

RATIONALITY PROPERTIES OF UNIPOTENT REPRESENTATIONS

G. LUSZTIG

INTRODUCTION

0.1. Let \mathbf{k} be an algebraic closure of a finite field F_q with q elements. Let G be a connected simple algebraic group of adjoint type over \mathbf{k} with a fixed F_q -rational structure; let $F : G \rightarrow G$ be the corresponding Frobenius map. The fixed point set G^F is a finite group. Let W be the Weyl group of G . For $w \in W$ let R_w be the character of the virtual representation $R^1(w)$ of G^F defined in [DL, 1.5]. (The definition of R_w is in terms of l -adic cohomology but in fact R_w has integer values and is independent of l , see [DL, 3.3].) An irreducible representation ρ of G^F over \mathbf{C} is said to be *unipotent* if its character $\chi_\rho : G^F \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ occurs with $\neq 0$ multiplicity in R_w for some $w \in W$ (see [DL, 7.8]). Let \mathcal{U} be the set of isomorphism classes of unipotent representations of G^F . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}} = \{\rho \in \mathcal{U} \mid \chi_\rho(g) \in \mathbf{Q} \ \forall g \in G^F\}$. Let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ be the set of all $\rho \in \mathcal{U}$ such that ρ is defined over \mathbf{Q} (that is, it can be realized by a $\mathbf{Q}[G^F]$ -module). We have $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}} \subset \mathcal{U}$.

Unless otherwise specified, we assume that G is *split over* F_q . The following is one of our results.

Theorem 0.2. *We have $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}} = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$.*

0.3. We will also show (see 1.12) that, if G is of type A, B, C or D , then $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathcal{U}$. (The analogous statement is false for exceptional types.) The rationality of certain unipotent cuspidal representations connected with Coxeter elements has been proved in [L1]. The method of [L1] has been extended in [L3] (unpublished) to determine explicitly $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ in the general case (including non-split groups). The case where G is non-split of type A has been also considered by Ohmori [Oh] by another extension of the method of [L1].

Our study of rationality of unipotent representations is based on the statement that a given unipotent representation appears with multiplicity 1 in some (possibly virtual) representation R defined using l -adic cohomology and then using the Hasse principle. In the first method (that of [L3]), R is a particular intersection cohomology space of a variety; see Sec.1. In the second method (which applies

Supported by the National Science Foundation

only in the cuspidal case), R will be one of the R_w above; see Sec.2. In one case ($G = SO_5$ with q odd), we give an elementary approach to rationality (without using the Hasse principle); see Sec.3.

1. FIRST METHOD

1.1. Let p be the characteristic of F_q . For any prime number $l \neq p$, we choose an imbedding of the field \mathbf{Q}_l , the l -adic numbers, into \mathbf{C} . This allows us to regard any representation of G^F over \mathbf{Q}_l as one over \mathbf{C} . Let X be the flag manifold of G ; let $F : X \rightarrow X$ be the map induced by $F : G \rightarrow G$. For $w \in W$ let O_w be the set of all $(B, B') \in X \times X$ that are in relative position w . As in [DL], for any $w \in W$, let X_w be the subvariety of X consisting of all $B \in X$ such that $(B, F(B)) \in O_w$; let \bar{X}_w be the closure of X_w in X . Then X_w, \bar{X}_w are stable under the conjugation action of G^F on X . Hence for any $j \in \mathbf{Z}$ there is an induced action of G^F on the l -adic cohomology with compact support $H_c^j(X_w, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ and on the l -adic intersection cohomology $\mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_w, \mathbf{Q}_l)$. (Note that \bar{X}_w has pure dimension $l(w)$ where $l : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is the length function.) Recall that R_w is the character of the virtual representation $\sum_{j \in \mathbf{Z}} (-1)^j H_c^j(X_w, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ of G^F .

Lemma 1.2. *Let $\rho \in \mathcal{U}$. There exists $x \in W$ and $j \in [0, l(x)]$ such that ρ appears with multiplicity 1 in the G^F -module $\mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$.*

The proof is based on results of [L2]. For any $x \in W$ let \mathcal{A}_x be the virtual representation of W defined in [L2, p.154,156]. For any virtual representation E of W we set $R_E = |W|^{-1} \sum_{w \in W} \text{tr}(w, E) R_w$. (A \mathbf{Q} -valued class function on G^F .) Thus, $R_{\mathcal{A}_x}$ is defined. Let $a : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ be as in [L2, p.178]. Assume that

(a) $x \in W$ is such that ρ appears with multiplicity 1 in $(-1)^{l(x)-a(x)} R_{\mathcal{A}_x}$. Then from [L2, 6.15, 6.17(i), 5.13(i)] we deduce that ρ appears with multiplicity 1 in $\mathbf{H}^{l(x)-a(x)}(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$. (Actually, in the references given, q is assumed to be sufficiently large; but this assumption is removed later in [L2].) Thus, to prove the lemma it is enough to show that (a) holds for some $x \in W$. Now in [L2], the multiplicities of any unipotent representation in $(-1)^{l(x)-a(x)} R_{\mathcal{A}_x}$ have been explicitly described for many x . (See for example the tables in [L2, p.304-306] for types E_8, F_4 and the results in [L2, Ch.9] for classical types.) In particular, we see that (a) holds for some $x \in W$.

Lemma 1.3. *Let $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Let l be a prime number invertible in \mathbf{k} . Let x, j be as in 1.2.*

- (a) ρ is defined over \mathbf{Q}_l .
- (b) If j is even then ρ is defined over \mathbf{R} . If j is odd then ρ is not defined over \mathbf{R} .
- (c) If j is even then $\rho \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

Clearly, (a) follows from 1.2. We prove (b). Let $c \in H^2(\bar{X}_w, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ be the Chern class of an ample line bundle on \bar{X}_w (we ignore Tate twists); we may assume that this line bundle is the restriction of a line bundle on X . Since G^F acts

trivially on $H^2(X, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ it follows that c is G^F -stable. Hence the map $\mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^{2l(x)-j}(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ given by $\xi \mapsto c^{l(x)-j}\xi$ is compatible with the G^F -action. This map is an isomorphism, by the Hard Lefschetz Theorem [BBD, 5.4.10]. Let $(,) : \mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l) \times \mathbf{H}^{2l(x)-j}(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_l$ be the Poincaré duality pairing. (We again ignore Tate twists.) Then $\xi, \xi' \mapsto (\xi, c^{l(x)-j}\xi')$ is a $(-1)^j$ -symmetric, non-singular, G^F -invariant bilinear form $\mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l) \times \mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_l$. This restricts to a $(-1)^j$ -symmetric, G^F -invariant bilinear form on the ρ -isotypic part of $\mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$, which is non-singular, since ρ is isomorphic to its dual (recall that $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$). This ρ -isotypic part is isomorphic to ρ and (b) follows. Under the assumption of (c), we see from (a),(b), using the Hasse principle for division algebras with centre \mathbf{Q} that ρ is defined over \mathbf{Q} . (The Hasse principle is applicable even when information is missing at one place, in our case at p -adic numbers.) The lemma is proved.

Lemma 1.4. *Let $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Let x, j be as in 1.2. Then j is even.*

It is known [L2] that the parity of an integer j such that ρ appears with non-zero multiplicity in $\mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ for some $x \in W$ is an invariant of ρ . Moreover, j is even except if G is of type E_7 and ρ is one the two unipotent cuspidal representations or G is of type E_8 and ρ is a component of the representation induced by one of the two unipotent cuspidal representations of a parabolic of type E_7 . (See [L2, Ch.11].) In these exceptional cases, we have $\rho \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$, as one sees using [L2, 11.2]. The lemma is proved.

1.5. Now Theorem 0.2 follows immediately from 1.3(c) and 1.4.

1.6. Let \mathcal{X} be the set of all triples (\mathcal{F}, y, σ) where \mathcal{F} is a "family" [L2, 4.2] of irreducible representations of W (with an associated finite group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}}$, see [L2, Ch.4]), y is an element of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}}$ defined up to conjugacy and σ is an irreducible representation of the centralizer of y in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}}$ defined up to isomorphism. For $(\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma) \in \mathcal{X}$, let $\lambda_{y,\sigma}$ be the scalar by which y acts on σ (a root of 1). Let \mathcal{X}_1 be the set of all $(\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma) \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $|\mathcal{F}| \neq 2$ and $\lambda_{y,\sigma} = \pm 1$. If q is a square, let \mathcal{X}_2 be the set of all $(\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma) \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $|\mathcal{F}| = 2, y = 1$. If q is not a square, let $\mathcal{X}_2 = \emptyset$. In any case, \mathcal{X}_2 is empty unless G is of type E_7 or E_8 . Let $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2$.

In [L2, 4.23], \mathcal{X} is put in a bijection

$$(a) \quad (\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma) \leftrightarrow \rho_{\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma}$$

with \mathcal{U} .

Lemma 1.7. *Assume that $\rho = \rho_{\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma}$, $\rho' = \rho_{\mathcal{F}', y', \sigma'}$ where $(\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma) \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{Q}}$, $(\mathcal{F}', y', \sigma') \in \mathcal{X}$ are distinct. Then there exists $x \in W$ such that ρ, ρ' have different multiplicities in the G^F -module $(-1)^{l(x)-a(x)} R_{\mathcal{A}_x}$.*

As mentioned in the proof of 1.2, the multiplicities of various unipotent representations have been explicitly computed in [L2] for many $x \in W$. From this the lemma follows easily.

Lemma 1.8. *Let $\rho = \rho_{\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma}$, where $(\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma) \in \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Then $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$.*

Let $\gamma \in \text{Gal}(\mathbf{C}/\mathbf{Q})$. Then $\gamma(\chi_{\rho}) = \chi_{\rho'}$ for some $\rho' \in \mathcal{U}$. Since the character of $(-1)^{l(x)-a(x)}R_{\mathcal{A}_x}$ is integer valued, it is fixed by γ . (Here x is any element of W .) Hence ρ, ρ' have the same multiplicity in $(-1)^{l(x)-a(x)}R_{\mathcal{A}_x}$. From 1.7 it follows that $\rho = \rho'$. Thus, $\gamma(\chi_{\rho}) = \chi_{\rho}$ for any $\gamma \in \text{Gal}(\mathbf{C}/\mathbf{Q})$, so that χ_{ρ} has rational values. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 1.9. *Let $\rho = \rho_{\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma}$, where $(\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma) \notin \mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Then $\rho \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$.*

Assume first that $\lambda_{y, \sigma} \neq \pm 1$. Then $\lambda_{y, \sigma} \notin \mathbf{Q}$ hence there exists $\gamma \in \text{Gal}(\mathbf{C}/\mathbf{Q})$ such that $\gamma(\lambda_{y, \sigma}) \neq \lambda_{y, \sigma}$. Using the interpretation of $\lambda_{y, \sigma}$ given in [L2, 11.2], it follows that $\gamma(\chi_{\rho}) \neq \chi_{\rho}$. Hence $\rho \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Next assume that $\lambda_{y, \sigma} = \pm 1$. Then $|\mathcal{F}| = 2$. Moreover, if q is a square, then $y \neq 1$. Let σ' be the character of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$ other than σ . Let $\rho' = \rho_{\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma'}$. If $y \neq 1$, then by the results of [L1], χ_{ρ} is carried to $\chi_{\rho'}$ by an element of $\text{Gal}(\mathbf{C}/\mathbf{Q})$ that takes $\sqrt{-q}$ to $-\sqrt{-q}$. If $y = 1$, then by the known construction of representations of Hecke algebras in terms of W -graphs, χ_{ρ} is carried to $\chi_{\rho'}$ by an element of $\text{Gal}(\mathbf{C}/\mathbf{Q})$ that takes \sqrt{q} to $-\sqrt{q}$. Hence again $\rho \notin \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

Proposition 1.10. *Under the bijection $\mathcal{X} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{U}$ in 1.6(a), the subset $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ of \mathcal{U} corresponds to the subset $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ of \mathcal{X} .*

This follows immediately from 1.9, 1.10.

Combining this proposition with 0.2, we obtain:

Corollary 1.11. *Under the bijection $\mathcal{X} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{U}$ in 1.6(a), the subset $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ of \mathcal{U} corresponds to the subset $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ of \mathcal{X} .*

If G is of type A, B, C or D , then for any family \mathcal{F} we have $|\mathcal{F}| \neq 2$ and the group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is an elementary abelian 2-group hence $\lambda_{y, \sigma} = \pm 1$ for any $(\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma) \in \mathcal{X}$. Thus, we have $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathcal{X}$ and we obtain:

Corollary 1.12. *If G is of type A, B, C or D , then $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathcal{U}$.*

1.13. In this subsection we assume that G is non-split. The analogues of Lemmas 1.2, 1.3 continue to hold but that of Lemma 1.4 does not. (It does in type D but not in type A .) Also, if G is non-split of type D , then $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathcal{U}$. If G is non-split of type A we have $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathcal{U}$ but $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}} \neq \mathcal{U}$ in general.

2. SECOND METHOD

2.1. Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a$ be a sequence of integers such that

$$(a) \quad \sum_i \lambda_i = n + \binom{a}{2}.$$

We define a virtual representation $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a]$ of the symmetric group S_n as follows. If $0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_a$, then $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a]$ is the irreducible representation of S_n corresponding to the partition $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 - 1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_a - a + 1$ of n , as in [L2, p.81]. If $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a$ are in \mathbf{N} and are distinct, then

$$[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a] = \text{sgn}(\sigma)[\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \lambda_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(a)}]$$

where σ is the unique permutation of $1, 2, \dots, a$ such that $\lambda_{\sigma(1)} < \lambda_{\sigma(2)} < \dots < \lambda_{\sigma(a)}$. If $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a$ are not distinct, or if at least one of them is < 0 , we set $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a] = 0$. From the definition we see easily that

$$[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a] = [0, \lambda_1 + 1, \lambda_2 + 1, \dots, \lambda_a + 1]$$

for any sequence of integers $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a$ such that (a) holds.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a$ be a sequence of integers such that 2.1(a) holds. Let $w = (k)w' \in S_k \times S_{n-k} \subset S_n$ where (k) denotes a k -cycle in S_k and $w' \in S_{n-k}$. We have*

$$(a) \quad \text{tr}(w, [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a]) = \sum_{i=1}^a \text{tr}(w', [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_i - k, \lambda_{i+1}, \dots, \lambda_a]).$$

If the λ_i are not distinct or if at least one of them is < 0 then both sides of (a) are 0. We may assume that $0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_a$. In this case, (a) can be seen to be equivalent to Murnaghan's rule, see [W].

2.3. For $n \geq 0$ let W_n be the group of all permutations of $1, 2, \dots, n, n', \dots, 2', 1'$ which commute with the involution $i \leftrightarrow i'$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. (We have $W_0 = \{1\}$.) Given two sequences of integers $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_a$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_b$ such that

$$(a) \quad \sum_i \lambda_i + \sum_i \mu_i = n + \binom{a}{2} + \binom{b}{2},$$

we define a virtual representation

$$(b) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_a \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_b \end{bmatrix}$$

of W_n as follows. If the λ_i are not distinct or if the μ_i are not distinct or if at least one of the λ_i or μ_i is < 0 we define (b) to be 0. Assume now that the $\lambda_i \in \mathbf{N}$ are distinct, and that the $\mu_i \in \mathbf{N}$ are distinct. Then r, \tilde{r} defined by

$$\sum_i \lambda_i = r + \binom{a}{2}, \quad \sum_i \mu_i = \tilde{r} + \binom{b}{2}$$

satisfy $r, \tilde{r} \in \mathbf{N}, r + \tilde{r} = n$. We identify $W_r \times W_{\tilde{r}}$ with a subgroup of W_n as in [L2, p.82]. The virtual representation $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a] \boxtimes [\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_b]$ of $S_r \times S_{\tilde{r}}$ may be regarded as a virtual representation of $W_r \times W_{\tilde{r}}$ via the obvious projection $W_r \times W_{\tilde{r}} \rightarrow S_r \times S_{\tilde{r}}$ (see [L2, p.82]). We tensor this with the one dimensional character of $W_r \times W_{\tilde{r}}$ which is the identity on the W_r -factor and is the restriction of $\chi : W_n \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ (see [L2, p.82]) on the $W_{\tilde{r}}$ -factor. Inducing the resulting virtual representation from $W_r \times W_{\tilde{r}}$ to W_n , we obtain the virtual representation (b) of W_n . Note that if $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_a$ and $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots < \mu_b$ then this is an irreducible representation; if σ is a permutation of $1, 2, \dots, a$ and σ' is a permutation of $1, 2, \dots, b$ then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{\sigma(1)} & \lambda_{\sigma(2)} & \dots & \lambda_{\sigma(a)} \\ \mu_{\sigma'(1)} & \mu_{\sigma'(2)} & \dots & \mu_{\sigma'(b)} \end{bmatrix} = \text{sgn}(\sigma)\text{sgn}(\sigma') \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_a \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_b \end{bmatrix}.$$

From the definition we see easily that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_a \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_1+1 & \lambda_2+1 & \dots & \lambda_a+1 \\ 0 & \mu_1+1 & \mu_2+1 & \dots & \mu_b+1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_a$ and $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_b$ be two sequences of integers such that 2.3(a) holds. Let $w = (2k) \times w' \in W_k \times W_{n-k} \subset W_n$ where $0 < k \leq n$, $(2k)$ denotes an element of W_k whose image under the obvious imbedding $W_k \subset S_{2k}$ is a $2k$ -cycle and $w' \in W_{n-k}$ has no cycles of length $2k$ as an element of S_{2n-2k} . We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(w, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_a \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_b \end{bmatrix}) &= \sum_{i=1}^a \text{tr}(w', \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{i-1} & \lambda_i-k & \lambda_{i+1} & \dots & \lambda_a \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_b & & & & \end{bmatrix}) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^a \text{tr}(w', \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_a \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_{i-1} & \mu_i-k & \mu_{i+1} & \dots & \mu_b \end{bmatrix}). \end{aligned}$$

This follows from Lemma 2.2, using the definitions.

2.5. Let $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and let $n = m^2 + m$. Let $w_m \in W_n$ be an element whose image under the imbedding $W_n \subset S_{2n} = S_{2(m^2+m)}$ is a product of cycles

$$(4)(8)(12)\dots(4m).$$

Let

$$(a) \quad \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_{m+1} \text{ and } \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots < \mu_m$$

be two sequences of integers such that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{m+1}, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_m$ is a permutation of $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, 2m$. Then 2.3(a) holds (with $a = m+1, b = m$ and $n = m^2 + m$). Consider the property

$$(*) \quad \lambda_i + \lambda_j \neq 2m \text{ for any } i \neq j \text{ and } \mu_i + \mu_j \neq 2m \text{ for any } i \neq j.$$

Lemma 2.6. *In the setup of 2.5, if $(*)$ holds, then*

$$\mathrm{tr}(w_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = (-1)^{(m^2+m)/2}.$$

If $()$ does not hold, then $\mathrm{tr}(w_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = 0$.*

We argue by induction on m . The result is clear when $m = 0$. Assume now that $m > 0$. We can assume that $w_m = (4m)w_{m-1} \in W_{2m} \times W_{n-2m} \subset W_n$ where $w_{m-1} \in W_{n-2m}$ is defined in a way similar to w_m . We apply 2.4 with $w = w_m, k = 2m, w' = w_{m-1}$. Note that in the formula in 2.4, at most one term is non-zero, namely the one in which $k = 2m$ is subtracted from the largest entry λ_i or μ_i (the other terms are zero since they contain some < 0 entry). We are in one of the four cases below.

Case 1. $2m = \lambda_{m+1}, 0 = \mu_1$.

Using 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \mathrm{tr}(w_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = \mathrm{tr}(w_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m & 0 \end{bmatrix}) \\ &= (-1)^m \mathrm{tr}(w_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m \\ 0 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m & 0 \end{bmatrix}) = (-1)^m \mathrm{tr}(w_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1-1 & \lambda_2-1 & \dots & \lambda_m-1 \\ \mu_2-1 & \mu_3-1 & \dots & \mu_m-1 \end{bmatrix}). \end{aligned}$$

Now the induction hypothesis is applicable to

$$(a) \quad \lambda_1 - 1 < \lambda_2 - 1 < \dots < \lambda_m - 1 \text{ and } \mu_2 - 1 < \mu_3 - 1 < \dots < \mu_m - 1$$

instead of 2.5(a). (Clearly, 2.5(a) satisfies $(*)$ if and only if (a) satisfies the analogous condition). Hence, if 2.5(a) satisfies $(*)$, then

$$A = (-1)^m (-1)^{(m^2-m)/2} = (-1)^{(m^2+m)/2}$$

as required. If 2.5(a) does not satisfy $(*)$, then $A = (-1)^m 0 = 0$, as required.

Case 2. $2m = \lambda_{m+1}, 0 = \lambda_1$.

Using 2.4, we have

$$\mathrm{tr}(w_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = \mathrm{tr}(w_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m & 0 \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m & 0 \end{bmatrix})$$

and this is 0 since 0 appears twice in the top row.

Case 3. $2m = \mu_m, 0 = \lambda_1$.

Using 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \mathrm{tr}(w_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = -\mathrm{tr}(w_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_{m-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}) \\ &= (-1)^m \mathrm{tr}(w_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m & \lambda_{m+1} \\ 0 & \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_{m-1} \end{bmatrix}) \\ &= (-1)^m \mathrm{tr}(w_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2-1 & \dots & \lambda_m-1 & \lambda_{m+1}-1 \\ \mu_1-1 & \mu_2-1 & \dots & \mu_{m-1}-1 \end{bmatrix}). \end{aligned}$$

Now the induction hypothesis is applicable to

$$(b) \quad \lambda_2 - 1 < \cdots < \lambda_m - 1 < \lambda_{m+1} - 1 \text{ and } \mu_1 - 1 < \mu_2 - 1 < \cdots < \mu_{m-1} - 1$$

instead of 2.5(a). (Clearly, 2.5(a) satisfies $(*)$ if and only if (b) satisfies the analogous condition.) Hence, if 2.5(a) satisfies $(*)$, then

$$A = (-1)^m (-1)^{(m^2-m)/2} = (-1)^{(m^2+m)/2}$$

as required. If 2.5(a) does not satisfy $(*)$, then $A = (-1)^m 0 = 0$, as required.

Case 4. $2m = \mu_m, 0 = \mu_1$.

Using 2.4, we have

$$\text{tr}(w_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \cdots & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \cdots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = -\text{tr}(w_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \cdots & \lambda_m & \lambda_{m+1} \\ 0 & \mu_2 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix})$$

and this is 0 since 0 appears twice in the bottom row. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.7. *In the setup of 2.6, if $(*)$ holds, then*

$$\sharp(k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}; \mu_k = \text{even}) = (m^2 + m)/2 \pmod{2}.$$

Since $(*)$ holds, the left hand side is equal to the number of pairs

$$(0, 2m), (1, 2m-1), (2, 2m-2), \dots, (m-1, m+1)$$

in which both components are even. This equals $m/2$ if m is even and $(m+1)/2$ if m is odd. Hence it has the same parity as $m(m+1)/2$. The lemma is proved.

2.8. Let $m \in \mathbf{N}, m \geq 1$ and let $n = m^2$. Let $w'_m \in W_n$ be an element whose image under the imbedding $W_n \subset S_{2n} = S_{2m^2}$ is a product of cycles

$$(2)(6)(10) \dots (4m-2).$$

Let

$$(a) \quad \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \cdots < \lambda_m \text{ and } \mu_1 < \mu_2 < \cdots < \mu_m$$

be two sequences of integers such that $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_m$ is a permutation of $0, 1, 2, \dots, 2m-1$. Then 2.3(a) holds (with $a = b = m$ and $n = m^2$). Let

$$(b) \quad N = \sharp(k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}; \mu_k \geq m).$$

Consider the property

$$(**) \quad \lambda_i + \lambda_j \neq 2m-1 \text{ for any } i \neq j \text{ and } \mu_i + \mu_j \neq 2m-1 \text{ for any } i \neq j.$$

Lemma 2.9. *In the setup of 2.8, if $(**)$ holds, then*

$$\mathrm{tr}(w'_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = (-1)^{N+m(m-1)/2}.$$

*If $(**)$ does not hold, then $\mathrm{tr}(w'_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = 0$.*

We argue by induction on m . The result is clear when $m = 1$. Assume now that $m > 1$. We can assume that $w'_m = (4m - 2)w'_{m-1} \in W_{2m-1} \times W_{n-2m+1} \subset W_n$ where $w'_{m-1} \in W_{n-2m+1}$ is defined in a way similar to w'_m . We apply 2.4 with $w = w'_m, k = 2m - 1, w' = w'_{m-1}$. Note that in the formula in 2.4, at most one term is non-zero, namely the one in which $k = 2m - 1$ is subtracted from the largest entry λ_i or μ_i (the other terms are zero since they contain some < 0 entry). We are in one of the four cases below.

Case 1. $2m - 1 = \lambda_m, 0 = \mu_1$.

Using 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \mathrm{tr}(w'_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = \mathrm{tr}(w'_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) \\ &= (-1)^{m-1} \mathrm{tr}(w'_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m-1} \\ 0 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) \\ &= (-1)^{m-1} \mathrm{tr}(w'_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1-1 & \lambda_2-1 & \dots & \lambda_{m-1}-1 \\ \mu_2-1 & \mu_3-1 & \dots & \mu_m-1 \end{bmatrix}). \end{aligned}$$

Now the induction hypothesis is applicable to

$$(a) \quad \lambda_1 - 1 < \lambda_2 - 1 < \dots < \lambda_{m-1} - 1 \text{ and } \mu_2 - 1 < \mu_3 - 1 < \dots < \mu_m - 1$$

instead of 2.8(a). (Clearly, 2.8(a) satisfies $(**)$ if and only if (a) satisfies the analogous condition). Let N' be defined as N in 2.8(b), in terms of (a). Then $N' = N$. If 2.8(a) satisfies $(**)$, then

$$A = (-1)^{m-1} (-1)^{(m-1)(m-2)/2} (-1)^{N'} = (-1)^{m(m-1)/2} (-1)^N$$

as required. If 2.8(a) does not satisfy $(**)$, then $A = (-1)^{m-1} 0 = 0$, as required.

Case 2. $2m - 1 = \lambda_m, 0 = \lambda_1$.

Using 2.4, we have

$$\mathrm{tr}(w'_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = \mathrm{tr}(w'_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m-1} & 0 \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix})$$

and this is 0 since 0 appears twice in the top row.

Case 3. $2m - 1 = \mu_m, 0 = \lambda_1$.

Using 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \mathrm{tr}(w'_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = -\mathrm{tr}(w'_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_{m-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}) \\ &= (-1)^m \mathrm{tr}(w'_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_m \\ 0 & \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_{m-1} \end{bmatrix}) \\ &= (-1)^m \mathrm{tr}(w'_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_2-1 & \dots & \lambda_{m-1}-1 \\ \mu_1-1 & \mu_2-1 & \dots & \mu_{m-1}-1 \end{bmatrix}). \end{aligned}$$

Now the induction hypothesis is applicable to

$$(b) \quad \lambda_2 - 1 < \lambda_3 - 1 < \cdots < \lambda_m - 1 \text{ and } \mu_1 - 1 < \mu_2 - 1 < \cdots < \mu_{m-1} - 1$$

instead of 2.8(a). (Clearly, 2.8(a) satisfies $(**)$ if and only if (b) satisfies the analogous condition.) Let N' be defined as N in 2.8(b), in terms of (b). Then $N' = N - 1$. If 2.8(a) satisfies $(**)$, then

$$A = (-1)^m (-1)^{(m-2)(m-1)/2} (-1)^{N'} = (-1)^{m(m-1)/2} (-1)^N$$

as required. If 2.8(a) does not satisfy $(**)$, then $A = (-1)^m 0 = 0$, as required.

Case 4. $2m - 1 = \mu_m, 0 = \mu_1$.

Using 2.4, we have

$$\text{tr}(w'_m, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \cdots & \lambda_m \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \cdots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}) = -\text{tr}(w'_{m-1}, \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \cdots & \lambda_m \\ 0 & \mu_2 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix})$$

and this is 0 since 0 appears twice in the bottom row. The lemma is proved.

Lemma 2.10. *Assume that we are in the setup of 2.9, that $(**)$ holds and that $m = 2m'$ for some integer $m' > 0$. Then*

- (a) $\sharp(k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}; \mu_k \geq m) - \sharp(k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}; \mu_k \text{ even}) = m' \pmod{2}$,
- (b) $\sharp(k \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}; \mu_k \text{ even}) = N + m(m-1)/2 \pmod{2}$.

Among the m' pairs $(0, 4m' - 1), (2, 4m' - 3), \dots, (2m' - 2, 2m' + 1)$ there are, say, α pairs with the first component of form λ_i and second component of form μ_j and β pairs with the first component of form μ_j and second component of form λ_i . Clearly, $\alpha + \beta = m'$. Among the m' pairs

$$(1, 4m' - 2), (3, 4m' - 4), \dots, (2m' - 1, 2m')$$

there are, say, γ pairs with the first component of form λ_i and second component of form μ_j and δ pairs with the first component of form μ_j and second component of form λ_i . Clearly, $\gamma + \delta = m'$. From the definitions we have

$$\sharp(k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2m'\}; \mu_k \geq 2m') = \alpha + \gamma,$$

$$\sharp(k \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2m'\}; \mu_k \text{ even}) = \beta + \gamma.$$

Hence the left hand side of (a) is equal to $\alpha + \gamma - (\beta + \gamma) = \alpha - \beta$, which has the same parity as $\alpha + \beta = m'$. This proves (a). Now (b) follows from (a) since $m' = 2m'(2m' - 1)/2 \pmod{2}$. The lemma is proved.

Proposition 2.11. *Assume that G in 0.1 is of type B_n or C_n where $n = m^2 + m, m \in \mathbf{N}, m \geq 1$. We identify the Weyl group W of G with W_n (see 2.3) in the standard way. Let $w = w_m$, see 2.5. Let ρ be the unique unipotent cuspidal representation of G^F . Then ρ appears with multiplicity 1 in R_w .*

For any subset J of cardinal m of $I = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2m\}$ let $E_J = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}$ (an irreducible representation of W) where $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots < \mu_m$ are the elements of J in increasing order and $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_{m+1}$ are the elements of $I - J$ in increasing order; let $f(J) = \sharp(j \in J | j \text{ even})$. By [L2, 4.23], the multiplicity of ρ in R_w is

$$(a) \quad 2^{-m} \sum_J (-1)^{f(J)} \text{tr}(w_m, E_J)$$

where J runs over all subsets of I of cardinal m . Using 2.6 and 2.7 we see that (a) equals $2^{-m} \sharp(J; J \cap (2m - J) = \emptyset) = 1$. The proposition is proved.

Proposition 2.12. *Assume that G in 0.1 is of type D_n where $n = m^2, m = 2m', m' \in \mathbf{N}, m' \geq 1$. We identify the Weyl group W of G with the subgroup of W_n consisting of all permutations $w \in W_n$ such that*

$$\sharp(k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}; w(k) \in \{1', 2', \dots, n'\})$$

is even. (A subgroup of index 2.) Let $w = w'_m$, see 2.8. (We have $w'_m \in W$.) Let ρ be the unique unipotent cuspidal representation of G^F . Then ρ appears with multiplicity 1 in R_w .

For any subset J of cardinal m of $I = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2m - 1\}$ let E_J be the restriction of $\begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \dots & \lambda_{m+1} \\ \mu_1 & \mu_2 & \dots & \mu_m \end{bmatrix}$ from W_n to W (an irreducible representation of W) where $\mu_1 < \mu_2 < \dots < \mu_m$ are the elements of J in increasing order and $\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_m$ are the elements of $I - J$ in increasing order; let $f(J) = \sharp(j \in J | j \text{ even})$. Note that $E_J = E_{I-J}$ and $f(J) = f(I - J)$. By [L2, 4.23], the multiplicity of ρ in R_w is

$$(a) \quad 2^{-m} \sum_J (-1)^{f(J)} \text{tr}(w_m, E_J)$$

where J runs over all subsets of I of cardinal m . Using 2.9 and 2.10 we see that (a) equals $2^{-m} \sharp(J; J \cap (2m - J) = \emptyset) = 1$. The proposition is proved.

We return to the general case.

Theorem 2.13. *Let ρ be a unipotent cuspidal representation of G^F . There exists $w \in W$ such that ρ appears with multiplicity 1 in R_w .*

In view of 2.11, 2.12, we may assume that G is of exceptional type. If $\rho \in \mathcal{U}$ is cuspidal, we have $\rho_{\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma}$ where \mathcal{F} is independent of ρ ; we will write $\rho_{y, \sigma}$ instead of $\rho_{\mathcal{F}, y, \sigma}$; for the pairs (y, σ) we will use the notation of [L2, 4.3]. For $w \in W$ we denote by $|w|$ the characteristic polynomial of w in the reflection representation of W . (A product of cyclotomic polynomials Φ_d .) In the cases that appear below, $|w|$ determines uniquely w up to conjugacy.

Type E_6 .

$$|w| = \Phi_{12}\Phi_3: \rho_{g_3, \theta^{\pm 1}}.$$

Type E_7 .

$$|w| = \Phi_{18}\Phi_2: \rho_{g_2, 1}, \rho_{g_2, \epsilon}.$$

Type E_8 .

$$|w| = \Phi_{30}: \rho_{g_5, \zeta^j}, j = 1, 2, 3, 4; \rho_{g_6, \theta^{\pm 1}}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_{24}: \rho_{g_4, i^{\pm 1}}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_{18}\Phi_6: \rho_{g_3, \epsilon\theta^{\pm 1}}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_{12}^2: \rho_{g'_2, \epsilon}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_{12}\Phi_6^2: \rho_{g_2, -\epsilon}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_6^4: \rho_{1, \lambda^4}.$$

Type F_4 .

$$|w| = \Phi_{12}: \rho_{g_3, \theta^{\pm 1}}, \rho_{g_4, i^{\pm 1}}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_6^2: \rho_{g'_2, \epsilon}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_8: \rho_{g_2, \epsilon}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_4^2: \rho_{1, \lambda^3}.$$

Type G_2 .

$$|w| = \Phi_6: \rho_{g_3, \theta^{\pm 1}}, \rho_{g_2, \epsilon}.$$

$$|w| = \Phi_3: \rho_{1, \lambda^2}.$$

In each case, one can compute the multiplicity of $\rho_{y, \sigma}$ in R_w for w in the same row, using [L2, 4.23]; for the computation we need the character table of W and the explicit entries of the non-abelian Fourier transform [L2, p.110-113]. The result in each case is 1. This completes the proof.

Theorem 2.14. (a) Assume that $\rho \in \tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is cuspidal. Then $\rho \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

(b) If G is of type B, C or D and ρ is a unipotent cuspidal representation then $\rho \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

We prove (a). Let $w \in W$ be such that ρ appears with multiplicity 1 in R_w (see 2.13). Since R_w is the character of a virtual representation defined over \mathbf{Q}_l , it follows that ρ is defined over \mathbf{Q}_l . (Here l is any prime $\neq p$.) Using the Hasse principle it is then enough to show that ρ is defined over \mathbf{R} . The following argument is inspired by an argument of Ohmori [Oh]. Let x be an element of minimal length in W such that ρ appears with odd multiplicity in R_x . (Such x exists by 2.13.) The multiplicity of ρ in $\sum_j (-1)^j \mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ is equal to the multiplicity of ρ in $\sum_j (-1)^j H_c^j(X_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ plus an integer linear combination of the multiplicities of ρ in $\sum_j (-1)^j H_c^j(X_{x'}, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ for various x' of strictly smaller length than x (these multiplicities are even, by the choice of x). It follows that the multiplicity of ρ in $\sum_j (-1)^j \mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ is odd. Recall that \bar{X}_x has pure dimension $l(x)$. By Poincaré duality, the G^F -modules $\mathbf{H}^j(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l), \mathbf{H}^{2l(x)-j}(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ are dual to each other. Hence they contain ρ with the same multiplicity (recall that ρ is self-dual.)

It follows that the multiplicity of ρ in $\mathbf{H}^{l(x)}(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ is odd. Now $\mathbf{H}^{l(x)}(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$ admits a $(-1)^{l(x)}$ -symmetric, non-degenerate, G^F -invariant \mathbf{Q}_l -bilinear form with values in \mathbf{Q}_l . (Actually, $l(x)$ is even, by 1.4.) Since ρ is self-dual and has odd multiplicity in $\mathbf{H}^{l(x)}(\bar{X}_x, \mathbf{Q}_l)$, an argument in [Oh] shows that ρ itself (regarded as a $\mathbf{Q}_l[G^F]$ -module) admits a symmetric, non-degenerate, G^F -invariant \mathbf{Q}_l -bilinear form with values in \mathbf{Q}_l . It follows that ρ is defined over \mathbf{R} . This proves (a).

In the setup of (b), ρ is unique up to isomorphism hence it is automatically in $\tilde{\mathcal{U}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Thus, (a) is applicable and $\rho \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbf{Q}}$. The theorem is proved.

2.15. In this subsection we assume that G is non-split. The analogue of 2.13 continues to hold for G . But the analogue of 2.14(a) fails if G is non-split of type A .

2.16. A statement like 2.13 was made without proof in [L2, p.356] (for not necessarily split G). In that statement, the assumption that ρ is cuspidal was missing. That assumption is in fact necessary, as 2.17(ii) below (for G of type C_4) shows.

Lemma 2.17. (i) *Let $\epsilon : W_2 \times W_2 \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ be a character. Then*

$$(a) \quad \text{tr}(w, \text{ind}_{W_2 \times W_2}^{W_4}(\epsilon)) \in 2\mathbf{Z}$$

for all $w \in W_4$.

(ii) *Let $E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & \end{bmatrix}$ (an irreducible representation of W_4). Then R_E is of the form χ_ρ for some $\rho \in \mathcal{U}$. The multiplicity of ρ in R_w is even for any $w \in W = W_4$.*

The residue class mod 2 of the left hand side of (a) is clearly independent of the choice of ϵ . Hence to prove (a) we may assume that $\epsilon = 1$. Let $\pi : W_4 \rightarrow S_4$ be the canonical homomorphism. We have $\text{tr}(w, \text{ind}_{W_2 \times W_2}^{W_4}(1)) = \text{tr}(\pi(w), \text{ind}_{S_2 \times S_2}^{S_4}(1))$. But if $y \in S_4$, then $\text{tr}(y, \text{ind}_{S_2 \times S_2}^{S_4}(1))$ is 6 if $y = 1$, is 2 if y has order 2 and is 0, otherwise; in particular, it is even for any y . This proves (i).

In (ii), the multiplicity of ρ in R_w is $\text{tr}(w, E)$ that is, the left hand side of (a) for a suitable ϵ . Hence it is even by (i). The lemma is proved.

3. AN EXAMPLE IN SO_5

3.1. In this section we assume that $p \neq 2$ and that $G = SO(V)$ where V is a 5-dimensional \mathbf{k} -vector space with a fixed F_q -rational structure and a fixed non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form $(,)$ defined over F_q . Let C be the set of all $g \in G$ such that $g = su = us$ where $-s \in O(V)$ is a reflection and $u \in SO(V)$ has Jordan blocks of sizes 2, 2, 1. Then C is a conjugacy class in G and $F(C) = C$. A line L in $V(F_q)$ is said to be of type 1 if $(x, x) \in F_q^2 - 0$ for any $x \in L - \{0\}$ and of type -1 if $(x, x) \in F_q - F_q^2$ for any $x \in L - \{0\}$. Let \mathcal{L}_1 (resp. \mathcal{L}_{-1}) be the set of lines of type 1 (resp. -1) in $V(F_q)$. For $\epsilon, \delta \in \{1, -1\}$, let $C^{\epsilon, \delta}$ be the set of all $g \in C^F$ such that the line L in $V(F_q)$ such that $g|_L = 1$ is in \mathcal{L}_ϵ and any line L in $V(F_q)$ such that $g|_L = -1$ and $(L, L) \neq 0$ is in \mathcal{L}_δ . Then $C^{\epsilon, \delta}$ is a conjugacy class

of G^F and C^F is union of the four conjugacy classes $C^{1,1}, C^{1,-1}, C^{-1,1}, C^{-1,-1}$. We define a class function $\phi : G^F \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ by $\phi(g) = 2\delta q$ if $g \in C^{\epsilon, \delta}$ and $\phi(g) = 0$ if $g \in G - C^F$. (This is the characteristic function of a cuspidal character sheaf on G .)

Let O_+ (resp. O_-) be the stabilizer in G of a 4-dimensional subspace of V defined over F_q on which $(,)$ is non-degenerate and split (resp. non-split). Let $\det : O_+ \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ (resp. $\det : O_- \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$) be the unique nontrivial homomorphism of algebraic groups. The restriction of \det to O_+^F or O_-^F is denoted again by \det . Consider the virtual representation

$$\Phi = \text{ind}_{O_+^F}^{G^F}(1) - \text{ind}_{O_+^F}^{G^F}(\det) - \text{ind}_{O_-^F}^{G^F}(1) + \text{ind}_{O_-^F}^{G^F}(\det)$$

of G^F . For $g \in G^F$ we have

$$\text{tr}(g, \Phi) = 2\sharp(L \in \mathcal{L}_1; g|_L = -1) - 2\sharp(L \in \mathcal{L}_{-1}; g|_L = -1)$$

. It follows easily that $\text{tr}(g, \Phi) = \phi(g)$.

Let θ be the unique unipotent cuspidal representation of G^F . Then θ appears with multiplicity 1 in ϕ . It follows that θ appears with multiplicity 1 in Φ . Since the character of θ is \mathbf{Q} -valued and Φ is a difference of two representations defined over \mathbf{Q} , it follows that θ is defined over \mathbf{Q} . Thus we have proved the rationality of θ without using the Hasse principle.

3.2. Assume now that $q = 3$. Then $SO(V)$ is isomorphic to a Weyl group W of type E_6 while O_+^F is isomorphic to a Weyl group of type F_4 and O_-^F is isomorphic to a Weyl group of type $A_5 \times A_1$ (imbedded in the standard way in the W). Now θ corresponds to the 6-dimensional reflection representation of W (Kneser). Its restriction to the Weyl group of type F_4 contains no one dimensional invariant subspace while its restriction to the Weyl group of type $A_5 \times A_1$ splits into a 5-dimensional irreducible representation and a non-trivial 1 dimensional representation. Since θ has multiplicity 1 in Φ (see 3.1) it follows that θ has multiplicity 1 in $\text{ind}_{O_-^F}^{G^F}(\det)$.

REFERENCES

- [BBD] A. A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein and P. Deligne, *Faisceaux pervers*, Asterisque **100** (1982).
- [DL] P. Deligne and G. Lusztig, *Representations of reductive groups over finite fields*, Ann. Math **103** (1976), 103-161.
- [L1] G. Lusztig, *Coxeter orbits and eigenspaces of Frobenius*, Inv. Math. **38** (1976), 101-159.
- [L2] G. Lusztig, *Characters of reductive groups over a finite field*, Ann. Math. Studies 107, Princeton Univ. Press, 1984.
- [L3] G. Lusztig, *lecture at the U.S.-France Conference on Representation Theory, Paris 1982*, unpublished.
- [Oh] Z. Ohmori, *The Schur indices of the cuspidal unipotent characters of the finite unitary groups*, Proc. Japan Acad. A (Math. Sci.) **72** (1996), 111-113.
- [W] H. Weyl, *The Classical Groups*, Princeton Univ. Press.