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#### Abstract

Let $F$ be a non-Archimedean local field of residual characteristic $p$; then conjecturally the supercuspidal representations of $G l_{n}(F)$ are parameterized by admissible characters of extensions of $F$ of degree $n$ provided that $n$ is prime to $p$. In this paper we establish the existence of the necessary representations if the conjecture is to be true. They will be realized as induced representations from certain subgroups, compact modulo the center. The more difficult question of whether all supercuspidal representations arise by this construction will not be treated. We will also leave aside the problem of computing the characters of these representations.


Let $F$ be a locally compact non-Archimedean field of residual characteristic $p$. To simplify certain parts of the discussion, we take $p$ to be odd. Let $R$ be a maximal order, $\pi$ a prime element. Let $F^{\times}, R^{\times}$be the multiplicative groups of $F$ and $R$, and $U=1+$ $\pi R \subseteq R^{\times}$. Let $F^{\prime}$ be an extension field of finite degree. We define $R^{\prime}$, $\pi^{\prime}, F^{\prime \times}, R^{\prime \times}, U^{\prime}$ in obvious analogy with $F$. Let $N\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F\right): F^{\prime \times} \rightarrow F^{\times}$ be the norm map.

If $\psi$ is a character of $F^{\prime \times}$, and $A \subseteq F^{\prime \times}$ is a subgroup, we will say $\psi$ is nondegenerate on $A$ if there is no proper subextension $F^{\prime \prime}$, $F \cong F^{\prime \prime} \cong F^{\prime \prime}$, such that ker $N\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap A \subseteq \operatorname{ker} \psi \cap A$.

Now suppose $F^{\prime}$ is tamely ramified over $F$. We will say a character $\psi$ of $F^{\prime \times}$ is admissible if
(a) $\psi$ is nondegenerate on $F^{\prime \times}$, and
(b) if on $U^{\prime}, \psi=\psi^{\prime \prime} \circ N\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, where $\psi^{\prime \prime}$ is nondegenerate on $U^{\prime \prime} \subseteq F^{\prime \prime \prime}$, then $F^{\prime \prime}$ is unramified over $F^{\prime \prime}$.

In particular, $\psi$ is admissible if it is nondegenerate on $U^{\prime}$.
Given extensions $F_{1}^{\prime}, F_{2}^{\prime}$ of $F$, and characters $\psi_{i}$ of $F_{i}^{\prime \times}$, we say $\psi_{1}$ and $\psi_{2}$ are equivalent if there is an $F$-linear field isomorphism of $F_{1}$ onto $F_{2}$ which sends $\psi_{2}$ to $\psi_{1}$.

There are reasons for believing the following conjecture is true.
Conjecture: Suppose $n$ is prime to $p$. Then the supercuspidal representations of $G l_{n}(F)$ are parametrized by admissible characters of extensions of $F$ of degree $n$. That is, given $F^{\prime}$ of degree $n$ over $F$, and $\psi$ an admissible character of $F^{\prime \times}$, then one may attach to $\psi$ a supercuspidal representation $V(\psi)$ of $G l_{n}(F)$. Two characters correspond to the same representation if and only if they are equivalent. Finally, all supercuspidal representations of $G l_{n}(F)$ arise in
this manner.
The evidence for this conjecture comes from the following sources:
(1) analogy with real groups,
(2) extension from $G l_{2}$,
(3) expected connections with division algebras of degree $n$ over $F$,
(4) Kirillov theory.

Here we will establish the existence of the correspondence indicated in the conjecture, and in particular, of the necessary representations. They will be realized as induced representations from certain subgroups, compact modulo the center. The more difficult question of whether all supercuspidal representations arise in this way, will not be treated. We will also leave aside the problem of computing the characters of these representations.

From now on $F^{\prime}$ will be a tamely ramified extension of $F$. In $F$, let $B$ denote the multiplicative group of roots of unity, of order prime to $p$, and $C$ the group generated by $B$ and $\pi$. Similarly $B^{\prime}$ stands for the roots of unity of $F^{\prime}$ of order prime to $p$. Let $e$ be the ramified degree of $F^{\prime}$ over $F$, and $f$ the unramified degree, so $m=e f$ is the total degree. It is well known ([6]) that the prime $\pi^{\prime}$ of $F^{\prime}$ may be chosen so that $\pi^{\prime e}=\pi b^{\prime}$, with $b^{\prime} \in B^{\prime}$. In this case, $\pi^{\prime}$ is determined by $\pi$ up to an eth root of unity, and the multiplicative group $C^{\prime}$ generated by $B^{\prime}$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ is totally determined by $\pi$. Moreover, we note $C \cong C^{\prime}$ and $N\left(F^{\prime} / F\right)\left(C^{\prime}\right) \cong C$. Also, if $F \cong$ $F^{\prime \prime} \subseteq F^{\prime \prime}$, then $C^{\prime \prime} \cong C^{\prime}$, and if $F^{\prime \prime}$ is galois, $C^{\prime}$ is invariant under the galois action.

Let $\left|\left.\right|_{F}\right.$ be the natural ultrametric norm on $F$, so that if $\bar{F}=$ $R / \pi R$ is the residue class field, with $q$ elements, and $\operatorname{ord}_{F}$ is the valuation attached to $R$, then $|x|_{F}=q^{-\operatorname{ord}_{F}(x)}$. Define similarly $\left|\left.\right|_{F^{\prime}}\right.$, $\bar{F}^{\prime}, q^{\prime}, \operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}$. Note that, on $F, \operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}=e \operatorname{ord}_{F}$, and $q^{\prime}=q^{f}$, so that $|x|_{F^{\prime}}=|x|_{F}^{m}$ for $x \in F \subseteq F^{\prime}$.

We have $F=C \cdot U$, and $F^{\prime}=C^{\prime} \cdot U^{\prime}$. Hence, given any $x \in F^{\prime}$, there is a unique $c \in C^{\prime}$, such that $c^{-1} x \in U$. Put another way, there is a unique $c \in C^{\prime}$ such that $|c-x|_{F^{\prime}}<|x|_{F^{\prime}}$. We call $c$ the standard representative of $x$, and write $c=$ s.r. $(x)$. From the above, and since the galois action fixes $C^{\prime}$, we see for any $g \in \operatorname{Gal}\left(F^{\prime} / F\right)$, either $g(c)=c$, or $|g(c)-c|_{F^{\prime}}=|c|_{F^{\prime}}$.

Now consider $M_{n}(F)$. In $M_{n}(F), M_{n}(R)=A$ is a maximal compact subring unique up to conjugacy, and $G l_{n}(R)=K$ is a maximal compact subgroup, again the only one up to conjugacy. $M_{n}(R)$ is the set of matrices preserving the lattices $\pi^{k} R^{n}$, and these are the only lattices preserved by all of $M_{n}(R)$. Similarly $K$ is the group of matrices $g$ such that $g\left(\pi^{k} R^{n}\right)=\pi^{k} R^{n}$.

Now take $F^{\prime}$ of degree $n$. A choice of basis of $R^{\prime}$ over $R$
defines an injection $\alpha: F^{\prime} \rightarrow G l_{n}(F)$ by the regular action. Clearly $\alpha\left(R^{\prime}\right) \subseteq M_{n}(R)$. We will identify $F^{\prime}$ and $\alpha\left(F^{\prime}\right)$. Under this identification, $R^{\prime}$ preserves precisely the lattices $\pi^{\prime l} R^{n}$. We associate to $F^{\prime}$ the order $A^{\prime}=\bigcap_{x \in F^{\prime}} x A x^{-1}=\bigcap_{l=0}^{e-1} \pi^{\prime l} A \pi^{\prime-l}$, which is characterized as the set of all matrices preserving the lattices $\pi^{\prime \prime} R^{n}$. We also associate to $F^{\prime \prime}$ the group $K^{\prime}=\bigcap_{x \in F^{\prime}} x K x^{-1}=A^{\prime} \cap G l_{n}(F)$. Then clearly $R^{\prime \times} \subseteq K^{\prime}$, and $F^{\prime}$ normalizes $K^{\prime}$, so $F^{\prime \times} \cdot K^{\prime}$ is an open subgroup of $G l_{n}(F)$, compact modulo the center. $A^{\prime}$ may also be described as the intersection of all maximal orders of $M_{n}(F)$ containing $R^{\prime}$, and $K^{\prime}$ as the intersection of all maximal compact subgroups containing $R^{\prime \times}$.

This first lemma guarantees that this and succeeding constructions have the necessary invariance properties.

Lemma 1. Suppose $F^{\prime \prime}=g F^{\prime} g^{-1}$ is a subfield of $M_{n}(F)$ conjugate to $F^{\prime \prime}$. Then if $R^{\prime \prime}=g R^{\prime} g^{-1} \cong A, g \pi^{\prime l} \in K$ for some l. If $R^{\prime \prime} \cong A^{\prime}$, then $g \pi^{\prime l} \in K^{\prime}$.

Proof. The invariant lattices of $R^{\prime}$ are, as we have said, the lattices $\pi^{\prime l} R^{n}$. Also, $g$ takes $R^{\prime}$-invariant lattices to $R^{\prime \prime}$-invariant lattices. If $R^{\prime \prime} \subseteq A, R^{n}=g\left(\pi^{\prime l} R^{n}\right)$ for some $l$, so $g \pi^{\prime l} \in K$. If $R^{\prime \prime} \subseteq$ $A^{\prime}$, then $\pi^{\prime m} R^{n}=g\left(\pi^{\prime l(m)} R^{n}\right)$. Since $\pi^{\prime m+1} R^{n}$ is characterized as the largest proper $A^{\prime}$-invariant sublattice of $\pi^{\prime m} R^{n}$, we see $l(m+1)=$ $l(m)+1$. Hence $g \pi^{\prime l}=g \pi^{\prime l(0)}$ is in $K^{\prime}$.

Now we choose particular coordinates to get a very explicit description of $A^{\prime}$. Let $F_{u}^{\prime} \subseteq F^{\prime}$ be the maximal unramified subextension, and let $\left\{b_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{f}$ be a basis of $R_{u}^{\prime}$ over $R$. We may assume $b_{i} \in B^{\prime}$ if we wish. Now define a basis $\left\{z_{k}\right\}_{k=1}^{n}$ of $R^{\prime}$ over $R$ by $z_{f j+i}=\pi^{\prime j} b_{i}$ for $0 \leqq j<e$. With respect to this basis, we see that if $m=k e+l$, then $\pi^{\prime m} R^{n}=\left\{\Sigma \alpha_{i} z_{i}=\left(\alpha_{1}, \cdots, a_{n}\right): \operatorname{ord}_{F}\left(a_{i}\right) \geqq k\right.$, and $\operatorname{ord}_{F}\left(\alpha_{i}\right) \geqq k+1$ if $\left.i \leqq f l\right\}$. Thus a basis for $\pi^{\prime m} R^{n}$ is $\left\{\pi^{k+1} z_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{f l} \cup$ $\left\{\pi^{k} z_{i}\right\}_{i=f l+1}^{n}$. Hence, we see that, in this basis $A^{\prime}=\left\{T=\left(t_{i j}\right): \operatorname{ord}_{F}\left(t_{i j}\right) \geqq 0\right.$, and $\operatorname{ord}_{F}\left(t_{i j}\right) \geqq 1$ if $\left.[(i-1) / f]>[(j-1) / f]\right\}$. (Here [ ] denotes greatest integer.)

Now let $\operatorname{tr}\left(M_{n}(F) / F\right)$ denote the usual trace on $M_{n}(F)$. Then $\langle S, T\rangle=\operatorname{tr}\left(M_{n}(F) / F\right)(S T)$ is a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form on $M_{n}(F)$. If $V \subseteq M_{n}(F)$ is a subspace, $V^{\perp}$ will denote its orthogonal complement with respect to 〈,〉. If $L \subseteq M_{n}(F)$ is a lattice, (e.g., a compact open $R$-module) then $L^{*}=\left\{l \in M_{n}(F),\langle l, L\rangle \cong R\right\}$ is also a lattice. $L^{*}$ is naturally isomorphic with $\operatorname{Hom}_{R}(L, R)$. It is very easy to see that $M_{n}(R)^{*}=M_{n}(R)$. Moreover, the description of $A^{\prime}$, and the action of $\pi^{\prime}$ given above make it a simple calculation to verify this lemma.

Lemma 2. $A^{\prime *}=\pi^{\prime 1-e} A^{\prime}$.

Now let $F^{\prime \prime} \subseteq F^{\prime \prime}$ be any subextension of $F$.
By virtue of the action of $F^{\prime \prime}$ on $F^{n}$, we may identify $F^{n}$ and $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$, where $n=l k$ and $k$ is the degree of $F^{\prime \prime}$ over $F$. In this identification, $R^{n}$ becomes $R^{\prime \prime \prime}$ and the commuting algebra of $F^{\prime \prime}$ is just $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. We note that $A_{1}=M_{l}\left(R^{\prime \prime}\right) \subseteq M_{n}(R)$.

Of course we have $F^{\prime} \subseteq M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and from the definition of $A^{\prime}$, it is clear that $A_{1}^{\prime}=A^{\prime} \cap M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=\bigcap_{x \in F^{\prime}} x A_{1} x^{-1}$.

In this next lemma, $\oplus$ denotes direct sum.
Lemma 3. $A^{\prime}=A_{1}^{\prime} \oplus\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp} \cap A^{\prime}\right)$. In particular, $A^{\prime}=R^{\prime} \oplus$ ( $F^{\prime \perp} \cap A^{\prime}$ ).

Remark. Whereas Lemmas 1 and 2 hold also for wildly ramified fields, Lemma 3 does not, and the resultant bad geometry makes analysis more difficult for that case.

Proof. This is a relation between various trace maps. $\alpha: A^{*} \rightarrow$ $\operatorname{Hom}_{R}\left(A_{1}^{\prime}, R\right)$, defined by $\alpha(x)(b)=\langle x, b\rangle$ has as kernel $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp} \cap A^{\prime *}$. Hence, if we can show $\alpha\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap A^{\prime *}\right)=\operatorname{Hom}_{R}\left(A_{1}^{\prime}, R\right)$, then $A^{*}=$ $\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap A^{\prime *}\right) \oplus\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp} \cap A^{\prime *}\right)$, and dualizing gives the decomposition of $A^{\prime}$. By Lemma 2, $A^{*}=\pi^{\prime 1-e} A^{\prime}$. Since $\pi^{\prime}$ preserves $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ and $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}, A^{\prime *} \cap M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=\pi^{\prime 1-e} A_{1}^{\prime}$.

Let $e^{\prime}$ be the degree of ramification of $F^{\prime}$ over $F^{\prime \prime}$ and let $e^{\prime \prime}$ be the degree of ramification of $F^{\prime \prime}$ over $F$. Then $e=e^{\prime} e^{\prime \prime}$. Reasoning with $F^{\prime \prime}$ instead of $F$, we see that $\pi^{\prime 1-e^{\prime}} A_{1}^{\prime} \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{R^{\prime \prime}}\left(A_{1}^{\prime}, R^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Now on $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, we have $\operatorname{tr}\left(M_{n}(F) / F\right)=\operatorname{tr}\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F\right) \circ \operatorname{tr}\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) / F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Since $F^{\prime \prime}$ is tamely ramified over $F$, the different of $F^{\prime \prime}$ over $F$ is $e^{\prime \prime}-1$, so that $\pi^{\prime{ }^{\prime 1-e^{\prime \prime}}} R^{\prime \prime} \cong \operatorname{Hom}_{R}\left(R^{\prime \prime}, R\right)$. It follows that $\pi^{\prime \prime 1-e^{\prime \prime}}\left(\pi^{\prime 1-e^{\prime}} A_{1}^{\prime}\right) \cong$ $\operatorname{Hom}_{R}\left(A_{1}^{\prime}, R\right)$. But now $\pi^{\prime \prime 1-e^{\prime \prime}}\left(\pi^{1-e^{\prime}} A_{1}^{\prime}\right)=\pi^{\prime e^{\prime}\left(1-e^{\prime \prime}\right)+1-e^{\prime}} A_{1}^{\prime}=\pi^{\prime 1-e} A_{1}^{\prime}$, and the lemma is proved.

We now establish some facts about the geometry of the adjoint action of $G l_{n}$ on $M_{n}$. This study is suggested by Kirillov theory and has important implications for the representation theory of $G l_{n}$.

For $T, S \in M_{n}(F)$, write $\operatorname{ad}_{T}(S)=[T, S]=T S-S T$. If $T$ and $W$ commute, then $\langle W,[T, S]\rangle=\operatorname{tr}(W T S)-\operatorname{tr}(W S T)=\langle[W, T], S\rangle=0$, so $\mathrm{ad}_{T}$ has image in the orthogonal complement of ker $\mathrm{ad}_{T}$, the commuting algebra of $T$. By dimension counting im $\mathrm{ad}_{T}=\left(\mathrm{ker} \mathrm{ad} \mathrm{a}_{T}\right)^{\perp}$. If $\langle$,$\rangle is nonsingular on ker \mathrm{ad}_{T}$, then $\operatorname{ad}_{T}$ will be nonsingular on $\operatorname{im~ad}{ }_{T}$.

Now suppose $T=c \in C^{\prime} \subseteq F^{\prime}$, and write $c=\pi^{\prime m} b, b \in B^{\prime}$. Let $F^{\prime \prime}$ be the subfield of $F^{\prime}$ generated over $F$ by $c$. Clearly $\operatorname{ad}_{c}\left(A^{\prime}\right) \subseteq$ $\pi^{\prime m} A^{\prime}$. Since also $\operatorname{ad}_{c}\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}\right) \cong M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$, we conclude that if $X=$ $A^{\prime} \cap M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$, then $\operatorname{ad}_{c}(X) \cong \pi^{\prime m} X$.

Lemma 4. In fact $\operatorname{ad}_{c}(X)=\pi^{\prime m} X$.
Proof. We see $\operatorname{ad}_{c}(y)=c y-y c=\left(c y c^{-1}-y\right) c . \quad$ Since $c X=\pi^{\prime m} X$, the lemma is equivalent to the statement that the map: $\beta: y \rightarrow c y c^{-1}-y$ maps $X$ onto itself. But since $\beta(X) \subseteq X$, it suffices to show that $\beta$ has as determinant an element in $R^{\times}$. But now the eigenvalues of $\beta$ are all of the form $c^{-1} \widetilde{c}-1$, where $\widetilde{c}$ is a conjugate to $c$ by the galois group of $F$ and not equal to $c$. From the properties of $C^{\prime}$ noted above, it follows that $c^{-1} \widetilde{c}-1$ has norm in $R^{\times}$, so also the determinant of $\beta$ is in $R^{\times}$.

Lemma 4 has as a consequence one of the basic facts we will need. Before stating it, we need one more observation. We filter the group $K^{\prime}$ by a sequence of subgroups $K^{\prime}=K_{0}^{\prime} \supseteq K_{1}^{\prime} \supseteq K_{2}^{\prime} \cdots$, where $K_{i}^{\prime}=1+\pi^{\prime i} A^{\prime}$ for $i \geqq 1$. For $i \geqq 1, K_{i}^{\prime}$ is a pro-p group.
$F^{\prime \prime}$ is still the subfield of $F^{\prime \prime}$ generated by $c \in C^{\prime}$.
Lemma 5. If $k \in K_{i}^{\prime}$, then $k=(1+a)(1+b)$, where $1+a \in K_{i}^{\prime} \cap$ $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ and $b \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$. (Then also $1+b \in K_{i}^{\prime}$, and $a \in \pi^{\prime i} A_{1}^{\prime}$.)

Proof. By definition of $K_{i}^{\prime}, k=1+z$, with $z \in \pi^{\prime i} A^{\prime}$. But by Lemma 3, $z=y+x$, with $y \in \pi^{\prime i} A_{1}^{\prime}$ and $x \in \pi^{\prime i} X$ ( $X$ as in Lemma 4). But now put $a=y, b=(1+y)^{-1} x$. Then since multiplication by elements from $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ preserves $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$, this is the desired decomposition.

Let Ad denote the standard adjoint action of $G l_{n}$ on $M_{n}$. That is, $\operatorname{Ad}(S)(T)=S T S^{-1}$. Then we have the following result on the geometry of this action.

Lemma 6. Take $c=\pi^{\prime m} b \in C^{\prime}$, and $S \in M_{n}(F)$. Suppose $S \in c+$ $\pi^{\prime j} A^{\prime}$, with $j>m$. Then there is $k \in K_{j-m}^{\prime}$, and $T \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ such that $S=\operatorname{Ad}(k)(T) . \quad$ In other words, $c+\pi^{\prime j} A^{\prime}=\operatorname{Ad} K_{j-m}^{\prime}\left(c+\pi^{\prime j} A_{1}^{\prime}\right)$.

Proof. We may write $S=c+y+x$, with $y \in \pi^{\prime j} A_{1}^{\prime}, x \in \pi^{\prime j} X$. By Lemma 4, $x=\operatorname{ad}_{c}(z)=[c, z]$ with $z \in \pi^{\prime j-m} X$. Then $\operatorname{Ad}(1+z)(S)=$ $S+[z, S]+[z, S] z(1+z)^{-1}=c+y+x+[z, c]+[z, y]+[z, x]+$ $[z, S] z(1+z)^{-1}=c+y+[z, y]+[z, x]+[z, S] z(1+z)^{-1}=c+y+\widetilde{x}$ where $\widetilde{x} \in \pi^{\prime 2 j-m} A^{\prime}$. Thus $\operatorname{Ad}(1+z)(S)$ is closer to $c+\pi^{\prime j} A_{1}^{\prime}$ than $S$ is. Continuing in this fashion, by a Hensel's lemma argument, the result follows.

We now begin to discuss representation theory. We will start by constructing certain representations of $K^{\prime}$, or more precisely of $F^{\prime \times} \cdot K^{\prime}$, the normalizer of $K^{\prime}$.

We notice that the commutator subgroup of $K_{i}^{\prime}$ and $K_{j}^{\prime}$ is contained in $K_{i+j}^{\prime}$. In particular, $K_{i-1}^{\prime} / K_{i}^{\prime}$ is in the center of $K_{1}^{\prime} / K_{i}$, and if $2 i>j, K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$ is abelian. In that case also, the mapping
$\nu: \pi^{\prime i} A^{\prime} / \pi^{\prime j} A^{\prime} \rightarrow K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$ defined by $\nu(\alpha)=1+\alpha$ is an isomorphism of groups, and commutes with the action of $K^{\prime}$ by Ad on the two quotient groups.

Now suppose $\chi$ is a character of the additive group of $F$. Then as is well known $\chi$ defines an isomorphism $\theta: M_{n}(F) \rightarrow \widehat{M_{n}(F)}$, where ^ denotes Pontryagin dual, by the formula $\theta(S)(T)=\chi(\langle S, T\rangle)$. The natural action of $G l_{n}$ on $\hat{M}_{n}$ is denoted $\mathrm{Ad}^{*}$, and is given explicitly by $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} S(\psi)(T)=\psi\left(\operatorname{Ad} S^{-1}(T)\right)$. We see that $\theta$ is equivariant with respect to the actions Ad and Ad*. That is, $\theta(\operatorname{Ad} S(T))=$ $\operatorname{Ad}^{*} S(\theta(T))$. This property will be retained, insofar as it makes sense, by the various maps obtained below from $\theta$.

We will suppose for simplicity that the largest lattice in $F$ on which $\chi$ is trivial (the conductor of $\chi$ ) is $R$ itself. Then for any lattice $L \subseteq M_{n}(F)$, $L^{\perp}$, the annihilator of $L$ in $\widehat{M}_{n}$, is identified to $L^{*}$ via $\theta$; and for a subspace $V$, the orthogonal complement $V^{\perp}$ is identified to the annihilator, also to be written $V^{\perp}$. Thus, if $L_{1} \subseteq L_{2}$ are two lattices, $\widehat{L_{2} / L_{1}} \cong L_{1}^{*} / L_{2}^{*}$. In particular, if we write $A^{\prime}(j)=$ $\pi^{\prime j} A^{\prime}$, and $\lambda(j)=-j-e+1$, then we have, if $i<j, \widehat{A^{\prime}(i) / A^{\prime}(j)} \cong$ $A^{\prime}(\lambda(j)) / A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$. As mentioned above, these identifications commute with the obvious (sub-quotient) actions, Ad and $\mathrm{Ad}^{*}$, of $K^{\prime}$.

Combining $\theta$ with $\nu$, we get a map $\mu: \widehat{K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}} \rightarrow A^{\prime}(\lambda(j)) / A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$ when $2 i \geqq j$. If $y+A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))=\mu(\psi)$ for some character $\psi$ of $K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$, we will say $y$ represents $\psi$. Again $\mu$ commutes with the obvious actions of $K^{\prime}$.

Now take $j>1$, and let $\psi$ be a nontrivial character of $K_{j-1}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$. Suppose $\psi$ has a representative $y \in F^{\prime}$. Then we see there is a unique $c \in C^{\prime}$ which represents $\psi$. We will call $c$ the standard representative of $\psi$. In this situation, we let $F^{\prime \prime}$ be the field generated by $c$ over $F$, and retain the relevant previous notation. In particular $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is the commuting algebra of $F^{\prime \prime}$. For $i \geqq 0$, put $H_{i}=K_{\imath}^{\prime} \cap$ $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Then for $i \geqq 1, H_{i}=1+\pi^{\prime i} A_{1}^{\prime}$.
$\psi$ is invariant under $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} K_{1}^{\prime}$. Suppose $2 i \geqq j$ and $\varphi$ is a character on $K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$ which agrees with $\psi$ on $K_{j-1}^{\prime}$. We will say $\varphi$ lies over $\psi$.

Lemma 7. Notations as above.
(a) $\varphi$ is conjugate by $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} K_{1}^{\prime}$ to $\varphi^{\prime}$, which has a representative $T \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$.
(b) If $\varnothing$ has a representative $T \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, then the isotropy group of $\rho$ under $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} K^{\prime}$ is contained in $H_{0} \cdot K_{j-i}^{\prime}$.

Proof. (a) Since $c$ is the standard representative for $\psi$, and $\psi$ is nontrivial on $K_{j-1}^{\prime}$, we see $c \in A^{\prime}(\lambda(j))-A^{\prime}(\lambda(j-1))$, so $c=\pi^{\prime \lambda(j)} b^{\prime}$,
with $b^{\prime} \in B^{\prime}$. If $S$ is a representative for $\varphi$, then since $\varphi$ lies over $\psi, S \in c+A^{\prime}(\lambda(j-1))$. Now it follows from Lemma 6 that $S=$ $\operatorname{Ad} k(T)$, with $k \in K_{1}^{\prime}$, and $T \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Then also, by the equivariance of $\mu, \operatorname{Ad}^{*} k^{-1}(\varphi)=\varphi^{\prime}$ is represented by $T$.
(b) If $T \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ represents $\varphi$, then we have, as above, $T \in$ $c+A^{\prime}(\lambda(j-1))$. If $k \in K_{1}^{\prime}$, and $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} k(\phi)=\varphi$, then we have $\operatorname{Ad} k(T) \in$ $T+A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$. Write $k=1+z$. Then $\operatorname{Ad} k(T)=(1+z) T(1+z)^{-1}=$ $T+[z, T](1+z)^{-1}$. Hence $\operatorname{Ad} k(T) \in T+A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$ if and only if $[z, T] \in A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$. But now write $z=y+x$ with $y \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right), x \in$ $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$. Then clearly $k \in H_{0} \cdot K_{j-i}^{\prime}$ if and only if $x \in \pi^{\prime j-i} X$, where $X$ is defined as in Lemma 4. Write $X(\alpha)=\pi^{\prime \alpha} X$, analogously to $A^{\prime}(\alpha)$. Now calculate $[z, T]=[y+x, c+T-c]=[x, c]+[x, T-c]+$ [ $y, T]$. Lemma 4 shows that if $x \in X(\alpha)-X(\alpha+1)$, then $[x, c] \in$ $X(\alpha+\lambda(j))-X(\alpha+\lambda(j)+1)$, whereas it is immediate that $[x, T-c] \in$ $X(\alpha+\lambda(j)+1)$. Since $[y, T] \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, it is now clear from Lemma 3 that $[z, T] \in A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$ if and only if $x \in X(j-i)$. Following back through the argument, (b) is proved for $k \in K_{1}^{\prime}$.

Now take any $k \in K^{\prime}$. Then if $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} k$ fixes $\varphi$, it must also fix $\psi$ on $K_{j-1}^{\prime}$. But this means $\operatorname{Ad} k(c) \in c+A^{\prime}(\lambda(j-1))$. Then by Lemma $6, \operatorname{Ad} k(c)=\operatorname{Ad} k_{1}(T)$ for some $k \in K_{1}^{\prime}$, and $T \in\left(c+A^{\prime}(\lambda(j-1))\right) \cap$ $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. From the next lemma it follows that $k k_{1}^{-1} \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, or $k \in H_{0} \cdot K_{1}^{\prime}$. By reduction to the previous case, then, the whole of (b) is proved.

Lemma 8. Suppose $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ belong to $\left(c+A^{\prime}(\lambda(j-1))\right) \cap M\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and suppose for some $g \in G l_{n}(F)$, $\operatorname{Ad} g\left(T_{1}\right)=T_{2}$. Then $g \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, that $i s, \operatorname{Ad} g(c)=c$.

Proof. By assumption, $S_{i}=c^{-1} T_{i} c \in K_{1}^{\prime}$. Hence $S_{i}^{p^{m}} \rightarrow 1$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Since $c$ and $T_{i}$ commute $S_{i}^{o}=c^{-a} T_{i}^{a}$. Since $C^{\prime}$ modulo the subgroup generated by $\pi$ is $p$-regular, there exists a sequence $m_{\alpha}$ soing to infinity, such that $c^{-p^{m_{\alpha}}}=c^{-1} \pi^{v} \alpha$. Then $\left(Y_{i}\right)_{\alpha}=\pi^{v} \alpha T_{i}^{p^{m_{\alpha}}} \rightarrow c$ as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\operatorname{Ad} g\left(\left(Y_{1}\right)_{\alpha}\right)=\left(Y_{2}\right)_{\alpha}$, we get in the limit $\operatorname{Ad} g(c)=c$.

Remark. Lemma 8 provides an explicit proof of a fact that was implicit earlier and is worth noting: namely, if $x \in F^{\prime \prime}$, then the field generated over $F$ by $x$ contains s.r. (x), so that any subfield of $F^{\prime \prime}$ is generated by its intersection with $C^{\prime}$.

Take $\rho \in \widehat{K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}}$, and suppose $\varphi$ lies over $\psi$ and is represented by $T \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. We want to make explicit the relation between $\varphi$ and its restriction to $H_{i} / H_{j}$.

We still have $2 i \geqq j$. Let $E(i, j)$ be the set of elements of the form $1+y+x$, where $y \in A^{\prime}(j)$ and $x \in X(i)$. Then in fact $E(i, j)$
is a group. Obviously, $K_{j}^{\prime} \subseteq E(i, j)$. Moreover, Lemma 3 shows $K_{i}^{\prime}=H_{i} \cdot E(i, j)$. In fact $E(i, j)$ is normal in $K_{i}^{\prime}$, and $K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}=$ $\left(H_{i} / H_{j}\right) \cdot\left(E(i, j) / K_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ (direct product); furthermore, $E(i, j)$ is normalized by $H_{0}$, and $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}=\left(H_{0} / H_{j}\right) \cdot\left(E(i, j) / K_{j}^{\prime}\right)$ (semidirect product). As a corollary to this, and for future reference, we remark that any representation of $H_{0} / H_{j}$ may be extended to $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$ by letting it be trivial on $E(i, j)$.

In fact, $\varphi$ arises in just this manner. For, since $\varphi$ is represented by $T \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, it is trivial on $E(i, j)$, and therefore comes, by extension, from a character $\varphi^{\prime \prime}$ of $H_{i} / H_{j}$. $\phi^{\prime \prime}$ may be described as follows.

On $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ we have the $F^{\prime \prime}$-bilinear form $\langle,\rangle^{\prime \prime}$, given by $\langle S, T\rangle^{\prime \prime}=\operatorname{tr}\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) / F^{\prime \prime}\right)(S T)$. If $\chi^{\prime \prime} \in \widehat{F^{\prime \prime}}$, then $\theta^{\prime \prime}: M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) \rightarrow \widehat{M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)}$ may be defined by $\theta^{\prime \prime}(S)(T)=\chi^{\prime \prime}\left(\langle S, T\rangle^{\prime \prime}\right)$. On the other hand, if $\tau: \widehat{M_{n}(F)} \rightarrow \widehat{M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)}$ is the natural projection, $\tau \circ \theta$ is also an isomorphism between $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ and its dual. Since on $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right),\langle S, T\rangle=$ $\left.\operatorname{tr}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) / F\right)\left(\langle S, T\rangle^{\prime \prime}\right)$, we see that if $\chi^{\prime \prime}=\chi \circ \operatorname{tr}\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F\right)$, then $\theta^{\prime \prime}=\tau \circ \theta$. Therefore, with this choice of $\chi^{\prime \prime}$, we may identify $\widehat{H_{i} / H_{j}}$ with $A_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda(j)) / A_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$, where $\lambda(j)=-j-e+1$, and we have written $A_{1}^{\prime}(\alpha)=\pi^{\prime \alpha} A_{1}^{\prime}$, in analogy with $A^{\prime}(\alpha)$ and $X(\alpha)$. (Note that the annihilator of $A_{1}^{\prime}$ is identified via $\theta^{\prime \prime}$ with $A_{1}^{\prime}(-e+1)$, and not with $A_{1}^{\prime}\left(-e^{\prime}+1\right)$, where $e^{\prime}$ is the degree of ramification of $F^{\prime}$ over $F^{\prime \prime}$, because the conductor of $\chi^{\prime \prime}$ is not $R^{\prime \prime}$ but $\pi^{\prime \prime-e^{\prime \prime}} R^{\prime \prime}, e^{\prime \prime}$ being the ramified degree of $F^{\prime \prime}$ over $F$.) Finally, we see that in the above identification $T$ becomes a representative for $\varphi^{\prime \prime}$ on $H_{i} / H_{j}$.

Now $c$ itself represents some $\varphi_{0} \in \widehat{K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}}$, and $\varphi_{0}$ clearly lies above $\psi$. Also, the isotropy group under $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} K^{\prime}$ of $\varphi_{0}$ is clearly $H_{0} \cdot K_{j-i}^{\prime}$; and if $\varphi_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ is the restriction of $\varphi_{0}$ to $H_{i} / H_{j}$, then $\varphi_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ is again represented by $c$ and is $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} H_{0}$-invariant.

Lemma 9. If $2 i \geqq j+e^{\prime}-1$, then $\varphi_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ is the restriction to $H_{i}$ of a linear character of $G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Moreover, $j \geqq e^{\prime}+1$, so this always holds for $i=j-1$.

Proof. It suffices to show that $S l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right) \cap H_{i} \subseteq \operatorname{ker} \varphi_{0}^{\prime \prime} . \quad \varphi_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ is given on $H_{i}$ by $\varphi_{0}(1+T)=\chi^{\prime \prime}\left(c \operatorname{tr}\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) / F^{\prime \prime}\right)(T)\right)$. Here $T \in A_{1}^{\prime}(i)$ and $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}} c=\lambda(j)=-j-e+1$, and $c \in F^{\prime \prime}$, and the conductor of $\chi^{\prime \prime}$ is $\pi^{\prime \prime 1-e^{\prime \prime}} R^{\prime \prime}=\pi^{\prime e^{\prime-e}} R^{\prime \prime}$. Thus, writing $\operatorname{tr}\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) / F^{\prime \prime}\right)=\operatorname{tr}$ for this proof, we will have $1+T \in \operatorname{ker} \varphi_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ if $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}(c)+\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}(\operatorname{tr} T) \geqq e^{\prime}-e$. Thus, we must show that, if $\operatorname{det}(1+T)=1$, then $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}(\operatorname{tr} T) \geqq$ $e^{\prime}+j-1$. But since $c \in F^{\prime \prime}$, $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}(c)$ is divisible by $e^{\prime}$, and therefore so is $j-1$; and since $j>1$, certainly $j \geqq e^{\prime}+1$. Also, we are reduced to showing $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime \prime}}(\operatorname{tr} T) \geqq\left(j-1 / e^{\prime}\right)+1$.

Now $T \in A_{1}^{\prime}(i)=\pi^{\prime i} A_{1}^{\prime}$, so $T^{e^{\prime}} \in A_{1}^{\prime}\left(i e^{\prime}\right) \subseteq \pi^{\prime \prime i} M_{l}\left(R^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Let $\tilde{F}$ be an extension field of $F^{\prime \prime}$ containing the characteristic roots $\rho_{1}, \cdots, \rho_{l}$ of $T$. Let $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime \prime}}$ denote the extension of $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime \prime}}$ to $\widetilde{F}$. Then $\pi^{\prime \prime-i} T^{e^{\prime}} \in$ $M_{l}\left(R^{\prime \prime}\right)$ implies $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}\left(\rho_{\alpha}\right) \geqq i / e^{\prime}$.

The condition $\operatorname{det}(1+T)=1$ means $\sum_{\beta=1}^{l} \sigma_{\beta}\left(\rho_{1}, \cdots, \rho_{l}\right)=0$, where $\sigma_{\beta}$ is the $\beta$ th basic symmetric polynomial in the $\rho_{\alpha}$ 's. In particular $\sigma_{1}\left(\rho_{1}, \cdots, \rho_{l}\right)=\sum_{\alpha=1}^{l} \rho_{\alpha}=\operatorname{tr} T$. Thus, the above relation implies $\operatorname{tr} T=-\sum_{\beta=2}^{l} \sigma_{\beta}\left(\rho_{1}, \cdots, \rho_{l}\right)$. Hence, $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime \prime}}(\operatorname{tr} T) \geqq 2 i / e^{\prime}$. Thus, we require $2 i / e^{\prime} \geqq\left(j-1 / e^{\prime}\right)+1$ or $2 i \geqq j-1+e^{\prime}$, as was to be proved.

We come now to a key result for this construction. The result actually holds in a wider context than that of $G l_{n}(F)$. It is at least true for all central simple algebras over $F$, and probably has an analogue in any semisimple group where no wild ramification occurs. For division algebras, it yields an inductive method for the complete determination of the representations (when the degree is prime to $p$ ).
$\psi^{\prime \prime}$ is the character of $H_{j-1}$ gotten by restricting $\psi$ from $K_{j-1}^{\prime}$. A representation of $H_{0}$ will be said to lie above $\psi^{\prime \prime}$ if its restriction to $H_{j-1}$ is a multiple of $\psi^{\prime \prime}$. Similarly, if $O(\psi)$ is the $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} K^{\prime}$ orbit of $\psi$ in $\widehat{K_{j-1}^{\prime}}$, a representation of $K^{\prime}$ will be said to lie over $O(\psi)$ if its restriction to $K_{j-1}^{\prime}$ contains precisely the characters in $O(\psi)$.

Theorem 1. There exists a one-to-one correspondence between the representations of $H_{0}$ lying over $\psi$ and the representations of $K^{\prime}$ lying over $O(\psi)$.

Remark. The correspondence which is described below is very simple and functional, and would seem to deserve to be called canonical, though in what sense is at present unclear. One sense involves the characters of corresponding representations. This will be gone into elsewhere.

Proof. We divide the theorem into two cases, $j$ even and $j$ odd. The case of even $j$ is very simple. Let $W$ be a representation of $K^{\prime}$ lying above $O(\psi)$, and let $W^{\prime \prime}$ be the corresponding representation of $H_{0}$. We describe how to get $W$ from $W^{\prime \prime}$. Since $j$ is even, $i=j / 2$ is an integer. Take $W^{\prime \prime}$ and extend it to $W^{\prime \prime}$ on $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$, by letting it be trivial on $E(i, j)$, as described above. The induced representation of $K^{\prime}$ is then $W$.

We must show that each $W$ lying over $O(\psi)$ arises uniquely in this fashion. This is easily done, using standard representation theory for finite groups. We briefly recall this.

Let $G$ be a finite group, $N$ a normal subgroup. Let $\hat{N}$ be the set of representations of $N ; \widehat{G}$, those of $G$. Conjugation by $G$ in-
duces an action of $G / N$ on $\hat{N}$, denoted $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} G / N$ or $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} G$. A representation $W$ of $G$ restricted to $N$ is a direct sum of a certain number of copies of the representations in some $\operatorname{Ad}^{*} G / N$ arbit $O . W$ is said to lie above $O$. To find all representations lying above $O$, proceed as follows. Fix $Y \in O$, and let $G_{1}$ be the isotropy group of $Y$ under $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} G / N$. If $Z_{1}, \cdots, Z_{m}$ are all the representations of $G_{1}$ lying above $\psi$ then $Z_{1}, \cdots, Z_{m}$ induce distinct irreducible representations of $G$, and all representations of $G$ lying above $O$ are obtained in this way.

Applying this to our situation, we have seen in Lemma 7 that every $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} K^{\prime}$ orbit in $K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$ (where now $2 i=j$ ) which lies above $O(\psi)$ contains an element $\varphi$ which lies over $\psi$ and whose isotropy group $I_{\varphi}$ is contained in $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$. Furthermore, if $Z$ is any representation of $I_{\varphi}$ lying over $\varphi$, then $Z$ is trivial on $E(i, j)$, and so then will $W^{\prime \prime}$, the representation of $H_{0} \cdot E(i, j)$ induced from $I_{\varphi}$, be trivial on $E(i, j)$. Evidently, then, inducing further on up to $K^{\prime}$ yields an irreducible representation $W$ of $K^{\prime}$. It is evident by this that all representations $W$ of $K^{\prime}$ lying above $O(\psi)$ arise in this manner, and furthermore, that distinct $W^{\prime \prime \prime}$ s lying above the same $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} H_{0}$ orbit in $\widehat{H}_{i} / H_{j}$ yield distinct $W$ 's. Finally, Lemma 8 guarantees that a subset of $\widehat{K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}}$ which lies over $\psi$, has representatives in $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and belongs to a single $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} K^{\prime}$ orbit actually belongs to a single $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} H_{0}$ orbit. Hence any two distinct $W^{\prime \prime}$ 's yield distinct $W^{\prime}$ s, and the theorem is established for $j$ even.

When $j$ is odd the procedure is more complicated. Let $j=2 i+1$. Our first goal will be to construct a certain representation on $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$. When this is done, we may proceed just as for even $j$.

Let $\widetilde{\phi}^{\prime \prime}$ be a linear character of $G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ lying above $\psi^{\prime \prime}$ on $H_{j-1} / H_{j}$. By restricting to $H_{0}$, then extending to $H_{1} \cdot K_{i+1}^{\prime}$, we get a character $\widetilde{\mathscr{P}}$ on this group. Of course, by definition $E(i+1, j) \subseteq$ $\operatorname{ker} \widetilde{\mathscr{q}}$. We see that $H_{1} / \operatorname{ker} \widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}$ is central in $\left(H_{1} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) / \operatorname{ker} \tilde{\mathscr{\varphi}}=\mathscr{H}$, and that $\left(H_{1} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) /\left(H_{1} \cdot K_{i+1}^{\prime}\right) \cong \mathscr{H} \mid \mathscr{Z}(\mathscr{Z}=$ center of $\mathscr{H})$ is isomorphic to $(\boldsymbol{Z} / p \boldsymbol{Z})^{2 \alpha}$ for some $\alpha$. We also observe that $\operatorname{Ad} H_{0}$ factors to an action by automorphisms on $\mathscr{H}$, again denoted by Ad. $H_{1}$ of course acts trivially. Since $\operatorname{Ad} G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ preserves $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$, we see that this action has the following property: for $x \in H_{0}, y \in \mathscr{C}, \operatorname{Ad} x(y)=y$ if and only if $\operatorname{Ad} x(y)=y \bmod \mathscr{Z}$.

Since the commutator group of $K_{i}^{\prime}$ is contained in $K_{j-1}^{\prime}$, the function $\alpha(x, y)=\psi\left(x y x^{-1} y^{-1}\right)$ is well defined on $K_{i}^{\prime} \times K_{i}^{\prime}$.

Lemma 10. $\alpha(x, y)$ factors to a nondegenerate antisymmetric biadditive form $\bar{\alpha}:(\mathscr{C} \mid \mathscr{A}) \times(\mathscr{C} \mid \mathscr{Z}) \rightarrow \boldsymbol{T}, \boldsymbol{T}$ being the unit circle.

Proof. If $x=1+a, y=1+b$, then, modulo $K_{j}^{\prime}$ we have
$x y x^{-1} y^{-1}=1+[a, b]$. Therefore $\alpha(x, y)=\psi(1+[a, b])=\chi(\langle c,[a, b]\rangle)$. This immediately gives antisymmetry and biadditivity of $\alpha$. If either $x$ or $y \in K_{i+1}^{\prime}$, then $x y x^{-1} y^{1} \in K_{j}^{\prime}$, so $\alpha(x, y)=1$. Also, if, say, $x \in H_{i}$, then write $b=b_{1}+b_{2}$, with $b_{1} \in A_{1}^{\prime}(i), b_{2} \in X(i)$. Then $\alpha(x, y)=$ $\chi\left(\left\langle c,\left[a, b_{1}+b_{2}\right]\right\rangle\right)=\chi\left(\left\langle c,\left[a, b_{1}\right]\right\rangle\right) \cdot \chi\left(\left\langle c,\left[a, b_{2}\right]\right\rangle\right)$. The first factor is 1 because $\tilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}$ is a character on $H_{i}$, and the second factor is 1 because $\left\langle c,\left[a, b_{2}\right]\right\rangle=0$, since $\left[a, b_{2}\right] \in M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$. Thus we see $\alpha$ factors to a form $\bar{\alpha}$ on $K_{i}^{\prime} / H_{i} \cdot K_{i+1}^{\prime} \cong \mathscr{H} \mid \mathscr{Z}$. It remains to show this factored form is nondegenerate. But we have $\alpha(x, y)=\chi(\langle c,[a, b]\rangle)=$ $\chi(\langle[c, a], b\rangle)$. If $x$ does not represent zero in $\mathscr{C} \mid \mathscr{Z}$, then Lemma 4 shows $[c, a] \in A^{\prime}(\lambda(j)+i)-A^{\prime}(\lambda(j)+i+1)=A^{\prime}(\lambda(i)-1)-A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$. On the other hand, $b$ is arbitrary in $A^{\prime}(i)$. Since $A^{\prime}(i)^{*}=A^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$, we conclude that for some $y, \alpha(x, y) \neq 0$, so $\bar{\alpha}$ is indeed nondegenerate.

Remark. It is precisely here that our assumption of $p$ odd makes its impact. We are dealing with the representation theory of a 2 -step nilpotent $p$-group. The extra complications in this theory that arise when $p=2$ could be handled, but at the expense of a long digression.

We want to find a representation of $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$ that lies over $\widetilde{\rho}$ on $H_{i} \cdot K_{i+1}^{\prime}$. Let $\tilde{\mathscr{H}}$ be the image in $\mathscr{H}$ of $E(i, j-1)$, and $\tilde{\tilde{Z}}=$ $\mathscr{\mathscr { Z }} \cap \tilde{\mathscr{H}}$. Then it is not hard to see that $\tilde{\mathscr{C}}|\tilde{\mathscr{Z}} \cong \mathscr{H}| \mathscr{Z}$. Also, it is easily verified that $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime} / \operatorname{ker} \widetilde{\mathscr{\varphi}}$ is a homomorphic image of the semidirect product $H_{0} / H_{j} \times{ }_{s} \tilde{\mathscr{H}}$, where the first factor acts on the second by Ad. (Of course $H_{1} / H_{j}$ acts trivially.) $\psi$ becomes a faithful character $\tilde{\psi}$ on $\tilde{\mathscr{Z}}$, which is isomorphic to $\boldsymbol{Z} / p \boldsymbol{Z}$.

A Heisenberg $p$-group is a 2 -step nilpotent $p$-group $P$ such that: (1) the center $\mathscr{Z}(P)$ is isomorphic to $Z / p Z$; (2) the center and the commutator subgroup of $P$ coincide; and (3) every element of $P$ has order $p$. A quick check shows that $\tilde{\mathscr{C}}$ is a Heisenberg $p$-group. Here one uses Lemma 10.

A Heisenberg $p$-group is determined by its order, which is $p^{r}$ for any odd $\gamma>1$. Owing to the celebrated Weil representation ([9]), the representation theory of Heisenberg groups is very well known. We summarize what we need.

Besides one-dimensional representations, $P$ has exactly $p-1$ irreducible representations, each of dimension $p^{(r-1) / 2}$ (where $p^{r}$ is the order of $P$ ), and each one determined by the character $\tilde{\psi}$ it defines on. $\mathscr{\mathscr { K }}(P)$. Call such a representation $Y(\tilde{\psi}) . \quad Y(\tilde{\psi})$ is induced from any character of any maximal abelian subgroup which agrees with $\tilde{\psi}$ on $\mathscr{L}(P)$.

The automorphism group of $P$ which acts trivially on $\mathscr{\mathscr { Z }}(P)$ is
isomorphic to $\operatorname{Sp}(p, \gamma-1) X_{s} P / \mathscr{Z}(P)$ (semidirect product), where the second factor is the inner automorphism group, and the first factor is the group preserving a symplectic form on a $\boldsymbol{Z} / p \boldsymbol{Z}$-module of dimension $\gamma-1$. It is known that for each (nontrivial) $\tilde{\psi}, Y(\tilde{\psi})$ extends in a unique way to $\operatorname{Sp}(p, \gamma-1) X_{s} P$. An arbitrary group $G$ of automorphisms will belong to a conjugate of $\operatorname{Sp}(p, \gamma-1)$ in Aut ( $P$ ) if and only if (1) $G$ acts trivially on $\mathscr{E}(P)$; and (2) $G$ commutes with an automorphism of $P$ trivial on $\mathscr{F}(P)$ and having no fixed points modulo $\mathscr{F}(P)$.

Applying these facts to our situation, we see immediately that there is a representation $V(\psi)$ of $H_{0} / H_{j} X_{s} \tilde{\mathscr{C}}$, of dimension $(\tilde{\mathscr{C}} \mid \tilde{\mathscr{Z}})^{1 / 2}=p^{\alpha}$ lying above $\tilde{\psi}$ on $\tilde{\mathscr{Z}} . \quad V(\psi)$ is completely determined by requiring that its restriction to $H_{0} / H_{j}$ be the pullback of the extension of $Y(\widetilde{\psi})$ to $\mathrm{Sp}(p, 2 \alpha)$ via the homomorphism Ad: $H_{0} / H_{j} \rightarrow$ Aut $(\tilde{\mathscr{C}})$. In particular $V(\psi)$ will be trivial on $H_{1} / H_{j}$. Now consider the representation $V\left(\widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}\right)=\widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime} \otimes V(\psi)$, where $\widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}$ here denotes the character of $H_{0} / H_{j} \times_{s} \tilde{\mathscr{L}}$ which is trivial on $\tilde{\mathscr{H}}$ and factors to $\tilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}$ on $H_{0} / H_{j}$. Tracing back through the above constructions shows that $V\left(\widetilde{\Phi}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ actually factors to a representation of $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime} / \operatorname{ker} \widetilde{\Phi}$, which then of course lifts to a representation of $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$. We denote this representation by $V\left(\widetilde{\Phi}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ also.

Now we may describe the correspondence between $W$ and $W^{\prime \prime}$. Given a representation $W^{\prime \prime}$ of $H_{0}$ lying over $\psi$, consider the representations $W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime-1}$. This is trivial on $H_{j-1}$. Hence it may be extended to a representation of $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$ (denoted by the same symbol). Now form the representation $V\left(\widetilde{\Phi}^{\prime \prime}\right) \otimes\left(W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\Phi}^{\prime \prime-1}\right)$ of $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$, and induce up to $K^{\prime}$. The resulting representation is $W$.

The proof that this correspondence sends irreducible $W^{\prime \prime}$ to irreducible $W$ and is bijective is similar in essence to the proof for $j$ even, but is again more complicated. It involves the same facts about Heisenberg groups used in the construction of $V\left(\widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}\right)$. We omit the rather tedious details.

With Theorem 1 proved, we can begin the construction of supercuspidal representations of $G l_{n}(F)$. Since these will be induced from the groups $F^{\prime \times} \cdot K^{\prime}$, we first construct the representations of these groups, from which we will be inducing.

Now let $\psi$ be a character of $F^{\prime \times}$. Recall that $U^{\prime}=U_{1}^{\prime}=1+$ $\pi^{\prime} R$. For all $i \geqq 1$, put $U_{i}^{\prime}=1+\pi^{\prime i} R^{\prime}$. The conductor of $\psi$ is the largest of the $U_{i}^{\prime}$ contained in ker $\psi$.

We can set up in a consistent way on $F^{\prime \prime}$ the same structures we set up on $M_{n}(F)$ for passing from the multiplicative to the additive situation. Thus when $F^{\prime \prime}$ is regarded as a subalgebra of $M_{n}(F), \operatorname{tr}\left(M_{n}(F) / F\right)$ coincides with $\operatorname{tr}\left(F^{\prime} / F\right)$. Thus there is no ambiguity if we write $\langle x, y\rangle=\operatorname{tr}\left(F^{\prime \prime} \mid F\right)(x y)$ for $x, y \in F^{\prime \prime}$. Using $\chi$,
we get an isomorphism $\theta^{\prime}: F^{\prime} \rightarrow \hat{F}^{\prime}$ given by $\theta^{\prime}(x)(y)=\chi(\langle x, y\rangle)$. $\quad \theta^{\prime}$ is just the composition of $\theta$ and the projection of $\widehat{M_{n}(F)}$ onto ${\widehat{F^{\prime}}}^{\prime}$. Since the conductor of $\chi$ is $R$, it is a simple computation to show $\theta^{\prime-1}\left(R^{\prime \perp}\right)=R^{*}=\pi^{\prime-e} R^{\prime}$.

Put, as with $A^{\prime}, A_{1}^{\prime}, X, R^{\prime}(i)=\pi^{\prime i} R^{\prime}$, and retain the notation $\lambda(i)=-i-e+1$. If $2 i \geqq j$, we again have the isomorphism $\nu^{\prime}$ : $R^{\prime}(i) / R^{\prime}(j) \rightarrow U_{i}^{\prime} / U_{j}^{\prime} . \quad \nu^{\prime}$ is just the restriction of $\nu$ defined previously.
 a unique $c \in C^{\prime}$ to represent a nontrivial character $\psi_{j-1}$ of $U_{j-1}^{\prime} / U_{j}^{\prime}$, and this $c$ will be called the standard representative $\psi_{j-1}$.

Lemma 11. Let $U_{j}^{\prime}$ be the conductor of $\psi$, and let $\psi_{j-1}$ be the restriction of ir to $U_{j-1}^{\prime}$. Let $c$ be the standard representative of $\psi_{j-1}$. Let $F^{\prime \prime}$ be the field generated by $c$ over $F$. Then
(i) $\psi=\psi_{1} \cdot \psi_{2}$ where $\psi_{2}=\psi^{\prime \prime} \cdot N\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, with $\psi^{\prime \prime} \in \widehat{F^{\prime \prime \prime}}$, and $\psi_{1}$ is trivial on $U_{j-1}^{\prime}$.
(ii) If $\psi$ is of the form $\psi=\psi^{\prime \prime \prime} \circ N\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$ for some subextension $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$, then $F^{\prime \prime} \subseteq F^{\prime \prime \prime}$.
(iii) $\psi$ is admissible if and only if $\psi_{1}$ is admissible when $F^{\prime}$ is considered as an extension of $F^{\prime \prime}$.

Proof. Clearly (i) and (ii) imply (iii). On the other hand, (i) is a consequence of Lemma 9 because of the consistency of the identifications $\nu$ and $\nu^{\prime}, \mu$ and $\mu^{\prime}, \theta$ and $\theta^{\prime}$. It remains to prove (ii).

Suppose $\psi=\psi^{\prime \prime \prime} \circ N\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$. Let $e^{\prime \prime \prime}$ be the degree of ramification of $F^{\prime \prime}$ over $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$. Then $N\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$ maps $U_{i e^{\prime \prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}$ onto $U_{i}^{\prime \prime \prime}$, and maps $U_{i e^{\prime \prime \prime+1}}^{\prime}$ into $U_{i+1}^{\prime \prime \prime}$. Thus if the conductor of $\psi^{\prime \prime \prime}$ is $U_{i}^{\prime \prime \prime}$, the conductor of $\psi$ is $U_{(i-1) e^{\prime \prime \prime}+1}$, that is, $j-1=(i-1) e^{\prime \prime \prime}$. Now $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}(c)=-j-$ $e+1=-e-(j-1)$, so $\operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}(c)$ is a multiple of $e^{\prime \prime \prime}$.

Let $e^{\prime \prime}$ be the smallest integer such that $e^{\prime \prime} \operatorname{ord}_{F^{\prime}}(c)$ is a multiple of $e$, the ramified degree of $F^{\prime}$ over $F$. Then $c^{e^{\prime \prime}}=\pi^{\alpha} b^{\prime}$ for some integer $\alpha$ and $b^{\prime} \in B^{\prime}$. Hence we see $e^{\prime \prime}$ is the ramified degree of $F^{\prime \prime}$ over $F$. If $e^{\prime}$ is the ramified degree of $F^{\prime}$ over $F^{\prime \prime}$, then $e=e^{\prime} e^{\prime \prime}$. Thus, from the previous paragraph we see that $e^{\prime \prime \prime}$ divides $e^{\prime}$.

Now let $F^{(4)}$ be the compositum of $F^{\prime \prime}$ and $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$. Define $\psi^{(4)}=$ $\psi^{\prime \prime \prime} \circ N\left(F^{(4)} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$. Then $\psi=\psi^{(4)} \circ N\left(F^{\prime} / F^{(4)}\right)$. Thus it suffices to prove (ii) when $F^{(4)}=F^{\prime}$. But by the previous paragraph, $F^{(4)}$ is unramified over $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$. So we may assume $F^{\prime \prime}$ is unramified over $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$. Then $F^{\prime \prime}$ is a cyclic galois extension of $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$, and $\psi=\psi^{\prime \prime \prime} \circ N\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$ if and only if $\psi$ is invariant by Gal ( $\left.F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$ by Hilbert's Theorem 90. In particular, $\psi_{j-1}$ on $U_{j-1}^{\prime}$ must be invariant by $\operatorname{Gal}\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$. If $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$, then since either $\sigma(c)=c$ or $|\sigma(c)-c|_{F^{\prime}}=|c|_{F^{\prime}}$, we see that $c$ must be invariant by $\operatorname{Gal}\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$, since our mappings
$\mu^{\prime}, \nu^{\prime}, \theta^{\prime}$ are all galois-equivariant for galois extensions. Thus we see $c \in F^{\prime \prime \prime}$, and so $F^{\prime \prime} \subseteq F^{\prime \prime \prime}$, since $c$ generates $F^{\prime \prime}$.

Corollary. Given $\psi \in F^{\prime \times}$, there is a well-defined sequence of integers $j_{1}>j_{2}>\cdots>j_{\alpha}$, and subfields $F_{1} \subset F_{2} \subset \cdots \subset F_{\alpha}$, such that $\psi=\psi_{1} \cdot \psi_{2} \cdots \psi_{\alpha}$, where the conductor of $\psi_{i}$ is $j_{i}=\left(l_{i}-1\right) e_{i}+1$ where $e_{i}$ is the degree of ramification of $F^{\prime}$ over $F_{i}$, and $\psi_{1} \cdot \psi_{2} \cdots \psi_{i}=$ $\psi^{(i)} \circ N\left(F^{\prime} / F_{i}\right)$ and $\psi^{(i)}$ is nondegenerate on $\left(U_{i}\right)_{l_{i-1}}$.

Proof. We may induce on the conductor of $\psi$. Then (i) of Lemma 11 gives $\psi=\psi_{1}\left(\psi_{1}^{-1} \psi\right)$, with $\psi_{1}$ having the desired properties (the relation between conductors being given in the proof of (ii)) and $\psi_{1}^{-1} \psi$ having conductor containing strictly the conductor of $\psi$. Then (ii) allows us to continue the induction, with $F^{\prime}$ now being regarded as an extension of $F^{\prime \prime}=F_{1}$.

We now show how to obtain the representations of $K^{\prime}$ from which we will be inducing.

Lemma 12. Let $\psi^{\prime}$ be an admissible character of $F^{\prime \times}$, with conductor $U_{j}^{\prime}$. Let $c$ be the standard representative of $\psi^{\prime}$ on $U_{j-1}^{\prime}$. Let $\psi$ be the character of $K_{j-1}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$ represented by $c$. Then there is an irreducible representation $W\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ of $K^{\prime}$, with conductor $K_{j}^{\prime}$, and lying over $\operatorname{Ad}^{*} K^{\prime}(\psi)$ on $K_{j-1}^{\prime}$, corresponding to $\psi^{\prime}$. $W\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ in fact depends only on the restriction of $\psi^{\prime}$ to $R^{\prime}$.

Proof. Let $F^{\prime \prime}$ be the field generated over $F$ by $c$. Let $\psi^{\prime}=$ $\psi_{1}^{\prime} \cdot \psi_{2}^{\prime}$ be the decomposition given by (i) of Lemma 11. By induction, and (iii) of Lemma 11, we may assume we have constructed $W^{\prime \prime}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}\right)$. $W^{\prime \prime}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ will then be trivial on $H_{j-1}$. Now let $\psi^{\prime \prime}$ be the character of $G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ defined by $\psi^{\prime \prime}(T)=\psi^{\prime \prime}\left(N\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) / F^{\prime \prime}\right) T\right)$ ( $N$ in this case being determinant). Then $\psi^{\prime \prime}$ agrees with $\psi_{2}^{\prime}$ on $F^{\prime \prime}$, is trivial on $H_{j}$, and has standard representative $c$ on $H_{j-1}$. Now simply let $W\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ be the representation of $K^{\prime}$ corresponding to $W^{\prime \prime}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}\right) \otimes \psi^{\prime \prime}$ by Theorem 1. $W\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ clearly has the properties required of it.

Finally, we must deal with the case when $\psi^{\prime}$ is trivial on $U^{\prime}$. When this happens, if $\psi^{\prime}$ is to be admissible, $F^{\prime \prime}$ must be unramified over $F$, and $K^{\prime}=K=G l_{n}(R)$. Moreover, the image $\bar{F}^{\prime}$ of $R^{\prime}$ in $G l_{n}(\bar{F})=K / K_{1}$, is the multiplicative group of the extension field of $\bar{F}$ of degree $n$ - in other words, is a "minisotropic" Cartan subgroup of $G l_{n}(\bar{F})$. Also $\psi$ factors to a nondegenerate character $\bar{\psi}$ of $\bar{F}^{\prime}$. Now it is known (see [1]) that to each nondegenerate character of $\bar{F}$, there is associated a cuspidal representation $W(\bar{\psi})$ of $G l_{n}(\bar{F})$. We associate to $\psi$ the lift of $W(\bar{\psi})$ to $G l_{n}(R)$. This finishes Lemma 12.

To construct our representations, we need to recall some basic facts ([7]) about induced representations. Let $G$ be a separable locally compact group, $I \subseteq G$ an open compact subgroup. Let $V_{1}, V_{2}$ be two finite dimensional representations of $I$, and write $V_{i}=$ $\sum m_{\alpha}^{i} W_{\alpha}$, where the $m_{\alpha}^{i}$ 's are the multiplicities of the irreducible representations $W_{\alpha}$ occurring in $V_{i}$. Then the intertwining number of $V_{1}$ and $V_{2}$, which is the dimension of the space of intertwining operators (or $I$-morphisms) from $V_{1}$ to $V_{2}$ is $\sum_{\alpha} m_{\alpha}^{1} m_{\alpha}^{2}$.

Now let $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$ be two irreducible representations of subgroups $I_{1}, I_{2}$. For $g \in G$, put $\operatorname{Ad}(g) I_{2}=g I_{2} g^{-1}$, and let $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g\left(W_{2}\right)$ be the representation on $\operatorname{Ad}(g)\left(I_{2}\right)$ defined by $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g\left(W_{2}\right)(x)=W_{2}\left(g^{-1} x g\right)$, for $x \in \operatorname{Ad}(g)\left(I_{2}\right)$. We say $g$ intertwines $W_{1}$ and $W_{2} i$ times if the intertwining number of the restrictions of $W_{1}$ and $\operatorname{Ad}^{*}(g)\left(W_{2}\right)$ to $I_{1} \cap \operatorname{Ad}(g) I_{2}$ is $i$. If $i>0$, we say $g$ intertwines $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$. The number of times $g$ intertwines $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$ depends only on the ( $I_{1}, I_{2}$ ) double coset of $g$ and is symmetric in $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$. It is known that if only a finite number of ( $I_{1}, I_{1}$ ) double cosets of $G$ contain elements which intertwine $W_{1}$ with itself, then the representation of $G$ induced from $W_{1}$ on $I_{1}$ decomposes into finitely many irreducible components; and in particular, if only $g \in I_{1}$ intertwine $W_{1}$ with itself, then the induced representation is irreducible. It is also known that if $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$ both induce irreducible representations, then these representations are inequivalent if and only if no $g \in G$ intertwines $W_{1}$ and $W_{2}$. All these remarks also apply if $I_{1}, I_{2}$ are compact modulo the center of $G$.

Now let $F^{\prime}$ and $\widetilde{F}^{\prime \prime}$ be two tamely ramified extensions of $F$ of degree $n$. Let $K^{\prime}$ and $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ be the corresponding compact subgroups. Let $\psi, \tilde{\psi}$ be nontrivial characters of $K_{j-1}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$ and $\widetilde{K}_{\tilde{j}-1}^{\prime} / \widetilde{K}_{\tilde{j}}^{\prime}$ which have standard representatives $c, \widetilde{c}$ in $F^{\prime \prime}, \widetilde{F}^{\prime}$ respectively. Let $F^{\prime \prime}, \widetilde{F}^{\prime \prime}$ be the subfields of $F^{\prime \prime}, \widetilde{F}^{\prime}$ generated by $c$ and $\tilde{c}$ over $F$. Take $i, \tilde{i}$ satisfying $2 i \geqq j, 2 \tilde{i} \geqq \tilde{j}$. Let $\varphi, \widetilde{\varphi}$ be characters of $K_{i}^{\prime} / K_{j}^{\prime}$ and $\widetilde{K}_{\tilde{i}}^{\prime} / \widetilde{K}_{\tilde{j}}^{\prime}$, respectively, which have representatives $T$ and $\widetilde{T}$ belonging to $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ and $M_{\widetilde{l}}\left(\widetilde{F}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ respectively.

Lemma 13. If $g \in G l_{n}(F)$ intertwines $\varphi$ and $\widetilde{\rho}$, then $g$ belongs to a double coset $K_{j-i}^{\prime} g_{0} \widetilde{K}_{\tilde{j}-\tilde{i}}^{\prime}$ with $\operatorname{Ad} g_{0}(c)=\widetilde{c}$. In particular, if $g$ intertwines $\varphi$ with itself, then $g \in K_{j-i}^{\prime} G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) K_{j-i}^{\prime}$.

Proof. For $1+x \in K_{i}^{\prime}$, we have $\varphi(1+x)=\chi(\langle T, x\rangle)$. Similarly, for $1+y \in \hat{K}_{\tilde{i}}^{\prime}$, we have $\widetilde{\mathscr{\rho}}(1+y)=\chi(\langle\widetilde{T}, y\rangle)$. Also $\operatorname{Ad}(g)(\underset{\sim}{1}+y)=$ $1+\operatorname{Ad} g(y)$. Recalling that $K_{i}^{\prime}=1+A^{\prime}(i)$ and $\widetilde{K}_{\tilde{i}}^{\prime}=1+\widetilde{A}^{\prime}(\tilde{i})$, we see $\varphi$ and $\operatorname{Ad}^{*} g(\widetilde{\rho})$ agree on $K_{i}^{\prime} \cap \operatorname{Ad} g \widetilde{K}_{\tilde{i}}^{\prime}$ if and only if $\theta(T)$ and $\theta(\operatorname{Ad}(g)(\widetilde{T}))$ agree on $A^{\prime}(i) \cap g \widetilde{A}^{\prime}(\tilde{i}) g^{-1}$. This means $T-\operatorname{Ad} g(\widetilde{T})$ is in $\left(A^{\prime}(i) \cap g \widetilde{A}^{\prime}(\widetilde{i}) g^{-1}\right)^{*}=A^{\prime}(i)^{*}+g \widetilde{A}^{\prime}(\tilde{i})^{*} g^{-1}$. Thus, we can find $S \in$
$A^{\prime}(i)^{*}, \widetilde{S} \in \widetilde{A}^{\prime}(\widetilde{i})^{*}$, such that $T+S=\operatorname{Ad} g(\widetilde{T}+\widetilde{S})$.
Now, since $\varphi$ lies over $\psi, T \in c+A_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda(j)+1)$, and $c^{-1} T \in H_{1}$. Therefore ad $c-\operatorname{ad} T(X) \subseteq \pi^{\prime} X$, and Lemmas 4 and 6 are true for $T$ as well as for $c$. That is, $T+S=\operatorname{Ad} k\left(T^{\prime}\right)$ for some $T^{\prime} \in T+$ $A_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda(i))$, and $k \in K_{j-i}^{\prime}$. Similarly $\widetilde{T}+\widetilde{S}=\operatorname{Ad} \widetilde{k}\left(\widetilde{T}^{\prime}\right)$ for $\widetilde{T}^{\prime} \in T+\widetilde{A}_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda(\widetilde{i}))$ and $\widetilde{k} \in \widetilde{K}_{\tilde{j}-\tilde{i}}^{\prime}$. Thus we have $T^{\prime}=\operatorname{Ad}\left(k^{-1} g \widetilde{k}\right)\left(\widetilde{T}^{\prime}\right)$. Put $g_{0}=k^{-1} g \widetilde{k}$. Since $T^{\prime} \in c+A_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda(j)+1)$ and $\widetilde{T}^{\prime} \in \widetilde{c}+A_{1}^{\prime}(\lambda(\widetilde{j})+1)$, a slight modification of the reasoning in Lemma 8 shows $\operatorname{Ad}\left(g_{0}\right)(\widetilde{c})=c$, and the lemma is proved.

Now, notations as above, we again consider $\psi$ on $K_{j-1} / K_{j}$, or on $H_{j-1} / H_{j}$. Let $W^{\prime \prime}$ be a representation of $H_{0}$ lying above $\psi$ and let $W$ be the representation of $K^{\prime}$ corresponding to it by Theorem 1.

If $j$ is even, put $i=j / 2$. If $j$ is odd, put $i=(j-1) / 2$. Then we know $W$ is induced from a representation, which we shall denote by $Y$, of $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$. Moreover, recalling $X(i)=\pi^{\prime i} X$, where $X$ is as in Lemma 4, we may see from Lemma 5 that the set $1+X(i)$ is a set of (right or left) coset representatives for $H_{0}$ in $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$. Thus $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}=H_{0} \cdot(1+X(i))=(1+X(i)) \cdot H_{0}$. If $j$ is even, then $1+X(i)$ is contained in the kernel of $Y$; however, for odd $j$ this is (unfortunately) not true.

Lemma 14. (i) If $g \in G l_{n}(F)$ intertwines $W$ with itself, then $g \in K^{\prime} g_{0} K^{\prime}$ with $g_{0} \in G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$.
(ii) If $j$ is even, then there is a one-to-one correspondence between intertwining operators for $W$ and for $W^{\prime \prime}$. Specifically, if $g_{0} \in G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ intertwines $W^{\prime \prime}$ on $H_{0} \gamma$ times, then it intertwines $W^{\prime \prime}$ on $K^{\prime} \gamma$ times.
(iii) Let $j$ be odd. Suppose $g_{0} \in G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is such that we may write $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}=S_{1} \oplus S_{2} \oplus S_{3}$ where $S_{i}$ is an invariant subspace for Ad $g_{0}, \quad X(i)=\left(S_{1} \cap X(i)\right) \oplus\left(S_{2} \cap X(i)\right) \oplus\left(S_{3} \cap X(i)\right)$, and Ad $g_{0}\left(S_{1} \cap X(i)\right) \subseteq$ $X(i+1)$, Ad $g_{0}\left(S_{2} \cap X(i)\right)=S_{2} \cap X(i)$, and Ad $g_{0}\left(S_{3} \cap(X(i)-X(i+1))\right) \cap$ $X(i)=\phi . \quad$ (That is, Ad $g_{0}$ shrinks $S_{1}$, is isometric on $S_{2}$, and stretches $\left.S_{3}.\right)$ Then if $g_{0}$ intertwines $W^{\prime \prime}$ on $H_{0} \gamma$ times, it intertwines $W$ on $K^{\prime} \gamma$ times.

Proof. Statements (i) and (ii) are quite easy. We observe that since $W$ is induced from $Y$, in order to compute intertwining operators for $W$, it suffices to compute them for $Y$. But since $Y$ lies over $\psi$ on $K_{j-1}$, it is easily seen from Lemma 13 that if $g$ intertwines $Y$ with itself, then $g \in\left(H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) g_{0}\left(H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ where $g_{0} \in G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Statement (i) follows a fortiori.

If $j$ is even, $Y$ is simply the extension of $W^{\prime \prime}$ from $H_{0}$ to $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}=H_{0} \cdot E(i, j)$ which is trivial on $E(i, j)$. If $g_{0} \in G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and $z=h x$, with $h \in H_{0}, x \in 1+X(i)$, then it is easy to see $g_{0} z g_{0}^{-1} \in H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$
if and only if $g_{0} h g_{0}^{-1} \in H_{0}$ and $g_{0} x g_{0}^{-1} \in 1+X(i)$. That is $B=\left(H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) \cap$ $g_{0}\left(H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) g_{0}^{-1}=\left(H_{0} \cap g_{0} H_{0} g_{0}^{-1}\right) \cdot\left(1+\left(X(i) \cap g_{0} X(i) g_{0}^{-1}\right)\right)$. Thus we see that the representations $Y$ and $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0}(Y)$ of $B$ are determined completely by their restrictions to $H_{0} \cap g_{0} H_{0} g_{0}^{-1}$. Thus $g_{0}$ intertwines $Y$ with itself $\gamma$ times if and only if it intertwines $W^{\prime \prime}$ with itself $\gamma$ times. This establishes the first part of (ii). For the second part, all we need verify is that if $g_{0} \in G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, then $K^{\prime} g_{0} K^{\prime} \cap G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=$ $H_{0} g_{0} H_{0}$. This follows fairly easily from the work of IwahoriMatsumoto ([4]). Since the precise statement of (ii) is not needed for the rest of this paper, we leave the indicated verification to the reader.

Now we turn to (iii). Take $g_{0} \in G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and let $S_{1} \oplus S_{2} \oplus S_{3}=$ $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$ be the posited decomposition of $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}$. Put $S_{j}(i)=S_{j} \cap$ $X(i)$, so $X(i)=S_{1}(i) \oplus S_{2}(i) \oplus S_{2}(i)$. I claim first that $1+S_{1}(i)$ and $1+S_{2}(i)$ are isotropic with respect to the form $\alpha($,$) of Lemma 10,$ and that both are orthogonal to $1+S_{2}(i)$. For if $s_{j} \in S_{j}(i)$, then we have, as calculated in Lemma 10, $\alpha\left(1+s_{j}, 1+s_{k}\right)=\chi\left(\left\langle c,\left[s_{j}, s_{k}\right]\right\rangle\right)=$ $\chi\left(\left\langle\operatorname{Ad} g_{0}^{-1}\left(c_{0}\right),\left[s_{j}, s_{k}\right]\right\rangle\right)=\chi\left(\left\langle c,\left[\operatorname{Ad} g_{0}\left(s_{j}\right), \operatorname{Ad} g_{0}\left(s_{k}\right)\right]\right\rangle\right)$. If now $j=1$ and $k=1$ or 2 , then $\operatorname{Ad} g_{0}\left(s_{j}\right) \in X(i+1)$, so $\operatorname{Ad}\left(g_{0}\right)\left(1+s_{j}\right) \in K_{i+1}$, and similarly Ad $g_{0}\left(1+s_{k}\right) \in K_{i}$. Hence $\alpha\left(1+s_{j}, 1+s_{k}\right)=1$ by Lemma 10. Replacing $g_{0}$ by $g_{0}^{-1}$ gives the result for $j=2,3, k=3$. (We note that by similar but more complicated arguments, we could show $S_{1}$ and $S_{3}$ are isotropic with respect to $\langle$,$\rangle , and are orthogonal$ to $S_{2}$. We do not need this, however.)

As noted before, we have $B=\left(H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) \cap g_{0}\left(H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) g_{0}^{-1}=\left(H_{0} \cap\right.$ $\left.g_{0} H_{0} g_{0}^{-1}\right) \cdot\left(1+\left(X(i) \cap g_{0} X(i) g_{0}^{-1}\right)\right.$, and $X(i) \cap g_{0} X(i) g_{0}^{-1}=\left(S_{1}(i) \cap g_{0} S(i) g_{0}^{-1}\right) \oplus$ $S_{2}(i) \oplus S_{3}(i) \cong X(i+1)+S_{2}(i)+S_{3}(i)$. Moreover, $g_{0}^{-1} S_{3}(i) g_{0} \subseteq X(i+1)$. Recall that $\mathscr{H}$ is the Heisenberg group constructed in the proof of Theorem 1 for $j$ odd. Let $I_{1}, I_{3}$, be the images in $\mathscr{H}$ of $1+S_{1}(i)$, $1+S_{2}(i)$, and let $I_{2}$ be the inverse image in $\mathscr{H}$ of the image of $1+S_{2}(i)$ in $\mathscr{C} \mid \mathscr{Z}$. Then $I_{1}, I_{3}$ are abelian, and $I_{2} \cap \mathscr{L}=I_{3} \cap \mathscr{L}=$
 inverse image in $\mathscr{C}$ of the image in $\mathscr{C} \mid \mathscr{\mathscr { K }}$ of $1+\left(X(i) \cap g_{0} X(i) g_{0}^{-1}\right)$ is $I_{2} \cdot I_{3}$. It is also clear that the restriction to $I_{3}$ of the representation $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0}(Y)$ is a multiple of the identity representation, since $1+g_{0}^{-1} S_{3}(i) g_{0} \cong 1+X(i+1) \cong$ ker $Y$. Thus in computing the intertwining number between $Y$ and $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0}(Y)$ on $B$, it suffices to compute the intertwining number between $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0}(Y)$ and the subrepresentation $Y_{1}$ of $Y$ on which $1+S_{3}(i)$, or the inverse image of $I_{3}$ in $E(i, j-1)$, acts trivially. Similarly, since $1+\operatorname{Ad} g_{0}\left(S_{1}(i)\right) \cong \operatorname{ker} Y$, we need only compute the intertwining number between $Y_{1}$ and the subrepresentation of $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0}(Y)$ on which $1+\operatorname{Ad} g_{0}\left(\mathrm{~S}_{1}(i)\right)$ acts trivially.

Since $B$ is a group, we see that $H_{0} \cap g_{0} H_{0} g_{0}^{-1}$, acting on $\mathscr{H}$, normalizes $I_{3}$ and $I_{2} \cdot I_{3}$. Also $I_{2}$ is a Heisenberg group, with center
$\mathscr{F}$ (unless it reduces to $\mathscr{F}$ ).
We must now recall the precise structure of $Y$. Let $\tilde{\phi}^{\prime \prime}$ be an extension of $\psi$ to a linear character of $H_{0}$. Since $W^{\prime \prime}$ lies over $\psi$, $W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\Phi}^{\prime \prime-1}$ is a representation of $H_{0}$ trivial on $H_{j-1}$. We extend it to a representation, also denoted $W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\Phi}^{\prime \prime-1}$, of $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$, trivial on $E(i, j-1)$. We then take the representation $V\left(\tilde{\mathscr{\varphi}}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ of $H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$, lying over $\psi$ on $K_{j-1}$ and constructed from the Weil representation, using $\tilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}$. Then $Y=\left(W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime-1}\right) \otimes V\left(\widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}\right)$. The restriction of $Y$ to $B$ is thus the tensor product of the restrictions of $W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime-1}$ and $V\left(\widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, and similarly for $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0}(Y)$.

Let $V_{1}$ be the restriction to $B$ of the subrepresentation of $V\left(\widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ on which the inverse image in $I_{3}$ in $E(i, j-1)$ acts trivially. Then the subrepresentation $Y_{1}$ of $Y$ defined above is just $\left(W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime-1}\right) \otimes V_{1}$. (Here we restrict $W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime-1}$ to $B$.)

Now $I_{2} \cdot I_{3} / I_{3} \cong I_{2}$ is a Heisenberg group, on which $H_{0} \cap g_{0} H_{0} g_{0}^{-1}$ acts, and $\mathscr{F}$ is the center of $I_{2}$, and the action preserves $\psi$ on $\mathscr{Z}$. Also $V_{1}$ is the lift of a representation from an extension to $H_{0} \cap$ $g_{0} H_{0} g_{0}^{-1} \mathrm{X}_{s} I_{2}$ (semidirect product), of the unique representation of $I_{2}$ lying over $\psi$ on $\mathscr{L}$. Thus $V_{1}$ is (essentially) simply the Weil representation of $B$ deriving from the action of $H_{0} \cap g_{0} H_{0} g^{-1}$ on $I_{2}$.

Now from our remarks above, it follows that the intertwining number of $Y$ and $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0}(Y)$ on $B$ is the same as the intertwining number of $\left(W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \tilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime-1}\right) \otimes V_{1}$, and $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0}\left(W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \tilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime-1}\right) \otimes V_{1}$. But now it follows from standard theory (see for example, the discussion of Proposition 2 of [3]) that this is the same as the intertwining number of $W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime-1}$ and $\operatorname{Ad}^{*} g_{0}\left(W^{\prime \prime} \otimes \widetilde{\Phi}^{\prime \prime-1}\right)$ on $H_{0} \cap g_{0} H_{0} g_{0}^{-1}$. But since $\tilde{\varphi}^{\prime \prime}$ is simply the restriction to $H_{0}$ of a character of $G l_{2}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$, this is the same as the intertwining number of $W^{\prime \prime}$ and $\mathrm{Ad}^{*} g_{0} W^{\prime \prime}$ on $H_{0} \cap g_{0} H_{0} g_{0}^{-1}$. This concludes the important part of (iii). To completely finish (iii), we should verify the same facts about double cosets as for (ii). But since we are here mainly interested in nonexistence of intertwining operators, and since for the double cosets in which we are particularly interested, the verification is especially simple, we again omit this point. Lemma 14 is now concluded.

The purpose of this next lemma is to provide an important class of $g_{0}$ which verify the conditions of (iii) in Lemma 14 .

Lemma 15. Let $F^{\prime \prime} \cong F^{\prime}$ be a subfield, and let $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime} \cong G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ be a Cartan subgroup, split over $F^{\prime \prime}$, and such that $\mathscr{A}_{0}^{\prime \prime}$, the maximal compact subgroup of $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$, is contained in $K^{\prime}$. Then $A^{\prime}(i)=$ $\oplus_{j}\left(A^{\prime}(i) \cap S_{j}\right)$, where the $S_{j}$ are irreducible subspaces for Ad $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$ : acting on $M_{n}(F)$.

Proof. We prove the result in stages. First we take $F^{\prime \prime}=F$,
then galois over $F$, then finally we reduce to the case of $F^{\prime \prime}$ galois.
If $F^{\prime \prime}=F$, then $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}=\mathscr{A}$ is just a split Cartan, which we may assume, by an analogue of Lemma 1, valid for all Cartan subgroups of $G l_{n}(F)$, that, up to conjugation by $K^{\prime}, \mathscr{A}$ is the diagonal matrices. Then let $E_{j k}$ be the one-dimensional subspaces of $M_{n}(F)$ spanned by the matrix units. It will certainly suffice to show $A^{\prime}(i)=$ $\oplus_{j, k}\left(A^{\prime}(i) \cap E_{j k}\right)$. If $F$ is unramified over $F$, then $A^{\prime}=M_{n}(R)$, and the desired conclusion is obvious. In general, $A^{\prime}(i)=\bigcap_{m} \pi^{\prime m+i} M_{n}(R) \pi^{\prime-m}$. We can find $y \in K^{\prime}$ such that $\pi^{\prime} y=x$ normalizes $\mathscr{A}$. Then $A^{\prime}(i)=$ $\bigcap_{m} x^{m+i} M_{n}(R) x^{-m}=\bigcap_{m} x^{m+i}\left(\oplus_{j, k} M_{n}(R) \cap E_{j k}\right) x^{-m}$. But now $x^{m+i} E_{j k} x^{-m}=$ $E_{j^{\prime} k^{\prime}}$, for some $j^{\prime}, k^{\prime}$, since $x$ normalizes $\mathscr{A}$. Now if $z \in A^{\prime}(i), z=$ $x^{m+i} z_{m} x^{-m}$ for each $m$, with $z_{m} \in M_{n}(R)$. Also $z=\sum e_{j k}$, with $e_{j k} \in E_{j k}$, and for each $m, z_{m}=\sum e_{j k}^{(m)}$, with $e_{j k}^{(m)} \in E_{j k} \cap M_{n}(R)$. Since each of the above decompositions is unique, $x^{m+i} e_{j k}^{(m)} x^{-m}=e_{j^{\prime} k^{\prime}}$. Therefore $e_{j^{\prime} k^{\prime}} \in A^{\prime}(i)$, and we have established the lemma when $F^{\prime \prime}=F$.

Now take $F^{\prime \prime}$ galois over $F$. Then we may choose a set $\{\tilde{\sigma}\} \subseteq$ $G l_{n}(F)$ of representatives for the galois group $\operatorname{Gal}\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F\right)$, such that each $\tilde{\sigma}$ is in $K^{\prime}$, and normalizes $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$. Then the $\tilde{\sigma}$ are then determined up to their $\mathscr{A}_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ cosets, satisfy $\widetilde{\sigma} a \tilde{\sigma}^{-1} a^{-1} \in \mathscr{A}_{0}^{\prime \prime}$ for any $a \in \mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$.

We have the decomposition $M_{n}(F)=\bigoplus_{\sigma \in G a 1\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F\right)} \widetilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Since $\widetilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right) \times \tilde{\tau} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=\tilde{\sigma} \tilde{\tau} M_{l}(F)$, we see $\tilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ and $\tilde{\tau} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ are orthogonal with respest to $\langle$,$\rangle unless \sigma \tau=1$. Thus $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp}=$ $\oplus_{a \neq 1} \widetilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. We know that $A^{\prime}(i)=\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap A^{\prime}(i)\right) \oplus\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)^{\perp} \cap\right.$ $\left.A^{\prime}(i)\right)$. Since $\widetilde{\sigma} \in K$, we see that multiplying this decomposition by $\widetilde{\sigma}$ yields $A^{\prime}(i)=\left(\widetilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap A^{\prime}(i)\right) \oplus\left(\left(\oplus_{\tau \neq \sigma} \tilde{\tau} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)\right) \cap A^{\prime}(i)\right)$ for each $\sigma$, which in turn implies $A^{\prime}(i)=\bigoplus_{\sigma}\left(\tilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap A^{\prime}(i)\right)$. Now each $\widetilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is left invariant by $\mathrm{Ad} \mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$, and so is a sum of irreducible spaces for $\operatorname{Ad} \Omega^{\prime \prime}$. Moreover, if $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=\bigoplus_{j, k} E_{j k}^{\prime \prime}$ is the decomposition of $M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ into matrix units, then, taking $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$ to be the diagonal matrices of $G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right), E_{j k}^{\prime \prime}$ is invariant by right and left multiplication by $\mathscr{L}^{\prime \prime}$. Therefore since $\tilde{\sigma}$ normalizes $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}, \tilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=$ $\bigoplus_{j, k} \tilde{\sigma} E_{j k}^{\prime \prime}$ is a decomposition of $\widetilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ into Ad $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$-invariant, irreducible subspaces. But now, again since $\tilde{\sigma} \in K^{\prime}$, we have $\widetilde{\sigma}\left(M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap\right.$ $\left.A^{\prime}(i)\right)=\widetilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right) \cap A^{\prime}(i)$. Since, by reduction to the case $F^{\prime \prime}=F$, we have $A^{\prime}(i) \cap M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=\bigoplus_{j, k}\left(A^{\prime}(i) \cap E_{j k}^{\prime \prime}\right)$, we see $A^{\prime}(i) \cap \widetilde{\sigma} M_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=$ $\oplus_{j, k}\left(A^{\prime}(i) \cap \tilde{\sigma} E_{j k}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ for all $\sigma \in \operatorname{Gal}\left(F^{\prime \prime} / F\right)$, and so finally $A^{\prime}(i)=$ $\bigoplus_{\sigma, j, k}\left(A^{\prime}(i) \cap \widetilde{\sigma} E_{j k}^{\prime \prime}\right)$.

Now we pass to the general case, when $F^{\prime \prime}$ is any subextension of $F^{\prime \prime}$. Since in any case $F^{\prime \prime}$ is tamely ramified, its galois closure $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$ is unramified over it. Therefore, for a suitable unramified extension $F_{u}$ of $F$, the algebra $F^{\prime \prime} \boldsymbol{\otimes}_{F} F_{u}$ breaks up into a direct sum of subalgebras isomorphic to $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$.

We consider the matrix algebra $M_{n}\left(F_{u}\right)=M_{n}(F) \otimes_{F} F_{u}$, and in
it $A_{u}^{\prime}(i)=A^{\prime}(i) \otimes R_{u}$, where of course $R_{u}$ denotes the integers of $F_{u} . \mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$ is just the multiplicative group of an abelian subalgebra $\mathfrak{Y}^{\prime \prime}$ of rank $n$ of $M_{n}(F)$, and $\mathfrak{Y}^{\prime \prime}$ is isomorphic of $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$. We let $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime \prime}$ be the multiplicative group of $\mathfrak{Q}^{\prime \prime} \mathbb{\bigotimes}_{F} F_{u}=\mathfrak{\mathfrak { X } ^ { \prime \prime \prime }}$. Then $\mathfrak{\mathfrak { X } ^ { \prime \prime \prime }}$ is a direct sum of a certain number of copies of $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$.

It is clear that $A_{u}^{\prime}=\bigcap_{m} \pi^{\prime m} M_{n}\left(R_{u}\right) \pi^{\prime-m}$ where $\pi^{\prime}=\pi^{\prime} \oplus 1 \subseteq M_{n}\left(F_{u}\right)$. Thus we may find a field $F_{u}^{\prime \prime}$ so that $A_{u}^{\prime}$ is the order associated to it by the discussion preceding Lemma 1. In fact, we may choose $F_{u}^{\prime}$ so that it contains $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$. (Let $F_{u}^{\prime}$ be any of the conjugate fields which are the summands of $F^{\prime \prime} \boldsymbol{\otimes}_{F} F_{u}$.) Suppose for a moment that the maximal order of $\mathfrak{Y}^{\prime \prime \prime}$ is contained in $A_{u}^{\prime}$. Then, since $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$ is galois $F_{u}$, we have $A_{u}^{\prime}(i)=\bigoplus_{j}\left(A_{u}^{\prime}(i) \cap S_{j}^{u}\right)$, where $S_{j}^{u}$ are isotypic subspaces for Ad $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime \prime}$. Now Gal $\left(F_{u} / F\right)$ acts on $M_{n}(F) \otimes F_{u}$ and on $\mathfrak{A}^{\prime \prime \prime}$, and this action permutes the $S_{j}^{u}$. Let $\left\{T_{k}\right\}$ be the collection of subspaces which are direct sums of $S_{j}^{u}$ 's-invariant by $\operatorname{Gal}\left(F_{u} / F\right)$, and minimal with respect to these properties. Then certainly $A_{u}^{\prime}(i)=\bigoplus_{k}\left(A_{u}^{\prime}(i) \cap T_{k}\right)$. Moreover $S_{k}=T_{k} \cap M_{n}(F)$ will be an isotypic component of Ad $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime}$ acting on $M_{n}(F)$. Now if $z \in A^{\prime}(i)=A_{u}^{\prime}(i) \cap$ $M_{n}(F)$, we have $z=\sum t_{k}$. This decomposition is unique, and since $z$ is Gal $\left(F_{u} / F\right)$-invariant, and the $T_{k}$ are, each $t_{k}$ must be, so $t_{k} \in$ $S_{k} \cap A_{u}^{\prime}(i)$, and so $A^{\prime}(i)=\bigoplus_{k}\left(A^{\prime}(i) \cap S_{k}\right)$.

The above reasoning was carried out under the assumption that the maximal order of $\mathfrak{Y}^{\prime \prime \prime}$ was contained in $A_{u}^{\prime}$. This will be a consequence of the next lemma, which will then complete the proof of Lemma 15.

Lemma 16. If $F_{1}$ is any extension of $F$, and $F_{u}$ is an unramified extension of $F$, then the maximal order of $F_{1} \boldsymbol{\otimes}_{F} F_{u}$ is the image of $R_{1} \otimes R_{u}$.

Proof. Let $F_{2} \subseteq F_{1}$ be the maximal unramified subfield over $F$. Then we may write $F_{1} \boldsymbol{\otimes}_{F} F_{u}=F_{1} \boldsymbol{\otimes}_{F_{2}}\left(F_{2} \boldsymbol{\otimes}_{F} F_{u}\right)$. Now $F_{2} \boldsymbol{\otimes}_{F} F_{u}$ will be a direct sum of unramified extensions of $F_{2}$. Therefore, we may reduce the lemma to the two extreme cases when $F_{1}$ is either unramified or totally ramified over $F$.

If $F_{1}$ is totally ramified over $F$, then $F_{1} \boldsymbol{\otimes}_{F} F_{u}$ is still a field, since $F_{1}$ and $F_{u}$ are linearly disjoint over $F$ (see Serre [8]). We see $R_{1} \otimes R_{u}$ will contain all roots of unity of $F_{1} \otimes F_{u}$ of order prime to $p$, and will contain a prime element of $F_{1} \otimes F_{u}$. Hence it must equal the entire maximal order.

In the second case, $F_{1} \otimes F_{u}$ is a direct sum of fields unramified over $F$. Therefore, the maximal order of $F_{1} \otimes F_{u}$ is its own dual lattice with respect to the bilinear form induced by the trace on $F_{1} \otimes F_{u}$. On the other hand, this bilinear form is just the tensor
product of the bilinear forms $\operatorname{tr}\left(F_{1} / F\right)(x y)$ and $\operatorname{tr}\left(F_{u} / F\right)(x y)$ on $F_{1}$ and $F_{u}$, and $R_{1}$ and $R_{u}$ are their own dual lattices with respect to these forms. Therefore $R_{1} \otimes R_{u} \subseteq F_{1} \otimes F_{u}$ is its own dual lattice. Since it is contained in the maximal order, it must be equal to it. This finishes Lemma 16.

We want to make note of the following result, which is immediate from Lemmas 14 and 15. Notations are as in those lemmas.

COROLLARY. Suppose $F \subseteq F^{\prime \prime} \subseteq F^{\prime \prime \prime} \subseteq F^{\prime \prime}$, and $g_{0} \in G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right) \subseteq$ $G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$ is in a split Cartan subgroup of $G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$, whose compact subgroup is contained in $K^{\prime}$. Then $g_{0}$ intertwines $W^{\prime \prime}$ if and only if $g_{0}$ intertwines $Y$ (if and only if $g_{0}$ intertwines $W$, providing $\left.K^{\prime} g_{0} K^{\prime} \cap G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)=H_{0} g_{0} H_{0}\right)$.

Now we are ready to construct our supercuspidal representations.
THEOREM 2. For every admissible character $\psi^{\prime}$ of $F^{\prime \times}$, for every tamely ramified extension $F^{\prime \prime}$ of $F$ of degree $n$, there exists a supercuspidal representation $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ of $G l_{n}(F)$, induced from a representation of $F^{\prime \times} \cdot K^{\prime}$, agreeing with $W\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ on $K^{\prime}$. $V\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and $V\left(\psi_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ are equivalent if and only if $\psi_{1}^{\prime}$ and $\psi_{2}^{\prime}$ are equivalent.

Proof. To begin, let us note that $F^{\prime \times} \cdot H_{0}=\widetilde{H}_{0}$ is actually the semidirect product of $H_{0}$ and the cyclic group generated by $\pi^{\prime}$. Similarly for $F^{\prime \times} \cdot K^{\prime}=\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$. Thus it is easy to see that Theorem 1 and Lemmas 12 and 14 apply equally well to these groups as to $H_{0}$ and $K^{\prime}$. Therefore, we may assume we have defined representations $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ on $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}$ in the manner of Lemma 12. Of course, the restriction of $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ to $K^{\prime}$ is just $W\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$. We will show the representations $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ induced from $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ have the desired properties.

To prove the theorem, we merely examine which $g$ can possibly intertwine $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ with itself, or $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ with $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi_{2}^{\prime}\right)$.

Put $\widetilde{K}_{i}^{\prime}=K_{i}^{\prime}$. Let $U_{j}^{\prime}$ be the conductor of $\psi$. We know $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ is induced from a representation, lying above $\psi(\psi$ is the extension to $\widetilde{K}_{j-1}$ of the restriction to $U_{j-1}^{\prime}$ ) of $\psi^{\prime}$ of the subgroup $\widetilde{H}_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}$, where $2 i=j$ if $j$ is even, or $2 i+1=j$ if $j$ is odd. We call this inducing representation $Y\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$.

It is clear from the constructions of Theorem 1 and Lemma 12 that the restriction of $Y\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ to $H_{1}$ is just a multiple of $W^{\prime \prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ restricted to $H_{1}$. Also, $Y\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ lies above $\psi$ on $K_{j-1}^{\prime}$. Therefore, Lemma 13 shows that the only double cosets which can support nontrivial intertwining operators for $Y\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ are those of the form $\left(\widetilde{H}_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) g_{0}\left(\widetilde{H}_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ where $g_{0} \in G l_{l}\left(F^{\prime \prime}\right)$. Moreover, since, as we mentioned $Y\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ on $H_{1}$ is a multiple of $W^{\prime \prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ on $H_{1}, g_{0}$ cannot intertwine $Y\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ unless it
intertwines $W^{\prime \prime}$ on $H_{1}$.
Now let $F^{\prime \prime \prime} \cong F^{\prime \prime}$ be the subfield of $F^{\prime \prime}$, such that the restriction of $\psi^{\prime}$ to $U_{1}^{\prime}$ is of the form $\psi^{\prime \prime \prime} \circ N\left(F^{\prime} / F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$, where $\psi^{\prime \prime \prime}$ is nondegenerate on $U_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime}$. Then $F^{\prime \prime} \cong F^{\prime \prime \prime}$, and $F^{\prime \prime}$ is unramified over $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$ by the definition of admissibility. By induction, we may assume that $g_{0}$ cannot intertwine $W^{\prime \prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ on $H_{1}$ with itself unless $g_{0}$ is in a double coset $H_{1} g_{1} H_{1}$, with $g_{1} \in G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$, the centralizer of $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$. Therefore, the only double cosets which can support intertwining operators for $Y\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ are of the form $\left(H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right) g_{1}\left(H_{0} \cdot K_{i}^{\prime}\right)$ with $g_{1} \in G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$.

Now since $F^{\prime}$ is unramified over $F^{\prime \prime \prime}, K^{\prime} \cap G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)=G l_{k}\left(R^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$ is a maximal compact subgroup of $G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$. It is well known (see [4]) that in this case, one may choose, as a set of double coset representatives for $K^{\prime} \cap G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$ in $G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$, elements from an $F^{\prime \prime \prime}$-split Cartan subgroup $\mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime \prime}$ in $G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$, whose maximal compact subgroup is contained in $K^{\prime}$. Therefore, applying Lemma 15, (ii) or (iii) according as $j$ is even or odd, we may conclude that $a \in \mathscr{A}^{\prime \prime \prime}$ can intertwine $Y\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ with itself if and only if it intertwines $\widetilde{W}^{\prime \prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ on $\tilde{H}_{0}$ with itself. Then by induction we may assume this can only happen if $a$ intertwines $\widetilde{W}^{\prime \prime \prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$, the representation of $\widetilde{K}^{\prime} \cap G l_{k}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$ associated to $\psi^{\prime}$, with itself. Therefore, we are reduced to the case when $F^{\prime \prime}$ is unramified over $F$.

If $F^{\prime \prime}$ is unramified over $F$, then $\widetilde{K}^{\prime}=\widetilde{K}=F^{\times} \cdot G l_{n}(R)$, and $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ is a character on $F^{\times}$times the pullback to $G l_{n}(R)$ of a cuspidal representation of $G l_{n}(\bar{F})$. A set of double coset representatives for $\widetilde{K}$ consists of diagonal matrices with entries ( $1, \pi^{\alpha_{2}}, \pi^{\alpha_{3}}, \cdots, \pi^{\alpha_{n}}$ ) with $0 \leqq \alpha_{2} \leqq \alpha_{3} \leqq \cdots \leqq \alpha_{n}$.

Let $N_{0}$ be the intersection of $G l_{n}(R)$ with the group $N$ of upper triangular unipotent matrices. Then, if $g$ is one of the above double coset representatives $N_{0} \subseteq \widetilde{K} \cap g \widetilde{K} g^{-1}$. Moreover, if $g \neq 1$, then there is some parabolic subgroup $P$, containing $N$, such that $N_{0}(P)$, the intersection of the unipotent radical of $P$ with $N_{0}$ satisfies $g^{-1} N_{0}(P) g \subseteq \widetilde{K}_{1}$. Therefore, since $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ is trivial on $K_{1} \cap N_{0}, N_{0}(P) \subseteq$ ker Ad ${ }^{*} g\left(\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right)$. On the other hand, the fact that $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ on $G l_{n}(R)$ is the pullback of a cuspidal representation of $G l_{n}(\bar{F})$ means that the restriction of $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ to $N_{0}(P)$ for any $P$ does not contain the trivial representation. Therefore, if $g \neq 1, g$ does not intertwine $\widetilde{W}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ with itself. This shows $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ is irreducible and completes the construction of the $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$.

It remains to establish the facts on the equivalence and nonequivalence of $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$. Let $F^{\prime(1)}$ and $F^{\prime(2)}$ be two fields, of degree $n$, and tamely ramified over $F$. Let $K^{(1)}$ and $K^{\prime(2)}$ be the corresponding compact groups. Let $\psi^{\prime(1)}$ and $\psi^{\prime(2)}$ be admissible characters of $F^{\prime(1) \times}$ and $F^{\prime(2) \times}$. Let $U_{j_{i}}^{\prime(i)}$ be the conductors of the $\psi^{\prime(i)}$, and let $c^{(i)}$ be the standard representatives for the $\psi^{\prime(i)}$ on $U_{j_{i}-1}^{\prime(i)}$. Let $F^{\prime \prime \prime}(i)$ be the
subfields generated by the $c^{(i)}$. Let $H_{k}^{\prime(i)}=K_{k}^{\prime(i)} \cap G l_{l_{i}}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime}(i)\right)$. Let $Y\left(\psi^{\prime(i)}\right)$ be the representations from which the $W\left(\psi^{\prime(i)}\right)$ are induced.

By Lemma 13, if $g_{0}$ intertwines the $Y\left(\psi^{\prime(i)}\right)$, we can take $g_{0}$ so that $\operatorname{Ad} g_{0}\left(c^{1}\right)=c^{(2)}$. If this is so, then by the same reasoning as in the construction of the $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right), g_{0}$ must intertwine the restrictions of the $Y\left(\psi^{\prime(i)}\right)$ to the $H_{1}^{\prime(i)}$. From this, by induction, we conclude that if $g_{0}$ is to intertwine the $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ then necessarily $\operatorname{Ad} g_{0}\left(F^{\prime \prime \prime(1)}\right)=F^{\prime \prime \prime \prime}(2)$, where $F^{\prime \prime \prime \prime}(i)$ is the subfield of $F^{\prime \prime(i)}$ such that, on $U_{1}^{\prime(i)}$, $\psi^{\prime(i)}=$ $\psi^{\prime \prime \prime}(i) \circ N\left(F^{\prime(i)} / F^{\prime \prime \prime \prime}(i)\right)$, and $\psi^{\prime \prime \prime(i)}$ is nondegenerate on $U_{1}^{\prime \prime \prime(i)}$. But then we see $F^{\prime(1)}$ and $F^{\prime(2)}$ must be conjugate, since they are determined by $F^{\prime \prime \prime \prime}(1)$ and $F^{\prime \prime \prime \prime}(2)$ respectively. Also, we see we may as well take $K^{\prime(1)}=K^{\prime(2)}=K^{\prime}$, and then we can choose by Lemma $1, g_{1} \in K^{\prime}$ such that $\operatorname{Ad} g_{1}\left(F^{\prime(1)}\right)=F^{\prime(2)}$. Then we are reduced to showing that two nonconjugate characters of $F^{\prime(1)}=F^{\prime}$ do not yield the same representation, and this proceeds precisely as for the construction of the $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$. This finishes Theorem 2.
(Strictly speaking, we should verify that the $V\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$, which are obviously representations with compactly supported matrix coefficients, are in fact cuspidal. This could be done. (In fact, the $W$ ( $\psi^{\prime}$ ) are already cuspidal on $K^{\prime}$.) However, we prefer to cite a result of Jacquet ([5]), which says an irreducible representation of $G l_{n}$ with compactly supported matrix coefficients is automatically cuspidal. (This has been generalized by Harish-Chandra (see [2]) to general $p$-adic groups.)

Concluding remarks. (a) The case of the basic inductive step of Theorem 2 when $j$ is even contrasts sharply with the intricacy of our arguments to accomplish the same step when $j$ is odd. Thus one may hope that Theorem 2 has a proof considerably simpler than the one we give.
(b) It seems likely that much of the construction given here for $G l_{n}$ can be carried over to other $p$-adic groups of classical or Chevalley type. This would require either a case-by-case analysis, or some general structure theorems involving considerably more detail then those now in the literature. The complete construction for $G l_{n}$, however, hinges on the knowledge of the cuspidal representations of $G l_{n}$ over a finite field. Thus until the representation theory of other finite algebraic groups is better known, the full construction given here is limited to $G l_{n}$.
(c) It follows from remarks of R.P. Langlands that Theorem 2 allows one to attach a supercuspidal representation of $G l_{n}$ to each irreducible representation of degree $n$ of the Weil group of $F$, (for $n$ prime to $p$ ). It should of course be checked that this correspondence has the proper $L$-function theoretic properties.
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