T}$, and $w_{(a_1, b_1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge w_{(a_k, b_k)}$ denote the image of $(v_{a_1} \otimes \dot{v}_{b_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes (v_{a_k} \otimes \dot{v}_{b_k})$ in $\Lambda_{S,T}^k$. By (5.5), we have the following relations in $\Lambda_{S,T}^2$:

$$(5.6) \quad w_{(a,b)} \wedge w_{(c,d)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (a, b) = (c, d), \\ -qw_{(c,b)} \wedge w_{(a,d)} & \text{if } a > c \text{ and } b = d, \\ q^{-1}w_{(a,d)} \wedge w_{(c,b)} & \text{if } a = c \text{ and } b < d, \\ w_{(c,d)} \wedge w_{(a,b)} & \text{if } a < c \text{ and } b < d, \\ w_{(c,d)} \wedge w_{(a,b)} - (q - q^{-1})w_{(c,b)} \wedge w_{(a,d)} & \text{if } a > c \text{ and } b < d, \end{cases}$$

for $a, a' \in \mathbf{S}$ and $b, b' \in \mathbf{T}$. It follows from (5.1) that $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}$ is the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebra generated by $w_{(a,b)}$ for $(a,b) \in \mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{T}$ subject to (5.6).

By Lemma 5.4, the involution $-$ on $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}^k$ is given as follows:

$$(5.7) \quad \overline{w_{(c_1, d_1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge w_{(c_k, d_k)}} = q^{-l(w_{\mathbf{c}})} p^{-l(w_{\mathbf{d}})} w_{(c_k, d_k)} \wedge \cdots \wedge w_{(c_1, d_1)},$$

where $w_{\mathbf{c}}$ is the element in the symmetric group S_k of maximal length among the ones fixing k -tuple of integers $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_k)$, and $w_{\mathbf{d}}$ is defined for $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_k)$ similarly.

We define a total order $<$ and $<'$ on $\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{T}$ by

$$(a, b) < (c, d) \text{ if and only if } (b < d) \text{ or } (a > c \text{ and } b = d),$$

$$(a, b) <' (c, d) \text{ if and only if } (a > c) \text{ or } (a = c \text{ and } b < d).$$

Let

$$B_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}} = \{ M = (m_{ab}) \mid m_{ab} \in \{0, 1\} \ (a \in \mathbf{S}, b \in \mathbf{T}) \}.$$

For $M = (m_{ab}) \in B_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}$, we put

$$w_M = \vec{\bigwedge} w_{(a,b)}^{m_{ab}},$$

where $\vec{\bigwedge}$ denotes the wedge product over $\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{T}$ with respect to the total order $<$ (that is, we read the entries in M column by column from left to right, and then from bottom to top in each column). By (5.6), we have $w_M = w'_M$, where w'_M is the product defined with respect to $<'$ (that is, we read the entries in M row by row from bottom to top, and then from left to right in each row). Then the set of standard monomials $\{w_M \mid M \in B_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}\}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear basis of $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}$ by standard arguments [3].

Example 5.6. Consider the case when $\mathbf{S} = [1, m]$ and $\mathbf{T} = [1, n]$ for $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We denote $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}$ by $\bigwedge_{m,n}$, and $B_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}$ by $B_{m,n}$. Let $M \in B_{m,n}$ be given. For $1 \leq a \leq m$ and $1 \leq b \leq n$, let M_a and M^b be the a -th row and b -th column of M , respectively. Then

$$w_M = w_{M^1} w_{M^2} \cdots w_{M^n} = w_{M_m} w_{M_{m-1}} \cdots w_{M_1},$$

where we regard M_a (resp. M^b) as an element in $B_{m,n}$ which is equal to M in the a -th row (resp. b -th column) and zero elsewhere. Then we have an isomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ -modules

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bigwedge_{m,n} & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_{m,1}^{\otimes n} \\ w_M & \longmapsto & w_{M^1} \otimes \cdots \otimes w_{M^n} \end{array},$$

and also an isomorphism of $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -modules

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bigwedge_{m,n} & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge_{1,n}^{\otimes m} \\ w_M & \longmapsto & w_{M_m} \otimes \cdots \otimes w_{M_1} \end{array}.$$

Let us construct a crystal base of $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}$. Let \tilde{e}_i and \tilde{f}_i be the lower crystal operators (2.2) on $\bigwedge_{\mathbf{S}, \mathbf{T}}$ with respect to the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\mathbf{S}})$ (2.2) for $i \in \mathbf{S} \cap (\mathbf{S} - 1)$.

To define crystal operators for the \mathfrak{gl}_T , let us twist the action of $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ by the isomorphism of \mathbb{Q} -algebras

$$(5.10) \quad \psi : U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_T) \longrightarrow U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$$

such that $\psi(e_i) = e_i$, $\psi(f_i) = f_i$, $\psi(q^h) = p^{-h}$ and $\psi(q) = p^{-1}$ for i and h . Then we define \check{e}_j and \check{f}_j for $j \in \mathbb{T} \cap (\mathbb{T} - 1)$ to be the upper crystal operators (2.3) with respect to this action of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$. Since $(\overline{\Delta}_+)^{\psi} := (\psi^{-1} \otimes \psi^{-1}) \circ (\overline{\Delta}_+) \circ \psi = \Delta_+$, the upper crystal lattice for $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ is compatible with (5.4). Note that \check{e}_j, \check{f}_j commute with \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i , although (5.10) does not extend to a homomorphism of \mathbb{Q} -algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$.

Let

$$\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{S,T}) = \bigoplus_{M \in B_{S,T}} A_0 w_M, \quad \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_{S,T}) = \{ w_M \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{S,T})} \mid M \in B_{S,T} \}.$$

Proposition 5.7. *The pair $(\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{S,T}), \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_{S,T}))$ is a lower crystal base of $\Lambda_{S,T}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ -module and also upper crystal base of $\Lambda_{S,T}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ -module with respect to (5.10).*

Proof. The proof is essentially the same as in [24, Propositions 4.2, 4.3]. It suffices to consider the case when S and T are bounded, since any element of $\Lambda_{S,T}$ is contained in a subspace $\Lambda_{S',T'}$ for bounded intervals S' and T' . So we may assume $S = [1, m]$ and $T = [1, n]$.

First, it is clear that $(\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{1,n}), \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_{1,n}))$ is a lower crystal base of $\Lambda_{1,n}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ -module, and hence so is $(\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{m,n}), \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_{m,n}))$ is a lower crystal base of $\Lambda_{m,n}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ -module by (5.8).

Next, it is also clear that $(\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{m,1}), \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_{m,1}))$ is an upper crystal base of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ with respect to \check{e}_j and \check{f}_j for $j = \mathbb{T} \cap (\mathbb{T} - 1)$ since $\Lambda_{m,1}$ is a direct sum of fundamental representations which are minuscule. Hence $(\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{m,n}), \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_{m,n}))$ is also an upper crystal base of $\Lambda_{m,n}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module by (5.9). \square

Example 5.8. We may identify $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_{m,n})$ with $B_{m,n}$. Note that for $M = (m_{a1})_{1 \leq a \leq m} \in B_{m,1}$ and i , we have $\tilde{e}_i M = M + \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_{i+1}$ and $\tilde{f}_i M = M - \mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{e}_{i+1}$, where \mathbf{e}_i denotes the standard basis of \mathbb{Z}^m and $\tilde{x}_i M$ ($x = e, f$) is assumed to be zero if it does not belong to $B_{m,1}$. Then we apply (2.5) to describe \tilde{e}_i and \tilde{f}_i on $B_{m,n} = B_{m,1}^{\otimes n}$. We have a similar description of \check{e}_j and \check{f}_j on $B_{m,n}$.

Remark 5.9. The q -deformed exterior algebra $\Lambda_{m,n}$ is similar to one in [30, Section 3.3] (when $n, l \mapsto \infty$), which is a $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{gl}}_m) \otimes U_p(\widehat{\mathfrak{gl}}_n)$ -module algebra of level 0 defined in terms of affine Hecke algebras. Also, its bar-involution is similar to the one here. We also expect to recover the higher level Fock space in [30], which is a $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{gl}}_m) \otimes U_p(\widehat{\mathfrak{gl}}_n)$ -module, following the construction (5.1). The algebra $\Lambda_{m,n}$ also appears as the subalgebra of the negative

half of the quantum superalgebra associated with $\mathfrak{gl}_{m|n}$ generated by odd root vectors [24, Section 2.4], where the linear order on $[n]$ is reversed.

Define a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -bilinear form on $\bigwedge_{S,T}$ by

$$(5.11) \quad \langle w_M, w_{M'} \rangle = \delta_{M,M'} \quad (M, M' \in B_{S,T}).$$

Then for $x, y \in \bigwedge_{S,T}$ and $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$, $\dot{u} \in U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$, we have

$$(5.12) \quad \langle ux, y \rangle = \langle x, \tau(u)y \rangle, \quad \langle x, \dot{u}y \rangle = \langle \tau(\dot{u})x, y \rangle.$$

(cf. [30, Proposition 5.7]), This also can be seen from the observation that (5.12) holds for the case of a single-column or single-row, and that $(\tau \otimes \tau) \circ \Delta = \Delta \circ \tau$.

5.3. Semi-infinite limit and the Fock space \mathcal{F}^n . Suppose that S and T are intervals with T bounded. Consider a directed system of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -spaces

$$\{ \bigwedge_{S',T} \mid S' \subset S, S' \text{ is an interval which is bounded below} \},$$

with respect to the maps $\psi_{S',S''}$ for $S' \subset S''$ with $(S'' \setminus S') \cap \mathbb{Z} = [a, b] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ for some a, b , which are defined by

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bigwedge_{S',T} & \xrightarrow{\psi_{S',S''}} & \bigwedge_{S'',T} \\ w & \longmapsto & w \wedge w_{[a, \min(b,0)] \times T} \end{array}$$

Here $[a, b] \times T$ denotes the matrix in $B_{S'',T}$ with 1's in the rows from a to b and 0's elsewhere. Since T is finite, $w_{[a,b] \times T}$ is well-defined. In particular, this sends w_M ($M \in B_{S',T}$) to another standard monomial $w_{M'}$, where $M' \in B_{S'',T}$ is obtained by extending M with 0's on the rows with positive indices, and 1's on the rows with non-positive indices.

Let $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ be the limit of (5.13), and $\psi_{S'} : \bigwedge_{S',T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ the canonical embedding. The map in (5.13) is $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{S'}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{sl}_T)$ -linear, and hence $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ becomes a well-defined $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{sl}_T)$ -module. Let $w \in \mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ be given such that w is an image of a weight vector $w' \in \bigwedge_{S',T}$ for some interval $S' \subset \mathbb{R}$ that is bounded below. We define $\dot{\text{wt}}(w) = \dot{\text{wt}}(w') - (\min(S' \cap \mathbb{Z}) - 1) \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i$, which is independent of S' . Hence, $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ becomes a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ -module with respect to wt and $\dot{\text{wt}}$.

Lemma 5.10. *We have $\overline{\psi_{S',S''}(w)} = \psi_{S',S''}(\overline{w})$ for $w \in \bigwedge_{S',T}$.*

Proof. It can be shown either by combinatorial arguments using (5.7), or by using quasi- R -matrices as follows. Let $w_\circ = w_{[a, \min(b,0)] \times T}$. It is easy to see that w_\circ is bar-invariant. By Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\overline{w \wedge w_\circ} = \Theta_{\otimes_-} \dot{\Theta}'_{\otimes_+} (\overline{w} \wedge \overline{w_\circ}).$$

Note that $\Theta_{\otimes_-} = \Pi^{-1} \Theta \Pi^{-1}$. First, $\Pi(\overline{w} \wedge w_\circ) = \overline{w} \wedge w_\circ$, since $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{S''})$ -weights of \overline{w} and $\overline{w_\circ}$ are orthogonal. Since Θ is a formal sum of elements of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{gl}_{S''})^- \otimes U_q^+(\mathfrak{gl}_{S''})$, and

$U_q^+(\mathfrak{gl}_{S''})$ acts trivially on $\overline{w_o}$, $\Theta(\overline{w} \wedge w_o) = \overline{w} \wedge w_o$. Similarly, $\dot{\Theta}_{\otimes^+}^L = \dot{\Theta}$ acts trivially on $\overline{w} \wedge w_o$. Therefore, $\overline{w \wedge w_o} = \overline{w} \wedge w_o$. \square

Then, we have the following.

Proposition 5.11. $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ has a \mathbb{Q} -linear involution – such that $\overline{\psi_{S'}(w)} = \psi_{S'}(\overline{w})$ for $w \in \bigwedge_{S',T}$.

Let

$$\mathcal{F}_{S,T} = \{ M = (m_{ab}) \mid a \in S, b \in T, m_{ab} = 0 \text{ for } a \gg 0, \text{ and } m_{ab} = 1 \text{ for } a \ll 0 \}.$$

For $M = (m_{ab}) \in \mathcal{F}_{S,T}$, we define w_M to be a unique element in $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ such that

$$w_M = \psi_{S'}(w_{M_{S'}}),$$

with $M_{S'} = (m_{ab})_{a \in S', b \in T}$ for some interval S' which is bounded below such that $m_{ab} = 1$ ($a \leq \min S', b \in T$). It immediately follows from the construction that $\{w_M \mid M \in \mathcal{F}_{S,T}\}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$,

Let

$$(5.14) \quad \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}_{S,T}) = \bigoplus_{M \in \mathcal{F}_{S,T}} A_0 w_M, \quad \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{S,T}) = \{w_M \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}_{S,T})} \mid M \in \mathcal{F}_{S,T}\}.$$

Proposition 5.12. The pair $(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}_{S,T}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{S,T}))$ is a lower crystal base of $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ -module and also upper crystal base as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ -module with respect to (5.10).

Proof. Let S', S'' be intervals bounded below with $S' \subset S'' \subset S$. Then $\psi_{S', S''}$ in (5.13) preserves the crystal bases, and $(\mathcal{L}(\bigwedge_{S',T}), \mathcal{B}(\bigwedge_{S',T}))$ forms a directed system, whose limit is equal to $(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}_{S,T}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_{S,T}))$. Hence it is a lower (resp. upper) base of $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ -module (resp. $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_T)$ -module). \square

Note that $\mathcal{F}_{S,n} := \mathcal{F}_{S,[1,n]}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{S,\{1\}}^{\otimes n}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_S)$ -module for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}^n = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R},n}.$$

Put $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^1$. The $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -crystal $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ (that is, a crystal with respect to \tilde{x}_i, \dot{y}_j for $i \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq j \leq n-1$) can be identified with $F_{\mathbb{R},n}$, and it is isomorphic to the one introduced in [22, Section 6]. In particular, we have a crystal isomorphism

$$(5.15) \quad \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n) \cong \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n} \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_\lambda) \times \mathcal{B}(\acute{\epsilon}_\lambda),$$

([22, Theorem 6.1]), where $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\acute{\epsilon}_\lambda)$ are the crystals of the highest weight modules $V(\Lambda_\lambda)$ and $V(\acute{\epsilon}_\lambda)$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ with highest weights Λ_λ and $\acute{\epsilon}_\lambda$, respectively. Here $\acute{\epsilon}_\lambda$ means the ϵ_λ with respect to wt . The corresponding decomposition of \mathcal{F}^n is a quantum analogue of the level-rank duality, whose non-quantum version is originally due to [8]:

$$(5.16) \quad \mathcal{F}^n \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n} V(\Lambda_\lambda) \otimes V(\acute{\epsilon}_\lambda).$$

Indeed, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, let $M(\lambda) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ be the matrix whose (i, j) entry is given by

$$M(\lambda)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & i \leq \lambda_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $M(\lambda)$ is the highest weight element in the connected component of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_\lambda) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\dot{\epsilon}_\lambda)$. The corresponding monomial $w_{M(\lambda)}$ is a highest weight vector, and generates a submodule isomorphic to $V(\Lambda_\lambda) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_\lambda)$. Since $w_{M(\lambda)}$'s generate $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$, they also generate \mathcal{F}^n , and hence (5.16) follows.

Note that the bilinear form (5.11) induces a bilinear form on $\mathcal{F}_{S,T}$, which restricts to the q -Shapovalov form (2.7) on each irreducible component $V(\Lambda_\lambda) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_\lambda)$ in case of \mathcal{F}^n .

Let us end this subsection with some notations which will be used in later sections.

For $M = (m_{ij}) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$, we define the charge of M to be $\#\{(i, j) \mid m_{ij} = 1 \ (i \geq 1)\} - \#\{(i, j) \mid m_{ij} = 0 \ (i \leq 0)\}$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -span of w_M for $M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ of charge k is invariant under the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Put $|k\rangle = w_{M((k))} \in \mathcal{F}$, which is a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$ -highest weight vector of weight Λ_k .

For $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $\ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu) \leq n$, put

$$(5.17) \quad \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n = \Lambda_\lambda, \quad M^n(\mu, \nu) = M(\lambda),$$

where λ is the unique element in \mathbb{Z}_+^n such that $\mu = (\max\{\lambda_1, 0\}, \max\{\lambda_2, 0\}, \dots)$ and $\nu = (-\min\{\lambda_n, 0\}, -\min\{\lambda_{n-1}, 0\}, \dots)$. We also let

$$\Lambda_{\mu, \nu} = \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n - (n - \ell(\mu) - \ell(\nu))\Lambda_0.$$

For $M = (m_{ij}) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ and $M' = (m'_{ij}) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^{n'})$, let $M \otimes M'$ be the element in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^{n+n'})$ whose (i, j) -entry is given by

$$(M \otimes M')_{ij} = \begin{cases} m_{ij} & \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq n, \\ m'_{i, j-n} & \text{if } n < j \leq n + n'. \end{cases}$$

This gives a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^{n'}) \cong \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^{n+n'})$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$ -crystal.

Put $\mathcal{F}_+^n = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}, n}$ and $\mathcal{F}_-^n = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}, n}$ which are representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$, respectively. There is a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear isomorphism

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}_+^n \otimes \mathcal{F}_-^n & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F}^n \\ w_{M_+} \otimes w_{M_-} & \longmapsto & w_{M_+ \otimes M_-} \end{array},$$

for $M_\pm \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_\pm^n)$. It is an isomorphism of $(U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -modules. Recall that \otimes in (5.18) is $\overline{\otimes}_+$ by (5.4) when it is understood with respect to the action of $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$.

For $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$ and $n \geq \ell(\mu)$, let $H_+^n(\mu) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_+^n)$ be given by

$$H_+^n(\mu)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & i \leq \mu_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Similarly, for $\nu \in \mathcal{P}$ and $n \geq \ell(\nu)$, let $H_-^n(\nu) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ be given by

$$H_-^n(\nu)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & i \leq -\nu_{n+1-j}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$, we have $M^n(\mu, \nu) = H_+^n(\mu) \otimes H_-^n(\nu) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$, and $w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} = w_{H_+^n(\mu)} \otimes w_{H_-^n(\nu)}$ under the isomorphism in (5.18).

6. FOCK SPACE $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ OF INFINITE LEVEL

6.1. Parabolic q -boson algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ and \mathcal{M} . Let $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty})$ be the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\infty})$ generated by e_i, f_i, q^{h_i} ($i \in \mathbb{Z}$). We consider the parabolic q -boson algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ in Section 3.1, when $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}$ and \mathfrak{p} is the parabolic subalgebra associated with $J = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. We may identify its weight and coweight lattices as $P^\vee = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}(E_{ii} - E_{i+1i+1})$, $P = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\epsilon_i \oplus \mathbb{Z}\Lambda_0$, $P_J^\vee = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}, i \neq 0} \mathbb{Z}(E_{ii} - E_{i+1i+1}) \subset P^\vee$, and $P_J = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\epsilon_i \subset P$.

For simplicity, we write $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) = U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$, $P_0 = P_J$ and $P_0^+ = P_J^+$. Note that $P_0^+ = \{ \Lambda_{\mu, \nu} \mid \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P} \}$. We also write $V_0(\Lambda) = V_J(\Lambda)$ and $(\mathcal{L}_0(\Lambda), \mathcal{B}_0(\Lambda)) = (\mathcal{L}_J(\Lambda), \mathcal{B}_J(\Lambda))$ for $\Lambda \in P_0^+$.

Let $\mathcal{M} = V_0(0)$. By (3.5), we identify \mathcal{M} with $U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}) / \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}) f_i$, which induces a natural Q_- -grading on \mathcal{M} , and denote the image of $1 \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty})$ by the same symbol.

From the proof of Theorem 3.16, we may regard $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M}) = \{ b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty) \mid \epsilon_i^*(b) = 0 \text{ for } i \neq 0 \}$, where $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is the crystal of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}) = U_q^-(\mathfrak{gl}_{\infty})$. By [29], $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ can be realized as

$$(6.1) \quad \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M}) = \{ M \in \text{Mat}_{\mathbb{Z}_{<0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}) \mid M_{ij} = 0 \text{ for all but finitely many } i, j \}.$$

Here, we regard each row (resp. column) of $M \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ as an element of the crystal of a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module $V(s\epsilon_1)$ for $s \geq 0$ (resp. $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -module $V(-t\epsilon_0)$ for $t \geq 0$), and then apply the tensor product rule row by row (resp. column by column) from top to bottom (resp. left to right). Moreover $\tilde{f}_0 M$ is given by increasing the $(0, 1)$ -entry of M by 1.

Note that

$$\text{wt}(\mathcal{M}) = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} c_i \epsilon_i \mid c_i \geq 0 \ (i > 0), \ c_j \leq 0 \ (j \leq 0), \ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} c_i = 0 \right\}.$$

This gives the following alternative description of the partial order on \mathcal{P}^2 .

Lemma 6.1. *For $(\mu, \nu), (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, $(\mu, \nu) \geq (\zeta, \eta)$ if and only if $\Lambda_{\mu, \nu} - \Lambda_{\zeta, \eta} \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$.*

We may also regard \mathcal{M} as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -module. By (6.1), we see that $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ is a disjoint union of the connected components of $\text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -crystal. This implies $\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$, where $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ is the irreducible $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -submodule of \mathcal{M} corresponding to λ .

Recall that the map $r := {}_0r^-$ in Section 3.4 induces a homomorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -modules

$$\mathcal{M} \longrightarrow V(-\alpha_0) \otimes \mathcal{M}.$$

By Lemma 3.15, it is injective on $\bigoplus_{\lambda \neq (0)} \mathcal{M}(\lambda)$. Hence it gives an embedding of $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$ into $V(-\alpha_0) \otimes \mathcal{M}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{(0)\}$.

This yields an embedding of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -crystals. More precisely, since the decomposition of \mathcal{M} is multiplicity-free, it follows from [15, Theorem 3] that

$$(6.2) \quad r^{-1}(\mathcal{L}(-\alpha_0) \otimes \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}((0))) \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{0\}} q^{n_\lambda} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}(\lambda)),$$

for some $n_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}(\mu)) = \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M}) \cap \mathcal{M}(\mu)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$. So we have a morphism of (abstract) $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -crystals

$$(6.3) \quad \bar{r} : \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M}) \setminus \{1\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(-\alpha_0) \otimes \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M}),$$

since $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ is a disjoint union of crystals of $\mathcal{M}(\lambda)$.

6.2. Fock space $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ of infinite level. We introduce a Fock space of infinite level, which is the main object in this paper.

First, note that $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ has a structure of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -module by Proposition 3.2. Since $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ is an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -module, $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ belongs to $\mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})}^{\text{int}}$. It has a singular vector $|0\rangle \otimes 1$ of weight 0, which generates a submodule isomorphic to \mathcal{M} by Theorem 3.13. Hence, there exists an injective $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -linear map

$$\phi : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M}.$$

By tensoring with \mathcal{F}^n for $n \geq 1$, this naturally extends to an injective $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -linear map

$$\phi_{n,n+1} : \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M}.$$

Then we define $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ to be the direct limit of $\{\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M} \mid n \geq 0\}$ along with $\phi_{n,n+1}$'s:

$$\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M} = \varinjlim_n \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}.$$

Let

$$\phi_n : \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$$

be the canonical embedding. Note that $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ carries a structure of $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module, acting on \mathcal{F}^n with $p = -q^{-1}$, which commutes with the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$. By definition of $\phi_{n,n+1}$, it is clear that ϕ_n is $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -linear. Hence, we may naturally define a $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module structure on $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ as follows: For $u \in U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ and $x \in \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$, take a sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $u \in U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ and $x = \phi_n(x_n)$ for some $x_n \in \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$, and then define $ux = \phi_n(ux_n)$.

As a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -module, $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ has a weight space decomposition with weights in $P_0 = P/\mathbb{Z}\Lambda_0$. We may assume that $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ has a weight space decomposition with weights

in P via the identification of P_0 as a subgroup of P (see Section 6.1), which is given by $\epsilon_i + \mathbb{Z}\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \epsilon_i$. This weight space decomposition of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ in terms of P is compatible with ϕ_n , and hence induces the one on $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. We denote by wt and $\dot{\text{wt}}$ the weights for the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ and $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ on $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$, respectively.

6.3. Crystal base of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. Let us describe a crystal base of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. For $n \geq 1$, let

$$(\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}), \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})) = (\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n) \otimes \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n) \otimes \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})),$$

which is a crystal base of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -module by Theorem 3.20. It is also a crystal base as a $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module for $n \geq 2$. Since $\phi(1) = |0\rangle \otimes 1$ and $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ is connected, we have $\phi(\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})) \subset \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ and $\bar{\phi}(\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})) \subset \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})$, where $\bar{\phi}$ is the induced map at $q = 0$. This implies that for $n \geq 1$

$$\phi_{n,n+1}(\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})) \subset \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M}), \quad \bar{\phi}_{n,n+1}(\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})) \subset \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M}),$$

where $\bar{\phi}_{n,n+1}$ commutes with the crystal operators \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i ($i \in \mathbb{Z}$) for $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ and $\dot{\tilde{e}}_j, \dot{\tilde{f}}_j$ ($j = 1, \dots, n-1$) for $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Define

$$\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}) = \varinjlim_n \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}), \quad \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}) = \varinjlim_n \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}).$$

Then $(\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}), \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}))$ is a crystal base of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module. Also, we have the following maps induced from $\phi_n : \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}) &\xrightarrow{\phi_n} \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}), \\ \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}) &\xrightarrow{\bar{\phi}_n} \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}). \end{aligned}$$

Let us describe $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})$ more explicitly. First, let $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0$ be the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -submodule of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ generated by

$$(6.4) \quad w_{\mu,\nu}^n := \phi_n(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)} \otimes 1),$$

for $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ and $n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$.

Proposition 6.2. *As a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module, we have*

$$(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0 \cong \bigoplus_{(\mu,\nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2} V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}) \otimes V_{\mu,\nu}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ is given. For $n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$, let $v = \phi_n(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)} \otimes 1)$. Since $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})}^{\text{int}}$ and v is a singular vector of weight $\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}$, v generates $V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu})$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -module. On the other hand, v generates $V_{\mu,\nu}$ as a $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module by Lemma 4.4. Hence v generates $V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}) \otimes V_{\mu,\nu}$. For $n' \geq n$, let $v' = \phi_{n'}(w_{M^{n'}(\mu,\nu)} \otimes 1)$. Then v is an extremal weight vector with respect to the action of $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ in the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -submodule generated by v' . Hence v and v' generate the same irreducible component. This implies that $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0$ is semisimple together with the required decomposition. \square

Let $\mathcal{L}_0((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0)$ be the A_0 -span of $\tilde{x}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{x}_{i_k} \tilde{y}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{y}_{j_l} w_{\mu, \nu}^n$'s for $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, $n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$, and $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j_1, \dots, j_l \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ ($k, l \geq 0$) with $x, y \in \{e, f\}$, and let $\mathcal{B}_0((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0)$ be the union of connected components of $w_{\mu, \nu}^n$'s in $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})$. Then $(\mathcal{L}_0((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0), \mathcal{B}_0((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0))$ is a crystal base of $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0$ by Proposition 6.2.

The crystal $\mathcal{B}((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0)$ can be identified with

$$(6.5) \quad F_{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_{>0}} = \left\{ M = (M_{ab})_{a \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \left| \begin{array}{l} (M_{ab})_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}) \text{ for all } b \\ (M_{ab})_{a \in \mathbb{Z}} = |0\rangle \text{ for } b \gg 0 \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

For $M = (M_{ab}) \in F_{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_{>0}}$, we may regard the submatrix $(M_{ab})_{a \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in [1, n]}$ as an element of $F_{\mathbb{R}, n}$.

Proposition 6.3. *We have $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{B}_0((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0)$.*

Proof. Let $b \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})$ be given. We have $b \equiv \bar{\phi}_l(M_1 \otimes b_1) \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})}$ for some $M_1 \otimes b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^l \otimes \mathcal{M})$. Suppose that $b_1 \neq 1$. Then $b_1 = \tilde{f}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_{k_1}} 1$ for some $k_1 \geq 1$ and $i_1, \dots, i_{k_1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Theorem 3.20, $\bar{\phi}(b_1) = M_2 \otimes b_2$ for some $M_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ with $M_2 \neq |0\rangle$ and $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$. Since $M_2 \neq |0\rangle$, we have $b_2 = \tilde{f}_{j_1} \cdots \tilde{f}_{j_{k_2}} 1$ for some $k_2 < k_1$ and $j_1 \cdots, j_{k_2} \in \mathbb{Z}$. By induction on k_1 , we conclude that if n is large enough, then

$$(6.6) \quad \bar{\phi}_{n-1, n} \cdots \bar{\phi}_{0, 1}(b) = M \otimes 1,$$

for some $M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$. Therefore, we have by (6.6)

$$b = \bar{\phi}_l(M_1 \otimes b_1) = \bar{\phi}_{l+n}(M_1 \otimes \bar{\phi}_{n-1, n} \circ \cdots \circ \bar{\phi}_{0, 1}(b_1)) = \bar{\phi}_{l+n}(M_1 \otimes M \otimes 1),$$

which belongs to $\mathcal{B}((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0)$ by (6.5). \square

In Section 8, we explicitly construct a socle filtration of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ and show that $\text{soc}(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}) = (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0$.

6.4. A bar-invariant basis of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ with upper-triangularity. Let us start with a \mathbb{Q} -linear involution $-$ on $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ compatible with the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$. We first construct an involution on each $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ that is compatible under $\phi_{n, n+1}$. Note that $\mathcal{M} = V_0(0)$ has a canonical bar-involution that fixes 1, and \mathcal{F}^n has a canonical bar-involution by Proposition 5.11. We define

$$(6.7) \quad \overline{w \otimes m} = \Theta'_-(\bar{w} \otimes \bar{m}) \quad (w \in \mathcal{F}^n, m \in \mathcal{M}),$$

where Θ'_- is the opposite quasi- R -matrix for $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$ in (2.11). It is well-defined since Θ'_- is a summation of elements of $U_q^+(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty) \otimes U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$, and $U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty) = U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0})$.

Lemma 6.4. *For $w \in \mathcal{F}^n$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $\phi_{n, n+1}(\overline{w \otimes m}) = \overline{\phi_{n, n+1}(w \otimes m)}$.*

Proof. Write $\phi(m) = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \otimes m_i$ for some $w_i \in \mathcal{F}$ and $m_i \in \mathcal{M}$. Since ϕ commutes with the action of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ and the bar-involutions,

$$\phi_{n,n+1}(\overline{w \otimes m}) = \phi_{n,n+1}(\Theta'_-(\overline{w \otimes m})) = (\Theta'_-)^{(3)}(\overline{w} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^N \overline{w_i} \otimes \overline{m_i}).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\phi_{n,n+1}(w \otimes m)} &= (\Delta_- \otimes 1)(\Theta'_-) \sum_{i=1}^N \overline{w \otimes w_i} \otimes m_i \\ &= (\Theta'_-)^{(3)}(\dot{\Theta}_{\otimes_+} \otimes 1) \sum_{i=1}^N \overline{w} \otimes \overline{w_i} \otimes \overline{m_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Under the canonical identification $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^{n+1}$, w_i is sent to an element that is a linear combination of products of $w_{(i,n+1)}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. So the action of $U_p^+(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1})$ on w_i vanishes. Since $\dot{\Theta}_{\otimes_+} = \dot{\Pi}^{-1} \dot{\Theta}^{\text{op}} \dot{\Pi}^{-1}$ and $\dot{\Theta}^{\text{op}}$ is a summation of elements of $U_p^-(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}) \otimes U_p^+(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1})$, we see that $\dot{\Theta}_{\otimes_+}(\overline{w} \otimes \overline{w_i}) = \overline{w} \otimes \overline{w_i}$. \square

Proposition 6.5. *There exists a \mathbb{Q} -linear involution $-$ on $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ such that $\overline{u \cdot x} = \overline{u} \cdot \overline{x}$, $\overline{\dot{u} \cdot x} = \overline{\dot{u}} \cdot \overline{x}$ for $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$, $\dot{u} \in U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$, and $x \in \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ be given. We have $x = \phi_n(w \otimes m)$ for some n and $w \otimes m \in \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$, and then define $\overline{x} = \phi_n(\overline{w \otimes m})$. By Lemma 6.4, this gives a well-defined \mathbb{Q} -linear involution satisfying the properties. \square

Remark 6.6. Our convention for the comultiplication on $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ in (5.4) is crucial for Lemma 6.4 to hold.

Now we construct a canonical basis of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ by the same arguments as [26, Section 24.2]. For $M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$, define a sequence of non-negative integers $c(M) : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ by $c(M)(i) = \sum_{k=1}^n M_{i+k,k}$. For $M, N \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$, we define $M \geq N$ if $\text{wt } M = \text{wt } N$, $\dot{\text{wt}} M = \dot{\text{wt}} N$, and $c(M) \geq c(N)$ with respect to the lexicographic order starting from $-\infty$. It is a partial order on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ that is locally finite, that is, for M_1 and $M_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$, there exists finitely many N such that $M_1 < N < M_2$.

By (5.6) and (5.7), $\overline{w_M}$ is a linear combination of w_M and w_N 's for $N \neq M$, where N is obtained from M by replacing two 1's at diagonal position to anti-diagonal position. Moreover, the coefficient of w_M is 1. Thus,

$$\overline{w_M} \in w_M + \sum_{N < M} A w_N.$$

By [26, Section 2.4.2], there exists a unique $G(M) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ such that $\overline{G(M)} = G(M)$ and $G(M) \equiv M \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n)}$.

For $b \in \mathcal{B}_0((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0)$, let $n(b)$ be the minimal n such that $b \in \overline{\phi}_n(\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}))$. Let $b_i \in \mathcal{B}_0((\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{M})_0)$ be given such that $\text{wt}(b_1) = \text{wt}(b_2)$ and $\dot{\text{wt}}(b_1) = \dot{\text{wt}}(b_2)$. Define $b_1 \geq b_2$

if $n(b_1) > n(b_2)$ or $n(b_1) = n(b_2)$ with $\text{wt}(b'_1) > \text{wt}(b'_2)$ or $n(b_1) = n(b_2)$ with $\text{wt}(b'_1) = \text{wt}(b'_2)$ and $M'_1 \geq M'_2$, where $b_i = M_i \otimes b'_i \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})$ with $n = n(b_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. It is a partial order on $\mathcal{B}_0((\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0)$, which can be easily seen to be locally finite.

Let $\{G_0(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})\}$ be the canonical basis of \mathcal{M} . By (6.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{w_M \otimes G_0(b)} &= \Theta'_-(\overline{w_M} \otimes G_0(b)) = \overline{\Theta^{\text{op}}(\overline{w_M} \otimes G_0(b))} \\ &\in \overline{w_M} \otimes G_0(b) + (U_q^+(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)_A \otimes U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)_A)(\overline{w_M} \otimes G_0(b)). \end{aligned}$$

Then, it is easy to see that $\overline{w_M \otimes G_0(b)}$ is an A -linear combination of $w_N \otimes G_0(b')$'s with $M \otimes b \geq N \otimes b'$.

Therefore, by the standard argument together with Lemma 6.4, we see that there exists a unique $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis $\{G(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})\}$ of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ satisfying

- (1) $\overline{G(b)} = G(b)$,
- (2) $G(b) \in w_M \otimes G_0(b_0) + \sum_{(M' \otimes b'_0) \leq b} q\mathbb{Z}[q]w_{M'} \otimes G_0(b'_0)$ where $b = \overline{\phi}_n(M \otimes b_0) \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})$.

6.5. $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -isotypic decomposition of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. Since $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ is an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -module, it admits a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -isotypic decomposition.

Theorem 6.7. *As a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module, we have*

$$\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M} \cong \bigoplus_{(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2} V_0(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}) \otimes (V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}).$$

Proof. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$ and $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$, let $L_-^n(\lambda) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_-^n)$ be given by

$$L_-^n(\lambda)_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & i \leq -\lambda_j, \\ 0 & -\lambda_j < i. \end{cases}$$

By convention, we assume $\lambda_i = 0$ for $i > \ell(\lambda)$.

For $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, we write $E^n(\mu, \nu) = H_+^n(\mu) \otimes L_-^n(\nu) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$. We have $w_{E^n(\mu, \nu)} = w_{H_+^n(\mu)} \otimes w_{L_-^n(\nu)}$ under the isomorphism $\mathcal{F}^n \cong \mathcal{F}_+^n \otimes \mathcal{F}_-^n$ in (5.18). Note that $\phi_n(w_{E^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes 1) \in \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ and $\overline{\phi}_n(E^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes 1) \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})$ are independent of n , which we denote by $w_{E(\mu, \nu)}$ and $E(\mu, \nu)$, respectively.

We claim that $E := \{w_{E(\mu, \nu)} \mid \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}\}$ generates $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module. Let S be the submodule of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ generated by E .

First, we claim that $E^n := \{E^n(\mu, \nu) \mid \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}, \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu) \leq n\}$ generates \mathcal{F}^n as a $(U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_+^n &\cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\mu \in \mathcal{P} \\ \ell(\mu) \leq n}} V(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}, \Lambda_{\mu, \emptyset}) \otimes V_{\mu, \emptyset}^n, \\ \mathcal{F}_-^n &\cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\nu \in \mathcal{P} \\ \ell(\nu) \leq n}} V(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0}, \Lambda_{\emptyset, \nu}) \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}^n. \end{aligned}$$

where $V(\mathfrak{gl}_*, \Lambda)$ ($* \Rightarrow 0, \leq 0$) denotes the irreducible highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_*)$ -module with highest weight Λ .

Note that $w_{H_+^n(\mu)}$ is a highest weight vector which generates $V(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}, \Lambda_{\mu, \emptyset}) \otimes V_{\mu, \emptyset}^n$. Similarly, $w_{L_-^n(\nu)}$ generates $V(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0}, \Lambda_{\emptyset, \nu}) \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}^n$. On the other hand, since $w_{E^n(\mu, \nu)} = w_{H_+^n(\mu)} \otimes w_{L_-^n(\nu)}$, a tensor product of highest weight vector and a lowest weight vector, it generates $V_{\mu, \emptyset}^n \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}^n$ as a $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module. Therefore, E^n generates $\mathcal{F}_+^n \otimes \mathcal{F}_-^n$. This implies that $\phi_n(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes 1) \subset S$ for all n .

Next, we claim that $\phi_n(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}) \subset S$ for all n , which implies that $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M} = S$. For $\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$, let $\mathcal{M}_{\geq \gamma} = \bigoplus_{\beta \geq \gamma} \mathcal{M}_\beta$. We use induction on the height of $\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$ to show that $\phi_n(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\geq \gamma}) \subset S$. When $\gamma = 0$, it follows from the previous argument. Let $\gamma < 0$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}_\gamma$ be given. We have $m = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} f_i m_i$ for some $m_i \in \mathcal{M}_{\gamma + \alpha_i}$, which are non-zero for only finitely many i 's. For $w \in \mathcal{F}^n$, consider $w \otimes m \in \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}_{\geq \gamma}$. Since $f_i(w \otimes m_i) = f_i w \otimes m_i + c_i w \otimes f_i m_i$ for some $c_i \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$, S contains $f_i(w \otimes m_i)$, and $f_i w \otimes m_i$ by induction hypothesis, we conclude that $w \otimes f_i m_i \in S$ for $c_i \neq 0$. This completes the induction.

Now we prove the decomposition of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})(d)$ be the submodule of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ generated by $w_{E(\mu, \nu)}$ for $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $|\mu|, |\nu| \leq d$. We use induction on d to show that

$$(6.8) \quad (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})(d) = \bigoplus_{|\mu|, |\nu| \leq d} V_0(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}) \otimes (V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}).$$

If $d = 0$, then (6.8) clearly holds. Suppose that (6.8) is true for $d - 1$. Let $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be given with $|\zeta| = d$ or $|\eta| = d$. We claim that $\overline{w_0}$, the image of $w_0 = w_{E(\zeta, \eta)}$ in $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}/(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})(d - 1)$ generates a submodule isomorphic to $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}) \otimes (V_{\zeta, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \eta})$. Since $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta})$ is irreducible, it suffices to show that w_0 generates $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta})$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0})$ -module and $V_{\zeta, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \eta}$ as a $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module, respectively. Then (6.8) follows from the semisimplicity of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}_{U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0})}^{\text{int}}$ and the induction hypothesis.

Let us prove the claim. Suppose first that $\overline{w_0}$ is non-zero in $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}/(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})(d - 1)$. In this case, w_0 is a singular vector of weight $\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}$ in $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}/(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})(d - 1)$. Indeed, $\overline{w_0}$ is singular with respect to the $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -action. Moreover, $e_0 w_0$ is a linear combination of $w_M \otimes 1$'s for $M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$, where $M = M_+ \otimes M_- \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_+^n) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}_-^n)$ such that M_+ contains 1's as many as $|\zeta| - 1$ and M_- contains 0's as many as $|\eta| - 1$. Therefore, $e_0 w_0$ is contained in $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})(d - 1)$.

So $\overline{w_0}$ generates $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta})$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0})$ -module. On the other hand, recall that $w_0 = \phi_n(w_{E^n(\zeta, \eta)} \otimes 1)$ for $n \geq \ell(\zeta) + \ell(\eta)$. Since $w_{E^n(\mu, \nu)}$ generates $V_{\mu, \emptyset}^n \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}^n$ and $\phi_{n, n+1}(w_{E^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes 1) = w_{E^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)} \otimes 1$, we see that $\overline{w_0}$ generates $V_{\zeta, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \eta}$. Next, suppose that $w_0 \in (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})(d - 1)$. Then by the previous argument, $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ does not have an isotypic component for $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta})$, which is a contradiction, since $w_{M^{\ell(\zeta) + \ell(\eta)}(\zeta, \eta)} \otimes 1$ is a singular vector of weight $\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}$. Hence, the claim is proved.

Finally, we obtain a decomposition of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ by taking a limit of $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})(d)$ as $d \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Remark 6.8. Recall that $V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}$ in Theorem 6.7 is $\overline{\otimes}_+$ by (5.4). However, we may replace it with $\overline{\otimes}_-$ by Remark 2.3. The isomorphism in Theorem 6.7 is compatible with the bar-involutions on both sides, where the bar-involution on $V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}$ is the unique involution fixing $u_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes u_{\emptyset, \nu}$.

6.6. Filtrations of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. In this subsection, we introduce a filtration of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ in terms of its isotypic component, which will be used to construct a filtration of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$.

Let $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be given. For $\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$ and $n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$, let

$$H_\gamma^n(\mu, \nu) = \{ b \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})_\gamma \mid M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes b \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})^{\text{h.w.}} \},$$

and $H^n(\mu, \nu) = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})} H_\gamma^n(\mu, \nu)$, where $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})$ is understood as a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -crystal. Note that $H_\gamma^n(\mu, \nu) \subset H_\gamma^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)$ by Theorem 3.20, and furthermore it stabilizes as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which we denote by $H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$.

We take a set $\{x_b \mid b \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})\} \subset \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})$ such that $x_b \equiv b \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})}$. For $n \geq 0$ and $\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$, we define

$$(6.9) \quad (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma} = U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p^-(\mathfrak{gl}_n)\text{-span of } \{ w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b \mid b \in H_\delta^n(\mu, \nu), \delta \geq \gamma \},$$

Note that $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ is a semisimple $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module. By Theorem 3.20 and (5.16), each irreducible component of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ is $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^n)$ for some $(\mu, \nu), (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $\ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu) \leq n$. We denote the corresponding isotypic component by $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$, and the canonical projection by $\pi_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} : \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$. Recall the partial order \leq on \mathcal{P}^2 in (4.4).

Lemma 6.9. *Under the above hypothesis, we have the following.*

- (1) $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$ is non-zero only when $(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta)$.
- (2) As a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module,

$$(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma} = \bigoplus_{\substack{(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta) \\ \Lambda_{\zeta, \eta} - \Lambda_{\mu, \nu} \geq \gamma}} (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}.$$

Proof. (1) Let $b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})^{\text{h.w.}}$ be given whose connected component is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^n)$. Since $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}) \cong \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n) \otimes \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M}) \cong \bigsqcup_{(\mu, \nu)} (\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^n)$, we have by Theorem 3.20 that $b = u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes b' \otimes u_{\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^n}$ for some $b' \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$. This implies that $\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta} - \Lambda_{\mu, \nu} \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$, or equivalently, $(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta)$ by Lemma 6.1.

(2) It follows directly from (1) and an analogue of Lemma 2.1 for $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -modules. Note that the decomposition is independent of the choice of x_b ($b \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$). \square

For $(\mu, \nu), (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta)$ and $\ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu) \leq n$, we let

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{\leq (\zeta, \eta)} &= \bigoplus_{(\sigma, \tau) \leq (\zeta, \eta)} (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\sigma, \tau)}, \\
(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq (\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} &= \bigoplus_{(\sigma, \tau) \geq (\mu, \nu)} (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\sigma, \tau)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}, \\
(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta, \eta)} &= \bigoplus_{(\sigma, \tau)} (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\sigma, \tau)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}, \\
(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)} &= \bigoplus_{(\sigma, \tau)} (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\sigma, \tau)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let

$$(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d} = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M}) \\ (\Lambda_0, \gamma) \geq -d}} (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma}.$$

Then $\{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}\}_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ gives a filtration of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ since we have $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d+1} \subset (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}$.

Proposition 6.10. *Under the above hypothesis, we have*

$$\phi_{n, n+1} \left((\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \right) \subset (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq (\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}.$$

Therefore, we have for $\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$,

$$\phi_{n, n+1} \left((\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma} \right) \subset (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma}.$$

Proof. Let $(\mu^i, \nu^i), (\zeta^i, \eta^i) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ ($i = 1, 2$) be given such that $(\zeta^i, \eta^i) \geq (\mu^i, \nu^i)$. By composing $\phi_{n, n+1}$ with the associated inclusion and projection, we have a map

$$(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu^1, \nu^1)}^{(\zeta^1, \eta^1)} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu^2, \nu^2)}^{(\zeta^2, \eta^2)}.$$

Suppose that it is non-zero. Since it is $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0})$ -linear, we have $\zeta := \zeta^1 = \zeta^2$ and $\eta := \eta^1 = \eta^2$. Also, since it is $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -linear, we have from the branching rule for the pair $(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{gl}_n)$ ([11, Theorem 8.1.1]) that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mu^2)_1 &\geq (\mu^1)_1 \geq (\mu^2)_2 \geq (\mu^1)_2 \geq \cdots (\mu^2)_{\ell(\mu^2)} \geq (\mu^1)_{\ell(\mu^2)}, \\
(\nu^2)_1 &\geq (\nu^1)_1 \geq (\nu^2)_2 \geq (\nu^1)_2 \geq \cdots (\nu^2)_{\ell(\nu^2)} \geq (\nu^1)_{\ell(\nu^2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, this implies $(\mu^1, \nu^1) \leq (\mu^2, \nu^2)$, which proves the first statement.

By Lemma 6.9, $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma}$ is a sum of $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$ such that $(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta)$ and $\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta} - \Lambda_{\mu, \nu} \geq \gamma$, so the second statement follows from the first. \square

Now we define for $\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$

$$(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma} = \varinjlim_n (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma}$$

to be the submodule of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ induced from $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma}$ with respect to $\phi_{n,n+1}$ for $n \geq 0$, which is well-defined by Proposition 6.10. For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we define

$$(6.11) \quad (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d} = \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M}) \\ (\Lambda_0, \gamma) \geq -d}} (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma}.$$

Then $\{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}\}_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ gives a filtration of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. We also define $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> \gamma}$ and $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}$ similarly.

7. CRYSTAL VALUATIONS

7.1. Crystal valuation. We introduce a weaker version of crystal lattice L , where L is not necessarily a free A_0 -module. We describe such an A_0 -submodule in terms of valuations. It is used to study a structure of a non-semisimple module including its socle filtration in Section 8.

Let $\mathfrak{v} : \mathbb{Q}(q) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{\infty\}$ be a canonical valuation on $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ given by $\mathfrak{v}(a) = \max\{n \mid q^{-n} \in A_0\}$. A valuation on a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -space V is a function $\mathfrak{v} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{\infty\}$ satisfying

- (1) $\mathfrak{v}(v) = \infty$ if and only if $v = 0$,
- (2) $\mathfrak{v}(cv) = \mathfrak{v}(c) + \mathfrak{v}(v)$ for all $c \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ and $v \in V$,
- (3) $\mathfrak{v}(v+w) \geq \min\{\mathfrak{v}(v), \mathfrak{v}(w)\}$ for all $v, w \in V$.

Then \mathfrak{v} is naturally in 1-1 correspondence with an A_0 -submodule $L \subset V$ such that no nonzero element of L is infinitely divisible by q , where the correspondence is given by $L_{\mathfrak{v}} = \{v \in V \mid \mathfrak{v}(v) \geq 0\}$ and $\mathfrak{v}_L(m) = \max\{n \mid q^{-n}m \in L\}$. By abuse of notation, we often identify \mathfrak{v} with $L_{\mathfrak{v}}$ when there is no confusion. Note that L need not be free, while it is true when L is finitely generated as an A_0 -module.

In this section, \mathfrak{U} denotes either $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ or $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$ in Section 3 for a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g} and its parabolic subalgebra \mathfrak{p} .

Definition 7.1. Let V be an integrable \mathfrak{U} -module. A *crystal valuation* on V is a valuation $\mathfrak{v} : M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{\infty\}$ satisfying

- (1) $\mathfrak{v}(v) = \min\{\mathfrak{v}(v_\mu) \mid \mu \in P\}$ for $v = \sum v_\mu \in V$ with $v_\mu \in V_\mu$,
- (2) $\mathfrak{v}(\tilde{e}_i v) \geq \mathfrak{v}(v)$ and $\mathfrak{v}(\tilde{f}_i v) \geq \mathfrak{v}(v)$ for all $v \in V$ and $i \in I$.

Equivalently, $L_{\mathfrak{v}} = \bigoplus_{\mu} (L_{\mathfrak{v}})_{\mu}$, and $\tilde{e}_i(L_{\mathfrak{v}}) \subset L_{\mathfrak{v}}$, $\tilde{f}_i(L_{\mathfrak{v}}) \subset L_{\mathfrak{v}}$ for $i \in I$, respectively.

In particular, $L_{\mathfrak{v}}$ is a crystal lattice if $L_{\mathfrak{v}}$ is a free A_0 -module.

Remark 7.2. For a crystal valuation \mathfrak{v} , $L_{\mathfrak{v}}$ is not necessarily A_0 -free. Let $f \in \mathbb{Q}[[q]] \setminus A_0$ (for example, $f = \sqrt{1+q}$) and $L = \{(r, s) \in \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus 2} \mid rf + s \in \mathbb{Q}[[q]]\}$. Then L is an A_0 -submodule of $\mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus 2}$, which is not free and has no nonzero element infinitely divisible by q (see [21, Lemma 5.2.7]). If we regard $\mathbb{Q}(q)L = \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus 2}$ as a two copy of trivial $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -representation, then \mathfrak{v}_L is a crystal valuation which does not give a crystal lattice.

7.2. Decomposition into isotypic components. Let $\mathbf{V}(\lambda)$ denote an integrable highest weight \mathbf{U} -module $V(\lambda)$ or $V_J(\lambda)$ for λ in P^+ or P_J^+ with a crystal base $(\mathbf{L}(\lambda), \mathbf{B}(\lambda))$. Let $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{U}}^{\text{int}}$ be a category of integrable \mathbf{U} -modules such that each object is isomorphic to a direct sum of $\mathbf{V}(\lambda)$ whose set of weights is finitely dominated.

Suppose that $V \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{U}}^{\text{int}}$ is given and \mathfrak{v} is a crystal valuation on V .

Lemma 7.3 (cf. [12, Lemma 5.2.4 (1)]). *Suppose that $V = \mathbf{V}(\lambda)^{\oplus m}$ for some $m \geq 1$. Let $v \in V$ be a weight vector that is not of highest weight. If $\mathfrak{v}(\tilde{e}_i v) \geq 0$ for all $i \in I$, then $\mathfrak{v}(v) \geq 0$.*

Proof. We have an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -spaces $V \cong V_\lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}(q)} \mathbf{V}(\lambda)$, which sends $u \in V_\lambda$ to $u \otimes u_\lambda$. Under this isomorphism, we may write $v = \sum_k v_k \otimes w_k$ for some $v_k \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ and $w_k \in \mathbf{L}(\lambda)$ such that $w_k \pmod{q\mathbf{L}(\lambda)}$ are pairwise distinct elements of $\mathbf{B}(\lambda)$. Fix k . By applying \tilde{e}_i 's to w_k to obtain $u_\lambda \pmod{q\mathbf{L}(\lambda)}$, we see that $v_k \in L_{\mathfrak{v}}$. This implies $\mathfrak{v}(v) \geq 0$. \square

Lemma 7.4 (cf. [15, Lemma 2.6.3]). *Suppose that $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$, where V_1 and V_2 are \mathbf{U} -submodules such that $V_1 = \mathbf{V}(\lambda)^{\oplus m}$ for a maximal weight λ of V and $m \geq 1$. Then we have $\mathfrak{v}(v_1 + v_2) = \min\{\mathfrak{v}(v_1), \mathfrak{v}(v_2)\}$ for $v_i \in V_i$ ($i = 1, 2$).*

Proof. It can be proved in the same way as [12, Lemma 5.2.1], where [12, Lemma 5.2.4 (1)] is replaced by Lemma 7.3. Note that [12, Lemma 5.2.1] assumes the existence of crystal base, but this is not necessary in the proof of the decomposition of crystal lattices. \square

The crystal valuation is compatible with the isotypic decomposition of V as follows.

Proposition 7.5. *Suppose that $V = \bigoplus_{s \in S} \mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s}$ for some S and $m_s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ($s \in S$) such that $\lambda_s \neq \lambda_{s'}$ for $s \neq s'$.*

- (1) *We have $\mathfrak{v}(v) = \min\{\mathfrak{v}(v_s) \mid s \in S\}$ for $v = \sum v_s$ with $v_s \in \mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s}$, equivalently, $L_{\mathfrak{v}} = \bigoplus_{s \in S} L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap (\mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s})$.*
- (2) *If $L_{\mathfrak{v}}$ is A_0 -free, then there exists a unique \mathbf{U} -linear automorphism ϕ of V such that $\phi(L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap (\mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s})) = \mathbf{L}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s}$.*

Proof. (1) It follows from a repeated application of Lemma 7.4. (2) The proof is similar to that of [15, Theorem 3]. We have $L_{\mathfrak{v}} = \bigoplus_{s \in S} L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap (\mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s})$ by (1). Since $L_{\mathfrak{v}}$ is A_0 -free and $\mathbf{B}(\lambda_s)$ is connected, each $L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap (\mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s})$ is free and coincides with the crystal lattice generated by $L_s = L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap (\mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)_{\lambda_s}^{\oplus m_s})$ under \tilde{f}_i 's. For $s \in S$, let ϕ_s be the automorphism of $\mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s}$ sending the A_0 -basis of L_s to the one consisting of u_{λ_s} 's in each component. Then $\phi_s(L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap (\mathbf{V}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s})) = \mathbf{L}(\lambda_s)^{\oplus m_s}$, and $\phi = \bigoplus_{s \in S} \phi_s$ is the required automorphism. \square

Remark 7.6. One may also apply Proposition 7.5 when \mathbf{U} is an algebra other than $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ or $U_q(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p})$. For example, one may take $\mathbf{U} = U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{U}}^{\text{int}}$ to be the category of

U-modules V , which is isomorphic to a direct sum of $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta,\eta}) \otimes V(\epsilon_{\mu,\nu}^m)$ for $(\mu, \nu), (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $\ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu) \leq n$, and whose set of weights is finitely dominated. This will be used in Section 8.

Proposition 7.5 also holds for a direct sum of extremal weight modules over $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$, whose set of weights is not necessarily finitely dominated.

Proposition 7.7. *Let $V = \bigoplus_{(\mu,\nu) \in S} V_{\mu,\nu}^{\oplus m_{\mu,\nu}}$ for some finite set S and $m_{\mu,\nu} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and let \mathfrak{v} be a crystal valuation on V . Then*

- (1) *We have $\mathfrak{v}(v) = \min\{\mathfrak{v}(v_{\mu,\nu}) \mid (\mu, \nu) \in S\}$ for $v = \sum v_{\mu,\nu}$ with $v_{\mu,\nu} \in V_{\mu,\nu}^{\oplus m_{\mu,\nu}}$.*
- (2) *If $L_{\mathfrak{v}}$ is A_0 -free, then there exists a unique $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -linear automorphism ψ of V such that $\psi(L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap V_{\mu,\nu}^{\oplus m_{\mu,\nu}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mu,\nu}^{\oplus m_{\mu,\nu}}$.*

Proof. We may write $V = \bigoplus_{k=1}^l V_{\mu^k, \nu^k}^{\oplus m_k}$ such that $(\mu^i, \nu^i) \succeq (\mu^j, \nu^j)$ implies $i < j$. Note that V is a direct limit of $V^n := \bigoplus_{(\mu,\nu) \in S} (V_{\mu,\nu}^n)^{\oplus m_{\mu,\nu}}$ for $n \geq \max\{\ell(\mu^k) + \ell(\nu^k) \mid 1 \leq k \leq l\}$ (see the proof of Proposition 4.1).

Put $V_1 = V_{\mu^1, \nu^1}^{\oplus n_1}$ and $V_2 = \bigoplus_{k \neq 1} V_{\mu^k, \nu^k}^{\oplus m_k}$. Then $(V_2)_{\epsilon_{\mu^1, \nu^1}^n} = 0$. Otherwise, we have $(V_{\mu^k, \nu^k}^{n'})_{\epsilon_{\mu^1, \nu^1}^n} \neq 0$ for some $k > 1$ and $n' > n$. Applying the action of Weyl group of $\mathfrak{gl}_{n'}$ to $\epsilon_{\mu^1, \nu^1}^n$, we have $(V_{\mu^k, \nu^k}^{n'})_{\epsilon_{\mu^1, \nu^1}^n} \neq 0$. This implies $\epsilon_{\mu^k, \nu^k}^{n'} > \epsilon_{\mu^1, \nu^1}^n$, which is a contradiction. Now we apply the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 7.4 and use induction on l to prove (1).

By (1), it suffices to consider the case $V \cong V_{\mu,\nu}^{\oplus m}$ in (2). By Proposition 7.5, there exists a unique $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -linear automorphism ψ^n of V^n such that $\psi^n(L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap V^n) = L_{\mu,\nu} \cap (V_{\mu,\nu}^n)^{\oplus m}$ for $n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$. For $n' > n$, the restriction of $\psi^{n'}$ on V^n is ψ^n by the uniqueness, so combining ψ^n 's give a desired $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -linear automorphism ψ of V . The uniqueness of ψ follows from that of ψ^n . \square

A non-semisimple module may not have a unique crystal valuation, as illustrated in the following example.

Example 7.8. Consider a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module $V_{(1),\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,(1)}$, which is not semisimple (cf. (1.1)). We may regard $V_{(1),\emptyset} = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Q}(q)v_n$, where an $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -action is given by $q^{\epsilon_i} v_j = q^{\delta_{ij}} v_j$, $f_i v_j = \delta_{ij} v_{i+1}$, $e_i v_j = \delta_{i+1,j} v_i$, and then $\mathcal{L}_{(1),\emptyset} = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_0 v_n$. Similarly, we let $V_{\emptyset,(1)} = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} v_n^\vee$ with $q^{\epsilon_i} v_j^\vee = q^{-\delta_{ij}} v_j^\vee$, $f_i v_j^\vee = \delta_{i+1,j} v_i^\vee$, $e_i v_j^\vee = \delta_{ij} v_{(i+1)^\vee}$, and $\mathcal{L}_{\emptyset,(1)} = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_0 v_n^\vee$. By the tensor product rule, $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_{(1),\emptyset} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\emptyset,(1)}$ is a crystal lattice of $V_{(1),\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,(1)}$,

The socle of $V_{(1),\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,(1)}$ is isomorphic to $V_{(1),(1)}$, which is spanned by $B = \{v_m \otimes v_n^\vee, (m \neq n), qv_n \otimes v_n^\vee + v_{n+1} \otimes v_{(n+1)^\vee} \ (n \geq 1)\}$. The A_0 -span $\mathcal{L}_{(1),(1)}$ of B is a crystal lattice of $V_{(1),(1)}$, and $\mathcal{L} \cap V_{(1),(1)} = \mathcal{L}_{(1),(1)}$.

On the other hand, consider for $S \subset \mathbb{N}$

$$\mathcal{L}_S = \mathcal{L} + \sum_{n \in S} A_0 D_n, \quad \text{where } D_n = \sum_{k=1}^n (-q)^{-n-1+k} v_k \otimes v_{k^\vee} \quad (n \geq 1).$$

Then it is not difficult to see that \mathcal{L}_S is also a crystal valuation of $V_{(1),\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,(1)}$. Indeed, we have

$$\tilde{e}_k D_n = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{1+q^2} v_n \otimes v_{(n+1)^\vee} & \text{if } k = n, \\ 0 & k \neq n, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{f}_k D_n = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{1+q^2} v_{n+1} \otimes v_{n^\vee} & \text{if } k = n, \\ 0 & k \neq n. \end{cases}$$

We also have $\mathcal{L}_S \cap V_{(1),(1)} = \mathcal{L}_{(1),(1)}$ for all S . In fact, \mathcal{L}_S is a crystal lattice, since it is easy to see that its finite rank submodule is finitely generated (cf. [21, Theorem 2.4.3]).

7.3. Saturated crystal valuation. Let V be a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -vector space. Given valuations $\mathfrak{v}_1, \mathfrak{v}_2$ on V , we define $\mathfrak{v}_1 \geq \mathfrak{v}_2$ when $\mathfrak{v}_1(v) \geq \mathfrak{v}_2(v)$ for all $v \in V$ (in particular, $L_{\mathfrak{v}_1} \supset L_{\mathfrak{v}_2}$). This gives a partial order on the set of valuations on V . Let W be a subspace of V . For a valuation \mathfrak{w} on W , we say that \mathfrak{v} is an extension of \mathfrak{w} if $\mathfrak{v}|_W = \mathfrak{w}$.

Lemma 7.9. *The following are equivalent.*

- (1) \mathfrak{v} is a maximal extension of \mathfrak{w} with respect to the partial order \geq ,
- (2) the \mathbb{Q} -linear map $L_{\mathfrak{w}}/qL_{\mathfrak{w}} \rightarrow L_{\mathfrak{v}}/qL_{\mathfrak{v}}$, which is induced from the inclusion $L_{\mathfrak{w}} \subset L_{\mathfrak{v}}$, is an isomorphism,
- (3) $L_{\mathfrak{v}}/L_{\mathfrak{w}}$ is a divisible A_0 -module, that is, any element of $L_{\mathfrak{v}}/L_{\mathfrak{w}}$ is divisible by q .

Proof. Put $L = L_{\mathfrak{w}}$ and $L' = L_{\mathfrak{v}}$.

(1) \Rightarrow (2): Let $l' \in L' \setminus qL'$ be given. By the maximality of L' , we have $L \subsetneq (L' + q^{-1}A_0l') \cap W$. So there exists $l'' \in L'$ and $c \in A_0$ such that $l'' + q^{-1}cl' \in W \setminus L$. Also, c is a unit of A_0 . If not, $q^{-1}c \in A_0$ and hence $l'' + q^{-1}cl' \in L$. If we put $l := qc^{-1}l'' + l' \in L' \cap W = L$, $l + qL$ is a preimage of $l' + qL'$. Since $L/qL \rightarrow L'/qL'$ is clearly injective, it is bijective.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): For any $l' \in L'$, there exists $l \in L$ and $l'' \in L'$ such that $l' = l + ql''$. Hence (3) holds.

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Suppose that there exists a strictly larger extension $L'' \supsetneq L'$. Then there exists $l' \in L'$ such that $q^{-1}l' \in L'' \setminus L'$. By assumption, we have $l' = ql'' + l$ for some $l \in L$ and $l'' \in L'$. Then $q^{-1}l = l'' - q^{-1}l' \in L'' \cap W = L$, so $q^{-1}l' \in L'$, which is a contradiction. \square

Suppose that V, W are integrable U -modules, and \mathfrak{v} is a crystal valuation.

Definition 7.10.

- (1) \mathfrak{v} is called a *maximal crystal valuation* with respect to W if it is maximal (with respect to \geq) among all crystal valuations on V that extends $\mathfrak{v}|_W$.
- (2) \mathfrak{v} is called a *saturated crystal valuation* with respect to W if it is maximal among all valuations on V that extends $\mathfrak{v}|_W$.

Proposition 7.11. *Suppose that V is of finite length, and $W = \text{soc } V$ with a crystal valuation \mathfrak{w} on W . If there exists at least one crystal valuation on V extending \mathfrak{w} , then there exists a maximal crystal valuation on V extending \mathfrak{w} . In particular, there exists a maximal crystal valuation on V extending $\mathfrak{w}|_{\text{soc } V}$.*

Proof. We apply Zorn's lemma. Suppose that $\{\mathfrak{v}_s\}_{s \in S}$ are crystal valuations on V extending \mathfrak{w} , parametrized by a totally ordered set S , satisfying $\mathfrak{v}_s \geq \mathfrak{v}_t$ when $s \geq t$. We show that $\tilde{\mathfrak{v}} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{\infty\}$ defined by $\tilde{\mathfrak{v}}(v) = \max\{\mathfrak{v}_s(v) \mid s \in S\}$ is a crystal valuation. The conditions (2) and (3) are straightforward.

Let $v \in V$ be given. Note that $\mathbb{U}v$ has a nontrivial intersection with W . Take $w \in (\mathbb{U}v \cap W) \setminus \{0\}$. We may write $w = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} c_{\mathbf{i}} \tilde{x}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{x}_{i_k} v$ ($x = e, f$), where the summation is over sequences $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ of elements of I with $c_{\mathbf{i}} \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$. Then for any crystal valuation \mathfrak{v}' on V extending \mathfrak{w} , we have $\mathfrak{v}(w) = \mathfrak{v}'(w) \geq \min\{\mathfrak{v}(c_{\mathbf{i}}) \mid \mathbf{i}\} + \mathfrak{v}'(v)$, and hence $\mathfrak{v}'(v)$ is bounded above. This verifies the first condition. \square

By definition, a saturated crystal valuation \mathfrak{v} with respect to W is a maximal crystal valuation with respect to W . By Lemma 7.9, we have the following characterization of \mathfrak{v} .

Proposition 7.12. *The crystal valuation \mathfrak{v} is saturated with respect to W if and only if $(L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap W)/q(L_{\mathfrak{v}} \cap W) \rightarrow L_{\mathfrak{v}}/qL_{\mathfrak{v}}$ is an isomorphism of \mathbb{Q} -spaces. In particular, when $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ is a crystal base of V , $\mathfrak{v}_{\mathcal{L}}$ is saturated with respect to W if and only if $(\mathcal{L} \cap W, \mathcal{B})$ is a crystal base of W .*

Example 7.13. Let $\mathbb{U} = U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$. Consider $V_{\emptyset, \nu} \otimes V_{\mu, \emptyset}$ and its crystal lattice $\mathcal{L}_{\emptyset, \mu} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \emptyset}$ for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$. By Corollary 4.7, there exists a submodule of $V_{\emptyset, \nu} \otimes V_{\mu, \emptyset}$ isomorphic to $V_{\mu, \nu}$ which is generated by $u_{\mu, \nu} = u_{\emptyset, \nu} \otimes u_{\mu, \emptyset}$. Note that $\mathcal{L}_{\mu, \nu} = V_{\mu, \nu} \cap (\mathcal{L}_{\emptyset, \mu} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \emptyset})$ can be identified with the A_0 -span of $\tilde{x}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{x}_{i_l} u_{\mu, \nu}$ for i_1, \dots, i_l ($l \geq 0$) with $x = e$ or f for each i_k . Since $\mathcal{B}_{\lambda, \mu} \simeq \mathcal{B}_{\emptyset, \mu} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\lambda, \emptyset}$ by Theorem 4.2, we conclude from Proposition 7.12 that $\mathcal{L}_{\emptyset, \mu} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\lambda, \emptyset}$ is saturated with respect to $V_{\mu, \nu}$. In fact, $V_{\mu, \nu}$ is the socle of $V_{\emptyset, \nu} \otimes V_{\mu, \emptyset}$ (see Theorem 8.25). It can be viewed as a generalization of (1.1).

Example 7.14. As another example when $\mathbb{U} = U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$, consider the crystal lattice $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{N}}$ of $V_{(1), \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, (1)}$ in Example 7.8, which is an extension of $\mathcal{L}_{(1), (1)}$. We see that $\mathcal{L}_{(1), (1)}/q\mathcal{L}_{(1), (1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{N}}/q\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{N}}$ is bijective since $D_n = -qD_{n+1} - v_{n+1} \otimes v_{(n+1)^{\vee}}$ and hence $D_n + q\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{N}}$ has a preimage $-qv_n \otimes v_{n^{\vee}} - v_{n+1} \otimes v_{(n+1)^{\vee}} + q\mathcal{L}_{(1), (1)}$. Thus $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{N}}$ is saturated with respect to its socle by Proposition 7.12.

Example 7.15. When $\mathbb{U} = U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$, $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ is saturated with respect to $(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_0 \subset \mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ by Proposition 6.3.

The saturated crystal valuations on V in Example 7.14 are given with respect to $\text{soc}(V)$. Conversely, we will show in Section 8 that when \mathfrak{v} is saturated with respect to W , we have $W = \text{soc } V$ under certain additional assumptions (cf. Theorem 8.22).

Example 7.16. Let $U = U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be a quantum affine algebra. Following the notations in [19], let $\varpi_i = \Lambda_i - a_i^\vee \Lambda_{0^\vee}$ ($i \in I$) be the i -th fundamental weight of level 0, and let $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I \setminus \{0\}} m_i \varpi_i$ with $m_i \geq 0$. Then $u_\lambda = \bigotimes_{i \in I \setminus \{0\}} u_{m_i \varpi_i}$ is an extremal weight vector in $\bigotimes_{i \in I \setminus \{0\}} V(m_i \varpi_i)$, and the induced map $V(\lambda) \rightarrow \bigotimes_{i \in I \setminus \{0\}} V(m_i \varpi_i)$ is injective such that the crystal lattice $\bigotimes_{i \in I \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{L}(m_i \varpi_i)$ is saturated with respect to $V(\lambda)$. It was conjectured in [19] and proved in [2].

From now on, we simply say that \mathfrak{v} is saturated if it is saturated with respect to $\text{soc } V$.

8. SATURATED CRYSTAL VALUATIONS AND SOCLE FILTRATION

8.1. Valuation on isotypic components of \mathcal{F}^n . We prove some important lemmas on the projection of standard monomials of a form $w_{M(\lambda) \otimes A}$ in \mathcal{F}^n to its irreducible components in (5.16).

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ be given with $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying (5.17). Let

$$\pi_\lambda^n = \pi_{\mu, \nu}^n : \mathcal{F}^n \longrightarrow V(\Lambda_\lambda) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_\lambda)$$

be the canonical projection. Denote $\lambda \cup \{0\}$ an element of \mathbb{Z}_+^{n+1} obtained from λ by adding 0 in its entries. Let $A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ be an element of charge 0.

Lemma 8.1. *For $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n+1}$, we have $\pi_\zeta^{n+1}(w_{M(\lambda) \otimes A}) = 0$ unless $\Lambda_\zeta \leq \Lambda_{\lambda \cup \{0\}}$.*

Proof. Let $M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^{n+1})$ be given such that $\text{wt}(M) = \text{wt}(M(\lambda) \otimes A)$. By (5.15), M belongs to $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_\zeta) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\dot{\epsilon}_\zeta)$ for some $\zeta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n+1}$. We claim that $\Lambda_\zeta \leq \Lambda_{\lambda \cup \{0\}}$. Note that $M(\zeta) = \dot{e}_{j_1} \cdots \dot{e}_{j_l} \tilde{e}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{e}_{i_k} M$ for some i_s, j_t 's. Since \tilde{e}_i 's may only move a single 1 to one position up in each column of M , the charge of each column of M does not change. This implies that $\text{wt}(M(\zeta)) = \text{wt}(\tilde{e}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{e}_{i_k} M) \leq \text{wt}(M(\lambda) \otimes |0\rangle) = \text{wt}(M(\lambda \cup \{0\}))$, which proves the claim.

Therefore, for each $M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^{n+1})$ with $\text{wt}(M) = \text{wt}(M(\lambda) \otimes A)$ and $\dot{\text{wt}}(M) = \dot{\text{wt}}(M(\lambda) \otimes A)$, we may choose its representative in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^{n+1})$ which is contained in $V(\Lambda_\zeta) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_\zeta)$ with $\Lambda_\zeta \leq \Lambda_{\lambda \cup \{0\}}$. Since the corresponding weight space is finite dimensional, $w_{M(\lambda) \otimes A}$ can be expressed as a linear combination of such representatives. It follows that the weight space of \mathcal{F}^{n+1} with weight $(\text{wt}(M(\lambda) \otimes A), \dot{\text{wt}}(M(\lambda) \otimes A))$ is contained in $U_q^-(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty) \otimes U_p^-(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -span of $w_{M(\mu)}$ for $\Lambda_\mu \leq \Lambda_{\lambda \cup \{0\}}$. This proves the lemma. \square

Let $\mathfrak{v}_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n)}$ be the crystal valuation associated to $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ in (5.14) (cf. Section 7.1). Under the isomorphism of (5.16), $\mathfrak{v}_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n)}$ gives a valuation on $\bigoplus V(\Lambda_\lambda) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_\lambda)$, which we denote by the same symbol. Then we have the following lemma, which will be crucially used in later sections.

Lemma 8.2. *If $A \neq |0\rangle$, then we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{v}_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^{n+1})}(\pi_{\mu, \nu}^{n+1}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes A})) = \infty.$$

Proof. Put $w = w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes A}$ and $w_{\mu,\nu} = \pi_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1}(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes A})$. Note that the irreducible components of \mathcal{F}^n are mutually orthogonal with respect to the bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on \mathcal{F}^n . Since $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n) = \{v \in \mathcal{F}^n \mid \langle v, \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n) \rangle \in A_0\}$ (cf. Section 2.2), we see that $\mathfrak{v}_{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n)}(w_{\mu,\nu})$ is the minimum of $\mathfrak{v}(\langle w, x \rangle)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1}) \otimes \mathcal{L}(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1})$ with $\text{wt}(x) = \text{wt}(w) = \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^n + \text{wt}(A)$ and $\dot{\text{wt}}(x) = \dot{\text{wt}}(w) = \dot{\epsilon}_{\mu,\nu}^n$, where \mathfrak{v} is the valuation on $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ defined in Section 7.1.

Recall that $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1}) \otimes \mathcal{L}(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1})$ is the A_0 -span of $G(b)G(b')w_{M^{n+1}(\lambda,\mu)}$ for $b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}, \infty)$ and $b' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}, \infty)$, where $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{g}, \infty)$ denotes the crystal of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$. Since $\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu,\nu}^n$ is an extremal weight of $V(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1})$, we have

$$A_0\text{-span of } \{ G(b')w_{M^{n+1}(\mu,\nu)} \mid b' \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}, \infty), \dot{\text{wt}}(b') = \dot{\epsilon}_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1} - \dot{\epsilon}_{\mu,\nu}^n \} = A_0w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$(8.1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min \{ \mathfrak{v}(\langle w, G(b)w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle} \rangle) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}, \infty)_{\text{wt}(A) - \Lambda_0} \} = \infty.$$

Since $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}, \infty)_{\text{wt}(A) - \Lambda_0}$ is finite, the set of $b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}, \infty)_{\text{wt}(A) - \Lambda_0}$ with $G(b)w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle} \neq 0$ (or equivalently, $\bar{\pi}_{\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1}}(b) \neq 0$) stabilizes as n tends to ∞ , and it is independent of n . So, it suffices to show $\mathfrak{v}(\langle w, G(b)w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle} \rangle)$ diverges as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for each b .

By definition of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on \mathcal{F}^n , $\langle w, G(b)w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle} \rangle$ is equal to the coefficient of w in $G(b)w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle}$ given as a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear combination of standard monomials. Write $G(b) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} c_{\mathbf{i}} f_{i_1} \cdots f_{i_k}$ ($c_{\mathbf{i}} \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$), where the sum is over all sequences $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_k)$ such that $\sum_{l=1}^k \alpha_{i_l} = \Lambda_0 - \text{wt}(A)$. Each action of f_{i_l} on a standard monomial w_M yields new standard monomials obtained from M by moving a certain 1 in M to the right. In order for $G(b)w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle}$ to have w in its expression, every action of f_{i_l} in $f_{i_1} \cdots f_{i_k}$ should move a 1 at the $n+1$ -th row of M . Hence, the coefficient of w in $f_{i_1} \cdots f_{i_k} w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle}$ is given by

$$q^{\langle \sum h_{i_l}, \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^n \rangle}.$$

Since $\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^n = \Lambda_{\mu,\nu} + (n - \ell(\lambda) - \ell(\mu))\Lambda_0$ and A is of charge 0, i_1, \dots, i_k must contain at least 0. Therefore, $\langle \sum_{l=1}^k h_{i_l}, \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^n \rangle$ becomes arbitrarily large as n tends to ∞ . This implies (8.1). \square

8.2. Semisimple subquotients of $\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M}$. Suppose that $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ and $\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$ are given such that $\Lambda_{\zeta,\eta} = \Lambda_{\mu,\nu} + \gamma$ for some $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$. Let us begin with the following description of images of the generators of $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq \gamma}$ elements under $\phi_{n,n+1}$.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $b \in H_{\gamma}^n(\mu, \nu)$ be given. Then we have*

$$\phi_{n,n+1}(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)} \otimes x_b) \equiv \sum_{b'} c_n(\mu, \nu; b, b') w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)\otimes|0\rangle} \otimes x_{b'} \pmod{(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> \gamma}}$$

for some $c_n(\mu, \nu; b, b') \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$, where the sum is over $b' \in H_{\gamma}^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)$.

Proof. Note that $x_b = u \cdot 1$ for some $u \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})_\gamma$, and $\Delta(u) \equiv t_\gamma \otimes u \pmod{U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}) \otimes U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty})_{>\gamma}}$, where $t_\gamma = \prod t_i^{m_i}$ for $\gamma = \sum_i m_i \alpha_i$. So, we may write

$$\phi_{0,1}(x_b) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i w_{A_i} \otimes x_{b_i} + q^{-(\Lambda_0, \gamma)} |0\rangle \otimes x_b,$$

for some $A_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \{|0\rangle\}$ and $b_i \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ ($i = 1, \dots, N$). Then

$$(8.2) \quad \phi_{n,n+1}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes A_i} \otimes x_{b_i} + q^{-(\Lambda_0, \gamma)} w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes |0\rangle} \otimes x_b.$$

We write $A_0 = |0\rangle$, $b_0 = b$, and $c_0 = q^{-(\Lambda_0, \gamma)}$ for convenience. Fix $i = 0, \dots, N$. First, by Lemma 8.1, we have

$$w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes A_i} \in \bigoplus_{(\sigma, \tau)} V(\Lambda_{\sigma, \tau}^{n+1}) \otimes V(\epsilon_{\sigma, \tau}^{n+1}) \subset \mathcal{F}^{n+1}$$

where the sum is over $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ such that $\Lambda_{\sigma, \tau}^{n+1} \leq \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^{n+1}$. Regarding $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^{n+1}) \otimes \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ as a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1})$ -crystal, we have by Lemma 2.1,

$$(8.3) \quad \begin{aligned} w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes A_i} \otimes x_{b_i} &\in U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p^-(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1})\text{-span of} \\ &\{ w_{M^{n+1}(\sigma, \tau)} \otimes x_{b'} \mid (\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{P}^2, b' \in H^n(\sigma, \tau) \text{ with } \Lambda_{\sigma, \tau}^{n+1} \leq \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^{n+1} \}. \end{aligned}$$

We see that $\text{wt}(b') \geq \text{wt}(b)$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}(M^{n+1}(\sigma, \tau)) + \text{wt}(b') &\geq \text{wt}(M^n(\mu, \nu)) + \text{wt}(A_i) + \text{wt}(b_i) \\ &= \text{wt}(M^n(\mu, \nu)) + \text{wt}(|0\rangle) + \text{wt}(b) \\ &= \text{wt}(M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)) + \text{wt}(b). \end{aligned}$$

Consider $w_{M^{n+1}(\sigma, \tau)} \otimes x_{b'}$ in (8.3). If $\text{wt}(b') > \text{wt}(b)$, then $w_{M^{n+1}(\sigma, \tau)} \otimes x_{b'} \equiv 0 \pmod{(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}}$. If $\text{wt}(b') = \text{wt}(b)$, then we have $M^{n+1}(\sigma, \tau) = M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)$, and $\text{wt}(M^n(\mu, \nu)) + \text{wt}(A_i) + \text{wt}(b_i) = \text{wt}(M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)) + \text{wt}(b')$. Hence

$$w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes A_i} \otimes x_{b_i} \in (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma} + U_p^-(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1})\text{-span of } \{ w_{M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_{b'} \mid b' \in H_\gamma^{n+1}(\mu, \nu) \}.$$

On the other hand, $\dot{\text{wt}}(M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu))$ is a dominant integral weight and $\xi := \dot{\text{wt}}(M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes A_i) = \dot{\text{wt}}(M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes |0\rangle)$ is a weight of an extremal weight vector generated by $w_{M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)}$. This implies that

$$(8.4) \quad (U_p^-(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1})w_{M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)})_\xi = \mathbb{Q}(q)\dot{S}_{i_1} \cdots \dot{S}_{i_k} w_{M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)} = \mathbb{Q}(q)w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes |0\rangle},$$

for some i_1, \dots, i_k , where \dot{S}_i denotes S_i in (2.6) with respect to $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1})$. Hence we have $w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes A_i} \otimes x_{b_i} \in (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma} + \mathbb{Q}(q)$ -span of $\{ w_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes |0\rangle} \otimes x_{b'} \mid b' \in H_\gamma^{n+1}(\mu, \nu) \}$.

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 8.4. Lemma 8.3 provides an alternative proof of Proposition 6.10.

Define

$$(8.5) \quad (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\gamma, (\mu, \nu)} = (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma} \oplus (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}.$$

Then

$$(8.6) \quad \frac{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\gamma, (\mu, \nu)}}{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}} \cong (V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}) \otimes V_{\mu, \nu}^n)^{\oplus |H_{\gamma}^n(\mu, \nu)|}.$$

On the other hand, by applying Lemma 2.1 to $V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathcal{M}$, we have

$$(8.7) \quad (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{\leq(\zeta, \eta)} = U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p^-(\mathfrak{gl}_n)\text{-span of } \{w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b \mid b \in H_{\delta}^n(\mu, \nu), \delta \geq \gamma\}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\gamma, (\mu, \nu)} \\ &= (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma} + U_q^-(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p^-(\mathfrak{gl}_n)\text{-span of } \{w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b \mid b \in H_{\gamma}^n(\mu, \nu)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\{w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b \pmod{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}} \mid b \in H_{\gamma}^n(\mu, \nu)\}$ forms a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of the highest weight space of the $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\gamma, (\mu, \nu)} / (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}$.

By Proposition 6.10, $\phi_{n, n+1}$ induces a map

$$(8.8) \quad \phi_{n, n+1}^{\gamma} : \frac{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\gamma, (\mu, \nu)}}{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}} \longrightarrow \frac{(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\gamma, (\mu, \nu)}}{(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}}.$$

Let

$$(8.9) \quad \mathbb{v}^n = \mathbb{v}_{\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})}$$

be the crystal valuation on $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ associated to $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n) \otimes \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})$.

Proposition 8.5. *For all sufficiently large n , the following statements hold;*

- (1) *The map $\phi_{n, n+1}^{\gamma}$ is injective.*
- (2) *For all $x \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\gamma, (\mu, \nu)} / (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{v}^{n+1}(\phi_{n, n+1}^{\gamma}(x)) = \mathbb{v}^n(x) - (\Lambda_0, \gamma),$$

where x and $\phi_{n, n+1}^{\gamma}(x)$ are identified with elements of $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$ and $(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$ in (8.5), respectively.

Proof. By Lemma 8.3, we have for $b \in H_{\gamma}^n(\mu, \nu)$,

$$(8.10) \quad \phi_{n, n+1}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b) \equiv \sum_{b' \in H_{\gamma}^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)} c_n(\mu, \nu; b, b') w_{M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_{b'} \pmod{(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}}.$$

Moreover, (8.10) is obtained by applying $\dot{S}_n \dot{S}_{n-1} \cdots \dot{S}_{\ell(\mu)+1}$ to $\sum_{b'} c_n(\mu, \nu; b, b') w_{M^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_{b'}$ (cf. (8.4)). Note that $\dot{S}_n \dot{S}_{n-1} \cdots \dot{S}_{\ell(\mu)+1}$ is an isomorphism on the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0})$ -highest

weight space of (8.6), and $\{w_{M^{n+1}(\mu,\nu)} \otimes x_{b'} \mid b' \in H_\gamma^{n+1}(\mu,\nu)\}$ is linearly independent in $(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\gamma,(\mu,\nu)}/(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>\gamma}$. Hence, to prove (1), it suffices to show that the matrix

$$C = (c_n(\mu,\nu; b, b'))_{b, b' \in H_\gamma^n(\mu,\nu)}$$

has non-zero determinant for all sufficiently large n .

To prove $\det C \neq 0$, we show

$$(8.11) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{v}(c_n(\mu,\nu; b, b')) = \begin{cases} -(\Lambda_0, \gamma) & \text{if } b = b', \\ \infty & \text{if } b \neq b'. \end{cases}$$

We use the same notations as in the proof of Lemma 8.3. Fix $i = 1, \dots, N$. The projection $\pi_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}$ factors through

$$\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1} \otimes 1} V(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1}) \otimes V(\epsilon_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1}) \otimes \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}.$$

Since $\mathbb{v}^{n+1}(\pi_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1}(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu) \otimes A_i} \otimes x_{b_i})) = \mathbb{v} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^{n+1})(\pi_{\mu,\nu}^{n+1}(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu) \otimes A_i}))$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{v}^{n+1}(\pi_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu) \otimes A_i} \otimes x_{b_i})) = \infty,$$

by Lemma 8.2. For $i = 0$, the term $q^{-(\Lambda_0, \gamma)} w_{M^n(\mu,\nu) \otimes |0\rangle} \otimes x_b$ in (8.2) contributes on the diagonal of C by $q^{-(\Lambda_0, \gamma)}$. Applying these observations to (8.2) and (8.4), we obtain (8.11).

This also implies (2). \square

Corollary 8.6. *For all sufficiently large n , the following statements hold;*

- (1) *The map $\pi_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)} \circ \phi_{n,n+1}$ induces an injection*

$$(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}.$$

- (2) *For all $x \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}$, we have*

$$\mathbb{v}^{n+1}(\pi_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}(\phi_{n,n+1}(x))) = \mathbb{v}^n(x) - (\Lambda_0, \gamma).$$

Let $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)} = \varinjlim_n (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}$, which is well-defined by Proposition 6.10, and $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}$ defined similarly. Then

$$(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq\gamma} = \sum_{\substack{(\mu,\nu) \leq (\zeta,\eta), \\ \Lambda_{\zeta,\eta} - \Lambda_{\mu,\nu} \geq \gamma}} (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}.$$

We have the following.

Theorem 8.7. *As a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module, we have*

$$\frac{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq-d}}{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{(\mu,\nu) \leq (\zeta,\eta), \\ |\zeta| - |\mu| = |\eta| - |\nu| = d}} (V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta,\eta}) \otimes V_{\mu,\nu})^{\oplus |H_\gamma(\mu,\nu)|},$$

for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ where $\gamma = \Lambda_{\zeta,\eta} - \Lambda_{\mu,\nu} \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M})$ for each $(\mu,\nu) \leq (\zeta,\eta)$.

Proof. Let $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $(\zeta, \eta), (\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be given such that $(\zeta, \eta) \geq (\mu, \nu)$ and $|\zeta| - |\mu| = |\eta| - |\nu| = d$. For each $n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)$, we have an exact sequence

$$(8.12) \quad 0 \longrightarrow (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here we regard $\left\{ (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \right\}_{n \geq \ell(\mu) + \ell(\nu)}$ as a directed system whose associated maps can be identified with $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -linear maps

$$(8.13) \quad V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus H_{\gamma}^n(\mu, \nu)} \rightarrow V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}) \otimes V(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^{n+1}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus H_{\gamma}^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)},$$

by (8.6). Taking a directed limit, we obtain

$$\frac{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}} \cong \varinjlim_n (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}.$$

By the branching rule for the pair $(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{gl}_n)$ ([11, Theorem 8.1.1]), any $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -linear inclusion $V(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^n) \rightarrow V(\dot{\epsilon}_{\mu, \nu}^{n+1})$ is a scalar multiple of the canonical inclusion. Therefore, there exists a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear map $\iota_n : \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus H_{\gamma}^n(\mu, \nu)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus H_{\gamma}^{n+1}(\mu, \nu)}$ such that the map (8.13) is given by $u \otimes v \otimes w \mapsto u \otimes v \otimes \iota_n(w)$.

By Proposition 8.5, ι_n is injective for all sufficiently large n , and hence

$$\varinjlim_n \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus |H_{\gamma}^n(\mu, \nu)|} \cong \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus |H_{\gamma}(\mu, \nu)|},$$

where the directed limit is taken with respect to ι_n . Thus, we have

$$(8.14) \quad \frac{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}} \cong V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}) \otimes V_{\mu, \nu} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(q)^{\oplus |H_{\gamma}(\mu, \nu)|}.$$

Next, observe that if $(\Lambda_0, \gamma) = -d$, then

$$(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \cap (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d+1} = (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}.$$

Indeed, if $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\sigma, \tau)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \subset (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d+1}$ for some $(\zeta, \eta) \geq (\sigma, \tau) \geq (\mu, \nu)$, then we have $(\sigma, \tau) \succeq (\mu, \nu)$. Conversely, if $(\sigma, \tau) \succeq (\mu, \nu)$, then $\Lambda_{\sigma, \tau} - \Lambda_{\mu, \nu} \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M}) \setminus \{0\}$, so $(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_{\sigma, \tau} - \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}) < 0$.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}}{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}} &= \frac{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d} + \sum_{\substack{(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta), \\ |\zeta| - |\mu| = |\eta| - |\nu| = d}} (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}} \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{\substack{(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta), \\ |\zeta| - |\mu| = |\eta| - |\nu| = d}} \frac{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu, \nu)}^{\zeta, \eta}}{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>(\mu, \nu)}^{\zeta, \eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining with (8.14), the assertion follows. \square

Remark 8.8. When $d = 0$, we have

$$(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq 0} = \bigoplus_{(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2} V_0(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}) \otimes V_{\mu, \nu},$$

which is equal to $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_0$ generated by $w_{\mu, \nu}^n$ (6.4) (cf. Proposition 6.2).

8.3. A crystal valuation on socle quotients of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. In this subsection, we introduce a crystal valuation on $(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})/(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}$. We remark that the image of $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})$ under the projection $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})/(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}$ may have an element which is infinitely divisible by q (see Proposition 8.5), and hence it does not give a well-defined crystal valuation.

Recall that \mathfrak{v}^n is the crystal valuation on $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ (8.9). For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d}$ be the direct summand of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ isomorphic to $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}/(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}$, and let $\pi_{-d}^n : \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d}$ be the canonical projection. Since $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d}$ exhausts isotypic components, that is, $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d}$ and $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}/(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d}$ do not have a common isotypic component, $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d}$ has a canonical crystal lattice given as the restriction of $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n) \otimes \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})$ by Proposition 7.5. Let \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n be the associated crystal valuation, that is,

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x) := \mathfrak{v}^n(\pi_{-d}^n(x)),$$

for $x \in \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$.

The goal of this subsection is to prove the following.

Theorem 8.9. *Let $x \in \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ be given such that $\phi_N(x_N) = x$ for some $x_N \in \mathcal{F}^N \otimes \mathcal{M}$. For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, the limit*

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_n) - dn)$$

exists and lies in $\mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{\infty\}$, where $x_n = \phi_{N,n}(x_N)$ for $n > N$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x)$ is finite if and only if $x \notin (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}$.

In order to prove the theorem, we first need a series of lemmas leading to an injectivity of $\phi_{N,n}$ followed by the projection to $(\mathcal{F}^\bullet \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d+1}$ with ‘one degree up’ (Lemma 8.13).

For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $\mathcal{M}_{-d} = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in \text{wt}(\mathcal{M}), (\gamma, \Lambda_0) = -d} \mathcal{M}_\gamma$, and let $\mathcal{M}_{\geq -d}, \mathcal{M}_{> -d}$ and so on be defined in a similar way.

Lemma 8.10. *Let $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\rho \in P_0$, and $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be given. Then there exists $N = N(d, \rho, M)$ such that the following statement holds for all $n \geq N$; For $x \in \mathcal{F}^n \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{\geq -d}) \cap \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{n\Lambda_0 + \rho}$, there exists $x^\circ \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d} \cap \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{n\Lambda_0 + \rho}$ such that*

- (1) $x \equiv x^\circ \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})}$,
- (2) $\mathfrak{v}^n(x_{< -d}^\circ) > M$, where $x_{< -d}^\circ$ denotes the projection of x° in $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{< -d})$.

Proof. We may assume $x \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}) \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})}$, say $M \otimes b$. Suppose that $M \otimes b$ is connected to $M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes b'$ for some $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ and $b' \in H^n(\mu, \nu)$. Let $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be such that $\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}^n = \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n + \text{wt}(b')$.

Since

$$(8.15) \quad \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^n \geq \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^n + \text{wt}(b') \geq \text{wt}(M \otimes b) = n\Lambda_0 + \rho,$$

and hence there are only finitely many $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ satisfying (8.15), it suffices to prove the case when (μ, ν) is fixed.

Let $v = v_{M^n(\mu,\nu) \otimes b'} \in \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})$ be the projection of $w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)} \otimes x_{b'}$ onto the associated isotypic component, which is a highest weight vector. Note that $M \otimes b = \check{f}_{j_1} \cdots \check{f}_{j_l} \check{f}_{i_1} \cdots \check{f}_{i_k} (M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes b')$ for some i_1, \dots, i_k and j_1, \dots, j_l . Let $b'' = \check{f}_{i_1} \cdots \check{f}_{i_k} 1 \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, where $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is the crystal of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$. Note that $\text{wt}(M \otimes b) = n\Lambda_0 + \rho$ is fixed, and

$$(8.16) \quad \text{wt}(b'') = \text{wt}(M \otimes b) - \text{wt}(M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes b') \geq n\Lambda_0 + \rho - \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^n,$$

where the rightmost term is independent of n . So, there are only finitely many b'' 's satisfying (8.16), and it suffices to prove the case when $b'' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is fixed.

Put

$$x^\circ = \check{f}_{j_1} \cdots \check{f}_{j_l} G(b'')v \in \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}).$$

We claim that there exists $N' \gg 0$ such that x° satisfies the required properties for all $n \geq N'$ and for all $M \otimes b$ subject to the assumptions on (μ, ν) , b' , and b'' .

By construction, we have $x^\circ \equiv M \otimes b \equiv x \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})}$. Also we have $v \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}$ since $\text{wt } b' \geq \text{wt } b$ and $(\text{wt } b, \Lambda_0) \geq -d$. This implies $x^\circ \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}$.

So it remains to prove that $\mathfrak{v}^n(x_{< -d}^\circ) > M$, where $x_{< -d}^\circ$ denotes the projection of x° in $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{< -d})$. Moreover, we may assume that $x^\circ = G(b'')v$, since $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{< -d})$ is stable under \check{f}_j and $\mathfrak{v}^n(\check{f}_j x) \geq \mathfrak{v}^n(x)$.

Step 1. First, we may write

$$(8.17) \quad \Delta(G(b'')) = \sum_i x_i t_{\rho_i} \otimes y_i,$$

for some $x_i \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$, $y_i \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)_{-\rho_i}$ and $t_{\rho_i} = \prod_k t_k^{(\rho_i, \Lambda_k)}$. Similarly, we write

$$(8.18) \quad v = \sum_j c_j w_{M_j} \otimes x_{b_j},$$

for some $c_j \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$, $M_j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ and $b_j \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$. Here, we have $c_j \in A_0$ since $v \in \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})$. By (8.17) and (8.18), we have

$$(8.19) \quad x^\circ = G(b'')v = \sum_{i,j} c_j (x_i t_{\rho_i} w_{M_j}) \otimes (y_i x_{b_j}).$$

Step 2. We have $\text{wt}(b_j) \geq \text{wt}(b') \geq n\Lambda_0 + \rho - \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}^n$ for all j , since $v \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu,\nu)}^{(\zeta,\eta)} \subset (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu,\nu)}^{\leq(\zeta,\eta)}$ (cf. (8.7) and (8.18)). Therefore, as n varies, there are only finitely many elements in $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ which may appear in (8.18) as b_j , depending only on ρ and (μ, ν) as in the case of b'' . Write $\text{wt}(M_j) = n\Lambda_0 + \pi_j$. Since $\text{wt}(M_j \otimes b_j) = \text{wt}(v) = \Lambda_{\zeta,\eta}^n$ and there

are only finitely many choices for $\text{wt}(b_j)$, there are only finitely many elements $\pi \in P$ which may appear as π_j , depending only on ρ and (μ, ν) as well.

Step 3. Consider $x_i w_{M_j}$ and $y_i x_{b_j}$'s in (8.19).

First, we take N_1 such that $q^{N_1} y_i x_{b_j} \in \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})$ for all i, j . By *Step 2*, we may assume that N_1 depends only on $\rho, (\mu, \nu)$, and b'' .

Next, consider $x_i w_{M_j}$. For a fixed $\pi \in P$, the set

$$\{ \varepsilon_k(M) \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}, M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n) \text{ with } \text{wt}(M) = n\Lambda_0 + \pi \}$$

is bounded above, whose upper bound is independent of n . Indeed, for $M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ with $\text{wt}(M) = n\Lambda_0 + \pi$, we have $(\pi, \varepsilon_k) \geq 0$ for $k > 0$ and $(\pi, \varepsilon_k) \leq 0$ for $k \leq 0$. Considering the actions of \tilde{e}_k, \tilde{f}_k ($k \in \mathbb{Z}$) on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^n) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})^{\otimes n}$, it is not difficult to see that

$$\varepsilon_k(M) \leq \begin{cases} (\pi, \varepsilon_{k+1}) & \text{for } k \geq 0, \\ -(\pi, \varepsilon_k) & \text{for } k < 0. \end{cases}$$

By applying (2.8), there exists N'' such that $q^{N''} f_k w_{M_j} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ for all k, j , and n . Repeating similar arguments, we conclude that there exists N_2 depending only on $\rho, (\mu, \nu)$, and b'' such that $q^{N_2} c_j x_i w_{M_j} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^n)$ for all i, j , and n .

Step 4. Finally, consider $t_{\rho_i} w_{M_j}$ in (8.19). Fix i and let $l_{k,j}$ be such that $t_k^{(\rho_i, \Lambda_k)} w_{M_j} = q^{l_{k,j}} w_{M_j}$. By *Step 2*, $\{l_{k,j} \mid k, j \text{ } (k \neq 0)\}$ has a lower bound independent of n . On the other hand, the projection of $y_i x_{b_j}$ onto $\mathcal{M}_{<-d}$ is nonzero if and only if $(\text{wt}(y_i x_{b_j}), \Lambda_0) < -d$, which is equivalent to

$$-(\rho_i, \Lambda_0) = (\text{wt}(y_i), \Lambda_0) < -d - (\text{wt}(b_j), \Lambda_0) \leq -d - (\text{wt}(b'), \Lambda_0) \leq -d - (\text{wt}(b), \Lambda_0) \leq 0.$$

So we have $(\rho_i, \Lambda_0) > 0$ in this case. Furthermore, this implies that $l_{0,j}$ can be arbitrarily large as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since the number of columns in M_j not equal to $|0\rangle$ is bounded above by $-(\pi_j, \Lambda_0)$, and the number of columns equal to $|0\rangle$ is arbitrarily large.

Therefore, combining with *Step 3*, we conclude that there exists $N = N(d, \rho, M)$ such that $\mathfrak{v}^n(x_{<-d}^\circ) > M$ for $n \geq N$. This completes the proof. \square

The following lemma says that an element of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{\geq -d})$ can be approximated by an element of $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}$ arbitrarily closely with respect to the q -adic topology in $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 8.11. *Let d, ρ and M be given as above. The following statement holds for all sufficiently large n ; For $x \in \mathcal{F}^n \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{\geq -d})$ of weight $n\Lambda_0 + \rho$, there exists $x^\circ \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}$ such that $\mathfrak{v}^n(x) = \mathfrak{v}^n(x^\circ)$ and $\mathfrak{v}^n(x) + M < \mathfrak{v}^n(x - x^\circ)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $n \geq N(d, \rho, M)$, where $N(d, \rho, M)$ is as in Lemma 8.10. We may assume that $\mathfrak{v}^n(x) = 0$. By using Lemma 8.10, we define $x^{(0)}, x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(M)} \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes$

$\mathcal{M}_{\geq -d} \cap \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{n\Lambda_0 + \rho}$ inductively by

$$q^{-k-1} \left(x - \sum_{i=0}^k q^i x_{\geq -d}^{(i)} \right) \equiv x^{(k+1)} \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})},$$

and $\mathfrak{v}^n(x_{< -d}^{(k+1)}) > M - k - 1$. Put $x^\circ = \sum_{i=0}^M q^i x^{(i)}$. Then $\mathfrak{v}^n(x) = \mathfrak{v}^n(x^\circ)$ and

$$\mathfrak{v}^n \left(x - \sum_{i=0}^M q^i x^{(i)} \right) = \min \left\{ \mathfrak{v}^n \left(x - \sum_{i=0}^M q^i x_{\geq -d}^{(i)} \right), \mathfrak{v}^n \left(\sum_{i=0}^M q^i x_{< -d}^{(i)} \right) \right\} > M.$$

□

Next, we prove a lemma on a valuation of a projection on certain $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -modules, which is analogous to Lemma 8.2.

Lemma 8.12. *Let $(\mu, \nu), (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be given with $(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta)$. Let $\pi_{\zeta, \eta}^n$ be the projection of $V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathcal{M}$ onto its isotypic component corresponding to $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta})$. Let $\mathfrak{v}_{\mu, \nu}^n$ be the crystal valuation associated to $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})$. Let $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be given such that $(\zeta, \eta) \preceq (\sigma, \tau)$ with $\gamma = \Lambda_{\sigma, \tau}^n - \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n$. Then for $x \in \mathcal{M}_\gamma$,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{v}_{\mu, \nu}^n(\pi_{\zeta, \eta}^n(u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x)) = \infty.$$

Proof. Recall that there exist q -Shapovalov forms on $V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n)$ in (2.7) and \mathcal{M} in Proposition 3.18. Define a bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathcal{M}$ by $\langle v_1 \otimes x_1, v_2 \otimes x_2 \rangle = \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ for $v_i \otimes x_i \in V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathcal{M}$. By Proposition 3.3, we have $\langle uv, w \rangle = \langle v, \tau(u)w \rangle$ for $v, w \in V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathcal{M}$ and $u \in U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$. Since $\mathcal{L}(V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n)) \otimes \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})$ is a crystal lattice, we also have an analogue of Proposition 3.19 for $\mathcal{L}(V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n)) \otimes \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})$.

Let $\gamma' = \Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}^n - \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n$. We may assume that $H_{\gamma'}^n(\mu, \nu) = H_{\gamma'}(\mu, \nu)$ by letting n sufficiently large. For $b \in H_{\gamma'}^n(\mu, \nu)$, let v_b the projection of $u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x_b$ onto the isotypic component of $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta, \eta})$. One can easily see that v_b is singular, $v_b \in \mathcal{L}(V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n)) \otimes \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{M})$, and

$$(8.20) \quad v_b - u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x_b \in V(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n) \otimes \mathcal{M}_{> \gamma}.$$

By similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 8.2, we have

$$\mathfrak{v}_{\mu, \nu}^n(\pi_{\zeta, \eta}^n(u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x)) = \min \left\{ \langle G(b')v_b, u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x \rangle \mid b \in H_{\gamma'}(\mu, \nu), b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{\gamma - \gamma'} \right\}.$$

We see from (8.20) that the weight of the first tensor component in $G(b')(v_b - u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x_b)$ is strictly less than $\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n$. Thus, this term cannot contribute to the pairing with $u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x$. Similarly, the only term in $G(b')(u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x)$ that may contribute to the pairing is $t_{-\gamma + \gamma'} u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes G(b')x_b$. Thus, we have

$$\mathfrak{v}_{\mu, \nu}^n(\pi_{\zeta, \eta}^n(u_{\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n} \otimes x)) = \min \left\{ q^{(-\gamma + \gamma', \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n)} \langle G(b')x_b, x \rangle \mid b \in H_{\gamma'}(\mu, \nu), b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{\gamma - \gamma'} \right\}.$$

Since $(\zeta, \eta) \preceq (\sigma, \tau)$, we have $(-\gamma + \gamma', \Lambda_0) \geq 1$, and hence the above value diverges as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

The following lemma, analogous to Proposition 8.5, is a key ingredient to the proof of our main theorem. It essentially depends on an analogous property of ${}_0r^-$ proved in Lemma 3.15.

Lemma 8.13. *Let $(\mu, \nu), (\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be given with $(\mu, \nu) \preceq (\zeta, \eta)$ and $d = |\zeta| - |\mu| = |\eta| - |\nu|$, and let $\gamma = \Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}^n - \Lambda_{\mu, \nu}^n$. Then the following statements hold for all sufficiently large n and N ;*

(1) *The map*

$$\pi_{-d+1}^{n+N} \circ \phi_{n, n+N} : (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d+1}$$

is injective.

(2) *For all $x \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$, we have*

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d+1}^{n+N}(\phi_{n, n+N}(x)) \in \mathfrak{v}^n(x) + N(d-1) + [r_1, r_2],$$

where $[r_1, r_2]$ is an interval independent of x , n and N , depending only on (μ, ν) and (ζ, η) .

Proof. Let N be given.

Step 1. Let V_N be the irreducible highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$ -module with highest weight $N\Lambda_0$. By Proposition 3.2, one can check the following commutative diagram of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{gl}_\infty)$ -linear maps:

$$(8.21) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{M} \\ \parallel & & \downarrow (\pi_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus 0, N\Lambda_0} \otimes 1) \circ \Xi_N \\ \mathcal{M} & \longrightarrow & V_N \otimes \mathcal{M} \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{M} & \xrightarrow{\phi_{0, N}} & \mathcal{F}^N \otimes \mathcal{M} \end{array}$$

where $\pi_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus 0, N\Lambda_0} : \mathcal{M} = V_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus 0}(0) \rightarrow V(N\Lambda_0)$ is the canonical projection (3.11), $\Xi_N(x \otimes y) = q^{-N(\text{wt } y, \Lambda_0)} x \otimes y$, and $V_N \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}^N$ is the unique embedding sending $u_{N\Lambda_0} \mapsto |0\rangle^{\otimes N}$.

On the other hand, let W be the irreducible highest weight $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -module with highest weight $-\alpha_0$, which is isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}_{-1} \subset \mathcal{M}$ with highest weight vector f_0 . Let $\pi_W : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow W$ be the canonical projection which is $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0}) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{\leq 0})$ -linear. Recall that

$$r := {}_0r^- : \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\pi_W \otimes \text{id}} W \otimes \mathcal{M}$$

(cf. (3.7)). Since the map $W \cong \mathcal{M}_{-1} \rightarrow V_N \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}^N$ is injective, where the first map is $\pi_{\mathbb{Z} \setminus 0, N\Lambda_0}$, we may regard r as a map

$$(8.22) \quad r : \mathcal{M} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}^N \otimes \mathcal{M}.$$

Step 2. Note that $(\gamma, \Lambda_0) = -d$ by assumption. We may assume that $H_\gamma^n(\mu, \nu) = H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$. Let $\phi = \pi_{-d+1}^{n+N} \circ \phi_{n, n+N}$. Let $w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{\leq(\zeta, \eta)}$ be given for $b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$.

Consider $\phi(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b)$. Since $\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} \mathcal{M}_{-d}$, we have by (8.21) and (8.22)

$$\phi_{0, N}(x_b) = q^{Nd} |0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes x_b + q^{N(d-1)} r(x_b) + y,$$

for some $y \in \mathcal{F}^N \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{\geq -d+2})$, while $r(x_b) \in \mathcal{F}^N \otimes (\mathcal{M}_{-d+1})$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi_{n, n+N}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b) \\ &= q^{Nd} w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes x_b + q^{N(d-1)} w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes r(x_b) + w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes y. \end{aligned}$$

Let N_b be such that $q^{-N_b} r(x_b) \in \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})$ and $q^{-N_b} r(b) \equiv \bar{r}(x_b) \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})}$ (cf. (6.2), (6.3)). We choose N to be sufficiently large so that $Nd > N(d-1) + N_b > 0$. Note that this choice of N is independent of n .

By Lemma 8.11, for all sufficiently large n , there exists $y^\circ \in (\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d+2}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{v}^{n+N}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes y - y^\circ) > \mathfrak{v}^{n+N}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes y) + Nd \geq Nd.$$

Put $X = \phi_{n, n+N}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b) - y^\circ$. Then X and $\phi_{n, n+N}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b)$ has the same image under π_{-d+1}^{n+N} , and

$$(8.23) \quad q^{-N(d-1)-N_b} X \equiv M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes \bar{r}(b) \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})}.$$

Since \bar{r} commutes with \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i for $i \neq 0$, we have $\tilde{e}_i(M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes \bar{r}(b)) = 0$ for $i \neq 0$. Moreover, if n is sufficiently large, $\tilde{e}_0(M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes \bar{r}(b)) = 0$ by tensor product rule (2.5). So $M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes \bar{r}(b)$ is connected to $M^{n+N}(\mu_b, \nu_b) \otimes b' \in \mathcal{B}_0((\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu_b, \nu_b)}^{\leq(\zeta, \eta)})^{\text{h.w.}}$ as a $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+N})$ -crystal for some (μ_b, ν_b) and $b' \in H_{\gamma'}(\mu_b, \nu_b)$ with $\gamma' = \Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}^{n+N} - \Lambda_{\mu_b, \nu_b}^{n+N}$.

By construction of \bar{r} and the fact that $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+N})$ -crystal operators does not affect the tensor component in \mathcal{M} , b' depends only on b and $(\text{wt}(b'), \Lambda_0) = -d+1$. This implies that X has non-zero image under the projection onto $(\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu_b, \nu_b)}^{\leq(\zeta, \eta)} \subset (\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{-d+1}$, and hence so does $\phi_{n, n+N}(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b)$, that is, $\phi(w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b) \neq 0$.

Step 3. For each $z \in \mathcal{B}_0 := \mathcal{B}_0((\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{\leq(\zeta, \eta)})$, choose sequences of crystal operators $\tilde{F}_z = \tilde{f}_{i_{z,1}} \cdots \tilde{f}_{i_{z,x_z}}$ and $\dot{F}_z = \dot{f}_{j_{z,1}} \cdots \dot{f}_{j_{z,y_z}}$ such that

$$z = \tilde{F}_z \dot{F}_z(M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes b_z),$$

for some $b_z \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$. For $b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$, let $v_b = v_{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes b}$ be the projection of $w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_b$ onto $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{\leq(\zeta, \eta)}$ (cf. the proof of Lemma 8.10).

Suppose a non-zero weight vector $x \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{\leq(\zeta, \eta)}$ is given. We have

$$(8.24) \quad x = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{B}_0} c_z F_z \dot{F}_z v_{b_z},$$

for some $c_z \in \mathbb{Q}(q)$ and $1 \leq j_{z,k} \leq n$, since $\{\tilde{F}_z \dot{F}_z v_{b_z}\}_{z \in \mathcal{B}_0}$ form a basis of $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$ at $q = 0$, and the weight spaces of $\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ are finite-dimensional.

Let us consider

$$y = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{B}_0} c_z \tilde{F}_z \dot{F}_z (w_{M^n(\mu, \nu)} \otimes x_{b_z}),$$

which will be used as an approximation of x . Then $x - y \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{<(\zeta, \eta)}$, and $\phi_{n, n+N}(x - y) \in (\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu, \nu)}^{<(\zeta, \eta)}$ (cf. Proposition 6.10). Thus, we have

$$\pi_{-d+1}^{n+N}(\phi_{n, n+N}(x - y)) = \pi_{-d+1}^{n+N}(\phi_{n, n+N}(\pi_{-d+1}^n(x - y))),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{v}_{-d+1}^{n+N}(\phi_{n, n+N}(x - y)) &= \mathfrak{v}^{n+N}(\pi_{-d+1}^{n+N}(\phi_{n, n+N}(x - y))) \\ (8.25) \quad &= \mathfrak{v}^{n+N}(\pi_{-d+1}^{n+N}(\phi_{n, n+N}(\pi_{-d+1}^n(x - y)))) \\ &= \mathfrak{v}^n(\pi_{-d+1}^n(x - y)) + N(d-1) \quad \text{by Proposition 8.5} \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large n , depending only on (ζ, η) .

Step 4. Next, consider $\phi(y)$. Let $z_1, \dots, z_l \in \mathcal{B}_0$ be such that

$$N(d-1) + N_{b_{z_i}} + \mathfrak{v}(c_{z_i}) = \min\{N(d-1) + N_{b_z} + \mathfrak{v}(c_z) \mid z \in \mathcal{B}_0\} =: m \quad (i = 1, \dots, l),$$

where N_b is defined in *Step 2*. Since $H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$ is finite, we may choose N sufficiently large so that assumptions in *Step 2* are satisfied for all $b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$. Then, by the same argument as in *Step 2* (see (8.23)), we have

$$(8.26) \quad q^{-m} \phi(y) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^l q^{-\mathfrak{v}(c_{z_i})} c_{z_i} F_{z_i} \dot{F}_{z_i} (M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes \bar{r}(b_{z_i})) \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})}.$$

On the other hand, as in *Step 2*, if n is sufficiently large, then $M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes \bar{r}(b)$ is of highest weight for all $b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$ as an element of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0})$ -crystal, and there exists a morphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -crystals

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \mathcal{B}_0 \left((\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \right) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_0 (\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M}) \\ M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes b &\longmapsto M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes \bar{r}(b), \end{aligned}$$

which is injective since \bar{r} is injective. In particular, since the summands of the right hand side of (8.26) are linearly independent, we have $\phi(y) \neq 0$ and $\mathfrak{v}^{n+N}(\phi(y)) = m$.

Step 5. We may assume that $\mathfrak{v}^n(x) = 0$ so that $\min\{\mathfrak{v}(c_z) \mid z \in \mathcal{B}_0\} = 0$. Let $r_1 = \min\{N_b \mid b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)\}$ and $r_2 = \max\{N_b \mid b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)\}$. Then we have

$$(8.27) \quad N(d-1) + r_1 \leq m \leq N(d-1) + r_2,$$

since $\mathfrak{v}(c_z) \geq 0$ for $z \in \mathcal{B}_0$ and $m \leq N(d-1) + N_{b_{z'}} + \mathfrak{v}(c_{z'}) = N(d-1) + N_{b_{z'}} \leq N(d-1) + r_2$ where $z' \in \mathcal{B}_0$ is such that $\mathfrak{v}(c_{z'}) = 0$.

By (8.20) and then applying Lemma 8.12, we see that if we take a sufficiently large n , then $\mathfrak{v}^n(\pi_{-d+1}^n(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)} \otimes x_b - v_b)) > r_2$ for all $b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$. Combining with (8.25) and (8.27), it follows that

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d+1}^{n+N}(\phi_{n,n+N}(x-y)) > m = \mathfrak{v}^{n+N}(\phi(y)).$$

Since $\phi(x) = \phi(y) + \pi_{-d+1}^{n+N}(\phi_{n,n+N}(x-y))$, we conclude that $\mathfrak{v}^{n+N}(\phi(x)) = m$.

In particular, we have $\phi(x) \neq 0$, and $\mathfrak{v}^{n+N}(\phi(x)) \in N(d-1) + [r_1, r_2]$ by (8.27). This proves (1) and (2). \square

Remark 8.14. We emphasize that there exist n' and N' , depending only on (μ, ν) and (ζ, η) , and not depending on each other such that the statements (1) and (2) of Lemma 8.13 hold for all $n \geq n'$ and $N \geq N'$.

Remark 8.15. For a weight vector $x \in \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ with $\mathfrak{v}^n(x) = l$, we have $q^{-l}x \equiv x_0 \pmod{q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})}$ for some $x_0 \in \mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})/q\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}) = \mathbb{Q}$ -span of $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})$. Let us call x_0 the *lowest degree coefficient* of x . We have seen in the proof of Lemma 8.13, more precisely, by (8.26), that the lowest degree coefficient of $\pi_{-d+1}^{n+N} \circ \phi_{n,n+N}(w_{M^n(\mu,\nu)} \otimes x_b)$ is in the \mathbb{Q} -span of the connected component of $M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes \bar{\mathfrak{r}}(b)$ ($b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)$) with respect the crystal operators for $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$.

For $n \geq 1$ and $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, let $\pi_{(\mu,\nu)} : \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M} \rightarrow (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu,\nu)}$ denote the canonical projection.

Lemma 8.16. For $x \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta,\eta)}$, let

$$W^n(x) = \{ (\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{P}^2 \mid (\sigma, \tau) \leq (\zeta, \eta), \pi_{(\mu,\nu)}(x) \neq 0 \text{ for some } (\mu, \nu) \leq (\sigma, \tau) \}.$$

Then we have $W^{n+1}(\phi_{n,n+1}(x)) \subset W^n(x)$.

Proof. If (μ^l, ν^l) ($l = 1, \dots, k$) are the minimal elements in $W^n(x)$, then $x \in \sum_{l=1}^k (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu^l, \nu^l)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}$. By Proposition 6.10, we have $\phi_{n,n+1}(x) \in \sum_{l=1}^k (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq(\mu^l, \nu^l)}^{(\zeta,\eta)}$, which proves the claim. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.9. Suppose that a nonzero $x \in \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ is given. Let $x_n \in \mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M}$ be given for all sufficiently large n such that $\phi_n(x_n) = x$ and $\phi_{n,n+1}(x_n) = x_{n+1}$. We may also assume that $x_n \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta,\eta)}$ for some $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$. For each n , we put $x_{n,-d} = \pi_{-d}^n(x_n)$ for simplicity. Note that $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_n) = \mathfrak{v}^n(x_{n,-d})$.

Let $W(x) = \bigcap_{n \geq 1} W^n(x_n)$, which is a well-defined non-empty set by Lemma 8.16. For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $W_{-d}(x) = \{ (\sigma, \tau) \in W(x) \mid |\zeta| - |\sigma| = d \}$, and similarly define $W_{\geq -d}(x), W_{> -d}(x)$, and so on.

Case 1. Suppose that $x \in (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}$, that is, $W(x) = W_{> -d}(x)$. Then $x_{n,-d} = 0$ for all sufficiently large n . Hence $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_n) = \infty$ for all sufficiently large n , which implies that $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x) = \infty$.

Case 2. Suppose that $x \in (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}) \setminus (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}$, that is, $W_{\leq-d}(x) \neq \emptyset$. We prove $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$ by using induction on $|W_{<-d}(x)|$.

Step 1. If $W_{<-d}(x) = \emptyset$, then $x_n \in (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq-d}$ for all sufficiently large n , and hence there exists, n' , independent of x , such that $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+1}(x_{n+N}) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_N) + d$ for $n \geq n'$ by Proposition 8.5, which implies $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Note that in this case, we have $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x) - nd$ for sufficiently large n . We remark that n depends only on (ζ, η) and not on x , while it depends on x in *Step 2*.

Step 2. Suppose that $W_{<-d}(x) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\pi_{(\mu, \nu)}(x_n) \neq 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ with $(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta)$ and $|\zeta| - |\mu| > d$. Since There exists $(\sigma, \tau) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ satisfying $(\mu, \nu) \leq (\sigma, \tau) \leq (\zeta, \eta)$ and $|\zeta| - |\sigma| = d + 1$, we have $(\sigma, \tau) \in W_{-d-1}(x)$ by definition, and hence $|W_{<-d-1}(x)| < |W_{<-d}(x)|$. By induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{v}_{-d-1}^\infty(x)$ is finite. This, in particular, implies that $x_{n, -d-1} \neq 0$ for all sufficiently large n , and hence $W_{-d-1}(x) \neq \emptyset$.

Fix a sufficiently large N so that Lemma 8.13 holds for all $(\mu, \nu) \in W_{-d-1}(x)$. For simplicity, we write $\psi = \pi_{-d}^{n+N} \circ \phi_{n, n+N}$. Since

$$x_n = x_{n, >-d} + x_{n, -d} + x_{n, -d-1} + x_{n, <-d-1},$$

where $x_{n, >-d} = \sum_{-d' > -d} x_{n, -d'}$ and $x_{n, <-d-1}$ is defined similarly, we have

$$(8.28) \quad x_{n+N, -d} = \psi(x_{n, -d}) + \psi(x_{n, -d-1}) + \psi(x_{n, <-d-1}).$$

Note that $\psi(x_{n, >-d}) = 0$ by Proposition 8.5.

Step 3. We proceed with finding a bound of valuation of each component in (8.28). First, we have

$$(8.29) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n, <-d-1})) &\geq \mathfrak{v}^n(x_{n, <-d-1}) = \min \{ \mathfrak{v}_{-d'}^n(x_{n, <-d-1}) \mid d' \geq d+2 \} \\ &= \min \{ \mathfrak{v}_{-d'}^\infty(x) + d'n \mid d' \geq d+2 \} \end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large n . Here, we have the first inequality since ϕ preserves crystal lattices, and the last equality by applying induction hypotheses to the case of d' since $|W_{<-d'}(x)| < |W_{<-d}(x)|$.

On the other hand, by applying Lemma 8.13 to all $(\mu, \nu) \in W_{-d-1}(x)$, we see that there exists r_1, r_2 such that

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d-1}^n(x_{n, -d-1}) + dN + r_1 \leq \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n, -d-1})) \leq \mathfrak{v}_{-d-1}^n(x_{n, -d-1}) + dN + r_2,$$

for all sufficiently large n . By induction hypothesis, we have $\mathfrak{v}_{-d-1}^n(x_{n, -d-1}) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d-1}^\infty(x) + (d+1)n$ and hence

$$(8.30) \quad \mathfrak{v}_{-d-1}^\infty(x) + (d+1)n + dN + r_1 \leq \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n, -d-1})) \leq \mathfrak{v}_{-d-1}^\infty(x) + (d+1)n + dN + r_2.$$

Step 4. We claim that

$$(8.31) \quad \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(x_{n+N, -d}) = \min \left\{ \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n, -d})), \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n, -d-1})) \right\},$$

for all sufficiently large n (cf. (8.28)).

First, the lower bound of (8.29) is $(d+2)n+c$ ($c \in \mathbb{Z}$), since there are only finitely many $d' \geq d+2$ such that $\mathfrak{v}_{-d'}^\infty(x) < \infty$, while the upper bound in (8.30) is of the form $(d+1)n+c'$ ($c' \in \mathbb{Z}$). This implies that

$$(8.32) \quad \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,-d-1})) < \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,<-d-1})),$$

for all sufficiently large n , and hence

$$(8.33) \quad \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(x_{n+N,-d}) \geq \min \left\{ \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi_{-d}(x)), \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,-d-1})) \right\}.$$

Now, we claim that the lowest degree coefficients of $\psi(x_{n,-d})$ and $\psi(x_{n,-d-1})$ (see Remark 8.15) do not cancel each other in $\psi(x_{n,-d}) + \psi(x_{n,-d-1})$. This implies that the inequality in (8.33) becomes equality.

Indeed, the lowest degree coefficient of $\psi(x_{n,-d})$ is in the \mathbb{Q} -linear span of elements of $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ connected to

$$(8.34) \quad \{M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes b \mid (\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta), |\zeta| - |\mu| = d, b \in H_\gamma(\mu, \nu)\},$$

under the crystal operators of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ (see the proof of Proposition 8.5, where $\gamma = \Lambda_{\zeta,\eta} - \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}$). On the other hand, by Remark 8.15, the lowest degree coefficient of $\psi(x_{n,-d-1})$ is in the \mathbb{Q} -span of elements of $\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{F}^{n+N} \otimes \mathcal{M})$ connected to

$$(8.35) \quad \{M^n(\mu', \nu') \otimes \bar{\tau}(b') \mid (\mu', \nu') \leq (\zeta, \eta), |\zeta| - |\mu'| = d+1, b' \in H_\gamma(\mu', \nu')\},$$

under the crystal operators of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Note that $\bar{\tau} : \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F}^N) \otimes \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$ and $\bar{\tau}(b') = M \otimes b''$ for some $M \neq |0\rangle^{\otimes N}$ and $b'' \in \mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{M})$. Also recall that $M^n(\mu', \nu') \otimes \bar{\tau}(b')$ is of highest weight as an element of a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -crystal for sufficiently large n (see *Step 2* in the proof of Lemma 8.13). Similarly, $M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes b$ is of highest weight as an element of a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -crystal. Hence, if $M^n(\mu', \nu') \otimes \bar{\tau}(b')$ and $M^n(\mu, \nu) \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes b$ are connected with respect to the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -crystal operators, they must be connected solely through the crystal operators of $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$, which is impossible, since the components $|0\rangle^{\otimes N} \otimes b$ and $M \otimes b'$ are clearly different. Note that they may still be connected with respect to $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{n+N})$ -crystal operators, and the restriction to $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ is crucial for this argument to work. This proves the claim and hence (8.31).

Step 5. Now, we claim that

$$(8.36) \quad \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(x_{n+N,-d}) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,-d})),$$

for all sufficiently large n . We observe from (8.31) that $x_{n+N,-d} \neq 0$ for all sufficiently large n .

By Proposition 8.5,

$$(8.37) \quad \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,-d})) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_{n,-d}) + dN,$$

for all sufficiently large n , which implies $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(x_{n+N,-d}) \leq \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_{n,-d}) + dN$ by (8.31). Suppose that this holds for $n \geq n_0$. Then the sequence $\{\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_{n,-d}) - dn\}$ takes maximum

value for $n \leq n_0 + N$, so there exists C such that $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(x_{m,-d}) \leq dm + C$ for all m . Combining this with m replaced by $n + N$ and (8.30), we have $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(x_{n+N,-d}) < \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,-d-1}))$ for all sufficiently large n . Hence, it follows from (8.31) that

$$(8.38) \quad \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(x_{n+N,-d}) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,-d})) < \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,-d-1}))$$

for all sufficiently large n , which proves (8.36).

Step 6. By (8.36) and (8.37), we have

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(x_{n+N,-d}) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_{n,-d}) + dN,$$

for all sufficiently large n . We may repeat the preceding argument with $N + 1$ instead of N to obtain $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N+1}(x_{n+N+1,-d}) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_{n,-d}) + d(N + 1)$ for all sufficiently large n . Combining these two equations, we conclude that the sequence $\{\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_{n,-d})\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ satisfies

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+1}(x_{n+1,-d}) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_{n,-d}) + d$$

for all sufficiently large n . Thus, $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x)$ is well-defined and is finite. This completes the induction step, and hence the proof of Theorem 8.9. \square

Remark 8.17. Summarizing from (8.32), (8.36)-(8.38), we see that given x ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(x_{n,-d}) + dN &= \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^n(\psi(x_{n,-d})) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(x_{n+N,-d}) < \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,-d-1})) \\ &= \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,<-d})) < \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{n+N}(\psi(x_{n,<-d-1})) \end{aligned}$$

(cf. (8.28)) for all sufficiently large n and N , where N depends on x , and n depends on x and N .

8.4. Socle filtration of $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let

$$(8.39) \quad \mathcal{V}_d^\circ = \frac{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}}{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}}, \quad \mathcal{V}_d = \frac{\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}}{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}}.$$

Then we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d) &= \{ \bar{x} \in \mathcal{V}_d \mid x \in \mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x) \geq 0 \}, \\ \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ) &= \mathcal{V}_d^\circ \cap \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 8.18. *For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have the following.*

- (1) $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)$ is a crystal valuation.
- (2) $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ)$ is a crystal lattice.
- (3) The map

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ)/q\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ) \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)/q\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)$$

induced from the inclusion $\mathcal{V}_d^\circ \subset \mathcal{V}_d$ is an isomorphism of \mathbb{Q} -spaces, that is, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)$ is saturated with respect to \mathcal{V}_d° .

Proof. (1) It is clear that \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^∞ induces a well-defined crystal valuation on \mathcal{V}_d by definition of \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^∞ and Theorem 8.9.

(2) Since \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^∞ is also a crystal valuation on \mathcal{V}_d° , it is enough to show that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ)$ is a free A_0 -module.

Let $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ be given. Let $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)} = (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta, \eta)} \cap (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}$. Then $\frac{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}$ is a direct limit of $\frac{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}^{\infty, (\zeta, \eta)} = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ) \cap \frac{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}, \quad \mathcal{L}^{n, (\zeta, \eta)} = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}) \cap \frac{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}.$$

Then by Proposition 8.5 (1) and Theorem 8.9,

$$\mathcal{L}^{\infty, (\zeta, \eta)} = \varinjlim_n q^{-dn} \mathcal{L}^{n, (\zeta, \eta)}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{L}^{n, (\zeta, \eta)}$ is a free A_0 -module, as it is given by a restriction of a crystal lattice on $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$. Any submodule of $\mathcal{L}^{\infty, (\zeta, \eta)}$ with finite rank is free, since it is contained in $\mathcal{L}^{n, (\zeta, \eta)}$ for some n . Therefore, we conclude that $\mathcal{L}^{\infty, (\zeta, \eta)}$ is free by [21, Theorem 2.4.3], since it is countably generated as an A_0 -module.

(3) Since the map is clearly injective, it is enough to show that it is surjective. Suppose that $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{V}_d$ is given. We show that $\bar{x} \equiv \bar{x}^\circ \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)}$ for some $x^\circ \in (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}$. We keep the notations and assumptions in the proof of Theorem 8.9. So we assume that $x \in (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta, \eta)} = \varinjlim_n (\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta, \eta)}$.

For $m \geq n$, denote $\psi_m = \pi_{-d}^m \circ \phi_{n, m}$. We claim that for all sufficiently large m ,

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(x_{m, -d}) < \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(\psi_m(x_{n, < -d})).$$

Let us denote the above statement by $P(m, n)$.

Step 1. We first prove that $P(m, n)$ implies $P(m + N, n)$ for all sufficiently large m and n , and N , where lower bounds for m and n depend only on N , and does not depend on each other.

We have

$$(8.40) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_{m+N}(x_{n, < -d}) &= \pi_{-d}^{m+N} \circ \phi_{m, m+N}(\psi_m(x_{n, < -d}) + \pi_{< -d}^m(\phi_{n, m}(x_{n, < -d}))) \\ &= \pi_{-d}^{m+N}(\phi_{m, m+N}(\psi_m(x_{n, < -d}))) + \pi_{-d}^{m+N}(\phi_{m, m+N}(x_{m, < -d})), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\pi_{-d}^{m+N}(\phi_{m, m+N}(\pi_{> -d}^m(\phi_{n, m}(x_{n, < -d})))) = 0$ at the first equality.

For all sufficiently large m ,

$$(8.41) \quad \begin{aligned} &\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{m+N}(\pi_{-d}^{m+N}(\phi_{m, m+N}(\psi_m(x_{n, < -d})))) \\ &= \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(\psi_m(x_{n, < -d})) + dN \quad \text{by Proposition 8.5} \\ &> \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(x_{m, -d}) + dN \quad \text{by } P(m, n) \\ &= \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{m+N}(x_{m+N, -d}) \quad \text{by Theorem 8.9,} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from Remark 8.17, we have

$$(8.42) \quad \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{m+N}(\pi_{-d}^{m+N}(\phi_{m,m+N}(x_{m,<-d}))) > \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^{m+N}(x_{m+N,-d}),$$

for all sufficiently large m and N , where m depends on N . Combining (8.41) and (8.42), we have $P(m+N, n)$ by (8.40).

Step 2. Recall that $P(n+N, n)$ holds for all sufficiently large n and N by Remark 8.17. Also, by applying *Step 1* to $N, N+1, \dots, 2N-1$, it follows that $P(m, n)$ implies $P(m+N, n), \dots, P(m+2N-1, n)$ for all sufficiently large m and N where m depends on N . Thus, if n is sufficiently large, then $P(m, n)$ holds for all $m \geq n+N$. This proves the claim.

Now, let $x^\circ = \phi_n(x_{n,\geq-d})$. Then $x^\circ \in (\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq-d}$. By $P(m, n)$, we have

$$\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(x_{m,-d}) < \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(\psi_m(x_{n,<-d})) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(\psi_m(x_n - x_{n,\geq-d})) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^m(x_m - x_m^\circ),$$

for all sufficiently large m , where $x_m^\circ = \phi_{n,m}(x_{n,\geq-d})$. By taking a limit, we have $0 = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x) < \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x - x^\circ)$, and hence $\mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x) = \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^\infty(x^\circ) = 0$ and $\bar{x} \equiv \bar{x}^\circ \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)}$. This completes the proof of the surjectivity. \square

Remark 8.19. The A_0 -modules $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)$ and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ)$ are given in a non-constructive way. We do not know an effective algorithm to compute \mathfrak{v}_{-d}^∞ .

Theorem 8.20. For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, \mathcal{V}_d° has a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ))$ with

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ) \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{(\mu,\nu) \leq (\zeta,\eta), \\ |\zeta| - |\eta| = |\eta| - |\nu| = d}} (\mathcal{B}_0(\Lambda_{\zeta,\eta}) \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\mu,\nu})^{\oplus |H_\gamma(\mu,\nu)|},$$

where $\gamma = \Lambda_{\zeta,\eta} - \Lambda_{\mu,\nu}$.

Proof. By Theorem 8.7, we have

$$\mathcal{V}_d^\circ \cong \bigoplus_{(\mu,\nu) \leq (\zeta,\eta)} (V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta,\eta}) \otimes V_{\mu,\nu})^{\oplus |H_\gamma(\mu,\nu)|}.$$

By uniqueness of a crystal lattice for an integrable $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -module (Proposition 7.5 (2)) and an extremal weight modules $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module (Proposition 7.7), any crystal lattice of \mathcal{V}_d° is isomorphic to $\bigoplus (\mathcal{L}_0(\Lambda_{\zeta,\eta}) \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mu,\nu})^{\oplus |H_\gamma(\mu,\nu)|}$, which has a crystal given above. The conclusion follows from Theorem 8.18 (2). \square

Remark 8.21. One may regard Theorem 8.18 as a generalization of Proposition 6.3. By Theorem 8.18, $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ)$ is a \mathbb{Q} -basis of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)/q\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)$. However, we do not know how to construct a basis of \mathcal{V}_d lifting the crystal $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ)$, while there exists a basis $B = \{x_b \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ)\}$ of \mathcal{V}_d° such that $x_b \equiv b \pmod{q\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d^\circ)}$.

Now we are in a position to show that the filtration $\{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq-d}\}_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ is indeed a socle filtration. We first consider the following general situation.

Let $(\{M_n\}_{n \geq 1}, \{\phi_n\}_{n \geq 1})$ be a directed system of $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -spaces with $M = \varinjlim_n M_n$ such that

- (1) M_n is a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module, whose set of weights is finitely dominated,
- (2) M_n is a direct sum of $V_0(\Lambda_{\zeta,\eta}) \otimes V_{\mu,\nu}^n$ with finite multiplicity,
- (3) $\phi_n : M_n \rightarrow M_{n+1}$ is an injective $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -linear map.

By (3), M becomes a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module. Let $(\{N_n\}_{n \geq 1}, \{\phi_n|_{N_n}\}_{n \geq 1})$ be a sub-directed system with $N = \varinjlim_n N_n$ satisfying the following:

- (1) N_n is a $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -submodule of M_n ,
- (2) N_n and M_n/N_n do not have common isotypic component,
- (3) N is a semisimple $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -submodule of M ,
- (4) M has a crystal valuation \mathfrak{v} , which is saturated with respect to N .

Theorem 8.22. *We have $N = \text{soc } M$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L}(M) = L_{\mathfrak{v}}$, and let $\mathcal{L}(M') = M' \cap \mathcal{L}(M)$ for any $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -subspace M' of M . We may regard $M_n \subset M$ since ϕ_n is injective for $n \geq 1$. Since $\mathcal{L}(M_n)$ is a crystal valuation, we may apply an analogue of Proposition 7.7 for $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0}) \otimes U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -modules M_n 's (see Remark 7.6).

Suppose that there exists a non-zero submodule $N' \subset M$ such that $N \cap N' = \{0\}$. Put $N'_n = N' \cap M_n$ for $n \geq 1$. By the condition (1) on N , Proposition 7.5, and Remark 7.6, we have $\mathcal{L}(N_n \oplus N'_n) = \mathcal{L}(N_n) \oplus \mathcal{L}(N'_n)$ for $n \geq 1$. Taking a direct limit, we have $\mathcal{L}(N \oplus N') = \mathcal{L}(N) \oplus \mathcal{L}(N')$. Since the inclusion $N \oplus N' \hookrightarrow M$ induces an embedding

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}(N \oplus N')}{q\mathcal{L}(N \oplus N')} \cong \frac{\mathcal{L}(N)}{q\mathcal{L}(N)} \oplus \frac{\mathcal{L}(N')}{q\mathcal{L}(N')} \hookrightarrow \frac{\mathcal{L}(M)}{q\mathcal{L}(M)},$$

and $\mathcal{L}(N)/q\mathcal{L}(N) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}(M)/q\mathcal{L}(M)$ is an isomorphism by Proposition 7.12, we conclude that $\mathcal{L}(N')/q\mathcal{L}(N') = 0$. This contradicts the fact that no element in $\mathcal{L}(M)$ is infinitely divisible by q . Therefore, N is a maximal semisimple submodule. \square

Theorem 8.23. $\{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}\}_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ is the socle filtration of $\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. It is equivalent to showing that $\mathcal{V}_d^{\circ} = \text{soc } \mathcal{V}_d$ for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, where \mathcal{V}_d° and \mathcal{V}_d are as in (8.39). For $(\zeta, \eta) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, let

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}^{(\zeta,\eta)} &= (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta,\eta)} \cap (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}, \\ (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta,\eta)} &= (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta,\eta)} \cap (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{(\zeta,\eta)} (\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta,\eta)}$, it is enough to show

$$(8.43) \quad \text{soc} \left(\frac{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta,\eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta,\eta)}} \right) = \frac{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}^{(\zeta,\eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta,\eta)}}.$$

First, consider

$$\phi_{n,n+1}^d : \frac{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta,\eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta,\eta)}} \longrightarrow \frac{(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})^{(\zeta,\eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{> -d}^{(\zeta,\eta)}}.$$

If n is sufficiently large, then the map $(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)} \rightarrow (\mathcal{F}^{n+1} \otimes \mathcal{M})_{(\mu, \nu)}^{(\zeta, \eta)}$ induced from $\phi_{n, n+1}^d$ is injective for all $(\mu, \nu) \leq (\zeta, \eta)$ with $|\zeta| - |\mu| = |\eta| - |\nu| = d$ by Corollary 8.6, and we have

$$\frac{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}} = \varinjlim_n \frac{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}.$$

By letting

$$M_n = \frac{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}, \quad N_n = \frac{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{\geq -d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}}{(\mathcal{F}^n \otimes \mathcal{M})_{>-d}^{(\zeta, \eta)}},$$

we can check that M_n and N_n satisfy all the other conditions, and then apply Theorem 8.22 to obtain (8.43). \square

Corollary 8.24. *For $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)$ is a saturated crystal valuation.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 8.18. \square

As an important application, we obtain the following, which is one of our main results.

Theorem 8.25. *For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$, the $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module $V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}$ has a socle filtration with the Loewy length $\min\{|\mu|, |\nu|\} + 1$, and its subquotients are given by*

$$\frac{\text{soc}^{d+1}(V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu})}{\text{soc}^d(V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu})} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{(\mu, \nu) \geq (\zeta, \eta) \\ |\mu| - |\zeta| = |\nu| - |\eta| = d}} V_{\zeta, \eta}^{\oplus n_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu}},$$

for $0 \leq d \leq \min\{|\mu|, |\nu|\}$, where $n_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu} = |H_\gamma(\zeta, \eta)|$ with $\gamma = \Lambda_{\mu, \nu} - \Lambda_{\zeta, \eta}$. In particular, $V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}$ is indecomposable.

Proof. By Theorem 6.7 and Theorem 8.23, we have

$$\text{soc} \left(\frac{V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu}}{\text{soc}^d(V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \nu})} \right) \cong \text{Hom}_{U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty, 0})}(V_0(\Lambda_{\mu, \nu}), \mathcal{V}_d^{\circ}),$$

which implies the decomposition of the associated subquotient. \square

Remark 8.26. The tensor product in Theorem 8.25 is $\otimes = \overline{\otimes}_+$ by our convention (5.4). The socle filtration of $V_{\emptyset, \nu} \otimes V_{\mu, \emptyset}$ has the same subquotients (cf. Corollary 4.7 and Remark 4.8). Moreover, combining with Proposition 4.6 and (4.3), we have a combinatorial formula for $n_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu}$ as follows:

$$n_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu} = m_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu} = \sum_{\sigma} c_{\sigma \zeta}^{\mu} c_{\sigma \eta}^{\nu}.$$

We may also obtain the above formula by applying Theorem 3.20 (cf. (2.5)) to $H_\gamma(\zeta, \eta)$.

Corollary 8.27. *For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, the $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module $V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes_{\pm} V_{\emptyset, \nu} / \text{soc}^d(V_{\mu, \emptyset} \otimes_{\pm} V_{\emptyset, \nu})$ has a saturated crystal valuation \mathfrak{v} such that $L_{\mathfrak{v}}/qL_{\mathfrak{v}}$ has a \mathbb{Q} -basis, which forms a crystal isomorphic to*

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{(\mu, \nu) \geq (\zeta, \eta) \\ |\mu| - |\zeta| = |\nu| - |\eta| = d}} \mathcal{B}_{\zeta, \eta}^{\oplus n_{\zeta, \eta}^{\mu, \nu}}.$$

Proof. By Theorem 6.7, the $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ -weight space of \mathcal{V}_d with weight $\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}$ is isomorphic to $V_{\mu,\emptyset} \overline{\otimes} V_{\emptyset,\nu} / \text{soc}^d(V_{\mu,\emptyset} \overline{\otimes} V_{\emptyset,\nu})$ as a $U_p(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ -module, and $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{V}_d)_{\Lambda_{\mu,\nu}}$ is its A_0 -submodule stable under the crystal operators \dot{e}_j, \dot{f}_j ($j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$), which are pullbacks of the upper crystal operators for $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_{>0})$ under the map (5.10). Hence, we have an *upper* crystal valuation (crystal valuation with upper crystal operators) of $V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes_+ V_{\emptyset,\nu} / \text{soc}^d(V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes_+ V_{\emptyset,\nu})$ at $q = 0$, under (5.10). By [15, Lemma 2.4.1], this gives a *lower* crystal valuation with the same properties. \square

Remark 8.28. By Remark 4.8, Corollary 8.27 also holds for $V_{\emptyset,\nu} \otimes_{\pm} V_{\mu,\emptyset}$.

Example 8.29. The crystal valuation constructed in Corollary 8.27 for $V_{(1),\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,(1)}$ agrees with $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{N}}$ in Example 7.14 up to scaling.

The inclusion $V_0(\Lambda_{(1),(1)}) \otimes (V_{\emptyset,(1)} \otimes_- V_{(1),\emptyset}) \subset \mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M}$ is given by

$$v_{\Lambda_{(1),(1)}} \otimes u_{\emptyset,(1)} \otimes u_{(1),\emptyset} \longmapsto f_0|0\rangle \otimes 1 + (q - q^{-1})|0\rangle \otimes f_0$$

up to scaling. Using the same notations as in Example 7.14, the image of elements of $V_{\emptyset,(1)} \otimes_- V_{(1),\emptyset}$ are given by

$$v_{m\vee} \otimes v_n \ (m \neq n) \longmapsto p^2|0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |-1\rangle \cdots \otimes |0\rangle \otimes 1$$

(|-1> at m -th position, |1> at n -th position)

$$v_{1\vee} \otimes v_1 \longmapsto f_0|0\rangle \otimes 1 + (q - q^{-1})|0\rangle \otimes f_0$$

$$v_{n\vee} \otimes v_n + pv_{(n+1)\vee} \otimes v_{n+1} \longmapsto \left(p^2|0\rangle^{\otimes(n-1)} \otimes f_0|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + p^3|0\rangle^{\otimes n} \otimes f_0|0\rangle \right) \otimes 1$$

Then for example, one can show that $q^{-N+2}v_{1\vee} \otimes v_1 + \cdots + qv_{N\vee} \otimes v_N$ is mapped to an element of $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})$. Using this, one can compute the restriction of $\mathcal{L}_0(\mathcal{F}^{\infty} \otimes \mathcal{M})$, which is constructed in the proof of Theorem 8.25, onto $V_{\emptyset,(1)} \otimes_- V_{(1),\emptyset}$.

8.5. Socle filtration of tensor product of extremal weight modules. For $\sigma, \tau, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}$, let

$$n_{\mu,\nu}^{\sigma,\tau} = \sum_{\lambda} (-1)^{|\lambda|} c_{\lambda\mu}^{\sigma} c_{\lambda'\nu}^{\tau},$$

where λ' denotes the conjugate of λ . For $V \in \mathcal{C}$, let $[V]$ denote the isomorphism class of V in $K(\mathcal{C})$. Given $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}$ with $\mu \subset \lambda$, write $[V_{\lambda/\mu,\emptyset}] = \sum_{\nu} c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda} [V_{\nu,\emptyset}]$ for simplicity, and write $[V_{\emptyset,\lambda/\mu}]$ in a similar way. Then we have the following character formula.

Proposition 8.30. For $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{P}$, we have

$$[V_{\sigma,\tau}] = \sum_{\mu,\nu \in \mathcal{P}} n_{\mu,\nu}^{\sigma,\tau} [V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}] = \sum_{\lambda \subset \sigma,\tau'} (-1)^{|\lambda|} [V_{\sigma/\lambda,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\tau/\lambda'}].$$

Proof. Note that $I = \{ [V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}] \mid \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P} \}$ and $S = \{ [V_{\sigma,\tau}] \mid \sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{P} \}$ are \mathbb{Z} -bases of $K(\mathcal{C})$. By Proposition 4.6, we have

$$(8.44) \quad [V_{\mu,\emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset,\nu}] = \sum_{\sigma,\tau \in \mathcal{P}} m_{\sigma,\tau}^{\mu,\nu} [V_{\sigma,\tau}].$$

On the other hand, let \mathcal{A} be the \mathbb{Z} -algebra generated by h_r^+, h_s^- ($r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$) subject to the relations $h_r^+ h_s^- = h_s^- h_r^+ + h_{s-1}^- h_{r-1}^+ \cdots + h_{s-m}^- h_{r-m}^+$ with $m = \min\{r, s\}$ [27, I.5 Example 29]. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$, we put $s_\lambda^\pm = \det(h_{\lambda_i - i + j}^\pm)_{1 \leq i, j \leq \ell(\lambda)}$. Then $\{s_\mu^+ s_\nu^- \mid \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}\}$ and $\{s_\tau^- s_\sigma^+ \mid \sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{P}\}$ are \mathbb{Z} -bases of \mathcal{A} . Then we have

$$(8.45) \quad \begin{aligned} s_\mu^+ s_\nu^- &= \sum_{\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{P}} m_{\sigma, \tau}^{\mu, \nu} s_\tau^- s_\sigma^+, \\ s_\tau^- s_\sigma^+ &= \sum_{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}} n_{\mu, \nu}^{\sigma, \tau} s_\mu^+ s_\nu^-, \end{aligned}$$

for $\mu, \nu, \sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{P}$ by [22, Corollary 7.3]. Comparing (8.44) and the first equation in (8.45), we see that the second equation in (8.45) also gives the transition matrix from I to S . \square

Now, we can describe the socle filtration of the tensor product of any two extremal weight modules.

Theorem 8.31. *Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathcal{P}$ be given with $|\alpha| + |\gamma| = M$ and $|\beta| + |\delta| = N$. For $0 \leq d \leq \min\{M, N\}$, we have*

$$\frac{\text{soc}^{d+1}(V_{\alpha, \beta} \otimes V_{\gamma, \delta})}{\text{soc}^d(V_{\alpha, \beta} \otimes V_{\gamma, \delta})} = \bigoplus_{\substack{\phi, \psi \in \mathcal{P} \\ |\phi| = M-d, |\psi| = N-d}} V_{\phi, \psi}^{\oplus c_{(\alpha, \beta)(\gamma, \delta)}^{(\phi, \psi)}},$$

where

$$c_{(\alpha, \beta)(\gamma, \delta)}^{(\phi, \psi)} = \sum_{(\xi, \pi, \rho)} \sum_{(\mu, \nu, \eta, \zeta)} \sum_{(\sigma, \tau)} (-1)^{|\sigma| + |\tau|} c_{\sigma\mu}^\alpha c_{\sigma'\nu}^\beta c_{\tau\zeta}^\gamma c_{\tau'\eta}^\delta c_{\mu\zeta}^\xi c_{\nu\eta}^\pi c_{\rho\phi}^\xi c_{\rho\psi}^\pi.$$

Proof. We have

$$U := V_{\alpha, \beta} \otimes V_{\gamma, \delta} \subset V_{\alpha, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \beta} \otimes V_{\gamma, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \delta} \cong V_{\alpha, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\gamma, \emptyset} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \beta} \otimes V_{\emptyset, \delta} =: V,$$

where the first inclusion follows from Corollary 8.25 and the second isomorphism follows from applying R matrix.

By Corollary 8.25, $\text{soc}^{d+1}(V)/\text{soc}^d(V)$ has a direct summand $V_{\phi, \psi}$ only when $|\phi| = M - d$ and $|\psi| = N - d$ for $0 \leq d \leq \min\{M, N\}$. Since $\text{soc}^d(U) = U \cap \text{soc}^d(V)$, the same holds for $\text{soc}^{d+1}(U)/\text{soc}^d(U)$. Finally, we obtain the formula for multiplicity of $V_{\phi, \psi}$ in U by Proposition 8.30 and the usual Littlewood-Richardson formula. \square

Remark 8.32. Although our construction of saturated crystal valuations using an embedding into $\mathcal{F}^\infty \otimes \mathcal{M}$ does not immediately extend to the case of $V_{\alpha, \beta} \otimes V_{\gamma, \delta} / \text{soc}^d(V_{\alpha, \beta} \otimes V_{\gamma, \delta})$, we expect that it has a crystal valuation.

Remark 8.33. We follow the notations in the proof of Proposition 8.30. Let $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$ be two sets of formal variables. Let e_k^\pm ($k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$) be another set of generators of \mathcal{A} determined by $s_\lambda^\pm = \det(e_{\lambda_i - i + j}^\pm)_{1 \leq i, j \leq \ell(\lambda)}$, which also satisfy $e_r^+ e_s^- =$

$e_s^- e_r^+ + e_{s-1}^- e_{r-1}^+ \cdots + e_{s-m}^- e_{r-m}^+$ with $m = \min\{r, s\}$. Put $\mathbf{E}^\pm(t) = \sum_{k \geq 0} e_k^\pm t^k$. Then we have the following identity called *non-symmetric Cauchy identity* [27, I.5 Example 29]:

$$(8.46) \quad \mathbf{E}^+(y)\mathbf{E}^-(x) = \mathbf{E}^-(x)\mathbf{E}^+(y) \frac{1}{\prod_{i,j \geq 1} (1 - x_i y_j)},$$

where $\mathbf{E}^+(y) = \mathbf{E}^+(y_1)\mathbf{E}^+(y_2)\mathbf{E}^+(y_3)\cdots$ and $\mathbf{E}^-(x) = \mathbf{E}^-(x_1)\mathbf{E}^-(x_2)\mathbf{E}^-(x_3)\cdots$. It can be viewed as a non-commutative character identity associated to the decomposition in Proposition 6.2 (see [22, Theorem 7.10] for a crystal-theoretic proof and also [23] for a bijective proof).

Put $\mathbf{H}^\pm(t) = \sum_{k \geq 0} h_k^\pm t^k$, $\mathbf{H}^+(y)$ and $\mathbf{H}^-(x)$ in a similar way. Then we have

$$(8.47) \quad \mathbf{E}^+(y)\mathbf{H}^-(x) = \mathbf{H}^-(x)\mathbf{E}^+(y) \prod_{i,j \geq 1} (1 + x_i y_j).$$

We may also have a similar representation theoretic interpretation of the above identity. In this case, we replace \mathcal{F}_+^n in $\mathcal{F}^n = \mathcal{F}_+^n \otimes \mathcal{F}_+^n$ with a bosonic Fock space so that $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty,0})$ is replaced by a q -boson algebra associated to a general linear Lie superalgebra of infinite rank with respect to its even part, and $V_0(\Lambda_{\mu,\nu})$ with a q -deformed Kac-module.

On the other hand, a categorification of the identities including (8.46) and (8.47) are given in case when x and y are replaced by single variables z and $-w$, respectively [9]. It is given in terms of a certain non-semisimple tensor category of \mathfrak{sl}_{∞} -modules [28], which has properties similar to \mathcal{C} .

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Brundan, *Dual canonical bases and Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials.*, J. Algebra **306** (2006), 17–46.
- [2] J. Beck, H. Nakajima, *Crystal bases and two-sided cells of quantum affine algebras*, Duke Math. J. **123** (2004), 335–402.
- [3] G. Bergman, *The diamond lemma for ring theory*, Adv. Math. **29** (1978), 178–218.
- [4] H. Bao, W. Wang, *Canonical bases in tensor products revisited*, American Journal of Mathematics, **138** (2016), 1731–1738.
- [5] A. Berenstein, Z. Sebastian, *Braided symmetric and exterior algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360** (2008), 3429–3472.
- [6] V. Chari, A. Pressley, *Weyl modules for classical and quantum affine algebras*, Represent. Theory **5** (2001), 191–223.
- [7] E. Dan-Cohen, I. Penkov, V. Serganova, *A Koszul category of representations of finitary Lie algebras*, Adv. Math. **289** (2016), 250–278.
- [8] I. B. Frenkel, *Representations of Kac-Moody algebras and dual resonance models in Applications of group theory in physics and mathematical physics*, Lectures in Appl. Math. **21** 325–353, AMS, Providence, 1985.
- [9] I. Frenkel, I. Penkov, V. Serganova, *A categorification of the boson-fermion correspondence via representation theory of $sl(\infty)$* , Comm. Math. Phys. **341** (2016), 911–931.
- [10] W. Fulton, *Young tableaux*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 35. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [11] R. Goodman, N. Wallach, *Representations and Invariants of the Classical Groups*, Cambridge U. Press, 1998.

- [12] J. Hong, S.-J. Kang, *Introduction to Quantum Groups and Crystal Bases*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 42, American Mathematical Society, 2002.
- [13] M. Jimbo, *A q -analogue of $U(\mathfrak{gl}(N+1))$, Hecke algebra, and the Yang-Baxter equation*, Lett. Math. Phys. **11** (1986), 247–252.
- [14] V. Kac, *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, Third edition, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.
- [15] M. Kashiwara, *On crystal bases of the q -analogue of universal enveloping algebras*, Duke Math. J. **63** (1991), 465–516.
- [16] M. Kashiwara, *The crystal base and Littelmann’s refined Demazure character formula*, Duke Math. J. **71** (1993), 839–858.
- [17] M. Kashiwara, *Crystal bases of modified quantized enveloping algebra*, Duke Math. J. **73** (1994), 383–413.
- [18] M. Kashiwara, *Bases cristallines des groupes quantiques*, Societe Mathematique de France, 2002.
- [19] M. Kashiwara, *On level-zero representations of quantized affine algebras*, Duke Math. J. **112** (2002), 117–175.
- [20] M. Kashiwara, T. Miwa, J.-U.H. Petersen, C.M. Yung *Perfect crystals and q -deformed Fock Spaces*, Selecta Math. **2**(1996), 415–499.
- [21] P. A. Krylov, A. A. Tuganbaev, *Modules over Discrete Valuation Rings*, De Gruyter Exp. Math., 43, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2018.
- [22] J.-H. Kwon, *Differential operators and crystals of extremal weight modules*, Adv. Math. **222** (2009), 1339–1369.
- [23] J.-H. Kwon, *A plactic algebra of extremal weight crystals and the Cauchy identity for Schur operators*, J. Algebraic Combin. **34** (2011), 427–449.
- [24] J.-H. Kwon, *Crystal bases of q -deformed Kac modules over the quantum superalgebra $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}(m|n))$* , Int. Math. Res. Not. (2014), 512–550.
- [25] G. Lusztig, *Canonical bases arising from quantized universal enveloping algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), 447–498.
- [26] G. Lusztig, *Introduction to Quantum Groups*, vol. 110. Progress in Mathematics. Boston, MA: Birkhäuser, 1993.
- [27] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 1995.
- [28] I. Penkov, K. Styrkas, *Tensor representations of infinite-dimensional root-reductive Lie algebras*, in: Developments and Trends in Infinite-Dimensional Lie Theory, in: Progr. Math., vol. 288, Birkhäuser, 2011, pp. 127–150.
- [29] B. Salisbury, A. Schultze, P. Tingley, *Combinatorial descriptions of the crystal structure on certain PBW bases*, Transf. Groups **23** (2018), 501–525.
- [30] D. Uglov, *Canonical bases of higher-level q -deformed Fock spaces and Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials*, Physical combinatorics (Kyoto, 1999), 249–299, Progr. Math., 191, Birkhauser Boston, Boston, MA, 2000.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND RIM, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 08826, KOREA

Email address: jaehoonkw@snu.ac.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 08826, KOREA

Email address: shlee@crystalline.site