

THE CONGRUENCE SUBGROUP PROBLEM FOR UNITS

KEITH CONRAD

Let K be a number field. Denote its unit group \mathcal{O}_K^\times by U_K . For any nonzero ideal \mathfrak{c} in \mathcal{O}_K , let

$$U_K(\mathfrak{c}) = \{u \in U_K : u \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{c}}\}.$$

This is the kernel of $U_K \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c})^\times$.

A subgroup of U_K which contains $U_K(\mathfrak{c})$ for some \mathfrak{c} is called a *congruence subgroup*. For a subgroup $\Gamma \subset U_K$ which contains $U_K(\mathfrak{c})$, any $u \in U_K$ which is congruent mod \mathfrak{c} to an element of Γ has to lie in Γ . Therefore Γ can be defined by congruence conditions, simply by indicating which congruence classes Γ fills up in the finite group $(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c})^\times$ when we reduce Γ modulo \mathfrak{c} . This explains the terminology “congruence subgroup.”

Being the kernel of a homomorphism from U_K into a finite group, $U_K(\mathfrak{c})$ has finite index in U_K . Therefore any congruence subgroup of U_K has finite index. Whether or not the converse holds is called the congruence subgroup problem: if $\Gamma \subset U_K$ is a finite index subgroup, does Γ contain $U_K(\mathfrak{c})$ for some nonzero ideal \mathfrak{c} ?

For example, the units in $\mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$ are $\pm(1 + \sqrt{2})^{\mathbf{Z}}$. The subgroup of positive units has index 2. Is there a nonzero $\alpha \in \mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$ such that any unit in $\mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$ satisfying $u \equiv 1 \pmod{\alpha}$ is positive? (Every congruence class in every $\mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{2}]/\alpha$, $\alpha \neq 0$, contains both positive and negative numbers; add and subtract α enough times from any number. So a congruence condition can't force a sign condition on unrestricted elements of $\mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$. However, our elements are restricted: we're looking only at *units*.) As another example, the squared units are a subgroup of index 4. Can a congruence condition on units in $\mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$ force them to be squares?

Theorem 1 (Chevalley, 1951). *For any number field K , every subgroup of finite index in U_K is a congruence subgroup. In other words, the congruence subgroup problem has an affirmative answer for U_K .*

To prove Chevalley's theorem we need three preliminary results. The first two are algebraic and the third is arithmetic.

Lemma 2. *Let p be a prime, K any field of characteristic not equal to p , and r a positive integer. Any element of K which is a p^r th power in $K(\zeta_{p^r})$ is a p^r th power in K , with the proviso that $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is in K if $p = 2$.*

Proof. This is due to Chevalley. See the remark after the proof of [1, Théorème 1], and items 2, 3, 4, and 5 in that proof. (Warning: the second proof of that theorem is incorrect.) \square

The case $p = 2$ in Lemma 2 requires that extra condition about i , since $-4 = (1 + i)^4$ is a fourth power in $\mathbf{Q}(i) = \mathbf{Q}(\zeta_4)$ but not in \mathbf{Q} .

Lemma 3. *Let K be a field with characteristic not equal to 2 and $i \notin K$. Choose $k \geq 2$ maximal such that $\zeta_{2^k} \in K(i)$. For any $e \geq 0$, if $x \in K$ is a 2^{k+e} th power in $K(i)$, then x is a 2^e th power in K .*

Proof. See Chevalley [1, p. 37]. □

Lemma 4. *If $F \subset L$ and all but finitely many primes in F split completely in L , then $L = F$.*

Proof. The shortest argument uses analytic properties of zeta-functions of number fields. The hypothesis implies that $\zeta_L(s)$ is equal to $\zeta_F(s)^{[L:F]}$ up to multiplication by finitely many Euler factors. Computing pole orders at $s = 1$ shows $1 = [L : F]$, so $L = F$. □

We now turn to a proof of Chevalley's theorem (following Chevalley).

Proof. Let $\Gamma \subset U_K$ have finite index, say m . Since U_K/Γ has order m , $U_K^m \subset \Gamma$, where U_K^m is the group of m th powers of units. Because U_K is finitely generated, U_K^m has finite index in U_K . Therefore it suffices to verify U_K^m is a congruence subgroup of U_K for every m and every K .

Step 1: Reduction to prime power m and $\zeta_m \in K$

Since the intersection of two congruence subgroups is a congruence subgroup (exercise), and $U_K^m \cap U_K^{m'} = U_K^{mm'}$ for relatively prime m and m' , it suffices to consider the case when m is a prime power. Prime power exponents are convenient because of Lemma 2, which will let us reduce to the case when K contains suitable roots of unity. (This is how Chevalley was led to Lemma 2.)

Let m be a prime power and K be any number field. We show there is an integer $n \geq 1$ such that

$$(1) \quad U_K^m = U_{K(\zeta_n)}^n \cap U_K.$$

If m is an odd prime power, or if m is a power of 2 and $i \in K$, then we can let $n = m$ by Lemma 2. (Powers and roots of units are again units, so Lemma 2 with K a number field remains valid when fields are replaced by unit groups.)

What if m is a power of 2 and $i \notin K$? Is (1) true with $n = m$? When $m = 2$, $K(\zeta_m) = K$ and we can use $n = 2$ in (1). But we can't always take $n = 4$ when $m = 4$ (exercise). For this we use Lemma 2.

If $m = 2^e$ and $i \notin K$ then successive applications of Lemma 2 (with $K(i)$ as base field) and Lemma 3 show we can take $n = 2^k m = 2^{k+e}$ in (1), where k comes from Lemma 3.

If $U_{K(\zeta_n)}^n$ is a congruence subgroup of $U_{K(\zeta_n)}$, (1) implies U_K^m is a congruence subgroup of U_K . Writing $K(\zeta_n)$ as K , we have reduced to the following:

Step 2: Show U_K^n is congruence subgroup of U_K when $\zeta_n \in K$, n a prime power.

Let $n = p^e$ be any prime power and K be a number field containing the n th roots of unity. We want to find a nonzero ideal \mathfrak{c} in \mathcal{O}_K such that any unit satisfying $u \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{c}}$ is a p^e th power. The argument will use Kummer theory.

The group U_K is finitely generated, say by u_1, \dots, u_t . (At least one u_j is a root of unity, and others usually have infinite order, but we treat all generators on an equal footing.) Let $L = K(\sqrt[p^e]{u_1}, \dots, \sqrt[p^e]{u_t})$, so L contains the n th roots of every unit in K .

Since n is a power of p , Kummer theory implies L/K is an abelian extension of p -power degree. In a finite abelian p -group (or even a finite nonabelian p -group), every proper subgroup lies in a maximal proper subgroup, which must have index p in the whole group. By Galois theory, L contains subfields L_1, \dots, L_s which have degree p over K and every intermediate field other than K contains an L_j .

For each L_j , Lemma 4 (at last!) implies there are infinitely many primes in K which don't split completely in L_j . Since L_j/K is Galois of prime degree p , the only options for

primes in K which don't split completely in L_j are to ramify or to remain prime. There are only finitely many of the former, and thus infinitely many of the latter. For $j = 1, \dots, s$, let \mathfrak{q}_j be a prime in K which remains prime in L_j and does not divide n .

We claim any unit $u \in U_K$ which satisfies $u \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_s}$ is an n th power in K , and thus also in U_K . The congruence condition on u implies $X^n - u$ splits into distinct linear factors modulo each \mathfrak{q}_j (because K contains the n th roots of unity). Therefore \mathfrak{q}_j splits completely in $K(\sqrt[n]{u}) \subset L$. Since \mathfrak{q}_j remains prime in each L_j , $K(\sqrt[n]{u})$ can't contain any L_j . That forces $K(\sqrt[n]{u}) = K$ by the definition of the L_j 's, so u is an n th power in K . \square

The most essential property of U_K for Theorem 1 is that it's a finitely generated subgroup of K^\times . Chevalley [1] established Theorem 1 for all such subgroups of K^\times .

The congruence subgroup problem can be posed for groups defined over number fields other than unit groups. For a discussion of the congruence subgroup problem in these settings, see [2], [3], and [4].

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Chevalley, "Deux Théorèmes d'Arithmétique," J. Math. Soc. Japan, **3** (1951), 36–44.
- [2] M. S. Raghunathan, "The congruence subgroup problem", pp. 465–494 in *Proceedings of the Hyderabad Conference on Algebraic Groups*, Manoj Prakashan, Madras, 1991.
- [3] A. S. Rapinchuk, "The congruence subgroup problem", pp. 175–188 in *Algebra, K-theory, groups, and education*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1999.
- [4] J-P. Serre, "Groupes de congruence (d'après H. Bass, H. Matsumoto, J. Mennicke, J. Milnor, C. Moore)", *Séminaire Bourbaki* 1966/1967, **14** (1968), W. A. Benjamin, New York, 1968. (Oeuvres II, 460–469).