

UNIPOTENT REPRESENTATIONS ATTACHED TO THE PRINCIPAL NILPOTENT ORBIT

LUCAS MASON-BROWN

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we construct and classify the special unipotent representations of a real reductive group attached to the principal nilpotent orbit. We give formulas for the \mathbf{K} -types, associated varieties, and Langlands parameters of all such representations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be the real points of a connected reductive algebraic group. In [1], Adams, Barbasch, and Vogan, following ideas of Arthur ([6],[7]), defined a finite set of irreducible representations of G , called *special unipotent representations*. These representations are conjectured to possess an array of interesting properties (see [1, Chapter 1]), including:

- (1) They are conjectured to be unitary.
- (2) They are conjectured to appear in spaces of automorphic forms.
- (3) They are conjectured to *generate* (through various kinds of induction) all irreducible unitary representations of G of integral infinitesimal character

These representations are naturally indexed by special nilpotent orbits for the complexification of G . For example, the trivial representation of G is a unipotent representation attached to the nilpotent orbit $\{0\}$. If G is quasi-split, then the spherical principal series representation $\text{Ind}_B^G \mathbb{C}$ is a unipotent representation attached to the principal nilpotent orbit (there are no other easy examples).

No general classification of special unipotent representations is known. However, properties (1)-(3) above suggest that obtaining one may be an essential ingredient in the classification of the irreducible unitary representations of G . In this paper, we will classify and construct all special unipotent representations attached to the principal nilpotent orbit.

1.1. Special unipotent representations. Let \mathbf{G} be the complexification of G , and let \mathbf{G}^\vee be the dual group. If we fix a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, there is a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}^\vee \subset \mathfrak{g}^\vee$ which is naturally identified with \mathfrak{h}^* . The nilpotent co-adjoint orbits for \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{G}^\vee are related by *Barbasch-Vogan duality*, first defined in [9]. This is a map

$$d : \{\text{nilpotent orbits } \mathcal{O}^\vee \subset \mathfrak{g}^\vee\} \rightarrow \{\text{nilpotent orbits } \mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}\}$$

A nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is *special* if it lies in the image of d .

Every nilpotent \mathbf{G}^\vee -orbit $\mathcal{O}^\vee \subset \mathfrak{g}^\vee$ gives rise to an infinitesimal character $\lambda_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}$ for $U(\mathfrak{g})$ as follows. First, choose an element $e^\vee \in \mathcal{O}^\vee$ and an $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -triple (e^\vee, f^\vee, h^\vee) .

Conjugating by \mathbf{G}^\vee if necessary, we can arrange so that $h^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}^\vee$. We define

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{O}^\vee} := \frac{1}{2}h^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}^\vee \simeq \mathfrak{h}^*$$

This element is well-defined modulo the action of the Weyl group and therefore defines an infinitesimal character for $U(\mathfrak{g})$ (still denoted $\lambda_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}$) by means of the Harish-Chandra isomorphism.

Definition 1.1.1. *Suppose $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a special nilpotent \mathbf{G} -orbit. A unipotent infinitesimal character attached to \mathcal{O} is one of the form $\lambda_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}$ for $d(\mathcal{O}^\vee) = \mathcal{O}$. Denote the set of all such $\lambda_{\mathcal{O}^\vee}$ by $\text{Unip}_Z(\mathcal{O})$.*

To any two-sided ideal $I \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$, one can attach a \mathbf{G} -invariant subset $\text{AV}(I) \subset \mathfrak{g}$ called the *associated variety* of I . If I is primitive (i.e. the annihilator of an irreducible $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module), then $\text{AV}(I)$ is the closure of a single nilpotent \mathbf{G} -orbit. Still assuming I is primitive, the intersection of I with the center of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ is a maximal ideal (this is an easy consequence of Schur's lemma), and hence defines an infinitesimal character for $U(\mathfrak{g})$.

Definition 1.1.2. *Suppose $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a special nilpotent \mathbf{G} -orbit. A unipotent ideal attached to \mathcal{O} is a primitive ideal $I \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$ such that*

- (i) *The infinitesimal character of I belongs to $\text{Unip}_Z(\mathcal{O})$*
- (ii) *$\text{AV}(I) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$.*

Denote the set of all such ideals by $\text{Unip}_I(\mathcal{O})$.

Choose a maximal compact subgroup $K \subset G$. Let \mathbf{K} be the complexification of K and let \mathfrak{k} be the Lie algebra of \mathbf{K} .

Definition 1.1.3. *Suppose $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a special nilpotent \mathbf{G} -orbit. A unipotent representation attached to \mathcal{O} is an irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module X such that $\text{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(X) \in \text{Unip}_I(\mathcal{O})$. Denote the set of (isomorphism classes of) such representations by $\text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$.*

If $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is the *principal* nilpotent orbit, then $d^{-1}(\mathcal{O})$ consists of a single \mathbf{G}^\vee -orbit, $\{0\}$, and so $\text{Unip}_Z(\mathcal{O}) = \{0\}$. Hence, a unipotent ideal attached to \mathcal{O} (a *principal unipotent ideal* for short) is a primitive ideal $I \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$ of infinitesimal character 0 and associated variety \mathcal{N} . A *principal unipotent representation* is an irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module which is annihilated by such an ideal. We will see that in the principal case, the associated variety condition in Definition 1.1.2 is vacuous, but this will require some work.

1.2. Main results. Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be the principal nilpotent orbit. In Section 3, we will give two parameterizations of $\text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$. Very roughly:

- (1) We will construct the elements of $\text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$ from (certain) characters of (certain) Borel subgroups using the Beilinson-Bernstein construction.
- (2) We will construct the elements of $\text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$ from (approximately) spherical principal series representations of θ -stable parabolic subalgebras using cohomological induction.

The precise statement is given in Corollary 3.7.6. Each parameterization has its advantages. Parameterization (1) leads to a simple description of the Langlands parameters of principal unipotent representations (this is done in Section 4). Parameterization (2) leads to simple formulas for the associated varieties and \mathbf{K} -multiplicities of the representations in question (this is done in Section 3.8).

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Special unipotent representations	1
1.2. Main results	2
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Cartan subgroups	4
2.2. Roots	4
2.3. Cayley transforms: preliminaries	5
2.4. Cayley transforms through real roots	6
2.5. Cayley transforms through noncompact imaginary roots	8
2.6. Three nilpotent cones	9
2.7. Associated varieties	11
2.8. Parabolic induction: general theory	13
2.9. Real parabolic induction	14
2.10. Cohomological induction	14
3. Two Classifications of Principal Unipotent Representations	16
3.1. Beilinson-Bernstein parameters	16
3.2. Principal unipotent Beilinson-Bernstein parameters	17
3.3. Cayley transforms and simple reflections on $BB_0(G)$	19
3.4. Principal nilpotent elements and quasi-split groups	28
3.5. The spherical principal series of infinitesimal character 0	31
3.6. Zuckerman parameters	32
3.7. Main results	33
3.8. \mathbf{K} -types and associated varieties of principal unipotent representations	36
4. Langlands parameters of principal unipotent representations	37
4.1. Langlands classification	37
4.2. From Beilinson-Bernstein parameters to Langlands parameters	38
4.3. Langlands parameters of principal unipotent representations	39
Appendix A. Clifford Theory for Harish-Chandra Modules	40
References	41

2. PRELIMINARIES

Let G be the real points of a connected reductive algebraic group defined over \mathbb{R} . Choose a Cartan involution θ of G and let $K \subset G$ be the fixed points of θ . Denote the (real) Lie algebras of K and G by \mathfrak{k}_0 and \mathfrak{g}_0 . Differentiating at the identity, θ gives rise to an involution of \mathfrak{g}_0 (which we will continue to denote by θ), and hence a decomposition of \mathfrak{g}_0 into $+1$ and -1 eigenspaces

$$\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{k}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{p}_0$$

Since G and K are algebraic, we can form their complexifications \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{K} . \mathbf{G} is a complex connected reductive algebraic group equipped with an antiholomorphic involution σ with fixed points equal to G . The complexification of θ is a holomorphic involution of \mathbf{G} (which we will continue to denote by θ) with fixed points equal to \mathbf{K} . Note that σ and θ commute.

Denote the (complex) Lie algebras of \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{G} by \mathfrak{k} and \mathfrak{g} . Again, θ gives rise to an involution of \mathfrak{g} (which we will continue to denote by θ), and hence a

decomposition into $+1$ and -1 eigenspaces

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$$

Certain aspects of this notation will be generalized without comment: we will use capital letters A, B, \dots to denote Lie groups, boldface capital letters $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \dots$ for their complexifications, lower-case gothic letters with subscripts $\mathfrak{a}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \dots$ for the real Lie algebras, and unadorned gothic letters $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \dots$ for the complexified Lie algebras.

2.1. Cartan subgroups. Recall that a Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g}_0 is by definition a subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_0 \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$ whose complexification \mathfrak{h} is a Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . A Cartan subgroup of G is by definition the centralizer in G of a Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g}_0 . Any such subgroup is conjugate by G to one preserved by θ . If $H \subset G$ is a θ -stable Cartan subgroup of G , then we can define

$$T := H \cap K \quad \mathfrak{a}_0 = \mathfrak{h}_0 \cap \mathfrak{p}_0 \quad A_0 := \exp(\mathfrak{a}_0)$$

Then the Cartan decomposition of H is a direct product

$$H = TA$$

Under our assumptions on G , H is abelian (though possibly disconnected).

2.2. Roots. Let H be a θ -stable Cartan subgroup of G . We will write $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ (resp. $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}, H)$) for the roots of \mathfrak{h} (resp. H) on \mathfrak{g} . There is a natural bijection $\Delta(H, \mathfrak{g}) \simeq \Delta(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{g})$ (differentiation), which we will often use without comment. Since H is θ -stable, there is a natural action of θ on $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, defined by

$$\theta(\alpha) := \alpha \circ \theta \quad \alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$$

In general, roots come in three different varieties.

Proposition 2.2.1. *Every root $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ takes real values on \mathfrak{a}_0 and imaginary values on \mathfrak{t}_0 . It is real if one (any) of the following equivalent conditions is satisfied*

- (1) $\alpha(\mathfrak{h}_0) \subset \mathbb{R}$
- (2) $\alpha(H) \subset \mathbb{R}^\times$
- (3) $\alpha|_{\mathfrak{t}_0} \equiv 0$
- (4) $\theta(\alpha) = -\alpha$
- (5) $\sigma(\alpha) = \alpha$

It is imaginary if one (any) of the following equivalent conditions is satisfied

- (1) $\alpha(\mathfrak{h}_0) \subset i\mathbb{R}$
- (2) $\alpha(H) \subset S^1$
- (3) $\alpha|_{\mathfrak{a}_0} \equiv 0$
- (4) $\theta(\alpha) = \alpha$
- (5) $\sigma(\alpha) = -\alpha$

It is complex if it is neither real nor imaginary.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) &:= \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) : \alpha \text{ real}\} \\ \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) &:= \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) : \alpha \text{ imaginary}\} \end{aligned}$$

It is clear from Proposition 2.2.1 that $\Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ and $\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ form root subsystems of $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$. If $\alpha \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, then $\theta(\alpha) = \alpha$ and hence $\theta(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, where \mathfrak{g}_α is the root space for α . Since \mathfrak{g}_α is one-dimensional, this means either $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{k}$ or $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{p}$. We say that α is *compact* or *noncompact*, accordingly.

Define

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_c(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) &:= \{\alpha \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) : \alpha \text{ compact}\} \\ \Delta_n(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) &:= \{\alpha \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) : \alpha \text{ noncompact}\}\end{aligned}$$

We get a \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading ϵ on $\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon(\beta) &= 0 \quad \text{if } \beta \in \Delta_c(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \\ \epsilon(\beta) &= 1 \quad \text{if } \beta \in \Delta_n(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})\end{aligned}$$

If \mathfrak{o} is a finite-dimensional \mathfrak{h} -module, we will write $\Delta(\mathfrak{o}, \mathfrak{h})$ for the multi-set of \mathfrak{h} -weights on \mathfrak{o} and define

$$\rho(\mathfrak{o}) := \frac{1}{2} \sum \Delta(\mathfrak{o}, \mathfrak{h}) \in \mathfrak{h}^*$$

Usually, \mathfrak{o} will be the nilradical \mathfrak{u} of a parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} (or its intersection with \mathfrak{k} or with \mathfrak{p}). In this case, the functional $2\rho(\mathfrak{u})$ corresponds to a complex character of H . If \mathfrak{q} is σ -stable, then this complex character is real and we can take its absolute value $|2\rho(\mathfrak{u})|$. In this case, we define

$$|\rho(\mathfrak{u})| := \sqrt{|2\rho(\mathfrak{u})|}$$

2.3. Cayley transforms: preliminaries. Write E, F, D for the usual (split) basis of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$:

$$E = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and E_c, F_c, D_c for the (compact) basis:

$$E_c = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i \\ -i & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad F_c = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ i & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad D_c = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Proposition 2.3.1. *Let $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ be real or noncompact imaginary. Write $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{g}$ for the three-dimensional subalgebra generated by the root spaces \mathfrak{g}_α and $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$. Let θ_s be the involution of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ defined by $\theta_s(X) = -X^t$ and let σ_s be complex conjugation. There is an isomorphism*

$$\phi_\alpha : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}_\alpha$$

intertwining θ with θ_s and σ with σ_s . If α is real, we can choose ϕ_α so that

$$\phi_\alpha(E) \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad \phi_\alpha(F) \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \quad \phi_\alpha(D) = \alpha^\vee$$

This isomorphism is unique up to pre-conjugation by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

If α is noncompact imaginary, we can choose ϕ_α so that

$$\phi_\alpha(E_c) \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad \phi_\alpha(F_c) \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \quad \phi_\alpha(D_c) = \alpha^\vee$$

This isomorphism is unique up to pre-conjugation by $O_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. The existence statements are immediate from Theorem 2.6.1. If α is real, two isomorphisms of the type described in the proposition differ by an automorphism ζ of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ satisfying

- (1) $\zeta \circ \theta_s = \theta_s \circ \zeta$
- (2) $\zeta \circ \sigma_s = \sigma_s \circ \zeta$

- (3) $\zeta(E) \in \mathbb{C}E$
(4) $\zeta(D) = D$

Every automorphism of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ corresponds to conjugation by a matrix $g \in GL_2(\mathbb{C})$. By an easy calculation in $SL_2(\mathbb{C})$, $g \in \{\pm \text{Id}\} \cup \{\pm \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\}$. The noncompact imaginary case is handled similarly. \square

2.4. Cayley transforms through real roots. In this subsection, we will describe a well-known procedure for producing, from a θ -stable Cartan subgroup and a real root, a new Cartan subgroup which is slightly more compact. For details and proofs, we refer the reader to [16].

Let H be a θ -stable Cartan subgroup of G and let $\alpha \in \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ be a real root. Fix an isomorphism

$$\phi_{\alpha} : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{sl}_{\alpha}$$

as in Proposition 2.3.1. Define a new θ -stable Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h}_0^{α} of \mathfrak{g}_0

$$\mathfrak{t}_0^{\alpha} := \mathfrak{t}_0 \oplus i\mathbb{R}\phi_{\alpha}(D_c) \quad \mathfrak{a}_0^{\alpha} := \ker \alpha \cap \mathfrak{a}_0 \quad \mathfrak{h}_0^{\alpha} := \mathfrak{t}_0^{\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^{\alpha}$$

and write H^{α} for the corresponding Cartan subgroup of G

$$T^{\alpha} := Z_K(\mathfrak{t}_0^{\alpha}) \quad A := \exp(\mathfrak{a}_0^{\alpha}) \quad H^{\alpha} := T^{\alpha}A^{\alpha}$$

Although the element $\phi_{\alpha}(D_c)$ depends on ϕ_{α} , pre-conjugation by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

takes $\phi_{\alpha}(D_c)$ to $-\phi_{\alpha}(D_c)$. In particular, the real line $\mathbb{R}\phi_{\alpha}(D_c)$ is independent of ϕ_{α} and hence H^{α} is well-defined.

The subalgebras \mathfrak{h}_0 and \mathfrak{h}_0^{α} are non-conjugate under G (since their compact dimensions differ). But their complexifications \mathfrak{h} and \mathfrak{h}^{α} (like any pair of complex Cartan subalgebras) are conjugate under \mathbf{G} . The Cayley transforms c_{α}^{\pm} are explicitly-defined inner automorphisms of \mathfrak{g} mapping \mathfrak{h} onto \mathfrak{h}^{α} .

Definition 2.4.1. *The Cayley transforms of \mathfrak{g} through α are the inner automorphisms*

$$c_{\alpha}^{\pm} := \exp(\text{ad}(\frac{\pm i\pi}{4}\phi_{\alpha}(E + F)))$$

This definition depends on ϕ_{α} , but not in a serious way. Pre-conjugation by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

takes $E + F$ to $-E - F$. Hence, the pair c_{α}^{\pm} is independent of ϕ_{α} (although the individual automorphisms are not).

Proposition 2.4.2. *Both c_{α}^{\pm} act by the identity on $\ker \alpha \subset \mathfrak{h}$ and on $\alpha^{\vee} \in \mathfrak{h}$ by*

$$c_{\alpha}^{\pm}\alpha^{\vee} = -\pm\phi_{\alpha}(D_c)$$

In particular,

$$c_{\alpha}^{\pm}\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^{\alpha}$$

In view of Proposition 2.4.2, the automorphisms c_α^\pm induce bijections (which we will continue to denote by c_α^\pm):

$$c_\alpha^\pm : \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \rightarrow \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha) \quad \beta \mapsto \beta \circ (c_\alpha^\pm)^{-1}$$

One can understand completely how these bijections behave with respect to the properties of being real, imaginary, complex, compact, and noncompact. For our purposes, the following proposition is sufficient.

Proposition 2.4.3. *Write $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})^\alpha$ for the set of roots orthogonal to α (i.e. roots β with $\langle \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$). Then*

(1) *The bijections*

$$c_\alpha^\pm : \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \cong \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha)$$

are related by

$$c_\alpha^- = c_\alpha^+ \circ s_\alpha \quad c_\alpha^+ = c_\alpha^- \circ s_\alpha$$

(2) *The roots $c_\alpha^\pm \alpha$ are noncompact imaginary (and, by (1), negatives of one another)*

(3) *c_α^\pm restrict to a (single, well-defined) bijection*

$$c_\alpha : \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})^\alpha \cong \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha)$$

Since ϕ_α commutes with complex conjugation, it restricts to an isomorphism

$$\phi_\alpha : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}_\alpha \cap \mathfrak{g}_0$$

Because G is algebraic, this integrates to a group homomorphism

$$\Phi_\alpha : SL_2(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow G$$

Define the element

$$m_\alpha := \Phi_\alpha \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in T$$

By Proposition 2.3.1, this element is independent of ϕ_α . We will need the following structural fact:

Lemma 2.4.4 ([27], Lemma 8.3.13). *Define*

$$T_1^\alpha := \ker \alpha \cap T$$

Then

$$\Phi_\alpha(SO_2(\mathbb{R})) \cap T_1^\alpha = \{1, m_\alpha\}$$

and there is a decomposition

$$T^\alpha = \Phi_\alpha(SO_2(\mathbb{R}))T_1^\alpha$$

Now, suppose χ is a (complex) character of H . Since $m_\alpha^2 = 1$ and χ is a group homomorphism, we have $\chi(m_\alpha) = \pm 1$.

Definition 2.4.5. *If $\alpha \in \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ is a real root and χ is a character of H , we say that α is even (resp. odd) for χ if $\chi(m_\alpha) = 1$ (resp. -1).*

If α is odd for χ , we will define two characters $c_\alpha^\pm \chi$ of H^α called the Cayley transforms of χ . First, define two characters $\tau_{\pm 1}$ of $SO_2(\mathbb{R})$

$$(2.4.6) \quad d\tau_{\pm 1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \pm i$$

Then

Definition 2.4.7. *Since ϕ_α is injective, $\ker \Phi_\alpha \subset Z(SL_2(\mathbb{R})) = \{\pm 1\}$. Under the assumption that α is odd, we must have $\Phi_\alpha(-1) = m_\alpha \neq 1$. So in this case, Φ_α is an embedding. Define characters $c_\alpha^\pm \chi$ of the product group $\Phi_\alpha(SO_2(\mathbb{R})) \times T_1^\alpha$ by the formulas*

$$c_\alpha^\pm \chi(\Phi_\alpha(g), t) = \tau_{\pm 1}(g)\chi(t)$$

Multiplication defines a group homomorphism

$$\Phi_\alpha(SO_2(\mathbb{R})) \times T_1^\alpha \rightarrow T^\alpha$$

which is surjective with kernel $\{(1, 1), (m_\alpha, m_\alpha)\}$ by Lemma 2.4.4. Since α is odd,

$$c_\alpha^\pm \chi(m_\alpha, m_\alpha) = (-1)^2 = 1$$

and therefore both characters $c_\alpha^\pm \chi$ descend to well-defined characters of T^α . Extend these characters to H^α by defining

$$c_\alpha^\pm \chi(ta) = c_\alpha^\pm(t)\chi(a) \quad t \in T^\alpha, a \in A^\alpha \subset A$$

2.5. Cayley transforms through noncompact imaginary roots. In this subsection, we will describe a well-known procedure for producing, from a θ -stable Cartan subgroup and a noncompact imaginary root, a new Cartan subgroup which is slightly less compact. The construction is analogous to that of Section 2.4. Again, a good reference is [16].

Let $H \subset G$ be a θ -stable Cartan subgroup and let $\alpha \in \Delta_n(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ be a noncompact imaginary root. Fix an isomorphism

$$\phi_\alpha : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}_\alpha$$

as in Proposition 2.3.1. Define a new θ -stable Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h}_0^α of \mathfrak{g}_0

$$\mathfrak{t}_0^\alpha := \ker \alpha \cap \mathfrak{t}_0 \quad \mathfrak{a}_0^\alpha := \mathfrak{a}_0 \oplus \mathbb{R}\phi_\alpha D \quad \mathfrak{h}_0^\alpha := \mathfrak{t}_0^\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{a}_0^\alpha$$

and write H^α for the corresponding Cartan subgroup of G

$$T^\alpha := Z_K(\mathfrak{t}_0^\alpha) \quad A := \exp(\mathfrak{a}_0^\alpha) \quad H^\alpha := T^\alpha A^\alpha$$

In contrast to the real case, H^α *does* depend on ϕ_α (as we vary ϕ_α , we get a one-parameter family of θ -stable Cartan subgroups).

We define

Definition 2.5.1. *The Cayley transforms of \mathfrak{g} through α are the inner automorphisms*

$$d_\alpha^\pm := \exp(\text{ad}(\frac{\pm\pi}{4}(\phi_\alpha(F_c - E_c)))) \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$$

Proposition 2.5.2. *Both d_α^\pm act by the identity on $\ker \alpha \subset \mathfrak{h}$ and on $\alpha^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}$ by*

$$d_\alpha^\pm \alpha^\vee = \pm \phi_\alpha(D)$$

In particular,

$$d_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^\alpha$$

In view of Proposition 2.5.2, the automorphisms d_α^\pm induce bijections:

$$d_\alpha^\pm : \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \rightarrow \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha) \quad \beta \mapsto \beta \circ (d_\alpha^\pm)^{-1}$$

and

Proposition 2.5.3. *We have*

(1) *The bijections*

$$d_\alpha^\pm : \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \cong \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha)$$

are related by

$$d_\alpha^- = d_\alpha^+ \circ s_\alpha \quad d_\alpha^+ = d_\alpha^- \circ s_\alpha$$

(2) $d_\alpha^\pm \alpha$ are real roots (and, by (1), negatives of one another)

(3) d_α^\pm restrict to a (single, well-defined) bijection

$$d_\alpha : \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})^\alpha \cong \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha)$$

(4) *and a bijection*

$$d_\alpha : \{\beta \in \Delta_n(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})^\alpha : \alpha \pm \beta \notin \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})\} \cup \{\beta \in \Delta_c(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})^\alpha : \alpha \pm \beta \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})\} \cong \Delta_n(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha)$$

A reformulation of (3) and (4) is helpful. Write ϵ for the $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -grading on $\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ defined in Section 2.2, and use d_α to identify the subsystem $\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})^\alpha$ with $\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha)$. The $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -grading on $\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha)$ induces a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -grading $d_\alpha \epsilon$ on $\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})^\alpha$, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (d_\alpha \epsilon)(\beta) &= 0 && \text{if } \epsilon(\beta) = 0 \text{ and } \alpha \pm \beta \notin \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}} \\ (d_\alpha \epsilon)(\beta) &= 1 && \text{if } \epsilon(\beta) = 0 \text{ and } \alpha \pm \beta \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}} \\ (d_\alpha \epsilon)(\beta) &= 0 && \text{if } \epsilon(\beta) = 1 \text{ and } \alpha \pm \beta \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}} \\ (d_\alpha \epsilon)(\beta) &= 1 && \text{if } \epsilon(\beta) = 1 \text{ and } \alpha \pm \beta \notin \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}} \end{aligned}$$

We need the following technical lemma. Part (2) is precisely [29, Lem 5.12]. Part (1) is proved analogously.

Lemma 2.5.4. *Let $(\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}, \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+, \epsilon)$ be a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -graded root system with a choice of positive roots. The triple $(\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}, \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+, \epsilon)$ is large if every $\beta \in \Pi_{i\mathbb{R}}^+$ has $\epsilon(\beta) = 1$. Let $\alpha \in \Pi_{i\mathbb{R}}^+$, and consider the grading $d_\alpha \epsilon$ on $\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^\alpha$.*

(1) *If $(\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}, \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+, \epsilon)$ is large, so is $(\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^\alpha, (\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+)^\alpha, d_\alpha \epsilon)$*

(2) *If $(\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^\alpha, (\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+)^\alpha, d_\alpha \epsilon)$ is large, either $(\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}, \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+, \epsilon)$ or $(\Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}, s_\alpha \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+, \epsilon)$ is too.*

The automorphisms c_α^\pm and d_α^\pm are essentially inverse to one another. More precisely

Proposition 2.5.5. *If $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is real, then $c_\alpha^+ \alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\alpha)$ is noncompact imaginary. There is a choice of $\phi_{c_\alpha^+ \alpha}$ as in Proposition 2.3.1 such that*

$$d_{c_\alpha^+ \alpha}^+ \circ c_\alpha^+ = c_\alpha^+ \circ d_{c_\alpha^+ \alpha}^+ = 1$$

If $\beta \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is noncompact imaginary, then $d_\beta^+ \beta \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^\beta)$ is real. There is a choice of $\phi_{d_\beta^+ \beta}$ as in Proposition 2.3.1 such that

$$c_{d_\beta^+ \beta}^+ \circ d_\beta^+ = d_\beta^+ \circ c_{d_\beta^+ \beta}^+ = 1$$

2.6. Three nilpotent cones. Let $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be the complex nilpotent cone. It is classically known that \mathbf{G} acts on \mathcal{N} with finitely-many orbits. There are two subcones of \mathcal{N} which play a special role in the representation theory of G :

$$\mathcal{N}_\theta = \mathcal{N} \cap \mathfrak{p} \quad \mathcal{N}_0 = \mathcal{N} \cap \mathfrak{g}_0$$

These subcones are invariant under the actions of \mathbf{K} and G , respectively, and in both cases, there are finitely-many orbits (see [20]).

There is an elegant relationship between \mathbf{K} -orbits on \mathcal{N}_θ and G -orbits on \mathcal{N}_0 , first observed by Sekiguchi ([23]). The following formulation is due to Vogan:

Theorem 2.6.1 ([28], Theorem 6.4). *Write θ_s for the involution of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ defined by $\theta_s(X) := -X^t$ and σ_s for complex conjugation. Then the following sets are in natural bijection*

- (1) \mathcal{N}_0/G
- (2) G -conjugacy classes of homomorphisms

$$\phi_\sigma : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$$

intertwining σ with σ_s

- (3) K -conjugacy classes of homomorphisms

$$\phi_{\sigma,\theta} : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$$

intertwining σ with σ_s and θ with θ_s

- (4) \mathbf{K} -conjugacy classes of homomorphisms

$$\phi_\theta : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$$

intertwining θ with θ_s

- (5) $\mathcal{N}_\theta/\mathbf{K}$

The maps from (3) to (2) and (3) to (4) are the inclusions. The map from (2) to (1) is defined by

$$\phi_\sigma \mapsto \phi_\sigma(E)$$

The map from (4) to (5) is defined by

$$\phi_\theta \mapsto \phi_\theta(E_c)$$

Choose a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on \mathfrak{g}_0 making \mathfrak{k}_0 and \mathfrak{p}_0 orthogonal. Using this form, we get a \mathbf{G} -invariant identification $\varphi : \mathfrak{g} \simeq \mathfrak{g}^*$. Define

$$\mathcal{N}^* := \varphi(\mathcal{N}) \quad \mathcal{N}_\theta^* := \varphi(\mathcal{N}_\theta) = \mathcal{N}^* \cap (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{k})^* \quad \mathcal{N}_0^* := \varphi(\mathcal{N}_0) = \mathcal{N}^* \cap \mathfrak{g}_0^*$$

Note that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is unique up to scalar multiplication. Hence, the subsets $\mathcal{N}^*, \mathcal{N}_\theta^*, \mathcal{N}_0^* \subset \mathfrak{g}$ are well-defined. By construction, these subsets are invariant under the (co-adjoint) actions of \mathbf{G} , \mathbf{K} , and G (respectively), and in each case there are finitely-many orbits. Each \mathbf{G} -orbit on \mathcal{N} carries a distinguished symplectic form. This is one reason for preferring these ‘dual’ cones to their counterparts in \mathfrak{g} . Of course, the bijection $\mathcal{N}_\theta/\mathbf{K} \cong \mathcal{N}_0/G$ of Theorem 2.6.1 induces a bijection $\mathcal{N}_\theta^*/\mathbf{K} \cong \mathcal{N}_0^*/G$. Some features of this correspondence are slightly easier to see on the ‘dual’ side:

Theorem 2.6.2 (Kostant-Sekiguchi-Vergne-Barbasch-Sepanski, [20], [23], [26],[8]). *The bijection*

$$\eta : \mathcal{N}_\theta^*/\mathbf{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_0^*/G$$

defined by the requirements of Theorem 2.6.1 has the following properties:

- (1) η respects the closure orderings on $\mathcal{N}_\theta^*/\mathbf{K}$ and \mathcal{N}_0^*/G .
- (2) For every $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{N}_\theta^*/\mathbf{K}$, there is a K -invariant diffeomorphism

$$\mathcal{O} \cong \eta(\mathcal{O})$$

- (3) For every $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{N}_\theta^*/\mathbf{K}$

$$\mathbf{G} \cdot \mathcal{O} = \mathbf{G} \cdot \eta(\mathcal{O})$$

Inside this co-adjoint \mathbf{G} -orbit, \mathcal{O} is a Lagrangian submanifold, and $\eta(\mathcal{O})$ is a real form.

2.7. Associated varieties. Equip $U(\mathfrak{g})$ with its usual filtration and let $I \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$ be a two-sided ideal. Then $\text{gr}(I)$ is a graded ideal in the commutative ring $\text{gr}U(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq S(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}^*]$.

Definition 2.7.1. *The associated variety of I is the \mathbf{G} and \mathbb{C}^\times -invariant, Zariski-closed subset of \mathfrak{g}^* defined by the graded ideal $\text{gr}(I) \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}^*]$*

$$\text{AV}(I) := V(\text{gr}(I)) \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$$

If $I \cap Z(\mathfrak{g}) \subset Z(\mathfrak{g})$ is an ideal of finite codimension, then $\text{AV}(I) \subset \mathcal{N}^*$ (see e.g. [28, Thm 5.7]). If $\mathcal{O}_1^{\mathbb{C}}, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n^{\mathbb{C}}$ are the open \mathbf{G} -orbits in $\text{AV}(I)$, then $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_i^{\mathbb{C}}$ are its irreducible components.

Theorem 2.7.2 (Joseph, Borho-Brylinski, [15], [11]). *If I is primitive (i.e. the annihilator of an irreducible \mathfrak{g} -module), then $\text{AV}(I)$ is irreducible, i.e. there is a \mathbf{G} -orbit $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathcal{N}^*$ such that*

$$\text{AV}(I) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}^{\mathbb{C}}$$

Now suppose X is a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module. The annihilator of X

$$\text{Ann}(X) := \{a \in U(\mathfrak{g}) \mid aX = 0\}$$

is a two-sided ideal in $U(\mathfrak{g})$. Thus, we can define its associated variety $\text{AV}(\text{Ann}(X)) \subset \mathfrak{g}^*$. There is a refinement of this invariant, which can distinguish between $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules with coinciding annihilators.

Definition 2.7.3 ([28]). *A filtration on X*

$$\dots \subseteq X_{-1} \subseteq X_0 \subseteq X_1 \subseteq \dots, \quad \bigcap_m X_m = 0, \quad \bigcup_m X_m = X$$

by complex subspaces is compatible if

- (1) $U_m(\mathfrak{g})X_n \subseteq X_{m+n} \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$
- (2) $KX_m \subseteq X_m \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}$

The first condition allows us to define on $\text{gr}(X)$ the structure of a graded $S(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. The second condition allows us to define on $\text{gr}(X)$ a graded algebraic \mathbf{K} -action. These two structures are compatible in the following ways

- (1) *The action map $S(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes \text{gr}(X) \rightarrow \text{gr}(X)$ is \mathbf{K} -equivariant,*
- (2) *The subspace $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{g} \subset S(\mathfrak{g})$ acts by 0 on $\text{gr}(X)$*

In short, $\text{gr}(X)$ has the structure of a graded, \mathbf{K} -equivariant $S(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{k})$ -module. A compatible filtration is good if

- (3) *$\text{gr}(X)$ is a finitely-generated $S(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{k})$ -module*

Thus, for any good filtration, $\text{gr}(X)$ can be identified with a graded, \mathbf{K} -equivariant coherent sheaf on $(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{k})^*$. We note that if X is finitely-generated, good filtrations exist. For example, if $X_0 \subset X$ is a finite-dimensional \mathbf{K} -invariant generating subspace, we can define

$$X_m := U_m(\mathfrak{g})X_0 \quad m \geq 0$$

Now, assume X has finite length. Then X is finitely-generated as a $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. If we choose a good filtration on X , there is an obvious containment (of ideals)

$$\text{gr}(\text{Ann}(X)) \subseteq \text{Ann}(\text{gr}(X))$$

and hence a containment (of sets)

$$\text{Supp}(\text{gr}(X)) \subseteq \text{AV}(\text{Ann}(X))$$

where $\text{Supp}(\text{gr}(X)) = V(\text{Ann}(\text{gr}(X)))$ denotes the (set-theoretic) support. Since X has finite-length, $\text{Ann}(X) \cap \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{g})$ is an ideal of finite codimension. By the remarks preceding Theorem 2.7.2 there is a containment

$$\text{Supp}(\text{gr}(X)) \subseteq \mathcal{N}^* \cap (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{k})^* = \mathcal{N}_\theta^*$$

Let $M^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ be the abelian category of finite-length $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules and let $K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ be its Grothendieck group. Then $K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ is a free \mathbb{Z} -module with basis equal to the set of (isomorphism classes of) irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules. If $X \in M^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$, write $[X] \in K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ for its class. By the remarks above, $\text{gr}(X)$ defines a class in $K^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{N}_\theta^*)$. Although $\text{gr}(X)$ depends on the filtration used to define it, its class $[\text{gr}(X)]$ does not. More precisely

Proposition 2.7.4 ([28], Proposition 2.2). *gr defines a group homomorphism*

$$K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow K^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{N}_\theta^*), \quad X \mapsto [\text{gr}(X)]$$

Thus, we can define

Definition 2.7.5. *Let X be a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module of finite-length. The associated variety of X is the \mathbf{K} and \mathbb{C}^\times -invariant, Zariski-closed subset of \mathcal{N}_θ^* defined by the graded ideal $\text{Ann}(\text{gr}(X)) \subset S(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{k})$*

$$\text{AV}(X) := \text{Supp}(\text{gr } X) = V(\text{Ann}(\text{gr}(X))) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_\theta^*$$

By Proposition 2.7.4, $\text{AV}(X)$ is well-defined.

Hence if X has finite-length, $\text{AV}(X)$ is a finite union of \mathbf{K} -orbits. If $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n$ are the open \mathbf{K} -orbits in $\text{AV}(X)$, then $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_i$ are the irreducible components. If X is irreducible, then the \mathbf{K} -orbits $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n$ are related to the \mathbf{G} -orbit $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}$ of Proposition 2.7.2 by the following result of Vogan

Theorem 2.7.6 ([28], Theorem 8.4). *Let X be an irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module. Let $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n$ be the open \mathbf{K} -orbits in $\text{AV}(X)$ and let $\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}$ be the open \mathbf{G} -orbit in $\text{AV}(I)$. Then*

$$\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{G} \cdot \mathcal{O}_i$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. In particular (by Theorem 2.6.2)

$$\dim(\mathcal{O}_i) = \frac{1}{2} \dim(\mathcal{O}^{\mathbf{C}}) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n$$

Let $\text{Rep}^f(\mathbf{K})$ be the abelian category of admissible representations of \mathbf{K} . Restriction to \mathbf{K} defines an exact functor

$$\text{res}_{\mathbf{K}}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} : M^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}^f(\mathbf{K})$$

Let $K^f(\mathbf{K})$ be the Grothendieck group of $\text{Rep}^f(\mathbf{K})$. Note that $K^f(\mathbf{K})$ is identified with functions $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{K}}$. The restriction functor induces a group homomorphism

$$\text{res}_{\mathbf{K}}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} : K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow K^f(\mathbf{K})$$

to the Grothendieck group $K^f(\mathbf{K})$ of $\text{Rep}^f(\mathbf{K})$.

Now suppose $M \in \text{Coh}^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{N}_\theta^*)$. Then $\Gamma(\mathcal{N}_\theta^*, M)$ has the structure of a \mathbf{K} -equivariant $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}_\theta^*]$ -module. Since \mathbf{K} is reductive, this module is admissible (when regarded as a representation of \mathbf{K}). Hence, we obtain a functor

$$\text{res}_{\mathbf{K}}^{\text{coh}} : \text{Coh}^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{N}_\theta^*) \rightarrow \text{Rep}^f(\mathbf{K})$$

which is exact, since \mathcal{N}_θ^* is an affine variety. This functor induces a group homomorphism

$$\text{res}_{\mathbf{K}}^{\text{coh}} : K^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{N}_\theta^*) \rightarrow K^f(\mathbf{K})$$

It is clear from definitions that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}) & \xrightarrow{\text{gr}} & K^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{N}_\theta^*) \\ & \searrow \text{res}_{\mathbf{K}}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} & \downarrow \text{res}_{\mathbf{K}}^{\text{coh}} \\ & & K^f(\mathbf{K}) \end{array}$$

Theorem 2.7.7 ([5], Corollary 6.4). *The restriction map*

$$\text{res}_{\mathbf{K}}^{\text{coh}} : K^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{N}_\theta^*) \rightarrow K^f(\mathbf{K})$$

is injective.

An immediate consequence of Theorem 2.7.7 is the somewhat surprising fact that the associated variety of a finite-length $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module is determined by its \mathbf{K} -types.

2.8. Parabolic induction: general theory. In this section, we will review the general theory of parabolic induction. See e.g. [27] or [17] for more details and proofs.

Let $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{G}$ be a parabolic subgroup. We will always assume that \mathbf{Q} has a Levi decomposition $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{U}$ with θ -stable Levi factor $\mathbf{L} \subset \mathbf{G}$. Parabolic induction is a left-exact functor

$$(2.8.1) \quad \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} : M(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$$

Roughly speaking, $\mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{Q} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W$ is the $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module

$$\mathbf{K} - \text{finite vectors in } \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{q}}(U(\mathfrak{g}), W \otimes \det(\mathfrak{u}))$$

where $\det(\mathfrak{u})$ is the top exterior power of \mathfrak{u} . This definition is not quite correct (or meaningful, strictly speaking) if \mathbf{K} is disconnected. For a precise definition, we refer the reader to [27, Chapter 5].

The category $M(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ has enough injectives (see [17], Corollary 2.26). Hence, we can define the right derived functors:

$$R^i \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} : M(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$$

The following Proposition catalogs the key properties of these functors.

Proposition 2.8.2. *The following are true:*

(i) *If $W \in M^f(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$, then*

$$R^i \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W \in M^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}) \quad \forall i \geq 0$$

(ii) *Let $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ be a Cartan subalgebra and suppose $W \in M(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ has infinitesimal character $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Then*

$$R^i \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W \text{ has infinitesimal character } \lambda + \rho(\mathfrak{u}) \in \mathfrak{h}^* \quad \forall i \geq 0$$

(iii) *There is an $s \geq 0$ such that for every $W \in M(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ we have*

$$R^i \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W = 0 \quad \forall i > s$$

In light of Proposition 2.8.2(i) and (iii), there is a group homomorphism
(2.8.3)

$$I(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \cdot) : K^f(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}) \quad I(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, [W]) := \sum_i (-1)^i [R^i \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W]$$

Proposition 2.8.4. *Suppose $\mathbf{Q}' = \mathbf{L}'\mathbf{U}'$ is a parabolic subgroup of \mathbf{L} with θ -stable Levi factor \mathbf{L}' . Then $\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{U}'$ is a parabolic subgroup of \mathbf{G} with θ -stable Levi \mathbf{L}' and*

$$I(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \cdot) \circ I(\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{q}', \cdot) = I(\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{q}' \oplus \mathfrak{u}, \cdot)$$

There are two ‘extreme’ cases of parabolic induction which are particularly well-understood: real parabolic and cohomological induction. We will briefly review these special cases.

2.9. Real parabolic induction. Assume that \mathbf{Q} is stable under σ . Then $Q := \mathbf{Q}^\sigma$ is a parabolic subgroup of G and there is an identification

$$(2.9.1) \quad I_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W \cong_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} \text{Ind}_Q^G(W \otimes |\rho(\mathfrak{u})|) \quad W \in M(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$$

where Ind_Q^G is the usual (analytically-defined) functor of parabolic induction (see [17, Sec 11.2] for a proof).

The main facts we will need in this case are the following.

Theorem 2.9.2. *Suppose \mathbf{Q} is σ -stable. Then the functor*

$$I_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} : M^f(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$$

- (1) *is exact, and*
- (2) *takes nonzero modules to nonzero modules*

Proof. Part (1) is [17, Prop 11.52]. Part (2) is clear from the analytic description of $I_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})}$. \square

Let $\mathfrak{h}_0^{\text{split}}$ be a maximally split θ -stable Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g}_0 . Choose an element $a \in \mathfrak{a}_0^{\text{split}}$ such that $\alpha(a) \neq 0$ for every nonimaginary $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}})$ and define the parabolic subalgebra

$$\mathfrak{l}^{\text{min}} := \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha(a)=0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad \mathfrak{u}^{\text{min}} := \bigoplus_{\alpha(a)>0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad \mathfrak{q}^{\text{min}} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$$

Since $\sigma(a) = a$, $\mathfrak{q}^{\text{min}}$ is σ -stable and since $\theta(a) = -a$, $\mathfrak{l}^{\text{min}}$ is θ -stable. The corresponding parabolic subgroup $Q^{\text{min}} = (\mathbf{Q}^{\text{min}})^\sigma$ is minimal among parabolics of G . We will eventually need the following deep result of Casselman:

Theorem 2.9.3 (Casselman Subrepresentation Theorem, [12]). *Let X be an irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module. Then there is a (finite-dimensional) irreducible representation V of L^{min} and an embedding of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules*

$$X \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}^{\text{min}}, \mathbf{L}^{\text{min}} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} V$$

2.10. Cohomological induction. Assume that \mathbf{Q} is stable under θ . Choose a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{l}$, and let W be a finite-length $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ -module with infinitesimal character $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. We say that W (or λ) is *in the weakly good range* if

$$\text{Re}\langle \lambda + \rho(\mathfrak{u}), \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall \alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{h})$$

When applied to irreducible $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ -modules in the weakly good range, the functors $R^i \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})}$ are particularly well-behaved.

Theorem 2.10.1 ([17], Theorem 8.2). *There is an integer $t \geq 0$ (depending only on the parabolic $\mathbf{Q} \subset \mathbf{G}$) such that for every irreducible $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ -module W in the weakly good range, the $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module $R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W$*

- (1) *is irreducible, or 0, if $i = t$, and*
- (2) *is 0 if $i \neq t$*

The functor $R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})}$ is called cohomological induction.

In the setting of Theorem 2.10.1, one can formulate necessary and sufficient conditions on W guaranteeing that $R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W \neq 0$. For this, we will need to define the *minimal \mathbf{K} -types* of a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module X . Choose a maximally compact θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ and a positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$. If τ_μ is an irreducible \mathbf{K} -representation with highest weight $\mu \in \mathfrak{t}^*$, define

$$|\tau_\mu| := B(\mu + 2\rho_{\mathfrak{k}}, \mu + 2\rho_{\mathfrak{t}})$$

A minimal \mathbf{K} -type of X is a \mathbf{K} -type τ_μ with minimal norm among all \mathbf{K} -types occurring in X . It is easy to see that minimal \mathbf{K} -types exist (if $X \neq 0$) and are independent of $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$.

Theorem 2.10.2 ([17], Theorem 10.44.). *Assume \mathfrak{h} is a maximally compact θ -stable Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{l} , and choose a positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$. Suppose W is a finite-length $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ -module in the weakly good range. Write $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ for highest-weights of the minimal $\mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K}$ -types of W . Then $R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W \neq 0$ if and only if some of the weights*

$$\mu_i + 2\rho(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p})$$

are dominant for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$. In this case, the dominant weights of this form are minimal \mathbf{K} -types of $R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W$.

For W a finite-length $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ -module in the weakly good range, the associated variety of $R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} W$ can be easily computed. Consider the restriction map

$$\pi_{\mathfrak{q}, \theta} : (\mathfrak{g}/(\mathfrak{u} + \mathfrak{k}))^* \rightarrow (\mathfrak{q}/(\mathfrak{u} + \mathfrak{k}))^* \simeq (\mathfrak{l}/(\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{k}))^*$$

Note that

$$\pi_{\mathfrak{q}, \theta}^{-1}(\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta}^*) \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}^*$$

The following statement is well-known to the experts. See, e.g. [25, Prop 5.4] for a proof.

Proposition 2.10.3. *Suppose W is a finite-length $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ -module in the weakly good range and assume*

$$R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} \neq 0$$

Then

$$(2.10.4) \quad \text{AV}(R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})}) = \mathbf{K} \left(\pi_{\mathfrak{q}, \theta}^{-1}(\text{AV}(W)) \right) \subset \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}^*$$

Remark 2.10.5. *If we regard $\text{AV}(R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})})$ as a subset of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}^*$ and $\text{AV}(W)$ as a subset of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta}$ (as will sometimes be convenient), (2.10.4) becomes*

$$\text{AV}(R^t \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})}) = \mathbf{K} (\text{AV}(W) + \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p})$$

3. TWO CLASSIFICATIONS OF PRINCIPAL UNIPOTENT REPRESENTATIONS

Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be the principal nilpotent orbit. In this section, we will give two classifications of $\text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$. The parameters (*principal unipotent Beilinson-Bernstein parameters* and *principal unipotent Zuckerman parameters*) are defined in Sections 3.2 and 3.6, respectively. The main result is Corollary 3.7.6.

3.1. Beilinson-Bernstein parameters. Fix a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ and a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{b}$. Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be an *integrally dominant weight*

$$(3.1.1) \quad \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \notin \{-1, -2, \dots\} \quad \forall \alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{h})$$

Definition 3.1.2. A *Beilinson-Bernstein parameter* for G of *infinitesimal character* λ (a *BB parameter* for short) is a \mathbf{K} -conjugacy class of triples $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi)$ consisting of

- (i) a θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}$,
- (ii) a Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, and
- (iii) a one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbf{T})$ -module χ such that $d\chi + \rho(\mathfrak{n}) = \lambda$

Denote the \mathbf{K} -conjugacy class of $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi)$ by $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ and denote the set of such classes by $\text{BB}_\lambda(G)$.

Remark 3.1.3. If $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_\lambda(G)$, we can (and will) choose \mathfrak{h} to be stable under σ . This allows us to define the Cartan subgroup $H := Z_G(\mathfrak{h})$. Now one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbf{T})$ -modules correspond precisely to continuous characters of H .

Proposition 3.1.4. $\text{BB}_\lambda(G)$ is a finite set.

Proof. It is classically known that there are only finitely many \mathbf{K} -conjugacy classes of Cartan and Borel subalgebras of \mathfrak{g} (see [30, Thms 1,2]). For each pair $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b})$ consisting of a θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{a}$ and Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$, there is a finite number of one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbf{T})$ -modules χ satisfying $d\chi + \rho(\mathfrak{n}) = \lambda$. Indeed, such a module is uniquely determined by an algebraic character of \mathbf{T} , of which there are finitely many. \square

Beilinson-Bernstein parameters can be parabolically induced. The assignment

$$(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi) \mapsto I(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi) := \sum_i (-1)^i [R^i \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbf{T})}^{\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}} \chi] \in K_\lambda^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$$

(cf. Section 2.8) is constant on \mathbf{K} -conjugacy class and hence gives rise to a function

$$I : \text{BB}_\lambda(G) \rightarrow K_\lambda^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$$

As our terminology suggests, this function admits an alternative description via the Beilinson-Bernstein localization theory. We will briefly summarize the main ideas (for more details, we refer the reader to [14]).

Let $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{g}\}$ be the flag variety for \mathbf{G} . Note that \mathbf{K} acts on \mathcal{B} with finitely many orbits. The functional $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ determines a sheaf $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}$ of twisted differential operators (TDOs) on \mathcal{B} . We will consider the abelian category $M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K})$ of \mathbf{K} -equivariant quasi-coherent $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}$ -modules on \mathcal{B} . The irreducible objects in this category are parameterized by \mathbf{K} -orbits on $\text{BB}_\lambda(G)$. The construction is as follows. Fix a parameter $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_\lambda(G)$. The borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ determines a \mathbf{K} -orbit $Z = \mathbf{K} \cdot \mathfrak{b} \subset \mathcal{B}$. Denote the locally-closed embedding by $j : Z \subset \mathcal{B}$. On the \mathbf{K} -orbit Z , there is a sheaf of TDOs $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}^Z$ obtained by restricting $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}$ along $Z \subset \mathcal{B}$, and the one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbf{T})$ -module χ determines an irreducible object

$\mathcal{L}_\chi \in M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}^Z, \mathbf{K})$. There is a left-exact functor $j_! : M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}^Z, \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K})$ called the *exceptional pushforward*. The object $j_!\mathcal{L}_\chi \in M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K})$ contains a unique irreducible subobject, and this defines a bijection

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BB}_\lambda(G) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \{\text{irreducibles in } M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K})\} \\ [\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] &\mapsto \text{unique irreducible subobject in } j_!\mathcal{L}_\chi \end{aligned}$$

The \mathbf{G} -action on \mathcal{B} induces an algebra homomorphism

$$\phi : U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho})$$

This map is surjective with kernel equal to the two-sided ideal generated by the kernel of the infinitesimal character corresponding to λ under the Harish-Chandra isomorphism. If $\mathcal{M} \in M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K})$, then $\Gamma(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M})$ can be regarded (using ϕ) as a finite-length $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module of infinitesimal character λ . This defines a functor

$$\Gamma : M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M_\lambda^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$$

Theorem 3.1.5. *Under the dominance condition (3.1.1), Γ is exact and induces a bijection*

$$\Gamma : \{\text{irreducibles in } M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K}) \text{ with non-zero global sections}\} \xrightarrow{\sim} \{\text{irreducibles in } M_\lambda(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})\}$$

We now have two methods for producing $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules from BB parameters: parabolic induction $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \mapsto I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ and the Beilinson-Bernstein construction $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \mapsto \Gamma(\mathcal{B}, j_!\mathcal{L}_\chi)$. The Duality Theorem of Hecht, Milicic, Schmid, and Wolf asserts that these two constructions (essentially) coincide.

Theorem 3.1.6 ([14], Theorem 4.3). *Suppose $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_\lambda(G)$. Then there is an equality in $K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$*

$$[\Gamma(\mathcal{B}, j_!\mathcal{L}_\chi)] = \pm I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$$

Corollary 3.1.7. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1], [\mathfrak{h}_2, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2] \in \text{BB}_\lambda(G)$. Suppose $I[\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1]$ and $I[\mathfrak{h}_2, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2]$ are nonzero and irreducible, and that*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1] = \pm I[\mathfrak{h}_2, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2]$$

Then $[\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1] = [\mathfrak{h}_2, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2]$.

3.2. Principal unipotent Beilinson-Bernstein parameters. We will construct the elements of $\text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$ from a very special set of BB parameters. To define this set of parameters, we will need several preliminary notions.

Definition 3.2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a θ -stable Cartan subalgebra and let $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \subset \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ be a positive system. We say that $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is*

- (i) *large if every imaginary simple root is noncompact.*
- (ii) *small if every imaginary simple root is compact*
- (iii) *type Z if for every complex simple root α*

$$\theta(\alpha) \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$$

- (iv) *type L if for every complex simple root α*

$$\theta(\alpha) \in -\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$$

If $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_\lambda(G)$, the Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ defines a positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) = \Delta(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{h})$ for $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$. We say that $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ is large, type Z, or type L according to the properties of this positive system.

If $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a θ -stable Cartan subalgebra and $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is a positive system, there are two naturally defined parabolic subalgebras $\mathfrak{q}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^L \subset \mathfrak{g}$. The first, \mathfrak{q}^Z , is the standard parabolic corresponding to the real roots for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$

$$(3.2.2) \quad \mathfrak{l}^Z := \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \quad \mathfrak{u}^Z := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \quad \mathfrak{q}^Z := \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$$

The second, \mathfrak{q}^L , is the standard parabolic corresponding to the imaginary roots for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$

$$(3.2.3) \quad \mathfrak{l}^L := \mathfrak{h} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \quad \mathfrak{u}^L := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \quad \mathfrak{q}^L := \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$$

Proposition 3.2.4. *In the setting described above*

- (i) \mathfrak{q}^Z is θ -stable if and only if $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is type Z
- (ii) \mathfrak{q}^L is σ -stable (i.e. real) if and only if $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is type L.

Proof. We will only prove the first statement. The second statement can be proved using a similar argument, replacing θ with $-\theta$.

For the first statement, one implication is clear: if \mathfrak{q}^Z is θ -stable, then the set of complex positive roots is preserved by θ . In particular, every complex simple root $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ satisfies $\theta(\alpha) \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$.

Conversely, suppose $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is type Z. To prove that \mathfrak{q}^Z is θ -stable, it suffices to show that θ preserves the set of complex positive roots. Denote the real, imaginary, and complex simple roots by α_i, β_j , and γ_k , respectively.

Every root $\mu \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ has a unique decomposition

$$\mu = \sum l_i \alpha_i + \sum m_j \beta_j + \sum n_k \gamma_k$$

for integers l_i, m_j, n_k which are either all nonnegative or all nonpositive.

Now suppose μ is positive and complex. If all $n_k = 0$, then

$$\theta(\mu) = - \sum l_i \alpha_i + \sum m_j \beta_j \notin \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$$

a contradiction. So every complex root has at least one complex simple root in its simple root decomposition.

Assuming still that μ is positive and complex,

$$\theta(\mu) = - \sum l_i \alpha_i + \sum m_j \beta_j + \sum n_k \theta(\gamma_k)$$

By hypothesis, each $\theta(\gamma_k)$ is positive and complex. And therefore, each has a complex simple root in its simple root decomposition. Consequently, $\theta(\mu)$ has at least one complex simple root in its simple root decomposition. Since $\theta(\mu)$ is a root, this means $\theta(\mu) \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$. \square

Definition 3.2.5. *Suppose $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$. We say that $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ is principal unipotent if*

- (i) $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is large
- (ii) $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is type Z
- (iii) Every simple real root for H is even for χ

Denote the set of principal unipotent BB parameters by $\text{BB}_0^(G)$.*

3.3. Cayley transforms and simple reflections on $\text{BB}_0(G)$. Following [27], we will define two operations on the parameter space $\text{BB}_0(G)$: simple reflections (through complex simple roots) and Cayley transforms (through odd simple real roots).

Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$. If $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is a complex simple root, we will define a new parameter

$$s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$$

called the simple reflection of $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ through α .

If $\beta \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is an odd simple real root, we will define two new parameters

$$c_\beta^\pm[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$$

called the *Cayley transforms* of $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ through β .

The definitions are rigged so that c_α^\pm and s_β commute (approximately) with parabolic induction $I : \text{BB}_0(G) \rightarrow K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$. As a result, these operations can be used in inductive arguments to relate the induced modules $I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ as $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ varies over $\text{BB}_0(G)$. For these inductive arguments to work, we will need a numerical invariant which keeps track of how many operations have been performed. There are several good candidates for this invariant. We will use

$$d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] := \dim(\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{k})$$

We will see that Cayley transforms and simple reflections have a predictable effect on $d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$.

3.3.1. Simple Reflections Through Complex Roots. Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and let $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ be a simple root.

Definition 3.3.1. Let $s_\alpha \mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be the Borel subalgebra corresponding to the positive system

$$s_\alpha \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) = \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \cup \{-\alpha\} \setminus \{\alpha\}$$

Define

$$s_\alpha \chi := \chi \otimes \alpha$$

Finally, let

$$s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] := [\mathfrak{h}, s_\alpha \mathfrak{b}, s_\alpha \chi]$$

Proposition 3.3.2. In the setting of Definition 3.3.1,

$$s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$$

Proof. We need only to verify that

$$ds_\alpha \chi = -\rho(s_\alpha \mathfrak{n})$$

This follows trivially from definitions

$$ds_\alpha \chi = d\chi + d\delta(\alpha) = -\rho(\mathfrak{n}) + \alpha = -\rho(s_\alpha \mathfrak{n})$$

□

Although $s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ is well-defined for any simple root, we will give special attention to the case when α is complex. This is due to the following

Theorem 3.3.3. Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and let $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ be a complex simple root. Then

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = -I(s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi])$$

Proof. This is an easy consequence of the Transfer Theorem of Knapp and Vogan (See [17], Theorem 11.87). \square

Under the conditions of Theorem 3.3.3, s_α has a predictable effect on $d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$.

Proposition 3.3.4. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and let $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ be a complex simple root.*

(i) *If*

$$\theta(\alpha) \in -\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$$

then

$$d(s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) = d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] + 1$$

(ii) *If*

$$\theta(\alpha) \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$$

then

$$d(s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) = d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] - 1$$

Proof. Since \mathfrak{h} is θ -stable, we have

$$d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = \dim(\mathfrak{t}) + \dim(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k})$$

Choose a basis of root vectors X_μ for \mathfrak{n} as in the proof of Proposition 3.3.23. Then $\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k}$ is spanned by

$$\begin{aligned} & \{X_\mu : \mu \text{ positive compact imaginary}\} \cup \\ & \{X_\mu + X_{\theta\mu} : \text{pairs } \{\mu, \theta\mu\} \text{ of complex positive roots}\} \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$s_\alpha \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) = \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}) \cup \{-\alpha\} \setminus \{\alpha\}$$

the positive systems $s_\alpha \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ and $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ contain the same number of compact imaginary roots. If $\theta(\alpha) \in -\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, $s_\alpha \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ contains one additional pair $\{-\alpha, \theta\alpha\}$ of complex positive roots. If $\theta(\alpha) \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, then $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ contains one additional pair $\{\alpha, \theta\alpha\}$ of complex positive roots. \square

A useful consequence of Theorem 3.3.3 is the following:

Proposition 3.3.5. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$.*

(i) *There is a BB parameter $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ of type Z such that*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = \pm I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1]$$

(ii) *There is a BB parameter $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2]$ of type L such that*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = \pm I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2]$$

Proof. Let $S \subset \text{BB}_0(G)$ be the set of all BB parameters which can be obtained from $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ through a finite sequence of simple reflections through complex simple roots α satisfying $\theta(\alpha) \in -\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$. Since S is finite, there is an element $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1) \in S$ which maximizes d . If $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is a complex simple root satisfying $\theta(\alpha) \in -\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, then $s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1] \in S$ and by Proposition 3.3.4 $d(s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1]) > d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1]$, a contradiction. Hence, $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1]$ is type Z. The equation

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = \pm I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_1, \chi_1]$$

follows by induction from Theorem 3.3.3. This proves (i).

The proof of (ii) is analogous. Let $S' \subset \text{BB}_0(G)$ be the set of all BB parameters which can be obtained from $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ through a sequence of simple reflections through complex simple roots α satisfying $\theta(\alpha) \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$. Since $d \geq 0$, there is an element $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2] \in S'$ which minimizes d . If $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is a complex simple root satisfying $\theta(\alpha) \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, then $s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2] \in S'$ and by Proposition 3.3.4 $d(s_\alpha[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) < d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2]$, a contradiction. Hence, $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2]$ is type L. The equation

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = \pm I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \chi_2]$$

follows by induction from Theorem 3.3.3. \square

3.3.2. Cayley Transforms Through Real Roots. Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and let $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ be an odd real root. Recall the Cartan subgroup H^α , the inner automorphisms c_α^\pm of \mathfrak{g} , and the characters $c_\alpha^\pm \chi$ of H^α defined in Section 2.4.

Definition 3.3.6. *In the setting described above, let*

$$c_\alpha^\pm[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] := [\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{b}, c_\alpha^\pm \chi]$$

Note that the pair $c_\alpha^\pm[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ is independent of the isomorphism $\phi_\alpha : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ used to define it (see the remarks preceding Proposition 2.4.2).

Proposition 3.3.7. *In the setting of Definition 3.3.6,*

$$c_\alpha^\pm[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$$

Proof. The only condition to check is

$$dc_\alpha^\pm \chi = -\rho(c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{n})$$

This will follow from the condition

$$d\chi = -\rho(\mathfrak{n})$$

if we can prove that $dc_\alpha^\pm \chi = d\chi \circ (c_\alpha^\pm)^{-1}$. We will check this equality independently on $\ker \alpha$ and $\phi(D_c)$ (which together span \mathfrak{h}^α). By definition, $dc_\alpha^\pm \chi|_{\ker \alpha} = d\chi|_{\ker \alpha}$ and on $\ker \alpha$, both c_α^\pm act by the identity (see Proposition 2.4.2). On $\phi_\alpha(D_c)$, we use Proposition 2.4.2 again to compute

$$d\chi(c_\alpha^\pm)^{-1} \phi_\alpha(D_c) = \pm d\chi(\alpha^\vee) = \pm \langle \rho(\mathfrak{n}), \alpha^\vee \rangle = \pm 1$$

and indeed

$$dc_\alpha^\pm \chi(\phi(D_c)) = \tau_{\pm 1}(D_c) = \pm 1$$

\square

Make the following

Definition 3.3.8 ([27], Def 8.3.4). *Suppose $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ is a real root. The image of T under α is a compact subgroup of \mathbb{R}^\times . Hence, α restricts to a group homomorphism*

$$\alpha : T \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$$

We say that α is type 1 (resp. type 2) if the image of this map is $\{1\}$ (resp. $\{\pm 1\}$).

The analogue of Theorem 3.3.3 for Cayley transforms is the following.

Theorem 3.3.9. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and let $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ be an odd simple real root. Then*

(i) *If α is type 1,*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = -I(c_\alpha^+[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) - I(c_\alpha^-[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi])$$

(ii) If α is type 2,

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = -I(c_\alpha^+[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) = -I(c_\alpha^-[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi])$$

Our proof of Theorem 3.3.9 will involve reduction to $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$ and, in the type 2 case, the basic Clifford theory of index 2 subpairs. To simplify notation, let

$$G^s = SL_2(\mathbb{R}) \quad K^s = SO_2(\mathbb{R}) \quad H^s = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right\} \quad T^s = \{\pm \text{Id}\}$$

Let $\epsilon \otimes -1$ be the character of H^s defined by

$$(\epsilon \otimes -1) \left(\begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \right) = t^{-1}$$

Let $\tau_{\pm 1}$ be the characters of K^s defined in (2.4.6). Let $\mathfrak{b}^s \subset \mathfrak{g}^s$ be the Borel subalgebra of upper triangular matrices, and let $\mathfrak{b}_c^s(\pm) \subset \mathfrak{g}^s$ be the Borel subalgebras containing \mathfrak{k}^s . Arrange the signs so that

$$d\tau_1 = -\rho(\mathfrak{n}_c^s(+)) \quad d\tau_{-1} = -\rho(\mathfrak{n}_c^s(-))$$

We will need the following basic fact about $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$:

Proposition 3.3.10. *There is an equality in $KM(\mathfrak{g}^s, K^s)$*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}^s, \mathfrak{b}^s, \epsilon \otimes -1] = -I[\mathfrak{k}^s, \mathfrak{b}_c^s(+), \tau_1] - I[\mathfrak{k}^s, \mathfrak{b}_c^s(-), \tau_{-1}]$$

The classes on the right correspond to irreducible (\mathfrak{g}^s, K^s) -modules.

Proof. There is a well-known decomposition of the non-spherical principal series representation

$$\text{Ind}_{B^s}^{G^s} \epsilon \otimes 0$$

into the two limit of discrete series representations, which are obtained by cohomological induction (in degree 1) from the θ -stable Borel subalgebras $\mathfrak{b}_c^s(\pm)$

$$\text{Ind}_{B^s}^{G^s} \epsilon \otimes 0 \cong_{(\mathfrak{g}^s, K^s)} R^1 \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{b}_c^s(+), K^s)}^{(\mathfrak{g}^s, K^s)} \tau_1 \oplus R^1 \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{b}_c^s(-), K^s)}^{(\mathfrak{g}^s, K^s)} \tau_{-1}$$

Now use Theorems 2.9.2, 2.10.1, and the identification (2.9.1). \square

Now let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and let $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ be any real root. Define a θ -stable Levi subgroup

$$L_\alpha := Z_G(\ker \alpha)$$

Since $\Phi_\alpha(G^s)$ centralizes $\ker \alpha$, there is a group homomorphism

$$r_\alpha : G^s \times \ker \alpha \rightarrow L_\alpha \quad r_\alpha(g, h) = \Phi_\alpha(g)h$$

We will also consider its restrictions

$$r_\alpha : H^s \times \ker \alpha \rightarrow H \quad r_\alpha : K^s \times \ker \alpha \rightarrow H^\alpha$$

Proposition 3.3.11. *The group homomorphisms*

$$(3.3.12) \quad r_\alpha : G^s \times \ker \alpha \rightarrow L_\alpha$$

$$(3.3.13) \quad r_\alpha : H^s \times \ker \alpha \rightarrow H$$

$$(3.3.14) \quad r_\alpha : K^s \times \ker \alpha \rightarrow H^\alpha$$

have the following properties

(i) *All three homomorphisms are isogenies (i.e. give rise to Lie algebra isomorphisms)*

(ii) All three homomorphisms are two-to-one, with

$$\ker r_\alpha = \{(1, 1), (-1, m_\alpha)\}$$

(iii) Homomorphism 3.3.14 is surjective (independent of α). Homomorphisms 3.3.12 and 3.3.13 are either surjective (if α is type 1) or surjective onto index-2 subgroups (if α is type 2).

Proof. The differential of r_α is given by

$$dr_\alpha : \mathfrak{g}^s \oplus \ker \alpha \rightarrow Z_{\mathfrak{g}}(\ker \alpha) \quad dr_\alpha(X, H) = \phi_\alpha(X) + H$$

The map $\phi_\alpha : \mathfrak{g}^s \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ is an injection, with image $\mathbb{C}\phi_\alpha(H) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$. In particular, $\phi_\alpha(\mathfrak{g}^s) \cap \ker \alpha = 0$ and dr_α is injective. To conclude that homomorphisms 3.3.12, 3.3.13, and 3.3.14 are isogenies, note that

$$dr_\alpha(\mathfrak{g}^s \oplus \ker \alpha) = \mathbb{C}\phi_\alpha(H) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \oplus \ker \alpha = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} = Z_{\mathfrak{g}}(\ker \alpha)$$

$$dr_\alpha(\mathfrak{h}^s \oplus \ker \alpha) = \mathbb{C}\phi_\alpha(H) \oplus \ker \alpha = \mathfrak{h}$$

$$dr_\alpha(\mathfrak{k}^s \oplus \ker \alpha) = \mathbb{C}\phi_\alpha(H_c) \oplus \ker \alpha = \mathfrak{h}^\alpha$$

This completes the proof of (i).

Since dr_α is injective, $\ker r_\alpha$ is a discrete, normal subgroup of $G^s \times \ker \alpha$. Let $\pi_1 : G^s \times \ker \alpha \rightarrow G^s$ be the projection map. Then $\pi_1(\ker r_\alpha)$ is a discrete, normal subgroup of G^s , and hence a subgroup of $Z(G^s) = \{\pm 1\}$. On the other hand, the restriction of π_1 to $\ker r_\alpha$ is injective. Hence, $\pi_1 : \ker r_\alpha \subseteq \{\pm 1\}$. Note finally that $r_\alpha(-1, m_\alpha) = \Phi_\alpha(-1)m_\alpha = m_\alpha^2 = 1$. So indeed, $\ker r_\alpha = \{(1, 1), (-1, m_\alpha)\}$, proving (ii).

The surjectivity statement for homomorphism 3.3.14 follows from Lemma 2.4.4. We will prove the statement for homomorphism 3.3.13. The statement for homomorphism 3.3.12 will then follow from the Bruhat decomposition for L_α . The restriction of Φ_α to H^s coincides with the co-root $\alpha^\vee : \mathbb{R}^\times \rightarrow H$. Since $\alpha(\alpha^\vee(t)) = t^2 > 0$, there is an inclusion

$$r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha) \subseteq \alpha^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$$

The reverse inclusion is equally clear: if $h \in H$ has $\alpha(h) > 0$, then

$$\alpha^\vee(\sqrt{\alpha(h)})^{-1}h \in \ker \alpha$$

and hence

$$h = \alpha^\vee(\sqrt{\alpha(h)}) \left(\alpha^\vee(\sqrt{\alpha(h)})^{-1}h \right) \in \alpha^\vee(\mathbb{R}^\times) \ker \alpha = r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha)$$

Combining these facts, we obtain

$$r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha) = \alpha^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{>0})$$

Now, $\alpha(H) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\times$ is a finite-index subgroup. There are two such subgroups of \mathbb{R}^\times : \mathbb{R}^\times and $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. If α is type 1, then $\alpha(H) = \alpha(TA) = \alpha(A)$, which is connected, and therefore necessarily $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. In this case $r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha) = H$. If α is type 2, then $\alpha(H)$ contains -1 and is therefore the full multiplicative group \mathbb{R}^\times . In this case, $r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha)$ has index 2 in H .

Since $r_\alpha(G^s \times \ker \alpha) \cap H = r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha)$, the inclusion $H \subset L_\alpha$ induces an injection of cosets

$$(3.3.15) \quad H/r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha) \subseteq L_\alpha/r_\alpha(G^s \times \ker \alpha)$$

We want to show that this mapping is onto. First note that the element

$$\sigma_\alpha := \Phi_\alpha(E - F)$$

normalizes \mathfrak{h} nontrivially. Hence, σ_α represents the nontrivial element of the real Weyl group $W(L_\alpha, H) \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. Let $U_\alpha = \exp(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \cap \mathfrak{g}_0)$. By the Bruhat decomposition for real reductive groups (see [16], Theorem 7.40),

$$L_\alpha = HU_\alpha \sqcup HU_\alpha\sigma_\alpha U_\alpha$$

Since U_α is connected and $\mathfrak{u}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{l}_\alpha$, $U_\alpha \subseteq r_\alpha(G^s \times \ker \alpha)$. Also, $\sigma_\alpha \in r_\alpha(G^s \times \ker \alpha)$ by definition. It follows from these observations and the decomposition above that every coset in $L_\alpha/r_\alpha(G^s \times \ker \alpha)$ has a representative in H and hence the injection 3.3.15 is onto.

The conclusion is that $[L_\alpha : r_\alpha(G^s \times \ker \alpha)] = [H : r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha)]$. Hence, the statement for homomorphism 3.3.13 implies the statement for homomorphism 3.3.12. This completes the proof of (iii). \square

Form three Borel subalgebras of \mathfrak{l}_α

$$\mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha} := \mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{l}_\alpha \supset \mathfrak{h} \quad \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(\pm) = c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{l}_\alpha \supset c_\alpha \mathfrak{h}$$

The conjugacy of $\mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(\pm)$ under L_α depends on the type of α .

Lemma 3.3.16. *If α is type 1, then $\mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(\pm)$ are non-conjugate under L_α . If α is type 2, then for any element $t \in T$ with $\alpha(t) = -1$, $\text{Ad}(t)$ acts by inversion on $\Phi_\alpha(K^s)$ and interchanges $\mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(\pm)$.*

Proof. Suppose α is type 1 and assume there is a group element $g \in L_\alpha$ such that

$$\text{Ad}(g)\mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(+) = \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(-)$$

By Proposition 3.3.11

$$(3.3.17) \quad \Phi_\alpha(G^s) \ker \alpha = L_\alpha$$

Write $g = \Phi_\alpha(g')h$ for elements $g' \in G^s$ and $h \in \ker \alpha$. Since $\ker \alpha$ is central in L_α , we can replace g with $\Phi_\alpha(g')$ in Equation 3.3.17 above. We deduce that

$$\text{Ad}(g')(\mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(+) \cap \mathfrak{g}^s) = \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(-) \cap \mathfrak{g}^s$$

The Borels appearing above are exactly $\mathfrak{b}_c^s(\pm)$. These are non-conjugate under G^s by an explicit calculation. We deduce that $\mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(\pm)$ are non-conjugate under L_α .

Now suppose α is type 2. Choose $t \in T$ with $\alpha(t) = -1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ad}(t)\phi_\alpha(D) &= \phi_\alpha(D) \\ \text{Ad}(t)\phi_\alpha(E) &= \alpha(t)\phi_\alpha(E) = -\phi_\alpha(E) \\ \text{Ad}(t)\phi_\alpha(F) &= \alpha(t)^{-1}\phi_\alpha(F) = -\phi_\alpha(F) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Ad}(t)\phi_\alpha(E - F) = -\phi_\alpha(E - F)$$

Therefore, since $E - F$ spans \mathfrak{k}^s , $\text{Ad}(t)$ acts by negation on $\phi_\alpha(\mathfrak{k}^s)$ and consequently, since $\Phi_\alpha(K^s)$ is connected, by inversion on $\Phi_\alpha(K^s)$.

By definition, $\mathfrak{h}^\alpha = \phi_\alpha(\mathfrak{k}^s) \oplus \ker \alpha$. $\text{Ad}(t)$ preserves this Cartan subalgebra: it normalizes the first factor by the computation above and centralizes the second factor since H is abelian. A Lie algebra automorphism of \mathfrak{l}_α which preserves \mathfrak{h}_α permutes the Borel subalgebras containing it. Hence, $\text{Ad}(t)$ permutes $\mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(\pm)$.

Since $\text{Ad}(t)$ acts nontrivially on the co-root $c_\alpha \alpha^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}^\alpha$, it acts by the nontrivial permutation. \square

Proposition 3.3.18. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and let $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ be an odd real simple root. Then*

(i) *If α is type 1, there is an equality in $K^f(\mathfrak{l}_\alpha, L_\alpha \cap K)$*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}, \chi] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi] - I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

and the terms on the right are irreducible.

(ii) *If α is type 2, there are equalities in $K^f(\mathfrak{l}_\alpha, L_\alpha \cap K)$*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}, \chi] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

and all terms are irreducible.

Proof. First, assume α is type 1. Consider the character $r_\alpha^* \chi$ of $H^s \times \ker \alpha$ obtained by pulling back χ along the surjective homomorphism

$$r_\alpha : H^s \times \ker \alpha \rightarrow H$$

This character has the form

$$r_\alpha^* \chi = \tau \otimes \chi|_{\ker \alpha}$$

for some character τ of H^s . Since α is odd, $\tau(-1) = -1$, and since $d\chi = -\rho(\mathfrak{n})$,

$$d\tau(H) = d\chi(\alpha^\vee) = -\rho(\mathfrak{n})(\alpha^\vee) = -1$$

Hence, $\tau = \epsilon \otimes -1$. Applying Proposition 3.3.10, we obtain an equality in $K^f(\mathfrak{g}^s \oplus \ker \alpha, K^S \times (\ker \alpha \cap T))$

(3.3.19)

$$\begin{aligned} I[\mathfrak{h}^s \times \ker \alpha, \mathfrak{b}^s \oplus \ker \alpha, r_\alpha^* \chi] &= I[\mathfrak{h}^s, \mathfrak{b}^s, \epsilon \otimes -1] \otimes \chi|_{\ker \alpha} \\ &= -(I[\mathfrak{k}^s, \mathfrak{b}_c^s(+), \tau_1] + I[\mathfrak{k}^s, \mathfrak{b}_c^s(-), \tau_{-1}]) \otimes \chi|_{\ker \alpha} \\ &= -I[\mathfrak{k}^s \times \ker \alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^s(+) \oplus \ker \alpha, \tau_1 \otimes \chi] - I[\mathfrak{k}^s \times \ker \alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^s(-) \oplus \ker \alpha, \tau_{-1} \otimes \chi] \end{aligned}$$

and the terms on the right are irreducible classes by the second half of the same proposition. By the definitions of $c_\alpha^\pm \chi$ and r_α , we have $r_\alpha^* c_\alpha^\pm \chi = \tau_{\pm 1} \otimes \chi$. Substituting these identities into 3.3.19, we get

$$I[\mathfrak{h}^s \times \ker \alpha, \mathfrak{b}^s \oplus \ker \alpha, r_\alpha^* \chi] = -I[\mathfrak{k}^s \times \ker \alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^s(+) \oplus \ker \alpha, r_\alpha^* c_\alpha^+ \chi] - I[\mathfrak{k}^s \times \ker \alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^s(-) \oplus \ker \alpha, r_\alpha^* c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

Since the homomorphisms of Proposition 3.3.11 are surjective, we can move r_α^* past I , thus obtaining

$$r_\alpha^* I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}, \chi] = -r_\alpha^* I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi] - r_\alpha^* I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

which forces an equality in $K^f(\mathfrak{l}_\alpha, L_\alpha \cap K)$

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}, \chi] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi] - I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

as desired.

Now suppose α is type 2. Define the subgroups

$$H' := r_\alpha(H^s \times \ker \alpha) \subset H \quad L'_\alpha := r_\alpha(G^s \times \ker \alpha) \subset L_\alpha$$

By Proposition 3.3.11, these are index-2 subgroups. By the argument provided above, there is an equality in $K^f(\mathfrak{l}_\alpha, L'_\alpha \cap K)$

$$(3.3.20) \quad I[\mathfrak{h}', \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}, \chi] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi] - I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{l}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

and the terms on the right are irreducible classes.

By Proposition A.0.1,

$$(3.3.21) \quad I_{(\mathfrak{h}, H' \cap K)}^{(\mathfrak{h}, T)} \chi \cong \chi \oplus (\chi \otimes \epsilon)$$

where ϵ (as in the statement of Proposition A.0.1) is the unique nontrivial (\mathfrak{h}, T) -module with trivial restriction to $(\mathfrak{h}, H' \cap K)$. Substituting 3.3.21 into 3.3.20, we get an equality (still in $K^f(\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, L'_\alpha \cap K)$)

$$(3.3.22) \quad I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}, \chi] + I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}, \chi \otimes \epsilon] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi] - I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

To deduce the desired equalities in $K^f(\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, L_\alpha \cap K)$, we must apply Proposition A.0.1 once more, this time a little less trivially. By Lemma 3.3.16, the two-element quotient group $(L_\alpha \cap K)/(L'_\alpha \cap K)$ exchanges the summands appearing on the right hand side of 3.3.22. Therefore by Proposition A.0.1, the classes

$$I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(\pm), c_\alpha^\pm \chi] \subset K^f(\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, L_\alpha \cap K)$$

are isomorphic and irreducible. If we apply the (exact) functor $I_{(\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, L'_\alpha \cap K)}^{(\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, L_\alpha \cap K)}$ to both sides of 3.3.22, we obtain an equality in $K^f(\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, L_\alpha \cap K)$

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}, \chi] + I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}, \chi \otimes \epsilon] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi] - I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

Since all terms are irreducible, this implies

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}, \chi] = I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}, \chi \otimes \epsilon] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi] = -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]$$

which proves part (2) of the proposition. \square

We are now prepared to prove Theorem 3.3.9.

Proof of Theorem 3.3.9. Recall the parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{q}^Z = \mathfrak{t}^Z \oplus \mathfrak{u}^Z$ defined in (3.2.2). By assumption, α is an odd simple root for the positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{t}^Z, H)$. Let $\mathfrak{p}_\alpha = \mathfrak{t}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{u}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{t}$ be the corresponding minimal parabolic. Then by definition

$$\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{u}^Z \quad c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(\pm) \oplus \mathfrak{u}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{u}^Z$$

Suppose α is type 1. Using Proposition 3.3.18 and Proposition 2.8.4, we obtain an equality

$$\begin{aligned} I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] &= I[\mathfrak{t}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, I[L_\alpha, \mathfrak{p}_\alpha, I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}, \chi]]] \\ &= -I[\mathfrak{t}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, I[\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, \mathfrak{p}_\alpha, I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(+), c_\alpha^+ \chi]]] - I[\mathfrak{t}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, I[\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, \mathfrak{p}_\alpha, I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(-), c_\alpha^- \chi]]] \\ &= -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, c_\alpha^+ \mathfrak{b}, c_\alpha^+ \chi] - I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, c_\alpha^- \mathfrak{b}, c_\alpha^- \chi] \\ &= -I(c_\alpha^+[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) - I(c_\alpha^-[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) \end{aligned}$$

If α is type 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] &= I[\mathfrak{t}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, I[\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, \mathfrak{p}_\alpha, I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}, \chi]]] \\ &= -I[\mathfrak{t}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, I[\mathfrak{t}_\alpha, \mathfrak{p}_\alpha, I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, \mathfrak{b}_c^{\mathfrak{t}_\alpha}(\pm), c_\alpha^\pm \chi]]] \\ &= -I[\mathfrak{h}^\alpha, c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{b}, c_\alpha^\pm \chi] \\ &= -I(c_\alpha^\pm[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) \end{aligned}$$

\square

As promised, the operations c_α^\pm have a predictable effect on $d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$.

Proposition 3.3.23. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and let $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ be an odd simple real root. Then*

$$d(c_\alpha^\pm[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) = d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] + 1$$

Proof. Choose a basis of root vectors X_μ in \mathfrak{n} such that

$$\theta X_\mu = X_{\theta\mu}$$

for every pair $(\mu, \theta\mu)$ of positive complex roots. Then the subspace $\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k}$ is spanned by the elements

$$\begin{aligned} & \{X_\mu : \mu \text{ positive compact imaginary}\} \cup \\ & \{X_\mu + X_{\theta\mu} : \text{pairs } (\mu, \theta\mu) \text{ of positive complex roots}\} \end{aligned}$$

If we define

$$\mathfrak{n}' := \bigoplus_{\alpha \neq \mu > 0} \mathfrak{g}_\mu \subset \mathfrak{n}$$

then $\dim(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k}) = \dim(\mathfrak{n}' \cap \mathfrak{k})$, since α is real. Since \mathfrak{h} is θ -stable, we have

$$\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k}$$

and therefore

$$\dim(\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{k}) = \dim(\mathfrak{t}) + \dim(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k}) = \dim(\mathfrak{t}) + \dim(\mathfrak{n}' \cap \mathfrak{k})$$

Next, we show that $c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{n}' = \mathfrak{n}'$. Recall,

$$c_\alpha^\pm = \exp(\text{ad}(X_\alpha + X_{-\alpha}))$$

for a particular choice of root vectors X_α and $X_{-\alpha}$. If β is a positive root not equal to α , then

$$[X_\alpha + X_{-\alpha}, X_\beta] \in \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha+\beta}$$

If $-\alpha + \beta$ is a root, then the simplicity of α implies that $-\alpha + \beta$ is positive. In any case, neither $\alpha + \beta$ nor $-\alpha + \beta$ is equal to α , so in fact

$$[X_\alpha + X_{-\alpha}, X_\beta] \in \mathfrak{n}'$$

And hence,

$$c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{n}' \subseteq \mathfrak{n}'$$

by exponentiation. Since c_α^\pm is an automorphism of \mathfrak{g} , this inclusion is an equality.

Now, we have a decomposition

$$\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}' \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$$

and hence a decomposition

$$c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{h}^\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{n}' \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{c_\alpha^\pm \alpha}$$

Since \mathfrak{h}^α is θ -stable (by construction) and $\mathfrak{g}_{c_\alpha^\pm \alpha}$ is non-compact (by Proposition 2.4.3.2), we have

$$c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{k} = (\mathfrak{h}^\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{c_\alpha^\pm \alpha}) \cap \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{n}' \cap \mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{t}^\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{n}' \cap \mathfrak{k}$$

and so

$$\dim(c_\alpha^\pm \mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{k}) = \dim(\mathfrak{t}) + 1 + \dim(\mathfrak{n}' \cap \mathfrak{k}) = 1 + \dim(\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{k})$$

□

3.4. Principal nilpotent elements and quasi-split groups. We will need several basic facts about principal nilpotent elements.

Proposition 3.4.1 ([18], Sec 5). *The following are true:*

- (i) *If e is a principal nilpotent element belonging to the nilradical \mathfrak{u} of a parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, then \mathfrak{q} is a Borel subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} .*
- (ii) *If e is a principal nilpotent element and*

$$\phi : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$$

is any homomorphism with $\phi(E) = e$, then $\phi(D)$ is \mathbf{G} -conjugate to

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})} \alpha^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}$$

for any choice of Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} and positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$.

- (iii) *If $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a Cartan subalgebra, $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is a positive system, and $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$ is the corresponding Borel subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , then $e \in \mathfrak{n}$*

$$e = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} c_\alpha X_\alpha$$

is a principal nilpotent element if and only if $c_\alpha \neq 0$ for every simple root $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$.

Principal nilpotent elements are related to quasi-split groups.

Proposition 3.4.2 ([3]). *The following are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathfrak{g} contains a σ -stable Borel subalgebra $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{g}$.
- (ii) \mathfrak{g} contains a θ -stable Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} and a θ -stable positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ such that every simple imaginary root $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is noncompact (i.e. $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is large)
- (iii) \mathfrak{g} contains a θ -stable Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} and a θ -stable positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ such that every imaginary simple root $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is noncompact.
- (iv) \mathcal{N}_θ contains a principal nilpotent element of \mathfrak{g} .

If any one of these equivalent conditions is satisfied, we say that G (or \mathfrak{g}_0) is quasi-split.

We will need a slight refinement of these results.

Proposition 3.4.3. *Let $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a θ -stable parabolic subalgebra. Choose a θ -stable Levi decomposition*

$$\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$$

The following are equivalent:

- (i) \mathfrak{g}_0 is quasi-split and the \mathbf{K} -saturation of $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta}$ has the same dimension as $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}$.
- (ii) $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta}$ contains a principal nilpotent element of \mathfrak{g}
- (iii) There is a maximally compact θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ and a large, type Z system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^c)$, compatible with \mathfrak{q} .
- (iv) There is a maximally split θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ and a large, type Z system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^s)$, compatible with \mathfrak{q} .

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Recall from Section 2.6 that $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}$ decomposes into finitely-many \mathbf{K} -orbits. If $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}$ is one such \mathbf{K} -orbit

$$\dim(\mathcal{O}) = \frac{1}{2} \dim(\mathbf{G}\mathcal{O})$$

This is an easy consequence of part (3) of Theorem 2.6.2. In particular, if $\mathcal{O}^{\text{prin}} \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}$ is nonempty, it decomposes into finitely-many \mathbf{K} -orbits $\mathcal{O}_1, \dots, \mathcal{O}_n$ and these are precisely the \mathbf{K} -orbits of maximal dimension on $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}$.

Since \mathfrak{g}_0 is quasi-split, $\mathcal{O}^{\text{prin}} \cap \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}$ is nonempty (by part (4) of Proposition 3.4.2). Then the condition

$$\dim(\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta})) = \dim(\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g},\theta})$$

implies that $\mathcal{O}_i \subset \mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta})$ for some $i = 1, \dots, n$. Hence, $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta}$ contains a principal nilpotent element of \mathfrak{g} .

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Since $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta} \subset \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g},\theta}$, and $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta}$ contains a principal nilpotent element, \mathfrak{g}_0 is quasi-split (by part (4) of Proposition 3.4.2). Hence, $\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta}$ has nonempty intersection with \mathcal{O}_i , for some $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then by \mathbf{K} -invariance, $\mathcal{O}_i \subset \mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta})$ and therefore

$$\dim(\mathbf{K} \cdot (\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta})) = \dim(\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g},\theta})$$

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Let $e_{\mathfrak{u}} \in \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p}$, $e_{\mathfrak{l}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta}^{\mathfrak{l}}$, and assume $e_{\mathfrak{u}} + e_{\mathfrak{l}} \in \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l},\theta}^{\mathfrak{l}}$ is a principal nilpotent element of \mathfrak{g} . By Theorem 2.6.1, there is an embedding

$$\phi : \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$$

intertwining θ with θ_s and σ with σ_s with the property that $\phi(E_c) = e_{\mathfrak{u}} + e_{\mathfrak{l}}$. Then $\phi(D_c)$ is a semisimple element of $\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{k}$. Choose a maximally compact θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ containing $\phi(D_c)$. By Proposition 3.4.1, there is a positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$ such that

$$\phi(D_c) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})} \alpha^{\vee}$$

Hence, the 2-eigenspace of $\text{ad } \phi(D_c)$ is the sum of the simple root spaces. Write Π^+ for the simple roots for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$, and choose root vectors X_{α} for every $\alpha \in \Pi^+$. Then

$$(3.4.4) \quad e_{\mathfrak{u}} + e_{\mathfrak{l}} = \sum c_{\alpha} X_{\alpha} \quad c_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}$$

If one of the c_{α} is zero, then $e_{\mathfrak{u}} + e_{\mathfrak{l}}$ is contained in the nilradical of the corresponding minimal parabolic $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, which is impossible by Proposition 3.4.1. Hence, all c_{α} are nonzero. Since $e_{\mathfrak{u}} + e_{\mathfrak{l}} \in \mathfrak{p}$, the simple roots for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$ are either complex (occurring in pairs) or noncompact imaginary. It remains to show that $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$ is compatible with \mathfrak{q} . By 3.4.4

$$e_{\mathfrak{u}} = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi^+ \setminus \Delta^+(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})} c_{\alpha} X_{\alpha} \quad e_{\mathfrak{l}} = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi^+ \cap \Delta^+(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})} c_{\alpha} X_{\alpha}$$

The former implies that $\Pi^+ \setminus \Delta^+(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}}) \subseteq \Delta(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{h}^c)$, and hence that $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^c) \setminus \Delta^+(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{h}^c) \subseteq \Delta(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{h}^c)$, since \mathfrak{u} is invariant under the adjoint action of \mathfrak{l} .

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii): Since $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}}$ is maximally compact, all of its roots are complex or imaginary. The complex positive roots are θ -stable, since $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$ is type Z. Choose positive root vectors X_α so that

$$\theta(X_\alpha) = -X_{\theta\alpha}$$

whenever α is complex, Define

$$e_{\mathfrak{u}} := \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}}) \\ \alpha \text{ complex or noncompact}}} X_\alpha$$

and

$$e_{\mathfrak{l}} := \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}}) \\ \alpha \text{ complex or noncompact}}} X_\alpha$$

By construction, $e_{\mathfrak{u}} \in \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p}$ and $e_{\mathfrak{l}} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}} \cap \mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta}$. Since $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$ is large, every simple root for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$ appears in $e_{\mathfrak{u}} + e_{\mathfrak{l}}$ with nonzero coefficient. So by part 3 of Proposition 3.4.1, $e_{\mathfrak{u}} + e_{\mathfrak{l}}$ is a principal nilpotent element of \mathfrak{g} .

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): There is a maximally split θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ and sequence of noncompact simple imaginary roots

$$\beta_1 \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}}) \quad \beta_2 \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+(\mathfrak{l}, d_{\beta_1}^+ \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}}) \quad \dots \quad \beta_n \in \Delta_{i\mathbb{R}}^+(\mathfrak{l}, d_{\beta_{n-1}}^+ \dots d_{\beta_1}^+ \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$$

such that

$$d_{\beta_n}^+ \dots d_{\beta_1}^+ \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}} = \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}}$$

By Lemma 2.5.4 and an easy induction on n , we see that the positive system

$$d_{\beta_n}^+ \dots d_{\beta_1}^+ \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}}) \subset \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}})$$

is large. Applying simple reflections through complex simple roots, we can make this system type Z (see the proof of Proposition 3.3.5).

Each $d_{\beta_i}^+$ acts on \mathfrak{g} by an element of $\text{Ad}(\mathfrak{l})$ and therefore preserves the nilradical \mathfrak{u} . Hence, this positive system is compatible with \mathfrak{q} .

(iv) \Rightarrow (iii): There is a maximally compact θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ and sequence of simple real roots

$$\alpha_1 \in \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}^+(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}}) \quad \alpha_2 \in \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}^+(\mathfrak{l}, c_{\alpha_1}^\pm \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}}) \quad \dots \quad \alpha_n \in \Delta_{\mathbb{R}}^+(\mathfrak{l}, c_{\alpha_{n-1}}^\pm \dots c_{\alpha_1}^\pm \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}})$$

such that

$$c_{\alpha_n}^\pm \dots c_{\alpha_1}^\pm \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}} = \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}}$$

By Lemma 2.5.4 and an easy induction on n , there is a sequence of signs $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$ so that the positive system

$$c_{\alpha_n}^{\epsilon_n} \dots c_{\alpha_1}^{\epsilon_1} \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{split}}) \subset \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}^{\text{comp}})$$

is large. Applying simple reflections through complex simple roots, we can arrange so that this positive system is type Z. It is compatible with \mathfrak{q} for the same reasons as above. \square

3.5. **The spherical principal series of infinitesimal character 0.** Write

$$\mathrm{Irrep}_0(G) \subset K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$$

for the set of (isomorphism classes of) nonzero irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules of infinitesimal character 0. By definition 1.1.3, there is an inclusion

$$\mathrm{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \mathrm{Irrep}_0(G)$$

We will soon see that this inclusion is an equality, but this will require some work.

Suppose G is quasi-split. Then by Proposition 3.4.2, there is a σ -stable Borel subgroup $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathbf{G}$. Let $B = \mathbf{B}^\sigma$ and define

$$S_0(G) := \text{Harish-Chandra module of } \mathrm{Ind}_B^G \mathbb{C} = \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{b}, \mathbf{T})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})}(-|\rho(\mathfrak{n})|)$$

Proposition 3.5.1. *Suppose G is quasi-split. Then $S_0(G)$ is independent (up to isomorphism) of B and*

$$[S_0(G)] \in \mathrm{Irrep}_0(G)$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.8.2, $S_0(G)$ has infinitesimal character 0. It is nonzero by Theorem 2.9.2. Its irreducibility was established by Kostant in [19, Thm 1]. \square

In [19], Kostant also calculates the \mathbf{K} -structure of $S_0(G)$. He proves that $S_0(G)$ has the same \mathbf{K} -multiplicities as $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}]$, the ring of regular functions on $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}$. Together with Theorem 2.7.7 this implies

Theorem 3.5.2. *There is an equality in $K^{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta})$*

$$[\mathrm{gr} S_0(G)] = [\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}}]$$

In particular,

$$[S_0(G)] \in \mathrm{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$$

If G is quasi-split, then $\mathrm{Irrep}_0(G) \neq \emptyset$ by Proposition 3.5.1. The converse is also true.

Proposition 3.5.3. *G is quasi-split if and only if*

$$\mathrm{Irrep}_0(G) \neq \emptyset$$

Proof. If G is quasi-split, then $[S_0(G)] \in \mathrm{Irrep}_0(G)$ by Proposition 3.5.1.

Now suppose $\mathrm{Irrep}_0(G) \neq \emptyset$, and choose an element $[X] \in \mathrm{Irrep}_0(G)$. Let $Q^{\min} = L^{\min}U^{\min} \subset G$ be a minimal parabolic. By the Casselman subrepresentation theorem (Theorem 2.9.3), there is an irreducible finite-dimensional representation V of L^{\min} and an embedding of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules

$$X \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{l}^{\min}, \mathbf{L}^{\min} \cap \mathbf{K})}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} V$$

By Proposition 2.8.2, the representation V has infinitesimal character $-\rho(\mathfrak{u})$. Since the infinitesimal character of a finite-dimensional representation is always nonsingular, this means that \mathfrak{l}^{\min} has no roots. Hence, \mathfrak{l}^{\min} is a Cartan subalgebra and Q^{\min} is a Borel. \square

To summarize: whenever $\mathrm{Irrep}_0(G)$ is nonempty, it contains a distinguished element $[S_0(G)]$. This representation has associated variety $\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{g}, \theta}$ and is therefore an element of $\mathrm{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$. We will soon see that the classes $[S_0(L)]$, as $L \subset G$ varies, form the building blocks of $\mathrm{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$ (see Corollary 3.7.6 for a precise statement and proof).

3.6. Zuckerman parameters. In this section, we define our second set of parameters for principal unipotent representations.

Definition 3.6.1. A Zuckerman parameter of infinitesimal character 0 (a Z parameter, for short) is a \mathbf{K} -conjugacy class of triples $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#)$ consisting of

- (i) a θ -stable Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l} \subset \mathfrak{g}$, split modulo center,
- (ii) a θ -stable parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ containing \mathfrak{l} as a Levi subalgebra, and
- (iii) a one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathbf{L} \cap \mathbf{K})$ -module $\chi^\#$ satisfying $d\chi^\# = -\rho(\mathfrak{u})$

Denote the \mathbf{K} -conjugacy class of $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#)$ by $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#]$ and denote the set of all such conjugacy classes by $Z_0(G)$.

A Z parameter is unipotent if it satisfies the additional condition

$$\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta} \text{ contains a principal nilpotent element of } \mathfrak{g}$$

Write $Z_0^*(G)$ for the set of unipotent Z parameters.

Remark 3.6.2. If $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#] \in Z_0(G)$, we can (and will) choose \mathfrak{l} to be stable under σ . This allows us to define the Levi subgroup $L := Z_G(\mathfrak{l})$.

Define the function

$$\tilde{I} : Z_0(G) \rightarrow K_0^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}) \quad \tilde{I}[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#] = I(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\# \otimes S_0(L))$$

(see (2.8.3)). There is a natural mapping

$$Z : \text{BB}_0^*(G) \rightarrow Z_0^*(G)$$

which intertwines I and \tilde{I} . To define it, we will need a lemma

Lemma 3.6.3 ([2], Lemma 16.1.4). *Let $H \subset G$ be a θ -stable Cartan subgroup. A character χ of H is an extremal weight of an irreducible, finite-dimensional representation of G if and only if*

- (i) $\langle d\chi, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every root $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, and
- (ii) $\chi(m_\alpha) = (-1)^{\langle d\chi, \alpha^\vee \rangle}$ for every real root $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$

Now, suppose $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0^*(G)$. Recall the parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{q}^Z = \mathfrak{l}^Z \oplus \mathfrak{u}^Z$ of \mathfrak{g} defined in (3.2.2). By Condition (iii) of Definition 3.2.5, every simple real root $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, H)$ is even for χ . Hence, every real root is even for χ by e.g. [27, Cor 4.3.20]. Define a new character of H

$$\chi^L := \chi \otimes |\rho(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{l}^Z)|$$

Since $|\rho(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{l}^Z)|$ takes strictly positive values, every real root is also even for χ^L .

Now

$$d\chi^L = -\rho(\mathfrak{n}) + \rho(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{l}^Z) = -\rho(\mathfrak{u}^Z)$$

Since $d\chi^L$ is the differential of a one-dimensional representation of \mathfrak{l}^Z , we have $\langle d\chi^L, \beta^\vee \rangle = 0$ for every $\beta \in \Delta(\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{h})$. Hence by Proposition 3.6.3, χ^L is an extremal weight of a finite-dimensional representation of L^Z . Since $\langle d\chi^L, \beta^\vee \rangle = 0$ for every $\beta \in \Delta(\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{h})$, $d\chi^L$ has minimal norm among its root lattice translates. So this finite-dimensional representation of L^Z is necessarily a character. We will (somewhat abusively) denote this character (and its Harish-Chandra module) by χ^L .

Proposition 3.6.4. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0^*(G)$. Then $[\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, \chi^Z] \in Z_0^*(G)$. Furthermore, the mapping*

$$Z : \text{BB}_0^*(G) \rightarrow Z_0^*(G) \quad Z[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = [\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, \chi^Z]$$

is surjective.

Proof. The Levi L^Z is split modulo center, since all of the roots $\Delta(\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{h})$ are real. the parabolic \mathfrak{q}^Z is θ -stable by Condition (ii) of Definition 3.2.5 and Proposition 3.2.4. The character χ^L satisfies $d\chi^L = -\rho(\mathfrak{u}^Z)$ by the calculation following Lemma 3.6.3. The final condition, namely that

$$\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta} \text{ contains a principal nilpotent element of } \mathfrak{g}$$

follows from Condition (i) of Definition 3.2.5 and Proposition 3.4.3. Hence, $(L^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, \chi^Z) \in Z_0^*(G)$, as desired.

Now suppose $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#) \in Z_0^*(G)$. By Proposition 3.4.3, there is a maximally split θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ and large, type Z system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$, compatible with \mathfrak{q} . Let \mathfrak{b} be the corresponding Borel subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . Define a character χ of H by

$$\chi := \chi^\#|_H \otimes |\rho(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{l})|^{-1}$$

Then $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0^*(G)$ (Conditions (i) and (ii) are automatic by our choice of $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ and Condition (iii) follows from Lemma 3.6.3) and $Z[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = [\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#]$. Hence, Z is surjective onto $Z_0^*(G)$. \square

Proposition 3.6.5. *The triangle of functions*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{BB}_0^*(G) & \xrightarrow{Z} & Z_0^*(G) \\ & \searrow I & \downarrow \tilde{I} \\ & & K_0^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}) \end{array}$$

commutes.

Proof. Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0^*(G)$. Let $B^L \subset L^Z$ be the real Borel subgroup corresponding to $\mathfrak{l}^Z \cap \mathfrak{b}$. By 2.9.1, there is an isomorphism of $(\mathfrak{l}^Z, L^Z \cap K)$ -modules

$$I_{(\mathfrak{l}^Z \cap \mathfrak{b}, T)}^{(\mathfrak{l}^Z, L^Z \cap K)} \chi \cong \text{Ind}_{B^L}^{L^Z} \chi^Z$$

And since χ^Z extends to a character of L^Z

$$\text{Ind}_{B^L}^{L^Z} \chi^Z \cong \chi^Z \otimes \text{Ind}_{B^L}^{L^Z} \mathbb{C}$$

Therefore by Theorem 2.9.2, there is an equality in $K^f(\mathfrak{l}^Z, L^Z \cap K)$

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{l}}, \chi] = \chi^L \otimes [S_0(L^Z)]$$

Using this and Proposition 2.8.4, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] &= I[\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathfrak{l}}, \chi]] \\ &= I[\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, \chi^Z \otimes S_0(L^Z)] \\ &= \tilde{I}[\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, \chi^Z] \end{aligned}$$

\square

3.7. Main results.

Proposition 3.7.1. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$. Then*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \neq 0$$

if and only if $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ is large.

Proof. By Proposition 3.2.4, we can assume without loss of generality that $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ is type L. Recall the parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{q}^L = \mathfrak{l}^L \oplus \mathfrak{u}^L$ of \mathfrak{g} defined in 3.2.3. By Proposition 3.2.4, \mathfrak{q}^L is σ -stable. Let $L^L = N_G(\mathfrak{l}^L)$, a θ -stable Levi subgroup of G .

By Proposition 2.8.4

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = I[\mathfrak{l}^L, \mathfrak{q}^L, I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{l}^L \cap \mathfrak{b}, \chi]]$$

Since \mathfrak{q} is real, $I[\mathfrak{l}^L, \mathfrak{q}^L, \cdot]$ is injective (see Theorem 2.9.2). Thus, by replacing \mathfrak{g} with \mathfrak{l}^L , we can reduce to the case where $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$ has only imaginary roots.

Now, assume $I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = 0$. Choose a positive system for $\Delta(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t}) = \Delta_c(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$. Then, by Theorem 2.10.2, the weight $-\rho(\mathfrak{n}) + 2\rho(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{p})$ is non-dominant for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$. Hence, there is a simple compact root $\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$ with

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> \langle -\rho(\mathfrak{n}) + 2\rho(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{p}), \alpha^\vee \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho(\mathfrak{n}) - 2\rho(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k}), \alpha^\vee \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho(\mathfrak{n}), \alpha^\vee \rangle - 2\langle \rho(\mathfrak{n} \cap \mathfrak{k}), \alpha^\vee \rangle \\ &= \langle \rho(\mathfrak{n}), \alpha^\vee \rangle - 2 \end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle \rho(\mathfrak{n}), \alpha^\vee \rangle$ is an integer, this implies $\langle \rho(\mathfrak{n}), \alpha^\vee \rangle \leq 1$, and hence $\langle \rho(\mathfrak{n}), \alpha^\vee \rangle = 1$, which implies that α is simple for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$.

Conversely, if there is a compact simple root, then $I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = 0$ by a character identity of Schmid ([22], Theorem 1). \square

Proposition 3.7.2. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0^*(G)$. Then*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.7.1, $I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ is a nonzero element of $K^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$. It remains to show that $I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$ is irreducible and $\text{AV}(\text{Ann}(I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi])) = \mathcal{N}$.

By Proposition 3.6.5, we have

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] = I[\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, \chi^L \otimes S_0(L)]$$

We know that $S_0(L)$ is irreducible by Proposition 3.5.1. Hence, $I[\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, \chi^L \otimes S_0(L)]$ is irreducible by Theorem 2.10.1.

We can use Proposition 2.10.3 and Theorem 3.5.2 to compute the associated variety of $I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$:

$$\text{AV}(I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]) = \text{AV}(I[\mathfrak{l}^Z, \mathfrak{q}^Z, \chi^L \otimes S_0(L)]) = \mathbf{K}(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta})$$

Hence by Theorem 2.7.6, we have

$$\text{AV}(\text{Ann}(I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi])) = \mathbf{G}(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta})$$

which is \mathcal{N} by Proposition 3.6.4. \square

Hence, we obtain a commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{BB}_0^*(G) & \xrightarrow{Z} & Z_0^*(G) \\ & \searrow I & \downarrow \bar{I} \\ & & \text{Unip}(\mathcal{O}) \end{array}$$

We will prove that $I : \text{BB}_0^*(G) \rightarrow \text{Rep}_0(G)$ is a bijection. Together with the surjectivity of Z (see Proposition 3.6.4) this will imply that all three maps in the diagram above are bijections.

Proposition 3.7.3. *Let $[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and assume*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0] \neq 0$$

Then there is a collection of unipotent parameters $\Omega^ \subset \text{BB}_0^*(G)$ such that*

$$I[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0] = \sum_{[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \Omega^*} \pm I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$$

Proof. Let $S \subset \text{BB}_0(G)$ be the set of all parameters which can be obtained from $[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0]$ through a sequence of

- (1) Cayley transforms through odd simple real roots, and
- (2) simple reflections through complex simple roots α satisfying

$$\theta(\alpha) \in -\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h})$$

By a *decomposition* of $[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0]$, we will mean a subset $\Omega \subset S$ such that

- (1) Every parameter $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \Omega$ has

$$I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \neq 0$$

and

- (2)

$$I[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0] = \sum_{[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \Omega} \pm I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$$

Let D be the set of all decompositions of $[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0]$. Note that $D \neq \emptyset$, since $\{[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0]\} \in D$.

Define a function $\tilde{d} : D \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by

$$\tilde{d}(\Omega) := \sum_{[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \Omega} d[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$$

If $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \in D$, we declare that $\Omega_1 \leq \Omega_2$ if and only if *every* parameter in Ω_2 can be obtained from some parameter in Ω_1 through a sequence of Cayley transforms and simple reflections (of the types described above). Note that \tilde{d} is strictly monotonic with respect to this relation (this is a consequence of Propositions 3.3.23 and 3.3.4). Hence, \leq defines a partial order on D (the only nontrivial condition is antisymmetry; this follows from the monotonicity of \tilde{d}). Since D is finite, it contains a maximal element Ω^* with respect to \leq .

Suppose $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \Omega^*$. We want to show that $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_0^*(G)$. Conditions (ii) and (iii) of Definition 3.2.5 follow from the maximality of Ω^* . Condition (i) follows from Proposition 3.7.1. \square

Corollary 3.7.4. *The map*

$$I : \text{BB}_0^*(G) \rightarrow \text{Irrep}_0(G)$$

is surjective.

Proof. Assume G is quasi-split (if it is not, $\text{Rep}_0(G) = \emptyset$ by Proposition 3.5.3 and the Corollary is vacuous). Let $B_0 = H_0 N_0 \subset G$ be a Borel subgroup of G and let $X \in \text{Irrep}_0(G)$. By the Casselman Subrepresentation Theorem (Theorem 2.9.3) there is a character χ_0 of H and an embedding of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules

$$X \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{b}_0, T_0)}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} \chi_0$$

Since X has infinitesimal character 0, $d\chi_0 = -\rho(\mathfrak{n}_0)$.

Evidently $[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0] \in \text{BB}_0(G)$ and $I[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0] \neq 0$, since $X \neq 0$ is a submodule. So Proposition 3.7.3 furnishes a collection $\Omega^* \subset \text{BB}_0^*(G)$ of unipotent BB parameters such that

$$I[\mathfrak{h}_0, \mathfrak{b}_0, \chi_0] = \sum_{[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \Omega^*} \pm I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$$

By Proposition 3.7.2, the terms on the right are irreducible. Hence, there is a parameter $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \Omega^*$ with

$$X = I[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi]$$

as desired. \square

Proposition 3.7.5. *The map*

$$I : \text{BB}_0^*(G) \rightarrow \text{Irrep}_0(G)$$

is injective.

Proof. This is a consequence of Corollary 3.1.7. and Proposition 3.7.2. \square

Corollary 3.7.6. *We have $\text{Irrep}_0(G) = \text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$, and there is a commutative triangle of bijections*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{BB}_0^*(G) & \xrightarrow{Z} & Z_0^*(G) \\ & \searrow I & \downarrow \tilde{I} \\ & & \text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O}) \end{array}$$

Proof. Since $Z : \text{BB}_0^*(G) \rightarrow Z_0^*(G)$ is a surjection (Proposition 3.6.4) and $I : \text{BB}_0^*(G) \rightarrow \text{Irrep}_0(G)$ is a bijection (Corollary 3.7.4 and Proposition 3.7.5), $\tilde{I} : Z_0^*(G) \rightarrow \text{Irrep}_0(G)$ is a bijection. This proves both claims at once. \square

3.8. \mathbf{K} -types and associated varieties of principal unipotent representations. One advantage of the parameterization

$$\tilde{I} : Z_0^*(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$$

described in Corollary 3.7.6 is that \mathbf{K} -types and associated varieties of the modules $\tilde{I}[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#]$ are particularly easy to compute. Choose a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{k}$ and a positive system $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$ compatible with \mathfrak{q} . Consider the dot-action of $W(\mathfrak{k})$ on \mathfrak{t}^* :

$$w \cdot (\lambda) = w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$$

If $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*$, there is at most one element $w \in W(\mathfrak{k})$ such that $w \cdot \lambda$ is dominant for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$. Write w_λ for this element (if it exists) and $\ell(w_\lambda)$ for its length. If λ is integral (for $\Delta(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$) and dominant (for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$), write $V(\lambda)$ for the unique irreducible \mathbf{K} -representation with highest weight λ (if λ is not integral or dominant, let $V(\lambda) = 0$). For $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#] \in Z_0^*(G)$, consider the multiset of weights

$$\Lambda(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#) := \Delta(2\rho(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p}) - \rho(\mathfrak{u}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta}] \otimes S[\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p}], \mathfrak{t})$$

The following theorem is an easy consequence of the Blattner formula and Theorem 3.5.2.

Theorem 3.8.1. *Let $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#] \in Z_0^*(G)$. Then*

$$I[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#] \simeq_{\mathbf{K}} \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda(\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#)} (-1)^{\ell(w_0) + \ell(w_\lambda)} [V(w_\lambda \cdot \lambda)]$$

The associated variety of $I[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#]$ can be computed using Proposition 2.10.3 and Theorem 3.5.2 (see the proof of Proposition 3.7.2).

Proposition 3.8.2. *Let $[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#] \in Z_0^*(G)$. Then*

$$\text{AV}(I[\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{q}, \chi^\#]) = \mathbf{K}(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{l}, \theta})$$

4. LANGLANDS PARAMETERS OF PRINCIPAL UNIPOTENT REPRESENTATIONS

In this section, we will describe the Langlands parameters of principal unipotent representations.

4.1. Langlands classification. We begin by reviewing the Langlands classification of irreducible representations of real reductive groups, as formulated in [1]. For details and proofs, we refer the reader to [1, Sec 4-5] or [4, Sec 2-3]. Let \mathbf{G} be a complex connected reductive algebraic group and form the corresponding *based root datum*

$$\Phi(\mathbf{G}) = (X^*, X_*, \Delta, \Delta^\vee, \vee, \Pi, \Pi^\vee)$$

(these symbols denote, respectively: the character lattice, the co-character lattice, the roots, the co-roots, the bijection between them, the simple roots, and the simple co-roots. This seven-tuple appears to depend on a choice of maximal torus and Borel. Up to canonical isomorphism, it does not). Let $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{G})$ be the group of (algebraic group) automorphisms of \mathbf{G} and let $\text{Int}(\mathbf{G}) \subset \text{Aut}(\mathbf{G})$ be the normal subgroup of inner automorphisms. Two automorphisms $\theta, \theta' \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{G})$ are *inner* if they are in the same (left) $\text{Int}(\mathbf{G})$ -coset. There is a canonical map $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{G}) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\Phi(\mathbf{G}))$, inducing a short exact sequence

$$(4.1.1) \quad 1 \rightarrow \text{Int}(\mathbf{G}) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathbf{G}) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\Phi(\mathbf{G})) \rightarrow 1$$

Hence, the inner classes in $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{G})$ are parameterized by automorphisms of $\Phi(\mathbf{G})$.

Now fix a pinning $(\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \{X_\alpha\})$ of \mathbf{G} (by this we mean a Cartan \mathfrak{h} , a Borel $\mathfrak{b} \supset \mathfrak{h}$, and a set $\{X_\alpha\} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ of simple root vectors). For each $\delta \in \text{Aut}(\Phi(\mathbf{G}))$, there is a unique automorphism $\theta_0 \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{G})$ in the inner class of δ which preserves the chosen pinning

$$d\theta_0(\mathfrak{h}) = \mathfrak{h} \quad d\theta_0(\mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{b} \quad d\theta_0\{X_\alpha\} = \{X_\alpha\}$$

This automorphism is called the *distinguished* automorphism in the inner class of δ , and the assignment $\delta \mapsto \theta_0$ defines a splitting of (4.1.1).

The dual group \mathbf{G}^\vee comes equipped with a canonical isomorphism of based root data $\Phi(\mathbf{G}^\vee) \simeq \Phi(\mathbf{G})^\vee$ and hence a canonical isomorphism of groups (called tranpose)

$$t : \text{Aut}(\Phi(\mathbf{G})) \simeq \text{Aut}(\Phi(\mathbf{G}^\vee))$$

For what follows, we will fix both a pinning $(\mathfrak{h}^\vee, \mathfrak{b}^\vee, \{X_{\alpha^\vee}\})$ of \mathbf{G}^\vee and an involution $\delta \in \text{Aut}(\Phi(\mathbf{G}))$. Let $w_0 \in W(\mathbf{G})$ be the longest element of the Weyl group. Note that $w_0^2 = 1$ and $w_0(\Pi) = -\Pi$. Hence $-w_0$ can be regarded as an involution of $\Phi(\mathbf{G}^\vee)$ (and as such, it commutes with every element of $\text{Aut}(\Phi(\mathbf{G}^\vee))$). We will consider the involution $\delta^\vee := -w_0\delta^t \in \text{Aut}(\Phi(\mathbf{G}^\vee))$. As explained in the previous paragraph, there is a unique distinguished involution $\theta_0^\vee \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{G}^\vee)$ in the inner class of δ^\vee .

The L -group of \mathbf{G} (with respect to δ) is the semi-direct product

$$\mathbf{G}^L := \mathbf{G}^\vee \ltimes \{1, \theta_0^\vee\}$$

The Weil group of \mathbb{R} is the Lie group defined by

$$W_{\mathbb{R}} := \langle \mathbb{C}^{\times}, j \rangle \quad jzj^{-1} = \bar{z}, \quad j^2 = -1$$

Definition 4.1.2 ([21], see also [10], Sec 8.2). *A Langlands parameter for \mathbf{G} (an L parameter, for short) is a \mathbf{G}^{\vee} -conjugacy class of continuous homomorphisms*

$$\phi : W_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}^L$$

such that

- (i) $\phi(\mathbb{C}^{\times})$ consists of semisimple elements
- (ii) $\phi(j) \in \mathbf{G}^{\vee}\theta_0^{\vee}$

Denote the \mathbf{G}^{\vee} -conjugacy class of ϕ by $[\phi]$, and denote the set of L parameters for \mathbf{G} by $\Pi(\mathbf{G})$.

For our purposes, a more concrete description of L parameters will be convenient. Suppose (y, λ) is a pair consisting of an element $y \in \mathbf{G}^{\vee}\theta_0^{\vee}$ and a semisimple element $\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}^{\vee}$ such that $\exp(2\pi i\lambda) = y^2$. From (y, λ) , we obtain an L parameter as follows. First, conjugate (y, λ) by \mathbf{G}^{\vee} so that

$$y \in N_{\mathbf{G}^{\vee}\theta_0^{\vee}}(\mathbf{H}^{\vee}) \quad \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^{\vee}$$

Then, define

$$(4.1.3) \quad \phi(j) = \exp(-\pi i\lambda)y \quad \phi(\exp(\pi z)) = \exp(\pi z\lambda + \pi \bar{z} \text{Ad}(y)\lambda)$$

It is easy to check that $[\phi] \in \Pi(\mathbf{G})$. Conversely, given an L parameter $[\phi] \in \Pi(\mathbf{G})$, we obtain a pair (y, λ) as follows. First, conjugate ϕ so that

$$\phi(\mathbb{C}^{\times}) \subset \mathbf{H}^{\vee} \quad \phi(j) \in N_{\mathbf{G}^{\vee}\theta_0^{\vee}}(\mathbf{H}^{\vee})$$

Then, define

$$(4.1.4) \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{2}(d\phi(1) - id\phi(i)) \quad y = \exp(\pi iy)\phi(j)$$

Lemma 4.1.5 ([1], Prop 5.6). *The formulas (4.1.3) and (4.1.4) define mutually inverse bijections between $\Pi(\mathbf{G})$ and the set*

$$\{(y, \lambda) \mid y \in \mathbf{G}^{\vee}\theta_0^{\vee}, \lambda \in \mathfrak{g}^{\vee} \text{ semisimple}, \exp(2\pi i\lambda) = y^2\} / \mathbf{G}^{\vee}$$

Now let G be a real form of \mathbf{G} . Assume that the Cartan involution $\theta \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{G})$ is in the inner class of δ .

Theorem 4.1.6 (Langlands [21], see also [10], Sec 11). *There is a natural map*

$$\varphi : \text{Irrep}(G) \rightarrow \Pi(\mathbf{G})$$

The fibers of this map are called L-packets in $\text{Irrep}(G)$. If G is quasi-split, then this map is surjective (i.e. all L-packets are non-empty).

4.2. From Beilinson-Bernstein parameters to Langlands parameters. Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfying the dominance condition (3.1.1). Recall from Section 3.1 the set $\text{BB}_{\lambda}(G)$ and the bijection

$$\text{BB}_{\lambda}(G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \{\text{irreducibles in } M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K})\}$$

Left-composing with $\Gamma : M(\mathcal{D}_{\lambda-\rho}, \mathbf{K}) \rightarrow M_{\lambda}^f(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$, we obtain a map

$$\bar{\Gamma} : \text{BB}_{\lambda}(G) \rightarrow \text{Irrep}_{\lambda}(G) \cup \{0\}$$

which by Theorem 3.1.5 is surjective onto $\text{Irrep}_\lambda(G)$. Choose $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_\lambda(G)$ with $\bar{I}[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \neq 0$. Following [4], we will construct the L parameter $\varphi(\bar{I}[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi])$. The construction is as follows:

- (1) Define an involution $\theta^\vee \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{H}^\vee)$ by

$$\theta^\vee := -\theta^t$$

Note that there is a uniquely defined $w \in W$ such that $\theta^\vee = w\delta^\vee$

- (2) For each simple root $\alpha \in \Pi$, the pinning on \mathbf{G}^\vee defines a canonical homomorphism $\phi_\alpha : SL_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{G}^\vee$ such that

$$\phi_\alpha(D) = \alpha(1) \in \mathbf{H}^\vee \quad \phi_\alpha(E) = X_{\alpha^\vee}$$

Put

$$\sigma_\alpha := \phi_\alpha \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

- (3) Form a reduced word decomposition $w = \prod w_{s_{\alpha_i}}$ and define $\sigma_w := \prod \sigma_{w_{\alpha_i}}$ (by a result of Tits [24], this element is well-defined).
 (4) Choose any $\mu \in X^*(\mathbf{H})$ such that $X|_{\mathbf{T}} = \chi|_{\mathbf{T}}$. Define

$$y := X(-1)e^{i\pi\lambda}\sigma_w\theta_0^\vee \in \mathbf{G}^\vee\theta_0^\vee$$

One easily checks that the pair (y, λ) is of the form described in Lemma 4.1.5.

Proposition 4.2.1 ([4], Sec 3). *Let $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \in \text{BB}_\lambda(G)$ and suppose $\bar{I}[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi] \neq 0$. Then the L parameter $\varphi(\bar{I}[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{b}, \chi])$ corresponds under the bijection of Lemma 4.1.5 to the pair (y, λ) constructed above.*

4.3. Langlands parameters of principal unipotent representations. Now suppose G is quasi-split.

Definition 4.3.1. *An L parameter $[\phi] \in \Pi(\mathbf{G})$ is principal unipotent if $\phi(\mathbb{C}^\times) = 1$. Write $\Pi_0(\mathbf{G})$ for the set of principal unipotent L parameters.*

Proposition 4.3.2. *Let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathcal{N}$ be the principal nilpotent orbit. Then*

$$\varphi(\text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})) = \Pi_0(\mathbf{G})$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.2.1, we have

$$\varphi(\text{Irrep}_0(G)) \subseteq \Pi_0(\mathbf{G}) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^{-1}(\Pi_0(\mathbf{G})) \subseteq \text{Irrep}_0(G)$$

Since G is quasi-split, φ is surjective (see Theorem 4.1.6). Hence

$$\varphi(\text{Irrep}_0(G)) = \Pi_0(\mathbf{G})$$

By Corollary 3.7.6, $\text{Irrep}_0(G) = \text{Unip}_R(\mathcal{O})$, completing the proof. \square

The main result of Section 3 provides a set of ‘normalized’ representatives for $\Pi(\mathbf{G})$.

Definition 4.3.3. *An element $y \in N_{\mathbf{G}^\vee\theta_0^\vee}(\mathbf{H}^\vee)$ is principal unipotent if*

- (i) $y^2 = 1$ (hence, $\text{Ad}(y)$ defines an involution of \mathbf{G}^\vee which preserves \mathbf{H}^\vee),
- (ii) \mathfrak{b}^\vee is small for $\text{Ad}(y)$ (see Definition 3.2.1(ii))
- (iii) \mathfrak{b}^\vee is type L for $\text{Ad}(y)$ (see Definition 3.2.1(iii))

The following proposition is an immediate consequence of Corollary 3.7.6 and Proposition 4.2.1.

Proposition 4.3.4. *There is a natural bijection*

$$\Pi_0(\mathbf{G}) \simeq \{\text{principal unipotent } y \in N_{\mathbf{G}^\vee \theta_0^\vee}(\mathbf{H}^\vee)\} / \mathbf{H}^\vee$$

Specializing Proposition 4.3.4 to the case when G is split (and hence $\theta_0^\vee = \text{id}$), we obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.3.5. *There is a natural bijection*

$$\{y \in \mathbf{G}^\vee \mid y^2 = 1\} / \mathbf{G}^\vee \simeq \{y \in N(\mathbf{H}^\vee) \mid y^2 = 1, \mathfrak{b}^\vee \text{ is large and type } L \text{ for } \text{Ad}(y)\} / \mathbf{H}^\vee$$

Note that Corollary 4.3.5 is a purely structural fact about connected reductive algebraic groups.

APPENDIX A. CLIFFORD THEORY FOR HARISH-CHANDRA MODULES

Fix \mathfrak{g} and \mathbf{K} as in Section 2.8. Suppose $\mathbf{K}' \subset \mathbf{K}$ is an index-2 subgroup and write $A = \mathbf{K}/\mathbf{K}'$. The theory of induction from finite-index subgroups (see [13]) has a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module analog.

Proposition A.0.1 (Clifford Theory for Harish-Chandra Modules). *Choose an element $s \in \mathbf{K} \setminus \mathbf{K}'$, so that*

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}' \sqcup s\mathbf{K}'$$

Let ϵ be the one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module which is trivial as a \mathfrak{g} -module with \mathbf{K} acting by the nontrivial character of A . Since \mathbf{K}' has finite index in \mathbf{K} , we have that $\mathbf{K}^0 \subset \mathbf{K}'$, so ϵ is indeed a well-defined $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module.

If X is an irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module, we can define a second (possibly isomorphic) irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -module $X \otimes \epsilon$. If X' is an irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')$ -module, we can define a second (possibly isomorphic) irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')$ -module X'_s by twisting the \mathbf{K} -action on X' by s , i.e.

$$k' \cdot x := (sk's^{-1}) \cdot x$$

The assignments $X \mapsto X \otimes \epsilon$ and $X' \mapsto X'_s$ define A -actions on the sets $\text{Irr}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ and $\text{Irr}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')$ of irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ - and $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')$ -modules, respectively. We have

- (1) If $X \in \text{Irr}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ is fixed by A , then $\text{Res}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} X$ is reducible, with two irreducible summands. If $X, Y \in \text{Irr}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ are A -conjugate, then $\text{Res}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} X$ and $\text{Res}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} Y$ are isomorphic, irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')$ -modules.
- (2) If $X \in \text{Irr}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')$ is fixed by A , then $\mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} X$ is reducible, with two irreducible summands. If $X', Y' \in \text{Irr}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')$ are A -conjugate, then $\mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} X'$ and $\mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})} Y'$ are isomorphic, irreducible $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})$ -modules.
- (3) In this fashion, induction and restriction define inverse bijections

$$\text{Irr}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')/A \longleftrightarrow \text{Irr}(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})/A$$

These bijections exchange one-element and two-element A -orbits.

Proposition A.0.1 can be deduced from the corresponding result for classical induction and a description ([17], Proposition 2.75) of $\mathbf{I}_{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K}')}^{(\mathfrak{g}, \mathbf{K})}$. We leave the details to the reader.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Adams, D. Barbasch, and D. Vogan. *The Langlands Classification and Irreducible Characters for Real Reductive Groups*. Birkhäuser, Boston-Basel-Berlin, 1992.
- [2] J. Adams, M.V. Leeuwen, P. Trapa, and D. Vogan. Unitary representations of real reductive groups. 2017. Preprint.
- [3] J. Adams and D. Vogan. L-groups, projective representations, and the langlands classification. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 114(1):45–138, 1992.
- [4] J. Adams and D. Vogan. Parameters for twisted representations. *Progr. Math.*, 312:51–116, 2015.
- [5] J. Adams and D. Vogan. Associated varieties for real reductive groups. *Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly*, 0(0), 2019.
- [6] J. Arthur. On some problems suggested by the trace formula. In *Lie Group Representations II*, volume 1041, pages 1–49. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1983.
- [7] J. Arthur. Unipotent automorphic representations: conjectures 13–71. In *Orbites Unipotentes et Représentations II. Groupes p-adiques et Réels, Astérisque*, volume 171–172. 1989.
- [8] D. Barbasch and M. Sepanski. Closure ordering and the kostant-sekiguchi correspondence. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 126(1):311–317, 1998.
- [9] D. Barbasch and D. Vogan. Unipotent representations of complex semisimple lie groups. *Ann. of Math.*, 121:41–110, 1985.
- [10] A. Borel. Automorphic l-functions. 33, part 2:27–61, 1979.
- [11] W. Borho and J.L. Brylinski. Differential operators on homogeneous spaces iii. *Invent. Math.*, 80:1–68, 1985.
- [12] W. Casselman. Jacquet modules for real reductive groups. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*, Helsinki, 1978.
- [13] A.H. Clifford. Representations induced in an invariant subgroup. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 38(3):533–550, 1937.
- [14] H. Hecht, D. Miličić, W. Schmid, and J. Wolf. Localization and standard modules for real semisimple lie groups i: The duality theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 90:297–332, 1987.
- [15] A. Joseph. On the associated variety of a primitive ideal. *J. Algebra*, 93:509–523, 1985.
- [16] A. Knapp. *Lie Groups: Beyond an Introduction*. Progress in Mathematics 140. Birkhäuser, Boston-Basel-Berlin, 1996.
- [17] A. Knapp and D. Vogan. *Cohomological induction and unitary representations*, volume 45 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1995.
- [18] B. Kostant. The principal three-dimensional subgroup and the betti numbers of a complex simple lie group. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 81(4):973–1032, 1959.
- [19] B. Kostant. On the existence and irreducibility of certain series of representations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 75(4):627–642, 07 1969.
- [20] B. Kostant and S. Rallis. Orbits and representations associated with symmetric spaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, 93:753–809, 1971.
- [21] R. P. Langlands. On the classification of irreducible representations of real algebraic groups. pages 101–170, 1989.
- [22] W. Schmid. Two character identities for semisimple lie groups. In *Non-Commutative Harmonic Analysis*, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1977. Springer.
- [23] J. Sekiguchi. Remarks on real nilpotent orbits of a symmetric pair. *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, 39(1):127–138, 1987.
- [24] J. Tits. Normalisateurs de tores. i. groupes de coxeter étendus. *J. Algebra*, 4:96–116, 1966.
- [25] Peter E. Trapa. Annihilators and associated varieties of $\mathfrak{aq}(\lambda)$ modules for $\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q})$. *Compositio Mathematica*, 129(1):145, 2001.
- [26] M. Vergne. Instantons et correspondance de kostant-sekiguchi. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 320(8):901–906, 1995.
- [27] D. Vogan. *Representations of real reductive Lie groups*, volume 15 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 1981.
- [28] D. Vogan. Associated varieties and unipotent representations. In *Harmonic Analysis on Reductive Groups*, volume 101 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 315–388. Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 1991.
- [29] Jr. Vogan, David A. Irreducible characters of semisimple lie groups. iv. character-multiplicity duality. *Duke Math. J.*, 49(4):943–1073.
- [30] J. Wolf. Finiteness of orbit structure for real flag manifolds. *Geometriae Dedicata*, 3, 1974.