## Transcendental Numbers (Draft)

Vincent Lin

Last Updated: 11/18/23

## Contents

Abstract			v
1	Preliminaries		1
	1.1	Algebraic and Transcendental Numbers	1
	1.2	Algebra Preliminaries	2
	1.3	Analysis Preliminaries	5
	1.4	Liouville Numbers	5
	1.5	Transcendence of $e$ and $\pi$	7
2	2 Lindemann-Weierstrass Theorem		9
3	Gelfond-Schneider Theorem		11
	3.1	Background	11
	3.2	Main Theorem	13
	3.3	Consequences	13
4	Baker	r's Theorem	15
5	Schar	nuel's Conjecture	17

CONTENTS

### Abstract

Research into transcendental numbers started with rational approximations. This paper covers preliminaries on the neccesary parts of field theory before going into the Lindemann-Weierstrass theorem, Gelfond-Schneider theorem, and Baker's theorem and concludes with a discussion of Schanuel's conjecture. This sequence of theorems are related to determining whether complex numbers are transcendental or not and is based off of the work by Baker.

### **Preliminaries**

#### 1.1 Algebraic and Transcendental Numbers

<u>Def</u> An <u>algebraic number</u> is  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  which is the root of a nonzero polynomial in  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ . A transcendental number is a complex number that is not algebraic.

<u>Note</u> We will use  $\mathbb{A}$  to denote the set of algebraic numbers and we will use  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{A}$  to denote the set transcendental numbers. We will use  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{A}$  to denote the set of real transcendental numbers.

To find examples of algebraic numbers, we can take any nonzero polynomial in  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$  find its roots. By definition, these roots are algebraic numbers. For example,  $\sqrt{2}$  is algebraic because it is a root of  $x^2-2$ . Also, i is algebraic because it is the root of  $x^2+1$ . All rational numbers are algebraic as well. Let  $\frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}$  be rational, where  $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$  and q is nonzero. Then, it is the root of  $x-\frac{p}{q}$ . Therefore,  $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{A}$ .

What about transcendental numbers? Do they exist?

Theorem 1.1.1 Yes, transcendental numbers exist.

**Proof** Consider the set of algebraic numbers, which we will denote by A. This set is countable. We will show this by forming a surjection

$$\phi: \left(\mathbb{N} \times \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Q}^n\right) \to \mathbb{A}.$$

Note that  $\mathbb{N} \times \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Q}^n$  is countable because it is the Cartesian product of a countable set with a countable union of countable sets. By the fundamental theorem of algebra, we know that a polynomial of degree k has k (not necessarily distinct) roots. Therefore, we can number the k roots from 1 to k for each polynomial. Thus, if we specify the

nonzero rational coefficients  $(a_0, \ldots, a_k)$  and an index i for  $i \in [k]$  to be the i-th root of the polynomial  $a_k x^k + \cdots + a_0$ , we get an algebraic number. We define the map  $\phi(i, (a_0, \ldots, a_k))$  to be the i-th root of  $a_k x^k + \cdots + a_0$  if it exists. Otherwise, we map the input to zero. From the definition, we know that every algebraic number can be encoded this way since it is one of the roots of a nonzero rational polynomial. Thus, for all  $a \in \mathbb{A}$ , there must be an input x such that  $\phi(x) = a$ , making this a surjective map from a countable set to  $\mathbb{A}$ . This makes  $\mathbb{A}$  countable. However, since  $\mathbb{C}$  is uncountable, it cannot be the case that all complex numbers are algebraic. Thus, if a complex number is not algebraic, it must be transcendental. Furthermore,  $\mathbb{R}$  is uncountable so there must be real transcendental numbers as well.

•

If transcendental numbers exist, then can we find an example? To show that a number is algebraic, we just have to find a nonzero rational polynomial that it is a root of, evaluate that polynomial at that number, and verify that we get zero. However, checking if a number is transcendental is a very hard problem. The rest of this paper will discuss the transcendence of a large class of numbers and methods for determining the transcendence.

#### 1.2 Algebra Preliminaries

Before that, we will generalize the concept of transcendence to other fields. In order to do this, we will list several definitions. Let k, l be fields and let l/k be a field extension.

- $a \in l$  is <u>algebraic</u> over k if there is a nonzero polynomial  $f \in k[x]$  such that f(a) = 0. Otherwise, a is <u>transcendental</u> over k. In other words, an algebraic number is a complex number that is algebraic over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and a transcendental number is a complex number that is not algebraic over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .
- $X \subseteq L$  is algebraically independent over k if for all  $a_1, \ldots, a_t$  distinct and all  $f \in k[x_1, \ldots, x_t], f(a_1, \ldots, a_t) = 0$  implies f = 0.
- If  $a \in l$  is algebraic over k, the <u>minimal polynomial</u> of a over k, denoted  $m_a$ , is the unique monic irreducible polynomial which generates the kernel of the evaluation map  $\phi(f) = f(a)$  for  $f \in k[x]$ . The <u>degree</u> of  $\alpha \in k$  is the degree of the minimial polynomial  $m_a$ .
- l/k is an algebraic extension if every element in l is algebraic over k.
- l is <u>algebraically closed</u> if every nonconstant single variable polynomial in l has a root in l.
- An algebraic closure of k is an algebraic extension of k that is algebraically closed.

**<u>Def</u>** The square <u>Vandermonde matrix</u> of size n is the matrix  $V = V(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$  is the  $n \times n$ 

matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_1 & x_1^2 & \cdots & x_1^{n-1} \\ 1 & x_2 & x_2^2 & \cdots & x_2^{n-1} \\ 1 & x_3 & x_3^2 & \cdots & x_3^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x_n & x_n^2 & \cdots & x_n^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

with nonzero complex elements  $x_i^j$  in the *i*-th row and j+1-th column column where  $0 \le j \le n-1$  and  $1 \le i \le n$ .

**Lemma 1.2.1** Let  $V = V(x_1, ..., x_n)$  be the square Vandermonde matrix of size n. Then, the determinant of the square Vandermonde matrix is

$$\prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} (x_j - x_i).$$

Therefore, the determinant vanishes if and only if  $x_i = x_j$  for any  $i \neq j$ .

**<u>Proof</u>** For  $1 \le i \le n$ , let  $E := \{e_i\}$  be the canonical basis for  $\mathbb{C}^n$ .

Let  $P_n$  be the  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space of polynomials with degree less than n. Furthermore, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $A := \{a_i\}$  be the monomial basis for  $P_n$  where  $a_i(x) = x^{i-1}$  and let  $B := \{b_i\}$  be another monomial basis for  $P_n$  where  $b_i(x) = \prod_{j < i} (x - x_j)$ . For example,

$$b_1 = 1,$$

$$b_2 = (x - x_1),$$

$$b_3 = (x - x_1)(x - x_2),$$

$$\vdots$$

$$b_n = (x - x_1)(x - x_2) \dots (x - x_{n-1}).$$

Consider the linear transformation  $\psi: P_n \to \mathbb{C}^n$  via  $\psi(p) = (p(x_1), \dots, p(x_n))$ . We can think of this as a map from p(x) to a column vector of length n.

$$p \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} p(x_1) \\ p(x_2) \\ \vdots \\ p(x_n) \end{pmatrix}$$

Let V be the matrix of  $\psi$  with respect to A and E. Now, let L be the matrix of  $\psi$  with respect to B and E. Finally, let U be the change of basis matrix from B to A. Then,

$$\begin{split} VU &= L \\ \det(VU) &= \det(L) \\ \det(V) \det(U) &= \det(L) \end{split}$$

Now, V, the matrix of  $\psi$  with respect to A and E is

$$\begin{pmatrix} | & | & \cdots & | \\ \psi(a_1) & \psi(a_2) & \cdots & \psi(a_n) \\ | & | & \cdots & | \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_1 & \cdots & x_1^{n-1} \\ 1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_2^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & x_n & \cdots & x_n^{n-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

the square Vandermonde matrix of size n.

On the other hand, L, the matrix of  $\psi$  with respect to B and E is

$$\begin{pmatrix} & & & & & & & & \\ \psi(b_1) & \psi(b_2) & \cdots & \psi(b_n) \\ & & & & & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & (x_1 - x_1) & \cdots & (x_1 - x_1)(x_1 - x_2) \dots (x_1 - x_{n-1}) \\ 1 & (x_2 - x_1) & \cdots & (x_2 - x_1)(x_2 - x_2) \dots (x_2 - x_{n-1}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 1 & (x_n - x_1) & \cdots & (x_n - x_1)(x_n - x_2) \dots (x_n - x_{n-1}) \end{pmatrix}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & (x_2 - x_1) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & (x_n - x_1) & \cdots & (x_n - x_1)(x_n - x_2) \dots (x_n - x_{n-1}) \end{pmatrix}$$

Note that L is lower triangular so  $\det(L)$  is the product of the entries along its diagonal, or  $\prod_{1 \le i \le j \le n} (x_j - x_i)$ .

Finally, consider the change of basis matrix U from basis B to basis A in  $P_n$ . The columns of U records the coefficients of the  $b_i$  polynomials after expanding. Note that since the  $b_i$  are monic, the diagonal of U consists of all 1s because the (i,i)-entry of U is the coefficient of  $x^{i-1}$  (the leading coefficient) in  $b_i$ . Therefore, U is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \text{blah} & \text{blah} & \cdots & \text{blah} \\ 0 & 1 & \text{blah} & \cdots & \text{blah} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & \text{blah} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, since U is upper triangular, det(U) is the product of the 1s along the diagonal so det(U) = 1.

Plugging what we know about  $\det(L)$  and  $\det(U)$  into  $\det(V) \det(U) = \det(L)$ , we get that  $\det(V) = \prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} (x_j - x_i)$ .

•

#### 1.3 Analysis Preliminaries

Now we will introduce some concepts from complex analysis. Consider the set of complex numbers  $\mathbb C$  as a normed space equipped with the absolute value function  $|\cdot|:\mathbb C\to\mathbb R$  via  $|z|=\sqrt{z\bar z}$ , where  $\bar z$  is the complex conjugate of z. This norm induces a metric space, so we can define the distance between x and y as d(x,y):=|x-y|. Furthermore, this metric space induces a topological space so we can define open sets  $U\subseteq\mathbb C$  such that all points  $z\in U$  are contained in a ball within U centered at z. In other words, for all  $z\in U$ , there is  $\varepsilon>0$  such that for all y where  $d(z,y)<\varepsilon$ ,  $y\in U$ .

**<u>Def</u>** Let  $f: \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$  be a function. The <u>limit</u> of f as  $z \to z_0$  is L if and only if for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$  such that  $0 < |z - z_0| < \delta \implies |f(x) - L| < \varepsilon$ . We write L as

$$\lim_{z \to z_0} f(z).$$

<u>Def</u> Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be an open subset. Let  $f: U \to \mathbb{C}$  be a function. The <u>derivative</u> of f at a point  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  is defined as

$$f'(z_0) := \lim_{z \to z_0} \frac{f(z) - f(z_0)}{z - z_0}.$$

If the derivative exists, the function is said to be <u>complex differentiable</u> or <u>differentiable</u> at  $z_0$ .

<u>Def</u> Let  $f: \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$  be a function and let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be an open subset of  $\mathbb{C}$ . Then, f is <u>holomorphic</u> on U if it is complex differentiable on every point in U. Furthermore, if  $U = \mathbb{C}$ , then f is an **entire** function.

**Theorem 1.3.1** (Cauchy's Residue Theorem) Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  be a simply connected open set containing a finite number of points  $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ . Then, let  $U_0$  be  $U \setminus \{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ . Let  $f: U_0 \to \mathbb{C}$  be holomorphic on  $U_0$ . Furthermore, let  $\gamma$  be a closed rectifiable curve in  $U_0$ ,  $\operatorname{Res}(f, a_i)$  denote the residue of f at each  $a_k$ , and  $I(\gamma, a_k)$  be the winding number of  $\gamma$  around  $a_k$ . Then,

$$\oint_{\gamma} f(z)dz = 2\pi i \sum_{k=1}^{n} I(\gamma, a_k) \operatorname{Res}(f, a_k).$$

#### 1.4 Liouville Numbers

Now we will start looking for our first transcendental number! First, we will start by proving a lemma.

**Lemma 1.4.1** For any nonzero polynomial p(x) with a root at  $x = \alpha$  of multiplicity m > 0, p'(x) has the root  $\alpha$  with multiplicity m - 1.

**Proof** From the fundamental theorem of algebra, we can write p(x) as  $(x - \alpha)^m q(x)$  where  $(x - \alpha) \nmid q(x)$ . Now, taking the derivatives of both sides and using the product rule, we get

$$p(x) = (x - \alpha)^{m} q(x)$$

$$p'(x) = ((x - \alpha)^{m})' q(x) + (x - \alpha)^{m} q'(x)$$

$$= m(x - \alpha)^{m-1} q(x) + (x - \alpha)^{m} q'(x)$$

$$= (x - \alpha)^{m-1} (mq(x) + (x - \alpha)q'(x))$$

Therefore, we get that  $(x - \alpha)^{m-1} \mid p'(x)$  so p'(x) has the root  $\alpha$  of multiplicity at least m-1.

Now, we want to show that p'(x) has root  $\alpha$  with multiplicity at most m-1. In order to show this, we will shift the polynomial by  $\alpha$  (all of the roots will therefore be shifted by  $\alpha$  as well). Namely, we look at  $p(x+\alpha) = x^m q(x+\alpha)$ . Note that  $p(x+\alpha)$  now has the root 0 with multiplicity m (it has m factors of x) and since q(x) had no  $x-\alpha$  factors,  $q(x+\alpha)$  has no roots at zero. In other words,  $x \nmid q(x+\alpha)$ . Now, showing p'(x) has root  $\alpha$  with multiplicity m-1 is equivalent to showing  $p'(x+\alpha)$  as root 0 with multiplicity m-1 (it has exactly m-1 factors of x). Thus, substituting  $x+\alpha$  in p'(x):

$$p'(x+\alpha) = x^{m-1} \left( mq(x+\alpha) + xq'(x+\alpha) \right)$$

We have m-1 factors of x from the  $x^{m-1}$  term. Therefore, we need to show the rest of the expression has no factors of x. In other words,  $x \nmid (mq(x+\alpha) + xq'(x+\alpha))$ , we can take the expression  $(mq(x+\alpha) + xq'(x+\alpha))$  modulo x to get  $mq(x+\alpha)$ . Since m > 0 and  $q(x+\alpha)$  has no factors of x, we know that x cannot divide the entire expression. Shifting back by  $\alpha$ , we get that  $x-\alpha$  cannot be a factor of  $mq(x) + (x-\alpha)q'(x)$ , so the multiplicity of  $x-\alpha$  in p(x) is at most m-1.



<u>Def</u> A <u>Liouville number</u> is a real number x such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , there exists integers p, q with q > 1 such that

$$0 < \left| x - \frac{p}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{q^n}.$$

Essentially, Liouville numbers are real numbers that can be approximately really, really closely by a sequence of rationals of the form  $\left\{\frac{p_i}{q_i}\right\}$ , where  $q_i > 1$ , and the distance between x and  $\frac{p_i}{q_i}$  is nonzero, but less than  $\frac{1}{(q_i)^i}$ .

**Theorem 1.4.2** (Liouville's Approximation Theorem) Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  be an algebraic number of degree n. Then, for any rational approximation  $\frac{p}{q}$  to  $\alpha$ , we have

$$\left|\alpha - \frac{p}{q}\right| \ge \frac{1}{q^n}$$

<u>Proof</u> Let f be the minimal polynomial of  $\alpha$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Note that  $f'(\alpha) \neq 0$ . This is because  $\deg(f') < \deg(f)$  and f is the minimal polynomial. Furthermore, f is irreducible in  $\mathbb{R}[x]$ , so it cannot be the case that  $(x-r) \mid f$  for a rational r. In other words, f has no rational roots. Now let  $\frac{p}{q}$  be a rational number which we will use to approximate  $\alpha$  and plug it into  $f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0$ .

$$f\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) = a_n \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^n + a_{n-1} \left(\frac{p}{q}\right)^{n-1} + \dots + a_0$$
$$= \frac{C}{q^n}$$

for some constant  $C \neq 0$  as  $\frac{p}{q}$  is not a root of f. Also, note that since we want a good approximation of  $\alpha$  that is close to  $\frac{1}{q^n}$  away, this rational must be at most distance 1 away from  $\alpha$ .

#### **♦**

#### 1.5 Transcendence of e and $\pi$

**Lemma 1.5.1** Let f(x) be a real polynomial with degree m. Let

$$I(t) = \int_0^t e^{t-x} f(x) dx.$$

Then,

$$I(t) = e^t \sum_{j=0}^m f^{(j)}(0) - \sum_{j=0}^m f^{(j)}(t).$$

where  $f^{(j)}(t)$  is the j-th derivative of f with respect to x evaluated at t.

**Proof** Probably induction and integration by parts. I will fill this in later.

## Lindemann-Weierstrass Theorem

 ${\bf Theorem~2.0.1~(\it Lindemann-Weierstrass~Theorem)~Suppose}$ 

$$\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n$$

are algebraic numbers that are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Then,

$$e^{\alpha_1},\ldots,e^{\alpha_n}$$

are linearly independent over the algebraic numbers. In other words, the extension field  $\mathbb{Q}(e^{\alpha_1},\ldots,e^{\alpha_n})$  has transcendence degree n over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

#### Proof

### Gelfond-Schneider Theorem

#### 3.1 Background

In this chapter, we will prove the Gelfond-Schneider Theorem. We will introduce two lemmas to help prove this.

**Lemma 3.1.1** Consider the follow system of m equations with n unknowns with m < n:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{1,1} & \cdots & a_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{m,1} & \cdots & a_{m,n} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and  $a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We write this compactly as  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ . Suppose  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  is an upper bound of the coefficients so that  $a \geq |a_{i,j}|$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Then, the system of equations has a nontrivial solution in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  for  $\mathbf{x}$ , such that for all  $x_j$ ,

$$|x_i| < 1 + (na)^{\frac{m}{n-m}}.$$

**Proof** Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a column vector of height n and let  $\mathbf{y}$  be a column vector of height m where  $A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}$ . Let the entries of  $\mathbf{y}$  be  $y_k$  where  $1 \le k \le m$ . A solution corresponds to finding an  $\mathbf{x}$  such that  $\mathbf{y}$  is the zero vector.

**<u>Def</u> x** is a **lattice point** if it is in  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ .

Note that if **x** is a lattice point, then since the entries of  $A = (a_{i,j})$  are integers, **y** will also be a lattice point.

Let q be any positive integer. Let C be the n-dimensional hypercube centered at the origin of side length 2q. Equivalently, this is all points with coordinates in [-q, q] or points whose coordinate's absolute values are upper bounded by q. Now, let  $\mathbf{x}$  range through all the  $(2q+1)^n$  lattice points in C (each of the n coordinates is in  $\{-q, -q+1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, q-1, q\}$ ,

which is a set of 2q + 1 options). We can now upper bound each of the  $y_k$  coordinates in  $\mathbf{y}$  via

$$|y_k| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^n a_{k,j} x_j \right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{k,j} x_j|$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{k,j}| |x_j|$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n aq$$

$$= naq$$

Therefore, we know that the coordinates of  $\mathbf{y}$  are in  $\{-naq, -naq + 1, \dots, 0, \dots, naq - 1, naq + 1\}$  and so there are  $(2naq + 1)^n$  possible lattice points  $\mathbf{y}$  could be as  $\mathbf{x}$  ranges through the lattice points of C.

As of now, we selected q to be any positive integer. However, to finish the proof of this lemma, we would like to use the pigeonhole principle to say that two of the inputs  $\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}''$  in C correspond to outputs that coincide. That is to say, the  $(2q+1)^n$  input points outnumber the  $(2naq+1)^m$  possible output locations. In order to do this, we select q to be the unique integer such that:

$$(na)^{\frac{m}{n-m}} - 1 \le 2q < (na)^{\frac{m}{n-m}} + 1.$$

This means 2q is the even integer in the interval of length 2. From the left inequality, we get  $(na)^m \leq (2q+1)^{n-m}$ . Now,

$$(2naq + 1)^m = \left(na \cdot \frac{2naq + 1}{na}\right)^m$$

$$= (na)^m \left(2q + \frac{1}{na}\right)^m$$

$$< (na)^m (2q + 1)^m$$

$$\le (2q + 1)^{n-m} (2q + 1)^m$$

$$= (2q + 1)^n.$$

Thus, we get that there are solutions  $\mathbf{x}' \neq \mathbf{x}''$  such that  $A\mathbf{x}' = A\mathbf{x}''$ . Thus,  $A(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}'') = \mathbf{0}$ . Note that if we let  $x'_j, x''_j$  denote the *j*-th coordinate of  $\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}''$  respectively,

$$|x_i' - x_i''| \le |x_i'| + |x_i''| \le q + q = 2q < (na)^{\frac{m}{m-n}} + 1,$$

so  $\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}''$  is a nontrivial solution to  $A\mathbf{x} = 0$  we were looking for.

•

#### 3.2 Main Theorem

**Theorem 3.2.1** (Gelfond-Schneider Theorem) Let  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be algebraic numbers such that  $\alpha \notin \{0,1\}$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ . Then,  $\alpha^{\beta}$  is transcendental.

### 3.3 Consequences

## Baker's Theorem

**Theorem 4.0.1** (Baker's Theorem) Let  $\mathbb{L} = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : e^{\lambda} \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\}$ . Then, if

$$\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_n\in\mathbb{L}$$

are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,

# Schanuel's Conjecture

Conjecture 5.0.1 (Schanuel's Conjecture) Suppose we have n complex numbers

$$z_1,\ldots,z_n$$

that are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Then,  $\mathbb{Q}(z_1,\ldots,z_n,e^{z_1},\ldots,e^{z_n})$  has transcendence degree at least n over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

## Index

```
algebraic, 2
algebraic closure, 2
algebraic extension, 2
algebraic number, 1
algebraically closed, 2
algebraically independent, 2
complex differentiable, 5
degree, 2
derivative, 5
differentiable, 5
entire, 5
holomorphic, 5
lattice point, 11
limit, 5
Liouville number, 6
minimal polynomial, 2
transcendental, 2
transcendental number, 1
Vandermonde matrix, 2
```