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#### Abstract

We determine the poles of the standard intertwining operators for a maximal parabolic subgroup of the quasi-split unitary group defined by a quadratic extension $E / F$ of $p$-adic fields of characteristic zero. We study the case where the Levi component $M \simeq \operatorname{GL}_{n}(E) \times U_{m}(F)$, with $n \equiv m$ $(\bmod 2)$. This, along with earlier work, determines the poles of the local Rankin-Selberg product $L$ function $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$, with $\tau^{\prime}$ an irreducible unitary supercuspidal representation of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ and $\tau$ a generic irreducible unitary supercuspidal representation of $U_{m}(F)$. The results are interpreted using the theory of twisted endoscopy.


## Introduction

One significance of the approach of Langlands-Shahidi to the definition of local $L$ functions is its connection with harmonic analysis and representation theory. More precisely, when the data is supercuspidal, the $L$-functions are defined precisely by means of the poles of standard intertwining operators. As investigated by the authors in several manuscripts, the residues of the operators at these poles can be studied by means of the theory of twisted endoscopy as developed by Kottwitz, Langlands, and Shelstad. When the groups are quasisplit special orthogonal or symplectic, the connection has already been studied by the authors. The purpose of this study is to complete the cases of quasisplit classical groups by completing the problem for quasisplit unitary groups.

It was first in [15], that the second named author studied the situation in which $\mathbf{G}$ is any of the split classical groups $\mathrm{Sp}_{2 n}$ or $\mathrm{SO}_{n}$, and $\mathbf{P}$ is the Siegel parabolic subgroup. In this case the $L$-functions in question are the symmetric square $L\left(s, \pi, \operatorname{Sym}^{2} \rho_{n}\right)$ and the exterior square $L\left(s, \pi, \wedge^{2} \rho_{n}\right)$, where $\pi$ is a supercuspidal representation of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(F)$ and $\rho_{n}$ is the standard representation of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(\mathbb{C})$ [15]. The first named author carried out a similar program for the Siegel parabolic subgroup of a quasisplit unitary group, determining the Asai $L$-functions $L\left(s, \pi, \Psi_{n}\right)$ and $L\left(s, \pi \otimes \mu, \Psi_{n}\right)$ [6, 7]. In fact, in each case the authors (separately) determined the $L$-functions $L\left(s, \pi, \operatorname{Sym}^{2} \rho_{n}\right), L\left(s, \pi, \wedge^{2} \rho_{n}\right)$, and $L\left(s, \pi, \Psi_{n}\right)$ for any irreducible admissible representation $\pi$ of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(F)$ or $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ (as appropriate). The case of an arbitrary maximal parabolic subgroup of $\mathrm{SO}_{2 n}, \mathrm{Sp}_{2 n}$, or the non-split quasi-split special orthogonal group $\mathrm{SO}_{2 n}^{*}$ was carried out in two further steps. The second named author studied $\mathrm{SO}_{2 n}$ in [16] while we examined the remaining cases in [8]. In these cases the

[^0]Levi subgroup is of the form $\mathbf{M} \simeq \mathrm{GL}_{n} \times \tilde{\mathbf{G}}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$ is a classical group of the same type and lower rank. The standard intertwining operator for a supercuspidal $\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau$ of $M=\mathbf{M}(F)$ is normalized by a product of two $L$-functions, $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right) L\left(2 s, \tau^{\prime}, \wedge^{2} \rho_{n}\right)$. Since the second factor, and in particular its poles, are known [15] and the product has at most a simple pole [14], the poles of the Rankin product $L$-function are determined by those of the intertwining operator which do not come from the exterior square $L$-function.

As explained before, in all the above cases the theory of twisted endoscopy [12] was used to describe the poles in question. This pattern continues in the case we study here, and is expected in general. Furthermore, in a general setting, the second named author has shown [13] that all poles of the intertwining operators come from twisted endoscopy in the case where the $L$-group ${ }^{L} N$ of $\mathbf{N}$ is abelian. (A situation which does not apply in the case we discuss here.)

Here we let $\mathbf{G}=\mathbf{G}(r)$ be the quasi-split unitary group in $r$ variables defined with respect to a quadratic extension $E / F$. Then a maximum parabolic subgroup is of the form $\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{M N}$ with $\mathbf{M} \simeq \operatorname{Res}_{E / F} \mathrm{GL}_{n} \times \mathbf{G}(m)$, with $r=n+m$. The case $m=0$ was discussed in [7], so we assume that $m \geq 1$. We further restrict ourselves to the case where $n \equiv r(\bmod 2)$. We then consider a unitary supercuspidal representation $\sigma \simeq \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau$ of $M=\mathbf{M}(F)$, and form the unitarily induced representation $I\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ of $G$. The reducibility of $I\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ is determined by the analytic behavior of the standard intertwining operator $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$ at $s=0$ (see Section 1 for the definition). Furthermore, the product of $L$-functions, $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right) L\left(2 s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$ normalizes $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$, and hence has the same poles. Here $\Psi_{n}$ is the Asai representation described in [7].

Let $u_{n}$ be the alternating anti-diagonal matrix which defines our quasi-split unitary group $U_{n}$ in $n$ variables, i.e. $U(n / 2, n / 2)$ if $n$ is even and $U([n / 2],[n / 2]+1)$ if $n$ is odd. Let $\varepsilon: \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ be the automorphism defined by $\varepsilon(g)=u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{g}^{-1} u_{n}^{-1}$, with $g \mapsto \bar{g}$ the coordinate action of the non-trivial Galois automorphism of $E / F$ on $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$. In the language of [16] we have $\varepsilon=\bar{\theta}^{*}$. As in $[8,16]$ computing the residue of $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$ leads us to consider a correspondence between certain $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ and ordinary conjugacy classes in $G(m)$. We again refer to this as the $\varepsilon$-norm correspondence ( $c f$. Definition 2.8). This correspondence is surjective when $n \geq m$ (cf. Lemmas 2.13 and 2.15), and always has finite fibers (cf. Corollary 2.14, Lemma 2.15, and Lemma 3.9). When $n<m$, the image of the norm correspondence contains no regular elliptic conjugacy classes. We let $\mathcal{A}$ be the inverse image of the norm map (which is one to finite) extended by the scalars $F^{\times} / N E^{\times}$. This then agrees with the image map $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{G}(m) / \mathbf{G}^{\prime}}$ of Kottwitz and Shelstad [12] (cf. the discussion prior to Lemma 3.5).

We break the residue of $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$ into two terms. The first of these we call the regular term, since it is the contribution which comes from regular elliptic conjugacy classes in $G(m)$. The remaining term is called the singular term. Let $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$ be a matrix coefficient for $\tau^{\prime}$ and $f_{\tau}$ one for $\tau$. Then the regular term can be given as

$$
R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=\sum_{\mathbf{T}_{i}} \mu\left(T_{i}\right)\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}} \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(\{\gamma\}, f_{\tau}\right)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

with the sum over representatives for the $G$-conjugacy classes of elliptic tori in $G(\ell)$ defined over $F$, (see pg. 287 of [8]). Here $\ell=\min (n, m), \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}$ is a certain twisted orbital integral, $\Phi$ is the ordinary orbital integral, $\mu\left(T_{i}\right)$ is the measure of $T_{i}=\mathbf{T}_{i}(F)$, and $|D(\gamma)|$ is the usual Harish-Chandra discriminant.

The singular term can be written as follows. Let $\left\{\mathbf{T}_{i}\right\}$ be a collection of representatives for the $G$-conjugacy classes of Cartan subgroups of $\mathbf{G}(\ell)$ defined over $F$. Let $T_{i}^{\prime}$ be the set of regular elements of $T_{i}=\mathbf{T}_{i}(F)$. For each $i$ choose any compact subgroup $\omega_{i}$ of $T_{i}^{\prime}$. Then,

$$
R_{\mathrm{sing}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=\operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \sum_{i}\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

where $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a function defined in Section 3. Note that the form of the singular term given here differs from that of [8], where we took the limit of such residues as $\omega_{i} \rightarrow$ $T_{i}^{\prime}$. However, as we argue here, the residue of the integral is in fact independent of $\omega_{i}$, and therefore the limit may be omitted (cf. the discussion prior to Lemma 3.9). This comment applies to the results of Section 4 of [8], and in particular to Theorem 4.8 and Corollary 4.9 of that paper.

We now state our main results.
Theorem Let $c=\left(4 n \log q_{E}\right)^{-1}$, with $q_{E}$ the order of the residue field of $E$. The intertwining operator $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$ has a pole at $s=0$ if and only if, for some choice of matrix coefficients $f_{\tau}$ and $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$ for $\tau$ and $\tau^{\prime}$, respectively,

$$
c R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)+R_{\mathrm{sing}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \neq 0
$$

Suppose now that $\tau^{\prime} \simeq\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$.
(a) The induced representation $I\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ is irreducible if and only if $c R_{\mathbf{G}}+R_{\text {sing }} \not \equiv 0$ (as an operator on the space, $\mathcal{A}(\tau) \times \mathcal{A}\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)$ of ordered pairs of matrix coefficients).
(b) If $\tau$ is generic and $I\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ is irreducible, then, for $s \in \mathbb{R}, I\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ is reducible at $s= \pm 1 / 2$ or at $s= \pm 1$, and at exactly one of these pairs.
As in [8], and [16], the non-vanishing of $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)$ is expressible as a pairing between the distribution character $\chi_{\tau}$ of $\tau$ and the $\varepsilon$-twisted character $\chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}$ of $\tau^{\prime}$. Thus, we say that $\tau^{\prime}$ is the twisted endoscopic transfer of $\tau$ if $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \neq 0$ for some choice of $f_{\tau}$ and $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(c f\right.$. Definition 4.1). Let $\mu$ be a character of $E^{\times}$which extends the class field character $\omega_{E / F}$. From [7] we know that if $\tau^{\prime} \simeq\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$, then exactly one of $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$ or $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \mu, \Psi_{n}\right)$ has a pole at $s=0$. Since such a pole depends only on $\tau^{\prime}$ and not on $\tau$, the non-vanishing of $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)$ must point to a pole of $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$.

On the other hand, $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$ has a pole at $s=0$ if and only if $\tau^{\prime}$ is an $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer from $U_{n}$ via one of the two maps described in [7] (and which one depends on the parity of $n$ ). Thus, in this case we expect $R_{\mathbf{G}} \equiv 0$, and therefore $R_{\text {sing }} \not \equiv 0$, for any choice of $\tau$. We summarize below.
Proposition (a) If $n$ is odd and $\tau^{\prime}$ comes from $U_{n}$ via standard $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer, then $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ is holomorphic at $s=0$ for any $\tau$. If $n$ is even and $\tau^{\prime}$ comes from $U_{n}$ via $\kappa$ - $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer, then $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ is holomorphic at $s=0$ for any $\tau$.
(b) Otherwise, $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$ has no pole at $s=0$, so $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ has a pole at $s=0$ if and only if $c R_{\mathrm{G}}+R_{\text {sing }} \not \equiv 0$.
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## 1 Preliminaries

Let $E / F$ be a quadratic extension of $p$-adic fields of characteristic zero with $x \mapsto \bar{x}=$ $\tau(x)$ the Galois automorphism. Let $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}(\bar{F} / F)$ satisfy $\sigma \equiv \tau(\bmod \operatorname{Gal}(\bar{F} / E))$. Choose $\beta$ such that $E=F(\beta)$, with $\bar{\beta}=-\beta$. We take $u_{n}=\left({ }_{-1}{ }^{\circ} \cdot{ }^{\circ}\right)$, where $n$ is the size of the matrix, and set $w_{n}=\left(._{1} .^{1}\right)$. Note that, if $n$ is even, then $u_{n}=J w_{n}$, where $J=\operatorname{diag}\{1,-1,1, \ldots,-1\}$, and $J w_{n}=-w_{n} J$. If $n$ is odd, then $u_{n}=J w_{n}=w_{n} J$, where $J=\operatorname{diag}\{-1,1, \ldots, 1,-1\}$. We further note that $u_{n}^{-1}=(-1)^{n+1} u_{n}$.

Now consider the group $\mathrm{GL}_{r}$, defined over $E$ and the cocycle given by $a_{\sigma}(g)=$ $u_{r}{ }^{t}(\sigma(g))^{-1} u_{r}^{-1}$. Then set $\mathbf{G}=\mathbf{G}(r)=\mathbf{U}_{r}$, defined with respect to the form $u_{r}$. The $F$-points of $\mathbf{G}$ are given by

$$
G(r)=\left\{g \in \mathrm{GL}_{r}(E) \mid g\left(u_{r}\right)^{t} \bar{g}=u_{r}\right\} .
$$

The maximal torus of diagonal elements is

$$
\mathbf{T}=\left\{\left.\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
x_{1} & & & & & \\
& \ddots & & & & \\
& & x_{r / 2} & & & \\
& & & \bar{x}_{r / 2}^{-1} & & \\
& & & & \ddots & \\
& & & & & \bar{x}_{1}^{-1}
\end{array}\right) \right\rvert\, x_{i} \in \operatorname{Res}_{E / F} \mathbf{G}_{m}\right\}
$$

if $r$ is even, and

$$
\mathbf{T}=\left\{\left.\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
x_{1} & & & & & \\
& \ddots & & & & \\
& & x_{[r / 2]} & & & \\
\\
& & & 1 & & \\
& & & & \bar{x}_{[r / 2]}^{-1} & \\
\\
& & & & & \ddots
\end{array}\right) \right\rvert\, x_{i} \in \mathbf{G}_{m}\right\}
$$

if $r$ is odd. Let $\mathbf{B}=$ TU be the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices in $\mathbf{G}(r)$. Denote by $\Delta$ the simple roots with respect to this choice of Borel subgroup. Suppose that $n \leq[r / 2]$, and let $m=[r / 2]-n$. We let $\Theta=\Delta \backslash\left\{e_{n}-e_{n+1}\right\}$. We let $\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{A}_{\Theta}$, and $\mathbf{M}=\mathbf{M}_{\Theta}$. Then

$$
\mathbf{M}=\left\{\left.\left(\begin{array}{lll}
g & & \\
& h & \\
& & \varepsilon(g)
\end{array}\right) \right\rvert\, g \in \operatorname{Res}_{E / F} \mathrm{GL}_{n}, h \in \mathbf{G}(m)\right\} \simeq \operatorname{Res}_{E / F} \mathrm{GL}_{n} \times \mathbf{G}(m)
$$

Here $\varepsilon(g)=u_{n}\left({ }^{t} \bar{g}^{-1}\right) u_{n}^{-1}$. For $X \in M_{n}(E)$, we let $\tilde{\varepsilon}(X)=u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X} u_{n}^{-1}$. Let $\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{M N}$ be the standard parabolic subgroup with Levi component $\mathbf{M}$.

Lemma 1.1 If $v \in \mathbf{N}$, then $v=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}I_{n} & X & Y \\ 0 & I_{m} & X^{\prime} \\ 0 & 0 & I_{n}\end{array}\right)$, with $X^{\prime}=u_{m}{ }^{t} \bar{X} u_{n}, Y \in M_{n}(E)$, and $Y+(-1)^{n+m} \tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$.

Proof Straightforward computation.

We denote such a $v$ by $n(X, Y)$.
The equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y+(-1)^{n+m} \tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is crucial to understanding the poles of the intertwining operator. Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes, $\{Y\}$, in $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$, for which there is an $E$-rational solution to (1.1).

Remark If $n=m$, we set $\tilde{\theta}(X)=w_{n}{ }^{t} X w_{n}^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\theta}(X)=\tilde{\theta}(\bar{X})$. Then we can rewrite (1.1) as

$$
\begin{gathered}
Y+J w_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{Y} w_{n} J=X J w_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X} J w_{n} \\
Y J+(-1)^{n+1} w_{n} J^{t} \bar{Y} w_{n}=X J w_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X} J w_{n} J=-1^{(n+1)} X J w_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X} w_{n} \\
Y J+(-1)^{n+1} \tilde{\bar{\theta}}(Y J)=(-1)^{n+1} X J \tilde{\bar{\theta}}(X) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Thus, when $X$ is invertible, (1.1) has an interpretation in terms of equivalence of hermitian or skew hermitian forms.

We compute the functional $\tilde{\alpha}$, as defined in [14]. (Also see [7].) The restricted root system for $\mathbf{G}(r)$ is of type $C_{r / 2}$, if $r$ is even, and of type $B C_{(r-1) / 2}$ if $r$ is odd. The unrestricted roots are of type $A_{r-1}$. We let $\Delta$ be the simple restricted roots, and $\tilde{\Delta}$ be the simple unrestricted roots. Then $\Delta=\left\{\alpha_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{[r / 2]}$, with $\alpha_{i}=e_{i}-e_{i+1}$, for $i \neq[r / 2]$, and $\alpha_{[r / 2]}=2 e_{[r / 2]}$. Similarly, we write $\tilde{\Delta}=\left\{\beta_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{r-1}$, with $\beta_{i}=e_{i}-e_{i+1}$. The action of $\operatorname{Gal}(E / F)$ on $\tilde{\Delta}$ identifies $\beta_{i}$ and $\beta_{r-i}$, and thus $\alpha_{i}$ is the restriction of both $\beta_{i}$ and
$\beta_{r-i}$. Since the subset $\Theta$ of $\Delta$ corresponding to $\mathbf{P}$ is $\Delta \backslash\left\{\alpha_{n}\right\}$, the corresponding subset $\tilde{\Theta}$ of $\tilde{\Delta}$ is $\tilde{\Delta} \backslash\left\{\beta_{n}, \beta_{r-n}\right\}$. Now, we compute $\rho_{\tilde{\Theta}}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
2 \rho_{\tilde{\Theta}} & =\sum_{\beta>0, \beta \notin \Sigma(\tilde{\Theta})} \beta \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=n}^{r-1} \sum_{k=i}^{j} \beta_{k}+\sum_{i=n+1}^{r-n} \sum_{j=r-n}^{r-1} \sum_{k=i}^{j} \beta_{k} \\
& =(r-n) \sum_{i=1}^{n} i \beta_{i}+n \sum_{i=n+1}^{r-1}(r-i) \beta_{i}+n \sum_{i=n+1}^{r-n-1}(i-n) \beta_{i}+(r-2 n) \sum_{i=r-n}^{r-1}(r-i) \beta_{i} \\
& =(r-n)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} i\left(\beta_{i}+\beta_{r-i}\right)+n \sum_{i=n+1}^{r-n-1} \beta_{i}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

To compute $\tilde{\alpha}$, we first compute, $\left\langle\rho_{\tilde{\Theta}}, \beta_{n}\right\rangle$, since $\beta_{n}$ represents the unique simple root in N. Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle\rho_{\tilde{\Theta}}, \beta_{n}\right\rangle & =\frac{2\left(\rho_{\tilde{\Theta}}, \beta_{n}\right)}{\left(\beta_{n}, \beta_{n}\right)}=\left(\rho_{\tilde{\Theta}}, \beta_{n}\right) \\
& =(r-n) / 2\left((n-1) \beta_{n-1}+n \beta_{n}+n \beta_{n+1}, \beta_{n}\right)=(r-n) / 2
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\alpha}$ is given by

$$
\left\langle\rho_{\tilde{\Theta}}, \beta_{n}\right\rangle^{-1} \rho_{\tilde{\Theta}}=\sum_{i=1}^{n} i\left(\beta_{i}+\beta_{r-i}\right)+n \sum_{i=n+1}^{r-n-1} \beta_{i} .
$$

Thus, if $m=(g, h) \in M$, then

$$
q_{F}^{\left\langle\tilde{\alpha}, H_{P}(m)\right\rangle}=|\operatorname{det} g|_{E}
$$

Note that the adjoint representation $r$ of ${ }^{L} M=\left(\mathrm{GL}_{n}(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}_{n}(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}_{m}(\mathbb{C})\right) \ltimes$ $W_{F}$ on ${ }^{L_{\mathfrak{n}}}$ decomposes into two irreducible pieces. Since $\left\langle\tilde{\alpha}, \alpha_{n}\right\rangle=1$, we see that the subspace of ${ }^{L} \mathfrak{n}$ containing $X_{\beta_{n}^{\vee}}$ should be labeled $V_{1}$ in the ordering given by [14]. Also note that if $\beta=\sum_{i=1}^{r-n+1} \beta_{i}$, then $X_{\beta \vee} \notin V_{1}$. Furthermore, a straightforward (but tedious) calculation shows that, if $\beta$ restricts to $\alpha^{\prime}$, then $\left\langle\tilde{\alpha}, \alpha^{\prime}\right\rangle=2$, and thus $X_{\beta \vee}$ indeed lies in $V_{2}$. Let $r_{i}$ denote the restriction of $r$ to $V_{i}$. Then $\left.r_{1}\right|^{L} M^{\circ} \simeq \rho_{n} \otimes$ $\tilde{\rho}_{m} \oplus \rho_{m} \otimes \tilde{\rho}_{n}$, where $\rho_{k}$ is the standard representation of $\mathrm{GL}_{k}(\mathbb{C})$. Also, $r_{2}$ is the Asai representation of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(\mathbb{C})$ described in [7].

Let $w_{0}=\left(I_{I_{n}} I^{(-1)^{n+m} I_{n}}\right)$ represent the non-trivial element of $W(\mathbf{G}(r), \mathbf{A})$.
Lemma 1.2 Suppose $n(X, Y) \in N$. Then $w_{0}^{-1} n(X, Y) \in P \bar{N}$ if and only if $Y \in$ $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$, and then
$w_{0}^{-1} n(X, Y)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}(-1)^{n+m} \varepsilon(Y) & -Y^{-1} X & I_{n} \\ 0 & I_{m}-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X & X^{\prime} \\ 0 & 0 & (-1)^{n+m} Y\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ccc}I_{n} & 0 & 0 \\ \left(Y^{-1} X\right)^{\prime} & I_{m} & 0 \\ Y^{-1} & Y^{-1} X & I_{n}\end{array}\right)$

## Proof Straightforward.

We note for future reference that $\left(Y^{-1} X\right)^{\prime}=X^{\prime} \varepsilon(Y)$.
For $n \in \mathbf{N}$ we let $\mathbf{M}_{n}=\{m \in \mathbf{M} \mid \operatorname{Ad}(m) n=n\}$. Similarly, for $\bar{n} \in \bar{N}$, we let $\mathbf{M}_{\bar{n}}=\{m \in \mathbf{M} \mid \operatorname{Ad}(m) \bar{n}=\bar{n}\}$. Finally, for $m_{1} \in \mathbf{M}$, we let $\mathbf{M}_{w_{0}, m_{1}}=\{m \in$ $\left.\mathbf{M} \mid \operatorname{Ad}\left(w_{0}\right)(m) m_{1} m^{-1}=m_{1}\right\}$. Note that $\mathbf{M}_{w_{0}, m_{1}}$ is the twisted centralizer of $m_{1}$, and if $m_{1}=(g, h)$, then $\mathbf{M}_{w_{0}, m_{1}}=\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, g}^{\prime} \times \mathbf{G}_{h}$, where $\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, g}^{\prime}$ is the $\varepsilon$-twisted centralizer of $g \in \mathbf{G}^{\prime}=\operatorname{Res}_{E / F} \mathrm{GL}_{n}$ and $\mathbf{G}_{h}$ is the centralizer of $h \in \mathbf{G}(m)$.
Lemma 1.3 Suppose that $n(X, Y)$ satisfies $w_{0}^{-1} n(X, Y)=p_{1} \bar{n}_{1}=m_{1} n_{1} \bar{n}_{1}$, as in Lemma 1.2. Then the following hold:
(a) $\mathbf{M}_{n(X, Y)}=\mathbf{M}_{n_{1}}=\mathbf{M}_{\bar{n}_{1}}$ and so the F-points of all of these groups are equal as well. Furthermore, $\mathbf{M}_{n_{1}} \subset \mathbf{M}_{w_{0}, m_{1}}$.
(b) $\mathbf{M}_{w_{0}, m_{1}}=\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} \times \mathbf{G}_{Z}$, where $Z=I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$;

Proof Statement (a) is taken directly from [13, Lemma 2.1]. Part (b) follows from Lemma 1.2 and the above discussion.

For a connected reductive group $\mathbf{H}$, defined over $F$, with $H=\mathbf{H}(F)$, we let $\mathcal{E}_{c}(H)$ be the collection of (equivalence classes of) irreducible admissible representations of $H$. We denote by $\mathcal{E}(H)$ the unitary classes in $\mathcal{E}_{c}(H)$. Let ${ }^{\circ} \mathcal{E}_{c}(H)$ be the collection of irreducible admissible supercuspidal representations of $H$, and we further denote by ${ }^{\circ} \mathcal{E}(H)$ the collection $\mathcal{E}(H) \cap{ }^{\circ} \mathcal{E}_{c}(H)$.

Let $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}=\operatorname{Res}_{E / F} \mathrm{GL}_{n}$. Choose $\left(\tau^{\prime}, V^{\prime}\right) \in{ }^{\circ} \mathcal{E}\left(G^{\prime}\right)$, and $(\tau, V) \in{ }^{\circ} \mathcal{E}(G(m))$. Let $\operatorname{Ind}_{P}^{G}\left(\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes|\operatorname{det}()|_{E}^{s}\right) \otimes \tau \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N}\right)$ be the representation of $G$ unitarily induced from $\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes|\operatorname{det}()|_{E}^{s}\right) \otimes \tau$. We usually denote this representation by $I\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$, and set $I\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)=I\left(0, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$. We let $V\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ be the space of $I\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ and let $V\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)_{0}$ be the subspace of functions supported in $P \bar{N}$.

We wish to study the reducibility of $I\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$, we need to study the poles of the intertwining operator $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$ defined by

$$
A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right) f(g)=\int_{N} f\left(w_{0}^{-1} n g\right) d n
$$

By Lemma 4.1 of [15] it is enough to assume that $g=e$ and $f \in V\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)_{0}$. Let $L$ and $L^{\prime}$ be compact subsets in $M_{n}(E)$ and $M_{n \times m}(E)$, respectively. Let $\xi_{L}$ and $\xi_{L^{\prime}}$ be their characteristic functions. Set

$$
h\left(\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I & 0 & 0 \\
X & I & 0 \\
Y & X^{\prime} & I
\end{array}\right)\right)=\xi_{L}(Y) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\left(v^{\prime} \otimes v\right)
$$

for some $v \in V$, and $v^{\prime} \in V^{\prime}$. Choose $\tilde{v}$ and $\tilde{v}^{\prime}$ in $\tilde{V}$ and $\tilde{V}^{\prime}$ respectively. We let
$\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g^{\prime}\right)=\left\langle\tilde{v}^{\prime}, \tau^{\prime}\left(g^{\prime}\right) v^{\prime}\right\rangle$, and $f_{\tau}(g)=\langle\tilde{v}, \tau(g) v\rangle$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\langle\tilde{v}^{\prime} \otimes \tilde{v}, A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes\right.\right. & \left.\left.\tau, w_{0}\right) h(e)\right\rangle  \tag{1.2}\\
=\int_{(X, Y)} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}} & \left((-1)^{n+m} \varepsilon(Y)\right) f_{\tau}\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right) \mid \\
& \left.\cdot \operatorname{det} Y\right|_{E} ^{-s-\left\langle\rho_{p}, H_{P}(Y)\right\rangle} \xi_{L}\left(Y^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(Y^{-1} X\right) d(X, Y)
\end{align*}
$$

## 2 Norm Correspondence

Lemma 2.1 Suppose that $(X, Y)$ is an E-rational solution to (1.1). Further suppose that $(X g)(X g)^{\prime}=X X^{\prime}$, for some $g \in \mathrm{GL}_{m}(E)$. Then $X g=X h$ for some $h \in G(m)$.

Proof Consider $E^{n}$ and $E^{m}$ as row vectors, and let $U=E^{n} X \subset E^{m}$. Let $\langle$,$\rangle be the$ hermitian form given by $\beta_{m} u_{m}$. Here $\beta_{m}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}\beta & \text { if } m \text { is even } \\ 1 & \text { if } m \text { is odd. }\end{array}\right.$ Let $g^{*}: U \rightarrow E^{m}$ be given by $g^{*}(v)=v g$. If $v_{1}, v_{2} \in U$, and $v_{i}=y_{i} X$, with $y_{i} \in E^{n}$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left\langle v_{1} g, v_{2} g\right\rangle & =v_{1} g \beta_{m} u_{m}{ }^{t} \bar{g}^{t} \bar{v}_{2} \\
& =y_{1} X g \beta_{m} u_{m}^{t} \bar{g}^{t} \bar{X}^{t} \bar{y}_{2} \\
& =y_{1} X \beta_{m} u_{m}{ }^{t} \bar{X}^{t} \bar{y}_{2}=\left\langle v_{1}, v_{2}\right\rangle .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, $g^{*}$ is an isometry onto a subspace of $E^{m}$. By the hermitian version of Witt's Theorem, we can choose $h \in G(m)$ with $v g=v h$, for all $v \in U$. If $y \in E^{n}$, we have $y X h=y X g$, and thus, $X h=X g$.

Suppose that $Y+(-1)^{n+m} \tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$, and $g \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}+(-1)^{n+m} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) & =g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}+(-1)^{n+m} u_{n} \overline{\left(g Y u_{n}^{t} \bar{g} u_{n}^{-1}\right)} u_{n}^{-1} \\
& =g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}+(-1)^{n+m} g u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{Y} u_{n}^{-1} \varepsilon(g)^{-1} \\
& =g\left(Y+(-1)^{n+m} \tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)\right) \varepsilon(g)^{-1}=g X X^{\prime} \varepsilon(g)^{-1} \\
& =g X(g X)^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, $\{X\} \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E) \backslash M_{n \times m}(E)$ parameterizes the $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes for which (1.1) has a rational solution. Now suppose $\{X\}$ parameterizes $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$, i.e. $(X, Y)$ satisfies (1.1). If $g \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$, then when we replace $X$ by $g X$, we see that $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ is replaced by $I-X^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon(g)^{-1} Y^{-1} g\right) X$. So, $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ is unchanged if we replace $Y^{-1}$ by $\varepsilon(g) Y^{-1} g^{-1}$, which is also in $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$.

If $X$ is changed to $X_{1}=g X$ then we say that $\left\{X_{1}\right\}$ parameterizes the $\varepsilon$-conjugacy class $\left\{Y_{1}^{-1}\right\}$ with $Y_{1}=g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}$, since it is the pair ( $X_{1}, Y_{1}$ ) which satisfies (1.1),
even though the classes are the same. If $X_{1}=X h$, with $h \in \mathrm{GL}_{m}(E)$, then by Lemma 2.1 we may assume $h \in G(m)$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
I-X_{1}^{\prime} Y^{-1} X_{1} & =I-(X h)^{\prime} Y^{-1} X h=I-u_{m}{ }^{t} \bar{h}^{t} \bar{X} u_{n} Y^{-1} X h \\
& =I-h^{-1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X h=h^{-1}\left(I-X Y^{-1} X\right) h
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, the conjugacy class of $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ is well defined for a class $\{X\}$. Moreover, only finitely many conjugacy classes $\left\{I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right\}$ are so attached to an $\varepsilon$-conjugacy class $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$.
Lemma 2.2 Suppose that $\left\{X_{1}\right\}$ parameterizes $\left\{Y_{1}^{-1}\right\}$ with $X_{1}=g X h$, for some $g \in$ $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ and $h \in \mathrm{GL}_{m}(E)$, and $Y_{1}=g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}$. Then in fact $X_{1} \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E) X G(m)$, and $\left\{X_{1}\right\}$ parameterizes precisely the same collection of $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes as $X$.

Lemma 2.3 Suppose that $n(X, Y) \in N$, with $Y \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$. Then
(a) $\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right) X^{\prime}=-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)$;
(b) $X\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right)=-\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1} X$.

Proof Since $n(X, Y) \in N$, and $Y \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$, we know that $w_{0}^{-1} n(X, Y) \in P \bar{N}$, and furthermore

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 0 & (-1)^{n+m} I \\
0 & I & X^{\prime} \\
I & X & Y
\end{array}\right) \\
& \quad=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
(-1)^{n+m} \varepsilon(Y) & -Y^{-1} X & I \\
0 & I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X & X^{\prime} \\
0 & 0 & (-1)^{n+m} Y
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I & 0 & 0 \\
X^{\prime} \varepsilon(Y) & I & 0 \\
Y^{-1} & Y^{-1} X & I
\end{array}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Comparing the $(2,1)$-entries, we see that $\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right) X^{\prime} \varepsilon(Y)+X^{\prime} Y^{-1}=0$, which implies (a). We then rewrite this as

$$
\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right) u_{m}{ }^{t} \bar{X} u_{n}=-u_{m}^{t} \bar{X} u_{n} Y^{-1} u_{n}^{-1 t} \bar{Y} u_{n} .
$$

Which implies

$$
u_{m}^{-1}\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right) u_{m}{ }^{t} \bar{X}=-{ }^{t} \bar{X} u_{n} Y^{-1} u_{n}^{-1 t} \bar{Y}
$$

This in turn implies

$$
{ }^{t}{\overline{\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right)}}^{-1}{ }^{1} \bar{X}=-{ }^{t} \bar{X} u_{n} Y^{-1} u_{n}^{-1 t} \bar{Y}
$$

i.e.,

$$
X\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right)^{-1}=-Y u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{Y}^{-1} u_{n}^{-1} X=-Y \varepsilon(Y) X
$$

This immediately implies (b).

Definition 2.4 Suppose that $X \in M_{n \times m}$. Let $\tilde{X}$ be the square matrix obtained by adding rows, if $n \leq m$, (respectively columns if $n \geq m$ ) of zeros to the bottom (respectively. right) of $X$. We call $X$ a projection if $\tilde{X}$ is, i.e., if $\tilde{X}^{2}=\tilde{X}$.

Lemma 2.5 Suppose that $X \in M_{n \times m}$ is a projection. Let $U=E^{n} X \subset E^{m}$. Set

$$
H_{X}=\left\{h \in G(m) \mid X h=g_{h} X, \text { for some } g_{h} \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)\right\}
$$

If $\{0\} \subsetneq U \subsetneq E^{m}$, then $H_{X} \subsetneq G(m)$.

Proof By Corollary 4.3 of [16], we know that $h \in H_{X}$ if and only if $U h=U$. So $U$ is an $H_{X}$-invariant subspace. Since the standard representation of $G(m)$ is irreducible, we have the lemma.

Lemma 2.6 Suppose that $\{X\} \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E) \backslash M_{n \times m}(E) / G(m)$. If there is some $Y \in$ $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ so that $(X, Y)$ satisfies (1.1), then

$$
X\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right)=-\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1} X
$$

and if $X$ is a projection, then $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X \in H_{X}$.

Proof This follows from Lemma 2.3(a) and the definition of $H_{X}$.
Lemma 2.7 Suppose that $X \in M_{n \times m}(E)$, and set $U=E^{n} X$. We consider $E^{m}$ as a hermitian space with the non-degenerate form $\beta_{m} u_{m}$. Set $H_{X}^{\prime}=\{h \in G(m) \mid U h=$ $U\}$. If $U$ is a non-degenerate subspace, then $H_{X}^{\prime}$ is the centralizer of an involution in $G(m)$. If $U$ is degenerate, then $H_{X}^{\prime}$ is contained in a proper parabolic subgroup of $G(m)$. If $X$ is a projection, then $H_{X}^{\prime}=H_{X}$.

Proof Suppose $U$ is non-degenerate. Then $E^{m}=U \oplus U^{\perp}$. If $h \in H_{X}^{\prime}$, then $U h=$ $U$, which implies that $U^{\perp} h=U^{\perp}$. Therefore, $h$ is in the centralizer of $\left(-1_{U} \oplus\right.$ $\left.1_{U^{\perp}}\right)$. Conversely, suppose $h$ is in the centralizer of $\left(-1_{U} \oplus 1_{U^{\perp}}\right)$. Let $v \in U$, and suppose that $v h=w \oplus w^{\perp}$. Then $v\left(-1_{U} \oplus 1_{U^{\perp}}\right) h=-v h=-w \oplus-w^{\perp}$, while $v h\left(-1_{U} \oplus 1_{U^{\perp}}\right)=-w \oplus w^{\perp}$. Therefore, $w^{\perp}=0$, and we see that $U h \subset U$.

Now suppose that $U$ is degenerate. Then $\operatorname{Rad} U \neq\{0\}$, and $H_{X}^{\prime}$ stabilizes $\operatorname{Rad} U$. Therefore, $H_{X}^{\prime} \subset P_{X}=M_{X} N_{X}$, where $P_{X}$ is the parabolic subgroup stabilizing precisely the isotropic subspace $\operatorname{Rad} U$.

Definition 2.8 Suppose that $Y \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$, and there is some $X_{0}$ for which $\left(X_{0}, Y\right)$ is an $E$-rational solution to (1.1). Let $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$ be the $\varepsilon$-conjugacy class of $Y^{-1}$, and set $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}\right)$ be the collection of $G(m)$-conjugacy classes $\left\{\left\{I-X_{1}^{\prime} Y_{1}^{-1} X_{1}\right\}\right\}$ for which $Y_{1}^{-1} \in\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$ and $\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right)$ satisfies (1.1). We call $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}\right)$ the $\varepsilon$-norm of $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$,
and it gives a one to finite correspondence between the $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ for which (1.1) has an $E$-rational solution, and conjugacy classes in $G(m)$.

Proposition 2.9 Suppose that $n<m$, and take $X \in M_{n \times m}(E)$. Fix a $Y$ (if such exists) in $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ satisfying (1.1) with $X$. Then $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ belongs to a proper parabolic subgroup of $G(m)$ or a proper centralizer of a singular elliptic element. Moreover, if $m>n+1$, then $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}\right)$ never contains regular elliptic classes.

Proof That $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ is in either a proper parabolic subgroup, or the proper centralizer of a singular elliptic element, follows from Lemmas 2.6 and 2.7. Further note that the rank of $X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ is at most $n$, and therefore, at least $m-n$ eigenvalues of $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ are equal to 1 . Thus, if $m>n+1$ we see that $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ cannot be regular elliptic.
Lemma 2.10 Suppose that $n=m$, that $S \in M_{n}(E)$, and that $I+S \in G(m)$. Then there is a projection $X \in M_{n}(E)$, and a choice of $Y \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ for which $S=$ $(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1}=Y^{-1} X$.

Proof Note that $X \mapsto \tilde{\varepsilon}(X)=u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X} u_{n}^{-1}$ is an anti-involution of $M_{n}(E)$. Moreover, since $u_{n}^{-1}=(-1)^{n+1} u_{n}$, we have $X^{\prime}=(-1)^{n+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}(X)$.

Since $I+S \in G(m)$, we have $(I+S)\left(u_{n}\right)\left(I+{ }^{t} \bar{S}\right)=u_{n}$, which implies $u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{S}+$ $S u_{n}+S u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{S}=0$. Therefore, $\tilde{\varepsilon}(S)=-(I+S)^{-1} S$. Now applying Lemma 5.6 of [16], we see that we can choose a projection $X$ in $M_{n}(E)$ and a $Y \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ for which $S=\tilde{\varepsilon}(X) Y^{-1} X=\tilde{\varepsilon}(X) Y^{-1}=Y^{-1} X$. Now $X$ and $Y$ have the desired property.

Definition 2.11 If $n=m$, and $\gamma \in G(m)$, and we choose $X, Y$ as in Lemma 2.10 for which $\gamma=I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$, then we say that $(X, Y)$ is a canonical section over $\gamma$ if $\operatorname{det}\left(\left.Y\right|_{\operatorname{ker} X}\right) \in N E^{\times}$. If $n>m$, and $n \equiv m(\bmod 2)$, then, letting $k=(n-m) / 2$, we say that $X=\left(\begin{array}{c}0_{k \times m} \\ X_{0} \\ 0_{k \times m}\end{array}\right) \in M_{n \times m}$ and $Y=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}I_{k} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & Y_{0} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I_{k}\end{array}\right) \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ form a canonical section over $\{\gamma\}$ if $\left(X_{0}, Y_{0}\right)$ is a canonical section over $\{\gamma\}$.
Lemma 2.12 Suppose that $n=m$. Then $N_{\varepsilon}$ is surjective. That is, if $\{\gamma\}$ is a conjugacy class in $G(m)$, then $\gamma \in N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}\right)$ for some $Y$.

Proof Let $S \in M_{n}(E)$ with $I+(-1)^{n} S=\gamma \in G(m)$. By Lemma 2.10, we can choose a projection $X$ and an element $Y$ of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ for which

$$
S=-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=-X^{\prime} Y^{-1}=(-1)^{n} Y^{-1} X
$$

Now,

$$
\left(I+(-1)^{n} S\right) u_{n}^{t} \overline{\left(I+(-1)^{n} S\right)}=u_{n}
$$

which implies

$$
\left(I+Y^{-1} X\right) u_{n}{ }^{t} \overline{\left(I+(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right)}=u_{n}
$$

Therefore,

$$
Y^{-1} X u_{n}+(-1)^{n+1} u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X}^{t} \bar{Y}^{-1 t} \bar{X}^{\prime}=(-1)^{n} Y^{-1} X u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X}^{t} \bar{Y}^{-1 t} \bar{X}^{\prime}
$$

or,

$$
Y^{-1} X u_{n}+(-1)^{n+1} u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{Y}^{-1} u_{n} X u_{n}=(-1)^{n} Y^{-1} X u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X} t \bar{Y} u_{n} X u_{n}
$$

Thus,

$$
Y^{-1} X+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X=(-1)^{n} Y^{-1} X X^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X
$$

In the case that $n$ is even, we have

$$
Y^{-1} X+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X=Y^{-1} X X^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X
$$

In the case where $n$ is odd, we let $X_{1}=-X$ and $Y_{1}=-Y$. Then we have

$$
I-X_{1}^{\prime} Y_{1}^{-1} X_{1}=I+X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=I-S=\gamma
$$

Also, we have

$$
Y^{-1} X+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X=-Y^{-1} X X^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X
$$

which implies

$$
Y_{1}^{-1} X_{1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{1}^{-1}\right) X_{1}=Y_{1}^{-1} X_{1} X_{1}^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{1}^{-1}\right) X_{1}
$$

Thus, for any $n$, we can choose $X$ and $Y$ so that $X^{2}= \pm X, I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=\gamma$, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
Y^{-1} X+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X=Y^{-1} X X^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, if $v$ is in the right image of $X$, then (2.1) and $X v= \pm v$ gives us

$$
\left(Y^{-1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)\right) v=Y^{-1} X X^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) v
$$

which shows that (1.1) holds on the image of $X$.
Thus, we need to show that such a choice of $X$ and $Y$ can be made for which (1.1) holds on the kernel of $X$. Notice that

$$
\operatorname{ker} X \subset \operatorname{ker} Y^{-1} X X^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X=\operatorname{ker} Y^{-1} X X^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)
$$

so we need to show we can choose $X$ and $Y$ with $Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=0$ on ker $X$.
We know that $Y^{-1} X=(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X=(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)$. Note that $(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime}=\tilde{\varepsilon}(X)$ is also a projection up to sign. Thus, $Y^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)$ both define isomorphisms from $\operatorname{ker} X$ onto $\operatorname{ker} \tilde{\varepsilon}(X)$. For $v \in E^{n}$, we define $\tilde{\varepsilon}(v)={ }^{t}\left(\overline{u_{n} v}\right)$. A straightforward calculation shows that $\tilde{\varepsilon}(v) \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)=\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1} v\right)$. Choose bases $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\prime}$ for $\operatorname{ker} X$ and $\operatorname{ker} X^{\prime}=\operatorname{ker} \varepsilon(X)$, respectively. Then the above equality shows that the matrix of $\left.Y^{-1}\right|_{\operatorname{ker} X}$ with respect to the bases $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\prime}$ is the same as the matrix of $\left.\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)\right|_{\operatorname{ker} X}$ with respect to the bases $\tilde{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B})$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{B}^{\prime}\right)$. Note that on $\operatorname{ker} X$, one can choose $Y$ for which $Y^{-1}$ is $\tilde{\varepsilon}$-skew hermitian. Thus, such a $Y$ satisfies $Y+$ $\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$.
Lemma 2.13 Suppose that $n$ is any positive integer. If $(X, Y)$ satisfies (1.1), then the conjugacy class $\left\{I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right\}$ in $G(m)$ determines the semisimple part of the conjugacy class $\left\{\varepsilon(Y)^{-1} Y^{-1}\right\}$ uniquely.

Proof We assume that $X$ is of rank $r$. Then we have $E^{n}=V \oplus W$, where $W$ is the right kernel of $X, \operatorname{dim} V=r$, and right multiplication by $X$ gives an embedding of $V$ into $E^{m}$. If $v \in W$ then $v\left(Y+(-1)^{n+m} \tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)\right)=v X X^{\prime}=0$, so $(-1)^{n+m+1} v=v \tilde{\varepsilon}(Y) Y^{-1}=$ $\nu \varepsilon(Y)^{-1} Y^{-1}$. Consequently, $\left.\varepsilon(Y)^{-1} Y^{-1}\right|_{W}=(-1)^{n+m+1} \mathrm{Id}_{W}$. For $v \in V$, we know by Lemma 2.3(b) that

$$
v \varepsilon(Y)^{-1} Y^{-1} X=-v X\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right)
$$

Thus, the matrix of $\varepsilon(Y)^{-1} Y^{-1}$ with respect to a basis which respects the decomposition $E^{n}=V \oplus W$ is of the form $\left(\begin{array}{cc}A \\ 0 & (-1)^{n+m+1} I\end{array}\right)$, and $A$ is determined by $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$. Thus, the lemma holds.
Corollary 2.14 If $n=m$, then $N_{\varepsilon}$ has finite fibers.
Corollary 2.15 If $n \geq m$, and $n \equiv m(\bmod 2)$ then $N_{\varepsilon}$ is surjective with finite fibers.
Proof Let $k=(n-m) / 2$. Let $h \in U_{m}(F)$. By Lemma 2.12, there is an element $Y_{0} \in \mathrm{GL}_{m}(E)$, and an $X_{0} \in M_{m}(E)$ so that $Y_{0}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{0}\right)=X_{0} X_{0}^{\prime}$ and $I_{m}-X_{0} Y_{0}^{-1} X_{0}=$ h. Let $S=X_{0}^{\prime} Y_{0}^{-1} X_{0}$. Let $X=\left(\begin{array}{c}0_{k \times m} \\ X_{0} \\ 0_{k \times m}\end{array}\right)$ and $Y=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}I_{k} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (-1)^{k} Y_{0} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -I_{k}\end{array}\right)$. Then $X^{\prime}=$ $\left(\begin{array}{lll}0_{m \times k} & (-1)^{k} X_{0}^{\prime} & 0_{m \times k}\end{array}\right)$, and thus

$$
X X^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times m} & 0_{k \times k} \\
0_{m \times k} & (-1)^{k} X_{0} X_{0}^{\prime} & 0_{m \times k} \\
0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times m} & 0_{k \times k}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Furthermore,

$$
\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-I_{k} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & (-1)^{k} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{0}\right) & 0 \\
0 & 0 & I_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y) & =\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times m} & 0_{k \times k} \\
0_{m \times k} & (-1)^{k}\left(Y_{0}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{0}\right)\right) & 0_{m \times k} \\
0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times m} & 0_{k \times k}
\end{array}\right) \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times m} & 0_{k \times k} \\
0_{m \times k} & (-1)^{k} X_{0} X_{0}^{\prime} & 0_{m \times k} \\
0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times m} & 0_{k \times k}
\end{array}\right)=X X^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X & =\left(\begin{array}{lll}
0_{m \times k} & (-1)^{k} X_{0}^{\prime} & 0_{m \times k}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I_{k} & & \\
& (-1)^{k} Y_{0}^{-1} & \\
& & -I_{k}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
0_{k \times m} \\
X_{0} \\
0_{k \times m}
\end{array}\right) \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{lll}
0 & X_{0}^{\prime} Y_{0}^{-1} & 0
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
X_{0} \\
0
\end{array}\right)=X_{0}^{\prime} Y_{0}^{-1} X_{0}=S
\end{aligned}
$$

The finiteness of the fibers follows from Lemma 2.13.
Lemma 2.16 The involution $\varepsilon$ fixes a splitting of $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}=\operatorname{Res}_{E / F} \mathrm{GL}_{n}$.

Proof Recall that $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}=\mathrm{GL}_{n} \times\left(\mathrm{GL}_{n}\right)^{\sigma}$, where $\sigma$ represents the Galois automorphism of $E / F$. Moreover, the action of $\mathrm{Gal} E / F$ on $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}$ is by $\sigma(g, h)=(\sigma(h), \sigma(g))$, where $\sigma(g)=\bar{g}$ is the coordinate-wise Galois action. We take $\mathbf{B}_{0}^{\prime}$ to be the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices in $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}$ the maximal torus of diagonal elements. Let $\alpha_{i}=e_{i}-e_{i+1}$ be a simple root, and let $X_{\alpha_{i}}(t)=t E_{i(i+1)}$ be the standard splitting of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}$ over $E$. Here $E_{i(i+1)}$ is the elementary matrix for the $i,(i+1)$ entry. Now set $X_{i}=\left(X_{\alpha_{i}}, \bar{X}_{\alpha_{i}}\right)$. Then $\left(\mathbf{B}_{0}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime},\left\{X_{i}\right\}_{i}\right)$ is a splitting for $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}$. Note that, to be precise, we should write $u_{n}^{\prime}=\left(u_{n}, u_{n}\right)$, and

$$
\varepsilon(g, h)=u_{n}^{\prime t}(\sigma(g, h))^{-1}\left(u_{n}^{\prime}\right)^{-1}=(\varepsilon(h), \varepsilon(g))
$$

where $\varepsilon(g)$ is as before. Note that $\varepsilon\left(X_{\alpha_{i}}\right)=\bar{X}_{\alpha_{i}}$, and therefore,

$$
\varepsilon\left(X_{i}\right)=\varepsilon\left(X_{\alpha_{i}}, \bar{X}_{\alpha_{i}}\right)=\left(\varepsilon\left(\bar{X}_{\alpha_{i}}\right), \varepsilon\left(X_{\alpha_{i}}\right)\right)=X_{i}
$$

Consequently, $\varepsilon$ fixes the splitting $\left(\mathbf{B}_{0}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime},\left\{X_{i}\right\}\right)$.
Suppose that $F$ is algebraically closed. Then $E=F$, and the Galois map $x \mapsto \bar{x}$ is the identity. Note that $\mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}$ is an $\varepsilon$-stable Cartan subgroup of $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}$. Let $\bar{N}_{\varepsilon}: \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}$ be given by $\bar{N}_{\varepsilon}(Y)=Y \varepsilon(Y)$. If $Y=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}$, then

$$
\varepsilon(Y)=\operatorname{diag}\left\{\bar{a}_{n}^{-1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{1}^{-1}\right\}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{n}^{-1}, \ldots, a_{1}^{-1}\right\}
$$

Thus, $\bar{N}_{\varepsilon}(Y)=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1} a_{n}^{-1}, a_{2} a_{n-1}^{-1}, \ldots, a_{n} a_{1}^{-1}\right\}$. Therefore,

$$
\operatorname{ker} \bar{N}_{\varepsilon}=\left\{\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n / 2}, a_{n / 2}, \ldots, a_{1}\right\}\right\}
$$

if $n$ is even, and

$$
\operatorname{ker} \bar{N}_{\varepsilon}=\left\{\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{[n / 2]}, a_{[n / 2]+1}, a_{[n / 2]}, \ldots, a_{1}\right\}\right\}
$$

if $n$ is odd. Assume $n$ is even. If $Y_{0}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n / 2}, 1, \ldots, 1\right\}$, then

$$
(I-\varepsilon) Y_{0}=Y_{0} \varepsilon\left(Y_{0}\right)^{-1}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n / 2}, a_{n / 2}, \ldots, a_{1}\right\}
$$

is in $\operatorname{ker} \bar{N}_{\varepsilon}$. Therefore, $\operatorname{ker} \bar{N}_{\varepsilon}=(I-\varepsilon) \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}$. Similarly, if $n$ is odd, and $Y_{0}=$ $\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{[n / 2]+1}, 1, \ldots, 1\right\}$, then

$$
(I-\varepsilon) Y_{0}=Y_{0} \varepsilon\left(Y_{0}\right)^{-1}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{[n / 2]}, a_{[n / 2]+1}^{2}, a_{[n / 2]}, \ldots, a_{1}\right\}
$$

is in $\operatorname{ker} \bar{N}_{\varepsilon}$. Since $F$ is algebraically closed, $\operatorname{ker} \bar{N}_{\varepsilon}=(I-\varepsilon) \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}$.
Now suppose that $F$ is not necessarily algebraically closed. Let $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{H}}$ be a Cartan subgroup of $\mathbf{G}(n)$ defined over $F$ and $\left(\mathbf{B}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}^{\prime}\right)$ be a $\varepsilon$-stable pair in $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}$, also defined over $F$, for which there is an isomorphism $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{H}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$, defined over $F$ [12].
Lemma 2.17 The map $Y \mapsto Y \varepsilon(Y)$ from $\mathbf{T}^{\prime}$ to $\mathbf{T}^{\prime}$ has $\left(\mathrm{T}^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$ as its image, and can be identified with the projection onto $\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}=\mathbf{T}^{\prime} /(I-\varepsilon) \mathbf{T}^{\prime}$.

Proof Since $\left(\mathbf{B}_{0}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ and $\left(\mathbf{B}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}^{\prime}\right)$ are both $\varepsilon$-stable pairs, there is an element $g$ in the $\varepsilon$-fixed points of $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}$ for which $g^{-1} \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime} g=\mathbf{T}^{\prime}$ [18]. Let $\mathbf{K}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{0}$ be the kernels of $Y \mapsto Y \varepsilon(Y)$ in $\mathbf{T}^{\prime}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}$, respectively. Note that $\mathbf{K}=g^{-1} \mathbf{K}_{0} g$. Since $\mathbf{K}_{0}=(I-\varepsilon) \mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}$, and $\varepsilon(g)=g$, we have $\mathbf{K}=(I-\varepsilon) \mathbf{T}^{\prime}$. Similarly, since the image of $\bar{N}_{\varepsilon}$ on $\mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}$ is $\left(\mathbf{T}_{0}^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$, we see that the image of the map $Y \mapsto Y \varepsilon(Y)$ on $\mathbf{T}^{\prime}$ is $\left(\mathbf{T}^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$.
Lemma 2.18 Suppose that $F$ is algebraically closed. Let $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\} \in \mathcal{N}=\mathcal{C}$ be $\varepsilon$ semisimple, with $Y$ in an $\varepsilon$-stable pair $\left(\mathbf{B}^{\prime}, \mathbf{T}^{\prime}\right)$ of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(F)$. Then there is an $X$ in $M_{n}(F)$ for which $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ is semisimple in $\mathbf{G}(n)$, and $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ is $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(F)$ conjugate to $-\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$. Furthermore, every $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(F)$-conjugate of $-\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ belongs to the image of $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$ under the norm correspondence $N_{\varepsilon}$.

Proof Since $Y$ is $\varepsilon$-semisimple, and lies in an $\varepsilon$-stable pair, there is an element $h \in$ $\left(\mathbf{G}^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}(F)=U_{n}(F)=G(n)$ for which $Y_{1}=h Y h^{-1}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}$. Note that $Y_{1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{1}\right)=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}+\bar{a}_{n}, a_{2}+\bar{a}_{n-1}, \ldots, a_{n}+\bar{a}_{1}\right\}$. Suppose $n$ is even. Let $i=\sqrt{-1}$. Set $X_{1}=i \operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}+\bar{a}_{n}, \ldots, a_{n / 2}+\bar{a}_{n / 2+1}, 1, \ldots, 1\right\}$. Note that $X_{1}^{\prime}=-\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(X_{1}\right)=$ $-i \operatorname{diag}\left\{1, \ldots, 1, \bar{a}_{n / 2}+a_{n / 2+1}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{1}+a_{n}\right\}$. Thus,

$$
X_{1} X_{1}^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}+\bar{a}_{n}, \ldots, a_{n}+\bar{a}_{1}\right\}=Y_{1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{1}\right)
$$

Note that $I-X_{1}^{\prime} Y_{1}^{-1} X_{1}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}^{-1} \bar{a}_{n}, \ldots, a_{n}^{-1} \bar{a}_{1}\right\}$, is semisimple. If $n$ is odd, then we take $y \in F$ with $y \bar{y}=y^{2}=2 a_{[n / 2]+1}$. Then let $X_{1}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{[n / 2]}, y, 1, \ldots, 1\right\}$. Then $X_{1}^{\prime}=\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(X_{1}\right)=\operatorname{diag}\left\{1, \ldots, 1, \bar{y}, \bar{a}_{[n / 2]}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{1}\right\}$. Thus,

$$
X_{1} X_{1}^{\prime}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1}+\bar{a}_{n}, \ldots, a_{[n / 2]}+\bar{a}_{[n / 2]+2}, 2 a_{[n / 2]+1}, \ldots, a_{n}+\bar{a}_{1}\right\}=Y_{1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{1}\right)
$$

If we set $X=h^{-1} X_{1}$, then $Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$, and $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=I-X_{1} Y_{1}^{-1} X_{1}$ is semisimple. Note that since $Y$ is in an $\varepsilon$-stable Cartan, we have $\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}=$ $Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)$ is semisimple, and in the fixed points of $\varepsilon$, i.e., in $G(n)$.

Now choose $Y_{2}$ which is $\varepsilon$-conjugate to $Y$, and a projection $X_{2}$ satisfying (1.1) for which $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=I-X_{2}^{\prime} Y_{2}^{-1} X_{2}$. Since $Y_{2}$ and $Y$ are $\varepsilon$-conjugate, we see that $\varepsilon\left(Y_{2}^{-1}\right) Y_{2}^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ are conjugate. We have already seen that $-\varepsilon\left(Y_{2}^{-1}\right) Y_{2}^{-1}$ has matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\left.\left(I-X_{2}^{\prime} Y_{2}^{-1} X\right)\right|_{\operatorname{Im} X_{2}} & * \\
0 & I
\end{array}\right)
$$

with respect to the decomposition $F^{n}=\operatorname{Im} X_{2} \oplus \operatorname{ker} X_{2}$. Thus, the eigenvalues of $-\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ different from 1 are among those of $I-X_{2}^{\prime} Y^{-1} X_{2}=I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$. Since $Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)=\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$, we see that $Y_{2}^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y_{2}^{-1}\right)$ has the same eigenvalues. Thus, the eigenvalues of $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ which are different from one are among the eigenvalues of $-\varepsilon\left(Y_{2}^{-1}\right) Y_{2}^{-1}$. Consequently, $-\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ and $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ are $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(F)$-conjugate.

Lemma 2.19 Assume that $n=m$. Suppose that $Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$, and $Z=I-$ $X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$. Let $g \in \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}(F)$, and suppose that $g X=X h$. Then $h$ belongs to $\mathbf{G}_{Z}(F)$, and is uniquely determined modulo the right stabilizer of $X$. Conversely, suppose that $h \in \mathbf{G}_{Z}(F)$, and $(X, Y)$ forms a canonical section over $Z$. If there is a $g \in \mathbf{G}^{\prime}(F)$ for which $g X=X h$, then $g$ can be chosen to lie in $\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}(F)$.

Proof Since $(X, Y)$ is a canonical section, we know that $X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=X^{\prime} Y^{-1}=$ $(-1)^{n+1} Y^{-1} X$, and $(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime}$ is a projection. We set $U_{1}=X E^{n}, U_{1}^{\prime}=X^{\prime} E^{n}$, $U=E^{n} X, U^{\prime}=E^{n} X^{\prime}, U_{2}=\{v \mid X v=0\}$, and $U_{2}^{\prime}=\left\{v \mid X^{\prime} v=0\right\}$. Then we have isomorphisms $Y^{-1}: U_{1} \xrightarrow{\sim} U_{1}^{\prime}$ and $Y^{-1}: U_{2} \xrightarrow{\sim} U_{2}^{\prime}$. If we let $\tilde{\varepsilon}(v)={ }^{t} \overline{\left(u_{n} v\right)}={ }^{t} \bar{v} u_{n}^{-1}$, then $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ gives isomorphisms from $U_{1}$ to $U^{\prime}$ and $U_{1}^{\prime}$ to $U$. Now $\varepsilon(Y)$ defines an isomorphism from $U^{\prime}$ to $U$.

Suppose that $h \in \mathbf{G}(F)$, and $h^{-1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X h=X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$. Then, applying $\varepsilon$ to both sides of this equality we have $h^{-1} X^{\prime} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) X h=X^{\prime} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) X$.

We know that $I-X$ and $I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}$ are projections and

$$
\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1}(I-X)=\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1}=Y^{-1}(I-X)
$$

Suppose that $g_{0} \in \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$ with $g_{0} X=X g_{0}$. Since $\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, \varepsilon(Y)}^{\prime}=\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y^{-1}}^{\prime}=\varepsilon\left(\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}\right)$, we have

$$
\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1}(I-X)=\varepsilon\left(g_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1}(I-X) g_{0}
$$

Let $g$ be defined by $\left.g\right|_{U_{1}}=\left.X h\right|_{U_{1}}$, and $\left.g\right|_{U_{2}}=\left.g_{0}\right|_{U_{2}}=\left.(I-X) g_{0}\right|_{U_{2}}$. If $v \in U_{1}$, then $g X v=g v=X h v$. If $v \in U_{2}$, then $Y^{-1} X h v=h Y^{-1} X v=0$, which says that $X h v=0=g X v$. Thus, $g X=X h$.

We now show that $g \in \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$. Suppose that $v \in U_{1}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left((-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime}\right) \varepsilon(g)^{-1} Y^{-1} g v & =(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime} \varepsilon(g)^{-1} Y^{-1} g X v=(-1)^{n+1} h^{-1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X h v \\
& =(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1} v
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) \varepsilon(g)^{-1}=\varepsilon\left(g_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right)$, we also see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) \varepsilon(g)^{-1} Y^{-1} g v & =\varepsilon\left(g_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1} X h v \\
& =\varepsilon\left(g_{0}\right)^{-1}\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) X^{\prime} Y^{-1} v \\
& =0=\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1} v
\end{aligned}
$$

Now suppose that $v \in U_{2}$. Then $Y^{-1} v \in U_{2}^{\prime}$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left((-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime}\right) \varepsilon(g)^{-1} Y^{-1} g v & =h^{-1}\left((-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1}(I-X) g_{0} v \\
& =0=(-1)^{n+1} X^{\prime} Y^{-1} v .
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) \varepsilon(g)^{-1} Y^{-1} g v & =\varepsilon\left(g_{0}\right)^{-1}(I+X)^{\prime} Y^{-1}(I-X) g_{0} v \\
& =\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1}(I-X) v=\left(I+(-1)^{n} X^{\prime}\right) Y^{-1} v .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, $\varepsilon(g) \in \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y-1}^{\prime}$, which says that $g \in \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$. Therefore, $g$ has the desired properties.
Corollary 2.20 Suppose that $n>m$, with $n \equiv n(\bmod 2)$. Then the statement of Lemта 2.19 is true.

Proof That the first statement of Lemma 2.19 holds is straightforward. Let $k=$ $(n-m) / 2$. Suppose that $X=\left(\begin{array}{c}0 \\ X_{0} \\ 0\end{array}\right)$ and $Y=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}I_{k} & & \\ & (-1)^{k} Y_{0} & \\ & & -I_{k}\end{array}\right)$, with $\left(X_{0}, Y_{0}\right)$ a canonical section over $Z$ for $M_{m}(E) \times \mathrm{GL}_{m}(E)$. If $g=\left(\begin{array}{lll}g_{11} & g_{12} & g_{13} \\ g_{21} & g_{2} & g_{23} \\ g_{31} & g_{32} & g_{33}\end{array}\right)$, then

$$
g X=\left(\begin{array}{l}
g_{12} X_{0} \\
g_{22} X_{0} \\
g_{32} X_{0}
\end{array}\right) \text { and } X h=\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
X_{0} h \\
0
\end{array}\right)
$$

Therefore, $g_{22} X_{0}=X_{0} h$, while $g_{12} X_{0}=g_{32} X_{0}=0$. By our choice of $X_{0}$ and $Y_{0}$, we can assume that $g_{22} \in \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y_{0}}^{\prime}(F)$. We let $g_{0}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}I_{k} & & \\ & g_{22} & \\ & & I_{k}\end{array}\right)$. Then $g_{0} X=g X=X h$. Moreover,

$$
\varepsilon\left(g_{0}\right)=u_{n} \overline{\bar{g}}^{-1} u_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
I_{k} & & \\
& \varepsilon\left(g_{22}\right) & \\
& & I_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Thus,

$$
g_{0}^{-1} Y \varepsilon\left(g_{0}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I_{k} & & \\
& (-1)^{k} g_{22}^{-1} Y_{0} \varepsilon\left(g_{22}\right) & \\
& & -I_{k}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I_{k} & & \\
& (-1)^{k} Y_{0} & \\
& & -I_{k}
\end{array}\right)=Y
$$

Thus, $g_{0}$ has the desired properties.
Lemma 2.21 Let $n=m$, and denote by $N_{\varepsilon}^{-1}$ the canonical section of the norm map, as defined in Definition 2.11. Then $N_{\varepsilon}^{-1}$ is continuous.

Proof Suppose that $n=m$. Further suppose that $S \in M_{n}(E)$ with $I-S \in G(m)$. Let $X$ be a projection and $Y \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ for which $S=X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=X^{\prime} Y^{-1}=$ $(-1)^{n+1} Y^{-1} X$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\varepsilon}(S)=\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(X^{\prime} Y^{-1}\right) & =u_{n}{ }^{t} \overline{\left(X^{\prime} Y^{-1}\right)} u_{n}^{-1} \\
& =u_{n}\left({ }^{t} \bar{Y}^{-1} u_{n} X u_{n}\right) u_{n}^{-1}=(-1)^{n+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$, we have

$$
Y^{-1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)=\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X X^{\prime} Y^{-1}=(-1)^{n+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}(S) S
$$

Now suppose that $\left\{I-S_{k}\right\}$ converges to $I-S$ in $G(m)$. Let $\left\{Y_{k}^{-1}\right\}=N_{\varepsilon}^{-1}\left(\left\{I-S_{k}\right\}\right)$, and let $X_{k}$ be the associated projection. Since $S_{k}(V)$ converges to $S(V)$ (pointwise) we see that $X_{k}^{\prime}$ converges to $X^{\prime}$, which says that $X_{k}$ converges to $X$. Therefore, there is a $k_{0}$ so that $k>k_{0}$ implies that $X_{k}=X$. We have

$$
S=X^{\prime} Y^{-1}=\lim _{k} S_{k}=\lim _{k} X_{k}^{\prime} Y_{k}^{-1}=X^{\prime} \lim _{k} Y_{k}^{-1}
$$

Applying $\tilde{\varepsilon}$, we see that

$$
\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(X^{\prime} \lim _{k} Y_{k}^{-1}\right)=(-1)^{n+1} \lim _{k} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{k}^{-1}\right) X,
$$

and thus,

$$
\lim _{k} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{k}^{-1}\right) X=\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) X
$$

Suppose that $v \in W$. Then $X v=v$, and so $\lim _{k} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{k}^{-1}\right) v=\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) v$, and therefore, $\left.\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{k}^{-1}\right)\right|_{W}$ converges to $\left.\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)\right|_{W}$. Moreover,

$$
Y_{k}^{-1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{k}^{-1}\right)=\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{k}^{-1}\right) X_{k} X_{k}^{\prime} Y_{k}^{-1}=(-1)^{n+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(S_{k}\right) S_{k}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lim _{k}\left(Y_{k}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{k}^{-1}\right)\right) & =\lim _{k} Y_{k}^{-1}+\lim _{k} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{k}^{-1}\right) \\
& =(-1)^{n+1} \lim _{k}\left(\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(S_{k}\right) S_{k}\right)=(-1)^{n+1} \tilde{\varepsilon}(S) S=Y^{-1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, on ker $X$, we have

$$
\lim _{k} Y_{k}^{-1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(\lim _{k} Y_{k}^{-1}\right)=0=Y^{-1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y^{-1}\right) .
$$

However, for $k>k_{0}$, we have $\operatorname{ker} X_{k}=\operatorname{ker} X$, and since $\operatorname{det}\left(\left.Y_{k}\right|_{\operatorname{ker} X}\right) \equiv$ $\operatorname{det}\left(\left.Y\right|_{\operatorname{ker} X}\right) \bmod N E^{\times}$, and both are $\varepsilon$-skew hermitian, we have $Y_{k} \mid \operatorname{ker} X$ is $\varepsilon$-conjugate to $\left.Y\right|_{\text {ker } X}$. Thus, we clearly have $\left\{Y_{k}\right\} \rightarrow\{Y\}$.

## 3 The Pole

Let $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}=\operatorname{Res}_{E / F} \mathrm{GL}_{n}$. If $Y \in \mathbf{G}^{\prime}$, then we define

$$
\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}=\left\{g \in \mathbf{G}^{\prime} \mid g^{-1} Y \varepsilon(g)=Y\right\}
$$

We also define

$$
\tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}=\left\{g \mid g^{-1} Y \varepsilon(g)=z Y, \text { for some } z \in N E^{\times}\right\}
$$

Note that $\chi_{Y}: \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} \rightarrow F^{\times}$, given by $\chi_{Y}(g)=z$ if $g^{-1} Y \varepsilon(g)=z Y$, is a homomorphism. If $a \in E^{\times}$, then $(a I)^{-1} Y \varepsilon(a I)=N_{E / F}(a) Y$. Thus, $\chi_{Y}$ is surjective, and

$$
\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}(F) \backslash \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}(F) \simeq N E^{\times}
$$

for any $\{Y\} \in \mathcal{N}$.
Suppose that $\omega$ is a character of $E^{\times}$. Let $\psi \in C^{\infty}\left(G^{\prime}, \omega\right)$. We define

$$
\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}(Y, \psi)=\int_{\tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} \backslash G^{\prime}} \psi\left(g^{-1} Y \varepsilon(g)\right) d \dot{g} .
$$

Suppose that $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$ is a matrix coefficient of $\tau^{\prime}$. For any $\{Y\} \in \mathcal{N}$, set

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{\varepsilon}(Y, & \left.\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}| |^{s}\right) \\
& =\int_{G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} \backslash G^{\prime}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g^{-1} Y \varepsilon(g)\right)\left|\operatorname{det}\left(g^{-1} Y \varepsilon(g)\right)\right|_{E}^{s} d \dot{g} \\
& =\int_{G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} \backslash \tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{\tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} \backslash G^{\prime}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g^{-1} h^{-1} Y \varepsilon(h) \varepsilon(g)\right)\left|\operatorname{det}\left(g^{-1} h^{-1} Y \varepsilon(h) \varepsilon(g)\right)\right|_{E}^{s} d \dot{g} d \dot{h} \\
& =\int_{N E^{\times}} \int_{\tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} \backslash G^{\prime}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g^{-1} z Y \varepsilon(g)\right)\left|\operatorname{det}\left(g^{-1} z Y \varepsilon(g)\right)\right|_{E}^{s} d \dot{g} d z \\
& =\int_{N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(z)^{-1}|z|_{E}^{n s} \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}| |^{s}\right) d z
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 3.1 The twisted orbital integral $\Phi_{\varepsilon}\left(Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}| |^{s}\right)$ converges for Res $>0$.

Proof Since $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$ is compactly supported modulo the center $Z$ of $G^{\prime}$, and $Z \subset \tilde{\mathbf{G}}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$, we see that $\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}| |^{s}\right)$ converges for all $s$. Since the integral over $N E^{\times}$converges for $\operatorname{Re} s>0$, we have the proposition.
Lemma 3.2 Let $n$ be even and $\alpha \in F^{\times} / N E^{\times} . \operatorname{Set} \alpha_{0}=\operatorname{diag}\{\alpha, 1, \alpha, 1, \ldots, \alpha, 1\} \in$ $G U_{n}$. Then, for any $\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\} \in \mathcal{N}$, we have $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\alpha \gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right)=\alpha_{0}^{-1} N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right) \alpha_{0}$. If $n$ is odd, and $\alpha \in N E^{\times}$, then we choose $\lambda \in E^{\times}$so that $\lambda \bar{\lambda}=\alpha$. We then set $\alpha_{0}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{\alpha I_{(n-1) / 2}, \lambda, I_{(n-1) / 2}\right\} \in G U_{n}$. Then, again we have $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\alpha \gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right)=$ $\alpha_{0}^{-1} N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right) \alpha_{0}$.

Proof Let $\alpha^{\vee}=\alpha I_{n}$. Then, for all $n$, we have $\alpha^{\vee}=\alpha_{0} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(\alpha_{0}\right)$. Suppose $Y^{-1} \in\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}$, and $Y$ satisfies (1.1) with $X$. Then

$$
X \alpha^{\vee} X^{\prime}=\alpha(Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y))=(\alpha Y)+\tilde{\varepsilon}(\alpha Y)
$$

On the other hand, we observe that

$$
\begin{aligned}
X \alpha^{\vee} X^{\prime} & =X \alpha_{0} \tilde{\varepsilon}\left(a_{0}\right) X^{\prime}=X \alpha_{0} u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{\alpha}_{0} u_{n}^{-1} u_{n}{ }^{t} \bar{X} u_{n} \\
& =X \alpha_{0} u_{n}{ }^{t} \overline{\left(X \alpha_{0}\right)} u_{n}=\left(X \alpha_{0}\right)\left(X_{0} \alpha_{0}\right)^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\alpha \gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right)=N_{\varepsilon}(\{\alpha Y\})$ is the collection of conjugacy classes given by

$$
\left\{I-\left(X \alpha_{0}\right)^{\prime}(\alpha Y)^{-1}\left(X \alpha_{0}\right)\right\}=\alpha_{0}^{-1}\left\{I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right\} \alpha_{0}
$$

as $X$ ranges over all its possible choices. This completes the lemma.
Proposition 3.3 Assume $n=m$. Suppose the $\varepsilon$-conjugacy class $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$ is $\varepsilon$-regular. Then $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}\right)$ consists of a single conjugacy class in $G$ of a regular semisimple element in $G$. Assuming that $Y$ and $\varepsilon(Y)$ commute, i.e., that $Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)$ is in $G$, then the converse is true, i.e., if $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}\right)$ is regular, then $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$ is $\varepsilon$-regular (and hence $\varepsilon$-semisimple).

Proof First we suppose the $\varepsilon$-conjugacy class $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$ is $\varepsilon$-regular. Then, up to $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(\bar{F})$-conjugation, $\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ is a regular semisimple element of $\mathbf{G}$. Choose $Y_{2}^{-1}, \varepsilon$-conjugate to $Y^{-1}$, and a projection $X_{2}$ satisfying (1.1) with $Y_{2}$, such that $I-X_{2}^{\prime} Y_{2}^{-1} X_{2}=I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$. By Lemma 2.13, the eigenvalues of $\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ different from 1 are among those of the semisimple part of $I-X_{2}^{\prime} Y_{2}^{-1} X_{2}$. Since $Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)$ is $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$-conjugate to $\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$, one sees that the eigenvalues of $-\varepsilon\left(Y_{2}\right)^{-1} Y_{2}^{-1}$ and $-Y_{2}^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y_{2}\right)^{-1}$ are the same. Therefore, one can apply the argument of Lemma 5.10 of [16] to the equation in Lemma 2.3(a) to show that the eigenvalues of the semisimple part of $I-X_{2}^{\prime} Y_{2}^{-1} X_{2}$ which are not 1 are also among those of $-\varepsilon\left(Y_{2}\right)^{-1} Y_{2}^{-1}$. Then the semisimple parts of $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ and $-\varepsilon(Y)^{-1} Y^{-1}$ are $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(\bar{F})$-conjugate. But $-\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ is $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(\bar{F})$-conjugate to a regular element in $\mathbf{G}$, and therefore, $I-$ $X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ must be semisimple and regular.

Suppose now that $Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$, with $Y^{-1} \varepsilon(Y)^{-1} \in \mathbf{G}(F)$, and assume $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}\right)$ contains a regular semisimple element $\left\{I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right\}$. Again by Lemma 2.3(a), and the argument of Lemma 2.13, the conjugacy class of $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ is completely determined by the semisimple part of the conjugacy class $\left\{-Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)\right\}$ in $\mathbf{G}(F)$. That is, the eigenvalues of the first are among those of the second. Moreover, by Lemma 2.13, the semisimple part of the conjugacy class of $-\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ is completely determined by $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$. Since $\left\{I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right\}$ is regular semisimple in $\mathbf{G}(F)$, and $Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) \in \mathbf{G}(F)$, we conclude that $Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)$ is regular and semisimple. Therefore, $\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}$ is $\varepsilon$-regular. In fact, let $\tilde{Y}=(Y, \varepsilon)$ represent an element in the non-identity component of $\mathrm{GL}_{n} \rtimes\{1, \varepsilon\}$. Write $\tilde{Y}=s u$, with $s$ semisimple and $u$ unipotent. Then $\tilde{Y}^{2}=s^{2} u^{2}=Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)$. If $Y^{-1} \varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)$ is semisimple, then $u^{2}=u=1$, and thus $Y$ is $\varepsilon$-semisimple and $\varepsilon$-regular.

Corollary 3.4 Suppose $n>m$ and $n \equiv m(\bmod 2)$. Then, for almost all regular elliptic conjugacy classes $\{h\} \in G(m)$, the collection of $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes, $N_{\varepsilon}^{-1}(\{h\})$ is parameterized by a unique $\varepsilon$-regular $\varepsilon$-conjugacy class in $\mathrm{GL}_{m}(\bar{F})$.

Proof For almost all regular semisimple classes in $G(m)$, there is a choice of $Y_{2} \in$ $\mathrm{GL}_{m}(F)$ which satisfies (1.1) with $X_{2}=I_{m}$, so that $I-X_{2}^{\prime} Y_{2}^{-1} X_{2} \in\{h\}$. In particular $Y_{2}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{2}\right)=I_{m}^{\prime}$. By Proposition 3.3, the $\varepsilon$-conjugacy class of $Y_{2}$ is $\varepsilon$-regular and uniquely determined by $h$. Let $k=(n-m) / 2$, as in Corollary 2.15. Let $X=\left(\begin{array}{c}0_{k \times m} \\ I_{m} \\ 0_{k \times m}\end{array}\right) \in M_{n \times m}(E)$. Then

$$
X X^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times m} & 0_{k \times k} \\
0_{m \times k} & (-1)^{k} I_{m}^{\prime} & 0_{m \times k} \\
0_{k \times k} & 0_{k \times m} & 0_{k \times k}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Let

$$
Y=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I_{k} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & (-1)^{k} Y_{2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -I_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Then as computed before, $Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$ (Corollary 2.15). We have also seen that $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X=h$.

It remains to check that for almost all $Y_{2}$, the class of $Y$ satisfying (1.1) is, up to $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(\bar{F})-\varepsilon$-conjugacy, of the form given in the previous paragraph. First observe that for almost all $Y$ satisfying (1.1) with $X=\left(\begin{array}{l}0 \\ I \\ 0\end{array}\right), Y$ acts semisimply on the direct sum of the image and the kernel of $X X^{\prime}$, both of which are invariant under $\varepsilon$, since $Y_{2}$ is $\varepsilon$-regular. Moreover, $Y$ must be $\varepsilon$-skew symmetric on $\operatorname{ker}\left(X X^{\prime}\right)$ and can therefore be given in the form $\operatorname{diag}\left(J_{1}, Y_{2}, J_{2}\right)$ with $\operatorname{diag}\left(J_{1}, J_{2}\right) \varepsilon$-symmetric or $\varepsilon$-skew symmetric proving our assertion.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of conjugacy classes in $G=G(m)$ and denote by $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$ the set of $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes in $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}(F)=\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$. Suppose that $n=m$, and that $\mathbf{T}$ is a Cartan subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$, defined over $F$. Let $\mathbf{T}^{\prime}$ be an $\varepsilon$-stable Cartan subgroup of $\mathbf{G}^{\prime}$ with $\mathbf{T} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ defined over $F$. This isomorphism induces the image map $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{G} / \mathbf{G}^{\prime}}$, as defined by Kottwitz and Shelstad, between semisimple classes in $\mathcal{C}$ and $\varepsilon$-semisimple classes in $\mathcal{C}^{\prime}$ [12]. Now we have

$$
N_{\varepsilon}: \mathbf{T}^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{T}
$$

with all the maps defined over $F$.
Lemma 3.5 Suppose that $\mathbf{T} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ is defined over $F$ as above. If $\delta \in \mathbf{T}^{\prime}$ is strongly $\varepsilon$-regular, then $\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, \delta}^{\prime}=\left(\mathbf{T}^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$.

Proof If $\delta$ is strongly $\varepsilon$-regular, then $\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, \delta}^{\prime}$ is a torus which is stable under $\operatorname{Int}(\delta) \circ \varepsilon$, and which is maximal with respect to this condition. Since $T^{\prime}$ is a maximal torus, we know that $\mathbf{T}_{\delta}^{\prime}=\mathbf{T}^{\prime}$. Moreover, $\mathbf{T}^{\prime}$ is $\varepsilon$-stable, so $\left(\mathbf{T}^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$ is the desired twisted centralizer.

As in [8] we wish to integrate over all the twisted conjugacy classes in $\mathcal{N}$. By Proposition 3.3 and the surjectivity of the norm correspondence, up to a set of measure zero these classes are parameterized by regular semisimple conjugacy classes in G. To account for the fact that more than one regular conjugacy class in $G$ can parameterize a class in $\mathcal{N}$, we integrate over all the Cartan subgroups of $G$. Fix a representative $\mathbf{T}$ for each conjugacy class of Cartan subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$ which are defined over $F$. Let $d \gamma$ be a Haar measure for $T=\mathbf{T}(F)$. For $\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\} \in \mathcal{C}^{\prime}$, we define

$$
D_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)=\left.\operatorname{det}\left(\operatorname{Ad}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right) \circ \varepsilon-1\right)\right|_{\mathfrak{g} / \mathfrak{g}_{\varepsilon, \gamma^{\prime}}}
$$

as in [12]. Now by Lemma 2.17, Lemma 3.5, Proposition 3.3, and by computing the Jacobian of the open immersion in page 227 of [1] (or Theorem 3.2 of [17]), the measure $|W(\mathbf{T})|^{-1}\left|D_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)\right| d \gamma$ as $\mathbf{T}$ ranges, will provide us with a measure for $\mathcal{N}$. Here $\{\gamma\}$ is in $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right)$ for each $\varepsilon$-regular $\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}$ in $\mathcal{N}$.

By Lemma 4.5.A of [12], the function

$$
\kappa_{1}\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right)=\left|D_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)\right| d \gamma^{\prime} /|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

is continuous on

$$
\left\{\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right) \mid\{\gamma\} \in N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right)\right\}
$$

We define

$$
\kappa\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right)= \begin{cases}\kappa_{1}\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right) & \text { if }\{\gamma\} \in N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right) \text { and } \gamma^{\prime} \text { is } \varepsilon-\text { regular } \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

For $\{\gamma\} \in \mathcal{C}$, we define

$$
\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\})=\left\{\left\{\alpha \gamma^{\prime}\right\} \in \mathcal{N} \mid\{\gamma\} \in N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right), \alpha \in N E^{\times} \backslash F^{\times}\right\} .
$$

We then set $\Delta\left(\gamma, \alpha \gamma^{\prime}\right)=\omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \kappa\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right)$.
We set

$$
\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=\sum_{\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\} \in \mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\})} \Delta\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right) \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) .
$$

As in [8] one part of the residue of $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$ at $s=0$ will come from the Weyl integration formula, applied to the class function $\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)$. Thus, we expect a contribution from these classes of the "regular term"

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=\sum_{\left\{\mathbf{T}_{i}\right\}} \mu\left(T_{i}\right)\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}} \Phi\left(\{\gamma\}, f_{\tau}\right) \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\left\{\mathbf{T}_{i}\right\}$ running over all the conjugacy classes of elliptic Cartan subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$, $T_{i}=\mathbf{T}_{i}(F)$, and $\mu\left(T_{i}\right)$ the measure of $T_{i}$. Note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)= & \sum_{\left\{\mathbf{T}_{i}\right\}} \mu\left(T_{i}\right)\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}} \sum_{\{\gamma\} \in N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right)} \\
& \cdot \sum_{\alpha \in N E^{\star} \backslash F^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \Phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\alpha \gamma^{\prime}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(\gamma, f_{\tau}\right)\left|D_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)\right| d \gamma \\
3.2) \quad & \int_{\mathcal{N}_{\text {reg }}} \sum_{\alpha} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) f_{\tau}\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right) \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(Y^{-1}\right)|\operatorname{det} Y|^{-\langle\rho \mathbf{p}, \tilde{\alpha}\rangle} d(X, Y) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We now address the question of the convergence of $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)$. By Lemma 2.2 of [16], we need to show that

$$
\int_{\mathbf{T}(F)} \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(\gamma, f_{\tau}\right)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

converges on any elliptic Cartan T of G. By Theorem 14 of [9], the function $|D(\gamma)|^{1 / 2}$. $\Phi\left(\gamma, f_{\tau}\right)$ is bounded on the intersection of $\mathbf{T}(F)$ with the regular set $G_{\text {reg }}$. Therefore, we need to prove the convergence of

$$
\int_{\mathbf{T}(F)} \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)|D(\gamma)|^{1 / 2} d \gamma
$$

That is, we need to look at the absolute convergence of

$$
\int_{\mathbf{T}(F)} \sum_{\{\gamma\} \in N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{\gamma^{\prime}\right\}\right)} \sum_{\alpha \in N E^{\times} \backslash F^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\alpha \gamma^{\prime}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \kappa\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right)|D(\gamma)|^{1 / 2} d \gamma
$$

It is enough to look at each term in the sum, namely, enough to show the convergence of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(F)}\left|\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\alpha \gamma^{\prime}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)\right||D(\gamma)|^{-1 / 2}| | D_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right) \mid d \gamma^{\prime} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $\tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}(-,-)$ is a tempered distribution, the results of [9], and [4], imply the function $\left|D_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)\right|^{1 / 2} \tilde{\Phi}_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)$ is bounded on the intersection of $\mathbf{T}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}(F)$ with the $\varepsilon$ regular set. Moreover, $\kappa\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right)^{1 / 2}$ is continuous, and thus (3.3) converges.

We let $M=\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E) \times G$ act on $N$ by the adjoint action. The orbit of $n(X, Y)$ is the set of pairs $n\left(g X h^{-1}, g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)$, with $g \in G^{\prime}=\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ and $h \in G$. The stabilizer $\Delta^{\vee}$ of this action at $n(X, Y)$ consists of all those pairs $(g, h) \in M$ with $g \in \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}(F)$ and for which $g X=X h$. Then, by Lemma 2.19, we see that $h \in \mathbf{G}_{Z}(F)$, with $Z=I-$ $X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$. We consider $\Delta^{\vee}$ as a subgroup of both $\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}(F)$ and $\mathbf{G}_{Z}(F)$ via its projections onto its components. We now reformulate (1.2) by first integrating over each $M$ orbit in $N$. Note that by Lemma 2.3 of [13] $d^{*}(X, Y)=|\operatorname{det} Y|^{-\left\langle\rho_{\mathbf{p}}, \tilde{\alpha}\right\rangle} d(X, Y)$ is an invariant measure on these orbits.

Now, making the change of variables, and using our assumption that $m$ and $n$ have the same parity, we see that (1.2) can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{(X, Y)} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}(Y) f_{\tau}\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right)|\operatorname{det} Y|_{E}^{s} \xi_{L}\left(\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right)\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}(X) d^{*}(X, Y) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We consider the map from the orbit of $n(X, Y)$ under $M$ to $G^{\prime} / \Delta^{\vee} \times \Delta^{\vee} \backslash G$ given by $n\left(g X h^{-1}, g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \mapsto\left(g \Delta^{\vee}, \Delta^{\vee} h\right)$. The fiber of this map is homeomorphic to $X \Delta^{\vee}$. Thus, integrating over the orbit of $n(X, Y)$ can be accomplished by integrating over the product of $G^{\prime} / \Delta^{\vee} \times \Delta^{\vee} \backslash G$ and $X \Delta^{\vee}$. Consequently, the contribution to (3.4) from the orbit of $n(X, Y)$ may be written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{g \in G^{\prime} / \Delta^{\vee}} \int_{h \in \Delta^{\vee} \backslash G} \int_{X \Delta^{\vee}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) f_{\tau}\left(h^{-1} Z h\right)\left|\operatorname{det}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)\right|_{E}^{s} \\
& \quad \cdot \xi_{\tilde{L}}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g X h_{0} h\right) d\left(X h_{0}\right) d h d g
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
= & \int_{g \in G^{\prime} / \tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{g_{1} \in \tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} / G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{G_{Z} \backslash G} \int_{G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} / \Delta^{\vee}} \int_{X G_{Z}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g g_{1} Y \varepsilon\left(g g_{1}\right)^{-1}\right) f_{\tau}\left(h^{-1} Z h\right)  \tag{3.5}\\
& \cdot\left|\operatorname{det}\left(g g_{1} Y \varepsilon\left(g g_{1}\right)^{-1}\right)\right|_{E}^{s} \xi_{\tilde{L}}\left(g g_{1} Y \varepsilon\left(g g_{1}\right)^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g g_{1} g_{0} X h_{0} h\right) d\left(X h_{0}\right) d g_{0} d h d g_{1} d g
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\tilde{L}=\tilde{\varepsilon}(L)$. Now we use the fact that $\tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} / G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} \simeq N E^{\times}$. For $z \in N E^{\times}$, let $g_{1}(z)$ be a choice of representative in $\tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$ which satisfies $g_{1}(z) Y \varepsilon\left(g_{1}(z)\right)^{-1}=z Y$. In
fact, we can take $g_{1}=a_{z} I_{n}$, where $a_{z}$ satisfies $a_{z} \bar{a}_{z}=z$. Then (3.5) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{G^{\prime} / \tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{N E^{\times}} \int_{G_{Z} \backslash G} \int_{G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} / \Delta^{\vee}} \int_{X G_{Z}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g(z Y) \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) f_{\tau}\left(h^{-1} Z h\right) \mid \\
& \left.\quad \cdot \operatorname{det}\left(g(z Y) \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)\right|_{E} ^{s} \xi_{\tilde{L}}\left(g\left((z Y) \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g a_{z} g_{0} X h_{0} h\right) d\left(X h_{0}\right) d g_{0} d h d^{\times} z d g \\
& \quad=\int_{N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(z)|z|_{E}^{2 n s} \int_{G^{\prime} / \tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{G_{Z} \backslash G} \int_{G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} / \Delta^{\vee}} \int_{X G_{Z}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) f_{\tau}\left(h^{-1} Z h\right) \\
& \quad \cdot\left|\operatorname{det}\left(g^{-1} Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)\right|_{E}^{s} \xi_{\tilde{L}}\left(g z Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g a_{z} g_{0} X h_{0} h\right) d\left(X h_{0}\right) d g_{0} d h d g d^{\times} z .
\end{aligned}
$$

However, since $\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon} \simeq \tau^{\prime}$, we know that $\omega^{\prime}(z) \equiv 1$ on $N E^{\times}$. Now, summing over $\alpha \in F^{\times} / N E^{\times}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\alpha \in F^{\times} / N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \int_{N E^{\times}}|z|_{E}^{2 n s} \int_{G^{\prime} / \tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{G_{Z} \backslash G} \int_{G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime} / \Delta^{\vee}} \int_{X G_{Z}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) f_{\tau}\left(h^{-1} Z h\right) \\
& \quad \cdot\left|\operatorname{det}\left(g^{-1} \alpha Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)\right|_{E}^{s} \xi_{\tilde{L}}\left(g z \alpha Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g a_{z} g_{0} X h_{0} h\right) d\left(X h_{0}\right) d g_{0} d h d g d^{\times} z .
\end{aligned}
$$

We denote this last expression by $\tilde{\psi}(s, Z)$.
Now suppose that $X=I$. Then $Z=I \pm Y^{-1}$. Moreover, if $(Y, I)$ satisfies (1.1) and $g \in G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$, then

$$
Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}= \pm I
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y) & =g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)=(g X)(g X)^{\prime} \\
& =g X X^{\prime} \varepsilon(g)^{-1}=g( \pm I) \varepsilon(g)^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

and therefore, $g \varepsilon(g)^{-1}=I$, which says that $g \in \mathbf{G}(F)$. Now we clearly have $G_{\varepsilon, Y}=$ $G_{Z}$. Also note that $g X=X h$ implies $g=h$, and so $\Delta^{\vee}=\left\{(g, g) \mid g \in G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}\right\} \simeq$ $G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$. We further assume that such a $Y$ is $\varepsilon$-regular and therefore $Z$ is regular and semisimple. Thus, in this case (3.6) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
\psi(s, Z)= & \sum_{F^{\times} / N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \int_{N E^{\times}}|z|_{E}^{2 n s} \int_{G^{\prime} / \tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{G_{Z} \backslash G} \int_{G_{Z}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g^{-1} Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \mid \\
& \left.\cdot \operatorname{det}\left(g \alpha Y \varepsilon\left(g_{0}^{-1}\right)\right)\right|_{E} ^{s} f_{\tau}\left(h^{-1} Z h\right) \xi_{\tilde{L}}\left(g \alpha z Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g a_{z} h_{0} h\right) d h_{0} d h d g d^{\times} z
\end{aligned}
$$

We may assume that $L$ is a basic open neighborhood about zero, that is, for some integer $t$,

$$
L=M_{n}\left(\mathfrak{p}_{E}^{t}\right)=\left\{x=\left.\left(x_{i j}\right)| | x_{i j}\right|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{-t} \text { for all } i, j\right\}
$$

Then $\tilde{L}=L$.
Lemma 3.6 For any $Y$ we have $\left\{g \mid g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1} \in \operatorname{supp}\left(\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)\right\}$ is compact.

Proof Let $L_{0}=\left\{y \in M_{n}(E) \mid q_{E}^{-t-1} \leq\|y\|_{\infty} \leq q_{E}^{t}\right\}$, where $\left\|\|_{\infty}\right.$ is the supremum norm. Therefore, if $z \in N E^{\times}$, with $|z|_{E}>1$, then $z y \notin L$ for any $y \in L_{0}$. Let $g \in G^{\prime}$. By changing $g$ by an element of $\tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$, we may assume that $g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1} \in L_{0}$. We fix our representatives for $G^{\prime} / \tilde{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$ to have this property.

Now let $C$ be a compact subset of $G^{\prime}$ so that $\operatorname{supp}\left(\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \subset C Z\left(G^{\prime}\right)$. Then, since $C$ is compact, we can choose integers $k_{1}, k_{2}, j_{1}$ and $j_{2}$ so that, for any $c \in C, q_{E}^{k_{1}} \leq$ $\|c\|_{\infty} \leq q_{E}^{k_{2}}$ and $q_{E}^{j_{1}} \leq|\operatorname{det} c|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{j_{2}}$. Note that if $c z \in L_{0}$, then

$$
q_{E}^{-t-1} \leq\|c z\|_{\infty}=\|c\|_{\infty}|z|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{t}
$$

which then implies

$$
q_{E}^{-t-1-k_{2}} \leq|z|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{t-k_{1}}
$$

Let $\Omega=\left\{z\left|q_{E}^{-t-1-k_{2}} \leq|z|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{t-k_{1}}\right\}\right.$. Then $\Omega$ is compact and $C \Omega \supset C Z\left(G^{\prime}\right) \cap L_{0}$. Thus,

$$
\left\{g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right\} \cap \operatorname{supp}\left(\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \subset L_{0} \cap C Z\left(G^{\prime}\right) \subset C \Omega
$$

is a closed subset of a compact set, hence compact.

$$
\text { Let } \operatorname{supp}(g)=\left\{g \mid g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1} \in \operatorname{supp}\left(\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)\right\} \text {. We see that }
$$

$$
\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \xi_{\tilde{L}}\left(\alpha z g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)=0
$$

unless $g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1} \in \operatorname{supp} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}} \cap \alpha^{-1} z^{-1} \tilde{L}$, and since $\operatorname{supp}(g)$ is compact, we have $|\operatorname{det} z|_{E} \geq \eta$, for some $\eta$, which depends only on $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$ and $L$. Also, since supp $f_{\tau}$ is compact modulo $Z(G)$, and $Z(G) \simeq E^{1}$ is compact, we see that supp $f_{\tau}$ is compact. Note that $\left\{h \mid h Z h^{-1} \in \operatorname{supp} f_{\tau}\right\}$ is then also compact, and we call this $\operatorname{supp}(h)$. Let $h_{0} \in \mathbf{G}_{Z}(F)$. We may assume that $h_{0}$ is diagonal, and we further assume that

$$
h_{0}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{a_{1} I_{k_{1}}, a_{2} I_{k_{2}} \ldots, a_{b} I_{k_{b}}, \bar{a}_{b}^{-1} I_{k_{b}}, \ldots, \bar{a}_{2}^{-1} I_{k_{2}}, \bar{a}_{1}^{-1} I_{k_{1}}\right\}
$$

with the pairs $\left(a_{i}, \bar{a}_{i}^{-1}\right)$ distinct. Note that $\xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g a_{z} h_{0} h\right)=0$ unless $a_{z} h_{0} \in$ $(\operatorname{supp}(g))^{-1} \cdot L^{\prime}(\operatorname{supp}(h))^{-1}$, which is compact. Further note that if $T$ is the compact part of $G_{Z}$, then there is some $\kappa$ so that if, for all $i,\left|a_{z} a_{i}\right|_{E} \leq \kappa$ and $\left|a_{z} a_{i}^{-1}\right|_{E} \leq \kappa$, then

$$
\operatorname{supp}(g) a_{z} h_{0} T \operatorname{supp}(h) \subseteq L^{\prime}
$$

Thus, for such a $z$ and $h_{0}$, the element $h$ ranges over all of $\operatorname{supp}(h)$, which then gives the term $\Phi\left(Z, f_{\tau}\right)$, which vanishes when the split component of $\mathbf{G}_{Z}$ is non-trivial. Thus, we may assume that $\mathbf{G}_{Z}$ is compact.

Let $\kappa_{1} \geq \kappa$, and further suppose that $\kappa=q_{E}^{-m}$ and $\kappa_{1}=q_{E}^{-m^{\prime}}$. Suppose that $\left|a_{z}\right|_{E}=q_{E}^{-\bar{\ell}}$. Then, since $\left|a_{z} a_{i}\right|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{-m}$ and $\left|a_{z} a_{i}^{-1}\right|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{-m}$, then we have $\left|a_{i}\right|_{E} \leq$ $q_{E}^{-m+\ell}$ and $\left|a_{i}\right|_{E} \geq q_{E}^{m-\ell}$. Thus for each $\ell \geq m^{\prime}$, we have a contribution to (3.6) of

$$
\left(\int_{\mathfrak{o}^{\times}} d \beta \prod_{i} \int_{q_{E}^{m-\ell} \leq\left|a_{i}\right|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{-m+\ell}} d^{\times} a_{i} \int_{T} d t q_{E}^{-4 \ell n s}\right) \Phi_{\varepsilon, s}\left(Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(Z, f_{\tau}\right) .
$$

Summing over all $\ell \geq m^{\prime}$, we have

$$
\Phi_{\varepsilon, s}\left(Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(Z, f_{\tau}\right) \sum_{\ell \geq m^{\prime}} q_{E}^{-4 \ell n s} \mu(\ell)
$$

where

$$
\mu(\ell)=\prod_{i} \int_{q_{E}^{m-\ell} \leq\left|a_{i}\right|_{E} \leq q_{E}^{-m+\ell}} d^{\times} a_{i} \int_{T} d t
$$

The series converges for Re $s>0$. Integrating over other values of $z$ can only lead to an entire function. Summing over $F^{\times} / N E^{\times}$, we have proved the following result.

Lemma 3.7 There is an entire function $E_{Z}(s)=E\left(s, Z, Y, f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}, L, L^{\prime}\right)$ so that $\psi(s, Z)=E_{Z}(s)$ is entire if $Z$ is regular and non-elliptic and

$$
\psi(s, Z)=E_{Z}(s)+\sum_{F^{\times} / N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \Phi_{\varepsilon, s}\left(Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(Z, f_{\tau}\right) \mu\left(G_{Z}(F)\right) q_{E}^{b(Y, Z) s} L\left(\mathbf{1}_{E}, 4 n s\right),
$$

for $\operatorname{Re} s>0$ if $Z$ is regular and elliptic. The integer $b(Y, Z)$ depends on $Y, Z, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}, f_{\tau}, L$ and $L^{\prime}$. Thus,

$$
\underset{s=0}{\operatorname{Res}} \psi(s, Z)=\left(4 n \log q_{E}\right)^{-1} \sum_{F^{\times} / N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \Phi_{e}\left(Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(Z, f_{\tau}\right) \mu\left(\mathbf{G}_{Z}(F)\right)
$$

if $Z$ is regular and elliptic and $\operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \psi(s, Z)=0$ if $Z$ is regular and non-elliptic.
Corollary 3.8 Let $\mathbf{T}_{i}$ be a Cartan subgroup of $\mathbf{G}$. Let $T_{i}^{\prime}$ be the regular set of $\mathbf{T}_{i}(F)$. Let $\omega_{i}$ be a compact subset of $T_{i}^{\prime}$. Then given $f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}, L$ and $L^{\prime}$, the integer $b(Y, Z)$ can be chosen independently for all $Y$ and all $Z \in \omega_{i}$.

Proof It is enough to show that one can choose the compact subsets $\operatorname{supp}(h)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(g)$ independently of $Y$ and $Z \in \omega_{i}$. For supp $(h)$ this follows from the corollary to Lemma 19 of [9]. For supp $(g)$ this follows from the fact that $\operatorname{supp}\left(\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)$ is compact modulo $Z\left(G^{\prime}\right)$ and Lemma 2.1 of [1].

In order to calculate the residue of the intertwining operator, we integrate over all the orbits of $M$ acting on $N$. We accomplish this by integrating over the $\varepsilon$-regular $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes in $\mathcal{N}$. First suppose that $n=m$. Then we must integrate $\psi(s, Z)$ over the orbits of $N$ under $M$. By Proposition 3.3 almost all such orbits are parameterized by single $\varepsilon$-regular $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes in $\mathcal{N}$. Thus, by removing a set of measure zero from these classes, we can instead integrate $\psi(s, Z)$ over $\varepsilon$-semisimple $\varepsilon$-regular $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes $\{Y\}$ in $\mathcal{N}$. Then $N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right\}\right)$ is regular and semisimple. Let $\left\{\mathbf{T}_{i}\right\}$ denote a complete set of conjugacy classes of Cartan subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$ defined over $F$. We can integrate over $\cup_{i} T_{i}$ using measures

$$
\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \kappa_{1}\left(\left\{\gamma_{i}\right\},\left\{\gamma_{i}^{\prime}\right\}\right)\left|D\left(\gamma_{i}\right)\right| d \gamma_{i}=\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1}\left|D_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right| d \gamma_{i}
$$

Now suppose that $n>m$ and $n \equiv m(\bmod 2)$. Then, for almost all $\{Y\}$, we can choose a representative $\operatorname{diag}\left\{J_{1}, Y_{2}, J_{2}\right\}$ as in Corollary 3.4, i.e., so that $Y_{2} \in$ $\mathrm{GL}_{m}(E)$ is $\varepsilon$-regular and that $X=\left(\begin{array}{l}0 \\ I \\ 0\end{array}\right)$. Outside of a set of measure zero, the twisted conjugacy classes in $\mathcal{N}$ form a fiber bundle with finite fibers coming from the twisted conjugacy classes of $\operatorname{diag}\left\{J_{1}, J_{2}\right\}$. The base of the fiber bundle is parameterized by $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes $\left\{Y_{2}^{-1}\right\}$ in $\mathrm{GL}_{m}(E)$ such that $\left(I_{m}, Y_{2}\right)$ is a solution to (1.1) when $\mathrm{GL}_{m}(E) \times G(m)$ is considered as a Levi subgroup of $G(3 m)$. Thus we may use $\varepsilon$ stable Cartan subgroups of $\mathrm{GL}_{m}$ and their $F$-isomorphisms with the $T_{i}^{\prime} s$ as in the case $n=m$. We get measures $\kappa_{1}\left(\left\{\gamma_{i}\right\},\left\{\gamma_{i}^{\prime}\right\}\right)\left|D\left(\gamma_{i}\right)\right| d \gamma_{i}$ on the $T_{i}$ 's, and by surjectivity, we can integrate over $\cup_{i} T_{i}$ and then use the image correspondence $\mathcal{A}$. Thus, for $n \geq m$, and $n \equiv m(\bmod 2)$, and $(X, Y)$ as above, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{\psi}(s, Z)= & \sum_{F^{\times} / N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \int_{N E^{\times}}|z|_{E}^{2 n s} \int_{G^{\prime} / G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{G_{Z} \backslash G} \int_{G_{Z}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) f_{\tau} \\
& \cdot\left(h^{-1} Z h\right)\left|\operatorname{det} g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right|_{E}^{s} \\
& \cdot \xi_{L}\left(g z Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g a_{z} X h_{0} h\right) d h_{0} d h d g d^{\times} z . \tag{3.6}
\end{align*}
$$

Applying Lemma 3.6 and Corollary 3.8 we find

$$
\psi(s, Z)=E_{s}(Z)+\sum_{\alpha} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) q_{E}^{b(Y, Z) s} L\left(\mathbf{1}_{E}, s\right) \Phi_{\varepsilon, s}\left(Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(Z, f_{\tau}\right)
$$

and thus the residue at $s=0$ is as above.
Let $\mathbf{T}_{i}$ be a representative of a conjugacy class of Cartan subgroups of $\mathbf{G}$. Let $T_{i}^{\prime}$ be the subset of regular elements of $T_{i}=\mathbf{T}_{i}(F)$. Now let

$$
R(s, Z)=\left(4 n \log q_{E}\right)^{-1} \sum_{\alpha} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \Phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\alpha Y, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(Z, f_{\tau}\right) \mu\left(\mathbf{G}_{Z}(F)\right)
$$

Then $\varphi(s, Z)=\psi(s, Z)-R(s, Z)$ is an entire function in $s$ while it is locally constant in $Z \in T_{i}^{\prime}$. For each $\gamma \in T_{i}^{\prime}$ we let

$$
\psi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)=\sum_{\{Y\} \in \mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\})} \psi(s, \gamma)
$$

Recall that $\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\})=\left\{\{Y\} \mid\{\gamma\} \in N_{\varepsilon}\left(\left\{Y^{-1}\right)\right\}\right.$. Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i}\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} & \int_{T_{i}^{\prime}} \psi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma \\
& \quad-\sum_{i}\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \mu\left(T_{i}\right) \int_{T_{i}^{\prime}} \Phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\alpha\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(\gamma, f_{\tau}\right)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma \\
& =\sum_{i}\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime}} \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)=\sum_{\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\})} \varphi(s, \gamma)
$$

Now we let $\omega_{i}$ denote a compact subset of $T_{i}^{\prime}$. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
\lim _{\omega_{i} \rightarrow T_{i}^{\prime}} \operatorname{Res}_{s=0} & \sum_{i}\left|W\left(T_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{\omega_{i}} \psi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma \\
= & c R_{G}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \\
& \quad+\lim _{\omega_{i}^{\prime} \rightarrow T_{i}^{\prime}} \operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \sum_{i}\left|W\left(T_{i}^{\prime}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \psi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma \\
= & \lim _{\omega_{i} \rightarrow T_{i}^{\prime}} \sum_{i}\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \mu\left(T_{i}\right) \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \Phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \Phi\left(\gamma, f_{\tau}\right)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma \\
& \quad+\lim _{\omega_{i} \rightarrow T_{i}^{\prime}} \sum_{i}\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{\omega_{i}} \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma \tag{3.7}
\end{align*}
$$

The first limit is zero since the normalized orbital integrals are locally bounded on $T_{i}^{\prime}$. Since $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)$ is entire in $s$,

$$
\operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \sum_{i}\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

is independent of the choice of $\omega_{i}$ and we can drop the limit in front of it. Thus, the residue is

$$
c R_{G}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)+\operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \sum_{i}\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \sum_{i}\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

is independent of $\omega_{i}$, and thus depends only on the singular part of $T_{i}$. Here $c=$ $\left(4 n \log q_{E}\right)^{-1}$.

Now suppose $n<m$ and $n \equiv m(\bmod 2)$. Let $k=(m-n) / 2$. Consider the injection

$$
h \mapsto\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I_{k} & & \\
& h & \\
& & I_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

of $G(n)$ into $G(m)$. Let $N_{\varepsilon}: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ be the $\varepsilon$-norm correspondence from $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes $\mathcal{N}$ in $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ to conjugacy classes of $G(m)$. Suppose $X \in M_{n \times m}(E)$ and $Y \in$ $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ satisfy $Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)=X X^{\prime}$. Note that rank $X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X \leq n$, so at most $n \leq$ $m-2$ eigenvalues of $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ are different from 1. Thus the conjugacy class $\left\{I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right\}$ has a representative in the image of $G(n)$ under the above injection. Let $\mathcal{C}^{\vee}$ be the subset of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of those conjugacy classes of $G(m)$ whose semisimple parts meet $G(n)$. Then we see that $N_{\varepsilon}: \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\vee}$.
Lemma 3.9 If $n<m$ the norm correspondence $N_{\varepsilon}$ has finite fibers.

Proof We need only show that if $Y \in \mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ and $X \in M_{n \times m}(E)$ satisfy (1.1), then $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$ determines the semisimple part of the conjugacy class of $\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1} X=-X\left(I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X\right)$. We suppose that $X$ is in row echelon form with the last $n-r$ rows identically zero. We consider the decomposition $E^{n} \oplus E^{n-r}$, with $\left.X\right|_{E^{n-r}} \equiv 0$ and $\left.X\right|_{E^{r}}$ an injection into $E^{m}$. Thus, the matrix of $\varepsilon\left(Y^{-1}\right) Y^{-1}$ with respect to a basis which respects the above decomposition is $\left(\begin{array}{cc}A & * \\ 0 & I\end{array}\right)$, with $A$ determined by $I-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} X$.

Note that almost all of the $\varepsilon$-conjugacy classes in $\mathcal{N}$ are parameterized by regular semisimple conjugacy classes in $G(n)$, and thus by classes in $\mathrm{C}^{\vee}$. To see this, note that if $k$ is even, then we can take $X_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}0_{n \times k} & I_{n} & 0_{n \times k}\end{array}\right)$. Then

$$
X_{1}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{lll} 
& & (-1)^{n} u_{k} \\
u_{k} & u_{n} &
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
0_{k \times n} \\
I_{n} \\
0_{k \times n}
\end{array}\right) u_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
I_{n}^{\prime} \\
0
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Thus, $X_{1} X_{1}^{\prime}=I_{n}^{\prime}=Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)$. Furthermore,

$$
I_{m}-X_{1}^{\prime} Y^{-1} X_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I_{k} & & \\
& I_{n}+(-1)^{n} Y^{-1} & \\
& & I_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

which represents a conjugacy class in $\mathcal{C}^{\vee}$. We further note that $I_{n}+(-1)^{n} Y^{-1}$ is in the image of the $\varepsilon$-norm correspondence in the case $n=m$. If $k$ is odd, and $n$ is even, we let

$$
w_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{llll} 
& & & 1 \\
& & . & \\
& 1 & &
\end{array}\right)
$$

and take $X_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}0_{n \times k} & w_{n} & 0_{n \times k}\end{array}\right)$. Then

$$
X_{1}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc} 
& & -u_{k} \\
& -u_{n} & \\
u_{k} & &
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
0_{k \times n} \\
w_{n} \\
0_{k \times n}
\end{array}\right) u_{n}=\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
-u_{n} w_{n} u_{n} \\
0
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{c}
0 \\
-w_{n} \\
0
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Thus, $X_{1} X_{1}^{\prime}=-I_{n}=Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y)$. Furthermore,

$$
I_{m}-X^{\prime} Y^{-1} Y=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I_{k} & & \\
& I_{n}+\left(w_{n} Y^{-1} w_{n}^{-1}\right) & \\
& & I_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Since $n$ is even, $\varepsilon\left(w_{n}\right)=-w_{n}=-w_{n}^{\prime}$, and so we have

$$
\left(w_{n} Y \varepsilon\left(w_{n}\right)^{-1}\right)+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(w_{n} Y \varepsilon\left(w_{n}\right)^{-1}\right)=w_{n} w_{n}^{\prime}=I_{n} .
$$

Therefore, $w_{n} Y w_{n}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(w_{n} Y w_{n}\right)=-I_{n}=I_{n} I_{n}^{\prime}$. Therefore,

$$
I_{n}+w_{n} Y^{-1} w_{n}=I_{n}-\left(I_{n}\right)^{\prime}\left(w_{n} Y w_{n}\right)^{-1} I_{n}
$$

is in the image of the norm correspondence for $n=m$. For the case where $k$ and $n$ are both odd, we let $Y_{1}=-Y$, and $X_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}0 & I_{n} & 0\end{array}\right)$. Then $X_{1}^{\prime}=\left(\begin{array}{c}0 \\ -1 \\ 0\end{array}\right)$, and $X_{1} X_{1}^{\prime}=-I=-(Y+\tilde{\varepsilon}(Y))=Y_{1}+\tilde{\varepsilon}\left(Y_{1}\right)$. Furthermore,

$$
I-X_{1}^{\prime} Y_{1}^{-1} X_{1}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
I_{k} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & I_{n}-Y^{-1} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & I_{k}
\end{array}\right)
$$

and we know $I_{n}-Y^{-1}$ is in the image of the norm correspondence when $n=m$.
Considering the pairs $\left(X_{1}, Y\right)$ as above, we see that $\Delta^{\vee}$ projects surjectively onto $\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}(F)$, and that for almost all $Y$ we have $X_{1} \mathbf{G}_{Z}(F) \simeq \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}(F)$. Thus, summing over $F^{\times} / N E^{\times}$, (3.5) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\psi}(s, Z)= & \sum_{F^{\times} / N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \int_{N E^{\times}}|z|_{E}^{2 n s} \\
& \cdot \int_{G^{\prime} / G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{G_{Z} \backslash G} \int_{X_{1} G_{Z}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) f_{\tau}\left(h^{-1} Z h\right)\left|\operatorname{det}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right)\right|_{E}^{s} \\
& \cdot \xi_{L}\left(g z Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(g a_{z} X_{1} h_{0} h\right) d\left(X_{1} h_{0}\right) d h d g d^{\times} z \\
= & \sum_{F \times / N E^{\times}} \omega^{\prime}(\alpha) \int_{N E^{\times}}|z|_{e}^{2 n s} \\
3.8) & \left.\cdot \int_{G^{\prime} / G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \int_{G_{Z} \backslash G} \int_{G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}} \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\left(g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) f_{\tau}\left(h^{-1} Z h\right)|\operatorname{det}| g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right|_{E} ^{s} \\
& \cdot \xi_{L}\left(z g Y \varepsilon(g)^{-1}\right) \xi_{L^{\prime}}\left(z g g_{0} X_{1} h\right) d g_{0} d h d g d^{\times} z .
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that expression (3.8) has the same form as the expression for $\tilde{\psi}(s, Z)$ when $n>m$, with the roles of $G_{\varepsilon, Y}^{\prime}$ and $G_{Z}$ as well as those of $g_{0}$ and $h_{0}$ exchanged. We again define $\psi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)=\sum_{Y \in \mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\})} \psi(s, \alpha \gamma)$. We also define $\varphi_{\mathcal{A}}$ as before. The integration can again be transferred to integration over $\cup_{i} T_{i}$, where $\left\{\mathbf{T}_{i}\right\}$ is a collection of representatives for the conjugacy classes of Cartan subgroups of $\mathbf{G}(n)$. We then argue as in the case $n \geq m$. Note that, since $n<m$, if $\{\gamma\}$ is elliptic in $\mathcal{C}^{\vee}$, then $\Phi\left(\gamma, f_{\tau}\right)=0$. Therefore, $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=0$. We have now proved the following result.
Theorem 3.10 Let $\ell=\min (n, m)$, and denote by $\left\{\mathbf{T}_{i}\right\}$ a collection of representatives for the conjugacy classes of Cartan subgroups of $\mathbf{G}(\ell)$. For each $i$ choose a compact subset $\omega_{i}$ of the set of regular elements $T_{i}^{\prime}$ of $T_{i}$. Then the intertwining operator $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$ has a pole at $s=0$ if and only if

$$
c R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)+\operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \sum_{i}\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \varphi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma \neq 0
$$

for some choice of matrix coefficients $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$ and $f_{\tau}$ of $\tau^{\prime}$ and $\tau$, respectively. Here $c=$ $\left(4 n \log q_{E}\right)^{-1}$. If $n<m$, then $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \equiv 0$, and thus the residue is determined by the second term above.

Corollary 3.11 Suppose that $\tau^{\prime} \simeq\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$. Fix a choice of compact subsets $\omega_{i}$ of $T_{i}^{\prime}$.
(a) The induced representation $I\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ is irreducible if and only if, for some choice of data,

$$
c R_{G}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)+\sum_{i}\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \underset{s=0}{\operatorname{Res}} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \psi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma \neq 0
$$

(b) Assume $\tau$ is generic. If $I\left(\tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$ is irreducible, then $I\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau\right)$, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, is reducible exactly at $s= \pm 1 / 2$ or at $s= \pm 1$, and only at one of these two pairs.

Remark We take this opportunity to correct some typographical errors in Section 4 of [8], which is the section corresponding to the current one. On pages 284-285, the three sums that appear are all missing factors $\omega^{\prime}(\alpha)$.

## 4 Connection With Twisted Endoscopy

We now describe the connection between the results of Section 3 and the theory of twisted endoscopy and $L$-functions. Our work here is similar to Section 5 of [8].

Let $\chi_{\tau}$ be the distribution character of $\tau$, and also denote by $\chi_{\tau}$ the locally integrable function, [9], supported on the regular set of $G$ satisfying

$$
\chi_{\tau}(f)=\int_{Z \backslash G} f(x) \chi_{\tau}(x) d x
$$

From [5, 11] we can choose a pseudocoefficient, $f_{\tau}$, for $\tau$, i.e., a matrix coefficient satisfying

$$
\Phi\left(\gamma, f_{\tau}\right)= \begin{cases}\chi_{\tau}(\gamma) & \text { for all elliptic regular semisimple } \gamma \in G \\ 0 & \text { for all non-elliptic regular semisimple } \gamma \in G\end{cases}
$$

We are assuming that $\tau^{\prime} \simeq\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$. Therefore, we choose an equivalence $\tau^{\prime}(\varepsilon)$ between $\tau^{\prime}$ and $\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$. Then for locally constant functions $\psi$ which transform according to $\left(\omega^{\prime}\right)^{-1}$, the $\varepsilon$-twisted character of $\tau^{\prime}$ is defined [4] by

$$
\chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}(\psi)=\operatorname{trace}\left(\tau^{\prime}(f) \tau^{\prime}(\varepsilon)\right)
$$

Furthermore, [4] there is a locally integrable function, also denoted by $\chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}$, so that

$$
\chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}(\psi)=\int_{Z^{\prime} \backslash G^{\prime}} \psi(x) \chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}(x) d x
$$

An $\varepsilon$-twisted pseudocoefficient $\psi$ for $\tau^{\prime}$, is a matrix coefficient satisfying

$$
\Phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}, \psi\right)= \begin{cases}\chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right) & \text { for all elliptic } \varepsilon \text {-regular } \varepsilon \text {-semisimple elements } \gamma^{\prime} \in G^{\prime} \\ 0 & \text { for all non-elliptic } \varepsilon \text {-regular } \varepsilon \text {-semisimple } \gamma^{\prime} \in G^{\prime}\end{cases}
$$

In general, the existence of twisted pseudocoefficients is yet to be determined. One expects such functions to exist and we shall assume their existence for all $\varepsilon$-invariant irreducible supercuspidal representations of $G^{\prime}$. We choose $\psi_{\tau}^{\prime}$ to be such a function. Then

$$
\Phi_{\varepsilon}\left(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}), \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=\sum_{\gamma^{\prime} \in \mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\})} \Delta\left(\gamma, \gamma^{\prime}\right) \chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}\left(\gamma^{\prime}\right)
$$

which we define to be $\chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}))$.
Suppose $n=m$. Then we suppose $f_{\tau}$ and $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$ are as above. Then

$$
R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=\sum_{\mathbf{T}_{i}} \mu\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime}} \chi_{\tau}(\gamma) \chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{A}(\{\gamma\}))|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

where now the sum is over representatives for the conjugacy classes of elliptic Cartan subgroups of $\mathbf{G}(n)$. Therefore, the operator $R_{\mathbf{G}}$ defines an elliptic pairing between the character $\chi_{\tau}$ and the $\varepsilon$-twisted character $\chi_{\tau^{\prime}}^{\varepsilon}$. Thus, one expects the non-vanishing of $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)$ must be related to $\tau^{\prime}$ coming from $\tau$ via twisted endoscopy [2, 3, 12]. For our purposes, we make the following definition, expecting it to agree with those referred to above.

Definition 4.1 A supercuspidal representation, $\tau^{\prime}$ of $\mathrm{GL}_{n}(E)$ which satisfies $\tau^{\prime} \simeq$ $\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$ is said to be the $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer of a discrete series representation $\tau$ of $G(n)$ if $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \neq 0$ for some matrix coefficients $f_{\tau}$ of $\tau$ and $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$ of $\tau^{\prime}$.

Now assume $n \geq m$ and suppose $\tau$ and $\tau^{\prime}$ are both supercuspidal. We expect the Rankin-Selberg product $L$-function $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$, formally defined in [14], satisfies the following defining condition:
$L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ has a pole at $s=0$ if and only if $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \neq 0$ for some choice of $f_{\tau}$ and $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$, or equivalently, if and only if $\tau^{\prime}$ comes from $\tau$ via twisted endoscopic transfer.

We will now discuss why this seems to agree with the definitions given in [7]. Since we now wish to discuss the contributions from singular orbits, we continue with the assumption that $n \geq m$. Let $\omega_{i} \subset T_{i}^{\prime}$ be a compact subset. As we have seen in Section 3, the residues of the intertwining operator will be independent of this choice of $\omega_{i}$, and we therefore fix our choice for the rest of this discussion. We set

$$
R_{\mathrm{sing}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=\sum_{i}\left|W\left(\mathbf{T}_{i}\right)\right|^{-1} \operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \int_{T_{i}^{\prime} \backslash \omega_{i}} \psi_{\mathcal{A}}(s, \gamma)|D(\gamma)| d \gamma
$$

So,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Res}_{s=0} A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau, w_{0}\right)(h)=c R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)+R_{\text {sing }}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $c=\left(4 n \log q_{F}\right)^{-1}$. Note that (4.1) suppresses the dependence of the function $h \in V\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ on $L$ and $L^{\prime}$.

We wish to distinguish the poles of $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ from those of the Asai $L$-function $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$. Recall that $\Psi_{n}$ is the representation $r_{2}$ of ${ }^{L} M$ on ${ }^{L} \mathfrak{n}$ discussed in Section 1. By Lemma 3.7 we know that $R_{\text {sing }}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=0$ if and only if the process of taking
residues can be interchanged with the integration at hand. On the other hand, the theory of $L$-functions says that there will be poles of $A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)$ which come from those of $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$. Such poles depend only on $\tau^{\prime}$, and therefore cannot depend on the non-vanishing of $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)$, and thus we expect $R_{\text {sing }} \not \equiv 0$. Therefore, the ability to interchange residues and integrals in this setting reflects some deep arithmetic content.

Let us suppose that $\tau^{\prime}$ comes from $U(n)$ via standard $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer if $n$ is odd, and by $\kappa$ - $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer if $n$ is even (see [7] for the precise definition). This is equivalent to assuming that $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$ has a pole at $s=0$. By the simplicity of the pole of the standard intertwining operators, we know that $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ must be holomorphic at $s=0$. Then we expect that $R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)=0$ for any choice of $f_{\tau}$ and $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}$. By the theory of $L$-functions [14] we have

$$
L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)^{-1} L\left(2 s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)^{-1} A\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \otimes \tau, w_{0}\right)
$$

is non-zero and holomorphic. Therefore, $R_{\text {sing }}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right) \neq 0$ for some choice of $f_{\tau}$, $\psi_{\tau^{\prime}}, L$, and $L^{\prime}$.
Proposition 4.2 Suppose $n \geq m$. Assume that $\tau^{\prime}$ comes from $G(n)$ via standard $\varepsilon$ twisted endoscopic transfer if $n$ is odd, and comes from $G(n)$ via $\kappa$ - $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer if $n$ is even. Then $R_{\text {sing }} \not \equiv 0$ for any unitary supercuspidal representation $\tau$ of $G(m)$ from which $\tau^{\prime}$ does not come via $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopy.

For $n<m$, we know that $R_{\mathrm{G}} \equiv 0$, so the residue is $R_{\text {sing }}$. Thus, the poles of both $L$-functions are determined, in some manner, by the non-vanishing of $R_{\text {sing }}$. To make sense of the poles of these $L$-functions in terms of twisted endoscopic transfer, one must further analyze the term $R_{\text {sing }}$. Note, however, that the poles of $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$ are completely known, and therefore, one must try to separate these out from other poles of $R_{\text {sing }}$.

We conclude by stating the result in general context. That is we allow $m$ and $n$ to be any positive integers with the same parity and assume that $\tau^{\prime} \simeq\left(\tau^{\prime}\right)^{\varepsilon}$.

Proposition 4.3 (a) Suppose that $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime}, \Psi_{n}\right)$ has a pole at $s=0$, i.e., $\tau^{\prime}$ comes from $U(n)$ via standard $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer if $n$ is odd and via $\kappa$ - $\varepsilon$-twisted endoscopic transfer if $n$ is even. Then $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ is holomorphic at $s=0$.
(b) If $\tau^{\prime}$ is not as in $(a)$, then $L\left(s, \tau^{\prime} \times \tau\right)$ has a pole ats $=0$ if and only if $c R_{\mathbf{G}}\left(f_{\tau}, \psi_{\tau^{\prime}}\right)+$ $R_{\text {sing }} \not \equiv 0$.
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