# WHY $i$ IS IN EULER'S IDENTITY

ADAM HYLAND

$$e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0$$

> What's $i$ doing in there?

Rearrange first. Written as $e^{i\pi} = -1$, the question is concrete: an exponential on the left, $-1$ on the right. For real input, $e^x$ lives entirely on the positive real ray — it scales, never returns, never crosses zero. There is no real number you can put in the exponent of $e$ to produce a negative output. So $i$ is in there because the exponent has to be non-real for the equation to hold; $\pi$ names the distance at which it lands on $-1$ exactly.

> What is $i$, actually?

The reals are full of one-way operations: squaring loses sign, exp grows without return. $i$ is what you invent specifically to refuse one of those — to insist that negation has a square root. Applied twice, by definition, it produces flip; so applied four times it produces identity. $i$ has finite order in the multiplicative structure. That is the algebraic stamp of return, the precise property the reals do not carry, and it is what lets the exponential come back at a finite distance instead of running off forever.

> We can invent lots of things. Can we invent another relation between $e$ and $\pi$ that's not just $i$ again?

Any candidate you put in the exponent — anything that makes the exponential come back to a finite point at a finite real distance — has to carry, somewhere inside it, the property that applying it twice produces flip. If the new tool genuinely produces forward return, the thing inside it doing the work is the same property $i$ was invented to carry.

> Forget exp entirely. Could there be some other algebraic link between $e$ and $\pi$?

The question — whether $e$ and $\pi$ satisfy any polynomial equation with rational coefficients — is open, and the expected answer is no. Euler's identity is not such a relation; it is an exact value of the complex exponential at $i\pi$.

> Sometimes people say that sine and cosine have something to do with $i$ being in there. Why?

In this explanation, cosine and sine arrive after the fact, not before. The rotation on the unit circle is already forced by $i$; what cosine and sine do is name the location of the rotating point — its real-axis component and its imaginary-axis component at angle $x$. The familiar formula $e^{ix} = \cos x + i \sin x$ is therefore not a derivation of the rotation but a coordinate readout of it, and reading it as the explanation gets the dependency backwards. That this readout coincides with the trigonometry of right triangles is no accident: pin the hypotenuse to length one and the original triangle ratios become exactly the $x$- and $y$-coordinates of a point on the unit circle.

*Date*: April 28, 2026.