

## Mathematics 403A Winter 2005

**Theorem 1.**  $e$  is transcendental.

I will need the following formulation of the Mean Value Theorem.

**Theorem 2 (Mean Value Theorem).** If  $g(x)$  is a continuously differential function on the interval  $[x_1, x_2]$ , then for some  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\frac{g(x_1) - g(x_2)}{x_1 - x_2} = g'(x_1 + \theta(x_2 - x_1)).$$

*Proof that  $e$  is transcendental.* [This is from *Topics in Algebra* by Herstein.]

Given a polynomial  $f(x) \in \mathbf{R}[x]$  of degree  $r$ , let

$$F(x) = f(x) + f'(x) + f''(x) + \cdots + f^{(r)}(x).$$

Then one can check that  $\frac{d}{dx}(e^{-x}F(x)) = -e^{-x}f(x)$ .

Apply the Mean Value Theorem to  $e^{-x}F(x)$ , on the interval  $[0, k]$ , for each positive integer  $k$ : there are numbers  $\theta_k \in (0, 1)$  such that

$$e^{-k}F(k) - F(0) = -ke^{(1-\theta_k)k}f(\theta_k k).$$

Also, define  $\epsilon_k$  to be  $\epsilon_k = F(k) - e^k F(0)$ . That is,

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon_1 &= F(1) - eF(0) = -e^{(1-\theta_1)}f(\theta_1), \\ \epsilon_2 &= F(2) - e^2F(0) = -2e^{2(1-\theta_2)}f(2\theta_2), \\ &\vdots \\ \epsilon_n &= F(n) - e^nF(0) = -ne^{n(1-\theta_n)}f(n\theta_n).\end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that  $e$  is algebraic: suppose there are integers  $c_i$  such that

$$c_n e^n + c_{n-1} e^{n-1} + \cdots + c_1 e + c_0 = 0.$$

We will (eventually) derive a contradiction.

Multiply the equation defining  $\epsilon_i$  by  $c_i$  and add up the resulting equations:

$$c_1 F(1) + c_2 F(2) + \cdots + c_n F(n) - F(0)(c_1 e + c_2 e^2 + \cdots + c_n e^n) = c_1 \epsilon_1 + c_2 \epsilon_2 + \cdots + c_n \epsilon_n.$$

The term in parentheses equals  $-c_0$ , so I can rewrite this as

$$c_0 F(0) + c_1 F(1) + c_2 F(2) + \cdots + c_n F(n) = c_1 \epsilon_1 + c_2 \epsilon_2 + \cdots + c_n \epsilon_n.$$

This holds for any  $f(x)$ ; now we pick a particular one. Let  $p$  be a prime number such that  $p > n$  and  $p > c_0$ . (Later on I'll assume that  $p$  is even larger, but this is good enough for now.) Let

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{(p-1)!} x^{p-1} (1-x)^p (2-x)^p \dots (n-x)^p.$$

Then

$$f(x) = \frac{(n!)^p}{(p-1)!} x^{p-1} + \frac{a_0}{(p-1)!} x^p + \frac{a_1}{(p-1)!} x^{p+1} + \dots$$

for some integers  $a_0, a_1, \dots$ .

**Claim.** For each  $i \geq p$ ,  $f^{(i)}(x)$  is a polynomial with integer coefficients, each of which is divisible by  $p$ .

*Proof of claim.* Exercise. □

For  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,  $f(j) = 0$  with multiplicity  $p$ , so  $f^{(i)}(j) = 0$  when  $i \leq p-1$ . Thus

$$F(j) = \underbrace{f(j) + f'(j) + \dots + f^{(p-1)}(j)}_0 + \underbrace{f^{(p)}(j) + \dots + f^{(r)}(j)}_{\text{divisible by } p}$$

is an integer which is divisible by  $p$ : the first bunch of terms are zero, and the second bunch are all divisible by  $p$ , by the claim.

On the other hand, consider

$$F(0) = \underbrace{f(0) + f'(0) + \dots + f^{(p-2)}(0)}_0 + f^{(p-1)}(0) + \underbrace{f^{(p)}(0) + \dots}_{\text{divisible by } p}$$

The first bunch of terms are all zero, and the last bunch are all divisible by  $p$ , but  $f^{(p-1)}(0) = (n!)^p$ . Since  $p$  was chosen to be larger than  $n$ , this is not divisible by  $p$ .

Also,  $p$  was chosen to be larger than  $c_0$ , and so doesn't divide  $c_0$ . As a result,  $p$  doesn't divide the integer  $c_0 F(0) + c_1 F(1) + \dots + c_n F(n)$ .

Recall from before that  $c_0 F(0) + c_1 F(1) + c_2 F(2) + \dots + c_n F(n) = c_1 \varepsilon_1 + c_2 \varepsilon_2 + \dots + c_n \varepsilon_n$ . The left side of this equation is a nonnegative integer (since it is not divisible by  $p$ ). I will show that the right side has absolute value less than 1, and this will be a contradiction.

Fix  $i$  with  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . From the definition of  $\varepsilon_i$  and the formula for  $f(x)$ , we see that

$$\varepsilon_i = -i e^{i(1-\theta_i)} f(i\theta_i) = \frac{-i e^{i(1-\theta_i)} (i\theta_i)^{p-1} (1-i\theta_i)^p \dots (n-i\theta_i)^p}{(p-1)!}.$$

Since  $0 < \theta_i < 1$ , we have

$$|\varepsilon_i| \leq \frac{e^n n^p (n!)^p}{(p-1)!}.$$

As  $p$  goes to  $\infty$ , the right hand side goes to zero, so for  $p$  a sufficiently large prime,

$$|c_1 \varepsilon_1 + \dots + c_n \varepsilon_n| < 1.$$

But  $c_1 \varepsilon_1 + \dots + c_n \varepsilon_n$  must be a nonzero integer. This is the contradiction we were looking for. □