(Kushik) Kaushal Timilsina

Riemann's ~~Hypothesis~~ Zeroes and Manifolds

(- ~~not an attempt to prove, just a~~ new perspective).

"An infinite dimensional manifold is a compact surface by itself" (that encloses nothing)

Part 1: The identification of the origin

1.1) Real line ⟵—+—⟶ 0

1.2) Fold the real line into a coil as:

a) Start with a point and fix the origin to it.

b) Rotate clockwise on a spiral about a center (not yet clear), and map $[0,\infty)$ on the clockwise rotation, moving inwards on the spiral.



c) Rotate counterclockwise starting at 0 and map $(-\infty,0)$ ("run to $-\infty$ from 0"); moving outwards on the spiral.

1.3) Define a map from the part of the spiral $[0,\infty)$ to the complex plane, identifying each point with a complex number $S=a+ib$. ("take the spiral to be a disc")

This is pretty sloppy, as the center is not well defined; which should be done but I am unable to do it.

Question: Can you identify the center to the origin (0)? This would mean to convert the real line into a closed curve, given that you can fix ~~the~~ a finite radius (0 and center relation) to define the center of the spiral from the origin (0).

- To accomodate the whole real line, the torsion ("not exactly") of the curve is defined accordingly.

Hypothesis (1) Whether you can form a closed curve by identifying a (0, center relation) will depend on where you start. Only special maps can define the identification.

I'm just being verbose here, but this could probably require non-linear mapping or some kind of non-Cauchy convergence on partitions of the domain $[0,\infty)$.

Part 2: Mysterious : diffeomorphism? or homeomorphism? or homorphism

2.1) consider $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ (n dimensional euclidean space).

2.2) Can you construct a vector field, V' at every point in V such that an orthonormal basis (linearly independent could be enough) $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n\}$ at a point p, can span V'? at every point. ("You can construct the basis at other points by linear combination of $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots e_n\}$")

2.3) Define $\varphi: V \to M^n$: which is already constructed as $f_\alpha: \mathcal{U}_\alpha \to M^n$, $\alpha: 1, \ldots n$ where $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ are open sets (domains). ("φ is a map from V to an already well defined Manifold M").

2.4) Assign norm 1 vectors $\{f_1, f_2, \ldots f_n\}$ to $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s such that for the set of points $\{q_1, q_2, q_3, \ldots q_n \mid q_i \in \mathcal{U}_i\}$, the map $\Phi_i: q_i \to q_i \cdot f_i$ (where dot is the scalar product) is defined such that the set of vectors $\{q_i \cdot f_i \mid i = 1, \ldots n\}$ form an n-dimensional vector space W, such that $q_i f_i$ are lineary independent.

2.5) ~~what~~ ~~sta~~

2.5) A map from $V' \to W$ can be defined by composition. $\{e_i\}$ on V' were defined orthonormal by brute force. $\{q_i h_i\}$ on W were defined ~~orthonormal~~ linearly independent by brute force.

2.6) Define a homomorphism $\omega : V' \to W$ if for any operation ~~defined~~ on ~~$\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$ at p with~~ between a vector in V' at a point p in V and a vector in W, and between a vector in V' at another point q in V and the same vector in W give the same result.

" operation($\sum_i^n \alpha_i e_{ip}$, $\sum_i^n q_i h_i$) = operation($\sum_i^n \alpha_i e_{iq}$, $\sum_i^n q_i h_i$) " $\forall$ p,q in V. ("back to the question in 2.2")

Part 3: Riemann's ~~hypothesis~~ zeta function.

3.1) n linearly dependent vectors may add upto 0 as do the nth roots of unity.



3.2) The Riemann zeta function:

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}, \quad Re(s) > 1.$$

3.3) Definition:

consider the sum, $1^{-s} + 2^{-s} + 3^{-s} + \dots + n^{-s}$

define: $Z_1 = (|g_{11}|)^{-s} + (|g_{12}| + |g_{22}|)^{-s} + \dots$
$\dots + (|g_{1n}| + |g_{2n}| + \dots |g_{nn}|)^{-s}$

where g_{ij} is the ith orthonormal basis of

ϑ^j (j dimensional vector space) such that

$\vartheta^j \subset \mathbb{F}^n, \forall j$. ~~and ϑ^j is a subspace of~~

$\mathbb{F}^n$, where $\mathbb{F}^n$ is defined as $\underbrace{\mathbb{F}^1 \times \mathbb{F}^1 \times \dots \mathbb{F}^1}_{n}$,

$\mathbb{F}^1$ is a field.

3.4) Definiton: $Z_2 = \left(\left| (g_{11}) + (g_{12} + g_{22}) + (g_{13} + g_{23} + g_{33}) + \dots \right.\right.$

$\left.\left. \dots + (g_{1n} + g_{2n} + \dots + g_{nn}) \right|^{-s} \right)$ with g_{ij}'s as

defined in 3.3.

3.5) If $Z_2 \neq 0$, direct sum of ϑ^j's over j

$= \mathbb{F}^n$ and ϑ^j's are subspaces that are

disjoint in some sense, $\cup_j \vartheta^j$'s is a

partion of $\mathbb{F}^n$. which is equal to $\mathbb{F}^n$.

If $Z_2 = 0$, the ϑ^j's are not disjoint.

This establishes some form of

compactness.

Part 4: The new perspective.

4.1) Define the construction in part 2 using $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s (2.3) as different refinements of the closed curve in part 1 (whose origin is identified with the center).

4.2) Define an operation (2.6)

$$\left(\sum_i^n \alpha_i e_{ip}, \sum_j^n q_j h_j\right) = \left(\sum_i^n \alpha_i e_{ip}\right) \wedge \left(\sum_j^n q_j h_j\right)$$

where $\wedge$ is some sort of exterior ~~derivative~~ product (by definition).)

(Because it gives out a vector and would be 0 if $\sum_i^n e_{ip}\alpha_i$ was in some sense parallel to $\sum_i^n q_i h_i$).

~~with the bilinearity of $\wedge$ on the component~~

$\Rightarrow$ operation $\left(\sum_i^n \alpha_i e_{ip}, \sum_i^n q_i h_i\right) = \alpha_i q_i \sum_i^n e_i h_i$

(and now we drop p in e_i using 2.6 definition of homomorphism.)

~~4.3) Plug $\alpha_i q_i \sum_i^n e_i h_i$~~

4.3) plug $\left(\sum_i^n \alpha_i e_i\right) \wedge \left(\sum_j^n q_j h_j\right)$ (dropped the p on e_i by 2.6 definition of homomorphism) into z_1 and z_3 such that

g_{ij} is the i'th component of

$$\left(\sum_{i'}^{j} \alpha_{i'} e_{i'}\right) \wedge \left(\sum_{j'}^{j} q_{j'} h_{j'}\right)$$

("without defining the i^{th} unit vector, this is a pretty big formula").

4.4) ~~Hypothesis:~~ With this setup, if $Z_1 = Z_2$ for a finite integer n, (some kind of saturation of the triangle inequality $|\vec{a}+\vec{b}| \leq |\vec{a}|+|\vec{b}|$.), in some sense on a finite dimensional manifold $\mathbb{M}^n$ you can using U_α from the the definition of $\mathbb{M}^n$ you can form a V (as in part 2) that can ~~cover~~ be defined at every point in M. ~~@~~

(In part 2, ~~things~~ ~~were~~ the relation between U_α's and V was defined by construction. But here we get V from U_α's.)

Hypothesis(2): $Z_1 = Z_2 = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{M}^n$ is closed ($\mathbb{M}^n$ is a compact surface.)

4.5) Define $Z_3 = (|g_{11}|)^{-s} + (|g_{12}|+|g_{22}|)^{-s} + \ldots$

$\ldots$ ~~infinitely many~~ such that

$$Z_3 = \lim_{n\to\infty} Z_1$$

$$Z_4 = (|(g_{11}) + (g_{12}+g_{22}) + (g_{13}+g_{23}+g_{33}) \cdots |)^{-s}$$

$$Z_4 = \lim_{n\to\infty} Z_2$$

(the definition of limit is sloppy here as indicated at the end of part 1, as it is not clearly defined here based on convergence.)

Hypothesis (3): Riemann's ~~hypothesis~~ $\Leftrightarrow Z_3 = Z_4 = 0$

which is to say that the existence of Riemann's ~~hypothesis~~ zeroes implies (and vice versa) that an infinite dimensional manifold is a compact surface (closed). Where? (what is the ambient space?)'

Well, by itself is the answer (possibly).

Rephrase: An infinite dimensional manifold is a compact surface by itself. (but there is nothing that it encloses.)

Summary about this perspective

Riemann zeta function.

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$$

- Many other perspectives on the zeta function try to exple the parameter, s.
- This perspective explore the possibilities on two other parameters of the zeta function – (i) n being natural numbers
  (ii) the sum being infinite.
- Hypothesis (3) is based on Hypothesis (2) and Hypothesis (2) is based on Hypothesis (1).

which is to say that if there exists and can be defined an identification as defined in part 1, Hypothesis (2) and Hypothesis (3) are implied.

- Indeed the zeta function depends on the parameter s as well, which could be describing the uniqueness of Riemann's zeroes.

Part 5: Motivations:

(5.1) If one of the principal curvature of a plane (S^2) blows up → it forms a 1 dimensional line, locally, which is a 1 dimensinal singularity in S^2.



(5.2) The singularity of a black hole is where the 4d spacetime (lorentzian manifold) forms (collapses into) a singularity (intuitively 0 dimensional, but I don't really know)

(5.3) Speculations on what lies on the "other side" of the singularity include wide range of notions.

(5.4) But if you collapse an infinite dimensional manifold into a singularity, perhaps you might not come out some where but connected to the ~~same~~ singularity is another singularity on the same manifold.

"sloppy figure" to demonstrate, two points both on the "outer surface" of the sphere identified by irregularity.



Even though you cannot (possibly) go there, what lies beyond a ~~a~~ singularity in an infinite dimensional manifold is the same manifold.

"Intuitively its just a surface, there is no inside"

(5.5) Question: Can two manifolds of different dimension be connected by a singularity?

("Is there a 100 dimensional universe beyond that black hole?", well how about the other one?")

(5.6) It can be difficult to start with this question for two finite dimensional ~~surfaces~~ manifolds. So we start with infinite two dimensional manifolds because Hypothesis (3) [the new perspective on the Riemann hypothesis], makes it easier.

Hypothesis: (4) Two infinite dimensional manifolds M^m, N^n can be connected by singularities. | Hypothesis (4) is based on Hypothesis (3).

I have not yet understood how infinite dimensional manifolds are generally treated, but this hypothesis would be constructed based on Cantor's theorem.

(5.7) Hypothesis: (5) An infinite dimensional "sphere" (sloppy) can be smoothly turned inside out or, An infinite dimensional manifold is globally unorientable

"It has the same information on the outer surface as in the inner surface and indeed the two surfaces can be identified the sphere, and hence there is no inside its just the surface"

Hypothesis (5) is based on hypothesis (4).

Scanned by CamScanner

(5.7). Hypothesis (6): A globally orientable ~~compact~~ manifold can store global information iff it is globally compact. A locally orientable manifold can store local information if it is locally compact.

Question: Can infinite dimensional manifolds store global information?

- it seems like the answer is No, but local information Yes.

- this question has major implications for defining conservation laws on manifolds.

(5.8) I do not yet understand clearly how loops in spacetime are realized. But this setting, can define loops in spacetime as intersection between spacetime manifold and itself. It doesn't always have to be ~~in~~ 0-dimensional singularity, and neither does it even have to be a singularity. If we can work on infinite dimensional manifolds with singularities, we can soon develop ~~in~~ intersections of finite dimensional manifolds (which includes self intersection)

This will help us explore notions of higher dimensions, and ideas of creation, annihilation and conservation.

(5.9) Aim: the aim of this discussion is build an understanding towards "A Theory of intersection of manifolds"

(5.10) In this discussion, $[0,\infty)$ was collapsed into a disc in complex coordinates which would later be used in the discussion to build $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$'s. It position $s = a+ib$ also plays an important part in the Riemann zeta function,

- Is it possible to collapse the whole complex plane into a similar spiral (or perhaps a stack of discs).

In General, can you collapse any topological space into an analogous structure ("make it closed" is the heart of the problem) and use it to build a more abstract version of a Manifold?

- For example the kähler manifold is defined with a 2-form structure.

Can you ~~define~~ work with constructions from n-form structures? ...

(5.11) Corollary of Hypothesis (6):

Black holes can not store local information. but they store global information. So perhaps one may not traverse beyond the singularity, but two people jumping into "entangled" black holes can meet at the center $\Longleftrightarrow$ (ER = EPR).

-In ~~the~~ the formulation of ER = EPR, "a theory of intersection of manifolds" will help us better understand what entanglement geometrically means.

(5.12) Integrating geometric flows in a theory of intersection of manifolds ~~with~~ could describe the foundations of the dynamics of interactions between manifolds; setting a new path for theories of quantum gravity.

(5.13). The fact that the Riemann zeta function describes the distribution of prime numbers, could hint at the spiral used in part 1 to be described by a map from the real line that preserves the distribution of primes. This could mean that this map could be a function like for example, von Mangoldt function which behaves differently for primes and non-primes. This could describe the relationship between the variable s in the zeta function and the different orders of infinities and the used in defining infinite that we have used in defining infinite dimensional manifolds. The fact that $\xi(s) \neq 0 \; \forall s$ could tell us something like "there is no set whose cardinality is strictly between the cardinality of set of Real numbers and the cardinality of the set of natural numbers"; helping extend this perspective to the Riemann hypothesis.