

# Mono-anabelian Transport

Yuichiro Hoshi

RIMS, Kyoto University

December 7, 2015

## Notation and Terminology

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}^\mu &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathcal{O}^\times)_{\text{tor}} \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\times \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{|z| = 1\} \\ \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\triangleright &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{0 < |z| \leq 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{O} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{|z| \leq 1\} \end{aligned}$$

an *isomorph* of  $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow}$  an object which is isomorphic to  $A$

a *poly-(iso)morphism*  $A \rightarrow B$

$\stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow}$  a set consisting of (iso)morphisms  $A \rightarrow B$

For a topological group  $G$ ,

$$\infty H^i(G, A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varinjlim_{H \subseteq G: \text{open subgps of finite index}} H^i(H, A)$$

In inter-universal Teichmüller theory,  
(mono-)anabelian geometry is applied so as to establish  
“mono-anabelian transport”  
of various Frobenius-like objects.

## Mono-anabelian Transport

- Suppose that we are given a Frobenioid which consists of an étale-like portion and a Frobenius-like portion.
- One relates the Frobenius-like portion to the étale-like portion via a Kummer isomorphism which arises from a cyclotomic rigidity.
- Then one can establish a relationship between the Frobenius-like portions of (independent) Frobenioids once one has a connection between the étale-like portions of the Frobenioids.

an étale-like connection  $\xrightleftharpoons[\text{isomorphism}]{\text{Kummer}}$  a Frobenius-like connection

In the following, let us observe some classical/typical examples of  
“mono-anabelian transport”.

## Mono-anabelian Transport

- Suppose that we are given a Frobenioid which consists of an étale-like portion and a Frobenius-like portion.
- One relates the Frobenius-like portion to the étale-like portion via a Kummer isomorphism which arises from a cyclotomic rigidity.
- Then one can establish a relationship between the Frobenius-like portions of (independent) Frobenioids once one has a connection between the étale-like portions of the Frobenioids.

an étale-like connection  $\xrightleftharpoons[\text{isomorphism}]{\text{Kummer}}$  a Frobenius-like connection

$k$ : a  $p$ -adic local field, i.e.,  $[k : \mathbb{Q}_p] < \infty$

$$G_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$$

Thus, we have (multiplicative)  $G_k$ -monoids

$$G_k \curvearrowright (\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\mu} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\triangleright} \subseteq \bar{k}^{\times}).$$

$G \curvearrowright M$ : an isomorph of  $G_k \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\triangleright}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times}; \bar{k}^{\times}$ )

(Such a data consists of essentially the same data as a Frobenioid.)

For such a “Frobenioid”:

- $G$ : the étale-like portion of  $G \curvearrowright M$
- $M$ : the Frobenius-like portion of  $G \curvearrowright M$

Here, let us recall that, by mono-anabelian geometry, one can reconstruct, from an isomorph  $H$  of  $G_k$  (e.g.,  $G$ ), isomorphs

$$H \curvearrowright (\mathcal{O}^\mu(H) \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\times(H) \subseteq \mathcal{O}^\triangleright(H) \subseteq \bar{k}^\times(H))$$

of the  $G_k$ -monoids

$$G_k \curvearrowright (\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^\mu \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^\times \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^\triangleright \subseteq \bar{k}^\times).$$



## Mono-anabelian Transport

- Suppose that we are given a Frobenioid which consists of an étale-like portion and a Frobenius-like portion.
- One relates the Frobenius-like portion to the étale-like portion via a Kummer isomorphism which arises from a cyclotomic rigidity.
- Then one can establish a relationship between the Frobenius-like portions of (independent) Frobenioids once one has a connection between the étale-like portions of the Frobenioids.

an étale-like connection  $\xrightleftharpoons[\text{isomorphism}]{\text{Kummer}}$  a Frobenius-like connection

$G \curvearrowright M$ : an isomorph of  $G_k \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\triangleright}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times}; \bar{k}^{\times}$ )

$\Rightarrow G \curvearrowright M_{\text{tor}}$ : an isomorph of  $G_k \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\mu}$

$\Rightarrow G \curvearrowright \Lambda(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varprojlim_n (M_{\text{tor}}[n])$ : an isomorph of  $G_k \curvearrowright \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}(1)$ ,  
i.e., a cyclotome  $\stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow}$  an isomorph of “ $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}(1)$ ”

On the other hand, by mono-anabelian geometry:

$G \Rightarrow G \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}^{\mu}(G)$ : an isomorph of  $G_k \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\mu}$

$\Rightarrow G \curvearrowright \Lambda(G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varprojlim_n (\mathcal{O}^{\mu}(G)[n])$ : a cyclotome

Thus:

- $G \curvearrowright M \Rightarrow$  the Frobenius-like cyclotome  $G \curvearrowright \Lambda(M)$
- $G \curvearrowright M \Rightarrow (G \Rightarrow)$  the étale-like cyclotome  $G \curvearrowright \Lambda(G)$

## Theorem (Cyclotomic Rigidity via Local Class Field Theory)

$G \curvearrowright M$ : an isomorph of  $G_k \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times}; \bar{k}^{\times}$ )

$\Gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1\}$  (resp.  $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}^{\times}; \{\pm 1\}$ )  $\subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{Z}}^{\times}$  ( $= \text{Aut}_{G_k}(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}(1))$ )

$\Rightarrow \exists$  a functorial algorithm of reconstructing, from  $G \curvearrowright M$ , a  $\Gamma$ -orbit of  $G$ -equivariant isomorphisms

$$\Lambda(M) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Lambda(G)$$

(i.e., a  $G$ -eq. isom.  $\Lambda(M) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Lambda(G)$  well-defined up to the action of  $\Gamma$ )

## Terminology

a cyclotomic rigidity isomorphism (cyclotomic synchronization isom.)

$\stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow}$  a “suitable” (poly-)isomorphism between cyclotomes

## Mono-anabelian Transport

- Suppose that we are given a Frobenioid which consists of an étale-like portion and a Frobenius-like portion.
- One relates the Frobenius-like portion to the étale-like portion via a Kummer isomorphism which arises from a cyclotomic rigidity.
- Then one can establish a relationship between the Frobenius-like portions of (independent) Frobenioids once one has a connection between the étale-like portions of the Frobenioids.

an étale-like connection  $\xrightleftharpoons[\text{isomorphism}]{\text{Kummer}}$  a Frobenius-like connection

$G \curvearrowright M$ : an isomorph of  $G_k \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_k^{\triangleright}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}_k^{\times}; \bar{k}^{\times}$ )

$$\Rightarrow G \curvearrowright (1 \rightarrow M_{\text{tor}} \rightarrow M^{\text{gp}} \xrightarrow{n} M^{\text{gp}} \rightarrow 1)$$

$$\xrightarrow{H^*(G, -)} M^G \hookrightarrow (M^{\text{gp}})^G = H^0(G, M^{\text{gp}}) \rightarrow H^1(G, M_{\text{tor}}[n])$$

$$\xrightarrow{\varprojlim^n} M^G \hookrightarrow H^1(G, \Lambda(M))$$

$$\xrightarrow{\varinjlim_{H \subseteq G: \text{open subgps}}} G \curvearrowright (M \hookrightarrow {}_{\infty}H^1(G, \Lambda(M)))$$

On the other hand, by mono-anabelian geometry:

$$G \Rightarrow G \curvearrowright M(G) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{O}^{\triangleright}(G) \text{ (resp. } \mathcal{O}^{\times}(G); \bar{k}^{\times}(G)\text{)}$$

Thus, by a similar procedure to the above procedure, we obtain:

$$G \curvearrowright (M(G) \hookrightarrow {}_{\infty}H^1(G, \Lambda(G)))$$

- $G \curvearrowright (M \hookrightarrow {}_{\infty}H^1(G, \Lambda(M)))$

- $G \curvearrowright (M(G) \hookrightarrow {}_{\infty}H^1(G, \Lambda(G)))$

## Theorem

$G \curvearrowright M$ : an isomorph of  $G_k \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\triangleright}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times}; \bar{k}^{\times}$ )

Then the  $\Gamma$ -orbit of  $G$ -equivariant isomorphisms

$${}_{\infty}H^1(G, \Lambda(M)) \xrightarrow{\sim} {}_{\infty}H^1(G, \Lambda(G))$$

induced by the  $\Gamma$ -orbit of  $G$ -equivariant isomorphisms  $\Lambda(M) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Lambda(G)$  of the preceding theorem determines a  $\Gamma$ -orbit of  $G$ -equivariant isomorphisms of  $G$ -submonoids

$$M \xrightarrow{\sim} M(G).$$

By the above theorem, one can reconstruct, from  $G \curvearrowright M$ :

- a (single)  $G$ -equiv. isom.  $M \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}^{\triangleright}(G)$  if  $M \cong \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\triangleright}$
- a  $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}^{\times}$ -orbit of  $G$ -equiv. isom.  $M \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}^{\times}(G)$  if  $M \cong \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times}$
- a  $\{\pm 1\}$ -orbit of  $G$ -equiv. isom.  $M \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{k}^{\times}(G)$  if  $M \cong \bar{k}^{\times}$

## Terminology

### a Kummer isomorphism

$\stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow}$  a “suitable” (poly-)isomorphism between the Frobenius-like and étale-like objects

## Mono-anabelian Transport

- Suppose that we are given a Frobenioid which consists of an étale-like portion and a Frobenius-like portion.
- One relates the Frobenius-like portion to the étale-like portion via a Kummer isomorphism which arises from a cyclotomic rigidity.
- Then one can establish a relationship between the Frobenius-like portions of (independent) Frobenioids once one has a connection between the étale-like portions of the Frobenioids.

an étale-like connection  $\xrightleftharpoons[\text{isomorphism}]{\text{Kummer}}$  a Frobenius-like connection



$\dagger G \curvearrowright \dagger M, \ddagger G \curvearrowright \ddagger M$ : isomorphs of  $G_k \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\triangleright}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times}; \bar{k}^{\times}$ )

Suppose that we are given a connection between the étale-like portions of these two data  $\dagger G \curvearrowright \dagger M, \ddagger G \curvearrowright \ddagger M$ ,

e.g., an isomorphism  $\alpha: \dagger G \xrightarrow{\sim} \ddagger G$ .

Then, by means of this “étale link”  $\alpha$  and the Kummer isomorphisms, we obtain an poly-isomorphism between the Frobenius-like portions

$${}^{\dagger}M \xrightarrow{\text{Kummer}} M({}^{\dagger}G) \xrightarrow{M(\alpha)} M({}^{\ddagger}G) \xrightarrow{\text{Kummer}^{-1}} {}^{\ddagger}M.$$

In summary, roughly speaking, by means of

- a connection between the étale-like portions and
- a Kummer isomorphism (which arises from a cyclotomic rigidity),

one can establish a relationship between the Frobenius-like portions.

In our example, by the “étale link”  $\alpha: \dagger G \xrightarrow{\sim} \ddagger G$ , we obtain:

- a (single)  $(\dagger G, \ddagger G)$ -equiv. isom.  $\dagger M \xrightarrow{\sim} \ddagger M$  if “ $M$ ”  $\cong \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\triangleright}$
- a  $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}^{\times}$ -orbit of  $(\dagger G, \ddagger G)$ -equiv. isom.  $\dagger M \xrightarrow{\sim} \ddagger M$  if “ $M$ ”  $\cong \mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^{\times}$
- a  $\{\pm 1\}$ -orbit of  $(\dagger G, \ddagger G)$ -equiv. isom.  $\dagger M \xrightarrow{\sim} \ddagger M$  if “ $M$ ”  $\cong \bar{k}^{\times}$

In particular, we can “transport”, via an étale-like connection “ $\alpha$ ”, Frobenius-like objects from the “ $\dagger$  side” to the “ $\ddagger$  side”.

## Mono-anabelian Transport

- Suppose that we are given a Frobenioid which consists of an étale-like portion and a Frobenius-like portion.
- One relates the Frobenius-like portion to the étale-like portion via a Kummer isomorphism which arises from a cyclotomic rigidity.
- Then one can establish a relationship between the Frobenius-like portions of (independent) Frobenioids once one has a connection between the étale-like portions of the Frobenioids.

an étale-like connection  $\xrightleftharpoons[\text{isomorphism}]{\text{Kummer}}$  a Frobenius-like connection

## Indeterminacy

The “output isomorphism” of a mono-anabelian transport is often subject to a certain indeterminacy.

### Example

- the  $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}^\times$ -indeterminacies on  ${}^{\dagger}M \xrightarrow{\sim} {}^{\ddagger}M$  in the case of “ $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{k}}^\times$ ”
- the  $\{\pm 1\}$ -indeterminacies on  ${}^{\dagger}M \xrightarrow{\sim} {}^{\ddagger}M$  in the case of “ $\bar{k}^\times$ ”

- a Kummer-detachment indeterminacy

$\stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow}$  an indeterminacy that occurs in the passage from

Frobenius-like str. to étale-like str. via Kummer isomorphisms

- an étale-transport indeterminacy

$\stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow}$  an indeterminacy that occurs in the transport of the

resulting étale-like objects via étale-like connections

$$\dagger M \xrightarrow{\text{Kummer} \sim} M(\dagger G) \xrightarrow{M(\alpha) \sim} M(\ddagger G) \xrightarrow{\text{Kummer}^{-1} \sim} \ddagger M$$

(Thus, the above two examples (i.e.,  $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}^\times$  and  $\{\pm 1\}$ ) are examples of a *Kummer-detachment indeterminacy*.)

## An Example of an Étale-transport Indeterminacy

In the case where “ $M$ ”  $\cong \mathcal{O}_k^\triangleright$ , let us consider, as a connection between the étale-like portions,

$$\text{the full poly-isomorphism } \phi: \dagger G \xrightarrow{\sim} \ddagger G$$

(i.e., the poly-isomorphism obtained by forming  $\text{Isom}(\dagger G, \ddagger G)$ ).

$\Rightarrow$

$$\dagger M \xrightarrow[\text{no indet.}]{\text{Kummer} \sim} \mathcal{O}_k^\triangleright(\dagger G) \xrightarrow[\text{Aut}(\dagger G) \cong \text{Aut}(\ddagger G) \curvearrowright]{M(\phi) \sim} \mathcal{O}_k^\triangleright(\ddagger G) \xrightarrow[\text{no indet.}]{\text{Kummer}^{-1} \sim} \ddagger M$$

Thus, our resulting isomorphism  $\dagger M \xrightarrow{\sim} \ddagger M$  is subject to indeterminacies which arise from the action of  $\text{Aut}(\dagger G) \cong \text{Aut}(\ddagger G)$ .

Let us recall (cf. the preceding talk):

## An Approximate Statement of the Main Theorem of IUT

$\exists$  A suitable multiradial algorithm whose output data consist of the following three objects  $\mathfrak{R} \curvearrowright$  mild indeterminacies

- the collection of log-shells  $\{\mathcal{I}_{\underline{v}}\}_{\underline{v} \in \underline{\mathbb{V}}}$
- the theta values  $(= \{q^{j^2/2l}\}_{1 \leq j \leq l^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lfloor \frac{l-1}{2} \rfloor}) \curvearrowright \prod_{\underline{v} \in \underline{\mathbb{V}}} \mathcal{I}_{\underline{v}}$
- $F_{\text{mod}}$  via  $\kappa$ -coric functions  $\curvearrowright \prod_{\underline{v}} ((K_{\underline{v}})_+ \text{ "via } \mathcal{I}_{\underline{v}} \text{ "})$

Moreover, this alg'm is *compatible* w/ the  $\Theta$ -link (more precisely,

$\Theta_{\text{LGP}}^{\times \mu}$ -link) “ $\dagger \mathcal{F}_{\text{MOD}}^{\otimes \mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \ddagger \mathcal{F}_{\text{MOD}}^{\otimes \mathbb{R}}$ ”; “ $\dagger$  theta values  $\mapsto \ddagger q^{1/2l}$ ”.



That is to say, we want to establish, relative to the link

$$\text{“}\dagger\text{theta values (= } \{q^{j^2/2l}\}_{1 \leq j \leq l^*}\text{) } \mapsto \text{ } \ddagger q^{1/2l}\text{”},$$

a suitable relationship between “ $\dagger\mathfrak{X}$ ” and “ $\ddagger\mathfrak{X}$ ”.

Thus, to obtain the main theorem of IUT, we have to consider

- the operation of “multiradial Kummer-detachment” — i.e., the passage from a Frobenius-like structure to an étale-like structure via a multiradial Kummer isomorphism — for theta functions and  $\kappa$ -coric functions and
- the operation of multiradial passage from such functions to special values (which belong to the log-shells).

- “multiradial Kmm-detach. for theta”: closely related to elliptic cuspidalization and the “additive” symm. of Hodge-theaters
- “multiradial Kmm-detach. for  $\kappa$ -coric”: closely related to Belyi cuspidalization and the “multiplicative” symm. of Hodge-theaters
- “multiradial passage into special values”: given by the operation of “Galois evaluation” — i.e., the operation of restricting Kummer classes of functions to decomposition subgroups associated to suitable closed points of (orbi)curves

(cf. “animation video concerning IUTeich”)