Introduction

THE RANK OF A RANDOM TRIANGULAR MATRIX OVER \mathbb{F}_q

ROGER VAN PESKI

ABSTRACT. We consider uniformly random strictly upper-triangular matrices in $\operatorname{Mat}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$. For such a matrix A_n , we show that $n - \operatorname{rank}(A_n) \approx \log_q n$ as $n \to \infty$, and find that the fluctuations around this limit are finite-order and given by explicit \mathbb{Z} -valued random variables. More generally, we consider the random partition whose parts are the sizes of the nilpotent Jordan blocks of A_n : its k largest parts (rows) were previously shown by Borodin [4, 5] to have jointly Gaussian fluctuations as $N \to \infty$, and its columns correspond to differences $\operatorname{rank}(A_n^{i-1}) - \operatorname{rank}(A_n^i)$. We show the fluctuations of the columns converge jointly to a discrete random point configuration $\mathcal{L}_{t,\chi}$ introduced in [25]. The proofs use an explicit integral formula for the probabilities at finite N, obtained by de-Poissonizing a corresponding one in [25], which is amenable to asymptotic analysis.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	T
2.	Symmetric function background	4
3.	Explicit formulas for the limit and prelimit	10
4.	Asymptotic analysis	16
References		25

1

1. INTRODUCTION

The family of groups G(n,q) of $n \times n$ upper-triangular matrices over \mathbb{F}_q with diagonal entries 1, is a basic yet rich object. Our goal here is to show that elementary asymptotic questions regarding such matrices lead naturally to a probability distribution defined recently in [25], which was found there as a limit law for *p*-adic random matrix products, but remains itself somewhat mysterious.

By now many works in probability have studied Markov chains on G(n,q) and their convergence to the stationary distribution, see for instance Stong [21], Coppersmith-Pak [10], Aris-Castro-Diaconis-Stanley [1], Peres-Sly [20], Ganguly-Martinelli [14], Nestoridi [19]. From the algebraic side, the character theory and conjugacy classes of these groups are 'wild type' and intractable, though various results exist; a nice exposition of these issues and of G(n,q) in general is given in Diaconis-Malliaris [11].

However, the Jordan forms are much simpler than conjugacy classes: all Jordan blocks are unipotent, and hence the Jordan form is parametrized by the multiset of their sizes, which is an integer partition of n. Similarly, elements of the corresponding Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}(n,q)$ of $n \times n$ strictly upper-triangular matrices have only nilpotent Jordan blocks, and the same partition parametrization holds; let us write J(A) for the partition of Jordan block sizes, arranged in decreasing order, as in Figure 1. Concretely, the length of the first row of the partition (i.e. largest Jordan block's size) is the lowest r such that $A^r = 0$, while first column, the number of Jordan blocks, is simply the corank of the matrix. More generally, the length of the i^{th} column is dim ker $(A^i)/\text{ker}(A^{i-1}) = \text{rank}(A^{i-1}) - \text{rank}(A^i)$, so the lengths of the first k columns are

Date: July 30, 2024.



FIGURE 1. The Jordan block sizes J(A) = (108, 45, 23, 12, 7, 3, 1, 1) of a uniformly random $A \in \mathfrak{g}(200, 2)$, generated on Sage.

equivalent information to the coranks of the first k powers of the matrix. For G(n,q) the same interpretation of the Jordan block sizes holds after replacing A by A - I, so in particular the length of the first column is the dimension of the fixed space of A.

Kirillov [16] asked how the Jordan type of a uniformly random element of $\mathfrak{g}(n,q)$ (equivalently, of G(n,q)) is distributed, and how this Jordan type partition 'looks' as $n \to \infty$. There are several ways to interpret this question, and Borodin [4, 5] answered one by finding the limits of the Jordan block sizes, the rows in Figure 1. Specifically, [4] showed that as $n \to \infty$, the size of the i^{th} largest Jordan block grows linearly as $(1-q^{-1})q^{1-i}n$, and the fluctuations of the k largest block sizes are jointly Gaussian. One can already see in Figure 1 that these linear growth rates appear to be different, and indeed this is the case.

The present paper answers the dual version of Kirillov's question, determining the asymptotics of the first k columns of the partition in Figure 1, or equivalently the rank of a large triangular matrix and its first k powers. If one samples such a matrix, the Jordan type will look something like Figure 1, with some long rows and much shorter columns, and indeed the asymptotics of the columns differ dramatically from those of the rows. Rather than growing linearly in n, they grow as $\log_q n$, and furthermore the order of the fluctuations remains bounded as $n \to \infty$. Hence the limit law of the fluctuations lives not on \mathbb{R}^k , but rather on the discrete set of integer signatures

$$\operatorname{Sig}_k := \{ (L_1, \dots, L_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k : L_1 \ge \dots \ge L_k \}.$$

$$(1.1)$$

In fact, there is not one unique limit law, but rather a family of them, and so we need the following notation.

Definition 1. For two Borel measures M_1, M_2 on a set S with discrete σ -algebra, we denote by

$$D_{\infty}(M_1, M_2) := \sup_{x \in S} |M_1(\{x\}) - M_2(\{x\})|$$
(1.2)

the ℓ_{∞} distance between them. When X_1, X_2 are two S-valued random variables with laws M_1, M_2 , we abuse notation and write $D_{\infty}(X_1, X_2) := D_{\infty}(M_1, M_2)$. Note that the set S is implicit in the notation, and we will often use the same notation D_{∞} for different sets S.

The limit object in our main result Theorem 1.1 below is a certain family of distributions $(\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1},\chi}^{(i)})_{i\geq 1}$ on infinite integer tuples, which depend on a positive real parameter χ ; our reason for delaying the definition of $\mathcal{L}_{...}$ is that it requires the notation of Hall-Littlewood symmetric functions. Once this is set up, Definition 11 gives explicit (though quite complicated) formulas for the finite-dimensional distributions of $\mathcal{L}_{...}$.

Though we referred to this family of distributions as the limit object, instead of convergence to a specific member of the family, we have approximation by the appropriate *n*-dependent member of this family with error going to 0 as $n \to \infty$. Below we use notation $\{x\} := x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ for the fractional part of a real number x.

Theorem 1.1. Fix a prime power q and for each $n \ge 1$, let A_n be a uniformly random element of the finite set

$$\mathfrak{g}(n,q) := \{ A = (a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n} \in \operatorname{Mat}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) : a_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for all } i \ge j \}.$$
(1.3)

Then for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} D_{\infty} \left((\operatorname{rank}(A_n^{i-1}) - \operatorname{rank}(A_n^i) - \lfloor \log_q n \rfloor)_{1 \le i \le k}, (\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1}, q^{\{\log_q n\}}}^{(i)})_{1 \le i \le k} \right) = 0,$$
(1.4)

where $\mathcal{L}_{\dots}^{(i)}$ is as defined in Definition 11, and D_{∞} is the metric of Definition 1 on the set Sig_k.

In the simplest case k = 1, which describes corank fluctuations of a large triangular matrix by Theorem 1.1, the distribution of $\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1},\chi}^{(1)}$ is fairly explicit:

$$\Pr(\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1},\chi}^{(1)} = x) = \frac{1}{\prod_{i \ge 1} (1 - q^{-i})} \sum_{m \ge 0} e^{-\chi q^{m-x}} \frac{(-1)^m q^{-\binom{m}{2}}}{\prod_{j=1}^m (1 - q^{-j})} \qquad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{Z}.$$
 (1.5)

Further properties of this random variable and its k > 1 generalizations are discussed in [25, Section 1.2]. One source of our interest in them comes from their appearance in limits of products of random *p*-adic matrices as both the matrix size and number of products are sent to ∞ simultaneously, proven in [25]. Though this is not entirely visible from our proofs, in our view the appearance of the same distribution for triangular matrices over a finite field and matrix products over \mathbb{Z}_p takes its origin in two facts. The first is that the Jordan form of A_n parametrizes the $\mathbb{F}_q[T]$ -module structure on \mathbb{F}_q^n where T acts by A_n , and modules over the ring of integers of a non-archimedean local field have the same structure for such rings as they do for \mathbb{Z}_p and finite extensions thereof [17, Chapter II]. The second is that \mathcal{L}_{\dots} appears—still conjecturally—to be a universal object in this setting, so even though the prelimit probability measures on modules are different in the two settings, this difference between them is irrelevant in the limit.

Remark 1. It is also natural to study Jordan forms of uniformly random matrices from larger sets such as $\operatorname{Mat}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ or $\operatorname{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, and many works do so, see Fulman [13] for a nice survey. In this case, the Jordan block partition associated to a given irreducible polynomial (e.g. the partition of nilpotent Jordan block sizes) does not grow in size as $n \to \infty$, so the asymptotics are quite different from the ones in the present paper or in [4].

The differences between growth of columns in Theorem 4.1 and the growth of rows in [4] mean that entirely different methods are needed for the proof. The approach of [4] is to define a growth process on partitions by successively adding independent random columns (and zero rows, to stay square) to the right and bottom of an $n \times n$ upper-triangular matrix to create an $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrix, as is done in [4]. For such a sequence of matrices $A_n, n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ defined in this way, $J(A_n)$ is a stochastic process on partitions in discrete 'time' n. One can then find explicit transition probabilities for the steps of this growth process (this was already done in [16]), show that the rows in Figure 1 are not affected by one anothers' positions in the limit because the linear growth rates are different, and then apply standard results on random walks. This approach was used for the rows of similar measures on partitions by Bufetov-Petrov [9], Féray-Méliot [12], and the author [22]. However, as Theorem 4.1 shows, the $\log_q n$ growth rates of all columns are the same, and indeed the explicit sampling algorithm given in [5, Theorem 2.3] (stated later as Proposition 3.3) shows that the positions of columns do continue to affect one another as $n \to \infty$. This makes such a hands-on approach untenable, at least as far as we can see.

Instead, we use the fact that this process $J(A_n)$, n = 0, 1, 2, ... is a time-discretization of a so-called Hall-Littlewood process in continuous time, see Section 2 for definitions. This allows one to derive explicit contour integral formulas for its finite-*n* distributions by 'de-Poissonizing' corresponding ones for this Hall-Littlewood process, which we do in Section 3. We note that for random partitions distributed by the Plancherel measure of the symmetric group, which has similar algebraic structure to our measure but quite different asymptotics, this trick of passing between Poissonized and de-Poissonized ensembles was used in the celebrated works of Baik-Deift-Johansson [2, 3] and Borodin-Okounkov-Olshanski [7]. The prelimit formulas we obtain by de-Poissonization are still quite nontrivial to analyze. Luckily, a similar analysis was recently carried out for integral formulas corresponding to the continuous-time Poissonized version in [25]. In Section 4 we carry out the analogous limit in our setting: many parts of the computation can be (and were) copied from [25], but our integrand has extra poles which create technical complications. These issues, and the extra steps needed to treat them, are detailed at the beginning of Section 4.

Acknowledgments. I thank Alexei Borodin for useful discussions and comments on the exposition. This work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC), Grant Agreement No. 101002013.

2. Symmetric function background

This section is mostly a pared-down version of [25, Section 3]. We denote by \mathbb{Y} the set of all integer partitions $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots)$, i.e. sequences of nonnegative integers $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots$ which are eventually 0. We often drop trailing zeroes and write such partitions as *n*-tuples where *n* is large enough. They may also be represented by Ferrers diagrams as in Figure 2.



FIGURE 2. The Young diagram of $\lambda = (5, 2, 2, 1)$ (left), and that of its conjugate partition $\lambda' = (4, 3, 1, 1, 1)$ obtained by flipping the diagram across the diagonal.

We call the integers λ_i the parts of λ , set $\lambda'_i = \#\{j : \lambda_j \ge i\}$, and write $m_i(\lambda) = \#\{j : \lambda_j = i\} = \lambda'_i - \lambda'_{i+1}$. We write $\operatorname{len}(\lambda)$ for the number of nonzero parts, and denote the set of partitions of length $\le n$ by \mathbb{Y}_n . We write $\mu \prec \lambda$ or $\lambda \succ \mu$ if $\lambda_1 \ge \mu_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge \mu_2 \ge \cdots$, and refer to this condition as *interlacing*. A stronger partial order is defined by containment of Ferrers diagrams, which we write as $\mu \subset \lambda$, meaning $\mu_i \le \lambda_i$ for all *i*. Finally, we denote the partition with all parts equal to zero by \emptyset .

We denote by Λ_n the ring $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]^{S_n}$ of symmetric polynomials in n variables x_1, \ldots, x_n . For a symmetric polynomial f, we will often write $f(\mathbf{x})$ for $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ when the number of variables is clear from context. We will also use the shorthand $\mathbf{x}^{\lambda} := x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_n^{\lambda_n}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}_n$. A simple \mathbb{C} -basis for Λ_n is given by the monomial symmetric polynomials $\{m_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) : \lambda \in \mathbb{Y}_n\}$ defined by

$$m_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n / \operatorname{Stab}(\lambda)} \sigma(\mathbf{x}^{\lambda})$$

where σ acts by permuting the variables, and $\operatorname{Stab}(\lambda)$ is the subgroup of permutations such that $\sigma(\mathbf{x}^{\lambda}) = \mathbf{x}^{\lambda}$. It is also a very classical fact that the power sum symmetric polynomials

$$p_k(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^k, k = 1, \dots, n$$

are algebraically independent and algebraically generate Λ_n , and so by defining

$$p_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) := \prod_{i \ge 1} p_{\lambda_i}(\mathbf{x})$$

for $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ with $\lambda_1 \leq n$, we have that $\{p_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) : \lambda_1 \leq n\}$ forms another basis for Λ_n .

Another special basis for Λ_n is given by the *Macdonald polynomials* $P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$, which depend on two additional parameters q and t which may in general be complex numbers, though in probabilistic contexts we take $q, t \in (-1, 1)$. Our first definition of them requires a certain scalar product on Λ_n .

Definition 2 ([17, Chapter VI, (9.10)]). For polynomials $f, g \in \Lambda_n$, define

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{q,t;n}' := \frac{1}{n! (2\pi \mathbf{i})^n} \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} f(z_1, \dots, z_n) \overline{g(z_1, \dots, z_n)} \prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le n} \frac{(z_i z_j^{-1}; q)_\infty}{(t z_i z_j^{-1}; q)_\infty} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{dz_i}{z_i}, \qquad (2.1)$$

where \mathbb{T} denotes the unit circle with usual counterclockwise orientation, and to avoid confusion we clarify that the product is over $\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z} : 1 \leq i, j \leq n, i \neq j\}$.

Definition 3. The Macdonald symmetric polynomials $P_{\lambda}(x_1, \ldots, x_n; q, t), \lambda \in \mathbb{Y}_n$ are defined by the following two properties:

(1) They are 'monic' and upper-triangular with respect to the $m_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$ basis, in the sense that they expand as

$$P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x};q,t) = m_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{\mu \subsetneq \lambda} R_{\lambda\mu}(q,t) m_{\mu}(\mathbf{x}).$$
(2.2)

(2) They are orthogonal with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle'_{a,t;n}$.

These conditions a priori overdetermine the set $\{P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}; q, t) : \lambda \in \mathbb{Y}_n\}$, and it is a theorem which follows from [17, VI (4.7)] that the Macdonald symmetric polynomials do indeed exist. It is then also clear that they form a basis for \mathbb{Y}_n . We note that this paper will only ever consider the two special cases of Macdonald polynomials when either q or t is set to 0, which are called *Hall-Littlewood polynomials* and q-Whittaker polynomials respectively.

Definition 4. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}_n$, the dual Macdonald polynomial Q_{λ} is given by

$$Q_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t) := b_{\lambda}(q, t) P_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t)$$
(2.3)

where b_{λ} is an explicit constant given in [17, p339, (6.19)]

The constant multiples $b_{\lambda}(q,t)$ are chosen so that the $Q_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x};q,t)$ form a dual basis to the $P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x};q,t)$ with respect to a different scalar product which is related to (a renormalized version of) $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle'_{q,t;n}$ in the $n \to \infty$ limit, see [17, Chapter VI, (9.9)]. Because the P_{λ} form a basis for the vector space of symmetric polynomials in n variables, there exist symmetric polynomials $P_{\lambda/\mu}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-k}; q, t) \in \Lambda_{n-k}$ indexed by $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}_{n+k}, \mu \in \mathbb{Y}_n$ which are defined by

$$P_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_{n+k}; q, t) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Y}_n} P_{\lambda/\mu}(x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+k}; q, t) P_{\mu}(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t).$$
(2.4)

It follows easily from (2.4) that for any $1 \le d \le k - 1$,

$$P_{\lambda/\mu}(x_1, \dots, x_k; q, t) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Y}_d} P_{\lambda/\nu}(x_{d+1}, \dots, x_k; q, t) P_{\nu/\mu}(x_1, \dots, x_d; q, t).$$
(2.5)

We define $Q_{\lambda/\mu}$ by (2.4) with Q in place of P, and it is similarly clear that (2.5) holds for Q. An important property of (skew) Macdonald polynomials for probabilistic purposes is the *Cauchy identity* below.

Proposition 2.1. Let $\nu, \mu \in \mathbb{Y}$. Then

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \mathbb{Y}} P_{\kappa/\nu}(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t) Q_{\kappa/\mu}(y_1, \dots, y_m; q, t)$$

$$= \prod_{\substack{1 \le i \le n \\ 1 \le j \le m}} \frac{(tx_i y_j; q)_\infty}{(x_i y_j; q)_\infty} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}} Q_{\nu/\lambda}(y_1, \dots, y_m; q, t) P_{\mu/\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t). \quad (2.6)$$

ROGER VAN PESKI

The above identity should be interpreted as an identity of formal power series in the variables, after expanding the $1/(1 - q^{\ell}x_iy_j)$ factors as geometric series. It may be seen as partial motivation for the definition of the Q polynomials earlier: the constant factors there are the ones needed for such an identity to hold. For later convenience we set

$$\Pi_{q,t}(\mathbf{x};\mathbf{y}) := \prod_{\substack{1 \le i \le n \\ 1 \le j \le m}} \frac{(tx_i y_j; q)_{\infty}}{(x_i y_j; q)_{\infty}} = \exp\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - t^{\ell}}{1 - q^{\ell}} \frac{1}{\ell} p_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\ell}(\mathbf{y})\right),$$
(2.7)

where the second equality in (2.7) is not immediate but is shown in [17].

The skew Macdonald polynomials may also be made explicit, which is needed for later computations.

Definition 5. For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{Y}$, let $f(u) := (tu; q)_{\infty}/(qu; q)_{\infty}$ and define

$$\psi_{\lambda/\mu}(q,t) := \mathbb{1}[\mu \prec \lambda] \prod_{1 \le i \le j \le \text{len}(\lambda)} \frac{f(t^{j-i}q^{\mu_i - \mu_j})f(t^{j-i}q^{\lambda_i - \lambda_{j+1}})}{f(t^{j-i}q^{\lambda_i - \mu_j})f(t^{j-i}q^{\mu_i - \lambda_{j+1}})}$$
(2.8)

and

$$\varphi_{\lambda/\mu}(q,t) := \mathbb{1}[\mu \prec \lambda] \prod_{1 \le i \le j \le \operatorname{len}(\mu)} \frac{f(t^{j-i}q^{\lambda_i - \lambda_j})f(t^{j-i}q^{\mu_i - \mu_{j+1}})}{f(t^{j-i}q^{\lambda_i - \mu_j})f(t^{j-i}q^{\mu_i - \lambda_{j+1}})}.$$
(2.9)

When q and t are clear from context we will often write $\psi_{\lambda/\mu}$ and $\varphi_{\lambda/\mu}$ without arguments.

Proposition 2.2 ([17, VI.7, (7.13) and (7.13')]). For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}_n, \mu \in \mathbb{Y}_{n-k}$, we have

$$P_{\lambda/\mu}(x_1, \dots, x_k; q, t) = \sum_{\mu = \lambda^{(0)} \prec \lambda^{(1)} \prec \dots \prec \lambda^{(k)} = \lambda} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i^{|\lambda^{(i+1)}| - |\lambda^{(i)}|} \psi_{\lambda^{(i+1)}/\lambda^{(i)}}$$
(2.10)

and

$$Q_{\lambda/\mu}(x_1,\ldots,x_k;q,t) = \sum_{\mu=\lambda^{(0)}\prec\lambda^{(1)}\prec\cdots\prec\lambda^{(k)}=\lambda} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i^{|\lambda^{(i+1)}|-|\lambda^{(i)}|} \varphi_{\lambda^{(i+1)}/\lambda^{(i)}}.$$
 (2.11)

The explicit forms of the Hall-Littlewood and q-Whittaker special cases of the formulas in Definition 5 will be useful, and are easy to establish by direct computation from Definition 5.

Lemma 2.3. Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{Y}$ with $\mu \prec \lambda$. In the Hall-Littlewood case q = 0 the formulas of Definition 5 specialize to

$$\psi_{\lambda/\mu}(0,t) = \prod_{\substack{i>0\\m_i(\mu)=m_i(\lambda)+1}} (1-t^{m_i(\mu)})$$

$$\varphi_{\lambda/\mu}(0,t) = \prod_{\substack{i>0\\m_i(\lambda)=m_i(\mu)+1}} (1-t^{m_i(\lambda)}).$$

(2.12)

In the q-Whittaker case t = 0 they specialize to

$$\psi_{\lambda/\mu}(q,0) = \prod_{i=1}^{\operatorname{len}(\mu)} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} \\ \lambda_i - \mu_i \end{bmatrix}_q$$

$$\varphi_{\lambda/\mu}(q,0) = \frac{1}{(q;q)_{\lambda_1 - \mu_1}} \prod_{i=1}^{\operatorname{len}(\lambda) - 1} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_i - \mu_{i+1} \\ \mu_i - \lambda_{i+1} \end{bmatrix}_q.$$
(2.13)

For pairs μ, λ with $\mu \not\prec \lambda$, all of the above are 0.

We will require two, in a sense orthogonal, extensions of Macdonald polynomials: symmetric Laurent polynomials in finitely many variables, and symmetric functions—informally, symmetric polynomials in infinitely many variables.

2.1. Symmetric Laurent polynomials. We wish to extend the indices of Macdonald polynomials in n variables from the set \mathbb{Y}_n of partitions of length at most n to the set Sig_n of signatures of length n, where we recall $\operatorname{Sig}_n := \{(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n : x_1 \geq \ldots \geq x_n\}$. Recall that for signatures $\mu \in \operatorname{Sig}_{k-1}, \lambda \in \operatorname{Sig}_k$ we write

$$\mu \prec \lambda \iff \lambda_1 \ge \mu_1 \ge \lambda_2 \ge \ldots \ge \mu_{k-1} \ge \lambda_k,$$

 $|\mu| = \sum_{i} \mu_{i}$, and $\mu - (d[k-1]) = (\mu_{1} - d, \dots, \mu_{k-1} - d)$.

Lemma 2.4. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}_n, \mu \in \mathbb{Y}_{n-k}$, and $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then

$$P_{(\lambda+(d[n]))/(\mu+(d[n-k]))}(x_1,\ldots,x_k;q,t) = (x_1\cdots x_k)^d P_{\lambda/\mu}(x_1,\ldots,x_k;q,t).$$
(2.14)

Proof. The claim follows from (2.10) together with the observation from the explicit formula (2.8) that for $\lambda^{(i)}$ as in (2.10),

$$\psi_{\lambda^{(i+1)}/\lambda^{(i)}}(q,t) = \psi_{(\lambda^{(i+1)} + (d[n-k+i+1]))/(\lambda^{(i)} + (d[n-k+i]))}.$$
(2.15)

This motivates the following.

Definition 6. For any $\lambda \in \text{Sig}_n, \nu \in \text{Sig}_{n-1}$ we define

$$\psi_{\lambda/\nu}(q,t) := \mathbb{1}[\nu \prec \lambda] \prod_{1 \le i \le j \le n-1} \frac{f(t^{j-i}q^{\nu_i - \nu_j})f(t^{j-i}q^{\lambda_i - \lambda_{j+1}})}{f(t^{j-i}q^{\lambda_i - \nu_j})f(t^{j-i}q^{\nu_i - \lambda_{j+1}})}$$
(2.16)

and for $\lambda \in \operatorname{Sig}_n, \mu \in \operatorname{Sig}_{n-k}$ define

$$P_{\lambda/\mu}(x_1, \dots, x_k; q, t) := \sum_{\mu = \lambda^{(0)} \prec \lambda^{(1)} \prec \dots \prec \lambda^{(k)} = \lambda} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} x_i^{|\lambda^{(i+1)}| - |\lambda^{(i)}|} \psi_{\lambda^{(i+1)}/\lambda^{(i)}}.$$
 (2.17)

Corollary 2.5. Let $\lambda \in \text{Sig}_n, \mu \in \text{Sig}_{n-k}$, and $d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$P_{(\lambda+(d[n]))/(\mu+(d[n-k]))}(x_1,\ldots,x_k;q,t) = (x_1\cdots x_k)^d P_{\lambda/\mu}(x_1,\ldots,x_k;q,t).$$
(2.18)

Proof. Same as Lemma 2.4.

Remark 2. We have not stated Lemma 2.4 and Definition 6 for the dual Macdonald polynomials, for the simple reasons that (1) the naive versions do not hold, and (2) we do not need this for our proofs. In fact, $\varphi_{\lambda/\nu}(q,t)$ and the skew polynomials $Q_{\lambda/\mu}(\mathbf{x};q,t)$ must be reinterpreted in a more nontrivial way in order to make such statements true, see [22, Section 2.1].

Remark 3. Note that for $\lambda \in \text{Sig}_n, \mu \in \text{Sig}_{n-1}$ the formula for $\psi_{\lambda/\mu}(q, 0)$ in Lemma 2.3 continues to makes sense, while for the Hall-Littlewood case one should instead interpret

$$\psi_{\lambda/\mu}(0,t) = \prod_{m_i(\mu)=m_i(\lambda)+1} (1 - t^{m_i(\mu)})$$
(2.19)

(without the i > 0 restriction in the product) in order for the translation-invariance property (2.15) to hold. If $\lambda \in \text{Sig}_n^+$ (and hence $\mu \in \text{Sig}_{n-1}^+$ by interlacing) then both (2.12) and (2.19) give the same result.

The defining orthogonality property of Macdonald polynomials also extends readily to their Laurent versions.

Proposition 2.6. If $\lambda, \mu \in \text{Sig}_n$ and $\lambda \neq \mu$, then

$$\langle P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{z};q,t), P_{\mu}(\mathbf{z};q,t) \rangle_{q,t;n}' = 0.$$
(2.20)

Proof. Let $D \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $\lambda + (D[n])$ and $\mu + (D[n])$ both lie in Sig⁺_n. Then

$$\left\langle P_{\lambda+(D[n])}(\mathbf{z};q,t), P_{\mu+(D[n])}(\mathbf{z};q,t) \right\rangle_{q,t;n}^{\prime} = 0$$
(2.21)

by the defining orthogonality property of Macdonald polynomials. However,

$$P_{\lambda+(D[n])}(\mathbf{z};q,t)\overline{P_{\mu+(D[n])}(\mathbf{z})} = (z_1 \cdots z_n)^D P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{z};q,t)\overline{(z_1 \cdots z_n)^D P_{\mu}(\mathbf{z};q,t)}$$
$$= P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{z};q,t)\overline{P_{\mu}(\mathbf{z};q,t)}$$
(2.22)

for any $z_1, \ldots, z_n \in \mathbb{T}$, so

$$\left\langle P_{\lambda+(D[n])}(\mathbf{z};q,t), P_{\mu+(D[n])}(\mathbf{z};q,t) \right\rangle_{q,t;n}' = \left\langle P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{z};q,t), P_{\mu}(\mathbf{z};q,t) \right\rangle_{q,t;n}',$$
(2.23)

which completes the proof.

2.2. Symmetric functions. It is often convenient to consider symmetric polynomials in an arbitrarily large or infinite number of variables, which we formalize as follows, heavily borrowing from the introductory material in [24]. One has a chain of maps

$$\cdots \to \Lambda_{n+1} \to \Lambda_n \to \Lambda_{n-1} \to \cdots \to 0$$

where the map $\Lambda_{n+1} \to \Lambda_n$ is given by setting x_{n+1} to 0. In fact, writing $\Lambda_n^{(d)}$ for symmetric polynomials in n variables of total degree d, one has

$$\cdots \to \Lambda_{n+1}^{(d)} \to \Lambda_n^{(d)} \to \Lambda_{n-1}^{(d)} \to \cdots \to 0$$

with the same maps. The inverse limit $\Lambda^{(d)}$ of these systems may be viewed as symmetric polynomials of degree d in infinitely many variables. From the ring structure on each Λ_n one gets a natural ring structure on $\Lambda := \bigoplus_{d\geq 0} \Lambda^{(d)}$, and we call this the ring of symmetric functions. Because $p_k(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto p_k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and $m_\lambda(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \mapsto m_\lambda(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ (for $n \geq \text{len}(\lambda)$) under the natural map $\Lambda_{n+1} \to \Lambda_n$, these families of symmetric polynomials define symmetric functions $p_k, m_\lambda \in \Lambda$. An equivalent definition of Λ is $\Lambda := \mathbb{C}[p_1, p_2, \ldots]$ where p_i are indeterminates; under the natural map $\Lambda \to \Lambda_n$ one has $p_i \mapsto p_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

The Macdonald polynomials satisfy a consistency property

$$P_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n, 0; q, t) = P_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t)$$

$$(2.24)$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$ (and similarly for the dual and skew polynomials). Hence here exist *Macdonald* symmetric functions, denoted P_{λ}, Q_{λ} as well, such that $P_{\lambda} \mapsto P_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$ under the natural map $\Lambda \to \Lambda_n$. Macdonald symmetric functions satisfy the skew Cauchy identity

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \mathbb{Y}} P_{\kappa/\nu}(\mathbf{x}; q, t) Q_{\kappa/\mu}(\mathbf{y}; q, t)$$
$$= \exp\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - t^{\ell}}{1 - q^{\ell}} \frac{1}{\ell} p_{\ell}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\ell}(\mathbf{y})\right) \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}} Q_{\nu/\lambda}(\mathbf{y}; q, t) P_{\mu/\lambda}(\mathbf{x}; q, t). \quad (2.25)$$

Here $P_{\kappa/\nu}(\mathbf{x}; q, t)$ is an element of Λ , a polynomial in $p_1(\mathbf{x}), p_2(\mathbf{x}), \ldots \in \Lambda$, and summands such as $P_{\kappa/\nu}(\mathbf{x}; q, t)Q_{\kappa/\mu}(\mathbf{y}; q, t)$ are interpreted as elements of a ring $\Lambda \otimes \Lambda$ and both sides interpreted as elements of a completion thereof.

To get a probability measure on \mathbb{Y} from the skew Cauchy identity, we would like homomorphisms $\phi : \Lambda \to \mathbb{C}$ which take P_{λ} and Q_{λ} to $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ —here we recall that we take $q, t \in (-1, 1)$. Simply plugging in nonnegative real numbers for the variables in (2.6) works, but does not yield all of them. However, a full classification of such homomorphisms, called *Macdonald nonnegative specializations* of Λ , was conjectured by Kerov [15] and proven by Matveev [18]. We describe them now: they are associated to triples of $\{\alpha_n\}_{n\geq 1}, \{\beta_n\}_{n\geq 1}, \tau$ (the Plancherel parameter) such that $\tau \geq 0, 0 \leq \alpha_n, \beta_n$ for all $n \geq 1$, and $\sum_n \alpha_n, \sum_n \beta_n < \infty$. These are typically called usual (or alpha) parameters, dual (or beta) parameters, and the Plancherel parameter¹ respectively. Given such a triple, the corresponding specialization is defined by

$$p_{1} \mapsto \sum_{n \ge 1} \alpha_{n} + \frac{1-q}{1-t} \left(\tau + \sum_{n \ge 1} \beta_{n} \right)$$

$$p_{k} \mapsto \sum_{n \ge 1} \alpha_{n}^{k} + (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1-q^{k}}{1-t^{k}} \sum_{n \ge 1} \beta_{n}^{k} \quad \text{for all } k \ge 2.$$

$$(2.26)$$

Note that the above formula defines a specialization for arbitrary tuples of reals α_n, β_n and τ satisfying convergence conditions, but it will not in general be nonnegative.

Definition 7. For the specialization θ defined by the triple $\{\alpha_n\}_{n\geq 1}, \{\beta_n\}_{n\geq 1}, \tau$, we write

$$P_{\lambda}(\alpha(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots), \beta(\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots), \gamma(\tau); q, t) := P_{\lambda}(\theta; q, t) := \theta(P_{\lambda})$$
(2.27)

and similarly for skew and dual Macdonald polynomials. Likewise, for any other specialization ϕ defined by parameters $\{\alpha'_n\}_{n\geq 1}, \{\beta'_n\}_{n\geq 1}, \tau'$, we let

$$\Pi_{q,t}(\alpha(\alpha_1,\ldots),\beta(\beta_1,\ldots),\gamma(\tau);\alpha(\alpha'_1,\ldots),\beta(\beta'_1,\ldots),\gamma(\tau')) := \Pi_{q,t}(\theta;\phi)$$
$$:= \exp\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{1-t^{\ell}}{1-q^{\ell}} \frac{1}{\ell} \theta(p_{\ell})\phi(p_{\ell})\right).$$
(2.28)

We will omit the $\alpha(\dots)$ in notation if all alpha parameters are zero for the given specialization, and similarly for β and γ .

We refer to a specialization as

- pure alpha if τ and all $\beta_n, n \ge 1$ are 0.
- pure beta if τ and all $\alpha_n, n \ge 1$ are 0.
- Plancherel if all $\alpha_n, \beta_n, n \ge 1$ are 0.

In our specific case, it is useful to define the Plancherel specialization for a general complex parameter as well, though this is *not* a Macdonald-nonnegative specialization.

Definition 8. For any $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$, not necessarily nonnegative real, the corresponding Plancherel specialization of Λ is given by

$$p_1 \mapsto \frac{1-q}{1-t}\tau$$

$$p_k \mapsto 0 \quad \text{for all } k \ge 2.$$

$$(2.29)$$

We write $\gamma(\tau)$ in the argument of symmetric functions for this specialization, as in Definition 7.

On Macdonald polynomials, the pure specializations act as follows.

Proposition 2.7. Let $\lambda, \mu \in Y$ and $c_1, \ldots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Then

$$P_{\lambda}(\alpha(c_{1},...,c_{n});q,t) = P_{\lambda}(c_{1},...,c_{n};q,t)$$

$$Q_{\lambda}(\alpha(c_{1},...,c_{n});q,t) = Q_{\lambda}(c_{1},...,c_{n};q,t)$$

$$P_{\lambda}(\beta(c_{1},...,c_{n});q,t) = Q_{\lambda'}(c_{1},...,c_{n};t,q)$$

$$Q_{\lambda}(\beta(c_{1},...,c_{n});q,t) = P_{\lambda'}(c_{1},...,c_{n};t,q),$$
(2.30)

¹The terminology 'Plancherel' comes from the fact that in the case q = t where the Macdonald polynomials reduce to Schur polynomials, the Plancherel specialization is related to (the poissonization of) the Plancherel measure on irreducible representations of the symmetric group S_N , see [8].

where in each case the left hand side is a specialized Macdonald symmetric function while the right hand side is a Macdonald polynomial with real numbers plugged in for the variables. Furthermore,

$$P_{\lambda}(\gamma(\tau);q,t) = \lim_{D \to \infty} P_{\lambda}\left(\tau \cdot \frac{1-q}{1-t}\frac{1}{D}[D];q,t\right)$$
(2.31)

and similarly for Q.

The alpha case of (2.30), and (2.31), are straightforward from (2.26). The β case follows from properties of a certain involution on Λ , see [17, Chapter VI], and explains the terminology 'dual parameter'.

We note that for any nonnegative specializations θ, ϕ with

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}} P_{\lambda}(\theta; q, t) Q_{\lambda}(\phi; q, t) < \infty,$$
(2.32)

the specialized Cauchy identity

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \mathbb{Y}} P_{\kappa/\nu}(\theta;q,t) Q_{\kappa/\mu}(\phi;q,t) = \Pi_{q,t}(\theta;\psi) \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}} Q_{\nu/\lambda}(\phi;q,t) P_{\mu/\lambda}(\theta;q,t).$$
(2.33)

holds by applying $\theta \otimes \phi$ to (2.25). Similarly, we have the branching rule for specializations: for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{Y}$,

$$P_{\lambda/\mu}(\phi, \phi'; q, t) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{Y}: \mu \subset \nu \subset \lambda} P_{\lambda/\nu}(\phi; q, t) P_{\nu/\mu}(\phi'; q, t),$$
(2.34)

see e.g. [6, (2.24)]. Here by $P_{\lambda/\mu}(\phi, \phi'; q, t)$ we simply mean $\phi(P_{\lambda/\mu}) + \phi'(P_{\lambda/\mu})$.

2.3. Macdonald processes. One obtains probability measures on sequences of partitions using (2.33) as follows.

Definition 9. Let θ and ϕ_1, \ldots, ϕ_k be Macdonald-nonnegative specializations such that each pair θ, ϕ_i satisfies (2.32). The associated *ascending Macdonald process* is the probability measure on sequences $\lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \lambda^{(k)}$ given by

$$\Pr(\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(k)}) = \frac{Q_{\lambda^{(1)}}(\phi_1; q, t) Q_{\lambda^{(2)}/\lambda^{(1)}}(\phi_2; q, t) \cdots Q_{\lambda^{(k)}/\lambda^{(k-1)}}(\phi_k; q, t) P_{\lambda^{(k)}}(\theta; q, t)}{\prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{q,t} (\phi_i; \theta)}.$$

The k = 1 case of Definition 9 is a measure on partitions, referred to as a *Macdonald measure*. Instead of defining joint distributions all at once as above, one can define Markov transition kernels on \mathbb{Y} .

Definition 10. Let θ, ϕ be Macdonald nonnegative specializations satisfying (2.32) and λ be such that $P_{\lambda}(\theta) \neq 0$. The associated *Cauchy Markov kernel* is defined by

$$\Pr(\lambda \to \nu) = Q_{\nu/\lambda}(\phi) \frac{P_{\nu}(\theta)}{P_{\lambda}(\theta) \Pi(\phi; \theta)}.$$
(2.35)

It is clear that the ascending Macdonald process above is nothing more than the joint distribution of k steps of a Cauchy Markov kernel with specializations ϕ_i , θ at the i^{th} step, and initial condition \emptyset . In this work we will only refer to the q = 0 case, where the Macdonald polynomials are Hall-Littlewood polynomials and the corresponding measure (resp. process) is called a Hall-Littlewood measure (resp. process).

3. Explicit formulas for the limit and prelimit

In this section we collect the algebraic parts of the proof of Theorem 4.1. We explicitly define the limiting random variables $\mathcal{L}_{k,t,\chi}$ below, relate Jordan normal forms of upper-triangular matrices to the Hall-Littlewood process $\lambda(\tau)$ of Definition 12 in Corollary 3.4, and give the exact formula for the prelimit probabilities we consider in Lemma 3.6.

3.1. The limiting random variable. Similarly to before, we define $\operatorname{Sig}_{\infty} := \{(\lambda_i)_{i \geq 1} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\infty} : \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \ldots\}.$

Definition 11. For any $t \in (0,1), \chi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we define the $\operatorname{Sig}_{\infty}$ -valued random variable $\mathcal{L}_{t,\chi} = (\mathcal{L}_{t,\chi}^{(i)})_{i\geq 1}$ by specifying its finite-dimensional distributions $\mathcal{L}_{k,t,\chi} := (\mathcal{L}^{(i)})_{1\leq i\leq k}$ through the formula

$$\Pr(\mathcal{L}_{k,t,\chi} = (L_1, \dots, L_k)) = \frac{1}{(t;t)_{\infty}} \sum_{d \le L_k} e^{-\chi t^d} \frac{t^{\sum_{i=1}^k {L_i^{-d}}}}{(t;t)_{L_k-d} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (t;t)_{L_i-L_{i+1}}} \\ \times \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \operatorname{Sig}_{k-1} \\ \mu \prec L}} (-1)^{|L|-|\mu|-d} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \begin{bmatrix} L_i - L_{i+1} \\ L_i - \mu_i \end{bmatrix}_t Q_{(\mu - (d[k-1]))'}(\gamma((1-t)t^d\chi), \alpha(1); 0, t)), \quad (3.1)$$

valid for any $(L_1, \ldots, L_k) \in \operatorname{Sig}_k$.

It is not obvious that the formulas define valid Sig_k -valued random variables which are consistent for different k, but this is shown in [25, Theorem 6.1]. The following alternative form will be useful for showing convergence to $\mathcal{L}_{k,t,\chi}$:

Proposition 3.1. The probability weights of \mathcal{L} have the contour integral expression

$$\Pr(\mathcal{L}_{k,t,\chi} = (L_1, \dots, L_k)) = \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi\mathbf{i})^k} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{t^{\binom{L_i - L_k}{2}}}{(t;t)_{L_i - L_{i+1}}} \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}^k} e^{\chi t^{L_k}(w_1 + \dots + w_k)} \frac{\prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le k} (w_i/w_j;t)_{\infty}}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-w_i^{-1};t)_{\infty} (-tw_i;t)_{\infty}} \times \sum_{j=0}^{L_{k-1} - L_k} t^{\binom{j+1}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1} - L_k \\ j \end{bmatrix}_t P_{(L_1 - L_k, \dots, L_{k-1} - L_k, j)}(w_1^{-1}, \dots, w_k^{-1};t, 0) \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{dw_i}{w_i}$$
(3.2)

for $k \geq 2$ and

$$\Pr(\mathcal{L}_{1,t,\chi} = (L)) = \frac{1}{2\pi \mathbf{i}} \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}} \frac{e^{\chi w}}{(-w;t)_{\infty}} dw, \qquad (3.3)$$

with contour

$$\tilde{\Gamma} := \{x + \mathbf{i} : x \le 0\} \cup \{x - \mathbf{i} : x \le 0\} \cup \{x + \mathbf{i}y : x^2 + y^2 = 1, x > 0\}$$
(3.4)

in usual counterclockwise orientation, see Figure 3.

Proof. Shown in [25, Theorem 6.1].

Remark 4. The k = 1 formula above appears different, but may be obtained by formally setting k = 1 and $L_{k-1} - L_k = \infty$ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \infty \\ j \end{bmatrix}_t := \frac{1}{(t;t)_j} \tag{3.5}$$

in the general form and applying the q-binomial formula.

3.2. Exact formula for the prelimit probability. Our analysis proceeds using a specific Hall-Littlewood process related to Jordan forms of triangular matrices, which we now give a name.

Definition 12. We denote by $\lambda(\tau), \tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ the stochastic process on \mathbb{Y} in continuous time τ with finite-dimensional marginals given by the Hall-Littlewood process

$$\Pr(\lambda(\tau_i) = \lambda(i) \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, k) = \frac{\left(\prod_{j=1}^k Q_{\lambda(j)/\lambda(j-1)}(\gamma(\tau_j - \tau_{j-1}); 0, t)\right) P_{\lambda(k)}(1, t, \dots; 0, t)}{\exp\left(\frac{\tau_k}{1 - t}\right)}$$
(3.6)



FIGURE 3. The contour $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in \mathbb{C} .

for each sequence of times $0 \le \tau_1 \le \tau_2 \le \cdots \le \tau_k$ and $\lambda(1), \ldots, \lambda(k) \in \mathbb{Y}$, where in the product we take the convention $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\lambda(0) = \emptyset$ is the zero partition.

Remark 5. For a fixed $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$, we write expectations and probabilities of $\lambda(\tau)$ to mean with respect to the complex-valued Hall-Littlewood measure defined using the complex Plancherel specialization of Definition 8, e.g. we use

$$\Pr((\lambda_1'(\tau),\ldots,\lambda_k'(\tau)) = \eta) := \frac{1}{\prod_{0,t}(1,t,\ldots;\gamma(\tau))} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}:\\ (\lambda_1',\ldots,\lambda_k') = \eta}} P_\lambda(1,t,\ldots;0,t) Q_\lambda(\gamma(\tau);0,t),$$
(3.7)

which will in general not be a nonnegative real number, in Proposition 3.5.

We then define the stopping times needed to turn it into a discrete-time process.

Definition 13. Define stopping times

$$\sigma_n := \inf\{\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{\ge 0} : |\lambda(\tau)| = n\}$$
(3.8)

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Now $\lambda(\sigma_n), n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ is a stochastic process on \mathbb{Y} in discrete time n. To compare with random matrices, we require explicit formulas for its transition probabilities.

Proposition 3.2. For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{Y}$,

$$\Pr(\lambda(\sigma_{n+1}) = \nu | \lambda(\sigma_n) = \mu) = \begin{cases} t^{\ell-1} (1 - t^{m_{\mu_\ell}(\mu)}) & \exists \ell \ge 1 \text{ such that } \nu_i = \mu_i + \mathbb{1}[i = \ell] \text{ for all } i \ge 1 \\ 0 & else \end{cases}$$

$$(3.9)$$

Proof. By $[23]^2$, $\lambda(\tau)$ has Markov generator

$$B(\mu,\nu) := \frac{d}{d\tau} \Big|_{\tau=0} \Pr(\lambda(T+\tau) = \nu | \lambda(T) = \mu)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \frac{-1}{1-t} & \mu = \nu \\ \frac{t^{\ell-1}(1-t^{m_{\mu_{\ell}}(\mu)})}{1-t} & \exists \ell \ge 1 \text{ such that } \nu_{i} = \mu_{i} + \mathbb{1}[i = \ell] \text{ for all } i \ge 1 \end{cases}$$
(3.10)
$$(3.10)$$

²Specifically, (3.3), (3.4), and (3.6) in the proof of Proposition 3.4, where one must take the parameter n in Proposition 3.4 to be ∞ .

Since

$$\Pr(\lambda(\sigma_{n+1}) = \nu | \lambda(\sigma_n) = \mu) = \frac{B(\mu, \nu)}{-B(\mu, \mu)},$$
(3.11)

the result follows by (3.10).

In the random matrix context, we compare with the following result. Recall that J(A) denotes the partition of sizes of nilpotent Jordan blocks of A, arranged in decreasing order.

Proposition 3.3 ([5, Theorem 2.3]). Let $(a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n+1}$ be uniformly random strictly uppertriangular over \mathbb{F}_q . Then the transition probabilities

$$\Pr(J((a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n+1}) = \nu | (a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n})$$
(3.12)

depend only on $J((a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n})$, and

$$\Pr(J((a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n+1}) = \nu | (a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n} = \mu) \\ = \begin{cases} q^{-\mu'_j} (1 - q^{\mu'_j - \mu'_{j-1}}) & \exists j \ge 1 \text{ such that } \nu'_i = \mu'_i + \mathbb{1}[i = j] \text{ for all } i \ge 1 \\ 0 & else \end{cases}$$
(3.13)

with the convention $\mu'_0 = \infty$ and $q^{-\infty} = 0$ when j = 1.

Finally, we connect random matrices over \mathbb{F}_q to the Hall-Littlewood process framework.

Corollary 3.4. Let q be a prime power, let $\lambda(\tau)$ be as in Definition 12 with t = 1/q, and let $\sigma_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be as in Definition 13. Let $a_{i,j}, j > i \geq 1$ be iid uniform elements of \mathbb{F}_q , and define $a_{i,j} = 0$ for all $i \geq j$. Then for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(\lambda(\sigma_n))_{0 \le n \le N} = (J((a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n}))_{0 \le n \le N}$$
(3.14)

in distribution.

Proof. Both initial conditions are the empty partition, so we must only check that the transition probabilities in Proposition 3.2 and Proposition 3.3 are equal. For this simply note that $\ell = \mu_j + 1$ and $\mu'_{\mu_\ell} - \mu'_{\mu_\ell+1} = \mu'_{j-1} - \mu'_j$ from our definitions of ℓ and j in those results. \Box

To get formulas for the prelimit probability we are interested in, we first give one for the Poissonized process $\lambda(\tau)$.

Proposition 3.5. Let $\lambda(\tau)$ be as in Definition 12, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, and $\eta \in \mathbb{Y}_k$. Then

$$\Pr((\lambda_1'(\tau), \dots, \lambda_k'(\tau)) = \eta) = \frac{(t; t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k! (2\pi \mathbf{i})^k \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (t; t)_{\eta_i - \eta_{i+1}}} \int_{c\mathbb{T}^k} e^{\frac{\tau}{1-t} (z_1 + \dots + z_k)} t^{\sum_{i=1}^k {\eta_i}} \sum_{j=0}^{n_k} t^{j(\eta_k + 1)} t^{\binom{j}{2}} \left[\frac{\eta_{k-1} - \eta_k}{j} \right]_t \frac{P_{\eta + j\mathbf{e}_k}(z_1^{-1}, \dots, z_k^{-1}; t, 0)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-z_i^{-1}; t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{dz_i}{z_i},$$
(3.15)

where \mathbb{T} denotes the unit circle with counterclockwise orientation, $c \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ is arbitrary, and for general complex τ we interpret the left hand side via Remark 5. If k = 1, we interpret $\eta_{k-1} - \eta_k$ to be ∞ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \infty \\ j \end{bmatrix}_t := \frac{1}{(t;t)_j} \tag{3.16}$$

in (3.15), c.f. Proposition 3.1 and Remark 4.

Proof. This is the special case of [25, Lemma 4.3] where $\nu = \emptyset$.

We will show the following variant, which was the goal of this subsection, by de-Poissonizing Proposition 3.5:

Lemma 3.6. Let $\lambda(\tau)$ be as in Definition 12, let $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, let σ_n be as in Definition 13, and let $\eta \in \mathbb{Y}_k$. Then

$$\Pr((\lambda_{1}'(\sigma_{n}),\ldots,\lambda_{k}'(\sigma_{n})) = \eta) = \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi\mathbf{i})^{k}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(t;t)_{\eta_{i}-\eta_{i+1}}} \int_{c\mathbb{T}^{k}} (1+z_{1}+\ldots+z_{k})^{n} t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\binom{\eta_{i}}{2}} \times \prod_{1\leq i\neq j\leq k} (z_{i}/z_{j};t)_{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_{k-1}-\eta_{k}} t^{j(\eta_{k}+1)} t^{\binom{j}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1}-\eta_{k}\\ j \end{bmatrix}_{t} \frac{P_{\eta+j}\mathbf{e_{k}}(z_{1}^{-1},\ldots,z_{k}^{-1};t,0)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}(-z_{i}^{-1};t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{dz_{i}}{z_{i}},$$

$$(3.17)$$

where \mathbb{T} denotes the unit circle with counterclockwise orientation, and $c \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ is arbitrary. If k = 1, we interpret $\eta_{k-1} - \eta_k$ to be ∞ and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \infty \\ j \end{bmatrix}_t := \frac{1}{(t;t)_j} \tag{3.18}$$

in (3.17), as in Proposition 3.5.

Proof. First note that, because $\lambda(\sigma_n)$ is independent of σ_n ,

LHS(3.17) = Pr
$$((\lambda'_i(\tau))_{i \le i \le k} = \eta ||\lambda(\tau)| = n)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\Pr(|\lambda(\tau)| = n)} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}: |\lambda| = n, \\ (\lambda'_i)_{i \le i \le k} = \eta}} \Pr(\lambda(\tau) = \lambda).$$
(3.19)

We recall that for any fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}$,

$$\Pr(\lambda(\tau) = \lambda) = e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}} P_{\lambda}(1, t, \dots; 0, t) Q_{\lambda}(\gamma(\tau); 0, t).$$
(3.20)

The proportionality constant in (3.19) is

$$\Pr(|\lambda(\tau)| = n) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}: |\lambda| = n} e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}} P_{\lambda}(1, t, \dots; 0, t) Q_{\lambda}(\gamma(\tau); 0, t)$$
$$= \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}} \frac{1}{2\pi \mathbf{i}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}} P_{\lambda}(u, ut, \dots; 0, t) Q_{\lambda}(\gamma(\tau); 0, t) u^{-n} \frac{du}{u}$$
(3.21)

where in the second line we use that $P_{\lambda}(u, ut, ...; 0, t) = u^{|\lambda|} P_{\lambda}(1, t, ...; 0, t)$. The norm of the integrand in (3.21) is bounded above by

$$e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}}P_{\lambda}(1,t,\ldots;0,t)Q_{\lambda}(\gamma(\tau);0,t),$$
 (3.22)

which is summable by the Cauchy identity, so Fubini's theorem applies:

$$\operatorname{RHS}(3.21) = \frac{1}{2\pi \mathbf{i}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}} e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}} P_{\lambda}(u, ut, \dots; 0, t) Q_{\lambda}(\gamma(\tau); 0, t) u^{-n} \frac{du}{u}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2\pi \mathbf{i}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}} e^{\frac{u\tau}{1-t}} u^{-n} \frac{du}{u}$$
$$= \frac{\left(\frac{\tau}{1-t}\right)^{n}}{n! e^{\frac{\tau}{1-t}}}.$$
(3.23)

The other part of (3.19), the sum, is

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}: |\lambda| = n, \\ (\lambda'_i)_{1 \le i \le k} = \eta}} \Pr(\lambda(\tau) = \lambda) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}: \\ (\lambda'_i)_{1 \le i \le k} = \eta}} \frac{e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}}}{2\pi \mathbf{i}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} P_{\lambda}(1, t, \dots; 0, t) Q_{\lambda}(\gamma(u\tau); 0, t) u^{-n} \frac{du}{u}$$
$$= \frac{e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}}}{2\pi \mathbf{i}} \int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{\frac{u\tau}{1-t}} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}: \\ (\lambda'_i)_{1 \le i \le k} = \eta}} \frac{P_{\lambda}(1, t, \dots; 0, t) Q_{\lambda}(\gamma(u\tau); 0, t)}{e^{\frac{u\tau}{1-t}}} u^{-n} \frac{du}{u},$$
(3.24)

where we justify the interchange of sum and integral as previously. For arbitrary $u \in \mathbb{T}$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, Proposition 3.5 yields

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{Y}:\\ (\lambda_{i}^{\prime})_{1 \leq i \leq k} = \eta}} \frac{P_{\lambda}(1, t, \dots; 0, t)Q_{\lambda}(\gamma(u\tau); 0, t)}{\Pi_{0, t}(1, t, \dots; \gamma(u\tau))} = \frac{(t; t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi \mathbf{i})^{k} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (t; t)_{\eta_{i} - \eta_{i+1}}} \int_{c\mathbb{T}^{k}} e^{\frac{u\tau}{1-t}(z_{1} + \dots + z_{k})} t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\frac{\eta_{i}}{2}\right)} \\ \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq k} (z_{i}/z_{j}; t)_{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_{k-1} - \eta_{k}} t^{j(\eta_{k} + 1)} t^{\binom{j}{2}} \left[\frac{\eta_{k-1} - \eta_{k}}{j} \right]_{t} \frac{P_{\eta + j\mathbf{e}_{k}}(z_{1}^{-1}, \dots, z_{k}^{-1}; t, 0)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} (-z_{i}^{-1}; t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{dz_{i}}{z_{i}},$$

$$(3.25)$$

for any c > 1; here we apply Proposition 3.5 with $u\tau$ for τ . Substituting (3.25) into (3.24) and interchanging the integrals (which are over compact contours so this is immediate) yields

$$\operatorname{RHS}(3.24) = \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi\mathbf{i})^{k}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(t;t)_{\eta_{i}-\eta_{i+1}}} \int_{c\mathbb{T}^{k}} \left(\frac{e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}}}{2\pi\mathbf{i}}\int_{\mathbb{T}} e^{\frac{u\tau}{1-t}}e^{\frac{u\tau}{1-t}}(z_{1}+\ldots+z_{k})u^{-n}\frac{du}{u}\right) t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\binom{\eta_{i}}{2}} \\ \times \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq k} (z_{i}/z_{j};t)_{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_{k-1}-\eta_{k}} t^{j(\eta_{k}+1)}t^{\binom{j}{2}} \left[\eta_{k-1}-\eta_{k}\right]_{t} \frac{P_{\eta+je_{k}}(z_{1}^{-1},\ldots,z_{k}^{-1};t,0)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}(-z_{i}^{-1};t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^{k}\frac{dz_{i}}{z_{i}} \\ = \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi\mathbf{i})^{k}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(t;t)_{\eta_{i}-\eta_{i+1}}} \int_{c\mathbb{T}^{k}} \left(\frac{\left(\frac{\tau}{1-t}(1+z_{1}+\ldots+z_{k})\right)^{n}}{n!e^{\frac{\tau}{1-t}}}\right) t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\binom{\eta_{i}}{2}} \\ \times \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq k} (z_{i}/z_{j};t)_{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_{k-1}-\eta_{k}} t^{j(\eta_{k}+1)}t^{\binom{j}{2}} \left[\eta_{k-1}-\eta_{k}\right]_{t} \frac{P_{\eta+je_{k}}(z_{1}^{-1},\ldots,z_{k}^{-1};t,0)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}(-z_{i}^{-1};t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^{k}\frac{dz_{i}}{z_{i}}$$

$$(3.26)$$

We now evaluate (3.19) by combining (3.24), (3.26) (for the sum) with (3.21), (3.23) (for the normalizing constant), yielding

$$\operatorname{RHS}(3.19) = \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi \mathbf{i})^k \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (t;t)_{\eta_i - \eta_{i+1}}} \int_{c\mathbb{T}^k} (1+z_1+\ldots+z_k)^n t^{\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{\eta_i}{2}} \\ \times \prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le k} (z_i/z_j;t)_{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_{k-1} - \eta_k} t^{j(\eta_k+1)} t^{\binom{j}{2}} \left[\frac{\eta_{k-1} - \eta_k}{j} \right]_t \frac{P_{\eta+j\mathbf{e}_k}(z_1^{-1},\ldots,z_k^{-1};t,0)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-z_i^{-1};t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{dz_i}{z_i}$$
(3.27)
and completing the proof.

and completing the proof.

Remark 6. Though we do not know a proof of Lemma 3.6 without passing through Proposition 3.5, if one assumes Lemma 3.6 it is easy to derive Proposition 3.5 by Poissonizing. Concretely, it follows by the explicit computation of jump rates for $\lambda(\tau)$ in (3.10) that the size $|\lambda(\tau)|$ evolves according to a Poisson process in time τ with rate 1/(1-t) (this is also shown algebraically in (3.23) above, but we do not want to use that proof in our argument here because it assumes the result Proposition 3.5 which we are showing). Hence the two probabilities on the right hand side of

$$\Pr((\lambda'_1(\tau),\dots,\lambda'_k(\tau))=\eta) = \sum_{n\geq 0} \Pr((\lambda'_1(\tau),\dots,\lambda'_k(\tau))=\eta ||\lambda(\tau)|=n) \Pr(\lambda(\tau)=n)$$
(3.28)

have explicit expressions, by Lemma 3.6 and the above discussion respectively. Using these and the fact that

$$\sum_{n\geq 0} e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}} \frac{\left(\frac{\tau}{1-t}\right)^n}{n!} (1+z_1+\ldots+z_k)^n = e^{-\frac{\tau}{1-t}+\frac{\tau}{1-t}(1+z_1+\ldots+z_k)} = e^{\frac{\tau}{1-t}(z_1+\ldots+z_k)}, \qquad (3.29)$$

Proposition 3.5 follows.

4. Asymptotic analysis

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. We will actually first prove the equivalent version stated as follows:

Theorem 4.1. Fix a prime power q and for each $N \ge 1$, let A_n be a uniformly random element of

$$\mathfrak{g}(n,q) = \{A = (a_{i,j})_{1 \le i,j \le n} \in \operatorname{Mat}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) : a_{i,j} = 0 \text{ for all } i \ge j\}.$$
(4.1)

Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(n_{\ell})_{\ell \geq 1}$ be a subsequence of \mathbb{N} such that $\log_q n_{\ell} \to -\zeta$ in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} . Then for any $k \geq 1$,

$$(J(A_{n_{\ell}})'_{i} - [\log_{q} n_{\ell} + \zeta])_{1 \le i \le k} \to \mathcal{L}_{k,q^{-1},q^{-\zeta}}$$
(4.2)

in distribution as $\ell \to \infty$, where \mathcal{L}_{\dots} is as defined in Definition 11, and $[\cdot]$ is the nearest integer function.

For this, our starting point is the integral formula Lemma 3.6 for the prelimit probabilities, which we wish to show converges to the corresponding integral formula in Proposition 3.1 for the limit probabilities. For this asymptotic analysis as we carry it out, it is necessary to have a smaller contour than the one in Lemma 3.6, which requires moving the contour through several poles. Hence we first compute the corresponding residues in Lemma 4.2, and then check they go to 0 in the limit in Lemma 4.3, before we show the necessary asymptotics of the integral itself. This residue expansion is the only feature where the asymptotic analysis of the de-Poissonized integral in Lemma 3.6 differs from the analysis of the Poissonized version in Proposition 3.5, which was carried out in the proof of [25, Theorem 4.1]. In that work, it was not necessary residue-expand the integral at all and the appropriate asymptotics could be computed directly.

Lemma 4.2. For any $v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $k \geq 2$, residue of the integral in (3.17) at the pole $z_k = -t^v$ is

$$E(n,\eta,v) := \frac{(-1)^{v}(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-2}t^{\binom{v}{2}}t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\binom{\eta_{i}}{2}}}{k!(t;t)_{v}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(t;t)_{\eta_{i}-\eta_{i+1}}} \sum_{\mu \in \operatorname{Sig}_{k-1}} (-t^{-v})^{|\eta|-|\mu|} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{i} - \eta_{i+1} \\ \eta_{i} - \mu_{i} \end{bmatrix}_{t} \\ \times (t^{\eta_{k}-v+1};t)_{\mu_{k-1}-\eta_{k}} \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^{k-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k-1}} (1-t^{v}+z_{1}+\ldots+z_{k-1})^{n} P_{\mu}(z_{1}^{-1},\ldots,z_{k-1}^{-1};t,0) \\ \times \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq k-1} (z_{i}/z_{j};t)_{\infty} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} (1+t^{-v}z_{i})z_{i}^{v}t^{-\binom{v+1}{2}}(-tz_{i};t)_{\infty} \frac{dz_{i}}{z_{i}}.$$
(4.3)

If k = 1, the residue is

$$E(n,\eta,v) := (1-t^v)^n \frac{(-1)^{\eta_k+v} t^{\binom{v}{2}+\binom{\eta_k}{2}-v\eta_k}}{(t;t)_{\eta_k}} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_k \\ v \end{bmatrix}_t.$$
(4.4)

Proof. We first show the $k \ge 2$ case, (4.3). We find the residue of the product term

$$\frac{\prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le k} (z_i/z_j; t)_{\infty}}{\prod_{i=1}^k z_i (-z_i^{-1}; t)_{\infty}}$$
(4.5)

appearing in (3.17). For the z_k -dependent term of the denominator, we see that

$$\operatorname{Res}_{z_k = -t^v} \frac{1}{z_k (-z_k^{-1}; t)_\infty} = \frac{(-1)^v t^{\binom{v}{2}}}{(t; t)_v (t; t)_\infty}.$$
(4.6)

When we set $z + k = -t^{v}$, the terms in (4.5) which depend on $z_{i}, i \neq k$ then become

$$\prod_{1 \le i \le k-1} \frac{(-z_i/t^v; t)_{\infty}(-t^v/z_i; t)_{\infty}}{z_i(-z_i^{-1}; t)_{\infty}} = \prod_{1 \le i \le k-1} (1 + t^{-v}z_i) z_i^v t^{-\binom{v+1}{2}} (-tz_i; t)_{\infty}$$
(4.7)

by an elementary computation, c.f. [25, (5.17)], where we let $\binom{v+1}{2} = (v^2 + v)/2$ even when v is negative. By the branching rule ((2.4) and Lemma 2.3), the sum over j with the q-Whittaker polynomial in (3.17) becomes

$$\begin{split} &\sum_{j=0}^{\eta_{k-1}-\eta_{k}} t^{\binom{j}{2}+(\eta_{k}+1)j} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1} - \eta_{k} \\ j \end{bmatrix}_{t} P_{\eta+je_{k}}(z_{1}^{-1}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{-1}, -t^{-v}; t, 0) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_{k-1}-\eta_{k}} t^{\binom{j}{2}+(\eta_{k}+1)j} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1} - \eta_{k} \\ j \end{bmatrix}_{t} \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \operatorname{Sig}_{k-1} \\ \mu \prec \eta+je_{k}}} (-t^{-v})^{|\eta|+|\mu|} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{1} - \eta_{2} \\ \eta_{1} - \mu_{1} \end{bmatrix}_{t} \cdots \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-2} - \eta_{k-1} \\ \eta_{k-2} - \mu_{k-2} \end{bmatrix}_{t} \\ &\times \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1} - \eta_{k} - j \\ \eta_{k-1} - \mu_{k-1} \end{bmatrix}_{t} P_{\mu}(z_{1}^{-1}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{-1}; t, 0) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \operatorname{Sig}_{k-1} \\ \mu \prec \eta}} (-t^{-v})^{|\eta|-|\mu|} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{1} - \eta_{2} \\ \eta_{1} - \mu_{1} \end{bmatrix}_{t} \cdots \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-2} - \eta_{k-1} \\ \eta_{k-2} - \mu_{k-2} \end{bmatrix}_{t} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1} - \eta_{k} \\ \eta_{k-1} - \mu_{k-1} \end{bmatrix}_{t} P_{\mu}(z_{1}^{-1}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{-1}; t, 0) \\ &\times \sum_{j=0}^{\mu_{k-1}-\eta_{k}} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{k-1} - \eta_{k} \\ j \end{bmatrix}_{t} t^{\binom{j}{2}+(\eta_{k}+1)j}(-t^{-v})^{j} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mu \in \operatorname{Sig}_{k-1} \\ \mu \prec \eta}} (-t^{-v})^{|\eta|-|\mu|} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{i} - \eta_{i+1} \\ \eta_{i} - \mu_{i} \end{bmatrix}_{t} P_{\mu}(z_{1}^{-1}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{-1}; t, 0) (t^{\eta_{k}-v+1}; t)_{\mu_{k-1}-\eta_{k}}, \end{split}$$

$$\tag{4.8}$$

where in the second equality we used the elementary identity

$$\begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1} - \eta_k - j \\ \eta_{k-1} - \mu_{k-1} \end{bmatrix}_t \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1} - \eta_k \\ j \end{bmatrix}_t = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{k-1} - \eta_k \\ j \end{bmatrix}_t \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1} - \eta_k \\ \eta_{k-1} - \mu_{k-1} \end{bmatrix}_t$$
(4.9)

and in the last equality used the q-binomial theorem. Putting this all together, the residue is

$$\frac{(-1)^{v}(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-2}t^{\binom{v}{2}}t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\binom{\eta_{i}}{2}}}{k!(t;t)_{v}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(t;t)_{\eta_{i}-\eta_{i+1}}}\sum_{\mu\in\operatorname{Sig}_{k-1}}(-t^{-v})^{|\eta|-|\mu|}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}\left[\frac{\eta_{i}-\eta_{i+1}}{\eta_{i}-\mu_{i}}\right]_{t}(t^{\eta_{k}-v+1};t)_{\mu_{k-1}-\eta_{k}} \times \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^{k-1}}\int_{\mathbb{T}^{k-1}}(1-t^{v}+z_{1}+\ldots+z_{k-1})^{n}P_{\mu}(z_{1}^{-1},\ldots,z_{k-1}^{-1};t,0) \times \prod_{1\leq i\neq j\leq k-1}(z_{i}/z_{j};t)_{\infty}\prod_{1\leq i\leq k-1}(1+t^{-v}z_{i})z_{i}^{v}t^{-\binom{v+1}{2}}(-tz_{i};t)_{\infty}\frac{dz_{i}}{z_{i}}, \quad (4.10)$$

where we have also shifted the contour from $c\mathbb{T}^{k-1}$ to \mathbb{T}^{k-1} , which we may do because there are no poles. This completes the $k \geq 2$ case.

For k = 1, we simply note that $P_{(\eta_k+j)}(z_1^{-1}; t, 0) = z_1^{-(\eta_k+j)}$, and

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} t^{j(\eta_k+1)+\binom{j}{2}} \frac{z_1^{-(\eta_k+j)}}{(t;t)_j(-z_1^{-1};t)_{\infty}} = z_1^{-\eta_k} \frac{(-t^{\eta_k+1}z_1^{-1};t)_{\infty}}{(-z_1^{-1};t)_{\infty}}$$
(4.11)

by the q-binomial theorem. By (4.6), we therefore have

$$E(n,\eta,v) = \operatorname{Res}_{z_1=-t^v}(1+z_1)^n t^{\binom{\eta_k}{2}} z_1^{-\eta_k} \frac{(-t^{\eta_k+1}z_1^{-1};t)_{\infty}}{z_1(-z_1^{-1};t)_{\infty}}$$

$$= (1-t^v)^n \frac{(-1)^{\eta_k+v}t^{\binom{v}{2}+\binom{\eta_k}{2}-v\eta_k}}{(t;t)_{\eta_k}} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_k \\ v \end{bmatrix}_t.$$
(4.12)

Lemma 4.3. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $E(n, \eta, v)$ be as in (4.3). Fix $(L_1, \ldots, L_k) \in \text{Sig}_k$, and define

$$\eta(n) := (L_i + [\log_{t^{-1}} n + \zeta])_{1 \le i \le k}$$
(4.13)

where $[\cdot]$ is the nearest integer function as usual. Then for any $v \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} E(n, \eta(n), v) = 0.$$
(4.14)

Proof. The case k = 1 is trivial from Lemma 4.2, since the $(1 - t^v)^n$ term dominates in (4.4), so let us suppose $k \ge 2$. The integrands in $E(n, \eta(n), v)$ have no poles on the punctured plane, so we first shrink the contour to $c\mathbb{T}$ where c > 0 is such that $1 - t^v + c(k-1) < 1$. We now rewrite the formula for $E(n, \eta(n), v)$ as follows. Define $\tilde{L} := (L_1 - L_k, \ldots, L_{k-1} - L_k, 0)$ and, for each μ in the sum in Lemma 4.2 (with $\eta(n)$ substituted for η), let $\tilde{\mu} := (\mu_i - \eta_k(n))_{1 \le i \le k-1}$. Then by Corollary 2.5,

$$P_{\mu}(z_1^{-1}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{-1}; t, 0) = (z_1 \cdots z_{k-1})^{-\eta_k(n)} P_{\tilde{\mu}}(z_1^{-1}, \dots, z_{k-1}^{-1}; t, 0).$$
(4.15)

Substituting this and moving all n-dependent terms inside the integral, we have

$$E(n,\eta(n),v) = \frac{(-1)^{v}(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-2}t^{\binom{v}{2}}}{k!(t;t)_{v}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(t;t)_{\tilde{L}_{i}-\tilde{L}_{i+1}}} \sum_{\tilde{\mu}\in\operatorname{Sig}_{k-1}} (-t^{-v})^{|\tilde{L}|-|\tilde{\mu}|} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left[\tilde{L}_{i} - \tilde{L}_{i+1} \right]_{t}$$

$$\times \frac{1}{(2\pi\mathbf{i})^{k-1}} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{k-1}} \left[(t^{\eta_{k}(n)-v+1};t)_{\tilde{\mu}_{k-1}}(1-t^{v}+z_{1}+\ldots+z_{k-1})^{n}(-t^{-v})^{\eta_{k}(n)}t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k}\binom{\eta_{i}}{2}} \right]$$

$$\times P_{\mu}(z_{1}^{-1},\ldots,z_{k-1}^{-1};t,0) \prod_{1\leq i\neq j\leq k-1} (z_{i}/z_{j};t)_{\infty} \prod_{1\leq i\leq k-1} (1+t^{-v}z_{i})z_{i}^{v}t^{-\binom{v+1}{2}}(-tz_{i};t)_{\infty} \frac{dz_{i}}{z_{i}}. \quad (4.16)$$

All n-dependent terms in (4.16) are inside the square braces, and the modulus of the term in braces is

$$O\left(e^{\log(1-t^{\nu}+c(k-1))n+\operatorname{const}_{1}\eta_{k}(n)^{2}+\operatorname{const}_{2}\eta_{k}(n)}\right).$$
(4.17)

Since $\eta_k(n) = L_k + [\log_{t^{-1}} n + \zeta]$, the $\log(1 - t^v + c(k-1))n$ term dominates, hence the function inside the exponential goes to $-\infty$ since we took c such that $1 - t^v + c(k-1) < 1$. Because the sum over $\tilde{\mu}$ is finite independent of n and the contour of integration is compact and independent of n, we may bring the limit in (4.14) inside the integral, and this completes the proof. \Box

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We set t = 1/q throughout the proof. Since $\mathcal{L}_{k,\cdot,\cdot}$ is a discrete random variable, it suffices to show

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr((J(A_{n_{\ell}})'_{i})_{1 \le i \le k} = (L_{i} + [\log_{t^{-1}} n_{\ell} + \zeta])_{1 \le i \le k}) = \Pr(\mathcal{L}_{k,t,t^{\zeta}} = (L_{1}, \dots, L_{k})).$$
(4.18)

Let us define

$$\eta(n) := (L_i + [\log_{t^{-1}} n + \zeta])_{1 \le i \le k}$$
(4.19)

as in Lemma 4.3, and note that

$$\eta_i(n) - \eta_j(n) = L_i - L_j.$$
(4.20)

By reexpressing the left hand side of (4.18) via Corollary 3.4 and Lemma 3.6, and the right hand side via Proposition 3.1, we see that (4.18) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi \mathbf{i})^k \prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(t;t)_{\eta(n_{\ell})_i - \eta(n_{\ell})_{i+1}}} \int_{c\mathbb{T}^k} (1+z_1+\ldots+z_k)^{n_{\ell}} t^{\sum_{i=1}^k \binom{\eta(n_{\ell})_i}{2}} \prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le k} (z_i/z_j;t)_{\infty} \\
\times \sum_{j=0}^{\eta(n_{\ell})_{k-1} - \eta(n_{\ell})_k} t^{j(\eta(n_{\ell})_k+1)} t^{\binom{j}{2}} \left[\frac{\eta(n_{\ell})_{k-1} - \eta(n_{\ell})_k}{j} \right]_t \frac{P_{\eta(n_{\ell}) + je_k}(z_1^{-1},\ldots,z_k^{-1};t,0)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-z_i^{-1};t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{dz_i}{z_i} \\
= \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi \mathbf{i})^k} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{t^{\binom{L_i-L_k}{2}}}{(t;t)_{L_i-L_{i+1}}} \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}^k} e^{t^{L_k+\zeta}(w_1+\ldots+w_k)} \frac{\prod_{1\le i\ne j\le k} (w_i/w_j;t)_{\infty}}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-w_i^{-1};t)_{\infty} (-tw_i;t)_{\infty}} \\
\times \sum_{j=0}^{L_{k-1}-L_k} t^{\binom{j+1}{2}} \left[\frac{L_{k-1}-L_k}{j} \right]_t P_{(L_1-L_k,\ldots,L_{k-1}-L_k,j)}(w_1^{-1},\ldots,w_k^{-1};t,0) \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{dw_i}{w_i} \quad (4.21)$$

The integrand in (4.21) is symmetric in z_1, \ldots, z_k and has residues at $z_i = -t^0, -t^1, \ldots$. For the rest of the proof, fix r to be any positive integer such that $t^r < 1/k$. Shrinking each contour to $t^{r+1/2}\mathbb{T}^k$, we encounter the pole at $z_i = -t^0, \ldots, -t^r$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$. The corresponding residues were computed for z_k in Lemma 4.2 and are the same for each z_i by symmetry, so we obtain

$$LHS(4.21) = \lim_{\ell \to \infty} k \sum_{\nu=0}^{r} E(n_{\ell}, \eta(n_{\ell}), \nu) + \frac{(t; t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k! (2\pi \mathbf{i})^{k} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (t; t)_{\eta_{i} - \eta_{i+1}}} \int_{t^{r+1/2} \mathbb{T}^{k}} (1 + z_{1} + \ldots + z_{k})^{n_{\ell}} t^{\sum_{i=1}^{k} \binom{\eta_{i}}{2}} \\ \times \prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le k} (z_{i}/z_{j}; t)_{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\eta_{k-1} - \eta_{k}} t^{j(\eta_{k}+1)} t^{\binom{j}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \eta_{k-1} - \eta_{k} \\ j \end{bmatrix}_{t} \frac{P_{\eta+j\boldsymbol{e}_{k}}(z_{1}^{-1}, \ldots, z_{k}^{-1}; t, 0)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} (-z_{i}^{-1}; t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{dz_{i}}{z_{i}}. \quad (4.22)$$

The utility of the residue expansion we have just carried out is that now the integral is over a smaller contour, allowing later error analysis which would break down if the real parts of z_i became too negative. We will now algebraically manipulate the integral in (4.22) into a form more suitable for asymptotics, and to control subscripts we do so with n in place of n_{ℓ} . Let

$$\epsilon(n) := (\log_{t^{-1}}(n) + \zeta) - [\log_{t^{-1}}(n) + \zeta], \tag{4.23}$$

so that $\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \epsilon(n_\ell) = 0$ by our choice of the subsequence n_ℓ . We then make a change of variables to

$$w_i := t^{-\eta_k(n)} z_i = n t^{-\zeta - L_k + \epsilon(n)} z_i.$$
(4.24)

Note that for $n = n_{\ell}$ this is $n_{\ell}t^{-\zeta - L_k}z_i(1 + o(1))$ as $\ell \to \infty$, but it will be clearer later to have the $t^{\epsilon(n_{\ell})} = 1 + o(1)$ multiplicative error term written explicitly, as the rate at which $\epsilon(n_{\ell})$ goes to 0 influences our choice of contours later.

With this change of variables, the integral on the left hand side of (4.38) becomes

$$\frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi\mathbf{i})^{k}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1}(t;t)_{L_{i}-L_{i+1}}} \int_{t^{-\eta_{k}(n)+r+1/2}\mathbb{T}^{k}} \left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta+L_{k}-\epsilon(n)}}{n}(w_{1}+\ldots+w_{k}))\right)^{n} \\
\times \sum_{j=0}^{L_{k-1}-L_{k}} t^{j(\eta_{k}(n)+1)+\binom{j}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1}-L_{k} \\ j \end{bmatrix}_{t} (t^{-\eta_{k}(n)})^{|\eta(n)|+j} P_{\eta(n)+j\mathbf{e}_{k}}(w_{1}^{-1},\ldots,w_{k}^{-1};t,0) \quad (4.25) \\
\times \frac{\prod_{1\leq i\neq j\leq k}(w_{i}/w_{j};t)_{\infty}\prod_{i=1}^{k}t^{\binom{\eta_{i}(n)}{2}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}(-t^{-\eta_{k}(n)}w_{i}^{-1};t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{dw_{i}}{w_{i}},$$

where we have used that $P_{\eta+je_k}$ is homogeneous of degree $|\eta| + j$. By the elementary identity

$$\binom{a+b}{2} = \binom{a}{2} + \binom{b}{2} + ab \tag{4.26}$$

and (4.20) we have

$$\binom{\eta_i}{2} = \binom{\eta_k}{2} + \binom{L_i - L_k}{2} + (\eta_i - \eta_k)\eta_k.$$
(4.27)

Additionally, by Corollary 2.5 and (4.20),

$$P_{\eta+j\boldsymbol{e}_{k}}(w_{1}^{-1},\ldots,w_{k}^{-1};t,0) = (w_{1}\cdots w_{k})^{-\eta_{k}}P_{(L_{1}-L_{k},\ldots,L_{k-1}-L_{k},j)}(w_{1}^{-1},\ldots,w_{k}^{-1};t,0).$$
(4.28)
Substituting (4.27) for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and (4.28) into (4.25) yields

$$\operatorname{RHS}(4.25) = \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi \mathbf{i})^k} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{t^{\binom{L_i-L_k}{2}}}{(t;t)_{L_i-L_{i+1}}} \int_{t^{-\eta_k(n)+r+1/2}\mathbb{T}^k} \left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta+L_k-\epsilon(n)}}{n} (w_1 + \dots + w_k))\right)^n \\ \times \prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le k} (w_i/w_j;t)_{\infty} \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{w_i^{-\eta_k(n)} t^{\binom{\eta_k(n)}{2}} + (\eta_i(n) - \eta_k(n))\eta_k(n) t^{-\eta_k(n)\eta_i(n)}}{(-t^{-\eta_k(n)} w_i^{-1};t)_{\infty}} \\ \times \sum_{j=0}^{L_{k-1}-L_k} t^{j+\binom{j}{2}} \left[\frac{L_{k-1}-L_k}{j}\right]_t P_{(L_1-L_k,\dots,L_{k-1}-L_k,j)}(w_1^{-1},\dots,w_k^{-1};t,0) \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{dw_i}{w_i}.$$

$$(4.29)$$

Noting that

$$\frac{w_i^{-\eta_k(n)}t^{\binom{\eta_k(n)}{2}} + (\eta_i(n) - \eta_k(n))\eta_k(n)t^{-\eta_k(n)}\eta_i(n)}{(-t^{-\eta_k(n)}w_i^{-1};t)_{\infty}} = \frac{1}{(-w_i^{-1};t)_{\infty}(-tw_i;t)_{\eta_k(n)}},$$
(4.30)

and shifting contours to

$$\Gamma(r,n) := \{x + \mathbf{i}y : x^2 + y^2 = 1, x > 0\} \cup \{x + \mathbf{i} : -t^{-\eta_k(n) + r + 1/2} < x \le 0\}$$
$$\cup \{x - \mathbf{i} : -t^{-\eta_k(n) + r + 1/2} < x \le 0\} \cup \{-t^{-\eta_k(n) + r + 1/2} + \mathbf{i}y : -1 \le y \le 1\} \quad (4.31)$$

(see Figure 4), yields

$$\operatorname{RHS}(4.29) = \frac{(t;t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!(2\pi \mathbf{i})^{k}} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{t^{\binom{L_{i}-L_{k}}{2}}}{(t;t)_{L_{i}-L_{i+1}}} \int_{\Gamma(r,n)^{k}} \left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta+L_{k}-\epsilon(n)}}{n} (w_{1} + \ldots + w_{k})\right)^{n} \\ \times \frac{\prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le k} (w_{i}/w_{j};t)_{\infty}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} (-w_{i}^{-1};t)_{\infty} (-tw_{i};t)_{\eta_{k}(n)}} \sum_{j=0}^{L_{k-1}-L_{k}} t^{\binom{j+1}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1} - L_{k} \\ j \end{bmatrix}_{t} \\ \times P_{(L_{1}-L_{k},\ldots,L_{k-1}-L_{k},j)} (w_{1}^{-1},\ldots,w_{k}^{-1};t,0) \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{dw_{i}}{w_{i}}$$

$$(4.32)$$

For the asymptotics, we will decompose the integration contour into a main term contour $\Gamma_1(r, n)$ and error term contour $\Gamma_2(r, n)$. Let $\xi(n)$ be any function such that

- (1) $\xi(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$,
- (2) $\xi(n) \ll \log_{t^{-1}} n \text{ as } n \to \infty$, and
- (3) $\xi(n_{\ell}) \ll -\log \epsilon(n_{\ell})$ as $\ell \to \infty$.

Any sufficiently slowly-growing function will do, but what we mean by 'slowly-growing' depends on how quickly the shifts $\log_t n_\ell$ become close to the appropriate lattice, and this is why we gave the error term $\epsilon(n_\ell)$ a name earlier.

Now decompose $\Gamma(r, n)$ as

$$\Gamma(r,n) = \Gamma_1(n) \cup \Gamma_2(r,n)
\Gamma_1(n) = \{x + \mathbf{i} : -t^{-\xi(n)} < x \le 0\} \cup \{x - \mathbf{i} : -t^{-\xi(n)} < x \le 0\} \cup \{x + \mathbf{i}y : x^2 + y^2 = 1, x > 0\}
\Gamma_2(r,n) = \{-t^{-\eta_k(n)+r-1/2} + \mathbf{i}y : -1 \le y \le 1\} \cup \{x + \mathbf{i} : -t^{-\eta_k(n)+r-1/2} < x \le -t^{-\xi(n)}\}
\cup \{x - \mathbf{i} : -t^{-\eta_k(n)+r-1/2} < x \le -t^{-\xi(n)}\}.$$
(4.33)



FIGURE 4. The contour $\Gamma(r, n)$ decomposed as in (4.33), with $\Gamma_1(n)$ in blue and $\Gamma_2(r, n)$ in red, and the poles of the integrand at $w_i = -t^{\mathbb{Z}}$ shown.

We further define another error term contour

$$\Gamma_3(n) = \{ x + \mathbf{i} : x \le -t^{-\xi(n)} \} \cup \{ x - \mathbf{i} : x \le -t^{-\xi(n)} \},$$
(4.34)

so that

$$\Gamma_1(n) \cup \Gamma_3(n) = \{x + \mathbf{i} : x \le 0\} \cup \{x - \mathbf{i} : x \le 0\} \cup \{x + \mathbf{i}y : x^2 + y^2 = 1, x > 0\} = \tilde{\Gamma} \quad (4.35)$$

is independent of n.



FIGURE 5. The contour $\tilde{\Gamma}$ decomposed as in (4.35), with $\Gamma_1(n)$ in blue and $\Gamma_3(n)$ in green.

To compress notation we abbreviate the n-independent part of the integrand as

$$\tilde{f}(w_1, \dots, w_k) := \frac{(t; t)_{\infty}^{k-1}}{k!} \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{t^{\binom{L_i - L_k}{2}}}{(t; t)_{L_i - L_{i+1}}} \frac{\prod_{1 \le i \ne j \le k} (w_i/w_j; t)_{\infty}}{\prod_{i=1}^k w_i (-w_i^{-1}; t)_{\infty}} \\ \times \sum_{j=0}^{L_{k-1} - L_k} t^{\binom{j+1}{2}} \begin{bmatrix} L_{k-1} - L_k \\ j \end{bmatrix}_t P_{(L_1 - L_k, \dots, L_{k-1} - L_k, j)} (w_1^{-1}, \dots, w_k^{-1}; t, 0). \quad (4.36)$$

When k = 1, we interpret the above by setting $L_{k-1} - L_k = \infty$ and $\begin{bmatrix} \infty \\ j \end{bmatrix}_t = \frac{1}{(t;t)_j}$, similarly to Proposition 3.1. We have shown by the above manipulations that

LHS(4.21) =
$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} k \sum_{\nu=0}^{r} E(n_{\ell}, \eta(n_{\ell}), \nu) + \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi \mathbf{i})^{k}} \int_{\Gamma(n_{\ell}, r)^{k}} \tilde{f}(w_{1}, \dots, w_{k}) \frac{\left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_{k} - \epsilon(n_{\ell})}}{n_{\ell}} (w_{1} + \dots + w_{k})\right)^{n_{\ell}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} (-tw_{i}; t)_{\eta_{k}(n_{\ell})}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} dw_{i}.$$
 (4.37)

The limit of the residues above is 0 by Lemma 4.3 since r is independent of ℓ , so to show (4.21) it suffices to show

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi \mathbf{i})^k} \int_{\Gamma(n_\ell, r)^k} \tilde{f}(w_1, \dots, w_k) \frac{\left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)}}{n_\ell} (w_1 + \dots + w_k)\right)^{n_\ell}}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-tw_i; t)_{\eta_k(n_\ell)}} \prod_{i=1}^k dw_i = \text{RHS}(4.21).$$
(4.38)

By subtracting the right hand side of (4.38), bringing it inside the limit, and splitting the resulting limit into three terms, (4.38) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi \mathbf{i})^k} \int_{\Gamma_1(n_\ell)^k} \tilde{f}(w_1, \dots, w_k) \left(\frac{\left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)}(w_1 + \dots + w_k)}{n_\ell} \right)^{n_\ell}}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-tw_i; t)_{\eta_k(n_\ell)}} - \frac{e^{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)}(w_1 + \dots + w_k)}}{\prod_{i=1}^k dw_i} \right) \prod_{i=1}^k dw_i$$
(4.39)

$$+\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi \mathbf{i})^k} \int_{\Gamma(r,n_\ell)^k \setminus \Gamma_1(n_\ell)^k} \frac{\tilde{f}(w_1,\dots,w_k) \left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)}(w_1 + \dots + w_k)}{n_\ell}\right)^{n_\ell}}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-tw_i;t)_{\eta_k(n_\ell)}} \prod_{i=1}^k dw_i$$
(4.40)

$$-\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi \mathbf{i})^k} \int_{\tilde{\Gamma}^k \setminus \Gamma_1(n_\ell)^k} \frac{\tilde{f}(w_1, \dots, w_k) e^{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)}(w_1 + \dots + w_k)}}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-tw_i; t)_{\infty}} \prod_{i=1}^k dw_i = 0,$$
(4.41)

We will show each of the three lines (4.39), (4.40) and (4.41) above are 0 separately.

The fact that the third line (4.41) is 0 follows because (a) by Proposition 3.1 the integral is finite when $\tilde{\Gamma}^k \setminus \Gamma_1(n_\ell)^k$ is replaced by the whole contour $\tilde{\Gamma}^k$, (b) $\Gamma_1(r, n-1) \subset \Gamma_1(r, n)$ for all (large enough) n, and (c) $\bigcup_n \Gamma_1(r, n)^k = \tilde{\Gamma}^k$ because $\xi(n) \to \infty$.

For the other two lines (4.39) and (4.40), we use the bounds on \tilde{f} and $(z;t)_n$ which are quoted from [25]:

Lemma 4.4 ([25, Lemma 4.9]). For any neighborhood $-1 \in U \subset \mathbb{C}$, there exist positive constants C, c_2 such that the bound

$$|\tilde{f}(w_1, \dots, w_k)| \le C \prod_{i=1}^k e^{\frac{k-1}{2}(\log t^{-1})\lfloor \log_t |w_i| \rfloor^2 + c_2 \lfloor \log_t |w_i| \rfloor}$$
(4.42)

holds for any $w_1, \ldots, w_k \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\mathbb{D} \cup U)$, where \mathbb{D} is the open unit disc.

Lemma 4.5 ([25, Lemma 4.8]). For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \cup \{\infty\}$, $\delta > 0$, and $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\operatorname{Re}(z) - (-t^{-i})| > \delta t^{-i}$, we have the bound

$$|(z;t)_n| \ge \delta(t^{1/2};t)_{\infty}^2. \tag{4.43}$$

Lemma 4.6 ([25, Lemma 4.7]). There exists a constant such that for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $w \in \tilde{\Gamma}$,

$$\left|\frac{1}{(-tw;t)_n}\right| \le C. \tag{4.44}$$

We now show that the limit (4.39) is 0. For $w_i \in \Gamma_1(n_\ell)$ we have $|t^{\eta_k(n_\ell)+1}w_i| \leq t^{\eta_k(n_\ell)-\xi(n_\ell)}$ (for *n* large enough so $|-t^{-\xi(n_\ell)}\pm i| \leq t^{-\xi(n_\ell)-1}$). Hence $(-t^{\eta_k(n_\ell)+1}w_i;t)_{\infty} = 1 + O(t^{\eta_k(n_\ell)-\xi(n_\ell)})$ and so

$$\frac{1}{(-tw_i;t)_{\eta_k(n_\ell)}} = \frac{1}{(-tw_i;t)_{\infty}} (1 + O(t^{\eta_k(n_\ell) - \xi(n_\ell)})).$$
(4.45)

We have by writing $(1+x)^{n_{\ell}} = e^{n_{\ell} \log(1+x)}$ and Taylor expanding the logarithm that

$$\left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{n_\ell}\right)^{n_\ell} = e^{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i + O(\sum_{i=1}^k w_i^2/n_\ell)}$$
$$= e^{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i (1 + O(\epsilon(n_\ell)))} (1 + O(\sum_{i=1}^k w_i^2/n_\ell)))$$
$$= e^{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i} (1 + O(\epsilon(n_\ell) \sum_{i=1}^k w_i) + O(\sum_{i=1}^k w_i^2/n_\ell)).$$
(4.46)

By the definition of $\Gamma_1(n)$, for any $w_i \in \Gamma_1(n)$ we have

$$|w_i| \le \operatorname{const} \cdot t^{-\xi(n_\ell)},\tag{4.47}$$

so the error terms in (4.46) are $O(t^{-\xi(n_{\ell})}\epsilon(n_{\ell}))$ and $O(t^{-2\xi(n_{\ell})}/n_{\ell})$ respectively. Since $t^{\eta_k(n)} = O(1/n)$, the error term in (4.45) is dominated by the latter term. Hence

$$\frac{\left(1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{n_\ell}\right)^{n_\ell}}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-tw_i; t)_{\eta_k(n_\ell)}} = \frac{e^{t^{\zeta + L_k} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^k (-tw_i; t)_{\infty}} (1 + O(t^{-\xi(n_\ell)} \epsilon(n_\ell)) + O(t^{-2\xi(n_\ell)}/n_\ell)) \quad (4.48)$$

for all $w_i \in \Gamma_1(n_\ell)$. By using Lemma 4.4 to bound \tilde{f} and using (4.48) (together with Lemma 4.6, which applies since $\Gamma_1(n_\ell) \subset \tilde{\Gamma}$, to bound the denominator $(-tw_i; t)_{\infty}$ by a constant) to bound the term inside parentheses, we have that the integrand in (4.39) is

$$O\left(e^{t^{\zeta+L_k}\sum_{i=1}^k \operatorname{Re}(w_i) + \operatorname{const} \cdot (\log|w_i|)^2} (O(t^{-\xi(n_\ell)}\epsilon(n_\ell)) + O(t^{-2\xi(n_\ell)}/n_\ell))\right).$$
(4.49)

Furthermore, the w_i -dependent exponential in (4.49) is bounded above by an ℓ -independent constant uniformly over all $(w_1, \ldots, w_k) \in \tilde{\Gamma}^k \supset \Gamma_1(n_\ell)^k$ (because the $\operatorname{Re}(w_i)$ cause it to shrink quickly), so we may absorb it into the O constant in (4.49). Because each contour $\Gamma_1(n_\ell)$ has length $O(t^{-\xi(n_\ell)})$ and there are k contours, multiplying the volume by the bound on the integrand yields the bound $O(t^{-(k+1)\xi(n_\ell)}\epsilon(n_\ell)) + O(t^{-(k+2)\xi(n_\ell)}/n_\ell)$ for the integral (4.39). Because $\xi(n_\ell) \ll \log n_\ell$ and $\xi(n_\ell) \ll -\log \epsilon(n_\ell)$ by definition, this bound is o(1), so we have shown the vanishing of the limit (4.39).

We now turn to the second line, (4.40). Because we have chosen r so that $t^r < 1/k$, and $\operatorname{Re}(w_i) > -t^{-\eta_k(n_\ell)+r}$ everywhere on $\Gamma(n_\ell)$, we have

$$\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{t^{\zeta+L_k-\epsilon(n_\ell)}(w_1+\ldots+w_k)}{n_\ell}\right) > -1 \tag{4.50}$$

for all $w_1, \ldots, w_k \in \Gamma(n_\ell)$; it is perhaps easiest to see this from the fact that the above expression is just $\operatorname{Re}(z_1+\ldots+z_k) > -kt^r > -1$ when expressed in terms of the z_i . Because $|x+iy| \leq |x|+|y|$, we have

$$\left|1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{n_\ell}\right| = \left|1 + \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{n_\ell}\right) + \operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{n_\ell}\right)\mathbf{i}\right|$$
$$\leq \left|1 + \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{n_\ell}\right)\right| + \left|\operatorname{Im}\left(\frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{n_\ell}\right)\right|$$
$$\leq 1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)}}{n_\ell} \sum_{i=1}^k (\operatorname{Re}(w_i) + 1),$$
(4.51)

where in the last inequality we have used (4.50) to remove the absolute value around the real part, and the fact that $|\text{Im}(w_i)| \leq 1$ on our contours. By the elementary inequality

$$\left(1+\frac{x}{n}\right)^n \le e^x \qquad \text{for } x \ge -n,$$
 (4.52)

it follows that

$$\left| 1 + \frac{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}{n_\ell} \right|^{n_\ell} \le e^{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_\ell)} \sum_{i=1}^k w_i}.$$
(4.53)

Finally, the $|(-tw_i; t)_{\eta_k(n_\ell)}|^{-1}$ terms in (4.40) are bounded above by a constant, by applying Lemma 4.6 to the part of the contour contained in $\tilde{\Gamma}$, and applying Lemma 4.5 (one may take any $0 < \delta < 1/2$) to the vertical parts. Combining (4.53) with Lemma 4.4 and this constant bound on $|(-tw_i; t)_{\eta_k(n_\ell)}|^{-1}$ yields the bound

$$\frac{\left|\frac{\tilde{f}(w_{1},\ldots,w_{k})\left(1+\frac{t^{\zeta+L_{k}-\epsilon(n_{\ell})}(w_{1}+\ldots+w_{k})}{n_{\ell}}\right)^{n_{\ell}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}(-tw_{i};t)_{\eta_{k}(n_{\ell})}}\right|$$

$$\leq \operatorname{const} \cdot e^{t^{\zeta+L_{k}-\epsilon(n_{\ell})}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left((\operatorname{Re}(w_{i})+1)+\frac{k-1}{2}(\log t^{-1})\lfloor\log_{t}|w_{i}|\rfloor^{2}+c_{2}\lfloor\log_{t}|w_{i}|\rfloor\right)} \quad (4.54)$$

for the integrand in (4.40). The right hand side factorizes, i.e.

$$RHS(4.54) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} b_{\ell}(w_i)$$
(4.55)

$$b_{\ell}(w) := \operatorname{const}^{1/k} e^{t^{\zeta + L_k - \epsilon(n_{\ell})} \left((\operatorname{Re}(w) + 1) + \frac{k-1}{2} (\log t^{-1}) \lfloor \log_t |w| \rfloor^2 + c_2 \lfloor \log_t |w| \rfloor \right)},$$
(4.56)

Now note that

$$\Gamma(r,n_{\ell})^{k} \setminus \Gamma_{1}(n_{\ell})^{k} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \Gamma(r,n_{\ell})^{i-1} \times \Gamma_{2}(r,n_{\ell}) \times \Gamma(r,n_{\ell})^{k-i}$$
(4.57)

(not a disjoint union). Hence by symmetry of the integrand, the bound (4.54), and the factorization (4.55), it suffices to show

$$\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \int_{\Gamma_2(r,n_\ell)} b_\ell(w) dw \cdot \left(\int_{\Gamma(r,n_\ell)} b_\ell(w) dw \right)^{k-1} = 0.$$
(4.58)

This is an easy exercise: the integral over $\Gamma(r, n_{\ell})$ is bounded above by a constant because the $e^{t^{\zeta+L_k}-\epsilon(n_{\ell})w}$ term in b_{ℓ} decays very rapidly as $\operatorname{Re}(w) \to -\infty$, while the integral over $\Gamma_2(r, n_{\ell})$ goes to 0 for the same reason since $\sup_{w\in\Gamma_2(r,n_{\ell})}\operatorname{Re}(w) \to -\infty$ as $\ell \to \infty$. This shows (4.58), which shows that the second line (4.40) is 0 and hence completes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We follow the proof of [25, Theorem 1.2] with appropriate substitutions. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that (1.4) does not hold. Then there exists some $\epsilon > 0$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and some subsequence $(n_j)_{j\geq 1}$ of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ such that

$$D_{\infty}\left((\operatorname{rank}(A_{n}^{i-1}) - \operatorname{rank}(A_{n}^{i}) - \lfloor \log_{q} n \rfloor)_{1 \leq i \leq k}, (\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1}, q^{\{\log_{q} N_{j}\}}}^{(i)})_{1 \leq i \leq k}\right) > \epsilon$$

$$(4.59)$$

for all j. Since the fractional parts $\{\log_q n_j\}$ always lie in the compact set [0, 1], there is some $\zeta \in [-1, 0]$ and further subsequence $(\tilde{n}_j)_{j\geq 1}$ of $(n_j)_{j\geq 1}$ such that

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \{ \log_q \tilde{n}_j \} = -\zeta, \tag{4.60}$$

and in particular $-\log_q \tilde{n}_j$ converges to ζ in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} . Hence by Theorem 4.1, for all $k \geq 1$ we have

$$(\operatorname{rank}(A_{\tilde{n}_j}^{i-1}) - \operatorname{rank}(A_{\tilde{n}_j}^i) - [\log_q \tilde{n}_j + \zeta])_{1 \le i \le k} \to (\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1}, q^{-\zeta}}^{(i)})_{1 \le i \le k}$$
(4.61)

in distribution as $j \to \infty$. By (4.60), $[\log_q \tilde{n}_j + \zeta] = \lfloor \log_q \tilde{n}_j \rfloor$ for all j sufficiently large, hence (4.61) implies that for all $k \ge 1$,

$$(\operatorname{rank}(A^{i-1}_{\tilde{n}_j}) - \operatorname{rank}(A^i_{\tilde{n}_j}) - \lfloor \log_q \tilde{n}_j \rfloor)_{1 \le i \le k} \to (\mathcal{L}^{(i)}_{q^{-1}, q^{-\zeta}})_{1 \le i \le k}$$
(4.62)

in distribution as $j \to \infty$. Equivalently,

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} D_{\infty} \left((\operatorname{rank}(A_{\tilde{n}_{j}}^{i-1}) - \operatorname{rank}(A_{\tilde{n}_{j}}^{i}) - \lfloor \log_{q} \tilde{n}_{j} \rfloor)_{1 \le i \le k}, (\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1}, q^{-\zeta}}^{(i)})_{1 \le i \le k} \right) = 0.$$
(4.63)

The integral representation in Proposition 3.1 and the integrand bound [25, Lemma 4.4] together imply that for each $L \in \text{Sig}_k$, the probability

$$\Pr((\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1},q^{-\zeta}}^{(i)})_{1 \le i \le k} = \boldsymbol{L})$$

$$(4.64)$$

depends continuously on ζ . Hence by (4.60),

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} D_{\infty} \left((\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1}, q^{\{\log_{q} \tilde{n}_{j}\}}}^{(i)})_{1 \le i \le k}, (\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1}, q^{-\zeta}}^{(i)})_{1 \le i \le k} \right) = 0$$
(4.65)

(this requires uniform continuity of the probabilities over all L, but this follows from the stated continuity of each individual probability since the sum of probabilities is 1). The triangle inequality for D_{∞} and the equations (4.63), (4.65) thus imply

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} D_{\infty} \left((\operatorname{rank}(A_{\tilde{n}_{j}}^{i-1}) - \operatorname{rank}(A_{\tilde{n}_{j}}^{i}) - \lfloor \log_{q} \tilde{n}_{j} \rfloor)_{1 \le i \le k}, (\mathcal{L}_{q^{-1}, q^{\{\log_{q} \tilde{n}_{j}\}}}^{(i)})_{1 \le i \le k} \right) = 0, \quad (4.66)$$

but this contradicts our assumption (4.59). Hence this assumption is false, i.e. the conclusion (1.4) of Theorem 1.1 holds, and this completes the proof.

References

- Ery Arias-Castro, Persi Diaconis, and Richard Stanley. A super-class walk on upper-triangular matrices. Journal of algebra, 278(2):739–765, 2004. (Cited on page 1.)
- Jinho Baik, Percy Deift, and Kurt Johansson. On the distribution of the length of the longest increasing subsequence of random permutations. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 12(4):1119–1178, 1999. (Cited on page 3.)
- [3] Jinho Baik, Percy Deift, and Kurt Johansson. On the distribution of the length of the second row of a Young diagram under Plancherel measure. *Geometric & Functional Analysis GAFA*, 10(4):702–731, 2000. (Cited on page 3.)
- [4] Alexei Borodin. Limit Jordan normal form of large triangular matrices over a finite field. Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen., 29(4):72–75, 1995. (Cited on pages 1, 2, and 3.)
- [5] Alexei Borodin. The law of large numbers and the central limit theorem for the Jordan normal form of large triangular matrices over a finite field. *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, 96(5):3455–3471, 1999. (Cited on pages 1, 2, 3, and 13.)
- [6] Alexei Borodin and Ivan Corwin. Macdonald processes. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 158(1-2):225–400, 2014. (Cited on page 10.)
- [7] Alexei Borodin, Andrei Okounkov, and Grigori Olshanski. Asymptotics of Plancherel measures for symmetric groups. Journal of the American Mathematical Society, 13(3):481–515, 2000. (Cited on page 3.)
- [8] Alexei Borodin and Grigori Olshanski. Representations of the infinite symmetric group, volume 160. Cambridge University Press, 2017. (Cited on page 9.)

ROGER VAN PESKI

- [9] Alexey Bufetov and Leonid Petrov. Law of large numbers for infinite random matrices over a finite field. Selecta Mathematica, 21(4):1271–1338, 2015. (Cited on page 3.)
- [10] Don Coppersmith and Igor Pak. Random walk on upper triangular matrices mixes rapidly. Probability theory and related fields, 117:407–417, 2000. (Cited on page 1.)
- [11] Persi Diaconis and Maryanthe Malliaris. Complexity and randomness in the Heisenberg groups (and beyond). New Zealand Journal of Mathematics, 52:403–426, 2021. (Cited on page 1.)
- [12] Valentin Féray and Pierre-Loïc Méliot. Asymptotics of q-Plancherel measures. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 152:589–624, 2012. (Cited on page 3.)
- [13] Jason Fulman. Random matrix theory over finite fields. Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 39(1):51–85, 2002. (Cited on page 3.)
- [14] Shirshendu Ganguly and Fabio Martinelli. Upper triangular matrix walk: Cutoff for finitely many columns. Random Structures & Algorithms, 55(2):313–341, 2019. (Cited on page 1.)
- [15] SV Kerov. Generalized Hall-Littlewood symmetric functions and orthogonal polynomials. Representation theory and dynamical systems Advances in Soviet Math, 9:67–94, 1992. (Cited on page 8.)
- [16] A. A. Kirillov. Variations on the triangular theme. In *Lie groups and Lie algebras: E. B. Dynkin's Seminar*, volume 169 of *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2*, pages 43–73. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995. (Cited on pages 2 and 3.)
- [17] Ian Grant Macdonald. Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials. Oxford university press, 1998. (Cited on pages 3, 5, 6, and 10.)
- [18] Konstantin Matveev. Macdonald-positive specializations of the algebra of symmetric functions: Proof of the Kerov conjecture. Annals of Mathematics, 189(1):277–316, 2019. (Cited on page 8.)
- [19] Evita Nestoridi. Super-character theory and comparison arguments for a random walk on the upper triangular matrices. Journal of Algebra, 521:97–113, 2019. (Cited on page 1.)
- [20] Yuval Peres and Allan Sly. Mixing of the upper triangular matrix walk. Probability Theory and Related Fields, 156(3):581–591, 2013. (Cited on page 1.)
- [21] Richard Stong. Random walks on the groups of upper triangular matrices. The Annals of Probability, pages 1939–1949, 1995. (Cited on page 1.)
- [22] Roger Van Peski. Limits and fluctuations of p-adic random matrix products. Selecta Mathematica, 27(5):1–71, 2021. (Cited on pages 3 and 7.)
- [23] Roger Van Peski. Hall-Littlewood polynomials, boundaries, and p-adic random matrices. International Mathematics Research Notices, 2023(13):11217-11275, 2022. (Cited on page 12.)
- [24] Roger Van Peski. q-TASEP with position-dependent slowing. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 27:1–35, 2022. (Cited on page 8.)
- [25] Roger Van Peski. Local limits in p-adic random matrix theory. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12275, 2023. To appear in Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society. (Cited on pages 1, 3, 4, 11, 13, 16, 17, 22, 23, and 25.)