arXiv:1909.00039v4 [math.NT] 11 Dec 2021

THE ARITHMETIC BASILICA: A QUADRATIC PCF ARBOREAL GALOIS GROUP

FASEEH AHMAD, ROBERT L. BENEDETTO, JENNIFER CAIN, GREGORY CARROLL, AND LILY FANG

ABSTRACT. The arboreal Galois group of a polynomial f over a field K encodes the action of Galois on the iterated preimages of a root point $x_0 \in K$, analogous to the action of Galois on the ℓ-power torsion of an abelian variety. We compute the arboreal Galois group of the postcritically finite polynomial $f(z) = z^2 - 1$ when the field K and root point x_0 satisfy a simple condition. We call the resulting group the *arithmetic basilica group* because of its relation to the basilica group associated with the complex dynamics of f. For $K = \mathbb{Q}$, our condition holds for infinitely many choices of x_0.

Let K be a field with algebraic closure $\overline{K}$, let $x_0 \in K$, and let $f \in K[z]$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$. For each $n \geq 0$, let f^n denote the n-th iterate $f \circ \cdots \circ f$ of f under composition, with $f^0(z) = z$ and $f^1(z) = f(z)$. The *backward orbit* of x_0 under f is

$$\mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0) := \coprod_{n \geq 0} f^{-n}(x_0) \subseteq \overline{K},$$

where $f^{-n}(y)$ is the set of roots of the equation $f^n(z) = y$ in $\overline{K}$.

If $f^n(z) - x_0$ is a separable polynomial, then $f^{-n}(x_0)$ has exactly d^n elements, and the field $K_n := K(f^{-n}(x_0)) \subseteq \overline{K}$ is a Galois extension of K, with Galois group

$$G_n := \mathrm{Gal}(K_n/K).$$

If $f^n(z) - x_0$ is separable for all $n \geq 0$, then we also define

$$G_\infty := \mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty/K), \quad \text{where} \quad K_\infty := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} K_n.$$

The backward orbit $\mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ has the structure of an infinite d-ary rooted tree $T_{d,\infty}$, formed by connecting each $y \in f^{-(n+1)}(x_0)$ to $f(y) \in f^{-n}(x_0)$ via an edge. Thus, G_∞ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_{d,\infty})$, and G_n is isomorphic to a subgroup of the automorphism group $\mathrm{Aut}(T_{d,n})$, where $T_{d,n}$ is the subtree of just the bottom n levels of $T_{d,\infty}$. The resulting action of Galois on the tree is analogous to the action of Galois on the ℓ-power torsion of an abelian variety A, since the ℓ-power torsion is precisely the backward orbit of the identity point O under the morphism $[\ell] : A \to A$.

Odoni introduced the study of such Galois groups in 1985 in [24], and Boston and Jones in 2007 called them "arboreal" in [6], since they act on trees. These groups have attracted increasing attention over the years; see [1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 28, 29] for a (very limited) selection. See also [16] for a survey of the field. Many examples have been found where G_∞ is the full group $\mathrm{Aut}(T_{d,\infty})$, as in [5, 18, 21, 22, 24, 27, 28]. More generally, the expectation has emerged that when K is a global field, G_∞ should usually

Date: January 7, 2020; revised September 14, 2021.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37P05, 11R32, 14G25.

have finite index in $\mathrm{Aut}(T_{d,\infty})$; see [16, Conjecture 3.11] for a precise conjecture when $d = 2$, and [7, 12, 19] for conditional results for $d = 2, 3$. By analogy, Serre's Open Image Theorem [26] states that for a non-CM elliptic curve over a number field, the action of Galois on the ℓ-power torsion has finite index in the appropriate automorphism group $GL(2, \mathbb{Z}_\ell)$.

However, just as Serre's Theorem excludes the special case of CM elliptic curves, there are special situations where G_∞ necessarily has infinite index in $\mathrm{Aut}(T_{d,\infty})$. One such case is that the map f is *postcritically finite*, or PCF, meaning that for every ramification point c of f, the forward orbit $\{f^n(c)|n \geq 0\}$ is finite; equivalently, every critical point of f is preperiodic. (See, for example, [16, Theorem 3.1].)

For any given PCF map, one may ask whether there is an associated subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_{d,\infty})$ that always contains, and in some cases equals, the arboreal Galois group G_∞. In [4], this question was answered in the affirmative for the PCF cubic polynomial $-2z^3 + 3z^2$, including an explicit computation of the subgroup $E_\infty \subsetneq \mathrm{Aut}(T_{3,\infty})$ and a simple sufficient condition on K and x_0 for G_∞ to be all of E_∞. In the present paper, we do the same for the PCF quadratic polynomial $f(z) := z^2 - 1$.

Let T_∞ and T_n denote the binary rooted trees $T_{2,\infty}$ and $T_{2,n}$, respectively. The two critical points $0, \infty$ of f are both periodic, with $\infty \mapsto \infty$ and $0 \mapsto -1 \mapsto 0$. Over the function field $K = \mathbb{C}(t)$ with $x_0 = t$, a setting in which arboreal Galois groups are often known as *profinite iterated monodromy groups*, G_∞ is isomorphic to the closure $\overline{B}_\infty$ of a well-understood subgroup B_∞ of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ called the *basilica group*. (See [23, Section 6.12.1], as well as [3, Section 5], especially Theorem 5.8 and following.) Here and throughout this paper, when we say that two groups that act on a tree are isomorphic, we mean not only that they are isomorphic as abstract groups, but also that the isomorphism is equivariant with respect to the action on the tree.

In [25, Theorem 2.5.6], Pink showed for *any* algebraically closed field $\overline{k}$ not of characteristic 2, then with $K = \overline{k}(t)$ and $x_0 = t$, the arboreal Galois group G_∞ is isomorphic to $\overline{B}_\infty$. Pink also showed that for function fields $K = k(t)$ where k is *not* algebraically closed, the arboreal Galois group G_∞ is an extension of $\overline{B}_\infty$ by a subgroup of the 2-adic multiplicative group $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$, via the 2-adic cyclotomic character $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{k}/k) \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$, which factors through G_∞. (See [25, Theorem 2.8.4].) We define and discuss $\overline{B}_\infty$ in Section 4.

However, our interest in this paper extends to the case that the field K is a number field, which is not directly covered by Pink's work [25]. More precisely, by choosing the coefficient field k in [25] to be a number field, and specializing the parameter t in $K = k(t)$ to some $x_0 \in k$, the resulting arboreal Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(k_\infty/k)$ is a decomposition subgroup of the generic Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$. Since our aims are to determine when that subgroup is the full group, and to present a new description of that group, we pursue a different strategy, as follows.

We give an explicit definition of a subgroup $M_\infty \subseteq \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ that we call the *arithmetic basilica group* and which is an extension of $\overline{B}_\infty$ by $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$. We do so by defining a quantity $P(\sigma, x) \in \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ for each $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ and each node x of the tree T_∞; see Section 2. Then, in Section 3, we define M_∞ to be the set of such σ for which $P(\sigma, x)$ has that same value for each node x. In the remaining sections, we prove that M_∞ is the desired group. Here is a formal statement summarizing our main results; as noted above, the group isomorphisms here are assumed to be equivariant with respect to the action on the associated trees. More precisely, when we say that G_∞ is isomorphic to a given

subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$, we mean T_∞ can be mapped onto the tree of preimages of x_0 so as to yield this equivariance.

Main Theorem. *Let K be a field of characteristic different from 2, and let $x_0 \in K$ with $x_0 \neq 0, -1$. Let G_∞ be the arboreal Galois group for $f(z) = z^2 - 1$ over K, rooted at x_0. Then:*

(1) *G_∞ is isomorphic to a subgroup of the arithmetic basilica group M_∞.*
(2) *The following are equivalent:*
   (a) $G_\infty \cong M_\infty$.
   (b) $G_5 \cong M_5$.
   (c) $[K(\sqrt{-x_0}, \sqrt{1+x_0}, \zeta_8) : K] = 16$.

Here, M_n denotes the quotient of M_∞ formed by restricting to its action on the subtree T_n, and ζ_8 denotes a primitive eighth root of unity.

The above theorem shows that, like the map $z \mapsto -2z^3 + 3z^2$ of [4], the PCF map $f(z) = z^2 - 1$ has an associated subgroup $M_\infty \subsetneq \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ that always contains and sometimes equals the arboreal Galois group G_∞. Condition (2b) shows that this equality is attained for the entire tree if it is already attained at the fifth level, and condition (2c) is very easy to check in practice.

We note that if $[K(\zeta_8) : K] = 4$, then by Hilbert's irreducibility theorem, there are many choices of $x_0 \in K$ for which $[K(\sqrt{-x_0}, \sqrt{1+x_0}, \zeta_8) : K] = 16$, since the set of $x_0 \in K$ failing this condition is a thin set, in the sense of Serre. For example, if $K = \mathbb{Q}$, then the condition holds for

$$x_0 \text{ or } -1 - x_0 \text{ in } \{5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 \ldots\}$$

among (infinitely) many other examples.

On the other hand, even when $[K(\sqrt{-x_0}, \sqrt{1+x_0}, \zeta_8) : K] < 16$, our computations suggest the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1. *Let K be a number field. Then for all but finitely many choices of $x_0 \in K$, the associated arboreal Galois group G_∞ for $f(z) = z^2 - 1$ has finite index in M_∞.*

We must allow for finitely many exceptional x_0 in Conjecture 1; for example, it is not hard to see that $[M_\infty : G_\infty] = \infty$ if x_0 is periodic. More generally, in light of our main theorem and the results of [4], as well as [17, Conjecture 1.1] and [8, Theorem 1.1], we propose the following broader conjecture.

Conjecture 2. *Let k be a number field, and let $\phi(z) \in k(z)$ be a rational function of degree $d \geq 2$, defined over k. Let L be the function field $L := k(t)$, and let $G(\phi, k)$ be the arboreal Galois group of ϕ over L with root point t; that is,*

$$G(\phi, k) := \mathrm{Gal}(L_\infty / L), \quad \textit{where} \quad L_\infty := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} L\big(\phi^{-n}(t)\big).$$

Then for any finite extension K/k and any $x_0 \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, the associated arboreal Galois group $G_\infty := \mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty / K)$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $G(\phi, k)$. Moreover, with $K = k$, it is possible to choose x_0 so that G_∞ is the full group $G(\phi, k)$.

The first conclusion of Conjecture 2 is an immediate consequence of the fact that when we specialize to $t = x_0$, the resulting Galois group G_∞ is the associated decomposition




FIGURE 1. Lemma 1.1: $(\alpha_1\alpha_2)^2 = -y$

subgroup of $G(\phi, k)$. Thus, the main content of Conjecture 2 is the second conclusion: that we can choose x_0 so that the inclusion of G_∞ in $G(\phi, k)$ is an (equivariant) isomorphism.

In the notation of Conjecture 2, one can also ask for sufficient conditions that G_∞ has finite index in $G(\phi, k)$. Besides periodic x_0, we also have $[G(\phi, k) : G_\infty] = \infty$ if some $\mathrm{Orb}_\phi^-(x_0)$ contains a critical point of ϕ; if ϕ is not PCF, then this can happen for an infinite (but thin) set of $x_0 \in K$. Another example arises for $\phi(z) = z^2$: for $x_0 = -1$, we have $K_\infty = L$, where $L = K(\zeta_{2^\infty})$, but for $x_0 = 3$, we have $K_\infty = L(3^{1/2^\infty})$, which is an infinite extension of L.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 1, we we discuss labelings of a binary tree and explicitly construct 2-power roots of unity in K_∞. Motivated by this construction, in Section 2 we define the quantity $P(\sigma, x) \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ that we mentioned just before our Main Theorem above, and in Section 3, we use P to define our arithmetic basilica group M_∞. In Section 4, we recall the definition and properties of the closed basilica group $\overline{B}_\infty$, and we study the finite groups M_n and B_n formed by restricting M_∞ and $\overline{B}_\infty$ to the finite subtree T_n. We also prove Theorems 4.5 and 4.6, that $P : M_\infty \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ is surjective, with kernel $\overline{B}_\infty$. Finally, Section 5 is devoted to the proof of statement (2) of our Main Theorem and related results.

1. Realizing roots of unity

In this section, we explicitly construct 2-power roots of unity from iterated preimages of $f(z) = z^2 - 1$. First, we set the following notation.

K:	a field of characteristic different from 2, with algebraic closure $\overline{K}$
f:	the polynomial $f(z) = z^2 - 1$
x_0:	an element of K, to serve as the root of our preimage tree
T_n:	a binary rooted tree, extending n levels above its root node
T_∞:	a binary rooted tree, extending infinitely above its root node
K_n:	for each $n \geq 0$, the extension field $K_n := K(f^{-n}(x_0))$
K_∞:	the union $K_\infty = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} K_n$ in $\overline{K}$
G_n:	the Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(K_n/K_0)$
G_∞:	the Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty/K_0)$

We will often abuse notation and write x_0 for both a chosen point in $K = K_0$, and for the root point of the abstract tree T_n or T_∞. The 2^m nodes at the m-th level of the abstract tree then correspond to the points of $f^{-m}(x_0)$ (repeated with appropriate multiplicity if x_0 is in the critical orbit), with a particular node w lying directly above another node y if and only if $f(w) = y$.




FIGURE 2. Lemma 1.2 for $m = 2$.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $y \in \overline{K}$, and let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in f^{-2}(y)$ with $f(\alpha_2) = -f(\alpha_1)$. Then*

$$(\alpha_1\alpha_2)^2 = -y.$$

Proof. Write $u = f(\alpha_1)$. Then $\alpha_1^2 = u + 1$ and $\alpha_2^2 = -u + 1$. See Figure 1, showing the tree T_2 rising above y, which has preimages u and $-u$, which in turn have preimages $\pm\alpha_1$ and $\pm\alpha_2$, respectively. Thus,

$$(\alpha_1\alpha_2)^2 = (u+1)(-u+1) = -(u^2-1) = -f(u) = -y. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 1.2. *Let $m \geq 0$, and let $y \in \overline{K}$ with $y \neq 0, -1$. Let $\alpha_{0,1} \in f^{-1}(y)$, and define $\beta_{0,1} := -\alpha_{0,1}$. For each $i = 1, \ldots, m$, choose points $\{\alpha_{i,j}, \beta_{i,j} : 1 \leq j \leq 2^i\} \subseteq f^{-(2i+1)}(y)$ so that*

$$f^{-2}\big(\alpha_{i-1,\ell}\big) = \{\pm\alpha_{i,2\ell-1}, \pm\alpha_{i,2\ell}\} \quad \textit{and} \quad f^{-2}\big(\beta_{i-1,\ell}\big) = \{\pm\beta_{i,2\ell-1}, \pm\beta_{i,2\ell}\}$$

for each $\ell = 1, \ldots, 2^{i-1}$, as in Figure 2. Define

$$\gamma_m := \prod_{j=1}^{2^m} \alpha_{m,j} \quad \textit{and} \quad \delta_m := \prod_{j=1}^{2^m} \beta_{m,j}.$$

Then $(-\gamma_m)^{2^m} = \beta_{0,1}$ and $(-\delta_m)^{2^m} = \alpha_{0,1}$. Moreover, γ_m/δ_m is a primitive 2^{m+1}-th root of unity.

Proof. The conclusion is trivially true for $m = 0$. Proceeding inductively, consider $m \geq 1$, and assume it holds for $m - 1$. For each $\ell = 1, \ldots, 2^{m-1}$, we have

$$\big(\alpha_{m,2\ell-1}\alpha_{m,2\ell}\big)^2 = -\alpha_{m-1,\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad \big(\beta_{m,2\ell-1}\beta_{m,2\ell}\big)^2 = -\beta_{m-1,\ell}$$

by Lemma 1.1. It follows immediately that

$$(-\gamma_m)^2 = \begin{cases} \gamma_{m-1} & \text{if } m \geq 2, \\ -\gamma_{m-1} & \text{if } m = 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad (-\delta_m)^2 = \begin{cases} \delta_{m-1} & \text{if } m \geq 2, \\ -\delta_{m-1} & \text{if } m = 1. \end{cases}$$

Raising each to the power 2^{m-1}, which is 1 if $m = 1$ and even for $m \geq 2$, we have

$$(-\gamma_m)^{2^m} = (-\gamma_{m-1})^{2^{m-1}} = \beta_{0,1} \quad \text{and} \quad (-\delta_m)^{2^m} = (-\delta_{m-1})^{2^{m-1}} = \alpha_{0,1},$$

as desired. The final statement is immediate from the fact that $\alpha_{0,1} \neq 0$ (since $y \neq -1$), and hence $\beta_{0,1}/\alpha_{0,1} = -1$. $\square$




FIGURE 3. A labeling of T_3

In light of the careful selection of points in Lemma 1.2, i.e., the highlighted nodes in Figure 2, we will need a precise system for labeling the nodes of a binary tree, as follows.

Definition 1.3. A *labeling* of T_∞ is a choice of two tree morphisms $a, b : T_\infty \to T_\infty$ such that a maps T_∞ bijectively onto the subtree rooted at one of the two nodes connected to the root node x_0, and b maps T_∞ bijectively onto the subtree rooted at the other.

For any integer $n \geq 1$, a labeling of T_n is a choice of two injective tree morphisms $a, b : T_{n-1} \to T_n$ with the same property.

To see why the choice of maps a, b in Definition 1.3 should be considered a "labeling" of each node of the tree, consider a node y at the m-th level of T_∞. By our choice of the maps a, b, there is a unique ordered m-tuple $(s_1, \ldots, s_m) \in \{a, b\}^m$ such that $y = s_1 \circ \cdots \circ s_m(x_0)$. Thus, it makes sense to label the node y with the m-tuple $(s_1, \ldots, s_m)$. The node directly underneath y then has label $(s_1, \ldots, s_{m-1})$. We will usually dispense with the punctuation and write $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_m$ instead of $(s_1, \ldots, s_m)$. We will also frequently abuse notation and refer to a node y and its label in $\{a, b\}^m$ interchangeably.

Note that the order we have written the m-tuple $(s_1, \ldots, s_m)$ is also the order we trace up the tree when following the path from x_0 to y. That is, s_1 tells us whether to go left (a) or right (b) to get from the root node to level 1; s_2 tells us whether to go left or right from there to level 2; and so on until we arrive at y. See Figure 3.

By Lemma 1.2, the field K_∞ formed by adjoining all preimages $f^{-n}(x_0)$ to K_0 contains all 2-power roots of unity. Our next result shows that we can choose a labeling to make this statement more precise.

Lemma 1.4. *Let $x_0 \in K$ with $x_0 \neq 0, -1$. Choose a sequence $\{\zeta_2, \zeta_4, \zeta_8, \ldots\}$ of primitive 2-power roots of unity in $\overline{K}$, in such a way that $(\zeta_{2^m})^2 = \zeta_{2^{m-1}}$ for each $m \geq 1$. It is possible to label the tree T_∞ of preimages $\mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ in such a way that for every node y of the tree and for every $i \geq 0$, we have*

$$\left(\prod_{s_1,\ldots,s_i \in \{a,b\}} [y a s_1 a s_2 \cdots a s_i a] \right) \left(\prod_{s_1,\ldots,s_i \in \{a,b\}} [y b s_1 a s_2 \cdots a s_i a] \right)^{-1} = \zeta_{2^{i+1}}, \tag{1}$$

where $[w]$ denotes the element of $\overline{K}$ that appears in the tree as a node with label w.

Lemma 1.4 says that it is always possible to choose a labeling of the tree of preimages $\mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ so that for the nodes $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\beta_{i,j}$ highlighted as in Figure 2, we have

$$\frac{\alpha_{1,1}\alpha_{1,2}}{\beta_{1,1}\beta_{1,2}} = \zeta_4, \quad \frac{\alpha_{2,1}\alpha_{2,2}\alpha_{2,3}\alpha_{2,4}}{\beta_{2,1}\beta_{2,2}\beta_{2,3}\beta_{2,4}} = \zeta_8, \quad \text{and so on.}$$

In fact, it says that we can label the tree so that these relationships hold simultaneously for every subtree of the full tree. By contrast, Lemma 1.2 says that after applying an arbitrary automorphism τ of T_∞, which is roughly equivalent to choosing an arbitrary labeling of the tree, any such product of elements of $f^{-(2m+1)}(y)$ is *some* primitive 2^{m+1}-root of unity, albeit not necessarily the particular root $\zeta_{2^{m+1}}$. Finding precisely which power of $\zeta_{2^{m+1}}$ would then be given by the resulting variant of expression (1) would be a finite but presumably stringy computation. Thus, our strategy in later sections will be to use Lemma 1.4 to fix a labeling of the tree once and for all.

Proof of Lemma 1.4. The assumption that $x_0 \neq 0, -1$ implies that no node $y \in \mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ is 0 or -1. We will label the tree of preimages inductively, starting from the root point x_0 and working our way up. To begin, label the two preimages of x_0 arbitrarily as a and b. Similarly, arbitrarily label the two preimages of a as aa and ab, and the two preimages of b as ba and bb. Thus, we have a labeling on the copy of T_2 rooted at x_0. For each of the nodes $y \in \{x_0, a, b\}$, we have $(ya)/(yb) = -1 = \zeta_2$. Thus, the desired identity (1) holds at every node of T_1 for $i = 0$.

For each successive $n \geq 3$, suppose that we have labeled T_{n-1} in such a way that for every node y at every level $0 \leq \ell \leq n-2$ of T_{n-1}, and for every $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor (n-\ell-2)/2 \rfloor$, the identity of equation (1) holds. For each node x at level $n-1$, label the two points of $f^{-1}(x)$ arbitrarily as xa and xb. We will now adjust these labels that we have just applied at the n-th level of the tree.

If $n = 2m+1$ is odd, consider the product on the left side of equation (1) for $y = x_0$, with $i = m$; or if $n = 2m+2$ is even, consider this product for each of $y = a$ and $y = b$, with $i = m$. As in the proof of Lemma 1.2, it is immediate from Lemma 1.1 that the square of this product is precisely the corresponding quantity for y with $i = m-1$. (When $m = 1$, each half has a negative sign, but the negatives cancel in that case.) By our successful labeling of T_{n-1}, this square is ζ_{2^m}. Thus, the original product is $\pm\zeta_{2^{m+1}}$. If it is $-\zeta_{2^{m+1}}$, exchange the labels of the two level-n nodes $ybaa\cdots aa$ and $ybaa\cdots ab$; otherwise, make no label changes for now. Since these two points in $f^{-n}(x_0)$ are negatives of each other, equation (1) now holds for y with $i = m$.

Next, consider the product on the left side of equation (1) with $i = m-1$ for each node y at level 2 of the tree (if $n = 2m+1$ is odd) or at level 3 (if $n = 2m+2$ is even). By Lemma 1.1 and our labeling of T_{n-1} again, the square of this product is $\zeta_{2^{m-1}}$, and hence the product itself is $\pm\zeta_{2^m}$. If it is $-\zeta_{2^m}$, exchange the labels of the two level-n nodes $ybaa\cdots aa$ and $ybaa\cdots ab$; otherwise, make no label changes for now. Since these two points in $f^{-n}(x_0)$ are negatives of each other, equation (1) now holds for y with $i = m-1$. In addition, because both of these nodes have labels beginning $yb\cdots$, they did not show up in the product of equation (1) for nodes strictly lower on the tree than y, so we have not disrupted our previous arrangements.

Continue in this fashion, considering nodes at successive even levels ℓ of the tree (if n is odd) or odd levels ℓ of the tree (if n is even). For each such node y, choose whether or not to switch the labels of $ybaa\cdots aa$ and $ybaa\cdots ab$ to ensure that equation (1) holds

for y with $i = (n-\ell-1)/2$. Once we have finished working our way up through level $\ell = n-1$, we have labeled T_n so that for every node y at every level $0 \le \ell \le n-1$ of T_n, and for every $0 \le i \le \lfloor (n-\ell-1)/2 \rfloor$, the identity of equation (1) holds. Thus, our inductive construction is complete. □

2. A special infinite sum on the tree

Any tree automorphism $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ or $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$ must permute the 2^m nodes at each level m of the tree. Moreover, since σ must preserve the tree structure, for each node x of the (labeled) tree, it must map the set $\{xa, xb\}$ of two nodes above x to the set $\{\sigma(x)a, \sigma(x)b\}$ of two nodes above $\sigma(x)$. Thus, for any tree automorphism σ and m-tuple $x \in \{a,b\}^m$, we define the *parity* $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x) \in \mathbb{Z}$ of σ at x to be

$$\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sigma(xa) = \sigma(x)a \text{ and } \sigma(xb) = \sigma(x)b \\ 1 & \text{if } \sigma(xa) = \sigma(x)b \text{ and } \sigma(xb) = \sigma(x)a \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Observe that any set of choices of $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x)$ for each node x of T_∞ (respectively, T_{n-1}) determines a unique automorphism $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ (respectively, $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$).

If $\sigma(x) = x$, then $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x)$ is 0 if σ fixes the two nodes above x, or 1 if it transposes them. However, $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x)$ is defined even when $\sigma(x) \neq x$, although in that case its value depends also on the labeling of the tree.

For a Galois element $\sigma \in G_n$ or $\sigma \in G_\infty$, considered as acting on the tree T_n or T_∞ of preimages of x_0, we will need to understand the action of σ on 2-power roots of unity ζ. Specifically, we must have $\sigma(\zeta) = \zeta^P$ for some $P = P(\sigma)$ in the group $(\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times$ (if $\sigma \in G_n$, where $j := \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$), or in $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ (if $\sigma \in G_\infty$). Lemmas 1.2 and 1.4 inspire the following candidate for this power P.

Definition 2.1. Fix a labeling of T_∞, and let $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$. For any node x of T_∞, define

$$Q(\sigma, x) := \sum_{i \ge 0} 2^i \sum_{s_1, \ldots, s_i \in \{a,b\}} \mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x a s_1 a s_2 \cdots a s_i) \in \mathbb{Z}_2, \tag{3}$$

and

$$P(\sigma, x) := (-1)^{\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x)} + 2 \sum_{t \in \{a,b\}} Q(\sigma, xbt) - 2 \sum_{t \in \{a,b\}} Q(\sigma, xat) \in \mathbb{Z}_2^\times. \tag{4}$$

In addition, for any $n \ge m \ge 0$, any node x at level m of T_n, and any $\tau \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$, set $j := \lfloor (n-m+1)/2 \rfloor$, and define $P(\tau, x) \in (\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times$ to be

$$P(\tau, x) :\equiv P(\tilde{\tau}, x) \pmod{2^j}, \tag{5}$$

where $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ is any extension of τ to all of T_∞.

Regarding equation (5), note that every $\tau \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$ has infinitely many extensions $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$, since we may choose the parity $\mathrm{Par}(\tilde{\tau}, y)$ at each node y at levels $n+1$ and higher to be either 0 or 1 as we please. However, the definition of $P(\tau, x)$ in equation (5) is independent of the extension $\tilde{\tau}$, since the contributions of $\mathrm{Par}(\tilde{\tau}, y)$ for nodes y at levels $n+1$ and higher from equations (3) and (4) all have coefficients divisible by 2^j. That is, when computing $P(\tau, x)$, we may simply truncate the sums in equations (3) and (4) to include only the contributions from nodes at levels $n-1$ and below.




FIGURE 4. $P(\sigma, x)$ is a weighted sum of $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, y)$ at the highlighted nodes y.

It is immediate from equation (3) that

$$Q(\sigma, x) = \mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x) + 2 \sum_{s \in \{a,b\}} Q(\sigma, xas), \tag{6}$$

where we understand this equation to be an equality in $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ in the T_∞ case, and a congruence modulo an appropriate power of 2 in the T_n case.

To help explain Definition 2.1, observe that $P(\sigma, x)$ is ± 1 plus a weighted sum of $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, y)$ at certain nodes y, chosen based on the labeling of the tree. For example, Figure 4 shows the nodes in question up to level 5. To compute $P = P(\sigma, x)$ in that case, we count the highlighted nodes as follows:

- count gray circles y for which $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, y) = 1$ with weight -2,
- count white circles y for which $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, y) = 1$ with weight 2,
- count gray squares y for which $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, y) = 1$ with weight -4,
- count white squares y for which $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, y) = 1$ with weight 4,

and so on up the tree. Finally, add 1 if $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x) = 0$ or add -1 if $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x) = 1$.

Note that the nodes highlighted in Figure 4, and hence figuring into the sum defining P, are the *parents* of the nodes highlighted in Figure 2 from Lemma 1.2. Indeed, we now prove that $P(\sigma, x)$ is exactly the requisite power suggested just before Definition 2.1.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $x_0 \in K$ with $x_0 \neq 0, -1$. Choose a sequence $\{\zeta_2, \zeta_4, \zeta_8, \ldots\}$ of primitive 2-power roots of unity in K_∞, with $(\zeta_{2^m})^2 = \zeta_{2^{m-1}}$ for each $m \geq 1$. Label the tree T_∞ of preimages $\mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ as in Lemma 1.4. Then for any node $y \in \mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$, any 2-power root of unity $\zeta \in K_\infty$, and any $\sigma \in G_\infty = \mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$, we have*

$$\sigma(\zeta) = \zeta^{P(\sigma, y)}.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that $\sigma(\zeta_{2^m}) = \zeta_{2^m}^{P(\sigma,y)}$ for every $\sigma \in G_\infty$, every $m \geq 1$, and every $y \in \mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$. Throughout the proof, then, fix such σ, m, and y.

Because of the choice of labeling of the tree specified in the hypotheses, for any point $w \in \mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ and any $i \geq 0$, we have

$$\prod_{t_1, \ldots, t_i} \big[\sigma(wa) t_1 a t_2 \cdots a t_i a\big] = \zeta_{2^{i+1}}^{-\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, w)} \prod_{t_1, \ldots, t_i} \big[\sigma(w) a t_1 a t_2 \cdots a t_i a\big]. \tag{7}$$

Indeed, if $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, w) = 1$, then equation (7) is simply equation (1) of Lemma 1.4 applied to $\sigma(w)$; and if $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, w) = 0$, then (7) is a tautology. Each product in equation (7) is over $t_1, \ldots, t_i \in \{a, b\}$; and for $i = 0$, we understand it to say $[\sigma(wa)] = \zeta_2^{-\mathrm{Par}(\sigma,w)}[\sigma(w)a]$.

In addition, since the two-element sets $\{\sigma(wa), \sigma(wb)\}$ and $\{\sigma(w)a, \sigma(w)b\}$ always coincide, we have

$$\prod_{s\in\{a,b\}} \big[\sigma(w_1 s)w_2\big] = \prod_{s\in\{a,b\}} \big[\sigma(w_1)sw_2\big]. \tag{8}$$

for any strings w_1 and w_2 of the symbols a, b. Thus, if we define

$$P_j(\sigma, w) := \sum_{t_1,\ldots,t_j\in\{a,b\}} \mathrm{Par}(\sigma, wt_1at_2a\cdots at_j),$$

then for any node x of the tree and any $m \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod \big[\sigma(xs_1as_2\cdots as_{m-1}a)\big] &= \zeta_2^{-P_{m-1}(\sigma,x)} \prod \big[\sigma(xs_1as_2\cdots as_{m-1})a\big] \\
&= \zeta_2^{-P_{m-1}(\sigma,x)} \prod \big[\sigma(xs_1as_2\cdots a)s_{m-1}a\big] \\
&= \zeta_2^{-P_{m-1}(\sigma,x)}\zeta_4^{-P_{m-2}(\sigma,x)} \prod \big[\sigma(xs_1as_2\cdots s_{m-2})as_{m-1}a\big] \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \left(\prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \zeta_{2^{m-j}}^{-P_j(\sigma,x)}\right) \prod \big[\sigma(x)s_1as_2\cdots as_{m-1}a\big],
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where each undecorated product is over $s_1, \ldots, s_{m-1} \in \{a, b\}$. In proving equation (9), we have alternately applied equations (7) and (8). Specifically, we used equation (7) with $i = 0$ and $w = xs_1a\cdots as_{m-1}$ at the first equality, then with $i = 1$ and $w = xs_1a\cdots as_{m-2}$ at the third, and so on through $i = m - 2$ with $w = x$. We then used (8) at the second equality with $w_1 = xs_1a\cdots as_{m-2}a$ and $w_2 = a$, then with $w_1 = xs_1a\cdots as_{m-3}a$ and $w_2 = as_{m-1}a$ at the fourth, and so on.

Applying equation (9) to both $x = ya$ and $x = yb$, and substituting the results in equation (1) with $i = m - 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(\zeta_{2^m}) &= \frac{\prod \big[\sigma(yas_1as_2\ldots as_{m-1}a)\big]}{\prod \big[\sigma(ybs_1as_2\ldots as_{m-1}a)\big]} \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \zeta_{2^{m-j}}^{P_j(\sigma,yb)-P_j(\sigma,ya)} \cdot \frac{\prod \big[\sigma(ya)s_1as_2\ldots as_{m-1}a\big]}{\prod \big[\sigma(yb)s_1as_2\ldots as_{m-1}a\big]},
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where each undecorated product is again over $s_1, \ldots, s_{m-1} \in \{a, b\}$. Since $\zeta_{2^i}^2 = \zeta_{2^{i-1}}$ for each i, the first product in expression (10) is $\zeta_{2^m}^M$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
M &:= \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} 2^j \big(P_j(\sigma, yb) - P_j(\sigma, ya)\big) \\
&\equiv 2 \sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} Q(\sigma, ybt) - 2 \sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} Q(\sigma, yat) \pmod{2^m},
\end{aligned}$$

and where $Q(\sigma, x)$ is as defined in equation (3). On the other hand, by equation (1) applied to $\sigma(y)$, the quotient of two products in expression (10) is ζ_{2^m} if $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, y) = 0$, or $\zeta_{2^m}^{-1}$ if $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, y) = 1$. Thus, equation (10) becomes

$$\sigma(\zeta_{2^m}) = \zeta_{2^m}^{P}, \quad \text{where} \quad P = (-1)^{\mathrm{Par}(\sigma,y)} + M = P(\sigma, y). \qquad \square$$

3. The arithmetic basilica group

Theorem 2.2 says that $\sigma \in G_n$ or $\sigma \in G_\infty$ maps a 2-power root of unity ζ to $\zeta^{P(\sigma,x)}$. Since this image should be independent of the node x, we make the following definition.

Definition 3.1. Fix a labeling of T_∞. Let x_0 denote the root point of the tree. Define the *arithmetic basilica group* M_∞ to be the set of all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ for which

$$P(\sigma, x) = P(\sigma, x_0) \quad \text{for every node } x \in T_\infty.$$

Similarly, given $n \geq 1$ and a labeling of T_n, define M_n to be the set of all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$ for which the following condition holds: for every $m \geq 0$, we have

$$P(\sigma, x) \equiv P(\sigma, x_0) \pmod{2^j} \quad \text{for every node } x \in \{a, b\}^m, \tag{11}$$

where $j := \lfloor (n - m + 1)/2 \rfloor$.

In light of Definition 3.1, for $\sigma \in M_\infty$ or $\sigma \in M_n$ we may write simply $P(\sigma)$ instead of $P(\sigma, x)$, since the value is independent of the node. That is, we have functions $P : M_\infty \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ and $P : M_n \to (\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times$, where $j := \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$.

Theorem 3.2.

(1) *M_∞ is a subgroup of* $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$.
(2) *For every $n \geq 1$, M_n is a subgroup of* $\mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$.
(3) *The map $P : M_\infty \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ is a group homomorphism.*
(4) *For every $n \geq 1$, the map $P : M_n \to (\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times$ where $j := \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$, is a group homomorphism.*

Proof. We prove statements (1) and (3); the proofs of statements (2) and (4) are similar. Our argument has five steps. In Step 1, we derive some simple formulas to be used later in the proof. In Step 2, we define a function $Z_{\sigma,\tau}$ on the nodes of the tree and prove that it satisfies a certain functional equation. In Step 3, we apply this functional equation to show that $Z_{\sigma,\tau}$ is in fact identically zero, yielding the key identity (19). In Step 4, we use (19) to deduce identity (20), which *a posteriori* says that P is a homomorphism. Finally, in Step 5 we use identity (20) to show that M_∞ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$.

Step 1. For any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ and any node x of T_∞, define

$$\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma, x) := (-1)^{\mathrm{Par}(\sigma,x)} = 1 - 2\,\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, x). \tag{12}$$

It is immediate from equation (2) that for any $\sigma, \tau \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ and any node x of T_∞, we have

$$\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma\tau, x) = \mathrm{sgn}\big(\sigma, \tau(x)\big) \cdot \mathrm{sgn}(\tau, x). \tag{13}$$

We also have

$$\mathrm{Par}(\sigma\tau, x) = \mathrm{Par}\big(\sigma, \tau(x)\big) + \mathrm{sgn}\big(\sigma, \tau(x)\big)\,\mathrm{Par}(\tau, x). \tag{14}$$

Equation (14) follows from equation (13) by writing $\mathrm{Par}(\cdot, \cdot) = (1 - \mathrm{sgn}(\cdot, \cdot))/2$, or simply by checking the four possible choices of $\mathrm{Par}(\tau, x)$ and $\mathrm{Par}(\sigma, \tau(x))$.

Step 2. For any $\sigma \in M_\infty$, any $\tau \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$, and any node x of T_∞, define

$$Z_{\sigma,\tau}(x) := Q\big(\sigma, \tau(x)\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau, x) - Q(\sigma\tau, x),$$

where $P(\sigma)$ is the constant value of $P(\sigma, w)$ for all nodes w of T_∞. In Step 3 we will show that $Z_{\sigma,\tau}$ is identically zero, but for now we make the weaker claim that

$$Z_{\sigma,\tau}(x) = 2Z_{\sigma,\tau}(xaa) + 2Z_{\sigma,\tau}(xab).$$

To see this, expand each appearance of Q in the definition of $Z_{\sigma,\tau}(x)$ according to equation (6), yielding

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\sigma,\tau}(x) &= \mathrm{Par}\big(\sigma, \tau(x)\big) + P(\sigma)\,\mathrm{Par}(\tau, x) - \mathrm{Par}(\sigma\tau, x) \\ &\qquad + 2\sum_{s\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma, \tau(x)as\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau, xas) - Q(\sigma\tau, xas)\Big] \\ &= \mathrm{Par}\big(\sigma, \tau(x)\big) + \mathrm{sgn}\big(\sigma, \tau(x)\big)\,\mathrm{Par}(\tau, x) - \mathrm{Par}(\sigma\tau, x) \qquad (15) \\ &\qquad + 2\,\mathrm{Par}(\tau, x)\sum_{s\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma, \tau(x)bs\big) - Q\big(\sigma, \tau(x)as\big)\Big] \qquad (16) \\ &\qquad + 2\sum_{s\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma, \tau(x)as\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau, xas) - Q(\sigma\tau, xas)\Big], \qquad (17) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality, we expanded the first appearance of $P(\sigma)$ as $P(\sigma, \tau(x))$. The expression on line (15) is zero by equation (14). Next, observe that

$$\big\{\tau(x)aa, \tau(x)ab\big\} = \begin{cases} \big\{\tau(xaa), \tau(xab)\big\} & \text{if } \mathrm{Par}(\tau, x) = 0, \\ \big\{\tau(xba), \tau(xbb)\big\} & \text{if } \mathrm{Par}(\tau, x) = 1, \end{cases} \qquad (18)$$

and similarly for the set $\{\tau(x)ba, \tau(x)bb\}$. Thus, the expression on line (16) is

$$\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathrm{Par}(\tau, x) = 0, \\ 2\displaystyle\sum_{s\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma, \tau(xas)\big) - Q\big(\sigma, \tau(xbs)\big)\Big] & \text{if } \mathrm{Par}(\tau, x) = 1. \end{cases}$$

and the expression on line (17) is

$$\begin{cases} 2\displaystyle\sum_{s\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma, \tau(xas)\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau, xas) - Q(\sigma\tau, xas)\Big], & \text{if } \mathrm{Par}(\tau, x) = 0, \\ 2\displaystyle\sum_{s\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma, \tau(xbs)\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau, xas) - Q(\sigma\tau, xas)\Big], & \text{if } \mathrm{Par}(\tau, x) = 1. \end{cases}$$

For either possible value of $\mathrm{Par}(\tau, x)$, then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\sigma,\tau}(x) &= 2\sum_{s\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma, \tau(xas)\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau, xas) - Q(\sigma\tau, xas)\Big] \\ &= 2Z_{\sigma,\tau}(xaa) + 2Z_{\sigma,\tau}(xab), \end{aligned}$$

proving our claim.

Step 3. As in Step 2, consider $\sigma \in M_\infty$ and $\tau \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$. We claim that $Z_{\sigma,\tau}$ is identically zero; that is, we claim

$$Q\big(\sigma, \tau(x)\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau, x) = Q(\sigma\tau, x) \qquad (19)$$

for every node x of T_∞. To prove this, it suffices to show that for every node x and each $j \geq 0$, we have $Z_{\sigma,\tau}(x) \in 2^j\mathbb{Z}_2$.

We proceed by induction on j. The base case $j = 0$ is immediate from the fact that $P(\cdot,\cdot), Q(\cdot,\cdot) \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. Assuming the statement holds for all x for some particular $j \geq 0$, then for any node x, Step 2 yields

$$Z_{\sigma,\tau}(x) = 2\big(Z_{\sigma,\tau}(xaa) + Z_{\sigma,\tau}(xab)\big) \in 2\big(2^j\mathbb{Z}_2\big) = 2^{j+1}\mathbb{Z}_2,$$

completing the induction and proving our claim.

Step 4. As in the previous two steps, consider $\sigma \in M_\infty$ and $\tau \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$, and consider a node x in T_∞. We claim that

$$P(\sigma)P(\tau,x) = P(\sigma\tau,x). \tag{20}$$

Indeed, expanding $P(\tau,x)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} P(\sigma)P(\tau,x) &= \mathrm{sgn}(\tau,x)P(\sigma) + 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} P(\sigma)Q(\tau,xbt) - 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} P(\sigma)Q(\tau,xat) \\ &= \mathrm{sgn}(\tau,x)\Big[\mathrm{sgn}\big(\sigma,\tau(x)\big) + 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} Q\big(\sigma,\tau(x)bt\big) - 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} Q\big(\sigma,\tau(x)at\big)\Big] \\ &\quad + 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} P(\sigma)Q(\tau,xbt) - 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} P(\sigma)Q(\tau,xat), \end{aligned}$$

where we have also expanded the first appearance of $P(\sigma)$ as $P(\sigma,\tau(x))$. Applying equations (13) and (18), then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\sigma)P(\tau,x) &= \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma\tau,x) + 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma,\tau(xbt)\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau,xbt)\Big] \\ &\quad - 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} \Big[Q\big(\sigma,\tau(xat)\big) + P(\sigma)Q(\tau,xat)\Big] \\ &= \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma\tau,x) + 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} Q(\sigma\tau,xbt) - 2\sum_{t\in\{a,b\}} Q(\sigma\tau,xat) = P(\sigma\tau,x), \end{aligned}$$

where we used identity (19) twice in the second equality, thus proving our claim.

Step 5. To prove statement (1), first observe that the identity automorphism $e \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ belongs to M_∞, since $\mathrm{Par}(e,y) = 0$ for all nodes y, and hence $P(e,x) = 1$ for all nodes x of T_∞. Next, given $\sigma,\tau \in M_\infty$, it follows from identity (20) that for any node x of T_∞, we have

$$P(\sigma\tau,x) = P(\sigma)P(\tau,x) = P(\sigma)P(\tau,x_0) = P(\sigma\tau,x_0),$$

and hence $\sigma\tau \in M_\infty$. Finally, given $\sigma \in M_\infty$, consider $\sigma^{-1} \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$. Then for any node x of T_∞, identity (20) again yields

$$1 = P(e,x) = P(\sigma\sigma^{-1},x) = P(\sigma)P(\sigma^{-1},x).$$

Thus,

$$P\big(\sigma^{-1},x\big) = P(\sigma)^{-1} = P\big(\sigma^{-1},x_0\big),$$

and therefore $\sigma^{-1} \in M_\infty$. That is, M_∞ is indeed a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$.

Finally, the fact that $P : M_\infty \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ is a homomorphism is immediate from identity (20), proving statement (2). □

Since M_∞ is indeed a group by Theorem 3.2, the following more precise version of statement (1) of our Main Theorem is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.2.

Corollary 3.3. *Fix notation and a tree labeling as in Theorem 2.2. Consider the embedding of G_∞ in $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ induced by its action on $\mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$. Then the image of this embedding is contained in the arithmetic basilica group M_∞.*

4. The basilica group and finite subtrees

For any $0 \le m \le n \le \infty$, define a function $R_{n,m} : \mathrm{Aut}(T_n) \to \mathrm{Aut}(T_m)$ by restricting $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$ to the subtree T_m. Clearly $R_{n,m}$ is a homomorphism.

The group $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ has a topological structure, as follows. For each $m \ge 0$, let $U_m := \ker(R_{\infty,m})$. That is, U_m consists of all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ that act trivially on levels 0 through m of the tree. The cosets of the normal subgroups U_m form a basis for a topology on $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$, making $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ compact and Hausdorff. For $n \ge m \ge 0$, we will often abuse notation and write U_m for the subgroup $R_{\infty,n}(U_m) = \ker(R_{n,m})$ of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$.

For any node x of T_∞, it is immediate from Definition 2.1 that $\sigma \mapsto P(\sigma, x)$ is a continuous function from $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ to $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$. It follows that M_∞ is a closed and hence compact subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$.

Fix a labeling of the tree T_∞. Define two particular automorphisms $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ by specifying that

- $\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, bb\cdots b) = 1$ for any node whose label is a string of an even number of b's,
- $\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, y) = 0$ for all other nodes y of T_∞,

and

- $\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, bb\cdots b) = 1$ for any node whose label is a string of an odd number of b's,
- $\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, y) = 0$ for all other nodes y of T_∞.

The maps $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ can be equivalently defined by the recursive relations

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}(aw) = bw, \quad \boldsymbol{\alpha}(bw) = a\boldsymbol{\beta}(w), \qquad \boldsymbol{\beta}(aw) = aw, \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}(bw) = b\boldsymbol{\alpha}(w)$$

for any word w in the symbols a, b.

Definition 4.1. The *basilica group* is the subgroup B_∞ of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ generated by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. The *closed basilica group* is the topological closure $\overline{B}_\infty$ of B_∞ in $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$.

Remark 4.2. Consider $\sigma \in U_1$, i.e., $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ fixing level 1 of the tree. Then σ acts on the subtree $T_{\infty,a}$ rooted at a as some automorphism $\sigma_a \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$, and similarly on the subtree $T_{\infty,b}$ rooted at b as some $\sigma_b \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$. That is, we may write $\sigma = (\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$.

In this notation, we have $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (e, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$, where e is the identity element of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$. Similarly, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^2$ also belong to U_1, and simple computations show that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\boldsymbol{\alpha}, e)$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^2 = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$.

Consider $\sigma \in B_\infty \cap U_1$. Then σ must be a finite product of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ involving an even number of copies of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. (The parity condition on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is because $\sigma \in U_1$). Any such product can also be written as a product of powers of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^2$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Thus, writing $\sigma = (\sigma_a, \sigma_b)$, we must have $\sigma_a, \sigma_b \in B_\infty$. Conversely, for any $\sigma_b \in B_\infty$, there is some $\sigma_a \in B_\infty$ such that $(\sigma_a, \sigma_b) \in B_\infty \cap U_1$. For this reason, the basilica group B_∞

is said to be a *self-similar group*. See [23] for more on self-similar groups, especially Sections 3.10.2, 5.2.2, and 6.12.1, which specifically concern B_∞.

Definition 4.3. Fix $n \geq 1$ and a labeling of T_∞. Define

(1) $B_n := R_{\infty,n}(B_\infty) = R_{\infty,n}(\overline{B}_\infty)$.
(2) $B'_n := \ker(P : M_n \to (\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times)$, where $j := \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$.
(3) $E_n := U_{n-1} \cap B'_n$.

Recall from Theorem 3.2 that the map P used to define B'_n above is indeed a homomorphism, so that both B_n and B'_n are subgroups of $\mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$. Moreover, a simple computation shows $P(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, x) = P(\boldsymbol{\beta}, x) = 1$ for every node x of the tree T_∞. Thus, we have $B_n \subseteq B'_n$. In fact, these two groups coincide, as we will show in Theorem 4.5.

To that end, consider the group $E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$ acting on the tree T_n, where the first copy of E_{n-1} acts on the copy of T_{n-1} rooted at node a, and the second acts on the copy of T_{n-1} rooted at b. We have the following result.

Lemma 4.4. *For every $n \geq 2$, E_n is a subgroup of $E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$, and*

$$[E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1} : E_n] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 2 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Every element σ of either group E_n or $E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$ acts trivially on the subtree T_{n-1}, with

$$P(\sigma, x) \equiv 1 \pmod{2^i}$$

for every $1 \leq m \leq n-1$ and every node $x \in \{a,b\}^m$, where $i := \lfloor (n-m+1)/2 \rfloor$. This is the full set of defining conditions for $E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$, but for E_n there is the extra condition that

$$P(\sigma, x_0) \equiv 1 \pmod{2^j}, \quad \text{where } j := \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor. \tag{21}$$

Thus, $E_n = \{\sigma \in E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1} : P(\sigma, x_0) \equiv 1 \pmod{2^j}\}$ is clearly a subgroup of $E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$. For n even, equation (21) is true for all $\sigma \in U_{n-1}$ and hence all $\sigma \in E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$. Thus, it suffices to show that the index is 2 when n is odd.

For the remainder of the proof, assume n is odd, so that $n = 2j-1$ with $j \geq 2$. For $\sigma \in E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1} \subseteq U_{n-1}$, we have $P(\sigma, x_0) \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{j-1}}$ by definition of P. Since $E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$ is a subgroup of M_n and $P : M_n \to (\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times$ is a homomorphism, it suffices to show that there is some $\lambda \in E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$ for which $P(\lambda, x_0) \equiv 1 + 2^{j-1} \pmod{2^j}$.

Let $\beta := R_{\infty,n-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \in B'_{n-1}$, and let $\lambda := (e, \beta^{2^{(j-2)}}) \in B'_{n-1} \times B'_{n-1}$. Because $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (e, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^2 = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, a simple induction on j shows that that $\beta^{2^{(j-2)}}$ acts trivially on $T_{2j-3} = T_{n-2}$, and hence $\lambda \in E_{n-1} \times E_{n-1}$. Finally, another induction shows that for every node $y \in \{a,b\}^{2j-3}$, we have

$$\mathrm{Par}\left(\beta^{2^{(j-2)}}, y\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y = bs_1bs_2b\cdots s_{j-2}b \text{ for some } s_1, \ldots, s_{j-2} \in \{a,b\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, when computing $Q(\lambda, st) \pmod{2^{j-1}}$ for any $s, t \in \{a,b\}$, the only nontrivial term in the sum of equation (3) occurs for $s = t = b$, and it is $2^{j-2}\,\mathrm{Par}(\lambda, bbaba\cdots bab)$. Therefore, Definition 2.1 yields

$$P(\lambda, x_0) \equiv (-1)^0 + 2 \cdot 2^{j-2} - 2 \cdot 0 \equiv 1 + 2^{j-1} \pmod{2^j},$$

as desired. □

Theorem 4.5. *For every $n \geq 1$, we have $|E_n| = 2^{e_n}$ and $|B_n| = |B_n'| = 2^{b_n}$, where*

$$e_n = \frac{2^n}{3} + \begin{cases} 2/3 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 1/3 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

$$b_n = \frac{2^{n+1}}{3} + \frac{n}{2} - \begin{cases} 2/3 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 5/6 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

In particular, for every $n \geq 1$, we have $B_n = B_n'$. Moreover, the closed basilica group $\overline{B}_\infty = \overline{\langle \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \rangle}$ is precisely the kernel of the homomorphism $P : M_\infty \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$

Proof. Since $E_1 = B_1 = B_1' = \mathrm{Aut}(T_1)$ is a group of order 2, and since formulas (22) specify $e_1 = b_1 = 1$, we have $|E_1| = 2^{e_1}$ and $|B_1| = |B_1'| = 2^{b_1}$. For all $n \geq 2$, the formula for e_n clearly satisfies

$$e_n = 2e_{n-1} - \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 1 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

and Lemma 4.4 says that the same relation holds for $\log_2 |E_n|$. By induction, then, $\log_2 |E_n| = e_n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Another simple induction shows that $b_n = e_1 + e_2 + \cdots + e_n$. However, we have not yet proven the equality of b_n, $\log_2 |B_n|$, and $\log_2 |B_n'|$ for $n \geq 2$.

Write $b_n' := \log_2 |B_n'|$, and note that $b_1' = 1$. For $n \geq 2$, the homomorphism $R_{n,n-1} : B_n' \to B_{n-1}'$ has kernel E_n, but we do not (yet) know that it is surjective. Thus, $b_n' \leq b_{n-1}' + e_{n-1}$, and hence

$$b_n' \leq e_1 + \cdots + e_n = b_n. \tag{23}$$

On the other hand, according to [25, Proposition 2.3.1], we have

$$\log_2 |B_n| = 2^n - 1 - \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} 2^{n-1-m} \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor \tag{24}$$

Using the elementary identity

$$\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} \frac{i}{4^i} = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \frac{(j-1)4^{-j} - j4^{1-j} + 1}{(3/4)^2} = \frac{1}{9 \cdot 4^{j-1}} \big(4^j - 3j - 1\big),$$

we have, for $n = 2j$ even,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} 2^{n-1-m} \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} 3i \cdot 2^{2j-2i-2} = \frac{1}{3}\big(4^j - 3j - 1\big) = \frac{2^n}{3} - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{3},$$

and for $n = 2j + 1$ odd,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} 2^{n-1-m} \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor = j + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} 3i \cdot 2^{2j-2i-1} = j + \frac{2}{3}\big(4^j - 3j - 1\big) = \frac{2^n}{3} - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{1}{6}.$$

Substituting these expressions into equation (24) yields $\log_2 |B_n| = b_n$, where b_n is as in equation (22). By inequality (23) and the fact that $B_n \subseteq B_n'$, we have

$$b_n' \leq b_n = \log_2 |B_n| \leq \log_2 |B_n'| = b_n'.$$

Thus, $|B_n| = |B'_n| = 2^{b_n}$, and $B_n = B'_n$.

Finally, as noted near the start of this section, the map $P : M_\infty \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ is continuous. Therefore, since $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \ker(P)$, we have $\overline{B}_\infty \subseteq \ker(P)$. Conversely, given $\sigma \in \ker(P)$, define $\sigma_n := R_{\infty,n}(\sigma) \in B'_n$ for each $n \geq 1$. Because $\sigma \in B'_n = B_n$, there exists $\tau_n \in B_\infty$ such that $R_{\infty,n}(\tau_n) = \sigma_n$. For any integer $n \geq 1$, the automorphisms $\sigma, \tau_n \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ agree on T_{n-1} and hence belong to the same coset of the subgroup U_{n-1}. Thus, we have

$$\sigma = \lim_{n\to\infty} \tau_n \in \overline{B}_\infty. \qquad \square$$

Theorem 4.6. *The homomorphism $P : M_\infty \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ is surjective, and we have the short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow \overline{B}_\infty \longrightarrow M_\infty \xrightarrow{P} \mathbb{Z}_2^\times \longrightarrow 0$$

In addition, for each $n \geq 1$, we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow B_n \longrightarrow M_n \xrightarrow{P} (\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $j := \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$. Moreover, $|M_n| = 2^{m_n}$, where

$$m_n = \frac{2^{n+1}}{3} + n - \begin{cases} 5/3 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 4/3 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

Proof. **First statement**. By Theorem 3.2, the map P is a homomorphism, and by Theorem 4.5, its kernel is $\overline{B}_\infty$. It remains to show that P is surjective.

Fix a labeling of T_∞. Define an automorphism $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ by

$$\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, x) = 1 \text{ for all nodes } x \text{ of } T_\infty. \tag{26}$$

It is immediate from Definition 2.1 that $Q(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, x) = 1+4+4^2+\cdots = -1/3 \in \mathbb{Z}_2$ for every node x, and hence that $P(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, x) = -1 \in \mathbb{Z}_2$. In particular, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in M_\infty$, with $P(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = -1$.

Define another automorphism $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathrm{Aut}(T_\infty)$ inductively, as follows. First, define

$$\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, x_0) := \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, a) := \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, b) := 0,$$

so that $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ acts trivially on T_2. Then, once we have defined $\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, x)$ at a particular node x, define $\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, y)$ for each node y two levels above x by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, xaa) &:= \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, xab) := 0, \\ \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, xba) &:= 1, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, xbb) &:= \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, x). \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Because $\mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, yaa) = \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, yab) = 0$ for any node y, we have $Q(\boldsymbol{\theta}, x) = \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, x)$ for all nodes x of the tree. Thus, according to Definition 2.1 and equations (27), we have

$$P(\boldsymbol{\theta}, x) = \begin{cases} (-1)^0 + 2(1+0-0-0) = 3 & \text{if } \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, x) = 0, \\ (-1)^1 + 2(1+1-0-0) = 3 & \text{if } \mathrm{Par}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, x) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in M_\infty$, with $P(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 3$.

Because of the automorphisms $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in M_\infty$, the image of P contains the closure of the subgroup $\langle -1, 3 \rangle$ of $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ generated by -1 and 3. However, $\{-1, 3\}$ is a set of topological generators for $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$; therefore, the image of P is all of $\mathbb{Z}_2^\times$, as desired.

Second statement. By Theorem 4.5, we know that $B_n = B'_n$ is the kernel of the homomorphism $P : M_n \to (\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times$. This homomorphism is surjective, since -1 and 3

together generate the group $(\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times$, and they are the images of $R_{\infty,n}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ and $R_{\infty,n}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ under P. Thus, we have the desired exact sequence.

Third statement. By the second statement, we have $|M_n| = |(\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z})^\times| \cdot |B_n|$ for every $n \geq 1$, where $j := \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor$. Therefore, by Theorem 4.6,

$$\begin{aligned}\log_2 |M_n| = (j-1) + b_n &= \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 + \frac{2^{n+1}}{3} + \frac{n}{2} - \begin{cases} 2/3 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 5/6 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \\ &= \frac{2^{n+1}}{3} + n - \begin{cases} 5/3 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 4/3 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

□

To help clarify formulas (22) and (25), the following table gives the logarithms of the orders of the 2-groups E_n, B_n, M_n, and $\mathrm{Aut}(T_n)$ for some small values of n.

n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$\log_2 \lvert E_n \rvert$	1	2	3	6	11	22	43	86	171	342
$\log_2 \lvert B_n \rvert$	1	3	6	12	23	45	88	174	345	687
$\log_2 \lvert M_n \rvert$	1	3	7	13	25	47	91	177	349	691
$\log_2 \lvert \mathrm{Aut}(T_n) \rvert$	1	3	7	15	31	63	127	255	511	1023

5. The Arithmetic Basilica as a Galois Group

In [25], Pink described $\mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$ in the case that K is a function field. We are now prepared to prove that Pink's description of M_∞ — in terms of generators and normalizers — coincides with our description in terms of the map P.

Theorem 5.1. *Let k be a field of characteristic different from 2, and suppose that $[k(\zeta_8) : k] = 4$, where ζ_8 is a primitive eighth root of unity. Let $K = k(t)$, where t is transcendental over k, let $x_0 := t \in K$, and let $G_\infty := \mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$. Then $G_\infty \cong M_\infty$.*

Proof. Let $K' := \overline{k}(t)$, where $\overline{k}$ is an algebraic closure of k, and let $K'_\infty = \bigcup_{n\geq 0} K'_n$, where $K'_n := K'(f^{-n}(t))$.

Label the tree T_∞ of preimages $\mathrm{Orb}_f^-(x_0)$ as in Lemma 1.4. For compatibility with Pink's labeling in [25], identify our label a with the label 1 of [25], and identify our label b with the label 0 of [25]. Then in the notation of [25, equation (2.0.1)], our automorphism $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a_1, and our automorphism $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a_2.

By Corollary 3.3, there is a homomorphism $G_\infty \hookrightarrow M_\infty$ respecting the action on the tree. By [25, Theorem 2.8.2], restricting this homomorphism yields an isomorphism $\mathrm{Gal}(K'_\infty/K') \cong \overline{B}_\infty$. In addition, by [25, Theorem 2.8.4], the Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(K'_\infty/K')$ fits into a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gal}(K'_\infty/K') \longrightarrow G_\infty \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathbb{Z}_2^\times \longrightarrow 0 \tag{28}$$

where $\rho : G_\infty \to \mathbb{Z}_2^\times$ is given by the cyclotomic action of Galois on 2-power roots of unity. The sequence (28) and that of Theorem 4.6 together yield the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Gal}(K'_\infty/K') & \longrightarrow & G_\infty & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \mathbb{Z}_2^\times & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \wr & & \downarrow & & \| & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{B}_\infty & \longrightarrow & M_\infty & \xrightarrow{P} & \mathbb{Z}_2^\times & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

The first square of the diagram commutes because the isomorphism $\mathrm{Gal}(K'_\infty/K') \cong \overline{B}_\infty$ is the restriction of the injection $G_\infty \hookrightarrow M_\infty$. The second square also commutes, because Theorem 2.2 says that P is also given by the cyclotomic action of Galois on 2-power roots of unity. Therefore, the homomorphism $G_\infty \hookrightarrow M_\infty$ is an isomorphism. □

With the goal of extending Theorem 5.1 to the case that the base field K is a number field, recall that the *Frattini subgroup* of a (profinite) group G is the intersection Φ of all maximal (closed) subgroups of G. Clearly Φ is a normal subgroup of G. We will need the following well-known fact, which we prove for the convenience of the reader.

Proposition 5.2. *Let G be a finite or profinite group. Let Φ be the Frattini subgroup of G. Let H be a subgroup of G that intersects all cosets of Φ, i.e., for which $\Phi H = G$. Then $H = G$.*

Proof. Suppose $H \neq G$. Since G is (pro)finite, there is a maximal (closed) subgroup $M \subsetneq G$ containing H. Because $M \neq G$, there is some $\sigma \in G \smallsetminus M$. We have $\Phi \subseteq M$ by definition of the Frattini subgroup. However, since $\Phi H = G$, there exist some $\phi \in \Phi$ and $\tau \in H$ such that $\sigma = \phi\tau$. Therefore, since $\phi \in \Phi \subseteq M$ and $\tau \in H \subseteq M$, we have $\sigma \in M$. The conclusion follows from this contradiction. □

We can use Theorem 5.1 to compute the Frattini subgroup of M_∞, as follows.

Theorem 5.3. *The Frattini subgroup Φ of the arithmetic basilica group M_∞ has index 16 in M_∞, and it consists precisely of those $\sigma \in M_\infty$ for which:*

- *σ fixes both nodes at level 1 of the tree T_∞,*
- *σ acts as an even permutation on the four nodes at level 2 of the tree, and*
- *$P(\sigma) \equiv 1 \pmod 8$.*

Proof. **Step 1**. Let $K := \mathbb{Q}(t)$ and let $L := K(\sqrt{t}, \sqrt{t+1}, \zeta_8)$. We claim that for any $a \in K$ for which $\sqrt{a} \in K_\infty$, we have $\sqrt{a} \in L$. To prove this claim, it suffices to consider squarefree $a \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ with $\sqrt{a} \in K_\infty$.

Let $K' := \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(t)$, and consider any monic irreducible polynomial $h \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[t]$ dividing a. Then the prime (h) of K' ramifies in $K'(\sqrt{a}) \subseteq K'_\infty$ and hence in K'_n for some n, where $K'_n := K'(f^{-n}(t))$ and $K'_\infty = \bigcup_n K_n$. However, the discriminant Δ_n of the polynomial $f^n(z) - t$ is

$$\Delta_n = (-4)^{2^{n-1}} \cdot \Delta_{n-1}^2 \cdot \big(f^n(0) - t\big). \tag{29}$$

(This is a standard iterative discriminant formula; see, for example, [1, Proposition 3.2] or [5, equation (1)].) Since $f^n(0)$ is always 0 or -1, it follows that the only finite primes at which K'_n/K' ramifies are (t) and $(t+1)$. Therefore, $h = t$ or $h = t+1$.

Hence, a is of the form $a = ct^i(t+1)^j$ where $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ is squarefree and $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$. If c is divisible by an odd prime p, then working over $k := \mathbb{Q}$ by specializing $t = 1$, the prime p ramifies in k_n for some n, where $k_n := k(f^{-n}(1))$. However, for $t = 1$, the discriminant Δ_n from equation (29) is of the form $(-1)^M 2^N$, and in particular is not divisible by p, a contradiction.

Thus, c must be ± 1 or ± 2. Either way, we have $\sqrt{a} \in L$, proving our claim.

Step 2. Let H be any maximal closed subgroup of M_∞. Since $M_\infty = \varprojlim M_n$ is a pro-2 group, we must have $[M_\infty : H] = 2$. The fields $k := \mathbb{Q}$ and $K := \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(t)$ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 5.1, and hence with $x_0 = t$, we have $G_\infty \cong M_\infty$. The

subfield K_∞^H of elements of K_∞ fixed by the isomorphic image of H in G_∞ is therefore a quadratic extension of K. By the claim of Step 1, then, we have $K_\infty^H \subseteq L$, where $L := K(\sqrt{t}, \sqrt{t+1}, \zeta_8)$. Thus, the Frattini subgroup of G_∞ is contained in $\Psi := \mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty/L)$.

Conversely, each of $\sqrt{t}$, $\sqrt{t+1}$, $\sqrt{2}$, $\sqrt{-1}$ generates a quadratic extension of K lying in K_∞, and together they generate L. That is, $\mathrm{Gal}(K_\infty/K(\sqrt{a}))$ is a maximal closed subgroup of G_∞ for each of $a = t, t+1, 2, -1$, and the intersection of these four subgroups is Ψ. Hence, the Frattini subgroup of G_∞ is exactly Ψ, which has index $[L : K] = 16$ in G_∞. Therefore, the Frattini subgroup Φ of M_∞ is the isomorphic copy of Ψ in M_∞, with the same action on the tree.

By equation (29), we have $\Delta_1 = 4(1+t)$ and $\Delta_2 = -64(1+t)^2 t$, so that $L = K(\sqrt{\Delta_1}, \sqrt{\Delta_2}, \zeta_8)$. Therefore, for any $\sigma \in G_\infty$, we have $\sigma \in \Psi$ if and only if σ fixes $\sqrt{\Delta_1}$, $\sqrt{\Delta_2}$, and ζ_8. That is, $\sigma \in \Psi$ if and only if σ acts as an even permutation on both the first and second levels of the tree, and $P(\sigma) \equiv 1 \pmod 8$, yielding precisely the three desired bullet points. (The third is by Theorem 2.2.) Therefore, the Frattini subgroup Φ of M_∞ is the subset carved out by the same conditions. □

Remark 5.4. Equation (29) shows that for $n \geq 2$, the discriminant Δ_n is always a square in K times either $-t$ or $-t-1$, depending on whether n is even or odd. (For $n = 1$, $\Delta_1 = 4(1+t)$ is off by a sign from this pattern.) Thus, for any $\sigma \in G_\infty$, the parity of σ as a permutation at each of the even levels of the tree is the same. Similarly, σ has the same parity at all odd levels of the tree from the third upwards; the parity on the first level is the same as the other odd levels if and only if $P(\sigma) \equiv 1 \pmod 4$.

For $K = \mathbb{Q}(t)$, Theorem 5.1 shows that $G_\infty \cong M_\infty$, and hence these parity observations carry over to the action of M_∞. In particular, for $\sigma \in M_\infty$, the three bullet points of Theorem 5.3 are equivalent to the following two conditions:

- σ acts as an even permutation at every level of the tree, and
- $P(\sigma) \equiv 1 \pmod 8$.

We are now prepared to prove statement (2) of our Main Theorem, which we state here in a more expanded form.

Theorem 5.5. *Fix notation as at the start of Section 1. Fix roots of unity ζ_{2^m} and a tree labeling as in Lemma 1.4. The following are equivalent.*

(1) $[K(\sqrt{-x_0}, \sqrt{1+x_0}, \zeta_8) : K] = 16$.
(2) $[K_5 : K] = 2^{25}$.
(3) $G_5 \cong M_5$.
(4) $G_n \cong M_n$ *for all* $n \geq 1$.
(5) $G_\infty \cong M_\infty$.

As always, the isomorphisms of statements (3)–(5) are of groups acting on trees, not just of abstract groups.

Proof. **Step 1**. The implications (5)⇒(4)⇒(3) are trivial. By Corollary 3.3, G_5 is isomorphic to a subgroup of M_5, and $|M_5| = 2^{25}$ by Theorem 4.6. Therefore, since $|G_5| = [K_5 : K]$, we have (2)⇔(3).

Step 2. To prove (1)⇒(5), define

$$L := K(\sqrt{-x_0}, \sqrt{1+x_0}, \zeta_8) = K(\sqrt{\Delta_1}, \sqrt{\Delta_2}, \zeta_8),$$

where $\Delta_1 := 4(1+x_0)$ and $\Delta_2 := -64(1+x_0)^2 x_0$, which are the discriminants of the polynomials $f(z) - x_0$ and $f^2(z) - x_0$, by equation (29). Thus, by Lemma 1.2, we have $L \subseteq K_\infty$.

Since $|\operatorname{Gal}(L/K)| = 16$, each of the 16 combinations of

$$\Delta_1 \mapsto \pm\Delta_1, \quad \Delta_2 \mapsto \pm\Delta_2, \quad \zeta_8 \mapsto \pm\zeta_8, \pm\zeta_8^3$$

is realized by some $\tau \in \operatorname{Gal}(L/K)$. Lifting each such τ to $\sigma \in G_\infty$, it follows that each of the 16 combinations of

- σ is even or odd at level 1 of the tree,
- σ is even or odd at level 2 of the tree,
- $P(\sigma)$ is $1, 3, 5, 7 \pmod 8$

is realized by some $\sigma \in G_\infty$.

By Corollary 3.3, G_∞ is isomorphic to a subgroup H of M_∞. By the previous paragraph, H intersects all the cosets of the Frattini subgroup Φ of M_∞. Therefore, by Theorem 5.3, the subgroup H is all of M_∞, and hence $G_\infty \cong M_\infty$.

Step 3. It remains to show (3)⇒(1). Use the same notation L, Δ_1, and Δ_2 from Step 2. Since $\zeta_8 \in K_5$ by Lemma 1.2, and since $\sqrt{\Delta_1} \in K_1$ and $\sqrt{\Delta_2} \in K_2$, we have $L \subseteq K_5$.

Let $\alpha, \beta, \varepsilon, \theta \in G_5$ denote the images of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in M_\infty$ from Section 4 under the homomorphism $R_{\infty,5} : M_\infty \to M_5$ composed with the isomorphism $M_5 \cong G_5$.

Then α, like $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, switches the two nodes at level 1 of the tree but is even on level 2, and moreover satisfies $P(\alpha) \equiv 1 \pmod 8$. Similarly, β fixes the two nodes at level 1 of the tree but is odd on level 2, and again satisfies $P(\alpha) \equiv 1 \pmod 8$. On the other hand, ε switches the two nodes at level 1 but is even at level 2, this time with $P(\varepsilon) \equiv -1 \pmod 8$. Therefore, $\alpha\varepsilon$ is even at both levels 1 and 2 and satisfies $P(\alpha\varepsilon) \equiv -1 \pmod 8$. Finally, θ is even at both levels 1 and 2 and satisfies $P(\theta) \equiv 3 \pmod 8$.

Hence, α fixes $\sqrt{\Delta_2}$ and ζ_8 but maps $\sqrt{\Delta_1}$ to its negative. Similarly, β fixes $\sqrt{\Delta_1}$ and ζ_8 but maps $\sqrt{\Delta_2}$ to its negative. Both $\alpha\varepsilon$ and θ fix both $\sqrt{\Delta_1}$ and $\sqrt{\Delta_2}$ but map ζ_8 to ζ_8^{-1} and ζ_8^3, respectively. Restricting each to L, then, we see that $\operatorname{Gal}(L/K)$ has at least 16 elements, and hence exactly 16. That is, $[L : K] = 16$. □

Acknowledgements. The results of this paper grew out of an REU project at Amherst College. Several of our results were originally suggested by computations using Magma. Authors RB, JC, and GC gratefully acknowledge the support of NSF grant DMS-1501766. Authors FA and LF gratefully acknowledge the support of Amherst College's Gregory S. Call student research funding. We thank Harris Daniels and Jamie Juul for helpful discussions, and Joseph Lupo for spotting some minor errors in the original manuscript. A particular thanks goes to Rafe Jones, for proposing this problem, for providing useful background, and for suggestions surrounding Conjectures 1 and 2. Finally, we thank the referee for their careful reading of the paper and their apt suggestions for improvements, including a significant simplification of the proof of Theorem 5.5, by leveraging the results of [25, Section 2.8] via the Frattini subgroup strategy of Theorem 5.3.

References

[1] Wayne Aitken, Farshid Hajir, and Christian Maire, Finitely ramified iterated extensions, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2005**, 855–880.

[2] Jacqueline Anderson, Irene I. Bouw, Ozlem Ejder, Neslihan Girgin, Valentijn Karemaker, and Michelle Manes, Dynamical Belyi maps, in *Women in numbers Europe II*, Springer, Cham (2018), 57–82.

[3] Laurent Bartholdi, Rostislav Grigorchuk, and Volodymyr Nekrashevych, From fractal groups to fractal sets, in *Fractals in Graz 2001*, 25–118, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2003.

[4] Robert L. Benedetto, Xander Faber, Benjamin Hutz, Jamie Juul, and Yu Yasufuku, A large arboreal Galois representation for a cubic postcritically finite polynomial, *Res. Number Theory* **3** (2017), Art. 29, 21.

[5] Robert L. Benedetto and Jamie Juul, Odoni's conjecture for number fields, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **51** (2019), 237–350.

[6] Nigel Boston and Rafe Jones, Arboreal Galois representations, *Geom. Dedicata* **124** (2007), 27–35.

[7] Andrew Bridy and Thomas J. Tucker, *Finite index theorems for iterated Galois groups of cubic polynomials*, *Math. Ann.* **373** (2019), 37–72.

[8] Michael R. Bush, Wade Hindes, and Nicole R. Looper, Galois groups of iterates of some unicritical polynomials, *Acta Arith.* **181** (2017), 57–73.

[9] Andrea Ferraguti and Giacomo Micheli, An equivariant isomorphism theorem for mod $\mathfrak{p}$ reductions of arboreal Galois representations, preprint, 2019. Available at `arXiv:1905.00506`.

[10] Andrea Ferraguti, Carlo Pagano, and Daniele Casazza, The inverse problem for arboreal Galois representations of index two, preprint, 2019. Available at `arXiv:1907.08608`.

[11] Richard Gottesman and Kwokfung Tang, Quadratic recurrences with a positive density of prime divisors, *Int. J. Number Theory*, **6** (2010), 1027–1045.

[12] Chad Gratton, Khoa Nguyen, and Thomas J. Tucker, *ABC* implies primitive prime divisors in arithmetic dynamics, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **45** (2013), 1194–1208.

[13] Wade Hindes, Average Zsigmondy sets, dynamical Galois groups, and the Kodaira-Spencer map, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **370** (2018), 6391–6410.

[14] Wade Hindes, Classifying Galois groups of small iterates via rational points, *Int. J. Number Theory* **14** (2018), 1403–1426.

[15] Patrick Ingram, Arboreal Galois representations and uniformization of polynomial dynamics, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **45** (2013), 301–308.

[16] Rafe Jones, Galois representations from pre-image trees: an arboreal survey, in *Actes de la Conférence "Théorie des Nombres et Applications"*, *Pub. Math. Besançon* (2013), 107-136.

[17] Rafe Jones and Michelle Manes, Galois theory of quadratic rational functions, *Comment. Math. Helv.* **89** (2014), 173–213.

[18] Jamie Juul, Iterates of generic polynomials and generic rational functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **371** (2019), 809–831.

[19] Jamie Juul, Holly Krieger, Nicole Looper, Michelle Manes, Bianca Thompson, and Laura Walton, Arboreal representations for rational maps with few critical points, preprint, 2018. Available at `arXiv:1804.06053`.

[20] Jamie Juul, Pär Kurlberg, Kalyani Madhu, and Tom J. Tucker, Wreath products and proportions of periodic points, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* **2016**, 3944–3969.

[21] Borys Kadets, Large arboreal Galois representations, preprint, 2018. Available at `arXiv:1802.09074`.

[22] Nicole Looper, Dynamical Galois groups of trinomials and Odoni's conjecture, *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **51** (2019), 278–292.

[23] Volodymyr Nekrashevych, *Self-Similar Groups*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2005.

[24] R. W. K. Odoni, The Galois theory of iterates and composites of polynomials, *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)* **51** (1985), no. 3, 385–414.

[25] Richard Pink, Profinite iterated monodromy groups arising from quadratic polynomials, preprint 2013. Available at `arXiv:1307.5678`.

[26] Jean-Pierre Serre, Propriétés galoisiennes des points d'ordre fini des courbes elliptiques, *Invent. Math.* **15** (1972), 259–331.
[27] Joel Specter, Polynomials with Surjective Arboreal Galois Representations Exist in Every Degree, preprint, 2018. Available at `arXiv:1803.00434`.
[28] Michael Stoll, Galois groups over **Q** of some iterated polynomials, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **59** (1992), 239–244.
[29] Ashvin A. Swaminathan, On arboreal Galois representations of rational functions, *J. Algebra* **448** (2016), 104–126.

Amherst College, Amherst, MA 01002, USA
Email address: `faseehirfan@gmail.com`

Email address: `rlbenedetto@amherst.edu`

Email address: `jentcain@gmail.com`

Email address: `gcarroll19@amherst.edu`

Email address: `lilycfang@yahoo.com`