

MATHEMATICAL CENTRE TRACTS 94

**SIMULTANEOUS APPROXIMATIONS
IN TRANSCENDENTAL
NUMBER THEORY**

A. BIJLSMA

MATHEMATISCH CENTRUM AMSTERDAM 1978

AMS (MOS) subject classification scheme (1970): 10F35, 10F45, 10F10

ISBN 90 6196 162 9

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
1. Introduction	1
2. A test for the simultaneous approximability of a , b and a^b	9
3. The non-interchangeability of a and b	29
4. Simultaneous approximation measures for subsets of $\{a, b, P(a, b, a^b)\}$	41
5. Many-variable analogues	51
6. The p -adic case	81
References	98
Index of special symbols	101

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To those that have contributed to the preparation of this monograph, I wish to express my gratitude. In particular, I owe much to Dr H. Jager and Dr P.L. Cijsouw for their valuable advice and criticism.

I thank the Mathematical Centre for the opportunity to publish this monograph in their series Mathematical Centre Tracts and all those at the Mathematical Centre who have contributed to its technical realization.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. DEFINITION. Let F be a field containing the rational numbers. An element ξ of F is called *algebraic* if there is a polynomial $P \neq 0$ with rational coefficients such that $P(\xi) = 0$; ξ is called *transcendental* if ξ is not algebraic.

Transcendental number theory is the branch of number theory that studies the relationship between transcendental and algebraic elements of the field of complex numbers, and of certain other fields such as the one introduced in 6.3 below. Many theorems in transcendental number theory have the following form: a set X of n -tuples of complex numbers and a complex function f , defined on X , are given and it is stated that for all (a_1, \dots, a_n) that belong to X the set $\{a_1, \dots, a_n, f(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}$ contains at least one transcendental number. The two most famous examples of such theorems are:

1.2. THEOREM (Hermite-Lindemann). *Let $a \neq 0$ be a complex number. Then the set $\{a, \exp(a)\}$ contains at least one transcendental number.*

PROOF. [Waldschmidt 1974], Théorème 3.1.1. The original memoirs are [Hermite 1873] and [Lindemann 1882]. \square

1.3. THEOREM (Gel'fond-Schneider). *Let a and b be complex numbers; suppose that $a \neq 0$ and that b is not rational. Let $\ell(a) \neq 0$ be a value of the logarithm of a and put $a^b := \exp(b\ell(a))$. Then the set $\{a, b, a^b\}$ contains at least one transcendental number.*

PROOF. [Waldschmidt 1974], Théorème 2.1.1. The original memoirs are [Gel'fond 1934] and [Schneider 1934]. \square

The theory of approximation measures provides a quantitative generalization to theorems of this type. This is achieved by introducing the concepts of degree and height of an algebraic number; instead of merely stating that some number is transcendental, we are enabled to estimate how well it can be approximated by algebraic numbers of given degree and height.

1.4. DEFINITION. (a) Let P be a polynomial in one variable with complex coefficients. Then the *height* of P , denoted $h(P)$, is defined as the max-

imum of the absolute values of the coefficients of P .

(b) Let F be a field containing the rational numbers; assume $\xi \in F$ is algebraic. The *minimal polynomial* of ξ is defined as the unique irreducible polynomial P with rational integer coefficients and positive leading coefficient that satisfies $P(\xi) = 0$.

(c) Let F be a field containing the rational numbers; assume $\xi \in F$ is algebraic. The *degree* of ξ , denoted $\text{dg}(\xi)$, is the degree of the minimal polynomial of ξ .

(d) Let F be a field containing the rational numbers; assume $\xi \in F$ is algebraic. The *height* of ξ , denoted $h(\xi)$, is the height of the minimal polynomial of ξ .

An approximation measure for a transcendental complex number a is a positive function g of two positive integer variables, such that for all d and H the inequality

$$|a - \alpha| > g(d, H)$$

is satisfied for all α belonging to the set of algebraic complex numbers of degree at most d and height at most H (note that for fixed d and H this set is finite). Again, many theorems are known of the following form: a set X of n -tuples of algebraic complex numbers and a complex function f , defined on X , are given and it is stated that for all (a_1, \dots, a_n) that belong to X the number $f(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ possesses a certain approximation measure g . In such results, however, the symmetry between a_1, \dots, a_n and $f(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is lost; the object of the following chapters is to investigate whether analogous theorems that preserve this symmetry can be derived. Let a_1, \dots, a_n be transcendental complex numbers; a simultaneous approximation measure for the set $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ is a positive function g of two positive integer variables, such that for all d and H the inequality

$$(1.1) \quad \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|) > g(d, H)$$

is satisfied for all algebraic complex numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ of degree at most d and height at most H . The results we desire are of the following form: a set X of n -tuples of complex numbers and a complex function f , defined on X , are given and it is stated that for all (a_1, \dots, a_n) that

belong to X the set $\{a_1, \dots, a_n, f(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}$ possesses a certain simultaneous approximation measure g . In order to simplify the problem, we shall limit ourselves to approximation by algebraic numbers of fixed degree; in other words, only the dependence of g on the second variable will be considered. Moreover, we relax the definition of a simultaneous approximation measure in that we allow that (1.1) is not satisfied for finitely many n -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$; if necessary, the validity of (1.1) may be extended to all $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ by multiplying $g(d, H)$ by a sufficiently large factor that depends only on a_1, \dots, a_n, d and not on H .

The generalization of the Hermite-Lindemann theorem to a result of this form has essentially been achieved; for instance, Cijssouw [1975] proved that for every positive number ϵ , positive integer d and complex number a , there exist only finitely many pairs (α, β) of algebraic complex numbers of degree at most d such that

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |\exp(a)-\beta|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{-1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta))$. (The notation \log_2 is an abbreviation for $\log \log$.)

The case of the Gel'fond-Schneider theorem presents more difficulties. After some initial results (see [Ricci 1935], [Franklin 1937]) the following statement appeared in [Schneider 1957]: suppose ϵ is a positive real number, d is a positive integer and a and b are complex numbers such that $a \neq 0$, $a \neq 1$ and b is not rational; suppose that $\ell(a)$ is a value of the logarithm of a . Then there exist only finitely many triples (α, β, γ) of algebraic complex numbers of degree at most d such that

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^{5+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$ and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$. Bundschuh [1973] remarked that in Schneider's proof a condition like " β not rational" is needed and tried to prove a theorem without such a restriction. His assertion is that, in the situation described above, there are only finitely many triples (α, β, γ) with

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^4 H \log_2^{-2+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$. However, there is an error at the beginning of the proof of his Satz 2a, so that his result, too, is only valid under some extra assumption.

Earlier Šmelev [1971] had proved that, in the situation described above, only finitely many triples (α, β, γ) with β not rational have the property

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^4 H \log_2^3 H).$$

Cijsouw and Waldschmidt [1977] recently improved upon the above results by demonstrating the following theorem.

1.5. THEOREM. *Let ϵ be a positive real number, d a positive integer. Let a and b be complex numbers with $a \neq 0$; let $\ell(a) \neq 0$ be a value of the logarithm of a and put $a^b := \exp(b\ell(a))$. Then there are only finitely many triples (α, β, γ) , with β not rational, of algebraic complex numbers of degree at most d for which*

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. [Cijsouw-Waldschmidt 1977], Theorem 2. \square

In [Bijlsma 1977], the present author showed that from all these theorems the condition that β not be rational cannot be omitted. More precisely, the following was proved:

1.6. THEOREM. *For any fixed positive integer κ , there exist irrational real numbers a and b with $0 < a < 1$ and $0 < b < 1$ such that for infinitely many triples (α, β, γ) of rational numbers*

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^\kappa H),$$

where $H = \max(h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. [Bijlsma 1977], Theorem 1. \square

In theorems like 1.5, the occurrence of a condition upon the num-

ber β is undesirable and one would naturally want to replace it by a condition upon the given number b . This is certainly possible: for instance, it is quite easy to see that the estimate in 1.5 holds for arbitrary triples (α, β, γ) if one assumes that, for real b , the convergents p_n/q_n of the continued fraction expansion of b satisfy

$$q_{n+1} \ll \exp(\log^3 q_n), \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

(Note that the real numbers b for which this condition is not fulfilled, are U^* -numbers (see [Schneider 1957], III §3) and thus form a set of Lebesgue measure zero.) A sharper result in the same direction is given by the next theorem.

1.7. THEOREM. *Let ε be a positive real number, d a positive integer. Let a and b be complex numbers; suppose that $a \neq 0$ and that b is not rational. Let $\ell(a) \neq 0$ be a value of the logarithm of a and put $a^b := \exp(b\ell(a))$. If b is not real, or if b is real such that the convergents p_n/q_n of the continued fraction expansion of b satisfy*

$$(1.2) \quad q_{n+1} \ll \exp(q_n^3), \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

there are only finitely many triples (α, β, γ) of algebraic complex numbers of degree at most d with

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. [Bijlsma 1977], Theorem 2. \square

The purpose of Chapter 2 below is to make this last assertion still more precise: it will be proved that the sufficient condition (1.2) may be sharpened to

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} q_n} = 0,$$

while a necessary condition is given by

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{q_n^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} q_n} < \infty.$$

In Chapter 3 we consider the question whether these conditions on b may be replaced by analogous assumptions as to the nature of a .

Chapter 4 is based on the following results of Fel'dman [1964] and Smelev [1970]:

1.8. THEOREM. Let ϵ be a positive real number, d a positive integer. Let a and b be complex numbers; suppose that $a \neq 0$ and that b is algebraic but not rational. Let $\ell(a)$ be a value of the logarithm of a ; put $a^b := \exp(b\ell(a))$. Let P be an irreducible polynomial of two variables, with rational integer coefficients, of degree at least one in each variable, such that $P(0,0) \neq 0$ and $P(1,1) \neq 0$. If $P(a, a^b) = 0$, there exist only finitely many algebraic complex numbers α of degree at most d for which

$$|a - \alpha| < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{-1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha))$.

PROOF. [Fel'dman 1964]. \square

1.9. THEOREM. Let ϵ be a positive real number, d a positive integer. Let a and b be complex numbers; suppose that $a \neq 0$, $a \neq 1$, a is algebraic and b is not rational. Let $\ell(a)$ be a value of the logarithm of a ; put $a^b := \exp(b\ell(a))$. Let P be a polynomial of two variables, with rational integer coefficients, of degree at least one in each variable, such that P is not divisible by a polynomial containing only the first variable. If $P(b, a^b) = 0$, there exist only finitely many algebraic complex numbers β of degree at most d with

$$|b - \beta| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{5+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta))$.

PROOF. [Smelev 1970], Theorem 1. \square

In Chapter 4 below, 1.8 and 1.9 are generalized to obtain simultaneous approximation measures for subsets of $\{a, b, P(a, b, a^b)\}$; we also con-

sider the case that $\ell(a) = 1$ and the case where P does not remain fixed.

Now let $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ be complex numbers such that none of a_1, \dots, a_n is zero; let $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ be non-zero values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively and put

$$\underline{a}^{\underline{b}} := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n)).$$

Wallisser [1973] derived a simultaneous approximation measure for $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ in case a_1, \dots, a_n and $\underline{a}^{\underline{b}}$ are algebraic; Bundschuh [1975] gave a simultaneous approximation measure for $\{b_1, \dots, b_n, \underline{a}^{\underline{b}}\}$ in case a_1, \dots, a_n are algebraic (however, this proof depends on the erroneous statement in [Bundschuh 1973]). Again, Cijssouw and Waldschmidt [1977] improved upon these results. For non-zero b_0 , they established simultaneous approximation measures for $\{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n, \underline{a}^{\underline{b} - \exp(b_0)}\}$ in case of algebraic a_1, \dots, a_n and for $\{a_1, \dots, a_n, b_0, b_1, \dots, b_n, \underline{a}^{\underline{b} - \exp(b_0)}\}$. Furthermore, they proved the following theorems.

1.10. THEOREM. Let ϵ be a positive real number, d a positive integer. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ be complex numbers such that a_1, \dots, a_n are algebraic and none of a_1, \dots, a_n is zero; let $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ be non-zero values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively and put

$$\underline{a}^{\underline{b}} := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n)).$$

Then there are only finitely many $(n+1)$ -tuples $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma)$ of algebraic complex numbers of degree at most d such that $1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ are linearly independent over the rationals and

$$\max(|b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|, |\underline{a}^{\underline{b} - \gamma}|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^\epsilon H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. [Cijssouw-Waldschmidt 1977], Theorem 3 and the remark following Theorem 4. \square

1.11. THEOREM. Let ϵ be a positive real number, d a positive integer. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ be complex numbers such that none of a_1, \dots, a_n is zero; let $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ be non-zero values of the logarithms of

a_1, \dots, a_n respectively and put $\underline{a}^b := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n))$. Then there are only finitely many $(2n+1)$ -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma)$ of algebraic complex numbers of degree at most d such that $1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ are linearly independent over the rationals and

$$\max(|a_1^{-\alpha_1}|, \dots, |a_n^{-\alpha_n}|, |b_1^{-\beta_1}|, \dots, |b_n^{-\beta_n}|, |\underline{a}^b - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log_2^{n+2} H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. [Cijssouw-Waldschmidt 1977], Theorem 5. \square

Because of the unnatural condition on the numbers β_1, \dots, β_n , 1.10 and 1.11 cannot be called simultaneous approximation measures in the strict sense. Again, it would be preferable if it could be replaced by a condition on the given numbers. This is achieved in Chapter 5: there analogues of 1.10 and 1.11 are proved in which the condition that $1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ be linearly independent over the rationals is replaced by conditions depending on a_1, \dots, a_n and their logarithms and on b_1, \dots, b_n . In the case of 1.10, it turns out to be sufficient to demand that $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ or $1, b_1, \dots, b_n$ be linearly independent over the rationals. In the case of 1.11, it is sufficient if there exists a $C > 1$ such that for rational integer x_0, \dots, x_n that are not all zero we have

$$(1.3) \quad |x_0 + x_1 b_1 + \dots + x_n b_n| \geq C^{-1} \exp(-x^\rho \log^{-\sigma} x),$$

where $\rho = (4n+8)/(n^2+2n+1)$, $\sigma = (3n^2+6n-1)/(n^2+2n+1)$, and x denotes the maximum of 2 and the absolute values of x_0, \dots, x_n . The case that b_1, \dots, b_n are fixed algebraic numbers is also considered; the results of this chapter enable us to derive many-variable analogues of the theorems in Chapter 4.

Finally, Chapter 6 gives an analogue of 1.7 in which the complex numbers have been replaced by an algebraically closed, complete field with a non-archimedean valuation.

2. A TEST FOR THE SIMULTANEOUS APPROXIMABILITY OF a , b AND a^b

As stated in the Introduction, the purpose of the present chapter is to prove a sharpened version of 1.7. This is achieved in 2.24 below; before that, however, we need to give a number of auxiliary results. First of all we introduce some definitions to simplify the phrasing of what follows.

2.1. DEFINITION. (a) By \mathbb{N} , \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{Q} , \mathbb{R} , \mathbb{C} we denote the sets of all positive integers, of all rational integers, and of all rational, real and complex numbers respectively. By $]a, b[$ we denote the open, by $[a, b]$ the closed interval from a to b .

(b) By \mathbb{A} we denote the set of all algebraic complex numbers, by \mathbb{A}_d the set of all algebraic complex numbers of degree at most d .

(c) If R is some ring, $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ denotes the ring of all polynomials in n variables with coefficients from R ; instead of $R[x_1]$ we write $R[x]$.

2.2. DEFINITION. (a) Let F be a field containing \mathbb{Q} ; assume $\eta \in F$ is algebraic. Then η is called an *algebraic integer* if its minimal polynomial has leading coefficient 1.

(b) Let F be a field containing \mathbb{Q} ; assume $\eta \in F$ is algebraic. The *denominator* of η , denoted $\text{den}(\eta)$, is the least $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m\eta$ is an algebraic integer.

(c) Let F be a field containing \mathbb{Q} ; assume $\eta \in F$, $\eta' \in F$ are algebraic. Then η and η' are called *conjugate* if η and η' have the same minimal polynomial.

(d) For $\eta \in \mathbb{A}$, by $|\eta|$ we denote the maximum of the absolute values of the conjugates of η in \mathbb{A} .

2.3. DEFINITION. (a) A field F is called a *normal extension* of \mathbb{Q} if $\mathbb{Q} \subset F$ and if every $\eta \in F$ that is algebraic of degree d has exactly d conjugates in F ; it is called a *finite normal extension* of \mathbb{Q} if it is a normal extension of \mathbb{Q} and has finite degree over \mathbb{Q} .

(b) If F is a finite normal extension of \mathbb{Q} , $\text{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$ denotes the set of automorphisms σ of F that satisfy $\sigma(\xi) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$.

2.4. LEMMA. (a) Let F be an algebraically closed field containing \mathbb{Q} ; as-

sume $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \in F$ are algebraic. Then there exists a finite normal extension F' of \mathbb{Q} such that $F' \subset F$ and F' contains η_1, \dots, η_n .

(b) Let F be a finite normal extension of \mathbb{Q} . Then $\eta, \eta' \in F$ are conjugate if and only if there exists a $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$ with $\sigma(\eta) = \eta'$.

PROOF. [Van der Waerden 1966], §§ 41, 57. \square

2.5. LEMMA. (a) Let F be a field containing \mathbb{Q} ; assume $\eta \in F$ is algebraic. Then $\text{den}(\eta) \leq h(\eta)$.

(b) For $\eta \in \mathbb{A}$ we have $|\overline{\eta}| \leq h(\eta) + 1$.

(c) For $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \in \mathbb{A}$ we have $|\overline{\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n}| \leq |\overline{\eta_1}| + \dots + |\overline{\eta_n}|$ and $|\overline{\eta_1 \dots \eta_n}| \leq |\overline{\eta_1}| \dots |\overline{\eta_n}|$.

PROOF. (a) [Schneider 1957], Hilfssatz 2.

(b) [Schneider 1957], Hilfssatz 1.

(c) According to 2.4(a), \mathbb{C} contains a finite normal extension F of \mathbb{Q} containing η_1, \dots, η_n ; put $G := \text{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$. According to 2.4(b),

$$\forall \xi \in F: |\overline{\xi}| = \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\xi)|.$$

Thus, if $\eta := \eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{\eta}| &= \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta)| = \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta_1) + \dots + \sigma(\eta_n)| \leq \\ &\max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta_1)| + \dots + \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta_n)| = |\overline{\eta_1}| + \dots + |\overline{\eta_n}| \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $|\overline{\eta_1 \dots \eta_n}| \leq |\overline{\eta_1}| \dots |\overline{\eta_n}|$. \square

2.6. LEMMA. For $\eta \in \mathbb{A}$ we have either $\eta = 0$ or

$$|\eta| \geq \exp(-2dg(\eta) \max(\log |\overline{\eta}|, \log \text{den}(\eta))).$$

PROOF. [Waldschmidt 1974], (1.2.3). \square

2.7. LEMMA (Siegel). Let F be a field such that $\mathbb{Q} \subset F \subset \mathbb{C}$ and F has degree d over \mathbb{Q} . Suppose $a_{i,j} \in F$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$ such that

$$|\overline{a_{i,j}}| \leq A, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad j = 1, \dots, m.$$

If $n > dm$, there exist $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_{i,j} x_i = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

and

$$\max(|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|) \leq (\sqrt{2} nA)^{dm/(n-dm)}.$$

PROOF. [Waldschmidt 1974], Lemme 1.3.1. \square

The next lemma gives a connexion between the rate of growth of an entire function and its number of zeros. Results of such a type are fundamental in transcendence proofs.

2.8. LEMMA. Let f be an entire function. Suppose $S, T \in \mathbb{N}$, $A, R \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $A > 2$ and $R \geq 2S$. If $f^{(t)}(s) = 0$ for $s = 0, \dots, S-1$ and $t = 0, \dots, T-1$, it follows that

$$\max_{|z| \leq R} |f(z)| \leq 2 \max_{|z| \leq AR} |f(z)| \left(\frac{2}{A}\right)^{ST}.$$

PROOF. [Cijssouw 1974], Lemma 7. \square

2.9. DEFINITION. A branch of the logarithm is a function ℓ , defined on a set $K \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, such that ℓ is holomorphic on K and $\exp(\ell(z)) = z$ for all $z \in K$.

Now we give two lemmas about vanishing linear forms in the logarithms of algebraic numbers.

2.10. LEMMA. Suppose $d \in \mathbb{N}$, K a compact subset of the complex plane not containing 0, ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 branches of the logarithm, defined on K , such that ℓ_1 does not take the value 0. Then only finitely many pairs $(\alpha, \gamma) \in K^2$ of algebraic numbers of degree at most d have the property that a $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ exists with

$$\beta \ell_1(\alpha) - \ell_2(\gamma) = 0$$

and

$$h(\beta) \geq \log H,$$

where $H = \max(h(\alpha), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. [Bijlsma 1977], Lemma 3. \square

2.11. LEMMA. For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d , with the following property. Let K be a compact subset of the complex plane not containing 0, ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 branches of the logarithm, defined on K , such that ℓ_1 does not take the value 0. Then only finitely many pairs $(\alpha, \gamma) \in K^2$ of algebraic numbers of degree at most d have the property that a $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ exists with

$$\beta \ell_1(\alpha) - \ell_2(\gamma) = 0$$

and

$$(2.1) \quad C \log H < B \log B,$$

where $H = \max(h(\alpha), h(\gamma))$ and $B = h(\beta)$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the lemma to be false. Let C be some real number greater than 1; additional restrictions on the choice of C will be formulated at later stages of the proof. Let $K, \ell_1, \ell_2, \alpha, \beta, \gamma$ satisfy the conditions of the lemma. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 that depend only on d . Throughout the proof we shall assume that H is sufficiently large in terms of d, K, ℓ_1, ℓ_2 and C , which will lead to a contradiction. It is clear that $|\ell_1(\alpha)|$ is bounded above and below by positive constants depending on K and ℓ_1 ; thus we may assume

$$(2.2) \quad \log^{-1/2} H < |\ell_1(\alpha)| < \log^{1/2} H.$$

Similarly, $|\ell_2(\gamma)|$ is bounded above by a constant depending on K and ℓ_2 ; thus we may assume

$$(2.3) \quad |\ell_2(\gamma)| < \log^{1/2} H.$$

Define $L := B - 1$. We introduce the auxiliary function

$$\Phi(z) := \sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \alpha^{\lambda_1 z} \gamma^{\lambda_2 z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

where

$$\alpha^{\lambda_1 z} = \exp(\lambda_1 z \ell_1(\alpha)), \quad \gamma^{\lambda_2 z} = \exp(\lambda_2 z \ell_2(\gamma))$$

and where $p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ are rational integers to be determined later. We have

$$\Phi^{(t)}(z) = \ell_1^t(\alpha) \sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta)^t \alpha^{\lambda_1 z} \gamma^{\lambda_2 z},$$

$$z \in \mathbb{C}, \quad t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Now put $a := \text{den}(\alpha)$, $b := \text{den}(\beta)$, $c := \text{den}(\gamma)$,

$$S := \left[\frac{1}{2} d^{-1} B^{1/2} \log^{1/2} B \log^{-1/2} H \right],$$

$$T := \left[\frac{1}{2} d^{-1} B^{3/2} \log^{-1/2} B \log^{1/2} H \right]$$

and consider the system of linear equations

$$(ac)^{LS} b^T \ell_1^{-t}(\alpha) \Phi^{(t)}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S-1, \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1.$$

These are ST equations in the $(L+1)^2$ unknowns $p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$; the coefficients are algebraic integers and lie in a field with degree at most d^2 over \mathbb{Q} . The absolute values of the conjugates of the coefficients are less than or equal to

$$(ac)^{LS} b^T \max(1, |\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta|^T) \max(1, |\alpha|^{LS}) \max(1, |\gamma|^{LS}) \leq$$

$$H^{4LS} B^{2T} L^T c_1^{LS+T} \leq \exp(c_2 B^{3/2} \log^{1/2} B \log^{1/2} H).$$

As $(L+1)^2 > \frac{1}{2} B^2 > d^2 ST$, there exists, by 2.7, a non-trivial choice for the $p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, such that

$$(2.4) \quad \Phi^{(t)}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S-1, \quad t = 0, \dots, T-1,$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
P &:= \max_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} |p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)| \leq \\
&(c_3 L^2 \exp(c_2 B^{3/2} \log^{1/2} B \log^{1/2} H)) d^{2ST} / ((L+1)^2 - d^{2ST}) \leq \\
&\exp(c_4 B^{3/2} \log^{1/2} B \log^{1/2} H).
\end{aligned}$$

II. For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we put $T_k := 2^k T$; suppose

$$2^k \leq B^{1/4} \log^{1/4} B \log^{-1/4} H.$$

Then, for our special choice of the $p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ we have

$$(2.5) \quad \phi^{(t)}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S-1, \quad t = 0, \dots, T_k - 1.$$

This is proved by induction; for $k = 0$ the assertion is precisely (2.4).

Now suppose that (2.5) holds for some k , while

$$2^{k+1} \leq B^{1/4} \log^{1/4} B \log^{-1/4} H.$$

By 2.8 we have

$$(2.6) \quad \max_{|z| \leq 2S} |\phi(z)| \leq 2 \max_{|z| \leq 2AS} |\phi(z)| \left(\frac{2}{A}\right)^{ST_k},$$

where $A = \log^{1/2} H$. Here (2.2) and (2.3) show

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.7) \quad \max_{|z| \leq 2AS} |\phi(z)| &\leq (L+1)^2 P \exp(4LS \log H) \leq \\
&\exp(c_5 B^{3/2} \log^{1/2} B \log^{1/2} H).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\left(\frac{2}{A}\right)^{ST_k} \leq \exp(-c_6^{-1} B^2 \log_2 H) \leq \exp(-c_6^{-1} B^2 \log B),$$

the last estimate by 2.10. Now (2.1) gives

$$c_5 B^{3/2} \log^{1/2} B \log^{1/2} H < c_5 C^{-1/2} B^2 \log B;$$

therefore, if we choose C so large that $c_5 C^{-1/2} < c_6^{-1}$, substitution in (2.6) shows

$$\max_{|z| \leq 2S} |\phi(z)| \leq \exp(-c_7^{-1} B^2 \log B).$$

Using the formula

$$\phi^{(t)}(s) = \frac{t!}{2\pi i} \int_{|z-s|=1} \frac{\phi(z)}{(z-s)^{t+1}} dz,$$

we see that for $s = 0, \dots, S-1$, $t = 0, \dots, T_{k+1}-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi^{(t)}(s)| &\leq \exp(t \log t - c_7^{-1} B^2 \log B) \leq \\ &\exp(c_8 B^{7/4} \log^{3/4} B \log^{1/4} H - c_7^{-1} B^2 \log B). \end{aligned}$$

Now (2.1) gives

$$c_8 B^{7/4} \log^{3/4} B \log^{1/4} H < c_8 C^{-1/4} B^2 \log B;$$

therefore, if we choose C so large that $c_8 C^{-1/4} < c_7^{-1}$, we may conclude

$$(2.8) \quad |\phi^{(t)}(s)| \leq \exp(-c_9^{-1} B^2 \log B).$$

However, $\ell_1^{-t}(\alpha) \phi^{(t)}(s)$ is algebraic and for $s = 0, \dots, S-1$, $t = 0, \dots, T_{k+1}-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dg}(\ell_1^{-t}(\alpha) \phi^{(t)}(s)) &\leq d^2, \\ \text{den}(\ell_1^{-t}(\alpha) \phi^{(t)}(s)) &\leq (\text{ac})_{\mathbb{B}}^{LS} T_{k+1} \leq H^{2LS} B^{T_{k+1}} \leq \\ &\exp(c_{10} B^{7/4} \log^{3/4} B \log^{1/4} H), \\ \left| \ell_1^{-t}(\alpha) \phi^{(t)}(s) \right| &\leq (L+1)^2 P_H^{2LS} B^{T_{k+1}} L^{T_{k+1}} c_{11}^{LS+T_{k+1}} \leq \\ &\exp(c_{12} B^{7/4} \log^{3/4} B \log^{1/4} H) \end{aligned}$$

(here (2.1) is used), so, by 2.6, either $\phi^{(t)}(s) = 0$ or

$$|\ell_1^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(s)| \geq \exp(-c_{13}B^{7/4}\log^{3/4}B \log^{1/4}H).$$

In the latter case, (2.2) shows that

$$(2.9) \quad |\phi^{(t)}(s)| \geq \exp(-c_{14}B^{7/4}\log^{3/4}B \log^{1/4}H) > \\ \exp(-c_{14}C^{-1/4}B^2\log B).$$

Combining (2.8) and (2.9), and choosing C so large that $c_{14}C^{-1/4} < c_9^{-1}$, gives $\phi^{(t)}(s) = 0$ for $s = 0, \dots, S-1$, $t = 0, \dots, T_{k+1}-1$. This completes the proof of (2.5).

III. Now let k be the largest natural number with

$$2^k \leq B^{1/4}\log^{1/4}B \log^{-1/4}H.$$

From (2.5) it follows that

$$\phi^{(t)}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S-1, \quad t = 0, \dots, T_k-1.$$

Once more apply 2.8; this gives (2.6) again and (2.7) also remains unchanged, but from the maximality of k we now get

$$\left(\frac{2}{A}\right)^{ST_k} \leq \exp(-c_{15}B^{-1}9/4\log^{1/4}B \log^{-1/4}H \log_2 H) \leq \\ \exp(-c_{15}B^{-1}9/4\log^{5/4}B \log^{-1/4}H),$$

the last estimate by 2.10. Using (2.1) we find

$$c_5B^{3/2}\log^{1/2}B \log^{1/2}H < c_5C^{-3/4}B^{9/4}\log^{5/4}B \log^{-1/4}H;$$

if C is chosen so large that $c_5C^{-3/4} < c_{15}^{-1}$, we see

$$\max_{|z| \leq 2S} |\phi(z)| \leq \exp(-c_{16}B^{-1}9/4\log^{5/4}B \log^{-1/4}H).$$

Now

$$\phi^{(t)}(0) = \frac{t!}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=1} \frac{\phi(z)}{z^{t+1}} dz,$$

whence for $t = 0, 1, \dots, (L+1)^2 - 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi^{(t)}(0)| &\leq \exp(t \log t - c_{16}^{-1} B^{9/4} \log^{5/4} B \log^{-1/4} H) \leq \\ &\exp(c_{17} B^2 \log B - c_{16}^{-1} B^{9/4} \log^{5/4} B \log^{-1/4} H). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.1) we know

$$c_{17} B^2 \log B < c_{17} C^{-1/4} B^{9/4} \log^{5/4} B \log^{-1/4} H;$$

if C is chosen so large that $c_{17} C^{-1/4} < c_{16}^{-1}$, we conclude

$$(2.10) \quad |\phi^{(t)}(0)| \leq \exp(-c_{18}^{-1} B^{9/4} \log^{5/4} B \log^{-1/4} H), \quad t = 0, 1, \dots, (L+1)^2 - 1.$$

For these values of t we have

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{dg}(\ell_1^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(0)) &= 1, \\ \operatorname{den}(\ell_1^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(0)) &\leq B^{(L+1)^2} \leq \exp(c_{19} B^2 \log B), \\ \left| \ell_1^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(0) \right| &\leq (L+1)^2 P_B^{(L+1)^2} L^{(L+1)^2} c_{20}^{(L+1)^2} \leq \\ &\exp(c_{21} B^2 \log B) \end{aligned}$$

(once more (2.1) is used), so according to 2.6 either $\phi^{(t)}(0) = 0$ or

$$\left| \ell_1^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(0) \right| \geq \exp(-c_{22} B^2 \log B).$$

In the latter case, (2.2) shows that

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |\phi^{(t)}(0)| &\geq \exp(-c_{23} B^2 \log B) > \\ &\exp(-c_{23} C^{-1/4} B^{9/4} \log^{5/4} B \log^{-1/4} H). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (2.10) and (2.11), and choosing C so large that $c_{23}C^{-1/4} < c_{18}^{-1}$, gives

$$\phi^{(t)}(0) = 0, \quad t = 0, \dots, (L+1)^2 - 1.$$

IV. For $t = 0, \dots, (L+1)^2 - 1$ we now have

$$(2.12) \quad \sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta)^t = 0.$$

As the $p(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ are not all zero, it follows that the coefficient matrix of the system (2.12), which is of the Vandermonde type, must be singular.

From this we deduce the existence of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_1', \lambda_2' \in \{0, \dots, L\}$ with

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta = \lambda_1' + \lambda_2' \beta, \quad \text{or}$$

$$\beta = \frac{\lambda_1' - \lambda_1}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_2'}.$$

This gives

$$B = h(\beta) \leq L = B - 1,$$

so we get a contradiction. \square

2.12. DEFINITION. For $\varepsilon > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ we define

$$\omega(\varepsilon, b) := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q_{n+1}}{3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} q_n},$$

where p_n/q_n are the convergents of the continued fraction expansion of b .

2.13. LEMMA (Bertrand's postulate). *If $n \geq 1$, there is at least one prime p such that $n < p \leq 2n$.*

PROOF. [Hardy-Wright 1960], Theorem 418. \square

2.14. LEMMA. *If $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, $w \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and*

$$\left| b - \frac{v}{w} \right| < \frac{1}{2w^2},$$

the number v/w is a convergent of the continued fraction expansion of b .

PROOF. [Perron 1954], Satz 2.11. \square

2.15. LEMMA. Suppose $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. By $(p_n/q_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ we denote the sequence of convergents of the continued fraction expansion of b ; here $p_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q_n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(p_n, q_n) = 1$. Then

$$\left| b - \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right| > \frac{1}{q_n(q_n + q_{n+1})}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

PROOF. [Perron 1954], § 13, (12). \square

2.16. LEMMA. Let $\varepsilon, \lambda > 0$ be given. Then there exists an irrational number b with $0 < b < 1$ and $\lambda \leq \omega(\varepsilon, b) \leq 5\lambda$.

PROOF. I. By induction we define a sequence $(\beta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of rational numbers in the interval $]0, 1[$. Take $\beta_1 = 1/w_1$, where w_1 is a natural number depending on λ , to be determined later. Now suppose β_n has already been chosen; put $\beta_n = v_n/w_n$, where $v_n, w_n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(v_n, w_n) = 1$. Consider the partition

$$D = \left(0, \frac{1}{w_{n+1}}, \frac{2}{w_{n+1}}, \dots, \frac{w_{n+1}-1}{w_{n+1}}, 1 \right)$$

of the interval $]0, 1[$, where w_{n+1} is the smallest prime number greater than $\exp(4\lambda w_n^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} w_n)$. By 2.13, it is clear that

$$(2.13) \quad \exp(4\lambda w_n^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} w_n) < w_{n+1} \leq 2 \exp(4\lambda w_n^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} w_n).$$

The width of the partition D is less than $\exp(-4\lambda w_n^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} w_n)$; thus there exists a $v_{n+1} \in \{1, \dots, w_{n+1}-1\}$ with

$$(2.14) \quad \left| \beta_n - \frac{v_{n+1}}{w_{n+1}} \right| < \exp(-4\lambda w_n^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} w_n).$$

Now define β_{n+1} as v_{n+1}/w_{n+1} . Note that $(v_{n+1}, w_{n+1}) = 1$ because w_{n+1} is prime and $1 \leq v_{n+1} < w_{n+1}$. If w_1 is chosen sufficiently large, (2.13) ensures that the sequence $(w_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is strictly increasing.

II. The sequence $(\beta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has the property

$$(2.15) \quad \forall m > n: \left| \beta_m - \beta_n \right| < \exp(-2\lambda w_n^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} w_n).$$

To prove this, put $I_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\beta_k - x| < \exp(-2\lambda w_k^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_k)\}$. Then (2.15) can be written as $\forall m > n: \beta_m \in I_n$. By (2.14) $\beta_m \in I_{m-1}$, so it is sufficient to prove $\forall k > n: I_k \subset I_{k-1}$. Take $x \in I_k$, which means $|\beta_k - x| < \exp(-2\lambda w_k^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_k)$. Then, by (2.13) and (2.14),

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_{k-1} - x| &\leq |\beta_k - x| + |\beta_{k-1} - \beta_k| < \\ &\exp(-2\lambda w_k^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_k) + \exp(-4\lambda w_{k-1}^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_{k-1}) < \\ &\exp(-2\lambda \exp(12\lambda w_{k-1}^3)) + \exp(-4\lambda w_{k-1}^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_{k-1}) < \\ &2 \exp(-4\lambda w_{k-1}^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_{k-1}) < \exp(-2\lambda w_{k-1}^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_{k-1}) \end{aligned}$$

if w_1 is chosen sufficiently large in relation to λ , so $x \in I_{k-1}$.

III. From (2.15) we see that $(\beta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence; it converges to a limit, which we shall call b . Then $b \in [0,1]$ and

$$(2.16) \quad \forall n: |b - \beta_n| \leq \exp(-2\lambda w_n^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_n).$$

By 2.14, this implies that β_n is a convergent of the continued fraction expansion of b , say

$$\beta_n = \frac{p_k}{q_k}.$$

Thus b is irrational. Now suppose $\omega(\epsilon, b) < \lambda$. By 2.15 and the definition of $\omega(\epsilon, b)$, we then have for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} |b - \beta_n| &> \frac{1}{q_{k_n} (q_{k_n} + q_{k_n+1})} \geq \frac{1}{q_{k_n} (q_{k_n} + \exp(\lambda q_{k_n}^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} q_{k_n}))} \geq \\ &\exp(-2\lambda q_{k_n}^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} q_{k_n}) = \exp(-2\lambda w_n^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} w_n), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (2.16).

If, on the other hand, $\omega(\epsilon, b) > 5\lambda$, there are infinitely many convergents p_k/q_k of b with

$$(2.17) \quad q_{k+1} > \exp(5\lambda q_k^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} q_k).$$

As all the β_n are convergents of b and $(w_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is increasing, for every k satisfying (2.17) we can find an n_k with

$$w_{n_k} \leq q_k < q_{k+1} \leq w_{n_k+1};$$

thus

$$w_{n_k+1} \geq q_{k+1} > \exp(5\lambda q_k^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} q_k) \geq \exp(5\lambda w_{n_k}^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} w_{n_k}),$$

which contradicts (2.13). \square

2.17. DEFINITION. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the set $\mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$ is defined as the set of all $b \in \mathbb{C}$ such that there exist an $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, a value $\ell(a) \neq 0$ of the logarithm of a , and infinitely many triples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^3$ with

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$ and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$.

2.18. LEMMA. For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d and n , with the following property. Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{A}_d \setminus \{0\}$, $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{A}_d$; let $\ell_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \ell_n(\alpha_n)$ be values of the logarithms of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ respectively. For $1 \leq j \leq n$, let $A_j \geq 6$ be an upper bound for $h(\alpha_j)$ and $\exp(|\ell_j(\alpha_j)|)$. Put

$$\Lambda := \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n \ell_n(\alpha_n).$$

Then either $\Lambda = 0$ or

$$|\Lambda| > \exp(-C\Omega \log \Omega^s (\log B + \log \Omega)),$$

where $\Omega = (\log A_1) \dots (\log A_n)$, $\Omega^s = (\log A_1) \dots (\log A_{n-1})$,
 $B = \max(6, h(\beta_0), \dots, h(\beta_n))$.

PROOF. [Baker 1977]; see also [Cijssouw-Waldschmidt 1977], Theorem 1 and the remark following it. \square

2.19. LEMMA. Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$; let $l_1(\alpha_1), \dots, l_n(\alpha_n)$ be values of the logarithms of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ respectively. Then $l_1(\alpha_1), \dots, l_n(\alpha_n)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} if and only if they are linearly independent over \mathbb{A} .

PROOF. [Baker 1967], Theorem 1. \square

2.20. LEMMA. For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d , such that, if $\varepsilon > 0$, no number $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ with $\omega(\varepsilon, b) < C^{-1}$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$.

PROOF. Suppose $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$. This gives the existence of an $a \neq 0$, a value $l(a) \neq 0$ of the logarithm of a , and infinitely many triples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^3$ with

$$(2.18) \quad \max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H),$$

where $a^b = \exp(bl(a))$ and $H = \max(h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$.

Let (α, β, γ) be such a triple and assume that H is large enough in terms of $d, a, b, l(a)$ and ε . Let \bar{l} be a branch of the logarithm, defined on a disk K_1 , centred at a , such that $\bar{l}(a) = l(a)$. Then

$$|l(a) - \bar{l}(\alpha)| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+2\varepsilon/3} H);$$

from $l(a) \neq 0$ we thus get $\bar{l}(\alpha) \neq 0$. Let l^* be a branch of the logarithm, defined on a disk K_2 , centred at a^b , such that

$$|bl(a) - l^*(\gamma)| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+2\varepsilon/3} H).$$

Together with (2.18), these formulas show

$$|\beta \bar{l}(\alpha) - l^*(\gamma)| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon/3} H).$$

In case $\beta \bar{l}(\alpha) - l^*(\gamma) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$|\beta \bar{l}(\alpha) - l^*(\gamma)| > \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon/3} H),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $\beta \bar{l}(\alpha) - l^*(\gamma) = 0$, so $\bar{l}(\alpha)$ and

$\ell^*(\gamma)$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{A} ; 2.19 now states that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . This gives the existence of $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{Q}$, not both zero, such that $\xi \bar{\ell}(\alpha) + \eta \ell^*(\gamma) = 0$. Here $\eta \neq 0$ because $\bar{\ell}(\alpha) \neq 0$, so

$$\beta = \frac{\ell^*(\gamma)}{\bar{\ell}(\alpha)} = -\frac{\xi}{\eta} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Applying 2.11 then shows that

$$\log H \geq c^{-1} B \log B,$$

where $B = h(\beta)$ and $c > 1$ depends only on d .

Put $q := \text{den}(\beta)$; then q must tend to infinity with H , so $\log H \geq c^{-1} q \log q \geq q$ for H large enough. This gives

$$(2.19) \quad |b - \beta| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H) < \exp(-c^{-3} q^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} q);$$

thus, by 2.14, β is a convergent of the continued fraction expansion of b , say $\beta = p_n/q_n$. By 2.15 we have, if $\omega(\epsilon, b) < C^{-1}$, and n is large enough,

$$(2.20) \quad |b - \beta| > \frac{1}{q_n(q_n + q_{n+1})} \geq \frac{1}{q_n(q_n + \exp(C^{-1} q_n^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} q_n))} > \exp(-2C^{-1} q_n^3 \log^{4+\epsilon} q_n).$$

Comparison of (2.19) and (2.20) gives a contradiction if $2C^{-1} < c^{-3}$. \square

2.21. LEMMA. All rational numbers ξ satisfy the following inequality:

$$\text{den}(\xi) \leq h(\xi) \leq \max(1, |\xi|) \text{den}(\xi).$$

PROOF. If $|\xi| \leq 1$, we have $h(\xi) = \text{den}(\xi)$; otherwise $h(\xi) = |\xi| \text{den}(\xi)$. \square

2.22. LEMMA. Suppose $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. By $(p_n/q_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ we denote the sequence of convergents of the continued fraction expansion of b ; here $p_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q_n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(p_n, q_n) = 1$. Then

$$\left| b - \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right| < \frac{1}{q_n q_{n+1}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

PROOF. [Perron 1954], Satz 2.10. \square

2.23. LEMMA. For every $M \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on M , such that, if $\varepsilon > 0$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$, every number $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ with $|b| \leq M$ and $\omega(\varepsilon, b) > C$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$.

PROOF. I. Let $C > 1$ be some number depending only on M , to be determined later; suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $|b| \leq M$ and $\omega(\varepsilon, b) > C$. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 that depend only on M . By 2.21 and 2.22, we have for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\left| b - \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right| < \frac{1}{q_n q_{n+1}} < \frac{1}{\exp(Cq_n^3 \log^{4+\varepsilon} q_n)} \leq \exp(-c_1^{-1} Ch^3(p_n/q_n) \log^{4+\varepsilon} h(p_n/q_n)).$$

Consequently, there exists a sequence $(\beta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of rational numbers with the properties

$$(2.21) \quad \left| b - \beta_n \right| < \exp(-c_1^{-1} Ch^3(\beta_n) \log^{4+\varepsilon} h(\beta_n)),$$

$$(2.22) \quad h(\beta_{n+1}) > \exp(c_1^{-1} Ch^3(\beta_n) \log^{4+\varepsilon} h(\beta_n)).$$

Furthermore, it is no restriction to assume that $h(\beta_1)$ is greater than some bound depending only on M .

II. We now use induction to define a sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of rational numbers in the interval $]0, 1[$ with the properties

$$(2.23) \quad \left| \alpha_n - \alpha_{n+1} \right| < \exp(-2C^{1/2} \log^3 h(\alpha_n) \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} h(\alpha_n)),$$

$$(2.24) \quad h(\alpha_{n+1}) > h^2(\alpha_n),$$

$$(2.25) \quad h(\alpha_n) < (2h(\beta_n))^{2h(\beta_n)},$$

$$(2.26) \quad \alpha_n \frac{1}{\text{den}(\beta_n)} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Choose

$$\alpha_1 := 2^{-\text{den}(\beta_1)}.$$

Now suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ have already been chosen and possess the desired properties. By 2.13, there is a prime number u with

$$\text{den}(\beta_{n+1})h(\beta_{n+1}) \leq u \leq 2 \text{den}(\beta_{n+1})h(\beta_{n+1}).$$

We observe

$$\frac{u}{\text{den}(\beta_{n+1})} \geq h(\beta_{n+1}) \geq \exp(-c_1^{-1} C h^3(\beta_n) \log^{4+\epsilon} h(\beta_n)).$$

If C is chosen large enough in terms of c_1 , we may write

$$(2.27) \quad c_1^{-1} C h^3(\beta_n) \log^{4+\epsilon} h(\beta_n) > \\ 16C^{1/2} h^3(\beta_n) \log^3(2h(\beta_n)) (\log(2h(\beta_n)) + \log_2(2h(\beta_n)))^{1+\epsilon};$$

by (2.25) the right hand member of (2.27) is greater than

$$2C^{1/2} \log^3 h(\alpha_n) \log_2^{1+\epsilon} h(\alpha_n),$$

so

$$(2.28) \quad \frac{u}{\text{den}(\beta_{n+1})} > \exp(2C^{1/2} \log^3 h(\alpha_n) \log_2^{1+\epsilon} h(\alpha_n)).$$

Write $w := \text{den}(\beta_{n+1})$ and consider the partition

$$D = \left(0, \frac{1}{u^w}, \frac{2^w}{u^w}, \dots, \frac{(u-1)^w}{u^w}, 1\right)$$

of the interval $]0, 1[$. Take $t \in \{0, \dots, u-1\}$. Then

$$\frac{(t+1)^w}{u^w} - \frac{t^w}{u^w} \leq \frac{w(t+1)^{w-1}}{u^w} \leq \frac{w}{u};$$

therefore the width of the partition D does not exceed w/u .

By (2.28), the interval

$$\{x \in]0, 1[: |\alpha_n - x| < \exp(-2C^{1/2} \log^3 h(\alpha_n) \log_2^{1+\epsilon} h(\alpha_n))\}$$

has a length greater than w/u , so that this interval contains at least one of the points of D . This proves the existence of a $t \in \{1, \dots, u-1\}$ with

$$\left| \alpha_n - \frac{t^w}{u} \right| < \exp(-2C^{1/2} \log^3 h(\alpha_n) \log_2^{1+\epsilon} h(\alpha_n)).$$

If one defines $\alpha_{n+1} := (t/u)^w$, (2.23) is satisfied, $\alpha_{n+1} \in]0, 1[$ and furthermore $\alpha_{n+1}^{1/w} \in \mathbb{Q}$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\alpha_{n+1}) &= u^w \leq (2 \operatorname{den}(\beta_{n+1}) h(\beta_{n+1}))^{\operatorname{den}(\beta_{n+1})} \leq \\ &(2h^2(\beta_{n+1}))^{h(\beta_{n+1})} \leq (2h(\beta_{n+1}))^{2h(\beta_{n+1})}, \end{aligned}$$

and, by 2.21,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\alpha_{n+1}) &= u^w \geq (\operatorname{den}(\beta_{n+1}) h(\beta_{n+1}))^{\operatorname{den}(\beta_{n+1})} \geq \\ &(c_2^{-1} h^2(\beta_{n+1}))^{c_2^{-1} h(\beta_{n+1})} = \exp(2c_2^{-1} h(\beta_{n+1}) \log(c_2^{-1} h(\beta_{n+1}))) \geq \\ &\exp(2c_2^{-1} \exp(\operatorname{Ch}^3(\beta_n))); \end{aligned}$$

here (2.22) is used and it is supposed that $h(\beta_1)$ is large enough in terms of c_1 and c_2 . As $h^2(\alpha_n) < \exp(4h(\beta_n) \log(2h(\beta_n)))$, this proves $h(\alpha_{n+1}) > h^2(\alpha_n)$. The construction of the sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is now completed.

III. The sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has the property

$$(2.29) \quad \forall m > n: |\alpha_m - \alpha_n| < \exp(-C^{1/2} \log^3 h(\alpha_n) \log_2^{1+\epsilon} h(\alpha_n)).$$

To prove this, put $i_k := C^{1/2} \log^3 h(\alpha_k) \log_2^{1+\epsilon} h(\alpha_k)$ and $I_k := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |\alpha_k - x| < \exp(-i_k)\}$. Then (2.29) can be written as $\forall m > n: \alpha_m \in I_n$. By (2.23), $\alpha_m \in I_{m-1}$, so it is sufficient to prove $\forall k > n: I_k \subset I_{k-1}$. Take $x \in I_k$, which means $|\alpha_k - x| < \exp(-i_k)$. Then, by (2.23) and (2.24),

$$\begin{aligned} |\alpha_{k-1} - x| &\leq |\alpha_k - x| + |\alpha_{k-1} - \alpha_k| < \\ &\exp(-i_k) + \exp(-2i_{k-1}) < \end{aligned}$$

$$\exp(-6i_{k-1}) + \exp(-2i_{k-1}) < 2 \exp(-2i_{k-1}) < \exp(-i_{k-1}),$$

if $h(\beta_1)$ is sufficiently large, so $x \in I_{k-1}$.

IV. From (2.29) we see that $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence; it converges to a limit, which we shall call a . Then

$$(2.30) \quad \forall n: |a - \alpha_n| \leq \exp(-C^{1/2} \log^3 h(\alpha_n) \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} h(\alpha_n)).$$

If we define

$$\gamma_n := \alpha_n^{\beta_n},$$

we have $\gamma_n \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\log h(\gamma_n) < c_3 \log h(\alpha_n)$. Furthermore, from (2.26) it follows that $h(\beta_n) < c_4 \log h(\alpha_n)$. From this we conclude that, if C is large enough in terms of c_1 , c_3 and c_4 , (2.21) and (2.30) give

$$\max(|a - \alpha_n|, |b - \beta_n|) \leq \exp(-C^{1/4} \log^3 H_n \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H_n),$$

where $H_n = \max(2, h(\alpha_n), h(\beta_n), h(\gamma_n))$. As the function $(x, y) \mapsto x^y$ is continuously differentiable on every compact subset of $]0, 1[\times]-M-1, M+1[$, there is a $\lambda > 1$, depending only on a and b , such that

$$\forall n: |a^b - \gamma_n| < \lambda \max(|a - \alpha_n|, |b - \beta_n|).$$

Consequently, if n is large enough in terms of C and λ , we have

$$\max(|a - \alpha_n|, |b - \beta_n|, |a^b - \gamma_n|) < \exp(-\log^3 H_n \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H_n),$$

which proves the lemma. \square

2.24. THEOREM. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $b \in \mathbb{C}$.

(i) If $b \notin \mathbb{R}$, then $b \notin \mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$.

(ii) If $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and $\omega(\varepsilon, b) = 0$, then $b \notin \mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$.

(iii) If $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and $\omega(\varepsilon, b) = \infty$, then $b \in \mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$.

(iv) If $b \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $b \in \mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$.

(v) In case $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ with $0 < \omega(\varepsilon, b) < \infty$, no general assertion is possible.

PROOF. In case $b \in \mathbb{Q}$, taking $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$|z - \zeta| < \exp(-\log^4 h(\zeta))$$

for infinitely many $\zeta \in \mathbb{A}_d$ (which is possible by 1.6) and writing

$$a = z^{\text{den}(b)}; \quad (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = (\zeta^{\text{den}(b)}, b, \zeta^{b \text{den}(b)})$$

shows that $b \in \mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$; this proves (iv).

The assertion (i) is a trivial consequence of 1.5. We may therefore assume that $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, in which case $\omega(\varepsilon, b)$ is defined. According to 2.20, there exists an effectively computable $c_0 > 1$ such that if $\omega(\varepsilon, b) < c_0^{-1}$, then $b \notin \mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$; this proves (ii). By 2.16, it is also clear that there exists a $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ with $0 < \omega(\varepsilon, b) < c_0^{-1}$ and so there is a b with $0 < \omega(\varepsilon, b) < \infty$ that does not belong to $\mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$.

Furthermore, 2.23 asserts that for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an effectively computable $c_M > 1$ such that, if $|b| \leq M$ and $\omega(\varepsilon, b) > c_M$, then $b \in \mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$. In case $\omega(\varepsilon, b) = \infty$ we may choose $M = |b|$ and (iii) is proved. Again by 2.16, it is clear that for any $M \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a b with $|b| \leq M$ and $c_M + 1 < \omega(\varepsilon, b) < \infty$; so there is a b with $0 < \omega(\varepsilon, b) < \infty$ that does belong to $\mathcal{P}_d(\varepsilon)$. \square

It has been pointed out to the author by A.A. Balkema that 2.11 can also be proved by purely algebraic means, without recourse to Gel'fond theory. The main tool in such a proof is the inequality stated as Lemma 4 of [Baker-Stark 1971], which follows from Gauss' lemma in algebraic number fields.

3. THE NON-INTERCHANGEABILITY OF a AND b

Let $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. In Chapter 2 our aim was to establish a criterion to decide for which $b \in \mathbb{C}$ there exist an $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and a value $\ell(a) \neq 0$ of the logarithm of a such that for infinitely many triples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^3$ the inequality

$$(3.1) \quad \max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H)$$

is satisfied (here H denotes the maximum of 2 and the heights of α , β and γ , and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$).

Let us now consider the converse problem, namely to investigate for which $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ there exist a $b \in \mathbb{C}$ and a value $\ell(a) \neq 0$ of the logarithm of a , such that for infinitely many triples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^3$ inequality (3.1) is satisfied.

3.1. LEMMA. *If $\eta \in \mathbb{A}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the following assertions hold:*

$$(3.2) \quad \overline{|\eta^k|} = \overline{|\eta|}^k,$$

$$(3.3) \quad \text{den}(\eta) \leq \text{den}(\eta^k) \leq \text{den}^k(\eta).$$

PROOF. I. According to 2.4(a), \mathbb{C} contains a finite normal extension F of \mathbb{Q} that contains η ; put $G := \text{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$. According to 2.4(b),

$$\forall \xi \in F: \overline{|\xi|} = \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\xi)|.$$

Therefore

$$\overline{|\eta^k|} = \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta^k)| = \left(\max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta)| \right)^k = \overline{|\eta|}^k.$$

II. If $m := \text{den}(\eta^k)$, the number $m\eta^k$ is an algebraic integer. The same must then be true for $m^{k-1}\eta^k = (m\eta)^k$; therefore there is a monic polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ such that $P((m\eta)^k) = 0$. This shows that $m\eta$ is an algebraic integer.

III. The last inequality in (3.3) is trivial. \square

3.2. LEMMA. Suppose $\eta \in \mathbb{A}$. Then

$$h(\eta) \leq (2 \operatorname{den}(\eta) \max(1, \lceil \eta \rceil))^{d_g(\eta)}.$$

PROOF. [Cijssouw-Tijdeman 1973], Lemma 1. \square

3.3. LEMMA. Suppose $d, j, k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j \leq k$, $\eta \in \mathbb{A}_d$. Then

$$h(\eta^j) \leq 2^{2d} h^{2d}(\eta^k).$$

PROOF. It is clear that $\operatorname{den}(\eta^j) \leq \operatorname{den}(\eta^k)$. Indeed, if $m := \operatorname{den}(\eta^k)$, the number $m\eta^k$ is an algebraic integer. The same must then be true for $m^{k-j} (m\eta^k)^j = (m\eta^j)^k$; therefore there is a monic polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ such that $P((m\eta^j)^k) = 0$. This shows that $m\eta^j$ is an algebraic integer.

Applying 3.1 and 3.2, we find

$$\begin{aligned} h(\eta^j) &\leq (2 \operatorname{den}(\eta^j) \max(1, \lceil \eta^j \rceil))^{d_g(\eta^j)} \leq \\ &(2 \operatorname{den}(\eta^k) \max(1, \lceil \eta^k \rceil))^d \leq (2h(\eta^k) (h(\eta^k) + 1))^d \leq \\ &2^{2d} h^{2d}(\eta^k). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

3.4. LEMMA. For each $a \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$, there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on a , with the following property: if $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}$, while $l_1(a)$, $l_2(\gamma)$ are values of the logarithms of a and γ respectively with

$$(3.4) \quad \beta l_1(a) - l_2(\gamma) = 0,$$

it follows that

$$\log h(\gamma) < C d_g(\gamma) h(\beta).$$

PROOF. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on a . Let $\beta, \gamma, l_1(a)$ and $l_2(\gamma)$ be such that (3.4) is satisfied; put $\beta = v/w$, where $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, $w \in \mathbb{N}$, $(v, w) = 1$. If $P = \sum_{j=0}^d a_j X^j$ is the minimal polynomial of γ , the minimal polynomial of $1/\gamma$ is either $P^* := \sum_{j=0}^d a_{d-j} X^j$ or $-P^*$. Thus $h(\gamma) = h(1/\gamma)$; replacing γ if necessary by $1/\gamma$

and observing that $-\ell_2(\gamma)$ is a value of the logarithm of $1/\gamma$ will ensure that $v \geq 0$. We have

$$\exp(w\ell_2(\gamma)) = \exp^w(\ell_2(\gamma)) = \gamma^w$$

and

$$\exp(w\ell_2(\gamma)) = \exp(w\beta\ell_1(a)) = \exp(v\ell_1(a)) = \exp^v(\ell_1(a)) = a^v;$$

applying 3.1 gives

$$|\gamma| = |a|^{v/w}$$

and

$$\text{den}(\gamma) \leq \text{den}^v(a).$$

According to 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\gamma) &\leq (2 \text{den}(\gamma) \max(1, |\gamma|))^d \leq (2 \text{den}^v(a) \max(1, |a|^{v/w}))^d \leq \\ &(c_1^v c_2^{v/w}) c_3^d \leq c_4^{dv} \leq c_4^{dh(\beta)}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

3.5. LEMMA. *Suppose $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$, $\ell_1(a) \neq 0$ a value of the logarithm of a . Suppose K is a compact subset of the complex plane, not containing 0 , ℓ_2 a branch of the logarithm defined on K . Then only finitely many rational numbers β have the property that an algebraic number $\gamma \in K$ of degree at most d exists with*

$$(3.5) \quad \beta\ell_1(a) - \ell_2(\gamma) = 0.$$

PROOF. Suppose the assertion of the lemma to be false. Let β be a rational number and $\gamma \in K$ algebraic with $dg(\gamma) \leq d$ such that (3.5) holds. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on $d, a, K, \ell_1(a)$ and ℓ_2 ; we assume that $h(\beta)$ is greater than such a number, which will lead to a contradiction. It is no restriction to assume $dg(a) \leq d$.

By 2.11, we see that either

$$(3.6) \quad \log \max(h(a), h(\gamma)) \geq c_1^{-1} h(\beta) \log h(\beta)$$

or

$$(3.7) \quad \max(h(a), h(\gamma)) \leq c_2.$$

As there are only finitely many rationals of the form $\ell_2(\gamma)/\ell_1(a)$, where $\deg(\gamma) \leq d$ and $h(\gamma) \leq c_2$, we may henceforth assume that (3.6) holds and even that

$$(3.8) \quad \log h(\gamma) \geq c_1^{-1} h(\beta) \log h(\beta).$$

On the other hand, by 3.4 we see that

$$(3.9) \quad \log h(\gamma) < c_3 h(\beta).$$

Comparing (3.8) and (3.9) gives a contradiction if $h(\beta)$ is sufficiently large. \square

Now we are able to solve the problem stated in the introduction to this chapter. If there are infinitely many $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}_d$ with

$$(3.10) \quad |a - \alpha| < \exp(-\log^3 A \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} A),$$

where $A = h(\alpha)$, taking $b = \beta = 1$, $\gamma = \alpha$ shows that (3.1) holds for infinitely many triples (α, β, γ) . Suppose, on the other hand, that infinitely many such triples satisfy (3.1), yet for only finitely many $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}_d$ inequality (3.10) holds. If H is taken large enough, (3.1) then implies that $\alpha = a$. Let K be a closed disk in the complex plane, centred at a^b , that does not contain 0. It is clear that there exists a branch ℓ^* of the logarithm, defined on K , such that $\ell^*(a^b) = b\ell(a)$. From (3.1) we deduce that $\gamma \in K$ and that the inequality

$$|\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(\gamma)| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon/2} H)$$

holds. If it were the case that $\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(\gamma) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$|\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(\gamma)| > \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon/2} H),$$

which gives a contradiction. Therefore

$$(3.11) \quad \beta \ell(a) - \ell^*(\gamma) = 0.$$

We have now proved that $\ell(a)$ and $\ell^*(\gamma)$ are linearly dependent over the field of all algebraic numbers; using 2.19, we find that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . In other words, there are $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{Q}$, not both zero, such that $\xi \ell(a) + \eta \ell^*(\gamma) = 0$. Here $\eta \neq 0$ because $\ell(a) \neq 0$, so

$$\beta = \frac{\ell^*(\gamma)}{\ell(a)} = -\frac{\xi}{\eta} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Using 3.5, we see that in the triples (α, β, γ) satisfying (3.1) occur only finitely many values of β . From (3.11) we see that the number of values of γ must also be finite and we arrive at a contradiction. Thus we have proved

3.6. THEOREM. *Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Then the following two assertions are equivalent:*

(i) *There exist a $b \in \mathbb{C}$ and a value $\ell(a) \neq 0$ of the logarithm of a , such that for infinitely many triples (α, β, γ) of algebraic numbers of degree at most d*

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$ and $a^b := \exp(b\ell(a))$.

(ii) *There exist infinitely many $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}_d$ such that*

$$|a - \alpha| < \exp(-\log^3 A \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A),$$

where $A = \max(2, h(\alpha))$. \square

A more interesting problem occurs if we demand that the triples (α, β, γ) contain infinitely many values of β , or, in other words, that $b \notin \mathbb{Q}$.

3.7. DEFINITION. *Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the set $P_d^*(\epsilon)$ is defined as the set of all $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ such that there exist a $b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$, a value*

$\ell(a) \neq 0$ of the logarithm of a , and infinitely many triples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^3$ with

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$ and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$.

In this case the condition (3.10) turns out to be no longer sufficient and there appears an extra condition on the nature of the numbers α occurring in (3.10).

3.8. THEOREM. *For every fixed $d \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$ with the following property. If $\epsilon > 0$, $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and ℓ_1 is a branch of the logarithm, defined on a neighbourhood of a , such that for infinitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$ an $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}$, depending on k , exists with*

$$(3.12) \quad \exp(k^{-1} \ell_1(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{A}_d \setminus \{1\},$$

$$(3.13) \quad |a - \alpha| < \exp(-C \log^3 A \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A),$$

where $A = \max(2, h(a))$, the number a necessarily belongs to $P_d^*(\epsilon)$.

PROOF. I. Let $C > 1$ be given and suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$; let $(k_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ and $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be sequences from \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{A} , respectively, such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} k_n = \infty,$$

$$(3.14) \quad \forall n: \exp(k_n^{-1} \ell_1(\alpha_n)) \in \mathbb{A}_d \setminus \{1\},$$

$$(3.15) \quad \forall n: |a - \alpha_n| < \exp(-C \log^3 A_n \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A_n),$$

where $A_n = \max(2, h(\alpha_n))$. Put $\theta_n := \exp(k_n^{-1} \ell_1(\alpha_n))$; then $\theta_n \in \mathbb{A}_d \setminus \{1\}$ and

$$\alpha_n = \theta_n^{k_n}.$$

Furthermore, 3.3 states

$$h(\theta_n) \leq 2^{2d} h^{2d}(\alpha_n) \leq 2^{2d} A_n^{2d}.$$

From this it follows that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \infty;$$

indeed, the opposite would imply that there is an $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}$ such that for infinitely many pairs (k, m) of natural numbers with $k \neq m$

$$(3.16) \quad \exp(k^{-1} l_1(\alpha)) = \exp(m^{-1} l_1(\alpha)) \neq 1,$$

so

$$(3.17) \quad \left(\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{m}\right) l_1(\alpha) \equiv 0 \pmod{2\pi i}.$$

By choosing $\min(k, m)$ in such a way that the left hand member of (3.17) has absolute value less than 2π , one proves that $l_1(\alpha) = 0$ and thus $\exp(k^{-1} l_1(\alpha)) = 1$, which contradicts (3.16).

By taking partial sequences if necessary, we can ensure that

$$(3.18) \quad \forall n: k_{n+1} > \exp(C \log^3 A_n \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A_n),$$

$$(3.19) \quad \forall n: A_{n+1} > A_n^2.$$

Furthermore, it is no restriction to assume that A_1 is sufficiently large in relation to C .

II. Put $\beta_1 := k_1^{-1}$; the sequence $(\beta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of rational numbers from the interval $]0, 1[$ will be defined inductively. Suppose β_1, \dots, β_n have been chosen; by (3.18) we see that there is a $j_{n+1} \in \{1, \dots, k_{n+1} - 1\}$ with

$$(3.20) \quad 0 < \left| \beta_n - \frac{j_{n+1}}{k_{n+1}} \right| < \exp(-C \log^3 A_n \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A_n).$$

Define $\beta_{n+1} := j_{n+1}/k_{n+1}$. It follows from (3.20) that $(\beta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence, and that its limit b satisfies

$$(3.21) \quad \forall n: |b - \beta_n| \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} C \log^3 A_n \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A_n\right).$$

To prove this, it will be sufficient to show

$$(3.22) \quad \forall m > n: |\beta_m - \beta_n| < \exp(-\frac{1}{2}C \log^3 A_n \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A_n).$$

Put $i_r := \frac{1}{2}C \log^3 A_r \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A_r$, $I_r := \{x \in \mathbb{R}: |\beta_r - x| < \exp(-i_r)\}$. Then (3.22) can be written as $\forall m > n: \beta_m \in I_n$. By (3.20), $\beta_m \in I_{m-1}$, so it is sufficient to prove $\forall r > n: I_r \subset I_{r-1}$. Take $x \in I_r$, which means $|\beta_r - x| < \exp(-i_r)$. Then, by (3.19) and (3.20),

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_{r-1} - x| &\leq |\beta_r - x| + |\beta_{r-1} - \beta_r| < \exp(-i_r) + \exp(-2i_{r-1}) < \\ &\exp(-8i_{r-1}) + \exp(-2i_{r-1}) < 2 \exp(-2i_{r-1}) < \exp(-i_{r-1}) \end{aligned}$$

if A_1 is sufficiently large in relation to C . This proves (3.22).

III. Define $\gamma_n := \exp(\beta_n \ell_1(\alpha_n)) = \exp(j_n k_n^{-1} \ell_1(\alpha_n))$; then

$$\gamma_n = \theta_n^{j_n} \in \mathbb{A}_d \setminus \{1\}.$$

By (3.15) and (3.21), it is clear that the sequences $(\alpha_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ and $(\gamma_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ are bounded and remain uniformly away from 0; applying 2.10, together with the fact that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \infty$ shows $h(\beta_n) \leq \log A_n$ for sufficiently large n . From (3.20) one sees that $(\beta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ does not become eventually constant, so that $|b - \beta_n| > 0$ for infinitely many n ; by (3.21) and 2.14, b must be irrational.

IV. By 3.3,

$$h(\gamma_n) = h(\theta_n^{j_n}) \leq 2^{2d} h^{2d}(\theta_n^{k_n}) \leq 2^{2d} A_n^{2d} \leq A_n^{3d};$$

therefore

$$H_n := \max(2, h(\alpha_n), h(\beta_n), h(\gamma_n)) \leq A_n^{3d}$$

for almost all n ; hence, if C is sufficiently large in relation to d , (3.15) and (3.21) imply

$$\max(|a - \alpha_n|, |b - \beta_n|) < \exp(-2 \log^3 H_n \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H_n)$$

for almost all n .

As the function $(x, y) \mapsto \exp(y\ell_1(x))$ is continuously differentiable on a compact neighbourhood of (a, b) , there exists a λ , independent of n , such that

$$|\exp(b\ell_1(a)) - \exp(\beta_n \ell_1(\alpha_n))| < \lambda \max(|a - \alpha_n|, |b - \beta_n|)$$

and therefore

$$|\exp(b\ell_1(a)) - \gamma_n| < \exp(-\log^3 H_n \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H_n)$$

for almost all n . Thus $a \in \mathcal{P}_d^*(\epsilon)$. \square

3.9. THEOREM. *If $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}_d^*(\epsilon)$, there is a branch ℓ_1 of the logarithm, defined on a neighbourhood of a , such that for infinitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$ an $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}$, depending on k , exists with*

$$(3.23) \quad \exp(k^{-1} \ell_1(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2 \setminus \{1\}$$

$$(3.24) \quad |a - \alpha| < \exp(-\log^3 A \log_2^{1+\epsilon} A),$$

where $A = \max(2, h(\alpha))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose $b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and $\ell(a) \neq 0$ a value of the logarithm of a , such that there exist infinitely many triples (α, β, γ) of algebraic numbers of degree at most d satisfying

$$(3.25) \quad \max(|a - \alpha|, |b - \beta|, |a^b - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$ and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$. From this it is immediately clear that (3.24) holds; we now proceed to prove (3.23).

Let $\bar{\ell}, \ell^*$ be branches of the logarithm, defined on disks K_1, K_2 , centred at a and a^b respectively, such that $\bar{\ell}(a) = \ell(a)$ and $\ell^*(a^b) = b\ell(a)$. Let (α, β, γ) be a triple satisfying (3.25); we suppose H to be greater than a certain bound depending on ϵ, d, a, b and $\ell(a)$. As $a \neq 0$ and $a^b \neq 0$, we may assume $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\gamma \neq 0$. Clearly

$$(3.26) \quad |\ell(a) - \bar{\ell}(\alpha)| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+2\epsilon/3} H),$$

$$(3.27) \quad |b\ell(\alpha) - \ell^*(\gamma)| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+2\epsilon/3} H);$$

from $\ell(\alpha) \neq 0$ we thus get $\bar{\ell}(\alpha) \neq 0$. As a consequence of (3.26), (3.27) and

$$|b - \beta| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H)$$

we have

$$|\beta\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(\gamma)| < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/3} H).$$

If it were the case that $\beta\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(\gamma) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$|\beta\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(\gamma)| > \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/3} H),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $\beta\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(\gamma) = 0$.

II. We have just proved that $\bar{\ell}(\alpha)$ and $\ell^*(\gamma)$ are linearly dependent over the field of all algebraic numbers; using 2.19 we find that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . In other words, there are $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{Q}$, not both zero, such that $\xi\bar{\ell}(\alpha) + \eta\ell^*(\gamma) = 0$. Here $\eta \neq 0$ because $\bar{\ell}(\alpha) \neq 0$, so

$$\beta = \frac{\ell^*(\gamma)}{\bar{\ell}(\alpha)} = -\frac{\xi}{\eta} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Put $\beta = v/w$, where $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, $w \in \mathbb{N}$, $(v, w) = 1$. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfy $xv + yw = 1$ and take $\theta := \gamma^x \alpha^y$; clearly $\text{dg}(\theta) \leq d^2$ and

$$\theta = \exp(x\ell^*(\gamma) + y\bar{\ell}(\alpha)) = \exp(xvw^{-1}\bar{\ell}(\alpha) + y\bar{\ell}(\alpha)) = \exp(w^{-1}\bar{\ell}(\alpha)).$$

As $\bar{\ell}(\alpha)$ is bounded and unequal to zero, we have now proved

$$\exp(w^{-1}\bar{\ell}(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{A}_d \setminus \{1\}$$

if w is sufficiently large. That the number w occurring in this formula tends to infinity with H , immediately results from (3.25) and the fact that $b \notin \mathbb{Q}$. \square

It could be asked whether the condition (3.12) on the special nature of the numbers α approximating a might be dispensed with if the approxima-

tion measure itself is strengthened. That, at least in case $d = 1$, such a result does not even hold when the right hand side of (3.13) is replaced by a very rapidly decreasing function of the height, follows from 3.12 below.

3.10. LEMMA (Dirichlet's Theorem). *If $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $b \neq 0$ and $(a, b) = 1$, the residue class $\{a+bn: n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ contains infinitely many prime numbers.*

PROOF. [Apostol 1976], Theorem 7.9. \square

3.11. LEMMA. *Let $(a_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of positive integers, suppose $a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define*

$$p_0 := a_0; p_1 := a_0 a_1 + 1; p_{n+1} := a_{n+1} p_n + p_{n-1}, n \in \mathbb{N};$$

$$q_0 := 1; q_1 := a_1; q_{n+1} := a_{n+1} q_n + q_{n-1}, n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we have $p_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $q_n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(p_n, q_n) = 1$; and there exists a number $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ such that $(p_n/q_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is the sequence of convergents of the continued fraction expansion of b .

PROOF. The first assertion follows from Satz 2.1, the second one from Satz 2.6 of [Perron 1954]. \square

3.12. THEOREM. *For any $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow]0, \infty[$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an $a \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that infinitely many rational numbers ξ satisfy*

$$|a - \xi| < f(h(\xi)),$$

while $a \notin P_1^(\epsilon)$.*

PROOF. I. By induction we define two sequences $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and $(q_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ of non-negative integers. Take $a_0 := 0$, $q_0 := 1$ and let $a_1 = q_1$ be a prime number greater than $1/f(1)$. Now suppose a_0, \dots, a_n and q_0, \dots, q_n have already been defined in such a way that q_1, \dots, q_n are prime numbers and $q_k > 1/f(q_{k-1})$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$. According to 3.10, the residue class $\{q_{n-1} + xq_n: x \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ contains infinitely many prime numbers, including one greater than $1/f(q_n)$. This prime number we shall call q_{n+1} , the correspond-

ing value of x will be a_{n+1} .

The sequence $(q_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ we have now constructed has the property that $q_n > 1/f(q_{n-1})$ and q_n prime for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, while $(q_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ and $(a_n)_{n=0}^{\infty}$ are connected by

$$(3.28) \quad q_0 = 1; \quad q_1 = a_1; \quad q_{n+1} = a_{n+1}q_n + q_{n-1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Using 3.11 we see that the numbers q_n are the denominators of the convergents of the continued fraction expansion of some irrational number a .

II. Let p_n be the numerator of the n -th convergent of a . According to 3.11,

$$p_0 = 0; \quad p_1 = 1; \quad p_{n+1} = a_{n+1}p_n + p_{n-1}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Comparison with (3.28) shows that $\forall n: p_n < q_n$, so we have $h(p_n/q_n) = q_n$. Now 2.22 states that

$$\left| a - \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right| < \frac{1}{q_n q_{n+1}} < \frac{1}{q_{n+1}} < f(q_n);$$

thus, if we define $\xi_n := p_n/q_n$,

$$\left| a - \xi_n \right| < f(h(\xi_n)), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

III. Now suppose $a \in \mathcal{P}_1^*(\varepsilon)$; according to 3.9, there is a branch ℓ_1 of the logarithm such that, for infinitely many positive integers k , an algebraic number α exists with

$$(3.29) \quad \exp(k^{-1}\ell_1(\alpha)) \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{1\},$$

$$(3.30) \quad |a - \alpha| < \exp(-\log^3 A \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} A),$$

where $A = h(\alpha)$. By 2.14, (3.30) implies that α is a convergent of the continued fraction expansion of a ; thus $\exists n: \alpha = \xi_n = p_n/q_n$, where q_n is prime. On the other hand, from (3.29) it follows that $\alpha = \theta^k$ with $\theta \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{1\}$, which gives a contradiction if $k > 1$. \square

4. SIMULTANEOUS APPROXIMATION MEASURES FOR SUBSETS OF $\{a, b, P(a, b, a^b)\}$

The purpose of this chapter is to generalize 1.8 and 1.9 in order to obtain simultaneous approximation measures for subsets of $\{a, b, P(a, b, a^b)\}$, where P is a polynomial with rational integer coefficients. As a further generalization, our results will not depend on the precise coefficients of P , but only on the degree and height of P . Our main theorem is 4.12; the other theorems in this chapter treat various special cases. In 4.8 and 4.10 we consider the case that a is a fixed algebraic number, in 4.11 the case that this is true for b . In 4.7 we assume that $a^b = \exp(b)$; this result was independently proved by Väänänen [19..], who used the method of Siegel and Šidlovskii.

4.1. LEMMA. Suppose $P_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$, its height and degree bounded by H_0 and n_0 respectively, with $n_0 \leq \log H_0$. If there exist a real number $\lambda > 6$ and a transcendental number ξ such that

$$|P_0(\xi)| < \exp(-n_0 \log H_0),$$

there also exist a positive integer $s \leq n_0$ and an irreducible divisor $P_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ of P_0 , its height and degree bounded by $\exp(s^{-1} \log H_0 + 2s^{-1} n_0)$ and $s^{-1} n_0$ respectively, satisfying

$$|P_1(\xi)| < \exp(-s^{-1} (\lambda - 6) n_0 \log H_0).$$

PROOF. The assertion is proved as Lemma VI' in Chapter III of [Gel'fond 1952] under the extra assumption that the coefficients of P_0 have greatest common divisor 1. This, however, is no restriction; indeed, if this greatest common divisor is $m > 1$, the polynomial $m^{-1} P_0$ has still height and degree bounded by H_0 and n_0 respectively, while $|m^{-1} P_0(\xi)| < |P_0(\xi)|$. Moreover, any irreducible divisor of $m^{-1} P_0$ also divides P_0 . \square

4.2. LEMMA. Suppose $P_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ separable, its height bounded by H_1 , its degree exactly k . Let $a > 0$ be the leading coefficient of P_1 and $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$ its roots; let ξ be an arbitrary complex number. Then

$$|P_1(\xi)| \geq a \exp(-2k^2 - k \log H_1) \min_{i=1, \dots, k} |\xi - \theta_i|.$$

PROOF. [Fel'dman 1951], Lemma 5. \square

4.3. DEFINITION. By $S_d^{(n)}$ we denote the set of all polynomials $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ such that the degree of P in each variable does not exceed d , while for all $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{n-1}$ the degree of $P(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}, X) \in \mathbb{A}[X]$ is at least one. Instead of $S_d^{(2)}$ we usually write S_d .

4.4. LEMMA. Let F be a finite normal extension of \mathbb{Q} ; suppose $\xi \in F$. Then $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$ if and only if $\sigma(\xi) = \xi$ for all $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$.

PROOF. [Van der Waerden 1966], § 57. \square

4.5. LEMMA. Suppose $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C}$, $b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{A}$. Then there exist effectively computable C_1, \dots, C_5 , greater than 1, depending only on d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n and b , such that the following holds. Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{A}_d$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}_d$, $P \in S_d^{(n+1)}$ with

$$(4.1) \quad H := \max(h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\gamma), h(P)) \geq C_1,$$

$$(4.2) \quad \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |P(a_1, \dots, a_n, b) - \gamma|) < \exp(-C_2 \log H).$$

Then there exists a number $\beta \in \mathbb{A}$ of degree at most C_3 and height at most $\exp(C_4 \log H)$ with

$$|b - \beta|^{C_5} < \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |P(a_1, \dots, a_n, b) - \gamma|).$$

PROOF. Suppose $C_1, C_2 > 1$, $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{A}_d$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{A}_d$, $P \in S_d^{(n+1)}$ are such that (4.1) and (4.2) are satisfied. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n and b ; throughout the proof we shall without further mention assume that C_1 and C_2 are greater than such a number. Put

$$U := -\log \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |P(a_1, \dots, a_n, b) - \gamma|).$$

Remark that the transcendency of b ensures that U is well-defined; from (4.2) it follows that $U > C_2 \log H$.

Denote $d_j := \text{dg}(\alpha_j)$, $m_j := \text{den}(\alpha_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$; denote $d_0 := \text{dg}(\gamma)$, $m_0 := \text{den}(\gamma)$, $D := d_0 d_1 \dots d_n$. Then $D \leq c_1$, $\max(m_0, m_1, \dots, m_n) \leq H$. Let R_0 be the polynomial

$$R_0 := \prod_{\delta_0=1}^{d_0} \dots \prod_{\delta_n=1}^{d_n} (P(\alpha_1^{(\delta_1)}, \dots, \alpha_n^{(\delta_n)}, X) - \gamma^{(\delta_0)}),$$

where

$$\alpha_j = \alpha_j^{(1)}, \alpha_j^{(2)}, \dots, \alpha_j^{(d_j)}$$

are the conjugates of α_j for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and

$$\gamma = \gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}, \dots, \gamma^{(d_0)}$$

are the conjugates of γ . Now, if $F \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a finite normal extension of \mathbb{Q} containing $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ and γ (such an extension always exists by 2.4(a)) and $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$, the coefficients of R_0 are clearly invariant under σ ; this implies that $R_0 \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$, by 4.4. Consequently, the polynomial $R := \prod_{m_0=1}^D \prod_{m_1=1}^{dD} \dots \prod_{m_n=1}^{dD} R_0$ has rational integer coefficients; the degree of this polynomial is bounded by $dD \leq c_2$ and its height by

$$H^D (H^{dD})^n c_3 (c_4 H(H+1))^{dn+H+1} \leq \exp(c_5 \log H).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |P(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, b) - \gamma| \leq \\ & |P(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, b) - P(a_1, \dots, a_n, b)| + |P(a_1, \dots, a_n, b) - \gamma| \leq \\ & c_6^H \max_{j=1, \dots, n} |a_j - \alpha_j| + |P(a_1, \dots, a_n, b) - \gamma| < \exp(-c_7^{-1}U) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \prod_{m_0=1}^D \prod_{m_1=1}^{dD} \dots \prod_{m_n=1}^{dD} \prod_{\delta_0 \delta_1 \dots \delta_n > 1} (P(\alpha_1^{(\delta_1)}, \dots, \alpha_n^{(\delta_n)}, b) - \gamma^{(\delta_0)}) \right| \leq \\ & H^D (H^{dD})^n (c_8 H(H+1))^{dn+H+1} \leq \exp(c_9 \log H) < \exp(c_{10} C_2^{-1}U); \end{aligned}$$

thus

$$|R(b)| < \exp(-c_7^{-1}U + c_{10} C_2^{-1}U) < \exp(-c_{11}^{-1}U).$$

By the definition of $S_d^{(n+1)}$, R cannot be a constant.

Now apply 4.1 with $P_0 = R$, $n_0 = c_2$, $H_0 = \exp(c_5 \log H)$, $\lambda = c_2^{-1} c_5^{-1} c_{11}^{-1} U \log^{-1} H$, $\xi = b$. We deduce the existence of a positive integer $s \leq c_2$ and an irreducible divisor $Q \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ of R , such that the degree of Q is bounded by $s^{-1} c_2 \leq c_2$ and its height by $\exp(s^{-1} c_5 \log H + 2s^{-1} c_2) \leq \exp(c_{12} \log H)$, while

$$\begin{aligned} |Q(b)| &< \exp(-s^{-1} (\lambda - 6) c_2 c_5 \log H) = \\ &\exp(-s^{-1} c_{11}^{-1} U + 6s^{-1} c_2 c_5 \log H) < \\ &\exp(-s^{-1} c_{11}^{-1} U + 6s^{-1} c_2 c_5 c_2^{-1} U) < \exp(-c_{13}^{-1} U). \end{aligned}$$

Apply 4.2 with $P_1 = Q$, $H_1 = \exp(c_{12} \log H)$, $\xi = b$. Note that Q is separable because Q is irreducible. Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k$ be the zeros of Q ; then $k \leq c_2$.

We find

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{i=1, \dots, k} |b - \theta_i| &\leq \exp(2k^2 + kc_{12} \log H) |Q(b)| \leq \\ &\exp(2c_2^2 + c_2 c_{12} c_2^{-1} U - c_{13}^{-1} U) < \exp(-c_{14}^{-1} U). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $i = 1, \dots, k$ we have $h(\theta_i) \leq \exp(c_{12} \log H)$, $\text{dg}(\theta_i) \leq c_2$; thus there exists an algebraic number β of degree at most c_2 and height at most $\exp(c_{12} \log H)$ with

$$|b - \beta| < \exp(-c_{14}^{-1} U).$$

The lemma follows by taking $C_3 = c_2$, $C_4 = c_{12}$, $C_5 = c_{14}$. \square

4.6. LEMMA. Suppose $d, M \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d and M , such that only finitely many pairs $(\beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2$ with $|\beta| \leq M$ satisfy

$$|\exp(\beta) - \gamma| < \exp(-C \log^2 H \log_2^{-1} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. [Cijsouw 1975], Theorem 2. \square

4.7. THEOREM. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Then there are only finitely many triples $(\beta, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2 \times S_d$ such that

$$(4.3) \quad \max(|b-\beta|, |P(b, \exp(b))-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{-1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta), h(\gamma), h(P))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a contradiction will be derived. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on ϵ , d and b .

First we show that under this assumption $\exp(b)$ must be transcendental. Suppose $(\beta, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2 \times S_d$ such that (4.3) is satisfied; assume that H is sufficiently large in terms of ϵ , d and b . Suppose also that $\exp(b)$ is algebraic; as b is a value of the logarithm of $\exp(b)$, application of 2.18 shows that either $\beta - b = 0$ or

$$(4.4) \quad |\beta - b| > \exp(-\log^{1+\epsilon} H).$$

It is no restriction to assume that ϵ is so small that (4.3) and (4.4) cannot hold simultaneously; therefore we need only consider the case that $\beta - b = 0$. However, in this case the number b is algebraic but unequal to 0; thus $\exp(b)$ is transcendental by 1.2.

II. Apply 4.5; this gives the existence of an algebraic number η of degree at most c_1 and height at most $\exp(c_2 \log H)$ satisfying

$$(4.5) \quad |\exp(b) - \eta| < \exp(-c_3^{-1} \log^2 H \log_2^{-1+\epsilon} H),$$

which contradicts 4.6. \square

4.8. THEOREM. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$, $b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \emptyset$. Let $\ell(a) \neq 0$ be a value of the logarithm of a . Then there are only finitely many triples $(\beta, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d \times S_d$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad \max(|b-\beta|, |P(b, a^b)-\gamma|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^\epsilon H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta), h(\gamma), h(P))$ and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a

contradiction will be derived. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on ϵ, d, a, b and $\ell(a)$.

First we show that a^b must be transcendental. Let K be a closed disk in the complex plane, centred at a^b , that does not contain 0. It is clear that there exists a branch ℓ^* of the logarithm, defined on K , such that

$$(4.7) \quad b\ell(a) = \ell^*(a^b).$$

Suppose $(\beta, \gamma, p) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2 \times S_d$ such that (4.6) is satisfied; assume that H is sufficiently large in terms of ϵ, d, a, b and $\ell(a)$. From (4.6) and (4.7) it is clear that

$$|\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(a^b)| < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{\epsilon/2} H).$$

Now suppose that a^b is algebraic. If it were the case that $\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(a^b) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$|\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(a^b)| > \exp(-\log^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

which gives a contradiction, because we may assume ϵ to be arbitrarily small. Therefore $\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(a^b) = 0$ and so, by (4.7), we find that $\beta = b$; accordingly, $b \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ and so $a^b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{A}$ by 1.3.

II. Apply 4.5; this gives the existence of an algebraic number η of degree at most c_1 and height at most $\exp(c_2 \log H)$ satisfying

$$(4.8) \quad |a^b - \eta| < \exp(-c_3^{-1} \log^2 H \log_2^{\epsilon} H).$$

From (4.7) and (4.8) we then deduce that $\eta \in K$ and that the inequality

$$|\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(\eta)| < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{\epsilon/2} H)$$

holds, which, by 2.18, implies $\beta\ell(a) - \ell^*(\eta) = 0$.

III. We have proved that $\ell(a)$ and $\ell^*(\eta)$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{A} ; using 2.19 we find that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . In other words, there are $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$, not both zero, such that $\xi_1 \ell(a) + \xi_2 \ell^*(\eta) = 0$. Here $\xi_2 \neq 0$ because $\ell(a) \neq 0$, so

$$\beta = \frac{\ell^*(\eta)}{\ell(a)} = -\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Using 3.5 we see that $h(\beta) < c_4$; from (4.6) it then follows that $b = \beta \in \mathbb{Q}$. This contradicts the conditions of the theorem. \square

4.9. LEMMA. Suppose $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{A}$. Then there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d and a , such that only finitely many $\alpha \in \mathbb{A}_d$ satisfy

$$|a - \alpha| < \exp(-C \log H),$$

where $H = h(\alpha)$.

PROOF. [Brauer 1929], Satz 1. \square

4.10. THEOREM. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$, $b \in \mathbb{C}$, $P \in S_d$. Let $\ell(a) \neq 0$ be a value of the logarithm of a . Then there are only finitely many pairs $(\beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2$ such that

$$\max(|b - \beta|, |P(b, a^b) - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^\varepsilon H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta), h(\gamma))$ and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$.

PROOF. The proof is completely analogous to that of 4.8, up to the end of part I, where the Gel'fond-Schneider theorem was used to establish the transcendency of a^b . This time, having proved that $\beta = b$, we deduce that $H = h(\gamma)$ and that $P(b, a^b)$ is algebraic, while from (4.6) we see that

$$|P(b, a^b) - \gamma| < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^\varepsilon H),$$

which contradicts 4.9. Therefore the assumption that a^b be algebraic is disproved, it follows that $b \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and we may proceed as in the case of 4.8. \square

Thus, in case P is taken fixed, the condition that $b \notin \mathbb{Q}$ may be dropped from 4.8. In the same way it is possible to remove the restriction $b \neq 0$ from 4.7.

4.11. THEOREM. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. Let $\ell(a) \neq 0$

be a value of the logarithm of a . Then there are only finitely many triples $(\alpha, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2 \times S_d$ with

$$(4.9) \quad \max(|a-\alpha|, |P(a, a^b) - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{2+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\gamma), h(P))$ and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a contradiction will be derived. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on ϵ, d, a, b and $\ell(a)$.

First we show that a^b must be transcendental. Let $\bar{\ell}, \ell^*$ be branches of the logarithm, defined on disks K_1, K_2 , centred at a and a^b respectively, such that

$$(4.10) \quad \ell(a) = \bar{\ell}(a),$$

$$(4.11) \quad b\ell(a) = \ell^*(a^b).$$

Suppose $(\alpha, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2 \times S_d$ such that (4.9) is satisfied; assume that H is sufficiently large in terms of ϵ, d, a, b and $\ell(a)$. From (4.10) and (4.11) it is clear that $\alpha \in K_1$ and

$$|b\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(a^b)| < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{2+\epsilon/2} H).$$

Now suppose that a^b is algebraic. If it were the case that $b\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(a^b) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$|b\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(a^b)| > \exp(-\log^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

which gives a contradiction because we may assume ϵ to be arbitrarily small. Therefore $b\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(a^b) = 0$ and so, by (4.10) and (4.11), we find $\alpha = a$; accordingly, the number a is algebraic and so $a^b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{A}$ by 1.3.

II. Apply 4.5; this gives the existence of an algebraic number η of degree at most c_1 and height at most $\exp(c_2 \log H)$ satisfying

$$(4.12) \quad |a^b - \eta| < \exp(-c_3^{-1} \log^2 H \log_2^{2+\epsilon} H).$$

From (4.11) and (4.12) we deduce that $\eta \in K_2$ and that the inequality

$$|b\ell(a) - \ell^*(\eta)| < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon/2} H)$$

holds; comparison with (4.9) and (4.10) gives

$$|b\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(\eta)| < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon/3} H).$$

If it were the case that $b\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(\eta) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$|b\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(\eta)| > \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon/3} H),$$

which gives a contradiction. Therefore $b\bar{\ell}(\alpha) - \ell^*(\eta) = 0$.

III. We have proved that $\bar{\ell}(\alpha)$ and $\ell^*(\eta)$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{A} ; using 2.19 we find that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . In other words, there are $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$, not both zero, such that $\xi_1 \bar{\ell}(\alpha) + \xi_2 \ell^*(\eta) = 0$. Here $\xi_2 \neq 0$ because, by (4.10), $\bar{\ell}(\alpha) \neq 0$, so

$$b = \frac{\ell^*(\eta)}{\bar{\ell}(\alpha)} = -\frac{\xi_1}{\xi_2} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

This contradicts the conditions of the theorem. \square

4.12. THEOREM. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $\ell(a) \neq 0$ be a value of the logarithm of a . If $b \in \mathbb{R}$, or if $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ such that the convergents p_n/q_n of the continued fraction expansion of b satisfy

$$(4.13) \quad q_{n+1} \ll \exp(q_n^3), \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

there are only finitely many quadruples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^3 \times S_d^{(3)}$ such that

$$(4.14) \quad \max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |P(a, b, a^b) - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma), h(P))$ and $a^b = \exp(b\ell(a))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose that b has the required properties, but that nevertheless there exist infinitely many quadruples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^3 \times S_d^{(3)}$ that satisfy (4.14).

From this it follows that a^b must be transcendental. If both a and b are algebraic, this is precisely the Gel'fond-Schneider theorem 1.3. Now

suppose that at least one of a and b is transcendental; then (4.14) implies that there are infinitely many pairs $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{A}_d^2$ that satisfy

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H),$$

where $H \geq \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta))$. If a^b is algebraic, this contradicts 1.7.

II. Apply 4.5; this gives the existence of infinitely many triples (α, β, η) of algebraic numbers, their degrees bounded by some constant depending only on ε, d, a, b and $\ell(a)$ such that

$$\max(|a-\alpha|, |b-\beta|, |a^b-\eta|) < \exp(-\log^3 H' \log_2^{1+\varepsilon/2} H'),$$

where $H' \geq \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\eta))$. Once again we get a contradiction with 1.7. \square

It is clear that the use of 2.24 instead of 1.7 would replace condition (4.13) by the slightly sharper $\omega(\varepsilon, b) = 0$.

5. MANY-VARIABLE ANALOGUES

In the present chapter we give analogues of 1.10 and 1.11 in which the condition that $1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ be linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} is replaced by conditions on $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$. As proved in 5.5 and 5.7, the estimate of 1.10 holds whenever $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ or $1, b_1, \dots, b_n$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} . In 5.8 and 5.10 it is proved that a similar result can be obtained in case the rôles of a_1, \dots, a_n and b_1, \dots, b_n in 1.10 are interchanged; here we need the additional restriction that b_1, \dots, b_n may not all be rational. Under these conditions, it is also possible to prove many-variable analogues of 4.8 and 4.11; this is done in 5.11 and 5.12. Finally, in 5.15 we give an analogue of 1.11 in which the condition that $1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ be linearly independent is replaced by the strong linear independence condition (1.3). In 5.13 it is shown that 5.15 may also be regarded as a generalization of the type of theorem of which 1.7 is an example; 5.16 uses 5.15 to give a many-variable analogue of 4.12.

5.1. LEMMA. *Suppose $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$; then there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d and n , such that for all n -tuples (η_1, \dots, η_n) of algebraic complex numbers of height at most $H \geq 2$ the following assertions hold:*

$$\text{dg}(\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n) \leq d \Rightarrow h(\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n) \leq H^C,$$

$$\text{dg}(\eta_1 \dots \eta_n) \leq d \Rightarrow h(\eta_1 \dots \eta_n) \leq H^C.$$

PROOF. Suppose $\text{dg}(\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n) \leq d$; put $\eta := \eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n \in \mathbb{A}_d$. The minimal polynomial of η is

$$a \prod_{j=1}^k (X - \eta^{(j)}),$$

where $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and where $\eta^{(1)}, \dots, \eta^{(k)}$ are the different conjugates of η (thus $k \leq d$). By 2.5(c) we have, for $j = 1, \dots, k$,

$$|\eta^{(j)}| \leq \overline{|\eta|} \leq \overline{|\eta_1|} + \dots + \overline{|\eta_n|} \leq n(H+1).$$

According to 2.4(a), \mathbb{C} contains a finite normal extension F of \mathbb{Q} , such that $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \in F$. Put $G := \text{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$. By 2.4(b),

$$\begin{aligned}
a &\leq \prod_{j=1}^k \text{den}(\eta^{(j)}) \leq \left(\max_{\sigma \in G} \text{den } \sigma(\eta) \right)^k \leq \\
&\max_{\sigma \in G} \left(\text{den } \sigma(\eta_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \text{den } \sigma(\eta_n) \right)^k \leq \\
&\max_{\sigma \in G} \text{den}^k \sigma(\eta_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \max_{\sigma \in G} \text{den}^k \sigma(\eta_n) \leq H^{dn}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first assertion of the lemma follows from the trivial fact that the height of a product of polynomials is less than the product of their heights times a constant depending only on their number and their degrees.

The second assertion is proved analogously, with the obvious replacements. \square

5.2. LEMMA. Suppose $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d and n , with the following property. Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{A}_d$ are multiplicatively dependent; then there exist $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, such that

$$\alpha_1^{t_1} \dots \alpha_n^{t_n} = 1$$

and

$$\max(|t_1|, \dots, |t_n|) < C \log^{n-1} H,$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n))$.

PROOF. [Van der Poorten-Loxton 1977], Theorem 1. \square

5.3. LEMMA. Suppose $R > 0$, $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_\ell \in \mathbb{C}$, $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $P_1, \dots, P_\ell \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ denote non-trivial polynomials of degree at most d . Define

$$\Phi(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} P_k(z) \exp(\omega_k z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

If Φ is not identically zero, the number of zeros of Φ in $\{z \in \mathbb{C}: |z - z_0| \leq R\}$ does not exceed

$$3\ell(d+1) - 3 + 4R \max(|\omega_1|, \dots, |\omega_\ell|).$$

PROOF. [Tijdeman 1971], Theorem 1, Corollary. \square

The following lemma is a generalization of 2.10 and 2.11 to an arbitrary number of logarithms; it has been brought to our attention that Waldschmidt [19..], in an as yet unpublished paper, proved a slightly sharper version of the second assertion of the lemma.

5.4. LEMMA. Suppose $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$, K a compact subset of the complex plane not containing 0, ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_n branches of the logarithm, defined on K . Then there exist effectively computable $C, H_0 > 1$, depending only on d, n, K and ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_n , with the following property. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in K$ be algebraic of degree at most d and heights at most H_1, \dots, H_n respectively, such that $\ell_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \ell_n(\alpha_n)$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . If $H \geq \max(H_0, H_1, \dots, H_n)$, then there exist $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, such that

$$x_1 \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + x_n \ell_n(\alpha_n) = 0$$

while

$$|x_j| \leq C \log_2^{n+1} H \prod_{i \neq j} \log H_i, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

In case $H_1 = \dots = H_n$, this inequality may be sharpened to

$$|x_j| \leq C \log^{n-1} H \log_2 H, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

PROOF. I. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in K$ be algebraic of degree at most d and heights at most H_1, \dots, H_n respectively, such that $\ell_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \ell_n(\alpha_n)$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} ; let H be a number greater than $\max(H_1, \dots, H_n)$. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 that depend only on d, n, K and ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_n . By C we shall denote some number greater than 1; additional restrictions on the choice of C will be formulated at later stages of the proof. Throughout the proof we shall assume that H is sufficiently large in terms of $d, n, K, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_n$ and C .

II. First we shall prove that there exist $u_1, \dots, u_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, their absolute values bounded by $c_1 \log^{2n-3} H$, such that

$$u_1 \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + u_n \ell_n(\alpha_n) = 0.$$

It is clear that there exist $r_1, \dots, r_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, such that

$$(5.1) \quad r_1 \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + r_n \ell_n(\alpha_n) = 0.$$

By 5.2, there exist $s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, their absolute values bounded by $c_2 \log^{n-1} H$, such that

$$\frac{s_1}{\alpha_1} \dots \frac{s_n}{\alpha_n} = 1;$$

suppose for instance that $s_n \neq 0$. Thus there is a $s_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ with

$$(5.2) \quad s_1 \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + s_n \ell_n(\alpha_n) + s_{n+1} \cdot 2\pi i = 0.$$

As $|\ell_j(\alpha_j)| \leq c_3$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, we have $|s_{n+1}| \leq c_4 \log^{n-1} H$. If $s_{n+1} = 0$, there is nothing left to prove; assume $s_{n+1} \neq 0$. Comparison of (5.1) and (5.2) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(r_1 - \frac{r_n}{s_n} s_1\right) \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \left(r_{n-1} - \frac{r_n}{s_n} s_{n-1}\right) \ell_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1}) - \\ & \frac{r_n}{s_n} s_{n+1} \cdot 2\pi i = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Again by 5.2, there exist $t_1, \dots, t_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, their absolute values bounded by $c_5 \log^{n-2} H$, such that

$$\frac{t_1}{\alpha_1} \dots \frac{t_{n-1}}{\alpha_{n-1}} = 1.$$

Thus there is a $t_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with

$$(5.3) \quad t_1 \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + t_{n-1} \ell_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1}) + t_n \cdot 2\pi i = 0.$$

As $|\ell_j(\alpha_j)| \leq c_3$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, we have $|t_n| \leq c_6 \log^{n-2} H$. If $t_n = 0$, there is nothing left to prove; assume $t_n \neq 0$. Comparison of (5.2) and (5.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & (s_1 t_n - s_{n+1} t_1) \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + (s_{n-1} t_n - s_{n+1} t_{n-1}) \ell_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1}) + \\ & s_n t_n \ell_n(\alpha_n) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

If we define $u_j := s_j t_n - s_{n+1} t_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ and $u_n := s_n t_n$, the

numbers u_1, \dots, u_n possess all the desired properties; in particular $u_n \neq 0$ because $s_n \neq 0$ and $t_n \neq 0$.

III. For convenience's sake, in the remainder of the proof we shall assume that $u_n \neq 0$ and write $\beta_j := -u_j/u_n$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$; we have

$$\beta_1 \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_{n-1} \ell_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1}) - \ell_n(\alpha_n) = 0$$

and

$$(5.4) \quad B := \max(h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_{n-1})) \leq c_1 \log^{2n-3} H.$$

Define $\Omega := (\log H_1) \dots (\log H_n)$ and

$$\Omega_j := \prod_{i \neq j} \log H_i$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Define

$$L_0 := [C^{1+1/n} \Omega \log_2^{n+2} H \log_2^{-n-1} A] - 1;$$

$$L_j := [C \Omega_j \log_2^{n+1} H \log_2^{-n} A] - 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

where

$$A := \begin{cases} H & \text{if } H_1 = \dots = H_n, \\ e & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We introduce the auxiliary function

$$\Phi(z) := \sum_{\lambda_0=0}^{L_0} \dots \sum_{\lambda_n=0}^{L_n} p(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n) z^{\lambda_0} \alpha_1^{\lambda_1 z} \dots \alpha_n^{\lambda_n z}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

where

$$\alpha_j^{\lambda_j z} = \exp(\lambda_j z \ell_j(\alpha_j)), \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

and where $p(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)$ are rational integers to be determined later. We have

$$(5.5) \quad \Phi^{(t)}(z) = \sum_{\tau} \frac{t!}{\tau_0! \dots \tau_{n-1}!} \ell_1^{\tau_1}(\alpha_1) \dots \ell_{n-1}^{\tau_{n-1}}(\alpha_{n-1}) \Phi_{\tau}(z),$$

where the summation ranges over all n -tuples $\underline{\tau} = (\tau_0, \dots, \tau_{n-1})$ of non-negative integers satisfying $\tau_0 + \dots + \tau_{n-1} = t$, and where

$$\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(z) = \sum_{\lambda_0=0}^{L_0} \dots \sum_{\lambda_n=0}^{L_n} p(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n) \frac{\lambda_0!}{(\lambda_0 - \tau_0)!} z^{\lambda_0 - \tau_0} \alpha_1^{\lambda_1} z^{\lambda_2} \dots \alpha_n^{\lambda_n} z^{\lambda_n} \times \prod_{v=1}^{n-1} (\lambda_v + \lambda_n \beta_v)^{\tau_v}.$$

Now put $a_j := \text{den}(\alpha_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, $b_j = \text{den}(\beta_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, $S := [C^{1/n} \log_2^2 H \log_2^2 A]$, $T := [\frac{1}{2} d^{-1} C^{1+1/n} \log_2^{n+2} H \log_2^{-n-1} A]$, and consider the system of linear equations

$$a_1^{L_1 S} \dots a_n^{L_n S} b_1^{\tau_1} \dots b_{n-1}^{\tau_{n-1}} \phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S-1, \quad \underline{\tau} \in V(T),$$

where $V(T)$ is the set of all n -tuples $\underline{\tau} = (\tau_0, \dots, \tau_{n-1})$ of non-negative integers satisfying $\tau_0 + \dots + \tau_{n-1} \leq T - 1$. These are fewer than ST^n equations in the $(L_0+1) \dots (L_n+1)$ unknowns $p(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)$; the coefficients are algebraic integers in the number field $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ of degree at most d^n . The absolute values of the conjugates of the coefficients are less than or equal to

$$a_1^{L_1 S} \dots a_n^{L_n S} \max^T(b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}) L_0! S^{L_0} \left(\prod_{j=1}^n \max(1, |\alpha_j|^{L_j S}) \right) \times \max_{v=1, \dots, n-1} \max(1, |\lambda_v + \lambda_n \beta_v|^T) \leq c_7^{LS+T} \frac{L_0^{L_0} L_0^T B^{2T}}{L_0} \prod_{j=1}^n H_j^{2L_j S} \leq \exp(c_8 C^{1+1/n} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A);$$

here (5.4) is used and $L := \max(L_1, \dots, L_n)$. As

$$(L_0+1) \dots (L_n+1) \geq \frac{1}{2} C^{n+1+1/n} \log_2^{n^2+2n+2} H \log_2^{-n^2-n-1} A \geq 2d^n ST^n,$$

2.7 states that there is a non-trivial choice for the $p(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)$ such that

$$(5.6) \quad \phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S-1, \quad \underline{\tau} \in V(T),$$

while

$$\begin{aligned}
P &:= \max_{\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n} |p(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)| \leq \\
&c_9 (L_0+1) \dots (L_n+1) \exp(c_8 C^{1+1/n} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A) \leq \\
&\exp(c_{10} C^{1+1/n} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A).
\end{aligned}$$

IV. Define $K := \lceil n^2 \log_2 H / \log 2 \rceil + 1$. For $k = 0, \dots, K$ we put $S_k := 2^k S$, $T_k := T - k \lceil T/2K \rceil$. Then, for our special choice of the $p(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)$, we have

$$(5.7) \quad \phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S_k - 1, \quad \underline{\tau} \in V(T_k).$$

This is proved by induction; for $k = 0$ the assertion is precisely (5.6). Now suppose that (5.7) holds for some $k \leq K - 1$. Then, for $\underline{\tau} \in V(T_{k+1})$ and $m \leq \lceil T/2K \rceil$ we have

$$\phi_{\underline{\tau}}^{(m)}(z) = \sum_{\underline{\mu}} \frac{m!}{\mu_0! \dots \mu_{n-1}!} \ell_1^{\mu_0}(\alpha_1) \dots \ell_{n-1}^{\mu_{n-1}}(\alpha_{n-1}) \phi_{\underline{\tau} + \underline{\mu}}(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C},$$

where the summation ranges over all n -tuples $\underline{\mu} = (\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{n-1})$ of non-negative integers satisfying $\mu_0 + \dots + \mu_{n-1} = m$, and where $\underline{\tau} + \underline{\mu} = (\tau_0 + \mu_0, \dots, \tau_{n-1} + \mu_{n-1})$. Clearly $\underline{\tau} + \underline{\mu} \in V(T_k)$ and thus, by the induction hypothesis,

$$\phi_{\underline{\tau}}^{(m)}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S_k - 1, \quad \underline{\tau} \in V(T_{k+1}), \quad m \leq \lceil T/2K \rceil.$$

By 2.8 we have, for $\underline{\tau} \in V(T_{k+1})$,

$$(5.8) \quad \max_{|z| \leq S_{k+1}} |\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(z)| \leq 2 \max_{|z| \leq 3S_{k+1}} \log A |\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(z)| \left(\frac{2}{3 \log A} \right)^{S_{k+1} \lceil T/2K \rceil}.$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{|z| \leq 3S_{k+1} \log A} |\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(z)| \leq \\
&\frac{L_0 + LS_{k+1}}{c_{11} \log A + T_{k+1}} \log A + T_{k+1} (L_0 + 1) \dots (L_n + 1) P L_0! (S_{k+1} \log A)^{L_0} (BL)^{T_{k+1}} \leq \\
&\exp(2^k c_{12} C^{1+1/n} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\left(\frac{2}{3 \log A}\right)^{S_k^{[T/2K]}} \leq \exp(-2^k c_{13}^{-1} C^{1+2/n_\Omega} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A);$$

therefore, if we choose C so large that $c_{13}^{-1} C^{1/2n} > c_{12}$, substitution in (5.8) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{|z| \leq S_{k+1}} |\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(z)| &\leq \exp(-2^k c_{14}^{-1} C^{1+3/2n_\Omega} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A), \\ \underline{\tau} &\in V(\mathbb{T}_{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(5.9) \quad |\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s)| \leq \exp(-2^k c_{14}^{-1} C^{1+3/2n_\Omega} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A),$$

$$s = 0, \dots, S_{k+1} - 1, \underline{\tau} \in V(\mathbb{T}_{k+1}).$$

However, $\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s)$ is algebraic and for $s = 0, \dots, S_{k+1} - 1, \underline{\tau} \in V(\mathbb{T}_{k+1})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dg}(\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s)) &\leq d^n, \\ \text{den}(\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s)) &\leq a_1^{L_1 s} \dots a_n^{L_n s} b_1^{\tau_1} \dots b_{n-1}^{\tau_{n-1}} \leq H_1^{L_1 S_{k+1}} \dots H_n^{L_n S_{k+1}} B^{\mathbb{T}_{k+1}} \leq \\ &\exp(2^k c_{15} C^{1+1/n_\Omega} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A), \\ |\overline{\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s)}| &\leq c_{16}^{L S_{k+1} + \mathbb{T}_{k+1}} (L_0 + 1) \dots (L_n + 1) P_{L_0}^{L_0} S_{k+1}^{L_0} (BL)^{\mathbb{T}_{k+1}} \times \\ &H_1^{L_1 S_{k+1}} \dots H_n^{L_n S_{k+1}} \leq \exp(2^k c_{17} C^{1+1/n_\Omega} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A), \end{aligned}$$

so, by 2.6, either $\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s) = 0$ or

$$(5.10) \quad |\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s)| \geq \exp(-2^k c_{18} C^{1+1/n_\Omega} \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A).$$

Combining (5.9) and (5.10), and choosing C so large that $c_{14}^{-1} C^{1/2n} > c_{18}$, gives $\phi_{\underline{\tau}}(s) = 0$ for $s = 0, \dots, S_{k+1} - 1, \underline{\tau} \in V(\mathbb{T}_{k+1})$. This completes the proof of \bar{f} (5.7).

V. Taking $k = K$ in (5.7) yields

$$\phi_{\underline{t}}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S_K - 1, \quad \underline{t} \in V(T_K).$$

Substitution in (5.5) shows that

$$\phi^{(t)}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S_K - 1, \quad t = 0, \dots, T_K - 1.$$

Thus the number of zeros of ϕ in $W := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq S_K^{-1}\}$ is at least

$$\begin{aligned} S_K T_K &\geq 2^{\lfloor n^2 \log_2 H / \log 2 \rfloor} & ST &\geq \frac{1}{2} ST \log^n H \geq \\ & & & \frac{1}{4} d^{-1} C^{1+2/n} \Omega \log^n H \log_2^{n+4} H \log_2^{-n-2} A. \end{aligned}$$

However, if ϕ is not identically zero, from 5.3 we see that the number of zeros of ϕ in W does not exceed

$$\begin{aligned} &3(L_0 + 1) \dots (L_n + 1) + c_{19} S_K L \leq \\ &3C^{n+1+1/n} \Omega \log_2^{n^2+2n+2} H \log_2^{-n^2-n-1} A + c_{19} 2^{n^2 \log_2 H / \log 2 + 1} S L \leq \\ &3C^{n+1+1/n} \Omega \log_2^{n^2-n} H \log_2^{n^2+2n+2} H \log_2^{-n^2-n-1} A + \\ &c_{20} C^{1+1/n} \Omega \log_2^{n^2} H \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A \leq \\ &c_{21} C^{1+1/n} \Omega \log_2^{n^2} H \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, comparison of the two estimates for the number of zeros of ϕ in W yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{4} d^{-1} C^{1+2/n} \Omega \log_2^{n^2} H \log_2^{n+4} H \log_2^{-n-2} A \leq \\ &c_{21} C^{1+1/n} \Omega \log_2^{n^2} H \log_2^{n+3} H \log_2^{-n-1} A, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$C \leq (4dc_{21} \log_2^{-1} H \log_2 A)^n \leq c_{22}.$$

If C is sufficiently large, there is a contradiction; thus ϕ is identical-

ly zero. As the $p(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)$ are not all zero, it follows that two of the frequencies of ϕ must be equal. This shows that there exist two non-identical n -tuples $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and $(\lambda_1', \dots, \lambda_n')$ of non-negative integers that satisfy

$$\lambda_1 \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \lambda_n \ell_n(\alpha_n) = \lambda_1' \ell_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \lambda_n' \ell_n(\alpha_n),$$

while

$$\max(\lambda_j, \lambda_j') \leq L_j.$$

Taking $x_j := \lambda_j - \lambda_j'$ proves the lemma. \square

5.5. THEOREM. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{C}$, $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively such that $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} . Put

$$\underline{a}^b := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n)).$$

Then there are only finitely many $(n+1)$ -tuples $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{n+1}$ for which

$$(5.11) \quad \max(|b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|, |\underline{a}^b - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^\varepsilon H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a contradiction will be derived. Let $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma)$ be an $(n+1)$ -tuple satisfying (5.11). By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on $\varepsilon, d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ and $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$; we assume H to be greater than such a number. Let ℓ be a branch of the logarithm, defined on a disk K , centred at \underline{a}^b , such that $\ell(\underline{a}^b) = b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n)$. From (5.11) we deduce that $\gamma \in K$ and that the inequality

$$|\beta_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + \beta_n \ell_n(a_n) - \ell(\gamma)| < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{\varepsilon/2} H)$$

holds. If it were the case that $\beta_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + \beta_n \ell_n(a_n) - \ell(\gamma) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$|\beta_1 l_1(a_1) + \dots + \beta_n l_n(a_n) - l(\gamma)| > \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{\varepsilon/2} H),$$

which gives a contradiction. Therefore

$$(5.12) \quad \beta_1 l_1(a_1) + \dots + \beta_n l_n(a_n) - l(\gamma) = 0.$$

II. We have now proved that $l_1(a_1), \dots, l_n(a_n), l(\gamma)$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{A} ; using 2.19 we find that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . By 5.4, there exist $x_1, \dots, x_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, such that $x_1 l_1(a_1) + \dots + x_n l_n(a_n) + x_{n+1} l(\gamma) = 0$, while $|x_{n+1}| \leq c_1 \log_2^{n+2} H$. Adding x_{n+1} times (5.12) gives

$$(x_1 + \beta_1 x_{n+1}) l_1(a_1) + \dots + (x_n + \beta_n x_{n+1}) l_n(a_n) = 0.$$

III. By the conditions of the theorem $l_1(a_1), \dots, l_n(a_n)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} ; 2.19 states that then $l_1(a_1), \dots, l_n(a_n)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{A} . Thus for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have $x_j + \beta_j x_{n+1} = 0$. Now $x_{n+1} = 0$ would imply $x_1 = \dots = x_n = 0$, which we have assumed to be not the case; therefore $x_{n+1} \neq 0$. From this it follows that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have

$$\beta_j = -\frac{x_j}{x_{n+1}}.$$

By 2.21 this implies $h(\beta_j) \leq c_2 \text{den}(\beta_j) \leq c_2 |x_{n+1}|$, and thus

$$(5.13) \quad h(\beta_j) \leq c_3 \log_2^{n+2} H, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Apply 5.1 with $\eta_j = \exp(\beta_j l_j(a_j))$. We have

$$\text{dg}(\eta_j) \leq \text{dg}(a_j) \text{den}(\beta_j) \leq c_4 \log_2^{n+2} H,$$

so, by 3.4,

$$h(\eta_j) \leq \exp(c_5 \text{dg}(\eta_j) h(\beta_j)) \leq \exp(c_6 \log_2^{2n+4} H),$$

and thus

$$(5.14) \quad h(\gamma) \leq \exp(c_7 \log_2^{2n+4} H).$$

However, (5.13) and (5.14) show that

$$H = \max(2, h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\gamma)) \leq \exp(c_8 \log_2^{2n+4} H),$$

which gives a contradiction for sufficiently large H . \square

5.6. LEMMA. Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , $l_1(\alpha_1), \dots, l_n(\alpha_n)$ values of the logarithms of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ respectively that are not all zero. Then

$$\exp(\beta_1 l_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n l_n(\alpha_n))$$

is transcendental.

PROOF. The lemma follows from Theorem 2 of [Baker 1967] in case none of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ equals 1. However, Baker's proof only uses the less restrictive condition that none of $l_1(\alpha_1), \dots, l_n(\alpha_n)$ is zero; and this assumption we may make without impairing the generality of the proof. To see this, assume that this special case has been proved and rearrange the given numbers in such a way that $l_{m+1}(\alpha_{m+1}) = \dots = l_n(\alpha_n) = 0$, while none of $l_1(\alpha_1), \dots, l_m(\alpha_m)$ equals zero. As the linear independence of $1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ entails that of $1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$, the special case of the lemma yields the transcendence of

$$\exp(\beta_1 l_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_m l_m(\alpha_m)) = \exp(\beta_1 l_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n l_n(\alpha_n)). \quad \square$$

5.7. THEOREM. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $1, b_1, \dots, b_n$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , $l_1(a_1), \dots, l_n(a_n)$ values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively that are not all zero. Put $\underline{a}^b := \exp(b_1 l_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n l_n(a_n))$. Then there are only finitely many $(n+1)$ -tuples $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{n+1}$ for which

$$(5.15) \quad \max(|b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|, |\underline{a}^b - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^\varepsilon H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. In case $n = 1$, the assertion of the theorem follows from 5.5. We now proceed by induction and assume that the assertion has been proved for all natural numbers less than n , while it does not hold for n itself; from this a contradiction will be derived. Let $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma)$ be an $(n+1)$ -tuple satisfying (5.15). By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on $\epsilon, d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ and $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$; we suppose H to be greater than such a number. If $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , the assertion is proved in 5.5; therefore we may suppose that there exist $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \in \mathbb{Q}$, not all zero, their heights bounded by a constant c_1 , such that $\eta_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + \eta_n \ell_n(a_n) = 0$. It is no restriction to assume $\eta_n \neq 0$; thus we may write

$$\ell_n(a_n) = - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} \ell_j(a_j),$$

from which it follows that $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_{n-1}(a_{n-1})$ cannot be all zero. If, for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, we define

$$(5.16) \quad b'_j := b_j - \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} b_n, \quad \beta'_j := \beta_j - \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} \beta_n,$$

we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \exp(b'_j \ell_j(a_j)) = \frac{b}{a}$$

and, for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |b'_j - \beta'_j| &\leq |b_j - \beta_j| + \left| \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} \right| \cdot |b_n - \beta_n| < \\ &\left(1 + \left| \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} \right|\right) \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{\epsilon} H). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, the numbers $1, b'_1, \dots, b'_{n-1}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , as may be seen from (5.16). The numbers $\beta'_1, \dots, \beta'_{n-1}$ are algebraic of degree at most d^2 , while their heights are bounded by $\exp(c_2 \log H)$ (here 5.1 is used). Thus

$$(5.17) \quad \max(|b'_1 - \beta'_1|, \dots, |b'_{n-1} - \beta'_{n-1}|, |a^{-b} - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^2 H' \log_2^{\epsilon/2} H'),$$

where $H' := \exp(c_2 \log H) \geq \max(h(\beta'_1), \dots, h(\beta'_{n-1}), h(\gamma))$. From the induction

hypothesis it now follows that

$$(5.18) \quad \max(h(\beta'_1), \dots, h(\beta'_{n-1}), h(\gamma)) \leq c_3;$$

from (5.17) and (5.18) we see that

$$\beta'_1 = b'_1, \dots, \beta'_{n-1} = b'_{n-1}, \gamma = \underline{a}^{\underline{b}}.$$

Thus b'_1, \dots, b'_{n-1} and $\underline{a}^{\underline{b}}$ are algebraic; however, by means of 5.6 this leads to a contradiction with the linear independence of $1, b'_1, \dots, b'_{n-1}$. \square

From the proof it is clear that the theorem remains valid when the condition that $1, b_1, \dots, b_n$ be linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} is replaced by the condition $\underline{a}^{\underline{b}} \notin \mathbb{A}_d$.

5.8. THEOREM. *Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{A}$ such that $1, b_1, \dots, b_n$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively that are not all zero. Put $\underline{a}^{\underline{b}} := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n))$. Then there are only finitely many $(n+1)$ -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{n+1}$ for which*

$$(5.19) \quad \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |\underline{a}^{\underline{b}} - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^{n+1} H \log_2^{2+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a contradiction will be derived. Let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \gamma)$ be an $(n+1)$ -tuple satisfying (5.19); assume that H is sufficiently large in terms of $\epsilon, d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ and $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$. Let $\bar{\ell}_1, \dots, \bar{\ell}_n$ and $\bar{\ell}$ be branches of the logarithm, defined on disks K_1, \dots, K_n and K , centred at a_1, \dots, a_n and $\underline{a}^{\underline{b}}$ respectively, such that

$$(5.20) \quad \bar{\ell}_j(a_j) = \ell_j(a_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

$$(5.21) \quad \bar{\ell}(\underline{a}^{\underline{b}}) = b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n).$$

From (5.19), (5.20) and (5.21) we deduce that $\alpha_j \in K_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$ and that $\bar{\ell}_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \bar{\ell}_n(\alpha_n)$ are not all zero; also that $\gamma \in K$ and that the in-

equality

$$|b_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + b_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n) - \ell(\gamma)| < \exp(-\log^{n+1}_H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon/2H})$$

holds. If it were the case that $b_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + b_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n) - \ell(\gamma) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$|b_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + b_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n) - \ell(\gamma)| > \exp(-\log^{n+1}_H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon/2H}),$$

which gives a contradiction. Therefore

$$b_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + b_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n) - \ell(\gamma) = 0$$

and thus $\exp(b_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + b_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n))$ is algebraic. This contradicts 5.6. \square

5.9. LEMMA. Suppose $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $b \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then there is an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d and b , with the following property: if $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{A}_d$, while $l_1(\alpha), l_2(\gamma)$ are values of the logarithms of α and γ respectively with

$$(5.22) \quad bl_1(\alpha) - l_2(\gamma) = 0,$$

it follows that

$$\log h(\gamma) < C \log \max(2, h(\alpha)).$$

PROOF (cf. 3.4). Let $\alpha, \gamma, l_1(\alpha)$ and $l_2(\gamma)$ be such that (5.22) is satisfied; put $b = v/w$, where $v \in \mathbb{Z}$, $w \in \mathbb{N}$, $(v, w) = 1$. If $P = \sum_{j=0}^d a_j x^j$ is the minimal polynomial of γ , the minimal polynomial of $1/\gamma$ is either $P^* := \sum_{j=0}^d a_{d-j} x^j$ or $-P^*$. Thus $h(\gamma) = h(1/\gamma)$; replacing γ if necessary by $1/\gamma$ and observing that $-l_2(\gamma)$ is a value of the logarithm of $1/\gamma$ shows that it is sufficient to prove the lemma in case $v \geq 0$. We have

$$\exp(wl_2(\gamma)) = \exp^w(l_2(\gamma)) = \gamma^w$$

and

$$\exp(wl_2(\gamma)) = \exp(wl_1(\alpha)) = \exp(vl_1(\alpha)) = \exp^v(l_1(\alpha)) = \alpha^v;$$

applying 3.1 gives

$$\overline{|\gamma|} = \overline{|\alpha|}^{v/w}$$

and

$$\text{den}(\gamma) \leq \text{den}^v(\alpha).$$

According to 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} h(\gamma) &\leq (2 \text{den}(\gamma) \max(1, \overline{|\gamma|}))^{\text{dg}(\gamma)} \leq (2 \text{den}^v(\alpha) \max(1, \overline{|\alpha|}^{v/w}))^d \leq \\ &(2h^v(\alpha) (h(\alpha)+1)^{v/w})^d. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

5.10. **THEOREM.** Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{A}$, not all rational, $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively such that $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} . Define $\underline{a}^b := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n))$. Then there are only finitely many $(n+1)$ -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{n+1}$ for which

$$(5.23) \quad \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |\underline{a}^b - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^{n+1} H \log_2^{2+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. I. In case $n = 1$, the assertion of the theorem follows from 5.8. We now proceed by induction and assume that the assertion has been proved for all natural numbers less than n , while it does not hold for n itself; from this a contradiction will be derived. Let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \gamma)$ be an $(n+1)$ -tuple satisfying (5.23). By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on $\epsilon, d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ and $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$; we suppose H to be greater than such a number. If $1, b_1, \dots, b_n$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , the assertion is proved in 5.8; therefore we may suppose that there exist $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_n \in \mathbb{Q}$, not all zero, their heights bounded by a constant c_1 , such that $\eta_0 + \eta_1 b_1 + \dots + \eta_n b_n = 0$. As $\eta_1 = \dots = \eta_n = 0$ would imply $\eta_0 = 0$, it is no restriction to assume $\eta_n \neq 0$; thus we may write

$$(5.24) \quad b_n = -\frac{\eta_0}{\eta_n} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} b_j.$$

Let ℓ and $\bar{\ell}_n$ be branches of the logarithm, defined on disks K_1 and K_2 , centred at $\frac{a_n^b}{n}$ and a_n respectively, such that

$$(5.25) \quad \ell\left(\frac{a_n^b}{n}\right) = b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n),$$

$$(5.26) \quad \bar{\ell}_n(a_n) = \ell_n(a_n).$$

From (5.23) and (5.26) we deduce that $\alpha_n \in K_2$; from (5.23) and (5.25) we deduce that $\gamma \in K_1$ and that the inequality

$$(5.27) \quad \left| b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n) - \ell(\gamma) \right| < \exp(-\log^{n+1} H \log_2^{2+\epsilon/2} H)$$

holds. For $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ we define

$$\begin{aligned} a'_j &:= a_j \exp\left(-\frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} \ell_n(a_n)\right), \quad \ell_j^*(a'_j) := \ell_j(a_j) - \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} \ell_n(a_n), \\ (a'_j)^{b_j} &:= \exp(b_j \ell_j^*(a'_j)). \end{aligned}$$

Then the numbers $\ell_1^*(a'_1), \dots, \ell_{n-1}^*(a'_{n-1})$ are non-zero values of the logarithms of a'_1, \dots, a'_{n-1} respectively, and are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} . We also define

$$\gamma' := \gamma \exp\left(\frac{\eta_0}{\eta_n} \bar{\ell}_n(\alpha_n)\right), \quad \ell^*(\gamma') := \ell(\gamma) + \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_n} \bar{\ell}_n(\alpha_n).$$

Then $\ell^*(\gamma')$ is a value of the logarithm of γ' . Using (5.24) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (a'_1)^{b_1} \dots (a'_{n-1})^{b_{n-1}} - \gamma' \right| \leq \\ & c_2 \left| b_1 \ell_1^*(a'_1) + \dots + b_{n-1} \ell_{n-1}^*(a'_{n-1}) - \ell^*(\gamma') \right| = \\ & c_2 \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j \left(\ell_j(a_j) - \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} \ell_n(a_n) \right) - \ell(\gamma) - \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_n} \bar{\ell}_n(\alpha_n) \right| \leq \\ & c_2 \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j \left(\ell_j(a_j) - \frac{\eta_j}{\eta_n} \ell_n(a_n) \right) - \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_n} \ell_n(a_n) - \ell(\gamma) \right| + \\ & c_2 \left| \frac{\eta_0}{\eta_n} (\ell_n(a_n) - \bar{\ell}_n(\alpha_n)) \right| \leq \\ & c_2 \left| b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n) - \ell(\gamma) \right| + c_3 \left| a_n - \alpha_n \right| \leq \end{aligned}$$

$$c_4 \exp(-\log^{n+1} H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon/2} H),$$

the last inequality by (5.23) and (5.27). Finally, we define

$$\alpha'_j := \alpha_j \exp(-\frac{n_j}{n} \bar{\ell}_n(\alpha_n)), \quad j = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Then, for $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, we have

$$|a'_j - \alpha'_j| \leq c_5 |a_j - \alpha_j| + c_6 |a_n - \alpha_n| \leq c_7 \exp(-\log^{n+1} H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon} H).$$

The numbers $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{n-1}, \gamma'$ are algebraic of degree at most $d^2 |n_n| \leq c_8$, while their heights are bounded by $\exp(c_9 \log H)$ (here 5.1 and 5.9 are used). Thus

$$(5.28) \quad \max(|a'_1 - \alpha'_1|, \dots, |a'_{n-1} - \alpha'_{n-1}|, |(a'_1)^{b_1} \dots (a'_{n-1})^{b_{n-1}} - \gamma'|) < \exp(-\log^{n+1} H' \log_2^{2+\varepsilon/3} H'),$$

where $H' := \exp(c_9 \log H) \geq \max(h(\alpha'_1), \dots, h(\alpha'_{n-1}), h(\gamma'))$. From the induction hypothesis it now follows that

$$(5.29) \quad \max(h(\alpha'_1), \dots, h(\alpha'_{n-1}), h(\gamma')) \leq c_{10};$$

from (5.28) and (5.29) we see that

$$(5.30) \quad \alpha'_1 = a'_1, \dots, \alpha'_{n-1} = a'_{n-1}, \quad \gamma' = (a'_1)^{b_1} \dots (a'_{n-1})^{b_{n-1}}.$$

II. From (5.30) we see that

$$(5.31) \quad b_1 \ell_1^*(\alpha'_1) + \dots + b_{n-1} \ell_{n-1}^*(\alpha'_{n-1}) - \ell^*(\gamma') = 0.$$

Thus $\ell_1^*(\alpha'_1), \dots, \ell_{n-1}^*(\alpha'_{n-1}), \ell^*(\gamma')$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{A} ; using 2.19 we find that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} .

In other words, there are $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in \mathbb{Q}$, not all zero, such that

$$\xi_1 \ell_1^*(\alpha'_1) + \dots + \xi_{n-1} \ell_{n-1}^*(\alpha'_{n-1}) + \xi_n \ell^*(\gamma') = 0. \text{ Adding } \xi_n \text{ times (5.31)}$$

gives

$$(5.32) \quad (\xi_1 + \xi_n b_1) \ell_1^*(\alpha'_1) + \dots + (\xi_{n-1} + \xi_n b_{n-1}) \ell_{n-1}^*(\alpha'_{n-1}) = 0.$$

By (5.30), $\ell_1^*(\alpha'_1), \dots, \ell_{n-1}^*(\alpha'_{n-1})$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} ; 2.19 states that then $\ell_1^*(\alpha'_1), \dots, \ell_{n-1}^*(\alpha'_{n-1})$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{A} . Thus for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ we have $\xi_j + \xi_n b_j = 0$. Now $\xi_n = 0$ would imply $\xi_1 \ell_1^*(\alpha'_1) + \dots + \xi_{n-1} \ell_{n-1}^*(\alpha'_{n-1}) = 0$ and thus $\xi_1 = \dots = \xi_{n-1} = 0$, which we have assumed to be not the case; therefore $\xi_n \neq 0$. From this it follows that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ we have

$$(5.33) \quad b_j = -\frac{\xi_j}{\xi_n} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Substitution in (5.24) gives $b_n \in \mathbb{Q}$; we have derived a contradiction with the conditions of the theorem. \square

5.11. **THEOREM.** Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{A} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{C}$, not all rational, $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively, not all zero, such that

$$(5.34) \quad 1, b_1, \dots, b_n \text{ linearly independent over } \mathbb{Q}$$

or

$$(5.35) \quad \ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n) \text{ linearly independent over } \mathbb{Q}.$$

Define $\underline{a}^b := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n))$. Then there are only finitely many $(n+2)$ -tuples $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{n+1} \times S_d^{(n+1)}$ with

$$(5.36) \quad \max(|b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|, |P(b_1, \dots, b_n, \underline{a}^b) - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^{\varepsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\gamma), h(P))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a contradiction will be derived. Let $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma, P)$ be an $(n+2)$ -tuple satisfying (5.36). By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on $\varepsilon, d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ and $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$; we assume H to be greater than such a number. First we show that \underline{a}^b must be

transcendental. Suppose this number to be algebraic; then 5.5 and 5.7, together with the inequality

$$(5.37) \quad \max(|b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|, |\underline{a}^b - \underline{a}^b|) < \exp(-\log^2 H \log_2^\epsilon H),$$

where $H \geq \max(h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\underline{a}^b))$, imply

$$\max(h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\underline{a}^b)) < c_1.$$

Together with (5.37) this shows $\beta_j = b_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Accordingly, the numbers b_1, \dots, b_n are algebraic. If (5.34) holds, the transcendancy of \underline{a}^b follows from 5.6. Now suppose that (5.35) holds. Define

$$\ell(\underline{a}^b) := b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n);$$

then $\ell(\underline{a}^b)$ is a value of the logarithm of \underline{a}^b and $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n), \ell(\underline{a}^b)$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{A} . Using 2.19, we find that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . In other words, there are $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Q}$, not all zero, such that $\xi_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + \xi_n \ell_n(a_n) + \xi_{n+1} \ell(\underline{a}^b) = 0$. Thus

$$(\xi_1 + \xi_{n+1} b_1) \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + (\xi_n + \xi_{n+1} b_n) \ell_n(a_n) = 0.$$

By (5.35) and 2.19, this implies $\xi_j + \xi_{n+1} b_j = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Now $\xi_{n+1} = 0$ would imply $\xi_1 = \dots = \xi_n = 0$, which we have assumed to be not the case; therefore $\xi_{n+1} \neq 0$. From this it follows that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have

$$b_j = -\frac{\xi_j}{\xi_{n+1}} \in \mathbb{Q},$$

which contradicts the conditions of the theorem.

II. Apply 4.5; this gives the existence of an algebraic number η of degree at most c_2 and height at most $\exp(c_3 \log H)$ satisfying

$$|\underline{a}^b - \eta| < \exp(-c_4^{-1} \log^2 H \log_2^\epsilon H).$$

As H may be taken arbitrarily large, there exist infinitely many $(n+1)$ -

tuples $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \eta)$ of algebraic numbers of degree at most c_5 satisfying

$$\max(|b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|, |\underline{a}^b - \eta|) < \exp(-\log^2 H' \log_2^{\varepsilon/2} H'),$$

where $H' \geq \max(2, h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\eta))$. This contradicts 5.5 or 5.7. \square

5.12. **THEOREM.** Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{A}$, not all rational, $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively, not all zero, such that (5.34) or (5.35) holds. Define

$$\underline{a}^b := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n)).$$

Then there are only finitely many $(n+2)$ -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{n+1} \times S_d^{(n+1)}$ with

$$(5.38) \quad \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |P(a_1, \dots, a_n, \underline{a}^b) - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^{n+1} H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon} H)$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\gamma), h(P))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a contradiction will be derived. Let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \gamma, P)$ be an $(n+2)$ -tuple satisfying (5.38). By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on $\varepsilon, d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ and $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$; we assume H to be greater than such a number. First we show that \underline{a}^b must be transcendental. Suppose this number to be algebraic; then 5.8 and 5.10, together with the inequality

$$(5.39) \quad \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |\underline{a}^b - \underline{a}^b|) < \exp(-\log^{n+1} H \log_2^{2+\varepsilon} H),$$

where $H \geq \max(h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\underline{a}^b))$, imply

$$\max(h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\underline{a}^b)) \leq c_1.$$

Together with (5.39) this shows $\alpha_j = a_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Accordingly, the numbers a_1, \dots, a_n are algebraic. If (5.34) holds, the transcendency

of \underline{a}^b follows from 5.6. Now suppose that (5.35) holds. Define

$$l(\underline{a}^b) := b_1 l_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n l_n(a_n);$$

then $l(\underline{a}^b)$ is a value of the logarithm of \underline{a}^b and $l_1(a_1), \dots, l_n(a_n), l(\underline{a}^b)$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{A} . Using 2.19 we find that these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . In other words, there are $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Q}$, not all zero, such that $\xi_1 l_1(a_1) + \dots + \xi_n l_n(a_n) + \xi_{n+1} l(\underline{a}^b) = 0$. Thus

$$(\xi_1 + \xi_{n+1} b_1) l_1(a_1) + \dots + (\xi_n + \xi_{n+1} b_n) l_n(a_n) = 0.$$

By (5.35) and 2.19, this implies $\xi_j + \xi_{n+1} b_j = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Now $\xi_{n+1} = 0$ would imply $\xi_1 = \dots = \xi_{n+1} = 0$, which we have assumed to be not the case; therefore $\xi_{n+1} \neq 0$. From this it follows that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have

$$b_j = -\frac{\xi_j}{\xi_{n+1}} \in \mathbb{Q},$$

which contradicts the conditions of the theorem.

II. Apply 4.5; this gives the existence of an algebraic number η of degree at most c_2 and height at most $\exp(c_3 \log H)$ satisfying

$$|\underline{a}^b - \eta| < \exp(-c_4^{-1} \log^{n+1} H \log_2^{2+\epsilon} H).$$

As H may be taken arbitrarily large, there exist infinitely many $(n+1)$ -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \eta)$ of algebraic numbers of degree at most c_5 satisfying

$$\max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |\underline{a}^b - \eta|) < \exp(-\log^{n+1} H' \log_2^{2+\epsilon/2} H'),$$

where $H' \geq \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\eta))$. This contradicts 5.8 or 5.10. \square

That a result similar to 5.5, 5.7, 5.8 and 5.10 does not hold without some extra condition if $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ and \underline{a}^b are approximated simultaneously, is evident from 1.6. One approach to obtain such a condition was demonstrated by Wüstholz [1976, 19..], who assumed a_1, \dots, a_n to be U^* -numbers with a sufficiently dense sequence of algebraic numbers converging to them; here, however, we shall frame a condition that is close-

ly analogous to the one we found for $n = 1$. Indeed, in case $n = 1$, 1.7 states that (i) in 5.13 is a sufficient condition; in order to generalize this to arbitrary values of n , it is necessary to bring it into the form (ii) in 5.13.

5.13. LEMMA. For $b \in \mathbb{C}$ the following assertions are equivalent:

(i) $b \notin \mathbb{R}$ or $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ such that the convergents p_n/q_n of the continued fraction expansion of b satisfy

$$(5.40) \quad q_{n+1} \ll \exp(q_n^3), \quad n \rightarrow \infty;$$

(ii) there exists a $C > 1$ such that for all $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ that are not both zero we have

$$(5.41) \quad |x_0 + x_1 b| \geq C^{-1} \exp(-|x_1|^3).$$

PROOF. I. Suppose (i) holds. First we consider the case $b \notin \mathbb{R}$; we have $b = b_1 + b_2 i$ with $b_2 \neq 0$. Now for all $(x_0, x_1) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ we have

$$|x_0 + x_1 b| = |x_0 + x_1 b_1 + x_1 b_2 i| \geq |x_1 b_2|$$

and therefore (ii) holds.

Now consider the case that $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ such that the convergents p_n/q_n of the continued fraction expansion of b satisfy (5.40). Then there is a number c_1 such that for all n the inequality

$$q_{n+1} \leq c_1 \exp(q_n^3)$$

holds. Suppose (ii) is not true, thus for all $c_2 > 1$ there exist $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$, not both zero, such that

$$(5.42) \quad |x_0 + x_1 b| < c_2^{-1} \exp(-|x_1|^3).$$

If c_2 is chosen large enough, (5.42) implies $x_1 \neq 0$ and

$$|x_0 + x_1 b| < \frac{1}{2|x_1|},$$

and thus, by 2.14, $-x_0/x_1$ is a continued fraction convergent of b , say

$-x_0/x_1 = p_n/q_n$, so $q_n \leq |x_1|$. Then, by 2.15,

$$|x_0 + x_1 b| = |x_1| \cdot \left| b - \frac{p_n}{q_n} \right| \geq |x_1| \frac{1}{q_n(q_n + q_{n+1})} >$$

$$\frac{q_n}{2q_n q_{n+1}} = \frac{1}{2q_{n+1}} \geq \frac{1}{2c_1} \exp(-|x_1|^3).$$

If c_2 is chosen sufficiently large in terms of c_1 , this contradicts (5.42).

II. Suppose that (ii) holds. If $b \in \mathbb{Q}$, we immediately get a contradiction; if $b \notin \mathbb{R}$, there is nothing left to prove. Thus we may assume that $b \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. Let p_n/q_n denote the convergents of the continued fraction expansion of b and suppose that (5.40) does not hold, i.e. for all c_3 there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$q_{n+1} \geq c_3 \exp(q_n^3).$$

For such an n we have, by 2.22,

$$|q_n b - p_n| < \frac{1}{q_{n+1}} \leq c_3^{-1} \exp(-q_n^3),$$

which contradicts (5.41) if c_3 is chosen sufficiently large in terms of c . \square

5.14. **LEMMA.** Suppose $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$, K a compact subset of the complex plane not containing 0, ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_n branches of the logarithm, defined on K . Then there exist effectively computable $C, H_0 > 1$, depending only on d, n, K and ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_n , with the following property. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in K$ be algebraic of degree at most d and height at most $H \geq H_0$, such that $\ell_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \ell_n(\alpha_n)$ are not all zero and $\ell_n(\alpha_n)$ is linearly dependent of $\ell_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \ell_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1})$ over \mathbb{A} . Then there is a subset $\ell_{k_1}(\alpha_{k_1}), \dots, \ell_{k_m}(\alpha_{k_m})$ of $\ell_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \ell_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1})$ that is linearly independent over \mathbb{A} such that for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k_1, \dots, k_m\}$ there exist $x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_{m+1}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying

$$x_1^{(j)} \ell_{k_1}(\alpha_{k_1}) + \dots + x_m^{(j)} \ell_{k_m}(\alpha_{k_m}) + x_{m+1}^{(j)} \ell_j(\alpha_j) = 0$$

while $x_{m+1}^{(j)} \neq 0$ and

$$\max(|x_1^{(j)}|, \dots, |x_{m+1}^{(j)}|) < C \log^m H \log_2 H.$$

PROOF. By Folgesatz 3 in § 20 of [Van der Waerden 1966], it is possible to choose a linearly independent subset $l_{k_1}(\alpha_{k_1}), \dots, l_{k_m}(\alpha_{k_m})$ of $l_1(\alpha_1), \dots, l_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1})$ such that all of $l_1(\alpha_1), \dots, l_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1})$ can be expressed as a linear combination of $l_{k_1}(\alpha_{k_1}), \dots, l_{k_m}(\alpha_{k_m})$ with algebraic coefficients. Take $j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k_1, \dots, k_m\}$. As $l_j(\alpha_j)$ is linearly dependent of $l_1(\alpha_1), \dots, l_{n-1}(\alpha_{n-1})$ over \mathbb{A} , $l_j(\alpha_j)$ is also linearly dependent of $l_{k_1}(\alpha_{k_1}), \dots, l_{k_m}(\alpha_{k_m})$ over \mathbb{A} . By 2.19 and 5.4, there exist $x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_{m+1}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all zero, with

$$x_1^{(j)} l_{k_1}(\alpha_{k_1}) + \dots + x_m^{(j)} l_{k_m}(\alpha_{k_m}) + x_{m+1}^{(j)} l_j(\alpha_j) = 0$$

and $\max(|x_1^{(j)}|, \dots, |x_{m+1}^{(j)}|) < c \log^m H \log_2 H$, where c depends only on d, m, K and the branches of the logarithm involved. If $x_{m+1}^{(j)} = 0$, this would imply $x_1^{(j)} l_{k_1}(\alpha_{k_1}) + \dots + x_m^{(j)} l_{k_m}(\alpha_{k_m}) = 0$ and thus, by the linear independence of $l_{k_1}(\alpha_{k_1}), \dots, l_{k_m}(\alpha_{k_m})$ it would follow that $x_1^{(j)} = \dots = x_m^{(j)} = 0$, which we have assumed to be not the case. Therefore $x_{m+1}^{(j)} \neq 0$. \square

5.15. THEOREM. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{C}$, $l_1(a_1), \dots, l_n(a_n)$ values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively that are not all zero. Put $\underline{a}^b := \exp(b_1 l_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n l_n(a_n))$. Suppose that there is a $C > 1$ such that for all $x_0, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ that are not all zero we have

$$|x_0 + x_1 b_1 + \dots + x_n b_n| \geq C^{-1} \exp(-x^\rho \log^{-\sigma} x),$$

where

$$\rho = \frac{4n+8}{n^2+2n+1}, \quad \sigma = \frac{3n^2+6n-1}{n^2+2n+1}, \quad X = \max(2, |x_0|, \dots, |x_n|).$$

Then there are only finitely many $(2n+1)$ -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{2n+1}$ for which

$$(5.43) \quad \max(|a_1^{-\alpha_1}|, \dots, |a_n^{-\alpha_n}|, |b_1^{-\beta_1}|, \dots, |b_n^{-\beta_n}|, |\underline{a}^{-\gamma}|) < \exp(-\log^{n+2} H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\gamma))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a contradiction will be derived. Let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma)$ be a $(2n+1)$ -tuple satisfying (5.43). By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on $\epsilon, d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n, C$ and $l_1(a_1), \dots, l_n(a_n)$. Throughout the proof we shall without further mention assume that H is sufficiently large in terms of these numbers.

Let $\bar{l}_1, \dots, \bar{l}_n$ and l be branches of the logarithm, defined on disks K_1, \dots, K_n and K , centred at a_1, \dots, a_n and $\frac{b}{a}$ respectively, such that

$$(5.44) \quad \bar{l}_j(a_j) = l_j(a_j), \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

$$(5.45) \quad l\left(\frac{b}{a}\right) = b_1 l_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n l_n(a_n).$$

From (5.43), (5.44) and (5.45) we deduce that $\alpha_j \in K_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, that $\gamma \in K$ and that the inequality

$$\left| \beta_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n) - l(\gamma) \right| < \exp(-\log^{n+2}_H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/2} H)$$

holds. If it were the case that $\beta_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n) - l(\gamma) \neq 0$, 2.18 would imply

$$\left| \beta_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n) - l(\gamma) \right| > \exp(-\log^{n+2}_H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/2} H),$$

which gives a contradiction. Therefore

$$(5.46) \quad \beta_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n) - l(\gamma) = 0.$$

II. As $l_1(a_1), \dots, l_n(a_n)$ are not all zero, neither are $\bar{l}_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \bar{l}_n(\alpha_n)$. Thus from 5.14, after a suitable renumbering, we find an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{l}_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \bar{l}_m(\alpha_m)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{A} ; we also find $s_1, \dots, s_{m+1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying

$$(5.47) \quad s_1 \bar{l}_1(\alpha_1) + \dots + s_m \bar{l}_m(\alpha_m) + s_{m+1} l(\gamma) = 0$$

while $s_{m+1} \neq 0$ and

$$(5.48) \quad \max(|s_1|, \dots, |s_{m+1}|) < c_1 \log^m H \log_2 H;$$

finally, for every $k \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$, we find $t_1^{(k)}, \dots, t_{m+1}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying

$$(5.49) \quad t_{m+1}^{(k)} \bar{\ell}_k(\alpha_k) = \sum_{j=1}^m t_j^{(k)} \bar{\ell}_j(\alpha_j),$$

while $t_{m+1}^{(k)} \neq 0$ and

$$(5.50) \quad \max(|t_1^{(k)}|, \dots, |t_{m+1}^{(k)}|) < c_1 \log^m H \log_2 H.$$

Comparison of (5.46) and (5.47) yields

$$(5.51) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m (s_j + s_{m+1} \beta_j) \bar{\ell}_j(\alpha_j) + \sum_{k=m+1}^n s_{m+1} \beta_k \bar{\ell}_k(\alpha_k) = 0.$$

Substitution of (5.49) in (5.51) shows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^m (s_j + s_{m+1} \beta_j) \bar{\ell}_j(\alpha_j) + \sum_{k=m+1}^n s_{m+1} \beta_k \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{t_j^{(k)}}{t_{m+1}^{(k)}} \bar{\ell}_j(\alpha_j) = 0,$$

which can also be written as

$$(5.52) \quad \sum_{j=1}^m \left(s_j + s_{m+1} \beta_j + \sum_{k=m+1}^n s_{m+1} \beta_k \frac{t_j^{(k)}}{t_{m+1}^{(k)}} \right) \bar{\ell}_j(\alpha_j) = 0.$$

III. From (5.52) and the linear independence of $\bar{\ell}_1(\alpha_1), \dots, \bar{\ell}_m(\alpha_m)$ we conclude

$$s_1 + s_{m+1} \beta_1 + \sum_{k=m+1}^n s_{m+1} \beta_k \frac{t_1^{(k)}}{t_{m+1}^{(k)}} = 0;$$

multiplying by the product of the denominators we get

$$x_0 + x_1 \beta_1 + \dots + x_n \beta_n = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &= s_1 \prod_{k=m+1}^n t_{m+1}^{(k)}, \\ x_1 &= s_{m+1} \prod_{k=m+1}^n t_{m+1}^{(k)}, \\ x_2 &= \dots = x_m = 0, \end{aligned}$$

$$\forall j > m: x_j = s_{m+1} t_1^{(j)} \prod_{\substack{k=m+1 \\ k \neq j}}^n t_{m+1}^{(k)};$$

thus $x_0, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x_1 \neq 0$. Furthermore, by (5.48) and (5.50),

$$\begin{aligned} \max(|x_0|, \dots, |x_n|) &\leq (c_1 \log^m H \log_2 H)^{n-m+1} \leq \\ c_2 \log^{m(n-m+1)} H \log_2^{n-m+1} H &\leq c_2 \log^{(n^2+2n+1)/4} H \log_2^n H. \end{aligned}$$

IV. Define $X := \max(\exp(\sigma/\rho), |x_0|, \dots, |x_n|)$. Then

$$(5.53) \quad \exp(\sigma/\rho) \leq X \leq c_3 \log^{(n^2+2n+1)/4} H \log_2^n H.$$

As the function $x \mapsto x^\rho \log^{-\sigma} x$ is increasing for $x \geq \exp(\sigma/\rho)$, (5.53) shows that

$$x^\rho \log^{-\sigma} x \leq c_4 \log^{n+2} H \log_2 H$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} |x_0 + x_1 b_1 + \dots + x_n b_n| &\leq |x_0 + x_1 \beta_1 + \dots + x_n \beta_n| + \\ \max(|x_1|, \dots, |x_n|) \max(|b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|) &< \\ c_3 \log^{(n^2+2n+1)/4} H \log_2^n H \exp(-\log^{n+2} H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H) &\leq \\ \exp(-\log^{n+2} H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/2} H) &\leq \\ \exp(-c_4^{-1} X^\rho \log^{-\sigma} X \log_2^{\epsilon/2} H) &< C^{-1} \exp(-X^\rho \log^{-\sigma} X) \end{aligned}$$

if H is sufficiently large. This contradicts the conditions of the theorem. \square

5.16. **THEOREM.** Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathbb{C}$, $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$ values of the logarithms of a_1, \dots, a_n respectively that are not all zero. Put $\underline{a}^b := \exp(b_1 \ell_1(a_1) + \dots + b_n \ell_n(a_n))$. Suppose that there is a $C > 1$ such that for all $x_0, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ that are not all zero we have

$$(5.54) \quad |x_0 + x_1 b_1 + \dots + x_n b_n| \geq C^{-1} \exp(-x^{\rho} \log^{-\sigma} x),$$

where

$$\rho = \frac{4n+8}{n^2+2n+1}, \quad \sigma = \frac{3n^2+6n-1}{n^2+2n+1}, \quad x = \max(2, |x_0|, \dots, |x_n|).$$

Then there are only finitely many $(2n+2)$ -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma, P) \in \mathbb{A}_d^{2n+1} \times S_d^{(2n+1)}$ such that

$$(5.55) \quad \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|, \\ |P(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n, \underline{a}^{\underline{b}}) - \gamma|) < \exp(-\log^{n+2} H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\gamma), h(P))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose the assertion of the theorem to be false; from this a contradiction will be derived. Let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \gamma, P)$ be a $(2n+2)$ -tuple satisfying (5.55). By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on $\epsilon, d, n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ and $\ell_1(a_1), \dots, \ell_n(a_n)$; we assume H to be greater than such a number.

First we show that $\underline{a}^{\underline{b}}$ must be transcendental. Suppose this number to be algebraic; then 5.15, together with (5.54) and the inequality

$$(5.56) \quad \max(|a_1 - \alpha_1|, \dots, |a_n - \alpha_n|, |b_1 - \beta_1|, \dots, |b_n - \beta_n|, |\underline{a}^{\underline{b}} - \underline{a}^{\underline{b}}|) < \\ \exp(-\log^{n+2} H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H \geq \max(h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\underline{a}^{\underline{b}}))$, implies

$$\max(h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\underline{a}^{\underline{b}})) < c_1.$$

Together with (5.56) this shows $\alpha_j = a_j$ and $\beta_j = b_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. Accordingly, the numbers $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n$ are algebraic. As a consequence of (5.54), moreover, $1, b_1, \dots, b_n$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} ; the transcendency of $\underline{a}^{\underline{b}}$ now follows from 5.6.

II. Apply 4.5; this gives the existence of an algebraic number η of degree at most c_2 and height at most $\exp(c_3 \log H)$ satisfying

$$|\underline{a}^b - \eta| < \exp(-c_4^{-1} \log^{n+2} H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H).$$

As H may be taken arbitrarily large, there exist infinitely many $(2n+1)$ -tuples $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n, \eta)$ of algebraic numbers of degree at most c_5 satisfying

$$\max(|a_1^{-\alpha_1}|, \dots, |a_n^{-\alpha_n}|, |b_1^{-\beta_1}|, \dots, |b_n^{-\beta_n}|, |\underline{a}^b - \eta|) < \exp(-\log^{n+2} H' \log_2^{1+\epsilon/2} H'),$$

where $H' \geq \max(2, h(\alpha_1), \dots, h(\alpha_n), h(\beta_1), \dots, h(\beta_n), h(\eta))$. This contradicts 5.15. \square

6. THE p -ADIC CASE

6.1. DEFINITION. (a) Let F be a field. A function $v: F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a *non-archimedean valuation* of F if it satisfies the following requirements:

- (i) $\forall \eta \in F: v(\eta) \geq 0$;
- (ii) $\forall \eta \in F: v(\eta) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \eta = 0$;
- (iii) $\forall \eta, \eta' \in F: v(\eta\eta') = v(\eta)v(\eta')$;
- (iv) $\forall \eta, \eta' \in F: v(\eta+\eta') \leq \max(v(\eta), v(\eta'))$.

(b) Let F be a field, v a non-archimedean valuation of F . The function $(\eta, \eta') \mapsto v(\eta-\eta')$ is called the *distance function* induced by v .

A trivial consequence of (i)-(iv), which we shall frequently use, is that for all $\eta, \eta' \in F$ such that $v(\eta) \neq v(\eta')$ we have $v(\eta+\eta') = \max(v(\eta), v(\eta'))$.

The distance function induced by v makes it possible to consider F as a metric space. Thus one can ask whether or not F is complete, and if not, construct the completion of F .

6.2. LEMMA. (a) Let F be a field, v a non-archimedean valuation of F , F' the completion of F with respect to the distance function induced by v . Then there exists exactly one non-archimedean valuation w of F' such that $w|_F = v$; and F' is complete with respect to the distance function induced by w .

(b) Let F be a field, v a non-archimedean valuation of F ; suppose that F is complete with respect to the distance function induced by v . Let F' be the algebraic closure of F . Then there exists exactly one non-archimedean valuation w of F' such that $w|_F = v$.

(c) Let p be a prime number. For $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$ we define $v_p(\xi) := p^{-m}$, where $\xi = p^m \frac{x}{y}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $y \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \nmid x$, $p \nmid y$. Then the function v_p is a non-archimedean valuation of \mathbb{Q} .

(d) Let p be a prime number, v_p the non-archimedean valuation of \mathbb{Q} defined in (c). Let w_p be the unique non-archimedean valuation of the algebraic closure of the completion of \mathbb{Q} with respect to the distance function induced by v_p satisfying $w_p|_{\mathbb{Q}} = v_p$. Then the completion of this field with respect to the distance function induced by w_p is algebraically closed.

PROOF. (a) [Amice 1975], Proposition 2.3.1. (b) [Amice 1975], Proposition 2.6.10. (c) Trivial. (d) [Amice 1975], Corollaire 2.7.3. \square

From now on p will denote a fixed prime number; the purpose of this chapter is to prove an analogue to 1.7 in which the complex numbers have been replaced by the algebraically closed, complete field described in 6.2(d).

6.3. DEFINITION. (a) Let v_p be the non-archimedean valuation of \mathbb{Q} defined in 6.2(c), w_p the unique non-archimedean valuation of the algebraic closure of the completion of \mathbb{Q} with respect to the distance function induced by v_p satisfying $w_p|_{\mathbb{Q}} = v_p$. Then the completion of this field with respect to the distance function induced by w_p is denoted by \mathbb{C}_p .

(b) Let v_p be the non-archimedean valuation of \mathbb{Q} defined in 6.2(c); take $\eta \in \mathbb{C}_p$. Then $|\eta|_p$, also called the *p-adic valuation* of η , denotes the value at η of the unique non-archimedean valuation of \mathbb{C}_p satisfying $|\xi|_p = v_p(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$.

(c) For $a \in \mathbb{C}_p$, $R \in \mathbb{R}$, $R \geq 0$ we write

$$B(a, R) := \{z \in \mathbb{C}_p : |z - a|_p < R\},$$

$$\overline{B}(a, R) := \{z \in \mathbb{C}_p : |z - a|_p \leq R\}.$$

(d) If $f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k x^k$ is a power series with coefficients in \mathbb{C}_p , while $R \in \mathbb{R}$, $R \geq 0$, we denote

$$|f|_R := \sup\{|a_k|_p R^k : k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}.$$

6.4. LEMMA. Let M, R be positive real numbers. Consider $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$, where $a_0, a_1, \dots \in \mathbb{C}_p$; suppose the power series converges for all $z \in B(0, R)$. Let $r \in B(0, R)$ be such that $|f(z)|_p < M$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}_p$ with $|z|_p = |r|_p$. Then

$$\left| \frac{f^{(n)}(z)}{n!} \right|_p < \frac{M}{|r|_p^n}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \quad z \in B(0, |r|_p).$$

PROOF. [Adams 1966], Appendix, Theorem 9. \square

6.5. LEMMA. Let R be a positive real number. Consider $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$, where $a_0, a_1, \dots \in \mathbb{C}_p$; suppose the power series converges for all $z \in \mathcal{B}(0, R)$. Take $r \in \mathcal{B}(0, R)$ and put $R' := |r|_p$. Then $|f|_{R'}$ is finite and

$$(6.1) \quad \sup_{|z|_p \leq R'} |f(z)|_p = |f|_{R'}.$$

PROOF. As $|r|_p < R$, the series $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k r^k$ converges, and consequently $|a_k|_p |r|_p^k$ takes a maximum for some k ; thus the right hand member of (6.1) is finite. If $|z|_p \leq |r|_p$, we have

$$|f(z)|_p = \left| \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k \right|_p \leq \max_{k \geq 0} |a_k|_p |r|_p^k;$$

so

$$\sup_{|z|_p \leq |r|_p} |f(z)|_p \leq \max_{k \geq 0} |a_k|_p |r|_p^k.$$

In particular, the left hand member is finite.

Application of 6.4 shows that for every $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$|a_k|_p |r|_p^k = \left| \frac{f^{(k)}(0)}{k!} \right|_p |r|_p^k < \sup_{|z|_p \leq |r|_p} |f(z)|_p + \varepsilon.$$

Therefore

$$\max_{k \geq 0} |a_k|_p |r|_p^k \leq \sup_{|z|_p \leq |r|_p} |f(z)|_p,$$

which proves the lemma. \square

6.6. LEMMA. Let R be a positive real number, $a \in \mathbb{C}_p$. Consider $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (z-a)^k$, where $a_0, a_1, \dots \in \mathbb{C}_p$; suppose the power series converges for all $z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$. Take $b \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$. Then

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k (z-b)^k, \quad z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R),$$

where

$$b_k = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} a_n \binom{n}{k} (b-a)^{n-k}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

PROOF. The proof is based on the obvious fact that a series in \mathbb{C}_p satis-

fies Cauchy's condition if and only if the general term tends to zero, and therefore convergence is conserved under rearrangement of terms. For $z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (z-a)^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (z-b+b-a)^n = \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (z-b)^k (b-a)^{n-k} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (z-b)^k \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} a_n \binom{n}{k} (b-a)^{n-k} = \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k (z-b)^k. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

6.7. **LEMMA.** Let R be a positive real number, $a \in \mathbb{C}_p$. Consider $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (z-a)^k$, where $a_0, a_1, \dots \in \mathbb{C}_p$; suppose the power series converges for all $z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$. Take $b \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$ and suppose that $f(b) = 0$. Then there exist $b_0, b_1, \dots \in \mathbb{C}_p$ such that

$$f(z) = (z-b) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k (z-a)^k, \quad z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R),$$

and

$$|b_k|_p \leq \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a_n|_p |b-a|_p^{n-k-1}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

PROOF. Applying 6.6 twice, we see that for $z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (z-a)^k = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (z-b)^k \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} a_n \binom{n}{k} (b-a)^{n-k} = \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (z-b)^k \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} a_n \binom{n}{k} (b-a)^{n-k} = \\ &= (z-b) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (z-b)^k \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} a_n \binom{n}{k+1} (b-a)^{n-k-1} = \\ &= (z-b) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (z-a)^k \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \sum_{n=j+1}^{\infty} a_n \binom{n}{j+1} (b-a)^{n-j-1} \binom{j}{k} (a-b)^{j-k} = \\ &= (z-b) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k (z-a)^k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$b_k = \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \sum_{n=j+1}^{\infty} a_n \binom{n}{j+1} (b-a)^{n-j-1} \binom{j}{k} (a-b)^{j-k} =$$

$$\sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} a_n (b-a)^{n-k-1} \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} (-1)^{j-k} \binom{j}{k} \binom{n}{j+1},$$

so

$$|b_k|_p \leq \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a_n|_p |b-a|_p^{n-k-1}. \quad \square$$

6.8. LEMMA. Consider the power series $f = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k x^k$ with coefficients in \mathbb{C}_p . Take $0 < R' < R$ and suppose $|f|_R < \infty$. Then f converges on $\overline{B}(0, R')$ to a function, which we shall again denote by f . If f has at least h zeros on $\overline{B}(0, R')$, multiplicities included, we have

$$|f|_{R'} \leq \left(\frac{R'}{R}\right)^h |f|_R.$$

PROOF. The first assertion of the lemma is trivial; we now proceed to prove the second one. Let $\alpha \in \overline{B}(0, R')$ be such that $f(\alpha) = 0$. By 6.7, we may write

$$f(z) = (z-\alpha) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k z^k, \quad z \in \overline{B}(0, R'),$$

with

$$|b_k|_p \leq \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a_n|_p |\alpha|_p^{n-k-1} \leq \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a_n|_p R^{n-k-1},$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k \geq 0} |b_k|_p R^k &\leq \sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a_n|_p R^{n-1} = \frac{1}{R} \sup_{n \geq 1} |a_n|_p R^n \leq \\ &\frac{1}{R} \sup_{n \geq 0} |a_n|_p R^n = \frac{1}{R} |f|_R. \end{aligned}$$

Define $g := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k x^k$; then

$$(6.2) \quad |g|_R = \sup_{k \geq 0} |b_k|_p R^k \leq \frac{1}{R} |f|_R < \infty.$$

On the other hand, for $z \in \overline{B}(0, R')$ we have $f(z) = (z-\alpha)g(z)$; from the unicity of power series development we conclude

$$a_k = b_{k-1} - \alpha b_k, \quad k \geq 0,$$

where $b_{-1} := 0$. Thus

$$|a_k|_p \leq \max(|b_{k-1}|_p, |\alpha|_p |b_k|_p), \quad k \geq 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |f|_R &= \sup_{k \geq 0} |a_k|_p R^k \leq \sup_{k \geq 0} R^k \max(|b_{k-1}|_p, |\alpha|_p |b_k|_p) = \\ &= \max\left(\sup_{k \geq 0} |b_{k-1}|_p R^k, |\alpha|_p \sup_{k \geq 0} |b_k|_p R^k\right) = \\ &= \max\left(\sup_{k \geq 0} |b_k|_p R^{k+1}, |\alpha|_p \sup_{k \geq 0} |b_k|_p R^k\right) = \\ &= \max(R|g|_R, |\alpha|_p |g|_R) = R|g|_R, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$(6.3) \quad |f|_R \leq R|g|_R.$$

From (6.2) and (6.3) we see that $f = (X-\alpha)g$ with

$$|g|_R = \frac{1}{R}|f|_R < \infty.$$

Similarly it is proved that

$$|g|_{R'} = \frac{1}{R'}|f|_{R'}.$$

If $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_h$ are the zeros of f on $\overline{B}(0, R')$, repeating the argument gives

$$f = f^* \prod_{j=1}^h (X - \alpha_j)$$

with

$$|f^*|_R = \frac{1}{h}|f|_R < \infty, \quad |f^*|_{R'} = \frac{1}{R'^h}|f|_{R'}.$$

Thus

$$|f|_{R'} = R'^h |f^*|_{R'} \leq R'^h |f^*|_R = \left(\frac{R'}{R}\right)^h |f|_R. \quad \square$$

6.9. COROLLARY. Let R be a positive real number. Consider $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$, where $a_0, a_1, \dots \in \mathbb{C}_p$; suppose the power series converges for all $z \in \mathcal{B}(0, R)$. If $|r_1|_p < |r_2|_p < R$ and f has at least h zeros in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(0, |r_1|_p)$, multiplicities included, we have

$$\sup_{|z|_p \leq |r_1|_p} |f(z)|_p \leq \left(\frac{|r_1|_p}{|r_2|_p} \right)^h \sup_{|z|_p \leq |r_2|_p} |f(z)|_p.$$

6.10. LEMMA. The set of all $z \in \mathbb{C}_p$ for which $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n/n!$ converges, is exactly $\mathcal{B}(0, p^{-1/(p-1)})$. The set of all $z \in \mathbb{C}_p$ for which $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} z^n/n$ converges, is exactly $\mathcal{B}(0, 1)$.

PROOF. [Amice 1975], Proposition 3.5.5(v). \square

6.11. DEFINITION. For $z \in \mathcal{B}(0, p^{-1/(p-1)})$ define $e_p(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} z^n/n!$. For $z \in \mathcal{B}(1, 1)$ define $\ell_p(z) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} (z-1)^n/n$.

6.12. LEMMA. (a) For $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{B}(0, p^{-1/(p-1)})$ we have $e_p(z_1+z_2) = e_p(z_1)e_p(z_2)$.
 (b) For $z \in \mathcal{B}(0, p^{-1/(p-1)})$ we have $|e_p(z) - 1|_p = |z|_p$.
 (c) For $z \in \mathcal{B}(0, p^{-1/(p-1)})$ we have $\ell_p(e_p(z)) = z$, $e_p'(z) = e_p(z)$.
 (d) For $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{B}(1, 1)$ we have $\ell_p(z_1 z_2) = \ell_p(z_1) + \ell_p(z_2)$.
 (e) For $z \in \mathcal{B}(1, p^{-1/(p-1)})$ we have $|\ell_p(z)|_p = |z - 1|_p$.
 (f) For $z \in \mathcal{B}(1, p^{-1/(p-1)})$ we have $e_p(\ell_p(z)) = z$.

PROOF. (a) [Amice 1975], Proposition 3.5.5(ii).

(b) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 2$, $z \in \mathcal{B}(0, p^{-1/(p-1)})$ we have

$$\left| \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{z^k}{k!} \right|_p \leq \max_{k=2, \dots, n} \frac{|z|_p^k}{|k!|_p} < \max_{k=2, \dots, n} |z|_p \frac{p^{-(k-1)/(p-1)}}{p^{-(k-1)/(p-1)}},$$

here we use the inequality

$$|k!|_p \geq p^{-(k-1)/(p-1)},$$

which follows from Lemme 3.5.6 of [Amice 1975]. We conclude that

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{z^k}{k!} \right|_p = |z|_p;$$

thus

$$\left| e_p(z) - 1 \right|_p = \left| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k!} \right|_p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{z^k}{k!} \right|_p = |z|_p.$$

(c) follows from (b) and the formal identity of the power series involved.

(d) [Amice 1975], Proposition 3.5.5(iii).

(e) Similar to (b), observing that $|k|_p \geq |k!|_p$.

(f) follows from (e) and the formal identity of the power series involved. \square

We remark that in 1.4(c), 1.4(d) and 2.2(b), we have already defined $\text{dg}(\eta)$, $h(\eta)$ and $\text{den}(\eta)$ for all algebraic $\eta \in \mathbb{C}_p$. In order to give p-adic analogue of our earlier reasoning, it is also necessary to define $\overline{|\eta|}$.

6.13. DEFINITION. Let $\eta \in \mathbb{C}_p$ be algebraic with minimal polynomial P . Then $\overline{|\eta|}$ denotes the maximum of the absolute values of the zeros of P in \mathbb{C} .

6.14. LEMMA. Let F be a finite normal extension of \mathbb{Q} ; suppose $\eta \in F$ has minimal polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$. Then $\eta' \in \mathbb{C}$ has minimal polynomial P if and only if there exists an injective homomorphism $\sigma: F \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sigma(\eta) = \eta'$ and $\sigma(\xi) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$.

PROOF. [Van der Waerden 1966], § 41. \square

6.15. LEMMA. For algebraic $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \in \mathbb{C}_p$ we have

$$\overline{|\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n|} \leq \overline{|\eta_1|} + \dots + \overline{|\eta_n|}, \quad \overline{|\eta_1 \dots \eta_n|} \leq \overline{|\eta_1|} \dots \overline{|\eta_n|}.$$

PROOF. According to 2.4(a), there exists a finite normal extension F of \mathbb{Q} such that $F \subset \mathbb{C}_p$ and F contains η_1, \dots, η_n . Let G be the set of all injective homomorphisms $\sigma: F \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sigma(\xi) = \xi$ for all $\xi \in \mathbb{Q}$; according to 6.14 we have

$$\forall \xi \in F: \overline{|\xi|} = \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\xi)|.$$

Thus, if $\eta := \eta_1 + \dots + \eta_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{|\eta|} &= \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta)| = \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta_1) + \dots + \sigma(\eta_n)| \leq \\ &\max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta_1)| + \dots + \max_{\sigma \in G} |\sigma(\eta_n)| = \overline{|\eta_1|} + \dots + \overline{|\eta_n|} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\overline{|\eta_1 \dots \eta_n|} \leq \overline{|\eta_1|} \dots \overline{|\eta_n|}$. \square

6.16. LEMMA. Let $\eta \in \mathbb{C}_p$ be an algebraic integer. Then $|\eta|_p \leq 1$.

PROOF. Suppose $\eta \in \mathbb{C}_p$ is an algebraic integer such that $|\eta|_p > 1$. There exist $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\eta^d + a_{d-1}\eta^{d-1} + \dots + a_1\eta + a_0 = 0.$$

Now for $j = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ we have $a_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and so $|a_j|_p \leq 1$; thus

$$|a_j \eta^j|_p \leq |\eta|_p^j < |\eta|_p^d.$$

Therefore

$$0 = |\eta^d + a_{d-1}\eta^{d-1} + \dots + a_1\eta + a_0|_p = |\eta|_p^d > 1,$$

and we have arrived at a contradiction. \square

6.17. LEMMA. Let $\eta \in \mathbb{C}_p$ be algebraic of degree at most d . Then either $\eta = 0$ or

$$|\eta|_p \geq \text{den}^{-d}(\eta) \overline{|\eta|}^{-d}.$$

PROOF. Put $\eta' := \text{den}(\eta) \cdot \eta$; then η' is an algebraic integer. As $|\text{den}(\eta)|_p \leq 1$, we have $|\eta|_p \geq |\eta'|_p$. Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the constant term in the minimal polynomial of η' . Then a is the product of the zeros of this polynomial in \mathbb{C}_p (apart from a possible factor -1). By 6.16, we may conclude $|\eta'|_p \geq |a|_p$. But a is also plus or minus the product of the zeros of this polynomial in \mathbb{C} ; thus $|a| \leq \overline{|\eta'|}^d$. Let F be a finite normal extension of \mathbb{Q} such that $F \subset \mathbb{C}_p$ and F contains η . Then, by 6.14,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{|\eta'|} &= \overline{|\text{den}(\eta) \cdot \eta|} = \sup_{\sigma} |\sigma(\text{den}(\eta) \cdot \eta)| = \text{den}(\eta) \cdot \sup_{\sigma} |\sigma(\eta)| = \\ &\text{den}(\eta) \overline{|\eta|}, \end{aligned}$$

where σ runs through the injective homomorphisms of F into \mathbb{C} that leave \mathbb{Q} fixed. The lemma now follows upon observing that $|a|_p \geq |a|^{-1}$. \square

6.18. LEMMA. Let F be a field containing \mathbb{Q} ; assume $\eta \in F$ is algebraic. Let the minimal polynomial of η have leading coefficient a , height H , degree d . Then, for each $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, there exist $a_0^{(j)}, \dots, a_{d-1}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$(a\eta)^j = a_0^{(j)} + a_1^{(j)}\eta + \dots + a_{d-1}^{(j)}\eta^{d-1},$$

while

$$\max(|a_0^{(j)}|, \dots, |a_{d-1}^{(j)}|) \leq (2H)^j.$$

PROOF. [Baker 1975], § 2.3. \square

6.19. LEMMA. Suppose $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \delta < 1$, $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Put $A := \{z \in \mathbb{C}_p : \delta < |z - 1|_p < p^{-1/(p-1)}\}$. Then only finitely many pairs $(\alpha, \gamma) \in A^2$ of algebraic numbers of degree at most d have the property that a $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ exists with

$$\beta \ell_p(\alpha) - \ell_p(\gamma) = 0$$

and

$$(6.4) \quad B \log^{-1-\varepsilon} B \geq \log H,$$

where $H = \max(h(\alpha), h(\gamma))$ and $B = \max(2, h(\beta))$.

PROOF. I. Suppose $\alpha, \gamma \in A$, $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$, such that the conditions of the lemma are fulfilled. By c_1, c_2, \dots we shall denote real numbers greater than 1 depending only on p, d, δ and ε ; we suppose that H is greater than such a number, which will lead to a contradiction.

Define $L := B - 1$. We introduce the auxiliary function

$$\Phi(z) := \sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \alpha^{\lambda_1 z} \gamma^{\lambda_2 z}, \quad z \in \overline{B}(0, 1),$$

where

$$\alpha^{\lambda_1 z} = e_p(\lambda_1 z \ell_p(\alpha)), \quad \gamma^{\lambda_2 z} = e_p(\lambda_2 z \ell_p(\gamma))$$

and where $q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ are rational integers to be determined later. We have

$$\phi^{(t)}(z) = \ell_p^t(\alpha) \sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta) t_\alpha^{\lambda_1 z} t_\gamma^{\lambda_2 z},$$

$$z \in \overline{B}(0,1), t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Now put $S := [\frac{1}{2}d^{-1} \log^{1+\varepsilon/2} B]$, $T := [\frac{1}{2}d^{-1} B^2 \log^{-1-\varepsilon/2} B]$ and consider the system of linear equations

$$(6.5) \quad \phi^{(t)}(ps) = 0, s = 0, \dots, S-1, t = 0, \dots, T-1$$

in the $(L+1)^2$ unknowns $q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$; we shall show that it has a non-trivial integer solution. Multiplying (6.5) by $(ac)^{pLs} b^t \ell_p^{-t}(\alpha)$, where a, b, c are the leading coefficients in the minimal polynomials of α, β and γ respectively, gives

$$\sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta) t_b^t (a\alpha)^{\lambda_1 ps} (c\gamma)^{\lambda_2 ps} \times$$

$$\frac{1}{a^{(L-\lambda_1)ps}} \frac{1}{c^{(L-\lambda_2)ps}} = 0.$$

Substitution of

$$(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta)^t = \sum_{\tau=0}^t \binom{t}{\tau} \lambda_1^{t-\tau} (\lambda_2 \beta)^\tau$$

transforms this into

$$\sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) (a\alpha)^{\lambda_1 ps} (c\gamma)^{\lambda_2 ps} \frac{1}{a^{(L-\lambda_1)ps}} \frac{1}{c^{(L-\lambda_2)ps}} \times$$

$$\sum_{\tau=0}^t \binom{t}{\tau} \lambda_1^{t-\tau} \lambda_2^\tau (b\beta)^\tau t_b^{t-\tau} = 0.$$

According to 6.18, for each $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, there exist $a_0^{(j)}, \dots, a_{d-1}^{(j)}$, $c_0^{(j)}, \dots, c_{d-1}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{Z}$, their absolute values bounded by $(2H)^j$, such that

$$(a\alpha)^j = a_0^{(j)} + a_1^{(j)} \alpha + \dots + a_{d-1}^{(j)} \alpha^{d-1},$$

$$(c\gamma)^j = c_0^{(j)} + c_1^{(j)} \gamma + \dots + c_{d-1}^{(j)} \gamma^{d-1}.$$

Our set of equations thus becomes

$$\sum_{\delta_1=0}^{d-1} \sum_{\delta_2=0}^{d-1} A(\delta_1, \delta_2, s, t) \alpha_1^{\delta_1} \alpha_2^{\delta_2} = 0,$$

where

$$A(\delta_1, \delta_2, s, t) = \sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L \sum_{\tau=0}^t q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) a_{\delta_1}^{(L-\lambda_1)ps} a_{\delta_2}^{(\lambda_1 ps)} \times \\ c_{\delta_2}^{(L-\lambda_2)ps} c_{\delta_1}^{(\lambda_2 ps)} \binom{t}{\tau} (b\lambda_1)^{t-\tau} \lambda_2^\tau (b\beta)^\tau.$$

We see that (6.5) is certainly satisfied if $A(\delta_1, \delta_2, s, t) = 0$ for $\delta_1 = 0, \dots, d-1$; $\delta_2 = 0, \dots, d-1$; $s = 0, \dots, S-1$; $t = 0, \dots, T-1$. These are $d^2 ST$ linear equations in the $(L+1)^2$ unknowns $q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ with rational integer coefficients, whose absolute values are at most

$$T(c_1 H)^{4pLS} 2^{TLB^T} \leq \exp(c_2 B^2 \log^{-\varepsilon/2} B)$$

(here (6.4) is used). As $(L+1)^2 < \frac{1}{2} B^2 < d^2 ST$, 2.7 states that there is a non-trivial choice for the $q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, such that (6.5) holds, while

$$Q := \max_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} |q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)| \leq \\ (c_3 L^2 \exp(c_2 B^2 \log^{-\varepsilon/2} B))^{d^2 ST / ((L+1)^2 - d^2 ST)} \leq \\ \exp(c_4 B^2 \log^{-\varepsilon/2} B).$$

II. For $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ we put $T_k := 2^k T$. Then, for our special choice of the $q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$, we have

$$(6.6) \quad \phi^{(t)}(s) = 0, \quad s = 0, \dots, S-1, \quad t = 0, \dots, T_k - 1.$$

This is proved by induction; for $k = 0$ the assertion is precisely (6.5). Now suppose that (6.6) holds for some k ; thus ϕ has at least ST_k zeros in $\overline{B}(0, p^{-1})$. Moreover, as $|\alpha - 1|_p$ and $|\gamma - 1|_p$ are less than $p^{-1/k(p-1)}$, the power series for ϕ converges, by 6.12, on some $B(0, r)$ with $r > 1$. Now 6.9 states that

$$\sup_{|z|_p \leq p^{-1}} |\phi(z)|_p \leq p^{-ST_k} \sup_{|z|_p \leq 1} |\phi(z)|_p.$$

Here

$$\sup_{|z|_p \leq 1} |\phi(z)|_p \leq 1,$$

as is evident from 6.12 and the fact that $q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore

$$p^{-ST_k} \leq \exp(-2^k c_5^{-1} B^2).$$

Thus

$$\sup_{|z|_p \leq p^{-1}} |\phi(z)|_p \leq \exp(-2^k c_5^{-1} B^2);$$

by 6.4 this implies

$$|\phi^{(t)}(ps)|_p \leq p^t \exp(-2^k c_5^{-1} B^2), \quad s, t \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\},$$

and so

$$(6.7) \quad |\phi^{(t)}(ps)|_p \leq \exp(-2^k c_6^{-1} B^2), \quad s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, t = 0, \dots, T_{k+1} - 1.$$

However, $\ell_p^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(ps)$ is algebraic and for $s = 0, \dots, S-1$, $t = 0, \dots, T_{k+1} - 1$ we have

$$dg(\ell_p^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(ps)) \leq d^2,$$

$$\text{den}(\ell_p^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(ps)) \leq (ac)^{pLS_B t} \leq H^{2pLS_B T_{k+1}} \leq$$

$$\exp(2^k c_7 B^2 \log^{-\epsilon/2} B);$$

$$\left| \ell_p^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(ps) \right| \leq Qc_8^{LS+T_{k+1}} L^{T_{k+1}+2} H^{2pLS_B T_{k+1}} \leq$$

$$\exp(2^k c_9 B^2 \log^{-\epsilon/2} B).$$

Applying 6.17 gives $\phi^{(t)}(ps) = 0$ or

$$\left| \ell_p^{-t}(\alpha)\phi^{(t)}(ps) \right|_p \geq \exp(-2^k c_{10} B^2 \log^{-\epsilon/2} B).$$

Furthermore, by 6.12,

$$|\ell_p^t(\alpha)|_p = |\alpha - 1|_p^t \geq \delta^t \geq \exp(-2^k c_{11} B^2 \log^{-1-\varepsilon/2} B),$$

so in the latter case we have

$$(6.8) \quad |\phi^{(t)}(ps)|_p \geq \exp(-2^k c_{12} B^2 \log^{-\varepsilon/2} B).$$

Combining (6.7) and (6.8) gives $\phi^{(t)}(ps) = 0$ for $s = 0, \dots, S-1$, $t = 0, \dots, T_{k+1}-1$. This completes the proof of (6.6).

III. From (6.6) it follows that $\phi^{(t)}(0) = 0$ for $t = 0, \dots, (L+1)^2 - 1$, in other words, that

$$(6.9) \quad \sum_{\lambda_1=0}^L \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^L q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta)^t = 0.$$

As the $q(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ are not all zero, it follows that the coefficient matrix of the system (6.9), which is of the Vandermonde type, must be singular.

From this we deduce the existence of $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_1', \lambda_2' \in \{0, \dots, L\}$ with

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 \beta = \lambda_1' + \lambda_2' \beta, \text{ or}$$

$$\beta = \frac{\lambda_1' - \lambda_1}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_2'}.$$

This gives

$$B = h(\beta) \leq L = B - 1,$$

so we get the desired contradiction. \square

6.20. LEMMA. Let R be a positive real number, $a \in \mathbb{C}_p$. Consider $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (z-a)^k$, where $a_0, a_1, \dots \in \mathbb{C}_p$; suppose the power series converges for all $z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$. Take $b, r \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$ and define

$$g(z) := \frac{f(z) - f(b)}{z - b}, \quad z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R) \setminus \{b\}.$$

Then g is bounded on $\overline{\mathcal{B}(a, |r-a|_p)} \setminus \{b\}$.

PROOF. For $z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R)$ we have

$$f(z) - f(b) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a'_k (z-a)^k,$$

where $a'_0 := a_0 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (b-a)^k$ and $a'_k := a_k$ for $k \geq 1$. According to 6.7,

$$g(z) = \frac{f(z) - f(b)}{z - b} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k (z-a)^k, \quad z \in \mathcal{B}(a, R) \setminus \{b\},$$

with

$$|b_k|_p \leq \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a'_n|_p |b-a|_p^{n-k-1}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k \geq 0} |b_k|_p |r-a|_p^k &= \sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a'_n|_p |b-a|_p^{n-k-1} |r-a|_p^k \leq \\ &\sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a'_n|_p \max(|b-a|_p, |r-a|_p)^{n-1} = \\ &\sup_{n \geq 1} |a'_n|_p \max(|b-a|_p, |r-a|_p)^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\max(|b-a|_p, |r-a|_p) < R$, the right hand member is finite. Application of 6.5 shows that g is bounded on $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(a, |r-a|_p) \setminus \{b\}$. \square

6.21. LEMMA. For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d and n , with the following property. Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{B}(1, 1)$ algebraic of degree at most d , $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n-1} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}(0, 1)$ algebraic of degree at most d , $\beta_n \in \mathbb{C}_p$ algebraic of degree at most d with $|\beta_n|_p = 1$. Put $\Lambda := \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ell_p(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n \ell_p(\alpha_n)$. Then either $\Lambda = 0$ or

$$|\Lambda| > \exp(-C\Omega \log \Omega' (\log B + \log \Omega)),$$

where $\Omega = (\log A_1) \dots (\log A_n)$, $\Omega' = (\log A_1) \dots (\log A_{n-1})$, $A_j = \max(16, h(\alpha_j))$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, $B = \max(6, h(\beta_0), \dots, h(\beta_n))$.

PROOF. See the remark preceding Theorem 3 in [Van der Poorten 1977]. \square

6.22. LEMMA. Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathcal{B}(1, 1)$ algebraic. Then $\ell_p(\alpha_1), \dots, \ell_p(\alpha_n)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} if and only if they are linearly independent over the field of all algebraic numbers in \mathbb{C}_p .

PROOF. [Brumer 1967], Theorem 1. \square

6.23. THEOREM. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{B}(1, p^{-1/(p-1)}) \setminus \{1\}$, $b \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}(0, 1)$. Suppose that there exists a $C > 1$ such that for all $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ that are not both zero we have

$$(6.10) \quad |x_0 + x_1 b|_p \geq C^{-1} \exp(-x^3 \log^{-2} x),$$

where $x = \max(2, |x_0|, |x_1|)$. Then there are only finitely many triples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{C}_p^3$ of algebraic numbers of degree at most d with

$$\max(|a - \alpha|_p, |b - \beta|_p, |a^b - \gamma|_p) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$ and $a^b = e_p(b \ell_p(a))$.

PROOF. I. Let (α, β, γ) be a triple satisfying the conditions of the theorem; we suppose H to be greater than a certain bound depending only on ϵ, d, a and b . This will lead to a contradiction. From 6.20 we see

$$(6.11) \quad |\ell_p(a) - \ell_p(\alpha)|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/2} H),$$

$$(6.12) \quad |b \ell_p(a) - \ell_p(\gamma)|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/2} H).$$

As a consequence of (6.11), (6.12) and

$$(6.13) \quad |b - \beta|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H)$$

we have

$$|\beta \ell_p(\alpha) - \ell_p(\gamma)|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/3} H).$$

If it were the case that $\beta \ell_p(\alpha) - \ell_p(\gamma) \neq 0$, 6.21 would imply

$$|\beta \ell_p(\alpha) - \ell_p(\gamma)|_p > \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/3} H),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $\beta \ell_p(\alpha) - \ell_p(\gamma) = 0$.

II. We have just proved that $\ell_p(\alpha)$ and $\ell_p(\gamma)$ are linearly dependent over the field of all algebraic numbers in \mathbb{C}_p ; using 6.22, we find that

$$f(z) - f(b) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a'_k (z-a)^k,$$

where $a'_0 := a_0 - \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k (b-a)^k$ and $a'_k := a_k$ for $k \geq 1$. According to 6.7,

$$g(z) = \frac{f(z) - f(b)}{z - b} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k (z-a)^k, \quad z \in \mathbb{B}(a, R) \setminus \{b\},$$

with

$$|b_k|_p \leq \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a'_n|_p |b-a|_p^{n-k-1}, \quad k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{k \geq 0} |b_k|_p |r-a|_p^k &= \sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a'_n|_p |b-a|_p^{n-k-1} |r-a|_p^k \leq \\ &\sup_{k \geq 0} \sup_{n \geq k+1} |a'_n|_p \max(|b-a|_p, |r-a|_p)^{n-1} = \\ &\sup_{n \geq 1} |a'_n|_p \max(|b-a|_p, |r-a|_p)^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\max(|b-a|_p, |r-a|_p) < R$, the right hand member is finite. Application of 6.5 shows that g is bounded on $\overline{\mathbb{B}}(a, |r-a|_p) \setminus \{b\}$. \square

6.21. LEMMA. *For every $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an effectively computable $C > 1$, depending only on d and n , with the following property. Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{B}(1, 1)$ algebraic of degree at most d , $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n-1} \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}(0, 1)$ algebraic of degree at most d , $\beta_n \in \mathbb{C}_p$ algebraic of degree at most d with $|\beta_n|_p = 1$. Put $\Lambda := \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ell_p(\alpha_1) + \dots + \beta_n \ell_p(\alpha_n)$. Then either $\Lambda = 0$ or*

$$|\Lambda| > \exp(-C\Omega \log \Omega' (\log B + \log \Omega)),$$

where $\Omega = (\log A_1) \dots (\log A_n)$, $\Omega' = (\log A_1) \dots (\log A_{n-1})$, $A_j = \max(16, h(\alpha_j))$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, $B = \max(6, h(\beta_0), \dots, h(\beta_n))$.

PROOF. See the remark preceding Theorem 3 in [Van der Poorten 1977]. \square

6.22. LEMMA. *Suppose $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{B}(1, 1)$ algebraic. Then $\ell_p(\alpha_1), \dots, \ell_p(\alpha_n)$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} if and only if they are linearly independent over the field of all algebraic numbers in \mathbb{C}_p .*

PROOF. [Brumer 1967], Theorem 1. \square

6.23. THEOREM. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $a \in \mathbb{B}(1, p^{-1/(p-1)}) \setminus \{1\}$, $b \in \overline{\mathbb{B}}(0, 1)$. Suppose that there exists a $C > 1$ such that for all $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ that are not both zero we have

$$(6.10) \quad |x_0 + x_1 b|_p \geq C^{-1} \exp(-x^3 \log^{-2} x),$$

where $x = \max(2, |x_0|, |x_1|)$. Then there are only finitely many triples $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{C}_p^3$ of algebraic numbers of degree at most d with

$$\max(|a - \alpha|_p, |b - \beta|_p, |a^b - \gamma|_p) < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H),$$

where $H = \max(2, h(\alpha), h(\beta), h(\gamma))$ and $a^b = e_p(b \ell_p(a))$.

PROOF. I. Let (α, β, γ) be a triple satisfying the conditions of the theorem; we suppose H to be greater than a certain bound depending only on ϵ, d, a and b . This will lead to a contradiction. From 6.20 we see

$$(6.11) \quad |\ell_p(a) - \ell_p(\alpha)|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/2} H),$$

$$(6.12) \quad |b \ell_p(a) - \ell_p(\gamma)|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/2} H).$$

As a consequence of (6.11), (6.12) and

$$(6.13) \quad |b - \beta|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon} H)$$

we have

$$|\beta \ell_p(a) - \ell_p(\gamma)|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/3} H).$$

If it were the case that $\beta \ell_p(a) - \ell_p(\gamma) \neq 0$, 6.21 would imply

$$|\beta \ell_p(a) - \ell_p(\gamma)|_p > \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\epsilon/3} H),$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $\beta \ell_p(a) - \ell_p(\gamma) = 0$.

II. We have just proved that $\ell_p(a)$ and $\ell_p(\gamma)$ are linearly dependent over the field of all algebraic numbers in \mathbb{C}_p ; using 6.22, we find that

these numbers must also be linearly dependent over \mathbb{Q} . In other words, there are $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{Q}$, not both zero, such that $\xi \ell_p(\alpha) + \eta \ell_p(\gamma) = 0$. As

$$|a - \alpha|_p < \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon} H) < |a - 1|_p,$$

we have

$$(6.14) \quad |\alpha - 1|_p < |a - 1|_p < p^{-1/(p-1)}.$$

Thus, by 6.12, $\ell_p(\alpha) \neq 0$ and we may conclude

$$\beta = \frac{\ell_p(\gamma)}{\ell_p(\alpha)} = -\frac{\xi}{\eta} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Using 6.19 with $\delta = \frac{1}{2}|a - 1|_p$ gives that $\log H > B \log^{-1-\varepsilon/10} B$, where $B = \max(2, h(\beta))$. Then, a fortiori, $\log H > B^{1/2}$, so $\log_2 H > \frac{1}{2} \log B$; thus

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-\log^3 H \log_2^{1+\varepsilon/3} H) &< \exp(-\frac{1}{4} B^3 \log^{-2+\varepsilon/30} B) < \\ \exp(-B^3 \log^{-2+\varepsilon/31} B). \end{aligned}$$

From (6.13) we see that

$$|b - \beta|_p < \exp(-B^3 \log^{-2+\varepsilon/31} B),$$

and so, if we put $\beta = -x_0/x_1$ with $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x_1 \in \mathbb{N}$, $(x_0, x_1) = 1$,

$$(6.15) \quad |x_0 + x_1 b|_p = |x_1|_p |b - \beta|_p \leq |b - \beta|_p < \exp(-B^3 \log^{-2+\varepsilon/31} B),$$

where $B = \max(2, |x_0|, |x_1|)$. From (6.10) we know that b cannot be rational; from (6.13) it then follows that B tends to infinity with H . Therefore (6.15) contradicts (6.10). \square

REFERENCES

- ADAMS, W.W., *Transcendental numbers in the P-adic domain*, Amer.J.Math. 88 (1966) 279-308.
- AMICE, Y., *Les nombres p-adiques*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1975.
- APOSTOL, T.M., *Introduction to analytic number theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
- BAKER, A., *Linear forms in the logarithms of algebraic numbers (II)*, Mathematika 14 (1967) 102-107.
- BAKER, A., *Transcendental number theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- BAKER, A., *The theory of linear forms in logarithms*, in A. BAKER & D.W. MASSER (eds.), *Transcendence theory: advances and applications*, Academic Press, London, 1977.
- BAKER, A. & H.M. STARK, *On a fundamental inequality in number theory*, Ann.Math. 94 (1971) 190-199.
- BIJLSMA, A., *On the simultaneous approximation of a , b and a^b* , Compositio Math. 35 (1977) 99-111.
- BRAUER, A., *Über diophantische Gleichungen mit endlich vielen Lösungen*, J.Reine Angew.Math. 160 (1929) 70-99.
- BRUMER, A., *On the units of algebraic number fields*, Mathematika 14 (1967) 121-124.
- BUNDSCHUH, P., *Zum Franklin-Schneiderschen Satz*, J.Reine Angew.Math. 260 (1973) 103-118.
- BUNDSCHUH, P., *Zur simultanen Approximation von $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{n-1}$ und $\prod_{v=0}^{n-1} \alpha_v^{\beta_v}$ durch algebraische Zahlen*, J. Reine Angew.Math. 278/279 (1975) 99-117.
- CIJSOUW, P.L., *Transcendence measures of exponentials and logarithms of algebraic numbers*, Compositio Math. 28 (1974) 163-178.
- CIJSOUW, P.L., *On the simultaneous approximation of certain numbers*, Duke Math.J. 42 (1975) 249-257.
- CIJSOUW, P.L. & R. TIJDEMAN, *On the transcendence of certain power series of algebraic numbers*, Acta Arith. 23 (1973) 301-305.
- CIJSOUW, P.L. & M. WALDSCHMIDT, *Linear forms and simultaneous approximations*, Compositio Math. 34 (1977) 173-197.
- FEL'DMAN, N.I., *Approximation of certain transcendental numbers (I): the approximation of logarithms of algebraic numbers* (in Russian). Izv. Akad.Nauk SSSR Ser.Mat. 15 (1951) 53-74. English translation: Amer. Math.Soc.Transl. (2) 59 (1966) 224-245.

- FEL'DMAN, N.I., *Arithmetic properties of the solution of a transcendental equation* (in Russian). Vestnik Moskov.Univ.Ser. I Mat.Meh. 1964, No. 1, 13-20. English translation: Amer.Math.Soc.Transl. (2) 66 (1968) 145-153.
- FRANKLIN, P., *A new class of transcendental numbers*, Trans.Amer.Math.Soc. 42 (1937) 155-182.
- GEL'FOND, A.O., *Sur le septième problème de Hilbert*, Izv.Akad.Nauk SSSR Ser.Mat. 1934, 623-630.
- GEL'FOND, A.O., *Transcendental and algebraic numbers* (in Russian). Gosudarstv. Izdat. Techn.-Teor. Lit., Moscow, 1952. English translation: Dover Publications, New York, 1960.
- HARDY, G.H. & E.M. WRIGHT, *An introduction to the theory of numbers*, 4th edition, Oxford University Press, 1960.
- HERMITE, Ch., *Sur la fonction exponentielle*, C.R.Acad.Sci. (Paris) 77 (1873) 18-24, 74-79, 226-233, 285-293.
- LINDEMANN, F., *Über die Zahl π* , Math.Ann. 20 (1882) 213-225.
- PERRON, O., *Die Lehre von den Kettenbrüchen*, Band I, 3. Auflage, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1954.
- POORTEN, A.J. van der, *Linear forms in logarithms in the p -adic case*, in A. BAKER & D.W. MASSER (eds.), *Transcendence theory: advances and applications*, Academic Press, London, 1977.
- POORTEN, A.J. van der & J.H. LOXTON, *Multiplicative relations in number fields*, Bull.Austral.Math.Soc. 16 (1977) 83-98.
- RICCI, G., *Sul settimo problema di Hilbert*, Ann.Scuola Norm.Sup.Pisa (2) 4 (1935) 341-372.
- SCHNEIDER, Th., *Transzendenzuntersuchungen periodischer Funktionen (I): Transzendenz von Potenzen*, J.Reine Angew.Math. 172 (1934) 65-69.
- SCHNEIDER, Th., *Einführung in die transzendenten Zahlen*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1957.
- ^VSMELEV, A.A., *On approximating the roots of some transcendental equations* (in Russian). Mat. Zametki 7 (1970) 203-210. English translation: Math. Notes 7 (1970) 122-126.
- ^VSMELEV, A.A., *A.O. Gelfond's method in the theory of transcendental numbers* (in Russian). Mat. Zametki 10 (1971) 415-426. English translation: Math. Notes 10 (1971) 672-678.
- TIJDEMAN, R., *On the number of zeros of general exponential polynomials*, Nederl.Akad.Wetensch.Proc.Ser. A 74 = Indag.Math. 33 (1971) 1-7.
- VÄÄNÄNEN, K., *On the arithmetic properties of certain values of the ex-*

ponential function (to appear).

WAERDEN, B.L. van der, *Algebra*, Teil I, 7. Auflage, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

WALDSCHMIDT, M., *Nombres transcendants*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 402, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974.

WALDSCHMIDT, M., *A lower bound for linear forms in logarithms* (to appear).

WALLISSER, R., *Über Produkte transzendenter Zahlen*, J.Reine Angew.Math. 258 (1973) 62-78.

WÜSTHOLZ, G., *Simultane Approximationen, die mit Potenzen bzw. Logarithmen zusammenhängen*, Dissertation, Freiburg, 1976.

WÜSTHOLZ, G., *Linearformen in Logarithmen von U-Zahlen und Transzendenz von Potenzen* (to appear).

INDEX OF SPECIAL SYMBOLS

Symbol:	Defined on page:
\mathbb{A}	9
$[a, b]$	9
$]a, b[$	9
\mathbb{A}_d	9
$\mathbb{B}(a, R)$	82
$\overline{\mathbb{B}}(a, R)$	82
\mathbb{C}	9
\mathbb{C}_p	82
$\text{den}(\eta)$	9
$\text{dg}(\xi)$	2
$ f _R$	82
$\text{Gal}(F/\mathbb{Q})$	9
$h(P)$	1
$h(\xi)$	2
$\log_2 H$	3
\mathbb{N}	9
$P_d(\varepsilon)$	21
$P_d^*(\varepsilon)$	33
\mathbb{Q}	9
\mathbb{R}	9
$R[x]$	9
$R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$	9
S_d	42
$S_d^{(n)}$	42
\mathbb{Z}	9
$ \eta $	9, 88
$ \eta _p$	82
$\omega(\varepsilon, b)$	18

OTHER TITLES IN THE SERIES MATHEMATICAL CENTRE TRACTS

A leaflet containing an order-form and abstracts of all publications mentioned below is available at the Mathematisch Centrum, Tweede Boerhaavestraat 49, Amsterdam-1005, The Netherlands. Orders should be sent to the same address.

- MCT 1 T. VAN DER WALT, *Fixed and almost fixed points*, 1963. ISBN 90 6196 002 9.
- MCT 2 A.R. BLOEMENA, *Sampling from a graph*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 003 7.
- MCT 3 G. DE LEVE, *Generalized Markovian decision processes, part I: Model and method*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 004 5.
- MCT 4 G. DE LEVE, *Generalized Markovian decision processes, part II: Probabilistic background*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 005 3.
- MCT 5 G. DE LEVE, H.C. TIJMS & P.J. WEEDA, *Generalized Markovian decision processes, Applications*, 1970. ISBN 90 6196 051 7.
- MCT 6 M.A. MAURICE, *Compact ordered spaces*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 006 1.
- MCT 7 W.R. VAN ZWET, *Convex transformations of random variables*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 007 X.
- MCT 8 J.A. ZONNEVELD, *Automatic numerical integration*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 008 8.
- MCT 9 P.C. BAAYEN, *Universal morphisms*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 009 6.
- MCT 10 E.M. DE JAGER, *Applications of distributions in mathematical physics*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 010 X.
- MCT 11 A.B. PAALMAN-DE MIRANDA, *Topological semigroups*, 1964. ISBN 90 6196 011 8.
- MCT 12 J.A.TH.M. VAN BERCKEL, H. BRANDT CORSTIUS, R.J. MOKKEN & A. VAN WIJNGAARDEN, *Formal properties of newspaper Dutch*, 1965. ISBN 90 6196 013 4.
- MCT 13 H.A. LAUWERIER, *Asymptotic expansions*, 1966, out of print; replaced by MCT 54 and 67.
- MCT 14 H.A. LAUWERIER, *Calculus of variations in mathematical physics*, 1966. ISBN 90 6196 020 7.
- MCT 15 R. DOORNBOS, *Slippage tests*, 1966. ISBN 90 6196 021 5.
- MCT 16 J.W. DE BAKKER, *Formal definition of programming languages with an application to the definition of ALGOL 60*, 1967. ISBN 90 6196 022 3.
- MCT 17 R.P. VAN DE RIET, *Formula manipulation in ALGOL 60, part 1*, 1968. ISBN 90 6196 025 8.
- MCT 18 R.P. VAN DE RIET, *Formula manipulation in ALGOL 60, part 2*, 1968. ISBN 90 6196 038 X.
- MCT 19 J. VAN DER SLOT, *Some properties related to compactness*, 1968. ISBN 90 6196 026 6.
- MCT 20 P.J. VAN DER HOUWEN, *Finite difference methods for solving partial differential equations*, 1968. ISBN 90 6196 027 4.

- MCT 21 E. WATTEL, *The compactness operator in set theory and topology*, 1968. ISBN 90 6196 028 2.
- MCT 22 T.J. DEKKER, *ALGOL 60 procedures in numerical algebra, part 1*, 1968. ISBN 90 6196 029 0.
- MCT 23 T.J. DEKKER & W. HOFFMANN, *ALGOL 60 procedures in numerical algebra, part 2*, 1968. ISBN 90 6196 030 4.
- MCT 24 J.W. DE BAKKER, *Recursive procedures*, 1971. ISBN 90 6196 060 6.
- MCT 25 E.R. PAERL, *Representations of the Lorentz group and projective geometry*, 1969. ISBN 90 6196 039 8.
- MCT 26 EUROPEAN MEETING 1968, *Selected statistical papers, part I*, 1968. ISBN 90 6196 031 2.
- MCT 27 EUROPEAN MEETING 1968, *Selected statistical papers, part II*, 1969. ISBN 90 6196 040 1.
- MCT 28 J. OOSTERHOFF, *Combination of one-sided statistical tests*, 1969. ISBN 90 6196 041 x.
- MCT 29 J. VERHOEFF, *Error detecting decimal codes*, 1969. ISBN 90 6196 042 8.
- MCT 30 H. BRANDT CORSTIUS, *Excercises in computational linguistics*, 1970. ISBN 90 6196 052 5.
- MCT 31 W. MOLENAAR, *Approximations to the Poisson, binomial and hypergeometric distribution functions*, 1970. ISBN 90 6196 053 3.
- MCT 32 L. DE HAAN, *On regular variation and its application to the weak convergence of sample extremes*, 1970. ISBN 90 6196 054 1.
- MCT 33 F.W. STEUTEL, *Preservation of infinite divisibility under mixing and related topics*, 1970. ISBN 90 6196 061 4.
- MCT 34 I. JUHÁSZ, A. VERBEEK & N.S. KROONENBERG, *Cardinal functions in topology*, 1971. ISBN 90 6196 062 2.
- MCT 35 M.H. VAN EMDEN, *An analysis of complexity*, 1971. ISBN 90 6196 063 0.
- MCT 36 J. GRASMAN, *On the birth of boundary layers*, 1971. ISBN 90 6196 064 9.
- MCT 37 J.W. DE BAKKER, G.A. BLAAUW, A.J.W. DULJVESTIJN, E.W. DIJKSTRA, P.J. VAN DER HOUWEN, G.A.M. KAMSTEEG-KEMPER, F.E.J. KRUSEMAN ARETZ, W.L. VAN DER POEL, J.P. SCHAAP-KRUSEMAN, M.V. WILKES & G. ZOUTENDIJK, *MC-25 Informatica Symposium*, 1971. ISBN 90 6196 065 7.
- MCT 38 W.A. VERLOREN VAN THEMAAT, *Automatic analysis of Dutch compound words*, 1971. ISBN 90 6196 073 8.
- MCT 39 H. BAVINCK, *Jacobi series and approximation*, 1972. ISBN 90 6196 074 6.
- MCT 40 H.C. TIJMS, *Analysis of (s,S) inventory models*, 1972. ISBN 90 6196 075 4.
- MCT 41 A. VERBEEK, *Superextensions of topological spaces*, 1972. ISBN 90 6196 076 2.
- MCT 42 W. VERVAAT, *Success epochs in Bernoulli trials (with applications in number theory)*, 1972. ISBN 90 6196 077 0.
- MCT 43 F.H. RUYMGAART, *Asymptotic theory of rank tests for independence*, 1973. ISBN 90 6196 081 9.
- MCT 44 H. BART, *Meromorphic operator valued functions*, 1973. ISBN 90 6196 082 7.

- MCT 45 A.A. BALKEMA, *Monotone transformations and limit laws*, 1973. ISBN 90 6196 083 5.
- MCT 46 R.P. VAN DE RIET, *ABC ALGOL, A portable language for formula manipulation systems, part 1: The language*, 1973. ISBN 90 6196 084 3.
- MCT 47 R.P. VAN DE RIET, *ABC ALGOL, A portable language for formula manipulation systems, part 2: The compiler*, 1973. ISBN 90 6196 085 1.
- MCT 48 F.E.J. KRUSEMAN ARETZ, P.J.W. TEN HAGEN & H.L. OUDSHOORN, *An ALGOL 60 compiler in ALGOL 60, Text of the MC-compiler for the EL-X8*, 1973. ISBN 90 6196 086 X.
- MCT 49 H. KOK, *Connected orderable spaces*, 1974. ISBN 90 6196 088 6.
- MCT 50 A. VAN WIJNGAARDEN, B.J. MAILLOUX, J.E.L. PECK, C.H.A. KOSTER, M. SINTZOFF, C.H. LINDSEY, L.G.L.T. MEERTENS & R.G. FISHER (Eds), *Revised report on the algorithmic language ALGOL 68*, 1976. ISBN 90 6196 089 4.
- MCT 51 A. HORDIJK, *Dynamic programming and Markov potential theory*, 1974. ISBN 90 6196 095 9.
- MCT 52 P.C. BAAYEN (ed.), *Topological structures*, 1974. ISBN 90 6196 096 7.
- MCT 53 M.J. FABER, *Metrizability in generalized ordered spaces*, 1974. ISBN 90 6196 097 5.
- MCT 54 H.A. LAUWERIER, *Asymptotic analysis, part 1*, 1974. ISBN 90 6196 098 3.
- MCT 55 M. HALL JR. & J.H. VAN LINT (Eds), *Combinatorics, part 1: Theory of designs, finite geometry and coding theory*, 1974. ISBN 90 6196 099 1.
- MCT 56 M. HALL JR. & J.H. VAN LINT (Eds), *Combinatorics, part 2: graph theory, foundations, partitions and combinatorial geometry*, 1974. ISBN 90 6196 100 9.
- MCT 57 M. HALL JR. & J.H. VAN LINT (Eds), *Combinatorics, part 3: Combinatorial group theory*, 1974. ISBN 90 6196 101 7.
- MCT 58 W. ALBERS, *Asymptotic expansions and the deficiency concept in statistics*, 1975. ISBN 90 6196 102 5.
- MCT 59 J.L. MIJNHEER, *Sample path properties of stable processes*, 1975. ISBN 90 6196 107 6.
- MCT 60 F. GÖBEL, *Queueing models involving buffers*, 1975. ISBN 90 6196 108 4.
- * MCT 61 P. VAN EMDE BOAS, *Abstract resource-bound classes, part 1*. ISBN 90 6196 109 2.
- * MCT 62 P. VAN EMDE BOAS, *Abstract resource-bound classes, part 2*. ISBN 90 6196 110 6.
- MCT 63 J.W. DE BAKKER (ed.), *Foundations of computer science*, 1975. ISBN 90 6196 111 4.
- MCT 64 W.J. DE SCHIPPER, *Symmetric closed categories*, 1975. ISBN 90 6196 112 2.
- MCT 65 J. DE VRIES, *Topological transformation groups 1 A categorical approach*, 1975. ISBN 90 6196 113 0.
- MCT 66 H.G.J. PIJLS, *Locally convex algebras in spectral theory and eigenfunction expansions*, 1976. ISBN 90 6196 114 9.

- * MCT 67 H.A. LAUWERIER, *Asymptotic analysis, part 2.*
ISBN 90 6196 119 x.
- MCT 68 P.P.N. DE GROEN, *Singularly perturbed differential operators of second order*, 1976. ISBN 90 6196 120 3.
- MCT 69 J.K. LENSTRA, *Sequencing by enumerative methods*, 1977.
ISBN 90 6196 125 4.
- MCT 70 W.P. DE ROEVER JR., *Recursive program schemes: semantics and proof theory*, 1976. ISBN 90 6196 127 0.
- MCT 71 J.A.E.E. VAN NUNEN, *Contracting Markov decision processes*, 1976.
ISBN 90 6196 129 7.
- MCT 72 J.K.M. JANSEN, *Simple periodic and nonperiodic Lamé functions and their applications in the theory of conical waveguides*, 1977.
ISBN 90 6196 130 0.
- * MCT 73 D.M.R. LEIVANT, *Absoluteness of intuitionistic logic.*
ISBN 90 6196 122 x.
- MCT 74 H.J.J. TE RIELE, *A theoretical and computational study of generalized aliquot sequences*, 1976. ISBN 90 6196 131 9.
- MCT 75 A.E. BROUWER, *Treelike spaces and related connected topological spaces*, 1977. ISBN 90 6196 132 7.
- MCT 76 M. REM, *Associons and the closure statement*, 1976. ISBN 90 6196 135 1.
- MCT 77 W.C.M. KALLENBERG, *Asymptotic optimality of likelihood ratio tests in exponential families*, 1977 ISBN 90 6196 134 3.
- MCT 78 E. DE JONGE, A.C.M. VAN ROOIJ, *Introduction to Riesz spaces*, 1977.
ISBN 90 6196 133 5.
- MCT 79 M.C.A. VAN ZUIJLEN, *Empirical distributions and rankstatistics*, 1977.
ISBN 90 6196 145 9.
- MCT 80 P.W. HEMKER, *A numerical study of stiff two-point boundary problems*, 1977. ISBN 90 6196 146 7.
- MCT 81 K.R. APT & J.W. DE BAKKER (eds), *Foundations of computer science II*, part I, 1976. ISBN 90 6196 140 8.
- MCT 82 K.R. APT & J.W. DE BAKKER (eds), *Foundations of computer science II*, part II, 1976. ISBN 90 6196 141 6.
- * MCT 83 L.S. VAN BENTEM JUTTING, *Checking Landau's "Grundlagen" in the AUTOMATH system*, ISBN 90 6196 147 5.
- MCT 84 H.L.L. BUSARD, *The translation of the elements of Euclid from the Arabic into Latin by Hermann of Carinthia (?) books vii-xii*, 1977.
ISBN 90 6196 148 3.
- MCT 85 J. VAN MILL, *Supercompactness and Wallman spaces*, 1977.
ISBN 90 6196 151 3.
- MCT 86 S.G. VAN DER MEULEN & M. VELDHORST, *Torriæ I*, 1978.
ISBN 90 6196 152 1.
- * MCT 87 S.G. VAN DER MEULEN & M. VELDHORST, *Torriæ II*,
ISBN 90 6196 153 x.
- MCT 88 A. SCHRIJVER, *Matroids and linking systems*, 1977.
ISBN 90 6196 154 8.

- MCT 89 J.W. DE ROEVER, *Complex Fourier transformation and analytic functionals with unbounded carriers*, 1978.
ISBN 90 6196 155 6.
- * MCT 90 L.P.J. GROENEWEGEN, *Characterization of optimal strategies in dynamic games*, . ISBN 90 6196 156 4.
- * MCT 91 J.M. GEYSEL, *Transcendence in fields of positive characteristic*, . ISBN 90 6196 157 2.
- * MCT 92 P.J. WEEDA, *Finite generalized Markov programming*, . ISBN 90 6196 158 0.
- MCT 93 H.C. TIJMS (ed.) & J. WESSELS (ed.), *Markov decision theory*, 1977.
ISBN 90 6196 160 2.
- MCT 94 A. BIJLSMA, *Simultaneous approximations in transcendental number theory*, . ISBN 90 6196 162 9.
- * MCT 95 K.M. VAN HEE, *Bayesian control of Markov chains*, . ISBN 90 6196 163 7.
- * MCT 96 P.M.B. VITÁNYI, *Lindenmayer systems: structure, languages, and growth functions*, . ISBN 90 6196 164 5.
- * MCT 97 A. FEDERGRUEN, *Markovian control problems; functional equations and algorithms*, . ISBN 90 6196 165 3.
- * MCT 98 R. GEEL, *Singular perturbations of hyperbolic type*, . ISBN 90 6196 166 1
- MCT 99 J.K. LENSTRA, A.H.G. RINNOOY KAN & P. VAN Emde BOAS, *Interfaces between computer science and operations research*, 1978.
ISBN 90 6196 170 X.
- * MCT 100 P.C. BAAYEN, D. VAN DULST & J. OOSTERHOFF (Eds), *Proceedings bicentennial congress of the Wiskundig Genootschap, part 1*,
ISBN 90 6196 168 8.
- * MCT 101 P.C. BAAYEN, D. VAN DULST & J. OOSTERHOFF (Eds), *Proceedings bicentennial congress of the Wiskundig Genootschap, part 2*,
ISBN 90 9196 169 6.

AN ASTERISK BEFORE THE NUMBER MEANS "TO APPEAR"

