

ADMISSIBLE MODULES AND NORMALITY OF CLASSICAL NILPOTENT ORBITS I

DAN BARBASCH AND KAYUE DANIEL WONG

ABSTRACT. In the case of complex symplectic and orthogonal groups, we find (\mathfrak{g}, K) -modules with the property that their K -structure matches the structure of regular functions on the closures of nilpotent orbits. This establishes a version of the *Orbit Method* of Kirrilov-Kostant-Souriau as proposed by Vogan. In the process we give another proof of the classification of nilpotent orbits with normal closure in the Lie algebra of a classical group first established by Kraft-Procesi.

1. INTRODUCTION

Normality of an algebraic variety is an essential property in algebraic geometry. Much insight can be gained from the case of a variety with a group action. In their seminal work, Kraft and Procesi, [KP1] and [KP2], classify orbits with normal closure for the action of a classical group, $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$, $Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$, $O(n, \mathbb{C})$, on the variety of nilpotent elements in the corresponding Lie algebra. All orbit closures are normal in the case of $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ but not for the other classical groups. We focus on the other classical groups from now on.

Let \mathcal{O} be a nilpotent orbit, $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ its closure, and $R(\mathcal{O})$ and $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ be the rings of regular functions. A well known result states that

$$(1) \quad R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \subseteq R(\mathcal{O}), \text{ and equality holds iff } \overline{\mathcal{O}} \text{ is normal.}$$

An important question (from our point of view at least) is what functions on $R(\mathcal{O})$ extend to the closure, and if not, how far they extend to orbits $\mathcal{O}' \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}}$. In this paper and its sequel, we provide an answer using the representation theory of infinite dimensional representations of the classical complex groups viewed as real Lie groups. The starting point is the work of Brylinski [Br] which associates to each nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} a (\mathfrak{g}, K) -module (or more precisely a Dixmier algebra) $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$. This module has a natural filtration such that the corresponding graded object is $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$. Being a (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -module (here the subscript c denotes complexification), it decomposes with finite multiplicity under $K_c \cong G$, where G is viewed as a complex group. Under this identification,

$$Gr(\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})) \cong R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}).$$

The main tool is the Θ –correspondence of dual reductive pairs as defined by Howe, [H]. Using the results in [AB], we provide a complete composition series for $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$. As consequences, we obtain the following results, which in particular answer the question posed earlier.

- There is an analogous Dixmier algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ with associated graded object isomorphic to $R(\mathcal{O})$, endowed with an injective map $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$. We specify the composition factors of these modules explicitly.
- We find explicit formulas for the K_c –types of the modules $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$.
- We obtain a new proof of the classification of normal closures of nilpotent orbits based on representation theory.
- All the composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ are **unitary**. The modules $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ fit into the general philosophy of the *Orbit Method*, pioneered by Kostant, Kirillov and Souriau.

Note that the modules $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ are generally neither irreducible nor unitary. Nevertheless, they do have filtrations by unitary modules. This is different from the other known versions of the orbit method. We view this as a feature of the lack of normality of $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$.

In the case of quantizing $R(\mathcal{O})$, one considers the more general case $R(\mathcal{O}, \psi)$ with ψ an equivariant local system. A version using the Θ –correspondence is analyzed in [B5]. It is not completely clear how to generalize a local system ψ of \mathcal{O} to $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$. The variety introduced by Kraft-Procesi, and used in this paper, provides a less singular cover of $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$, which we call $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{ns}$. For this cover an analogue of ψ makes sense. As a consequence of the results in this paper, one obtains a quantization of $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{ns}, \psi)$.

Here are more details on the results of this paper. In [B5], the first author constructed a unipotent representation $\Pi(\mathcal{O})$ for each classical nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} , and proved that it is a quantization model of the orbit. We ‘deform’ some characters in the inducing module of $\Pi(\mathcal{O})$, and obtain a family of (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) –modules $\Pi_t(\mathcal{O})$ for $t \geq 0$ with $\Pi_0(\mathcal{O}) = \Pi(\mathcal{O})$ (Definition 2.11). Deformation of this kind was studied by Vogan [V2, Section 6] for the only non-normal nilpotent variety $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{(4220)}$ in $\mathfrak{sp}(8, \mathbb{C})$.

The first reducibility point of $\Pi_t(\mathcal{O})$ occurs at $t = 1$. Writing $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) := \Pi_1(\mathcal{O})$, the main theorem of the manuscript is the following:

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 5.1). *Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit. There is an injective (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) –module morphism:*

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{E} : \mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}),$$

whose image is the submodule of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ generated by the spherical vector.

For a spherical module (a module containing the trivial K –type with multiplicity one), we will call the submodule generated by the spherical vector the “*cyclic submodule*”. For $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{(4220)}$, the above theorem was conjectured in [V2, Section 6]. Therefore, our result verifies and generalizes Vogan’s observation to all classical nilpotent orbits.

In view of (1), one can determine the (non-)normality of $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ by checking whether (2) is a proper inclusion or not. In Corollary 5.2, we obtain the multiplicities of *diminutive* K_c -types (Definition 2.2) of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$. This gives a new proof of the classification of normal nilpotent varieties in the classical cases, and refines the theorem of [KP2] by showing that whenever $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is not normal, the discrepancy between $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $R(\mathcal{O})$ occurs as early as diminutive K_c -types.

A list of candidates for the composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ are given in Proposition B.4. The fact that all the candidates have diminutive lowest K_c -types plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.1. Since $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) = \Pi_1(\mathcal{O})$ occurs at the first reducibility point by deforming the unitary representation $\Pi(\mathcal{O})$, all its composition factors must be unitarizable. In a subsequent work, we will show which of these candidates appear in the composition series of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$. As a result, the multiplicities of *all* K_c -types in $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $R(\mathcal{O})$ can be computed explicitly. Details will appear in a sequel to this paper.

On the other hand, the map \mathcal{E} in (2) can be seen as a ‘quantized’ version of the inclusion (1). It would be of interest to have a geometric interpretation of the quantized morphism \mathcal{E} . For example, Losev [Lo] defined a ‘*quantization parameter space*’ \mathfrak{P} for each nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} , so that for all $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}$, there is a filtered algebra $\mathcal{A}_\mu(\mathcal{O})$ equipped with a graded Poisson isomorphism satisfying $\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_\mu(\mathcal{O})) \cong R(\mathcal{O})$. Recently, [LMM] proved that $\mathcal{A}_0(\mathcal{O}) \cong \Pi(\mathcal{O})$ as (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -modules for all classical nilpotent orbits. More generally, there exists $\nu \in \mathfrak{P}$ such that $\Pi_t(\mathcal{O}) \cong \mathcal{A}_{t\nu}(\mathcal{O})$ for all $t \geq 0$ (see Remark 2.12). It is therefore natural to ask about the relationship between the filtered Poisson algebra $\mathcal{A}_\nu(\mathcal{O})$ and the normality of $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$. We expect this will be helpful in studying certain non-normal exceptional nilpotent varieties with branching generic singularities classified in [FJLS].

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Langlands Parameters. We recall the Langlands parametrization of irreducible (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -modules for a complex Lie group G viewed as a real Lie group. Fix a maximal compact subgroup K , and a pair $(B, H = TA)$ where B is a real Borel subgroup and H is a θ -stable Cartan subgroup such that $T = B \cap H$, and A the complement stabilized by θ .

The *Langlands parameter* of any irreducible module is a pair $(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$ such that $\mu := \lambda_L - \lambda_R$ is the parameter of a character of T in the decomposition of the θ -stable Cartan subalgebra $H = T \cdot A$, and $\nu := \lambda_L + \lambda_R$ the A -character. The *principal series representation* associated to $(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$ is the (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -module

$$X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R) = \text{Ind}_B^G(e^\mu \otimes e^\nu \otimes 1)_{K\text{-finite}}.$$

The symbol Ind refers to Harish-Chandra induction. The infinitesimal character, when \mathfrak{g}_c is identified with $\mathfrak{g} \times \mathfrak{g}$, is $(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$. Since $e^{(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)}|_T = e^\mu$,

$$X(\lambda_L, \lambda_R)|_K = \text{Ind}_T^K(e^\mu).$$

Let $\overline{X}(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$ be the unique irreducible subquotient of $X(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$ containing the K_c -type with extremal weight $\mu = \lambda_L - \lambda_R$. This is called the Langlands subquotient.

Proposition 2.1 (Parthasarathy-Rao-Varadarajan, Zhelobenko). *Let $(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$ and (λ'_L, λ'_R) be parameters. The following are equivalent:*

- $(\lambda_L; \lambda_R) = (w\lambda'_L; w\lambda'_R)$ for some $w \in W$.
- $X(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$ and $X(\lambda'_L; \lambda'_R)$ have the same composition factors with same multiplicities.
- The Langlands subquotient of $X(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$, written as $\overline{X}(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$, is the same as that of $X(\lambda'_L, \lambda'_R)$.

Furthermore:

- Every irreducible (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -module is equivalent to some $\overline{X}(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$.
- When $\text{Re } \nu$ is dominant (anti-dominant) with respect to the roots in B , $X(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$ has a unique irreducible quotient (submodule) identical to $\overline{X}(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$; it is the image of the long intertwining operator given by integration (see [Kn] for details).

The case of the orthogonal group is dealt with via Clifford theory. We use Weyl's parametrization of the finite dimensional representations of the orthogonal groups (see page 6 of [AB]). The highest weight of a K_c -type will be denoted

$$(3) \quad \mu = (a_1 \geq \cdots \geq a_n | \pm 1)$$

whenever $a_n = 0$, and the Langlands quotients will acquire a ± 1 whenever the corresponding lowest K_c -types are in different irreducible quotients.

If we need to specify the group, the standard module and Langlands quotient will acquire a subscript, e.g. $X_G(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$ or $\overline{X}_G(\lambda_L; \lambda_R)$. Also, we only deal with *spherical* parameters $\lambda_L = \lambda_R = \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ for most parts of this paper. In such cases, we will write

- $X_G(\lambda) := X_G(\lambda; \lambda)$ (or $X_G(\lambda; |\lambda| + 1)$ for orthogonal groups); and
- $\overline{X}_G(\lambda) := \overline{X}_G(\lambda; \lambda)$ (or $\overline{X}_G(\lambda; |\lambda| + 1)$ for orthogonal groups).

Definition 2.2. *Let G be a classical complex Lie group, and V_μ be the irreducible, finite-dimensional K_c -type with highest weight μ (or Weyl's parametrization (3) for orthogonal groups). The **diminutive K_c -types** of G are:*

$$\begin{cases} V_{(1^k, 0^{n-2k}, -1^k)} & (0 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) & \text{for } G = GL(n, \mathbb{C}) \\ V_{(1^k, 0^{n-k} | (-1)^k)} & (0 \leq k \leq n) & \text{for } G = O(2n+1, \mathbb{C}) \\ V_{(1^{2k}, 0^{n-2k})} & (0 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) & \text{for } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}) \\ V_{(1^{2k}, 0^{n-2k} | \pm 1)} & (0 \leq k \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) & \text{for } G = O(2n, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases}.$$

For instance, the diminutive K_c -types of $Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ are of the form $\wedge^{2\ell} \mathbb{C}^{2n} / \wedge^{2\ell-2} \mathbb{C}^{2n}$, and the diminutive K_c -types of $O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C})$ ($\delta \in \{0, 1\}$) are of the form $\wedge^{2\ell} \mathbb{C}^{2n+\delta}$ for some positive integer ℓ .

Let $\gamma : X \rightarrow Y$ be a (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -morphism. We write

$$\gamma : X \xrightarrow{dm} Y$$

if γ is an isomorphism when restricted to diminutive K_c -types.

As in [B4], we will use the strings to denote the parameters λ :

Definition 2.3. Let $a, A \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ be such that $A - a \in \mathbb{Z}$. A **string** is an ascending sequence of numbers

$$(a \dots A) := (a, a + 1, \dots, A - 1, A)$$

(if $A - a < 0$ then the string is empty).

The **dual string** of $(a \dots A)$ is defined as

$$(a \dots A)^* := (-A \dots -a) = (-A, -A + 1, \dots, -a - 1, -a),$$

so that the dual (or contragredient) representation of $\overline{X}_{GL}((a \dots A))$ is $\overline{X}_{GL}((a \dots A))^* = \overline{X}_{GL}((a \dots A)^*)$.

We also introduce some shorthand notation for induced modules:

Definition 2.4. Let G' be the Lie group with the same type as G of lower rank, and Ψ be a representation of G' . We write

$$I^G(\lambda \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \lambda' \boxtimes \Psi) := \text{Ind}_{GL \times \dots \times GL \times G'}^G(\overline{X}_{GL}(\lambda) \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \overline{X}_{GL}(\lambda') \boxtimes \Psi).$$

Similarly, we write

$$I^G(\lambda \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \lambda') := \text{Ind}_{GL \times \dots \times GL}^G(\overline{X}_{GL}(\lambda) \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \overline{X}_{GL}(\lambda')).$$

2.2. An Intertwining Operator. Let $(a \dots A), (b \dots B)$ be two strings. In this manuscript, we make extensive use of the intertwining operator

$$(4) \quad \iota : I^{GL}((a \dots A) \boxtimes (b \dots B)) \longrightarrow I^{GL}((b \dots B) \boxtimes (a \dots A)),$$

where ι is normalized so that it is identity on the trivial K_c -type. Following [B4, Section 2], we say that the strings are **nested**, if one of the following conditions hold:

- (i) $a - b \notin \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$; or
- (ii) $b \leq a \leq A \leq B$; or
- (iii) $a - b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $B + 1 < a$.

For example, the strings

$$(a, \quad \dots, \quad B, \quad B + 1, \quad B + 2, \quad \dots, \quad A)$$

$$(b, \quad \dots, \quad a - 2, \quad a - 1, \quad a, \quad \dots, \quad B)$$

and

$$(a = B + 1, \dots, A)$$

$$(b, \dots, B)$$

are **not** nested.

Proposition 2.5. Consider the intertwining operator ι in (4).

- (a) If the parameter is nested, then ι is an isomorphism on the level of diminutive K_c -types, i.e.

$$I^{GL}((a \dots A) \boxtimes (b \dots B)) \xrightarrow{dm} I^{GL}((b \dots B) \boxtimes (a \dots A)).$$

Moreover, if the strings satisfy (i) or (ii) above, then both modules are irreducible, and the map is an isomorphism on all K_c -types.

- (b) If $a - b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $a \leq B + 1 \leq A$, then the kernel of ι is the irreducible module with parameter

$$\begin{pmatrix} a-1 & \dots & B & a & \dots & B+1 & B+2 & \dots & A & b & \dots & a-2 \\ a & \dots & B+1 & a-1 & \dots & B & B+2 & \dots & A & b & \dots & a-2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this case, the image of ι is equal to

$$I^{GL}((b \dots A) \boxtimes (a \dots B))$$

Proof. Detailed calculations for intertwining operators and diminutive K_c -types can be found in [B4]; they exploit the relations between diminutive K_c -types and Weyl group representations. The composition factors of modules of $GL(m+n)$ induced from characters on $GL(m) \times GL(n)$ can be obtained from the techniques employed in [BSS]. We omit further details. \square

2.3. Nilpotent Orbits. A classical nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} is denoted by its Young diagram. We specify \mathcal{O} by the *columns* of its Young diagram. This parametrization is already employed in Kraft and Procesi [KP2]. Our results are best phrased in these terms as well.

We describe the nilpotent orbits for symplectic groups $G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ first. Denote the columns of the Young diagram by

$$(5) \quad (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \dots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1}) \quad (\text{set } c_{2p+1} = 0 \text{ if necessary})$$

with $\sum_i c_i = 2n$. The condition that \mathcal{O} is a symplectic orbit translates into $c_{2i} + c_{2i+1}$ is even. A *special* nilpotent orbit in the sense of [Lu] satisfies the additional condition that if c_{2i} is odd, then $c_{2i} = c_{2i+1}$.

There are similar characterizations of nilpotent orbits for orthogonal groups $G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C})$ ($\delta = 0$ or 1). Namely, suppose the columns of the Young diagram are given by

$$(6) \quad (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \dots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1}) \quad (\text{set } c_{2p+1} = 0 \text{ if necessary})$$

with $\sum_i c_i = 2n + \delta$. Then it corresponds to an orthogonal nilpotent orbit iff $c_{2i} + c_{2i+1}$ is even for $1 \leq i \leq p$. Moreover, the special nilpotent orbits satisfies the additional condition that if $c_{2i} \equiv \delta + 1 \pmod{2}$, then $c_{2i} = c_{2i+1}$.

From now on, we will specify any classical nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} by the column sizes of its corresponding Young diagram given by (5) or (6).

Definition 2.6. We call \mathcal{O} **odd** or **even** if its column sizes c_i are all odd or all even respectively.

We recall the necessary and sufficient conditions for a classical nilpotent variety orbit $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ to be non-normal:

Theorem 2.7 ([KP2]). *A classical nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} of the form (5) or (6) has non-normal closure if and only if there exists $1 \leq i \leq j \leq k$ such that*

$$c_{2i-2} > c_{2i-1} = c_{2i} = \dots = c_{2j-1} = c_{2j} > c_{2j+1}.$$

(omit the condition on c_{2i-2} in orthogonal groups when $i = 1$). For instance, the first example for a symplectic orbit having non-normal closure is $\mathcal{O} = (4 > 2 = 2 > 0)$ in $\mathfrak{sp}(8, \mathbb{C})$ as mentioned in the introduction.

Proof. This is a rephrasing of the main result in [KP2]. Let \mathcal{O} be of the form

$$\mathcal{O} = (\cdots c_{2i-2} > c_{2i-1} = c_{2i} = \cdots = c_{2j-1} = c_{2j} > c_{2j+1} \cdots).$$

Then the orbit \mathcal{O}' with

$$\mathcal{O}^b = (\cdots c_{2i-2} \geq c_{2i-1} + 2 > c_{2i} = \cdots = c_{2j-1} > c_{2j} - 2 \geq c_{2j+1} \cdots)$$

occurs in the closure of \mathcal{O} . Table I of [KP2] states that \mathcal{O}^b is a minimal ϵ -degeneration of type $A_{2n-1} \cup A_{2n-1}$ with $n = 2(i - j + 1)$. By Theorem 2 of [KP2], this is the only type of non-normal singularity that can occur in $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$. \square

Example 2.8. The closure of $\mathcal{O} = (8, 8, 6, 6, 6, 4, 4, 2)$ in $\mathfrak{sp}(44, \mathbb{C})$ is not normal, since $c_4 = 6 > c_5 = 4 = c_6 = 4 > c_7 = 2$.

In fact, under the setting of Definition 3.3(a) of [KP2] and the main results therein, the singularity type of the orbit

$$\mathcal{O}^b = (8, 8, 6, 6, 6, 6, 2, 2) \subset \overline{\mathcal{O}} = \overline{(8, 8, 6, 6, 6, 4, 4, 2)}$$

is equivalent to that of

$$(6, 2, 2) \subset \overline{(4, 4, 2)}$$

in $\mathfrak{o}(10, \mathbb{C})$ by removing the common columns of \mathcal{O}^b and \mathcal{O} on the left, which in turn is equivalent to that of

$$(4) \subset \overline{(2, 2)}$$

in $\mathfrak{o}(4, \mathbb{C})$ by removing the first two common rows. This becomes a minimal irreducible ϵ -degeneration by Definition 3.3(b) of [KP2], whose singularity is of type $A_1 \cup A_1$ from Table I of [KP2], which is not normal.

2.4. Unipotent Representations. In this section, we recall the content of [B5] for a quantization model $\Pi(\mathcal{O})$ of all classical orbits \mathcal{O} .

Definition 2.9. Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit of the form

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{O} = \begin{cases} (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p+1}) & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p+1}) & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}), \end{cases}$$

and let $\tau(\mathcal{O}) := \{i \mid c_{2i-1} = c_{2i}\}$. Define \mathcal{O}' by

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{O}' := \begin{cases} (c'_0 \geq c'_1 \geq \cdots \geq c'_{2q+1}) & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ (c'_1 \geq c'_2 \geq \cdots \geq c'_{2q+1}) & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}), \end{cases}$$

where \mathcal{O}' is obtained from \mathcal{O} by removing all c_{2i-1}, c_{2i} for $i \in \tau(\mathcal{O})$ in \mathcal{O} . Then \mathcal{O}' is a nilpotent orbit in \mathfrak{g}' of the same type as \mathfrak{g} but of smaller rank.

Example 2.10. Consider $\mathcal{O} = (8, 8, 6, 6, 6, 4, 4, 2)$ in $\mathfrak{sp}(44, \mathbb{C})$ as in the previous example. Then $\tau(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{O}' = (8, 8, 6, 2)$.

Using the notations in Definition 2.9, the **spherical unipotent representation** attached to a classical nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} is

$$(9) \quad \Pi(\mathcal{O}) := \text{Ind}_{\prod_{i \in \tau(\mathcal{O})} GL(c_{2i}) \times G'}^G (\text{triv} \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \text{triv} \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}')),$$

where

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}') := \begin{cases} \overline{X}_{G'}(\lambda[c'_0, c'_1], \dots, \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}]) & \text{if } G' = Sp(2n', \mathbb{C}) \\ \overline{X}_{G'}(\lambda[-\delta, c'_1], \lambda[c'_2, c'_3], \dots, \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}]) & \text{if } G' = O(2n' + \delta, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases}$$

and $\lambda[x, y]$ is given by

$$(10) \quad \lambda[x, y] := \left(-\frac{y}{2} + 1 \dots \frac{x}{2}\right)$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq -1}$.

In [B1] and [B5], it was shown that $\Pi(\mathcal{O})$ is an irreducible, unitary (\mathfrak{g}, K) -module, whose $K_c \cong G$ -spectrum satisfies $\Pi(\mathcal{O})|_{K_c} \cong R(\mathcal{O})$. In order to relate $\Pi(\mathcal{O})$ with the Brylinski model $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$, one needs to ‘deform’ $\Pi(\mathcal{O})$ as follows:

Definition 2.11. *Retain the notations above. For $t \geq 0$, define*

$$\Pi_t(\mathcal{O}) := \text{Ind}_{\prod_{i \in \tau(\mathcal{O})} GL(c_{2i}) \times G'}^G (|\det|^t \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes |\det|^t \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}')),$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) := \Pi_1(\mathcal{O})$$

(if $\tau(\mathcal{O})$ is empty set and $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}'$, then $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O})$).

Obviously, when $t = 0$, $\Pi_0(\mathcal{O}) = \Pi(\mathcal{O})$. Also note that $\Pi_t(\mathcal{O})$ has the same K_c -spectrum for all $t \geq 0$.

Remark 2.12. *We now explain the relation between $\Pi_t(\mathcal{O})$ and deformation quantization. For all nilpotent orbits \mathcal{O} , Losev in [Lo] constructed a quantization parameter space \mathfrak{P} such that for each $\mu \in \mathfrak{P}$, there exists a filtered quantization $\mathcal{A}_\mu(\mathcal{O})$ satisfying $\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_\mu(\mathcal{O})) \cong R(\mathcal{O})$ (see [LMM, Section 4] for more details). In the special case when \mathcal{O} is a classical nilpotent orbit, it is proved in Section 10 of [LMM] that there exists a $\nu \in \mathfrak{P}$ such that for all $t \geq 0$, we have a (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -module isomorphism $\Pi_t(\mathcal{O}) \cong \mathcal{A}_{t\nu}(\mathcal{O})$.*

3. DUAL PAIRS AND THE KRAFT-PROCESI MODEL

3.1. The Kraft-Procesi Model $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$. The Kraft-Procesi model, introduced in Definition 6.1 in [Br], is an admissible (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -module whose K_c -structure matches $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$.

Given a classical nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} as in (7), let $G_{2i} = Sp(c_{2i} + \cdots + c_{2p+1}, \mathbb{C})$ and $G_{2i+1} = O(c_{2i+1} + \cdots + c_{2p+1}, \mathbb{C})$. Let \mathfrak{g}_j be the corresponding Lie algebras, and K_j the maximal compact subgroups. Then

- $G = G_\alpha$, where $\alpha = 0$ if G is symplectic and $\alpha = 1$ if G is orthogonal.
- $G_j \times G_{j+1}$ is a reductive dual pair, and let Ω_{j+1} be the oscillator representation as in [AB].

Definition 3.1 (Kraft-Procesi Model). *Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit given in (7). Using the notations above, define a $((\mathfrak{g}_\alpha)_c, (K_\alpha)_c) = (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c)$ -module $\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ by:*

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) := \Omega_{\alpha+1} \otimes \Omega_{\alpha+2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1} / (\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+1} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{g}_{2p+1}) (\Omega_{\alpha+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}).$$

Let $K^1 := K_{\alpha+1} \times \cdots \times K_{2p}$, and $(K^1)^0$ be the connected component of the identity. Then $(K^1)^0$ acts trivially on $\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$. So $K^1 / (K^1)^0$ acts on $\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$.

Theorem 3.2 ([Br], Theorem 6.3). *Let $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) := \Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}})^{K^1 / (K^1)^0}$, then*

$$\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) |_{K_c} \cong R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) |_G,$$

where on the right hand side the complex group G is identified with K_c .

3.2. The Induction Principle for Dual Pairs. Since the definition of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ involves oscillator representations, we first recall some results in [AB] on the dual pair correspondence:

Theorem 3.3 ([AB], Corollary 3.21). *Let $H_1 \times H_2$ be a reductive dual pair, and $P = MN = P_1 \times P_2 = M_1 N_1 \times M_2 N_2 \subset H_1 \times H_2$ a real parabolic subgroup:*

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= O(2m + \tau), & M_1 &= GL(k) \times O(2m + \tau - 2k); \\ H_2 &= Sp(2n), & M_2 &= GL(\ell) \times Sp(2n - 2\ell); \end{aligned}$$

with $\tau = 0, 1$. Suppose there is a non-trivial M -equivariant map $\Omega_M \longrightarrow \sigma_1 \boxtimes \sigma_2$. Then there is a non-trivial map

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &\longrightarrow \text{Ind}_{P_1}^{H_1} (\alpha_1 \sigma_1) \boxtimes \text{Ind}_{P_2}^{H_2} (\alpha_2 \sigma_2), \text{ where} \\ \alpha_1(g_1) &= |\det g_1|^{2n-2m-\tau+k-\ell+1}, & \alpha_2(g_2) &= |\det g_2|^{-2n+2m+\tau-k+\ell-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.4. *The exponents in α_1, α_2 are negatives of the ones in [AB], because the parabolic subgroups in [AB] are opposite from the ones used here.*

The following corollary is an almost direct consequence of Theorem 3.3:

Corollary 3.5.

(a) *Let $G_i \times G_j$ be a dual pair, with G'_i and G'_j be of the same type of G_i and G_j respectively such that*

$$\begin{aligned} L_i &= GL(\alpha) \times \cdots \times GL(\beta) \times G'_i \\ L_j &= GL(\alpha) \times \cdots \times GL(\beta) \times G'_j \end{aligned}$$

are Levi subgroups of G_i and G_j respectively. Suppose there is a non-trivial $G'_i \times G'_j$ -equivariant map

$$\Omega' \longrightarrow \Pi'_i \boxtimes \Pi'_j$$

corresponding to the dual pair $G'_i \times G'_j$, with Π'_i, Π'_j spherical, and the spherical vector in the image. Then there is a non-trivial intertwining operator

$$\Omega \longrightarrow I^{G_i} ((a \dots A) \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes (b \dots B) \boxtimes \Pi'_i) \boxtimes I^{G_j} ((a \dots A)^* \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes (b \dots B)^* \boxtimes \Pi'_j),$$

to the induced module with $\alpha = A - a + 1, \dots, \beta = B - b + 1$. Moreover, the spherical vector is in its image.

(b) Let $k > 0$ be an integer such that $k \equiv \delta \pmod{2}$ and $O(2r + \delta) \times Sp(2r + \delta + k)$ forms a dual pair. Suppose there is a non-trivial $O(2r + \delta) \times Sp(2r + \delta + k)$ -equivariant map

$$\Omega' \longrightarrow \Pi \boxtimes \Pi'$$

with the spherical vector in its image. Then there is an intertwining operator corresponding to the dual pair $O(2r + \delta + 2k) \times Sp(2r + \delta + k)$

$$\Omega \longrightarrow I^{O(2r+\delta+2k)} \left(\left(-\frac{k}{2} + 1 \dots \frac{k}{2} \right) \boxtimes \Pi \right) \boxtimes \Pi'$$

with the spherical vector in its image.

Proof. (a) follows by induction on the number of GL -strings. The initial case is the fact that the oscillator representation for the dual pair $GL(m) \times GL(m)$ has a quotient

$$\Omega_{GL} \longrightarrow \chi \boxtimes \chi^*$$

for any 1-dimensional character χ of $GL(m)$ (cf. [AB, Proposition 2.2(1)]).

(b) Consider

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= O(2r + \delta + 2k), & M_1 &= GL(k) \times O(2r + \delta); \\ H_2 &= Sp(2r + \delta + k), & M_2 &= GL(0) \times Sp(2r + \delta + k); \end{aligned}$$

and $\Omega_M \rightarrow (\text{triv}_{GL(k)} \otimes \Pi) \boxtimes \Pi'$. Then

$$2n - 2m - \tau + k - \ell + 1 = (2r + \delta + k) - (2r + \delta + 2k) + k - 0 + 1 = 1$$

and Theorem 3.3 implies there is a non-trivial map

$$\Omega \rightarrow I^{H_1} \left(\left(-\frac{k-1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \dots \frac{k-1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \boxtimes \Pi \right) \boxtimes \Pi' = I^{H_1} \left(\left(-\frac{k}{2} + 1 \dots \frac{k}{2} \right) \boxtimes \Pi \right) \boxtimes \Pi'.$$

□

Proposition 3.6. *Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit. Then there is a (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -module map*

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}).$$

with the spherical vector in its image.

Proof. The proof is by induction on the number of columns of \mathcal{O} as defined in (7). When $p = 0$, consider the orbits $\mathcal{Q}_0 = (c_0, c_1)$ in $Sp(c_0 + c_1, \mathbb{C})$, and the zero orbit $\mathcal{Q}_1 = (c_1)$ in $O(c_1, \mathbb{C})$. It is obvious that

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{Q}_1}) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_1) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_1)$$

are all equal to the trivial representation of $O(c_1, \mathbb{C})$, so the proposition holds for \mathcal{Q}_1 .

For \mathcal{Q}_0 , consider the pair $O(c_1) \times Sp(c_0 + c_1)$. By [B5, Theorem 3.5.1], the unipotent representations $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_1) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_0)$ are in dual pair correspondence. So there is a non-trivial $O(c_1) \times Sp(c_0 + c_1)$ -equivariant map

$$\Omega_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_0).$$

Since $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_1)$ is the trivial representation, the above map factors through $\mathfrak{g}_1\Omega_1$, and there is a non-trivial (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -equivariant map

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{Q}_0}) = \Omega_1/\mathfrak{g}_1\Omega_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{Q}_0) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{Q}_0).$$

as claimed in the proposition.

Suppose the proposition holds for $\mathcal{O}_2 := (c_2 \geq c_3 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$ in G_2 . We will prove that it also holds for $\mathcal{O}_1 := (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$ in G_1 and $\mathcal{O}_0 := (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$ in G_0 .

Let

$$\tau(\mathcal{O}_2) := \{i_r, \dots, i_1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O}'_2 := (c'_2 \geq c'_3 \geq \cdots \geq c'_{2q+1})$$

be as defined in (8). By induction hypothesis, there is a non-trivial $(\mathfrak{g}_2)_c, (K_2)_c$ -equivariant map

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}_2}) := \Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}/(\mathfrak{g}_3 \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{g}_{2p+1})(\Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}) &\longrightarrow \\ \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_2) := I^{G_2} (\lambda[c_{2i_1}, c_{2i_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2i_r}, c_{2i_r}] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)) &, \end{aligned}$$

noting that $\overline{X}_{GL}(\lambda[a, a]) = \overline{X}_{GL(a)}(-\frac{a}{2} + 1 \dots \frac{a}{2}) = |\det|^1$ by (10).

To prove the proposition for $\mathcal{O}_1 := (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$ in G_1 , one needs to consider the following two cases:

Case I: $c_1 \neq c_2 (= c'_2)$. In this case, $\tau(\mathcal{O}_1) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_2)$ and $\mathcal{O}'_1 := (c_1 \geq c'_2 \geq c'_3 \geq \cdots \geq c'_{2q+1})$. By [B5, Theorem 3.5.1], there is a non-trivial $G'_1 \times G'_2$ -equivariant map

$$\Omega' \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)$$

to the appropriate unipotent representations. Applying Corollary 3.5(a) to the above correspondence, there is a non-trivial $G_1 \times G_2$ -equivariant map

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_2 \longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} I^{G_1} (\lambda[c_{2i_1}, c_{2i_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2i_r}, c_{2i_r}] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \\ \boxtimes \\ I^{G_2} (\lambda[c_{2i_1}, c_{2i_1}]^* \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2i_r}, c_{2i_r}]^* \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)) \end{array} &= \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_2)^*. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have the non-trivial $G_1 \times G_2$ -equivariant map

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_2 \otimes (\Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}/(\mathfrak{g}_3 \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{g}_{2p+1})(\Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1})) &\longrightarrow (\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_2)^*) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_2) \\ &\longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_1) \boxtimes \text{triv}_{G_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last \longrightarrow is the contraction map $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_2)^* \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_2) \rightarrow \text{triv}_{G_2}$. As a consequence, the map factors through $\mathfrak{g}_2\Omega_2$ and one has

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}_1}) := \Omega_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}/(\mathfrak{g}_2 \times \mathfrak{g}_3 \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{g}_{2p+1})(\Omega_2 \otimes \Omega_3 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_{2p+1}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_1)$$

as in the proposition.

Case II: $c_1 = c_2 (= c'_2)$. Then $\tau(\mathcal{O}_1) = \tau(\mathcal{O}_2) \cup \{1\}$, and $\mathcal{O}'_1 := (c'_3 \geq \cdots \geq c'_{2q+1})$. By [B5, Theorem 3.5.1] again, there is a non-trivial $G'_3 \times G'_2$ -equivariant map

$$\Omega' \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2).$$

Now apply Corollary 3.5(b) with $k = c_2$ to the above correspondence to get a non-trivial there is a non-trivial $G'_1 \times G'_2$ -equivariant map

$$\Omega'' \longrightarrow I^{\mathcal{O}}(\lambda[c_2, c_2] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2).$$

Finally, using Corollary 3.5(a) on the above correspondence, one has a non-trivial $G_1 \times G_2$ -equivariant map

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_2 &\longrightarrow \begin{array}{c} I^{G_1}(\lambda[c_{2i_2}, c_{2i_2}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2i_r}, c_{2i_r}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_2, c_2] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \\ \boxtimes \\ I^{G_2}(\lambda[c_{2i_2}, c_{2i_2}]^* \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2i_r}, c_{2i_r}]^* | \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)) \end{array} \\ &\xrightarrow{dm} \begin{array}{c} I^{G_1}(\lambda[c_2, c_2] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2i_2}, c_{2i_2}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2i_r}, c_{2i_r}] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \\ \boxtimes \\ I^{G_2}(\lambda[c_{2i_2}, c_{2i_2}]^* \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2i_r}, c_{2i_r}]^* | \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)) \end{array} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_2)^*, \end{aligned}$$

where the \xrightarrow{dm} comes from applying the intertwining operator ι between the nested strings $\lambda[c_2, c_2]$ and $\lambda[c_{2i_j}, c_{2i_j}]$ on the first induced module. Consequently, the proposition follows from the arguments in Case I.

As for $\mathcal{O} = (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$ in G_0 , note that

$$\Omega' \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_0)$$

are in dual pair correspondence by [B5, Theorem 3.5.1], so one can apply Corollary 3.5(a) as before to conclude that

$$\Omega_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_1)^* \boxtimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_0).$$

Then the contraction argument above applies, so that one has $\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}_0}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_0)$ as stated in the proposition. \square

Example 3.7. We present an example of the above proposition for $\mathcal{O} = (8, \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{6}, 4, 2, 0)$ in $\mathfrak{sp}(26, \mathbb{C})$. Note that $c_1 = 6 = c_2 = 6$ are in bold, so that $\mathcal{O}' = (8, 4, 2, 0)$.

The intermediate orbits and dual pairs are given by:

$$\begin{array}{llllll} G_4 = Sp(2, \mathbb{C}); & G_3 = O(6, \mathbb{C}); & G_2 = Sp(12, \mathbb{C}); & G_1 = O(18, \mathbb{C}); & G_0 = Sp(26, \mathbb{C}); \\ \mathcal{O}_4 = (20); & \mathcal{O}_3 = (420); & \mathcal{O}_2 = (6420); & \mathcal{O}_1 = (\mathbf{66420}); & \mathcal{O}_0 = (\mathbf{866420}) \\ \mathcal{O}'_4 = (20); & \mathcal{O}'_3 = (420); & \mathcal{O}'_2 = (6420); & \mathcal{O}'_1 = (420); & \mathcal{O}'_0 = (8420). \end{array}$$

Begin with the trivial representation

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}_4}) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_4) = \overline{X}_{G_4}(1) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_4).$$

By [B5, Theorem 3.5.1], the dual pair correspondence $G_3 \times G_4$ gives

$$\Omega_4 \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_3) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_4) = \overline{X}_{G_3}(-1, 0, 1) \boxtimes \overline{X}_{G_4}(1)$$

Since the last module of G_4 is trivial, the map factors through $\mathfrak{g}_4\Omega_4$ and hence we have

$$(11) \quad \Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_3) := \Omega_4/\mathfrak{g}_4\Omega_4 \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_3) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_3).$$

Continue with the dual pair $G_3 \times G_2$. [B5, Theorem 3.5.1] gives

$$\Omega_3 \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_3) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2) = \overline{X}_{G_3}(-1, 0, 1) \boxtimes \overline{X}_{G_2}(-1, 0, 1; 1, 2, 3).$$

Note that $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_3)^* = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_3)$ is self-dual. Combining (11) with the above map, one has

$$\Omega_3 \otimes \Omega_4/\mathfrak{g}_4\Omega_4 \longrightarrow (\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_3) \otimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_3)^*) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2) \longrightarrow \text{triv}_{G_3} \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)$$

and hence it factors through $\mathfrak{g}_3\Omega_3$ so that

$$(12) \quad \Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_2) := \Omega_3 \otimes \Omega_4/(\mathfrak{g}_3 \times \mathfrak{g}_4)\Omega_3 \otimes \Omega_4 \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_2).$$

The case for \mathcal{O}_1 is different, since $\mathcal{O}_1 \neq \mathcal{O}'_1$ and we are in **Case II** of the above proof. Instead of considering $G_1 \times G_2$ directly, first consider the dual pair $G'_1 \times G_2 = G_3 \times G_2 = O(6, \mathbb{C}) \times Sp(12, \mathbb{C})$ where we have a non-trivial map

$$\Omega' \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)$$

as above. By Corollary 3.5(b), the dual pair $G_1 \times G_2$ has a non-trivial map

$$\Omega_2 \longrightarrow I^{G_1}((-2 \dots 3) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2) = I^{G_1}(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)$$

Using (12) and $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)^* = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_2)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_2 \otimes (\Omega_3 \otimes \Omega_4/(\mathfrak{g}_3 \times \mathfrak{g}_4)\Omega_3 \otimes \Omega_4) &\longrightarrow I^{G_1}(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2) \otimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_2)^* \\ &\longrightarrow I^{G_1}(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \boxtimes \text{triv}_{G_2} \end{aligned}$$

and hence the map factors through $\mathfrak{g}_2\Omega_2$:

$$(13) \quad \Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_1) := \Omega_2 \otimes \Omega_3 \otimes \Omega_4/(\mathfrak{g}_2 \times \mathfrak{g}_3 \times \mathfrak{g}_4)\Omega_2 \otimes \Omega_3 \otimes \Omega_4 \longrightarrow I^{G_1}(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_1)$$

Finally, by [B5, Theorem 3.5.1], one has

$$\Omega' \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_0) \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1) = \overline{X}_{O(6)}(-1, 0, 1) \boxtimes \overline{X}_{Sp(14)}(-1, 0, 1; 1, 2, 3, 4)$$

Hence Corollary 3.5(a) gives the dual pair correspondence of $G_0 \times G_1$:

$$\Omega_1 \longrightarrow I^{G_1}(\lambda[6, 6]^* \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_1)) \boxtimes I^{G_0}(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}'_0)) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_1)^* \boxtimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_0).$$

By combining the above map with (13), along with the contraction arguments, one has

$$\Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}}_0) = \Omega_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_4/(\mathfrak{g}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{g}_4)\Omega_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \Omega_4 \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}_0)$$

Corollary 3.8. *Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit. Then there is a (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -equivariant map*

$$\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$$

with the spherical vector in its image.

Proof. The inclusion map

$$\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) := \Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}})^{K^1/(K^1)^0} \hookrightarrow \Omega(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$$

has the trivial K_c -type in its image. Then the result follows directly from the above inclusion and Proposition 3.6. \square

Remark 3.9. By Corollary 3.8, \mathcal{E} maps the cyclic submodule of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ surjectively onto $\Xi(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$, the cyclic submodule of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$. In particular, $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ gives a ‘**lower bound**’ on $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$. In the next couple of sections, we will study $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ in full detail, and conclude that it is also an ‘**upper bound**’. Consequently, we have $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \cong \Xi(\mathcal{O})$, and \mathcal{E} is an injection as stated in the introduction (see Theorem 5.1).

4. THE CYCLIC SUBMODULE OF $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$

In this section, we study the cyclic submodule $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$. The main result of this section is the following:

Theorem 4.1. Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit of the form

$$\mathcal{O} = \begin{cases} (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1}) & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1}) & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases}.$$

Consider the induced module

$$(14) \quad \Gamma(\mathcal{O}) := \begin{cases} I^G(\lambda[c_0, c_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}]) & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ I^G(\lambda[c_2, c_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c_1)}) & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases}.$$

Then the multiplicities of the diminutive K_c -types of $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ coincide with that of $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$.

Lemma 4.2. Let \mathcal{O} be a nilpotent orbit. Then the module $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ defined in Theorem 4.1 is cyclic.

Proof. Let λ^0 be dominant and a W -conjugate of the infinitesimal character of $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$. The module $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ is the image of the intertwining operator

$$I_1 : X(\lambda^0) \longrightarrow X(w_1\lambda^0)$$

for some $w_1 \in W$ given in Equation (6.72) of [B4]. For instance, in Equations (6.73) – (6.77) of [B4], w_1 is given explicitly when G is of Type B . Since the spherical vector for the principal series at dominant parameter is cyclic, and the induced module $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ is a homomorphic image, $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ is cyclic as well. \square

Example 4.3. Consider $\mathcal{O} = (8, 6, 4, 4)$ in $G = Sp(22, \mathbb{C})$. Then

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{O}) := I^G(\lambda[8, 6] \boxtimes \lambda[4, 4]) = I^G((-2 - 101234) \boxtimes (-1012)),$$

and the dominant infinitesimal character is $\lambda^0 = (43222111100)$.

By applying suitable intertwining operators ι in (4) to the principal series representation

$$X(\lambda^0) = I^G((4) \boxtimes (3) \boxtimes (2) \boxtimes (2) \boxtimes (2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (0) \boxtimes (0)),$$

Proposition 2.5 implies that $I^G((2) \boxtimes (2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (0) \boxtimes (01234))$ is a homomorphic image of $X(\lambda^0)$. Similarly,

$$I^G((2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (012) \boxtimes (01234)) \xrightarrow{dm} I^G((2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (01234) \boxtimes (012))$$

is a homomorphic image of $X(\lambda^0)$. Now reflect along the long roots and get

$$I^G((2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (01234) \boxtimes (012)) \rightarrow I^G((2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (01234) \boxtimes (-2 - 10)).$$

By applying Proposition 2.5 again to the strings $(01234) \boxtimes (-2 - 10)$, one has

$$I^G((2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (01234) \boxtimes (-2 - 10)) \rightarrow I^G((2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (-2 - 101234) \boxtimes (0)).$$

Now the long string $\lambda[8, 6] = (-2 - 101234)$ is nested with the strings on the left, hence

$$I^G((2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (-2 - 101234) \boxtimes (0)) \xrightarrow{dm} I^G((-2 - 101234) \boxtimes (2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (0)).$$

By applying a similar argument on the strings $(2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (0)$, one can conclude that

$$I^G((-2 - 101234) \boxtimes (2) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (1) \boxtimes (0)) \rightarrow I^G((-2 - 101234) \boxtimes (-1012)).$$

is the homomorphic image of an intertwining operator.

Proposition 4.4. *Let \mathcal{O} be a nilpotent orbit given in Theorem 4.1 with $\tau(\mathcal{O})$ and \mathcal{O}' as in Definition 2.9. Then there is a non-trivial (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -morphism η from $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ to the induced module*

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} & I^G(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}]) \quad \text{or} \\ & I^G(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{\mathcal{O}(c'_1)}) \end{aligned}$$

for $G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ or $O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C})$ respectively. Moreover, η is injective on the level of diminutive K_c -types.

We postpone the proof of the above proposition to the end of this section. Assuming its validity, we give a proof of Theorem 4.1.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 4.1. Consider the special case when $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}'$ first, so that $\Xi(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O})$ is the (irreducible) unipotent representation.

By Lemma 4.2, $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}')$ is the image of the intertwining operator I_1 . Then the intertwining operator

$$I_2 : X(w_1 \lambda^0) \rightarrow X(-\lambda^0)$$

in Equation (6.72) of [B4] maps $I_2(\Gamma(\mathcal{O}')) = \overline{X}(\lambda^0) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}')$ onto the irreducible subquotient. Using the arguments of Equations (6.78) – (6.80) of [B4], I_2 is injective on the level of diminutive K'_c -types, and hence

$$(16) \quad I_2|_{\Gamma(\mathcal{O}')} : \Gamma(\mathcal{O}') \xrightarrow{dm} \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}') = \Xi(\mathcal{O}')$$

as stated in the theorem.

For general \mathcal{O} , apply induction in stages to (16) and get a (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -morphism

$$\begin{aligned} \beta : I^G(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \Gamma(\mathcal{O}')) \\ \xrightarrow{dm} I^G(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}')) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}) \end{aligned}$$

whose domain is equal to (15). Composing β with η in Proposition 4.4, we have a surjection

$$(17) \quad \beta \circ \eta : \Gamma(\mathcal{O}) \twoheadrightarrow \Xi(\mathcal{O}) \quad (\subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}))$$

since $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ and $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ are both cyclic. Now the result follows from the fact that η and β are injective on the level of diminutive K_c -types. \square

4.2. Proof of Proposition 4.4 for Symplectic Groups. For $G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$, one has to prove that there is a map η injective on the level of diminutive K_c -types:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\mathcal{O}) &:= I^G(\lambda[c_0, c_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}]) \\ &\xrightarrow{\eta} I^G(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}]) \end{aligned}$$

In fact, we will prove the above statement for $G = GL(n, \mathbb{C})$, so that the case of $G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$ follows from parabolic induction.

We proceed by induction on the number of columns of \mathcal{O} . The result is automatic if $\mathcal{O} = (c_0 \geq c_1)$. Now suppose $\mathcal{O} = (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq c_2 \geq c_3)$. There are two cases:

- (i) If $c_1 > c_2$, i.e. $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}'$ with $\tau(\mathcal{O}) = \emptyset$ is empty, then there is nothing to prove.
- (ii) If $c_1 = c_2$, i.e. $\mathcal{O}' = (c_0 \geq c_3)$ with $\tau(\mathcal{O}) = \{1\}$, Consider the intertwining operator

$$I^{GL}(\lambda[c_0, c_3] \boxtimes \lambda[c_2, c_2]) \xrightarrow{\iota} I^{GL}(\lambda[c_2, c_2] \boxtimes \lambda[c_0, c_3]).$$

By Proposition 2.5(b), its image is equal to

$$(18) \quad I^{GL}(\lambda[c_0, c_1] \boxtimes \lambda[c_2, c_3]) \subseteq I^{GL}(\lambda[c_2, c_2] \boxtimes \lambda[c_0, c_3]).$$

So the proposition follows in this setting.

Suppose the result holds for $\mathcal{O}_p = (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$, i.e.

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} &I^{GL}(\lambda[c_0, c_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}]) \\ &\xrightarrow{\eta_p} I^{GL}(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}]), \end{aligned}$$

keeping in mind that $c'_0 = c_0$ and $c'_{2q+1} = c_{2p+1}$. Consider $\mathcal{O}_{p+1} = (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p+2} \geq c_{2p+3})$. By induction in stages, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &I^{GL}(\lambda[c_0, c_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p+2}, c_{2p+3}]) \\ &\xrightarrow{\eta_p^+} I^{GL}(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p+2}, c_{2p+3}]) \\ &= I^{GL}(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c_{2p+1}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p+2}, c_{2p+3}]), \end{aligned}$$

where the η_p^+ is obtained from (19) and induction in stages. There are two cases:

- (i) If $c_{2p+1} > c_{2p+2}$, then $p+1 \notin \tau(\mathcal{O})$ and we are done.
- (ii) If $c_{2p+1} = c_{2p+2}$, then $r_{k+1} = p+1 \in \tau(\mathcal{O})$, and one has

$$\begin{aligned} &I^{GL}(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c_{2p+2}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p+2}, c_{2p+3}]) \\ &\subseteq I^{GL}(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p+2}, c_{2p+2}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c_{2p+3}]) \\ &\cong I^{GL}(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p+2}, c_{2p+2}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c_{2p+3}]) \\ &= I^{GL}(\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_{k+1}}, c_{2r_{k+1}}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_0, c'_1] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c_{2p+3}]), \end{aligned}$$

where the \subseteq follows from (18) and induction in stages. To see why the above \cong holds, note that $c_{2p+1} = c_{2p+2} \leq c'_l$ for all $l = 1, \dots, 2q$. So the strings $\lambda[c'_{2j}, c'_{2j-1}]$, $\lambda[c_{2p+2}, c_{2p+2}]$ satisfy Condition (ii) of nestedness for all $j = 1, \dots, q$. Therefore, the proposition follows for $G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$.

4.3. Proof of Proposition 4.4 for Orthogonal Groups. Now study the case of $G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C})$ for $\mathcal{O} = (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p+1})$. There are two cases:

(i) If $c_1 \neq c_2$, i.e. $1 \neq r_1 \in \tau(\mathcal{O})$ and $c_1 = c'_1$. Then from above, there is a (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -morphism injective on the level of diminutive K_c -types:

$$I^{GL} (\lambda[c_2, c_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}]) \\ \xrightarrow{\eta_{GL}} I^{GL} (\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}])$$

and hence by induction in stages we have

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{O}) = I^G (\lambda[c_2, c_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c_1)}) \\ \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{O}}} I^G (\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c'_1)})$$

to the induced module (15), injective for all diminutive K_c -types.

(ii) If $c_1 = c_2$, i.e. $1 = r_1 \in \tau(\mathcal{O})$. Then we have

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{O}) = I^G (\lambda[c_2, c_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2q}, c_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c_1)}) \\ \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{O}}} I^G (\lambda[c_{2r_2}, c_{2r_2}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_2, c'_1] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c_1)}) \\ = I^G (\lambda[c_{2r_2}, c_{2r_2}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_2, c'_1] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c_2)}) \\ \cong I^G (\lambda[c_{2r_2}, c_{2r_2}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_2, c'_1] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c_2)}) \\ \xrightarrow{(*)} I^G (\lambda[c_{2r_2}, c_{2r_2}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_2, c_2] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c'_1)}) \\ \cong I^G (\lambda[c_2, c_2] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_2}, c_{2r_2}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c'_1)}) \\ = I^G (\lambda[c_{2r_1}, c_{2r_1}] \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_2}, c_{2r_2}] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2r_k}, c_{2r_k}] \boxtimes \lambda[c'_2, c'_3] \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \lambda[c'_{2q}, c'_{2q+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c'_1)}),$$

where the \cong 's above hold since the strings involved satisfy Condition (ii) of nestedness. On the other hand, the map $(*)$ above is defined as follows: For $a \geq b$, consider

$$(20) \quad I^{G'} (\lambda[a, b] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(a)}) \hookrightarrow I^{G'} (\lambda[a, b] \boxtimes \lambda[-\delta, a]) \xrightarrow{\iota} I^{G'} (\lambda[-\delta, a] \boxtimes \lambda[a, b]).$$

We claim that the image of the map (20) is in $I^{G'} (\lambda[a, a] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(b)})$. Indeed, by Proposition 2.5(b), the image of ι is equal to $I^{G'} (\lambda[a, a] \boxtimes \lambda[-\delta, b])$. By restricting ι to the cyclic submodule $I^{G'} (\lambda[a, b] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(a)})$, its image $\iota (I^{G'} (\lambda[a, b] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(a)})) \subseteq I^{G'} (\lambda[a, a] \boxtimes \lambda[-\delta, b])$ must also be cyclic. Since

$$I^{G'} (\lambda[a, a] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(b)}) \subseteq I^{G'} (\lambda[a, a] \boxtimes \lambda[-\delta, b])$$

is a spherical submodule, one has

$$\iota (I^{G'} (\lambda[a, b] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(a)})) \subseteq I^{G'} (\lambda[a, a] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(b)}) \subseteq I^{G'} (\lambda[a, a] \boxtimes \lambda[-\delta, b]).$$

So we are left to show (20) is an isomorphism on the level of diminutive K'_c -types. This can be done by carefully tracing the intertwining operator ι using the calculations in [B4, Section 6]. Details are given in Appendix A.

Example 4.5. *We continue with our example $\mathcal{O} = (8, \mathbf{6}, \mathbf{6}, 4, 2, 0)$ in $\mathfrak{sp}(26, \mathbb{C})$ with $\mathcal{O}' = (8, 4, 2, 0)$. The strings $\lambda[6, 6] = (-2 \dots 3)$ and $\lambda[8, 4] = (-1 \dots 4)$ are **not** nested. So the intertwining operator*

$$\begin{aligned} I^G(\lambda[8, 4] \boxtimes \lambda[6, 6]) &= I^G((-1 \dots 4) \boxtimes (-2 \dots 3)) \\ &\xrightarrow{\iota} I^G((-2 \dots 3) \boxtimes (-1 \dots 4)) = I^G(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \lambda[8, 4]) \end{aligned}$$

has image

$$I^G((-2 \dots 4) \boxtimes (-1 \dots 3)) = I^G(\lambda[8, 6] \boxtimes \lambda[6, 4]) \subseteq I^G(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \lambda[8, 4]).$$

by Proposition 2.5(b). Using induction in stages, there is an inclusion

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{O}) := I^G(\lambda[8, 6] \boxtimes \lambda[6, 4] \boxtimes \lambda[2, 0]) \subseteq I^G(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \lambda[8, 4] \boxtimes \lambda[2, 0]),$$

where $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$ is cyclic. By the discussions in Section 4.1, we have:

$$I^G(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \lambda[8, 4] \boxtimes \lambda[2, 0]) \xrightarrow{dm} I^G(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \overline{X}(\lambda[8, 4], \lambda[2, 0])) = I^G(\lambda[6, 6] \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}')) =: \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$$

Restricting the above map to the cyclic submodule $\Gamma(\mathcal{O})$, one has a map between the cyclic modules $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{dm} \Xi(\mathcal{O}) (\subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O}))$ as stated in Theorem 4.1.

5. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

We are now in the position to state and prove the main theorem of this manuscript:

Theorem 5.1. *Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit. Then Equation (2) gives an isomorphism onto the cyclic submodule $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit as in Definition 2.9. By Remark 3.9, the composition factors of the cyclic module $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ must appear in $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ as well. By Theorem 4.1, the multiplicities of diminutive K_c -types V_β of $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (21) \quad [\Xi(\mathcal{O}) : V_\beta] &= [\Gamma(\mathcal{O}) : V_\beta] \\ &= \begin{cases} [I^G(\lambda[c_0, c_1] \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}]) : V_\beta] & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ [I^G(\lambda[c_2, c_3] \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \lambda[c_{2p}, c_{2p+1}] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(c_1)}) : V_\beta] & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \left[\text{Ind}_{GL(\frac{c_0+c_1}{2}) \times \dots \times GL(\frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2})}^G (\text{triv}) : V_\beta \right] & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ \left[\text{Ind}_{GL(\frac{c_0+c_1}{2}) \times \dots \times GL(\frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2}) \times O(c_1)}^G (\text{triv}) : V_\beta \right] & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have an inclusion of nilpotent varieties $\overline{\mathcal{O}} \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{O}^\#}$, where

$$(22) \quad \mathcal{O}^\# := \begin{cases} \left(\frac{c_0+c_1}{2} \geq \frac{c_0+c_1}{2} \geq \dots \geq \frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2} \geq \frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2} \right) & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ \left(c_1 \geq \frac{c_2+c_3}{2} \geq \frac{c_2+c_3}{2} \geq \dots \geq \frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2} \geq \frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2} \right) & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases}$$

Note that $\overline{\mathcal{O}^\#}$ is normal and is a Richardson orbit induced from

$$L = \begin{cases} GL(\frac{c_0+c_1}{2}) \times \dots \times GL(\frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2}) & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ GL(\frac{c_2+c_3}{2}) \times \dots \times GL(\frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2}) \times O(c_1) & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases}$$

Hence the multiplicities of all K_c -types of $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ is **bounded above** by

$$(23) \quad [R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) : V_\beta] \leq [R(\overline{\mathcal{O}^\#}) : V_\beta],$$

where

$$(24) \quad \begin{aligned} [R(\overline{\mathcal{O}^\#}) : V_\beta] &= [R(\mathcal{O}^\#) : V_\beta] \\ &= \begin{cases} \left[\text{Ind}_{GL(\frac{c_0+c_1}{2}) \times \dots \times GL(\frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2})}^G (\text{triv}) : V_\beta \right] & \text{if } G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C}), \\ \left[\text{Ind}_{GL(\frac{c_2+c_3}{2}) \times \dots \times GL(\frac{c_{2p}+c_{2p+1}}{2}) \times O(c_1)}^G (\text{triv}) : V_\beta \right] & \text{if } G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C}) \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Suppose on the contrary that $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ is not isomorphic to $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$. Then it must have at least one extra composition factor other than those appearing $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$. Let π be one of such factor; its lowest K_c -type, V_γ , must be diminutive by Proposition B.4. So one has

$$(25) \quad [R(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) : V_\gamma] = [\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) : V_\gamma] \geq [\pi \oplus \Xi(\mathcal{O}) : V_\gamma] > [\Xi(\mathcal{O}) : V_\gamma] \stackrel{(21),(24)}{=} [R(\overline{\mathcal{O}^\#}) : V_\gamma],$$

contradicting Equation (23). Therefore, $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ must have the same composition factors as $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$. \square

Corollary 5.2. *Let \mathcal{O} be a classical nilpotent orbit. The diminutive K_c -type multiplicity of $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ is equal to that of $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}^\#})$, where $\overline{\mathcal{O}^\#} \supset \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is given in Equation (22). Moreover, $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ is not normal iff $R(\mathcal{O})$ and $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ have different multiplicities on the level of diminutive K_c -types.*

Proof. The statement on diminutive K_c -type multiplicities are precisely Theorem 5.1. For the second statement, let $\mathcal{O} = (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \dots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$ for $G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$, and $\mathcal{O} = (c_1 \geq c_2 \geq \dots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$ for $G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C})$. By Theorem 5.1 and [B5], the diminutive K_c -type multiplicities of $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $R(\mathcal{O})$ are given by the induced modules

$$(26) \quad \text{Ind}_{\prod_{j=0}^p GL(\frac{c_{2j}+c_{2j+1}}{2})}^G (\text{triv}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ind}_{\prod_{i \in \mathcal{R}} GL(c_{2i}) \times \prod_{j=0}^q GL(\frac{c'_{2j}+c'_{2j+1}}{2})}^G (\text{triv})$$

for $G = Sp(2n, \mathbb{C})$, and

$$(27) \quad \text{Ind}_{\prod_{j=1}^p GL(\frac{c_{2j}+c_{2j+1}}{2}) \times O(c_1)}^G (\text{triv}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ind}_{\prod_{i \in \mathcal{R}} GL(c_{2i}) \times \prod_{j=1}^q GL(\frac{c'_{2j}+c'_{2j+1}}{2}) \times O(c'_1)}^G (\text{triv})$$

for $G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C})$ respectively. The two induced modules have the same multiplicities iff they are induced from the same Levi type, which occurs precisely when \mathcal{O} is of the form given in Theorem 2.7. \square

Example 5.3. *We study the orbit $\mathcal{O} = (6, 4, 4, 2, 2, 0)$ in $\mathfrak{sp}(18, \mathbb{C})$. Then the induced modules in Equation (26) are*

$$(28) \quad \text{Ind}_{GL(5) \times GL(3) \times GL(1)}^G(\text{triv}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Ind}_{GL(4) \times GL(2) \times GL(3)}^G(\text{triv}).$$

By Frobenius reciprocity, the discrepancy of K_c -type multiplicities between $R(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $R(\mathcal{O})$ occurs as early as $V_{(1,1,1,1,0,0,0,0)}$.

By the Appendix, the seven possible composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_1 &:= \text{Ind}_{GL(2) \times GL(4) \times Sp(6)}^G(\det \boxtimes \det \boxtimes \text{triv}), & \pi_2^\pm &:= \text{Ind}_{GL(4) \times Sp(10)}^G(\det \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(6, 4; \pm)), \\ \pi_3^\pm &:= \text{Ind}_{GL(2) \times Sp(14)}^G(\det \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(6, 6, 2; \pm)), & \pi_4^\pm &:= \mathcal{U}(6, 6, 3, 3; \pm). \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}; \epsilon)$ are the special unipotent representations attached to the (special) orbit \mathcal{P} . All these factors are unitary.

By studying closely the expression of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ in Definition 2.11, one can check that all the seven factors appears in the composition series of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ with multiplicity one. As for $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}}) \cong \Xi(\mathcal{O})$, one can obtain the composition series of $\Xi(\mathcal{O})$ by studying that of $\Gamma(\mathcal{O}) = I^G(\lambda[6, 4], \lambda[4, 2], \lambda[2, 0])$ in Equation (14). In our subsequent work, we show that the composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ are precisely π_1, π_2^-, π_3^+ and π_4^+ .

APPENDIX A. IMAGE OF AN INTERTWINING OPERATOR

Let $G = O(2n + \delta, \mathbb{C})$. In this section, we will prove that the map

$$(29) \quad \iota|_{I^G(\lambda[a, b] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(a)})} : I^G(\lambda[a, b] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(a)}) \longrightarrow I^G(\lambda[a, a] \boxtimes \text{triv}_{O(b)}).$$

defined in (20) is injective on the level of diminutive K_c -types, where ι is the intertwining operator

$$I^G(\lambda[a, b] \boxtimes \lambda[-\delta, a]) \xrightarrow{\iota} I^G(\lambda[-\delta, a] \boxtimes \lambda[a, b]).$$

Let $p := \frac{1}{2}(a + b)$, $q := \frac{1}{2}(a - \delta)$, $M = GL(p, \mathbb{C}) \times GL(q, \mathbb{C})$ so that $n = p + q$, and $w \in W(M) = S_p \times S_q$ be the involution swapping the first p coordinates with the last q coordinates. Then the above intertwining operator can be rewritten in the notations of [B4] as

$$\iota(w) : X_M((\nu_1)(\nu_2)) \longrightarrow X_M((\nu_2)(\nu_1))$$

with $\nu_1 = a - b + 1$ and $\nu_2 = \frac{a + \delta - 2}{2}$.

In [B4], the signatures of $\iota(w)$ for the isotypic components of all diminutive (or more generally *relevant*) K_c -types are explicitly computed. More precisely, let $V_i := \wedge^{2i} \mathbb{C}^{2n' + \delta}$ be a diminutive K_c -type. Consider

$$V_i \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \Sigma_i := (n - i) \times (i),$$

where Σ_i is the irreducible $W(G)$ -module obtained by the zero weight space of V_i^* . Then the image of $\iota(w)$ on the V_i -isotypic component of $X_M((\nu_1)(\nu_2))$ can be obtained by studying the operator

$$(30) \quad R_i(w) : (\Sigma_i)^{W(M)} \longrightarrow (\Sigma_i)^{W(w \cdot M)},$$

given in Equation (5.3) of [B4].

To check whether (29) is injective for diminutive K_c -types, consider the inclusion $(\Sigma_i)^{W(GL(p) \times O(2q+\delta))} \subseteq (\Sigma_i)^{W(M)}$, and check whether the restriction of (30) to $(\Sigma_i)^{W(GL(p) \times O(2q+\delta))}$ is an injection for all i .

We now compute $(\Sigma_i)^{W(GL(p) \times O(2q+\delta))}$ explicitly. Let

$$\{e_1, \dots, e_n, f_1, \dots, f_n, \delta\}$$

be an isotropic basis of $(\mathbb{C}^{2n+\delta})^*$. Then the Σ_i is spanned by

$$\{\theta_{k_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_{k_i} \mid 1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq n\},$$

where $\theta_1 := e_1 \wedge f_1, \dots, \theta_n := e_n \wedge f_n$. It is easy to see that $(\Sigma_i)^{W(GL(p) \times O(2q+\delta))}$ is one dimensional for $1 \leq i \leq p$, spanned by the single vector

$$\mathbf{v}_i := \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq p} \theta_{k_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_{k_i}$$

So one needs to check $R_i(w)(\mathbf{v}_i) \neq 0$.

Recall the calculation of $R_i(w)$ around Equations (6.12) – (6.14) of [B4]: Consider the restriction of the $W(G)$ -module

$$(n-i) \times (i)|_{S_n} = (n) \oplus (n-1, 1) \oplus \dots \oplus (n-i, i)$$

into $W(GL(n, \mathbb{C})) = S_n$ -modules. Since $\Sigma_i \cong (n-i) \times (i)$ as $W(G)$ -modules, one has the decomposition

$$(31) \quad (\Sigma_i)^{W(M)} = (\Sigma_{i,(n)})^{W(M)} \oplus \dots \oplus (\Sigma_{i,(n-i,i)})^{W(M)}$$

where $\Sigma_{i,(n-k,k)}$ is the $(n-k, k)$ -isotypic component of the restricted module Σ_i to S_n . For all $\mathbf{x}_i \in (\Sigma_i)^{W(M)}$, write

$$(32) \quad \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{x}_{i,0} + \dots + \mathbf{x}_{i,i}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{i,k} \in (\Sigma_{i,(n-k,k)})^{W(M)}$$

under the decomposition (31), then

$$R_i(w)(\mathbf{x}_i) = \alpha_0 \mathbf{x}_{i,0} + \dots + \alpha_i \mathbf{x}_{i,i},$$

where $\alpha_k := r_{\sigma(n-k,k)}(p, q, \nu_1, \nu_2) \in \mathbb{R}$ is given in Equation (6.15) of [B4]. In particular, $\alpha_0 = 1$.

Now we are ready to compute $r_i(w)(\mathbf{v}_i)$. Under the decomposition (32) $\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}_{i,0} + \dots + \mathbf{v}_{i,i}$ of \mathbf{v}_i ,

$$\mathbf{v}_{i,0} = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{w \in S_n} \sum_{1 \leq k_1 < \dots < k_i \leq p} w \cdot (\theta_{k_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_{k_i}) = \frac{i!(n-i)!}{n!} \sum_{1 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_i \leq n} \theta_{\ell_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \theta_{\ell_i} \neq \mathbf{0}.$$

Therefore, for all $1 \leq i \leq p$,

$$r_i(w)(\mathbf{v}_i) = \alpha_0 \mathbf{v}_{i,0} + \cdots + \alpha_i \mathbf{v}_{i,i} = \mathbf{v}_{i,0} + \cdots + \alpha_i \mathbf{v}_{i,i} \neq \mathbf{0}$$

since the vectors $\{\mathbf{v}_{i,k} \mid 0 \leq k \leq i\}$ are linearly independent, and consequently (29) is an injection for all diminutive K_c -types.

APPENDIX B. COMPOSITION FACTORS OF $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$

In this section, we list the possible Langlands parameters that *can* appear in the composition series of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ for even orbits of Type C . The results can be generalized to all other classical orbits.

For any orbit $\mathcal{O} = (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$, the infinitesimal character attached to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ is

$$(33) \quad c_{2i} \longrightarrow \left(\frac{c_{2i}}{2}, \dots, 1\right); \quad c_{2i+1} \longrightarrow \left(\frac{c_{2i+1}}{2} - 1, \dots, 1, 0\right).$$

This is implicit from the constructions in Section 3. Moreover, it also matches the dual pair correspondence in, for example, [Pz].

Let λ be as in Equation (33). There is a unique maximal primitive ideal $I(\lambda) \subset U(\mathfrak{g})$ with a given infinitesimal character λ . This determines a nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O}_λ such that any admissible irreducible (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -module will have at least $\overline{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}$ as its associated variety. In particular, the spherical irreducible module with infinitesimal character λ has associated variety precisely the closure of \mathcal{O}_λ (see [BV2] for details). The composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ are irreducible (\mathfrak{g}_c, K_c) -modules with infinitesimal character λ and associated varieties contained in $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$ and containing $\overline{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}$.

B.1. Definition of $Norm(\mathcal{O})$. In this section, we describe all nilpotent orbits \mathcal{P} lying between $\overline{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$.

Definition B.1. Let $(b_0 \geq b_1 = b_2 \geq b_3)$ be four positive integers of the same parity. A **fundamental degeneration** is defined by:

- $(b_0 > b_1 = b_2 > b_3) \rightarrow (b_0, b_1 + 2, b_2 - 2, b_3)$.
- $(b_0 = b_1 = b_2 > b_3) \rightarrow (b_0 + 1, b_1 + 1, b_2 - 2, b_3)$.
- $(b_0 > b_1 = b_2 = b_3) \rightarrow (b_0, b_1 + 2, b_2 - 1, b_3 - 1)$.
- $(b_0 = b_1 = b_2 = b_3) \rightarrow (b_0 + 1, b_1 + 1, b_2 - 1, b_3 - 1)$.

In the first two cases, we omit the columns $b_2 - 2, b_3$ if both terms are equal to zero. Note that when $b_0 > b_1$, the size of b_0 remains unchanged after degeneration. Similarly, if $b_2 > b_3$, the size of b_3 is the same after degeneration.

Definition B.2. Let $\mathcal{O} = (c_0 \geq c_1 \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p} \geq c_{2p+1})$ be an even orbit. We construct a collection of orbits as follows:

(1) For each $\dots c_{2i} \geq c_{2i+1} = c_{2i+2} = \cdots = c_{2j-1} = c_{2j} \geq c_{2j+1} \dots$ appearing in \mathcal{O} , perform fundamental degeneration on the columns $c_{2i} \geq c_{2i+1} = c_{2j} \geq c_{2j+1}$ and get a new orbit:

$$(c_0 \geq \cdots \geq c'_{2i} \geq c'_{2i+1} \geq c_{2i+2} = \cdots = c_{2j-1} \geq c'_{2j} \geq c'_{2j+1} \geq \cdots \geq c_{2p+1}).$$

(2) For each new orbit obtained in Step (1), repeat Step (1) on them until there are no more $c_{2j+1} = c_{2j+2}$'s.

Denote the collection of all such orbits by $Norm(\mathcal{O})$. They are precisely the orbits between $\overline{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$.

Example B.3. Let $\mathcal{O} = (8 \geq 6 \geq 6 \geq 4 \geq 4 \geq 2 \geq 2 \geq 0)$. Then the $\mathcal{P} \in Norm(\mathcal{O})$ are given by

$$(34) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & (86644220) & \\ & (88444220) & (86662220) & (866444) \\ & (88552220) & (884444) & (866633) \\ & (885533) & & \end{array} .$$

The following proposition gives an explicit construction of the irreducible modules $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$ with infinitesimal character given by (33) and associated variety $AV(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)) = 1 \cdot \overline{\mathcal{P}}$ for all $\mathcal{P} \in Norm(\mathcal{O})$.

Proposition B.4. Let \mathcal{O} be an even orbit. For each $\mathcal{P} = (d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_{2s+1}) \in Norm(\mathcal{O})$, let

$$\tau_0(\mathcal{P}) := \{i \mid d_{2i-1} = d_{2i} \text{ is even}\}$$

and \mathcal{P}^* is obtained from \mathcal{P} by removing the columns $d_{2i-1} = d_{2i}$ for $i \in \tau_0(\mathcal{P})$. Consider the induced modules

$$(35) \quad \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon) := \text{Ind}_{\prod_{i \in \tau_0(\mathcal{P})} GL(d_{2i}) \times G^*}^G (\det \boxtimes \dots \boxtimes \det \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}^*; \epsilon)),$$

where each $\epsilon \in \overline{A}(\mathcal{P}^*)^\vee$ is an irreducible representation of the Lusztig's quotient group $\overline{A}(\mathcal{P}^*)$ of \mathcal{P}^* , and $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}^*; \epsilon)$ are the special unipotent representations attached to the special orbit \mathcal{P}^* .

Then all $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$ are irreducible having associated variety $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$. Moreover, this exhausts all irreducible representations with infinitesimal character given by Equation (33) and associated variety $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$.

We will prove the proposition in the next subsection.

Since the modules $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ constructed in Section 3 have infinitesimal character given by Equation (33) and associated variety $\overline{\mathcal{O}}$, the last paragraph of the above Proposition says all composition factors of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{O})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\overline{\mathcal{O}})$ must be of the form given by Equation (35).

By construction, all the representations in Equation (35) are unitary. Furthermore, the lowest K_c^* -types of the unipotent representations $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{P}^*; \epsilon)$ are diminutive, so the induced modules in Equation (35) also have diminutive lowest K_c -types. This observation is essential in the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Example B.5. Let $\mathcal{O} = (8 \geq 6 \geq 6 \geq 4 \geq 4 \geq 2 \geq 2 \geq 0)$ as above. Then the induced modules in Equation (35) are:

$$\begin{aligned}
& I_{GL(6,4,2) \times G_8^*}^G(\det^{\boxtimes 3} \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(80)) \\
& I_{GL(4,2) \times G_{20}^*}^G(\det^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(8840; \pm)) \quad I_{GL(6,2) \times G_{16}^*}^G(\det^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(8620; \pm)) \quad I_{GL(6,4) \times G_{12}^*}^G(\det^{\boxtimes 2} \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(84; \pm)) \\
& I_{GL(2) \times G_{28}^*}^G(\det \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(885520; \pm)) \quad I_{GL(4) \times G_{24}^*}^G(\det \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(8844; \pm, \pm)) \quad I_{GL(6) \times G_{20}^*}^G(\det \boxtimes \mathcal{U}(8633; \pm)) \\
& \mathcal{U}(885533; \pm)
\end{aligned}$$

where $GL(n_1, \dots, n_k) := GL(n_1) \times \dots \times GL(n_k)$ and $G_m^* = Sp(m, \mathbb{C})$. In particular, there are 17 irreducible representations in total, all of which are unitary.

B.2. Proof of Proposition B.4. Since \mathcal{O} is even, the infinitesimal character λ in Equation (33) is integral.

Given the integral infinitesimal character (λ, λ) in Equation (33), we study the **left cone representation** corresponding to the orbit \mathcal{O}_λ as described in the beginning of Section 4:

$$\overline{V}^L(w_0 w_\lambda) = \text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^W(\text{triv}),$$

where $W(\lambda)$ is the largest Weyl Levi subgroup of W fixing λ , and w_λ is the longest element in $W(\lambda)$.

For any special orbit \mathcal{P} , the number of irreducible representations with infinitesimal character (λ, λ) and associated variety $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ is given by

$$[\overline{V}^L(w_0 w_\lambda) : V(\mathcal{P})] = [\text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^W(\text{triv}) : V(\mathcal{P})],$$

where $V(\mathcal{P})$ is the **left cell representation** corresponding to the orbit \mathcal{P} . In particular, each $V(\mathcal{P})$ contains $|\overline{A}(\mathcal{P})|$ distinct irreducible representations of W (see [BV2], Proposition 5.28 for instance).

The decomposition of $\overline{V}^L(w_0 w_\lambda) = \text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^W(\text{triv})$ into irreducible representations can be easily computed using the Robinson-Schensted algorithm. In particular, one can check that for any even \mathcal{O} and any $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$, each irreducible factor of $V(\mathcal{P})$ appears in $\text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^W(\text{triv})$ exactly once.

Example B.6. Consider $\mathcal{O} = (6 \geq 4 \geq 4 \geq 2 \geq 2 \geq 0)$ with $\lambda = (322111100)$. Then

$$\text{Norm}(\mathcal{O}) = \{\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{P}_1 := (6 \geq 4 \geq 4 \geq 4), \mathcal{P}_2 := (6 \geq 6 \geq 2 \geq 2 \geq 2 \geq 0), \mathcal{O}_\lambda = (6 \geq 6 \geq 3 \geq 3)\}$$

and $W(\lambda) = W(A_0) \times W(A_1) \times W(A_3) \times W(C_2)$.

The left cell representation for each $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ is given by the following:

- \mathcal{O} : (21×321) .
- \mathcal{P}_1 : $(22 \times 32), (43 \times 11)$.
- \mathcal{P}_2 : $(31 \times 311), (41 \times 211)$.
- \mathcal{O}_λ : $(32 \times 31), (42 \times 21)$.

Note that the Young diagrams are all described in terms of columns, i.e.

$$(43 \times 11) = \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \right).$$

One can easily show that each irreducible representation above shows up exactly once in $\text{Ind}_{W(\lambda)}^W(\text{triv})$. In other words, there is only one way to fill up the Young diagrams into semi-standard Young tableaux using the coordinates of λ with the first row of the left Young diagram filled with zeros. For example, the only way to fill up (43×11) is given by

$$\left(\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \right).$$

For an arbitrary orbit \mathcal{O} with even columns, there is a systematic way of describing the left cell representations for all $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ (c.f. [Lu, Chapter 4]) and the same results hold. We omit the details here.

Consequently, the number of irreducible modules with infinitesimal character (λ, λ) and associated variety $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$ for each $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ is equal to $|\overline{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{P})|$. By our definition of fundamental degeneration and $\text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$, one can check that all $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$ are special orbits. Moreover, the number of irreducible representations of the form $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$ in Proposition B.4 is equal to $|\overline{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{P}^*)|$ which is equal to $|\overline{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{P})|$ by the construction of \mathcal{P}^* from \mathcal{P} . So we are left to show that the induced module $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$ in Equation (35) is irreducible.

Let $\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$ be the irreducible subquotient of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$ having the same lowest K_c -type. Then the lowest K_c -type of both modules are diminutive, and hence all diminutive K_c -types of $\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$ are *bottom-layer* in the sense of [SV]. Therefore, one can check, by [B1, Proposition 2.7] for instance, that

$$(36) \quad \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon) \approx \overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon),$$

i.e. they have the same diminutive K_c -type multiplicities. In order to prove Proposition B.4, one needs to check the \approx in (36) is indeed an equality.

We proceed by induction on the closure ordering of the orbits in $\text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$: Consider the smallest orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$, then the $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \epsilon)$ are precisely the special unipotent representations $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{O}_\lambda; \epsilon)$, which is irreducible.

Now consider any nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{P} \in \text{Norm}(\mathcal{O})$. By induction hypothesis, assume that for all $\mathcal{P}' \subsetneq \overline{\mathcal{P}}$, all the induced modules $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}', \epsilon') = \overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}', \epsilon')$ are irreducible.

Suppose on the contrary that Φ is a composition factor of $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$ other than $\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$, then Φ must have associated variety $\overline{\mathcal{P}'} \subsetneq \overline{\mathcal{P}}$ since $AV(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)) = 1 \cdot \overline{\mathcal{P}}$. Hence $\Phi = \overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}', \epsilon') = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}', \epsilon')$ for some ϵ' , which has diminutive lowest K_c -type V_ω . So we have

$$[\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon) : V_\omega] \geq [\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon) : V_\omega] + [\Phi : V_\omega] > [\overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon) : V_\omega] \stackrel{(36)}{=} [\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon) : V_\omega],$$

which gives a contradiction. So $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon) = \overline{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{P}, \epsilon)$, and the result follows. \square

B.3. General Orbits. For general nilpotent orbits \mathcal{O} of Type C , the infinitesimal character λ in (33) is not integral, and is formed of integers and half-integers. The Kazhdan-Lusztig conjectures reduce this case to the one considered in the previous section for an *endoscopic group*. Let

$$\Delta(\lambda) := \{\alpha \in R : (\check{\alpha}, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

This root system is again of classical type. Then $\check{\Delta}(\lambda) = \{\check{\alpha} : \alpha \in \Delta(\lambda)\}$ forms a root system. As in [V6], for instance, the character theory of (\mathfrak{g}, K) -modules at infinitesimal character (λ, λ) can be deduced via translation functors from a corresponding $(\lambda_{reg}, \lambda_{reg})$ with the same “*integral roots*”. The category of representations with this infinitesimal character decomposes into a sum of “*blocks*” each with a *coherent continuation action* of the Weyl group $W(\lambda)$ generated by the root reflections coming from $\Delta(\lambda)$. The Kazhdan-Lusztig conjectures for non-integral infinitesimal character state that the character theory of each block is equivalent to the character theory of an *endoscopic group* $G(\lambda)$ with roots $\delta(\lambda)$. The induced module in Proposition B.4 corresponding to an even nilpotent orbit. We omit further details.

REFERENCES

- [AB] J. Adams, D. Barbasch *The Reductive Dual Pairs Correspondence for Complex Groups*, J. of Func. An. vol 132, 1995
- [B1] D. Barbasch *The unitary dual for complex classical Lie groups*, Invent. Math., vol 96, 1989, pp 103-176
- [B2] ——— *Unipotent representations for real reductive groups*, Proceedings of ICM 1990, Springer Verlag, Tokyo, 1991, pp. 769-777
- [B3] ——— *Orbital integrals of nilpotent orbits*, volume in honor of Harish-Chandra, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 68 (2000) pp. 97-110.
- [B4] ——— *The unitary spherical spectrum for split classical groups*, Journal of Inst. of Math. Jussieu, 2010 9(2) pp 265-356
- [B5] ——— *Unipotent Representations and the Dual Pairs Correspondence*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 323, 2017
- [BSS] D. Barbasch, S. Sahi, B. Speh, *Degenerate series representations for $GL(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and Fourier Analysis* Symposia Mathematica, vol XXXI, 45-69, Rome 1988, Academic Press, London, 1990
- [BV] N. Berline, M. Vergne *Fourier transforms of orbits of the coadjoint representation*, Representation theory of reductive groups, Birkhäuser-Boston, Progress in Mathematics vol 40, 1983, pp. 53-69
- [BV1] D. Barbasch, D. Vogan *The local structure of characters*, J. Funct. Analysis, vol. 34 no. 1, 1980, pp. 27-55
- [BV2] D. Barbasch, D. Vogan *Unipotent representations of complex semisimple Lie groups*, Ann. of Math., 1985, vol 121, pp. 41-110
- [BV3] D. Barbasch, D. Vogan *Weyl group representations and nilpotent orbits*, Representation theory of reductive groups, Birkhäuser-Boston, Progress in mathematics vol 40, 1983, pp. 21-35
- [Br] R. Brylinski *Line bundles on the cotangent bundle of the flag variety*, Invent. Math., vol 113 Fasc. 1, 1993, pp. 1-20
- [BZ] I.N. Bernstein, A.V. Zelevensky *Induced representations of reductive p -adic groups. I*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 10 (1977), no. 4, 441–472.
- [CM] D. Collingwood and W. M. McGovern, *Nilpotent orbits in semisimple Lie algebras*, Van Norstrand Reinhold Mathematics Series, 1993
- [FJLS] B. Fu, D. Juteau, P. Levy, E. Sommers, *Generic singularities of nilpotent orbit closures*, Adv. Math. **305** (2017), 1-77.

- [G] W. Graham, *Functions on the universal cover of the principal nilpotent orbit*, Inv. Math. **108** (1992), 15-27.
- [HC1] Harish-Chandra, *Fourier transform on a semisimple Lie algebra II*, Amer. J. of Math., vol 79, 1957, pp. 193-257
- [HC2] Harish-Chandra, *Harmonic analysis on semisimple Lie groups*, Bulletin AMS. vol 76, 1970, pp. 529-551
- [H] R. Howe, *Transcending Classical Invariant Theory*, Journal of the AMS, vol 2, no. 3, 1989
- [J] J. C. Jantzen, *Nilpotent orbits in representation theory*, in volume Lie Theory, Lie algebras and Representations by J.-P Anker and B. Orsted, Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser, 2004
- [Kn] A. Knapp, *Representation Theory of Semisimple Groups*, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 1986
- [KnV] A. Knapp, D. Vogan, *Cohomological induction and unitary representations*, Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ, 1995
- [KP1] H-P. Kraft, C. Procesi, *Closures of conjugacy classes of matrices are normal* Inventiones mathematicae, October 1979 vol. 53, no. 3, pp 227-247
- [KP2] H-P. Kraft, C. Procesi *On the geometry of conjugacy classes in classical groups*, Comm. Math. Helv., 57, 1982, pp. 539-601
- [LMM] I. Losev, L. Mason-Brown, D. Matvieievskiy, *Unipotent Ideals and Harish-Chandra Bimodules*, arXiv:2108.03453
- [Lo] I. Losev., *Deformations of symplectic singularities and Orbit method for semisimple Lie algebras*, arXiv: 1605.00592
- [Lu] G. Lusztig, *Characters of Reductive Groups over a Finite Field*, Ann. Math. Studies, vol. 107, Princeton University Press, 1984
- [LS] G. Lusztig, N. Spaltenstein *Induced unipotent classes*, J. London Math. Soc., vol. 19, 1979, pp. 41-52
- [McG] M. McGovern *Rings of regular functions on nilpotent orbits and their covers*, Invent. Math., 97, 1989, pp. 209-217
- [Pz] T. Przebinda *The dual correspondence of infinitesimal characters*, Colloq. Math. 70 (1996), pp. 93-102
- [R] R. Rao *Orbital integrals in reductive groups*, Annals of Math., vol. 96 no. 3, 1972, pp. 505-510
- [Ro] W. Rossmann *Nilpotent orbital integrals in a real semisimple Lie algebra and representations of Weyl groups*, Operator algebras, unitary representations, enveloping algebras and invariant theory, Progress in Mathematics 92, Birkhäuser Boston, 1990, pp. 263-287
- [ScVi1] W. Schmid, K. Vilonen *Two geometric character formulas for reductive Lie groups*, J. Amer. math. Soc., vol. 11 no. 4, 1998, pp. 799-867
- [ScVi2] W. Schmid, K. Vilonen *Characteristic cycles and wave front cycles of representations of reductive groups*, Annals of Math. 151 (2000), pp. 1071 - 1118.
- [SV] B. Speh, D. Vogan *Reducibility of generalized principal series representations*, Acta Math. 145 (1980), pp. 227-299
- [V1] D. Vogan *The Algebraic Structure of the Representations of Semisimple Lie Groups I*, Annals of Mathematics, Second Series, Vol. 109, No. 1 (Jan., 1979), pp. 1-60
- [V2] D. Vogan *The orbit method and primitive ideals for semisimple Lie algebras*, Canad. Math. Soc. Conf. Proc. Vol. 5 (1986), pp. 281-316
- [V3] D. Vogan *The unitary dual of $GL(n)$ over an archimedean field*, Invent. Math. 83 (1986), pp. 449-505
- [V4] D. Vogan *Associated varieties and unipotent representations*, Harmonic Analysis on reductive groups, Progress in Mathematics vol. 101, Birkhäuser, Boston-Basel-Berlin, 1991, pp. 315-388
- [V5] D. Vogan *The method of coadjoint orbits for real reductive groups*, Representation Theory of Lie Groups, IAS/Park City Mathematics Series 8 (1999), pp. 179-238
- [V6] D. Vogan *Representation of Real Reductive Lie Groups*, Birkhauser, 1981
- [W] N. Wallach *Invariant differential operators on a reductive Lie algebra and Weyl group representations*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 6 no. 4, 1993, pp. 779-816

- [Wo1] K. D. Wong, *Dixmier Algebras on Complex Classical Nilpotent Orbits and their Representation Theories*, Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University, 2013
- [Wo2] K.D. Wong *Regular functions on symplectic spherical nilpotent orbits and their quantizations*, Represent. Theory 19 (2015), pp. 333-346
- [Wo3] K.D. Wong *Quantization of special symplectic nilpotent orbits and normality of their closures*, J. Algebra 462 (2016), pp. 37-53

(Barbasch) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NY 14853, U.S.A.
Email address: `barbasch@math.cornell.edu`

(Wong) SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, SHENZHEN, GUANGDONG 518172, P. R. CHINA
Email address: `kayue.wong@gmail.com`