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Abstract. We propose a conjectural characterization of when the dynamical Galois group associated to a polynomial is abelian, and we prove our conjecture in several cases, including the stable quadratic case over \( \mathbb{Q} \). In the postcritically infinite case, the proof uses algebraic techniques, including a result concerning ramification in towers of cyclic \( p \)-extensions. In the postcritically finite case, the proof uses the theory of heights together with results of Amoroso-Zannier and Amoroso-Dvornicich, as well as properties of the Arakelov-Zhang pairing.

1. Introduction

Let \( K \) be a number field with algebraic closure \( \bar{K} \). Let \( \phi(x) \in K[x] \) be a polynomial of degree \( d \geq 2 \), and denote by \( \phi^n = \phi \circ \cdots \circ \phi \) the \( n \)-fold composition of \( \phi \) with itself. Let \( \alpha \in K \) be a non-exceptional point for \( \phi \); that is, assume that the backward orbit \( \{ \beta \in \bar{K} \mid \phi^n(\beta) = \alpha \text{ for some } n \geq 0 \} \) of \( \alpha \) is an infinite set.

For each \( n \geq 1 \), define the \( n \)-th inverse image set of the pair \((\phi, \alpha)\) by
\[
\phi^{-n}(\alpha) = \{ \beta \in \bar{K} \mid \phi^n(\beta) = \alpha \},
\]
and let \( K_n = K_n(\phi, \alpha) \) be the field generated over \( K \) by \( \phi^{-n}(\alpha) \). Since the generators of \( K_n \) are \( \phi \)-images of generators of \( K_{n+1} \), we obtain a tower \( K = K_0 \subseteq K_1 \subseteq K_2 \subseteq \ldots \) of Galois extensions of \( K \). Set \( K_\infty = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} K_n \).

As described for example in [18], \( \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \) acts faithfully on the \( n \)-th preimage tree \( T_n = T_n(\phi, \alpha) \) associated to the pair \((\phi, \alpha)\), which can be described as follows. For each \( 0 \leq m \leq n \), the level-\( m \) vertices of \( T_n \) are indexed by the elements of \( \phi^{-m}(\alpha) \), and edge relations on \( T_n \) are determined by \( \phi \)-evaluation. In the limit as \( n \to +\infty \), \( \text{Gal}(K_\infty/K) \) acts faithfully on \( T_\infty = \bigcup T_n \), and we obtain the arboreal Galois representations
\[
\rho_n : \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \hookrightarrow \text{Aut}(T_n) \\
\rho : \text{Gal}(K_\infty/K) \hookrightarrow \text{Aut}(T_\infty).
\]

The study of the representations (1) goes back to Odoni [22, 23, 24, 25] and Stoll [30] in the 1980s-1990s, and has found renewed interest since the mid 2000s due to a series of papers by Boston [6], Boston-Jones [7, 8] and Jones...
Much of the current research in this area focuses on identifying cases in which $\text{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$ is large in the sense that the arboreal Galois representation $\rho$ is surjective, or has image with finite index in $\text{Aut}(T_\infty)$.

Assume for now that the pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ is stable, that is that the $\text{Gal}(K_n/K)$-action on $\phi^{-n}(\alpha)$ is transitive for each $n \geq 1$; this is equivalent to the irreducibility of $\phi^n(x) - \alpha$ for all $n \geq 1$. In this case, each $T_n$ is the complete $d$-ary rooted tree of level $n$, so using transitivity and comparing with the size of $\text{Aut}(T_n)$, it follows from the injectivity of (1) that

$$d^n \leq |\text{Gal}(K_n/K)| \leq d!(d^n - 1)/(d - 1)$$

for all $n$. Examples in which the upper bound in (2) is achieved for all $n \geq 1$ have been identified by Odoni [23] and Stoll [30] in degree $d = 2$, by Looper [21] in every prime degree, and by Specter [29] in arbitrary degree.

In the opposite direction, let us say that a pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ is minimally stable if it is stable, and the lower bound in (2) is achieved for all $n \geq 1$. For example, let $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $\phi(x) = x^2$, and $\alpha = -1$. This pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ is stable, indeed $\phi^n(x) - \alpha = x^{2^n} + 1$ is the $2^{n+1}$-th cyclotomic polynomial and hence is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$, and $|\text{Gal}(K_n/\mathbb{Q})| = [K_n : \mathbb{Q}] = 2^n$. Since $K_\infty/\mathbb{Q}$ is cyclotomic, $\text{Gal}(K_\infty/\mathbb{Q})$ is abelian. (In fact $\text{Gal}(K_\infty/\mathbb{Q}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2^\times \simeq \{\pm\} \times \mathbb{Z}_2$.)

More generally, an elementary argument shows that if the pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ is stable and $\text{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$ is abelian, then $(\phi, \alpha)$ is minimally stable; see Lemma 2. We do not know whether the converse is true; i.e. whether the only minimally stable pairs $(\phi, \alpha)$ are those for which $\text{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$ is abelian. We do not directly address this question here. Instead, in this paper we consider the following question: for precisely which pairs $(\phi, \alpha)$ is $\text{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$ abelian? In the stable case, this is closely related to the question of characterizing minimally stable pairs $(\phi, \alpha)$, but the question makes sense even in the absence of a stability hypothesis. We conjecture that in general, $\text{Gal}(K_\infty/K)$ is abelian only in cases related to the powering map example described above, or to similar examples arising from Chebyshev polynomials.

Given a field extension $L/K$, we say the pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ is conjugate over $L$ to the pair $(\psi, \beta)$ if there exists an affine transformation $\gamma(x) = ax + b$ defined over $L$ such that $\psi = \gamma \circ \phi \circ \gamma^{-1}$ and $\beta = \gamma(\alpha)$. It is not hard to see that if $(\phi, \alpha)$ and $(\psi, \beta)$ are conjugate over $K$, then $K_\infty(\phi, \alpha) = K_\infty(\psi, \beta)$. But for us, the more important fact is that whether or not $\text{Gal}(K_\infty(\phi, \alpha)/K)$ is abelian is an invariant of the $K^{\text{ab}}$-conjugacy class of the pair $(\phi, \alpha)$, where $K^{\text{ab}}$ is the maximal abelian extension of $K$ in $\overline{K}$; see Proposition 11.
Conjecture 1. Let $K$ be a number field, let $\phi(x) \in K[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$, let $\alpha \in K$, and assume that $\alpha$ is not an exceptional point for $\phi$. Then $K_{\infty}(\phi, \alpha)/K$ is an abelian extension if and only if the pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ is $K^{ab}$-conjugate to the pair $(\psi, \beta)$ occurring in one of the following two families of examples:

(i) $\psi(x) = x^d$ and $\beta = \zeta$, a root of unity in $\bar{K}$.
(ii) $\psi(x) = T_d(x)$ is the $d$-th Chebyshev polynomial and $\beta = \zeta + \zeta^{-1}$, where $\zeta$ is a root of unity in $\bar{K}$.

As a special case, when $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $d = 2$, we recall the well-known fact that every quadratic polynomial over $\mathbb{Q}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-conjugate to $x^2 + c$ for a unique $c \in \mathbb{Q}$, and moreover any such $\mathbb{Q}$-conjugacy is actually defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Thus Conjecture 1 asserts in this case that for a pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ with $\deg(\phi) = 2$, the extension $K_{\infty}(\phi, \alpha)/\mathbb{Q}$ is abelian if and only if $(\phi, \alpha)$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-conjugate to $(x^2, \pm 1)$ or $(x^2 - 2, \beta)$ for $\beta = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2$.

We prove partial results toward Conjecture 1 which can be divided into three main categories. First, we prove Conjecture 1 in the quadratic, stable, postcritically infinite case (Theorem 8). (Recall that a quadratic polynomial $\phi(x)$ is said to be postcritically finite if its critical point is $\phi$-preperiodic; otherwise it is postcritically infinite.) The main ideas in this proof are algebraic, and culminate in showing under the above hypotheses that if $K_{\infty}/K$ were abelian, then no primes of $K$ with odd residue characteristic would ramify in $K_{\infty}$, in contradiction with a result of Bridy et. al. [9] on arbitrary postcritically infinite maps.

Next, we prove Conjecture 1 for polynomials $\phi$ which are $\bar{K}$-conjugate to either a powering map or a Chebyshev map (Theorems 12 and 13). These proofs use the theory of heights together with a result of Amoroso-Zannier [3] (generalizing a result of Amoroso-Dvornicich [2]), giving a lower bound on the heights of elements in abelian extensions of number fields. Notably, the results on powering and Chebyshev maps do not require a stability hypothesis.

Finally, we treat the particular postcritically finite map $\phi(x) = x^2 - 1$. Using a combination of the ramification techniques of Theorem 8 with the height techniques of Theorems 12 and 13 (and in particular a lower bound on the height in certain cyclotomic extensions due to Amoroso-Dvornicich [2]), we prove Conjecture 1 for stable pairs $(x^2 - 1, \alpha)$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. We point out that the proof of this result is computer-assisted, in the sense that the key step in the proof is to numerically calculate the Arakelov-Zhang pairing $\langle x^2 - 1, x^2 \rangle$ with enough precision to show that it is less than the Bogomolov constant of the maximal abelian extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ unramified at all odd primes. In particular, we use SageMath to calculate a sum of elementary approximations to local height functions evaluated at roots of unity.
Combining these results, and using the well known fact that every quadratic polynomial over $\mathbb{Q}$ is either postcritically infinite or else $\mathbb{Q}$-conjugate to either the squaring map $x^2$, the Chebyshev map $x^2 - 2$, or $x^2 - 1$, we obtain the following.

**Theorem 1.** Conjecture [1] is true for all quadratic stable pairs $(\phi, \alpha)$ over $\mathbb{Q}$.

It is well-known that any iterate of an Eisenstein polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ is again Eisenstein, so the pair $(\phi(x), 0)$ is stable whenever $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is Eisenstein. Using this observation, we can give the following simple examples to show that in each of the cases described above, stable pairs $(x^2 + c, \alpha)$ exist over $\mathbb{Q}$ and hence Theorem [1] is non-vacuous in each case.

(i) For any prime $p$, the (post-critically infinite) pair $(x^2 + p, 0)$ is stable.

(ii) If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \equiv 2$ or $3 \pmod{4}$, then the squaring pair $(x^2, \alpha)$ is stable, since it is conjugate to $(x^2 + 2\alpha x + \alpha^2 - \alpha, 0)$, which is 2-Eisenstein. Note that this family includes both abelian examples, such as $(x^2, -1)$, and nonabelian examples, such as $(x^2, 3)$.

(iii) If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \equiv 0$ or $1 \pmod{4}$, then the Chebyshev pair $(x^2 - 2, \alpha)$ is stable, since it is conjugate to $(x^2 + 2\alpha x + \alpha^2 - \alpha - 2, 0)$, which is 2-Eisenstein. Note that this family includes both abelian examples, such as $(x^2 - 2, 0)$, and nonabelian examples, such as $(x^2 - 2, 4)$.

(iv) This example was shown to us by Chifan Leung. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha \equiv 1$ or $2 \pmod{4}$, then the squaring pair $(x^2 - 1, \alpha)$ is stable. It suffices to show that $(\phi^2, \alpha)$ is stable, where $\phi(x) = x^2 - 1$ and $\phi^2(x) = x^4 - 2x^2$, since the irreducibility of $\phi^{2n}(x) - \alpha$ implies the irreducibility of $\phi^{2n-1}(x) - \alpha$. The stability of $(\phi^2, \alpha)$ follows from the fact that it is conjugate to $(\phi^2(x + \alpha) - \alpha, 0)$, which is easily checked to be 2-Eisenstein. (See also [1] for a study of large-image results for arboreal Galois representations associated to $\phi(x) = x^2 - 1$.)

While this paper was under review, A. Ferraguti and C. Pagano [13] have informed us that they have used an entirely different approach to give a complete proof of the $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $d = 2$ case of Conjecture [1] (not requiring any stability assumption).

The plan of this paper is as follows. In § 2 we prove some preliminary algebraic lemmas, and in § 3 we prove Conjecture [1] in the quadratic, stable, postcritically infinite case. In § 4 we review the absolute Weil height function defined on algebraic extensions of $\mathbb{Q}$, we recall the concept of the Bogomolov constant associated to such fields, and we describe related results of Amoroso-Zannier [3] and Amoroso-Dvornicich [2]. In § 5 we prove Conjecture [1] for powering maps and Chebyshev maps. In § 6 we review the definition and basic facts about
the Arakelov-Zhang pairing, and in §7 and §8 we treat the particular polynomial \( \phi(x) = x^2 - 1 \), calculate the Arakelov-Zhang pairing \( \langle x^2 - 1, x^2 \rangle \), and prove Conjecture 1 for stable pairs \((x^2 - 1, \alpha)\) over \(\mathbb{Q}\).

Acknowledgements: We thank Rafe Jones for several helpful suggestions.

2. Some algebraic lemmas

Lemma 2. Let \( G \) be a finite abelian group acting faithfully and transitively on a finite set \( X \). Then \( |G| = |X| \).

Proof. For each \( x \in X \), let \( G_x \) be the stabilizer of \( x \). Then \( G_x = G_y \) for all \( x, y \in X \). Indeed, writing \( y = gx \) for \( g \in G \), if \( h \in G_x \) then \( hy = hgx = ghx = gx = y \), showing that \( h \in G_y \) as well. Thus \( G_x \subseteq G_y \), and \( G_x = G_y \) follows from symmetry. Since the action is faithful, we have \( \bigcap_{x \in X} G_x = \{1\} \), and since the stabilizers are all equal to each other we conclude that \( G_x = \{1\} \) for all \( x \in X \). Therefore \( |X| = (G : G_x) = (G : 1) = |G| \) by the orbit stabilizer theorem. \( \square \)

Lemma 3. If \( G \) is an abelian, transitive subgroup of \( S_N \) and if \( \sigma \in G \) is an element of order \( \ell \), then \( \sigma = c_1 c_2 \ldots c_r \) for some \( r \) disjoint \( \ell \)-cycles \( c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_r \), where \( r = N/\ell \).

Proof. Recall the standard calculation that if \((i_1 \ldots i_\ell) \in S_N \) is a cycle and if \( \tau \in S_N \), then \( \tau(i_1 \ldots i_\ell)\tau^{-1} = (\tau(i_1) \ldots \tau(i_\ell)) \).

We may write \( \sigma = c_1 c_2 \ldots c_r \) for some \( r \) disjoint cycles \( c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_r \) of lengths \( \ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_r \), respectively, and this decomposition is unique up to ordering. If necessary, interpreting some of the cycles \( c_j \) to be 1-cycles, we may assume that every element of \( \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \) occurs in precisely one of the cycles \( c_j \).

Fix \( 2 \leq j \leq r \). By transitivity, select \( \tau \in G \) taking some element of \( \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \) occurring in the cycle \( c_j \) to some element occurring in the cycle \( c_1 \). Since \( G \) is abelian,

\[
\sigma = \tau \sigma \tau^{-1} = (\tau c_1 \tau^{-1}) \ldots (\tau c_r \tau^{-1}),
\]

and so by uniqueness of the disjoint cycle decomposition of \( \sigma \), we conclude that \( c_1 = \tau c_j \tau^{-1} \). In particular, all of the cycles \( c_j \) have the same length \( \ell_1 \), which must then be equal to the order \( \ell \) of \( \sigma \). Finally, \( r \ell = N \), as every element of \( \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \) occurs in precisely one of the cycles \( c_j \). \( \square \)

Lemma 4. Let \( G \) be an abelian, transitive subgroup of \( S_{2n} \) which is not a subgroup of \( A_{2n} \). Then \( G \) is cyclic.

Proof. By Lemma 2 we have \( |G| = 2^n \). Let \( \sigma \in G \) be an odd permutation of order \( \ell \); thus \( \ell \geq 2 \) is a power of 2. By Lemma 3 we have a decomposition
$\sigma = c_1c_2 \ldots c_r$ into disjoint $\ell$-cycles $c_j$, and $r\ell = 2^n$. Since $\ell$ is even, $\text{sgn}(c_j) = -1$ for all $j$, and therefore

$$-1 = \text{sgn}(\sigma) = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq r} \text{sgn}(c_j) = (-1)^r.$$ 

Thus $r$ is odd, and as $r\ell = 2^n$, we must have $r = 1$. We conclude that $\sigma = c_1$ is a $2^n$-cycle and hence that $G = \langle \sigma \rangle$ is cyclic.

The assumption that $G \notin A_{2^n}$ cannot be omitted. For example, the order 8 subgroup $G = \langle \sigma, \tau \rangle$ of $A_8$ generated by the (commuting) permutations $\sigma = (1537)(2648)$ and $\tau = (12)(34)(56)(78)$ is abelian and transitive, but not cyclic. We also point out that this counterexample cannot be removed using properties of tree automorphisms, as we may view $G$ as a subgroup of the automorphism group of a binary rooted tree of level 3, by embedding the tree in the usual way in the plane and labeling the level-3 vertices by the numbers $1, \ldots, 8$ from left to right.

**Lemma 5.** Let $f(x) = Ax^2 + Bx + C \in K[x]$ be a quadratic polynomial, and let $c = -B/2A$ be its critical point. Then for all $n \geq 1$,

$$(3) \quad \text{disc}(f^n) = (-1)^{2n-1}2^n A^{2n-1-1}\text{disc}(f^{-1})^2 f^n(c).$$

This identity is worked out (in greater generality) up to sign by Jones in [17] Lemma 2.6; it is straightforward to go through Jones’ calculation and keep track of the factor $(-1)^{2n-1}$, which of course is $-1$ when $n = 1$ and $+1$ when $n \geq 2$. To check (3) when $n = 1$, take $f^0(x) = x$ and hence $\text{disc}(f^0) = 1$, which is reasonable as one typically interprets the empty product to be 1. In this case, the right hand side of (3) simplifies to $-4Af(c) = B^2 - 4AC$, as expected.

3. **Ramification and postcritically infinite quadratic maps**

We recall standard facts and notation surrounding a finite Galois extension $L/K$ of number fields; see Lang [19] Ch. 1. Given a prime $p$ of $K$, by the Galois assumption we have a factorization of the form $p\mathcal{O}_L = q_1^{e_1} \cdots q_r^{e_r}$ for primes $q_1, \ldots, q_r$ of $L$, and $ref = [L : K]$, where $e = e(q_i/p)$ and $f = f(q_i/p)$ are the (common) ramification indices and inertial degrees of the $q_i$, respectively. Moreover, each $\mathcal{O}_L/q_i$ is a degree $f$ extension of $\mathcal{O}_K/p$. For each $1 \leq i \leq r$, let

$$D_{q_i/p} = \{ \sigma \in \text{Gal}(L/K) \mid \sigma(q_i) = q_i \}$$

$$I_{q_i/p} = \{ \sigma \in D_{q_i/p} \mid \sigma(x) \equiv x \pmod{q_i} \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{O}_L \}$$

be the associated decomposition and inertia groups. Thus $I_{q_i/p}$ has order $e(q_i/p)$, $p$ is unramified in $L^{I_{q_i/p}}$, and if $p'$ denotes any prime of $L^{I_{q_i/p}}$ lying over $p$, then $p'$ is totally ramified in $L$. 

Lemma 6. Let $L/K$ be a Galois extension of number fields and let $p$ be a prime of $K$ which is tamely ramified in $L$. Let $q$ be a prime of $L$ lying over $p$. Then

$$e(q/p) \leq |O_K/p|^{f(q/p)} - 1.$$  

Proof. Let $\pi \in O_L$ be a uniformizer for $q$, and consider the group homomorphism

$$I_{q/p} \to (O_L/q)^\times$$

$$\sigma \mapsto \sigma(\pi)/\pi \pmod q$$

Standard arguments from the theory of local fields show that this map does not depend on the choice of uniformizer, and the tame ramification hypothesis implies that it is injective; see [10], §1.8. Together with the fact that $|O_L/q| = |O_K/p|^{f(q/p)}$, we obtain the desired inequality. \qed

Lemma 7. Let $K$ be a number field, let $K = K_0 \subset K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \ldots$ be a tower of distinct cyclic $p$-extensions of $K$, and let $K_\infty = \cup K_n$. If $p$ is a prime of $K$ with residue characteristic not equal to $p$, then $p$ is unramified in $K_\infty$.

Proof. Since a quotient of a cyclic $p$-group is another cyclic $p$-group, without loss of generality we may insert intermediate fields and reindex to ensure that $[K_n : K_{n-1}] = p$ for all $n \geq 1$. Since $\text{Gal}(K_n/K)$ is a cyclic $p$-group, its subgroups are totally ordered by inclusion, and thus the same is true of intermediate fields $K \subseteq F \subseteq K_n$. In particular, the fields $K = K_0 \subset K_1 \subset \cdots \subset K_n$ are the only subfields of $K_n$ containing $K$.

Contrary to what has been claimed, assume that $p$ has residue characteristic not equal to $p$ and that $p$ ramifies (hence tamely ramifies) in $K_\infty$. Let $p_0 = p$, and for each $n \geq 1$, let $p_n$ be a prime of $K_n$ lying over $p_{n-1}$. Let $n_0$ be maximal with the property that $p$ is unramified in $K_{n_0}$; thus $p_{n_0}$ is ramified in $K_{n_0+1}$. Let $n > n_0$ be arbitrary, and define $F_p = K_n^{I_{p_n/p}}$, the fixed field of the inertia subgroup $I_{p_n/p}$ of $\text{Gal}(K_n/K)$. In particular, $p$ is unramified in $F_p$, and if $p'$ denotes any prime of $F_p$ lying over $p$, then $p'$ is totally ramified in $K_n$. Since we must have $F_p = K_m$ for some $0 \leq m \leq n$, the only possibility is $F_p = K_{n_0}$.

To summarize, we have shown that $p$ is unramified in $K_{n_0}$, and that $p_{n_0}$ is totally ramified in $K_{n_0}$ for all $n > n_0$. In particular, we have

$$f(p_n/p) = f(p_{n_0}/p) \leq [K_{n_0} : K] = p^{n_0}$$  

$$e(p_n/p) = e(p_{n_0}/p) = [K_n : K_{n_0}] = p^{n-n_0}.$$  

But for large enough $n$, (4) contradicts the bound

$$e(p_n/p) \leq |O_K/p|^{f(p_n/p)} - 1.$$  

which follows from Lemma 6. \qed
Theorem 8. Let \( \phi(x) \in K[x] \) be a quadratic polynomial which is not postcritically finite, let \( \alpha \in K \), and assume that the pair \((\phi, \alpha)\) is stable. Then \( \text{Gal}(K_\infty/K) \) is nonabelian.

Proof. Let \( \phi(x) \in K[x] \) be a quadratic polynomial which is not postcritically finite, let \( \alpha \in K \), assume that the pair \((\phi, \alpha)\) is stable, and assume that \( \text{Gal}(K_\infty/K) \) is abelian; we will obtain a contradiction.

We first prove that \( \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \) is cyclic for all \( n \geq 1 \). To see this, note first that the stability and abelian hypotheses imply via Lemma 2 that \( [K_n : K] = 2^n \) for all \( n \geq 1 \). It suffices to show that \( \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \) is cyclic for arbitrarily large \( n \), because if \( \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \) is cyclic then so are its quotients \( \text{Gal}(K_m/K) \) for \( 1 \leq m < n \). By the stability hypothesis and Lemma 4, it suffices to show, for arbitrarily large \( n \), that \( \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \) is not contained in \( A_{2^n} \) when viewed as a subgroup of \( S_{2^n} \) via its action on the roots of \( \phi^n(x) - \alpha \). Suppose on the contrary that \( \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \subseteq A_{2^n} \) for all sufficiently large \( n \). By a well-known exercise in elementary Galois theory, this means that \( \text{disc}(\phi^n(x) - \alpha) \) is a square in \( K \) for all sufficiently large \( n \). Letting \( \psi(x) = \phi(x + \alpha) - \alpha \), using Lemma 5 we have

\[
\text{disc}(\phi^n(x) - \alpha) = \text{disc}(\phi^n(x + \alpha) - \alpha) = \text{disc}(\psi^n(x)) = R_n^2 A \psi^n(c)
\]

for all \( n \geq 2 \), where \( A, R_n \in K \) are nonzero and where \( c \) is the critical point of \( \psi(x) \). In particular, \( A \psi^n(c) \) is a square in \( K \) for all sufficiently large \( n \).

The pair \((\psi, 0)\) is stable by the stability assumption on the pair \((\phi, \alpha)\). In particular, the degree 8 polynomial \( \psi^3(x) \) has eight distinct roots in \( \bar{K} \), and thus \( C = \{ y^2 = A \psi^3(x) \} \) is a smooth hyperelliptic curve of genus 3. There are infinitely many \( n \geq 3 \) for which \( A \psi^n(c) \) is a square in \( K \) and hence for which \( \psi^{n-3}(c) \) is the \( x \)-coordinate of a \( K \)-rational point on \( C \). Moreover, these points are distinct by the postcritically infinite hypothesis on \( \phi \) (and hence on \( \psi \) as well). This violation of Faltings theorem provides a contradiction, and thus the assumption \( \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \subseteq A_{2^n} \) for all large enough \( n \) is false. As explained above, by Lemma 4 this completes the proof that \( \text{Gal}(K_n/K) \) is cyclic for all \( n \geq 1 \).

We now apply the \( p = 2 \) case of Lemma 7, which implies that no primes \( p \) of \( K \) with odd residue characteristic can ramify in \( K_\infty \). However, this violates a theorem of Bridy et. al. [9], which states that if \( K_\infty \) is generated over \( K \) by the preimage tree associated to a postcritically infinite rational map, then infinitely many primes of \( K \) ramify in \( K_\infty \). The contradiction completes the proof of the theorem. \( \square \)

The use of Falting’s theorem to limit the number of squares in the critical orbit of a polynomial is borrowed from Boston-Jones [8]. In fact, Theorem 8 may be
viewed as a generalization of Theorem 3.1 of [8], in the sense that our result implies that the hypotheses of that theorem can never be satisfied.

4. Heights and Bogomolov Constants

We recall the definition of the absolute Weil height function $h : K \to \mathbb{R}$ for a number field $K$. For each finite extension $L/K$, denote by $M_L$ the set of places of $L$, and for each place $v$ let $| \cdot |_v$ be a corresponding absolute value normalized so that it coincides with either the standard real or $p$-adic absolute value when restricted to $\mathbb{Q}$. Given $\alpha \in \bar{K}$, let $L/K$ be a finite extension containing $\alpha$, and define

$$h(\alpha) = \sum_{v \in M_L} r_v \log^+ |\alpha|_v$$

where $r_v = [L_v : \mathbb{Q}_v]/[L : \mathbb{Q}]$ and $\log^+ t = \log \max(1, t)$. Standard arguments show that this definition is independent of the choice of $L$, and that $h(\alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \bar{K}$, with $h(\alpha) > 0$ unless $\alpha$ is zero or a root of unity. It is immediate from the definition that $h(\zeta \alpha) = h(\alpha)$ for all roots of unity $\zeta$, and that $h(\alpha^n) = |n|h(\alpha)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Given a field $K \subseteq L \subseteq \bar{K}$ (with $L/K$ not necessarily a finite extension), define the Bogomolov constant of $L$ by

$$B_0(L) = \lim inf \{h(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in L \text{ and } h(\alpha) > 0\}.$$ 

In other words, $B_0(L)$ is the unique extended real number $[0, +\infty]$ with the property that the set $\{\alpha \in L \mid 0 < h(\alpha) \leq B\}$ is finite for all $B < B_0(L)$ and infinite for all $B > B_0(L)$.

**Theorem 9** (Amoroso-Zannier [3]). If $L/K^{ab}$ is a finite extension of degree $D = [L : K^{ab}]$, then $h(\alpha) \geq C_{K,D} > 0$ for all nonzero, non-root of unity $\alpha \in L$, where $C_{K,D}$ is a constant depending only on $K$ and $D$. In particular, $B_0(L) \geq C_{K,D} > 0$.

This result generalizes a result of Amoroso-Dvornicich [2], which states that $h(\alpha) \geq (\log 5)/12$ for all nonzero, non-root of unity $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^{ab}$. In particular, $B_0(\mathbb{Q}^{ab}) \geq (\log 5)/12$. For our purposes, another useful result from the paper [2] is the following. For each $k \geq 1$, let $\zeta_k$ be a primitive $k$-th root of unity in $\mathbb{C}$, and let $\mu_k$ be the group of all $k$-th roots of unity in $\mathbb{C}$. Let $\mu_{2^\infty} = \cup_{m \geq 1} \mu_{2^m}$; thus $\mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2^\infty}) = \cup_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^m})$.

**Theorem 10** (Amoroso-Dvornicich [2]). If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2^\infty})$ is nonzero and not a root of unity, then $h(\alpha) \geq (\log 2)/4$. In particular, $B_0(\mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2^\infty})) \geq (\log 2)/4$.

Basically all of the ideas needed to prove this result are present in Proposition 2 of [2], which treats the cyclotomic fields $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_k)$ for $4 \mid k$. The statement of the
implies are forbidden by assumption.

Proof of Theorem \[10\] If \( \zeta \alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \) for some root of unity \( \zeta \in \mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2^{\infty}}) \), then \( \zeta \alpha \notin \{0, \pm 1\} \) and so \( h(\alpha) = h(\zeta \alpha) \geq \log 2 > \frac{\log 2}{4} \). Thus we may assume that \( \zeta \alpha \notin \mathbb{Q} \) for all roots of unity \( \zeta \in \mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2^{\infty}}) \). Let \( m \) be the smallest positive integer with the property that \( \zeta \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m}) \) for some root of unity \( \zeta \in \mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2^{\infty}}) \); thus \( m \geq 2 \) by assumption. Since \( h(\zeta \alpha) = h(\alpha) \), without loss of generality we may just assume that \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m}) \) and that \( \zeta \alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m-1}) \) for all roots of unity \( \zeta \in \mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2^{\infty}}) \).

Write \( \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m})/\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m-1})) = \{1, \sigma\} \); thus \( \sigma(\zeta_{2m}) = -\zeta_{2m} \). Set
\[
\gamma = \sigma(\alpha)^2 - \alpha^2.
\]
Note that \( \gamma \neq 0 \) as otherwise either \( \sigma(\alpha) = \alpha \) or \( \sigma(\alpha) = -\alpha \); the former case implies \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m-1}) \), and the latter case implies \( \zeta_{2m} \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m-1}) \), both of which are forbidden by assumption.

If \( v \) is a place of \( \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m}) \), then
\[
(6) \quad |\gamma|_v \leq \max(1, |\alpha|_v)^2 \max(1, |\sigma(\alpha)|_v)^2 \quad \text{if } v \nmid 2, \infty
\]
\[
(7) \quad |\gamma|_v \leq (1/4) \max(1, |\alpha|_v)^2 \max(1, |\sigma(\alpha)|_v)^2 \quad \text{if } v \mid 2
\]
\[
(8) \quad |\gamma|_v \leq 2 \max(1, |\alpha|_v)^2 \max(1, |\sigma(\alpha)|_v)^2 \quad \text{if } v \mid \infty
\]
These inequalities and the product formula, together with the fact that \( h(\sigma(\alpha)) = h(\alpha) \), imply that \( 0 = \sum_v r_v \log |\gamma|_v \leq 4h(\alpha) - \log 4 + \log 2 \), and the desired bound \( h(\alpha) \geq (\log 2)/4 \) follows. The bounds (6) and (8) are trivial applications of the triangle inequality.

It remains only to prove (7); thus fix a place \( v \mid 2 \) of \( \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2m}) \). Using Proposition Lemma 4.4.12 of [5], there exists \( \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_{2m}] \) such that \( \alpha \beta \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_{2m}] \) and \( |\beta|_v = \max(1, |\alpha|_v)^{-1} \). Note that for arbitrary \( x \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_{2m}] \), writing \( x = \sum_j a_j \zeta_{2m}^j \), since \( \sigma(\zeta_{2m}) = -\zeta_{2m} \) we have
\[
\sigma(x)^2 - x^2 = (\sigma(x) - x)(\sigma(x) + x) = -4\left(\sum_{2j} a_j \zeta_{2m}^j\right)\left(\sum_{2j} a_j \zeta_{2m}^j\right)
\]
and thus \( |\sigma(x)^2 - x^2|_v \leq 1/4 \). We conclude
\[
|\beta|_v^2 |\gamma|_v = |\beta^2 \sigma(\alpha)^2 - \alpha^2 \beta^2|_v
\]
\[
= |(\beta^2 - \sigma(\beta)^2) \sigma(\alpha)^2 + \sigma(\alpha \beta)^2 - (\alpha \beta)^2|_v
\]
\[
\leq \max(|\beta^2 - \sigma(\beta)^2|_v, |\sigma(\alpha)|_v^2, |\sigma(\alpha \beta)^2 - (\alpha \beta)^2|_v)
\]
\[
\leq \max((1/4)|\sigma(\alpha)|_v^2, 1/4)
\]
\[
= \left(1/4\right)\max(1, |\sigma(\alpha)|_v)^2.
\]
which is equivalent to \([7]\) as \(|\beta|_v = \max(1, |\alpha|_v)^{-1}\).

\[\Box\]

5. Powering maps and Chebyshev maps

In a slightly more general framework than what has been described above, in this section we consider pairs \((\phi, \alpha)\), where \(\phi(x) \in \bar{K}[x]\) is a polynomial and where \(\alpha \in \bar{K}\). We define recursively \(K_0 = K_0(\phi, \alpha) = K(\alpha)\) and \(K_n = K_n(\phi, \alpha) = K_{n-1}(\phi^{-n}(\alpha))\) for \(n \geq 1\), and set \(K_\infty(\phi, \alpha) = \cup K_n(\phi, \alpha)\). Since the requirement that \(\phi\) and \(\alpha\) are defined over \(K\) have been relaxed, \(K_0/K\) may be a proper extension and the \(K_n/K\) may no longer be Galois extensions.

**Proposition 11.** Let \(K\) be a number field, let \(\phi(x), \psi(x) \in \bar{K}[x]\) be two polynomials of degree \(d \geq 2\), and let \(\alpha, \beta \in \bar{K}\).

(a) If \((\phi, \alpha)\) is \(\bar{K}\)-conjugate to \((\psi, \beta)\), then \(K_\infty(\phi, \alpha)\) is contained in a finite extension of \(K^{ab}\) if and only if \(K_\infty(\psi, \beta)\) is contained in a finite extension of \(K^{ab}\).

(b) If \(\phi(x), \psi(x), \alpha, \beta\) are defined over \(K^{ab}\) and \((\phi, \alpha)\) is \(K^{ab}\)-conjugate to \((\psi, \beta)\), then \(K_\infty(\phi, \alpha)/K\) is an abelian extension if and only if \(K_\infty(\psi, \beta)/K\) is an abelian extension.

**Proof.** (a) There exists a finite extension \(F/K\) such that \(\phi(x), \psi(x), \alpha, \beta\) are all defined over \(F\), and extending \(F\) if necessary there exists an automorphism \(\gamma(x) = ax + b\) defined over \(F\) for which \(\psi = \gamma \circ \phi \circ \gamma^{-1}\) and \(\beta = \gamma(\alpha)\). Note that for each \(n \geq 0\), \(\gamma\) restricts to a bijection from \(\phi^{-n}(\alpha)\) onto \(\psi^{-n}(\beta)\). In particular, it follows that \(K_\infty(\psi, \beta) \subseteq FK_\infty(\phi, \alpha)\), and thus if \(K_\infty(\phi, \alpha)\) is contained in a finite extension \(L\) of \(K^{ab}\), then \(K_\infty(\psi, \beta)\) is contained in the finite extension \(LF\) of \(K^{ab}\). The reverse implication follows from symmetry.

(b) In the preceding argument, we may take \(F \subseteq K^{ab}\). Thus if \(K_\infty(\phi, \alpha) \subseteq K^{ab}\), then \(K_\infty(\psi, \beta) \subseteq K^{ab}\) as well, and conversely by symmetry. \(\Box\)

The following two results verify Conjecture \([4]\) in the special case that \(\phi(x)\) is \(\bar{K}\)-conjugate to a powering map \(x^d\) or to a Chebyshev map \(T_d(x)\).

**Theorem 12.** Let \(\phi(x) \in \bar{K}[x]\) be a polynomial of degree \(d \geq 2\), let \(\alpha \in \bar{K}\) be a non-exceptional point for \(\phi\), and assume that the pair \((\phi, \alpha)\) is \(\bar{K}\)-conjugate to the pair \((x^d, \beta)\) for \(\beta \in \bar{K}\). Then \(K_\infty(\phi, \alpha)/K\) is an abelian extension if and only if \(\beta\) is a root of unity and \((\phi, \alpha)\) is \(K^{ab}\)-conjugate to \((x^d, \beta)\).

**Proof.** Assume that \(\beta\) is a root of unity and that \((\phi, \alpha)\) is \(K^{ab}\)-conjugate to \((x^d, \beta)\). Then \(K_\infty(x^d, \beta)\) is a cyclotomic, and hence abelian, extension of \(K\), and it follows from Proposition \([4]\)(b) that \(K_\infty(\phi, \alpha)/K\) is an abelian extension.
Conversely, assume that $K_{\infty}(\phi, \alpha)/K$ is an abelian extension. Using Proposition 11 (a), it follows that $K_{\infty}(x^d, \beta)$ is contained in a finite extension $L$ of $K^{ab}$. If $\beta$ is not a root of unity, then $h(\beta) > 0$. (Note that $\beta \neq 0$ by the assumption that $\alpha$ is not an exceptional point of $\phi$, and hence $\beta$ is not an exceptional point of $x^d$.) But $\beta^{1/d^n} \in K_{\infty}(x^d, \beta) \subseteq L$ for all $n \geq 0$, and $h(\beta^{1/d^n}) = \frac{1}{d^n} h(\beta) \to 0^+$ as $n \to +\infty$, a contradiction of Theorem 9. We conclude that $\beta$ must be a root of unity.

Finally, we must show that the $\bar{K}$-conjugacy between $(\phi, \alpha)$ and $(x^d, \beta)$ is actually defined over $K^{ab}$. By hypothesis there exists $\gamma(x) = ax + b$ defined over $\bar{K}$ for which $x^d = \gamma \circ \phi \circ \gamma^{-1}(x)$ and $\beta = \gamma(\alpha)$. Moreover, $\gamma$ restricts to a bijection from the backward $\phi$-orbit of $\alpha$ onto the backward $x^d$-orbit of $\beta$. These are infinite sets contained in $K^{ab}$, since both $K_{\infty}(\phi, \alpha)/K$ and $K_{\infty}(x^d, \beta)/K$ are abelian extensions. Selecting distinct corresponding pairs $\gamma(s_1) = t_1$ and $\gamma(s_2) = t_2$ with $s_j, t_j \in K^{ab}$, we have that both $a = (t_1 - t_2)/(s_1 - s_2)$ and $b = (s_1t_2 - t_1s_2)/(s_1 - s_2)$ are in $K^{ab}$. □

Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $T_d(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be the $d$-th Chebyshev polynomial; that is, $T_d(x)$ is the unique polynomial of degree $d$ satisfying $T_d(x + \frac{1}{2}) = x^d + \frac{1}{2x}$. In other words, considering the 2-to-1 rational map $\pi : \mathbb{G}_m \to \mathbb{A}^1$ defined by $\pi(x) = x + \frac{1}{x}$, we have a commutative diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbb{G}_m & \xrightarrow{x^d} & \mathbb{G}_m \\
\pi \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\
\mathbb{A}^1 & \xrightarrow{T_d} & \mathbb{A}^1.
\end{array}
\] (9)

See Silverman [28] §6.2.

**Theorem 13.** Let $\phi(x) \in \bar{K}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $d \geq 2$, let $\alpha \in \bar{K}$ be a non-exceptional point for $\phi$, and assume that the pair $(\phi, \alpha)$ is $\bar{K}$-conjugate to the pair $(T_d, \beta)$ for $\beta \in \bar{K}$. Then $K_{\infty}(\phi, \alpha)/K$ is an abelian extension if and only if $\beta = \zeta + \frac{1}{\zeta}$ for some root of unity $\zeta \in \bar{K}$ and $\phi$ is $K^{ab}$-conjugate to $(T_d, \beta)$.

**Proof.** Assume that $\beta = \zeta + \frac{1}{\zeta}$ for some root of unity $\zeta \in \bar{K}$ and that $(\phi, \alpha)$ is $K^{ab}$-conjugate to $(T_d, \beta)$. By the commutative diagram (9), the points $\epsilon \in \bar{K}$ satisfying $T_d^n(\epsilon) = \beta$ are precisely the points of the form $\epsilon = \xi + \frac{1}{\xi}$, as $\xi$ ranges over the $d^n$-th roots of $\zeta$. In particular, $K_{\infty}(T_d, \beta)$ is contained in a cyclotomic, and hence abelian, extension of $K$, and it follows from Proposition 11 (b) that $K_{\infty}(\phi, \alpha)/K$ is an abelian extension.

Conversely, assume that $K_{\infty}(\phi, \alpha)/K$ is an abelian extension. Using Proposition 11 (a), it follows that $K_{\infty}(T_d, \beta)$ is contained in a finite extension $L$ of
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Select \( \zeta \in \pi^{-1}(\beta) \), thus \( \beta = \zeta + \frac{1}{\zeta} \), and assume that \( \zeta \) is not a root of unity. In particular \( h(\zeta) > 0 \). Let \( n \geq 0 \) and select \( \epsilon_n \in \bar{K} \) satisfying \( T^d_d(\epsilon_n) = \beta \); thus \( \epsilon_n = \xi_n + \frac{1}{\xi_n} \) for some \( d^n \)-th root \( \xi_n = \zeta^{1/d^n} \) of \( \zeta \). Since \( \epsilon_n \in K_{\infty}(T_d, \beta) \subseteq L \), it follows that \( \xi_n \) is contained in a quadratic extension of \( L \) and hence contained in an extension of \( K^{ab} \) of degree \( \leq 2D \). It follows from Theorem 9 that \( h(\xi_n) \geq C_{K, 2D} \). But as \( n \geq 0 \) is arbitrary, we may let \( n \to +\infty \) and obtain \( h(\xi_n) = \frac{1}{d^n}h(\zeta) \to 0^+ \), a contradiction. We conclude that \( \zeta \) must be a root of unity. That the \( \bar{K} \)-conjugacy between \((\phi, \alpha)\) and \((T_d, \beta)\) is actually defined over \( K^{ab} \) follows from the same argument used in Theorem 12. □

6. MAPS WITH SMALL ARAKELOV-ZHANG PAIRING

We now describe how to extend the ideas used in the proof of Theorem 12 to treat polynomials which are not necessarily \( \bar{K} \)-conjugate to powering maps, but which are \( K^{ab} \)-conjugate to some polynomial \( \phi(x) \in K[x] \) that is arithmetically close to a powering map.

We first recall the definitions of several arithmetic-dynamical objects associated to a polynomial \( \phi(x) \in K[x] \) of degree \( d \geq 2 \) defined over a number field \( K \); see [28] §3.4-3.5 for further details. The Call-Silverman canonical height function \( \hat{h}_\phi : \bar{K} \to \mathbb{R} \) may be defined by the limit

\[
\hat{h}_\phi(x) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{h(\phi^n(x))}{d^n}
\]

and can be characterized by the the identity \( \hat{h}_\phi(\phi(x)) = d\hat{h}_\phi(x) \) together with the fact that \( h - \hat{h}_\phi \) is bounded on \( \bar{K} \). Locally, given a finite extension \( L/K \), for each place \( v \in M_L \) define the canonical local height function by

\[
\lambda_{\phi, v} : \mathbb{C}_v \to \mathbb{R} \quad \lambda_{\phi, v}(x) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{d^n} \log^+ |\phi^n(x)|_v.
\]

Then an alternative expression for the canonical height is given by

\[
\hat{h}_\phi(\alpha) = \sum_{v \in M_L} r_v \lambda_{\phi, v}(\alpha),
\]

for all \( \alpha \in L \), a formula which may be viewed as analogous to (5).

For each place \( v \in M_K \), standard arguments show that \( \lambda_{\phi, v}(x) \geq 0 \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{C}_v \), with equality if and only if \( x \) is in the filled Julia set

\[
F_{\phi, v} = \{ x \in \mathbb{C}_v \mid |\phi^n(x)|_v \text{ is bounded as } n \to +\infty \}
\]

associated to \( \phi \). The canonical measure \( \mu_{\phi, v} \) associated to \( \phi \) is a \( \phi \)-invariant unit Borel measure supported on \( F_{\phi, v} \) which describes the limiting distribution of preperiodic points and iterated inverse images with respect to \( \phi \). There are several
equivalent constructions of this measure in the literature; see \cite{14, 20} in the Archimedean case and \cite{11, 12} in the non-Archimedean case. (Technically, when \( v \) is a non-Archimedean place, the objects \( \lambda_{\phi,v}, F_{\phi,v}, \) and \( \mu_{\phi,v} \) need to be interpreted on the Berkovich affine line \( A^1_v \). We will not need to go into these details in the present paper.)

Given two polynomials \( \phi(x), \psi(x) \in K[x] \) of degree at least two, the Arakelov-Zhang pairing can be defined by either of the two expressions

\[
\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \sum_{v \in M_K} r_v \int_{\lambda_{\phi,v}} \mu_{\psi,v} = \sum_{v \in M_K} r_v \int_{\lambda_{\psi,v}} \mu_{\phi,v}.
\]

Thus \( \langle \phi, \psi \rangle \) is a nonnegative real number, and in some sense it measures the global arithmetic-dynamical distance between the two maps. This pairing was originally defined as a limit of arithmetic intersection products by Zhang \cite{32}, and described analytically using Berkovich spaces by Petsche-Szpiro-Tucker \cite{27}. For our purposes the most important fact about the Arakelov-Zhang pairing is that it is closely related to points which have small canonical height with respect to one of the two maps. In particular, it was shown in \cite{27} that if \( \{\alpha_n\} \) is a sequence of distinct points in \( \overline{K} \) with \( \hat{h}_{\phi}(\alpha_n) \to 0 \), then \( \hat{h}_{\psi}(\alpha_n) \to \langle \phi, \psi \rangle \).

In the special case \( \psi(x) = x^d \) for \( d \geq 2 \), the canonical height \( \hat{h}_{\psi} \) is the same as the usual Weil height \( h, \lambda_{\psi,v}(\cdot) = \log^+ |\cdot|_v, F_{\psi,v} \) is the closed unit disc, and \( \mu_{\psi,v} \) is equal to the normalized Haar measure supported on the unit circle of \( C_v = \mathbb{C} \) when \( v \) is Archimedean, and equal to the Dirac measure supported at the Gauss point of \( A^1_v \) when \( v \) is non-Archimedean. In particular, the value of the pairing \( \langle \phi, x^d \rangle \) does not depend on \( d \).

**Theorem 14.** Let \( \phi(x) \in K[x] \) be a polynomial of degree \( d \geq 2 \) defined over \( K \) such that \( \langle \phi, x^d \rangle > 0 \), and let \( \alpha \) be a non-exceptional point for \( \phi \). If \( K_{\infty}(\phi, \alpha) \subseteq L \subseteq \overline{K} \), then

\[
(13) \quad B_0(L) \leq \langle \phi, x^d \rangle.
\]

**Proof.** For each \( n \geq 1 \), let \( \alpha_n \in K_{\infty} \subseteq L \) satisfy \( \phi^n(\alpha_n) = \alpha \); since \( \alpha \) is not an exceptional point we may assume that the \( \alpha_n \) are distinct. It follows from properties of the canonical height that \( \hat{h}_{\phi}(\alpha_n) = \hat{h}_{\phi}(\alpha)/d^n \to 0 \) as \( n \to +\infty \). By Theorem 1 of Petsche-Szpiro-Tucker \cite{27}, it follows that \( h(\alpha_n) \to \langle \phi, x^d \rangle > 0 \), and \( (13) \) follows from the definition of \( B_0(L) \). \( \square \)

As a sample application of Theorem 14, we can show that for any number field \( K \), a certain infinite family of polynomials satisfies Conjecture 1.
Corollary 15. For each number field \( K \), there exists a constant \( C_K \) such that \( \text{Gal}(K_\infty(x^{p-x}/p, \alpha)/K) \) is nonabelian over \( K \) for all \( \alpha \in K \) and all primes \( p \geq C_K \).

In particular, \( \text{Gal}(K_\infty(x^{p-x}/p, \alpha)/\mathbb{Q}) \) is nonabelian for all \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \) and all \( p \geq 29 \).

Proof. It has been shown by Petsche-Stacy [26] that \( (x^{p-x}/p, x^d) = \frac{\log p}{p-1} \). Thus if \( K_\infty(x^{p-x}/p, \alpha) \subseteq K^{ab} \), Theorem 14 implies that \( B_0(K^{ab}) \leq \frac{\log p}{p-1} \). But since \( B_0(K^{ab}) > 0 \) (Amoroso-Zannier [3]), we have a contradiction for large enough \( p \). In particular, it was shown by Amoroso-Dvornicich [2] that \( B_0(\mathbb{Q}^{ab}) \geq \frac{\log 5}{12} \), which exceeds \( \frac{\log p}{p-1} \) once \( p \geq 29 \).

We remark that, according to Conjecture [1], we expect that \( \text{Gal}(K_\infty(x^{p-x}/p, \alpha)/K) \) is nonabelian for all number fields \( K \), all \( \alpha \in K \), and all primes \( p \).

7. The map \( x^2 - 1 \)

It is well known that there are exactly three \( \mathbb{Q} \)-conjugacy classes of postcritically finite quadratic polynomials over \( \mathbb{Q} \), represented by \( x^2 \), \( x^2 - 1 \), and \( x^2 - 2 \). By \( \mathbb{Q} \)-conjugacy it suffices to check the family \( \phi_c(x) = x^2 + c \) for \( c \in \mathbb{Q} \), and the assumption that the critical point 0 is preperiodic (i.e. \( \phi_c^m(0) = \phi_c^n(0) \) for \( m < n \)) forces \( c \) to be an algebraic integer (hence a rational integer) and also an element of the complex Mandelbrot set \( \mathcal{M} = \{ c \in \mathbb{C} \mid \phi_c^0(0) \not\rightarrow \infty \} \). It is elementary to check that \( \mathcal{M} \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{-2, -1, 0\} \).

Since \( x^2 \) and \( x^2 - 2 \) are a powering map and a Chebyshev map, respectively, they are treated by Theorems 12 and 13 and the stable postcritically infinite quadratic case is treated in Theorem 8. Thus in order to complete the proof of Theorem 11 it suffices to consider the polynomial \( \phi(x) = x^2 - 1 \) over \( \mathbb{Q} \) in the stable case.

In order to show that \( K_\infty(x^2 - 1, \alpha)/\mathbb{Q} \) is never an abelian extension, one might hope to combine the bound \( B_0(\mathbb{Q}^{ab}) \geq (\log 5)/12 = 0.134... \) of Amoroso-Dvornicich with Theorem 14 but it turns out that the Arakelov-Zhang pairing \( \langle x^2 - 1, x^2 \rangle = 0.167... \) is too large for this argument to apply directly. However, we can recover this strategy (in the stable case) by showing that if \( K_\infty(x^2 - 1, \alpha) \) is an abelian extension of \( \mathbb{Q} \) then it is contained in the subfield \( \mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2\infty}) \) of \( \mathbb{Q}^{ab} \), which has Bogomolov constant \( B_0(\mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2\infty})) \geq (\log 2)/4 = 0.173... \), large enough to obtain a contradiction.

Lemma 16. Let \( \phi(x) = x^2 - 1 \), let \( \alpha \in K \), and assume that the pair \( (\phi, \alpha) \) is stable over \( K \) and that \( K_\infty = K_\infty(x^2 - 1, \alpha) \) is an abelian extension of \( K \). If \( \mathfrak{p} \) is a prime of \( K \) with residue characteristic not equal to 2, then \( \mathfrak{p} \) is unramified in \( K_\infty \).
Proof. The stability and abelian hypotheses imply via Lemma 2 that \([K_n : K] = 2^n\) for all \(n \geq 1\). Let \(\psi(x) = \phi(x + \alpha) - \alpha = x^2 + 2\alpha x + \alpha^2 - \alpha - 1\). The critical point of \(\psi(x)\) is \(c = -\alpha\), which is part of a 2-cycle; that is, \(\psi^n(c) = -\alpha\) for all even \(n\), and \(\psi^n(c) = -1 - \alpha\) for all odd \(n\). Clearly
\[
\text{disc}(\phi(x) - \alpha) = 4(1 + \alpha)
\]
and using Lemma 5 for \(n \geq 2\) we have
\[
\text{disc}(\phi^n(x) - \alpha) = \text{disc}(\phi(x + \alpha) - \alpha) = \text{disc}(\psi^n(x)) = \begin{cases} R_n^2(-\alpha) & \text{if } n \geq 2 \text{ is even} \\ R_n^2(-1 - \alpha) & \text{if } n \geq 3 \text{ is odd} \end{cases}
\]
for some nonzero \(R_n \in K\).

**Case 1:** \(-1 - \alpha\) is not a square in \(K\). Then \(\text{disc}(\phi^n(x) - \alpha)\) is not a square for all odd \(n \geq 3\), and thus viewing \(\text{Gal}(K_n/K)\) as a subgroup of \(S_{2^n}\) via its action on the roots of \(\phi^n(x) - \alpha\), \(\text{Gal}(K_n/K)\) is not a subgroup of \(A_{2^n}\) for all odd \(n \geq 3\). By Lemma 4 it follows that \(\text{Gal}(K_n/K)\) is cyclic for all odd \(n \geq 3\). Then \(\text{Gal}(K_n/K)\) must be cyclic for all \(n\), since \(\text{Gal}(K_m/K)\) is a quotient of \(\text{Gal}(K_n/K)\) when \(1 \leq m < n\). We conclude from Lemma 7 that no primes of \(K\) of odd residue characteristic ramify in \(K_\infty\).

**Case 2:** \(-1 - \alpha = t^2\) for \(t \in K\). By the stability hypothesis we know that \(\text{disc}(\phi(x) - \alpha) = 4(1 + \alpha) = -4t^2\) is not a square in \(K\), and thus we conclude that \(-1\) is not a square in \(K\) and \(K_1 = K(\phi^{-1}(\alpha)) = K(\sqrt{4(1 + \alpha)}) = K(-1)\).
In particular, no primes of \(K\) with odd residue characteristic ramify in \(K_1\), so it now suffices to show that no primes of \(K_1\) with odd residue characteristic ramify in \(K_\infty\).

Let \(\phi^{-1}(\alpha) = \{\alpha', \alpha''\}\). Thus for each \(n \geq 1\), we have a disjoint union
\[
\phi^{-n}(\alpha) = \phi^{-(n-1)}(\alpha') \amalg \phi^{-(n-1)}(\alpha'').
\]
and it follows from the transitive action of \(\text{Gal}(K_n/K)\) on \(\phi^{-n}(\alpha)\) that \(\text{Gal}(K_n/K_1)\) acts transitively on \(\phi^{-(n-1)}(\alpha')\). We conclude that \((\phi, \alpha')\) is a stable pair over \(K_1\).

Arguing as above, it follows that \(1 + \alpha'\) is not a square in \(K_1\), and as \(-1\) is a square in \(K_1\), we deduce that \(-1 - \alpha'\) is not a square in \(K_1\). We are now in the setting of Case 1 for the pair \((\phi, \alpha')\) over \(K_1\), and we conclude that no primes of \(K_1\) with odd residue characteristic ramify in \(K_\infty\). □

**Theorem 17.** Let \(\phi(x) = x^2 - 1\), let \(\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}\), and assume that the pair \((\phi, \alpha)\) is stable. Then \(\text{Gal}(K_\infty/\mathbb{Q})\) is nonabelian.
Proof. Assume on the contrary that $K_{\infty}/\mathbb{Q}$ is an abelian extension. By Lemma 16, no odd primes ramify in $K_{\infty}$, and it follows from class field theory that $K_{\infty} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2\infty})$. As we will calculate in §8, we have
\[ \langle x^2 - 1, x^2 \rangle = 0.167..., \]
and we conclude from Theorem 14 that $B_0(\mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2\infty})) \leq \langle x^2 - 1, x^2 \rangle = 0.167...$ This is a contradiction of the bound $B_0(\mathbb{Q}(\mu_{2\infty})) \geq (\log 2)/4 = 0.173...$ proved in Theorem 10. □

8. Numerical approximation of Archimedean Arakelov-Zhang integrals

In this section we prove a result which may be of use in numerically approximating the value of the Archimedean part of the Arakelov-Zhang pairing $\langle x^2 + c, x^2 \rangle$.

Given a polynomial $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ of degree 2, we may express the corresponding canonical local height function as
\[ \lambda_{\phi}(x) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \log(1 + |\phi^n(x)|^2)^{1/2}. \]

Note that, compared to (10), we have replaced $\log^+ |\cdot|$ with $\log(1 + |\cdot|^2)^{1/2}$; this choice gives differentiable approximations to $\lambda_{\phi}(x)$, but in the limit it defines precisely the same Archimedean local height function as in (10).

Next define
\[ B(\phi) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{C}} |\log(1 + |\phi(x)|^2)^{1/2} - 2 \log(1 + |x|^2)^{1/2}|. \]
The significance of this constant follows from a standard telescoping series argument ([28] Thm. 3.20), which shows that for each $n \geq 1$ we have
\[ \left| \lambda_{\phi}(x) - \frac{1}{2^n} \log(1 + |\phi^n(x)|^2)^{1/2} \right| \leq \frac{B(\phi)}{2^n}. \]

Proposition 18. Let $\phi(x) = x^2 + c$ for $c \in \mathbb{C}$, let $N \geq 1$ and $M \geq 1$ be integers, and let $\mu_M$ denote the set of $M$-th roots of unity in $\mathbb{C}$. Then
\[ \left| \int_0^1 \lambda_{\phi}(e^{2\pi it}) dt - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\zeta \in \mu_M} \frac{1}{2^N} \log(1 + |\phi^N(\zeta)|^2)^{1/2} \right| \leq \frac{B(\phi)}{2^N} + \frac{\pi T^N}{M} \]
where $T = (1 + \sqrt{1 + 4|c|})/2$.

Proof. Using (17) we obtain
\[ \left| \int_0^1 \lambda_{\phi}(e^{2\pi it}) dt - \int_0^1 f_N(t) dt \right| \leq \frac{B(\phi)}{2^N} \]
where
\[ f_N : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R} \quad f_N(t) = \frac{1}{2^{N}} \log(1 + |\phi^N(e^{2\pi it})|^2)^{1/2}. \]

If \( f : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R} \) is continuously differentiable and \( M \geq 1 \), then
\[
\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M} f(m/M) - \int_{0}^{1} f(t) dt \right| \leq \frac{\|f'\|_{\infty}}{2M},
\]
where \( \|g\|_{\infty} = \sup\{|g(t)| \mid t \in \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}\} \). This inequality can be verified using an elementary Riemann sum argument, together with the mean-value theorem estimate \( |f(\frac{m}{M}) - f(t)| \leq \|f'\|_{\infty}/2M \) whenever \( t \in [\frac{m}{M} - \frac{1}{2M}, \frac{m}{M} + \frac{1}{2M}] \).

We are going to show that \( \|f'_N\|_{\infty} \leq 2\pi T^N \), and so applying (20) with \( f = f_N \), and combining with (19), we obtain (18).

It remains only to prove \( \|f'_N\|_{\infty} \leq 2\pi T^N \). Given any polynomial \( F(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x] \), an application of the multivariable chain rule gives, for \( t \in \mathbb{R} \),
\[
\left| \frac{d}{dt} \log(1 + |F(e^{2\pi it})|^2)^{1/2} \right| \leq \frac{2\pi |F(e^{2\pi it})||F'(e^{2\pi it})|}{1 + |F(e^{2\pi it})|^2}.
\]

The choice of \( T \) in terms of \( c \) was made so that \( T^2 - T - |c| = 0 \), which can be used to show that
\[
|x| > T \quad \Rightarrow \quad |\phi(x)| > |x|^2/T > T
\]
for all \( x \in \mathbb{C} \). Indeed, \( |\phi(x)| \geq |x|^2 - |c| \) and therefore
\[
\frac{|\phi(x)|}{|x|^2} \geq 1 - \frac{|c|}{|x|^2} > 1 - \frac{|c|}{T^2} = \frac{1}{T}.
\]

Using an iteration of the inequality (22), we claim that for each \( x \in \mathbb{C} \), we have
\[
|x\phi(x)\phi^2(x) \ldots \phi^N(x)| \leq T^N(1 + |\phi^N(x)|^2).
\]

Indeed, if \( |\phi^n(x)| \leq T \) for all \( n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, N-1 \), the bound is trivial. Otherwise, let \( 0 \leq n_0 \leq N - 1 \) be the smallest \( n \) for which \( |\phi^n(x)| > T \). Using (22) we have
\[
|\phi^n(x)| < T^{1/2}|\phi^{n+1}(x)|^{1/2} \quad \text{for all} \quad n_0 \leq n \leq N - 1.
\]
Thus, letting \( m_0 = N - n_0 \), we have
\[
|x\phi(x)\phi^2(x) \ldots \phi^N(x)| \leq T^{n_0}|\phi^{n_0}(x)||\phi^{n_0+1}(x)| \ldots |\phi^N(x)|
\]
\[
< T^{n_0}T^{1/2}|\phi^{n_0+1}(x)|^{1/2+1} \ldots |\phi^N(x)|
\]
\[
< T^{n_0}T^{1+1/2}|\phi^{n_0+2}(x)|^{1/2+1+1} \ldots |\phi^N(x)|
\]
\[
\vdots
\]
\[
< T^{n_0}T^{1/2+1/2} \ldots T^{1/m_0+\ldots+1/2}|\phi^N(x)|T^{1/m_0+\ldots+1/2+1}
\]
\[
< T^N(1 + |\phi^N(x)|^2).
\]
Using \( \phi'(x) = 2x \) and the chain rule we have
\[
(\phi^N)'(x) = \phi'(\phi^{N-1}(x))\phi'(\phi^{N-2}(x)) \ldots \phi'(\phi(x))\phi'(x)
\]
and applying (23) we obtain
\[
|\phi^N(x)||(\phi^N)'(x)| = 2^N|\phi^N(x)\phi^{N-1}(x)\phi^{N-2}(x) \ldots \phi(x)x|
\leq 2^N T^N(1 + |\phi^N(x)|^2).
\]
Finally, taking \( F(x) = \phi^N(x) \) in (21) and using the bound (25) we conclude
\[\|f'_N\|_\infty \leq 2\pi T^N,\]
completing the proof. \(\Box\)

We conclude with an explanation of how to use Proposition 18 to obtain the numerical calculation (14) of \( \langle x^2 - 1, x^2 \rangle \) to the specified precision. Since both \( \phi(x) = x^2 - 1 \) and \( \psi(x) = x^2 \) are monic with integer coefficients, the non-Archimedean contributions in (12) vanish, and since the Archimedean canonical measure \( \mu_{\phi,\infty} \) is the normalized Haar measure supported on the unit circle of \( \mathbb{C} \), we have
\[
\langle \phi, \psi \rangle = \int_0^1 \lambda_{\phi,\infty}(e^{2\pi it})dt.
\]
We approximate this integral using Proposition 18 with \( \phi(x) = x^2 - 1 \). Clearly \( T = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2 \), and we will show that \( B(\phi) = (\log 5)/2 \), which according to the definition (16) is equivalent to checking that
\[
\sup_{x \in \mathbb{C}} \left| \log \frac{1 + |x^2 - 1|^2}{(1 + |x|^2)^2} \right| = \log 5.
\]
To establish (27) is to prove both of the inequalities
\[
\frac{1}{5}(1 + |x|^2)^2 \leq 1 + |x^2 - 1|^2 \leq 5(1 + |x|^2)^2
\]
and to prove that at least one of them is sharp. The second inequality (with the stronger constant 2 in place of 5) is easily checked using only the triangle inequality. For the second inequality, we see using the triangle inequality that
\[1 + |x^2 - 1|^2 \geq |x|^4 - 2|x|^2 + 2,\]
with equality when \( x \) is real; we complete the proof by noting that \( \frac{r^2 - 2r^2 + 2}{(1+r^2)^2} \) is minimized at \( r = \sqrt{3}/2 \) with minimum value 1/5.

Taking \( N = 13 \) and \( M = 2^{24} \), we have
\[
\int_0^1 \lambda_{\phi,\infty}(e^{2\pi it})dt = \frac{1}{2^{38}} \sum_{\zeta \in \mu_{2^{24}}} \log(1 + |\phi^{13}(\zeta)|^2) + \theta
\]
where $|\theta| \leq (\log 5)/2^{14} + \pi((1 + \sqrt{5})/2)^{13}/2^{24} = 0.000195...$. Finally, one may perform the calculation

\[
\frac{1}{2^{38}} \sum_{\zeta \in \mu_{2^{24}}} \log(1 + |\phi^{13}(\zeta)|^2) = 0.16772223...
\]

using any implementation of arbitrary precision floating-point arithmetic; specifically we used the RealField() package in SageMath [31] in a computation taking about three hours. It follows from (26), (29), (30), and the bound on $\theta$ that (14) is accurate to the indicated precision.

It was pointed out to us by an anonymous referee that, if one only wants to check that $\langle x^2 - 1, x^2 \rangle < (\log 2)/4$ but without giving an explicit numerical approximation for $\langle x^2 - 1, x^2 \rangle$, then one could get away with the smaller parameters $N = 9$ and $M = 2^{16}$, resulting in a much faster calculation.
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