

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: (Sep. 18, 2025)	15

§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 ζ -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. ζ 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 χ 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 χ 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 χ 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 χ_1, χ_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 χ 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 ε , 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 ζ_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 φ_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 χ , $L(s, \chi)$ 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 ζ 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 μ_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 χ 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 χ_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 χ_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 χ such that $\chi(\bar{p}) = w$. Consider the chain

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

If we let $\widehat{}$ 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 $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$,

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

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

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

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 $a \pmod{m}$ 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_χ ,

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

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_χ 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: (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).