

# MAT417 Lecture Notes

ARKY!! :3C

'25 Fall Semester

## Contents

1	Day 1: Course Administrative Details and Preliminaries (Sep. 2, 2025)	2
2	Day 2: More accurate treatment of the Riemann-Zeta function (Sep. 4, 2025)	4
3	Day 3: Characters (Sep. 9, 2025)	8
4	Day 4: (Sep. 11, 2025)	10
5	Day 5: Density (Sep. 16, 2025)	13
6	Day 6: Quadratic Reciprocity (Sep. 18, 2025)	15
7	Day 7: Law of Quadratic Reciprocity (Sep. 23, 2025)	18
8	Day 8: (Sep. 25, 2025)	20
9	Day 9: Fourier Transform (Sep. 30, 2025)	23

## §1 Day 1: Course Administrative Details and Preliminaries (Sep. 2, 2025)

Course materials will be free and available online; here is a list of reference materials:

- Serre's *Course in Arithmetics* up to Chapter 4,
- Lecture notes by Noam Elkies (which will be posted on Quercus).

Homework will be posted every Thursday and due the following Thursday, and is worth **20%** of the course grade.

The central question of number theory is about the structure of prime numbers, of which the main analytic tools used are the Riemann  $\zeta$ -functions and its relatives (the  $L$ -functions). We may discuss things like modular forms, Hecke operators and  $L$ -functions related to Galois representation later on.

Let us consider the following two questions;

- (a) How many primes are there? There are infinitely many of them.
- (b) Can you say something about how the primes are distributed?

Given  $x > 0$ , where  $x$  may be a natural or a real, let us define

$$\pi(x) = \#\{p \text{ is prime} \mid p \leq x\}.$$

Can we estimate how  $\pi(x)$  grows? The prime number theorem states that the growth of  $\pi(x)$  is proportional to  $\frac{x}{\log x}$ , i.e.,

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi(x)}{x / \log x} = 1, \quad \frac{\pi(x)}{x} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

As an exercise, show that the prime number theorem informally says that the  $n$ th prime  $p_n$  is of the size  $n \log n$ .

**Theorem 1.1** (Dirichlet Theorem). Let  $a, d$  be coprime naturals where  $a < d$ . Consider all numbers of the form  $a + kd$ , where  $k$  is also a natural; infinitely many of these numbers are prime.

*Proof.* Done with  $L$ -functions. Check [here](#). □

**Theorem 1.2** (Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic). Any natural number  $N$  can be written uniquely as  $p_1^{a_1} \dots p_n^{a_n}$ , where  $p_i$  are primes and  $a_i > 0$ .

**Proposition 1.3** (Euclid's Argument on the Infinitude of Primes). Assume that  $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_n$  constitute all the primes. Then it is clear that  $p_1 \dots p_n + 1$  is coprime to any  $p_i$ . By the fundamental theorem of arithmetic, this means that  $p_1 \dots p_n + 1$  is divisible by a prime less than  $p_1 \dots p_n + 1$  not given by some  $p_i$ , which is a contradiction.

Can we use this to get an estimate on  $\pi(x)$ ? We claim that  $\pi(x) > \log_2 \log_2 x$ . Let  $p_n$  be the  $n$ th prime. Then

$$p_{n+1} < 1 + \prod_{i=1}^n p_i < \prod_{i=1}^n p_n.$$

If equality always held then we would have  $p_n = 2^{2^{n-1}}$ . However, in actuality,  $p_n < 2^{2^{n-1}}$ , so we must have that  $\pi(x) > \log_2 \log_2 x$ .

The Riemann-Zeta function is given by

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

**Claim 1.4.**  $\zeta$  is absolutely convergent for any  $s > 1$ .

*Proof.* Will be given next class. □

**Lemma 1.5.** For  $s > 1$ , we have that

$$\zeta(s) \leq \prod_{p \text{ is prime}} \frac{1}{1 - p^{-s}}.$$

*Proof.* This is given directly by geometric series, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{1 - p^{-s}} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} p^{-is} = \sum_{\substack{p_1 < \dots < p_n \\ a_1, \dots, a_n > 0}} p_1^{a_1} \dots p_n^{a_n}. \quad \square$$

Moreover, if we had finitely many primes, we could apply this to  $s = 1$  and obtain that the sum of  $\frac{1}{n}$  is convergent, which is clearly false. This also implies that the sum of the reciprocals of primes is divergent, and you can't have  $\pi(x)$  be bounded from above by  $Cx^D$ , where  $C > 0, D < 1$ .

## §2 Day 2: More accurate treatment of the Riemann-Zeta function (Sep. 4, 2025)

Note that I won't be here for the second hour of Thursday classes because I have complex analysis during that time. Isaac will be taking the full hour's worth of notes, though. *I lied I'm staying for this lecture*

Today's lesson agenda is as follows,

- (i) More accurate treatment of  $\zeta(s)$ ;
- (ii) Prove that  $\sum_{p \text{ is prime}} \frac{1}{p}$  is divergent (per Euler),
- (iii) Start doing preaportory material for the Dirichlet theorem, and introduce the Dirichlet  $L$ -functions.

**Lemma 2.1.** The Riemann-Zeta function is convergent for  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $s > 1$ ; it is absolutely convergent for  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\Re s > 1$ .

We will later prove that for  $\Re s > 1$ ,  $\zeta(s)$  is a holomorphic function. Let's start by comparing  $\sum \frac{1}{n^s}$  to  $\int_1^\infty x^{-s} dx$ ; observe that

$$\int_1^a x^{-s} dx = \left. \frac{x^{1-s}}{1-s} \right|_1^a = \frac{a^{1-s}}{1-s} - \frac{1}{1-s},$$

of which  $a^{1-s}$  approaches 0 as  $a \rightarrow \infty$ . Thus, we have that

$$\int_1^\infty x^{-s} dx = \frac{1}{s-1}.$$

We also have that

$$\sum_{n=2}^\infty n^{-s} \leq \int_1^\infty x^{-s} dx = \frac{1}{s-1},$$

and

$$\sum_{n=2}^N n^{-s} \leq \int_1^N x^{-s} dx,$$

which yields convergence. Thus, we have that inequality that  $\zeta(s) \leq 1 + \frac{1}{s-1}$ .

**Exercise 2.2.** Run a very similar argument and prove that  $\zeta(s) > \frac{1}{s-1}$ . In particular,

$$\frac{1}{s-1} < \zeta(s) < 1 + \frac{1}{s-1}.$$

In particular, the Riemann-Zeta function can also be written in the *Euler product* form, given by

$$\zeta(s) = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} \left( \frac{1}{1-p^{-s}} \right).$$

Taking the log of both sides, we get that

$$\log \zeta(s) = - \sum_p \log(1-p^{-s}).$$

From here on, we simply write a subscript of  $p$  on summations or products to indicate that they're prime (unless stated otherwise). Clearly, the above is divergent for  $s = 1$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** (i) For all  $s_0 > 1$ , there exists some constant  $M > 0$  such that

$$\log \left| \sum_p p^{-s} - \log \frac{1}{s-1} \right| < M \text{ for all } 1 < s \leq s_0.$$

(ii) The sum of  $\frac{1}{p}$  over all primes diverge.

*Proof.* We may rewrite the equation in the first line as follows,

$$\sum_p p^{-s} = \log \frac{1}{s-1} + O(1) \text{ as } s \rightarrow 1,$$

where we may note  $O(1)$  is some bounded function. Recall the following,

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $f, g$  be functions on some space  $X$ , where  $g \geq 0$ . We say that  $f = O(g)$  if  $|f| \leq Mg$ , where  $M$  is some constant.

In this manner, saying  $f = O(1)$  is equivalent to saying that  $|f|$  is bounded. Now, let us take the log of the entire following inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{s-1} &< \zeta(s) < 1 + \frac{1}{s-1} = \frac{s}{s-1}, \\ \log \left( \frac{1}{s-1} \right) &< - \sum_p \log(1 - p^{-s}) < \log \left( \frac{s}{s-1} \right), \\ 0 &< - \left( \log(s-1) + \sum_p \log(1 - p^{-s}) \right) < \log s \end{aligned} \quad (*)$$

where the Taylor expansion of  $|\log(1 - p^{-s}) - p^{-s}|$  is less than  $p^{-2s}$ .

**Exercise 2.5.** Check that  $|\log(1 - y) - y| < y^2$  for  $0 < y < 1$  for  $y \in \mathbb{R}$ . This is done by expanding  $\log(1 + x)$  around  $x = 0$ .

Specifically, summing over all  $p$  and applying the triangle inequality, the above tells us that

$$\left| \sum_p (p^{-s} + \log(1 - p^{-s})) \right| < \sum_p p^{-2s} < \zeta(2).$$

Using both inequalities together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_p p^{-s} - \log \frac{1}{s-1} \right| \\ &= \left| \left( \sum_p p^{-s} + \sum_p \log(1 - p^{-s}) \right) - \left( \log \frac{1}{s-1} + \sum_p \log(1 - p^{-s}) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \zeta(2) + \log s \leq \zeta(2) + s_0 - 1, \end{aligned}$$

if  $1 < s \leq s_0$ . Indeed, this shows that  $M = s_0 - 1 + \zeta(2)$  for (i). The second part of the lemma is also left as homework.  $\square$

We now discuss Dirichlet series and Dirichlet  $L$ -functions. Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$  be the invertible elements in the ring  $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ . Specifically, these are the residues modulo  $m$  which are prime to  $m$ . This forms an abelian group under multiplication, of which its size is given by the totient  $\varphi(m)$ .

**Exercise 2.6.** If  $m$  is prime, then  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$  is the cyclic group of order  $m - 1$ .

Fix a character  $\chi : (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ , where  $\mathbb{C}^*$  are the nonzero complex numbers. Extend  $\chi$  as a map  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\chi(n)\chi(m) = \chi(nm)$  as follows,

$$\chi(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \gcd(n, m) \neq 1, \\ \chi(n \bmod m) & \text{if } \gcd(n, m) = 1. \end{cases}$$

As an example, let  $m = 3$ , and consider  $(\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})^* = \{\pm 1\}$ . Then

$$\chi(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 3 \mid n, \\ 1 & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod{3}, \\ -1 & \text{if } n \equiv -1 \pmod{3}. \end{cases}$$

For all  $m$ , we have the trivial homomorphism  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ . Let  $\chi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be the function

$$\chi(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \gcd(n, m) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \gcd(n, m) \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

Then we may define the  $L$ -function

$$L(\chi, s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\chi(n)}{n^s} = \prod_p \left( \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s}} \right).$$

**Claim 2.7.**  $L(\chi, x)$  is absolutely convergent for  $\Re s > 1$ .

**Theorem 2.8.** (i)  $L(\chi, s)$  is holomorphic for  $\Re s > 1$ . (ii) Assume the extension of  $\chi$  is not equal to 1. Then  $L(\chi, s)$  converges for  $\Re s > 0$  and defines a holomorphic function there. (iii) If the extension of  $\chi$  is not equal to 1, then  $L(\chi, 1) \neq 0$ .

Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group. Consider all characters  $\chi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ ; they form a group  $G^\vee$  under multiplication.

**Claim 2.9.** (i)  $G^\vee$  is (non-canonically) isomorphic to  $G$ , and  $\#G^\vee = \#G$ . (ii)  $(G^\vee)^\vee \cong G$  canonically.

*Proof.* The claim lets us say that if  $G$  is finite and abelian, then  $G$  is isomorphic to a product of finite cyclic groups

$$G \cong \prod_{i=1}^k (\mathbb{Z}/a_i\mathbb{Z}), \quad a_i > 1.$$

Using the fact that  $(G \times H)^\vee \cong G^\vee \times H^\vee$ , we see that specifying  $\chi : G \times H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$  is equivalent to specifying characters  $\chi_1, \chi_2$  on  $G$  and  $H$  respectively. Letting  $a > 1$ , we have that if  $\chi : \mathbb{Z}/a\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$  and  $g^a = 1$ , we have that  $\chi(g) \in \mathbb{C}^*$  and  $\chi(g)^a = 1$ . This means that  $\chi(g)$  must be an  $a$ th root of unity. All the roots of 1 of order  $a$  form a cyclic group of order  $a$ .

For the second part of the claim, in the direction of  $G \rightarrow (G^\vee)^\vee$ , we have that for each  $g \in G$ , we obtain a canonical map  $G^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$  where all  $x \in G^\vee \mapsto \chi(g)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.10.** This map is an isomorphism.

**Lemma 2.11.** (i) All  $\chi \in G^\vee$  form a basis of  $\mathbb{C}(G)$ , the complex valued functions on  $G$ .  
(ii) This basis is orthonormal with respect to  $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_g f_1(g) \bar{f}_2(g)$ .

*Proof.* We know that  $\dim \mathbb{C}(G) = \#G = \#G^\vee$ . Recall that we have

$$\langle \chi, \chi \rangle = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_g \chi(g) \bar{\chi}(g) = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_g \chi(g) \chi_g^{-1} = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_g \chi(gg^{-1}) = 1,$$

since  $\chi(1) = 1$ . Now, let us evaluate  $\#G \langle \chi, 1 \rangle = \sum_g \chi(g)$ . We have that since  $\chi$  is not uniformly 1, there must exist some  $h \in G$  such that  $\chi(h) \neq 1$ ; and so

$$\chi(h) \sum_g \chi(g) = \sum_g \chi(hg) = \sum_g \chi(g),$$

meaning  $\sum_g \chi(g) = 0$ , as  $\chi(h)$  is nonzero as well. Thus, we obtain that

$$\#G \langle \chi_1, \chi_2 \rangle = \sum_g \chi_1(g) \bar{\chi}_2(g) = \sum_g \chi_1(g) \chi_2^{-1}(g),$$

meaning that  $\#G = \langle \chi_1 \chi_2^{-1}, 1 \rangle$ . If  $\chi_1 \chi_2^{-1} \neq 1$  (i.e., if  $\chi_1 \neq \chi_2$ ), then this is 0.  $\square$

Let  $x_n$  be a sequence of elements of  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  such that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = \infty$ . The main example we will be looking at is  $\lambda_n = \log n$  (or  $\lambda_n = n$ ), and the Dirichlet series  $\sum_n a_n e^{-\lambda_n z}$  where  $a_n \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Next lecture, we will do some general analysis of convergence and analytic properties of such series. We will apply this to  $L(\chi, s)$ .

### §3 Day 3: Characters (Sep. 9, 2025)

Recall that given  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq n}$ , we have  $\chi : (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$  and  $\tilde{\chi} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  satisfies

$$\tilde{\chi}(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & n \text{ is not prime to } m, \\ \chi(n, \text{mod } m) & \text{if } \gcd(n, m) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Also, we ask that  $|\chi(n)| \leq 1$  for all  $n$  (so the magnetude does not spiral off to infinity). Recall that the  $L$ -function is defined as

$$L(\chi, s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\chi(n)}{n^s},$$

which converges absolutely for  $\Re s > 1$ . Then we have the following theorem,

**Theorem 3.1.**  $L(\chi, s)$  is holomorphic in  $s$  for  $\Re s \geq 1$ , and it extends meromorphically to  $\Re s > 0$ . If  $\chi \neq 1$ , then  $L(\chi, s)$  is holomorphic for  $\Re s > 0$  and the series  $\sum \frac{\chi(n)}{n^s}$  is convergent for  $\Re s > 0$ . Moreover, if  $\chi = 1$ , then  $L(\chi, s)$  has a simple pole at  $s = 1$  and has no other poles.

In fact,  $L(\chi, s)$  is meromorphic for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ .

**Theorem 3.2.** If  $\chi \neq 1$ , then  $L(\chi, 1) \neq 0$ .

We plan to prove theorem 3.1, then, assuming theorem 3.2, we will deduce the Dirichlet theorem about primes in an arithmetic progression. We will follow Serre's book [here](#) (section 2.2, Dirichlet series).

Let  $x_n$  be a sequecne of positive real numbers tending to infinity, i.e.,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n = \infty$ . A *Dirichlet series* is a series, where, given  $\{a_n\}$  a sequence of complex numbers, we write

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{-\lambda_n z}, \quad (a_n \in \mathbb{C}, z \in \mathbb{C}).$$

Two such examples of Dirichlet series are given by setting  $\lambda_n = \log n$  (the ordinary Dirichlet series), where such a series is written  $\sum \frac{a_n}{n^s}$ , and  $\lambda_n = n$  where by setting  $t = e^{-z}$ , the series turns into a power series in  $t$  as follows,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e^{-nz} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t^n.$$

**Theorem 3.3.** Assume that  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n e^{-\lambda_n z}$  is convergent for  $z = z_0$ . Then it is convergent uniformly on every set of the form  $\Re(z - z_0) \geq 0$ , where  $\arg(z - z_0) \leq \alpha$  with  $\alpha < \frac{\pi}{2}$ .

**Exercise 3.4.** Analyze what this means for  $\lambda_n = n$  and realize that you know this statement.

**Lemma 3.5.** Suppose  $\{f_n(z)\}$  is a sequence of holomorphic functions on some domain  $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ . Assume there exists  $f(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n(z)$  for all  $z \in U$  such that the convergence is uniform on every compact subset of  $U$ . Then  $f(z)$  is holomorphic, and moreover,  $f'(z) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f'_n(z)$ .

In particular, if we let  $U = \{z \mid \Re(z) > \Re(z_0)\}$ , then every compact set can be covered by finitely many sectors, meaning there exists a uniform convergence no every compact set.



**Corollary 3.6.** Let  $L(\chi, s)$  be holomorphic for  $\Re s > 1$ .

The following lemma is necessary to study series with summands of the form  $a_n b_n$ .

**Lemma 3.7** (Abel's lemma). Let  $A_{m,p} = \sum_{n=m}^p a_n$  and let  $B_{m,m'} = \sum_{n=m}^{m'} a_n b_n$ . Then we have

$$S_{m,m'} = \sum_{n=m}^{m'-1} A_{m,n}(b_n - b_{n+1}) + A_{m,m'} b_{m'}.$$

**Lemma 3.8.** Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ , and let  $0 < \alpha < \beta$ . Then  $z = x + iy$  with  $x > 0$ ; then

$$\left| e^{-\alpha z} - e^{-\beta z} \right| \leq \left| \frac{z}{x} \right| (e^{-\alpha x} - e^{-\beta x}).$$

For  $z = z_0$ ,  $f(z_0)$  converges and  $\sum a_n$  converges, meaning that for all  $\varepsilon$ , there exists  $N$  such that for all  $m, m' \geq N$ , we have that  $|A_{m,m'}| < \varepsilon$ . Applying the lemma with  $b_n = e^{-\lambda_n z}$ , we have that

$$S_{m,m'} = \sum_{n=m}^{m'-1} A_{m,n}(e^{-\lambda_n z} - e^{-\lambda_{n+1} z}) + A_{m,m'} e^{-\lambda_{m'} z},$$

and putting  $z = x + iy$  and applying lemma 3.8, we have that

$$|S_{m,m'}| \leq \varepsilon \left( 1 + \frac{|z|}{x} \sum_{n=m}^{m'-1} (e^{-\lambda_n x} - e^{-\lambda_{n+1} x}) \right) \leq \varepsilon (1 + k(e^{-\lambda_m x} - e^{-\lambda_{m'} x})) \leq \varepsilon (1 + k),$$

and so uniform convergence is clear. Note that I am not entirely confident about this argument, so re-check the proof of proposition 6 in Serre's book if confused.

## §4 Day 4: (Sep. 11, 2025)

Last time, we proved that  $L(\chi, s)$  are holomorphic for  $\Re s > 1$ , up to some lemma; next, we are going to show that all  $L(s, \chi)$  are in fact, meromorphic, for  $\Re s > 0$ .

1. (Page 71, Prop. 11) If  $\chi = 1$ , then  $\zeta(s)$  is meromorphic for  $\Re s > 0$  and has a unique simple pole for  $s = 1$ .
2. (Prop. 12) If  $\chi \neq 1$ , then  $L(s, \chi)$  is holomorphic for  $\Re s > 0$ .

Later today, we will show that (prop. 13)

$$\zeta_m(s) = \prod_{\chi} L(s, \chi) \iff \forall x, x \neq 1, L(1, \chi) \neq 0.$$

We note that  $\zeta_m$  has a simple pole at  $s = 1$ . We also have the unproved lemma from last time, where if  $0 < \alpha < \beta$ , then for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $\Re z > 0$ , written  $z = x + iy$ , we have that

$$\left| e^{-\alpha z} - e^{-\beta z} \right| \leq \frac{|z|}{x} \left( e^{-\alpha x} - e^{-\beta x} \right).$$

This is true by writing

$$z \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} e^{-tz} dt = e^{-\alpha z} - e^{-\beta z} \implies \left| e^{-\alpha z} - e^{-\beta z} \right| \leq |z| \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} e^{-tx} dt = \frac{|z|}{x} \left( e^{-\alpha x} - e^{-\beta x} \right).$$

We now discuss proposition 10. In the case  $\chi = 1$ , we claim the following,

**Claim 4.1** (Prop. 10).  $\zeta(s) = \frac{1}{s-1} + \varphi(s)$ , where  $\varphi(s)$  is holomorphic in  $\Re s > 0$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\frac{1}{s-1} = \int_1^{\infty} t^{-s} dt = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_n^{n+1} t^{-s} dt,$$

meaning we may write

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{1}{s-1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_n^{n+1} (n^{-s} - t^{-s}) dt.$$

With this, we may construct a sequence of  $\varphi_n$ ,

$$\varphi_n(s) = \int_n^{n+1} (n^{-s} - t^{-s}) dt, \quad \varphi(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \varphi_n(s),$$

where each  $\varphi_n(s)$  is holomorphic for  $\Re s > 0$ . Since each  $\varphi_n(s)$  holds this property, it suffices to check that the series converges normally, of which we have that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|\varphi_n\|$  converges, where  $\|\varphi_n\| = \sup_{s \in S} |\varphi_n(s)|$ . We claim that normal convergence implies uniform absolute convergence, i.e., for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the series of  $\varphi_n(s)$  is normally convergent in  $\Re s \geq \varepsilon$ .

*Subproof.* To start, let us make the naive bound

$$\|\varphi_n(s)\| \leq \sup_{n \leq t \leq n+1} |n^{-s} - t^{-s}| \leq \sup_{n \leq t \leq n+1} \left| \frac{dt^{-s}}{dt} \right|,$$

which we have from the lemma that if  $f$  is a continuously differentiable function, we have that

$$|f(a) - f(b)| \leq \sup_{a \leq x \leq b} |f'(x)| (b - a).$$

In this manner, we also have that

$$\sup_{n \leq t \leq n+1} \left| \frac{dt^{-s}}{dt} \right| = \sup_{n \leq t \leq n+1} \left| \frac{s}{t^{s+1}} \right| = \frac{|s|}{n^{s+1}},$$

where we have that on  $\Re s \geq \varepsilon$ ,  $\sum_n \frac{|s|}{n^{s+1}}$  is convergent. ■

**Claim 4.2.**  $L(s, \chi)$  converges for  $\Re s > 0$ .

By what we did last time, this implies that  $L(s, \chi)$  is holomorphic in  $\Re s > 0$ . □

**Conjecture 4.3** (Riemann Hypothesis). For  $\Re s > 0$ , the only zeros of  $\zeta(s)$  have  $\Re = \frac{1}{2}$ .

We will discuss the motivations and applications for this later. We start by considering the section post-proposition 12,

**Lemma 4.4** (Proposition 9). Suppose we have a series  $\sum a_n n^{-s}$ . Assume that all partial sums of  $\{a_n\}$  are bounded; if all  $A_{m,m'}$ , given by

$$A_{k,k'} = \sum_{n=k}^{k'} a_n,$$

are bounded, then  $\sum a_n n^{-s}$  is convergent for  $\Re s > 0$ .

Consider the function,

$$\tilde{\chi}(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \gcd(n, m) \neq 1, \\ \chi(n \bmod m) & \gcd(n, m) = 1; \end{cases}$$

if we let  $a_n = \tilde{\chi}_n$ , then for all  $k$ , we have that

$$\sum_{n=k}^{k+m-1} \tilde{\chi}(n) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Assume all  $|A_{k,k'}| \leq K$ ; by applying Abel's lemma, we have that

$$|S_{k,k'}| = \left| \sum_{n=k}^{k'} a_n \underbrace{n^{-s}}_{b_n} \right| \leq K \left( \sum_{n=k}^{k'} \left| \frac{1}{n^s} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^s} \right| + \left| \frac{1}{(k')^s} \right| \right).$$

If  $\Re s > 0$ , then the right hand side is simply equal to  $\frac{K}{k^s}$ , and for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $N$  such that if  $k \geq N$ , then the  $\frac{K}{k^s} \leq \varepsilon$ . □

So far, we've proven that

- (i) For all  $\chi$ ,  $L(s, \chi)$  is meromorphic for  $\Re s > 0$ .

(ii) If  $x = 1$ , there is a unique simple pole at  $s = 1$ .

(iii) If  $x \neq 1$ , there are no poles.

Finally, we need that  $L(1, \chi) \neq 0$  if  $\chi \neq 1$  (p.73, thm. 1). Define

$$\zeta_m(s) = \prod_x L(s, \chi),$$

which we already know to be meromorphic for  $\Re s > 0$ . We want to show that  $\zeta_m(s)$  has a unique simple pole at  $s = 1$ . As a quick digression, consider  $\mathbb{Q} \subset K \subset \mathbb{C}$ , where  $K$  is a finite extension of  $\mathbb{Q}$  (equivalently,  $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(K) < \infty$ ). There exists a notion that  $\zeta_K(s)$ , which is a  $\zeta$  function of a number field  $K$ . All of those have analytic properties similar to  $\zeta(s)$ . We have that  $\zeta(s) = \zeta_{\mathbb{Q}}(s)$  has a unique simple pole at  $s = 1$ ; if we fix  $m \geq 1$ , then the cyclotomic field of order  $m$ ,  $K_m$ , is given by  $K_m = \mathbb{Q}(\mu_m) = K(e^{2\pi i \frac{1}{m}})$ , where  $\mu_m$  are the roots of 1 of order  $m$ . Secretly, we have that  $\zeta_m(s) = \zeta_{K_m}(s)$ .

We write out the explicit Dirichlet series for  $\zeta_m(s)$ . Let  $p$  be a prime that does not divide into  $m$ , i.e.,  $\bar{p} = (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^* = G(m)$ . Let  $f(p)$  be the order of  $\bar{p}$  in  $G(m)$ , and let  $g(p) = \frac{f(m)}{f(p)}$ , which is the order of  $G(m)$  quotiented by the subgroup generated by  $\bar{p}$ .

**Claim 4.5** (Proposition 13). We have that

$$\zeta_m(s) = \prod_{p \nmid m} \left( \frac{1}{1 - p^{-f(p)s}} \right)^{g(p)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a variable. Fix  $p$  where  $p \nmid m$ ; then we have

$$\prod_{\chi} (1 - \chi(\bar{p})T) = (1 - T^{f(p)})^{g(p)},$$

which follows from

$$\prod_w (1 - wT) = 1 - T^{f(p)},$$

and the product is taken over all  $w$  where  $w^{f(p)} = 1$ , i.e., the  $f(p)$ -th roots of unity (we note that  $f(p)$  can be any element of  $\mathbb{N}$ ). For all such  $w$ , there exist  $g(p)$  characters  $\chi$  such that  $\chi(\bar{p}) = w$ , which implies our result. To see why this is true, let  $A$  be a finite abelian group,  $B \subset A$  a subgroup, and let  $\chi_B : B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ . Then there exists exactly  $\#(A/B)$  extensions of  $\chi_B$  to  $A$ .

In our case, let  $A = (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$ ,  $B$  be the subgroup generated by  $\bar{p}$ , and fix  $w$  such that  $w^{f(p)} = 1$ . There exists a unique character  $\chi_B$  of  $B$  such that  $\chi_B(\bar{p}) = w$ . An extension to  $A$  is a character  $\chi : (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$  such that  $\chi(\bar{p}) = w$ , and so

$$g(p) = \# \frac{(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*}{B},$$

meaning that for all  $w$  with  $w^{f(p)} = 1$ , there exist  $g(p)$  characters  $\chi$  such that  $\chi(\bar{p}) = w$ . Consider the chain

$$0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow A \rightarrow A/B \rightarrow 0.$$

If we let  $\widehat{\phantom{x}}$  denote the dual groups,

$$0 \rightarrow \widehat{A/B} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \widehat{A} \xrightarrow{\beta} \widehat{B} \rightarrow 0,$$

then we claim that  $\widehat{A/B} \rightarrow \widehat{A}$  is injective, and  $\ker \beta = \text{im } \alpha$ , which is obvious; since  $\#A = \#\widehat{A}$ , we have that  $\widehat{A} \xrightarrow{\beta} \widehat{B}$  is onto, and we are done.  $\square$

## §5 Day 5: Density (Sep. 16, 2025)

Recall that last time, we discussed that given  $m > 0$ , we have that

$$\zeta_m(s) = \prod L(\chi, s) = \prod_{p \nmid m} \left(1 - p^{-f(p)}\right)^{-g(p)},$$

where the first product is taken over all characters of  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$ . We have that  $f(p)$  denotes the order of  $\bar{p}$ , the image of  $p$ , in  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$ , and  $g(n)$  the number of quotients of  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})$  by the span generated by  $\bar{p}$ .

**Theorem 5.1.**  $\zeta_m(s)$  has a pole of order 1 at  $s = 1$ .

**Corollary 5.2.**  $L(\chi, 1) \neq 0$  for all nontrivial characters.

Today, we will use this for the Dirichlet theorem; we will give a more precise formulation of the Dirichlet theorem, and define the notion of density of some set  $A \subset \underline{P}$ , where  $\underline{P}$  is the set of all primes.

**Lemma 5.3** (4.1). Given  $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ , we have that  $\sum_p p^{-s} \sim -\log(s-1)$  as  $s \rightarrow 1$ , i.e., the ratio approaches 1 as  $s \rightarrow 1$ .

Specifically, we have

$$\sum_p p^{-s} = -\log(s-1) + O(1).$$

Using the fact that  $\zeta(s)$  has a pole of order 1 at  $s = 1$ , we have that, for  $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ ,

$$\log \zeta(s) = \sum_{p \in \underline{P}} -\log(1 - p^{-s}) = \sum_{p, k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k p^{ks}} - \frac{1}{p^{ks}} \leq \frac{1}{p^s(p^s - 1)}.$$

It is sufficient to show that  $\sum \frac{1}{k p^{ks}}$  remains bounded when  $s > 1$ , which we readily see from

$$\sum_{p, k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k p^{ks}} \leq \sum_p \frac{1}{p^s(p^s - 1)} \leq \sum_p \frac{1}{p(p-1)} \leq \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n(n-1)} = 1.$$

If  $A \subset \underline{P}$ , we say that  $A$  has *density*  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  if

$$\lim_{\substack{s \rightarrow 1 \\ s > 1}} \frac{\left(\sum_{p \in A} \frac{1}{p^s}\right)}{-\log(s-1)} = k;$$

clearly,  $0 \leq k \leq 1$ . We remark that if  $k > 0$ , then  $A$  is an infinite set (all finite  $A$  has density zero).

**Remark 5.4.** Let  $P \subset \mathbb{N}$  be any infinite subset, and let  $A \subset \underline{P}$ . The natural density is defined as

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{i \in A \mid i \leq n\}}{\#\{i \in \underline{P} \mid i \leq n\}},$$

of which we note this is a stronger notion, since if  $A \subset \underline{P}$  has natural density  $k$ , then it has density  $k$ , but the opposite direction is not necessarily true.

**Theorem 5.5.** Let  $m > 0$ ,  $\gcd(a, m) = 1$ . The set  $\underline{P}_a$  of all primes which are congruent to  $a \bmod m$  has density  $\frac{1}{\varphi(m)}$ .

We note that the above is also true for natural density. To prove the theorem, we'll need to know that  $L(\chi, 1) \neq 0$  for  $\chi \neq 1$ . Assuming this is true, we will give the proof as follows; define  $f_\chi$ ,

$$f_\chi(s) = \sum_{p \nmid m} \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s},$$

where  $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$  for  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  with real part greater than 1. To start, observe that  $f(1) \sim -\log(s-1)$  as  $s \rightarrow 1$ ; this differs from  $\sum_{p \in \underline{P}} p^{-s}$  by finitely many terms. For  $\chi \neq 1$ , we have that  $f_\chi$  is bounded where  $s > 1$ ; let  $g_a(s) = \sum_{p \in P_a} p^{-s}$ , and let us claim that

$$g_a(s) = \frac{1}{\varphi(m)} \sum_{\chi} \chi(a)^{-1} f_\chi(s).$$

This yields that  $f_\chi(s) \sim -\log(s-1)$ , where, if  $\chi = 1$  and bounded if  $\chi \neq 1$ , then we have that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{f_\chi(s)}{-\log(s-1)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \chi \neq 1, \\ 1 & \chi = 1. \end{cases} \implies \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{g_a(s)}{-\log(s-1)} = \frac{1}{\varphi(m)}.$$

To fill in the gaps in the above proof outline, observe that

$$\sum_{\chi} \chi(a)^{-1} f_\chi = \sum_{\chi, p \nmid m} \frac{\chi(a)^{-1} \chi(p)}{p^s}, \quad \sum_{\chi} \chi(a^{-1}p) = \begin{cases} \varphi(m) & \text{if } a^{-1}p \equiv 1 \pmod{m}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

More generally, for  $G$ -finite abelian groups, we have that

$$\sum_{x \in \widehat{G}} \chi(x) = \begin{cases} \#G & x = 1, \\ 0 & x \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

Moreover,  $f_\chi(s) = \sum_{p \nmid m} \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s}$  remains bounded as  $s \rightarrow 1$ , and for  $\log L(\chi, s)$ , we have that

$$\log \prod_{p \nmid m} (1 - \chi(p)p^{-s})^{-1} = \sum_{p \nmid m} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\chi(p)^k}{k p^{ks}} = f_\chi(s) \underbrace{\sum_{p, k \geq 2} \frac{\chi(p)^k}{k p^{ks}}}_{=: B(s)}.$$

In this way,

$$|B(s)| = \sum_{p, k \geq 2} \frac{1}{k p^{ks}},$$

which is bounded above as  $s \rightarrow 1$ , so  $B(s)$  itself is bounded.

## §6 Day 6: Quadratic Reciprocity (Sep. 18, 2025)

Our plan for today is to finish the proof that  $L(\chi, 1) \neq 0$  for all  $\chi \neq 1$ , and find an example of explicit number theoretic applications. This example will require the law of quadratic reciprocity, which we will discuss (in chapter 1 of Serre's book).

Let  $\zeta_m(s) = \prod L(\chi, s)$ , taken over the characters of  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$ . We want to show that  $\zeta_m$  has a pole at  $s = 1$ .

$$\zeta_m(s) = \prod_{p \nmid m} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^{-f(p)s}} \right)^{-g(p)},$$

where  $f(p)$  is the order of  $\bar{p}$ , i.e., the image of  $p$  in  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$ , and  $g(p) = \frac{\#\varphi(m)}{f(p)}$ . With this, we see that  $\zeta_m(s)$  further equals

$$\prod_{p \nmid m} \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p^{-kf(p)s} \right)^{g(p)}.$$

If we expand  $\prod_{p \nmid m}$ , we get  $\sum a_n n^{-s}$ , where  $a_n \geq 0$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** Let  $f = \sum a_n e^{-\lambda_n z}$  be a Dirichlet series such that  $a_n \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\{\lambda_n\}$  is an increasing sequence of real numbers with  $\lambda_n \rightarrow +\infty$ , there exists  $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f(z)$  is convergent for  $\Re z > \rho$ , and assume that  $f$  analytically continues to a neighborhood of  $\rho$ . Then there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $f(z)$  is convergent for  $\Re z > \rho - \varepsilon$ .

A similar statement states that if  $f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (z - \alpha)^n$  converges absolutely for  $|z - \alpha| < r$  and extends analytically to  $|z - \alpha| < R$ , then  $\sum a_n (z - \alpha)^n$  converges absolutely for  $|z - \alpha| < R$ .

We will not prove our lemma here; said lemma implies that if  $\zeta_m(s)$  has no pole at  $s = 1$ , then its Dirichlet series is convergent for  $\Re s > 0$ . If

$$\zeta_m(s) = \prod_{p \nmid m} \left( 1 + p^{-f(p)s} + p^{-2f(p)s} + \dots \right)$$

is convergent for  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ , then

$$\prod_{p \nmid m} \left( 1 + p^{-\varphi(m)s} + p^{-2\varphi(m)s} + \dots \right)$$

is convergent, meaning that the above is equal to  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-\varphi(m)s}$ , which we know is divergent for  $s = \frac{1}{\varphi(m)}$ , yielding a contradiction. This concludes our work with this section of Serre's textbook.

We now move onto quadratic reciprocity (chapter 1 in Serre).

**Claim 6.2.** Let  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ . If the equation  $x^2 = a$  has a solution mod  $p$  (i.e., in  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ ) for almost all  $p$  (all but finitely many), then  $a$  is a square ( $x^2 = a$  has a solution in  $\mathbb{Z}$ ).

**Definition 6.3** (Legendre Symbol). Let  $p$  be prime,  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and write

$$\left( \frac{a}{p} \right) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } p \mid a, \\ 1 & \text{if } p \nmid a \text{ and } a \text{ is a square mod } p, \\ -1 & \text{if } p \nmid a \text{ and } a \text{ is not a square mod } p. \end{cases}$$

In particular, for fixed  $p$ , we have that  $\left( \frac{a}{p} \right) \left( \frac{b}{p} \right) = \left( \frac{ab}{p} \right)$ .

**Proposition 6.4.** Let  $a \neq 0$  be a squarefree integer. Let  $m = 4|a|$ . Then there exists a unique character  $\chi_a$  of  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$  such that  $\chi_a(p) = \left(\frac{a}{p}\right)$  for all  $p \nmid m$ . We have that  $\chi_a^2 = 1$ .

This proposition requires quadratic reciprocity.

**Corollary 6.5.** Let  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  not be a square. Then the set of all  $p$  such that  $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = 1$  has density  $\frac{1}{2}$  (Dirichlet density).

The corollary follows from the proposition and the Dirichlet theorem. We can assume that  $a$  is square by taking  $m = 4|a|$ . Let  $H \subset (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$  be the kernel of  $\chi_a$ , and let  $p \nmid m$ ; let  $\bar{p} \in (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$ . Then  $\chi_a(p) = 1$  if and only if  $p \in H$ . We have that

$$|H| = \frac{\varphi(m)}{2} = \frac{\#(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*}{2}.$$

For all  $x \in (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$ , the density of primes  $p$  such that  $\bar{p} = x$  is  $\frac{1}{\varphi(m)}$ , which implies that the density of  $p$  such that  $\bar{p} \in H$  is exactly  $\frac{1}{2}$ . In the claim, the density of  $p$  such that  $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = 1$  is assumed to be 1, we have that  $a$  has to be a square.

Quadratic reciprocity compares  $\left(\frac{p}{q}\right)$  with  $\left(\frac{q}{p}\right)$  where  $p, q$  are primes. Let  $n$  be an odd integer. Then define  $\varepsilon(n) = \pm 1$ , given by  $\frac{n-1}{2} \bmod 2$ .

**Theorem 6.6** (Quadratic Reciprocity). Using  $\varepsilon$  as defined above, we have that

$$\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) \left(\frac{q}{p}\right) = (-1)^{\varepsilon(p)\varepsilon(q)} = (-1)^{\frac{p-1}{2} \frac{q-1}{2}}.$$

The law of quadratic reciprocity is a special case of a much more general series of reciprocity laws in class field theory (this is a baby case of Langlands identity).

Let  $p$  be a prime, and consider  $\mathbb{F}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  (this is a field).

**Lemma 6.7.**  $\mathbb{F}_p^* = (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$  is a cyclic group of order  $p-1$ .

**Corollary 6.8.** If  $p \nmid a$  and  $p \neq 2$ , then  $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = a^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \bmod p$ .

We see this from  $a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \bmod p$ , so  $a^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv \pm 1 \bmod p$ , which is given by the Legendre symbol  $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right)$ . If we write  $\bar{a} = \bar{b}^2$ , then  $\bar{a}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} = \bar{b}^{p-1} = 1$  in  $\mathbb{F}_p^*$ .

**Exercise 6.9.** If we know that  $\mathbb{F}_p^*$  is cyclic, then the converse of this is true.

**Lemma 6.10.** Let  $G$  be a cyclic group of order  $2n$ .  $g \in G$  is a square if and only if  $g^n = 1$ .

Let  $K$  be any field. Then either  $n \cdot 1_K \neq 0$  for all nonzero integers  $n$  (and in this case  $K \supset \mathbb{Q}$  and is said to have characteristic  $\mathbb{Q}$ ), or  $p$  is prime and  $\{n \in \mathbb{Z} \mid n \cdot 1_K = 0\} = \{pk \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Here,  $p$  is called the characteristic of  $K$ , and in this case,  $K \supset \mathbb{F}_p$ , which is the finite field with  $p$  elements. If  $K$  is finite, then  $\text{char } K = p > 0$ , and  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow K$  given by  $n \mapsto n \cdot 1_K$  cannot be injective. We have that  $K \supset \mathbb{F}_p$  for some  $p$ , and  $K$  is a finite dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ . This means  $K \cong \mathbb{F}_p^n \implies \#K = p^n = q$ .

For all  $p, n$ , there exists a unique (up to isomorphism) field  $\mathbb{F}_q$  such that  $\#\mathbb{F}_q = q = p^n$ . Let  $K$  be the algebraic closure of  $\mathbb{F}_p$  (unique up to isomorphism). If  $K$  is any field of characteristic  $p$ , then  $x \mapsto x^p$  is an automorphism of  $K$ , which we may readily check

$$(xy)^p = x^p y^p, \quad (x+y)^p = x^p + y^p,$$



and the same is true for  $x \mapsto x^q = x^{p^n}$ . Let  $\{x \in K \mid x^q = x\}$  be a subfield. Its size is the number of roots of  $x^q - x$ ; we see that  $(x^q - x)' = qx^{q-1} - 1 = -1$ , where  $x^q - x \in K[x]$ . Since  $\gcd(x^q - x, (x^q - x)') = 1$ , we see that there are no multiple roots, and so said subfield is given by  $\mathbb{F}_q$  and has  $q$  elements.

If  $L$  has  $q$  elements, then for all  $x \in L$ ,  $x^q = x$ , i.e., for  $x \neq 0$ , we have  $x^{q-1} = 1$ , and  $L^* = L \setminus \{0\}$  is a group under multiplication, where  $\#L^* = q - 1$ , and  $x^{q-1} = 1$  for all  $x \in L^*$ .

**Lemma 6.11.** For all  $q = p^n$ , the group  $\mathbb{F}_q^*$  is cyclic of order  $q - 1$ .

**Lemma 6.12.** For  $n \geq 1$ ,  $n = \sum_{d|n} \varphi(d)$ .

**Lemma 6.13.** Let  $H$  be a finite group of order  $n$ . Assume that, for all  $d \mid n$ ,  $\#\{x \in H \mid x^d = 1\} \leq d$ . Then  $H$  is cyclic of order  $n$ .

We prove the last two lemmas, since the first follows from our earlier discussion. We start with lemma 6.13.

*Proof.* If there exists  $x \in H$  of order  $d$ , then  $\#\{1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{d-1}\} = d$ . This means for all  $g \in H$ ,  $g^d = 1$ , then  $y = x^i$ , where  $i \in [d]$ . This means  $\#\{x \in H \mid \text{ord } x = d\} = \varphi(d)$ . Lemma 6.12 implies that  $\{x \mid \text{ord } x = d\}$  is nonempty, and so

$$\#H = n = \sum_{d|n} \#\{x \in H \mid \text{ord } x = d\},$$

and we know that it is given by either  $\varphi(d) = 0$ . Lemma 6.12 states that it is  $\varphi(d)$  for all  $d$ . In this way, we can take  $n = d$  to see that  $\{x \in H \mid \text{ord } x = n\}$  is nonempty, and we conclude.  $\square$

Take  $H = \mathbb{F}_q^*$ , where  $q = p^n$ . We have that  $\#\mathbb{F}_q^* = p^n - 1$ , and let  $d$  be a divisor of  $q - 1$ . Then  $\{x \mid x^d = 1\} \leq d$ , i.e., the set of roots of  $x^d - 1$ , which has at most  $d$  roots.

**Lemma 6.14.** (i)  $\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) = 1$ , (ii)  $\left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) = (-1)^{\varepsilon(p)}$ , (iii)  $\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) = (-1)^{\omega(p)}$ , where  $\omega(n) = \frac{n^2-1}{8} \bmod 2$  for odd integers  $n$ .

Let  $K$  be the algebraic closure of  $\mathbb{F}_p$ . Let  $\alpha$  be the primitive 8th root of 1, where  $\alpha^8 = 1$ ,  $\alpha^i \neq 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 7$ . We have that  $y = \alpha + \alpha^{-1}$  and  $y^p = \alpha^p + \alpha^{-p}$  in general, where  $\alpha^4 = -1$ ,  $\alpha^2 + \alpha^{-2} = 0$ , so  $y^2 = \alpha^2 + \alpha^{-2} + 2 = 2$ . This means that if  $p$  satisfies  $y^p = -y$ , we have  $y \notin \mathbb{F}_p$ . This means if  $p \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 8$ , then  $y^p = y$  implies  $y \in \mathbb{F}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ ; specifically,  $y^2 = 2$  means 2 is a square modulo  $p$ , and if  $p \equiv \pm 5 \bmod 8$ , we have a similar argument to follow.

## §7 Day 7: Law of Quadratic Reciprocity (Sep. 23, 2025)

Today, our main objective is to prove the law of quadratic reciprocity, and discuss an application from last lecture. Let  $p, \ell$  be distinct odd primes; then recall that we have

$$\left(\frac{p}{\ell}\right) \left(\frac{\ell}{p}\right) = (-1)^{\varepsilon(p)\varepsilon(\ell)},$$

where  $\varepsilon(p) = \frac{p-1}{2} \bmod 2$ , which is given by 0 if  $p \equiv 1$  modulo 4, and 1 if  $p \equiv 3$  modulo 4. In this manner, we have that

$$\left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) = (-1)^{\varepsilon(p)},$$

which was discussed last time. The trick is to use a Gauss sum in a  $K$ -algebraically closed field (later, we'll assume that  $\text{char } K = p > 0$ ). Let  $w$  be a primitive  $\ell$ -th root of 1. As an example, if we take  $K = \mathbb{C}$ , we may take  $w = e^{2\pi i/\ell}$ , and the Gauss sum

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}} \left(\frac{x}{\ell}\right) w^x = y \in K$$

makes sense.

**Lemma 7.1.**  $y^2 = (-1)^{\varepsilon(\ell)} \ell$ .

**Lemma 7.2.**  $y^{p-1} = \left(\frac{p}{\ell}\right)$  if  $\text{char } K = p$ .

Taking both lemmas together, we have the theorem of quadratic reciprocity, where in particular, in  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , we have that  $\left(\frac{n}{p}\right) = n^{\frac{p-1}{2}}$ . For all  $K$ , we have a map  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow K$  where  $n \mapsto n \cdot 1_K$ , and so

$$\left(\frac{(-1)^{\varepsilon(\ell)} \ell}{p}\right) = y^{p-1} = \left(\frac{p}{\ell}\right),$$

where the first lemma yields the first equality, and the second lemma the second. We start by proving lemma 2.

*Proof.* We want  $y^p = \left(\frac{p}{\ell}\right)y$ , for which we need to know the  $y \neq 0$  case which will follow from lemma 1. We may write,

$$y^p = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} \left(\frac{x}{\ell}\right) w^{xp} = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} \left(\frac{p^{-1}z}{\ell}\right) w^z = \left(\frac{p^{-1}}{\ell}\right) y,$$

since

$$\left(\frac{p^{-1}z}{\ell}\right) = \left(\frac{p^{-1}}{\ell}\right) \left(\frac{z}{\ell}\right), \quad \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} \left(\frac{p^{-1}z}{\ell}\right) w^z = \left(\frac{p^{-1}}{z}\right) \sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} w^z.$$

□

In particular, the lemma says that

$$\left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} \left(\frac{x}{\ell}\right) e^{2\pi i x/\ell}\right)^2 = (-1)^{\varepsilon(\ell)} \ell.$$

We now work through lemma 1.

*Proof.* Let  $y = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} \left(\frac{x}{\ell}\right) w^x$ , and consider that

$$\sum_{x, z \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} \left(\frac{xz}{\ell}\right) w^{x+z} = \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} w^u \left( \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} \left(\frac{t(u-t)}{\ell}\right) \right),$$

for which we note  $t(u-t) = tu - t^2$ , so

$$\left(\frac{t(u-t)}{\ell}\right) = \left(\frac{-t^2}{\ell}\right) \left(\frac{1-ut^{-1}}{\ell}\right) = (-1)^{\varepsilon(\ell)} \left(\frac{1-ut^{-1}}{\ell}\right),$$

and

$$(-1)^{\varepsilon(\ell)} y^2 = \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} C_u w^u,$$

where  $C_u = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{F}_\ell^*} \left(\frac{1-ut^{-1}}{\ell}\right)$ , for which we may note that for  $u = 0$ , we have  $C_u = \ell$ , and for nonzero  $u$ , we have  $s = 1 - ut^{-1}$ , and so the sums over  $\mathbb{F}_\ell \setminus \{1\}$  are given by

$$C_u = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} \left(\frac{s}{\ell}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{\ell}\right) = -1.$$

In this manner, we may continue our computation from earlier and obtain

$$\sum C_u w^u = (\ell - 1) - \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_\ell^*} w^u = \ell,$$

where the latter summation is equal to  $-1$  because  $\sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_\ell} w^u = 0$ . □

We now discuss applications. Let  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and let  $m = 4|a|$ ; then there exists a unique character modulo  $m$  such that, for all  $p \nmid m$ ,  $\chi_a(p) = \left(\frac{a}{p}\right)$ . Uniqueness is obvious; next time, we will show existence from quadratic reciprocity.

## §8 Day 8: (Sep. 25, 2025)

Today, we will talk about analytic continuations and an analytic function for  $\zeta$ .

**Theorem 8.1.**  $\zeta(s)$  is meromorphic on all of  $\mathbb{C}$ , with the only pole being at  $s = 1$  (we already know that  $\zeta$  is meromorphic for  $\Re s > 0$ ).

**Theorem 8.2** (Approximate Formulation). We have that  $\zeta(s) = \zeta(1-s)$  up to some simple factor for  $0 < \Re s < 1$ .

We have that the second theorem implies the first. If  $\zeta(s)$  were just equal to  $\zeta(1-s)$  for  $0 < \Re s < 1$ , we could define  $\zeta(s)$  for  $\Re(s) < 1$  as  $\zeta(1-s)$ .

Recall the Gamma function,

$$\Gamma(s) = \int_0^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt,$$

which converges absolutely for  $\Re s > 0$ . We can check that integrating on  $\Re s > 0$  causes no problems, since

$$\int_\varepsilon^1 t^{s-1} dt = \left. \frac{t^s}{s} \right|_\varepsilon^1 = \frac{1}{s} - \frac{\varepsilon^s}{s}.$$

**Lemma 8.3.**  $\Gamma(s)$  is absolutely convergent for  $\Re s > 0$  and defines an analytic function.  $\Gamma(s)$  is a continuous version of  $n!$ .

To do this, we have to show uniform convergence on a compact set.

**Claim 8.4.** (i)  $\Gamma(s+1) = s\Gamma(s)$ , (ii)  $\Gamma(1) = 1$ , (iii)  $\Gamma(s)$  is meromorphic on all of  $\mathbb{C}$  with simple poles at  $0, -1, -2, \dots$ .

Together, we get  $\Gamma(n) = (n-1)!$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and observe that  $\Gamma(s) = \frac{1}{s}\Gamma(s+1)$ , which is meromorphic for  $\Re s > -1$ , with a simple pole at  $s = 0$  (residue 1). In this manner, near  $s = -1$ ,  $\frac{\Gamma(s+1)}{s}$  has a simple pole at  $s = -1$ . We may proceed inductively to conclude the third part of the claim. We now check the first and second parts of the claim, where we first integrate by parts to get

$$\int_0^\infty t^{s-1} e^{-t} dt = \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{t^s}{s} \right)' e^{-t} dt - \int_0^\infty \frac{t^s}{s} (e^{-t})' dt = \int_0^\infty \frac{t^s}{s} e^{-t} dt = \frac{\Gamma(s+1)}{s}.$$

Also,

$$\Gamma(1) = \int_0^\infty e^{-t} dt = -e^{-s} \Big|_0^\infty = 1.$$

As a fun fact, if we pick  $s, s'$ , then we have that

$$\Gamma(s+s')B(s, s') = \Gamma(s)\Gamma(s'), \quad B(s, s') = \int_0^1 x^{s-1}(1-x)^{s'-1} dx.$$

With the above established (minus the part about  $B$  functions, that was just for fun), we have that  $\xi(s) = \zeta(s)\pi^{-\frac{s}{2}}\Gamma(\frac{s}{2})$ .

**Theorem 8.5.**  $\xi(s) = \xi(1-s)$ .

*Proof.* We check that

$$\zeta(s)\pi^{-\frac{s}{2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{s}{2}\right) = \zeta(1-s)\pi^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{1-s}{2}\right).$$

Near  $s = 0$ , we have that  $\zeta(s)$  is non-singular at  $s = 0$ ,  $\Gamma(\frac{s}{2})$  has a first order pole,  $\zeta(1-s)$  has a first order pole at  $s = 0$ , and  $\Gamma(\frac{1-s}{2})$  is non-singular.

As an example, if we let  $s = -2$ ,  $\zeta(s)$  will have a zero of first order, and  $\zeta(s)$  will have simple zeros at even negative integers (i.e., the “trivial” zeros). This leads into the Riemann hypothesis, i.e. that the only other zeros of  $\zeta$  are on the line  $\Re s = \frac{1}{2}$ , which we call the “critical line”. There is an axis of symmetry for  $s \mapsto 1-s$ .  $\square$

Let  $\theta(u)$  be the series,

$$\theta(u) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 u} = 1 + 2(e^{-\pi u} + e^{-4\pi u} + e^{-9\pi u} + \dots).$$

We want to show that  $\theta$  is absolutely convergent for  $\Re u > 0$ .

**Claim 8.6.**  $\theta(\frac{1}{u}) = u^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta(u)$ .

Our goal is to first formulate the Poisson summation formula and deduce the claim from it, then show that the claim demonstrates  $\zeta(s) = \zeta(1-s)$ . We start with the summation formula. Let  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a “nice function”, i.e.,  $f$  is infinitely differentiable and for all polynomials  $p(x)$ , we have that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |f(x)p^{(n)}(x)| = 0,$$

i.e., it is rapidly decreasing with all its derivatives. In fact, it is enough to require that  $f$  is  $C^2$  with the rapidly decreasing condition up to its second derivative. As an example, take  $f(x) = e^{-\pi u x^2}$  for  $\Re u > 0$ .

**Definition 8.7** (Fourier Transform).  $\hat{f}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i x y} f(x) dx$ .

In particular, the Poisson summation formula is given by

$$\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} f(n) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{f}(n).$$

This means that we obtain  $\theta(\frac{1}{u}) = u^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta(u)$ , and by applying Poisson summation to  $f(x) = e^{-\pi u x^2}$ , we have  $\hat{f}(y) = u^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\pi u^{-1} y^2}$ , which follows from

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\pi u x^2} dx = u^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

and

$$u^{-\frac{1}{2}}\theta\left(\frac{1}{u}\right) = u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 u^{-1}} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{f}(n) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} f(n) = \theta(u).$$

The Mellin transform also gives

$$2\xi(s) = \int_0^{\infty} (\theta(u) - 1) u^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{du}{u},$$

and

$$\frac{\theta(u) - 1}{2} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi^2 n u},$$

where we may let  $t = \pi n^2 u$  and  $u^{\frac{s}{2}-1} = \frac{t^{\frac{s}{2}-1}}{(\pi n^2)^{\frac{s}{2}-1}}$ . This means we obtain

$$\int_0^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 u} u^{\frac{s}{2}-1} du = \left( \int e^{-t} t^{\frac{s}{2}-1} dt \right) = \frac{1}{(\pi n^2)^{\frac{s}{2}}} = \frac{1}{\pi^{\frac{s}{2}} n^s}.$$

Summing over all  $n$ , we have

$$\zeta(s) = \int_0^{\infty} \left( \frac{\theta(u) - 1}{2} \right) u^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{du}{u},$$

meaning we may identify  $\xi$  with  $\zeta$  on its domain. We may further write

$$\int_0^{\infty} (\theta(u) - 1) u^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{du}{u} = \int_0^1 + \int_1^{\infty} = -\frac{2}{s} + \int_0^1 \theta(u) u^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{du}{u} + \int_1^{\infty} (\theta(u) - 1) u^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{du}{u}.$$

Using

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \theta(u) u^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{du}{u} &= \int_1^{\infty} \theta(u^{-1}) u^{-\frac{s}{2}} \frac{du}{u} \\ &= \int_1^{\infty} \theta(u) u^{\frac{1-s}{2}} \frac{du}{u} \\ &= \frac{2}{s-1} + \int_1^{\infty} (\theta(u) - 1) u^{\frac{1-s}{2}} \frac{du}{u}, \end{aligned}$$

we get that

$$\xi(s) + \frac{1}{s} + \frac{1}{1-s} = \frac{1}{2} \int_1^{\infty} (\theta(u) - 1) u^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{du}{u} + \frac{1}{2} \int_1^{\infty} (\theta(u) - 1) u^{\frac{1-s}{2}} \frac{du}{u},$$

which is symmetric under  $s \mapsto 1-s$ , since  $\xi$  itself is symmetric as well.

## §9 Day 9: Fourier Transform (Sep. 30, 2025)

Last time, we had

$$\xi(s) = \zeta(s)\pi^{-\frac{s}{2}}\Gamma\left(\frac{s}{2}\right), \quad \xi(s) = \xi(1-s),$$

and

$$f(x) = e^{-\pi u x^2} \implies \hat{f}(y) = u^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\pi u^{-1} y^2}$$

from the Poisson summation formula, where if  $f(x)$  is a “nice” function on  $\mathbb{R}$ , then

$$\hat{f}(y) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i x y} f(x) dx.$$

We expect that the more rapidly decreasing  $f$  is, the smoother  $\hat{f}$  is, and vice versa. We have that  $S(\mathbb{R}) \subset C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ ; for every  $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ , we have that  $f \in S(\mathbb{R})$  as well if  $(1 + |x|^r) |f^{(i)}(x)|$  is bounded for all  $r > 1$ ,  $i \geq 0$ ; we note that  $1 + |x|^r$  can be replaced by any polynomial.

**Theorem 9.1.**  $f \mapsto \hat{f}$  is an isomorphism from  $S(\mathbb{R})$  to  $S(\mathbb{R})$ , where  $\hat{\hat{f}}(x) = f(-x)$ .

Recall the Poisson summation; for all  $f \in S(\mathbb{R})$ , we have that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{f}(n).$$

Consider a function on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$  (i.e.,  $\mathbb{Z}$ -periodic function on  $\mathbb{R}$ ), where  $f$  is any “nice” function (such as continuous); then its Fourier series coefficients is given by

$$a_n = \int_0^1 f(x) e^{-2\pi i n x} dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \dots,$$

and the series itself is  $\sum a_n e^{2\pi i n x}$ . If  $f$  is “nice”, the Fourier series converges in the original function. Said “nice” functions define the inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_0^1 f(x) \overline{g(x)} dx,$$

where  $\{e^{2\pi i n x}\}$  is an orthonormal basis.

**Theorem 9.2.** If  $f$  is  $C^2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}$ -periodic, then  $f(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n e^{2\pi i n x}$  is absolutely convergent.

Let  $f \in S(\mathbb{R})$ ; we have that  $F(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(x+n)$  is a  $C^\infty$  function on  $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $F(0) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n)$  is just the sum of Fourier coefficients  $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_n = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_0^1 e^{2\pi i n x} F(x) dx$ . This yields

$$\sum_{n, m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^1 e^{2\pi i n x} f(x+m) dx,$$

so if we fix  $n$ , we have that

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_0^1 e^{2\pi i n x} f(x+m) dx = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \int_m^{m+1} e^{2\pi i n x} f(x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i n x} f(x) dx = \hat{f}(n).$$

It is enough to require that there exists some  $x > 1$  such that

$$(1 + |x|^n)(|f| + |f''|)$$

is bounded, and  $f \in C^2$ . We may prove this differently, however; consider  $S(\mathbb{R})$  as a vector space, and define  $S^*(\mathbb{R})$  as a tempered distribution of linear functional on  $S(\mathbb{R})$  which are continuous in some sense. Then  $f \mapsto \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f(n)$  is an element of  $S^*(\mathbb{R})$ . Observe that  $\lambda(f(x+n)) = \lambda(f)$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ; then

$$\lambda(e^{2\pi i n x} f(x)) = \lambda(f(x)), \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

**Lemma 9.3.** An element of  $S^*(\mathbb{R})$  with these properties is unique up to multiplication by a constant.

On the other hand,  $\mu(f) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{f}(n)$ , so we claim that  $\mu$  satisfies the same properties;  $\lambda$  is equal to  $\mu$  up to a constant, so we show that the constant is equal to 1. It is enough to find  $f$  such that  $\lambda(f) = 0$  and  $f = \hat{f}$ . If we take  $f(x) = e^{-\pi x^2}$ , we have that

$$e^{2\pi i m x} \widehat{f}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i x y} e^{2\pi i m x} f(x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{2\pi i x (y+m)} f(x) dx = \hat{f}(y+m).$$

We have that the correction function in the definition of  $\xi(s)$  can be written as

$$\int_0^{\infty} e^{-\pi x^2} x^{s-1} dx.$$