

EXPLICIT CLASS FIELD THEORY FOR ORDERS IN GLOBAL FUNCTION FIELDS

L. DEMANGOS AND T.M. GENDRON

ABSTRACT. This paper develops explicit class field theory for orders: of rank 1 in any global function field – Hayes theory – and of rank 2 in real quadratic function fields – Real Multiplication. The essential ingredient in the development of the Hayes Theory is an orders version of Shimura’s Main Theorem on Complex Multiplication, see §3. The section on Real Multiplication for orders uses values of the quantum modular invariant to generate the Hilbert class field of a rank 2 order contained in $\mathcal{O}_K =$ the integral closure of $\mathbb{F}_q[T]$.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Orders in Function Fields	2
2. Drinfeld and Hayes Modules over Rank 1 Orders	7
3. Shimura’s Main Theorem for Drinfeld Modules over Rank 1 Orders	12
4. Hayes Theory Over Rank 1 Orders	23
5. Generation of Hilbert Class Fields of Real Quadratic Rank 2 Orders	30
References	34

INTRODUCTION

Hayes theory, an explicit class field theory in positive characteristic, is an outgrowth of Drinfeld’s initial breakthrough [10], where *elliptic modules* – originally introduced as a tool to provide a complete proof of the Langlands conjectures for GL_2 over a global field in positive characteristic – give rise to the natural analog of the classical theory of elliptic curves over a number field.

While E. U. Gekeler introduced a *modular invariant* for rank 2 Drinfeld modules with Complex Multiplication, in order to generate class fields of *imaginary quadratic global function fields* [11] in the style of the classical Theorem of Weber-Fueter, V. Drinfeld [10] and D. Hayes [16] explored alternative approaches to generate class fields over *any* global function field K . This was accomplished by replacing the Dedekind domain \mathcal{O}_K by the Dedekind domain $A_\infty \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ of functions regular outside of a point $\infty \in \Sigma_K =$ the curve associated to K . Each such A_∞ gives rise to its own collection of dedicated class fields, for which an explicit description can

Date: July 15, 2024.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11R37, 11R80, 11R58, 11F03; Secondary 11K60.

Key words and phrases. quantum Drinfeld module, ray class field, function field arithmetic.

be made, and whose union gives the maximal abelian extension of K unramified over ∞ .

The key point is that the Dedekind domain A_∞ embeds discretely into \mathbb{C}_∞ (the function field complexes) as a non cocompact lattice, to which there is associated an exponential that defines an analytic isomorphism

$$(1) \quad (\mathbb{C}_\infty, +)/A_\infty \cong (\mathbb{C}_\infty, +)$$

which mirrors the behavior of the classical Weierstrass map in the new setting. This isomorphism allows one to push forward the analytic A_∞ -module structure on the left hand side of (1) to an algebraic A_∞ -module structure on the right hand side of (1), which is expressed by a representation of A_∞ in the algebra of polynomials in the Frobenius τ ,

$$\rho : A_\infty \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_\infty\{\tau\}.$$

This is the Drinfeld module \mathbb{D} associated to A_∞ ; it gives rise to an analog of the theory of elliptic curves with Complex Multiplication.

With this structure in hand, Hayes proved an analog of the Kronecker-Weber Theorem for *any* finite extension $K/\mathbb{F}_q(T)$. In this setting, the Drinfeld module \mathbb{D} is normalized by a suitable transcendental element ξ_{A_∞} which plays the role of π . The Hilbert class field H_{A_∞} is generated by the coefficients of $\rho(a)$ for any non-constant $a \in A_\infty$ and the ray class field $K_{\mathfrak{m}}$ associated to an ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset A_\infty$ is generated over H_{A_∞} by $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}] =$ the (cyclic) module of \mathfrak{m} -torsion.

It is of interest to extend Hayes' Theory to orders $R \subset A_\infty$: indeed, Hayes himself initiated such a study. In [15], Hayes developed the theory of Drinfeld modules over R , proved the generation result for H_R but only gave ray class field generation in the case $R = A_\infty$.

The main aim of this paper is to conclude Hayes' original work by proving the class field generation result for arbitrary $R \subset A_\infty$. In doing so, we revamp Hayes' original account by introducing the modular invariant $j(\mathfrak{a})$ of an *invertible* R -ideal \mathfrak{a} and show that $H_R = K(j(\mathfrak{a}))$, which makes the theory closer in spirit with that of elliptic curves, via the Weber-Feuter Theorem. The main tool we use in the ray class field generation result is a version of Shimura's Main Theorem valid in this setting, proved here in §3.

In §5, as an application, we prove a generalization of the main theorem of [7] to the order context: if $K/\mathbb{F}_q(T)$ is *real* and quadratic, $f \in \mathcal{O}_K$ a fundamental unit and $\mathcal{O}_f = \mathbb{F}_q[T, f, f^{-1}] \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ then

$$H_{\mathcal{O}_f} = K \left(\prod_{\alpha \in j^{\text{qt}}(f)} \alpha \right).$$

This result, as well as the Hayes Theory for orders, are essential to the generation of ray class fields over rank 2 rings, where the theory we develop only works for orders of the form \mathcal{O}_f and not \mathcal{O}_K , see [9].

1. ORDERS IN FUNCTION FIELDS

In this section we state and if necessary, prove, some general facts about orders in function fields. In what follows, we fix a curve Σ_K over \mathbb{F}_q with $\text{Rat}(\Sigma_K) = K$, a point $\infty \in \Sigma_K$ and the Dedekind domain

$$A = A_\infty = \{\text{elements of } K \text{ regular outside of } \infty\}.$$

Let $R \subset A$ be an **order**: by definition a subring with 1 whose field of quotients is K . In what follows $\text{ord}_\infty(f)$ is the order of $f \in K$ at ∞ . By definition, for all $f \in A$, $\text{ord}_\infty(f) \leq 0$.

Lemma 1.1. *There exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq N$, there exists $g \in R$ with $\text{ord}_\infty(g) = -k$.*

Proof. The field $K = \text{Frac}(R)$ has an element of order -1 at ∞ , therefore there exists $r, s \in R$ having orders $-m, -m-1$ at ∞ . The set of valuations of $r^n s^{n'}$, $n, n' \in \mathbb{N}$ is the additive submonoid of \mathbb{Z} generated by $m, m-1$. Since $(m, m-1) = 1$, the result follows. \square

Corollary 1.1. *$(A, +)/(R, +)$ is a finite R -module, and in particular, A is a finitely generated R -module. More generally, R/\mathfrak{a} is finite for any R -ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1.1, any coset of the quotient R -module $(A, +)/(R, +)$ has a representative of order $\geq -N$, where N is as in the Lemma. But the set of elements of A having order bounded below by $-N$ is finite, since A is an \mathbb{F}_q algebra whose elements are those elements of K regular outside of ∞ . Thus $(A, +)/(R, +)$ is finite. The second statement follows from an identical argument, since any ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$ also has the property described in the statement of Lemma 1.1, of having elements of all orders less than some lower bound. \square

Corollary 1.2. *A is integral over R . In particular, $\overline{R} = \text{integral closure of } R = A$.*

Proof. Since $(A, +)/(R, +)$ is finite, given $f \in A$, we may write $f^m - f^n = r \in R$ for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ hence f satisfies $P(X) = X^m - X^n - r \in R[X]$. Thus $A \subset \overline{R}$. But since $R \subset A$ and A is Dedekind, $\overline{R} = A$. \square

Corollary 1.3. *R is a 1-dimensional Noetherian domain.*

Proof. By Corollary 1.1, A is a finitely generated R -module, and by Proposition 7.8 of [1], R is a finitely generated \mathbb{F}_q algebra, hence Noetherian. By Lemma 1.1, every principal ideal aR has elements of all orders $-k \leq -N + \text{ord}_\infty(a)$ hence R/aR is a finite R -module. In particular, if $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$ is a prime ideal, R/\mathfrak{p} is a finite integral domain, hence a field. Thus \mathfrak{p} is maximal, so the Krull dimension is 1. \square

Proposition 1.1. *Every prime ideal of R is the contraction of a prime ideal in A .*

Proof. A is integral over R by Corollary 1.2, so by Proposition 9 on page 9 of [17], for any prime $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$, $\mathfrak{p}A \neq A$, hence there is a prime $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}} \supset \mathfrak{p}A$. By Corollary 1.3, R has Krull dimension 1, hence this prime contracts to \mathfrak{p} . \square

We recall that the **conductor**

$$\mathfrak{c} \subset R$$

is the largest A -ideal contained in R . The conductor is always non-zero.

Theorem 1.1. *The contraction map*

$$(2) \quad A \supset \mathfrak{a} \longmapsto \mathfrak{a}_R := \mathfrak{a} \cap R \subset R$$

induces a bijective, multiplicative correspondence between ideals of A prime to \mathfrak{c} and ideals of R prime to \mathfrak{c} . The inverse correspondence of (2) is given by the expansion, $\mathfrak{a}_R \mapsto A\mathfrak{a}_R$. The bijection (2) induces a bijection between prime ideals prime to the conductor.

Proof. The proof is formally the same as that for orders in rings of integers in number fields, for the latter see Theorem 3.8 of [4]. \square

For any fractional R -ideal \mathfrak{a} , define

$$(3) \quad \mathfrak{a}^* = \{\beta \in K : \beta \mathfrak{a} \subset R\}.$$

Thus $\mathfrak{a}^* \mathfrak{a} \subset R$; if $\mathfrak{a}^* \mathfrak{a} = R$, we say that \mathfrak{a} is invertible and write $\mathfrak{a}^{-1} = \mathfrak{a}^*$. All principal ideals of R are invertible, and if R is Dedekind, every ideal is invertible.

Lemma 1.2. *Let $\mathfrak{b} \subset R$ be an ideal and*

$$R^{\mathfrak{b}} := \{x \in K : x\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{b}\}.$$

Then $R \subset R^{\mathfrak{b}} \subset A$ and if \mathfrak{b} is prime to the conductor, $R^{\mathfrak{b}} = R$.

Proof. $R^{\mathfrak{b}}$ is a commutative ring with 1 and clearly

$$\mathfrak{b}^* \supset R^{\mathfrak{b}} \supset R,$$

so $R^{\mathfrak{b}}$ is an R -module. We claim that the quotient R -module $(R^{\mathfrak{b}}, +)/(R, +)$ is finite: this will follow if $(\mathfrak{b}^*, +)/(R, +)$ is finite. However, for any $y \in \mathfrak{b}$, $(\mathfrak{b}^*, +)/(R, +)$ is contained in $(y^{-1}R, +)/(R, +) \cong R/yR$, which is finite by Corollary 1.1. Given $x \in R^{\mathfrak{b}}$, all of the powers x^n , $n \geq 0$, define elements of $(R^{\mathfrak{b}}, +)/(R, +)$, so there exist exponents m, n with $x^n - x^m = r \in R$. Thus x is integral over R , hence $x \in A$ by Corollary 1.2. If \mathfrak{b} is prime to \mathfrak{c} , let $b \in \mathfrak{b}$, $c \in \mathfrak{c}$ with $b + c = 1$. Then $x = xb + xc \in R$. \square

Theorem 1.2. *Let $0 \neq \mathfrak{p} \subset R$ be prime. Then \mathfrak{p} is invertible $\Leftrightarrow R^{\mathfrak{p}} = R$.*

Proof. Formally the same as the proof of Theorem 3.4 of [4]. \square

Theorem 1.3. *If $\mathfrak{b} \subset R$ is prime to \mathfrak{c} , then \mathfrak{b} may be written as a product of invertible primes. In particular, \mathfrak{b} is invertible.*

Proof. Formally the same as the proof of Theorem 3.6 of [4]. \square

The class group of R is by definition

$$\text{Cl}_R = \{\text{invertible fractional } R \text{ ideals}\} / \{\text{principal } R \text{ ideals}\}.$$

The proof of the following is due to W. Sawin.

Lemma 1.3. *Let $\mathfrak{n} \subset R$ be an ideal. Then every class $[\mathfrak{a}] \in \text{Cl}_R$ contains a representative prime to \mathfrak{n} .*

Proof. When $R = A$ is Dedekind, this is an elementary consequence of the Chinese remainder theorem, see [4], Lemma 5.1. Otherwise, let \mathfrak{a} be an invertible fractional R -ideal, $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^{-1}$, so that $\alpha \mathfrak{a} \subset R$ is an integral representative of $[\mathfrak{a}]$. For any prime $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$, then, we have

$$(\alpha \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{p}) = 1 \iff \alpha \mathfrak{a} \not\subset \mathfrak{p} \iff \exists \beta \in \mathfrak{a}, \alpha \beta \notin \mathfrak{p}. \quad (\dagger_{\mathfrak{p}})$$

In particular, $(\alpha \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{n}) = 1$ if and only if $(\dagger_{\mathfrak{p}})$ holds for all $\mathfrak{p} | \mathfrak{n}$. The satisfaction of $(\dagger_{\mathfrak{p}})$ for a particular α only depends on the coset $\alpha \bmod \mathfrak{p} \mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ and, moreover, the quotient module $\mathfrak{a}^{-1} / \mathfrak{p} \mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ contains a class defined by $\alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}$ satisfying $(\dagger_{\mathfrak{p}})$, since $\mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \supseteq \mathfrak{p}$. By the Chinese remainder theorem for modules, the map

$$\mathfrak{a}^{-1} \longrightarrow \prod_{\mathfrak{p} | \mathfrak{n}} \mathfrak{a}^{-1} / \mathfrak{p} \mathfrak{a}^{-1}$$

is surjective, hence there exists $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ satisfying $(\dagger_{\mathfrak{p}})$ for all $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{n}$. \square

Corollary 1.4. *The expansion map*

$$R \supset \mathfrak{a} \mapsto \mathfrak{a}A \subset A$$

induces an epimorphism

$$\mathrm{Cl}_R \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Cl}_A.$$

Proof. Let $[\mathfrak{A}] \in \mathrm{Cl}_A$. By Lemma 1.3, we may assume \mathfrak{A} is prime to \mathfrak{c} . Then by Theorem 1.1, $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{A} \cap R$ is also prime to the conductor, hence invertible by Theorem 1.3, and so defines an element $[\mathfrak{a}] \in \mathrm{Cl}_R$ mapping onto $[\mathfrak{A}]$. \square

Corollary 1.5. *An ideal in R that is prime to the conductor has unique factorization into prime ideals which are prime to the conductor. In particular, a prime ideal prime to the conductor is invertible. All but finitely many prime ideals are prime to the conductor, hence all but finitely many prime ideals are invertible.*

Proof. Again, the proof here is formally the same as that for orders in number fields, see Corollary 3.11 of [4]. \square

Theorem 1.4. *A prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$ is invertible $\iff \mathfrak{p}$ is prime to the conductor.*

Proof. \Leftarrow By Corollary 1.5.

\Rightarrow The proof is formally the same as that of Theorem 6.1 of [4]; in this connection, we remark that the proof requires that A is a finitely generated R -module, which is a consequence of Corollary 1.1. \square

Theorem 1.5. *Every invertible ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$ has the 2-generator property: there exists $\alpha, \beta \in R$ with*

$$\mathfrak{a} = (\alpha, \beta).$$

Proof. Every ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$, invertible or not, is contained in finitely many prime ideals. Indeed, by Proposition 1.1, every prime ideal of R is of the form $\mathfrak{p}_R = \mathfrak{p} \cap R$ for $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ prime. Thus if \mathfrak{a} is contained in infinitely many distinct primes $\mathfrak{p}_{i,R}$ we would have

$$\mathfrak{a} \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{p}_{i,R} \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{p}_i = (0).$$

By Corollary 1 of [13], any invertible ideal in a commutative ring contained in a finite number of maximal ideals has the 2-generator property. \square

Note 1.1. By Theorem 3 of [13], given any $0 \neq a \in \mathfrak{a} \subset R$ an invertible ideal, there exists $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ with $\mathfrak{a} = (a, b)$.

Let I_R be the monoid of fractional R -ideals, I_R^* the subgroup of invertible ideals, P_R the subgroup of principal ideals, so that $\mathrm{Cl}_R = I_R^*/P_R$. Denote by

$$I_R^{\mathfrak{c}} < I_R^*$$

the subgroup of R -ideals prime to the conductor and $P_R^{\mathfrak{c}} < P_R$ the subgroup of principal R -ideals prime to the conductor. Similarly, let $I_A^{\mathfrak{c}}$ be the group of A -ideals prime to the conductor and let

$$P_A^{\mathfrak{c}} = \langle rA \mid r \in R, (r, \mathfrak{c}) = 1 \rangle$$

be the group of principal A -ideals generated by an element of R which is prime to the conductor.

Theorem 1.6. *We have the following isomorphisms*

$$\text{Cl}_R \cong \text{I}_R^c / \text{P}_R^c \cong \text{I}_A^c / \text{P}_A^c.$$

Proof. See [15]. □

We close this section with a discussion of localizations and completions. If $\mathfrak{p}_R \subset R$ is a prime ideal, by Proposition 1.1, it is the contraction of a prime $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$. Denote the localization with respect to \mathfrak{p}_R by

$$R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)} = R S_{\mathfrak{p}_R}^{-1}, \quad S_{\mathfrak{p}_R} = R \setminus \mathfrak{p}_R.$$

Since $S_{\mathfrak{p}_R} \subset S_{\mathfrak{p}} = A \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, there is a canonical inclusion

$$R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)} \hookrightarrow A_{(\mathfrak{p})}.$$

Proposition 1.2. *If $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$ then $R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)} = A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$.*

Proof. By hypothesis, there exists $c \in \mathfrak{c} \setminus \mathfrak{p} \subset S_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then for all $\alpha/s \in A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$, $\alpha/s = c\alpha/cs \in R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$. □

The completion of $R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$ with respect to its maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}_R R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$ is denoted $R_{\mathfrak{p}_R}$.

There is another way to complete $R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$: namely, with respect to its embedding into the completion $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of A . Denote this completion $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Proposition 1.3. *The completion $R_{\mathfrak{p}_R}$ is canonically isomorphic, as a topological ring, to $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.*

Proof. The canonical inclusion of localizations $R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)} \hookrightarrow A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$ induces a continuous inclusion of completions $R_{\mathfrak{p}_R} \hookrightarrow R_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset A_{\mathfrak{p}}$, since $\mathfrak{p}_R R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)} \subset \mathfrak{p} A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$, the maximal ideal of $A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$. To see that this map is bicontinuous, we must show that the two completion topologies are compatible: that is, there is a power of $\mathfrak{p} A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$ contained in $\mathfrak{p}_R R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$. But $R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$ is an order in the Dedekind domain $A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$; denote the corresponding conductor by $\mathfrak{c}_{(\mathfrak{p})}$. Since $A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$ is Dedekind, $\mathfrak{c}_{(\mathfrak{p})} \subset \mathfrak{p}_R R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$ is a power of $\mathfrak{p} A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$. That is, convergence to zero with respect to either topology is the same, and the completions with respect to either topology produce canonically isomorphic rings. □

In view of Proposition 1.3, we may write unambiguously $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for the completion of $R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$ with respect to either topology.

Corollary 1.6. $K \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}} = R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$.

Proof. The inclusion $R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)} \subset K \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is clear. Let $\alpha \in K \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then there exists a sequence $x_i/s_i \in R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$ converging to α . By definition of the completion topology, for any n and i large, $\alpha - x_i/s_i \in \mathfrak{p}_R^n R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$. But this implies *a fortiori* that eventually $\alpha - x_i/s_i \in R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$, which gives $\alpha \in R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$. □

Proposition 1.4. *The completion of $R \subset R_{(\mathfrak{p})}$ (with respect to either completion topology) is $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.*

Proof. It is enough to show that $R \subset R_{(\mathfrak{p})}$ is dense in either topology, and to show this, it is enough to show that given $s \in S_{\mathfrak{p}_R}$, there exists a sequence $(y_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset R$ converging to $1/s$, or equivalently, $y_i s \rightarrow 1$. But $(s, \mathfrak{p}_R^i) = 1$ for all i , so choose y_i such that $y_i s + z_i \rho_i = 1$ where $\rho_i \in \mathfrak{p}_R^i$ and $z_i \in R$: this gives the desired sequence. □

2. DRINFELD AND HAYES MODULES OVER RANK 1 ORDERS

The theory of Drinfeld modules over an order was introduced in [15], however, this paper was written before Hayes had arrived at the final form of his theory (c.f. [16]). In particular, in [15], Hayes did not introduce the notion of sign normalization and only gave an explicit generation result for the Hilbert class field of an order. Regarding ray class fields, Hayes elected to restrict to the case when the order is Dedekind. The purpose of this section then is to introduce the reader to Hayes' foundational work, updating it according to the requirements of the present paper.

We continue to use notation established in section §1. We will use lower case gothic letters such as \mathfrak{a} to denote ideals in A ; ideals in R will be denoted by lower case gothic letters with the subindex R e.g. \mathfrak{a}_R . If $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$ happens to be a contraction of an ideal in A , the latter ideal will be denoted \mathfrak{a} .

The completions $K_\infty \subset \mathbb{C}_\infty$ have their usual meanings. The Frobenius automorphism acting on \mathbb{C}_∞ is denoted $\tau(x) = x^q$, and for any subfield $L \subset \mathbb{C}_\infty$,

$$L\{\tau\}$$

is the noncommutative algebra of additive polynomials in τ , with product given by composition. Let

$$\iota : A \rightarrow L$$

be a ring homomorphism, making L an A -field: the characteristic is defined to be $\wp = \text{Ker}(\iota)$. If $\wp = (0)$ we say that the characteristic is generic. A rank 1 Drinfeld R -module defined over L

$$\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho),$$

consists of an \mathbb{F}_q -algebra homomorphism

$$\rho : R \longrightarrow L\{\tau\} \subset \mathbb{C}_\infty\{\tau\}$$

in which each $\rho_a := \rho(a)$ has the form

$$\rho_a(\tau) = \iota(a)\tau^0 + a_1\tau + \cdots + a_d\tau^d, \quad d = \deg(a), \quad a_1, \dots, a_d \in L, \quad a_d \neq 0.$$

Note that $a_0 = \iota(a)$ implies that

$$\iota = D \circ \rho,$$

where $D = d/dx$ is the derivative with respect to x .

We have the following analytical version of rank 1 Drinfeld R -modules. See §4 of [15]. By a rank 1 R -lattice is meant a discrete rank 1 R -submodule Λ of \mathbb{C}_∞ . By Dirichlet's Unit Theorem for global fields (see Theorem 3.3 on page 102 of [2]), $A^\times = \mathbb{F}_q^\times$, which implies as well that $R^\times = \mathbb{F}_q^\times$ (since $\text{Frac}(R) = K$). In particular, R and all of its fractional ideals are rank 1 R -lattices in \mathbb{C}_∞ , and any rank 1 R -lattice Λ is of the form $\xi\mathfrak{a}_R$ for $\xi \in \mathbb{C}_\infty$ and \mathfrak{a}_R a fractional R -ideal. To an R -lattice Λ we may associate the exponential function

$$e_\Lambda : \mathbb{C}_\infty \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_\infty, \quad e_\Lambda(z) = z \prod_{0 \neq \lambda \in \Lambda} \left(1 - \frac{z}{\lambda}\right).$$

The exponential function in turn defines a unique Drinfeld R -module $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$, isomorphic as an R -module to $\mathbb{C}_\infty/\Lambda$ via e_Λ i.e.

$$(4) \quad e_\Lambda(az) = \rho_a(e_\Lambda(z)), \quad \text{for all } a \in A.$$

See page 188 of [15]. Every rank 1 Drinfeld R -module $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$ in generic characteristic may be obtained in this way. See [15], Theorem 5.9. We denote by Λ_ρ and e_ρ the corresponding lattice and exponential map.

At this point, we depart slightly from [15] and introduce the notion of an *invertible rank 1 Drinfeld R -module*: a generic characteristic Drinfeld R -module with lattice of the form $\xi \mathfrak{a}_R$, for $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$ an invertible ideal. For \mathbb{D} an invertible rank 1 Drinfeld module,

$$\text{End}(\mathbb{D}) \cong \text{End}(\mathfrak{a}_R) = \{\alpha \in K : \alpha \mathfrak{a}_R \subset \mathfrak{a}_R\} = R,$$

where the last equality follows immediately from the invertibility of \mathfrak{a}_R .

Important Assumption In what follows, all rank 1 Drinfeld R -modules will be assumed invertible.

The Assumption appears to be a hypothesis necessary in the proof of the analog of Shimura's Main Theorem, see section §3.

Denote by $\mathbb{F}_\infty \supset \mathbb{F}_q$ the field of constants of K_∞ , $d_\infty = [\mathbb{F}_\infty : \mathbb{F}_q]$. We fix a sign function: a homomorphism

$$\text{sgn} : K_\infty^\times \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}_\infty^\times$$

which is the identity on \mathbb{F}_∞^\times and trivial on the 1-units. There are exactly

$$\#\mathbb{F}_\infty^\times = q^{d_\infty} - 1$$

sign functions. For any $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_\infty/\mathbb{F}_q)$, a twisted sign function is a homomorphism of the form $\sigma \circ \text{sgn}$.

For $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$ a rank 1 Drinfeld module, the leading coefficient of ρ_a is denoted

$$\mu_\rho(a) := a_d,$$

where d is the degree of a at ∞ . By Lemma 1.1, R contains functions whose pole at ∞ is of order $-n$, for all n sufficiently large. Then following the standard arguments (c.f. [20], page 68), the map $R \ni a \mapsto \mu_\rho(a)$ may be extended to K_∞^\times . The restriction of μ_ρ to \mathbb{F}_∞ gives an automorphism i_ρ fixing \mathbb{F}_q i.e. an element of $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_\infty/\mathbb{F}_q)$.

We say that \mathbb{D} is *sign normalized* or a *Hayes module* if μ_ρ is a twisting of the sign function. See [16] for a discussion of this notion in the case where R is Dedekind.

Proposition 2.1. *Let h_R be the class number of R . Then there are exactly h_R isomorphism classes of rank 1 Drinfeld modules over \mathbb{C}_∞ .*

Proof. When $R = A$ is Dedekind, this is the content of [15], Corollary 5.13, page 195. For general R , the proof is essentially the same: since we are assuming that our Drinfeld modules are uniformized by lattices homothetic to invertible ideals, and isomorphic Drinfeld modules have homothetic lattices, the corresponding ideals must define the same class in Cl_R . \square

Proposition 2.2. *Every isomorphism class $[\mathbb{D}]$ of Drinfeld R -module contains exactly $(q^{d_\infty} - 1)/(q - 1)$ Hayes modules.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$ be a representative of the isomorphism class and let π be a uniformizer at the prime ∞ with $\text{sgn}(\pi) = 1$. Let $z \in \mathbb{C}_\infty$ satisfy $z^{1-q^{d_\infty}} = \mu_\rho(\pi^{-1})$.

Then the Drinfeld module \mathbb{D}_0 defined by $\rho_0 = z\rho z^{-1}$ satisfies $\mu_{\rho_0}(\pi) = 1$. From this it follows that for any $x = \sum_{i \geq n} c_i \pi^i \in K_\infty = \mathbb{F}_\infty((\pi))$, $c_i \in \mathbb{F}_\infty$,

$$\mu_{\rho_0}(x) = \mu_{\rho_0}(c_n) = \mu_{\rho_0}(\text{sgn}(x)) = i_\rho(\text{sgn}(x)).$$

Thus the class $[\mathbb{D}]$ contains the Hayes module \mathbb{D}_0 . The rest of the argument is the same as that in the case of a Dedekind domain, see page 69 of [20]. \square

Each Hayes module $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$ is thus associated to a class of invertible ideal \mathfrak{a}_R which we assume is contained in R . Then, for each Hayes module \mathbb{D} in the associated class, there is a transcendental element $\xi_\rho \in \mathbb{C}_\infty$ so that the Drinfeld module of the lattice $\Lambda_\rho := \xi_\rho \mathfrak{a}_R$ is \mathbb{D} .

We define the Hilbert class field H_R associated to R (c.f. [15], Theorem 8.10) as the minimal field of definition of any (invertible) Drinfeld R -module. To state the results of Hayes Theory, which we extend to R , we also require the narrow version of the Hilbert class field. The narrow class group of R may be identified with the quotient

$$\text{Cl}_R^1 := \mathfrak{I}_R^c / \mathfrak{P}_R^{c,1}$$

where \mathfrak{I}_R^c is as before the group of fractional ideals of R prime to the conductor and $\mathfrak{P}_R^{c,1}$ is the subgroup of principal ideals prime to the conductor that are generated by a sgn one element. Then

$$h_R^1 := \#\text{Cl}_R^1 = h_R(q^{d_\infty} - 1)/(q - 1)$$

where h_R is the class number of R .

We now translate some of these constructions into the idèlic language¹, see for example [20], page 80. If $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ is prime, by $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ we mean the completion of R in $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then, if we let

$$U_R^1 := \{s \in \mathbb{I}_K \mid \text{for all } \mathfrak{p} \subset A, s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times \text{ and } \text{sgn}(s_\infty) = 1\},$$

and if π_∞ is a uniformizer of K_∞ with $\text{sgn}(\pi_\infty) = 1$, then the narrow Hilbert class field

$$H_R^1$$

is defined to be the class field corresponding to the group

$$\mathbb{I}_R^1 := K^\times \cdot \pi_\infty^{\mathbb{Z}} \cdot U_R^1 \subset \mathbb{I}_K.$$

Thus, Artin reciprocity gives an isomorphism

$$[\cdot, K] : \mathbb{I}_K / \mathbb{I}_R^1 \longrightarrow \text{Gal}(H_R^1/K),$$

which induces, on the level of ideal classes, an isomorphism

$$\text{Cl}_R^1 \longrightarrow \text{Gal}(H_R^1/K), \quad \mathfrak{a}_R \longmapsto \sigma_{\mathfrak{a}_R}.$$

When $d_\infty = 1$, i.e., $\mathbb{F}_\infty = \mathbb{F}_q$, then $H_R^1 = H_R$.

If $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$ is a (not necessarily invertible) ideal and $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$ is a Drinfeld R -module over a field L , the set $\{\rho_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_R\}$ is a principal left ideal of $L\{\tau\}$ and has a unique generator $\rho_{\mathfrak{a}_R}$ of $\text{sgn} 1$. Then there exists a unique Drinfeld R -module defined over L , denoted

$$\mathfrak{a}_R * \mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \mathfrak{a}_R * \rho),$$

for which

$$\rho_{\mathfrak{a}_R} \circ \rho_a = (\mathfrak{a}_R * \rho)_a \circ \rho_{\mathfrak{a}_R},$$

¹We continue the convention of indexing factors of the idèles using primes in A along with ∞ .

for all $a \in R$. That is, $\rho_{\mathfrak{a}_R}$ defines an isogeny

$$\rho_{\mathfrak{a}_R} : \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{a}_R * \mathbb{D}.$$

See [15], page 182. If $\mathfrak{a}_R = (a)$ is principal, $(a) * \rho$ is isomorphic to ρ . Thus, if we restrict to invertible ideals, there is an induced action of the group Cl_R on isomorphism classes of Drinfeld R -modules. See [15], page 185.

When ρ is a Hayes module, $\mathfrak{a}_R * \rho$ is also a Hayes module, so that the $*$ action preserves the set of Hayes modules, and this time, the principal ideals with a monic generator act trivially. Thus, the set of Hayes R -modules is a principal homogeneous space for the $*$ action of Cl_R^1 . We have

$$(5) \quad \mathfrak{a}_R * \mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}^{\sigma_{\mathfrak{a}_R}}$$

where $\sigma_{\mathfrak{a}_R}$ is the automorphism associated to the narrow class of \mathfrak{a}_R by Class Field Theory, and where for any automorphism σ of \mathbb{C}_∞ , $\mathbb{D}^\sigma = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho^\sigma)$, with $\rho^\sigma = \sigma \circ \rho$. The statements in this paragraph do not appear as such in [15] (but see Theorem 8.5 of [15]), however, they may be verified using the same techniques as in the case when R is Dedekind, c.f. [20], §3 and particularly Theorem 3.3.4.

The narrow Hilbert class field has the following relation to any rank 1 Hayes R -module $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$. For any $a \in R$, let

$$H_R^{\text{norm}}$$

be the *normalizing field*: the field generated over K by the coefficients of ρ_a .

Theorem 2.1. H_R^{norm} is independent of the choice of Hayes module \mathbb{D} and $a \in R$, and is equal to H_R^1 .

Proof. The exponential e_ρ satisfies the functional equation: for all $a \in R$,

$$e_\rho(x) = \rho_a \circ e_\rho(a^{-1}x).$$

Then, as in [20], Remark 2.4.3 (1), the coefficients of ρ_a are determined recursively by an algebraic equation with parameters in the coefficients of ρ_b , for any other choice of $b \in R$, and vice versa. Thus H_R^{norm} is independent of the choice of $a \in R$. The class group Cl_R^1 acts transitively on the set of Hayes modules over R via the $*$ -action. Moreover, the fundamental relation $\rho_{\mathfrak{a}_R} \circ \rho = \rho' \circ \rho_{\mathfrak{a}_R}$ where $\rho' = \mathfrak{a}_R * \rho$, implies that the coefficient fields coincide, so H_R^{norm} is independent of the choice of Hayes module. The rest of the proof is formally the same as that found in Proposition 3.3.1 of [20], page 70, where it is shown that $\text{Gal}(H_R^{\text{norm}}/K)$ is canonically isomorphic to Cl_R^1 via an isomorphism compatible with that of class field theory. It follows that H_R^{norm} is H_R^1 . \square

Corollary 2.1. Let $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$ be a Hayes module. Then the coefficients of the exponential e_ρ are in H_A^1 .

Proof. By Theorem 2.1, the coefficients of ρ_a are in H_A^1 . Since e_ρ conjugates multiplication by a with ρ_a (see equation (4)), the coefficients of e_ρ are also in H_A^1 . \square

We will need the following result concerning reduction of torsion. Fix $\mathfrak{p}_R \subset R$ a prime ideal. Let L be a finite Galois extension of K , $\mathcal{O}_L \supset R$ the integral closure of R in L : we note that \mathcal{O}_L is Dedekind, by the Krull-Akizuki Theorem (see [18], page 77). Let $\mathfrak{P} \subset \mathcal{O}_L$ be a prime ideal which divides \mathfrak{p}_R and denote by $\mathcal{O}_{(\mathfrak{P})}$ the localization of \mathcal{O}_L at \mathfrak{P} .

For $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$ a rank 1 Drinfeld R -module defined over L , we recall that \mathbb{D} is said to have good reduction with respect to \mathfrak{P} if \mathbb{D} is, up to isomorphism, a Drinfeld module with coefficients in the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{(\mathfrak{P})} \subset L$ and the reduction mod \mathfrak{P} is also a rank 1 Drinfeld module. In this case, we denote by $\tilde{\mathbb{D}} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \tilde{\rho})$ the reduction of \mathbb{D} mod \mathfrak{P} .

Now we assume that \mathbb{D} is a Hayes R -module, and so is defined over $L = H_R^1$. Note then that \mathbb{D} has coefficients in \mathcal{O}_L (see Corollary 7.4 of [15]) and good reduction at all primes because it is of rank 1. Let $\mathfrak{m}_R \subset R$ be a fixed modulus (an integral ideal, *not* necessarily invertible) and recall that the \mathfrak{m}_R -torsion module of \mathbb{D} is defined

$$\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] := \{x \in \mathbb{C}_\infty : \rho_{\mathfrak{m}_R}(x) = 0\}.$$

Note 2.1. If \mathbb{D} is analytically uniformized by $\mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{a}_R$ for \mathfrak{a}_R an invertible ideal, then the exponential map identifies

$$\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] \cong (\mathfrak{m}_R \mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/\mathfrak{a}_R$$

Here we recall that for any fractional R -ideal \mathfrak{n}_R ,

$$\mathfrak{n}_R^* = \{\beta \in K : \beta \mathfrak{n}_R \subset R\},$$

and that $\mathfrak{n}_R^{-1} = \mathfrak{n}_R^*$ if \mathfrak{n}_R is invertible.

Proposition 2.3. *Let \mathfrak{m}_R be prime to \mathfrak{c} . Then $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$ is a free R/\mathfrak{m}_R -module of rank 1.*

Proof. The proof follows the structure of that of Proposition 1.4 on page 102 of [19]. We may assume without loss of generality that a uniformizing lattice Λ for \mathbb{D} has been chosen to be a fractional R -ideal. Since \mathfrak{m}_R is invertible, we have $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] \cong \mathfrak{m}_R^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda$. Using the Chinese remainder theorem, we may write both $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$ and R/\mathfrak{m}_R as direct sums of primary factors, so that the Proposition splits along each factor. That is, if $\mathfrak{p}_R \subset R$ is a prime not dividing the conductor, we are reduced to showing that the quotient

$$\mathfrak{b}_R/\mathfrak{p}_R^e \mathfrak{b}_R := \mathfrak{m}_R^{-1}\Lambda/\mathfrak{p}_R^e \mathfrak{m}_R^{-1}\Lambda$$

is a rank 1 module over the local ring R/\mathfrak{p}_R^e , where e is the exponent of \mathfrak{p}_R in the prime factorization of \mathfrak{m}_R (which exists, by Corollary 1.5 of section §1). Write

$$R' = R/\mathfrak{p}_R^e, \quad \mathfrak{p}'_R = \mathfrak{p}_R/\mathfrak{p}_R^e, \quad \mathfrak{b}'_R = \mathfrak{b}_R/\mathfrak{p}_R^e \mathfrak{b}_R,$$

and consider the quotient

$$\mathfrak{b}'_R/\mathfrak{p}'_R \mathfrak{b}'_R \cong \mathfrak{b}_R/\mathfrak{p}_R \mathfrak{b}_R$$

as a vector space over R/\mathfrak{p}_R . Since \mathfrak{b}_R is a product of invertible ideals, it is invertible, and thus, by Theorem 1.5, it has the 2-generator property. It follows then that any two elements of \mathfrak{b}_R are R dependent, so the dimension of $\mathfrak{b}_R/\mathfrak{p}_R \mathfrak{b}_R$ over R/\mathfrak{p}_R is ≤ 1 , however, if the dimension were 0, we would have $\mathfrak{b}_R = \mathfrak{p}_R \mathfrak{b}_R$, which cannot be the case. Thus the dimension is 1. By Nakayama's Lemma applied to R' and the R' module \mathfrak{b}'_R , \mathfrak{b}'_R is free of rank 1. \square

Note 2.2. If $\mathfrak{m}_R = mR$ is principal, it is invertible and $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] \cong m^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda$. In this case, there is a canonical isomorphism

$$m^{-1}\Lambda/\Lambda \longrightarrow \Lambda/m\Lambda \longrightarrow R/mR, \quad x + \Lambda \longmapsto mx + m\Lambda \longmapsto mx + mR.$$

Thus in the case, the conclusion in Proposition 2.3 follows for \mathfrak{m}_R principal, even if it is not prime to the conductor.

If $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] \subset L$, then since $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$ consists of the roots of the monic polynomial $\rho_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$, $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] \subset \mathcal{O}_L \subset \mathcal{O}_{(\mathfrak{P})}$: it then makes sense to reduce $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$ modulo \mathfrak{P} . Denote by

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$$

the \mathfrak{m}_R -torsion points of the reduced Drinfeld module $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{m}_R \subset R$ be a (not necessarily invertible) modulus. Suppose that $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] \subset L$ and $\mathfrak{P} \nmid \mathfrak{m}_R$. Then the reduction map*

$$\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{D}}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$$

is injective.

Proof. We note that the Lemma is true for $\mathfrak{m}_R = (m)$ principal: indeed, the polynomial ρ_m defining the m -torsion points is \mathfrak{P} primitive (i.e. $\not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}}$) and since we have good reduction at \mathfrak{P} , $\widetilde{\mathbb{D}}$ is a rank 1 Drinfeld module hence $\widetilde{\rho}_m$ reduces to a separable polynomial. Then, we may apply Hensel's Lemma to conclude that the reduction map on m -torsion is injective (in fact bijective). For general \mathfrak{m}_R , not necessarily invertible, we have that \mathfrak{m}_R is finitely generated. We first observe that we may choose generators m_1, \dots, m_k of \mathfrak{m}_R none of which are in \mathfrak{P} . Indeed, by hypothesis, at least one of them, say m_1 , is not in \mathfrak{P} . If $m_2 \in \mathfrak{P}$ then we replace m_2 by $m_1 + m_2 \notin \mathfrak{P}$. We then proceed inductively, as needed, to replace any generators in \mathfrak{P} by generators that are not in \mathfrak{P} . We claim that $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] = \mathbb{D}[m_1] \cap \dots \cap \mathbb{D}[m_k]$. Indeed, the inclusion $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] \subset \mathbb{D}[m_1] \cap \dots \cap \mathbb{D}[m_k]$ follows from

$$\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] = \bigcap_{m \in \mathfrak{m}_R} \mathbb{D}[m].$$

On the other hand, for $m = a_1 m_1 + \dots + a_k m_k$, $\rho_m = \rho_{a_1} \rho_{m_1} + \dots + \rho_{a_k} \rho_{m_k}$ and the vanishing of all of the $\rho_{m_1}, \dots, \rho_{m_k}$ implies that of ρ_m , which proves the claim. Since the reduction map commutes with the intersection this shows injectivity. \square

Note 2.3. Let \mathbb{D} be a Hayes R -module, $\mathfrak{p}_R \subset R$ an invertible prime ideal and consider the isogeny

$$\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R} : \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{p}_R * \mathbb{D}$$

between Hayes modules. Let \mathfrak{P} in L be above \mathfrak{p}_R . Then the associated reduction map

$$\widetilde{\rho}_{\mathfrak{p}_R} : \widetilde{\mathbb{D}} \longrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{p}_R * \mathbb{D}}$$

is equal to $\tau^{\deg(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$, where $\deg(\mathfrak{p}_R) = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_q}(A/\mathfrak{p}_R A)$. See² Corollary 3.8 of [15].

3. SHIMURA'S MAIN THEOREM FOR DRINFELD MODULES OVER RANK 1 ORDERS

In this section we prove Shimura's Main Theorem for Complex Multiplication in the setting of the order R . This was proved in [8] in the case $R = A$. We begin with a few remarks on Class Field Theory adapted to the order R .

²Note however that Hayes uses the p -Frobenius $\varphi(x) = x^p$ in the statement of Corollary 3.8, whereas we use the q -Frobenius $\tau(x) = x^q = \varphi^n(x)$, which is why his statement differs slightly from ours.

Let \mathbb{I}_K be the group of K -idèles, $C_K = \mathbb{I}_K/K^\times$ the idèle class group. If S is a finite set of places, \mathbb{I}^S is the subgroup of S -idèles:

$$\mathbb{I}_K^S = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} K_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times \cdot \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \notin S} A_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times.$$

When $S = \{\infty\}$, we write $\mathbb{I}_A := \mathbb{I}_K^{\{\infty\}}$. The subgroup

$$C_A = (\mathbb{I}_A \cdot K^\times) / K^\times < C_K$$

corresponds to the Hilbert class field H_A via reciprocity.

In this spirit, for an order $R \subset A$, we define

$$\mathbb{I}_R := K_\infty^\times \cdot \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \neq \infty} R_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times < \mathbb{I}_A.$$

Then the Hilbert class field H_R of R corresponds to the subgroup $C_R < C_K$ defined

$$C_R = (\mathbb{I}_R \cdot K^\times) / K^\times.$$

The narrow Hilbert class field H_R^1 corresponds to

$$C_R^1 = (\mathbb{I}_R^1 \cdot K^\times) / K^\times$$

where

$$\mathbb{I}_R^1 = (K_\infty^\times)_+ \times \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} R_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times$$

and where $(K_\infty^\times)_+ < K_\infty^\times$ is the subgroup of sign 1 elements.

If $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$ is an ideal with prime factorization $\mathfrak{m} = \prod \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$, \mathfrak{m}_R its contraction to R , the narrow ray class field $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$ corresponds to

$$C_{\mathfrak{m}_R} = (\mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R} \cdot K^\times) / K^\times < C_R < C_K$$

where

$$\mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R} = (K_\infty^\times)_+ \times \prod U_{\mathfrak{p}, R}^{(n_{\mathfrak{p}})}, \quad U_{\mathfrak{p}, R}^{(n_{\mathfrak{p}})} := U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(n_{\mathfrak{p}})} \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

(We recall that $U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(n)}$ is the n th higher unit group of $K_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times$.)

Given an extension L/K , let \mathfrak{m} be the product of primes of A ramifying in L/K and let \mathfrak{m}_R be the contraction of \mathfrak{m} to R . Let

$$\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{m}_R}^{\mathfrak{c}}$$

be the group of R -ideals prime to both \mathfrak{c} and \mathfrak{m}_R ; by Theorem 1.1 of section §1, it is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\mathfrak{c}}$, the group of ideals in A prime to both \mathfrak{c} and \mathfrak{m} . Thus we may consider the Artin symbol as defining a map

$$(\cdot, L/K) : \mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{m}_R}^{\mathfrak{c}} \longrightarrow \text{Gal}(L/K).$$

In the idèlic formulation, the reciprocity map

$$[\cdot, K] : \mathbb{I}_K \longrightarrow \text{Gal}(K^{\text{ab}}/K)$$

satisfies

$$[s, K]|_L = ((s), L/K)$$

where now $(s) \subset A$ is the A -ideal associated to $s \in \mathbb{I}_K$.

As we have seen in the previous sections, when working with the order R , it is convenient to work with ideal classes represented by an ideal prime to the conductor \mathfrak{c} ; similarly, it will often be useful to restrict to idèles prime to \mathfrak{c} . Define

$$(6) \quad \mathbb{I}_R < \mathbb{I}^R := K_\infty^\times \cdot \prod_{\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{c}} R_\mathfrak{p}^\times \cdot \prod'_{\infty \neq \mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}} K_\mathfrak{p}^\times,$$

where the primes range over those in A , and where the final product is restricted over the $R_\mathfrak{p}^\times = A_\mathfrak{p}^\times$ for $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let \mathbb{I}^R be as above. Then*

$$(7) \quad \mathbb{I}_K = \mathbb{I}^R \cdot K^\times.$$

Proof. Given $\alpha = (\alpha_\mathfrak{p}) \in \mathbb{I}_K$, by the Approximation Theorem, for any ε , we may find $a \in K$ so that for all $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{c}$, $|a - \alpha_\mathfrak{p}^{-1}| < \varepsilon$. In particular, given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we may find $a \in K$ so that for all $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{c}$,

$$a\alpha_\mathfrak{p} \in U_\mathfrak{p}^{(N)} = N\text{th higher unit group} := 1 + \mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{p}^N.$$

On the other hand, since $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{p}$, the completion $\mathfrak{c}_\mathfrak{p}$ is a power of $\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{p}$,

$$\mathfrak{c}_\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{p}^{s_\mathfrak{p}}, \quad s_\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{N}.$$

So choosing N sufficiently large, $a\alpha_\mathfrak{p} \in 1 + \mathfrak{c}_\mathfrak{p}$, for all $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{c}$. But since $\mathfrak{c} \subset R$, $1 + \mathfrak{c}_\mathfrak{p} \in R_\mathfrak{p}^\times$. Thus, $a\alpha \in \mathbb{I}^R$, which proves (7). \square

Using the Proposition, we may write

$$(8) \quad C_K = \frac{\mathbb{I}^R \cdot K^\times}{K^\times} \cong \frac{\mathbb{I}^R}{\mathbb{I}^R \cap K^\times}.$$

which is framed in terms of the particular order A_f . By (7) and the fact that $K^\times \subset \text{Ker}([\cdot, K])$,

$$\text{Image}([\cdot, K]) = [\mathbb{I}_K, K] = [\mathbb{I}^R, K].$$

Given L/K an abelian extension, the integral closure of R in L is Dedekind. Then it makes sense to speak of a prime $\mathfrak{p}_R \subset R$ which is unramified in L . Assume also \mathfrak{p}_R is prime to the conductor, so that it is the contraction of a unique $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$. Then $A_\mathfrak{p} = R_\mathfrak{p}$. If $\pi_\mathfrak{p}$ is a uniformizer of $K_\mathfrak{p}^\times$, identified as an idèle by taking 1's at all other places, then if $\sigma_\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Gal}(L/K)$ denotes the Frobenius associated to \mathfrak{p} , then

$$(9) \quad [\pi_\mathfrak{p}, K]|_L = \sigma_\mathfrak{p}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset \mathfrak{l}_R^\mathfrak{c}$: by primeness to \mathfrak{c} , \mathfrak{a}_R is the contraction of a unique ideal of $\mathfrak{a} \subset A$. For any prime $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ (not necessarily prime to \mathfrak{c}), denote

$$\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} := \mathfrak{a}_R R_\mathfrak{p}.$$

The quotient

$$K_\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$$

is then an R -module.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathfrak{a}_R \in \mathfrak{l}_R^\mathfrak{c}$. Then there is an isomorphism of R -modules*

$$K/\mathfrak{a}_R \cong \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \subset A} K_\mathfrak{p}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Proof. We follow the general structure of the proof as presented in the case of Dedekind domains (see Lemma 8.1 of Chapter II, §8 of [19]), making adjustments where necessary. We may assume without loss of generality that $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$: indeed, simply take $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_R^{-1}$ and write $\mathfrak{a}'_R = \alpha \mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$. If the isomorphism asserted in the Theorem exists for \mathfrak{a}'_R , we may obtain a corresponding isomorphism for \mathfrak{a}_R by multiplying by α^{-1} .

Let us write $M = K/\mathfrak{a}_R$ and define $M[\mathfrak{p}^\infty]$ as the submodule of elements of M killed by some power of $\mathfrak{p}_R = \mathfrak{p} \cap R$. We claim that the sum-of-coordinates map

$$S : \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \subset A} M[\mathfrak{p}^\infty] \longrightarrow M, \quad \mu = (\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}) \longmapsto \sum \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

is an isomorphism. Let $\mu \in \text{Ker}(S)$. Now for each \mathfrak{p} let $e(\mathfrak{p})$ be the minimal exponent so that $\mathfrak{p}_R^{e(\mathfrak{p})} \mu_{\mathfrak{p}} = (0)$. Fix $\mathfrak{q} \subset A$ a prime and write

$$\mathfrak{d}_R := \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{q}} \mathfrak{p}_R^{e(\mathfrak{p})},$$

so that $\mathfrak{d}_R \mu_{\mathfrak{p}} = (0)$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{q}$. On the other hand, we have as well $\mathfrak{d}_R \mu_{\mathfrak{q}} = \mathfrak{d}_R S(\mu) = (0)$. We note that \mathfrak{d}_R is prime to \mathfrak{q}_R , that is, $\mathfrak{d}_R + \mathfrak{q}_R^{e(\mathfrak{q})} = R$. Therefore

$$\mu_{\mathfrak{q}} R = \mu_{\mathfrak{q}} (\mathfrak{d}_R + \mathfrak{q}_R^{e(\mathfrak{q})}) = (0)$$

hence $\mu_{\mathfrak{q}} = 0$, and since \mathfrak{q} is arbitrary, $\mu = 0$. Thus S is injective.

On the other hand, let $m \in M$. We note that M is a torsion R -module, so there exists $\alpha \in R$, non constant (i.e. not an A -unit) such that $\alpha m = 0$. The principal ideal $\alpha A \subsetneq A$ has a nontrivial prime decomposition in A

$$\alpha A = \prod_{i=1}^s \mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i}$$

which contracts to a *primary decomposition*³

$$\alpha R = \mathfrak{r}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{r}_s.$$

If we write

$$\mathfrak{e}_i = \bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathfrak{r}_j \supset \alpha R$$

then the set of \mathfrak{e}_i are coprime. Indeed, there is no contraction $(\mathfrak{p}_i)_R$ which divides all of the \mathfrak{e}_i . If there were a prime in R dividing all of the \mathfrak{e}_i , this prime would be a contraction \mathfrak{p}_R of $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$, by Proposition 1.1. Then $\mathfrak{p}_R \supset \alpha R$ and expanding this inclusion to A gives

$$\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{p}_R A \supset \alpha A,$$

which implies that $\mathfrak{p} | \alpha A$, forcing $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_i$ for some i . Thus, we conclude that $\sum \mathfrak{e}_i = R$. If we take $\varepsilon_i \in \mathfrak{e}_i$ with $\sum \varepsilon_i = 1$ then $\varepsilon_i \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{r}_i}$ and $\varepsilon_i \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{r}_j}$. Since

$$\mathfrak{r}_i \varepsilon_i \subset \mathfrak{r}_i \cap \mathfrak{e}_i = \alpha R,$$

$\mathfrak{r}_i \varepsilon_i m = 0$. And since $(\mathfrak{p}_i)_R^{e_i} \subset \mathfrak{r}_i = (\mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i})_R$, it follows that $\varepsilon_i m \in M[\mathfrak{p}_i^\infty]$. Let $\mu = (\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})$ with $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = \varepsilon_i m$ and $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$ for all other primes. Then $S(\mu) = m$ and we conclude that S is an isomorphism.

³The contraction of the prime decomposition would also be a prime decomposition if the prime factors of αA are prime to \mathfrak{c} . Otherwise it is not necessarily the case that $(\mathfrak{p}^e)_R = (\mathfrak{p}_R)^e$. Nonetheless, the contraction of a power of a prime $\mathfrak{r} = (\mathfrak{p}^e)_R$ is primary.

To finish the proof, we will show that the inclusion $K \hookrightarrow K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ induces an isomorphism

$$T : M[\mathfrak{p}^\infty] \xrightarrow{\cong} K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}.$$

In what follows, we omit parentheses around the power of a contraction and write simply

$$\mathfrak{p}_R^e := (\mathfrak{p}_R)^e.$$

Let $\bar{\alpha} \in \text{Ker}(T)$; if $\alpha \in K$ is a representative,

$$(10) \quad \mathfrak{p}_R^e \alpha \subset \mathfrak{a}_R$$

for some $e \geq 0$, and being in the kernel, we have $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$.

Claim 1. $\alpha \in R_{\mathfrak{q}}$ for every prime $\mathfrak{q} \subset A$. As a consequence, $\alpha \in R$.

Proof of Claim 1. When $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p}$ this follows trivially from $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} \subset R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. If $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p}$ then we have

$$\alpha (\mathfrak{p}_R)_\mathfrak{q}^e = \alpha (\mathfrak{p}_R^e)_\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{q}} \subset R_{\mathfrak{q}},$$

where 1) the equality above follows from the fact that the sum and product are continuous with respect to completion at \mathfrak{q} , and 2) the first inclusion follows from (10). But since $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p}$, $(\mathfrak{p}_R)_\mathfrak{q} = R_{\mathfrak{q}}$. This proves the first part of the claim. The proof of the second statement follows from Corollary 1.6 of section §1:

$$(11) \quad \alpha \in R_{\mathfrak{q}} \cap K = R_{(\mathfrak{q}_R)} \quad \text{for all } \mathfrak{q},$$

hence $\alpha \in \bigcap R_{(\mathfrak{q}_R)} = R$. \diamond

For any prime $\mathfrak{q} \subset A$ and $x \in R$, define

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(x) := \max \{n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : xR \subset \mathfrak{q}_R^n\}.$$

For $\bar{\alpha} \in \text{Ker}(T)$, by *Claim 1*, $\alpha \in R$, hence $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha)$ is well-defined.

Note 3.1. We point out that if $\mathfrak{q} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$, then $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha)$ agrees with $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\alpha)$, is available for any $\alpha \in K$ and has values that range over \mathbb{Z} . If $\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{c}$, \mathfrak{q} is not invertible and $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha)$ cannot be extended to negative integers and is available only for $\alpha \in R$.

Thus we have

$$\alpha R \subset \bigcap \mathfrak{q}_R^{\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha)}.$$

Since \mathfrak{a}_R is prime to the conductor \mathfrak{c} , it is invertible, and may be written as a product of invertible prime ideals $\mathfrak{q}_{1,R}, \dots, \mathfrak{q}_{r,R}$, each of which is a contraction of a corresponding prime in A :

$$\mathfrak{a}_R = \mathfrak{q}_{1,R}^{e_1} \cdots \mathfrak{q}_{r,R}^{E_A} = \mathfrak{q}_{1,R}^{e_1} \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_{r,R}^{E_A}.$$

In this case, defining $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R)$ as we did for α , we have

$$\mathfrak{a}_R = \bigcap \mathfrak{q}_R^{\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R)}.$$

By the choice of α in the kernel, it follows that

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha \mathfrak{p}_R^e) \geq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R).$$

Claim 2. For $\mathfrak{q}_R \neq \mathfrak{p}_R$, $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha \mathfrak{p}_R^e) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha)$. In particular,

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha) \geq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R).$$

Proof of Claim 2. Suppose the contrary: writing $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha) = n$, that $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\alpha \mathfrak{p}_R^e) = n + k$ for $k > 0$. Then

$$(12) \quad \alpha \mathfrak{p}_R^e \subset \mathfrak{q}_R^{n+k}.$$

Now the ideal \mathfrak{q}_R^{n+k} is primary, and by the inclusion (12), for all $x \in \mathfrak{p}_R^e$, $\alpha x \in \mathfrak{q}_R^{n+k}$ implies either $\alpha \in \mathfrak{q}_R^{n+k}$ or $x \in \text{Rad}(\mathfrak{q}_R^{n+k}) = \mathfrak{q}_R$, where $\text{Rad}(\mathfrak{b})$ is the radical of an ideal \mathfrak{b} . But $\alpha \notin \mathfrak{q}_R^{n+k}$ therefore $x \in \mathfrak{q}_R$ i.e. $\mathfrak{p}_R^e \subset \mathfrak{q}_R$. But $\text{Rad}(\mathfrak{p}_R^e) = \mathfrak{p}_R \subset \text{Rad}(\mathfrak{q}_R) = \mathfrak{q}_R$, which contradicts $\mathfrak{q}_R \neq \mathfrak{p}_R$, since R is of dimension 1. \diamond

We now treat the case $\mathfrak{q}_R = \mathfrak{p}_R$.

Claim 3. $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\alpha) \geq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R)$.

Proof of Claim 3. Let $\mathfrak{p}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$ be the completion of \mathfrak{p}_R in $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Note that for all n , by continuity,

$$(13) \quad (\mathfrak{p}_{R,\mathfrak{p}})^n = (\mathfrak{p}_R^n)_{\mathfrak{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathfrak{p}_R^n)_{\mathfrak{p}} \cap R = \mathfrak{p}_R^n.$$

By hypothesis, $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$. Therefore

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}}(\alpha) \geq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}).$$

By (13),

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\alpha) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}}(\alpha), \quad \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}),$$

which proves the claim. \diamond

By *Claims 2.* and *3.*,

$$\alpha R \subset \bigcap \mathfrak{q}_R^{\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R)} = \mathfrak{a}_R,$$

therefore $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_R$. Thus $\bar{\alpha} = 0$ in $M[\mathfrak{p}^\infty]$. This shows that T is injective.

What remains is surjectivity. Let $\bar{\beta} \in K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$ be represented by $\beta \in K_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Suppose first that $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$. By Proposition 1.2 of section §1, the localizations $A_{(\mathfrak{p})}$ and $R_{(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$ are equal, thus

$$A_{\mathfrak{p}} = R_{\mathfrak{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

We now apply weak approximation to the Dedekind domain A , in which modular constraints are enforced with respect to the ideals dividing either \mathfrak{a} or \mathfrak{c} : that is, we deduce the existence of $\alpha \in K$ with the following properties:

- ❶ $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\alpha - \beta) \geq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

We emphasize that here, $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the order calculated with respect to the A -ideal \mathfrak{p} . However, since $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$, this inequality implies a corresponding inequality for $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}$:

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\alpha - \beta) \geq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R).$$

Here, we note that since $\alpha - \beta \in K_{\mathfrak{p}}$, $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\alpha - \beta)$ is defined as the order with respect to the completion of \mathfrak{p}_R , which is equal to the completion of \mathfrak{p} . That is, $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\alpha - \beta) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\alpha - \beta)$ and $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

- ② $\text{ord}_q(\alpha) \geq \text{ord}_q(\mathfrak{a})$ if $q|\mathfrak{a}$ and $q \neq \mathfrak{p}$.

Since, for such q , $q \nmid \mathfrak{c}$, this is again equivalent to

$$\text{ord}_{q_R}(\alpha) \geq \text{ord}_{q_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R),$$

where we are using the observation in *Note 3.1* that $\text{ord}_{q_R}(\alpha)$ is defined for any $\alpha \in K$. In particular, for such primes, $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}$.

- ③ $\text{ord}_q(\alpha) \geq \text{ord}_q(\mathfrak{c})$ for all other primes.

For such primes, this inequality implies

$$\alpha \in \mathfrak{c}_q \subset R_q.$$

However, we claim that $R_q = \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}$. Indeed, note that since \mathfrak{a}_R is prime to \mathfrak{c} , the contraction $\mathfrak{a} \cap R$ is \mathfrak{a}_R , and the contraction $\mathfrak{a}_q \cap R_q$ contains *a priori* $\mathfrak{a}_{R,q}$ = the q -completion of $\mathfrak{a}_R = \mathfrak{a} \cap R$. As both \mathfrak{a}_q and R_q are open in K_q , any point in the intersection may be approximated by a limit of points in the dense subset \mathfrak{a}_R , hence the contraction $\mathfrak{a}_q \cap R_q$ is equal to $\mathfrak{a}_{R,q}$. But since $q \nmid \mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{a}_q = A_q$, thus $\mathfrak{a}_{R,q} = \mathfrak{a}_q \cap R_q = A_q \cap R_q = R_q$. As a result, in this case we have

$$\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}.$$

The inequality in ① implies that $\alpha - \beta \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$, hence $T(\overline{\alpha}) = \overline{\beta}$. If e is a non-negative integer satisfying

$$e \geq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a}) - \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\alpha)$$

then since $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$, $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R} = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ takes products to sums and

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\mathfrak{p}_R^e \alpha) + \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\alpha) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\mathfrak{p}_R^e \alpha) \geq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R)$$

which implies that

$$\mathfrak{p}_R^e \alpha \subset \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}.$$

For the primes occurring in ② the same is true:

$$\text{ord}_{q_R}(\mathfrak{p}_R^e \alpha) \geq \text{ord}_{q_R}(\alpha) \geq \text{ord}_{q_R}(\mathfrak{a}_R)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{p}_R^e \alpha \subset \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}.$$

Finally, for the primes in ③, we have trivially

$$\mathfrak{p}_R^e \alpha \subset \mathfrak{p}_R^e \mathfrak{c}_q \subset \mathfrak{c}_q \subset R_q = \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}.$$

It follows that

$$\mathfrak{p}_R^e \alpha \subset \bigcap (\mathfrak{a}_{R,q} \cap K) = \mathfrak{a}_R,$$

i.e., $\overline{\alpha} \in M[\mathfrak{p}^\infty]$. This proves surjectivity when $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$.

Lastly, we consider the case $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{c}$. In this case we have, for some $n \geq 1$, that

$$\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^n \subset R_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

We point out here that $\mathfrak{p}^n \neq \mathfrak{p}_R^n$: in the above, we are taking the completion of the power of the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ using the fact that $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a discrete valuation ring, hence every ideal in $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a power of $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. We then replace condition ① by

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\alpha - \beta) \geq n = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{c}).$$

The latter implies that

$$\alpha \equiv \beta \pmod{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}.$$

However, by an argument identical to that found in ❸ above, $R_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$. Thus $T(\overline{\alpha}) = \overline{\beta}$. The remaining modular constraints are imposed to guarantee that $\overline{\alpha}$ is in $M[\mathfrak{p}^\infty]$. Conditions ❷ and ❸ are identical to those above. Choose ϵ non-negative so that

$$\mathfrak{p}^\epsilon \alpha \subset \mathfrak{p}_p^m = \mathfrak{c}_p.$$

Since $\mathfrak{p}_R^\epsilon \alpha \subset \mathfrak{p}^\epsilon \alpha$ and $\mathfrak{c}_p \subset R_p = \mathfrak{a}_{R,p}$,

$$\mathfrak{p}_R^\epsilon \alpha \subset \mathfrak{a}_{R,p}.$$

Along with conditions ❷ and ❸ we deduce as before that $\mathfrak{p}_R^\epsilon \alpha \subset \mathfrak{a}_R$ and thus $\overline{\alpha} \in M[\mathfrak{p}^\infty]$. Thus T is surjective in this case as well. This completes the proof of the Theorem. \square

Recall the ideal group $\mathbb{I}^R < \mathbb{I}_K$, defined in equation (6) at the beginning of this section. For every $x = (x_v) \in \mathbb{I}^R$ the R -ideal generated by x is defined

$$(x) := \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \subset A, \mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}} \mathfrak{p}_R^{\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x_{\mathfrak{p}})} \in \mathbb{I}_R^{\mathfrak{c}}.$$

Moreover, for every $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$, an ideal prime to \mathfrak{c} , we denote

$$x\mathfrak{a}_R := (x)\mathfrak{a}_R.$$

Note that

$$(x\mathfrak{a}_R)_{\mathfrak{p}} = (x)\mathfrak{a}_R R_{\mathfrak{p}} = x_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{a}_R R_{\mathfrak{p}} = x_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{a}_{R,p}.$$

Theorem 3.1 now gives the following isomorphism of R -modules:

$$K/x\mathfrak{a}_R \cong \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}} K_{\mathfrak{p}}/x_{\mathfrak{p}}\mathfrak{a}_{R,p}.$$

We then define, given $x \in \mathbb{I}^R$, a homomorphism $x : K/\mathfrak{a}_R \rightarrow K/x\mathfrak{a}_R$ so that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K/\mathfrak{a}_R & \xrightarrow{x} & K/x\mathfrak{a}_R \\ \simeq \downarrow & & \downarrow \simeq \\ \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}} K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,p} & \xrightarrow{x} & \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}} K_{\mathfrak{p}}/x_{\mathfrak{p}}\mathfrak{a}_{R,p} \end{array}$$

where the bottom horizontal arrow is defined

$$(t_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mapsto (x_{\mathfrak{p}} t_{\mathfrak{p}}).$$

Recall that for an ideal $\mathfrak{n}_R \subset R$,

$$\mathfrak{n}_R^* := \{\beta \in K : \beta \mathfrak{n}_R \subset R\}.$$

Thus $\mathfrak{n}_R^* \mathfrak{n}_R \subset R$ and if \mathfrak{n}_R is invertible, $\mathfrak{n}_R^* = \mathfrak{n}_R^{-1}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathfrak{a}_R \in \mathbb{I}_R^{\mathfrak{c}}$. Then*

$$K = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{m} \subset A} (\mathfrak{m}_R \mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*$$

where the \mathfrak{m}_R vary over all contractions $\mathfrak{m}_R = \mathfrak{m} \cap R$ of integral ideals $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$.

Proof. It is enough to assume $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$; as usual, $\mathfrak{a} \subset A$ is the extension of \mathfrak{a}_R to A . In this case given $\alpha = x/y \in K$, $x, y \in R$ let

$$\mathfrak{m} = y\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{a}_R,$$

which is an A -ideal due to the factor \mathfrak{c} . Then $\mathfrak{m} \subset y\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$ hence $\mathfrak{m}_R = \mathfrak{m}$. It follows that $\alpha \in (\mathfrak{m}_R\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*$, since

$$\frac{x}{y}\mathfrak{m}_R\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1} \subset \frac{x}{y}y\mathfrak{a}_R\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1} \in R.$$

□

In what follows, we denote by K_∞^{ab} the maximal abelian extension completely split at ∞ .

Theorem 3.2 (Main Theorem of “Complex Multiplication” over Orders). *Let*

$$\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$$

be a rank 1 Drinfeld R -module. Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{C}_\infty/K)$ be such that $\sigma|_{K_\infty^{\text{ab}}}$ is in the image of the reciprocity map and let $s \in \mathbb{I}^R$ be such that

$$[s, K] = \sigma|_{K_\infty^{\text{ab}}}.$$

Let \mathfrak{a}_R be an ideal of R prime to \mathfrak{c} . Given an analytic isomorphism of R -modules

$$\Upsilon : \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{a}_R \longrightarrow \mathbb{D},$$

there exists an analytic isomorphism of R -modules

$$\Upsilon' : \mathbb{C}_\infty/s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R \longrightarrow \mathbb{D}^\sigma,$$

whose restriction to K_∞ is unique, such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K/\mathfrak{a}_R & \xrightarrow{s^{-1}} & K/s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R \\ \Upsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \Upsilon' \\ \mathbb{D} & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \mathbb{D}^\sigma \end{array}$$

Proof. We begin with a standard observation: if $(\mathbb{D}_1, \Upsilon_1)$ is another rank 1 Drinfeld R -module isomorphic to \mathbb{D} , with $\Upsilon_1 : \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{a}_{1,R} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_1$ an analytic isomorphism, then if the Theorem holds for $(\mathbb{D}_1, \Upsilon_1)$, it holds also for (\mathbb{D}, Υ) . The proof of this is straight-forward, formally identical to that appearing, for example, on pages 160-161 of [19]. This allows us to assume that

1. \mathbb{D} is a Hayes module i.e. it is sign normalized and its coefficients belong to $H_R^1 =$ the narrow Hilbert class field of R . See section §2.
2. $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$.

Fix $\mathfrak{m}_R \subset R$ an ideal which is the contraction of $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$. The first step will be to show the existence of a commutative diagram

$$(14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (\mathfrak{m}_R\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/\mathfrak{a}_R & \xrightarrow{s^{-1}} & (\mathfrak{m}_R s\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R \\ \Upsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \Upsilon'_m \\ \mathbb{D} & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \mathbb{D}^\sigma \end{array}$$

where Υ'_m is the restriction of an analytical isomorphism $\mathbb{C}_\infty/s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R \rightarrow \mathbb{D}^\sigma$. Let $L \subset K_\infty^{\text{ab}}$ be a finite Galois extension of K containing

- the narrow Hilbert class field H_R^1 : so that \mathbb{D} is defined over L .

- the torsion submodule $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$.
- the narrow ray class field $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$.

Let $\mathcal{O}_L \supset R$ be the integral closure of R in L : it is equal to the integral closure of A in L , hence is Dedekind. Choose a prime $\mathfrak{P} \subset \mathcal{O}_L$ with the following properties: if $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{P} \cap A$, then

- ① L is unramified at \mathfrak{p} .
- ② $\sigma|_L = [s, K]|_L = \sigma_{\mathfrak{p}} = (\mathfrak{p}, L/K)$.
- ③ $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{m}$.

As \mathbb{D} is a Hayes module, the leading coefficients of its additive polynomials belong to the constant field of H_R^1 , hence it has good reduction at \mathfrak{P} . The existence of such a \mathfrak{P} satisfying ① – ③ is guaranteed by the Chebotarev Density Theorem.

Let $\pi \in \mathbb{I}_K$ be such that it has a uniformizer at the \mathfrak{p} component and is 1 everywhere else. Then by (9)

$$[\pi, K] = (\mathfrak{p}, L/K),$$

hence $[s\pi^{-1}, K]$ acts trivially on $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R} \subset L$. Recall from the beginning of this section that $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$ is indexed via Class Field Theory by the subgroup

$$C_{\mathfrak{m}_R} = (\mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R} \cdot K^\times) / K^\times < C_K.$$

Thus the reciprocity map induces an isomorphism

$$(15) \quad [\cdot, K] : \mathbb{I}_K / (\mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R} \cdot K^\times) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Gal}(K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}/K).$$

Therefore,

$$s\pi^{-1} = \alpha u$$

where $\alpha \in K^\times$ and $u \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$.

By the hypothesis $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$, we have $\mathfrak{p}_R \nmid \mathfrak{c}$, which implies \mathfrak{p}_R defines a class of the narrow class group Cl_R^1 . Hence the isogeny

$$\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R} : \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{p}_R * \mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}^\sigma$$

is defined, where the equality on the right hand side comes from (5). We recall by *Note 2.3* that its reduction mod \mathfrak{P} satisfies $\widetilde{\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}} = \tau^{\deg(\mathfrak{p}_R)}$. The key observation in the proof of the Main Theorem is that we can replace the *discontinuous automorphism* σ by the *analytic endomorphism* $\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}$ if we restrict to $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$: that is, we claim that the following diagram commutes

$$(16) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R] & \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}} & \mathbb{D}^\sigma[\mathfrak{m}_R] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{D} & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \mathbb{D}^\sigma \end{array},$$

where the vertical arrows are the inclusions. Indeed, for every torsion point $t \in \mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$, we have the equalities mod \mathfrak{P}

$$\widetilde{\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}}(t) = \widetilde{\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}}(\widetilde{t}) = \widetilde{t}^{\widetilde{\sigma}} = \widetilde{t}^\sigma$$

since $\widetilde{\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}} = \tau^{\deg(\mathfrak{p}_R)} = \widetilde{\sigma}$. As $\mathfrak{P} \nmid \mathfrak{m}_R$, by Lemma 2.1, the reduction map

$$\mathbb{D}^\sigma[\mathfrak{m}_R] \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{D}^\sigma}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$$

is injective, hence

$$\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(t) = t^\sigma.$$

By hypothesis ③ above, $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$, so \mathfrak{p}_R is invertible. We now fix

$$\Upsilon'' : \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{p}_R^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R \longrightarrow \mathbb{D}^\sigma$$

an analytic isomorphism such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{a}_R & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{p}_R^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R \\ \Upsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \Upsilon'' \\ \mathbb{D} & \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}} & \mathbb{D}^\sigma. \end{array}$$

where can is the canonical map $x + \mathfrak{a}_R \mapsto x + \mathfrak{p}_R^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R$. The existence of Υ'' is a consequence of the fact that the kernel of the additive homomorphism $\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}$ is $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{p}_R]$, whose pre-image by the analytical R -module isomorphism Υ is exactly $\mathfrak{p}_R^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R$.

Using the decomposition $s = \alpha\pi u$, we have

$$(s) = (\alpha)(\pi) = (\alpha)\mathfrak{p}_R.$$

Therefore $s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R = (s^{-1})\mathfrak{a}_R = \alpha^{-1}\mathfrak{p}_R^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R$, and multiplication by α^{-1} gives the following isomorphism:

$$\alpha^{-1} : \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{p}_R^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_\infty/s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R.$$

We can then form the following diagram:

$$(17) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{a}_R & \xrightarrow{\text{can}} & \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{p}_R^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R & \xrightarrow{\alpha^{-1}} & \mathbb{C}_\infty/s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R \\ \Upsilon \downarrow & & \downarrow \Upsilon'' & & \downarrow \Upsilon' \\ \mathbb{D} & \xrightarrow{\rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}} & \mathbb{D}^\sigma & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathbb{D}^\sigma \end{array}$$

where Υ' is the unique analytic isomorphism making the diagram commute. By *Note 2.1*, $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$ may be identified with

$$(\mathfrak{m}_R\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/\mathfrak{a}_R;$$

if \mathfrak{m}_R is invertible, this reduces to the usual $\mathfrak{m}_R^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R/\mathfrak{a}_R$.

Claim. For all $t \in (\mathfrak{m}_R\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/\mathfrak{a}_R$,

$$\Upsilon(t)^\sigma = \Upsilon'(s^{-1}t).$$

Proof of the Claim: By (16) we know that $\Upsilon(t)^\sigma = \rho_{\mathfrak{p}_R}(\Upsilon(t))$ for every $t \in (\mathfrak{m}_R\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/\mathfrak{a}_R$. Using the commutativity of (17) the statement reduces to proving that

$$\Upsilon'(\alpha^{-1}t) = \Upsilon'(s^{-1}t).$$

This is equivalent to showing that

$$\alpha^{-1}t - s^{-1}t \in s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_R$$

for all $t \in (\mathfrak{m}_R\mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/\mathfrak{a}_R$. Or equivalently, by Theorem 3.1,

$$\alpha^{-1}t - s_q^{-1}t \in s_q^{-1}\mathfrak{a}_{R,q}$$

for all $t \in (\mathfrak{m}_R\mathfrak{a}_{R,q}^{-1})^*$ and all q a prime ideal in A . Since $s_q = \alpha\pi_q u_q$, we are reduced to showing that

$$\pi_q u_q t - t \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}.$$

First, note that since $u_q \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}}$, $u_q = 1 + m$, $m \in \mathfrak{m}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$ and since $t \in (\mathfrak{m}_R \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}^{-1})^*$, $tm \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}$. Thus

$$\pi_q u_q t - t \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,q} \iff \pi_q t - t \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,q}.$$

Now if $q \neq \mathfrak{p}$, $\pi_q = 1$ and the result follows immediately since $\pi_q t - t = 0$. If $q = \mathfrak{p}$, then since $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{m}$ we have

$$R_{\mathfrak{p}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}}, \quad \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{m}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

It follows that $(\mathfrak{m}_R^*)_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{m}_R^* R_{\mathfrak{p}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}}$, hence $t \in (\mathfrak{m}_R \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}^{-1})^*$ implies $t \in \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Since $\pi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a uniformizer, $\pi_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1$ is a unit and so

$$\pi_{\mathfrak{p}} t - t = (\pi_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1)t \in \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}.$$

This proves the claim. \diamond

The choice $\Upsilon_{\mathfrak{m}}' = \Upsilon'$ makes the diagram (14) commute. By Lemma 3.1, $K/\mathfrak{a}_R = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{m}} (\mathfrak{m}_R \mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/\mathfrak{a}_R$, therefore it is enough to show that these diagrams are compatible and so fit together to produce the diagram appearing in the statement of the Main Theorem. Let $\mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{m}$; note that

$$\xi := \Upsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}' \circ \Upsilon_{\mathfrak{m}}'^{-1} \in \text{Aut}(\mathbb{D}^{\sigma}) = R^{\times} = \mathbb{F}_q^{\times};$$

in the above, we are using the fact that \mathbb{D}^{σ} is a Drinfeld module with lattice identified with $\mathfrak{p}_R^{-1} \mathfrak{a}_R$, hence, by Theorem 1.6 of [15], the endomorphism ring is equal to R and thus $\text{Aut}(\mathbb{D}^{\sigma}) = R^{\times}$.

It will be enough to show that

$$\Upsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}' |_{(\mathfrak{m}_R \mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^*/s^{-1} \mathfrak{a}_R} = \Upsilon_{\mathfrak{m}}'.$$

This follows, since

$$\xi \Upsilon_{\mathfrak{m}}'(s^{-1}t) = \Upsilon_{\mathfrak{n}}'(s^{-1}t) = \Upsilon(t)^{\sigma} = \Upsilon_{\mathfrak{m}}'(s^{-1}t),$$

so that in particular, ξ acts as the identity on $\mathbb{D}^{\sigma}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$ and thus $\xi = 1$. \square

4. HAYES THEORY OVER RANK 1 ORDERS

In this section, we will present what is commonly known as Hayes Theory for the order $R \subset A$. That is, we will prove generation theorems for the Hilbert class field H_R and the ray class fields $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$, defined in the previous sections.

As we have already indicated, this topic was initiated by Hayes in his orders paper [15], however this section contains material not proved in Hayes' original work. In the first place, we will generate H_R using the modular invariant $j(\mathfrak{a}_R)$ of any invertible ideal $\mathfrak{a}_R \subset R$, in the style of [8] and [7]: in contrast with [15], §8, where H_R is identified with the field of invariants of a Drinfeld R -module ρ with lattice homothetic to \mathfrak{a}_R . Secondly, in [15], Hayes restricts to $R = A$ in his Theorem on the generation of the ray class fields $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$ using torsion elements of ρ : in this section, we prove this in this case where R is not necessarily equal to A .

The main tool will be Theorem 3.2, proved in §3. In particular, the strategy will be to adapt the arguments found in [8] to the order R , discussing in detail only those results whose proofs require a non trivial modification in this case.

First some notation. In this section we will drop the subscript R from ideals in R , as we will not need to pass from ideals in A to ideals in R . Write

$$K_\infty = \mathbb{F}_\infty((u_\infty))$$

where u_∞ is a uniformizer at ∞ and $\mathbb{F}_\infty \supset \mathbb{F}_q$ is the field of constants. We also choose a sign function

$$\text{sgn} : K_\infty^\times \longrightarrow \mathbb{F}_\infty^\times$$

so that if $x = c_N u_\infty^N + \text{lower order terms}$, then $\text{sgn}(x) = c_N$. Let S be a set of representatives of $\mathbb{F}_\infty^\times / \mathbb{F}_q^\times$, where we assume $1 \in S$. We say that $f \in K_\infty$ is positive if $\text{sgn}(f) \in S$.

Let $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$ be an ideal. Denote by

$$\mathfrak{a}^+ = \{x \in \mathfrak{a} \mid \text{sgn}(x) \in S\};$$

define

$$\zeta^\alpha(n) := \sum_{x \in \mathfrak{a}^+} x^{-n}$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The definition of $\zeta^\alpha(n)$ is independent of the choice of signs S , see Note 3 of [8].

Now assume $A \neq \mathbb{F}_q[T]$. Writing

$$(18) \quad J(\mathfrak{a}) := \frac{\zeta^\alpha(q^2 - 1)}{\zeta^\alpha(q - 1)^{q+1}},$$

we define

$$(19) \quad j(\mathfrak{a}) := \frac{1}{\frac{1}{T^q - T} - \frac{T^{q^2} - T}{(T^q - T)^{q+1}} J(\mathfrak{a})}.$$

If $\alpha \in K^\times$ has sgn one then $((\alpha)\mathfrak{a})^+ = \alpha\mathfrak{a}^+$. This implies that $j((\alpha)\mathfrak{a}) = j(\mathfrak{a})$ and we obtain a well-defined function on the narrow class group

$$j = j_R : \text{Cl}_R^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_\infty.$$

In fact, it is a class invariant:

Proposition 4.1. *j induces a well-defined function*

$$j : \text{Cl}(A) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_\infty.$$

Proof. Formally the same as that of Proposition 1 of [8]. □

Since R is Noetherian, it is a finitely generated \mathbb{F}_q -algebra:

$$(20) \quad R = \mathbb{F}_q[f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N] = \langle 1, f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N, f_{N+1}, \dots \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_q}$$

where the presentation on the far right is that of an \mathbb{F}_q vector space and where the additional vector space generators f_{N+1}, \dots complement the ring generators f_1, \dots, f_N . We assume that $0 < \deg(f_1) < \deg(f_2) < \dots$.

Fix $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$ a non-principal invertible ideal: by Theorem 1.5, we may write $\mathfrak{a} = (g, h)$; we suppose that $\deg(g) < \deg(h)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume

1. g has the smallest degree of all positive non-zero elements of \mathfrak{a} . Indeed, by Note 1.1, for any non-zero $x \in \mathfrak{a}$, there exists $y \in \mathfrak{a}$ with $\mathfrak{a} = (x, y)$.
2. The degree of h is minimal amongst h' with $\mathfrak{a} = (g, h')$ and in particular, $\deg h \neq \deg(fg)$ for all $f \in R$ (otherwise, we may replace h by $h' = ch + fg$, where $c \in \mathbb{F}_q$ is chosen so that $\deg(h') < \deg(h)$.)

Theorem 4.1. *For all $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$ a non principal invertible ideal, $j(\mathfrak{a}) \neq j((1))$.*

Proof. The proof of this result is formally the same as that found in §6 of [8]. \square

The following is the analog for R of a Theorem of Goss:

Theorem 4.2. *Let ρ be an Hayes R -module with lattice $\xi_\rho \mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$ an invertible ideal. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\xi_\rho^{-n} \sum_{0 \neq x \in \mathfrak{a}} x^{-n} \in H_R^1.$$

Proof. Since for each $a \in R$, the coefficients of ρ_a are in H_R^1 , the same is true of the corresponding exponential e_ρ . The proof is then identical to that in the case of $R = A$ e.g. see Theorem 5.2.5 on page 159 of [20]. \square

We now use the Main Theorem to prove the following key result.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \in I_R^c$ and let $s \in \mathbb{I}^R$ be a K -idèle prime to \mathfrak{c} . Then $J(\mathfrak{a}) \in K_\infty^{\text{ab}}$ and*

$$J(s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}) = J(\mathfrak{a})^{[s, K]}.$$

Proof. We first show that $J(\mathfrak{a}) \in H_R^1$. Let us call

$$(21) \quad \tilde{\zeta}^\mathfrak{a}(n) := \frac{\zeta^\mathfrak{a}(n)}{\xi_\rho^n}$$

the *normalized* value of $\zeta^\mathfrak{a}(n)$, where ξ_ρ is the normalizing transcendental element of \mathbb{C}_∞ that corresponds to $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$, a Hayes module associated to the ideal \mathfrak{a} , see section §2 of this paper. As we shall see, the choice of \mathbb{D} amongst the $(q^{d_\infty} - 1)/(q - 1)$ Hayes modules associated to \mathfrak{a} will not effect our arguments. Because $J(\mathfrak{a})$ is a homogeneous ratio of values of the zeta function $\zeta^\mathfrak{a}$ (see equation (18)), we may replace these values by their normalized values. Then, we claim, by Theorem 4.2, that the normalized values are all in H_R^1 . Indeed, we have $\xi_\rho^{-n} \cdot \sum_{0 \neq x \in \mathfrak{a}} x^{-n} \in H_R^1$. However, since $\mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\} = \bigsqcup_{c \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times} c\mathfrak{a}^+$,

$$\sum_{0 \neq x \in \mathfrak{a}} x^{-n} = \#\mathbb{F}_q^\times \cdot \zeta^\mathfrak{a}(n) = -\zeta^\mathfrak{a}(n).$$

Let $\sigma = [s, K]$. We claim that for $(q - 1)|n$,

$$(22) \quad \tilde{\zeta}^\mathfrak{a}(n)^\sigma = \tilde{\zeta}^{s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}}(n).$$

First note that if $e_\rho(z) = e_{\xi_\rho \mathfrak{a}}(z)$ is the associated exponential function, then taking its logarithmic derivative we get

$$\frac{1}{e_\rho(z)} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}} \frac{1}{z + \xi_\rho \alpha} = - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}} \frac{z^n}{(\xi_\rho \alpha)^{n+1}} = - \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\zeta}^\mathfrak{a}(n+1) z^n.$$

Therefore

$$e_\rho(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n z^{qn}, \quad c_n \in H_R^1,$$

where the c_n are algebraic combinations of the $\tilde{\zeta}^\mathfrak{a}(n+1)$ of a universal form which is dictated by the formula for the reciprocal of a power series. Fix $a \in R$ and write

$$\rho_a(\tau) = a + g_1 \tau + \cdots + g_d \tau^d, \quad g_1, \dots, g_d \in H_R^1.$$

Then, the equation

$$e_\rho(az) = \rho_a(e_\rho(z))$$

implies that

$$\begin{aligned} az + c_1 a^q z^q + (c_2 a^{q^2}) z^{q^2} + \dots &= \rho_a(z + c_1 z^q + \dots) \\ &= \rho_a(z) + \rho_a(c_1 z^q) + \dots \\ &= az + (g_1 + ac_1)z^q + (g_2 + c_1^q g_1 + ac_2)z^{q^2} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

The shape of the last expression above is again of a universal nature and depends only on the coefficients of ρ_a and the coefficients $e_\rho(z)$. That is, we have

$$c_1 = \frac{g_1}{a^q - a}, \quad c_2 = \frac{g_2 + c_1^q g_1}{a^{q^2} - a}, \quad \dots$$

and the coefficients of $e_\rho(z)$ may be solved for in terms of the coefficients of ρ_a using a universal recursion. In particular, we have given a formula for the coefficients of the normalized exponential attached to any Hayes module (\mathbb{D}, ρ) , which only depends on the coefficients of ρ_a for $a \in R$ fixed. As $\mathbb{D}^\sigma = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho^\sigma)$ has lattice homothetic to $s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}$ by Theorem 3.2, it follows that

$$e_{\rho^\sigma}(z) = e_{\xi_{\rho^\sigma} s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}}(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n^\sigma z^n$$

where ξ_{ρ^σ} is the transcendental factor associated to \mathbb{D}^σ . Therefore for all n

$$(23) \quad \frac{\zeta^{s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}}(n)}{\xi_{\rho^\sigma}^n} = \tilde{\zeta}^{s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}}(n) = (\tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{a}}(n))^\sigma.$$

The statement about J follows immediately. □

Theorem 4.4. *For all $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Cl}_R$, $j(\mathfrak{a}) \neq \infty$. In particular, for any $s \in \mathbb{I}^R$,*

$$j(s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}) = j(\mathfrak{a})^{[s, K]}.$$

Proof. The proof is identical to that of Theorem 3, [8]. □

Corollary 4.1. *The j -invariant takes values in $H_R \subset H_R^1$, the function*

$$j : \text{Cl}_R \longrightarrow H_R$$

is injective and

$$H_R = K(j(\mathfrak{a})).$$

Proof. Identical to the proofs of Corollary 1 and Theorem 4 of [8]. □

In what follows, we will need to pass back and forth between ideals of A and their contractions in R , so we return to our notation which makes the distinction.

Let $\mathfrak{m}_R \subset R$ be an ideal contracted from a non-trivial ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$, and $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$ the associated narrow ray class field. By Class Field Theory, $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R} \subset K_\infty^{\text{ab}}$ is the fixed field of the group of Artin symbols $[s, K] \in \text{Aut}(K_\infty^{\text{ab}}/K)$, where $s \in K^\times \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$. By definition, an analytical isomorphism $\Upsilon : \mathbb{C}_\infty/\mathfrak{a}_R \rightarrow \mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_\infty, \rho)$ of R -modules takes the analytical torsion

$$\text{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R) := (\mathfrak{m}_R \mathfrak{a}_R^{-1})^* / \mathfrak{a}_R$$

to the algebraic torsion $\mathbb{D}[\mathfrak{m}_R]$. We will need to identify the image of $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$ under the isomorphism

$$(24) \quad \Theta : K/\mathfrak{a}_R \cong \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \subset A} K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$$

of Theorem 3.1. If the factorization in A of \mathfrak{m} is $\mathfrak{m} = \prod \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$, then \mathfrak{m}_R has the primary factorization

$$\mathfrak{m}_R = \bigcap (\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R.$$

We will be interested in the torsion groups corresponding to the \mathfrak{p} -primary factors,

$$\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R),$$

which canonically include into the corresponding summand $K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$ on the right-hand side of (24). Accordingly, the notation $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R)$ will also be used to denote the image in $K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$.

Lemma 4.1. Θ takes $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R) \subset K/\mathfrak{a}_R$ isomorphically onto

$$\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{m}} \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R)$$

Proof. It is enough to observe that the summation-of-coordinates map, used in the proof of Theorem 3.1, defines an isomorphism

$$S : \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{m}} \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R), \quad \mu = (\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mapsto \sum \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Indeed, since $\mathfrak{m}_R \subset (\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R$,

$$\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R) \subset \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R),$$

so S defines an inclusion into $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$. Following the notation of the proof of surjectivity of S in Theorem 3.1: given $m \in \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$, the unique element mapping onto it is given by $\mu = (\mu_{\mathfrak{p}})$, which has non-0 coordinates only at $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{m}$, with the property that $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}} = m\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{p}}$, where $\sum \varepsilon_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1$ and

$$\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{q} \supset \mathfrak{m}} (\mathfrak{q}^{n_{\mathfrak{q}}})_R.$$

But then it follows that

$$\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R = m\varepsilon_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R \in m\mathfrak{m}_R \subset \mathfrak{a}_R,$$

so $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R)$, as asserted. \square

In what follows we will assume that $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$ is an extension of an ideal $\mathfrak{n} \subset R$ i.e.

$$A\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{m}.$$

In this connection, we recall that the set of contractions of ideals in A to R is in bijection with the set of extensions of ideals of R to A ,

$$C_R := \{\mathfrak{m}_R : \mathfrak{m} \subset A\} \longleftrightarrow E_A := \{A\mathfrak{n} : \mathfrak{n} \subset R\};$$

the bijection is given by the contraction and extension operations. See Proposition 1.17 of [1]. Note that every ideal $\mathfrak{m} \subset A$ contains an element of E_A : since $A\mathfrak{m}_R \subset \mathfrak{m}$. Thus, at the level of associated ray class fields, we have

$$K_{\mathfrak{m}} \subset K_{A\mathfrak{m}_R}.$$

Proposition 4.2. *If $\mathfrak{m} \in E_A$ with prime factorization $\mathfrak{m} = \prod \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$, then $\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \in E_A$.*

Proof. For $\mathfrak{n}_1, \mathfrak{n}_2 \subset R$, $A(\mathfrak{n}_1 \cap \mathfrak{n}_2) \subset (A\mathfrak{n}_1) \cap (A\mathfrak{n}_2)$ ([1], Exercise 1.18). It follows that

$$\mathfrak{m} = A\mathfrak{m}_R \subset \bigcap A(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R \subset \bigcap \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} = \mathfrak{m}.$$

Hence

$$\bigcap A(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R = \prod \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}.$$

But for each \mathfrak{p} , $A(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R \subset \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$, so by uniqueness of prime factorization in A , we must have $A(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R = \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that $s \in \mathbb{I}^R$ is such that $s\mathfrak{a}_R = \mathfrak{a}_R$. Fix $\mathfrak{m} \in E_A$. If $s \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$ then s acts as the identity on $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$. If in addition, \mathfrak{m} is either prime to \mathfrak{c} or contained in \mathfrak{c} , then the converse is true as well.*

Proof. Recall (see the discussion preceding Lemma 4.1) that we may identify

$$\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R) \hookrightarrow K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}.$$

The hypothesis $s\mathfrak{a}_R = \mathfrak{a}_R$ implies for all \mathfrak{p} that $s_{\mathfrak{p}}\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$, whence $s_{\mathfrak{p}}$ acts on each factor module $K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$, and in particular, the question as to its effect on $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R)$ is well-posed.

Suppose $s = (s_{\mathfrak{p}}) \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$. Then for all $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ prime, we claim that

$$(25) \quad (s_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1)\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R) \subset \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Indeed, $s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(n_{\mathfrak{p}})} \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times}$ implies

$$s_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1 \in \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \cap R_{\mathfrak{p}} = (\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} = (\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_{R,\mathfrak{p}},$$

where $(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ denotes the contraction of $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ to $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. As $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an open subring of $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ (since it contains $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{p}}$), it follows that $(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R$ is dense in $(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$. But by definition,

$$(26) \quad (\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R \cdot \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R) \subset \mathfrak{a}_R,$$

and since $s_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1$ is approximated by elements of $(\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R$, the claim (25) follows from (26). In particular, $s_{\mathfrak{p}}$ acts as the identity on $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R)$; by Lemma 4.1, it follows that s acts as the identity on $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$.

Now suppose that either \mathfrak{m} is prime to \mathfrak{c} or contained in \mathfrak{c} ; we will show the converse of the statement we have just proved. Consider first the case where $\mathfrak{c} \supset \mathfrak{m}$ and suppose that $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{c}$. In particular, $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{m}$, and after localizing,

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \subset \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset R_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

hence

$$U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(n_{\mathfrak{p}})} = 1 + \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \subset R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times}$$

Since s is prime to \mathfrak{c} , that is, $s \in \mathbb{I}^R$, $s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times}$, and so what remains is to show that $s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(n_{\mathfrak{p}})} \subset R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times}$. In this case $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{a}$ and thus $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{p}} = A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Additionally, since $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \subset \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{p}}$, we have $\mathfrak{p}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ and is moreover principal, generated by $\pi^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ if $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}} = \pi A_{\mathfrak{p}}$. In particular, $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is now invertible as an $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -ideal, with inverse $\pi^{-n_{\mathfrak{p}}} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. It follows that we may identify $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R)$ in $K_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = K_{\mathfrak{p}}/R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ with $\pi^{-n_{\mathfrak{p}}} R_{\mathfrak{p}}/R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Now

$$(27) \quad \pi^{-n_{\mathfrak{p}}} R_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset \pi^{-n_{\mathfrak{p}}} A_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-n_{\mathfrak{p}}} :$$

From this we conclude that the hypothesis that s acts as the identity on $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$ implies, by Lemma 4.1,

$$(s_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1)\pi^{-n_{\mathfrak{p}}}R_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = R_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

which in turn gives, after multiplying the above inclusion by $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$,

$$(s_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1)\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \subset A_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

i.e. $s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(n_{\mathfrak{p}})}$. Now assume that $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{m}$ but $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$. Then $A_{\mathfrak{p}} = R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and hence $\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^m$ for some $m \geq 0$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{p}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} = \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is invertible as an $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ ideal, which allows us to identify $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}((\mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}})_R)$ with $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-n_{\mathfrak{p}}}/\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^m$. Since, by hypothesis, $s_{\mathfrak{p}}$ acts as the identity on the latter, $s_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1 \in \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{m+n_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ which implies $s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(m+n_{\mathfrak{p}})} \subset U_{\mathfrak{p}}^{(n_{\mathfrak{p}})}$. If $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{m}$, no restrictions are imposed (i.e. $n_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$), and since $s \in \mathbb{I}^R$, we have trivially $s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times} = A_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times} = U_{\mathfrak{p},R}^{(0)}$. This finishes the proof of the converse for $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{p}$.

Finally, we prove the converse when $(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{c}) = 1$. If $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{c}$ then $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{m}$ and $n_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$. There is then nothing to show since, by the overall hypothesis that $s \in \mathbb{I}^R$, we have immediately $s_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times} = U_{\mathfrak{p},R}^{(0)}$. On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{m}$ then $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}$, the proof is the same as that in the previous paragraph, where we were assuming $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{c}$. The case where $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{m}$ is also handled exactly as in the previous paragraph. This finishes the proof of the converse statement when $(\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{c}) = 1$. \square

Let $\mathbb{D} = (\mathbb{C}_{\infty}, \rho)$ be a Drinfeld module defined over the minimal field of definition H_R (= the Hilbert class field) and let e_{ρ} be the exponential inducing an isomorphism

$$e_{\rho} : \mathbb{C}_{\infty}/\Lambda_{\rho} \longrightarrow \mathbb{D}.$$

Then there exists $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$ an ideal and $\xi \in \mathbb{C}_{\infty}$ so that $\Lambda_{\rho} = \xi\mathfrak{a}$. We point out that \mathbb{D} is in general *not* sign normalized, unless $d_{\infty} = 1$.

Theorem 4.5. *Let \mathbb{D} be as in the previous paragraph, $\mathfrak{m} \in E_A$ a modulus which is either prime to \mathfrak{c} or contained in \mathfrak{c} . Then*

$$K_{\mathfrak{m}_R} = H_R(e_{\rho}(\xi t) \mid t \in \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)).$$

Proof. By definition, $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$ is abelian. Moreover, by the order analog of Theorem 3.1.1 of [20] (whose proof is identical to that in the case $R = A$), $H_R(e_{\rho}(\xi t) \mid t \in \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(mR))$ is abelian for any $m \in \mathfrak{m}_R$, hence $H_R(e_{\rho}(\xi t) \mid t \in \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}))$ is abelian as well. Therefore, it will be enough to show that the two fields appearing in the statement of the Theorem are the fixed fields of the same subgroup of $\mathrm{Gal}(K_{\infty}^{\mathrm{ab}}/K)$. Let $\sigma = [s, K]$. Then

$$\sigma|_{K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}} \text{ is trivial} \iff s^{-1} = \alpha u, \quad \alpha \in K^{\times} \text{ and } u \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R}.$$

Suppose first that $\sigma|_{K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}}$ is trivial. Then $\mathbb{D}^{\sigma} = \mathbb{D}$ since \mathbb{D} is defined over $H_R \subset K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$. Choose the analytical isomorphism Υ in the Main Theorem to be the composition $\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \xi\mathfrak{a}$ with the exponential e_{ρ} . By the Main Theorem, it follows that $s^{-1}\mathfrak{a}$ also parametrizes \mathbb{D} and therefore is a multiple of \mathfrak{a} by an element of K^{\times} . In particular, we may choose the element α above so that $s^{-1}\mathfrak{a} = \alpha\mathfrak{a}$. But for all $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$, $u_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times}$ (by definition of $\mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$), hence $u_{\mathfrak{p}}\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$, which implies $\alpha\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$, forcing $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_q^{\times}$. We may thus choose $\alpha = 1$. Then, by Lemma 4.2, s acts trivially on the analytic torsion $\mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$, and by the Main Theorem, it follows that σ fixes $H_R(e_{\rho}(\xi t) \mid t \in \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R))$. In the other direction, suppose $\sigma = [s, K]$ fixes $H_R(e_{\rho}(\xi t) \mid t \in \mathrm{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R))$. In particular, $\mathbb{D}^{\sigma} = \mathbb{D}$, and after re-choosing α , we may

assume $s^{-1}\alpha\mathfrak{a}_R = \mathfrak{a}_R$. The latter implies that $s^{-1}\alpha \in \mathbb{I}^R$: indeed, it implies that for all $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ $s_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}\alpha\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}}$. If $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{c}$, then $\mathfrak{a}_{R,\mathfrak{p}} = R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, hence for such \mathfrak{p} , $s_{\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}\alpha \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times}$, which implies $s^{-1}\alpha \in \mathbb{I}^R$. By the Main Theorem and its proof (especially (17)), $\Upsilon' = \Upsilon \circ \alpha^{-1}$ restricted to $\text{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$, so

$$\Upsilon \circ s^{-1}\alpha = \sigma \circ \Upsilon = \Upsilon \quad \text{restricted to } \text{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R).$$

From this we conclude $s^{-1}\alpha$ acts trivially on $\text{Tor}_{\mathfrak{a}_R}(\mathfrak{m}_R)$ as well, and by Lemma 4.2, (applied to $s^{-1}\alpha$), we have $s \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathfrak{m}_R} K^{\times}$. Therefore, by (15), $\sigma = [s, K]$ is the identity on $K_{\mathfrak{m}_R}$. \square

5. GENERATION OF HILBERT CLASS FIELDS OF REAL QUADRATIC RANK 2 ORDERS

In this section we will consider $K/\mathbb{F}_q[T]$ quadratic and real, where the latter means that over the place ∞ there are two places ∞_1, ∞_2 in the associated curve Σ_K . The Dedekind domain A will be defined as the ring of functions regular outside of ∞_1 . The absolute value associated to ∞ is denoted $|\cdot|$.

Let $f \in k_{\infty}$ and define

$$\Lambda_{\varepsilon}(f) = \{a \in \mathbb{F}_q[T], \|af\| < \varepsilon\},$$

where $\|x\|$ = the distance of x to the nearest element of $\mathbb{F}_q[T]$,

$$\zeta_{f,\varepsilon}(n) = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda_{\varepsilon}(f) \text{ monic}} \alpha^{-n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Define

$$\Delta_{\varepsilon}(f) := -(T^{q^2} - T)\zeta_{f,\varepsilon}(q^2 - 1) + (T^q - T)^q \zeta_{f,\varepsilon}(q - 1)^{q+1}$$

and

$$g_{\varepsilon}(f) := -(T^q - T)\zeta_{f,\varepsilon}(q - 1).$$

Then the ε -modular invariant of f is defined

$$j_{\varepsilon}(f) := \frac{g_{\varepsilon}^{q+1}(f)}{\Delta_{\varepsilon}(f)} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{T^q - T} - J_{\varepsilon}(f)}$$

where

$$(28) \quad J_{\varepsilon}(f) := \frac{T^{q^2} - T}{(T^q - T)^{q+1}} \cdot \frac{\zeta_{f,\varepsilon}(q^2 - 1)}{\zeta_{f,\varepsilon}(q - 1)^{q+1}}.$$

The **quantum modular invariant** or **quantum j -invariant** of f is

$$j^{\text{qt}}(f) := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} j_{\varepsilon}(f) \subset k_{\infty} \cup \{\infty\},$$

where by $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} j_{\varepsilon}(f)$ we mean the *set of limit points* of convergent sequences $\{j_{\varepsilon_i}(f)\}$, $\varepsilon_i \rightarrow 0$.

We remark that the association $f \mapsto j^{\text{qt}}(f)$ is non-trivially multi-valued: see [6]. It is invariant with respect to the action of $\text{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q[T])$ on k_{∞} (i.e. $j^{\text{qt}}(Mf) = j^{\text{qt}}(f)$ for all $M \in \text{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q[T])$ and $f \in k_{\infty}$, see [5]), and so defines a multi-valued function

$$j^{\text{qt}}(f) : \text{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q[T]) \backslash k_{\infty} \dashrightarrow k_{\infty} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

Let $K/\mathbb{F}_q(T)$ be real and quadratic. In what follows, let $f_0 \in \mathcal{O}_K^{\times}$ be a fundamental unit and write $f = f_0^k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. We define the quadratic order

$$R = A_f := \mathbb{F}_q[f, fT, \dots, fT^{d-1}] \subset A = \mathbb{F}_q[f_0, f_0T, \dots, f_0T^{d_0-1}],$$

where $|f_0| = q^{-d_0}$ and $d = kd_0$, and where the equality $A = \mathbb{F}_q[f_0, f_0T, \dots, f_0T^{d_0-1}]$ is proved for example in [7]. Thus, $A_{f_0} = A$.

Lemma 5.1. *The set*

$$(29) \quad \{1, f, fT, \dots, fT^{d-1}, f^2, f^2T, \dots, f^2T^{d-1}, \dots\}$$

is an \mathbb{F}_q vector space basis of A_f . In particular, if $g \in A \setminus \mathbb{F}_q$ and $-d \leq \deg_{\infty_1}(g)$ then $g \notin A_f$.

Proof. Let $G(X_0, \dots, X_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \dots, X_{d-1}]$ with

$$\alpha = G(f, \dots, fT^{d-1}) \in A_f.$$

Then α is a linear combination of monomials of the form

$$f^l T^m, \quad l, m \geq 0$$

in which, if $l = 0$, then $m = 0$. Suppose first that $m = d$. Then using the minimal polynomial for f ,

$$(30) \quad f^2 = \mathbf{a}f + \mathbf{b}, \quad \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{F}_q[T], \deg_T(\mathbf{a}) = d, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_q^\times,$$

we may solve for T^d as

$$T^d = f - \mathbf{a}_{\text{lower}} - \frac{\mathbf{b}}{f}$$

where

$$\mathbf{a}_{\text{lower}} = \mathbf{a} - \text{leading term} = \mathbf{a} - T^d.$$

We then have

$$f^l T^d = f^l \left(f - \mathbf{a}_{\text{lower}} - \frac{\mathbf{b}}{f} \right)$$

which is a linear combination of elements in (29). By induction, one can express any monomial of the shape $f^l T^m$ as a linear combination of monomials occurring in the set (29). \square

Consider the ideals

$$(31) \quad \mathfrak{a}_i = \mathfrak{a}_{f,i} = (f, fT, \dots, fT^i) \subset A_f, \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, d-1.$$

Proposition 5.1. *For all i , $\mathfrak{a}_i = \mathfrak{a}_{d-1}^{d-i}$. In particular, $Z = \{\mathfrak{a}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{a}_{d-1}\}$ forms a cyclic subgroup of the class group Cl_{A_f} .*

Proof. See also [7], where a proof is given for $\mathbf{a} = T^d$. A generating set for \mathfrak{a}_{d-1}^2 is $\{f^2 T^j\}_{j=0}^{2d-2}$. Now the generators with $j \geq d$ may be written

$$(32) \quad f^2 T^d = f^3 - f^2 \mathbf{a}_{\text{lower}} - f\mathbf{b}, \quad \dots, f^2 T^{2d-2} = T^{d-2}(f^3 - f^2 \mathbf{a}_{\text{lower}} - f\mathbf{b}),$$

where, as in Lemma 5.1, $\mathbf{a}_{\text{lower}} = \mathbf{a} - T^d$. It follows by inspection that these generators all belong to \mathfrak{a}_{d-2} . The generators with $j \leq d-1$ trivially belong to \mathfrak{a}_{d-2} , which gives the inclusion $\mathfrak{a}_{d-1}^2 \subset \mathfrak{a}_{d-2}$. On the other hand,

$$f^3 - f^2 \mathbf{a}_{\text{lower}}, \dots, T^{d-2}(f^3 - f^2 \mathbf{a}_{\text{lower}}) \in \mathfrak{a}_{d-1}^2,$$

and together with (32), this gives $f, \dots, fT^{d-2} \in \mathfrak{a}_{d-1}^2$ i.e. $\mathfrak{a}_{d-1}^2 = \mathfrak{a}_{d-2}$. The general statement proceeds by showing, by induction, that $\mathfrak{a}_{d-i} \mathfrak{a}_{d-1} = \mathfrak{a}_{d-i-1}$. \square

By Proposition 5.1, the \mathfrak{a}_i are invertible and thus define elements of $\mathcal{C}|_{A_f}$. For any $\mathfrak{a} \subset A_f$, the modular invariant $j(\mathfrak{a})$ was defined in (19) of section §4.

Now consider the allied “rank 2” order

$$\mathcal{O}_f = \mathbb{F}_q[T][f, f^{-1}] = \mathbb{F}_q[T, f, f^{-1}] \subset \mathcal{O}_K.$$

It has conductor \mathfrak{C} for which $A \cap \mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{c} =$ the conductor of $A_f \subset A$. Its Hilbert class field $H_{\mathcal{O}_f}$ is defined via class field theory as the abelian extension associated to the group

$$C_{\mathcal{O}_f} = \frac{\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{O}_f} \cdot K^\times}{K^\times}$$

where

$$\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{O}_f} = K_{\infty_1}^\times \cdot K_{\infty_2}^\times \cdot \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \neq \infty_1, \infty_2} (\mathcal{O}_f)_{\mathfrak{p}}^\times.$$

We have the following diamond of Hilbert class fields

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{A_f} & & \\ | & \searrow & \\ H_A & & H_{\mathcal{O}_f} \\ & \searrow & | \\ & & H_{\mathcal{O}_K}. \end{array}$$

As usual,

The purpose of the present section is to prove the following Theorem, which is the order analog of the main result of [7]:

Theorem 5.1. *The Hilbert class field $H_{\mathcal{O}_f}$ is primitively generated over K by*

$$\prod_{\alpha \in j^{\mathfrak{a}^t}(f)} \alpha = \prod_{i=0}^{d-1} j(\mathfrak{a}_i).$$

All of the arguments used in [7] extend in an expected way to H_{A_f} , particularly because the main ingredient in most of our proofs was that f is a unit, not necessarily fundamental. The assumption that f is a fundamental unit makes an explicit appearance in the middle of §1 of [7]: this was done so that we could identify generators of A , which necessarily use a fundamental unit. In what follows, we will review carefully all of the elements in the proof appearing in [7], pointing out whatever changes need to be made to deal with the fact that A_f is no longer a Dedekind domain. The main point is that

$$A_f = \mathbb{F}_q[f, fT, \dots, fT^{d-1}]$$

has exactly the same shape as A when expressed explicitly using generators.

§1 of [7]: “Diophantine Approximations of Quadratic Units”

In the first part of the section, before assuming f fundamental, we provide an explicit formula for $\Lambda_\varepsilon(f)$ which we describe this now. Define $\mathfrak{q}_n \in \mathbb{F}_q[T]$ by $\mathfrak{q}_0 = 1, \mathfrak{q}_1 = \mathfrak{a}, \dots, \mathfrak{q}_{n+1} = \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{q}_n + \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{q}_{n-1}$, $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ are as in (30). If f^* denotes the Galois

conjugate of f , we may assume $|f| > |f^*|$, and then $|f| = |\mathfrak{a}| = q^d$ and $|f^*| = q^{-d}$. Let $D = \mathfrak{a}^2 + 4\mathfrak{b}$ be the discriminant. Using Binet's formula

$$(33) \quad \mathfrak{Q}_n = \frac{f^{n+1} - (f^*)^{n+1}}{\sqrt{D}}, \quad n = 0, 1, \dots,$$

one may show that $\|\mathfrak{Q}_n f\| = q^{-(n+1)d}$, from which it follows that the set

$$\mathcal{B} = \{T^{d-1}\mathfrak{Q}_0, \dots, T\mathfrak{Q}_0, \mathfrak{Q}_0; T^{d-1}\mathfrak{Q}_1, \dots, T\mathfrak{Q}_1, \mathfrak{Q}_1; \dots\}$$

forms an \mathbb{F}_q basis of $\mathbb{F}_q[T]$. Write $\mathcal{B}(i) = \{T^{d-1}\mathfrak{Q}_i, \dots, \mathfrak{Q}_i\}$ for the i th block of \mathcal{B} and for $0 \leq \tilde{d} \leq d-1$, denote $\mathcal{B}(i)_{\tilde{d}} = \{T^{\tilde{d}}\mathfrak{Q}_i, \dots, \mathfrak{Q}_i\}$. Then (see [7], Lemma 1)

$$\Lambda_{q^{-Nd-l}}(f) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathcal{B}(N)_{d-1-l}, \mathcal{B}(N+1), \dots).$$

Then, there is the renormalization result, Proposition 1 of [7], which shows that the renormalized $\Lambda_\varepsilon(f)$ converge to the \mathfrak{a}_i . The proof of this statement is valid for an arbitrary order, since it only uses Binet's formula.

§2 of [7]: “The Quantum j -Invariant in Positive Characteristic”

The definitions of the j invariant for ideal classes of A_f and the associated quantum j -invariant are the same as those that appear in [7]. The analog of Lemma 2 of [7] is proved in Proposition 5.1. Finally, Theorem 4 of [7], which says that

$$j^{\text{qt}}(f) = \{j(\mathfrak{a}_i)\}_{i=0}^{d-1}$$

remains valid for an arbitrary unit f , since the proof only uses Binet's formula.

§3 of [7]: “Injectivity”

In the very beginning of this section, we pick an ideal class $[\mathfrak{a}] \in \text{Cl}_A$ and write $\mathfrak{a} = (g, h)$. In the case of A_f , by definition, an element of $[\mathfrak{a}] \in \text{Cl}_{A_f}$ is the class of an invertible ideal. We prove above (see Theorem 1.5) that invertible ideals may be generated by two elements. So this presentation of $\mathfrak{a} = (g, h)$ remains valid. We also need that g has the smallest degree amongst all non-0 elements of \mathfrak{a} . We may make this assumption in view of *Note* 1.1 of section §1. The remainder of this section, which comprises the main technical results of [7], only uses the fact that f is a unit and the shape of A_f as displayed above, which is identical in form to that of A . Therefore these results hold identically in the case of A_f .

§4 of [7]: “Generation of the Hilbert Class Field”

Just as in the case of A , since K is totally real, $H_{A_f}^1 =$ the narrow Hilbert class field of $A_f = H_{A_f}$. The analog of Theorem 7 of [7] for A_f is simply Corollary 4.1 of section §4, we simply note that $\mathfrak{a} \subset K$ is now an invertible A_f fractional ideal. The analog of Proposition 2 of [7] is the following:

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\mathfrak{a}_{d-1} \in \text{Cl}_{A_f}$ be as above. Then $\langle \mathfrak{a}_{d-1} \rangle = \text{Ker}(\text{Cl}_{A_f} \rightarrow \text{Cl}_{\mathcal{O}_f})$. In particular, the Galois group $Z = \text{Gal}(H_{A_f}/H_{\mathcal{O}_f})$ is canonically isomorphic to $\langle \mathfrak{a}_{d-1} \rangle$ via Class Field Theory.*

Proof. For $f = f_0$ a fundamental unit, this result was proved in Proposition 2 of [7]; we will use the latter to prove the Proposition. Denote $Z_0 := \text{Gal}(H_A/H_{\mathcal{O}_K}) \cong \text{Ker}(\text{Cl}_A \rightarrow \text{Cl}_{\mathcal{O}_K}) = \langle \mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1} \rangle$, where $\mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1} = (f_0, f_0T, \dots, f_0T^{d_0-1})$. In what

follows, we simply write $Z = \text{Ker}(\text{Cl}_{A_f} \rightarrow \text{Cl}_{\mathcal{O}_f})$ and $Z_0 = \text{Ker}(\text{Cl}_A \rightarrow \text{Cl}_{\mathcal{O}_K}) = \langle \mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1} \rangle$. We have the following commutative diagram of short exact sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & Z & \hookrightarrow & \text{Cl}_{A_f} \cong \mathfrak{I}_{A_f}^{\mathfrak{c}}/\mathfrak{P}_{A_f}^{\mathfrak{c}} & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \text{Cl}_{\mathcal{O}_f} \cong \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{O}_f}^{\mathfrak{c}}/\mathfrak{P}_{\mathcal{O}_f}^{\mathfrak{c}} & \longrightarrow & 1 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \Psi_A & & \downarrow \Psi_{\mathcal{O}} & & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & Z_0 = \langle \mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1} \rangle & \hookrightarrow & \text{Cl}_A \cong \mathfrak{I}_A/\mathfrak{P}_A & \xrightarrow{\Phi_0} & \text{Cl}_{\mathcal{O}_K} \cong \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{O}_K}/\mathfrak{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K} & \longrightarrow & 1, \end{array}$$

in which $\text{Cl}_{A_f} \cong \mathfrak{I}_{A_f}^{\mathfrak{c}}/\mathfrak{P}_{A_f}^{\mathfrak{c}}$ follows from Theorem 1.6. The identification $\text{Cl}_{\mathcal{O}_K} \cong \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{O}_K}/\mathfrak{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}$ is proved as in Theorem 1.6, where we remark that the proofs of the supporting results go thorough in rank 2 as they are rank independent. The vertical maps $\Psi_A, \Psi_{\mathcal{O}}$ are induced by ideal expansion, e.g., $\mathfrak{b}_f \mapsto \mathfrak{b} := \mathfrak{b}_f A_{\infty_1}$, which are bijections on ideals prime to \mathfrak{c} (see Theorem 1.1). We have the inclusion $\langle \mathfrak{a}_{d-1} \rangle \subset Z$ since \mathfrak{a}_{d-1} contains the \mathcal{O}_f -unit f . Suppose there is an ideal class $\mathfrak{b}_f \in Z \setminus \langle \mathfrak{a}_{d-1} \rangle$; without loss of generality, by Lemma 1.3, we may assume that \mathfrak{b}_f is prime to \mathfrak{a}_{d-1} . Then by Theorems 1.3 and 1.4, \mathfrak{b}_f may be written as a product of primes that are prime to the conductor. We claim that $\mathfrak{a}_{d-1}A \subset \mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1}$. Indeed, the generators of \mathfrak{a}_{d-1} are of the form fT^j , $j = d_0m + i \in \{0, \dots, d-1 = nd_0 - 1\}$; writing the exponent of T as $j = md_0 + i$ for $m < n$ and $i < d_0$, we have $fT^j = f_0^n T^j = (f_0 T^{d_0})^m \cdot f_0^{n-m} T^i$. Using the quadratic relation for f_0 , $f_0 T^{d_0} \in \mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1}$, and this proves the claim. But by Theorem 1.1, the expansion $\mathfrak{a}_{d-1}A$ is prime, hence $\mathfrak{a}_{d-1}A = \mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1}$. In particular, the expansion $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}_f A$ is therefore a product of primes that do not involve \mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1} . By the commutativity of the diagram, $\mathfrak{b} \in Z_0 = \langle \mathfrak{a}_{d_0-1} \rangle$, contradiction. \square

The rest of the proof of Theorem 5.1 follows *mutatis mutandis* that of [7].

REFERENCES

- [1] Atiyah, M.F. & Macdonald, I.G., *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1969.
- [2] Cohn, P.M., *Algebraic Numbers and Algebraic Functions*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, London, 1991.
- [3] Conrad, Keith, Ideal factorization. <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/gradnumthy/idealfactor.pdf>.
- [4] Conrad, Keith, The Conductor Ideal of an Order. <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/gradnumthy/conductor.pdf>.
- [5] Demangos, L. & Gendron, T.M., Quantum j -Invariant in Positive Characteristic I: Definitions and Convergence. *Arch. Math.* **107** (1), 23–35 (2016).
- [5e] Demangos, L. & Gendron, T.M., Correction to: Quantum j -invariant in positive characteristic I: definition and convergence. *Arch. Math.* (2018).
- [6] Demangos, L. & Gendron, T.M., Quantum j -Invariant in Positive Characteristic II: Formulas and Values at the Quadratics. *Arch. Math.* **107** (2), 159–166 (2016).
- [7] Demangos, L. & Gendron, T.M., Quantum modular invariant of Hilbert class fields of real quadratic global function fields. *Sel. Math. New Ser.* **27**, 13 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-021-00619-4>.
- [8] Demangos, L. & Gendron, T.M., Modular invariant of rank 1 Drinfeld modules and class field generation. *J. Number Theory* (Joint Special Issue: New Developments in the Theory of Modular Forms Over Function Fields: Conference in Pisa, 2018/p-adic Cohomology and Arithmetic Applications: conference in Banff, 2017) **237**, 40–66 (2022).
- [9] Demangos, L. & Gendron, T.M., Quantum Drinfeld modules and ray class fields of real quadratic global function fields. arXiv:1709.05337v3
- [10] Drinfeld, V.G., Elliptic modules. *Math Sbornik* **94** (1974), 594–627.

- [11] Gekeler, Ernst-Ulrich, Zur Arithmetik von Drinfeld Moduln, *Math. Ann.* **262** (1983), 167–182.
- [12] Gendron, T.M., Leichtnam, E. & Lochak, P., Modules de Drinfeld Quasicristallins, arXiv 1912.12323.
- [13] Gilmer, Robert & Heinzer, William, On the number of generators of an invertible ideal. *J. of Algebra* **14**, 139–151 (1970).
- [14] Goss, D., *Basic structures of Function Field Arithmetic*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [15] Hayes, David R., Explicit class field theory in global functions fields, in *Studies in Algebra and Number Theory*, Advances in Mathematics Supplementary Studies, Vol. 6, (ed. Gian-Carlo Rota), pp. 173 – 217, Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [16] Hayes, D., A brief introduction to Drinfeld modules, in *The Arithmetic of Function Fields*, (ed. D. Goss, D.R. Hayes & M.I. Rosen), Ohio State U. Mathematical Research Institute Publications **2**, pp. 313–402, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1992.
- [17] Lang, Serge, *Algebraic Number Theory*. Second Edition. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [18] Neukirch, J., *Algebraic Number Theory*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **322**, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [19] Silverman, *Advanced Topics in the Arithmetic of Elliptic Curves*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **151**. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [20] Thakur, D.S., *Function Field Arithmetic*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2004.

XI'AN JIAOTONG - LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, MATHEMATICS BUILDING BLOCK B, 111 REN'AI ROAD, SUZHOU DUSHU LAKE SCIENCE AND EDUCATION INNOVATION DISTRICT, SUZHOU INDUSTRIAL PARK, SUZHOU, PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA, 215123
Email address: Luca.Demangos@xjtlu.edu.cn

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS – UNIDAD CUERNAVACA, UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTÓNOMA DE MÉXICO, AV. UNIVERSIDAD S/N, C.P. 62210 CUERNAVACA, MORELOS, MÉXICO
Email address: tim@matcuer.unam.mx