Model theory (analytic part)

Mário Edmundo U. Aberta & CMAF/UL

Days in Logic 2014

• A bit of o-minimality

- A bit of o-minimality
- A bit of o-minimality and Gronthendieck

- A bit of o-minimality
- A bit of o-minimality and Gronthendieck
- A bit of o-minimality and André-Oort.

A bit of o-minimality and Andre-Oort

A bit of o-minimality and Andre-Oort

...

Theorem (Manin-Mumford conjecture)

. . .

Let *A* be an abelian variety and *X* an algebraic sub variety of *A*, both defined over a number field. Suppose that *X* does no contain any translate of an abelian sub variety of *A* of dimension > 0. Then *X* contains only finitely many torsion points of *A*.

Theorem (Manin-Mumford conjecture)

. . .

Let *A* be an abelian variety and *X* an algebraic sub variety of *A*, both defined over a number field. Suppose that *X* does no contain any translate of an abelian sub variety of *A* of dimension > 0. Then *X* contains only finitely many torsion points of *A*.

Proved by Raynaud (1983), later other proofs all using methods from arithmetic geometry...

Theorem (Manin-Mumford conjecture)

. . .

Let *A* be an abelian variety and *X* an algebraic sub variety of *A*, both defined over a number field. Suppose that *X* does no contain any translate of an abelian sub variety of *A* of dimension > 0. Then *X* contains only finitely many torsion points of *A*.

Proved by Raynaud (1983), later other proofs all using methods from arithmetic geometry...

Pila and Zanier (2008) give a new proof using o-minimality which they generalize to other cases of André-Oort type conjectures...

Special case of abelian variety *A* are the <u>elliptic curves</u>, given by equations of the form:

$$y = x^3 + ax + b$$

with $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$ (see picture....)

Special case of abelian variety *A* are the <u>elliptic curves</u>, given by equations of the form:

$$y = x^3 + ax + b$$

with $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$ (see picture....)

They:

- have a group operation (A, ⊕) also given (on charts) by rational functions ^{P(x)}/_{Q(x)} where P(x), Q(x) are polynomials with coefficients in some number field (i.e. finite extension of Q).
- are complete (like "compact")

- an abelian sub variety is another abelian variety *B* which is a subgroup.
- an *T*-torsion point is a point $x \in A$ such that $\underbrace{x \oplus \ldots \oplus x}_{\text{T times}} = e$ (the identity).
- a translate is something of the form $x \oplus B$.
- an algebraic variety is something defined on charts by

$$\{\overline{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n : P_1(\overline{x}) = \ldots = P_k(\overline{x}) = 0\}$$

where $P_i(\overline{x})$ are polynomials with coefficients in some number field (i.e. finite extension of \mathbb{Q}).

.... ingredients from arithmetic geometry

Theorem (Masser (1984))

Suppose A is defined over a number field K. If x is a T-torsion point of A, then

$$[K(x):\mathbb{Q}]\geq c_2(A)T^{\rho}$$

for $c_2(A) > 0$ and $\rho > 0$ which depend only on dim A. In particular,

conjugates of x is
$$\geq c_3(A)T^{\rho}$$
.

.... ingredients from o-minimality

.... ingredients from o-minimality

Let

$$\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{R}, 0, 1, -, +, \cdot, (f)_{f \in \mathcal{F}}, (R)_{R \in \mathcal{R}}, <)$$

be an o-minimal structure over the field of real numbers.

.... ingredients from o-minimality

Let

$$\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{R}, 0, 1, -, +, \cdot, (f)_{f \in \mathcal{F}}, (R)_{R \in \mathcal{R}}, <)$$

be an o-minimal structure over the field of real numbers.

If Z is definable, let

 Z^{alg}

be the union of all definably connected, semi-algebraic subsets of Z of positive dimension.

.... ingredients from o-minimality

Let

$$\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{R}, 0, 1, -, +, \cdot, (f)_{f \in \mathcal{F}}, (R)_{R \in \mathcal{R}}, <)$$

be an o-minimal structure over the field of real numbers.

If Z is definable, let

 Z^{alg}

be the union of all definably connected, semi-algebraic subsets of Z of positive dimension.

If $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a set, let

 $N(W, T) = \#\{\overline{q} \in W \cap \mathbb{Q}^n : \text{ denominators of } \overline{q} \text{ divide } T\}$

Theorem (Pila and Wilkie (2006)) Let *Z* be a definable set. For every $\epsilon > 0$ we have

....

$$N(Z \setminus Z^{\mathrm{alg}}, T) \leq c_1(Z, \epsilon) T^{\epsilon}.$$

Theorem (Pila and Wilkie (2006))

....

Let Z be a definable set. For every $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$N(Z \setminus Z^{\mathrm{alg}}, T) \leq c_1(Z, \epsilon) T^{\epsilon}.$$

This follows from a parametrization (after Gromov) result for definable sets and functions in o-minimal expansions of real closed field... this is like a <u>dual</u> of C^r -Cell decomposition theorem.

.... the new proof of Manin-Mumford:

.... the new proof of Manin-Mumford:

There is a complex analytic uniformization

$$0 o \Lambda o \mathbb{C}^g o A o 0$$

periodic with period lattice Λ , where $g = \dim A$.

.... the new proof of Manin-Mumford:

There is a complex analytic uniformization

 $0 \to \Lambda \to \mathbb{C}^g \to \textbf{A} \to 0$

periodic with period lattice Λ , where $g = \dim A$.

- \mathbb{C}^g/Λ is a complex abelian Lie group, so a torus.
- sub-torus of C^g/∧ corresponde to abelian sub-varieties of A (by Chow's theorem).

....

. . . .

Fix a \mathbb{Z} -basis $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{2g}$ of Λ and use it to identify \mathbb{C}^g with \mathbb{R}^{2g} .

. . . .

Fix a \mathbb{Z} -basis $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{2g}$ of Λ and use it to identify \mathbb{C}^g with \mathbb{R}^{2g} .

T-torsions of *A* correspond to *q* ∈ Q^{2g} with denominators dividing *T*.

Theorem (Peterzil-Starchenko)

There is a fundamental domain $H \subseteq \mathbb{C}^g$ such that the restriction of the uniformization $\mathbb{C}^g \to A$ is definable in

$$\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{\mathrm{an}} = (\mathbb{R}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, -, +, \cdot, (f)_{f \in an}, <).$$

• a subvariety X of A corresponds to a definable set $Z \subseteq H$.

....

Lemma

If *X* a sub variety of *A* does not contain a translate of an abelian sub variety of *A* of positive dimension, then $Z^{alg} = \emptyset$.

...this is where an actual proof is needed in the paper... it uses also finiteness properties of o-minimal structuctures.

Lemma

. . . .

If *X* a sub variety of *A* does not contain a translate of an abelian sub variety of *A* of positive dimension, then $Z^{alg} = \emptyset$.

...this is where an actual proof is needed in the paper... it uses also finiteness properties of o-minimal structuctures.

Conclusion of proof:

- by Masser $c_3(A)T^{\rho} \leq N(Z,T)$.
- by Pila-Wilkie with $\epsilon = \frac{\rho}{2}$ we get

$$c_3(A)T^{
ho} \leq N(Z,T) \leq c_1(A,
ho)T^{rac{
ho}{2}}$$

• #*T*-torsions in *X* is bounded as $T \to +\infty$, so is finite

...

Conjecture (André-Ort type conjectures)

...

Let *A* be an algebraic variety of suitable type and *X* an algebraic sub variety of *A*, both defined over a number field. Suppose that *X* does no contain any special sub variety of *A* of dimension > 0. Then *X* contains only finitely many special points of *A*.

...

...

Proved by Klingler, Ullmo and Yafaev (2007), under GRH.

...

Proved by Klingler, Ullmo and Yafaev (2007), under GRH.

Pila extends the new proof of Manin-Mumford to other special cases which were unknown unconditionally.

... in one of these other special cases:

... in one of these other special cases:

- A = C² parametrizing pairs of elliptic curves, up to isomorphism, by their *j*-invariant.
- (j, j') ∈ A = C² is special, if j, j' are both j-invariants of CM elliptic curves.
- the special sub varieties of positive dimension are:
 - $\{z, z_2\} \in \mathbb{C}^2 : z \text{ is a CM } j\text{-invariant}\}$
 - $\{z_1, z\} \in \mathbb{C}^2 : z \text{ is a CM } j\text{-invariant}\}$
 - modular curves defined by $F_N(z, z') = 0$ where for each N, F_N is such that $F_N(j(\tau), j(N\tau)) = 0$ for all $\tau \in \mathcal{H}$.
 - C².

...the proof is similar with the following replacements:

...the proof is similar with the following replacements:

- lower bound on *T*-torsion by lower bounds on discriminates of CM fields;
- uniformization by action of Λ on C^g by uniformization by action of SL₂(Z) on upper half plane H;
- $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{an}$ by $\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{an,exp}$.
- upper bound of N(Z, T) by upper bound of $N_k(Z, T)$

.....

THANK YOU!