

NOTETAKER CHECKLIST FORM

(Complete one for each talk.)

Name: Alex Kruckman Email/Phone: Kruckman@gmail.com

Speaker's Name: Martin Hils

Talk Title: A Model Theoretic Approach to Berkovich Spaces (II)

Date: 02, 06, 14 Time: 9:30 (am) / pm (circle one)

List 6-12 key words for the talk: Hrushovski-Loeser spaces, stably dominated types, pro-definable sets, Berkovich spaces

Please summarize the lecture in 5 or fewer sentences: Part 2 of 3. The construction of Hrushovski and Loeser's "version" of Berkovich spaces: the space of stably dominated types on an algebraic variety. This space is not literally definable - it requires the machinery of pro-definable sets. The definable topology on Hrushovski-Loeser spaces, and limits of types.

CHECK LIST

(This is **NOT** optional, we will **not** pay for incomplete forms)

- Introduce yourself to the speaker prior to the talk. Tell them that you will be the note taker, and that you will need to make copies of their notes and materials, if any.
- Obtain ALL presentation materials from speaker. This can be done before the talk is to begin or after the talk; please make arrangements with the speaker as to when you can do this. You may scan and send materials as a .pdf to yourself using the scanner on the 3rd floor.
 - **Computer Presentations:** Obtain a copy of their presentation
 - **Overhead:** Obtain a copy or use the originals and scan them
 - **Blackboard:** Take blackboard notes in black or blue **PEN**. We will **NOT** accept notes in pencil or in colored ink other than black or blue.
 - **Handouts:** Obtain copies of and scan all handouts
- For each talk, all materials must be saved in a single .pdf and named according to the naming convention on the "Materials Received" check list. To do this, compile all materials for a specific talk into one stack with this completed sheet on top and insert face up into the tray on the top of the scanner. Proceed to scan and email the file to yourself. Do this for the materials from each talk.
- When you have emailed all files to yourself, please save and re-name each file according to the naming convention listed below the talk title on the "Materials Received" check list.
(YYYY.MM.DD.TIME.SpeakerLastName)
- Email the re-named files to notes@msri.org with the workshop name and your name in the subject line.

algebraic variety

①

The Hrushovski-Loeser space associated to V

Thm (HHM) Let p be a definable type in ACVF. TFAE:

(1) $p \perp \Gamma$

(2) p is generically stable ($p(x) \otimes p(y) = p(y) \otimes p(x)$)

(3) p is stably dominated

Note: (1) \Rightarrow (3) is the interesting part. (3) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (1) is easy.

Ex: $p_{\mathcal{O}}$ is "dominated" by $\text{res}: \mathcal{O} \rightarrow k$ ^(stable)

Let $K \subseteq L$, $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$.

Then $a \in \mathcal{O}_L \Leftrightarrow \text{res}(a) \notin k_L^{\text{alg}}$
 $\Leftrightarrow \text{res}(a) \not\perp_{K,K} k_L$

Fact: (1) IF $p \in \hat{X}(A)$, $F: X \rightarrow Y$ A -def, then $F_* p \in \hat{Y}(A)$.

(2) IF $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/K)$ is stably dominated and $\bar{b} \in \text{acl}(K \cup \{\bar{a}\})$, then $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/K)$ is stably dominated.

(3) IF both $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/A)$ and $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/A \cup \{\bar{a}\})$ are stably dominated, then $\text{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{b}/A)$ is stably dominated.

Cor: (1) Let C be an alg. curve / $K = \text{ACVF}$. Let $\bar{a} \in C(U)$.

Then $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/K) \in C(K) \Leftrightarrow \text{td}(K(\bar{a})/K) = \text{td}(k_{K(\bar{a})}/k_K)$.

[This uses: $\hat{A}^1 = B^{\text{cl}}$, the set of closed balls]

(2) More generally, let \bar{a} be any tuple in U^n . IF $\text{td}(K(\bar{a})/K) = \text{td}(k_{K(\bar{a})}/k_K)$, then $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/K)$ is stably dominated. The converse is false in general!

Goal: Put \hat{X} into the definable category.

Ex: • $\hat{A}^1 = B^{\text{cl}}$ (def. set in ACVF_q)

• Let $X \subseteq \text{def } \Gamma_{\infty}^n$. Then $\hat{X}(A) = X(A) \rightsquigarrow \hat{X}$ is def. naturally.

In general, we need pro-definable sets.

(2)

Def: Let $W = K^N$ be a finite dim. vector space ($K = \text{ACVF}$).

An \mathcal{O} -submodule $\Lambda \leq W$ is a semi-lattice if $\Lambda \cong K^m \times \mathcal{O}^{N-m}$ for some m .

Easy Fact: The set $L(W)$ of semi-lattices in W is a definable family.

Lemma: A def. \mathcal{O} -submodule $\Lambda \leq W$ is a semi-lattice iff $\forall w \in W, w \neq 0$, either $K \cdot w \subseteq \Lambda$ or $K \cdot w \cap \Lambda \cong \mathcal{O}$ (linear algebra).

Look at \widehat{A}^\wedge . For $d \geq 1$, let $W_d = K[X_1, \dots, X_n]_{\leq d}$. Let $p \in \widehat{A}^\wedge(K)$. Define $\Lambda_d(p) = \{F \in W_d \mid \text{val}(F(p)) \geq 0\}$.

Note: Clear by the Lemma: $\Lambda_d(p) \in L(W_d)$.

Note: The sequence $(\Lambda_d(p))_{d \geq 1}$ determines p completely.

Def: A pro-definable set is a projective limit $D = \varprojlim D_i(U)$, where D_i are definable and the transition functions $\pi_{ij}: D_i \rightarrow D_j$ are definable. Identify $D(U)$ with the correct subset of $\prod_{i \in I} D_i(U)$.

- * There is a notion of a pro-definable map $F: D \rightarrow E$ for D and E pro-definable.
- * A pro-def. set is strict pro-definable if it may be given by a surjective system of D_i 's.
- * If D is pro-def, $D = \varprojlim D_i$, $X \in D$ is relatively definable if there is i and $X_i \in D_i$ s.t. $X = \pi_i^{-1}(X_i)$.

Thm: Let X be a \mathcal{C} -def set in ACVF. Then there is a strict pro-def. set (over \mathcal{C}) $D = \varprojlim D_i$ s.t. $\forall A \geq \mathcal{C}, D(A) = \widehat{X}(A)$ naturally.

Remark: Once established, we'll identify \widehat{X} with D .

PF: $X = \widehat{A}^\wedge$; For $d \geq 1$, let $E_d = L(W_d)$. $\pi_{d+1,d}: E_{d+1} \rightarrow E_d$.

Then $E = \varprojlim E_d$

$$D(U) = \{(\Lambda_d(p))_d \mid p \in \widehat{A}^\wedge(U)\}$$

"Same" objects as in the Berkovich construction (seminorms), but in a less naive way.

Need to show: $D_i := \pi_i(D)$

- (1) $D(U) = \varprojlim D_i$ } \Leftarrow compactness +
 - (2) D_i is type-definable } $p \in \hat{X}$ iff $p \perp \Gamma$
 - (3) D_i is a union of def. sets } $\Leftarrow p \in \hat{X}$ iff p is stably dominated
- (2) + (3) + compactness \Rightarrow result (D_i are definable)

General X : Take relatively definable subsets and glue.

Fact: IF $X \subseteq^{def} Y$, then $\hat{X} \subseteq \hat{Y}$ is relatively definable.

A subset $X \subseteq \varprojlim D_i$ is called iso-definable if it is isomorphic to a def. set.

Remark: $X(U) \subseteq \hat{X}(U)$ is relatively definable and iso-definable.

Question: Are all iso-def. sets relatively def.?

Answer: Usually, the contrary! The notions are somehow orthogonal.

Thm: IF C is an alg. curve, then \hat{C} is def.

PF: We may assume C is smooth and projective, $C \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$, $\text{genus}(C) = g$.

Riemann-Roch \Rightarrow {

- every $F \in K(C)^*$ is a product of functions with $\leq g+1$ poles.
- $\exists N \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. any $F \in K(C)^*$ with $\leq g+1$ poles is given by $(\frac{G}{H})|_C$, where $G, H \in K[x_0, \dots, x_n]_{\leq N}$.

Thus, enough to check on a definable family of rational functions.

Ex: $\hat{\mathbb{C}}^2$ is not definable.

Consider $P_n(x, y) = P_0(x) \cup \{y = x^n\}$. If $F(x, y)$ is of degree $< n$, then $\text{val}(F(p_n)) = \text{val}(F(p_{n+1}))$.

\Rightarrow The types $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are not separated by a def. family of polynomials.

Remark: IF $X \subseteq^{def} K^n$, then \hat{X} is def. iff $\dim_{\text{zar}}(X^{\text{zar}}) \leq 1$.

↙ in the case of a variety V

A def. topology on \hat{X} (on \hat{V}):

* \hat{A}^1 : The topology is generated by sets of the form $\{a \in \hat{A}^1 \mid \text{val}(F(a)) > \delta / < \delta\}$, where $F \in \mathcal{U}[X]$ and $\delta \in \Gamma_\infty(U)$.

Thus, we have countably many definable families of (relatively) def. basic open sets. Such a space is called a (pro-)def. space

Note: IF $K = \text{ACVF}$, $\hat{A}^1(K)$ together with the K -def. open sets is a top. space. BUT $\hat{A}^1(K) \subseteq \hat{A}^1(U)$ is not continuous.

→ Similar to the situation in minimality: The restriction of the order topology to a submodel might be discrete!

* On \hat{V} , define the topology on affine charts and glue the topologies to get a topology on \hat{V} .

* IF $X \subseteq^{\text{def}} V$, take the subspace topology on \hat{X} . Such an $\hat{X} \subseteq \hat{V}$ will be called semialgebraic.

Easy facts: (1) \hat{V} has a basis of open semialgebraic sets,

(2) $V(K) \hookrightarrow \hat{V}(K)$ gets the valuation topology.

(3) $V(K)$ is dense in $\hat{V}(K)$.

(4) $\hat{V}(U)$ is Hausdorff.

Ex: $V = \mathbb{A}^1$. A basis of definable open sets is given by sets of the form

$\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n F_i$, where Ω is an open ball and the F_i 's are closed subballs,



\hat{m} is open.
 $\text{cl}(\hat{m}) = \hat{m} \cup \{p_0\}$.

In particular, $\text{int}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}) = \bigcup_{x \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{x} + \hat{m} = \hat{\mathcal{O}} \setminus \{p_0\}$.



Example of an open non-semialgebraic set:

$\{p_B \in \hat{\mathbb{A}}^1 \mid \text{radius}(B) > \delta\}$, $\delta < \infty$.

Def: \hat{V} is the Hrushovski-Loeser space (the stable completion of V).

Def: Let g be a def. type on a (pro-)def. space (X, \mathcal{J}) . $a \in X(U)$ is a limit of g if $g(x) \vdash x \in \Omega$ for every def. open nbhd Ω of a .

Ex: $0^+ \in S_{\text{def}, \Gamma_\infty}$. Then $0 = \lim(0^+)$.

Prop: Let Z be a (pro-)def subset of \hat{V} . Then the closure of Z is given by limits of definable types:

- If Z is closed, ~~then~~ then any $q \in S_{\text{def}, Z}$ having a limit in \hat{V} has its limit in Z .
- $\forall a \in \text{cl}(Z) \exists q \in S_{\text{def}, Z}$ s.t. $\lim(q) = a$.

In the example, let $q \in S_{\text{def}, \hat{m}}$. $q(x)$ says: x is the generic type of $B_{\geq \varepsilon}(0)$, with $\varepsilon \neq 0^+$. $\lim(q) = \text{Po}$.

Example in the o-minimal setting (in Γ_∞):
 $Z = \{(x, y) \in [0, \infty]^2 \mid x > 0, y < \infty\}$. $\text{cl}(Z) = [0, \infty]^2$.

