

# Black magic: xnor’s 43-byte Python answer to “Triangular Lattice Points close to the Origin”

Lynn

This document is a proof that xnor’s 43-byte Python answer to “Triangular Lattice Points close to the Origin” is correct, and an explanation of how it computes what it does.

To start with, we need to define **Eisenstein integers**. These are complex numbers of the form  $x+y\omega$  where  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$ , the primitive third root of unity. These numbers are arranged on a triangular lattice exactly like the one in the PPCG question. (You can find a nice image on Wikipedia.)

We can compute the **norm** of an Eisenstein integer, i.e. the squared<sup>1</sup> Euclidean distance from the origin, in much the same way that we do so for other complex numbers:

$$\begin{aligned} N(z) &= |z|^2 = z \cdot \bar{z} = (x + y\omega)(x + y\bar{\omega}) \\ &= x^2 + xy(\omega + \bar{\omega}) + y^2(\omega\bar{\omega}) \\ &= x^2 - xy + y^2. \end{aligned}$$

The PPCG question as it is asked is then equivalent to this:

Given  $N$ , how many Eisenstein integers are there with norm less than or equal to  $N^2$ ?

Which is furthermore equivalent to this:

How many ways are there to write  $N$  in the form  $X^2 - XY + Y^2$ , for integers  $X, Y$ ?

---

<sup>1</sup>Yes: in number theory, *norm* refers to the square of what you might know as the *norm* from analysis or linear algebra. It’s quite confusing.

To answer this question, we'll need some facts about Eisenstein integers that I won't prove in detail:<sup>2</sup>

- The Eisenstein integers form a **unique factorization domain**. This means that we can uniquely factor any Eisenstein integer into **irreducible elements**  $p_i$  and a **unit**  $u$ . The units are the Eisenstein integers that have a multiplicative inverse:  $\{\pm 1, \pm\omega, \pm\bar{\omega}\}$ . The irreducible elements are called **Eisenstein primes**: they cannot be broken down into a product of two non-units. For example,  $2 + \omega$  is an Eisenstein prime, but  $7 = (3 + \omega)(3 + \bar{\omega})$  is not.
- Every ordinary prime congruent to 2 modulo 3 is an Eisenstein prime.
- Every ordinary prime congruent to 1 modulo 3 can be factored into

$$(x + y\omega)(x + y\bar{\omega})$$

for *some* integers  $x$  and  $y$ .

Now we can get started counting them.

*Lemma* (xnor–Legendre). Let  $N$  be a positive integer. The number of Eisenstein integers with norm  $N$  is given by

$$R(N) := 6(d_1 - d_2),$$

where  $d_r$  is the number of divisors of  $N$  congruent to  $r \pmod 3$ .

Equivalently,  $N$  can be written in the form

$$X^2 - XY + Y^2,$$

for integers  $(X, Y)$ , in exactly  $R(N)$  different ways.

(The proof below is an adaptation of a proof, given in Chapter 36 of Joseph H. Silverman's *A Friendly Introduction to Number Theory*, of Legendre's "Sum of Two Squares Theorem", which states that  $N$  can be written as a sum of two squares in exactly

$$R(N) = 4(d_1 - d_3)$$

different ways, with  $d_r$  the number of divisors of  $N$  congruent to  $r \pmod 4$ .)

---

<sup>2</sup>Okay, I actually don't *know* how to prove these facts, either; I'm not a very skilled ring theorist. But I read them on Wikipedia so they *must* be true.

*Proof.* We begin by factoring  $N$  into a product of ordinary primes:

$$N = 3^t \underbrace{p_1^{e_1} p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_r^{e_r}}_{\text{primes } \equiv 1 \pmod{3}} \cdot \underbrace{q_1^{f_1} q_2^{f_2} \cdots q_s^{f_s}}_{\text{primes } \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}.$$

Then we factor  $N$  into a product of Eisenstein primes. The integer 3 factors as  $3 = (2 + \omega)(2 + \bar{\omega})$ . As stated earlier, each  $p_i$  factors as  $(x_i + y_i\omega)(x_i + y_i\bar{\omega})$ , and the  $q_i$  are Eisenstein primes themselves.

We now set

$$N = X^2 - XY + Y^2 = (X + Y\omega)(X + Y\bar{\omega}),$$

intending to count the solutions  $(X, Y)$ . Here,  $X + Y\omega$  and  $X + Y\bar{\omega}$  are composed of the prime factors of  $N$ , and each prime that appears in one of their factorizations *must* have its complex conjugation appearing in the other, as they are complex conjugates.<sup>3</sup>

If any of the  $f_i$  is odd, then there is no way at all to evenly distribute factors of  $q_i$  among  $X + Y\omega$  and its conjugation, so  $R(N) = 0$ . For the remainder of the proof, suppose that all of the  $f_i$  are even.

Every way to write  $N$  as  $X^2 - XY + Y^2$  corresponds to a possible value of  $X + Y\omega$ . So we will expand  $X + Y\omega$  into factors, and count how many choices we can make. It factors into a unit  $u \in \{\pm 1, \pm\omega, \pm\bar{\omega}\}$  and some primes  $\pi_i$  so that  $u(\prod \pi_i)\bar{u}(\prod \bar{\pi}_i) = N$ . We get something like this:

$$X + Y\omega = u(2 + \omega)^t \left( (x_1 + y_1\omega)^{z_1} (x_1 + y_1\bar{\omega})^{e_1 - z_1} \right) \cdots \\ \left( (x_r + y_r\omega)^{z_r} (x_r + y_r\bar{\omega})^{e_r - z_r} \right) q_1^{f_1/2} \cdots q_s^{f_s/2},$$

where  $u$  is a unit and the exponents  $z_i$  satisfy  $0 \leq z_i \leq e_i$ .

Counting all the ways to vary  $u$  and  $z_i$ , we find

$$\# \text{ possible values of } (X + Y\omega) = R(N) = 6(e_1 + 1) \cdots (e_r + 1).$$

So far we have shown:

$$R(N) = \begin{cases} 6(e_1 + 1) \cdots (e_r + 1) & \text{if } f_j \text{ all even,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

---

<sup>3</sup>If  $X + Y\omega = up_1 \cdots p_n$ , then  $\bar{u} \cdot \bar{p}_1 \cdots \bar{p}_n = \overline{up_1 \cdots p_n} = \overline{X + Y\omega} = X + Y\bar{\omega}$ , and factorizations are unique. So if  $p_i$  occurs in  $X + Y\omega$  then  $\bar{p}_i$  necessarily occurs in  $X + Y\bar{\omega}$ .

It remains to show that this equals  $6(d_1 - d_2)$ . Recall our factorization of  $N$  into primes:

$$N = 3^t \underbrace{p_1^{e_1} p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_r^{e_r}}_{\text{primes } \equiv 1 \pmod{3}} \cdot \underbrace{q_1^{f_1} q_2^{f_2} \cdots q_s^{f_s}}_{\text{primes } \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}.$$

We proceed by induction on  $s$ . If  $s = 0$ , then  $N = 3^t p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_r^{e_r}$  and every divisor  $d = p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_r^{e_r} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  of  $N$  is congruent to 1 modulo 3. By varying the exponents we can make this many choices:

$$d_1 - d_2 = d_1 - 0 = (e_1 + 1) \cdots (e_r + 1).$$

Now let  $N$  be divisible by  $q$  for some prime  $q \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , and assume that we have completed the proof for all numbers having fewer 2 modulo 3 prime divisors than  $N$ . Let  $q^f$  be the highest power of  $q$  dividing  $N$ , so  $N = q^f n$  with  $f \geq 1$  and  $q \nmid n$ .

If  $f$  is odd, the divisors of  $N$  that are  $\not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  are the numbers

$$q^i d, \quad \text{with } 0 \leq i \leq f, \text{ and } d \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3} \text{ dividing } n.$$

Thus each divisor  $d$  of  $n$  gives rise to exactly  $f + 1$  divisors of  $N$ , of which half are  $\equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and half are  $\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Thus  $d_1(N) - d_2(N) = 0$ .

If  $f$  is even, that very same logic applies to the divisors  $q^i d$  that have exponents  $0 \leq i \leq f - 1$ , so we are left to consider the divisors of  $N$  of the form  $q^f d$ . The exponent  $f$  is even, so that  $q^f \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and hence  $q^f d$  contributes to  $d_1$  if  $d \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and to  $d_2$  if  $d \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . In other words,

$$(d_1 \text{ for } N) - (d_2 \text{ for } N) = (d_1 \text{ for } n) - (d_2 \text{ for } n).$$

By the induction hypothesis, our proof is complete:

$$d_1 - d_2 = \begin{cases} (e_1 + 1) \cdots (e_r + 1) & \text{if } f_j \text{ all even,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} = R(N)/6.$$

□

This lemma gives us a formula we can use to answer the PPCG question: there is obviously one Eisenstein integer of norm 0, namely  $0 + 0\omega$  (the origin of the lattice), and for all  $k > 0$  there are  $R(k)$  Eisenstein integers of norm  $k$ . So we have to compute  $1 + \sum_{k=1}^{N^2} R(k)$ . It turns out that there is a very clever way to do this!

*Claim* (Rewriting the sum). The sum  $1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n^2} R(k)$  equals

$$1 + 6 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{n^2}{3i+1} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n^2}{3i+2} \right\rfloor \right). \quad (1)$$

The proof here follows an argument given in *Geometry and the Imagination* by David Hilbert and Stephan Cohn-Vossen, pp. 37–38. Again, that proof concerns the Gauss circle problem (on a square lattice), but we can easily adapt it to our triangular case.

*Proof.* We take a new perspective on the summation. Instead of iterating over all  $1 \leq k \leq n^2$  and counting divisors of each  $k$ , we can iterate over all possible divisors  $d$ , and count how many times  $d$  occurs as a divisor in *any* of the positive integers  $k$  up to  $n^2$ .

This is an easier question:  $d$  will occur as many times as there are multiples of it that do not exceed  $n^2$ , that is,  $\lfloor n^2/d \rfloor$  times. So we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n^2} d_1(k) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left\lfloor \frac{n^2}{3i+1} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n^2} d_2(k) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left\lfloor \frac{n^2}{3i+2} \right\rfloor$$

from which the formula follows. □

*Claim.* Equation (1) is computed by the Python 2.7 function

```
f=lambda n,a=1:n*n<a/3or n*n/a*6-f(n,a+a%3).
```

*Proof.* Note that instead of summing to  $\infty$ , we can sum until the result of the floor function will always be 0, which is when  $3i+1 > n^2$ . Thus, a relatively straightforward translation of (1) is:

```
f=lambda n,i=0:1 if 3*i>n*n else
n*n/(3*i+1)*6-n*n/(3*i+2)*6+f(n,i+1)
```

We use `or` to golf down the base case:

```
f=lambda n,i=0:3*i>n*n or
n*n/(3*i+1)*6-n*n/(3*i+2)*6+f(n,i+1)
```

Now, we apply a clever substitution: we can replace  $i=0$  by  $a=1$  then add  $a\%3$  to  $a$  every iteration to run through the values 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, ... Then we could add a constantly flipping “sign” value to get the alternating sum back:

```
f=lambda n,a=1,s=1:a>n*n or n*n/a*6*s+f(n,a+a%3,-s)
```

But an even shorter way to make the terms alternate is to “fold by -”:

```
f=lambda n,a=1:n*n<a/3or n*n/a*6-f(n,a+a%3)
```

The carefully chosen base case condition,  $n*n < a/3$ , will be met after an even amount of sign flips, as  $a/3$  (floor division) only changes every other term. This is crucial, as we want to make sure the base case will contribute 1 to the sum, not  $-1$ . (If you try replacing the base case by something like  $n*n < a$ , you get lots of off-by-two errors.)  $\square$