
Fourth Meeting, February 9th, 1894.

Dr J. M'COWAN, Vice-President, in the Chair.

On the Geometrical Interpretation of i^i .

By T. B. SPRAGUE, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., etc.

If we put $\theta = \pi/2$ in the well known equation

$$e^{i\theta} = \cos\theta + i \sin\theta$$

we get $e^{i\pi/2} = i$; and raising both sides to the power i ,

$$i^i = (e^{i\pi/2})^i = e^{i^2\pi/2} = e^{-\pi/2}.$$

Before proceeding further it will be useful to consider the former of these results. Putting for $e^{i\pi/2}$ the equivalent series, we have

$$i = 1 - \frac{1}{2!} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{4!} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^4 - \dots$$

$$+ i \left\{ \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{1}{3!} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^3 + \frac{1}{5!} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^5 - \dots \right\}$$

It is obvious that each of the infinite series here involved is convergent, and a very little numerical calculation is sufficient to show that their limits are 0 and 1 respectively. In fact, taking $\pi = 3.1416$, or $\pi/2 = 1.5708$, the two series become

$$1 - 1.2337 + .2537 - .0208 + .0009 = .0001,$$

$$\text{and } 1.5708 - .6459 + .0797 - .0047 + .0001 = 1.0000.$$

Returning now to the equation $i^i = e^{-\pi/2}$, and substituting for e and π their numerical values, we get

$$i^i = .20788;$$

and the question I propose to consider is how this result is to be understood or interpreted. It will be convenient first to consider the more general expression a^i , where a is a complex number. We first observe that

$$(a^i)^i = a^{i^2} = a^{-1};$$

so that the effect of the operation $()^i$, if performed twice upon a , is to give us the reciprocal of a ; or the operation is one which goes half way towards the reciprocal. Next, writing $re^{i\theta}$ for a , we have

$$(re^{i\theta})^i = r^i e^{-\theta} = e^{-\theta} e^{i \log r} = e^{-\theta} (\cos \log r + i \sin \log r).$$

This shows us that the operation $()^i$, when performed on a complex with modulus r and amplitude θ , gives us a new complex, of which the modulus is $e^{-\theta}$, and the amplitude $\log r$. Performing the same operation on this new complex, we have

$$(r^i e^{-\theta})^i = r^{-1} e^{-i\theta};$$

the result being the reciprocal of our original complex. Proceeding in the same way, we get

$$(r^{-1} e^{-i\theta})^i = r^{-i} e^{-i^2\theta} = r^{-i} e^{\theta};$$

$$(r^{-i} e^{\theta})^i = r^{-i^2} e^{i\theta} = r e^{i\theta}$$

We have thus produced the original complex, and we see that the moduli of the four complexes are $r, e^{-\theta}, r^{-1}, e^{\theta}$; and the amplitudes $\theta, \log r, -\theta, -\log r$.

If OP_1 in Figure 13 represents $re^{i\theta}$, so that $OP_1 = r, P_1OA = \theta$, then the other three complexes will be represented by OP_2, OP_3, OP_4 ; where $AOP_1 = AOP_3, AOP_2 = AOP_4$, and $OP_1 \cdot OP_3 = OP_2 \cdot OP_4 = 1$. The figure is drawn for the case where $r = \frac{3}{4}, e^{-\theta} = \frac{1}{2}$; so that

the moduli are $\frac{3}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{3}, 2$;

and the amplitudes $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \cdot 693, -\cdot 288, -\cdot 693, \cdot 288, \\ \text{or } 39^\circ \cdot 7, -16^\circ \cdot 6, -39^\circ \cdot 7, 16^\circ \cdot 6. \end{array} \right.$

If the complex $(re^{i\theta})^i$ is a real number, the point P_2 lies in OA or in AO produced; and the condition for this is that the amplitude shall be 0 or π . If now we suppose r to approach 1, the angles AOP_2 and AOP_4 gradually diminish, and ultimately vanish when $r = 1$. In this case

the moduli become $1, e^{-\theta}, 1, e^{\theta}$;
 and the amplitudes $\theta, 0, -\theta, 0$;

so that the points, P_2, P_4 , lie in OA, and the equation $(re^{i\theta})^i = r^i e^{-\theta}$ becomes $(e^{i\theta})^i = e^{-\theta}$. If we now suppose θ to approach $\pi/2$, or the line OP_1 to approach the perpendicular OB,

the moduli become $1, e^{-\pi/2}, 1, e^{\pi/2}$;
 and the amplitudes $\pi/2, 0, -\pi/2, 0$.

In this case $e^{i\theta} = \cos\theta + i \sin\theta$, becomes $= i$, and we have $i^i = e^{-\pi/2} = .20788$. We thus see that this apparently anomalous result admits of a simple geometrical interpretation.

Another special case deserving of notice is when $AOP_1 = AOP_4$. This will happen when $\theta = -\log r$ or $r = e^{-\theta}$; and then

the moduli are $e^{-\theta}, e^{-\theta}, e^{\theta}, e^{\theta}$;
 and the amplitudes $\theta, -\theta, -\theta, \theta$.

(See Figure 14.)

In the foregoing investigation I have not taken into account the possibility that a^i may have a multiplicity of values, and I will now consider that point. If l is any integer, we have

$$e^{2il\pi} = \cos 2l\pi + i \sin 2l\pi = 1.$$

Hence

$$re^{i\theta} = re^{i(\theta + 2l\pi)}$$

and $(re^{i\theta})^i = \{re^{i(\theta + 2l\pi)}\}^i = r^i e^{-\theta - 2l\pi} = e^{-\theta - 2l\pi} e^{i \log r}$.

We thus see that, instead of the first member having a single value, as we have hitherto assumed, it has an infinite number of values, all

of which have the same amplitude, $\log r$; while the moduli are $e^{-\theta}$, $e^{-\theta \pm 2\pi}$, $e^{-\theta \pm 4\pi}$, etc., and form a geometric series of which the ratio is $e^{\pm 2\pi}$.

Repeating the operation $(\)^i$, since $e^{2im\pi} = 1$, where m is any integer,

$$\begin{aligned} (r^i e^{-\theta - 2l\pi})^i &= (r^i e^{2im\pi} \cdot e^{-\theta - 2l\pi})^i \\ &= r^{-1} e^{-2m\pi} \cdot e^{-i\theta} \cdot e^{-2il\pi} \\ &= r^{-1} e^{-2m\pi} \cdot e^{-i\theta} \end{aligned}$$

so that, instead of the reciprocal $r^{-1} e^{-i\theta}$, we have an infinite number of complexes, all of which have the same amplitude, $-\theta$; while the moduli are r^{-1} , $r^{-1} e^{\pm 2\pi}$, $r^{-1} e^{\pm 4\pi}$, etc., and form a geometric series, of which the ratio is $e^{\pm 2\pi}$. Since l and m each denote any integer, and they do not occur in the same formula, we may say that by successive repetitions of $(\)^i$ we get a series of complexes, of which

the moduli are r , $e^{-\theta + 2l\pi}$, $r^{-1} e^{2l\pi}$, $e^{\theta + 2l\pi}$, $r e^{2l\pi}$, ...
and the amplitudes θ , $\log r$, $-\theta$, $-\log r$, θ , ...

It thus appears that we are not entitled to reason, as we did above, that $(a^i)^i = a^{ii} = a^{i^2} = a^{-1}$. This is analogous to what occurs with fractional indices; for instance, $(a^1)^2 = a$; while $(a^2)^i$ is not a , but $\pm a$.

We have seen that $(\)^i$ is a periodic operation with a period 4, subject to the remark that the original complex is only one of a series that are produced by performing the operation four times. Subject to a similar remark, we may say that $(\)^z$ is a periodic operation, the period of which is n , if z is a primary n^{th} root of unity. Suppose that $z = x + iy = \cos 2\pi/n + i \sin 2\pi/n$; then

$$\begin{aligned} (r e^{i\theta})^z &= (r e^{i\theta} \cdot e^{2if\pi})^z, \text{ where } f \text{ is any integer} \\ &= r^z e^{iz\theta} \cdot e^{2ifz\pi} \\ &= r^z e^{iz\theta} \cdot e^{2ifz\pi} \cdot e^{2ig\pi}, \text{ where } g \text{ is any integer.} \end{aligned}$$

Performing the operation $()^z$ again,

$$(re^{i\theta})^{z^2} = r^{z^2} e^{iz^2\theta} \cdot e^{2ifz^2\pi} \cdot e^{2igz^2\pi} \cdot e^{2ih\pi}, \quad \text{where } h \text{ is any integer.}$$

Proceeding in this way, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (re^{i\theta})^{z^n} &= r^{z^n} e^{iz^n\theta} \cdot e^{2ifz^n\pi} \cdot e^{2igz^{n-1}\pi} \dots e^{2isz\pi} \\ &= re^{i\theta} \cdot e^{2i\pi(gz^{n-1} + hz^{n-2} + \dots + sz)}. \end{aligned}$$

The index of e in the last factor becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &2i\pi\{g\cos 2(n-1)\pi/n + h\cos 2(n-2)\pi/n + \dots + s\cos 2\pi/n\} \\ &- 2\pi\{g\sin 2(n-1)\pi/n + h\sin 2(n-2)\pi/n + \dots + s\sin 2\pi/n\} \end{aligned}$$

where $g h \dots s$ are any integers.

The preceding investigation was suggested to me by a perusal of Hayward's *Vector Algebra and Trigonometry*. In chap. 5 Mr Hayward gives the result (p. 115), $(4\cdot810475\dots)^i = i$; and this at once leads to $i^i = (4\cdot810475\dots)^{-1} = \cdot20788$. He then discusses the interpretation of A^B , where A and B are complex numbers; and shows that it has an infinite number of values, forming a series with a constant ratio; and he explains how these may be geometrically represented as derived from a "fundamental vector". He also considers several "particular cases"; but not specially the case where $B = i$, which is the one I have mostly had in view.

