

# DEFORMATIONS OF GALOIS REPRESENTATIONS

MISJA STEINMETZ

*A talk in the Derived Structures in the Langlands Program study group at UCL in Spring 2019. These are notes taken by Ashwin Iyengar (ashwin.iyengar@kcl.ac.uk), edited by Misja Steinmetz.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Why would one be interested in studying the deformation theory of Galois representations?

- (1) To understand the results in this study group.
- (2) They are used to prove Fermat’s Last Theorem and the Shimura-Taniyama conjecture.
- (3) They are used in proofs of the Sato-Tate conjecture.
- (4) They are used in proofs of Serre’s conjecture.

**1.1. Notation.** Let’s fix some notation. In this talk,  $K/\mathbf{Q}_p$  is a finite extension with ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}$ , uniformizer  $\varpi$ , and residue field  $k$  (for example, if  $K$  was unramified, then  $\mathcal{O} = W(k)$  is just the Witt vectors of  $k$ ). Let  $G$  be a profinite group, and fix a continuous  $n$ -dimensional representation  $\bar{\rho} : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(k)$ .

**1.2. Rough idea of what’s to come.** Roughly, we want to study lifts of  $\rho$  to local  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebras  $A$  with residue field  $k$ , that is,  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(A)$  such that  $\rho \bmod \mathfrak{m}_A \cong \bar{\rho}$ . Then the universal deformation ring  $R$  can be thought of as a parameter space for all lifts of  $\bar{\rho}$ .

For example, in nice cases (when the deformation problem is “unobstructed”), we will have  $R = \mathcal{O}[[x_1, \dots, x_r]]$ , and if we let  $\varphi : R \rightarrow A$  be an  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra homomorphism taking  $x_i \mapsto m_i$  for some chosen  $m_i \in \mathfrak{m}_A$ , then we get a composition of maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \xrightarrow{\text{universal map}} & \mathrm{GL}_n(R) \\ & \searrow \rho & \downarrow \varphi \\ & & \mathrm{GL}_n(A), \end{array}$$

and maybe we can think of  $m_1, \dots, m_r$  as the “coordinates” defining the lift  $\rho$ . The deformation ring  $R$  can then be thought of as a “parameter space” with “parameters”  $x_i$  and we can recover the lift  $\rho$  by specialising the parameters  $x_i \mapsto m_i$  to the “coordinates” of the lift.

Some references for this talk are Mazur’s original paper [2] and Böckle’s notes in [1].

## 2. DEFORMATIONS OF REPRESENTATIONS OF PROFINITE GROUPS

**2.1. Deformation Functors.** Let  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}}$  denote the category of local Artinian  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebras  $A$  together with a fixed isomorphism  $A/\mathfrak{m}_A \xrightarrow{\sim} k$ , whose morphisms are local homomorphisms respecting the isomorphism with  $k$ . Let  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{O}}$  denote the same category, replacing “local Artinian” with “complete local Noetherian”.

---

*Date:* January 16, 2019.

**Remark 2.1.1.** If  $A \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{O}}$ , then  $A = \varprojlim_n A/\mathfrak{m}_A^n$ , and each  $A/\mathfrak{m}_A^n \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}}$ , so we may think of  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{O}}$  as the “completion” of  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}}$  in some suitable sense.

**Definition 2.1.1.** The *deformation functor*  $D_{\bar{\rho}} : \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is defined as

$$D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}(A) = \{(\rho, M, \iota)\} / \sim,$$

where

- (1)  $M$  is a free  $A$ -module of rank  $n$ ,
- (2)  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_A(M)$  is a continuous representation
- (3)  $\iota$  is an isomorphism  $\iota : \rho \otimes_A k \cong \bar{\rho}$ ,

and two such triples are equivalent if they are isomorphic via some isomorphism respecting the reduction map  $\iota$ .

**Definition 2.1.2.** The *framed deformation functor*  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square} : \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is defined as

$$D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}(A) = \{(\rho, M, \iota, \beta)\} / \sim,$$

where  $\rho$  and  $M$  and  $\iota$  are as above, and  $\beta$  is a basis of  $M$  lifting the standard basis of  $k^n$  under  $\iota$ .

Equivalently, by picking coordinates, one can define  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}(A)$  to be the set of continuous representations  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(A)$  which reduce to  $\bar{\rho}$  under the map  $\mathrm{GL}_n(A) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(A/\mathfrak{m}_A) \cong \mathrm{GL}_n(k)$ , i.e.

$$D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}(A) := \{\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(A) \mid \rho \bmod \mathfrak{m}_A = \bar{\rho}\}.$$

Then

$$D_{\bar{\rho}}(A) = D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}(A) / (\text{conjugation by } \ker(\mathrm{GL}_n(A) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(k)))$$

**Remark 2.1.2.** Both  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}$  and  $D_{\bar{\rho}}$  are “continuous functors”, where a functor  $F : \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is continuous if

$$F(A) = \varprojlim_n F(A/\mathfrak{m}_A^n).$$

Therefore, we may compute the deformation functors on  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}}$ .

**2.2.  $p$ -finiteness.** We want to find representing objects for  $D_{\bar{\rho}}$  and  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}$  in  $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{O}}$ , but we can only do this if  $G$  is “not too big”. We make this precise now.

**Definition 2.2.1.** A profinite group  $G$  satisfies the *finiteness condition*  $\Phi_p$  if for all open subgroups  $H \leq G$ , the  $\mathbf{F}_p$ -vector space  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{cts}}(H, \mathbf{F}_p)$  is finite-dimensional, or, equivalently, if the maximal pro- $p$  quotient of  $H$  is topologically finitely generated.

We will mainly be concerned with the following two primary examples.

**Example 2.2.1.**

- (1) Fix a finite extension  $L/\mathbf{Q}_{\ell}$  (with possibly  $\ell = p$ ). Then open subgroups of  $G_L := \mathrm{Gal}(\bar{L}/L)$  are  $G_M$  for finite extensions  $M/L$ . But by local class field theory

$$\dim_{\mathbf{F}_p} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{cts}}(G_M, \mathbf{F}_p) = \dim_{\mathbf{F}_p} \mathrm{Hom}(M^{\times}/(M^{\times})^p, \mathbf{F}_p) < \infty,$$

so Galois groups of  $p$ -adic local fields satisfy  $\Phi_p$ .

- (2) If  $F$  is a number field and  $S$  is a finite set of places then let  $F_S \subset \bar{F}$  be the maximal extension of  $F$  unramified outside  $S$ . Similar arguments then show that  $G_{F,S} = \mathrm{Gal}(F_S/F)$  satisfies  $\Phi_p$ .

## 3. TANGENT SPACES AND REPRESENTABILITY

**3.1. Tangent Spaces.** We let  $k[\epsilon] = k[x]/(x^2)$  be the ring of dual numbers.

**Definition 3.1.1.** The tangent space to  $D_{\bar{\rho}}$  is

$$\mathfrak{t}_{D_{\bar{\rho}}} := D_{\bar{\rho}}(k[\epsilon]).$$

Similarly, the tangent space to  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}$  is

$$\mathfrak{t}_{D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}} := D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}(k[\epsilon]).$$

**Remark 3.1.1.** We have natural multiplication maps  $k[\epsilon] \xrightarrow{-a} k[\epsilon]$  for  $a \in k$  by sending  $x + y\epsilon \mapsto x + ay\epsilon$  and an addition map  $k[\epsilon] \times_k k[\epsilon] \rightarrow k[\epsilon]$ . Let  $D$  be either of the two functors considered above. Simply by functoriality we get maps  $D(k[\epsilon]) \xrightarrow{D(\cdot a)} D(k[\epsilon])$  and  $D(k[\epsilon] \times_k k[\epsilon]) \rightarrow D(k[\epsilon])$ . We always have a natural map  $D(k[\epsilon] \times_k k[\epsilon]) \xrightarrow{\sim} D(k[\epsilon]) \times_{D(k)} D(k[\epsilon])$  and it turns out this is a bijection. This allows us to define an appropriate addition map  $\mathfrak{t}_D \times \mathfrak{t}_D \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_D$  which gives  $\mathfrak{t}_D = D(k[\epsilon])$  a  $k$ -vector space structure.

Recall that we denote the adjoint representation  $\text{End}_k(\bar{\rho})$  (with  $G$  acting by conjugation) by  $\text{ad } \bar{\rho}$ .

**Lemma 3.1.1.**

- (1)  $D_{\bar{\rho}}(k[\epsilon]) \cong H^1(G, \text{ad } \bar{\rho})$ .
- (2) If  $G$  satisfies  $\Phi_p$ , then  $\dim_k D_{\bar{\rho}}(k[\epsilon]) < \infty$ .
- (3)  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}(k[\epsilon]) \cong Z^1(G, \text{ad } \bar{\rho})$ .

*Proof.* For (1), if  $V \in D_{\bar{\rho}}(k[\epsilon])$ , then  $V/\epsilon V \cong \bar{\rho}$  and  $\epsilon V \cong \bar{\rho}$ , so there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \bar{\rho} \rightarrow V \rightarrow \bar{\rho} \rightarrow 0,$$

so  $V$  defines a class in  $\text{Ext}^1(\bar{\rho}, \bar{\rho}) = H^1(G, \text{ad } \bar{\rho})$  and one can check that this gives the required isomorphism.

For (2), note  $H = \ker \bar{\rho}$ . Then by the inflation-restriction exact sequence, we get

$$0 \rightarrow H^1(G/H, \text{ad } \bar{\rho}) \rightarrow H^1(G, \text{ad } \bar{\rho}) \rightarrow H^1(H, \text{ad } \bar{\rho})^{G/H}$$

but  $H^1(G/H, \text{ad } \bar{\rho})$  is finite-dimensional (as both  $G/H$  and  $\text{ad } \bar{\rho}$  are), and

$$H^1(H, \text{ad } \bar{\rho})^{G/H} = (\text{Hom}(H, \mathbf{F}_p) \otimes \text{ad } \bar{\rho})^{G/H}$$

is finite-dimensional as well (by  $\Phi_p$ ) so in fact  $H^1(G, \text{ad } \bar{\rho})$  is finite-dimensional.

For (3), given some  $\rho \in D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}(k[\epsilon])$ , we can write

$$\rho(g) = \bar{\rho}(g) + \epsilon\phi(g)\bar{\rho}(g).$$

It turns out that  $\rho$  being a group homomorphism means that  $\phi(g) \in Z^1(G, \text{ad } \bar{\rho})$ , and this gives the required isomorphism.  $\square$

**3.2. Representability.** Question: when are the functors  $D_{\bar{\rho}}$  and  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^{\square}$  representable?

In general, let  $F : \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \text{Set}$  be a functor. We say that  $F$  is *representable* if there exists an  $R \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathcal{O}}$  such that we have isomorphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(R, A) \xrightarrow{\sim} F(A)$$

which are functorial in  $A \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}}$ . (In fancy language, we should possibly call this *pro-representable*, but I don't think there is a risk of confusion for the sake of this talk.)

Now suppose  $F$  is representable. Then it satisfies some conditions:

- (1)  $|F(k)| = |\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(R, k)| = 1$ .

(2)  $\dim_k \mathfrak{t}_F < \infty$

(3) If  $A \rightarrow C \leftarrow B$  are morphisms in  $\mathcal{C}_\theta$ , then the natural map

$$F(A \times_C B) \rightarrow F(A) \times_{F(C)} F(B)$$

is bijective.

**Fact 3.2.1.** *These conditions are also sufficient for  $F$  to be representable. In fact, we can give a necessary and sufficient refinement of (3) called Schlessinger's criterion.*

We can use this criterion to prove

**Proposition 3.2.1.** *Assume  $\text{End}_{k[G]}(\bar{\rho}) = k$  and  $G$  satisfies  $\Phi_p$ . Then  $D_{\bar{\rho}}$  is representable. Call the representing object  $R_{\bar{\rho}} \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_\theta$  the universal deformation ring.*

We will not prove this, but we will prove:

**Proposition 3.2.2.** *Assume  $G$  satisfies  $\Phi_p$ . Then  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^\square$  is representable. Call the representing object  $R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square$  the universal framed deformation ring.*

*Proof.* First, assume  $G$  is finite, and pick a presentation  $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_s \mid r_1(g_1, \dots, g_s), \dots, r_t(g_1, \dots, g_s) \rangle$  such that the relations do not contain inverses.

Define

$$R = \mathcal{O}[x_{i,j}^k : i, j = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, s] / I,$$

where each  $x_{i,j}^k$  is thought of as the  $(i, j)$ -th entry in a matrix  $X^k$ , and  $I$  is generated by the entries of the matrices

$$r_\ell((X^1), \dots, (X^s)) - I$$

for  $\ell = 1, \dots, t$ . Now let  $J = \ker(R \rightarrow k)$ , where the map  $R \rightarrow k$  is given by sending  $x_{i,j}^k$  to the  $(i, j)$ -th entry of  $\bar{\rho}(g_k)$ .

Then for the finite case, we have  $R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square = \varprojlim_m R/J^m$ , and we get a universal deformation  $\rho^\square : g_k \mapsto (X^k) \in \text{GL}_n(R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square)$ .

Then if  $G$  is profinite with  $G = \varprojlim_i G/H_i$ , then we define

$$R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square = \varprojlim_i R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square,$$

which will be a representing object of  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^\square$ . We need to prove it is Noetherian.

Let  $R := R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square$ . We have a natural isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D_{\bar{\rho}}^\square(k[\epsilon]) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}}(R, k[\epsilon]) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Hom}_k(\mathfrak{m}_R/(\mathfrak{m}_R^2, \varpi), k) \\ \Psi & & \Psi \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a+x \mapsto a+f(x)\epsilon \\ \text{for } a \in \mathcal{O} \text{ and } x \in \mathfrak{m}_R \end{array} \right\} & \longleftarrow & f. \end{array}$$

Then by  $\Phi_p$  we know that the tangent space and hence its dual  $\mathfrak{m}_R/(\mathfrak{m}_R^2, \varpi)$  is finite-dimensional. Then we can use a Nakayama-type argument and completeness to lift a basis of this space to a generating set of  $R$  (as an  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra) and therefore  $R$  is Noetherian.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.1.** We now have a universal lifting  $\rho^\square : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square)$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{\text{liftings } \rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(A)\} & \xleftarrow{\sim} & \{\mathcal{O}\text{-homs } R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square \xrightarrow{\varphi} A\} \\ \downarrow \Psi & & \downarrow \Psi \\ (G \xrightarrow{\rho^\square} \mathrm{GL}_n(R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathrm{GL}_n(A)) & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \varphi \end{array}$$

### 3.3. Presentations of Deformation Rings.

**Theorem 3.3.1.** *Let  $r = \dim_k Z^1(G, \mathrm{ad } \bar{\rho})$ . Then there exists an  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{O}[[x_1, \dots, x_r]]/(f_1, \dots, f_s) \cong R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square$$

where  $s \leq \dim_k H^2(G, \mathrm{ad } \bar{\rho})$ .

*Proof.* This is just a very rough outline. Since  $\dim_k \mathfrak{m}_R/(\mathfrak{m}_R^2, \varpi\mathcal{O}) = r < \infty$ , we can lift a basis to  $\mathfrak{m}_R$ , so that we get a surjection  $\varphi : \mathcal{O}[[x_1, \dots, x_r]] \twoheadrightarrow R_{\bar{\rho}}^\square$ . Then we can show that if  $J = \ker \varphi$ , then there is an injection

$$(J/(\varpi, x_1, \dots, x_r)J)^\vee \hookrightarrow H^2(G, \mathrm{ad } \bar{\rho}).$$

□

## 4. DEFORMATION CONDITIONS

We want to be able to impose extra conditions on our liftings (e.g. only consider crystalline lifts) without affecting representability. Towards this goal we make the following definition.

**Definition 4.0.1.** A *deformation condition* on (framed) deformations of  $\bar{\rho}$  to  $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}}$  is a property  $Q$  satisfying

- (1)  $\bar{\rho}$  satisfies  $Q$ ;
- (2) Given a deformation  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(A)$  and an  $\mathcal{O}$ -algebra hom.  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ , the representation  $\varphi \circ \rho$  also has property  $Q$ ;
- (3) If we have a fiber product

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \times_C B & \xrightarrow{\rho} & A \\ \downarrow q & & \downarrow \alpha \\ B & \xrightarrow{\beta} & C \end{array}$$

and a deformation  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(A \times_C B)$ , then  $\rho$  has property  $Q$  if and only if  $\rho \circ \beta$  and  $q \circ \rho$  have property  $Q$ .

**Definition 4.0.2.** Let  $Q$  be a deformation condition for  $\bar{\rho}$ . Define a functor  $D_{\bar{\rho}}^{(\square)} : \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  by setting

$$D_{\bar{\rho}, Q}^{(\square)}(A) := \{(\text{framed}) \text{ deformations of } \bar{\rho} \text{ to } A \text{ satisfying } Q\}.$$

Then by the properties above  $D_{\bar{\rho}, Q}^{(\square)} : \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$  is a subfunctor which is relatively representable.

**Example 4.0.1.** Let  $\chi : G \rightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times$  be a continuous character such that  $\chi \bmod \varpi = \det \bar{\rho}$ . Then we can define a universal framed deformation ring  $R_{\bar{\rho}, \chi}^\square$  whose lifts have fixed determinant  $\chi$ . If  $\mathrm{End}_k(\bar{\rho}) = k$ , we get a universal deformation ring  $R_{\bar{\rho}, \chi}$ .

**4.1.  $\mathbf{T}$ -framed deformations.** Let  $|S| < \infty$  be a finite set of places of a number field  $F$ , and let  $G_v \hookrightarrow G_{F,S}$  be the decomposition group at each  $v \in S$ , and suppose we have a framed deformation condition  $Q_v$  on the universal framed deformation functor for  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_v}$  – note that in this generality the unframed deformation function for  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_v}$  may not be representable. Now assume  $\text{End}_k(\bar{\rho}) = k$  so that  $D_{\bar{\rho}}$  is representable. Fix  $A \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{O}}$ .

**Definition 4.1.1.** If  $T \subset S$  is a subset, then a  $T$ -framed deformation of  $\bar{\rho}$  of type  $(S, \{Q_v\}, \chi)$  is an equivalence class in the set of pairs  $(\rho, \{\alpha_v\}_{v \in T})$  such that

- (1)  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(A)$  is a lift such that  $\det \rho = \chi$  and  $\rho|_{G_v} \in Q_v$  for all  $v \in S$
- (2)  $\alpha_v \in \ker(\text{GL}_n(A) \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(k))$

where the equivalence relation is given by  $(\rho, \{\alpha_v\}_{v \in T}) \sim (\beta\rho\beta^{-1}, \{\beta\alpha_v\}_{v \in T})$ .

In fact, this is representable, and gives us a way to look at deformations of a residual satisfying conditions at some places, which reduces the size of the universal deformation ring of  $\bar{\rho} : G_{F,S} \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(k)$ . This will be important for the patching arguments, where we will need  $R$  to be small enough so that it is actually isomorphic to a properly defined Hecke algebra  $\mathbf{T}$ .

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Gebhard Böckle. Deformations of Galois representations. In *Elliptic curves, Hilbert modular forms and Galois deformations*, Adv. Courses Math. CRM Barcelona, pages 21–115. Birkhäuser/Springer, Basel, 2013.
- [2] B. Mazur. Deforming Galois representations. In *Galois groups over  $\mathbf{Q}$  (Berkeley, CA, 1987)*, volume 16 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 385–437. Springer, New York, 1989.