

The $A_M^{(1)}$ automata related to crystals of symmetric tensors

G. Hatayama*, K. Hikami[†], R. Inoue[†],
A. Kuniba*, T. Takagi[‡], and T. Tokihiro[§]

Abstract

A soliton cellular automaton associated with crystals of symmetric tensor representations of the quantum affine algebra $U'_q(A_M^{(1)})$ is introduced. It is a crystal theoretic formulation of the generalized box-ball system in which capacities of boxes and carriers are arbitrary and inhomogeneous. Scattering matrices of two solitons coincide with the combinatorial R matrices of $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$. A piecewise linear evolution equation of the automaton is identified with an ultradiscrete limit of the nonautonomous discrete KP equation. A class of N soliton solutions is obtained through the ultradiscretization of soliton solutions of the latter.

1 Introduction

The box-ball system invented by Takahashi and Satsuma [TS] is an important example of soliton cellular automata. It is a discrete dynamical system in which finitely many balls move along the one dimensional array of boxes under a certain rule. Its integrability has been proved in [TTMS] by making a connection to the difference analogue of the Lotka-Volterra equation [HT] through the limiting procedure called *ultradiscretization*.

*Institute of Physics, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Tokyo, Komaba, Tokyo 153-8902, Japan

[†]Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

[‡]Department of Mathematics and Physics, National Defense Academy, Yokosuka 239-8686, Japan

[§]Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo, Komaba, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan

By now the original box-ball system has been generalized into several directions. First, one can introduce the balls distinguished by the index from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, M\}$. Second, one lets the box at site n accommodate up to θ_n balls, where the capacity θ_n may depend on n . Third, one can introduce a *carrier* with capacity κ_t to redefine the time evolution at time t . The carrier comes from the left and proceeds to the right, picking up the balls in a box and dropping them into another under a certain rule. While it goes through the array of boxes, the successive loading-unloading process induces the motion of balls over the boxes hence the time evolution of the system. These generalizations of the Takahashi-Satsuma box-ball system are characterized by the parameters (M, θ_n, κ_t) . ($n, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ play the role of space and time coordinates as in the figure in Section 2.3.) The original one [TS] corresponds to the choice $(M, \forall \theta_n, \forall \kappa_t) = (1, 1, \infty)$. The case $(M, \forall \theta_n = 1, \forall \kappa_t = \infty)$ was introduced in [T] and studied in [TNS]. Similarly, the cases $(M = 1, \forall \theta_n = \theta, \forall \kappa_t = \kappa)$ with $\kappa > \theta$ and $(M, \theta_n, \forall \kappa_t = \infty)$ were treated in [TM] and [TTM], respectively. These works have been done mainly from the viewpoint of the ultradiscretization.

The purpose of this paper is to study the general (M, θ_n, κ_t) case. In Section 2 we formulate the corresponding generalization of the box-ball system in terms of the crystal theory [K, KMN1, KMN2]. The latter is a representation theory of quantum groups at $q = 0$. The unexpected link between the crystals and the box-ball systems has also been exploited in [HKT, FOY] through a crystal theoretic interpretation of the L -operator approach [HIK]. The idea is to regard the box-ball system as a solvable vertex model [B] at $q = 0$ under a ‘ferromagnetic’ boundary condition. More concretely, the box-ball system corresponding to the data (M, θ_n, κ_t) is naturally related to the $U'_q(A_M^{(1)})$ vertex model at $q = 0$ whose inhomogeneity in the quantum and auxiliary spaces is parametrized by θ_n ’s and κ_t ’s, respectively.

Let B_l be the classical crystal of $U'_q(A_M^{(1)})$ in the sense of [KMN1] corresponding to the l -fold symmetric tensor representation of $U_q(A_M)$. Then the array of boxes and the ball configurations are identified with the elements from $\dots \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \dots$. The time evolution by the carrier with capacity κ_t is realized as the action of the $q = 0$ row transfer matrix acting on $\dots \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \dots$ with the auxiliary space corresponding to B_{κ_t} . We call the resulting dynamical system the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton. It is the most general one in the $A_M^{(1)}$ case as far as the crystals for symmetric tensors are concerned. For generalizations to other root systems, see [HI] for a supersymmetric one and [HKT] for the non exceptional series other than $A_M^{(1)}$.

In Section 3 we introduce solitons and study the 2 soliton scattering. As in [HKT, FOY] we label the solitons in terms of the elements of the

$U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ -crystal B_l , where l plays the role of the amplitude of a soliton. In the collisions of two solitons associated with B_l and B_k , the scattering matrix is shown to coincide with the combinatorial R matrix giving the isomorphism $B_l \otimes B_k \simeq B_k \otimes B_l$ of the $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ -crystals. These features are essentially the same with the $\forall \theta_n = 1$ case [TNS, HKT, FOY]. A new aspect here is that depending on the amplitudes l, k and the parameters θ_n, κ_t , smaller soliton can overtake the larger one. This is most transparently understood by viewing the scattering from the cross channel. By interchanging θ_n and κ_t , one can swap the role of the space and time and thereby the boxes and carriers. Then the curious scattering mentioned above reduces to the ‘usual’ one in the cross channel where the larger soliton overtakes the smaller one. In Section 3.4 we also give a brief sketch of the conserved quantities of our automaton following [FOY].

In Section 4 we set up piecewise linear equation for the relevant combinatorial R matrix [NY] and the resulting evolution equation for the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton. Extending the earlier result [TTM], we identify the evolution equation with an ultradiscrete limit of the nonautonomous discrete Kadomtsev-Petviashvili (ndKP) equation. A class of N soliton solutions is obtained through an ultradiscretization of the τ functions. As in the previous case [TTM] one needs to make a fine adjustment of the fermion momenta entering the vacuum expectation value expression of the τ functions. Each soliton in the automaton is obtained by letting M solitons in the ndKP merge together in the ultradiscrete limit.

Section 5 is a summary. Appendices A and B contain the details of the proofs of Proposition 3.8 and Theorem 4.5, respectively.

2 Automata from crystals

2.1 $U'_q(A_M^{(1)})$ -crystals

Let B_k be the classical crystal of $U'_q(A_M^{(1)})$ corresponding to the k -fold symmetric tensor representation. As a set it consists of the single row semistandard tableaux of length k on letters $\{1, 2, \dots, M+1\}$:

$$B_k = \{ \boxed{m_1 \cdots m_k} \mid m_i \in \{1, \dots, M+1\}, m_1 \leq \cdots \leq m_k \},$$

where we have omitted the $k-1$ vertical lines separating the entries. We also represent the elements by the multiplicities of their contents. Namely, $b = \boxed{m_1 \cdots m_k} \in B_k$ is also denoted by $b = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{M+1})$ with $x_i = \#\{l \mid m_l = i\}$.


Denote the Kashiwara operators of B_k by \tilde{f}_i and \tilde{e}_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, M$. The actions of \tilde{e}_i, \tilde{f}_i on B_k are defined as follows: for $b = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{M+1}) \in B_k$,

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{e}_0 b &= (x_1 - 1, x_2, \dots, x_{M+1} + 1), \\ \tilde{f}_0 b &= (x_1 + 1, x_2, \dots, x_{M+1} - 1), \\ \tilde{e}_i b &= (x_1, \dots, x_i + 1, x_{i+1} - 1, \dots, x_{M+1}) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, M, \\ \tilde{f}_i b &= (x_1, \dots, x_i - 1, x_{i+1} + 1, \dots, x_{M+1}) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, M. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

In the above, the right hand sides are to be understood as 0 if they are not in B_k . A crystal can be regarded as a colored oriented graph called a ‘‘crystal graph’’ by defining

$$b \xrightarrow{i} b' \iff \tilde{f}_i b = b'.$$

Thus for example $B_1 = \{\boxed{1}, \dots, \boxed{M+1}\}$ has the crystal graph:



Setting $\varepsilon_i(b) = \max_l \{\tilde{e}_i^l b \neq 0 \mid l \geq 0\}$ and $\varphi_i(b) = \max_l \{\tilde{f}_i^l b \neq 0 \mid l \geq 0\}$ for $b \in B_k$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_0(b) &= x_1, & \varepsilon_i(b) &= x_{i+1} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, M, \\ \varphi_0(b) &= x_{M+1}, & \varphi_i(b) &= x_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, M. \end{aligned}$$

This data is necessary when we treat tensor products of the crystals. For two crystals B and B' , the tensor product $B \otimes B'$ is defined. As a set,

$$B \otimes B' = \{b_1 \otimes b_2 \mid b_1 \in B, b_2 \in B'\}.$$

The actions of \tilde{e}_i and \tilde{f}_i are defined by

$$\tilde{e}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \begin{cases} \tilde{e}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) \geq \varepsilon_i(b_2) \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{e}_i b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) < \varepsilon_i(b_2), \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$\tilde{f}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \begin{cases} \tilde{f}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) > \varepsilon_i(b_2) \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{f}_i b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_1) \leq \varepsilon_i(b_2). \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here $0 \otimes b$ and $b \otimes 0$ are understood to be 0. For two crystals B and B' , the tensor products $B' \otimes B$ and $B \otimes B'$ constructed as above are again crystals which are canonically isomorphic. The isomorphism $R : B' \otimes B \xrightarrow{\sim} B \otimes B'$

is called the combinatorial R matrix [KMN1, NY]. By the definition R commutes with \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{e}_i for any $i = 0, 1, \dots, M$. (More precisely one introduces affine crystals and the associated energy function, but in this paper we shall exclusively treat classical crystals and concern the energy function only in connection with the conserved quantities in Section 3.4.)

Example 2.1. Figure 1 and Figure 2 are the crystal graphs of $U'_q(A_2^{(1)})$ -crystals $B_2 \otimes B_1$ and $B_1 \otimes B_2$, respectively.




Figure 1: crystal graph of $U'_q(A_2^{(1)})$ -crystal $B_2 \otimes B_1$




Figure 2: crystal graph of $U'_q(A_2^{(1)})$ -crystal $B_1 \otimes B_2$

Example 2.2. Let $B' = B_2$, $B = B_1$ of $U'_q(A_2^{(1)})$ -crystals.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad R &: \boxed{13} \otimes \boxed{2} \mapsto \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{23}, \\ \text{(ii)} \quad R &: \boxed{23} \otimes \boxed{2} \mapsto \boxed{3} \otimes \boxed{22}. \end{aligned}$$

These are obtained by comparing the crystal graphs in Example 2.1.


We write the highest weight element in B_k with respect to $U_q(A_M)$ as u_k :

$$u_k = \overbrace{\boxed{11 \dots 1}}^k = (k, 0, \dots, 0) \in B_k. \quad (4)$$

2.2 Isomorphism

Here we give an explicit procedure to obtain the isomorphism $R : B_k \otimes B_l \rightarrow B_l \otimes B_k$ without drawing the whole crystal graphs of $B_k \otimes B_l$ and $B_l \otimes B_k$.

Let $b_1 \otimes b_2$ be an element in $B_k \otimes B_l$ such as $b_1 = (x_1, \dots, x_{M+1})$ and $b_2 = (y_1, \dots, y_{M+1})$. We represent $b_1 \otimes b_2$ by the two column diagram. Each column has $M + 1$ rows, enumerated as 1 to $M + 1$ from the top to the bottom. We put x_i (resp. y_i) dots \bullet in the i -th row of the left (resp. right) column.



Proposition 2.3. *The rule to obtain the isomorphism R is as follows.*

- (1) Assume $k \geq l$ (resp. $k \leq l$). Pick any dot, say \bullet_a , in the right (resp. left) column and find its partner \bullet'_a in the left (resp. right) column. The \bullet'_a is chosen from the dots which are in the lowest (resp. highest) row among all dots whose positions are higher (resp. lower) than that of \bullet_a . If there is no such dot, we return to the bottom (resp. top) and the partner \bullet'_a is chosen from the dots in the lowest (resp. highest) row among all dots. Connect \bullet_a and \bullet'_a by a line. We call the lines in the latter case winding and in the former case unwinding.
- (2) Repeat the procedure (1) for the remaining unconnected dots ($l - 1$ -times (resp. $(k - 1)$ -times).


(3) The isomorphism R is obtained by sliding the remaining $(k-l)$ (resp. $(l-k)$) unpaired dots in the left (resp. right) column to the right (resp. left).

The R obtained by this rule has the correct property as the isomorphism. This fact has been proved in section 3 of [NY]. We will write the relation $R : u \otimes v \mapsto v' \otimes u'$ also as $u \otimes v \simeq v' \otimes u'$. Obviously one has

$$u_k \otimes u_l \simeq u_l \otimes u_k \quad (5)$$

for the element (4).

Example 2.4. Let $M = 2$, $k = 2$, $l = 1$. Example 2.2 (i),(ii) are obtained by the following diagrams:



The line in (i) is unwinding and that in (ii) is winding.

Suppose $b \otimes b' \in B \otimes B'$ is mapped to $\tilde{b}' \otimes \tilde{b} \in B' \otimes B$ under the isomorphism $B \otimes B' \simeq B' \otimes B$ of $U'_q(A_M^{(1)})$ -crystals. A \mathbb{Z} -valued function H on $B \otimes B'$ is called an *energy function* if for any i and $b \otimes b' \in B \otimes B'$ such that $\tilde{e}_i(b \otimes b') \neq 0$, it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} H(\tilde{e}_i(b \otimes b')) &= H(b \otimes b') + 1 \text{ if } i = 0, \varphi_0(b) \geq \varepsilon_0(b'), \varphi_0(\tilde{b}') \geq \varepsilon_0(\tilde{b}), \\ &= H(b \otimes b') - 1 \text{ if } i = 0, \varphi_0(b) < \varepsilon_0(b'), \varphi_0(\tilde{b}') < \varepsilon_0(\tilde{b}), \\ &= H(b \otimes b') \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

When we want to emphasize $B \otimes B'$, we write $H_{BB'}$ for H . This definition of the energy function is due to (3. 4. e) of [NY], that is a generalization of the definition for $B = B'$ case in [KMN1]. The energy function is unique up to additive constant, since $B \otimes B'$ is connected. By definition, $H_{BB'}(b \otimes b') = H_{B'B}(\tilde{b}' \otimes \tilde{b})$. Throughout this paper we normalize it as

$$H_{B_l B_k}(u_l \otimes u_k) = 0, \quad (7)$$

irrespective of $l < k$ or $l \geq k$. Then it is the result of [NY] that the energy function is (-1) times the number of unwinding lines in the sense of Example 2.4.

With a successive application of R 's, one interchanges the order of tensor product pairwise and obtains the isomorphism of $B_{k_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{k_n}$ and $B_{k_{P_1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{k_{P_n}}$ for any permutation P . The compatibility of this construction is guaranteed by the Yang-Baxter equation obeyed by R . The following assertion follows easily from Proposition 2.3.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $k_1, k_2, \dots \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ be any sequence. Suppose $b \otimes u_{k_1} \otimes \dots \otimes u_{k_n} \simeq c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_n \otimes b'$ is valid for some b' and c_i 's under the isomorphism $B_l \otimes B_{k_1} \otimes \dots \otimes B_{k_n} \simeq B_{k_1} \otimes \dots \otimes B_{k_n} \otimes B_l$. For any $b \in B_l$, there exists n_0 such that $b' = u_l$ for all $n \geq n_0$.*

This property will be needed in constructing the automaton in Section 2.3.


2.3 Automaton

Let $\dots, \theta_{-1}, \theta_0, \theta_1, \dots$ and $\dots, \kappa_{-1}, \kappa_0, \kappa_1, \dots$ be two sequences of positive integers. Denote the former indices by n , and the latter indices by t . Consider the 2D-lattice with n - and t - directions,

$$\begin{array}{ll} n\text{-direction} & \dots \otimes B_{\theta_{n-1}} \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \dots \\ t\text{-direction} & \dots \otimes B_{\kappa_{t-1}} \otimes B_{\kappa_t} \otimes B_{\kappa_{t+1}} \otimes \dots \end{array}$$

In terms of the box-ball systems, θ_n is the capacity of the n -th box and κ_t is the capacity of the t -th carrier.

Draw t - constant lines horizontally, and n - constant lines vertically. Number the former downward, and the latter to the right. At any horizontal or vertical line segment of the lattice, we inscribe an element of the crystals in the following way. At the point labeled by (t, n) , we put $b_n^t \in B_{\theta_n}$ on the upper line segment and $v_n^t \in B_{\kappa_t}$ on the left line segment. Thus we have $b_n^{t+1} \in B_{\theta_n}$ on the lower line segment and $v_{n+1}^t \in B_{\kappa_t}$ on the right line segment.



We impose the condition that they are related by the combinatorial R matrix,

$$R : v_n^t \otimes b_n^t \xrightarrow{\sim} b_n^{t+1} \otimes v_{n+1}^t. \quad (8)$$

In the following sections, we consider the time evolution of the system downward. In view of Proposition 2.5 we can and will exclusively consider the

case where for any t , $b_n^t \neq u_{\theta_n}$ only for finitely many n 's and similarly for any n , $v_n^t \neq u_{\kappa_t}$ only for finitely many t 's. Sometimes we ignore v_n^t 's and display the time evolution of the system only with the arrays

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \dots & b_{-2}^0 & b_{-1}^0 & b_0^0 & b_1^0 & b_2^0 & \dots \\ \dots & b_{-2}^1 & b_{-1}^1 & b_0^1 & b_1^1 & b_2^1 & \dots \\ \dots & b_{-2}^2 & b_{-1}^2 & b_0^2 & b_1^2 & b_2^2 & \dots \end{array}$$

In short, the evolution of the array $\{b_n^t\}$ to $\{b_n^{t+1}\}$ is determined by

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\kappa_t} \otimes (\dots \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \dots) &\simeq (\dots \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \dots) \otimes B_{\kappa_t} \\ u_{\kappa_t} \otimes (\dots \otimes b_n^t \otimes b_{n+1}^t \otimes \dots) &\simeq (\dots \otimes b_n^{t+1} \otimes b_{n+1}^{t+1} \otimes \dots) \otimes u_{\kappa_t} \end{aligned}$$

under the successive applications of the combinatorial R matrices $R : B_{\kappa_t} \otimes B_{\theta_j} \xrightarrow{\sim} B_{\theta_j} \otimes B_{\kappa_t}$.

Setting $\mathbf{p} = \dots \otimes b_n^t \otimes b_{n+1}^t \otimes \dots$, we denote the time evolution induced by u_{κ_t} as above by $T_{\kappa_t}(\mathbf{p}) = \dots \otimes b_n^{t+1} \otimes b_{n+1}^{t+1} \otimes \dots$. Obviously the time evolutions are invertible, and due to (5) they are commutative,

$$T_{\kappa} T_{\kappa'} = T_{\kappa'} T_{\kappa}. \quad (9)$$

In the rest of the paper, the 2 dimensional lattice on which the automaton is defined should be appropriately understood either as large but finite or formally infinite depending on the situation.

The following observation will turn out useful in the sequel.

Remark 2.6. *Interchanging the role of 'space' and 'time', one can view (8) as the evolution of the array $\dots \otimes v_{n+1}^{t+1} \otimes v_{n+1}^t \otimes v_{n+1}^{t-1} \otimes \dots$ to the left as*


$$T_{\theta_n}(\dots \otimes v_{n+1}^{t+1} \otimes v_{n+1}^t \otimes v_{n+1}^{t-1} \otimes \dots) = \dots \otimes v_n^{t+1} \otimes v_n^t \otimes v_n^{t-1} \otimes \dots$$

Example 2.7. Let $M = 3, \forall \theta_n = 1$ and $\forall \kappa_t = \infty$.

$$\begin{array}{l} \dots 11114211311111111111 \dots \\ \dots 11111142131111111111 \dots \\ \dots 11111111423111111111 \dots \\ \dots 11111111112431111111 \dots \\ \dots 11111111111214311111 \dots \\ \dots 111111111111211431111 \dots \end{array}$$

where i denotes \boxed{i} . This is a typical 2 soliton scattering. One can see that a soliton with amplitude l moves to the right with velocity l if separated sufficiently. Hence the larger solitons overtake the smaller ones. (See Section 3.1 for the precise definition of the solitons and their amplitude.)

Example 2.8. Let $M = 3, \forall \theta_n = 2$ and $\forall \kappa_t = 1$.



Here i and ij denote \boxed{i} and \boxed{ij} , respectively. We have depicted the both variables $\{b_n^t\}$ and $\{v_n^t\}$. This time 14 on the top left is the smaller soliton and 33 or $13 \otimes 13$ is the larger soliton. Thus in terms of the $\{b_n^t\}$ variable, the smaller one overtakes the larger one as we go down the figure ending with the solitons 34 and 13. This is an opposite feature from the previous example. However in the space-time interchanged picture (Remark 2.6), it reduces to the situation similar to Example 2.7. Namely, in terms of the $\{v_n^t\}$ variable, the larger soliton overtakes the small one as $\dots 43 \dots 3 \dots \rightarrow \dots 4 \dots 33 \dots$, as we trace the diagram from the right to the left.

2.4 Equivalence with box-ball systems

Our $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton can be viewed as a generalized box-ball system. One interprets the letter 1 in the tableaux as an empty space and the other letters $2 \leq i \leq M + 1$ as the balls with index $M + 2 - i$. The element b_n^t signifies the balls contained in the n th box with capacity θ_n at time t . Similarly v_n^t stands for the carrier with capacity κ_t . Then (8) tells that through the loading-unloading process, the box and the carrier change into b_n^{t+1} and v_{n+1}^t , respectively. Sending the carrier through to the left, one has the time evolution of the box-ball state $\dots \otimes b_n^t \otimes b_{n+1}^t \otimes \dots$ into $\dots \otimes b_n^{t+1} \otimes b_{n+1}^{t+1} \otimes \dots$. For a concrete rule describing (8) in terms of the box-ball terminology, see

BBS scattering rule in [TNS]. The relation (8) will also be expressed as a piecewise linear equation in Proposition 4.1.

When $\forall \kappa_t = \infty$ we claim that the evolution of $\{b_n^t\}$ in our $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton is equivalent to the box-ball system studied in [TTM] under the above stated translation. In the latter the one-dimensional array of boxes with capacities $\dots, \theta_{n-1}, \theta_n, \theta_{n+1}, \dots$ accommodate the balls with an index from the set $\{1, \dots, M\}$. The dynamics of the balls in each time step is governed by the rule [TTM]:

1. Move every ball only once.
2. Move the leftmost ball with index 1 to the nearest right box with space.
3. Move the leftmost ball with index 1 among the rest to its nearest right box with space.
4. Repeat this procedure until all of the balls with index 1 are moved.
5. Do the same procedure 2 – 4 for the balls with index 2.
6. Repeat this procedure successively until all of the balls with index M are moved.

If the ball with some index is absent, one just proceeds to those with the next index. A box with space means the one that contains strictly fewer balls than its capacity. If a box contains more than one balls with the same index and they are not yet moved at an instant during the procedure, one may pick any one of them when looking for the leftmost one. The equivalence to our automaton with $\forall \kappa_t \rightarrow \infty$ is shown by the fact that the both lead to the same evolution equation, which is given from Proposition 4.1 under the said limit.

The above rule tells that the time evolution T_∞ in our automaton admits the factorization:

$$T_\infty = \tilde{T}_M \cdots \tilde{T}_2 \tilde{T}_1, \quad (10)$$

where \tilde{T}_j moves the balls with index j only, and we identify the left hand side with the corresponding operator acting on the box-ball systems.

For a later convenience we introduce the *canonical system* following [TNS]. We keep assuming $\forall \kappa_t = \infty$ and stay in the description in terms of the box-ball system rather than crystals until the end of this subsection. Thus we identify $b \in B_\theta$ with the capacity θ box containing the balls as specified before. Suppose a state $\mathbf{p} = \cdots \otimes b_n \otimes b_{n+1} \otimes \cdots$ contains J balls in total.

Then the action of $\tilde{T}_M \cdots \tilde{T}_2 \tilde{T}_1$ consists of J steps, each of which is to move a certain ball. To a ball to be moved in the j th step ($1 \leq j \leq J$), we assign a *signature* j . The assignment is unique up to the trivial freedom among the commonly indexed balls within the same boxes. Let $c(\mathbf{p})$ be the ball configurations obtained from \mathbf{p} just by regarding the signatures as new indices. It consists of the same array of the boxes and J balls as before but with the new distinct index from 1 to J . One can still let $c(\mathbf{p})$ evolve under the previously stated rule 1–6 by replacing M therein with J . The resulting new box-ball system is called the canonical system. By a close inspection of the rule 1-6, it is not difficult to confirm the commutativity:

$$c(\tilde{T}_M \cdots \tilde{T}_2 \tilde{T}_1(\mathbf{p})) = \tilde{T}_J \cdots \tilde{T}_2 \tilde{T}_1(c(\mathbf{p})). \quad (11)$$

In this sense the canonical system essentially grasps the time development pattern of the original one. This fact, firstly recognized in [TNS] for $\forall \theta_n = 1$, will be utilized in Appendix A.

3 Combinatorial R matrix as scattering matrix of ultra-discrete solitons

Here we prove Theorem 3.10, which identifies the scattering matrix of the ultra-discrete solitons with the combinatorial R matrix of $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$.

3.1 Solitons

Let B'_k be the classical crystal of $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ corresponding to the k -fold symmetric tensor representation:

$$B'_k = \{\boxed{m_1 \cdots m_k} \mid m_i \in \{1, \dots, M\}, m_1 \leq \cdots \leq m_k\}.$$

Denote the Kashiwara operators of B'_k by \tilde{f}'_i and \tilde{e}'_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, M-1$. For distinction, from now on we use the notation $B_k, \tilde{f}_i, \tilde{e}_i$ for $U'_q(A_M^{(1)})$ -crystals and $B'_k, \tilde{f}'_i, \tilde{e}'_i$ for $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ -crystals. Let R and R' be the combinatorial R matrices for $U'_q(A_M^{(1)})$ and $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$, respectively. Thus $R\tilde{f}_i = \tilde{f}_i R$ and $R'\tilde{f}'_i = \tilde{f}'_i R'$ hold when they act on the tensor product of two crystals, and similarly for $\tilde{e}_i, \tilde{e}'_i$. (We will specify the crystals that they act each time.)

Remark 3.1. When $M = 1$ we still define B'_k as above, which is the set with the single element $u_k = \boxed{1 \dots 1}$. We further understand that the “ $U'_q(A_0^{(1)})$ ” combinatorial R matrix $R' : B'_l \otimes B'_k \rightarrow B'_k \otimes B'_l$ is given by $R'(u_l \otimes u_k) = u_k \otimes u_l$.

For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ define a map ι_k by

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_k : B'_k &\longrightarrow (B_1)^{\otimes k} \\ \boxed{m_1 \cdots m_k} &\mapsto \boxed{m_k + 1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \boxed{m_1 + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $k_1, \dots, k_N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $L_0, \dots, L_N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. In terms of ι_k we further introduce a map

$$\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)} : B'_{k_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes B'_{k_N} \longrightarrow (B_1)^{\otimes L_0 + \cdots + L_N + k_1 + \cdots + k_N}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} &\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)}(b_1 \otimes b_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_N) \\ &= \boxed{1}^{\otimes L_0} \otimes \iota_{k_1}(b_1) \otimes \boxed{1}^{\otimes L_1} \otimes \iota_{k_2}(b_2) \otimes \cdots \otimes \boxed{1}^{\otimes L_{N-1}} \otimes \iota_{k_N}(b_N) \otimes \boxed{1}^{\otimes L_N}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular $\iota_k = \iota_k^{(0,0)}$. The map $\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)}$ is injective. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ let ς_k denote the map

$$\begin{aligned} \varsigma_k : (B_1)^{\otimes k} &\longrightarrow B_k \\ \boxed{m_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \boxed{m_k} &\mapsto \boxed{m'_1 \dots m'_k} \end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq m'_1 \leq \cdots \leq m'_k \leq M + 1$ are just the re-ordering of m_1, \dots, m_k into the weakly increasing order. We assume that $\mathcal{L} := \sum_n \theta_n$ is sufficiently large. We set

$$\hat{\theta} = (\cdots \otimes \varsigma_{\theta_n} \otimes \varsigma_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \cdots) : B_1^{\otimes \mathcal{L}} \longrightarrow \cdots \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \cdots. \quad (12)$$

For non-negative integers L_0, \dots, L_N such that $\mathcal{L} = L_0 + \cdots + L_N + k_1 + \cdots + k_N$, denote by $\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)}$ the composition $\hat{\theta} \circ \iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)}$, i.e.,

$$\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)} : B'_{k_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes B'_{k_N} \xrightarrow{\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)}} B_1^{\otimes \mathcal{L}} \xrightarrow{\hat{\theta}} \cdots \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \cdots. \quad (13)$$

Suppose that the image is obtained from the element $\cdots \otimes u_{\theta_n} \otimes u_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \cdots$ by replacing only the isolated segments $u_{\theta_{n_i}} \otimes u_{\theta_{n_i+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes u_{\theta_{n'_i}}$ ($n_i \leq n'_i$) with some $b_{\theta_{n_i}} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{\theta_{n'_i}} \in B_{\theta_{n_i}} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{\theta_{n'_i}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$. Assume further that the interval is sufficiently large, namely, $n_i - n'_{i-1} \gg \max(k_1, \dots, k_N)$ for any $2 \leq i \leq N$. In such a case we call the image of (13) an *asymptotic N soliton state*. Each soliton is essentially associated with an element in B'_k , and we call k the *amplitude* of the corresponding soliton. States obtained from an asymptotic N soliton state under arbitrary time evolutions $T_{\kappa'} \cdots T_{\kappa}$ will be

called N soliton states. This definition will naturally be justified from the consideration on the conserved quantities in Section 3.4. Note that $\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)}$ is not injective since $\hat{\theta}$ is not. Consequently, the result of application of $\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L'_0, \dots, L'_N)}$ is not necessarily an ‘overall translation’ of (13) in a naive sense even when $L'_i - L_i$ is i -independent for $i < N$ or $i > 0$. See Example 3.2 below.

First we consider $N = 1$ case. As it turns out in Proposition 3.3, there is no distinction between an asymptotic 1 soliton state and a 1 soliton state. Moreover one can check that the definition of the 1 soliton state here agrees with the 1 soliton solution that will be given later in (51). Given a 1 soliton state

$$\mathbf{p} = \cdots \otimes b_{n-1} \otimes b_n \otimes b_{n+1} \otimes \cdots \in \cdots \otimes B_{\theta_{n-1}} \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \cdots,$$

one can unambiguously specify integers $n, k(\geq 1), s, t$ by the conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} b_j &= u_{\theta_j} \quad \text{if } j < n \text{ or } j > n + k, \\ b_n &= \boxed{1 \cdots 1 m_1 \cdots m_t} \quad 1 \leq t \leq \theta_n, 2 \leq m_1 \leq \cdots \leq m_t \leq M + 1, \\ b_{n+k} &= \boxed{1 \cdots 1 m'_1 \cdots m'_s} \quad 0 \leq s \leq \theta_{n+k} - 1, 2 \leq m'_1 \leq \cdots \leq m'_s \leq M + 1, \\ b_{n+1}, \dots, b_{n+k-1} &\text{ do not contain 1 in their tableaux.} \end{aligned}$$

Note that ‘if’ in the first condition is not ‘only if’ in that $b_{n+k} = u_{\theta_{n+k}}$ is allowed as $s = 0$. The amplitude of the soliton according to the above definition equals $t + \theta_{n+1} + \cdots + \theta_{n+k-1} + s$. We set

$$x(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{j \leq n} \theta_j - t, \quad y(\mathbf{p}) = t + \theta_{n+1} + \cdots + \theta_{n+k-1}$$

and call $x(\mathbf{p})$ the *coordinate* of the soliton. $y(\mathbf{p})$ should not be confused with the amplitude of the soliton.

Example 3.2. Consider $B_{\theta_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes B_{\theta_6}$ with $\theta_1 = \theta_3 = 1, \theta_2 = \theta_4 = \theta_6 = 2$ and $\theta_5 = 3$, hence $\mathcal{L} = 11$.

(i) Take $b = \boxed{1} \in B_1$. Then $\iota_1^{(L_0, L_1)}(b)$ with $L_0 + L_1 = 10$ are examples of 1 soliton states with amplitude 1. One has $\iota_1^{(1,9)}(b) = \iota_1^{(2,8)}(b), \iota_1^{(4,6)}(b) = \iota_1^{(5,5)}(b)$

and $\iota_1^{(6,4)}(b) = \iota_1^{(7,3)}(b) = \iota_1^{(8,2)}(b)$. For $L_0 \leq 8$ they look as

\mathbf{p}	n	$n+k$	$x(\mathbf{p})$	$y(\mathbf{p})$
$\iota_1^{(0,10)}(b) = \boxed{2} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{111} \otimes \boxed{11}$	1	2	0	1,
$\iota_1^{(2,8)}(b) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{12} \otimes \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{111} \otimes \boxed{11}$	2	3	2	1,
$\iota_1^{(3,7)}(b) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{2} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{111} \otimes \boxed{11}$	3	4	3	1,
$\iota_1^{(5,5)}(b) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{12} \otimes \boxed{111} \otimes \boxed{11}$	4	5	5	1,
$\iota_1^{(8,2)}(b) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{112} \otimes \boxed{11}$	5	6	8	1,

where we have also listed $n, n+k, x(\mathbf{p})$ and $y(\mathbf{p})$.

(ii) Take $c = \boxed{11223} \in B'_5$. Then $\iota_1^{(L_0, L_1)}(b)$ with $L_0 + L_1 = 6$ are examples of 1 soliton states with amplitude 5. For $L_0 \leq 5$ they look as

\mathbf{p}	n	$n+k$	$x(\mathbf{p})$	$y(\mathbf{p})$
$\iota_5^{(0,6)}(c) = \boxed{4} \otimes \boxed{33} \otimes \boxed{2} \otimes \boxed{12} \otimes \boxed{111} \otimes \boxed{11}$	1	4	0	4,
$\iota_5^{(1,5)}(c) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{34} \otimes \boxed{3} \otimes \boxed{22} \otimes \boxed{111} \otimes \boxed{11}$	2	5	1	5,
$\iota_5^{(2,4)}(c) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{14} \otimes \boxed{3} \otimes \boxed{23} \otimes \boxed{112} \otimes \boxed{11}$	2	5	2	4,
$\iota_5^{(3,3)}(c) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{4} \otimes \boxed{33} \otimes \boxed{122} \otimes \boxed{11}$	3	5	3	3,
$\iota_5^{(4,2)}(c) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{34} \otimes \boxed{223} \otimes \boxed{11}$	4	6	4	5,
$\iota_5^{(5,1)}(c) = \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{11} \otimes \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{14} \otimes \boxed{233} \otimes \boxed{12}$	4	6	5	4.

In Section 3.3 we will make use of

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathbf{p} = \iota_l^{(L_0, L_1)}(b)$ be the 1 soliton of amplitude l associated with $b \in B'_l$. Then its time evolution $T_\kappa(\mathbf{p})$ is again 1 soliton and expressible as $T_\kappa(\mathbf{p}) = \iota_l^{(L'_0, L'_1)}(b)$ for some L'_0, L'_1 ($L'_0 + L'_1 = L_0 + L_1$) but with the same $b \in B'_l$. The difference of their coordinates (velocity under T_κ) is given by*

$$x(T_\kappa(\mathbf{p})) - x(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{cases} \kappa & \kappa < y(\mathbf{p}), \\ \min(\kappa, l) + \max(\theta_{n+k} - l, 0) & \kappa \geq y(\mathbf{p}). \end{cases}$$

The proof is done by a cumbersome case study. When $\forall \theta_n = 1$, the above result simplifies to $x(T_\kappa(\mathbf{p})) - x(\mathbf{p}) = \min(\kappa, l)$ in agreement with [FOY]. In general, the velocity varies locally depending on the data $\{\theta_n\}$. In Example 3.2 (i) one has $T_\kappa(\iota_1^{(0,10)}(b)) = \iota_1^{(2,8)}(b)$, $T_\kappa(\iota_1^{(2,8)}(b)) = \iota_1^{(3,7)}(b)$, $T_\kappa(\iota_1^{(3,7)}(b)) = \iota_1^{(5,5)}(b)$, $T_\kappa(\iota_1^{(5,5)}(b)) = \iota_1^{(8,2)}(b)$ for any $\kappa \geq 1$. Similarly in (ii) one has $T_\kappa(\iota_5^{(0,6)}(c)) = \iota_5^{(\kappa', 6-\kappa')}(c)$ for any $\kappa \geq 1$, where $\kappa' = \min(\kappa, 5)$. These results agree with Proposition 3.3.

Let $\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)}(c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_N)$ ($c_i \in B'_{k_i}$) be an asymptotic N soliton state and

$$\dots \otimes b_n^t \otimes b_{n+1}^t \otimes \dots = T_{\kappa_t} T_{\kappa_{t-1}} \dots \left(\iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L_0, \dots, L_N)}(c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_N) \right)$$

be its time evolution. Assume that the solitons are enough separated without an interaction throughout the time interval in consideration. Let $\{v_n^t\}$ be the associated variables on the vertical edges as in (8). Then in the space-time interchanged picture, the state $\dots \otimes v_n^{t+1} \otimes v_n^t \otimes \dots$ is also an asymptotic N soliton state associated with the same $c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_N$. Namely,

$$\dots \otimes v_n^{t+1} \otimes v_n^t \otimes \dots = \hat{\kappa} \circ \iota_{k_1, \dots, k_N}^{(L'_0, \dots, L'_N)}(c_1 \otimes \dots \otimes c_N)$$

for some L'_0, \dots, L'_N . Here

$$\hat{\kappa} = (\dots \otimes \varsigma_{\kappa_{t+1}} \otimes \varsigma_{\kappa_t} \otimes \dots) : B_1^{\otimes \mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \dots \otimes B_{\kappa_{t+1}} \otimes B_{\kappa_t} \otimes \dots$$

is an analogue of $\hat{\theta}$ in (12), and we have set $\mathcal{M} = \sum_t \kappa_t$. The figure in Example 2.8 will be of help to understand this fact. In a sense one can employ either picture to describe the scattering process. Indeed our discussion in the end of Section 3.3 will rely on this observation.

3.2 Scattering of 2 solitons; a typical case

Our aim here is to show Theorem 3.9 which is valid in the ‘typical’ situation (19).

Lemma 3.4. *For each $i = 1, \dots, M - 1$, we have a commutative diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B'_k & \xrightarrow{\iota_k} & (B_1)^{\otimes k} \\ \tilde{e}'_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \tilde{e}_{i+1} \\ B'_k \sqcup \{0\} & \xrightarrow{\iota_k} & (B_1)^{\otimes k} \sqcup \{0\}, \end{array}$$

where $\iota_k(0) = 0$. The same relation holds also between \tilde{f}'_i and \tilde{f}_{i+1} .

Combining Lemma 3.4 with the realization of B_θ in $B_1^{\otimes \theta}$ as a $U_q(A_M)$ -crystal (cf. [KN]), one can derive the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.5. *In the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B'_l \otimes B'_k & \xrightarrow{\iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}} & (\dots \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \dots) \\ \tilde{e}'_i \downarrow & & \downarrow \tilde{e}_{i+1} \\ (B'_l \otimes B'_k) \sqcup \{0\} & \xrightarrow{\iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}} & (\dots \otimes B_{\theta_n} \otimes B_{\theta_{n+1}} \otimes \dots) \sqcup \{0\}, \end{array}$$

suppose that the image of $\iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}$ is an asymptotic 2 soliton state. Then the diagram is commutative for any $i = 1, \dots, M - 1$. The same relation holds also between \tilde{f}'_i and \tilde{f}'_{i+1} .

Actually, the commutativity of the above diagram holds under a milder condition than being an asymptotic 2 soliton state.

Lemma 3.6. *Let p_1, \dots, p_m be the subsequence of a_1, \dots, a_L ($a_n \in B_{\theta_n}$) consisting of all the elements such that $a_n \neq u_{\theta_n}$. Assume the same relation between p'_1, \dots, p'_m and a'_1, \dots, a'_L . Then for any $t, t' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, the two relations*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{f}'_{i+1}(p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_m) &= p'_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p'_m, \\ \tilde{f}'_{i+1}(u_\kappa^{\otimes t} \otimes a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_L \otimes u_\kappa^{\otimes t'}) &= u_\kappa^{\otimes t} \otimes a'_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a'_L \otimes u_\kappa^{\otimes t'}\end{aligned}$$

are equivalent for each $i = 1, \dots, M - 1$. The equivalence persists even when the right hand sides are both 0. The same is true also for \tilde{c}_{i+1} .

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose an asymptotic two soliton state has evolved into another as*

$$T_\kappa^t \left(\iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}(b \otimes c) \right) = \iota_{k,l}^{(L'_0, L'_1, L'_2)}(c' \otimes b') \quad (14)$$

for some $\kappa, t, L_i, L'_i > 0, b, b' \in B'_l$ and $c, c' \in B'_k$. Then (14) is also valid under the replacement of $b \otimes c$ (resp. $c' \otimes b'$) by $\tilde{f}'_i(b \otimes c)$ (resp. $\tilde{f}'_i(c' \otimes b')$) for any $i = 1, \dots, M - 1$ such that $\tilde{f}'_i(b \otimes c) \neq 0$.

Proof. (14) is equivalent to

$$u_\kappa^{\otimes t} \otimes \iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}(b \otimes c) \simeq \iota_{k,l}^{(L'_0, L'_1, L'_2)}(c' \otimes b') \otimes u_\kappa^{\otimes t}$$

Apply \tilde{f}'_{i+1} to the both sides. Due to Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, the result becomes

$$u_\kappa^{\otimes t} \otimes \iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}(\tilde{f}'_i(b \otimes c)) \simeq \iota_{k,l}^{(L'_0, L'_1, L'_2)}(\tilde{f}'_i(c' \otimes b')) \otimes u_\kappa^{\otimes t}.$$

□

Proposition 3.8. *Let $l > k$ and assume that $\iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}(b_1 \otimes b_2)$ is an asymptotic 2 soliton state with*

$$b_1 = (l, 0, \dots, 0) \in B'_l, \quad b_2 = (h, k - h, 0, \dots, 0) \in B'_k \quad (15)$$

with $0 \leq h \leq k$ in the notation of (1). Assume further that $l > \theta_n$ for all but finitely many n 's. Then if $\kappa \gg l$, there exists $t > 0$ such that the result of the time evolution T_κ^t also becomes the asymptotic 2 soliton state as

$$T_\kappa^t \left(\iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \right) = \iota_{k,l}^{(L'_0, L'_1, L'_2)}(c_2 \otimes c_1), \quad (16)$$

where c_1, c_2 are given by

$$c_2 = (k, 0, \dots, 0) \in B'_k, \quad c_1 = (l - k + h, k - h, 0, \dots, 0) \in B'_l. \quad (17)$$

The proof is given in Appendix A. In fact both $b_1 \otimes b_2$ and $c_2 \otimes c_1$ are $U_q(A_{M-1})$ highest element, i.e., $\tilde{e}'_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \tilde{e}'_i(c_2 \otimes c_1) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq M - 1$. Combining this property with the conservation of weights (number of the letters) and the soliton content (cf. Section 3.4), one can argue that the outgoing state should necessarily correspond to $c_2 \otimes c_1$ if it is an asymptotic 2 soliton state at all. However, to establish the separation into 2 solitons asymptotically is not a trivial task for inhomogeneous θ_n 's only bounded by the condition $l \geq \theta_n$ for all but finitely many n 's. So far we have not managed it without recourse to the actual 2 soliton solution as in Appendix A.

As a $U_q(A_{M-1})$ -crystal, the $U_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ -crystal $B'_l \otimes B'_k$ decomposes into the connected components. Each component is parametrized with the $U_q(A_{M-1})$ highest elements $b_1 \otimes b_2$ (15), and is generated by applying \tilde{f}'_i operators ($1 \leq i \leq M - 1$) to it. The decomposition of the same pattern takes place also for $B'_k \otimes B'_l$ according to the highest elements $c_2 \otimes c_1$. Combining this fact with Propositions 3.7 and 3.8, we conclude that there exists a map S' (S matrix) uniquely defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S' : B'_l \otimes B'_k &\rightarrow B'_k \otimes B'_l \\ T_\kappa^t \left(\iota_{l,k}^{(L_0, L_1, L_2)}(b \otimes c) \right) &= \iota_{k,l}^{(L'_0, L'_1, L'_2)}(S'(b \otimes c)), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

under the condition

$$\kappa \gg l > k, \quad l > \theta_n \text{ for all but finitely many } n\text{'s}. \quad (19)$$

It describes the 2 soliton scattering.

Theorem 3.9. *Under the assumption (19), we have $R' = S'$ on the $U_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ -crystal $B'_l \otimes B'_k$.*

Proof. By the definition and Proposition 3.7, the both R' and S' commute with \tilde{f}'_i for any $1 \leq i \leq M - 1$. Moreover, for any $U_q(A_{M-1})$ highest elements

$b_1 \otimes b_2$ given by (15), their actions are the same, i.e., $S'(b_1 \otimes b_2) = c_2 \otimes c_1 = R'(b_1 \otimes b_2)$, where the latter can be verified from Proposition 2.3. \square

Thus in the situation (19) the larger soliton overtakes the smaller soliton and the scattering matrix coincides with the combinatorial R matrix of $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ -crystal. For instance Example 2.7 tells that

$$S' : \boxed{13} \otimes \boxed{2} \mapsto \boxed{1} \otimes \boxed{23}.$$

This agrees with Example 2.2 (i).

3.3 Scattering of 2 solitons; general case

First let us consider the homogeneous case $\forall \theta_n = \theta, \forall \kappa_t = \kappa$. Fix positive integers $l > k$. We study the scattering of 2 solitons in $\cdots \otimes B_\theta \otimes B_\theta \otimes \cdots$ with amplitudes l and k under the time evolution T_κ^t . The qualitative feature of the scattering depends on the cases:

- (i) $l > k \geq \max(\theta, \kappa)$ $v_l = v_k = \kappa$,
- (ii) $\min(\theta, \kappa) \geq l > k$ $v_l = v_k = \theta$,
- (iii) $l \geq \kappa > k \geq \theta$ $v_l = \kappa > v_k = k$,
- (iv) $\kappa \geq l > k \geq \theta$ $v_l = l > v_k = k$,
- (v) $l \geq \kappa > \theta \geq k$ $v_l = \kappa > v_k = \theta$,
- (vi) $\kappa \geq l > \theta \geq k$ $v_l = l > v_k = \theta$,
- (vii) $l \geq \theta > k \geq \kappa$,
- (viii) $\theta \geq l > k \geq \kappa$,
- (ix) $l \geq \theta > \kappa \geq k$,
- (x) $\theta \geq l > \kappa \geq k$.

Here the classification has been done so that

$$\{(i) \text{ II } (ii)\} \coprod \{(iii) \cup (iv) \cup (v) \cup (vi)\} \coprod \{(vii) \cup (viii) \cup (ix) \cup (x)\}.$$

For example (iii) and (iv) share $l = \kappa > k \geq \theta$ case. However the three groups are mutually disjoint and correspond to distinct features of the scattering as we will see below. The v_l and v_k are the velocities of the solitons with amplitude l and k , respectively. For each soliton it has been calculated by using Proposition 3.3 by assuming no effect from the other soliton. In (vi) and (x) we have excluded $l = \theta$ and $l = \kappa$, respectively since they both lead to $v_l = v_k = \theta$ hence no scattering. By the same reason the cases (i) and (ii) are out of question. Via the space-time interchange $\theta \leftrightarrow \kappa$, the cases

(vii),(viii), (ix) and (x) are mapped to (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi), respectively. (See the argument before Theorem 3.10 on the velocities in the cases (vii) - (x).) Thus we are left with (iii)-(vi), where $l > \theta$ and $v_l > v_k$ are always valid. Following [FOY], we utilize the commutativity (9) and consider the 2 soliton scattering under T_κ^t as

$$T_\kappa^t = T_\infty^{-t'} T_\kappa^t T_\infty^{t'}$$

The scattering are thus divided into three stages. In the first stage, we let solitons evolve under $T_\infty^{t'}$ for sufficiently large t' . Since $l > \theta$ matches the condition (19), Theorem 3.9 tells that the larger soliton overtakes the smaller one with the scattering rule described by $S' = R'$. In the second stage corresponding to T_κ^t , the larger soliton goes further ahead than the smaller one with no interaction because of $v_l > v_k$. Therefore in the last stage $T_\infty^{-t'}$, the two remain isolated even though they are drawn back and get relatively closer. Thus we conclude that in all the cases (iii)-(vi), the qualitative feature is the same as the one in Theorem 3.9. Namely, the larger soliton overtakes the smaller one and the scattering rule is given by the combinatorial R matrix $R' : B'_l \otimes B'_k \rightarrow B'_k \otimes B'_l$. Through the space-time interchange argument, this implies the opposite feature of scattering in the cases (vii)-(x). Namely, the smaller one overtakes the larger one with the scattering rule given by the combinatorial R matrix $R' : B'_k \otimes B'_l \rightarrow B'_l \otimes B'_k$.

We note that in the cases (vii) - (x), one does not necessarily have $v_l < v_k$ at any time. It actually depends on whether $\kappa \geq y(\mathbf{p})$ when Proposition 3.3 is applied. Nevertheless $v_l < v_k$ should be valid “on average” and the above feature of the scattering should hold due to the reduction to the cases (iii) - (vi) where the strict inequality $v_l > v_k$ is always valid. To summarize, we have shown

Theorem 3.10. *Let $l > k$ be the amplitude of 2 solitons in $\cdots \otimes B_\theta \otimes B_\theta \otimes \cdots$. Under the time evolution T_κ , the scattering matrix of the collision (if any) in the sense of (18) or $(18)_{l \leftrightarrow k}$ is given by $S' = R'$, where R' is the combinatorial R matrix of the $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ -crystals for*

- (I) $B'_l \otimes B'_k \xrightarrow{\sim} B'_k \otimes B'_l$ if $\min(l, \kappa) > \max(k, \theta)$,
- (II) $B'_k \otimes B'_l \xrightarrow{\sim} B'_l \otimes B'_k$ if $\min(l, \theta) > \max(k, \kappa)$,
- (III) no scattering (same velocity) otherwise.

Example 2.8 corresponds to the choice $l = \theta = 2, k = \kappa = 1$, hence to (II) in the theorem. The scattering matrix is read off the figure,

$$S' : \boxed{3} \otimes \boxed{22} \mapsto \boxed{23} \otimes \boxed{2}.$$

This agrees with the inverse of the R matrix in Example 2.2 (ii).

Let us comment on the inhomogeneous case where θ_n 's and κ_t 's actually depend on the indices. In view of (19), the qualitative feature of the scattering remains the same as Theorem 3.10 even if we slightly relax the conditions therein. For instance the larger soliton still overtakes the smaller one with the rule $S' = R'$ if $\min(l, \kappa_t) > \max(k, \theta_n)$ holds for almost all n and t that are relevant during the scattering in question. In such cases we expect that the asymptotic N soliton state in the sense of Section 3.1 undergoes the scattering which are essentially factorized into the two-body ones studied here. On the other hand, if θ_n 's and κ_t 's are not bounded by the condition as above and indeed far from being homogeneous, even 2 solitons can collide many times in general depending on the local velocities. In such a case we do not have a simple picture of the scattering.

Example 3.11. Let $M = 3$.

0 : ... 14 · 3 · 123 · 111 · 24 · 1 · 1 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1111 · 1111 · 11111 · 11111 · 111 · 1111 ...
1 : ... 11 · 1 · 114 · 233 · 11 · 4 · 2 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1111 · 1111 · 11111 · 11111 · 111 · 1111 ...
2 : ... 11 · 1 · 111 · 111 · 34 · 3 · 1 · 224 · 11 · 1 · 1111 · 1111 · 11111 · 11111 · 111 · 1111 ...
3 : ... 11 · 1 · 111 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 4 · 113 · 34 · 2 · 1112 · 1111 · 11111 · 11111 · 111 · 1111 ...
4 : ... 11 · 1 · 111 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1 · 114 · 13 · 1 · 1234 · 1112 · 11111 · 11111 · 111 · 1111 ...
5 : ... 11 · 1 · 111 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1 · 111 · 14 · 3 · 1114 · 1223 · 11111 · 11111 · 111 · 1111 ...
6 : ... 11 · 1 · 111 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1134 · 1234 · 11112 · 11111 · 111 · 1111 ...
7 : ... 11 · 1 · 111 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1111 · 2334 · 11114 · 11112 · 111 · 1111 ...
8 : ... 11 · 1 · 111 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1111 · 1134 · 11123 · 11114 · 112 · 1111 ...
9 : ... 11 · 1 · 111 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1 · 111 · 11 · 1 · 1111 · 1111 · 12334 · 11111 · 114 · 1112 ...

where \cdot denotes \otimes , and 14 for example does $\boxed{14} \in B_2$. Not only θ_n 's but also κ_t are inhomogeneous here so that the relevant time evolutions are T_5 for the process $0 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4$, whereas they are T_2 for $4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 9$. This is an example of the double scattering of 2 solitons caused by the inhomogeneity. The larger soliton once overtakes the smaller one, but after the collision it gets slower due to the environmental change and is eventually passed by the smaller one again. This is easily understood from the classification (I)–(III) in Theorem 3.10 for the homogeneous case. In the first stage we have $l = 4, \kappa = 5, k = 2, \theta_n \leq 3$ so that the larger soliton overtakes the smaller as in (I). On the other hand we have $\kappa = 2, \theta_n \geq 3$ in the second stage hence the smaller one passes the larger one as in (II). Following the time evolution downward, one finds the scattering matrices for the successive collisions:

$$\boxed{1223} \otimes \boxed{13} \mapsto \boxed{23} \otimes \boxed{1123} \mapsto \boxed{1223} \otimes \boxed{13}$$

in terms of the soliton labels with the $U'_q(A_2^{(1)})$ -crystal elements. They agree with the combinatorial R matrices $B'_4 \otimes B'_2 \simeq B'_2 \otimes B'_4$ calculated from Proposition 2.3.

3.4 Conserved quantities

Let us give a class of conserved quantities in the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton. Since our construction here is based on [FOY] and the result is quite parallel, we will only present a brief sketch. Given an automaton state $\mathbf{p} = \cdots \otimes b_n \otimes b_{n+1} \otimes \cdots$ ($b_n = u_{\theta_n}$ for $|n| \gg 1$), let

$$u_\kappa \otimes \mathbf{p} \simeq \cdots \otimes b'_{n-1} \otimes b'_n \otimes v_n \otimes b_{n+1} \otimes b_{n+2} \otimes \cdots$$

for some $b'_i \in B_{\theta_i}$ and $v_n \in B_\kappa$. Set

$$E_\kappa(\mathbf{p}) = - \sum_n H_{B_\kappa B_{\theta_{n+1}}} (v_n \otimes b_{n+1}),$$

which is well defined owing to the normalization (7). By the same argument as in [FOY] we get

$$E_\kappa(T_{\kappa'}(\mathbf{p})) = E_\kappa(\mathbf{p}) \quad \text{for any } \kappa, \kappa'.$$

Thus $E_\kappa(\mathbf{p})$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ form a family of conserved quantities. If \mathbf{p} is an asymptotic N soliton state in the sense of Section 3.1, it is straightforward to derive

$$E_\kappa(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{l \geq 1} \min(l, \kappa) N_l, \tag{20}$$

where N_l is the number of solitons with amplitude l . Therefore if a state with the soliton content $\{N_l\}$ scatter into another state with the content $\{N'_l\}$, $N_l = N'_l$ must be valid for any l due to the conservation of all E_κ 's. In both Example 2.7 and 2.8, we have $E_1 = 2, E_l = 3$ for $l \geq 3$, in agreement with $N_1 = N_2 = 1, N_l = 0$ for $l \geq 3$. In Example 3.11, we have $E_1 = 2, E_2 = 4, E_3 = 5$ and $E_l = 6$ for $l \geq 4$, in agreement with $N_l = \delta_{l2} + \delta_{l4}$.

When $\forall \theta_n = 1$, (20) is obtained in proposition 4.4 in [FOY]. An equivalent family of the conserved quantities has also been given in [TNS].

Another conserved quantity is the semistandard Young tableau, which can be constructed as follows. Given an automaton state $\mathbf{p} = \cdots \otimes b_n \otimes b_{n+1} \otimes \cdots$, let $c_s \dots c_2 c_1$ be the subsequence of $\dots b_{n-1} b_n b_{n+1} \dots$ obtained by dropping all the b_j 's such that $b_j = u_{\theta_j}$. Each c_j has the form

$$c_j = \boxed{1 \dots 1 m_1 \dots m_k} \quad 2 \leq m_1 \leq \dots \leq m_k \leq M + 1 \quad \text{for some } k \geq 1,$$

for which we set

$$\bar{c}_j = \boxed{m_1 - 1 \dots m_k - 1} \in B'_k.$$

Let $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{p}) := ((\bar{c}_1 \cdot \bar{c}_2) \cdot \bar{c}_3) \cdot \cdots \cdot \bar{c}_s$ be the semistandard tableau constructed from the successive products of \bar{c}_j 's defined via the row insertion as in [F] p.11. By virtue of the $U'_q(A_{M-1})$ -invariance [FOY], it is a conserved quantity under any time evolution T_κ , i.e., $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{T}(T_\kappa(\mathbf{p}))$. In the context of the Robinson-Schensted-Knuth correspondence, $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{p})$ stands for the P -symbol. For any 1 soliton state $\mathbf{p} = \iota_k^{(L_0, L_1)}(b)$, $b \in B'_k$, one has $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{p}) = b$. One can also check that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{p})$ equals

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 3 & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

in Examples 2.7, 2.8 and 3.11, respectively throughout the scattering.

4 $A_M^{(1)}$ Automaton as Ultradiscrete KP equation

Here we investigate the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton constructed in Section 2.3 from the viewpoint of ultradiscretization [TTMS, MSTTT]. With the same notations as (1) we define $u_{n,j}^t$ and $v_{n,j}^t$ to be the multiplicities of $(M+2-j)$ th content of b_n^t and v_n^t , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} b_n^t &= (u_{n,M+1}^t, u_{n,M}^t, \cdots, u_{n,1}^t), \\ v_n^t &= (v_{n,M+1}^t, v_{n,M}^t, \cdots, v_{n,1}^t). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.1. *The map*

$$R : v_n^t \otimes b_n^t \xrightarrow{\sim} b_n^{t+1} \otimes v_{n+1}^t, \quad (21)$$

is expressed by ($1 \leq j \leq M$)

$$\begin{aligned} u_{n,j}^{t+1} - v_{n,j}^t &= \max[X_1 - \theta_n, X_2 - \theta_n, \cdots, X_{j-1} - \theta_n, X_j - \kappa_t, \cdots, X_M - \kappa_t, 0] \\ &\quad - \max[X_1 - \theta_n, X_2 - \theta_n, \cdots, X_j - \theta_n, X_{j+1} - \kappa_t, \cdots, X_M - \kappa_t, 0], \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$v_{n+1,j}^t = u_{n,j}^t + v_{n,j}^t - u_{n,j}^{t+1}, \quad (23)$$

where $X_\ell = X_{n,\ell}^t := \sum_{i=\ell}^M u_{n,i}^t + \sum_{i=1}^\ell v_{n,i}^t$. Actually (23) is valid also for $j = M+1$.

Proof. In the present proof, we abbreviate $u_{n,j}^t$ and $v_{n,j}^t$ to u_j and v_j respectively. We also put $u_{j+M+1} = u_j$, $v_{j+M+1} = v_j$ etc., i.e. each suffix is defined modulo $M+1$.

We define $u_j^{(k)}$, $v_j^{(k)}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, M+1$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, M+1$) as follows.

- (1) Let $\Delta u_j = \Delta v_{j+1} := \min[u_j, v_{j+1}]$, and $u_j^{(1)} := u_j - \Delta u_j$, $v_j^{(1)} := v_j - \Delta v_j$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, M+1$.
- (2) For $\forall j$, we define $\Delta u_j^{(1)} = \Delta v_{j+2}^{(1)} := \min[u_j^{(1)}, v_{j+2}^{(1)}]$, and $u_j^{(2)} := u_j^{(1)} - \Delta u_j^{(1)}$, $v_j^{(2)} := v_j^{(1)} - \Delta v_j^{(1)}$.
- (3) Similarly to the step (2), we recursively define $\Delta u_j^{(\ell-1)} = \Delta v_{j+\ell}^{(\ell-1)} := \min[u_j^{(\ell-1)}, v_{j+\ell}^{(\ell-1)}]$, $u_j^{(\ell)} := u_j^{(\ell-1)} - \Delta u_j^{(\ell-1)}$ and $v_j^{(\ell)} := v_j^{(\ell-1)} - \Delta v_j^{(\ell-1)}$ for $\ell = 2, 3, \dots, M+1$.

From Proposition 2.3, we see that $u_j^{(M+1)}$ and $v_j^{(M+1)}$ are the numbers of *unconnected* dots in $(M+2-j)$ th box in the column diagrams for b_n^t and v_n^t respectively. See Example 2.4. Noting that $\Delta u_j^{(M)} = \Delta v_j^{(M)}$ we have

$$u_{n,j}^{t+1} = v_j + u_j^{(M+1)} - v_j^{(M+1)} = v_j + u_j^{(M)} - v_j^{(M)} \quad (24)$$

for $1 \leq j \leq M+1$. The following formulae are easily shown by induction:

$$u_j^{(\ell)} = \max \left[\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} u_{j+i}, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} u_{j+i} + v_{j+1}, \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} u_{j+i} + \sum_{i=1}^2 v_{j+i}, \dots, u_{j+\ell-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} v_{j+i}, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} v_{j+i} \right] \\ - v_{j+1} - \max \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} u_{j+i}, \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} u_{j+i} + v_{j+2}, \dots, u_{j+\ell-1} + \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} v_{j+i}, \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} v_{j+i} \right], \quad (25)$$

$$v_j^{(\ell)} = \max \left[\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} v_{j-i}, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} v_{j-i} + u_{j-1}, \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} v_{j-i} + \sum_{i=1}^2 u_{j-i}, \dots, v_{j-\ell+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} u_{j-i}, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} u_{j-i} \right] \\ - u_{j-1} - \max \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} v_{j-i}, \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} v_{j-i} + u_{j-2}, \dots, v_{j-\ell+1} + \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} u_{j-i}, \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} u_{j-i} \right]. \quad (26)$$

Noticing $u_{j-1} = u_{j+M}$, $v_{j+1} = v_{j-M}$, we find

$$u_j^{(M)} - v_j^{(M)} = \max \left[\sum_{i=0}^M u_{j+i}, \sum_{i=1}^M u_{j+i} + v_{j+1}, \sum_{i=2}^M u_{j+i} + \sum_{i=1}^2 v_{j+i}, \dots, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{i=M-1}^M u_{j+i} + \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} v_{j+i}, u_{j+M} + \sum_{i=1}^M v_{j+i} \right] \\ - \max \left[\sum_{i=0}^M v_{j-i}, \sum_{i=1}^M v_{j-i} + u_{j-1}, \sum_{i=2}^M v_{j-i} + \sum_{i=1}^2 u_{j-i}, \dots, \right. \\ \left. \sum_{i=M-1}^M v_{j-i} + \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} u_{j-i}, v_{j-M} + \sum_{i=1}^M u_{j-i} \right]. \quad (27)$$

Subtracting $\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} u_i + \sum_{i=j+1}^{M+1} v_i$ from the both $\max[\dots]$ terms in the left hand

side of the equation and using the relations: $u_{M+1} = \theta_n - \sum_{j=1}^M u_j$ and $v_{M+1} =$

$\kappa_t - \sum_{j=1}^M v_j$, we get (22) from (24). Noticing that the number of dots of two

column diagrams are preserved in the rule, we obtain (23). \square

Our goal in this section is to show that (22) and (23) are ultradiscrete limits of the (one-constrained) nonautonomous discrete KP equation (ndKP eq.):

$$(b_{n+1} - c_{j+1})\tau(t, n, j)\tau(t+1, n+1, j+1) + (c_{j+1} - a_{t+1})\tau(t+1, n+1, j)\tau(t, n, j+1) + (a_{t+1} - b_{n+1})\tau(t, n+1, j)\tau(t+1, n, j+1) = 0. \quad (28)$$

Here a_t, b_n, c_j are arbitrary complex parameters. The ndKP eq. (28), which is sometimes called the (nonautonomous) Hirota-Miwa equation, is equivalent to the generating formulae of the KP hierarchy [S, DJKM]. Its soliton solutions, Lax operators, Darboux transformations *etc.* have been investigated in [WTS]. We set $a_{t+1} = 1 + \delta_t$ and $b_{n+1} = 1 + \gamma_n$. We also assume that $c_1 = 1, c_2 = c_3 = \dots = c_{M+1} = 0$ and

$$\tau(t, n, j+M+1) = \tau(t, n, j). \quad (29)$$

The constraint (29) is an analogue of M -reduction of the KP hierarchy which restricts the space of transformation group of τ functions to the subgroup generated by $A_M^{(1)}$ [DJKM]. Let

$$U_{n,j}^t := \frac{\tau(t, n+1, j)\tau(t, n, j+1)}{\tau(t, n, j)\tau(t, n+1, j+1)},$$

$$V_{n,j}^t := \frac{\tau(t+1, n, j+1)\tau(t, n, j)}{\tau(t+1, n, j)\tau(t, n, j+1)} \quad (30)$$

for $1 \leq j \leq M$. We also introduce a small positive parameter ε , and put $\delta_t = \exp[-\kappa_t/\varepsilon]$ and $\gamma_n = \exp[-\theta_n/\varepsilon]$. Then we have

Theorem 4.2. *Let*

$$u_{n,j}^t = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log U_{n,j}^t,$$

$$v_{n,j}^t = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log V_{n,j}^t$$

be the ultradiscrete limits for $1 \leq j \leq M$, and specify $u_{n,M+1}^t$ and $v_{n,M+1}^t$ by $\sum_{j=1}^{M+1} u_{n,j}^t = \theta_n$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{M+1} v_{n,j}^t = \kappa_t$. Then $\{u_{n,j}^t\}$ and $\{v_{n,j}^t\}$ satisfy (22) and (23).

Proof. We use abbreviations: $\tau_j := \tau(t, n, j)$, $\tau_j^t := \tau(t+1, n, j)$, $\tau_{n,j} := \tau(t, n+1, j)$, $\tau_{n,j}^t := \tau(t+1, n+1, j)$. The ndKP eq. (28) with the constraint (29) is rewritten as the following $M+1$ simultaneous equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 + \gamma_n)\tau_1\tau_{n,2}^t - (1 + \delta_t)\tau_{n,1}^t\tau_2 + (\delta_t - \gamma_n)\tau_{n,1}\tau_2^t &= 0, \\
(1 + \gamma_n)\tau_2\tau_{n,3}^t - (1 + \delta_t)\tau_{n,2}^t\tau_3 + (\delta_t - \gamma_n)\tau_{n,2}\tau_3^t &= 0, \\
&\dots \\
(1 + \gamma_n)\tau_M\tau_{n,M+1}^t - (1 + \delta_t)\tau_{n,M}^t\tau_{M+1} + (\delta_t - \gamma_n)\tau_{n,M}\tau_{M+1}^t &= 0, \\
\gamma_n\tau_{M+1}\tau_{n,1}^t - \delta_t\tau_{n,M+1}^t\tau_1 + (\delta_t - \gamma_n)\tau_{n,M+1}\tau_1^t &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Defining

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1 &:= \tau_{n,1}^t\tau_2\tau_3 \cdots \tau_{M+1}, & y_1 &:= \tau_{n,1}\tau_2^t\tau_3\tau_4 \cdots \tau_{M+1}, \\
x_2 &:= \tau_1\tau_{n,2}^t\tau_3 \cdots \tau_{M+1}, & y_2 &:= \tau_1\tau_{n,2}\tau_3^t\tau_4 \cdots \tau_{M+1}, \\
&\dots & &\dots \\
x_{M+1} &:= \tau_1\tau_2\tau_3 \cdots \tau_{n,M+1}^t, & y_{M+1} &:= \tau_1^t\tau_2\tau_3\tau_4 \cdots \tau_{n,M+1}, \\
\vec{x} &:= (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{M+1})^T, & \vec{y} &:= (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{M+1})^T,
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\mathbf{L}\vec{x} = (\delta_t - \gamma_n)\vec{y},$$

where

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{pmatrix} (1 + \delta_t) & -(1 + \gamma_n) & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (1 + \delta_t) & -(1 + \gamma_n) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & (1 + \delta_t) & -(1 + \gamma_n) \\ -\gamma_n & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \delta_t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Its inverse matrix is easily calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{L}^{-1} &= \mathbf{D} / ((1 + \delta_t)^M \delta_t - (1 + \gamma_n)^M \gamma_n), \\
(\mathbf{D})_{i,j} &= \begin{cases} (1 + \gamma_n)^{M+1-i} (1 + \delta_t)^{i-1}, & j = M+1, \\ \delta_t (1 + \delta_t)^{M+i-j-1} (1 + \gamma_n)^{j-i}, & j \geq i \ (j \neq M+1), \\ \gamma_n (1 + \gamma_n)^{M-i+j} (1 + \delta_t)^{i-j-1}, & j \leq i-1 \ (j \neq M+1). \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for $0 < \delta_t, \gamma_n \ll 1$, we have

$$(\delta_t - \gamma_n)\mathbf{L}^{-1} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \delta_t & \delta_t & \delta_t & \cdots & \delta_t & 1 \\ \gamma_n & \delta_t & \delta_t & \cdots & \delta_t & 1 \\ \gamma_n & \gamma_n & \delta_t & \cdots & \delta_t & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \gamma_n & \gamma_n & \gamma_n & \cdots & \gamma_n & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Precisely speaking, $A \sim B$ means $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log A(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log B(\varepsilon)$. Since

$$x_j \sim \gamma_n \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} y_i + \delta_t \sum_{i=j}^M y_i + y_{M+1}, \quad (32)$$

$$x_{j+1} \sim \gamma_n \sum_{i=1}^j y_i + \delta_t \sum_{i=j+1}^M y_i + y_{M+1}, \quad (33)$$

we have

$$\frac{x_j}{x_{j+1}} \sim \frac{\gamma_n \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (y_i/y_{M+1}) + \delta_t \sum_{i=j}^M (y_i/y_{M+1}) + 1}{\gamma_n \sum_{i=1}^j (y_i/y_{M+1}) + \delta_t \sum_{i=j+1}^M (y_i/y_{M+1}) + 1}. \quad (34)$$

From the definition of $U_{n,j}^t$ and $V_{n,j}^t$, we find that the left hand side of (34) is equal to $U_{n,j}^{t+1}/V_{n,j}^t$ and that $(y_j/y_{M+1}) = \prod_{i=j}^M U_{n,i}^t \prod_{i=1}^j V_{n,i}^t$. Since it holds that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log \left(\frac{x_j}{x_{j+1}} \right) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log [\text{right hand side of (34)}],$$

we have (22) by putting

$$\begin{aligned} u_{n,j}^t &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log U_{n,j}^t, \\ v_{n,j}^t &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log V_{n,j}^t. \end{aligned}$$

From the definitions (30), we have

$$\frac{U_{n,j}^{t+1}}{U_{n,j}^t} = \frac{V_{n,j}^t}{V_{n+1,j}^t},$$

which gives (23) in the ultradiscrete limit. \square

Next, we consider soliton solutions to the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton. It is obvious that if the limit :

$$Y_{n,j}^t := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log \tau(t, n, j) \quad (35)$$

exists, then from (30) we have for $1 \leq j \leq M$

$$\begin{aligned} u_{n,j}^t &= Y_{n+1,j}^t + Y_{n,j+1}^t - Y_{n,j}^t - Y_{n+1,j+1}^t, \\ v_{n,j}^t &= Y_{n,j+1}^{t+1} + Y_{n,j}^t - Y_{n,j}^{t+1} - Y_{n,j+1}^t. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

From Theorem 4.2, they satisfy (22) and (23). Hence we have only to know $Y_{n,j}^t$ to get solutions to (22) and (23). We will call $Y_{n,j}^t$ an N soliton solution to the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton when it is an ultradiscrete limit of one parameter (ε) family of a certain $M \times N$ soliton solutions $\tau(t, n, j)$ to the ndKP eq. (28) as explained in Appendix B. It indeed corresponds to an N soliton state in the sense of Section 3.1.

The following fact is well known [DJKM, WTS].

Proposition 4.3. *The N soliton solution to (28) is given by the vacuum expectation value:*

$$\tau(t, n, j) = \langle vac | g(\mathbf{t}) | vac \rangle, \quad (37)$$

$$g(\mathbf{t}) = \prod_{k=1}^N (1 + \alpha_k \psi(p_k, \mathbf{t}) \psi^*(q_k, \mathbf{t})). \quad (38)$$

Here $\mathbf{t} = (t, n, j)$ and α_k ($k = 1, 2, \dots, N$) are arbitrary complex constants.

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(p, \mathbf{t}) &= \left[\prod_{t'}^t (a_{t'} - p) \prod_{n'}^n (b_{n'} - p)^{-1} \prod_{j'=1}^j (-c_{j'} + p)^{-1} \right] \psi(p), \\ \psi^*(q, \mathbf{t}) &= \left[\prod_{t'}^t (a_{t'} - q)^{-1} \prod_{n'}^n (b_{n'} - q) \prod_{j'=1}^j (-c_{j'} + q) \right] \psi^*(q), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\prod_{n'}^n X_{n'} := \begin{cases} \prod_{n'=1}^n X_{n'} & 1 \leq n \\ 1 & n = 0 \\ \prod_{n'=n+1}^0 X_{n'}^{-1} & n \leq -1, \end{cases}$$

and $\psi(p)$, $\psi^*(q)$ are fermionic field operators which satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \{\psi(p), \psi(p')\}_+ &:= \psi(p)\psi(p') + \psi(p')\psi(p) = 0, \\ \{\psi^*(q), \psi^*(q')\}_+ &= 0, \quad \{\psi(p), \psi^*(q)\}_+ = 0 \text{ for } (p \neq q), \\ \langle vac | \psi(p_1)\psi(p_2) \cdots \psi(p_r)\psi^*(q_r)\psi^*(q_{r-1}) \cdots \psi^*(q_1) | vac \rangle \\ &= \det \left(\frac{1}{p_i - q_j} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} = \frac{\prod_{i < j} (p_i - p_j)(q_j - q_i)}{\prod_{i, j} (p_i - q_j)}. \end{aligned}$$

The N soliton solution (38) is also a solution to (31) when it satisfies the constraint (29). We can easily show

Proposition 4.4. *The constraint (29) is achieved if it holds that*

$$\left(\frac{q_k}{p_k}\right)^M \left(\frac{1-q_k}{1-p_k}\right) = 1 \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots, N). \quad (39)$$

Note that, for a given p_k , there are M q_k 's which satisfy (39) and $q_k \neq p_k$. We use this fact to construct explicit solutions.

From Propositions 4.3 and 4.4, we can construct a class of N soliton solutions to the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton. The result is summarized as

Theorem 4.5.

$$Y_{n+1, j+1}^{t+1} = \max_{\vec{\mu}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i K^{(i)}(t, n, j) - A(\vec{\mu}; j) \right] \quad (40)$$

is an N soliton solution to the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton. Here $\vec{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N)$ ($\mu_i = 0, 1$) and $\max_{\vec{\mu}}[\dots]$ denotes the maximum among the 2^N values obtained by putting $\mu_i = 0$ or 1 for $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$.

$$K^{(i)}(t, n, j) = K_0^{(i)} - \sum_{j'=1}^j \ell_{j'}^{(i)} - \sum_{t'}^t \min[\kappa_{t'}, L^{(i)}] + \sum_{n'}^n \min[\theta_{n'}, L^{(i)}],$$

where the sums here are generally defined by

$$\sum_{n'}^n X_{n'} := \begin{cases} \sum_{n'=1}^n X_{n'} & 1 \leq n \\ 0 & n = 0 \\ -\sum_{n'=n+1}^0 X_{n'} & n \leq -1. \end{cases}$$

$L^{(i)}, \ell_j^{(i)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq M$) are non-negative integers which satisfy

$$L^{(i)} = \sum_{j=1}^M \ell_j^{(i)},$$

$$\begin{aligned} L^{(1)} &\geq L^{(2)} \geq \dots \geq L^{(N)}, \\ \ell_j^{(1)} &\geq \ell_j^{(2)} \geq \dots \geq \ell_j^{(N)}, \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, M), \end{aligned}$$

and $K_0^{(i)}$ is an arbitrary integer. In the case: $\begin{cases} \mu_i = 1 & \text{for } i = i_1, i_2, \dots, i_p \\ \mu_i = 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$

the phase factor $A(\vec{\mu}; j)$ is given by

$$A(\vec{\mu}; j) = \sum_{k=1}^p (k-1)L^{(i_k)} + \sum_{k=1}^p (X^{(i_k)}(j+k-1) - X^{(i_k)}(j)),$$

where $X^{(i)}(j) = \sum_{j'=1}^j \ell_{j'}^{(i)}$ with $\ell_{j+M}^{(i)} = \ell_j^{(i)}$.

The proof of this theorem is parallel to that in [TTM]. We give the detail in Appendix B. For $N = 1$ it is the general solution, and we conjecture that it is also so for $M = 1$. Except these cases the above result does not cover the arbitrary initial condition. There is some freedom to employ different ‘phase factor’ $A(\vec{\mu}; j)$ than the above one depending on the way in taking the ultradiscrete limit.

5 Summary

In this paper we have introduced the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton, which is a crystal theoretic formulation of the generalized box-ball systems. In terms of the box-ball systems, it corresponds to the dynamics of M kinds of balls, where the carriers and boxes have arbitrary and inhomogeneous capacities. We have introduced the solitons labeled with the crystals B'_k of $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$. Scattering matrices of two solitons are identified with the combinatorial R matrices of $U'_q(A_{M-1}^{(1)})$ -crystals. Piecewise linear evolution equations are obtained and identified with an ultradiscrete limit of the nonautonomous discrete KP equation. It allowed us to construct a class of N soliton solutions. We have left the studies of phase shifts in the scattering and construction of N soliton solutions corresponding to arbitrary initial conditions for $N \geq 2$ as future problems. The interplay between the ultradiscrete limit of the classical integrable systems and the $q \rightarrow 0$ limit of the quantum integrable systems elucidated in this paper deserves further investigation.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank M. Okado and Y. Yamada for discussions and sending a preprint prior to the publication. Thanks are also due to J. Matsukidaira, A. Nagai, J. Satsuma and D. Takahashi for helpful discussions about soliton solutions.

A Proof of Proposition 3.8

First we show that it suffices to prove Proposition 3.8 for $M = 1$ and $h = k$. Without a loss of generality we may set $M = 2$ and consider the time evolution $T_{\kappa=\infty}$. We find it convenient to adopt the equivalent box-ball system picture explained in Section 2.4. Thus the elements in $B_1^{\otimes \mathcal{L}}$ in (13) will be represented as $\dots 131..2\dots$ for example. It stands for the array of the balls

with the indices 1,3,1 and 2 and . denotes an empty box. (So they do *not* correspond to the letters in the semistandard tableaux in the crystal notation.) We keep the same notation $\hat{\theta}$ to denote the map corresponding to (12) in the box-ball picture. It groups the array of balls and empty boxes locally together into the boxes with capacities $\dots, \theta_n, \theta_{n+1}, \dots$. Then the assertion of Proposition 3.8 is that the scattering

$$\hat{\theta}(\dots \overbrace{2 \cdots 2}^l \dots \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^{k-h} \overbrace{2 \cdots 2}^h \dots) \xrightarrow{(\tilde{T}_2 \tilde{T}_1)^t} \hat{\theta}(\dots \overbrace{2 \cdots 2}^k \dots \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^{k-h} \overbrace{2 \cdots 2}^{l+h-k} \dots) \quad (41)$$

takes place for sufficiently large t . Here \tilde{T}_1, \tilde{T}_2 are the ball-moving operators defined in Section 2.4, and we have used $T_\infty^t = (\tilde{T}_2 \tilde{T}_1)^t$ in view of (10) and the fact that the balls with index ≥ 3 are absent. In (41) the sequences \dots of the empty boxes are sufficiently long since both sides are to represent the asymptotic 2 soliton states in the sense of Section 3.1. Now we make use of the relation $(\tilde{T}_2 \tilde{T}_1)^t = \tilde{T}_2 (\tilde{T}_1 \tilde{T}_2)^{t-1} \tilde{T}_1$. From the definition of the operators \tilde{T}_i 's and the assumption that the 2 solitons are enough separated, (41) is equivalent to

$$\hat{\theta}(\dots \overbrace{2 \cdots 2}^l \dots \overbrace{2 \cdots 2}^h \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^{k-h} \dots) \xrightarrow{(\tilde{T}_1 \tilde{T}_2)^{t-1}} \hat{\theta}(\dots \overbrace{2 \cdots 2}^k \dots \overbrace{2 \cdots 2}^{l+h-k} \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^{k-h} \dots). \quad (42)$$

But this is justified once one establishes

$$\hat{\theta}(\dots \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^l \dots \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^k \dots) \xrightarrow{\tilde{T}_1^{t-1}} \hat{\theta}(\dots \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^k \dots \overbrace{1 \cdots 1}^l \dots), \quad (43)$$

because (42) and (43) correspond to the same canonical system $\hat{\theta}(\dots 12 \cdots l \dots l+1 \cdots l+k \dots)$ in the sense of Section 2.4 with respect to the relevant time evolutions and therefore they possess the parallel time evolution pattern owing to (11). In this way the proof of Proposition 3.8 is reduced to (43), which is equivalent to the case $M = 1$ and $h = k$.

Now setting $L^{(1)} = l$ and $L^{(2)} = k$, we are to show

Proposition A.1. *Set $M = 1$, assume that $\kappa_t \gg L^{(1)}$ ($\forall t$) and $\theta_n < L^{(1)}$ for all but finitely many n 's. Then two solitons with amplitudes $L^{(1)}$ and $L^{(2)}$ ($L^{(1)} > L^{(2)}$) scatter into two solitons with amplitudes $L^{(2)}$ and $L^{(1)}$, respectively.*

Namely, the amplitudes of two solitons do not change after the collision. To prove the proposition, we need several lemmas. The following two lemmas are obvious.

Lemma A.2. For given integers K_1 and K_2 , if there exists an integer n_0 such that

$$K_1 + \sum_{n'}^{n_0} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}] \geq 0 \geq K_2 + \sum_{n'}^{n_0} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}],$$

then, for $n \geq n_0$,

$$K_1 + \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}] \geq K_2 + \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}],$$

and for $n < n_0$

$$0 > K_2 + \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}].$$

Lemma A.3. For given integers K'_1 and K'_2 , if there exists an integer n_0 such that

$$K'_2 + \sum_{n'}^{n_0} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}] \geq 2L^{(2)} > 0 \geq K'_1 + \sum_{n'}^{n_0} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}],$$

then, for $n \geq n_0$,

$$K'_1 + K'_2 + \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}] + \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}] - 2L^{(2)} \geq K'_1 + \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}],$$

and for $n < n_0$,

$$0 > K'_1 + \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}].$$

Now we define an integer $N_0(t)$ for given integers K_2 and t as

$$\begin{aligned} & K_2 - L^{(2)}t + \sum_{n'}^{N_0(t)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}] \\ & \geq 2L^{(2)} \\ & > K_2 - L^{(2)}t + \sum_{n'}^{N_0(t)-1} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}]. \end{aligned}$$

With this $N_0(t)$ we can show

Lemma A.4. For any integers K_1 and K_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} (K_2 - L^{(2)}T + \sum_{n'}^{N_0(T)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}] \\ & - K_1 + L^{(1)}T - \sum_{n'}^{N_0(T)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}]) = +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From the definition of $N_0(t)$, we have

$$-L^{(2)} < -tL^{(2)} + \sum_{n'=N_0(0)+1}^{N_0(t)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}] < L^{(2)}. \quad (44)$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(t) & := -L^{(2)}t + \sum_{n'=N_0(0)+1}^{N_0(t)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}] \\ & - \left(-L^{(1)}t + \sum_{n'=N_0(0)+1}^{N_0(t)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}] \right) \\ & = t(L^{(1)} - L^{(2)}) - \sum_{n'=N_0(0)+1}^{N_0(t)} (\min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}] - \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}]) \\ & \geq t(L^{(1)} - L^{(2)}) - \sum_{n'=N_0(0)+1}^{N_0(t)} (\theta_{n'} - \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}]) \\ & > tL^{(1)} - L^{(2)} - \sum_{n'=N_0(0)+1}^{N_0(t)} \theta_{n'}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

From (44), we obtain an inequality:

$$t > -1 + \frac{1}{L^{(2)}} \sum_{n'=N_0(0)+1}^{N_0(t)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}].$$

Thus, from (45), we find

$$\Delta(t) > -(L^{(1)} + L^{(2)}) + \sum_{n'=N_0(0)+1}^{N_0(t)} \min \left[\frac{L^{(1)} - L^{(2)}}{L^{(2)}} \theta_{n'}, L^{(1)} - \theta_{n'} \right]. \quad (46)$$

Since $L^{(1)} > L^{(2)}$, $L^{(1)} > \theta_n$ for all but finitely many n 's and $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} N_0(t) = +\infty$ which is seen from (44), we find

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \Delta(t) = +\infty. \quad (47)$$

This suffices to prove the lemma. \square

Now we prove Proposition A.1. From (36) we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_n^t &:= u_{n,j=1}^{t+1} \\ &= Y_{n+1,1}^{t+1} - Y_{n+1,2}^{t+1} - Y_{n,1}^{t+1} + Y_{n,2}^{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

Specializing Theorem 4.5 to a two soliton solution with $M = 1$ and $\kappa_t = +\infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n+1,1}^{t+1} &= \max [0, K_1(n, t), K_2(n, t), K_1(n, t) + K_2(n, t) - 2L^{(2)}], \\ Y_{n+1,2}^{t+1} &= \max [0, K_1(n, t) - L^{(1)}, K_2(n, t) - L^{(2)}, K_1(n, t) + K_2(n, t) - L^{(1)} - 3L^{(2)}], \\ K_i(n, t) &= K_i + \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(i)}] - tL^{(i)} \quad (i = 1, 2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $Y_{n,2}^t = Y_{n,1}^{t+1}$ due to the last equation in (31) and the condition $\delta_t = \exp[-\kappa_t/\varepsilon] = 0$. Given $L^{(1)} > L^{(2)}$, there exist integers n_1, n_2, j, r_1, r_2 that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 \ll n_1 + j \ll n_2, \quad 1 \leq r_1 \leq \min(L^{(1)}, \theta_{n_1}), \quad 1 \leq r_2 \leq \min(L^{(2)}, \theta_{n_2}), \\ K_1 + \sum_{n'}^{n_1} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}] > 0 \geq K_2 + \sum_{n'}^{n_1} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}], \\ K_1 - L^{(1)} + \sum_{n'}^{n_1+j} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}] > 0 \geq K_2 - L^{(2)} + \sum_{n'}^{n_1+j} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}], \end{aligned}$$

where K_i ($i = 1, 2$) is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= r_1 - \sum_{n'}^{n_1} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}], \\ K_2 &= r_2 + 2L^{(2)} - \sum_{n'}^{n_2} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}]. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma A.2, we find at $t = 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n+1,1}^1 &= \max [0, K_1(n, 0), K_1(n, 0) + K_2(n, 0) - 2L^{(2)}], \\ Y_{n+1,2}^1 &= \max [0, K_1(n, 0) - L^{(1)}, K_1(n, 0) + K_2(n, 0) - L^{(1)} - 3L^{(2)}]. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Substituting (49) into eq. (48), we obtain

$$u_n^0 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } n < n_1 \\ r_1 & \text{for } n = n_1 \\ \theta_n & \text{for } n_1 < n < n'_1 \\ L^{(1)} - \sum_{n'=n_1+1}^{n'_1-1} \theta_{n'} - r_1 & \text{for } n = n'_1 \\ 0 & \text{for } n'_1 < n < n_2 \\ r_2 & \text{for } n = n_2 \\ \theta_n & \text{for } n_2 < n < n'_2 \\ L^{(2)} - \sum_{n'=n_2+1}^{n'_2-1} \theta_{n'} - r_2 & \text{for } n = n'_2 \\ 0 & \text{for } n'_2 < n, \end{cases} \quad (50)$$

where n'_i ($i = 1, 2$) are defined by $n'_i = n_i + 1$ if $r_i = L^{(i)}$, and otherwise by

$$L^{(i)} - \sum_{n'=n_i+1}^{n'_i} \theta_{n'} - r_i \leq 0 < L^{(i)} - \sum_{n'=n_i+1}^{n'_i-1} \theta_{n'} - r_i.$$

Thus we see that the two soliton solution can correspond to *any* initial configuration in which $L^{(1)}$ soliton is situated left hand side of $L^{(2)}$ soliton with sufficient spacing. Hence, to prove the proposition, we have only to show that the solution u_n^t describes the two soliton state in which $L^{(2)}$ soliton is left hand side of $L^{(1)}$ soliton for $t \gg 1$.

From the definition of $N_0(t)$ and Lemma A.4, there exists T and j such that

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 - L^{(2)}T + \sum_{n'}^{N_0(T)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}] &> 0 \geq K_1 - L^{(1)}T + \sum_{n'}^{N_0(T)} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}], \\ K_2 - L^{(2)}T - L^{(2)} + \sum_{n'}^{N_0(T)+j} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(2)}] &> 0 \geq K_1 - L^{(1)}T - L^{(1)} + \sum_{n'}^{N_0(T)+j} \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(1)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from Lemma A.3, we have at $t = T$ that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{n+1,1}^{T+1} &= \max [0, K_2(n, T), K_1(n, T) + K_2(n, T) - 2L^{(2)}], \\ Y_{n+1,2}^{T+1} &= \max [0, K_2(n, T) - L^{(2)}, K_1(n, T) + K_2(n, T) - L^{(1)} - 3L^{(2)}]. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these into eq. (48), we find that u_n^T describes a configuration in which $L^{(2)}$ soliton locates around $n = N_0(T)$ and $L^{(1)}$ soliton does around $n \gg N_0(T)$. This completes the proof.

B Derivation of N soliton solutions

Here we explain the derivation of the N soliton solution in Theorem 4.5 along the simple cases $N = 1$ and $N = 2$. First we consider one soliton solution. We will show that it has the form:

$$Y_{n,j}^t = \max \left[0, K_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \ell_i - \sum_{t'}^{t-1} \min[\kappa_{t'}, L] + \sum_{n'}^{n-1} \min[\theta_{n'}, L] \right], \quad (51)$$

where L is the amplitude, K_0 is an integer which is related to the phase of the soliton, and ℓ_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, M$) are the non-negative integers which correspond to the number of i th balls in the soliton and $\sum_{i=1}^M \ell_i = L$. We give some details of its derivation, because similar technical difficulties in obtaining multi-soliton solutions are resolved in the same way.

To obtain (51), we take $g(\mathbf{t})$ in (38) as

$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{t}) &= \prod_{\ell=0}^{M-1} (1 + c_\ell(p)\psi(p, \mathbf{t})\psi^*(q_\ell, \mathbf{t})) \\ &= 1 + \psi(p, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p, \mathbf{t}), \\ \phi^*(p, \mathbf{t}) &:= \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} c_\ell(p)\psi^*(q_\ell, \mathbf{t}), \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

where q_ℓ ($\ell = 0, 1, \dots, M-1$) are the roots of the algebraic equation :

$$\frac{x^M(1-x) - p^M(1-p)}{x-p} = 0, \quad (x \neq p) \quad (53)$$

for a given real number p [$(1+M^{-1})^{-1} < p < 1$], and $c_\ell(p)$ ($0 \leq \ell \leq M-1$) are complex coefficients which will be determined later. Since (53) has one real positive root, we assume that q_0 is positive and we put $\eta = q_0/p$. Then p and q_0 satisfy

$$p = \frac{1 - \eta^M}{1 - \eta^{M+1}}, \quad (54)$$

$$1 - p = \eta^M \left(\frac{1 - \eta}{1 - \eta^{M+1}} \right), \quad (55)$$

$$q_0 = \eta \left(\frac{1 - \eta^M}{1 - \eta^{M+1}} \right). \quad (56)$$

The τ -function $\tau(t, n, j)$ is given by vacuum expectation value as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(t, n, j) &= \langle vac | g(\mathbf{t}) | vac \rangle \\
&= 1 + \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} c_\ell(p) \frac{1}{p - q_\ell} \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p} \right)^{j-M-1} \left(\frac{1 - p/(1 + \delta_0)}{1 - q_\ell/(1 + \delta_0)} \right) \left(\frac{1 - q_\ell/(1 + \gamma_0)}{1 - p/(1 + \gamma_0)} \right) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{t'}^{t-1} \left(\frac{1 - p/(1 + \delta_{t'})}{1 - q_\ell/(1 + \delta_{t'})} \right) \prod_{n'}^{n-1} \left(\frac{1 - q_\ell/(1 + \gamma_{n'})}{1 - p/(1 + \gamma_{n'})} \right). \tag{57}
\end{aligned}$$

We introduce a small positive parameter ε and put $\eta = \exp[-L/(M\varepsilon)]$. We also put

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{c}_\ell(p) &:= \frac{c_\ell(p)}{p - q_\ell} \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p} \right)^{-M-1} \left(\frac{1 - p/(1 + \delta_0)}{1 - q_\ell/(1 + \delta_0)} \right) \left(\frac{1 - q_\ell/(1 + \gamma_0)}{1 - p/(1 + \gamma_0)} \right) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{t'=-T_0}^0 (1 - q_\ell/(1 + \delta_{t'})) \prod_{n'=1}^{N_0} (1 - q_\ell/(1 + \gamma_{n'})), \tag{58}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\chi_p(s) := \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} \tilde{c}_\ell(p) \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p} \right)^s \quad (s \in \mathbb{Z}), \tag{59}$$

where $T_0 = T_0(\varepsilon)$ and $N_0 = N_0(\varepsilon)$ are positive integers which satisfy $T_0 \simeq N_0 \simeq 1/\varepsilon$. Hence, $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} T_0 = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} N_0 = +\infty$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_p(s + M) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} \tilde{c}_\ell(p) \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p} \right)^{s+M} \\
&= \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} \tilde{c}_\ell(p) \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p} \right)^s \left(\frac{1 - p}{1 - q_\ell} \right) \\
&= (1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} p^i \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} \tilde{c}_\ell(p) \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p} \right)^{s+i} \\
&= (1 - p) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} p^i \chi_p(s + i),
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\chi_p(s + M) = \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} (1 - p)^{\ell+1} p^{M\ell} \varrho_\ell(i) \right) p^i \chi_p(s + i), \tag{60}$$

where $\varrho_0(i) = 1$, $\varrho_1(i) = i + 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\varrho_\ell(i) &= \sum_{k_1=(\ell-1)M}^{(\ell-1)M+i} \sum_{k_2=(\ell-2)M}^{k_1} \cdots \sum_{k_\ell=0}^{k_{\ell-1}} 1 \\ &= \frac{(i+1)}{\ell!} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell-1} (\ell M + i + j + 1),\end{aligned}$$

for $\ell \geq 2$. Note that $\chi_p(s)$ is a real function when $\chi_p(j)$ ($0 \leq j \leq M-1$) are real. The ratio $\varrho_{\ell+1}(i)/\varrho_\ell(i)$ ($\ell \geq 1, 0 \leq i \leq M-1$) is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\varrho_{\ell+1}(i)}{\varrho_\ell(i)} &= \frac{(\ell+1)(M+1) + i}{\ell+1} \prod_{k=2}^{\ell} \left(1 + \frac{M}{\ell M + i + k}\right) \\ &< (M+1) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\ell}\right)^\ell \\ &< (M+1)e.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, if it holds that $(1-p)p^M < (M+1)^{-1}e^{-1}$, we obtain

$$|\chi_p(s+M)| \leq (1-p) \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \left(1 + (i+1) \frac{(1-p)p^M}{1 - (1-p)p^M(M+1)e}\right) |\chi_p(s+i)|. \quad (61)$$

Thus we find $\chi_p(s+M) \sim \eta^M \sum_{i=0}^{M-1} \chi_p(s+i)$ for sufficiently small η .

We assume the following for $\chi_p(j)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_p(1) &= \chi_0 \\ \chi_p(2) &= N_1 y^{\ell_1} \chi_p(1) \\ \chi_p(3) &= N_2 y^{\ell_2} \chi_p(2) \\ &\dots \\ \chi_p(M) &= N_{M-1} y^{\ell_{M-1}} \chi_p(M-1).\end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Here χ_0 is a positive number which is related to the initial phase of soliton, $y = \exp[-1/\varepsilon]$, ℓ_j and $N_j = N_j(\varepsilon)$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, M-1$) are non-negative integers and positive numbers respectively. They are also supposed to satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_M &:= L - \sum_{j=1}^{M-1} \ell_j \geq 0, \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varepsilon \log N_j(\varepsilon) &= 0, \\ N_j y^{\ell_j} &\leq \varepsilon^{N^*},\end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

for a sufficiently large positive integer N^* . From these conditions, $\tilde{c}_\ell(p)$ ($0 \leq \ell \leq M-1$) are uniquely determined by the equation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} q_0 & q_1 & \cdots & q_{M-1} \\ q_0^2 & q_1^2 & \cdots & q_{M-1}^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_0^M & q_1^M & \cdots & q_{M-1}^M \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{c}_0(p) \\ \tilde{c}_1(p) \\ \vdots \\ \tilde{c}_{M-1}(p) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} p\chi_p(1) \\ p^2\chi_p(2) \\ \vdots \\ p^M\chi_p(M) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (64)$$

Note that the determinant of the $M \times M$ matrix in the left hand side is equal to $\left(\prod_{i=0}^{M-1} q_i\right) \left(\prod_{j>i} (q_j - q_i)\right) \neq 0$. It should be also noted from (61)–(63) that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_p(i) &\geq \varepsilon^{-N^*} \chi_p(i+1) \quad \text{for } \forall i, \\ \chi_p(i) &\geq C \exp[L/\varepsilon] \chi_p(i+M) \quad \text{for } \forall i \text{ and } \exists C > 0. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

From (57), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(t, n, j) &= 1 + \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} \tilde{c}_\ell(p) \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p}\right)^j \prod_{t'=-T_0}^{t-1} \left(1 - \frac{q_\ell}{1 + \delta_{t'}}\right)^{-1} \prod_{t'}^{t-1} \left(1 - \frac{p}{1 + \delta_{t'}}\right) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{n'}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{p}{1 + \gamma_{n'}}\right)^{-1} \prod_{n'=n}^{N_0} \left(1 - \frac{q_\ell}{1 + \gamma_{n'}}\right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Hereafter we restrict ourselves to the region: $|n| \leq N_0$ and $|t| \leq T_0$. Noticing that

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{t'=-T_0}^{t-1} \left(1 - \frac{q_\ell}{1 + \delta_{t'}}\right)^{-1} \prod_{n'=n}^{N_0} \left(1 - \frac{q_\ell}{1 + \gamma_{n'}}\right)^{-1} \\ &= 1 + \left(\sum_{t=-T_0}^{t-1} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \delta_{t'}}\right) + \sum_{n'=n}^{N_0} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \gamma_{n'}}\right)\right) q_\ell + \cdots \\ &=: 1 + a_1 \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p}\right) + a_2 \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p}\right)^2 + a_3 \left(\frac{q_\ell}{p}\right)^3 + \cdots, \end{aligned}$$

we find

$$\tau(t, n, j) = 1 + \prod_{t'}^{t-1} \left(1 - \frac{p}{1 + \delta_{t'}}\right) \prod_{n'}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{p}{1 + \gamma_{n'}}\right)^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \chi_p(j+i), \quad (67)$$

where $a_0 = 1$ and $a_{i+1}/a_i \sim \varepsilon^{-1}$. From (65), we have $0 < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i \chi_p(j+i) < \chi_p(j)$ for sufficiently small ε . Putting $\chi_0 = \exp[K_0/\varepsilon]$ and noticing the

relation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log(1-p) &= -L, \\
\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log \chi_p(j) &= K_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \ell_i, \\
\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log \left(1 - \frac{p}{1 + \gamma_n}\right)^{-1} &= \min[L, \theta_n], \\
\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log \left(1 - \frac{p}{1 + \delta_t}\right) &= -\min[L, \kappa_t],
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log \tau(t, n, j) = \max \left[0, K_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \ell_i - \sum_{t'}^{t-1} \min[\kappa_{t'}, L] + \sum_{n'}^{n-1} \min[\theta_{n'}, L] \right]. \quad (68)$$

Since $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} N_0(\varepsilon) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} T_0(\varepsilon) = +\infty$, we have shown that (51) is a one soliton solution to the $A_M^{(1)}$ automaton.

Next we consider two soliton solutions. From the above arguments about one soliton solution, we see that the field operators $\psi(p)$ and $\phi^*(p)$ are essentially determined by L , ℓ_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, M$) and K_0 . Therefore we denote these operators by

$$\psi(p) = \psi(L : \varepsilon), \quad \phi^*(p) = \phi^*(L; \{\ell_j\}; K_0 : \varepsilon). \quad (69)$$

Then we take

$$g(\mathbf{t}) = (1 + \psi(p_1, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p_1, \mathbf{t}))(1 + \psi(p_2, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p_2, \mathbf{t})), \quad (70)$$

where

$$\psi(p_i) = \psi(L^{(i)} : \varepsilon), \quad \phi^*(p_i) = \phi^*(L^{(i)}; \{\ell_j^{(i)}\}; K_0^{(i)} : \varepsilon) \quad (i = 1, 2). \quad (71)$$

We also assume $L^{(1)} \geq L^{(2)}$ and $\ell_j^{(1)} \geq \ell_j^{(2)}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, M$). As we shall see below, the latter condition turns out to be a natural constraint for soliton solutions. Using the similar notations as above, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(t, n, j) &= \langle vac | (1 + \psi(p_1, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p_1, \mathbf{t}))(1 + \psi(p_2, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p_2, \mathbf{t})) | vac \rangle \\
&= 1 + \langle vac | \psi(p_1, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p_1, \mathbf{t}) | vac \rangle + \langle vac | \psi(p_2, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p_2, \mathbf{t}) | vac \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle vac | \psi(p_1, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p_1, \mathbf{t})\psi(p_2, \mathbf{t})\phi^*(p_2, \mathbf{t}) | vac \rangle. \quad (72)
\end{aligned}$$

The second and third terms are calculated in the same way as above. The fourth term is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle vac | \psi(p_1, \mathbf{t}) \phi^*(p_1, \mathbf{t}) \psi(p_2, \mathbf{t}) \phi^*(p_2, \mathbf{t}) | vac \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\ell_1=0}^{M-1} \sum_{\ell_2=0}^{M-1} \tilde{c}_{\ell_1}(p_1) \tilde{c}_{\ell_2}(p_2) \left(\frac{(p_1 - p_2)(q_{\ell_2}^{(2)} - q_{\ell_1}^{(1)})}{(p_1 - q_{\ell_2}^{(2)})(p_2 - q_{\ell_1}^{(1)})} \right) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{i=1,2} \left(\frac{q_{\ell_i}^{(i)}}{p_i} \right)^j \prod_{t'=-T_0}^{t-1} \left(1 - \frac{q_{\ell_i}^{(i)}}{1 + \delta_{t'}} \right)^{-1} \prod_{t'}^{t-1} \left(1 - \frac{p_i}{1 + \delta_{t'}} \right) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{n'}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{p_i}{1 + \gamma_{n'}} \right)^{-1} \prod_{n'=n}^{N_0} \left(1 - \frac{q_{\ell_i}^{(i)}}{1 + \gamma_{n'}} \right)^{-1} \dots \quad (73)
\end{aligned}$$

We define $\chi_{p_i}(s)$ by

$$\chi_{p_i}(s) := \sum_{\ell=0}^{M-1} \tilde{c}_{\ell}(p_i) \left(\frac{q_{\ell}^{(i)}}{p_i} \right)^s \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad (74)$$

and suppose

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{p_i}(1) &= \chi_0^{(i)} \\
\chi_{p_i}(2) &= N_1^{(i)} y^{\ell_1^{(i)}} \chi_{p_i}(1) \\
\chi_{p_i}(3) &= N_2^{(i)} y^{\ell_2^{(i)}} \chi_{p_i}(2) \\
&\dots \\
\chi_{p_i}(M) &= N_{M-1}^{(i)} y^{\ell_{M-1}^{(i)}} \chi_{p_i}(M-1), \quad (75)
\end{aligned}$$

where positive numbers $N_j^{(i)}$ satisfy the similar inequalities to (63). From the assumption: $\ell_j^{(1)} \geq \ell_j^{(2)}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, M$), it is always possible to choose $N_j^{(i)}$ such that

$$\frac{\chi_{p_2}(j+1)}{\chi_{p_2}(j)} \gg \frac{\chi_{p_1}(j+1)}{\chi_{p_1}(j)}. \quad (76)$$

Then (73) is expanded as

$$\begin{aligned}
(73) &= \frac{(p_1 - p_2)}{p_1 p_2} \prod_{k=1}^2 \prod_{t'}^{t-1} \prod_{n'}^{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{p_k}{1 + \delta_{t'}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{p_k}{1 + \gamma_{n'}} \right)^{-1} \\
&\quad \times \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i'=0}^{\infty} (a_{i,i'} \chi_{p_1}(j+i) \chi_{p_2}(j+1+i') - b_{i,i'} \chi_{p_2}(j+i) \chi_{p_1}(j+1+i')),
\end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients $a_{i,i'}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{p_1 p_2^2}{(p_1 - q_{\ell_2}^{(2)})(p_2 - q_{\ell_1}^{(1)})} \right) \prod_{k=1,2} \prod_{t'=-T_0}^{t-1} \left(1 - \frac{q_{\ell_k}^{(k)}}{1 + \delta_{t'}} \right)^{-1} \prod_{n'=n}^{N_0} \left(1 - \frac{q_{\ell_k}^{(k)}}{1 + \gamma_{n'}} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i'=0}^{\infty} a_{i,i'} \left(\frac{q_{\ell_1}^{(1)}}{p_{\ell_1}} \right)^i \left(\frac{q_{\ell_2}^{(2)}}{p_{\ell_2}} \right)^{i'}, \end{aligned}$$

and $b_{i,i'} = \left(\frac{p_1}{p_2} \right) a_{i',i}$. From (65), we evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} a_{0,0} \chi_{p_1}(j) \chi_{p_2}(j+1) &\gg \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{i'=0 \\ i+i' \neq 0}}^{\infty} a_{i,i'} \chi_{p_1}(j+i) \chi_{p_2}(j+1+i') \\ b_{0,0} \chi_{p_2}(j) \chi_{p_1}(j+1) &\gg \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{i'=0 \\ i+i' \neq 0}}^{\infty} b_{i,i'} \chi_{p_2}(j+i) \chi_{p_1}(j+1+i'). \end{aligned}$$

Then, noticing $a_{0,0} = p_2$, $b_{0,0} = p_1$ and using (76), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow +0} \varepsilon \log \tau(t+1, n+1, j+1) &= \max [0, K^{(1)}(t, n, j), K^{(2)}(t, n, j), \\ &K^{(1)}(t, n, j) + K^{(2)}(t, n, j) - A(j)], \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(i)}(t, n, j) &:= K_0^{(i)} - \sum_{j'=1}^j \ell_{j'}^{(i)} - \sum_{t'}^t \min [\kappa_{t'}, L^{(i)}] \\ &+ \sum_{n'}^n \min [\theta_{n'}, L^{(i)}] \quad (i = 1, 2), \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

$$A(j) := L^{(2)} + \ell_{j+1}^{(2)} \quad (0 \leq j \leq M-1). \quad (79)$$

This gives a two soliton solution. For the scattering where the larger soliton overtakes the smaller one like (I) in Theorem 3.10, the integer $\ell_j^{(1)}$ ($1 \leq j \leq M$) corresponds to the number of j th balls in the larger soliton at $t \rightarrow -\infty$, and $\ell_j^{(2)}$ corresponds to that of the smaller soliton at $t \rightarrow +\infty$. Since the balls in the smaller soliton at $t \rightarrow +\infty$ must be included in the larger soliton at $t \rightarrow -\infty$, the condition $\ell_j^{(1)} \geq \ell_j^{(2)}$ must hold for soliton solutions. Similarly, for the scattering where the smaller soliton overtakes the larger one like (II) in Theorem 3.10, the integer $\ell_j^{(2)}$ ($1 \leq j \leq M$) corresponds to the number of j th balls in the smaller soliton at $t \rightarrow -\infty$, and $\ell_j^{(1)}$ corresponds to that of the larger soliton at $t \rightarrow +\infty$. We should also note that there are

several freedoms to choose the ‘phase’ $A(j)$ in taking the ultradiscrete limit. However we conjecture that the above choice will cover all the canonical systems, hence essentially all the time development patterns for $N = 2$.

The N soliton solution (40) is obtained in the same way. The key in the construction is to evaluate the expansion:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle vac | \psi(p_1) \psi^*(q_1) \psi(p_2) \psi^*(q_2) \cdots \psi(p_r) \psi^*(q_r) | vac \rangle \\
&= \langle vac | \psi(p_1) \psi(p_2) \cdots \psi(p_r) \psi^*(q_r) \psi^*(q_{r-1}) \cdots \psi^*(q_1) | vac \rangle \\
&= \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} (p_i - p_j)(q_j - q_i)}{\prod_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} (p_i - q_j)} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq r} (p_i - p_j)}{\prod_{i=1}^r p_i^r} (q_r^{r-1} q_{r-1}^{r-2} \cdots q_2 + \text{other terms})
\end{aligned}$$

and show that this term gives the phase factor $A(\vec{\mu}; j)$ and the ‘other terms’ do not contribute to the final results. This can be done in the same manner as in the case of two soliton solutions. We take

$$g(\mathbf{t}) = \prod_{i=1}^N (1 + \psi(p_i, \mathbf{t}) \phi^*(p_i, \mathbf{t})), \quad (80)$$

where

$$\psi(p_i) = \psi(L^{(i)} : \varepsilon), \quad \phi^*(p_i) = \phi^*(L^{(i)}; \{\ell_j^{(i)}\}; K_0^{(i)} : \varepsilon) \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, N). \quad (81)$$

We suppose

$$L^{(1)} \geq L^{(2)} \geq \cdots \geq L^{(N)},$$

and

$$\ell_j^{(1)} \geq \ell_j^{(2)} \geq \cdots \geq \ell_j^{(N)}, \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, M).$$

Note that this implies: $p_1 > p_2 > \cdots > p_N$. The latter condition is also a natural constraint for N soliton solutions as in the case of two soliton solutions. Finally we find that the result is given by (40).

References

- [B] R.J. Baxter, *Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics*, Academic Press, London (1982).

- [DJKM] E. Date, M. Jimbo, M. Kashiwara and T. Miwa, *Transformation groups for soliton equations*, Proc. of RIMS Symposium on Non-Linear Integrable Systems-Classical Theory and Quantum Theory, Kyoto, edited by M. Jimbo and T. Miwa (World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore, 1983) p.39.
- [FOY] K. Fukuda, M. Okado and Y. Yamada, *Energy functions in box ball systems*, preprint, math.QA/9908116.
- [F] W. Fulton, *Young tableaux*, Cambridge University Press (1997).
- [HKT] G. Hatayama, A. Kuniba and T. Takagi, *Soliton cellular automata associated with finite crystals*, preprint, solv-int/9907020.
- [HI] K. Hikami and R. Inoue, *Supersymmetric extension of the integrable box-ball system*, preprint.
- [HIK] K. Hikami, R. Inoue and Y. Komori, *Crystallization of the Bogoyavlensky lattice*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 68 (1999) 2234–2240.
- [HT] R. Hirota and S. Tsujimoto, *Conserved quantities of a class of nonlinear difference-difference equations*, J. Phys. Soc. Japan **64** (1995) 3125-3127.
- [KMN1] S-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara, K. C. Misra, T. Miwa, T. Nakashima and A. Nakayashiki, *Affine crystals and vertex models*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **7** (suppl. 1A), (1992) 449-484.
- [KMN2] S-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara, K. C. Misra, T. Miwa, T. Nakashima and A. Nakayashiki, *Perfect crystals of quantum affine Lie algebras*, Duke Math. J. **68** (1992) 499-607.
- [K] M. Kashiwara, *Crystalizing the q -analogue of universal enveloping algebras*, Commun. Math. Phys. **133** (1990) 249–260.
- [KN] M. Kashiwara and T. Nakashima, *Crystal graph for representations of the q -analogue of classical Lie algebras*, J. Alg. **165** (1994) 295-345.
- [MSTTT] J. Matsukidaira, J. Satsuma, D. Takahashi, T. Tokihiro and M. Torii, *Toda-type cellular automaton and its N -soliton solution*, Phys. Lett. A **255** (1997) 287–295.
- [NY] A. Nakayashiki and Y. Yamada, *Kostka polynomials and energy functions in solvable lattice models*, Selecta Mathematica, New Ser. **3** (1997) 547-599.

- [S] M. Sato and Y. Sato, *Soliton Equations as Dynamical Systems on Infinite Dimensional Grassmann Manifold*, Nonlinear PDE in Applied Science. U.S.-Japan Seminar, Tokyo, 1982, Lecture Notes in Num. Appl. Anal. 5 (1982) p.259.
- [T] D. Takahashi, *One some soliton systems defined by using boxes and balls*, Proceedings of the International Symposium on Nonlinear Theory and Its Applications (NOLTA '93), (1993) 555–558.
- [TM] D. Takahashi and J. Matsukidaira, *Box and ball system with a carrier and ultra-discrete modified KdV equation*, J. Phys. A **30** (1997) L733 – L739.
- [TS] D. Takahashi and J. Satsuma, *A soliton cellular automaton*, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **59** (1990) 3514–3519.
- [TTM] T. Tokihiro, D. Takahashi and J. Matsukidaira, *Box and ball system as a realization of ultradiscrete nonautonomous KP equation*, to appear in J. Phys. A.
- [TTMS] T. Tokihiro, D. Takahashi, J. Matsukidaira and J. Satsuma, *From soliton equations to integrable cellular automata through a limiting procedure*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, (1996) 3247–3250.
- [TNS] T. Tokihiro, A. Nagai and J. Satsuma, *Proof of solitonical nature of box and ball systems by means of inverse ultra-discretization*, to appear in Inverse Problems.
- [WTS] R. Willox, T. Tokihiro and J. Satsuma, *Darboux and binary Darboux transformations for the nonautonomous discrete KP equation*, J. Math. Phys. **38** (1997) 6455–6469.