

**Book review for
“Fermat’s Last Theorem”
by Takeshi Saito**

I was excited to hear that Takeshi Saito’s books on the proof of Fermat’s Last Theorem had been translated and appeared as two fairly thin books in the series “Translation of Mathematical Monographs” by the AMS. Richard Taylor and Andrew Wiles made this major breakthrough in the mid-nineties. Saito’s books, containing both the “Basic Tools” as well as “The Proof”, appear twenty years later with these subtitles.

The subject has lost none of its appeal and importance in the interim; on the contrary, the methods used in the proof produced numerous other important results, such as the proof of the Sato-Tate conjecture by Richard Taylor and his collaborators and the proof of Serre’s modularity conjecture by Chandrashekhara Khare and Jean-Pierre Wintenberger.

There have been quite a number of publications devoted to the mathematics involved in the the proof of Fermat’s Last Theorem. Most of them are surveys or they present the main mathematical concepts (elliptic curves, modular forms and Galois representations) involved in the proof without going into details. The conference volume [1] edited by Cornell, Silverman and Stevens and the article [2] by Darmon, Diamond and Taylor stand out as having a similar aim as the books under review. The former is a collection of very good articles, though it may lack in consistency and clear focus which is one of the strengths of Saito’s books. The latter does not cover the basic tools in as much detail and it is less self-contained. All three are best used in parallel.

The books follow the original arguments and

modifications already present in [1] and [2] to a large degree. As I am not a specialist in the field myself, I cannot comment on whether with more recent methods one could simplify part of the proof. However I am certain that the two books under review provide a very good base for reading more recent articles in this active research area.

Obviously, one should not expect that the complete proof is contained in these two volumes. For instance, no reader will be surprised to see that neither Falting’s proof of the Mordell conjecture nor the proof of global duality in Galois cohomology is included. The author had to make some choices as to what prerequisites he assumes and what material he leaves out. For instance, despite the rather gentle first 25 pages, the reader needs to know quite a bit of scheme theory. Although it is not strictly necessary, it is also good if the reader is familiar with the basics theory of elliptic curves and modular forms.

In my opinion, the author makes an excellent choice as to what to include in order to obtain a coherent exposition which is as self-contained as possible. The references at the end contain precise indications on where to find the proofs which are omitted in the books. For instance, rather than including the full proof of Ribet’s level lowering theorem, only Mazur’s earlier theorem is given. The reader still gets a good grasp of how to obtain such results. The only omission I felt a bit disappointed about was the lack of discussion on the crucial result by Langlands and Tunnell. The Galois representation associated to the 3-torsion points of an elliptic curve becomes magically modular with one reference while the remaining part of the book is then about how to deduce from this the modularity of the elliptic curve itself.

Let me give an overview of the contents of

the eleven chapters of the books. The first book starts with a synopsis containing the statement of Fermat's Last Theorem and an explanation of how the modularity of the Frey curve implies it.

Then the first chapter covers elliptic curves over arbitrary base schemes and generalised elliptic curves in view of the moduli problems described later. As mentioned before, this is self-contained but having seen a more elementary approach before may be helpful. The following chapter covers the basics on modular forms of weight 2. They are systematically developed as geometric modular forms by constructing the modular curves as moduli spaces over \mathbb{Q} and modular forms are defined as differentials on them. Chapter 3 introduces Galois representations and local conditions on them. It is here that we meet for the first time the crucial condition simply called "good at p " which requires the local representation to come from a finite flat group scheme defined over \mathbb{Z}_p . It is explained when this is the case for the Galois representation attached to an elliptic curve and stated for the Galois representation attached to a modular form.

After having set up the three main concepts that are involved in the proof, the next two chapters give an overview of the proof and announce the major theorems that will be proven later. In chapter 4, the 3–5 trick explains how the modular lifting theorem implies the modularity of semi-stable elliptic curves. An overview of the proof of the modular lifting theorem is given in the next chapter. It explains the meaning and use of what is simply called $R = T$, namely that a certain universal deformation ring of Galois representations is isomorphic to a certain Hecke algebra connected to modular forms. Both of them are described together with finer versions R_Σ and T_Σ which impose the local restrictions on

ramification only outside a finite set Σ of primes. The author defines what he calls an RTM-triple, which consists of triples $(R_\Sigma, T_\Sigma, M_\Sigma)$ together with a map $f: R_\Sigma \rightarrow T_\Sigma$. Two numerical criteria for a ring like R_Σ to be a local complete intersection and for the map f to be an isomorphism are stated. The first will be used to prove the case when Σ is empty and the second to prove it inductively when enlarging the set Σ .

The first book finishes with two more technical chapters, one on commutative algebra proving the two criteria for local complete intersections and the other on deformation rings of Galois representations. In the latter the construction of the universal deformation ring R_Σ is given.

The second book starts with chapter 8, which contains a thorough and nice development of moduli problems for elliptic curves with the aim of constructing the modular curves as schemes over \mathbb{Z} . The curves $Y_0(N)$ and $Y_1(N)$, their compactifications and the important maps between them are carefully constructed. More exotic moduli problems and the Igusa curves are also explained. They are used in the next chapter which starts by constructing the Hecke algebra with integer coefficients and the Galois representation attached to a modular form. The second part of this chapter is devoted to the level lowering result studying the Néron model of the Jacobian of the modular curve.

The heart of the proof that R_Σ and T_Σ are isomorphic is contained in the last two chapters. First, in chapter 10, the Hecke module M_Σ coming from modular symbols is defined and analysed. The maps between modular curves are used to compute a so-called multiplier and show the surjectivity of a map between the Hecke modules as Σ increases. Then one has to verify the numerical criterion using a well-chosen set Q of auxiliary primes. The final chapter introduces

Galois cohomology. The relevant Selmer groups are defined and linked to the deformation problem of Galois representations. Finally, global duality of Galois cohomology concludes the proof.

The books also have appendices with collections of results on arithmetic geometry, on the theory of Fontaine and Laffaille and on Néron models. They have good indices of notations, a complete bibliography, but they contain hardly any examples or exercises.

As I reach the conclusion of this review, I would like to mention one issue I had with these books: The logical structure is very complicated. Frequently, theorems are announced and only proven much later after they were used to deduce earlier statements. It is a matter of taste, but I would have preferred a more linear structure to these frequent flash-forwards. Sections 4.2, 5.5 and 5.6 are of much help with understanding the structure.

Another strange, yet harmless fact about the book is that it omits to attribute any of the intermediate results to the mathematicians who discovered them. Also famous buzzwords like “modularity lifting” or “level lowering” are not mentioned.

In summary, I enjoyed reading this book. The author states in his introduction “I would be extremely gratified if more people could appreciate one of the highest achievements of the twentieth century in mathematics.” These books are a very good contribution for exactly this purpose. Number theorists, including graduate students, will find the proof of Fermat’s Last Theorem and the modularity of elliptic curves and its prerequisites much more accessible thanks to these two books.

References

- [1] Gary Cornell, Joseph H. Silverman, and Glenn Stevens, editors. *Modular forms and Fermat’s last theorem*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. Papers from the Instructional Conference on Number Theory and Arithmetic Geometry held at Boston University, Boston, MA, August 9–18, 1995.
- [2] Henri Darmon, Fred Diamond, and Richard Taylor. Fermat’s last theorem. In *Elliptic curves, modular forms & Fermat’s last theorem (Hong Kong, 1993)*, pages 2–140. Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1997.

Christian Wuthrich
University of Nottingham

Home » MAA Publications » MAA Reviews » Fermat's Last Theorem: The Proof. Fermat's Last Theorem: The Proof. Takeshi Saito. Publisher: American Mathematical Society. Fermat's Last Theorem can be stated simply as follows: It is impossible to separate any power higher than the second into two like powers, or, more precisely: If an integer n is greater than 2, then the equation $a^n + b^n = c^n$ has no solutions in non-zero integers a , b , and c . If you let $n = 2$, the equation takes the form $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$. He. 5. Pythagoras produced by means of a combination of logic and elementary geometry a proof for every right angled triangle. He then passed from an empirical proof for a finite number of cases to a proof as we currently understand it, that is a proof that it is always true for $n > 2$. Proofs are those which differentiate mathematics from all other sciences.