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Abstract. For a connected split reductive algebraic group $G$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$, a finite field of $q$ elements, let $G^{op}$ be the opposite group over $\mathbb{F}_q$ that is constructed by Prasad in his conjectures describing distinguished representations for Galois pairs over $p$-adic fields. We prove: Let $\pi$ be an irreducible representation of $G_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, where $\mathbb{F}_q$ denote a quadratic extension of $\mathbb{F}_q$. Assume that $\pi$ is generic with respect to a non-degenerate character of $U_{\mathbb{F}_q}$ that is trivial on $U_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, with $U$ a maximal unipotent subgroup of $G$. If $\pi$ is a Shintani base change lift of some representation of $G^{op}_{\mathbb{F}_q}$, then $\pi$ is distinguished by $G_{\mathbb{F}_q}$.

1. Introduction

Let $G$ be a connected reductive algebraic group over a field $F$, which is either a finite field or a $p$-adic field $F$. Let $H$ be a subgroup of $G(F)$ and $\chi$ a character of $H$. A complex representation $(\pi, V)$ of $G(F)$ is said to be $\chi$-distinguished with respect to $H$ if there is a nonzero linear functional $l$ on $V$ such that $l(\pi(h)v) = \chi(h)v$ for all $h \in H$ and $v \in V$. When $\chi$ is trivial, $(\pi, V)$ is also called distinguished representations with respect to $H$. Often appeared in the literature is the case where $H$ is the fixed points of an involution on $G$. A guiding principle, due to Jacquet, is that the class of $H$-distinguished representations are often base change lifts from another group.

In this paper, we consider the case where $H$ is the fixed points of a Galois involution, i.e., $G = G(E)$, $H = G(F)$ for $E/F$ a quadratic extension of fields. In [Pra1], when the field $F$ is a local field, Prasad has proposed very general conjectures about representations of $G(E)$ distinguished by $G(F)$ in terms of the Langlands parameters of the representations of $G(E)$.

We recall the part of Prasad’s conjecture that we are interested in. In [Pra1] §7-8, Prasad constructs a certain quasi-split group $G^{op}$ over $F$ which becomes isomorphic to $G$ over $E$; and a quadratic character $\omega_{G,E}: G(F) \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$. In §9 in loc.cit, he describes base change lifts in terms of Langlands parameters. One of the conjectures made in [Pra1] is the following
**Conjecture 1.1.** Let $\pi$ be an irreducible admissible representation of $G(E)$. Assume that $\pi$ has a Whittaker model for a character $$\psi : N(E)/N(F) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times,$$ and that the $L$-packet $\{\pi\}$ on $G(E)$ arises from base change of an $L$-packet on $G^{op}$, i.e., the Langlands parameter $\sigma$ of $\pi$ in $\text{Hom}(W_{E,1}^\dagger G) = \text{Hom}(W_{E,1}^\dagger G^{op})$ arises as the restriction of a parameter $\tilde{\sigma}$ in $\text{Hom}(W_{F,1}^\dagger G^{op})$, then $\pi$ is $\omega_{G,E}$-distinguished.

In this paper, we consider the finite field analogue of this conjecture. In the finite fields setting, we still have the involutions introduced in [Pra2] or [Pra1] §4, as these involutions are constructed for a general field. So we can still form the opposite group $G^{op}$. There are already notions of base change lifts that have been much studied in the representation theory of finite groups of Lie type, e.g., [Shi], [Kaw1], [Gyo], etc. In [Shi], Shintani constructs a norm map and use it to define a concept of lifting (or descent) between irreducible representations of $\text{GL}_n(F_q)$ and Galois invariant irreducible representations of $\text{GL}_n(F_p)$ via a character relation. In [Kaw1], Kawanaka introduces another norm map in a borader context and hence get another form of base change lift. In this paper, we adopt the definition in [Kaw1] §2. We remark that the original base chang lift of Shintani and the character relation were generalized by Arthur and Clozel in [AC] to $GL_n$ for a cyclic extension of $p$-adic fields (for tempered representations in loc.cit, for unitary and elliptic representations, see [BH]).

Let $G$ be a connected split reductive group over $\mathbb{F}_q$. It is convinient for us to start from a pinning $\mathcal{P}$ on $G$. Fix an additive character $\psi_o$ of $\mathbb{F}_q^\dagger$ that is trivial on $\mathbb{F}_q$. Let $\psi = \psi_o \circ \Psi$ be the non-degenerate character of $U(\mathbb{F}_q^\dagger)$, see Section 2.3. Our main theorem is

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $\pi$ be an irreducible, $\psi$-generic representation of $G(\mathbb{F}_q^\dagger)$. Assume that $\pi$ is a Shintaini base change of some representation $\rho$ of $G^{op}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Then $\pi$ is distinguished by $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

There are already some works on the distinction problem in the case of finite fields. For connected reductive groups $G$ with connected center, Lusztig in [Lus1] gave an explicit calculation for the multiplicity $m_2(\pi) = \dim_{C} \text{Hom}_{G(\mathbb{F}_q)}(\pi, C)$ for all irreducible representations $\pi$ of $G(\mathbb{F}_q^\dagger)$. Before Lusztig’s work, Kawanaka in [Kaw2] gave a formula of $m_2$ for all irreducible representations of classical groups. For groups with non-connected center, Shoji and Sorlin in [SS1] gave an explicit computation for finite special linear group. All the works are based on a general formula for the multiplicity of a Deligne-Lusztig character in [Lus2] and a relation between the multiplicity formula and twisted Frobenius-Schur indicators. However, it is not clear to see the relationship between distinction property and functorial lifts from their results.

We mention that our method follows the same line with the one in [AM] by Anandavarahan and Matringe which the authors use to find test vectors for invariant linear forms in the case $G = GL_n$. 


2. Preliminaries

It is convenient for us to assume at first that the field $k$ is arbitrary. Let $G$ be a connected reductive group which is split over $k$. Let $T$ be a maximally $k$-split torus in $G$.

Let $X(T)$ resp. $Y(T)$ be the group of characters resp. cocharacters of $T$. Let $\Phi = \Phi(T, G) \subset X(T)$ be the set of roots of $T$ in $G$, and $\Phi \subset Y(T)$ be the set of coroots. $(X(T), \Phi, Y(T), \Phi^\vee)$ is the root datum of $G$.

Let $B$ be a Borel subgroup containing $T$. Then the choice of $B$ defines a set of positive roots $\Phi^+$ and simple roots $\Delta$ of $T$ in $B$. For $\alpha \in \Phi$, denote by $U_\alpha$ the root subgroup of $G$ corresponding to $\alpha$ over $k$.

Let $W = N_G(T)/T$ be the Weyl group. For each $\alpha \in \Phi$, let $w_\alpha$ denote the corresponding reflection on $X(T)$ which we extend to $X(T) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Then $W$ is isomorphic to the finite reflection group generated by all $w_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \Phi$. We will view $w_\alpha$ as elements in $W$. As an abstract group, $W$ is a Coxeter group with generators $w_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \Delta$. Denote by $l$ the length function on $W$.

Denote by $w_0$ the unique longest Weyl element in $W$. We have $w_0^2 = 1$ and $w_0(\Phi^+) = -\Phi^+$. For $I \subset \Delta$, let $\Phi(I) \subset \Phi$ be the roots generated by $I$. The group $L_I$ generated by $T$ and $U_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \Phi(I)$ is split and reductive. Let $W_I = \langle w_\alpha \mid \alpha \in I \rangle$. Then $W_I$ is the Weyl group of $L_I$. Denote by $w_I$ the longest Weyl element in $W_I$.

2.1. Pinning. A pinning of $G$ is a set $\mathcal{P} = (B, T, \Delta, \{u_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Delta\})$, where $T$ is a maximally $k$-split torus, $B$ is a Borel subgroup containing $T$, $\Delta$ is the set of simple roots determined by $B$ and, for each $\alpha \in \Delta$,

$$u_\alpha : G_\alpha \rightarrow U_\alpha$$

is an isomorphism over $k$. The pair $(G, \mathcal{P})$ is refered as a pinned reductive group. An isomorphism $f : (G, \mathcal{P}) \rightarrow (G', \mathcal{P}')$ is an isomorphism of pinned groups if

1. Under the correspondence $\alpha \leftrightarrow \alpha'$, $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha' \in \Phi'$ defined by $f$, elements of $\Delta$ correspond to elements of $\Delta'$;
2. $f(u_\alpha(1)) = u_{\alpha'}(1)$, for all $\alpha \in \Delta$.

A based root datum is a root datum $(X, \Phi, Y, \Phi)$ equipped with a base $\Delta$ for $\Phi$. To each pinned reductive group is associated a based root datum. An isomorphism of based root data is an isomorphism of root data that preserves the bases.

A fundamental theorem in the theory of reductive group is that an isomorphism of based root data can be lifted to a unique isomorphism of pinned reductive group (see [Mil, Theorem 23.40]).

Each pinning $\mathcal{P}$ gives a canonical choice of representatives of elements in $W$. For $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $u_\alpha : G_\alpha \rightarrow U_\alpha$, we can associate a unique $u_{-\alpha} : G_\alpha \rightarrow U_{-\alpha}$ such that, among other things,

$$\hat{w}_\alpha = u_\alpha(1)u_{-\alpha}(-1)u_\alpha(1)$$
lies in $N_G(T)$ and has image $w_\alpha$ in $W$ ([BT 3.2.1]). If $w = w_{\alpha_1} \cdots w_{\alpha_r}$ is a reduced decomposition of $w \in W$, the element $w_{\alpha_1} \cdots w_{\alpha_r}$ is independent of the choice of the reduced decomposition of $w$. We denote this element by $\dot{w}$.

We make frequent use of the following facts.

**Lemma 2.1.**
1. If $w, w' \in W$ and $l(w) + l(w') = l(ww')$, we have $\dot{ww'} = (\dot{w}\dot{w'})$.
2. If $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta$ and $w \in W$ such that $w \cdot \alpha = \beta$, then
   \[\dot{w}\alpha \dot{w}^{-1} = u_{\beta}(x), \quad x \in k.\]

**Proof.** Part (1) is easy and appears as an exercise in [Spr 9.3.4]. Part (2) is Proposition in [Spr 9.3.5]. Q.E.D.

### 2.2. Bruhat decomposition.
For $w \in W$ let
\[\Phi^+_w = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid w(\alpha) > 0\}\]
and set
\[U^+_w = U_{\Phi^+_w} = U \cap w^{-1}Uw \quad \text{and} \quad U^-_w = U_{\Phi^-_w} = U \cap w^{-1}U^-w.\]
Then
\[U = U^+_wU^-_w.\]

For each $w \in W$ let $C(w) = BwB = BwU^-_w$ be the corresponding Bruhat cell. The $k$-rational Bruhat decomposition for $G$ is then
\[G = \bigcup_{w \in W} C(w) = \bigcup_{w \in W} BwU^-_w.\]

### 2.3. Algebraic nondegenerate characters.
Let $(G, \mathcal{P} = (B, T, \{u_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Delta}))$ be a pinned split reductive group. Let
\[U = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+} U_\alpha, \quad U_1 = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi^+, \alpha \notin \Delta} U_\alpha\]
By the commutator relations [Spr 8.2.3], $U_1$ is a normal subgroup of $U$ and $U/U_1$ is abelian. The map $(u_1, u_2, \cdots, u_s) \to \prod u_i$ is an isomorphism from the direct product $U_{\alpha_1} \times \cdots \times U_{\alpha_s}$ to the quotient group $U/U_1$.

We can associate a homomorphism of algebraic groups $\Psi: U \to \mathbb{G}_a$ defined over $k$ to the pinning $\mathcal{P}$ by
\[\Psi(\prod u_\alpha(x_\alpha)) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} x_\alpha.\]
Fix a non-trivial additive character $\psi_0$ of $k$. $\psi = \psi_0 \circ \Psi$ is then a non-degenerate character of $U(k)$. Recall that a character $\psi$ of $U(k)$ is non-degenerate means that $\psi$ is not trivial when restricted to each root subgroup $U_\alpha, \alpha \in \Delta$ and $\psi$ is trivial on each $U_\alpha$ with $\alpha \notin \Delta$. If the field $k$ is self-dual, such as finite fields or local fields, one find that each non-degenerate character of $U(k)$ arises from this way.
3. The duality involution $\iota_{G,\mathcal{P}}$

Dipendra Prasad in [Pra2] constructs an involution for any quasi-split reductive group over an arbitrary field that generalizes the Moeglin-Vigneras-Waldspurger involution in [MVW] for classical groups. In the local field case, the involution is conjectured to take an irreducible admissible representation to its contragredient ([Pra2 Conjecture 1]).

We first recall the definition in [Pra2].

**Definition 3.1.** (Duality involution) For a fixed pinned reductive group $(G, \mathcal{P})$, with $\mathcal{P} = (B, T, \{u_\alpha\})$. Let $c_{G,\mathcal{P}}$ be the Chevalley involution that fixes $\mathcal{P}$ and acts on $T$ as $t \to w_0(t^{-1})$. Let $\iota \in T^{ad}(k)$ is the unique element which acts by $-1$ on all simple root spaces of $T$ in $B$. Define the duality involution $\iota_{G,\mathcal{P}}$ as the product of two commuting automorphisms: $\iota_{G,\mathcal{P}} = \iota \circ c_{G,\mathcal{P}}$.

We briefly indicate how it is constructed. Note that $-w_0$ gives an isomorphism between the based root datum $(X(T), \Phi, Y(T), \Phi^\vee, \Delta)$ and itself. By [MVW Theorem 23.40], there is a unique isomorphism $c_{G,\mathcal{P}} : G \to G$ fixing $\mathcal{P}$ and inducing $-w_0$. So $c_{G,\mathcal{P}}(t) = w_0(t^{-1})$ for $t \in T$. This implies $c_{G,\mathcal{P}}(U_\alpha) = U_{-w_0\alpha}$. Since $c_{G,\mathcal{P}}$ fixes $\mathcal{P}$, we have $c_{G,\mathcal{P}}(u_\alpha(x)) = u_{-w_0\alpha}(x)$, $x \in k$. After composing with $\iota$, we get the duality involution $\iota_{G,\mathcal{P}}$. In particular, we have

$$\iota_{G,\mathcal{P}}(u_\alpha(x)) = u_{-w_0\alpha}(-x), \quad \alpha \in \Delta.$$  

As we shall always fix a pinned group, we omit the subscript $\mathcal{P}$ in the notations. The following description of $\iota_G$ will be central to our work.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let $I \subset \Delta$ be a subset of simple roots. Define $I' = -w_0I \subset \Delta$. Then

$$\iota_G(w_I) = (w_{I'})^{-1}.$$  

**Proof.** For $\alpha \in \Phi$, let $\alpha'$ denote the root $-w_0\alpha$; similar notations for subset of roots. We consider the Coxeter graph (that is, omitting the values on the edges of the Coxeter diagram) of $W$. Let $C(I)$ be the full subgraph whose set of vertices are just $I$. Denote the connected components of $C(I)$ by $C(I_1), \ldots, C(I_r)$, where $I_1, \ldots, I_r$ are the set of vertices of the components. By the construction of Coxeter diagram, if two vertices are not connected by an edge, the Weyl elements they correspond commute. Thus Weyls elements in different $I'$'s commute. By picking a reduced decomposition of $w_I$ and rearranging the order of the product, we find that

$$w_I = \hat{w}_{I_1} \hat{w}_{I_2} \cdots \hat{w}_{I_r}$$

and any two factors in the decomposition (3.3) commute. Note that the map $-w_0$ between simple roots can be realized as conjugation by $w_0$ between corresponding Weyl elements. Hence the subgraphs $C(I'_1), \ldots, C(I'_r)$ are also connected components of $C(I')$. In this way we can reduce to the case when $C(I)$ is connected. This also means that the Weyl group $W_I$ is an irreducible Coxeter group.
First, consider the case where $I = \{\alpha\}$ consists one simple root. So

$$\tilde{w}_\alpha = u_\alpha(1)u_{-\alpha}(-1)u_\alpha(1).$$

By (3.1), we get that

$$\iota_G(\tilde{w}_\alpha) = u_{-w_\alpha}(1)u_{w_\alpha}(1)u_{-w_{\alpha}}(1) = (\tilde{w}_{-w_{\alpha}})^{-1}.$$  (3.4)

For general $I$, we choose a special reduced decomposition of $w_I$. I learned this from an online note [Hum] of James Humphreys. As there is no loops on the Coxeter diagram, we can divide the vertices into two disjoint subset, $I = I_a \sqcup I_b$, such that all simple reflections in $I_a$ (or $I_b$) commute. Let $w_{I_a}$ resp. $w_{I_b}$ denote the product of simple reflections in $I_a$ resp. $I_b$. There are two cases for the construction of a reduced decomposition of the longest Weyl element in $W_I$.

- Type not $A_n$, with $n$ even: In this case,
  $$w_{I_a}w_{I_b}w_{I_a}w_{I_b} \cdots w_{I_a}w_{I_b} = w_{I_a}w_{I_a}w_{I_b}w_{I_b} \cdots w_{I_a}w_{I_b}$$
  is a reduced decomposition of $w_I$.

- Type $A_n$, $n$ even: In this case
  $$w_{I_a}w_{I_a}w_{I_b}w_{I_b} \cdots w_{I_a}w_{I_b} = w_{I_a}w_{I_a}w_{I_b}w_{I_b} \cdots w_{I_a}w_{I_b}$$
  is a reduced decomposition of $w_I$.

By Lemma 2.1(1), these relations still hold if we replace Weyl element by its canonical representative. In view of (3.4), we have

$$\iota_G(\tilde{w}_{I_a}) = (\tilde{w}_{I_a}')^{-1}, \quad \iota_G(\tilde{w}_{I_b}) = (\tilde{w}_{I_b}')^{-1}.$$  

So, for type not $A_n$, $n$ even, we have

$$\iota_G(\tilde{w}_I) = \iota_G(\tilde{w}_{I_a}) \cdots \iota_G(\tilde{w}_{I_b}) = (\tilde{w}_{I_a}')^{-1} \cdots (\tilde{w}_{I_b}')^{-1}$$

$$= (\tilde{w}_{I_a}' \cdots \tilde{w}_{I_b}')^{-1} = (\tilde{w}_I')^{-1}.$$  

for type $A_n$, $n$ even, we have

$$\iota_G(\tilde{w}_I) = \iota_G(\tilde{w}_{I_a}) \cdots \iota_G(\tilde{w}_{I_a}) = (\tilde{w}_{I_a}')^{-1} \cdots (\tilde{w}_{I_a}')^{-1}$$

$$= (\tilde{w}_{I_a}' \cdots \tilde{w}_{I_a}')^{-1} = (\tilde{w}_I')^{-1}.$$  

Q.E.D.

4. Bessel functions over finite fields

In this section, the field $k$ is assumed to be a finite field. The basics of the theory of Bessel functions for representations of algebraic groups over finite field can be found in [Gel]. Our reference for this section is [CPSS 2.1, 2.2].

Let $(G, \mathcal{P})$ be a pinned connected reductive group over $k$. We retain all the notations of Section 2 and Section 3. Let $\psi_o$ be a nontrivial character of $k$, then $\psi = \psi_o \circ \Psi$ is a non-degenerate character of $U(k)$. By a theorem [SFW] Theorem 49] of Steinberg, the representation $\text{Ind}_{U(k)}^G(\psi)$ is multiplicity free. Let $\pi$ be a $\psi$-generic representation of $G(k)$,
that is,
\[ \dim_C \Hom_{G(k)}(\pi, \text{Ind}_{U(k)}^G \psi) = \dim_C \Hom_{U(k)}(\pi, \psi) = 1. \]

Take a nonzero Whittaker functional \( \Lambda \), that is, \( \Lambda(\pi(u)v) = \psi(u)v \) for all \( u \in U(k) \) and all \( v \in V_\pi \). As any representation of a finite group is automorphically unitary, we can choose a nonzero \( \nu_w \in V_\pi \) such that \( \pi(u)\nu_w = \psi(u)\nu_w \) for all \( u \in U(k) \) and \( v \in V_\pi \). Such \( \Lambda \) and \( \nu_w \) are unique up to a scalar factor. Assume further that \( \Lambda \) and \( \nu_w \) are normalized so that \( \Lambda(\nu_w) = 1 \).

**Definition 4.1.** The (normalised) Bessel function of \( \pi \) (with respect to \( \psi \)) is the function \( B_\pi \) on \( G(k) \) such that
\[ B_\pi(g) = \Lambda(\pi(g)\nu_w). \] (4.1)

One sees immediately that \( B_\pi(1) = 1 \) and
\[ B_\pi(u_1gu_2) = \psi(u_1)\psi(u_2)B_\pi(g) \] (4.2)
for all \( u_1, u_2 \in U(k) \). One sees that \( B_\pi \) is nothing but a Whittaker vector in Whittaker model of \( \pi \). By the uniqueness of Whittaker models, the Bessel function \( B_\pi \) is uniquely determined for an isomorphism class of \((\psi\text{-generic})\) representations of \( G(k) \). On the other hand, the Bessel function also determines the isomorphism class of \( \pi \) because the restriction of the right regular representation to the space of linear combinations of right translations of \( B_\pi \) is isomorphic to \( \pi \).

We take a closer look at the transformation rule (4.2) of a Bessel function. We remark that Proposition 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 are well known to experts and appear in [CPSS 2.1, 2.2] without a proof. Though simple, we include here a proof for the sake of completeness.

**Definition 4.2.** Let \( w \in W \). \( w \) supports a Bessel function if for every \( \alpha \in \Delta \) such that \( \omega_\alpha > 0 \), \( \omega_\alpha w \) is simple.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let \( w \in W \). If \( w \) does not support a Bessel function, then the restriction of any function on \( G(k) \) satisfying (4.2) to the Bruhat cell \( C(w) \) is identically zero.

**Proof.** Let \( B \) be such a function. For a \( w \) not supporting a Bessel function, we can choose \( \alpha \in \Delta \) such that \( \omega_\alpha > 0 \), \( \omega_\alpha \notin \Delta \). Thus \( \alpha \in \Phi_w^+ \) and \( wU_\alpha w^{-1} = U_{\omega_\alpha} \subset U \).

As \( \psi \) is non-degenerated, choose \( x \in U_\alpha \) such that \( \psi(x) \neq 1 \). For any \( a \in T \), we have \( (aw)x = (a\omega_\alpha x a^{-1})(aw) \). So \( \psi(x)B(aw) = \psi(a\omega_\alpha x a^{-1})B(aw) \). Note that \( \omega_\alpha \notin \Delta \), \( \psi \) is trivial on restriction to \( U_{\omega_\alpha} \). Therefore we conclude \( B(aw) = 0 \).

Q.E.D.

If \( w \) supports a Bessel function, let
\[ A_w = \{ a \in T(k) \mid \omega_\alpha a = 1 \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Delta \text{ such that } \omega_\alpha > 0 \}. \]

**Proposition 4.4.** Let \( a \notin A_w \). Then any function on \( G(k) \) satisfying (4.2) vanishes at \( aw \).

**Proof.** If \( a \notin A_w \), then there exists \( \alpha \in \Delta \) with \( \omega_\alpha > 0 \) such that \( \omega_\alpha a = 1 \). Take \( x = u_\alpha(z) \in U_\alpha \), \( z \in k \). By assumption, the root \( \omega_\alpha \) is simple. Thus \( wu_\alpha(z)w^{-1} = \)
The elements \( w \) which supports Bessel functions and the group \( A_w \) have the following nice description.

**Proposition 4.5.** Let \( w_0 \) be the long Weyl element of \( W \). Then \( w \) supports a Bessel function if and only if \( w = w_0w_J \) with \( w_J \) the long Weyl element of \( W_J \). Also, \( A_w \) is the center of the Levi subgroup \( L_w \).

**Proof.** The first statement is in [SFW] Lemma 89. The second statement follows from (4.3). Q.E.D.

**Proposition 4.6.** Assume that \( w \) supports a Bessel function. For \( a \in A_w \), we have

\[
(4.4) \quad \iota_G(aw) = (aw)^{-1}.
\]

**Proof.** It is equivalent to show that

\[
(4.5) \quad \iota_G(\hat{w})^{-1}\iota_G(a)^{-1}\iota_G(\hat{w})\iota_G(\hat{w})^{-1} = aw.
\]

We first show that \( \iota_G(\hat{w}) = \hat{w}^{-1} \). Write \( w = w_0w_J \). As \( w_J^2 = 1 \), \( l(w) + l(w_J) = l(w_0) = l(ww_J) \). Thus by Lemma 2.1(1), we get \( \hat{w_0}w_J = \hat{w} \). By Theorem 3.2, we get \( \iota_G(w) = \hat{w_0}^{-1}w_J \), where \( J' = -w_0J \). So what we need to show is that

\[
\hat{w_0}w_J\hat{w_0}^{-1} = w_J
\]

Using Lemma 2.1(1) again, we get that \( \hat{w_0} = (w_0w_Jw_0^{-1})(w_0w_J) \) and \( \hat{w_0} = (w_0w_J)w_J \). Hence \( \hat{w_0}w_J\hat{w_0}^{-1} = (w_0w_Jw_0^{-1}) = \hat{w}_J \).

Next we show \( \hat{w_0}\iota_G(a^{-1})\hat{w_0}^{-1} = a \). By Proposition 4.5, \( \hat{w}^{-1}aw \) is in the center of \( L_J \), hence commutes with \( \hat{w}_J \). This gives that \( \hat{w}^{-1}aw = \hat{w}_0^{-1}aw_0 = \hat{w}_0a^{-1}\hat{w}_0^{-1} = \iota_G(a^{-1}) \). Q.E.D.

5. The opposite group and Shintani base change

Let \( \mathbb{E}/\mathbb{F} \) be a quadratic extension of finite fields, and \( G \) be a split connected reductive group over \( \mathbb{F} \). To simplify matters, we give a direct construction of the opposite group.

Let \( F_0 \) denote the Frobenius endomorphism associated to the \( \mathbb{F} \)-structure of \( G \). So \( G(\mathbb{F}) = G^{F_0} \). Let \( F_1 = F_0 \circ \iota_G \). Note that \( G^{F_1} \subset G^{F_1} = G(\mathbb{F}) \).

**Definition 5.1.**

\[
G^{op}(\mathbb{F}) := G^{F_1} = \{ g \in G(\mathbb{F}) \mid F_0(\iota_G(g)) = g \},
\]

\[
G^{op}(\mathbb{E}) := G^{F_1} = G(\mathbb{E}).
\]
5.1. Double cosets $B(\mathbb{F}) \backslash G^{\text{op}}(\mathbb{F}) / G^{\text{op}}(\mathbb{F})$. The following lemma is well known, e.g., it is contained implicitly in \cite{Hen} Lemma 2.1.2).

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $G'$ be a connected affine algebraic groups over $\mathbb{F}$ with an Frobenius endomorphism $F'$. Let $B'$, $K'$ be $F'$-stable, connected subgroups of $G'$. Assume that, for any $g \in G'^{F'}$, the subgroup $B' \cap gK'g^{-1}$ is connected. Assume that $F'$, and its restrictions to $B'$, $K'$, $B' \cap gK'g^{-1}$, are all surjective. Assume also that $|G'^{F'}| < \infty$. Then the natural map

$$(5.1) \quad B'^{F'} \backslash G'^{F'} / K'^{F'} \to (B' \backslash G' / K')^{F'}$$

is a bijection.

**Proof.** This is a standard use of Lang-Steinberg theorem. For injectivity, let $g_1, g_2 \in G'^{F'}$ with $B'_g1K' = B'_g2K'$. Take $b \in B'$ and $k \in K'$ such that $g_1 = bg_2k$. As $g_1, g_2$ are $F'$-fixed, $bg_2k = F'(b)g_2F'(k)$. So $g_2kF'(k)^{-1}g_2^{-1} = b^{-1}F'(b) \in B' \cap gK'g^{-1}$. Applying the Lang-Steinberg theorem, there exists $h \in B' \cap gK'g^{-1}$ such that

$$g_2kF'(k)^{-1}g_2^{-1} = b^{-1}F'(b) = h^{-1}F'(h).$$

Thus we get that $bh^{-1} \in B'^{F'}$, $g_2^{-1}h \in K'^{F'}$. Therefore $g_1 = (bh^{-1})g_2(g_2^{-1}h)g_2k$. The argument for surjectivity is similar, so we omit it. Q.E.D.

We use a slightly broader framework. The group $G$ is still assume to be a split connected reductive group. Take any involution $\tau$ (maybe trivial) on $G$ such that $F_0 \circ \tau = \tau \circ F_0$. Assume further that $\tau$ fixes the maximal torus $T$ and the Borel subgroup $B$. So $\tau$ induces an involution, which we still denote by $\tau$, on the Weyl group $W$. Denote $F_0 \circ \tau$ by $F_\tau$.

**Proposition 5.5.** The double coset space $B'^{F_\tau} \backslash G^{F_\tau} / G^{F_\tau}$ is in bijection with the set $\{ w \in W : \tau(w) = w^{-1} \}$. Moreover, for each such $w$, take a (any) $\eta_w$ such that $\eta_wF_\tau(\eta_w)^{-1} = w$ according to the Lang-Steinberg theorem. Then the group $G^{F_\tau}$ is the disjoint union of the double cosets $B'^{F_\tau} \eta_wG^{F_\tau}$ over all $w \in W$, $w\tau(w) = 1$.

**Proof.** We consider the connected reductive group $G' = G \times G$ and a Frobenius map $F'$ which is given by $F'(g_1,g_2) = (F_\tau(g_2), F_\tau(g_1))$. Then $g \mapsto (g, F_\tau(g))$ is an isomorphism

$$(5.2) \quad G^{F_\tau} \cong G'^{F'}.$$ 

Let $K' = \Delta G \subset G'$ be the diagonal subgroup and $B' = B \times B$. Under the isomorphism $(5.2)$, we get

$$(5.3) \quad B'^{F_\tau} \cong B'^{F'} , \quad G^{F_\tau} \cong K'^{F'}.$$ 

and hence a bijection

$$B'^{F_\tau} \backslash G^{F_\tau} / G^{F_\tau} \to B'^{F'} \backslash G'^{F'} / K'^{F'}.$$ 

Note that $(b_1, b_2) \mapsto b_2$ is an isomorphism

$$(5.5) \quad B \times B \cap (g_1,g_2)\Delta G(g_1,g_2)^{-1} \cong B \cap g_2g_2^{-1}Bg_2g_2^{-1}$$

and hence a bijection

$$B'^{F_\tau} \backslash G^{F_\tau} / G^{F_\tau} \to B'^{F'} \backslash G'^{F'} / K'^{F'}.$$
The intersection of any two Borel subgroups is again connected (see \[\text{[Bor]}\, 14.22\]). Thus the conditions of Lemma 5.2 are satisfied. We then get a bijection
\[(5.6) \quad B^{F'} \setminus G^{F'} / K^{F'} \rightarrow (B' \setminus G' / K')^{F'}.
\]
Under the map \((g_1, g_2) \mapsto g_1 g_2^{-1}\), the set of double cosets \(B' \setminus G' / K'\) is in canonical bijection with the Weyl group \(W\) via the Bruhat decomposition. The action of \(F'\) is transformed as an action \(w \mapsto \tau(w)^{-1}\). Tracing these bijections, we can find the representatives of the double coset space as those required. Q.E.D.

Let \(X_\tau\) be the ‘norm one’ elements in \(G^{F^*}\) with respect to \(F_\tau\), that is,
\[(5.7) \quad X_\tau = \{ g \in G^{F^*} \mid F_\tau(g) = g^{-1} \}.
\]

**Lemma 5.4.** If \(g \in X_\tau\), then \(g = n a w F_\tau(n)^{-1}\) for some \(n \in U(\mathbb{E}), a \in T, w \in W\) with \(w \tau(w) = 1\).

**Proof.** Write \(g = h F_\tau(h)^{-1}\) by Lang-Steinberg theorem. As \(g \in X_\tau\), we get \(F_\tau^2(h) = h\), that is, \(h \in G^{F^*}\). By Proposition 5.3, write \(h = b n \tau k\), where \(b \in B^{F^*}, k \in G^{F_{\bar{T}}}\) and \(n \tau F_\tau(n)^{-1} = w\), for some \(w, \tau(w) = 1\). Hence \(g = b w F_\tau(h)^{-1} = n a w F_\tau(n)^{-1}\) for some \(n \in U(\mathbb{E})\) and \(a \in T\). Q.E.D.

The next lemma will be used in Proposition 6.3.

**Lemma 5.5.** Let \(H\) be a connected normal subgroup of \(G\). Assume that \(H\) is \(F_\tau\) stable. Then we have a bijection
\[(5.8) \quad G^{F_\tau} / H^{F_\tau} \cong \left( G^{F^*} / H^{F^*} \right)^{F_\tau}.
\]

**Proof.** The proof involves Lang-Steinberg theorem and is similar to Lemma 5.2, so we omit the details. Q.E.D.

**Remark 5.6.** There should be a cohomological explanation for (5.8), at least when \(\tau\) is trivial. In such case, the obstruction for an isomorphism is \(H^1(\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{E}}/\mathbb{F}), H(\mathbb{E}))\) while Lang’s theorem is actually \(H^1(\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{E}}/\mathbb{F}), H(\mathbb{E})) = 1\).

5.2. **Shintani base change.** Unlike the \(p\)-adic cases in \[\text{[Pra1]}\], where the base change of a representation (or an \(L\)-packet) is described in terms of its Langlands parameter, we use a language here that the base change is defined by a character relation as that originally considered by Shintani.

Put \(\mathcal{G} = G^{F^*}, \mathcal{G}_{F_\tau} = G^{F_\tau}\). One says \(g, h \in \mathcal{G}\) are \(F_\tau\)-conjugate if \(g = x h F_\tau(x)^{-1}\) for an \(x \in \mathcal{G}\). By Lang-Steinberg theorem, every element \(x \in G\) can be written as \(y F_\tau(y)^{-1}\); the choice of \(y\) is unique up to right translation by \(\mathcal{G}_{F_\tau}\). It can be easily checked that \(x \in \mathcal{G}\) if and only if
\[F_\tau^2(y)^{-1} y = F_\tau(y)^{-1} (F_\tau(x) x) F_\tau(y) \in \mathcal{G}_{F_\tau}.
\]
We then have a ‘norm correspondence’
\[N : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{F_\tau}, \]
x \mapsto F_2^2(y)^{-1}y,

One checks that $N$ induces a well-defined map

$$N: \{F_2\text{-conjugacy classes of } G\} \rightarrow \{\text{conjugacy classes of } G_{F_2}\}$$

The map $N$ is called the Shintani norm map.

**Lemma 5.7.** The Shintani norm map $N$ is bijective.

**Proof.** This is proved in [Kaw1] Lemma 2.2. Q.E.D.

We will denote by $\widetilde{G}$ the semi-direct product $G \times \langle t \rangle$, where $t^2 = 1, t(g) = F_2(g)$. The subset $\widetilde{G} \times \{t\}$ consists of $\widetilde{G}$ conjugacy classes. One checks easily that the set of $\widetilde{G}$ conjugacy classes in $\widetilde{G} \times \{t\}$ are in bijection with the set of $F_2$-conjugacy classes in $G$. For any representation $\Pi$ of $G$ with $\Pi_{F_2} \cong \Pi$, one can extend $\Pi$ to a representation $\bar{\Pi}$ of $\widetilde{G}$.

To define the Shintani base change, we need a canonical extension. We follow the treatment in [AC]. This will rely on Whittaker models. Assume that $\Pi$ is $\psi$-generic, $\Pi_{F_2} \cong \Pi$. This will necessarily requires that $\psi = \psi_{F_2}$, which we shall also assume. By [SFW Theorem 49], both $\Pi$ and $\Pi_{F_2}$ have a unique $\psi$-Whittaker model contained in the space of functions on $G(\mathbb{F})$ that is left $(U(\mathbb{F}), \psi)$ invariant. In fact, This is the linear combinations of right translations of $\psi$-Bessel functions of $\Pi_{F_2}$. For $f \in W(\Pi, \psi)$, let $f_{F_2}(g) = f(F_2(g))$. Now we define $T_{F_2}$ that intertwines $\Pi$ and $\Pi_{F_2}$ by

$$T_{F_2}: \Pi \rightarrow \Pi_{F_2},$$

$$f \mapsto f_{F_2}.$$

**Definition 5.8.** Let $\pi, \Pi$ be irreducible representations of $G_{F_2}, G_{F_2}^{\psi} = G(\mathbb{F})$ respectively. Assume that $\Pi \cong \Pi_{F_2}$ and $\Pi$ is $\psi$-generic (automorphically $\psi = \psi_{F_2}$). We say that $\Pi$ is a (Shintani) base change of $\pi$, if for $g \in G(\mathbb{F})$,

$$\text{trace} (\Pi(g)T_{F_2}) = \text{trace} \pi(N(g)).$$

**Remark 5.9.** Our definition of norm map (5.9) is due to Kawanaka [Kaw1] §2. In [Shi], Shintani construct a (real) norm map $N$ by letting $N(g) = gF_2(g)$. He proves that, in the case $G = \text{GL}_m$, the conjugacy class of $N(g)$ in $G$ contains exactly one conjugacy class of $G_{F_2}$. Thus he obtain a norm map $N$ as (5.9). However, this is not true in general. A theorem [SS2] 1, 3.4 of Springer and Steinberg says that if the centralizer $Z_G(x)$ for all $x \in G$ is connected, the conjugacy class of $N(g)$ in $G$ contains exactly one conjugacy class of $G_{F_2}$.

6. Main Theorem

We fix a non-trivial character $\psi_0$ of $\mathbb{F}/\mathbb{F}$. We retain the notations of Section 1 and Section 2. So we have a non-degenerate character $\psi$ associated with $\psi_0$ and the pinning $P$ on $G$. For simplicity, we write $F_{\psi_0}$ as $\bar{\iota}$.
Let \( \pi \) be an irreducible, \( \psi \)-generic representation of \( G(\mathbb{E}) \). To show that \( \pi \) is distinguished by \( G(\mathbb{F}) \), we consider the obvious \( G(\mathbb{F}) \)-invariant linear form \( \lambda \) on the Whittaker model of \( \pi \):

\[
\lambda(W) = \sum_{h \in G(\mathbb{F})} W(h), \quad W \in \mathcal{W}(\pi, \psi).
\]

(6.1)

Our goal is then to show, if \( \pi(\mathbb{E}) = \mathcal{W}(\pi, \psi) \), that the \( \mathcal{W}(\pi, \psi) \) is not zero. The key idea in \([AM]\) is to compare \( \lambda \) with another linear functional \( \mu \) on the Whittaker model:

\[
\mu(W) = \sum_{g \in X_i} W(g), \quad W \in \mathcal{W}(\pi, \psi),
\]

(6.2)

where \( X_i \) is the set of ‘norm one’ elements defined in (5.7), with \( \tau \) replaced by the Chevalley involution \( \iota_G \), i.e.,

\[
X_i = \{ g \in G(\mathbb{E}) \ | \ \overline{g}(g) = 1 \}.
\]

First, one observe that

**Lemma 6.1.** The non-degenerate character \( \psi \) is trivial on \( U(\mathbb{F}) \); \( \psi = \psi^\dagger \).

**Proof.** As \( \psi_a \) is trivial on \( \mathbb{F} \), \( \psi = \psi_a \circ \Psi \) is then trivial on \( U(\mathbb{F}) \). The second statement follows from the construction of \( \iota \) and the fact \( \psi_a(x + \bar{x}) = 1 \), \( x \in \mathbb{E} \). Q.E.D.

**Proposition 6.2.** Let \( B_\pi \) be the \( \psi \)-Bessel function associated to \( \pi \). Then \( \lambda(B_\pi) = \mu(B_\pi) \).

**Proof.** There are actions of \( U(\mathbb{F}) \times U(\mathbb{F}) \) and \( U(\mathbb{E}) \) on \( G(\mathbb{F}) \) and \( X_i \) respectively, given by

\[
(n_1, n_2) \cdot g = n_1gn_2^{-1}, \quad n_1, n_2 \in U(\mathbb{F}), \ g \in G(\mathbb{F}),
\]

(6.3)

\[
n \cdot g = \iota(n)gn^{-1}, \quad n \in U(\mathbb{E}), \ g \in X_i.
\]

(6.4)

By the transformation rule (4.2) of Bessel functions and Lemma 6.1, \( B_\pi \) takes the same values on each orbits.

By Bruhat decomposition for \( G(\mathbb{F}) \) and Lemma 5.4, we can take \( a \hat{\omega}, \ a \in T(\mathbb{E}), \ w \in W \) as a set of representatives for each action.

Set

\[
X_1 = \{ a \hat{\omega} \in G(\mathbb{F}) \ | \ a \in T(\mathbb{E}), \ w \in W, \ B_\pi(a \hat{\omega}) \neq 0 \};
\]

\[
X_2 = \{ a \hat{\omega} \in X_1 \ | \ a \in T(\mathbb{E}), \ w \in W, \ B_\pi(a \hat{\omega}) \neq 0 \}.
\]

As \( B_\pi(a \hat{\omega}) \neq 0 \), by Proposition 4.3, 4.4, we have that \( w \) supports a Bessel function and \( a \in A_a(\mathbb{E}) \). By Proposition 4.6, for such \( a \) and \( \hat{\omega} \), we have \( \iota_G(a \hat{\omega}) = (a \hat{\omega})^{-1} \). One then checks easily that the two sets \( X_1 \) and \( X_2 \) are equal.

We claim that, for each \( a \hat{\omega} \) with \( B_\pi(a \hat{\omega}) \neq 0 \), the orbits for the two actions have the same number of elements. This suffices to conclude that \( \lambda(B_\pi) = \mu(B_\pi) \). In fact, we only need to show that the stabilizers in each case have the same number of elements as
\[|U(\mathbb{F}) \times U(\mathbb{F})| = |U(\mathbb{F})| = q^{2|h^+|}.\] For \(U(\mathbb{F}) \times U(\mathbb{F})\) acting on \(G(\mathbb{F})\), the map \((n_1, n_2) \to n_2\) is an isomorphism

\[\text{Stab}_{U(\mathbb{F}) \times U(\mathbb{F})}(a\hat{w}) \cong U(\mathbb{F}) \cap \hat{w}^{-1}U(\mathbb{F})\hat{w}.\]

In view of (2.4), we have \(|U(\mathbb{F}) \cap \hat{w}^{-1}U(\mathbb{F})\hat{w}| = q^{h^+-l(w)}\). The proposition will be completed after Proposition 6.3 where we investigate in detail the stabilizers of the remaining case.

Q.E.D.

**Proposition 6.3.** Suppose that \(a\hat{w} \in X_c\). The action of \(U(\mathbb{F})\) on \(X_c\) is given in (6.4). Then

\[|\text{Stab}_{U(\mathbb{F})}(a\hat{w})| = q^{h^+-l(w)}.\]

**Proof.** By Lemma 5.4, we can write \(a = \iota(b)\hat{w}b^{-1}\hat{w}^{-1}\). One check that \(n\) fix \(a\hat{w}\) if and only if \(b^{-1}nb\) fixes \(\hat{w}\). So we may assume that \(a = 1\).

From (6.4), we get that \(n\) fixes \(\hat{w}\) if and only if \(n = \hat{w}^{-1}l(n)\hat{w}\). Thus \(n \in U(\mathbb{F}) \cap \hat{w}^{-1}U(\mathbb{F})\hat{w} = U_{\Phi^+}\), where \(\Phi^+ = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ | w(\alpha) > 0\}\). There is another description for \(\Phi^+\). Set \(I = \{\alpha \in \Delta | w(\alpha) > 0\}\). Let \(\Phi(I)\) denote the positive roots that are linear combinations of roots in \(I\). As \(w\) supports a Bessel function, \(w(\alpha)\) is simple if \(w(\alpha) > 0\). One sees that \(\Phi^+_w = \Phi(I)\).

We next introduce a filtration on \(\Phi(I)\). For \(\alpha \in \Phi(I)\), let \(m(\alpha)\) be the number of simple roots that appeared in the decomposition of \(\alpha\). So \(m(1) = 1\) if and only if \(\alpha \in I\). Set

\[\Psi_k = \{\alpha \in \Phi(I) | m(\alpha) > k\}\]

is a decreasing sequence. Each \(\Psi_k\) is a closed subset of positive roots (see [Bor, 14.5]). Thus, for each \(k\), the root subgroups \(U_{\alpha}, \alpha \in \Psi_k\) directly span a unipotent subgroup \(U_{\Psi_k}\) ([Bor, 14.5]). By the commutator relations ([Spr, 8.2.3], we get that \(U_{\Psi_k}\) is a normal subgroup of \(U_{\Psi_{k-1}}\) and that the map \((x_1, \cdots, x_n) \to \prod_{i=1}^n u_{\alpha_i}(x_i)\) is an isomorphism of

\[\mathbb{G}^n_a \cong U_{\Psi_{k-1}}/U_{\Psi_k}\]

where \(\{1, \cdots, n\}\) is a numbering on the roots \(\alpha\) in \(\Phi(I)\) with \(m(\alpha) = k\).

Let \(\tau\) denote the involution \(n \to \hat{w}^{-1}F_\iota(n)\hat{w}\) on \(U_{\Phi(I)}\) (Here we use \(F_\iota\) instead of \(\tau\) to stress that the involution happens in the algebraic group setting). By Proposition 4.5, we can write \(w = w_\iota w_\iota\), where \(w_\iota\) the unique long Weyl element associated to \(I \subset \Delta\). We have \(-w_\iota(I) = I\), in particular, \(-w_\iota\) sends any simple root in \(I\) to a simple root. Note that

\[\tau(U_{\alpha}) \subset U_{-w_\iota(\alpha)}, \quad \alpha \in \Phi(I)\]

This means that each \(\Psi_k\) is \(\tau\)-stable.

Now we see that the stabilizer of \(\hat{w}\) in \(U(\mathbb{F})\) is nothing but \(U_{\Phi(I)}^\tau\). Applying Lemma 5.5 to each \(\Psi_k\) and \(\tau\), we get, by a simple argument, that

\[|U_{\Phi(I)}^\tau| = \prod [U_{\Psi_{k-1}}/U_{\Psi_k}]^\tau.\]

It remains to calculate \([U_{\Psi_{k-1}}/U_{\Psi_k}]^\tau\) for each \(k\). In view of (6.5), we consider the action of \(\tau\) on \(\mathbb{G}^n_a\) which is transformed by (6.5). Assume that \(\Psi_{k-1}\setminus \Psi_k = \{\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n\}\). If
\[ \alpha_i \text{ is fixed by } -w_i, \text{ we have } \tau(u_{\alpha_i}(x_i)) = u_{\alpha_i}(\pm \xi_i). \text{ The sign is always } - \text{ if } \alpha_i \text{ is simple. If } \]
\[ -w_i(\alpha_i) = \alpha_j, \ i \neq j, \text{ there exists } \lambda \in \mathbb{F}^\times \text{ such that } \]
\[ \tau(u_{\alpha_i}(x_i)) = u_{\alpha_j}(\lambda \xi_i), \quad \tau(u_{\alpha_j}(x_j)) = u_{\alpha_i}(\lambda^{-1} \xi_j). \]

One then concludes that the number of solutions \((x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{G}_m^n(\mathbb{F})\) that is fixed by \(\tau\) is \(q^n\). All these \(\Psi_{k-1} \backslash \Psi_k\) form a partition of \(\Phi(I) = \Phi_{\mathbb{F}}^+\) and the proposition follows. Q.E.D.

It turns out that the evaluation of \(\mu\) at \(B_\pi\) is easier to calculate. The arguments in [AM, Lemma 3.4] works verbatim here. However, we remark that the base change used in \(\text{loc.cit}\) is different from ours. The point is that these two forms of norm map have the same image at (the \(\bar{\tau}\)-conjugacy class) of \(g \in X_i\). We include the proof here for the sake of completeness.

**Proposition 6.4.** Let \(\pi\) be an irreducible, \(\psi\)-generic representation of \(G(\mathbb{F})\) which is a base change of a representation \(\rho\) of \(G^{\text{op}}(\mathbb{F})\). Then

\[
(6.7) \quad \sum_{g \in X_i} B_{\pi}(g) = \frac{\dim \rho}{\dim \pi} |X_i|.
\]

**Proof.** Consider the operator

\[
T = \sum_{g \in X_i} \pi(g) T_i,
\]

defined on the \(\psi\)-Whittaker space \(\mathcal{W}\) of \(\pi\). Then \(T\) intertwines \(\pi\) and itself. Indeed,

\[
T\pi(x) = \sum_{g \in X_i} \pi(g) T_i \pi(x) = \sum_{g \in X_i} \pi(g) T_i (x) = \sum_{g \in X_i} \pi(x g^{-1}) T_i = \sum_{g \in X_i} \pi(x) \pi(g) T_i = \pi(x) T_i.
\]

So \(T\) is of the form \(c(\pi) \cdot I, \ c(\pi) \in \mathbb{C}^\times\).

If \(\pi\) is a base change of a representation \(\rho\) of \(G^{\text{op}}(\mathbb{F})\), we have, by the definition, that

\[
(6.8) \quad \text{trace } (\pi(g) T_i) = \text{trace } \rho(N(g)), \quad g \in G(\mathbb{F}).
\]

Summing over \(X_i\), we get

\[
(6.9) \quad c(\pi) \dim \pi = \sum_{g \in X_i} \text{trace } \rho(N(g)).
\]

Write \(g = hF_i(h)^{-1}\). One checks that \(g \in X_i\) is equivalent to \(h \in G^{F_i}\). By the definition of base change, we have \(N(g)\) is the conjugacy class of 1 in \(G^{\text{op}}(\mathbb{F})\). Thus we get

\[
(6.10) \quad c(\pi) = \frac{\dim \rho}{\dim \pi} |X_i|
\]

Note that \(T_i(B_\pi) = B_\pi\) by the uniqueness of \(\psi\)-Bessel functions of \(\pi \cong \pi^t\). Thus

\[
\sum_{g \in X_i} B_{\pi}(g) = \sum_{g \in X_i} (\pi(g) B_\pi)(I) = \sum_{g \in X_i} (\pi(g) T_i B_{\pi})(I) = T B_{\pi}(I) = c(\pi) B_{\pi}(I) = c(\pi).
\]

Q.E.D.

**Theorem 6.5.** Let \(\pi\) be an irreducible, \(\psi\)-generic representation of \(G(\mathbb{F})\). Assume that \(\pi\) is the Shintani base change of a representation \(\rho\) of \(G^{\text{op}}(\mathbb{F})\). Let \(\lambda\) be the linear functional
on the Whittaker model \( W(\pi, \psi) \) defined by
\[
\lambda(W) = \sum_{h \in G(F)} W(h),
\]
then we have
\[
\lambda(B_\pi) = \frac{\dim \rho_{G|G(F)\partial}}{\dim \rho_{\pi|G(F)\partial}},
\]
where \( B_\pi \) is the Bessel function of \( \pi \). In particular, \( \pi \) is distinguished by \( G(F) \).

**Proof.** The theorem follows from Proposition 6.3 and the fact that \( G(\mathbb{F})/G^\partial(\mathbb{F}) \cong X_\pi \).

**Q.E.D.**
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