

# A Truly Easy Proof: Pi is Irrational

Timothy Jones

January 15, 2024

## Abstract

Using the sum of the derivatives of an integer polynomial with Euler's formula we prove that  $\pi$  is irrational. We show how the technique can be used to show  $e$  and  $\pi$ 's transcendence.

## Proof

Proofs of the irrationality of  $\pi$  are numerous [1], but none are as easy and direct as the following.

**Theorem 1.**  $\pi$  is irrational.

*Proof.* A simple case generalizes. Suppose  $f_3(x) = x^3$  and consider the sum of its derivatives:

$$F_3(x) = x^3 + 3x^2 + 3!x + 3!.$$

It follows that  $F_3(0) = 3!$ . Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} F_3(0)e^x &= 3! \left( 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^3}{3!} + \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k!} \right) \\ &= F_3(x) + 3! \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} \frac{x^k}{k!} \\ &= F_3(x) + 3!(e^x - s_3(x)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $s_3(x)$  is a partial sum of  $e^x$ .

Adding  $F(0)$  we have

$$(e^x + 1)F_3(0) = F_3(0) + F_3(x) + 3!(e^x - s_3(x)). \quad (1)$$

Now imaging  $x = \pi i$  and applying Euler's formula,  $e^{\pi i} + 1 = 0$  makes (1)

$$0 = \frac{F_3(0) + F_3(x)}{3!} + (e^x - s_3(x)),$$

after dividing by  $3!$ , the multiplicity of the single root of  $f(x)$  factorial.

There is no reason to believe that for a general term of any polynomial this pattern would change. Nor is there any reason that all surviving non-zero coefficients of  $F_n(r)$ ,  $r$  a root of  $f_n(x)$  would not have factors of the multiplicity of the root factorial (like this easy case), if the coefficients of  $f_n(x)$  are integers. Thus assuming  $\pi = p/q$ , we can use  $x^3(qx - pi)^3$ , for example, and these conditions are met. So, 0 is an integer plus a something less than 1, a contradiction.  $\square$

Of course this is a *forest* only proof. We are definitely not getting into the weeds, the details. The next two, slightly harder ideas, give credence to our evolving forest.

## The Mean Value Theorem

Another property of  $F(x)$  is

$$\begin{aligned} F(x) - F'(x) &= (x^3 + 3x^2 + 3!x + 3!) - \frac{d}{dx}(x^3 + 3x^2 + 3!x + 3!) \quad (2) \\ &= x^3 = f(x) \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

and this is clearly the case for any polynomial,  $f(x)$ . We also notice the product formula for derivatives is of interest:  $(fg)' = f'g + g'f$ . Consider that  $(e^x F(x))' = e^x F(x) + F'(x)e^x$  is close to  $e^x(F(x) - F'(x))$ . We need subtraction;  $-e^{-x}F(x)$  does the trick:

$$(-e^{-x}F(x))' = e^{-x}F(x) + F'(x)(-e^{-x}) = e^{-x}(F(x) - F'(x)). \quad (4)$$

The mean value theorem can be combined with (4). Let  $G(x) = -e^{-x}F(x)$ , then

$$\frac{G(x) - G(0)}{(x - 0)} = G'(\xi) = e^{-\xi}f(\xi),$$

where  $\xi \in (0, x)$ . Translating back,

$$-e^{-x}F(x) + e^0F(0) = xe^{-\xi}f(\xi)$$

and then multiplying by  $e^x$  gives

$$-F(x) + e^x F(0) = xe^{x-\xi}f(\xi).$$

This is our pattern:  $e^x F(0) = F(x) + xe^{x-\xi}f(\xi)$ .

## Integration

This pattern  $e^x F(0) = F(x) + xe^{x-\xi}f(\xi)$  might be called Hermite's Formula. With it (and other things) he showed  $e$  is transcendental and later Lindemann used it again to show  $\pi$  is transcendental too. We can give the essence of their ideas. Before going there, here's another derivation of Hermite's formula using a definite integral.

Just integrating

$$\frac{d(-e^{-x}F(x))}{dx} = e^{-x}f(x)$$

gives

$$\int_0^x \frac{d}{dx} (-e^{-x}F(x)) = \Big|_0^x (-e^{-x}F(x)) = -e^{-x}F(x) + F(0)$$

on the left side and

$$\int_0^x e^{-x}f(x) dx$$

on the right. Multiplying by  $-e^x$  then gives

$$F(x) - e^x F(0) = -e^x \int_0^x e^{-x}f(x) dx$$

or

$$e^x F(0) = F(x) + e^x \int_0^x e^{-x}f(x) dx.$$

## Transcendence

A number is transcendental if it is not the root of an integer polynomial. Naturally, to show a number is transcendental, we suppose that it is a root of polynomial and derive a contradiction. We can use Hermite's polynomial as a starting point. Consider that  $\pi i = r_0$  and  $r_k$ ,  $0 < k \leq n$ , are other roots an integer polynomial. Supposing we made the right Hermite polynomial, we might hope for something involving

$$F(0)(e^{r_0} + e^{r_1} + \dots + e^{r_n}) = -F(0) + F(r_1) + \dots + F(r_n) + \sum_{k=0}^n \epsilon_k.$$

But this isn't equal to zero. We need a modification that will make this equal to 0 but also yield a way to sum those large capital  $F$  values. We know  $e^{\pi i} + 1 = 0$ , so we can say

$$0 = F(0) ((e^{r_0} + 1)(e^{r_1} + 1) \dots (e^{r_n} + 1))$$

and this will yield sums of  $F$  at the various exponents generated. We will have to modify the small case  $f$  used for our capital  $F$  to make the roots equal to these exponents. Will the resulting polynomial be the requisite integer polynomial or something close – i.e. with coefficients rationals awaiting a constant multiple to make them all integers.

That's  $\pi$  and it seems complicated. Remember

$$\prod_{k=0}^n (x - r_k) = P_0 x^n + P_1 x^{n-1} + P_2 x^{n-2} + \dots + P_n \quad (5)$$

where  $P_k$  is the sum of roots multiplied  $k$  at a time. You observe this with

$$(x - 1)(x - 2)(x - 3) = x^3 - (1 + 2 + 3)x^2 + (1 \cdot 2 + 1 \cdot 3 + 2 \cdot 3)x^1 - 1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3.$$

And we can get these coefficients with Maple, Figure 1.

```
=
> expand((x - 1) · (x - 2) · (x - 3));
      x3 - 6x2 + 11x - 6
```

Figure 1: Maple's expand command in action.

This example gives some evidence that integer roots generate integer coefficients; a pretty obvious result. But what about  $(x - \sqrt{2})(x + \sqrt{2}) = x^2 - 2$ ? The

roots are not integers, but the coefficients are. So it isn't clear whether or not we can form a polynomial from the roots of an integer polynomial that will for sure also have integer coefficients. More on this in a separate article. Let's try an easier case of transcendence.

Suppose we wanted to prove  $e$  is transcendental. As always we assume it isn't and attempt to derive a contradiction. Suppose  $e$  is a root of  $p(x)$

$$p(x) = c_0x^n + c_1x^{n-1} + \cdots + c_n,$$

where the coefficients are integers. Then

$$p(e) = c_0e^n + \cdots + c_n = 0.$$

It seems likely we can form a polynomial  $f(x)$  with an  $F(0)$  such that

$$0 = F(0)(c_0e^n + \cdots + c_n) = c_0F(n) + \cdots + c_nF(0) + \sum_{i=0}^n \epsilon_i. \quad (6)$$

We can read the necessary roots off of (6). They are just the integers  $0, \dots, n$ ; the exponents of  $e$ .

## Conclusion

This is a *forest* article. With it students might seek to happily learn what's needed to complete our sketches.

## References

- [1] Eymard, P., Lafon, J.-P. (2004). *The Number  $\pi$* . Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society.