

Chandan Singh DALAWAT

Wilson's theorem

Tome 21, nº 3 (2009), p. 517-521.

<a href="http://jtnb.cedram.org/item?id=JTNB\_2009\_\_21\_3\_517\_0">http://jtnb.cedram.org/item?id=JTNB\_2009\_\_21\_3\_517\_0</a>

© Université Bordeaux 1, 2009, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux articles de la revue « Journal de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux » (http://jtnb.cedram.org/), implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://jtnb.cedram.org/legal/). Toute reproduction en tout ou partie cet article sous quelque forme que ce soit pour tout usage autre que l'utilisation à fin strictement personnelle du copiste est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

# cedram

Article mis en ligne dans le cadre du

Centre de diffusion des revues académiques de mathématiques

http://www.cedram.org/

# Wilson's theorem

## par Chandan Singh DALAWAT

RÉSUMÉ. On fait voir comment K. Hensel aurait pû étendre le théorème de Wilson de  $\mathbf Z$  à l'anneau des entiers  $\mathfrak o$  d'un corps de nombres, pour trouver le produit de tous les éléments inversibles d'un quotient fini de  $\mathfrak o$ .

ABSTRACT. We show how K. Hensel could have extended Wilson's theorem from  $\mathbf{Z}$  to the ring of integers  $\mathfrak{o}$  in a number field, to find the product of all invertible elements of a finite quotient of  $\mathfrak{o}$ .

#### 1. Introduction

...puisque de tels hommes n'ont pas cru ce sujet indigne de leurs méditations... [1].

More than two hundred years ago, Gauss generalised Wilson's theorem  $((p-1)! \equiv -1 \pmod p)$  for a prime number p) to an arbitrary integer A>0 in §78 of his Disquisitiones:

**Theorem 1.1.** ([1]) Poductum ex omnibus numeris, numero quocunque dato A minoribus simulque ad ipsum primis, congruum est secundum A, vnitati vel negatiue vel positiue sumtae.

(The product of all elements in  $(\mathbf{Z}/A\mathbf{Z})^{\times}$  is  $\bar{1}$  or  $-\bar{1}$ ). He then specifies that the product in question is  $-\bar{1}$  if A is 4, or  $p^m$ , or  $2p^m$  for some odd prime p and integer m > 0; it equals  $\bar{1}$  in the remaining cases.

According to Gauss ([1], §76) the elegant theorem according to which "upon augmenting the product of all numbers less than a given prime number by the unity, it becomes divisible by that prime number" was first stated by Waring in his *Meditationes* — which appeared in Cambridge in 1770 — and attributed to Wilson, but neither could prove it. Waring remarks that the proof must be all the more difficult as there is no *notation* which might express a prime number. Nach unserer Meinung aber müssen derartige Wahrheiten vielmehr aus Begriffen (notionibus) denn aus Bezeichnungen (notationibus) geschöpft werden [1]. The first proof was given by Lagrange (1771).

Some hundred years later, Hensel [2] developed his local notions, which could have allowed him to extend the result from  $\mathbf{Z}$  to rings of integers in number fields; our aim here is to show how he could have done it.

**Proposition 1.1.** ("Wilson's theorem") For an ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{o}$  in the ring of integers of a number field K, the product of all elements in  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a})^{\times}$  is  $\bar{1}$ , except that it is

- (1)  $-\bar{1}$  when  $\mathfrak{a}$  has precisely one odd prime divisor, and  $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a}) < 2$  for every even prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ ,
- (2)  $\bar{1} + \bar{\pi}$  (resp.  $\bar{1} + \bar{\pi}^2$ ) when all prime divisors of  $\mathfrak{a}$  are even and for precisely one of them, say  $\mathfrak{p}$ ,  $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a}) > 1$  with moreover  $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a}) = 2$ ,  $f_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1$  (resp.  $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a}) = 3$ ,  $f_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1$ ,  $e_{\mathfrak{p}} > 1$ ); here  $\pi$  is any element of  $\mathfrak{p}$  not in  $\mathfrak{p}^2$ , and we have indentified  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^2)^{\times}$  (resp.  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^3)^{\times}$ ) with a subgroup of  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a})^{\times}$ .

The notation and the terminology are unambiguous: a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathfrak{o}$  is even if  $2 \in \mathfrak{p}$ , odd if  $2 \notin \mathfrak{p}$ ;  $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a})$  is the exponent of  $\mathfrak{p}$  in the prime decomposition of  $\mathfrak{a}$ ;  $f_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is the residual degree and  $e_{\mathfrak{p}}$  the ramification index of  $K_{\mathfrak{p}}|\mathbf{Q}_p$  (p being the rational prime which belongs to  $\mathfrak{p}$ ).

(It may happen that  $\bar{1}+\bar{\pi}=-\bar{1}$  in  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^2)^{\times}$  (resp.  $\bar{1}+\bar{\pi}^2=-\bar{1}$  in  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^3)^{\times}$ ) for some even prime  $\mathfrak{p}\subset\mathfrak{o}$ . Example:  $\mathfrak{o}=\mathbf{Z}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$ ) and  $\mathfrak{p}$  the unique even prime of  $\mathfrak{o}$ . More banally, we have  $-\bar{1}=\bar{1}$  in  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times}$  when  $\mathfrak{p}$  is an even prime and n is between 1 and  $e_{\mathfrak{p}}$ .)

# 2. $d_2$

The elementary observation behind the proof of Gauss's th. 1.1, also used in our proof of prop. 1.1, is that the sum s of all the elements in a finite commutative group G is 0, unless G has precisely one order-2 element  $\tau$ , in which case  $s = \tau$ . Anyone can supply a proof; he can then skip this section, and take the condition " $d_2(G) = 1$ " as a shorthand for "G has precisely one order-2 element".

Define  $d_2(G) = \dim_{\mathbf{F}_2}({}_2G)$ , where  ${}_2G$  is the subgroup of G killed by 2. It is clear that G has  $2^{d_2(G)} - 1$  order-2 elements.

**Example.** For a prime number p and a positive integer n, we have  $d_2((\mathbf{Z}/p^n\mathbf{Z})^{\times}) =$ 

- (1) 1 if  $p \neq 2$ ,
- (2) 0 if p = 2 and n = 1,
- (3) 1 if p = 2 and n = 2,
- (4) 2 if p = 2 and n > 2.

In this example, the unique order-2 element is -1 whenever  $d_2 = 1$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** The sum s of all elements in G is 0 unless  $d_2(G) = 1$ , in which case s is the unique order-2 element of G.

The involution  $\iota: g \mapsto -g$  fixes every element of the subgroup  ${}_2G = \operatorname{Ker}(x \mapsto 2x)$ . As the sum of elements in the remaining orbits of  $\iota$  is 0, we are reduced to the case  $G = {}_2G$  of a vector  $\mathbf{F}_2$ -space, and the proof is over by induction on the dimension  $d_2(G)$  of  ${}_2G$ , starting with dimension 2.

Proof of Gauss's th. 1.1: Let  $A = \prod_p p^{m_p}$  be the prime decomposition of A. By the Chinese remainder theorem,  $(\mathbf{Z}/A\mathbf{Z})^{\times}$  is the product over p of  $(\mathbf{Z}/p^{m_p}\mathbf{Z})^{\times}$ , so  $d_2((\mathbf{Z}/A\mathbf{Z})^{\times})$  is the sum over p of  $d_2((\mathbf{Z}/p^{m_p}\mathbf{Z})^{\times})$ . In view of the foregoing Example, the only way for this sum to be 1 is for A to be  $2^2$ , or  $p^{m_p}$ , or  $2p^{m_p}$  for some odd prime p and integer  $m_p > 0$ .

#### 3. Local units

Let's enter Hensel's world: let p be a prime number,  $K \mid \mathbf{Q}_p$  a finite extension,  $\mathfrak{o}$  its ring of integers,  $\mathfrak{p}$  the unique maximal ideal of  $\mathfrak{o}$ . Let n > 0 be an integer. We would like to know when  $d_2((\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times}) = 1$ , and, when such is the case, which one the unique order-2 element is.

**Proposition 3.1.** Denoting by e the ramification index and by f the residual degree of  $K \mid \mathbf{Q}_p$ , we have  $d_2((\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times}) =$ 

- (1) 1 if  $p \neq 2$ ,
- (2) 0 if p = 2, n = 1,
- (3) 1 if p = 2, n = 2, f = 1,
- (4) 1 if p = 2, n = 3, f = 1, e > 1,
- (5) > 1 in all other cases.

For any  $\mathfrak o\text{-basis }\pi$  of  $\mathfrak p,$  the unique order-2 element in the cases  $d_2=1$  is

- (1)  $-\bar{1} \ if \ p \neq 2$ ,
- (2)  $\bar{1} + \bar{\pi}$  if p = 2, n = 2, f = 1,
- (3)  $\bar{1} + \bar{\pi}^2$  if p = 2, n = 3, f = 1, e > 1.

*Proof*: For every j > 0, denote by  $U_j$  the kernel of  $\mathfrak{o}^{\times} \to (\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^j)^{\times}$ . If  $p \neq 2$ , the group  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times}$  is the direct product of the even-order cyclic group  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p})^{\times}$  and the p-group  $U_1/U_n$ , so  $d_2 = 1$ .

Assume now that p = 2. When n = 1, the group  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p})^{\times}$  is (cyclic) of odd order, so  $d_2 = 0$ . If f > 1, then the  $d_2$  of  $U_1/U_2$  is f and hence the  $d_2$  of  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times}$  is > 1 for every n > 1.

Assume further that f = 1. When n = 2, the  $d_2$  of  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^2)^{\times} = U_1/U_2$  is f = 1. If moreover e = 1, then the  $d_2$  of  $U_1/U_n$  is 2 for n > 2 (see Example).

Assume finally that, in addition, e > 1. We see that  $U_1/U_3$  is generated by  $\bar{1} + \bar{\pi}$ , since  $(1 + \pi)^2 = 1 + \pi^2 + 2\pi$  is in  $U_2$  but not in  $U_3$ . However,  $U_1/U_4$  is not cyclic because its order is 8 whereas every element has order at most 4: for every  $a \in \mathfrak{o}$ ,

$$(\bar{1} + \bar{a}\bar{\pi})^4 = \bar{1} + \bar{4}\bar{\pi}\bar{a} + \bar{6}\bar{\pi}^2\bar{a}^2 + \bar{4}\bar{\pi}^3\bar{a}^3 + \bar{\pi}^4\bar{a}^4 = \bar{1}$$

in  $U_1/U_4$ . Hence  $U_1/U_n$  is not cyclic for n > 3 (cf. Narkiewicz, *Elem. and anal. theory of alg. numbers*, 1990, p. 275). This concludes the proof.

(For p=2 and n>2e, we have  $d_2((\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times})=1+ef$ ; cf. Hasse, Zahlentheorie, Kap. 15.)

**Corollary 3.1.** The only cases in which the group  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times}$  has precisely one order-2 element s are  $: p \neq 2 : p = 2, n = 2, f = 1 : p = 2, n = 3, f = 1, e > 1$ . In these three cases,  $s = -\bar{1}, \bar{1} + \bar{\pi}, \bar{1} + \bar{\pi}^2$ , respectively. The group  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times}$  has no order-2 element precisely when p = 2, n = 1.

## 4. The proof

Let us return to the global situation of an ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{o}$  in the ring of integers of a number field  $K \mid \mathbf{Q}$ . The proof can now proceed as in the case  $\mathfrak{o} = \mathbf{Z}$  (§2). Everything boils down to deciding if the  $d_2$  of  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a})^{\times}$  is 1 — we know that the product of all elements is 1 if  $d_2 \neq 1$  (lemma 2.1). Writing  $\mathfrak{a} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}}$  the prime decomposition of  $\mathfrak{a}$ , the Chinese remainder theorem tells us that  $d_2((\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a})^{\times})$  is the sum, over the various primes  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathfrak{o}$ , of  $d_2((\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}})^{\times})$ . This sum can be 1 only when one of the terms is 1, the others being 0.

For each  $\mathfrak{p}$ , the group  $(\mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}})^{\times}$  is the same as  $(\mathfrak{o}_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}})^{\times}$ , where  $\mathfrak{o}_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is the completion of  $\mathfrak{o}$  at  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is the unique maximal ideal of  $\mathfrak{o}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . Running through the possibilities enumerarted in prop. 3.1 completes the proof of prop. 1.1.

**Example.** Let  $\zeta \in \bar{\mathbf{Q}}^{\times}$  be an element of order  $2^t$  (t > 1); take  $K = \mathbf{Q}(\zeta)$  and  $\mathfrak{p}$  the unique even prime of its ring of integers  $\mathbf{Z}[\zeta]$ . We have  $e_{\mathfrak{p}} = 2^{t-1}$  and  $f_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1$ ; we may take  $\pi = 1 - \zeta$ . The product of all elements in  $(\mathbf{Z}[\zeta]/\mathfrak{p}^n)^{\times}$  is respectively  $\bar{1}$ ,  $\bar{1} + \bar{\pi}$ ,  $\bar{1} + \bar{\pi}^2$ ,  $\bar{1}$  for n = 1, n = 2, n = 3 and n > 3.

### 5. Acknowledgements

We thank Herr Prof. Dr. Peter Roquette for suggesting the present definition  $d_2(G) = \dim_{\mathbf{F}_2}({}_2G)$  instead of the original  $d_2(G) = \dim_{\mathbf{F}_2}(G/2G)$ . After this Note was completed, a search in the literature revealed M. Laššák, Wilson's theorem in algebraic number fields, Math. Slovaca, **50** (2000), no. 3, pp. 303–314. We solicited a copy from Prof. G. Grekos, and thank him for supplying one; it contains substantially the same result as our prop. 1.1. Our proof is shorter, simpler, more direct, and more conceptual; it is based on notionibus rather than notationibus, of which there is now-a-days a surfeit. In any case, our aim was to show how Hensel could have proved prop. 1.1.

### References

- [1] C. Gauss, Disquisitiones arithmeticae. Gerh. Fleischer, Lipsiae, 1801, xviii+668 pp.
- [2] K. Hensel, Die multiplikative Darstellung der algebraischen Zahlen für den Bereich eines beliebigen Primteilers. J. f. d. reine und angewandte Math., 146 (1916), pp. 189–215.

Chandan Singh Dalawat Harish-Chandra Research Institute Chhatnag Road, Jhunsi 211019 Allahabad, Inde E-mail: dalawat@gmail.com