Schanuel's Conjecture

Petra Staynova

Durham University

December 5, 2013

The Conjecture

Conjecture (Schanuel)

If $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are n linearly-independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ complex numbers, then at least n of the following $2n$ numbers are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{Q}$:

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

The Hermite-Lindemann Theorem

The Hermite-Lindemann Theorem

Theorem (Hermite-Lindemann)

If x is a non-zero complex number, then at least one of x, e^x is transcendental.

The Hermite-Lindemann Theorem

Theorem (Hermite-Lindemann)

If x is a non-zero complex number, then at least one of x, e^x is transcendental.

Proposition

The following numbers are transcendental:

The Hermite-Lindemann Theorem

Theorem (Hermite-Lindemann)

If x is a non-zero complex number, then at least one of x, e^x is transcendental.

Proposition

The following numbers are transcendental:

1. e

The Hermite-Lindemann Theorem

Theorem (Hermite-Lindemann)

If x is a non-zero complex number, then at least one of x, e^x is transcendental.

Proposition

The following numbers are transcendental:

1. e
2. π

The Hermite-Lindemann Theorem

Theorem (Hermite-Lindemann)

If x is a non-zero complex number, then at least one of x, e^x is transcendental.

Proposition

The following numbers are transcendental:

1. e
2. π
3. $\log 2$

The Hermite-Lindemann Theorem

Theorem (Hermite-Lindemann)

If x is a non-zero complex number, then at least one of x, e^x is transcendental.

Proposition

The following numbers are transcendental:

1. e
2. π
3. $\log 2$
4. $e^{\sqrt{2}}$

The Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem

The Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem

Theorem (Lindemann-Weierstraß)

If $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then the numbers $e^{x_1}, \ldots, e^{x_n}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-algebraically independent.

The Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem

Theorem (Lindemann-Weierstraß)

If $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ *are* $\mathbb{Q}$*-linearly independent, then the numbers* $e^{x_1}, \ldots, e^{x_n}$ *are* $\mathbb{Q}$*-algebraically independent.*

Note (Proofs of the Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem)

The Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem

Theorem (Lindemann-Weierstraß)

If $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then the numbers $e^{x_1}, \ldots, e^{x_n}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-algebraically independent.

Note (Proofs of the Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem)

- Lindemann approach

The Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem

Theorem (Lindemann-Weierstraß)

If $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then the numbers $e^{x_1}, \ldots, e^{x_n}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-algebraically independent.

Note (Proofs of the Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem)

- Lindemann approach
- Weierstraß approach

The Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem

Theorem (Lindemann-Weierstraß)

If $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ *are* $\mathbb{Q}$*-linearly independent, then the numbers* $e^{x_1}, \ldots, e^{x_n}$ *are* $\mathbb{Q}$*-algebraically independent.*

Note (Proofs of the Lindemann-Weierstraß Theorem)

- Lindemann approach
- Weierstraß approach
- Niven approach (Galois Theory)

The Gel'fond-Schneider Theorem and Baker's Theorem

The Gel'fond-Schneider Theorem and Baker's Theorem

Theorem (Gel'fond-Schneider)

If $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \{0\}$, $\alpha \neq 1$, *and* $\beta \notin \mathbb{Q}$, *then any value of* α^{β} *is transcendental.*

The Gel'fond-Schneider Theorem and Baker's Theorem

Theorem (Gel'fond-Schneider)

If $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \{0\}$, $\alpha \neq 1$, and $\beta \notin \mathbb{Q}$, then any value of α^β is transcendental.

Theorem (Baker's Theorem)

If $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\log \alpha_1, \ldots, \log \alpha_n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then the numbers $1, \log \alpha_1, \ldots, \log \alpha_n$ are linearly independent over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

The Six Exponentials Theorem

The Six Exponentials Theorem

Theorem (Six Exponentials)

Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ also be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then at least one of the six numbers

$$e^{y_1 x_1}, e^{y_1 x_2}, e^{y_2 x_1}, e^{y_2 x_2}, e^{y_3 x_1}, e^{y_3 x_2}$$

is transcendental (over $\mathbb{Q}$).

The Six Exponentials Theorem

Theorem (Six Exponentials)

Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ also be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then at least one of the six numbers

$$e^{y_1 x_1}, e^{y_1 x_2}, e^{y_2 x_1}, e^{y_2 x_2}, e^{y_3 x_1}, e^{y_3 x_2}$$

is transcendental (over $\mathbb{Q}$).

Note

The Six Exponentials Theorem

Theorem (Six Exponentials)

Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ also be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then at least one of the six numbers

$$e^{y_1 x_1}, e^{y_1 x_2}, e^{y_2 x_1}, e^{y_2 x_2}, e^{y_3 x_1}, e^{y_3 x_2}$$

is transcendental (over $\mathbb{Q}$).

Note

- Special case attributed to Siegel in a paper by L. Alaoglu and P. Erdős in 1944.

The Six Exponentials Theorem

Theorem (Six Exponentials)

Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ also be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then at least one of the six numbers

$$e^{y_1 x_1}, e^{y_1 x_2}, e^{y_2 x_1}, e^{y_2 x_2}, e^{y_3 x_1}, e^{y_3 x_2}$$

is transcendental (over $\mathbb{Q}$).

Note

- Special case attributed to Siegel in a paper by L. Alaoglu and P. Erdős in 1944.
- Two independent proofs of the Six Exponentials Theorem were published by S. Lang and K. Ramachandra.

The Six Exponentials Theorem

Theorem (Six Exponentials)

Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, and let $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ also be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Then at least one of the six numbers

$$e^{y_1 x_1}, e^{y_1 x_2}, e^{y_2 x_1}, e^{y_2 x_2}, e^{y_3 x_1}, e^{y_3 x_2}$$

is transcendental (over $\mathbb{Q}$).

Note

- Special case attributed to Siegel in a paper by L. Alaoglu and P. Erdős in 1944.
- Two independent proofs of the Six Exponentials Theorem were published by S. Lang and K. Ramachandra.
- Can also be deduced from a much more general result by Theodor Schneider.

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e + \pi,$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e + \pi, e\pi,$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e + \pi, e\pi, \pi^e,$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e+\pi, e\pi, \pi^e, e^e,$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e+\pi, e\pi, \pi^e, e^e, e^{e^2}, \dots,$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e+\pi, e\pi, \pi^e, e^e, e^{e^2}, \ldots, e^{e^e}, \ldots,$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e+\pi, e\pi, \pi^e, e^e, e^{e^2}, \ldots, e^{e^e}, \ldots, \pi^\pi,$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e+\pi, e\pi, \pi^e, e^e, e^{e^2}, \ldots, e^{e^e}, \ldots, \pi^\pi, \pi^{\pi^2}, \ldots,$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e+\pi, e\pi, \pi^e, e^e, e^{e^2}, \ldots, e^{e^e}, \ldots, \pi^\pi, \pi^{\pi^2}, \ldots, \pi^{\pi^\pi}, \ldots$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures

By induction on n, one can use Schanuel's Conjecture to obtain the algebraic independence of

$$e+\pi, e\pi, \pi^e, e^e, e^{e^2}, \ldots, e^{e^e}, \ldots, \pi^\pi, \pi^{\pi^2}, \ldots, \pi^{\pi^\pi}, \ldots$$

and of

$$\log \pi, \log(\log 2), \pi \log 2, (\log 2)(\log 3), 2^{\log 2}, (\log 2)^{\log 3}, \ldots.$$

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Conjecture

If $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then at least 2 of the 4 numbers $x_1, x_2, e^{x_1}, e^{x_2}$ are algebraically independent.

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Conjecture

If $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then at least 2 of the 4 numbers $x_1, x_2, e^{x_1}, e^{x_2}$ are algebraically independent.

We obtain the algebraic independence of:

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Conjecture

If $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then at least 2 of the 4 numbers $x_1, x_2, e^{x_1}, e^{x_2}$ are algebraically independent.

We obtain the algebraic independence of:

1. e and π;

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Conjecture

If $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then at least 2 of the 4 numbers $x_1, x_2, e^{x_1}, e^{x_2}$ are algebraically independent.

We obtain the algebraic independence of:

1. e and π;
2. e and e^e ;

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Conjecture

If $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then at least 2 of the 4 numbers $x_1, x_2, e^{x_1}, e^{x_2}$ are algebraically independent.

We obtain the algebraic independence of:

1. e and π;
2. e and e^e ;
3. π and e^π;

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Conjecture

If $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then at least 2 of the 4 numbers $x_1, x_2, e^{x_1}, e^{x_2}$ are algebraically independent.

We obtain the algebraic independence of:

1. e and π;
2. e and e^e ;
3. π and e^π;
4. $\log 2$ and $\log 3$;

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Conjecture

If $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then at least 2 of the 4 numbers $x_1, x_2, e^{x_1}, e^{x_2}$ are algebraically independent.

We obtain the algebraic independence of:

1. e and π;
2. e and e^e ;
3. π and e^π;
4. $\log 2$ and $\log 3$;
5. $\log 2$ and $2^{\log 2}$.

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

To give an idea of the difficulty of these seeminly innocuous consequences, item 3 was not proven until 1996:

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

To give an idea of the difficulty of these seemingly innocuous consequences, item 3 was not proven until 1996:

Theorem (Nesterenko)

π and e^{π} are algebraically independent.

The Four Exponentials Conjecture

We also don't know if there exist two logaritms of algebraic numbers which are algebraically independent.

The Four Exponentials Conjecture

We also don't know if there exist two logaritms of algebraic numbers which are algebraically independent.

Conjecture (Four Exponentials)

Given $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_4 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $(\log \alpha_1)(\log \alpha_4) = (\log \alpha_2)(\log \alpha_3)$, then either $\log \alpha_1$ and $\log \alpha_2$ are linearly dependent, or else $\log \alpha_1$ and $\log \alpha_3$ are linearly dependent.

The Four Exponentials Conjecture

We also don't know if there exist two logaritms of algebraic numbers which are algebraically independent.

Conjecture (Four Exponentials)

Given $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_4 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $(\log \alpha_1)(\log \alpha_4) = (\log \alpha_2)(\log \alpha_3)$, then either $\log \alpha_1$ and $\log \alpha_2$ are linearly dependent, or else $\log \alpha_1$ and $\log \alpha_3$ are linearly dependent.

Conjecture (Four Exponentials, restated)

If $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are such that α_1, α_2 are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ and β_1, β_2 are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, then at least one of the four numbers

$$e^{\alpha_1 \beta_1}, e^{\alpha_1 \beta_2}, e^{\alpha_2 \beta_1}, e^{\alpha_2 \beta_2},$$

is transcendental.

Corollaries of Four Exponentials

Corollaries of Four Exponentials

Corollary

If for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, *both* $2^{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $3^{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}$, *then* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$.

Corollaries of Four Exponentials

Corollary

If for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, *both* $2^{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $3^{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}$, *then* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$.

It is interesting to ask:

Corollaries of Four Exponentials

Corollary

If for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, both $2^\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $3^\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$.

It is interesting to ask:

Open Question

If $3^\alpha - 2^\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, can we deduce that either $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ or $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$?

Corollaries of Four Exponentials

Corollary

If for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, both $2^\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $3^\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$.

It is interesting to ask:

Open Question

If $3^\alpha - 2^\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, can we deduce that either $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ or $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$?

Proposition (PS)

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that if $3^\alpha - 2^\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ or $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Proof

Assume Schanuel's Conjecture and consider the set $\{\log 2, \log 3, \alpha \log 2, \alpha \log 3\}$ for α an irrational algebraic number. This set is $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, so by SC,

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{Q}\left(\log 2, \log 3, \alpha \log 2, \alpha \log 3, 2, 3, 2^{\alpha}, 3^{\alpha}\right)) \geqslant 4.$$

Noting that

$$\mathbb{Q}\left(\log 2, \log 3, \alpha \log 2, \alpha \log 3, 2, 3, 2^{\alpha}, 3^{\alpha}\right) = \mathbb{Q}\left(\log 2, \log 3, 2^{\alpha}, 3^{\alpha}\right)$$

and applying properties of bases of extension fields, we have

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{Q}\left(\log 2, \log 3, 2^{\alpha}, 3^{\alpha}\right)\}) = 4.$$

Proof, cont'd

Hence, $3^\alpha - 2^\alpha$ is transcendental for α algebraic irrational.
By the contrapositive, we have that if $3^\alpha - 2^\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$, then α cannot be algebraic irrational, so $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ or $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Gel'fond (in 1948) and Schneider (in 1952) conjectured that:

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Gel'fond (in 1948) and Schneider (in 1952) conjectured that:

Conjecture

If $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and if β has degree $d \geqslant 2$, then $\mathrm{trdeg}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\mathbb{Q}\left(\alpha^{\beta}, \ldots, \alpha^{\beta^{d-1}}\right)\right) = d - 1$.

Consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture Which are Conjectures (cont'd)

Gel'fond (in 1948) and Schneider (in 1952) conjectured that:

Conjecture

If $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and if β has degree $d \geqslant 2$, then $\mathrm{trdeg}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left(\mathbb{Q}\left(\alpha^{\beta}, \ldots, \alpha^{\beta^{d-1}}\right)\right) = d - 1$.

Conjecture (Gel'fond)

If $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \{0\}$ are such that $\log \beta_1, \ldots, \log \beta_n$ are also linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, then

$$e^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, e^{\alpha_n}, \log \beta_1, \ldots, \log \beta_n$$

are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-algebraically independent.

Even more conjectural consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture

Even more conjectural consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture

Conjecture

[Algebraic Independence of Logarithms] Let $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \{0\}$ and suppose that $\log \beta_1, \ldots, \log \beta_n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent. Then $\log \beta_1, \ldots, \log \beta_n$ are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-algebraically independent.

Even more conjectural consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture

Conjecture

[Algebraic Independence of Logarithms] Let $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \{0\}$ and suppose that $\log \beta_1, \ldots, \log \beta_n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent. Then $\log \beta_1, \ldots, \log \beta_n$ are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-algebraically independent.

Conjecture

If $\alpha, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\alpha \neq 0, 1$, and $1, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, then $\log \alpha, \alpha^{\beta_1}, \ldots, \alpha^{\beta_n}$ are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-algebraically independent.

Even more conjectural consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture

Lang and Ramachandra independently stated special cases of yet another conjecture which follows from Schanuel's Conjecture:

Even more conjectural consequences of Schanuel's Conjecture

Lang and Ramachandra independently stated special cases of yet another conjecture which follows from Schanuel's Conjecture:

Conjecture (Lang and Ramachandra)

If $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent, and β is a transcendental number, then

$$\operatorname{trdeg}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbb{Q}\left(e^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, e^{\alpha_n}, e^{\alpha_1\beta}, \ldots, e^{\alpha_n\beta}\right)) \geqslant n-1.$$

An interesting consequence

Another interesting consequence is:

Conjecture

The numbers

An interesting consequence

Another interesting consequence is:

Conjecture

The numbers

$e, e^{\pi}, e^{e}, e^{i}, \pi, \pi^{\pi}, \pi^{e}, \pi^{i}, 2^{\pi}, 2^{e}, 2^{i}, \log\pi, \log 2, \log 3, \log\log 2, (\log 2)^{\log 3}, 2^{\sqrt{2}}$

An interesting consequence

Another interesting consequence is:

Conjecture

The numbers

$$e, e^{\pi}, e^{e}, e^{i}, \pi, \pi^{\pi}, \pi^{e}, \pi^{i}, 2^{\pi}, 2^{e}, 2^{i}, \log \pi, \log 2, \log 3, \log \log 2, (\log 2)^{\log 3}, 2^{\sqrt{2}}$$

are $\mathbb{Q}$-algebraically independent (and, in particular, they are transcendental).

An interesting consequence

Another interesting consequence is:

Conjecture

The numbers

$$e, e^{\pi}, e^{e}, e^{i}, \pi, \pi^{\pi}, \pi^{e}, \pi^{i}, 2^{\pi}, 2^{e}, 2^{i}, \log \pi, \log 2, \log 3, \log \log 2, (\log 2)^{\log 3}, 2^{\sqrt{2}}$$

are $\mathbb{Q}$-algebraically independent (and, in particular, they are transcendental).

Jump to Relations to Model Theory

Lang's Conjecture

We now turn to a conjecture by Lang.

Definition

We define the field E by transfinite induction on the ordinals:

Lang's Conjecture

We now turn to a conjecture by Lang.

Definition

We define the field E by transfinite induction on the ordinals:

1. $E_0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,

We now turn to a conjecture by Lang.

Definition

We define the field E by transfinite induction on the ordinals:

1. $E_0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,
2. $E_{n+1} = \overline{E_n\left(e^x : x \in E_n\right)}$,

Lang's Conjecture

We now turn to a conjecture by Lang.

Definition

We define the field E by transfinite induction on the ordinals:

1. $E_0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,
2. $E_{n+1} = \overline{E_n\left(e^x : x \in E_n\right)}$,
3. $E = E_\omega = \bigcup_{n \leqslant \omega} E_n$

Lang's Conjecture

We now turn to a conjecture by Lang.

Definition

We define the field E by transfinite induction on the ordinals:

1. $E_0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,
2. $E_{n+1} = \overline{E_n\left(e^x : x \in E_n\right)}$,
3. $E = E_\omega = \bigcup_{n \leqslant \omega} E_n$

Note

For ordinals $\alpha > \omega$, $E_\alpha = E$. In particular,
$E_{\omega+1} = \overline{E_\omega\left(e^x : x \in E_\omega\right)} = \overline{E\left(e^x : x \in E\right)} = E$.

Lang's Conjecture

Proposition

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that $\pi \notin E$.

Lang's Conjecture

Proposition

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that $\pi \notin E$.

Definition

We define the field L by

Lang's Conjecture

Proposition

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that $\pi \notin E$.

Definition

We define the field L by

1. $L_0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,

Lang's Conjecture

Proposition

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that $\pi \notin E$.

Definition

We define the field L by

1. $L_0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,
2. $L_{n+1} = \overline{L_n\left(\log x : x \in \mathbb{E}_n\right)}$,

Lang's Conjecture

Proposition

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that $\pi \notin E$.

Definition

We define the field L by

1. $L_0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,
2. $L_{n+1} = \overline{L_n\left(\log x : x \in \mathbb{E}_n\right)}$,
3. $L = L_\omega = \bigcup_{n<\omega} L_n$,

Lang's Conjecture

Proposition

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that $\pi \notin E$.

Definition

We define the field L by

1. $L_0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$,
2. $L_{n+1} = \overline{L_n (\log x : x \in \mathbb{E}_n)}$,
3. $L = L_\omega = \bigcup_{n<\omega} L_n$,

again noting that $L_{\omega+1} = L$.

Lang's Conjecture

Definition (linearly disjoint field extensions)

Let $F \supset K$ be a field extension and $K \subseteq F_1, F_2 \subseteq F$ be two subextensions. We say they are *linearly disjoint over* K if and only if whenever $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset F_1$ is linearly independent over K, then $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ is also linearly independent over F_2.

Lang's Conjecture

Definition (linearly disjoint field extensions)

Let $F \supset K$ be a field extension and $K \subseteq F_1, F_2 \subseteq F$ be two subextensions. We say they are *linearly disjoint over* K if and only if whenever $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \subset F_1$ is linearly independent over K, then $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ is also linearly independent over F_2.

Theorem (Lang's Exercise)

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that the fields E and L are linearly disjoint over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Lang's Conjecture, corollaries

Lang's Conjecture, corollaries

Corollary

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that:

1. $L \cap E = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$;
2. $\pi \notin E$;

Lang's Conjecture, corollaries

Corollary

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that:

1. $L \cap E = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$;
2. $\pi \notin E$;

The following corollary to Lang is interesting in light of the previous Conjectures:

Lang's Conjecture, corollaries

Corollary

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that:

1. $L \cap E = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$;
2. $\pi \notin E$;

The following corollary to Lang is interesting in light of the previous Conjectures:

Corollary

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that:

1. $\pi, \log \pi, \log\log \pi, \ldots$ *are algebraically independent over* E;
2. $e, e^e, e^{e^e}, \ldots$ *are algebraically independent over* L;

Lang's Conjecture, corollaries

Corollary

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that:

1. $L \cap E = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$;
2. $\pi \notin E$;

The following corollary to Lang is interesting in light of the previous Conjectures:

Corollary

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that:

1. $\pi, \log \pi, \log\log \pi, \ldots$ *are algebraically independent over* E;
2. $e, e^e, e^{e^e}, \ldots$ *are algebraically independent over* L;

Jump to Relations to Model Theory

Chow's Interesting Result I

We note that the Hermite-Lindemann Theorem can be restated as:

Theorem

The only solution to equation

$$e^{\alpha} = \beta$$

in the algebraic numbers is $\alpha = 0, \beta = 1$.

We know that the equation has many solutions for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$. But can we do better in narrowing down the domain over which it still has solutions? A natural idea would be to take $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and close it with respect to taking exp and log, which leads us to the following definition:

Chow's Interesting Result II

Definition

A subfield F of $\mathbb{C}$ is *closed under* exp *and* log if (1) $\exp(x) \in F$ for all $x \in F$ and (2) $\log(x) \in F$ for all nonzero $x \in F$, where log is the branch of the natural logarithm function such that $-\pi < \mathrm{I}m(\log x) \leqslant \pi$ for all x. The *field* $\mathbb{E}$ *of EL numbers* is the intersection of all subfields of $\mathbb{C}$ that are closed under exp and log.

Now, let us make the question a bit more specific: rather than considering pairs (α, β), we consider the special case when $\alpha = -\beta$, so now we ask whether the equation

$$\alpha + e^{\alpha} = 0 \tag{1}$$

has a real root in $\mathbb{E}$. In [?], Timothy Chow claims that the Conjecture we have just stated is still unsolved:

Chow's Interesting Result III

Conjecture (Chow)

The real root R of $\alpha + e^{\alpha} = 0$ is not in $\mathbb{E}$.

Theorem

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that the real root R of $\alpha + e^{\alpha} = 0$ is not in $\mathbb{E}$.

In fact, Schanuel's Conjecture implies a stronger result, due to Lin [?]:

Theorem

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that whenever $f(x, y) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x, y]$ is an irreducible polynomial and $f(\alpha, \exp(\alpha)) = 0$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, then $\alpha \notin \mathbb{L}$, where $\mathbb{L}$ is the smallest algebraically closed subfield of $\mathbb{C}$ that is closed under exp *and* log.

Jump to Relations to Model Theory

Even even more consequences! I

A curious result is given by Sondow:

Theorem

Assuming Schanuel's Conjecture, let $z, w \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$*. If both* $z^w, w^z \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$*, then* z *and* w *are either both rational or both transcendental.*

There is another very interesting consequence of Schanuel's Conjecture by Guiseppina Terzo, concerning algebraic relations among the elements of the exponential ring $(\mathbb{C}, e^x)$. Let us first give the formal definition, found in:

Definition

An *exponential ring* is a pair (R, E) with R a commutative ring with 1 and $E : R \to \mathcal{U}(R)$ a morphism of the additive group of R into the multiplicative group of units of R satisfying $E(x + y) = E(x).E(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$, and $E(0) = 1$.

Even even more consequences! II

So, intuitively, E plays the role of the exponential function in the commutative ring R. For her result, Terzo uses a more general version of Schanuel's Conjecture, which holds for any exponential ring:

Conjecture (Schanuel's Condition)

An exponential ring R satisfies Schanuel's Condition if R is a characteristic 0 domain and whenever $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ in R are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$, the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n, E(\alpha_1), \ldots, E(\alpha_n)]$ has transcendence degree at least n over $\mathbb{Q}$.

We recall that:

Definition

The characteristic of a field K is the smallest positive integer n with the property $nx = 0$ for all $x \in K$, and it is zero if no such n exists.

With these preliminaries in mind, Terzo's result states:

Even even more consequences! III

Theorem

Assuming Schanuel's Conjecture, there are no further relations between π *and* i *except the known ones,* $e^{i\pi} = -1$ *and* $i^2 = -1$.

Connections with Model Theory, take I

Connections with Model Theory, take I

Definition (decidability)

A theory is *decidable* iff there is an effective procedure that, given an arbitrary formula expressible in the language of the theory, decides whether the formula is a member of the theory or not.

Connections with Model Theory, take I

Definition (decidability)

A theory is *decidable* iff there is an effective procedure that, given an arbitrary formula expressible in the language of the theory, decides whether the formula is a member of the theory or not.

Open Question (Tarski, 1951)

Is the theory of the real field with exponentiation, $\mathbb{R}_{\exp}$ decidable?

Connections with Model Theory, take I

Definition (decidability)

A theory is *decidable* iff there is an effective procedure that, given an arbitrary formula expressible in the language of the theory, decides whether the formula is a member of the theory or not.

Open Question (Tarski, 1951)

Is the theory of the real field with exponentiation, $\mathbb{R}_{\text{exp}}$ decidable?

Theorem (McIntyre and Wilkie, 1996)

Schanuel's Conjecture implies that the real field with exponentiation, $\mathbb{R}_{\text{exp}}$, is decidable.

Zilber's Result

"It's always a pleasure to introduce ideas from model theory to people who do real mathematics." Professor Boris Zilber

Zilber's Result

"It's always a pleasure to introduce ideas from model theory to people who do real mathematics." Professor Boris Zilber

Definition

Let $X \subseteq K$ be finite. We define a *dimension*

$$\partial(X) = \mathsf{sup}\{\mathrm{trdeg}(Y \cup E(\mathrm{span}(Y)) - \mathrm{lindim}(Y) : X \subseteq Y \text{ is finite}\}$$

and a *closure operator*

$$\mathrm{cl}(X) = \{a : \partial(X) = \partial(Xa)\}.$$

Zilber's Result

Theorem (Zilber, 2005)

For all uncountable cardinals κ, there is a unique model of Φ of cardinality κ. If $(K, +, ., E) \models \Phi$, then every definable subset of K is countable or with countable complement. If $A \subseteq K$ is finite and $a, b \notin cl(A)$ there is an automorphism of K taking a to b.

Zilber's Result

Moreover, if $(K, +, ., E) \models \Phi$, then $(K, +, ., E)$ satisfies the following five axioms:

Zilber's Result

Moreover, if $(K, +, ., E) \models \Phi$, then $(K, +, ., E)$ satisfies the following five axioms:

Axiom (EXP)

$$E(x_1 + x_2) = E(x_1).E(x_2)$$
$$\ker(E) = \pi\mathbb{Z}, \text{ some } \pi \in K.$$

Zilber's Result

Moreover, if $(K, +, ., E) \vDash \Phi$, then $(K, +, ., E)$ satisfies the following five axioms:

Axiom (EXP)

$$E(x_1 + x_2) = E(x_1).E(x_2)$$
$$\ker(E) = \pi\mathbb{Z}, \text{ some } \pi \in K.$$

Axiom (SCH)

$$\mathrm{trdeg}(X \cup E(X)) - \mathrm{lindim}(X) \geqslant 0,$$

Zilber's Result

Axiom (EC)

For any non-overdetermined irreducible system of polynomial equations

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n) = 0$$

there exists a generic solution satisfying

$$y_i = E(x_i) \ i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Zilber's Result

Axiom (EC)

For any non-overdetermined irreducible system of polynomial equations

$$P(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n) = 0$$

there exists a generic solution satisfying

$$y_i = E(x_i) \; i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Axiom (CC)

Analytic subsets of K^n of dimension 0 are countable.

Zilber's Result

Axiom (EC)

For any non-overdetermined irreducible system of polynomial equations

$$P(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n) = 0$$

there exists a generic solution satisfying

$$y_i = E(x_i) \; i = 1, \ldots, n.$$

Axiom (CC)

Analytic subsets of K^n of dimension 0 are countable.

Axiom (ACF_0)

Axioms for algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0.

Even more from Zilber

Conjecture

The field of complex numbers with exponentiation, $\mathbb{C}_{\exp}$, is isomorphic to the unique field with exponentiation K_E of cardinality $2^{\aleph_0}$.

Even more from Zilber

Conjecture

The field of complex numbers with exponentiation, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}}$, is isomorphic to the unique field with exponentiation K_E of cardinality $2^{\aleph_0}$.

We conclude with a final interesting result from Model Theory which runs in a similar vein:

Even more from Zilber

Conjecture

The field of complex numbers with exponentiation, $\mathbb{C}_{\exp}$, is isomorphic to the unique field with exponentiation K_E of cardinality $2^{\aleph_0}$.

We conclude with a final interesting result from Model Theory which runs in a similar vein:

Theorem

There are at most countably many essential counterexamples to Schanuel's Conjecture.

Want more fun consequences?

- Lang's Exercise
- Chow's Interesting Result
- Terso's Curious Consequence
- Some of the Proofs we have omitted