## Spectral questions in endoscopic transfer for real reductive groups

Diana Shelstad

May 20, 2013

Diana Shelstad ()

a. endoscopic transfer vs stable transfer

ullet two related transfer principles introduced by Langlands 1970 $\pm$ , 2010 $\pm$ 

- $\bullet\,$  two related transfer principles introduced by Langlands 1970 $\pm,\,2010\pm$
- archimedean local case and its relation to broader picture

- ullet two related transfer principles introduced by Langlands 1970 $\pm$ , 2010 $\pm$
- archimedean local case and its relation to broader picture
- endoscopic transfer relates invariant harmonic analysis on given group  $G(\mathbb{R})$  to stable harmonic analysis on the generally lower dimensional endoscopic groups  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$

- ullet two related transfer principles introduced by Langlands 1970 $\pm$ , 2010 $\pm$
- archimedean local case and its relation to broader picture
- endoscopic transfer relates invariant harmonic analysis on given group  $G(\mathbb{R})$  to stable harmonic analysis on the generally lower dimensional endoscopic groups  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$
- part of broader themes involving stable conjugacy, packets of representations and stabilization of the Arthur-Selberg trace formula

- ullet two related transfer principles introduced by Langlands 1970 $\pm$ , 2010 $\pm$
- archimedean local case and its relation to broader picture
- endoscopic transfer relates invariant harmonic analysis on given group  $G(\mathbb{R})$  to stable harmonic analysis on the generally lower dimensional endoscopic groups  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$
- part of broader themes involving stable conjugacy, packets of representations and stabilization of the Arthur-Selberg trace formula
- second principle, **stable transfer**, concerns stable harmonic analysis on any two groups  $G(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $H(\mathbb{R})$  related by a morphism of *L*-groups, part of *Beyond Endoscopy*, not discussed here

b. endoscopic transfer: geometric side vs spectral side

• stable conjugacy in  $G(\mathbb{R})$ :  $G(\mathbb{C})$ -conjugacy with small refinement

b. endoscopic transfer: geometric side vs spectral side

- stable conjugacy in  $G(\mathbb{R})$ :  $G(\mathbb{C})$ -conjugacy with small refinement
- start with geometric transfer: unstable combinations of orbital integrals on given group G(R) match stable combinations on an endoscopic group H<sub>1</sub>(R)

b. endoscopic transfer: geometric side vs spectral side

- $\bullet$  stable conjugacy in  ${\mathcal G}({\mathbb R}){:}$   ${\mathcal G}({\mathbb C}){-}{\rm conjugacy}$  with small refinement
- start with geometric transfer: unstable combinations of orbital integrals on given group G(R) match stable combinations on an endoscopic group H<sub>1</sub>(R)
- matching: based on norm correspondence for very regular stable conjugacy classes in H<sub>1</sub>(R) and (twisted) classes in G(R)

b. endoscopic transfer: geometric side vs spectral side

- $\bullet$  stable conjugacy in  ${\mathcal G}({\mathbb R}){:}$   ${\mathcal G}({\mathbb C}){\operatorname{-conjugacy}}$  with small refinement
- start with geometric transfer: unstable combinations of orbital integrals on given group G(R) match stable combinations on an endoscopic group H<sub>1</sub>(R)
- matching: based on norm correspondence for very regular stable conjugacy classes in H<sub>1</sub>(R) and (twisted) classes in G(R)
- matching provides a transfer of test functions from G(ℝ) to H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ), then a dual map from 3-finite stable distributions on H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) to 3-finite invariant distributions on G(ℝ)

b. endoscopic transfer: geometric side vs spectral side

- $\bullet$  stable conjugacy in  ${\mathcal G}({\mathbb R}){:}$   ${\mathcal G}({\mathbb C}){\operatorname{-conjugacy}}$  with small refinement
- start with geometric transfer: unstable combinations of orbital integrals on given group G(R) match stable combinations on an endoscopic group H<sub>1</sub>(R)
- matching: based on norm correspondence for very regular stable conjugacy classes in H<sub>1</sub>(R) and (twisted) classes in G(R)
- matching provides a transfer of test functions from  $G(\mathbb{R})$  to  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$ , then a dual map from 3-finite stable distributions on  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$  to 3-finite invariant distributions on  $G(\mathbb{R})$
- **spectral transfer:** interpret this dual map in terms of traces of irreducible admissible representations

Diana Shelstad ()



c. our approach

• geometric side: transfer for orbital integrals has been proved using transfer factors

-

c. our approach

- geometric side: transfer for orbital integrals has been proved using *transfer factors*
- transfer factors = coefficients for unstable combinations: are defined a priori and have various properties useful for descent arguments, comparison among inner forms, global questions etc. [Langlands-Shelstad, Kottwitz-Shelstad]

c. our approach

- geometric side: transfer for orbital integrals has been proved using *transfer factors*
- transfer factors = coefficients for unstable combinations: are defined a priori and have various properties useful for descent arguments, comparison among inner forms, global questions etc. [Langlands-Shelstad, Kottwitz-Shelstad]
- introduce spectral transfer factors with same basic structure (incomplete) and prove similar properties

- c. our approach
  - geometric side: transfer for orbital integrals has been proved using *transfer factors*
  - transfer factors = coefficients for unstable combinations: are defined a priori and have various properties useful for descent arguments, comparison among inner forms, global questions etc. [Langlands-Shelstad, Kottwitz-Shelstad]
  - introduce spectral transfer factors with same basic structure (incomplete) and prove similar properties
  - show that they are the only possible coefficients for spectral interpretation of dual transfer

- c. our approach
  - geometric side: transfer for orbital integrals has been proved using *transfer factors*
  - transfer factors = coefficients for unstable combinations: are defined a priori and have various properties useful for descent arguments, comparison among inner forms, global questions etc. [Langlands-Shelstad, Kottwitz-Shelstad]
  - introduce spectral transfer factors with same basic structure (incomplete) and prove similar properties
  - show that they are the only possible coefficients for spectral interpretation of dual transfer
  - apply this to various known identities to get (partial) spectral transfer

- c. our approach
  - geometric side: transfer for orbital integrals has been proved using *transfer factors*
  - transfer factors = coefficients for unstable combinations: are defined a priori and have various properties useful for descent arguments, comparison among inner forms, global questions etc. [Langlands-Shelstad, Kottwitz-Shelstad]
  - introduce spectral transfer factors with same basic structure (incomplete) and prove similar properties
  - show that they are the only possible coefficients for spectral interpretation of dual transfer
  - apply this to various known identities to get (partial) spectral transfer
  - the spectral factors contain precise information needed about packets

a. general twisted setting

• *G* connected, reductive algebraic group defined over  $\mathbb{R}$  $\theta$  an  $\mathbb{R}$ -automorphism of *G*,  $\omega$  a quasi-character on  $G(\mathbb{R})$ study representations  $\pi$  for which  $\pi \circ \theta \simeq \omega \otimes \pi$ 

a. general twisted setting

- *G* connected, reductive algebraic group defined over  $\mathbb{R}$  $\theta$  an  $\mathbb{R}$ -automorphism of *G*,  $\omega$  a quasi-character on  $G(\mathbb{R})$ study representations  $\pi$  for which  $\pi \circ \theta \simeq \omega \otimes \pi$
- quasi-split data  $(G^*, \theta^*)$  :
  - $G^*$  quasi-split over  $\mathbb{R}$ , has an  $\mathbb{R}$ -splitting  $spl^* = (B^*, T^*, \{X_{\alpha}\})$ [ultimately choice of  $spl^*$  will not matter]  $\theta^*$  an  $\mathbb{R}$ -automorphism of  $G^*$  preserving  $spl^*$

a. general twisted setting

- *G* connected, reductive algebraic group defined over  $\mathbb{R}$  $\theta$  an  $\mathbb{R}$ -automorphism of *G*,  $\omega$  a quasi-character on  $G(\mathbb{R})$ study representations  $\pi$  for which  $\pi \circ \theta \simeq \omega \otimes \pi$
- quasi-split data  $(G^*, \theta^*)$  :
  - $G^*$  quasi-split over  $\mathbb{R}$ , has an  $\mathbb{R}$ -splitting  $spl^* = (B^*, T^*, \{X_{\alpha}\})$ [ultimately choice of  $spl^*$  will not matter]  $\theta^*$  an  $\mathbb{R}$ -automorphism of  $G^*$  preserving  $spl^*$
- inner form  $(G, \theta, \eta)$  of  $(G^*, \theta^*)$ :  $(G, \theta)$  as above, and  $\eta : G \to G^*$  an inner twist such that  $\eta$  transports  $\theta$  to  $\theta^*$  up to inner automorphism:  $\theta = Int(h_{\theta}) \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \theta^* \circ \eta$ , where  $h_{\theta} \in G$

a. general twisted setting

- *G* connected, reductive algebraic group defined over  $\mathbb{R}$  $\theta$  an  $\mathbb{R}$ -automorphism of *G*,  $\omega$  a quasi-character on  $G(\mathbb{R})$ study representations  $\pi$  for which  $\pi \circ \theta \simeq \omega \otimes \pi$
- quasi-split data  $(G^*, \theta^*)$  :
  - $G^*$  quasi-split over  $\mathbb{R}$ , has an  $\mathbb{R}$ -splitting  $spl^* = (B^*, T^*, \{X_{\alpha}\})$ [ultimately choice of  $spl^*$  will not matter]  $\theta^*$  an  $\mathbb{R}$ -automorphism of  $G^*$  preserving  $spl^*$
- inner form  $(G, \theta, \eta)$  of  $(G^*, \theta^*)$ :  $(G, \theta)$  as above, and  $\eta : G \to G^*$  an inner twist such that  $\eta$  transports  $\theta$  to  $\theta^*$  up to inner automorphism:  $\theta = Int(h_{\theta}) \circ \eta^{-1} \circ \theta^* \circ \eta$ , where  $h_{\theta} \in G$
- up to **isomorphism** of inner forms, can arrange that transport  $\eta^{-1} \circ \theta^* \circ \eta$  is defined over  $\mathbb{R}$ , so  $Int(h_{\theta}) \in G_{ad}(\mathbb{R})$ [use **fundamental splittings** - exist for all G].

Diana Shelstad ()

b. dual data

• dual complex group  $G^{\vee}$  with splitting  $spl^{\vee}$  dual to  $spl^*$ , action of Weil group  $W_{\mathbb{R}}$  through  $W_{\mathbb{R}} \to \Gamma = Gal(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}) = \{1, \sigma\}$ action preserves  $spl^{\vee}$ , and *L*-group  ${}^LG = G^{\vee} \rtimes W_{\mathbb{R}}$ 

b. dual data

- dual complex group  $G^{\vee}$  with splitting  $spl^{\vee}$  dual to  $spl^*$ , action of Weil group  $W_{\mathbb{R}}$  through  $W_{\mathbb{R}} \to \Gamma = Gal(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}) = \{1, \sigma\}$ action preserves  $spl^{\vee}$ , and *L*-group  ${}^LG = G^{\vee} \rtimes W_{\mathbb{R}}$
- automorphism  $\theta^{\vee}$  of  $G^{\vee}$ : preserves  $spl^{\vee}$  and dual to  $\theta^*$ quasi-character  $\varpi$  comes from  $a: W_{\mathbb{R}} \to {}^L Z = Center(G^{\vee}) \rtimes W_{\mathbb{R}}$

b. dual data

- dual complex group  $G^{\vee}$  with splitting  $spl^{\vee}$  dual to  $spl^*$ , action of Weil group  $W_{\mathbb{R}}$  through  $W_{\mathbb{R}} \to \Gamma = Gal(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}) = \{1, \sigma\}$ action preserves  $spl^{\vee}$ , and *L*-group  ${}^LG = G^{\vee} \rtimes W_{\mathbb{R}}$
- automorphism  $\theta^{\vee}$  of  $G^{\vee}$ : preserves  $spl^{\vee}$  and dual to  $\theta^*$ quasi-character  $\varpi$  comes from  $a: W_{\mathbb{R}} \to {}^L Z = Center(G^{\vee}) \rtimes W_{\mathbb{R}}$
- automorphism  ${}^{L}\theta_{a}$  of  ${}^{L}G$  extends  $\theta^{\vee}$  with twist by a:  ${}^{L}\theta_{a}(g \times w) = \theta^{\vee}(g)a(w)$ , for  $g \in G^{\vee}$ ,  $w \in W_{\mathbb{R}}$

b. dual data

- dual complex group  $G^{\vee}$  with splitting  $spl^{\vee}$  dual to  $spl^*$ , action of Weil group  $W_{\mathbb{R}}$  through  $W_{\mathbb{R}} \to \Gamma = Gal(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}) = \{1, \sigma\}$ action preserves  $spl^{\vee}$ , and *L*-group  ${}^LG = G^{\vee} \rtimes W_{\mathbb{R}}$
- automorphism  $\theta^{\vee}$  of  $G^{\vee}$ : preserves  $spl^{\vee}$  and dual to  $\theta^*$ quasi-character  $\varpi$  comes from  $a: W_{\mathbb{R}} \to {}^L Z = Center(G^{\vee}) \rtimes W_{\mathbb{R}}$
- automorphism  ${}^{L}\theta_{a}$  of  ${}^{L}G$  extends  $\theta^{\vee}$  with twist by a:  ${}^{L}\theta_{a}(g \times w) = \theta^{\vee}(g)a(w)$ , for  $g \in G^{\vee}$ ,  $w \in W_{\mathbb{R}}$

 in talk: assume G<sup>∨</sup>-component of a is **bounded**, so 𝔅 unitary [otherwise, insert *essentially* in various statements ...]

bb. endoscopic data

#### (bounded) supplemented endoscopic data ε<sub>z</sub> : endoscopic data ε = (H, H, s), together with z-extension data (H<sub>1</sub>, ξ<sub>1</sub>) [Kaletha refinement ...]

bb. endoscopic data

- (bounded) supplemented endoscopic data ε<sub>z</sub> : endoscopic data ε = (H, H, s), together with z-extension data (H<sub>1</sub>, ξ<sub>1</sub>) [Kaletha refinement ...]
- basic picture:

$$1 \rightarrow Cent_{\theta^{\vee}}(s, G^{\vee})^{0} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \stackrel{\xi_{1}}{\underset{incl}{\swarrow}} W_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow 1 \qquad (1)$$

where  $W_{\mathbb{R}}$  acts on  $Cent_{\theta^{\vee}}(s, G^{\vee})^0 = H^{\vee}$  by conjugation by elements of  $Cent_{\ell_{\theta_a}}(s, {}^{L}G)$ 

c. norm correspondence

in talk: assume θ preserves a fundamental splitting
 [at each step should note effect of extra twist by elt of G<sub>ad</sub>(ℝ)]

c. norm correspondence

- in talk: assume θ preserves a fundamental splitting
   [at each step should note effect of extra twist by elt of G<sub>ad</sub>(ℝ)]
- there is  $\Gamma$ -map  $\mathcal{A}$  from the set  $Cl_{ss}(H_1)$  of semisimple conjugacy classes in  $H_1(\mathbb{C})$  to the set  $Cl_{\theta$ -ss}(G,  $\theta$ ) of  $\theta$ -semisimple  $\theta$ -conjugacy classes in  $G(\mathbb{C})$ :

$$Cl_{ss}(H_{1}) \downarrow \qquad (2)$$

$$Cl_{ss}(H) \xrightarrow{endo} Cl_{\theta^{*}-ss}(G^{*},\theta) \xrightarrow{inner} Cl_{\theta-ss}(G,\theta)$$

c. norm correspondence

- in talk: assume θ preserves a fundamental splitting
   [at each step should note effect of extra twist by elt of G<sub>ad</sub>(ℝ)]
- there is  $\Gamma$ -map  $\mathcal{A}$  from the set  $Cl_{ss}(H_1)$  of semisimple conjugacy classes in  $H_1(\mathbb{C})$  to the set  $Cl_{\theta$ -ss}(G,  $\theta$ ) of  $\theta$ -semisimple  $\theta$ -conjugacy classes in  $G(\mathbb{C})$ :

$$Cl_{ss}(H_{1}) \downarrow \qquad (2)$$

$$Cl_{ss}(H) \xrightarrow{endo} Cl_{\theta^{*}-ss}(G^{*},\theta) \xrightarrow{inner} Cl_{\theta-ss}(G,\theta)$$

•  $\gamma_1$  is **strongly** *G*-regular if and only if  $\mathcal{A}$  maps its class to a class of strongly  $\theta$ -regular elements in *G* 

c. norm correspondence

- in talk: assume θ preserves a fundamental splitting
   [at each step should note effect of extra twist by elt of G<sub>ad</sub>(ℝ)]
- there is  $\Gamma$ -map  $\mathcal{A}$  from the set  $Cl_{ss}(H_1)$  of semisimple conjugacy classes in  $H_1(\mathbb{C})$  to the set  $Cl_{\theta$ -ss}(G,  $\theta$ ) of  $\theta$ -semisimple  $\theta$ -conjugacy classes in  $G(\mathbb{C})$ :

$$Cl_{ss}(H_{1}) \downarrow \qquad (2)$$

$$Cl_{ss}(H) \xrightarrow{endo} Cl_{\theta^{*}-ss}(G^{*},\theta) \xrightarrow{inner} Cl_{\theta-ss}(G,\theta)$$

- γ<sub>1</sub> is strongly G-regular if and only if A maps its class to a class of strongly θ-regular elements in G
- strongly G-regular  $\gamma_1$  is a norm of strongly  $\theta$ -regular  $\delta$ , *i.e.*  $(\gamma_1, \delta)$  is a norm pair, if and only if  $\delta$  is in image of class of  $\gamma_1$

d. transfer factors

• sufficient to specify geometric transfer on **very regular set**: all pairs  $(\gamma_1, \delta) \in H_1(\mathbb{R}) \times G(\mathbb{R})$ , where  $\gamma_1$  is strongly *G*-regular and  $\delta$  is strongly  $\theta$ -regular

- sufficient to specify geometric transfer on very regular set: all pairs (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) ∈ H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) × G(ℝ), where γ<sub>1</sub> is strongly G-regular and δ is strongly θ-regular
- transfer factor  $\Delta$  is complex-valued function on very regular set

- sufficient to specify geometric transfer on very regular set: all pairs (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) ∈ H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) × G(ℝ), where γ<sub>1</sub> is strongly G-regular and δ is strongly θ-regular
- transfer factor  $\Delta$  is complex-valued function on very regular set
- define  $\Delta(\gamma_1,\delta)={\sf 0}$  if  $(\gamma_1,\delta)$  is not a norm pair

- sufficient to specify geometric transfer on **very regular set**: all pairs  $(\gamma_1, \delta) \in H_1(\mathbb{R}) \times G(\mathbb{R})$ , where  $\gamma_1$  is strongly *G*-regular and  $\delta$  is strongly  $\theta$ -regular
- transfer factor  $\Delta$  is complex-valued function on very regular set
- define  $\Delta(\gamma_1,\delta)={\sf 0}$  if  $(\gamma_1,\delta)$  is not a norm pair
- $\bullet$  now assume  $(\gamma_1,\delta),(\gamma_1',\delta')$  are norm pairs

- sufficient to specify geometric transfer on very regular set: all pairs (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) ∈ H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) × G(ℝ), where γ<sub>1</sub> is strongly G-regular and δ is strongly θ-regular
- transfer factor  $\Delta$  is complex-valued function on very regular set
- define  $\Delta(\gamma_1,\delta)={\sf 0}$  if  $(\gamma_1,\delta)$  is not a norm pair
- $\bullet$  now assume  $(\gamma_1,\delta), (\gamma_1',\delta')$  are norm pairs
- our transfer statement will not fix normalization for  $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  instead define canonical relative factor  $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta; \gamma_1', \delta')$  and use any factor  $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  satisfying

$$\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) / \Delta(\gamma'_1, \delta') = \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta; \gamma'_1, \delta')$$
(3)
d. transfer factors

- sufficient to specify geometric transfer on very regular set: all pairs (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) ∈ H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) × G(ℝ), where γ<sub>1</sub> is strongly G-regular and δ is strongly θ-regular
- transfer factor  $\Delta$  is complex-valued function on very regular set
- define  $\Delta(\gamma_1,\delta)=$ 0 if  $(\gamma_1,\delta)$  is not a norm pair
- $\bullet$  now assume  $(\gamma_1,\delta),(\gamma_1',\delta')$  are norm pairs
- our transfer statement will not fix normalization for  $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  instead define canonical relative factor  $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta; \gamma_1', \delta')$  and use any factor  $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  satisfying

$$\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) / \Delta(\gamma'_1, \delta') = \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta; \gamma'_1, \delta')$$
(3)

• two versions of transfer: here use factors for classical version other version: (turns out to be) complex conjugate

### Endoscopic transfer: geometric side dd. transfer factors (cont.)

 definitions allow simultaneously treatment of inner forms extended group = K-group: fills out stable conjugacy classes

- definitions allow simultaneously treatment of inner forms extended group = K-group: fills out stable conjugacy classes
- particular normalizations , esp. Whittaker normalization for several inner forms of quasi-split data  $(G^*, \theta^*)$

- definitions allow simultaneously treatment of inner forms extended group = K-group: fills out stable conjugacy classes
- particular normalizations , esp. Whittaker normalization for several inner forms of quasi-split data  $(G^*, \theta^*)$
- relative  $\Delta$  is product  $\Delta_I \Delta_{II} \Delta_{III}$ ; only  $\Delta_{III}$  is genuinely relative

- definitions allow simultaneously treatment of inner forms extended group = K-group: fills out stable conjugacy classes
- particular normalizations , esp. Whittaker normalization for several inner forms of quasi-split data  $(G^*, \theta^*)$
- relative  $\Delta$  is product  $\Delta_I \Delta_{II} \Delta_{III}$ ; only  $\Delta_{III}$  is genuinely relative
- $\Delta_I, \Delta_{III}$  have Galois-cohomological definitions, spectral versions in same groups [sample at end of talk]

- definitions allow simultaneously treatment of inner forms extended group = K-group: fills out stable conjugacy classes
- particular normalizations , esp. Whittaker normalization for several inner forms of quasi-split data  $(G^*, \theta^*)$
- relative  $\Delta$  is product  $\Delta_I \Delta_{II} \Delta_{III}$ ; only  $\Delta_{III}$  is genuinely relative
- Δ<sub>1</sub>, Δ<sub>111</sub> have Galois-cohomological definitions, spectral versions in same groups [sample at end of talk]
- $\Delta_{II}(\gamma_1, \delta)$  comes from analysis of jumps in orbital integrals spectral version: different form, involves character formula

ddd. transfer factors (cont.)

toral data associated with norm pair (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) : there is θ\*-stable pair (B, T) in G\*, with T defined over ℝ, and various maps yielding

ddd. transfer factors (cont.)

 toral data associated with norm pair (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) : there is θ\*-stable pair (B, T) in G\*, with T defined over ℝ, and various maps yielding

•  $R_{res} = \theta^*$ -restricted root system for T in  $G^*$ , Galois orbits  $\mathcal{O}_{res}$   $R_1 = \text{root}$  system for  $T_1$  in  $H_1$ , Galois orbits  $\mathcal{O}_1$ to each indivisible  $\mathcal{O}_{res}$  attach well-defined  $\chi_{\alpha}(\frac{N\alpha(\delta^*)^{r_{\alpha}} - 1}{a_{\alpha}})$ to each  $\mathcal{O}_1$  attach well-defined  $\chi_{\alpha_1}(\frac{\alpha_1(\gamma_1) - 1}{a_{\alpha_1}})$  [notation]  $\Delta_{II}(\gamma_1, \delta)$  is quotient over all indivisible  $\mathcal{O}_{res}$  by all  $\mathcal{O}_1$ 

ddd. transfer factors (cont.)

 toral data associated with norm pair (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) : there is θ\*-stable pair (B, T) in G\*, with T defined over ℝ, and various maps yielding

 R<sub>res</sub> = θ\*-restricted root system for T in G\*, Galois orbits O<sub>res</sub> R<sub>1</sub> = root system for T<sub>1</sub> in H<sub>1</sub>, Galois orbits O<sub>1</sub> to each indivisible O<sub>res</sub> attach well-defined χ<sub>α</sub>(Nα(δ\*)<sup>rα</sup> - 1)/(a<sub>α</sub>) to each O<sub>1</sub> attach well-defined χ<sub>α1</sub>(α<sub>1</sub>(γ<sub>1</sub>)-1)/(a<sub>α1</sub>) [notation] Δ<sub>II</sub>(γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) is quotient over all indivisible O<sub>res</sub> by all O<sub>1</sub>
 χ-data, a-data: {χ<sub>α</sub>}, {a<sub>α</sub>} etc. as above

ddd. transfer factors (cont.)

 toral data associated with norm pair (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) : there is θ\*-stable pair (B, T) in G\*, with T defined over ℝ, and various maps yielding

- *R<sub>res</sub>* = θ\*-restricted root system for *T* in *G*\*, Galois orbits *O<sub>res</sub> R*<sub>1</sub> = root system for *T*<sub>1</sub> in *H*<sub>1</sub>, Galois orbits *O*<sub>1</sub> to each indivisible *O<sub>res</sub>* attach well-defined χ<sub>α</sub>(<sup>Nα(δ\*)<sup>rα</sup> - 1</sup>/<sub>a<sub>α</sub></sub>) to each *O*<sub>1</sub> attach well-defined χ<sub>α1</sub>(<sup>α<sub>1</sub>(γ<sub>1</sub>)-1</sup>/<sub>a<sub>α1</sub></sub>) [notation] Δ<sub>II</sub>(γ<sub>1</sub>, δ) is quotient over all indivisible *O<sub>res</sub>* by all *O*<sub>1</sub>
  χ-data, a-data: {χ<sub>α</sub>}, {a<sub>α</sub>} etc. as above
  same data used in Δ<sub>I</sub>, Δ<sub>III</sub>; two of the three affect each of
  - relative  $\Delta_I, \Delta_{II}, \Delta_{III}$  but product  $\Delta$  is independent of all choices

e. main theorem and corollary [Sh 2012]

#### Theorem

For each  $\theta$ -Schwartz fdg on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  there exists  $\lambda_1$ -Schwartz f<sub>1</sub>dh<sub>1</sub> on  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$  such that

$$SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1) = \sum_{\delta, \ \theta \text{-conj}} \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) \ O^{\theta, \varpi}(\delta, f dg)$$
(5)

for all strongly G-regular  $\gamma_1$  in  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$ .

### Corollary

If f has compact support then we may take  $f_1$  of compact support mod  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ .

f. remarks on statement

corollary follows immediately from a theorem of Bouaziz

- corollary follows immediately from a theorem of Bouaziz
- notation:  $Z_1 = Ker(H_1 \to H)$ ,  $\mathfrak{e}_z$  determines character  $\lambda_1$  on  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ , require  $f_1(z_1h_1) = \lambda_1(z_1)^{-1}f_1(h_1)$  for  $z_1 \in Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $h_1 \in H_1(\mathbb{R})$

- corollary follows immediately from a theorem of Bouaziz
- notation:  $Z_1 = Ker(H_1 \to H)$ ,  $\mathfrak{e}_z$  determines character  $\lambda_1$  on  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ , require  $f_1(z_1h_1) = \lambda_1(z_1)^{-1}f_1(h_1)$  for  $z_1 \in Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $h_1 \in H_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  is invariant under stable conjugacy in first variable, also has correct behavior under translation by  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$

- corollary follows immediately from a theorem of Bouaziz
- notation:  $Z_1 = Ker(H_1 \to H)$ ,  $\mathfrak{e}_z$  determines character  $\lambda_1$  on  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ , require  $f_1(z_1h_1) = \lambda_1(z_1)^{-1}f_1(h_1)$  for  $z_1 \in Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $h_1 \in H_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  is invariant under stable conjugacy in first variable, also has correct behavior under translation by  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1)$  is usual normalized stable orbital integral

- corollary follows immediately from a theorem of Bouaziz
- notation:  $Z_1 = Ker(H_1 \to H)$ ,  $\mathfrak{e}_z$  determines character  $\lambda_1$  on  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ , require  $f_1(z_1h_1) = \lambda_1(z_1)^{-1}f_1(h_1)$  for  $z_1 \in Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $h_1 \in H_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  is invariant under stable conjugacy in first variable, also has correct behavior under translation by  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1)$  is usual normalized stable orbital integral
- left and right: compatible Haar measures in denominators of quotients

- corollary follows immediately from a theorem of Bouaziz
- notation:  $Z_1 = Ker(H_1 \to H)$ ,  $\mathfrak{e}_z$  determines character  $\lambda_1$  on  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ , require  $f_1(z_1h_1) = \lambda_1(z_1)^{-1}f_1(h_1)$  for  $z_1 \in Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $h_1 \in H_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  is invariant under stable conjugacy in first variable, also has correct behavior under translation by  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1)$  is usual normalized stable orbital integral
- left and right: compatible Haar measures in denominators of quotients
- $(\theta, \omega)$ -twisted orbital integral

$$O^{\theta, \omega}(\delta, \mathsf{fd}g) := \int_{\mathsf{Cent}_{\theta}(\delta, G)(\mathbb{R}) \setminus G(\mathbb{R})} f(g^{-1}\delta\theta(g)) \omega(g) \frac{dg}{dt_{\delta}}$$
(6)

f. remarks on statement

- corollary follows immediately from a theorem of Bouaziz
- notation:  $Z_1 = Ker(H_1 \rightarrow H)$ ,  $\mathfrak{e}_z$  determines character  $\lambda_1$  on  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ , require  $f_1(z_1h_1) = \lambda_1(z_1)^{-1}f_1(h_1)$  for  $z_1 \in Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $h_1 \in H_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  is invariant under stable conjugacy in first variable, also has correct behavior under translation by  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$
- $SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1)$  is usual normalized stable orbital integral
- left and right: compatible Haar measures in denominators of quotients
- $(\theta, \omega)$ -twisted orbital integral

$$O^{\theta,\varpi}(\delta, \mathsf{fd}g) := \int_{\mathsf{Cent}_{\theta}(\delta,G)(\mathbb{R})\backslash G(\mathbb{R})} f(g^{-1}\delta\theta(g))\varpi(g)\frac{dg}{dt_{\delta}}$$
(6)

•  $\Delta(\gamma_1, \delta)$  has correct behavior under  $\theta$ -conjugacy to make right side of (5) well-defined

ff. steps of proof

• For proof of theorem:

Image: Image:

### Endoscopic transfer: geometric side ff. steps of proof

#### • For proof of theorem:

 (old) characterization of stable orbital integrals via Harish-Chandra Plancherel theory in terms of jump behavior

### Endoscopic transfer: geometric side ff. steps of proof

### • For proof of theorem:

- (old) characterization of stable orbital integrals via Harish-Chandra Plancherel theory in terms of jump behavior
- introduce form better adapted to canonical transfer factors

### • For proof of theorem:

- (old) characterization of stable orbital integrals via Harish-Chandra Plancherel theory in terms of jump behavior
- introduce form better adapted to canonical transfer factors
- Harish-Chandra descent for twisted orbital integrals and *semi-regular is sufficient* principle, along with descent properties of the norm correspondence, reduce problem to simple wall-crossing properties for transfer factors

### • For proof of theorem:

- (old) characterization of stable orbital integrals via Harish-Chandra Plancherel theory in terms of jump behavior
- introduce form better adapted to canonical transfer factors
- Harish-Chandra descent for twisted orbital integrals and *semi-regular is sufficient* principle, along with descent properties of the norm correspondence, reduce problem to simple wall-crossing properties for transfer factors
- (long) calculations with transfer factors to check these properties

a. dual transfer: summary

• for each test fdg on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  attach test  $f_1dh_1$  on  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$ with matching orbital integrals in the sense of (5) of main theorem

- for each test fdg on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  attach test  $f_1dh_1$  on  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$ with matching orbital integrals in the sense of (5) of main theorem
- Θ<sub>1</sub>: stable distribution on H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ), correct Z<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) behavior and eigendistribution for center 3<sub>1</sub> of universal enveloping algebra

- for each test fdg on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  attach test  $f_1dh_1$  on  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$ with matching orbital integrals in the sense of (5) of main theorem
- Θ<sub>1</sub>: stable distribution on H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ), correct Z<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) behavior and eigendistribution for center 3<sub>1</sub> of universal enveloping algebra
- then  $\Theta: fdg \to \Theta_1(f_1dh_1)$  well-defined  $\theta$ -twisted invariant distribution on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  and eigendistribution for  $\mathfrak{Z}$

- for each test fdg on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  attach test  $f_1dh_1$  on  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$ with matching orbital integrals in the sense of (5) of main theorem
- Θ<sub>1</sub>: stable distribution on H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ), correct Z<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) behavior and eigendistribution for center 3<sub>1</sub> of universal enveloping algebra
- then  $\Theta: fdg \to \Theta_1(f_1dh_1)$  well-defined  $\theta$ -twisted invariant distribution on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  and eigendistribution for  $\mathfrak{Z}$
- $\Theta_1$  tempered  $\Longrightarrow \Theta$  tempered

- for each test fdg on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  attach test  $f_1dh_1$  on  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$ with matching orbital integrals in the sense of (5) of main theorem
- Θ<sub>1</sub>: stable distribution on H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ), correct Z<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) behavior and eigendistribution for center 3<sub>1</sub> of universal enveloping algebra
- then  $\Theta: fdg \to \Theta_1(f_1dh_1)$  well-defined  $\theta$ -twisted invariant distribution on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  and eigendistribution for  $\mathfrak{Z}$
- $\Theta_1$  tempered  $\Longrightarrow \Theta$  tempered
- endo  $\mathfrak{e}_z$  determines shift in infinitesimal character

- for each test fdg on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  attach test  $f_1dh_1$  on  $H_1(\mathbb{R})$ with matching orbital integrals in the sense of (5) of main theorem
- Θ<sub>1</sub>: stable distribution on H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ), correct Z<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) behavior and eigendistribution for center 3<sub>1</sub> of universal enveloping algebra
- then  $\Theta: fdg \to \Theta_1(f_1dh_1)$  well-defined  $\theta$ -twisted invariant distribution on  $G(\mathbb{R})$  and eigendistribution for  $\mathfrak{Z}$
- $\Theta_1$  tempered  $\Longrightarrow \Theta$  tempered
- endo  $e_z$  determines shift in infinitesimal character
- formula for Θ₁ as smooth function on regular set
   ⇒ formula for Θ as smooth function on regular set

b. dual transfer as spectral transfer

goal: for a stable character Θ<sub>1</sub> = St-Trace π<sub>1</sub>, where π<sub>1</sub> irreducible admissible representation of H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) with correct Z<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) behavior, to describe Θ explicitly as a combination of (θ, ∞)-twisted traces

$$f \longrightarrow Trace [\pi(f) \circ \pi(\theta, \omega)]$$
 (7)

notation:  $\pi(\theta, \omega)$  intertwines  $\pi \circ \theta$  and  $\omega \otimes \pi$  [also drop dg, dh]

b. dual transfer as spectral transfer

goal: for a stable character Θ<sub>1</sub> = St-Trace π<sub>1</sub>, where π<sub>1</sub> irreducible admissible representation of H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) with correct Z<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) behavior, to describe Θ explicitly as a combination of (θ, ∞)-twisted traces

$$f \longrightarrow Trace [\pi(f) \circ \pi(\theta, \omega)]$$
 (7)

notation:  $\pi(\theta, \omega)$  intertwines  $\pi \circ \theta$  and  $\omega \otimes \pi$  [also drop dg, dh]

• thus to establish dual transfer in the form

St-Trace 
$$\pi_1(f_1) = \sum_{\pi} \Delta(\pi_1, \pi) [$$
Trace  $\pi(f) \circ \pi(\theta, \omega) ]$  (8)

b. dual transfer as spectral transfer

goal: for a stable character Θ<sub>1</sub> = St-Trace π<sub>1</sub>, where π<sub>1</sub> irreducible admissible representation of H<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) with correct Z<sub>1</sub>(ℝ) behavior, to describe Θ explicitly as a combination of (θ, ∞)-twisted traces

$$f \longrightarrow Trace [\pi(f) \circ \pi(\theta, \omega)]$$
 (7)

notation:  $\pi(\theta, \omega)$  intertwines  $\pi \circ \theta$  and  $\omega \otimes \pi$  [also drop dg, dh]

• thus to establish dual transfer in the form

St-Trace 
$$\pi_1(f_1) = \sum_{\pi} \Delta(\pi_1, \pi) [\text{Trace } \pi(f) \circ \pi(\theta, \omega)]$$
 (8)

• term on right side will be independent of normalization of  $\pi(\theta, \omega)$ [ $\Delta_{II}$  involves twisted character formula and effects cancel]

bb. dual transfer as spectral transfer (cont.)

in place of very regular norm pairs (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ), (γ'<sub>1</sub>, δ'), consider very regular related pairs (π<sub>1</sub>, π), (π'<sub>1</sub>, π'): define (almost) canonical Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π; π'<sub>1</sub>, π')

bb. dual transfer as spectral transfer (cont.)

- in place of very regular norm pairs (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ), (γ'<sub>1</sub>, δ'), consider very regular related pairs (π<sub>1</sub>, π), (π'<sub>1</sub>, π'): define (almost) canonical Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π; π'<sub>1</sub>, π')
- again  $\Delta$  has same form  $\Delta_I \Delta_{II} \Delta_{III}$ ; may also define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \gamma_1, \delta)$

bb. dual transfer as spectral transfer (cont.)

- in place of very regular norm pairs (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ), (γ'<sub>1</sub>, δ'), consider very regular related pairs (π<sub>1</sub>, π), (π'<sub>1</sub>, π'): define (almost) canonical Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π; π'<sub>1</sub>, π')
- again  $\Delta$  has same form  $\Delta_I \Delta_{II} \Delta_{III}$ ; may also define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \gamma_1, \delta)$
- in transfer theorems use geom-spec compatible factors:  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) / \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) = \Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \gamma_1, \delta)$

bb. dual transfer as spectral transfer (cont.)

- in place of very regular norm pairs (γ<sub>1</sub>, δ), (γ'<sub>1</sub>, δ'), consider very regular related pairs (π<sub>1</sub>, π), (π'<sub>1</sub>, π'): define (almost) canonical Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π; π'<sub>1</sub>, π')
- again  $\Delta$  has same form  $\Delta_I \Delta_{II} \Delta_{III}$ ; may also define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \gamma_1, \delta)$
- in transfer theorems use geom-spec compatible factors:  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) / \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) = \Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \gamma_1, \delta)$
- standard setting: θ = identity, ω = trivial character results ⇒ structure on packets of representations
   ... then twisted setting ⇒ compatible additional structure on packets preserved by π → ω<sup>-1</sup> ⊗ (π ∘ θ)
c. very regular pairs

• prescribe very regular pairs via Arthur parameters, start with  $G^*$ 

c. very regular pairs

- prescribe very regular pairs via Arthur parameters, start with  $G^*$
- Arthur parameter:  $G^{\vee}$ -conjugacy class of an admissible hom  $\psi = (\varphi, \rho) : W_{\mathbb{R}} \times SL(2, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow {}^{L}G$

here  $\varphi$  [in general, essentially] bounded Langlands parameter

- prescribe very regular pairs via Arthur parameters, start with  $G^*$
- Arthur parameter: G<sup>∨</sup>-conjugacy class of an admissible hom ψ = (φ, ρ) : W<sub>R</sub> × SL(2, C) → <sup>L</sup>G
   here φ [in general, essentially] bounded Langlands parameter
- let S = S<sub>ψ</sub> = Cent(ψ(W<sub>ℝ</sub> × SL(2, ℂ)), G<sup>∨</sup>): ψ is elliptic if S<sup>0</sup> central

- prescribe very regular pairs via Arthur parameters, start with  $G^*$
- Arthur parameter: G<sup>∨</sup>-conjugacy class of an admissible hom ψ = (φ, ρ) : W<sub>R</sub> × SL(2, C) → <sup>L</sup>G
   here φ [in general, essentially] bounded Langlands parameter
- let S = S<sub>ψ</sub> = Cent(ψ(W<sub>R</sub> × SL(2, ℂ)), G<sup>∨</sup>): ψ is elliptic if S<sup>0</sup> central
- $\rho(SL(2,\mathbb{C})) \subset M^{\vee} = M_{\varphi}^{\vee} =$ Levi group  $Cent(\varphi(\mathbb{C}^{\times}), G^{\vee})$  in  $G^{\vee}$

- prescribe very regular pairs via Arthur parameters, start with  $G^*$
- Arthur parameter: G<sup>∨</sup>-conjugacy class of an admissible hom ψ = (φ, ρ) : W<sub>R</sub> × SL(2, C) → <sup>L</sup>G
   here φ [in general, essentially] bounded Langlands parameter
- let S = S<sub>ψ</sub> = Cent(ψ(W<sub>ℝ</sub> × SL(2, ℂ)), G<sup>∨</sup>): ψ is elliptic if S<sup>0</sup> central
- $\rho(SL(2,\mathbb{C})) \subset M^{\vee} = M_{\varphi}^{\vee} =$  Levi group  $Cent(\varphi(\mathbb{C}^{\times}), G^{\vee})$  in  $G^{\vee}$ • call  $\psi$  *u*-regular if  $\rho(SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$  contains regular unipotent elts of  $M^{\vee}$

- prescribe very regular pairs via Arthur parameters, start with  $G^*$
- Arthur parameter: G<sup>∨</sup>-conjugacy class of an admissible hom ψ = (φ, ρ) : W<sub>R</sub> × SL(2, C) → <sup>L</sup>G
   here φ [in general, essentially] bounded Langlands parameter
- let S = S<sub>ψ</sub> = Cent(ψ(W<sub>ℝ</sub> × SL(2, ℂ)), G<sup>∨</sup>): ψ is elliptic if S<sup>0</sup> central
- $\rho(SL(2,\mathbb{C})) \subset M^{\vee} = M_{\varphi}^{\vee} =$  Levi group  $Cent(\varphi(\mathbb{C}^{\times}), G^{\vee})$  in  $G^{\vee}$ • call  $\psi$  *u*-regular if  $\rho(SL(2,\mathbb{C}))$  contains regular unipotent elts of  $M^{\vee}$
- define group  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_{\varphi}$  in  ${}^{L}G$  as subgp gen by  $\mathcal{M}^{\vee}$  and  $\varphi(\mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}})$   $1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\vee} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \rightleftharpoons \mathcal{W}_{\mathbb{R}} \longrightarrow 1$ extract *L*-action same way as endo,  $\mathcal{M}^{*} = \text{dual, quasi-split over } \mathbb{R}$

cc. very regular pairs (cont.)

• *u*-regular  $\psi$  is elliptic  $\iff T \hookrightarrow M^* \hookrightarrow G^*$  all over  $\mathbb{R}$ , with T anisotropic modulo the center of G

cc. very regular pairs (cont.)

- *u*-regular  $\psi$  is elliptic  $\iff T \hookrightarrow M^* \hookrightarrow G^*$  all over  $\mathbb{R}$ , with T anisotropic modulo the center of G
- u-regular  $\psi = (\varphi, triv)$  is elliptic  $\iff \varphi$  discrete series parameter

cc. very regular pairs (cont.)

- *u*-regular  $\psi$  is elliptic  $\iff T \hookrightarrow M^* \hookrightarrow G^*$  all over  $\mathbb{R}$ , with T anisotropic modulo the center of G
- u-regular  $\psi = (\varphi, triv)$  is elliptic  $\Longleftrightarrow \varphi$  discrete series parameter
- attach packet Π to u-regular ψ : L-packet if ρ = triv, or Arthur packet otherwise [see Adams-Johnson, just elliptic here]

cc. very regular pairs (cont.)

- *u*-regular  $\psi$  is elliptic  $\iff T \hookrightarrow M^* \hookrightarrow G^*$  all over  $\mathbb{R}$ , with T anisotropic modulo the center of G
- u-regular  $\psi = (\varphi, \mathit{triv})$  is elliptic  $\Longleftrightarrow \varphi$  discrete series parameter
- attach packet Π to u-regular ψ : L-packet if ρ = triv, or Arthur packet otherwise [see Adams-Johnson, just elliptic here]
- do same for endo group: use only those *u*-regular  $\psi_1$  such that  $\psi_1(W_{\mathbb{R}} \times SL(2, \mathbb{C}))$  lies in the image of endo  $\mathcal{H}$ , up to conjugacy [ $\iff$  members of attached  $\Pi_1$  have correct  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$  behavior]

cc. very regular pairs (cont.)

- *u*-regular  $\psi$  is elliptic  $\iff T \hookrightarrow M^* \hookrightarrow G^*$  all over  $\mathbb{R}$ , with T anisotropic modulo the center of G
- u-regular  $\psi = (\varphi, \mathit{triv})$  is elliptic  $\Longleftrightarrow \varphi$  discrete series parameter
- attach packet Π to u-regular ψ : L-packet if ρ = triv, or Arthur packet otherwise [see Adams-Johnson, just elliptic here]
- do same for endo group: use only those *u*-regular  $\psi_1$  such that  $\psi_1(W_{\mathbb{R}} \times SL(2, \mathbb{C}))$  lies in the image of endo  $\mathcal{H}$ , up to conjugacy [ $\iff$  members of attached  $\Pi_1$  have correct  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$  behavior]
- such  $\psi_1$  determines parameter  $\psi_{\psi_1}$  for  $G^*$ , Levi group  $\mathcal{M}_1$  for  $\psi_1$  determines subgroup  $\mathcal{M}_H$  of  $\mathcal{H}$ contained in Levi  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $\psi_{\psi_1}$ : call  $\psi_1$  G-regular if  $\mathcal{M}_H = \mathcal{M}$

イロト 不得下 イヨト イヨト 二日

cc. very regular pairs (cont.)

- *u*-regular  $\psi$  is elliptic  $\iff T \hookrightarrow M^* \hookrightarrow G^*$  all over  $\mathbb{R}$ , with T anisotropic modulo the center of G
- u-regular  $\psi = (\varphi, \mathit{triv})$  is elliptic  $\Longleftrightarrow \varphi$  discrete series parameter
- attach packet Π to u-regular ψ : L-packet if ρ = triv, or Arthur packet otherwise [see Adams-Johnson, just elliptic here]
- do same for endo group: use only those *u*-regular  $\psi_1$  such that  $\psi_1(W_{\mathbb{R}} \times SL(2, \mathbb{C}))$  lies in the image of endo  $\mathcal{H}$ , up to conjugacy [ $\iff$  members of attached  $\Pi_1$  have correct  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$  behavior]
- such  $\psi_1$  determines parameter  $\psi_{\psi_1}$  for  $G^*$ , Levi group  $\mathcal{M}_1$  for  $\psi_1$  determines subgroup  $\mathcal{M}_H$  of  $\mathcal{H}$ contained in Levi  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $\psi_{\psi_1}$ : call  $\psi_1$  G-regular if  $\mathcal{M}_H = \mathcal{M}$
- $(\psi_1,\psi)$  very regular pair:  $\psi_1,\psi$  are *u*-regular and  $\psi_1$  is *G*-regular

・ロト ・四ト ・ヨト ・ヨト ・ヨ

cc. very regular pairs (cont.)

- *u*-regular  $\psi$  is elliptic  $\iff T \hookrightarrow M^* \hookrightarrow G^*$  all over  $\mathbb{R}$ , with T anisotropic modulo the center of G
- u-regular  $\psi = (\varphi, \mathit{triv})$  is elliptic  $\Longleftrightarrow \varphi$  discrete series parameter
- attach packet Π to u-regular ψ : L-packet if ρ = triv, or Arthur packet otherwise [see Adams-Johnson, just elliptic here]
- do same for endo group: use only those *u*-regular  $\psi_1$  such that  $\psi_1(W_{\mathbb{R}} \times SL(2, \mathbb{C}))$  lies in the image of endo  $\mathcal{H}$ , up to conjugacy [ $\iff$  members of attached  $\Pi_1$  have correct  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$  behavior]
- such ψ<sub>1</sub> determines parameter ψ<sub>ψ1</sub> for G<sup>\*</sup>,
   Levi group M<sub>1</sub> for ψ<sub>1</sub> determines subgroup M<sub>H</sub> of H
   contained in Levi M for ψ<sub>ψ1</sub> : call ψ<sub>1</sub> G-regular if M<sub>H</sub> = M
- (ψ<sub>1</sub>, ψ) very regular pair: ψ<sub>1</sub>, ψ are *u*-regular and ψ<sub>1</sub> is *G*-regular
  very regular related pair: also ψ = ψ<sub>ψ</sub>

◆□▶ ◆圖▶ ◆圖▶ ◆圖▶ ─ 圖

d. standard setting: tempered pairs

• same defs for pairs  $(\pi_1, \pi)$  in packets  $(\Pi_1, \Pi)$  attached to  $(\psi_1, \psi)$ 

- same defs for pairs  $(\pi_1,\pi)$  in packets  $(\Pi_1,\Pi)$  attached to  $(\psi_1,\psi)$
- start with standard setting, tempered (ρ = triv) and elliptic:

   (8) says: St-Trace π<sub>1</sub>(f<sub>1</sub>) = ∑<sub>π</sub> Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π) Trace π(f)
   (π<sub>1</sub>, π), (π'<sub>1</sub>, π') related pairs discrete series representations with Langlands parameters (φ<sub>1</sub>, φ), (φ'<sub>1</sub>, φ')

- same defs for pairs  $(\pi_1,\pi)$  in packets  $(\Pi_1,\Pi)$  attached to  $(\psi_1,\psi)$
- start with standard setting, tempered (ρ = triv) and elliptic:
   (8) says: St-Trace π<sub>1</sub>(f<sub>1</sub>) = ∑<sub>π</sub> Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π) Trace π(f)
   (π<sub>1</sub>, π), (π'<sub>1</sub>, π') related pairs discrete series representations with Langlands parameters (φ<sub>1</sub>, φ), (φ'<sub>1</sub>, φ')
- define relative factor  $\Delta(\pi_1,\pi;\pi_1',\pi')$

- same defs for pairs  $(\pi_1,\pi)$  in packets  $(\Pi_1,\Pi)$  attached to  $(\psi_1,\psi)$
- start with standard setting, tempered ( $\rho = triv$ ) and elliptic: (8) says: St-Trace  $\pi_1(f_1) = \sum_{\pi} \Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  Trace  $\pi(f)$  $(\pi_1, \pi), (\pi'_1, \pi')$  related pairs discrete series representations

with Langlands parameters  $(\varphi_1, \varphi)$ ,  $(\varphi'_1, \varphi')$ 

- define relative factor  $\Delta(\pi_{1},\pi;\pi_{1}',\pi')$
- toral data  $T_1 \rightarrow T$ , with T anisotropic mod center of G, *a*-data,  $\chi$ -data for  $\Delta_I, \Delta_{II}, \Delta_{III}$

- same defs for pairs  $(\pi_1,\pi)$  in packets  $(\Pi_1,\Pi)$  attached to  $(\psi_1,\psi)$
- start with standard setting, tempered ( $\rho = triv$ ) and elliptic: (8) says: St-Trace  $\pi_1(f_1) = \sum_{\pi} \Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  Trace  $\pi(f)$

 $(\pi_1,\pi),\,(\pi_1',\pi')$  related pairs discrete series representations with Langlands parameters  $(\varphi_1,\varphi),\,(\varphi_1',\varphi')$ 

- define relative factor  $\Delta(\pi_{1},\pi;\pi_{1}',\pi')$
- toral data  $T_1 \rightarrow T$ , with T anisotropic mod center of G, *a*-data,  $\chi$ -data for  $\Delta_I$ ,  $\Delta_{II}$ ,  $\Delta_{III}$
- Δ<sub>II</sub> involves local formula for *Trace* π(f) as smooth function ...
   [fourth root of unity if rewrite usual Harish-Chandra formula]

dd. standard setting: tempered pairs (cont.)

• via parabolic induction extend defns to  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$ ,  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \gamma_1, \delta)$ , for all very regular norm pairs  $(\gamma_1, \delta)$ and all tempered very regular related pairs  $(\pi_1, \pi), (\pi'_1, \pi')$ [set  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) = 0$  if pair not related]

dd. standard setting: tempered pairs (cont.)

- via parabolic induction extend defns to  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$ ,  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \gamma_1, \delta)$ , for all very regular norm pairs  $(\gamma_1, \delta)$ and all tempered very regular related pairs  $(\pi_1, \pi), (\pi'_1, \pi')$ [set  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) = 0$  if pair not related]
- proof of (8) for tempered very regular pairs: reduce quickly to elliptic case, discrete series both sides, and then apply Harish-Chandra characterization theorem: transfer  $\Theta$  is tempered invariant eigendistribution with correct infinitesimal character and agrees with  $\sum_{\pi} \Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  Trace  $\pi(f)$  on regular elliptic set

dd. standard setting: tempered pairs (cont.)

- via parabolic induction extend defns to  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$ ,  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \gamma_1, \delta)$ , for all very regular norm pairs  $(\gamma_1, \delta)$ and all tempered very regular related pairs  $(\pi_1, \pi), (\pi'_1, \pi')$ [set  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) = 0$  if pair not related]
- proof of (8) for tempered very regular pairs: reduce quickly to elliptic case, discrete series both sides, and then apply Harish-Chandra characterization theorem: transfer  $\Theta$  is tempered invariant eigendistribution with correct infinitesimal character and agrees with  $\sum_{\pi} \Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  Trace  $\pi(f)$  on regular elliptic set
- now theorem for all tempered pairs? for example, need this for converse: spec transfer for  $(f_1, f) \implies$  geom transfer for  $(f_1, f)$

e. standard setting: tempered transfer theorem

main case = elliptic on left: transfer discrete series to limits of discrete series, limits which arise have Levi *M* of type (A<sub>1</sub>)<sup>n</sup> then Hecht-Schmid character identities + analysis in G<sup>∨</sup> identifies transfer Θ as right side of (8), where factor Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π) is defined via analog of Zuckerman translation for parameters

e. standard setting: tempered transfer theorem

- main case = elliptic on left: transfer discrete series to limits of discrete series, limits which arise have Levi *M* of type (A<sub>1</sub>)<sup>n</sup> then Hecht-Schmid character identities + analysis in G<sup>∨</sup> identifies transfer Θ as right side of (8), where factor Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π) is defined via analog of Zuckerman translation for parameters
- conclude the following continuation of geom transfer thm, std setting:

e. standard setting: tempered transfer theorem

- main case = elliptic on left: transfer discrete series to limits of discrete series, limits which arise have Levi *M* of type (A<sub>1</sub>)<sup>n</sup> then Hecht-Schmid character identities + analysis in G<sup>∨</sup> identifies transfer Θ as right side of (8), where factor Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π) is defined via analog of Zuckerman translation for parameters
- conclude the following continuation of geom transfer thm, std setting:

#### Theorem

Suppose geom, spec factors  $\Delta$  are compatible. Then

St-Trace 
$$\pi_1(f_1dh_1) = \sum_{\pi} \Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$$
 Trace  $\pi(fdg)$  (9)

for all tempered irreducible admissible representations  $\pi_1$  such that  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$  acts by  $\lambda_1$ .

Diana Shelstad ()

f. comments

• Conversely: if fdg,  $f_1 dh_1$  are test measures satisfying (9) then  $SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1) = \sum_{\delta \ coni} \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) \ O(\delta, fdg)$  (10)

for all strongly G-regular  $\gamma_1$  in  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ . Proof: Use both transfer thms plus same  $SO's \implies$  same St-Traces

f. comments

• Conversely: if fdg,  $f_1 dh_1$  are test measures satisfying (9) then  $SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1) = \sum_{\delta \ conj} \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) \ O(\delta, fdg)$  (10)

for all strongly G-regular  $\gamma_1$  in  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ . Proof: Use both transfer thms plus same  $SO's \implies$  same St-Traces

• alternate argument to prove tempered spectral transfer:

f. comments

• Conversely: if fdg,  $f_1 dh_1$  are test measures satisfying (9) then  $SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1) = \sum_{\delta \ conj} \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) \ O(\delta, fdg)$  (10)

for all strongly G-regular  $\gamma_1$  in  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ . Proof: Use both transfer thms plus same  $SO's \implies$  same St-Traces

- alternate argument to prove tempered spectral transfer:
- (i) in the elliptic case the chosen Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π) are the only possible coefficients for a spectral version of dual transfer ..., plus they have correct properties re translation principle and parabolic induction ... again this depends also on properties of the geometric factors and compatibility factors

f. comments

• Conversely: if fdg,  $f_1 dh_1$  are test measures satisfying (9) then  $SO(\gamma_1, f_1 dh_1) = \sum_{\delta \ conj} \Delta(\gamma_1, \delta) \ O(\delta, fdg)$  (10)

for all strongly G-regular  $\gamma_1$  in  $Z_1(\mathbb{R})$ . Proof: Use both transfer thms plus same  $SO's \implies$  same St-Traces

- alternate argument to prove tempered spectral transfer:
- (i) in the elliptic case the chosen Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π) are the only possible coefficients for a spectral version of dual transfer ..., plus they have correct properties re translation principle and parabolic induction ... again this depends also on properties of the geometric factors and compatibility factors
- (ii) theorem is true for some choice of coefficients [old result] and so it is true with the factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  we have defined

g. standard setting: very regular pairs in general

• still in standard setting, nontempered examples? define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  for very regular pairs in general: enough to define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  for some tempered  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$ , then  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) := \Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi') \cdot \Delta(\pi'_1, \pi')$ 

- still in standard setting, nontempered examples? define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  for very regular pairs in general: enough to define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  for some tempered  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$ , then  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) := \Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi') \cdot \Delta(\pi'_1, \pi')$
- start with elliptic case: construct  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$  tempered elliptic or just  $\pi'_1$  tempered elliptic in some cases

- still in standard setting, nontempered examples? define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  for very regular pairs in general: enough to define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  for some tempered  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$ , then  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) := \Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi') \cdot \Delta(\pi'_1, \pi')$
- start with elliptic case: construct  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$  tempered elliptic or just  $\pi'_1$  tempered elliptic in some cases
- for transfer statement (9): apply alternate argument to character identities of Adams-Johnson [see Arthur, Kottwitz]

- still in standard setting, nontempered examples? define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  for very regular pairs in general: enough to define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  for some tempered  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$ , then  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) := \Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi') \cdot \Delta(\pi'_1, \pi')$
- start with elliptic case: construct  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$  tempered elliptic or just  $\pi'_1$  tempered elliptic in some cases
- for transfer statement (9): apply alternate argument to character identities of Adams-Johnson [see Arthur, Kottwitz]
- or check directly that these factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  work in A-J arguments: use familiar formula for relative factor  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi') := \Delta(\pi_1, \pi) / \Delta(\pi'_1, \pi')$  when  $\pi, \pi'$  lie in same Arthur packet

- still in standard setting, nontempered examples? define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  for very regular pairs in general: enough to define  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  for some tempered  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$ , then  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi) := \Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi') \cdot \Delta(\pi'_1, \pi')$
- start with elliptic case: construct  $(\pi'_1, \pi')$  tempered elliptic or just  $\pi'_1$  tempered elliptic in some cases
- for transfer statement (9): apply alternate argument to character identities of Adams-Johnson [see Arthur, Kottwitz]
- or check directly that these factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi)$  work in A-J arguments: use familiar formula for relative factor  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi') := \Delta(\pi_1, \pi) / \Delta(\pi'_1, \pi')$  when  $\pi, \pi'$  lie in same Arthur packet
- [remove elliptic assumption]

h. general twisted setting

• return to twist by  $(\theta, \omega)$  and start with tempered setting

h. general twisted setting

- return to twist by  $(\theta, \omega)$  and start with tempered setting
- now concerned only with (θ, ∞)-stable packets Π, *i.e.* those Π preserved by π → ∞<sup>-1</sup> ⊗ (π ∘ θ), along with attached twist-packet Π<sup>θ,∞</sup> consisting of those π ∈ Π fixed by this map

h. general twisted setting

- return to twist by ( heta, arnothing) and start with tempered setting
- now concerned only with  $(\theta, \varpi)$ -stable packets  $\Pi$ , *i.e.* those  $\Pi$  preserved by  $\pi \to \varpi^{-1} \otimes (\pi \circ \theta)$ , along with attached twist-packet  $\Pi^{\theta, \varpi}$  consisting of those  $\pi \in \Pi$  fixed by this map
- enough:  $\theta$  preserves fundamental splitting [earlier comment]
# Endoscopic transfer: spectral side

h. general twisted setting

- return to twist by  $(\theta, \omega)$  and start with tempered setting
- now concerned only with  $(\theta, \omega)$ -stable packets  $\Pi$ , *i.e.* those  $\Pi$  preserved by  $\pi \to \omega^{-1} \otimes (\pi \circ \theta)$ , along with attached twist-packet  $\Pi^{\theta, \omega}$  consisting of those  $\pi \in \Pi$  fixed by this map
- enough:  $\theta$  preserves fundamental splitting [earlier comment]
- essentially harmonic analysis on group G(ℝ) ⋊ ⟨θ⟩ outside Harish-Chandra class [some results not yet written in sufficient generality to claim transfer results in general]

# Endoscopic transfer: spectral side

h. general twisted setting

- return to twist by  $(\theta, \omega)$  and start with tempered setting
- now concerned only with  $(\theta, \omega)$ -stable packets  $\Pi$ , *i.e.* those  $\Pi$  preserved by  $\pi \to \omega^{-1} \otimes (\pi \circ \theta)$ , along with attached twist-packet  $\Pi^{\theta, \omega}$  consisting of those  $\pi \in \Pi$  fixed by this map
- enough:  $\theta$  preserves fundamental splitting [earlier comment]
- essentially harmonic analysis on group G(ℝ) ⋊ ⟨θ⟩ outside Harish-Chandra class [some results not yet written in sufficient generality to claim transfer results in general]
- approach to defining tempered spectral factors: again elliptic setting first, translation, and then parabolic descent [Mezo 2013: use results of Duflo for parabolic induction]

イロト イヨト イヨト

• spectral factors in tempered elliptic case: now constructions parallel those for twisted geometric factors of Kottwitz-Shelstad, again compatibility factors, parallel properties, *etc.* 

- spectral factors in tempered elliptic case: now constructions parallel those for twisted geometric factors of Kottwitz-Shelstad, again compatibility factors, parallel properties, *etc.*
- Proof of transfer: apply alternate argument again, here to character identities of Mezo

- spectral factors in tempered elliptic case: now constructions parallel those for twisted geometric factors of Kottwitz-Shelstad, again compatibility factors, parallel properties, *etc.*
- Proof of transfer: apply alternate argument again, here to character identities of Mezo
- Mezo 2012: identities for elliptic (π<sub>1</sub>, π), also when only π<sub>1</sub> elliptic, with coefficients written in terms of data from Duflo's method rather than directly from Harish-Chandra character formula

- spectral factors in tempered elliptic case: now constructions parallel those for twisted geometric factors of Kottwitz-Shelstad, again compatibility factors, parallel properties, *etc.*
- Proof of transfer: apply alternate argument again, here to character identities of Mezo
- Mezo 2012: identities for elliptic (π<sub>1</sub>, π), also when only π<sub>1</sub> elliptic, with coefficients written in terms of data from Duflo's method rather than directly from Harish-Chandra character formula
- again similar approach to standard case to define twisted factors Δ(π<sub>1</sub>, π) for nontempered very regular pairs (π<sub>1</sub>, π) ...

introduction

• summary: along with geometric transfer factors come spectral factors, in both standard and twisted settings; these express dual transfer as a spectral transfer [incomplete ...]

introduction

- summary: along with geometric transfer factors come spectral factors, in both standard and twisted settings; these express dual transfer as a spectral transfer [incomplete ...]
- now we use the relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  to establish pairings of a packet  $\Pi$  with a finite group defined on dual side

introduction

- summary: along with geometric transfer factors come spectral factors, in both standard and twisted settings; these express dual transfer as a spectral transfer [incomplete ...]
- now we use the relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  to establish pairings of a packet  $\Pi$  with a finite group defined on dual side
- then twisted relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  provide compatible pairings for twist-packets  $\Pi^{\theta, \omega}$  within  $(\theta, \omega)$ -stable  $\Pi$

introduction

- summary: along with geometric transfer factors come spectral factors, in both standard and twisted settings; these express dual transfer as a spectral transfer [incomplete ...]
- now we use the relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  to establish pairings of a packet  $\Pi$  with a finite group defined on dual side
- then twisted relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi'_1, \pi')$  provide compatible pairings for twist-packets  $\Pi^{\theta, \omega}$  within  $(\theta, \omega)$ -stable  $\Pi$
- various (Galois-cohomological) properties of pairings have consequences for harmonic analysis, *e.g.* inversion of spectral transfer in tempered setting

[Whittaker normalizations  $\implies$  simplest spectral pairings]

Diana Shelstad ()

a. standard setting

• start with tempered packet  $\Pi$  and use relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi_1, \pi')$ , with  $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$ , to put structure on  $\Pi$ 

- a. standard setting
  - start with tempered packet  $\Pi$  and use relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi_1, \pi')$ , with  $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$ , to put structure on  $\Pi$
  - $\pi_1$  determined by spectral construction of endo data:

- start with tempered packet  $\Pi$  and use relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi_1, \pi')$ , with  $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$ , to put structure on  $\Pi$
- $\pi_1$  determined by spectral construction of endo data:
- $\varphi: W_{\mathbb{R}} \to {}^{L}G$  Langlands parameter for  $\Pi$   $S = Cent(\varphi(W_{\mathbb{R}}), G^{\vee})^{0}, \qquad S^{ad} = \text{image of } S \text{ in } (G^{\vee})_{ad},$  $S^{sc} = \text{preimage of } S^{ad} \text{ in } (G^{\vee})_{sc}, \quad s_{sc} = \text{semisimple element in } S^{sc}$

- start with tempered packet  $\Pi$  and use relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi_1, \pi')$ , with  $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$ , to put structure on  $\Pi$
- $\pi_1$  determined by spectral construction of endo data:
- φ: W<sub>R</sub> → <sup>L</sup>G Langlands parameter for Π S = Cent(φ(W<sub>R</sub>), G<sup>∨</sup>)<sup>0</sup>, S<sup>ad</sup> = image of S in (G<sup>∨</sup>)<sub>ad</sub>, S<sup>sc</sup> = preimage of S<sup>ad</sup> in (G<sup>∨</sup>)<sub>sc</sub>, s<sub>sc</sub> = semisimple element in S<sup>sc</sup>
  s = image of s<sub>sc</sub> in G<sup>∨</sup> H(s) = subgroup of <sup>L</sup>G generated by Cent(s, G<sup>∨</sup>)<sup>0</sup> and φ(W<sub>R</sub>) e<sub>z</sub>(s<sub>sc</sub>) = e<sub>z</sub>(s) = attached suppl. endo data

- start with tempered packet  $\Pi$  and use relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi_1, \pi')$ , with  $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$ , to put structure on  $\Pi$
- $\pi_1$  determined by spectral construction of endo data:
- $\varphi: W_{\mathbb{R}} \to {}^{L}G$  Langlands parameter for  $\Pi$   $S = Cent(\varphi(W_{\mathbb{R}}), G^{\vee})^{0}, \qquad S^{ad} = \text{image of } S \text{ in } (G^{\vee})_{ad},$   $S^{sc} = \text{preimage of } S^{ad} \text{ in } (G^{\vee})_{sc}, \quad s_{sc} = \text{semisimple element in } S^{sc}$ •  $s = \text{image of } s_{sc} \text{ in } G^{\vee}$   $\mathcal{H}(s) = \text{subgroup of } {}^{L}G \text{ generated by } Cent(s, G^{\vee})^{0} \text{ and } \varphi(W_{\mathbb{R}})$  $\mathfrak{e}_{z}(s_{sc}) = \mathfrak{e}_{z}(s) = \text{ attached suppl. endo data}$
- by construction,  $\varphi$  factors through well-positioned  $\varphi^s: W_{\mathbb{R}} \to {}^L H_1$

- start with tempered packet  $\Pi$  and use relative factors  $\Delta(\pi_1, \pi; \pi_1, \pi')$ , with  $\pi, \pi' \in \Pi$ , to put structure on  $\Pi$
- $\pi_1$  determined by spectral construction of endo data:
- φ: W<sub>R</sub> → <sup>L</sup>G Langlands parameter for Π S = Cent(φ(W<sub>R</sub>), G<sup>∨</sup>)<sup>0</sup>, S<sup>ad</sup> = image of S in (G<sup>∨</sup>)<sub>ad</sub>, S<sup>sc</sup> = preimage of S<sup>ad</sup> in (G<sup>∨</sup>)<sub>sc</sub>, s<sub>sc</sub> = semisimple element in S<sup>sc</sup>
  s = image of s<sub>sc</sub> in G<sup>∨</sup> H(s) = subgroup of <sup>L</sup>G generated by Cent(s, G<sup>∨</sup>)<sup>0</sup> and φ(W<sub>R</sub>) e<sub>z</sub>(s<sub>sc</sub>) = e<sub>z</sub>(s) = attached suppl. endo data
- by construction,  $\varphi$  factors through *well-positioned*  $\varphi^s: W_{\mathbb{R}} \to {}^LH_1$
- ullet now for  $\pi_1$  take any  $\pi^s\in\Pi^s=$  packet attached to  $arphi^s$

aa. standard setting

Theorem: s<sub>sc</sub> → Δ(π<sup>s</sup>, π; π<sup>s</sup>, π') depends only on the image of s<sub>sc</sub> under S<sup>sc</sup> → S<sup>ad</sup> → π<sub>0</sub>(S<sup>ad</sup>) = S<sup>ad</sup> = sum of Z/2's

- Theorem: s<sub>sc</sub> → Δ(π<sup>s</sup>, π; π<sup>s</sup>, π') depends only on the image of s<sub>sc</sub> under S<sup>sc</sup> → S<sup>ad</sup> → π<sub>0</sub>(S<sup>ad</sup>) = S<sup>ad</sup> = sum of ℤ/2's
- and defines character on S<sup>ad</sup>, trivial iff π = π', all ...
   [in general this requires a dual, uniform by packet, version of Knapp-Zuckerman decomposition of unitary principal series]

- Theorem: s<sub>sc</sub> → Δ(π<sup>s</sup>, π; π<sup>s</sup>, π') depends only on the image of s<sub>sc</sub> under S<sup>sc</sup> → S<sup>ad</sup> → π<sub>0</sub>(S<sup>ad</sup>) = S<sup>ad</sup> = sum of ℤ/2's
- and defines character on S<sup>ad</sup>, trivial iff π = π', all ...
   [in general this requires a dual, uniform by packet, version of Knapp-Zuckerman decomposition of unitary principal series]
- ullet elliptic case: just Tate-Nakayama duality  $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}$

aa. standard setting

- Theorem: s<sub>sc</sub> → Δ(π<sup>s</sup>, π; π<sup>s</sup>, π') depends only on the image of s<sub>sc</sub> under S<sup>sc</sup> → S<sup>ad</sup> → π<sub>0</sub>(S<sup>ad</sup>) = S<sup>ad</sup> = sum of ℤ/2's
- and defines character on S<sup>ad</sup>, trivial iff π = π', all ...
   [in general this requires a dual, uniform by packet, version of Knapp-Zuckerman decomposition of unitary principal series]
- ullet elliptic case: just Tate-Nakayama duality  $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}$
- in general, don't use duality with  $\mathbb{S}^{ad}$  but with extension, e.g.  $\mathbb{S}^{sc}$ so will write  $\Delta(\pi^s, \pi; \pi^s, \pi') = \langle \pi, s_{sc} \rangle / \langle \pi', s_{sc} \rangle$ : pick base point  $\pi_0$  for  $\Pi$  and specify character  $s_{sc} \rightarrow \langle \pi_0, s_{sc} \rangle$ , then  $\langle \pi, s_{sc} \rangle := \Delta(\pi^s, \pi; \pi^s, \pi_0) \langle \pi_0, s_{sc} \rangle$

... pairing of type proposed by Arthur for global picture [2007] [better, new approach of Kaletha]

aa. standard setting

- **Theorem:**  $s_{sc} \to \Delta(\pi^s, \pi; \pi^s, \pi')$  depends only on the image of  $s_{sc}$ under  $S^{sc} \to S^{ad} \to \pi_0(S^{ad}) = \mathbb{S}^{ad} = \text{sum of } \mathbb{Z}/2$ 's
- and defines character on S<sup>ad</sup>, trivial iff π = π', all ...
   [in general this requires a dual, uniform by packet, version of Knapp-Zuckerman decomposition of unitary principal series]
- ullet elliptic case: just Tate-Nakayama duality  $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}$
- in general, don't use duality with  $\mathbb{S}^{ad}$  but with extension, e.g.  $\mathbb{S}^{sc}$ so will write  $\Delta(\pi^s, \pi; \pi^s, \pi') = \langle \pi, s_{sc} \rangle / \langle \pi', s_{sc} \rangle$ : pick base point  $\pi_0$  for  $\Pi$  and specify character  $s_{sc} \rightarrow \langle \pi_0, s_{sc} \rangle$ , then  $\langle \pi, s_{sc} \rangle := \Delta(\pi^s, \pi; \pi^s, \pi_0) \langle \pi_0, s_{sc} \rangle$

... pairing of type proposed by Arthur for global picture [2007] [better, new approach of Kaletha]

• simpler case... **Theorem:** G of quasi-split type, Whittaker norm of absolute  $\Delta$ ,  $\pi_0$  generic, trivial character  $s_{sc} \rightarrow \langle \pi_0, s_{sc} \rangle$ :  $\langle \pi, s \rangle := \Delta(\pi^s, \pi)$  gives perfect pairing ...  $\Pi$  as dual of  $\mathbb{S}^{ad}$ 

b. inversion and a calculation

• Corollary: invert transfer in Whittaker setting simply as

Trace 
$$\pi(f) = \left| \mathbb{S}^{ad} \right|^{-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}^{ad}} \langle \pi, s \rangle$$
 St-Trace  $\pi^s(f_1^s)$  (11)

for all tempered  $\pi$ , test f and corresponding test  $f_1^s$ 

b. inversion and a calculation

• Corollary: invert transfer in Whittaker setting simply as

$$Trace \ \pi(f) = \left| \mathbb{S}^{ad} \right|^{-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}^{ad}} \ \langle \pi, s \rangle \ St-Trace \ \pi^{s}(f_{1}^{s})$$
(11)

for all tempered  $\pi$ , test f and corresponding test  $f_1^s$ 

 now review some constructions, focus on Whittaker case, and move to twisted setting ...

b. inversion and a calculation

• Corollary: invert transfer in Whittaker setting simply as

$$Trace \ \pi(f) = \left| \mathbb{S}^{ad} \right|^{-1} \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}^{ad}} \ \langle \pi, s \rangle \ St-Trace \ \pi^{s}(f_{1}^{s})$$
(11)

for all tempered  $\pi$ , test f and corresponding test  $f_1^s$ 

- now review some constructions, focus on Whittaker case, and move to twisted setting ...
- elliptic case, Whittaker setting: calculate ⟨π, s⟩?
   G<sup>\*</sup> cuspidal, T anisotropic mod center, also T<sub>G</sub> ⊆ G
   π = discrete series, π<sub>0</sub> determines Weyl chamber(s) C<sub>0</sub>
   yielding toral data for T in G<sup>\*</sup> and then well-defined character κ
   on H<sup>1</sup>(Γ, T<sup>sc</sup>); π determines chamber for T<sub>G</sub>; inner twist carries this chamber to C<sub>0</sub> up to inner automorphism; make a well defined element ω in H<sup>1</sup>(Γ, T<sup>sc</sup>); finally, ⟨π, s⟩ = κ(ω)

- c. twisted setting
  - remarks on last calculation:

э

#### c. twisted setting

- remarks on last calculation:
- (i) (π, s) is the absolute version of Δ<sub>III</sub> available in this setting in general setting, there is a central obstruction to defining ω in H<sup>1</sup> which is handled by going to relative version using a trick from the original definition of geometric factors in [L-S] [trick works for any pair T, T' of maximal tori over local field F ...] nonabelian variant for general elliptic u-regular case

#### c. twisted setting

- remarks on last calculation:
- (i) (π, s) is the absolute version of Δ<sub>III</sub> available in this setting in general setting, there is a central obstruction to defining ω in H<sup>1</sup> which is handled by going to relative version using a trick from the original definition of geometric factors in [L-S] [trick works for any pair T, T' of maximal tori over local field F ...] nonabelian variant for general elliptic u-regular case
- (ii) it is easy to extend this type of calculation (for discrete series) to the twisted setting using fundamental splittings (Weyl chambers → fnd. splittings):

#### c. twisted setting

- remarks on last calculation:
- (i) (π, s) is the absolute version of Δ<sub>III</sub> available in this setting in general setting, there is a central obstruction to defining ω in H<sup>1</sup> which is handled by going to relative version using a trick from the original definition of geometric factors in [L-S] [trick works for any pair T, T' of maximal tori over local field F ...] nonabelian variant for general elliptic u-regular case
- (ii) it is easy to extend this type of calculation (for discrete series) to the twisted setting using fundamental splittings (Weyl chambers → fnd. splittings):
- assume  $\theta$  preserves fnd. splitting  $spl_f$ ; may assume inner twist  $\eta$  transports  $spl_f$  to fnd. splitting  $spl_f^*$  of  $G^*$  preserved by  $\theta^*$ ,  $spl_f^*$  provides toral data to transport objects from  $G^{\vee}$ ...

cc. twisted setting (cont.)

Π = (θ, ω)-stable packet of discrete series
 fnd. splitting spl<sub>π</sub> for π in twist-packet Π<sup>θ,ω</sup> is preserved by θ
 up to inner automorphism η transports spl<sub>π</sub> to spl<sub>f</sub><sup>\*</sup>
 make Galois cocycle in this setting (relative in general)

- Π = (θ, ω)-stable packet of discrete series
   fnd. splitting spl<sub>π</sub> for π in twist-packet Π<sup>θ,ω</sup> is preserved by θ
   up to inner automorphism η transports spl<sub>π</sub> to spl<sup>\*</sup><sub>f</sub>
   make Galois cocycle in this setting (relative in general)
- cocycle almost takes values in θ\*-invariants; instead, satisfies hypercocycle condition, so back to setting of Kottwitz-Shelstad for geometric transfer factors

- Π = (θ, ω)-stable packet of discrete series
   fnd. splitting spl<sub>π</sub> for π in twist-packet Π<sup>θ,ω</sup> is preserved by θ
   up to inner automorphism η transports spl<sub>π</sub> to spl<sub>f</sub><sup>\*</sup>
   make Galois cocycle in this setting (relative in general)
- cocycle almost takes values in θ\*-invariants; instead, satisfies hypercocycle condition, so back to setting of Kottwitz-Shelstad for geometric transfer factors
- compatibility statement: introduce twisted version of S,

- Π = (θ, ω)-stable packet of discrete series
   fnd. splitting spl<sub>π</sub> for π in twist-packet Π<sup>θ,ω</sup> is preserved by θ
   up to inner automorphism η transports spl<sub>π</sub> to spl<sup>\*</sup><sub>f</sub>
   make Galois cocycle in this setting (relative in general)
- cocycle almost takes values in θ\*-invariants; instead, satisfies hypercocycle condition, so back to setting of Kottwitz-Shelstad for geometric transfer factors
- compatibility statement: introduce twisted version of S, • work in  $G^{\vee} \rtimes \langle \theta^{\vee} \rangle$  ...

- Π = (θ, ω)-stable packet of discrete series
   fnd. splitting spl<sub>π</sub> for π in twist-packet Π<sup>θ,ω</sup> is preserved by θ
   up to inner automorphism η transports spl<sub>π</sub> to spl<sup>\*</sup><sub>f</sub>
   make Galois cocycle in this setting (relative in general)
- cocycle almost takes values in θ\*-invariants; instead, satisfies hypercocycle condition, so back to setting of Kottwitz-Shelstad for geometric transfer factors
- compatibility statement: introduce twisted version of S,
- work in  $G^{\vee} \rtimes \langle \theta^{\vee} \rangle \dots$
- for nontrivial twisting character  $\mathcal{O}$ , analysis exploits map on endo data:  $\mathfrak{e}_z \to (\mathfrak{e}_z)_{ad}$  dual to  $G_{sc} \to G$