

ON THE HODGE-NEWTON DECOMPOSITION FOR SPLIT GROUPS

ROBERT E. KOTTWITZ

1. INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this paper is to prove a group-theoretic generalization of a theorem of Katz on isocrystals. Along the way we reprove the group-theoretic generalization of Mazur's inequality for isocrystals due to Rapoport-Richartz, and generalize from split groups to unramified groups a result from [KR] which determines when the affine Deligne-Lusztig subset $X_\mu^G(b)$ of $G(L)/G(\mathfrak{o}_L)$ is non-empty.

Let F be a finite extension of \mathbf{Q}_p with uniformizing element ϖ . We write L for the completion of the maximal unramified extension of F in some algebraic closure \bar{F} of F . We write σ for the Frobenius automorphism of L over F , and we write \mathfrak{o} (respectively, \mathfrak{o}_L) for the valuation ring of F (respectively, L).

Let G be a split connected reductive group over \mathfrak{o} and let A be a split maximal torus of G over \mathfrak{o} . Fix a Borel subgroup $B = AU$ containing A with unipotent radical U , as well as a parabolic subgroup P of G containing B . Write $P = MN$, where M is the unique Levi subgroup of P containing A and N is the unipotent radical of P .

We write X_G for the quotient of $X_*(A)$ by the coroot lattice for G , and we define a homomorphism $w_G : G(L) \rightarrow X_G$ as follows. For $g \in G(L)$ we define $r_B(g) \in X_*(A)$ to be the unique element $\mu \in X_*(A)$ such that $g \in G(\mathfrak{o}_L) \cdot \mu(\varpi) \cdot U(L)$, and we define $w_G(g)$ to be the image of $r_B(g)$ under the canonical surjection from $X_*(A)$ to X_G . (This definition of w_G suffices for the purposes of this paper; see §7 of [Kot97] for a definition that applies to groups G that are not split over L .)

Applying the construction above to M rather than G , we obtain X_M , the quotient of $X_*(A)$ by the coroot lattice for M , and a homomorphism

$$w_M : M(L) \rightarrow X_M.$$

For $\mu, \nu \in X_M$ we write $\mu \stackrel{P}{\leq} \nu$ if $\nu - \mu$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of (images in X_M of) coroots α^\vee , where α ranges over the roots of A in N .

We write A_P for the identity component of the center of M ; thus A_P is a split torus over F . Let \mathfrak{a}_P denote the real vector space $X_*(A_P) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$. As usual P determines an open chamber \mathfrak{a}_P^+ in \mathfrak{a}_P , defined by

$$\mathfrak{a}_P^+ := \{x \in \mathfrak{a}_P : \langle \alpha, x \rangle > 0 \text{ for every root } \alpha \text{ of } A_P \text{ in } N\}.$$

The composition $X_*(A_P) \hookrightarrow X_*(A) \twoheadrightarrow X_M$, when tensored with \mathbf{R} , yields a canonical isomorphism $\mathfrak{a}_P \simeq X_M \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$. We write X_M^+ for the subset of X_M consisting of all elements whose image in $X_M \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R} \simeq \mathfrak{a}_P$ lies in \mathfrak{a}_P^+ .

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 14L05; Secondary 11S25, 20G25, 14F30.
Partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-0071971.

For any coweight $\mu \in X_*(A)$ (usually taken to be dominant) and any $b \in G(L)$ we consider the affine Deligne-Lusztig set

$$(1.1) \quad X_\mu^G(b) := \{x \in G(L)/G(\mathfrak{o}_L) : x^{-1}b\sigma(x) \in G(\mathfrak{o}_L)\mu(\varpi)G(\mathfrak{o}_L)\}.$$

For $b \in M(L)$ we may replace G by M in this definition, obtaining the affine Deligne-Lusztig set $X_\mu^M(b)$; moreover, the inclusion $M(L)/M(\mathfrak{o}_L) \hookrightarrow G(L)/G(\mathfrak{o}_L)$ induces an inclusion

$$X_\mu^M(b) \hookrightarrow X_\mu^G(b).$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mu \in X_*(A)$ be a dominant coweight, and let b be a basic element in $M(L)$ such that $w_M(b)$ lies in the subset X_M^+ of X_M .*

- (1) [RR96] *If $X_\mu^G(b)$ is non-empty, then $w_M(b) \stackrel{P}{\leq} \mu$. Here we are regarding μ as an element of X_M .*
- (2) *Suppose that $w_M(b) = \mu$ (with μ again regarded as an element of X_M). Then the natural injection $X_\mu^M(b) \hookrightarrow X_\mu^G(b)$ is a bijection.*

See [Kot85] for the definition of basic. The first part of the theorem is a reformulation of the group-theoretic generalization of Mazur's inequality (see Theorem 1.4.1 of [Kat79]) proved by Rapoport-Richartz [RR96]. Proposition 4.10 shows that our formulation agrees with that of [RR96]. The second part of the theorem is the group-theoretic generalization of Katz's theorem (see Theorem 1.6.1 of [Kat79]) which was formulated in [KR, Remark 4.12] and proved there for GL_n and GSp_{2n} as a consequence of Katz's theorem.

The theorem above is proved in §3. In §4 it is generalized to the case of unramified groups (see Theorem 4.1 for a precise statement). Theorem 4.3 determines (for any unramified G) when the affine Deligne-Lusztig set $X_\mu^G(b)$ is non-empty, generalizing Proposition 4.6 of [KR], which treated the case of split groups.

We now draw the reader's attention to some related work. In [FR02] (respectively, [KR]) the converse to Mazur's inequality is proved for GL_n (respectively, GL_n and GSp_{2n}). Recently C. Leigh [Lei02] has proved the converse to Mazur's inequality for all split classical groups. The reader who would like to know how these questions relate to the reduction modulo p of Shimura varieties should consult the survey article [Rap02] by Rapoport.

It is a pleasure to thank M. Rapoport, both for the interest he has taken in this work and the helpful comments he made about a preliminary version of the paper.

2. RETRACTIONS

2.1. Notation. Let \mathfrak{o} be a complete discrete valuation ring with fraction field F , uniformizing element ϖ , and residue field $k = \mathfrak{o}/\varpi\mathfrak{o}$.

Let G be a split connected reductive group over \mathfrak{o} and let A be a split maximal torus of G over \mathfrak{o} . We denote by $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(A)$ the set of Borel subgroups of G containing A (all of which are defined over \mathfrak{o}). For $B \in \mathcal{B}$ denote by \bar{B} the Borel subgroup in \mathcal{B} that is opposite to B . For B, B_1, B_2, \dots in \mathcal{B} we denote the unipotent radical by U, U_1, U_2, \dots , so that (for instance) $B = AU$. We write K for $G(\mathfrak{o})$.

2.2. Definition of retractions. For $g \in G(F)$ and $B = AU$ in \mathcal{B} we define $r_B(g) \in X_*(A)$ to be the unique element $\mu \in X_*(A)$ such that $g \in K \cdot \mu(\varpi) \cdot U(F)$. The family $(r_B(g))_{B \in \mathcal{B}}$ of retractions is used by Arthur to form weighted orbital integrals.

2.3. Positivity properties of families of retractions. The family $(r_B(g))_{B \in \mathcal{B}}$ has the following basic positivity property [Art76, Lemma 3.6], [HC66, Lemma 85]. Let $B_1 = AU_1$ and $B_2 = AU_2$ be adjacent Borel subgroups in \mathcal{B} , and let α be the unique root of A that is positive for B_1 and negative for B_2 . Then

$$(2.1) \quad r_{B_2}(g) - r_{B_1}(g) = j \cdot \alpha^\vee,$$

where j is a non-negative integer that we will now define. (We will not recall the proof except to say that one reduces to the case of $SL(2)$, for which a simple computation with 2×2 matrices does the job.)

The group U_1 is the semidirect product of the normal subgroup $U_1 \cap U_2$ and the root subgroup U_α determined by α . In particular U_α is a quotient of U_1 , and we refer to the image of $u_1 \in U_1$ in U_α as the α -component of u_1 . Choosing an isomorphism between U_α and \mathbf{G}_a over \mathfrak{o} , we may view the α -component of $u_1 \in U_1(F)$ as an element of F , well-defined up to multiplication by a unit.

Now we can define j . Decompose g as $g = k \cdot u_1 \cdot \mu(\varpi)$ with $k \in K$, $u_1 \in U_1(F)$ and $\mu \in X_*(A)$ (so that $\mu = r_{B_1}(g)$), and write $x \in F$ for the α -component of u_1 . Then j is defined to be 0 if $x \in \mathfrak{o}$ and is defined to be $-\text{val}(x)$ if $x \notin \mathfrak{o}$.

The basic positivity property above has some obvious consequences. One is that for any $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ the coweight $r_{B_2}(g) - r_{B_1}(g)$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of coroots α^\vee that are positive for B_1 and negative for B_2 . Thus for any $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$(2.2) \quad r_B(g) \stackrel{B}{\leq} r_{B'}(g) \stackrel{B}{\leq} r_{\bar{B}}(g),$$

where $\mu \stackrel{B}{\leq} \nu$ (for coweights μ, ν) means that $\nu - \mu$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of coroots that are positive for B .

2.4. Recognizing the subset $K \cdot M(F)$ of $G(F)$ using retractions. Let M be a Levi subgroup of G containing A and note that M is automatically defined over \mathfrak{o} . We write X_M for the quotient of $X_*(A)$ by the coroot lattice for M . For example, when $M = A$, we have $X_M = X_*(A)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $g \in G(F)$. Then $g \in K \cdot M(F)$ if and only if $r_{B_1}(g)$ and $r_{B_2}(g)$ are equal in X_M for all $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. Assume first that $g = km$ with $k \in K$ and $m \in M(F)$. We must show that all the retractions of g are equal in X_M . For any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ the intersection $B \cap M$ is a Borel subgroup of M , and it is clear that $r_B(g) = r_{B \cap M}(m)$. Thus, for $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ the coweight $r_{B_2}(g) - r_{B_1}(g)$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of coroots α^\vee for M that are positive for B_1 and negative for B_2 , and in particular $r_{B_2}(g) = r_{B_1}(g)$ in X_M .

Now assume that all the retractions of g are equal in X_M . Choose $B = AU$ in \mathcal{B} and choose a minimal gallery

$$(2.3) \quad B = B_0, B_1, \dots, B_{l-1}, B_l = \bar{B}$$

of Borel subgroups in \mathcal{B} joining B to \bar{B} . Thus l is equal to the number of positive roots for B , and the subgroups B_i, B_{i+1} are adjacent for $0 \leq i \leq l-1$. Write $B_i = AU_i$ and put $V_i := U \cap U_i$. Note that $V_0 = U$ and $V_l = \{1\}$. We will prove by induction on i (for $0 \leq i \leq l$) that $g \in K \cdot V_i(F) \cdot M(F)$. The case $i = 0$ is obvious and the case $i = l$ is the statement of the lemma.

For the induction step we suppose that for some i less than l we have $g = kum$ for $k \in K$, $u \in V_i(F)$, $m \in M(F)$. The group V_i is the semidirect product of the normal subgroup V_{i+1} and the root subgroup U_α , where α is the unique root of A that is positive for B_i and negative for B_{i+1} . If α is not a root of M , then α^\vee is a non-torsion element in X_M , and our hypothesis that the retractions for B_i and B_{i+1} are equal in X_M ensures that the α -component u_α of u lies in $U_\alpha(\mathfrak{o})$, so that we can write $g = (ku_\alpha) \cdot u_\alpha^{-1}u \cdot m \in K \cdot V_{i+1}(F) \cdot M(F)$. If α is a root of M , then we can write $g = k \cdot uu_\alpha^{-1} \cdot u_\alpha m \in K \cdot V_{i+1}(F) \cdot M(F)$. \square

2.5. Review of two relations between the Iwasawa and Cartan decompositions. We now recall two results of Bruhat-Tits. Fix $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and a B -dominant coweight $\mu \in X_*(A)$. Suppose that $g \in K \cdot \mu(\varpi) \cdot K$. Then (see [BT72, 4.4.4]) for all $B' \in \mathcal{B}$

$$(2.4) \quad r_{B'}(g) \stackrel{B}{\leq} \mu$$

and if $r_B(g) = \mu$, then $g \in K \cdot A(F)$.

Note that (2.2) and (2.4) together yield

$$(2.5) \quad r_B(g) \stackrel{B}{\leq} r_{B'}(g) \stackrel{B}{\leq} \mu$$

for all $B' \in \mathcal{B}$, so that the hypothesis $r_B(g) = \mu$ implies that all the retractions of g are equal; therefore the second result of Bruhat-Tits follows from the first together with Lemma 2.1. This proof of their second result (different from the one given in [BT72]) has the advantage that it generalizes immediately to parabolic subgroups, as we now check.

2.6. Variant (for parabolic subgroups) of the two results of Bruhat-Tits.

Fix $B = AU \in \mathcal{B}$ as well as a parabolic subgroup P of G containing B . Write $P = MN$, where M is the unique Levi subgroup of P containing A and N is the unipotent radical of P . As before we write X_M for the quotient of $X_*(A)$ by the coroot lattice for M . For $\mu, \nu \in X_M$ we write $\mu \stackrel{P}{\leq} \nu$ if $\nu - \mu$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of (images in X_M of) coroots α^\vee , where α ranges over the roots of A in N (or, equivalently, U).

As in the previous section, fix a B -dominant coweight $\mu \in X_*(A)$ and an element $g \in K \cdot \mu(\varpi) \cdot K$. It follows immediately from (2.4) that

$$(2.6) \quad r_{B'}(g) \stackrel{P}{\leq} \mu$$

for all $B' \in \mathcal{B}$, where the two sides of this inequality are now viewed as elements in X_M .

Lemma 2.2. *With μ, g as above assume further that $r_B(g)$ is equal to μ in X_M . Then $g \in K \cdot M(F)$. Moreover, writing $g = km$ for $k \in K$ and $m \in M(F)$, then $m \in K_M \cdot \mu(\varpi) \cdot K_M$, where we have written K_M for $M(\mathfrak{o})$.*

Proof. Let $B' \in \mathcal{B}$. Since (by (2.5))

$$(2.7) \quad r_B(g) \stackrel{P}{\leq} r_{B'}(g) \stackrel{P}{\leq} \mu,$$

our hypothesis that $r_B(g) = \mu$ in X_M implies that $r_B(g) = r_{B'}(g)$ in X_M for all $B' \in \mathcal{B}$. Therefore Lemma 2.1 implies that $g \in K \cdot M(F)$.

Now we write g as km and verify the second statement of the lemma. By the Cartan decomposition for M there exists a unique coweight $\nu \in X_*(A)$ that is

dominant with respect to the Borel subgroup $B \cap M$ of M and is such that m lies in $K_M \cdot \nu(\varpi) \cdot K_M$. By the Cartan decomposition for G the coweights μ and ν lie in the same orbit of the Weyl group of A in G . Since both μ and ν are dominant for M , no root hyperplane for M separates μ from ν . Therefore $\mu - \nu$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of coroots α^\vee , for α ranging through the roots of A in N ; on the other hand it is clear that μ and ν are equal in X_M (since $\mu = r_B(g) = r_{B \cap M}(m)$ and $m \in K_M \nu(\varpi) K_M$); therefore $\mu = \nu$, showing that $m \in K_M \cdot \mu(\varpi) \cdot K_M$, as desired. \square

3. GENERALIZATIONS OF MAZUR'S INEQUALITY AND KATZ'S THEOREM

3.1. Notation. In the rest of the paper F denotes a finite extension of \mathbf{Q}_p and \mathfrak{o} denotes the valuation ring of F . We write L for the completion of the maximal unramified extension of F in some algebraic closure \bar{F} of F . We write σ for the Frobenius automorphism of L over F , and we write \mathfrak{o}_L for the valuation ring of L .

3.2. A lemma about σ - L -spaces. Recall that a σ - L -space is a pair (V, Φ) consisting of a finite dimensional vector space V over L and a σ -semilinear bijection $\Phi : V \rightarrow V$. In case $F = \mathbf{Q}_p$ a σ - L -space is an isocrystal, and the theory of σ - L -spaces is completely parallel to that of isocrystals. In particular there are finitely many rational numbers, called slopes, attached to (V, Φ) (see §3 in [Kot85]).

Lemma 3.1. *Let (V, Φ) be a σ - L -space and assume that all its slopes are strictly positive.*

- (1) *For any $v \in V$ the sequence $\Phi^n v$ approaches 0 as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.*
- (2) *Suppose that Λ is an \mathfrak{o}_L -lattice in V such that $\Phi\Lambda \subset \Lambda$, and suppose that v is an element of V such that $v - \Phi v \in \Lambda$. Then $v \in \Lambda$.*

Proof. We begin by proving the first part of the lemma. Choose a positive integer j such that $jr \in \mathbf{Z}$ for every slope r of (V, Φ) . Then, in a suitable basis for V the map Φ^j can be represented by a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries are strictly positive powers of the uniformizing parameter ϖ for F , and it is clear that $\Phi^{jm} v' \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow +\infty$ for every $v' \in V$. Taking for v' the j vectors $v, \Phi v, \dots, \Phi^{j-1} v$, we see that $\Phi^n v \rightarrow 0$, as desired. Now we prove the second part of the lemma. It follows from the first part of the lemma that we may define an additive homomorphism $\Psi : V \rightarrow V$ by $\Psi = 1 + \Phi + \Phi^2 + \Phi^3 + \dots$ and hence that the additive homomorphism $1 - \Phi$ is bijective with inverse Ψ . Also, it is clear from the definition of Ψ that $\Psi\Lambda \subset \Lambda$.

We are given $v \in V$ such that $(1 - \Phi)v \in \Lambda$. Applying Ψ , we conclude that $v \in \Psi\Lambda \subset \Lambda$, as desired. \square

3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1. In the proof of Theorem 1.1 we will need the following non-abelian analog of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mu \in X_*(A)$ be a dominant coweight, and let b be a basic element in $M(L)$ such that $w_M(b)$ lies in the subset X_M^+ of X_M . Assume further that $b \in M(\mathfrak{o}_L)\mu(\varpi)M(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Write Φ for the automorphism $n \mapsto b\sigma(n)b^{-1}$ of N over L . Let $n \in N(L)$ and assume that $n^{-1}\Phi(n) \in N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Then $n \in N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$.*

Proof. Conjugation by $M(\mathfrak{o}_L)$ preserves $N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$, and since μ is dominant, we have $\mu(\varpi)N(\mathfrak{o}_L)\mu(\varpi)^{-1} \subset N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$; it follows that $bN(\mathfrak{o}_L)b^{-1} \subset N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$ and hence that $\Phi N(\mathfrak{o}_L) \subset N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Our hypothesis that $w_M(b) \in X_M^+$ ensures that all the slopes of

Φ on $\text{Lie } N(L)$ are strictly positive. Indeed, since b is basic in $M(L)$, these slopes are given by $\langle \alpha, \overline{w_M(b)} \rangle$, where α ranges through the roots of A_P on $\text{Lie}(N)$, and $\overline{w_M(b)}$ denotes the image of $w_M(b)$ in \mathfrak{a}_P . Thus, if N is abelian, we have only to appeal to Lemma 3.1.

In the general case we need to choose an M -stable filtration

$$(3.1) \quad N = N_0 \supset N_1 \supset N_2 \supset \cdots \supset N_r = \{1\}$$

by normal subgroups with N_i/N_{i+1} abelian for all i . Each N_i is A -stable, hence is a product of root subgroups and is necessarily defined over \mathfrak{o} . We will prove by induction on i ($0 \leq i \leq r$) that $n \in N_i(L) \cdot N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. For $i = 0$ this statement is trivial, and for $i = r$ it is the statement of the lemma. It remains to do the induction step. So suppose that for $0 \leq i < r$ we can write n as $n = n_i n_{\mathfrak{o}}$ for $n_i \in N_i(L)$ and $n_{\mathfrak{o}} \in N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Then $n_i^{-1} \Phi(n_i) \in N_i(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. So (by Lemma 3.1) the image of n_i in $(N_i/N_{i+1})(L)$ lies in $(N_i/N_{i+1})(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Since $N_i(\mathfrak{o}_L)$ maps onto $(N_i/N_{i+1})(\mathfrak{o}_L)$, we see that n_i can be written as $n_{i+1} n'_{\mathfrak{o}}$ with $n_{i+1} \in N_{i+1}(L)$ and $n'_{\mathfrak{o}} \in N_i(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Thus $n = n_{i+1} \cdot (n'_{\mathfrak{o}} n_{\mathfrak{o}}) \in N_{i+1}(L) N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$, as desired. \square

Now we are ready to prove the main theorem for split groups.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $g \in G(L)$ and suppose that

$$(3.2) \quad g^{-1} b \sigma(g) \in K_L \mu(\varpi) K_L,$$

where we have written K_L for $G(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Use the Iwasawa decomposition to write g as $m n k$ for $m \in M(L)$, $n \in N(L)$ and $k \in K_L$. It follows from (3.2) that

$$(3.3) \quad n_1 m_1 \in K_L \mu(\varpi) K_L,$$

where $m_1 := m^{-1} b \sigma(m) \in M(L)$ and $n_1 := n^{-1} m_1 \sigma(n) m_1^{-1} \in N(L)$. We claim that

$$(3.4) \quad w_M(b) = r_B(n_1 m_1),$$

with the right side being regarded as an element of X_M . Indeed,

$$(3.5) \quad w_M(b) = w_M(m_1) = r_{B \cap M}(m_1),$$

which in turn is equal to the image in X_M of $r_B(n_1 m_1)$.

We conclude from (2.6), (3.3), (3.4) that $w_M(b) \stackrel{P}{\leq} \mu$, which proves the first part of the theorem.

Now we prove the second part of the theorem. Under the hypothesis that $w_M(b) = \mu$ (and with g, m, n, m_1, n_1 as above), we must prove that $g \in M(L) \cdot K_L$. It follows from (3.3), (3.4) and Lemma 2.2 that $n_1 m_1 \in K_L \cdot M(L)$. Therefore $n_1 \in K_L \cdot M(L)$, say $n_1 = k_2 m_2$ with $k_2 \in K_L$ and $m_2 \in M(L)$. Then $n_1 m_2^{-1} \in P(\mathfrak{o}_L)$, and therefore $n_1 \in N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$ and $m_2 \in M(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Since $n_1 \in N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$, the second statement of Lemma 2.2 applies to $n_1 m_1$, and hence $m_1 \in M(\mathfrak{o}_L) \mu(\varpi) M(\mathfrak{o}_L)$.

Now applying Lemma 3.2 (not to the element b , but to its σ -conjugate m_1 , which satisfies the same hypotheses as b), we see that $n \in N(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. Therefore $g = m \cdot n k \in M(L) K_L$, and we are done, since we have already seen that

$$(3.6) \quad m^{-1} b \sigma(m) = m_1 \in M(\mathfrak{o}_L) \mu(\varpi) M(\mathfrak{o}_L).$$

\square

4. UNRAMIFIED GROUPS

It is easy to generalize Theorem 1.1 from the case of split groups to that of unramified groups, in other words, quasi-split groups G over F that split over L . There is no need to generalize the results in §2, since we will apply them to the group G over L , where it becomes split.

Continuing with unramified G , we will then determine precisely which affine Deligne-Lusztig sets (1.1) are non-empty, generalizing Proposition 4.6 of [KR].

4.1. Notation. We will now change notation slightly, to emphasize that our maximal torus is no longer assumed to be split. We consider a Borel subgroup $B = TU$ of G , where T is a maximal torus in B and U is the unipotent radical of B ; all these subgroups are assumed to be defined over \mathfrak{o} . In addition we fix a parabolic subgroup $P = MN$ containing B , with M containing T ; again all these subgroups are assumed to be defined over \mathfrak{o} .

We denote by A_P the maximal split torus in the center of M , and we write \mathfrak{a}_P for $X_*(A_P) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$. In the special case $P = B$, we often write A and \mathfrak{a} rather than A_B and \mathfrak{a}_B ; of course A is simply the maximal split torus in T . As usual we identify \mathfrak{a}_P with a subspace of \mathfrak{a} .

As before we denote by X_M the quotient of $X_*(T)$ by the coroot lattice for M . The Frobenius automorphism σ acts on X_M , and we denote by Y_M the coinvariants of σ on X_M . Thus Y_M is the quotient of X_M by the image of the homomorphism $1 - \sigma : X_M \rightarrow X_M$. We introduce a partial order on Y_M as follows: for $y_1, y_2 \in Y_M$ we say that $y_2 \preceq_P y_1$ if $y_1 - y_2$ is a non-negative integral linear combination of images in Y_M of coroots α^\vee corresponding to simple roots α of T in N .

We identify $Y_M \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$ with \mathfrak{a}_P , and we write Y_M^+ for the subset of Y_M consisting of those elements whose image in \mathfrak{a}_P lies in the cone

$$(4.1) \quad \mathfrak{a}_P^+ := \{x \in \mathfrak{a}_P : \langle \alpha, x \rangle > 0 \ \forall \text{ root } \alpha \text{ of } A_P \text{ in } N\}.$$

As in [Kot85]) the homomorphism $w_M : M(L) \rightarrow X_M$ induces a map

$$(4.2) \quad \kappa_M : B(M) \rightarrow Y_M.$$

Now we can generalize Theorem 1.1 to this more general context, with the affine Deligne-Lusztig sets $X_\mu^G(b)$ still defined by (1.1).

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mu \in X_*(T)$ be a dominant coweight, and let b be a basic element in $M(L)$ such that $\kappa_M(b) \in Y_M^+$.*

- (1) [RR96] *If $X_\mu^G(b)$ is non-empty, then $\kappa_M(b) \preceq_P \mu$. Here we are regarding μ as an element of Y_M .*
- (2) *Suppose that $\kappa_M(b) = \mu$ (with μ again regarded as an element of Y_M). Then the natural injection $X_\mu^M(b) \hookrightarrow X_\mu^G(b)$ is a bijection.*

Proof. The proof of part (1) is the same as the proof in the split case. The proof of part (2) is the same as in the split case, except for one new complication, which we will now explain. Suppose that $g \in G(L)$ represents an element of $X_\mu^G(b)$, so that

$$(4.3) \quad g^{-1}b\sigma(g) \in K_L\mu(\varpi)K_L,$$

where we have written K_L for $G(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. As before we use the Iwasawa decomposition to write g as mnk for $m \in M(L)$, $n \in N(L)$ and $k \in K_L$. It follows from (4.3) that

$$(4.4) \quad n_1 m_1 \in K_L \mu(\varpi) K_L,$$

where $m_1 := m^{-1} b \sigma(m) \in M(L)$ and $n_1 := n^{-1} m_1 \sigma(n) m_1^{-1} \in N(L)$. We need to prove that $g \in M(L) \cdot K_L$ (under the hypothesis that $\kappa_M(b) = \mu$). Denote by ν the image of $r_B(n_1 m_1)$ in X_M . As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, the elements ν , $w_M(b)$ of X_M have the same image in Y_M , and by hypothesis the image of $w_M(b)$ in Y_M is μ . We would like to apply Lemma 2.2 to the element $n_1 m_1$, but for this we would need to know that ν and μ are equal in X_M , while all we know at the moment is that they are equal in the quotient Y_M of X_M . However, by (4.4) and (2.6) we also know that $\nu \stackrel{P}{\leq} \mu$. Therefore Lemma 4.2 shows that $\nu = \mu$ in X_M , as desired. Thus we may apply Lemma 2.2 to the element $n_1 m_1$ in order to see that $n_1 m_1 \in K_L \cdot M(L)$. The rest of the proof is exactly the same as in the split case. Of course we need to appeal to Lemma 3.2, but its statement generalizes without change to the general unramified case, and its proof stays the same too, though one should note that the subgroups N_i used in the proof need to be chosen so as to be defined over \mathfrak{o} . \square

Next we prove the lemma we just used.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $x \in X_M$. Suppose that $x \stackrel{P}{\geq} 0$ and suppose further that the image of x in Y_M is 0. Then $x = 0$.*

Proof. Let X_M^G denote the kernel of the canonical surjection $X_M \rightarrow X_G$, so that we get a short exact sequence

$$(4.5) \quad 0 \rightarrow X_M^G \rightarrow X_M \rightarrow X_G \rightarrow 0.$$

Taking coinvariants for σ , we get an exact sequence

$$(4.6) \quad Y_M^G \rightarrow Y_M \rightarrow Y_G \rightarrow 0,$$

where Y_M^G denotes the coinvariants of σ on X_M^G .

Clearly X_M^G is a free abelian group on the set S of coroots α^\vee for simple roots α of T that occur in N , and σ permutes these basis elements. Therefore Y_M^G is a free abelian group on the set \bar{S} of orbits of σ on S . In particular Y_M^G is torsion-free, which implies that the map $Y_M^G \rightarrow Y_M$ is injective.

Now consider $x \in X_M$ such that $x \stackrel{P}{\geq} 0$. In particular x lies in the subgroup X_M^G . Consider the image y of x in Y_M . It is clear that y lies in the subgroup Y_M^G , and that its coefficients in the basis \bar{S} are given by summing over the orbits of σ on S the coefficients of x in the basis S ; since these latter coefficients are non-negative by our hypothesis that $x \stackrel{P}{\geq} 0$, we see that if $y = 0$, then $x = 0$ as well. \square

4.2. Non-emptiness of affine Deligne-Lusztig subsets of $G(L)/G(\mathfrak{o}_L)$. We will now determine when the affine Deligne-Lusztig set $X_\mu^G(b)$ (see (1.1)) is non-empty. The split case is treated in Proposition 4.6 of [KR], and we follow closely the method used there.

As in [KR], for $\mu \in X_*(T)$ we put

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{P}_\mu := \{\nu \in X_*(T) : \nu = \mu \text{ in } X_G, \text{ and } \nu \in \text{Conv}(W\mu)\}$$

where $\text{Conv}(W\mu)$ denotes the convex hull of the W -orbit $W\mu$ of μ in $X_*(T) \otimes \mathbf{R}$, W being the absolute Weyl group of T in G . With $P = MN$, Y_M as in 4.1 we

let $\mathcal{P}_{\mu,M}$ denote the subset of Y_M obtained as the image of \mathcal{P}_μ under the canonical surjection $X_*(T) \rightarrow Y_M$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $b \in M(L)$ be basic, and let $\mu \in X_*(T)$. Then $X_\mu^G(b)$ is non-empty if and only if $\kappa_M(b)$ lies in $\mathcal{P}_{\mu,M}$.*

Since every σ -conjugacy class in $G(L)$ contains an element that is basic in some standard Levi subgroup M (see [Kot85]), this theorem gives a complete answer to the question of when $X_\mu^G(b)$ is non-empty. The theorem follows immediately from the following three lemmas.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $b \in G(L)$ be basic. Then the σ -conjugacy class of b meets $K_L\mu(\varpi)K_L$ if and only if $\kappa_G(b)$ is equal to the image of μ in Y_M .*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Obvious, since the homomorphism w_G is trivial on K_L .

(\Leftarrow) We write $N(T)$ for the normalizer of T in G . Then we have an exact sequence

$$(4.8) \quad 1 \rightarrow T(\mathfrak{o}_L) \rightarrow N(T)(L) \rightarrow \tilde{W} \rightarrow 1,$$

where $\tilde{W} := W \ltimes X_*(T)$ is the extended affine Weyl group for G over L . Using this exact sequence, one sees without difficulty that the map $N(T)(L) \rightarrow \tilde{W}$ induces a bijection from $B(N(T))$ to the set of σ -conjugacy classes in the affine Weyl group \tilde{W} .

For $w \in W$ choose $\dot{w} \in N(T)(\mathfrak{o}_L)$ such that $\dot{w} \mapsto w$. Associated (see [Kot85]) to the element $b' := \mu(\varpi)\dot{w}$ of $N(T)(L)$ is a homomorphism $\nu : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow N(T)$, where \mathbf{D} is the diagonalizable group with character group \mathbf{Q} . It is easy to calculate ν . Indeed, choose a positive integer r such that $(w\sigma)^r = \sigma^r$. We use w to twist the action of σ on T , obtaining a new unramified torus T_w which becomes equal to T over the fixed field F_r of σ^r in L , but for which the action of σ is now given by $w\sigma$ rather than σ . Thus $X_*(T_w)$ coincides with $X_*(T)$ as an abelian group, but σ acts by $w\sigma$ rather than σ . From this point of view, the homomorphism $\nu : \mathbf{D} \rightarrow N(T)$ may be regarded as an element of $\text{Hom}(\mathbf{D}, T_w)$, or in other words as an element in $X_*(T) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ fixed by $w\sigma$, the explicit formula for ν being given by

$$(4.9) \quad r^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^r (w\sigma)^i(\mu) \in X_*(T) \otimes \mathbf{Q}.$$

The remarks above are valid for any $w \in W$. The well-known fact that semisimple groups over finite fields have anisotropic maximal tori translates into the fact that there exists $w \in W$ for which the torus T_w is anisotropic modulo the center of G ; for the rest of this proof we work with such an element w . In this case ν is forced to be central in G , and therefore the element $b' = \mu(\varpi)\dot{w}$ is basic in $G(L)$. It is obvious from the form of b' that $\kappa_G(b') = \mu$. By hypothesis b is basic and $\kappa_G(b) = \mu$. Therefore [Kot85] b is σ -conjugate in $G(L)$ to b' . From the form of b' it is obvious that b' lies in the K_L -double coset of $\mu(\varpi)$. This concludes the proof. \square

As in [KR] for $\mu \in X_*(T)$ we denote by $M(\mu)$ the image of $K_L\mu(\varpi)K_L \cap P(L)$ under the canonical surjection $P(L) \rightarrow M(L)$; obviously $M(\mu)$ is a union of $M(\mathfrak{o}_L)$ -double cosets.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $b \in M(L)$ and let $\mu \in X_*(T)$. Then the following three conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) The σ -conjugacy class of b in $G(L)$ meets $K_L\mu(\varpi)K_L$.
- (2) The σ -conjugacy class of b in $P(L)$ meets $K_L\mu(\varpi)K_L \cap P(L)$.
- (3) The σ -conjugacy class of b in $M(L)$ meets $M(\mu)$.

Proof. The equivalence of the first two conditions is clear from the Iwasawa decomposition $G(L) = K_L P(L)$. The equivalence of the second two conditions follows from the fact [Kot97, 3.6] that $B(P) \rightarrow B(M)$ is a bijection. \square

Lemma 4.6. *The set $w_M(M(\mu))$ is equal to the image of \mathcal{P}_μ under the canonical surjection $X_*(T) \rightarrow X_M$.*

Proof. This is Lemma 4.5 of [KR], which can be applied since G splits over L . Note that the assumption, made at the beginning of §4 of [KR], that the derived group of G be simply connected was made merely for convenience; in particular it was not used in the proof of Lemma 4.5. \square

4.3. Remarks concerning the converse to Mazur's inequality. Let b, μ be as in Theorem 4.1. Mazur's inequality (in other words the first part of that theorem) says that if $X_\mu^G(b)$ is non-empty, then $\kappa_M(b) \overset{P}{\preceq} \mu$, where μ is being regarded an element of Y_M . Thus the converse to Mazur's inequality is the statement, only known to be true in certain cases, that if $\kappa_M(b) \overset{P}{\preceq} \mu$, then $X_\mu^G(b)$ is non-empty. Since Theorem 4.3 does tell us exactly when $X_\mu^G(b)$ is non-empty, proving the converse to Mazur's inequality is the same as proving that $\kappa_M(b) \overset{P}{\preceq} \mu$ is equivalent to $\kappa_M(b) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mu,M}$. Thus, in order to prove the converse to Mazur's inequality in general, it would be enough to answer the following question about root systems affirmatively.

Question 4.7. Let $\mu \in X_*(T)$ be a dominant coweight and let $\nu \in Y_M^+$. Are the following two conditions equivalent?

- (1) $\nu \overset{P}{\preceq} \mu$
- (2) $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_{\mu,M}$

It is immediate that the second condition implies the first. The challenge is to prove that the first condition implies the second; this was done for GL_n and GSp_{2n} in [KR] and for all split classical groups in [Lei02]; non-split groups have not been examined yet.

4.4. Comparison with [RR96, 4.2]. Condition (1) in Question 4.7 looks superficially different from the one used in [RR96] (and also used to define the set $B(G, \mu)$ in [Kot97]), but in fact it is equivalent, as we now check (see Proposition 4.10 below).

This equivalent condition involves some additional notation. We write $X_{\mathbf{R}}$ for the real vector space $X_*(T) \otimes \mathbf{R}$. We identify \mathfrak{a} with the subspace of σ -fixed vectors in $X_{\mathbf{R}}$, and we view \mathfrak{a} as a direct summand of $X_{\mathbf{R}}$, the projection map $X_{\mathbf{R}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$, denoted $x \mapsto x^\flat$, being given by averaging over orbits of σ . We have already identified \mathfrak{a}_P with a subspace of \mathfrak{a} . In fact we view \mathfrak{a}_P as a direct summand of \mathfrak{a} , the projection map $pr_M : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}_P$ being given by averaging over the relative Weyl group $W_{M(F)}$ of T in M . As usual we identify $W_{M(F)}$ with the fixed points of σ in the absolute Weyl group W_M of T in M .

The partial order \leq^B on $X_*(T)$ extends as usual to a partial order on $X_{\mathbf{R}}$, which we will denote simply by \leq ; thus for $x, y \in X_{\mathbf{R}}$ the inequality $x \leq y$ means that $y - x$ is a non-negative real linear combination of simple coroots.

Recall that we have already identified $Y_M \otimes \mathbf{R}$ with \mathfrak{a}_P . For $\nu \in Y_M$ we denote by $\bar{\nu}$ the image of ν in \mathfrak{a}_P (which lets us view $\bar{\nu}$ as an element in $X_{\mathbf{R}}$, as we will do in the next lemma).

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\nu \in Y_M$. Then $\nu \succ^P 0$ if and only if $\bar{\nu} \geq 0$ and the image of ν in Y_G is 0.*

Proof. Exercise. □

Lemma 4.9. *Let x be a dominant element of $X_{\mathbf{R}}$, and let $y \in \mathfrak{a}_P$. Then $y \leq x^b$ if and only if $y \leq pr_M(x^b)$.*

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Apply pr_M to the inequality $y \leq x^b$, using that pr_M preserves \leq .

(\Leftarrow) This follows from the fact that $pr_M(x^b) \leq x^b$, a consequence of the inequalities $wx^b \leq x^b$ for $w \in W_{M(F)}$, which hold since x^b is dominant. □

Proposition 4.10. *Let $\mu \in X_*(T)$ be a dominant coweight and let $\nu \in Y_M$. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\nu \preccurlyeq^P \mu$.
- (2) μ, ν have the same image in Y_G , and $\bar{\nu} \leq \mu^b$.

Proof. This follows from Lemmas 4.8 and 4.9. □

REFERENCES

- [Art76] J. Arthur, *The characters of discrete series as orbital integrals*, Invent. Math. **32** (1976), 205–261.
- [BT72] F. Bruhat and J. Tits, *Groupes réductifs sur un corps local. I*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **41** (1972), 5–251.
- [Lei02] C. Leigh, *A converse to Mazur’s inequality for split classical groups*, preprint, 2002, arXiv:math.NT/0211327.
- [FR02] J.-M. Fontaine and M. Rapoport, *Existence de filtrations admissibles sur des isocristaux*, preprint, 2002, arXiv:math.NT/0204293.
- [HC66] Harish-Chandra, *Discrete series for semisimple Lie groups II*, Acta Math. **116** (1966), 1–111.
- [Kat79] N. Katz, *Slope filtration of F -crystals*, Astérisque **63** (1979), 113–163.
- [Kot85] R. Kottwitz, *Isocrystals with additional structure*, Compositio Math. **56** (1985), 201–220.
- [Kot97] R. Kottwitz, *Isocrystals with additional structure. II*, Compositio Math. **109** (1997), 255–339.
- [KR] R. Kottwitz and M. Rapoport, *On the existence of F -crystals*, to appear in Comment. Math. Helv., arXiv:math.NT/0202229.
- [Rap02] M. Rapoport, *A guide to the reduction modulo p of Shimura varieties*, preprint, 2002, arXiv:math.AG/0205022.
- [RR96] M. Rapoport and M. Richartz, *On the classification and specialization of F -isocrystals with additional structure*, Compositio Math. **103** (1996), 153–181.

E-mail address: kottwitz@math.uchicago.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 5734 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637