

The Riemann Hypothesis in Characteristic p
in Historical Perspective

Peter Roquette

Preliminary and incomplete Version of August 8, 2017

Preface

This book is the result of many years' work. I am telling the story of the Riemann hypothesis for function fields (or curves) starting with Artin's thesis in the year 1921, covering Hasse's work in the 1930s for elliptic fields and more, until Weil's final proof in 1948. The main sources are letters which were exchanged among the protagonists during that time and which I found in various archives, mostly in the University Library in Göttingen but also in other places in the world. I am trying to show how the ideas have developed, how the proper notions and proofs were found. This is a good example, fortunately well documented, about the general way how mathematics has developed.

Some of the chapters have already been pre-published in the "*Mitteilungen der Mathematischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg*". But before including them into this book they have been thoroughly reworked, extended and polished. I have written this book for mathematicians but it does not require any special knowledge of particular mathematical fields. I have tried to explain whatever is needed in the particular situation, even if this may seem to be superfluous for the specialists.

Every chapter is written such that it can be read independently of the other chapters. Therefore the chapters are accompanied by a "summary". Perhaps it may be advisable first to look at these summaries in order to get an overview of what is going on.

I have been supported and helped by a number of colleagues, friends and organizations and it is impossible for me to mention all of them here. Nevertheless . . .

[In der Druckfassung wird hier noch ein Text eingefügt]

Contents

1	Overture	11
1.1	Artin and the intervention by Hilbert	11
1.2	Hasse's project	13
1.3	Weil's contribution	16
	Summary	18
2	Setting the stage	21
2.1	Our Terminology	21
2.2	The Theorem: Rhp	24
3	The beginning: Artin's thesis	27
3.1	Quadratic function fields	28
3.1.1	The arithmetic part	32
3.1.2	The analytic part	36
3.2	Artin's letters to Herglotz	42
3.2.1	Extension of the base field	43
3.2.2	Complex multiplication	45
3.2.3	Birational transformation	48
3.3	Hilbert and the consequences	49
	Summary	50

3.4	Side remark: Gauss' last entry	51
	Summary	57
4	Building the foundations	59
4.1	F. K. Schmidt	59
4.2	Zeta function and Riemann-Roch theorem	64
4.3	F. K. Schmidt's L-polynomial	68
4.3.1	Some comments	70
4.4	The functional equation	71
4.5	Consequences	73
	Summary	76
5	Enter Hasse	79
6	Diophantine congruences	83
6.1	Davenport	83
6.2	The challenge	86
6.3	The Davenport-Hasse paper	93
6.3.1	Davenport's letter and generalized Fermat fields	93
6.3.2	Gauss sums	97
6.3.3	Davenport-Hasse fields	100
6.3.4	Stickelberger's theorem	102
6.4	Exponential sums	103
	Summary	106
7	Elliptic function fields	109
7.1	The breakthrough	109
7.2	The problem	112

7.3	Hasse's first proof: complex multiplication	114
7.4	The second proof	120
7.4.1	Meromorphisms and the Jacobian	123
7.4.2	The double field	128
7.4.3	Norm Addition formula	130
7.4.4	The Frobenius operator	136
7.5	Some Comments	139
7.5.1	Rosati's anti-automorphism	139
	Summary	140
8	More on elliptic fields	143
8.1	The Hasse invariant A	143
8.2	Unramified cyclic extensions of degree p	145
8.2.1	The Hasse-Witt matrix	148
8.3	Group structure of the Jacobian	149
8.3.1	Higher Derivations	153
8.4	The structure of the endomorphism ring	155
8.4.1	The supersingular case	156
8.4.2	Singular invariants	160
8.4.3	Elliptic subfields	162
8.4.4	Good reduction	164
8.5	Class field theory and complex multiplication	167
	Summary	170
9	Towards higher genus	173
9.1	Preliminaries	173
9.2	The years 1934-35	177

9.2.1	Deuring	180
9.2.2	More political problems	183
9.3	Deuring's letter to Hasse	186
9.3.1	Correspondences	187
9.4	Hasse's letter to Weil	193
9.5	Weil's reply and Lefschetz's note	196
9.6	The workshop on algebraic geometry	201
9.7	Summary	206
10	A Virtual Proof	207
10.1	The quadratic form	208
10.1.1	The different	210
10.2	Positivity	217
10.2.1	Applying the Riemann-Hurwitz formula	217
10.2.2	The discriminant estimate	222
10.3	The Rhp	226
10.4	Some Comments	228
10.4.1	Frobenius meromorphism.	228
10.4.2	Differents.	229
10.4.3	Integral differentials	230
10.5	The geometric language	231
11	Intermission	235
11.1	Artin leaves	236
11.2	The Italian connection	238
11.2.1	Severi	238
11.2.2	The Volta congress	242

11.3 The French Connection	247
11.3.1 On function fields	247
11.3.2 The book	253
11.3.3 Paris and Strasbourg	257
11.4 Summary	262
12 A. Weil	263
12.1 Bonne Nouvelle	263
12.2 The first note 1940	267
12.3 The second note 1941	270
12.4 Summary	274
13 Epilogue	275
Bibliography	276

Chapter 1

Overture

1.1 Artin and the intervention by Hilbert

Our story starts in Göttingen in the early 1920s. The mathematical scene in Göttingen had recovered from the difficult years of World War 1 and the immediate post-war period. Göttingen was again considered as “the” center of mathematics in the world. It was to become an attractive place in particular for young mathematicians from Germany and from abroad, who were eager to learn about the latest developments. The mathematical atmosphere was bristling with new ideas – an ideal background for progress.

But not all the young people arriving in Göttingen found the atmosphere congenial to their expectations. Let me cite from a letter written by a young Austrian postdoc to his academic teacher. The letter is dated on 30 Nov 1921. He had recently arrived in Göttingen and had already introduced himself to the big shots, i.e., to Courant, Hilbert, Klein and Landau.¹ He had been friendly received, and Hilbert had invited him to give a talk at the *Mathematische Gesellschaft* in order to report on his thesis. The talk had been scheduled for 25 Nov 1921.

However, in his letter dated five days after his talk, he reports that he is

¹Emmy Noether was not yet considered an important figure in the Göttingen scene whom any newcomer had to formally introduce himself – although she was the one who cared personally for the young people arriving in Göttingen including our man.

deeply disappointed:

... I have now given my talk but with Hilbert I had no luck. Landau and the other number theorists were quite pleased with it, they said so even during my talk when Hilbert often interrupted me. But he kept interrupting frequently – finally I could not speak any more at all – and he said that from the start he did not even listen since he had the impression that everything was trivial. But then he changed his mind when I mentioned the said decomposition of prime numbers.² I had to do this out of the proper context since I could not speak and hence could not present the latest results of my thesis and of my recent investigations. But anyhow this talk had not been successful and Hilbert, through his criticism, has killed my enthusiasm for this work. By the way, in my opinion (and in the opinion of the others) his criticism is not justified. I do not know your opinion about this but as to myself, the delight for these results is gone.

The name of this young man was Emil Artin, he was 23 years of age and wrote this letter to his Ph.D. advisor Gustav Herglotz in Leipzig. Hilbert's conduct came as a shock to Artin. In fact, Artin closed his letter with the words:

Now please excuse me, Herr Professor, from again having bothered you with such a long letter³ but this will probably not happen any more with this subject since I intend to drop it.

When Artin wrote “this subject” then he referred to the subject of his thesis. This contained the foundations of the arithmetic theory of quadratic function fields over a finite base field, in analogy to quadratic number fields. It included the definition and study of the zeta-functions of those fields, with the aim of applying this to class number formulas, density results etc. Artin had

²See formulas (3.15b) and (3.16b) in section 3.2.2.

³Artin's letter has 5 pages. We have cited the last page only, the earlier pages contain a report on certain supplements to his thesis which however Artin was not able to present in his talk due to Hilbert's interruptions (see section 3.2).

added a list of about 30 numeric cases where he computed the class numbers and, on the way, he observed the validity of the Rhp for these fields.

Young Artin's disappointment about Hilbert's unfounded criticism went quite deep. Indeed he did what he had announced in his letter to Herglotz, namely he turned to other problems and never took up again the topic of his thesis. Also, he left Göttingen and accepted a position at Hamburg University which then witnessed the rapid rise of Artin to one of the top mathematicians of his time.

To vindicate Hilbert it should be said that some days after the talk he admitted that now he appreciated Artin's work and did not any more consider it trivial. He offered Artin the publication of his results in the *Mathematische Annalen*. But Artin did not accept the offer.

Artin's thesis appeared in print three years later in the *Mathematische Zeitschrift* [Art24].⁴ It is the only one of all his publications in which the Rhp is mentioned. In the *Nachlass* of Artin there was found a print-ready manuscript dated Nov 1921, containing his subsequent investigations which he had reported to Herglotz. But Artin had never submitted this for publication.⁵

1.2 Hasse's project

It took quite a while until the Rhp was taken up by another mathematician. His name was Helmut Hasse. He had refereed Artin's thesis in the "*Jahrbuch für die Fortschritte der Mathematik*"⁶ but had not given any sign that he was particularly interested in the Rhp – until he had occasion to talk to Artin in November 1932 when Hasse visited Artin in Hamburg and gave a colloquium talk. At that time, not only Artin but also Hasse was an established mathematician in the top ranks. They had exchanged letters since many years, see [FLR14].

⁴A prepublication had appeared in the local *Jahrbuch der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität zu Leipzig* [Art21]. This journal contained abstracts of all Ph.D.-theses of the year in the philosophical faculty in Leipzig.

⁵The manuscript was edited by P. Ullrich in the year 2000 [Art00].

⁶Today the reviews in this journal are incorporated in the database of "zbMATH".

In his Hamburg talk 1932 Hasse spoke about the problem of estimating the number of solutions of diophantine congruences, a problem which he had recently become interested in through his friend Davenport. In the ensuing discussion Artin pointed out that Hasse's problem was equivalent to the Rhp – as a consequence of his (Artin's) unpublished results which he had reported in his letter to Herglotz but never published. Thus Hasse's problem on diophantine congruences had mutated into the Rhp. With this information at hand he and Davenport succeeded quickly with the proof of Rhp for generalized Fermat function fields and for Davenport-Hasse fields.

Parallel to this Hasse also considered the problem of the Rhp for elliptic function fields. There he could draw on the classic theory of complex multiplication of elliptic functions which he was familiar with. The date of his success in the elliptic case is documented by a letter of Hasse to Mordell of 6 March 1933 where he reports that he has just obtained the proof. But Hasse's second (final) proof for elliptic fields appeared in print three years later only [Has36c]. Hasse's result, although still limited to the elliptic case, received much attention at that time in the mathematical community. It led to an invitation for a special 1-hour lecture at the next conference of the International Mathematical Union which was scheduled for 1936 at Oslo.

Thus Artin, although not any more active in this direction, contributed essentially to the further development by informing Hasse about his results which he had found in 1921 but Hilbert did not wish to take notice of.

By the way, Hasse like Artin had also not found the mathematical atmosphere in Göttingen congenial to his expectations. He had entered Göttingen University at the end of 1918 when he was 20 years of age. There, in his first semester he attended Hecke's course on algebraic numbers and analytic functions (see [Hec87]). This was quite fascinating as he later recalled. But unfortunately Hecke soon left Göttingen and went to Hamburg. Hasse then became interested in Hensel's theory of p -adic numbers but he was told (by Courant) that in Göttingen this was considered but an unimportant side track and hence not worthwhile to study. So Hasse left Göttingen in 1920 and went to Hensel in Marburg where he wanted to learn more about p -adics.⁷ He soon got his Ph.D. with a thesis on the Local-Global Principle

⁷Thus when Artin arrived in November 1921 Hasse was not any more in Göttingen. The two met first in September 1922 at the annual meeting of the German Mathematical Society (DMV) in Leipzig.

for quadratic forms. In consequence of Hasse's further work the p -adic numbers became an important, indispensable tool of algebraic number theory – contrary to Courant's prophecy which at that time seems to have been the general opinion in the circle around Hilbert.

After his success in the case of elliptic function fields, Hasse pushed towards a proof of Rhp for arbitrary function fields with finite base fields. This turned out to become a larger project since it became necessary first to develop generally the algebraic theory of function fields (over arbitrary base fields) including their Jacobians. At that time this was not yet sufficiently established. From today's geometric viewpoint this is seen as part of the transfer of classical algebraic geometry of curves from characteristic 0 to the case when the base field is of arbitrary characteristic p .

In this story we shall meet the names of quite a number of mathematicians who at least for some time joined Hasse in this work, some of them are: ⁸

- *F. K. Schmidt* (1901-1977) who had provided the proper definition of the zeta-function of an arbitrary function field over a finite base field. Moreover, he proved the Riemann-Roch theorem for function fields and showed that this is essentially equivalent with the functional equation of the zeta-function [Sch31a].
- *Harold Davenport* (1907-1969) who had introduced Hasse to the problem of counting solutions of diophantine congruences. Moreover, jointly with Hasse he showed that for generalized Fermat function fields and related fields (the so-called Davenport-Hasse fields) the zeros of the zeta-function are given explicitly by means of Gaussian sums. This solved the Rhp for these fields [DH34].
- *Ernst Witt* (1911-1991) who gave the first proof of the functional equation for the L -series of function fields over a finite base field. (But he never published it.) Moreover, among quite a number of other important contributions, he determined jointly with Hasse the structure of the maximal unramified abelian extension of exponent p (the characteristic of the field) by means of the so-called Hasse-Witt matrix [HW36].

⁸Most mathematicians which are mentioned in this book have an article in “Wikipedia” or in “Mac Tutor History of Mathematics Archive”, hence I believe it is not necessary here to always include biographical information – except in a few cases when I believe some such information may be helpful.

- *Max Deuring* (1907-1984) who provided an algebraic theory of correspondences and so constructed the endomorphism ring of the Jacobian of an function field of arbitrary genus [Deu37], generalizing what Hasse had done in the elliptic case. Moreover he continued Hasse's work on elliptic function fields by determining completely the structure of their endomorphism rings.
- *André Weil* (1906-1998) who had shown interest in Hasse's project right from the beginning. He had visited Hasse in Marburg in the summer of 1933 and they exchanged letters thereafter. With the outbreak of World War 2 their contact broke down. Weil was able to escape from the Nazi terror from France to USA. There in the year 1941 he announced a proof of the Riemann hypothesis for arbitrary function fields with finite base field [Wei41].

Thus Weil was able to complete Hasse's project ten years after it had been started.

1.3 Weil's contribution

There is a letter of Weil to Artin dated 10 July 1942 in which he informed Artin about the main ideas and some details of his proof. (At that time both Weil and Artin resided as refugee immigrants in the USA.) This letter which Weil has included and commented in his Collected Works [Wei80], is more detailed than his announcement in 1941. The fact that the letter was sent to Artin shows that Artin still was regarded as the ultimate expert for the Rhp – although he had nothing published on this subject except what was contained in his thesis more than 20 years ago. The final version of Weil's proof appeared six years later [Wei48a].

But Weil did much more. In his proof he stressed the analogy of Rhp to problems which had been treated within the framework of classical Italian algebraic geometry. But there, algebraic geometry was studied over the complex base field \mathbb{C} only, i.e., in characteristic 0. So Weil had first to make sure that those results which he needed remain valid in characteristic $p > 0$. To this end he wrote a book containing a complete foundation of algebraic geometry in arbitrary characteristic [Wei46]. This was a formidable task.

Weil did not only establish the theory of curves in characteristic p (which would have been sufficient for the Rhp) but he covered varieties of arbitrary dimension. This enabled him to develop the theory of abelian varieties over any characteristic. In particular his treatment included Jacobian varieties which led to a second proof of Rhp [Wei48b].

Weil's "Foundations of Algebraic Geometry" [Wei46] had an enormous influence. In the course of time it led to what today is generally accepted under the name of "arithmetic geometry", i.e., to the use of the language of algebraic geometry in algebra and number theory, and in other branches of mathematics.

After Weil's success there appeared several papers putting into evidence that the Rhp could also have been proved within the theory algebraic function fields, in which it had been started by Artin in 1921 and continued by Hasse. The last(?) word in this endeavor was given by Bombieri in 1972 [Bom74]. He perfected Hasse's idea to search for a proof which works in the function field directly, concentrating on the Frobenius map without caring for the general theory of correspondences of curves. But he still relied heavily on Artin's unpublished results of 1921.

In the following I will tell the fascinating story of this development. This book covers roughly the years from 1921 to 1942. As said above already, in this period Hasse and his team did not yet reach a proof for arbitrary function fields of higher genus. But all the prerequisites of a proof had been available already. In order to put this in evidence I have included a chapter with a short "virtual" proof which, indeed, could have been given in 1936 by Hasse or Deuring or any one of his team.

Our story is a good example of what we often observe in the history of mathematics:⁹ That much effort and time had to be spent by the pioneers to explore their way into unknown territory, and thereby they paved the way for the next generations who now can travel comfortably along their smooth tracks. I have extensively used original letters and documents¹⁰, hoping that this provides the reader a glimpse into the communication channels of

⁹And not only of mathematics

¹⁰Many of the letters are written in German, some in English or other languages. I have translated the cited text into English for easier reading. The text in the original language is freely accessible at the mentioned sources, some of it in the internet.

mathematicians of that time, seeing the difficulties which had to be overcome although nowadays they are not any more considered difficult at all.

I have met in my life many of the people whose letters I am citing but I have to admit that I did not use the opportunity to ask them about their own opinions and remembrances of those times. When I was younger I was not yet too much interested in the details of historical evolution of mathematics, how mathematical ideas arise, develop and are treated by later generations. Today I regret that I missed the opportunity to get to know more about the personal memories of these people. Nevertheless, my interpretation of their letters and notes may show a certain personal touch in as much as it could possibly depend on my own impressions of their personalities.

Most of the cited letters and documents are kept in the *Handschriftenabteilung* of Göttingen University Library – except if I explicitly mention another source. The letters from Hasse to Davenport I have found in the archive of Trinity College, Cambridge, and those to Mordell in King's College.

Summary

After having received his degree in Leipzig, Artin spent a year 1921/22 as post-doc in Göttingen. In several letters from there to his academic teacher Herglotz he developed some important further results for zeta functions of quadratic function fields beyond his thesis. But these results were never published. The reason was that when Artin reported about it in Göttingen in the presence of Hilbert, the latter criticized his work heavily. Although Hilbert later changed his mind and offered Artin publication of his new results, Artin did not accept. He left Göttingen and went to Hamburg where he turned to other problems. He continued to be interested in the Rhp but did not publish anything more in this direction.

Ten years later the Rhp was taken up by Hasse. In the year 1932 he gave a colloquium talk in Hamburg about the problem of estimating the number of solutions of diophantic equations, a problem in which he had recently become interested through his friend Harold Davenport. In the discussion with Artin the latter pointed out that the Hasse-Davenport problem was equivalent to the Rhp for the function fields in question – as a consequence of Artin's

unpublished results which he had reported in his letters to Herglotz mentioned above but never published. Hasse succeeded quickly with the proof of Rhp for what today are called the generalized Fermat function fields and for related fields. Parallel to this Hasse was able to prove the Rhp for elliptic function fields. There he could draw on the classic theory of complex multiplication of elliptic functions which he was familiar with. While preparing his proof for publication Hasse found that it is possible to develop much of "complex multiplication" directly in the case of characteristic $p > 0$. He decided to write a new proof on this basis. This appeared in print three years later, in the year 1936. Although it was still limited to the elliptic case, it received much attention at that time in the mathematical community. It led to an invitation for a special 1-hour lecture at the next conference of the International Mathematical Union at Oslo in the year 1936.

After his success in the elliptic case Hasse and his collaborators started a project towards a proof of Rhp for function fields of arbitrary genus. A number of new results were reached in this direction, in particular by Deuring. Today we can see that these results were well sufficient to compose a proof of the Rhp. However this goal was not reached at the time.

André Weil had shown interest in Hasse's project right from the beginning. During the 1930s they exchanged a number of letters, among others about the envisaged proof of the Rhp for function fields of higher genus. Weil discovered that there is a close connection of the problem to results of Severi in classical algebraic geometry. He managed to translate the foundations of algebraic geometry to characteristic $p > 0$ and on this basis solve the Rhp for general function fields in the year 1941.

